

Comparative Effects of E-cigarette Aerosol on Periodontium

Fangxi Xu^{1*}, Eman Abozeria^{1*}, Malvin N Janal², Smruti Pushalkar¹ Maria V Bederoff¹, Rebeca Vasconcelos¹, Sakshi Sapru¹, Bidisha Paul¹, Erica Queiroz¹, Shreya Makwana¹, Julia Solarewicz¹, Yuqi Guo¹, Deanna Aguallo¹, Claudia Gomez¹, Donna Shelly⁴, Yindalon Aphinyanaphongs^{3,4}, Terry Gordon⁵, Patricia Corby⁶, Angela R. Kamer⁷, Xin Li^{1**}, and Deepak Saxena^{1**}

¹Department of Molecular Pathobiology, ²Department of Epidemiology and Health Promotion, ⁷Department of Periodontology and Implant Dentistry, New York University College of Dentistry, New York, NY 10010, USA, ³Department of Population Health, ⁴Department of Medicine, and ⁵Department of Environmental Medicine, New York University School of Medicine, New York, NY 10016, USA, ⁶Department of Oral Medicine, University of Pennsylvania, School of Dental Medicine, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA.

*Co-first authors

**Co-senior authors

Corresponding Authors:

Deepak Saxena, PhD
345 E 24th St, Room 921B
Department of Basic Science,
New York University College of Dentistry
New York NY 10010
Ph: 212-998-9256
Email: ds100@nyu.edu

Xin Li, PhD
345 E 24th St, Rm 901D
Department of Basic Science,
New York University College of Dentistry
New York NY 10010
Ph: 212-992-7009
Email: xl15@nyu.edu

Abstract word count: 308; Total word count: 3990, Total number of tables: 3 and figures 2, number of references: 33.

Keywords: E-cigarettes, aerosol, smoking, microbiome, periodontal disease, host response.

34 *Knowledge Transfer Statement: The results of this study can be used by scientist and clinicians when*
35 *designing clinical research which they may use to study periodontal disease.*

36

37 ***Abstract***

38 Introduction: Tobacco use is one of the main causes of periodontitis. E-cigarettes are gaining in
39 popularity, and studies are needed to better understand the impact of e-cigarettes on oral health.

40 Objective: To perform a longitudinal study to evaluate the adverse effects of e-cigarettes on
41 periodontal health.

42 Methods: Naïve e-cigarette users, cigarette smokers, and non-smokers were recruited using
43 newspaper and social media. Demographics, age, gender, and ethnicity, were recorded.

44 Participants were scheduled for two visits 6 months apart. At each visit, we collected data on the
45 daily frequency puffs of an e-cigarette, the number of cigarettes smokes, and other parameters,
46 such as alcohol consumption. Carbon monoxide levels, cotinine levels, salivary flow rate,
47 probing depth, and bleeding on probing were determined at both baseline and follow-up visits. P-
48 values less than 0.05 were considered statistically significant.

49 Results: We screened 159 subjects and recruited 140 subjects. One-hundred-one subjects (31
50 cigarette smokers, 32 e-cigarette smokers, and 38 non-smokers) completed every assessment in
51 both visits. The retention and compliance rate of subjects was 84.1%. The use of social media
52 and craigslist was significant in recruiting e-cigarette subjects. Ethnicity and race differed
53 between cohorts, as did average age in the male subjects. Carbon monoxide and salivary cotinine
54 levels were highest among cigarette smokers. Bleeding on probing and average probing depths
55 similarly increased over time in all three cohorts. Increase in the rates of severe periodontal
56 disease were significantly higher in cigarette smokers and e-cigarette users than non-smokers.
57 Confounding factors were subjects' age as most of the e-cigarette group were much younger than
58 cigarette smokers.

59 Conclusion: Among the recruited participants, periodontal severity status after 6 month was
60 significantly worse in cigarette smokers and e-cigarette smokers than non-smokers. This study
61 design and protocol will assist in future larger studies on e-cigarette and oral health.

62

63

64 **INTRODUCTION**

65 Periodontitis, also known as gum disease, is a chronic, polymicrobial inflammatory
66 disease affecting the tissue supporting the tooth. One of the main risks for periodontitis is
67 smoking, as it alters the microbiome (Eggert et al. 2001) of the oral cavity and the host immune
68 response (Lee et al. 2012), causing the oral tissue to become vulnerable and susceptible to
69 disease. Previous studies have demonstrated that the use of tobacco-containing products could
70 potentially lead to oral manifestations, such as mucosal lesions (e.g., leukoplakia, candidiasis,
71 nicotine stomatitis), plaque formation, teeth staining, gingivitis, periodontitis, tooth loss, failure
72 of prosthetic and surgical treatments, and increased risk of oral cancer (Chaffee 2019; Couch et
73 al. 2016; Johnson and Bain 2000). Over the years, conventional cigarette smoking has declined;
74 however, the use of emerging tobacco products, such as electronic cigarettes (e-cigarettes) has
75 increased (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2016). E-cigarettes are non-combustible
76 battery-operated devices that allow users to inhale an aerosol mixture that typically contains
77 propylene glycol and/or glycerin with or without nicotine and other additives (Breland et al.
78 2017). It has been proposed that e-cigarettes serve as a strategy of smoking cessation or a less
79 harmful replacement for conventional cigarettes. However, the data is inconclusive (Charlotte
80 Wells 2017). Switching from smoking to e-cigs reduces the number of cigarettes smoked;
81 however, it does not result in complete withdrawal, and the risk of developing smoking-related
82 diseases, particularly oral diseases, remains a high possibility (Malas et al. 2016; Tomar et al.
83 2015). Moreover, the CDC recently reported 2668 hospitalized e-cigarettes use-associated lung
84 injury cases or deaths (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2020, February 25). Among
85 those cases, 15% of patients were under 18 years old, and 37% of patients were 18 to 24 years
86 old (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2020, February 25). These pathologies suggest
87 that e- cigarettes can significantly damage various tissues, including oral tissues. As the
88 popularity of e-cigarettes use increases, and the potential for damage exists, it is necessary to
89 investigate the impact of e-cigarette use on oral health.

90 The e-cigarette aerosol includes, but is not limited to, tobacco-specific nitrosamines,
91 aldehydes, metals, and volatile organic compounds (Cheng 2014). These compounds could
92 potentially alter the oral microbiome and have adverse effects on oral health. Disturbance of the
93 oral microbiome, particularly commensal microorganisms, might lead to dysbiosis and increase
94 pathobionts, which might lead to oral diseases, such as periodontal disease. Dysbiosis might, in

95 turn, activate different inflammatory pathways and, subsequently, lead to systemic health
96 conditions, such as respiratory (Chun et al. 2017; Clapp and Jaspers 2017), immune (Reidel et al.
97 2018), and cardiovascular complications (Benowitz and Fraiman 2017). Furthermore, our recent
98 study showed that e-cigarette aerosol exposure caused elevated concentrations of
99 proinflammatory cytokines (IL)-6 and IL-1 β , thus potentially increasing susceptibility to
100 periodontal disease (Pushalkar et al. 2020).

101 Clinical parameters of periodontal inflammation include clinical attachment loss,
102 increased probing depth (PD), and bleeding on probing (BoP) (Jeong et al. 2020; Lang and
103 Bartold 2018). Studies have shown that clinical parameters of periodontitis are poorer in
104 cigarette smokers compared to non-smokers (Al-Wahadni and Linden 2003). However, there is
105 limited information on the impact of e-cigarette use on oral health, particularly periodontal
106 status. The current longitudinal study is designed to present a demographic description of our
107 population and compare the clinical periodontal status among cigarette smokers, e-cigarette
108 users, and non-smokers. The primary hypothesis is that clinical parameters of periodontal disease
109 are worse in cigarette smokers and e-cigarette users compared to non-smokers. The findings of
110 this study will help to understand the potential risks associated with e-cigarette use.

111

112 **2. METHODS**

113 **2.1. Ethical guidelines**

114 The approval of the study protocol, informed consent form(s), and all subject materials were
115 obtained by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of the New York University Langone Medical
116 Center. Before any study-related assessment, the participants received a detailed explanation of
117 the research study and procedures. The informed consent of each participant was obtained prior
118 to sample collection, and a copy of the consent form was provided to each participant for their
119 record. Information regarding the risks and possible benefits of study participation was provided,
120 and participants were informed that they might withdraw consent at any time throughout the
121 course of the study. All STROBE guidelines were followed.

122

123 **2.2. Study design and participants**

124 The present study aimed to compare clinical indicators (PD, BOP, CAL) of periodontitis among
125 cigarette smokers, e-cigarette users, and non-smokers. Study visits were conducted at the

126 NYUCD Bluestone Center for Clinical Study. Upon obtaining informed consent and completion
127 of a standardized oral health questionnaire, further social, medical, and dental history was
128 recorded. Subjects were asked to report on the frequency and intensity of tobacco and alcohol
129 use, previous and current health conditions, surgeries, medications, and symptoms of existing
130 conditions. Carbon monoxide levels were assessed, and saliva was collected for the
131 determination of cotinine levels. Periodontal examinations were performed by a calibrated
132 examiner, and subgingival plaque and saliva samples were collected for microbiome analysis
133 (reported elsewhere) (Pushalkar et al. 2020). A follow-up visit (V2) was scheduled 6 months
134 after the baseline visit (V1), and the protocol was repeated along with the assessment of adverse
135 events. Participant charts were assigned an identification number and secured at the NYU's
136 Bluestone Center for Clinical Research.

137 To be eligible for the study, participants were required to meet conditions specific to each
138 cohort. A cigarette smoker was defined as someone who, at the time of the study, smoked at least
139 10 cigarettes daily for a period of 12 months or more. E-cigarette users were defined as a non-
140 cigarette smoker who used minimum of 0.5–1 e-cigarettes daily for minimum of the last 6
141 months. Lastly, a non-smoker was defined as someone who never smoked a cigarette or used an
142 e-cigarette in their lifetime.

143

144 **2.3. Participants enrollment, recruitment, and eligibility**

145 Recruitment of participants was managed by the study coordinator and personnel from New
146 York University's Bluestone Center for Clinical Research. Study flyers were displayed at
147 NYUCD Television screens, NYU primary care, and dental clinics, as well as the Health and
148 Hospital Corporation's primary care sites. Additionally, the study advertisement was posted in
149 local newspapers on Craig's list and Facebook, which has been an effective tool for recruitment.
150 Participants were required to be 21 years of age, to have a minimum of 16 teeth, including eight
151 posterior teeth, and diagnosed with mild, moderate, or severe periodontal disease (Jeong et al.
152 2020; Lang and Bartold 2018). The exclusion criteria were as follows: (a) a medical condition
153 (including uncontrolled diabetes and HIV); (b) recent febrile illness that delays or precludes
154 participation; (c) pregnancy or lactation; (d) history of radiation therapy to the head and neck
155 region; (e) antibiotic use or professional dental cleaning within 1 month; (f) enrollment in other
156 studies; (g) or presence of oral mucosal lesions, such as leukoplakia, herpes labialis, and

157 candidiasis. In addition, non-smoker subjects were excluded from the study if the carbon
158 monoxide (CO) level was at least 7 parts per million (ppm), calling into doubt their non-smoking
159 status.

160 Among the 159 subjects who attended the screening visits, a total of 119 subjects
161 participated in our study; 39 non-smokers, 40 exclusively conventional cigarette smokers, and 40
162 exclusively e-cigarette users successfully enrolled and completed all the assessments of baseline
163 visits. Of these participants, 101 (38 non-smokers, 31 cigarette smokers, and 32 e-cigarette users)
164 have completed the follow-up examination 6 months after the baseline visit (Fig. 1). Participants
165 who did not complete the follow-up visit were either lost to follow-up, withdrew for personal
166 reasons (such as relocation).

167

168 **2.4. Questionnaire**

169 A questionnaire was developed from the Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) oral
170 health questionnaire (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2011, July 22) and completed
171 at baseline and follow-up visits. The questionnaire included eight questions related to periodontal
172 health and past treatment, tooth status, and how many times they used floss and mouthwash
173 during the preceding 7 days.

174

175 **2.5. Clinical data collection**

176 Subject's sex, age, ethnicity, race, nicotine (conventional cigarette and e-cigarette [daily puffs]),
177 and alcohol use history were recorded. Subjects who were eligible and included in this study
178 were asked to follow up daily via specially created text messaging applications to monitor
179 smoking and e-cigarette status for compliance. The information collected was secured by the
180 REDCap database and Twilio software. The subject's identification was encrypted, and the
181 information was transferred to the NYUCD database. The database includes the medical history,
182 dental history, and periodontal status of the subjects.

183

184 **2.6. Assessment of CO levels**

185 To confirm the smoking status of each participant, carbon monoxide (CO) levels were tested by
186 CO Smokerlyzer (Smokerlyzer, Covita, Santa Barbara, CA) according to the manufacturer's
187 instructions. Participants were instructed to inhale deeply and hold their breath for fifteen

188 seconds before slowly exhaling into the device. Based on the CO test results, participants were
189 categorized into one of five groups: non-smoking (NS) (0–6 ppm), low addicted smokers (LAS)
190 (10–15 ppm), moderately addicted smokers (MAS) (16–25 ppm), heavily addicted smokers
191 (HAS) (26–35), and very heavily addicted smokers (VHAS) (≥ 36 ppm) (Pushalkar et al. 2020).

192

193 **2.7. Oral examination**

194 Oral examination was performed by three different calibrated periodontists or dental hygienists.
195 Oral examination was completed at each visit and included: mucosal assessment of lower and
196 upper lip, hard and soft palate, uvula, the floor of the mouth, tongue, tonsils, and labial and
197 buccal mucosa. If any abnormality (such as candidiasis, herpes labialis, aphthous stomatitis) was
198 present, the participant was referred to an oral medicine specialist.

199

200 **2.8. Gingival and periodontal assessment**

201 A full mouth examination was performed to assess the periodontal condition. Periodontal
202 measurements were recorded at six sites per tooth (mesio-buccal, buccal, disto-buccal, mesio-
203 lingual, lingual, and disto-lingual) on all teeth present and included the following: (1) probing
204 depth (PD) defined as the distance from the free gingival margin to the depth of the pocket; (2)
205 distance from the free gingival margin to the cement enamel junction (CEJ); and (3) presence or
206 absence of bleeding on probing (BOP). Clinical attachment loss (CAL) was then calculated by
207 subtracting the CEJ measurement from the PD. For analysis, the percentage of bleeding sites was
208 determined by dividing the number of sites that bled by the total number of sites sampled and
209 multiplying by 100. Probing depth and CAL were summarized as the average PD and CAL
210 among the sampled sites.

211 The classification of mild, moderate, or severe periodontal disease followed the definition
212 given by the CDC in collaboration with the American Academy of Periodontology (CDC-AAP)
213 (Eke et al. 2013). Mild periodontitis was defined as \geq two interproximal sites with ≥ 3 mm
214 attachment loss, and ≥ 2 mm interproximal sites with probing depth ≥ 4 mm (not on the same
215 tooth), or one interproximal site with PD ≥ 5 mm. Moderate periodontitis was defined as two or
216 more interproximal sites with ≥ 4 mm clinical AL (not on the same tooth), or two or more
217 interproximal sites with PD ≥ 5 mm, also not on the same tooth. Severe periodontitis was defined

218 as having two or more interproximal sites with ≥ 6 mm AL (not on the same tooth), and one or
219 more interproximal site(s) with ≥ 5 mm PD [20].

220

221 **2.9. Saliva sample collection and flow rate assessment**

222 Participants were asked to chew paraffin wax pellets (Gleegum, Verve Inc., Providence, RI) to
223 stimulate salivary secretion. After chewing gum for 30 s to 1-min, participants were asked to
224 expectorate 10 ml saliva into a sterile graduated 50 mL centrifuge tube on ice. The amount of
225 saliva was measured after 5 min. If the measured amount was less than 5 mL, participants were
226 asked to keep expectorating. The salivary flow rate was calculated based on recorded data at 5
227 min. Saliva samples were stored on ice and delivered to the clinical site's laboratory for
228 processing. Some saliva (1 mL) was utilized immediately for the cotinine level evaluation (Nic
229 Alert kit, Salimetrics, State College, PA). Retained samples were aliquoted, preserved with
230 phenylmethylsulfonyl fluoride (PMFS), and subjected to aprotinin immune mediator analysis.
231 Aliquots were also saved for microbiome analysis. All the samples were stored at -80°C .

232

233 **2.10. Plaque sample collection**

234 Subgingival plaque samples were collected before periodontal probing by the study clinician
235 using the stroke technique with sterile Gracey mini-curette from the distal and mesial aspects of
236 eight posterior teeth. The samples were then placed into individual sterile 2 mL microcentrifuge
237 tubes with transport (TE) buffer and kept on ice until delivered to the lab, where PMFS buffer
238 and aprotinin were added, labeled, and stored at -80°C .

239

240 **2.11. Statistical analysis**

241 All data were exported from NYULMC REDCap, and statistical analysis was performed using
242 IBM SPSS (v26, IBM Corp., Armonk, NY). Analysis of continuous measures (a measure of CO,
243 salivary flow rate, PD, BOP, and CAL) compared means from the three cohorts over time using
244 a two-way mixed model analysis of variance (ANOVA) followed by Tukey's honestly
245 significant difference (HSD) test. If confronted with heterogeneous variances, the Kruskal-Wallis
246 or Welch test was substituted. Differences between groups in rates of periodontal diagnosis were
247 evaluated using the chi-square test, and changes in diagnosis over time within groups were
248 evaluated using the McNemar test. Logistic regression was then used to evaluate confounding

249 between-group differences in clinical and demographic variables. It was estimated that a sample
250 size of 40 per cohort was sufficient to detect a one standard deviation difference in a two-tailed
251 independent samples t-test with a power of 99%. P-values less than 0.05 were considered
252 statistically significant.

253

254

255 ***RESULTS***

256 ***Participant's demographics***

257 A total of 101 subjects completed the baseline and 6-month follow-up evaluations and sample
258 collections: 31 were cigarette smokers, 32 were e-cigarette smokers, and 38 were non-smokers.
259 The demographic characteristics of the study subjects are shown in Table 1. Seventy percent of
260 the subjects were male. Among males, non-smokers were significantly younger than e-cigarette
261 smokers, and e-cigarette smokers were significantly younger than cigarette smokers. Most non-
262 smokers were Asian, most cigarette smokers were Black, and most e-cigarette smokers were
263 White.

264

265 ***Tobacco and alcohol use***

266 By design, each cohort was enrolled considering the inclusion criteria for the smoking behavior.
267 Table 2a shows that e-cigarette smokers consumed an average of less than one cartridge per day
268 at each study visit. However, the average puffs per day of e-cigarettes declined between the
269 baseline visit and follow-up visit ($p = 0.03$). By contrast, cigarette smokers maintained a constant
270 average use over time, of about 13 cigarettes per day ($p = 0.70$).

271 Table 2b shows that approximately half of the subjects in each study cohort reported
272 using alcohol on both visits. Each cohort reported drinking about two times per week, consuming
273 two or three drinks each time. Although not reaching statistical significance, e-cigarette smokers
274 tended to drink more often than others ($p = 0.1$).

275

276 ***The CO, cotinine level, and saliva flow rate across groups***

277 Cigarette smoking subjects showed higher mean levels of carbon monoxide than e-cigarette
278 smokers or non-smokers (Fig. 2A, 20.8 vs. 5.8 and 2.8 ppm, respectively, $p < 0.001$), as well as
279 higher mean levels of salivary flow rate (Fig. 2B, 3.1 vs. 2.2 and 2.5 mL/min, respectively, $p =$

280 0.02). Consistent with their smoking behaviors, salivary cotinine levels were higher in cigarette
281 smokers than e-cigarette smokers, who were higher than non-smokers at each test period (Fig.
282 2C Kruskal-Wallis test, all $p < 0.001$). Figure 2C also shows a reduction in cotinine levels over
283 time in the cigarette smokers (paired sample t-tests $p = 0.002$). Analysis failed to show an
284 interaction between group and time on any of these measures.

285

286 **Bleeding on probing, pocket depth, clinical attachment loss, and periodontal disease status**

287 The mean percentage of bleeding on probing (BoP) in the three cohorts was increased similarly
288 over time from 56% at baseline to 64% at follow-up (Table 3, $p = 0.03$). The mean probing depth
289 and clinical attachment loss (CAL) were significantly greater in the cigarette smoker group than
290 the non-smoker group or e-cigarette smoker group at both visits (Table 3). While there was an
291 increase in probing depth over time from 2.9 to 3.1 mm, a change that was comparable for the
292 three cohorts, CAL was stable over time. As age, sex, and race were not evenly distributed
293 among the cohorts, we evaluated confounding variables between cohort and demographic
294 effects. Age was not related to either bleeding on probing or probing depth, and so analyses of
295 cohort differences in probing depth were unchanged when adjusted for age and sex. These results
296 suggest similar levels of gingival health and changes in gingival health overtime in each cohort,
297 but more attachment loss in cigarette smokers than other cohorts. Periodontal disease diagnosis
298 also varied among the cohorts studied. Table 3 shows that the prevalence of severe periodontal
299 disease was higher among cigarette smokers than either other cohorts, at both visits (baseline, p
300 $= 0.002$; follow-up, $p = 0.006$). The prevalence of severe periodontal disease increased in all
301 three cohorts from baseline visits to follow-up visits (Fig. 2D), multiple comparison showed no
302 significant changes (McNemar test: Cigarette smoker, $p = 0.69$; e- cigarette smoker, $p = 1.00$;
303 Non-smoker, $p = 0.22$) however all the mild periodontal subject progressed to moderate to
304 severe periodontitis in 6 month follow-up analysis. Prevalence of severe periodontal disease also
305 increased with age (baseline $r = 0.43$; follow-up $r = 0.47$, both $p < 0.001$) (Table 3b). These
306 results suggest that e-cigarettes smokers has higher risk of periodontal disease progression as
307 compared to non-smokers.

308

309 **DISCUSSION**

310 Although a great deal of literature is available on conventional tobacco products, limited data is
311 available on the effects of e-cigarette on oral health. To address this, we conducted a clinical
312 study to determine the impact of e-cigarette use on oral health, particularly periodontal health.
313 The initial interaction of e-cigarette aerosol mixtures occurs largely in the oral cavity, where
314 nicotine and other compounds are expected to be most active, and the exposure is most intense.
315 A recent online survey of 543 e-cigarette users indicated that most negative health effects were
316 observed in the mouth and throat (Hua et al. 2013). We reported previously that the periodontal
317 inflammatory indicators were elevated in cigarette smokers relative to individuals who use e-
318 cigarettes and to non-smokers (Pushalkar et al. 2020).

319 In our clinical study for recruitment we used electronic social media and we were very
320 successful in recruiting naive e-cigarette subjects. One hundred fifty nine subjects attended the
321 screening visits and 120 were recruited, 101 completed the follow-up assessments after 6
322 months. Among this 24 failed the initial screening, and 15% withdrew or were lost to the follow-
323 up visit. In the analysis, we only included subjects who completed both visits.

324 The cigarettes smoking behavior did not change in the use of cigarette or e-cigarette per
325 day but there was a significant change in the number of puffs per e-cigarette (151.3 puffs at
326 baseline and 94.4 puffs at 6 month follow up), suggesting more intensive puffing and higher
327 consumption of nicotine per puff as they get adapted to e-cigarette. Studies have shown that
328 puffing patterns associated with nicotine strength or e-liquids and voltage used in e-cigarette
329 which result in higher toxicant exposure (Cox et al. 2016; Dawkins et al. 2016; Farsalinos et al.
330 2018).

331 The prevalence of severe periodontal disease was higher than expected in all cohorts (Fig
332 2D). This is likely due to the inclusion criterion that required at least mild levels of periodontal
333 disease. Nevertheless, the rate of severe periodontal disease increased in all three groups from
334 baseline visit to follow-up visit, however, this more severe in cigarette smokers and e-cigarettes
335 users. When comparing bleeding on probing did between the e-cigarette group and non-smokers,
336 no significant difference was detected; however, probing depth and clinical attachment loss was
337 much higher in the e-cigarette group. Overall, the percentage of severe periodontal disease was
338 much higher in the e-cigarette group than among the non-smokers (Table 3a).

339 A limitation of the study design was that the groups were not matched for age; although it
340 is difficult as e-cigarette users are much younger than the cigarette smokers but this should be a

341 considered in all future e-cigarette clinical research. E-cigarette users were much younger than
342 the cigarette smokers, and that cofounded some of our findings (Garnett et al. 2020; Jeong et al.
343 2020; Omoike and Johnson 2020; Subica et al. 2020; Vallone et al. 2020; Walker et al. 2020;
344 Wamamili et al. 2020). Age was also considered a confounder of the relationship between
345 cigarette smoking status and the rate of severe periodontitis. As such, age appears to be the more
346 parsimonious explanation of higher rates in those participants. Another variable that could have
347 led to differential outcomes is the ethnic group, which was not evenly distributed in the study
348 cohorts. We notice that most non-smokers were Asian, most cigarette smokers were black, and
349 most e-cigarette smokers were white, suggesting disparity among smokers and e- cigarette users.
350 It has been reported by the CDC that US Blacks and Hispanics show poorer oral health compared
351 to Whites and Asians (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2016, May 17). Nevertheless,
352 while the majority of the subjects in the non-smoker group were Asian, e-cigarette users were
353 primarily White, and cigarette smokers were primarily Black, the analysis showed effects of race
354 on periodontal status.

355 Modified questionnaires, with more precise information on the subject's social practices,
356 including alcohol usage and their dental hygiene routine, will control for confounding factors in
357 the study. The study design could be further improved if social and education status were
358 evaluated to check whether there is a relationship between higher education, better oral health,
359 and e-cigarette use.

360 To our knowledge, this is the first clinical research report on the oral health impacts of
361 vaping (e-cigarette use) relative to cigarette smokers and non-smokers. The described study
362 design and its limitations can guide future larger studies on e-cigarette use.

363
364 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.** This research project was supported by NIH grants DE025992
365 (DS, XL), DE027074 (DS, XL), CA206105 (DS) and the NYU Mega grant initiative (DS, XL).

366 **DECLARATION OF CONFLICTING INTERESTS:** The Author(s) declare(s) that there is no
367 conflict of interest

368 **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS.**

369 FX and EA: carried out REDCap data entry, data analyses and interpretation, manuscript
370 preparation; S.P and BP: carried out sample collection, data analyses and interpretation,
371 manuscript preparation; MB, SS, SM, JS, YQ: carried out clinical data analysis, data entry,

372 technical lab work and statistical analyses, manuscript preparation; M.L. statistical data analyses
373 and critical review; EQ, RV: carried out subject recruitment; D.A. performed oral exam and
374 clinical sample collection; C.G. performed oral exam and clinical sample collection; A.K.
375 performed oral exam, clinical sample collection and analyses; D.S. performed subject
376 recruitment; Y.A. managed REDCap, clinical data and electronic messaging system; T.G.
377 assisted in aerosol generating machine and manuscript preparation; P.C. provided assistance in
378 subject recruitment and clinical sample collection; X.L. and D.S. conceived, designed,
379 supervised, analyzed, interpreted the study, provided critical review and manuscript preparation.

References

- Al-Wahadni A, Linden GJ. 2003. The effects of cigarette smoking on the periodontal condition of young Jordanian adults. *J Clin Periodontol*. 30(2):132-137.
- Benowitz NL, Fraiman JB. 2017. Cardiovascular effects of electronic cigarettes. *Nat Rev Cardiol*. 14(8):447-456.
- Breland A, Soule E, Lopez A, Ramoa C, El-Hellani A, Eissenberg T. 2017. Electronic cigarettes: What are they and what do they do? *Ann N Y Acad Sci*. 1394(1):5-30.
- Oral health questionnaire. 2011, July 22. [accessed].
https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nhanes/nhanes_11_12/ohq.pdf.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2016. Chapter 1 introduction, conclusions, and historical background relative to e-cigarettes.
- Disparities in oral health. 2016, May 17. [accessed].
https://www.cdc.gov/oralhealth/oral_health_disparities/index.htm.
- Outbreak of lung injury associated with e-cigarette use, or vaping. 2020, February 25. [accessed].
https://www.cdc.gov/tobacco/basic_information/e-cigarettes/severe-lung-disease.html#latest-information.
- Chaffee BW. 2019. Electronic cigarettes: Trends, health effects and advising patients amid uncertainty. *J Calif Dent Assoc*. 47(2):85-92.
- Charlotte Wells KF. 2017. Electronic cigarettes for the reduction or cessation of smoking: Clinical utility, safety, and guidelines. Ottawa: CADTH.
- Cheng T. 2014. Chemical evaluation of electronic cigarettes. *Tob Control*. 23 Suppl 2:ii11-17.
- Chun LF, Moazed F, Calfee CS, Matthay MA, Gotts JE. 2017. Pulmonary toxicity of e-cigarettes. *Am J Physiol Lung Cell Mol Physiol*. 313(2):L193-L206.
- Clapp PW, Jaspers I. 2017. Electronic cigarettes: Their constituents and potential links to asthma. *Curr Allergy Asthma Rep*. 17(11):79.
- Couch ET, Chaffee BW, Gansky SA, Walsh MM. 2016. The changing tobacco landscape: What dental professionals need to know. *J Am Dent Assoc*. 147(7):561-569.
- Cox S, Kosmider L, McRobbie H, Goniewicz M, Kimber C, Doig M, Dawkins L. 2016. E-cigarette puffing patterns associated with high and low nicotine e-liquid strength: Effects on toxicant and carcinogen exposure. *BMC Public Health*. 16:999.
- Dawkins LE, Kimber CF, Doig M, Feyerabend C, Corcoran O. 2016. Self-titration by experienced e-cigarette users: Blood nicotine delivery and subjective effects. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)*. 233(15-16):2933-2941.
- Eggert FM, McLeod MH, Flowerdew G. 2001. Effects of smoking and treatment status on periodontal bacteria: Evidence that smoking influences control of periodontal bacteria at the mucosal surface of the gingival crevice. *J Periodontol*. 72(9):1210-1220.
- Eke PI, Dye BA, Wei L, Slade GD, Thornton-Evans GO, Beck JD, Taylor GW, Borgnakke WS, Page RC, Genco RJ. 2013. Self-reported measures for surveillance of periodontitis. *J Dent Res*. 92(11):1041-1047.
- Farsalinos K, Poulas K, Voudris V. 2018. Changes in puffing topography and nicotine consumption depending on the power setting of electronic cigarettes. *Nicotine Tob Res*. 20(8):993-997.
- Garnett C, Tombor I, Beard E, Jackson SE, West R, Brown J. 2020. Changes in smoker characteristics in England between 2008 and 2017. *Addiction*. 115(4):748-756.
- Hua M, Alfi M, Talbot P. 2013. Health-related effects reported by electronic cigarette users in online forums. *J Med Internet Res*. 15(4):e59.

- Jeong W, Choi DW, Kim YK, Lee HJ, Lee SA, Park EC, Jang SI. 2020. Associations of electronic and conventional cigarette use with periodontal disease in south korean adults. *J Periodontol.* 91(1):55-64.
- Johnson NW, Bain CA. 2000. Tobacco and oral disease. Eu-working group on tobacco and oral health. *Br Dent J.* 189(4):200-206.
- Lang NP, Bartold PM. 2018. Periodontal health. *J Periodontol.* 89 Suppl 1:S9-S16.
- Lee J, Taneja V, Vassallo R. 2012. Cigarette smoking and inflammation: Cellular and molecular mechanisms. *J Dent Res.* 91(2):142-149.
- Malas M, van der Tempel J, Schwartz R, Minichiello A, Lightfoot C, Noormohamed A, Andrews J, Zawertailo L, Ferrence R. 2016. Electronic cigarettes for smoking cessation: A systematic review. *Nicotine Tob Res.* 18(10):1926-1936.
- Omoike OE, Johnson KR. 2020. Prevalence of vaping and behavioral associations of vaping among a community of college students in the united states. *J Community Health.*
- Pushalkar S, Paul B, Li Q, Yang J, Vasconcelos R, Makwana S, Gonzalez JM, Shah S, Xie C, Janal MN et al. 2020. Electronic cigarette aerosol modulates the oral microbiome and increases risk of infection. *iScience.* 23(3):100884.
- Reidel B, Radicioni G, Clapp PW, Ford AA, Abdelwahab S, Rebuli ME, Haridass P, Alexis NE, Jaspers I, Kesimer M. 2018. E-cigarette use causes a unique innate immune response in the lung, involving increased neutrophilic activation and altered mucin secretion. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med.* 197(4):492-501.
- Subica AM, Guerrero E, Wu LT, Aitaoto N, Iwamoto D, Moss HB. 2020. Electronic cigarette use and associated risk factors in u.s.-dwelling pacific islander young adults. *Subst Use Misuse.* 55(10):1702-1708.
- Tomar SL, Fox CH, Connolly GN. 2015. Electronic cigarettes: The tobacco industry's latest threat to oral health? *J Am Dent Assoc.* 146(9):651-653.
- Vallone DM, Cuccia AF, Briggs J, Xiao H, Schillo BA, Hair EC. 2020. Electronic cigarette and juul use among adolescents and young adults. *JAMA Pediatr.*
- Walker N, Parag V, Wong SF, Youdan B, Broughton B, Bullen C, Beaglehole R. 2020. Use of e-cigarettes and smoked tobacco in youth aged 14-15 years in new zealand: Findings from repeated cross-sectional studies (2014-19). *Lancet Public Health.* 5(4):e204-e212.
- Wamamili B, Wallace-Bell M, Richardson A, Grace RC, Coope P. 2020. Electronic cigarette use among university students aged 18-24 years in new zealand: Results of a 2018 national cross-sectional survey. *BMJ Open.* 10(6):e035093.

Figure legends:

Figure 1. Schematic showing the flow of subject recruitment and sample collection. The types of samples collected and their transit from collection points to a processing laboratory where they were labeled, entered into an inventory database.

Figure 2. (A) Levels of breath carbon monoxide (ppm) across the subjects in the cigarette smokers, e-cigarette smokers, and the Non-smokers at base line and 6 month follow-up: 0-6 ppm, Borderline (BdL): 7-9 ppm, low addicted smoker (LAS): 10-15 ppm, moderate addicted smoker (MAS): 16-25 ppm, heavily addicted smoker (HAS): 26-35 ppm and very heavily addicted smoker (VHAS): 36+ ppm. (B) Saliva flow rate in three cohort at base line and follow-up. (C) Distribution of salivary cotinine levels in the participants of the three cohorts. (D) Prevalence of periodontal disease in all three cohorts from baseline visits to follow-up visits.

Table 1. Demographics

	Cigarette smokers	E-cigarette smokers	Non-Smokers	p value
N	31	32	38	
Sex (% male)	77.4	78.1	57.9	0.11
Age (yr), M (SD)				
<i>Male</i>	46.9 (10.1) ^b	36.0 (9.8) ^c	28.8 (6.1) ^a	<0.001*
<i>Female</i>	46.6 (11.5)	38.7 (10.6)	39.0 (14.1)	0.40
Ethnicity (% Hispanic)	6.5	22.6	23.7	0.13
Race (%)				0.002
<i>White</i>	32.3	56.3	26.3	
<i>Black</i>	54.8	34.4	28.9	
<i>Asian</i>	9.7	6.3	42.1	
<i>Other</i>	3.2	3.1	2.6	

* One-way analysis of variance and Tukey post-hoc test.

^{a;b;c} Unlike superscripts indicate significantly different group means($p<0.05$)

Table 2a. Smoking Behavior

	Baseline Visit	Follow-up Visit	p value
E-cigarette smoker			
<i>E-cigarettes/day</i>	0.78 (0.25)	0.74 (0.51)	0.70
<i>Puffs/use</i>	151.3 (104.4)	94.4 (99.1)	0.03
Cigarette smoker			
<i>Cigarettes/Day</i>	13.5 (4.8)	12.3 (4.4)	0.17

Table 2b. Alcohol Consumption

	<i>Alcohol User at f/u, n(%)</i>	<i>Drinking (days/week), Mean(SD)*</i>	<i># Drinks/drinking day, Mean(SD)*</i>
Cigarette smokers	14 (48.4)	2.0 (1.2)	2.8 (2.3)
E-cigarette smokers	15 (53.1)	2.4 (1.2)	4.1 (2.3)
Non-Smokers	18 (50.0)	1.5 (1.2)	2.6 (2.3)
p value	0.93	0.10	0.16

*The analysis of alcohol use (days/week and # drinks/day) is based on the consuming participants.

Table 3a. Rates of BoP and periodontal disease severity, and levels of, probing depth and clinical attachment loss as a function of cohort and time

	Visit	Non-Smokers	E-cigarette smokers	Cigarette smokers	p value
<i>Bleeding on Probing (%)</i> , Mean(SD)*	Baseline	52.6(32.1)	53.0 (32.5)	61.5 (27.6)	0.03
	Follow-up	68.3(24.4)	57.0 (32.6)	66.2 (30.5)	
<i>Probing depth (mm)</i> , Mean (SD)	Baseline	2.7 (0.4) ^a	3.0 (0.6) ^a	3.1 (0.7) ^b	0.001*
	Follow-up	2.9 (0.4) ^a	3.1 (0.7) ^a	3.2 (0.6) ^b	0.01*
<i>Clinical attachment loss (mm)</i> , Mean (SD)	Baseline	2.2 (0.9) ^a	2.8 (1.5) ^a	3.5 (1.1) ^b	<0.001*
	Follow-up	2.2 (0.7) ^a	3.1 (1.4) ^a	3.4 (1.1) ^b	<0.001*
<i>Periodontal disease (% progressed)</i> +	Follow-up	18	29	44	NA

* Welch test for heterogeneous variances and Tukey post-hoc test.

^{a;b;c} Unlike superscripts indicate significantly different group means($p < 0.05$).

+Cases with mild and moderate periodontal disease used in this analysis.

Table 3b. Logistic regression analysis relating rates of severe periodontal disease to cigarette smoking status and age.

Baseline Visit				Follow-up Visit			
<i>Step1*</i>		OR	p value	<i>Step1*</i>		OR	p value
	Cigarette smoking	6.0	<0.001		Cigarette smoking	5.3	0.002
<i>Step2*</i>				<i>Step2*</i>			
	Cigarette smoking	2.8	0.08		Cigarette smoking	1.9	0.31
	Age(y)	1.07	0.003		Age(y)	1.09	<0.001

**Smoking status was entered into the regression on step 1, and age was then added in step 2. When adjusting age, smoking status no longer predicts periodontal severe periodontal disease.*



