medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.26.24314418; this version posted September 27, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Associations of Smoking Status and Leisure-time Physical Activity with Waist Circumference Change – Ten-year Follow-up among Twin Adults

Piirtola Maarit [1, 2], Filippone Eeva-Liisa [3], Ranjit Anu [1], Kinnunen Taru [1], Kaprio Jaakko [1], Korhonen Tellervo [1]

[1] Institute for Molecular Medicine Finland, FIMM, HiLIFE, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

[2] UKK Institute for Health Promotion Research, Tampere, Finland

[3] Department of Public Health, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

Contact information:

Tellervo Korhonen, PhD

University of Helsinki

e-mail: tellervo.korhonen@helsinki.fi

Tel: +358 40 755 6881

CONFLICT OF INTEREST: None Disclosed

FUNDING: This study was financially supported by the grants from the Juho Vainio Foundation (Tellervo Korhonen) and from the Sigrid Juselius Foundation and Research Council of Finland (grant # 352792 to Jaakko Kaprio).

KEY WORDS: Smoking Cessation, Waist Circumference, Leisure-time Physical Activity, Twins, Adults, Cohort study

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.26.24314418; this version posted September 27, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

ABSTRACT

BACKGROUND: This follow-up study investigated the associations of smoking status and leisure-time physical activity (LTPA) with weight circumference (WC) change.

METHODS: In the FinnTwin16 cohort, 3,431 twins (47% men) reported smoking status, LTPA, and WC in early adulthood and 10 years later. Regression models were conducted to investigate associations of smoking status and of LTPA change (metabolic equivalent tasks [MET]-h/week) with WC change (cm) during the follow-up. Within-pair associations were analyzed using linear mixed fixed-effect regression among 800 same-sexed (409 identical) pairs.

RESULTS: During the 10-year follow-up, 40% (n=454) quit smoking. Among those who quit smoking, the mean WC increase was 7.4 cm (SD 8.2) and the mean LTPA decrease was -0.02 MET-h/week (SD 35.8). Compared to individuals continuing daily smoking, only quitters who smoked daily at baseline (β 1.87; 95% CI 0.68, 3.06) increased their WC. This association was not robust after shared familial influences were controlled for. Each additional MET-h/week lowered the risk for WC increase among individuals who smoked occasionally (β -0.054; -0,08, -0.003), quitters who smoked daily (β -0.05; -0.06, -0.02) and those who had never smoked (β -0.04; -0.05, -0.03). In the analyses among identical twin pairs, LTPA was associated with less WC increase among those who quit occasional smoking or had never smoked. For quitters from daily smoking, this association approached significance, but no association remained for those continuing smoking.

CONCLUSIONS: Smoking cessation seems to be associated with WC increase, but familial confounding is involved in this process. LTPA may inhibit post-cessation WC increase.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.26.24314418; this version posted September 27, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

KEY MESSAGES

This will be published as a summary box after the abstract in the final published article.

What is already known on this topic

1. Individuals quitting smoking tend to gain weight, but less is known of post-cessation abdominal obesity and the role of leisure-time physical activity in this process.

What this study adds

2. Smoking cessation associates with moderate increase in waist circumference among those who quit daily smoking, but shared familial influences are involved in this process.

3. Increase in leisure-time physical activity may prevent post-cessation waist circumference increase.

How this study might affect research, practice, or policy

4. More research is needed to unravel genetic and epigenetic mechanisms underlying post-cessation waist circumference increase.
5. In practice, individuals who quit smoking should be encouraged to be physically active.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.26.24314418; this version posted September 27, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

INTRODUCTION

Although smoking cessation has numerous health benefits, individuals quitting smoking tend to gain weight[1-3]. On average, the first post-cessation year weight gain is 3-6 kilograms, but 10-15% experience more weight gain[3 4]. This is modified by age, sex, pre-cessation Body Mass Index (BMI) and heavy smoking[5 6]. Negative consequences of weight gain main reduce the benefits of smoking cessation[7 8].

Post-cessation weight changes are well documented. However, weight, may not be the most informative health-related measurement. Measures of abdominal obesity, such as waist circumference (WC), may be a better predictors of weight-related health conditions than weight[9 10]. There is short-term evidence of increased abdominal obesity after smoking cessation[11-13]. However, verification on long-term post-cessation changes in abdominal obesity is limited.

Leisure-time physical activity (LTPA) has been shown to inhibit weight gain in general[14]. Evidence whether LTPA could impact post-cessation weight gain has been inconsistent[15]. It has been suggested that exercise may prevent weight gain in the long run[15]. Less is known about the impact of LTPA on post-cessation change in abdominal obesity. However, in a smoking cessation trial including exercise intervention, abstinence was followed by moderate weight gain, but not by increase in relation between visceral and abdominal fat[16].

Finally, familial influences, including shared genetic and environmental factors, may confound the associations of smoking behavior and physical activity with metabolic reactions of the body[17-19]. In epidemiological research, twin samples are therefore valuable in testing the role of familial factors[20].

AIMS

Our aims were to investigate how smoking behavior, especially smoking cessation, is associated with WC change during the 10-year follow-up and whether higher amount of LTPA is associated with lower level of WC increase. Our further aim was to test if the associations are independent of familial influences.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.26.24314418; this version posted September 27, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

METHODS

Sample

The data is based on the Finnish population sample, FinnTwin16 cohort[21]. We used two surveys conducted in 2000-2003 (baseline) and 2010-2012 (follow-up) (Figure 1). At baseline 5,240 (46% men, mean age 24 years, born in 1975-79), and at follow-up, 4,397 (45% men, mean age 34 years) twin individuals completed the surveys. Data were collected by questionnaires, including self-measurements of WC. Analyses are based on 3,431 twins (44% men) who reported their smoking status, LTPA, and WC in both surveys. Characteristics of the participants by long-term smoking status are presented in Supplement Table 1.

Data includes 1,147 full twin pairs who fulfilled the inclusion criteria and both siblings participated both data collection points. Of the twin pairs, 409 were monozygotic (MZ) (169 male, 240 female), 353 same-sexed dizygotic (DZ) (180 male, 173 female), 347 opposite-sexed DZ pairs, and 38 same-sexed pairs without verified zygosity. For within-pair analyses, we used 800 same-sexed pairs.

Dependent variable

Abdominal obesity was operationalized with a self-measured WC in centimeters at baseline and follow-up. Participants received detailed pictorial instruction and a tape measure[22]. Self-reported measurements have reasonable accuracy in Finnish data[22]. Change in WC was calculated as the difference in centimeters between the follow-up and baseline values.

Independent variables

Smoking status

At baseline, smoking status was asked with a categorical question: smoking daily (≥20, 10-19, ≤9 cigarettes), smoking occasionally (at least once week, less frequently than each week), has quit smoking, and being a never-smoker. At follow-up, smoking status question included: smoking daily, smoking weekly, smoking less often than weekly, has quit smoking, never-smoked. The participants were then categorized into the following long-term smoking status categories: persistent daily smoking, consistent occasionally smoking, quit from daily smoking, quit from occasionally smoking, consistent former smoking (quit before the baseline), consistent never

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.26.24314418; this version posted September 27, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

smoking, and others (remaining participants). No interpretation was made for the last group given its heterogeneity. The proportions and distributions of long-term smoking status are shown in Figure 1 and Supplement Figure 1.

Leisure-time physical activity

LTPA was calculated using the self-reported frequency (per month), duration (minutes per one session), and an average intensity in metabolic equivalents (METs). In addition, daily time of physically active commuting to work and back home was included. From these measures, the total MET index of LTPA-h/week was calculated at both waves[14].

Covariates

Both at baseline and follow-up, self-reported weight (to the nearest kilogram) and height (to the nearest centimeter) were used to calculate BMI (weight [kg]/ height [m]2). In addition to sex and age, we included baseline socio-economic status, self-rated health, sleep problems, snus use, cigar smoking, alcohol use (g/week), diet quality, psychological distress (General Health Questionnaire - 12), and life satisfaction as co-variates. From the end of the follow-up, we used information regarding snus usage, education level, and physical activity (PA) heaviness at work. The distributions of the covariates by participants' long-term smoking status are described in Supplement Table 1.

Analyses

Individual-based analyses

We report total numbers and percentages for categorical variables, means and standard deviations with minimum and maximum values for continuous variables by long-term smoking status. One-way ANOVA or Kruskal-Wallis test was used in testing differences in WC or WC change, weight or weight change, BMI or BMI change, and LTPA or LTPA change between smoking status categories.

Interactions between sex and smoking with WC change as well as between LTPA change and smoking with WC change were tested using Likelihood-ratio test comparing two nested models

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.26.24314418; this version posted September 27, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

with and without interaction terms. Baseline age, sex, BMI, and WC were adjusted in the analyses. Interaction was considered if p<0.15. As there was no sex#smoking-interaction (p=0.375) men and women were pooled in the analyses. Because there was interaction between LTPA change and smoking status on WC change (p=0.068), LTPA#smoking-interaction term was included when analyzing associations of LTPA with WC change.

In analyzing the associations of smoking status with WC change and the associations of LTPA change with WC change, we used linear regression models providing beta coefficients (β) and 95% Confidence Intervals (CI). Normality of WC distributions between the groups (sex and smoking status) were tested using the Shapiro-Wilk test of normality and equality of WC variances between the groups by the Levene's robust test centered at the median.

To examine the association of smoking status with WC change, regression models were performed as follows: model 1: adjusted for sex, age, and BMI at baseline; model 2: Model 1 plus snus use at the end of follow-up; model 3: Model 2 plus baseline dietary behavior; model 4: Model 3 plus change in LTPA during follow-up; model 5: Model 4 plus PA load at work at the end of follow-up; model 6: Model 5 plus education (life satisfaction, sleep problems, GHQ12, alcohol use, socioeconomic status, and self-rated health at baseline. The effect of LTPA change on WC change by smoking status was analyzed as above, but without model 4. The statistical dependence of twins within the twin pairs was corrected in all individual-based analyses[23].

Within-pair analyses

Twin pairs commonly share the same childhood environment and experiences. DZ pairs are genetically full siblings, whereas MZ pairs, are identical at their genomic sequence[24].
Within-pair analyses were conducted using linear fixed-effects regression models. In the common use of such models, estimates of exposure-outcome associations are derived from longitudinal variation within individuals, everyone being their own control. The models can be used to conduct within-pair analyses of twin data, in which exposed twins are compared with their unexposed co-twins[25]. The twin pair design accounts for sex and age, as well as shared familial effects, whether measured or unmeasured in all twin pairs. In DZ pairs, there is residual genetic confounding, while genetic effects are fully controlled for in MZ pairs.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.26.24314418; this version posted September 27, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

The results from within-pair analyses are informative when they are compared with the results from individual-based analyses[26]. If familial confounding plays a significant role, we should see an association among all individuals, but less or none within twin pairs. Examining MZ and DZ pairs separately informs whether familial confounding is due to shared genes or environment.

Stata SE version 18 (StataCorp, College Station, Texas, USA) was used for all analyses. In the main analyses two-tailed $p<0.05$ was regarded as statistically significant.

RESULTS

Individual-based analyses

Nearly half of the participants (43%, n=1,482) were never smokers. At baseline, 891 (26%) were smoking daily and 521 (15%) smoked occasionally. During the 10-year follow-up, 32% (n=454 of 1412) of all smokers and 32% of daily smokers (n=282 of 891) quit smoking (Figure 1).

In the whole sample, the mean increase in WC was 6.5 cm (SD 8.1, range -36–64), being 7.1 cm (SD 6.0, -27–45) in men and 6.1 (SD 5.0, -36–64) in women. The detailed values for WC, weight, and BMI at baseline, at the end of follow-up plus the change of them during the follow-up are described by smoking status in the Supplement Table 2. The distributions of WC by smoking status are shown in the Supplement Figure 2.

The mean decrease in LTPA was -6.1 MET-h/week (SD 35.5), -7.9 (SD -3.5) in men and -4.6 (SD -2.8) in women. Among those who quit smoking, the mean increase in WC was 7.4 cm (SD 8.2) and in LTPA MET-h/week -0.02 (SD 35.8). The detailed values for LTPA by smoking status are shown in the Supplement Table 2.

Compared to those who continued daily smoking, WC increase was statistically significant only among those who quit daily smoking (β 1.87; 95% CI 0.68, 3.06) (Table 1). The association remained significant in the multiple adjusted analyses.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.26.24314418; this version posted September 27, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

While each additional MET-h/week lowered the risk for WC in the entire sample, the statistically significant associations, i.e., those who were consistently occasional smokers (β -0.04; -0.08, -0.003), quit daily smoking (β -0.05; -0.06, -0.02) or had never smoked (β -0.04; -0.05, -0.03), accounted for the relationship (Table 2). For example, among never smokers, each Met-h/week associated with 0.04 cm decrease in WC in the multiple-adjusted models.

Within-pair analyses

In pairs discordant for their smoking status, smoking cessation was not associated with WC increase. In other words, co-twin who had quit smoking did not have increased WC if compared to his/her co-twin continuing daily smoking (Table 3). In all same-sex pairs, each additional MET-h/week of LTPA showed negative association with WC increase across smoking status groups. Yet, the association was statistically significant only for consistent never smoking. In MZ pairs, the effect sizes were consistently similar across all smoking groups apart from persistent smokers, even though statistically significant effects were seen for those who quit from occasional smoking (β=-0.09; -0.15, -0.03) and for never smokers (β=-0.08; -0.11, -0.05) (Table 4).

DISCUSSION

This study showed a decrease in the prevalence of smoking, reduced amount of LTPA and an increasing trend in abdominal obesity among the adult twin cohort at the end of the 10-year follow-up. Based on individual analyses, quitting daily smoking was significantly associated with moderate increase in WC when compared to those who continued daily smoking. However, based on pair-wise analyses, this process seems to be confounded by shared familial factors. Further, increased LTPA suggested a preventive effect on post-cessation WC increase. Namely, when comparing the estimates from the individual-based and pair-wise analyses among identical twin pairs, they remained stable for those who had quit occasional or daily smoking and for never smokers, whereas for persistent smokers, the association disappeared.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.26.24314418; this version posted September 27, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

In this cohort, one third of baseline smokers quit during the follow-up. Quitting smoking in our data follows the global trend of smoking prevalence in high income western countries[27]. In our data, BMI and WC generally increased during the 10-year follow-up, but the individual variability was wide. Our results support previous findings about post-cessation weight gain and also with increase in BMI in most high-income countries[28].

In our cohort, the overall mean WC increase was 6.5 cm. Among those who quit daily smoking, the mean increase was 8.4 cm. Although longitudinal studies about the effect of smoking status on WC are rare, there is evidence that on average, WC increases 3.9 cm during the first post-cessation year[11]. As a mechanism for this it has been suggested that nicotine increases energy expenditure about 10%, especially during exercise and after eating[29], and thus individuals who quit smoking tend to increase their body weight[1-4 6].

As reported, the variability in WC increase was large in our data. In a Danish study[11], 40% of quitters and 15% of those continuing smoking increased their WC at least 5 cm during one-year follow-up. When we compared those quitting smoking to those who continued daily smoking, the WC increase was about 2 cm more. Notably, even 2 cm increase in WC increases risk for insulin resistance and cardiometabolic diseases[1 13 30]. However, there is growing evidence that also continuing smoking increases the risk for abdominal obesity.[13 31] Therefore, the notion of smoking as 'weight control method' appears to be misleading.

When familial factors were controlled for, smoking cessation was no longer associated with WC increase. Therefore, our twin data do not support causal association between smoking cessation and risk for abdominal obesity. Genetic factors confounding the association between smoking cessation and weight gain has also been found in adult male twins[32]. Smoking was associated with lower BMI, and smoking cessation with higher BMI in the multicenter study of 150,000 twins[33]. However, the 'net effect' of smoking cessation on weight was not more than an average of 0.7 kg/m^2. This evidence supports previous suggestions that after smoking cessation, individual's weight returns in long run to the same weight-age trajectory as observed in never smokers[29 33].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.26.24314418; this version posted September 27, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

The mean amount of LTPA decreased in all smoking status groups except among quitters from daily smoking. Our results, in general, are in line with previous findings demonstrating a decrease in LTPA by age[34]. The association between smoking status and WC increase is moderated by sedentary behavior so that current and former smokers spend more sedentary time compared with never smokers. Sedentary ever smokers had also highest BMI and WC values[12]. The mediating role of physical inactivity has also been reported earlier: heavy smoking among sedentary population increases BMI, that in turn further decreases LTPA level[35].

Previous evidence about the role of physical exercise in preventing post-cessation WC increase is limited[15]. In a smoking cessation trial including nicotine replacement therapy, counselling, and exercise, abstinence was followed by moderate weight gain, but not by increase in visceral fat[16]. In our individual-based analysis, every increase in LTPA MET-h/week decreased the likelihood for WC increase by 0.05 cm among those who quit daily smoking. The effect is small since to prevent one cm WC increase, a person should have performed at least 20 MET-h additional exercise per week (equal to 4 hours walking at speed of 5 km/h). Importantly, in the MZ within-pair analyses, the effect sizes of the association remained consistent in all smoking status groups except among those smoking persistently daily. However, the MZ pair association was statistically significant only in those who had quit occasional smoking or had never smoked. Larger twin samples are needed to replicate these pair-wise results.

To summarize, our results suggest that the association of LTPA with WC increase may be independent of familial predisposition in those who quit smoking, as the effect sizes in the within-pair analyses of MZ pairs were consistent with the effect sizes for individuals. But this interpretation needs to be made with caution because only one group of quitters showed a statistically significant association. However, it is also possible that the true causality exists, because in sibling control models, measurement error in exposure can falsely attenuate the association between exposure and outcome[25].

We do not know why persistent smokers and quitters behave differently from others in terms of the effects of exercise on abdominal obesity. Interestingly, however, based on a Randomized Controlled Trial, loss of visceral adipose tissue mass mediated by exercise requires IL-6 receptor signaling in participants with abdominal obesity[36]. While exercise reduced visceral adipose tissue

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.26.24314418; this version posted September 27, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

mass, this effect of exercise was abolished in the presence of IL-6 blockade. This raises a question for future investigation whether cigarette smoking and nicotine may be involved in such kind of processes and mechanisms.

Other studies have reported that smoking cessation is associated with post-cessation-related obesity which in turn might contribute to worsening in lipid parameters and insulin resistance[1 30 37]. If this association is causal, it is essential to improve weight management interventions during smoking cessation. This is especially important for people living with diabetes[37]. While there is no constant evidence that physical exercise during the quitting process might increase the successfulness of smoking cessation[38], some physical exercise interventions have been associated with less weight gain during 12-month post-cessation follow-up[15]. Post-cessation weight management is also important in supporting smoking abstinence and in relapse prevention[39]. Whether longer behavioral and weight management interventions benefit successful cessation and reduce post-cessation abdominal obesity remains to be investigated[29].

Strengths

First, our study is based on longitudinal population-based data including a large sample of men and women. Second, we included several long-term smoking status groups, also never smokers. Third, WC was measured twice for estimating abdominal obesity. Fourth, the data allowed adjustment for several potential confounders. Finally, we utilized twin data providing a powerful design for testing familial confounding.

Limitations

The main limitation is using self-reported data. However, self-reported values of weight, height, and WC have been shown relatively accurate for large cohort studies[22]. Further, we were not able to verify smoking cessation biochemically. Except for snus use, we did not have information about the use of nicotine replacement therapy or other nicotine products during the follow-up. We do not have information how many times participants had changed their smoking behavior and when exactly they had quit smoking during the follow-up. However, there is evidence that most of the weight related changes usually occur during the first post-cessation years[3 4].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.26.24314418; this version posted September 27, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

CONCLUSIONS

Smoking cessation is associated with moderate increase in waist circumference and familial influences are involved in this process. Leisure-time physical activity may prevent post-cessation waist circumference increase. More research is needed to understand behavioral, genetic, and epigenetic mechanisms underlying post-cessation waist circumference increase.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.26.24314418; this version posted September 27, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

REFERENCES

1. Harris KK, Zopey M, Friedman TC. Metabolic effects of smoking cessation. *Nat Rev Endocrinol* 2016;12(5):299-308. doi: 10.1038/nrendo.2016.32 [published Online First: 20160304]
2. Tian J, Venn A, Otahal P, et al. The association between quitting smoking and weight gain: a systematic review and meta-analysis of prospective cohort studies. *Obesity reviews : an official journal of the International Association for the Study of Obesity* 2015;16(10):883-901. doi: 10.1111/obr.12304 [published Online First: 20150626]
3. Aubin HJ, Farley A, Lycett D, et al. Weight gain in smokers after quitting cigarettes: meta-analysis. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)* 2012;345:e4439. doi: 10.1136/bmj.e4439 [published Online First: 20120710]
4. Spring B, Howe D, Berendsen M, et al. Behavioral intervention to promote smoking cessation and prevent weight gain: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Addiction* 2009;104(9):1472-86. doi: 10.1111/j.1360-0443.2009.02610.x [published Online First: 20090622]
5. Locatelli I, Collet TH, Clair C, et al. The joint influence of gender and amount of smoking on weight gain one year after smoking cessation. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2014;11(8):8443-55. doi: 10.3390/ijerph110808443 [published Online First: 20140818]
6. Veldheer S, Yingst J, Zhu J, et al. Ten-year weight gain in smokers who quit, smokers who continued smoking and never smokers in the United States, NHANES 2003-2012. *International journal of obesity* 2015;39(12):1727-32. doi: 10.1038/ijo.2015.127 [published Online First: 20150709]
7. Siahpush M, Singh GK, Tibbits M, et al. It is better to be a fat ex-smoker than a thin smoker: findings from the 1997-2004 National Health Interview Survey-National Death Index linkage study. *Tobacco control* 2014;23(5):395-402. doi: 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2012-050912 [published Online First: 20130410]
8. Hu Y, Zong G, Liu G, et al. Smoking Cessation, Weight Change, Type 2 Diabetes, and Mortality. *The New England journal of medicine* 2018;379(7):623-32. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1803626
9. Reis JP, Allen N, Gunderson EP, et al. Excess body mass index- and waist circumference-years and incident cardiovascular disease: the CARDIA study. *Obesity* 2015;23(4):879-85. doi: 10.1002/oby.21023 [published Online First: 20150309]
10. Cerhan JR, Moore SC, Jacobs EJ, et al. A pooled analysis of waist circumference and mortality in 650,000 adults. *Mayo Clinic proceedings* 2014;89(3):335-45. doi: 10.1016/j.mayocp.2013.11.011
11. Pisinger C, Jorgensen T. Waist circumference and weight following smoking cessation in a general population: the Inter99 study. *Preventive medicine* 2007;44(4):290-5. doi: 10.1016/j.ypmed.2006.11.015 [published Online First: 20070111]
12. Kaufman A, Augustson EM, Patrick H. Unraveling the Relationship between Smoking and Weight: The Role of Sedentary Behavior. *Journal of obesity* 2012;2012:735465. doi: 10.1155/2012/735465 [published Online First: 20110927]
13. Terry JG, Hartley KG, Steffen LM, et al. Association of smoking with abdominal adipose deposition and muscle composition in Coronary Artery Risk Development in Young Adults (CARDIA) participants at mid-life: A population-based cohort study. *PLoS medicine* 2020;17(7):e1003223. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1003223 [published Online First: 20200721]
14. Piirtola M, Kaprio J, Waller K, et al. Leisure-time physical inactivity and association with body mass index: a Finnish Twin Study with a 35-year follow-up. *International journal of epidemiology* 2017;46(1):116-27. doi: 10.1093/ije/dyw007

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.26.24314418; this version posted September 27, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

15. Hartmann-Boyce J, Theodoulou A, Farley A, et al. Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation. *The Cochrane database of systematic reviews* 2021;10(10):CD006219. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD006219.pub4 [published Online First: 20211006]
16. Prapavessis H, De Jesus S, Fitzgeorge L, et al. Anthropometric and body composition changes in smokers vs abstainers following an exercise-aided pharmacotherapy smoking cessation trial for women. *Addictive behaviors* 2018;85:125-30. doi: 10.1016/j.addbeh.2018.06.003 [published Online First: 20180607]
17. Tynkkynen NP, Tormakangas T, Palviainen T, et al. Associations of polygenic inheritance of physical activity with aerobic fitness, cardiometabolic risk factors and diseases: the HUNT study. *European journal of epidemiology* 2023;38(9):995-1008. doi: 10.1007/s10654-023-01029-w [published Online First: 20230821]
18. Zadro JR, Shirley D, Andrade TB, et al. The Beneficial Effects of Physical Activity: Is It Down to Your Genes? A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Twin and Family Studies. *Sports Med Open* 2017;3(1):4. doi: 10.1186/s40798-016-0073-9 [published Online First: 20170110]
19. Sillanpaa E, Palviainen T, Ripatti S, et al. Polygenic Score for Physical Activity Is Associated with Multiple Common Diseases. *Medicine and science in sports and exercise* 2022;54(2):280-87. doi: 10.1249/MSS.0000000000002788
20. Boomsma D, Busjahn A, Peltonen L. Classical twin studies and beyond. *Nature reviews Genetics* 2002;3(11):872-82. doi: 10.1038/nrg932 [published Online First: 2002/11/05]
21. Kaidesoja M, Aaltonen S, Bogl LH, et al. FinnTwin16: A Longitudinal Study from Age 16 of a Population-Based Finnish Twin Cohort. *Twin research and human genetics : the official journal of the International Society for Twin Studies* 2019;22(6):530-39. doi: 10.1017/thg.2019.106 [published Online First: 20191203]
22. Tuomela J, Kaprio J, Sipila PN, et al. Accuracy of self-reported anthropometric measures - Findings from the Finnish Twin Study. *Obes Res Clin Pract* 2019;13(6):522-28. doi: 10.1016/j.orcp.2019.10.006 [published Online First: 20191121]
23. Williams RL. A note on robust variance estimation for cluster-correlated data. *Biometrics* 2000;56(2):645-6. doi: 10.1111/j.0006-341x.2000.00645.x [published Online First: 2000/07/06]
24. Jonsson H, Magnusdottir E, Eggertsson HP, et al. Differences between germline genomes of monozygotic twins. *Nature genetics* 2021;53(1):27-34. doi: 10.1038/s41588-020-00755-1 [published Online First: 20210107]
25. Gustavson K, Torvik FA, Davey Smith G, et al. Familial confounding or measurement error? How to interpret findings from sibling and co-twin control studies. *European journal of epidemiology* 2024;39(6):587-603. doi: 10.1007/s10654-024-01132-6 [published Online First: 20240616]
26. McGue M, Osler M, Christensen K. Causal Inference and Observational Research: The Utility of Twins. *Perspectives on psychological science : a journal of the Association for Psychological Science* 2010;5(5):546-56. doi: 10.1177/1745691610383511
27. 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. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(21)01169-7 [published Online First: 20210527]
28. Collaboration NCDRF. Worldwide trends in underweight and obesity from 1990 to 2022: a pooled analysis of 3663 population-representative studies with 222 million children, adolescents, and adults. *Lancet* 2024;403(10431):1027-50. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(23)02750-2 [published Online First: 20240229]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.26.24314418; this version posted September 27, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

29. Audrain-McGovern J, Benowitz NL. Cigarette smoking, nicotine, and body weight. *Clinical pharmacology and therapeutics* 2011;90(1):164-8. doi: 10.1038/clpt.2011.105 [published Online First: 20110601]
30. Driva S, Korkontzelou A, Tonstad S, et al. The Effect of Smoking Cessation on Body Weight and Other Metabolic Parameters with Focus on People with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2022;19(20) doi: 10.3390/ijerph192013222 [published Online First: 20221014]
31. Carrasquilla GD, Garcia-Urena M, Romero-Lado MJ, et al. Estimating causality between smoking and abdominal obesity by Mendelian randomization. *Addiction* 2024;119(6):1024-34. doi: 10.1111/add.16454 [published Online First: 20240320]
32. Swan GE, Carmelli D. Characteristics associated with excessive weight gain after smoking cessation in men. *American journal of public health* 1995;85(1):73-7. doi: 10.2105/ajph.85.1.73 [published Online First: 1995/01/01]
33. Piirtola M, Jelenkovic A, Latvala A, et al. Association of current and former smoking with body mass index: A study of smoking discordant twin pairs from 21 twin cohorts. *PloS one* 2018;13(7):e0200140. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0200140 [published Online First: 20180712]
34. Guthold R, Stevens GA, Riley LM, et al. Worldwide trends in insufficient physical activity from 2001 to 2016: a pooled analysis of 358 population-based surveys with 1.9 million participants. *Lancet Glob Health* 2018;6(10):e1077-e86. doi: 10.1016/S2214-109X(18)30357-7 [published Online First: 20180904]
35. Dvorak RD, Del Gaizo AL, Engdahl RM, et al. Tobacco use and body mass index: mediated effects through physical inactivity. *Journal of health psychology* 2009;14(7):919-23. doi: 10.1177/1359105309341005 [published Online First: 2009/09/30]
36. Wedell-Neergaard AS, Lang Lehrskov L, Christensen RH, et al. Exercise-Induced Changes in Visceral Adipose Tissue Mass Are Regulated by IL-6 Signaling: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Cell Metab* 2019;29(4):844-55 e3. doi: 10.1016/j.cmet.2018.12.007 [published Online First: 20181227]
37. Walicka M, Russo C, Baxter M, et al. Impact of stopping smoking on metabolic parameters in diabetes mellitus: A scoping review. *World J Diabetes* 2022;13(6):422-33. doi: 10.4239/wjd.v13.i6.422
38. Ussher MH, Taylor AH, Faulkner GE. Exercise interventions for smoking cessation. *The Cochrane database of systematic reviews* 2014;8:Cd002295. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD002295.pub5 [published Online First: 2014/08/30]
39. Hankey C, Leslie W. Obesity: is weight gain after smoking cessation an important concern? *Nat Rev Endocrinol* 2012;8(11):630-2. doi: 10.1038/nrendo.2012.175 [published Online First: 20121002]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.26.24314418; this version posted September 27, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Longitudinal associations of leisure-time physical activity with abdominal obesity after smoking cessation in the FinnTwin16 cohort



Figure 1. The flow chart of individuals included in the analysis by their long-term smoking status. WC= waist circumference, LTPA= leisure time physical activity, Met-h/week = metabolic equivalent hours/week, CPD= cigarettes per day
*Dropped in listed order.

Table 1. Individual-based associations of long-term smoking status with change in the waist circumference (cm) in the linear regression analyses* in the FinnTwin16 sample (n=3,431) during a 10-year follow-up.

Long-term smoking status	**Model 1** **n=3,431** β (95% CI)	**Model 2** **n= 3,422** β (95% CI)	**Model 3** **n= 3,415** β (95% CI)	**Model 4** **n= 3,415** β (95% CI)	**Model 5** **n= 3,410** β (95% CI)	**Model 6** **n= 3,315** β (95% CI)
Persistent daily smoking (n=503)	reference	reference	reference	reference	reference	reference
Consistent occasional smoking (n=172)	0.62 (-0.75, 2.0)	0.60 (-0.79, 2.00)	1.07 (-0.31, 2.45)	0.82 (-0.55, 2.19)	0.76 (-0.62, 2.13)	1.13 (-0.25, 2.51)
Quit from daily smoking (n=282)	1.87 (0.68, 3.06)	1.86 (0.67, 3.06)	2.34 (1.15, 3.52)	2.54 (1.37, 3.71)	2.47 (1.31, 3.63)	1.84 (0.34, 3.33)
Quit from occasional smoking (n=172)	-0.52 (-1.96, 0.93)	-0.51 (-1.96, 0.95)	0.22 (-1.26, 1.70)	-0.04 (-1.51, 1.43)	-0.14 (-1.63, 1.35)	0.18 (-1.34, 1.70)
Consistent former smoking (n=253)	-0.30 (-1.53, 0.94)	-0.29 (-1.54, 0.95)	0.33 (-0.90, 1.57)	0.24 (-0.98, 1.47)	0.22 (-1.01, 1.45)	0.31 (-1.00, 1.57)
Consistent never smoking (n=1,482)	-0.33 (-1.19, 0.52)	-0.30 (-1.16, 0.56)	0.38 (-0.48, 1.25)	0.11 (-0.75, 0.97)	0.06 (-0.81, 0.93)	0.25 (-0.66, 1.16)

BMI = Body mass Index, β = linear regression coefficients, CI = confidence intervals, ni=no interpretation, GHQ=General Health Questionnaire, LTPA= leisure-time physical activity, PA= physical activity.
*Linear Regression model including a robust variance estimator to adjust for the non-independence of observations within twin pairs.
Group "other" (n=567) has been included in the analysis but is not reported in the table.

Model 1: adjusted for sex and BMI and age at baseline.
Model 2: Model 1 plus snus use at the end of follow-up (wave 5).
Model 3: Model 2 plus dietary at baseline.
Model 4: Model 3 plus change in LTPA during follow-up.
Model 5: Model 4 plus PA load at work at the end of follow-up (wave 5).
Model 6: Model 5 plus education (wave 5), life satisfaction, sleep problems, GHQ12, alcohol use, socioeconomic status, and self-rated health at baseline.

Table 2. Individual-based associations of change in leisure-time physical activity (Met-h/week) with change in waist circumference (cm) in the linear regression analyses* in the FinnTwin16 sample (n=3,431) during a 10-year follow-up.

Long-term smoking status	**Model 1** **n=3,431** β (95% CI)	**Model 2** **n= 3,422** β (95% CI)	**Model 3** **n= 3,415** β (95% CI)	**Model 4** **n= 3,410** β (95% CI)	**Model 5** **n= 3,315** β (95% CI)
Persistent daily smoking (n=503)	-0.03 (-0.06, 0.004)	-0.03 (-0.06, 0.003)	-0.02 (-0.05, 0.01)	-0.02 (-0.05, 0.01)	-0.02 (-0.05, 0.01)
Consistent occasional smoking (n=172)	-0.04 (-0.08, -0.003)	-0.04 (-0.08, -0.003)	-0.04 (-0.08, 0.001)	-0.04 (-0.08, 0.001)	-0.05 (-0.09, -0.01)
Quit from daily smoking (n=282)	-0.05 (-0.06, -0.02)	-0.04 (-0.06, -0.02)	-0.03 (-0.06, -0.01)	-0.03 (-0.06, -0.01)	-0.03 (-0.06, -0.01)
Quit from occasional smoking (n=172)	-0.02 (-0.05, 0.004)	-0.02 (-0.05, 0.005)	-0.02 (-0.05, 0.005)	-0.02 (-0.05, 0.01)	-0.02 (-0.05, 0.01)
Consistent former smoking (n=253)	-0.02 (-0.05, 0.01)	-0.02 (-0.05, 0.01)	-0.02 (-0.05, 0.01)	-0.02 (-0.05, 0.02)	-0.02 (-0.06, 0.02)
Consistent never smoking (n=1,482)	-0.04 (-0.05, -0.03)	-0.04 (-0.05, -0.03)	-0.04 (-0.05, -0.03)	-0.04 (-0.05, -0.02)	-0.04 (-0.05, -0.03)

BMI=Body Mass Index, β =linear regression coefficients, CI=confidence intervals, GHQ=General Health Questionnaire, PA=physical activity, LTPA= leisure-time physical activity, Met-h=Metabolic Equivalent Hours
Group "other" (n=567) has been included in the analysis but is not reported in the table.

*Linear Regression model including a robust variance estimator to adjust for the non-independence of observations within twin pairs.
Model 1: adjusted for sex, BMI and age at baseline plus smoking status # LTPA change interaction term.
Model 2: Model 1 plus snus use at the end of follow-up (wave 5) plus smoking status # LTPA change interaction term.
Model 3: Model 2 plus dietary at baseline plus smoking status # LTPA change interaction term.
Model 4: Model 3 plus PA load at work at the end of follow-up (wave 5) plus smoking status # LTPA change interaction term.
Model 5: Model 4 plus education (wave 5), life satisfaction, sleep problems, GHQ12, alcohol use, socioeconomic status, and self-rated health at baseline plus smoking status # LTPA change interaction term.

Table 3. Individual and within-pair associations of long-term smoking behavior with a change in the waist circumference (cm) in the FinnTwin16 sample during a 10-year follow-up.

Long-term smoking status	**Individuals*** n= 3431	**All pairs # **** *800 pairs*	**Same-sexed DZ pairs #** *353 pairs*	**MZ pairs #** *409 pairs*
	β (95% CI)	β (95% CI)	β (95% CI)	β (95% CI)
*Persistent daily smoking (n=225)****	reference	reference	reference	reference
Consistent occasional smoking (n=81)	0.62 (-0.75, 2.0)	0.72 (-2.23, 3.67)	1.05 (-3.85, 5.95)	-0.09 (-3.93, 3.75)
Quit from daily smoking (n=114)	1.87 (0.68, 3.06)	-0.38 (-2.70, 1.94)	1.26 (-2.34, 4.86)	-2.58 (-5.96, 0.80)
Quit from occasional smoking (n=81)	-0.52 (-1.96, 0.93)	-0.67 (-3.41, 2.06)	0.26 (-3.98, 4.49)	-1.93 (-5.67, 1.81)
Consistent former smoking (n=113)	-0.30 (-1.53, 0.94)	1.13 (-1.33, 3.60)	3.03 (-0.77, 6.83)	-1.97 (-4.90, 0.95)
Consistent never smoking (n=708)	-0.33 (-1.19, 0.52)	-0.90 (-2.97, 1.17)	-0.50 (-3.66, 2.65)	-1.97 (-4.90, 0.95)

β = linear regression coefficients, CI = confidence intervals, BMI = Body Mass Index,

* Results of twins as individuals are shown as a comparison. Linear Regression analyses adjusted for sex, age and BMI at baseline including a robust variance estimator to adjust for the non-independence of observations within twin pairs.

Linear mixed fixed-effects regression model adjusted for sex, age and BMI at baseline.
** Including MZ, same-sexed DZ pairs and same-sexed pairs without known zygosity (n=38 pairs).
*** Number of individuals by their smoking status included in the within pair analyses (n=800 pairs).

Note: Smoking behavior group “Other” is included in the analyses (567 individuals in the individual-based linear regression analyses and 278 individuals in the within-pair analyses) to increase statistical power but the results of the group are not reported because of the heterogeneity of the group.

Table 4. Individual and within-pair associations of change in leisure-time physical activity (Met-h/wk) with a change in the waist circumference (cm) by long-term smoking behavior in the linear regression analyses in the FinnTwin16 sample during a 10-year follow-up.

Long-term smoking status	**Individuals***	**All same-sexed pairs** # **	**Same-sexed DZ pairs#**	**MZ pairs#**
	n= 3431	*800 pairs*	*353 pairs*	*409 pairs*
	β (95% CI)	β (95% CI)	β (95% CI)	β (95% CI)
*Persistent daily smoking (n=225) ******	-0.03 (-0.06, 0.004)	-0.02 (-0.06, 0.02)	-0.07 (-0.14, 0.0001)	0.01 (-0.03, 0.05)
Consistent occasional smoking (n=81)	-0.04 (-0.08, -0.003)	-0.002 (-0.06, 0.06)	0.04 (-0.06, 0.14)	-0.04 (-0.11, 0.03)
Quit from daily smoking (n=114)	-0.04 (-0.06, -0.02)	-0.02 (-0.07, 0.03)	0.01 (-0.07, 0.10)	-0.06 (-0.13, 0.01)
Quit from occasional smoking (n=81)	-0.02 (-0.05, 0.004)	-0.03 (-0.08, 0.02)	0.02 (-0.06, 0.11)	-0.09 (-0.15, -0.03)
Consistent former smoking (n=113)	-0.02 (-0.05, 0.01)	-0.006 (-0.05, 0.04)	0.003 (-0.06, 0.07)	-0.04 (-0.11, 0.04)
Consistent never smoking (n=708)	-0.04 (-0.05, -0.03)	-0.04 (-0.06, -0.02)	-0.01 (-0.05, 0.03)	-0.08 (-0.11, -0.05)

β = linear regression coefficients, CI = confidence intervals, BMI = Body mass Index, Met-h= Metabolic Equivalent Hours

* Results of twins as individuals are shown as a comparison. Linear Regression analyses adjusted for sex, age, BMI at baseline, and interaction term of smoking status by leisure-time physical activity change. A robust variance estimator was used to adjust for the non-independence of observations within twin pairs.
# Linear Mixed fixed-effects regression model adjusted for BMI at baseline, and interaction term smoking status # leisure-time physical activity change. Age and sex are matched by design.
** Including MZ, same-sexed DZ pairs and same-sexed pairs without known zygosity (n=38 pairs).
*** Number of individuals by their smoking status included in the within pair analyses (n=800 pairs).
Note: Smoking behavior group “Other” is included in the analyses (567 individuals in the individual-based linear regression analyses and 278 individuals in the within-pair analyses) to increase statistical power but the results of the group are not reported because of the heterogeneity of the group.