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ABSTRACT
Introduction: The use of electronic cigarettes (e-cigarettes) has increased rapidly around the world. In Malaysia, apart from tobacco smoking, the use of e-cigarette has emerged as an alternative habit among the population. Among the reasons given by the users are to help them to quit or to cut down tobacco smoking. The objective of this study is to identify differences in the perceptions about e-cigarette between the former and the current users. Method: A nationwide household survey was conducted in 2016 to study the use of electronic cigarettes among Malaysian adults. A multistage stratified sampling method was used and about 3500 Living Quarters (LQs) were sampled. All eligible respondents aged 18 years and above were included in the survey. Respondents were asked on e-cigarette use and their perceptions about e-cigarettes. Analysis were done to identify differences in the perceptions about e-cigarette between the former and the current e-cigarette users. Results: A total of 4,288 adults participated in the survey, where 110 and 289 were identified as current and former e-cigarette users respectively. Compared to the current e-cigarette users, the former e-cigarette users were more likely to disagree that e-cigarette helps people to quit tobacco smoking (OR: 2.6), helps people to maintain cigarette abstinence (OR: 2.7), helps people to cut down tobacco smoking (OR: 2.5), is less harmful to health of the user compared to tobacco smoking (OR: 2.6), is less addictive than tobacco cigarette (OR: 2.6), the vapour is less harmful to others compared to tobacco smoke (OR: 2.4) should be allowed in places where smoking is banned (OR: 2.5) and should be regulated rather than banned completely (OR: 1.8). Conclusion: Significant differences in the perceptions about e-cigarette were observed between the former and the current e-cigarette users. Continuous health education should be given to change the perceptions about e-cigarette among the users.
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ABSTRACT
Background: Rapid evidence synthesis is gaining popularity due to the demand of stakeholders and users for top-priority questions on health care. Rapid evidence synthesis using the Cochrane methods, which represents the most rigorous methods in systematic review, is a challenge. Malaysia is one of the largest producers and consumers of palm oil related products. In response to on-going publicity on the negative health effects of palm oil, the Malaysian Ministry of Heath commissioned the National Institute of Health (NIH) to conduct a series of rapid evidence synthesis to evaluate the benefits and harms of palm oil and related products in seven major health related areas. Objective: This report describes our efforts in performing a series of rapid evidence synthesis projects using the Cochrane systematic reviews methods in a cross-institutional collaboration under the NIH, among review authors in Ministry of Health, Malaysia. Methods: Leveraging on the expertise in primary research and systematic review, a program was developed to provide trainings in systematic review using Cochrane method to answer the question by policy maker on the effect of palm oil on health. The researchers were divided into six groups according to area of interest in the effect of palm oil. Weekly meetings, with rigorous hands on training were conducted among the researchers from August 2016 to December 2016. Strict time lines for each stage of the review process were adhered to, using the Cochrane methods as a reference. Result: A total of eight systematic reviews were prepared from the training. Over 30 authors from three institutions under NIH were involved in preparing these reviews. Evidence was synthesised combining both narrative review and systematic quantitative methods. Conclusion: These trainings of rigorous preparation of systematic review is a very useful tool in synthesising reliable evidence for support of decision policy making.