

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

Annalisa Theodorou<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Sapienza University of Rome

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

The paper proposes a new theory to predict preparedness behavior regarding hurricanes. The article is well-written and clearly explains the proposed model, trying to fill an important literature gap. There are some thoughts and comments that I would like to share, and I hope could help.

First, I think that the paper could benefit from a part in the introduction in which the choice of the 23 theories is justified, namely why they were chosen and not others. Second, I think that a stronger rationale for the need for a new model could strengthen the claims made in the article. There are other protective behaviors theories (many of them within the 23 cited for example) that could explain preparedness. Also considering that it is not clear to me what makes it a model of hurricane preparedness. I think that the way in which the theory is formulated can be generally applied to different kinds of preparedness (e.g., flood, earthquake) as it is also stated in the final part of the article, and the specificities of hurricane preparedness are not clearly highlighted. Third, I think that, as a theoretical paper, it could benefit from some previous evidence that could support the new theory (also vs. previous theories). Previous results could be interpreted in light of the new theory to strengthen the claims made in the article. Fourth, I think that, in the explanation of the new model, it could be stated more clearly how each construct is based on each of the theories mentioned.

Lastly, in the final part of the article, some indications for theory testing are listed that involve only cross-sectional designs. I think that, for a new theory to be established and verified, much more sound designs should be employed such as experimental designs (assessing causality) and longitudinal designs (monitoring dynamics over time).

Some minor points:

- Consider adding a table in which each construct is connected to the previous theories could help the reader follow the model explanation.
- It is not clear to me why the peripheral route in knowledge seeking involves observing others and not, for instance, listening to experts (trustworthiness of the source) or other kinds of attributes of the source or the message, according to ELM.
- I think that, in the model, there could be other influences of personality, for instance on information seeking and self-monitoring.

In conclusion, I hope my comments could be useful and many congratulations for the work.

