

The Macro-Social Smoking Control

Fé Fernández Hernández, Efraín Sánchez González

Department of Health Technology, Faculty of Medical Science “10 de Octubre,” University of Medical Science of Havana, Havana, Cuba, Caribbean

Smoking is a very complex socioeconomic risk factor. This is because of the diversity from the smoking impact over the society and the health at same time.^[1-3]

Usually, public health sector assumes a strong leader position around the smoking control. This position is mainly supported in several scientific researches showing the smoking consequences over the morbidity and health quality too.^[4-6]

Since the economic point of view, the analysis could be simpler. In this way, the cost–benefit relation is utilized as reference rate designing and applying economic policies related with the smoking behavior.^[7-10]

Since the legal point of view, it awards the tobaccos and cigarettes as legal drugs which trade may be limited but not forbidden.^[11,12] Consequently it is awarded the smoker right to smoke and it is awarded the no-smoker right to not be exposit to tobacco smoke.^[13]

Since the labor point of view, the analysis is complex too. By a side, the tobacco industry could be an important supplier of employees. This condition is very important for families who depend from that employ. By other side, the tobacco consumption during the working time reduces the potential labor productivity.^[14,15]

Social security must assume a dual effect too. Smoking consequences over morbidity carry to increase the services demand from this social sector agree to the tobacco intensity consumption and lifetime consumption too.^[16,17] However, the life expectation reduction because of smoking reduces the retired payments because of the earlier death from smokers.^[7,11]

Individual position from socioeconomic sectors related with smoking around the smoking control may carry to

several and different positions. This condition may null the effectiveness of applying a macro-social policy for the smoking control. Then, it is very important the agreement from all socioeconomic sectors around the smoking control starting in the knowledge from the smoking impact over each sector and between then.

Respect to the social sector role for the smoking control, it is important to appoint that:

- 1) Public health sector do not trade with health, only supply health services that in much time cannot eliminate the smoking consequences over the morbidity and life quality too.^[18]
- 2) The application of the cost–benefit relation is imperfect and incomplete because it is not possible to quantify all costs and benefits attributable to smoking.^[19]
- 3) The present law must be an exact reflex from the social knowledge around the smoking control. This legislation must not be utilized as motive to justify the smoking consequences based on smokers' rights.^[20]
- 4) Social security cannot back the life quality lose attributable to smoking. Neither cannot supply the lifetime losses because of cigarettes and tobacco consumption.^[21]

The social development must not be supported in partial or complete form in the existence of a risk factor witch reduce the life quality and life expectation too that raise the economic benefits because of the economic potential reduction from the other socioeconomic sectors and that uses the personal right as pretext for it prevalence. That is why all social and economic sectors must be agree in a macro-social strategic for an effective smoking control.

REFERENCES

1. Lightwood J, Glantz SA. The effect of the California tobacco control program on smoking prevalence, cigarette consumption,

Address for correspondence:

Fé Fernández Hernández, Faculty of Medical Science “10 de Octubre”, University of Medical Science of Havana, Havana, Cuba.

© 2021 The Author(s). This open access article is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY) 4.0 license.

- and healthcare costs: 1989-2008. *PLoS One* 2013;8:e47145.
2. Arredondo A, Recaman AL, Pinzon C, Azar A. Financial consequences from smoking-related diseases in middle-income countries: Evidence and lessons from Mexico. *Int J Health Plann Manag* 2018;33:e454-63.
 3. Hernández FF, González ES. The social and economic inequity from smoking in Cuba. *Ann Med Surg Case Rep* 2020;2:100037.
 4. Hernández FF, González ES. The smoking epidemiologic control across the primary health service. *Asclepius Med Res* 2020;3:1-3.
 5. León Román CA, Morgado Gutiérrez FC, Vázquez Borges B. Adicción al tabaco en estudiantes de enfermería técnica. *Revista Cubana Enferm* 2017;33:e1211.
 6. González Rodríguez R, Cardentey García J. Comportamiento de las enfermedades crónicas no transmisibles en adultos mayores. *Rev Finlay* 2018;8:103-10.
 7. González ES, Hernández FF. Brief appointments about fiscal policy for the smoking control. *J Clin Res Rep* 2020;2:1-2.
 8. Selvaraj S, Srivastava S, Karan A. Price elasticity of tobacco products among economic classes in India, 2011-2012. *BMJ Open* 2015;5:e008180.
 9. Abascal W, Lorenzo A. Impacto de la política de control de tabaco en población adolescente en Uruguay. *Salud Pública Méx* 2017;59:40-4.
 10. González ES, Hernández FF. La relación entre la política tributaria y el control del tabaquismo en Cuba. *Correo Cient Méd* 2018;22:238-49.
 11. González ES, Hernández FF. The smoking fiscal space in Cuba. *J Clin Med Res* 2019;1:1-5.
 12. Pinto MT, Pichon-Riviere A, Bardach A. Estimación de la carga de enfermedad atribuible al tabaquismo en Brasil: Mortalidad, morbilidad y costos. *Cad Saúde Pública* 2015;31:1283-97.
 13. Rodríguez CA, Gálvez GA, Álvarez VL. Aspectos económicos del envejecimiento demográfico y su importancia para la toma de decisiones en el sector salud. El caso Cuba. *INFODIR* 2018;28:13-27.
 14. González ES, Hernández FF. La pérdida de productividad laboral atribuible al tabaquismo. *Rev Cubana Salud Trab* 2016;17:57-60.
 15. Hernández FF, González ES. Pérdida de productividad por el consumo de cigarrillos en la jornada laboral. *Rev Cubana Salud Trab* 2017;18:9-12.
 16. González ES, Hernández FF. Costo social por pérdida absoluta de productividad laboral. *Rev Cubana Salud Trab* 2018;19:33-9.
 17. González ES, Hernández FF. The fiscal policy and the smoking control in Cuba. *J Clin Res Rep* 2020;2:1-4.
 18. Frómata MM, Pimentel BF, Silverio BM, Fernández IG, Toledo DT, Rodríguez EH. Labor extensionista desde la universidad médica para prevenir el tabaquismo en niños y adolescentes. *EDUMECENTRO* 2016;8:84-95.
 19. González ES, Hernández FF. Characterization of the socioeconomic inequity attributable to smoking. *J Qual Health Care Econ* 2020;3:1-9.
 20. Fé F Hernández, Efraín S González. Personal spend on cigarettes and tobaccos in Cuba from 2013 to 2016. *Clin Rev Clin Trials* 2020;2:1-3.
 21. Hernández FF, González E. La Carga Económica del Tabaquismo: Cuantificación de los Costos Directos Tangibles del Tabaquismo. Barcelona, Spain: Editorial Académica Española; 2019.

How to cite this article: Hernández FF, González ES. The Macro-Social Smoking Control. *Asclepius Med Res* 2021;4(1):1-2.