

## Peer Review

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

Kathleen Turmaine<sup>1,2</sup>

1. ECEVE, Inserm, Paris, France; 2. Université Paris Cité, Paris, France

## Presentation

This paper synthesises research on the defining features of successful health promotion campaigns and proposes recommendations for future development. It pays particular attention to cultural contexts and gender norms, while discussing a wide range of communication channels and tools, from print media to digital formats, that are likely to shape future health communication efforts. The discussion of disinformation and persistent inequalities in access is especially timely, and the inclusion of examples (smoking cessation, mental health) helps ground the argument.

Overall, the manuscript offers an engaging and relevant perspective on contemporary campaign design, notably in its focus on cultural dimensions and evolving digital environments.

## Major Comments

### 1. Structural organisation

The manuscript touches on many important dimensions of modern health promotion campaigns: digital transformation, audience engagement, cultural responsiveness, misinformation, equity, and sustainability. These are all highly pertinent.

However, as the discussion progresses, these themes tend to reappear across several sections (characteristics, recommendations, campaign types, challenges, and evaluation), sometimes at different analytical levels. This makes the overall structure somewhat difficult to follow. Concepts such as

evaluation, community engagement, and multi-channel strategies are introduced more than once under different headings.

A clearer reorganisation of the manuscript (perhaps by more explicitly separating foundational principles, design strategies, implementation approaches, and evaluation processes) would greatly improve readability and coherence.

## 2. Conceptual delineation

Related to the structural issue above, some conceptual boundaries would benefit from clarification. In Section I, for instance, the distinction between “evidence-based approaches” and “audience-centred strategies” is not always fully clear. Likewise, the relationship between “cultural comparisons” and “cultural sensitivity” could be articulated more precisely.

Community engagement is another concept that appears across several sections; clarifying how it fits within the broader framework would strengthen analytical consistency. A slightly more detailed explanation of how such engagement is operationalised in practice would also be helpful.

## 3. Methods

The narrative review design is appropriate given the paper’s conceptual aims. That said, providing a bit more detail on the literature search process (such as timeframe, rationale for database selection, or inclusion criteria) would enhance transparency. It would also be useful to clarify whether the synthesis should be understood primarily as a structured literature review or as an expert-informed perspective.

## Minor comments

p.3 (“Evidence-Based Approaches”) – Could you clarify what is meant by “underdeveloped nations” in this context?

p.4 (“Audience-Centred Strategies”) – The discussion of gain- versus loss-framed messaging would benefit from further specification. Under what conditions (e.g., type of behaviour, audience characteristics) is each approach most effective?

Smoking cessation is a helpful recurring example. Including a wider range of case illustrations could further strengthen the generalisability of the argument.

The ACME framework is a useful addition. Clarifying how it relates to the earlier section on campaign characteristics would improve structural alignment.

## **Declarations**

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.