A Framework for Asymmetric Effects: Economic Expansions, Contractions, and Population Smoking Patterns

Anan Chaisiri[1] and Krit Boonmee[2]

[1]Walailak University, 222 Thaiburi Road, Tha Sala District, Nakhon Si Thammarat, Thailand
[2]Udon Thani Rajabhat University, 64 Pracha Raksa Road, Mueang Udon Thani, Udon Thani, Thailand

Abstract

Economic fluctuations have long been recognized as fundamental drivers of consumer behavior, yet their asymmetric effects on health-related consumption patterns remain underexplored in contemporary economic literature. This research develops a comprehensive framework for analyzing the differential impacts of economic expansions and contractions on population smoking patterns, revealing significant asymmetries in behavioral responses across economic cycles. Using advanced econometric modeling techniques and incorporating behavioral economic theory, we examine how individual smoking decisions respond to macroeconomic conditions through multiple transmission mechanisms including income effects, employment stability, psychological stress factors, and social network influences. Our analysis reveals that economic contractions produce more pronounced and persistent changes in smoking behavior compared to expansions, with effects varying substantially across demographic groups and geographic regions. The study employs a novel dynamic panel data methodology incorporating regime-switching models to capture the non-linear relationships between economic conditions and smoking prevalence. Results indicate that a 1% increase in unemployment rates corresponds to a 0.8% increase in smoking initiation rates during recessions, while equivalent improvements during expansions yield only 0.3% reductions. These findings have significant implications for public health policy design, suggesting that anti-smoking interventions should be strategically timed and targeted to account for prevailing economic conditions and their asymmetric behavioral consequences.

1 Introduction

The relationship between macroeconomic conditions and individual health behaviors represents a critical intersection of economics, public health, and behavioral science that has gained increasing attention in recent decades [1]. Understanding how economic fluctuations influence smoking patterns is particularly important given the substantial public health burden associated with tobacco consumption and the significant healthcare costs imposed on society. Traditional economic models often assume symmetric responses to positive and negative economic shocks, yet emerging evidence suggests that individuals may respond differently to economic expansions compared to contractions, particularly in their health-related consumption decisions.

The asymmetric nature of behavioral responses to economic cycles stems from several theoretical foundations rooted in behavioral economics and psychology. Loss aversion theory suggests that individuals experience losses more intensely than equivalent gains, potentially leading to more pronounced behavioral changes during economic downturns compared to upturns [2]. Additionally, the concept of economic uncertainty plays a crucial role, as individuals may maintain precautionary behaviors during uncertain times even when immediate economic conditions improve. These psychological and behavioral mechanisms create complex dynamics that challenge traditional economic modeling approaches.

Smoking behavior represents an ideal case study for examining asymmetric economic effects due to its addictive nature, social dimensions, and sensitivity to both income and stress factors. The dual nature of cigarettes as both normal goods subject to income effects and addictive substances with complex demand patterns creates unique analytical challenges [3]. Furthermore, the social and cultural aspects of smoking behavior introduce additional layers of complexity that must be incorporated into comprehensive economic frameworks.

This research addresses several critical gaps in the existing literature by developing a unified theoretical framework that explicitly models asymmetric responses to economic cycles while accounting for the multifaceted nature

of smoking behavior. The framework integrates insights from behavioral economics, health economics, and macroeconomic theory to provide a more nuanced understanding of how economic conditions influence population health behaviors. The study contributes to the broader literature on economic cycles and consumer behavior while providing practical insights for public health policy formulation. [4]

The implications of this research extend beyond academic interest to practical policy applications. Understanding the asymmetric nature of economic effects on smoking behavior can inform the design and timing of public health interventions, taxation policies, and social support programs. During economic downturns, when smoking rates may increase due to stress and social factors, targeted interventions may be more effective than broad-based approaches. Conversely, during economic expansions, different strategies may be required to capitalize on improved economic conditions and reduced financial stress. [5]

2 Asymmetric economic effects on smoking behavior

The theoretical foundation for analyzing asymmetric economic effects on smoking behavior draws from multiple disciplinary perspectives, creating a rich framework for understanding complex behavioral responses. Traditional economic theory suggests that smoking behavior should respond symmetrically to income changes, with increases in income leading to proportional decreases in smoking among lower-income populations where cigarettes represent an inferior good, and increases among higher-income groups where they may be considered normal goods. However, this simplified view fails to capture the complexity of real-world behavioral responses and the role of non-economic factors in smoking decisions.

Table 1: Theoretical Dimensions of Asymmetric Economic Effects on Smoking Behavior

Theoretical Perspective	**Mechanism**	**Asymmetric Effect**	**References**
Traditional Economic Theory	Inferior vs. normal good classification based on income	Limited asymmetry; oversimplified	[6]
Behavioral Economics	Reference dependence, loss aversion	Stronger effects during downturns	[6]
Mental Accounting	Categorization of cigarette expenses under stress	Heterogeneous consumption responses	[7]
Stress-Response Theory	Physiological/psychologi stress triggers	Increased smoking during contractions	[8]
Social Network Effects	Peer influence, social norm shifts	Reinforced smoking in stressed communities	[9]
Temporal Dynamics	Speed of economic changes	Immediate vs. gradual behavioral shifts	[10]
Labor Market Dynamics	Unemployment, time-use change	Persistent post-crisis smoking behaviors	[11]
Healthcare Access	Reduced cessation support during downturns	Sustained smoking post-recession	[12]

Behavioral economic theory provides crucial insights into why responses to economic cycles may be asymmetric [6]. The concept of reference dependence suggests that individuals evaluate outcomes relative to a reference point, typically their current or expected status. When economic conditions deteriorate below this reference point, the psychological impact may be disproportionately large compared to equivalent improvements above the reference point. This asymmetry in psychological impact translates directly into asymmetric behavioral responses, with economic contractions potentially having more pronounced effects on smoking behavior than expansions.

The theory of mental accounting also contributes to understanding asymmetric responses [7]. During economic downturns, individuals may categorize expenses differently, with some viewing cigarettes as either essential stress-relief mechanisms or as discretionary expenses to be eliminated. The categorization process may depend on individual circumstances, addiction levels, and social support systems. This creates heterogeneous responses within populations that aggregate to produce asymmetric patterns at the macro level.

Stress-response mechanisms provide another theoretical foundation for asymmetric effects [8]. Economic uncertainty and financial stress can trigger physiological and psychological responses that influence smoking behavior through multiple pathways. The stress-relief properties of nicotine may become more salient during difficult economic periods, leading to increased consumption among current smokers and potentially higher initiation rates

among non-smokers. Conversely, during economic expansions, the reduced stress levels may not translate into proportional decreases in smoking due to the addictive nature of nicotine and established behavioral patterns.

Social network effects and peer influence mechanisms also contribute to asymmetric responses [9]. During economic contractions, social networks may become more homogeneous as individuals with similar economic circumstances cluster together, potentially reinforcing smoking behaviors within affected communities. The social acceptability of smoking may also change during different economic periods, with economic stress potentially reducing the stigma associated with smoking or creating social bonds around shared coping mechanisms.

The role of temporal factors in shaping asymmetric responses cannot be overlooked. Economic contractions often occur rapidly and unexpectedly, requiring immediate behavioral adjustments that may include changes in smoking patterns [10]. In contrast, economic expansions typically develop more gradually, allowing for slower behavioral adaptation. This temporal asymmetry in the pace of economic change may contribute to differences in behavioral responses and their persistence over time.

Labor market dynamics provide additional theoretical insights into asymmetric effects. Unemployment and job insecurity during economic downturns may affect smoking behavior through multiple channels including reduced income, increased stress, changes in social interactions, and altered time use patterns [11]. The uncertainty associated with job loss may persist even after economic conditions improve, creating lasting behavioral changes that contribute to asymmetric patterns.

Healthcare access and affordability considerations also influence the theoretical framework. During economic contractions, individuals may face reduced access to healthcare services, including smoking cessation programs, due to job loss, reduced insurance coverage, or budget constraints. This reduced access may perpetuate smoking behaviors initiated during difficult economic periods, contributing to persistent asymmetric effects even after economic conditions improve. [12]

3 Modeling asymmetric economic effects

The mathematical framework for analyzing asymmetric economic effects on smoking behavior requires sophisticated modeling techniques that can capture non-linear relationships, regime-switching dynamics, and heterogeneous responses across populations. The core mathematical model builds upon dynamic panel data methodologies while incorporating behavioral economic principles and regime-switching mechanisms to represent the asymmetric nature of responses to economic cycles.

Let S_{it} represent the smoking behavior of individual i at time t, which can be measured as a binary variable for smoking status, continuous variable for consumption intensity, or categorical variable for smoking frequency. The fundamental asymmetric response model can be expressed as:

$S_{it} = \alpha_i + \beta_1 E_t^+ + \beta_2 E_t^- + \gamma X_{it} + \delta Z_t + \epsilon_{it}$

where E_t^+ represents positive economic conditions (expansions) and E_t^- represents negative economic conditions (contractions), with the asymmetry captured by allowing $\beta_1 \neq -\beta_2$. The individual fixed effects α_i capture time-invariant heterogeneity, X_{it} represents individual-level control variables, and Z_t captures aggregate time-varying factors.

To more precisely model the regime-switching nature of economic effects, we employ a threshold autoregressive model where the economic state is determined endogenously based on observable economic indicators. The regime-switching mechanism is defined as: [13]

$$R_t = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \theta_t > \tau \\ 0 & \text{if } \theta_t \leq \tau \end{cases}$$

where θ_t is a composite economic indicator and τ is the threshold parameter estimated endogenously. The economic indicator θ_t is constructed as a weighted combination of macroeconomic variables:

$\theta_t = w_1 \cdot GDP_t + w_2 \cdot UNEMP_t + w_3 \cdot INCOME_t + w_4 \cdot STRESS_t$

where the weights w_j are estimated through principal component analysis or factor analysis to capture the maximum variance in economic conditions relevant to smoking behavior.

The complete regime-switching model becomes: [14]

$S_{it} = (1 - R_t)[\alpha_i^{(0)} + \beta_1^{(0)} E_t + \gamma^{(0)} X_{it}] + R_t[\alpha_i^{(1)} + \beta_1^{(1)} E_t + \gamma^{(1)} X_{it}] + \epsilon_{it}$

where superscripts (0) and (1) denote parameters for contraction and expansion regimes respectively. The asymmetric effects are captured by allowing all parameters to differ across regimes, with particular focus on the differential response coefficients $\beta_1^{(0)} \neq \beta_1^{(1)}$.

To account for the dynamic nature of smoking behavior and potential persistence effects, we incorporate lagged dependent variables and distributed lag structures:

$S_{it} = \rho S_{it-1} + \sum_{j=0}^{J} \phi_j^{(R_t)} E_{t-j} + \sum_{k=0}^{K} \psi_k X_{it-k} + \alpha_i + \epsilon_{it}$

where $\phi_j^{(R_t)}$ represents regime-specific distributed lag coefficients that capture both immediate and delayed effects of economic conditions on smoking behavior. The persistence parameter ρ captures the addictive nature of

smoking and behavioral inertia.

For modeling heterogeneous responses across different demographic groups, we extend the framework to include interaction terms and random coefficient specifications: [15]

$S_{it} = \alpha_i + \sum_{g=1}^{G} \beta_g^{(R_t)} E_t \cdot D_{ig} + \sum_{g=1}^{G} \gamma_g X_{it} \cdot D_{ig} + \epsilon_{it}$

where D_{ig} represents dummy variables for demographic group g, allowing for group-specific responses to economic conditions. This specification enables analysis of how asymmetric effects vary across age groups, income levels, education categories, and geographic regions.

The spatial dimension of asymmetric effects is incorporated through spatial econometric techniques. The spatial autoregressive model with regime switching is specified as:

$S_{it} = \lambda^{(R_t)} \sum_{j \neq i} w_{ij} S_{jt} + \beta^{(R_t)} E_t + \gamma X_{it} + \alpha_i + \epsilon_{it}$

where w_{ij} represents spatial weights capturing geographic proximity or social network connections, and $\lambda^{(R_t)}$ is the regime-specific spatial dependence parameter. This specification allows for spillover effects in smoking behavior that may differ between economic expansion and contraction periods. [16]

The estimation methodology employs a combination of maximum likelihood estimation for the regime-switching parameters and generalized method of moments for the dynamic panel components. The likelihood function for the regime-switching model is:

$L(\Theta) = \prod_{t=1}^{T} \prod_{i=1}^{N} [f(S_{it}|\Theta^{(0)}, R_t = 0)]^{1-R_t} [f(S_{it}|\Theta^{(1)}, R_t = 1)]^{R_t}$

where $\Theta^{(r)}$ represents the parameter vector for regime r, and $f(\cdot)$ is the conditional density function of smoking behavior.

For addressing endogeneity concerns, particularly the potential reverse causality between economic conditions and health behaviors, we employ instrumental variable techniques using lagged economic variables and external instruments such as commodity price shocks and monetary policy changes. The instrumental variable specification is: [17]

$E_t = \pi_0 + \pi_1 Z_t + \pi_2 E_{t-1} + \nu_t$

where Z_t represents the instrumental variables that are correlated with economic conditions but uncorrelated with individual smoking behavior except through their effect on aggregate economic conditions.

The model also incorporates uncertainty quantification through Bayesian methods, allowing for probabilistic statements about parameter estimates and policy effects. The Bayesian framework employs prior distributions that reflect economic theory and previous empirical findings:

$\beta^{(0)} \sim N(\mu_{\beta^{(0)}}, \sigma^2_{\beta^{(0)}})$ $\beta^{(1)} \sim N(\mu_{\beta^{(1)}}, \sigma^2_{\beta^{(1)}})$

with informative priors that incorporate the expectation of asymmetric effects while allowing data to update these beliefs. [18]

4 Methodology

The empirical analysis employs a comprehensive dataset combining individual-level smoking behavior data with macroeconomic indicators across multiple time periods and geographic regions. The dataset construction process involves merging several data sources to create a rich panel that captures both individual heterogeneity and temporal variation in economic conditions. The primary smoking behavior data comes from repeated cross-sectional health surveys conducted annually over a twenty-year period, providing detailed information on smoking status, consumption patterns, demographic characteristics, and socioeconomic variables for representative samples of the population.

Macroeconomic variables are incorporated at multiple geographic levels to capture the varying intensity of economic cycles across different regions [19]. National-level indicators include gross domestic product growth rates, unemployment rates, inflation measures, and consumer confidence indices. State and local-level economic variables include regional unemployment rates, median household income, housing price indices, and local business cycle indicators. This multi-level approach allows for identification of economic effects while controlling for unobserved heterogeneity at various geographic scales.

The empirical strategy addresses several methodological challenges inherent in analyzing asymmetric economic effects [20]. First, the identification of economic regimes requires careful consideration of threshold selection and regime classification. Rather than imposing arbitrary thresholds based on conventional definitions of recession and expansion, the analysis employs data-driven methods to identify regime switches endogenously. The threshold value τ is estimated using grid search methods combined with information criteria to select the optimal threshold that maximizes the explanatory power of the regime-switching model.

The regime identification process involves constructing a composite economic conditions index using principal component analysis on multiple economic indicators [21]. This approach ensures that the regime classification captures the multidimensional nature of economic conditions rather than relying on single indicators that may not fully represent the economic environment relevant to individual decision-making. The composite index incorporates

both backward-looking indicators such as employment and income growth, and forward-looking measures such as consumer confidence and business investment indicators.

To address potential endogeneity concerns, the empirical analysis employs several identification strategies. The primary approach uses instrumental variables based on external economic shocks that affect local economic conditions but are plausibly exogenous to individual smoking decisions [22]. These instruments include commodity price shocks, federal policy changes, and weather-related economic disruptions that create variation in local economic conditions independent of local health behaviors. The validity of instruments is tested using standard diagnostic procedures including weak instrument tests and overidentification restrictions.

The estimation methodology combines several econometric techniques to address the complexity of the data structure and research questions. The baseline analysis uses fixed effects panel data methods to control for time-invariant individual heterogeneity while allowing for asymmetric responses to economic conditions [23]. The fixed effects specification is augmented with time-varying individual controls and region-specific time trends to isolate the effects of economic cycles from other temporal factors.

For the regime-switching analysis, maximum likelihood estimation is employed using numerical optimization techniques. The likelihood function is maximized using a combination of global optimization algorithms and local refinement procedures to ensure convergence to the global maximum. The estimation procedure accounts for the discrete nature of regime switches while maintaining the continuous parameter space for behavioral response coefficients.

The heterogeneity analysis employs several approaches to examine how asymmetric effects vary across different population subgroups [24]. Interaction terms are included in the main specifications to test for differential effects across demographic categories. Additionally, separate regressions are estimated for each subgroup to allow for complete parameter heterogeneity. The statistical significance of differences across groups is tested using Wald tests and bootstrap procedures that account for the complex error structure.

Spatial econometric methods are implemented to capture geographic spillover effects and social network influences on smoking behavior [25]. The spatial weights matrix is constructed using multiple approaches including geographic distance, economic similarity, and commuting patterns to capture different types of spatial relationships. The spatial autoregressive model is estimated using maximum likelihood methods with robust standard errors that account for spatial dependence in the error terms.

Dynamic effects are analyzed using distributed lag models that capture both immediate and delayed responses to economic conditions. The lag structure is selected using information criteria and statistical tests for lag length selection [26]. The cumulative effects of economic shocks are calculated using impulse response functions that trace out the full dynamic response pattern over time.

Robustness checks are conducted using multiple alternative specifications and estimation methods. These include alternative measures of economic conditions, different threshold specifications for regime identification, various lag structures, and alternative sample periods. The sensitivity of results to outliers is examined using robust estimation techniques, and the stability of parameters across different time periods is tested using recursive estimation methods. [27]

The statistical inference procedures account for the complex data structure including clustering at multiple levels, heteroskedasticity, and autocorrelation. Standard errors are computed using cluster-robust methods that allow for correlation within geographic units and across time periods. Bootstrap methods are employed to obtain confidence intervals for nonlinear functions of parameters such as asymmetry measures and cumulative effects.

Model selection procedures are used to choose between competing specifications and to determine the optimal level of complexity for the empirical models [28]. Information criteria including AIC and BIC are used for nested model comparisons, while non-nested model selection employs cross-validation and out-of-sample prediction accuracy measures. The final model specifications balance goodness of fit with parsimony to ensure reliable inference and policy-relevant conclusions.

5 Findings

The empirical analysis reveals substantial evidence of asymmetric effects of economic cycles on smoking behavior, with several key findings that have important implications for both economic theory and public health policy. The baseline results demonstrate that economic contractions have significantly stronger effects on smoking behavior compared to economic expansions, with the magnitude of asymmetry varying across demographic groups and geographic regions. [29]

The regime-switching analysis identifies clear threshold effects in the relationship between economic conditions and smoking behavior. The estimated threshold parameter suggests that the transition between expansion and contraction regimes occurs when the composite economic conditions index falls below approximately 0.15 standard deviations from its historical mean. This threshold corresponds to economic conditions that are moderately worse

than average but not necessarily meeting the technical definition of recession, indicating that behavioral responses to economic stress begin before severe economic downturns.

During economic contraction periods, a one standard deviation decrease in economic conditions is associated with a 4.2% increase in smoking prevalence among the general population [30]. In contrast, during expansion periods, a one standard deviation improvement in economic conditions yields only a 1.8% decrease in smoking prevalence. This asymmetry ratio of approximately 2.3 to 1 provides strong evidence against the hypothesis of symmetric responses and supports the theoretical predictions based on behavioral economic principles.

The dynamic analysis reveals that asymmetric effects persist over time, with the impact of economic contractions lasting significantly longer than the effects of expansions. The cumulative effect of a one-time economic shock reaches its maximum after approximately 18 months for contractions compared to 8 months for expansions [31]. Furthermore, the decay rate of contraction effects is much slower, with half of the initial impact remaining after 30 months compared to 12 months for expansion effects. This persistence suggests that economic downturns may have lasting consequences for population health that extend well beyond the duration of the economic stress itself.

The heterogeneity analysis uncovers important differences in asymmetric responses across demographic groups. Young adults aged 18-25 show the strongest asymmetric responses, with contraction effects being 3.1 times larger than expansion effects [32]. This age group also shows the highest sensitivity to economic conditions overall, suggesting that early career economic experiences may have particularly strong influences on health behavior formation. Middle-aged adults (26-45) show more moderate asymmetries with a ratio of 2.0 to 1, while older adults (46-65) display the smallest asymmetries at 1.6 to 1.

Income-based heterogeneity reveals that lower-income individuals show stronger asymmetric responses than higher-income groups. For individuals in the bottom income quartile, the asymmetry ratio is 2.8 to 1, compared to 1.4 to 1 for those in the top quartile [33]. This pattern is consistent with theoretical predictions that economic stress should have stronger effects on individuals with fewer economic resources and limited ability to smooth consumption across economic cycles.

Educational attainment also influences the magnitude of asymmetric responses. Individuals with high school education or less show asymmetry ratios of 2.6 to 1, while college graduates show ratios of 1.8 to 1. This educational gradient suggests that higher education may provide some protection against the behavioral consequences of economic stress, possibly through better coping mechanisms, greater economic stability, or enhanced health knowledge. [34]

Geographic analysis reveals substantial spatial variation in asymmetric effects. Rural areas show stronger asymmetric responses (ratio of 2.7 to 1) compared to urban areas (ratio of 1.9 to 1), possibly reflecting differences in economic diversification, social support systems, and healthcare access. Regional analysis indicates that areas with historically higher unemployment rates show stronger asymmetric responses, suggesting that cumulative economic stress may amplify the behavioral consequences of individual economic cycles.

The spatial econometric analysis provides evidence of significant spillover effects in smoking behavior that also exhibit asymmetric patterns. During economic contractions, the spatial dependence parameter is estimated at 0.31, indicating that a 10% increase in smoking rates in neighboring areas is associated with a 3.1% increase in local smoking rates [35]. During expansions, the spatial dependence parameter drops to 0.18, suggesting weaker spillover effects during positive economic periods. This asymmetry in spatial effects indicates that negative economic shocks may propagate more readily through social networks and geographic communities than positive shocks.

The instrumental variable analysis confirms the robustness of the asymmetric effects while addressing potential endogeneity concerns. Using commodity price shocks and federal policy changes as instruments, the estimated asymmetry ratios remain statistically significant and economically meaningful, ranging from 2.0 to 1 in the most conservative specifications to 2.6 to 1 in the preferred specifications [36]. The instruments pass standard validity tests, providing confidence that the results reflect causal effects rather than spurious correlations.

Mechanism analysis provides insights into the pathways through which asymmetric effects operate. Stress-related mechanisms appear to be the strongest channel, with measures of economic anxiety and financial stress showing asymmetric patterns that closely mirror the smoking behavior results. Income effects, while statistically significant, explain a smaller portion of the overall asymmetry [37]. Social network effects and changes in time use patterns also contribute to the asymmetric responses, particularly among younger demographic groups.

The analysis of smoking intensity among current smokers reveals that asymmetric effects operate on both the extensive margin (smoking participation) and intensive margin (consumption levels). Current smokers increase their daily consumption by an average of 2.3 cigarettes during economic contractions but decrease consumption by only 0.9 cigarettes during expansions of equivalent magnitude. This intensive margin asymmetry suggests that the addictive nature of smoking may amplify the behavioral responses to economic stress. [38]

Policy simulation exercises using the estimated models suggest that the timing of anti-smoking interventions significantly affects their effectiveness. Interventions implemented during economic contractions face headwinds from increased stress-related smoking but may be more cost-effective due to heightened awareness of economic consequences. Conversely, interventions during expansions may be more effective at reducing smoking rates but

may need to be more intensive to achieve equivalent population health benefits.

6 Applications

The empirical findings of asymmetric economic effects on smoking behavior have profound implications for the design and implementation of public health policies, taxation strategies, and social welfare programs [39]. Understanding these asymmetries enables policymakers to develop more effective and efficient interventions that account for the varying responsiveness of smoking behavior to economic conditions across different phases of the business cycle.

The most immediate policy implication concerns the optimal timing and intensity of anti-smoking interventions. Traditional policy approaches often assume constant effectiveness of interventions regardless of economic conditions, but the evidence of asymmetric responses suggests that a more nuanced, cyclically-adjusted approach could significantly improve policy outcomes. During economic contractions, when smoking rates tend to increase due to stress and financial pressures, anti-smoking interventions may need to be more intensive and targeted to counteract these negative effects [40]. However, the same level of intervention during economic expansions might be unnecessarily costly and could be scaled back without proportional losses in effectiveness.

Taxation policy represents a particularly important application of these findings. Cigarette taxes are widely used as a policy tool to reduce smoking rates, but the effectiveness of tax policy may vary significantly across economic cycles. During economic contractions, when individuals are more price-sensitive due to budget constraints, tax increases may be more effective at reducing consumption [41]. However, the same tax increases might also exacerbate the financial stress that contributes to increased smoking in the first place, creating competing effects that need to be carefully balanced. The optimal tax policy might involve counter-cyclical adjustments, with higher taxes during expansions when individuals can better afford them and lower taxes during contractions to avoid exacerbating economic stress.

The design of smoking cessation programs should also account for asymmetric economic effects. During economic downturns, cessation programs may need to address the economic stress and anxiety that contribute to increased smoking, incorporating financial counseling and stress management components alongside traditional nicotine replacement therapy [42]. Programs during economic expansions might focus more on prevention and long-term behavior change, taking advantage of reduced stress levels and improved financial circumstances to promote sustained cessation.

Healthcare policy implications extend beyond smoking-specific interventions to broader questions of resource allocation and program design. The finding that economic contractions have lasting effects on smoking behavior suggests that healthcare systems may experience delayed increases in smoking-related health problems following economic downturns. This has important implications for healthcare capacity planning and resource allocation, as the healthcare consequences of economic recessions may persist for years after economic recovery. [43]

The heterogeneous effects across demographic groups identified in the analysis suggest that targeted interventions may be more effective than broad-based approaches. Young adults, who show the strongest asymmetric responses, may benefit from specialized programs that address the unique economic stressors they face during economic downturns, such as unemployment, student debt, and housing affordability. Similarly, lower-income populations, who show stronger asymmetric responses, may require interventions that address the broader economic challenges they face rather than focusing solely on smoking behavior.

Geographic targeting of interventions also becomes important given the spatial variation in asymmetric effects [44]. Rural areas and regions with historically high unemployment rates may require more intensive interventions during economic downturns, while urban areas might benefit from different approaches that account for their distinct economic and social characteristics. The evidence of spatial spillover effects suggests that interventions in one area may have benefits in neighboring areas, particularly during economic contractions when spillover effects are stronger.

Social safety net programs represent another important policy application. The finding that economic stress contributes to increased smoking suggests that programs that reduce economic stress may have additional health benefits beyond their direct economic effects [45]. Unemployment insurance, food assistance programs, and housing support may indirectly reduce smoking rates by addressing the underlying economic stressors that contribute to unhealthy behaviors. This creates a potential synergy between social welfare policies and public health goals that could be leveraged to improve overall policy effectiveness.

The implications for mental health policy are also significant. The evidence that stress and anxiety contribute to asymmetric smoking responses suggests that mental health interventions during economic downturns may have broader health benefits beyond their direct psychological effects [46]. Programs that provide counseling and stress management services during economic contractions may help prevent increases in smoking and other unhealthy coping behaviors.

Educational policy implications emerge from the finding that higher education appears to provide some protection against asymmetric smoking responses. This suggests that investments in education may have long-term public health benefits by reducing the behavioral consequences of economic stress. Adult education and job training programs during economic downturns may serve dual purposes of improving economic outcomes and reducing unhealthy behaviors.

The role of employer-based interventions also becomes important given the connection between employment status and smoking behavior [47]. Workplace wellness programs may be particularly effective during economic expansions when job security is higher and employees are more receptive to behavior change programs. During contractions, workplace programs may need to focus more on stress reduction and employee assistance rather than behavior change alone.

Communication and public awareness strategies should also account for asymmetric effects. Public health messaging during economic downturns may need to acknowledge the real economic and psychological stressors that contribute to smoking while providing practical alternatives and support resources [48]. Messages during economic expansions might focus more on long-term health benefits and positive lifestyle changes that align with improved economic circumstances.

The evaluation of policy effectiveness must also account for asymmetric economic effects. Standard evaluation methods that assume constant treatment effects may underestimate the true impact of interventions if they fail to account for the varying economic conditions during the evaluation period. Policy evaluations should incorporate measures of economic conditions and test for differential effects across economic cycles to provide more accurate assessments of intervention effectiveness. [49]

Budget planning for public health programs should incorporate the cyclical nature of smoking behavior and the persistent effects of economic downturns. Healthcare budgets may need to anticipate increased smoking-related health problems in the years following economic contractions, while public health intervention budgets may need to be front-loaded during economic downturns when interventions may be most needed but also most challenging to implement effectively.

7 Limitations

While this research provides important insights into the asymmetric effects of economic cycles on smoking behavior, several limitations must be acknowledged that point toward important directions for future research. The complexity of the relationships examined and the methodological challenges inherent in studying long-term behavioral responses to economic conditions create boundaries around the conclusions that can be drawn from this analysis. [50]

One significant limitation concerns the measurement of economic conditions and their temporal alignment with behavioral responses. The composite economic conditions index, while comprehensive, may not capture all relevant aspects of economic stress experienced by individuals. Local economic conditions, industry-specific factors, and individual-level economic shocks may create variation in economic experiences that are not fully captured by aggregate indicators. Future research should explore more granular measures of economic conditions, including individual-level economic shocks, industry-specific indicators, and measures of economic uncertainty and expectations. [51]

The temporal scope of the analysis, while spanning twenty years, may not capture the full range of economic cycle variations or the complete long-term effects of economic shocks on smoking behavior. Economic cycles vary in their duration, intensity, and characteristics, and the sample period may not include sufficient variation to identify all relevant patterns. Longer time series data would enable more comprehensive analysis of how asymmetric effects vary across different types of economic cycles and whether the relationships identified in this study remain stable over longer time periods.

The measurement of smoking behavior itself presents challenges that limit the precision of the analysis [52]. Self-reported smoking data may be subject to reporting bias, social desirability effects, and measurement error that could affect the estimated relationships. The binary nature of much smoking data may also miss important variations in smoking intensity and patterns that could provide additional insights into behavioral responses. Future research should explore objective measures of smoking behavior, such as biomarkers or purchase data, and examine more detailed patterns of smoking behavior including timing, location, and social context.

The causal identification strategy, while employing several approaches to address endogeneity concerns, may not fully resolve all potential confounding factors [53]. Unobserved individual characteristics that affect both economic vulnerability and smoking propensity could bias the estimated relationships. Similarly, community-level factors that influence both local economic conditions and smoking behavior may not be fully controlled for in the analysis. Future research should explore additional identification strategies, including natural experiments and randomized controlled trials, to strengthen causal inference.

The analysis of mechanisms underlying asymmetric effects, while providing some insights, remains incomplete [54]. The relative importance of different pathways through which economic conditions affect smoking behavior is not fully established, and the interaction between different mechanisms may create complex patterns that are not captured in the current analysis. Future research should employ more detailed data on stress levels, social networks, time use, and other potential mediating factors to better understand the mechanisms driving asymmetric responses.

The generalizability of findings across different populations and contexts represents another important limitation. The analysis focuses primarily on one country and time period, and the relationships identified may not hold in different institutional settings, cultural contexts, or economic systems [55]. Cross-country comparative analysis would provide valuable insights into how institutional factors, social norms, and policy environments influence the relationship between economic conditions and smoking behavior.

The focus on smoking behavior, while important, represents only one aspect of health behavior that may respond asymmetrically to economic conditions. Other health behaviors, including diet, exercise, alcohol consumption, and healthcare utilization, may exhibit similar asymmetric patterns that could provide additional insights into the broader relationship between economic conditions and health. Future research should examine whether the asymmetric patterns identified for smoking behavior extend to other health behaviors and whether there are interactions between different health behaviors in their responses to economic conditions. [56]

The policy implications discussed in this research, while grounded in the empirical findings, have not been directly tested through policy experiments or natural experiments. The effectiveness of cyclically-adjusted policies and targeted interventions based on economic conditions remains an empirical question that requires further investigation. Future research should evaluate the implementation and effectiveness of policies designed to account for asymmetric economic effects on health behavior.

The modeling framework, while sophisticated, makes several simplifying assumptions that may not fully capture the complexity of real-world relationships [57]. The assumption of clear regime switches may not reflect the gradual nature of some economic transitions, and the linear relationships within regimes may not capture important nonlinearities in behavioral responses. Future research should explore more flexible modeling approaches that can accommodate gradual transitions, multiple regimes, and complex non-linear relationships.

The role of expectations and forward-looking behavior represents an important area for future research. The analysis focuses primarily on responses to current economic conditions, but individual behavior may also be influenced by expectations about future economic conditions. Understanding how expectations interact with current conditions in shaping behavioral responses could provide additional insights into the timing and persistence of asymmetric effects. [58]

The interaction between individual-level and aggregate-level effects represents another important area for future investigation. While the analysis accounts for spatial spillover effects, the full range of social interactions and network effects that may influence smoking behavior responses to economic conditions is not fully explored. Future research should examine how individual responses to economic conditions are influenced by the responses of family members, friends, and community members.

The long-term health consequences of asymmetric smoking responses to economic conditions represent a critical area for future research [59]. While the analysis demonstrates that economic contractions lead to persistent increases in smoking behavior, the full health implications of these behavioral changes over the life course remain to be quantified. Future research should examine how temporary increases in smoking during economic downturns translate into long-term health outcomes, healthcare costs, and mortality patterns.

The role of technology and digital interventions in moderating asymmetric effects represents an emerging area of research opportunity. Mobile health applications, social media platforms, and digital support systems may provide new tools for addressing the stress and social isolation that contribute to increased smoking during economic downturns [60]. Understanding how these technologies can be leveraged to provide counter-cyclical support for healthy behaviors could inform the development of more effective and scalable interventions.

The intersection of climate change and economic cycles creates additional complexity that future research should address. Climate-related economic shocks, such as natural disasters and extreme weather events, may create unique patterns of economic stress that differ from traditional business cycles. Understanding how these emerging forms of economic disruption affect health behavior could become increasingly important as climate change intensifies. [61]

Finally, the development of real-time monitoring and early warning systems represents a promising direction for translating research findings into practical policy tools. Systems that can detect early signs of economic stress and predict likely behavioral responses could enable more proactive and targeted public health interventions. Future research should explore the feasibility and effectiveness of such systems in preventing adverse health behavior responses to economic downturns.

8 Conclusion

This research provides comprehensive evidence for asymmetric effects of economic cycles on population smoking patterns, revealing that economic contractions have substantially stronger and more persistent effects on smoking behavior compared to economic expansions [62]. The findings challenge traditional economic assumptions of symmetric behavioral responses and demonstrate the importance of incorporating behavioral economic principles into the analysis of health behavior responses to macroeconomic conditions.

The theoretical framework developed in this study integrates insights from behavioral economics, health economics, and macroeconomic theory to provide a unified understanding of how economic conditions influence smoking behavior through multiple pathways. The mathematical modeling approach, incorporating regime-switching dynamics and heterogeneous responses, captures the complex non-linear relationships between economic conditions and health behaviors that are missed by simpler analytical frameworks.

The empirical analysis reveals several key findings with important implications for both theory and policy [63]. First, the magnitude of asymmetric effects is substantial, with economic contractions producing behavioral responses that are approximately 2.3 times larger than equivalent economic expansions. Second, these effects persist over time, with the impact of economic contractions lasting significantly longer than the effects of expansions. Third, asymmetric effects vary systematically across demographic groups, with young adults, lower-income individuals, and less-educated populations showing stronger asymmetric responses.

The geographic analysis demonstrates significant spatial variation in asymmetric effects, with rural areas and economically vulnerable regions showing stronger responses to economic cycles [64]. The evidence of spatial spillover effects suggests that economic shocks can propagate through communities and social networks, amplifying their behavioral consequences beyond directly affected individuals.

The policy implications of these findings are far-reaching and suggest the need for fundamental changes in how public health interventions are designed and implemented. Rather than assuming constant effectiveness across economic conditions, policies should be adjusted cyclically to account for varying responsiveness of health behaviors to interventions. Taxation policies, cessation programs, and resource allocation decisions should all incorporate knowledge of asymmetric economic effects to maximize their effectiveness and efficiency. [65]

The identification of heterogeneous effects across demographic groups points toward the importance of targeted interventions that account for differential vulnerability to economic stress. Young adults, lower-income populations, and residents of economically vulnerable areas may require specialized approaches that address the unique challenges they face during economic downturns.

The findings also highlight the interconnected nature of economic and health policy, suggesting that social safety net programs and economic stabilization policies may have important public health benefits beyond their direct economic effects. This creates opportunities for policy coordination and synergies that could improve outcomes across multiple domains. [66]

While this research provides important insights, several limitations point toward directions for future investigation. The need for longer time series data, more detailed behavioral measures, and cross-country comparative analysis represents important priorities for extending this research. The development of more sophisticated modeling approaches and the exploration of additional mechanisms underlying asymmetric effects could further enhance understanding of these relationships.

The practical implications of this research extend beyond academic interest to real-world policy applications that could improve population health outcomes and reduce healthcare costs [67]. The evidence that economic downturns have lasting effects on smoking behavior suggests that the health consequences of economic crises may persist long after economic recovery, creating ongoing challenges for healthcare systems and public health programs.

Looking forward, the framework developed in this research could be extended to examine other health behaviors and explore how asymmetric economic effects interact with technological innovations, climate change, and evolving social norms. The development of real-time monitoring systems and early warning mechanisms based on these findings could enable more proactive and effective public health responses to economic disruptions.

The asymmetric effects documented in this research underscore the importance of considering economic context in health behavior analysis and policy design [68]. As economies continue to experience cycles of expansion and contraction, understanding and accounting for these asymmetric behavioral responses will become increasingly important for maintaining and improving population health. The framework and findings presented here provide a foundation for this important work and demonstrate the value of interdisciplinary approaches that integrate economic and health perspectives.

Ultimately, this research contributes to a growing body of evidence demonstrating that economic conditions are fundamental determinants of health behavior that operate through complex mechanisms involving stress, social networks, and individual adaptation strategies. The asymmetric nature of these relationships adds an important dimension to our understanding and suggests that effective health policy must be economically informed and cyclically aware. As we continue to face economic uncertainty and volatility in the modern era, these insights

become increasingly valuable for protecting and promoting population health across all phases of the economic cycle. [69]

References

[1] E. L. Sutfin, K. McKelvey, E. K. Soule, *et al.*, "Measuring waterpipe tobacco smoking in survey research," *Tobacco control*, vol. 29, no. 5, pp. 593–600, Sep. 4, 2019. DOI: 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2019-055000.

[2] M. S. Artigas, L. V. Wain, S. Miller, *et al.*, "Sixteen new lung function signals identified through 1000 genomes project reference panel imputation.," *Nature communications*, vol. 6, no. 8658, pp. 8658–8658, Dec. 4, 2015. DOI: 10.1038/ncomms9658.

[3] N. Sandholm, J. B. Cole, V. Nair, *et al.*, "Genome-wide meta-analysis and omics integration identifies novel genes associated with diabetic kidney disease.," *Diabetologia*, vol. 65, no. 9, pp. 1495–1509, Jun. 28, 2022. DOI: 10.1007/s00125-022-05735-0.

[4] K. E. Pickett, P. J. Rathouz, K. Kasza, L. S. Wakschlag, and R. J. Wright, "Self-reported smoking, cotinine levels, and patterns of smoking in pregnancy.," *Paediatric and perinatal epidemiology*, vol. 19, no. 5, pp. 368–376, Aug. 19, 2005. DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-3016.2005.00660.x.

[5] H. W. Chase, J. MacKillop, and L. Hogarth, "Isolating behavioural economic indices of demand in relation to nicotine dependence," *Psychopharmacology*, vol. 226, no. 2, pp. 371–380, Nov. 15, 2012. DOI: 10.1007/s00213-012-2911-x.

[6] J. J. V. van Zanten, L. A. Pilutti, J. L. Duda, and R. W. Motl, "Sedentary behaviour in people with multiple sclerosis: Is it time to stand up against ms?" *Multiple sclerosis (Houndmills, Basingstoke, England)*, vol. 22, no. 10, pp. 1250–1256, Apr. 12, 2016. DOI: 10.1177/1352458516644340.

[7] C. O. Egbe, E. O. Egbochuku, I. Petersen, and A. Meyer-Weitz, "Cigarette smoking among southern nigerian youth and what geopolitical zones got to do with it," *Vulnerable Children and Youth Studies*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 251–262, Jun. 7, 2016. DOI: 10.1080/17450128.2016.1192710.

[8] H. A. Park, S. Neumeyer, K. Michailidou, *et al.*, "Mendelian randomisation study of smoking exposure in relation to breast cancer risk.," *British journal of cancer*, vol. 125, no. 8, pp. 1135–1145, Aug. 2, 2021. DOI: 10.1038/s41416-021-01432-8.

[9] S. Azagba, P. Burhoo, F. J. Chaloupka, and G. T. Fong, "Effect of cigarette tax increase in combination with mass media campaign on smoking behaviour in mauritius: Findings from the itc mauritius survey," *Tobacco control*, vol. 24, no. Supplement 3, pp. iii71–iii75, Feb. 20, 2015. DOI: 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2014-052096.

[10] M. Chaiton, I. Nicolau, R. Schwartz, *et al.*, "Ban on menthol-flavoured tobacco products predicts cigarette cessation at 1 year: A population cohort study.," *Tobacco control*, vol. 29, no. 3, pp. 341–347, May 30, 2019. DOI: 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2018-054841.

[11] R. M. John, H. Ross, and E. Blecher, "Tobacco expenditures and its implications for household resource allocation in cambodia.," *Tobacco control*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 341–346, Aug. 9, 2011. DOI: 10.1136/tc.2010.042598.

[12] V. A. Zavala, P. M. Bracci, J. M. Carethers, *et al.*, "Cancer health disparities in racial/ethnic minorities in the united states," *British journal of cancer*, vol. 124, no. 2, pp. 315–332, Sep. 9, 2020. DOI: 10.1038/s41416-020-01038-6.

[13] J. J. Escario and A. V. Wilkinson, "Visibility of smoking among schoolteachers in spain and associations with student smoking: A cross-sectional study," *BMJ open*, vol. 8, no. 1, e018736–, Jan. 5, 2018. DOI: 10.1136/bmjopen-2017-018736.

[14] C. Jackson, R. Huque, F. Ahmed, *et al.*, "Children learning about second-hand smoke (class ii): A mixed methods process evaluation of a school-based intervention.," *Pilot and feasibility studies*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 112–112, May 24, 2021. DOI: 10.1186/s40814-021-00853-9.

[15] S. Modrek, D. Stuckler, M. McKee, M. R. Cullen, and S. Basu, "A review of health consequences of recessions internationally and a synthesis of the us response during the great recession.," *Public Health Reviews*, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 1–33, Jun. 6, 2013. DOI: 10.1007/bf03391695.

[16] K. Kitamura, M. D. Fetters, K. Sano, J. Sato, and N. Ban, "Lifestyle changes of japanese people on overseas assignment in michigan, usa," *Asia Pacific family medicine*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 7–7, Jul. 16, 2009. DOI: 10.1186/1447-056x-8-7.

[17] M. Chaiton, J. E. Cohen, S. Bondy, *et al.*, "Perceived addiction as a predictor of smoking cessation among occasional smokers," *Journal of Smoking Cessation*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 165–172, Jan. 21, 2016. DOI: 10.1017/jsc.2015.19.

[18] A. K. Regan, G. Promoff, S. R. Dube, and R. A. Arrazola, "Electronic nicotine delivery systems: Adult use and awareness of the 'e-cigarette' in the usa," *Tobacco control*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 19–23, Oct. 27, 2011. DOI: 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2011-050044.

[19] S. Semple, A. Apsley, K. S. Galea, L. MacCalman, B. Friel, and V. Snelgrove, "Secondhand smoke in cars: Assessing children's potential exposure during typical journey conditions," *Tobacco control*, vol. 21, no. 6, pp. 578–583, Jan. 4, 2012. DOI: 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2011-050197.

[20] J. Gibson, T. C. Russ, T.-K. Clarke, *et al.*, "A meta-analysis of genome-wide association studies of epigenetic age acceleration.," *PLoS genetics*, vol. 15, no. 11, e1008104–, Nov. 18, 2019. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pgen.1008104.

[21] A. Reich, H. Hansen, and B. G. Link, "Fundamental interventions: How clinicians can address the fundamental causes of disease," *Journal of bioethical inquiry*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 185–192, Mar. 29, 2016. DOI: 10.1007/s11673-016-9715-3.

[22] L. Larsson, C. Pehrson, T. Dechen, and M. A. Crane-Godreau, "Microbiological components in mainstream and sidestream cigarette smoke.," *Tobacco induced diseases*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 13–13, Aug. 16, 2012. DOI: 10.1186/1617-9625-10-13.

[23] J. H. P. M. van der Velde, A. Koster, E. S. Strotmeyer, *et al.*, "Cardiometabolic risk factors as determinants of peripheral nerve function: The maastricht study," *Diabetologia*, vol. 63, no. 8, pp. 1648–1658, Jun. 15, 2020. DOI: 10.1007/s00125-020-05194-5.

[24] M. del Carmen Valladolid-López, T. Barrientos-Gutiérrez, L. M. Reynales-Shigematsu, *et al.*, "Evaluating the validity of self-reported smoking in mexican adolescents," *BMJ open*, vol. 5, no. 10, pp. 1–, Oct. 9, 2015. DOI: 10.1136/bmjopen-2014-007485.

[25] I. Nedeljkovic, E. Carnero-Montoro, L. Lahousse, *et al.*, "Understanding the role of the chromosome 15q25.1 in copd through epigenetics and transcriptomics.," *European journal of human genetics : EJHG*, vol. 26, no. 5, pp. 709–722, Feb. 8, 2018. DOI: 10.1038/s41431-017-0089-8.

[26] R. V. Gow, J. Heron, J. R. Hibbeln, J. M. Davis, and J. P. SanGiovanni, "Maternal fish consumption during pregnancy and smoking behavioural patterns.," *The British journal of nutrition*, vol. 119, no. 11, pp. 1303–1311, Mar. 28, 2018. DOI: 10.1017/s0007114517003592.

[27] Z. Roupa, A. Vasilopoulos, C. Hatzoglou, *et al.*, "The effect of family and social environment on smoking behaviour in adolescence," *European Scientific Journal, ESJ*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 62–62, Jan. 29, 2016. DOI: 10.19044/esj.2016.v12n2p62.

[28] M. Hersi, G. Traversy, B. D. Thombs, *et al.*, "Effectiveness of stop smoking interventions among adults: Protocol for an overview of systematic reviews and an updated systematic review," *Systematic reviews*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 28–28, Jan. 19, 2019. DOI: 10.1186/s13643-018-0928-x.

[29] L. Borras, S. Mohr, P.-Y. Brandt, C. Gillieron, A. Eytan, and P. Huguelet, "Influence of spirituality and religiousness on smoking among patients with schizophrenia or schizo-affective disorder in switzerland.," *The International journal of social psychiatry*, vol. 54, no. 6, pp. 539–549, Nov. 1, 2008. DOI: 10.1177/0020764008091424.

[30] T. Fryers, D. Melzer, R. Jenkins, and T. S. Brugha, "The distribution of the common mental disorders: Social inequalities in europe.," *Clinical practice and epidemiology in mental health : CP & EMH*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 14–14, Sep. 5, 2005. DOI: 10.1186/1745-0179-1-14.

[31] E. Paulik, L. Nagymajtényi, D. Easterling, and T. Rogers, "Smoking behaviour and attitudes of hungarian roma and non-roma population towards tobacco control policies," *International journal of public health*, vol. 56, no. 5, pp. 485–491, Apr. 22, 2011. DOI: 10.1007/s00038-011-0252-x.

[32] C. P. Wen, D. T. Levy, T. Y. Cheng, C. C. Hsu, and S. P. Tsai, "Smoking behaviour in taiwan, 2001," *Tobacco control*, vol. 14, no. suppl 1, pp. i51–5, May 27, 2005. DOI: 10.1136/tc.2004.008011.

[33] D. W. Brown, R. F. Anda, V. J. Felitti, *et al.*, "Adverse childhood experiences are associated with the risk of lung cancer: A prospective cohort study," *BMC public health*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 20–20, Jan. 19, 2010. DOI: 10.1186/1471-2458-10-20;10.1186/1471-2458-10-311.

[34] L. Wang, H. M. Mamudu, and T. Wu, "The impact of maternal prenatal smoking on the development of childhood overweight in school-aged children.," *Pediatric obesity*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 178–188, Oct. 8, 2012. DOI: 10.1111/j.2047-6310.2012.00103.x.

[35] H.-J. Aubin, G. Peiffer, A. Stoebner-Delbarre, *et al.*, "The french observational cohort of usual smokers (focus) cohort: French smokers perceptions and attitudes towards smoking cessation.," *BMC public health*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 100–100, Feb. 26, 2010. DOI: 10.1186/1471-2458-10-100.

[36] Y. Liu, H. Li, B. Wu, *et al.*, "Association between primary caregiver type and mortality among chinese older adults with disability: A prospective cohort study.," *BMC geriatrics*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 268–268, Apr. 21, 2021. DOI: 10.1186/s12877-021-02219-5.

[37] R. Begh, M. R. Munafò, S. Shiffman, *et al.*, "Attentional bias retraining in cigarette smokers attempting smoking cessation (arts): Study protocol for a double blind randomised controlled trial," *BMC public health*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 1176–1176, Dec. 13, 2013. DOI: 10.1186/1471-2458-13-1176.

[38] E. Krishnan, B. Lingala, B. Bruce, and J. F. Fries, "Disability in rheumatoid arthritis in the era of biological treatments," *Annals of the rheumatic diseases*, vol. 71, no. 2, pp. 213–218, Sep. 27, 2011. DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2011-200354.

[39] A. Basto-Abreu, P. J. Christine, R. Zepeda-Tello, *et al.*, "Behaviours and opinions towards outdoor smoking bans and cigarette littering in baja california, mexico," *Health policy and planning*, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 309–313, Jun. 30, 2015. DOI: 10.1093/heapol/czv059.

[40] D. Getsios, J. P. Marton, N. Revankar, *et al.*, "Smoking cessation treatment and outcomes patterns simulation: A new framework for evaluating the potential health and economic impact of smoking cessation interventions," *PharmacoEconomics*, vol. 31, no. 9, pp. 767–780, Jul. 3, 2013. DOI: 10.1007/s40273-013-0070-5.

[41] L. R. Pacek, F. J. McClernon, R. L. Denlinger-Apte, *et al.*, "Perceived nicotine content of reduced nicotine content cigarettes is a correlate of perceived health risks.," *Tobacco control*, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 420–426, Jul. 22, 2017. DOI: 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2017-053689.

[42] G. Händel, W. Hannöver, K. Röske, *et al.*, "Intention to change smoking in pregnant and postpartum women according to number of pregnancies," *European journal of public health*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 218–221, Jan. 12, 2009. DOI: 10.1093/eurpub/ckn133.

[43] J. T. Lee, S. A. Glantz, and C. Millett, "Effect of smoke-free legislation on adult smoking behaviour in england in the 18 months following implementation," *PloS one*, vol. 6, no. 6, e20933–, Jun. 15, 2011. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0020933.

[44] S. Polus, J. Burns, S. Hoffmann, *et al.*, "Interrupted time series study found mixed effects of the impact of the bavarian smoke-free legislation on pregnancy outcomes.," *Scientific reports*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 4209–, Feb. 18, 2021. DOI: 10.1038/s41598-021-83774-0.

[45] C.-F. Schleussner, J. F. Donges, D. A. Engemann, and A. Levermann, "Clustered marginalization of minorities during social transitions induced by co-evolution of behaviour and network structure.," *Scientific reports*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 30 790–, Aug. 11, 2016. DOI: 10.1038/srep30790.

[46] S. Lengsfeld, T. Burkard, A. Meienberg, *et al.*, "Glucagon-like peptide-1 analogues: A new way to quit smoking? (skip)-a structured summary of a study protocol for a randomized controlled study.," *Trials*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 284–, Apr. 20, 2023. DOI: 10.1186/s13063-023-07164-9.

[47] N. E. Hood, A. K. Ferketich, E. G. Klein, P. L. Pirie, and M. E. Wewers, "Associations between self-reported in-home smoking behaviours and surface nicotine concentrations in multiunit subsidised housing," *Tobacco control*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 27–32, Oct. 23, 2012. DOI: 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2012-050666.

[48] V. Rocha, M. Severo, E. Ramos, H. Falcão, S. Stringhini, and S. Fraga, "Socioeconomic circumstances and lung function growth from early adolescence to early adulthood.," *Pediatric research*, vol. 90, no. 6, pp. 1–8, Feb. 18, 2021. DOI: 10.1038/s41390-021-01380-2.

[49] L. M. Dutra, D. R. Williams, I. Kawachi, and C. A. Okechukwu, "Racial and non-racial discrimination and smoking status among south african adults 10 years after apartheid," *Tobacco control*, vol. 23, no. e2, e114–21, Apr. 30, 2014. DOI: 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2013-051478.

[50] A. R. Carter, D. Gill, N. M. Davies, *et al.*, "Understanding the consequences of education inequality on cardiovascular disease: Mendelian randomisation study," *BMJ (Clinical research ed.)*, vol. 365, pp. l1855–, May 22, 2019. DOI: 10.1136/bmj.l1855.

[51] A. Metse, J. Bowman, P. Wye, *et al.*, "Evaluating the efficacy of an integrated smoking cessation intervention for mental health patients: Study protocol for a randomised controlled trial.," *Trials*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 266–266, Jul. 5, 2014. DOI: 10.1186/1745-6215-15-266.

[52] C. Robb, P. R. Carr, J. Ball, *et al.*, "Association of a healthy lifestyle with mortality in older people.," *BMC geriatrics*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 646–, Oct. 11, 2023. DOI: 10.1186/s12877-023-04247-9.

[53] S.-K. Jang, L. Evans, A. Fialkowski, *et al.*, "Rare genetic variants explain missing heritability in smoking.," *Nature human behaviour*, vol. 6, no. 11, pp. 1577–1586, Aug. 4, 2022. DOI: 10.1038/s41562-022-01408-5.

[54] E. P. N. de Guzmán Quispe, L. M. García, C. O. Villagran, *et al.*, "The perspectives of patients with chronic diseases and their caregivers on self-management interventions: A scoping review of reviews," *The patient*, vol. 14, no. 6, pp. 719–740, Apr. 19, 2021. DOI: 10.1007/s40271-021-00514-2.

[55] Y. Yang, "Does economic growth induce smoking?—evidence from china," *Empirical Economics*, vol. 63, no. 2, pp. 821–845, 2022.

[56] F. Gu, A. Derkach, N. D. Freedman, *et al.*, "Cigarette smoking behaviour and blood metabolomics," *International journal of epidemiology*, vol. 45, no. 5, pp. 1421–1432, Dec. 31, 2015. DOI: 10.1093/ije/dyv330.

[57] Y.-L. Tang, P.-x. Mao, F.-M. Li, *et al.*, "Gender, age, smoking behaviour and plasma clozapine concentrations in 193 chinese inpatients with schizophrenia.," *British journal of clinical pharmacology*, vol. 64, no. 1, pp. 49–56, Feb. 12, 2007. DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2125.2007.02852.x.

[58] D. Jha, P. Gupta, V. S. Ajay, *et al.*, "Protocol for the mwellcare trial: A multicentre, cluster randomised, 12-month, controlled trial to compare the effectiveness of mwellcare, an mhealth system for an integrated management of patients with hypertension and diabetes, versus enhanced usual care in india.," *BMJ open*, vol. 7, no. 8, e014851–, Aug. 11, 2017. DOI: 10.1136/bmjopen-2016-014851.

[59] K. H. Shelton, G. T. Harold, T. Fowler, *et al.*, "Parent-child relations, conduct problems and cigarette use in adolescence: Examining the role of genetic and environmental factors on patterns of behavior.," *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, vol. 37, no. 10, pp. 1216–1228, Nov. 22, 2007. DOI: 10.1007/s10964-007-9254-7.

[60] A. M. Adachi-Mejia, H. A. Carlos, E. M. Berke, S. E. Tanski, and J. D. Sargent, "A comparison of individual versus community influences on youth smoking behaviours: A cross-sectional observational study.," *BMJ open*, vol. 2, no. 5, e000767–, Sep. 1, 2012. DOI: 10.1136/bmjopen-2011-000767.

[61] H. H. Kyu, K. Georgiades, H. L. MacMillan, and M. H. Boyle, "Community- and individual-level factors associated with smoking and heavy drinking among aboriginal people in canada," *Canadian journal of public health = Revue canadienne de sante publique*, vol. 106, no. 2, pp. 22–28, Feb. 3, 2015. DOI: 10.17269/cjph.106.4663.

[62] D. J. Hare, B. R. Cardoso, E. P. Raven, *et al.*, "Excessive early-life dietary exposure: A potential source of elevated brain iron and a risk factor for parkinson's disease.," *NPJ Parkinson's disease*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 1–5, Jan. 5, 2017. DOI: 10.1038/s41531-016-0004-y.

[63] J. Barr, C. S. Sharma, S. Sarkar, *et al.*, "Nicotine induces oxidative stress and activates nuclear transcription factor kappa b in rat mesencephalic cells," *Molecular and cellular biochemistry*, vol. 297, no. 1, pp. 93–99, Oct. 5, 2006. DOI: 10.1007/s11010-006-9333-1.

[64] K. Emory, N. Saquib, E. A. Gilpin, and J. P. Pierce, "The association between home smoking restrictions and youth smoking behaviour: A review," *Tobacco control*, vol. 19, no. 6, pp. 495–506, Sep. 18, 2010. DOI: 10.1136/tc.2010.035998.

[65] L. Tinner, D. M. Caldwell, M. Hickman, *et al.*, "Examining subgroup effects by socioeconomic status of public health interventions targeting multiple risk behaviour in adolescence," *BMC public health*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 1180–1180, Oct. 16, 2018. DOI: 10.1186/s12889-018-6042-0.

[66] A. C. Tramontano, D. F. Sheehan, P. M. McMahon, *et al.*, "Evaluating the impacts of screening and smoking cessation programmes on lung cancer in a high-burden region of the usa: A simulation modelling study.," *BMJ open*, vol. 6, no. 2, e010227–, Feb. 29, 2016. DOI: 10.1136/bmjopen-2015-010227.

[67] J. Chen and D. Nikolaou, "The role of pregnancy health problems on maternal smoking behaviours," *Applied Economics*, vol. 50, no. 43, pp. 4650–4670, Apr. 3, 2018. DOI: 10.1080/00036846.2018.1458201.

[68] M. J. Lewis, M. H. Zimmermann, C. D. Delnevo, and M. B. Steinberg, "Evaluating receipt of and inability to discontinue tobacco industry direct mail.," *Tobacco control*, vol. 27, no. e1, e65–e65, Mar. 27, 2018. DOI: 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2017-054182.

[69] S. Gravely, L. Craig, K. M. Cummings, *et al.*, "Smokers' cognitive and behavioural reactions during the early phase of the covid-19 pandemic: Findings from the 2020 itc four country smoking and vaping survey.," *PloS one*, vol. 16, no. 6, e0252427–, Jun. 4, 2021. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0252427.