

Review of: "Purchasing and sourcing of e-cigarettes among youth in Scotland and England following Scotland's implementation of an e-cigarette retail register and prohibition of e-cigarette sales to under-18s"

Yvonne Chen¹

¹ University of Kansas

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

I appreciate the succinct and solid writing of this manuscript in which the authors investigate the extent to which Scotland's implementation of an e-cigarette retail register and prohibition of e-cigarette sales to under 18s influences youth's purchasing behavior. This study provides data beyond the typical North America e-cigarette regulation research context. Even though the research team's hypotheses were not supported, the data and the findings are still valuable.

Below I provide a list of suggestions for the research team to consider:

Table 1 and outcome measures: The authors justified their rationale for analyzing past 12-month purchase (any, from a vape shop, from a regular shop/chemist and from the internet). Yet, in the "outcomes" paragraph, six outcomes were assessed, including the aforementioned variables along with past 30-day source (social source, purchased from a store). It'd be helpful if the research team could expand its Table 1 to accommodate all possible outcomes. This would enhance the function of Table 1 and enable readers to comprehend the research team's primary outcomes in a quick glance.

Analyses: In this section, the team explained the interaction terms. To better educate readers who may not be familiar with "difference in difference" treatment, it'd be helpful to explain how these interaction terms enable the research team to estimate the effects of this policy by comparing the changes in outcomes in Britain and Scotland over time.

Discussion – consider to re-organize: The research team presented findings vis-à-vis the hypotheses in an earlier section of the Discussion. The team then in later paragraphs presented weighted % findings. It is reasonable to expect that while the team's hypotheses did not receive support, weighted % and its associated trend still tells an interesting story. But the order of these write-up may be interpreted as an attempt to justify the importance of this research. (Readers would value this research regardless of the most non-significant findings.) Perhaps it'd be helpful to present the general % trends and then the findings of the hypotheses.

Discussion – 2nd paragraph: It'd be helpful to provide some explanations as to why the hypotheses did not receive support to help readers further interpret these findings.

Discussion – 3rd paragraph: The team wrote that “For example, rather than a registration system, a more comprehensive licensing system similar to that recommended by the World Health Organization Framework Convention on Tobacco Control for tobacco products (World Health Organization, 2013) may facilitate better enforcement of policies against selling products to youth ([Kuipers et al., 2021](#)).” It’d be helpful to elaborate on the details with regard to WHO’s recommendation.

Discussion – 5th paragraph: The team stated that youth sourced e-cigarette from their social sources. How might this finding guide the development of appropriate policy or intervention? What is the real-world implication of this finding?