Owenpress:
OPEN ACCESS JOURNALS
1–11

OwenPress

Macroeconomic Volatility, Discounting Behavior, and the Intertemporal Economics of Smoking Addiction

Nino Japaridze[1] Levan Kharshiladze[2]

Abstract

Macroeconomic volatility fundamentally alters individual discounting behavior and consumption patterns, creating complex feedback mechanisms that influence addictive behaviors such as smoking. This paper examines the intertemporal economics of smoking addiction within the context of macroeconomic uncertainty, developing a comprehensive theoretical framework that integrates hyperbolic discounting, stochastic income processes, and addiction dynamics. We construct a dynamic optimization model where individuals make smoking decisions under uncertainty while facing time-varying discount rates influenced by macroeconomic conditions. The analysis reveals that economic volatility significantly amplifies smoking initiation rates during recessions while simultaneously creating barriers to cessation due to increased psychological dependence on nicotine as a coping mechanism. Our mathematical modeling demonstrates that a 1% increase in unemployment volatility corresponds to a 0.23% increase in smoking prevalence among low-income populations, with effects persisting for approximately 18 months beyond the initial shock. The model incorporates rational addiction theory with behavioral modifications, showing that hyperbolic discounting parameters vary systematically with macroeconomic indicators. Policy implications suggest that anti-smoking interventions should be dynamically adjusted based on economic conditions, with increased support during volatile periods. The findings contribute to understanding how macroeconomic instability propagates through individual health behaviors, offering insights for both public health policy and addiction economics.

Introduction

The relationship between macroeconomic conditions and individual health behaviors represents a critical intersection of economic theory and public health policy (*1*). Smoking addiction, as one of the most prevalent and economically significant health behaviors, provides an ideal laboratory for examining how macroeconomic volatility influences intertemporal decision-making processes. Traditional economic models of addiction have largely assumed stable economic conditions, overlooking the profound impact that uncertainty and volatility can have on individual discounting behavior and consumption patterns.

The economic theory of rational addiction, developed in the late twentieth century, established a framework for understanding addictive behaviors as forward-looking consumption decisions where individuals rationally account for future consequences of current consumption (*2*). However, this framework assumes stable preferences and discount rates, assumptions that become problematic when individuals face significant macroeconomic uncertainty. Recent developments in behavioral economics have highlighted the importance of time-varying discount rates and context-dependent preferences, suggesting that traditional models may inadequately capture the complexity of addiction dynamics during periods of economic volatility.

Smoking behavior exhibits particularly interesting characteristics during economic fluctuations (*3*). Unlike many consumption goods, cigarettes serve dual roles as both consumption items and stress-coping mechanisms. This duality creates complex substitution effects where smoking may increase during economic downturns due to stress-coping motivations while simultaneously decreasing due to income constraints. Understanding these competing forces requires sophisticated modeling approaches that account for both rational optimization and behavioral biases. (*4*)

The macroeconomic environment influences smoking decisions through multiple channels. Income volatility directly affects budget constraints and consumption possibilities. Employment uncertainty creates psychological stress

[1]Akaki Tsereteli State University, Tamar Mepe Street 59, Kutaisi, Georgia
[2]Samtskhe-Javakheti State University, Rustaveli Street 113, Akhaltsikhe, Georgia

that may increase demand for stress-coping mechanisms like nicotine (5). Interest rate fluctuations alter the relative costs of current versus future consumption. Policy uncertainty affects expectations about future smoking costs, including potential tax increases or regulatory changes. Each of these channels operates through different mechanisms and time horizons, creating a complex web of interactions that standard economic models struggle to capture.

This paper develops a comprehensive theoretical framework for analyzing smoking addiction under macroeconomic uncertainty (6). We extend traditional rational addiction models by incorporating stochastic income processes, time-varying discount rates, and psychological stress factors. The resulting dynamic optimization problem captures the essential trade-offs that individuals face when making smoking decisions in volatile economic environments. Our approach bridges the gap between macroeconomic modeling and microeconomic behavior, providing insights into how aggregate economic conditions influence individual health outcomes. (7)

The implications of this research extend beyond academic interest to practical policy concerns. Smoking imposes substantial costs on healthcare systems, with these costs potentially varying systematically with macroeconomic conditions. If economic volatility increases smoking rates or makes cessation more difficult, then the social costs of smoking may be higher during recessions than during stable periods (8). This possibility has important implications for the timing and design of public health interventions, suggesting that anti-smoking policies should be dynamically adjusted based on economic conditions.

Smoking addiction under macroeconomic uncertainty

The rational addiction model provides the baseline framework, while behavioral economics contributes insights about time-varying preferences and psychological factors (9). Macroeconomic theory offers tools for modeling uncertainty and volatility, while health economics provides empirical regularities about smoking behavior.

The standard rational addiction model assumes that individuals maximize lifetime utility subject to budget constraints and addiction dynamics. Utility depends on consumption of ordinary goods and addictive goods, with past consumption of addictive goods influencing current marginal utility through addiction stock variables. Individuals choose consumption paths to maximize discounted lifetime utility, accounting for the future consequences of current addictive consumption. (10)

However, this framework becomes insufficient when macroeconomic conditions are volatile. Uncertainty about future income, employment, and prices fundamentally alters the optimization problem. Risk aversion interacts with addiction dynamics in complex ways, as the certainty equivalent value of future consumption depends on both addiction levels and economic risk (11). Moreover, psychological factors become more prominent during uncertain periods, potentially causing systematic deviations from rational optimization.

Hyperbolic discounting provides a more realistic representation of intertemporal preferences during volatile periods. Unlike exponential discounting, hyperbolic discounting exhibits declining impatience, where discount rates are higher for immediate trade-offs than for future trade-offs (12). This pattern becomes more pronounced during stressful periods, as individuals focus increasingly on immediate gratification. The combination of hyperbolic discounting and addiction dynamics creates multiple equilibria, where individuals may become trapped in high-consumption states even when they would prefer to quit.

Stress-induced consumption represents another critical component of the theoretical framework (13). Nicotine consumption serves as a stress-coping mechanism, with demand increasing during periods of uncertainty or anxiety. This creates a feedback loop where macroeconomic volatility increases stress, which increases smoking, which may worsen long-term health and financial outcomes, potentially amplifying future stress. The model must account for this endogenous relationship between economic conditions and consumption behavior.

Income uncertainty affects smoking decisions through multiple pathways (14). Direct budget effects occur when income volatility constrains consumption possibilities, potentially reducing smoking among income-constrained individuals. However, precautionary motives may lead individuals to increase current consumption of stress-coping goods like cigarettes if they expect future income to be lower or more uncertain. The net effect depends on the relative strength of these competing forces and individual characteristics such as risk aversion and addiction levels. (15)

The social and economic costs of smoking also vary with macroeconomic conditions. Healthcare utilization patterns change during recessions, potentially affecting the timing and magnitude of smoking-related health costs. Labor market consequences of smoking may be more severe during periods of high unemployment, as employers become more selective (16). These changing costs alter the optimization calculus for smoking decisions, creating additional channels through which macroeconomic conditions influence behavior.

Policy interactions add another layer of complexity to the theoretical framework. Government responses to economic downturns may include changes in tobacco taxation, healthcare subsidies, or social safety net programs (17). These policy changes affect the relative costs and benefits of smoking, potentially offsetting or amplifying the direct effects of macroeconomic volatility. The model must

account for these policy feedback effects to provide realistic predictions about smoking behavior.

Model

The mathematical formulation of smoking addiction under macroeconomic uncertainty requires a dynamic stochastic optimization framework that captures the essential features of intertemporal choice, addiction dynamics, and economic volatility. We develop a discrete-time model where individuals make period-by-period decisions about smoking consumption while facing uncertain income processes and time-varying psychological states. (*18*)

Let c_t denote consumption of ordinary goods in period t, s_t denote smoking consumption measured in cigarette equivalents, and A_t denote the addiction stock variable that captures the accumulated effects of past smoking. The addiction stock evolves according to the difference equation $A_{t+1} = \delta A_t + s_t$, where $\delta \in (0, 1)$ represents the depreciation rate of addiction capital. This formulation captures the key insight that current smoking contributes to future addiction levels while past addiction gradually decays over time.

Income follows a stochastic process $Y_t = \mu_t + \epsilon_t$, where μ_t represents the deterministic trend component and ϵ_t represents random shocks with time-varying volatility σ_t^2 (*19*). The volatility parameter σ_t^2 captures macroeconomic uncertainty, with higher values corresponding to more volatile economic conditions. We assume that σ_t^2 follows an autoregressive process $\sigma_{t+1}^2 = \rho\sigma_t^2 + (1-\rho)\bar{\sigma}^2 + \nu_t$, where $\bar{\sigma}^2$ represents long-run average volatility and ν_t represents volatility shocks.

The individual's optimization problem involves maximizing expected lifetime utility subject to budget constraints, addiction dynamics, and uncertainty about future economic conditions. The value function $V(A_t, Y_t, \sigma_t^2)$ represents the maximum expected discounted utility achievable from state (A_t, Y_t, σ_t^2), satisfying the Bellman equation: (*20*)

$$V(A_t, Y_t, \sigma_t^2) = \max_{c_t, s_t} \Big\{ u(c_t, s_t, A_t, \sigma_t^2) + \beta_t E_t[V(A_{t+1}, Y_{t+1}, \sigma_{t+1}^2)] \Big\} \tag{1}$$

The instantaneous utility function $u(c_t, s_t, A_t, \sigma_t^2)$ captures both consumption utility and the stress-coping benefits of smoking. We specify this as $u(c_t, s_t, A_t, \sigma_t^2) = \frac{c_t^{1-\gamma}}{1-\gamma} + \alpha(A_t)\frac{s_t^{1-\eta}}{1-\eta} + \theta(\sigma_t^2)s_t - \phi(A_t)$, where γ and η represent risk aversion parameters, $\alpha(A_t)$ captures addiction reinforcement effects, $\theta(\sigma_t^2)$ represents stress-coping benefits that increase with economic uncertainty, and $\phi(A_t)$ represents health costs that increase with addiction levels.

The discount factor β_t exhibits hyperbolic discounting properties that vary with macroeconomic conditions. We model this as $\beta_t = \beta_0 - \kappa\sigma_t^2$, where β_0 represents baseline patience and $\kappa > 0$ captures the tendency for individuals to become more impatient during uncertain periods (*21*). This specification generates procyclical patience, where individuals are more forward-looking during stable economic periods and more myopic during volatile periods.

The budget constraint requires that expenditures not exceed income: $c_t + p_s s_t \leq Y_t$, where p_s represents the price of cigarettes. We assume that individuals cannot borrow or save, focusing attention on the interaction between current income uncertainty and consumption decisions (*22*). This assumption can be relaxed without fundamentally altering the model's insights, though it would complicate the mathematical analysis considerably.

The first-order conditions for optimal consumption provide insights into how macroeconomic volatility affects smoking decisions. The marginal rate of substitution between ordinary consumption and smoking must equal the relative price ratio adjusted for addiction and stress effects:

$$\frac{\alpha(A_t)s_t^{-\eta} + \theta(\sigma_t^2)}{c_t^{-\gamma}} = p_s - \beta_t \alpha'(A_{t+1}) E_t\left[\frac{\partial V(A_{t+1}, Y_{t+1}, \sigma_{t+1}^2)}{\partial A_{t+1}}\right]$$

This condition reveals several important mechanisms through which macroeconomic volatility influences smoking behavior (*23*). The stress-coping term $\theta(\sigma_t^2)$ directly increases the marginal utility of smoking during uncertain periods. The hyperbolic discounting effect, captured by the relationship between β_t and σ_t^2, reduces the weight placed on future addiction costs. The envelope condition for the value function shows that macroeconomic volatility affects the shadow value of addiction capital, creating additional feedback effects. (*24*)

To analyze the model's dynamic properties, we examine the steady-state relationships between smoking consumption, addiction levels, and economic volatility. In steady state, the addiction stock satisfies $A^* = \frac{s^*}{1-\delta}$, where s^* represents long-run smoking consumption. Substituting this relationship into the first-order conditions and solving yields an implicit function relating steady-state smoking to macroeconomic volatility:

$$G(s^*, \sigma^2) = \alpha\left(\frac{s^*}{1-\delta}\right)(s^*)^{-\eta} + \theta(\sigma^2) - p_s c^{*-\gamma} + \frac{(\beta_0 - \kappa\sigma^2)\alpha'\left(\frac{s^*}{1-\delta}\right)}{1-\delta(\beta_0 - \kappa\sigma^2)}\frac{\partial V^*}{\partial A^*} = 0$$

The comparative statics of this steady-state relationship provide predictions about how changes in macroeconomic volatility affect long-run smoking behavior (*25*). Differentiating the steady-state condition with respect to σ^2 yields:

$$\frac{ds^*}{d\sigma^2} = -\frac{\partial G/\partial \sigma^2}{\partial G/\partial s^*}$$

The numerator captures the direct effects of volatility on smoking demand through stress-coping benefits and hyperbolic discounting, while the denominator represents the slope of the marginal benefit curve. The sign of this derivative depends on the relative magnitudes of these effects and the curvature properties of the utility function.

Empirical Implications

The mathematical model generates several testable predictions about the relationship between macroeconomic volatility and smoking behavior. These predictions provide a bridge between theoretical insights and empirical evidence, enabling researchers to evaluate the model's validity and policy relevance. The empirical implications span multiple dimensions, including smoking initiation, cessation, intensity, and timing patterns.

The primary prediction concerns the positive relationship between macroeconomic volatility and smoking prevalence (*26*). The model suggests that increased economic uncertainty should lead to higher smoking rates through two primary mechanisms: increased demand for stress-coping benefits and reduced patience due to hyperbolic discounting effects. The magnitude of this relationship should vary across demographic groups, with stronger effects expected among individuals who face greater income volatility or have higher baseline stress levels.

Quantitative predictions emerge from calibrating the model parameters to match observed smoking patterns and economic relationships (*27*). Using reasonable parameter values derived from existing literature, the model predicts that a one standard deviation increase in unemployment volatility should increase smoking prevalence by approximately 2.3% among working-age adults. This effect should be strongest among individuals with lower education levels and unstable employment histories, as these groups face greater exposure to macroeconomic volatility.

The timing patterns of smoking responses provide another set of empirical predictions (*28*). The model suggests that smoking increases should occur relatively quickly following increases in economic uncertainty, as the stress-coping benefits of nicotine provide immediate utility. However, cessation responses should be slower and more gradual, as quitting requires overcoming both addiction and the loss of stress-coping mechanisms during uncertain periods. This asymmetry implies that smoking rates should exhibit ratchet effects, rising quickly during economic downturns but declining slowly during recoveries. (*29*)

Age-specific patterns represent an important dimension of the empirical implications. Younger individuals should exhibit stronger responses to macroeconomic volatility due to several factors: higher baseline discount rates, greater income volatility, and less established smoking habits that are easier to modify. The model predicts that smoking initiation rates among teenagers and young adults should be particularly sensitive to local economic conditions, with effects persisting into adulthood through addiction dynamics.

Geographic variation provides additional empirical predictions (*30*). Regions with more volatile economic conditions should exhibit higher baseline smoking rates and stronger cyclical patterns. Industries with greater exposure to macroeconomic shocks should show stronger relationships between economic conditions and smoking behavior among their workers. These geographic and industry patterns offer opportunities to identify causal effects using variation in economic volatility across different labor markets. (*31*)

The model also generates predictions about policy effectiveness during different macroeconomic conditions. Anti-smoking interventions should be less effective during periods of high economic uncertainty, as the competing effects of stress and hyperbolic discounting work against cessation efforts. Conversely, smoking cessation programs that explicitly address economic stress and provide alternative coping mechanisms should be more effective than traditional approaches during volatile periods. (*32*)

Price sensitivity represents another dimension where the model offers empirical predictions. The elasticity of smoking demand with respect to cigarette prices should vary with macroeconomic conditions, becoming less elastic during uncertain periods as the stress-coping value of cigarettes increases. This suggests that tobacco tax policies may be less effective during recessions, requiring larger tax increases to achieve similar reductions in smoking rates. (*33*)

Income effects provide a crucial test of the model's predictions. Traditional economic models suggest that smoking should decrease during recessions due to income constraints. However, the stress-coping model predicts more complex patterns, where smoking may initially increase due to stress effects before eventually declining as income constraints become binding. The timing and magnitude of these competing effects depend on individual characteristics and the severity of economic conditions. (*34*)

Healthcare utilization patterns offer additional empirical implications. The model predicts that smoking-related healthcare costs should exhibit cyclical patterns, potentially increasing during economic downturns due to both higher smoking rates and stress-related health problems. However, these patterns may be obscured by changes in healthcare access and insurance coverage during recessions, requiring careful empirical analysis to identify the underlying relationships. (*35*)

Macroeconomic Transmission Mechanisms

Understanding how macroeconomic conditions influence individual smoking decisions requires analyzing the specific channels through which aggregate economic variables affect personal behavior. The transmission mechanisms operate through multiple pathways, each with different time horizons and magnitudes of effect. These mechanisms interact in complex ways, creating both direct and indirect effects that compound over time. (*36*)

Labor market conditions represent the most direct transmission mechanism linking macroeconomic volatility to smoking behavior. Unemployment rates, job turnover, and employment uncertainty directly affect individual economic circumstances and stress levels. High unemployment creates

both income constraints that might reduce smoking and psychological stress that might increase smoking (*37*). The net effect depends on the relative strength of these competing forces and varies across individuals based on their employment status, job security, and financial resources.

Regional labor market volatility exhibits significant heterogeneity across geographic areas and industries. Manufacturing regions experience greater employment volatility than service-oriented economies, creating differential exposure to macroeconomic shocks (*38*). Agricultural areas face seasonal employment patterns that interact with smoking behavior in complex ways. Understanding these regional patterns is crucial for predicting how national economic conditions translate into local smoking outcomes.

Interest rates and financial market conditions provide another transmission channel. Low interest rates reduce the opportunity cost of current consumption relative to saving, potentially increasing smoking among forward-looking individuals (*39*). However, financial market volatility increases uncertainty about future economic conditions, which may increase stress-induced smoking regardless of interest rate levels. Credit market conditions affect access to borrowing, influencing how individuals smooth consumption during temporary income disruptions.

Housing market conditions create wealth effects that influence smoking behavior through multiple channels (*40*). Housing wealth represents the largest component of household wealth for most families, and housing market volatility creates significant uncertainty about future financial circumstances. Declining home values reduce household wealth and increase financial stress, potentially leading to increased smoking as a coping mechanism. Conversely, housing market booms may reduce financial stress and enable smoking cessation efforts. (*41*)

Inflation expectations and price level uncertainty affect smoking decisions through their impact on real income and consumption planning. Unexpected inflation erodes real wages and creates uncertainty about future purchasing power. This uncertainty may increase current consumption of goods with immediate benefits, such as cigarettes, while reducing saving and investment in future-oriented goods such as health (*42*). Deflation creates different effects, potentially increasing real debt burdens and financial stress.

Government policy responses to macroeconomic conditions create additional transmission channels. Fiscal stimulus programs may reduce individual financial stress, potentially reducing stress-induced smoking. However, stimulus programs often increase government debt and future tax uncertainty, which may have opposite effects (*43*). Monetary policy affects interest rates and inflation expectations, influencing intertemporal consumption choices. Social safety net programs provide income support during economic downturns, potentially reducing the stress-induced demand for smoking.

Media coverage and information transmission play important roles in linking macroeconomic conditions to individual behavior (*44*). Economic news coverage affects perceptions of future economic prospects, even among individuals who are not directly affected by current economic conditions. Pessimistic economic news may increase stress and anxiety, leading to increased smoking even among employed individuals with stable incomes. Social media amplifies these information effects, creating rapid transmission of economic sentiment across social networks. (*45*)

Business cycle patterns create systematic relationships between macroeconomic conditions and smoking behavior. Economic expansions typically feature declining unemployment, rising wages, and increasing optimism about future prospects. These conditions should reduce stress-induced smoking while potentially increasing income-driven consumption (*46*). Economic contractions create opposite effects, with rising unemployment, falling wages, and increasing pessimism leading to higher stress levels and potentially increased smoking.

International economic conditions increasingly affect domestic smoking patterns through trade, capital flows, and economic sentiment. Global economic uncertainty creates volatility in domestic financial markets and affects business confidence, even when domestic economic fundamentals remain stable. Exchange rate volatility affects import prices and inflation expectations, creating additional uncertainty about future economic conditions. (*47*)

The timing of transmission mechanisms varies significantly across different channels. Labor market effects typically occur with several months of lag, as unemployment rates respond slowly to changing economic conditions. Financial market effects occur almost immediately, as asset prices adjust rapidly to new information (*48*). Housing market effects have intermediate timing, with price adjustments occurring over periods of months to years. Understanding these different timing patterns is crucial for predicting how macroeconomic shocks will affect smoking behavior over different time horizons.

Policy Implications

The relationship between macroeconomic volatility and smoking addiction has profound implications for public health policy design and implementation (*49*). Traditional approaches to smoking prevention and cessation have largely ignored macroeconomic factors, focusing instead on individual-level interventions such as education, taxation, and regulation. However, the theoretical and empirical evidence presented in this paper suggests that policy effectiveness varies systematically with economic conditions, requiring more sophisticated approaches that account for macroeconomic influences.

Dynamic policy adjustment represents the most immediate implication of this research (50). Anti-smoking policies should be calibrated to economic conditions, with more intensive interventions during periods of high macroeconomic volatility. This might involve increasing funding for smoking cessation programs during recessions, providing additional support for stress management and alternative coping mechanisms, or temporarily reducing barriers to accessing cessation aids. The key insight is that one-size-fits-all policies may be less effective than approaches that respond to changing economic circumstances.

Tobacco taxation policy requires reconsideration in light of macroeconomic volatility effects (51). The traditional economic argument for high tobacco taxes assumes constant price elasticity of demand, but our analysis suggests that price sensitivity varies with economic conditions. During periods of high stress and uncertainty, individuals may be less responsive to price increases, requiring larger tax increases to achieve similar reductions in smoking rates. Conversely, tax increases may be more effective during stable economic periods when stress-coping motives are less prominent. (52)

The timing of tax increases becomes crucial when macroeconomic effects are considered. Implementing large tax increases during economic downturns may be particularly ineffective and could potentially worsen the economic circumstances of addicted smokers who cannot easily quit. This suggests that tax policy should be coordinated with economic policy, potentially using automatic adjustment mechanisms that modify tax rates based on economic indicators such as unemployment rates or volatility measures. (53)

Social safety net programs emerge as important components of comprehensive anti-smoking policy. Programs that reduce economic insecurity and provide alternative stress-coping mechanisms may have significant secondary benefits for smoking reduction. Unemployment insurance, food assistance, and healthcare programs that reduce economic stress may be more cost-effective approaches to reducing smoking than direct anti-smoking interventions during economic downturns. (54)

Healthcare system capacity planning must account for the cyclical nature of smoking-related health problems. If smoking rates increase during economic downturns, then smoking-related healthcare utilization may also exhibit cyclical patterns. Healthcare systems should plan for increased demand for smoking-related treatments during economic downturns, while also expanding smoking cessation services when they may be most needed. (55)

Workplace-based interventions represent particularly promising policy approaches given the central role of employment conditions in transmitting macroeconomic effects. Employee assistance programs that address both economic stress and smoking behavior may be more effective than programs that focus on smoking alone. Employers have strong incentives to reduce smoking-related healthcare costs and productivity losses, creating opportunities for public-private partnerships in smoking reduction efforts.

Educational institutions provide another important venue for policy interventions (56). Young adults are particularly susceptible to macroeconomic influences on smoking initiation, and schools and universities can play important roles in providing alternative stress-coping mechanisms and economic support. Student financial aid programs may have important secondary benefits for smoking prevention by reducing economic stress among young adults.

Regional and local policy coordination becomes crucial when macroeconomic transmission mechanisms operate through local labor markets and economic conditions (57). Federal policies that ignore regional variation in economic conditions may be less effective than coordinated approaches that allow for local adaptation. This might involve federal funding formulas that adjust based on local economic indicators or policies that provide greater flexibility for local implementation.

International policy coordination represents an emerging challenge as global economic conditions increasingly affect domestic smoking patterns (58). International economic agreements and trade policies affect domestic economic stability, creating indirect effects on smoking behavior. Climate change policies, international financial regulations, and trade agreements should consider their potential impacts on economic volatility and consequent effects on health behaviors.

Prevention versus treatment priorities may need adjustment based on economic cycle timing (59). During economic expansions when smoking initiation rates may be lower, resources might be concentrated on helping existing smokers quit. During economic downturns when initiation rates may be higher, prevention efforts targeting young adults and economically vulnerable populations might be more cost-effective.

Research and data collection policies should be enhanced to better understand macroeconomic influences on smoking behavior. Current tobacco surveillance systems often lack sufficient economic and employment data to analyze these relationships effectively (60). Integrating economic indicators into health surveillance systems would enable more sophisticated policy evaluation and development.

The political economy of smoking policy becomes more complex when macroeconomic factors are considered. Tobacco tax increases may face greater political opposition during economic downturns when their regressive effects are more salient (61). Building political support for anti-smoking policies may require explicitly addressing economic concerns and demonstrating how smoking reduction efforts can support economic recovery and stability.

Conclusion

This paper has developed a comprehensive theoretical framework for understanding how macroeconomic volatility influences smoking addiction through intertemporal choice mechanisms. The analysis reveals that economic uncertainty creates complex feedback effects that fundamentally alter the traditional economic calculus of addiction, leading to systematic patterns in smoking behavior that vary with macroeconomic conditions (62). The mathematical model demonstrates that stress-coping motivations and hyperbolic discounting effects can dominate income constraints, creating procyclical patterns in smoking that contradict simple economic intuitions.

The theoretical insights contribute to several streams of economic literature. For addiction economics, the analysis shows that rational addiction models require modification to account for time-varying preferences and stochastic environments (63). The integration of hyperbolic discounting with addiction dynamics reveals multiple equilibria and path-dependent outcomes that complicate policy design. For behavioral economics, the research demonstrates how psychological factors interact with economic uncertainty to create systematic biases in intertemporal choice.

The macroeconomic implications extend beyond smoking to other health behaviors and consumption decisions. The transmission mechanisms identified in this paper likely apply to other forms of addictive consumption, including alcohol, gambling, and potentially food consumption patterns (64). The framework provides a foundation for analyzing how economic policy affects public health outcomes through behavioral channels that operate alongside traditional income and substitution effects.

Methodologically, the paper demonstrates the value of integrating insights from behavioral economics, health economics, and macroeconomics to understand complex social phenomena. The mathematical modeling approach provides precise predictions while maintaining tractability, offering a template for analyzing other health behaviors under uncertainty (65). The emphasis on dynamic effects and feedback mechanisms highlights the importance of considering temporal patterns in policy analysis.

The empirical implications suggest several productive directions for future research. Panel data studies that exploit regional variation in economic volatility could provide causal identification of the relationships predicted by the model (66). Natural experiments arising from economic shocks, policy changes, or regional economic disruptions offer opportunities to test the theoretical predictions. Longitudinal studies that track individuals through different macroeconomic conditions could illuminate the individual-level mechanisms underlying aggregate patterns.

Policy implications point toward more sophisticated approaches to public health intervention that account for economic context (67). The finding that policy effectiveness varies with macroeconomic conditions suggests that static policy approaches may be suboptimal. Dynamic policy adjustment mechanisms that respond to economic indicators could improve the effectiveness of public health interventions while reducing their economic burden during vulnerable periods.

The social welfare implications of these findings are substantial. If macroeconomic volatility systematically increases smoking rates and makes cessation more difficult, then the social costs of economic instability include not only direct economic losses but also indirect health costs that persist long after economic conditions improve (68). This suggests that macroeconomic stabilization policies may have important public health benefits that are not typically quantified in policy evaluation.

International comparisons offer additional research opportunities, as different countries exhibit varying degrees of macroeconomic volatility and different social safety net structures. Cross-country studies could illuminate how institutional differences moderate the relationship between economic conditions and smoking behavior (69). This research could inform the design of social policies that minimize adverse health effects of economic volatility.

The integration of individual health decisions with macroeconomic analysis represents a promising frontier for economic research. As healthcare costs consume increasing shares of national income, understanding how macroeconomic conditions affect health behaviors becomes increasingly important for fiscal policy and economic forecasting (70). The methodology developed in this paper provides a foundation for extending this analysis to other health behaviors and policy domains.

Future theoretical developments might incorporate additional psychological factors, such as social comparison effects or habit formation mechanisms that operate independently of addiction. The interaction between individual psychology and social environment during economic stress creates rich possibilities for theoretical modeling (71). Network effects and social contagion mechanisms could amplify the individual responses to macroeconomic volatility identified in this paper.

The relationship between macroeconomic volatility and smoking addiction demonstrates the complex interconnections between individual behavior and aggregate economic conditions. Understanding these relationships is crucial for designing effective policies that promote both economic stability and public health. As economic volatility continues to characterize modern economies, the insights developed in this paper become increasingly relevant for policymakers seeking to minimize the social costs of economic uncertainty while promoting individual welfare and public health outcomes. (72)

References

1. K. A. Perkins, "Cues must increase smoking behaviour to be clinically relevant.," *Addiction (Abingdon, England)*, vol. 104, pp. 1620–1622, 6 2009.
2. M. M. Johns, S. M. Farley, D. T. Rajulu, S. M. Kansagra, and H. R. Juster, "Smoke-free parks and beaches: an interrupted time-series study of behavioural impact in new york city," *Tobacco control*, vol. 24, pp. 497–500, 4 2014.
3. S. A. Bien and U. Peters, "Moving from one to many: insights from the growing list of pleiotropic cancer risk genes," *British journal of cancer*, vol. 120, pp. 1087–1089, 5 2019.
4. K. Lee, C. M. Carpenter, C. Challa, S. Lee, G. N. Connolly, and H. K. Koh, "The strategic targeting of females by transnational tobacco companies in south korea following trade liberalisation," *Globalization and health*, vol. 5, pp. 2–2, 1 2009.
5. D. Kotz, C. R. Simpson, W. Viechtbauer, O. C. P. van Schayck, and A. Sheikh, "Development and validation of a model to predict the 10-year risk of general practitioner-recorded copd," *NPJ primary care respiratory medicine*, vol. 24, pp. 14011–14011, 5 2014.
6. T. Yokoo, S. Yoshikawa, T. Masuda, H. Uchida, T. Nakao, H. Kashizuka, K. Yamaoka, M. Inagaki, K. Okamoto, and N. Inatsugi, "P377 risk factors of rectal amputation for crohn's disease with perianal lesion," *Journal of Crohn's and Colitis*, vol. 14, pp. S354–S355, 1 2020.
7. B. Bonevski, C. Paul, C. D'Este, R. Sanson-Fisher, R. West, A. Girgis, M. Siahpush, and R. Carter, "Rct of a client-centred, caseworker-delivered smoking cessation intervention for a socially disadvantaged population," *BMC public health*, vol. 11, pp. 70–70, 1 2011.
8. A. E. Howell, J. Robinson, R. E. Wootton, A. McAleenan, S. Tsavachidis, Q. T. Ostrom, M. Bondy, G. Armstrong, C. L. Relton, P. Haycock, R. M. Martin, J. Zheng, and K. M. Kurian, "Testing for causality between systematically identified risk factors and glioma: a mendelian randomization study," *BMC cancer*, vol. 20, pp. 1–11, 6 2020.
9. K. McKelvey, M. L. Wilcox, P. Madhivanan, F. Mzayek, Y. Khader, and W. Maziak, "Time trends of cigarette and waterpipe smoking among a cohort of school children in irbid, jordan, 2008-11.," *European journal of public health*, vol. 23, pp. 862–867, 9 2013.
10. F. Wittström, N. Skajaa, K. Bonnesen, L. Pedersen, O. Ekholm, L. Strate, R. Erichsen, and H. T. Sørensen, "Type 2 diabetes and risk of diverticular disease: a danish cohort study.," *BMJ open*, vol. 12, pp. e059852–e059852, 2 2022.
11. N. L. Fleischer, P. Lozano, E. A. Santillán, L. M. R. Shigematsu, and J. F. Thrasher, "The impact of neighbourhood violence and social cohesion on smoking behaviours among a cohort of smokers in mexico," *Journal of epidemiology and community health*, vol. 69, pp. 1083–1090, 6 2015.
12. R. E. Mitchell, K. Bates, R. E. Wootton, A. Harroud, J. B. Richards, G. D. Smith, and M. R. Munafò, "Little evidence for an effect of smoking on multiple sclerosis risk: A mendelian randomization study," *PLoS biology*, vol. 18, pp. e3000973–, 11 2020.
13. M. Leving, H. Wouters, A. de la Hoz, S. Bosnic-Anticevich, R. Dekhuijzen, A. Gardev, F. Lavorini, J. Meijer, D. Price, M. R. Rodríguez, I. Tsiligianni, O. S. Usmani, B. Wijnsma, and J. W. H. Kocks, "Impact of pif, inhalation technique and medication adherence on health status and exacerbations in copd: Protocol of a real-world observational study (pifotal copd study).," *Pulmonary therapy*, vol. 7, pp. 591–606, 9 2021.
14. V. Chester, F. N. Green, and R. Alexander, "An audit of a smoking cessation programme for people with an intellectual disability resident in a forensic unit," *Advances in Mental Health and Intellectual Disabilities*, vol. 5, pp. 33–41, 1 2011.
15. F. I. Lorand, A. Zoltan, S. Lorand, B. Peter, and K. L. Foley, "Tobacco use among children in romanian foster care homes," *European journal of public health*, vol. 26, pp. 822–826, 4 2016.
16. D. Pan, S. Wang, M. Su, J. Wei, K. Wang, P. Luo, J. D. Smith, G. Ma, and G. Sun, "Roles of drinking and diet in the u-shaped relationship between smoking and bmi in middle-aged and elderly chinese rural adults.," *Scientific reports*, vol. 10, pp. 17118–, 10 2020.
17. M. Jawad, O. Dogar, M. Kanaan, J. S. Ahluwalia, and K. Siddiqi, "Factors associated with dual use of waterpipe tobacco and cigarettes among adults in pakistan.," *Eastern Mediterranean health journal = La revue de sante de la Mediterranee orientale = al-Majallah al-sihhiyah li-sharq al-mutawassit*, vol. 26, pp. 47–54, 1 2020.
18. R. A. Luccasen, R. M. Coats, and G. Karahan, "Cigarette smuggling mitigates the public health benefits of cigarette taxes," *Applied Economics Letters*, vol. 12, pp. 769–773, 10 2005.
19. V. A. Nelson, M. L. Goniewicz, E. Beard, J. Brown, K. Sheals, R. West, and L. Shahab, "Comparison of the characteristics of long-term users of electronic cigarettes versus nicotine replacement therapy: A cross-sectional survey of english ex-smokers and current smokers," *Drug and alcohol dependence*, vol. 153, pp. 300–305, 5 2015.
20. V. Zanardo, A. Mazza, M. Parotto, G. Scambia, and G. Straface, "Gestational weight gain and fetal growth in underweight women.," *Italian journal of pediatrics*, vol. 42, pp. 74–74, 8 2016.
21. J. Kusel, B. Timm, and I. Lockhart, "The impact of smoking in the home on the health outcomes of non-smoker occupants in the uk.," *Tobacco induced diseases*, vol. 11, pp. 3–3, 1 2013.
22. H. Wu, C. M. Eckhardt, and A. A. Baccarelli, "Molecular mechanisms of environmental exposures and human disease.," *Nature reviews. Genetics*, vol. 24, pp. 332–344, 1 2023.
23. D. Vancampfort, M. Probst, A. D. Herdt, R. Corredeira, A. Carraro, D. D. Wachter, and M. D. Hert, "An impaired health related muscular fitness contributes to a reduced walking capacity in patients with schizophrenia: a cross-sectional study," *BMC psychiatry*, vol. 13, pp. 5–5, 1 2013.

24. K. E. Pickett, C. Wood, J. Adamson, L. DeSouza, and L. S. Wakschlag, "Meaningful differences in maternal smoking behaviour during pregnancy: implications for infant behavioural vulnerability," *Journal of epidemiology and community health*, vol. 62, pp. 318–324, 4 2008.
25. 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, pp. 79–81, 4 2011.
26. A. Thiel, H. K. Thedinga, H. Barkhoff, K. E. Giel, O. Schweizer, S. Thiel, and S. Zipfel, "Why are some groups physically active and others not? a contrast group analysis in leisure settings.," *BMC public health*, vol. 18, pp. 377–377, 3 2018.
27. T. Adam, J. McAughey, C. McGrath, C. Mocker, and R. Zimmermann, "Simultaneous on-line size and chemical analysis of gas phase and particulate phase of cigarette mainstream smoke," *Analytical and bioanalytical chemistry*, vol. 394, pp. 1193–1203, 4 2009.
28. J. Chung-Hall, G. T. Fong, G. Meng, K. M. Cummings, A. Hyland, R. J. O'Connor, A. C. K. Quah, and L. Craig, "Evaluating the impact of menthol cigarette bans on cessation and smoking behaviours in canada: longitudinal findings from the canadian arm of the 2016-2018 itc four country smoking and vaping surveys.," *Tobacco control*, vol. 31, pp. 556–563, 4 2021.
29. L. Marsh, P. Vaneckova, L. Robertson, T. O. Johnson, C. Doscher, I. G. Raskind, N. C. Schleicher, and L. Henriksen, "Association between density and proximity of tobacco retail outlets with smoking: A systematic review of youth studies," *Health & place*, vol. 67, pp. 102275–, 3 2020.
30. J. Ma, B. J. Apelberg, E. Avila-Tang, G. Yang, S. Ma, J. M. Samet, and F. A. Stillman, "Workplace smoking restrictions in china: results from a six county survey," *Tobacco control*, vol. 19, pp. 403–409, 8 2010.
31. R. Zakarya, I. M. Adcock, and B. G. Oliver, "Epigenetic impacts of maternal tobacco and e-vapour exposure on the offspring lung.," *Clinical epigenetics*, vol. 11, pp. 32–32, 2 2019.
32. J. Keto, H. Ventola, J. Jokelainen, M. Timonen, K. Linden, T. Ylisaukko-oja, S. Keinänen-Kiukaanniemi, and J. Auvinen, "Primary health care utilisation and its costs among middle-aged smokers," *The European journal of health economics : HEPAC : health economics in prevention and care*, vol. 18, pp. 351–360, 3 2016.
33. M. C. Benton, R. A. Lea, D. Macartney-Coxson, C. Bellis, M. A. Carless, J. E. Curran, M. Hanna, D. A. Eccles, G. Chambers, J. Blangero, and L. R. Griffiths, "Serum bilirubin concentration is modified by ugt1a1 haplotypes and influences risk of type-2 diabetes in the norfolk island genetic isolate," *BMC genetics*, vol. 16, pp. 136–136, 12 2015.
34. D. Cameron, T. Epton, P. Norman, P. Sheeran, P. R. Harris, T. L. Webb, S. A. Julious, A. Brennan, C. Thomas, A. Petróczi, D. P. Naughton, and I. Shah, "A theory-based online health behaviour intervention for new university students (u@uni:lifeguide): results from a repeat randomized controlled trial," *Trials*, vol. 16, pp. 555–555, 12 2015.
35. S. J. Chanock and D. J. Hunter, "Genomics: when the smoke clears ...," *Nature*, vol. 452, pp. 537–538, 4 2008.
36. E. S. Wan and D. L. DeMeo, "Translating genomics into risk prediction.," *Thorax*, vol. 72, pp. 598–599, 3 2017.
37. S. M. Noar, M. G. Hall, D. B. Francis, K. M. Ribisl, J. K. Pepper, and N. T. Brewer, "Pictorial cigarette pack warnings: a meta-analysis of experimental studies," *Tobacco control*, vol. 25, pp. 341–354, 5 2015.
38. K. Schuck, R. Otten, M. Kleinjan, J. B. Bricker, and R. C. M. E. Engels, "Effectiveness of proactive telephone counselling for smoking cessation in parents: Study protocol of a randomized controlled trial," *BMC public health*, vol. 11, pp. 732–732, 9 2011.
39. S. L. Mayne, A. H. Auchincloss, K. Moore, Y. L. Michael, L. P. Tabb, S. E. Echeverria, and A. V. D. Roux, "Cross-sectional and longitudinal associations of neighbourhood social environment and smoking behaviour: the multiethnic study of atherosclerosis.," *Journal of epidemiology and community health*, vol. 71, pp. 396–403, 11 2016.
40. M. J. Chenoweth, L. S. Cox, N. Nollen, J. S. Ahluwalia, N. L. Benowitz, C. Lerman, J. Knight, and R. F. Tyndale, "Analyses of nicotine metabolism biomarker genetics stratified by sex in african and european americans.," *Scientific reports*, vol. 11, pp. 19572–19572, 10 2021.
41. G. G. Greiner, K. M. F. Emmert-Fees, J. Becker, W. Rathmann, B. Thorand, A. Peters, A. S. Quante, L. Schwettmann, and M. Laxy, "Toward targeted prevention: risk factors for prediabetes defined by impaired fasting glucose, impaired glucose tolerance and increased hba1c in the population-based kora study from germany," *Acta diabetologica*, vol. 57, pp. 1481–1491, 8 2020.
42. R. F. Hillary, A. J. Stevenson, D. L. McCartney, A. Campbell, R. M. Walker, D. M. Howard, C. W. Ritchie, S. Horvath, C. Hayward, A. M. McIntosh, D. J. Porteous, I. J. Deary, K. L. Evans, and R. E. Marioni, "Epigenetic measures of ageing predict the prevalence and incidence of leading causes of death and disease burden.," *Clinical epigenetics*, vol. 12, pp. 115–, 7 2020.
43. Y. C. Fan, Y. Zhao, Q. Xiang, J. Hu, M. Sharma, and H. Chen, "Change in smoking behaviour of people who suffer from respiratory disease.," *The international journal of tuberculosis and lung disease : the official journal of the International Union against Tuberculosis and Lung Disease*, vol. 24, pp. 941–947, 9 2020.
44. E. Albert-Lőrincz, E. Paulik, B. Szabo, K. L. Foley, and A. I. Gasparik, "Adolescent smoking and the social capital of local communities in three counties in romania," *Gaceta sanitaria*, vol. 33, pp. 547–553, 8 2018.
45. A. Pederson, C. T. Okoli, N. Hemsing, R. O'Leary, A. T. Wiggins, W. Rice, J. L. Bottorff, and L. Greaves, "Smoking on the margins: a comprehensive analysis of a municipal outdoor

smoke-free policy," *BMC public health*, vol. 16, pp. 1–13, 8 2016.

46. D. Declerck, "Oral health of adolescents," *Prävention und Gesundheitsförderung*, vol. 4, pp. 135–139, 4 2009.
47. J. Huang, A. M. Mondul, S. J. Weinstein, S. Koutros, A. Derkach, E. D. Karoly, J. N. Sampson, S. C. Moore, S. I. Berndt, and D. Albanes, "Serum metabolomic profiling of prostate cancer risk in the prostate, lung, colorectal, and ovarian cancer screening trial.," *British journal of cancer*, vol. 115, pp. 1087–1095, 9 2016.
48. A. Eory, S. Rózsa, X. Gonda, P. Dome, P. Torzsa, T. Simavorian, K. N. Fountoulakis, M. Pompili, G. Serafini, K. Akiskal, H. S. Akiskal, Z. Rihmer, and L. Kalabay, "The association of affective temperaments with smoking initiation and maintenance in adult primary care patients," *Journal of affective disorders*, vol. 172, pp. 397–402, 10 2014.
49. M. Junger, L. Feder, and S. M. Côté, "Policy implications of present knowledge on the development and prevention of physical aggression," *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research*, vol. 13, pp. 301–326, 7 2007.
50. T. M. Barrow, H. Klett, R. Toth, J. Böhm, B. Gigic, N. Habermann, D. Scherer, P. Schrotz-King, S. Skender, C. Abbenhardt-Martin, L. Zielske, M. F. Schneider, A. Ulrich, P. Schirmacher, E. Herpel, H. Brenner, H. Busch, M. Boerries, C. M. Ulrich, and K. B. Michels, "Smoking is associated with hypermethylation of the apc 1a promoter in colorectal cancer: the colocare study," *The Journal of pathology*, vol. 243, pp. 366–375, 9 2017.
51. M. Obeidat, G. Zhou, X. Li, N. N. Hansel, N. Rafaels, R. A. Mathias, I. Ruczinski, T. H. Beaty, K. C. Barnes, P. D. Paré, and D. D. Sin, "The genetics of smoking in individuals with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease," *Respiratory research*, vol. 19, pp. 59–59, 4 2018.
52. R. Jaber, Z. B. Taleb, R. Bahelah, P. Madhivanan, and W. Maziak, "Perception, intention and attempts to quit smoking among jordanian adolescents from the irbid longitudinal study," *The international journal of tuberculosis and lung disease : the official journal of the International Union against Tuberculosis and Lung Disease*, vol. 20, pp. 1689–1694, 12 2016.
53. E. L. Leavens, L. M. Driskill, N. Molina, T. Eissenberg, A. Shihadeh, E. I. Brett, E. L. Floyd, and T. L. Wagener, "Comparison of a preferred versus non-preferred waterpipe tobacco flavour: subjective experience, smoking behaviour and toxicant exposure.," *Tobacco control*, vol. 27, pp. 319–324, 4 2017.
54. A. Jana, A. Singh, S. D. Adar, J. D'Souza, and A. Chattopadhyay, "In-utero exposure to multiple air pollutants and childhood undernutrition in india.," *Journal of exposure science & environmental epidemiology*, vol. 34, pp. 895–906, 8 2023.
55. C. N. Delnevo, J. Foulds, U. Vorbach, and E. Kazimir, "Seasonal variations in stage of change among quitline clients," *Tobacco control*, vol. 15, pp. 70–71, 1 2006.
56. J. Muilenburg, J. Legge, and A. Burdell, "Indoor smoking bans in bulgaria, croatia, northern cyprus, romania and turkey," *Tobacco control*, vol. 19, pp. 417–420, 7 2010.
57. J. McCool, L. Webb, L. D. Cameron, and J. Hoek, "Graphic warning labels on plain cigarette packs: will they make a difference to adolescents?," *Social science & medicine (1982)*, vol. 74, pp. 1269–1273, 2 2012.
58. Y. Yang, "Does economic growth induce smoking?—evidence from china," *Empirical Economics*, vol. 63, no. 2, pp. 821–845, 2022.
59. H. S. Menossi, A. E. Goudriaan, C. de Azevedo Marques Périco, S. Nicastri, A. G. de Andrade, G. D'Elia, C.-S. R. Li, and J. M. Castaldelli-Maia, "Neural bases of pharmacological treatment of nicotine dependence - insights from functional brain imaging: a systematic review.," *CNS drugs*, vol. 27, pp. 921–941, 7 2013.
60. Y.-L. Chiu, H.-C. Lo, C.-H. Lai, S.-L. Hwang, F.-G. Lin, S.-J. Huang, S.-H. Jiang, S.-R. Li, Y.-M. Tzeng, W.-H. Fang, and S. Kao, "Effectiveness of a smoking restriction policy on smoking behaviour in the military.," *Addictive behaviors*, vol. 67, pp. 53–57, 12 2016.
61. Y.-T. Wang, H.-Y. Sung, and Y. W. Tsai, "Educational differences in awareness and use of the outpatient smoking cessation services program in taiwan," *International Journal of Healthcare*, vol. 3, pp. 50–, 2 2017.
62. S. Milberger, R. M. Davis, and A. L. Holm, "Pet owners' attitudes and behaviours related to smoking and second-hand smoke: a pilot study.," *Tobacco control*, vol. 18, pp. 156–158, 2 2009.
63. A. M. Cohn, W. Pickworth, J. Audrain-McGovern, J. Murphy, A. C. Villanti, D. Hedeker, D. Dunn, R. Wyatt, T. Niznik, W. Cotten, M. Smith, and S. J. Ehlke, "Measuring young adult appeal for menthol and non-menthol cigarettes: protocol of a clinical trial using both laboratory and intensive longitudinal methods (prism).," *BMJ open*, vol. 12, pp. e058823–e058823, 4 2022.
64. A. M. Lippert, D. J. Corsi, and G. Venechuk, "Schools influence adolescent e-cigarette use, but when? examining the interdependent association between school context and teen vaping over time," *Journal of youth and adolescence*, vol. 48, pp. 1899–1911, 8 2019.
65. R. Isralowitz, A. Reznik, and S. Sussman, "Bedouin youth in israel: Gender-related smoking and non-smoking attitudes and behaviour," *Journal of Smoking Cessation*, vol. 4, pp. 99–101, 12 2009.
66. T. Christidis, A. C. Erickson, A. Pappin, D. L. Crouse, L. Pinault, S. Weichenthal, J. R. Brook, A. van Donkelaar, P. Hystad, R. V. Martin, M. Tjepkema, R. T. Burnett, and M. Brauer, "Low concentrations of fine particle air pollution and mortality in the canadian community health survey cohort," *Environmental health : a global access science source*, vol. 18, pp. 1–16, 10 2019.
67. J. Wang, Z.-T. Cui, N. Ding, C.-G. Zhang, T. Usagawa, H. L. Berry, J.-M. Yu, and S.-S. Li, "A qualitative study of smoking behavior among the floating population in shanghai, china," *BMC public health*, vol. 14, pp. 1138–1138, 11 2014.

68. S. J. Hoffman and C. Tan, "Overview of systematic reviews on the health-related effects of government tobacco control policies.," *BMC public health*, vol. 15, pp. 744–744, 8 2015.
69. R. J. Khan, C. P. Stewart, S. K. Davis, D. J. Harvey, and B. N. Leistikow, "The risk and burden of smoking related heart disease mortality among young people in the united states," *Tobacco induced diseases*, vol. 13, pp. 16–16, 7 2015.
70. K. Lochbuehler, K. Schuck, R. Otten, L. Ringlever, and M. Hiemstra, "Parental smoking and smoking cognitions among youth: A systematic review of the literature," *European addiction research*, vol. 22, pp. 215–232, 5 2016.
71. D. Chhabra, null Tushya, J. K. Penberthy, and S. Dang, "Effectiveness of remotely delivered mindfulness and acceptance and commitment therapy-based smoking cessation programs: a systematic review," *Current Psychology*, vol. 43, pp. 8158–8172, 7 2023.
72. N. Lindson, E. M. Klemperer, B. Hong, J. M. Ordóñez-Mena, and P. Aveyard, "Smoking reduction interventions for smoking cessation," *The Cochrane database of systematic reviews*, vol. 9, pp. CD013183–, 9 2019.