

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

BMJ Open

Predictors of electronic cigarette use among Swedish teenagers – a population-based cohort study

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2020-040683
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	19-May-2020
Complete List of Authors:	Hedman, Linnea; Umeå Universitet Medicinska fakulteten, Department of Public health and clinical medicine, Section of Sustainable Health, The OLIN unit; Luleå university of Technology, Department of Health Science, Division of Nursing Backman, Helena; Umeå Universitet Medicinska fakulteten, Public Health and Clinical Medicine, Section of Sustainable Health; Lulea University of Technology, Department of Health Sciences Stridsman, Caroline; Umeå Universitet Medicinska fakulteten, Department of Public health and clinical medicine, Division of Medicine Lundbäck, Magnus; Karolinska Institutet, Department of clinical sciences, Danderyd Hospital Andersson, Martin; Umeå Universitet Medicinska fakulteten, Department of Public Health and Clinical Medicine, Section of Sustainable health, Umeå University Rönmark, Eva ; Umeå Universitet Medicinska fakulteten, Department of Public health and clinical medicine, Section of Sustainable health, The OLIN unit
Keywords:	PUBLIC HEALTH, EPIDEMIOLOGY, PREVENTIVE MEDICINE

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

Predictors of electronic cigarette use among Swedish teenagers – a population-based cohort study

Linnea Hedman^{1,2}, Helena Backman¹, Caroline Stridsman³, Magnus Lundbäck⁴, Martin Andersson¹,
Eva Rönmark¹

1. Department of Public Health and Clinical Medicine, Division of Sustainable Health, The OLIN Unit, Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden
2. Department of Health Science, Division of Nursing, Luleå University of Technology, Luleå, Sweden
3. Department of Public Health and Clinical Medicine, Division of Medicine, Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden
4. Karolinska Institutet, Division of Cardiovascular Medicine, Department of Clinical Science, Danderyd University Hospital, Stockholm, Sweden

Corresponding author: Linnea Hedman, Associate professor
The OLIN studies
Norrbotten county council
971 89 Luleå, Sweden
email: linnea.hedman@norrbotten.se
phone: +46 920-284482

Word count: 2940

Abstract

Objectives: The aim was to identify predictors of e-cigarette use among teenagers.

Design and setting: a prospective population-based cohort study of schoolchildren in northern Sweden.

Participants: In 2006, a cohort study about asthma and allergic diseases among schoolchildren started within the Obstructive Lung Disease in Northern Sweden (OLIN) studies. The study sample (n=2185) was recruited at age 7-8y and participated in questionnaire surveys at age 14-15y, and 19y. The questionnaire included questions about respiratory symptoms, living conditions, upper secondary education, physical activity, diet, health-related quality of life, parental smoking and parental occupation. Questions about tobacco use were included at age 14-15 and 19y.

Primary outcome: E-cigarette use at age 19y.

Results: At age 19y, 21.4% had ever tried e-cigarettes and 4.2% were current users. Among those who were daily tobacco smokers at age 14-15y, 60.9% had tried e-cigarettes at age 19y compared with 19.1% of never-smokers and 34.0% of occasional smokers ($p<0.001$). Among those who had tried e-cigarettes 28.1% were never smokers both at age 14-15 and 19y, and 14.4% were never smokers among the current e-cigarette users. In unadjusted analyses, e-cigarette use was associated with daily smoking, use of snus and having a smoking father at age 14-15y, as well as with attending vocational education, physical inactivity and unhealthy diet. In adjusted analyses, current e-cigarette use was associated with daily tobacco smoking at age 14-15y (OR 6.27 95%CI 3.12-12.58), attending a vocational art program (OR 2.22 95% CI 1.04-4.77), and inversely associated with eating a healthy diet (OR 0.74 95% CI 0.59-0.92).

Conclusions: E-cigarette use was associated with personal and parental tobacco use as well as with physical inactivity, unhealthy diet and attending vocational upper secondary education. Importantly,

1
2
3 almost one-third of those who had tried e-cigarettes at age 19 years had never been tobacco
4
5 smokers.

6
7
8 Keywords: adolescents, electronic cigarettes, epidemiology, smoking, vaping
9

10 11 12 13 14 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

- 15 - This paper presents data from a prospective cohort study with high response rates and few
 - 16 participants lost to follow-up
 - 17 - Self-reported use of tobacco or e-cigarettes was not validated by objective measures
 - 18 - E-cigarette use was measured only at the last follow-up
- 19
20
21
22
23

24 25 **Introduction**

26 In the last ten years, the use of electronic cigarettes (e-cigarettes) has increased rapidly among
27 teenagers¹⁻³, but the increase seems to level off in some countries including England¹ and Sweden⁴.

28
29 One explanation for their popularity may be that they are perceived as less harmful and less
30 addictive than tobacco cigarettes⁵⁻⁷. Although the levels are considerably lower than in conventional
31 cigarette smoke, e-cigarette aerosol does contain carcinogenic and toxic substances^{8,9} and they can
32 deliver similar nicotine levels as conventional cigarettes and thereby cause nicotine addiction^{10,11}.

33
34 Because e-cigarettes are portrayed as an alternative to tobacco smoking, studies of predictors for e-
35 cigarette use have mostly evaluated the association with smoking conventional cigarettes^{12,13}. For
36 instance, e-cigarette use was more common among current smokers than former smokers^{14,15} and
37 younger smokers appear to be more prone to start using e-cigarettes than older smokers^{15,16}. A
38 major concern regarding e-cigarettes is that they also seem to appeal to non-smoking teenagers^{17,18}
39 and might serve as a gateway to initiation of tobacco smoking as well as other drugs^{11,17,19}. However,
40 another explanation for the association between e-cigarette use and tobacco smoking may be that
41 these behaviors share many risk factors such as social disadvantage, addictive behaviors, low
42 academic achievement and having family members or friends that smoke²⁰⁻²⁴. These shared
43 characteristics may serve as a common liability for any tobacco or nicotine product^{25,26}, which implies
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 that the sequential order of product initiation is of less importance. Nevertheless, predictors of e-
4
5 cigarette use need to be identified both among smoking and non-smoking teenagers but prospective
6
7 studies are lacking²⁷.
8
9

10 The aim of the present study was to identify predictors of e-cigarette use in a prospective
11
12 population-based cohort study of teenagers in Sweden followed from 14-15 to 19 years of age.
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 **Methods**

20 **Study sample**

21
22 Within the Obstructive Lung Disease in Northern Sweden (OLIN) studies, a population-based
23
24 paediatric cohort study has been ongoing since 2006. The starting point was a parental questionnaire
25
26 survey inviting all children in first and second grade (age 7-8 years) in three municipalities of
27
28 northern Sweden: Luleå, Piteå, and Kiruna^{28,29 30}. The cohort was followed-up at age 14-15 years and
29
30 19 years. At age 19 years, the study sample consists of the 2,185 individuals that participated in all
31
32 surveys, corresponding to 82% of the invited and 78% of the original cohort. The study was approved
33
34 by the Regional Ethical Review Board in Umeå, Sweden. At recruitment the parents gave consent for
35
36 their child to participate. The participants gave written informed consent at the follow-up at 19
37
38 years.
39
40
41
42

43 **Questionnaire**

44
45 The questionnaire surveys at age 14-15y and 19y were performed at school. The questionnaire
46
47 included the International Study of Asthma and Allergies in Childhood (ISAAC) core questionnaire³¹
48
49 with additional questions about asthma and allergic diseases including physician diagnoses,
50
51 symptoms, use of medicine and heredity²⁸. Other questions included possible risk factors such as
52
53 living conditions, physical activity, diet, parental smoking and parental occupation. In the
54
55 questionnaire at the age of 14-15 years, questions about smoking and use of snus were included³²
56
57 and at age 19 years, questions about e-cigarettes were added. At age 14-15 years, health-related
58
59
60

1
2
3 quality of life (HRQoL) was assessed using the KIDSCREEN-10 questionnaire which consists of 10
4
5 items with responses on a five-point ordinal scale³³. The crude values were transformed into a single
6
7 score and poor HRQoL was defined as a value lower than the group mean score minus 0.5 standard
8
9 deviation.

16 Definitions

17
18 At age 14-15 years and 19 years, respectively, tobacco use was defined based on the questions 'Do
19
20 you smoke/use snus?' as *Never* if they smoked/used snus 'Never'; *Occasional*, if they smoked/used
21
22 snus 'Almost never', 'Monthly' or 'Weekly'; and *Daily* if they smoked/used snus 'Almost daily' or
23
24 'Daily'. At age 19 years, the category Former smoker was also included in the analyses.

25
26
27
28 At age 19 years, e-cigarette use was defined based on the question 'Do you use e-cigarettes?' as *Ever*
29
30 *tried e-cigarettes* if they responded 'No, have quit', 'Have only tried', 'Use sometimes' or 'Use daily';
31
32 and *Current e-cigarette user* if they responded 'Use sometimes' or 'Use daily'.

33
34
35 In Sweden, the upper secondary school education offers three year programs that are vocational or
36
37 preparatory for higher education (e.g. economics, natural science, social science or technology). We
38
39 divided the vocational programs into *work shop* (e.g. building and construction, electricity, energy,
40
41 vehicle, transport or industrial technology), *service* (e.g. child and recreation, hotel and tourism,
42
43 restaurant management, or health and social care), and *art* (theater, dance, or music).

44
45
46
47 *Healthy diet* was defined based on a score between 0-4 with one point each for: eating fish every
48
49 week; eating a fruit every day; eating fast food less than every week; and drinking soda less than
50
51 every week.

52
53
54
55 *Parental socioeconomic status* was based on parental occupation reported in a parentally completed
56
57 questionnaire at age 7-8 years, defined according to the socio-economic classification by Statistics
58
59 Sweden³⁴ and categorized into the following groups: manual workers in service, manual workers in

1
2
3 industry, assistant non-manual employees, intermediate non-manual employees, self-employed,
4
5 unemployed and professionals and executives.
6
7

8 **Statistical analyses**

9

10
11 Analyses were performed using the IBM SPSS statistics version 24 (IBM, Armonk, NY). Differences in
12
13 proportions between groups were analysed by the Chi square test. A p-value <0.05 was considered
14
15 statistically significant. Individuals with missing data in questions about exposure to parental smoking
16
17 and tobacco use at age 14-15y, and e-cigarette use at age 19y were excluded from the analyses.
18
19 Factors significantly associated with e-cigarette use in unadjusted analyses were included in adjusted
20
21 logistic regression models and the results were expressed as odds ratios (OR) with 95% confidence
22
23 intervals (CI). The adjusted analyses were also performed among those who were never smokers and
24
25 did not use snus at age 14-15 years. A representativeness analysis was performed comparing the
26
27 n=2,185 participants at age 19 years with the n=153 individuals that were invited but did not
28
29 participate. Participants and non-participants were compared regarding sex, parental smoking habits,
30
31 single parent household and prevalence of asthma at recruitment.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 **Results**

42 **The prevalence of tobacco use at ages 14-15 and 19 years**

43

44 At age 14-15 years, the majority of the adolescents were never smokers, 90.0% (Table 1). The
45
46 prevalence of occasional smoking (7.7% vs. 6.0%) and daily smoking (3.8% vs. 2.6%) was similar in
47
48 girls and boys (p=0.083). Daily use of snus was significantly more common among boys than girls,
49
50 5.0% vs 0.8%, p<0.001.
51
52

53 At age 19 years, 61.8% were never smokers and 8.3% daily smokers. Occasional smoking was more
54
55 common among boys than girls, 31.3% vs 25.6%, while daily smoking was more common among girls
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 than boys, 9.3% vs 7.4% ($p=0.021$). Daily use of snus was more common among boys than girls,
4
5 22.2% vs 6.2%, $p<0.001$.
6
7

8 **The prevalence of e-cigarette use at age 19 years**

9

10
11 At age 19 years, 21.4% ($n=460$) of the cohort had ever tried e-cigarettes, with a higher prevalence
12
13 among boys than girls, 27.6% vs 15.1%, $p<0.001$. Current e-cigarette use ($n=90$ or 4.2%) was also
14
15 more common among boys than girls, 4.9% vs 3.4%, but the difference was not statistically
16
17 significant, $p=0.084$ (Table 1). The prevalence of dual use of e-cigarettes and conventional cigarettes
18
19 was 1.7% ($n=36$), dual use of e-cigarettes and snus was 1.3% ($n=28$) while 0.5% ($n=10$) used all three
20
21 products.
22
23
24
25

26 **E-cigarette use at age 19 years in relation to tobacco use at age 14-15 years**

27

28 Among those who were daily tobacco smokers at age 14-15 years, 60.9% ($n=39$) had tried e-
29
30 cigarettes at age 19 years, compared with 34.0% ($n=50$) among occasional smokers and 19.1%
31
32 ($n=364$) among never smokers ($p<0.001$). Of the daily smokers at age 14-15 years, 28.1% ($n=18$) were
33
34 current e-cigarette users compared with 7.5% ($n=11$) among occasional smokers and 3.2% ($n=61$)
35
36 among never smokers (Table 2). Of the current e-cigarette users at age 19 years, 14.4% reported
37
38 being never smokers both at age 14-15 years and at 19 years (Figure 1). Corresponding proportion of
39
40 never smokers among those who had tried e-cigarettes was 28.5%. Among those who were former
41
42 smokers at age 19 years, 24.1% had tried e-cigarettes but only one individual was a current user.
43
44
45

46 The prevalence of e-cigarette use as well as current smoking at age 19 years increased with
47
48 increasing number of tobacco smoking family members (Figure 2). Among those with two or more
49
50 smoking family members, 33.1% had ever tried e-cigarettes and 8.4% were current users, compared
51
52 with 18.7% and 3.3% among those with no smoking family members ($p<0.001$).
53
54
55

56 **Predictors of e-cigarette use**

57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In unadjusted analyses, current e-cigarette use at age 19 years was associated with daily smoking (OR
4 10.79 95% CI 5.96-19.53) and use of snus (OR 4.24 95% CI 2.02-8.89) at age 14-15 years. Further, it
5 was associated with the vocational programs of work shop (OR 2.68 95% CI 1.59-4.49), service (OR
6 2.15 95% CI 1.01-4.54), and art (OR 2.22 95% CI 1.07-4.58) using preparatory programs as reference
7 category. E-cigarette use was also associated with poor HRQoL (OR 1.59 95% CI 1.03-2.46), having a
8 smoking father (OR 2.20 95% CI 1.31-3.68) and inversely associated with physical activity (OR 0.56
9 95% CI 0.37-0.86) and eating a healthy diet (OR 0.64 95% CI 0.53-0.78). We found no significant
10 associations between current e-cigarette use and sex, having a smoking mother, physician diagnosis
11 of asthma, living in a single parent household or parental socioeconomic status at age 14-15 years.
12
13

14
15
16 In the adjusted analyses, current e-cigarette use remained significantly associated with daily smoking
17 (OR 6.27 95% CI 3.12-12.58), the vocational program of art (OR 2.22 95% CI 1.04-4.77), and inversely
18 associated with eating a healthy diet (OR 0.74 95% CI 0.59-0.92) (Figure 3).
19
20
21

22
23
24 In analyses stratified by sex, current e-cigarette use among the girls was associated with poor HRQoL
25 at age 14-15 years (OR 2.92 95% CI 1.25-6.81), the vocational program of art (OR 3.13 95% CI 1.17-
26 8.34) and inversely associated with eating a healthy diet (OR 0.64 95% CI 0.45-0.91). Among the boys
27 current e-cigarette use was significantly associated only with daily smoking (OR 5.37 95% CI 1.94-
28 14.84).
29
30
31

32 **Predictors of e-cigarette use among non-tobacco users**

33
34
35 Adjusted analyses were also performed among those who were never smokers and did not use snus
36 at age 14-15 years. Current e-cigarette use at age 19 years was associated with male sex (OR 2.29
37 95% CI 1.19-4.43) and having a smoking father (OR 2.48 95% CI 1.28-4.81) (Figure 4).
38
39
40

41 **Analyses of representativeness**

42
43
44 The sex distribution did not differ significantly between participants (n=2,185) and non-participants
45 (n=153), female sex: 48.5% vs. 41.2%, p=0.081, and there was no difference in the prevalence of
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 asthma, 6.7% vs. 8.0%, $p=0.564$. However, compared with the participants, the non-participants
4
5 more often had a smoking mother (16.2% vs. 23.7%, $p<0.017$), a smoking father (13.7% vs. 19.6%,
6
7 $p=0.046$), and lived in a single-parent household (10.5% vs. 17.2%, $p=0.012$) at recruitment.
8
9

10 11 12 13 14 **Discussion**

15
16 In this population-based cohort study, daily smoking, use of snus and having a smoking father at age
17
18 14-15 years predicted e-cigarette use at age 19 years. Furthermore, e-cigarette use was more
19
20 common among boys and less common among teenagers who were physically active and ate a
21
22 healthy diet. Among never smokers and non-snus users at age 14-15 years, male sex and having a
23
24 smoking father predicted e-cigarette use at age 19 years. Importantly, almost one-third of those who
25
26 had tried e-cigarettes at age 19 years had never been smokers.
27
28

29
30 Biologically, teenagers are particularly susceptible to nicotine addiction and it has been shown that
31
32 occasional smoking at a young age is associated with greater likelihood of daily smoking and future
33
34 nicotine dependence^{35,36}. Even occasional smoking is sufficient to develop abstinence symptoms³⁶
35
36 and may increase the likelihood of trying new nicotine delivery products out of curiosity^{37,38}. Thus, we
37
38 were not surprised that smoking conventional cigarettes and using snus predicted e-cigarette use in
39
40 our study. Although the prevalence of dual use was low in our study, other studies have shown that
41
42 the use of multiple tobacco and nicotine products has become more common particularly among
43
44 young adults³⁹. The different properties and legislation of cigarettes, snus and e-cigarettes enable the
45
46 user to choose product depending on the situation. We found that one-fifth of never smokers and
47
48 never snus users, respectively, at age 14-15 years had tried e-cigarettes four years later. Notably,
49
50 even though the proportion of e-cigarette users was higher among the daily smokers than never
51
52 smokers, the absolute number of individuals using e-cigarettes without being a smoker was high in
53
54 the cohort. Moreover, almost one-third of e-cigarette users had never been a tobacco user, which is
55
56 a cause for concern as the association seems to be bidirectional - it has been shown that e-cigarette
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 use is a predictor of becoming a tobacco smoker¹⁷. Finally, the teenagers in this cohort did not seem
4
5 to use e-cigarettes as a smoking cessation method, as only one former smoker was a current e-
6
7 cigarette user. Thus, due to the appeal of e-cigarettes among never smokers, our findings further
8
9 undermine the claim that e-cigarettes are a useful harm reduction product.
10
11

12
13 One explanation for the strong appeal of e-cigarettes to non-smoking teenagers may be the plethora
14
15 of flavors, including fruits, sweets and desserts^{40,41}. In order to make e-cigarettes less appealing it
16
17 has been suggested, for instance by the Food And Drug Administration (FDA) in the U.S. that flavors
18
19 other than tobacco, mint and menthol should be banned⁴². The prominent taste of conventional
20
21 cigarettes and most varieties of Swedish snus may avert teenagers from use. Consequently, e-
22
23 cigarettes seem to appeal to new users that may not have initiated tobacco use otherwise,
24
25 supporting the gateway theory¹⁹.
26
27
28
29
30

31
32 In line with other studies, we found that e-cigarette use was more common in boys than girls^{23,24,43}.
33
34 One explanation may be that teenaged boys have a more risk-taking behavior than girls and
35
36 therefore are willing to try a new nicotine delivery product. For a long time, tobacco smoking was
37
38 more common among men than women in Sweden, but during the 1990s and 2000s it was more
39
40 common among women⁴⁴. It may be that e-cigarette use follows the same pattern as the traditional
41
42 tobacco epidemic, with a higher uptake among men in the beginning followed by an increase among
43
44 women. Among teenagers, social role modelling may contribute to the choice of tobacco product as
45
46 smoking is more common among mothers and daughters, while snus use is more common among
47
48 fathers and sons^{45,46}. Unfortunately we did not ask for parental e-cigarette use, but we did find that
49
50 e-cigarette use was associated with having a smoking father and that it was more common the more
51
52 family members that smoked, suggesting that parental smoking habits play an important role for e-
53
54 cigarette uptake.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 We did not find any associations with parental socio-economic status, but e-cigarette use was more
4
5 common among teenagers in vocational than preparatory upper secondary education. In Sweden,
6
7 the vocational programs mainly lead to jobs within the industry and service, while many attending
8
9 preparatory programs continue on to higher education. It is well known that smoking conventional
10
11 cigarettes is associated with lower educational level, while studies of e-cigarette use have shown
12
13 inconsistent results^{27,47}. Nevertheless, our results indicate that the associations between lower
14
15 educational level and smoking conventional or electronic cigarettes seen among adults is present
16
17 already in early teenage in the choice of education. Moreover, e-cigarette use was less common
18
19 among the teenagers who were physically active and ate a healthy diet. Tobacco use, physical
20
21 inactivity and unhealthy diet as well as low educational level are known risk factors for public health
22
23 diseases, for instance cardiovascular disease, and regrettably, the same individuals often recur in all
24
25 of these high-risk groups^{48,49}, in accordance with the common liability theory^{19,25}. Another interesting
26
27 finding was that e-cigarette use was associated with poor HRQoL, particularly among the girls. An
28
29 association between HRQoL and tobacco smoking has been demonstrated among teenagers³². Thus,
30
31 the predictors for e-cigarette use were to a large extent the same as for conventional cigarettes,
32
33 which implies that the already available successful tobacco prevention measures only need minor
34
35 modifications to also include e-cigarette use. Supporting teenagers to choose a healthy lifestyle
36
37 without any tobacco or nicotine products is an important public health effort.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 The strengths of the study include the prospective study design, with high initial participation rates
48
49 and few individuals lost to follow-up. Among those lost to follow-up, there was a higher proportion
50
51 of children having smoking parents than among those who participated in the survey at age 19 years.
52
53 As having smoking parents and initiation of tobacco use in teenage is strongly correlated, we may
54
55 have underestimated the prevalence of tobacco and e-cigarette use. On the other hand, most likely
56
57 we have not overestimated the significance of the associations⁵⁰. Tobacco and e-cigarette use was
58
59
60

1
2
3 based on self-reports and not verified by objective measures such as level of cotinine. However, the
4 prevalence of smokers, snus and e-cigarette users were in line with the prevalence in corresponding
5 ages reported in Swedish national surveys⁴, supporting the external validity of our results. The main
6 focus of this cohort study is asthma and allergic diseases, therefore we did not include questions
7 about alcohol intake or other risk-taking behavior in the questionnaire.
8
9

10
11 In conclusion, daily smoking, use of snus and having a smoking father at age 14-15 years predicted e-
12 cigarette use at age 19 years. Furthermore, e-cigarette use was associated with male sex, physical
13 inactivity, eating an unhealthy diet and attending vocational upper secondary education. Alarminglly,
14 almost one-third of those who had tried e-cigarettes at age 19 years had never been smokers or used
15 snus. Until the effects of e-cigarette use on respiratory and cardiovascular health have been fully
16 elucidated, the rapid increase of e-cigarette use among teenagers needs to be curbed. In order to
17 increase the efficacy of intervention efforts, the predictors and pattern of e-cigarette use among
18 teenagers need to be studied in detail and our study contribute new knowledge in the field.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 **Funding**

35
36 This work was supported by The Swedish Heart-Lung Foundation, ALF – a regional agreement
37 between Umeå University and Västerbotten County Council, the Swedish Asthma-Allergy
38 Foundation, Visare Norr fund: Northern County Council's Regional Federation, and Norrbotten
39 County Council are acknowledged for financial support. None of the funders had any role in study
40 design, analysis or interpretation of data, or writing of the manuscript.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **Acknowledgements**

49
50 Sigrid Sundberg, Ann-Christin Jonsson, Chatrin Wahlgren and Zandra Lundgren are acknowledged for
51 data collection.
52
53
54

55 **Competing interests**

56
57 None declared
58
59
60

Author contributions

LH participated in study design, data collection, performed the statistical analyses, drafted and revised the manuscript and approved the final manuscript. HB, CS, ML and MA contributed to the analyses and interpretation of data, revised the manuscript for important intellectual content and approved the final manuscript. ER is responsible for study conception and study design, participated in data collection, contributed to the analyses and interpretation of data, revised the manuscript for important intellectual content and approved the final manuscript. All authors are accountable for all aspects of the work.

Data sharing statement

No additional data available.

Patient and public involvement statement

Patients and/or the public were not involved in the design, or conduct, or reporting or dissemination plans of this research.

References

1. Hammond D, Reid JL, Rynard VL, et al. Prevalence of vaping and smoking among adolescents in canada, england, and the united states: Repeat national cross sectional surveys. *BMJ*. 2019;365:l2219. Accessed May 5, 2020. doi: 10.1136/bmj.l2219.
2. Kapan A, Stefanac S, Sandner I, Haider S, Grabovac I, Dorner TE. Use of electronic cigarettes in european populations: A narrative review. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2020;17(6). Accessed May 5, 2020. doi: 10.3390/ijerph17061971.
3. Bals R, Boyd J, Esposito S, et al. Electronic cigarettes: A task force report from the european respiratory society. *Eur Respir J*. 2019;53(2). Accessed May 5, 2020. doi: 10.1183/13993003.01151-2018.

- 1
2
3 4. The Swedish Council for Information on Alcohol and other drugs, (CAN). Skolelevers drogvanor
4
5 2019 (alcohol and drug use among students). report number 187. . 2019.
6
7
- 8
9 5. Ying Xu, Yanfang Guo, Kaiqian Liu, Zheng Liu, Xiaobo Wang. E-cigarette awareness, use, and harm
10
11 perception among adults: A meta-analysis of observational studies. *PLoS One*.
12
13 2016;11(11):e0165938. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27861501>. doi:
14
15 10.1371/journal.pone.0165938.
16
17
- 18
19 6. Glasser AM, Collins L, Pearson JL, et al. Overview of electronic nicotine delivery systems: A
20
21 systematic review. *Am J Prev Med*. 2017;52(2):e33-e66. doi: S0749-3797(16)30573-6 [pii].
22
23
- 24
25 7. Kalkhoran S, Alvarado N, Vijayaraghavan M, Lum PJ, Yuan P, Satterfield JM. Patterns of and reasons
26
27 for electronic cigarette use in primary care patients. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2017;32(10):1122-1129.
28
29 Accessed Apr 8, 2019. doi: 10.1007/s11606-017-4123-x.
30
31
- 32
33 8. Goniewicz ML, Knysak J, Gawron M, et al. Levels of selected carcinogens and toxicants in vapour
34
35 from electronic cigarettes. *Tob Control*. 2014;23(2):133-139. Accessed Oct 9, 2017. doi:
36
37 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2012-050859.
38
39
- 40
41 9. Williams M, Villarreal A, Bozhilov K, Lin S, Talbot P. Metal and silicate particles including
42
43 nanoparticles are present in electronic cigarette cartomizer fluid and aerosol. *PLoS ONE*.
44
45 2013;8(3):e57987. Accessed Oct 9, 2017. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0057987.
46
47
- 48
49 10. DeVito EE, Krishnan-Sarin S. E-cigarettes: Impact of E-liquid components and device
50
51 characteristics on nicotine exposure. *Curr Neuropharmacol*. 2018;16(4):438-459.
52
53 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6018193/>. Accessed May 5, 2020. doi:
54
55 10.2174/1570159X15666171016164430.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 11. Ren M, Lotfipour S. Nicotine gateway effects on adolescent substance use. *The western journal of*
4 *emergency medicine*. 2019;20(5):696-709. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31539325>. doi:
5
6 10.5811/westjem.2019.7.41661.
7
8
9
10
11 12. de Lacy E, Fletcher A, Hewitt G, Murphy S, Moore G. Cross-sectional study examining the
12 prevalence, correlates and sequencing of electronic cigarette and tobacco use among 11-16-year olds
13 in schools in wales. *BMJ Open*. 2017;7(2):e012784-012784. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2016-012784
14
15 [doi].
16
17
18
19
20
21 13. Tavolacci MP, Vasiliu A, Romo L, Kotbagi G, Kern L, Ladner J. Patterns of electronic cigarette use in
22 current and ever users among college students in france: A cross-sectional study. *BMJ Open*.
23 2016;6(5):e011344-011344. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2016-011344 [doi].
24
25
26
27
28
29 14. Hedman L, Backman H, Stridsman C, et al. Association of electronic cigarette use with smoking
30 habits, demographic factors, and respiratory symptoms. *JAMA Network Open*. 2018;1(3):e180789.
31
32 doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2018.0789.
33
34
35
36
37 15. Vardavas CI, Filippidis FT, Agaku IT. Determinants and prevalence of e-cigarette use throughout
38 the european union: A secondary analysis of 26 566 youth and adults from 27 countries. *Tob Control*.
39 2015;24(5):442-448.
40
41
42
43
44
45 16. Li J, Newcombe R, Walton D. The prevalence, correlates and reasons for using electronic
46 cigarettes among new zealand adults. *Addict Behav*. 2015;45:245-251. Accessed Oct 4, 2017. doi:
47
48 10.1016/j.addbeh.2015.02.006.
49
50
51
52
53 17. Soneji S, Barrington-Trimis JL, Wills TA, et al. Association between initial use of e-cigarettes and
54 subsequent cigarette smoking among adolescents and young adults: A systematic review and meta-
55 analysis. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2017;171(8):788-797. doi: 10.1001/jamapediatrics.2017.1488 [doi].
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 18. Barrington-Trimis JL, Urman R, Leventhal AM, et al. E-cigarettes, cigarettes, and the prevalence of
4 adolescent tobacco use. *Pediatrics*. 2016;138(2):10.1542/peds.2015-3983. Epub 2016 Jul 11. doi:
5 10.1542/peds.2015-3983 [doi].
6
7
8
9
10
11 19. Etter JF. Gateway effects and electronic cigarettes. *Addiction*. 2018;113(10):1776-1783. doi:
12 10.1111/add.13924 [doi].
13
14
15
16 20. Barrington-Trimis JL, Berhane K, Unger JB, et al. Psychosocial factors associated with adolescent
17 electronic cigarette and cigarette use. *Pediatrics*. 2015;136(2):308-317. doi: 10.1542/peds.2015-0639
18 [doi].
19
20
21
22
23
24 21. Vogel EA, Ramo DE, Rubinstein ML. Prevalence and correlates of adolescents' e-cigarette use
25 frequency and dependence. *Drug Alcohol Depend*. 2018;188:109-112. doi: S0376-8716(18)30263-1
26 [pii].
27
28
29
30
31
32 22. Cardenas VM, Breen PJ, Compadre CM, et al. The smoking habits of the family influence the
33 uptake of e-cigarettes in US children. *Ann Epidemiol*. 2015;25(1):60-62. doi:
34 10.1016/j.annepidem.2014.09.013 [doi].
35
36
37
38
39
40 23. Kinnunen JM, Ollila H, Minkkinen J, Lindfors PL, Rimpela AH. A longitudinal study of predictors for
41 adolescent electronic cigarette experimentation and comparison with conventional smoking. *Int J*
42 *Environ Res Public Health*. 2018;15(2):10.3390/ijerph15020305. doi: E305 [pii].
43
44
45
46
47
48 24. Babineau K, Taylor K, Clancy L. Electronic cigarette use among irish youth: A cross sectional study
49 of prevalence and associated factors. *PLoS One*. 2015;10(5):e0126419. doi:
50 10.1371/journal.pone.0126419 [doi].
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 25. Vanyukov MM, Tarter RE, Kirillova GP, et al. Common liability to addiction and "gateway
4 hypothesis": Theoretical, empirical and evolutionary perspective. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 2012;123
5
6
7 Suppl 1:3. doi: 10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2011.12.018 [doi].
8
9
10
11 26. Kim S, Selya AS. The relationship between electronic cigarette use and conventional cigarette
12 smoking is largely attributable to shared risk factors. *Nicotine Tob Res.* 2019. doi: ntz157 [pii].
13
14
15
16 27. Hartwell G, Thomas S, Egan M, Gilmore A, Petticrew M. E-cigarettes and equity: A systematic
17 review of differences in awareness and use between sociodemographic groups. *Tobacco Control.*
18 2017;26(e2):e85-e91. <https://tobaccocontrol.bmj.com/content/26/e2/e85>. Accessed Sep 2, 2019.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27 28. Rönmark E, Bjerg A, Perzanowski M, Platts-Mills T, Lundbäck B. Major increase in allergic
28 sensitization in schoolchildren from 1996 to 2006 in northern sweden. *J Allergy Clin Immunol.*
29 2009;124:357-363.
30
31
32
33
34
35 29. Bjerg A, Sandström T, Lundbäck B, Rönmark E. Time trends in asthma and wheeze in swedish
36 children 1996-2006: Prevalence and risk factors by sex. *Allergy.* 2010;65(1):48-55.
37
38
39
40
41 30. Bunne J, Moberg H, Hedman L, et al. Increase in allergic sensitization in schoolchildren: Two
42 cohorts compared 10 years apart. *J Allergy Clin Immunol Pract.* 2017;5(2):457-463.e1. doi: S2213-
43
44
45
46
47
48 31. Asher MI, Keil U, Anderson HR, et al. International study of asthma and allergies in childhood
49 (ISAAC): Rationale and methods. *Eur Respir J.* 1995;8(3):483-91.
50
51
52
53
54 32. Hedman L, Andersson M, Stridsman C, Ronmark E. Evaluation of a tobacco prevention
55 programme among teenagers in sweden. *BMJ Open.* 2015;5(5):e007673-007673.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 33. Ravens-Sieberer U, Erhart M, Rajmil L, et al. Reliability, construct and criterion validity of the
4
5 KIDSCREEN-10 score: A short measure for children and adolescents' well-being and health-related
6
7 quality of life. *Qual Life Res.* 2010;19(10):1487-1500.
8
9
10
11 34. Statistics Sweden. Socio-economic classification. . ;MIS 1982:4.
12
13
14 35. Kendler KS, Myers J, Damaj MI, Chen X. Early smoking onset and risk for subsequent nicotine
15
16 dependence: A monozygotic co-twin control study. *Am J Psychiatry.* 2013;170(4):408-413. doi:
17
18 10.1176/appi.ajp.2012.12030321 [doi].
19
20
21
22 36. Siqueira LM, COMMITTEE ON SUBSTANCE USE AND PREVENTION. Nicotine and tobacco as
23
24 substances of abuse in children and adolescents. *Pediatrics.* 2017;139(1):10.1542/peds.2016-3436.
25
26 doi: e20163436 [pii].
27
28
29
30 37. Margolis KA, Nguyen AB, Slavik WI, King BA. E-cigarette curiosity among U.S. middle and high
31
32 school students: Findings from the 2014 national youth tobacco survey. *Prev Med.* 2016;89:1-6.
33
34 Accessed Jun 5, 2019. doi: 10.1016/j.ypmed.2016.05.001.
35
36
37
38 38. Kinnunen JM, Ollila H, Lindfors PL, Rimpelä AH. Changes in electronic cigarette use from 2013 to
39
40 2015 and reasons for use among finnish adolescents. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2016;13(11).
41
42 Accessed Jun 5, 2019. doi: 10.3390/ijerph13111114.
43
44
45
46 39. Osibogun O, Taleb ZB, Bahelah R, Salloum RG, Maziak W. Correlates of poly-tobacco use among
47
48 youth and young adults: Findings from the population assessment of tobacco and health study, 2013-
49
50 2014. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 2018;187:160-164. doi: S0376-8716(18)30187-X [pii].
51
52
53
54 40. Patel D, Davis KC, Cox S, et al. Reasons for current E-cigarette use among U.S. adults. *Prev Med.*
55
56 2016;93:14-20. doi: S0091-7435(16)30268-7 [pii].
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 41. Publications Office of the European Union. Attitudes of europeans towards tobacco and
4
5 electronic cigarettes : Report; special eurobarometer 458. . 2018:1-205.
6
7 [https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/2f01a3d1-0af2-11e8-966a-](https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/2f01a3d1-0af2-11e8-966a-01aa75ed71a1/language-en/format-PDF)
8
9 [01aa75ed71a1/language-en/format-PDF](https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/2f01a3d1-0af2-11e8-966a-01aa75ed71a1/language-en/format-PDF). Accessed May 28, 2019.
10
11
12
13 42. Drazen JM, Morrissey S, Campion EW. The dangerous flavors of E-cigarettes. *The New England*
14
15 *Journal of Medicine*. 2019;380(7):679-680. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1056/NEJMe1900484>. doi:
16
17 10.1056/NEJMe1900484.
18
19
20
21 43. Farsalinos KE, Poulas K, Voudris V, Le Houezec J. Prevalence and correlates of current daily use of
22
23 electronic cigarettes in the european union: Analysis of the 2014 eurobarometer survey. *Intern*
24
25 *Emerg Med*. 2017;12(6):757-763. Accessed Oct 10, 2017. doi: 10.1007/s11739-017-1643-7.
26
27
28
29 44. Backman H, Raisanen P, Hedman L, et al. Increased prevalence of allergic asthma from 1996 to
30
31 2006 and further to 2016-results from three population surveys. *Clin Exp Allergy*. 2017;47(11):1426-
32
33 1435. doi: 10.1111/cea.12963 [doi].
34
35
36
37 45. Hedman L, Bjerg A, Perzanowski M, Sundberg S, Rönmark E. Factors related to tobacco use
38
39 among teenagers. *Respir Med*. 2007;101(3):496-502.
40
41
42
43 46. Rosendahl KI, Galanti MR, Ahlbom A. Smoking mothers and snuffing fathers: Behavioural
44
45 influences on youth tobacco use in a swedish cohort. *Tobacco Control*. 2003;12:74-78.
46
47
48
49 47. Hedman L, Backman H, Stridsman C, et al. Association of electronic cigarette use with smoking
50
51 habits, demographic factors, and respiratory symptoms. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2018;1(3):e180789. doi:
52
53 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2018.0789 [doi].
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 48. Reas DL, Wisting L, Stedal K, Dahlgren CL. Unhealthy eating and weight dissatisfaction in
4 adolescents who never, occasionally, or regularly use smokeless tobacco (swedish snus). *Int J Eat*
5 *Disord.* 2019;52(7):846-854. Accessed Aug 29, 2019. doi: 10.1002/eat.23085.
6
7
8
9
10
11 49. Manuel DG, Perez R, Sanmartin C, et al. Measuring burden of unhealthy behaviours using a
12 multivariable predictive approach: Life expectancy lost in canada attributable to smoking, alcohol,
13 physical inactivity, and diet. *PLOS Medicine.* 2016;13(8):e1002082.
14
15 <https://journals.plos.org/plosmedicine/article?id=10.1371/journal.pmed.1002082>. Accessed Aug 29,
16 2019. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1002082.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23 50. Rönmark EP, Ekerljung L, Lötvall J, Torén K, Rönmark E, Lundbäck B. Large scale questionnaire
24 survey on respiratory health in sweden: Effects of late- and non-response. *Respir Med.*
25 2009;103:1807-1815.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. The prevalence of smoking and use of snus at age 14-15 years and 19 years, and e-cigarette use at age 19 years*.

	Girls		Boys		Difference by sex, p-value	All	
	n	%	n	%		n	%
<i>Parental smoking at age 14-15 years</i>							
Father smoker	129/1034	12.5	127/1093	11.6	0.544	256/2127	12.0
Mother smoker	115/1036	11.1	146/1092	13.4	0.111	261/2128	12.3
<i>Tobacco use at age 14-15 years</i>							
Never smoker	932/1053	88.5	1012/1108	91.3		1944/2161	90.0
Occasional smoker	81/1053	7.7	67/1108	6.0		148/2161	6.8
Daily smoker	40/1053	3.8	29/1108	2.6	0.083	69/2161	3.2
Never snus user	1036/1055	98.2	1034/1109	93.2		2070/2164	95.7
Occasional snus user	11/1055	1.0	19/1109	1.7		30/2164	1.4
Daily snus user	8/1055	0.8	56/1109	5.0	<0.001	64/2164	3.0
<i>Tobacco use at age 19 years</i>							
Never smoker	666/1044	63.8	662/1105	59.9		1328/2149	61.8
Former smoker	14/1044	1.3	15/1105	1.4		29/2149	1.3
Occasional smoker	267/1044	25.6	346/1105	31.3		613/2149	28.5
Daily smoker	97/1044	9.3	82/1105	7.4	0.021	179/2149	8.3
Daily snus user	65/1052	6.2	247/1111	22.2	<0.001	312/2163	14.4
<i>E-cigarette use at age 19 years</i>							
Ever tried/used e-cigarettes	158/1049	15.1	302/1096	27.6	<0.001	460/2145	21.4
Current e-cigarette user	36/1049	3.4	54/1096	4.9	0.084	90/2145	4.2

*Individuals with missing answers in the individual questions about tobacco use and e-cigarette use were excluded from the analysis.

Table 2. E-cigarette use at the age of 19 years in relation to smoking, use of snus and parental tobacco use at age 14-15 years*.

	Ever tried/used e-cigarettes			Current e-cigarette use		
	n	%	p-value	n	%	p-value
<i>Smoking at age 14-15 years</i>						
Never	364/1910	19.1		61/1910	3.2	
Occasionally	50/147	34.0		11/147	7.5	
Daily	39/64	60.9	<0.001	18/64	28.1	<0.001
<i>Use of snus at age 14-15 years</i>						
Never	405/2035	19.9		76/2035	3.7	
Occasionally	16/28	57.1		5/28	17.9	
Daily	31/61	50.8	<0.001	9/61	14.8	<0.001
<i>Parental smoking at age 14-15 years</i>						
Father smoker	No	374/1835	20.4	69/1835	3.8	
	Yes	72/253	28.5	20/253	7.9	0.002
Mother smoker	No	368/1832	20.1	73/1832	4.0	
	Yes	76/256	29.7	16/256	6.3	0.093

*Individuals with missing answers in the individual questions about tobacco use and e-cigarette use were excluded from the analysis.




Figure 1. Smoking habits among e-cigarette users, based on questionnaire reports both at age 14-15 years and 19 years. The bars represent all those who had ever tried e-cigarettes and all current e-cigarette users at age 19 years, respectively.

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




Figure 2. The prevalence of ever and current e-cigarette use and current tobacco smoking at age 19 years in relation to number of smoking family members at age 14-15 years.




Figure 3. Risk factors for current e-cigarette use at age 19 years, analysed in an adjusted logistic regression analysis (including all factors listed in the figure) with the result expressed as odds ratios with 95% confidence intervals.

*Entered as a continuous variable (score 0-4)

**Upper secondary education, reference category: preparatory education

HRQoL: health-related quality of life For peer review only - <http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml>

40

41

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




Figure 4. Risk factors for current e-cigarette use at age 19 years among the teenagers who were never-smokers and did not use snus at age 14-15 years, analysed in an adjusted logistic regression analysis (including all factors listed in the figure) with the results expressed as odds ratios with 95% confidence intervals.

* Entered as a continuous variable (score 0-4)

**Upper secondary education, reference category: preparatory education

STROBE 2007 (v4) Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cohort studies*

Section/Topic	Item #	Recommendation	Reported on page #
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	1 and 2
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	2
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	3-4
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	4
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	4; Study sample
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	4; Study sample
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up	4; Study sample
		(b) For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed	NA
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	4; Questionnaire 5; Definitions
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	4; Questionnaire 5; Definitions
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	6; Statistical analyses
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	4; Study sample 6; Statistical analyses
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	6; Statistical analyses
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	6; Statistical analyses
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	6; Statistical analyses
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	6; Statistical analyses
		(d) If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed	6; Statistical analyses
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	NA

Results			
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	4; Study sample 6; Statistical analyses 7-8; Analyses of representativeness
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	7-8; Analyses of representativeness
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	NA
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	Table 1 6: The prevalence of tobacco use at ages 14-15 and 19 years
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	Table 1 Table 2
		(c) Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	4; Study sample
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	Table 1
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	Table 2 Figure 3 Figure 4
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	NA
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	NA
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	Figure 4
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	10; Discussion
Limitations			
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	10-12
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	12
Other information			

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	13; Funding
---------	----	---	-------------

*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

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.

For peer review only

BMJ Open

Predictors of electronic cigarette use among Swedish teenagers – a population-based cohort study

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2020-040683.R1
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	06-Oct-2020
Complete List of Authors:	Hedman, Linnea; Umeå Universitet Medicinska fakulteten, Department of Public health and clinical medicine, Section of Sustainable Health, The OLIN unit; Luleå university of Technology, Department of Health Science, Division of Nursing Backman, Helena; Umeå Universitet Medicinska fakulteten, Public Health and Clinical Medicine, Section of Sustainable Health; Lulea University of Technology, Department of Health Sciences Stridsman, Caroline; Umeå Universitet Medicinska fakulteten, Department of Public health and clinical medicine, Division of Medicine Lundbäck, Magnus; Karolinska Institutet, Department of clinical sciences, Danderyd Hospital Andersson, Martin; Umeå Universitet Medicinska fakulteten, Department of Public Health and Clinical Medicine, Section of Sustainable health, Umeå University Rönmark, Eva ; Umeå University, Department of Public Health and Clinical Medicine, Section of Sustainable Health, The OLIN unit
Primary Subject Heading:	Smoking and tobacco
Secondary Subject Heading:	Public health
Keywords:	PUBLIC HEALTH, EPIDEMIOLOGY, PREVENTIVE MEDICINE

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

Predictors of electronic cigarette use among Swedish teenagers – a population-based cohort study

Linnea Hedman^{1,2}, Helena Backman¹, Caroline Stridsman³, Magnus Lundbäck⁴, Martin Andersson¹,
Eva Rönmark¹

1. Department of Public Health and Clinical Medicine, Division of Sustainable Health, The OLIN Unit, Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden
2. Department of Health Science, Division of Nursing, Luleå University of Technology, Luleå, Sweden
3. Department of Public Health and Clinical Medicine, Division of Medicine, Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden
4. Karolinska Institutet, Division of Cardiovascular Medicine, Department of Clinical Science, Danderyd University Hospital, Stockholm, Sweden

Corresponding author: Linnea Hedman, Associate professor
The OLIN studies
Norrbotten county council
971 89 Luleå, Sweden
email: linnea.hedman@norrboten.se
phone: +46 920-284482

Word count: 3050

Abstract

Objectives: The aim was to identify predictors of e-cigarette use among teenagers.

Design and setting: a prospective population-based cohort study of schoolchildren in northern Sweden.

Participants: In 2006, a cohort study about asthma and allergic diseases among schoolchildren started within the Obstructive Lung Disease in Northern Sweden (OLIN) studies. The study sample (n=2185) was recruited at age 7-8y and participated in questionnaire surveys at age 14-15y, and 19y. The questionnaire included questions about respiratory symptoms, living conditions, upper secondary education, physical activity, diet, health-related quality of life, parental smoking and parental occupation. Questions about tobacco use were included at age 14-15 and 19y.

Primary outcome: E-cigarette use at age 19y.

Results: At age 19y, 21.4% had ever tried e-cigarettes and 4.2% were current users. Among those who were daily tobacco smokers at age 14-15y, 60.9% had tried e-cigarettes at age 19y compared with 19.1% of never-smokers and 34.0% of occasional smokers (p<0.001). Among those who had tried e-cigarettes 28.1% were never smokers both at age 14-15 and 19y, and 14.4% were never smokers among the current e-cigarette users. In unadjusted analyses, e-cigarette use was associated with daily smoking, use of snus and having a smoking father at age 14-15y, as well as with attending vocational education, physical inactivity and unhealthy diet. In adjusted analyses, current e-cigarette use was associated with daily tobacco smoking at age 14-15y (OR 6.27 95%CI 3.12-12.58), attending a vocational art program (OR 2.22 95% CI 1.04-4.77), and inversely associated with eating a healthy diet (OR 0.74 95% CI 0.59-0.92).

Conclusions: E-cigarette use was associated with personal and parental tobacco use as well as with physical inactivity, unhealthy diet and attending vocational upper secondary education. Importantly,

1
2
3 almost one-third of those who had tried e-cigarettes at age 19 years had never been tobacco
4
5 smokers.
6
7

8 Keywords: adolescents, electronic cigarettes, epidemiology, smoking, vaping
9
10
11
12
13

14 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

- 16 - This paper presents data from a prospective cohort study with high response rates and few
17 participants lost to follow-up
- 18 - Self-reported use of tobacco or e-cigarettes was not validated by objective measures
- 19 - E-cigarette use was measured only at the last follow-up
20
21
22
23

24 **Introduction**

25 In the last ten years, the use of electronic cigarettes (e-cigarettes) has increased rapidly among
26 teenagers¹⁻³, but the increase seems to level off in some countries including England¹ and Sweden⁴.
27
28

29 One explanation for their popularity may be that they are perceived as less harmful and less
30 addictive than tobacco cigarettes⁵⁻⁷. Although the levels are considerably lower than in conventional
31 cigarette smoke, e-cigarette aerosol does contain carcinogenic and toxic substances^{8,9} and they can
32 deliver similar nicotine levels as conventional cigarettes and thereby cause nicotine addiction^{10,11}.
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 Because e-cigarettes are portrayed as an alternative to tobacco smoking, studies of predictors for e-
40 cigarette use have mostly evaluated the association with smoking conventional cigarettes^{12,13}. For
41 instance, e-cigarette use was more common among current smokers than former smokers^{14,15} and
42 younger smokers appear to be more prone to start using e-cigarettes than older smokers^{15,16}. A
43 major concern regarding e-cigarettes is that they also seem to appeal to non-smoking teenagers^{17,18}
44 and might serve as a gateway to initiation of tobacco smoking as well as other drugs^{11,17,19}. However,
45 another explanation for the association between e-cigarette use and tobacco smoking may be that
46 these behaviors share many risk factors such as social disadvantage, addictive behaviors, low
47 academic achievement and having family members or friends that smoke²⁰⁻²⁴. These shared
48 characteristics may serve as a common liability for any tobacco or nicotine product^{25,26}, which implies
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 that the sequential order of product initiation is of less importance. Nevertheless, predictors of e-
4
5 cigarette use need to be identified both among smoking and non-smoking teenagers but prospective
6
7 studies are lacking. In Sweden, smoking is more common among women while the use of snus
8
9 (smokeless, moist, grounded tobacco placed under the upper lip) and e-cigarettes is more common
10
11 among men^{14,27-29}, but there are no epidemiological studies on sex differences in e-cigarette use
12
13 among Swedish teenagers⁴.
14
15

16
17 The aim of the present study was to identify predictors of e-cigarette use in a prospective
18
19 population-based cohort study of teenagers in Sweden followed from 14-15 to 19 years of age.
20
21
22
23
24

25 26 **Methods**

27 **Study sample**

28
29 Within the Obstructive Lung Disease in Northern Sweden (OLIN) studies, a population-based
30
31 paediatric cohort study has been ongoing since 2006. The starting point was a parental questionnaire
32
33 survey inviting all children in first and second grade (age 7-8 years) in three municipalities of
34
35 northern Sweden: Luleå, Piteå, and Kiruna³⁰⁻³². The cohort was followed-up at age 14-15 years and 19
36
37 years. At age 19 years, the study sample consists of the 2,185 individuals that participated in all
38
39 surveys, corresponding to 82% of the invited and 78% of the original cohort (n=2819). The study was
40
41 approved by the Regional Ethical Review Board in Umeå, Sweden. At recruitment the parents gave
42
43 consent for their child to participate. The participants gave written informed consent at the follow-up
44
45 at 19 years.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 **Patient and Public Involvement**

54
55 Patients and/or the public were not involved in the design, or conduct, or reporting or dissemination
56
57 plans of this research.
58
59
60

Questionnaire

The questionnaire surveys at age 14-15y and 19y were performed at school. The questionnaire included the International Study of Asthma and Allergies in Childhood (ISAAC) core questionnaire³³ with additional questions about asthma and allergic diseases including physician diagnoses, symptoms, use of medicine and heredity³⁰. Other questions included possible risk factors such as living conditions, physical activity, diet, parental smoking and parental occupation. In the questionnaire at the age of 14-15 years, questions about smoking and use of snus were included³⁴ and at age 19 years, questions about e-cigarettes were added. At age 14-15 years, health-related quality of life (HRQoL) was assessed using the KIDSCREEN-10 questionnaire which consists of 10 items with responses on a five-point ordinal scale³⁵. The crude values were transformed into a single score and poor HRQoL was defined as a value lower than the group mean score minus 0.5 standard deviation.

Definitions

At age 14-15 years and 19 years, respectively, tobacco use was defined based on the questions 'Do you smoke/use snus?' as *Never* if they smoked/used snus 'Never'; *Occasional*, if they smoked/used snus 'Almost never', 'Monthly' or 'Weekly'; and *Daily* if they smoked/used snus 'Almost daily' or 'Daily'. At age 19 years, the category Former smoker was also included in the analyses. Former smoker was defined as either self-reported former smoker in the questionnaire at age 19y, or reporting being an occasional or daily smoker at age 14-15y and non-smoker at age 19y.

At age 19 years, e-cigarette use was defined based on the question 'Do you use e-cigarettes?' as *Ever tried e-cigarettes* if they responded 'No, have quit', 'Have only tried', 'Use sometimes' or 'Use daily'; and *Current e-cigarette user* if they responded 'Use sometimes' or 'Use daily'.

1
2
3 In Sweden, the upper secondary school education offers three year programs that are vocational or
4 preparatory for higher education (e.g. economics, natural science, social science or technology). The
5 program is chosen at age 15 years and they attend the program until graduation at age 19 years. We
6 divided the vocational programs into *work shop* (e.g. building and construction, electricity, energy,
7 vehicle, transport or industrial technology), *service* (e.g. child and recreation, hotel and tourism,
8 restaurant management, or health and social care), and *art* (theater, dance, or music).
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17 *Healthy diet* was defined based on a score between 0-4 with one point each for: eating fish every
18 week; eating a fruit every day; eating fast food less than every week; and drinking soda less than
19 every week. These four items were chosen based on recommendations by the Swedish National Food
20 Agency.
21
22
23
24
25

26
27 *Physical activity* was defined as regular participation in sports or physical activity, not including
28 physical education at school
29
30

31
32 *Parental socioeconomic status* was based on parental occupation reported in a parentally completed
33 questionnaire at age 7-8 years, defined according to the socio-economic classification by Statistics
34 Sweden³⁶ and categorized into the following groups: manual workers in service, manual workers in
35 industry, assistant non-manual employees, intermediate non-manual employees, self-employed,
36 unemployed and professionals and executives.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 **Statistical analyses**

45
46
47 Analyses were performed using the IBM SPSS statistics version 24 (IBM, Armonk, NY). Differences in
48 proportions between groups were analysed by the Chi square test. A p-value <0.05 was considered
49 statistically significant. Individuals with missing data in questions about exposure to parental smoking
50 (2.7%), tobacco use at age 14-15y (0.97-1.1%) and 19y (1.0-1.7%), and e-cigarette use at age 19y
51 (1.8%) were excluded from the analyses. Factors significantly associated with e-cigarette use in
52 unadjusted analyses were included in adjusted logistic regression models. Sex was also included in
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the analysis. The results were expressed as odds ratios (OR) with 95% confidence intervals (CI). The
4
5 adjusted analyses were also performed among those who were never smokers and did not use snus
6
7 at age 14-15 years. A representativeness analysis was performed comparing the n=2,185 individuals
8
9 that participated in the follow-up surveys both at 14-15 years and 19 years with the n=634
10
11 individuals that did not participate in the follow-ups surveys. Participants and non-participants were
12
13 compared regarding sex, parental smoking habits, single parent household and prevalence of asthma
14
15 at recruitment.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 **Results**

24 **The prevalence of tobacco use at ages 14-15 and 19 years**

25
26 At age 14-15 years, the majority of the adolescents were never smokers, 90.0% (Table 1). The
27
28 prevalence of occasional smoking was 6.8% and 3.2% were daily smokers, with similar prevalence in
29
30 girls and boys. Daily use of snus was significantly more common among boys than girls, 5.0% vs 0.8%,
31
32 $p<0.001$.
33
34
35

36 At age 19 years, 61.8% were never smokers and 8.3% daily smokers. Occasional smoking was more
37
38 common among boys than girls, 31.3% vs 25.6%, while daily smoking was more common among girls
39
40 than boys, 9.3% vs 7.4% ($p=0.021$). Daily use of snus had increased to 14.4% and was still more
41
42 common among boys.
43
44
45

46 **The prevalence of e-cigarette use at age 19 years**

47
48
49 At age 19 years, 21.4% (n=460) of the cohort had ever tried e-cigarettes, with a higher prevalence
50
51 among boys than girls, 27.6% vs 15.1%, $p<0.001$, and 4.2% (n=90) were current e-cigarette users. The
52
53 prevalence of dual use of e-cigarettes and conventional cigarettes was 1.7% (n=36), dual use of e-
54
55 cigarettes and snus was 1.3% (n=28) while 0.5% (n=10) used all three products.
56
57
58

59 **E-cigarette use at age 19 years in relation to tobacco use at age 14-15 years**

1
2
3 Among those who were daily tobacco smokers at age 14-15 years, 60.9% (n=39) had tried e-
4
5 cigarettes at age 19 years, compared with 34.0% (n=50) among occasional smokers and 19.1%
6
7 (n=364) among never smokers ($p<0.001$). Of the daily smokers at age 14-15 years, 28.1% (n=18) were
8
9 current e-cigarette users compared with 7.5% (n=11) among occasional smokers and 3.2% (n=61)
10
11 among never smokers (Table 2). Of the current e-cigarette users at age 19 years, 14.4% reported
12
13 being never smokers both at age 14-15 years and at 19 years (Figure 1). Corresponding proportion of
14
15 never smokers among those who had tried e-cigarettes was 28.5%. Among those who were former
16
17 smokers at age 19 years, 24.1% (n=7) had tried e-cigarettes but only one individual was a current
18
19 user. At age 19 years, there were 13 individuals reported having quit using e-cigarettes. Of them, 10
20
21 were occasional smokers, 2 daily smokers, 1 never smoker but none of them was a former smoker.
22
23
24
25
26 The prevalence of e-cigarette use as well as current smoking at age 19 years increased with
27
28 increasing number of tobacco smoking family members (Figure 2). Among those with two or more
29
30 smoking family members, 33.1% had ever tried e-cigarettes and 8.4% were current users, compared
31
32 with 18.7% and 3.3% among those with no smoking family members ($p<0.001$).
33
34
35

36 **Predictors of e-cigarette use**

37
38 Unadjusted analyses are presented in an online supplement, Table E1. Current e-cigarette use at age
39
40 19 years was associated with occasional and daily smoking, and use of snus at age 14-15 years.
41
42 Further, it was associated with the vocational programs of work shop, service, and art using
43
44 preparatory programs as reference category. E-cigarette use was also associated with poor HRQoL ,
45
46 having a smoking father and inversely associated with physical activity and eating a healthy diet.
47
48
49

50 In the adjusted analyses, current e-cigarette use remained significantly associated with daily smoking
51
52 (OR 6.27 95% CI 3.12-12.58), the vocational program of art (OR 2.22 95% CI 1.04-4.77), and inversely
53
54 associated with eating a healthy diet (OR 0.74 95% CI 0.59-0.92) (Figure 3).
55
56

57 In analyses stratified by sex, current e-cigarette use among the girls was associated with poor HRQoL
58
59 at age 14-15 years (OR 2.92 95% CI 1.25-6.81), the vocational program of art (OR 3.13 95% CI 1.17-
60

1
2
3 8.34) and inversely associated with eating a healthy diet (OR 0.64 95% CI 0.45-0.91). Among the boys
4
5 current e-cigarette use was significantly associated only with daily smoking (OR 5.37 95% CI 1.94-
6
7 14.84).
8
9

10 **Predictors of e-cigarette use among non-tobacco users**

11
12
13 Adjusted analyses were also performed among those who were never smokers and did not use snus
14
15 at age 14-15 years, n=1827. Current e-cigarette use at age 19 years was associated with male sex (OR
16
17 2.00 95% CI 1.06-3.77) and having a smoking father (OR 2.28 95% CI 1.19-4.39) (Figure 4).
18
19

20 **Analyses of representativeness**

21
22
23 The sex distribution did not differ between participants (n=2,185) and non-participants (n=634), male
24
25 sex: 51.5% vs. 54.6%, p=0.177. However, compared with the participants, the non-participants more
26
27 often had a smoking mother (16.2% vs. 26.7%, p<0.001), a smoking father (13.7% vs. 21.3%,
28
29 p<0.001), lived in a single-parent household (10.5% vs. 19.7%, p<0.001), and reported having
30
31 physician-diagnosed asthma (6.7% vs. 10.4%, p=0.004) at recruitment. Further, a comparison
32
33 between the n=2185 participants and the n=213 that participated at age 14-15y but not at age 19y
34
35 showed a similar pattern in the characteristics.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 **Discussion**

45 In this population-based cohort study, daily smoking, use of snus and having a smoking father at age
46
47 14-15 years predicted e-cigarette use at age 19 years. Furthermore, e-cigarette use was more
48
49 common among boys and less common among teenagers who were physically active and ate a
50
51 healthy diet. Among never smokers and non-snus users at age 14-15 years, male sex and having a
52
53 smoking father predicted e-cigarette use at age 19 years. Importantly, almost one-third of those who
54
55 had tried e-cigarettes at age 19 years had never been smokers.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Biologically, teenagers are particularly susceptible to nicotine addiction and it has been shown that
4 occasional smoking at a young age is associated with greater likelihood of daily smoking and future
5 nicotine dependence^{37,38}. Even occasional smoking is sufficient to develop abstinence symptoms³⁸
6 and may increase the likelihood of trying new nicotine delivery products out of curiosity^{39,40}. Thus, we
7 were not surprised that smoking conventional cigarettes and using snus predicted e-cigarette use in
8 our study. Although the prevalence of dual use was low in our study, other studies have shown that
9 the use of multiple tobacco and nicotine products has become more common particularly among
10 young adults⁴¹. The different properties and legislation of cigarettes, snus and e-cigarettes enable the
11 user to choose product depending on the situation. We found that one-fifth of never smokers and
12 never snus users, respectively, at age 14-15 years had tried e-cigarettes four years later. Moreover,
13 almost one-third of e-cigarette users had never been a tobacco user, which is a cause for concern as
14 it has been shown that e-cigarette use is a predictor of becoming a tobacco smoker¹⁷. Finally, the
15 teenagers in this cohort did not seem to use e-cigarettes as a smoking cessation method, as only one
16 former smoker was a current e-cigarette user. Thus, due to the appeal of e-cigarettes among never
17 smokers, our findings further undermine the claim that e-cigarettes are a useful harm reduction
18 product.

19
20 One explanation for the strong appeal of e-cigarettes to non-smoking teenagers may be the plethora
21 of flavors, including fruits, sweets and desserts^{42,43}. In order to make e-cigarettes less appealing it has
22 been suggested, for instance by the Food And Drug Administration (FDA) in the U.S. that flavors
23 other than tobacco, mint and menthol should be banned⁴⁴. The prominent taste of conventional
24 cigarettes and most varieties of Swedish snus may avert teenagers from use. Consequently, e-
25 cigarettes seem to appeal to new users that may not have initiated tobacco use otherwise,
26 supporting the gateway theory¹⁹.

1
2
3 In line with other studies, we found that e-cigarette use was more common in boys than girls^{23,24,45}.

4
5 One explanation may be that teenaged boys have a more risk-taking behavior than girls and
6
7 therefore are willing to try a new nicotine delivery product. For a long time, tobacco smoking was
8
9 more common among men than women in Sweden, but during the 1990s and 2000s it was more
10
11 common among women⁴⁶. It may be that e-cigarette use follows the same pattern as the traditional
12
13 tobacco epidemic, with a higher uptake among men in the beginning followed by an increase among
14
15 women. Among teenagers, social role modelling may contribute to the choice of tobacco product as
16
17 smoking is more common among mothers and daughters, while snus use is more common among
18
19 fathers and sons^{28,29}. Unfortunately we did not ask for parental e-cigarette use, but we did find that
20
21 e-cigarette use was associated with having a smoking father and that it was more common the more
22
23 family members that smoked, suggesting that parental smoking habits play an important role for e-
24
25 cigarette uptake.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 We did not find any associations with parental socio-economic status, but e-cigarette use was more
35
36 common among teenagers in vocational than preparatory upper secondary education. In Sweden,
37
38 the vocational programs mainly lead to jobs within the industry and service, while many attending
39
40 preparatory programs continue on to higher education. It is well known that smoking conventional
41
42 cigarettes is associated with lower educational level, while studies of e-cigarette use have shown
43
44 inconsistent results^{14,47}. Nevertheless, our results indicate that the associations between lower
45
46 educational level and smoking conventional or electronic cigarettes seen among adults is present
47
48 already in early teenage in the choice of education. Moreover, e-cigarette use was less common
49
50 among the teenagers who were physically active and ate a healthy diet. Tobacco use, physical
51
52 inactivity and unhealthy diet as well as low educational level are known risk factors for public health
53
54 diseases, for instance cardiovascular disease, and regrettably, the same individuals often recur in all
55
56 of these high-risk groups^{48,49}, in accordance with the common liability theory^{19,25}. Another interesting
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 finding was that e-cigarette use was associated with poor HRQoL, particularly among the girls. An
4
5 association between HRQoL and tobacco smoking has been demonstrated among teenagers³⁴. Thus,
6
7 the predictors for e-cigarette use were to a large extent the same as for conventional cigarettes,
8
9 which implies that the already available successful tobacco prevention measures only need minor
10
11 modifications to also include e-cigarette use. Supporting teenagers to choose a healthy lifestyle
12
13 without any tobacco or nicotine products is an important public health effort.
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 The strengths of the study include the prospective study design, with high initial participation rates
21
22 and few individuals lost to follow-up. Among those lost to follow-up, there was a higher proportion
23
24 of children having smoking parents than among those who participated in the survey at age 19 years.
25
26 As having smoking parents and initiation of tobacco use in teenage is strongly correlated, we may
27
28 have underestimated the prevalence of tobacco and e-cigarette use. On the other hand, most likely
29
30 we have not overestimated the significance of the associations⁵⁰. Tobacco and e-cigarette use was
31
32 based on self-reports and not verified by objective measures such as level of cotinine. However, the
33
34 prevalence of smokers, snus and e-cigarette users were in line with the prevalence in corresponding
35
36 ages reported in Swedish national surveys⁴, supporting the external validity of our results. Questions
37
38 about diet and physical activity were included in the questionnaire at age 19y and thus represent
39
40 cross-sectional associations with e-cigarette use. Another limitation is that the main focus of this
41
42 cohort study is asthma and allergic diseases, and therefore we did not include questions about
43
44 personality traits related to tobacco or nicotine product initiation, sensation seeking behavior,
45
46 alcohol intake or other risk-taking behavior in the questionnaire.
47
48
49
50

51
52 In conclusion, daily smoking, use of snus and having a smoking father at age 14-15 years predicted e-
53
54 cigarette use at age 19 years. Furthermore, e-cigarette use was associated with male sex, physical
55
56 inactivity, eating an unhealthy diet and attending vocational upper secondary education. Alarmingly,
57
58 almost one-third of those who had tried e-cigarettes at age 19 years had never been smokers or used
59
60

1
2
3 snus. Until the effects of e-cigarette use on respiratory and cardiovascular health have been fully
4
5 elucidated, the rapid increase of e-cigarette use among teenagers needs to be curbed. In order to
6
7 increase the efficacy of intervention efforts, the predictors and pattern of e-cigarette use among
8
9 teenagers need to be studied in detail and our study contribute new knowledge in the field.
10
11
12

13 **Funding**

14
15 This work was supported by The Swedish Heart-Lung Foundation [20140264; 20170438; 20170696;
16
17 20180214], ALF – a regional agreement between Umeå University and Västerbotten County Council
18
19 [RV-638731; RV-738451], the Swedish Asthma-Allergy Foundation [F2012-0036; F2012-0039], Visare
20
21 Norr fund: Northern County Council's Regional Federation [646191], and Norrbotten County Council
22
23 [867371; 933163] are acknowledged for financial support. None of the funders had any role in study
24
25 design, analysis or interpretation of data, or writing of the manuscript.
26
27
28

29 **Acknowledgements**

30
31 Sigrid Sundberg, Ann-Christin Jonsson, Chatrin Wahlgren and Zandra Lundgren are acknowledged for
32
33 data collection.
34
35

36 **Competing interests**

37
38
39 None declared
40
41

42 **Author contributions**

43
44 LH participated in study design, data collection, performed the statistical analyses, drafted and
45
46 revised the manuscript and approved the final manuscript. HB, CS, ML and MA contributed to the
47
48 analyses and interpretation of data, revised the manuscript for important intellectual content and
49
50 approved the final manuscript. ER is responsible for study conception and study design, participated
51
52 in data collection, contributed to the analyses and interpretation of data, revised the manuscript for
53
54 important intellectual content and approved the final manuscript. All authors are accountable for all
55
56 aspects of the work.
57
58
59
60

Data sharing statement

No additional data available.

References

1. Hammond D, Reid JL, Rynard VL, et al. Prevalence of vaping and smoking among adolescents in Canada, England, and the United States: Repeat national cross sectional surveys. *BMJ*. 2019;365:l2219. doi: 10.1136/bmj.l2219.
2. Kapan A, Stefanac S, Sandner I, Haider S, Grabovac I, Dorner TE. Use of electronic cigarettes in European populations: A narrative review. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2020;17:1971. doi: 10.3390/ijerph17061971.
3. Bals R, Boyd J, Esposito S, et al. Electronic cigarettes: A task force report from the European Respiratory Society. *Eur Respir J*. 2019;53(2). doi: 10.1183/13993003.01151-2018.
4. The Swedish Council for Information on Alcohol and other drugs, (CAN). Skolelevers drogvanor 2019 (alcohol and drug use among students). Report number 187. 2019.
5. Ying Xu, Yanfang Guo, Kaiqian Liu, Zheng Liu, Xiaobo Wang. E-cigarette awareness, use, and harm perception among adults: A meta-analysis of observational studies. *PLoS One*. 2016;11(11):e0165938. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0165938.
6. Glasser AM, Collins L, Pearson JL, et al. Overview of electronic nicotine delivery systems: A systematic review. *Am J Prev Med*. 2017;52(2):e33-e66. doi: S0749-3797(16)30573-6 [pii].
7. Kalkhoran S, Alvarado N, Vijayaraghavan M, Lum PJ, Yuan P, Satterfield JM. Patterns of and reasons for electronic cigarette use in primary care patients. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2017;32(10):1122-1129. doi: 10.1007/s11606-017-4123-x.

- 1
2
3 8. Goniewicz ML, Knysak J, Gawron M, et al. Levels of selected carcinogens and toxicants in vapour
4 from electronic cigarettes. *Tob Control*. 2014;23(2):133-139. doi: 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2012-
5
6 from electronic cigarettes. *Tob Control*. 2014;23(2):133-139. doi: 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2012-
7
8 050859.
9
10
11 9. Williams M, Villarreal A, Bozhilov K, Lin S, Talbot P. Metal and silicate particles including
12 nanoparticles are present in electronic cigarette cartomizer fluid and aerosol. *PLoS ONE*.
13
14 2013;8(3):e57987. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0057987.
15
16
17
18 10. DeVito EE, Krishnan-Sarin S. E-cigarettes: Impact of E-liquid components and device
19 characteristics on nicotine exposure. *Curr Neuropharmacol*. 2018;16(4):438-459. doi:
20
21 10.2174/1570159X15666171016164430.
22
23
24
25
26 11. Ren M, Lotfipour S. Nicotine gateway effects on adolescent substance use. *The Western Journal*
27
28 *of Emergency Medicine*. 2019;20(5):696-709. doi: 10.5811/westjem.2019.7.41661.
29
30
31
32 12. de Lacy E, Fletcher A, Hewitt G, Murphy S, Moore G. Cross-sectional study examining the
33 prevalence, correlates and sequencing of electronic cigarette and tobacco use among 11-16-year olds
34 in schools in Wales. *BMJ Open*. 2017;7(2):e012784-012784. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2016-012784
35
36 [doi].
37
38
39
40
41
42 13. Tavalacci MP, Vasiliu A, Romo L, Kotbagi G, Kern L, Ladner J. Patterns of electronic cigarette use in
43 current and ever users among college students in France: A cross-sectional study. *BMJ Open*.
44
45 2016;6(5):e011344-011344. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2016-011344 [doi].
46
47
48
49
50 14. Hedman L, Backman H, Stridsman C, et al. Association of electronic cigarette use with smoking
51 habits, demographic factors, and respiratory symptoms. *JAMA Network Open*. 2018;1(3):e180789.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 15. Vardavas CI, Filippidis FT, Agaku IT. Determinants and prevalence of e-cigarette use throughout
4 the European Union: A secondary analysis of 26 566 youth and adults from 27 countries. *Tob Control*.
5 2015;24(5):442-448.
6
7
8
9
10
11 16. Li J, Newcombe R, Walton D. The prevalence, correlates and reasons for using electronic
12 cigarettes among New Zealand adults. *Addict Behav*. 2015;45:245-251. doi:
13 10.1016/j.addbeh.2015.02.006.
14
15
16
17
18 17. Soneji S, Barrington-Trimis JL, Wills TA, et al. Association between initial use of e-cigarettes and
19 subsequent cigarette smoking among adolescents and young adults: A systematic review and meta-
20 analysis. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2017;171(8):788-797. doi: 10.1001/jamapediatrics.2017.1488 [doi].
21
22
23
24
25
26 18. Barrington-Trimis JL, Urman R, Leventhal AM, et al. E-cigarettes, cigarettes, and the prevalence of
27 adolescent tobacco use. *Pediatrics*. 2016;138(2):10.1542/peds.2015-3983. Epub 2016 Jul 11. doi:
28 10.1542/peds.2015-3983 [doi].
29
30
31
32
33
34 19. Etter JF. Gateway effects and electronic cigarettes. *Addiction*. 2018;113(10):1776-1783. doi:
35 10.1111/add.13924 [doi].
36
37
38
39
40 20. Barrington-Trimis JL, Berhane K, Unger JB, et al. Psychosocial factors associated with adolescent
41 electronic cigarette and cigarette use. *Pediatrics*. 2015;136(2):308-317. doi: 10.1542/peds.2015-0639
42 [doi].
43
44
45
46
47
48 21. Vogel EA, Ramo DE, Rubinstein ML. Prevalence and correlates of adolescents' e-cigarette use
49 frequency and dependence. *Drug Alcohol Depend*. 2018;188:109-112. doi: S0376-8716(18)30263-1
50 [pii].
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 22. Cardenas VM, Breen PJ, Compadre CM, et al. The smoking habits of the family influence the
4 uptake of e-cigarettes in US children. *Ann Epidemiol*. 2015;25(1):60-62. doi:
5
6 10.1016/j.annepidem.2014.09.013 [doi].
7
8
9
10
11 23. Kinnunen JM, Ollila H, Minkkinen J, Lindfors PL, Rimpela AH. A longitudinal study of predictors for
12 adolescent electronic cigarette experimentation and comparison with conventional smoking. *Int J*
13 *Environ Res Public Health*. 2018;15(2):10.3390/ijerph15020305. doi: E305 [pii].
14
15
16
17
18
19 24. Babineau K, Taylor K, Clancy L. Electronic cigarette use among irish youth: A cross sectional study
20 of prevalence and associated factors. *PLoS One*. 2015;10(5):e0126419. doi:
21
22 10.1371/journal.pone.0126419 [doi].
23
24
25
26
27 25. Vanyukov MM, Tarter RE, Kirillova GP, et al. Common liability to addiction and "gateway
28 hypothesis": Theoretical, empirical and evolutionary perspective. *Drug Alcohol Depend*. 2012;123
29 Suppl 1:3. doi: 10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2011.12.018 [doi].
30
31
32
33
34
35 26. Kim S, Selya AS. The relationship between electronic cigarette use and conventional cigarette
36 smoking is largely attributable to shared risk factors. *Nicotine Tob Res*. 2020;22:1123-1130. doi:
37
38 10.1093/ntr/ntz157
39
40
41
42
43 27. Leon ME, Lugo A, Boffetta P, Gilmore A, Ross H, Schüz J, La Vecchia C, Gallus S. Smokeless tobacco
44 use in Sweden and other 17 European countries. *Eur J Public Health* 2016;26:817-821. doi:
45
46 10.1093/eurpub/ckw032.
47
48
49
50
51 28. Rosendahl KI, Galanti MR, Ahlbom A. Smoking mothers and snuffing fathers: Behavioural
52 influences on youth tobacco use in a Swedish cohort. *Tobacco Control*. 2003;12:74-78. doi:
53
54 10.1136/tc.12.1.74.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 29. Hedman L, Bjerg A, Perzanowski M, Sundberg S, Rönmark E. Factors related to tobacco use
4 among teenagers. *Respir Med*. 2007;101(3):496-502. doi: 10.1016/j.rmed.2006.07.001.
5
6
7
8
9 30. Rönmark E, Bjerg A, Perzanowski M, Platts-Mills T, Lundbäck B. Major increase in allergic
10 sensitization in schoolchildren from 1996 to 2006 in northern Sweden. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*.
11 2009;124:357-363. doi: 10.1016/j.jaci.2009.05.011.
12
13
14
15
16 31. Bjerg A, Sandström T, Lundbäck B, Rönmark E. Time trends in asthma and wheeze in Swedish
17 children 1996-2006: Prevalence and risk factors by sex. *Allergy*. 2010;65(1):48-55. doi:
18 10.1111/j.1398-9995.2009.02105.x.
19
20
21
22
23
24 32. Bunne J, Moberg H, Hedman L, et al. Increase in allergic sensitization in schoolchildren: Two
25 cohorts compared 10 years apart. *J Allergy Clin Immunol Pract*. 2017;5(2):457-463.e1. doi: S2213-
26 2198(16)30426-3 [pii].
27
28
29
30
31
32 33. Asher MI, Keil U, Anderson HR, et al. International study of asthma and allergies in childhood
33 (ISAAC): Rationale and methods. *Eur Respir J*. 1995;8(3):483-91. doi:
34 10.1183/09031936.95.08030483.
35
36
37
38
39
40 34. Hedman L, Andersson M, Stridsman C, Rönmark E. Evaluation of a tobacco prevention
41 programme among teenagers in Sweden. *BMJ Open*. 2015;5(5):e007673-007673. doi:
42 10.1136/bmjopen-2015-007673.
43
44
45
46
47
48 35. Ravens-Sieberer U, Erhart M, Rajmil L, et al. Reliability, construct and criterion validity of the
49 KIDSCREEN-10 score: A short measure for children and adolescents' well-being and health-related
50 quality of life. *Qual Life Res*. 2010;19(10):1487-1500. doi: 10.1007/s11136-010-9706-5.
51
52
53
54
55
56 36. Statistics Sweden. Socio-economic classification. MIS 1982:4.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 37. Kendler KS, Myers J, Damaj MI, Chen X. Early smoking onset and risk for subsequent nicotine
4 dependence: A monozygotic co-twin control study. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2013;170(4):408-413. doi:
5
6 10.1176/appi.ajp.2012.12030321 [doi].
7
8
9
10
11 38. Siqueira LM, COMMITTEE ON SUBSTANCE USE AND PREVENTION. Nicotine and tobacco as
12 substances of abuse in children and adolescents. *Pediatrics*. 2017;139(1):10.1542/peds.2016-3436.
13 doi: e20163436 [pii].
14
15
16
17
18 39. Margolis KA, Nguyen AB, Slavik WI, King BA. E-cigarette curiosity among U.S. middle and high
19 school students: Findings from the 2014 national youth tobacco survey. *Prev Med*. 2016;89:1-6. doi:
20
21 10.1016/j.ypmed.2016.05.001.
22
23
24
25
26 40. Kinnunen JM, Ollila H, Lindfors PL, Rimpelä AH. Changes in electronic cigarette use from 2013 to
27 2015 and reasons for use among Finnish adolescents. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2016;13(11).
28 Accessed Jun 5, 2019. doi: 10.3390/ijerph13111114.
29
30
31
32
33
34 41. Osibogun O, Taleb ZB, Bahelah R, Salloum RG, Maziak W. Correlates of poly-tobacco use among
35 youth and young adults: Findings from the population assessment of tobacco and health study, 2013-
36 2014. *Drug Alcohol Depend*. 2018;187:160-164. doi: S0376-8716(18)30187-X [pii].
37
38
39
40
41
42 42. Patel D, Davis KC, Cox S, et al. Reasons for current E-cigarette use among U.S. adults. *Prev Med*.
43 2016;93:14-20. doi: S0091-7435(16)30268-7 [pii].
44
45
46
47
48 43. Publications Office of the European Union. Attitudes of Europeans towards tobacco and
49 electronic cigarettes: Report; special Eurobarometer 458. 2018:1-205.
50
51 [https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/2f01a3d1-0af2-11e8-966a-](https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/2f01a3d1-0af2-11e8-966a-01aa75ed71a1/language-en/format-PDF)
52
53 [01aa75ed71a1/language-en/format-PDF](https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/2f01a3d1-0af2-11e8-966a-01aa75ed71a1/language-en/format-PDF) . Accessed May 28, 2019.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 44. Drazen JM, Morrissey S, Campion EW. The dangerous flavors of E-cigarettes. *The New England*
4
5 *Journal of Medicine*. 2019;380(7):679-680. doi: 10.1056/NEJMe1900484.
6
7
8
9 45. Farsalinos KE, Poulas K, Voudris V, Le Houezec J. Prevalence and correlates of current daily use of
10
11 electronic cigarettes in the European Union: Analysis of the 2014 Eurobarometer survey. *Intern*
12
13 *Emerg Med*. 2017;12(6):757-763. Accessed Oct 10, 2017. doi: 10.1007/s11739-017-1643-7.
14
15
16
17 46. Backman H, Raisanen P, Hedman L, et al. Increased prevalence of allergic asthma from 1996 to
18
19 2006 and further to 2016—results from three population surveys. *Clin Exp Allergy*. 2017;47(11):1426-
20
21 1435. doi: 10.1111/cea.12963 [doi].
22
23
24
25 47. Hartwell G, Thomas S, Egan M, Gilmore A, Petticrew M. E-cigarettes and equity: A systematic
26
27 review of differences in awareness and use between sociodemographic groups. *Tobacco Control*.
28
29 2017;26(e2):e85-e91. doi: 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2016-053222.
30
31
32
33 48. Reas DL, Wisting L, Stedal K, Dahlgren CL. Unhealthy eating and weight dissatisfaction in
34
35 adolescents who never, occasionally, or regularly use smokeless tobacco (Swedish snus). *Int J Eat*
36
37 *Disord*. 2019;52(7):846-854. doi: 10.1002/eat.23085.
38
39
40
41 49. Manuel DG, Perez R, Sanmartin C, et al. Measuring burden of unhealthy behaviours using a
42
43 multivariable predictive approach: Life expectancy lost in Canada attributable to smoking, alcohol,
44
45 physical inactivity, and diet. *PLOS Medicine*. 2016;13(8):e1002082. doi:
46
47 10.1371/journal.pmed.1002082.
48
49
50
51 50. Rönmark EP, Ekerljung L, Lötvall J, Torén K, Rönmark E, Lundbäck B. Large scale questionnaire
52
53 survey on respiratory health in sweden: Effects of late- and non-response. *Respir Med*.
54
55 2009;103:1807-1815.
56
57

58 **Legends to figures**

59
60

1
2
3 Figure 1. Smoking habits among e-cigarette users. The bars represent all those who had ever tried e-
4 cigarettes and all current e-cigarette users at age 19 years, respectively.
5

6 Never smoker: never smoker at age 14-15 and 19y; Ever occasional smoker: occasional smoker at age
7 14-15 or 19y but not a daily smoker; Former smoker: either self-reported former smoker at age 19y
8 or being a non-smoker or occasional smoker at 14-15y and non-smoker at 19y; Ever daily smoker:
9 daily smoker at 14-15 or 19y.
10
11
12
13

14 Figure 2. The prevalence of ever and current e-cigarette use and current tobacco smoking at age 19
15 years in relation to number of smoking family members at age 14-15 years.
16
17
18
19

20 Figure 3. Risk factors for current e-cigarette use at age 19 years, analysed in an adjusted logistic
21 regression analysis (including all factors listed in the figure) with the result expressed as odds ratios
22 with 95% confidence intervals.
23
24

25 *Entered as a continuous variable (score 0-4)
26

27 **Upper secondary education, reference category: preparatory education
28

29 HRQoL: health-related quality of life
30
31
32

33 Figure 4. Risk factors for current e-cigarette use at age 19 years among the teenagers who were
34 never-smokers and did not use snus at age 14-15 years, analysed in an adjusted logistic regression
35 analysis (including all factors listed in the figure) with the results expressed as odds ratios with 95%
36 confidence intervals.
37
38

39 * Entered as a continuous variable (score 0-4)
40

41 **Upper secondary education, reference category: preparatory education
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. The prevalence of smoking and use of snus at age 14-15 years and 19 years, and e-cigarette use at age 19 years*.

	Girls		Boys		Difference by sex, p-value	All	
	n	%	n	%		n	%
<i>Parental smoking at age 14-15 years</i>							
Father smoker	129/1034	12.5	127/1093	11.6	0.544	256/2127	12.0
Mother smoker	115/1036	11.1	146/1092	13.4	0.111	261/2128	12.3
<i>Tobacco use at age 14-15 years</i>							
Never smoker	932/1053	88.5	1012/1108	91.3		1944/2161	90.0
Occasional smoker	81/1053	7.7	67/1108	6.0		148/2161	6.8
Daily smoker	40/1053	3.8	29/1108	2.6	0.083	69/2161	3.2
Never snus user	1036/1055	98.2	1034/1109	93.2		2070/2164	95.7
Occasional snus user	11/1055	1.0	19/1109	1.7		30/2164	1.4
Daily snus user	8/1055	0.8	56/1109	5.0	<0.001	64/2164	3.0
<i>Tobacco use at age 19 years</i>							
Never smoker	666/1044	63.8	662/1105	59.9		1328/2149	61.8
Former smoker	14/1044	1.3	15/1105	1.4		29/2149	1.3
Occasional smoker	267/1044	25.6	346/1105	31.3		613/2149	28.5
Daily smoker	97/1044	9.3	82/1105	7.4	0.021	179/2149	8.3
Daily snus user	65/1052	6.2	247/1111	22.2	<0.001	312/2163	14.4
<i>E-cigarette use at age 19 years</i>							
Ever tried/used e-cigarettes	158/1049	15.1	302/1096	27.6	<0.001	460/2145	21.4
Current e-cigarette user	36/1049	3.4	54/1096	4.9	0.084	90/2145	4.2

*Individuals with missing answers in the individual questions about tobacco use and e-cigarette use were excluded from the analysis.

Table 2. E-cigarette use at the age of 19 years in relation to smoking, use of snus and parental tobacco use at age 14-15 years*.

	Ever tried/used e-cigarettes			Current e-cigarette use		
	n	%	p-value	n	%	p-value
<i>Smoking at age 14-15 years</i>						
Never	364/1910	19.1		61/1910	3.2	
Occasionally	50/147	34.0		11/147	7.5	
Daily	39/64	60.9	<0.001	18/64	28.1	<0.001
<i>Use of snus at age 14-15 years</i>						
Never	405/2035	19.9		76/2035	3.7	
Occasionally	16/28	57.1		5/28	17.9	
Daily	31/61	50.8	<0.001	9/61	14.8	<0.001
<i>Parental smoking at age 14-15 years</i>						
Father smoker	No	374/1835	20.4	69/1835	3.8	
	Yes	72/253	28.5	20/253	7.9	0.002
Mother smoker	No	368/1832	20.1	73/1832	4.0	
	Yes	76/256	29.7	16/256	6.3	0.093

*Individuals with missing answers in the individual questions about tobacco use and e-cigarette use were excluded from the analysis.




Figure 1. Smoking habits among e-cigarette users. The bars represent all those who had ever tried e-cigarettes and all current e-cigarette users at age 19 years, respectively.

Never smoker: never smoker at age 14-15 and 19y; Ever occasional smoker: occasional smoker at age 14-15 or 19y but not a daily smoker; Former smoker: either self-reported former smoker at age 19y or being a non-smoker or occasional smoker at 14-15y and non-smoker at 19y; Ever daily smoker: daily smoker at 14-15 or 19y.

Figure 1. Smoking habits among e-cigarette users. The bars represent all those who had ever tried e-cigarettes and all current e-cigarette users at age 19 years, respectively. Never smoker: never smoker at age 14-15 and 19y; Ever occasional smoker: occasional smoker at age 14-15 or 19y but not a daily smoker; Former smoker: either self-reported former smoker at age 19y or being a non-smoker or occasional smoker at 14-15y and non-smoker at 19y; Ever daily smoker: daily smoker at 14-15 or 19y.

81x60mm (300 x 300 DPI)

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




Figure 2. The prevalence of ever and current e-cigarette use and current tobacco smoking at age 19 years in relation to number of smoking family members at age 14-15 years.

Figure 2. The prevalence of ever and current e-cigarette use and current tobacco smoking at age 19 years in relation to number of smoking family members at age 14-15 years.

81x60mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Figure 3. Risk factors for current e-cigarette use at age 19 years, analysed in an adjusted logistic regression analysis (including all factors listed in the figure) with the result expressed as odds ratios with 95% confidence intervals.

*Entered as a continuous variable (score 0-4)
 **Upper secondary education, reference category: preparatory education
 HRQoL: health-related quality of life

Figure 3. Risk factors for current e-cigarette use at age 19 years, analysed in an adjusted logistic regression analysis (including all factors listed in the figure) with the result expressed as odds ratios with 95% confidence intervals. *Entered as a continuous variable (score 0-4). **Upper secondary education, reference category: preparatory education. HRQoL: health-related quality of life

81x60mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Figure 4. Risk factors for current e-cigarette use at age 19 years among the teenagers who were never-smokers and did not use snus at age 14-15 years, analysed in an adjusted logistic regression analysis (including all factors listed in the figure) with the results expressed as odds ratios with 95% confidence intervals.
 * Entered as a continuous variable (score 0-4)
 **Upper secondary education, reference category: preparatory education

Figure 4. Risk factors for current e-cigarette use at age 19 years among the teenagers who were never-smokers and did not use snus at age 14-15 years, analysed in an adjusted logistic regression analysis (including all factors listed in the figure) with the results expressed as odds ratios with 95% confidence intervals. * Entered as a continuous variable (score 0-4). **Upper secondary education, reference category: preparatory education

81x60mm (300 x 300 DPI)

Online supplement

Table E1. Factors associated with current e-cigarette use at age 19 years, analysed in unadjusted logistic regression analyses with the results expressed as odds ratios with 95% confidence intervals.

		OR	95% CI
Sex	Female	1.00	
	Male	1.46	(0.95-2.24)
Upper secondary school education	Preparatory	1.00	
	Work shop	2.68	(1.59-4.49)
	Service	2.15	(1.01-4.54)
	Art	2.22	(1.07-4.58)
<i>Factors at age 14-15 years</i>			
Father smoker	No	1.00	
	Yes	2.20	(1.31-3.68)
Mother smoker	No	1.00	
	Yes	1.61	(0.82-2.81)
Personal smoking habits	Never	1.00	
	Occasionally	2.45	(1.26-4.77)
	Daily	11.86	(6.50-21.65)
Use of snus	Never	1.00	
	Occasionally	5.60	(2.07-15.14)
	Daily	4.46	(2.12-9.39)
Parental socioeconomic status	Professionals and executives	1.00	
	Self-employed	1.03	(0.34-3.15)
	Intermediate non manual employees	1.18	(0.62-2.24)
	Assistant non-manual employees	1.07	(0.47-2.47)
	Manual workers in industry	1.78	(0.87-3.61)
	Manual workers in service	1.91	(0.92-3.98)
	Unemployed	Too few cases	
Single parent household	No	1.00	
	Yes	1.14	(0.58-2.25)
Current asthma at age 14-15 years	No	1.00	
	Yes	0.87	(0.43-1.76)
<i>Factors at age 19 years</i>			
Physical activity	No	1.00	
	Yes	0.56	(0.37-0.86)
Healthy diet	Entered as a continuous variable	0.64	(0.53-0.78)

STROBE 2007 (v4) Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cohort studies*

Section/Topic	Item #	Recommendation	Reported on page #
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	1 and 2
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	2
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	3-4
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	4
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	4; Study sample
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	4; Study sample
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up	4; Study sample
		(b) For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed	NA
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	4; Questionnaire 5; Definitions
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	4; Questionnaire 5; Definitions
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	6; Statistical analyses
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	4; Study sample 6; Statistical analyses
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	6; Statistical analyses
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	6; Statistical analyses
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	6; Statistical analyses
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	6; Statistical analyses
		(d) If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed	6; Statistical analyses
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	NA

Results			
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	4; Study sample 6; Statistical analyses 7-8; Analyses of representativeness
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	7-8; Analyses of representativeness
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	NA
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	Table 1 6: The prevalence of tobacco use at ages 14-15 and 19 years
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	Table 1 Table 2
		(c) Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	4; Study sample
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	Table 1
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	Table 2 Figure 3 Figure 4
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	NA
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	NA
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	Figure 4
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	10; Discussion
Limitations			
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	10-12
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	12
Other information			

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	13; Funding
---------	----	---	-------------

*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

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.

For peer review only