

Peer Review

Review of: "Designing Health Communication Campaigns for the Next Decade"

Julia Zielke¹

1. Charité Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Berlin, Germany

This is a great topic, and I generally encourage more work along these lines, but I must admit I stopped reading after page 7 because I had a strong suspicion that the work was AI-generated. When I ran this through an AI detector, it suggested a 99% chance of AI generation. There is no deep focus, and it feels like a piecemeal of different components that lack a red thread or a wider analytical or theoretical framework. I would therefore reject the paper unless an AI statement is included and a clear independent, theory-driven voice is identified. My comments until page 7 are as follows:

In general, the individual sections don't really flow and seem a bit separate from one another. Can you add connectors between the sections (i.e., sentences that show how one topic leads into the next one)?

In the introduction, explain a bit more in depth what you will do in this paper and what the overall aim, approach, and research question are. I want to understand what exactly will happen in this paper here. Also, highlight your unique contribution to the literature.

You can also frame your introduction with a general push towards more DEI in health. Try to find a supporting source like the WHO or APHA to support the wider relevance of gender-sensitive health communication.

One area for improvement is the methodology chapter. While I understand that "Literature selection was guided by relevance to the conceptual focus of the review rather than strict inclusion or exclusion criteria," it is not clear to me how that relevance was assessed. Can you define some kind of matrix by which to guide relevance? Is there a reason you did not use PubMed or other databases? It is not clear why the two databases you mentioned are bolded. What about forward tracing or other ways of identifying relevant literature? Please cite at least one reference on conducting a narrative review that supports your

approach. Here is a possible one that may help you to make your methods section more rigorous
<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9380636/>

p. 3. There is also a call for theory-informed interventions/communication campaigns, e.g., those based on theories of hegemonic masculinities.

pp. 3. Can you integrate the case study more into the text? A picture could be nice, too, if possible.

p. 4, in the section “cultural comparison,” try to avoid absolute language. Instead of “campaigns that highlight the advantages of the family and the community are more successful in societies that place a high priority on communal values,” change to “campaigns that highlight the advantages of the family and the community **tend to be**/appear to be more successful in societies that place a high priority on communal values.” Please change this throughout the paper.

p. 7, “according to studies” – be precise here; you only list one article here.

p. 7, “combining conventional and contemporary communication techniques guarantees inclusion and improves ...” – again, try to avoid this absolute kind of language. Better: “is generally regarded as best practice” or “shows good results in this study (reference).”

p. 7, Section C – what about different languages? Is this part of cultural sensitivity? Please cover this.

There is also a lot of health communication that focuses on neurodiverse patients, or patients who struggle to read, etc. Can you find an example here? In general, I would suggest that you consider an intersectional lens for improving health communications.

The focus on smoking cessation comes as a surprise. Wouldn't it be worth thinking about just focusing on smoking cessation as an example of gender-sensitive health communication? If so, this needs to be reflected in your introduction and title. I think your paper could become stronger if it had a specific focus and avoided generalising or making unspecific remarks about health communication (which is in itself so diverse).

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.