Published in final edited form as:

Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev. 2015 February ; 24(2): 472–476. doi:
10.1158/1055-9965.EPI-14-0739.

Compensatory smoking from gradual and immediate reduction in cigarette nicotine content

Dorothy K. Hatsukami¹, Eric C. Donny², Joseph S. Koopmeiners³, and Neal L. Benowitz⁴

¹University of Minnesota, Tobacco Research Programs and Department of Psychiatry, Minneapolis, MN

²University of Pittsburgh, Department of Psychology, Pittsburgh, PA

³University of Minnesota, Masonic Comprehensive Cancer Center and School of Public Health, Division of Biostatistics, Minneapolis, MN

⁴University of California San Francisco, Departments of Medicine and Bioengineering & Therapeutic Sciences, San Francisco

Abstract

Reducing the addictiveness of cigarettes by reducing their nicotine content can potentially have a profound impact on public health. Two different approaches to nicotine reduction have been proposed: gradual and immediate. To determine if either of these approaches results in significant compensatory smoking behavior, which might lead to safety concerns, we performed a secondary analysis of data from studies that have utilized these two approaches. The number of cigarettes smoked per day, carbon monoxide exposure, and cotinine levels in plasma or urine were assessed while participants smoked reduced nicotine content cigarettes and compared to when they smoked their usual brand cigarettes. The results showed that in general, these two approaches led to minimal compensatory smoking and reduced levels of cotinine over the course of the experimental period, suggesting that neither of these approaches poses a major safety concern.

Keywords

reduced nicotine cigarettes-compensatory smoking; gradual vs. immediate reduction; nicotine exposure; smoking behavior

Introduction

The Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act provides the Food and Drug Administration with the authority to regulate tobacco products. Under this Act, the FDA can establish standards for constituents in tobacco products, including reducing nicotine in all cigarettes to non-addictive levels (except to zero). Reducing nicotine content in cigarette

Correspondence Dorothy K. Hatsukami, 717 Delaware St. SE, Minneapolis, MN 55414, Fax: 612 624-4610, Phone: 612 626-2121, hatsu001@umn.edu.

Conflict of interest: Dr. Benowitz has been a consultant and/or served on advisory boards of Pfizer, GlaxoSmithKline and McNeil, all companies that market smoking cessation medications and has been a paid expert witness in litigation against tobacco companies.

tobacco would be unlike prior “light” and “ultralight” cigarettes that achieved reductions in nicotine yield in smoke (not nicotine content), as measured by smoking machines, through the use of ventilated filters and other engineering modifications. The actual nicotine content was in fact similar whether the cigarettes were regular, light or ultralight; and smokers were easily able to change their smoking behavior to receive higher levels of nicotine. As a tobacco control strategy, reducing nicotine levels in cigarettes has one of the greatest potentials to profoundly impact public health (1). Nicotine reduction could prevent the development of dependence in new smokers and enable those who already smoke to quit, resulting in a dramatic decrease in the prevalence of smoking (2). Therefore, the reduction in harm associated with reducing nicotine in cigarettes is due to decreasing their addictiveness, not toxicity. To date, the scientific evidence supports the feasibility of such a national regulatory measure. Decades of research show that nicotine is the primary agent that is responsible for the addiction to tobacco (1, 3, 4). Recent studies find that when the nicotine content in cigarettes reaches 1 mg or below, reductions in cigarettes smoked per day and exposure to nicotine and some tobacco smoke toxicants (5–8) are observed. Furthermore, some studies show that among smokers motivated to quit, assignment to very low nicotine content (VLNC) cigarettes leads to abstinence rates comparable to medicinal nicotine products (6, 7) or greater when combined with medicinal nicotine (9).

Two different approaches for reducing nicotine content of cigarettes have been proposed and examined. These include either a gradual reduction to non-addictive levels (5, 8, 10) or an immediate reduction to these levels (6, 7). In determining which approach would be the best for a national policy, one factor to consider is the comparative safety of each of these approaches. One indicator of safety is the extent to which compensatory smoking (increased intensity or rate of smoking) occurs. Compensatory smoking is an important safety issue because if a person smokes more cigarettes or smokes cigarettes more intensively in response to nicotine reduction, they could be exposed to higher levels of tobacco combustion-derived toxicants. To begin addressing this topic, we conducted a secondary analysis of studies that have used these two approaches to determine the extent to which either of these approaches leads to compensatory smoking.

Materials and Methods

This analysis was conducted on five different studies, two focused on gradual reduction in nicotine content of cigarettes (5, 8) and the other three on immediate reduction to VLNC cigarettes (<1 mg nicotine content or <0.1 mg FTC machine determined nicotine yield (Eric Donny, unpublished observations, 6, 7). The Donny study is based on a pre-determined interim analysis of <50% of the targeted sample enrolled in a study examining the dose-response effects of varying nicotine content cigarettes. This project was conducted under the Center for the Evaluation of Nicotine in Cigarettes (CENIC, NCT01681875) and involved 10 institutions and employed a similar design as the Hatsukami et al. study (6). Participants were randomized to one of seven different groups with varying levels of nicotine. For this analysis, we examined only those smokers assigned to the lowest dose.

In all studies, daily smokers who were currently stable medically and psychiatrically, not pregnant and not regularly using other tobacco products were recruited. Assessments were

made while smoking usual brand cigarettes (UBC), just prior to assignment of study cigarettes. All subjects were instructed to abstain from UBC while smoking the assigned study cigarettes. Two of the studies included a control group of UBC smoking (8, Donny, unpublished observations).

For the gradual reduction studies, smokers not interested in quitting smoking in the next 6 months were asked to smoke progressively lower nicotine content experimental cigarettes (0.8–0.9, .0.6, 0.3–0.4, 0.2 and 0.1 mg FTC machine determined nicotine yield). Nicotine reduction occurred weekly (5) or monthly (8). In the immediate reduction studies, smokers not interested in quitting (Donny, unpublished observations) or motivated to quit (6, 7) smoked study cigarettes (<0.1 mg machine-determined nicotine yield: 0.05 [6], 0.05–0.09 [7]; 0.03 Donny, unpublished observations) over the course of six weeks. All study cigarettes were provided free to participants post-randomization, including those participants assigned to the UBC control group.

The primary outcome focused on indices of compensatory smoking and included analysis of number of cigarettes smoked per day (CPD) and expired carbon monoxide (CO) over time across the various studies. Additionally, cotinine concentration was measured in plasma in some studies (5, 8) and in urine in others (6, 7, Donny, unpublished observations) and analyzed to determine the extent of reduction across nicotine doses and not primarily as a measure of compensatory smoking. All cotinine ratios were based on levels in the same biofluid for each subject. Cotinine was measured using chromatographic methods. Compensatory smoking was summarized for an individual by dividing their weekly/monthly value for CPD and CO while smoking reduced nicotine cigarettes (RNC) by the corresponding baseline value while smoking UBC. Within a study, we calculated the mean of these ratios for each time point over the experimental period. An overall summary for each of the strategies was created by calculating a weighted average along with 95% CI across studies over time with weights inversely proportional to the standard error of the mean. We compared the weighted average to 1 at the final time point using a Wald test to test for a significant difference from baseline. This weighting scheme will weight studies based on the precision with which they estimate the mean, with more precise estimates of the mean receiving more weight (i.e. studies with a smaller standard error) and less precise estimates receiving less weight (11). In addition, the groups that continued to smoke UBC over the course of the study were analyzed (8, Donny, unpublished observation). For these studies, a between-group comparison was completed by dividing the ratio for the RNC group by the ratio for the group smoking UBC over the course of the experimental period (Supplemental Table). Finally, to examine the possibility that compensation is occurring in a subset of smokers, we determined the percentages of smokers whose biomarker levels exceeded greater than 150% (50% above baseline; e.g., 15 to 22.5 CPD) and 200% (or 2-fold; e.g. 15 to 30 CPD) of baseline.

Results

Table 1 shows demographic and smoking history data across the various studies and conditions. In general, the Benowitz studies (5, 8) tended to have smokers who were slightly younger compared to the other studies and the Donny (unpublished observations) study had

smokers who smoked fewer mean number of CPD and demonstrated lower expired CO (but no differences in dependence scores), and had a higher prevalence of African Americans.

Table 2 shows the weighted average ratios (experimental week over baseline) for CPD, CO and cotinine across the two different approaches for nicotine reduction and for the UBC condition. In general, the extent of compensatory smoking for either the gradual or immediate nicotine reduction approach was minimal. The weighted averages indicated a similar, significant decrease in CPD compared to baseline for both the gradual and immediate reduction approaches ($p < 0.003$ and $p < 0.001$, respectively). On the other hand, the weighted average for the UBC condition was associated with a significant increase in CPD ($p < 0.001$). Our data were consistent with at least a 5% reduction in CPD in the gradual group (95% CI: 0.75, 0.95) and at least an 11% reduction in the immediate group (95% CI: 0.78, 0.89), compared to at least a 12% increase in the UBC group (95% CI: 1.12, 1.26). A similar, but non-significant decrease in CO compared to baseline was observed for both nicotine reduction approaches, which suggests a limited risk of compensatory smoking for both strategies. No significant increase in CO was also observed for the UBC condition. While the reductions in CO for the RNC cigarette conditions were not significant, our data suggest that any increase in CO would be no more than 2% for the immediate group (95% CI: 0.85, 1.02) and no more than 11% in the gradual group (95% CI: 0.83, 1.11). Finally, the weighted averages for cotinine suggest a similar, significant ($p < 0.001$) decrease in cotinine compared to baseline for both RNC approaches, with no observed decrease in the UBC condition. A more detailed analysis for each individual study is described in the Supplemental Table.

Table 3 shows the percent of individuals whose biomarker levels exceeded 150% and 200% compared to baseline values for CPD and CO. The percentage varied considerably from study to study, but for the two studies that included usual brand controls, the percentage of subjects exceeding 150% or 200% baseline was no different for reduced nicotine vs. usual brand smokers.

Discussion

The results from this post-hoc data analysis suggest minimal if any compensatory smoking for both the gradual and immediate reduction approaches to reducing levels of nicotine content in cigarettes, particularly when compared to usual brand cigarettes. For example, the percent of smokers that increased their smoking above a specific threshold in the RNC conditions was similar to the UBC condition. This finding might indicate that smokers who have access to free cigarettes tend to smoke more CPD (regardless of their nicotine content), and our results may in fact reflect an overestimation of the extent of smoking that may occur with RNC if they cost as much as the price of conventional cigarettes.

Our analysis also suggests that there are minimal differences in compensatory smoking across the two approaches to nicotine reduction. Furthermore, the results showed that by the end of the experimental period, similar reductions in cotinine in both approaches were achieved. These substantial reductions in nicotine exposure in both approaches would have implications for the level of nicotine dependence. If these results are replicated and reducing

nicotine in cigarettes is found to be a viable national policy approach, the decision for which approach will lead to the greatest public health benefit will rest on factors other than compensatory smoking. For example, on the one hand, gradual reduction would ease the smoker towards non-addictive cigarettes, potentially leading to less discomfort over the course of time and be associated with greater consumer acceptance. On the other hand, this approach would take longer to achieve public health benefit. That is, a greater number of smokers may be more likely to quit sooner with the immediate reduction to non-addictive nicotine levels in cigarettes compared to reducing nicotine content levels over time. The gradual reduction approach might also be more difficult to implement and lead to enhanced smoking in some smokers during the initial phases of transition because it is easier to engage in compensatory smoking with cigarettes that are minimally reduced in nicotine content (6, 12). The immediate reduction approach would lead to greater discomfort, but this discomfort may be alleviated with the use of medicinal nicotine (7, 13), other medicinal products, or alternative non-combusted tobacco products that are less toxic than cigarettes. It is also likely that even with an immediate reduction policy, smokers will continue to have access to conventional nicotine content cigarettes until all store supplies have been bought, potentially resulting in a more gradual introduction of non-addictive cigarettes with less associated discomfort.

This study is not without limitations including: the small number of trials and the relatively small number of participants enrolled in these trials; two of the studies involved participants motivated to quit; and lack of representativeness of the samples to the general U.S. population of smokers. Some participants were not fully compliant with smoking reduced nicotine content cigarettes and smoked some conventional cigarettes, which might lead to an underestimation of the occurrence of compensatory smoking.

While additional research is currently being conducted to determine whether our results can be replicated and to support the feasibility of establishing nicotine standard, our analysis suggests that neither approach results in significant safety concerns related to compensatory smoking.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

Financial support: National Institutes of Health grants P50 DA013333 (D.K. Hatsukami), R01 DA025598 (D.K. Hatsukami), U54DA031659 (E.C. Donny, D.K. Hatsukami, J.S. Koopmeiners), R01 CA78603 (N.L. Benowitz), and P30 DA12393 (N.L. Benowitz). The National Institute on Drug Abuse and FDA Center for Tobacco Products (CTP) (U54 DA031659) supported some of the research reported in this publication. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the NIH or the Food and Drug Administration. Sources of funding for all authors are NIH and their respective departments.

We would like to thank all the researchers and research assistants who contributed to the conduct of the various studies. For the CENIC study, we would like to thank Mustafa al' Absi, Paul Cinciripini, David Drobos, Joe McClemon, Maxine Stitzer, Andrew Strasser, Jennifer Tidey, Ryan Vandrey. Special thanks to Tonya Lane and Rachel Denlinger for coordinating and helping to oversee the CENIC project.

References

1. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. The Health Consequences of Smoking -- 50 Years of Progress: A Report of the Surgeon General. Atlanta, GA: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Office on Smoking and Health; 2014.
2. Tengs TO, Ahmad S, Savage JM, Moore R, Gage E. The AMA proposal to mandate nicotine reduction in cigarettes: a simulation of the population health impacts. *Prev Med.* 2005; 40:170–80. [PubMed: 15533526]
3. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. The health consequences of smoking: nicotine and addiction. A report of the Surgeon General. U.S. Department of Health & Human Services; 1988. Report No.: DHHS Publication No. (CDC) 88–8406
4. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. How Tobacco Smoke Causes Disease: The Biology and Behavioral Basis for Smoking-Attributable Disease. A Report of the Surgeon General. Atlanta, GA: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Office on Smoking and Health; 2010.
5. Benowitz NL, Hall SM, Stewart S, Wilson M, Dempsey D, Jacob P 3rd. Nicotine and carcinogen exposure with smoking of progressively reduced nicotine content cigarette. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev.* 2007; 16:2479–85. [PubMed: 18006940]
6. Hatsukami DK, Kotlyar M, Hertsgaard LA, Zhang Y, Carmella SG, Jensen JA, et al. Reduced nicotine content cigarettes: effects on toxicant exposure, dependence and cessation. *Addiction.* 2010; 105:343–55. [PubMed: 20078491]
7. Hatsukami DK, Hertsgaard LA, Vogel RI, Jensen JA, Murphy SE, Hecht SS, et al. Reduced nicotine content cigarettes and nicotine patch. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev.* 2013; 22:1015–24. [PubMed: 23603206]
8. Benowitz NL, Dains KM, Hall SM, Stewart S, Wilson M, Dempsey D, et al. Smoking behavior and exposure to tobacco toxicants during 6 months of smoking progressively reduced nicotine content cigarettes. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev.* 2012; 21:761–9. [PubMed: 22354905]
9. Walker N, Howe C, Bullen C, Grigg M, Glover M, McRobbie H, et al. The combined effect of very low nicotine content cigarettes, used as an adjunct to usual Quitline care (nicotine replacement therapy and behavioural support), on smoking cessation: a randomized controlled trial. *Addiction.* 2012; 107:1857–67. [PubMed: 22594651]
10. Benowitz NL, Henningfield JE. Establishing a nicotine threshold for addiction. The implications for tobacco regulation. *N Engl J Med.* 1994; 331:123–5. [PubMed: 7818638]
11. Rosner, B. Fundamentals of Biostatistics. 5. Pacific Grove, CA: Duxbury; 2000.
12. Hatsukami DK, Heishman SJ, Vogel RI, Denlinger RL, Roper-Batker AN, Mackowick KM, et al. Dose-response effects of spectrum research cigarettes. *Nicotine Tob Res.* 2013; 15:1113–21. [PubMed: 23178320]
13. Donny EC, Jones M. Prolonged exposure to denicotinized cigarettes with or without transdermal nicotine. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 2009; 104:23–33. [PubMed: 19446968]

Table 1

Baseline and demographic information (mean [SD] or number [percent]) for each study

Variable ^a	Benowitz 2007 ⁽⁵⁾ Gradual	Benowitz 2012 ⁽⁸⁾ Gradual	Donny Immediate	Hatsukami 2010 ⁽⁶⁾ Immediate	Hatsukami 2013 ⁽⁷⁾ Immediate	Benowitz 2012 ⁽⁸⁾ Usual Brand	Donny Usual Brand
N	20	53	101	53	79	50	49
Age	28.7 (8.79)	36.6 (10.97)	41.0 (12.94)	40.7 (13.26)	46.5 (12.25)	37.4 (11.67)	41.5 (12.47)
Sex: Male	11 (55%)	25 (47.2%)	51 (50.5%)	30 (56.6%)	32 (40.5%)	31 (62.0%)	22 (44.9%)
Sex: Female	9 (45.0%)	28 (52.8%)	50 (49.5%)	23 (43.4%)	47 (59.5%)	19 (38.0%)	27 (55.1%)
Race: White	14 (70.0%)	37 (69.8%)	54 (53.5%)	42 (79.2%)	68 (86.1%)	35 (70.0%)	27 (55.1%)
Race: Black	0 (0.0%)	4 (7.5%)	36 (35.6%)	7 (13.2%)	3 (3.8%)	4 (8.0%)	20 (40.8%)
Race: Other	6 (30.0%)	12 (22.6%)	11 (10.9%)	4 (7.5%)	8 (10.1%)	11 (22.0%)	2 (4.1%)
CPD ^b	18.9 (7.4)	23.2 (7.3)	15.6 (7.0)	19.8 (7.1)	19.4 (6.2)	20.2 (7.7)	15.2 (6.6)
FTND ^c	4.2 (2.0)	5.3 (1.9)	5.4 (2.2)	5.1 (2.1)	5.6 (1.7)	5.3 (2.2)	5.1 (1.9)

^a Minor variations of some of the variables compared to prior published studies may exist based on the source of the data

^b Cigarettes per day

^c Fagerstrom Test for Nicotine Dependence

Table 2

Weighted average (95% CI) of ratio of reduced nicotine cigarette (RNC) divided by baseline usual brand cigarette (UBC) values for cigarettes per day (CPD), carbon monoxide (CO) and cotinine, respectively, for studies associated with gradual^a and immediate^b reduction in nicotine and usual brand^c cigarettes.

Study	Summary	Baseline	Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4	Time 5	Time 6	p-value ^d
CPD									
Weighted Average (95% CI)	Gradual			1.06 (1.00, 1.13)	1.09 (1.02, 1.16)	1.05 (0.98, 1.13)	0.94 (0.84, 1.03)	0.85 (0.75, 0.95)	0.003
Weighted Average (95% CI)	Immediate		1.09 (1.05, 1.13)	1.05 (1.01, 1.10)	0.98 (0.93, 1.04)	0.95 (0.89, 1.00)	0.89 (0.83, 0.94)	0.83 (0.78, 0.89)	<0.001
Weighted Average (95% CI)	Usual Brand		1.08 (1.03, 1.12)	1.15 (1.1, 1.2)	1.13 (1.07, 1.19)	1.16 (1.1, 1.22)	1.17 (1.11, 1.23)	1.19 (1.12, 1.26)	<0.001
CO									
Weighted Average (95% CI)	Gradual			1.08 (0.98, 1.19)	1.04 (0.93, 1.15)	1.01 (0.89, 1.14)	0.91 (0.8, 1.03)	0.97 (0.83, 1.11)	0.687
Weighted Average (95% CI)	Immediate		1.04 (0.97, 1.11)	1.09 (1.01, 1.17)	1.02 (0.93, 1.10)	0.99 (0.90, 1.07)	0.94 (0.86, 1.02)	0.94 (0.85, 1.02)	0.157
Weighted Average (95% CI)	Usual Brand		1.08 (0.99, 1.18)	1.12 (1.01, 1.22)	1.07 (0.96, 1.19)	1.06 (0.94, 1.17)	1.14 (1.03, 1.24)	1.05 (0.94, 1.16)	0.353
Cotinine									
Weighted Average (95% CI)	Gradual			0.96 (0.86, 1.06)	0.63 (0.56, 0.70)	0.46 (0.39, 0.53)	0.41 (0.33, 0.49)	0.38 (0.29, 0.47)	<0.001
Weighted Average (95% CI)	Immediate			0.36 (0.29, 0.43)				0.30 (0.23, 0.37)	<0.001
Weighted Average (95% CI)	Usual Brand			1.07 (0.97, 1.16)				0.95 (0.82, 1.08)	0.445

^a Benowitz et al., 2007⁽⁵⁾ weekly reduction schedule (with Time 1 serving as baseline) and Benowitz et al., 2012⁽⁸⁾ monthly reduction schedule (with Time 5 and 6 at the lowest dose), nicotine yields were 0.8-0.9, 0.6, 0.3-0.4, 0.2 and 0.1 mg FTC.

^b Hatsukami 2010⁽⁶⁾, Hatsukami 2013⁽⁷⁾, Donny (unpublished observation); study time points are weekly with nicotine yields <0.1 mg. Cotinine was only assessed at baseline, weeks 2 and 6

^c Benowitz 2012⁽⁸⁾, Donny (unpublished observation)

^d Significance of mean ratio, assessed at the final time point as compared to 1

Table 3

Percent of subjects exceeding 150% and 200% cigarettes per day (CPD) and carbon monoxide (CO)^a

Percent of subjects exceeding 200% (or 2-fold) of baseline cigarettes per day (CPD) and carbon monoxide (CO)							
Study	Summary	Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4	Time 5	Time 6
CPD							
Benowitz 2007 ⁽⁵⁾	Gradual	Baseline	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0
Benowitz 2012 ⁽⁸⁾	Gradual	0.0	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Donny	Immediate	0.0	1.0	2.1	1.0	2.1	0.0
Hatsukami 2010 ⁽⁶⁾	Immediate	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hatsukami 2013 ⁽⁷⁾	Immediate	0.0	3.2	3.2	3.5	3.6	3.6
Benowitz 2012 ⁽⁸⁾	Usual Brand	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0
Donny	Usual Brand	0.0	2.0	10.2	10.2	10.2	6.1
CO							
Benowitz 2007 ⁽⁵⁾	Gradual	Baseline	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Benowitz 2012 ⁽⁸⁾	Gradual	1.9	5.7	8.0	5.9	3.9	7.5
Donny	Immediate	3.3	6.5	5.6	2.2	5.6	7.6
Hatsukami 2010 ⁽⁶⁾	Immediate	6.7	10.5	11.4	9.4	6.2	6.1
Hatsukami 2013 ⁽⁷⁾	Immediate	2.8	1.6	5.0	3.5	3.6	1.8
Benowitz 2012 ⁽⁸⁾	Usual Brand	4.1	4.0	6.0	8.0	4.0	2.0
Donny	Usual Brand	6.2	6.5	0.0	2.1	4.3	10.4
Percent of subjects exceeding 150% of baseline cigarettes per day (CPD) and carbon monoxide (CO)							
Study ^a	Summary	Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4	Time 5	Time 6
CPD							
Benowitz 2007 ⁽⁵⁾	Gradual	Baseline	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0
Benowitz 2012 ⁽⁸⁾	Gradual	0.0	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Donny	Immediate	0.0	1.0	2.1	1.0	2.1	0.0
Hatsukami 2010 ⁽⁶⁾	Immediate	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hatsukami 2013 ⁽⁷⁾	Immediate	0.0	3.2	3.2	3.5	3.6	3.6
Benowitz 2012 ⁽⁸⁾	Usual Brand	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0

Percent of subjects exceeding 200% (or 2-fold) of baseline cigarettes per day (CPD) and carbon monoxide (CO)								
Study	Summary	Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4	Time 5	Time 6	
Donny	Usual Brand	0.0	2.0	10.2	10.2	10.2	6.1	
CO								
Benowitz 2007 ⁽⁵⁾	Gradual	Baseline	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Benowitz 2012 ⁽⁸⁾	Gradual	1.9	5.7	8.0	5.9	3.9	7.5	
Donny	Immediate	3.3	6.5	5.6	2.2	5.6	7.6	
Hatsukami 2010 ⁽⁶⁾	Immediate	6.7	10.5	11.4	9.4	6.2	6.1	
Hatsukami 2013 ⁽⁷⁾	Immediate	2.8	1.6	5.0	3.5	3.6	1.8	
Benowitz 2012 ⁽⁸⁾	Usual Brand	4.1	4.0	6.0	8.0	4.0	2.0	
Donny	Usual brand	6.2	6.5	0.0	2.1	4.3	10.4	

^aBenowitz et al., 2007⁽⁵⁾ weekly reduction schedule (with Time 1 serving as baseline) and Benowitz et al., 2012⁽⁸⁾ monthly reduction schedule (with Time 5 and 6 at the lowest dose), nicotine yields were 0.8-0.9, 0.6, 0.3-0.4, 0.2 and 0.1 mg FTC; all other study time points are weekly with nicotine yields < 0.1 mg. Cotinine was only assessed at baseline, weeks 2 and 6 for the immediate reduction studies.