

Peer Review

Review of: "Critical Appraisal of Exposure Studies on E-Cigarette Aerosols Generated by High-Powered Devices"

David Kane¹

1. Independent researcher

This paper is a review of research conducted with the EVIC Mini box mod, an e-cigarette aerosol generator, and Scireq's InExpose system compared to research that the authors had previously published. The authors conducted an extensive literature review and identified several papers with sufficient information to compare to their seminal work. The main results of the paper appear to be a list of 9 areas of deficiency in the current literature and a set of guidelines to consider for future experiments.

I did not find any technical errors in this work; most of what the authors present is reasonable and fits with my current experience. However, the tone of the paper makes it quite difficult to read. The paper comes across as critical of other researchers for the information they presented or left out of their papers and their apparent lack of understanding of the operating conditions, smoker usage patterns, and physiology associated with vaping. I think their audience would be more receptive to this work if they revised the tone to make it more accepting of the available reports and framed it as building on previous learnings rather than mistakes.

Some specific comments:

I'm not sure how to interpret Table 2. I suggest providing some more context or perhaps presenting the data graphically.

Page 26, line 3 - VOCs instead of COVs.

Page 28, Section 5.8 title - use "of" instead of "on" - there are lots more grammar/useage errors; I don't have time to get them all.

Section 5.9 - I'm not sure what point they are trying to make in this section. Should the authors do more comparison to cigarettes, or are they just explaining why they have not done a comparison?

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.