

Review of: "Evidence-based policies benefit the men and women who smoke"

Mochammad Farid Afandi¹

¹ Universitas Jember

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

In general, the article entitled "Evidence-based policies benefit the men and women who smoke" provides new insights into the WHO policies on the issue of reducing the effects of harmful substances contained in cigarettes. In addition, this article offers information on how the WHO's efforts to categorize the existence of derivative products that produce the same importance as contained in cigarettes. A written paper based on a public policy case is commonly accepted, especially from a socio-medical perspective. Those working in public health studies can understand the issues that have been carried out. However, this article needs to be developed into a more comprehensive analysis for other researchers who are less familiar with public health issues.

This article focuses on the consequences of WHO policies, becoming interesting later when tobacco restrictions are intended to prevent non-smokers from becoming active smokers. In the context of this policy, the regulation of tobacco and its derivative products contributes to 1 billion smokers. The reviewer sees that this issue should be capitalized as the novelty of this article by showing empirical data and arguments for the thesis statement. It should be written argumentatively in the abstract by elaborating the methodological framework to elaborate on the issues raised by the researcher.

The WHO policies leading to the Status Quo are a conclusion that needs to be elaborated more. Mainly to explain how the Status Quo was formed as a healthy political-economic system. Furthermore, finding a status quo that can persist even when health policies restrict tobacco distribution is an exciting finding in this article. However, it requires a more comprehensive analysis and precise statistical data, including a case example, ratified WHO policies in one country. The researchers see the issue of the limited information related to alternative products to replace smoking activities because of the knowledge structure systematically formed by the cigarette industry. In this case, it will be more exciting and essential to present to readers the socio-medical effect of limiting alternative cigarettes to substitute products. The risks that smokers live in need to be part of a shared responsibility which the author only emphasizes in WHO policies; in this case, it is necessary how WHO policies to intervene in countries that allow their citizens to continue smoking have not been seriously discussed by researchers.

The researcher's limited analysis of crucial issues is a problem that limits the reader's imagination and critical power. Therefore, the reviewer recommends that the author be more detailed in building an explicit construction of thinking and argumentation in this article. This article needs to be done by rearranging the writing structure by providing a clear conceptual framework and a firm methodological approach to clarify this article, which is currently closed to a critical opinion than scientific research.

