

Clearing the Air:

A systematic review
on the harms and benefits
of e-cigarettes and
vapour devices

Renée O'Leary, PhD(c)
Marjorie MacDonald, PhD,
RN
Tim Stockwell, PhD
Dan Reist, MTh

January 2017

For a full version of this report,
please email: kholeary@uvic.ca



**University
of Victoria**

Centre for
Addictions
Research of BC

Acknowledgements

We thank our Knowledge User partners for their involvement and contributions to this study:

Dr. Perry Kendall, Provincial Health Officer, BC Ministry of Health
Frank Welsh, Director of Policy, Canadian Public Health Association
Matt Herman, Executive Director, Healthy Living Branch, BC Ministry of Health

We gratefully acknowledge the participation of our Stakeholders:

Deanne Chafe, MSW RSW, Addictions Specialist, Canadian Armed Forces
Kim Bulger, Social Worker, Canadian Forces Health Services Group
Dr. Richard Stanwick, Chief Medical Officer, Island Health
Dr. Mark Tyndall, Executive Medical Director, BC Centre for Disease Control

Suggested Citation

O’Leary, R., MacDonald, M., Stockwell, T., & Reist, D. (2017). Clearing the Air: A systematic review on the harms and benefits of e-cigarettes and vapour devices. Victoria, BC: Centre for Addictions Research of BC.

Clearing the Air is a Knowledge Synthesis project funded by the Canadian Institutes of Health Research, Grant KRS-138211. PROSPERO registration CRD42015025267.

© Centre for Addictions Research of BC, 2017

www.carbc.ca
www.facebook.com/CARBC.UVic
www.twitter.com/CARBC_UVic

Authors

Renée O’Leary, PhD(c), Doctoral candidate,
Social Dimensions of Health Research Program

Marjorie MacDonald, PhD, RN
Professor, School of Nursing and Scientist, Centre for Addictions Research of BC

Tim Stockwell, PhD
Professor, Department of Psychology and Scientist, Centre for Addictions Research of BC

Dan Reist, MTh
Assistant Director (Knowledge Exchange), Centre for Addictions Research of BC

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	i
About the Clearing the Air Project	1
Research Questions	1
Search Processes and Quality Assessments	1
Search Strategy	1
Search Process for Research Questions.....	3
Quality Assessment.....	3
Systematic Review 1: Effectiveness of Vapour Devices for Smoking Cessation	3
Systematic Reviews	4
The first two RCTs: Bullen et al. (2013), and Caponnetto et al. (2013).....	4
Two comprehensive systematic reviews: Kalkhoran and Glantz (2016) and Malas et al. (2016).....	4
Individual Study Findings	11
Reasons for use of vapour devices as a quit aid.....	11
Impact of vapour device use on quitting attempts and success.....	11
Quit rates and relapse.....	11
Best practices for cessation with vapour devices.....	12
Conclusion.....	15
Systematic Review 2: Youth Vapour Device Use and Transition to Tobacco Use	15
Vapour Device Use Initiation by Youth.....	15
Flavours	16
Advertising.....	16
Psycho-social factors in youth initiation	18
Patterns of Use.....	20
Nicotine use.....	21
Population Data Research.....	22
Population prevalence surveys.....	22
Longitudinal cohort studies.....	23
Cross-Sectional study	24
Surveys	26
Sequence of use.....	26
Smoking intentions.....	27
Conclusion.....	28
Systematic Review 3: Second Hand Exposure from Vapour Devices	29
Systematic Review	30
Individual Studies - Environmental Testing	32
Physiology Studies.....	33
Conclusions	34
Systematic Review 4: Comparison of Vapour Devices and Cigarettes for Emissions and Physiology	35
Emissions.....	35
Physiology.....	38
Conclusion.....	40
References	41

Executive Summary

Clearing the Air is a Canadian Institutes of Health Research funded knowledge synthesis project that examines the debate around vapour devices (e-cigarettes) through a synthesis and evidence review. In the literature search we queried 15 databases and retrieved 1,622 journal articles through April 26, 2016. This library was searched for articles on cessation, youth use, second-hand exposure, and the toxicity of vapour devices compared to cigarettes. In a number of instances, the research studies provided conflicting data. The overriding caveat for evaluating the findings is that the plethora of different devices and liquids means that the findings of a particular study may not be generalizable to other devices.

Regarding cessation with vapour devices, the limited number of studies to date do not allow for a definitive judgement about their efficacy for cessation. However, evidence from higher quality studies is encouraging, and many researchers found an appreciable number of vapour device users are quitting tobacco. The research is mixed as to whether vapour device use had an effect on the desire or ability of those who smoke to quit tobacco use, but based on the preponderance of findings, it is clear that claims for a negative impact on cessation are unjustified. Newer models (for example, tank systems) provide more effective nicotine delivery, and with earlier models rapidly falling out of favour, studies on earlier devices could be reasonably excluded in evaluations of vapour device use for cessation.

A key issue around vapour devices is the concern that youth use of vapour devices could lead to their uptake of tobacco products. This does not appear to be occurring as tobacco use in the US, Canada, and other countries is declining significantly among 12 – 19 year olds as vapour device use is increasing. Two independent regression analyses provide solid evidence against a gateway effect. Comparing rates of youth tobacco use in US states with and without bans on sales to minors, where adolescents had access to vapour devices, the prevalence of tobacco use was lower. In addition, addiction may not always be a factor as 23% - 72% of teens have reported consuming non-nicotine liquids. Based on the studies, we suggest a common liabilities model with vapour device use and tobacco use driven by the same psycho-social factors, particularly adolescent sensation seeking and the influence of family and peers who are themselves tobacco users.

Another critical issue is the potential risks from second hand exposure to vapour. Several studies found that vapour did produce a measureable absorption of nicotine in bystanders, but it is not yet clear how to frame the extent of risk from transient exposure to nicotine. Tests determined that second hand vapour is far less toxic than cigarette smoke, often by several orders of magnitude, and that it does not contain carbon monoxide or volatile organic compounds. Yet more testing is urgently needed to clarify the conflicting findings on the emissions of particulate matter, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, and metals, and to determine the levels of passive exposure that may put vulnerable populations at risk, such as children and persons with smoke-sensitive morbidities.

Comparing the emissions of vaping to smoking, the studies are very encouraging for the potential of vapour devices for tobacco harm reduction. Vapour devices do not deliver tar, and emissions do not contain 61 of 79 cigarette toxins. Vaping produced exponentially lower levels of cancer causing agents, tobacco-specific nitrosamines, and volatile organic compounds. Nevertheless, the reduction in emissions most likely differs between products and may be influenced by user behaviours. Unfortunately, no independent research has measured vapour device emissions of 1,3-butadiene (BDE), the highest source of cancer risk in cigarettes. The lower level emissions of metals and particulate matter remain of concern, and could possibly be addressed by manufacturing standards or improvements in product design.

Based on our systematic reviews of literature published up to April 2016, we conclude with the following four observations:

1. Overall, there is encouraging evidence that vapour devices can be at least as effective as other nicotine replacements as aids to help tobacco smokers quit.
2. There is no evidence of any gateway effect whereby youth who experiment with vapour devices are, as a result, more likely to take up tobacco use. The available evidence is that tobacco use by youth has been declining while use of vapour devices has been increasing.
3. Second hand exposure to vapour is more transient than exposure to tobacco smoke. However, it has been shown to create measurable but small exposure to nicotine and no significant exposure to carcinogens such as found in tobacco smoke. It is unclear whether low level nicotine exposure poses any risk to health.
4. Vapour from e-cigarettes contains substantially fewer toxicants than does smoke from regular tobacco cigarettes, however there has been insufficient research regarding some significant carcinogens that may still be present.

In conclusion, we recommend that Canadian regulation of vapour devices be driven by best available evidence with a view to supporting improved public health outcomes. Policy should not be driven by ungrounded fears of a 'gateway effect' but, rather, be geared towards helping tobacco smokers quit and ensuring that only the safest devices are legally available, thereby reducing harm for both direct and second hand exposure.

**For a full version of this report,
please email: kholeary@uvic.ca**