



Intentions to smoke cigarettes among never-smoking U.S. middle and high school electronic cigarette users, National Youth Tobacco Survey, 2011-2013

Journal:	<i>Nicotine & Tobacco Research</i>
Manuscript ID:	NTR-2014-376.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original Investigation
Date Submitted by the Author:	31-Jul-2014
Complete List of Authors:	Bunnell, Rebecca; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Office on Smoking and Health Israel, Agaku; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Office on Smoking and Health Apelberg, Benjamin; US Food and Drug Administration, Center for Tobacco Products Caraballo, Ralph; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Office on Smoking and Health King, Brian; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Office on Smoking and Health Arrazola, Rene; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Office on Smoking and Health Corey, Catherine; US Food and Drug Administration, Center for Tobacco Products Coleman, Blair; US Food and Drug Administration, Center for Tobacco Products; US Food and Drug Administration, Center for Tobacco Products Dube, Shanta; Georgia State University, Division of Epidemiology and Biostatistics
Keywords:	Youth tobacco use, Survey research, Prevention, Epidemiology, Electronic Nicotine Delivery Devices, United States

ACC

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Intentions to smoke cigarettes among never-smoking U.S. middle and high school electronic cigarette users, National Youth Tobacco Survey, 2011-2013

Rebecca E. Bunnell, ScD, MEd;^{1*} Israel T. Agaku, DMD, MPH;¹ Rene Arrazola, MPH;¹ Benjamin J. Apelberg, PhD, MHS;² Ralph S. Caraballo, PhD;¹ Catherine G. Corey, MSPH;² Blair Coleman, MPH;² Shanta R. Dube, PhD, MPH;³ Brian A. King, PhD, MPH;¹

¹Office on Smoking and Health, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, Georgia

²Office of Science, Center for Tobacco Products, Food and Drug Administration, Rockville, Maryland

³Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, School of Public Health, Georgia State University

Corresponding Author: Dr. Rebecca E. Bunnell, Office on Smoking and Health, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 4770 Buford Highway, MS F-79, Atlanta, Georgia 30341, Phone: 770.488.5107, Fax: 770.488.5848, rrb7@cdc.gov

Disclaimer: The findings and conclusions in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention or the Food and Drug Administration

Word Count:

Abstract: 251

Manuscript Text: 3927 (without references)

ABSTRACT

Introduction

Electronic cigarette (e-cigarette) use is increasing rapidly and their impact on youth is unknown. We assessed associations between e-cigarette use and smoking intentions among U.S. youth who had never smoked conventional cigarettes.

Methods

We analyzed data from the nationally representative 2011, 2012, and 2013 National Youth Tobacco Surveys of students in grades 6-12. Youth reporting they would definitely not smoke in the next year or if offered a cigarette by a friend were defined as not having an intention to smoke, while all others were classified as having positive intention to smoke conventional cigarettes. Demographics, pro-tobacco advertisement exposure, ever use of e-cigarettes, and ever use of other combustibles (cigars, hookah, bidis, kreteks, and pipes) and non-combustibles (chewing tobacco, snuff, dip, snus, and dissolvables) were included in multivariate analyses assessing associations with smoking intentions among never-cigarette-smoking youth.

Results

Between 2011-2013, the number of never-smoking youth who used e-cigarettes increased three-fold, from 79,000 to over 263,000. Intention to smoke conventional cigarettes was 43.9% among ever e-cigarette users and 21.5% among never users. Ever e-cigarette users had higher adjusted odds of having smoking intentions than never users (Adjusted Odds Ratio: 1.70, 95% Confidence Interval: 1.24-2.32). Those who ever used other combustibles, ever used non-combustibles, or reported pro-tobacco advertisement exposure also had increased odds of smoking intentions.

Conclusion

In 2013, over a quarter million never-smoking youth had used e-cigarettes. E-cigarette use was associated with increased intentions to smoke cigarettes. Enhanced prevention efforts for youth are important for all forms of tobacco, including e-cigarettes.

INTRODUCTION

The impact of new and emerging products, including electronic cigarettes (e-cigarettes) and other electronic nicotine delivery systems (ENDS) (Ritchel 2014), on youth use of conventional combusted tobacco products is unknown (Durmowicz 2014; Grana, Benowitz & Glanz 2014). Surveillance data on ENDS use and related behaviors remain scarce, and there is much speculation about the net public health impact of ENDS at the population level (Callahan-Lyon, 2014; Grana et. al. 2014; Wagener, Siegel & Borrelli 2012). ENDS are being marketed heavily, using both traditional (e.g. television) and digital marketing strategies (de Andrade, Hastings, Angus, 2013; Grana & Ling 2014; Kim, Arnold & Makarenko 2014; Kornfield, Vera, & Emery 2014; Pepper, Emery, Ribis & Brewer 2014). ENDS use is increasing rapidly among both adults and youth (CDC 2013; King, Alam, Promoff, Arrazola, & Dube 2013; Zhu, Gamst, Lee, Cummins, Yin, & Zoref 2013) with ever e-cigarette use doubling from 3.3% to 6.8% between 2011 and 2012 among middle and high school students (CDC 2013).

Preventing youth initiation and transition to established smoking are critical and well-established public health goals (CDC 2014) DHHS 2014). Cigarette smoking remains the leading cause of preventable disease and death in the U.S., and more than 80% of adult smokers begin smoking by 18 years of age (DHHS 2012). While cigarette smoking rates have declined in recent decades in the United States, an estimated 5.6 million American children alive today will die prematurely from a smoking-related illness unless smoking rates decline much more (DHHS 2014).

Evidence-based strategies, including mass media campaigns, price increases, and changes in smoke-free policies and norms have been effective in reducing the initiation, prevalence, and intensity of youth smoking in settings where they have been comprehensively implemented (DHHS 2012; Brown, Moodie, & Hastings, 2009). Full implementation of comprehensive tobacco control programs, coupled with FDA regulation of tobacco products (GPO 2014), would be expected to reduce youth tobacco use further. However, implementation has been limited and uneven across states and communities, and an estimated 3000 youth start smoking cigarettes every day (DHHS 2012).

The use of cigarettes and other combusted tobacco products has been the principle cause of the 20 million tobacco-related deaths that have occurred in the U.S. since 1964 (DHHS 2014). In theory, if ENDS (including e-cigarettes) or other nicotine delivery devices cause less harm than

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
cigarettes and other combustible tobacco products, their use by current conventional tobacco smokers could reduce disease and death, if smokers switch completely and end all combustible product use (Benowitz 2014). ENDS are more likely to be beneficial if their use is concurrent with interventions that rapidly reduce the appeal, accessibility, promotion and use of cigarettes (DHHS 2014). However, if conventional tobacco smokers become concurrent users of ENDS and combustible products (dual users) rather than quitting both products or completely substituting ENDS for combustible products, or if ENDS leads to initiation of nicotine use among non-users and relapse among former smokers, then ENDS could result in net public health harm to the U.S. population (DHHS 2014). ENDS, which contain nicotine, may be particularly harmful to youth, because ENDS and nicotine exposure could have long-term negative consequences on adolescent brain development (DHHS 2014), can result in nicotine addiction (Zhan, Dierker, Rose, Selya, & Mermalstein 2012), and have the potential to lead youth to use other forms of tobacco products (Durmowicz 2014).

27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
Prior research has examined youth experimentation and progression to cigarette smoking (DHHS 2014). Measures of intention to smoke cigarettes have been validated (Pierce, Choi, Gilpin, Farkas, & Merritt 1996) and have been shown to predict future cigarette smoking, irrespective of previous smoking behavior (Choi, Gilpin, Farkas, & Pierce, 2001; Wakefield et. al. 2004). Additionally, research has identified other predictors of future cigarette use, including exposure to pro-tobacco marketing and promotion, living with a smoker, parental smoking, having friends who smoke, and performing poorly in school (Dube, Arrazola, Lee, Engstrom, & Malarcher 2013; Tomar 2003; Pierce, Distefan, Kaplan, & Gilpin 2005). However, additional research will be useful to understand predictors of intention to use cigarettes, given the changing tobacco product landscape with the advent of ENDS.

46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
To address this gap and to help inform decisions regarding public health policy and practice, we analyzed U.S. nationally representative data from the 2011, 2012, and 2013 National Youth Tobacco Surveys (NYTS) to determine if e-cigarette use is associated with elevated intentions to smoke conventional cigarettes among middle and high school students who have never smoked cigarettes.

55 56 57 58 59 60 **METHODS**

Data Source

The NYTS is a nationally representative, self-administered survey of U.S. students enrolled in grades 6-12 in both public and private schools. Details of the NYTS methodology are available elsewhere (http://www.cdc.gov/TOBACCO/data_statistics/surveys/NYTS/index.htm). In brief, NYTS uses a stratified, three-stage cluster sample design to produce a nationally representative sample of middle school and high school students in the U.S. Sampling procedures are probabilistic and conducted without replacement at all stages, and entail selection of Primary Sampling Units (PSUs) within each stratum, schools within each selected PSU, and, lastly, classes within each selected school. Participation is voluntary for schools and students and anonymous at the student level. Participants complete the self-administered, scannable questionnaire booklet via pencil and paper.

Sample

We analyzed data from the 2011, 2012, and 2013 NYTS. Overall NYTS participation rates, representing the product of the school-level and student-level participation rates, were 67.8% in 2013 with 18,406 completed student questionnaires, 73.6% in 2012, with 24,658 completed student questionnaires, and 72.7% in 2011, with 18,866 completed student questionnaires.

Measures

For all of the definitions below, specific questionnaire wording is available at (http://www.cdc.gov/TOBACCO/data_statistics/surveys/NYTS/index.htm).

Never Cigarette Smokers

Students who selected “no” to the question “Have you ever tried cigarette smoking, even one or two puffs?” were considered never cigarette smokers. Those who selected “yes” were considered ever cigarette smokers.

Intention to use cigarettes among never cigarette smokers

1
2
3 Drawing from prior research, (Pierce et al 1996; Choi et al 2001; Wakefield et al 2004) we
4 defined intention to use cigarettes among never cigarette smokers using a composite measure of
5 the two questions that were available for all three survey years: “Do you think you will smoke a
6 cigarette in the next year?” and “If one of your best friends were to offer you a cigarette, would
7 you smoke it?” Response options included: “definitely yes”, “probably yes”, “probably not” and
8 “definitely not”. Those who responded “definitely not” to both intentions questions were
9 classified as not having intentions; otherwise, respondents were classified as having intentions.
10 This definition was also applied to 0.45% of the total sample who had a missing response to one
11 of the two intentions questions and were classified as having intentions. Respondents with
12 missing responses to both intentions questions represented 0.35% of the sample and were
13 excluded.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24
25
26 *Ever Electronic Cigarette Users:*

27 Students who selected “Electronic Cigarettes or E-cigarettes, such as Ruyan or NJOY” to the
28 question “Which of the following products have you ever tried, even just one time?” were
29 considered ever e-cigarette users.
30
31
32
33

34
35 *Current Electronic Cigarette Users:*

36 Students who selected “Electronic Cigarettes or E-cigarettes, such as Ruyan or NJOY” to the
37 question “In the past 30 days, which of the following products have you used on at least one
38 day?” were considered to be current e-cigarette users.
39
40
41
42

43
44 *Ever other combustible user:*

45 Other combustible tobacco products assessed included: cigars, hookah, bidis, kreteks, and pipes.
46 Students who reported ever use of any of these other combustible products were considered to be
47 ever other combustible product users.
48
49
50
51

52
53 *Current other combustible user:*

54 Students who reported using any of the other combustible products on at least one day in the last
55 30 days were defined as current other combustible users.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Ever non-combustible users:

Non-combustible products included chewing tobacco, snuff, dip, snus, and dissolvables. Students who reported ever use of any of these non-combustible products were defined as ever non-combustible users.

Current non-combustible users:

Students who reported using any of the non-combustible products on at least one day in the last 30 days were defined as current non-combustible users.

Pro-Tobacco Exposure

Pro-tobacco advertisement exposures were assessed for the following media sources: internet, magazine/newspaper, retail, and television/movies. For each source, respondents were asked "...how often do you see ads or promotions for cigarettes or other tobacco products?", with the beginning of the question describing each particular media source. Respondents who answered "I do not use/read/go/watch", "never", or "rarely" were considered not exposed to that source; otherwise, those who answered that they had seen pro-tobacco advertisements "sometimes", "most of the time", or "always" were considered exposed to pro-tobacco advertisement through that source. The total number of distinct sources of pro-tobacco advertisement exposure reported by each student was summed to create a cumulative exposure measure and categorized (none, 1-2, 3-4).

Respondent Characteristics

Student characteristics included: sex (male or female), school level (middle or high), presence of a tobacco user in the household (yes or no), and race/ethnicity (non-Hispanic white, non-Hispanic black, non-Hispanic other, or Hispanic). The 'non-Hispanic other' category included respondents who were non-Hispanic and Asian, Native American or Alaska Native, Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, or multiple races. Additionally, survey year (2011, 2012, or 2013) was assessed.

Household member uses tobacco

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Students who responded and selected anything other than “no one who lives with me now uses any form of tobacco” to the question “Does anyone who lives with you now...?” were considered to live with a household member that uses tobacco.

School:

Students who reported being in 6th, 7th, or 8th grades were considered to be in middle school. Those who reported being in 9th, 10th, 11th, or 12th grades were considered to be in high school.

Analysis:

To augment sample size of ever and current electronic cigarette users who had never smoked cigarettes for the intention to smoke analysis, we pooled data from the 2011, 2012, and 2013 NYTS surveys. Data were adjusted for nonresponse and weighted to be representative of the U.S. middle and high school student population; 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were calculated to account for the complex survey design. All analyses were performed using SAS-Callable SUDAAN (v. 11.0.0).

We assessed respondent characteristics and prevalence of ever and current use of e-cigarette use among never cigarette smokers (n=43,873). Characteristics and exposures were assessed for never smokers with and without smoking intentions. Chi-squared tests were used to compare differences across these two groups. Multivariate logistic regression models were fit for never cigarette smokers to assess correlates of intention to smoke (p<0.05). Different models were used to assess current and ever use of e-cigarettes. Covariates included sex, race/ethnicity, school level, number of distinct sources of pro-tobacco advertisement exposure, presence of a tobacco user in the household, and survey year. Variables for ever and current other combustible use and noncombustible use were included in the ever and current models, respectively. In addition we fit models with categorical (ever use, current use, and never use) variables for combustible, non-combustible and e-cigarette use and a model using only a single question to define intentions (i.e. smoking in the next year). For all models, variables were entered into the model simultaneously and no model reduction procedures were performed.

RESULTS

E-Cigarette Use

Overall, 73.0% (95% CI: 71.6-74.3) of youth (n=43,873) were never cigarette smokers. Of all youth, 6.1% (95% CI: 5.5-6.6) reported ever e-cigarette use, including 20.2% (CI: 18.7--21.8) among ever cigarette smokers and 0.9% (CI: 0.7-1.1) among never cigarette smokers.. Current e-cigarette use was 6.9% (CI: 6.2-7.8) among ever cigarette smokers and 0.3% (CI: 0.2-0.4) among never cigarette smokers. From 2011 to 2013, weighted population estimates among students who were never cigarette smokers but had ever used an e-cigarette increased over three fold, from approximately 79,000 (CI: 44,000 – 114,000) to over 263,000 (CI: 176,000 – 351,000).

Intention to Smoke Cigarettes

Overall, 21.9% (CI: 21.2-22.6) of never cigarette smokers had an intention to smoke. Intention to smoke was 43.9% (CI: 37.1-50.9) among ever e-cigarette users compared with 21.5% (CI: 20.9-22.2) among those who had never tried e-cigarettes (p<0.001).

Prevalence of smoking intention varied by demographic and tobacco use characteristics among never cigarette smokers (Table 1). Intention to smoke was highest among Hispanic students (27.5%) compared with other race/ethnicity groups (p<0.001). Intention to smoke was 26.7% (25.5-27.9) among those who lived with a tobacco-using household member compared with 19.4% (18.6-20.2) among those who did not (Table 1).

Among all never smokers, 7.7% (7.1-8.2) had ever used another combustible tobacco product and 3.0% (2.6-3.3) had ever used other non-combustible tobacco products. Current use was 2.6% for other combustible tobacco products and 1.0% (0.9-1.2) for other non-combustible tobacco products. Intentions to smoke cigarettes were significantly higher among those who had ever used other combustible (38.3%; CI: 36.2-40.5) or other non-combustible tobacco products. (41.4%; CI: 38.5-44.3) than among non-users (p<0.001) (Table 1). Current users also had similarly higher rates of smoking intention compared to non-current users (Table 1). In addition, intention to smoke in 2013 was significantly lower than in 2012 and 2011 (p<0.001) (Table 1).

Pro-tobacco advertisement exposure and other tobacco use

Of all never cigarette smokers, 90% reported some level of exposure to pro-tobacco advertising. Youth who reported exposure to pro-tobacco advertisements had higher rates of intention to smoke than those without exposures on the internet (26.3%, CI: 25.3-27.3 versus 18.8%, CI:18.1-19.6; $p<0.001$), magazine and newspapers (25.4%, CI:24.4-26.5 versus 19.8% CI:19.0-20.6; $p<0.001$), retail environments (23.3%, CI: 22.5-24.1 versus 17.1; CI:16.0-18.1; $p<0.001$), and television programs and movie advertisements (23.3%; CI:22.6-24.1 versus 18.5%; CI: 17.4-19.6; $p<0.001$) (Table 1). A significant dose response in intention to smoke was evident by exposure to increasing numbers of pro-tobacco advertisement sources. Intention to smoke was 13.0% (CI: 11.7-14.5) among those with no exposure, 20.4% (CI: 19.5-21.2) among those with 1-2 exposure sources and 25.6% (CI: 24.7-26.6) among those with 3-4 sources ($p<0.001$) (Table 1).

Multivariate Analyses

Table 2 reports results from two multivariate models assessing independent predictors of intention to smoke. Model 1 included ever use variables for e-cigarettes, other combustible, and non-combustible tobacco use. In this model, among never-smoking students, those who had ever used e-cigarettes were more likely to have smoking intentions than never users of e-cigarettes (AOR: 1.70, CI: 1.24-2.32). Similarly, those who had ever used some other combustible product had increased odds of smoking intention (AOR: 2.08, CI: 1.87-2.32) as did those who had ever used non-combustible product (AOR: 1.92, CI: 1.65-2.23).

A dose-response relationship between exposure to pro-tobacco advertisements and intention to smoke was also observed (Table 2). Students who reported exposure to 3-4 distinct sources of pro-tobacco advertisements had greater odds of smoking intention (AOR: 2.30 (CI: 1.97-2.68) than those with no exposure. Similarly, those who had 1-2 exposure sources had greater odds of smoking intention than those with no exposure (AOR: 1.68; CI: 1.45-1.95; $p<0.001$).

Hispanic students were more likely to have smoking intentions than non-Hispanic white students (AOR: 1.60, CI: 1.46-1.75) $p<0.001$ (Table 2). In addition, those who lived with a household

1
2
3 member who uses tobacco were more likely to have intentions to smoke (AOR: 1.37, CI: 1.28-
4 1.46) compared with those who did not live with a tobacco user.
5
6

7
8 Model 2, which assessed the association of current use of e-cigarettes, other combustible, and
9 non-combustible tobacco products with intention to smoke, produced similar results as Model 1
10 (Table 2). Current use of e-cigarettes was associated with intention to smoke (AOR: 1.87, CI:
11 1.17-2.97), and all other factors remained significant in the model. Additional models with
12 categorical responses (ever, current, never) for combustible and non-combustible product use
13 gave almost identical results.
14
15
16
17

18
19 To assess potential effect of our definition of intention to smoke, we also fit a model using a
20 single question to define intentions (i.e. smoking in the next year) instead of our 2 question
21 definition. Model results for a single question definition did not differ significantly for any factor
22 except being in high school (compared with middle school), which showed a statistically
23 significant association with intention to smoke.
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 31 32 33 **DISCUSSION**

34
35 In a nationally representative sample of middle and high school students who had never smoked
36 cigarettes, we found that youth who had used e-cigarettes were nearly two times more likely to
37 have intentions to smoke conventional cigarettes than youth who had never used e-cigarettes.
38
39 Among youth who had ever used e-cigarettes, 43.9% had intention to smoke conventional
40 cigarettes within the next year compared with 21.5% of never e-cigarette users. Although the
41 number of e-cigarette users who had never used cigarettes was small, the number increased three
42 fold between 2011 and 2013. By 2013, over a quarter million students who had never smoked
43 cigarettes had used e-cigarettes. Our study also found elevated rates of smoking intention among
44 youth who had used other combustible products such as cigars, cigarillos, pipes, or hookahs, as
45 well as among those who used non-combustible tobacco products. These findings highlight the
46 importance of enhanced efforts to prevent all forms of tobacco use among youth, including e-
47 cigarettes.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Consistent with previous studies, exposure to pro-tobacco advertisements was also associated with smoking intentions in this study (Pierce, Lee, & Gilpin 1994; Dube et al 2013). We found a dose response in youth smoking intentions across increased levels of exposure to pro-tobacco advertisements. This finding is of particular concern at a time when ENDS advertising is increasing rapidly; e-cigarette advertising expenditures in magazines, television, newspapers, and the Internet grew nearly three-fold during 2011-2012, from \$6.4 million to \$18.3 million, and totaled \$60 million in 2013 (Kim et al 2014; Sebastian, 2014). Of note, in the present study, 40% of never smokers reported exposure to pro-tobacco advertisements on the internet, which could place them at heightened risk of non-face-to-face e-cigarette sales. Internet sales are estimated to be a large portion of the e-cigarette market and are currently not part of existing regulation. Furthermore, e-cigarette advertising is currently permitted on television, which is exposing youth to smoking images for the first time in nearly four decades (Warner & Goldenhar, 1989).

Independent of e-cigarette use, our multivariate analysis showed that youth who used non-combustible products had elevated intentions to smoke cigarettes, reinforcing prior research (Tomar 2003). Although youth e-cigarette use is receiving considerable attention, youth non-combustible use is also a major public health concern. A growing number of non-combustible products are on the market, youth use is high (CDC 2013), and industry practices include features known to appeal to youth, such as flavorings and point-of-sale and print promotions (Morrison, Krugman, & Park, 2008; Widome, Brock, Klein, & Forster 2012). Similarly, use of other combustible products was associated with elevated odds of smoking intentions in the present study. Among never cigarette smokers, 7.7% had used other combustible products including cigars, cigarillos, pipes or hookahs. Our findings also indicated higher prevalence of use and intentions among Hispanic youth and early interventions focusing on Hispanic youth could help avert tobacco use disparities. This study reinforces the importance of surveillance and prevention of all tobacco products for youth.

Our study also highlights several methodological issues of potential relevance for youth tobacco use surveillance and for future investigations about ENDS and conventional smoking intentions. First, patterns of tobacco use among youth have grown in complexity, with many youth using multiple products (Arrazola, Kuiper, & Dube, 2014) and numerous new products emerging in the

1
2
3 market (CDC 2013b). Given the rapid proliferation of tobacco products, particularly of different
4 types of ENDS (Richtel 2014), close monitoring of market trends may be necessary to identify
5 new product names and shifts in product popularity that could help inform surveillance
6 questionnaire updates. Secondly, the present analysis identified three highly vulnerable sub-
7 groups within never cigarette smokers, for example, e-cigarette users, other combustible users,
8 and non-combustible users. The heightened risk of these groups may have been obscured within the
9 broader never-smoker groups in previous susceptibility and intentions analyses that did not
10 assess or control for product use other than conventional cigarettes (Dube et. al. 2013). Use of a
11 broader definition of tobacco products in future research that incorporates not only cigarettes, but
12 also other combustible, smokeless tobacco products and ENDS, will help capture the increasing
13 number of youth who do not smoke cigarettes but use other products such as flavored little
14 cigars and hookahs, (King, Tynan, Dube, & Arrazola 2014), smokeless tobacco or ENDS.

15
16 We conducted our smoking intentions analyses among youth who had never smoked cigarettes.
17 This approach aligns with the findings of previous studies that determined that intentions not to
18 smoke had a protective effect for never smokers as well as for those with smoking experience
19 (Choi et al 2001; Wakefield et al 2004). In the present study, the two questions used to define
20 smoking intention were future intention (use one year from now) and peer influence (would you
21 smoke if a best friend offered you a cigarette). Although this two question definition of intention
22 to smoke varies from prior studies that validated a single question measure for intentions
23 (Wakefield et al 2004) (Sussman, Dent, Flay, Hansen, & Johnson, 1987) and a three question
24 measure for susceptibility (Pierce et al 1996), we had only two questions consistently available
25 across all three years of NYTS. While it is possible that we under or overestimated smoking
26 intention due to these definitional constraints, we fit additional logistical regression models using
27 a single question for intentions and found similar results.

28
29 In addition, our results showed that the overall percentage of youth who reported smoking
30 intentions decreased significantly in 2013. To control for this in our models, we included survey
31 year in all analyses, but on-going monitoring of smoking intentions is needed to assess whether
32 this decline continues.

33
34 This study is subject to at least four limitations. First, the data were self-reported and subject to
35 potential misreporting. Secondly, while our definitions of combustible, smokeless tobacco

1
2
3 product and ENDS use included a comprehensive list of tobacco products, we were restricted to
4 products included in all three survey years. Third, we may have underestimated ENDS use, as
5 NYTS asked only about e-cigarette use, giving only two brands as examples, and did not capture
6 electronic hookah, e-pens, or a host of other new and emerging products that may be referred to
7 by a variety of names among youth (Richtel, 2014). Likewise, we may not have captured all
8 exposure to e-cigarette marketing since the advertisement exposure questions asked about
9 “tobacco products.” Finally, this study analyzed data from never smokers and did not account
10 for youth who may have previously experimented with conventional cigarettes. E-cigarette use
11 could also be associated with increased intentions to smoke cigarettes among experimenters.
12 Additionally, NYTS was conducted among in-school youth, which may have led to biases
13 (Biglan, Gilpin, Rohrbach, & Pierce, 2004) because youth who have dropped out of school have
14 higher smoking prevalence than in-school youth (Townsend, Flisher, & King 2007).
15

16
17 Since NYTS is a cross-sectional survey, we cannot determine the causal or temporal direction of
18 the association between e-cigarettes and intention to smoke among youth, but either scenario
19 raises public health concerns. If youth with intentions to smoke initiate ENDS, they are being
20 exposed to nicotine, which can be harmful to adolescent brain development regardless of
21 whether they progress to cigarette smoking (DHHS 2014). Overcoming the barriers to obtaining
22 and using e-cigarettes could also make youth more likely to use conventional cigarettes. In
23 addition, e-cigarette use can lead to nicotine addiction, which increases risk of combustible
24 product use (DHHS 2014). On the other hand, if the temporal direction is reversed and ENDS
25 use leads youth to develop intentions to smoke conventional cigarettes, then ENDS use could
26 result in higher smoking prevalence among youth and ultimately in higher smoking-related
27 morbidity and mortality. Although longitudinal studies could empirically validate the predictive
28 value of a smoking intention measure in the context of ENDS, a controlled trial assessing ENDS
29 use among youth would not be ethical given the known harms of nicotine. Irrespective of
30 causality, non-smoking youth who use e-cigarettes have nearly double the rate of smoking
31 intention, a finding which, from a public health perspective, merits prevention efforts to protect
32 youth.
33

34
35 Our nationally representative findings that youth e-cigarette use is associated with intentions to
36 smoke conventional cigarettes have important public health implications. Interventions to
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 prevent youth access and exposure to ENDS marketing on the internet, television, and elsewhere
4 could help reduce product appeal and use. For example, some state and local authorities have
5 already established a minimum legal age of purchase and prohibiting use of e-cigarettes in
6 smoke-free establishments (American Nonsmokers' Rights Foundation, 2014) and efforts to
7 protect youth are expanding. Furthermore, when FDA's proposed rule released in April 2014 to
8 extend its jurisdictional authorities to other tobacco products is finalized, FDA will have
9 authority to regulate the manufacture, marketing and distribution of ENDS, which includes, in
10 the proposed rule, establishing federal regulations concerning minimum age of purchase, and
11 requiring health warnings on products. There is also the potential to establish product standards
12 in the future focused on diminishing the product's appeal, addictiveness, and/or harm (GPO
13 2014). For youth, further research on the impact of e-cigarette marketing, perceptions about the
14 health risks of e-cigarettes, and the impact of youth e-cigarette use on the transition to
15 conventional cigarette or cigar use could help inform public health efforts, including regulation.
16 . However, while further research may be needed to clarify the net population impact of ENDS
17 for adults, youth are particularly susceptible to the effects of nicotine and timely prevention
18 efforts are needed to protect this vulnerable population. . Enhancement of tobacco prevention
19 efforts at the local, state and federal levels could help avert premature death and disease for 5.6
20 million of today's children.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 **FUNDING**

41
42 There were no sources of funding, direct or indirect, for the reported research.
43
44

45 **DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

46
47 The authors have no competing interests to report.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

REFERENCES

- American Nonsmokers' Rights Foundation. (2014). U.S. State and local laws regulating use of electronic cigarettes. Retrieved from <http://www.no-smoke.org/pdf/ecigslaws.pdf>. Accessed April 25, 2014.
- Arrazola, R.A., Kuiper N.M., Dube, S.R..(2014) Patterns of current use of tobacco products among U.S. high school students for 2000-2012--findings from the National Youth Tobacco Survey. *Journal of Adolescent Health* 2014 Jan 54(1):54-60.e9. doi: 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2013.08.003.
- Benowitz, N. L. (2014). "Emerging nicotine delivery products. Implications for public health." *Annals of American Thoracic Society* **11**(2): 231-235. doi: 10.1513/AnnalsATS.201312-433PS
- Biglan, M., E. A. Gilpin, L. A. Rohrbach and J. P. Pierce (2004). "Is there a simple correction factor for comparing adolescent tobacco-use estimates from school- and home-based surveys?" *Nicotine & Tobacco Research* **6**(3): 427-437
- Brown A., Moodie C., Hastings G. (2009). A longitudinal study of policy effect (smoke-free legislation) on smoking norms: ITC Scotland/United Kingdom. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research*, *11*, 924-932. doi: 10.1093/ntr/ntp087
- Callahan-Lyon P. (2014). Electronic cigarettes: human health effects. *Tobacco Control*, *23*, ii36–ii40. doi: 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2013-051470
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). (2013). Notes from the field: electronic cigarette use among middle and high school students – United States, 2011-2012. *Morbidity & Mortality Weekly Report*, *62*, 729–730.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). (2013). "Tobacco product use among middle and high school students--United States, 2011 and 2012." *Morbidity & Mortality Weekly Report* **62**(45): 893-897.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). (2014). Best Practices for Comprehensive Tobacco Control Programs--2014. Atlanta, GA.
- Choi, W. S., E. A. Gilpin, A. J. Farkas and J. P. Pierce (2001). "Determining the probability of future smoking among adolescents." *Addiction* **96**(2): 313-323.
- de Andrade, M., G. Hastings and K. Angus (2013). "Promotion of electronic cigarettes: tobacco marketing reinvented?" *British Medical Journal* **347**: f7473. doi: 10.1136/bmj.f7473
- Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). (2012). *Preventing Tobacco Use Among Youth and Young Adults: A Report of the Surgeon General*. Atlanta GA.

1
2
3 Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). (2014). *The Health Consequences of*
4 *Smoking—50 Years of Progress: A Report of the Surgeon General*. Atlanta, GA: U.S.
5 Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention,
6 National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Office on Smoking and
7 Health. <http://www.surgeongeneral.gov/library/reports/50-years-of-progress/index.html>.
8 Accessed April 20, 2014.
9
10

11
12 Dube, S. R., R. A. Arrazola, J. Lee, M. Engstrom and A. Malarcher (2013). "Pro-tobacco
13 influences and susceptibility to smoking cigarettes among middle and high school students--
14 United States, 2011." *Journal of Adolescent Health* **52**(5 Suppl): S45-51. doi:
15 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2012.07.007
16
17

18 Durmowicz, E. L. (2014). "The impact of electronic cigarettes on the paediatric population."
19 *Tobacco Control* **23** Suppl 2: ii41-ii46. doi: 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2013-051468
20
21

22 Government Printing Office (GPO). (2014). Federal Register / Vol. 79, No. 80 / Friday, April 25,
23 2014 / Proposed Rules. Retrieved from [http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2014-04-25/pdf/2014-](http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2014-04-25/pdf/2014-09491.pdf)
24 [09491.pdf](http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2014-04-25/pdf/2014-09491.pdf). Accessed May 12, 2014.
25
26

27 Grana, R., N. Benowitz and S. A. Glantz (2014). "E-cigarettes: a scientific review." *Circulation*
28 **129**(19): 1972-1986. doi: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.114.007667
29
30

31 Grana, R. A. and P. M. Ling (2014). ""Smoking revolution": a content analysis of electronic
32 cigarette retail websites." *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* **46**(4): 395-403. doi:
33 10.1016/j.amepre.2013.12.010
34
35

36 Kim, A. E., K. Y. Arnold and O. Makarenko (2014). "E-cigarette advertising expenditures in the
37 U.S., 2011-2012." *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* **46**(4): 409-412. doi:
38 10.1016/j.amepre.2013.11.003
39
40

41 King, B. A., S. Alam, G. Promoff, R. Arrazola and S. R. Dube (2013). "Awareness and ever-use
42 of electronic cigarettes among U.S. adults, 2010-2011." *Nicotine & Tobacco Research* **15**(9):
43 1623-1627. doi: 10.1093/ntr/ntt013. Epub 2013 Feb 28
44
45

46 King, B. A., M. A. Tynan, S. R. Dube and R. Arrazola (2014). "Flavored-little-cigar and
47 flavored-cigarette use among U.S. middle and high school students." *Journal of Adolescent*
48 *Health* **54**(1): 40-46. doi: 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2013.07.033. Epub 2013 Oct 22.
49
50

51 Kornfield, R., J. Huang, L. Vera and S. L. Emery (2014). "Rapidly increasing promotional
52 expenditures for e-cigarettes." *Tobacco Control* **2014** Apr 30. doi: 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2014-
53 051580
54
55

1
2
3 Morrison, M. A., D. M. Krugman and P. Park (2008). "Under the radar: smokeless tobacco
4 advertising in magazines with substantial youth readership." *American Journal of Public Health*
5 **98**(3): 543-548.
6
7

8 Pepper JK, Emery SL, Ribisl KM, Brewer NT. "How U.S. adults find out about electronic
9 cigarettes: implications for public health messages." *Nicotine Tob Res.* 2014 Apr 22. doi:
10 10.1093/ntr/ntu060
11

12
13 Pierce, J. P., W. S. Choi, E. A. Gilpin, A. J. Farkas and R. K. Merritt (1996). "Validation of
14 susceptibility as a predictor of which adolescents take up smoking in the United States." *Health*
15 *Psychology* **15**(5): 355-361.
16

17
18 Pierce, J. P., J. M. Distefan, R. M. Kaplan and E. A. Gilpin (2005). "The role of curiosity in
19 smoking initiation." *Addictive Behaviors* **30**(4): 685-696.
20

21
22 Pierce, J. P., L. Lee and E. A. Gilpin (1994). "Smoking initiation by adolescent girls, 1944
23 through 1988. An association with targeted advertising." *Journal of American Medical*
24 *Association* **271**(8): 608-611.
25

26
27 Richtel M. (2014, March 4). E-cigarettes, by Other Names, Lure Young and Worry Experts. *The*
28 *New York Times*. Retrieved from [http://www.nytimes.com/2014/03/05/business/e-cigarettes-](http://www.nytimes.com/2014/03/05/business/e-cigarettes-under-aliases-elude-the-authorities.html?_r=0)
29 [under-aliases-elude-the-authorities.html?_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2014/03/05/business/e-cigarettes-under-aliases-elude-the-authorities.html?_r=0). Accessed May 17, 2014.
30

31
32 Sebastian, Michael. (May 2014). E-Cig Marketing Budgets Growing by More than 100% Year
33 over Year, *Advertisement Age*. Retrieved from: [http://adage.com/article/media/e-cig-companies-](http://adage.com/article/media/e-cig-companies-spent-60-million-ads-year/292641/)
34 [spent-60-million-ads-year/292641/](http://adage.com/article/media/e-cig-companies-spent-60-million-ads-year/292641/)) Accessed May 29, 2014.
35

36
37 Sussman, S., C. W. Dent, B. R. Flay, W. B. Hansen and C. A. Johnson (1987). "Psychosocial
38 predictors of cigarette smoking onset by white, black, Hispanic, and Asian adolescents in
39 Southern California." *Morbidity & Mortality Weekly Report* **36 Suppl 4**: 11s-16s.
40

41
42 Tomar, S. L. (2003). "Smokeless tobacco use is a significant predictor of smoking when
43 appropriately modeled." *Nicotine & Tobacco Research* **5**(4): 571-573.
44

45
46 Townsend, L., A. J. Flisher and G. King (2007). "A systematic review of the relationship
47 between high school dropout and substance use." *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*
48 **10**(4): 295-317.
49

50
51 Wagener T.L., Siegel M., Borrelli B. (2012). Electronic cigarettes: achieving a balanced
52 perspective. *Addiction*, *107*, 1545–1548. doi: 10.1111/j.1360-0443.2012.03826.x
53

54
55 Wakefield, M., D. D. Kloska, P. M. O'Malley, L. D. Johnston, F. Chaloupka, J. Pierce, G.
56 Giovino, ...B. R. Flay (2004). "The role of smoking intentions in predicting future smoking
57 among youth: findings from Monitoring the Future data." *Addiction* **99**(7): 914-922.
58
59
60

1
2
3 Warner K.E., Goldenhar L.M. (1989). The cigarette advertising broadcast ban and magazine
4 coverage of smoking and health. *Journal of Public Health Policy*, 10, 32-42.
5
6

7 Widome, R., B. Brock, E. G. Klein and J. L. Forster (2012). "Smokeless tobacco advertising at
8 the point of sale: prevalence, placement, and demographic correlates." *Nicotine & Tobacco*
9 *Research* 14(2): 217-223. doi: 10.1093/ntr/ntr188. Epub 2011 Nov 11
10
11

12 Zhan, W., L. C. Dierker, J. S. Rose, A. Selya and R. J. Mermelstein (2012). "The natural course
13 of nicotine dependence symptoms among adolescent smokers." *Nicotine & Tobacco Research*
14 **14**(12): 1445-1452. doi: 10.1093/ntr/nts031. Epub 2012 Mar 15
15
16

17 Zhu SH¹, Gamst A, Lee M, Cummins S, Yin L, and Zoref L. (2013). "The use and perception of
18 electronic cigarettes and snus among the U.S. population." *PLoS One*. 2013 Oct
19 24;8(10):e79332. doi: 10.1371/jone.0079332. eCollection 2013.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1: Smoking intention and characteristics of middle and high school students who were never smokers, National Youth Tobacco Survey, 2011-2013

		Never smoker (n= 43,873)	Never smoker, No smoking intention (n=33,951)	Never smoker, Smoking intention (n= 9,897)	Chi-squared test p-value
		% (95% CI)	% (95% CI)	% (95% CI)	
Characteristics and exposures:					
Smoking intention	Yes	21.9 (21.2-22.6)	---	---	---
	No	78.1 (77.4-78.8)	---	---	---
Year	2011	32.4 (28.2-36.9)	77.2 (75.8-78.5)	22.8 (21.5-24.2)	<0.001
	2012	33.7 (30.1-37.4)	75.0 (74.1-75.9)	25.0 (24.1-25.9)	
	2013	33.9 (30.1-37.9)	82.1 (81.1-83.2)	17.9 (16.8-18.9)	
Sex	Female	50.4 (49.6-51.1)	78.4 (77.5-79.4)	21.6 (20.6-22.5)	0.255
	Male	49.6 (48.9-50.4)	77.8 (77.0-78.6)	22.2 (21.4-23.0)	
School	Middle	51.2 (48.2-54.2)	78.7 (77.8-79.6)	21.3 (20.4-22.2)	0.054
	High	48.8 (45.8-51.8)	77.4 (76.3-78.5)	22.6 (21.5-23.7)	
Race/Ethnicity	Non-Hispanic White	55.4 (52.4-58.3)	79.4 (78.5-80.3)	20.6 (19.7-21.5)	<0.001
	Non-Hispanic Black	14.2 (12.4-16.3)	80.3 (78.5-81.9)	19.7 (18.1-21.5)	
	Hispanic	19.6 (17.8-21.5)	72.5 (71.1-73.9)	27.5 (26.1-28.9)	
	Non-Hispanic Other	10.8 (9.8-11.9)	79.0 (77.1-80.7)	21.0 (19.3-22.9)	
Internet ads	Yes	40.5 (39.6-41.3)	73.7 (72.7-74.7)	26.3 (25.3-27.3)	<0.001
	No	59.5 (58.7-60.4)	81.2 (80.4-81.9)	18.8 (18.1-19.6)	
Magazine/newspaper ads	Yes	37.0 (36.1-37.8)	74.6 (73.5-75.6)	25.4 (24.4-26.5)	<0.001
	No	63.0 (62.2-63.9)	80.2 (79.4-81.0)	19.8 (19.0-20.6)	
Retail ads	Yes	76.9 (76.0-77.8)	76.7 (75.9-77.5)	23.3 (22.5-24.1)	<0.001
	No	23.1 (22.2-24.0)	82.9 (81.9-84.0)	17.1 (16.0-18.1)	
Television program/movie ads	Yes	69.2 (68.3-70.0)	76.7 (75.9-77.4)	23.3 (22.6-24.1)	<0.001
	No	30.8 (30.0-31.7)	81.5 (80.4-82.6)	18.5 (17.4-19.6)	
Total number of distinct sources of pro-tobacco advertisements exposed to	None	10.0 (9.5-10.5)	87.0 (85.5-88.3)	13.0 (11.7-14.5)	<0.001
	1-2	47.8 (47.1-48.6)	79.6 (78.8-80.5)	20.4 (19.5-21.2)	
	3-4	42.2 (41.4-43.0)	74.4 (73.4-75.3)	25.6 (24.7-26.6)	
Household member uses tobacco	Yes	34.3 (33.0-35.7)	73.3 (72.1-74.5)	26.7 (25.5-27.9)	<0.001
	No	65.7 (64.3-67.0)	80.6 (79.8-81.4)	19.4 (18.6-20.2)	
Ever Use:					
Electronic cigarettes	Yes	0.9 (0.7-1.1)	56.1 (49.1-62.9)	43.9 (37.1-50.9)	<0.001
	No	99.1 (98.9-99.3)	78.5 (77.8-79.4)	21.5 (20.9-22.2)	
Other combustible tobacco products	Yes	7.7 (7.1-8.2)	61.7 (59.5-63.8)	38.3 (36.2-40.5)	<0.001
	No	92.3 (91.8-92.9)	79.5 (78.8-80.2)	20.5 (19.8-21.2)	
Other non-combustible tobacco products	Yes	3.0 (2.6-3.3)	58.6 (55.7-61.5)	41.4 (38.5-44.3)	<0.001
	No	97.0 (96.7-97.4)	78.7 (78.0-79.4)	21.3 (20.6-22.0)	
Current (past 30 day) Use:					
Electronic cigarettes	Yes	0.3 (0.2-0.4)	58.2 (47.5-68.1)	41.8 (31.9-52.5)	<0.001
	No	99.7 (99.6-99.8)	78.3 (77.6-79.0)	21.7 (21.0-22.4)	
Other combustible tobacco products	Yes	2.6 (2.4-2.9)	60.4 (56.4-64.3)	39.6 (35.7-43.6)	<0.001
	No	97.4 (97.1-97.6)	78.6 (77.9-79.3)	21.4 (20.7-22.1)	

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

Other non-combustible tobacco products	Yes	1.0 (0.9-1.2)	59.3 (54.1-64.3)	40.7 (35.7-45.9)	<0.001
	No	99.0 (98.8-99.1)	78.3 (77.6-79.0)	21.7 (21.0-22.4)	

Accepted Manuscript

Table 2: Factors associated with smoking intention among middle and high school students who are never smokers, NYTS 2011-2013

		NEVER SMOKER MODELS			
		MODEL 1—Ever use of tobacco products		MODEL 2—Current use of tobacco products	
		Adjusted OR (95% CI)	p-value	Adjusted OR (95% CI)	p-value
Year	2011	Referent	---	Referent	---
	2012	1.12 (1.02-1.23)	0.014	1.13 (1.04-1.24)	0.007
	2013	0.70 (0.63-0.78)	<0.001	0.72 (0.65-0.81)	<0.001
Sex	Female	Referent	---	Referent	---
	Male	1.03 (0.96-1.11)	0.373	1.06 (0.99-1.14)	0.103
School	Middle	Referent	---	Referent	---
	High	0.95 (0.88-1.11)	.204	1.01 (0.94-1.10)	0.732
Race/Ethnicity	Non-Hispanic White	Referent	---	Referent	---
	Non-Hispanic Black	0.97 (0.86-1.09)	0.624	0.98 (0.88-1.10)	0.755
	Hispanic	1.60 (1.46-1.75)	<0.001	1.58 (1.44-1.73)	<0.001
	Non-Hispanic Other	1.07 (0.95-1.20)	0.262	1.06 (0.95-1.20)	0.300
Total number of distinct sources of pro-tobacco ads exposed to	None	Referent	---	Referent	---
	1-2	1.68 (1.45-1.95)	<0.001	1.67 (1.45-1.93)	<0.001
	3-4	2.30 (1.97-2.68)	<0.001	2.31 (2.00-2.67)	<0.001
Household member uses tobacco	No	Referent	---	Referent	---
	Yes	1.37 (1.28-1.46)	<0.001	1.41 (1.32-1.52)	<0.001
Ever Use:					
Electronic cigarettes	No	Referent	---	---	---
	Yes	1.70 (1.24-2.32)	<0.001	---	---
Other combustible tobacco products	No	Referent	---	---	---
	Yes	2.08 (1.87-2.32)	<0.001	---	---
Other non-combustible tobacco products	No	Referent	---	---	---
	Yes	1.92 (1.65-2.23)	<0.001	---	---
Current (past 30 day) Use:					
Electronic cigarettes	No	---	---	Referent	---
	Yes	---	---	1.87 (1.17-2.97)	0.009
Other combustible tobacco products	No	---	---	Referent	---
	Yes	---	---	2.03 (1.69-2.45)	<0.001
Other non-combustible tobacco products	No	---	---	Referent	---
	Yes	---	---	1.77 (1.40-2.24)	<0.001