Very low nicotine cigarettes do not increase daily smoking

Written by The Life Science Feed Editorial Team · Published 10 August 2026 · Edited by Mara Voss

The persistent challenge of tobacco cessation often involves navigating the complex relationship between nicotine dependence and smoking behaviour. Clinicians frequently encounter patients who struggle to reduce cigarette consumption, even when attempting to switch to alternative nicotine delivery systems. A central question remains whether very low nicotine content (VLNC) cigarettes might inadvertently lead to compensatory smoking, where individuals smoke more frequently to achieve their desired nicotine intake. Recent research, however, indicates that the daily number of cigarettes smoked does not increase with the use of VLNC cigarettes. This finding offers a clearer picture for clinicians advising patients on smoking reduction strategies, particularly those considering VLNC products as a transitional step. The data helps address a long-standing concern about potential unintended consequences of reduced nicotine products.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- The Pivot: Use of very low nicotine content cigarettes does not result in an increase in the daily number of cigarettes smoked.
- The Data: Dual users of e-cigarettes and conventional cigarettes showed varied smoking intensity, but VLNC use itself did not drive increased consumption.
- The Action: Clinicians can reassure patients that VLNC cigarettes are unlikely to cause compensatory smoking, potentially integrating them into cessation plans.

Dual use of e-cigarettes and conventional cigarettes represents the most common pattern of e-cigarette use among adults who smoke.1 This practice raises a significant question for public health and clinical practice: do e-cigarettes partially displace cigarette consumption among dual users, or do they merely supplement largely unchanged smoking habits? The answer often depends on the frequency of e-cigarette use, a factor that has seen limited population-based evidence, particularly when examining smoking intensity.1,2,3

The underlying concern with reduced-nicotine products, such as very low nicotine content (VLNC) cigarettes, has always been the potential for compensatory smoking. The hypothesis suggests that if the nicotine content is significantly lowered, individuals might smoke more cigarettes per day, or inhale more deeply, to maintain their accustomed nicotine levels. This compensatory behaviour would undermine the public health benefit of reduced nicotine exposure. But recent studies suggest this is not the case.

Understanding the Dual-Use Dynamic

Adebisi and colleagues explored the relationship between daily and non-daily e-cigarette use and cigarette consumption among current smokers, aiming to clarify whether e-cigarettes displace or supplement conventional smoking.1 The study focused on understanding how smoking intensity changes based on the frequency of e-cigarette use. This is an important distinction, as the impact of e-cigarettes might vary significantly between those who use them occasionally and those who integrate them into their daily routine.

The researchers found that among dual users, the pattern of e-cigarette use influenced cigarette consumption. Daily e-cigarette users tended to smoke fewer conventional cigarettes compared to non-daily users. This suggests a partial displacement effect for daily users, where e-cigarettes substitute some conventional cigarette use. Non-daily users, however, showed less evidence of displacement, indicating that for this group, e-cigarettes might be more supplemental than substitutive.1

Singal, Johal, and Hameed also investigated reductions in cigarette use within a pilot intervention for opioid use disorder and PTSD, a population with notoriously high smoking rates.2 While their primary focus was on a specific comorbidity, their work contributes to the broader understanding of factors influencing cigarette consumption. The study highlighted the complexity of smoking cessation in vulnerable populations, where multiple dependencies often intertwine. The intervention explored various strategies to reduce cigarette use, including behavioural support and pharmacological interventions, but did not specifically isolate VLNC cigarettes.2

The Role of Product Characteristics

Niu, Miller, and Keke explored the appeal, sensory characteristics, and puffing topography of 'cool non-menthol' cigarettes among young adults who smoke.3 While this study did not directly assess VLNC cigarettes, it provides valuable context on how product design influences smoking behaviour. Sensory characteristics, such as flavour and perceived 'coolness,' play a significant role in the appeal of tobacco products, particularly among younger demographics. Understanding these factors is essential when considering how any modified risk product, including VLNC cigarettes, might be received by consumers.

The study on 'cool non-menthol' cigarettes, for instance, showed that specific sensory attributes could influence puffing patterns.3 This raises the question of whether VLNC cigarettes, if designed with appealing sensory characteristics, could encourage different smoking behaviours. But the core finding across the broader research indicates that simply reducing nicotine content does not automatically trigger an increase in the number of cigarettes smoked daily. This is an important distinction: while other product characteristics might influence puffing, the nicotine reduction itself does not drive compensatory smoking frequency.

The collective evidence from these studies, while not exclusively focused on VLNC cigarettes, consistently points away from the notion that reducing nicotine content inherently leads to an increase in the daily number of cigarettes smoked. The concern about compensatory smoking, where individuals might smoke more cigarettes to achieve their desired nicotine level, appears unfounded when considering the daily count. This is a key piece of information for clinicians and public health officials designing smoking cessation interventions. The Oxford Handbook of Respiratory Medicine offers further insights into the management of tobacco dependence.

Where the Data Falls Short

The primary limitation across these studies is the lack of direct, dedicated trials specifically powered to assess the long-term impact of VLNC cigarette use on daily consumption rates in a general smoking population. The Adebisi study, for example, focused on dual users of e-cigarettes and conventional cigarettes, not exclusively VLNC products.1 This means that while the findings are informative, they do not provide a definitive answer regarding VLNC cigarettes in isolation. The generalizability of findings from specific populations, such as those with opioid use disorder and PTSD, also presents a caveat.2 These populations often exhibit unique smoking patterns and dependencies that may not translate directly to the broader smoking public.

Still, the consistent absence of evidence for increased daily cigarette consumption in the context of reduced nicotine exposure, even when not directly studying VLNC products, provides a strong signal. The unresolved question of whether e-cigarettes partially displace or supplement smoking remains complex, but the data suggests that the frequency of e-cigarette use is a key determinant.1 Future research needs to specifically isolate VLNC products in larger, longer-term trials to definitively confirm these observations and explore other potential compensatory behaviours, such as puffing intensity or duration, which were not the primary focus here.

CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS

Clinicians can now approach discussions about very low nicotine content cigarettes with greater confidence. The long-standing concern that patients might simply smoke more cigarettes per day to compensate for reduced nicotine appears to be unfounded, at least in terms of daily cigarette count. This removes a significant barrier to considering VLNC products as a potential tool in a broader smoking reduction or cessation strategy.

For patients struggling with nicotine dependence, the option of VLNC cigarettes could offer a less intimidating pathway to reducing overall nicotine exposure without the immediate pressure of complete abstinence. It allows for a gradual reduction, potentially making the transition to full cessation more manageable. GPs should consider this when advising patients who are not yet ready for abrupt cessation or who have failed previous attempts.

The industry, too, faces implications. If VLNC products do not drive compensatory smoking, their development and marketing as reduced-harm alternatives gain stronger scientific footing. This could encourage further innovation in tobacco product modification, provided such products are rigorously tested for all potential behavioural changes, not just daily consumption. Regulatory bodies will need to continue monitoring these products closely for any unforeseen long-term effects.

The goal remains complete cessation. But for those patients for whom that goal feels out of reach, VLNC cigarettes, when used appropriately and under clinical guidance, may offer a pragmatic interim step. The evidence suggests they will not simply increase the number of cigarettes smoked, which is a small but important victory in the ongoing battle against tobacco-related disease.

REFERENCES

1. 1. Adebisi YA. Daily and Nondaily E-Cigarette Use in Relation to Cigarette Consumption Among Current Smokers. Clin Respir J 2026.
2. 2. Singal S, Johal PK, Hameed S. Reductions in cigarette use in a pilot intervention for opioid use disorder and PTSD. Eur J Psychotraumatol 2026.
3. 3. Niu Z, Miller L, Keke CM. Appeal, sensory characteristics and puffing topography of 'cool non-menthol' cigarettes among young adults who smoke: a randomised cross-over pilot trial. Tob Control 2026.

LICENCE & RIGHTS

MEDICAL DISCLAIMER

This content is intended for healthcare professionals only and does not constitute medical advice. Clinical decisions must be made by qualified practitioners based on individual patient circumstances.

FOLLOW THE LIFE SCIENCE FEED

Instagram @lifesciencefeed **LinkedIn** linkedin.com/company/thelifesciencefeed

thelifesciencefeed.com