

UCSF

WHO Tobacco Control Papers

Title

Electronic Nicotine Delivery Systems and Electronic Non-Nicotine Delivery Systems (ENDS/ENNDS)

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2f65f2j5>

Author

World Health Organization

Publication Date

2016-08-01



WHO FRAMEWORK CONVENTION
ON TOBACCO CONTROL

Conference of the Parties to the WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control

Seventh session
Delhi, India, 7–12 November 2016
Provisional agenda item 5.5.2

FCTC/COP/7/11
August 2016

Electronic Nicotine Delivery Systems and Electronic Non-Nicotine Delivery Systems (ENDS/ENNDS)

Report by WHO

INTRODUCTION

1. This document was prepared in response to the request¹ made by the Conference of the Parties (COP) at its sixth session (Moscow, Russian Federation, 13–18 October 2014) to the Convention Secretariat to invite WHO to: (a) prepare a report on Electronic Nicotine Delivery Systems and Electronic Non-Nicotine Delivery Systems (ENDS/ENNDS) for the seventh session of the COP (COP7), covering updates on the evidence of the health impact of ENDS/ENNDS, their potential role in tobacco cessation and impact on tobacco control efforts; (b) subsequently assess policy options to achieve the objectives outlined in paragraph 2 of decision FCTC/COP6(9); and (c) consider the methods to measure the contents and emissions of these products. Following the terminology approved by COP, this report differentiates between ENDS and ENNDS depending on whether or not the heated solution delivered as an aerosol by the device contains nicotine.

2. This report incorporates the December 2015 deliberations and scientific recommendations on ENDS/ENNDS by the WHO Study Group on Tobacco Product Regulation (TobReg) at its eighth meeting (Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 9–11 December 2015)², the May 2016 informal consultation on policy options held in Panama (4–5 May 2016, Panama City, Panama) and four background papers commissioned by WHO^{3,4,5,6}. This report does not consider methods to measure the contents and emissions of ENDS/ENNDS. All appendices to this report can be found on the WHO websiteⁱ.

ENDS/ENNDS PRODUCTS

3. All ENDS/ENNDS heat a solution (e-liquid) to create an aerosol which frequently contains flavourants, usually dissolved into Propylene Glycol or/and Glycerin. All ENDS (but not ENNDS) contain nicotine. Although generally considered a single product class, these products constitute a diverse group with potentially significant differences in the production of toxicants and delivery of nicotine. There are several coexisting types of devices on the market: first-generation or so-called cigalikes, second-generation tank systems and even larger third-generation or personal vaporizers. Others classify these devices into closed and open systems depending mainly on the degree of control that users have over the e-liquid used and the voltage and resistance applied to heating the e-liquid and ventilation features.

4. The choice of e-liquid, the user's puffing style and the device's capacity to aerosolize the e-liquid at increasing temperatures by modulating its wattage and resistance will all determine whether the use of ENDS/ENNDS produces a satisfactory experience to the user in terms of the speedy delivery of sufficient nicotine to mimic the sensory feel of smoking.

ⁱ http://who.int/tobacco/industry/product_regulation/electronic-cigarettes-report-cop7/en/index.html

POTENTIAL ROLE OF ENDS/ENNDS IN TOBACCO CONTROL

5. If the great majority of tobacco smokers who are unable or unwilling to quit would switch without delay to using an alternative source of nicotine with lower health risks, and eventually stop using it, this would represent a significant contemporary public health achievement. This would only be the case if the recruitment of minors and non-smokers into the nicotine-dependent population is no higher than it is for smoking, and eventually decreases to zero. Whether ENDS/ENNDS can do this job is still a subject of debate between those who want their use to be swiftly encouraged and endorsed on the basis of available evidence, and others who urge caution given the existing scientific uncertainties as well as the performance variability of products and the diversity of user behaviour.

ENDS/ENNDS MARKET SIZE

6. The global market for ENDS/ENNDS in 2015 was estimated at almost US\$ 10 billion. About 56% was accounted for by the United States of America and 12% by the United Kingdom. Another 21% of the market was divided between China, France, Germany, Italy and Poland (3–5% each)⁷. It is unclear whether the sales of ENDS/ENNDS will continue to increase⁸. In addition, the market may change since the tobacco industry has launched alternative nicotine delivery systems that heat but do not burn tobacco^{9,10,11}, and is developing or has bought nicotine inhaler technology that does not require a heating mechanism^{12, 13,14}.

HEALTH RISKS OF EXCLUSIVE ENDS/ENNDS USEⁱⁱ

7. The typical use of unadulterated ENDS/ENNDS produces aerosol that ordinarily includes glycols, aldehydes, volatile organic compounds (VOCs), polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon (PAHs), tobacco-specific nitrosamines (TSNAs), metals, silicate particles and other elements. Dicarbonyls (glyoxal, methylglyoxal, diacetyl) and hydroxycarbonyls (acetol) also are thought to be important compounds in the aerosol. Many of these substances are toxicants that have known health effects resulting in a range of significant pathological changes.

8. The number and level of known toxicants generated by the typical use of unadulterated ENDS/ENNDS is on average lower or much lower than in cigarette smoke, with a few new toxicants specific to ENDS such as glyoxal. However, the levels of toxicants can vary enormously across and within brands and sometimes reach higher levels than in tobacco smoke¹⁵. This is probably due, among other things, to the increased thermal decomposition of e-liquid ingredients with rising applied temperatures in open system devices.ⁱⁱⁱ A number of metals - including lead, chromium, and nickel and formaldehyde^{15,16} - have been found in the aerosol of some ENDS/ENNDS at concentrations equal to or greater than traditional cigarettes under normal experimental conditions of use.

9. ENDS aerosol contains nicotine, the addictive component of tobacco products. In addition to dependence, nicotine can have adverse effects on the development of the foetus during pregnancy and may contribute to cardiovascular disease. Although nicotine itself is not a carcinogen, it may function as a “tumour promoter” and seems to be involved in the biology of malignant diseases, as well as of neurodegeneration¹⁷. Foetal and adolescent nicotine exposure may have long-term consequences for brain development, potentially leading to learning and anxiety disorders^{18,19,20}. The evidence is sufficient to warn children and adolescents, pregnant women, and women of reproductive age against ENDS use and nicotine.

10. Close to 8,000 e-liquid unique flavours²¹ have been reported. The health effects of heated and inhaled flavourants used in the e-liquids have not been well studied.²² Heated and inhaled popcorn^{23,24},

ⁱⁱ See also Appendix 1 on other health risks to be considered.

ⁱⁱⁱ Other possible explanations for this variance are the potential for the heating element and associated components to shed metallic and other particles on heating and the unpredictability of some of the analytical methods used, since very few have been standardized and validated for analysing ENDS/ENNDS.

cinnamon²⁵ and cherry flavourants are potentially hazardous, with the limited literature on the topic indicating that most flavourants may pose appreciable health risks from long-term use, especially those that are sweet. Many are irritants^{26,27,28} which may increase airway inflammation²⁹; some are more cytotoxic than unflavoured aerosol although less so than tobacco smoke³⁰, or increase the susceptibility of airway cells to viral infection after direct contact with e-liquid³¹, although the relevance of direct effects of contact with e-liquid, as opposed to aerosol, is unclear³².

11. Based mostly on the levels and number of toxicants produced during the typical use of unadulterated ENDS/ENNDS made with pharmaceutical-grade ingredients, it is very likely that ENDS/ENNDS are less toxic than cigarette smoke. However, ENDS/ENNDS are unlikely to be harmless, and long-term use is expected to increase the risk of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, lung cancer, and possibly cardiovascular disease as well as some other diseases also associated with smoking³³. The magnitude of these risks is likely to be smaller than from tobacco smoke^{34,35,36}, although there is not enough research to quantify the relative risk of ENDS/ENNDS over combustible products. Therefore, no specific figure about how much “safer” the use of these products is compared to smoking can be given any scientific credibility at this time. Existing modelling studies indicate, however, that in order for there to be a potential population-wide net health benefit from ENDS/ENNDS at present usage rates, these products would need to be at least three times “safer” than cigarettes^{37,38}.

12. There is an urgent need to elucidate the range of relative risks when using the diverse ENDS/ENNDS devices and e-liquids, and about user behaviour compared to smoking and use of other nicotine products, recognizing that:

- a. complex mixtures, such as in ENDS liquids and aerosol, have the potential for toxicological effects even if toxicants are at low or very low concentrations³⁹;
- b. predicting adverse health effects of these complex mixtures solely on the basis of aerosol composition might prove futile without solid evidence from the coordinated use of chemical, in vitro, clinical³⁹ and epidemiological methods; and that
- c. simple comparisons of toxicant levels in ENDS/ENNDS aerosol to the high levels in tobacco smoke, as advocated by the tobacco industry^{40,41}, may be of little value given the absence of science on safe tolerance limits for smoke constituents or their specific effects on the multiple diseases caused by smoking.

HEALTH RISKS TO BYSTANDERS FROM EXPOSURE TO EXHALED AEROSOL FROM ENDS/ENNDS USERS

13. A recent systematic review of the health risks from passive exposure to exhaled aerosol from ENDS/ENNDS users - or second-hand aerosol (SHA) - concluded that “the absolute impact from passive exposure to electronic cigarette vapour has the potential to lead to adverse health effects⁴².” A WHO-commissioned review³ found that while there are a limited number of studies in this area^{43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50,51,52,53,54,55}, it can be concluded that SHA is a new air contamination source for particulate matter, which includes fine and ultrafine particles, as well as 1,2-propanediol, some VOCs, some heavy metals, and nicotine.

14. The levels of some metals such as nickel and chromium are higher in SHA from ENDS than in second-hand smoke (SHS) and certainly background air. Compared to air background levels, PM 1.0 and PM 2.5 in SHA are between 14 and 40 times, and between 6 and 86 times higher respectively^{iv}. In addition, nicotine in SHA has been found between 10 and 115 times higher than in background air levels, acetaldehyde between two and eight times higher, and formaldehyde about 20% higher. Except for heavy metals, these compounds are generally found at lower concentrations than those found in SHS. At present, the magnitude of health risks from higher than background levels of these compounds and elements are empirically unknown.

^{iv} Particle matter from SHA, however, tend to be in the air a shorter time than from SHS and it is not clear what could have a health effect, whether it is its concentration or its composition (which is different from PM in SHS).

15. While some argue that exposure to SHA is unlikely to cause significant health risks⁵⁶, they concede that SHA can be deleterious to bystanders with some respiratory pre-conditions⁵⁷. It is nevertheless reasonable to assume that the increased concentration of toxicants from SHA over background levels poses an increased risk for the health of all bystanders⁵⁸.

ABILITY OF ENDS/ENNDS TO AID SMOKERS TO QUIT SMOKING

16. The scientific evidence regarding the effectiveness of ENDS/ENNDS as a smoking cessation aid is scant and of low certainty, making it difficult to draw credible inferences. A 2014 review⁵⁹ based on two randomized clinical trials (RCTs) concluded that although the analyzed ENDS had a similar, although low, efficacy for quitting smoking, the overall quality of the evidence was low⁶⁰. The WHO-commissioned review reached similar conclusions about the RCTs' quality of evidence and efficacy.

17. Longitudinal studies are more abundant and better reflect "real world" conditions of use than RCTs, but present more methodological concerns. Two reviews of these studies suggest that the use of ENDS may reduce the chances of quitting smoking^{61,4}. However, the evidence is of very low certainty. Although most longitudinal studies found no cessation benefit or a diminished cessation benefit associated with use of ENDS, a few studies^{62,63} found that the use of third generation ENDS under specific conditions of frequency of use may have cessation benefits. This needs to be further explored before reaching any final conclusions. In summary, given the scarcity and low quality of scientific evidence, it cannot be determined whether ENDS may help most smokers to quit or prevent them from doing so.

ABILITY OF ENDS/ENNDS TO INITIATE YOUTH IN NICOTINE USE AND SMOKING

18. WHO commissioned a review of the data on the prevalence and trends of ENDS/ENNDS use among people of 20 years of age or less⁶. The review identified a total of 27 studies that used probability sampling from very few countries. The age range of respondents varied across studies, as did the prevalence of ENDS/ENNDS use reported across jurisdictions. From 2013 to 2015, current use among non-smokers is around 2%, although in jurisdictions like Florida, USA and Poland it was 13% and 19%, respectively. Current use among smokers is around 17%, with Florida (44.8% in the 11–14 age range and 51.7% in the 15–18 age range) and Poland (57.4%) showing much higher prevalence^v.

19. Trend data of young people's current use of ENDS/ENNDS from probability sample surveys are only available from three countries: the USA, Poland and Italy. In Italy, current use of ENDS/ENNDS among smokers and non-smokers is very low and is not increasing. England presents a similar situation, although available trend data is not based on probability samples. The USA and Poland both show a rapid increase in the current use of ENDS/ENNDS. Use among non-smoking youth in Florida, USA and Poland has increased by a factor of five and eight respectively in three years, to reach a prevalence of 6.9% and 13% in these jurisdictions.

20. The trend data show that there are two groups of countries. In one, the prevalence of ENDS/ENNDS use is low and is not increasing significantly; in the other, which includes the largest market in the world (the USA), prevalence is rapidly increasing. There is considerable debate about whether in these countries the increase in ENDS/ENNDS use among young non-smokers is a precursor to smoking. Existing longitudinal studies^{64,65,66,67} indicate that ENDS/ENNDS use by minors who have never smoked at least doubles their chance of starting to smoke. It is not clear whether the association of ENDS/ENNDS use and smoking is because their use leads to smoking, or because young ENDS/ENNDS users and smokers share similar social and behavioural characteristics, rendering them susceptible to the use of nicotine.

^v Appendix 2 presents more details.

ENDS/ENNDS MARKETING

21. **Promotion:** There is insufficient research or surveillance on how and to what extent ENDS/ENNDS manufacturers are promoting their products in the main country markets⁶⁸. Existing data indicates that spending on ENDS/ENNDS advertising has been increasing since 2012^{69,70}; that marketing uses diverse channels - point-of-sale,⁷¹ audiovisual and print mass media and online⁷²; and that promotional approaches vary by type of manufacturer⁷³. An unquantified amount of advertising uses deceptive health claims and its targeting includes youth^{74,75,76,77,78} and incites rebellion against smoke-free policies⁷⁹. There are also concerns that some companies are using or might use ENDS/ENNDS advertising to promote smoking, advertently or unintentionally^{80,81,82}.

22. **Price:** The limited empirical research on the topic shows that:

- a. ENDS/ENNDS sales and prices have a strong inverse relation⁸³;
- b. ENDS/ENNDS and cigarettes are substitutes, with higher cigarette prices being associated with increased ENDS/ENNDS sales⁸⁴. Therefore, differential tax policies based on product type could lead to substitution between different types of ENDS/ENNDS and between ENDS/ENNDS and cigarettes⁸⁵;
- c. Existing initial costs for a rechargeable ENDS/ENNDS devices and costs of disposable ENDS/ENNDS are generally higher than those of cigarettes⁸⁶.

23. **Product characteristics:** Flavour is one of several significant product appeal factors that influences people's willingness to try ENDS. Certain flavours, such as fruit and confectionary or candy-like aromas, appeal to children, younger never-smokers and young ENDS/ENNDS beginners^{87,88,89,90} and may therefore play a role in motivating experimentation among them. In 2009, one company declared that they would halt flavour sales to discourage underage use⁹¹ although years later they reversed their decision. Flavours also seem to play a role among adults and experienced ENDS/ENNDS users in helping migration away from tobacco⁹². Flavoured ENDS/ENNDS may be, therefore, one of several product features that appeal to taste predilections, while also suggesting a level of safety and building user image.

24. **Product placement:** Internet sales, as opposed to those in retail stores, accounted for one-third of the worldwide market in 2014. In three regions - Asia Pacific, Australasia and Latin America - Internet sales accounted for the largest share of the market (70%, 85% and 94%, respectively).

COMMERCIAL INTERESTS

25. Initially, the growth of the ENDS/ENNDS market was driven by companies that were independent from traditional tobacco transnational companies (TTCs). However, TTCs are rapidly increasing their share of what is so far a generally unregulated market. Some^{93,94} argue that recently approved regulations in the USA and the European Union - the main ENDS/ENNDS markets in size - will force a market concentration as a result of the costs of bringing regulated devices to market and that this will allow TTCs to increase their market dominance.

26. The engagement of TTCs in the marketing of ENDS/ENNDS is a major threat to tobacco control. There are concerns that TTCs are marketing ENDS/ENNDS in order to:

- a. minimize the threat to tobacco sales by promoting ENDS as a complement rather than an alternative to tobacco, or controlling technological innovations that would prevent improvements in their efficacy as an aid to cessation;
- b. promote smoking through ENDS/ENNDS advertising, and promotion to adults and children;
- c. assert potential benefits of ENDS/ENNDS - and, in the near future, nicotine inhaler technology - as an excuse to engage with and influence policymakers, scientists and advocates in tobacco control with a view to undermining the WHO FCTC, while at the same time building credibility in corporate social responsibility initiatives.

27. A growing concern is the extent to which research on the topic has links to commercial and other vested interests of the ENDS/ENNDS industry, including the tobacco industry, and its allies. In a review⁵ of 105 studies analysing the composition of liquids and emissions, 30% had authors that had received funding from ENDS/ENNDS interests - including the tobacco industry^{vi}.

REGULATORY OPTIONS

28. The following is a non-exhaustive list of options that Parties might consider in accordance with their national law, in order to achieve the ENDS/ENNDS objectives set out in the COP 6 decision on ENDS/ENNDS.

29. *Objective: prevent the initiation of ENDS/ENNDS by non-smokers and youth with special attention to vulnerable groups.* Although the debate about whether the use of ENDS/ENNDS is a gateway to smoking is unresolved, preventing this eventuality requires making the initiation and persistence of smoking as difficult as possible. Parties that have not banned the importation, sale, and distribution of ENDS/ENNDS may consider the following options:

- a. Banning the sale and distribution of ENDS/ENNDS to minors;
- b. Banning the possession of ENDS/ENNDS by minors;
- c. Banning or restricting advertising, promotion and sponsorship of ENDS/ENNDS (see FCTC/COP/6/10 Rev.1);
- d. Taxing ENDS/ENNDS at a level that makes the devices and e-liquids unaffordable to minors in order to deter its use in this age group^{vii}. In parallel, combustible tobacco products should be taxed at a higher level than ENDS/ENNDS to deter initiation and reduce regression to smoking;
- e. Banning or restricting the use of flavours that appeal to minors;
- f. Regulating places, density and channels of sales; and
- g. Taking measures to combat illicit trade in ENDS/ENNDS.

30. *Objective: minimize as far as possible potential health risks to ENDS/ENNDS users and protect non-users from exposure to their emissions.*

- a. Parties that have not banned the importation, sale, and distribution of ENDS/ENNDS may consider the following options to minimize health risks to users:
 - i. Testing heated and inhaled flavourants used in the e-liquids for safety, and banning or restricting the amount of those found to be of serious toxicological concern such as diacetyl, acetyl propionyl, cinnamaldehydes or benzaldehyde;
 - ii. Requiring the use of ingredients that are not a risk to health and are, when allowed, of the highest purity;
 - iii. Regulating electrical and fire safety standards of ENDS/ENNDS devices;
 - iv. Regulating the need for manufacturers to disclose product content to government;
 - v. Regulating appropriate labelling of devices and e-liquids;
 - vi. Requiring manufacturers to monitor and report adverse effects; and
 - vii. Providing for the removal of products that do not comply with regulations.

^{vi} See Appendix 3

^{vii} If ENDS/ENNDS are regulated as prescribed medicinal products and regulations are well-enforced, the current taxation policy for these products should be applied.

- b. Parties that have not banned the importation, sale, and distribution of ENDS/ENNDS may consider the following options to minimize health risks to non-users:
- i. Prohibiting by law the use of ENDS/ENNDS in indoor spaces or at least where smoking is not permitted^{viii};
 - ii. Requiring health warnings about potential health risks deriving from their use. Health warnings may additionally inform the public about the addictive nature of nicotine in ENDS; and
 - iii. Reducing the risk of accidental acute nicotine intoxication by a) requiring tamper-evident/child resistant packaging for e-liquids and leak-proof containers for devices and e-liquids and b) limiting the nicotine concentration and total nicotine amount in devices and e-liquids.

31. *Objective: prevention of unproven health claims being made about ENDS/ENNDS.* Parties that have not banned the importation, sale, and distribution of ENDS/ENNDS may consider the following options:

- a. Prohibiting implicit or explicit claims about the effectiveness of ENDS/ENNDS as smoking cessation aids unless a specialized governmental agency has approved them;
- b. Prohibiting implicit or explicit claims that ENDS/ENNDS are innocuous or that ENDS are not addictive; and
- c. Prohibiting implicit or explicit claims about the comparative safety or addictiveness of ENDS/ENNDS with respect to any product unless these have been approved by a specialized governmental agency.

32. *Objective: protect tobacco control activities from all commercial and other vested interests related to ENDS/ENNDS, including interests of the tobacco industry.* Parties, including those that have banned the importation, sale, and distribution of ENDS/ENNDS, may consider the following options:

- a. Raising awareness about potential industry interference with Parties' tobacco control policies;
- b. Establishing measures to limit interactions with the industry and to ensure transparency in those interactions that do take place;
- c. Rejecting partnerships with the industry;
- d. Taking measures to prevent conflicts of interest for government officials and employees;
- e. Requiring that information provided by the industry be transparent and accurate;
- f. Banning activities described as "socially responsible" by the industry, including but not limited to activities described as "corporate social responsibility";
- g. Refusing to give preferential treatment to industry; and
- h. Treating State-owned industry in the same way as any other industry.

ACTION BY THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES

33. The COP is invited to note this report and provide further guidance.

= = =

^{viii} See Appendix 4.

REFERENCES

- ¹ FCTC/COP/6/9
- ² http://www.who.int/tobacco/industry/product_regulation/tobreg/en/
- ³ Fernandez, E., et al, Institut Català d'Oncologia, Exposure to Aerosols from Smoking-proxy Electronic Inhaling Systems: a Systematic Review, unpublished report, (2016) Fernandez
- ⁴ El Dib, R., et al, Electronic nicotine delivery systems and/or electronic non-nicotine delivery systems for tobacco smoking cessation or reduction: A systematic review and meta-analysis, unpublished report (2016)
- ⁵ Pisinger, C., Research Centre for Prevention and Health, A systematic review of health effects of electronic cigarettes, unpublished report (2015)
- ⁶ Yoong, et. Al., Prevalence of Smoking-proxy Electronic Inhaling Systems (SEIS) use and its association with tobacco initiation in youth, unpublished report (2016)
- ⁷ Based on Euromonitor's 2015 data
- ⁸ Mickle T. E-Cigarette Sales Rapidly Lose Steam [Internet]. WSJ. 2016 [cited 2 June 2016]. Available from: <http://www.wsj.com/articles/e-cig-sales-rapidly-lose-steam-1447798921>
- ⁹ Japan Tobacco International. JTI acquires "Ploom" Intellectual Property Rights from Ploom, Inc. [Internet]. Jti.com. 2015 [cited 2 June 2016]. Available from: <http://www.jti.com/media/news-releases/jti-acquires-ploom-intellectual-property-rights-ploom-inc/>
- ¹⁰ Philip Morris International. A New Era Begins in Japan: Revolutionary Tobacco Heating Technology 'iQOS' to be Rolled Out Nationwide [Internet]. 2015 [cited 2 June 2016]. Available from: http://www.pmi.com/ja_jp/media_center/press_releases/Documents/20150818iQOS_E.pdf
- ¹¹ Spencer B. The iFuse 'hybrid' cigarette combines e-cig technology with tobacco [Internet]. Mail Online. 2015 [cited 3 June 2016]. Available from: <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-3330238/The-iFuse-hybrid-cigarette-combines-e-cig-technology-tobacco-improve-flavour-vapour.html>
- ¹² Moyses C, Hearn A, Redfern A. Evaluation of a Novel Nicotine Inhaler Device: Part 1--Arterial and Venous Pharmacokinetics. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research*. 2014;17(1):18-25.
- ¹³ Moyses C, Hearn A, Redfern A. Evaluation of a Novel Nicotine Inhaler Device: Part 2--Effect on Craving and Smoking Urges. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research*. 2014;17(1):26-33.
- ¹⁴ Rose J, Turner J, Murugesan T, Behm F, Laugesen M. Pulmonary delivery of nicotine pyruvate: Sensory and pharmacokinetic characteristics. *Experimental and Clinical Psychopharmacology*. 2010;18(5):385-394.
- ¹⁵ Visser W, Geraets L, Klerx W, Hernandez L, Stephens E, Croes E et al. The health risks of using e-cigarettes. [Internet]. Bilthoven The Netherlands: National Institute for Public Health and the Environment; 2015. Available from: <http://www.rivm.nl/bibliotheek/rapporten/2015-0144.pdf>
- ¹⁶ Goniewicz M, Knysak J, Gawron M, Kosmider L, Sobczak A, Kurek J et al. Levels of selected carcinogens and toxicants in vapour from electronic cigarettes. *Tobacco Control*. 2013;23(2):133-139.
- ¹⁷ U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. The Health Consequences of Smoking—50 Years of Progress: A Report of the Surgeon General. Rockville, MD: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Office on Smoking and Health; 2014.
- ¹⁸ Kutlu MGould T. Nicotine modulation of fear memories and anxiety: Implications for learning and anxiety disorders. *Biochemical Pharmacology*. 2015;97(4):498-511.
- ¹⁹ Yuan M, Cross S, Loughlin S, Leslie F. Nicotine and the adolescent brain. *J Physiol*. 2015;593(16):3397-3412.
- ²⁰ Hall F, Der-Avakian A, Gould T, Markou A, Shoaib M, Young J. Negative affective states and cognitive impairments in nicotine dependence. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*. 2015;58:168-185.
- ²¹ Zhu S, Sun J, Bonnevie E, Cummins S, Gamst A, Yin L et al. Four hundred and sixty brands of e-cigarettes and counting: implications for product regulation. *Tobacco Control*. 2014;23(suppl 3):iii3-iii9.
- ²² Barrington-Trimis J, Samet J, McConnell R. Flavorings in Electronic Cigarettes. *JAMA*. 2014;312(23):2493.
- ²³ Kreiss K, Gomaa A, Kullman G, Fedan K, Simoes E, Enright P. Clinical Bronchiolitis Obliterans in Workers at a Microwave-Popcorn Plant. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2002;347(5):330-338.
- ²⁴ Harber P, Saechao K, Boomus C. Diacetyl-Induced Lung Disease. *Toxicological Reviews*. 2006;25(4):261-272.
- ²⁵ Behar R, Davis B, Wang Y, Bahl V, Lin S, Talbot P. Identification of toxicants in cinnamon-flavored electronic cigarette refill fluids. *Toxicology in Vitro*. 2014;28(2):198-208.
- ²⁶ van Assendelft A. Adverse drug reactions checklist. *BMJ*. 1987;294(6571):576-577.
- ²⁷ Saint DM, Vanillin-triggered migraine. *Food and Chemical Toxicology*. 1997;35(5):527-528.
- ²⁸ Tierney P, Karpinski C, Brown J, Luo W, Pankow J. Flavour chemicals in electronic cigarette fluids. *Tobacco Control*. 2015;25(e1):e10-e15.

- ²⁹ Lerner C, Sundar I, Yao H, Gerloff J, Ossip D, McIntosh S et al. Vapors Produced by Electronic Cigarettes and E-Juices with Flavorings Induce Toxicity, Oxidative Stress, and Inflammatory Response in Lung Epithelial Cells and in Mouse Lung. *PLOS ONE*. 2015;10(2):e0116732.
- ³⁰ Cervellati F, Muresan X, Sticozzi C, Gambari R, Montagner G, Forman H et al. Comparative effects between electronic and cigarette smoke in human keratinocytes and epithelial lung cells. *Toxicology in Vitro*. 2014;28(5):999-1005.
- ³¹ Wu Q, Jiang D, Minor M, Chu H. Electronic Cigarette Liquid Increases Inflammation and Virus Infection in Primary Human Airway Epithelial Cells. *PLoS ONE*. 2014;9(9):e108342.
- ³² Bahl V, Lin S, Xu N, Davis B, Wang Y, Talbot P. Comparison of electronic cigarette refill fluid cytotoxicity using embryonic and adult models. *Reproductive Toxicology*. 2012;34(4):529-537.
- ³³ Britton J, Arnott D, McNeill A, Hopkinson N. Nicotine without smoke—putting electronic cigarettes in context. *BMJ*. 2016;:i1745.
- ³⁴ Public Health England. E-cigarettes: a new foundation for evidence-based policy and practice [Internet]. Public Health England. 2015 [cited 22 June 2016]. Available from: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/454517/E-cigarettes_a_firm_foundation_for_evidence_based_policy_and_practice.pdf
- ³⁵ McNeill A, Brose L, Calder R, Hitchman S, Hajek P, McRobbie H. E-cigarettes: an evidence update A report commissioned by Public Health England [Internet]. Public Health England. 2015 [cited 22 June 2016]. Available from: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/457102/E-cigarettes_an_evidence_update_A_report_commissioned_by_Public_Health_England_FINAL.pdf
- ³⁶ McNeill A, Brose L, Calder R, Hitchman S, Hajek P, McRobbie H. Underpinning evidence for the estimate that e-cigarette use is around 95% safer than smoking: authors' note [Internet]. Public Health England. 2015 [cited 22 June 2016]. Available from: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/456704/McNeill-Hajek_report_authors_note_on_evidence_for_95_estimate.pdf
- ³⁷ Levy D, Borland R, Villanti A, Niaura R, Yuan Z, Zhang Y et al. The Application of a Decision-Theoretic Model to Estimate the Public Health Impact of Vaporized Nicotine Product Initiation in the United States. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research*. 2016;:ntw158.
- ³⁸ Kalkhoran S, Glantz S. Modeling the Health Effects of Expanding e-Cigarette Sales in the United States and United Kingdom. *JAMA Internal Medicine*. 2015;175(10):1671.
- ³⁹ Combes RD, Balls M. On the safety of e-cigarettes: "I can resist anything except temptation". *Alternatives to Laboratory Animals*. 2015;43(6):417-425.015;43(6):417-425.
- ⁴⁰ British American Tobacco. A new framework for assessing Potentially Reduced Risk Tobacco and Nicotine products [Internet]. *Bat-science.com*. 2015 [cited 19 July 2016]. Available from: http://www.bat-science.com/groupms/sites/BAT_9GVJXS.nsf/vwPagesWebLive/DOA3XF63?opendocument#
- ⁴¹ Philip Morris International. Reduced-Risk Product Development [Internet]. *Pmi.com*. [cited 19 July 2016]. Available from: http://www.pmi.com/eng/research_and_development/Pages/reduced_risk_product_development.aspx#
- ⁴² Hess I, Lachireddy K, Capon A. A systematic review of the health risks from passive exposure to electronic cigarette vapour. *Public Health Research & Practice*. 2016;26(2).
- ⁴³ Bertholon J, Becquemin M, Roy M, Roy F, Ledur D, Annesi Maesano I et al. Comparaison de l'aérosol de la cigarette électronique à celui des cigarettes ordinaires et de la chicha. *Revue des Maladies Respiratoires*. 2013;30(9):752-757.
- ⁴⁴ Ballbè M, Martínez-Sánchez JM, Sureda X, Fu M, Pérez-Ortuño R, Pascual JA, et al. Cigarettes vs. e-cigarettes: Passive exposure at home measured by means of airborne marker and biomarkers. *Environ Res*. 2014;135:76–80.
- ⁴⁵ Long GA. Comparison of select analytes in exhaled aerosol from e-cigarettes with exhaled smoke from a conventional cigarette and exhaled breaths. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2014;11:11177–91.
- ⁴⁶ Ruprecht AA, De Marco C, Pozzi P, Munarini E, Mazza R, Angellotti G, et al. Comparison between particulate matter and ultrafine particle emission by electronic and normal cigarettes in real-life conditions. *Tumori*. 2014;100:24–7.
- ⁴⁷ Saffari A, Daher N, Ruprecht A, De Marco C, Pozzi P, Boffi R, et al. Particulate metals and organic compounds from electronic and tobacco-containing cigarettes: comparison of emission rates and secondhand exposure. *Environ Sci Process Impacts*. 2014;16:2259–67.
- ⁴⁸ Schripp T, Markewitz D, Uhde E, Salthammer T. Does e-cigarette consumption cause passive vaping? *Indoor Air*. 2013;23:25–31. *Environ Sci Process Impacts*. 2014;16:2259–67.
- ⁴⁹ Czogala J, Goniewicz ML, Fidelus B, Zielinska-Danch W, Travers MJ, Sobczak A. Secondhand exposure to vapors from electronic cigarettes. *Nicotine Tob Res*. 2014;16:655–62.
- ⁵⁰ Marco E, Grimalt JO. A rapid method for the chromatographic analysis of volatile organic compounds in exhaled breath of tobacco cigarette and electronic cigarette smokers. *J Chromatogr A*. 2015;1410:51–9.
- ⁵¹ Long GA. Comparison of select analytes in exhaled aerosol from e-cigarettes with exhaled smoke from a conventional cigarette and exhaled breaths. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2014;11:11177–91.
- ⁵² Saffari A, Daher N, Ruprecht A, De Marco C, Pozzi P, Boffi R, et al. Particulate metals and organic compounds from electronic and tobacco-containing cigarettes: comparison of emission rates and secondhand exposure. *Environ Sci Process Impacts*. 2014;16:2259–67.

- ⁵³ Schober W, Szendrei K, Matzen W, Osiander-Fuchs H, Heitmann D, Schettgen T, et al. Use of electronic cigarettes (e-cigarettes) impairs indoor air quality and increases FeNO levels of e-cigarette consumers. *Int J Hyg Environ Health*. 2014;217:628–37.
- Vargas Trassierra C, Cardellini F, Buonanno G, De Felice P. On the interaction between radon progeny and particles generated by electronic and traditional cigarettes. *Atmos Environ*. 2015;106:442–50.
- ⁵⁴ O’Connell G, Colard S, Cahours X, Pritchard J. An Assessment of Indoor Air Quality before, during and after Unrestricted Use of E-Cigarettes in a Small Room. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2015;12:4889–907.
- ⁵⁵ Vargas Trassierra C, Cardellini F, Buonanno G, De Felice P. On the interaction between radon progeny and particles generated by electronic and traditional cigarettes. *Atmos Environ*. 2015;106:442–50.
- ⁵⁶ Royal College of Physicians. Nicotine without smoke: Tobacco harm reduction [Internet]. Rcpplondon.ac.uk. 2016 [cited 31 July 2016]. Available from: <https://www.rcplondon.ac.uk/file/3563/download?token=uV0R0Twz>
- ⁵⁷ Public Health England. Use of e-cigarettes in public places and workplaces. London, England: Public Health England; 2016.
- ⁵⁸ Unger J. E-Cigarettes: Introducing New Complexities and Controversies to the Field of Nicotine and Tobacco Research. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research*. 2015;17(10):1185-1186.
- ⁵⁹ McRobbie H, Bullen C, Hartmann-Boyce J, Hajek P. Electronic cigarettes for smoking cessation and reduction. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2014.
- ⁶⁰ GRADE Working Group. Grading quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. *BMJ*. 2004;328(7454):1490-0.
- ⁶¹ Kalkhoran S, Glantz S. E-cigarettes and smoking cessation in real-world and clinical settings: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Lancet Respiratory Medicine*. 2016;4(2):116-128.
- ⁶² Biener L, Hargraves J. A Longitudinal Study of Electronic Cigarette Use Among a Population-Based Sample of Adult Smokers: Association With Smoking Cessation and Motivation to Quit. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research*. 2014;17(2):127-133.
- ⁶³ Brose L, Hitchman S, Brown J, West R, McNeill A. Is the use of electronic cigarettes while smoking associated with smoking cessation attempts, cessation and reduced cigarette consumption? A survey with a 1-year follow-up. *Addiction*. 2015;110(7):1160-1168.
- ⁶⁴ Leventhal A, Strong D, Kirkpatrick M, Unger J, Sussman S, Riggs N et al. Association of Electronic Cigarette Use With Initiation of Combustible Tobacco Product Smoking in Early Adolescence. *JAMA*. 2015;314(7):700.
- ⁶⁵ Primack B, Soneji S, Stoolmiller M, Fine M, Sargent J. Progression to Traditional Cigarette Smoking After Electronic Cigarette Use Among US Adolescents and Young Adults. *JAMA Pediatrics*. 2015;169(11):1018.
- ⁶⁶ Wills T, Knight R, Sargent J, Gibbons F, Pagano I, Williams R. Longitudinal study of e-cigarette use and onset of cigarette smoking among high school students in Hawaii. *Tobacco Control*. 2016;:tobaccocontrol-2015-052705.
- ⁶⁷ Barrington-Trimis J, Urman R, Berhane K, Unger J, Cruz T, Pentz M et al. E-Cigarettes and Future Cigarette Use. *Pediatrics*. 2016;.
- ⁶⁸ A sample collection of ENDS/ENNDS advertisement can be seen here: http://tobacco.stanford.edu/tobacco_main/ecigs.php
- ⁶⁹ Cantrell J, Emelle B, Ganz O, Hair E, Vallone D. Rapid increase in e-cigarette advertising spending as Altria’s MarkTen enters the marketplace. *Tobacco Control*. 2015;25(e1):e16-e18.
- ⁷⁰ Kornfield R, Huang J, Vera L, Emery S. Rapidly increasing promotional expenditures for e-cigarettes. *Tobacco Control*. 2014;24(2):110-111.
- ⁷¹ Ganz O, Cantrell J, Moon-Howard J, Aidala A, Kirchner T, Vallone D. Electronic cigarette advertising at the point-of-sale: a gap in tobacco control research. *Tobacco Control*. 2014;24(e1):e110-e112.
- ⁷² Huang J, Kornfield R, Szczycka G, Emery S. A cross-sectional examination of marketing of electronic cigarettes on Twitter. *Tobacco Control*. 2014;23(suppl 3):iii26-iii30.
- ⁷³ Seidenberg A, Jo C, Ribisl K. Differences in the design and sale of e-cigarettes by cigarette manufacturers and non-cigarette manufacturers in the USA: Table 1. *Tobacco Control*. 2015;25(e1):e3-e5.
- ⁷⁴ Grana R, Ling P. “Smoking Revolution”. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*. 2014;46(4):395-403.
- ⁷⁵ Richardson A, Ganz O, Vallone D. Tobacco on the web: surveillance and characterisation of online tobacco and e-cigarette advertising. *Tobacco Control*. 2014;24(4):341-347.
- ⁷⁶ Cobb N, Brookover J, Cobb C. Forensic analysis of online marketing for electronic nicotine delivery systems. *Tobacco Control*. 2013;24(2):128-131.
- ⁷⁷ Singh T, Marynak K, Arrazola R, Cox S, Rolle I, King B. Vital Signs : Exposure to Electronic Cigarette Advertising Among Middle School and High School Students — United States, 2014. *MMWR Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*. 2016;64(52):1403-1408.
- ⁷⁸ Ramamurthi D, Fadadu R, Jackler R. Electronic cigarette marketers manipulate antitobacco advertisements to promote vaping. *Tobacco Control*. 2015;:tobaccocontrol-2015-052661.
- ⁷⁹ Rooke CA, Amos A. News media representations of electronic cigarettes: an analysis of newspaper coverage in the UK and Scotland: Table 1. *Tobacco Control*. 2013;23(6):507-512.

-
- ⁸⁰ Andrade M, Hastings G, Angus K. Promotion of electronic cigarettes: tobacco marketing reinvented?. *BMJ*. 2013;347(dec 20 1):f7473-f7473.
- ⁸¹ National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Smoking: harm reduction | 3-Considerations | Guidance and guidelines | NICE [Internet]. *Nice.org.uk*. 2013 [cited 20 July 2016]. Available from: <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ph45/chapter/3-Considerations>
- ⁸² Advertising Standards Authority. Ruling on Mirage Cigarettes Ltd - Advertising Standards Authority [Internet]. *Asa.org.uk*. 2015 [cited 20 July 2016]. Available from: https://www.asa.org.uk/Rulings/Adjudications/2015/4/Mirage-Cigarettes-Ltd/SHP_ADJ_292291.aspx#.V4-DZrjhDIU
- ⁸³ Huang J, Tauras J, Chaloupka F. The impact of price and tobacco control policies on the demand for electronic nicotine delivery systems. *Tobacco Control*. 2014;23(suppl 3):iii41-iii47.
- ⁸⁴ Stoklosa M, Drope J, Chaloupka F. Prices and E-Cigarette Demand: Evidence From the European Union. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research*. 2016;:ntw109.
- ⁸⁵ Chaloupka F, Sweanor D, Warner K. Differential Taxes for Differential Risks — Toward Reduced Harm from Nicotine-Yielding Products. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2015;373(7):594-597.
- ⁸⁶ Liber A, Drope J, Stoklosa M. Combustible cigarettes cost less to use than e-cigarettes: global evidence and tax policy implications. *Tobacco Control*. 2016;:tobaccocontrol-2015-052874.
- ⁸⁷ Czoli C, Goniewicz M, Islam T, Kotnowski K, Hammond D. Consumer preferences for electronic cigarettes: results from a discrete choice experiment. *Tobacco Control*. 2015;25(e1):e30-e36.
- ⁸⁸ Ford A, MacKintosh A, Bauld L, Moodie C, Hastings G. Adolescents' responses to the promotion and flavouring of e-cigarettes. *International Journal of Public Health*. 2015;61(2):215-224.
- ⁸⁹ Ambrose B, Day H, Rostron B, Conway K, Borek N, Hyland A et al. Flavored Tobacco Product Use Among US Youth Aged 12-17 Years, 2013-2014. *JAMA*. 2015;314(17):1871.
- ⁹⁰ Vasiljevic M, Petrescu D, Marteau T. Impact of advertisements promoting candy-like flavoured e-cigarettes on appeal of tobacco smoking among children: an experimental study. *Tobacco Control*. 2016;:tobaccocontrol-2015-052593.
- ⁹¹ Business Wire. NJOY to Discontinue Flavors, Takes Additional Steps to Prevent Underage Electronic Cigarette Use [Internet]. *Reuters*. 2016 [cited 10 May 2016]. Available from: <http://www.reuters.com/article/idUS219183+10-Dec-2009+BW20091210>
- ⁹² Farsalinos K, Romagna G, Tsiapras D, Kyrzopoulos S, Spyrou A, Voudris V. Impact of Flavour Variability on Electronic Cigarette Use Experience: An Internet Survey. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2013;10(12):7272-7282.
- ⁹³ Burrus T. Why Big Tobacco Loves the New FDA E-Cig Regulations [Internet]. *Cato Institute*. 2016 [cited 31 July 2016]. Available from: <http://www.cato.org/blog/why-big-tobacco-loves-new-fda-e-cig-regulations>
- ⁹⁴ Snowdon C. E-cigarettes and Article 20 of the Tobacco Products Directive [Internet]. *Epicenter*. [cited 31 July 2016]. Available from: <http://www.epicenternetwork.eu/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/EPICENTER-Briefing-E-cigarettes-and-Article-20-14th-September-2015.pdf>

Appendices to WHO report (FCTC/COP/7/11)

"Electronic Nicotine Delivery Systems and Electronic Non-Nicotine Delivery Systems (ENDS/ENNDS)"

Appendix 1. Other health risks related to ENDS/ENNDS

Other health risks to be considered include those related to:

1. The simultaneous use of ENDS/ENNDS and combustible tobacco products.
 - a. There is a debate about whether simultaneous dual use of ENDS/ENNDS and cigarettes translates to lower quantity of cigarettes smoked with lower intake of smoke toxicants and if ultimately dual users quit smoking and switch entirely to ENDS use.
 - b. Almost no research has examined whether dual use is a transitional stage to quitting or rather a lingering sign of failure to quit and relapse to exclusive smoking.
 - c. Dual use may lead to some reduction on number and duration of smoking, depending on the degree of substitution and age of initial dual use with all other factors - user behavior, type of ENDS and e-liquids – being equal. However, its translation into reduction of lifetime risk it is not expected to be significant. Initial data on the impact of reduce cigarette consumption might have raised some hope.¹ Nevertheless, the most recent data indicates that reduction of smoking reduces very little if any the lifetime risk.^{2,3,4}
2. The defective design or packaging, and adulterated or manipulated e-liquid.
 - a. Defective design of devices includes batteries causing accidental fires. Overcharging of the lithium ion batteries or use of the wrong charger or battery resulted in 25 known fire incidents in the USA between 2009 and 2014 causing 9 injuries and no deaths.⁵ Fire in checked baggage claim areas of US airports resulted in US Federal Aviation Authority (FAA) banning ENDS in checked baggage in February 2016.⁶
 - b. Reckless packaging of e-liquid has led to child poisonings and death.⁷ According to the American Association of Poison Centers the number of calls on poisoning among infants and young children rose from 268 in 2011 to 1,214 by 2013 and 3,831 by 2014.⁸
 - c. Adulteration of e-liquid has been cited^{9,10} as concern given the lack of manufacturing regulatory control. In fact, there have been reports were ethylene glycol was the dominant compound in the solvent.¹¹

Appendix 2. Table - Pooled prevalence of ENDS/ENNDS use during the period 2013-2015 among youth ≤20 years

		Non-smokers	Smokers
Ever use of ENDS/ENNDS	<i>N</i>	13 studies from 8 countries	13 studies from 8 countries
	<i>Range</i>	0.7% (Italy)–14.0% (N Zealand)	26.3% (Italy)–72.5% (Canada)
	<i>Pooled</i>	7% (95% CI: 5.1%-9.3%)	54.7% (95% CI: 45.9%-60.5%)

Currentⁱ use of ENDS/ENNDS (≥1 last 30 days)	<i>N</i>	11 studies from 6 countries	10 studies from 6 countries
	<i>Range</i>	0.0% (Italy) – 19.0% (USA FI)	2.7% (US FI) – 57.4% (Poland)
	<i>Pooled</i>	2.2% - 95% CI: 0.3%-5.6%	17.2% - 95% CI: 5.8%-32.6%

Appendix 3. Role of commercial/tobacco industry in research on ENDS/ENNDS

In a review¹² of 105 studies analyzing the composition of liquids and emissions, on which ENDS/ENNDS safety assessments have been mostly based until now, 30% had authors that had received funding from ENDS/ENNDS interests –including the tobacco industry - for the studies analyzed or for previous studies (25% declared and 5% undeclared). Another 5% declared interests from the pharmaceutical industry. While this in itself does not necessarily invalidate the results of studies, in the past, studies linked to commercial interests of the tobacco and pharmaceutical industries have been found to be biased.^{13,14}

Responsible academics should be able to use scientific journals to raise concerns about how commercial interests have biased the design of the research and/or interpretation of the data. A mere declaration of interests may be insufficient to clarify potential biases. Some ENDS critics have complained about the refusal of well-established peer-reviewed journals to publish their critiques of how declared commercial interest of some authors might have been minimized or reflected in the results of some published studies.^{15,16} ENDS advocates and authors linked to the industry have complained about the limited value of journal peer review when it comes to articles on harm reduction,¹⁷ or ENDS research,^{18,19} with some of them charged in turn with undue influence.^{20,21,22,23,24} There is a clear need to safeguard research from conflicts of interest and to promote a transparent, paused debate of results in order to maximize the contribution of ENDS research to evidence-based policy.

ⁱ Defined as at least once in last 30 days. There is now some agreement that current use should better measured as use a least once in the last 7 days. However, most studies reviewed can only be compared for frequency of use in the last month.

Appendix 4. Public support for policies on use of ENDS/ENNDS in indoor public places or workplaces where smoking is not permitted

Banning ENDS/ENNDS use in smoke-free public places or indoor public and workplaces is opposed by a relatively low proportion of the few studied general adult populations: between 5% and 25% in the USA^{25,26,27,28} and between 20% (schools) and 41% (bars) in Spain²⁹ depending on the type of public place. This policy option is opposed by a higher proportion of smokers and former smokers with smokers more reticent than former smokers: between 25% and 40% in the USA^{30,31} and 45% in the UK.³² Some experts, although opposed to banning ENDS/ENNDS use in indoor places, recognize that reasons other than the health risk to bystanders may exist for prohibiting their use in all or part of a public place or workplace.³³ One governmental agency, in this case, recommends that employers should allow indefinitely ENDS/ENNDS users to utilize their devices during work hours as frequently as needed in designated rooms.³⁴

REFERENCES TO APPENDICES

- ¹ Flanders W, Lally C, Zhu B, Henley S, Thun M. Lung cancer mortality in relation to age, duration of smoking, and daily cigarette consumption: results from Cancer Prevention Study II. *Cancer Research*. 2003;63(19):6556-6562.
- ² Song Y, Sung J, Cho H. Reduction and Cessation of Cigarette Smoking and Risk of Cancer: A Cohort Study of Korean Men. *Journal of Clinical Oncology*. 2008;26(31):5101-5106.
- ³ Hart C, Gruer L, Bauld L. Does Smoking Reduction in Midlife Reduce Mortality Risk? Results of 2 Long-Term Prospective Cohort Studies of Men and Women in Scotland. *American Journal of Epidemiology*. 2013;178(5):770-779.
- ⁴ Tverdal AB, Jartveit K. Health consequences of reduced daily cigarette consumption. *Tobacco Control*. 2006;15(6):472-480.
- ⁵ U.S. Fire Administration. *Electronic Cigarette Fires and Explosions* [Internet]. 1st ed. U.S. Fire Administration; 2014 [cited 21 July 2016]. Available from: https://www.usfa.fema.gov/downloads/pdf/publications/electronic_cigarettes.pdf
- ⁶ US Federal Aviation Administration. *FAA to Airlines: E-cigs in Checked Bags are Fire Risk* [Internet]. Faa.gov. 2016 [cited 21 July 2016]. Available from: <http://www.faa.gov/news/updates/?newsId=81445>
- ⁷ Kamboj A, Spiller H, Casavant M, Chounthirath T, Smith G. Pediatric Exposure to E-Cigarettes, Nicotine, and Tobacco Products in the United States. *PEDIATRICS*. 2016;137(6):e20160041-e20160041.
- ⁸ American Association of Poison Control Centers. *Electronic Cigarettes (E-Cigs) and Liquid Nicotine* [Internet]. 1st ed. American Association of Poison Control Centers; 2015 [cited 21 July 2016]. Available from: https://aapcc.s3.amazonaws.com/files/library/NPDS_Data_Product_Overview_Electronic_Cigarettes.pdf
- ⁹ Barboza D. China's E-Cigarette Boom Lacks Oversight for Safety [Internet]. *Nytimes.com*. 2014 [cited 3 June 2016]. Available from: http://www.nytimes.com/2014/12/14/business/international/chinas-e-cigarette-boom-lacks-oversight-for-safety-.html?_r=1
- ¹⁰ Saitta D, Ferro G, Polosa R. Achieving appropriate regulations for electronic cigarettes. *Therapeutic Advances in Chronic Disease*. 2014;5(2):50-61.
- ¹¹ Hutzler C, Paschke M, Kruschinski S, Henkler F, Hahn J, Luch A. Chemical hazards present in liquids and vapors of electronic cigarettes. *Archives of Toxicology*. 2014;88(7):1295-1308.
- ¹² Pisinger, C., Research Centre for Prevention and Health, A systematic review of health effects of electronic cigarettes, unpublished report (2015)
- ¹³ Bero L. Tobacco industry manipulation of research. *Public Health Reports*. 2005;120(March-April):200-208.
- ¹⁴ Etter J, Burri M, Stapleton J. The impact of pharmaceutical company funding on results of randomized trials of nicotine replacement therapy for smoking cessation: a meta-analysis. *Addiction*. 2007;102(5):815-822.
- ¹⁵ Glantz S. Addiction refuses to allow discussion of industry ties to criticism of our “softening paper” | Center for Tobacco Control Research and Education [Internet]. *Tobacco.ucsf.edu*. 2016 [cited 11 May 2016]. Available from: <https://tobacco.ucsf.edu/addiction-refuses-allow-discussion-industry-ties-criticism-our-%E2%80%9Csoftening-paper%E2%80%9D>
- ¹⁶ Glantz S. Shiffman et al paper in *Nicotine & Tobacco Research* is not a reliable estimate of effects of ecig flavors | Center for Tobacco Control Research and Education [Internet]. *Tobacco.ucsf.edu*. 2015 [cited 18 May 2016]. Available from: <https://tobacco.ucsf.edu/shiffman-et-al-paper-nicotine-tobacco-research-not-reliable-estimate-effects-ecig-flavors>
- ¹⁷ Phillips C, Burstyn I, Carter B. The limited value of journal peer review in public health: a case series of tobacco harm reduction articles [Internet]. *Online: Ep-ology*; 2015. Available from: <https://epology.files.wordpress.com/2015/06/phillips-burstyn-carter-peer-review-review-working-paper-23jun15.pdf>
- ¹⁸ Farsalinos K. Politics over science: unprecedented distortion of evidence by a prestigious medical journal [Internet]. *ecigarette-research*. 2014 [cited 11 May 2016]. Available from: <http://www.ecigarette-research.com/web/index.php/2013-04-07-09-50-07/2014/179-coc>
- ¹⁹ Bates C. Flawed e-cigarette formaldehyde paper should be retracted – formal complaint and supporting letter published [Internet]. *The counterfactual*. 2015 [cited 11 May 2016]. Available from: <http://www.clivebates.com/?p=3304>
- ²⁰ Siegel M. Discontinuation of Crowdfunding Campaign for BSCiTS Study [Internet]. *The Smokers ClubS*. 2016 [cited 11 May 2016]. Available from: <http://www.smokersclubinc.com/modules.php?name=News&file=article&sid=5835>

-
- ²¹ CASAA. We have received several queries about... - CASAA.org - The Consumer Advocates for Smoke-free Alternatives Association | Facebook [Internet]. Facebook.com. 2016 [cited 11 May 2016]. Available from: <https://www.facebook.com/CASAAmedia/posts/10152865189257868>
- ²² Phillips C. Michael Siegel puts himself in a hole, and then keeps digging [Internet]. EP-ology. 2014 [cited 11 May 2016]. Available from: <https://ep-ology.com/2014/09/29/michael-siegel-puts-himself-in-a-hole-and-then-keeps-digging/>
- ²³ Phillips C. Mike Siegel inappropriately blames the failure of his ill-advised research plans on others [Internet]. EP-ology. 2014 [cited 11 May 2016]. Available from: <https://ep-ology.com/2014/09/27/mike-siegel-inappropriately-blames-the-failure-of-his-ill-advised-research-plans-on-others/>
- ²⁴ Phillips C. Mike Siegel still doesn't understand what is wrong with his study "plan" [Internet]. EP-ology. 2014 [cited 11 May 2016]. Available from: <https://ep-ology.com/2014/10/17/mike-siegel-still-doesnt-understand-what-is-wrong-with-his-study-plan/>
- ²⁵ Tan A, Bigman C, Sanders-Jackson A. Sociodemographic correlates of self-reported exposure to e-cigarette communications and its association with public support for smoke-free and vape-free policies: results from a national survey of US adults. *Tobacco Control*. 2014;24(6):574-581.
- ²⁶ Mello S, Bigman C, Sanders-Jackson A, Tan A. Perceived Harm of Secondhand Electronic Cigarette Vapors and Policy Support to Restrict Public Vaping: Results From a National Survey of US Adults. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research*. 2015;18(5):686-693.
- ²⁷ Majeed B, Dube S, Sterling K, Whitney C, Eriksen M. Opinions About Electronic Cigarette Use in Smoke-Free Areas Among U.S. Adults, 2012. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research*. 2014;17(6):675-681.
- ²⁸ Tan A, Lee C, Bigman C. Public support for selected e-cigarette regulations and associations with overall information exposure and contradictory information exposure about e-cigarettes: Findings from a national survey of U.S. adults. *Preventive Medicine*. 2015;81:268-274.
- ²⁹ Martínez-Sánchez J, Ballbè M, Fu M, Martín-Sánchez J, Gottlieb M, Saltó E et al. Attitudes towards Electronic Cigarettes Regulation in Indoor Workplaces and Selected Public and Private Places: A Population-Based Cross-Sectional Study. *PLoS ONE*. 2014;9(12):e114256.
- ³⁰ Kolar S, Rogers B, Hooper M. Support for Indoor Bans on Electronic Cigarettes among Current and Former Smokers. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2014;11(12):12174-12189.
- ³¹ Wackowski ODelnevo C. Smokers' attitudes and support for e-cigarette policies and regulation in the USA: Table 1. *Tobacco Control*. 2015;24(6):543-546.
- ³² Brose L, Partos T, Hitchman S, McNeill A. Support for e-cigarette policies: a survey of smokers and ex-smokers in Great Britain. *Tobacco Control*. 2016;:tobaccocontrol-2016-052987.
- ³³ Public Health England. Use of e-cigarettes in public places and workplaces. London, England: Public Health England; 2016.
- ³⁴ Public Health England. Use of e-cigarettes in public places and workplaces. London, England: Public Health England; 2016.