

Peer Review

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

Jen Peterson¹

1. Psychology, University of Alaska, United States

I appreciate the author taking the time to address this important topic. This paper explores an issue that could make a meaningful contribution to the field. I recommend extensive revisions, particularly with a clearer stated goal.

The overall topic has been covered extensively; however, the author brings together some unique ideas that, if updated and streamlined, would make a valuable contribution.

Here are my comments for revision:

Overall Comments:

The overall writing style is vague. The document feels pieced together and does not flow in a cohesive manner. The paper lacks necessary transitions between topics in many areas.

Your paper is missing several studies that I am familiar with that fit very well with your topic. I could not deduce from your method how you chose your articles, and it seems that you may have missed some strong examples to support your point.

Instead of trying to focus on everything needed for successful health promotion, consider discussing how the various demographics utilize differing technologies and include examples. This would include the key message of the need for gender and cultural sensitivity and would remove much of the “clutter” from your paper.

Introduction:

The introduction needs streamlining so that the direction of the paper is clear.

At the end of the introduction, the statement “...this paper contends that successful health communication campaigns will need to incorporate culturally relevant messaging, emerging media technologies, and a thorough understanding of target populations, particularly with regard to gender roles and cultural differences.” does not clearly represent everything that is presented in the document.

Methodology:

What constitutes “influential theoretical perspectives,” and how was this determined? What qualified as a “landmark campaign evaluation”?

There are many terms used in the methodology that are not operationally defined. This section lacks clarity.

The process for choosing journal articles is unclear.

Why did you use Google Scholar?

Page 2: What “cutting-edge” technology are you referring to? The only specific technology mentioned in the introduction was telehealth and digital health tools. This line of the paragraph is very dramatic and vague at the same time.

The meaning of this lead-in is unclear.

“The changing environment also emphasizes the importance of cultural sensitivity since various cultural groups have an impact on health behaviors and how people react to health messaging.”

I. Characteristics of Effective Health Communication Campaigns

This section would benefit from additional case studies and/or examples.

II. Cultural Comparisons and III. Recommendations for Campaign Design and Implementation

These sections are where the organization of the paper becomes very disjointed, and new topics are introduced that were not part of the original thesis of the paper. The discussion includes program evaluation, program feedback, and the inclusion of social media influencers.

IV. Focus on Specific Campaign Types

The examples throughout the paper are very engaging, but there should be examples to represent all of the areas you have discussed.

Again, your idea is solid, and all of this is essential in promoting health in these populations. I hope you will revise your paper so that it has the impact this topic deserves.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.