Peer Review Report

Review Report on Effect of health intervention via web-based education on improving Information-Motivation-Behavioral skills related to HPV vaccination among Chinese female college students

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Xizhu Xiao

EVALUATION

Q 1 **Please summarize the main findings of the study.**

The study examines the effectiveness of a web-based education in improving HPV vaccination related outcomes.

Q 2 **Please highlight the limitations and strengths.**

Strength: the study examines the HPV vaccination promotion in the context of China, while majority of current research focus on Western contexts.

Limitations: lack of uniqueness. The authors did not specify the uniqueness of the intervention that differentiates itself from other interventions examined in prior research.

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 timely topic and an interesting study. However, the study lacks crucial details in the introduction and research methods. Therefore, the manuscript in the current form is not suitable for publication.

Introduction
– The authors should outline the importance of this study and how this study is different from other similar research both in China and other cultural contexts. Now it seems that the "why" part is largely missing. We understand that HPV vaccination promotion is an urgent issue in China but we don't understand why testing this particular intervention is imperative at the moment. For example, what's special about this intervention? Is this intervention designed under the guidance of IMB (merely using IMB measures is not enough). Does this intervention apply theories that could further enrich our understanding regarding HPV vaccination promotion? How does this intervention differ from other interventions or whether it contains similarities that have been tested in prior research. The authors should elaborate on these "whys" in detail.

Methods
– Relatedly, the description of the intervention is way too perfunctory. What is the content of this intervention? Please also provide details as an appendix.
– It seems that the study does not control for the vaccination status. How many people have already been vaccinated or started the vaccine series? How does this influence the outcome?
– The authors should provide reliability and validity results of each measure in the method section. Please also include a table of complete measurement items

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?

No.

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:

Major revisions.