OPEN ACCESS

Check for updates

For numbered affiliations see end of article.

Correspondence to: C Zielinski
CZielinski@ippnw.org

Cite this as: *BMJ* 2026;395:e101273
http://doi.org/10.1136/bmj-2026-101273

Critical condition: what are we doing about nuclear war?

Health professionals must ensure discussions on nuclear risk maintain a health focus

Kamran Abbasi, [1] Parveen Ali, [2] Virginia Barbour, [3] Marion Birch, [4] Matthew Bivens, [5] Inga Blum, [6] Francisco Javier Bonilla-Escobar, [7] Richard Horton, [8] Kati Juva, [6] Jose F Lapena, [9] Elena N Naumova, [10] Tilman Ruff, [6] Peush Sahni, [11] Olga Trushina, [6] James Tumwine, [12] Tiago Villanueva, [13] Paul Yonga, [14] Chris Zielinski[15]

Editorials on nuclear risk and health appeared in over 150 leading health journals in 2023 and 2025.[1 2] Why, then, are we publishing a new series of editorials on the subject?

Tensions affecting the planet have become extreme. Nuclear sabre rattling has been heard in Russia and Ukraine, India and Pakistan, and Iran, Israel, and the United States and intensified over much of the globe. Nuclear arsenals carrying the instruments of death have been modernised, upgraded, and expanded. In 2025, the nuclear armed states—China, France, India, Israel, North Korea, Pakistan, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States—spent just under $119bn, or $3768 per second, on their nuclear arsenals, an increase of 19% from the previous year.[3] The Doomsday clock is inexorably approaching midnight.[4]

Nuclear armed states collectively hold more than 12 000 nuclear warheads.[5] Given the number of cities on the planet, it may seem that the world could survive a fullscale nuclear war. But this is not the case. Urban sprawl links everyone: about 2.8 billion people (30% of the world's population) live in 33 megacities.[6] In fact, it would take very few bombs to kill billions directly and then bring about abrupt global cooling in a nuclear winter that would kill billions more from ensuing famine.[7]

Today's climate models show that even a "small" nuclear war would have far more catastrophic effects on world climate and food supplies than previously thought.[7] These models have begun to look at what would happen to our ozone and what the effects of increased ultraviolet radiation would be on crops[8] but as yet do not account for disruption of agricultural labour and food transport, storage, and distribution; disruption of agricultural inputs, including fuel, machinery, parts, seed, fertiliser, and pesticides; contamination of croplands; or wider political and economic unrest. Modern civilization could not survive even a small nuclear war, while using just 2-3% of the weapons we currently possess could cause billions to die, mostly from starvation.

The imperative to pull back from the brink has pushed the multilateral system into action. In late 2024, the United Nations (UN) General Assembly, declaring itself "alarmed at the renewed prospect of nuclear war, and gravely concerned by the catastrophic humanitarian and environmental consequences that would result," voted to initiate a comprehensive review of current knowledge about the consequences of nuclear war.[9] The UN secretary general appointed a 21 member independent scientific panel to prepare a report, which is due in 2027.

In 2025, thanks to global pressure (including our last editorial[2]), the World Health Assembly voted to update obsolete World Health Organization (WHO) studies on the public health effects of nuclear war.[10] A new WHO report is due in 2029. In March 2026, WHO staff were reported as being "vigilant in the event of a nuclear incident" in relation to the war on Iran.[11]

Together, the forthcoming reports of the UN and WHO represent the first major international reassessments of the effects of nuclear war by these bodies in nearly 40 years.

Meanwhile, work on top level international nuclear treaties has intensified. In 2017, an overwhelming majority of the world's nations adopted a global agreement to ban nuclear weapons, known officially as the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons (TPNW).[12] The treaty entered into force in January 2021 and, to date, 75 countries have become "states parties" legally bound to it, and a further 26 have signed it.[13] However, as we approach the first TPNW review conference, to be held in New York at the end of 2026, none of the nine states with nuclear weapons has signed or ratified the treaty, although pressure for them to do so is growing.

The principal focus of those in favour of nuclear weapons is that they prevent nuclear war through nuclear deterrence: nuclear weapons are presumed to provide "strategic stability" among the states that possess them, since nobody wants to escalate quarrels into a nuclear war. However, deterrence creates a form of security, or merely a feeling of security, that remains fragile, asymmetric, dependent on the permanent threat of catastrophe, and blind to the needs of non-nuclear states.

Insights from psychology and neuroscience suggest that decisions about nuclear weapons are not "rational," as deterrence implies, but are likely to be shaped by mental shortcuts, statistical reasoning errors, and slight changes in decision contexts.[14 15] All of these may lower the threshold regarding the use of nuclear weapons and lead to an irrational reluctance to abandon vast nuclear arsenals that are more than sufficient to end human civilisation. Humanity's survival is thus in the hands of a few fallible decision makers. A future editorial will address evidence from neurobiology and cognitive and social psychology.

Apart from geopolitical developments, the world is witnessing the growing impact of technology on war—artificial intelligence used in profiling and targeting, drones, and other delivery technology[16 17]—accompanied by the rise of "infodemics" of misinformation and disinformation,[18 19] which raise the likelihood of nuclear weapons accidents and have their own effect on health. We will be considering these information disorders in another future editorial.

Health professionals have a vital role in keeping a health focus in public discussions on nuclear risk. We need a verifiable, deadline driven agreement to eliminate all nuclear weapons. This is why it is essential that the health sector continues to demand that every country—including the nuclear weapon states—should join the TPNW. The flourishing, and even the survival, of the human species is at stake.

AUTHOR AFFILIATIONS

1 The BMJ, UK
2 International Nursing Review, UK
3 Medical Journal of Australia, Australia
4 Medicine, Conflict and Survival, UK
5 Harvard Medical School, USA
6 International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War
7 International Journal of Medical Students, USA
8 Lancet, UK
9 Philippine Journal of Otolaryngology, Head and Neck Surgery, Philippines
10 Journal of Public Health Policy, USA
11 National Medical Journal of India, India
12 African Health Sciences, Uganda
13 Acta Médica Portuguesa, Portugal
14 East African Medical Journal, Kenya
15 University of Winchester, Winchester, UK

This editorial is being co-published with other journals. A full list of participating journals is available at www.bmj.com/content/full-list-authors-and-signatories-critical-condition-editorial-november-2026

Competing interests: The BMJ has judged that there are no disqualifying ties to commercial companies. The authors declare no other interests.

Provenance and peer review: Not commissioned; not externally peer reviewed.

AI use: No AI was used in writing this article.

1 Abbasi K, Ali P, Barbour V, etal. Reducing the risks of nuclear war. *BMJ* 2023; 382:p1682. doi: 10.1136/bmj.p1682. pmid: 37527852
2 Abbasi K, Ali P, Barbour V, etal. Ending nuclear weapons, before they end us. *BMJ* 2025;389:. pmid: 40360204. doi: 10.1136/bmj.r881
3 International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN). Premeditated: nuclear weapons spending in 2025: report. 2026. https://assets.nationbuilder.com/ican/pages/13703/attachments/original/1780950756/ICAN_Spending_Report_2026_web.pdf
4 Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists. Doomsday clock. 2026. https://thebulletin.org/doomsday-clock/
5 Arms Control Association. Nuclear weapons: who has what at a glance. 2026. https://www.armscontrol.org/factsheets/nuclear-weapons-who-has-what-glance
6 United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. World urbanization prospects 2025: summary of results. UN DESA/POP/2025/TR/NO. 12. 2025. https://desapublications.un.org/publications/world-urbanization-prospects-2025-summary-results
7 Xia L, Robock A, Scherrer K, etal. Global food insecurity and famine from reduced crop, marine fishery and livestock production due to climate disruption from nuclear war soot injection. *Nat Food* 2022;3:-96. pmid: 37118594. doi: 10.1038/s43016-022-00573-0
8 Shi Y, Montes F, Di Gioia F, etal. Adapting agriculture to climate catastrophes: the nuclear winter case. *Environ Res Lett* 2025;20:. doi: 10.1088/1748-9326/adcfb5
9 United Nations. Nuclear war effects and scientific research. Resolution A/C.1/79/L.39. 2024. https://docs.un.org/en/A/C.1/79/L.39
10 World Health Organization. Effects of nuclear war on public health. World Health Assembly resolution WHA78.28. 2025. https://apps.who.int/gb/ebwha/pdf_files/WHA78/A78_R28-en.pdf
11 Lubin R. WHO officials admit they are preparing for possible nuclear weapon use in Iran. Independent 19 Mar 2026. https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/us-politics/iran-nuclear-weapons-who-warning-b2941153.html
12 United Nations. Treaty on the prohibition of nuclear weapons. 2017. https://treaties.un.org/pages/viewdetails.aspx?chapter=26&clang=_en&mtdsg_no=xxvi-9&src=treaty
13 International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN). TPNW signature and ratification status. 2026 . https://www.icanw.org/signature_and_ratification_status
14 Slovic P, Peterson M, McDermott R, etal. When our minds go nuclear: rethinking nuclear strategy through the psychology of risk and decision-making. *Texas Natl Secur Rev* 2026;9:-27. doi: 10.1353/tns.00038.
15 Landau-Wells M. Building from the brain: advancing the study of threat perception in international relations. *Int Organ* 2024;78:-67. doi: 10.1017/S0020818324000328
16 Kirichenko D. Artificial intelligence's growing role in modern warfare. War Room 21 Aug 2025. https://warroom.armywarcollege.edu/articles/ais-growing-role/
17 Bhardwaj S. Killer robots, drone swarms, and deepfakes: how AI is running modern warfare. Open 8 Mar 2026. https://openthemagazine.com/world/killer-robots-drone-swarms-and-deep-fakes-how-ai-is-running-modern-warfare
18 Zielinski C. Infodemics and infodemiology: a short history, a long future. *Rev Panam Salud Publica* 2021;45:e40. pmid: 33995517. doi: 10.26633/RPSP.2021.40
19 Rodrigues F, Newell R, Rathnaiah Babu G, etal. The social media infodemic of health-related misinformation and technical solutions. *Health Policy Technol* 2024;13:. doi: 10.1016/j.hlpt.2024.100846

This is an Open Access article distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution Non Commercial (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which permits others to distribute, remix, adapt, build upon this work non-commercially, and license their derivative works on different terms, provided the original work is properly cited and the use is non-commercial. See: http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/.