

Review of: "Toward a comprehensive behavioral model of hurricane preparedness: The Protective Behavior Model"

Zhi-Xiong Mao¹

¹ Beijing Sport University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Strong points: The topic is very realistic, and the factors considered by PBM are very comprehensive. It really makes sense. It is a starting point for doing empirical verification in the future. The following suggestions might be taken into the authors' further consideration.

1) "2. Literature review" lists many theories, but there are few cues leading to your final theory. Giving a "hint" of which framework or variable you want to adopt would be even better.

2) better to name the three phases of PBM. As the framework of PBM is built according to the Stages of Change (SOC), it might be necessary to consider whether these 3 stages are in line with different stages or different levels.

3) "3. The Protective Behavior Model (PBM)" only showed which theories or models the structure come from, but still needs to explain why they are adopted.

4) Structure "13. Self-efficacy" may not shape from "enough knowledge about a certain behavior" in accordance with Albert Bandura's self-efficacy theory. Please also be suggested to refer to the health action process approach (HAPA), which believes that different self-efficacies play a role at different stages (Schwarzer & Luszczynska, 2008).

5) The relationships between structures need to be fully explained, e.g. structure 3 (important life experience) affects structure 13 (self-efficacy), why.

6) The more concise a theoretical framework, the better, as more as 19 psychological constructs needs to be simplified from this point of view.

Reference

Schwarzer, R., & Luszczynska, A. (2008). How to overcome health-compromising behaviors: The health action process approach. *European Psychologist*, 13(2), 141-151. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040.13.2.141>