

Discursive Essay – A Smoking Ban Too Far

Since New York City's ban on smoking indoors came into force, The City Council has shown an interest in a significant reduction of outdoor smoking. Michael B. Siegel, a professor of community health sciences at the Boston University School of Public health, presented an article discussing the relevance of the possible prohibition based on scientific evidence.

As researchers at Stanford discovered, an exposure within three feet outdoors is comparable to the exposure indoors. Also, the surgeon general's office stated that even short-term exposure to secondhand smoke can cause significant health damage such as cardiovascular disease, potentially triggering a heart attack, or damage the DNA leading to cancer.

According to Siegel's assertion, two researchers mentioned above don't take into account all the factors. Stanford research doesn't consider the ability to move freely outdoors and the quick dispersion of smoke. Moreover, cancer risk and damage to coronary arteries generally require repeated brief exposure to develop. Besides bans would create places with a high concentration of smoke resulting to even bigger secondhand exposure. Furthermore, trying to base conclusions on incomplete facts can lead to loss of scientific credibility of the antismoking movement.

To conclude, more researches in that matter should be conducted before conclusions are drawn. In my opinion (supported by Siegel's claim), it is more important now to focus on the unification of bans throughout the country to ensure equal health conditions for all residents. Any action leading to loss of trustworthiness of the antismoking movement would harm this endeavor.

better: "credibility"

because the idea (collocation) is "scientific credibility"

Researchers (plural) exists
but is not commonly used.

Excellent work!!
Tone, register, language
and development of material.

Thanks, -p-

Excellent.