

Peer Review Report

Review Report on How Message frames promote people's willingness to get vaccinated? The mediation role of perceived net benefits

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Ziqiang Han

Submitted on: 09 Oct 2022

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2022.1605232

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

This study investigated the egoism-, altruism-, and loss-framed information on perceived net benefits, willingness to receive a Covid-19 vaccine. The results demonstrated that the experimental groups exhibited stronger vaccination willingness, higher PNB was associated with enhanced vaccination willingness.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

The limitation: the sample is relatively small, and the sampling method is not clear.

The strength: survey experimental study

Q 3 Please provide your detailed review report to the authors. The editors prefer to receive your review structured in major and minor comments. Please consider in your review the methods (statistical methods valid and correctly applied (e.g. sample size, choice of test), is the study replicable based on the method description?), results, data interpretation and references. If there are any objective errors, or if the conclusions are not supported, you should detail your concerns.

This is a good study with clear writing. Here are some suggestions:

1. The sampling procedure should be reported more clearer. Credamo is just a survey platform. Did the authors use the Credamo database, using a random sampling method? Or just convenience sampling methods by themselves? The sampling procedure should be detailly documented, and a convincing sampling method is OK.
2. Since the authors included a mediation analysis, presented the mediation effect in a graph.
3. Though most public health journals do not have strict theory requirements, the authors can strength the theory discussions in both the Introduction and Discussion sections.

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Yes

Q 5 Are the keywords appropriate?

Yes

Q 6 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes

Q 7 Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

Yes.

Q 8 Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?)

Yes

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 9 Originality

Q 10 Rigor

Q 11 Significance to the field

Q 12 Interest to a general audience

Q 13 Quality of the writing

Q 14 Overall scientific quality of the study

REVISION LEVEL

Q 15 Please make a recommendation based on your comments:

Minor revisions.