Review of: "Government Communication and Behavioral Change amidst COVID-19: Role of Awareness and Fear & Panic"

Sanjeev M A

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Article Title: Review of: Government Communication and Behavioral Change amidst COVID-19: Role of Awareness and Fear & Panic.

The article deals with a very relevant subject – Health communication, during the Covid pandemic, and is well conceived. However, the following needs to be considered before its final acceptance and publication

1. The article should be language edited as it contains many grammatical errors.
2. The text also needs to be reorganized to make it more comprehensive and interesting to the readers.
3. The literature review should be separated from the introduction (unless specified by the journal standards/ format) and the last section may be dedicated to the need for the research
4. The RM section is weak. The Research design descriptions are very vague and exhibits a lack of understanding of the various research designs. The section needs significant improvement also in the sampling and data design descriptions too.
5. In the results section – the authors should also indicate the dropped items and their loadings (they should mention the complete item instead of its numbers). Dropping of items with less than 0.5 looks a bit stringent considering the fact that there were more than 300 participants in the survey.
6. The authors should also calculate and present the predictive power of the model (sample size required to have a statistically significant results). The same may be done through any number of free online tools like one at danielsoper.com.
7. The research model is silent on the relation between GC & F&P. I feel, FP will be a mediating variable between GC & BC and also between GC-CA & BC. Else, it might have a mediated moderation kind of role and the same needs to be investigated.
8. The authors can present only the path analysis in the second figure from SEM results (fig 3). Now it is too cluttered (i.e. separate the presentation of the measurement and structural model.
9. The F&P construct has only 2 items, whereas SEM specifies at least three items for every latent construct. How do the researchers justify the same?
10. The result table 4 may be done away with (provided the complete item is mentioned in the result table 1).
11. 11. The result of the effect of F&P on BC looks +ve as per table 5. How did the authors mention it as 'negative influence'? (in the discussion)

12. What is the construct 'AC_FP' in the structural model (which is having a –ve relationship to BC). If it is some interaction effect, the same should be included in the research model itself.
13. Might include a section of implication.
14. Should include a section on limitation.