

Review of: "[Commentary] On Heated Tobacco Products and the Importance of Science-Based Assessments and Product Classification"

Debasree Saha

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The commentary makes a good attempt to focus on the alternatives to cigarettes for adults. The author has well tried to interpret the difference between aerosol generation in HTP and smoke from cigarettes. In this case, at least a short comparison/discussion of HTP and burned tobacco/combustible cigarettes is needed for scientific justification of this article, as well as to become more acceptable to international readers. In the 'Comparative analysis of HTP aerosol with cigarette smoke' section (3.2-3.6), a brief discussion is needed.... & A clinical study conducted over 90 days....parts require a brief discussion; otherwise, these are quite difficult to understand clearly. The authors conclude that HTP is less harmful than cigarettes on the basis of aerosol generation instead of smoke. On that point, my suggestion to the authors is to include some discussion regarding the oral and lung effects of aerosol and smoke for a strong as well as fair conclusion of this article. In the 'Conclusion' part of this commentary, the authors directly mention the number of compounds in HTP and cigarette smoke instead of any prior discussion in the main body of this commentary. I think it is a very weak point for any article, and please try to modify it.