

## Expert Review of the MedECC Second Mediterranean Assessment (MAR2)

### Purpose

This note outlines the process for the Expert Review of the MedECC Second Mediterranean Assessment Report (MAR2).

### Background

Expert Review is an integral part of MedECC reports preparation. Its purpose is to ensure that the report is comprehensive, objective, and balanced. The principles governing MedECC work require the expert review process to be open and transparent, with wide participation of experts.

The external review of the First Order Draft (FOD) of MAR2 will open in July 2026 and will run for approximately eight weeks.

### Expert review registration

Following IPCC principles and procedures, the MedECC requires that the review be carried out by experts. This is not a public review and all prospective Expert Reviewers will be required to register. The online registration system for Expert Reviewers requests contact details, a description of relevant scientific and technical expertise related to the chapters that will be reviewed, a list of up to five most relevant publications, and the highest academic degree earned.

Registration requires experts to agree to maintain confidentiality.

The last date to register as a reviewer is 15 July 2026. Reviewers should register early and allow enough time to read and comment on relevant sections.

### Expert review process

To access the draft, Expert Reviewers must agree to the terms of the review, noting that all drafts and any supporting material are provided strictly for the purpose of the review and must not be cited, quoted, or distributed. Expert Reviewers may not reproduce the contents of the MAR2 draft, including in social media and other public fora.

Review comments must be provided in English, using the Excel comments sheet provided. Reviewers are encouraged to provide feedback that strengthens the scientific quality of the report, and review comments should focus on substantive issues. The report will undergo a professional copyedit before publication. Comments on typographical and other copyediting issues are not needed.

Constructive contributions include, for example, suggestions on:

- the structure, comprehensiveness, and balance of the assessment, including the appropriate use of peer-reviewed literature,
- identifying overlaps, gaps, or inconsistencies found within the assessment,
- proposed revisions of specific text, provided that supporting evidence from the literature is included,
- relevant additional papers that should be considered, provided that full citations are supplied,
- ways to shorten the text to meet page constraints without the loss of relevant information,
- improving the presentation of material through more effective graphics or tables.

When reviewing the report, please recall that the assessment may not go beyond the scope of the agreed outline and that authors are required to work within page length constraints to present a concise assessment of current knowledge, not a scientific review.

All review comments submitted during the formal expert and government reviews, together with the author team's responses to those comments, will be made available upon request after the publication of the report. Review comments will not be anonymous.

Expert Reviewers will be recognised for their important contribution, with their name, affiliation, and country of residence included in the Annex of Reviewers to the published report.