



Revue rapide version 1 : Quelles sont les meilleures pratiques en matière de communication des risques et de stratégies visant à réduire les comportements à risques?

Préparé par : Centre de collaboration nationale des méthodes et outils

Date: 12 mars 2021

Citation proposée :

Centre de collaboration nationale des méthodes et outils. (2021). *Quelles sont les meilleures pratiques en matière de communication des risques et de stratégies visant à réduire les comportements à risques?* <https://www.nccmt.ca/knowledge-repositories/covid-19-rapid-evidence-service>.

Veillez noter : Cette revue a peut-être été mise à jour. Consultez la version la plus récente de cette revue en visitant le Service rapide de données probantes sur la COVID-19 du Centre de collaboration nationale des méthodes et outils, au lien ci-dessus.

© 2021. Centre de collaboration nationale des méthodes et outils, Université McMaster. Tous droits réservés.

Le Centre de collaboration nationale des méthodes et outils (CCNMO) est hébergé par l'Université McMaster et financé par l'Agence de la santé publique du Canada. Les vues exprimées dans ce document ne représentent pas nécessairement celles de l'Agence de la santé publique du Canada.

Cette revue a été rendue possible par un soutien financier de nib Health. Ce bailleur de fonds n'a joué aucun rôle dans la collecte ou l'interprétation des données.

Cette revue rapide est destinée à des fins d'information générale seulement. Les renseignements qui figurent dans le présent revue rapide sont fournis « en l'état » et l'Université McMaster ne fait aucune garantie, promesse et/ou représentation de quelque nature que ce soit, expresse ou implicite, quant à la nature, la norme, l'exactitude, l'exhaustivité, la fiabilité ou autre des renseignements fournis dans le présent revue rapide, ni quant à la pertinence ou autre des renseignements par rapport à des circonstances particulières. L'Université McMaster n'accepte aucune responsabilité quant à l'exactitude, au contenu, à l'exhaustivité, à la légalité, à la fiabilité ou à l'utilisation des renseignements contenus dans le présent revue rapide.

Les auteurs déclarent n'avoir aucun conflit d'intérêts à divulguer.

Résumé

Contexte

Alors que les États continuent de lutter contre la maladie à coronavirus 2019 (COVID-19), y compris contre de récents variants préoccupants, le respect des mesures de santé publique recommandées, comme la distanciation physique, l'hygiène des mains et le port du masque, sera déterminant pour réduire le fardeau de la maladie à coronavirus 2019 (COVID-19) et prévenir sa propagation afin de protéger les plus vulnérables. Un sujet de plus en plus préoccupant est le relâchement du respect des individus envers ces mesures. Ce relâchement peut être en partie attribué à la confusion et au manque de clarté entourant les changements dans les recommandations, alors que plusieurs mesures sont levées pour être ensuite réintroduites. Pour aider à contrôler la propagation, il faut une communication efficace de la part des responsables gouvernementaux, médecins, des organisations de santé publique locales et d'autres leaders de la communauté.

Cette revue rapide a été produite pour soutenir la réponse de l'Agence de la santé publique du Canada à la pandémie de coronavirus 2019 (COVID-19). Cette revue vise à recenser, évaluer et résumer les nouvelles données de recherche à l'appui de la prise de décision fondée sur des données probantes.

Cette revue se fonde sur les données probantes issues de la recherche les plus récentes auxquelles il était possible d'avoir accès au moment de sa publication. Une version précédente a été terminée le 8 octobre 2020. Cette version mise à jour inclut les données probantes disponibles au 12 février 2021 pour répondre à la question suivante : **Quelles sont les meilleures pratiques en matière de communication des risques et de stratégies visant à réduire les comportements à risques?**

Qu'est-ce qui a changé dans cette version?

- Quatre nouvelles synthèses portant sur des domaines autres que la COVID-19 ont été ajoutées. La pertinence de ces résultats pour le contexte de la COVID-19 est inconnue.
- De nouvelles données probantes spécifiques à la COVID-19 sont apparues dans cette mise à jour, tirées de six nouvelles études uniques. Ces études offrent davantage de précisions quant aux caractéristiques des porte-parole efficaces, comme des médecins pour certaines populations.
- Les principaux éléments demeurent cohérents.

Point Clés

- Dans plusieurs domaines, la littérature portant sur la communication des risques souligne l'importance de messages clairs, répétés et axés sur l'action, provenant d'un leader en qui les gens ont confiance (p. ex., un ou une leader de la communauté, un professionnel ou une professionnelle de la santé publique crédible, etc.). Le degré de certitude des données probantes est modéré (GRADE).

- On peut renforcer la confiance envers le message et la personne qui le livre en répondant à l'incertitude et en reconnaissant que les recommandations ou les informations peuvent avoir changé et que des erreurs peuvent avoir été commises. Le degré de certitude des données probantes est faible (GRADE) et pourrait changer à mesure que de nouvelles données apparaîtront.
- Tant le message que le support de communication devraient être adaptés aux publics cibles. L'implication des parties prenantes est importante pour trouver le cadrage et le support les plus appropriés au message. Le degré de certitude des données probantes est modéré (GRADE).
- On a observé que la consommation des médias traditionnels entraînait une meilleure rétention des messages ainsi que l'expression d'opinions plus favorables à la gestion de crise des gouvernements. La communication sur la santé entre les pairs et les interventions multimédias intensives ont démontré leur efficacité pour influencer la modification de comportements à risque relativement aux virus. Des messages cadrés de façon positive et mettant l'accent sur une responsabilité collective ou sociale, comparativement à une approche individuelle, pourraient être plus efficaces. Toutefois, une synthèse et une étude n'ont démontré aucun effet du cadrage des messages sur les attitudes et les intentions en matière de vaccination. Le degré de certitude des données probantes est faible (GRADE) et pourrait changer à mesure que de nouvelles données apparaîtront.
- Les données probantes sont insuffisantes en ce qui concerne l'expérience des inégalités sociales et structurelles vécues par certaines populations, comme les communautés autochtones ou racialisées. Plus d'études sont nécessaires pour garantir que ces populations seront représentées dans la prise de décisions.
- En ce qui concerne l'expression du risque à l'aide de statistiques, les fréquences sont mieux comprises que les pourcentages, et le risque relatif est plus persuasif que le risque absolu ou le nombre de personnes à traiter. Le degré de certitude des données probantes est modéré (GRADE).

Aperçu des données probantes et lacunes dans les connaissances

- On a observé que les médecins sont des porte-parole efficaces permettant d'améliorer les connaissances relatives à la COVID-19 chez certains segments de la population, dont les publics japonais et les personnes noires. De plus, le fait que des médecins soient de la même race/ethnicité que leur public est particulièrement efficace pour améliorer les connaissances des personnes noires. D'autres efforts de personnalisation (p. ex., reconnaître l'injustice et les difficultés économiques, ou répondre à la peur que le port du masque suscite de l'ostracisme ou du racisme) n'ont pas eu d'effets significatifs sur les connaissances ou les comportements de prévention.
- Les données probantes sont insuffisantes concernant la transmission de messages pour changer les comportements et améliorer l'adhésion aux pratiques de contrôle des infections. Les autres caractéristiques d'un leader de confiance, et une meilleure compréhension des traits de la meilleure personne pouvant livrer des messages à des publics cibles précis, sont des questions qui nécessitent davantage d'études.
- Les approches participatives en matière de communication des risques dans les pays à revenu faible ou intermédiaire sont les plus efficaces.

- La communication efficace au sujet des vaccins dépend de plusieurs facteurs, dont la perception du risque, mais les résultats de recherche sont contradictoires, selon une synthèse.
- La majorité des données proviennent d'études réalisées dans d'autres domaines (p. ex., au sujet d'épidémies antérieures, de la vaccination des enfants ou des comportements liés au tabac). Étant donné l'ampleur inégalée de la pandémie de COVID-19 ainsi que l'influence des réseaux sociaux aujourd'hui, les résultats antérieurs ne s'appliquent peut-être pas directement à la situation actuelle.
- Peu de données probantes portent sur les types de campagnes de marketing social qui démontrent un effet d'augmentation du dépistage. Plusieurs des études uniques qui explorent les répercussions de la communication des risques spécifique à la COVID-19 se limitent à une évaluation de la diffusion des informations dans les réseaux sociaux. Une évaluation continue des effets des campagnes de communication actuelles spécifiques à la COVID-19 sur les connaissances ainsi que sur les changements d'attitudes et de comportements aidera à éclairer les interventions de lutte contre la pandémie.

Méthodologie

Question de recherche :

Quelles sont les meilleures pratiques en matière de communication des risques et de stratégies visant à réduire les comportements à risques?

Recherche

Les bases de données suivantes ont été fouillées le 12 février 2021 en utilisant les termes clés "risk communication", "behavioural science", "behavioral science", "social marketing", "social behaviour", "social behavior", "persuasive communication", "health communication". Cette recherche s'appuie sur la recherche précédente réalisée dans la première version de cette revue rapide :

- Pubmed's curated COVID-19 literature hub: [LitCovid](#)
- [Trip Medical Database](#)
- World Health Organization's [Global literature on coronavirus disease](#)
- [COVID-19 Evidence Alerts](#) from McMaster PLUS™
- [Public Health +](#)
- [COVID-19 Living Overview of the Evidence \(L·OVE\)](#)
- [McMaster Health Forum](#)
- [Prospero Registry of Systematic Reviews](#)
- [MedRxiv preprint server](#)
- [PsyArXiv preprint server](#)
- [MEDLINE](#) database
- [EMBASE](#) database
- NCCMT [COVID-19 Rapid Evidence Reviews](#)
- NCCDH [Equity-informed Responses to COVID-19](#)
- NCCEH [Environmental Health Resources for the COVID-19 Pandemic](#)
- NCCHPP [Public Health Ethics and COVID-19](#)
- NCCID [Disease Debrief](#)
- NCCIH [Updates on COVID-19](#)
- [Institute national d'excellence en santé et en services sociaux \(INESSS\)](#)
- [BC Centre for Disease Control \(BCCDC\)](#)
- [PsycINFO](#)
- [ERIC](#)
- [Public Health Ontario](#)
- [Cochrane Library](#)
- [Public Health England COVID-19 Rapid Reviews](#)
- [Oxford COVID-19 Evidence Service](#)
- [COVID-19 Evidence Prime](#)

Une copie de la stratégie de recherche complète peut être consultée à [lien](#).

Critères de sélection des études

Les sources de langue anglaise et français évaluées par les pairs et les sources publiées avant l'impression et avant l'évaluation par les pairs ont également été incluses. Lorsqu'ils sont disponibles, les conclusions des synthèses et les guides de pratique clinique sont présentés en premier, car ils tiennent compte de l'ensemble des preuves disponibles et peuvent donc être appliqués largement aux populations et aux milieux.

En raison de la vaste littérature sur la communication des risques dans les contextes autres que celui de la COVID-19, seules des synthèses de cette littérature ont été incluses. Les études uniques relatives à la COVID-19 ont été incluses si aucune synthèse n'était disponible, ou si ces études uniques avaient été publiées après la date de la recherche réalisée dans les synthèses incluses. Les documents d'orientation spécifiques à la communication des risques durant la pandémie de COVID-19 et issus d'organisations réputées ont été considérés comme pertinents et inclus. Les sources de surveillance ont été exclues.

	Critères d'inclusion	Critères d'exclusion
Population	La population en général	
Intervention	Communication des risques, en santé publique et dans d'autres contextes	Prise de décision clinique, aide à la décision clinique
Comparaison	-	
Résultats	Modification des connaissances, des attitudes et des comportements	

Extraction et synthèse des données

Pour les synthèses, les données sur la conception de l'étude, le cadre, l'emplacement, les caractéristiques de la population, les interventions ou l'exposition et les résultats ont été extraites au moment de la déclaration. Pour les documents d'orientation, les données sur l'administration, l'organisation, la date de publication et la nature de l'orientation ont été extraites au moment de la déclaration.

Évaluation de la qualité des données probantes

Nous avons évalué la qualité des données probantes incluses en utilisant des outils d'évaluation critique, comme nous le décrivons ci-dessous. L'évaluation de la qualité a été réalisée par un examinateur et vérifiée par un deuxième examinateur. Les conflits ont été résolus par la discussion. Pour certaines des données probantes incluses, aucun outil approprié n'a été trouvé, ou l'équipe de revue n'avait pas l'expertise nécessaire pour évaluer leur qualité méthodologique. Les études pour lesquelles aucune évaluation de la qualité n'a été effectuée sont indiquées dans les tableaux de données.

Méthodologie de l'étude	Outils d'évaluation critique
Synthèse	Assessing the Methodological Quality of Systematic Reviews (AMSTAR) AMSTAR 1 Tool
Étude transversale	Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) Checklist for Analytical Cross-Sectional Studies
Qualitative	Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) Checklist for Qualitative Research
Quasi expérimentale	Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) Checklist for Quasi-Experimental Studies
Essai clinique randomisé	Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) Checklist for Randomized Controlled Trials

Les évaluations de la qualité effectuées pour chaque étude incluse sont disponibles sur demande.

L'approche [GRADE](#) (Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development and Evaluations) a été utilisée pour évaluer la certitude des résultats sur la base de huit domaines clés (Schünemann *et al.*, 2013).

Selon l'approche GRADE en matière de qualité des données probantes, les **études observationnelles**, telles que celles incluses dans cette revue, fournissent des données probantes de **faible qualité**. Cette évaluation peut être réduite encore davantage en fonction d'autres domaines :

- un risque de biais élevé;
- l'incohérence des effets;
- le caractère indirect des interventions/résultats;
- des imprécisions dans l'estimation de l'effet;
- un biais de publication.

À l'inverse, elle peut être rehaussée sur la base des domaines suivants :

- un effet important;
- une relation dose-effet;
- une prise en compte des variables confusionnelles.

Pour chaque résultat, la certitude globale des données probantes a été déterminée en tenant compte des caractéristiques des données probantes dont on dispose (des études observationnelles, dont certaines n'ont pas été évaluées par les pairs, des variables confusionnelles potentielles qui n'ont pas été prises en compte, des essais et des protocoles d'essais différents, et une absence de groupes de comparaison valides). Un jugement selon lequel « la certitude globale est très faible » signifie que les résultats risquent fort de changer à mesure que de nouvelles données probantes apparaissent.

Résultats

Synthèse de la qualité des données probantes

Dans cette mise à jour, 4 nouvelles synthèses, 6 nouvelles études individuelles, et 1 nouvelle synthèse en cours ont été recensées, pour un total de 28 publications portant sur la question de recherche. La qualité des données probantes incluses dans cette revue se décrit comme suit :

Question(s) de recherche	Données probantes incluses		Certitude globale des données probantes
Quelles sont les meilleures pratiques en matière de communication des risques et de stratégies visant à réduire les comportements à risques?	Synthèses terminées	13	Modérée
	Études individuelles	9	
	Synthèses en cours	1	
	Études individuelles en cours	2	
	Documents d'orientation	3	

Attention

Comme il faut rendre rapidement disponibles les nouvelles données probantes sur la COVID-19, plusieurs études émergentes n'ont pas été révisées par des pairs. Pour cette raison, nous vous conseillons la prudence quand vous utilisez et interprétez les données probantes incluses dans cette revue rapide. Nous avons résumé la qualité des données probantes en la catégorisant comme faible, modérée ou élevée, afin de soutenir le processus de prise de décision. Lorsque c'est possible, nous vous recommandons de fonder vos décisions sur les données probantes de la plus haute qualité possible.

Tableau 1 : Synthèses

Reference	Date Released	Description of Included Studies	Summary of Findings	Quality Rating: Synthesis	Quality Rating: Included Studies
New evidence from other topical areas reported on March 12, 2021					
Winograd, D. M., Fresquez, C. L., Egli, M., Peterson, E. K., Lombardi, A. R., Megale, A., ... McAndrew, L. M. (2021). Rapid Review of Virus Risk Communication Interventions: Directions for COVID-19. Patient Education and Counseling. Epub ahead of print.	Jan 20, 2021 (search date not specified)	This rapid review included 31 single studies (14 randomized controlled trials) evaluating interventions for reducing the spread of viruses (HIV, Hepatitis B, influenza, H1N1, MERS, Zika) by changing individual cognitions or behaviours.	<p>There was no clear best intervention among peer health communication, intensive multimedia communication, and audio/visual interventions.</p> <p>Peer health communication, in which peers share knowledge and behaviour change approaches, showed the most consistent positive findings for changing cognitive risk perception related to viruses and behaviour change outcomes.</p> <p>Intensive multimedia communication showed somewhat positive findings for behaviour change outcomes.</p> <p>Audio/visual communication showed somewhat positive findings for improving cognitive risk perception, cognitions about behaviours, and behavioural intention outcomes, with mixed results for behaviour change outcomes.</p> <p>Tailored interventions were more consistently related to behavioural changes (vs. non-tailored interventions).</p> <p>Interventions to reduce risk from HIV/AIDS consistently improved cognitive risk perceptions, cognitions about behaviours, behavioural intentions and behaviours to reduce risk; influenza interventions only showed improved cognitions about behaviours. Findings related to other viruses are few in number and hard to interpret.</p>	Moderate	Very low-Low

<p>Olawepo, J. O., Pharr, J. R., & Kachen, A. (2018). The Use of Social Marketing Campaigns to Increase HIV Testing Uptake: A Systematic Review. <i>AIDS Care</i>, 31(2), 153-162.</p>	<p>Oct 10, 2018</p> <p>Articles were included up to Oct 18, 2017.</p> <p>(Search date not specified)</p>	<p>13 included studies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 cross-sectional • 3 observational cohort • 2 laboratory/surveillance • 1 randomized controlled trial • 1 quasi-experimental <p>Studies assessed the effect of social marketing campaigns on HIV testing uptake.</p>	<p>Studies reported positive (38%), mixed (38%) and no effect (31%) of social marketing campaigns on HIV testing uptake. Neither campaign design, location, use of theory, population, duration, channels used, or sample size demonstrated an effect on testing outcomes.</p> <p>Limitations of this review include weak study designs of included studies and lack of meta-analysis of the included studies due to differences in reporting metrics. Standardized methodology for reporting exposure to and impact of social marketing campaigns is needed.</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>Not reported</p>
<p>Schiavo R., May Leung M., & Brown M. (2014). Communicating Risk and Promoting Disease Mitigation Measures in Epidemics and Emerging Disease Settings. <i>Pathogens and Global Health</i>, 108(2), 76-94.</p>	<p>Mar 21, 2014 (search completed Jul 2013)</p>	<p>29 included studies; description of included studies not provided.</p>	<p>Specific to low and middle-income countries, interventions to communicate risk and promote disease control at the community, healthcare or multi-sectoral levels may be most effective when using community-based or participatory approaches.</p> <p>There is a gap in research related to how interventions influence policy adoption, social determinants of health, or cost-effectiveness.</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>Moderate-Low to High</p>
<p>Akl, E. A., Oxman, A. D., Herrin, J., Vist, G. E., Terrenato, I., Sperati, F., ... Schünemann, H. (2011). Using Alternative Statistical Formats for Presenting Risks and Risk Reductions. <i>Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews</i>.</p>	<p>Mar 16, 2011 (search completed Oct 2007)</p>	<p>35 included controlled trials with 41 total comparisons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 30 randomized • 4 not randomized • 7 unclear 	<p>When presenting statistics on risk, frequencies (e.g., 1 in 100) are better understood than percentages (e.g., 1%) (Standard Mean Difference (SMD)=0.69, 95% CI=0.45-0.93) by health professionals and consumers.</p> <p>For risk reductions, relative risk reduction was perceived as larger and was more likely to be persuasive than absolute risk reduction (SMD=0.66, 95% CI=0.51-0.81) and number needed to treat (SMD=0.65, 95% CI=0.51-0.80).</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>Moderate, by GRADE</p>

Previously reported evidence specific to the COVID-19 pandemic					
<p>Ghio, D., Lawes-Wickwar, S., Tang, M. Y., Epton, T., Howlett, N., Jenkinson, E., ... Keyworth, C. (2020). What Influences People's Responses to Public Health Messages for Managing Risks and Preventing Disease During Public Health Crises? A Rapid Review of the Evidence and Recommendations. Preprint.</p>	<p>Jul 13, 2020 (Search completed May 20, 2020)</p>	<p>78 included studies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 systematic reviews <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2 mixed methods ○ 1 quantitative • 61 single studies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1 randomized controlled trial ○ 11 survey ○ 23 qualitative ○ 10 content analysis ○ 7 commentary ○ 8 experimental ○ 1 rapid review • 14 preprint manuscripts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 3 experimental ○ 11 survey <p>Studies were specific to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H1N1 (n=20) • COVID-19 (n=15) • Ebola (n=12) • Influenza (n=8) • SARS (n=6) • Zika (n=4) • Bird flu (n=3) • West Nile (n=1) • General pandemics (n=1) 	<p>4 key recommendations identified:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Engage with different communities</u> to ensure relevance and relatability and build community resilience: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Target and tailor messages to specific populations • Translate to other languages, considering accuracy and cultural relevance • Use diverse media forms and consider barriers to access 2. <u>Address uncertainty</u> to increase trust: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledge changing information and admit errors • Coordinate consistent messages across information sources • Use sources perceived as credible to target population • Focus on positive, solution-oriented messaging 3. <u>Unify messaging</u> to ensure accurate understanding and heighten risk perception: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keep core message consistent • Increase awareness • Clear instructions are more memorable 4. <u>Message framing</u> to increase understanding and knowledge of threat: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positively frame messages in the context of social responsibility and norms • Language to explain severity • Emphasize sense of personal control 	<p>Low</p>	<p>Moderate-High</p>

<p>Lunn, P. D., Belton, C. A., Lavin, C., McGowan, F. P., Timmons, S., & Robertson, D. A. (2020). Using Behavioral Science to Help Fight the Coronavirus. <i>Journal of Behavioral Public Administration</i>, 3(1).</p>	<p>Mar 29, 2020 (Search date not reported)</p>	<p>Over 100 studies were reviewed; a description of included studies not provided</p>	<p>Systematic reviews find that multiple behavioural levers (education plus reminders, availability, social influences, and cues to capture attention) increase handwashing in healthcare settings.</p> <p>Clear and repeated messaging delivered by trusted leaders to establish social norms is necessary.</p> <p>Messaging around what is “best for all” is more effective than persuasion to undertake a certain behaviour.</p> <p>Cooperation is more likely when behaviours are publicly visible and there is social disapproval.</p> <p>Crisis communication requires tailoring for targeted audiences.</p> <p>Messages communicating ‘threat’ are more effective when self-efficacy is high. Also important in messaging is to be solution-focused or action-oriented.</p> <p>Invoking empathy in messaging has a positive influence on behaviour change.</p> <p>Communicating risk honestly (neither exaggerating or downplaying) builds trust and sets an example for others who play a role in risk perception (e.g., businesses and media). In communicating threats, there should also be clear messaging about extent of uncertainty, which can also build credibility.</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>Not reported</p>
---	--	---	---	------------	---------------------

Previously reported evidence from other topical areas					
<p>Aya Pastrana, N., Lazo-Porras, M., Miranda, J. J., Beran, D., & Suggs, L. S. (2020). Social Marketing Interventions for the Prevention and Control of Neglected Tropical Diseases: A Systematic Review. <i>PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases</i>, 14(6), e0008360.</p>	<p>Jun 17, 2020 (Search date not reported)</p>	<p>This systematic review included 47 articles describing 20 interventions to prevent neglected tropical diseases in 13 countries.</p>	<p>Interventions used a broad range of social marketing concepts and techniques.</p> <p>It is important for the intervention audiences and context to be understood when developing a social marketing intervention.</p> <p>Relationship building is critical – stakeholders should be involved from an early stage and can be involved in co-creation of intervention elements.</p> <p>Intervention strategies should be integrated and complementary to each other.</p> <p>Consider barriers to adoption of the desired behaviour.</p> <p>Effective interventions generally tended to incorporate health education and capacity building and were culturally appropriate.</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>Moderate</p>
<p>McParland, J. L., Williams, L., Gozdzielewska, L., Young, M., Smith, F., MacDonald, J., ... Flowers, P. (2018). What Are the 'Active Ingredients' of Interventions Targeting the Public's Engagement With Antimicrobial Resistance and How Might They Work? <i>British Journal of Health Psychology</i>, 23(4), 804-819.</p>	<p>May 27, 2018 (Search date not reported)</p>	<p>20 studies included that examined active components and mechanisms of action of interventions that aimed to improve public awareness and behaviours regarding antimicrobial resistance.</p>	<p>The most common behaviour change techniques focused on education about consequences and instructions for performing antimicrobial resistance-related behaviours delivered by a credible source.</p> <p>Successful interventions included behaviour change techniques, including promoting beliefs regarding capability, behaviour reinforcement, encouraging commitment to behaviour change and imagining future outcomes if lack of behaviour change occurs, behavioural monitoring (+/- feedback), and provision of information on antecedents of behaviour.</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>Low</p>

<p>Carson, K. V., Ameer, F., Sayehmiri, K., Hnin, K., van Agteren, J. E., Sayehmiri, F., ... Smith, B. J. (2017). Mass Media Interventions for Preventing Smoking in Young People. <i>Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews</i>.</p>	<p>Jun 2, 2017 (Search completed Jun 2016)</p>	<p>This systematic review included 8 studies (52,746 participants) that assessed the effects of mass media interventions on smoking behaviour among youth under 25 years of age.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 randomized controlled trials • 1 interrupted time-series <p>Interventions included</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mass media alone (n=4) • Mass media plus school education (n=3) • Peer-led social media messaging (n=1) 	<p>Overall, certainty about the effects of mass media campaigns on smoking behaviours in youth is very low:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 studies found that mass media interventions reduced the smoking behaviours of young people • Five studies found no effect. <p>Overall, effective campaigns tended to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use multiple channels for delivery (newspapers, television, radio, posters) • Last longer (minimum of 3 years) • Have more contact time for both school-based lessons and media spots • Build upon elements of existing effective campaigns • Carry out “developmental work” with representatives of the target audience • Use messages that were designed to reach the target audience (via media channels preferred by the target audience at the most appropriate times) • Combine campaigns with a structured support curriculum such as those available via school-based collaborations • Use social influence or social learning theory approach 	<p>High</p>	<p>Low</p>
--	--	--	--	-------------	------------

<p>Ames, H. M., Glenton, C., & Lewin, S. (2017). Parents' and Informal Caregivers' Views and Experiences of Communication About Routine Childhood Vaccination: A Synthesis of Qualitative Evidence. <i>Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews</i>.</p>	<p>Feb 7, 2017 (Search completed Aug 30, 2016)</p>	<p>This systematic review included 38 studies examining parent/caregiver perceptions of vaccine communication and its influence on childhood vaccination decisions (for children up to 6 years of age).</p>	<p>Type, quantity, and availability of information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide credible sources of information using a balanced approach with both risks and benefits. • Provide information to health service and community settings. • Tailor information to needs; vaccine-hesitant parents may need different types and amounts of information. • Use a variety of strategies to provide information such as text messaging. <p>Sources of information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health workers are important and trusted sources of information. • Health workers should have open, respectful discussions in a caring, sensitive, and non-judgmental way and provide clear answers to their questions. • Provide a supportive environment for decision-making. Poor communication and negative relationships with health workers sometimes impacted vaccination decisions. <p>Timing of information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide information clearly and simply and in good time prior to each vaccination appointment, not while vaccinating the child. 	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>Moderate-High</p>
<p>Penta, M. A., & Baban, A. (2018). Message Framing in Vaccine Communication: A Systematic Review of Published Literature. <i>Health Communication</i> 33(3), 299-314.</p>	<p>Jan 6, 2017 (Search completed Jul 2016)</p>	<p>This systematic review identified 34 studies comparing gain-framed versus loss-framed messages for vaccine communication.</p>	<p>Most studies found that goal framing had no effect on vaccine attitudes, intentions or uptake.</p> <p>Across studies, some participant characteristics appear to be mediators or moderators of the effect (e.g., perceived risk, loss avoidance, etc.), but findings are inconsistent.</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>Not reported</p>

<p>Infanti, J., Sixsmith, J., Barry, M.M., Núñez-Córdoba, J., Oroviogicoechea-Ortega, C., & Guillén-Grima, F. (2013). A Literature Review on Effective Risk Communication for the Prevention and Control of Communicable Diseases in Europe. <i>European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control</i>.</p>	<p>Jan 2013 (Search date not reported)</p>	<p>A number of models, guidelines and reviews were included (number not reported).</p>	<p>Risk communication messages often fail to reach intended communities; needs assessment and public engagement is critical.</p> <p>Clear objectives, consistent messages, transparent and credible decision making.</p> <p>Messages must contain precise details about what, when, how and for how long.</p> <p>Effective risk communication must include acknowledgement and explanations of complexities and uncertainties.</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>Not reported</p>
<p>Cugelman, B., Thelwall, M., & Dawes, P. (2011). Online Interventions for Social Marketing Health Behavior Change Campaigns: A Meta-Analysis of Psychological Architectures and Adherence Factors. <i>Journal of Medical Internet Research</i> 13(1), e17.</p>	<p>Feb 14, 2011 (Search completed Jan 16, 2009)</p>	<p>This systematic review assessed online intervention design features to inform the development of online health campaigns seeking voluntary health behaviour change.</p> <p>31 papers met the inclusion criteria. 29 of these described 30 interventions and 2 qualified for adherence analysis.</p>	<p>The impact of online interventions was small but significant.</p> <p>Most interventions used feedback mechanisms, with 83% using tailoring, while 40% used personalization combined with tailoring.</p> <p>Shorter interventions achieved the largest impacts – as the length of an intervention increased, behavioural impacts and intervention adherence decreased. Goal-oriented interventions, using multiple behaviour change components, and providing normative pressure appeared to be most effective.</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>Not reported</p>

Tableau 2 : Études individuelles

Reference	Date Released	Study Design	Population	Setting	Summary of findings	Quality Rating:
New Evidence Reported March 12, 2021						
Chen, T., Dai, M., Xia, S., & Zhou, Y. (2021). Do Messages Matter? Investigating the Combined Effects of Framing, Outcome Uncertainty, and Number Format on COVID-19 Vaccination Attitudes and Intention. <i>Health Communication</i> . Epub ahead of print.	Jan 27, 2021	Randomized controlled trial	n=413 adults aged 18 to 60	China	<p>Participants were randomly assigned to view 1 of 8 news articles related to COVID-19 vaccination, which varied based on framing of messages (gain vs. loss), outcome uncertainty (certain vs. uncertain), and number format (frequency vs. percentage). Vaccination attitudes and intentions were compared between groups.</p> <p>No differences were found between groups on attitudes or intentions.</p>	Moderate
Heydari, S. T., Zarei, L., Sadati, A. K., Moradi, N., Akbari, M., Mehralian, G., & Lankarani, K. B. (2021). The Effect of Risk Communication on Preventive and Protective Behaviours During the COVID-19 Outbreak: Mediating Role of Risk Perception. <i>BMC Public Health</i> 21(54).	Jan 6, 2021	Cross-sectional	n=3213 adults aged 15 and older	Iran	<p>The association between risk communication and risk perception and protective and preventive behaviours during the COVID-19 pandemic was assessed via an online survey.</p> <p>73% of participants receive COVID-19 news via national media and social networks.</p> <p>Applying the survey data to a risk communication model showed that risk communication and risk perception were positively correlated, such that communication related to accurate understanding of risk can influence risk perception and mitigation behaviours.</p>	Moderate

<p>Alsan, M., Stanford, F. C., Banerjee, A., Breza, E., Chandrasekhar, A. G., Eichmeyer, S., ... Duflo, E. (2020). Comparison of Knowledge and Information-Seeking Behavior After General COVID-19 Public Health Messages and Messages Tailored for Black and Latinx Communities: A Randomized Controlled Trial. <i>Annals of Internal Medicine</i>. Epub ahead of print.</p>	<p>Dec 21, 2020</p>	<p>Randomized controlled trial</p>	<p>n=7174 Black and 4520 Latinx adults</p>	<p>United States</p>	<p>Participants were randomized to receive one of 3 video messages from physicians that varied by physician race/ethnicity, acknowledgement of racism/inequality and community perceptions of mask wearing, or a control group.</p> <p>Seeing any video message reduced knowledge gaps (Incidence Rate Ratio (IRR)=0.737, 95% CI=0.643, 0.846) but did not change information-seeking.</p> <p>Messages from race/ethnic-concordant physicians increased information-seeking behaviour among Black participants (IRR=1.085, 95% CI=1.022, 1.153) but not for Latinx participants. Other tailoring efforts (e.g., acknowledging injustice and economic hardship, addressing fear of stigma and racism when wearing a mask) did not have a significant effect on information-seeking or knowledge.</p> <p>Intentions and behaviours were not explored.</p>	<p>High</p>
---	---------------------	------------------------------------	--	----------------------	---	-------------

<p>Brewer, L. C., Asiedu, G. B., Jones, C., Richard, M., Erickson, J., Weis, J., ... Doubeni, C. A. (2020). Emergency Preparedness and Risk Communication Among African American Churches: Leveraging a Community-based Participatory Research Partnership COVID-19 Initiative. <i>Preventing Chronic Disease</i>, 17, E158.</p>	<p>Dec 10, 2020</p>	<p>Quasi-experimental</p>	<p>n=120 African American churches (number of congregation members not provided)</p>	<p>United States</p>	<p>This study describes the reach and engagement, feasibility, and acceptability of a COVID-19 emergency preparedness strategy using culturally relevant materials and community contacts within African American churches. Uptake of preventive measures was not studied.</p> <p>COVID-19 risks were communicated using message maps, containing 4 content areas: 1) inspirational messaging to promote spiritual, physical, and mental wellness; 2) COVID-19 health and preventive measures; 3) financial and community-based support resources; and 4) social support connections. Messages were disseminated via Zoom, Facebook Live, email, and social media channels.</p> <p>Results are described narratively:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reach and engagement of Facebook posts increased over the course of the intervention. • The intervention was considered feasible. • Acceptability of the intervention overall was positive. 	<p>Moderate</p>
--	---------------------	---------------------------	--	----------------------	---	-----------------

<p>Okuhara, T., Okada, H., & Kiuchi, T. (2020). Examining Persuasive Message Type to Encourage Staying at Home During the COVID-19 Pandemic and Social Lockdown: A Randomized Controlled Study in Japan. <i>Patient Education and Counseling</i>. Epub ahead of print.</p>	<p>Aug 21, 2020</p>	<p>Randomized controlled trial</p>	<p>n=1980 adults aged 18-69</p>	<p>Japan</p>	<p>Participants were randomized to receive persuasive messaging, from different narrators (e.g., local political leader, public health expert, physician, patient, resident or control). Intentions to stay home during lockdown, perceived severity, vulnerability, response efficacy, self-efficacy were measured.</p> <p>Messages delivered by a physician significantly increased intention to stay home in areas with high numbers of infections (mean change=0.34; 95% CI=0.26, 0.41), vs. political leader, mean change=0.17; 95% CI=0.11, 0.22); vs. expert, mean change=0.19; 95% CI=0.13, 0.25); vs. resident, mean change=0.17; 95% CI=0.12, 0.23).</p> <p>Messages delivered by a physician also increased perceived severity of the pandemic (mean change=0.23; 95% CI=0.14–0.32), vs. political leader, mean change=0.06; 95% CI=0, 0.12, response efficacy (mean change=0.37; 95% CI=0.29, 0.46) (vs. resident, mean change=0.19; C.I. 0.12, 0.26), and self-efficacy (mean change=0.33; 95% CI= 0.25, 0.41) vs. political leader, mean change=0.17; 95% CI=0.11, 0.23); vs. patient, mean change=0.16, 95% CI=0.09, 0.23).</p>	<p>High</p>
--	---------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------	--	-------------

<p>Moreno, Á., Fuentes-Lara, C., & Navarro, C. (2020). COVID-19 Communication Management in Spain: Exploring the Effect of Information-Seeking Behavior and Message Reception in Public's Evaluation. <i>El profesional de la información, 29</i>(4), e290402.</p>	<p>Jul 2, 2020</p>	<p>Cross-sectional</p>	<p>n=546</p>	<p>Spain</p>	<p>A survey was conducted from Mar 14-Apr 14, 2020 to assess how information forms and sources influence public information-seeking behaviours and perception of the government's crisis response strategies during the pandemic.</p> <p>Mainstream media use (television, newspapers and radio) was reported as high, with users of these platforms expressing more positive opinions of the government's crisis response. People who were mainly informed through Twitter (50.7%) and Facebook (49.5%) strongly believed that the government's communication confused the population, compared to those who used print newspapers (45.4%), online newspapers (46.7%), television (45.9%) and radio (43.8%).</p> <p>Results showed that people rely on different information channels during crisis situations with high simultaneous and multiplatform consumption of information. Television (86.2%), WhatsApp (77.6%), online newspapers (75%), and radio (42.6%) were the most frequently used information channels.</p> <p>Use of multiple and simultaneous platforms may contribute to over-information and contra-information. The inability of some users to discern unreliable messaging must be considered in planning. Factors related to media choice, including use of social media platforms, need to be understood for risk and crisis communication strategies and for further research.</p>	<p>Moderate</p>
--	--------------------	------------------------	--------------	--------------	---	-----------------

Previously Reported Evidence						
Sutton, J., Renshaw, S. L., & Butts, C. T. (2020). COVID-19: Retransmission of Official Communications in an Emerging Pandemic . <i>PLoS One</i> , 15(9), e0238491.	Sep 16, 2020	Cross-sectional	n=690 social media accounts	United States	<p>This study explored spread of risk communication messages on social media through social media accounts of public health, emergency management, elected officials; 149,335 tweets analyzed.</p> <p>The following content increased odds of message spread:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surveillance data (40%) • Technical information (30%) • Efficacy, how individual can protect themselves (28%) • Symptoms (27%) • Primary threat, using words to describe COVID-19 (21.5%) • Secondary threat, words describing threats resulting from COVID-19 (20%) • Official pandemic responses (19%) • Collective efficacy (12.5%) • Closures and openings (12%) <p>Smallest positive effect on message retransmission was for content focused on resilience (6.8%) and susceptibility (4.6%).</p> <p>Factors that increase frequency of message retransmission include the use of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Videos (63%) • Photos/images (27%) • Hashtags (12%) <p>Factors that decreased message retransmission:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of quote tweets (7% decrease) • Mentioning another account (23% decrease) • Directly replying to a user (82% decrease) • Use of weblinks (30% decrease) 	High

<p>Purohit, N., & Mehta, S. (2020). Risk Communication Initiatives Amid COVID-19 in India: Analyzing Message Effectiveness of Videos on National Television. <i>Journal of Health Management</i>, 22(2), 262-280.</p>	<p>Aug 11, 2020</p>	<p>Cross-sectional</p>	<p>n=36 videos</p>	<p>India</p>	<p>A conceptual model of emergency risk communication was used as a tool to analyze the effectiveness of risk communication messages in 36 videos available in India from Mar-Apr 2020. The effectiveness of the videos at changing knowledge, attitudes or behaviours was not studied.</p> <p>Risk communication messages disseminated via videos demonstrated 9 key principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scientifically accurate • Open and transparent messages • Clear messaging • Tailored messaging for target audiences • Consistency in messaging across different mediums • Repetition in messaging • Actionable messages, identify desirable behaviours • Timely dissemination of message • Messaging through multiple channels 	<p>Moderate</p>
<p>Liao, Q., Yuan, J., Dong, M., Yang, L., Fielding, R., & Lam, W. W. T. (2020). Public Engagement and Government Responsiveness in the Communications About COVID-19 During the Early Epidemic Stage in China: Infodemiology Study on Social Media Data. <i>Journal of Medical Internet Research</i> 22(5), e18796.</p>	<p>May 26, 2020</p>	<p>Cross-sectional</p>	<p>Weibo users</p>	<p>China</p>	<p>Engagement was compared between 644 Weibo posts from personal accounts and 273 posts from government agency accounts.</p> <p>Government posts focused mainly on pandemic updates, policies, guidelines and government response, and prevention messaging, using one-way communication. Government reassurance about risk was central to message content early on in the pandemic, which may have translated into low perception of risk.</p> <p>Personal posts more likely to show empathy to those affected, attribute blame to others/government, and express worry about pandemic; frequency in sharing of this content increased throughout the pandemic.</p> <p>There was lower public engagement with government agency posts with respect to likes, comments, and shares.</p>	<p>Moderate</p>

Tableau 3 : Synthèses en cours

Title	Anticipated Date of Completion	Setting	Description of Document
New evidence reported March 12, 2021			
Grimani, A., Bonell, C., Michie, S., Antonopoulou, V., Kelly, M., & Vlaev, I. (2020). The Effect of Communication Strategies for Population Behaviour Change in Relation to Infectious Disease: A Systematic Review . PROSPERO, CRD42020198874.	Apr 30, 2021	England	This systematic review will explore the effect of communication strategies with a focus on protecting others (mass media, social media, or small media [leaflets, posters] or health professional consultation) on population behaviour change in relation to infectious disease pandemics/ epidemics/ endemics.

Tableau 4 : Études individuelles en cours

Title	Anticipated Date of Completion	Setting	Description of Document
Previously Reported Evidence			
Dorison, C., Lerner, J. S., Heller, B. H., Rothman, A., Kawachi, I. I., Wang, K., ... Coles, N. A. (2020). <i><u>A Global Test of Message Framing on Behavioural Intentions, Policy Support, Information Seeking, and Experienced Anxiety During the COVID-19 Pandemic.</u></i>	Not reported	Global	This research will experimentally test the effects of framing messages in terms of losses versus gains and examine effects on 3 primary outcomes: intentions to adhere to polices on COVID-19 prevention, opinions about these policies, and likelihood that participants seek additional policy information. Anxiety will be measured as a secondary outcome variable.
Betsch, C., Wieler, L., Bosnjak, M., Ramharter, M., Stollorz, V., Omer, S. B., ... Schmid, P. (2020). <i><u>Germany COVID-19 Snapshot Monitoring (Cosmo Germany): Monitoring Knowledge, Risk Perceptions, Preventive Behaviours, and Public Trust in the Current Coronavirus Outbreak in Germany.</u></i>	Not reported	Germany	This serial cross-sectional study will collect data on public perceptions of COVID-19 risk, protective and preparedness behaviours weekly over a 10-week period (10 data collections) using an online platform. This will allow rapid and adaptive monitoring of these variables over time and assess the relations between risk perceptions, knowledge, and misinformation to preparedness and protective behaviour regarding COVID-19.

Tableau 5 : Documents d'orientation

Reference	Date Released	Summary of findings	Quality Rating:
Previously Reported Evidence			
The British Psychological Society. (2020, Apr 4). Behavioural Science and Disease Prevention: Psychological Guidance.	Apr 14, 2020	The British Psychological Society provides 9 recommendations to optimize communication during COVID-19: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Focus on collective vs. individual 2. Deliver messages from a source viewed as credible to the target audience 3. Create worry but not fear 4. Ensure policies, messages and interventions target behavioural influences including capabilities, opportunities and motivations 5. Clearly specify behaviours 6. Avoid unintended consequences and consider equity 7. Create clear channels across levels of health literacy 8. Engage with behavioural scientists and rely on psychological evidence 9. Use a multidisciplinary approach 	Low NOT PEER REVIEWED
World Health Organization. (2020, Mar 19). Risk Communication and Community Engagement Readiness and Response to Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19): Interim Guidance, 19 March 2020.	Mar 19, 2020	Action steps for risk communication and community engagement follows 6 main categories: risk communication systems, internal and partner coordination, public communication, community engagement, addressing uncertainty and perceptions and managing misinformation, and capacity building. <p>Countries preparing for COVID-19 cases (no identified cases):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communicate about preparedness activities and public health advice • Identify communication capacity and main stakeholders and form partnerships • Train risk communication and community engagement staff <p>Countries where 1 or more identified COVID-19 cases:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engage in two-way communication with public, address misinformation, misunderstandings, common questions • Encourage protective behaviours • Communicate uncertainties • Coordinate collaboration among response partners • Assess risk perception of public • Information delivery <p>Countries with ongoing COVID-19 transmission:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adapt and apply initial response steps • Modify risk communication plan based on risk perception and public questions • Focus on public resilience • Monitor processes for evaluation 	Moderate NOT PEER REVIEWED

<p>World Health Organization. (2018, Jan 10). <i>Communicating Risk in Public Health Emergencies: A WHO Guideline for Emergency Risk Communication Policy and Practice.</i></p>	<p>Jan 10, 2018</p>	<p>3 primary recommendations for risk communication in public health emergencies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Building trust and engaging with affected populations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trust: consider accessibility, demonstrate transparency, timeliness, disseminate using multiple platforms, methods • Communicating uncertainty: acknowledge information that is known and unknown, provide explicit information about uncertainties related to risk, events, interventions • Community engagement: identify and involve key trusted community leaders 2. Integrate emergency risk communication (ERC) into health and emergency response systems: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governance and leadership: Strategically integrate ERC role into responsibilities of global and national emergency preparedness and response leadership teams • Information systems and coordination: develop and maintain multi-disciplinary networks across geography • Tailor information and communication systems: involve stakeholders to ensure relevance of messaging and dissemination across sectors • Capacity building: regular training of ERC personnel with focus on stakeholder coordination • Finance: Allocate sustained funding to ERC as part of emergency preparedness and response 3. ERC practice: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic communication planning: Overarching planning is required that includes process of needs assessment, objective setting, coordinated implementation of interventions, monitoring and evaluation of activities • Monitoring and evaluation tools: further research required • Social media: can be used for public engagement, increase awareness, monitor and manage misinformation, public concerns 	<p>High</p> <p><i>NOT PEER REVIEWED</i></p>
---	---------------------	---	--

Références

- Akl, E. A., Oxman, A. D., Herrin, J., Vist, G. E., Terrenato, I., Sperati, F., ... Schünemann, H. (2011). [Using Alternative Statistical Formats for Presenting Risks and Risk Reductions](#). *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*.
- Alsan, M., Stanford, F. C., Banerjee, A., Breza, E., Chandrasekhar, A. G., Eichmeyer, S., ... Duflo, E. (2020). [Comparison of Knowledge and Information-Seeking Behavior After General COVID-19 Public Health Messages and Messages Tailored for Black and Latinx Communities: A Randomized Controlled Trial](#). *Annals of Internal Medicine*. Epub ahead of print.
- Ames, H. M., Glenton, C., & Lewin, S. (2017). [Parents' and Informal Caregivers' Views and Experiences of Communication About Routine Childhood Vaccination: A Synthesis of Qualitative Evidence](#). *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*.
- Aya Pastrana, N., Lazo-Porras, M., Miranda, J. J., Beran, D., & Suggs, L. S. (2020). [Social Marketing Interventions for the Prevention and Control of Neglected Tropical Diseases: A Systematic Review](#). *PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases*, 14(6), e0008360.
- Betsch, C., Wieler, L., Bosnjak, M., Ramharter, M., Stollorz, V., Omer, S. B., ... Schmid, P. (2020). [Germany COVID-19 Snapshot Monitoring \(Cosmo Germany\): Monitoring Knowledge, Risk Perceptions, Preventive Behaviours, and Public Trust in the Current Coronavirus Outbreak in Germany](#).
- Brewer, L. C., Asiedu, G. B., Jones, C., Richard, M., Erickson, J., Weis, J., ... Doubeni, C. A. (2020). [Emergency Preparedness and Risk Communication Among African American Churches: Leveraging a Community-Based Participatory Research Partnership COVID-19 Initiative](#). *Preventing Chronic Disease*, 17, E158.
- The British Psychological Society. (2020, April 14). [Behavioural Science and Disease Prevention: Psychological Guidance](#).
- Carson, K. V., Ameer, F., Sayehmiri, K., Hnin, K., van Agteren, J. E., Sayehmiri, F., ... Smith, B. J. (2017). [Mass Media Interventions for Preventing Smoking in Young People](#). *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*.
- Chen, T., Dai, M., Xia, S., & Zhou, Y. (2021). [Do Messages Matter? Investigating the Combined Effects of Framing, Outcome Uncertainty, and Number Format on COVID-19 Vaccination Attitudes and Intention](#). *Health Communication*. Epub ahead of print.
- Cugelman, B., Thelwall, M., & Dawes, P. (2011). [Online Interventions for Social Marketing Health Behavior Change Campaigns: A Meta-Analysis of Psychological Architectures and Adherence Factors](#). *Journal of Medical Internet Research* 13(1), e17.
- Dorison, C., Lerner, J. S., Heller, B. H., Rothman, A., Kawachi, I. I., Wang, K., ... Coles, N. A. (2020). [A Global Test of Message Framing on Behavioural Intentions, Policy Support, Information Seeking, and Experienced Anxiety During the COVID-19 Pandemic](#).

- Ghio, D., Lawes-Wickwar, S., Tang, M. Y., Epton, T., Howlett, N., Jenkinson, E., ... Keyworth, C. (2020). [What Influences People's Responses to Public Health Messages for Managing Risks and Preventing Disease During Public Health Crises? A Rapid Review of the Evidence and Recommendations](#). *Preprint*.
- Grimani, A., Bonell, C., Michie, S., Antonopoulou, V., Kelly, M., & Vlaev, I. (2020). [The Effect of Communication Strategies for Population Behaviour Change in Relation to Infectious Disease: A Systematic Review](#). PROSPERO, CRD42020198874
- Heydari, S. T., Zarei, L., Sadati, A. K., Moradi, N., Akbari, M., Mehralian, G., & Lankarani, K. B. (2021). [The Effect of Risk Communication on Preventive and Protective Behaviours During the COVID-19 Outbreak: Mediating Role of Risk Perception](#). *BMC Public Health* 21(54).
- Infanti, J., Sixsmith, J., Barry, M.M., Núñez-Córdoba, J., Oroviogicoechea-Ortega, C., & Guillén-Grima, F. (2013). [A Literature Review on Effective Risk Communication for the Prevention and Control of Communicable Diseases in Europe](#). *European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control*.
- Liao, Q., Yuan, J., Dong, M., Yang, L., Fielding, R., & Lam, W. W. T. (2020). [Public Engagement and Government Responsiveness in the Communications About COVID-19 During the Early Epidemic Stage in China: Infodemiology Study on Social Media Data](#). *Journal of Medical Internet Research* 22(5), e18796.
- Lunn, P. D., Belton, C. A., Lavin, C., McGowan, F. P., Timmons, S., & Robertson, D. A. (2020). [Using Behavioral Science to Help Fight the Coronavirus](#). *Journal of Behavioral Public Administration*, 3(1).
- McParland, J. L., Williams, L., Gozdzielewska, L., Young, M., Smith, F., MacDonald, J., ... Flowers, P. (2018). [What Are the 'Active Ingredients' of Interventions Targeting the Public's Engagement with Antimicrobial Resistance and How Might They Work?](#) *British Journal of Health Psychology*, 23(4), 804-819.
- Moreno, Á., Fuentes-Lara, C., & Navarro, C. (2020). [COVID-19 Communication Management in Spain: Exploring the Effect of Information-Seeking Behavior and Message Reception in Public's Evaluation](#). *El profesional de la información*, 29(4), e290402.
- Okuhara, T., Okada, H., & Kiuchi, T. (2020). [Examining Persuasive Message Type to Encourage Staying at Home During the COVID-19 Pandemic and Social Lockdown: A Randomized Controlled Study in Japan](#). *Patient Education and Counseling*. Epub ahead of print.
- Olawepo, J. O., Pharr, J. R., & Kachen, A. (2018). [The Use of Social Marketing Campaigns to Increase HIV Testing Uptake: A Systematic Review](#). *AIDS Care*, 31(2), 153-162.
- Penta, M. A., & Baban, A. (2018). [Message Framing in Vaccine Communication: A Systematic Review of Published Literature](#). *Health Communication* 33(3), 299-314.
- Purohit, N., & Mehta, S. (2020). [Risk Communication Initiatives Amid COVID in India: Analyzing Message Effectiveness of Videos on National Television](#). *Journal of Health Management*, 22(2), 262-280.

- Schiavo R., May Leung M., & Brown M. (2014). [Communicating Risk and Promoting Disease Mitigation Measures in Epidemics and Emerging Disease Settings](#). *Pathogens and Global Health*, 108(2), 76-94.
- Schünemann, H., Brożek, J., Guyatt, G., & Oxman, A. (2013). [Handbook for Grading the Quality of Evidence and the Strength of Recommendations Using the GRADE Approach](#).
- Sutton, J., Renshaw, S. L., & Butts, C. T. (2020). [COVID-19: Retransmission of Official Communications in an Emerging Pandemic](#). *PLoS One*, 15(9), e0238491.
- Winograd, D. M., Fresquez, C. L., Egli, M., Peterson, E. K., Lombardi, A. R., Megale, A., ... McAndrew, L. M. (2021). [Rapid Review of Virus Risk Communication Interventions: Directions for COVID-19](#). *Patient Education and Counseling*. Epub ahead of print.
- World Health Organization. (2018, January 10). [Communicating Risk in Public Health Emergencies: A WHO Guideline for Emergency Risk Communication Policy and Practice](#).
- World Health Organization. (2020, March 19). [Risk Communication and Community Engagement Readiness and Response to Coronavirus Disease \(COVID-19\): Interim Guidance, 19 March 2020](#).