PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (**http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf**) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Smoking cessation in individuals who use vaping as compared to traditional nicotine replacement therapies; a systematic review and meta-analysis
AUTHORS	Pound, Catherine; Zhang, Jennifer; Kodua, Ama; Sampson, Margaret

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Prof Adrian Esterman University of South Australia, Australia
REVIEW RETURNED	19-Sep-2020

GENERAL COMMENTS	The statistical analysis is appropriate. My only query is fairly minor. Surely, you are measuring a prevalence rate ratio rather than a risk ratio?

REVIEWER	Eric Shah, MD Dartmouth Hitchcock Medical Center, USA
REVIEW RETURNED	30-Sep-2020

GENERAL COMMENTS	This is a well done meta-analysis adhering to the Cochrane Handbook and PRISMA. Presentation of data is provided in the typical and expected pattern consistent with systematic reviews. Disclosure of limitations on exploratory endpoints is appropriately disclosed in the discussion.

REVIEWER	ALISON WALLACE Dalhousie University Canada
REVIEW RETURNED	09-Dec-2020

GENERAL COMMENTS	I found the paper to be well written and comprehensive in addressing the question of the impact of vaping vs other modes of nicotine delivery in smoking cessation. While I see no faults with the paper as written, my main concern for this meta-analysis and review is that it may be premature for publication. In the paper, the authors show that only a limited number of RCT studies are present in the literature that are underpowered with slight trends showing efficacy of vaping, but also that several large RCT are currently being conducted that will answer the question of how vaping compares to other modes of delivery. The question is whether the paper should be accepted as is, or to wait for these larger studies to be published first and a meta-analysis to be then performed.

Reviewer 1:

The statistical analysis is appropriate. My only query is fairly minor. Surely, you are measuring a prevalence rate ratio rather than a risk ratio?

We have clarified in the text under "measures of treatment effect"

Reviewer 2

This is a well done meta-analysis adhering to the Cochrane Handbook and PRISMA. Presentation of data is provided in the typical and expected pattern consistent with systematic reviews. Disclosure of limitations on exploratory endpoints is appropriately disclosed in the discussion.

Thank you for your comment

Reviewer 3

I found the paper to be well written and comprehensive in addressing the question of the impact of vaping vs other modes of nicotine delivery in smoking cessation. While I see no faults with the paper as written, my main concern for this meta-analysis and review is that it may be premature for publication. In the paper, the authors show that only a limited number of RCT studies are present in the literature that are underpowered with slight trends showing efficacy of vaping, but also that several large RCT are currently being conducted that will answer the question of how vaping compares to other modes of delivery. The question is whether the paper should be accepted as is, or to wait for these larger studies to be published first and a meta-analysis to be then performed.

The authors feel it is important to publish this review despite the small number of studies included, as this brings attention to the need for further research, especially given how commonly ENDS are used.