

1 **Title:** Changing patterns of cigarette and ENDS transitions in the USA: a multistate transition analysis of  
2 adults in the PATH Study in 2017–2019 vs 2019–2021

3 **Authors:** Andrew F. Brouwer<sup>1\*</sup>, Jihyoun Jeon<sup>1</sup>, Evelyn Jimenez-Mendoza<sup>1</sup>, Stephanie R. Land<sup>2</sup>, Theodore  
4 R. Holford<sup>3</sup>, Abigail S. Friedman<sup>4</sup>, Jamie Tam<sup>4</sup>, Ritesh Mistry<sup>5</sup>, David T. Levy<sup>6</sup>, Rafael Meza<sup>7</sup>

5 **Affiliations:**

- 6 1. Department of Epidemiology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, United States
- 7 2. Tobacco Control Research Branch, National Cancer Institute, Rockville, MD, United States
- 8 3. Department of Biostatistics, Yale University, New Haven, CT, United States
- 9 4. Department of Health Management and Policy, Yale University, New Haven, CT, United States
- 10 5. Department of Health Behavior and Health Education, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI,  
11 United States
- 12 6. Department of Oncology, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, United States
- 13 7. Department of Integrative Oncology, BC Cancer Research Institute, Vancouver, British Columbia,  
14 Canada

15 **Corresponding authors\***: email: [brouweaf@umich.edu](mailto:brouweaf@umich.edu); mail: Department of Epidemiology, 1415  
16 Washington Heights, Ann Arbor, MI, 48109, United States

17 **Word count:**

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

## Abstract

**Introduction:** The use of cigarettes and electronic nicotine delivery system (ENDS) has likely changed since 2019 with the rise of pods and disposables, the outbreak of lung injuries related to vaping THC, flavor bans, and the COVID pandemic. We analyzed patterns of initiation, cessation, and transitions between cigarettes, ENDS, and dual use before and after 2019.

**Methods:** Using the Population Assessment of Tobacco and Health (PATH) Study, we applied a multistate transition model to 28,061 adults in Waves 4–5 (2017–19) and 24,751 adults in Waves 5–6 (2019–21), estimating transition rates for initiation, cessation, and switching products for each period overall and by age group.

**Results:** Cigarette initiation among adults who never used either product decreased from 2017–19 to 2019–21, but ENDS initiation did not significantly change. Persistence of ENDS-only use remained high, with 75–80% still using ENDS only after 1 year. Cigarette-only use transitions remained similar, with about 88% remaining, 7% transitioning to non-current use, and 5% transitioning to dual or ENDS-only use. In contrast, dual use to ENDS-only transitions increased from 9.5% (95%CI: 7.3–11.7%) to 20.1% (95%CI: 17.5–22.7%) per year from 2017–19 to 2019–21, decreasing the persistence of dual use. The dual use to cigarette-only transition remained at about 25%. These changes were qualitatively similar across adult age groups, though adults ages 18–24 years exhibited the highest probability of switching from cigarette-only use to dual use and from dual use to ENDS-only use.

**Conclusions:** Persistence of ENDS use among adults remained high in 2019–21, but a larger fraction of dual users transitioned to ENDS-only use compared to 2017–19. Because the fraction of cigarette-only users switching to dual use remained low, the public health implications of the increased dual use to ENDS-only transition are minimal.

**Keywords:** tobacco, cigarette, electronic nicotine delivery system (ENDS), dual use, transition, multistate transition model

## 44 **Introduction**

45 The landscape of tobacco and nicotine products in the US and other countries has evolved quickly over  
46 the past decade. Electronic nicotine delivery systems (ENDS), including e-cigarettes, have transformed  
47 from cig-a-likes, refillables, and tank systems—which initially used freebase nicotine that was  
48 unpalatable at higher nicotine concentrations—to pod mods and disposables that use nicotine salts,  
49 often perceived as less harsh.<sup>1–5</sup> As ENDS products have changed, so too have patterns of transitions  
50 between ENDS and cigarette products.<sup>6,7</sup> Moreover, recent events and policies, including the lung injury  
51 outbreak in 2019,<sup>8</sup> the COVID-19 pandemic, and the increasing restriction of ENDS flavors,<sup>9</sup> may have  
52 further shifted patterns of use and transition between ENDS and cigarettes.

53 Understanding product transitions is key to determining the likely public health benefit or harm of  
54 ENDS.<sup>10–12</sup> If ENDS promote cigarette cessation, reduced smoking, or divert those who would have  
55 otherwise smoked, there would be a benefit to public health.<sup>13–16</sup> However, there remain concerns  
56 about youth initiation, particularly as many flavors are targeted to youth,<sup>17,18</sup> as well as concerns that  
57 ENDS may interfere with long-term cigarette cessation because of continued or enhanced nicotine  
58 addiction.<sup>19–21</sup> Many of the clinical trials that suggested ENDS can facilitate cigarette cessation used early  
59 generation products that bear little resemblance to products more recently on the market,<sup>13,14</sup> and the  
60 real-world effectiveness may differ from the efficacy measured in clinical trials for many reasons. Hence,  
61 continued analysis of how actual transition rates change over time is important for tracking real-world  
62 associations between ENDS and other product use and providing the information necessary to project  
63 future public health outcomes.

64 In previous work, we analyzed transitions in the Population Assessment of Tobacco and Health (PATH)  
65 Study Waves 1–5 (2013–19), a nationally representative longitudinal survey of the US, using a multistate  
66 transition model.<sup>6,7</sup> Multistate transition models estimate the transition rates that underly observed  
67 transitions between product.<sup>22–31</sup> In this analysis, we extend our models to compare transitions observed  
68 in PATH in 2017–19 to 2019–21.

## 69 **Methods**

### 70 **Data**

71 The Population Assessment of Tobacco and Health (PATH) Study is a nationally representative  
72 longitudinal cohort study of tobacco and nicotine product use behaviors in the US among the civilian,

73 noninstitutionalized adult population. Our analysis compared 28,061 adults in the Wave 4 cohort in  
74 Waves 4–5 (Dec 2016 to Nov 2019, abbreviated as 2017–19) and 24,751 adults in the Wave 4 cohort in  
75 Waves 5–6 (Dec 2018 to Nov 2021, abbreviated as 2019–21). Although this analysis primarily focuses on  
76 the differences between 2017–19 and 2019–21, we include previous results in 2015–17 in the  
77 supplementary material for comparison purposes (Figures S1–S3).<sup>7</sup>

78 Follow-up time for participants was approximately two years between Waves 4 and 5 and between  
79 Waves 5 and 6, and follow-up time was treated as exactly two years in the model. The multistate  
80 transition framework explicitly accounts for the time between observations and for potential  
81 unobserved transitions, so one-year transition probabilities can be estimated from two-year data. We  
82 categorized participants as ages 18–24, 25–34, or 35–90 years. This set of groups was chosen because  
83 our transition estimates were not well-powered for participants ages 55–90 alone in 2019–21.

84 Each participant’s product use was categorized as never established use (of either product), non-current  
85 use, cigarette-only use, ENDS-only use, or dual use of cigarettes and ENDS, as in previous work.<sup>6,7</sup>

86 Established cigarette use was defined as having smoked at least 100 cigarettes in one’s lifetime, and  
87 established ENDS use was defined as ever “fairly regularly” using ENDS. Current use of cigarettes and  
88 ENDS was defined as any past 30-day use by an established use of that product, and current dual use  
89 was defined as current use of both cigarettes and ENDS by established users of both products. Non-  
90 current use was defined as no past 30-day use of either product by a participant who had established  
91 use of one or both products. Characteristics of the populations are given in the supplementary material  
92 (Table S1). This analysis was not regulated as human subjects research (University of Michigan  
93 Institutional Review Board HUM00162265).

#### 94 **Transition modeling**

95 We applied our multistate transition model to analyze the underlying transition hazard rates between  
96 product use for adults overall and in each of the three age categories (18–24, 25–34, or 35–90 years) in  
97 each of the two time periods (2017–19, 2019–21). Multistate transition models are finite-state,  
98 stochastic process models that assume that transition hazard rates depend only on the current state and  
99 not on past states or transition history. Technical details of the multistate transition model are provided  
100 in the Supplemental Material. Using discrete-time observations, the model estimated instantaneous risk  
101 of transition from one state to another, i.e., transition hazard rates, which collectively define the  
102 probability of transitioning from one state to any other at a future time. We incorporated Wave 4

103 longitudinal survey weights into the model. Using the estimated transition rates, we estimated the 1-  
104 year transition probabilities for each group for the two time periods separately. Additionally, two-sided  
105 p-values for whether transition rates were significantly different between periods were calculated as  
106 described in the Supplemental Material using the replicate weights provided by PATH. Multistate  
107 transition models were estimated using the `wmsm` function<sup>6</sup> in R (publicly available at  
108 [https://tcors.umich.edu/Resources\\_Research.php](https://tcors.umich.edu/Resources_Research.php)), which is an extension of the `msm` function<sup>32</sup>  
109 modified to incorporate participant weights.

## 110 Results

111 Over 2019–21, the average weighted prevalence of never established use was 57.7%, the prevalence of  
112 non-current use was 23.7%, the prevalence of cigarette-only use was 14.2%, the prevalence of ENDS-  
113 only use was 2.5%, and the prevalence of dual cigarette and ENDS use was 1.9%.

### 114 Transition hazard rates

115 There were three transitions that statistically significantly changed between 2017–19 and 2019–21  
116 (Figure 1). The transition rate of cigarette initiation declined for adults in 2019–21 ( $p=0.02$ ). The  
117 transition rate from ENDS-only use to non-current use increased in 2019–21 ( $p=0.005$ ). The dual use to  
118 ENDS-only use transition also increased in 2019–21 rate ( $p<0.001$ ).

119 **Figure 1:** *Transition hazard rates among adults in 2017–19 (Waves 4–5) and 2019–21 (Waves 5–6). A*  
120 *version of this figure including previous results from 2015–17 (Waves 2–4) is given in Figure S1.*

### 121 Transition probabilities

122 The changing transition rates resulted in changes in the 1-year transition probabilities (Figure 2). The  
123 transition patterns for those with never established use, non-current use, and cigarette only use  
124 remained largely similar between the two periods, with the large majority remaining in the same use  
125 state (never established use persistence: 98.8% (95% CI: 98.6–98.9%) and 98.6% (95% CI: 98.4–98.8%) in  
126 the two periods; non-current use persistence: 96.3% (95%CI: 95.9–96.7%) and 96.8% (95%CI: 96.4–  
127 97.2%); and cigarette-only use: 88.2% (95%CI: 87.3–89.9%) and 88.2% (95%CI: 87.4–89.0%)). ENDS  
128 uptake among adults who only use cigarettes remained low, with 3.8% (95%CI: 3.4–4.2%) and 4.0%  
129 (95%CI: 3.5–4.4%) transitioning.

130 The ENDS cessation probability increased slightly from 13.9% (95%CI: 11.9–16.0%) to 18.1% (95%CI:  
131 16.2–19.9%). The transition patterns for those who dual used both products changed substantially over

132 this period, driven by the increase in cigarette cessation. Specifically, from 2017–19 to 2019–21, the  
133 transition probability from dual to cigarette-only use did not significantly change, but the transition  
134 probability from dual to ENDS-only use nearly doubled, increasing from 9.5% (95%CI: 7.3–11.7%) to  
135 20.1% (95%CI: 17.5–22.7%). This increase was at the expense of the persistence of dual use, which  
136 decreased from 63.8% (95%CI: 59.9–67.6%) to 50.0% (95%CI: 46.1–54.0%) between the periods. There  
137 was no analogous increase in the cigarette-only to non-current use transition, which remained low at  
138 6.8% (95%CI 6.2–7.5%) and 7.1% (6.4–7.7%) in the two periods.

139 **Figure 2:** *One-year transition probabilities for adults in A. 2017–19 (Waves 4–5), and B. 2019–21 (Waves*  
140 *5–6). Confidence intervals, including previous results from 2015–17 (Waves 2–4), are shown in Figure S2.*  
141 *The transitions weighted by each use state’s prevalence are given in Figure S4.*

142 Considering the age-stratified transition probabilities (Figure 3), most of the changes in transitions for  
143 those using ENDS only or dual using both products were qualitatively similar across the age groups. The  
144 persistence of e-cigarette-only use remained similar in 2017–19 and 2019–21, decreasing somewhat for  
145 ages 25–34 only. Persistence of dual use decreased in 2019–21 for all three groups, accompanied by an  
146 increase in the transition probability of dual to ENDS-only.

147 In 2019–21, young adults ages 18–24 were more likely to transition from cigarette-only use to dual use  
148 15.3% (95%CI: 9.6–21.0%) than those ages 25–34 (6.8% (95%CI: 5.4–8.2%)) or ages 35–90 (2.3% (95%CI:  
149 1.9–2.7%)). Additionally, while the dual use to ENDS-only transition increased for all age groups, it was  
150 higher for young adults (28.0% (95%CI: 21.6–34.4%) than for the other two ages groups (19.2% (95%CI:  
151 14.2–24.1%) and 16.8% (95%CI: 13.0–20.7%), respectively).

152  
153 **Figure 3:** *One-year transition probabilities for adults ages 18–24 (A–C), ages 25–34 (D–F), and ages 35–*  
154 *90 (G–I). Each of the three plots compares periods 2015–17 (Waves 2–4), 2017–19 (Waves 4–5), and*  
155 *2019–21 (Waves 5–6). Confidence intervals, including previous results from 2015–17 (Waves 2–4), are*  
156 *shown in Figure S3.*

157

## 158 Discussion

159 Changing marketplaces, policy environments, public health crises, and evolving attitudes and  
160 perceptions of products have made it difficult to predict short-term patterns of use of cigarettes and

161 ENDS, let alone their longer-term impacts on public health. In previous work, we had identified dramatic  
162 increases in the persistence of ENDS-only and dual use of cigarettes and ENDS around the time of the  
163 marketplace shift to pod mod products, including JUUL.<sup>7</sup> Here, we found that many of the transition  
164 rates that significantly changed from 2015–17 to 2017–19 did not significantly change again in 2017–19  
165 to 2019–21 (Figure S1), including the non-current to cigarette-only use, cigarette-only to non-current  
166 use, ENDS-only to dual use, and dual to cigarette-only use transitions. We did find three significant  
167 changes in transition rates from 2017–19 to 2019–21: a decline in never-established to cigarette-only  
168 use, an increase in ENDS-only to non-current use, and an increase in dual to ENDS-only use. From the  
169 perspective of reducing cigarette use, these changes appear to be beneficial, but the big picture  
170 underscores the overall public health challenge (Figure S4), with high persistence of cigarette, ENDS, and  
171 dual use. In particular, because dual use remained uncommon (1.9% among adults overall) and ENDS  
172 uptake among adults who smoke cigarettes remained low (<5% switching to dual or ENDS-only use in  
173 one year), particularly for those ages 25 and older, the population public health impact of the increase in  
174 the dual to ENDS-only use transition is likely to be limited.

175 While dual use remained persistent, potentially fueling concerns that continued nicotine addiction  
176 through ENDS use may make cigarette cessation more difficult, there is evidence of increased harm  
177 reduction as well, with an increased fraction of adults who dual used both products having transitioned  
178 to ENDS-only use. Although that fraction remains small (overall, we estimated 20.1% of those who used  
179 both products transitioned to ENDS-only use in one year), it exceeded the fraction of participants who  
180 transitioned from cigarette-only to non-current use (7.1% overall). However, we cannot attribute the  
181 increased cigarette cessation from dual use to participants' use of ENDS; the pattern may be a result of  
182 demographic differences between dual and cigarette users or of ENDS use being an indicator of trying to  
183 quit. Additionally, our results continue to highlight the importance of understanding the different  
184 patterns among different stages of adulthood. Adoption of ENDS among those who currently or  
185 previously used cigarettes was much greater among those ages 18–24 (15.3%) than among those ages  
186 25–34 (6.8%) and was nearly negligible among older adults (2.3%) in 2019–21.

187 There were multiple major public health events and policy changes during the 2019–21 period that  
188 could have affected public perception and behaviors around cigarette and ENDS use. Following sharply  
189 increased rates of ENDS use among youth in 2018, the US Surgeon General declared youth ENDS use to  
190 be an “epidemic”<sup>33</sup> Less than a year later, the outbreak of vaping-related lung injuries began in August

191 2019 and continued through the end of the year.<sup>8</sup> Although the injuries are now thought to largely be  
192 associated with the use of vitamin E acetate as a diluent for tetrahydrocannabinol (THC) containing  
193 liquids, early CDC reports suggested nicotine vaping as the cause.<sup>8,34</sup> The consequent emphasis on  
194 dangers of vaping in US news resulted in more negative public perceptions of ENDS use and more of the  
195 public discourse focusing on their potential dangers to youth,<sup>35-39</sup> in contrast to countries like the UK,  
196 where there has been more emphasis on ENDS' potential benefits for adults.<sup>40,41</sup> Additionally, in the US,  
197 many states and localities enacted restrictions or bans on flavored ENDS sales in 2020 and 2021.<sup>9</sup>

198 Early 2020 marked the start of the COVID-19 pandemic in the US, as SARS-CoV-2 spread rapidly across  
199 the country. Cigarette smoking was quickly found to be a risk factor for severe COVID-19 outcomes,<sup>42-44</sup>  
200 and many studies linked greater perceived risk from COVID-19 to increased motivation to quit  
201 smoking.<sup>45-47</sup> At the same time, elevated stress, particularly during lockdown or similarly restrictive  
202 periods, may have led to increased nicotine use as a coping mechanism.<sup>48</sup> Ultimately, COVID-19 appears  
203 to have resulted in a combination of conflicting pressures for and against tobacco and nicotine product  
204 use.<sup>49</sup>

205 Given the period's many public health events and policy changes, it is perhaps surprising that we do not  
206 see more changes in transition patterns for adults who use cigarettes only or ENDS only between 2017-  
207 19 and 2019-21. We did find a small increase in the ENDS-only to non-current use rate, but we found no  
208 change in the initiation rate of ENDS among never established users of cigarettes or ENDS nor in the  
209 ENDS cessation rate among those using both cigarettes and ENDS. Because the 2019 PATH data  
210 collection period encompassed December 2018 to November 2019, the changes we previously found  
211 between 2015-17 and 2017-19 may already reflect some of the changes discussed above. Also, because  
212 of the local nature of flavor restrictions, the impacts of those restrictions may not be observed at the  
213 national scale. Further, any changes in perceptions and behavior may have been short-lived, e.g., if lung-  
214 injury-related hesitance to use ENDS in 2019 or COVID-related motivation to quit smoking in early 2020  
215 became irrelevant by the time PATH collected data in 2021. Or, the lack of change may represent the  
216 disruption of existing trends, e.g., if more adults who smoke cigarettes would have taken up ENDS in the  
217 absence of the lung injury outbreak and flavor restrictions. Because we cannot know what would have  
218 happened without these events, we cannot be certain about the extent to which any individual public  
219 health event or policy change was associated with the observed transition changes.



220 The strengths of our analysis include the high-quality, nationally representative data collected by PATH  
221 and our multistate transition analysis allowing us to analyze the population-level changes in the  
222 transition rates that underly observed changes in transition probabilities over time. Additionally, our  
223 results continue to highlight the importance of understanding the different patterns of nicotine product  
224 use at different stages of adulthood, given the very different rates of adoption and transition between  
225 product use categories between younger and older adults. One limitation of this study is that we did not  
226 incorporate data from the Adult Telephone Survey conducted in 2020; we chose to omit these data for  
227 this analysis because of the sample size and change in data collection methods. Additionally, our work is  
228 limited by our focus only on adults and by a reduced set of age categories compared to previous work.<sup>7</sup>  
229 These changes were made so that the subgroups that had sufficient sizes to support inferences about all  
230 the transitions of interest. We plan to analyze youth transitions in separate work with models using a set  
231 of product use categories and transitions tailored to the youth population. Finally, our work does not  
232 account for the use of other tobacco products, such as cigars, cigarillos, or oral nicotine pouches.

233 As we discussed above, although many of the changes identified in this analysis appear to be positive  
234 from the point of view of reducing cigarette use, the overall public health implications are likely minimal.  
235 The US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is currently determining which ENDS should be authorized  
236 and potentially marketed as reduced risk products. Their primary regulatory challenge is to make  
237 decisions that encourage cigarette cessation or reduced cigarette use among adults who use cigarettes,  
238 while limiting ENDS use among youth and young adults who would never have initiated tobacco use in  
239 the absence of ENDS.<sup>18</sup> While some tobacco-flavored ENDS have received FDA marketing authorization,  
240 it is not clear if or when other flavored ENDS could be authorized. In the meantime, a regulation banning  
241 non-tobacco characterizing flavors, including menthol, in cigarettes and cigars has been proposed.<sup>50</sup> It  
242 will be important to continue to monitor how transitions in product use continue to change in response  
243 to regulatory changes, changes in the marketplace, and future public health events.

244

## 245 **What this paper adds**

- 246 • It is uncertain how recent changes in the marketplace, as well as events including the lung injury  
247 outbreak, COVID-19 pandemic, and ENDS flavor restrictions have impacted real-world product  
248 transition patterns.

- 249       • Underlying transition hazard rates can explain changes in observed transition probabilities  
250           between different patterns of cigarettes and ENDS use.
- 251       • We estimated how transition rates and probabilities changed from 2017–19 to 2019–21.
- 252       • We found decreased cigarette initiation, increased cessation from ENDS-only use, and increased  
253           transitions from dual to ENDS-only use among adults overall. ENDS uptake among cigarette-only  
254           users was highest among young adults.
- 255       • Dual use remained uncommon (1.9% among adults overall) and ENDS uptake among adult  
256           cigarette users remained low (<5% overall), so the population public health impact of the  
257           increase in the dual to ENDS-only use transition is likely to be limited.
- 258
- 259
- 260

## 261 **Acknowledgments**

262 This project was funded through National Cancer Institute (NCI) and Food and Drug Administration (FDA)  
263 grant U54CA229974. The opinions expressed in this article are the authors' own and do not reflect the  
264 views of the National Institutes of Health, the Department of Health and Human Services, or the United  
265 States government.

266

## 267 **Competing interests**

268 All authors declare that they have no competing interests.

269

## 270 **Contributors**

271 Conceptualisation and methodology: AFB and RMe; data curation: JJ and EJ-M; analysis and original  
272 draft preparation: AFB; review and editing: AFB, JJ, EJ-M, SRL, TRH, ASF, JT, RMi, DTL and RMe; funding  
273 acquisition: RMe and DTL; guarantor: AFB.

274

## 275 **Data availability statement**

276 Most data are available in a public, open access repository. Other data may be obtained from a third  
277 party and are not publicly available. Public Use Files from the Population Assessment of Tobacco and  
278 Health Study are available for download from an open access repository  
279 (<https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR36498.v18>). Restricted-use files  
280 (<https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR36231.v37>) require a restricted data use agreement. Conditions of use  
281 are available on the aforementioned websites.

282

## 283 References


- 284 1. Huang J, Duan Z, Kwok J, et al. Vaping versus JUULing: How the extraordinary growth and  
285 marketing of JUUL transformed the US retail e-cigarette market. *Tob Control*. 2019;28(2):146-  
286 151. doi:10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2018-054382
- 287 2. Ali FRM, Diaz MC, Vallone D, et al. E-cigarette Unit Sales, by Product and Flavor Type — United  
288 States, 2014–2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2020;69(37):1313-1318.  
289 doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6937e2
- 290 3. Hammond D, Reid JL, Burkhalter R, et al. Trends in e-cigarette brands, devices and the nicotine  
291 profile of products used by youth in England, Canada and the USA: 2017-2019. *Tob Control*.  
292 2021;1-11. doi:10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2020-056371
- 293 4. Leventhal AM, Madden DR, Peraza N, et al. Effect of Exposure to e-Cigarettes With Salt vs Free-  
294 Base Nicotine on the Appeal and Sensory Experience of Vaping: A Randomized Clinical Trial.  
295 *JAMA Netw open*. 2021;4(1):e2032757. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.32757
- 296 5. US Department of Health and Human Services. *Smoking Cessation: A Report of the Surgeon  
297 General*; 2020.
- 298 6. Brouwer AF, Jeon J, Hirschtick JL, et al. Transitions between cigarette, ENDS and dual use in  
299 adults in the PATH study (waves 1–4): multistate transition modelling accounting for complex  
300 survey design. *Tob Control*. 2022;31(3):424-431. doi:10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2020-055967
- 301 7. Brouwer AF, Jeon J, Jimenez-Mendoza E, et al. Changing patterns of cigarette and ENDS  
302 transitions in the USA: a multistate transition analysis of youth and adults in the PATH Study in  
303 2015–2017 vs 2017–2019. *Tob Control*. March 2023;tc-2022-057905. doi:10.1136/tc-2022-  
304 057905
- 305 8. Krishnasamy VP, Hollowell BD, Ko JY, et al. Update: Characteristics of a Nationwide Outbreak of  
306 E-cigarette, or Vaping, Product Use-Associated Lung Injury - United States, August 2019-January  
307 2020. *Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2020;69(3):90-94. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6903e2
- 308 9. Cadham CJ, Sanchez-Romero LM, Fleischer NL, et al. The actual and anticipated effects of a  
309 menthol cigarette ban: A scoping review. *BMC Public Health*. 2020;20(1):1-17.  
310 doi:10.1186/s12889-020-09055-z
- 311 10. Levy DT, Yuan Z, Li Y, Alberg AJ, Cummings KM. A modeling approach to gauging the effects of  
312 nicotine vaping product use on cessation from cigarettes: what do we know, what do we need to  
313 know? *Addiction*. 2019;114(S1):86-96. doi:10.1111/add.14530
- 314 11. Levy DT, Cummings KM, Villanti AC, et al. A framework for evaluating the public health impact of  
315 e-cigarettes and other vaporized nicotine products. *Addiction*. 2017;112(1):8-17.  
316 doi:10.1111/add.13394
- 317 12. Levy DT, Borland R, Villanti AC, et al. The Application of a Decision-Theoretic Model to Estimate  
318 the Public Health Impact of Vaporized Nicotine Product Initiation in the United States. *Nicotine  
319 Tob Res*. 2017;19(2):149-159. doi:10.1093/ntr/ntw158
- 320 13. Bullen C, Howe C, Laugesen M, et al. Electronic cigarettes for smoking cessation: a randomised  
321 controlled trial. *Lancet*. 2013;382(9905):1629-1637. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(13)61842-5
- 322 14. Hajek P, Phillips-Waller A, Przulj D, et al. A randomized trial of E-cigarettes versus nicotine-  
323 replacement therapy. *N Engl J Med*. 2019;380(7):629-637. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1808779

- 324 15. McNeill A. Should clinicians recommend e-cigarettes to their patients who smoke? Yes. *Ann Fam*  
325 *Med.* 2016;14(4):300-301. doi:10.1370/afm.1962
- 326 16. Hartmann-Boyce J, McRobbie H, Lindson N, et al. Electronic cigarettes for smoking cessation.  
327 *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2020;100(5):867. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD010216.pub4
- 328 17. McKelvey K, Baiocchi M, Ramamurthi D, McLaughlin S, Halpern-Felsher B. Youth say ads for  
329 flavored e-liquids are for them. *Addict Behav.* 2019;91:164-170.  
330 doi:10.1016/j.addbeh.2018.08.029
- 331 18. Kasza KA, Hammond D, Reid JL, Rivard C, Hyland A. Youth Use of e-Cigarette Flavor and Device  
332 Combinations and Brands Before vs After FDA Enforcement. *JAMA Netw open.*  
333 2023;6(8):e2328805. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.28805
- 334 19. Kalkhoran S, Glantz SA. E-cigarettes and smoking cessation in real-world and clinical settings: A  
335 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Respir Med.* 2016;4(2):116-128. doi:10.1016/S2213-  
336 2600(15)00521-4
- 337 20. Bhatnagar A, Payne TJ, Robertson RM. Is There A Role for Electronic Cigarettes in Tobacco  
338 Cessation? *J Am Heart Assoc.* 2019;8(12):10-13. doi:10.1161/JAHA.119.012742
- 339 21. Wang RJ, Bhadriraju S, Glantz SA. E-Cigarette Use and Adult Cigarette Smoking Cessation: A  
340 Meta-Analysis. *Am J Public Health.* 2021;111(2):230-246. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2020.305999
- 341 22. Cobb CO, Villanti AC, Graham AL, et al. Markov Modeling to Estimate the Population Impact of  
342 Emerging Tobacco Products: A Proof-of-Concept Study. *Tob Regul Sci.* 2015;1(2):129-141.  
343 doi:10.18001/TRS.1.2.3
- 344 23. Hair EC, Romberg AR, Niaura R, et al. Longitudinal Tobacco Use Transitions Among Adolescents  
345 and Young Adults: 2014–2016. *Nicotine Tob Res.* 2019;21(4):458-468. doi:10.1093/ntr/ntx285
- 346 24. Niaura R, Rich I, Johnson AL, et al. Young Adult Tobacco and E-cigarette Use Transitions:  
347 Examining Stability Using Multistate Modeling. *Nicotine Tob Res.* 2020;22(5):647-654.  
348 doi:10.1093/ntr/ntz030
- 349 25. Loukas A, Marti CN, Harrell MB. Electronic Nicotine Delivery Systems Use Predicts Transitions in  
350 Cigarette Smoking among Young Adults. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 2021;231(December  
351 2021):109251. doi:10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2021.109251
- 352 26. Mantey DS, Harrell MB, Chen B, Kelder SH, Perry CL, Loukas A. A Longitudinal Examination of  
353 Behavioral Transitions among Young Adult Menthol and Non-Menthol Cigarette Smokers Using a  
354 Three-State Markov Model. *Nicotine Tob Res.* 2021;23(6):1047-1054. doi:10.1093/ntr/ntaa240
- 355 27. Brouwer AF, Jeon J, Cook SF, et al. The Impact of Menthol Cigarette Flavor in the U.S.: Cigarette  
356 and ENDS Transitions by Sociodemographic Group. *Am J Prev Med.* 2022;62(2):243-251.  
357 doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2021.08.007
- 358 28. Brouwer AF, Levy DT, Jeon J, et al. The Impact of Current Tobacco Product Use Definitions on  
359 Estimates of Transitions Between Cigarette and ENDS Use. *Nicotine Tob Res.* 2022;24(11):1756-  
360 1762. doi:10.1093/ntr/ntac132
- 361 29. Shafie-Khorassani F, Piper ME, Jorenby DE, et al. Associations of Demographics, Dependence, and  
362 Biomarkers With Transitions in Tobacco Product Use in a Cohort of Cigarette Users and Dual  
363 Users of Cigarettes and E-cigarettes. *Nicotine Tob Res.* 2022;(August):1-8.  
364 doi:10.1093/ntr/ntac207

- 365 30. Schwamm E, Noubary F, Rigotti NA, Reddy KP. Longitudinal transitions in initiation, cessation, and  
366 relapse of cigarette smoking and e-cigarette use among US youth and adults: Validation of a  
367 microsimulation model. Cowley H, ed. *PLoS One*. 2023;18(4):e0284426.  
368 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0284426
- 369 31. Parnham JC, Vrinten C, Radó MK, Bottle A, Filippidis FT, Lavery AA. Multistate transition  
370 modelling of e-cigarette use and cigarette smoking among youth in the UK. *Tob Control*. March  
371 2023;tc-2022-057777. doi:10.1136/tc-2022-057777
- 372 32. Jackson C. Multi-state modelling with R: the msm package. 2019:1-57.  
373 <http://www.jstatsoft.org/v38/i08/>.
- 374 33. US Department of Health and Human Services. Surgeon General releases advisory on e-cigarette  
375 epidemic among youth. [https://e-cigarettes.surgeongeneral.gov/documents/surgeon-generals-](https://e-cigarettes.surgeongeneral.gov/documents/surgeon-generals-advisory-on-e-cigarette-use-among-youth-2018.pdf)  
376 [advisory-on-e-cigarette-use-among-youth-2018.pdf](https://e-cigarettes.surgeongeneral.gov/documents/surgeon-generals-advisory-on-e-cigarette-use-among-youth-2018.pdf). Published 2018. Accessed August 4, 2023.
- 377 34. Hall W, Gartner C, Bonevski B. Lessons from the public health responses to the US outbreak of  
378 vaping-related lung injury. *Addiction*. 2021;116(5):985-993. doi:10.1111/add.15108
- 379 35. Moustafa AF, Rodriguez D, Mazur A, Audrain-McGovern J. Adolescent perceptions of E-cigarette  
380 use and vaping behavior before and after the EVALI outbreak. *Prev Med (Baltim)*.  
381 2021;145:106419. doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2021.106419
- 382 36. Morgan JC, Silver N, Cappella JN. How did beliefs and perceptions about e-cigarettes change after  
383 national news coverage of the EVALI outbreak? *PLoS One*. 2021;16(4):e0250908.  
384 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0250908
- 385 37. Kreslake JM, Diaz MC, Shinaba M, Vallone DM, Hair EC. Youth and young adult risk perceptions  
386 and behaviours in response to an outbreak of e-cigarette/vaping-associated lung injury (EVALI) in  
387 the USA. *Tob Control*. 2022;31(1):88-97. doi:10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2020-056090
- 388 38. East K, Reid JL, Burkhalter R, et al. Exposure to Negative News Stories About Vaping, and Harm  
389 Perceptions of Vaping, Among Youth in England, Canada, and the United States Before and After  
390 the Outbreak of E-cigarette or Vaping-Associated Lung Injury ('EVALI'). *Nicotine Tob Res*.  
391 2022;24(9):1386-1395. doi:10.1093/ntr/ntac088
- 392 39. Hall W, Gartner C, Bonevski B. Lessons from the public health responses to the US outbreak of  
393 vaping-related lung injury. *Addiction*. 2021;116(5):985-993. doi:10.1111/add.15108
- 394 40. Svenson MRE, Freeman TP, Maynard OM. The Effect of Conflicting Public Health Guidance on  
395 Smokers' and Vapers' E-cigarette Harm Perceptions. *Nicotine Tob Res*. 2022;24(12):1945-1950.  
396 doi:10.1093/ntr/ntac163
- 397 41. East K, Reid JL, Burkhalter R, et al. Exposure to Negative News Stories About Vaping, and Harm  
398 Perceptions of Vaping, Among Youth in England, Canada, and the United States Before and After  
399 the Outbreak of E-cigarette or Vaping-Associated Lung Injury ('EVALI'). *Nicotine Tob Res*.  
400 2022;24(9):1386-1395. doi:10.1093/ntr/ntac088
- 401 42. Patanavanich R, Glantz SA. Smoking Is Associated With COVID-19 Progression: A Meta-analysis.  
402 *Nicotine Tob Res*. 2020;22(9):1653-1656. doi:10.1093/ntr/ntaa082
- 403 43. Reddy RK, Charles WN, Sklavounos A, Dutt A, Seed PT, Khajuria A. The effect of smoking on  
404 COVID-19 severity: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Med Virol*. 2021;93(2):1045-1056.  
405 doi:10.1002/jmv.26389
- 406 44. Shastri MD, Shukla SD, Chong WC, et al. Smoking and COVID-19: What we know so far. *Respir*

- 407 *Med.* 2021;176:106237. doi:10.1016/j.rmed.2020.106237
- 408 45. Elling JM, Crutzen R, Talhout R, de Vries H. Tobacco smoking and smoking cessation in times of  
409 COVID-19. *Tob Prev Cessat.* 2020;6:39. doi:10.18332/tpc/122753
- 410 46. Nyman AL, Spears CA, Churchill V, et al. Associations between COVID-19 risk perceptions and  
411 smoking and quitting behavior among U.S. adults. *Addict Behav Reports.* 2021;14:100394.  
412 doi:10.1016/j.abrep.2021.100394
- 413 47. Kalkhoran SM, Levy DE, Rigotti NA. Smoking and E-Cigarette Use Among U.S. Adults During the  
414 COVID-19 Pandemic. *Am J Prev Med.* 2022;62(3):341-349. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2021.08.018
- 415 48. Kalkhoran SM, Levy DE, Rigotti NA. Smoking and E-Cigarette Use Among U.S. Adults During the  
416 COVID-19 Pandemic. *Am J Prev Med.* 2022;62(3):341-349. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2021.08.018
- 417 49. Klemperer EM, West JC, Peasley-Miklus C, Villanti AC. Change in Tobacco and Electronic Cigarette  
418 Use and Motivation to Quit in Response to COVID-19. *Nicotine Tob Res.* 2020;22(9):1662-1663.  
419 doi:10.1093/ntr/ntaa072
- 420 50. US Food and Drug Administration. FDA Proposes Rules Prohibiting Menthol Cigarettes and  
421 Flavored Cigars to Prevent Youth Initiation, Significantly Reduce Tobacco-Related Disease and  
422 Death. [https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/fda-proposes-rules-prohibiting-](https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/fda-proposes-rules-prohibiting-menthol-cigarettes-and-flavored-cigars-prevent-youth-initiation)  
423 [menthol-cigarettes-and-flavored-cigars-prevent-youth-initiation.](https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/fda-proposes-rules-prohibiting-menthol-cigarettes-and-flavored-cigars-prevent-youth-initiation) Published April 28, 2022.  
424 Accessed September 27, 2023.
- 425
- 426

Period ○ 2017–19 ● 2019–21





**A. Adults in 2017–2019 (Waves 4–5)**  
**Ages 18–90, N=28,061**

To

	Never established use	Non-current use	Cigarette-only use	ENDS-only use	Dual use
Never established use	98.8	0.6	0.3	0.3	0.0
Non-current use	96.3	2.6	1.0	0.1	
Cigarette-only use	6.8	88.2	1.1	3.8	
ENDS-only use	13.9	1.4	78.2	6.5	
Dual use	1.8	24.9	9.5	63.8	

**B. Adults in 2019–2021 (Waves 5–6)**  
**Ages 18–90, N=24,751**

To

	Never established use	Non-current use	Cigarette-only use	ENDS-only use	Dual use
Never established use	98.6	0.8	0.2	0.3	0.0
Non-current use	96.8	2.2	0.9	0.1	
Cigarette-only use	7.1	88.2	0.7	4.0	
ENDS-only use	18.1	1.3	75.7	4.9	
Dual use	3.6	26.3	20.1	50.0	

From

From

**A. Ages 18–24 in 2017–2019 (Waves 4–5)**  
**N=8,891**

		To				
		Never established use	Non-current use	Cigarette-only use	ENDS-only use	Dual use
From	Never established use	96.4	1.1	0.6	1.8	0.1
	Non-current use	78.9	8.3	11.8	1.1	
	Cigarette-only use	10.0	76.6	3.2	10.2	
	ENDS-only use	19.3	1.7	73.0	6.0	
	Dual use	3.8	15.2	20.3	60.6	

**B. Ages 18–24 in 2019–2021 (Waves 5–6)**  
**N=8,186**

		To				
		Never established use	Non-current use	Cigarette-only use	ENDS-only use	Dual use
From	Never established use	96.0	1.7	0.4	1.8	0.1
	Non-current use	84.1	6.0	9.0	1.0	
	Cigarette-only use	10.4	69.8	4.5	15.3	
	ENDS-only use	20.4	1.5	73.7	4.5	
	Dual use	5.4	18.0	28.0	48.6	

**C. Ages 25–34 in 2017–2019 (Waves 4–5)**  
**N=5,794**

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.10.20.23297320>; this version posted October 21, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).

		To				
		Never established use	Non-current use	Cigarette-only use	ENDS-only use	Dual use
From	Never established use	98.8	0.5	0.5	0.2	0.0
	Non-current use	90.4	7.4	1.9	0.3	
	Cigarette-only use	7.8	85.2	1.7	5.2	
	ENDS-only use	13.7	2.0	75.6	8.7	
	Dual use	2.2	23.0	11.8	63.0	

**E. Ages 25–34 in 2019–2021 (Waves 5–6)**  
**N=5,283**

		To				
		Never established use	Non-current use	Cigarette-only use	ENDS-only use	Dual use
From	Never established use	98.8	0.9	0.2	0.2	0.0
	Non-current use	92.8	4.0	2.9	0.3	
	Cigarette-only use	9.0	82.9	1.2	6.8	
	ENDS-only use	24.4	1.7	67.7	6.2	
	Dual use	4.7	22.5	19.2	53.6	

**F. Ages 35–90 in 2017–2019 (Waves 4–5)**  
**N=13,373**

		To				
		Never established use	Non-current use	Cigarette-only use	ENDS-only use	Dual use
From	Never established use	99.3	0.5	0.2	0.0	0.0
	Non-current use	97.9	1.6	0.4	0.0	
	Cigarette-only use	6.3	90.6	0.6	2.5	
	ENDS-only use	11.3	1.1	82.7	4.9	
	Dual use	1.3	29.1	3.9	65.7	

**G. Ages 35–90 in 2019–2021 (Waves 5–6)**  
**N=11,282**

		To				
		Never established use	Non-current use	Cigarette-only use	ENDS-only use	Dual use
From	Never established use	99.2	0.7	0.1	0.0	0.0
	Non-current use	97.9	1.7	0.3	0.0	
	Cigarette-only use	6.3	91.1	0.3	2.3	
	ENDS-only use	12.9	1.1	82.1	3.8	
	Dual use	2.6	32.3	16.8	48.2	