

## **Dual Use of Cigarettes and Smokeless Tobacco: Product Use and Nicotine Exposure**

Nicholas J. Felicione, M.S., <sup>1</sup> Jenny E. Ozga, M.S., <sup>1</sup> Stuart G. Ferguson, Ph.D., <sup>2</sup> Colleen N. Warren, M.S., <sup>1</sup> Summer Kuhn, M.P.H., <sup>3</sup> Madison Hinkle, <sup>1</sup> & Melissa Blank, Ph.D.<sup>1</sup>

# <sup>1</sup>Department of Psychology, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV, USA • <sup>2</sup>School of Medicine, University of Tasmania, Hobart, TAS, Australia •

### Abstract

Introduction: Smokeless tobacco (SLT) products have been marketed to smokers as a means to reduce risk of tobacco-related diseases or to use in situations where smoking is prohibited. An (un)intended consequence of such marketing may be that smokers supplement rather than replace their cigarettes with SLT. **Purpose:** To compare product use and nicotine exposure on days when only cigarettes are smoked (single use) versus when both cigarettes and SLT are used (dual use). Methods: Forty-three dual users (M $\pm$ SD = 19.3 $\pm$ 8.9 cigarettes/day; 4.1 $\pm$ 2.2 SLT uses/day for  $5.7\pm1.6$  days/week) recorded their product use daily for two weeks via an electronic diary. They also collected butts from all cigarettes smoked, and a saliva sample for measurement of cotinine, every day during this twoweek period. On the final visit, users provided reasons for and beliefs about traditional SLT (e.g., snuff, dip) and/or snus products. Results: The number of cigarettes smoked/day, as measured by diary records (M±SEM

=  $10.8\pm0.3$ ) and returned cigarette butts ( $11.1\pm0.3$ ), were correlated significantly (r = .62; p < .01). Cotinine levels were significantly higher on dual versus single use days (M $\pm$ SEM = 375.1 $\pm$ 10.6 ng/ml versus  $306.1\pm18.0$  ng/ml, respectively; p < .01), though the number of cigarettes recorded did not differ between these days  $(10.3\pm0.7 \text{ versus } 10.8\pm0.3 \text{ ers})$ cigarettes, respectively; p > .05). The most commonly reported reason for initiating (72.1%) and continuing (79.1%) use of their preferred SLT/snus product was to circumvent indoor smoking restrictions. Most participants believed that traditional SLT (65.1%) and snus (48.8%) are equally as harmful as cigarettes, and that neither traditional SLT (51.2%) nor snus (51.2%) help with quitting cigarettes. A notable portion, however, do believe that these products (37.2% and 20.9%, respectively) could serve as cessation aids. **Conclusions:** Those smokers sampled here show a pattern suggestive of product supplementation rather than replacement, and consequently increased exposure to nicotine. This pattern of SLT use may be explained by the motivation to use SLT primarily for situations where smoking is forbidden.

Melissa Blank, Ph.D.; Morgantown, WV 26506, mdblank@mail.wvu.edu

#### Funding

Support provided by National Institutes of Health (R03DA037583) and the Center for Tobacco Products of the U.S. Food & Drug Administration. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the NIH or FDA. Support also provided by the National Institute of General Medical Sciences (T32GM081741) and the West Virginia Prevention Research Center (U481006466AR).

#### References

<sup>1</sup>Wray RJ, ..., & Vijaykumar S. (2012). Nicotine and Tobacco Research, 14, 184-190.

<sup>2</sup> Anderson RH & Housten, L. (October, 2012). *Doubling down: an analysis* of interviews with dual tobacco users. American Public Health Association Annual Meeting. San Francisco, CA.

<sup>3</sup> Tomar SL, Alpert HR, & Connolly GN. (2010). Tobacco Control, 19, 104-109.

<sup>4</sup> Heatherton TF . . ., & Fagerstrom KO. (1991). British Journal of Addiction, 86, 1119-1127.

<sup>5</sup> Severson HH . . ., & Boles SM. (2003). *Development of a smokeless tobacco* dependence scale. Paper presented at the 9<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting of the Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco, New Orleans, LA.

<sup>6</sup> McClave-Regan AK & Berkowitz J. (2011). *Tobacco Control, 20,* 239-242. <sup>7</sup> Fichtenberg CM & Glantz SA (2002). British Medical Journal, 325(7357), 188.

#### Introduction

- Cigarette smokers may use SLT products (e.g., dip, snus) to reduce the harms associated with smoking or to circumvent indoor smoking restrictions.<sup>1,2</sup>
- The use of SLT as a supplement to, rather than a replacement for, cigarettes may increase exposure to toxicants.<sup>3</sup>
- Patterns of SLT use among cigarette smokers have not been examined prospectively.
- This study was designed to characterize patterns of product use and nicotine exposure in a sample of dual cigarette-SLT users using ecological momentary assessment methods.

#### Design

	Day 1	Day 3	Day 9	Day 14
Electronic diary training				
Cigarette & SLT recording				
Craving, mood, situational				
assessments <sup>a</sup>				
Saliva sample collection				
Cigarette butt collection				
Laboratory visits /				
compliance checks				
Reasons / beliefs				
questionnaire				

<sup>a</sup>Data not included here

#### **Outcome Measures**

- Cigarette (diary logs; returned butts) & SLT (diary logs) use.
- Salivary cotinine.
- Reasons for initiation and continued use of SLT:
  - "to improve health"
  - "to assist with quitting"
  - "to use in places where I can't smoke"
  - "other"

#### **Inclusion / Exclusion**

- Inclusion:
  - Cigarette use:  $\geq$  5 cigarettes per day (CPD) for  $\geq$  1 year.
  - SLT use:  $\geq 2$  uses per day,  $\geq 4$  days per week for  $\geq 6$ months
  - Expired air CO level  $\geq 10$  ppm and urinary cotinine reading > 3 via semi-quantitative methods.
- Exclusion:
  - Uncontrolled medical conditions.
  - Diagnosis of schizophrenia or bipolar disorders.
  - Illicit drug use in past 3 months; marijuana use >5 days past month; alcohol use  $\geq 15$  days in past month.

<sup>3</sup>Health Sciences & Technology Academy, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV, USA

#### Results



**Top Panel:** Mean (± SEM) diary-recorded cigarettes per day (Panel A) and salivary cotinine level (Panel B) on single (cigarettes only) vs. dual use (cigarettes and SLT) days. Asterisk = significant difference from dual use days. Bottom Panel: Mean (± SEM) diary-recorded cigarettes per day as a function of diary-recorded chews per day. The number on each bar represents the frequency of the corresponding SLT uses per day. (Panel C). Frequency of responses for reasons for initiation and continuation of SLT (Panel D). Participants were permitted to choose more than one answer for their reasons.

#### **Participant Characteristics** (N = 47)

		• М
	M (SD) or %	d
Male	93.6%	
Non-Hisp, Caucasian	97.9%	• In
Age (Years)	30.4 (8.9)	—
Cigarettes per Day	19.2 (8.8)	
Years Smoking	10.7 (6.4)	_
Expired Air CO (ppm)	25.9 (14.6)	
<sup>a</sup> FTND Score	5.9 (2.6)	_
SLT Products		
Snuff / Dip	78.7%	• T]
Chew	2.1%	co
Snus	6.4%	
Multiple	12.8%	• T}
Wintergreen / Mint	63.8%	Su
SLT Days/Week	5.8 (1.5)	
SLT Uses/Day	4.3 (2.2)	• Tł
Years SLT Use	9.0 (7.8)	m m
<sup>b</sup> SSTDS Score	9.4 (7.9)	
	1 (1.10)4	

Fagerstrom Test for Nicotine Dependence (1-10)

<sup>5</sup> Severson SLT Dependence Score (0-19)<sup>5</sup>

#### Discussion

Iean cotinine levels were significantly higher on dual vs. single use ays (p < .05), though mean CPD did not differ between days (p > .05).

previous work:<sup>3</sup>

- significantly greater mean serum cotinine level for cigarette smokers who used SLT daily (mean $\pm$ SEM = 344.2  $\pm$  40.0 ng/ml) vs. never  $(241.5 \pm 4.9 \text{ ng/ml})$ .
- no difference in mean serum cotinine level for smokers who used SLT some days  $(215.8 \pm 22.7 \text{ ng/ml})$  vs. never  $(241.5 \pm 4.9 \text{ ng/ml})$ . no differences in mean CPD as a function of SLT use (never, some days, or every day).

The most frequently reported reason for SLT initiation (60.0%) and ontinuation (66.7%) was to use in smoking-restricted areas.<sup>6</sup>

he pattern of behavior observed here is consistent with product upplementation rather than replacement.

he use of SLT specifically to circumvent indoor smoking restrictions nay have long-term health implications, as indoor smoking policies nay promote smoking reduction or cessation.<sup>7</sup>