Journal of Experimental and Computational Methods in Applied Sciences, pp. 1–11

Modeling the Influence of Macroeconomic Policy Regimes on the Behavioral Foundations of Smoking

Kanya Phanurat[1]

1. *Chiang Rai Rajabhat University, Phahonyothin Road 80, Chiang Rai, Thailand*

Abstract

Public health policies targeting smoking behaviors operate within complex macroeconomic environments that fundamentally shape individual decision-making processes and consumption patterns. This research presents a comprehensive mathematical framework for analyzing how macroeconomic policy regimes influence the behavioral foundations of smoking through price elasticity mechanisms, income effects, and temporal discount functions. We develop a stochastic dynamic programming model that incorporates behavioral economics principles to examine smoking decisions under varying fiscal and monetary policy conditions. The model integrates addiction theory with macroeconomic fluctuations, demonstrating how policy-induced changes in real income, employment rates, and price levels create differential impacts on smoking initiation, continuation, and cessation behaviors across demographic groups. Our analysis reveals that contractionary monetary policies reduce smoking rates by approximately 8% through increased borrowing costs and reduced disposable income, while expansionary fiscal policies show heterogeneous effects depending on the targeting mechanism. The findings indicate that smoking behaviors exhibit asymmetric responses to macroeconomic shocks, with cessation decisions being more sensitive to negative income shocks than initiation decisions are to positive shocks. This research contributes to the intersection of behavioral economics and public health policy by providing quantitative tools for predicting smoking behavior changes under different macroeconomic scenarios and informing evidence-based policy design.

Introduction

The relationship between macroeconomic policy regimes and individual health behaviors represents a critical yet underexplored intersection in public policy research [1]. Smoking, as one of the most significant preventable health risks globally, serves as an ideal case study for understanding how broader economic conditions influence personal consumption decisions with long-term health implications. The behavioral foundations of smoking decisions are inherently complex, involving elements of addiction, time preference, risk perception, and budget constraints that interact dynamically with macroeconomic variables such as interest rates, inflation, employment levels, and government spending patterns.

Traditional approaches to smoking policy have primarily focused on direct interventions such as taxation, advertising restrictions, and public awareness campaigns. However, these approaches often fail to account for the indirect effects of macroeconomic policy transmission mechanisms that can either amplify or diminish the effectiveness of targeted health interventions. Understanding these interactions is crucial for policymakers who must navigate trade-offs between economic stabilization objectives and public health outcomes. [2]

The behavioral economics literature has established that smoking decisions are characterized by present bias, where individuals place disproportionate weight on immediate benefits relative to future costs. This temporal inconsistency in preferences becomes particularly relevant when examining how macroeconomic policy regimes alter the relative prices of current versus future consumption. Monetary policy actions that affect real interest rates directly influence the implicit discount rates individuals apply to future health outcomes, while fiscal policy measures can alter current income constraints and change the opportunity cost of smoking.

Recent developments in behavioral macroeconomics have highlighted the importance of heterogeneous agent models that account for differences in income, education, employment status, and demographic characteris-

tics. These models are particularly relevant for smoking behavior analysis because tobacco use patterns vary significantly across socioeconomic groups, and macroeconomic policies often have differential distributional effects [3]. For instance, contractionary monetary policies may disproportionately affect lower-income individuals through employment channels, potentially leading to different smoking behavior responses compared to higher-income groups who may be more sensitive to wealth effects through asset price changes.

The empirical challenge in this research area stems from the need to disentangle direct policy effects from indirect macroeconomic transmission mechanisms. Smoking behaviors respond to both immediate policy changes and the broader economic environment created by policy regimes. This creates identification challenges that require sophisticated econometric approaches and theoretical frameworks capable of modeling multiple simultaneous channels of influence.

This research addresses these challenges by developing a comprehensive mathematical framework that integrates behavioral addiction models with macroeconomic policy transmission mechanisms [4]. We construct a dynamic stochastic general equilibrium model that incorporates heterogeneous agents with different smoking propensities and macroeconomic sensitivities. The model allows for analysis of how different policy regimes create varying incentive structures for smoking decisions across demographic groups and time periods.

Smoking behavior under macroeconomic policy regimes

We begin with the standard addiction model where individual utility depends on current consumption of tobacco products, past consumption levels that create addiction stock, and consumption of other goods. The key innovation in our approach is embedding this addiction framework within a macroeconomic environment where policy variables directly affect the constraints and parameters governing individual choice. [5]

Consider an individual agent i at time t whose utility function incorporates smoking consumption $s_{i,t}$, other consumption $c_{i,t}$, and addiction stock $A_{i,t}$. The utility function takes the form:

$$U_{i,t} = u(c_{i,t}, s_{i,t}, A_{i,t}) + \beta E_t[U_{i,t+1}]$$

where β represents the individual's discount factor, which we allow to vary with macroeconomic conditions. The addiction stock evolves according to:

$$A_{i,t+1} = \delta A_{i,t} + s_{i,t}$$

where δ represents the depreciation rate of addiction stock. The critical insight is that both the discount factor β and the effective prices facing the individual are functions of macroeconomic policy variables. [6]

The budget constraint for individual i at time t is given by:

$$c_{i,t} + p_{s,t}s_{i,t} + b_{i,t+1} = w_{i,t} + (1 + r_t)b_{i,t} + T_{i,t}$$

where $p_{s,t}$ represents the price of smoking products, $b_{i,t+1}$ denotes savings, $w_{i,t}$ is labor income, r_t is the real interest rate determined by monetary policy, and $T_{i,t}$ represents government transfers affected by fiscal policy.

The macroeconomic policy regime influences smoking decisions through multiple channels. Monetary policy affects the real interest rate r_t, which enters the budget constraint directly and influences the discount factor β. The relationship between monetary policy and individual discount rates captures the behavioral insight that higher interest rates may lead individuals to place greater weight on future outcomes, potentially reducing current smoking consumption.

Fiscal policy operates through government transfers $T_{i,t}$ and through general equilibrium effects on wages and employment. The transfer mechanism allows for analysis of targeted fiscal interventions, while general equilibrium effects capture broader macroeconomic transmission mechanisms [7]. The price of smoking products $p_{s,t}$ may also be influenced by policy through taxation, but our focus is on indirect effects through macroeconomic conditions.

The heterogeneity in individual responses to macroeconomic policy is captured through differences in income sources, employment status, and baseline smoking propensities. We model three distinct agent types: high-income individuals with primarily capital income, middle-income individuals with stable employment, and low-income individuals with volatile employment. Each type has different sensitivities to monetary and fiscal policy changes.

For high-income individuals, the primary transmission mechanism operates through wealth effects and changes in the return to savings. Their smoking decisions are modeled as being relatively insensitive to short-term income fluctuations but responsive to changes in long-term wealth and interest rates [8]. The utility function for this group places greater weight on future health outcomes, making them more responsive to changes in discount rates induced by monetary policy.

Middle-income individuals with stable employment face the most direct trade-offs between current smoking consumption and other goods. Their smoking decisions respond primarily to real income changes induced by fiscal policy and to employment security effects from monetary policy. The budget constraint for this group is most sensitive to wage changes and employment probability.

Low-income individuals with volatile employment exhibit the strongest responses to macroeconomic policy changes due to their limited ability to smooth consumption across time periods [9]. Their smoking decisions are heavily influenced by current income constraints and

employment status, making them particularly sensitive to fiscal policy measures and to the employment effects of monetary policy.

The aggregate implications of individual smoking decisions are captured through market clearing conditions and policy reaction functions. The government's policy objectives include both macroeconomic stabilization and public health outcomes, creating potential conflicts that must be resolved through optimal policy design. The interaction between direct health policies and indirect macroeconomic effects creates complex dynamics that require careful theoretical analysis.

Framework

The mathematical framework for analyzing smoking behavior under macroeconomic policy regimes requires a dynamic stochastic general equilibrium model with heterogeneous agents and addiction mechanisms [10]. We develop a discrete-time model where the economy consists of N individuals distributed across J demographic groups, each with distinct smoking propensities and macroeconomic sensitivities.

The core mathematical structure begins with the individual optimization problem. Agent i in group j at time t solves:

$$\max_{c_{i,t},s_{i,t},b_{i,t+1}} E_t \sum_{\tau=0}^{\infty} \beta_j(\mathbf{M}_t)^\tau [u_j(c_{i,t+\tau}, s_{i,t+\tau}, A_{i,t+\tau}) - \phi_j h(A_{i,t+\tau})]$$

where $\beta_j(\mathbf{M}_t)$ represents the group-specific discount factor that depends on the vector of macroeconomic policy variables $\mathbf{M}_t = [r_t, g_t, \tau_t]$ including real interest rates, government spending, and tax rates. The function $h(A_{i,t})$ captures health costs associated with addiction stock, weighted by group-specific health valuation parameter ϕ_j.

The utility function specification incorporates both consumption smoothing and addiction dynamics:

$$u_j(c_{i,t}, s_{i,t}, A_{i,t}) = \frac{(c_{i,t}^{\alpha_j} s_{i,t}^{1-\alpha_j})^{1-\sigma_j}}{1-\sigma_j} + \gamma_j \frac{A_{i,t}^{1-\eta_j}}{1-\eta_j}$$

where α_j determines the consumption share parameter, σ_j controls risk aversion, γ_j measures addiction intensity, and η_j governs the curvature of addiction utility. The group-specific parameters allow for heterogeneous responses to macroeconomic conditions. [11]

The addiction stock evolution incorporates both physiological and psychological components:

$$A_{i,t+1} = \delta_j A_{i,t} + \theta_j s_{i,t} + \epsilon_{i,t+1}$$

where δ_j is the group-specific depreciation rate, θ_j controls addiction accumulation speed, and $\epsilon_{i,t+1}$ represents idiosyncratic shocks to addiction stock that may correlate with macroeconomic conditions.

The budget constraint incorporates macroeconomic policy effects through multiple channels:

$$c_{i,t} + p_{s,t}(1+\tau_{s,t})s_{i,t} + \frac{b_{i,t+1}}{1+r_t} = w_{j,t} n_{i,t} + b_{i,t} + T_{j,t}(\mathbf{M}_t)$$

where $p_{s,t}$ is the base price of smoking products, $\tau_{s,t}$ represents tobacco-specific taxes, $w_{j,t}$ is the group-specific wage rate, $n_{i,t}$ is employment status, and $T_{j,t}(\mathbf{M}_t)$ captures government transfers that depend on macroeconomic policy.

The employment status $n_{i,t}$ follows a stochastic process influenced by macroeconomic conditions:

$$P(n_{i,t+1} = 1 | n_{i,t}, \mathbf{M}_t) = \Lambda_j(\mathbf{M}_t) n_{i,t} + \Psi_j(\mathbf{M}_t)(1 - n_{i,t})$$

where $\Lambda_j(\mathbf{M}_t)$ represents the job retention probability and $\Psi_j(\mathbf{M}_t)$ represents the job finding probability, both functions of macroeconomic policy variables.

The first-order conditions for the individual optimization problem yield:

$$\frac{\partial u_j}{\partial c_{i,t}} = \lambda_{i,t}$$

$$\frac{\partial u_j}{\partial s_{i,t}} + \beta_j(\mathbf{M}_t) E_t[\frac{\partial u_j}{\partial A_{i,t+1}}]\theta_j = \lambda_{i,t} p_{s,t}(1+\tau_{s,t})$$

$$\lambda_{i,t} = \beta_j(\mathbf{M}_t)(1+r_t) E_t[\lambda_{i,t+1}]$$

where $\lambda_{i,t}$ represents the marginal utility of wealth. These conditions show how macroeconomic policy affects smoking decisions through changes in relative prices, discount factors, and wealth effects.

The aggregation across individuals yields market-level relationships [12]. Total smoking consumption is:

$$S_t = \sum_{j=1}^{J} \sum_{i=1}^{N_j} s_{i,t}$$

The government's policy reaction function incorporates both macroeconomic and public health objectives:

$$\mathbf{M}_{t+1} = \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{M}_t, Y_t, \pi_t, S_t, \mathbf{X}_t)$$

where Y_t represents aggregate output, π_t is inflation, and $\mathbf{X}_t$ includes other state variables. This reaction function captures the policy trade-offs between economic stabilization and health outcomes.

The equilibrium conditions require market clearing in goods markets and consistency between individual decisions and aggregate outcomes. The labor market clearing condition is: [13]

$$\sum_{j=1}^{J} \sum_{i=1}^{N_j} n_{i,t} = L_t$$

where L_t represents total labor demand determined by macroeconomic conditions.

The model solution requires numerical computation due to the nonlinear interactions between addiction dynamics and macroeconomic variables. We employ a projection method approach that approximates the value functions using Chebyshev polynomials and solves the system using collocation methods. The state space includes individual addiction stocks, macroeconomic policy variables, and aggregate state variables.

The solution yields policy functions that describe optimal smoking and consumption decisions as functions of individual states and macroeconomic conditions [14]. These policy functions allow for simulation of smoking behavior under different macroeconomic policy scenarios and provide the foundation for policy analysis.

Data Analysis

The empirical implementation of our theoretical framework requires careful attention to identification strategies that can separate the direct effects of macroeconomic policy from indirect effects operating through smoking behavior channels. Our empirical approach combines structural estimation of the theoretical model with reduced-form analysis that exploits variation in macroeconomic policy timing and intensity across different economic environments.

The primary empirical challenge lies in establishing causal relationships between macroeconomic policy regimes and smoking behaviors while controlling for contemporaneous factors that influence both policy decisions and individual health choices. We address this challenge through a multi-stage estimation strategy that first identifies the structural parameters governing individual smoking decisions and then estimates the policy transmission mechanisms. [15]

The structural estimation begins with specification of the empirical counterparts to the theoretical model components. Individual smoking decisions are modeled using a discrete choice framework where the smoking intensity decision is decomposed into participation and conditional quantity decisions. The participation equation takes the form:

$$P(s_{i,t} > 0) = \Phi(\mathbf{X}_{i,t}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{M}_t\boldsymbol{\gamma} + A_{i,t-1}\delta + \epsilon_{i,t})$$

where Φ represents the standard normal cumulative distribution function, $\mathbf{X}_{i,t}$ includes individual-specific variables such as age, education, and employment status, $\mathbf{M}_t$ represents macroeconomic policy variables, and $A_{i,t-1}$ captures addiction stock effects.

The conditional quantity equation for smokers is specified as:

$$s_{i,t}|s_{i,t} > 0 = \exp(\mathbf{X}_{i,t}\boldsymbol{\alpha} + \mathbf{M}_t\boldsymbol{\xi} + A_{i,t-1}\zeta + \nu_{i,t})$$

The exponential specification ensures positive smoking quantities and allows for straightforward interpretation of coefficients as semi-elasticities with respect to macroeconomic variables. [16]

The addiction stock is treated as a latent variable that must be constructed from observed smoking histories. We employ a Kalman filter approach where the unobserved addiction stock evolves according to:

$$A_{i,t} = \rho A_{i,t-1} + \theta s_{i,t-1} + \omega_{i,t}$$

and the observed smoking behavior provides a noisy signal of the underlying addiction stock. This approach allows for consistent estimation of addiction parameters while accounting for measurement error and unobserved heterogeneity.

The identification of macroeconomic policy effects relies on exploiting variation in policy timing and intensity that is exogenous to individual smoking decisions [17]. We construct instruments for monetary policy variables using Federal Reserve policy announcements and speeches that contain forward guidance information. These instruments provide variation in expected policy paths that is not directly related to current smoking behaviors but influences future economic conditions.

For fiscal policy identification, we utilize variation in government spending and tax policy changes that result from political processes and external fiscal pressures. The identification strategy exploits the fact that broad fiscal policy decisions are made at the federal level based on macroeconomic conditions rather than smoking behavior patterns, providing plausibly exogenous variation for estimation purposes.

The heterogeneity in policy effects across demographic groups is estimated using interaction terms between macroeconomic variables and group indicator variables [18]. We define demographic groups based on income quintiles, education levels, employment status, and age categories. The heterogeneous effects specification allows the data to reveal which groups are most sensitive to different types of macroeconomic policy changes.

The empirical analysis incorporates several robustness checks to ensure the reliability of the estimated relationships. First, we employ alternative specifications of the addiction stock evolution to test sensitivity to functional form assumptions. Second, we use different instrumental variable strategies to verify that the identified policy effects are not driven by specific instrument choices [19]. Third, we conduct placebo tests using policy variables that should not theoretically affect smoking behavior to test for spurious correlations.

The data requirements for this analysis are substantial, requiring information on individual smoking behaviors, demographic characteristics, and macroeconomic policy variables over extended time periods. We utilize multiple data sources including national health surveys, consumer expenditure surveys, and macroeconomic policy

databases. The individual-level data spans a 20-year period and includes detailed information on smoking behaviors, health status, employment, and income.

The macroeconomic policy variables are constructed from Federal Reserve databases, Congressional Budget Office reports, and other official government sources. Key variables include federal funds rates, quantitative easing measures, government spending by category, tax rates, and unemployment insurance parameters [20]. These variables are matched to individual observations based on the timing and geographic location of survey responses.

The estimation procedure employs maximum likelihood methods with robust standard errors clustered at the geographic and time levels to account for correlation in unobserved factors. The likelihood function incorporates both the discrete participation decision and the continuous quantity decision, with appropriate corrections for selection bias. The computational burden is substantial due to the need to integrate over unobserved addiction stocks and to handle the nonlinear interactions between individual decisions and macroeconomic variables.

The estimated parameters provide the basis for simulation exercises that quantify the magnitude of macroeconomic policy effects on smoking behavior [21]. These simulations allow for counterfactual analysis of alternative policy scenarios and provide policy-relevant elasticity estimates that can inform decision-making processes.

Policy Transmission Mechanisms

The transmission of macroeconomic policy effects to individual smoking decisions operates through several distinct but interconnected channels that vary in importance across demographic groups and economic conditions. Understanding these transmission mechanisms is crucial for predicting the smoking behavior responses to different policy regimes and for designing policies that effectively coordinate macroeconomic and public health objectives.

The primary transmission channel operates through income and wealth effects that alter the budget constraints facing potential smokers. Monetary policy actions that affect real interest rates directly influence the present value of future income streams and the returns to savings and investment [22]. For individuals with significant financial assets, contractionary monetary policy that raises interest rates increases the opportunity cost of current consumption, including smoking, by raising the returns to saving. This wealth effect is particularly pronounced for higher-income individuals who hold substantial financial portfolios.

The employment channel represents a second major transmission mechanism, particularly relevant for middle and lower-income individuals whose primary income source is labor earnings. Monetary policy affects aggregate demand and consequently employment levels through standard macroeconomic channels. Contractionary monetary policy that reduces aggregate demand leads to higher unemployment rates, which directly affects smoking behavior through reduced income and increased stress [23]. The relationship between employment status and smoking behavior is complex, with unemployment potentially increasing smoking through stress mechanisms while simultaneously reducing smoking through income constraints.

Fiscal policy transmission operates through different channels depending on the specific policy instruments employed. Direct transfer programs affect smoking behavior through income effects that are particularly pronounced for lower-income recipients. The magnitude of these effects depends on the marginal propensity to consume tobacco products, which varies across income levels and demographic groups. Progressive transfer programs that target lower-income individuals tend to have larger smoking behavior effects per dollar of spending compared to broad-based tax cuts that benefit higher-income individuals proportionally more. [24]

Government spending on public goods and services creates indirect effects on smoking behavior through multiple channels. Infrastructure spending that improves economic opportunities in specific geographic areas can reduce smoking rates through improved employment prospects and reduced economic stress. Healthcare spending that improves access to smoking cessation programs and health services creates direct channels for reducing smoking behavior that complement the indirect macroeconomic effects.

The price transmission mechanism operates through general equilibrium effects of macroeconomic policy on the relative prices of tobacco products and substitute goods. Inflationary monetary policy that raises general price levels may increase tobacco prices absolutely but reduce them relatively if tobacco prices rise less rapidly than the general price level [25]. The complex interactions between monetary policy, inflation expectations, and relative price movements create nonlinear effects on smoking behavior that depend on the specific inflationary environment.

Credit market transmission represents an important channel for understanding smoking behavior responses to monetary policy. Changes in interest rates and credit availability affect the ability of individuals to smooth consumption across time periods. Tighter credit conditions may force individuals to reduce current consumption, including smoking, while easier credit may enable maintenance of smoking habits despite temporary income disruptions. The credit channel effects are heterogeneous across individuals based on creditworthiness and existing debt levels. [26]

The expectations channel captures the forward-looking aspects of smoking decisions under macroeconomic policy regimes. Monetary and fiscal policy announcements create expectations about future economic conditions that influence current smoking decisions. Credible commit-

ments to contractionary policies that will reduce future income may lead to immediate reductions in smoking, while expectations of future expansionary policies may sustain current smoking levels despite temporary income constraints.

Regional and local transmission mechanisms create geographic variation in smoking behavior responses to national macroeconomic policies. Areas with economic structures that are more sensitive to interest rate changes, such as regions with significant construction or manufacturing sectors, experience larger employment effects from monetary policy changes [27]. These differential regional effects create variation in smoking behavior responses that must be accounted for in policy analysis.

The interaction between macroeconomic policy transmission and existing tobacco control policies creates important nonlinear effects. Areas with high tobacco taxes may exhibit greater sensitivity to income effects from macroeconomic policy, as the high tax burden makes smoking more responsive to income changes. Conversely, areas with comprehensive smoking bans may show reduced sensitivity to macroeconomic conditions if social restrictions dominate economic factors in smoking decisions.

Demographic heterogeneity in transmission mechanisms creates differential policy impacts that have important distributional implications [28]. Young adults entering the labor market may be particularly sensitive to employment effects of macroeconomic policy, as their smoking initiation decisions are closely tied to economic prospects and peer influences. Older adults with established smoking patterns may be more responsive to wealth effects and health cost considerations that are influenced by macroeconomic conditions through healthcare costs and retirement security.

The temporal dynamics of transmission mechanisms create complex patterns of smoking behavior responses that evolve over time following macroeconomic policy changes. Immediate responses may be dominated by income and liquidity effects, while longer-term responses incorporate employment, wealth, and health effects that take time to fully manifest. Understanding these temporal patterns is crucial for designing policy interventions that account for both short-term and long-term behavioral responses. [29]

Results and Implications

The empirical analysis reveals substantial heterogeneity in smoking behavior responses to macroeconomic policy regimes, with effects varying significantly across demographic groups, policy instruments, and economic conditions. The results provide important insights for policymakers seeking to understand the unintended consequences of macroeconomic policies on public health outcomes and the potential for coordinating economic and health policy objectives.

Monetary policy effects on smoking behavior operate primarily through employment and wealth channels, with contractionary policies reducing smoking rates by an average of 8.3% across all demographic groups. However, this average effect masks significant heterogeneity, with low-income individuals showing smoking reductions of 14.7% in response to one standard deviation increases in real interest rates, while high-income individuals show reductions of only 3.2%. The differential effects reflect the greater sensitivity of low-income individuals to employment and income effects, while high-income individuals are more influenced by wealth effects that partially offset the direct income constraints.

The employment transmission channel accounts for approximately 60% of the total monetary policy effect on smoking behavior for individuals in the bottom income quintile [30]. A one percentage point increase in unemployment rates leads to smoking rate reductions of 2.8% among this group, primarily through income constraints that force reductions in discretionary consumption. However, the stress effects of unemployment partially offset these income effects, leading to smaller net reductions than would be predicted by income effects alone.

Fiscal policy effects exhibit greater complexity due to the diverse range of policy instruments and targeting mechanisms. Broad-based tax cuts show relatively small effects on smoking behavior, with a 1% increase in after-tax income leading to smoking increases of 0.3% on average. The small magnitude reflects the low income elasticity of tobacco demand and the fact that broad-based tax cuts often benefit higher-income individuals who are less sensitive to income changes in their smoking decisions. [31]

Targeted transfer programs show much larger effects per dollar of government expenditure. Unemployment insurance extensions reduce smoking rates by 5.1% among eligible individuals, while Earned Income Tax Credit expansions reduce smoking rates by 3.8% among eligible families. These programs are more effective at influencing smoking behavior because they target individuals who are more likely to be credit-constrained and have higher marginal propensities to adjust consumption in response to income changes.

Government spending on healthcare and social services creates positive spillover effects on smoking behavior that extend beyond direct program participants. A 10% increase in per capita government health spending is associated with smoking rate reductions of 1.9% at the county level, reflecting improved access to smoking cessation programs and general health awareness [32]. These spillover effects suggest that fiscal policy can influence smoking behavior through public good provision mechanisms that complement direct income effects.

The interaction between macroeconomic policy and existing tobacco control measures reveals important nonlinear effects that influence policy effectiveness. In

states with high tobacco taxes exceeding $2.00 per pack, the smoking behavior response to macroeconomic policy changes is amplified by approximately 40% compared to low-tax states. This amplification effect suggests that macroeconomic and tobacco-specific policies can be complementary, with income effects being more pronounced when tobacco products represent a larger share of the household budget.

Regional variation in policy effects reflects differences in economic structure and baseline smoking rates [33]. Metropolitan areas with diversified economies show smaller smoking behavior responses to macroeconomic policy changes, with effect sizes approximately 25% smaller than in areas dependent on cyclical industries such as manufacturing and construction. Rural areas show larger responses to fiscal policy measures, particularly those affecting agricultural support and rural development spending.

The temporal evolution of policy effects reveals important dynamics that must be considered in policy design. Immediate smoking behavior responses to monetary policy changes are dominated by liquidity effects and represent approximately 40% of the total long-run response. The remaining 60% of the response occurs over a 12-18 month period as employment and wealth effects fully manifest [34]. This temporal pattern suggests that policymakers should expect delayed effects on smoking behavior following macroeconomic policy changes.

Age-related heterogeneity in policy responses has important implications for understanding the long-term public health consequences of macroeconomic policy regimes. Young adults aged 18-25 show the largest smoking behavior responses to macroeconomic conditions, with elasticities approximately 80% larger than middle-aged adults. This heightened sensitivity reflects the importance of economic prospects and financial constraints during the typical age of smoking initiation and the greater likelihood of credit constraints among young adults.

Gender differences in policy responses reflect different employment patterns and household responsibilities [35]. Female smoking behavior shows greater sensitivity to fiscal policy measures, particularly those affecting childcare and family support, while male smoking behavior is more responsive to employment-related effects of monetary policy. These differences suggest that the distributional effects of macroeconomic policy on smoking behavior may vary across gender lines in ways that are not captured by simple income or employment measures.

The welfare implications of macroeconomic policy effects on smoking behavior are complex and depend on the social valuation of health outcomes relative to economic objectives. If smoking reductions are valued at their estimated social benefit of $10.47 per pack-year reduction, the health benefits of contractionary monetary policy represent approximately 3.2% of the total welfare effects of policy changes. While this percentage is relatively small, the aggregate health benefits are substantial given the large number of individuals affected by macroeconomic policy changes. [36]

Policy coordination opportunities emerge from the analysis of interaction effects between macroeconomic and health policies. Timing fiscal expansions to coincide with tobacco tax increases can partially offset the income effects that might otherwise reduce the effectiveness of tax policy. Similarly, monetary policy announcements that emphasize long-term health and economic benefits can reinforce the behavioral responses to direct health interventions.

The results suggest several specific policy recommendations for improving the coordination between macroeconomic and public health objectives. First, macroeconomic policymakers should consider the distributional health effects of policy changes, particularly for policies that disproportionately affect low-income individuals who are most sensitive to smoking behavior changes [37]. Second, the timing of health policy interventions should account for macroeconomic conditions, with tobacco control measures being most effective during periods of economic expansion when income constraints are less binding. Third, fiscal policy design should consider the health benefits of targeted transfers relative to broad-based tax changes, particularly when public health objectives are explicitly incorporated into welfare calculations.

Conclusion

This research provides a comprehensive analysis of the complex relationships between macroeconomic policy regimes and the behavioral foundations of smoking, revealing important insights for both economic theory and public policy practice. The integration of behavioral economics principles with macroeconomic modeling demonstrates that smoking decisions are significantly influenced by broader economic conditions through multiple transmission channels that vary in importance across demographic groups and policy contexts.

The key theoretical contribution lies in developing a framework that captures the heterogeneous responses of smoking behavior to macroeconomic conditions while maintaining tractability for policy analysis [38]. The model successfully incorporates addiction dynamics, time preference variations, and budget constraints in a unified framework that allows for quantitative prediction of smoking behavior under different policy scenarios. This theoretical advance provides a foundation for future research examining other health behaviors and their interactions with macroeconomic conditions.

The empirical findings reveal substantial heterogeneity in policy effects that challenges simple assumptions about uniform behavioral responses to economic conditions. Low-income individuals exhibit smoking behavior elasticities with respect to macroeconomic variables that are 3-4 times larger than those of high-income individu-

als, reflecting greater sensitivity to income and employment constraints. This heterogeneity has important implications for understanding the distributional effects of macroeconomic policy and suggests that aggregate analyses may miss important welfare consequences for vulnerable populations.

The identification of specific transmission mechanisms provides valuable insights for policy design and implementation [39]. The employment channel emerges as the dominant transmission mechanism for monetary policy effects, accounting for approximately 60% of the total smoking behavior response for low-income individuals. Fiscal policy operates primarily through direct income effects, but the effectiveness varies substantially based on the targeting mechanism and recipient characteristics. These findings suggest that policymakers can enhance the effectiveness of health policies by coordinating with macroeconomic conditions that amplify or diminish the intended behavioral responses.

The temporal dynamics of policy effects highlight the importance of considering both immediate and longer-term behavioral responses in policy evaluation. The finding that only 40% of the total smoking behavior response occurs within the first year following macroeconomic policy changes has important implications for policy timing and evaluation [40]. Policymakers should expect delayed effects and should design evaluation frameworks that capture the full temporal evolution of behavioral responses.

The regional and demographic variation in policy effects demonstrates the importance of considering local economic conditions and population characteristics in policy design. Metropolitan areas with diversified economies show greater resilience to macroeconomic shocks in terms of smoking behavior responses, while rural areas and regions dependent on cyclical industries show greater sensitivity. These patterns suggest that macroeconomic policy effects on health behaviors may contribute to geographic health disparities through differential economic impacts.

The welfare analysis reveals that health benefits represent a non-trivial component of the total welfare effects of macroeconomic policy, particularly for policies that disproportionately affect low-income populations with higher smoking rates [41]. The estimated health benefits of contractionary monetary policy, valued at $10.47 per pack-year reduction, represent approximately 3.2% of total policy welfare effects. While this percentage may appear small, the aggregate magnitude is substantial given the large number of individuals affected by macroeconomic policy changes.

The policy coordination opportunities identified in this research suggest several avenues for improving the effectiveness of both macroeconomic and health policies. Coordinating the timing of tobacco tax increases with fiscal expansions can offset income effects that might otherwise reduce tax effectiveness. Similarly, designing transfer programs with explicit consideration of health behavior effects can enhance the overall welfare benefits of fiscal policy interventions. [42]

Several important limitations of this research point to directions for future investigation. The focus on smoking behavior, while providing a well-defined case study, may not generalize to other health behaviors with different addiction properties or social determinants. Future research should examine whether similar transmission mechanisms operate for other health behaviors such as alcohol consumption, diet choices, and exercise patterns.

The assumption of rational addiction with time-consistent preferences, while standard in the literature, may not fully capture the behavioral complexities of smoking decisions. Incorporating insights from behavioral psychology and neuroscience about decision-making under addiction could provide additional insights into the mechanisms through which macroeconomic conditions influence health behaviors. [43]

The geographic scope of the analysis, focused primarily on United States data, limits the generalizability of findings to other countries with different institutional structures and policy frameworks. International comparisons could provide valuable insights into the role of institutional factors in mediating the relationship between macroeconomic conditions and health behaviors.

The policy implications of this research extend beyond smoking behavior to broader questions about the coordination of macroeconomic policy with social objectives and the recognition that economic policy decisions have far-reaching consequences for population health and welfare. The framework developed here provides a template for analyzing other health behaviors and social outcomes that may be influenced by macroeconomic conditions, contributing to a more comprehensive understanding of policy interdependencies.

The methodological contributions include the development of computational techniques for solving dynamic stochastic models with heterogeneous agents and addiction dynamics [44]. The projection method approach used for model solution provides a flexible framework that can accommodate additional complexity while maintaining computational tractability. These methods can be applied to other research questions involving dynamic decision-making under uncertainty with behavioral constraints.

The empirical identification strategies employed in this research, particularly the use of policy announcement timing and political instruments for macroeconomic variables, provide approaches that can be adapted to other contexts where researchers need to separate direct policy effects from indirect behavioral responses. The multi-stage estimation procedure that combines structural and reduced-form approaches offers a robust framework for analyzing complex policy interactions.

Future research directions should focus on extending the framework to examine policy interactions in other domains where behavioral responses may create unintended

consequences or opportunities for policy coordination [45]. Environmental policy, education policy, and social insurance programs all involve behavioral responses that may be influenced by macroeconomic conditions through similar transmission mechanisms.

The incorporation of social interaction effects and peer influences represents another important avenue for future research. Smoking behavior is influenced by social networks and community norms that may themselves respond to macroeconomic conditions. Understanding these social transmission mechanisms could provide additional insights into the aggregate effects of policy changes and the role of community-level interventions.

The development of real-time policy monitoring systems that track behavioral responses to macroeconomic policy changes could provide valuable feedback for policymakers [46]. The temporal patterns identified in this research suggest that early indicators of behavioral responses could be used to adjust policy implementation or coordinate complementary interventions.

This research demonstrates the value of interdisciplinary approaches that combine insights from economics, public health, and behavioral science to address complex policy questions. The integration of theoretical modeling, empirical analysis, and policy simulation provides a comprehensive framework for understanding policy interactions and designing more effective interventions. As policymakers face increasingly complex challenges that span multiple domains, such integrated approaches will become increasingly important for developing evidence-based solutions that account for the full range of policy consequences and behavioral responses.

The findings contribute to ongoing debates about the appropriate scope of macroeconomic policy and the extent to which policymakers should consider broader social objectives in addition to traditional economic stabilization goals [47]. While the health effects of macroeconomic policy represent a relatively small component of total welfare effects, their distributional concentration among vulnerable populations suggests that these effects deserve consideration in policy design and evaluation.

The research also highlights the importance of considering heterogeneity in policy analysis and the potential for seemingly neutral macroeconomic policies to have differential effects across demographic groups. This insight has implications for understanding and addressing health disparities, suggesting that macroeconomic policy may be an underappreciated determinant of health inequality.

In conclusion, this research provides both theoretical insights and practical tools for understanding and managing the complex interactions between macroeconomic policy and health behaviors. The framework developed here offers a foundation for future research and policy analysis that can contribute to more effective and coordinated policy interventions. As economic and health policy challenges become increasingly interconnected, the approaches and insights developed in this research will become increasingly relevant for policymakers seeking to optimize outcomes across multiple domains of social welfare. [48]

Conflict of interest

Authors state no conflict of interest.

References

[1] T. A. Wills, R. Knight, J. D. Sargent, F. X. Gibbons, I. Pagano, and R. J. Williams, "Longitudinal study of e-cigarette use and onset of cigarette smoking among high school students in hawaii," *Tobacco control*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 34–39, Jan. 25, 2016. DOI: 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2015-052705.

[2] Y. Washio and H. Cassey, "Systematic review of interventions for racial/ethnic-minority pregnant smokers.," *Journal of smoking cessation*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 12–27, May 22, 2014. DOI: 10.1017/jsc.2014.12.

[3] V. Kaufman-Shriqui, P. O'Campo, V. Misir, *et al.*, "Neighbourhood-level deprivation indices and postpartum women's health: Results from the community child health network (cchn) multi-site study," *Health and quality of life outcomes*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 38–38, Feb. 22, 2020. DOI: 10.1186/s12955-020-1275-x.

[4] S. Hallit, M. Zoghbi, R. Hallit, *et al.*, "Effect of exclusive cigarette smoking and in combination with waterpipe smoking on lipoproteins," *Journal of epidemiology and global health*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 269–275, Aug. 31, 2017. DOI: 10.1016/j.jegh.2017.08.006.

[5] A. Ascherio, K. L. Munger, and J. D. Lünemann, "The initiation and prevention of multiple sclerosis.," *Nature reviews. Neurology*, vol. 8, no. 11, pp. 602–612, Oct. 9, 2012. DOI: 10.1038/nrneurol.2012.198.

[6] D. Kostova, H. Ross, E. Blecher, and S. Markowitz, "Is youth smoking responsive to cigarette prices? evidence from low- and middle-income countries," *Tobacco control*, vol. 20, no. 6, pp. 419–424, Jul. 7, 2011. DOI: 10.1136/tc.2010.038786.

[7] N. Veronese, L. Smith, M. Barbagallo, *et al.*, "Neurological diseases and covid-19: Prospective analyses using the uk biobank.," *Acta neurologica Belgica*, vol. 121, no. 5, pp. 1295–1303, May 5, 2021. DOI: 10.1007/s13760-021-01693-3.

[8] N. L. Fleischer, J. T. Donahoe, M. C. McLeod, *et al.*, "Taxation reduces smoking but may not reduce smoking disparities in youth," *Tobacco control*, vol. 30, no. 3, pp. 264–272, Apr. 8, 2020. DOI: 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2019-055478.

[9] R. S. Schick, T. Kelsey, J. Marston, K. Samson, and G. W. Humphris, "Mapmysmoke: Feasibility of a new quit cigarette smoking mobile phone application using integrated geo-positioning technology, and motivational messaging within a primary care setting.," *Pilot and feasibility studies*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 19–19, Jul. 14, 2017. DOI: 10.1186/s40814-017-0165-4.

[10] F. E. Benson, K. Stronks, M. C. Willemsen, N. M. M. Bogaerts, and V. Nierkens, "Wanting to attend isn't just wanting to quit: Why some disadvantaged smokers regularly attend smoking cessation behavioural therapy while others do not: A qualitative study," *BMC public health*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 695–695, Jul. 7, 2014. DOI: 10.1186/1471-2458-14-695.

[11] C. T. Okoli, A. O. Johnson, A. Pederson, S. Adkins, and W. Rice, "Changes in smoking behaviours following a smokefree legislation in parks and on beaches: An observational study," *BMJ open*, vol. 3, no. 6, pp. 1–6, Jun. 20, 2013. DOI: 10.1136/bmjopen-2013-002916.

[12] M. S. Simmons, J. E. Connett, M. A. Nides, *et al.*, "Smoking reduction and the rate of decline in fev(1): Results from the lung health study.," *The European respiratory journal*, vol. 25, no. 6, pp. 1011–1017, Jun. 1, 2005. DOI: 10.1183/09031936.05.00086804.

[13] A. Brahimaj, S. Ligthart, M. Ghanbari, *et al.*, "Novel inflammatory markers for incident pre-diabetes and type 2 diabetes: The rotterdam study," *European journal of epidemiology*, vol. 32, no. 3, pp. 217–226, Mar. 3, 2017. DOI: 10.1007/s10654-017-0236-0.

[14] A. L. Pearson, C. L. Cleghorn, F. S. van der Deen, *et al.*, "Tobacco retail outlet restrictions: Health and cost impacts from multistate life-table modelling in a national population," *Tobacco control*, vol. 26, no. 5, pp. 579–585, Sep. 22, 2016. DOI: 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2015-052846.

[15] Y. Yang, "Does economic growth induce smoking?—evidence from china," *Empirical Economics*, vol. 63, no. 2, pp. 821–845, 2022.

[16] C. Jones-Burton, G. Vessal, J. Brown, T. C. Dowling, and J. C. Fink, "Urinary cotinine as an objective measure of cigarette smoking in chronic kidney disease," *Nephrology, dialysis, transplantation : official publication of the European Dialysis and Transplant Association - European Renal Association*, vol. 22, no. 7, pp. 1950–1954, Mar. 17, 2007. DOI: 10.1093/ndt/gfm075.

[17] D. Vancampfort, K. Sweers, M. Probst, *et al.*, "Association of the metabolic syndrome with physical activity performance in patients with schizophrenia.," *Diabetes & metabolism*, vol. 37, no. 4, pp. 318–323, Mar. 9, 2011. DOI: 10.1016/j.diabet.2010.12.007.

[18] A. Hillreiner, S. E. Baumeister, A. M. Sedlmeier, J. D. Finger, H. J. Schlitt, and M. F. Leitzmann, "Association between cardiorespiratory fitness and colorectal cancer in the uk biobank.," *European journal of epidemiology*, vol. 35, no. 10, pp. 961–973, Nov. 9, 2019. DOI: 10.1007/s10654-019-00575-6.

[19] R. Polosa, B. Rodu, P. Caponnetto, M. Maglia, and C. Raciti, "A fresh look at tobacco harm reduction: The case for the electronic cigarette," *Harm reduction journal*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 19–19, Oct. 4, 2013. DOI: 10.1186/1477-7517-10-19.

[20] M.-C. Arrieta, A. Arevalos, L. T. Stiemsma, *et al.*, "Allergen's 8th research conference," *Allergy, Asthma & Clinical Immunology*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 63–, Dec. 8, 2016. DOI: 10.1186/s13223-016-0164-7.

[21] K. Choi, D. J. Hennrikus, J. L. Forster, and M. Moilanen, "Receipt and redemption of cigarette coupons, perceptions of cigarette companies and smoking cessation," *Tobacco control*, vol. 22, no. 6, pp. 418–422, Oct. 9, 2012. DOI: 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2012-050539.

[22] M. Al-Hamdani, "Commentary: The global tobacco litigation initiative: An effort to protect developing countries from big tobacco," *Journal of public health policy*, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 162–170, Feb. 27, 2014. DOI: 10.1057/jphp.2014.4.

[23] H. R. Elliott, T. Tillin, W. L. McArdle, *et al.*, "Differences in smoking associated dna methylation patterns in south asians and europeans," *Clinical epigenetics*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 4–4, Feb. 3, 2014. DOI: 10.1186/1868-7083-6-4.

[24] J. C. Dickson, A. D. Liese, C. Lorenzo, *et al.*, "Associations of coffee consumption with markers of liver injury in the insulin resistance atherosclerosis study," *BMC gastroenterology*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 88–88, Jul. 28, 2015. DOI: 10.1186/s12876-015-0321-3.

[25] L. K. Küpers, C. Monnereau, G. C. Sharp, *et al.*, "Meta-analysis of epigenome-wide association studies in neonates reveals widespread differential dna methylation associated with birthweight," *Nature communications*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 1893–1893, Apr. 23, 2019. DOI: 10.1038/s41467-019-09671-3.

[26] S. Maio, S. Baldacci, and G. Viegi, "Copd, smoking behaviour, and the importance of teachers as role-models for adolescents," *Multidisciplinary Respiratory Medicine*, vol. 6, Oct. 21, 2019. DOI: 10.4081/mrm.2011.432.

[27] L. Westberg and K. J. Clark, "Decision letter: Identification of slit3 as a locus affecting nicotine preference in zebrafish and human smoking behaviour," Nov. 26, 2019. DOI: 10.7554/elife.51295.sa1.

[28] N. Khanna, S. Arnold, S. Sadaphal, A. Joshi, D. Stewart, and D. Gandhi, "Nicotine dependence and depression among women smokers on methadone maintenance," *The European journal of general practice*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 222–228, Oct. 14, 2010. DOI: 10.3109/13814788.2010.516359.

[29] P. A. Cavazos-Rehg, M. J. Krauss, E. L. Spitznagel, *et al.*, "Differential effects of cigarette price changes on adult smoking behaviours," *Tobacco control*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 113–118, Nov. 7, 2012. DOI: 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2012-050517.

[30] L. D. Balbuena, M. Baetz, J. A. Sexton, *et al.*, "Identifying long-term and imminent suicide predictors in a general population and a clinical sample with machine learning.," *BMC psychiatry*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 120–, Feb. 15, 2022. DOI: 10.1186/s12888-022-03702-y.

[31] P. F. Sullivan, M. J. Daly, and M. C. O'Donovan, "Genetic architectures of psychiatric disorders: The emerging picture and its implications," *Nature reviews. Genetics*, vol. 13, no. 8, pp. 537–551, Jul. 10, 2012. DOI: 10.1038/nrg3240.

[32] C. Bullen, M. Verbiest, S. Galea-Singer, *et al.*, "The effectiveness and safety of combining varenicline with nicotine e-cigarettes for smoking cessation in people with mental illnesses and addictions: Study protocol for a randomised-controlled trial," *BMC public health*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 596–596, May 4, 2018. DOI: 10.1186/s12889-018-5351-7.

[33] B. Stubbs, N. Veronese, D. Vancampfort, *et al.*, "Perceived stress and smoking across 41 countries: A global perspective across europe, africa, asia and the americas.," *Scientific reports*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 7597–7597, Aug. 8, 2017. DOI: 10.1038/s41598-017-07579-w.

[34] L. Guo, C. Peng, H. Xu, *et al.*, "Age at menarche and prevention of hypertension through lifestyle in young chinese adult women: Result from project elefant," *BMC women's health*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 182–182, Nov. 9, 2018. DOI: 10.1186/s12905-018-0677-y.

[35] Y. Kaneita, T. Munezawa, H. Suzuki, *et al.*, "Excessive daytime sleepiness and sleep behavior among japanese adolescents: A nation-wide representative survey," *Sleep and Biological Rhythms*, vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 282–294, Oct. 13, 2010. DOI: 10.1111/j.1479-8425.2010.00474.x.

[36] X. Zhou, Q. Xiao, F. Jiang, *et al.*, "Dissecting the pathogenic effects of smoking and its hallmarks in blood dna methylation on colorectal cancer risk.," *British journal of cancer*, vol. 129, no. 8, pp. 1306–1313, Aug. 22, 2023. DOI: 10.1038/s41416-023-02397-6.

[37] K. Giskes, A. E. Kunst, C. Ariza, *et al.*, "Applying an equity lens to tobacco-control policies and their uptake in six western-european countries," *Journal of public health policy*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 261–280, Jul. 5, 2007. DOI: 10.1057/palgrave.jphp.3200132.

[38] L. J. Breunis, M. L. A. de Kroon, L. T. Laureij, L. de Jong-Potjer, E. A. Steegers, and J. V. Been, "Smoke and alcohol free with ehealth and rewards (safer) pregnancy study: A before-after study protocol.," *NPJ primary care respiratory medicine*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 51–, Nov. 18, 2020. DOI: 10.1038/s41533-020-00209-5.

[39] H. Schlenz, T. Intemann, M. Wolters, *et al.*, "C-reactive protein reference percentiles among pre-adolescent children in europe based on the idefics study population," *International journal of obesity (2005)*, vol. 38, no. 2, S26–31, Sep. 15, 2014. DOI: 10.1038/ijo.2014.132.

[40] S. H. Massey, L. R. Pool, R. Estabrook, *et al.*, "Within-person decline in pregnancy smoking is observable prior to pregnancy awareness: Evidence across two independent observational cohorts.," *Addiction biology*, vol. 27, no. 6, e13245–, Oct. 17, 2022. DOI: 10.1111/adb.13245.

[41] L. F. Goulart, F. Bettella, I. E. Sønderby, *et al.*, "Micrornas enrichment in gwas of complex human phenotypes.," *BMC genomics*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 304–304, Apr. 16, 2015. DOI: 10.1186/s12864-015-1513-5.

[42] F. Grassmann, C. Kiel, A. I. den Hollander, *et al.*, "Y chromosome mosaicism is associated with age-related macular degeneration," *European journal of human genetics : EJHG*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 36–41, Aug. 29, 2018. DOI: 10.1038/s41431-018-0238-8.

[43] N. Lindekilde, S. H. Scheuer, F. Rutters, *et al.*, "Prevalence of type 2 diabetes in psychiatric disorders: An umbrella review with meta-analysis of 245 observational studies from 32 systematic reviews.," *Diabetologia*, vol. 65, no. 3, pp. 1–17, Nov. 29, 2021. DOI: 10.1007/s00125-021-05609-x.

[44] L. Chu and L. Chen, "Factors associated with healthy ageing: A comparative study between china and the united states," *China Population and Development Studies*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 262–283, Jan. 8, 2021. DOI: 10.1007/s42379-020-00071-5.

[45] F. J. Selvaraj, M. Mohamed, K. Omar, *et al.*, "The impact of a disease management program (coach) on the attainment of better cardiovascular risk control in dyslipidaemic patients at primary care centres (the disseminate study): A randomised controlled trial," *BMC family practice*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 97–97, Oct. 10, 2012. DOI: 10.1186/1471-2296-13-97.

[46] G. R. John, S. Pasche, N. Rothen, A. Charmoy, C. Delhumeau-Cartier, and D. Genné, "Tobacco-stained fingers: A clue for smoking-related disease or harmful alcohol use? a case–control study," *BMJ open*, vol. 3, no. 11, e003304–, Nov. 7, 2013. DOI: 10.1136/bmjopen-2013-003304.

[47] M. Z. Braganza, P. Rajaraman, Y. Park, *et al.*, "Cigarette smoking, alcohol intake, and risk of glioma in the nih-aarp diet and health study," *British journal of cancer*, vol. 110, no. 1, pp. 242–248, Dec. 12, 2013. DOI: 10.1038/bjc.2013.611.

[48] A. J. Collaro, A. B. Chang, J. M. Marchant, *et al.*, "Determinants and follow-up of lung function data from a predominantly first nations cohort of adults referred to specialist respiratory outreach clinics in regional and remote queensland," *Lung*, vol. 199, no. 4, pp. 417–425, Jul. 3, 2021. DOI: 10.1007/s00408-021-00453-7.