

Review of: "Design of an Educational Campaign Based on the Theory of Planned Behavior to Encourage People to Donate Organs: A Study Protocol"

Sajjad Rostamzadeh¹

¹ Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear Chief Editor

Thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to read and review this manuscript. I thank the authors for taking the time to conduct this study. The paper is a worthy contribution to the design of an educational intervention based on the theory of planned behavior (TPB) to encourage people over 18 years old to become organ donors. This article has sufficient writing and scientific structure in presenting the content. I enjoyed reading this study and congratulate its authors on this scientific achievement. The following clarifications/additions, however, are suggested prior to publication.

Abstract: Good

Introduction:

- References in the "Introduction" section do not follow the same format as the "Guidelines for Authors". For example, some are presented in parentheses and others as superscript.
- In the sentence "According to the theory of planned behavior (TPB), intention to perform a behavior is predicted by three factors (Knowledge, Attitudes, Intention towards behavior, Behavior, Subjective norms, Normative beliefs, Control beliefs, and Perceived behavioral control)"; the authors have mentioned more than three factors. Is it possible to fix this inconsistency?
- It is necessary for the authors to increase the level of fluency and coordination of the sentences presented in the paragraphs of this section.
- It is necessary for the authors to use the appropriate verbs in expressing the content of each section (for example, "will" in the entire text is completely inappropriate and out of the scope of writing scientific articles).

Materials and Methods:

- In order to avoid repeating the contents in different sections of this manuscript, the authors are requested to remove the two sections "**2.1. Aim**" and "**2.2. Research hypotheses**" from this section. It is better to integrate the material presented in this section in the last paragraph of the introduction section.
- In the sentence "The campaign logo was also designed during a call (logo design contest). The campaign logo was chosen from 20 submitted works, in a meeting and based on the majority of votes (Figure 1)"; What criteria did the

experts pay attention to in choosing the logo? How was the selection of these criteria made?

- It is suggested that the sections “[2.3.3. Sampling method](#)”, “[2.3.4. Inclusion criteria](#)”, and “[2.3.5. Exclusion criteria](#)” be inserted as a section with the title “**[Sampling and subjects](#)**”.
- The section “**[2.3.7. Validity and Reliability](#)**” needs to be rewritten because it does not have the necessary fluency in expressing the content.
- It is necessary for the authors to use the appropriate verbs in expressing the content of each section (for example, “**will**” in the entire text is completely inappropriate and out of the scope of writing scientific articles).
- The authors have provided information about the sampling method in two sections “**[2.3.3. Sampling method](#)**” and “**[2.3.11. Sample size](#)**”. Please merge these two sections and mention the sample size formula along with its reference.
- In the “**[2.3.11. Sample size](#)**” section, it is stated that the cluster sampling method was used, while in the “**[2.3.3. Sampling method](#)**” section, the authors stated that the sampling was done randomly. Please explain or resolve this inconsistency and conflict.
- “**Data analysis**” section; Please edit this section for grammar.

Results:

- Don't the authors decide to present the findings of their study in a separate section (results)? This section seems to be missing!

Discussions:

- It is necessary to evaluate and edit this section in terms of grammar. For example, the authors have used the future tense in their sentences (this problem can also be seen in the whole text).
- The text does not provide more information about the evaluated or studied variables.

Conclusions:

- Authors should add an independent section titled "Conclusion" to this study.

Sincerely

Sajjad Rostamzadeh