

Review of: "Evidence-based policies benefit the men and women who smoke"

Daniel Mallinson¹

¹ Pennsylvania State University

Potential competing interests: The author(s) declared that no potential competing interests exist.

This piece provides an industry response to the most recent report of the WHO's study group on tobacco regulation. It argues that the TobReg report ignores findings from industry research demonstrating a relative reduction in harm from smokeless products versus traditional cigarettes. The piece reads more like an opinion piece or commentary as it is written. This is not an original research piece. My major critique is that the piece is light on citation of relevant scholarly literature. There are numerous references to "the available scientific evidence," "several studies," "many studies," and more, but no citations of the relevant work. The piece also critiques studies references in the TobReg report, but does not directly reference them either. The only directly described piece of research that was discussed was one of the authors' own studies on IQOS. It is understandable that this is written as a commentary, but it would gain substantially from a stronger referencing of relevant scientific research.