

E-cigarette Use and Myocardial Infarction: Association Versus Causal Inference



We read with particular interest the study by Alzahrani et al.,¹ who examined the association between e-cigarette use and myocardial infarction (MI). With this letter, we would like to express our concern about the study conclusions.

Although annual data sets of the National Health Interview Survey (NHIS) have been released consistently, the authors chose to pool non-consecutive years (2014 and 2016) and did not mention any particular reason for this. According to the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS), a new sampling design was implemented in 2016.² Therefore, 2014 and 2016 fall into different sampling design periods. The NCHS guidance clearly states that the different sample design periods should be treated as statistically independent. It is unclear whether this may have affected the outcome of their logistic regression analysis, which was based on treating the pooled data as one sample.

More importantly, Alzahrani and colleagues¹ concluded that daily e-cigarette use is associated with increased risk of MI. This is a misinterpretation and misrepresentation of the study findings. The “increased risk” claim clearly implies causality and a specific temporal definition of events (i.e., that e-cigarette use precedes MI and e-cigarette use caused the MI). This disagrees with what Alzahrani and colleagues mention in the Limitations section of their article: the study cannot permit identifying causal relationships in part because it is not known when the MIs occurred relative to e-cigarette use. It also violates a basic principle of epidemiology that no causal inference can be derived from any cross-sectional study, such as the NHIS.

To more clearly demonstrate the perils of such an approach, we performed logistic regression analyses of the 2016 and 2017 (pooled) NHIS to examine if ever taking prescribed medicine to lower cholesterol is associated with MI and coronary heart disease (CHD). Both years fall into the same sampling design period and thus the data can be pooled.² Weighting was performed according to NCHS guidelines.² The dependent variables in the two models were MI and CHD; independent variables were age, BMI, gender, race/ethnicity, risk factors for MI/CHD (smoking, hypertension, diabetes, and

hypercholesterolemia), and ever taking prescribed medicine to lower cholesterol. Data were collected in 2016 and 2017 and analyzed in 2018. No significant collinearity was observed (all variance inflation factors ≤ 3.22).^{3,4} Ever taking prescribed medicine to lower cholesterol was independently associated with increased odds of having had an MI (OR=2.15, 95% CI=1.65, 2.80, $p<0.001$) and having CHD (OR=2.05, 95% CI=1.65, 2.55, $p<0.001$). Having hypercholesterolemia was also associated with both MI (OR=1.31, 95% CI=1.01, 1.71, $p=0.044$) and CHD (OR=1.42, 95% CI=1.15, 1.75, $p=0.001$). Obviously, it would be inappropriate to conclude that ever taking prescribed medicine to lower cholesterol, adjusted for having hypercholesterolemia as well as other risk factors, is associated with increased risk of MI and CHD. Our findings show the well-established limitations of cross-sectional studies, which cannot justify any claims about causal inference, as mentioned in the conclusion by Alzahrani and colleagues.¹ Therefore, the conclusion of their study is incorrect and should be revised.

Konstantinos Farsalinos, MD, MPH,

Department of Cardiology, Onassis Cardiac Surgery Center, Kallithea, Greece
Department of Pharmacy, University of Patras, Patras, Greece
National School of Public Health, Greece

Raymond Niaura, PhD

Departments of Social and Behavioral Science and Epidemiology, College of Global Public Health, New York University

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2018.11.013>

© 2018 American Journal of Preventive Medicine. Published by Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

No funding was provided for this letter. KF reports that, for the past 5 years, two of his studies were funded by the nonprofit association American E-liquid Manufacturing Standards Association in 2013 and one study was funded by the nonprofit association Tennessee Smoke-Free Association in 2015. RN has no financial disclosures to report.

REFERENCES

1. Alzahrani T, Pena I, Temesgen N, Glantz SA. Association between electronic cigarette use and myocardial infarction. *Am J Prev Med*. 2018;55(4):455–461. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2018.05.004>.

2. National Center for Health Statistics. National Health Interview Survey, 2017. Public-use data file and documentation. www.cdc.gov/nchs/nhis/data-questionnaires-documentation.htm. Published 2018. Accessed October 10, 2018.
3. Hair JF Jr., Anderson RE, Tatham RL, Black WC. *Multivariate Data Analysis*. 4th ed. New York: Macmillan, 1995.
4. Menard S. *Applied Logistic Regression Analysis: Sage University Series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1995.

The Association Between E-cigarette Use and Myocardial Infarction Is What One Would Expect Based on the Biological and Clinical Evidence



Farsalinos and Niaura¹ state that because we identify e-cigarettes as a “risk factor” for myocardial infarction, we imply “causality” when we clearly only used terms consistent with “associations” when reporting the findings of our study.² In particular, “risk factor” is established terminology for describing such associations in cross-sectional studies.^{3–5}

In our study, we did not use the 2015 National Health Interview Survey (NHIS) data set because respondents were not asked about e-cigarette use that year. Farsalinos and Niaura ignore the fact that we combined the 2014 and 2016 data in accordance with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention procedures (reference 18 in our paper²). They also ignore the fact that, in addition to the pooled analysis, we reported the analyses of the 2014 and 2016 NHIS data sets separately; the overall conclusion is the same.

It is not surprising that Farsalinos and Niaura found an association between taking medicines to lower cholesterol with having had a myocardial infarction because these drugs are recommended and routinely prescribed for people who have had myocardial infarctions.^{6,7} Likewise, it is not surprising that we found an association between using e-cigarettes and having had a myocardial infarction because of the adverse biological and clinical effects that e-cigarettes have on the cardiovascular system that we summarize in our paper.²

Talal Alzahrani, MD, MPH,
Department of Medicine, The George Washington University, Washington, District of Columbia

Stanton A. Glantz, PhD
Department of Medicine, Cardiovascular Research Institute, Philip R. Lee Institute for Health Policy Studies, Center for Tobacco Control Research and Education, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, California
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2018.11.006>

© 2018 American Journal of Preventive Medicine. Published by Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Dr. Glantz’s work was supported by grants R01DA043950 from the National Institute of Drug Abuse, U54HL147127 from the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, and from the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) Center for Tobacco Products. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of NIH or FDA. The funding agencies played no role in study design; collection, analysis, and interpretation of data; writing the report; or the decision to submit for publication.

The authors have no financial disclosures.

REFERENCES

1. Farsalinos K, Niaura R. Electronic cigarette use and myocardial infarction: association versus causal inference. *Am J Prev Med*. In press.
2. Alzahrani T, Pena I, Temesgen N, Glantz SA. Association between electronic cigarette use and myocardial infarction. *Am J Prev Med*. 2018;55(4):455–461. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2018.05.004>.
3. Dawson B, Trapp RG. *Basic and Clinical Biostatistics*. 3rd ed New York, NY: McGraw Hill, 2001304.
4. Datta F, Erb T, Heininger U, et al. A multicenter, cross-sectional study on the prevalence and risk factors for nasal colonization with *Staphylococcus aureus* in patients admitted to children’s hospitals in Switzerland. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2008;47:923–926. <https://doi.org/10.1086/591700>.
5. Jewkes R, Levin J, Penn-Kekana L. Risk factors for domestic violence: findings from a South African cross-sectional study. *Soc Sci Med*. 2002;55(9):1603–1617. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536\(01\)00294-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536(01)00294-5).
6. O’Gara PT, Kushner FG, Ascheim DD, et al. 2013 ACCF/AHA guideline for the management of ST-elevation myocardial infarction: a report of the American College of Cardiology Foundation/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines. *Circulation*. 2013;127(4):e362–e425. <https://doi.org/10.1161/CIR.0b013e3182742c84>.
7. Amsterdam EA, Wenger NK, Brindis RG, et al. 2014 AHA/ACC guideline for the management of patients with non-ST-elevation acute coronary syndromes: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2014;64(24):e139–e228. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2014.09.017>.