

The Economic Burden of Exposure to Secondhand Smoke for Child and Adult Never Smokers Residing in U.S. Public Housing

JACQUELYN MASON, PhD^a
WILLIAM WHEELER, MPH^{a,b}
MARY JEAN BROWN, ScD, RN^a

ABSTRACT

Objective. The World Health Organization (WHO) reports that nonsmokers experience disease and death due to secondhand smoke (SHS) exposure in the home. We estimated the total excess burden and costs to society due to SHS exposure in U.S. public housing.

Methods. We quantified the public health burden for outcomes causally related to SHS exposure for nationally representative never-smoking residents in U.S. public housing using (1) WHO-recommended health outcomes and methodology, (2) publicly available and other large databases, and (3) published estimates of morbidity and mortality rates. We used published estimates of direct medical and nonmedical care costs and the value of productivity losses to estimate SHS-related societal costs for disease and death. We estimated the public health and economic burden for two serum cotinine limits of detection (LODs): 0.05 nanograms per milliliter (ng/mL) and 0.015 ng/mL.

Results. In 2011, an estimated 37,791 never-smoking child and adult U.S. public housing residents experienced illness and death due to SHS exposure at home based on an LOD=0.05 ng/mL (50,967 residents at LOD=0.015 ng/mL). Costs incurred by society for these illnesses and deaths totaled \$183 million (LOD=0.05 ng/mL) and \$267 million (LOD=0.015 ng/mL) annually. Of the total costs, direct costs (medical and nonmedical) accounted for \$128 million and \$176 million for LOD=0.05 ng/mL and LOD=0.015 ng/mL, respectively. Medical care accounted for the majority of direct costs—\$110 million at LOD=0.05 ng/mL and \$153 million at LOD=0.015 ng/mL. Adverse respiratory health outcomes accounted for approximately one-half (56% at LOD=0.05 ng/mL and 52% at LOD=0.015 ng/mL) of total societal costs.

Conclusion. Implementing smoke-free policies in all U.S. public housing could save lives and decrease SHS-related morbidity and mortality in never-smoking residents, resulting in annual societal savings of \$183 million at LOD=0.05 ng/mL and \$267 million at LOD=0.015 ng/mL.

^aCenters for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Environmental Health, Division of Emergency and Environmental Health Services, Atlanta, GA

^bCurrent affiliation: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Division of Nutrition, Physical Activity, and Obesity, Atlanta, GA

Address correspondence to: Jacquelyn Mason, PhD, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Environmental Health, Division of Emergency and Environmental Health Services, 4770 Buford Hwy. NE, MS F-58, Atlanta, GA 30341; tel. 770-488-3625; fax 770-488-3635; e-mail <zao4@cdc.gov>.

An estimated 15%–18% of U.S. children are exposed to secondhand smoke (SHS) at home.¹ SHS is a major cause of disease, and there is no safe level of SHS exposure.^{1,2} Children and nonsmoking adults living below the federal poverty level (FPL) are more likely to be exposed to SHS than those in higher socioeconomic status households.³ Children are especially vulnerable because their exposure patterns and developmental status enhance absorption of environmental toxicants.⁴ Additionally, because many elderly people with limited mobility live in public housing, they may spend more time indoors, be exposed to more SHS, and suffer more severe adverse health outcomes than the general population.² People with disabilities comprise nearly one-third of the public housing population and have greater SHS exposure than those without a disability.^{5,6} Because SHS migrates, residents of multiunit housing who do not allow smoking in their home are at risk for SHS exposure if other residents in their building smoke.⁷ SHS migration has implications for nonsmoking public housing residents, as 88% of public housing is multiunit.⁸

The World Health Organization (WHO) reports that there is sufficient evidence of causal relationships between SHS and adverse health outcomes, including lung cancer, heart disease, and asthma in adults; and low birthweight (LBW) (i.e., birthweight $\leq 2,500$ grams), sudden infant death syndrome (SIDS), and lower respiratory infections (LRIs)—including respiratory syncytial virus, bronchitis, otitis media (OM), and asthma—in children.²

Smoke-free policies significantly reduce adverse health outcomes caused by SHS.^{9–13} In 2009 and 2012, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) encouraged public housing authorities to implement smoke-free policies in subsidized housing.^{14,15} Recent research suggests that smoke-free policies are supported by a majority of never- and former-smoking subsidized housing residents and are associated with cessation or lower rates of smoking among smokers.^{16,17} Recent data indicate that in 2013, more than 300 housing authorities had instituted smoke-free policies.^{18,19}

The health and economic consequences of childhood SHS exposure in the United States are well documented,^{20–28} but similar analyses are not available for nonsmoking adults. While there are published estimates of the U.S. public health burden associated with SHS exposure in adults and state-level economic studies on SHS that include nonsmoking adults, information on the national aggregate costs of SHS-related health effects in adults is sparse.^{29–36}

A recent study estimated SHS-related costs in all

government-subsidized housing using state-level estimates.³⁷ However, to our knowledge this is the first study to estimate the public health and economic burden of SHS in public housing based on nationally representative and other large-scale databases, including biomarker data. Quantifying the burden of SHS for residents may provide incentives to institute smoke-free policies in public housing.

METHODS

We used methods described by the WHO to estimate the annual public health burden for new cases (i.e., incidence) of SHS-attributable illness and death for adult and child never-smoker U.S. public housing residents.^{2,38} When the number of incident cases was unavailable, we used self-reported (asthma) or treated (OM and LRI) prevalence rates. We based population-attributable fractions (PAFs) and attributable burdens for each health outcome on WHO estimates of relative risk (RR). We then estimated annual societal economic burdens for each health outcome and overall using previously described methods.³⁹

Public housing never smokers

We estimated the number of adult never smokers by multiplying the national percentage of adult never smokers with a household income $\leq 200\%$ FPL by the number of adults living in public housing (Personal communication, Lydia Taghavi, HUD, February 2012). We used the national prevalence of middle school and high school never smokers from the 2009 National Youth Tobacco Survey to estimate the number of never smokers among public housing adolescents because data stratified by family income or housing type were not available. We defined adults and adolescents aged 11–17 years as never smokers if they reported lifetime consumption of ≤ 99 cigarettes and either had not smoked (adults) or used any tobacco products (adolescents) in the past 30 days. All children < 11 years of age were considered never smokers. We used the proportion of adult never smokers receiving government housing assistance in the 2010 National Health Interview Survey (NHIS) as a proxy for the proportion of adult public housing never smokers. However, government housing assistance is overreported in NHIS; therefore, we further limited NHIS never-smoker data extracted to those who reported both government-subsidized housing and a household income $\leq 200\%$ FPL.⁴⁰

Exposure to SHS

We used the national percentage of current nonsmokers with detectable serum cotinine levels who participated

in the 2007–2008 and 2009–2010 cycles of the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) to estimate the proportion of adults and children exposed to SHS. Because NHANES participants are not asked if they live in government-assisted housing, we used SHS-exposed nonsmokers in NHANES with a reported income $\leq 130\%$ FPL guidelines as a proxy for the nonsmoking public housing population. We classified adults ≥ 20 years of age with a serum cotinine concentration $>$ the limit of detection (LOD) but ≤ 10 nanograms per millimeter (ng/mL) who did not report being a current cigarette smoker or having used any nicotine-containing products within the previous five days as nonsmokers.³ We defined SHS-exposed nonsmoking adolescents as those aged 12–19 years who reported no smoking in the previous 30 days, no use of any nicotine-containing product within the previous five days, and a serum cotinine level $>$ LOD but ≤ 10 ng/mL. All children aged 3–11 years were classified as SHS-exposed if their cotinine level was $>$ LOD but ≤ 10 ng/mL. Serum cotinine is not measured in NHANES participants < 3 years of age. SHS exposure prevalence for these children was assumed to be the same as in children aged 3–11 years.⁴¹ We present results based on the current serum cotinine LOD=0.015 ng/mL as well as the historically important LOD=0.05 ng/mL to allow comparisons with previous work.

Disease status

We derived incidence, prevalence, and mortality rates for both adult and child health outcomes causally related to SHS exposure from sources listed in Tables 1 and 2. We multiplied each disease/mortality rate by the relevant number of never smokers living in public housing to estimate the number of never-smoking residents with each health outcome of interest. We estimated the public health burden attributable to SHS for each health outcome by calculating a PAF using the RR estimated by WHO (Tables 1 and 2).² We used SAS[®] version 9.2 and SUDAAN[®] release 10.0 to calculate population-based estimates.^{42,43}

Estimates of costs of health outcomes

We conducted a literature search using PubMed, Google, and Google Scholar to identify treatment costs for each health outcome considered in our analysis. Keywords included “asthma,” “cost,” “cardiovascular disease,” “coronary heart disease,” “coronary artery disease,” “economic burden,” “ischemic heart disease,” “lower respiratory infection,” “low birthweight,” “lung cancer,” “myocardial infarction,” “otitis media,” “respiratory syncytial virus,” “secondhand smoke,” “smoke inhalation,” and “sudden infant death syndrome.” We

took a societal perspective and included all costs for treatment of the health outcomes, regardless of who accrued the cost. Depending on costs considered in the source studies used, we accounted for direct costs (i.e., medical costs including hospitalizations, physician’s visits, and medications; and nonmedical costs including travel and paid childcare) and/or productivity losses (e.g., caregiver time lost from work or school due to a patient’s illness) (Table 3).⁴⁴

We applied monetary valuations for morbidity-related productivity losses for all adult health outcomes, but only for asthma in children (Table 3). We used only published estimates of data from the United States.⁴⁵ We valued premature loss of life as the present value of lifetime economic productivity.^{46,47} We used a human capital approach behind a “veil of ignorance” (i.e., productivity losses due to morbidity were based on annual costs using national average wages).⁴⁸ We excluded costs associated with premature death when such deaths were rare events and did not contribute substantially to the societal burden resulting from SHS exposure in public housing.

Because excess expenditures better estimate the potential cost savings of policies aimed at reducing adverse health outcomes, we calculated costs for each health outcome by multiplying per-person excess costs by number of never smokers impacted.⁴⁹ We summed these costs to derive total aggregated costs for all health outcomes. We used the personal consumption health care expenditure index to adjust direct medical costs and the gross domestic product index to adjust productivity losses and nonmedical direct costs to 2011 dollars.

RESULTS

In 2011, exposure to SHS resulted in morbidity or mortality in 37,791 (at LOD=0.05 ng/mL) and 50,967 (at LOD=0.015 ng/mL) never-smoking U.S. public housing residents. SHS caused the premature death of 14 (at LOD=0.05 ng/mL) and 21 (at LOD=0.015 ng/mL) infant U.S. public housing residents, and 116 (at LOD=0.05 ng/mL) and 215 (at LOD=0.015 ng/mL) adult U.S. public housing residents (Table 4).

Annual costs attributable to SHS in U.S. public housing were approximately \$183 million (at LOD=0.05 ng/mL) and \$267 million (at LOD=0.015 ng/mL) in 2011. Direct medical costs alone accounted for about \$110 million (at LOD=0.05 ng/mL) and \$153 million (at LOD=0.015 ng/mL) of total costs (calculations not shown). Asthma ranked highest in total SHS-attributable costs for both adults and children at both LODs. Productivity losses accounted for \$54 million (at LOD=0.05 ng/mL) and \$91 million (at LOD=0.015

Table 1 (continued). Annual SHS-attributable morbidity and mortality of adult never smokers residing in U.S. public housing, 2011

Health condition	LOD=0.05 ng/mL										LOD=0.015 ng/mL									
	Age (in years)	Disease rate in never smokers (percent)	Disease rate data source	Relative risk associated with SHS ^a population ^b	Total public housing	Percent never smokers ^c	Public housing never smokers N	Diseased population N	Percent of population exposed ^d	Population with disease attributable to SHS N	Percent of population exposed	Population with disease attributable to SHS N								
Sample calculation	A	B	C ^e	D	E = C × D ^e	F = A × E ^e	G _{0.05}	H _{0.05} = G _{0.05} (B-1)/(G _{0.05} [B-1]+1)	I _{0.05} = H _{0.05} × F ^e	G _{0.015}	H _{0.015} = G _{0.015} (B-1)/(G _{0.015} [B-1]+1)	I _{0.015} = H _{0.015} × F ^e								
Asthma morbidity			NHIS ^c (2009–2010)																	
	18–50	6.4		1.97	1,301,507	54	689,525	47,150	48	0.32	14,579	20,462								
	51–64	10.3			754,835	48	407,611	26,065	46	0.31	8,341	11,469								
	65–84	6.1			275,962	52	132,462	13,601	38	0.27	4,217	5,849								
	≥85	NA ⁱ			34,734	77	26,745	NA	38	0.27	NA	3,144								
Asthma mortality			CDC WONDER ^h (2009–2010)																	
	18–50	0.0003		1.97	1,301,507	54	686,315	8	48	0.32	4	5								
	51–64	0.0004			754,835	48	406,856	2	46	0.31	1	1								
	65–84	0.0008			275,962	52	131,082	1	38	0.27	1	1								
	≥85	0.0105			34,734	77	26,849	3	38	0.27	1	2								

^aOberg M, Jaakkola MS, Prüss-Ustün A, Schweizer C, Woodward A. Second-hand smoke: assessing the burden of disease at national and local levels. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2010.

^bUnpublished data: personal communication, Lydia Taghavi, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, February 2012

^cData extracted from: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (US). National Health Interview Survey 2009 data release [cited 2014 Feb 11]. Available from: URL: http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nhis/nhis_2009_data_release.htm

^dData extracted from: National Center for Health Statistics (US). National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey questionnaires, datasets and related documentation [cited 2014 Mar 10]. Available from: URL: http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nhanes/nhanes_questionnaires.htm

^eSummed values may not add to totals due to rounding.

^fCenters for Disease Control and Prevention (US). CDC WONDER: National Program of Cancer Registries Early Release publication information data: incidence 1999–2010 [cited 2014 Feb 25]. Available from: URL: <http://wonder.cdc.gov/wonder/help/cancerpcr.html>

^gRoger VL, Go AS, Lloyd-Jones DM, Adams RJ, Berry JD, Brown TM, et al. Heart disease and stroke statistics—2011 update: a report from the American Heart Association. Circulation 2011;123:e18-e209.

^hCenters for Disease Control and Prevention (US). CDC WONDER: underlying cause of death 1999–2013 [cited 2014 Apr 1]. Available from: URL: <http://wonder.cdc.gov/wonder/help/ucd.html>

ⁱInsufficient sample size to obtain a reliable estimate

SHS = secondhand smoke

LOD = limit of detection

ng/mL = nanograms per milliliter

NPCR = National Program of Cancer Registries

NHLBI = National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute

CDC = Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

WONDER = Wide-ranging Online Data for Epidemiologic Research

NHIS = National Health Interview Survey

NA = not applicable

Table 2. Annual SHS-attributable morbidity and mortality of child never smokers residing in U.S. public housing, 2011

Health condition	Age (in years)	Disease rate in never smokers (in years)	Percent never smokers	Disease rate data source	Relative risk associated with SHS ^a	Total public housing population ^b	Percent never smokers ^c	Public housing never smokers	Diseased population N	Percent population exposed ^d	Population-attributable fraction	Population with disease attributable to SHS N	Percent of population exposed	Population-attributable fraction	Population with disease attributable to SHS N
Children															
Low birthweight morbidity	<1	8.2		NVSR ^f (2009)	1.38	40,094	100	40,094	3,288	48	0.15	494	81	0.24	790
Low birthweight mortality	<1	0.11		NVSR ^f (2009)	1.38	40,094	100	40,094	44	48	0.15	7	81	0.24	11
Sudden infant death syndrome	<1	0.05		NVSR ^f (2009)	1.94	40,094	100	40,094	22	48	0.31	7	81	0.43	10
Lower respiratory infection															
Respiratory syncytial virus	<1	2.4		NHDS ^g (1997–2000 and 2006)	1.55	40,094	100	40,094	975	61	0.25	244	85	0.32	312
Pneumonia	1–2	0.28		NHDS ^g (2006)	1.55	101,764	100	101,764	288	61	0.25	72	85	0.32	93
Bronchitis/bronchiolitis	1–2	0.25		NHDS ^g (2006)	1.55	101,764	100	101,764	255	61	0.25	64	85	0.32	82
Otitis media	0–3	31.4		NHANES III ^{eh} (2003)	1.34	195,555	100	195,555	61,405	61	0.17	10,439	85	0.22	13,510

continued on p. 236

Table 2 (continued). Annual SHS-attributable morbidity and mortality of child never smokers residing in U.S. public housing, 2011

Health condition	Age (in years)	Disease rate in never smokers (Percent)	Disease rate data source	Relative risk associated with SHS ^a	Total public housing population ^b	Percent never smokers ^c	Public housing never smokers N	Diseased population N	Percent population exposed ^d	Population attributable fraction	LOD=0.05 ng/mL		LOD=0.015 ng/mL	
											$G_{0.05}$	$H_{0.05} = \frac{G_{0.05}(B-1)}{(G_{0.05}[B-1]+1)}$	$I_{0.05} = H_{0.05} \times F^e$	$G_{0.015}$
Asthma	1-11	9.6	NHIS (2009)	1.32	814,909	100	761,052	73,061	61	0.16	11,690	85	0.21	15,343
	12-13	9.6			505,232	91 ^a	505,232	48,503	61	0.16	7,761	85	0.21	10,186
	14-17	9.6			132,719	76 ^a	120,854	11,602	61	0.16	1,857	85	0.21	2,437
					176,958		134,966	12,957	61	0.16	2,074	85	0.21	2,721

^aÖberg M, Jaakkola MS, Prüss-Ustün A, Schweizer C, Woodward A. Second-hand smoke: assessing the burden of disease at national and local levels. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2010.

^bUnpublished data: personal communication, Lydia Taghavi, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, February 2012

^cData extracted from: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention CDC (US), Office on Smoking and Health. National Youth Tobacco Survey (NYTS) 2009 [cited 2012 Jun 15]. Available from: URL: http://www.cdc.gov/tobacco/data_statistics/surveys/nyts/index.htm. The NYTS captures smoking status by status in school (i.e., middle or high school). For children >11 years of age, we assumed children aged 12-13 years were in middle school and those aged ≥14 years were in high school.

^dData extracted from: National Center for Health Statistics (US). National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey III questionnaires, datasets and related documentation [cited 2014 Mar 10]. Available from: URL: http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nhanes/nhanes_questionnaires.htm

^eSummed values may not add to totals due to rounding.

^fHamilton BE, Martin JA, Ventura SJ. Births: preliminary data for 2009. Natl Vital Stat Rep 2010 Dec 21;59:1-19. Also available from: URL: http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nvsr/nvsr60/nvsr60_02.pdf [cited 2014 Feb 19].

^gNational Center for Health Statistics (US). National Hospital Discharge Survey, 1997-2000 and 2006 [cited 2015 Feb 4]. Available from: URL: http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nhds/nhds_publications.htm

^hPublished estimate in: Aunger P, Lanphear BP, Kalkwarf HJ, Mansour ME. Trends in otitis media among children in the United States. Pediatrics 2003;112:514-20.

ⁱNational Center for Health Statistics (US). 2009 National Health Interview Survey public-use data release. Hyattsville (MD): NCHS; 2010.

SHS = secondhand smoke

LOD = limit of detection

ng/mL = nanograms per milliliter

NVSR = National Vital Statistics Report

NHDS = National Hospital Discharge Survey

NHANES III = National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey III

NHIS = National Health Interview Survey

Table 3. Source articles for cost data and selected source article study characteristics on SHS-attributable health outcomes in the U.S.

Health outcome	Authors and year of publication	Sample size (n)	Cost data source(s)	Costs included	Type of cost estimate	Age of study population	Dollar year reported
Adults Lung cancer morbidity	Chang et al., 2004 ^a	Lung cancer: 2,038 Controls: 6,120	MarketScan Commercial Claims and Encounters Database, Medicare Supplemental and Coordination of Benefits Database, Health and Productivity Management Database	Direct medical: \$74,172 per person per year	Incremental	CCAE: mean age 34 years Medicare: mean age 74 years	2000
Lung cancer mortality	Bradley et al., 2008 ^b	NA: population based	Bureau of Labor Statistics Current Population Survey	Productivity losses: mortality: \$210,330 per premature death	Present value of lifetime earnings	≥20 years of age Median age at death: 72 years ^c	2010
Ischemic heart disease morbidity	Personal communication, Justin Trogdon, RTI International, September 2011	Not provided	Medical Expenditure Panel Survey	Direct medical: \$6,958 per person per year Productivity losses: morbidity: \$1,787 per premature death	Incremental	≥18 years of age	2008
Ischemic heart disease mortality	Roger et al., 2011 ^d	NA: population based	Unpublished estimates of lifetime earnings ^e	Productivity losses: mortality: \$245,390 per premature death ^f	Present value of lifetime earnings	All ages Median age at death: 76 years (men), 84 years (women) ^d	2008
Asthma morbidity	Barnett and Nurmagambetov, 2011 ^g	Asthma: 8,719 No asthma: 198,132	Medical Expenditure Panel Survey Medical Expenditure Panel Survey: authors' model	Direct medical: \$3,259 per person per year Productivity losses: morbidity: \$301 per adult worker per year lost	Incremental	All ages	2009
Asthma mortality	Barnett and Nurmagambetov, 2011 ^g	72,922	Published estimates of lifetime productivity ^h	Productivity losses: mortality: \$586,422 per premature adult death ⁱ	Present value of lifetime earnings	All ages Median age at death: 63 years ^j	2009
Children Low birthweight morbidity	Russell et al., 2007 ^k	Preterm/low birthweight newborns: 160,700 Uncomplicated newborns: 721,800	Healthcare Cost and Utilization Project—Nationwide Inpatient Sample	Direct medical: \$15,200 per infant delivery	Incremental	<1 year	2005
	Schmitt et al., 2006 ^l	<2,500 grams at birth: 25,986 ≥2,500 grams at birth: 411,525	California infant and maternal hospital discharge summaries linked with infant vital statistics data	Maternal delivery costs: \$4,442 per infant delivery	Incremental	Mothers of infants born in California hospitals	2003

continued on p. 238

Table 3 (continued). Source articles for cost data and selected source article study characteristics on SHS-attributable health outcomes in the U.S.

Health outcome	Authors and year of publication	Sample size	Cost data source(s)	Costs included	Type of cost estimate	Age of study population	Dollar year reported
Low birthweight mortality	Grosse et al., 2009 ^m	72,922	American Time Use Survey; Employer Cost for Employee Compensation survey; Occupational Employment Statistics survey	Productivity losses: mortality: \$1,180,796 per premature death	Present value of lifetime earnings	0–4 years	2007
Sudden infant death syndrome	Grosse et al., 2009 ^m	72,922	American Time Use Survey; Employer Cost for Employee Compensation survey; Occupational Employment Statistics survey	Productivity losses: mortality: \$1,180,796 per premature death	Present value of lifetime earnings	0–4 years	2007
Lower respiratory infection morbidity	Shi et al., 2011 ⁿ	RSV LRI in-patient: 2,720 UBP in-patient: 5,621	MarketScanMulti-state Medicaid	Direct medical: RSV LRI: \$9,151 per hospitalized infant per year; UBP: \$2,823 per hospitalized infant per year	Incremental	<1 year	2006
Otitis media morbidity	Leader et al., 2003 ^o	Preterm infants (33–35 weeks gestation): 48; Full-term infants: 36	Tertiary-care hospitals	Direct nonmedical: \$2,135 per hospitalized full-term infant per year	Total	<1 year	Not stated; assumed 2000
Asthma morbidity	Ahmed et al., 2014 ^p	Acute otitis media: 995 No acute otitis media: 10,420	Medical Expenditure Panel Survey-Health Care	Direct medical: \$331 per child per year	Total	0–17 years	2009
	Alsarraf et al., 1999 ^q	Acute otitis media: 12 Controls: 13	Diary	Direct nonmedical: \$1,157 per child per year	Incremental	1–3 years	1996
	Barnett and Nurmagambetov, 2011 ^q	Asthma: 8,719 No asthma: 198,132	Medical Expenditure Panel Survey	Direct medical: \$3,259 per person per year	Incremental	All ages	2010
			Medical Expenditure Panel Survey: authors' model	Productivity losses: morbidity: \$93 per student per year	Incremental	Parents/caregivers of children 3–19 years of age	

^aChang S, Long SR, Kutikova L, Bowman L, Finley D, Crown WH, et al. Estimating the cost of cancer: results on the basis of claims data analyses for cancer patients diagnosed with seven types of cancer during 1999 to 2000. *J Clin Oncol* 2004;22:3524–30.

^bBradley CJ, Yabroff KR, Dahman B, Feuer EJ, Mariotto A, Brown ML. Productivity costs of cancer mortality in the United States: 2000–2020. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2008;100:1763–70.

continued on p. 239

Table 3 (continued). Source articles for cost data and selected source article characteristics on SHS-attributable health outcomes in the U.S.

^c Lung cancer median age at death from Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER) stat fact sheets/lung and bronchus [cited 2014 Mar 12]. Available from: URL: www.seer.cancer.gov
^d Roger VL, Go AS, Lloyd-Jones DM, Adams RJ, Berry JD, Brown TM, et al. Heart disease and stroke statistics—2011 update: a report from the American Heart Association. <i>Circulation</i> 2011;123:e18-e209.
^e Kelly BB, Fuster V, editors. Promoting cardiovascular health in the developing world: a critical challenge to achieve global health. Washington: National Academies Press; 2010.
^f Provided by the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute to the American Heart Association
^g Calculated by authors based on published costs due to lost productivity (mortality) in: Roger VL, Go AS, Lloyd-Jones DM, Adams RJ, Berry JD, Brown TM, et al. Heart disease and stroke statistics—2011 update: a report from the American Heart Association. <i>Circulation</i> 2011;123:e18-e209, and the number of ischemic heart disease deaths from: Kochanek KD, Xu J, Murphy SL, Minino AM, Kung H-C. Deaths: final data for 2009. <i>Natl Vital Stat Rep</i> 2011 Dec 29;60:1-117.
^h Barnett SB, Nurmagambetov TA. Costs of asthma in the United States: 2002–2007. <i>J Allergy Clin Immunol</i> 2011;127:145-52.
ⁱ Costs were adapted from data presented in: Grosse SD, Krueger KV, Mvundura M. Economic productivity by age and sex: 2007 estimates for the United States. <i>Med Care</i> 2009;47(7 Suppl 1):S94-103.
^j Calculated by the authors based on ages and mortality costs for those aged ≥ 15 years presented in: Barnett SB, Nurmagambetov TA. Costs of asthma in the United States: 2002–2007. <i>J Allergy Clin Immunol</i> 2011;127:145-52.
^k Calculated by the authors from number and age of asthma-related deaths published in: Barnett SB, Nurmagambetov TA. Costs of asthma in the United States: 2002–2007. <i>J Allergy Clin Immunol</i> 2011;127:145-52.
^l Russell RB, Green NS, Steiner CA, Meikle S, Howse JL, Poschman K, et al. Cost of hospitalization for preterm and low birthweight infants in the United States. <i>Pediatrics</i> 2007;120:e1-9.
^m Schmitt SK, Sneed L, Phibbs CS. Costs of newborn care in California: a population-based study. <i>Pediatrics</i> 2006;117:154-60.
ⁿ Grosse SD, Krueger KV, Mvundura M. Economic productivity by age and sex: 2007 estimates for the United States. <i>Med Care</i> 2009;47(7 Suppl 1):S94-103.
^o Shi N, Palmer L, Chu BC, Katkin JP, Hall CB, Masaquel AS, et al. Association of RSV lower respiratory tract infection and subsequent healthcare use and costs: a Medicaid claims analysis in early-preterm, late-preterm, and full-term infants. <i>J Med Econ</i> 2011;14:335-40.
^p Leader S, Yang H, DeVincenzo J, Jacobson P, Marciniak JP, Murray DL. Time and out-of-pocket costs associated with respiratory syncytial virus hospitalization of infants. <i>Value Health</i> 2003;6:100-6.
^q Ahmed S, Shapiro NL, Bhattacharyya N. Incremental health care utilization and costs for acute otitis media in children. <i>Laryngoscope</i> 2014;124:301-5.
^r Alsarraf R, Jung CJ, Perkins J, Crowley C, Alsarraf NW, Gates GA. Measuring the indirect and direct costs of acute otitis media. <i>Arch Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg</i> 1999;125:12-8.
SHS = secondhand smoke
CCAE = Commercial Claims and Encounters
NA = not applicable
RSV = respiratory syncytial virus
LRI = lower respiratory infection
UBP = unspecified bronchiolitis/pneumonia

Table 4. Estimates of annual public health burden and societal costs of SHS-attributable health outcomes for child and adult never smokers in U.S. public housing, 2011

SHS-attributable health condition	Per-person productivity losses			LOD=0.05 ng/mL			LOD=0.015 ng/mL				
	Per-person direct costs (medical and nonmedical)	Per-person morbidity-related productivity losses ^a	Per-person mortality-related productivity losses ^a	Number with health condition	Total direct costs ^a (medical and nonmedical)	Total productivity losses ^{a,b}	Total costs ^a (medical and nonmedical)	Total productivity losses ^{a,b}	Total costs ^a		
Sample calculation	A	B	C	D	E = A × D	F = B × D	G = E + F	H	I = A × H	J = B × H	K = I + J
Adults											
Lung cancer morbidity	\$102,761 ^b	\$14,489	NA	8	\$822,091	\$115,913	\$938,004	12	\$1,233,137	\$173,869	\$1,407,006
Lung cancer mortality	NA	NA	\$214,814	6	NA	\$1,288,882	\$1,288,882	10	NA	\$2,148,137	\$2,148,137
Lung cancer total				14	\$822,091	\$1,404,795	\$2,226,886	22	\$1,233,137	\$2,322,006	\$3,555,143
IHD morbidity	\$7,462 ^b	\$1,865	NA	71	\$529,778	\$132,446	\$662,224	127	\$947,632	\$236,910	\$1,184,542
IHD mortality	NA	NA	\$244,162	106	NA	\$27,152,985	\$27,152,985	200	NA	\$51,232,046	\$51,232,046
IHD total				177	\$529,778	\$27,285,430	\$27,815,209	327	\$947,632	\$51,468,956	\$52,416,588
Asthma morbidity	\$3,402 ^b	\$312	NA	14,579	\$49,603,056	\$4,541,568	\$54,144,624	20,462	\$69,619,160	\$6,374,207	\$75,993,367
Asthma mortality	NA	NA	\$606,907	4	NA	\$2,427,626	\$2,427,626	5	NA	\$3,034,533	\$3,034,533
Asthma total				14,583	\$49,603,056	\$6,969,194	\$56,572,250	20,467	\$69,619,160	\$9,408,739	\$79,027,899
Adult disease total				14,774	\$50,954,926	\$35,659,419	\$86,614,345	20,816	\$71,799,929	\$63,199,702	\$134,999,631
Children											
Low birthweight morbidity	\$25,968 ^b	NC ^c	NA	494	\$12,828,194	NA	\$12,828,194	790	\$20,514,723	NA	\$20,514,723
Low birthweight mortality	NA	NA	\$1,260,089	7	NA	\$8,820,620	\$8,820,620	11	NA	\$13,860,975	\$13,860,975
Low birthweight total				501	\$12,828,194	\$8,820,620	\$21,648,814	801	\$20,514,723	\$13,860,975	\$34,375,697
Sudden infant death syndrome	NA	NA	\$1,260,089	7	NA	\$8,820,620	\$8,820,620	10	NA	\$12,600,886	\$12,600,886
Lower respiratory infection morbidity											
Respiratory syncytial virus	\$13,179 ^d	NC ^c	NA	244	\$3,215,727	NA	\$3,215,727	312	\$4,111,914	NA	\$4,111,914
Pneumonia	\$5,952 ^d	NC ^c	NA	72	\$428,546	NA	\$428,546	93	\$553,539	NA	\$553,539
Bronchitis/bronchiolitis	\$5,952 ^d	NC ^c	NA	64	\$380,930	NA	\$380,930	82	\$488,066	NA	\$488,066
Lower respiratory infection morbidity total				380	\$4,025,203	NA	\$4,025,203	487	\$5,153,518	NA	\$5,153,518
Otitis media morbidity	\$1,972	NC ^c	NA	10,439	\$20,584,149	NA	\$20,584,149	13,510	\$26,639,702	NA	\$26,639,702
Asthma morbidity	\$3,402	\$96	NA	11,690	\$39,773,628	\$1,125,146	\$40,898,775	15,343	\$52,202,462	\$1,476,743	\$53,679,204
Children's disease total				23,017	\$77,211,174	\$18,766,387	\$95,977,560	30,151	\$104,510,405	\$27,938,603	\$132,449,008
Grand total				37,791	\$128,166,100	\$54,425,806	\$182,591,905	50,967	\$176,310,334	\$91,138,305	\$267,448,639

^aSummed dollar amounts may not add to totals due to rounding.

^bIncludes direct medical costs only

^cEstimate was not found in published data.

^dIncludes direct medical and nonmedical costs

SHS = secondhand smoke

LOD = limit of detection

IHD = ischemic heart disease

ng/mL = nanograms per milliliter

NA = not applicable

NC = not considered

ng/mL). The average total per-person cost due to SHS exposure in never-smoking U.S. public housing residents was an estimated \$4,832 (at LOD=0.05 ng/mL) and \$5,247 (at LOD=0.015 ng/mL) (calculations not shown).

Adults

SHS-related morbidity and mortality in adult U.S. public housing never smokers accounted for about \$87 million (at LOD=0.05 ng/mL) and \$135 million (at LOD=0.015 ng/mL) in 2011 (Table 4). Direct medical care accounted for approximately 59% (at LOD=0.05 ng/mL) and 53% (at LOD=0.015 ng/mL) of total adult costs (calculations not shown), with asthma and IHD responsible for virtually all SHS-related morbidity and mortality in adults; asthma alone accounted for 99% (at LOD=0.05 ng/mL) and 98% (at LOD=0.015 ng/mL) of the health burden, and 65% (at LOD=0.05 ng/mL) and 59% (at LOD=0.015 ng/mL) of costs for adults (calculations not shown). Lung cancer ranked highest in annual per-person direct medical care costs (\$102,761) and morbidity-related productivity losses (\$14,489).^{50,51} However, because it is a rare condition relative to asthma and IHD, lung cancer contributed little (3% for both LODs) to the total economic burden for adults (calculations not shown).

Children

Health-care, productivity, and nonmedical direct costs for children exposed to SHS in U.S. public housing totaled \$96 million (at LOD=0.05 ng/mL) and \$132 million (at LOD=0.015 ng/mL) (Table 4), or 53% (at LOD=0.05 ng/mL) and 50% (at LOD=0.015 ng/mL) of total societal costs (calculations not shown). Direct costs accounted for 80% (at LOD=0.05 ng/mL) and 79% (at LOD=0.015 ng/mL) of the total economic burden for children (calculations not shown). Asthma together with OM affected 96% of children who had SHS-attributable health outcomes (11,690 [at LOD=0.05 ng/mL] and 15,343 [at LOD=0.015 ng/mL] for asthma and 10,439 [at LOD=0.05 ng/mL] and 13,510 [at LOD=0.015 ng/mL] for OM) (Table 4), and incurred nearly two-thirds of total costs for children (\$61 million [at LOD=0.05 ng/mL] and \$80 million [at LOD=0.015 ng/mL]) (calculations not shown). Of infants who lived in U.S. public housing and died from SIDS or LBW-related factors, 31% (at LOD=0.05 ng/mL) and 43% (at LOD=0.015 ng/mL) of deaths from SIDS and 15% (at LOD=0.05 ng/mL) and 24% (at LOD=0.015 ng/mL) of deaths from LBW-related factors were attributable to SHS (calculations not shown). Although the number of infants in U.S. public housing expected to have died from SHS-attributable

deaths was small (14 [at LOD=0.05 ng/mL] and 21 [at LOD=0.015 ng/mL] out of 40,094 infants), these deaths accounted for 18% (at LOD=0.05 ng/mL) and 20% (at LOD=0.015 ng/mL) of total annual SHS-attributable costs for children in U.S. public housing (calculations not shown).

DISCUSSION

The annual economic burden of SHS-attributable illness and death of never smokers in U.S. public housing totaled approximately \$183 million (at LOD=0.05 ng/mL) and \$267 million (at LOD=0.015 ng/mL). The benefits of reducing SHS exposure in U.S. public housing include lower out-of-pocket expenditures for medical care, lower apartment clean-up costs, and fewer productivity losses for employers and society.^{52,53} To our knowledge, this study is the first to estimate both the national public health burden and the economic impact of SHS on never-smoking U.S. public housing residents using nationally representative and other large-scale databases, and including biomarker data. Our results may help frame the problem of SHS exposure in U.S. public housing by quantifying the public health burden and associated monetary costs.

U.S. public housing residents have higher levels of exposure to SHS than the national population and a majority support policies aimed at eliminating SHS where they live.^{16,54} Because U.S. public housing is owned by public housing authorities, there are fewer barriers to implementing a smoke-free policy compared with voucher-assisted or privately owned housing (e.g., Section 8) (Personal communication, Barry Steffen, HUD, February 2012). The health benefits of a smoke-free policy for children would be substantial because they receive most of their exposure to SHS in the home and have a higher intake of SHS than adults.^{1,2} An effective U.S. public housing smoke-free policy would result in 130 (at LOD=0.05 ng/mL) and 236 (at LOD=0.015 ng/mL) fewer lives lost annually in never smokers. Even if never smokers are routinely exposed to SHS outside of the home, evidence suggests that a temporary respite from SHS may reduce adverse health outcomes such as IHD in adults.²⁹

A recent study estimated \$521 million in annual societal cost savings if smoking was banned in all government-subsidized U.S. housing. Our estimate of the annual societal direct medical costs (\$110 million [at LOD=0.05 ng/mL] and \$153 million [at LOD=0.015 ng/mL]) incurred due to SHS in U.S. public housing only is within the range (\$50–\$181 million) estimated by King et al.³⁷ However, several differences between the two studies are worth noting. First, we provide both

aggregated and health outcome-specific estimates of the public health and economic burdens; King et al. provided neither the public health burden nor health outcome-specific costs. Whereas King et al. relied on data based on self-report, we used biomarker data to determine the proportion of never smokers exposed to SHS. We calculated our estimates using both the current and previous LOD for detecting cotinine in serum (0.015 ng/mL and 0.05 ng/mL, respectively). While not explicitly stated, we assume King et al. used the previous LOD in their analysis. King et al. estimated SHS-attributable fire-related and apartment renovation costs, which were not included in our study. We used costs of illness or death from nationally representative or large-scale databases with national data when available. In contrast, the King et al. study used state-adjusted costs based on Minnesota health-care claims data. Finally, King et al. did not account for productivity losses, which were 40% (at LOD=0.015 ng/mL) and 43% (at LOD=0.05 ng/mL) of the total economic burden in our study.

Our estimate is higher than a previous estimate of the national annual per-person cost of productivity losses due to SHS-related death (\$373,159 [at LOD=0.05 ng/mL] and \$351,172 [at LOD=0.015 ng/mL] in 2011 dollars vs. \$158,000 in 2006 dollars per premature death).⁵⁵ This difference might be because (1) the prevalence of smoking in low-income families is higher than the national average^{3,56} and (2) public housing has a higher percentage of infants and children than the national population.^{57,58} Premature death in the young exacts high societal costs.⁴⁶

Our cost-of-illness study did not include the implementation costs of smoke-free policies. We speculate these costs would be outweighed by the societal benefits of such policies. However, there is scant information on the costs or cost-effectiveness of implementing or enforcing smoke-free policies.⁵⁹ Widespread adherence to a smoke-free policy in U.S. public housing would reduce adverse outcomes and societal costs from SHS exposure for both former and current smokers, which would greatly increase its benefits. Moreover, if barriers could be reduced in implementing smoke-free policies in voucher-assisted (i.e., Section 8) homes, there would be substantial additional savings produced by HUD-recommended smoke-free policies.

Limitations

Our study had several limitations. First, the RR estimates we used were not based exclusively on SHS exposures occurring solely in the home.² Serum cotinine measurements reflect recent SHS exposure, regardless of location. Thus, we may have overestimated the health

and economic impact of SHS exposure in the home. However, young children, the elderly, and the disabled comprise a substantial proportion of public housing residents and likely spend more time at home.^{5,57} Thus, the effect of exposures occurring outside the home for these groups may be small. Additionally, SHS exposure inside the home likely, but not necessarily, results in higher exposure levels than exposure due to migration between apartments. For example, it is unclear whether exposure from smoke that migrates from an apartment with one or more heavy smokers to a nonsmoker's apartment is higher or lower than the exposure experienced by never smokers with infrequent exposure to cigarette smoke in their home. Recent studies report that residents living in nonsmoking multiunit housing have higher cotinine levels and are more likely to smell smoke in their buildings than are residents of single-family homes.^{60,61} These findings suggest that the proportion of people exposed to SHS in our analysis is likely higher than the values we used.

When available, we used the incremental cost of each SHS-caused disease. However, these data were not available for all health outcomes of interest (e.g., OM). Moreover, this approach has been criticized because comorbidities or related health outcomes may account for a substantial portion of total excess costs, leading to double counting of effects and, thus, overestimation of true excess costs.^{62,63} On the other hand, incorrect coding for patients with comorbidities may lead to an underestimation of SHS-attributable costs.

The use of disease rates and health care based on the general population likely underestimates the amount of disease in the public housing population.^{64,65} However, we used national disease rates for individuals living in government-assisted housing, where possible, in an attempt to minimize the discrepancy. However, public housing residents may differ in meaningful ways from residents receiving other government housing subsidies. Excluding respiratory syncytial virus, none of the cost estimates we used were derived from studies conducted on low-income populations. Therefore, these costs may not accurately reflect health-care expenditures or the value of productivity losses in the low-income population.⁶⁶ In particular, nearly half of people in poverty are covered by public insurance or are uninsured,⁶⁷ which may result in lower reimbursements than for those who have private insurance. Additionally, some of the published estimates we used were quite dated and may not reflect current health-care practices and costs.⁶³ In two cases, OM and LRI, we used morbidity-related productivity loss estimates based on small studies with convenience samples not designed to measure these losses among public housing

residents. Finally, although we used a societal perspective, we did not account for all costs that are borne by society (e.g., long-term care, copayments, and other nonmedical direct expenses), as well as the intangible costs of the health effects (e.g., pain and suffering) of SHS exposure.

CONCLUSION

Implementation of smoke-free policies in all U.S. public housing can improve the health of residents and reduce societal costs, including medical costs. Our analysis provides national estimates of the public health and economic burdens associated with SHS exposure in U.S. public housing and quantifies the benefits of implementing a smoke-free policy in all U.S. public housing.

The authors thank Lydia Taghavi, Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), for demographic data on the population living in HUD-subsidized public housing; and Peter Ashley, Alastair McFarlane, and Barry Steffen of HUD, and Turnsymbek Nurmagambetov of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) for their review and comments.

The findings and conclusions in this article are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position of CDC.

REFERENCES

- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (US). The health consequences of involuntary exposure to tobacco smoke: a report of the Surgeon General. Atlanta: Department of Health and Human Services (US), Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Chronic Disease, Prevention and Health Promotion, Office on Smoking and Health; 2006. Also available from: URL: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK44324/pdf/toc.pdf> [cited 2012 May 12].
- Öberg M, Jaakkola MS, Prüss-Üstün A, Schweizer C, Woodward A. Second-hand smoke: assessing the burden of disease at national and local levels. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2010. WHO Environmental Burden of Disease Series No. 18. Also available from: URL: http://www.who.int/quantifying_ehimpacts/publications/SHS.pdf [cited 2011 Jul 11].
- Kaufmann RB, Babb S, O'Halloran A, Asman K, Bishop E, Tynan M, et al. Vital signs: nonsmokers' exposure to secondhand smoke—United States, 1999–2008. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2010;59(35):1141-6.
- National Research Council (US). Pesticides in the diets of infants and children. Washington: National Academy Press; 1993.
- National Center for Health in Public Housing. Demographic facts: residents living in public housing [cited 2011 Aug 1]. Available from: URL: <http://www.namgt.com/hphr/pdfs/demographicfacts.pdf>
- Hall AG, Schumacher JR, Cannell MB, Berry JB, Schiaffino M, Park S. Tobacco use in Florida: comparisons between adults living with and without disabilities. *Disabil Health J* 2013;6:213-9.
- Kraev TA, Adamkiewicz G, Hammond SK, Spengler JD. Indoor concentrations of nicotine in low-income, multi-unit housing: associations with smoking behaviours and housing characteristics. *Tob Control* 2009;18:438-44.
- Department of Housing and Urban Development (US). Characteristics of HUD-assisted renters and their units in 2003. Washington: HUD, Office of Policy Development and Research; 2008. Also available from: URL: http://www.huduser.org/portal/publications/pubasst/hud_asst_rent.html [cited 2011 Aug 1].
- Herman PM, Walsh ME. Hospital admissions for acute myocardial infarction, angina, stroke, and asthma after implementation of Arizona's comprehensive statewide smoking ban. *Am J Public Health* 2011;101:491-6.
- Meyers DG, Neuberger JS, He J. Cardiovascular effect of bans on smoking in public places: a systematic review and meta-analysis [published erratum appears in *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2009;54:1902]. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2009;54:1249-55.
- Hahn EJ, York NL, Rayens MK. Smoke-free legislation in Appalachian counties. *Am J Public Health* 2010;100:2012-3.
- Kabir Z, Clarke V, Conroy R, McNamee E, Daly S, Clancy L. Low birthweight and preterm birth rates 1 year before and after the Irish workplace smoking ban. *BJOG* 2009;116:1782-7.
- Markowitz S. The effectiveness of cigarette regulations in reducing cases of Sudden Infant Death Syndrome. *J Health Econ* 2008;27:106-33.
- Department of Housing and Urban Development (US). Non-smoking policies in public housing. Washington: HUD, Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control; 2009. Also available from: URL: <http://www.hud.gov/offices/pih/publications/notices/09/pih2009-21.pdf> [cited 2011 Sep 12].
- Department of Housing and Urban Development (US). Smoke-free policies in public housing. Washington: HUD, Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control; 2012. Also available from: URL: <http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/documents/huddoc?id512-25pihn.pdf> [cited 2011 Sep 12].
- Drach LL, Pizacani BA, Rohde KL, Schubert S. The acceptability of comprehensive smoke-free policies to low-income tenants in subsidized housing. *Prev Chronic Dis* 2010;7:A66.
- Pizacani BA, Maher JE, Rohde K, Drach L, Stark MJ. Implementation of a smoke-free policy in subsidized multiunit housing: effects on smoking cessation and secondhand smoke exposure. *Nicotine Tob Res* 2012;14:1027-34.
- American Nonsmokers' Rights Foundation. U.S. laws and policies restricting or prohibiting smoking in private units of multi-unit housing. 2014 [cited 2012 May 23]. Available from: URL: <http://www.no-smoke.org/pdf/smokefreemuh.pdf>
- The Center for Social Gerontology. Housing authorities/commissions which have adopted smoke-free policies; 2011 [cited 2012 Oct 12]. Available from: URL: <http://www.tcs.org/sfelp/SFHousingAuthorities.pdf>
- Aligne CA, Stoddard JJ. Tobacco and children. An economic evaluation of the medical effects of parental smoking [published erratum appears in *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med* 1997;151:988]. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med* 1997;151:648-53.
- Cook DG, Strachan DP. Health effects of passive smoking: summary of effects of parental smoking on the respiratory health of children and implications for research. *Thorax* 1999;54:357-66.
- DiFranza JR, Aligne CA, Weitzman M. Prenatal and postnatal environmental tobacco smoke exposure and children's health. *Pediatrics* 2004;113(4 Suppl):1007-15.
- Florence CS, Adams EK, Ayadi MF. Pediatric health care costs attributable to exposure to second-hand smoke: an exploratory analysis. *J Health Care Finance* 2007;34:36-43.
- Leung GM, Ho LM, Lam TH. The economic burden of environmental tobacco smoke in the first year of life. *Arch Dis Child* 2003;88:767-71.
- Levy DE, Rigotti NA, Winickoff JP. Medicaid expenditures for children living with smokers. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2011;11:125.
- Levy DE, Winickoff JP, Rigotti NA. School absenteeism among children living with smokers. *Pediatrics* 2011;128:650-6.
- Miller T, Rauh VA, Glied SA, Hattis D, Rundle A, Andrews H, et al. The economic impact of early life environmental tobacco smoke exposure: early intervention for developmental delay. *Environ Health Perspect* 2006;114:1585-8.
- Oh SS, Tcheurekdjian H, Roth LA, Nguyen EA, Sen S, Galanter JM, et al. Effect of secondhand smoke on asthma control among black and Latino children. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2012;129:1478-83.
- Lightwood J. The economics of smoking and cardiovascular disease. *Prog Cardiovasc Dis* 2003;46:39-78.
- Lightwood JM, Glantz SA. Declines in acute myocardial infarction after smoke-free laws and individual risk attributable to secondhand smoke. *Circulation* 2009;120:1373-9.
- Pope CA 3rd, Burnett RT, Turner MC, Cohen A, Krewski D, Jerrett M, et al. Lung cancer and cardiovascular disease mortality associated with ambient air pollution and cigarette smoke: shape

- of the exposure-response relationships. *Environ Health Perspect* 2011;119:1616-21.
32. Plescia M, Wansink D, Waters HR, Herndon S. Medical costs of secondhand-smoke exposure in North Carolina. *NC Med J* 2011;72:7-12.
 33. Waters H. The economic impact of secondhand smoke in Maryland. Report submitted to the American Cancer Society. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health; 2006.
 34. Waters HR, Foldes SS, Alesci NL, Samet J. The economic impact of exposure to secondhand smoke in Minnesota. *Am J Public Health* 2009;99:754-9.
 35. Zollinger TW, Saywell RM Jr, Muegge CM, Przybylski MJ. Estimating the economic impact of secondhand smoke on Indiana in 2007. Indianapolis: Bowen Research Center—Indiana University School of Medicine; 2008.
 36. Behan DF, Eriksen MP, Lin Y. Economic effects of environmental tobacco smoke. Schaumburg (IL): Society of Actuaries; 2005.
 37. King BA, Peck RM, Babb SD. Cost savings associated with prohibiting smoking in U.S. subsidized housing. *Am J Prev Med* 2013;44:631-4.
 38. Lewit EM, Baker LS, Corman H, Shiono PH. The direct cost of low birth weight. *Future Child* 1995;5:35-56.
 39. Trasande L, Landrigan PJ, Schechter C. Public health and economic consequences of methyl mercury toxicity to the developing brain. *Environ Health Perspect* 2005;113:590-6.
 40. Department of Housing and Urban Development (US). Improving housing subsidy surveys: data collection techniques for identifying the housing subsidy status of survey respondents. Washington: HUD, Office of Policy Development and Research; 2005. Also available from: URL: <http://www.huduser.org/publications/pdf/datacollect.pdf> [cited 2012 Dec 1].
 41. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (US). Fourth national report on human exposure to environmental chemicals, 2009. Atlanta: CDC; 2009.
 42. SAS Institute, Inc. SAS®: Version 9.3. Cary (NC): SAS Institute, Inc.; 2011.
 43. Research Triangle Institute. SUDAAN®: Release 10.0. Research Triangle Park (NC): Research Triangle Institute; 2008.
 44. Haddix AC, Teutsch SM, Corso PS. Prevention effectiveness: a guide to decision analysis and economic evaluation. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press; 2003.
 45. Wolleswinkel-van den Bosch JH, Stolk EA, Francois M, Gasparini R, Brosa M. The health care burden and societal impact of acute otitis media in seven European countries: results of an Internet survey. *Vaccine* 2010;28 Suppl 6:G39-52.
 46. Grosse SD, Krueger KV, Mvundura M. Economic productivity by age and sex: 2007 estimates for the United States. *Med Care* 2009;47(7 Suppl 1):S94-103.
 47. Barnett SB, Nurmagambetov TA. Costs of asthma in the United States: 2002–2007. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2011;127:145-52.
 48. Harris J. Double jeopardy and the veil of ignorance—a reply. *J Med Ethics* 1995;21:151-7.
 49. Trogdon JG, Finkelstein EA, Nwaise IA, Tangka FK, Orenstein D. The economic burden of chronic cardiovascular disease for major insurers. *Health Promot Pract* 2007;8:234-42.
 50. Chang S, Long SR, Kutikova L, Bowman L, Finley D, Crown WH, et al. Estimating the cost of cancer: results on the basis of claims data analyses for cancer patients diagnosed with seven types of cancer during 1999 to 2000. *J Clin Oncol* 2004;22:3524-30.
 51. Bradley CJ, Yabroff KR, Dahman B, Feuer EJ, Mariotto A, Brown ML. Productivity costs of cancer mortality in the United States: 2000–2020. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2008;100:1763-70.
 52. National Center for Healthy Housing. Reasons to explore smoke-free housing. Columbia (MD): National Center for Healthy Housing; 2009.
 53. Live Smoke Free. The benefits of a smoke-free policy [cited 2014 Dec 11]. Available from: URL: <http://www.mnsmokefreehousing.org/organizations/benefits.html>
 54. Levy DE, Rigotti NA, Winickoff JP. Tobacco smoke exposure in a sample of Boston public housing residents. *Am J Prev Med* 2013;44:63-6.
 55. Max W, Sung HY, Shi Y. Deaths from secondhand smoke exposure in the United States: economic implications. *Am J Public Health* 2012;102:2173-80.
 56. Max W, Sung HY, Shi Y. Who is exposed to secondhand smoke? Self-reported and serum cotinine measured exposure in the U.S., 1999–2006. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2009;6:1633-48.
 57. Department of Housing and Urban Development (US). HUD resident characteristics report. Washington: HUD; 2011.
 58. Census Bureau (US). Statistical abstract of the United States: 2012 (131st edition). Washington: Census Bureau; 2011. Also available from: URL: <http://www.census.gov/compendia/statab> [cited 2012 May 17].
 59. Brownson RC, Hopkins DP, Wakefield MA. Effects of smoking restrictions in the workplace. *Annu Rev Public Health* 2002;23:333-48.
 60. Wilson KM, Klein JD, Blumkin AK, Gottlieb M, Winickoff JP. Tobacco-smoke exposure in children who live in multiunit housing. *Pediatrics* 2011;127:85-92.
 61. Wilson KM, Torok M, McMillen R, Tanski S, Klein JD, Winickoff JP. Tobacco smoke incursions in multiunit housing. *Am J Public Health* 2014;104:1445-53.
 62. Akobundu E, Ju J, Blatt L, Mullins CD. Cost-of-illness studies: a review of current methods. *Pharmacoeconomics* 2006;24:869-90.
 63. Foster TS, Miller JD, Marton JP, Caloyeras JP, Russell MW, Menzin J. Assessment of the economic burden of COPD in the U.S.: a review and synthesis of the literature. *COPD* 2006;3:211-8.
 64. Bryant-Stephens T. Asthma disparities in urban environments. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2009;123:1199-206.
 65. Cole N, Fox MK, Lin BH. Nutrition and health characteristics of low-income populations: volume II, WIC participants and non-participants. Washington: Department of Agriculture (US), Food Assistance and Nutrition Research Program; 2004. EFAN-04014-2. Also available from: URL: <http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/efan-electronic-publications-from-the-food-assistance-nutrition-research-program/efan04014-2.aspx> [cited 2011 Dec 2].
 66. Shi N, Palmer L, Chu BC, Katkin JP, Hall CB, Masaquel AS, et al. Association of RSV lower respiratory tract infection and subsequent healthcare use and costs: a Medicaid claims analysis in early-preterm, late-preterm, and full-term infants. *J Med Econ* 2011;14:335-40.
 67. Census Bureau (US). Current Population Survey: annual social and economic supplement, 2012 [cited 2014 Feb 4]. Available from: URL: https://www.census.gov/hhes/www/cpstable/032013/health/h02_000.htm