

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_80013
Title of the Manuscript:	The effect of vaping and nicotine-containing liquids to suppress the immune system: A Pilot Studyd
Type of the Article	survey

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	This is a very well-written and interesting manuscript that is using the frequency of acute short-term respiratory illness as a surrogate for 'immune health'. The authors assume there is a correlation between vaping characteristics and suppressed immune response by surveying the patients' recollections of both vaping and 'cold' frequency. I think it is a good try, but, honestly, the paper would be better, IMO, if the authors simply left off the immune suppression segment. Unless there are actual OBJECTIVE data....resp T cell line , etc. Anyway, good job and keep working. I definitely would like to see a correlation between vaping and C-19 in this age group	
Minor REVISION comments	I am curious if your survey is statistically validated? The questions you used are your original questions, correct? 'a power calculation to detect a difference of approximately 0.25...' exactly 0.25 of what? Shouldn't this be explained?	
Optional/General comments	'Using a T-test assuming unequal variances....' Two thoughts: why not show the p value? And, is T test better than median (Mann Whitney U) in this circumstance? A flow diagram of the patient numbers as they are excluded would be better, I think Should you mention the confounding variables? For example, the incidence of 'colds' is related to close proximity to people, especially in enclosed areas. Also, BMI is a variable among others.....	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Steve
Department, University & Country	USA