

Neighborhood distribution of availability of newer tobacco products: A four-site study, 2021

Shyanika W. Rose, PhD MA^{1,2}

Arati Annabathula, MHA¹

Susan Westneat, MA^{1,3}

Judy van de Venne, PhD¹

Mary Hrywna, PhD, MPH⁴

Christopher Ackerman, MPH⁴

Joseph G. L. Lee, PhD, MPH⁵

Mahdi Sesay, BS⁵

Daniel P. Giovenco, PhD, MPH⁶

Torra Spillane, MPH⁶

Shawna V. Hudson, PhD^{7,9}

Cristine D. Delnevo, PhD^{4,8,9}

Affiliations

1. University of Kentucky, College of Medicine, Behavioral Science and Center for Health Equity Transformation, Lexington, KY, USA
2. University of Kentucky, Markey Cancer Center, Lexington, KY, USA
3. University of Kentucky, College of Public Health, Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Lexington, KY, USA
4. Rutgers Center for Tobacco Studies, New Brunswick, NJ, USA
5. Department of Health Education and Promotion, College of Health and Human Performance, East Carolina University, Greenville, NC, USA
6. Department of Sociomedical Sciences, Columbia University Mailman School of Public Health, New York City, NY, USA
7. Dept of Family Medicine and Community Health, Rutgers Robert Wood Johnson Medical School, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, New Brunswick, NJ, USA
8. Department of Health Behavior, Society, and Policy, Rutgers School of Public Health, New Brunswick, NJ, USA
9. Rutgers Cancer Institute of New Jersey, New Brunswick, NJ, USA

Word count: 1900/2000

Tables: 2

Disclosures: All authors report no conflicts of interest.

Funding: Research reported in this publication was supported by the National Cancer Institute of the National Institutes of Health under Award Number [R01CA231139, MPI Delnevo/Hudson]. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health.

Abstract 250/250 words:

Background: Audits of tobacco retail stores can identify marketing patterns as newer tobacco products are introduced in the US. Our study examined store and neighborhood correlates of availability of nicotine pouches and disposable e-cigarettes in four US sites.

Methods: We conducted standardized store audits of n=242 tobacco retailers in 2021 in different states: New Jersey, Kentucky, North Carolina, and New York. Store audits focused on availability of nicotine pouches and disposable e-cigarettes. We geocoded stores linking them with census tract demographics. We conducted unadjusted and adjusted Poisson regression of availability of each product with correlates of the proportion of Non-Hispanic White residents, households under poverty, proximity to schools, site, and store type.

Results: Nicotine pouches and disposable e-cigarettes were each available in around half the stores, but availability differed across sites. In adjusted analyses, nicotine pouches were less likely to be available in each store type vs. chain convenience and more likely in stores in census tracts with more non-Hispanic White residents. In contrast, disposable e-cigarettes were more likely to be available in tobacco store/vape shops than convenience stores and less likely in non-specialty store types like groceries.

Conclusions: The availability of newer tobacco products like nicotine pouches and disposable e-cigarettes were widely available in stores across sites, but retail marketing patterns appear to differ. As these product types become subject to increased regulation as they go through the FDA pre-market authorization process, understanding changes in their retail environment is critical to inform potential policies regulating their sale and marketing.

Introduction

Retail outlets are one of the main avenues for marketing and promotion of tobacco products in the US. In 2020, cigarette manufacturers spent \$7.84 billion to advertise and promote tobacco – almost 80% for discounts and other promotions at the point-of-sale.¹ Exposure to point-of-sale marketing of tobacco products has been linked with youth and adult tobacco use and unsuccessful quit attempts among smokers.^{2,3} There is also clear evidence of tobacco manufacturer targeting of products and marketing by neighborhood demographics with substantial consequences for health equity.⁴ A higher density of tobacco retailers have been found in neighborhoods with higher proportions of Black and low-income residents, potentially contributing to disparities in tobacco product use.⁵ Additionally, different products have been disproportionately marketed in different communities. For instance, more retail menthol cigarette and cigarillo marketing is found in neighborhoods with more Black residents;^{6,7} however, smokeless tobacco marketing is generally found to be lower in neighborhoods with more non-White residents.⁸ Prior research on retail availability has shown that e-cigarettes were not initially marketed in neighborhoods with more residents from racial/ethnic minority backgrounds but became more prevalent in such neighborhoods over time.⁹

Retail surveillance of the tobacco product landscape can help identify early trends in newer tobacco product availability and marketing in communities. Several non-combustible product types including disposable e-cigarettes and smokeless nicotine pouch products have emerged on the US market, but little is known about retail availability of these products. In 2021, disposable e-cigarettes such as Puffbar were used by 54% of youth e-cigarette users after these products were exempted from flavor restrictions imposed on cartridge/pod-based e-cigarettes such as JUUL.¹⁰ Nicotine pouches, often marketed as ‘tobacco-free’ or ‘tobacco-leaf free’

nicotine, are newer smokeless tobacco products that come in pouches like moist snuff or snus but contain a nicotine powder concentration instead of tobacco leaf. Market leaders like Zyn and On! are sold by major tobacco manufacturers.¹¹ Sales of such products have greatly increased since their introduction to the market in 2016.¹¹

Understanding the retail availability of these products can help to determine to whom and where these products are marketed. However, to date, little is known about the retail availability and neighborhood and store correlates of recently introduced products. Thus, we sought to assess neighborhood differences in the availability of nicotine pouches and disposable e-cigarette devices as part of a four-state study investigating tobacco product availability and health inequity.

Methods

Data Collection

Data Source: Each site randomly sampled stores from tobacco retailer lists. Sites in New Jersey (NJ) and New York (NY) used tobacco retailer license lists. In Kentucky (KY) and North Carolina (NC), which lack tobacco retailer licensing, this came from compliance check lists used by the state for Synar compliance in KY and from a list of probable tobacco retailers created using a validated method in NC.¹² In NC and KY, vape shops were identified using a validated search of Google Maps and Yelp.¹³ In NJ, vape shops were also added through Google search as these store types were not included on tobacco retailer license lists.

Sample: NJ included 65 stores selling tobacco, which were visited in prior rounds of data collection from stores in a 25-mile radius around Rutgers University campus center in New Brunswick, NJ and 10 additional vape stores. In sites selecting a new sample, each site randomly

selected 50 tobacco retailers and up to 10 vape shops or as many as available in the jurisdiction. Thus, in these jurisdictions, stores were randomly selected from retailers in Fayette County, KY, (in the Lexington metro area) and Pitt County, NC, around Greenville, and the Borough of Manhattan in New York City, NY. Thus, the full sample set was comprised of KY (n=60), NC (n=56), NY (n=56), and NJ (n=74), bringing the total number of stores where audits were attempted to 246. During audits, we found 4 stores did not carry any tobacco and were thus ineligible and dropped from the analytic sample (n=242).

Store audits: Following standard store audit practices,¹⁴ trained data collectors at each site visited stores to record the different types of products sold and store characteristics. A Qualtrics survey was created with standardized questions used across sites. Each data collector used a smartphone to access this survey either while inside the store or while in the parking lot immediately after the store visit. The Qualtrics survey included a geolocator which identified the data collector's latitude/longitude based on the phone location when completing the survey. Store auditors were trained to conduct audits covertly and not interact with store staff unless necessary. If the store did sell tobacco but was not safe or closed at the time of visit, the data collector returned to complete the audit at a later time. No products were purchased as part of the audit, but occasionally in smaller stores data collectors would make small purchases to make the visit appear more natural and avoid suspicion. These availability audits were conducted as part of a larger study dealing with underage purchasing of tobacco products. Audits were completed between April 2021 and September 2021.

Measures: We assessed availability (yes/no) of cigarettes, e-cigarettes (pod and disposable), cigars, smokeless tobacco (e.g., chew, dip, snuff), and tobacco-free nicotine pouches. Where data collectors responded yes to e-cigarettes, we followed up with "Which e-

cigarette brands are available?” and gave visual examples and yes/no options for Puff Bar Disposable, Hypppe bar disposable, Posh Plus disposable, Fruyt disposable, Flair disposable, Pop disposable, Lava pod disposable, Eon smoke disposable, and a free-text response for other disposable e-cigarette brands. A yes to any of these items was coded that disposable e-cigarettes were available. Availability of JUUL or VUSE Alto tobacco or menthol pods was coded as pod e-cigarette availability. We coded store types into 10 categories (convenience store, drug store, gas kiosk only, dollar store, grocery/supermarket, mass merchandiser, chain convenience, vape shop, tobacco store, other store type).

Geocoding: After collecting product availability (see Table 1), ArcMap and ArcGIS Pro were utilized to geocode store locations based on address and cross-checked with the geolocation position collected in the field. If the points did not match, we would search coordinates on Google map to update the store address if needed. This verified geocoded position was used to identify the census tract of the store and merge stores with the most recent publicly available American Community Survey 5-year estimates (2015-2019) census tract data as well as the National Center for Educational Statistics’ public school (2020-2021) dataset. We performed a closest facility analysis to determine whether the store was within a half mile of a school. We picked this buffer to account for reasonable walking distance from schools in the areas that were less urban in our sample. We linked tract demographics (percent non-Hispanic White residents, percent households under federal poverty level) to stores based on their census tract.

Data Analysis: We conducted descriptive statistics by site using Pearson chi-square tests to examine differences in proportions across sites. Since the availability of nicotine pouches and disposable e-cigarettes was high in our sample, we conducted Poisson regression to estimate prevalence with robust standard errors to derive risk ratios.¹⁵ We then used unadjusted and

adjusted Poisson regression analyses to examine the prevalence of (1) nicotine pouches and (2) disposable e-cigarettes separately. Initial results including the proportions of Hispanic and Black/African-American residents and median household income and percent households under poverty did not converge due to multicollinearity as these measures were correlated at $\alpha=0.76$. Instead, for neighborhood measures we included percent of non-Hispanic White residents and percent households under poverty as well as a proximity measure of whether the retailer was within ½ mile of a school. Thus, adjusted analyses included these measures along with store type collapsed into four categories (chain convenience (ref), non-chain convenience, tobacco/vape stores, other store types [including grocery/supermarket, pharmacy, dollar stores, mass merchandisers, and gas kiosks]), and site (NJ (ref), KY, NC, NYC). We used Stata v16 and SAS 9.4 and conducted analyses in February 2022. This research was classified as Not Human Subjects Research by the Institutional Review Board at the University of Kentucky.

Results

As shown in Table 1, almost all retailers carried cigarettes and cigars, but half or less of all retailers carried other products including pod e-cigarettes, disposable e-cigarettes, smokeless tobacco and nicotine pouches. There were significant differences in the availability of product types across sites except cigarettes. There were more stores in census tracts with the highest quartile of non-Hispanic White residents in Kentucky than in the other sites, while there were more stores in areas with the highest quartile of residents under poverty in North Carolina than other sites.

Nicotine Pouches. As shown in Table 2, in unadjusted analyses, prevalence of nicotine pouches was significantly lower in all store types relative to chain convenience stores, in stores in census tracts with the 3rd quartile of residents under poverty compared with the lowest

quartile, and in stores near schools. Additionally, unadjusted prevalence of nicotine pouches was higher in Kentucky compared with New Jersey, and in neighborhoods with more non-Hispanic White residents compared with neighborhoods with the fewest non-Hispanic White residents. In adjusted analyses, only store type and the proportion of non-Hispanic White residents remained significant.

Disposable E-Cigarettes. In unadjusted analyses, compared with chain convenience stores, tobacco stores/vape stores were significantly more likely to carry disposable e-cigarettes, but other store types like grocery stores and pharmacies were less likely to have these products. These products were also more prevalent in NY stores compared with NJ stores and in stores in census tracts with the 2nd and 4th quartile of White residents compared with the lowest quartile. Stores in neighborhoods with the 3rd quartile of residents under poverty compared with the lowest quartile were less likely to have disposable e-cigarettes available. In adjusted analyses, only store type was a significant correlate of disposable e-cigarette availability.

Discussion

The availability of newer tobacco products like nicotine pouches and disposable e-cigarettes was found in roughly half the stores in our sample in some cases exceeding the availability of more established tobacco products such as e-cigarette pods and smokeless tobacco products. Availability varies in different parts of the country and patterns of availability of these two product types are not the same. Though these products share some common features such as relatively high nicotine concentration, flavor availability, ‘tobacco-free’ claims, and relatively low price,¹⁶⁻¹⁹ retail marketing appears to differ. Nicotine pouches seem to be more common in chain convenience stores likely driven by their promotion by major tobacco companies. They are also focused in neighborhoods with more non-Hispanic White residents--perhaps capitalizing on

marketing to those who already use smokeless tobacco as non-Hispanic White populations use smokeless tobacco at higher rates than any other racial/ethnic group.²⁰ In contrast, disposable e-cigarettes appear to be more prevalent in tobacco/vape shops, but not in other non-specialty store types like groceries and pharmacies. Encouragingly in our sample, there does not appear to be targeting of either product by neighborhood poverty or in stores near schools. Additional retail surveillance in more locations and especially outside of predominantly urban centers is needed to confirm such patterns.

Conclusion

Our results provide an early indication of different patterns of retail availability of newer non-combustible tobacco products of nicotine pouches and disposable e-cigarettes. As both product types potentially face increased regulation under the FDA pre-market authorization process, understanding changes in their availability in the retail environment is critical to inform potential policies regulating their sale and marketing.

Tables

Table 1. Product availability and store and neighborhood characteristics in tobacco retail audits in four sites, 2021 (n=242)

	KY n=59	NC n=56	NJ n=71	NY n= 56	Overall n=242	p-value
Product Availability						
Cigarettes	49 (83%)	51 (91%)	62 (87%)	49 (88%)	211 (87%)	.4764
Pod E-cigarettes	33 (56%)	19 (34%)	30 (42%)	37 (66%)	119 (49%)	.0147
Disposable e-cigarettes	27 (46%)	18 (32%)	34 (48%)	35 (63%)	114 (47%)	.0150
Cigars	48 (81%)	52 (93%)	65 (92%)	36 (64%)	201 (83%)	.0004
Smokeless tobacco	43 (73%)	22 (39%)	28 (39%)	19 (34%)	112 (46%)	<.0001
Tobacco-free nicotine pouches	45 (76%)	26 (46%)	26 (37%)	24 (43%)	121 (50%)	<.0001
Store Characteristics						
Store type						
<.0001						
Convenience Store (non-chain)	4 (7%)	14 (25%)	30 (42%)	34 (61%)	82 (34%)	
Chain Convenience	30 (51%)	11 (20%)	16 (23%)	2 (4%)	59 (24%)	
Drug store	3 (5%)	5 (9%)	6 (8%)	N/A	14 (6%)	
Gas Kiosk only	0	2 (4%)	5 (7%)	1 (2%)	8 (3%)	
Dollar store	4 (7%)	11 (20%)	1 (1%)	0	16 (7%)	
Grocery store/supermarket	6 (10%)	5 (9%)	1 (1%)	0	12 (5%)	
Mass Merchandiser	2 (3%)	N/A	0	0	2 (0.8%)	
Vape Shop	10 (17%)	4 (7%)	10 (14%)	4 (7%)	28 (12%)	
Tobacco Store	0	4 (7%)	0	13 (23%)	17 (7%)	
Other store type	0	0	2 (3%)	2 (4%)	4 (2%)	
Store Neighborhood Demographics						
Non-Hispanic White residents						
Q1 (0-28%)	2 (3%)	15 (25%)	27 (44%)	17 (28%)	61 (25%)	<.0001
Q2 (28-60%)	6 (10%)	19 (32%)	21 (35%)	14 (23%)	60 (25%)	
Q3 (60-74%)	22 (37%)	21 (35%)	8 (13%)	9 (15%)	60 (25%)	
Q4 (74% +)	29 (48%)	1 (2%)	15 (25%)	16 (26%)	61 (25%)	
Households under poverty						
Q1 (0-7%)	17 (28%)	0	35 (57%)	9 (15%)	61 (25%)	<.0001
Q2 (7-17%)	14 (23%)	3 (5%)	16 (27%)	27 (45%)	60 (25%)	
Q3 (17-26%)	15 (26%)	22 (38%)	10 (17%)	11 (19%)	58 (24%)	
Q4 (26% +)	13 (21%)	31 (49%)	10 (16%)	9 (14%)	63 (26%)	
Within 0.5 mile of school						
No	36 (61%)	42 (75%)	22 (31%)	0	64 (26%)	<.0001
Yes	23 (39%)	14 (25%)	49 (69%)	56 (100%)	178 (74%)	

Table 2. Correlates of availability of Nicotine Pouches and Disposable E-cigarettes in tobacco retail stores in four sites (n=242)

	Product Availability			
	Availability of TFNP (unadjusted) IRR (95% CI)	Availability of TFNP (adjusted) IRR (95% CI)	Availability of disposable e-cig (unadjusted) IRR (95% CI)	Availability of disposable e-cig (adjusted) IRR (95% CI)
Store Type				
Chain Convenience store	ref	ref	ref	ref
Non-chain convenience store	0.2 (0.2-0.4)	0.3 (0.2-0.4)	0.9 (0.7-1.3)	1.0 (0.7-1.5)
Tobacco Store/Vape Store	0.6 (0.5-0.8)	0.6 (0.4-0.8)	2.0 (1.5-2.6)	1.9 (1.5-2.6)
Other Store types (grocery/supermarket, pharmacy, dollar store, mass merchandiser, gas kiosk)	0.4 (0.3-0.6)	0.5 (0.4-0.7)	0.2 (0.1-0.4)	0.2 (0.1-0.5)
Site				
NJ	ref	ref	ref	ref
KY	2.1 (1.5-2.9)	1.2 (0.9-1.7)	1 (0.7-1.4)	1.1 (0.7-1.4)
NC	1.3 (0.8-1.9)	1.3 (0.8-2.0)	0.7 (0.4-1.1)	0.9 (0.5-1.5)
NYC	1.2 (0.8-1.8)	1.5 (1.0-2.4)	1.3 (1.0-1.8)	1.1 (0.8-1.5)
Store Neighborhood Demographics				
Non-Hispanic White residents				
Q1 (0-28%)	ref	ref	ref	ref
Q2 (28-60%)	2.7 (1.5-4.7)	2.0 (1.2-3.5)	1.7 (1.1-2.6)	1.5 (0.9-2.5)
Q3 (60-74%)	2.9 (1.7-5.0)	1.8 (1.0-3.0)	1.5 (0.9-2.3)	1.3 (0.8-2.2)
Q4 (74% +)	3.6 (2.1-6.1)	2.3 (1.3-4.0)	1.6 (1.0-2.5)	1.2 (0.7-2.1)
Households under poverty				
Q1 (0-7%)	ref	ref	ref	ref
Q2 (7-17%)	1.1 (0.8-1.5)	1.1 (0.8-1.4)	1 (0.7-1.3)	0.8 (0.6-1.1)
Q3 (17-26%)	0.6 (0.4-0.9)	0.8 (0.5-1.2)	0.6 (0.4-0.9)	0.7 (0.5-1.2)
Q4 (26% +)	0.9 (0.6-1.2)	1.1 (0.8-1.6)	0.7 (0.5-1.0)	0.9 (0.5-1.4)
Within .5 mile of school				
No	ref	ref	ref	ref
Yes	0.7 (0.6-0.9)	1.0 (0.8-1.3)	1.1 (0.8-1.5)	1.0 (0.7-1.4)

References

1. Federal Trade Commission Cigarette Report for 2020 (2021).
2. Robertson L, McGee R, Marsh L, Hoek J. A systematic review on the impact of point-of-sale tobacco promotion on smoking. *Nicotine Tob Res*. Jan 2015;17(1):2-17. doi:10.1093/ntr/ntu168
3. Siahpush M, Shaikh RA, Smith D, et al. The Association of Exposure to Point-of-Sale Tobacco Marketing with Quit Attempt and Quit Success: Results from a Prospective Study of Smokers in the United States. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. Feb 6 2016;13(2):203. doi:10.3390/ijerph13020203
4. Lee JG, Henriksen L, Rose SW, Moreland-Russell S, Ribisl KM. A Systematic Review of Neighborhood Disparities in Point-of-Sale Tobacco Marketing. *Am J Public Health*. Sep 2015;105(9):e8-18. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2015.302777
5. Lee JG, Sun DL, Schleicher NM, Ribisl KM, Luke DA, Henriksen L. Inequalities in tobacco outlet density by race, ethnicity and socioeconomic status, 2012, USA: results from the ASPIRE Study. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. May 2017;71(5):487-492. doi:10.1136/jech-2016-208475
6. Mills SD, Henriksen L, Golden SD, et al. Disparities in retail marketing for menthol cigarettes in the United States, 2015. *Health Place*. Sep 2018;53:62-70. doi:10.1016/j.healthplace.2018.06.011
7. Rose SW, Anesetti-Rothermel A, Westneat S, et al. Inequitable distribution of FTP marketing by neighborhood characteristics: further evidence for targeted marketing. *Nicotine Tob Res*. Oct 23 2021;doi:10.1093/ntr/ntab222
8. Giovenco DP, Ackerman C, Hrywna M, Delnevo CD. Changes in the availability and promotion of non-cigarette tobacco products near high schools in New Jersey, USA. *Tob Control*. Sep 2018;27(5):578-579. doi:10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2017-053800
9. D'Angelo H, Rose SW, Golden SD, Queen T, Ribisl KM. E-cigarette availability, price promotions and marketing at the point-of sale in the contiguous United States (2014-2015): National estimates and multilevel correlates. *Prev Med Rep*. 2020;19:101152-101152. doi:10.1016/j.pmedr.2020.101152
10. Park-Lee E, Ren C, Sawdey MD, et al. Notes from the Field: E-Cigarette Use Among Middle and High School Students - National Youth Tobacco Survey, United States, 2021. *MMWR Morbidity and mortality weekly report*. 2021;70(39):1387-1389. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm7039a4
11. Marynak KL, Wang X, Borowiecki M, et al. Nicotine Pouch Unit Sales in the US, 2016-2020. *JAMA*. 2021;326(6):566-568. doi:10.1001/jama.2021.10366
12. D'Angelo H, Fleischhacker S, Rose SW, Ribisl KM. Field validation of secondary data sources for enumerating retail tobacco outlets in a state without tobacco outlet licensing. *Health Place*. Jul 2014;28:38-44. doi:10.1016/j.healthplace.2014.03.006
13. Lee JG, D'Angelo H, Kuteh JD, Martin RJ. Identification of Vape Shops in Two North Carolina Counties: An Approach for States without Retailer Licensing. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. Oct 27 2016;13(11)doi:10.3390/ijerph13111050
14. Lee JG, Henriksen L, Myers AE, Dauphinee AL, Ribisl KM. A systematic review of store audit methods for assessing tobacco marketing and products at the point of sale. *Tob Control*. Mar 2014;23(2):98-106. doi:10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2012-050807
15. Zou G. A modified poisson regression approach to prospective studies with binary data. *Am J Epidemiol*. Apr 1 2004;159(7):702-6. doi:10.1093/aje/kwh090
16. Czaplicki L, Patel M, Rahman B, Yoon S, Schillo B, Rose SW. Oral nicotine marketing claims in direct-mail advertising. *Tob Control*. May 6 2021;doi:10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2020-056446
17. Delnevo C, Giovenco DP, Hrywna M. Rapid proliferation of illegal pod-mod disposable e-cigarettes. *Tob Control*. Dec 2020;29(e1):e150-e151. doi:10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2019-055485
18. Talih S, Salman R, Soule E, et al. Electrical features, liquid composition and toxicant emissions from 'pod-mod'-like disposable electronic cigarettes. *Tobacco Control*. 2021;

19. Lunell E, Fagerström K, Hughes J, Pendrill R. Pharmacokinetic comparison of a novel non-tobacco-based nicotine pouch (ZYN) with conventional, tobacco-based Swedish snus and American moist snuff. *Nicotine and Tobacco Research*. 2020;22(10):1757-1763.
20. Cornelius ME, Wang TW, Jamal A, Loretan CG, Neff LJ. Tobacco Product Use Among Adults - United States, 2019. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. Nov 20 2020;69(46):1736-1742.
doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6946a4