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Comparing the Johns Hopkins website with the Veppo website helps us find the difference between the two websites and think dialectically. I used the CAAPO test to see the difference and wrote this report.

**Currency**

The currency of the Veppo website is more comprehensive than the Johns Hopkins website. It has a published date and a findable author, Stuart. Unfortunately, the Johns Hopkins website only has findable author Michael Joseph Blaha, M.D., M.P.H.

**Relevancy**

On the relevancy level, although the Johns Hopkins website is like educating, its words are easy to understand. Because the Veppo website is like an advertisement website, they are trying to sell their products. Their content is also easily understood to show that vaping is not bad for you and is better than the category. So, both of their writing is clear and direct.

**Authority**

Although the Veppo website has a findable author, we still need to determine who the author is. The only information that we know is that he might be a salesperson. However, on the Johns Hopkins website, we can directly and clearly understand that the author is the director of clinical research at the Johns Hopkins Ciccarone Center of the Prevention of Heart Disease, who shares health information about vaping. We can also find his data at the bottom of the article. From this information, we can know that the author is an authority in this report, which can increase its reliability. Therefore, the Johns Hopkins website is better at the Authority level than the Veppo website.

**Accuracy**

Because the Johns Hopkins website is an educational text written by a doctor, its grammar and evidence are good. We can find the supporting source for almost his opinions and conclusions from the links in his article. These sources are all from a reliable place, which can significantly enhance the report’s credibility. For the Veppo website, the author only talks about his opinions but does not have any supporting words to confirm his points. Sometimes we can not believe these words because we do not know whether these are facts or only one-sided terms.

**Purpose**

From the Veppo website, we can directly know that the author is trying to sell their products, supporting people to buy vaping instead of categories because this article only talks about the harmful of nicotine and emphasises that their products do not have nicotine. This can be misleading to people that vaping is not harmful to humans, even good for people. However, the Johns Hopkins website shows vaping, based on credible supporting sources. Also, his report is dialectical. It compared that vaping is less harmful but still dangerous. Therefore, Michael Joseph Blaha’s article is not to sell or advertise something but to educate.

In conclusion, the Johns Hopkins website is credible and referential. Its objectivity shows the difference between vaping and categories and their dangers to people. Unfortunately, the Veppo website was talking about how better their product is than the categorise but trying to avoid the dangers of their products. Also, their report can not be trusted because it had no supporting sources.