

# BMJ Open

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email [info.bmjopen@bmj.com](mailto:info.bmjopen@bmj.com)

# BMJ Open

## Socioeconomic status and cigarette expenditure among U.S. households: Results from 2010-2015 Consumer Expenditure Survey

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2017-020571
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	10-Nov-2017
Complete List of Authors:	Siahpush, Mohammad; University of Nebraska Medical Center, Department of Health Promotion, Social and Behavioral Health Farazi, Paraskevi; University of Nebraska Medical Center, Epidemiology Maloney, Shannon; University of Nebraska Medical Center, Health Promotion Dinkel, Danae; University of Nebraska at Omaha, School of Health & Kinesiology Nguyen, Minh; University of Nebraska Medical Center, Epidemiology Singh, Gopal; US Department of Health & Human Services, HRSA/Maternal and Child Health Bureau
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Smoking and tobacco
Secondary Subject Heading:	Public health
Keywords:	Economics < TROPICAL MEDICINE, PUBLIC HEALTH, EPIDEMIOLOGY

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

only

1  
2  
3 **Socioeconomic status and cigarette expenditure among U.S. households:**  
4 **Results from 2010-2015 Consumer Expenditure Survey**  
5

6  
7 Mohammad Siahpush<sup>a</sup>, PhD, Paraskevi A Farazi<sup>b</sup>, PhD, Shannon I Maloney<sup>a</sup>, PhD, Danae  
8 Dinkel<sup>c</sup>, PhD, Minh N Nguyen<sup>b\*</sup>, MPH, BSN, Gopal K Singh<sup>d</sup>, PhD  
9

- 10 a. Department of Health Promotion, College of Public Health, University of Nebraska Medical  
11 Center, 984365 Nebraska Medical Center, Omaha, NE 68198, USA  
12 b. Department of Epidemiology, College of Public Health, University of Nebraska Medical  
13 Center, 984365 Nebraska Medical Center, Omaha, NE 68198, USA  
14 c. School of Health and Kinesiology, College of Education, University of Nebraska at Omaha,  
15 6001 Dodge Street, Omaha, NE 68182, USA  
16 d. Health Resources and Services Administration, U.S. Department of Health & Human  
17 Services, 5600 Fishers Lane, Room 13N42, Rockville, MD 20857, USA  
18  
19 \* Correspondence: minh.n.nguyen@unmc.edu; Tel: +1-402-559-9409  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## ABSTRACT

**Objectives:** To examine (1) the association between household socioeconomic status (SES) and whether a household spends money on cigarettes, and (2) socioeconomic variations in percentage of total household expenditure spent on cigarettes among smoking households.

**Methods:** We used data from six consecutive years, 2010-2015, of the Consumer Expenditure Interview Survey. The interviews involved a structured questionnaire to collect data on household income, demographics, and a complete range of expenditures including expenditure on cigarettes. Households that reported cigarette expenditure in the previous three months were distinguished as smoking households. SES indicators employed in this study were education and occupation of the head of household and household poverty status. Logistic regression was used to assess the association of household smoking status with SES. Linear regression was used to assess the association of cigarette expenditure as a percentage of total household expenditure with SES. The analysis sample size was 39,218.

**Results:** Overall, 17.4% of households reported expenditure on cigarettes. Among smoking households, the average quarterly expenditure on cigarettes in constant 2015 dollars was \$458.1 and the average cigarette expenditure as a percentage of total household expenditure was 5.6%. Multivariable regression results showed that poorer households, those headed by a person with a lower level of education or lower occupational status were more likely to report cigarette expenditure and had a higher cigarette expenditure as a percentage of total household expenditure ( $p < 0.001$  for all of the stated associations).

**Conclusion:** Lower SES households are more likely to spend money on cigarettes and spend a larger percentage of their total expenditure on cigarettes. We recommend enhanced efforts in increasing cigarette taxation, anti-smoking mass media campaigns, and smoking bans in public places, which are effective in reducing smoking among low SES smokers.

### Strengths and limitations of this study:

- We used a national household survey representing the entire U.S. civilian noninstitutional population that involved a structured questionnaire to collect data on household income, demographics, and a complete range of expenditures.
- Conclusions are based on data from six consecutive years of national and comprehensive expenditure data with relatively high response rates and large sample sizes.
- The cross-sectional design does not allow for inferences about the effect of socioeconomic status on whether a household spends money on cigarettes or percent of household expenditure spent on cigarettes among smoking households.
- Very high-income households are less likely to respond to the survey as households in the CES were linked to zip-code level average income, however non-response rates were not associated with income over most of the income distribution.

## INTRODUCTION

Smoking cigarettes not only causes numerous health conditions,<sup>1</sup> but also is associated with deleterious financial consequences and a lowered standard of living. For example, smokers compared to non-smokers are more likely to experience financial stress, defined as events such as going without meals or not being able to pay rent.<sup>2</sup> Similarly, among smokers, higher cigarette expenditure is associated with a higher probability of experiencing financial stress.<sup>3</sup> Furthermore, smokers who spend more on cigarettes are more likely to report “smoking-induced deprivation”, measured by asking smokers whether “money ... spent on cigarettes resulted in not having enough money for household essentials such as food.”<sup>3 4</sup> There is also evidence that quitting smoking is associated with a subsequent reduction in the probability of experiencing financial stress<sup>5 6</sup> and an increased level of prosperity.<sup>5</sup>

One of the strong and persistent determinants of smoking behavior in developed countries is socioeconomic status (SES).<sup>7-12</sup> For example, in the United States (U.S.), in 2015, smoking prevalence among adults living below poverty line was nearly twice that of those at or above poverty line (26.1% versus 13.9%). Similarly, smoking prevalence among individuals aged 25 years or older ranged from 34.1% in persons with a high school diploma to 16.6% in those with an associate degree to only 3.6% in those with a graduate degree.<sup>9</sup>

While there are numerous studies documenting the association between SES and smoking behavior, very little has been published on the association between SES and expenditure on cigarettes. An expenditure study conducted in Australia used data from a sample of 6,892 households and showed that those with a lower SES were more likely to report tobacco expenditure.<sup>13</sup> The odds of tobacco expenditure was 2.3 times greater among households headed by a person with no educational qualification than a university degree and 1.4 times greater

1  
2  
3 among households headed by a person with a blue-collar occupation than a professional  
4 occupation. Furthermore, among smoking households, those with a lower SES spent more of  
5 their funds on tobacco. Percent of total household expenditure spent on tobacco was 46% higher  
6 among households headed by a person with no educational qualification than a university degree  
7 and 38% higher among households headed by a person with a blue-collar occupation than a  
8 professional occupation. A different study of 1,144 households in Sri Lanka revealed that while  
9 higher income households spent more on tobacco products, they had a lower tobacco expenditure  
10 as a percentage of total household expenditure.<sup>14</sup> Similar results were reported in a study  
11 conducted in the Russian Federation, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan,<sup>15</sup>  
12 and another in Morocco.<sup>16</sup> We do not know of any studies in the U.S. that examine SES as a  
13 determinant of whether a household spends money on cigarettes and how much of the total  
14 household expenditure is spent on cigarettes. Our aim was to use data from the Consumer  
15 Expenditure Survey (CES) in the U.S. to examine (1) the association between household SES  
16 and whether a household reports cigarette expenditure, and (2) SES variations in percentage of  
17 total household expenditure spent on cigarettes among smoking households.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

## 39 METHODS

### 40 Data

41 We used data from the CES, which is conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau under contract with  
42 the Bureau of Labor Statistics.<sup>17</sup> The CES is a national household survey representing the entire  
43 U.S. civilian noninstitutional population. The CES uses a cluster sampling design where primary  
44 sampling units are small clusters of counties grouped together into geographic entities. The  
45 sampling frame within the primary sampling units is the Census Bureau's Master Address File,  
46 which contains residential addresses identified in the 2010 census. Approximately 6,900  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 households at the identified addresses are interviewed each quarter of the year. Each household  
4  
5 is interviewed every three months over four calendar quarters. After the fourth interview, the  
6  
7 household is dropped from the survey and replaced by a new sample. The response rates varied  
8  
9 from the highest of 74.5% in 2010 to the lowest of 64.2% in 2015.<sup>18</sup> The interviews' duration  
10  
11 was about 60 minutes and they were primarily conducted in person using a structured  
12  
13 questionnaire to collect data on household income, demographics, and a complete range of  
14  
15 expenditure items. We appended data from the third quarter data collection (i.e., July, August,  
16  
17 and September) of six consecutive years, 2010-2015, with a total sample size of 39,806  
18  
19 households. We did not use the first quarter data because the expenditure report of some of the  
20  
21 participants pertained to the previous calendar year. Our sensitivity analyses revealed that using  
22  
23 data from the second and fourth quarter yields very similar results as we report in this article. We  
24  
25 excluded from the analysis 588 households, i.e., 1.5% of the total number of households, for  
26  
27 which there was a missing value for one or more study variables except income. While the  
28  
29 amount of missing data was negligible and not likely to have biased the results, we note that  
30  
31 households with missing data were more likely to be of a higher SES background and report  
32  
33 cigarette expenditure. The study sample size was 39,218. No source of funding was used to  
34  
35 conduct this study. Ethical approval was not needed for this study as we used secondary data that  
36  
37 are publically available by the U.S. Bureau of Statistics.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 **Measurement of smoking status of households and cigarette expenditure as a percentage of**  
47 **total household expenditure**  
48  
49

50 The head of household was asked: "since the first of the reference month [three months prior to  
51  
52 the interview], have you or any members of your household purchased cigarettes?" An  
53  
54 affirmative answer indicated a smoking household. The head of a smoking household was asked:  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 “What is the usual weekly expense for cigarettes?” Weekly cigarette expenditure amounts were  
4 converted to quarterly amounts by the Census Bureau to match the timeframe for the reporting of  
5 most other household expenditures items. We converted nominal expenditure amounts to  
6 constant 2015 dollars using all-item consumer price index to account for inflation.<sup>19 20</sup> For  
7 smoking households, we computed cigarette expenditure as a percentage of total expenditure  
8 including expenditure on items such as food, alcoholic beverages, tobacco and smoking supplies,  
9 housing, apparel, transportation, health care, entertainment, and personal care.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

### 19 **Measurement of SES and other covariates**

20  
21 We employed three SES indicators: household poverty status, education, and occupation of head  
22 of household. We defined poverty status as the ratio of household income to poverty threshold  
23 for a given family size and composition for each survey year.<sup>21</sup> Regression-based multiple  
24 imputation was used by the Census Bureau to replace missing household income data.<sup>22</sup> We  
25 categorized education of the head of household into four groups as follows: less than high  
26 school, high school graduate, some college or associate degree, and Bachelor’s or higher degree.  
27  
28 We categorized occupation of the head of household into five groups as follows: manager and  
29 professional; administrative support, technician, sales; service, including protective and private  
30 household service; blue-collar, including machine and transportation operator, handler, laborer,  
31 mechanic, and construction worker; other occupations; and not in the labor force.  
32  
33 Other covariates used in the models were as follows: race/ethnicity of head of household,  
34 categorized as non-Hispanic White, non-Hispanic Black, Hispanic, and other; household size;  
35 number of males aged 16 and over in the household; and survey year.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

### 52 **Statistical analysis**



1  
2  
3 The unit of analysis in this study was the household. U.S. Department of Labor provides  
4 sampling weights for each CES. These weights were computed based on the probability of  
5 selection of a household, household non-response, and national household distribution of age,  
6 race, and region.<sup>17</sup> In order to combine six years of surveys, we created a unified weight by  
7 multiplying the original weight in a given survey to the ratio of the sample size for that survey  
8 and the sum of samples sizes of all six surveys.<sup>23</sup> We used this unified weight for the  
9 computation of all point estimates and in all analyses.

10  
11 The U.S. Department of Labor also provides 44 replicate weights for standard error estimation.<sup>17</sup>  
12  
13 Researchers are instructed to use these replicate weights to construct 44 subsamples from the  
14 original sample data and thereby generate 44 separate estimates for each statistic. These  
15 estimates are then used to approximate standard errors based on the standard formula for  
16 computing sample standard deviation. We used this data-dependent method of estimating  
17 standard errors which is especially useful when data is generated through a multi-stage sampling  
18 design and where, to preserve respondent anonymity, complete information on sample clusters or  
19 strata is not made available to researchers as is the case in CES.<sup>24</sup>

20  
21 We first conducted preliminary analyses to assess the bivariate associations of household  
22 smoking status and cigarette expenditure as a percentage of total household expenditure with  
23 covariates. Subsequently, we used logistic regression to assess the association of household  
24 smoking status and SES indicators. We also used multivariable linear regression to assess the  
25 association of cigarette expenditure as a percentage of total household expenditure with SES  
26 indicators. In regression analyses, we used the natural log transformation for cigarette  
27 expenditure as a percentage of total household expenditure as this variable had a highly  
28 positively skewed distribution. Covariates whose *p*-values were greater than 0.1 in the bivariate  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 models were not included in the multivariable models. We used Stata version 14.1 for all  
4  
5 analyses.<sup>25</sup>  
6  
7

## 8 RESULTS

### 10 Sample characteristics and bivariate associations

11  
12 Table 1 provides weighted sample characteristics and bivariate associations between the  
13  
14 covariates and the outcomes. Overall, 17.4% of households reported expenditure on cigarettes.  
15  
16 Among smoking households, the average quarterly expenditure on cigarettes in constant 2015  
17  
18 dollars was \$458.1 and the average cigarette expenditure as a percentage of total household  
19  
20 expenditure was 5.6%. About 14.6% of the households lived below the poverty threshold and  
21  
22 38.4% of the heads of households did not report a level of education beyond high school  
23  
24 graduation. About 25.5% of the households were headed by a person holding a managerial or  
25  
26 professional occupation, 16.8% by a person with an administrative occupation, 12.9% by a  
27  
28 person holding a service occupation, and 10.4% by a person in a blue-collar occupation. The  
29  
30 percentage of non-Hispanic Whites, non-Hispanic Blacks, and Hispanics were 69.1, 12.5, and  
31  
32 12.7%, respectively.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38  
39 At the bivariate level, poorer households, those headed by a person with a lower level of  
40  
41 education, and those headed by a person with a lower occupational status (such as blue-collar,  
42  
43 service, or administrative compared to managerial or professional occupations) had a higher  
44  
45 probability of being a smoking household. For example, while 22.1% of households below  
46  
47 poverty reported cigarette expenditure, only 13.2% of those at or above 300% of poverty  
48  
49 threshold did so. Similarly, while the percentage of smoking households was 22.6 among  
50  
51 households headed by a person who did not complete high school, that percentage was only 8.2  
52  
53 among households headed by a college graduate. Furthermore, while 25.5% of household headed  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

by a blue-collar person reported cigarette expenditure, only 11.7% of those headed by a person in a managerial or professional occupation did so.

Bivariate results also showed that poorer households, those headed by a person with a lower level of education or lower occupational status had a higher percentage of their total expenditure devoted to cigarette expenditure.

**Table 1. Weighted sample characteristics, bivariate association of smoking status of households and covariates (n = 39,218), and bivariate association of cigarette expenditure and covariates among smoking household (n = 6,559)**

Covariates	% in sample	% smoking household ( <i>p</i> -value for $\chi^2$ <sup>a</sup> )	Cigarette expenditure as % of total expenditure ( <i>p</i> -value for $\chi^2$ <sup>a</sup> )
Total sample		17.35	5.56
Poverty status		( <i>p</i> < 0.001)	( <i>p</i> < 0.001)
< 100%	14.63	22.07	7.74
100% $\geq$ and < 200%	21.38	19.47	6.64
200% $\geq$ and < 300%	30.55	18.20	5.00
$\geq$ 300%	33.44	13.15	3.63
Education		( <i>p</i> < 0.001)	( <i>p</i> < 0.001)
Less than high school	13.06	22.62	7.60
High school graduate	25.37	23.66	5.98
Some college or associate degree	31.09	18.93	4.98
Bachelor's or higher degree	30.47	8.22	3.48
Occupation		( <i>p</i> < 0.001)	( <i>p</i> < 0.001)
Manager and professional	25.48	11.72	3.64
Administrative support	16.78	18.67	4.63
Service	12.91	19.51	5.38
Blue-collar	10.44	25.46	5.44
Other Occupations	0.80	13.92	4.28
Not in the labor force	33.59	17.68	7.16
Race/ethnicity		( <i>p</i> < 0.001)	( <i>p</i> < 0.001)
Non-Hispanic White	69.09	19.06	5.69
Non-Hispanic Black	12.52	16.76	5.94
Hispanic	12.71	10.97	4.28
Other	5.68	12.04	4.36
Household size		( <i>p</i> < 0.001)	( <i>p</i> < 0.001)
1	29.51	15.13	7.20
2	32.15	17.57	5.41
3	15.22	20.13	4.94
4+	23.11	18.03	4.44
Number of males aged 16 +		( <i>p</i> < 0.001)	( <i>p</i> < 0.001)
0	22.81	14.34	6.56
1	63.85	17.22	5.46

2+	13.34	23.13	4.82
Year		( $p = 0.009$ )	( $p = 0.281$ )
2010	16.97	18.53	5.93
2011	16.00	18.81	5.56
2012	16.55	17.06	5.29
2013	16.7	16.41	5.48
2014	16.77	16.31	5.39
2015	17.01	17.01	5.62

a  $P$ -values for the bivariate association of covariates and each of the three outcomes using 44 replicate weights.

### Multivariable analyses

Table 2 shows adjusted odds ratios for the association of being a smoking household and SES indicators. Poorer households, those headed by a person with a lower level of education or lower occupational status were more likely to report cigarette expenditure ( $p < 0.001$  for poverty, education, and occupation). The odds of being a smoking household was 91% larger among households in poverty than those whose income was at or above 300% of poverty threshold. Similarly, households headed by a person who did not complete high school had 3.4 times the odds of being a smoking household than those headed by a person with at least a Bachelor's degree. Furthermore, the odds of being a smoking household was 46% larger among households headed by a blue-collar worker than those headed by a person in a managerial or professional occupation. Race/ethnicity was associated with smoking status ( $p < 0.001$ ) such that the odds of being a smoking household were largest among households headed by a non-Hispanic White person and lowest among those headed by a Hispanic individual. Larger households and those with more males 16 years or older had higher odds of reporting cigarette expenditure ( $p < 0.001$  for both household size and number of males 16 years or older). Finally, there was some evidence that odds of being a smoking household were greater in 2010 and 2011 than in later years ( $p = 0.037$ ).

Table 2 also shows the results of the regression of the natural logarithm of cigarette expenditure as a percentage of total household expenditure on SES and other covariates. Poorer households, those headed by a person with a lower level of education or a lower occupational status had a higher cigarette expenditure as a percentage of total household expenditure. Percent spent on cigarettes was 77% ( $e^{0.57} \times 100 - 100$ ) higher among households in poverty compared to those with an income at or above 300% of poverty threshold. Similarly, percent spent on cigarettes was 82% ( $e^{0.60} \times 100 - 100$ ) higher among households headed by a person who did not complete high school than those headed by a person with at least a Bachelor's degree. Furthermore, percent spent on cigarettes was 19% ( $e^{0.17} \times 100 - 100$ ) higher among households headed by a person with a blue-collar occupation than those headed by a person in a managerial or professional occupation. Race/ethnicity was associated with percent spent on cigarettes such that households headed by a non-Hispanic White person had the highest and those headed by a Hispanic individual had the lowest percent spent on cigarettes ( $p < 0.001$ ). Larger households and those with a smaller number of males 16 years or older had a lower percentage spent on cigarettes ( $p < 0.001$  for household size and  $p = 0.018$  for number of males 16 years or older).

**Table 2: Multivariable results<sup>a</sup> for the association of smoking status of household and cigarette expenditure as a percentage of total household expenditure with socioeconomic status indicators and other covariates**

Covariates	Probability of being a smoking household (n = 39,218)		Cigarette expenditure as a % of household expenditure (n = 6,559)	
	Adjusted OR (95% CI)	p-value	Adjusted $\hat{\beta}$ (95% CI)	p-value
Poverty status		<0.001		<0.001
< 100%	1.91 (1.66, 2.21)		0.57 (0.50, 0.64)	
100% $\geq$ and < 200%	1.48 (1.30, 1.67)		0.47 (0.40, 0.55)	
200% $\geq$ and < 300%	1.27 (1.19, 1.37)		0.27 (0.21, 0.33)	
$\geq$ 300%	1.00		0.00	
Education		<0.001		<0.001
Less than high school	3.40 (2.95, 3.93)		0.60 (0.51, 0.69)	
High school graduate	3.04 (2.73, 3.37)		0.44 (0.36, 0.52)	
Some college or associate degree	2.34 (2.13, 2.57)		0.27 (0.20, 0.34)	
Bachelor's or higher degree	1.00		0.00	
Occupation		<0.001		<0.001
Manager and professional	1.00		0.00	

Administrative support	1.20 (1.09, 1.32 )	0.05 (-0.02, 0.12)
Service	1.20 (1.09, 1.33)	0.12 (0.04, 0.20)
Blue-collar	1.46 (1.27, 1.67)	0.17 (0.07, 0.26)
Other Occupations	0.68 (0.45, 1.04)	-0.08 (-0.34, 0.19)
Not in the labor force	0.90 (0.81, 1.01)	0.23 (0.17, 0.29)
Race/ethnicity	<0.001	<0.001
Non-Hispanic White	1.00	0.00
Non-Hispanic Black	0.67 (0.59, 0.76)	-0.17 (-0.25, -0.10 )
Hispanic	0.32 (0.28, 0.36)	-0.54 (-0.63, -0.45)
Other	0.59 (0.51, 0.68)	-0.31 (-0.41, -0.21)
Household size	<0.001	<0.001
1	1.00	0.00
2	1.23 (1.10, 1.37)	-0.19 (-0.24, -0.14 )
3	1.40 (1.26, 1.55)	-0.32 (-0.38, -0.25)
4+	1.15 (1.03, 1.29)	-0.49 (-0.54, -0.43)
Number of males aged 16 +	<0.001	0.0178
0	1.00	0.00
1	1.33 (1.23, 1.44)	0.05 (-0.00, 0.11)
2+	1.88 (1.70, 2.09)	0.12 (0.04, 0.20)
Year	0.037	--
2010	1.00	--
2011	1.02 (0.93, 1.11)	--
2012	0.92 (0.83, 1.00)	--
2013	0.88 (0.78, 0.99)	--
2014	0.88 (0.79, 0.98)	--
2015	0.95 (0.85, 1.06)	--

<sup>a</sup> All odds ratios (OR) from logistic analysis and regression coefficients ( $\hat{\beta}$ ) from linear regression analyses are adjusted for the effect of all covariates in the model.

## DISCUSSION

In this study, we used data from six consecutive years of the U.S. CES and found that lower SES households not only are more likely to spend money on cigarettes but also spend a larger portion of their total household expenditure on cigarettes. Our results were consistent with the findings from other countries, although these findings pertained to the general category of tobacco expenditure and not specifically to cigarette expenditure.<sup>13-16</sup>

We also found that larger households, households with more males aged 16+ years, and households headed by a non-Hispanic white person compared to others had a higher probability

1  
2  
3 of reporting cigarette expenditure and spent a larger percentage of their total household  
4 expenditure on cigarettes. None of these covariates, except number of males in the household,  
5  
6 have been previously investigated in regards to tobacco expenditure. Our finding about number  
7  
8 of males in the household was consistent with a study that was conducted in the New  
9  
10 Independent States.<sup>15</sup>  
11  
12

13  
14 A strength of this work was its use of six consecutive years of national and comprehensive  
15 expenditure data with relatively high response rates and large sample sizes. The validity of the  
16  
17 CES data has been investigated by comparing them with National Income and Product Accounts  
18  
19 data.<sup>26</sup> While this comparison was not specifically done for cigarette expenditure, the findings  
20  
21 showed that most of the large categories of consumption were measured well in the CES, as the  
22  
23 ratio to the National Income and Accounts statistics was close to one and has not declined  
24  
25 notably over time.<sup>26</sup> The major weakness of the study is that, as it is the case with all cross-  
26  
27 sectional analyses, it does not allow inferences about causality. It is plausible that poorer  
28  
29 households headed by a person with a low level of formal education are more likely to have one  
30  
31 or more smokers in the household and spend money on cigarettes. The effect of SES on smoking  
32  
33 has been extensively studied.<sup>7 27-31</sup> It is also plausible that households that spend money on  
34  
35 cigarettes and have higher health care expenditures due to smoking are more likely to have  
36  
37 reduced income and experience downward socioeconomic mobility. However, to our knowledge,  
38  
39 the effect of smoking on downward mobility has not been studied. Another weakness of this  
40  
41 work is that, as reported in a study where households in the CES were linked to zip-code level  
42  
43 average income, the very high income households are less likely to respond to the survey.<sup>32</sup>  
44  
45 However, non-response rates were not associated with income over most of the income  
46  
47 distribution.<sup>32</sup>  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 In light of our finding that lower SES households are more likely to include a smoker and spend  
4 relatively more on cigarettes, we recommend tobacco control policies that are effective in  
5 reducing smoking among lower SES groups. Increasing taxation on cigarettes is the most  
6 effective policy for reducing smoking among all segments of the population. In fact, many  
7 studies have shown that increasing the price of cigarettes results in a larger decrease in smoking  
8 prevalence among lower income and occupational groups than others.<sup>7 33 34</sup> This policy, however,  
9 is likely to negatively affect the finances of low income smokers who fail to quit or reduce  
10 smoking. To address this problem, part or all of the revenues from increased taxation can be used  
11 to fund evidence-based smoking cessation programs<sup>35</sup> for these smokers. There is also evidence  
12 that anti-smoking mass media campaigns are effective in reducing smoking prevalence<sup>36 37</sup> and  
13 increasing cessation rates<sup>38</sup> among low SES smokers. Finally, there is some evidence that bans  
14 on smoking in public places are effective in reducing smoking prevalence and consumption  
15 among lower SES smokers<sup>39 40</sup> and across all socioeconomic groups.<sup>41</sup>

16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36 **Contributorship statement:** Mohammad Siahpush contributed to the following aspects of the  
37 work: conception, design, data acquisition, data analysis, interpretation of data, drafting, and  
38 critical revision. Paraskevi Farazi contributed to the following aspects of the work: conception,  
39 data analysis, interpretation of data, and critical revision. Shannon Maloney contributed to the  
40 following aspects of the work: conception, data analysis, interpretation of data, and critical  
41 revision. Danae Dinkel contributed to the following aspects of the work: conception, data  
42 analysis, interpretation of data, and critical revision. Minh Nguyen contributed to the following  
43 aspects of the work: design, data analysis, interpretation of data, drafting, and critical revision.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000



1  
2  
3 critical revision. All authors approve the final version as submitted. All authors are accountable  
4  
5 for all aspects of the work.  
6

7  
8 **Competing interests:** We acknowledge that none of the authors or their institutions have  
9  
10 financial or personal relationships or affiliations that could influence (or bias) our decisions,  
11  
12 work, or manuscript. We confirm that this conflict of interest disclosure information is accurate  
13  
14 and complete.  
15

16  
17 **Funding:** No source of funding was used to conduct this study. Ethical approval was not needed  
18  
19 for this study as we used secondary data that are publically available by the U.S. Bureau of  
20  
21 Statistics.  
22

23  
24 **Data sharing statement:** No additional data available.  
25  
26

## 27 28 29 REFERENCES

- 30  
31  
32 1. U.S. Department of Health Human Services. The health consequences of smoking—50 years  
33  
34 of progress: a report of the Surgeon General. *Atlanta, GA: US Department of Health and*  
35  
36 *Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for*  
37  
38 *Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Office on Smoking and Health*  
39  
40 2014;17  
41  
42
- 43 2. Siahpush M, Borland R, Scollo M. Smoking and financial stress. *Tobacco Control*  
44  
45 2003;12:60-66.  
46  
47
- 48 3. Siahpush M, Borland R, YONG HH, et al. Tobacco expenditure, smoking-induced  
49  
50 deprivation and financial stress: Results from the International Tobacco Control (ITC)  
51  
52 Four-Country Survey. *Drug and alcohol review* 2012;31(5):664-71.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4 4. Siahpush M, Thrasher JF, Yong HH, et al. Cigarette prices, cigarette expenditure and  
5  
6 smoking-induced deprivation: findings from the International Tobacco Control Mexico  
7  
8 survey. *Tobacco control* 2013;22(4):223-26. doi: 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2012-050613;  
9  
10 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2012-050613
- 11  
12 5. Siahpush M, Spittal M, Singh GK. Association of Smoking Cessation With Financial Stress  
13  
14 and Material Well-Being: Results From a Prospective Study of a Population-Based  
15  
16 National Survey. *American Journal of Public Health* 2007;97(12):2281-87.
- 17  
18 6. Siahpush M, Spittal M, Singh GK. Smoking cessation and financial stress. *Journal of Public*  
19  
20 *Health* 2007;29(4):338-42.
- 21  
22 7. Hiscock R, Bauld L, Amos A, et al. Socioeconomic status and smoking: a review. *Annals of*  
23  
24 *the New York Academy of Sciences* 2012;1248(1):107-23.
- 25  
26 8. Garrett BE, Dube SR, Trosclair A, et al. Cigarette smoking—United States, 1965–2008.  
27  
28 *MMWR Surveill Summ* 2011;60(1):109-13.
- 29  
30 9. Jamal A. Current cigarette smoking among adults—United States, 2005–2015. *MMWR*  
31  
32 *Morbidity and mortality weekly report* 2016;65
- 33  
34 10. Siahpush M, Borland R. Sociodemographic variations in smoking status among Australians  
35  
36 aged 18 years and over: Multivariate results from the 1995 National Health Survey.  
37  
38 *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health* 2001;25:438-42.
- 39  
40 11. Nagelhout GE, de Korte-de Boer D, Kunst AE, et al. Trends in socioeconomic inequalities in  
41  
42 smoking prevalence, consumption, initiation, and cessation between 2001 and 2008 in the  
43  
44 Netherlands. Findings from a national population survey. *BMC Public Health*  
45  
46 2012;12(1):303.
- 47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
12. Hiscock R, Bauld L, Amos A, et al. Smoking and socioeconomic status in England: the rise of the never smoker and the disadvantaged smoker. *Journal of Public Health* 2012;34(3):390-96.
  13. Siahpush M. Socioeconomic status and tobacco expenditure among Australian households: results from the 1998-99 Household Expenditure Survey. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* 2003;57:798-801.
  14. Perera KMN, Guruge GD, Jayawardana PL. Household Expenditure on Tobacco Consumption in a Poverty-Stricken Rural District in Sri Lanka. *Asia Pacific Journal of Public Health* 2017;29(2):140-48.
  15. Djibuti M, Gotsadze G, Mataradze G, et al. Influence of household demographic and socio-economic factors on household expenditure on tobacco in six New Independent States. *BMC Public Health* 2007;7(1):222.
  16. Tachfouti N, Berraho M, Elfakir S, et al. Socioeconomic status and tobacco expenditures among Moroccans: results of the “Maroc Tabagisme” survey. *American Journal of Health Promotion* 2010;24(5):334-39.
  17. U.S. Department of Labor. 2015 Users' Document: Interview Survey Public-Use Microdata (PUMD) Consumer Expenditure: Bureau of Labor Statistics, Division of Consumer Expenditure Surveys, 2016.
  18. U.S. Department of Labor. 2015 Response Rates: Interview and Diary Survey Consumer Expenditure Public Use Microdata: Bureau of Labor Statistics, Division of Consumer Expenditure Surveys, 2016.
  19. Perrins G, Nilsen D. Math calculations to better utilize CPI data: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2017.

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
20. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Consumer Price Index Historical Tables for U.S. City Average: U.S. Department of Labor, 2017.
  21. U.S. Census Bureau. Poverty thresholds: U.S. Census Bureau; 2016 [Available from: <https://www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/demo/income-poverty/historical-poverty-thresholds.html> accessed May 2, 2017.
  22. U.S. Department of Labor. User's Guide to Income Imputation in the CE: Bureau of Labor Statistics, Division of Consumer Expenditure Surveys, 2006.
  23. Korn EL, Graubard BI. Analysis of health surveys. New York: John Wiley & Sons 1999.
  24. StataCorp. Stata Base Reference Manual Release 14. College Station, Texas: StataCorp LP 2015.
  25. StataCorp. Stata Statistical Software: Release 14.1, MP Parallel Edition. College Station, TX: StataCorp LP 2015.
  26. Bee A, Meyer BD, Sullivan JX. The Validity of Consumption Data: Are the Consumer Expenditure Interview and Diary Surveys Informative?: National Bureau of Economic Research, 2012.
  27. Businelle MS, Kendzor DE, Reitzel LR, et al. Mechanisms linking socioeconomic status to smoking cessation: a structural equation modeling approach. *Health Psychology* 2010;29(3):262.
  28. Mathur C, Erickson DJ, Stigler MH, et al. Individual and neighborhood socioeconomic status effects on adolescent smoking: a multilevel cohort-sequential latent growth analysis. *American journal of public health* 2013;103(3):543-48.

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
29. Jarvis MJ, Wardle J. Social patterning of individual health behaviours: the case of cigarette smoking. In: Marmot M, Wilkinson RG, eds. *Social Determinants of Health*. Oxford: Oxford University Press 1999.
30. Paavola M, Vartiainen E, Haukkala A. Smoking from adolescence to adulthood: the effects of parental and own socioeconomic status. *The European Journal of Public Health* 2004;14(4):417-21.
31. Lindström M, Modén B, Rosvall M. A life-course perspective on economic stress and tobacco smoking: a population-based study. *Addiction* 2013;108(7):1305-14.
32. Sabelhaus J, Johnson D, Ash S, et al. Is the Consumer Expenditure Survey representative by income?: National Bureau of Economic Research, 2012.
33. Siahpush M, Wakefield MA, Spittal MJ, et al. Taxation reduces social disparities in adult smoking prevalence. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 2009;36(4):285-91. doi: 10.1016/j.amepre.2008.11.013
34. Farrelly MC, Engelen M. Cigarette prices, smoking, and the poor, revisited. *American Journal of Public Health* 2008;98(4):582-3; author reply 83-84. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2007.132647
35. Tobacco TCPGT. A clinical practice guideline for treating tobacco use and dependence: 2008 update: a US public health service report. *American journal of preventive medicine* 2008;35(2):158-76.
36. White VM, Hayman J, Hill DJ. Can population-based tobacco-control policies change smoking behaviors of adolescents from all socio-economic groups? Findings from Australia: 1987-2005. *Cancer causes & control : CCC* 2008;19(6):631-40. doi: 10.1007/s10552-008-9127-8

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
37. Levy DT, Mumford EA, Compton C. Tobacco control policies and smoking in a population of low education women, 1992-2002. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* 2006;60:ii20-ii26.
38. Durkin SJ, Biener L, Wakefield MA. Effects of different types of antismoking ads on reducing disparities in smoking cessation among socioeconomic subgroups. *American Journal of Public Health* 2009;99(12):2217-23. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2009.161638
39. Dinno A, Glantz S. Tobacco control policies are egalitarian: a vulnerabilities perspective on clean indoor air laws, cigarette prices, and tobacco use disparities. *Social science & medicine (1982)* 2009;68(8):1439-47. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2009.02.003
40. Hackshaw L, McEwen A, West R, et al. Quit attempts in response to smoke-free legislation in England. *Tobacco control* 2010;19(2):160-64.
41. Hahn EJ, Rayens MK, Butler KM, et al. Smoke-free laws and adult smoking prevalence. *Preventive medicine* 2008;47(2):206-09.

# BMJ Open

## Socioeconomic status and cigarette expenditure among U.S. households: Results from 2010-2015 Consumer Expenditure Survey

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2017-020571.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	16-Jan-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Siahpush, Mohammad; University of Nebraska Medical Center, Department of Health Promotion, Social and Behavioral Health Farazi, Paraskevi; University of Nebraska Medical Center, Epidemiology Maloney, Shannon; University of Nebraska Medical Center, Health Promotion Dinkel, Danae; University of Nebraska at Omaha, School of Health & Kinesiology Nguyen, Minh; University of Nebraska Medical Center, Epidemiology Singh, Gopal; US Department of Health & Human Services, HRSA/Maternal and Child Health Bureau
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Smoking and tobacco
Secondary Subject Heading:	Public health
Keywords:	Economics < TROPICAL MEDICINE, PUBLIC HEALTH, EPIDEMIOLOGY

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3 **Socioeconomic status and cigarette expenditure among U.S. households:**  
4 **Results from 2010-2015 Consumer Expenditure Survey**  
5

6 Mohammad Siahpush<sup>a</sup>, PhD, Paraskevi A Farazi<sup>b</sup>, PhD, Shannon I Maloney<sup>a</sup>, PhD, Danae  
7 Dinkel<sup>c</sup>, PhD, Minh N Nguyen<sup>b\*</sup>, MPH, BSN, Gopal K Singh<sup>d</sup>, PhD  
8  
9

- 10 a. Department of Health Promotion, College of Public Health, University of Nebraska Medical  
11 Center, 984365 Nebraska Medical Center, Omaha, NE 68198, USA  
12 b. Department of Epidemiology, College of Public Health, University of Nebraska Medical  
13 Center, 984365 Nebraska Medical Center, Omaha, NE 68198, USA  
14 c. School of Health and Kinesiology, College of Education, University of Nebraska at Omaha,  
15 6001 Dodge Street, Omaha, NE 68182, USA  
16 d. Office of Health Equity, Health Resources and Services Administration, U.S. Department of  
17 Health & Human Services, Rockville, MD 20857, USA  
18  
19

20 \* Correspondence: minh.n.nguyen@unmc.edu; Tel: +1-402-559-9409  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



## ABSTRACT

**Objectives:** To examine (1) the association between household socioeconomic status (SES) and whether a household spends money on cigarettes, and (2) socioeconomic variations in percentage of total household expenditure spent on cigarettes among smoking households.

**Methods:** We used data from six consecutive years, 2010-2015, of the Consumer Expenditure Interview Survey. The interviews involved a structured questionnaire to collect data on household income, demographics, and a complete range of expenditures including expenditure on cigarettes. Households that reported cigarette expenditure in the previous three months were distinguished as smoking households. SES indicators employed in this study were education and occupation of the head of household and household poverty status. Logistic regression was used to assess the association of household smoking status with SES. Linear regression was used to assess the association of cigarette expenditure as a percentage of total household expenditure with SES. The analysis sample size was 39,218.

**Results:** Overall, 17.4% of households reported expenditure on cigarettes. Among smoking households, the average quarterly expenditure on cigarettes in constant 2015 dollars was \$458.1 and the average cigarette expenditure as a percentage of total household expenditure was 5.6%. Multivariable regression results showed that poorer households, those headed by a person with a lower level of education or lower occupational status were more likely to report cigarette expenditure and had a higher cigarette expenditure as a percentage of total household expenditure ( $p < 0.001$  for all of the stated associations).

**Conclusion:** Lower SES households are more likely to spend money on cigarettes and spend a larger percentage of their total expenditure on cigarettes. We recommend enhanced efforts in increasing cigarette taxation, anti-smoking mass media campaigns, and smoking bans in public places, which are effective in reducing smoking among low SES smokers.

### Strengths and limitations of this study:

- We used a national household survey representing the entire U.S. civilian noninstitutional population that involved a structured questionnaire to collect data on household income, demographics, and a complete range of expenditures.
- Conclusions are based on data from six consecutive years of national and comprehensive expenditure data with relatively high response rates and large sample sizes.
- The cross-sectional design does not allow for inferences about the effect of socioeconomic status on whether a household spends money on cigarettes or percent of household expenditure spent on cigarettes among smoking households.

## INTRODUCTION

Smoking cigarettes not only causes numerous health conditions,<sup>1</sup> but also is associated with deleterious financial consequences and a lowered standard of living. For example, smokers compared to non-smokers are more likely to experience financial stress, defined as events such as going without meals or not being able to pay rent.<sup>2</sup> Similarly, among smokers, higher cigarette expenditure is associated with a higher probability of experiencing financial stress.<sup>3</sup> Furthermore, smokers who spend more on cigarettes are more likely to report “smoking-induced deprivation”, measured by asking smokers whether “money ... spent on cigarettes resulted in not having enough money for household essentials such as food.”<sup>3 4</sup> There is also evidence that quitting smoking is associated with a subsequent reduction in the probability of experiencing financial stress<sup>5 6</sup> and an increased level of prosperity.<sup>5</sup>

One of the strong and persistent determinants of smoking behavior in developed countries is socioeconomic status (SES).<sup>7-12</sup> For example, in the United States (U.S.), in 2015, smoking prevalence among adults living below poverty line was nearly twice that of those at or above poverty line (26.1% versus 13.9%). Similarly, smoking prevalence among individuals aged 25 years or older ranged from 34.1% in persons with a high school diploma to 16.6% in those with an associate degree to only 3.6% in those with a graduate degree.<sup>9</sup>

While there are numerous studies documenting the association between SES and smoking behavior, very little has been published on the association between SES and expenditure on cigarettes. Whereas the primary implication of studies of the SES determinants of smoking pertains to the deleterious health effects of smoking and health inequalities, the primary implication of studies of cigarette expenditure relates to the financial burden of smoking.<sup>3 13-15</sup> An expenditure study conducted in Australia used data from a sample of 6,892 households and

1  
2  
3 showed that those with a lower SES were more likely to report tobacco expenditure.<sup>16</sup> The odds  
4 of tobacco expenditure were 2.3 times greater among households headed by a person with no  
5 educational qualification than a university degree and 1.4 times greater among households  
6 headed by a person with a blue-collar occupation than a professional occupation. Furthermore,  
7 among smoking households, those with a lower SES spent more of their funds on tobacco.  
8 Percent of total household expenditure spent on tobacco was 46% higher among households  
9 headed by a person with no educational qualification than a university degree and 38% higher  
10 among households headed by a person with a blue-collar occupation than a professional  
11 occupation. A different study of 1,144 households in Sri Lanka revealed that while higher  
12 income households spent more on tobacco products, they had a lower tobacco expenditure as a  
13 percentage of total household expenditure.<sup>13</sup> Similar results were reported in a study conducted  
14 in the Russian Federation, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan,<sup>15</sup> and  
15 another in Morocco.<sup>14</sup> Finally, a study of 748 smokers in the U.S. showed that lower income  
16 households spent a higher percentage of their household income on cigarettes.<sup>17</sup> We do not know  
17 of any other published studies in the U.S. that examine SES as a determinant of whether a  
18 household spends money on cigarettes and how much of the total household expenditure is spent  
19 on cigarettes. Our aim was to use data from the Consumer Expenditure Survey (CES) in the U.S.  
20 to examine (1) the association between household SES and whether a household reports cigarette  
21 expenditure, and (2) SES variations in percentage of total household expenditure spent on  
22 cigarettes among smoking households.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

## 49 METHODS

### 50 51 Data

1  
2  
3 We used data from the CES, which is conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau under  
4 contract with the Bureau of Labor Statistics.<sup>18</sup> The CES is a national household survey  
5 representing the entire U.S. civilian noninstitutional population. The CES uses a cluster sampling  
6 design where primary sampling units (PSUs) are small clusters of counties grouped together into  
7 geographic entities. The sampling frame within the primary sampling units is the Census  
8 Bureau's Master Address File, which contains residential addresses identified in the 2010 census.  
9  
10 Approximately 6,900 households at the identified addresses are interviewed each quarter of the  
11 year. Each household is interviewed every three months over four calendar quarters. After the  
12 fourth interview, the household is dropped from the survey and replaced by a new sample. The  
13 response rates varied from the highest of 74.5% in 2010 to the lowest of 64.2% in 2015.<sup>19</sup> The  
14 interviews' duration was about 60 minutes and they were primarily conducted in person using a  
15 structured questionnaire to collect data on household income, demographics, and a complete  
16 range of expenditure items. We appended data from the third quarter data collection (i.e., July,  
17 August, and September) of six consecutive years, 2010-2015, with a total sample size of 39,806  
18 households. We did not use the first quarter data because the expenditure report of some of the  
19 participants pertained to the previous calendar year. Our sensitivity analyses revealed that using  
20 data from the second and fourth quarter yields very similar results as we report in this article. We  
21 excluded from the analysis 588 households, i.e., 1.5% of the total number of households, for  
22 which there was a missing value for one or more study variables except income. While the  
23 amount of missing data was negligible and not likely to have biased the results, we note that  
24 households with missing data were more likely to be of a higher SES background and report  
25 cigarette expenditure. The study sample size was 39,218. No source of funding was used to  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 conduct this study. Ethical approval was not needed for this study as we used secondary data that  
4 are publically available by the U.S. Bureau of Statistics.  
5  
6

### 7 **Measurement of smoking status of households and cigarette expenditure as a percentage of** 8 **total household expenditure** 9

10  
11 The head of household, who is defined as the primary person who rents or owns the home  
12 of the household,<sup>20</sup> was asked: “since the first of the reference month [three months prior to the  
13 interview], have you or any members of your household purchased cigarettes?” An affirmative  
14 answer indicated a smoking household. The head of a smoking household was asked: “What is  
15 the usual weekly expense for cigarettes?” Weekly cigarette expenditure amounts were converted  
16 to quarterly amounts by the Census Bureau to match the timeframe for the reporting of most  
17 other household expenditures items. We converted nominal expenditure amounts to constant  
18 2015 dollars using all-item consumer price index to account for inflation.<sup>21 22</sup> For smoking  
19 households, we computed cigarette expenditure as a percentage of total expenditure including  
20 expenditure on items such as food, alcoholic beverages, tobacco and smoking supplies, housing,  
21 apparel, transportation, health care, entertainment, and personal care.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

### 37 **Measurement of SES and other covariates** 38

39  
40 We employed three SES indicators: household poverty status, education, and occupation  
41 of head of household. We defined poverty status as the ratio of household income to poverty  
42 threshold for a given family size and composition for each survey year.<sup>23</sup> Regression-based  
43 multiple imputation was used by the Census Bureau to replace missing household income data.<sup>24</sup>  
44  
45 We categorized education of the head of household into four groups as follows: less than high  
46 school, high school graduate, some college or associate degree, and Bachelor’s or higher degree.  
47  
48 We categorized occupation of the head of household into five groups as follows: manager and  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 professional; administrative support, technician, sales; service, including protective and private  
4 household service; blue-collar, including machine and transportation operator, handler, laborer,  
5 mechanic, and construction worker; other occupations; and not in the labor force.  
6  
7

8  
9  
10 Other covariates used in the models were as follows: race/ethnicity of head of household,  
11 categorized as non-Hispanic White, non-Hispanic Black, Hispanic, and other; household size;  
12 number of males aged 16 and over in the household; and survey year.  
13  
14

### 15 16 17 **Statistical analysis** 18

19 The unit of analysis in this study was the household. U.S. Department of Labor provides  
20 sampling weights for each CES survey quarter. These weights were computed based on the  
21 probability of selection of a household, household non-response, and national household  
22 distribution of age, race, and region.<sup>18</sup> In order to combine six years of surveys, we created a  
23 unified weight by multiplying the original weight in a given survey to the ratio of the sample size  
24 for that survey and the sum of samples sizes of all six surveys.<sup>25</sup> We used this unified weight for  
25 the computation of all point estimates and in all analyses.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35 The U.S. Department of Labor also provides 44 replicate samples with accompanying  
36 sampling weights for standard error estimation.<sup>18</sup> Using replicate samples to estimate a standard  
37 error involves computing a statistic for subsets of the full study sample and examining the  
38 variability of the statistic over the subsets.<sup>26</sup> In essence, this method allows a single sample to  
39 simulate multiple samples. Replicate samples were constructed using the “balanced repeated  
40 replication” method where the sampled PSUs were divided into 44 strata and the households  
41 within each stratum were randomly divided into two half samples. CES uses a 44x44 Hadamard  
42 matrix to create the replicates in a “balanced” way.<sup>27</sup> Once the subsamples were formed, survey  
43 weights were computed for each subsample using the method described above for the weights for  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

each CES survey quarter. Subsequently, 44 different estimates of a statistic were generated using only one half-sample per stratum. These estimates were then used to approximate standard errors based on the formula for computing sample standard deviation:

$$\sigma_{\hat{\theta}} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{44} \sum_{r=1}^{44} (\hat{\theta}_r - \hat{\theta})^2}$$

where  $\hat{\theta}$  is the estimated statistic based on the full sample,  $\sigma_{\hat{\theta}}$  is the standard error of  $\hat{\theta}$ , and  $\hat{\theta}_r$  is the  $r^{\text{th}}$  replicate estimate of  $\hat{\theta}$ . We used this data-dependent method of estimating standard errors which is especially useful when data is generated through a multi-stage sampling design and where, to preserve respondent anonymity, complete information on sample clusters or strata is not made available to researchers as is the case in CES.<sup>28</sup>

We first conducted preliminary analyses to assess the bivariable associations of household smoking status and cigarette expenditure as a percentage of total household expenditure with each predictor. Subsequently, we used logistic regression to assess the association of household smoking status and SES indicators. We also used multivariable linear ordinary least squares regression to assess the association of cigarette expenditure as a percentage of total household expenditure with SES indicators. In linear regression analyses, we used the natural log transformation for cigarette expenditure as a percentage of total household expenditure as this variable had a highly positively skewed distribution. We checked for the normality of residuals and multicollinearity and found no violation of these ordinary least squares regression assumptions in the multivariable model. In relation to the issue of multicollinearity, we note that the associations between poverty status and education (Kendall's tau-b=0.34), poverty status and occupation (Cramer's V = 0.27), and education and occupation (Cramer's V = 0.27) were moderate. Covariates whose  $p$ -values were greater than 0.1 in the

bivariable models were not included in the multivariable models. When the outcome is a log-transformed variable in a regression equation, the interpretation of the regression coefficients can be derived as follows. An equation with a log-transformed variable and two covariates  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  can be written as:

$$\ln(Y) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2$$

Suppose,

$$\ln(Y_1) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 \quad (\text{Equation 1})$$

$$\ln(Y_2) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 (X_1 + 1) + \beta_2 X_2 \quad (\text{Equation 2})$$

Subtracting Equation 1 from Equation 2 gives:

$$\beta_1 = \ln(Y_2) - \ln(Y_1)$$

which can be expressed as:

$$e^{\beta_1} = 1 + \frac{Y_2 - Y_1}{Y_1}$$

It follows that a one unit increase in  $X_1$  is associated with " $e^{\beta_1} * 100 - 100$ " percentage change in  $Y$ , controlling for all other covariates. We used Stata version 14.1 for all analyses.<sup>29</sup>

## RESULTS

### Sample characteristics and bivariable associations

Table 1 provides weighted sample characteristics and bivariable associations between the covariates and the outcomes. Overall, 17.4% of households reported expenditure on cigarettes. Among smoking households, the mean quarterly expenditure on cigarettes in constant 2015 dollars was \$458.1 and the mean cigarette expenditure as a percentage of total household expenditure was 5.6%. About 14.6% of the households lived below the poverty threshold and 38.4% of the heads of households did not report a level of education beyond high school graduation. About 25.5% of the households were headed by a person holding a managerial or



professional occupation, 16.8% by a person with an administrative occupation, 12.9% by a person holding a service occupation, and 10.4% by a person in a blue-collar occupation. The percentage of non-Hispanic Whites, non-Hispanic Blacks, and Hispanics were 69.1, 12.5, and 12.7%, respectively.

At the bivariable level, poorer households, those headed by a person with a lower level of education, and those headed by a person with a lower occupational status (such as blue-collar, service, or administrative compared to managerial or professional occupations) had a higher probability of being a smoking household. For example, while 22.1% of households below poverty reported cigarette expenditure, only 13.2% of those at or above 300% of poverty threshold did so. Similarly, while the percentage of smoking households was 22.6 among households headed by a person who did not complete high school, that percentage was only 8.2 among households headed by a college graduate. Furthermore, while 25.5% of household headed by a blue-collar person reported cigarette expenditure, only 11.7% of those headed by a person in a managerial or professional occupation did so.

Bivariable results also provide strong evidence that poorer households, those headed by a person with a lower level of education or lower occupational status had a higher percentage of their total expenditure devoted to cigarette expenditure.

**Table 1. Weighted sample characteristics, bivariable association of smoking status of households and covariates (n = 39,218), and bivariable association of cigarette expenditure and covariates among smoking household (n = 6,559)**

Covariates	% in sample	% smoking household ( <i>p</i> -value for $\chi^2$ <sup>a</sup> )	Cigarette expenditure as % of total expenditure ( <i>p</i> -value for $\chi^2$ <sup>a</sup> )
Total sample		17.35	5.56
Poverty status		( <i>p</i> < 0.001)	( <i>p</i> < 0.001)
< 100%	14.63	22.07	7.74
100% $\geq$ and < 200%	21.38	19.47	6.64
200% $\geq$ and < 300%	30.55	18.20	5.00
$\geq$ 300%	33.44	13.15	3.63
Education		( <i>p</i> < 0.001)	( <i>p</i> < 0.001)

Less than high school	13.06	22.62	7.60
High school graduate	25.37	23.66	5.98
Some college or associate degree	31.09	18.93	4.98
Bachelor's or higher degree	30.47	8.22	3.48
Occupation		( $p < 0.001$ )	( $p < 0.001$ )
Manager and professional	25.48	11.72	3.64
Administrative support	16.78	18.67	4.63
Service	12.91	19.51	5.38
Blue-collar	10.44	25.46	5.44
Other Occupations	0.80	13.92	4.28
Not in the labor force	33.59	17.68	7.16
Race/ethnicity		( $p < 0.001$ )	( $p < 0.001$ )
Non-Hispanic White	69.09	19.06	5.69
Non-Hispanic Black	12.52	16.76	5.94
Hispanic	12.71	10.97	4.28
Other	5.68	12.04	4.36
Household size		( $p < 0.001$ )	( $p < 0.001$ )
1	29.51	15.13	7.20
2	32.15	17.57	5.41
3	15.22	20.13	4.94
4+	23.11	18.03	4.44
Number of males aged 16 +		( $p < 0.001$ )	( $p < 0.001$ )
0	22.81	14.34	6.56
1	63.85	17.22	5.46
2+	13.34	23.13	4.82
Year		( $p = 0.009$ )	( $p = 0.281$ )
2010	16.97	18.53	5.93
2011	16.00	18.81	5.56
2012	16.55	17.06	5.29
2013	16.7	16.41	5.48
2014	16.77	16.31	5.39
2015	17.01	17.01	5.62

<sup>a</sup>  $P$ -values for the bivariable association of covariates and each of the three outcomes using 44 replicate weights.

## Multivariable analyses

Table 2 shows adjusted odds ratios for the association of being a smoking household and SES indicators. Poorer households, those headed by a person with a lower level of education or lower occupational status were more likely to report cigarette expenditure ( $p < 0.001$  for poverty, education, and occupation). The odds of being a smoking household were 91% larger among households in poverty than those whose income was at or above 300% of poverty threshold.

1  
2  
3 Similarly, households headed by a person who did not complete high school had 3.4 times the  
4 odds of being a smoking household than those headed by a person with at least a Bachelor's  
5 degree. Furthermore, the odds of being a smoking household were 46% larger among households  
6 headed by a blue-collar worker than those headed by a person in a managerial or professional  
7 occupation. Race/ethnicity was associated with smoking status ( $p < 0.001$ ) such that the odds of  
8 being a smoking household were largest among households headed by a non-Hispanic White  
9 person and lowest among those headed by a Hispanic individual. Larger households and those  
10 with more males 16 years or older had higher odds of reporting cigarette expenditure ( $p < 0.001$   
11 for both household size and number of males 16 years or older). Finally, there was some  
12 evidence that odds of being a smoking household were greater in 2010 and 2011 than in later  
13 years ( $p = 0.037$ ).  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 Table 2 also shows the results of the regression of the natural logarithm of cigarette  
29 expenditure as a percentage of total household expenditure on SES and other covariates. Poorer  
30 households, those headed by a person with a lower level of education or a lower occupational  
31 status had a higher cigarette expenditure as a percentage of total household expenditure. Percent  
32 spent on cigarettes was 77% ( $e^{0.57} * 100 - 100$ ) higher among households in poverty compared to  
33 those with an income at or above 300% of poverty threshold. Similarly, percent spent on  
34 cigarettes was 82% ( $e^{0.60} * 100 - 100$ ) higher among households headed by a person who did not  
35 complete high school than those headed by a person with at least a Bachelor's degree.  
36 Furthermore, percent spent on cigarettes was 19% ( $e^{0.17} * 100 - 100$ ) higher among households  
37 headed by a person with a blue-collar occupation than those headed by a person in a managerial  
38 or professional occupation. Race/ethnicity was associated with percent spent on cigarettes such  
39 that households headed by a non-Hispanic White person had the highest and those headed by a  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Hispanic individual had the lowest percent spent on cigarettes ( $p < 0.001$ ). Larger households and those with a smaller number of males 16 years or older had a lower percentage spent on cigarettes ( $p < 0.001$  for household size and  $p = 0.018$  for number of males 16 years or older).

**Table 2: Multivariable results<sup>a</sup> for the association of smoking status of household and cigarette expenditure as a percentage of total household expenditure with socioeconomic status indicators and other covariates**

Covariates	Probability of being a smoking household (n = 39,218)		Cigarette expenditure as a % of household expenditure (n = 6,559)	
	Adjusted OR (95% CI)	p-value	Adjusted $\hat{\beta}$ (95% CI)	p-value
Poverty status		<0.001		<0.001
< 100%	1.91 (1.66, 2.21)		0.57 (0.50, 0.64)	
100% $\geq$ and < 200%	1.48 (1.30, 1.67)		0.47 (0.40, 0.55)	
200% $\geq$ and < 300%	1.27 (1.19, 1.37)		0.27 (0.21, 0.33)	
$\geq$ 300%	1.00		0.00	
Education		<0.001		<0.001
Less than high school	3.40 (2.95, 3.93)		0.60 (0.51, 0.69)	
High school graduate	3.04 (2.73, 3.37)		0.44 (0.36, 0.52)	
Some college or associate degree	2.34 (2.13, 2.57)		0.27 (0.20, 0.34)	
Bachelor's or higher degree	1.00		0.00	
Occupation		<0.001		<0.001
Manager and professional	1.00		0.00	
Administrative support	1.20 (1.09, 1.32)		0.05 (-0.02, 0.12)	
Service	1.20 (1.09, 1.33)		0.12 (0.04, 0.20)	
Blue-collar	1.46 (1.27, 1.67)		0.17 (0.07, 0.26)	
Other Occupations	0.68 (0.45, 1.04)		-0.08 (-0.34, 0.19)	
Not in the labor force	0.90 (0.81, 1.01)		0.23 (0.17, 0.29)	
Race/ethnicity		<0.001		<0.001
Non-Hispanic White	1.00		0.00	
Non-Hispanic Black	0.67 (0.59, 0.76)		-0.17 (-0.25, -0.10)	
Hispanic	0.32 (0.28, 0.36)		-0.54 (-0.63, -0.45)	
Other	0.59 (0.51, 0.68)		-0.31 (-0.41, -0.21)	
Household size		<0.001		<0.001
1	1.00		0.00	
2	1.23 (1.10, 1.37)		-0.19 (-0.24, -0.14)	
3	1.40 (1.26, 1.55)		-0.32 (-0.38, -0.25)	
4+	1.15 (1.03, 1.29)		-0.49 (-0.54, -0.43)	
Number of males aged 16 +		<0.001		0.0178
0	1.00		0.00	
1	1.33 (1.23, 1.44)		0.05 (-0.00, 0.11)	
2+	1.88 (1.70, 2.09)		0.12 (0.04, 0.20)	
Year		0.037		--
2010	1.00		--	
2011	1.02 (0.93, 1.11)		--	
2012	0.92 (0.83, 1.00)		--	
2013	0.88 (0.78, 0.99)		--	

2014	0.88 (0.79, 0.98)	--
2015	0.95 (0.85, 1.06)	--

<sup>a</sup> All odds ratios (OR) from logistic analysis and regression coefficients ( $\beta$ ) from linear regression analyses are adjusted for the effect of all covariates in the model.

## DISCUSSION

In this study, we used data from six consecutive years of the U.S. CES and found that lower SES households not only are more likely to spend money on cigarettes but also spend a larger portion of their total household expenditure on cigarettes. Our results were consistent with a previous report in the U.S.<sup>17</sup> and the findings from other countries, although these findings pertained to the general category of tobacco expenditure and not specifically to cigarette expenditure.<sup>13-16</sup>

We also found that larger households, households with more males aged 16+ years, and households headed by a non-Hispanic white person compared to others had a higher probability of reporting cigarette expenditure and spent a larger percentage of their total household expenditure on cigarettes. None of these covariates, except number of males in the household, have been previously investigated in regards to tobacco expenditure. Our finding about number of males in the household was consistent with a study that was conducted in the New Independent States.<sup>15</sup>

A strength of this work was its use of six consecutive years of national and comprehensive expenditure data with relatively high response rates and large sample sizes. The validity of the CES data has been investigated by comparing them with National Income and Product Accounts data.<sup>30</sup> While this comparison was not specifically done for cigarette expenditure, the findings showed that most of the large categories of consumption were measured well in the CES, as the ratio to the National Income and Accounts statistics was close to one and has not declined

1  
2  
3 notably over time.<sup>30</sup> The major weakness of the study is that, as it is the case with all cross-  
4 sectional analyses, it does not allow inferences about causality. It is plausible that poorer  
5 households headed by a person with a low level of formal education are more likely to have one  
6 or more smokers in the household and spend money on cigarettes. The effect of SES on smoking  
7 has been extensively studied.<sup>7 31-35</sup> It is also plausible that households that spend money on  
8 cigarettes and have higher health care expenditures due to smoking are more likely to have  
9 reduced income and experience downward socioeconomic mobility. However, to our knowledge,  
10 the effect of smoking on downward mobility has not been studied. Another weakness of this  
11 work is that, as reported in a study where households in the CES were linked to zip-code level  
12 average income, the very high income households are less likely to respond to the survey.<sup>36</sup>  
13  
14 However, non-response rates were not associated with income over most of the income  
15 distribution.<sup>36</sup>  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30  
31 Cigarette expenditure may contribute to financial deprivation and lower standards of  
32 living, which in turn can lead to unfavorable smoking behaviors and outcomes.<sup>3 4 37-39</sup> For  
33 example, financial stress is associated with a lower probability of smoking cessation among  
34 smokers and a higher probability of relapse among ex-smokers.<sup>37</sup> Moreover, while smokers with  
35 financial stress are more likely to have an interest in quitting, they are less likely to make a quit  
36 attempt or succeed in quitting.<sup>40</sup> In light of our finding that lower SES households are more  
37 likely to include a smoker and spend relatively more on cigarettes, we recommend tobacco  
38 control policies that are effective in reducing smoking among lower SES groups. Increasing  
39 taxation on cigarettes is the most effective policy for reducing smoking among all segments of  
40 the population. In fact, many studies have shown that increasing the price of cigarettes results in  
41 a larger decrease in smoking prevalence among lower income and occupational groups than  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 others.<sup>7 41 42</sup> This policy, however, is likely to negatively affect the finances of low income  
4 smokers who fail to quit or reduce smoking. To address this problem, part or all of the revenues  
5 from increased taxation can be used to fund evidence-based smoking cessation programs<sup>43</sup> for  
6 these smokers. Moreover, there is evidence that the effectiveness of increased taxation can be  
7 undermined by the availability of cheap tobacco and that changing the tobacco tax structure for  
8 cheap tobacco may promote quitting among low income groups.<sup>44 45</sup> In addition to increasing  
9 taxation, there is evidence that anti-smoking mass media campaigns are also effective in  
10 reducing smoking prevalence<sup>46 47</sup> and increasing cessation rates<sup>48</sup> among low SES smokers.  
11 Furthermore, it has been reported that plain packaging of and featuring large health warning  
12 labels on cigarette packs are associated with reduced positive brand image and intention to  
13 purchase cigarettes among socioeconomically disadvantaged smokers.<sup>49</sup> Finally, there is some  
14 evidence that bans on smoking in public places are effective in reducing smoking prevalence  
15 and consumption among lower SES smokers<sup>50 51</sup> and across all socioeconomic groups.<sup>52</sup>  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35 **Contributorship statement:** Mohammad Siahpush contributed to the following aspects of the  
36 work: conception, design, data acquisition, using Stata for data analysis, interpretation of data,  
37 drafting, and critical revision. Paraskevi Farazi contributed to the following aspects of the work:  
38 conception, data analysis, interpretation of data, and critical revision. Shannon Maloney  
39 contributed to the following aspects of the work: conception, data analysis, interpretation of data,  
40 and critical revision. Danae Dinkel contributed to the following aspects of the work: conception,  
41 data analysis, interpretation of data, and critical revision. Minh Nguyen contributed to the  
42 following aspects of the work: design, data analysis, interpretation of data, drafting, and critical  
43 revision. Gopal Singh contributed to the following aspects of the work: conception, data analysis,  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 and critical revision. All authors approve the final version as submitted. All authors are  
4  
5 accountable for all aspects of the work.  
6

7  
8 **Competing interests:** We acknowledge that none of the authors or their institutions have  
9  
10 financial or personal relationships or affiliations that could influence (or bias) our decisions,  
11  
12 work, or manuscript. We confirm that this conflict of interest disclosure information is accurate  
13  
14 and complete.  
15

16  
17 **Funding:** No source of funding was used to conduct this study. Ethical approval was not needed  
18  
19 for this study as we used secondary data that are publically available by the U.S. Bureau of  
20  
21 Statistics.  
22

23  
24 **Data sharing statement:** No additional data available.  
25

## 26 REFERENCES

- 27  
28  
29  
30 1. U.S. Department of Health Human Services. The health consequences of smoking—  
31 50 years of progress: a report of the Surgeon General. *Atlanta, GA: US*  
32 *Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and*  
33 *Prevention, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health*  
34 *Promotion, Office on Smoking and Health 2014;17*  
35  
36  
37  
38 2. Siahpush M, Borland R, Scollo M. Smoking and financial stress. *Tobacco Control*  
39 2003;12:60-66.  
40  
41  
42 3. Siahpush M, Borland R, Yong HH, et al. Tobacco expenditure, smoking-induced  
43 deprivation and financial stress: Results from the International Tobacco Control  
44 (ITC) Four-Country Survey. *Drug and alcohol review* 2012;31(5):664-71.  
45  
46  
47 4. Siahpush M, Thrasher JF, Yong HH, et al. Cigarette prices, cigarette expenditure and  
48 smoking-induced deprivation: findings from the International Tobacco Control  
49 Mexico survey. *Tobacco control* 2013;22(4):223-26. doi: 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-  
50 2012-050613; 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2012-050613  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57



- 1  
2  
3  
4 5. Siahpush M, Spittal M, Singh GK. Association of Smoking Cessation With Financial  
5 Stress and Material Well-Being: Results From a Prospective Study of a  
6 Population-Based National Survey. *American Journal of Public Health*  
7 2007;97(12):2281-87.  
8  
9
- 10 6. Siahpush M, Spittal M, Singh GK. Smoking cessation and financial stress. *Journal of*  
11 *Public Health* 2007;29(4):338-42.  
12
- 13 7. Hiscock R, Bauld L, Amos A, et al. Socioeconomic status and smoking: a review.  
14 *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 2012;1248(1):107-23.  
15
- 16 8. Garrett BE, Dube SR, Trosclair A, et al. Cigarette smoking—United States, 1965–  
17 2008. *MMWR Surveill Summ* 2011;60(1):109-13.  
18
- 19 9. Jamal A. Current cigarette smoking among adults—United States, 2005–2015.  
20 *MMWR Morbidity and mortality weekly report* 2016;65  
21
- 22 10. Siahpush M, Borland R. Sociodemographic variations in smoking status among  
23 Australians aged 18 years and over: Multivariate results from the 1995 National  
24 Health Survey. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health*  
25 2001;25:438-42.  
26
- 27 11. Nagelhout GE, de Korte-de Boer D, Kunst AE, et al. Trends in socioeconomic  
28 inequalities in smoking prevalence, consumption, initiation, and cessation  
29 between 2001 and 2008 in the Netherlands. Findings from a national population  
30 survey. *BMC Public Health* 2012;12(1):303.  
31
- 32 12. Hiscock R, Bauld L, Amos A, et al. Smoking and socioeconomic status in England:  
33 the rise of the never smoker and the disadvantaged smoker. *Journal of Public*  
34 *Health* 2012;34(3):390-96.  
35
- 36 13. Perera KMN, Guruge GD, Jayawardana PL. Household Expenditure on Tobacco  
37 Consumption in a Poverty-Stricken Rural District in Sri Lanka. *Asia Pacific*  
38 *Journal of Public Health* 2017;29(2):140-48.  
39
- 40 14. Tachfouti N, Berraho M, Elfakir S, et al. Socioeconomic status and tobacco  
41 expenditures among Moroccans: results of the “Maroc Tabagisme” survey.  
42 *American Journal of Health Promotion* 2010;24(5):334-39.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

15. Djibuti M, Gotsadze G, Mataradze G, et al. Influence of household demographic and socio-economic factors on household expenditure on tobacco in six New Independent States. *BMC Public Health* 2007;7(1):222.
16. Siahpush M. Socioeconomic status and tobacco expenditure among Australian households: results from the 1998-99 Household Expenditure Survey. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* 2003;57:798-801.
17. Farrelly MC, Nonnemaker JM, Watson KA. The consequences of high cigarette excise taxes for low-income smokers. *PloS one* 2012;7(9):e43838.
18. U.S. Department of Labor. 2015 Users' Document: Interview Survey Public-Use Microdata (PUMD) Consumer Expenditure: Bureau of Labor Statistics, Division of Consumer Expenditure Surveys, 2016.
19. U.S. Department of Labor. 2015 Response Rates: Interview and Diary Survey Consumer Expenditure Public Use Microdata: Bureau of Labor Statistics, Division of Consumer Expenditure Surveys, 2016.
20. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Consumer Expenditure Survey: Frequently Asked Questions: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics,; 2017 [Available from: <https://www.bls.gov/cex/csxfaqs.htm> accessed 12/14/2017 2017.
21. Perrins G, Nilsen D. Math calculations to better utilize CPI data: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2017.
22. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Consumer Price Index Historical Tables for U.S. City Average: U.S. Department of Labor, 2017.
23. U.S. Census Bureau. Poverty thresholds: U.S. Census Bureau; 2016 [Available from: <https://www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/demo/income-poverty/historical-poverty-thresholds.html> accessed May 2, 2017.
24. U.S. Department of Labor. User's Guide to Income Imputation in the CE: Bureau of Labor Statistics, Division of Consumer Expenditure Surveys, 2006.
25. Korn EL, Graubard BI. Analysis of health surveys. New York: John Wiley & Sons 1999.
26. Levy PS, Lemeshow S. Sampling of populations: methods and applications: John Wiley & Sons 2013.

- 1  
2  
3  
4 27. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Handbook of Methods: Consumer Expenditure and  
5 Income Calculations Washington D.C.: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics; 2016  
6 [Available from: <https://www.bls.gov/opub/hom/cex/calculation.htm> accessed  
7 12/17/2017 2017.  
8  
9
- 10 28. StataCorp. Stata Base Reference Manual Release 14. College Station, Texas:  
11 StataCorp LP 2015.  
12
- 13 29. StataCorp. Stata Statistical Software: Release 14.1, MP Parallel Edition. College  
14 Station, TX: StataCorp LP 2015.  
15
- 16 30. Bee A, Meyer BD, Sullivan JX. The Validity of Consumption Data: Are the  
17 Consumer Expenditure Interview and Diary Surveys Informative?: National  
18 Bureau of Economic Research, 2012.  
19
- 20 31. Businelle MS, Kendzor DE, Reitzel LR, et al. Mechanisms linking socioeconomic  
21 status to smoking cessation: a structural equation modeling approach. *Health*  
22 *Psychology* 2010;29(3):262.  
23
- 24 32. Mathur C, Erickson DJ, Stigler MH, et al. Individual and neighborhood  
25 socioeconomic status effects on adolescent smoking: a multilevel cohort-  
26 sequential latent growth analysis. *American journal of public health*  
27 2013;103(3):543-48.  
28
- 29 33. Jarvis MJ, Wardle J. Social patterning of individual health behaviours: the case of  
30 cigarette smoking. In: Marmot M, Wilkinson RG, eds. *Social Determinants of*  
31 *Health*. Oxford: Oxford University Press 1999.  
32
- 33 34. Paavola M, Vartiainen E, Haukkala A. Smoking from adolescence to adulthood: the  
34 effects of parental and own socioeconomic status. *The European Journal of*  
35 *Public Health* 2004;14(4):417-21.  
36
- 37 35. Lindström M, Modén B, Rosvall M. A life-course perspective on economic stress  
38 and tobacco smoking: a population-based study. *Addiction* 2013;108(7):1305-14.  
39
- 40 36. Sabelhaus J, Johnson D, Ash S, et al. Is the Consumer Expenditure Survey  
41 representative by income?: National Bureau of Economic Research, 2012.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4 37. Siahpush M, Carlin JB. Financial stress, smoking cessation and relapse: results  
5 from a prospective study of an Australian national sample. *Addiction*  
6 2006;110:121-27.  
7  
8  
9 38. Siahpush M, Borland R, Yong HH. Sociodemographic and psychosocial correlates  
10 of smoking-induced deprivation and its effect on quitting: findings from the  
11 International Tobacco Control Policy Evaluation Survey. *Tobacco Control*  
12 2007;16(2):e2. doi: 10.1136/tc.2006.016279  
13  
14  
15 39. Kendzor DE, Businelle MS, Costello TJ, et al. Financial strain and smoking  
16 cessation among racially/ethnically diverse smokers. *American Journal of Public*  
17 *Health* 2010;100(4):702-06. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2009.172676;  
18 10.2105/AJPH.2009.172676  
19  
20  
21 40. Siahpush M, Yong HH, Borland R, et al. Smokers with financial stress are more  
22 likely to want to quit but less likely to try or succeed: findings from the  
23 International Tobacco Control (ITC) Four Country Survey. *Addiction (Abingdon,*  
24 *England)* 2009;104(8):1382-90. doi: 10.1111/j.1360-0443.2009.02599.x  
25  
26  
27 41. Siahpush M, Wakefield MA, Spittal MJ, et al. Taxation reduces social disparities in  
28 adult smoking prevalence. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*  
29 2009;36(4):285-91. doi: 10.1016/j.amepre.2008.11.013  
30  
31  
32 42. Farrelly MC, Engelen M. Cigarette prices, smoking, and the poor, revisited.  
33 *American Journal of Public Health* 2008;98(4):582-3; author reply 83-84. doi:  
34 10.2105/AJPH.2007.132647  
35  
36  
37 43. Tobacco TCPGT. A clinical practice guideline for treating tobacco use and  
38 dependence: 2008 update: a US public health service report. *American journal of*  
39 *preventive medicine* 2008;35(2):158-76.  
40  
41  
42 44. Partos TR, Gilmore AB, Hitchman SC, et al. Availability and use of cheap tobacco in  
43 the UK 2002-2014: Findings from the International Tobacco Control Project.  
44 *Nicotine & Tobacco Research* 2017:ntx108.  
45  
46  
47 45. Hiscock R, Branston JR, McNeill A, et al. Tobacco industry strategies undermine  
48 government tax policy: evidence from commercial data. *Tobacco control*  
49 2017:tobaccocontrol-2017-053891.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4 46. White VM, Hayman J, Hill DJ. Can population-based tobacco-control policies  
5 change smoking behaviors of adolescents from all socio-economic groups?  
6 Findings from Australia: 1987-2005. *Cancer causes & control : CCC*  
7 2008;19(6):631-40. doi: 10.1007/s10552-008-9127-8  
8  
9  
10 47. Levy DT, Mumford EA, Compton C. Tobacco control policies and smoking in a  
11 population of low education women, 1992-2002. *Journal of Epidemiology and*  
12 *Community Health* 2006;60:ii20-ii26.  
13  
14 48. Durkin SJ, Biener L, Wakefield MA. Effects of different types of antismoking ads on  
15 reducing disparities in smoking cessation among socioeconomic subgroups.  
16 *American Journal of Public Health* 2009;99(12):2217-23. doi:  
17 10.2105/AJPH.2009.161638  
18  
19 49. Guillaumier A, Bonevski B, Paul C, et al. Socioeconomically disadvantaged  
20 smokers' ratings of plain and branded cigarette packaging: an experimental  
21 study. *BMJ open* 2014;4(2):e004078.  
22  
23 50. Dinno A, Glantz S. Tobacco control policies are egalitarian: a vulnerabilities  
24 perspective on clean indoor air laws, cigarette prices, and tobacco use  
25 disparities. *Social science & medicine (1982)* 2009;68(8):1439-47. doi:  
26 10.1016/j.socscimed.2009.02.003  
27  
28 51. Hackshaw L, McEwen A, West R, et al. Quit attempts in response to smoke-free  
29 legislation in England. *Tobacco control* 2010;19(2):160-64.  
30  
31 52. Hahn EJ, Rayens MK, Butler KM, et al. Smoke-free laws and adult smoking  
32 prevalence. *Preventive medicine* 2008;47(2):206-09.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies*

Page #	Item	Item No	Recommendation
1-2	<b>Title and abstract</b>	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found
<b>Introduction</b>			
3	Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported
4	Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses
<b>Methods</b>			
5	Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper
5	Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection
5	Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants
6-7	Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable
5	Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group
5	Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias
5	Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at
6-7	Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why
7-9	Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding (b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions (c) Explain how missing data were addressed (d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy (e) Describe any sensitivity analyses
<b>Results</b>			
5, 9	Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage (c) Consider use of a flow diagram
9-10	Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest
10-13	Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures
13	Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear

			which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included
			(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized
			(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period
	Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses
	<b>Discussion</b>		
14	Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives
14	Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias
14- 15	Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence
14- 15	Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results
	<b>Other information</b>		
17	Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based

\*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

**Note:** An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at [www.strobe-statement.org](http://www.strobe-statement.org).

# BMJ Open

## Socioeconomic status and cigarette expenditure among U.S. households: Results from 2010-2015 Consumer Expenditure Survey

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2017-020571.R2
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	16-Mar-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Siahpush, Mohammad; University of Nebraska Medical Center, Department of Health Promotion, Social and Behavioral Health Farazi, Paraskevi; University of Nebraska Medical Center, Epidemiology Maloney, Shannon; University of Nebraska Medical Center, Health Promotion Dinkel, Danae; University of Nebraska at Omaha, School of Health & Kinesiology Nguyen, Minh; University of Nebraska Medical Center, Epidemiology Singh, Gopal; US Department of Health & Human Services, HRSA/Maternal and Child Health Bureau
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Smoking and tobacco
Secondary Subject Heading:	Public health
Keywords:	Economics < TROPICAL MEDICINE, PUBLIC HEALTH, EPIDEMIOLOGY

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts



1  
2  
3 **Socioeconomic status and cigarette expenditure among U.S. households:**  
4 **Results from 2010-2015 Consumer Expenditure Survey**  
5

6 Mohammad Siahpush<sup>a</sup>, PhD, Paraskevi A Farazi<sup>b</sup>, PhD, Shannon I Maloney<sup>a</sup>, PhD, Danae  
7 Dinkel<sup>c</sup>, PhD, Minh N Nguyen<sup>b\*</sup>, MPH, BSN, Gopal K Singh<sup>d</sup>, PhD  
8  
9

- 10 a. Department of Health Promotion, College of Public Health, University of Nebraska Medical  
11 Center, 984365 Nebraska Medical Center, Omaha, NE 68198, USA  
12 b. Department of Epidemiology, College of Public Health, University of Nebraska Medical  
13 Center, 984365 Nebraska Medical Center, Omaha, NE 68198, USA  
14 c. School of Health and Kinesiology, College of Education, University of Nebraska at Omaha,  
15 6001 Dodge Street, Omaha, NE 68182, USA  
16 d. Office of Health Equity, Health Resources and Services Administration, U.S. Department of  
17 Health & Human Services, Rockville, MD 20857, USA  
18  
19

20 \* Correspondence: minh.n.nguyen@unmc.edu; Tel: +1-402-559-9409  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## ABSTRACT

**Objectives:** To examine (1) the association between household socioeconomic status (SES) and whether a household spends money on cigarettes, and (2) socioeconomic variations in proportion of total household expenditure spent on cigarettes among smoking households.

**Methods:** We pooled data from six consecutive years, 2010-2015, of the Consumer Expenditure Interview Survey. The interviews involved a structured questionnaire to collect data on household income, demographics, and a complete range of expenditures including expenditure on cigarettes. Households that reported cigarette expenditure in the previous three months were distinguished as smoking households. SES indicators employed in this study were education and occupation of the head of household and household poverty status. Binary logistic regression was used to assess the association of household smoking status with SES. Fractional logistic regression was used to assess the association of cigarette expenditure as a proportion of total household expenditure with SES. The analysis sample size was 39,218.

**Results:** Overall, 17.4% of households reported expenditure on cigarettes. Among smoking households, the average quarterly expenditure on cigarettes in constant 2015 dollars was \$458.1 and the average cigarette expenditure as a percentage of total household expenditure was 5.6%. Multivariable regression results showed that poorer households, those headed by a person with a lower level of education or lower occupational status were more likely to report cigarette expenditure and had a higher cigarette expenditure as a proportion of total household expenditure ( $p < 0.001$  for all of the stated associations).

**Conclusion:** Lower SES households are more likely to spend money on cigarettes and spend a larger proportion of their total expenditure on cigarettes. We recommend enhanced efforts in increasing cigarette taxation, anti-smoking mass media campaigns, and smoking bans in public places, which are effective in reducing smoking among low SES smokers.

### Strengths and limitations of this study:

- We used a national household survey representing the entire U.S. civilian noninstitutional population that involved a structured questionnaire to collect data on household income, demographics, and a complete range of expenditures.
- Conclusions are based on data from six consecutive years of national and comprehensive expenditure data with relatively high response rates and large sample sizes.
- The cross-sectional design does not allow for inferences about the effect of socioeconomic status on whether a household spends money on cigarettes or percent of household expenditure spent on cigarettes among smoking households.

## INTRODUCTION

Smoking cigarettes not only causes numerous health conditions,<sup>1</sup> but also is associated with deleterious financial consequences and a lowered standard of living. For example, smokers compared to non-smokers are more likely to experience financial stress, defined as events such as going without meals or not being able to pay rent.<sup>2</sup> Similarly, among smokers, higher cigarette expenditure is associated with a higher probability of experiencing financial stress.<sup>3</sup> Furthermore, smokers who spend more on cigarettes are more likely to report “smoking-induced deprivation”, measured by asking smokers whether “money ... spent on cigarettes resulted in not having enough money for household essentials such as food.”<sup>3 4</sup> There is also evidence that quitting smoking is associated with a subsequent reduction in the probability of experiencing financial stress<sup>5 6</sup> and an increased level of prosperity.<sup>5</sup>

One of the strong and persistent determinants of smoking behavior in developed countries is socioeconomic status (SES).<sup>7-12</sup> For example, in the United States (U.S.), in 2015, smoking prevalence among adults living below the poverty line was nearly twice that of those at or above the poverty line (26.1% versus 13.9%). Similarly, smoking prevalence among individuals aged 25 years or older ranged from 34.1% in persons with a high school diploma to 16.6% in those with an associate degree to only 3.6% in those with a graduate degree.<sup>9</sup>

There are numerous studies documenting the association between SES and smoking behavior. Less has been published on the association between SES and expenditure on cigarettes. Whereas the primary implication of studies of the SES determinants of smoking pertains to the deleterious health effects of smoking and health inequalities, the primary implication of studies of cigarette expenditure relates to the financial burden of smoking.<sup>3 13-15</sup> An expenditure study conducted in Australia used data from a sample of 6,892 households and showed that those with

1  
2  
3 a lower SES were more likely to report tobacco expenditure.<sup>16</sup> The odds of tobacco expenditure  
4 were 2.3 times greater among households headed by a person with no educational qualification  
5 than a university degree and 1.4 times greater among households headed by a person with a blue-  
6 collar occupation than a professional occupation. Furthermore, among smoking households,  
7 those with a lower SES spent a higher proportion of their funds on tobacco. Percent of total  
8 household expenditure spent on tobacco was 46% higher among households headed by a person  
9 with no educational qualification than a university degree and 38% higher among households  
10 headed by a person with a blue-collar occupation than a professional occupation. A different  
11 study of 1,144 households in Sri Lanka revealed that while higher income households spent more  
12 on tobacco products, they had a lower tobacco expenditure as a percentage of total household  
13 expenditure.<sup>13</sup> Similar results were reported in a study conducted in the Russian Federation,  
14 Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan,<sup>15</sup> and another in Morocco.<sup>14</sup> Finally, a  
15 study of 748 smokers in the U.S. showed that lower income households spent a higher  
16 percentage of their household income on cigarettes.<sup>17</sup> This study did not assess the association of  
17 other commonly used indicators of SES (e.g. education and occupation) with cigarette  
18 expenditure. Furthermore, the study did not adjust for the effect of possible confounders in  
19 assessing the relationship between income and percent of income spent on cigarettes. Finally, the  
20 study did not measure cigarette expenditure directly; instead, it was estimated indirectly by  
21 asking respondents how many cigarettes they smoked each day and the price they paid for their  
22 last pack of cigarettes. Our aim was to address these shortcomings. We used data from the  
23 Consumer Expenditure Survey (CES) in the U.S. to examine (1) the association between  
24 household SES and whether a household reports cigarette expenditure, and (2) SES variations in  
25 proportion of total household expenditure spent on cigarettes among smoking households.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## METHODS

### Data

We used data from the CES, which is conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau under contract with the Bureau of Labor Statistics.<sup>18</sup> The CES is a national household survey representing the entire U.S. civilian noninstitutional population. The CES uses a cluster sampling design where primary sampling units (PSUs) are small clusters of counties grouped together into geographic entities. The sampling frame within the primary sampling units is the Census Bureau's Master Address File, which contains residential addresses identified in the 2010 census. Approximately 6,900 households at the identified addresses are interviewed each quarter of the year. Each household is interviewed every three months over four calendar quarters. After the fourth interview, the household is dropped from the survey and replaced by a new sample. The response rates varied from the highest of 74.5% in 2010 to the lowest of 64.2% in 2015.<sup>19</sup> The interviews' duration was about 60 minutes and they were primarily conducted in person using a structured questionnaire to collect data on household income, demographics, and a complete range of expenditure items. We appended data from the third quarter data collection (i.e., July, August, and September) of six consecutive years, 2010-2015, with a total sample size of 39,806 households. We did not use the first quarter data because the expenditure report of some of the participants pertained to the previous calendar year. Our sensitivity analyses revealed that using data from the second and fourth quarter yields very similar results as we report in this article. We excluded from the analysis 588 households, i.e., 1.5% of the total number of households, for which there was a missing value for one or more study variables except income. While the amount of missing data was negligible and not likely to have biased the results, we note that households with missing data were more likely to be of a higher SES background and report

1  
2  
3 cigarette expenditure. The final sample size for the analysis was 39,218. Ethical approval was  
4  
5 not needed for this study as we used secondary data that are publically available by the U.S.  
6  
7 Bureau of Statistics.  
8  
9

### 10 **Measurement of smoking status of households and cigarette expenditure as a proportion of** 11 **total household expenditure** 12 13

14  
15 The head of household, who is the first person mentioned by a respondent to be the one  
16 who owns or rents the home of the household,<sup>20 21</sup> was asked: “since the first of the reference  
17 month [three months prior to the interview], have you or any members of your household  
18 purchased cigarettes?” An affirmative answer indicated a smoking household. The head of a  
19 smoking household was asked: “What is the usual weekly expense for cigarettes?” Weekly  
20 cigarette expenditure amounts were converted to quarterly amounts by the Census Bureau to  
21 match the timeframe for the reporting of most other household expenditures items. We converted  
22 nominal expenditure amounts to constant 2015 dollars using the commonly used all-items  
23 consumer price index to account for inflation.<sup>22 23</sup> For smoking households, we computed  
24 cigarette expenditure as a proportion of total expenditure including expenditure on items such as  
25 food, alcoholic beverages, tobacco and smoking supplies, housing, apparel, transportation, health  
26 care, entertainment, and personal care.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

### 42 **Measurement of SES and other covariates** 43 44

45 We employed three SES indicators: household poverty status, education, and occupation  
46 of head of household. We defined poverty status as the ratio of household income to poverty  
47 threshold for a given family size and composition for each survey year.<sup>24</sup> Regression-based  
48 multiple imputation was used by the Census Bureau to replace missing household income data.<sup>25</sup>  
49  
50 We categorized education of the head of household into four groups as follows: less than high  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 school, high school graduate, some college or associate degree, and Bachelor's or higher degree.  
4  
5 We categorized occupation of the head of household into five groups as follows: manager and  
6  
7 professional; administrative support, technician, sales; service, including cleaning and building  
8  
9 service, health service, food and beverage preparation, and protective and private household  
10  
11 service; blue-collar, including machine and transportation operator, handler, laborer, mechanic,  
12  
13 and construction worker; other occupations; and not in the labor force.  
14  
15

16  
17 Other covariates used in the models were as follows: race/ethnicity of head of household,  
18  
19 categorized as non-Hispanic White, non-Hispanic Black, Hispanic, and other; household size;  
20  
21 number of males aged 16 and over in the household; number of females aged 16 and over in the  
22  
23 household; and survey year.  
24  
25

## 26 **Statistical analysis**

27  
28 The unit of analysis in this study was the household. U.S. Department of Labor provides  
29  
30 sampling weights for each CES survey quarter. These weights were computed based on the  
31  
32 probability of selection of a household, household non-response, and national household  
33  
34 distribution of age, race, and region.<sup>18</sup> In order to combine six years of surveys, we created a  
35  
36 unified weight by multiplying the original weight in a given survey to the ratio of the sample size  
37  
38 for that survey and the sum of samples sizes of all six surveys.<sup>26</sup> We used this unified weight for  
39  
40 the computation of all point estimates and in all analyses.  
41  
42  
43

44  
45 The U.S. Department of Labor also provides 44 replicate samples with accompanying  
46  
47 sampling weights for standard error estimation.<sup>18</sup> Using replicate samples to estimate a standard  
48  
49 error involves computing a statistic for subsets of the full study sample and examining the  
50  
51 variability of the statistic over the subsets.<sup>27</sup> In essence, this method allows a single sample to  
52  
53 simulate multiple samples. Replicate samples were constructed using the “balanced repeated  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 replication” method where the sampled PSUs were divided into 44 strata and the households  
4 within each stratum were randomly divided into two half samples. CES uses a 44x44 Hadamard  
5 matrix to create the replicates in a “balanced” way.<sup>28</sup> Once the subsamples were formed, survey  
6 weights were computed for each subsample using the method described above for the weights for  
7 each CES survey quarter. Subsequently, 44 different estimates of a statistic were generated using  
8 only one half-sample per stratum. These estimates were then used to approximate standard errors  
9 based on the formula for computing sample standard deviation:

$$\sigma_{\hat{\theta}} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{44} \sum_{r=1}^{44} (\hat{\theta}_r - \hat{\theta})^2}$$

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25 where  $\hat{\theta}$  is the estimated statistic based on the full sample,  $\sigma_{\hat{\theta}}$  is the standard error of  $\hat{\theta}$ , and  $\hat{\theta}_r$   
26 is the  $r^{\text{th}}$  replicate estimate of  $\hat{\theta}$ . We used this data-dependent method of estimating standard  
27 errors which is especially useful when data is generated through a multi-stage sampling design  
28 and where, to preserve respondent anonymity, complete information on sample clusters or strata  
29 is not made available to researchers as is the case in CES.<sup>29</sup>

30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37 We first conducted preliminary analyses to assess the bivariable associations of  
38 household smoking status and cigarette expenditure as a proportion of total household  
39 expenditure with each predictor. Subsequently, we used binary response logistic regression to  
40 assess the association of household smoking status and SES indicators. We also used fractional  
41 response logistic regression to assess the association of cigarette expenditure as a proportion of  
42 total household expenditure with SES indicators.<sup>30-32</sup> Fractional models are suitable for doubly  
43 bounded continuous variables such as proportions. The results of these models can be presented  
44 as relative proportion ratios.<sup>30</sup> We checked for the normality of residuals and multicollinearity  
45 and found no violation of these ordinary least squares regression assumptions in the  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57



1  
2  
3 multivariable model. In relation to the issue of multicollinearity, we note that the associations  
4 between poverty status and education (Kendall's tau-b=0.34), poverty status and occupation  
5 (Cramer's V = 0.27), and education and occupation (Cramer's V = 0.27) were moderate.  
6  
7 Furthermore, the largest change in a standard error comparing bivariable and multivariable  
8 regression results was 29.3% and pertained to the dummy variable comparing households in  
9 poverty with those at or above 300% of poverty line in the binary response logistic regression.  
10  
11 Covariates whose *p*-values were greater than 0.1 in the bivariable models were not included in  
12 the multivariable models. We used Stata version 14.1 for all analyses.<sup>33</sup>  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

## 21 RESULTS

### 22 Sample characteristics and bivariable associations

23  
24  
25  
26 Table 1 provides weighted sample characteristics and bivariable associations between the  
27 covariates and the outcomes. Overall, 17.4% of households reported expenditure on cigarettes.  
28  
29 Among smoking households, the mean quarterly expenditure on cigarettes in constant 2015  
30 dollars was \$458.1 and the mean cigarette expenditure as a percentage of total household  
31 expenditure was 5.6%. About 14.6% of the households lived below the poverty threshold and  
32  
33 38.4% of the heads of households did not report a level of education beyond high school  
34 graduation. About 25.5% of the households were headed by a person holding a managerial or  
35 professional occupation, 16.8% by a person with an administrative occupation, 12.9% by a  
36 person holding a service occupation, and 10.4% by a person in a blue-collar occupation. The  
37 percentage of non-Hispanic Whites, non-Hispanic Blacks, and Hispanics were 69.1, 12.5, and  
38  
39 12.7%, respectively. Table 1 also shows that compared with all households, smoking household  
40 had a higher percentage from lower SES backgrounds.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

At the bivariable level, poorer households, those headed by a person with a lower level of education, and those headed by a person with a lower occupational status (such as blue-collar, service, or administrative compared to managerial or professional occupations) had a higher probability of being a smoking household. For example, while 22.1% of households below poverty reported cigarette expenditure, only 13.2% of those at or above 300% of poverty threshold did so. Similarly, while the percentage of smoking households was 22.6 among households headed by a person who did not complete high school, that percentage was only 8.2 among households headed by a college graduate. Furthermore, while 25.5% of household headed by a blue-collar person reported cigarette expenditure, only 11.7% of those headed by a person in a managerial or professional occupation did so.

Bivariable results also provide strong evidence that poorer households, those headed by a person with a lower level of education or lower occupational status had a higher percentage of their total expenditure devoted to cigarette expenditure.

**Table 1. Weighted sample characteristics, bivariable association of smoking status of households and covariates (n = 39,218), and bivariable association of cigarette expenditure and covariates among smoking household (n = 6,559)**

Covariates	% in full sample (% among smoking households)	% smoking household and 95% CI ( <i>p</i> -value for $\chi^2$ <sup>a</sup> )	Cigarette expenditure as % of total expenditure and 95% CI ( <i>p</i> -value for $\chi^2$ <sup>a</sup> )
Total sample		17.35	5.56 (5.37, 5.74)
Poverty status		( <i>p</i> < 0.001)	( <i>p</i> < 0.001)
< 100%	14.63 (18.61)	22.07 (20.45, 23.77)	7.74 (7.28, 8.20)
100% $\geq$ and < 200%	21.38 (24.00)	19.47 (18.31, 20.68)	6.64 (6.33, 6.95)
200% $\geq$ and < 300%	30.55 (32.05)	18.20 (17.27, 19.17)	5.00 (4.78, 5.23)
$\geq$ 300%	33.44 (25.35)	13.15 (12.18, 14.18)	3.63 (3.46, 3.79)
Education		( <i>p</i> < 0.001)	( <i>p</i> < 0.001)
Less than high school	13.06 (17.03)	22.62 (20.92, 24.41)	7.60 (7.21, 7.99)
High school graduate	25.37 (34.60)	23.66 (22.45, 24.91)	5.98 (5.69, 6.27)
Some college or associate degree	31.09 (33.93)	18.93 (17.90, 20.01)	4.98 (4.74, 5.21)
Bachelor's or higher degree	30.47 (14.44)	8.22 (7.64, 8.85)	3.48 (3.28, 3.68)
Occupation		( <i>p</i> < 0.001)	( <i>p</i> < 0.001)
Manager and professional	25.48 (17.21)	11.72 (10.85, 12.65)	3.64 (3.43, 3.84)
Administrative support	16.78 (18.06)	18.67 (17.24, 20.20)	4.63 (4.43, 4.84)

Service	12.91 (14.52)	19.51 (18.17, 20.92)	5.38 (5.41, 5.73)
Blue-collar	10.44 (15.33)	25.46 (23.31, 27.74)	5.44 (5.09, 5.78)
Other Occupations	0.80 (0.64)	13.92 (9.88, 19.26)	4.28 (3.14, 5.41)
Not in the labor force	33.59 (34.20)	17.68 (16.93, 18.46)	7.16 (6.83, 7.49)
Race/ethnicity		( $p < 0.001$ )	( $p < 0.001$ )
Non-Hispanic White	69.09 (75.92)	19.06 (18.17, 19.99)	5.69 (5.50, 5.89)
Non-Hispanic Black	12.52 (12.09)	16.76 (15.13, 18.52)	5.94 (5.38, 6.50)
Hispanic	12.71 (8.04)	10.97 (9.84, 12.22)	4.28 (3.79, 4.78)
Other	5.68 (3.94)	12.04 (10.56, 13.70)	4.36 (3.85, 4.86)
Household size		( $p < 0.001$ )	( $p < 0.001$ )
1	29.51 (25.75)	15.13 (14.31, 16.00)	7.20 (6.85, 7.56)
2	32.15 (32.57)	17.57 (16.33, 18.89)	5.41 (5.16, 5.65)
3	15.22 (17.67)	20.13 (18.92, 21.40)	4.94 (4.61, 5.27)
4+	23.11 (24.02)	18.03 (16.96, 19.15)	4.44 (4.18, 4.70)
Number of males aged 16 +		( $p < 0.001$ )	( $p < 0.001$ )
0	22.81 (18.85)	14.34 (13.40, 15.34)	6.56 (6.16, 6.97)
1	63.85 (63.36)	17.22 (16.35, 18.12)	5.46 (5.27, 5.66)
2+	13.34 (17.78)	23.13 (21.90, 24.41)	4.82 (4.52, 5.12)
Number of females aged 16 +		( $p < 0.001$ )	( $p < 0.001$ )
0	16.38 (18.54)	19.63 (18.42, 20.91)	6.83 (6.47, 7.19)
1	68.47 (63.51)	16.09 (15.25, 16.96)	5.39 (5.19, 5.59)
2+	15.15 (17.95)	20.56 (19.23, 21.95)	4.82 (4.46, 5.19)
Year		( $p = 0.009$ )	( $p = 0.190$ )
2010	16.97 (18.13)	18.53 (17.20, 19.94)	5.93 (5.65, 6.22)
2011	16.00 (17.35)	18.81 (17.44, 20.26)	5.56 (5.27, 5.86)
2012	16.55 (16.27)	17.06 (15.78, 18.42)	5.29 (4.98, 5.61)
2013	16.70 (15.80)	16.41 (15.18, 17.73)	5.48 (5.08, 5.89)
2014	16.77 (15.77)	16.31 (15.14, 17.55)	5.39 (5.02, 5.76)
2015	17.01 (16.68)	17.01 (15.80, 18.30)	5.62 (5.21, 6.03)

<sup>a</sup>  $P$ -values for the bivariable association of covariates and each of the three outcomes using 44 replicate weights.

## Multivariable analyses

Table 2 shows adjusted odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals (CI) for the association of being a smoking household and SES indicators. Poorer households, those headed by a person with a lower level of education or lower occupational status were more likely to report cigarette expenditure ( $p < 0.001$  for poverty, education, and occupation). The odds ratio comparing households in poverty with those above 300% of poverty threshold was 1.86 (95% CI: 1.61, 2.16). Similarly, the odds ratio comparing households headed by a person who did not complete

1  
2  
3 high school with those headed by a person with at least a Bachelor's degree was 3.37 (95% CI:  
4 2.92, 3.89). Furthermore, the odds ratio comparing households headed by a blue-collar worker  
5  
6 with those headed by a person in a managerial or professional occupation was 1.45 (95% CI:  
7  
8 1.26, 1.66). Race/ethnicity was associated with smoking status ( $p < 0.001$ ) such that the odds of  
9  
10 being a smoking household were largest among households headed by a non-Hispanic White  
11  
12 person and lowest among those headed by a Hispanic individual. Larger households ( $p < 0.001$ ),  
13  
14 those with more males 16 years or older ( $p < 0.001$ ), and those with fewer females 16 years or  
15  
16 older ( $p = 0.036$ ) had higher odds of reporting cigarette expenditure. Finally, there was some  
17  
18 evidence that the odds of being a smoking household were greater in 2010 and 2011 than in later  
19  
20 years ( $p = 0.036$ ).  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 Table 2 also shows the results of the fractional logit regression for modelling the  
27  
28 association of cigarette expenditure as a proportion of total household expenditure with SES and  
29  
30 other covariates, among smoking households. Poorer households, those headed by a person with  
31  
32 a lower level of education or a lower occupational status had a higher cigarette expenditure as a  
33  
34 proportion of total household expenditure. The relative proportion ratio comparing households in  
35  
36 poverty with those above 300% of poverty threshold was 1.74 (95% CI: 1.62, 1.87). Similarly,  
37  
38 the relative proportion ratio comparing households headed by a person who did not complete  
39  
40 high school with those headed by a person with at least a Bachelor's degree was 1.80 (95% CI:  
41  
42 1.65, 1.96). Furthermore, the relative proportion ratio comparing households headed by a blue-  
43  
44 collar worker with those headed by a person in a managerial or professional occupation was 1.16  
45  
46 (95% CI: 1.06, 1.27). Race/ethnicity was associated with proportion spent on cigarettes such that  
47  
48 households headed by a non-Hispanic White person had the highest and those headed by a  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Hispanic individual had the lowest proportion spent on cigarettes ( $p < 0.001$ ). Larger households had a lower proportion spent on cigarettes ( $p < 0.001$ ).

**Table 2: Multivariable results<sup>a</sup> for the association of smoking status of household and cigarette expenditure as a proportion of total household expenditure with socioeconomic status indicators and other covariates**

Covariates	Odds of being a smoking household (n = 39,218)		Cigarette expenditure as a proportion of household expenditure (n = 6,559)	
	Adjusted odds ratios (95% CI)	p-value	Adjusted relative proportion ratios (95% CI)	p-value
<b>Poverty status</b>		<0.001		<0.001
< 100%	1.86 (1.61, 2.16)		1.74 (1.62, 1.87)	
100% $\geq$ and < 200%	1.46 (1.29, 1.65)		1.57 (1.46, 1.69)	
200% $\geq$ and < 300%	1.26 (1.18, 1.35)		1.28 (1.21, 1.36)	
$\geq$ 300%	1.00		1.00	
<b>Education</b>		<0.001		<0.001
Less than high school	3.37 (2.92, 3.89)		1.80 (1.65, 1.96)	
High school graduate	3.02 (2.72, 3.35)		1.50 (1.37, 1.63)	
Some college or associate degree	2.31 (2.11, 2.54)		1.28 (1.18, 1.39)	
Bachelor's or higher degree	1.00		1.00	
<b>Occupation</b>		<0.001		<0.001
Manager and professional	1.00		1.00	
Administrative support	1.20 (1.09, 1.32)		1.05 (0.97, 1.14)	
Service	1.20 (1.09, 1.33)		1.16 (1.07, 1.26)	
Blue-collar	1.45 (1.26, 1.66)		1.16 (1.06, 1.27)	
Other Occupations	0.68 (0.44, 1.04)		0.90 (0.71, 1.13)	
Not in the labor force	0.92 (0.82, 1.03)		1.33 (1.25, 1.41)	
<b>Race/ethnicity</b>		<0.001		<0.001
Non-Hispanic White	1.00		1.00	
Non-Hispanic Black	0.65 (0.57, 0.46)		0.88 (0.81, 0.95)	
Hispanic	0.31 (0.78, 0.35)		0.68 (0.60, 0.77)	
Other	0.58 (0.50, 0.68)		0.80 (0.71, 0.90)	
<b>Household size</b>		<0.001		<0.001
1	1.00		1.00	
2	1.45 (1.28, 1.65)		0.82 (0.75, 0.89)	
3	1.62 (1.41, 1.86)		0.74 (0.66, 0.82)	
4+	1.32 (1.13, 1.54)		0.61 (0.54, 0.68)	
<b>Number of males aged 16 +</b>		<0.001		0.085
0	1.00		1.00	
1	1.17 (1.06, 1.29)		1.04 (0.95, 1.13)	
2+	1.60 (1.40, 2.09)		1.11 (0.99, 1.24)	
<b>Number of females aged 16 +</b>		0.036		0.867
0	1.00		1.00	

1	0.73 (0.65, 0.83)	0.99 (0.90, 1.09)
2+	0.92 (0.80, 1.05)	1.01 (0.88, 1.16)
Year	0.036	--
2010	1.00	--
2011	1.02 (0.93, 1.11)	--
2012	0.92 (0.83, 1.00)	--
2013	0.88 (0.78, 0.99)	--
2014	0.88 (0.79, 0.98)	--
2015	0.95 (0.85, 1.06)	--

<sup>a</sup> All odds ratios (OR) from logistic analysis and regression coefficients ( $\hat{\beta}$ ) from linear regression analyses are adjusted for the effect of all covariates in the model.

## DISCUSSION

In this study, we pooled data from six consecutive years of the U.S. CES and found that lower SES households not only are more likely to spend money on cigarettes but also spend a larger portion of their total household expenditure on cigarettes. Our results were consistent with a previous report in the U.S.<sup>17</sup> and the findings from other countries, although these findings pertained to the general category of tobacco expenditure and not specifically to cigarette expenditure.<sup>13-16</sup>

We also found that larger households and households headed by a non-Hispanic white person compared to others had a higher probability of reporting cigarette expenditure and spent a larger proportion of their total household expenditure on cigarettes. Furthermore, households with a larger number of males aged 16+ years and those with fewer females aged 16+ years had a higher probability of reporting cigarette expenditure. None of these covariates, except number of males and females in the household, have been previously investigated in regards to tobacco expenditure. Our findings about number of males and females were not consistent with a study that was conducted in the Russian Federation, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Tajikistan,<sup>15</sup> where number of males was positively and number of females was negatively associated with tobacco expenditure as a share of total household expenditure.

1  
2  
3 A strength of this work was its use of six consecutive years of national and  
4 comprehensive expenditure data with relatively high response rates and large sample sizes. The  
5 validity of the CES data has been investigated by comparing them with National Income and  
6 Product Accounts data.<sup>34</sup> While this comparison was not specifically done for cigarette  
7 expenditure, the findings showed that most of the large categories of consumption were  
8 measured well in the CES, as the ratio to the National Income and Accounts statistics was close  
9 to one and has not declined notably over time.<sup>34</sup> The major weakness of the study is that, as it is  
10 the case with all cross-sectional analyses, it does not allow causal inferences. It is plausible that  
11 poorer households headed by a person with a low level of formal education are more likely to  
12 have one or more smokers in the household and spend money on cigarettes. The effect of SES on  
13 smoking has been extensively studied.<sup>7 35-39</sup> It is also plausible that households that spend money  
14 on cigarettes and have higher health care expenditures due to smoking are more likely to have  
15 reduced income and experience downward socioeconomic mobility. However, to our knowledge,  
16 the effect of smoking on downward mobility has not been studied. Another weakness of this  
17 work is that, as reported in a study where households in the CES were linked to zip-code level  
18 average income, the very high income households are less likely to respond to the survey.<sup>40</sup>  
19 However, non-response rates were not associated with income over most of the income  
20 distribution.<sup>40</sup> Finally, we note that we did not have a reliable variable for survey mode to  
21 include in the analyses. Telephone surveys are associated with underreporting of smoking<sup>41 42</sup>  
22 and based on the extent to which survey mode is associated with SES, the results of this study  
23 could be biased.

24  
25  
26 Cigarette expenditure may contribute to financial deprivation and lower standards of  
27 living, which in turn can lead to unfavorable smoking behaviors and outcomes.<sup>3 4 43-45</sup> For

1  
2  
3 example, financial stress is associated with a lower probability of smoking cessation among  
4 smokers and a higher probability of relapse among ex-smokers.<sup>43</sup> Moreover, while smokers with  
5 financial stress are more likely to have an interest in quitting, they are less likely to make a quit  
6 attempt or succeed in quitting.<sup>46</sup> In light of our finding that lower SES households are more  
7 likely to include a smoker and spend relatively more on cigarettes, we recommend tobacco  
8 control policies that are effective in reducing smoking among lower SES groups. Increasing  
9 taxation on cigarettes is the most effective policy for reducing smoking among all segments of  
10 the population. In fact, many studies have shown that increasing the price of cigarettes results in  
11 a larger decrease in smoking prevalence among lower income and occupational groups than  
12 others.<sup>7 47 48</sup> This policy, however, is likely to negatively affect the finances of low income  
13 smokers who fail to quit or reduce smoking. To address this problem, part or all of the revenues  
14 from increased taxation can be used to fund evidence-based smoking cessation programs<sup>49</sup> for  
15 these smokers. Moreover, there is evidence that the effectiveness of increased taxation can be  
16 undermined by the availability of cheap tobacco and that changing the tobacco tax structure for  
17 cheap tobacco may promote quitting among low income groups.<sup>50 51</sup> In addition to increasing  
18 taxation, there is evidence that anti-smoking mass media campaigns are also effective in  
19 reducing smoking prevalence<sup>52 53</sup> and increasing cessation rates<sup>54</sup> among low SES smokers.  
20 Furthermore, it has been reported that plain packaging of and featuring large health warning  
21 labels on cigarette packs are associated with reduced positive brand image and intention to  
22 purchase cigarettes among socioeconomically disadvantaged smokers.<sup>55</sup> Finally, there is some  
23 evidence that bans on smoking in public places are effective in reducing smoking prevalence  
24 and consumption among lower SES smokers<sup>56 57</sup> and across all socioeconomic groups.<sup>58</sup>  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 **Contributorship statement:** Mohammad Siahpush contributed to the following aspects of the  
4 work: conception, design, data acquisition, using Stata for data analysis, interpretation of data,  
5 drafting, and critical revision. Paraskevi Farazi contributed to the following aspects of the work:  
6 conception, data analysis, interpretation of data, and critical revision. Shannon Maloney  
7 contributed to the following aspects of the work: conception, data analysis, interpretation of data,  
8 and critical revision. Danae Dinkel contributed to the following aspects of the work: conception,  
9 data analysis, interpretation of data, and critical revision. Minh Nguyen contributed to the  
10 following aspects of the work: design, data analysis, interpretation of data, drafting, and critical  
11 revision. Gopal Singh contributed to the following aspects of the work: conception, data analysis,  
12 and critical revision. All authors approve the final version as submitted. All authors are  
13 accountable for all aspects of the work.

14  
15 **Competing interests:** We acknowledge that none of the authors or their institutions have  
16 financial or personal relationships or affiliations that could influence (or bias) our decisions,  
17 work, or manuscript. We confirm that this conflict of interest disclosure information is accurate  
18 and complete.

19  
20 **Funding:** No source of funding was used to conduct this study. Ethical approval was not needed  
21 for this study as we used secondary data that are publically available by the U.S. Bureau of  
22 Statistics.

23  
24 **Data sharing statement:** No additional data available.

## 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60

### REFERENCES

1. U.S. Department of Health Human Services. The health consequences of smoking—  
50 years of progress: a report of the Surgeon General. *Atlanta, GA: US  
Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and*

- 1  
2  
3  
4 *Prevention, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health*  
5 *Promotion, Office on Smoking and Health 2014;17*  
6
- 7 2. Siahpush M, Borland R, Scollo M. Smoking and financial stress. *Tobacco Control*  
8 2003;12:60-66.  
9
  - 10 3. Siahpush M, Borland R, Yong HH, et al. Tobacco expenditure, smoking-induced  
11 deprivation and financial stress: Results from the International Tobacco Control  
12 (ITC) Four-Country Survey. *Drug and alcohol review* 2012;31(5):664-71.  
13
  - 14 4. Siahpush M, Thrasher JF, Yong HH, et al. Cigarette prices, cigarette expenditure and  
15 smoking-induced deprivation: findings from the International Tobacco Control  
16 Mexico survey. *Tobacco control* 2013;22(4):223-26. doi: 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-  
17 2012-050613; 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2012-050613  
18
  - 19 5. Siahpush M, Spittal M, Singh GK. Association of Smoking Cessation With Financial  
20 Stress and Material Well-Being: Results From a Prospective Study of a  
21 Population-Based National Survey. *American Journal of Public Health*  
22 2007;97(12):2281-87.  
23
  - 24 6. Siahpush M, Spittal M, Singh GK. Smoking cessation and financial stress. *Journal of*  
25 *Public Health* 2007;29(4):338-42.  
26
  - 27 7. Hiscock R, Bauld L, Amos A, et al. Socioeconomic status and smoking: a review.  
28 *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 2012;1248(1):107-23.  
29
  - 30 8. Garrett BE, Dube SR, Trosclair A, et al. Cigarette smoking—United States, 1965–  
31 2008. *MMWR Surveill Summ* 2011;60(1):109-13.  
32
  - 33 9. Jamal A. Current cigarette smoking among adults—United States, 2005–2015.  
34 *MMWR Morbidity and mortality weekly report* 2016;65  
35
  - 36 10. Siahpush M, Borland R. Sociodemographic variations in smoking status among  
37 Australians aged 18 years and over: Multivariate results from the 1995 National  
38 Health Survey. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health*  
39 2001;25:438-42.  
40
  - 41 11. Nagelhout GE, de Korte-de Boer D, Kunst AE, et al. Trends in socioeconomic  
42 inequalities in smoking prevalence, consumption, initiation, and cessation  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4 between 2001 and 2008 in the Netherlands. Findings from a national population  
5 survey. *BMC Public Health* 2012;12(1):303.  
6
- 7 12. Hiscock R, Bauld L, Amos A, et al. Smoking and socioeconomic status in England:  
8 the rise of the never smoker and the disadvantaged smoker. *Journal of Public*  
9 *Health* 2012;34(3):390-96.  
10
- 11 13. Perera KMN, Guruge GD, Jayawardana PL. Household Expenditure on Tobacco  
12 Consumption in a Poverty-Stricken Rural District in Sri Lanka. *Asia Pacific*  
13 *Journal of Public Health* 2017;29(2):140-48.  
14
- 15 14. Tachfouti N, Berraho M, Elfakir S, et al. Socioeconomic status and tobacco  
16 expenditures among Moroccans: results of the "Maroc Tabagisme" survey.  
17 *American Journal of Health Promotion* 2010;24(5):334-39.  
18
- 19 15. Djibuti M, Gotsadze G, Mataradze G, et al. Influence of household demographic and  
20 socio-economic factors on household expenditure on tobacco in six New  
21 Independent States. *BMC Public Health* 2007;7(1):222.  
22
- 23 16. Siahpush M. Socioeconomic status and tobacco expenditure among Australian  
24 households: results from the 1998-99 Household Expenditure Survey. *Journal of*  
25 *Epidemiology and Community Health* 2003;57:798-801.  
26
- 27 17. Farrelly MC, Nonnemaker JM, Watson KA. The consequences of high cigarette  
28 excise taxes for low-income smokers. *PloS one* 2012;7(9):e43838.  
29
- 30 18. U.S. Department of Labor. 2015 Users' Document: Interview Survey Public-Use  
31 Microdata (PUMD) Consumer Expenditure: Bureau of Labor Statistics, Division of  
32 Consumer Expenditure Surveys, 2016.  
33
- 34 19. U.S. Department of Labor. 2015 Response Rates: Interview and Diary Survey  
35 Consumer Expenditure Public Use Microdata: Bureau of Labor Statistics,  
36 Division of Consumer Expenditure Surveys, 2016.  
37
- 38 20. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Consumer Expenditure Survey: Frequently Asked  
39 Questions: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics,; 2017 [Available from:  
40 <https://www.bls.gov/cex/csxfaqs.htm> accessed 12/14/2017 2017.  
41
- 42 21. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Consumer Expenditure Survey: Glossary: Unites  
43 States Department of Labor, 2018.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4 22. Perrins G, Nilsen D. Math calculations to better utilize CPI data: U.S. Bureau of
- 5 Labor Statistics, 2017.
- 6
- 7 23. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Consumer Price Index Historical Tables for U.S.
- 8 City Average: U.S. Department of Labor, 2017.
- 9
- 10 24. U.S. Census Bureau. Poverty thresholds: U.S. Census Bureau; 2016 [Available
- 11 from: [https://www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/demo/income-](https://www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/demo/income-poverty/historical-poverty-thresholds.html)
- 12 [poverty/historical-poverty-thresholds.html](https://www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/demo/income-poverty/historical-poverty-thresholds.html) accessed May 2, 2017.
- 13
- 14
- 15 25. U.S. Department of Labor. User's Guide to Income Imputation in the CE: Bureau of
- 16 Labor Statistics, Division of Consumer Expenditure Surveys, 2006.
- 17
- 18 26. Korn EL, Graubard BI. Analysis of health surveys. New York: John Wiley & Sons
- 19 1999.
- 20
- 21
- 22 27. Levy PS, Lemeshow S. Sampling of populations: methods and applications: John
- 23 Wiley & Sons 2013.
- 24
- 25
- 26 28. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Handbook of Methods: Consumer Expenditure and
- 27 Income Calculations Washington D.C.: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics; 2016
- 28 [Available from: <https://www.bls.gov/opub/hom/cex/calculation.htm> accessed
- 29 12/17/2017 2017.
- 30
- 31
- 32
- 33 29. StataCorp. Stata Base Reference Manual Release 14. College Station, Texas:
- 34 StataCorp LP 2015.
- 35
- 36 30. Smithson M, Merkle EC. Generalized linear models for categorical and continuous
- 37 limited dependent variables. London: CRC Press 2014.
- 38
- 39
- 40 31. Papke LE, Wooldridge JM. Panel data methods for fractional response variables
- 41 with an application to test pass rates. *Journal of Econometrics* 2008;145(1-
- 42 2):121-33.
- 43
- 44
- 45 32. Papke LE, Wooldridge J. Econometric methods for fractional response variables
- 46 with an application to 401 (k) plan participation rates. *Journal of Applied*
- 47 *Econometrics* 1996;11:619-32.
- 48
- 49
- 50 33. StataCorp. Stata Statistical Software: Release 14.1, MP Parallel Edition. College
- 51 Station, TX: StataCorp LP 2015.
- 52
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60

- 1  
2  
3  
4 34. Bee A, Meyer BD, Sullivan JX. The Validity of Consumption Data: Are the  
5 Consumer Expenditure Interview and Diary Surveys Informative?: National  
6 Bureau of Economic Research, 2012.  
7  
8  
9 35. Businelle MS, Kendzor DE, Reitzel LR, et al. Mechanisms linking socioeconomic  
10 status to smoking cessation: a structural equation modeling approach. *Health*  
11 *Psychology* 2010;29(3):262.  
12  
13  
14 36. Mathur C, Erickson DJ, Stigler MH, et al. Individual and neighborhood  
15 socioeconomic status effects on adolescent smoking: a multilevel cohort-  
16 sequential latent growth analysis. *American journal of public health*  
17 2013;103(3):543-48.  
18  
19  
20  
21 37. Jarvis MJ, Wardle J. Social patterning of individual health behaviours: the case of  
22 cigarette smoking. In: Marmot M, Wilkinson RG, eds. *Social Determinants of*  
23 *Health*. Oxford: Oxford University Press 1999.  
24  
25  
26 38. Paavola M, Vartiainen E, Haukkala A. Smoking from adolescence to adulthood: the  
27 effects of parental and own socioeconomic status. *The European Journal of*  
28 *Public Health* 2004;14(4):417-21.  
29  
30  
31 39. Lindström M, Modén B, Rosvall M. A life-course perspective on economic stress  
32 and tobacco smoking: a population-based study. *Addiction* 2013;108(7):1305-14.  
33  
34  
35 40. Sabelhaus J, Johnson D, Ash S, et al. Is the Consumer Expenditure Survey  
36 representative by income?: National Bureau of Economic Research, 2012.  
37  
38  
39 41. Donovan RJ, Corti CAJ, Jalleh G. Face-to-face household interviews versus  
40 telephone interviews for health surveys. *Australian and New Zealand journal of*  
41 *public health* 1997;21(2):134-40.  
42  
43  
44 42. Arday DR, Tomar SL, Nelson DE, et al. State smoking prevalence estimates: a  
45 comparison of the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System and current  
46 population surveys. *American Journal of Public Health* 1997;87(10):1665-69.  
47  
48  
49 43. Siahpush M, Carlin JB. Financial stress, smoking cessation and relapse: results  
50 from a prospective study of an Australian national sample. *Addiction*  
51 2006;110:121-27.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4 44. Siahpush M, Borland R, Yong HH. Sociodemographic and psychosocial correlates  
5 of smoking-induced deprivation and its effect on quitting: findings from the  
6 International Tobacco Control Policy Evaluation Survey. *Tobacco Control*  
7 2007;16(2):e2. doi: 10.1136/tc.2006.016279  
8  
9
- 10  
11 45. Kendzor DE, Businelle MS, Costello TJ, et al. Financial strain and smoking  
12 cessation among racially/ethnically diverse smokers. *American Journal of Public*  
13 *Health* 2010;100(4):702-06. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2009.172676;  
14 10.2105/AJPH.2009.172676  
15  
16
- 17  
18 46. Siahpush M, Yong HH, Borland R, et al. Smokers with financial stress are more  
19 likely to want to quit but less likely to try or succeed: findings from the  
20 International Tobacco Control (ITC) Four Country Survey. *Addiction (Abingdon,*  
21 *England)* 2009;104(8):1382-90. doi: 10.1111/j.1360-0443.2009.02599.x  
22  
23
- 24  
25 47. Siahpush M, Wakefield MA, Spittal MJ, et al. Taxation reduces social disparities in  
26 adult smoking prevalence. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*  
27 2009;36(4):285-91. doi: 10.1016/j.amepre.2008.11.013  
28  
29
- 30  
31 48. Farrelly MC, Engelen M. Cigarette prices, smoking, and the poor, revisited.  
32 *American Journal of Public Health* 2008;98(4):582-3; author reply 83-84. doi:  
33 10.2105/AJPH.2007.132647  
34
- 35  
36 49. Tobacco TCGT. A clinical practice guideline for treating tobacco use and  
37 dependence: 2008 update: a US public health service report. *American journal of*  
38 *preventive medicine* 2008;35(2):158-76.  
39
- 40  
41 50. Partos TR, Gilmore AB, Hitchman SC, et al. Availability and use of cheap tobacco in  
42 the UK 2002-2014: Findings from the International Tobacco Control Project.  
43 *Nicotine & Tobacco Research* 2017:ntx108.  
44
- 45  
46 51. Hiscock R, Branston JR, McNeill A, et al. Tobacco industry strategies undermine  
47 government tax policy: evidence from commercial data. *Tobacco control*  
48 2017:tobaccocontrol-2017-053891.  
49
- 50  
51 52. White VM, Hayman J, Hill DJ. Can population-based tobacco-control policies  
52 change smoking behaviors of adolescents from all socio-economic groups?  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Findings from Australia: 1987-2005. *Cancer causes & control : CCC*  
4 2008;19(6):631-40. doi: 10.1007/s10552-008-9127-8  
5  
6  
7 53. Levy DT, Mumford EA, Compton C. Tobacco control policies and smoking in a  
8 population of low education women, 1992-2002. *Journal of Epidemiology and*  
9 *Community Health* 2006;60:ii20-ii26.  
10  
11  
12 54. Durkin SJ, Biener L, Wakefield MA. Effects of different types of antismoking ads on  
13 reducing disparities in smoking cessation among socioeconomic subgroups.  
14 *American Journal of Public Health* 2009;99(12):2217-23. doi:  
15 10.2105/AJPH.2009.161638  
16  
17  
18 55. Guillaumier A, Bonevski B, Paul C, et al. Socioeconomically disadvantaged  
19 smokers' ratings of plain and branded cigarette packaging: an experimental  
20 study. *BMJ open* 2014;4(2):e004078.  
21  
22  
23 56. Dinno A, Glantz S. Tobacco control policies are egalitarian: a vulnerabilities  
24 perspective on clean indoor air laws, cigarette prices, and tobacco use  
25 disparities. *Social science & medicine (1982)* 2009;68(8):1439-47. doi:  
26 10.1016/j.socscimed.2009.02.003  
27  
28  
29 57. Hackshaw L, McEwen A, West R, et al. Quit attempts in response to smoke-free  
30 legislation in England. *Tobacco control* 2010;19(2):160-64.  
31  
32  
33 58. Hahn EJ, Rayens MK, Butler KM, et al. Smoke-free laws and adult smoking  
34 prevalence. *Preventive medicine* 2008;47(2):206-09.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies*

Page #	Item	Item No	Recommendation
1-2	<b>Title and abstract</b>	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found
<b>Introduction</b>			
3	Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported
4	Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses
<b>Methods</b>			
5	Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper
5	Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection
5	Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants
6-7	Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable
5	Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group
5	Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias
5	Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at
6-7	Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why
7-9	Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding (b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions (c) Explain how missing data were addressed (d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy (e) Describe any sensitivity analyses
<b>Results</b>			
5, 9	Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage (c) Consider use of a flow diagram
9-10	Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest
10-13	Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures
13	Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear



			which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included
			(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized
			(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period
	Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses
	<b>Discussion</b>		
14	Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives
15	Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias
14- 15	Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence
14- 15	Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results
	<b>Other information</b>		
18	Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based

\*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

**Note:** An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at [www.strobe-statement.org](http://www.strobe-statement.org).

# BMJ Open

## Socioeconomic status and cigarette expenditure among U.S. households: Results from 2010-2015 Consumer Expenditure Survey

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2017-020571.R3
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	27-Apr-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Siahpush, Mohammad; University of Nebraska Medical Center, Department of Health Promotion, Social and Behavioral Health Farazi, Paraskevi; University of Nebraska Medical Center, Epidemiology Maloney, Shannon; University of Nebraska Medical Center, Health Promotion Dinkel, Danae; University of Nebraska at Omaha, School of Health & Kinesiology Nguyen, Minh; University of Nebraska Medical Center, Epidemiology Singh, Gopal; US Department of Health & Human Services, HRSA/Maternal and Child Health Bureau
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Smoking and tobacco
Secondary Subject Heading:	Public health
Keywords:	Economics < TROPICAL MEDICINE, PUBLIC HEALTH, EPIDEMIOLOGY

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3 **Socioeconomic status and cigarette expenditure among U.S. households:**  
4 **Results from 2010-2015 Consumer Expenditure Survey**  
5

6 Mohammad Siahpush<sup>a</sup>, PhD, Paraskevi A Farazi<sup>b</sup>, PhD, Shannon I Maloney<sup>a</sup>, PhD, Danae  
7 Dinkel<sup>c</sup>, PhD, Minh N Nguyen<sup>b\*</sup>, MPH, Gopal K Singh<sup>d</sup>, PhD  
8  
9

- 10 a. Department of Health Promotion, College of Public Health, University of Nebraska Medical  
11 Center, 984365 Nebraska Medical Center, Omaha, NE 68198, USA  
12 b. Department of Epidemiology, College of Public Health, University of Nebraska Medical  
13 Center, 984365 Nebraska Medical Center, Omaha, NE 68198, USA  
14 c. School of Health and Kinesiology, College of Education, University of Nebraska at Omaha,  
15 6001 Dodge Street, Omaha, NE 68182, USA  
16 d. Office of Health Equity, Health Resources and Services Administration, U.S. Department of  
17 Health & Human Services, Rockville, MD 20857, USA  
18  
19

20 \* Correspondence: minh.n.nguyen@unmc.edu; Tel: +1-402-559-9409  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## ABSTRACT

**Objectives:** To examine (1) the association between household socioeconomic status (SES) and whether a household spends money on cigarettes, and (2) socioeconomic variations in proportion of total household expenditure spent on cigarettes among smoking households.

**Methods:** We pooled data from six consecutive years, 2010-2015, of the Consumer Expenditure Interview Survey. The interviews involved a structured questionnaire about household income, demographics, and expenditures including expenditure on cigarettes. Households that reported cigarette expenditure in the previous three months were distinguished as smoking households. SES indicators were household poverty status, education, and occupation of the head of household. Logistic regression was used to assess the association of household smoking status with SES. Fractional logistic regression was used to assess the association of cigarette expenditure as a proportion of total household expenditure with SES. The analysis sample size was 39,218.

**Results:** The probability of spending money on cigarettes was higher among lower SES households. Households in poverty compared with those above 300% of poverty threshold had 1.86 (95% CI: 1.61, 2.16), households headed by a person with less than high school education compared with those headed by a person with at least a bachelor's degree had 3.37 (95% CI: 2.92, 3.89), and households headed by a blue-collar work compared with those headed by a person in a managerial occupation had 1.45 (95% CI: 1.26, 1.66) higher odds of spending money on cigarettes. Similarly, the proportion of total household expenditure spent on cigarettes was higher among lower SES smoking households.

**Conclusion:** Lower SES households are more likely to spend money on cigarettes and spend a larger proportion of their total expenditure on cigarettes. We recommend strategies effective in reducing smoking among low SES smokers.

### Strengths and limitations of this study:

- We used a national household survey representing the entire U.S. civilian noninstitutional population that involved a structured questionnaire to collect data on household income, demographics, and a complete range of expenditures.
- Conclusions are based on data from six consecutive years of national and comprehensive expenditure data with relatively high response rates and large sample sizes.
- The cross-sectional design does not allow for causal inferences about the relationship between socioeconomic status and whether a household spends money on cigarettes or percent of household expenditure spent on cigarettes among smoking households.

## INTRODUCTION

Smoking cigarettes not only causes numerous health conditions,<sup>1</sup> but also is associated with deleterious financial consequences and a lowered standard of living. For example, smokers compared to non-smokers are more likely to experience financial stress, defined as events such as going without meals or not being able to pay rent.<sup>2</sup> Similarly, among smokers, higher cigarette expenditure is associated with a higher probability of experiencing financial stress.<sup>3</sup> Furthermore, smokers who spend more on cigarettes are more likely to report “smoking-induced deprivation”, measured by asking smokers whether “money ... spent on cigarettes resulted in not having enough money for household essentials such as food.”<sup>3 4</sup> There is also evidence that quitting smoking is associated with a subsequent reduction in the probability of experiencing financial stress<sup>5 6</sup> and an increased level of prosperity.<sup>5</sup>

One of the strong and persistent determinants of smoking behavior in developed countries is socioeconomic status (SES).<sup>7-12</sup> For example, in the United States (U.S.), in 2015, smoking prevalence among adults living below the poverty line was nearly twice that of those at or above the poverty line (26.1% versus 13.9%). Similarly, smoking prevalence among individuals aged 25 years or older ranged from 34.1% in persons with a high school diploma to 16.6% in those with an associate degree to only 3.6% in those with a graduate degree.<sup>9</sup>

There are numerous studies documenting the association between SES and smoking behavior. Less has been published on the association between SES and expenditure on cigarettes. Whereas the primary implication of studies of the SES determinants of smoking pertains to the deleterious health effects of smoking and health inequalities, the primary implication of studies of cigarette expenditure relates to the financial burden of smoking.<sup>3 13-15</sup> An expenditure study conducted in Australia used data from a sample of 6,892 households and showed that those with

1  
2  
3 a lower SES were more likely to report tobacco expenditure.<sup>16</sup> The odds of tobacco expenditure  
4 were 2.3 times greater among households headed by a person with no educational qualification  
5 than a university degree and 1.4 times greater among households headed by a person with a blue-  
6 collar occupation than a professional occupation. Furthermore, among smoking households,  
7 those with a lower SES spent a higher proportion of their funds on tobacco. Percent of total  
8 household expenditure spent on tobacco was 46% higher among households headed by a person  
9 with no educational qualification than a university degree and 38% higher among households  
10 headed by a person with a blue-collar occupation than a professional occupation. A different  
11 study of 1,144 households in Sri Lanka revealed that while higher income households spent more  
12 on tobacco products, they had a lower tobacco expenditure as a percentage of total household  
13 expenditure.<sup>13</sup> Similar results were reported in a study conducted in the Russian Federation,  
14 Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan,<sup>15</sup> and another in Morocco.<sup>14</sup> Finally, a  
15 study of 748 smokers in the U.S. showed that lower income households spent a higher  
16 percentage of their household income on cigarettes.<sup>17</sup> This study did not assess the association of  
17 other commonly used indicators of SES (e.g. education and occupation) with cigarette  
18 expenditure. Furthermore, the study did not adjust for the effect of possible confounders in  
19 assessing the relationship between income and percent of income spent on cigarettes. Finally, the  
20 study did not measure cigarette expenditure directly; instead, it was estimated indirectly by  
21 asking respondents how many cigarettes they smoked each day and the price they paid for their  
22 last pack of cigarettes. Our aim was to address these shortcomings. We used data from the  
23 Consumer Expenditure Survey (CES) in the U.S. to examine (1) the association between  
24 household SES and whether a household reports cigarette expenditure, and (2) SES variations in  
25 proportion of total household expenditure spent on cigarettes among smoking households.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## METHODS

### Data

We used data from the CES, which is conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau under contract with the Bureau of Labor Statistics.<sup>18</sup> The CES is a national household survey representing the entire U.S. civilian noninstitutional population. The CES uses a cluster sampling design where primary sampling units (PSUs) are small clusters of counties grouped together into geographic entities. The sampling frame within the primary sampling units is the Census Bureau's Master Address File, which contains residential addresses identified in the 2010 census. Approximately 6,900 households at the identified addresses are interviewed each quarter of the year. Each household is interviewed every three months over four calendar quarters. After the fourth interview, the household is dropped from the survey and replaced by a new sample. The response rates varied from the highest of 74.5% in 2010 to the lowest of 64.2% in 2015.<sup>19</sup> The interviews' duration was about 60 minutes and they were primarily conducted in person using a structured questionnaire to collect data on household income, demographics, and a complete range of expenditure items. We appended data from the third quarter data collection (i.e., July, August, and September) of six consecutive years, 2010-2015, with a total sample size of 39,806 households. Each household appears only once in the pooled dataset. We did not use the first quarter data because the expenditure report of some of the participants pertained to the previous calendar year. Our sensitivity analyses revealed that using data from the second and fourth quarter yields very similar results as we report in this article. We excluded from the analysis 588 households, i.e., 1.5% of the total number of households, for which there was a missing value for one or more study variables except income. While the amount of missing data was negligible and not likely to have biased the results, we note that households with missing data were more likely

1  
2  
3 to be of a higher SES background and report cigarette expenditure. The final sample size for the  
4 analysis was 39,218. Ethical approval was not needed for this study as we used secondary data  
5 that are publically available by the U.S. Bureau of Statistics.  
6  
7  
8

### 9 10 **Measurement of smoking status of households and cigarette expenditure as a proportion of** 11 **total household expenditure** 12 13

14  
15 The head of household, who is the first person mentioned by a respondent to be the one  
16 who owns or rents the home of the household,<sup>20 21</sup> was asked: “since the first of the reference  
17 month [three months prior to the interview], have you or any members of your household  
18 purchased cigarettes?” An affirmative answer indicated a smoking household. The head of a  
19 smoking household was asked: “What is the usual weekly expense for cigarettes?” Weekly  
20 cigarette expenditure amounts were converted to quarterly amounts by the Census Bureau to  
21 match the timeframe for the reporting of most other household expenditures items. We converted  
22 nominal expenditure amounts to constant 2015 dollars using the commonly used all-items  
23 consumer price index to account for inflation.<sup>22 23</sup> For smoking households, we computed  
24 cigarette expenditure as a proportion of total expenditure including expenditure on items such as  
25 food, alcoholic beverages, tobacco and smoking supplies, housing, apparel, transportation, health  
26 care, entertainment, and personal care.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

### 42 **Measurement of SES and other covariates** 43

44  
45 We employed three SES indicators: household poverty status, education, and occupation  
46 of head of household. We defined poverty status as the ratio of household income to poverty  
47 threshold for a given family size and composition for each survey year.<sup>24</sup> Regression-based  
48 multiple imputation was used by the Census Bureau to replace missing household income data.<sup>25</sup>  
49  
50 We categorized education of the head of household into four groups as follows: less than high  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 school, high school graduate, some college or associate degree, and Bachelor's or higher degree.  
4  
5 We categorized occupation of the head of household into five groups as follows: manager and  
6  
7 professional; administrative support, technician, sales; service, including cleaning and building  
8  
9 service, health service, food and beverage preparation, and protective and private household  
10  
11 service; blue-collar, including machine and transportation operator, handler, laborer, mechanic,  
12  
13 and construction worker; other occupations; and not in the labor force.  
14  
15

16  
17 Other covariates used in the models were as follows: race/ethnicity of head of household,  
18  
19 categorized as non-Hispanic White, non-Hispanic Black, Hispanic, and other; household size;  
20  
21 number of males aged 16 and over in the household; number of females aged 16 and over in the  
22  
23 household; and survey year.  
24  
25

## 26 **Statistical analysis**

27  
28 The unit of analysis in this study was the household. U.S. Department of Labor provides  
29  
30 sampling weights for each CES survey quarter. These weights were computed based on the  
31  
32 probability of selection of a household, household non-response, and national household  
33  
34 distribution of age, race, and region.<sup>18</sup> In order to combine six years of surveys, we created an  
35  
36 adjusted weight by multiplying the original weight in a given survey to the ratio of the sample  
37  
38 size for that survey and the sum of samples sizes of all six surveys.<sup>26</sup> We used this adjusted  
39  
40 weight for the computation of all point estimates and in all analyses.  
41  
42  
43

44  
45 The U.S. Department of Labor also provides 44 replicate samples with accompanying  
46  
47 sampling weights for standard error estimation.<sup>18</sup> Using replicate samples to estimate a standard  
48  
49 error involves computing a statistic for subsets of the full study sample and examining the  
50  
51 variability of the statistic over the subsets.<sup>27</sup> In essence, this method allows a single sample to  
52  
53 simulate multiple samples. Replicate samples were constructed using the “balanced repeated  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 replication” method where the sampled PSUs were divided into 44 strata and the households  
4 within each stratum were randomly divided into two half samples. CES uses a 44x44 Hadamard  
5 matrix to create the replicates in a “balanced” way.<sup>28</sup> Once the subsamples were formed, survey  
6 weights were computed for each subsample using the method described above for the weights for  
7 each CES survey quarter. Subsequently, 44 different estimates of a statistic were generated using  
8 only one half-sample per stratum. These estimates were then used to approximate standard errors  
9 based on the formula for computing sample standard deviation:

$$\sigma_{\hat{\theta}} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{44} \sum_{r=1}^{44} (\hat{\theta}_r - \hat{\theta})^2}$$

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25 where  $\hat{\theta}$  is the estimated statistic based on the full sample,  $\sigma_{\hat{\theta}}$  is the standard error of  $\hat{\theta}$ , and  $\hat{\theta}_r$   
26 is the  $r^{\text{th}}$  replicate estimate of  $\hat{\theta}$ . We used this data-dependent method of estimating standard  
27 errors which is especially useful when data is generated through a multi-stage sampling design  
28 and where, to preserve respondent anonymity, complete information on sample clusters or strata  
29 is not made available to researchers as is the case in CES.<sup>29</sup>

30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37 We first conducted preliminary analyses to assess the bivariable associations of  
38 household smoking status and cigarette expenditure as a proportion of total household  
39 expenditure with each predictor. Subsequently, we used binary response logistic regression to  
40 assess the association of household smoking status and SES indicators. We also used fractional  
41 response logistic regression to assess the association of cigarette expenditure as a proportion of  
42 total household expenditure with SES indicators.<sup>30-32</sup> Fractional models are suitable for doubly  
43 bounded continuous variables such as proportions. The results of these models can be presented  
44 as relative proportion ratios.<sup>30</sup> We checked for the normality of residuals and multicollinearity  
45 and found no violation of these ordinary least squares regression assumptions in the  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

1  
2  
3 multivariable model. In relation to the issue of multicollinearity, we note that the associations  
4 between poverty status and education (Kendall's tau-b=0.34), poverty status and occupation  
5 (Cramer's V = 0.27), and education and occupation (Cramer's V = 0.27) were moderate.  
6  
7 Furthermore, the largest change in a standard error comparing bivariable and multivariable  
8 regression results was 29.3% and pertained to the dummy variable comparing households in  
9 poverty with those at or above 300% of poverty line in the binary response logistic regression.  
10  
11 Covariates whose *p*-values were greater than 0.1 in the bivariable models were not included in  
12 the multivariable models. We used Stata version 14.1 for all analyses.<sup>33</sup>  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

### 21 **Patient and public involvement**

22 Patients and public were not involved.  
23  
24  
25

## 26 **RESULTS**

### 27 **Sample characteristics and bivariable associations**

28  
29 Table 1 provides weighted sample characteristics and bivariable associations between the  
30 covariates and the outcomes. Overall, 17.4% of households reported expenditure on cigarettes.  
31  
32 Among smoking households, the mean quarterly expenditure on cigarettes in constant 2015  
33 dollars was \$458 and the mean cigarette expenditure as a percentage of total household  
34 expenditure was 5.6%. About 14.6% of the households lived below the poverty threshold and  
35  
36 38.5% of the heads of households did not report a level of education beyond high school  
37 graduation. About 25.5% of the households were headed by a person holding a managerial or  
38 professional occupation, 16.8% by a person with an administrative occupation, 12.9% by a  
39 person holding a service occupation, and 10.4% by a person in a blue-collar occupation. The  
40 percentage of non-Hispanic Whites, non-Hispanic Blacks, and Hispanics were 69.1, 12.5, and  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

12.7%, respectively. Table 1 also shows that compared with all households, smoking household had a higher percentage from lower SES backgrounds.

At the bivariable level, poorer households, those headed by a person with a lower level of education, and those headed by a person with a lower occupational status (such as blue-collar, service, or administrative compared to managerial or professional occupations) had a higher probability of being a smoking household. For example, while 22.1% of households below poverty reported cigarette expenditure, only 13.2% of those at or above 300% of poverty threshold did so. Similarly, while the percentage of smoking households was 22.6 among households headed by a person who did not complete high school, that percentage was only 8.2 among households headed by a college graduate. Furthermore, while 25.5% of household headed by a blue-collar person reported cigarette expenditure, only 11.7% of those headed by a person in a managerial or professional occupation did so.

Bivariable results also provide strong evidence that poorer households, those headed by a person with a lower level of education or lower occupational status had a higher percentage of their total expenditure devoted to cigarette expenditure.

**Table 1. Weighted sample characteristics, bivariable association of smoking status of households and covariates (n = 39,218), and bivariable association of cigarette expenditure and covariates among smoking household (n = 6,559)**

Covariates	% in full sample (% among smoking households)	% smoking household and 95% CI ( <i>p</i> -value for $\chi^2$ <sup>a</sup> )	Cigarette expenditure as % of total expenditure and 95% CI ( <i>p</i> -value for $\chi^2$ <sup>a</sup> )
Total sample		17.4	5.6 (5.4, 5.7)
Poverty status <sup>b</sup>		( <i>p</i> < 0.001)	( <i>p</i> < 0.001)
< 100%	14.6 (18.6)	22.1 (20.5, 23.8)	7.7 (7.3, 8.2)
100% $\geq$ and < 200%	21.4 (24.0)	19.5 (18.3, 20.7)	6.6 (6.3, 7.0)
200% $\geq$ and < 300%	30.6 (32.1)	18.2 (17.3, 19.2)	5.0 (4.8, 5.2)
$\geq$ 300%	33.4 (25.4)	13.2 (12.2, 14.2)	3.6 (3.5, 3.8)
Education		( <i>p</i> < 0.001)	( <i>p</i> < 0.001)
Less than high school	13.1 (17.0)	22.6 (20.9, 24.4)	7.6 (7.2, 8.0)
High school graduate	25.4 (34.6)	23.7 (22.5, 24.9)	6.0 (5.7, 6.3)
Some college or associate degree	31.1 (33.9)	18.9 (17.9, 20.0)	5.0 (4.7, 5.2)

Bachelor's or higher degree	30.5 (14.4)	8.2 (7.6, 8.9)	3.5 (3.3, 3.7)
Occupation		( $p < 0.001$ )	( $p < 0.001$ )
Manager and professional	25.5 (17.2)	11.7 (10.9, 12.7)	3.6 (3.4, 3.8)
Administrative support	16.8 (18.1)	18.7 (17.2, 20.2)	4.6 (4.4, 4.8)
Service	12.9 (14.5)	19.5 (18.2, 20.9)	5.4 (5.4, 5.7)
Blue-collar	10.4 (15.3)	25.5 (23.3, 27.7)	5.4 (5.1, 5.8)
Other Occupations	0.8 (0.6)	13.9 (9.9, 19.3)	4.3 (3.1, 5.4)
Not in the labor force	33.6 (34.2)	17.7 (16.9, 18.5)	7.2 (6.8, 7.5)
Race/ethnicity		( $p < 0.001$ )	( $p < 0.001$ )
Non-Hispanic White	69.1 (75.9)	19.1 (18.2, 20.0)	5.7 (5.5, 5.9)
Non-Hispanic Black	12.5 (12.1)	16.7 (15.1, 18.5)	5.9 (5.4, 6.5)
Hispanic	12.7 (8.0)	11.0 (9.8, 12.2)	4.3 (3.8, 4.8)
Other	5.7 (3.9)	12.0 (10.6, 13.7)	4.4 (3.9, 4.9)
Household size		( $p < 0.001$ )	( $p < 0.001$ )
1	29.5 (25.8)	15.1 (14.3, 16.0)	7.2 (6.9, 7.6)
2	32.2 (32.6)	17.6 (16.3, 18.9)	5.4 (5.2, 5.7)
3	15.2 (17.7)	20.1 (18.9, 21.4)	4.9 (4.6, 5.3)
4+	23.1 (24.0)	18.0 (17.0, 19.2)	4.4 (4.2, 4.7)
Number of males aged 16 +		( $p < 0.001$ )	( $p < 0.001$ )
0	22.8 (18.9)	14.3 (13.4, 15.3)	6.6 (6.2, 7.0)
1	63.9 (63.4)	17.2 (16.4, 18.1)	5.5 (5.3, 5.7)
2+	13.3 (17.8)	23.1 (21.9, 24.4)	4.8 (4.5, 5.1)
Number of females aged 16 +		( $p < 0.001$ )	( $p < 0.001$ )
0	16.4 (18.5)	19.6 (18.4, 20.9)	6.8 (6.5, 7.2)
1	68.5 (63.5)	16.1 (15.3, 17.0)	5.4 (5.2, 5.6)
2+	15.2 (18.0)	20.6 (19.2, 22.0)	4.8 (4.5, 5.2)
Year		( $p = 0.009$ )	( $p = 0.190$ )
2010	17.0 (18.1)	18.5 (17.2, 19.9)	5.9 (5.7, 6.2)
2011	16.0 (17.4)	18.8 (17.4, 20.3)	5.6 (5.3, 5.9)
2012	16.6 (16.3)	17.1 (15.8, 18.4)	5.3 (5.0, 5.6)
2013	16.7 (15.8)	16.4 (15.2, 17.7)	5.5 (5.1, 5.9)
2014	16.8 (15.8)	16.3 (15.1, 17.6)	5.4 (5.0, 5.8)
2015	17.0 (16.7)	17.0 (15.8, 18.3)	5.6 (5.2, 6.0)

<sup>a</sup>  $P$ -values for the bivariable association of covariates and each of the three outcomes using 44 replicate weights.

<sup>b</sup> Higher percentages indicate higher relative income.

## Multivariable analyses

Table 2 shows adjusted odds ratios (OR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) for the association of being a smoking household and SES indicators. Poorer households, those headed by a person with a lower level of education or lower occupational status were more likely to report cigarette expenditure ( $p < 0.001$  for poverty, education, and occupation). The odds ratio

1  
2  
3 comparing households in poverty with those above 300% of poverty threshold was 1.86 (95%  
4 CI: 1.61, 2.16). Similarly, the odds ratio comparing households headed by a person who did not  
5  
6 complete high school with those headed by a person with at least a Bachelor's degree was 3.37  
7  
8 (95% CI: 2.92, 3.89). Furthermore, the odds ratio comparing households headed by a blue-collar  
9  
10 worker with those headed by a person in a managerial or professional occupation was 1.45 (95%  
11  
12 CI: 1.26, 1.66). Race/ethnicity was associated with smoking status ( $p < 0.001$ ) such that the odds  
13  
14 of being a smoking household were largest among households headed by a non-Hispanic White  
15  
16 person and lowest among those headed by a Hispanic individual. Larger households ( $p < 0.001$ ),  
17  
18 those with more males 16 years or older ( $p < 0.001$ ), and those with fewer females 16 years or  
19  
20 older ( $p = 0.036$ ) had higher odds of reporting cigarette expenditure. Finally, there was some  
21  
22 evidence that the odds of being a smoking household were greater in 2010 and 2011 than in later  
23  
24 years ( $p = 0.036$ ).  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30  
31 Table 2 also shows the results of the fractional logit regression for modelling the  
32  
33 association of cigarette expenditure as a proportion of total household expenditure with SES and  
34  
35 other covariates, among smoking households. Poorer households, those headed by a person with  
36  
37 a lower level of education or a lower occupational status had a higher cigarette expenditure as a  
38  
39 proportion of total household expenditure. The relative proportion ratio comparing households in  
40  
41 poverty with those above 300% of poverty threshold was 1.74 (95% CI: 1.62, 1.87). Similarly,  
42  
43 the relative proportion ratio comparing households headed by a person who did not complete  
44  
45 high school with those headed by a person with at least a Bachelor's degree was 1.80 (95% CI:  
46  
47 1.65, 1.96). Furthermore, the relative proportion ratio comparing households headed by a blue-  
48  
49 collar worker with those headed by a person in a managerial or professional occupation was 1.16  
50  
51 (95% CI: 1.06, 1.27). Race/ethnicity was associated with proportion spent on cigarettes such that  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

households headed by a non-Hispanic White person had the highest and those headed by a Hispanic individual had the lowest proportion spent on cigarettes ( $p < 0.001$ ). Larger households had a lower proportion spent on cigarettes ( $p < 0.001$ ).

**Table 2: Multivariable results<sup>a</sup> for the association of smoking status of household and cigarette expenditure as a proportion of total household expenditure with socioeconomic status indicators and other covariates**

Covariates	Odds of being a smoking Household (n = 39,218)		Cigarette expenditure as a proportion of household expenditure (n = 6,559)	
	Adjusted odds ratios (95% CI)	p-value	Adjusted relative proportion ratios (95% CI)	p-value
Poverty status		<0.001		<0.001
< 100%	1.86 (1.61, 2.16)		1.74 (1.62, 1.87)	
100% $\geq$ and < 200%	1.46 (1.29, 1.65)		1.57 (1.46, 1.69)	
200% $\geq$ and < 300%	1.26 (1.18, 1.35)		1.28 (1.21, 1.36)	
$\geq$ 300%	1.00		1.00	
Education		<0.001		<0.001
Less than high school	3.37 (2.92, 3.89)		1.80 (1.65, 1.96)	
High school graduate	3.02 (2.72, 3.35)		1.50 (1.37, 1.63)	
Some college or associate degree	2.31 (2.11, 2.54)		1.28 (1.18, 1.39)	
Bachelor's or higher degree	1.00		1.00	
Occupation		<0.001		<0.001
Manager and professional	1.00		1.00	
Administrative support	1.20 (1.09, 1.32)		1.05 (0.97, 1.14)	
Service	1.20 (1.09, 1.33)		1.16 (1.07, 1.26)	
Blue-collar	1.45 (1.26, 1.66)		1.16 (1.06, 1.27)	
Other Occupations	0.68 (0.44, 1.04)		0.90 (0.71, 1.13)	
Not in the labor force	0.92 (0.82, 1.03)		1.33 (1.25, 1.41)	
Race/ethnicity		<0.001		<0.001
Non-Hispanic White	1.00		1.00	
Non-Hispanic Black	0.65 (0.57, 0.46)		0.88 (0.81, 0.95)	
Hispanic	0.31 (0.78, 0.35)		0.68 (0.60, 0.77)	
Other	0.58 (0.50, 0.68)		0.80 (0.71, 0.90)	
Household size		<0.001		<0.001
1	1.00		1.00	
2	1.45 (1.28, 1.65)		0.82 (0.75, 0.89)	
3	1.62 (1.41, 1.86)		0.74 (0.66, 0.82)	
4+	1.32 (1.13, 1.54)		0.61 (0.54, 0.68)	
Number of males aged 16 +		<0.001		0.085
0	1.00		1.00	
1	1.17 (1.06, 1.29)		1.04 (0.95, 1.13)	
2+	1.60 (1.40, 2.09)		1.11 (0.99, 1.24)	
Number of females aged 16 +		0.036		0.867
0	1.00		1.00	

1	0.73 (0.65, 0.83)	0.99 (0.90, 1.09)
2+	0.92 (0.80, 1.05)	1.01 (0.88, 1.16)
Year	0.036	--
2010	1.00	--
2011	1.02 (0.93, 1.11)	--
2012	0.92 (0.83, 1.00)	--
2013	0.88 (0.78, 0.99)	--
2014	0.88 (0.79, 0.98)	--
2015	0.95 (0.85, 1.06)	--

<sup>a</sup> All odds ratios (OR) from logistic analysis and regression coefficients ( $\hat{\beta}$ ) from linear regression analyses are adjusted for the effect of all covariates in the model.

## DISCUSSION

In this study, we pooled data from six consecutive years of the U.S. CES and found that lower SES households not only are more likely to spend money on cigarettes but also spend a larger portion of their total household expenditure on cigarettes. Our results were consistent with a previous report in the U.S.<sup>17</sup> and the findings from other countries, although these findings pertained to the general category of tobacco expenditure and not specifically to cigarette expenditure.<sup>13-16</sup>

We also found that larger households and households headed by a non-Hispanic white person compared to others had a higher probability of reporting cigarette expenditure and spent a larger proportion of their total household expenditure on cigarettes. Furthermore, households with a larger number of males aged 16+ years and those with fewer females aged 16+ years had a higher probability of reporting cigarette expenditure. None of these covariates, except number of males and females in the household, have been previously investigated in regard to tobacco expenditure. Our findings about number of males and females were not consistent with a study that was conducted in the Russian Federation, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Tajikistan,<sup>15</sup> where number of males was positively and number of females was negatively associated with tobacco expenditure as a share of total household expenditure.



1  
2  
3 A strength of this work was its use of six consecutive years of national and  
4 comprehensive expenditure data with relatively high response rates and large sample sizes. The  
5 validity of the CES data has been investigated by comparing them with National Income and  
6 Product Accounts data.<sup>34</sup> While this comparison was not specifically done for cigarette  
7 expenditure, the findings showed that most of the large categories of consumption were  
8 measured well in the CES, as the ratio to the National Income and Accounts statistics was close  
9 to one and has not declined notably over time.<sup>34</sup> The major weakness of the study is that, as it is  
10 the case with all cross-sectional analyses, it does not allow causal inferences. It is plausible that  
11 poorer households headed by a person with a low level of formal education are more likely to  
12 have one or more smokers in the household and spend money on cigarettes. The effect of SES on  
13 smoking has been extensively studied.<sup>7 35-39</sup> It is also plausible that households that spend money  
14 on cigarettes and have higher health care expenditures due to smoking are more likely to have  
15 reduced income and experience downward socioeconomic mobility. However, to our knowledge,  
16 the effect of smoking on downward mobility has not been studied. Another weakness of this  
17 work is that, as reported in a study where households in the CES were linked to zip-code level  
18 average income, the very high income households are less likely to respond to the survey.<sup>40</sup>  
19 However, non-response rates were not associated with income over most of the income  
20 distribution.<sup>40</sup> Finally, we note that we did not have a reliable variable for survey mode to  
21 include in the analyses. Telephone surveys are associated with underreporting of smoking<sup>41 42</sup>  
22 and based on the extent to which survey mode is associated with SES, the results of this study  
23 could be biased.

24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
Cigarette expenditure may contribute to financial deprivation and lower standards of  
living, which in turn can lead to unfavorable smoking behaviors and outcomes.<sup>3 4 43-45</sup> For

1  
2  
3 example, financial stress is associated with a lower probability of smoking cessation among  
4 smokers and a higher probability of relapse among ex-smokers.<sup>43</sup> Moreover, while smokers with  
5 financial stress are more likely to have an interest in quitting, they are less likely to make a quit  
6 attempt or succeed in quitting.<sup>46</sup> In light of our finding that lower SES households are more  
7 likely to include a smoker and spend relatively more on cigarettes, we recommend tobacco  
8 control policies that are effective in reducing smoking among lower SES groups. Increasing  
9 taxation on cigarettes is the most effective policy for reducing smoking among all segments of  
10 the population. In fact, many studies have shown that increasing the price of cigarettes results in  
11 a larger decrease in smoking prevalence among lower income and occupational groups than  
12 others.<sup>7 47 48</sup> This policy, however, is likely to negatively affect the finances of low income  
13 smokers who fail to quit or reduce smoking. To address this problem, part or all of the revenues  
14 from increased taxation can be used to fund evidence-based smoking cessation programs<sup>49</sup> for  
15 these smokers. Moreover, there is evidence that the effectiveness of increased taxation can be  
16 undermined by the availability of cheap tobacco and that changing the tobacco tax structure for  
17 cheap tobacco may promote quitting among low income groups.<sup>50 51</sup> In addition to increasing  
18 taxation, there is evidence that anti-smoking mass media campaigns are also effective in  
19 reducing smoking prevalence<sup>52 53</sup> and increasing cessation rates<sup>54</sup> among low SES smokers.  
20 Furthermore, it has been reported that plain packaging of and featuring large health warning  
21 labels on cigarette packs are associated with reduced positive brand image and intention to  
22 purchase cigarettes among socioeconomically disadvantaged smokers.<sup>55</sup> Finally, there is some  
23 evidence that bans on smoking in public places are effective in reducing smoking prevalence  
24 and consumption among lower SES smokers<sup>56 57</sup> and across all socioeconomic groups.<sup>58</sup>  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 **Contributorship statement:** Mohammad Siahpush contributed to the following aspects of the  
4 work: conception, design, data acquisition, using Stata for data analysis, interpretation of data,  
5 drafting, and critical revision. Paraskevi Farazi contributed to the following aspects of the work:  
6 conception, data analysis, interpretation of data, and critical revision. Shannon Maloney  
7 contributed to the following aspects of the work: conception, data analysis, interpretation of data,  
8 and critical revision. Danae Dinkel contributed to the following aspects of the work: conception,  
9 data analysis, interpretation of data, and critical revision. Minh Nguyen contributed to the  
10 following aspects of the work: design, data analysis, interpretation of data, drafting, and critical  
11 revision. Gopal Singh contributed to the following aspects of the work: conception, data analysis,  
12 and critical revision. All authors approve the final version as submitted. All authors are  
13 accountable for all aspects of the work.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 **Competing interests:** We acknowledge that none of the authors or their institutions have  
29 financial or personal relationships or affiliations that could influence (or bias) our decisions,  
30 work, or manuscript. We confirm that this conflict of interest disclosure information is accurate  
31 and complete.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 **Funding:** No source of funding was used to conduct this study. Ethical approval was not needed  
39 for this study as we used secondary data that are publically available by the U.S. Bureau of  
40 Statistics.  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 **Data sharing statement:** No additional data available.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## REFERENCES

1. U.S. Department of Health Human Services. The health consequences of smoking—50 years of progress: a report of the Surgeon General. *Atlanta, GA: US Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Office on Smoking and Health* 2014;17
2. Siahpush M, Borland R, Scollo M. Smoking and financial stress. *Tobacco Control* 2003;12:60-66.
3. Siahpush M, Borland R, Yong HH, et al. Tobacco expenditure, smoking-induced deprivation and financial stress: Results from the International Tobacco Control (ITC) Four-Country Survey. *Drug and alcohol review* 2012;31(5):664-71.
4. Siahpush M, Thrasher JF, Yong HH, et al. Cigarette prices, cigarette expenditure and smoking-induced deprivation: findings from the International Tobacco Control Mexico survey. *Tobacco control* 2013;22(4):223-26. doi: 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2012-050613; 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2012-050613
5. Siahpush M, Spittal M, Singh GK. Association of Smoking Cessation With Financial Stress and Material Well-Being: Results From a Prospective Study of a Population-Based National Survey. *American Journal of Public Health* 2007;97(12):2281-87.
6. Siahpush M, Spittal M, Singh GK. Smoking cessation and financial stress. *Journal of Public Health* 2007;29(4):338-42.
7. Hiscock R, Bauld L, Amos A, et al. Socioeconomic status and smoking: a review. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 2012;1248(1):107-23.
8. Garrett BE, Dube SR, Trosclair A, et al. Cigarette smoking—United States, 1965–2008. *MMWR Surveill Summ* 2011;60(1):109-13.
9. Jamal A. Current cigarette smoking among adults—United States, 2005–2015. *MMWR Morbidity and mortality weekly report* 2016;65
10. Siahpush M, Borland R. Sociodemographic variations in smoking status among Australians aged 18 years and over: Multivariate results from the 1995 National

- 1  
2  
3  
4 Health Survey. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health*  
5 2001;25:438-42.  
6
- 7 11. Nagelhout GE, de Korte-de Boer D, Kunst AE, et al. Trends in socioeconomic  
8 inequalities in smoking prevalence, consumption, initiation, and cessation  
9 between 2001 and 2008 in the Netherlands. Findings from a national population  
10 survey. *BMC Public Health* 2012;12(1):303.  
11  
12 12. Hiscock R, Bauld L, Amos A, et al. Smoking and socioeconomic status in England:  
13 the rise of the never smoker and the disadvantaged smoker. *Journal of Public*  
14 *Health* 2012;34(3):390-96.  
15  
16 13. Perera KMN, Guruge GD, Jayawardana PL. Household Expenditure on Tobacco  
17 Consumption in a Poverty-Stricken Rural District in Sri Lanka. *Asia Pacific*  
18 *Journal of Public Health* 2017;29(2):140-48.  
19  
20 14. Tachfouti N, Berraho M, Elfakir S, et al. Socioeconomic status and tobacco  
21 expenditures among Moroccans: results of the "Maroc Tabagisme" survey.  
22 *American Journal of Health Promotion* 2010;24(5):334-39.  
23  
24 15. Djibuti M, Gotsadze G, Mataradze G, et al. Influence of household demographic and  
25 socio-economic factors on household expenditure on tobacco in six New  
26 Independent States. *BMC Public Health* 2007;7(1):222.  
27  
28 16. Siahpush M. Socioeconomic status and tobacco expenditure among Australian  
29 households: results from the 1998-99 Household Expenditure Survey. *Journal of*  
30 *Epidemiology and Community Health* 2003;57:798-801.  
31  
32 17. Farrelly MC, Nonnemaker JM, Watson KA. The consequences of high cigarette  
33 excise taxes for low-income smokers. *PloS one* 2012;7(9):e43838.  
34  
35 18. U.S. Department of Labor. 2015 Users' Document: Interview Survey Public-Use  
36 Microdata (PUMD) Consumer Expenditure: Bureau of Labor Statistics, Division of  
37 Consumer Expenditure Surveys, 2016.  
38  
39 19. U.S. Department of Labor. 2015 Response Rates: Interview and Diary Survey  
40 Consumer Expenditure Public Use Microdata: Bureau of Labor Statistics,  
41 Division of Consumer Expenditure Surveys, 2016.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4 20. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Consumer Expenditure Survey: Frequently Asked
- 5 Questions: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics,; 2017 [Available from:
- 6 <https://www.bls.gov/cex/csxfaqs.htm> accessed 12/14/2017 2017.
- 7
- 8
- 9 21. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Consumer Expenditure Survey: Glossary: Unites
- 10 States Department of Labor, 2018.
- 11
- 12 22. Perrins G, Nilsen D. Math calculations to better utilize CPI data: U.S. Bureau of
- 13 Labor Statistics, 2017.
- 14
- 15 23. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Consumer Price Index Historical Tables for U.S.
- 16 City Average: U.S. Department of Labor, 2017.
- 17
- 18 24. U.S. Census Bureau. Poverty thresholds: U.S. Census Bureau; 2016 [Available
- 19 from: [https://www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/demo/income-](https://www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/demo/income-poverty/historical-poverty-thresholds.html)
- 20 [poverty/historical-poverty-thresholds.html](https://www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/demo/income-poverty/historical-poverty-thresholds.html) accessed May 2, 2017.
- 21
- 22
- 23 25. U.S. Department of Labor. User's Guide to Income Imputation in the CE: Bureau of
- 24 Labor Statistics, Division of Consumer Expenditure Surveys, 2006.
- 25
- 26 26. Korn EL, Graubard BI. Analysis of health surveys. New York: John Wiley & Sons
- 27 1999.
- 28
- 29 27. Levy PS, Lemeshow S. Sampling of populations: methods and applications: John
- 30 Wiley & Sons 2013.
- 31
- 32 28. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Handbook of Methods: Consumer Expenditure and
- 33 Income Calculations Washington D.C.: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics; 2016
- 34 [Available from: <https://www.bls.gov/opub/hom/cex/calculation.htm> accessed
- 35 12/17/2017 2017.
- 36
- 37 29. StataCorp. Stata Base Reference Manual Release 14. College Station, Texas:
- 38 StataCorp LP 2015.
- 39
- 40 30. Smithson M, Merkle EC. Generalized linear models for categorical and continuous
- 41 limited dependent variables. London: CRC Press 2014.
- 42
- 43 31. Papke LE, Wooldridge JM. Panel data methods for fractional response variables
- 44 with an application to test pass rates. *Journal of Econometrics* 2008;145(1-
- 45 2):121-33.
- 46
- 47
- 48
- 49
- 50
- 51
- 52
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60

- 1  
2  
3  
4 32. Papke LE, Wooldridge J. Econometric methods for fractional response variables  
5 with an application to 401 (k) plan participation rates. *Journal of Applied*  
6 *Econometrics* 1996;11:619-32.
- 7  
8  
9 33. StataCorp. Stata Statistical Software: Release 14.1, MP Parallel Edition. College  
10 Station, TX: StataCorp LP 2015.
- 11  
12 34. Bee A, Meyer BD, Sullivan JX. The Validity of Consumption Data: Are the  
13 Consumer Expenditure Interview and Diary Surveys Informative?: National  
14 Bureau of Economic Research, 2012.
- 15  
16 35. Businelle MS, Kendzor DE, Reitzel LR, et al. Mechanisms linking socioeconomic  
17 status to smoking cessation: a structural equation modeling approach. *Health*  
18 *Psychology* 2010;29(3):262.
- 19  
20 36. Mathur C, Erickson DJ, Stigler MH, et al. Individual and neighborhood  
21 socioeconomic status effects on adolescent smoking: a multilevel cohort-  
22 sequential latent growth analysis. *American journal of public health*  
23 2013;103(3):543-48.
- 24  
25 37. Jarvis MJ, Wardle J. Social patterning of individual health behaviours: the case of  
26 cigarette smoking. In: Marmot M, Wilkinson RG, eds. *Social Determinants of*  
27 *Health*. Oxford: Oxford University Press 1999.
- 28  
29 38. Paavola M, Vartiainen E, Haukkala A. Smoking from adolescence to adulthood: the  
30 effects of parental and own socioeconomic status. *The European Journal of*  
31 *Public Health* 2004;14(4):417-21.
- 32  
33 39. Lindström M, Modén B, Rosvall M. A life-course perspective on economic stress  
34 and tobacco smoking: a population-based study. *Addiction* 2013;108(7):1305-14.
- 35  
36 40. Sabelhaus J, Johnson D, Ash S, et al. Is the Consumer Expenditure Survey  
37 representative by income?: National Bureau of Economic Research, 2012.
- 38  
39 41. Donovan RJ, Corti CAJ, Jalleh G. Face-to-face household interviews versus  
40 telephone interviews for health surveys. *Australian and New Zealand journal of*  
41 *public health* 1997;21(2):134-40.
- 42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4 42. Arday DR, Tomar SL, Nelson DE, et al. State smoking prevalence estimates: a  
5 comparison of the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System and current  
6 population surveys. *American Journal of Public Health* 1997;87(10):1665-69.  
7  
8  
9 43. Siahpush M, Carlin JB. Financial stress, smoking cessation and relapse: results  
10 from a prospective study of an Australian national sample. *Addiction*  
11 2006;110:121-27.  
12  
13  
14 44. Siahpush M, Borland R, Yong HH. Sociodemographic and psychosocial correlates  
15 of smoking-induced deprivation and its effect on quitting: findings from the  
16 International Tobacco Control Policy Evaluation Survey. *Tobacco Control*  
17 2007;16(2):e2. doi: 10.1136/tc.2006.016279  
18  
19  
20  
21 45. Kendzor DE, Businelle MS, Costello TJ, et al. Financial strain and smoking  
22 cessation among racially/ethnically diverse smokers. *American Journal of Public*  
23 *Health* 2010;100(4):702-06. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2009.172676;  
24 10.2105/AJPH.2009.172676  
25  
26  
27  
28 46. Siahpush M, Yong HH, Borland R, et al. Smokers with financial stress are more  
29 likely to want to quit but less likely to try or succeed: findings from the  
30 International Tobacco Control (ITC) Four Country Survey. *Addiction (Abingdon,*  
31 *England)* 2009;104(8):1382-90. doi: 10.1111/j.1360-0443.2009.02599.x  
32  
33  
34  
35 47. Siahpush M, Wakefield MA, Spittal MJ, et al. Taxation reduces social disparities in  
36 adult smoking prevalence. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*  
37 2009;36(4):285-91. doi: 10.1016/j.amepre.2008.11.013  
38  
39  
40  
41 48. Farrelly MC, Engelen M. Cigarette prices, smoking, and the poor, revisited.  
42 *American Journal of Public Health* 2008;98(4):582-3; author reply 83-84. doi:  
43 10.2105/AJPH.2007.132647  
44  
45  
46 49. Tobacco TCPGT. A clinical practice guideline for treating tobacco use and  
47 dependence: 2008 update: a US public health service report. *American journal of*  
48 *preventive medicine* 2008;35(2):158-76.  
49  
50  
51 50. Partos TR, Gilmore AB, Hitchman SC, et al. Availability and use of cheap tobacco in  
52 the UK 2002-2014: Findings from the International Tobacco Control Project.  
53 *Nicotine & Tobacco Research* 2017:ntx108.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



- 1  
2  
3  
4 51. Hiscock R, Branston JR, McNeill A, et al. Tobacco industry strategies undermine  
5 government tax policy: evidence from commercial data. *Tobacco control*  
6 2017;tobaccocontrol-2017-053891.  
7  
8  
9 52. White VM, Hayman J, Hill DJ. Can population-based tobacco-control policies  
10 change smoking behaviors of adolescents from all socio-economic groups?  
11 Findings from Australia: 1987-2005. *Cancer causes & control : CCC*  
12 2008;19(6):631-40. doi: 10.1007/s10552-008-9127-8  
13  
14  
15 53. Levy DT, Mumford EA, Compton C. Tobacco control policies and smoking in a  
16 population of low education women, 1992-2002. *Journal of Epidemiology and*  
17 *Community Health* 2006;60:ii20-ii26.  
18  
19  
20  
21 54. Durkin SJ, Biener L, Wakefield MA. Effects of different types of antismoking ads on  
22 reducing disparities in smoking cessation among socioeconomic subgroups.  
23 *American Journal of Public Health* 2009;99(12):2217-23. doi:  
24 10.2105/AJPH.2009.161638  
25  
26  
27  
28 55. Guillaumier A, Bonevski B, Paul C, et al. Socioeconomically disadvantaged  
29 smokers' ratings of plain and branded cigarette packaging: an experimental  
30 study. *BMJ open* 2014;4(2):e004078.  
31  
32  
33 56. Dinno A, Glantz S. Tobacco control policies are egalitarian: a vulnerabilities  
34 perspective on clean indoor air laws, cigarette prices, and tobacco use  
35 disparities. *Social science & medicine (1982)* 2009;68(8):1439-47. doi:  
36 10.1016/j.socscimed.2009.02.003  
37  
38  
39  
40 57. Hackshaw L, McEwen A, West R, et al. Quit attempts in response to smoke-free  
41 legislation in England. *Tobacco control* 2010;19(2):160-64.  
42  
43  
44 58. Hahn EJ, Rayens MK, Butler KM, et al. Smoke-free laws and adult smoking  
45 prevalence. *Preventive medicine* 2008;47(2):206-09.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies*

Page #	Item No	Recommendation
1-2	<b>Title and abstract</b>	1 (a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found
<b>Introduction</b>		
3	Background/rationale	2 Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported
4	Objectives	3 State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses
<b>Methods</b>		
5	Study design	4 Present key elements of study design early in the paper
5	Setting	5 Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection
5	Participants	6 (a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants
6-7	Variables	7 Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable
5	Data sources/ measurement	8* For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group
5	Bias	9 Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias
5	Study size	10 Explain how the study size was arrived at
6-7	Quantitative variables	11 Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why
7-9	Statistical methods	12 (a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding (b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions (c) Explain how missing data were addressed (d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy (e) Describe any sensitivity analyses
<b>Results</b>		
9-10	Participants	13* (a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage (c) Consider use of a flow diagram
9-10	Descriptive data	14* (a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest
11-13	Outcome data	15* Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures
11-13	Main results	16 (a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear

			which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included
			(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized
			(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period
	Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses
	<b>Discussion</b>		
14	Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives
15	Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias
15-16	Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence
15-16	Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results
	<b>Other information</b>		
17	Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based

\*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

**Note:** An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at [www.strobe-statement.org](http://www.strobe-statement.org).