Disclosure: My employer, PinneyAssociates, Inc., provides consulting services regarding tobacco harm minimization and vaping products to JUUL Labs, Inc, on an exclusive basis. I also own an interest in a nicotine gum that has not been developed nor commercialized.

What Will it Take to Move the Harm Reduction Debate Forward?

Joe Gitchell PinneyAssociates, Inc, Bethesda, MD

Background

The role of explicit harm reduction approaches to tobacco smoking has been debated for decades. From the historical deception of reportedly low-tar filtered cigarettes versus actual low-toxin exposure smokeless tobacco and snus, to the current focus around ecigarettes and other noncombustible tobacco and nicotine products, the issues and positions have not changed much even as the evidence has continued to mount. Why has science not been able to drive convergence towards truth and a solid evidence base for regulation and policy? Without identifying and grappling with these issues, it is unlikely that sufficient agreement will be achieved within the global tobacco control community to take full advantage of nicotine without smoke substituting for tobacco cigarettes to accelerate declines in smoking.

Collectively in society, we have not really begun, let alone completed, the hard work of

prioritizing and discussing trade-offs between the main policy objectives for smoking or tobacco control policy. When cigarettes were nicotine, and vice versa, no compromises were necessary. But technology and regulatory change has liberated nicotine from smoke, so now we need to accept that we can't have it all anymore.

Imagine you had 5 priority points to allocate to these five goals. Any point towards one is a point that cannot be used for the others. How would YOU divvy them up?

Reduce Premature Death and Disease	Reduce Addiction to Nicotine	Punish Bad Corporate Behavior	Prevent Youth Initiation of Nicotine	Protect Non-users

Poster 160 presented at SRNT-E 2023, September 13, 2023, London