

Peer Review

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

Himika Akram¹

1. Department of Communication, University of Kentucky, United States

This paper offers an easy-to-follow overview of how health communication has changed over time. It brings together traditional communication approaches with newer digital strategies, showing how cultural sensitivity and ideas about masculinity can influence behavior change. By discussing current topics such as eHealth, influencer marketing, and social listening, the paper feels up-to-date and useful for both researchers and professionals working in the field.

The good parts of this paper are -

The "unique selling point" of this paper is its gender aspect. Most papers just say "be culturally sensitive," but you actually dive into the *psychology* of masculinity. Using stoicism and the "provider" role as a tool for health (rather than just a barrier) is a sophisticated take.

Secondly, the paper does not fall into the trap of thinking digital replaces everything. The defense of traditional media (radio/TV) for rural equity is grounded and realistic.

The flow is logical. The writing moves from the "what" (characteristics) to the "how" (recommendations) to the "safeguards" (evaluation).

Now there are some weak points as well. Such as, It's 2026. A paper about the "next decade" of communication that doesn't deeply address Generative AI feels slightly dated. You mention "data analytics," but you should address how AI can now generate thousands of *hyper-personalized* messages in seconds. This is the biggest shift in the field since the smartphone.

The Methodology is a bit "thin." A "narrative review" is fine, but you need to be clearer about your boundaries. Why these specific case studies? Without a defined date range or "inclusion criteria," this looks like a "cherry-picked" list rather than a rigorous review.

Lastly, misinformation has been identified as a problem, but the author's solution is mostly "provide better info." In the current landscape, that's often not enough. You might want to mention "pre-bunking" (teaching people how to spot lies before they see them) or active "social listening" tools.

Overall, this paper is well-organized and clearly written, and it makes a valuable contribution to health communication research, especially through its discussion of gender and culture. The paper is easy to understand, up to date, and useful for real-world practice. To make it stronger, the author should include a deeper discussion of generative AI, explain more clearly how the sources for the review were selected, and go beyond simply providing information when addressing misinformation.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.