

E-Cigarette Use and Subclinical Cardiac Effects

Florian Rader, MD, MS;^a Mohamad A. Rashid, MBChB;^a Trevor Trung Nguyen, BS;^a
Eric Luong, MPH;^a Andy Kim, BA;^a Elizabeth H. Kim, BA;^a Robert Elashhoff, PhD;^c
Katherine Davoren, MD, PharmD;^b Norma B. Moy, BA;^a Fida Nafeh, RDCS;^a
C. Noel Bairey Merz, MD;^a Joseph E. Ebinger, MD;^a Naomi M. Hamburg, MD, MS;^d
Jonathan R. Lindner, MD^e Susan Cheng, MD, MMSc, MPH^a

^a Smidt Heart Institute, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, Los Angeles, CA;

^b Division of Nephrology, University of Massachusetts School of Medicine, Worcester, MA;

^c University of California Los Angeles School of Public Health, Los Angeles, CA;

^d Whitaker Cardiovascular Institute, Boston University School of Medicine, Boston, MA; and,

^e Knight Cardiovascular Institute, Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, OR.

Correspondence: Florian Rader, MD, MSc, Smidt Heart Institute, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, Los Angeles, CA; phone (310) 423-3880; fax (310) 423-4627; florian.rader@cshs.org; and, Susan Cheng, MD, MMSc, MPH, Smidt Heart Institute, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, Los Angeles, CA; phone (310) 423-9680; fax (310) 423-9680; susan.cheng@cshs.org.

ABSTRACT

BACKGROUND. Electronic (e-) cigarettes are marketed as a safer alternative to conventional tobacco cigarettes. Although e-cigarettes contain a lower level of nicotine, the delivery method involves delivering an aerosolized bolus of poorly-characterized ultrafine particles that have unknown cardiovascular effects.

METHODS. We studied apparently adult volunteers, free of any chronic disease, including: non-smoking controls, chronic e-cigarette users, and chronic tobacco cigarette smokers. After overnight abstinence, we used myocardial contrast echocardiography to measure acute increases in myocardial blood flow (MBF) induced by ischemic rhythmic handgrip stress, which causes sympathetically-mediated increases in myocardial work and oxygen demand and, in turn, shear stress, nitric oxide production, and coronary endothelial-dependent vasodilation.

RESULTS. In non-smoking controls, handgrip stress increased myocardial blood flow, reflecting normal endothelial function. Chronic tobacco cigarette smokers demonstrated stress-induced blunting in myocardial blood flow change, when compared to non-smoking controls. Chronic e-cigarette smokers demonstrated a decrease, rather than increase, in myocardial blood flow change.

CONCLUSION. Chronic e-cigarette users demonstrated substantially impaired coronary microvascular endothelial function, even more pronounced than that seen in chronic tobacco cigarette users. These findings suggest that chronic e-cigarette use leads to measurable and persistent adverse vascular effects that are not directly related to nicotine.

BACKGROUND

E-cigarette (vaping) devices continue to be perceived as a safer alternative to conventional tobacco cigarettes. While providing variable and sometimes lower amounts of nicotine, e-cigarettes rely on a battery-powered aerosolization method that involves delivering with each inhalation a bolus of poorly-characterized small molecules (e.g. ultra-fine particles, heavy metals, volatile organic compounds). Recent reports have now linked e-cigarette use with toxic inhalation syndromes and risk for severe pulmonary disease.¹ Beyond direct lung injury, inhaled small molecules can rapidly cross the alveolar-capillary barrier and enter into the circulation, potentially causing harm to other end-organs including the heart.

METHODS

To understand the possible cardiac effects of e-cigarette use, we prospectively studied N=30 apparently healthy adults (mean age 28 ± 4 years, 27% female) who were free of any chronic disease including: self-reported non-smoking controls (n=10), chronic exclusive e-cigarette users (n=10; mean e-cigarette use 3 ± 2 years), and chronic exclusive tobacco cigarette smokers (n=10; mean smoking history 8 ± 2 years). The institutional review board of Cedars-Sinai Medical Center approved all protocols, and each study participant provided written informed consent.

Following overnight abstinence to ensure nicotine has cleared from their system (average half-life=11 hours),² all participants underwent myocardial contrast echocardiography (MCE) perfusion imaging to quantify relative myocardial blood volume (MBVol), microvascular flux rate (β), and blood flow (MBF) according to previously described methods³. Because conventional tobacco cigarettes have been firmly established to cause both acute and chronic coronary endothelial dysfunction and thereby initiating coronary atherosclerosis,⁴ MCE was used to directly compare cigarette smoke and e-cigarette vapor exposure on coronary endothelial function.⁵ Echocardiographic assessments were conducted before and after isometric handgrip exercise (**Figure 1**),⁶ a standardized and reliable exercise stress protocol that leads to sympathetically-mediated increases in myocardial work and oxygen demand (MVO_2) and, in turn, coronary endothelial-dependent vasodilation under normal conditions. Participants who indicated regular use of both cigarettes and e-cigarettes (i.e. “dual users”) were placed into a separate group which also completed the protocol. Their data was not included in this analysis due to redundancy and time constraints.

RESULTS

Normally, modest exercise stress induces physiologic increases in MBF through augmentation in myocardial microvascular flux rate with relatively smaller degrees of increase in MBVol. Accordingly, in non-smoking controls, exercise produced a statistically significant increase in microvascular flux rate (median: $0.61_{\text{pre-test}}$ vs. $1.14_{\text{post-test}} \text{ s}^{-1}$) and MBF (median: $84.3_{\text{pre-test}}$ vs. $137.9_{\text{post-test}} \text{ IU/s}$) (**Table 1** and **Supplementary Table**). Exercise also increased MBF and flux rate in tobacco users, albeit to a smaller degree than in normal controls; whereas no change in perfusion was seen in e-cigarette users. These results indicate a significant degree of impaired coronary endothelial function that is pronounced in chronic e-cigarette users.

To further examine whether changes in myocardial perfusion were different between groups, we compared the percent change in MCE values between groups. The percent changes between the post- and pre-test were compared, as opposed to the raw differences, to account for differences in basal values. Indeed, we detected a significant difference in change of flux rate and MBF between controls and e-cigarette users (**Table 2** and **Figure 2**). In fact, differences were even seen between tobacco users and e-cigarette users.

DISCUSSION

Use of conventional combustible cigarettes has long been associated with vascular dysfunction as well as incident cardiovascular disease. In this prospective study, we found evidence of coronary microvascular endothelial dysfunction that was even worse in exclusive e-cigarettes users than in exclusive combustible cigarette users. Importantly, these adverse cardiovascular effects were seen to persist in apparently healthy young adult users. While the longer-term cardiovascular consequences of e-cigarette remain unclear, our findings support the need for further investigations into the safety profile of chronic e-cigarette use to better inform regulation and policy.

Disclosures

None.

Funding

This study was funded in part by an Exploratory/Developmental research grant TRDRP #22XT-0017 from the California Tobacco-Related Disease Research Program, an unrestricted research grant from Gilead Sciences, contracts from the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institutes N01-HV-68161, N01-HV-68162, N01-HV-68163, N01-HV-68164, grants U01-64829, U01-HL649141, U01-HL649241, R01-HL090957, R01-HL134168, R01-HL131532, R01-HL143227, R01-HL078610 and R01-HL130046; and R03AG032631 from the National Institute on Aging, GCRC grant MO1-RR00425 from the National Center for Research Resources, the National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences Grant UL1TR000124, the Edythe L. Broad and the Constance Austin Women's Heart Research Fellowships, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, Los Angeles, California, the Barbra Streisand Women's Cardiovascular Research and Education Program, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, Los Angeles, The Society for Women's Health Research (SWHR), Washington, D.C., the Linda Joy Pollin Women's Heart Health Program, the Erika Glazer Women's Heart Health Project, and the Adelson Family Foundation, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, Los Angeles, California.

Acknowledgements

We dedicate this work to memory of Dr. Ronald G. Victor, MD, to whom we are indebted for his pioneering investigations in cardiovascular physiology.

REFERENCES

1. Layden JE, Ghinai I, Pray I, Kimball A, Layer M, Tenforde M, Navon L, Hoots B, Salvatore PP, Elderbrook M, Haupt T, Kanne J, Patel MT, Saathoff-Huber L, King BA, Schier JG, Mikosz CA and Meiman J. Pulmonary Illness Related to E-Cigarette Use in Illinois and Wisconsin - Preliminary Report. *N Engl J Med*. 2019.
2. Benowitz NL, Hukkanen J and Jacob P, 3rd. Nicotine chemistry, metabolism, kinetics and biomarkers. *Handb Exp Pharmacol*. 2009:29-60.
3. Nelson MD, Rezk-Hanna M, Rader F, Mason OR, Tang X, Shidban S, Rosenberry R, Benowitz NL, Tashkin DP, Elashoff RM, Lindner JR and Victor RG. Acute Effect of Hookah Smoking on the Human Coronary Microcirculation. *Am J Cardiol*. 2016;117:1747-54.
4. Morris PB, Ference BA, Jahangir E, Feldman DN, Ryan JJ, Bahrami H, El-Chami MF, Bhakta S, Winchester DE, Al-Mallah MH, Sanchez Shields M, Deedwania P, Mehta LS, Phan BA and Benowitz NL. Cardiovascular Effects of Exposure to Cigarette Smoke and Electronic Cigarettes: Clinical Perspectives From the Prevention of Cardiovascular Disease Section Leadership Council and Early Career Councils of the American College of Cardiology. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2015;66:1378-91.
5. Lindner JR. Molecular imaging of cardiovascular disease with contrast-enhanced ultrasonography. *Nat Rev Cardiol*. 2009;6:475-81.
6. Jake Samuel T, Beaudry R, Haykowsky MJ, Sarma S, Park S, Dombrowsky T, Bhella PS and Nelson MD. Isometric handgrip echocardiography: A noninvasive stress test to assess left ventricular diastolic function. *Clin Cardiol*. 2017;40:1247-1255.

Figure 1. Endothelial-Dependent Coronary Vasodilation Quantified by Myocardial

Contrast Echocardiography Before and After Static Handgrip Stress. In Panel A,

myocardial contrast echocardiography images are shown for a 30 year old healthy non-smoker.

After destruction of microbubbles at pulse interval 0, the septal myocardium (arrow) has

increased opacification at all post-destructive time intervals during static handgrip at 33%

maximal voluntary contraction, indicating increased perfusion. In this participant, both

microvascular flux rate and especially the plateau video intensity of the post-destructive time-

intensity plot, which represents myocardial blood volume, are clearly increased during static

handgrip. Time plots show increase in myocardial blood volume (A) by 21%, microvascular flux

rate (β) by 65%, and myocardial blood flow ($A \times \beta$) by 99%. In **Panel B**, myocardial contrast

echocardiography images are shown for a 33 year old apparently healthy e-cigarette user. After

destruction of microbubbles at pulse interval 0, we would expect the septal myocardium to

opacify similarly to what was seen in the non-smoker; however, it remains dark after

microbubble destruction, indicating an impairment of endothelial dependent vasodilation and,

thus, perfusion. Time plots show a decrease during static handgrip in myocardial volume by 6%,

microvascular flux rate by 25%, and myocardial blood flow by 30%.




Figure 2. Change in Myocardial Blood Flow Following Standardized Stress.




Table 1. Pre- and Post-Stress Myocardial Blood Flow and Related Measures

Group	Myocardial Blood	Pre-test					Post-test					p-value
		Mean ± SD	Median	Q1	Q3	IQR	Mean ± SD	Median	Q1	Q3	IQR	
Control	Volume (IU)	136 ± 19	131	121	154	33	139 ± 21	143	128	154	26	0.76 ^a
	Flux Rate (s ⁻¹)	0.69 ± 0.23	0.61	0.57	0.77	0.2	1.11 ± 0.33	1.14	0.8	1.38	0.57	0.002 *
	Flow (IU/s)	95 ± 42	84	67	104	37	153 ± 50	138	112	184	72	0.002 *
Tobacco users	Volume (IU)	155 ± 13	153	146	164	18	148 ± 26	150	140	168	28	0.846
	Flux Rate (s ⁻¹)	0.62 ± 0.17	0.61	0.5	0.68	0.18	0.83 ± 0.24	0.9	0.69	0.97	0.27	0.006 *
	Flow (IU/s)	97 ± 31	93	73	109	36	126 ± 47	134	105	154	49	0.027
E-Cig users	Volume (IU)	139 ± 18	139	124	152	28	137 ± 21	142	119	148	29	0.492
	Flux Rate (s ⁻¹)	0.59 ± 0.08	0.57	0.53	0.62	0.09	0.55 ± 0.1	0.55	0.52	0.62	0.11	0.492
	Flow (IU/s)	82 ± 20	77	74	91	17	76 ± 18	79	62	90	28	0.432

* Denotes statistically significant changes from pre- to post- test at the alpha = 0.01 level

^a Based on a normal approximation, due to tie in ranks

Wilcoxon Signed-Rank tests with exact p-values were run to compare post- and pre-test values.

Table 2. Change Between Pre- and Post-Stress Myocardial Blood Flow and Related Measures Across User Groups

Myocardial Blood	Controls					Tobacco users					E-cig users					p-values		
	Mean ± SD	Median	Q1	Q3	IQR	Mean ± SD	Median	Q1	Q3	IQR	Mean ± SD	Median	Q1	Q3	IQR	Control s vs. Tobacc o users	Controls vs. E-cig users	Tobacco vs. E-cig users
Volume (IU)	2.7 ± 12.7	0.1	-2.9	11.4	14.3	-4.3 ± 16.8	-3.9	-7.2	8.3	15.5	-0.9 ± 9.2	-2.3	-7	3.5	10.5	0.353	0.529	0.971
Flux Rate (s)	66.8 ± 42.8	71.5	27.3	92.2	64.9	34.7 ± 28.3	42.4	13.4	54.4	41.1	-4.7 ± 20.9	-0.3	-24.5	5.3	29.8	0.105	< 0.001 *	0.005 *
Flow (IU/s)	72.1 ± 53.2	67.8	30.5	98.4	67.9	30.5 ± 40.9	30.1	6.5	50.3	43.8	-5.8 ± 20.8	-4.2	-20.3	5	25.3	0.089	< 0.001 *	0.023

* Denotes a statistically significant difference between in MB measurement between the two groups at an alpha = 0.01 level

Wilcoxon Rank-Sum tests with exact p-values were run to compare percent changes between groups.

Supplementary Table 1. Summary of Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test Between Pre- and Post-Stress Myocardial Blood Measurements

Within Groups

Group	Myocardial Blood	Negative Ranks			Positive Ranks			Test Statistics	
		<i>n</i>	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	<i>n</i>	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	Ties	p-value
Controls	Volume (IU)	5	4.8	24	5	6.2	31	1	0.76 ^a
	Flux Rate (s ⁻¹)	-	-	-	10	5.5	55	0	0.002 *
	Flow (IU/s)	-	-	-	10	5.5	55	0	0.002 *
Tobacco users	Volume (IU)	6	5.0	30	4	6.3	25	0	0.846
	Flux Rate (s ⁻¹)	1	2.0	2	9	5.9	53	0	0.006 *
	Flow (IU/s)	2	3.0	6	8	6.1	49	0	0.0273
E-Cig users	Volume (IU)	6	5.8	35	4	5.0	20	0	0.492
	Flux Rate (s ⁻¹)	5	7.0	35	5	4.0	20	0	0.492
	Flow (IU/s)	6	6.0	36	4	4.8	19	0	0.432

* Denotes statistically significant changes from pre- to post- test at the alpha = 0.01 level

^a Based on a normal approximation, due to tie in ranks