

Review of: "Randomized Experimental Test of a Reduced-Exposure Message for an E-cigarette: Comprehension and Related Misperceptions"

Hatim Almahdi¹

¹ King Faisal University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Reviewer's Comments

Abstract:

1. Avoid all abbreviations (e.g., ENDS, JUUL).
2. I suggest using a structured type of abstract (sections for more clarity).
3. The aim of the study needs clarity. If the aim is how the population interprets the message of reduced exposure information to ENDS as general or specifically to the JUUL brand, explain.
4. Explain how randomization was done.
5. State the conclusion.

Introduction:

1. The introduction is not informative and not structured. It should have a briefing about what ENDS is and its pros and cons (https://www.cdc.gov/tobacco/basic_information/e-cigarettes/about-e-cigarettes.html#:~:text=Top%20of%20Page-,Are%20e%2Dcigarettes%20less%20harmful%20than%20regular%20cigarettes%3F,in%20smoke%20from%20regular%20cigarettes.).
2. A brief literature review is a must.
3. Should have balanced reporting and not be biased.
4. Nothing is mentioned about the FDA ban on JUUL (<https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/fda-denies-authorization-market-juul-products>”).

Methods:

1. The section on study design should be elaborated: how randomization was done, what type of randomization, is it double blind or not, how the recruitment was done.
2. Is the payment for the participant ethical and not considered as part of the bias, especially if the investigation is about a brand that had issues of banning?
3. The validation of the survey is not mentioned.
4. The whole section is poorly organized and written.
5. No information about the data collection and duration is provided.

Results:

1. Poorly organized and redundant.
2. No comparisons should be made in this section; just state the results.

3. Tables are too many with lots of numbers that make confusion rather than clarity.

Discussion:

1. Poorly organized and not reader-friendly, and as advertisement to JUUL.
2. The conclusion is a promotion for JUUL, not ENDS.
3. There is an obvious conflict of interest as the authors are employees at the JUUL company.

Recommendations

This is a biased reporting full of unethical issues and a lack of proper scientific methods, as well as misleading results and conclusions.