

Review of: "The effects of offering a disposable EC versus NRT on smoking cessation outcomes: a retrospective community pharmacy study"

Sun Kim¹

¹ University of Massachusetts Boston

Potential competing interests: The author(s) declared that no potential competing interests exist.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to review this interesting study. The study has many flaws. First of all, as the authors stated, there is no information about how many of those in the electronic cigarettes (EC) group used nicotine replacement therapy (NRT) alongside. This information is crucial. The authors should have compared only those who used NRT or EC exclusively. Without this information, the comparison of the two conditions (EC and NRT) became moot. Another major shortcoming of the study is that abstinence rates are based on self-report. The authors argued that CO verification is beyond the control of the study. There are several commercially available Smokerlyzers enabling CO testing remotely. There are many brands of salivary cotinine test kits that are easy to do and economical. The authors should have reported separately those who continue to use EC with NRT or without NRT and complete abstinence from all nicotine products. They should have conducted the salivary cotinine test for the latter while keeping social distance.