U.S. FOOD & DRUG ADMINISTRATION

FDA's Response to External Peer Review on the Methodological Approach to Modeling the Potential Impact of a Nicotine Product Standard on Tobacco Use, Morbidity, and Mortality in the U.S.

September 2023

1 INTRODUCTION

The FDA, Center for Tobacco Products (CTP), developed a document, titled "Methodological Approach to Modeling the Potential Impact of a Nicotine Product Standard on Tobacco Use, Morbidity, and Mortality in the U.S.," that outlines the methodology and framework of a computational model aimed to quantify the potential public health impact of a nicotine product standard for cigarettes and other combusted tobacco products in the United States.

ICF, an independent FDA contractor, coordinated an external letter peer review of FDA's draft document. For this peer review, four external scientific experts were screened for conflict of interest (COI) and selected by ICF to evaluate the document and provide written comments on the scientific support for FDA's conclusions, as well as any additional comments, such as methodological concerns, objectivity and strength of the data, limitations, outcomes not discussed, or recommendations of any additional publicly available information.

In Section 2 of this peer review response report, we list the charge questions given to the reviewers regarding the objective of the peer review and specific advice sought through the peer review. In Section 3 of this report, we provide a table containing the individual (anonymized) peer reviewers' comments along with FDA's responses to those comments, including either a description of any changes made to the scientific assessment document in response to peer reviewer comments or an explanation of our decision to not make suggested changes. We also provide an Appendix at the end of this report, providing itemized responses to a list of additional papers submitted by one of the peer reviewers.

Based on this external peer review, the scientific assessment document was updated where appropriate and subsequently finalized. The final version can be found at https://www.fda.gov/science-research/peer-review-scientific-information-and-assessments/completed-peer-reviews.

Below are the names and affiliations of the peer reviewers:

David Levy, PhD
Georgetown Lombardi Comprehensive Cancer Center
Georgetown University

David Mendez, PhD, MS
School of Public Health
University of Michigan

Rafael Meza Rodriguez, PhD
BC Cancer Research Centre (Vancouver, British Columbia)

Andrea Villanti, PhD, MPH
Center for Tobacco Studies
Rutgers University

2 CHARGE TO REVIEWERS

Charge Questions:

1. Is the modeling framework and methodological approach of the population health model appropriate? If not, please explain.

2. Are the data inputs and assumptions of the baseline scenario appropriate and reasonable? If not, please specify alternatives and provide details regarding the source of that data.

3. Are the data inputs and assumptions of the policy scenario appropriate and reasonable? If not, please specify alternatives and provide details regarding the source of that data.

4. Is the approach to incorporate uncertainty through the sensitivity analyses detailed in the document appropriate? If not, please provide details on alternative approaches.

5. Other comments, suggestions, or recommendations for improving the report.

3 FDA RESPONSES TO INDIVIDUAL REVIEWER COMMENTS

In the following sections, FDA's responses to individual comments from the external peer reviewers are organized according to the sequence of the charge questions, i.e., general impressions followed by Questions 1 through 5. Comments from all four reviewers, anonymized as Reviewers A through D, are itemized and listed under each charge question.

Methodological Approach to Modeling the Potential Impact of a Nicotine Product Standard on Tobacco Use, Morbidity, and Mortality in the U.S.

3.1 GENERAL IMPRESSIONS

Comment ID	Reviewer	Comment	Response
A1	Reviewer A	The draft "Methodological Approach to Modeling the Potential Impact of a Nicotine Product Standard on Tobacco Use, Morbidity, and Mortality in the U.S." provides a clear description of the framework, methods, data inputs, and sensitivity analyses conducted to quantify the public health impact of a nicotine product standard for cigarettes and certain other combusted tobacco products. The rationale for base case estimates, policy scenario, and ranges used in sensitivity analyses are appropriate and justified; where possible, comparisons across different models are presented, highlighting consistency of findings from this model with different modeling parameters and assumptions. It updates and extends prior models published by FDA (Vugrin 2015, Apelberg 2018) to estimate the impact of the policy on mortality from secondhand smoke exposure, smoking-related perinatal conditions, smoking-related fires, and the use of non-premium cigars and pipe tobacco. Additional analyses address the potential impact of illicit trade on public health outcomes, highlighting the robustness of policy effects on smoking cessation, tobacco-attributable deaths avoided, and life-years gained.	We thank the reviewer for this comment summarizing the model and its features and finding them to be appropriate.
A2	Reviewer A	The text, tables, figures, and appendices convey the inputs and assumptions of each aspect of the simulation modeling approach, as well as the median results and range (5th – 95th percentile) of findings for each outcome. This level of clarity and transparency ensures the rigor and reproducibility of these analyses and aligns with guidelines for Modeling Good Research Practices. FDA's interpretations of estimates throughout the report follow directly from the data presented, as do	We thank the reviewer for this comment summarizing features and characteristics of the modeling approach and finding them to be appropriate.

Comment ID	Reviewer	Comment	Response
		the conclusions. Findings from this model support that a nicotine product standard would be expected to result in significant reductions in smoking prevalence, premature death from tobacco, and improved health-related quality of life. This model builds on two peer-reviewed, published studies using this population health model to estimate the potential impact of a nicotine product standard for cigarettes and certain other combusted tobacco products, accounting for updated input parameters and assumptions based on the changing tobacco and nicotine marketplace. Together, rigor, transparency, coherence, and model validation strengthen confidence in conclusions derived from this model.	
D3	Reviewer D	I have read and studied this report in detail. I reviewed the model's constructs, as well as the published models used as references. I carefully examined the appendices containing technical details of the study and parameters used to populate the model.	We thank the reviewer for this comment noting their care in reviewing the report.

3.2 RESPONSE TO CHARGE QUESTIONS

3.2.1 Charge Question 1

Charge Question 1. Is the modeling framework and methodological approach of the population health model appropriate? If not, please explain.			
Comment ID	**Reviewer**	**Comment**	**Response**
A4	Reviewer A	The modeling framework and methodological approach of the population health model derive from a peer-reviewed multi-state dynamic model that incorporates underlying population changes and projects the impact of changes in tobacco use initiation, cessation, switching, and dual use on tobacco use prevalence, morbidity, and mortality in the U.S. Specification of the population covered by the model and the data sources used to estimate population changes accounting for births, migration, and deaths are clearly presented. This modeling approach addresses transitions in use of two products (i.e., cigarettes and non-combusted tobacco products), which maps to the most likely product transitions following a nicotine product standard on cigarettes and certain other combusted products. While it sacrifices detail on specific product transitions (e.g., cigarette to smokeless tobacco) resulting from policy change, it allows for more robust estimation of key tobacco product use transitions (e.g., combusted tobacco to non-combusted tobacco) and their resulting effect on prevalence and health outcomes as they relate to the FDA's public health standard.	We thank the reviewer for this comment summarizing the model's population and tobacco use inputs. As noted, the model incorporates cigarettes and noncombusted tobacco products as its product classes instead of more specific categories because of their importance in terms of tobacco use and population health impact.
B5	Reviewer B	The modeling framework and approach are adequate. This is a comprehensive model of tobacco use behavior and its health consequences in the U.S. The analysis is thorough, the model and assumptions are clearly described, and the policy scenario impacts are well justified. Overall, this is an outstanding analysis, and I commend the authors for describing the model and analysis so clearly and thoroughly.	We thank the reviewer for this comment stating that the analysis is outstanding and that the model and analysis are well described.

Charge Question 1. Is the modeling framework and methodological approach of the population health model appropriate? If not, please explain.			
Comment ID	**Reviewer**	**Comment**	**Response**
C6	Reviewer C	The primary analysis involves a simulation model that examines the impact of a nicotine standard on cigarette and noncombustible use and related attributable mortality and is later used to gauge the impact on premature mortality of non-premium cigar use, and perinatal and second-hand smoke health issues. The methodological framework for the basic cigarette-centered baseline model is appropriate. While I am critical of some aspects of the methodology, the results derived from the modeling as they apply to cigarette and noncombustible use are generally well supported.	We thank the reviewer for the comment stating that the modeling framework for the baseline scenario is appropriate and note that we address the reviewer's other concerns in subsequent responses.
C7	Reviewer C	The model applies a standard Markov process approach. This approach implies that future states depend on the immediate past time state and not previous time states. That assumption raises potential complications. The instability and measurement problems that modelers today face in a highly complex, dynamic nicotine product environment requires added attention to the unstable use patterns in the last 5 years of the use of combustible (smoking prevalence rates of youth and young adults dramatically dropped) and noncombustible (e-cigarettes dramatically increased and then fell) products, and potential impact of changing regulatory policies especially as they are applied to non-combustibles. As described below, a more structured approach to sensitivity analysis would improve the model presentation. Uncertainty about the appropriate measures of prevalence and stability of transitions is a central problem in modeling nicotine product use in the current environment and needs to be more clearly recognized.	We agree with the reviewer that our model, like any modeling approach, has strengths and limitations, but we believe that the approach and the resulting estimates are fundamentally sound. We addressed and sought to minimize the effects of potential complications or limitations in the following ways. We agree with the reviewer that the Markov process approach raises certain complications, specifically, the limitation of not considering previous time states (beyond the present state) when projecting future states. To some extent, we address this issue by not incorporating relapse into the model as a possible transition since relapse may be influenced by factors beyond the immediate past. Specifically, in the model, transition probabilities for smoking relapse are set to 0. Modeling assumptions on smoking relapse are described in Appendices A and I. We also agree with the reviewer that trends for use of certain tobacco products such as youth use of e-cigarettes have been unstable in the past five years or so. To address

Charge Question 1. Is the modeling framework and methodological approach of the population health model appropriate? If not, please explain.			
Comment ID	**Reviewer**	**Comment**	**Response**
			these concerns, we added a paragraph to the "Limitations" subsection of Section 7 "Conclusion" noting the recent trends in tobacco product use and the uncertainty in predicting future trends as well as our attempts to use the most reliable data on current trends and sensitivity analysis to assess the effects of different assumptions about future product use. To address the comment about a more structured approach to sensitivity analysis, we included additional sensitivity analyses, as explained in Section 2.4.2 "Sensitivity Analyses," based on comments from the reviewers. These include an analysis assuming a 25% decrease in cigarette smoking initiation from 2021 to 2030 and an analysis assuming lower risks for dual use compared to exclusive cigarette smoking.
C8	Reviewer C	While the main analysis was well-conducted, I found the extensions to the basic cigarette-oriented approach, such as to non-premium cigars, as second-hand smoke, perinatal and fire impacts problematic. It was unclear how the use of noncombustibles was treated. These extensions are analyzed separately from the model, raising questions on their validity (see discussion below).	We acknowledge that the extension of model results to other causes has limitations, but we used this approach because of the more limited data available for these causes, usually in the form of mortality estimates for the U.S., as discussed in the Limitations subsection of Section 7 "Conclusion." We also used this approach because the model was developed to focus on the health effects of direct cigarette smoking, given the magnitude of population harm it causes. We believe that this approach and its estimates are valid and reasonable because they are based on the model outputs and published mortality estimates for these causes for the U.S. We added to the report a statement that this approach for covered combusted products was motivated by the model only

Charge Question 1. Is the modeling framework and methodological approach of the population health model appropriate? If not, please explain.			
Comment ID	**Reviewer**	**Comment**	**Response**
			allowing for two tobacco product classes at a time, as explained in the response to comment C9. We also added more information about how the estimates for these additional causes were estimated, including the sources of information for the original estimates of population harm from these exposures. We also added a discussion of the possibility that transitions to noncombusted product use in response to the standard could lead to some deaths from these causes, such as e-cigarette use leading to fires.
C9	Reviewer C	In reviewing the report, my major concern is that I found the parts of the presentation confusing. I found the discussion in the Methods section particularly confusing. Up front, it can be made clearer that the baseline model directly applies only to transitions to and from cigarette and noncombustible (with emphasis on e-cigarette) use and does not incorporate non-premium cigar, heated tobacco product or oral nicotine pouch use. In the beginning of the Methodology section, it would help to include a diagram that shows the impact of a potential nicotine product standard on cigarette and noncombustible use, which in turn affects related morbidity and mortality. I would suggest emphasizing the central role of cigarette use and more generally their health risks relative to noncombustible health risks, which underlies the support for a nicotine product standard. On first reading, I was baffled by the Conceptual Framework diagram in the second section of the Methodology section, both because the diagram is very complex and because it was not immediately clear why each box had two states (e.g., Never, Never). The two states should be defined, presumably combustible (or cigarettes only?) vs. noncombustible use. In light of all of the arrows, it may be preferable to either simplify the diagram or	We clarified the introduction of the "Methodology" Section 2 to state that the model incorporates cigarettes and noncombusted products but not non-premium cigars and other combusted products. We explained that cigarettes are included as a product class because of the magnitude of their population health effects and noncombusted products are included because of the likelihood of switching to them. We noted that mortality from other exposures was not directly modeled in the two-product model and instead were calculated from model outputs. We also defined and explained the particular product categories and use states in this implementation of the model in the figure's caption.

Charge Question 1. Is the modeling framework and methodological approach of the population health model appropriate? If not, please explain.			
Comment ID	**Reviewer**	**Comment**	**Response**
		provide more explanation (perhaps best kept in the Appendices as currently also provided).	
D10	Reviewer D	The model described in the report is a linear, dynamic, compartmental model, where individuals are classified by age, gender, combusted tobacco use status (including current, never, and former smokers, the latter further identified by years-since-quit), and non-combusted tobacco use status. Appropriate differential all-cause mortality is applied to the compartments of the model. The constructs of the model are conceptually and technically sound and are fully presented in the appendices and references. The framework and model presented in the report are appropriate for the study's goals.	We thank the reviewer for this comment summarizing the model and its framework and judging them to be appropriate.
D11	Reviewer D	My only minor criticism about this model's framework, as well as that of most tobacco-related models in the literature, is the treatment of initiation and cessation parameters as exogenous variables. Such treatment was appropriate when the population's smoking initiation and cessation rates were slowly changing. During the last decade, we have seen initiation rates plummeting and cessation rates rising at an accelerating pace. It is more than likely that non-linear diffusion effects, endogenous to the processes of initiation and cessation, are at play in determining the trend on these parameters. In this study, this lack of modeling detail is handled by an extensive sensitivity analysis of the initiation and cessation rates. For the purposes of the study, this is appropriate, although future efforts should attempt to incorporate those non-linear effects within the model's constructs.	We thank the reviewer for this comment noting that non-linear, endogenous effects are affecting tobacco use initiation and cessation. We agree that future modeling efforts could attempt to incorporate these effects within the modeling framework and that such efforts are not necessary for the model at the present time. In the meantime, our extensive sensitivity analyses serve to address these concerns, including those related to different assumptions of future smoking initiation and the use of increased smoking cessation data in the baseline scenario.

3.2.2 Charge Question 2

Charge Question 2. Are the data inputs and assumptions of the baseline scenario appropriate and reasonable? If not, please specify alternatives and provide details regarding the source of that data.			
Comment ID	**Reviewer**	**Comment**	**Response**
A12	Reviewer A	Baseline scenario inputs and assumptions are clearly documented and use recent data from the U.S. Census, other national sources, and published studies. These are appropriate and reasonable.	We thank the reviewer for this comment stating that the model baseline scenario inputs are well documented and appropriate.
B13	Reviewer B	In general, the assumptions are reasonable. However, I have some suggestions for your consideration: Smoking projections. The model projections in the baseline scenario (figure 3) agree with the current smoking prevalence trends. However, this is unclear from the model validation presented in the supplement as these show an old version of the model and NHIS data only through 2012 (figure C2 and Table C1). Could these figures be updated to show the performance of the current version of the model relative to more recent data?	We thank the reviewer for this comment stating that the model assumptions are generally reasonable. We updated the model validation by including a figure (Figure C3) comparing adult cigarette smoking prevalence from the baseline model projection from 2015 to 2050 (as presented in Apelberg et al., 2018) to published estimates of U.S. smoking prevalence from 2015 to 2022.
B14	Reviewer B	On a related note, the model uses CISNET initiation and cessation parameters based on data through 2018. While the model seems to be doing a reasonable job with more recent trends and starts with an adult prevalence of around 12% in 2021, I wonder if there might be updated CISNET data to inform the model, as there have been considerable changes in smoking initiation and cessation in the past few years. I do not think this is essential, and I am satisfied with the model as presented, as the projected smoking in the baseline scenario seems reasonable, reaching 6% after 2070. But I wonder how using more updated rates might affect the model projections.	We agree with the reviewer that using the current CISNET initiation and cessation rates is a reasonable approach. Given that we do not have more recent data, we did not update the rates and cannot comment on how this would affect model projections.
B15	Reviewer B	Switching between cigarettes and non-combusted products. These are based on Brouwer et al. for the baseline scenario. However, as	We now use the updated transition rates in the Brouwer et al. (2023) article referenced by the reviewer as our main

Charge Question 2. Are the data inputs and assumptions of the baseline scenario appropriate and reasonable? If not, please specify alternatives and provide details regarding the source of that data.			
Comment ID	**Reviewer**	**Comment**	**Response**
		described in the report, these are based on earlier PATH surveys. Sensitivity analyses were conducted assuming 50% and 100% higher switching rates versus the baseline. Brouwer et al. recently updated their analysis estimating switching rates based on more recent PATH surveys (https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2022.12.15.22283292v1). It would be helpful to assess if the assumption of 50% or 100% versus the baseline agrees with the estimates from this new analysis of Brouwer et al. If so, should one of the higher switching rates scenarios become the baseline scenario?	estimate for product switching in the baseline scenario. As such, there is no need to use one of the sensitivity analysis values as the main estimate.
B16	Reviewer B	The assumption of 80% of cigar mortality coming from non-premium cigars is likely an overestimation of the risk of premium cigars, since premium cigar users tend not to smoke cigarettes and not to use cigars frequently. A 90% from non-premium vs 10% from premium break might be more realistic.	We rewrote the paragraph to clarify the calculation and now note that the 80% figure may be an underestimate of the mortality effects of non-premium cigars due to possible differences in use patterns such as frequency and health effects for premium cigars. However, the estimates for mortality from regular cigar smoking are for the independent effects from cigar smoking and would not be affected by cigarette smoking status.
B17	Reviewer B	Decrease in mortality by the Lee-Carter method. This is a reasonable approach as it is a validated demography methodology. However, I was surprised by the huge impact on infant and childhood mortality. For example, by 2100, it is projected that infant mortality will be only 10% of that in 2021 (scaling factor 0.111). This is very optimistic. This likely has a limited impact as the bigger decreases in mortality are seen for young ages, so these are unlikely to impact the projections of smoking-related mortality. However, one additional sensitivity analysis could keep the mortality rates constant after a given year (e.g., 2060) to	We implemented the reviewer's suggestion of keeping mortality rates constant after 2060 as an additional sensitivity analysis with results given in Table 6.

Charge Question 2. Are the data inputs and assumptions of the baseline scenario appropriate and reasonable? If not, please specify alternatives and provide details regarding the source of that data.			
Comment ID	**Reviewer**	**Comment**	**Response**
		assess the impact of the optimistic decreases in mortality from the Lee-Carter approach.	
C18	Reviewer C	Initial population. The model is initialized with population and smoking prevalence for the year 2020. The year 2020 is a logical choice, since it is largely pre-covid pandemic and thus avoids some of the data problems and issues related to product use measures. It would be useful to provide additional references for this choice, especially regarding potential impacts of covid and survey issues. I would recommend that the report present the specific prevalence measures used to initialize exclusive cigarette, exclusive combustible, and dual use in the model in the initial population section. Currently, some of that information is provided in the transitions section, but, as described below, the discussion is often unclear as it relates to each of the categories of use. In particular, it is important to stress the importance of measuring regular use for the purpose of public health analyses, and specifically defending a measure of relatively stable dual use patterns (in terms of extent of use of both cigarettes and noncombustibles), which is admittedly a difficult task. Instead, the first paragraph launches into a discussion of how the previous model accurately incorporates projections of smoking prevalence over time, which is more directly relevant to the section on transitions. The discussion in the first sections may be less confusing by first discussing initial population measures along with population transitions (births, migration, and deaths) and then separately discuss combustible and noncombustible measures and transitions.	The baseline (initial) year of the model is 2021. We added explanations about the use of initial tobacco use prevalence from 2020 NHIS and NYTS data in Section 2.2.2 (Tobacco Use Inputs). We noted issues involving the COVID-19 pandemic that affected NHIS and NYTS data collection in relevant years. We also added the tobacco product use definitions to the main text and noted that we tried to capture regular use in our analysis when the available data permitted it. We also reordered the paragraphs to first discuss population measures and transitions and then tobacco use measures and transitions.
C19	Reviewer C	Product Transitions: It would be helpful to begin this section by summarizing the transition parameters needed, i.e., initiation and	We added an introductory statement summarizing the transitions included in the model. We also noted that

Charge Question 2. Are the data inputs and assumptions of the baseline scenario appropriate and reasonable? If not, please specify alternatives and provide details regarding the source of that data.			
Comment ID	**Reviewer**	**Comment**	**Response**
		cessation rates for exclusive combustible, dual combustible, and exclusive noncombustible rates, and switching rates between combustibles and noncombustibles. The set of assumptions made with regard to transitions could then be explicitly set out in a table. I found that it was unclear what assumptions were being made regarding transition rates from exclusive cigarette and dual use and whether any distinctions are made within noncombustible categories (e.g., distinguishing smokeless tobacco from e-cigarette use).	smokeless tobacco and e-cigarette are treated as a single noncombusted product class. More detailed information about how transitions are handled is given in the subsequent paragraphs, and we referenced the list of assumptions about transitions in the "Tobacco Use Transition Inputs" section of Table I1 "Summary of Modeling Assumptions ..." in Appendix I "Summary of Model Assumptions."
C20	Reviewer C	Cigarettes: It would be helpful to discuss the age-period-cohort analysis in more detail. The use of the two-year cessation rates is appropriate, as this methodology has now been widely used and has been shown by the CISNET group to capture relevant trends. However, this simplification will not pick up the gradual reduction in relative risks beyond two years of quitting smoking (which cumulates over time). The following statement is unclear, "Under these assumptions, model projections in the baseline scenario closely match estimates of population size, mortality, and smoking prevalence for the U.S. produced by other federal agencies.", i.e., over what time period and which federal agencies (why even mentioned?). In addition to mentioning validation in the previous FDA nicotine standard analysis, I would suggest citing recent CISNET publications regarding validation and use of the two-year cessation rates. While the measure of cessation is discussed, the measurement of smoking initiation is not discussed.	In response to the reviewer's comment about relative risks over time, we would like to clarify that Section 2.2.3 "Mortality Inputs" explains that relative risks for former smokers are estimated as a function of years since quitting. We removed the statement about comparisons of model projections and divided the previous statement about validation into a statement about population and a statement about smoking prevalence. In Section 2.2.2 "Tobacco Use Inputs," we cited recent publications that discuss in detail the mathematical approach used to fit the age-period-cohort model, as well as the initiation and cessation definitions used by the CISNET group. In Section 2.2.2 "Tobacco Use Inputs," we also added a statement to clarify how we operationalized smoking initiation within the modeling framework.
C21	Reviewer C	A discussion of how the NHIS age-period-cohort analysis incorporates cohort and period over time and thus implicitly incorporates recent changes in trend would be helpful. In particular, the use of NHIS data	In response to the reviewer's suggestions, we noted changes in tobacco use since 2018 as a potential limitation of the current CISNET rates in Section 2.2.2 "Tobacco Use

Charge Question 2. Are the data inputs and assumptions of the baseline scenario appropriate and reasonable? If not, please specify alternatives and provide details regarding the source of that data.			
Comment ID	**Reviewer**	**Comment**	**Response**
		through 2018 in the age-period-cohort analysis raises concern; the large drop in the initiation rates of recent cohorts and the general increase in cessation rates may incorporate the replacement of cigarette with noncombustible use, and thus have implications for the measurement of switching rates (see discussion below). My concerns arise because the period 2013-2021 includes dramatic shifts in smoking and e-cigarette patterns. In particular, more attention is warranted regarding the unstable nicotine product use and transition patterns from 2013-2021, especially those observed between 2017 and 2022.	Inputs" and added a paragraph to the Limitations subsection in Section 7 "Conclusion" in which we discuss the recent dynamic trends in cigarette and e-cigarette use. We conducted sensitivity analyses as explained in Section 2.4.2 "Sensitivity Analyses" to assess the effect of different assumptions about tobacco use trends such as cigarette and noncombusted tobacco product initiation over time. We added discussion in Section 5.1 "Baseline Parameter Assumptions" on how results were robust to alternative baseline input parameter input values.
C22	Reviewer C	Non combustibles: In general, I found the application of transitions to initial levels of combustible and noncombustible use unclear and assumptions regarding those transitions were not made explicit. To derive initiation rates for noncombustibles, smoking initiation rates are scaled, implying that age and gender patterns for the initiation and cessation of combustible use follows those of cigarettes. This assumption should be clearly stated. The application of scalers transitions is applied to exclusive combustible as well as dual use is not clear. In the model, combustible smoking cessation rates are applied as cessation rates for noncombustibles. This decision is based on a comparison of quit ratios for smokeless and cigarette users (how are dual users treated), but has unclear applicability to e-cigarettes users. Why not use the quit rates provided through the Brouwer article (used to determine switch rates, see below) or cessation rates estimated from PATH (or possibly the ratio of transition to no use by smokers as compared to e-cigarette users)? The application of smoking initiation rates to noncombustible rates is not justified. While it is difficult to	We thank the reviewer for the suggestion to use ENDS cessation rates provided in Brouwer et al. (2023), as well as initiation rates from PATH data. We explored the use of initiation and cessation rates associated with ENDS, as presented in Brouwer's paper. Specifically, we conducted the following two sensitivity analyses: 1. We used cessation and initiation rates of ENDS from Brouwer et al. (2023), and results show a slight increase in public health benefits compared to outcomes of the main analyses. For example, by year 2100, cumulative tobacco-attributable deaths avoided, cumulative life years gained, and cumulative QALY gained increase by 3.4%, 3.8%, and 0.7%, respectively. 2. We used initiation rates of ENDS from Brouwer et al. (2023) only, and results show almost no change compared to outcomes of the main analysis. For

Charge Question 2. Are the data inputs and assumptions of the baseline scenario appropriate and reasonable? If not, please specify alternatives and provide details regarding the source of that data.			
Comment ID	**Reviewer**	**Comment**	**Response**
		determine noncombustible transition patterns, it would be useful to conduct analysis of use rates at early ages using PATH survey to consider initiation patterns with respect to e-cigarettes.	example, by year 2100, cumulative tobacco-attributable death avoided, cumulative life years gained, and cumulative QALY gained decrease by 0.3%, 0.2% and 0.2%, respectively. We included results from these sensitivity analyses in Section 5.1 "Baseline Parameter Assumptions" (Table 6) and stated that the use of initiation and cessation rates for noncombusted products, derived from PATH data, do not significantly change the results, as compared with the results from the main analysis. In order to provide additional justification on the use of scaled smoking initiation rates for noncombusted product initiation, we added the following sentence in Section 2.2.2 "Tobacco Use Inputs": "Further, Brouwer et al. (2022) provides data on ENDS use initiation with different frequency of use thresholds (at least 1, 10, 20, and 30 days in the past 30 days) using PATH Study data, Waves 1-4 (2013-2017). Also, Brouwer et al. (2023) provides data on ENDS use initiation based on both established use and past 30-day use, using PATH Study data from Waves 2-4 (2015-2017) and Waves 4-5 (2017-2019). However, estimates from these papers do not account for transitions to smokeless tobacco, heated tobacco product, and oral nicotine product use, as defined in the population model."

Charge Question 2. Are the data inputs and assumptions of the baseline scenario appropriate and reasonable? If not, please specify alternatives and provide details regarding the source of that data.			
Comment ID	**Reviewer**	**Comment**	**Response**
			We also stated in the "Limitations" subsection of Section 7 "Conclusion" that we make assumptions about use patterns of noncombusted tobacco products in using scaled cigarette smoking initiation and cessation rates.
C23	Reviewer C	As mentioned above, the relationship of transitions to exclusive and noncombustible use to measures of initial exclusive is unclear. The use of a 20 of the last 30 days for regular youth use is acceptable, although arguably it is too restrictive especially at younger ages (although some sensitivity analysis is later conducted). While the study uses NYTS, potentially better measures can be obtained from PATH, where they specifically ask about "fairly regular" use and distinctions can also be made regarding number of days in the past month. A range of estimates in terms of days used can then be applied for sensitivity analysis. A recent paper by Brouwer (NTR 2022) considers the role of prevalence definitions (e.g., number of days) in gauging transitions.	As stated in the previous response, we clarified in the "Limitations" subsection of Section 7 "Conclusion" that we are making assumptions for regular noncombusted tobacco product use using prevalence data from NYTS and NHIS to scale smoking initiation and cessation rates. Prevalence data used for this purpose was calculated considering regular youth use (20 days use in the last 30 days) for noncombusted tobacco products, and "fairly regular" use (every day or some days at time of interview) for adults. We also considered transition rates obtained from PATH Study data analyses. For example, we examined the use of tobacco use transitions from the PATH Study, as described in Brouwer et al. (2023) and Brouwer et al. (2022). Sensitivity analysis conducted using Brouwer's initiation rates for ENDS underestimates the prevalence trend of noncombusted tobacco use as compared with the main analysis. For example, from year 2021 to 2100, the prevalence from the sensitivity analysis increases from 6% to below 8%; however, the prevalence from the main analysis increases from 6% to 12%. Regardless of this difference, outputs for smoking prevalence and public health outcomes (mortality and morbidity estimates) from both the sensitivity and main analyses are very similar to

Charge Question 2. Are the data inputs and assumptions of the baseline scenario appropriate and reasonable? If not, please specify alternatives and provide details regarding the source of that data.			
Comment ID	**Reviewer**	**Comment**	**Response**
			each other. Hence, varying the definition of "fairly regular" use and thus initiation rates for noncombusted products showed little impact, if any, on the nicotine policy scenario, which can be seen as an indication of the minimal impact of varying initiation rates based on number of days used or frequency of use on the nicotine policy scenario. These results are consistent with the findings presented in Brouwer et al. (2022) that showed that varying frequency of use thresholds had minimal effect on estimates of adult transition probabilities.
C24	Reviewer C	Regarding switching rates, the use of transitions developed by Brouwer (TC, 2022) is a good choice. Note, however, that the Brouwer transitions are over a 1-year period, unlike smoking cessation which is over a 2-year period. It appears from the discussion that switching rates from Brouwer were applied to exclusive cigarette use, but Brouwer also considers switching from dual use and the application of these two measures is not specified. While the report mentions potential instability in switching rates and provides a sensitivity analysis, more attention is needed here. I would suggest also examining PATH data, especially regarding recent transitions from waves 4 to 5 (over nearly a two-year period). A paper by Brower, available on Medriv, considers the stability of transitions using data from PATH 2017-2019 compared to wave 2015-2017. Another potential problem is that the use of NHIS through 2018 in the age-period cohort analysis may incorporate some of the switching from cigarettes to other products as reflected in the period and cohort effects on cessation rates in recent years, thus	We thank the reviewer for the suggestion to use switching rates provided in Brouwer et al. (2023) from PATH data analyses. We updated the switching rates with the more recent transition estimates from Brouwer's paper. We are also now using estimates from this paper for transitions from dual use to exclusive cigarette and noncombusted product use. The transition probabilities presented in Brouwer et al. (2023) are for a one-year period and are consistent with the transition definitions used in the model. The CISNET cessation rates used in the model are also annual rates (the cessation rates themselves are calculated with cessation defined as NHIS participants reporting not having smoked for at least 2 years with more recent smoking quitters censored in the analysis, see Tam et al. (2018) for a more detailed explanation). We noted changes in tobacco use since 2018 as a potential limitation of the

Charge Question 2. Are the data inputs and assumptions of the baseline scenario appropriate and reasonable? If not, please specify alternatives and provide details regarding the source of that data.			
Comment ID	**Reviewer**	**Comment**	**Response**
		raising concerns regarding double counting of the switching process. Another concern is that increases in switching rates may have occurred since 2019, especially in regard to young adults in recent years (e.g., NHIS survey results show major declines in age 18-24 smoking prevalence from 2013 up through 2021).	current CISNET rates, as noted in the response to Comment C21. To address the concern regarding double counting of the switching process, we considered using the smoking cessation and switching (from cigarette-only use to ENDS-only use) rates from Brouwer's paper in a sensitivity analysis. Cessation and switching rates provided in that paper are mutually exclusive transitions, that is, there is no double counting. Results from that analysis were included in Section 5.1 "Baseline Parameter Assumptions" (Table 6) and show a minimal impact in the results. We also compared the CISNET smoking cessation rates used in our simulations with the cessation rates reported in Brouwer at al. (2023) and found that the CISNET rates were generally lower than the rates derived from PATH data. Thus, although we acknowledge the possibility of some double counting of cessation by using CISNET cessation rates and PATH Study switching rates, we believe that the effect, if any, would be minimal since we used lower cessation rates compared with the ones presented in Brouwer's paper. Note: we assume that this comment and comment D28 are referring to papers by Brouwer et al.
C25	Reviewer C	Mortality rates: The measures of never-smoker mortality rates were well developed. Although it would be useful to control for smokeless tobacco use, it would be impractical to conduct that analysis as	We added comparisons in the "Conclusion" Section 7 between the results in this analysis and those in the previous Apelberg et al. 2018 analysis as well as the Tengs

Charge Question 2. Are the data inputs and assumptions of the baseline scenario appropriate and reasonable? If not, please specify alternatives and provide details regarding the source of that data.			
Comment ID	**Reviewer**	**Comment**	**Response**
		suggested in the report. For smoker mortality rates, updated data were used relative to the earlier FTC nicotine reduction analysis, and a hazard rate analysis was appropriately applied. It would be useful to present and reference this hazard rate analysis in the supplementary material. A comparison of the results to the previous FTC analysis and to other studies would also be helpful in evaluating the results.	et al. 2005 simulation of the AMA proposal. In Appendix B, we also added estimates for never smoker death rates, as well as model-based results from the hazard ratio analyses.
C26	Reviewer C	I found the analysis of noncombustible and dual use mortality rates more problematic. Regarding smokeless tobacco mortality rates, the studies reviewed (2005 and 2008) are outdated, as patterns of exclusive and dual smokeless use changed considerably beginning in 2002 (with cigarette companies buying up the smokeless tobacco companies in 2006 and 2009). The associated risks of smokeless tobacco have also likely declined with the use of oral nicotine pouches, snus and other more recent forms of smokeless tobacco. The applicability of smokeless tobacco relative risks to e-cigarettes is particularly questionable, given the wide variety of types of smokeless products at the time of the 2005 and 2008 studies and the introduction of presumably safer forms since those studies. I would recommend surveying the e-cigarette literature. The England Public Health Service has recently published an extensive analysis and update of their analysis of e-cigarette (and heated tobacco product) risks, and in my view is the most rigorous attempt to date. I would suggest using their estimates but conducting extensive sensitivity analysis especially at higher relative risk estimates. The assumption regarding the risk to dual users (same as exclusive smokers) is conservative, and sensitivity analysis should be conducted at lower levels of risks. In my view, the basis for increased risk of dual use is weak; stronger evidence is	We appreciate the reviewer's comments about the need for updated relative risks for noncombusted and dual users. Our understanding is that mortality relative risk estimates directly calculated from data for ENDS users are not currently available, as we now state in Section 2.4.2 "Sensitivity Analyses." We acknowledge that opinion about the risks of these products can vary in the research community and that the risks likely vary across different types of noncombusted products. For the purposes of this analysis, we used the best available long-term data for noncombusted products. We included lower risks for dual users as part of our sensitivity analysis. We also noted in the "Limitations" subsection of Section 7 "Conclusion" that we have considered higher and lower risks for noncombusted products in sensitivity analysis. We note in Section 2.4.2 "Sensitivity Analyses" that the relative excess risk of the lower risk value is 7%, similar in magnitude to previous estimates from Public Health England for ENDS and consistent with conclusions in their 2022 review.

Charge Question 2. Are the data inputs and assumptions of the baseline scenario appropriate and reasonable? If not, please specify alternatives and provide details regarding the source of that data.			
Comment ID	**Reviewer**	**Comment**	**Response**
		available for lower risks among dual users than exclusive smokers, as found in biomarker studies, smokeless tobacco studies that consider dual use, and simply that lower rates of cigarette use suggest reduced lung cancer and COPD risks, especially for those who initiate into dual use at a younger age (as opposed to those that transition into dual use from exclusive cigarette use).	
D27	Reviewer D	Yes, for the most part. The assumption of frozen initiation and cessation rates can be challenged since those population parameters have been trending for some time (see my remarks on question 1). A more realistic baseline, with an increasing cessation rate and a decreasing initiation rate, would result in a smaller policy effect.	To address the reviewer's comment about changing cigarette smoking rates, we conducted an additional sensitivity analysis incorporating a 25% decrease in smoking initiation during the period from 2021 to 2030. We also conducted a sensitivity analysis with increased smoking cessation rates, with results for both analyses shown in Table 6.
D28	Reviewer D	The initiation, cessation, and transition rates are obtained exogenously. Transitions among combustible, non-combustible, and dual product use are published estimates by Brower et al. (2022) based on analysis of PATH data. A question could be raised whether those transition parameters are stable, although they are the best available information on the subject.	We thank the reviewer for this comment supporting the use of transition rates for product switching from analysis of PATH Study data by Brouwer et al. We note that we updated the transition rates with those based on PATH Study Waves 2-5 data that are presented in Brouwer et al. (2023).
D29	Reviewer D	Initiation rates are taken to be CISNET estimates. I have a certain concern about these figures, but I am not sure whether my misgiving is totally justified. According to Table D6, about 19% of a cohort would initiate smoking between the ages 9 and 30, which seems very high since the 2018 prevalence for 18–24-year-olds was only 7.8%, according to NHIS data. This apparent discrepancy could be driven by the specific definition of smoking initiation used in this study.	We appreciate the comment, but we respectfully disagree with the conclusion of a 19% smoking initiation rate drawn from Table D6. Although the table provides smoking initiation rates for different ages from 9-30 and for male and female, they cannot simply be added to estimate a single smoking initiation rate for the entire group. In particular, we cannot estimate a rate of 10.62% for females

Charge Question 2. Are the data inputs and assumptions of the baseline scenario appropriate and reasonable? If not, please specify alternatives and provide details regarding the source of that data.			
Comment ID	**Reviewer**	**Comment**	**Response**
		Nevertheless, I recommend that the report's authors double-check the initiation rate figures.	or 8.33% for males by summing all the rates across ages 9-30 since percentages (rates) that have different base values (denominators) cannot be directly combined by addition. Additionally, we cannot conclude a rate of 19% for the entire age group by summing up 10.62% and 8.33%. A better crude approximation of the cumulative initiation could be obtained by averaging the cumulative percentage across males and females, which is about 9.5%. This is consistent with the 7.8% prevalence estimate provided by the reviewer for 18-24-year-olds, and with a model-based projection of 8.6% in 2024. The rates presented in Table D6 that correspond to sex- and age-specific annual initiation rates for exclusive cigarette use, exclusive use of noncombusted tobacco products, and dual use should not be seen as cohort rates. We edited the caption in Table D6 to clarify this. We also checked the rates in Table D6 and noticed that annual initiation rates for cigarette smoking (exclusive cigarette smoking + dual use) varied according to age, peaking at the age of 17 years old for both females (2.7% per year) and males (4.1% per year). When we looked at baseline smoking prevalence estimates from the model, for 18–24-year-olds, the results are consistent with the 7.8% estimate provided by the reviewer.
D30	Reviewer D	All input data are properly referenced and/or shown in the appendix.	We thank the reviewer for this comment noting that all input data are properly presented in the appendix.

3.2.3 Charge Question 3

Charge Question 3. Are the data inputs and assumptions of the policy scenario appropriate and reasonable? If not, please specify alternatives and provide details regarding the source of that data.			
Comment ID	**Reviewer**	**Comment**	**Response**
A31	Reviewer A	This model updates estimates for the impact of the proposed standard on behavioral transitions in tobacco use (e.g., initiation, cessation, product switching) from a 2018 Expert Elicitation. FDA investigators describe reviewing clinical data from trials of very low nicotine content cigarettes and justify the use of the expert elicitation estimates, as they better reflect real-world conditions rather than an idealized research setting. This approach is appropriate and reasonable.	We thank the reviewer for this comment stating that the use of expert elicitation for estimates of the impact of the proposed product standard is appropriate.
B32	Reviewer B	The policy scenario assumptions are reasonable and based on the best available information. I appreciated the careful description and justification of the policy impact assumptions, the description of the results of the expert-elicitation, and the comparison with the available empirical data.	We thank the reviewer for this comment complimenting the description of the policy scenario assumptions and results.
C33	Reviewer C	The introductory paragraph of the Product Standard Scenario Data Inputs and Assumptions section clearly summarizes the relevant transitions under a nicotine product standard. The transitions under a nicotine standard are based on an expert elicitation (EE) conducted in 2018, following a similar procedure used for the original 2015 EE minus one participant. Like the 2015 EE, the 2018 EE follows well-established practices. However, the early date of the EE, 2018, limits the ability to incorporate the abundance of more recent studies of nicotine reduction policies, and knowledge about the dramatic changes in combustible and noncombustible use patterns and transitions	We appreciate the reviewer's statements about the somewhat earlier date of the 2018 expert elicitation. In response to the reviewer's comment, in the "Limitations" subsection of Section 7 "Conclusion" we added that the 2018 elicitation does not reflect changes in tobacco use since that time. FDA is conducting another expert elicitation to obtain updated quantitative inputs for tobacco use transitions and intends to publish the results for public review and comment. In addition, to address the limitation of not considering recent studies reporting dramatic changes in combustible and noncombustible use patterns and transitions, we added new

Charge Question 3. Are the data inputs and assumptions of the policy scenario appropriate and reasonable? If not, please specify alternatives and provide details regarding the source of that data.			
Comment ID	**Reviewer**	**Comment**	**Response**
		since 2018, especially in terms of prevalence (the referenced Jamal study is outdated) and initiation.	sensitivity analyses in Section 5. Specifically, Table 6 presents results from those sensitivity analyses that show that different assumptions about combusted and noncombusted product use patterns and transitions have minimal effect on model projections of smoking prevalence and avoided mortality and morbidity.
C34	Reviewer C	With the above caveats, the description of the EE process (particularly in an Appendix) and the results of the EE were well presented. However, there was limited discussion of how the estimates were actually applied. The median measure and incorporation of uncertainty is discussed in the next (uncertainty and sensitivity) section, but I found that discussion to be cursory. There appears to be bimodal distributions for some of the transition parameters. Was there any consideration of this variation? There was reference to application of the EE analysis in an Appendix, but I could not find information on the choice of median and uncertainty measures. Information about how measures are applied and the rationale for the choice of the median and variation measure in the first section of the Product Standard section would clarify later discussion of the uncertainty and sensitivity analysis.	In Section 2.3 "Product Standard Scenario Data Inputs and Assumptions," we added a paragraph on how the experts' estimates were sampled and used in the simulation to the . As stated in the report, the experts' estimates were used to generate 1000 samples for each response and for each of the seven experts, resulting in 7000 samples in total for all experts. These samples were then fed directly into the model. For each parameter, we explored the distributions of these samples, and found that most of them were skewed or skewed bimodal. We also examined the output distributions from the 7000 simulations and found that while they varied depending on the year or output variable, distributions associated with smoking cessation appear to be skewed, with medians closer to the 95th percentile. As a result, we chose to use the median as preferred measure of central tendency, since the mean is not usually in the middle of the distribution, as well as the 5th or 95th percentiles as summary statistics. In Section 2.4.1 "Uncertainty Through Monte Carlo Simulation," we added

Charge Question 3. Are the data inputs and assumptions of the policy scenario appropriate and reasonable? If not, please specify alternatives and provide details regarding the source of that data.			
Comment ID	**Reviewer**	**Comment**	**Response**
			details of the summary metrics we used, accounting for the skewed distribution patterns present in the outcome distributions.
C35	Reviewer C	Following the discussion of the EE process and results, the report discusses and correctly dismisses premium cigars as playing a significant role. The focus on e-cigarettes by the experts is also indicated, confirming the importance of the abovementioned issues regarding the measures, transitions and risks involving e-cigarettes.	We thank the reviewer for this comment supporting the experts' consensus that e-cigarettes would play a key role and premium cigars a minor role in terms of switching from covered combusted products.
C36	Reviewer C	In addition to the nicotine standard transition analysis based on the EE process, the report includes an analysis based on clinical studies (p. 17-18), "In addition to applying the experts' estimates of cigarette smoking cessation, we also examined a scenario in which the impact of the proposed product standard on smoking cessation is derived from clinical studies of VLNC cigarette use." While I find the results from the cited studies generally convincing that compensation is minimal, the cited studies are not the most up to date. The report later presents results of a broader public health analysis using the clinical studies (p. 24). I found that discussion confusing and incomplete, and, therefore, a diversion from the main analysis. I would recommend either expanding that analysis (perhaps in an Appendix) or omitting the analysis. It is unclear how that analysis complements the more comprehensive analysis using EE results.	We moved this discussion and results from Section 3.2 "Mortality and Morbidity Impact" to the sections on sensitivity analysis, Sections 2.4.2 "Sensitivity Analyses" and 5.1 "Baseline Parameter Assumptions." We also added a paragraph to the Conclusion section that summarizes the research literature on VLNC cigarettes since the expert elicitation in 2018 that cites the 2022 Donny et al. review, among other studies. This summary finds that the results from these studies are consistent with those from previous studies. We believe that the analysis using results from clinical studies complements and supports the analysis using results from the expert elicitation because both analyses produced comparable estimates, as stated in Section 5.1 "Baseline Parameter Assumptions," using smoking cessation estimates obtained from different data sources.
C37	Reviewer C	In the discussion of regulatory impacts, I would recommend including potential compliance problems (i.e., the ability to	At the end of Section 2.4.2 "Sensitivity Analyses," we discuss sensitivity analysis in which we look at the effects of varying

Charge Question 3. Are the data inputs and assumptions of the policy scenario appropriate and reasonable? If not, please specify alternatives and provide details regarding the source of that data.			
Comment ID	**Reviewer**	**Comment**	**Response**
		obtain illicit non-reduced nicotine cigarettes), and not delaying this discussion until the next section. That issue will be important to some tobacco control researchers and advocates.	levels of use of illicit full nicotine content cigarettes. We also added discussion of compliance issues to the preceding table of assumptions and sensitivity analyses stating that the behavioral inputs provided by the experts assumed regulatory compliance with the product standard.
C38	Reviewer C	The Outcome Metric section at the end of the regulatory analysis section was brief and provides the reader with minimal discussion of the outcomes themselves and how the public health analysis is conducted. I would suggest a paragraph describing each of the health outcomes in more detail and their relevance to public health, with a second paragraph describing cumulation of these outcomes over time. A third paragraph would then consider how public health impacts are derived, i.e., the difference in each of health outcomes related to all nicotine product use between the baseline and nicotine standard scenarios. I expect that most readers will need this background. This discussion should probably be a separate section from the regulatory analysis.	We expanded the "Outcome Metrics" Section 2.5 by adding two paragraphs explaining each of the tobacco use and health outcomes in greater detail and another paragraph explaining the calculation of cumulative measures over time and differences in measures between the baseline and product standard scenarios.
C39	Reviewer C	In results section, the discussion of the impact of reduced secondhand smoke exposure, smoking-related perinatal conditions, smoking-related fires, and use of non-premium cigars and pipe tobacco should provide more information about how their impacts are measured in the original studies. In applying these estimates to the impact of a reduced nicotine standard, none of these studies, to my knowledge, incorporate substitution to noncombustible use. Consistent with the nicotine standard analysis, the impact on noncombustible use would	We expanded our discussion of the extension of model results to other exposures in Section 4 "Mortality Impact of Reduced Secondhand Smoke Exposure, Smoking-Related Perinatal Conditions, Smoking-Related Fires, and Use of Non-Premium Cigars and Pipe Tobacco." We added additional information about how the population health impact of each of the other exposures were measured in the original studies. We also now discuss the possible impact for these causes of transitions to noncombusted tobacco product use due to the product

Charge Question 3. Are the data inputs and assumptions of the policy scenario appropriate and reasonable? If not, please specify alternatives and provide details regarding the source of that data.			
Comment ID	**Reviewer**	**Comment**	**Response**
		need to be considered. Please clarify and state any implicit assumptions (e.g., no fire deaths caused by e-cigarettes) regarding those analyses.	standard. For example, we state that transitions to e-cigarette use could lead to deaths from fires, although it is expected based on data compiled by the US Fire Administration through 2016 that any such deaths from fire would be less than those caused by cigarette smoking.
D40	Reviewer D	Yes, in general. The weakest aspect of the analysis is the use of expert elicitation to estimate the effects of a nicotine product standard policy. of the effects of the policy. I understand there is no "real world" empirical data to draw from, and expert elicitation might be the best course of action, but this weakness must always be weighted heavily when discussing the analysis results' implications. I am somewhat concerned that the experts estimated different policy effects in 2018 from the 2015 analysis. I am also concerned about the wide differences among the experts in estimating certain parameters. I understand this approach might be the best way to proceed, but sometimes, the best might not be good enough. Having expressed my misgivings about estimating the policy effects on initiation, cessation, and transition rates, I would like to note that the expert elicitation process is clearly documented in the report and appears to be well executed, except, possibly, on one step.	We thank the reviewer for this comment noting the limitations of the expert elicitation process. We also thank the reviewer for stating that the process is the best way to proceed although it may have limitations and noting that the process is well documented in the report. We state in the "Limitations" subsection of Section 7 "Conclusion" that even though the experts were selected through a rigorous and objective process and were knowledgeable about the subject matter, their estimates are ultimately subjective. We added statements in Section 7 "Conclusion" noting that there was variability among the experts' estimates and that some of the experts' estimates changed from the 2015 to 2018 elicitations, due in part to changes in their opinions of the appeal of e-cigarettes. We also added a statement in Section 2.3 "Product Standard Scenario Data Inputs and Assumptions" that calculations indicate that the absence of one expert in the 2018 elicitation did not substantially contribute to the differences in median estimates from the experts between 2015 and 2018. We state at the end of the paragraph in the "Limitations" subsection of Section 7 "Conclusion" on these issues. For example, we added that even with differences in estimates between experts and over time, the range of

Charge Question 3. Are the data inputs and assumptions of the policy scenario appropriate and reasonable? If not, please specify alternatives and provide details regarding the source of that data.			
Comment ID	**Reviewer**	**Comment**	**Response**
			estimates produced by the elicitation process all resulted in projections that showed substantial benefits in population health resulting from the nicotine product standard. Moreover, as noted in Section 5 "Sensitivity Analyses", we also conducted model projections using estimates of the potential impact of the standard obtained from clinical trials data and found population health benefits that were similar to those from projections based on elicitation results. Finally, FDA is conducting another expert elicitation to obtain updated quantitative inputs for tobacco use transitions and intends to publish the results for public review and comment.
D41	Reviewer D	The experts were asked to provide their best estimate of the "true value of the parameter" and the 5th, 25th, 75th, and 95th percentiles of their estimates. Later, in the appendix, it is explained that the "true value" asked would be assigned to the median of the uncertainty distribution. I think this works on a unimodal symmetric distribution where the mode and the median coincide. For skewed distributions, for instance, most individuals would report the mode (the most likely parameter value) as the "true value of the parameter." In fact, in many settings, it is customary to ask experts for the "lowest possible value," "the most likely value," and the "highest possible value." To carry on the uncertainty analysis using Monte Carlo simulation, those three values serve as parameters of a triangular uncertainty distribution from which to sample. I find it unlikely that the experts had a clear idea of the location of the	The experts were asked to provide seven values including the minimum and maximum values and the 50th percentile value (median). The term "true value" is used in the summary of the expert elicitation process to indicate that the experts were trying to identify the correct value of parameter by providing seven estimates (minimum and maximum plausible values, and estimates of the 5th, 25th, 50th, 75th and 95th percentile values). To clarify this, we edited the referred text in Section 2.3 "Product Standard Scenario Data Inputs and Assumptions," as follow, which is consistent with the description provided in the Appendix: "*Each expert was asked to provide his or her best estimates of expected impacts of the potential nicotine product standard. To characterize the uncertainty surrounding each expert's estimates, the protocol asks for estimates of seven values (minimum and maximum plausible values, and*

Charge Question 3. Are the data inputs and assumptions of the policy scenario appropriate and reasonable? If not, please specify alternatives and provide details regarding the source of that data.			
Comment ID	**Reviewer**	**Comment**	**Response**
		50th percentile in all cases and could have reported the mode. However, I do not think this issue significantly affects the results of the uncertainty analysis.	*estimates of the 5th, 25th, 50th, 75th and 95th percentile values), reflecting the expert's level of confidence (or uncertainty) about the true value of the parameter to be estimated*." Also, for the simulations, the estimates from each expert were used to generate the 1000 samples for each expert using a Latin hypercube sampling method. These samples were fed directly into the model. Hence, we do not think the results could be affected by the issue stated since the raw estimates alone were not fed into the model.

3.2.4 Charge Question 4

Charge Question 4. Is the approach to incorporate uncertainty through the sensitivity analyses detailed in the document appropriate? If not, please provide details on alternative approaches.			
Comment ID	**Reviewer**	**Comment**	**Response**
A42	Reviewer A	A range of sensitivity analyses are described and conducted to understand the robustness of model findings accounting for uncertainty of model parameters. Of particular relevance, the use of Monte Carlo simulation for the product standard scenario estimates (i.e., behavioral responses to a nicotine product standard) resulted in 7,000 simulations which were aggregated to produce distribution percentiles and inform the median, 5th percentile and 95th percentile findings. This method captures the range of potential responses to the policy and ensures that estimates reflect the median response across this range. Novel sensitivity analyses documented the potential impact of an illicit market on the public health impacts of a nicotine product standard for cigarettes and certain other combusted products. These approaches are appropriate and well-described.	We thank the reviewer for this comment summarizing the Monte Carlo simulation and sensitivity analyses that were conducted and finding them to be appropriate.
B43	Reviewer B	Yes, I appreciate the care and effort to assess the impact of the model assumptions on the results via extensive sensitivity analyses. I found it valuable to include the alternative policy scenario based on the limited trial/empirical data. While all sensitivity analyses are helpful and reasonable, I have some questions about a couple of assumptions.	We thank the reviewer for this comment praising the sensitivity analysis.
B44	Reviewer B	Sensitivity analysis of dual use relative risks. In the baseline analysis it was assumed that the mortality risks of dual use were equivalent to those of exclusive smoking. In a sensitivity analysis, it was assumed that the mortality risks of dual use	We conducted a new sensitivity analysis with lower risks for dual use compared to cigarette smoking, which produced minimal effects on model projections as shown in Table 6.

Charge Question 4. Is the approach to incorporate uncertainty through the sensitivity analyses detailed in the document appropriate? If not, please provide details on alternative approaches.			
Comment ID	**Reviewer**	**Comment**	**Response**
		were higher than those of exclusive smoking. While I agree with the baseline scenario, I wonder if a sensitivity analysis assuming lower risk from dual versus exclusive cigarette smoking should also be considered, given the lack of data on the risks of dual use, as mentioned to justify the baseline scenario.	
B45	Reviewer B	Why does the sensitivity analysis of non-combustible use prevalence among youth assume increasing trends since these are currently decreasing? It seems contradictory to the data presented. I am referring to this assumption: *"According to results from the NYTS, frequent e-cigarette use defined as use at least 20 days in the past 30 days among middle school and high school students ages 9-17 rose from 2.9% in 2018 to 5.3% in 2019, then declined to 3.9% in 2020 (see Cullen et al., 2018, Wang et al., 2019, and Wang et al., 2020 for additional results). Given previous trends, in a sensitivity analysis we also projected prevalence for exclusive cigarette smoking, exclusive non-combusted use, and dual use for the period 2021-2030 from NYTS data, assuming that exclusive non-combusted use and dual use would increase by 25% during the period 2021-2030 (see Appendix D, Table D2)."* Is the assumption that the decreases since 2019 are sort of a reversion to the mean and that non-combustible product use will now increase? While plausible, I believe this might also do not agree with the NYTS 2021 and 2022 data. In any case, I do agree with the value of doing a sensitivity analysis with increasing non-combusted use prevalence. But perhaps it should not be justified with the current trends which do not agree with it.	We agree with the reviewer that youth ENDS use has decreased somewhat since 2019 after increasing substantially in previous years. We added NYTS data for 2022 and noted this decrease in youth ENDS use prevalence since 2019. We now state that we assume an increase in youth e-cigarette use in the sensitivity analysis, despite this recent decrease, because of the previous substantial increases in youth use and that this assumption may be conservative in terms of model projections if youth use does not increase over time

Charge Question 4. Is the approach to incorporate uncertainty through the sensitivity analyses detailed in the document appropriate? If not, please provide details on alternative approaches.			
Comment ID	**Reviewer**	**Comment**	**Response**
C46	Reviewer C	The analysis applies a Monte-Carlo simulation process, an appropriate state-of-art technique, subject to underlying assumptions, to develop confidence intervals for the nicotine standard scenario. Sensitivity analyses are then applied to very specific parameters. While the analysis focuses on those parameters that the authors found most problematic, it does not consider parameters that can be also argued problematic (see above discussion). For example, in recent years, the dramatic drop in smoking initiation and increase in smoking cessation merit attention both in terms of whether those changes will be maintained, increase, or decrease. A more systematic approach would involve examining the credible ranges in all transition parameters in the base case and the nicotine standard scenario. As suggested above, other areas for sensitivity analysis include lower risks of noncombustibles, lower risks from dual use, and the smoking and noncombustible initiation and cessation parameters.	In response to the reviewer's comment, we conducted additional sensitivity analyses as shown in Table 1. These analyses include using 1) lower risks for dual users compared to exclusive cigarette smokers; 2) a 25% decrease in smoking initiation from 2021 to 2030; 3) constant mortality rates after 2060; 4) initiation and cessation rates for ENDS from PATH Study data from 2015-2019; and 5) a 10% increase in smoking cessation in the baseline scenario.
C47	Reviewer C	The report focuses on sensitivity to individual parameters to draw conclusion about the robustness of results, whereas the robustness depends more broadly on the multiple variation of parameters, particularly those most central to the analysis. That point should be recognized in the sensitivity analysis section and how application of some of the more serious areas of parameter uncertainty combined might affect the analysis.	In response to the reviewer's comment, we noted in the "Limitations" subsection of Section 7 "Conclusion" that the combined effect of variation of multiple relevant parameter values could contribute to uncertainty and that this combined effect was not assessed in this analysis, although the effect of varying individual parameter values such as product initiation, switching, and health risks was minimal as shown in Table 6.
D48	Reviewer D	The report describes thorough uncertainty and sensitivity analyses. The uncertainty analysis was carried out via Monte	The statistical summaries of the model (5^{th}, median and 95^{th} percentiles) were taken from the 7000 Monte Carlo simulations

Charge Question 4. Is the approach to incorporate uncertainty through the sensitivity analyses detailed in the document appropriate? If not, please provide details on alternative approaches.			
Comment ID	**Reviewer**	**Comment**	**Response**
		Carlo simulation, sampling from the parameter distributions specified by the expert panel. While the overall analysis is sound, it neglects to consider the correlation between parameters estimated by the same individual. It is likely that, when asked to provide ranges for parameters, the expert panelists thought about different scenarios that affect multiple parameters simultaneously. For example, when asked to provide a lower limit for the effects of a nicotine reduction policy on smoking cessation, experts thought about a scenario that would carry a small policy effect on smoking initiation. As described in the report, it appears that the uncertainty distributions belonging to a particular expert were sampled independently, which likely lowers the uncertainty range of the outputs. The added sampling correlation to the simulation exercise might not make a significant difference, but it should be checked in case it does since the assumption of independence is likely reducing the output variance artificially.	conducted by considering uncertainty of inputs from expert elicitation data. Since inputs from the expert elicitations are uniquely grouped and ordered by experts (for each of the 7 experts), inputs from the same expert are used together to conduct 1000 simulations per expert. As the reviewer mentioned, inputs from the same expert may be correlated and the correlation among inputs may impact the output of the model. To remove or reduce unintended correlations, inputs are randomly sampled from all the 7 experts and grouped into 7 groups, and 7000 Monte Carlo simulations were conducted. The statistical summaries of the model (5^{th}, median and 95^{th} percentiles) resulting from these randomly sampled inputs show no significant difference compared to the summaries used in this report.

3.2.5 Charge Question 5

Charge Question 5. Other comments, suggestions, or recommendations for improving the report.			
Comment ID	**Reviewer**	**Comment**	**Response**
A49	Reviewer A	Page 4, paragraph 1 – Scope of the analysis: Context for inclusion of roll-your-own tobacco, non-premium cigars, and pipe tobacco in the product standard should be introduced early in this document. Recommend including the following sentence from Table I1 as the second sentence in this paragraph: "Roll-your-own tobacco, non-premium cigars, and pipe tobacco are the combusted products that people who smoke cigarettes would be most likely to switch to in order to sustain addiction."	We added the recommended statement that explains that the covered non-cigarette combusted products are included in the standard's provisions because they are the products that cigarette smokers are most likely to switch to.
A50	Reviewer A	Page 6, paragraph 1 – Births and Net International Migration: Text from Table 1 should be included in this paragraph to understand why 2014-2018 NHIS data were used to estimate tobacco product use in recent immigrants to the U.S., as follows: "We opted for not pooling 2018 and earlier data with 2019 and later data due to significant changes introduced in 2019 to NHIS data collection."	We added the recommended statement saying that we did not pool NHIS data from before 2019 with data from 2019 and after because of changes in that year in NHIS data collection.
A51	Reviewer A	Page 15, paragraph 3 – Incorporation of Uncertainty and Sensitivity Analyses: Please clarify how the relative mortality risk for non-combusted product use from Henley et al 2005 (i.e., 1.1 and 1.3) was used in sensitivity analyses presented in the in-text equations.	We added a statement to this section saying that "in the sensitivity analyses conducted, mortality probabilities for current users of noncombusted tobacco products are obtained by multiplying never-user probabilities of dying by the relative risk of 1.1 or 1.3."
A52	Reviewer A	Page 22, paragraph – Description of the assumptions for estimating the mortality impact on new outcomes from this model (e.g., secondhand smoke exposure, smoking-related perinatal conditions, smoking-related fires, use of non-premium cigars and pipe tobacco) derive from existing estimates of the	We thank the reviewer for this comment summarizing the approach to estimating mortality from other exposures. In response to the reviewer's comment, we added to the report that deaths averted from smoking-related perinatal conditions and fires may be underestimated for the first few

Charge Question 5. Other comments, suggestions, or recommendations for improving the report.			
Comment ID	**Reviewer**	**Comment**	**Response**
		ratio of these deaths to primary smoking-attributable deaths. There is a comment related to the likelihood that deaths from smoking-related perinatal conditions would have immediate rather than lagged effects and are thus, underestimated. Recommend clarifying the lag between exposure and outcome for the analyses of these new outcomes and whether they are consistent with the three-year lag used in the general model and Apelberg 2018. Recommend also clarifying whether this ratio (deaths for specific outcome vs. primary smoking-attributable deaths) is held constant or changes over the analytic horizon.	years post-policy implementation because the mortality benefits for these causes may be more immediate than for tobacco-attributable deaths generally, which are not counted in the model in the first three years after implementation of the product standard. We clarified that the ratios for deaths from specific outcomes compared to deaths from direct smoking-attributable deaths are held constant during the projection period. We also noted that these ratios could in fact change over time, particularly for deaths from use of non-premium cigars and pipe tobacco, given that changes in prevalence of use of these products and cigarettes could differ over time.
A53	Reviewer A	Page 28, paragraph 2 – Conclusion: Please reword "This document provides documentation..." Recommend "This document outlines…" I suggest including the median estimated impacts on cigarette smoking prevalence, premature deaths from tobacco, and QALYs in the final sentence of this paragraph.	We reworded the statement as recommended by the reviewer to state "This document outlines …." We added the median estimated impacts of cigarette smoking prevalence, premature deaths from tobacco, and QALYs due to smoking morbidity to the final sentence of the paragraph.
B54	Reviewer B	Table 3 and Figure J3. One suggestion is to add more explanation about the life-years and QALYs behavior in Table 3 and Figure J3. At first, I was confused by the results showing that QALYs were higher than the cumulative life-years gained in the first few decades after policy implementation. This is likely because QALYs are a function of morbidity, with former smokers assumed to have a higher quality of life even if not living longer than current smokers. In contrast, life years gained are calculated exclusively	The reviewer is correct that the QALYs presented in the report are a function of smoking morbidity whereas life-years gained are calculated from population counts. We clarified in the titles of Table 3 and Figure J3 that the QALYs gained presented here are those specifically due to reductions in smoking morbidity.

Charge Question 5. Other comments, suggestions, or recommendations for improving the report.			
Comment ID	**Reviewer**	**Comment**	**Response**
		by increases in population counts (reasonable approach). Assuming this is indeed correct, it would help the reader if a couple of sentences could be added explaining these patterns.	We also added the following statement in Section 3.2 "Mortality and Morbidity Impact," before Table 3: "*Further, results presented in Table 3 show that the cumulative QALYs gained estimates are higher than the cumulative life-years gained estimates in the first few decades after the nicotine product standard implementation; specifically, until year 2064 (see Figure J3 in Appendix J). This is due to the way those metrics were calculated. QALYs outcomes are calculated as a function of reductions in QALYs due to smoking morbidity, whereas life-years gained outcomes are calculated as a function of increases in the number of years of life lived by people in the population. Since the increase in former smokers and consequent reduced morbidity is greater than the increase in population size due to reduced mortality during the first years after the nicotine standard implementation, QALYs outcomes are higher than life-years gained in the first few decades.*"
B55	Reviewer B	Could the authors please clarify why this assumption is needed: "*We used the estimated HRs in the baseline scenario, while in the product standard scenario, we capped HRs for former smokers at the levels for current smokers of the same sex and age group because increased smoking cessation in this scenario would be due to the policy rather than the cessation of smoking due to existing illness (Apelberg et al., 2018)*"? The exposure stopped regardless of the reason. Does this mean HRs for former smokers are as high as those for current smokers in the policy scenario?	The referenced statement has been removed because the latest hazard ratio data do not require this adjustment.
B56	Reviewer B	Table 1. "Examine the impact of lower (RR=1.1) and higher (RR=1.3) non-combusted tobacco product risk." It would be	We added the statement "These are the lower (7%) and higher (20%) relative excess risks of noncombusted tobacco

Charge Question 5. Other comments, suggestions, or recommendations for improving the report.			
Comment ID	**Reviewer**	**Comment**	**Response**
		helpful to give the range in terms of the percentage of excess risk of exclusive smoking (7 to 20%) as this is how it is presented in the preceding text.	products compared to cigarettes" to Table 1 "Key Modeling Assumptions ..." to clarify the range of relative excess risks as suggested by the reviewer.
B57	Reviewer B	Section 4. "We then calculated the ratio of non-premium cigar to cigarette-attributable deaths, 1.7%, and applied that value to the projections of avoided tobacco-attributable deaths under the main policy (Table 3)." It might be helpful to explain where the 1.7% comes from ((0.8*9,246/437,400))	We added the numbers used in the calculations in bold to show that **0.8 * 9,246** = 7,397 and that **7,397 / 437,400** = 1.7%.
B58	Reviewer B	Table A1. Description of Baseline Input Parameters and Data Sources Used in the Analysis: Description of Baseline Input Parameters and Data Sources Used in the Analysis; Tobacco use Status parameter. It would be helpful to list the product use definitions used for each survey (NHIS, NYTS).	We agree with the reviewer that listing the product use definitions used for each survey could be helpful. We added references to the relevant surveys to Table A1 and added the product use definitions to the text in Section 2.2.1 "Demographic Inputs" instead of in the table.
B59	Reviewer B	Table A1. Immigrant smoking prevalence by sex: Not pooling of 2018 and 2019 NHIS data (described in Table A1, Immigrant smoking prevalence by sex). This is reasonable, but analysis by the CDC of the impact of the redesign in smoking and e-cig prevalence suggest limited impact: https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nhis/earlyrelease/EReval202009-508.pdf	We thank the reviewer for pointing out that the 2019 NHIS questionnaire redesign had limited impact on estimates of cigarette smoking and e-cigarette use prevalence among US adults according to NCHS. We agree with the reviewer that it is reasonable to not pool NHIS data from 2018 and 2019 because of the survey redesign.
B60	Reviewer B	Appendix. Projected Tobacco Use Prevalence to Compute Non-Combusted Product Initiation for Sensitivity Analysis: Change "4.58% / 1.42%" to "4.58% / 1.42% = 3.23%" so it is clear where the scaling factors in table D4 come from? Similar for other examples presented.	We added the resulting quotients for the scaling factors as shown in bold - 0.41% / 1.42% **= 28.87%** 1.01% / 1.42% **= 71.13%** 4.58% / 1.42% **= 322.54%**

Charge Question 5. Other comments, suggestions, or recommendations for improving the report.			
Comment ID	**Reviewer**	**Comment**	**Response**
C61	Reviewer C	The Introduction would benefit from setting out a framework in terms of combustibles vs. noncombustibles. From the outset, it is important to clarify what that distinction means and why it is important. The definition of combustibles would benefit from early discussion. While most readers will be aware of the role of cigarettes and roll-your-own and non-premium cigars are recognized (end of the last paragraph of the Introduction), the role of little cigars/cigarillos in particular merits earlier discussion in terms of their importance as a substitute for cigarettes. References should be provided. Less clear is the role of pipe tobacco. The point also needs to be made that the health risk of combustibles is well-defined by a large literature and central to the public health implications of the analysis, while the risk of noncombustibles is less well-defined but likely far less than for combustibles. The definition of non-combustibles also benefits from a discussion up front. In particular, the definition of smokeless products would benefit from clarification, e.g., especially the role of (modern) oral nicotine pouches and perhaps nicotine lozenges. The role of substitution of noncombustible for combustible use merits early discussion. Discussion of recent studies by Donny, Hatsukami et al. will help readers understand the thrust of the analysis and the potential role of noncombustibles. With this discussion up-front, I expect that the discussion in the methodology section will become clearer and more comprehensible. In the Introduction, please also define what is meant by "scalar methodology."	We expanded the "Background" Section 1 by defining what combusted products are covered by the standard and explaining that covered products such as little cigars and cigarillos are often used as substitutes for cigarettes. The added content notes that combusted products are responsible for most of the health burden of tobacco products in this country and state that noncombusted products have health risks, but those risks may be less than those of combusted products. We agree with the reviewer that the potential for switching to pipe tobacco is less clear than for little cigars and cigarillos, but we note in the text that pipe smoking was found in an earlier analysis to be responsible for around 1000 deaths in the US per year. We defined noncombusted products and added oral nicotine products as a specific type. We also discussed the role of VLNC cigarettes in promoting switching to noncombusted products citing Hatsukami et al. (2017). We rewrote the description of the calculation of the mortality effects from other causes and removed the term "scalar methodology."
C62	Reviewer C	In the Health Impact from Main Analysis section, it would be useful to provide a description of projected baseline trends in	We clarified that the figures are for cigarette smoking and noncombusted tobacco use overall. We added a description

Charge Question 5. Other comments, suggestions, or recommendations for improving the report.			
Comment ID	**Reviewer**	**Comment**	**Response**
		cigarette (a relatively large initial reduction with slowing decline) and dual use (increases slightly and flattens) for context in later discussing trends with a nicotine standard. Only exclusive combustible trends are described. The report provides a graph on overall nicotine use, which in my view is unneeded and may be misleading given the problems in defining what is meant overall nicotine use and that the analysis does not include oral nicotine pouches. I expect that the provision of that figure may detract from the more relevant results on exclusive cigarette, exclusive noncombustible and dual use. The rest of the section and the section on mortality impact were well presented (although the cumulative measures should probably be explained to avoid confusion, i.e., attributable deaths each year presumably decline).	of the baseline trends shown in each figure. We clarified that oral nicotine tobacco products are considered noncombusted products. We also noted that annual smoking-attributable deaths with and without the product standard and cumulative deaths averted by year are available in Appendix J "Additional Results from Main Analysis," thus showing trends over time.
C63	Reviewer C	In the Conclusion section, the first two paragraphs provide a nice summary of the report. It would also be helpful to add a paragraph here which compares the results to the earlier 2018 paper (based on the 2015 EE) analysis. I also recommend a paragraph on any additional insights from the literature on nicotine reductions since 2018 that support or contradict the results from the 2018 EE.	We added a paragraph to the "Conclusion" Section 7 comparing the estimates for cigarette smoking initiation and mortality from the main text of the Apelberg et al. (2018) article to those in this report. We also added a paragraph reviewing the research literature on studies of the effects of VLNC cigarettes since 2018.
C64	Reviewer C	Limitations: 1) More limited data are available for non-combusted tobacco products. It is stated, "Where possible, we conducted sensitivity analyses to examine the impact of these assumptions on the reductions in morbidity and mortality." Definitely more is possible and is suggested as discussed above.	We rephrased this sentence to remove the phrase "where possible." As we explained in prior responses to reviewer comments, we also conducted additional sensitivity analyses suggested by the reviewer, such as including lower risks for dual users compared to exclusive cigarette smokers, and included them in the report.

Charge Question 5. Other comments, suggestions, or recommendations for improving the report.			
Comment ID	**Reviewer**	**Comment**	**Response**
C65	Reviewer C	Limitations: 2) Inability to capture the wide variety of tobacco product use. "It was also not possible" could be better stated, "we were not able" (anything is possible). The discussion is otherwise well-presented.	We changed the phrasing of the sentence as the reviewer has suggested.
C66	Reviewer C	Limitations: 3) Application of model-derived attributable mortality projections as the basis for projecting avoided mortality due to use of other combusted products (i.e., non-premium cigars and pipe tobacco). The discussion is on point, but, as discussed above, it is not clear how that analysis incorporates transitions to noncombustible products.	We noted in this paragraph of the "Limitations" subsection that we do not consider additional deaths from the other exposures that could result from switching to noncombusted products in the product standard scenario.
C67	Reviewer C	Limitations: 4) Morbidity from non-combusted tobacco product use was not assessed. Point well taken.	We thank the reviewer for this comment agreeing that it was appropriate for us to note that we did not assess morbidity from noncombusted tobacco use.
C68	Reviewer C	Limitations: 5) Other future population-level policies could impact the inputs and assumptions of the model (e.g., changes in tobacco use behaviors, prevalence rates, as well as changes in the tobacco market). This is an important point, especially in light of recent FDA regulatory policies. More broadly, the analysis depends on the implementation and enforcement of recent and newly implemented policies toward combustibles and noncombustibles. Another important and related limitation is that the results depend on how the nicotine reduction standard is implemented (gradual vs all at once) as well as policies to enforce a nicotine standard (e.g., limiting noncompliance through illegal markets).	We added a paragraph to the "Limitations" subsection noting that we assume that the product standard will require immediate nicotine reduction and will be comprehensively enforced. We also noted in the "Limitations" subsection that results could be affected by changes in other regulatory policies.

Charge Question 5. Other comments, suggestions, or recommendations for improving the report.			
Comment ID	**Reviewer**	**Comment**	**Response**
C69	Reviewer C	Limitations: 6) Any attempt to model the impact of future actions on behavior over the long-term will be inherently uncertain. Drop the phrase "Any attempt to." The report then states that "the expert elicitation was completed in 2018 and was based on the state of the science on VLNC cigarettes available at that time. Findings from more recent studies could impact expert opinion." As discussed above, I would recommend discussing that literature, given the large growth in literature in the past 4 years (including a recent review article by Donny et al.)	We rewrote the sentence as recommended by the reviewer. We also added a paragraph to the "Conclusion" Section 7 summarizing research studies on VLNC cigarettes since 2018, which are largely consistent with the studies that informed our sensitivity analyses.
C70	Reviewer C	Limitations: 7) The "analysis was not able to capture all possible sources of uncertainty." That point is obvious, but more important is to point out some of the areas that might further be considered.	In terms of other possible sources of uncertainty, we also noted that the analysis does not capture the combined effect of variation in multiple relevant parameter values, as suggested by the reviewer.
C71	Reviewer C	Another limitation not mentioned is that the report does not distinguish smokers by SES or mental health issues, both in terms of projections in the baseline scenario and potential impacts under the nicotine standard.	We noted that the model estimates are for the US population overall are not broken down for subgroups including by SES or mental health status.
C72	Reviewer C	Other Public Health Impacts: The statement, "The overall public health benefits are likely to be even greater than those quantified, since our analysis does not account for the full range of impacts that smoking has on public health in the U.S." is too overstated given that there are reasons that risks may be overestimated. Instead, I would suggest stating that the analysis is conservative in that it does not incorporate some additional public health benefits that would likely arise from a nicotine standard. In addition to the failure to incorporate some quality-of-life factors, other benefits from secondhand smoke reduction,	In subsection "Other Public Health Impacts" of Section 7 "Conclusion", we rephrased the introductory statement in the manner recommended by the reviewer. We also noted that another public health benefit of the product standard would be reductions in smoking for groups such as those with lower SES and mental health conditions that have relatively high smoking prevalence. We added a concluding paragraph summarizing the main results of the report. We give the median estimates in terms of differences in smoking initiates, smoking quitters, tobacco-attributable deaths, life-years, and

Charge Question 5. Other comments, suggestions, or recommendations for improving the report.			
Comment ID	**Reviewer**	**Comment**	**Response**
		reduced fires, and benefits from reducing the number of cigarettes smoked, another benefit from a public health perspective and more generally a health equity standpoint is the potential impacts on health disparities by reducing the relatively high smoking rates for those of low SES and those with mental health issues. The report ends after the section on Other Public health Impacts. A concluding paragraph is suggested to emphasize the main results of the report.	QALYs adjusted for smoking morbidity. We also note the additional benefits of reductions in mortality from non-premium cigar and pipe tobacco use, secondhand smoke exposure, smoking-related perinatal conditions, and smoking-related fires.
D73	Reviewer D	Overall, this study represents a solid scientific effort to evaluate the likely impact of a nicotine standard policy on tobacco products. The modeling approach is sound, as it is the implementation of the model. The strength of the study lies in its transparency and reproducibility, as well as the extensive uncertainty and sensitivity analyses carried out to evaluate the range of the potential impact of the policy on public health measures. My main concern in the analysis is the overreliance on expert elicitation to estimate the effect of a nicotine standard policy on the model's parameters. There should be an attempt to formally incorporate into the analysis the empirical results from clinical studies.	We thank the reviewer for their positive assessment of the model and analysis. We included a sensitivity analysis that examines doubling baseline smoking cessation rates in the product standard scenario based on results from clinical studies of the effects of VLNC cigarettes. This analysis resulted in estimated impacts that fell within the range of those predicted by the main analysis using estimates from the expert elicitation.