

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

Giuseppe Biondi Zoccai¹

¹ Sapienza University of Rome

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This commentary summarizes the evidence base comparing aerosol generated by combustion cigarettes and heated tobacco products. While intriguing and useful, it does not provide details on aerosol generated by nicotine-containing vaping smoke, nor nicotine-free vaping smoke, which might be more appealing for users. In addition, its perspective, while consistent with a harm reduction strategy, might be too lenient towards heated tobacco products.

In order to have a more balanced and attentive perusal of this work, we have also asked ChatGPT the following question, after uploading the full text of the commentary: ‘Peruse attentively this work, and then generate a 10-item index highlighting its main implications, as well as strengths and weaknesses.’

This is its reply:

Based on the provided commentary by Carrie Wade and colleagues on heated tobacco products (HTPs) and the importance of science-based assessments and product classification, here is a 10-item index highlighting its main implications, strengths, and weaknesses:

Index

Introduction to Heated Tobacco Products (HTPs)

- Implication: Emphasizes the necessity for proper assessment of HTPs to understand their potential risks and benefits.
- Strength: Sets a clear context for the discussion on HTPs.
- Weakness: Lacks specific examples of how HTPs have been previously assessed or misclassified.

The Distinction Between Nicotine and Combustion Byproducts

- Implication: Clarifies that the health risks associated with smoking primarily come from combustion byproducts, not nicotine.
- Strength: Highlights the importance of distinguishing between sources of harm in tobacco products.
- Weakness: Does not discuss the addictive properties of nicotine and its own health implications.

Tobacco Harm Reduction

- Implication: Advocates for the development and use of lower-risk alternatives to traditional cigarettes, like HTPs and e-cigarettes.
- Strength: Supports public health initiatives aimed at reducing smoking-related diseases.
- Weakness: May overlook the potential risks associated with alternative tobacco products.

Comparison of HTP Aerosol to Cigarette Smoke

- Implication: Argues that emissions from HTPs are fundamentally different from cigarette smoke, suggesting a lower risk profile.
- Strength: Uses scientific evidence to support claims about the nature of HTP emissions.
- Weakness: The reliance on studies possibly funded or influenced by tobacco companies could introduce bias.

Controversies in Product Classification and Risk Comparison

- Implication: Addresses recent debates on whether HTP emissions should be considered smoke and how they are compared to cigarette emissions.
- Strength: Attempts to clarify misunderstandings and misrepresentations in the literature.
- Weakness: The discussion may not fully address all criticisms or independent studies on the matter.

Physicochemical Analysis of Emissions

- Implication: Emphasizes the importance of analyzing the processes generating emissions and their chemical composition.
- Strength: Provides a scientific basis for distinguishing between smoke and aerosol.
- Weakness: Complex scientific data may not be accessible or easily understood by all readers.

Comparative Risk of HTPs and Cigarettes

- Implication: Suggests that HTPs present a lower health risk compared to cigarettes based on emissions analysis.
- Strength: Offers hope for smokers unable to quit by switching to a potentially less harmful product.
- Weakness: Does not address the long-term health effects of HTP use.

Consumer Behavior and Product Use

- Implication: Highlights the need to consider real-world usage patterns of HTPs versus cigarettes in risk assessments.
- Strength: Recognizes the importance of understanding consumer behavior for accurate risk evaluation.
- Weakness: Assumes similarity in usage patterns between cigarettes and HTPs without extensive data.

Conclusions on HTP Aerosol Characterization

- Implication: Reinforces the view that HTP aerosol is distinct from cigarette smoke and presents a lower risk.

- **Strength:** Summarizes the key scientific arguments made throughout the commentary.
- **Weakness:** Conclusions are drawn primarily from studies and viewpoints that may have affiliations with the tobacco industry.

Future Directions and Need for Independent Research

- **Implication (Inferred):** Suggests a need for ongoing, independent research to fully understand the implications of HTP use.
- **Strength:** Acknowledges the dynamic nature of tobacco product research and public health policy.
- **Weakness:** The actual commentary may not explicitly address the need for independent research, which could be seen as a critical oversight in ensuring unbiased assessments.

This index reflects the main implications, strengths, and weaknesses based on the content of the commentary, focusing on the critical evaluation of HTPs and the science surrounding them.