LETTER TO THE EDITOR | Electronic Cigarettes: Not All Good News?

Reply to “Letter to the Editor: Pulmonary toxicity of electronic cigarettes: more doubts than certainties”

Lauren F. Chun, Farzad Moazed, Carolyn S. Calfee, Michael A. Matthay, and Jeffrey E. Gotts
Departments of Medicine and Anesthesia, Cardiovascular Research Institute, University of California, San Francisco

Submitted 20 September 2017; accepted in final form 20 September 2017

REPLY: In their letter to the editor, in this issue of the *American Journal of Physiology-Lung Cellular and Molecular Physiology*, Caruso and colleagues (3) reprise longstanding arguments that the tobacco industry uses to cast doubt on evidence linking smoking with disease (7) to question our conclusion that e-cigarettes pose important potential pulmonary risks (4). They argue that we have systematically ignored evidence, failed to consider significant methodological limitations, and disregarded the uncertain relevance of in vitro and animal studies to humans. We reject this characterization.

They criticize us for excluding four studies (2, 5, 11, 12). Two of the four (11, 12) are purely observational, finding that smokers who began using e-cigarettes and then reduced their cigarette consumption had improvement in symptoms and spirometry relative to smokers who did not reduce their cigarette consumption. In one of these studies (12), patients were included only if they were regularly using e-cigarettes on at least 2 follow-up visits at 24 mo. This design is biased toward including subjects who found e-cigarettes to be helpful. The other two studies (2, 5) refer to a single experiment in which smokers were randomized to e-cigarettes with three different nicotine concentrations. While less cigarette smoking was associated with improved symptoms and spirometry, this study did not include a control group of people who did not use e-cigarettes. As a result, none of these studies permits any conclusions about the pulmonary toxicity of e-cigarettes.

Reducing exposure to cigarette smoke is a desirable goal that yields innumerable health benefits. However, the effect of e-cigarette use on smoking cessation was not tested in these four studies (nor was it a major focus of our review), and the evidence shows that overall e-cigarette use is associated with less smoking cessation, not more (9). More important, the implicit assumption that Caruso et al. (3) make is that e-cigarette aerosol is harmless, which as our review shows is not correct. Focusing exclusively on the effect of e-cigarettes on cessation among current smokers also ignores consistent evidence that e-cigarettes increase smoking initiation among non-smokers (1, 6, 14). As we (4) and others (8) have suggested, the overall health impact of e-cigarettes will depend both on their inherent toxicity and how they reduce or increase the consumption of traditional tobacco products.

All experimental models have limitations, but experimental models are well-established ways to generate important insights into human toxicity. For example, by the early 1950s, the incidence of lung cancer was dramatically increasing and epidemiological data suggested cigarette smoking was the cause (15). Early attempts to induce tumors in animals with tobacco smoke frequently failed (10). However, a seminal 1953 study (16) exposed mice to skin “painting” with tobacco smoke for three times a week for over a year and found that epithelial tumors frequently developed with a mean appearance time of 71 weeks. Mice were subsequently used to explore mechanisms of carcinogenesis with similar intense exposure paradigms (13). The tobacco companies aggressively criticized these and other toxicological approaches on the grounds that they did not “replicate normal conditions of use” for decades despite the companies’ internal acceptance of these studies (7).

As detailed in our review (4), e-cigarettes have a different spectrum of toxicity than cigarettes. The case of diacetyl, the butter flavored food additive that has been proven to be an etiologic agent of obliterative bronchiolitis when inhaled, raises the possibility that various components of e-cigarettes may have unpredictable yet severe toxicity. Only industry will benefit if we await decades of human use to identify such toxicities, as we did with cigarettes. We argue that research should proceed at the cell culture, animal, and human levels simultaneously, leveraging the strengths of each approach while acknowledging their limitations.
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