

1 **The potential impact of removing a ban on electronic nicotine delivery systems**
2 **using the Mexico smoking and vaping model (SAVM)**

3 Luz María Sánchez-Romero¹, Yameng Li¹, Luis Zavala-Arciniega², Katia Gallegos-Carrillo³⁻⁴, James
4 F. Thrasher⁵, Rafael Meza⁶⁻⁷, David T. Levy¹

5
6 1. Lombardi Comprehensive Cancer Center, Georgetown University, Washington, DC.
7 United States of America

8 2. Department of Epidemiology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, United
9 States of America

10 3. Epidemiology and Health Services Research Unit, Morelos, Mexican Institute of Social
11 Security, Mexico.

12 4. Evaluation and Surveys Research Center, National Institute of Public Health, Cuernavaca,
13 Mexico.

14 5. Department of Health Promotion, Education & Behavior, Arnold School of Public Health,
15 University of South Carolina, Columbia, United States of America

16 6. Department of Integrative Oncology, BC Cancer Research Institute, British Columbia,
17 Canada

18 7. School of Population and Public Health, University of British Columbia, Canada

19 **April 2024**

20 **Corresponding Author**

21 E-mail: Thrasher@mailbox.sc.edu (JFT)

22 **Short Title:** The Potential Impact of Removing an ENDS Ban. Results from The Mexico SAVM

23 **Abstract**

24 **Objective**

25 To develop the Mexico Smoking and Vaping Model (Mexico SAVM) to estimate cigarette and
26 electronic nicotine delivery systems (ENDS) prevalence and the public health impact of
27 legalizing ENDS use.

28 **Methods**

29 SAVM, a cohort-based discrete-time simulation model, compares two scenarios. The *ENDS-*
30 *Restricted Scenario* estimates smoking prevalence and associated mortality outcomes under the
31 current policy of an ENDS ban, using Mexico-specific population projections, death rates, life
32 expectancy, and smoking and e-cigarette prevalence. *The ENDS-Unrestricted Scenario* projects
33 smoking and vaping prevalence under a hypothetical scenario where ENDS use is allowed. The
34 impact of legalizing ENDS use is estimated as the difference in smoking- and vaping-attributable
35 deaths (SVADs) and life-years lost (LYLs) between the ENDS-Restricted and Unrestricted
36 scenarios.

37 **Results**

38 Compared to a national ENDS ban, The Mexico SAVM projects that legalizing ENDS use
39 could decrease smoking prevalence by 40.1% in males and 30.9% in females by 2049
40 compared to continuing the national ENDS ban. This reduction in prevalence would save
41 2.9 (2.5 males and 0.4 females) million life-years and avert almost 106 (91.0 males and 15.5
42 females) thousand deaths between 2025 and 2049. Public health gains decline by 43% to
43 59,748 SVADs averted when the switching rate is reduced by half and by 24.3% (92,806

44 SVADs averted) with a 25% ENDS risk level from that of cigarettes but increased by 24.3%
45 (121,375 SVADs averted) with the 5% ENDS risk.

46 **Conclusions**

47 Mexico SAVM suggests that greater access to ENDS and a more permissive ENDS regulation,
48 simultaneous with strong cigarette policies, would reduce smoking prevalence and decrease
49 smoking-related mortality. The unanticipated effects of an ENDS ban merit closer scrutiny, with
50 further consideration of how specific ENDS restrictions may maximize public health benefits.

51

52 Introduction

53 Patterns of tobacco use worldwide have changed considerably over time (1-3). In the
54 last decade, many high-income countries (HICs) have seen rapid growth in the use of electronic
55 nicotine delivery systems (ENDS, aka e-cigarettes), especially among younger people. However,
56 ENDS use is much less prevalent in low and middle-income countries (LMICs) (4-13). Compared
57 to HICs, LMICs tend to have relatively low rates of ENDS use among people who have never
58 smoked cigarettes but relatively high rates of “dual use” with cigarettes (4-10).

59 Currently, 34 countries – representing 17% of LMICs and 13% of HICs – have banned
60 ENDS (14, 15), with some evidence for their effectiveness (16-19). However, enforcement of
61 these bans in LMICs is often weak, and implementation is frequently challenged by the
62 relatively large size of informal economies in those countries. In contrast, some HICs have
63 adopted permissive approaches to regulating ENDS. This approach is driven by the recognition
64 of ENDS’ potential for harm reduction, especially among adults who struggle to quit cigarette
65 smoking (20). The potential of ENDS for harm reduction is likely to be greater when
66 implemented alongside strong regulations to discourage cigarette use, which, in general, tend
67 to be stronger in HICs than LMICs (14). A simulation model for Australia, one of the few HICs
68 with strict ENDS regulations and strong cigarette-oriented policies, reported that a permissive
69 ENDS policy could reduce smoking and ENDS associated deaths by 7.7% compared to the
70 current restrictive ENDS regulation (21). A modeling study for New Zealand projected that
71 removing their ENDS ban could gain 236,000 quality-adjusted life years (QALYs) and save
72 US\$2.5 billion (22). Simulating the effects of alternative regulatory approaches in LMICs that

73 ban ENDS has yet to be done but could offer valuable insights into the need to tailor regulations
74 to specific country contexts.

75 This paper aims to develop a population simulation model that considers the impact of
76 shifting from stricter to more permissive ENDS policies in LMICs. Currently, seven countries in
77 Latin America, of which six are LMICs, have banned ENDS (15). We focus on Mexico as a case
78 study for LMICs removal of a current ENDS ban because of its large population, implementation
79 of a range of WHO-recommended tobacco control policies (e.g., taxes 69% of the final price
80 (23); smoke-free areas (24, 25); pictorial warnings on packs (26, 27); marketing bans), and
81 relatively stable smoking prevalence over the period since their implementation (28). The
82 federal-level Tobacco Control Act of 2008 included a de facto ban on the importation,
83 distribution, marketing and sales of novel nicotine products, which regulators interpreted as
84 encompassing ENDS; courts affirmed the ban in 2021 and 2022 (29). Current e-cigarette use
85 (exclusive and dual) among 15- to 65-year-old Mexicans has increased from 0.7% in 2015 to
86 1.5% in 2018 and has remained near that level through 2022 (30). However, from 2015-2022,
87 male and female exclusive e-cigarette use increased (males=0.40% to 1.9%; females=0.14%-
88 0.83%) while dual use of ENDS with cigarettes also increased (males=0.77% to 1.46%;
89 females=0.12% to 0.74%) (31). Meanwhile, current e-cigarette use among adolescents ages 15
90 to 19 years increased from 2.1% in 2015 to 2.6% in 2022 (30).

91 We developed the Mexico Smoking and Vaping Model (SAVM) based on the structure of
92 the “Australia SAVM” (21). The Mexico SAVM projects cigarette and ENDS prevalence with and
93 without an ENDS ban and calculates the public health impact of legalizing ENDS use. The model

94 offers preliminary evidence for decision-makers about the potential effects of lifting Mexico's
95 ENDS ban on product use rates and tobacco-related mortality.

96 **Materials and methods**

97 The Mexico SAVM is a cohort-based discrete-time simulation model that simulates
98 cigarette smoking and vaping for the Mexican population and estimates the public health
99 impact of legalizing ENDS use (vaping) by simulating and comparing two scenarios. First, the
100 *ENDS-Restricted Scenario* (baseline) estimates smoking prevalence and associated mortality
101 outcomes when vaping is restricted and accounts for ENDS use under those restrictions (due to
102 limited enforcement of tobacco control regulations) (32, 33). Second, *the ENDS-Unrestricted*
103 *Scenario* incorporates permissive ENDS access into the cohort trajectories to project smoking
104 and vaping prevalence in a hypothetical scenario where ENDS use is allowed, or access is less
105 restricted, similarly to their status in the US until 2021. The public health impact is then derived
106 by comparing smoking- and vaping-attributable mortality and averted life-years lost outcomes
107 in the ENDS-Unrestricted Scenario (less stringent ENDS regulation) to those in the ENDS-
108 Restricted Scenario.

109 The Mexico SAVM runs from 2009 to 2049 and simulates individuals ages 15 to 65. We
110 focus our analysis on individuals up to 65 years old to capture a demographic where smoking
111 behaviors are likely most influenced by using non-cigarette nicotine products: the consumption
112 of ENDS among Mexican adults aged 65 and above is negligible (0.1% current ENDS users) (34).
113 The 2009 baseline was chosen as the initial year based on the availability of a nationally
114 representative survey to initialize the model and relatively stable tobacco control policy levels

115 in the years before and after 2009.(33) We decided on a short modeling period because the
116 latest available nationally representative smoking data are from 2020-2022. The lockdowns
117 during the COVID-19 pandemic (particularly in 2020 and 2021) impacted the population's
118 health-related behaviors. Thus, data from that period or immediately afterward may not
119 represent reliable smoking and vaping trends (35-37). Table 1 lists the demographic data
120 sources and parameter values used as inputs in the Mexico SAVM.

121

122 **The ENDS-Restricted Scenario**

123 The ENDS-Restricted Scenario estimates the prevalence and mortality of never, current
124 (daily and nondaily), and former smokers, as well as never smokers using ENDS (N-ENDS) and
125 former smokers using ENDS (FS-ENDS) over time in the present Mexican scenario of an ENDS
126 ban, a nationally implemented sales ban with low enforcement (Fig 1).

127 SAVM projects the population by simulating separate cohorts for males and females by
128 individual age. Births and overall mortality are based on Mexico's single-age yearly population
129 projections for 2009-2049 from the Mexico National Council of Population (CONAPO) (38, 39).
130 Gender-specific life expectancy by five-year age groups (ages 1 to 85+) for 2010, 2015 and 2019
131 from the World Health Organization- Global Health Observatory (40). Since Mexico's life
132 expectancy was only available for certain years and SAVM requires life-expectancy data for the
133 complete modeling period, we applied the 2010 life expectancy as the same life expectancy in
134 2009-2014, the 2015 as the life expectancy in 2015-2018, and the 2019 rates as extrapolated to
135 2049. Mexico's overall life expectancy was then transformed into never smokers' life
136 expectancy for each modeling year by multiplying this data by the ratio of the 2016 US never

137 smoking and US overall life expectancy (41), assuming that each age-gender ratio is constant
138 over the modeling period. US Life expectancy of never smokers increases over time in relative
139 terms by 7% (5%) from 2009-2049 for males (females) at age 20, 14% (10%) for age 40, and 22%
140 (18%) for age 60.

141 Mexico-SAVM smoking prevalence estimates are based on Mexico's prevalence by
142 smoking status in the initial year (2009) and Mexico-specific smoking initiation and cessation
143 rates. Mexico SAVM uses gender-specific weighted smoking status prevalence (never, current,
144 and former) by five-year age groups (ages 15-65) from the nationally representative 2009
145 Global Adult Tobacco Survey (GATS)-Mexico (42). GATS defines current smokers as those
146 individuals who answered "daily" and "less than daily" to the question "Do you currently smoke
147 tobacco on a daily basis, less than daily, or not at all?". Former smokers were those who
148 responded, "Not at all" to "Do you currently smoke tobacco on a daily basis, less than daily, or
149 not at all?" and "daily or less than daily" to "In the past have you smoked tobacco on a daily
150 basis, less than daily or not at all?" Never users are those who never smoked tobacco products
151 or ENDS in their lifetime. GATS considers smokers as those who smoke any combustible
152 tobacco (cigars, cigarettes, and pipes) either daily or occasionally. However, in Mexico, among
153 all the people who smoke tobacco, about 98-99% smoke cigarettes (43). Therefore, Mexico
154 SAVM assumes smoking corresponds to cigarette use. Further, SAVM does not distinguish
155 between dual use (smoking and ENDS) and exclusive smokers due to the relatively unstable
156 transitions of dual use behaviors and limited information. Most relapse by former smokers
157 occurs within one year after quitting. Relapse among those who quit for ≥ 2 years is less than

158 30% (44-47). Permanent cessation is measured by quitting for at least two years to reflect
159 cessation net of relapse rather than distinguishing former smoking by years quit.

160 To fit the model by single-age smoking status prevalence in the initial year, we
161 transformed the 2009 GATS five-year age groups (ages 15 to 65 years) prevalence into
162 individual age prevalence by assigning the prevalence by age group to the mid-age of each age
163 group and then linear interpolating between those mid-ages (SAVM User Guide, sec 3.2.4). For
164 example, we apply the same prevalence for ages groups 15 to 19 and 20 to 24 as the
165 prevalence at ages 17 and 22 (the midpoints in the 15-19 and 20-24 age groups from GATS) and
166 estimate the prevalence at ages 18-21 by assuming the prevalence at age 17 will evenly and
167 gradually increase to the prevalence at age 22. Current and former smoking prevalence is set to
168 0% before age 9 and age 15, respectively. After age 62 (the mid-age of the last age group 60-
169 65), we assume the prevalence for older ages is the same as the prevalence at age 62.

170 The Mexico initiation and cessation rates (by single age 0-65), gender and single year
171 2009-2049) were estimated using age-period cohort models and national survey data following
172 the same approach as previous analyses for the US (48, 49). For initiation, we used data from
173 Mexico's national health surveys [National Survey on Drug Use and Health (ENA), National
174 Health and Nutrition Survey (ENSANUT) and GATS) covering 1998-2016 and reporting data on
175 age at initiation from ever smokers. For cessation, we used data from national surveys covering
176 the period 1998-2016 and reporting on age at cessation for former smokers (ENA and GATS).
177 Based on these estimates, Mexico SAVM applies initiation rates from ages 6 to 39 years and
178 cessation rates from ages 11 to 65.

179 To reflect current Mexico ENDS use despite the ban (31), Mexico SAVM incorporated
180 ENDS use under the ENDS Restricted Scenario starting in 2015 and through the modeling
181 period. In this scenario, Mexico SAVM assumes that exclusive ENDS users come from never
182 smokers using ENDS (N-ENDS) and former smokers who use ENDS (FS-ENDS). SAVM considers
183 N-ENDS users as those who initiate exclusive ENDS daily or less than daily in the absence of
184 smoking for all ages and those who quit cigarette use before age 35 and switch to exclusive
185 ENDS use. FS-ENDS are those who quit cigarette use after age 35 and switch to exclusive ENDS
186 use. To estimate N-ENDS and FS-ENDS, we used the proportion of ENDS use among never
187 smokers (ENDS-PN) and the proportion of ENDS users among former smokers (ENDS-PF) from
188 Mexican national datasets. The ENDS-PN acts as the ENDS initiation rate from never users and
189 ENDS-PF acts as the switching rate from current smokers.

190 Mexico's gender-specific ENDS-PN and ENDS-PF by age group (ages 15-24, 25-39 and 40-
191 65 years) were obtained from the 2015 Global Adult Tobacco Survey (GATS), the 2016 National
192 Survey of Drugs, Alcohol, and Tobacco Consumption (ENCODAT) and the 2018, 2020, 2021 and
193 2022 National Health and Nutrition Survey (ENSANUT). ENDS-PN was calculated as those who
194 answered "not at all" to "In the past, have you smoked tobacco on a daily basis, less than daily
195 or not at all?" and answered "daily or less than daily" to "Do you currently use electronic
196 cigarettes on a daily basis, less than daily, or not at all?" divided by the total number of never
197 smokers. ENDS-PF was calculated as those who answered "Not at all" to "Do you currently
198 smoke tobacco on a daily basis, less than daily, or not at all?"; "daily or less than daily" to "In
199 the past, have you smoked tobacco on a daily basis, less than daily or not at all?" and answered
200 "daily or less than daily" to "Do you currently use electronic cigarettes on a daily basis, less than

201 daily, or not at all?" divided by the total number of former smokers. To fit the model, we
202 transformed survey data by age group (15-24, 25-39 and 40-65 years) into single-age ENDS-PN
203 and PFs by applying the age group's value to each age within each group. We also estimated
204 ENDS-PN and ENDS-PF values for years without survey information (2017 and 2019) by
205 averaging the proportions from neighboring years (i.e., we used 2016 and 2018 to estimate
206 2017 and 2018 and 2020 for 2019). Mexico SAVM assumes that ENDS-PN and ENDS-PF remain
207 constant at the 2022 level (last year of survey data) from 2023 to 2049, effectively assuming
208 that ENDS initiation and cessation offset each other. We decided on this assumption given the
209 limited information on ENDS initiation and cessation patterns under the current context in
210 Mexico where products are banned yet available and to keep the model manageable with the
211 least number of assumptions. S1 Table presents the ENDS-PN and ENDS-PF values from surveys
212 used as inputs.

213 To derive Mexico-specific mortality rates by smoking status (never, current and former),
214 SAVM uses the product of the ratio (R) ($R = \text{overall Mexico mortality rates} / \text{overall US mortality}$
215 rates) and US death rates (e.g., *Mexico never death rates = R * US never death rates*). The US
216 male (female) overall mortality rate was 0.12% (0.04%) at age 20, increasing to 0.21% (0.14%)
217 at age 40 and 1.13% (0.68%) at age 60 in 2009. It decreases in relative terms by 46% (43%) from
218 2009-2049 for males (females) at age 20, 52% (49%) for age 40, and 48% (47%) for age 60. For
219 smokers who quit before age 35, SAVM assumes the same mortality risks as never smokers (50-
220 52). US smoking status and mortality data are obtained from the CISNET Lung group (50, 53-55).
221 The CISNET mortality rates are based on mortality data through 2012 and smoking relative risks
222 informed by data through the early 2000s, prior to the wide adoption of ENDS (56).

223

224 **Mexico SAVM calibration and validation**

225 We first calibrated the ENDS-Restricted Scenario to ensure that projected future trends
226 in Mexico were consistent with observed Mexican current smoking trends. Projected changes in
227 smoking prevalence (smoking relative reductions) between 2009 and 2015 are compared to
228 those changes from the Mexican GATS 2009 to 2015 for all population (15 to 65 years old) and
229 three age groups (15 to 24, 25 to 39 and 40 to 65). We utilized GATS for Mexico SAVM
230 calibration because it predates the widespread adoption of ENDS in Mexico, offering a clearer
231 picture of pre-e-cigarette smoking prevalence. Based on the discrepancy between the model
232 and the surveys in 2009-2015, we calibrated the model by applying separate smoking initiation
233 and smoking cessation adjusters, i.e., a fixed scaling factor (adjuster) to both the ENDS-
234 Restricted Scenario smoking initiation and cessation rates. The Mexico SAVM smoking initiation
235 adjusters are set for males (females) at 1.52 (1.53) for ages 15-24 years and at 1.78 (1.56) for
236 ages 25-40 years of the smoking initiation from the ENDS-Restricted Scenario. Smoking
237 cessation adjusters are set at 0.50 (0.50) for ages 25-39 years and 0.48 (0.00) for ages 40 years
238 and above of the smoking cessation from the ENDS-Restricted Scenario.

239 Mexico SAVM initially underestimated exclusive ENDS prevalence (from never and
240 former smokers) use for ages 15 to 24 years for males and females. Calibration to ENDS
241 estimates for this age group was made by replacing the original ENDS-PN or ENDS-PF from the
242 Mexican surveys with the product of [*Exclusive ENDS prevalence from surveys for each data*
243 *point/Prevalence estimates of Exclusive ENDS use from SAVM without calibration*] multiplied by

244 *the corresponding ENDS-PN or ENDS-PF from each year*]. See S1 Table for the adjusted ENDS-PN
245 and ENDS-PF.

246 The validation data used for the Mexico SAVM was over a specified period based on
247 survey availability. The Mexico SAVM was validated by comparing relative changes in current
248 smoking prevalence between 2015 and 2018 and 2015 and 2022 from the ENDS-Restricted
249 Scenario to those from ENSANUT 2018 and 2022. These surveys were chosen because they
250 collect nationally representative data representing tobacco and ENDS use trends in Mexico
251 under the current national ENDS ban. They enabled us to estimate current smokers using the
252 same measure as from GATS 2009 (baseline inputted data).

253

254 **The ENDS-Unrestricted Scenario**

255 The ENDS-Unrestricted Scenario projects the prevalence of never, current, and former
256 smokers, current exclusive ENDS users, and former ENDS users while allowing for direct
257 switching from smoking to exclusive ENDS use (Fig 2), assuming that the current ENDS-ban is
258 lifted in 2024. The baseline transition rates (switching rates) from smoking to exclusive ENDS
259 use before age 35 and to former smokers using ENDS after age 35 are based on US cigarette
260 and ENDS regular switching rates through 2017 (57), implying a relatively unrestricted approach
261 to ENDS, with strong tobacco control policies. The unrestricted case implicitly assumes that
262 ENDS regulations are implemented at a national level and strongly enforced, similar to
263 enforcement in the UK and Canada (58). Later the transition rates and assumptions are varied
264 in sensitivity analyses.

265 The ENDS-Unrestricted Scenario smoking and ENDS initiation rates were developed by
266 applying separate smoking and ENDS use multipliers to the ENDS-Restricted Scenario smoking
267 initiation rates, thus implying an age and gender pattern for initiation like those in the ENDS-
268 Restricted Scenario subject to the constant scaler (multiplier). A smoking initiation multiplier
269 >100% implies that smoking initiation with ENDS legalized availability increases above that in
270 the presence of an ENDS ban (i.e., a gateway into smoking). Less than 100% implies ENDS
271 diverting the never smokers away from smoking initiation. The Mexico SAVM smoking initiation
272 multiplier is set at 75% of the smoking initiation from the ENDS-Restricted Scenario. The ENDS
273 initiation rate multiplier is 50% of the ENDS Restricted Scenario smoking initiation. These
274 parameters are based on the rapid decline in US youth and young adult smoking since vaping
275 increased (59-61) and consider Mexico vaping trends. Mexico SAVM assumes that the ENDS-
276 Unrestricted Scenario initiation rate multipliers for both genders and all ages are constant over
277 time.

278 As mentioned, the ENDS-Unrestricted Scenario allows individuals to quit smoking and
279 switch to exclusive ENDS use (aka switching rate). Prevalence of ENDS use is higher in the US
280 than in Mexico (30, 31), consequently the US population has a higher exchangeability between
281 ENDS and cigarette use (62, 63). Further, ENDS regulation in the US is less restrictive than in
282 Mexico (14). To account for these differences, Mexico SAVM switching rates are set as 50% of
283 the rates from prospective data from the US PATH survey over 2013-2017. We estimate male
284 (female) switching rates as 2.0% (1.3%) per year for ages under 24, 1.3% (1.0%) for ages 25-34,
285 1.3% (0.8%) for ages 35-44, 0.7% (0.7%) for ages 45-54, 0.6% (0.7%) for ages 55-64 and 0.3%
286 (0.5%) for ages 65. These rates are applied each year. We conduct a sensitivity analysis and

287 consider switching rates at 25% from US PATH rates to reflect the uncertainty on switching
288 from cigarettes to ENDS when permissive cigarette regulations are in place (e.g., legalization of
289 flavored tobacco-products) (64, 65). We also consider 75% of those switching rates from PATH
290 to showcase a scenario where strong cigarette policies and strong enforcement are in place.

291 Smoking cessation multipliers reflect those who quit both smoking and ENDS use. With
292 ENDS unrestricted availability, smoking cessation rates of those who do not continue to vape
293 regularly or who quit smoking without vaping are maintained at 100% of the ENDS Restricted
294 smoking cessation rates. In contrast to the Restricted Scenario, the Exclusive ENDS and Former
295 smokers-ENDS users can quit ENDS use through ENDS cessation rates and become former ENDS
296 users. We assume the ENDS cessation as 100% of the ENDS Restricted smoking cessation rates.

297 An ENDS relative risk multiplier specifies the ENDS excess mortality risks relative to the
298 excess mortality risk for current and former smokers (*current or former smoker death rate –*
299 *never smoker death rate*). We consider a constant ENDS excess mortality risk at 15% that of
300 smoking for both genders at all ages, based on estimates reached through a multi-criteria
301 decision analysis (66) and an independent review (67). In Mexico SAVM, people who quit
302 smoking but currently vape are accorded the risk of former smoking plus the ENDS risk
303 multiplied by the difference in risk between current and former smokers. To reflect uncertainty
304 around this estimate (68-70), we performed a sensitivity analysis by also considering ENDS
305 relative risks of 5% and 25% of excess risks of smoking.

306

307 **Public Health Impacts**

308 The public health impact of the ENDS-Unrestricted Scenario is evaluated as the
309 difference in projected smoking- and vaping-attributable deaths (SVADs) and life-years saved
310 (averted life-years lost [LYLs]) between the Restricted and Unrestricted Scenarios for individuals
311 aged 15-65 years. Based on previous approaches (54, 71), SVADs are calculated by multiplying
312 the number of people who currently (formerly) smoked and vaped by their excess mortality
313 rate, measured by the current (former) smoking and vaping minus never smoking mortality
314 rates. LYLs are calculated by multiplying the number of SVADs by the remaining life years of a
315 never-smoker at the same age.

316

317 **Results**

318 **Validation of Current Smoking Prevalence in the Restricted ENDS**

319 **Scenario**

320 Compared to ENSANUT 2018 and 2022 surveys, for ages 15-65, Mexico SAVM under the
321 Restricted Scenario projected that male (female) smoking prevalence remains stable from
322 25.6% (8.6%) in 2015 to 25.7% (8.8%) in 2022, while Mexican observed data reported an
323 increase from 26.2% (8.8%) in 2015 to 29.1% (10.5%) in 2022. For males ages 15-24, Mexico
324 SAVM predicts a slight increase in smoking prevalence with relative differences between years
325 ranging from 2.4% by 2018 and 3.8% by 2022 contrasting with the reported decrease in
326 prevalence from Mexican data, with differences ranging from -10.4% to -16.8%. For ages 25-39,

327 both SAVM and survey data showed increasing trends but reported differences in trend
328 changes. Mexico SAVM reported relative differences ranging from 2.2% to 1.8% compared to
329 differences of 17.6% by 2018 and 23.5% by 2022 from surveys. Male estimates for ages 40 to 65
330 from SAVM projected a constant decrease in smoking prevalence, but this pattern is not
331 observed in the trend from surveys (Fig 3a).

332 For females, overall, SAVM under the Restricted Scenario underestimated smoking
333 prevalence from surveys except for ages 45-65 years. For ages 15 -24 and 40-65, both Mexico
334 SAVM and survey data smoking prevalence remained relatively stable after 2015, with SAVM
335 projecting a slight increase in trends. The largest relative differences between SAVM and the
336 surveys were observed for ages 25-39 years, with relative differences ranging from 5.7% to
337 3.4% from SAVM compared to differences of 22.5% by 2018 and 50.4% by 2022 from Mexico
338 survey data (Fig 3b). Complete results by age group can be seen in S2 Table.

339 **Comparison of ENDS-Restricted Scenario and ENDS-Unrestricted**

340 **Scenario for All Cohorts**

341 Table 2 presents the results by gender for all cohorts 15 to 65 years born in or after
342 2009 with an ENDS risk at 15% of excess smoking mortality risk.

343 In the ENDS-Restricted Scenario, adult male smoking prevalence is projected to
344 decline from 25.6% in 2015 to 24.5% in 2035 and 21.8% in 2049. Female smoking
345 prevalence remained stable from 8.0% in 2015 to 8.7% in 2035 and 8.53% in 2049. Male and
346 female exclusive ENDS use was projected an increase for males (females) from 0.36%
347 (0.12%) in 2015, 1.07% (0.62%) in 2035 and 0.91% (0.59%) in 2049. From 2009-2049, SAVM

348 projects for males (females) 1.5 (0.28) million cumulative SVADs with 39.0 (6.8) million
349 cumulative LYLs due to smoking and vaping.

350 In the ENDS-Unrestricted Scenario, by 2035 smoking prevalence declines to 19.0%
351 for males and 7.2% for females. These values represent a relative decline of 22.4% in male
352 and 17.2% in female smoking prevalence from the values under the ENDS-Restricted
353 Scenario. By 2049, male smoking declines to 13.0%, a 40.1% relative decline while female
354 smoking declines to 5.9%, a 30.9% relative decline from the Restricted Scenario. Under a
355 ban removal, exclusive ENDS use projected an increase for males (females) to 7.1% (2.3%) in
356 2035, and to 10.7% (3.5%) in 2049. Mexico SAVM projected smoking and vaping prevalence
357 by age-group and gender in two scenarios are shown in S3 Table. The prevalence of former
358 smokers using ENDS is projected to increase to 1.4% for males and 0.7% for females by
359 2049. From 2009-2049, a total of 1.5 million male and 0.27 million female SVADs and 36.4
360 male and 6.4 million female LYLs are projected.

361 From 2025-2049, approximately 106.5 (91.0 males and 15.5 females) thousand
362 SVADs are averted, and 2.9 (2.5 males and 0.4 females) million life years are gained in the
363 ENDS-Unrestricted Scenario compared to the ENDS-Restricted Scenario, representing
364 relative reductions of 5.8% in SVADs and 6.4% in LYLs.

365 **Sensitivity Analysis**

366 Sensitivity analyses are shown in S4 and S5 Tables for SVADs and LYLs for both genders
367 combined for the ENDS-Restricted and Unrestricted Scenarios for 2025-2049. To gauge the
368 public health effect of the change in parameters, we estimate relative changes from the
369 baseline scenario (i.e., ENDS relative risk of 15% that of cigarettes). Applying the same

370 input parameters but with 25% of the US PATH switching rates, public health gains decline
371 by -43.9% to 59,748 SVADs averted and by -43.1 % to 1.7 million LYLs averted compared to
372 106,522 SVADS and 2.9 million LYLs averted with a 50% from US PATH switching rates. In
373 contrast a 75% of the US PATH switching rates estimated 148,695 SVADS and 4.1 million
374 LYLs averted, representing an increase in almost 40% of the health impact from baseline.
375 In a separate sensitivity analysis, mortality relative risks associated with ENDS were
376 examined, ranging from 5% to 25% of that for cigarettes. The total number of averted
377 SVADs for both genders decreased from 121,375 at the 5% ENDS risk level to 106,522 at
378 15% and further to 92,806 at 25% risk, indicating a relative reduction of 24.3% from the
379 lower bound (5%) to the upper bound (25%). Total averted LYLs decline from 3.5 million
380 with 5% ENDS risk to 2.9 million with 15% risk and 2.5 million with 25% risk, a 24.9%
381 relative reduction from the lower to the upper bound.

382 **Discussion**

383 Our simulation study indicates that lifting the ENDS ban in the upper middle-income
384 country of Mexico could reduce cigarette use and its negative public health impacts. Results
385 suggest that implementing less restrictive ENDS regulations could decrease smoking
386 prevalence by 40.1% in males and 30.9% in females by 2049 compared to continuing a
387 national ENDS ban. This reduction in prevalence would save 2.9 million life-years and avert
388 almost 106,000 deaths between 2025 and 2049. These results align with those from
389 simulation models on ENDS ban removal from HICs, whether estimated using previous
390 SAVM (i.e., The Australia SAVM) (72) or alternative approaches (22). Our results are also

391 consistent with a systematic review of modeling studies on public health impacts of e-
392 cigarettes in HICs (20), which concluded that a population increase in ENDS use due to
393 increased ENDS availability would be associated with decreased smoking rates, smoking-
394 associated mortality, and health system costs, as well as increased QALYs compared to a
395 scenario where combustible cigarette was the only product in the market.

396 Previous simulation models for Mexico (SimSmoke) focus on the public health
397 impacts of tobacco control policies focusing on cigarettes. For example, the model
398 estimated that a one-peso increase in the cigarette tax could avert 146,000 female deaths
399 and 483,000 male deaths, along with gains of 2.9 million and 9 million life-years,
400 respectively (73). Mexico SimSmoke also estimated that stricter enforcement of existing
401 policies could lead to relative reductions in daily smoking prevalence by 25.6% for men and
402 26.7% for women, with nondaily smoking also declining by 26.9% and 27.3%, respectively
403 (74). However, while Mexico SimSmoke effectively captured the decline in daily smoking
404 following the implementation of various FCTC policies, it failed to anticipate the concurrent
405 increase in nondaily smoking. This discrepancy highlights the necessity for further research
406 to unravel the intricacies of nondaily smoking patterns and their implications for our current
407 study. While this issue presents a challenge, it is crucial to acknowledge that lifting the ban
408 on ENDS would complement the impact from other public health measures, and according
409 to Mexico-SAVM, could save 106,000 lives and gain 2.9 million life-years over 24 years. This
410 potential benefit should not be overlooked, even if it is somewhat attenuated by persistent
411 nondaily smoking. Research is needed to understand whether switching to ENDS is more or
412 less likely among Mexicans who smoke with varying frequency.

413 Despite Mexico's de facto 2008 ENDS ban, national health surveys have reported
414 observable utilization of e-cigarettes since 2015. Simultaneously, the prevalence of last 30-day
415 smoking has remained stable (4, 31). Could lifting the ban reduce smoking prevalence? Current
416 access to e-cigarettes in Mexico is influenced by two factors: low enforcement of the ENDS ban
417 (14, 33) and a large informal economy (approximately 29% of GDP)(75) that appear to bolster
418 their availability and affordability (4, 76, 77). Therefore, lifting the ban could have a relatively
419 limited impact on overall cigarette use if it does not further increase access to and affordability
420 of ENDS. Nevertheless, by legalizing and regulating ENDS, Mexican smokers could have access
421 to more standardized and, likely, less harmful ENDS than those currently on the market, which
422 are often mislabeled and include a range of potentially harmful constituents (78, 79).
423 Moreover, current smokers might be more willing to try ENDS for cessation if these are
424 approved and regulated than in the current environment.

425 Nonetheless, permissive ENDS regulation also carries risks, such as the potential
426 renormalization of nicotine use attracting new users, particularly youth. To help prevent these
427 downsides, for example, regulations could limit ENDS flavors that appeal to youth and young
428 adults. To optimize the potential impact of legalizing ENDS, their regulation should be viewed as
429 a component of a comprehensive strategy alongside strong tobacco control policies and
430 enforcement to steer consumers away from cigarette smoking. Specifically, regulations should
431 ban flavor capsule cigarettes, which come in a range of flavors as ENDS and are particularly
432 popular among youth, women, and nondaily smokers (64), with increasing use rates (65, 80). It
433 is also imperative for Mexico to ratify and enforce the Protocol to Eliminate Illicit Tobacco
434 Products (71, 72], as its enforcement would play a pivotal role in curbing access to and

435 availability of tobacco and nicotine products that pose potential harm to public health. Despite
436 such efforts, it is unclear how the illegal market would respond to ENDS legalization, though it is
437 unlikely that it would disappear altogether, given the size of the informal economy in Mexico.

438 Research is needed to better project such market dynamics. Ultimately, the decision to
439 lift the ban hinges on a balancing act. Policymakers must carefully weigh the potential health
440 gains for existing smokers against the risks of increased nicotine use, especially among young
441 people. Implementing stringent regulations, including marketing restrictions, age verification,
442 and flavor bans, could mitigate these risks. Additionally, ongoing research and monitoring are
443 crucial to understanding the long-term impact of lifting the ban on both individual and public
444 health in Mexico.

445 **Limitations**

446 SAVM's accuracy depends on the availability of tobacco surveillance data to exhibit
447 changes in smoking behaviors. Nationally representative surveys on e-cigarette use in
448 Mexico started in 2015; this short period of data collection, in combination with the COVID-
449 19 pandemic in the last years, brings uncertainty to the stability of our estimates. As more
450 recent data are published and Mexico SAVM is updated, the projections in this paper should
451 be evaluated and updated if necessary.

452 Further consideration should also be given to the assumptions of the ENDS-Restricted and
453 Unrestricted Scenarios. The ENDS-Restricted Scenario applies initiation and cessation rate
454 parameters based on an age-period-cohort smoking analysis (49, 81, 82) using data from
455 Mexico through 2016 and did not consider changes in use since 2016. Further, the data on
456

457 smoking prevalence were based on any cigarette use and thus may overestimate the effect on
458 established cigarette use (i.e., smoked at least 100 cigarettes during their lifetime and currently
459 smokes daily or nondaily), the more appropriate population in gauging public health impacts
460 (57, 83). We also calibrated the model to Mexican trends between 2009 and 2015, dampening
461 recent increases in ENDS use among 15–24-year-old Mexicans and flattening their declining
462 smoking rates. These modifications reduced the decline in smoking rates and factored a smaller
463 increase in e-cigarette use for individuals under 40 years than observed in recent years. In
464 addition, Mexico SAVM projected that up to 2049, ENDS use among former smokers remains
465 under 2%. SAVM classifies individuals who quit smoking before age 35 as never smoking due to
466 the reduced mortality risk; this could underestimate the actual prevalence of ENDS use among
467 former smokers. Finally, we do not report results on cigarette users aged 66 and above despite
468 their minimal vaping prevalence. We expect ENDS's impact on this older population will occur
469 in those who become older after 2050; still, this demographic presents an opportunity for the
470 potential adoption of ENDS (84).

471 Our analysis of the ENDS-Restricted Scenario also assumed that the 2022 rates of
472 exclusive ENDS use would continue into the short term. Recent evidence indicates that
473 ENDS use in Mexico has generally continued to increase (30, 31). To the extent that ENDS
474 use, especially exclusive use trends continue, the impact of eliminating Mexico's ENDS ban
475 is likely to be less than projected by our estimates because those likely to use ENDS may
476 have already become regular users. Currently, ENDS use occurs predominantly among
477 individuals who concomitantly use cigarettes (80% of males and 90% of females who use
478 ENDS in 2021) (85), while the prevalence among never tobacco users is very low (31),

479 indicating that the ban may have discouraged smokers from switching entirely to ENDS
480 use, potentially due, at least partially, to the lack of legally available products and current
481 cigarette policies.

482 SAVM follows a conservative approach and does not distinguish dual use from
483 exclusive smoking and assumes the same cessation and switching patterns and health risks
484 among dual users as among exclusive smoking (86, 87). However, this approach poses the
485 risk of oversimplifying the complex behavior among individuals who use cigarettes and
486 vape. While evidence of the health impact of dual relative to exclusive cigarette use is
487 mixed (88-91), the health impacts of dual use merit further study. Further examination of
488 dual use in Mexico and the impact of implemented tobacco regulations is warranted to
489 inform more targeted and effective public health policies tailored to address the
490 complexities of dual tobacco use behaviors. We also did not consider heated tobacco
491 product, used by 1% of smokers according to a recent study (92).

492 The estimated number of averted deaths due to a more permissive ENDS policy is
493 sensitive to assumptions about the presumed relative risks of ENDS use compared to
494 smoking and the estimates of switching from smoking to ENDS (21). The ENDS-Unrestricted
495 Scenario switching rates draw on US data from before 2017, a period when e-cigarette use
496 had not yet reached its peak, and newer devices like nicotine-salt pods and disposable
497 vapes (e.g., Puffbar) had not yet been released (57). Our projections scaled down to 50%
498 of the US switching rates to partially reflect the differences in ENDS consumption and
499 tobacco control policies implementation and enforcement between the US and Mexico. It
500 also assumes a more stringent cigarette-oriented policy framework than what is currently

501 implemented in Mexico. Presently, Mexico's tobacco regulations afford consumers access
502 to various combustible alternatives aside from ENDS, such as flavored capsule products,
503 thereby offering a selection beyond vaping alone (33, 93). In the Unrestricted-ENDS
504 Scenario, this expanded selection of combustible options would likely lessen the relative
505 appeal of ENDS, potentially impeding the transition from smoking to vaping and decreasing
506 the switching rates lower than 50%. This shift would consequently lead to a reduction in
507 health gains by 43%, as estimated by our sensitivity analysis utilizing 25% of US PATH
508 switching rates (S4 Table). Still, a deeper understanding of e-cigarette switching behavior is
509 crucial, as it has the most significant impact on our public health projections (57, 72, 94).
510 Moreover, attributing a conservative 15% ENDS excess risk highlights the potential for even
511 greater health risks from e-cigarettes regardless of the ban status. We performed a
512 sensitivity analysis with the ENDS excess risk at 5% and 25% and the results showed that
513 even if the risk from ENDS is higher than assumed there could be an important public
514 health benefit of legalization.

515 In modeling the impact of a more permissive ENDS policy, we did not consider
516 differences in past ENDS-oriented and cigarette-oriented policies in Mexico compared to
517 the US. Negative government and health organization messaging and history of restrictive
518 ENDS policies may reduce the impact of more permissive ENDS policies (95, 96). For
519 example, messaging about the unknown health risks of ENDS may have augmented
520 misperceptions of their harm relative to cigarettes. However, Mexico's current cigarette-
521 oriented policies may instead heighten the impact of more relaxed ENDS policies. For
522 example, higher levels of cigarette taxes in Mexico (68%) relative to the US (40%), a

523 national smoke-free-air law that was recently strengthened, and more restrictive cigarette
524 marketing regulations in Mexico (93) along with lower incomes (97), may more strongly
525 motivate current and potential future to switch to ENDS in Mexico, particularly if their
526 price compared to cigarettes is lower than in the US.

527 Mexico-SAVM represents, to our knowledge, the first simulation modeling study of
528 the potential effect of a permissive ENDS regulation in LMICs. Further study of the potential
529 impact of alternative nicotine delivery products in LMICs is needed since they represent
530 about 80% of the world population and carry most of the smoking-associated disease
531 burden (2). However, a general lack of data on ENDS use from LMICs represents a limitation
532 to quantifying the effects in these countries (3).

533 **Conclusion**

534 Results from the Mexico SAVM suggest that greater access to ENDS and a more
535 permissive ENDS regulation could create significant reductions in smoking prevalence and
536 replace smoking with vaping. The results are subject to the model's assumptions and
537 uncertainty about the impact of countries switching from a more to a less restrictive ENDS
538 regime and the role and level of cigarette-oriented policies. Nevertheless, the use of ENDS
539 in low- and middle-income nations merits closer scrutiny, and further consideration should
540 be given to the role of ENDS restrictions.

541

542 **Authors Contributions**

543 Conceptualization: James F. Thrasher, Luz María Sánchez-Romero, Rafael Meza, David T. Levy

544 Formal analysis: Luz María Sánchez-Romero, Yameng Li, Luis Zavala-Arciniega
545 Funding acquisition: James F. Thrasher
546 Investigation: Luz María Sánchez-Romero, Luis Zavala-Arciniega, Katia Gallegos-Carrillo
547 Methodology: Luz María Sánchez-Romero, Yameng Li, David T. Levy
548 Resources: Luis Zavala-Arciniega, James F. Thrasher, David T. Levy
549 Writing-original draft: Luz María Sánchez-Romero, Yameng Li, David T. Levy
550 Writing-review & editing: Luis Zavala-Arciniega, Katia Gallegos-Carrillo, James F. Thrasher,
551 Rafael Meza.
552
553 **Ethics approval and consent to participate:** This study uses publicly available data sets. No
554 ethical approval was required. This study uses publicly available anonymized data sets.
555 Informed consent was not required.
556 **Consent for publication:** Not Applicable
557 **Availability of data and materials:**
558 Data used to parameterize the model are publicly available <https://ensanut.insp.mx/>
559 [https://www.gob.mx/conapo/documentos/catalogo-digital-direccion-de-analisis-estadistico-e-](https://www.gob.mx/conapo/documentos/catalogo-digital-direccion-de-analisis-estadistico-e-informatica?idiom=es)
560 [informatica?idiom=es](https://www.gob.mx/conapo/documentos/catalogo-digital-direccion-de-analisis-estadistico-e-informatica?idiom=es)
561 The SAVM package and User Guide are made available to the public by the University of
562 Michigan and Georgetown University-Tobacco Center of Regulatory Science (TCORS)-Center for
563 the Assessment of Tobacco Regulation (CAStoR) group upon request at:
564 https://tcors.umich.edu/Resources_Download.php?FileType=SAV_Model
565 **Competing interest:** The authors report no competing interests.

566 **Funding:** Research reported in this publication was partly supported by the Fogarty
567 International Center of the National Institutes of Health under award number R01 TW010652.
568 We also acknowledge support from NIH/NCI grants U01CA253858 and K01CA260378. The
569 content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official
570 views of the National Institutes of Health.


571 **Table 1:** Data sources and parameter values used in the Mexico SAVM

Input parameters	Description	Data source or estimate
Population	Population by age, gender, and year (2009-2049)	The Mexico National Council of Population (CONAPO).
Mortality rates for overall population	Overall mortality rates by age, and gender in 2009; separated by the US overall and smoking status-specific death rate; extended using US smoking status trend (2009-2049).	The Mexico National Council of Population (CONAPO).
Expected life years for overall population	Overall life expectancy by age, gender, scaled up by the US never smoking and overall life expectancy ratio; extended using US trend (2009-2049).	Global Health Observatory. Mexico-Life expectancy and healthy life expectancy
Smoking prevalence	Prevalence of never, current, and former smokers by age group and gender for initial year	2009 Global Adult Tobacco Survey (GATS), Mexico
Smoking initiation and cessation rate for the ENDS-Restricted Scenario	Percentage of never smokers who become smokers and the percentage of smokers who permanently quit every year.	Patterns of Birth Cohort-Specific Smoking Histories in Mexico
ENDS users from Never Smokers (ENDS-PN)	Proportion of ENDS users among never smokers	Global Adult Tobacco Survey (GATS) in 2015, the National Survey of Drugs, Alcohol, and Tobacco Consumption (ENCODAT) in 2016 and the National Health and Nutrition Survey (ENSANUT) in 2018, 2020, 2021 and 2022
ENDS users from former smokers (ENDS-PF)	Proportion of ENDS users among former smokers	
Smoking initiation adjustor for the ENDS-Restricted Scenario	Ratio of smoking initiation rate in the Restricted Scenario	Male (female): 15-24 years: 1.52 (1.53) 25-40 years: 1.78 (1.56)
Smoking cessation adjustor for the ENDS-Restricted Scenario	Ratio of smoking cessation rate in the Restricted Scenario	Male (female): 25-39 years: 0.50 (0.50) 40+ years: 0.48(0.00)
ENDS relative risk multiplier	Excess risk of ENDS use measured relative to excess smoking risks (mortality rate	ENDS excess mortality risks set at 15% (5% and 25%) [†]

	of current smokers – mortality rate of never smokers)	
ENDS Switching rate	Rate of switching from smoking cigarettes to exclusive ENDS use	Ranges from 0.3%-2.0%, estimated by age group and gender using the 50% of the estimated switching rate from a prospective analysis from PATH data wave 1 (2013) to wave 4 (2017)
Smoking initiation multiplier in the ENDS-Unrestricted Scenario	Ratio of smoking initiation rate in the Unrestricted Scenario to smoking initiation rate in the Restricted Scenario	75% of the Restricted Scenario smoking initiation rate, based on recent studies.(59-61)
ENDS initiation multiplier in the ENDS-Unrestricted Scenario	Ratio of ENDS initiation rate in the Unrestricted Scenario to smoking initiation rate in the Restricted Scenario	50% of the Restricted Scenario smoking initiation rate, based on recent studies.(98-101)
Smoking cessation multiplier in the ENDS-Unrestricted Scenario	Ratio of smoking cessation rate in the Unrestricted Scenario to smoking cessation rate in the Restricted Scenario	100% of the ENDS-Restricted Scenario smoking cessation rate
ENDS cessation multiplier in the ENDS-Unrestricted Scenario	Ratio of ENDS cessation rate in the Unrestricted Scenario to smoking cessation rate in the Restricted Scenario	100% of the ENDS-Restricted Scenario smoking cessation rate

572 ENDS=electronic nicotine delivery systems, *ENDS-Restricted Scenario*=values in the presence of
573 an ENDS ban. *ENDS-Unrestricted Scenario*=values in the absence of an ENDS ban. PATH= The
574 Population Assessment of Tobacco and Health Study, US. †Suggested change in ENDS relative
575 risk multiplier for sensitivity analysis.


577 **Fig 1.** Transitions between Smoking and ENDS Use in the ENDS-Restricted Scenario
 578
 579



580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590 ENDS-PN: Proportion of ENDS use among never smokers.

591 ENDS-PF proportion of ENDS users among former smokers. ENDS-PF was used to estimate the
 592 switching rates from current smokers.

593 **Fig 2.** Transitions between Smoking and ENDS Use in the ENDS-Unrestricted Scenario
 594
 595



596
597

Fig 3a Validation of Mexico SAVM male current smoker estimates against Mexican surveys between 2015 and 2022.







Fig 3b Validation of Mexico SAVM female current smoker estimates against Mexican surveys between 2015 and 2022.







Table 2. The Mexico Smoking and Vaping Model, ENDS Restricted vs. Unrestricted Scenario by gender with a 15% ENDS Risk

Multiplier, All Cohorts with New Births, Ages 15-65, 2009–2049.

	Years	2009	2015	2025	2035	2049	Total
Male							
ENDS-Restricted Scenario	Smokers (%)	25.01%	25.60%	25.58%	24.53%	21.75%	
	N-ENDS users (%)		0.36%	1.07%	0.99%	0.91%	
	FS-ENDS users (%)		0.04%	0.11%	0.11%	0.12%	
	SVADs	26,340	30,810	37,943	39,809	35,852	1,543,675
	LYLs	655,037	780,571	962,664	1,008,628	886,537	38,981,126
ENDS-Unrestricted Scenario	Smokers (%)	25.01%	25.60%	24.98%	19.03%	13.03%	
	N-ENDS users (%)		0.36%	1.74%	7.06%	10.67%	
	FS-ENDS users (%)		0.04%	0.21%	1.04%	1.41%	
	SVADs	26,340	30,810	37,750	36,938	28,422	1,452,634
	LYLs	655,037	780,571	957,189	926,601	679,616	36,431,244
Health impacts	Smokers averted (%)			-2.3%	-22.4%	-40.1%	
	Averted SVADs	-	-	193	2,872	7,430	91,041
	Life-year gains	-	-	5,475	82,027	206,920	2,549,883
Female							
ENDS-Restricted Scenario	Smokers (%)	8.02%	8.58%	8.84%	8.73%	8.53%	
	N-ENDS users (%)		0.12%	0.67%	0.62%	0.59%	
	FS-ENDS users (%)		0.02%	0.11%	0.10%	0.10%	
	SVADs	3,374	5,106	7,083	6,876	8,043	283,539
	LYLs	86,046	127,677	167,704	167,694	186,037	6,818,611
ENDS-Unrestricted Scenario	Smokers (%)	8.02%	8.58%	8.67%	7.22%	5.89%	
	N-ENDS users (%)		0.12%	0.87%	2.29%	3.52%	
	FS-ENDS users (%)		0.02%	0.14%	0.42%	0.67%	

	SVADs	3,374	5,106	7,044	6,446	6,683	268,058
	LYLs	86,046	127,677	166,758	156,921	153,174	6,439,220
Health impacts	Smokers averted (%)			-1.9%	-17.2%	-30.9%	
	Averted SVADs	-	-	40	430	1,360	15,481
	Life-year gains	-	-	946	10,773	32,863	379,391
Both genders							
Health impacts	SVADS averted			233	3,301	8,790	106,522
	LYLs averted			6,421	92,800	239,784	2,929,274
	SVADS averted (%)	-	-	0.6%	7.4%	18.7%	5.8%
	LYLs averted (%)	-	-	0.6%	7.9%	22.4%	6.4%

Abbreviations: ENDS =electronic nicotine delivery systems, LYL = Life years lost, SVADs = smoking and vaping attributable deaths.

^a Cumulative results include the deaths and life-years lost, which are the sum of attributable deaths or life-years lost over the years 2009–2049.

^b Restricted Scenario refers to values in the assumption of restricted ENDS use.

^c Unrestricted Scenario refers to values relative to less restricted ENDS use.

^d Difference between the ENDS Restricted Scenario and ENDS Unrestricted Scenario includes the percent averted smokers (measured by the relative reduction in the smoking prevalence each year) by gender, averted SVADs, and LYLs for males, females, and both genders. The relative differences (%) of averted SVADs and LYLs are also available for both genders by using formulas:

SVADs averted (%) = $SVAD\ averted / SVAD_{\text{Restricted ENDS}}$; LYLs averted (%) = $LYL\ averted / LYL_{\text{Restricted ENDS}}$

REFERENCES

1. WHO global report on trends in prevalence of tobacco use 2000-2025. . Geneva: World Health Organization; 2021.
2. Collaborators GBDT. Spatial, temporal, and demographic patterns in prevalence of smoking tobacco use and attributable disease burden in 204 countries and territories, 1990-2019: a systematic analysis from the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. *Lancet*. 2021;397(10292):2337-60.
3. WHO global report on trends in prevalence of tobacco use 2000—2030. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2024.
4. Zavala-Arciniega L, Reynales-Shigematsu LM, Lozano P, Rodriguez-Andrade MA, Arillo-Santillan E, Thrasher JF. Patterns of awareness and use of electronic cigarettes in Mexico, a middle-income country that bans them: Results from a 2016 national survey. *Prev Med*. 2018;116:211-8.
5. Gravely S, Driezen P, Ouimet J, Quah ACK, Cummings KM, Thompson ME, et al. Prevalence of awareness, ever-use and current use of nicotine vaping products (NVPs) among adult current smokers and ex-smokers in 14 countries with differing regulations on sales and marketing of NVPs: cross-sectional findings from the ITC Project. *Addiction*. 2019;114(6):1060-73.
6. Sharan RN, Chanu TM, Chakrabarty TK, Farsalinos K. Patterns of tobacco and e-cigarette use status in India: a cross-sectional survey of 3000 vapers in eight Indian cities. *Harm Reduct J*. 2020;17(1):21.
7. Sreeramareddy CT, Manoharan A. Awareness About and E-Cigarette Use Among Adults in 15 Low- and Middle-Income Countries, 2014-2018 Estimates From Global Adult Tobacco Surveys. *Nicotine Tob Res*. 2022;24(7):1095-103.
8. Crosbie E, Severini G, Beem A, Tran B, Sebrie EM. New tobacco and nicotine products in Latin America and the Caribbean: assessing the market and regulatory environment. *Tob Control*. 2023;32(4):458-66.
9. Kalan ME, Mejia R, Egbe CO, Chopra M, Bteddini D, Jebai R, et al. E-cigarette use in low-income and middle-income countries: opportunity or challenge for global tobacco control. *Lancet Glob Health*. 2023;11(12):e1855-e6.
10. O'Connor R, Schneller LM, Felicione NJ, Talhout R, Goniewicz ML, Ashley DL. Evolution of tobacco products: recent history and future directions. *Tob Control*. 2022;31(2):175-82.
11. Ollila H, Tarasenko Y, Ciobanu A, Lebedeva E, Raitasalo K. Exclusive and dual use of electronic cigarettes among European youth in 32 countries with different regulatory landscapes. *Tob Control*. 2023.
12. Rahman MA, Joseph B, Nimmi N. Electronic Cigarettes or Vaping: Are There Any Differences in the Profiles, Use and Perceptions between a Developed and a Developing Country? *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2022;19(3).
13. Sreeramareddy CT, Acharya K, Manoharan A. Electronic cigarettes use and 'dual use' among the youth in 75 countries: estimates from Global Youth Tobacco Surveys (2014-2019). *Sci Rep*. 2022;12(1):20967.

14. WHO report on the global tobacco epidemic, 2023:protect people from tobacco smoke. Geneva: World Health Organization.,; 2023.
15. Johnson S. Vape, E-Cigarette Sales Bans Around the World. USNews. 2024.
16. Jerzynski T, Stimson GV, Shapiro H, Krol G. Estimation of the global number of e-cigarette users in 2020. *Harm Reduct J.* 2021;18(1):109.
17. Theilmann M, Lemp JM, Winkler V, Manne-Goehler J, Marcus ME, Probst C, et al. Patterns of tobacco use in low and middle income countries by tobacco product and sociodemographic characteristics: nationally representative survey data from 82 countries. *BMJ.* 2022;378:e067582.
18. Siddiqi K, Husain S, Vidyasagaran A, Readshaw A, Mishu MP, Sheikh A. Global burden of disease due to smokeless tobacco consumption in adults: an updated analysis of data from 127 countries. *BMC Med.* 2020;18(1):222.
19. Ianco Marquizo A, Bianco E PG, Gouda HN, Birckmayer J, Welding K, Reynales-Shigematsu LM, et al. Seguir avanzando en las Américas: el control del tabaco fomenta el desarrollo sostenible. *Rev Panam Salud Publica.* 2022;46.
20. Vu GT, Stjepanovic D, Sun T, Leung J, Chung J, Connor J, et al. Predicting the long-term effects of electronic cigarette use on population health: a systematic review of modelling studies. *Tob Control.* 2023.
21. Levy DT, Gartner C, Liber AC, Sanchez-Romero LM, Yuan Z, Li Y, et al. The Australia Smoking and Vaping Model: The Potential Impact of Increasing Access to Nicotine Vaping Products. *Nicotine Tob Res.* 2022.
22. Petrovic-van der Deen FS, Wilson N, Crothers A, Cleghorn CL, Gartner C, Blakely T. Potential Country-level Health and Cost Impacts of Legalizing Domestic Sale of Vaporized Nicotine Products. *Epidemiology.* 2019;30(3):396-404.
23. Saenz-de-Miera B, Reynales-Shigematsu L, Cárdenas-Denham M, López-Díaz V, Ramos-Carbajales A. Impuestos Saludables Para El Control Del Tabaco En México [Healthy Taxes for Tobacco Control in Mexico]. La Paz, Mexico.2022 [cited 2024 04, April]. Available from: <https://www.insp.mx/avisos/impuestos-saludables-para-el-control-del-tabaco-en-mexico-2022>.
24. Thrasher JF, Nayeli Abad-Vivero E, Sebrie EM, Barrientos-Gutierrez T, Boado M, Yong HH, et al. Tobacco smoke exposure in public places and workplaces after smoke-free policy implementation: a longitudinal analysis of smoker cohorts in Mexico and Uruguay. *Health Policy Plan.* 2013;28(8):789-98.
25. Thrasher JF, Swayampakala K, Arillo-Santillan E, Sebrie E, Walsemann KM, Bottai M. Differential impact of local and federal smoke-free legislation in Mexico: a longitudinal study among adult smokers. *Salud Publica Mex.* 2010;52 Suppl 2(0 2):S244-53.
26. Thrasher JF, Abad-Vivero EN, Huang L, O'Connor RJ, Hammond D, Bansal-Travers M, et al. Interpersonal communication about pictorial health warnings on cigarette packages: Policy-related influences and relationships with smoking cessation attempts. *Soc Sci Med.* 2016;164:141-9.
27. Thrasher JF, Osman A, Moodie C, Hammond D, Bansal-Travers M, Cummings KM, et al. Promoting cessation resources through cigarette package warning labels: a longitudinal survey with adult smokers in Canada, Australia and Mexico. *Tob Control.* 2015;24(e1):e23-31.

28. Zavala-Arciniega L, Reynales-Shigematsu LM, Levy DT, Lau YK, Meza R, Gutierrez-Torres DS, et al. Smoking trends in Mexico, 2002-2016: before and after the ratification of the WHO's Framework Convention on Tobacco Control. *Tob Control*. 2020;29(6):687-91.
29. López Obrador AM. Decreto por el que se prohíbe la circulación y comercialización en el interior de la República, cualquiera que sea su procedencia, de los Sistemas Electrónicos de Administración de Nicotina, Sistemas Similares Sin Nicotina, Sistemas Alternativos de Consumo de Nicotina, cigarrillos electrónicos y dispositivos vaporizadores con usos similares, así como las soluciones y mezclas utilizadas en dichos sistemas. 2022 [cited 2024 January 19]. Available from: https://www.dof.gob.mx/nota_detalle.php?codigo=5653845&fecha=31/05/2022#gsc.tab=0.
30. Barrera-Núñez DA, López-Olmedo N, Zavala-Arciniega L, Barrientos-Gutiérrez I, LM. R-S. Tobacco consumption and e-cigarette use in Mexican adolescents and adults. *Ensanut Continua* 2022. *Salud Publica Mex*. 2023;65:S65-S74.
31. Zavala-Arciniega L., Reynales-Shigematsu LM., Fleischer NL., Levy D., Saenz de Miera-Juarez B., Sanchez-Romero LM., et al. Trends in smoking (2002 to 2020) and e-cigarette use (2015 to 2020) among Mexicans by sex and age. 2022 Annual Meeting-Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco; Baltimore, Maryland US2022.
32. Theodore FL, Gonzalez-Angeles LR, Reynales-Shigematsu LM, Saenz-de-Miera B, Antonio-Ochoa E, Llorente B. The challenges of tobacco fiscal policy implementation in Mexico from the perspective of key actors. *Nicotine Tob Res*. 2023.
33. Reynales-Shigematsu LM, Wipfli H, Samet J, Regalado-Pineda J, Hernandez-Avila M. Tobacco control in Mexico: a decade of progress and challenges. *Salud Publica Mex*. 2019;61(3):292-302.
34. Instituto Nacional de Salud Pública. Encuesta Global de Tabaquismo en Adultos. GATS México 2023. Cuernavaca, Mexico; 2024.
35. Alomari MA, Khabour OF, Alzoubi KH, Maikano AB. The impact of COVID-19 pandemic on tobacco use: A population-based study. *PLoS One*. 2023;18(6):e0287375.
36. Delgado-Ortiz L, Carsin AE, Merino J, Cobo I, Koch S, Goldberg X, et al. Changes in Population Health-Related Behaviors During a COVID-19 Surge: A Natural Experiment. *Ann Behav Med*. 2023;57(3):216-26.
37. Loud EE, Gallegos-Carrillo K, Barrientos-Gutierrez I, Arillo-Santillan E, Lambert VC, Zavala-Arciniega L, et al. Smoking Behaviors, Mental Health, and Risk Perceptions during the Beginning of the COVID-19 Pandemic among Mexican Adult Smokers. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2021;18(20).
38. Consejo Nacional de Poblacion (CONAPO). Bases de datos de la Conciliación Demográfica 1950 a 2019 y Proyecciones de la población de México 2020 a 2070 2023 [cited 2024 January 20th]. Available from: <https://www.gob.mx/conapo/documentos/bases-de-datos-de-la-conciliacion-demografica-1950-a-2019-y-proyecciones-de-la-poblacion-de-mexico-2020-a-2070>.
39. Consejo Nacional de Poblacion (CONAPO). Bases de datos de la Conciliación Demográfica 1950 a 2019 y Proyecciones de la población de México 2020 a 2070. Defunciones 1950-2070 2023 [cited 2024 January 20th]. Available from: <https://datos.gob.mx/busca/dataset/proyecciones-de-la-poblacion-de-mexico-y-de-las-entidades-federativas-2020-2070/resource/fcbf25eb-ff94-4d87-8f0c-90612ce41f41>.

40. World Health Organization. The Global Health Observatory. Life tables by country (GHE: Life tables) 2020 [cited 2024 January 20th]. Available from: <https://www.who.int/data/gho/data/indicators/indicator-details/GHO/gho-ghe-life-tables-by-country>.
41. CISNET. 2016, "Smoking Histories". [cited 2021 August 2021]. Available from: (<https://resources.cisnet.cancer.gov/projects/>).
42. World Health Organization. Global Adult Tobacco Survey (GATS) México 2009. . Cuernavaca, Mexico: National Institute of Public Health Mexico; 2010.
43. Pan American Health Organization, Instituto Nacional de Salud Pública. Global Adult Tobacco Survey. Mexico 2015. Cuernavaca, Mexico: INSP/PAHO; 2017.
44. Pesce G, Marcon A, Calciano L, Perret JL, Abramson MJ, Bono R, et al. Time and age trends in smoking cessation in Europe. *PLoS One*. 2019;14(2):e0211976.
45. Hughes JR, Keely J, Naud S. Shape of the relapse curve and long-term abstinence among untreated smokers. *Addiction*. 2004;99(1):29-38.
46. Garcia-Rodriguez O, Secades-Villa R, Florez-Salamanca L, Okuda M, Liu SM, Blanco C. Probability and predictors of relapse to smoking: results of the National Epidemiologic Survey on Alcohol and Related Conditions (NESARC). *Drug Alcohol Depend*. 2013;132(3):479-85.
47. Lee SE, Kim CW, Im HB, Jang M. Patterns and predictors of smoking relapse among inpatient smoking intervention participants: a 1-year follow-up study in Korea. *Epidemiol Health*. 2021;43:e2021043.
48. Tam J, Jaffri MA, Mok Y, Jeon J, Szklo AS, Souza MC, et al. Patterns of Birth Cohort-Specific Smoking Histories in Brazil. *Am J Prev Med*. 2023;64(4 Suppl 1):S63-S71.
49. Holford TR, Levy DT, McKay LA, Clarke L, Racine B, Meza R, et al. Patterns of birth cohort-specific smoking histories, 1965-2009. *Am J Prev Med*. 2014;46(2):e31-7.
50. Holford TR, Meza R, Warner KE, Meernik C, Jeon J, Moolgavkar SH, et al. Tobacco control and the reduction in smoking-related premature deaths in the United States, 1964-2012. *JAMA*. 2014;311(2):164-71.
51. Burns D, Garfinkel L, Samet J, editors. *Changes in Cigarette-Related Disease Risks and Their Implication for Prevention and Control*. Bethesda, MD: National Institutes of Health, National Cancer Institute; 1997.
52. Jha P, Ramasundarahettige C, Landsman V, Rostron B, Thun M, Anderson RN, et al. 21st-century hazards of smoking and benefits of cessation in the United States. *N Engl J Med*. 2013;368(4):341-50.
53. Rosenberg MA, Feuer EJ, Yu B, Sun J, Henley SJ, Shanks TG, et al. Chapter 3: Cohort life tables by smoking status, removing lung cancer as a cause of death. *Risk Anal*. 2012;32 Suppl 1:S25-38.
54. Institute of Medicine. *Public Health Implications of Raising the Minimum Age of Legal Access to Tobacco Products*. Bonnie RJ, Stratton K, Kwan LY, editors. Washington (DC): National Academy of Sciences; 2015.
55. Holford TR, Levy DT, Meza R. Comparison of Smoking History Patterns Among African American and White Cohorts in the United States Born 1890 to 1990. *Nicotine Tob Res*. 2016;18 Suppl 1:S16-29.
56. Dai H, Leventhal AM. Prevalence of e-Cigarette Use Among Adults in the United States, 2014-2018. *JAMA*. 2019;322(18):1824-7.

57. Levy DT, Tam J, Sanchez-Romero LM, Li Y, Yuan Z, Jeon J, et al. Public health implications of vaping in the USA: the smoking and vaping simulation model. *Popul Health Metr.* 2021;19(1):19.
58. At-a-glance: Provincial restrictions on vaping products Canada2023 [cited 2024 February 26]. Available from: <https://www.smoke-free.ca/SUAP/2020/Provincial%20regulations%20on%20vaping%20promotions.pdf>.
59. Levy DT, Warner KE, Cummings KM, Hammond D, Kuo C, Fong GT, et al. Examining the relationship of vaping to smoking initiation among US youth and young adults: a reality check. *Tob Control.* 2018.
60. Levy DT, Yuan Z, Li Y. The Prevalence and Characteristics of E-Cigarette Users in the U.S. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2017;14(10).
61. National Center for Health Statistics. Percentage of Adults Aged 18–24 Years Who Currently Smoke Cigarettes or Who Currently Use Electronic Cigarettes, by Year — National Health Interview Survey, United States, 2014–2018 MMWR2019 [Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/68/wr/mm6839a6.htm>].
62. Ebrahimi Kalan M, Brewer NT. Longitudinal transitions in e-cigarette and cigarette use among US adults: prospective cohort study. *Lancet Reg Health Am.* 2023;22:100508.
63. Bandi P, Cahn Z, Goding Sauer A, Douglas CE, Drope J, Jemal A, et al. Trends in E-Cigarette Use by Age Group and Combustible Cigarette Smoking Histories, U.S. Adults, 2014-2018. *Am J Prev Med.* 2021;60(2):151-8.
64. Ogunnaik A, Gallegos-Carrillo K, Barrientos-Gutierrez I, Arillo Santillan E, Cho YJ, Thrasher JF. Why Smoke Flavor Capsule Cigarettes? Preferences and Perceptions Among Adult Smokers in Mexico. *Nicotine Tob Res.* 2022;24(10):1635-44.
65. Zavala-Arciniega Luis, Gutiérrez-Torres Daniela Sarahí, Reynales-Shigematsu Luz Myriam, Barrientos-Gutiérrez Inti, Fleischer Nancy L, Meza Rafael, et al. Cigarros con cápsulas de sabor en México: prevalencia, proporción de uso entre fumadores y predictores de consumo. *Ensanut 2018-19. . Salud pública Méx* 2020;62(6):820-8.
66. Nutt DJ, Phillips LD, Balfour D, Curran HV, Dockrell M, Foulds J, et al. E-cigarettes are less harmful than smoking. *Lancet.* 2016;387(10024):1160-2.
67. McNeill A, Brose L, Calder R, Bauld L, Robson D. Vaping in England: an evidence update including mental health and pregnancy, March 2020: a report commissioned by Public Health England. . London: Public Health England; March 2020.
68. Alzahrani T, Pena I, Temesgen N, Glantz SA. Association Between Electronic Cigarette Use and Myocardial Infarction. *Am J Prev Med.* 2018;55(4):455-61.
69. Bhatta DN, Glantz SA. Association of E-Cigarette Use With Respiratory Disease Among Adults: A Longitudinal Analysis. *Am J Prev Med.* 2020;58(2):182-90.
70. Eissenberg T, Bhatnagar A, Chapman S, Jordt SE, Shihadeh A, Soule EK. Invalidity of an Oft-Cited Estimate of the Relative Harms of Electronic Cigarettes. *Am J Public Health.* 2020;110(2):161-2.
71. Tam J, Levy DT, Jeon J, Clarke J, Gilkeson S, Hall T, et al. Projecting the effects of tobacco control policies in the USA through microsimulation: a study protocol. *BMJ Open.* 2018;8(3):e019169.

72. Levy DT, Gartner C, Liber AC, Sanchez-Romero LM, Yuan Z, Li Y, et al. The Australia Smoking and Vaping Model: The Potential Impact of Increasing Access to Nicotine Vaping Products. *Nicotine Tob Res.* 2023;25(3):486-97.
73. Reynales-Shigematsu LM, Sáenz-de-Miera B, Llorente B, Maldonado N, Shanon G, P. J. Beneficios del impuesto a los cigarros en México: análisis por sexo y quintil de ingreso [Benefits of the cigarette tax in Mexico, by sex and income quintile]. *Rev Panam Salud Publica.* 2022;10;46.
74. Sanchez-Romero LM, Zavala-Arciniega L, Reynales-Shigematsu LM, de Miera-Juarez BS, Yuan Z, Li Y, et al. The Mexico SimSmoke tobacco control policy model: Development of a simulation model of daily and nondaily cigarette smoking. *PLoS One.* 2021;16(6):e0248215.
75. Kose M, Elgin C, Ohnsorge F, Yu S. Understanding Informality 2021 [cited 2024 February 20]. Available from: <https://ideas.repec.org/p/cpr/ceprdp/16497.html>.
76. Davila G, editor E-cigarette vending machine availability in Mexico and Guatemala. Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco, Annual Meeting; 2023; San Antonio, TX.
77. Vidaña-Pérez D, et al., editors. How do adults get e-cigarettes when they are banned? A case study of Mexico. Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco, Annual Meeting; 2023; San Antonio, TX
78. Taylor A, Dunn K, Turfus S. A review of nicotine-containing electronic cigarettes-Trends in use, effects, contents, labelling accuracy and detection methods. *Drug Test Anal.* 2021;13(2):242-60.
79. Omaiye EE, Cordova I, Davis B, Talbot P. Counterfeit Electronic Cigarette Products with Mislabeled Nicotine Concentrations. *Tob Regul Sci.* 2017;3(3):347-57.
80. Tseng TY, Welding K, Saenz-de-Miera B, Grilo G, Cohen JE. The Use of Packaging Descriptors in a Rapidly Growing Market for Capsule Cigarettes: Evidence From Mexico. *Nicotine Tob Res.* 2023.
81. Jeon J, Holford TR, Levy DT, Feuer EJ, Cao P, Tam J, et al. Smoking and Lung Cancer Mortality in the United States From 2015 to 2065: A Comparative Modeling Approach. *Ann Intern Med.* 2018;169(10):684-93.
82. CISNET. Smoking histories 2016 [Available from: <https://resources.cisnet.cancer.gov/projects/>].
83. Levy DT, Meza R, Yuan Z, Li Y, Cadham C, Sanchez-Romero LM, et al. Public health impact of a US ban on menthol in cigarettes and cigars: a simulation study. *Tob Control.* 2023;32(e1):e37-e44.
84. Rubenstein D, Denlinger-Apte RL, Cornacchione Ross J, McClernon FJ. Adoption of E-Cigarettes Among Older Adults Who Smoke to Reduce Harm and Narrow Age-Related Disparities: An Application of the Health Belief Model. *Nicotine Tob Res.* 2023;25(6):1212-4.
85. Zavala-Arciniega L, Barrientos-Gutierrez I, Arillo-Santillan E, Gallegos-Carrillo K, Rodriguez-Bolanos R, J FT. Profile and patterns of dual use of e-cigarettes and combustible cigarettes among Mexican adults. *Salud Publica Mex.* 2021;63(5):641-52.
86. Czoli CD, Fong GT, Goniewicz ML, Hammond D. Biomarkers of Exposure Among "Dual Users" of Tobacco Cigarettes and Electronic Cigarettes in Canada. *Nicotine Tob Res.* 2019;21(9):1259-66.

87. Shahab L, Goniewicz ML, Blount BC, Brown J, McNeill A, Alwis KU, et al. Nicotine, Carcinogen, and Toxin Exposure in Long-Term E-Cigarette and Nicotine Replacement Therapy Users: A Cross-sectional Study. *Ann Intern Med.* 2017;166(6):390-400.
88. Pisinger C, Rasmussen SKB. The Health Effects of Real-World Dual Use of Electronic and Conventional Cigarettes versus the Health Effects of Exclusive Smoking of Conventional Cigarettes: A Systematic Review. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2022;19(20).
89. Smith DM, Christensen C, van Bommel D, Borek N, Ambrose B, Erives G, et al. Exposure to Nicotine and Toxicants Among Dual Users of Tobacco Cigarettes and E-Cigarettes: Population Assessment of Tobacco and Health (PATH) Study, 2013-2014. *Nicotine Tob Res.* 2021;23(5):790-7.
90. Sanchez-Romero LM, Bondarenko I, Knoll M, Hirschtick JL, Cook S, Fleischer NL, et al. Assessment of Electronic Nicotine Delivery Systems With Cigarette Use and Self-reported Wheezing in the US Adult Population. *JAMA Netw Open.* 2023;6(4):e236247.
91. Cook SF, Hirschtick JL, Fleischer NL, Arenberg DA, Barnes GD, Levy DT, et al. Cigarettes, ENDS Use, and Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease Incidence: A Prospective Longitudinal Study. *Am J Prev Med.* 2023;65(2):173-81.
92. Cruz-Jimenez L, Barrientos-Gutierrez I, Zavala-Arciniega L, Arillo-Santillan E, Gallegos-Carrillo K, Rodriguez-Bolanos R, et al. Heated tobacco product use, its correlates, and reasons for use among Mexican smokers. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 2022;232:109283.
93. López Obrador AM. DECRETO por el que se Reforman, Adicionan y Derogan diversas disposiciones del Reglamento de la Ley General para el Control del Tabaco. Mexico2022 [cited 2024 January 24]. Available from: https://www.dof.gob.mx/nota_detalle.php?codigo=5674791&fecha=16/12/2022#gsc.tab=0.
94. Sanchez-Romero LM, Liber AC, Li Y, Yuan Z, Tam J, Travis N, et al. The smoking and vaping model, A user-friendly model for examining the country-specific impact of nicotine VAPING product use: application to Germany. *BMC Public Health.* 2023;23(1):2299.
95. Rohde JA, Noar SM, Mendel JR, Hall MG, Baig SA, Ribisl KM, et al. E-Cigarette Health Harm Awareness and Discouragement: Implications for Health Communication. *Nicotine Tob Res.* 2020;22(7):1131-8.
96. Arshad H, Jackson SE, Kock L, Ide-Walters C, Tattan-Birch H. What drives public perceptions of e-cigarettes? A mixed-methods study exploring reasons behind adults' perceptions of e-cigarettes in Northern England. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 2023;245:109806.
97. The World Bank. Adjusted net national income per capita (current US\$) 2021 [cited 2024 February 24]. Available from: <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.ADJ.NNTY.PC.CD>.
98. Cullen KA, Gentzke AS, Sawdey MD, Chang JT, Anic GM, Wang TW, et al. e-Cigarette Use Among Youth in the United States, 2019. *JAMA.* 2019.
99. Hammond D, Reid JL, Rynard VL, Fong GT, Cummings KM, McNeill A, et al. Prevalence of vaping and smoking among adolescents in Canada, England, and the United States: repeat national cross sectional surveys. *BMJ.* 2019;365:l2219.
100. Miech R, Johnston L, O'Malley PM, Bachman JG, Patrick ME. Trends in Adolescent Vaping, 2017-2019. *N Engl J Med.* 2019;381(15):1490-1.
101. Miech R, Johnston L, O'Malley PM, Bachman JG, Patrick ME. Adolescent Vaping and Nicotine Use in 2017-2018 - U.S. National Estimates. *N Engl J Med.* 2019;380(2):192-3.

