

Real-world effectiveness of e-cigarettes when used to aid smoking cessation: a cross-sectional population study

Jamie Brown^{1,2}, Emma Beard¹, Daniel Kotz^{1,3}, Susan Michie^{2,4} & Robert West^{1,4}

Cancer Research UK Health Behaviour Research Centre, University College London, London, UK,¹ Department of Clinical, Educational and Health Psychology, University College London, London, UK,² Department of Family Medicine, CAPHRI School for Public Health and Primary Care, Maastricht University Medical Centre, Maastricht, the Netherlands³ and National Centre for Smoking Cessation and Training, London, UK⁴

ABSTRACT

Background and Aims Electronic cigarettes (e-cigarettes) are rapidly increasing in popularity. Two randomized controlled trials have suggested that e-cigarettes can aid smoking cessation, but there are many factors that could influence their real-world effectiveness. This study aimed to assess, using an established methodology, the effectiveness of e-cigarettes when used to aid smoking cessation compared with nicotine replacement therapy (NRT) bought over-the-counter and with unaided quitting in the general population. **Design and Setting** A large cross-sectional survey of a representative sample of the English population. **Participants** The study included 5863 adults who had smoked within the previous 12 months and made at least one quit attempt during that period with either an e-cigarette only ($n = 464$), NRT bought over-the-counter only ($n = 1922$) or no aid in their most recent quit attempt ($n = 3477$). **Measurements** The primary outcome was self-reported abstinence up to the time of the survey, adjusted for key potential confounders including nicotine dependence. **Findings** E-cigarette users were more likely to report abstinence than either those who used NRT bought over-the-counter [odds ratio (OR) = 2.23, 95% confidence interval (CI) = 1.70–2.93, 20.0 versus 10.1%] or no aid (OR = 1.38, 95% CI = 1.08–1.76, 20.0 versus 15.4%). The adjusted odds of non-smoking in users of e-cigarettes were 1.63 (95% CI = 1.17–2.27) times higher compared with users of NRT bought over-the-counter and 1.61 (95% CI = 1.19–2.18) times higher compared with those using no aid. **Conclusions** Among smokers who have attempted to stop without professional support, those who use e-cigarettes are more likely to report continued abstinence than those who used a licensed NRT product bought over-the-counter or no aid to cessation. This difference persists after adjusting for a range of smoker characteristics such as nicotine dependence.

Keywords Cessation, cross-sectional population survey, e-cigarettes, electronic cigarettes, nicotine replacement therapy, NRT, quitting, smoking.

Correspondence to: Jamie Brown, Health Behaviour Research Centre, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, University College London, 1-19 Torrington Place, London WC1E 6BT, UK. E-mail: jamie.brown@ucl.ac.uk

Submitted 27 February 2014; initial review completed 8 April 2014; final version accepted 12 May 2014

INTRODUCTION

Smoking is one of the leading risk factors for premature death and disability and is estimated to kill 6 million people world-wide each year [1]. The mortality and morbidity associated with cigarette smoking arises primarily from the inhalation of toxins other than nicotine contained within the smoke. Electronic cigarettes (e-cigarettes) provide nicotine via a vapour that is drawn into the mouth, upper airways and possibly lungs [2, 3].

These devices use a battery-powered heating element activated by suction or manually to heat a nicotine solution and transform it into vapour. By providing a vapour containing nicotine without tobacco combustion, e-cigarettes appear able to reduce craving and withdrawal associated with abstinence in smokers [2,4,5], while toxicity testing suggests that they are much safer to the user than ordinary cigarettes [3].

E-cigarettes are increasing rapidly in popularity: prevalence of ever-use among smokers in the United

States appears to have increased from approximately 2% in 2010 to more than 30% in 2012, and the rate of increase appears to be similar in the United Kingdom [6–9]. Although there are concerns about their wider public health impact relating to the renormalization of smoking and promotion of smoking in young people, crucially two randomized controlled trials have suggested that e-cigarettes may aid smoking cessation [10,11]. However, there are many factors that influence real-world effectiveness, including the brand of e-cigarette, the way they are used and who chooses to use them [12]. Therefore, it is a challenge to establish probable contribution to public health through randomized efficacy trials alone. Moreover, this kind of evidence will take many years to emerge, and in the meantime the products are developing rapidly and countries require evidence on effectiveness to inform decisions on how to regulate them [13–19]. As a result, there is an urgent need to be able to make an informed judgement on the real-world effectiveness of currently popular brands as chosen by the millions of smokers across the world who are using them in an attempt to stop smoking [6–9].

Several studies have attempted to examine the relationship between the use of e-cigarettes and smoking status in the real world by surveying regular e-cigarette users [20–27]. These studies—including one using a longitudinal design [27]—have found that users consistently report that e-cigarettes helped them to quit or reduce their smoking. However, because the samples were self-selected, the results have to be interpreted with caution. In more general samples the evidence is less positive. One national study of callers to a quitline, which assessed the cross-sectional association of e-cigarette use and current smoking status at a routine follow-up evaluation of the quitline service, found that e-cigarette users compared with never users were less likely to be abstinent [28]. In a longitudinal study of a general population sample, e-cigarette users at baseline were no more likely to have quit permanently at a 12-month follow-up despite having reduced their cigarette consumption [29]. However, neither of these studies adjusted for important potential confounding variables and both evaluated the association between quitting and the use of e-cigarettes for any purpose, not specifically as an aid to quitting. It is crucial to distinguish between the issue of whether use of e-cigarettes in a quit attempt improves the chances of success of that attempt from the issue of whether the use of e-cigarettes, for whatever purpose, such as aiding smoking reduction or recreation, promotes or suppresses attempts to stop. In determining the overall effect on public health both considerations are important, but they require different methodologies to address them.

An ongoing national surveillance programme (the Smoking Toolkit Study) has been tracking the use of

e-cigarettes as a reported aid to cessation among the general population in England since July 2009 [30]. This programme has established a method of assessing real-world effectiveness of aids to cessation by comparing the success rates of smokers trying to quit with different methods and adjusting statistically for a wide range of factors that could bias the results, such as nicotine dependence [31]. The method has been able to detect effects of behavioural support and prescription medications to aid cessation and found a higher rate of success when using varenicline than prescription nicotine replacement therapy (NRT) [32,33], supporting findings from randomized controlled trials and clinical observation studies [34–37]. This method cannot achieve the same level of internal validity as a randomized controlled trial, but clearly has greater external validity, so both are important in determining the potential public health contribution of devices hypothesized to aid cessation, such as e-cigarettes.

Given that smokers already have access to licensed NRT products, it is important to know whether e-cigarettes are more effective in aiding quitting. This comparison is particularly important for two reasons. First, buying a licensed NRT product from a shop, with no professional support, is the most common way of using it in England, and secondly, previous research has found that this usage was not associated with greater success rates than quitting unaided in the real-world [33]. It is therefore important to know whether e-cigarettes can increase abstinence compared to NRT bought over-the-counter.

The current study addressed the question of how effective e-cigarettes are compared with NRT bought over-the-counter and unaided quitting in the general population of smokers who are attempting to stop.

METHODS

Study design

The design was cross-sectional household surveys of representative samples of the population of adults in England conducted monthly between July 2009 and February 2014. To examine the comparative real-world effectiveness of e-cigarettes, the study compared the self-reported abstinence rates of smokers in the general population trying to stop who used e-cigarettes only (i.e. without also using face-to-face behavioural support or any medically licensed pharmacological cessation aid) with those who used NRT bought over-the-counter only or who made an unaided attempt, while adjusting for a wide range of key potential confounders. The surveys are part of the ongoing Smoking Toolkit Study, which is designed to provide information about smoking

prevalence and behaviour in England [30]. Each month a new sample of approximately 1800 adults aged ≥ 16 years are selected using a form of random location sampling, and complete a face-to-face computer-assisted survey with a trained interviewer. The full methods have been described in detail and shown to result in a sample that is nationally representative in its socio-demographic composition and proportion of smokers [30]. Approval was granted by the ethics committee of University College London, UK.

Study population

For the current study, we used aggregated data from respondents to the survey in the period from July 2009 (the first wave to track use of e-cigarettes to aid cessation) to February 2014 (the latest wave of the survey for which data were available), who smoked either cigarettes (including hand-rolled) or any other tobacco product (e.g. pipe or cigar) daily or occasionally at the time of the survey or during the preceding 12 months. We included those who had made at least one quit attempt in the preceding 12 months, assessed by asking: 'How many serious attempts to stop smoking have you made in the last 12 months? By serious attempt I mean you decided that you would try to make sure you never smoked again. Please include any attempt that you are currently making and please include any successful attempt made within the last year'. We included respondents who used either e-cigarettes or NRT bought over-the-counter during their most recent quit attempt, and an unaided group defined as those who had not used any of the following: e-cigarettes; NRT bought over-the-counter; a prescription stop-smoking medication; or face-to-face behavioural support. We excluded those who used either e-cigarettes or NRT bought over-the-counter in combination with one another, a prescription stop-smoking medication or face-to-face behavioural support.

Measurement of effect: quitting method

The use of different quitting methods were assessed for the most recent attempt by asking: 'Which, if any, of the following did you try to help you stop smoking during the most recent serious quit attempt?' and included: (i) e-cigarettes; (ii) NRT bought over-the-counter; (iii) no aid (i.e. had not used any of e-cigarettes, NRT bought over-the-counter, a prescription stop-smoking medication or face-to-face behavioural support).

Measurement of outcome: self-reported non-smoking

Our primary outcome was self-reported non-smoking up to the time of the survey. Respondents were asked: 'How long did your most recent serious quit attempt last before

you went back to smoking?'. Those responding 'I am still not smoking' were defined as non-smokers. Previous research has shown that self-reported abstinence in surveys of this kind is not subject to the kind of biases observed in clinical trials where there is social pressure to claim abstinence [38].

Measurement of potential confounders

We measured variables potentially associated with the different quitting methods and that may also have an effect on the outcome. These potential confounders were chosen a priori. The most important factor was nicotine dependence, for which we used two questions. First, time spent with urges to smoke was assessed by asking all respondents: 'How much of the time have you felt the urge to smoke in the past 24 hours? Not at all (coded 0), a little of the time (i), some of the time (ii), a lot of the time (iii), almost all of the time (iv), all of the time (v)'. Secondly, strength of urges to smoke was measured by asking: 'In general, how strong have the urges to smoke been? Slight (i), moderate (ii), strong (iii), very strong (iv), extremely strong (v)'. This question was coded '0' for smokers who responded 'not at all' to the previous question. In this population these two ratings have been found to be a better measure of dependence (i.e. more closely associated with relapse following a quit attempt) than other measures [32,33,39]. The demographic characteristics assessed were age, sex and social grade (dichotomized into two categories: ABC1, which includes managerial, professional and intermediate occupations; and C2DE, which includes small employers and own-account workers, lower supervisory and technical occupations, and semi-routine and routine occupations, never workers and long-term unemployed). We also assessed the number of quit attempts in the last year prior to the most recent attempt, time since the most recent quit attempt was initiated (either more or less than 6 months ago), whether smokers had tried to quit abruptly or gradually and the year of the survey.

Analysis

Bivariate associations between the use of different quitting methods and potentially confounding socio-demographic and smoking history variables were assessed with χ^2 tests and one-way analyses of variance (ANOVA)s for categorical and continuous variables, respectively. Significant omnibus results were investigated further by *post-hoc* Sidak-adjusted χ^2 tests and *t*-tests.

Our measure of dependence (strength of urges to smoke) assumed that the score relative to other smokers would remain the same from pre- to post-quitting [32,33]. If a method of quitting reduced the strength of

urges to smoke more than another method, this would tend to underestimate the effectiveness of that intervention because the smokers using this method would appear to be less dependent. To test for this bias, we used an analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) to examine whether the difference in strength of urges to smoke in smokers versus non-smokers depended upon the method of quitting, adjusting for the time since the quit attempt started.

In the analysis of the associations between quitting method and abstinence, we used a logistic regression model in which we regressed the outcome measure (self-reported non-smoking compared with smoking) on the effect measure (use of e-cigarettes compared with either NRT bought over-the-counter or no aid). The primary analysis was an adjusted model that included the potential confounders listed above and two interaction terms: (i) between time since last quit attempt and time spent with urges, and (ii) between time since last quit attempt and strength of urges to smoke. These interaction terms were used to reflect the fact that urges to smoke following a quit attempt are influenced by whether an individual is currently abstinent and the duration of abstinence [32,33]. In addition to the model from the primary analysis ('fully adjusted model'; model 4), we constructed a simple model including only the effect measure ('unadjusted model'; model 1), a model that included the effect measure, year of the survey and all potential confounders except for the two measures of tobacco dependence, and a model that included all variables from the previous model and the two measures of tobacco dependence but without their interaction terms ('partially adjusted models'; models 2 and 3, respectively) to assess the extent of confounding by dependence. As *post-hoc* sensitivity analyses, the models were re-examined using different potential confounders from the ones specified a priori and reported in previous publications using the same methodology [32,33]. First, the time since the initiation of the quit attempt was included using the following six categories: 'in the last week'; 'more than a week and up to a month'; 'more than 1 month and up to 2 months'; 'more than 2 months and up to 3 months'; 'more than 3 months and up to 6 months'; and 'more than 6 months and up to a year'. Secondly, an additional index of dependence—the heaviness of smoking index (HSI) [40]—was included. The HSI was assessed by asking current smokers to estimate current cigarettes per day and time to first cigarette (the two items comprising HSI) and by asking non-smokers to recall these behaviours prior to their quit attempt. Finally, in *post-hoc* subgroup analyses all models were repeated (i) among those reporting smoking one or more than one cigarette per day (CPD) to determine whether inclusion of very light smokers might have had an influence on the results; (ii) among those completing the survey between 2012–14

once e-cigarette usage had become prevalent; and (iii) in the two subsamples of respondents who had started their most recent quit attempt less or more than 6 months ago, in order to assess the interplay between long-term effectiveness and the occurrence of differential recall bias. All analyses were performed with complete cases.

RESULTS

A total of 6134 respondents reported a most recent quit attempt in the last 12 months that was either unaided ($n = 3477$) or supported by NRT bought over-the-counter ($n = 2095$), e-cigarettes ($n = 489$) or both ($n = 73$). Those using both were excluded as were those using a prescription stop-smoking medication or face-to-face behavioural support in combination with either NRT bought over-the-counter ($n = 173$) or e-cigarettes ($n = 25$). Thus, the study population consisted of 5863 smokers who had made an attempt to quit in the previous year, of whom 7.9% (464) had used e-cigarettes, 32.8% (1922) had used NRT bought over-the-counter and 59.3% (3477) had used no aid to cessation. Quitting method did not differ by sex or the number of quit attempts in the past year but was associated with age, social grade, time since the quit attempt started, CPD, smoking less than one CPD, the measures of dependence (time with and strength of urges and HSI) and whether the attempt had begun abruptly (see Table 1). The *post-hoc* comparisons showed that those who used either e-cigarettes or no aid were younger than those using NRT over-the-counter, and that those who used NRT over-the-counter or no aid were more likely to hold a lower social grade than those using e-cigarettes. As would be expected, given the recent advent of e-cigarettes, the quit attempts of e-cigarette users were less likely to have begun more than 6 months previously than those using NRT over-the-counter or no aid. Those using NRT bought over-the-counter smoked more cigarettes and scored higher than either of the other two groups on all measures of dependence. E-cigarette users smoked more cigarettes, and were more dependent by the strength of urges measure and HSI than those using no aid. Finally, those using no aid were more likely to have smoked less than one CPD and stopped abruptly than the other two groups.

Strengths of urges to smoke were higher in smokers than in non-smokers (see Table 2). However, the mean differences in strength of urges between smokers and non-smokers were similar across method of quitting: the interaction between smoking status (smokers versus non-smokers) and method of quitting in an ANCOVA of the strength of urges adjusted for the time since quit attempt started was not significant ($F_{(2, 5856)} = 1.50, P = 0.22$).

Non-smoking was reported among 20.0% (93 of 464) of those using e-cigarettes, 10.1% (194 of 1922) using

Table 1 Associations between characteristics of the sample and use of different quitting methods.

	<i>E-cigarettes</i> (<i>n</i> = 464)	<i>NRT over-the-counter</i> [§] (<i>n</i> = 1922)	<i>No aid</i> (<i>n</i> = 3477)	<i>P</i>
Mean (SD) age	39.0 (15.6) ^a	41.2 (15.3) ^{ab}	37.5 (16.2) ^b	***
% (<i>n</i>) Female	47.2 (219)	51.1 (982)	48.9 (1699)	NS
% Social grade C2DE	59.3 (275) ^{cd}	65.9 (1266) ^c	65.5 (2277) ^d	*
Mean (SD) cigarettes per day ^f	12.6 (8.0) ^{ef}	13.8 (8.5) ^{eg}	10.9 (8.1) ^{fg}	***
% (<i>n</i>) < 1 cigarettes per day ^f	0.7 (3) ^h	0.8 (15) ⁱ	2.8 (94) ^{hi}	***
% (<i>n</i>) Time since quit attempt started >26 weeks	23.7 (110) ^{jk}	36.4 (700) ^j	36.5 (1269) ^k	***
Mean (SD) quit attempts in the past year	1.6 (0.9)	1.6 (0.9)	1.5 (0.9)	NS
Mean (SD) time spent with urges to smoke (0–5)	1.9 (1.3) ^l	2.2 (1.3) ^{lm}	1.8 (1.3) ^m	***
Mean (SD) strength of urges to smoke (0–5)	2.0 (1.2) ^{no}	2.2 (1.1) ^{np}	1.8 (1.1) ^{op}	***
Mean (SD) heaviness of smoking index [†]	2.0 (1.5) ^{qr}	2.3 (1.5) ^{qs}	1.6 (1.5) ^{rs}	***
% (<i>n</i>) Abrupt attempt (no gradual cutting down first)	50.4 (234) ^t	52.5 (1010) ^u	59.0 (2051) ^{tu}	***

Different pairs of superscript letters indicate a significant difference ($P < 0.05$) between two groups after Sidak adjustment for multiple comparisons. * $P < 0.05$; *** $P < 0.001$; NS = not statistically significant ($P \geq 0.05$). §A subgroup of those using nicotine replacement therapy (NRT) over-the-counter provided information about the form of NRT ($n = 975$): 60.0% (585) used a patch, 21.0% (205) gum, 14.9% (145) an inhalator, 6.2% (60) lozenges, 1.2% (12) microtabs and 1.0% (10) nasal spray. NB: response options were not mutually exclusive and 11.1% (108) reported using more than one form. †Data were missing for 156 respondents (e-cigarettes: 22; NRT over-the-counter: 34; no aid: 100). ‡Data were missing for 172 respondents (e-cigarettes: 23; NRT over-the-counter: 36; no aid: 113). SD = standard deviation.

Table 2 Differences between smokers and non-smokers in strength of urges to smoke by method of quitting.

<i>Method of quitting</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean (SD) strength of urges to smoke in smokers</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean (SD) strength of urges to smoke in non-smokers</i>	<i>Mean difference (95% CI) in strength of urges to smoke</i>
E-cigarettes	371	2.3 (1.1)	93	0.8 (1.1)	1.4 (1.2–1.7)
NRT over-the-counter	1728	2.3 (1.0)	194	1.2 (1.3)	1.2 (1.0–1.3)
No aid	2942	2.0 (1.0)	535	0.7 (1.1)	1.3 (1.2–1.4)

NB: the mean differences are calculated from exact rather than the rounded figures presented in columns 3 and 5 of this table. The mean difference in strength of urges to smoke was not different across the methods of quitting ($F_{(2, 5856)} = 1.50$, $P = 0.22$ for the interaction term between smoking status and method of quitting adjusted for the time since the quit attempt started). SD = standard deviation; CI = confidence interval; NRT = nicotine replacement therapy.

NRT over-the-counter and 15.4% (535 of 3477) using no aid. The unadjusted analyses indicated that e-cigarette users were more likely to be abstinent than either those using NRT bought over-the-counter [odds ratio (OR) = 2.23, 95% confidence interval (CI) = 1.70–2.93] or those who used no aid (OR = 1.38, 95% CI = 1.08–1.76; see model 1, Table 3). The primary analyses revealed that the fully adjusted odds of non-smoking in users of e-cigarettes were 1.63 (95% CI = 1.17–2.27) times higher compared with users of NRT bought over-the-counter and 1.61 (95% CI = 1.19–2.18) times higher compared with those using no aid (see model 4, Table 3). The relative magnitudes of the ORs from the fully adjusted model with the other three unadjusted and partially adjusted models illustrate the confounding effects of dependence (see Table 3).

In *post-hoc* sensitivity analyses, the associations between quitting method and non-smoking were re-examined using models including different potential confounders. In a model including the more fine-grained assessment of time since the initiation of the quit attempt

than the measure presented in Table 1, the adjusted odds of non-smoking in users of e-cigarettes were 1.58 (95% CI = 1.13–2.21) times higher compared with users of NRT bought over-the-counter and 1.55 (95% CI = 1.14–2.11) times higher compared with those using no aid. In another model that included another measure of dependence (HSI; missing data 3%, $n = 172$), the adjusted odds of non-smoking in users of e-cigarettes were 1.63 (95% CI = 1.15–2.32) times higher compared with users of NRT bought over-the-counter and 1.43 (95% CI = 1.03–1.98) times higher compared with those using no aid.

In *post-hoc* subgroup analyses, very light smokers were shown to have little influence on the pattern of results: in repeated analyses among those 5595 smokers reporting smoking one or more than one CPD the adjusted odds of non-smoking in users of e-cigarettes were higher compared with users of NRT bought over-the-counter (OR = 1.59, 95% CI = 1.13–2.26) and compared with those using no aid (OR = 1.63, 95% CI = 1.18–2.24). Similarly, the exclusion of respondents

Table 3 Associations between quitting method and abstinence.

	(1) <i>e-Cigarettes</i>	(2) NRT <i>over-the-counter</i>	(3) <i>No aid</i>	(1) versus (2)		(1) versus (3)	
				Model 1: OR (95% CI)	Model 2: OR (95% CI)	Model 1: OR (95% CI)	Model 2: OR (95% CI)
Full sample (<i>n</i> = 5863)							
% (<i>n</i>) Self-reported non-smoking	20.0 (93/464)	10.1 (194/1922)	15.4 (535/3477)	2.23 (1.70–2.93)***	1.88 (1.40–2.52)***	1.38 (1.08–1.76)*	1.21 (0.92–1.58)
				1.63 (1.17–2.28)**	1.63 (1.17–2.27)**	1.62 (1.19–2.19)**	1.61 (1.19–2.18)**
Subsample: quit attempt started ≤26 weeks (<i>n</i> = 3784)							
% (<i>n</i>) Self-reported non-smoking	20.3 (72/354)	11.0 (135/1222)	14.6 (323/2208)	2.06 (1.50–2.82)***	1.80 (1.27–2.55)***	1.49 (1.12–1.98)**	1.39 (1.01–1.90)*
				1.56 (1.06–2.29)*	–	1.88 (1.32–2.68)***	–
Subsample: quit attempt started >26 weeks (<i>n</i> = 2079)							
% (<i>n</i>) Self-reported non-smoking	19.1 (21/110)	8.4 (59/700)	16.7 (212/1269)	2.56 (1.49–4.42)***	1.98 (1.11–3.53)**	1.18 (0.72–1.94)	0.91 (0.54–1.55)
				1.64 (0.83–3.24)	–	1.10 (0.59–2.06)	–

Model 1 = unadjusted; model 2 = adjusted for age, sex, social grade, time since quit attempt started, quit attempts in the past year, abrupt versus gradual quitting and year of the survey; model 3 = adjusted for the variables from model 2 and time spent with urges to smoke and strength of urges to smoke; model 4 = adjusted for the variables from model 3 and the interaction terms time since last quit attempt started × time spent with urges and time since last quit attempt started × strength of urges to smoke. NB: for the two subsample analyses, model 4 is redundant, as there is no variation in the time since quit attempt. **P* < 0.05; ***P* < 0.01; ****P* < 0.001. OR = odds ratio; CI = confidence interval; NRT = nicotine replacement therapy.

during a time when e-cigarette usage was relatively rare (2009–11) had little effect on the results: among those 2306 smokers responding between 2012–14 the adjusted odds of non-smoking in users of e-cigarettes were higher compared with users of NRT bought over-the-counter (OR = 1.59, 95% CI = 1.05–2.42) and those using no aid (OR = 1.46, 95% CI = 1.04–2.05). In a final subgroup analysis the models were re-examined among those who started their quit attempt more or less than 6 months ago: there was only evidence among those who began their attempts less than 6 months ago of higher odds of non-smoking in users of e-cigarettes compared with users of NRT bought over-the-counter or those using no aid in the fully adjusted models (see Table 3).

DISCUSSION

Respondents who reported having used an e-cigarette in their most recent quit attempt were more likely to report still not smoking than those who used NRT bought over-the-counter or nothing. This difference remained after adjusting for time since the quit attempt started, year of the survey, age, gender, social grade, abrupt versus gradual quitting, prior quit attempts in the same year and a measure of nicotine dependence.

The unadjusted results have value in that they demonstrate self-reported abstinence is associated with quit-

ting method among those who use these methods to aid cessation in real-world conditions. However, this was not a randomized controlled trial and there were differences in the characteristics of those using different methods. For example, more dependent smokers tended to be more likely to use treatment, and smokers from lower social grades were less likely to use e-cigarettes. Although the adjustments go beyond what is typically undertaken in these types of real-world studies [28,29,41–44], it was not possible to assess all factors that may have been associated with the self-selection of treatment and we cannot rule out the possibility that an unmeasured confounding factor is responsible for the finding. For example, motivation to quit is likely to have been associated positively with the use of treatment. However, previous population studies have found that the strength of this motivation is not associated with success of quit attempts once started, so it is unlikely to explain our findings [45]. There are other variables which are typically related to abstinence that may also be related to the selection of treatment; for example, those using e-cigarettes may have been less likely to share their house with other smokers, had better mental health or greater social capital of a kind not measured by social grade. These possibilities mean the associations reported here must be interpreted with caution. Nevertheless, the data provide some evidence in forming a judgement as to whether the advent of e-cigarettes in the UK market is likely to be having a

positive or negative impact on public health, in a way that a randomized controlled trial is unable to do.

The finding that smokers who had used an e-cigarette in their most recent quit attempt were more likely to report abstinence than those who used NRT bought over-the-counter, and that the latter did not appear to give better results than not using any aid [33], contributes to the debate about how far medicine regulation can go in ensuring that products used for smoking cessation are or continue to be effective in the real world [14–17]. Randomized controlled trials are clearly important in identifying potential efficacy, but real-world effectiveness will depend upon a number of other contextual variables. The current study, together with previous randomized trials, suggests that e-cigarettes may prove to be both an efficacious and effective aid to smoking cessation [10,11]. In so far that this is true, e-cigarettes may substantially improve public health because of their widespread appeal [6–9] and the huge health gains associated with stopping smoking [46]. This has to be offset against any detrimental effects that may emerge, as the long-term effects on health have not yet been established. However, the existing evidence suggests the associated harm may be minimal: the products contain low levels of carcinogens and toxicants [3] and no serious adverse event has yet been reported in any of the numerous experimental studies. Regardless, the harm will certainly be less than smoking, and thus of greater importance is the possible long-term effect of e-cigarettes on cigarette smoking prevalence beyond helping some smokers to quit. For example, it has been suggested that e-cigarettes might re-normalize smoking, promote experimentation among young people who otherwise may not have tried smoking or lead to dual use together with traditional cigarettes, and thereby deter some smokers from stopping [47]. The current data do not address these issues. However, the rise in e-cigarette prevalence in England since 2010 has coincided with continued reduction in smoking prevalence [48].

If e-cigarette use is proving more effective than NRT bought over-the-counter, a number of factors may contribute to this [49]. A greater similarity between using e-cigarettes and smoking ordinary cigarettes in terms of the sensory experience could be one factor. Greater novelty is another. It is also possible that users of e-cigarettes use their products more frequently or for a longer period than those using NRT without professional support. These are all issues that need to be examined in future research.

This study was not designed to assess the comparative effectiveness of e-cigarettes and NRT or other medications obtained on prescription or behavioural support. The evidence still favours the combination of behavioural support and prescription medication as providing the

greatest chance of success [33,34,37], which is currently offered free at the point of access by the NHS stop smoking services in the United Kingdom.

A major strength of the current study is the use of a large, representative sample of the English population. Additionally, the study benefits from having begun to track the use of e-cigarettes as an aid to cessation at a time when e-cigarettes were only an emerging research issue. The importance of adjusting for nicotine dependence in real-world studies of smoking cessation is illustrated by the difference in the ORs between the models with and without this adjustment. The optimal method of adjusting for dependence would be to assess this in all participants prior to their quit attempt. However, in a wholly cross-sectional study, we believe the particular method used to adjust for dependence, established in two previous studies, is valid [32,33]. One of the most commonly used alternative measures of dependence—HIS—relies upon the number of cigarettes smoked and time to first cigarette of the day [40]. When smokers relapse they tend to do so with reduced consumption, which can lead to a false estimation of prior dependence in cross-sectional studies. This potential confound was avoided in the primary analysis by using a validated measure involving ratings of current urges to smoke and statistical adjustment of the urges for the time since the quit attempt was initiated [39]. The value of strength of urges as a measure of dependence in cross-sectional research would be limited if different methods of stopping were linked differentially to lower or higher levels of urges in abstinent compared with relapsed smokers. For example, a method of stopping that led to a relatively higher reduction in urges could underestimate the effectiveness of that method by making it seem that those using it were less dependent. However, we have not previously found evidence in this population data set that urges to smoke in smokers versus quitters differs as a function of method [33], and it was true again in this study. Regardless, the pattern of results remained the same in both a sensitivity analysis that also included HSI and in a subgroup analysis that excluded very light smokers. It is unlikely, therefore, that differential dependence between the users of different treatments has led to a substantial over- or underestimation of the relative effectiveness of e-cigarettes in the current study. Nevertheless, future studies may be able to draw stronger inferences by including a broader array of dependence measures or assessing dependence prior to a quit attempt.

The study had several limitations. First, abstinence was not verified biochemically. In randomized trials, this would represent a serious limitation because smokers receiving an active treatment often feel social pressure to report abstinence. However, in population surveys the

social pressure and the related rate of misreporting is low and it is generally considered acceptable to rely upon self-reported data [38]. A related issue is the assessment of abstinence by asking respondents whether they were 'still not smoking'. This definition classified as abstinent those who had one or more lapses but resumed not smoking. This limitation would be serious if the rate of lapsing was associated with method of quitting, and should be assessed in future studies. By contrast, advantages of this measure were the assessment of prolonged abstinence, as advocated in the Russell Standard, and a clear relationship to the quit attempt in question. An alternative approach, with a view to survival analysis, may have been to assess the length of abstinence since quit date among all respondents, including those who had relapsed by the time of the survey. However, this assessment would have added noise and potential bias with smokers needing to recall the time of relapse and having different interpretations of their return to smoking (i.e. first lapse, daily but reduced smoking, or smoking at pre-quit level). The strength of our approach is that smokers only needed to know whether they were currently still not smoking.

Secondly, there was a reliance upon recall data. The assessment of the most recent quit attempt involved recall of the previous 12 months and introduced scope for bias. The bias associated with recall of failed quit attempts would be expected to reduce the apparent effectiveness of reported aids to cessation because quit attempts using such aids would be more salient than those that were unaided [31]. Therefore, recall bias should militate against finding a benefit of e-cigarettes compared with no aid to cessation. Consistent with this explanation, the effect size for e-cigarettes compared with no aid appeared lower in smokers who started their quit attempt more than 6 months ago than in smokers who started their quit attempt less than 6 months ago. Although the power to detect the associations in these subgroups was limited, the explanation that the lack of effect in the more distant attempts was related to differential recall bias is also supported by the absolute rate of non-smoking being higher in those making unaided attempts more than 6 compared with less than 6 months ago. Alternatively, the finding may reflect a reduced long-term effectiveness of e-cigarettes. Future longitudinal studies of e-cigarettes as aids to cessation in the general population may differentiate these explanations and would represent a valuable improvement upon the current study.

Thirdly, NRT over-the-counter and e-cigarettes both represent heterogeneous categories. In particular, there is considerable variability in nicotine vaporization between different types of e-cigarette [50, 51]. Similarly, the simple definition of using one or the other aid to support an attempt is likely to have masked variability in how heavily, frequently and how long either NRT over-the-counter or

e-cigarettes were used by different smokers [12, 52–54]. It is also possible that there were differences between the groups in their experience of unanticipated side effects. It is precisely because of all these factors—type/brand of NRT over-the-counter or e-cigarette, intensity and frequency of usage and experience of unanticipated side effects—that it is important to examine real-world effectiveness. However, it also means that we cannot make more exact statements about relative effectiveness of different products and ways in which they may be used. Given this huge variability it may be many years before one could accumulate enough real-world data to address these questions. Finally, the prevalence of e-cigarettes has been increasing in England over the study period and this may affect real-world effectiveness. Although the evidence does not yet suggest an 'early adopters' effect—the current results persisted after adjusting for the year of survey and in a subgroup analysis limiting the data to a period when e-cigarette usage had become prevalent—these findings will need to be revisited to establish whether or not the apparent advantage of e-cigarettes is sustained.

In conclusion, among smokers trying to stop without any professional support, those who use e-cigarettes are more likely to report abstinence than those who use a licensed NRT product bought over-the-counter or no aid to cessation. This difference persists after adjusting for a range of smoker characteristics such as nicotine dependence.

Declaration of interests

All authors have completed the Unified Competing Interest form at http://www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf (available on request from the corresponding author) and declare: JB's post is funded by a fellowship from the UK Society for the Study of Addiction; R.W. is funded by Cancer Research UK; Cancer Research UK, the Department of Health and Pfizer funded data collection for this study (including a Pfizer investigator initiated award), and that at the outset data collection for the Smoking Toolkit Study was also supported by GlaxoSmithKline and Johnson and Johnson; J.B., D.K. and E.B. have all received unrestricted research grants from Pfizer; R.W. undertakes research and consultancy and receives fees for speaking from companies that develop and manufacture smoking cessation medications (Pfizer, J&J, McNeil, GSK, Nabi, Novartis and Sanofi-Aventis); there are no other financial relationships with any organizations that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous 3 years, particularly electronic cigarette companies, and there are no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work. Funding was provided for the conduct of this research and preparation of the manuscript. The funders had no

final role in the study design; in the collection, analysis and interpretation of data; in the writing of the report; or in the decision to submit the paper for publication. All researchers listed as authors are independent from the funders and all final decisions about the research were taken by the investigators and were unrestricted.

Transparency declaration

J.B. affirms that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study being reported; that no important aspects of the study have been omitted; and that any discrepancies from the study as planned have been explained.

STROBE statement

All authors declare that study hypotheses arose before any inspection of the data and that all STROBE recommendations were followed.

Acknowledgements

The research team is part of the UK Centre for Tobacco and Alcohol Studies. We would like to thank Martin Jarvis, Lion Shahab and Tobias Raupach for providing valuable comments on a draft of the manuscript. The full data set, which includes individual level data, and statistical code are all available from the corresponding author at jamie.brown@ucl.ac.uk. Participants gave informed consent for anonymized data sharing.

References

- Lim S. S., Vos T., Flaxman A. D., Danaei G., Shibuya K., Adair-Rohani H. *et al.* A comparative risk assessment of burden of disease and injury attributable to 67 risk factors and risk factor clusters in 21 regions, 1990–2010: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2010. *Lancet* 2012; **380**: 2224–60.
- Bullen C., McRobbie H., Thornley S., Glover M., Lin R., Laugesen M. Effect of an electronic nicotine delivery device (e cigarette) on desire to smoke and withdrawal, user preferences and nicotine delivery: randomised cross-over trial. *Tob Control* 2010; **19**: 98–103.
- Goniewicz M. L., Knysak J., Gawron M., Kosmider L., Sobczak A., Kurek J. *et al.* Levels of selected carcinogens and toxicants in vapour from electronic cigarettes. *Tob Control* 2014; **23**: 133–9.
- Vansickel A. R., Cobb C. O., Weaver M. F., Eissenberg T. E. A clinical laboratory model for evaluating the acute effects of electronic 'cigarettes': nicotine delivery profile and cardiovascular and subjective effects. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev* 2010; **19**: 1945–53.
- Dawkins L., Turner J., Hasna S., Soar K. The electronic-cigarette: effects on desire to smoke, withdrawal symptoms and cognition. *Addict Behav* 2012; **37**: 970–3.
- Pearson J. L., Richardson A., Niaura R. S., Vallone D. M., Abrams D. B. e-Cigarette awareness, use, and harm perceptions in US adults. *Am J Public Health* 2012; **102**: 1758–66.
- Zhu S.-H., Gamst A., Lee M., Cummins S., Yin L., Zoref L. The use and perception of electronic cigarettes and snus among the U.S. population. *PLOS ONE* 2013; **8**: e79332.
- Dockrell M., Morison R., Bauld L., McNeill A. E-cigarettes: prevalence and attitudes in Great Britain. *Nicotine Tob Res* 2013; **15**: 1737–44.
- Brown J., West R., Beard E., Michie S., Shahab L., McNeill A. Prevalence and characteristics of e-cigarette users in Great Britain: findings from a general population survey of smokers. *Addict Behav* 2014; **39**: 1120–25.
- Bullen C., Howe C., Laugesen M., McRobbie H., Parag V., Williman J. *et al.* Electronic cigarettes for smoking cessation: a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2013; **382**: 1629–37.
- Caponnetto P., Campagna D., Cibella F., Morjaria J. B., Caruso M., Russo C. *et al.* Efficiency and Safety of an eElectronic cigAreTte (ECLAT) as tobacco cigarettes substitute: a prospective 12-month randomized control design study. *PLOS ONE* 2013; **8**: e66317.
- Vansickel A. R., Eissenberg T. Electronic cigarettes: effective nicotine delivery after acute administration. *Nicotine Tob Res* 2013; **15**: 267–70.
- Lancet. E-cigarettes: a moral quandary. *Lancet* 2013; **382**: 914.
- Cobb N. K., Abrams D. B. E-cigarette or drug-delivery device? Regulating novel nicotine products. *N Engl J Med* 2011; **365**: 193–5.
- Cobb N. K., Cobb C. O. Regulatory challenges for refined nicotine products. *Lancet Respir Med* 2013; **1**: 431–3.
- Hajek P., Foulds J., Houezec J. L., Sweanor D., Yach D. Should e-cigarettes be regulated as a medicinal device? *Lancet Respir Med* 2013; **1**: 429–31.
- Etter J.-F. Should electronic cigarettes be as freely available as tobacco? Yes. *BMJ (Clinical Research edn)* 2013; **346**: 3845–6.
- Borland R. Electronic cigarettes as a method of tobacco control. *BMJ* 2011; **343**: 6269–70.
- Flouris A. D., Oikonomou D. N. Electronic cigarettes: miracle or menace? *BMJ* 2010; **340**: 311.
- Etter J.-F. Electronic cigarettes: a survey of users. *BMC Public Health* 2010; **10**: 231.
- Etter J.-F. B. C. Electronic cigarette: users profile, utilization, satisfaction and perceived efficacy. *Addiction* 2011; **106**: 2017–28.
- Foulds J., Veldheer S., Berg A. Electronic cigarettes (e-cigs): views of aficionados and clinical/public health perspectives. *Int J Clin Pract* 2011; **65**: 1037–42.
- Siegel M. B., Tanwar K. L., Wood K. S. Electronic cigarettes as a smoking-cessation tool: results from an online survey. *Am J Prev Med* 2011; **40**: 472–5.
- Dawkins L., Turner J., Roberts A., Soar K. 'Vaping' profiles and preferences: an online survey of electronic cigarette users. *Addiction* 2013; **108**: 1115–25.
- Goniewicz M. L., Lingas E. O., Hajek P. Patterns of electronic cigarette use and user beliefs about their safety and benefits: an internet survey. *Drug Alcohol Rev* 2013; **32**: 133–40.
- Farsalinos K. E., Romagna G., Tsiapras D., Kyrzopoulos S., Spyrou A., Voudris V. Impact of flavour variability on electronic cigarette use experience: an internet survey. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2013; **10**: 7272–82.

27. Etter J. F., Bullen C. A longitudinal study of electronic cigarette users. *Addict Behav* 2014; **39**: 491–4.
28. Vickerman K. A., Carpenter K. M., Altman T., Nash C. M., Zbikowski S. M. Use of electronic cigarettes among state tobacco cessation quitline callers. *Nicotine Tob Res* 2013; **15**: 1787–91.
29. Adkison S. E., O'Connor R. J., Bansal-Travers M., Hyland A., Borland R., Yong H.-H. *et al.* Electronic nicotine delivery systems: international tobacco control Four-Country Survey. *Am J Prev Med* 2013; **44**: 207–15.
30. Fidler J. A., Shahab L., West O., Jarvis M. J., McEwen A., Stapleton J. A. *et al.* 'The smoking toolkit study': a national study of smoking and smoking cessation in England. *BMC Public Health* 2011; **11**: 479.
31. Borland R., Partos T. R., Cummings K. M. Systematic biases in cross-sectional community studies may underestimate the effectiveness of stop-smoking medications. *Nicotine Tob Res* 2012; **14**: 1483–7.
32. Kotz D., Brown J., West R. Effectiveness of varenicline versus nicotine replacement therapy for smoking cessation with minimal professional support: evidence from an English population study. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)* 2014; **231**: 37–42.
33. Kotz D., Brown J., West R. 'Real-world' effectiveness of smoking cessation treatments: a population study. *Addiction* 2014; **109**: 491–9.
34. Brose L. S., West R., McDermott M. S., Fidler J. A., Croghan E., McEwen A. What makes for an effective stop-smoking service? *Thorax* 2011; **66**: 924–6.
35. Brose L. S., West R., Stapleton J. A. Comparison of the effectiveness of varenicline and combination nicotine replacement therapy for smoking cessation in clinical practice. *Mayo Clin Proc* 2013; **88**: 226–33.
36. Cahill K., Stead L. F., Lancaster T. Nicotine receptor partial agonists for smoking cessation. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2012; **4**: CD006103.
37. Stead L. F., Lancaster T. Combined pharmacotherapy and behavioural interventions for smoking cessation. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2012; **10**: CD008286.
38. Wong S. L., Shields M., Leatherdale S., Malaisson E., Hammond D. Assessment of validity of self-reported smoking status. *Health Rep* 2012; **23**: 47–53.
39. Fidler J., Shahab L., West R. Strength of urges to smoke as a measure of severity of cigarette dependence: comparison with the Fagerström Test for Nicotine Dependence and its components. *Addiction* 2010; **106**: 631–8.
40. Fagerström K., Furberg H. A comparison of the Fagerström Test for Nicotine Dependence and smoking prevalence across countries. *Addiction* 2008; **103**: 841–5.
41. Pierce J. P., Gilpin E. A. Impact of over-the-counter sales on effectiveness of pharmaceutical aids for smoking cessation. *JAMA* 2002; **288**: 1260–4.
42. Lee C-w K. J. Factors associated with successful smoking cessation in the United States, 2000. *Am J Public Health* 2007; **97**: 1503–9.
43. Hagimoto A., Nakamura M., Morita T., Masui S., Oshima A. Smoking cessation patterns and predictors of quitting smoking among the Japanese general population: a 1-year follow-up study. *Addiction* 2010; **105**: 164–73.
44. Yang J., Hammond D., Driezen P., O'Connor R. J., Li Q., Yong H. H. *et al.* The use of cessation assistance among smokers from China: findings from the ITC China Survey. *BMC Public Health* 2011; **11**: 75.
45. Vangeli E., Stapleton J., Smit E. S., Borland R., West R. Predictors of attempts to stop smoking and their success in adult general population samples: a systematic review. *Addiction* 2011; **106**: 2110–21.
46. West R. The clinical significance of 'small' effects of smoking cessation treatments. *Addiction* 2007; **102**: 506–9.
47. Chapman S. Should electronic cigarettes be as freely available as tobacco cigarettes? No. *BMJ* 2013; **346**: 3840–1.
48. Brown J., West R. Smoking prevalence in England is below 20% for the first time in 80 years. *BMJ* 2014; **348**: 1378.
49. Wagener T. L., Siegel M., Borrelli B. Electronic cigarettes: achieving a balanced perspective. *Addiction* 2012; **107**: 1545–8.
50. Goniewicz M. L., Kuma T., Gawron M., Knysak J., Kosmider L. Nicotine levels in electronic cigarettes. *Nicotine Tob Res* 2013; **15**: 158–66.
51. Goniewicz M. L., Hajek P., McRobbie H. Nicotine content of electronic cigarettes, its release in vapour and its consistency across batches: regulatory implications. *Addiction* 2014; **109**: 500–7.
52. Etter J-F B. C. Saliva cotinine levels in users of electronic cigarettes. *Eur Respir J* 2011; **38**: 1219–20.
53. Bansal M. A., Cummings K. M., Hyland A., Giovino G. A. Stop-smoking medications: who uses them, who misuses them, and who is misinformed about them? *Nicotine Tob Res* 2004; **6**: S303–S10.
54. Etter J-F. Levels of saliva cotinine in electronic cigarette users. *Addiction* 2014; **109**: 825–9.