

Review of: "Interrogating the Role of Opinion Leaders in Media's COVID-19 Awareness Campaign to Mass Audience"

Pilar Lacasa¹

¹ Universidad de Alcalá de Henares

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This paper suggests relevant questions in a world where the media are essential in people's daily lives. The information transmitted through them influences the decisions people make. The situation generated by COVID, which the article takes as an object of study, allows us to analyze the relationships between three axes of the communicative process: messages, audiences, and transmitters. Whoever reads the study begins to ask questions about these three axes and their influence on people's lives. But the reader immediately understands that there was not just one message, homogeneous audience, or single transmitter. We are facing an event in which context plays a decisive role.

It is precisely a certain lack of definition of this context that is the study's main limitation. It needs to be made clear who the message's senders or audiences are. More concretely: What are the messages, at least through some precise examples? What did people receive? Have they been asked about it? To what extent did the government generate messages modified or contextualized by the media?

In this context, the originality of the work lies in posing COVID-19 as the core of a communicative process that affects people's lives. Greater data collection and processing rigor would be necessary for the work to be truly significant in the field.

I will now focus on specific parts of the study. As for the introduction, which provides the framework as a starting point for the research, it would be necessary to connect the three parts in which the information is presented: 1) What is Covid? 2) The author proposed a model to understand communication. 3) The HBM model The Health Belief Model (HBM).

Considering methods, the data come from a questionnaire filled out online. More information on the respondents would be needed. Although a map of Nigeria is provided, how the map's content relates to the population that answered the questionnaire needs to be clarified. In addition, the fact that the questionnaire is not provided makes it difficult to interpret the results. For example, were the responses intended to be in the first person, and were they asking for a general opinion?

Regarding the graphs relevant to understanding the results, entering the total in the figures is distorting. On the other hand, concerning the data provided, the relationship between the appendix tables, presented as an annex, and the results obtained and analyzed needs to be better explained.

The conclusions are clear and focus on the essential messages.

