

1 **Key topics in pandemic health risk communication: A qualitative**
2 **study of expert opinions and knowledge**

3 Siv Hilde Berg^{1*}, Marie Therese Shortt¹, Jo Røislien¹, Daniel Adrian Lungu¹, Henriette
4 Thune¹, Siri Wiig¹

5 1. Centre for Resilience in Healthcare, Department of Quality and Health Technology,
6 Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Stavanger, Stavanger, Norway

7 *Corresponding author

8 Email: Siv.h.berg@uis.no (SHB)

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 **Abstract**

21 **Background.** Science communication can provide people with more accurate information on
22 pandemic health risks by translating complex scientific topics into language that helps people
23 make more informed choices on how to protect themselves and others. During pandemics,
24 experts in medicine, science, public health, and communication are important sources of
25 knowledge for science communication. This study uses the COVID-19 pandemic to explore
26 these experts' opinions and knowledge of what to communicate to the public during a
27 pandemic. The research question is: What are the key topics to communicate to the public
28 about health risks during a pandemic?

29 **Method.** We purposively sampled 13 experts in medicine, science, public health, and
30 communication for individual interviews, with a range of different types of knowledge of
31 COVID-19 risk and communication at the national, regional and hospital levels in Norway.
32 The interview transcripts were coded and analysed inductively in a qualitative thematic
33 analysis.

34 **Results.** The study's findings emphasise three central topics pertaining to communication
35 about pandemic health risk during the first year of the COVID-19 pandemic in Norway: 1)
36 how the virus enters the human body and generates disease; 2) how to protect oneself and
37 others from being infected; and 3) pandemic health risk for the individual and the society.

38 **Conclusion.** The key topics emerging from the expert interviews relate to concepts
39 originating from multiple disciplinary fields, and can inform frameworks for interprofessional
40 communication about health risks during a pandemic. The study highlights the complexity of
41 communicating pandemic messages, due to scientific uncertainty, fear of risk amplification,
42 and heterogeneity in public health and scientific literacy. The study contributes with insight
43 into the complex communication processes of pandemic health risk communication.

44

45 **Key words:** Science communication, mental models' theory, expert study, risk
46 communication, health communication, pandemic response.

47

48 1 Introduction

49 In a pandemic, a virus capable of infecting humans spreads and crosses international
50 borders, usually affecting a large number of people (1). In the past century, there have been
51 four pandemics: influenza (1918–1919), AIDS (1966-), H1N1 “swine flu” (2009–2010), and
52 COVID-19 (2019-).

53 A pandemic associated with an unknown virus brings uncertainty that challenges
54 politicians’ and policy makers’ decision making. Scientific uncertainty gives rise to a difficult
55 balancing act in public communication: being transparent about the limits of human
56 knowledge, yet still communicating clear messages (2). The challenge is reinforced by poor
57 public health literacy, which impedes people’s ability to understand the rationale for
58 governmental recommendations and to anticipate the consequences of their health choices (3).
59 To strengthen peoples’ scientific-and health literacy, science communication should convey
60 accurate information on health risks in a language that enables people to make independent
61 and informed choices that will protect both themselves and others (4).

62 Scientific uncertainty, combined with the difficulty of delivering timely but complex
63 messages to the population in a competitive media market, highlights the importance of health
64 risk communication being not only correct and trustworthy, but also engaging. What to
65 communicate to the public about staying safe during a pandemic – and how to communicate it
66 – thus needs to be done with tremendous care (5).

67 Experts in medicine, risk, public health, and communication are important sources of
68 knowledge in science communication during public health crisis (4, 6). This study uses the
69 COVID-19 pandemic to explore experts’ opinions and knowledge of what to communicate to
70 the public during a pandemic. The research question is: What are the key topics to
71 communicate to the public about health risks during a pandemic?

72 1.1 Health risk communication

73 Public communication during health emergencies aims to improve health outcomes by
74 influencing, engaging, and reaching out to different at-risk audiences (7, 8). Public
75 communication about a pandemic is, as with all communication, a multifaceted field in which
76 the contents of the message, the messenger and the qualities of the audience attributes affect
77 the reception of the message itself (8-11). In this section, we present four topics which are
78 relevant to this study's findings regarding the experts' communication of key topics: 1) trust
79 and communicating uncertainty; 2) tradeoffs in decision making; 3) risk amplification; and 4)
80 public engagement.

81 1.1.1 Trust and communicating uncertainty

82 Communicating honestly about uncertainty can build public trust and increase the
83 legitimacy and credibility of the decision making process (12). Public trust in the messengers
84 of pandemic health risk information is associated with their willingness to comply with
85 measures to prevent infection (13, 14). The World Health Organisation (WHO) advises health
86 authorities to be candid about risk, events and interventions and to be forthcoming about what
87 is known and what is not (7). However, the different types of uncertainty that have been
88 communicated have different effects on trust. Gustafson and Rice (15) reviewed the
89 experimental literature and found that communicating disagreements or conflict in science
90 (*consensus uncertainty*) were most often associated with reduced credibility. Communicating
91 *technical uncertainty* (e.g., probabilities) had positive or no effect on perceived credibility.
92 The effect was mixed in relation to communicating *scientific uncertainty*, which had both
93 positive and negative effects on perceived credibility.

94 1.1.2 Tradeoffs in decision making

95 Several safety science theorists have outlined *tradeoffs* as an inevitable balancing act
96 among all kinds of pressures and safety in hazardous systems (16-18), including healthcare
97 (19). Tradeoffs involve ambiguity over what constitutes the right answer. According to
98 Gregory et al. (20) tradeoffs are usually difficult to communicate. Changes in one endpoint
99 are often achieved at the expense of other goals, and the consequences of tradeoffs are often
100 unclear to the decision makers. According to Gregory et al. (20) tradeoffs reflect issues that
101 science cannot resolve; they depend on values in making decisions about risk. Little is known
102 about the public behavioral effect of communicating tradeoffs on decision making in
103 pandemics, yet Gregory et al. (20) and Norheim et al. (21) argued that tradeoffs should be
104 transparent to foster trust.

105 1.1.3 Risk amplification

106 The Social Amplification of Risk Framework (SARF) suggests that most health risk
107 messages are sent through transmitters (e.g. media, messengers) which alter the original
108 message by intensifying or attenuating some signals before passing them on (10). SARF
109 proposes that risk deemed less urgent by experts may be *amplified* by other transmitters;
110 however, risk that experts consider less urgent may be *attenuated*. According to SARF,
111 silence from experts and decision makers may breed fear and suspicion among those at risk
112 and lead to risk amplification. Nevertheless, a moderate level of fear can mitigate the risk of a
113 pandemic by encouraging behaviour that protects public health (22). To minimise risk
114 amplification, health risk communicators should avoid sensationalism, speculation and
115 disturbing images (23).

116 1.1.4 Public engagement

117 In the early 1980s, “lay” perspectives were perceived as fallible and subjective by
118 communication experts and policy makers, and communication interventions aimed to align
119 lay perspectives with those of the experts in a *one-way approach*. As the field of health and
120 risk communication evolves, multi-way approaches to communication emphasising *public*
121 *engagement* have largely replaced the one-way approach to communication (9). The WHO
122 advises health authorities to involve the public in decision making to ensure that interventions
123 are collaborative and contextually suitable, thereby constituting a *two-way approach* (7).
124 There is growing awareness of the benefits of including patients and the public in healthcare.
125 However, involvement needs to be conducted at an even wider system level, e.g., involvement
126 in the design of public health communication (24).

127

128 2 Method

129 The present study applies a qualitative design using individual interviews with
130 Norwegian experts in medicine, science, public health, and communication guided by the
131 mental models’ approach to risk communication (4, 25). The mental models’ approach to risk
132 communication involves both experts’ knowledge and opinions of what people should know
133 to make informed decisions about a topic (normative research) and the ability of the intended
134 audience (descriptive research) to create tailored risk communication interventions
135 (prescriptive research) (4). This study reports on the normative research phase (26). See Berg
136 et al. (27) for results from the audience analysis, and Røislien et al. (28) for the design of the
137 intervention.

138 Expert opinions are valuable components of communication designs when the scientific
139 evidence is missing, is inconsistent or incomplete, as is often the case with new viruses such
140 as the coronavirus (SARS-COV-2) (25). Prior research of expert mental models’ have used

141 health scientists' and medical practitioners' knowledge of infectious diseases to design health
142 risk communications (29, 30). To our knowledge, no mental models' studies of infectious
143 diseases have so far included the knowledge of communication experts.

144 2.1 Participants and sampling strategy

145 Communicating key topics during a pandemic is a dynamic process in which a range of
146 interprofessional issues of pandemic health risk are attributed different temporal weights.
147 Infection control was the Norwegian government's and policy makers' main focus in the first
148 wave of the pandemic, while mental health and public health became increasingly important
149 as the pandemic evolved (31). Communication science is an important field of knowledge to
150 pandemic responses (7), however it is not necessarily emphasised as part of the public health
151 risk communication field. We therefore sought informants with expertise in medicine,
152 science, public health, and communication to cover the variety of expertise relevant to
153 pandemic risk communication.

154 We purposively sampled 13 experts in medicine, medical/health research, public health,
155 and communication for individual interviews, all with extensive knowledge of COVID-19 and
156 risk communication at the hospital, regional and national levels in Norway. Participants who
157 met the inclusion criteria were identified and recruited by invitation from the research group.
158 One participant dropped out of the study due to time issues. Table 1 displays sample
159 characteristics and the participants' field of expertise, professional role during the COVID-19
160 pandemic and in public communication.

Table 1 Sample Characteristics

	Field of expertise and sample category	Professional role	Public communication role related to COVID-19	Gender
1	Public health management, nurse (Public health)	Head of department for community healthcare service. Infection tracing and training of healthcare professionals	Advisor of municipal communication to the public	F

2	Specialist in community medicine (medicine)	Municipal chief physician and head of COVID-19 emergency room. Infection prevention at individual and group level	Municipal communication to the public	M
3	Public emergency and risk management (public health)	Head of municipal emergency management and community risk communication	Municipal communication to the public	M
4	Marketing (communication)	Audience analysis, targeted communication to adolescents and young adults	Advisor of municipal communication to the public	F
5	Clinical psychologist, PhD in psychology, journalism (public health)	Psychologist in primary mental healthcare	Municipal communication to the public	F
6	Communication and journalism (communication)	Audience analysis. Targeted communication related to motivation and mental health	Advisor of municipal communication to the public	F
7	Professor and infection medicine specialist (medicine)	Head of infection medicine in a Regional Hospital. Infection prevention at individual and group level	Communication to the public at regional level	M
8	Infection medicine specialist (medicine)	Infection prevention at hospital level. Microbiology, virus transmission and treatment of COVID patients	Science dissemination in medical journals	F
9	Infection medicine specialist (medicine)	Head of infection medicine in a Regional Hospital. Infection prevention at individual and group level	Communication to the public at regional level	M
10	Risk communication and ethnography (communication)	Director of nationwide health risk communication	Strategy level, nationwide health risk communication	F
11	Professor of statistics (medical research)	Biostatistician. Mathematical modelling of the R-value and the spread of COVID-19.	Communication to the public at national level	M
12	Professor of health communication and cell-biologist (health research)	Health communication researcher. Health literacy in the general public	Science dissemination in national media	M
13	PhD and infection medicine specialist (medical research)	Infection medicine researcher. Virus transmission, immunity and antibodies related to SARS-COV-2	Communication in national media	F

161

162 2.2 Interviews

163 A semi-structured interview guide was developed to explore key topics related to
 164 communication about COVID-19 virus transmission and exposure, mitigation management,
 165 and potential effects of infection (S1 File). The interview guide also explored key topics

166 related to pandemic health risk generally and those in each expert's specialty. The interview
167 guide was pilot tested with participant number one. The interviewer had no prior established
168 relationships with the participants, and the participants were informed about the reasons for
169 this research (exploring key topics in pandemic communication and their experiences with
170 communication). Due to national COVID-19 measures to keep physical distance, the
171 participants were interviewed individually by SHB using a video conferencing software
172 program (Zoom). Mean duration of interviews was 59 (range 46-80 min) minutes. Interviews
173 were audio recorded and transcribed. Ethical approval was obtained from the Norwegian
174 Centre for Research Data (Ref nr. 583192). All participants gave written, voluntary and
175 informed consent. The interviews were conducted between February and April 2021.

176 2.3 Context

177 The data material in this study presents important topics for a first-year pandemic
178 response. At the time of data collection, individuals in Norway with the highest risk of severe
179 consequences of COVID-19 were being vaccinated. The UK variant of the coronavirus
180 (B.1.1.7) had started to spread in the Norwegian population and led to the third wave of
181 COVID-19.

182 In the first year of the pandemic, the number of positive cases and deaths per million due
183 to COVID-19 were much lower in Norway than in other European countries (32). Since the
184 first wave of COVID-19 struck Norway in March-April 2020, the government strategy has
185 been to limit the spread of infection by using testing, isolation, contact tracing, and
186 quarantine, and by occasionally closing schools and kindergartens, and cancelling cultural
187 events (33). The goal has been to control the spread of infection so that the infection is
188 manageable and does not exceed the capacity of the health and care service and the municipal
189 health service (34).

190 Norway has a strong public healthcare system; most hospitals are funded and owned by
191 the state. The welfare state is well-developed and founded on the principles of universal
192 access, decentralisation and free choice of provider (35). Compared to other OECD countries,
193 Norway is a high-trust society (36); in a recent study 96% of the participants reported that
194 they trusted the health authorities in general (37). Trust in the health authorities has remained
195 high and stable during the pandemic; between 80 and 90% of the population expressed a high
196 level of trust in the health authorities (31), and especially in the Norwegian Institute of Public
197 Health (NIPH) (38). Norway has a population of 5.4 million. Although the country has the
198 third lowest population density in Europe, at the beginning of the COVID-19 outbreak,
199 Norway was second only to Italy in the number of confirmed cases per capita. However, by
200 April 2020 Norway had been able to “flatten the curve” and ease the competition for hospital
201 beds (38). A strategy used by the Norwegian government during the first pandemic response
202 was to appeal to people’s sense of solidarity by using the term *dugnad*, an old cultural
203 practice that describes volunteer activities that will benefit the community (39).

204 2.4 Analysis

205 The expert interview transcripts were coded and analysed inductively in a qualitative
206 thematic analysis (40). The unit of analysis was “what people should know”, and the analysis
207 followed the five phases of systematic thematic analysis as outlined by Braun and Clark (40).
208 To become familiar with the data, all transcripts were read by SHB and MT (phase 1), who
209 discussed first impressions of the material with SW. SHB inductively coded data across the
210 entire data set related to the meaning units (phase 2). The initial codes were extracted to
211 tables, which were used to search for meaningful patterns, themes, and levels of themes. All
212 co-authors reviewed the initial organisation of codes. The codes were then compiled under 36
213 key messages, which were then abstracted into seven sub-themes and three themes (phase 3).

214 In phase 4, a table with thematically organised codes was made to validate the themes in
215 relation to the codes and the entire data set. The themes were refined and renamed to generate
216 clear terms for each theme (phase 5). The fifth and final phase consisted of writing out the
217 results with codes and extract examples, which all co-authors read and discussed.

218 Thematic mapping is used in thematic analysis to find and display relationships between
219 codes and themes (40) and influence diagrams are often used to visualise experts mental
220 models (25, 26). However, these visualisation techniques are one-dimensional and do not
221 allow for multi-layered information to be displayed. A *bubble chart* was thus created; a
222 visualisation method developed by Shortt et al. (41) for visualising qualitative interview data,
223 inspired by thematic mapping and influence diagrams (25, 40). The bubble chart displays
224 topics emphasised by experts in medicine, medical/health researchers (science), public health,
225 and communication, with colour coding that enables visual comparison of topics emphasised
226 by the different experts. Topics with disagreement whether they should be communicated to
227 the public or due to being perceived as not relevant, to complicated or too uncertain to
228 communicate to the public, are highlighted.

229

230 3 Results

231 The first impression of the data material was linked to how seriously the medical and
232 research experts took their responsibility for communicating pandemic risk to the public, yet
233 they emphasised not being trained in public communication. The medical and research
234 experts were reflexive in crafting each message to each audience, and in maintaining their
235 ethics in public communication. They expressed personal uncertainty in their role as
236 communicators to the public. Although the communication experts had been trained, none of
237 them had ever had to issue communications about such an ambiguous situation, especially one

238 of the scale of the COVID-19 pandemic. All of the experts had to learn about this type of
239 communication during a pandemic by doing it, despite scientific uncertainty and constantly
240 changing evidence.

241 The analysis of expert opinions and knowledge identified 36 key messages in
242 pandemic health risk communication to the public which were organised into seven sub-
243 themes as part of three main themes: how the virus enters the human body and produces
244 disease; how to protect oneself and others from infection; and pandemic health risk for the
245 individual and the society (Table 2).


Table 2 Key Topics to Communicate to the Public Related to Pandemic Risk

Themes	How the virus gets into the human body and generates disease	How to protect oneself and others from being infected	Pandemic health risk for the individual and the society
Sub-themes	Modes of virus transmission	Infection prevention at the individual level	Solidarity
	Virus and immunity	Infection prevention at group level	Control of the spread Risk tradeoffs

246

247 How each of the expert groups emphasised each of the themes and sub-themes is visualised in
248 Figure 1. An animated version of the bubble chart reveals the multi-layer organisation of the
249 themes and sub-themes according to the various expert groups (S2 File).

250



251

252 **Figure 1** Bubble chart visualising concept mapping of expert opinions.

253 3.1 How the virus gets into the human body and generates disease

254 The theme “how the virus gets into the body and generates disease” has two sub-

255 themes: modes of virus transmission, and virus and immunity (Figure 2).



256

257 *Figure 2* Bubble chart representation of information relating to the theme ‘How the virus gets into the human body and
 258 generates disease’

259

260 3.1.1 Modes of virus transmission

261 The experts’ emphasis on modes of virus transmission is related to a potential increase
 262 in people’s comprehension of why they should comply with recommendations to protect
 263 themselves from COVID-19. One necessary message to communicate was how droplets
 264 containing the virus could reach people within a metre of the person emitting the droplets.
 265 This message helps to reinforce the need to keep physical distance.

266 Experts from several fields insisted that the public needed to comprehend the concepts
 267 of *incubation period* and *asymptomatic transmission*, which they expressed as: “You can be

268 contagious even if you don't have symptoms. Non-symptomatic people can carry the disease
269 without being aware of it. You cannot tell if a person is infected or not, so everyone needs to
270 keep distance”.

271 At the time of data collection there was scientific uncertainty about the modes of
272 virus transmission of the corona virus. Specialists in infectious disease highlighted that it was
273 important to address this uncertainty by communicating the *most dominant route of*
274 *transmission* to help people distinguish *possible* from the *most probable* way of transmission.

275 Some of the experts used the terms *contact/surface transmission*, *droplet transmission*
276 and *airborne transmission* when communicating with the public. The experts agreed that
277 there was not a clear distinction but rather a continuum between droplet and airborne
278 transmission. Although one expert in infectious diseases believed it was important to illustrate
279 a continuum of droplets with different sizes and reach, another expert communicated how
280 temperature and humidity affected how long the droplets stayed in the air and thus increased
281 the probability of virus survival, and therefore the chance of being infected.

282 Contact transmission was found to be difficult to explain, as people who received the
283 message interpreted the same information in different ways:

284 *We try to communicate that the main infection path is air and other people.*
285 *If you practice good hand hygiene then you are reasonably safe, even if you*
286 *touch a door handle covered with virus. But people perceive that*
287 *information very differently. Some people perceive it as deadly and go to*
288 *extremes, but others will perceive this as something they don't have to think*
289 *about, so it does not matter how you deliver the message (No. 12).*

290

291 Some of the infectious disease experts did not communicate airborne transmission to
292 the public. They considered that communicating the topic could elicit excessive fear due to
293 the scientific uncertainty related to airborne transmission and SARS-COV-2, and due to the
294 high level of scientific/health literacy needed to comprehend how aerosols could stay in the

295 air. The health communication expert described how creating mental images of the airspace
296 around people by using analogies to water have been used successfully as a pedagogic tool:

297 *People have rather vague ideas about the medium of air, and what it means*
298 *to breathe at a distance of one metre. It spreads in the same way, as if you*
299 *dip a teabag in a cup of water. Because there is no hole here, it's compact*
300 *matter.... These particles are carried through matter in the same way as if*
301 *you had dropped a small wooden plank on the water surface (No. 12)*

302

303 Experts who did not use the terms *droplets*, *airborne* and *contact/surface*
304 *transmission*, believed they were too technical and ambiguous. Instead, they prioritised the
305 conveying of clear messages; how people could protect themselves by washing their hands
306 and keeping their distance, as exemplified by a communication expert for nationwide health
307 risk communication:

308 *We have not been completely oblique about how the virus infects, and new*
309 *virus variants change how the virus behaves... We have not used the terms*
310 *airborne, droplet and contact transmission so often. We have been more*
311 *concerned with explaining what the best precautions to take to avoid being*
312 *infected by the virus are... We have noticed that there is a great demand*
313 *among the general public for information about the type of infection, but*
314 *people are just as concerned about how to handle the infection. They want*
315 *to know what to do (No. 10).*

316

317 The marketing expert pointed out that modes of virus transmission were not
318 mentioned in their target group analysis of young people's concerns and values, thus the topic
319 was not included in their targeted communication to adolescents.

320 3.1.2 Virus and immunity

321 The infectious diseases experts believed that it was important to explain how a *virus*
322 *attaches itself to the cells* and creates disease. Such mechanisms were important to increase
323 peoples understanding of variant virus' changes in transmission. The variants of the virus had
324 different causes for their increased contagiousness; for example, an infectious diseases expert

325 explained how a virus which can be in the upper respiratory tract one to two days before the
326 disease breaks out is extremely contagious. The health communication expert believed that
327 explanations of virus autonomy and multiplication were too complicated for most people to
328 understand. The communication expert for nationwide health risk communication noted that
329 they had included this information when communicating to the public, despite its complexity:

330 *We have tried to explain that here is a part of this virus, this spike that*
331 *attached better [SARS-COV-2 Spike Protein]. It is complex information, but*
332 *we have really thought that it is important to try to give it anyway, so that*
333 *people understand why we still ask them to keep distance, and maybe even*
334 *keep more distance now, because the contagiousness in the virus variations*
335 *is different to the first virus variant that we are familiar with. We have*
336 *changed the information both about the virus itself and also about the*
337 *advice we give (No. 10)*

338

339 Infectious diseases experts experienced that the public tended to perceive *mutations of*
340 *viruses* as dangerous, and considered it important to communicate the message that mutations
341 are a natural part of the virus's life cycle. The virus spreads by becoming more contagious
342 without killing its host. Thus, by mutating the virus becomes less lethal.

343 Experts from diverse fields considered it important to inform about the effects of
344 vaccination on immunity and how vaccination affected the individual and the society. At the
345 individual level, it was important to convey the message that “you can still be infected and
346 infect others even if you are vaccinated, however the vaccine may limit the lethality of
347 infection”. At the society level, reducing the risk of infection through *herd immunity* through
348 mass vaccination was a relevant concept to communicate.

349 3.2 How to protect oneself and others from being infected

350 The theme “how to protect oneself and others from being infected” pertained to two
351 sub-themes: infection prevention at the individual level, and at the group level (Figure 3).



352

353 *Figure 3 Bubble chart representation of information from interviews relating to the theme 'How to protect oneself and others*
 354 *from being infected'*

355

356 3.2.1 Infection prevention at the individual level

357 Experts from various fields agreed that the basic infection prevention measures were
 358 the most important to communicate to the public: keep distance; wash your hands; stay at
 359 home and get tested if you show symptoms; limit your contacts; and what quarantine and
 360 isolation mean. The communication expert for nationwide health risk communication
 361 explained the importance of conveying core messages with clear instructions:

362 *We have observed a rather surprising desire for clear messages... There is a*
 363 *much greater willingness to be told what to do in Norway than I was*
 364 *prepared for... It's very special, and a little different from the risk*
 365 *communication theory that state that you should describe the risk and let*
 366 *people make their own decisions (No. 10).*

367

368 However, the rules were difficult to enforce if people did not understand the
369 underlying principles. Many of the experts insisted that the rationales for infection prevention
370 measures were important to explain to the public. Explaining *why* people had to follow the
371 rules, and being open about the evidence and the pandemic decision making, were considered
372 important in the creation of trust. The marketing expert emphasised that adolescents did not
373 understand the rationale for the rules, so they produced videos to describe not only *how* to
374 protect themselves, but also *why*.

375 The infectious diseases experts considered it important to teach the public about
376 probabilities, and to convey the message that “there are no clear boundaries between safe and
377 unsafe distance, the larger distance you keep, the less probability you have for being exposed
378 to infection”. According to the research and infectious diseases expert:

379 *In communication with the public, it is important to emphasise that when*
380 *you set a two-metre limit, it is not because there is a black-and-white limit*
381 *that if you are 2 metres and 10 cm from someone, you are safe, and if you*
382 *are 1 metre and 90 cm, then you are not. That’s silly. So, you have to trust*
383 *people to use their common sense and understand that it is a question of*
384 *probabilities in all of the rules and guidelines that exist (No.13).*

385

386 3.2.2 Infection prevention at group level

387 While the scientific evidence for infection prevention was more definitive at the
388 individual level, higher scientific uncertainty was related to infection prevention at the group
389 level, which often led to public debates in the media over whether or not the evidence
390 supported lockdowns of specific activities. The infectious disease experts emphasised the
391 need to communicate the risk of being physically close to others and engaging in activities
392 that increased the expulsion of droplets containing the virus (e.g., singing, going to pubs and

393 gyms) to increase people’s understanding of why those activities had been stopped. As the
394 nationwide health risk communication expert emphasised:

395 *It is not about whether it is correct to close that particular school or*
396 *shopping centre or not, it’s about reducing the total contact frequency*
397 *among individuals, and these choices will be implemented with a high level*
398 *of uncertainty regarding their efficiency (No. 10).*

399

400 To reduce the stigma of contracting COVID-19, the communication director
401 communicated that “this virus does not differentiate between people”. However, some of the
402 experts at community and regional hospitals reported feeling trapped between safeguarding
403 individuals’ right to privacy and satisfying the media’s need for information.


404 Experts emphasised that conveying a message of hope could help people remain
405 motivated despite of social distancing. The medical experts emphasised supportive messages
406 and acknowledging people’s compliance. A communication expert described tailoring
407 different messages to different populations in the municipality by showing them activities
408 they could do during lockdown:

409 *We identified that people wanted the municipality to stop telling them what*
410 *they could not do, but rather what they could do. People can be outdoors*
411 *even if we are on red level, and we have to think about measures to support,*
412 *that involves being outdoor (No. 6).*

413

414 3.3 Pandemic health risk for the individual and the society

415 The theme “pandemic health risk for the individual and the society” was related to three
416 sub-themes: solidarity, control of the spread, and risk-tradeoffs (Figure 4).



417

418 *Figure 4 Bubble chart representation of information from interviews relating to the theme 'Pandemic health risk for the*
419 *individual and the society'*

420

421 3.3.1 Solidarity

422 Experts explained the importance of informing the public of the collective moral
423 responsibility to protect others, appealing to Norwegians' sense of solidarity. As the
424 communication expert at the national level explained:

425 *Initially we needed to bring the entire population to the same problem*
426 *definition, because we need to share the problem. We explained that it was*
427 *most dangerous for the oldest and groups with chronic diseases. You could*
428 *have chosen to be a society that said: you have to protect yourself in a*
429 *bubble until we are all infected. But that's ethically completely*
430 *unjustifiable. This means that approximately 70 percent of the population*
431 *should be careful to protect the remaining population, and that as an*
432 *individual you get some tasks to do to protect someone else than yourself*
433 *(No. 10).*

434 However, appealing to solidarity was considered challenging, because the messages
435 need to be understood by the whole population, including people who are not in a life or work
436 situation where they can participate in the collective effort by keeping physical distance, and
437 people who come from cultural backgrounds that have a different understanding and valuation
438 of collective moral responsibility.

439 3.3.2 Control of the spread

440 Experts from different fields stressed the need to communicate the risk of losing
441 control of the spread. They stated that “while the pandemic risk is low for many individuals, it
442 is high for society”. To express the risk to society, the experts reiterated the potential
443 consequences and future scenarios, conveyed as: “The virus is highly contagious. Losing
444 control of the spread of the virus, will lead to healthcare services becoming overloaded which
445 makes the pandemic deadlier”.

446 The media often used the reproduction number (R-number) to describe the status of
447 the spread. According to the biostatistician:

448 *The R, the reproduction number, is important because it says something*
449 *about the growth of the disease, so it is the speed with which the disease*
450 *will grow, the number of infected people will grow. And if this number is*
451 *above 1, then the epidemic is exploding, if it is below 1, it is under control*
452 *and will disappear. So, it is a fundamental number that describes the*
453 *current status, where are we now, today we are 0.8, that is good, last week*
454 *we were 1.3, not so good, and so on right... (No. 11)*

455 However, many of the experts decided against mentioning the R-number in their
456 public messaging, because of the risk of misunderstanding it. The R-number was considered
457 too complicated to explain to the public due to the need to understand uncertainties,
458 simplified assumptions, and exponential growth. Many of the experts believed that the R-
459 number could result in a misleading picture of the pandemic.

460 The experts stated that explanations of the risk of losing control should be balanced
461 with information empowering the population to control the spread. Descriptions of realistic
462 risk scenarios needed to be balanced with messages of hope. It was just as important to
463 convey the severity of the risk as it was to avoid creating panic. As the psychologist stated:

464 *If too much fear is triggered, I think some people will defend themselves*
465 *and refuse to deal with it. You should neither make the message so*
466 *dangerous that it becomes overwhelming, neither so harmless that people*
467 *think it does not matter what they do. I think you cannot under-*
468 *communicate the consequences. You have to get a balance there (No. 5).*

469

470 Lastly, messages implying the risk of losing control needed to be balanced with
471 messages strengthening people's sense of control. As such, the infectious diseases experts did
472 not merely reveal the status of infected and hospitalised people, but also that "we have
473 control" to ensure the public's trust in healthcare delivery. The experts believed in creating
474 situational awareness while offering specific advice on how to minimise their risk.

475 3.3.3 Risk tradeoffs

476 Some experts believed that giving people insight into their dilemmas could improve
477 the public's understanding of management strategies for the pandemic.

478 The experts emphasised the significance of informing the public of the risk tradeoffs
479 between primary and secondary consequences of the pandemic". However, their perspectives
480 on risk differed. The medical experts had low risk acceptance for the negative consequences
481 of lockdown and isolation (e.g., increased mental illness among children and adolescents).
482 Thus, they wanted all measures to be proportionate to the infection risk. Nevertheless, the
483 emergency management expert had low risk acceptance for primary consequences of the
484 pandemic, and thus communicated the importance of preventing the spread of the virus by
485 implementing measures as early as possible:

486 *It's very difficult to use strict and invasive measures to prevent infection.*
487 *You have to wait until the infection has spread. Different professional*
488 *experts, health and emergency preparedness disagree. We [emergency*
489 *preparedness specialists] believe it is not about spreading fear. It is about*
490 *having a proactive approach around a potential hazardous situation in the*
491 *future. It is difficult to communicate well, because our message is often shot*
492 *down by the central health authorities (No. 3).*

493

494 The science and infectious diseases expert contended that the risk tradeoff between
495 being infected versus being vaccinated needed to be communicated. This tradeoff was
496 difficult to express, especially at the individual level:

497 *To communicate that vaccines are used when a virus is so dangerous that it*
498 *is worth taking the risk of side-effects to avoid being exposed to the*
499 *infection is challenging. Where is that threshold? There is no final decision*
500 *on that... When is the intersection where your individual risk should*
501 *actually take precedence over the best interest of society and herd*
502 *immunity? It's twisted. I try to communicate the dilemma. I do not have a*
503 *definitive answer, because there is no definitive answer (No. 13).*

504

505 4 Discussion

506 This study uses COVID-19 as a case to explore medicine, science (medical/health research,
507 public health and communication expert' opinions and knowledge of topics to communicate
508 to the public in relation to pandemic health risks. The discussion of the findings is related to
509 the interdisciplinarity of the emerging key topics, communicating uncertainty and messages
510 which may amplify risk, and the role of public engagement along with expertise knowledge in
511 designing messages.

512 4.1 Interdisciplinarity

513 This study has identified three key topics of scientific knowledge in pandemic health
514 risk communication. The experts focused on viral replication and modes of virus
515 transmission, protection from the disease, and the health risk for individuals and the society.

516 These key topics relate to concepts which originate from different fields and disciplines,
517 including infectious diseases (e.g., virus transmission, immunity), psychology (e.g., fear,
518 hope, motivation), philosophy (e.g., collective moral responsibility), statistics (e.g., R-number),
519 risk communication (e.g., situational awareness, risk tradeoffs), health communication (e.g.,
520 health literacy), pedagogy (e.g., visual analogies), and marketing (e.g., targeted
521 communication).

522 Furthermore, the different experts had different priorities in terms of what messages to
523 convey. This poses a risk for contradictory communication. The multi-disciplinarity of the
524 key topics in this study, and the different views on key topics to communicate, demonstrate
525 that messages should not be developed from one scientific field only, but should rather rely on
526 interdisciplinarity to ensure coherence, clarity, and engagement.

527 4.2 Communicating uncertainty and messages which may amplify risk

528 In this study, the omission of talking about the R-number and airborne transmission in
529 public communication were related to the experts' belief that raising these topics
530 characterised by scientific uncertainty could amplify the risk. However, under those
531 circumstances people may consult other sources of information, which may lead to
532 misinformation and consequently risk amplification (42).

533 Nevertheless, evidence does not support the communication of uncertainty on all
534 occasions. The communication of uncertainty can have a range of outcomes. According to
535 Gustafson and Rices' (15) review of the experimental literature on different types of trust,
536 explaining the confidence interval related to the R-number and explaining probabilities
537 related to infection prevention measures may increase public trust, as these are related to
538 communicating technical uncertainty (15). Nonetheless, communicating uncertainty about

539 airborne transmission at the early phase of the pandemic may undermine public trust, as this
540 type of uncertainty is related to scientific uncertainty, and lack of experts' consensus (15).

541 The experts emphasised being open and transparent and communicating tradeoffs in crisis
542 management as vital to the creation of trust and strengthening people's comprehension of the
543 rationale behind infection prevention measures. Trust is essential during rapidly evolving
544 events characterised by scientific uncertainty (9, 13, 14). The experts reflect that the pandemic
545 measures have both intended and unintended consequences, forcing decision makers to trade
546 short-term policy goals for unintended long-term effects (43). Recent studies have shown that
547 quarantine, staying home and closing schools have implications for unemployment (44),
548 mental health issues (45, 46), interrupted learning (47) and domestic violence (48). Countries
549 strive to balance safety and health with economic security and personal freedom (49).
550 Norheim et al. (21) argue that by explaining these dilemmas, people learn about the
551 complexity of the decision making process, and strengthen social trust. Gregory et al. (20)
552 argue that experts and authorities should be transparent and acknowledge value-based
553 judgements in environmental risk management, rather than pretend that the decision making
554 is objective and non-value-based. Consistent with the literature, this study identifies risk
555 tradeoffs in pandemic health risk communication as a topic to communicate. Tradeoffs can be
556 conveyed by the messenger in their messages through transparency about what is at stake and
557 how the interests of different parties are assessed and weighted.

558 Furthermore, in this study, medical experts emphasised the balance between providing
559 people with facts and instilling fear. The experts protected this balance by suggesting future
560 scenarios and the consequences of uncontrolled virus spread with the aim of creating a
561 realistic picture of the threat while avoiding war-framing and exaggerations. Both social
562 amplification and attenuation of risk undermine the effectiveness of risk communication
563 (10). A moderate level of fear is needed to take the risk seriously and act on it (22). Consistent

564 with the literature, this study identifies the balance between fear and efficacy as vital when
565 communicating control of the spread (10, 50). By doing so, health risk communicators may
566 provide the public with necessary information, without attenuation or amplification of the risk
567 in correspondence with the SARF (42).

568 4.3 Public engagement

569 This study indicates that experts across professional fields are taking the audience's
570 knowledge (or lack of) and concerns into account. The medical and science experts are
571 mindful of relying clear messages, and of simplifying complex scientific topics and
572 principles. However, medical/health research, public health and medical experts have
573 different preferences from the communication experts in terms of selecting the content of their
574 messages. The medical and research experts, although acknowledging their audience, adopt a
575 one-way approach that consists of identifying topics based on what they consider most
576 important. The communication experts adopt a two-way approach that is intended to fill gaps
577 in the public's knowledge.

578 There are limitations to both approaches. The recipients of communication must regard
579 the message as relevant; this is a drawback of the one-way approach because without knowing
580 their audience experts' communication may be too detailed and detached from public's values
581 (9). The drawback of communication interventions informed by audience analysis only is the
582 omission of topics not emphasised by the target group. Pandemic health risk communication
583 also needs to provide people with information that they do not realise they need to protect
584 themselves and others. Communication created based on audience analysis, without expert
585 opinions may fail to fill knowledge gaps (4).

586 There is no one-size-fits-all to the communication of health risk during a pandemic.
587 There will always be unintended effects on some audience members. Both audience analysis

588 and interdisciplinary collaboration among experts in medicine, public health, science, and
589 communication may facilitate the creation of engaging messages with intended outcomes (4).

590 4.4 Limitations

591 This study uses a normative expert study approach to collect multi-professional domain-
592 specific knowledge (25). Analytical generalisations made on a theoretical level can inform
593 frameworks for inter-professional pandemic health risk communication and public health
594 emergencies (51). This study holds strong information power due to the quality of the
595 interview dialogue (52), and the inclusion of participants with relevant experiences with the
596 phenomenon under study (53). However, the phenomenon of pandemic communication is
597 ambiguous and complex, and a larger sample could have revealed an even larger breadth of
598 pandemic communication topics. Future studies are needed to explore pandemic
599 communication in other settings and phases of a pandemic with other fast spreading infectious
600 diseases.

601 5 Conclusion

602 In this study we have explored experts' opinions and knowledge about health-related
603 information topics that need to be shared with the public in a pandemic situation. By looking
604 into the COVID-19 as a case, the experts in our sample revealed diverse key topics
605 representing several disciplinary fields. The experts found it is fundamental to communicate
606 the ways a virus enters the body and generates disease; the measures needed to protect oneself
607 and others; and enabling a wider perspective on the individual and societal risks caused by the
608 pandemic. This study demonstrates that pandemic health risk communication relies on
609 interdisciplinary expertise across medicine, public health, medical/health research, and
610 communication. Experts emphasise not merely what to communicate but understand the
611 message as meaning produced in the intersection of the messenger, the message attributes,

612 and its audience. Thus, what to communicate is highly related to the complexity of
613 communicating messages due to scientific uncertainty, fear of risk amplification,
614 heterogeneity in public health and scientific literacy, among others. Therefore, the study
615 contributes to the knowledge of complex communication processes of pandemic health risk
616 communication.

617 The results from this study can be used to create communication interventions related to
618 pandemic health risk, first of all by emphasising the need for a genuinely interdisciplinary
619 approach to what needs to be communicated. The study contributes to the field of pandemic
620 preparedness and informs effective communication interventions in future pandemic events.
621 Studies of intended audience members are required to identify what the public does and does
622 not know, as advised by the mental models' approach to risk communication (4).

623

624 **Acknowledgements**

625 We want to acknowledge the COVCOM user panel for providing feedback on our work in
626 progress.

627 **Research team**

628 This study was conducted by an interdisciplinary team of researchers in the Covid
629 Communication project (COVCOM) lead by JR. SHB (PhD, Licenced Clinical Psychologist)
630 is an associate professor with a background from psychology and safety science. She is an
631 experienced interviewer. MT (PhD) is a postdoctoral researcher with a background from
632 visual communication and media studies. JR (PhD) is a professor in medical statistics with a
633 background from mass media communication and mathematics. DAL (PhD) is an associate
634 professor with a background from experimental research and management studies. HT (PhD)

635 is dean of research with a background from aesthetics, gender and intermedial studies. SW

636 (PhD) is a professor with a background from safety science and risk communication.

637 **References**

- 638 1. Porta M. A dictionary of epidemiology. New York: Oxford university press; 2014.
- 639 2. Salajan A, Tsoleva S, Ciotti M, Suk JE. To what extent does evidence support decision making
640 during infectious disease outbreaks? A scoping literature review. *Evidence & Policy: A Journal of*
641 *Research, Debate and Practice*. 2020;16(3):453-75.
- 642 3. Paakkari L, Okan O. COVID-19: health literacy is an underestimated problem. *The Lancet*
643 *Public Health*. 2020;5(5):e249-e50.
- 644 4. de Bruin WB, Bostrom A. Assessing what to address in science communication. *Proceedings of*
645 *the National Academy of Sciences*. 2013;110(Supplement 3):14062-8.
- 646 5. Antiochou K. Science communication: challenges and dilemmas in the age of COVID-19.
647 *History and Philosophy of the Life Sciences*. 2021;43(3):87.
- 648 6. Wong-Parodi G, De Bruin WB. Informing public perceptions about climate change: A 'mental
649 models' approach. *Science and engineering ethics*. 2017;23(5):1369-86.
- 650 7. World Health Organization. Communicating risk in public health emergencies: a WHO
651 guideline for emergency risk communication (ERC) policy and practice. Switzerland: World Health
652 Organization; 2017.
- 653 8. Berg SH, O'Hara JK, Shortt MT, Thune H, Brønnick KK, Lungu DA, et al. Health authorities'
654 health risk communication with the public during pandemics: a rapid scoping review. *BMC Public*
655 *Health*. 2021;21(1):1401.
- 656 9. Balog-Way D, McComas K, Besley J. The Evolving Field of Risk Communication. *Risk*
657 *Analysis*. 2020;40(S1):2240-62.
- 658 10. Kasperson RE, Renn O, Slovic P, Brown HS, Emel J, Goble R, et al. The social amplification of
659 risk: A conceptual framework. *Risk analysis*. 1988;8(2):177-87.
- 660 11. Lungu DA, Røislien J, Wiig S, Shortt MT, Ferrè F, Berg SH, et al. The Role of Recipient
661 Characteristics in Health Video Communication Outcomes: Scoping Review. *J Med Internet Res*.
662 2021;23(12):e30962.
- 663 12. Van der Bles AM, Van Der Linden S, Freeman AL, Mitchell J, Galvao AB, Zaval L, et al.
664 Communicating uncertainty about facts, numbers and science. *Royal Society open science*.
665 2019;6(5):181870.
- 666 13. Fancourt D, Steptoe A, Wright L. The Cummings effect: politics, trust, and behaviours during
667 the COVID-19 pandemic. *The Lancet*. 2020;396(10249):464-5.
- 668 14. Plohl N, Musil B. Modeling compliance with COVID-19 prevention guidelines: The critical role
669 of trust in science. *Psychology, Health & Medicine*. 2021;26(1):1-12.
- 670 15. Gustafson A, Rice RE. A review of the effects of uncertainty in public science communication.
671 *Public Understanding of Science*. 2020;29(6):614-33.
- 672 16. Hollnagel E. *The ETTO principle: efficiency-thoroughness trade-off: why things that go right*
673 *sometimes go wrong*. London: CRC press; 2009.
- 674 17. Rasmussen J. Risk management in a dynamic society: a modelling problem. *Safety Science*.
675 1997;27(2):183-213.
- 676 18. Reason J. *Managing the Risks of organizational accidents*. England: Ashgate; 1997.
- 677 19. Glette MK, Wiig S. The role of organizational factors in how efficiency-thoroughness trade-offs
678 potentially affect clinical quality dimensions—a review of the literature. *International Journal of Health*
679 *Governance*. 2021;26(3):250-65.
- 680 20. Gregory R, Failing L, Ohlson D, McDaniels TL. Some pitfalls of an overemphasis on science in
681 environmental risk management decisions. *Journal of Risk Research*. 2006;9(7):717-35.
- 682 21. Norheim OF, Abi-Rached JM, Bright LK, Bærøe K, Ferraz OL, Gloppen S, et al. Difficult trade-
683 offs in response to COVID-19: the case for open and inclusive decision making. *Nature Medicine*.
684 2021;27(1):10-3.
- 685 22. Harper CA, Satchell LP, Fido D, Latzman RD. Functional fear predicts public health
686 compliance in the COVID-19 pandemic. *International journal of mental health and addiction*.
687 2020;19(5):1875-88.
- 688 23. Garfin DR, Silver RC, Holman EA. The novel coronavirus (COVID-2019) outbreak:
689 Amplification of public health consequences by media exposure. *Health Psychology*. 2020;39(5):355-7.

- 690 24. Ocloo J, Garfield S, Franklin BD, Dawson S. Exploring the theory, barriers and enablers for
691 patient and public involvement across health, social care and patient safety: a systematic review of
692 reviews. *Health Research Policy and Systems*. 2021;19(1):8.
- 693 25. Morgan MG, Fischhoff B, Bostrom A, Atman CJ. Risk communication: A mental models
694 approach: Cambridge University Press; 2002.
- 695 26. Austin LC, Fischhoff B. Injury prevention and risk communication: a mental models approach.
696 *Injury prevention*. 2012;18(2):124-9.
- 697 27. Berg SH., MT. S, Thune H., Røislien J., JK. OH, Lungu DA., et al. Comprehending and Acting
698 on Pandemic Health Risk Information Differently: A Qualitative Study Using the Mental Models'
699 Approach. *BMC Public Health*. 2022 Forthcoming.
- 700 28. Røislien J., O'Hara JK., Smeets I., Brønnick K., Berg SH., Shortt MT., et al. Creating Effective,
701 Evidence-Based Video Communication of Public Health Science (COVCOM Study): Protocol for a
702 Sequential Mixed Methods Effect Study. *JMIR Res Protoc* 2022;11(3):e34275.
- 703 29. Bruine de Bruin W, Fischhoff B, Brilliant L, Caruso D. Expert judgments of pandemic
704 influenza risks. *Global Public Health*. 2006;1(2):179-94.
- 705 30. Dhar-Chowdhury P, Haque CE, Driedger SM. Dengue Disease Risk Mental Models in the City
706 of Dhaka, Bangladesh: Juxtapositions and Gaps Between the Public and Experts. *Risk Analysis*.
707 2016;36(5):874-91.
- 708 31. Coronavirus Commission. The Norwegian Authorities pandemic management. Report from
709 the Coronavirus Commission. . Kommunal- og moderniseringsdepartementet; 2021.
- 710 32. Worldometers. Reported Cases and Deaths by Country or Territory 2021 [Available from:
711 <https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/#countries>.
- 712 33. Government.no. The Government is establishing clear quarantine and isolation rules 2020
713 [Available from: [https://www.regjeringen.no/en/aktuelt/the-government-is-establishing-clear-](https://www.regjeringen.no/en/aktuelt/the-government-is-establishing-clear-quarantine-and-isolation-rules/id2693647/)
714 [quarantine-and-isolation-rules/id2693647/](https://www.regjeringen.no/en/aktuelt/the-government-is-establishing-clear-quarantine-and-isolation-rules/id2693647/)].
- 715 34. Ministry of Health and Care Services. Emergency preparedness plan for infection mitigation
716 during the COVID-19 pandemic Regjeringen.no2020 [Available from:
717 [https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/73a60433276240bb9247a00ecc8b23c7/beredskapsplan-](https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/73a60433276240bb9247a00ecc8b23c7/beredskapsplan-covid-19-oppdatert-desember-2020-hbrj.pdf)
718 [covid-19-oppdatert-desember-2020-hbrj.pdf](https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/73a60433276240bb9247a00ecc8b23c7/beredskapsplan-covid-19-oppdatert-desember-2020-hbrj.pdf)].
- 719 35. Norwegian Medicines Agency. The Norwegian health care system and pharmaceutical system
720 legemiddelverket.no2021 [Available from: [https://legemiddelverket.no/english/about-us/the-](https://legemiddelverket.no/english/about-us/the-norwegian-health-care-system-and-pharmaceutical-system)
721 [norwegian-health-care-system-and-pharmaceutical-system](https://legemiddelverket.no/english/about-us/the-norwegian-health-care-system-and-pharmaceutical-system)].
- 722 36. OECD.org. Trust in Government OECD2021 [Available from: [http://www.oecd.org/gov/trust-](http://www.oecd.org/gov/trust-in-government.htm)
723 [in-government.htm](http://www.oecd.org/gov/trust-in-government.htm)].
- 724 37. Sætrevik B. Realistic expectations and pro-social behavioural intentions to the early phase of
725 the COVID-19 pandemic in the Norwegian population. *Collabra Psychology* 2021;7:18698.
- 726 38. Zickfeld JH, Schubert TW, Herting AK, Grahe J, Faasse K. Correlates of health-protective
727 behavior during the initial days of the COVID-19 outbreak in Norway. *Frontiers in psychology*.
728 2020;11:564083.
- 729 39. Nilsen ACE, Skarpenes O. Coping with COVID-19. Dugnad: a case of the moral premise of the
730 Norwegian welfare state. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*. 2020.
- 731 40. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*.
732 2006;3(2):77-101.
- 733 41. Shortt MT, Berg SH, Wiig S, Lungu DA, Smeets I, Thune H, et al. Exploring health experts'
734 and creative communicators' focus in pandemic video communication: A qualitative study. *Frontiers*
735 *in Communication*. 2022 Forthcoming.
- 736 42. Bearth A, Siegrist M. The Social Amplification of Risk Framework: A Normative Perspective
737 on Trust? *Risk Analysis*. 2021.
- 738 43. Balog-Way DH, McComas KA. COVID-19: Reflections on trust, tradeoffs, and preparedness.
739 *Journal of Risk Research*. 2020:1-11.
- 740 44. Nicola M, Alsafi Z, Sohrabi C, Kerwan A, Al-Jabir A, Iosifidis C, et al. The socio-economic
741 implications of the coronavirus and COVID-19 pandemic: a review. *International Journal of Surgery*.
742 2020;78:185-93.
- 743 45. Xiong J, Lipsitz O, Nasri F, Lui LM, Gill H, Phan L, et al. Impact of COVID-19 pandemic on
744 mental health in the general population: A systematic review. *Journal of affective disorders*.
745 2020;277:55-64. .
- 746 46. de Lima CVC, Cândido EL, da Silva JA, Albuquerque LV, de Menezes Soares L, do Nascimento
747 MM, et al. Effects of quarantine on mental health of populations affected by Covid-19. *Journal of*
748 *affective disorders*. 2020;275:253-4.
- 749 47. Adverse consequences of school closures UNESCO2020 [Available from:
750 <https://en.unesco.org/covid19/educationresponse/consequences>].

- 751 48. Kofman YB, Garfin DR. Home is not always a haven: The domestic violence crisis amid the
752 COVID-19 pandemic. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy*. 2020;12:199–201.
753 .
754 49. Norheim OF, Abi-Rached JM, Bright LK, Bærøe K, Ferraz OLM, Gloppen S, et al. Difficult
755 trade-offs in response to COVID-19: the case for open and inclusive decision making. *Nature Medicine*.
756 2021;27(1):10-3.
757 50. Zhang XA, Cozma R. Risk sharing on Twitter: Social amplification and attenuation of risk in
758 the early stages of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Computers in Human Behavior*. 2022;126:106983.
759 51. Tracy SJ. Qualitative quality: Eight “big-tent” criteria for excellent qualitative research.
760 *Qualitative inquiry*. 2010;16(10):837-51.
761 52. Malterud K, Siersma VD, Guassora AD. Sample Size in Qualitative Interview Studies: Guided
762 by Information Power. *Qualitative Health Research*. 2016;26(13):1753-60.
763 53. Graneheim UH, Lindgren BM, Lundman B. Methodological challenges in qualitative content
764 analysis: A discussion paper. *Nurse Educ Today*. 2017;56:29-34.

765

766

767

768 **Supporting information**

769 **S1 File Interview guide expert interviews**

770 **S2 File. Key topics animated bubble chart.** Animated bubble chart visualising concept
771 mapping of expert opinions.