APPENDIX A Table S1 Eighth Grade Models Predicting Tobacco Use, 2000-2006					
Variable ^a	Current cigarette use OR (95%CI)	Daily cigarette use OR (95%CI)	Current smokeless tobacco use OR (95%CI)		
State tobacco policies					
Cigarette excise tax (\$)	0.83 (0.73, 0.95)	0.78 (0.63, 0.97)	0.61 (0.43, 0.86)		
Smoke-free air score	0.97 (0.93, 1.01)	0.94 (0.89, 0.999)	0.94 (0.85, 1.06)		
PUP score	1.04 (0.99, 1.09)	1.04 (0.97, 1.11)	1.12 (0.98, 1.30)		
Youth access to tobacco score	1.00 (0.99, 1.01)	1.00 (0.99, 1.01)	1.02 (0.99, 1.04)		
Synar retailer violation rate	1.00 (0.99, 1.01)	1.00 (0.98, 1.01)	0.98 (0.95, 1.02)		
School tobacco policy					
Tobacco Policy Monitoring Score	1.00 (0.92, 1.08)	0.98 (0.90, 1.07)	1.05 (0.86, 1.29)		
Exposure to anti-smoking advertising					
0 TRP	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.		
< 1 TRP	0.82 (0.72, 0.93)	0.86 (0.74, 1.003)	0.63 (0.47, 0.84)		
$\geq 1 \text{ TRP}$	0.72 (0.55, 0.93)	0.75 (0.54, 1.04)	0.50 (0.30, 0.82)		

Note.

a Each model adjusts for the following covariates: age, sex, race, type of school, school size, parental education level, number of parents at home, percent of students in the school on subsidized lunch, percent of students Black, percent of students Hispanic population density, and state tobacco acres.

Multiple Levels of Influence That Impact Youth Tobacco Use

APPENDIX A Table S2 Tenth Grade Models Predicting Tobacco Use, 2000-2006					
Variable ^a	Current cigarette use OR (95%CI)	Daily cigarette use OR (95%CI)	Current smokeless tobacco use OR (95%CI)		
State tobacco policies					
Cigarette excise tax (\$)	0.99 (0.91, 1.07)	0.97 (0.88, 1.07)	0.87 (0.70, 1.07)		
Smoke-free air score	0.99 (0.95, 1.03)	0.98 (0.94, 1.03)	0.96 (0.90, 1.03)		
PUP score	0.98 (0.92, 1.04)	0.99 (0.92, 1.07)	1.11 (1.01, 1.23)		
Youth access to tobacco score	1.00 (0.99, 1.01)	1.00 (0.98, 1.01)	1.01 (0.99, 1.02)		
Synar retailer violation rate	1.01 (0.998, 1.01)	1.01 (1.000, 1.02)	1.00 (0.98, 1.02)		
School tobacco policy					
Tobacco Policy Monitoring Score	1.03 (0.95, 1.11)	1.00 (0.93, 1.08)	0.99 (0.86, 1.15)		
Exposure to anti-smoking advertising	Ş				
0 TRP	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.		
< 1 TRP	1.03 (0.90, 1.17)	1.03 (0.89, 1.19)	0.89 (0.72, 1.10)		
$\geq 1 \text{ TRP}$	0.98 (0.83, 1.16)	0.93 (0.75, 1.16)	0.81 (0.58, 1.14)		

Note.

a Each model adjusts for the following covariates: age, sex, race, type of school, school size, parental education level, number of parents at home, percent of students in the school on subsidized lunch, percent of students Black, percent of students Hispanic population density, and state tobacco acres.

APPENDIX A Table S3 Twelfth Grade Modelsª Predicting Tobacco Use, 2000-2006					
Variable ^a	Current cigarette use OR (95%CI)	Daily cigarette use OR (95%CI)	Current smokeless tobacco use OR (95%CI)		
State tobacco policies					
Cigarette excise tax (\$)	0.81 (0.72, 0.92)	0.83 (0.72, 0.95)	0.65 (0.48, 0.88)		
Smoke-free air score	0.96 (0.94, 0.98)	0.97 (0.94, 0.995)	0.88 (0.80, 0.96)		
PUP score	1.06 (0.997, 1.13)	1.04 (0.97, 1.13)	1.13 (0.97, 1.32)		
Youth access to tobacco score	1.00 (0.99, 1.01)	0.99 (0.98, 1.003)	1.02 (0.99, 1.05)		
Synar retailer violation rate	1.01 (1.003, 1.02)	1.01 (1.002, 1.02)	1.01 (1.001, 1.01)		
School tobacco policy					
Tobacco Policy Monitoring Score	1.00 (0.91, 1.09)	1.00 (0.91, 1.11)	0.99 (0.82, 1.18)		
Exposure to anti-smoking advertising					
0 TRP	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.		
< 1 TRP	0.93 (0.82, 1.05)	0.90 (0.79, 1.02)	0.79 (0.58, 1.09)		
$\geq 1 \text{ TRP}$	0.90 (0.76, 1.07)	0.89 (0.75, 1.05)	1.02 (0.73, 1.44)		

Note.

a Each model adjusts for the following covariates: age, sex, race, type of school, school size, parental education level, number of parents at home, percent of students in the school on subsidized lunch, percent of students Black, percent of students Hispanic population density, and state tobacco acres.