European Food Safety Authority

EFSA Journal 2011;9(4):2071

SCIENTIFIC OPINION

Scientific Opinion on the substantiation of health claims related to sugar-free chewing gum with carbamide and plaque acid neutralisation (ID 1153) pursuant to Article 13(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1924/2006[1]

EFSA Panel on Dietetic Products, Nutrition and Allergies (NDA)[2, 3]

European Food Safety Authority (EFSA), Parma, Italy

SUMMARY

Following a request from the European Commission, the Panel on Dietetic Products, Nutrition and Allergies was asked to provide a scientific opinion on a list of health claims pursuant to Article 13 of Regulation (EC) No 1924/2006. This opinion addresses the scientific substantiation of health claims in relation to sugar-free chewing gum with carbamide and plaque acid neutralisation. The scientific substantiation is based on the information provided by the Member States in the consolidated list of Article 13 health claims and references that EFSA has received from Member States or directly from stakeholders.

The food that is the subject of the health claim is sugar-free chewing gum with carbamide. A claim on sugar-free chewing gum and plaque acid neutralisation has already been assessed with a favourable outcome. From the proposed wordings, the Panel assumes that the claim refers to an effect of sugar-free chewing gum with carbamide on plaque acid neutralisation beyond the well established effect that other sugar-free chewing gums (i.e. without carbamide) have on plaque acid neutralisation. The Panel considers that sugar-free chewing gum with carbamide and the comparison food, sugar-free chewing gum without carbamide, are both sufficiently characterised in relation to the claimed effect.

The claimed effect is "improved plaque acid neutralisation". The target population is assumed to be the general population. The Panel considers that plaque acid neutralisation is a beneficial physiological effect.

In weighing the evidence, the Panel took into account that the use of sugar-free chewing gum with carbamide after a sugar challenge consistently increased plaque pH compared to sugar-free chewing

[1] On request from the European Commission, Question No EFSA-Q-2008-1892, adopted on 28 January 2011.

[2] Panel members: Carlo Agostoni, Jean-Louis Bresson, Susan Fairweather-Tait, Albert Flynn, Ines Golly, Hannu Korhonen, Pagona Lagiou, Martinus Løvik, Rosangela Marchelli, Ambroise Martin, Bevan Moseley, Monika Neuhäuser-Berthold, Hildegard Przyrembel, Seppo Salminen, Yolanda Sanz, Sean (J.J.) Strain, Stephan Strobel, Inge Tetens, Daniel Tomé, Hendrik van Loveren and Hans Verhagen. Correspondence: nda@efsa.europa.eu

[3] Acknowledgement: The Panel wishes to thank the members of the Working Group on Claims for the preparatory work on this scientific opinion: Carlo Agostoni, Jean-Louis Bresson, Susan Fairweather-Tait, Albert Flynn, Ines Golly, Marina Heinonen, Hannu Korhonen, Martinus Løvik, Ambroise Martin, Hildegard Przyrembel, Seppo Salminen, Yolanda Sanz, Sean (J.J.) Strain, Inge Tetens, Hendrik van Loveren and Hans Verhagen. The members of the Claims Sub-Working Group on Bone/Teeth/Connective Tissue: Rikke Andersen, Olivier Bruyère, Albert Flynn, Ingegerd Johansson, Jukka Meurman and Hildegard Przyrembel.

Suggested citation: EFSA Panel on Dietetic Products, Nutrition and Allergies (NDA); Scientific Opinion on the substantiation of health claims related to sugar-free chewing gum with carbamide and plaque acid neutralisation (ID 1153) pursuant to Article 13(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1924/2006. EFSA Journal 2011;9(4):2071. [14 pp.] doi:10.2903/j.efsa.2011.2071. Available online: www.efsa.europa.eu/efsajournal

gums without carbamide, that the pH raising effect correlated positively with the urea content of the gum, and that the mechanism for the effect is well established.

On the basis of the data presented, the Panel concludes that a cause and effect relationship has been established between the use of sugar-free chewing gum with carbamide and plaque acid neutralisation, over and above the effect achieved with sugar-free chewing gums without carbamide.

The Panel considers that, in order to obtain the claimed effect, sugar-free chewing gum containing carbamide (at least 20 mg carbamide per piece) should be used for at least 20 minutes after eating or drinking. The target population is the general population.

The use of chewing gum should be avoided in children less than three years of age because of a high choking hazard.

KEY WORDS

Chewing gum, sugar-free, carbamide, plaque acid neutralisation, health claims.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BACKGROUND AS PROVIDED BY THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION

See Appendix A

TERMS OF REFERENCE AS PROVIDED BY THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION

See Appendix A

EFSA DISCLAIMER

See Appendix B

INFORMATION AS PROVIDED IN THE CONSOLIDATED LIST

The consolidated list of health claims pursuant to Article 13 of Regulation (EC) No 1924/2006[4] submitted by Member States contains main entry claims with corresponding conditions of use and literature for similar health claims. EFSA has screened all health claims contained in the original consolidated list of Article 13 health claims which was received by EFSA in 2008 using six criteria established by the NDA Panel to identify claims for which EFSA considered sufficient information had been provided for evaluation and those for which more information or clarification was needed before evaluation could be carried out[5]. The clarifications which were received by EFSA through the screening process have been included in the consolidated list. This additional information will serve as clarification to the originally provided information. The information provided in the consolidated list for the health claims which are the subject of this opinion is tabulated in Appendix C.

ASSESSMENT

1. Characterisation of the food/constituent (ID 1153)

The food that is the subject of the health claim is sugar-free chewing gum with carbamide.

The composition of the gum, i.e. gum base and sweetening agent, is unspecified. The characteristic components of chewing gums are the gum base, which may comprise a complex mixture of elastomers, natural and synthetic resins, fats, emulsifiers, waxes, antioxidants, and filler, together with sweetening and flavouring agents (Imfeld, 1999; Rassing, 1996). The common characteristic of sugar-free chewing gums is the absence of fermentable carbohydrates (Edgar, 1998; Ly et al., 2008). The ingredients are well characterised, can be measured by established methods, and the principles of the manufacturing process have been described (Rassing, 1996). Many of the ingredients in the gum base and most of the sweetening agents used in sugar-free chewing gums occur naturally in foods.

Carbamide (urea) is naturally produced from ammonia as a waste product from protein and amino acid metabolism. It is highly soluble in water and excreted through the kidneys, and to a smaller extent via saliva and sweat glands. Urea is used in chewing gums (typically 20 mg/piece).

A claim on sugar-free chewing gum and plaque acid neutralisation has already been assessed with a favourable outcome (EFSA Panel on Dietetic Products Nutrition and Allergies (NDA), 2009).

From the proposed wordings, the Panel assumes that the claim refers to an effect of sugar-free chewing gum with carbamide on plaque acid neutralisation beyond the well established effect that other sugar-free chewing gums (i.e. without carbamide) have on plaque acid neutralisation.

The Panel considers that the food, sugar-free chewing gum with carbamide, which is the subject of the health claim, and the comparison food, sugar-free chewing gum without carbamide, are both sufficiently characterised in relation to the claimed effect.

2. Relevance of the claimed effect to human health (ID 1153)

The claimed effect is "improved plaque acid neutralisation". The Panel assumes that the target population is the general population.

[4] Regulation (EC) No 1924/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 December 2006 on nutrition and health claims made on foods. OJ L 404, 30.12.2006, p. 9–25.

[5] Briefing document for stakeholders on the evaluation of Article 13.1, 13.5 and 14 health claims: http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/ndameetings/docs/nda100601-ax01.pdf

Acid is produced in plaque through the fermentation of carbohydrates by acid-producing bacteria. Lowering plaque pH contributes to demineralisation of tooth tissues.

The Panel considers that plaque acid neutralisation is a beneficial physiological effect.

3. Scientific substantiation of the claimed effect (ID 1153)

Tooth tissue hydroxyapatite is a highly resistant tissue at neutral pH, but at lowered pH its solubility is increased. Therefore, acid production from saccharolytic bacteria colonising the oral cavity is the key actor in caries development, whereas exposure to acidic products, such as sodas, fruit juices or regurgitation of gastric juice is critical for dental erosion. The evidence from the reviews and original scientific papers provided shows that there is good consensus that chewing a sugar-free gum leads to an increase in saliva secretion and rapid neutralisation of pH in the dental biofilm after metabolic acid production (Imfeld, 1999). The dominating effect of chewing a gum as such on plaque pH is in accordance with basic salivary gland physiology (Garrett et al., 1998; Wong, 2008). The net effect, however, depends on the individuals´ salivary secretory capacity, and of its content of bicarbonate and phosphate.

There is also a consensus that some oral commensal bacteria degrade urea in a reaction catalysed by urease, that leads to ammonia production and a rise of pH.

Dawes and Dibdin (2001) observed that urea is effectively released into saliva when a urea-containing gum is chewed. They also demonstrated, using an ureolytic model of bacteria in an agarose gel-stabilised system and saliva from subjects who chewed carbamide gum, that pH rose upon urea gum chewing. To obtain the effect, the gum had to be taken after, and not before, sugar exposure. In addition, chewing for 20 minutes has been recommended to counteract a decrease in pH (Dawes and Dibdin, 2001; Edgar and Geddes, 1990).

Five studies have been identified where the effect of chewing a carbamide containing sugar-free gum was evaluated *in vivo* on tooth biofilm pH after sugar challenge (Gopinath et al., 1997; Imfeld et al., 1995; Nyvad, 1993; Sjogren et al., 2002; Smith et al., 2004). The pH in dental plaque was monitored either by the "microtouch" method, where a thin electrode is placed in accumulated plaque, or by a plaque pH telemetry system, where an electrode is mounted into a crown or removable appliance (Imfeld et al., 1995; Lingstrom et al., 1993). All five studies compared the results with a placebo sugar-free gum, and two also with a no gum placebo (Gopinath et al., 1997; Nyvad, 1993). All studies showed that chewing a gum had a major effect on pH normalisation after a sugar induced pH drop, and that urea significantly enhanced the immediate and long term (50 minutes) pH raising effect compared to placebo sugar-free chewing gums. Imfeld et al. (1995) also found that the pH raising effect correlated positively with the urea content of the gum (urea range 0-80 mg/gum piece). On the other hand, chewing a sugar-free, carbamide-containing chewing gum five times a day (100 mg/day) for four weeks had no effect on resting biofilm pH when sugar challenges were not performed (Fure et al., 1998).

In weighing the evidence, the Panel took into account that the use of sugar-free chewing gum with carbamide after a sugar challenge consistently increased plaque pH compared to sugar-free chewing gums without carbamide, that the pH raising effect correlated positively with the urea content of the gum, and that the mechanism for the effect is well established.

The Panel concludes that a cause and effect relationship has been established between the use of sugar-free chewing gum with carbamide and plaque acid neutralisation, over and above the effect achieved with sugar-free chewing gums without carbamide.

4. Panel's comments on the proposed wording (ID 1153)

The Panel considers that the following wording reflects the scientific evidence: "Sugar-free chewing gum with carbamide neutralises plaque acids more effectively than sugar-free chewing gums without carbamide".

5. Conditions and possible restrictions of use (ID 1153)

The Panel considers that, in order to obtain the claimed effect, sugar-free chewing gum containing carbamide (at least 20 mg carbamide per piece) should be used for at least 20 minutes after eating or drinking. The target population is the general population.

The use of chewing gum should be avoided in children less than three years of age because of a high choking hazard.

CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of the data presented, the Panel concludes that:

- The food, sugar-free chewing gum with carbamide, which is the subject of the health claim, and the comparison food, sugar-free chewing gum without carbamide, are both sufficiently characterised in relation to the claimed effect.
- The claimed effect is "improved plaque acid neutralisation". The target population is assumed to be the general population. Plaque acid neutralisation is a beneficial physiological effect.
- A cause and effect relationship has been established between the use of sugar-free chewing gum with carbamide and plaque acid neutralisation, over and above the effect achieved with sugar-free chewing gums without carbamide.
- The following wording reflects the scientific evidence: "Sugar-free chewing gum with carbamide neutralises plaque acids more effectively than sugar-free chewing gums without carbamide".
- In order to obtain the claimed effect, sugar-free chewing gum containing carbamide (at least 20 mg carbamide per piece) should be used for at least 20 minutes after eating or drinking. The target population is the general population. The use of chewing gum should be avoided in children less than three years of age because of a high choking hazard.

DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO EFSA

Health claims pursuant to Article 13 of Regulation (EC) No 1924/2006 (No: EFSA-Q-2008-1892). The scientific substantiation is based on the information provided by the Member States in the consolidated list of Article 13 health claims and references that EFSA has received from Member States or directly from stakeholders.

The full list of supporting references as provided to EFSA is available on: http://www.efsa.europa.eu/panels/nda/claims/article13.htm.

REFERENCES

Dawes C and Dibdin GH, 2001. Salivary concentrations of urea released from a chewing gum containing urea and how these affect the urea content of gel-stabilized plaques and their pH after exposure to sucrose. Caries Research, 35, 344-353.

Edgar WM and Geddes DA, 1990. Chewing gum and dental health--a review. British Dental Journal, 168, 173-177.

Edgar WM, 1998. Sugar substitutes, chewing gum and dental caries--a review. British Dental Journal, 184, 29-32.

EFSA Panel on Dietetic Products Nutrition and Allergies (NDA), 2009. Scientific Opinion on the substantiation of health claims related to sugar free chewing gum and dental and oral health, including gum and tooth protection and strength (ID 1149), plaque acid neutralisation (ID 1150), maintenance of tooth mineralisation (ID 1151), reduction of oral dryness (ID 1240), and maintenance of the normal body weight (ID 1152) pursuant to Article 13(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1924/2006. EFSA Journal, 7(9):1271, 20 pp.

Fure S, Lingstrom P and Birkhed D, 1998. Effect of three months' frequent use of sugar-free chewing gum with and without urea on calculus formation. Journal of Dental Research, 77, 1630-1637.

Garrett JR, Ekström J and Anderson LC, 1998. Glandular Mechanisms of Salivary Secretion. Karger, Basel.

Gopinath VK, Tandon S and Shirwaikar A, 1997. The effect of chewing gums on acidogenicity of plaque after a sucrose challenge. Journal of Clinical Pediatric Dentistry, 22, 77-81.

Imfeld T, Birkhed D and Lingstrom P, 1995. Effect of urea in sugar-free chewing gums on pH recovery in human dental plaque evaluated with three different methods. Caries Research, 29, 172-180.

Imfeld T, 1999. Chewing gum--facts and fiction: a review of gum-chewing and oral health. Critical Reviews in Oral Biology and Medicine, 10, 405-419.

Lingstrom P, Imfeld T and Birkhed D, 1993. Comparison of three different methods for measurement of plaque-pH in humans after consumption of soft bread and potato chips. Journal of Dental Research, 72, 865-870.

Ly KA, Milgrom P and Rothen M, 2008. The potential of dental-protective chewing gum in oral health interventions. Journal of the American Dental Association, 139, 553-563.

Nyvad B, 1993. pH-rise effect of adding urea, arginine, or urea/arginine to sorbitol gum. Abstract fot the 2nd NOF/CED Joint Meeting August 25-28, 1993, Kolding, Denmark.

Rassing MR, 1996. Specialized Oral Mucosal Drug Delivery Systems: Chewing Gum. In: Oral Mucosal Drug Delivery. Ed Rathbone M. Marcel Dekker, New York, 319-353.

Sjogren K, Ruben J, Lingstrom P, Lundberg AB and Birkhed D, 2002. Fluoride and urea chewing gums in an intra-oral experimental caries model. Caries Research, 36, 64-69.

Smith CA, Higham SM, Smith PW and Verran J, 2004. The effect of chewing urea-containing gum on plaque acidogenic and alkaligenic parameters. Caries Research, 38, 124-129.

Wong DT, 2008. Salivary Diagnostics. Wiley-Blackwell, Ames.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

BACKGROUND AND TERMS OF REFERENCE AS PROVIDED BY THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION

The Regulation 1924/2006 on nutrition and health claims made on foods[6] (hereinafter "the Regulation") entered into force on 19th January 2007.

Article 13 of the Regulation foresees that the Commission shall adopt a Community list of permitted health claims other than those referring to the reduction of disease risk and to children's development and health. This Community list shall be adopted through the Regulatory Committee procedure and following consultation of the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA).

Health claims are defined as "any claim that states, suggests or implies that a relationship exists between a food category, a food or one of its constituents and health".

In accordance with Article 13 (1) health claims other than those referring to the reduction of disease risk and to children's development and health are health claims describing or referring to:

a) the role of a nutrient or other substance in growth, development and the functions of the body; or

b) psychological and behavioural functions; or

c) without prejudice to Directive 96/8/EC, slimming or weight-control or a reduction in the sense of hunger or an increase in the sense of satiety or to the reduction of the available energy from the diet.

To be included in the Community list of permitted health claims, the claims shall be:

(i) based on generally accepted scientific evidence; and

(ii) well understood by the average consumer.

Member States provided the Commission with lists of claims as referred to in Article 13 (1) by 31 January 2008 accompanied by the conditions applying to them and by references to the relevant scientific justification. These lists have been consolidated into the list which forms the basis for the EFSA consultation in accordance with Article 13 (3).

ISSUES THAT NEED TO BE CONSIDERED

IMPORTANCE AND PERTINENCE OF THE FOOD[7]

Foods are commonly involved in many different functions8 of the body, and for one single food many health claims may therefore be scientifically true. Therefore, the relative importance of food e.g. nutrients in relation to other nutrients for the expressed beneficial effect should be considered: for functions affected by a large number of dietary factors it should be considered whether a reference to a single food is scientifically pertinent.

[6] OJ L12, 18/01/2007
[7] The term 'food' when used in this Terms of Reference refers to a food constituent, the food or the food category.
[8] The term 'function' when used in this Terms of Reference refers to health claims in Article 13(1)(a), (b) and (c).

It should also be considered if the information on the characteristics of the food contains aspects pertinent to the beneficial effect.

SUBSTANTIATION OF CLAIMS BY GENERALLY ACCEPTABLE SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE

Scientific substantiation is the main aspect to be taken into account to authorise health claims. Claims should be scientifically substantiated by taking into account the totality of the available scientific data, and by weighing the evidence, and shall demonstrate the extent to which:

(a) the claimed effect of the food is beneficial for human health,

(b) a cause and effect relationship is established between consumption of the food and the claimed effect in humans (such as: the strength, consistency, specificity, dose-response, and biological plausibility of the relationship),

(c) the quantity of the food and pattern of consumption required to obtain the claimed effect could reasonably be achieved as part of a balanced diet,

(d) the specific study group(s) in which the evidence was obtained is representative of the target population for which the claim is intended.

EFSA has mentioned in its scientific and technical guidance for the preparation and presentation of the application for authorisation of health claims consistent criteria for the potential sources of scientific data. Such sources may not be available for all health claims. Nevertheless it will be relevant and important that EFSA comments on the availability and quality of such data in order to allow the regulator to judge and make a risk management decision about the acceptability of health claims included in the submitted list.

The scientific evidence about the role of a food on a nutritional or physiological function is not enough to justify the claim. The beneficial effect of the dietary intake has also to be demonstrated. Moreover, the beneficial effect should be significant i.e. satisfactorily demonstrate to beneficially affect identified functions in the body in a way which is relevant to health. Although an appreciation of the beneficial effect in relation to the nutritional status of the European population may be of interest, the presence or absence of the actual need for a nutrient or other substance with nutritional or physiological effect for that population should not, however, condition such considerations.

Different types of effects can be claimed. Claims referring to the maintenance of a function may be distinct from claims referring to the improvement of a function. EFSA may wish to comment whether such different claims comply with the criteria laid down in the Regulation.

WORDING OF HEALTH CLAIMS

Scientific substantiation of health claims is the main aspect on which EFSA's opinion is requested. However, the wording of health claims should also be commented by EFSA in its opinion.

There is potentially a plethora of expressions that may be used to convey the relationship between the food and the function. This may be due to commercial practices, consumer perception and linguistic or cultural differences across the EU. Nevertheless, the wording used to make health claims should be truthful, clear, reliable and useful to the consumer in choosing a healthy diet.

In addition to fulfilling the general principles and conditions of the Regulation laid down in Article 3 and 5, Article 13(1)(a) stipulates that health claims shall describe or refer to "the role of a nutrient or other substance in growth, development and the functions of the body". Therefore, the requirement to

describe or refer to the 'role' of a nutrient or substance in growth, development and the functions of the body should be carefully considered.

The specificity of the wording is very important. Health claims such as "Substance X supports the function of the joints" may not sufficiently do so, whereas a claim such as "Substance X helps maintain the flexibility of the joints" would. In the first example of a claim it is unclear which of the various functions of the joints is described or referred to contrary to the latter example which specifies this by using the word "flexibility".

The clarity of the wording is very important. The guiding principle should be that the description or reference to the role of the nutrient or other substance shall be clear and unambiguous and therefore be specified to the extent possible i.e. descriptive words/ terms which can have multiple meanings should be avoided. To this end, wordings like "strengthens your natural defences" or "contain antioxidants" should be considered as well as "may" or "might" as opposed to words like "contributes", "aids" or "helps".

In addition, for functions affected by a large number of dietary factors it should be considered whether wordings such as "indispensable", "necessary", "essential" and "important" reflects the strength of the scientific evidence.

Similar alternative wordings as mentioned above are used for claims relating to different relationships between the various foods and health. It is not the intention of the regulator to adopt a detailed and rigid list of claims where all possible wordings for the different claims are approved. Therefore, it is not required that EFSA comments on each individual wording for each claim unless the wording is strictly pertinent to a specific claim. It would be appreciated though that EFSA may consider and comment generally on such elements relating to wording to ensure the compliance with the criteria laid down in the Regulation.

In doing so the explanation provided for in recital 16 of the Regulation on the notion of the average consumer should be recalled. In addition, such assessment should take into account the particular perspective and/or knowledge in the target group of the claim, if such is indicated or implied.

TERMS OF REFERENCE

HEALTH CLAIMS OTHER THAN THOSE REFERRING TO THE REDUCTION OF DISEASE RISK AND TO CHILDREN'S DEVELOPMENT AND HEALTH

EFSA should in particular consider, and provide advice on the following aspects:

- Whether adequate information is provided on the characteristics of the food pertinent to the beneficial effect.

- Whether the beneficial effect of the food on the function is substantiated by generally accepted scientific evidence by taking into account the totality of the available scientific data, and by weighing the evidence. In this context EFSA is invited to comment on the nature and quality of the totality of the evidence provided according to consistent criteria.

- The specific importance of the food for the claimed effect. For functions affected by a large number of dietary factors whether a reference to a single food is scientifically pertinent.

In addition, EFSA should consider the claimed effect on the function, and provide advice on the extent to which:

- the claimed effect of the food in the identified function is beneficial.
- a cause and effect relationship has been established between consumption of the food and the claimed effect in humans and whether the magnitude of the effect is related to the quantity consumed.
- where appropriate, the effect on the function is significant in relation to the quantity of the food proposed to be consumed and if this quantity could reasonably be consumed as part of a balanced diet.
- the specific study group(s) in which the evidence was obtained is representative of the target population for which the claim is intended.
- the wordings used to express the claimed effect reflect the scientific evidence and complies with the criteria laid down in the Regulation.

When considering these elements EFSA should also provide advice, when appropriate:

- on the appropriate application of Article 10 (2) (c) and (d) in the Regulation, which provides for additional labelling requirements addressed to persons who should avoid using the food; and/or warnings for products that are likely to present a health risk if consumed to excess.

APPENDIX B

EFSA DISCLAIMER

The present opinion does not constitute, and cannot be construed as, an authorisation to the marketing of the food/food constituent, a positive assessment of its safety, nor a decision on whether the food/food constituent is, or is not, classified as foodstuffs. It should be noted that such an assessment is not foreseen in the framework of Regulation (EC) No 1924/2006.

It should also be highlighted that the scope, the proposed wordings of the claims and the conditions of use as proposed in the Consolidated List may be subject to changes, pending the outcome of the authorisation procedure foreseen in Article 13(3) of Regulation (EC) No 1924/2006.

APPENDIX C

Table 1. Main entry health claims related to sugar-free chewing gum with carbamide, including conditions of use from similar claims, as proposed in the Consolidated List.

ID	Food or Food constituent	Health Relationship	Proposed wording
1153	Sugar-free chewing gum with Carbamide	Improved plaque acid neutralisation	-help to neutralise plaque acids; -improved acid neutralisation when compared to other chewing gums.
	Conditions of use - Use after eating or drinking		