Peer Review Report

Review Report on Unveiling the Impact of Smokers' Self-Construals on the Effectiveness of Smoking Cessation Campaigns: A Comparative Analysis of E-Cigarettes and Combustible Cigarettes

Original Article, Int J Public Health

EVALUATION

Q 1   Please summarize the main findings of the study.

The findings from Study 1 reveal that smokers with a strong interdependent self-construal are more likely to express an intention to quit smoking when using e-cigarettes as opposed to combustible cigarettes. Study 2 found that e-cigarette smokers were more receptive to the message framed with an interdependent self-construal than those with an independent self-construal.

Q 2   Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

Data were collected in South Korea, a culture with a strong emphasis on interdependent self-construal. To validate the interaction effect of cigarette types and smokers' self construal on the efficacy of anti-smoking campaigns, it is imperative to conduct cross-cultural studies.

This research is important because it suggests that tailoring advertising campaigns to align with both cigarette types and self-construal can enhance intentions to quit smoking.

Q 3   Please provide your detailed review report to the authors. The editors prefer to receive your review structured in major and minor comments. Please consider in your review the methods (statistical methods valid and correctly applied (e.g. sample size, choice of test), is the study replicable based on the method description?), results, data interpretation and references. If there are any objective errors, or if the conclusions are not supported, you should detail your concerns.

This is a well written article on an important topic. Study 1 investigates the relationship between Korean smokers' (n=125; 85% male) self-construal and cigarette types and their impact on smoking cessation intentions. Study 2 recruited Korean smokers (n=123; 83% male) to examine the interaction between anti-smoking messages (independent or interdependently focused) and cigarette types on the efficacy of anti-smoking campaigns. The findings from Study 1 reveal that smokers with a strong interdependent self-construal are more likely to express an intention to quit smoking when using e-cigarettes as opposed to combustible cigarettes. Study 2 found that e-cigarette smokers were more receptive to the message framed with an interdependent self-construal than those with an independent self-construal.

Introduction
- In the first paragraph (and throughout the manuscript), the authors discuss "smoking e-cigarettes", but this language should be changed because vapes are not smoked.
- The following article on nicotine vaping, nicotine-free vaping, and dual use (both nicotine and nicotine-free vaping) would be very useful to cite, probably in your third paragraph: Wiley ER, Seabrook JA. Nicotine and Nicotine-Free Vaping Behavior among a Sample of Canadian High School Students: A Cross-Sectional Study. Children. 2023 Feb 13;10(2):368.
- In the sixth paragraph (bottom of page 3), don't start two sentences back-to-back with "However".

Methods

– A multiple regression analysis investigated the relationship between cigarette types and self–construal for Study 1, whereas independent samples t–tests and a series ANCOVA was used for Study 2. It is important to provide all the statistical tests used in a statistical analysis subsection, rather than the reader finding out when the authors report the results.

Results
– The authors need a Results section in the body of the manuscript because all the results are contained in the Methods section.
– The authors need to comment on partial eta squared, which reveal a small effect size ($\eta 2=0.05$) for the significant interaction effect between the cigarette type and self construal on smoking cessation intentions. Similarly, a small effect size was found ($\eta 2=0.04$) when e–cigarette smokers demonstrated a stronger intention to quit smoking when exposed to the interdependent self–construal message compared to the one with the independent self–construal messages.
– Figure 2 looks like graphs from SPSS. Regardless, the figures should all stem from the same source for consistency in appearance.

Discussion
– Change the "Limitation" subsection to Limitations
– In the Conclusions sections of the Abstract and body of the article, although the authors suggest that anti–vaping campaigns emphasizing the risk of second–hand smoke as being more persuasive, your data do not show that per se. I would recommend toning down that statement and putting it out more as a possibility and/or something that is hypothesis–generating.

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Yes

Q 5 Are the keywords appropriate?

Yes

Q 6 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes, the manuscript is very well written.

Q 7 Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

Yes.

Q 8 Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?)

Yes

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 9 Originality

Q 10 Rigor

Q 11 Significance to the field

Q 12	Interest to a general audience	■ ■ ■ □ □
Q 13	Quality of the writing	■ ■ ■ ■ ■
Q 14	Overall scientific quality of the study	■ ■ ■ □ □

REVISION LEVEL

| Q 15 | Please make a recommendation based on your comments: |

Minor revisions.