

Interventions to Mitigate Vaping Misinformation: Protocol for a Scoping Review

Navin Kumar (✉ navin.kumar@yale.edu)

Yale University <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4502-069X>

Sam Hampsher

BOTEC Analysis, LLC

Nathan Walter

Northwestern University

Kate Nyhan

Yale University

Qinglan Ding

Purdue University

Kathlene Tracy

Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai

S Mo Jones-Jang

Boston College

Brendan J Nyhan

Dartmouth College

Munmun De Choudhury

Georgia Tech: Georgia Institute of Technology

Laura Forastiere

Yale University School of Public Health

Protocol

Keywords: vaping, misinformation, health, e-cigarette, mitigate

Posted Date: April 20th, 2021

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-417190/v1>

License: © ⓘ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Abstract

Background: The impact of misinformation about vapes' relative harms compared with smoking may lead to increased tobacco-related burden of disease. To date, no systematic efforts have been made to chart interventions that mitigate vaping-related misinformation. We plan to conduct a scoping review that seeks to fill gaps in the current knowledge of interventions that mitigate vaping-related misinformation.

Methods: A scoping review focusing on interventions that mitigate vaping-related misinformation will be conducted. We will search (no date restrictions) MEDLINE, Scopus, EMBASE, CINAHL, PsycINFO, Web of Science Core Collection, Global Health, ERIC and Sociological Abstracts. Grey literature will be identified using Disaster Lit, Google Scholar, Open Science Framework, governmental websites and preprint servers (e.g. EuropePMC, PsyArXiv, MedRxiv, JMIR Preprints). Study selection will conform to Joanna Briggs Institute Reviewers' Manual 2020 Methodology for JBI Scoping Reviews. Only English language, original studies will be considered for inclusion. Two reviewers will independently screen all citations, full-text articles, and abstract data. A narrative summary of findings will be conducted. Data analysis will involve quantitative (e.g. frequencies) and qualitative (e.g. content and thematic analysis) methods.

Discussion: Original research is urgently needed to design interventions to mitigate vaping-related misinformation. The planned scoping review will help to address this gap.

Systematic Review registrations: Systematic Review Registration: Open Science Framework (osf.io/hy3tk).

Background

The recent introduction of alternative forms of nicotine products into the market- place (e.g., e-cigarettes, heated tobacco products, and smokeless tobacco) has led to a more complex informational environment. For example, misinformation from the online marketing of vapes (e-cigarettes) by manufacturers, retailers, and social media influencers has claimed that e-cigarettes contain only water vapor and are harmless [1]. Misinformation is defined as information that has the features of being false or clearly unsubstantiated, determined based on expert opinion and evidence [2]. This misinformation may downplay the risks of vape use and may be in part responsible for the recent youth vaping epidemic [3]. Conversely, online misinforma- tion that vapes are just as or more harmful than smoking [4, 5] may deter current cigarette smokers who are unable to quit smoking from considering reducing harms by switching to vapes as a tool to be used for a period of time to assist in achieving abstinence from cigarettes [6]. For example, regarding the outbreak of vaping-related lung injury (EVALI), most cases were related to consumption of vitamin E acetate, an additive included in some tetrahydrocannabinol devices [7]. However, news re- ports did not always differentiate between tetrahydrocannabinol devices and standard nicotine-based vapes [6, 8], perhaps disproportionately characterizing vaping harms. Thus, the impact of misinformation about vapes' relative harms compared with smoking may lead to increased tobacco-related burden of disease [9]. However, while there have been studies on preventing vaping

among adolescents [10, 11], and the effect of vaping misinformation on attitudes toward vapes [1], there is limited research on interventions to mitigate misinformation about vapes. Thus, we are far from knowing when and how to intervene best. As a clarification, the scientific consensus is that vape aerosol contains fewer numbers and lower levels of toxicants than smoke from combustible tobacco cigarettes [12]. However, use of vapes results in dependence on the devices, but with apparently less risk and severity than that of combustible tobacco cigarettes [12].

To date, no systematic efforts have been made to chart interventions that mitigate vaping-related misinformation. Past reviews have detailed interventions to mitigate misinformation on social media [13, 14, 15, 16], the prevalence of misinformation on social media [17, 18], and whether messages about vapes alter harm perception and behavioral intentions [19] but have not focused on vaping-related misinformation. To provide information that can be used to design effective interventions for vaping misinformation, we plan a scoping review that seeks to compile published evidence in the field to identify gaps in current understanding of experimental evidence regarding the mitigation of vaping-related misinformation. We will conduct a scoping review rather than use other methods of research synthesis because scoping reviews are appropriate for mapping an area of research [20]. We will not be examining the effect of an intervention on an outcome of interest, and it does not make sense to assess the risk of bias, as per a systematic review. Additionally, vaping misinformation intervention research outcomes are likely not sufficiently similar to each other to warrant pooling or formal meta-analysis regarding a specific outcome. The review will take a broad view of vaping misinformation, from claims that vaping is completely safe to statements around vaping being more dangerous than combustible cigarettes. We will consider both explicit misinformation (information that is verifiably false based on current scientific evidence) and implicit misinformation (information that misleads the public about the harms and benefits of vaping e.g. inaccurate and incomplete information) [21], where the primary audience for misinformation is the general public.

Methods/design

The review protocol has been preregistered within the Open Science Framework database (osf.io/hy3tk). It is being reported in accordance with the reporting guidance provided in the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) [22] (see checklist in Additional file 1). Research objectives, inclusion criteria, and methodological techniques will be determined before study commencement using the Joanna Briggs Institute Reviewers' Manual 2020 Methodology for JBI Scoping Reviews [23]. This process will adhere to the indicated framework: 1) identifying research question; 2) developing comprehensive search strategy; 3) identifying relevant studies; 4) selecting studies; 5) charting data; and 6) collating, summarizing, and reporting results. The study team will develop a search strategy as recommended by the 2020 Methodology for JBI Scoping Reviews.

This scoping review will be conducted by 10 individuals: 9 researchers from several universities worldwide, from a range of disciplines (e.g. public health, communication studies, nursing, medicine,

political science, computer science), and an informationist from the Harvey Cushing/John Hay Whitney Medical Library at Yale University. The objective of the scoping review is to develop a better understanding of the current research landscape around interventions to mitigate vaping-related misinformation by investigating existing studies and gaps in the research. The broad research questions are “what has been reported on interventions to mitigate vaping misinformation?” and “what are the gaps in the current knowledge base on interventions to mitigate vaping misinformation?” The search strategy will be performed in line with techniques that enhance methodological transparency and improve the reproducibility of the results and evidence synthesis.

Information sources and search strategy

The primary source of literature will be a structured search of electronic databases (no date restrictions): MEDLINE, Scopus, EMBASE, CINAHL, PsycINFO, Web of Science Core Collection, Global Health, ERIC and Sociological Abstracts. The secondary source of potentially relevant material will be a search of preprint servers (e.g. EuropePMC, PsyArXiv, JMIR Preprints), Google Scholar (e.g. the first five pages will be searched based on guidance in prior research), Open Science Framework and governmental websites. The references of included documents will be hand-searched to identify any additional evidence sources. We will also conduct forward citation chaining. The search strategy will be designed by a research librarian and peer reviewed by using the Peer Review of Electronic Search Strategies (PRESS) checklist [24]. A draft search strategy for Scopus is provided in Additional file 2. We will use search terms similar to our main search to find articles for inclusion. The same keywords for the main search will be used to search grey literature each time. All grey literature will be compiled in a folder and reviewed similarly to articles obtained from our database searches. EndNote, a bibliographic software, will be used to store, organize, and manage all references [25].

Eligibility criteria

We will include all intervention studies to mitigate vaping misinformation including inaccurate and incomplete information, where the primary audience for misinformation is the general public. Only English language studies will be considered for inclusion. Past work indicated that excluding non-English language records from a review seemed to have a minimal effect on results [26, 27].

Inclusion criteria

Published research (peer reviewed and grey literature where primary data was collected such as reports, research letters and briefs) investigating interventions to mitigate vaping misinformation (as long as the authors have denoted the topic of study as misinformation) in all populations, and settings will be eligible for inclusion.

Only intervention-based studies will be included (e.g. experimental studies, quasi-experimental studies, randomized controlled trials).

There will be no restrictions on region.

Studies reported only as conference abstracts will also be included, only if we do not have access to the full paper. Conference abstracts are often left out of systematic reviews as they may not contain adequate information to conduct quality assessment or a meta-analysis. Here, we will include conference abstracts as they are often published earlier than full manuscripts [28], which is key to a thorough scoping review on an ongoing phenomenon.

Exclusion criteria

Commentaries, correspondences, case reports, case series, editorials, and opinion pieces will be excluded. Case reports and case series often contain relatively limited evidence [29].

Qualitative studies will be excluded.

Non-intervention studies will be excluded.

Governmental, other agency guidelines and white papers will be excluded. Reviews such as systematic reviews and scoping reviews will be excluded but we will review the references in these for inclusion, if applicable.

Screening and selection procedure

All reports identified from the searches will be screened by two reviewers independently. First, titles and abstracts of articles returned from initial searches will be screened based on the eligibility criteria outlined above. Second, full texts will be examined in detail and screened for eligibility. Third, references of all considered articles will be hand-searched to identify any relevant report missed in the search strategy. We will also conduct forward citation chaining. Any disagreements will be resolved by discussion, or if necessary, with a third reviewer. A flow chart showing details of studies included and excluded at each stage of the study selection process will be provided. We will contact authors where necessary if the abstracts do not provide sufficient information [28]. Covidence will be used to manage the title/abstract and full-text screening phases [30].

Data extraction

Reviewers will undergo a practice exercises till they have a high level of agreement (>0.8 kappa) and then independently extract data from studies. Reviewers will abstract the data using a pretested data extraction template. We will use a standardized coding protocol to collect information such as: title of

study, authors, date published; study setting; study design; description of methodology; description of study sample; type of intervention; type of misinformation (if any); main findings. Even though a formal risk of bias is not planned for this scoping review, we will note which studies are pre-prints, and thus, have not been formally peer reviewed. We will also note if some studies fail to report appropriate information.

Data synthesis

Outcomes and other information collected regarding selected studies will be synthesized using quantitative (e.g. outcomes) and qualitative (e.g. content and thematic analysis) methods, with a narrative summary of findings conducted. Synthesis will be presented in tables, summary data in graphs, and individual data for each study in tables. The broad goal of the synthesis is to identify gaps in research and present recommendations for future research agendas.

Discussion

There has been limited research which compiles available evidence from various settings around interventions which mitigate vaping misinformation. Our review will provide an overview of these studies, synthesizing evidence. We will provide an overview of known gaps in the literature, such as how to target corrective information better and to make it more effective, disrupt the formation of linkages between group identities and false claims and reduce the flow of cues reinforcing those claims from elites and the media [31]. There is much anecdotal work around misinformation and vaping, with few intervention studies. The planned review will highlight areas of research focus and gaps which require more attention. Results will provide high-level information to inform, support, and customize design of interventions to mitigate vaping misinformation. As researchers attempt to minimize vaping misinformation, they need to be aware of scientific evidence to develop interventions to achieve their aim. The planned scoping review seeks to provide this evidence by contributing an evaluation of what is currently known about interventions to mitigate vaping misinformation, with the goal of identifying gaps in research and presenting recommendations for future research foci.

The methodological strength of the planned scoping review is the use of a transparent and reproducible procedure for a scoping literature examination. We state the data sources, search strategy, and data extraction [32]. Through publishing this research protocol, we strengthen the clarity of the search strategy. This protocol can be applied to other substances or public health topics, providing insight for conducting similar reviews. Any amendments to this protocol will be documented in the final published scoping review with reference to saved searches and analysis.

Results of the review will be disseminated in a peer-reviewed journal and likely in other media such as: conferences, seminars, symposia. The protocol and final review article will be made open access upon publication. As per PRISMA-ScR guidelines, we will present results in a user-friendly format [33].

Limitations

Our planned review should be read in line with some limitations. Although we plan to search several databases and gray literature sources, we may miss some studies. Our explicit focus on misinformation may miss articles around health communication, risk communication, advertising, marketing, and packaging. Not all authors we reach out to may respond and we may thus miss some unpublished work. We may not be able to make policy recommendations due to the lack of quality appraisal of studies [34]. Misinformation is an inherent moving target and as advancements are made in our knowledge and new research results surface as does the context of what is considered accurate; nonetheless it is important to understand how misinformation is mitigated to meet advancements in science.

Abbreviations

PRISMA-ScR: PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews

JBI: Joanna Briggs Institute

COVID-19: Coronavirus Disease 2019

Declarations

Availability of data and materials

The datasets used and analyzed will be made available upon reasonable request.

Ethical Approval and Consent to participate

Not applicable

Consent for publication

All authors approved submission.

Availability of supporting data

Available from authors at reasonable request.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Funding

Study was funded by the Foundation for a Smoke-Free World. The funding body had no role in the design, analysis, or interpretation of the data in the study.

Author's contributions

NK wrote the first draft. NK, KN, LF, SH, NW, QD, KT, SMJ, BJN, MDC contributed to the manuscript write-up and review.

Acknowledgements

We thank the reviewers and editors for their assistance.

References

1. Albarracin D, Romer D, Jones C, Jamieson KH, Jamieson Misleading claims about tobacco products in YouTube videos: experimental effects of misinformation on unhealthy attitudes. *Journal of medical Internet research*. 2018;20(6):e229.
2. Vraga EK, Bode Correction as a Solution for Health Misinformation on Social Media. 2020;110:S278–S280.
3. England K, Edwards A, Paulson A, Libby E, Harrell P, Mondejar K. Rethink Vape: Development and evaluation of a risk communication campaign to prevent youth E-cigarette use. *Addictive Behaviors*. 2021;113:106664.
4. McNeill A, Brose LS, Calder R, Bauld L, Robson D. Evidence review of e-cigarettes and heated tobacco products 2018. A report commissioned by Public Health England London: Public Health England. 2018;6.
5. Nyman AL, Huang J, Weaver SR, Eriksen Perceived Comparative Harm of Cigarettes and Electronic Nicotine Delivery Systems. *JAMA Network Open*. 2019;2(11):e1915680–e1915680.
6. Tattan-Birch H, Brown J, Shahab L, Jackson SE. Association of the US Outbreak of Vaping-Associated Lung Injury With Perceived Harm of e-Cigarettes Compared With *JAMA Network Open*. 2020;3(6).
7. Nyakutsikwa B, Britton J, Bogdanovica I, Langley T. Vitamin E acetate is not present in licit e-cigarette products available on the UK market. *Addiction*. 2020;115(4):782–783.
8. Janmohamed K, Soale AN, Forastiere L, Tang W, Sha Y, Demant J, et al. Intersection of the Web-Based Vaping Narrative With COVID-19: Topic Modeling *Journal of Medical Internet Research*. 2020;22(10):e21743.

9. Harlow AF, Stokes A, Brooks DR. Socioeconomic and racial/ethnic differences in e-cigarette uptake among cigarette smokers: longitudinal analysis of the population assessment of tobacco and health (PATH) Nicotine and Tobacco Research. 2019;21(10):1385–1393.
10. Chaplin MD, Brogie J, Burch A, Hetzler J, Hough D, Gustafson B, et al. Effectiveness of an educational intervention on health risks of vaping for high school–aged adolescents. *Journal of the American Pharmacists Association*. 2020;60(6):e158–e161.
11. Chu KH, Matheny S, Furek A, Sidani J, Radio S, Miller E, et al. Identifying student opinion leaders to lead e-cigarette interventions: protocol for a randomized controlled pragmatic Trials. 2021;22(1):1–6.
12. Stratton K, Kwan LY, Eaton DL, et al. Public health consequences of e-cigarettes: consensus study report. *Public health consequences of e-cigarettes: consensus study 2018*;
13. Walter N, Brooks JJ, Saucier CJ, Suresh S. Evaluating the impact of attempts to correct health misinformation on social media: A meta-analysis. *Health Communication*. 2020;p. 1–9.
14. Wood T, Porter E. The elusive backfire effect: Mass attitudes’ steadfast factual adherence. *Political Behavior*. 2019;41(1):135–163.
15. Walter N, Murphy ST. How to unring the bell: A meta-analytic approach to correction of misinformation. *Communication Monographs*. 2018;85(3):423–441.
16. Chan MpS, Jones CR, Hall Jamieson K, Albarracín Debunking: A meta-analysis of the psychological efficacy of messages countering misinformation. *Psychological science*. 2017;28(11):1531–1546.
17. Suarez-Lledo V, Alvarez-Galvez J. Prevalence of Health Misinformation on Social Media: Systematic *Journal of medical Internet research*. 2021;23(1):e17187.
18. Porter E, Wood TJ. *False alarm: The truth about political mistruths in the Trump Cambridge University Press*; 2019.
19. Erku DA, Bauld L, Dawkins L, Gartner CE, Steadman KJ, Noar SM, et al. Does the content and source credibility of health and risk messages related to nicotine vaping products have an impact on harm perception and behavioural intentions? A systematic review. *Addiction*. 2021;
20. Arksey H, O’Malley L. Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework. *International journal of social research methodology*. 2005;8(1):19–32.
21. Tan AS, Bigman CA. *Misinformation About Commercial Tobacco Products on Social Media— Implications and Research Opportunities for Reducing Tobacco-Related Health Disparities*. American Public Health Association; 2020.
22. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O’Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D, et al. PRISMA extension for scoping reviews (PRISMA-ScR): checklist and explanation. *Annals of internal medicine*. 2018;169(7):467–473.
23. Peters MD, Marnie C, Tricco AC, Pollock D, Munn Z, Alexander L, et al. Updated methodological guidance for the conduct of scoping reviews. *JBIC Evidence Synthesis*. 2020;18(10):2119–2126.
24. Lefebvre C, Duffy S. *Peer reviewing search strategies*. HTAi 2018;
25. Clarivate Analytics. *Endnote X8 for windows*. Philadelphia, PA: Clarivate Analytics. 2017;

26. Nussbaumer-Streit B, Klerings I, Dobrescu A, Persad E, Stevens A, Garritty C, et al. Excluding non-English publications from evidence-syntheses did not change conclusions: a meta-epidemiological *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*. 2020;118:42–54.
27. Morrison A, Polisena J, Husereau D, Moulton K, Clark M, Fiander M, et al. The effect of English-language restriction on systematic review-based meta-analyses: a systematic review of empirical *International journal of technology assessment in health care*. 2012;28(2):138.
28. Scherer RW, Saldanha How should systematic reviewers handle conference abstracts? A view from the trenches. *Systematic reviews*. 2019;8(1):264.
29. Turner RM, Bird SM, Higgins The impact of study size on meta-analyses: examination of underpowered studies in Cochrane reviews. *PloS one*. 2013;8(3):e59202.
30. VH Innovation. Covidence systematic review software. Melbourne, Australia. 2017;.
31. Nyhan B. Facts and myths about misperceptions. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*. 2020;34(3):220–36.
32. Silagy CA, Middleton P, Hopewell S. Publishing protocols of systematic reviews: comparing what was done to what was planned. *Jama*. 2002;287(21):2831–2834.
33. Miake-Lye IM, Hempel S, Shanman R, Shekelle PG. What is an evidence map? A systematic review of published evidence maps and their definitions, methods, and products. *Systematic reviews*. 2016;5(1):28.
34. Boström AM, Slaughter SE, Chojecki D, Estabrooks CA. What do we know about knowledge translation in the care of older adults? A scoping review. *Journal of the American Medical Directors Association*. 2012;13(3):210–219.

Supplementary Files

This is a list of supplementary files associated with this preprint. Click to download.

- [Additionalfile1.pdf](#)
- [AdditionalFile2.docx](#)