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Abstract: Study of smoking initiation and cessation is particularly important in adolescent population because smoking prevention and cessation at this time may prevent several health consequences later in life. There is a very limited knowledge about the determinants of smoking initiation and cessation among youths in Vietnam. This limits the development and implementation of appropriately targeted anti-smoking prevention interventions. This study applied pooled data from 3 rounds of a longitudinal survey in the Chi Linh Demographic—Epidemiological Surveillance System (CHILILAB DESS) in a northern province in Vietnam to analyse the determinants of smoking initiation and cessation among youths. The total of youths in the first round, second, and third rounds was 12,406, 10,211, and 7,654, respectively. The random-effects logit model controlling for both time-variant and time-invariant variables was conducted to explore the associated factors with new smokers and quitters. We found an increase trend of new smokers (7.0% to 9.6%) and quitters (27.5% to 31.4%) during 2009–2013. Smoking initiation and cessation are the result of
multifactorial influences of demographic and health behaviours and status. Demographic background (older youths, male, unmarried youths, and youths having informal work) and health behaviours and status (youths who had smoking family members and/or smoking close friends, and had harmful drinking) were more likely to initiate smoking and more difficult to quit smoking. Among these variables, youths who had smoking close friends had the highest likelihood of both initiating smoking and failed quitting. Our results could represent the similar health problems among youths in peri-urban areas in Vietnam. Further, our findings suggested that anti-smoking interventions should involve peer intervention, integrated with the reduction of other unhealthy behaviours such as alcohol consumption, and to focus on adolescents in their very early age (10–14 years old).
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1. **Introduction**

   During the twentieth century, smoking rose to epidemic proportions and has become a leading cause of premature death and disability [1]. Every year about six million deaths worldwide are attributed to tobacco use and exposure to second hand smoke [1]. Smoking is still rising globally, largely because of the emerging of targeted advertising toward youths and women in many low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) [1]. Further, smoking is not only a stand-alone disease but co-occurrence to many other health problems such as use of alcohol [2], and depression [3,4] in LMICs. In response to this epidemic, the World Health Organization has called to develop scientifically-based research evidence, an important step to assist in tobacco control efforts [5].

   Adolescence is considered as the key period for studying smoking initiation and cessation [4]. Most people start smoking before the age of 18. Aiming to effectively monitor the smoking rate among youths, the Global Youths Tobacco Survey has been developed and provided a lot of useful information for LMICs over the past decade [1]. For example, young men smoke more than young women both in overall consumption and in prevalence [6]. In many LMICs, at all levels of income, it is the poorest group who smokes the most, and bears most of the economic and disease burden of tobacco use [7,8]. Moreover, the poorest group spend a significant more money on tobacco than on education and health care [8]. While there are some examples of cross-sectional studies exploring social determinants of smoking among youths, there is very little information about the smoking initiation and cessation among adolescents and youths in these settings.

   Similar to other LMICs, smoking is one of the three leading factors for premature death and disability in Vietnam [9]. Smoking is the leading cause of preventable death among youths, estimated to cause more than 40,000 deaths a year, and this is predicted to rise [10]. Moreover, few studies offer evidences that explore the association of stages of smoking initiation, or patterns of cessation attempts among youths in Vietnam. Specifically, there are no current longitudinal studies,
to the best of our knowledge, reporting the association of demographic and socioeconomic determinants of smoking initiation and cessation among adolescents and youths in Vietnam.

Society’s treatment of smoking is complex and has radically changed over the years in Vietnam. A number of different measures have been issued and enforced in tobacco control programmes to reduce the prevalence of use in Vietnam [6,11]. Tobacco advertising, for examples, is prohibited in all print and electronic media, excluding at the point-of-sale [12]. Following the WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control, Vietnamese government has required pictorial health warnings on all tobacco packages since 2013 [13]. Vietnam has also imposed a special tax on cigarettes, 70% of the retail price in 2016, in addition to the regular excise tax [13]. There have been, however, low proportions of quitters in Vietnam [6]. Understanding the factors that influence smoking initiation and cessation may provide valuable information for efforts to reduce smoking-related morbidity and mortality. Therefore, this study aimed to assess the association of demographic determinants and some health behaviours and status, such as alcohol drinking and depression, with smoking initiation and cessation among adolescents and youths in a peri-urban area in Vietnam during 2006–2013.

2. Methods

2.1. Study Setting

The study was conducted in the Chi Linh Demographic- Epidemiological Surveillance System (CHILILAB DESS) in Chi Linh, a peri-urban district in a northern province in Vietnam. This district covers an area of about 300 square kilometres including 12 communes and 8 towns with about 175,000 residents by 2015 [14]. The population density varies with a higher density in lowland communes. Approximately a fourth of the total population lives in urban areas.

The CHILILAB provides data on an urban and rural population, which is in view of the rapid economic and population growth in Vietnam. The socio-economic development and geographic characteristic as well as the health problems in this peri-urban district are considered to be representative of similar settings in Vietnam [15]. In addition to collecting quarterly basic health and demographic data, CHILILAB was designed to collect data on adolescent health. The adolescent health survey, which was conducted in 7 communes/towns in Chi Linh, to better understand the current situation in Vietnam with regard to youths’ health, associated behaviours and the related antecedents that both predispose youths to risk and determinants that diminish health compromising behaviours.
2.2. **Study Design & Population**

This was a longitudinal cohort study among all youths aged 10–24 years old in 7 communes/towns in Chi Linh. Data was collected in three rounds during 7 years (2006–2013) at every 3-year interval from the same adolescents. Youths, who did not participate in three rounds, were either sick or did not stay in their house during the survey. The first, second, and third rounds of the survey were respectively conducted during July 2006 to January 2007, February to July 2009, and September to December 2013. The duration between the second and third round was longer than the duration between the first and second round due to a delay in survey organization. Virtually all youths had 7 years between the first and last survey. The three rounds included information from the household surveys, for example, sex, education level, and household economy using DESS questionnaires. The household surveys, which have been conducted biennially at both the household and individual levels since 2004, covered approximately 18,000 households in Chi Linh.

2.3. **Data Collection**

The current study used existing adolescent health survey data. The survey included three surveys, that is, health status and behaviour survey, risk and protective factors survey, and parent/family survey. The health status and behaviour survey was used for the analysis in this paper to obtain an accurate picture of the current health status of youths, experience with adverse health-related events, and risk-taking and health-seeking behaviours.

Data collection was done by trained female interviewers, who were also the data collectors of the CHILILAB DESS. They were local residents who had been selected by a thorough recruitment process. Most of these data collectors participated in all three rounds of survey as the turnover rate was as low as 10%. Several measures were conducted to ensure the quality of the data. A separate quality-control superiors re-surveyed 5% of the households and the main survey data was cross-checked with the re-survey findings to valid of the survey data. Any differences were re-checked and discussed to reach consensus.

2.4. **Study Variables**

2.4.1. Outcome Variables

To assess current smoking, youths were asked how often, if ever, they had used cigarettes. The answers were then categorized into “never smoked” and “ever smoked in the last 30 days”. Current smoking was defined as those who reported to have used at least 1 cigarette in the past 30 days.

New smoker was defined as the transition from “never smoked” to current smoking at either follow-up.
Quitter was defined as the transition from current smoking to “not smoked cigarettes” at either follow-up in the past 30 days.

2.4.2. Independent Variables

We selected and divided 11 potential independent variables relating to smoking initiation and cessation into: (1) demographic background: sex, age, marital status, occupation, household income, educational level; and (2) health behaviours and status: harmful drinking, depression status, and family member and peer influences (family members’ smoking, close-friends’ smoking, and family members’ drinking). All these potential variables were evaluated in the present study.

Sex was composed of two categories: male and female. Age was categorised into three age groups of 10–14, 15–19, and 20–24 years as suggesting of the World Health Organization [5]. Marital status was dichotomised into married or single and the single group included those who were divorced. Household income was divided into two groups: poor and near poor (households that earn less than 1000 USD annually) and middle or higher income (households that earn more than 1000 USD annually). Current occupation was comprised of three groups: informal work (farmer, housework, and craft worker), student (students and vocational/work training) and others. Educational level was divided into two categories in the order of increasing level of education: high-school graduation or below and university degree or above. Setting was categorised as: rural and urban areas.

In term of health behaviours and status, similar to our previous publication, peer influences (family members’ smoking, close-friends’ smoking, family members’ drinking) was categorized into “yes” or “no” by asking the youths about the cigarette smoking habits of their family members’ smoking or drinking behaviour [2]. Harmful drinking, which was using the question, “Have you ever gotten into trouble because of drinking”, was also defined as those who reported that they had gotten into trouble because of drinking [2].

The depression status was assessed using a 16-item questionnaire. This depression scale was translated from the Centre for Epidemiological Studies—Depression Scale (CES-D) in the United States and adapted and tested for validity and reliability in the Chi Linh district context [16,17]. The depression score was the sum of these items and then classified as either “yes” or “no” using a cut-off set at >40 and ≤40.

2.5. Data Analysis

The data analyses were carried out in two regression models using Stata version 13. The primary model was to explore the empirical relationship between independent variables and the outcome measures among youths aged 15–24 years old using the logistic regression model per round. The final model which used random-effects logit model at individual level for panel data was
computed to control for both time-variant and time-invariant variables in all three rounds. Variables included in our analysis were dependent variable (new smoker and quitter), and independent variables (sex, age, marital status, occupation, household income, educational level, family members’ smoking, close-friends’ smoking, family members’ drinking, harmful drinking and depression). 

\( p \)-value < 0.05 was considered as statistical significance.

2.6. Ethical Considerations

Ethical approval for this study was obtained from the Institutional Review Board of Ha Noi School of Public Health. All respondents were asked to participate in the survey by signing informed consent document. Further caregivers’ agreement was also collected if the adolescents were under 18 years of age. Respondents could refuse to participate in or withdraw from the interview at any time. Respondents were given a small present for their participation.

3. Results

3.1. General Characteristics of the Study Respondents

The total sample size was about 20% lower after each round, ranging from a high of 12,406 in 2006 to a low of 7,654 in 2013. The sample divided equally in terms of sex and setting. The mean age of our youths by 2006 was 16.5 (SD = 3.9). There were changes overtime amongst sub-groups of other variables, including decreases in unmarried youths (from 91.4% to 72.8% during 2006–2013), decreases in being student (from 70.9% to 41.7% during 2006–2013), decreases in having high school or lower level (from 89.4% to 57.9% during 2006–2013), and increases in poor and near-poor households (27.8% in 2006 to 38.2% in 2013). In terms of peer and family members’ smoking, about half of the youths had a smoking family member and a close-friend. About other health behaviours and status, a fourth of youths had harmful drinking by 2013. Notably, a fourth of the youths had some depression symptoms. For further details regarding Demographic Background, see Table 1.
Table 1. Demographic Background and Health behaviours and status among Youths: Three rounds of survey 2006–2013 in CHILILAB DESS.

| Variables (N, %) | 2006 | 2009 | 2013 |
|-----------------|------|------|------|
|                 | n    | %    | n    | %    | n    | %    |
| Overall         | 12,406 | 10,211 | 7,654 |      |      |      |

Demographic background

1 Sex
   Male        6,091   49.1  4,996  48.9  3,678  48.1
   Female      6,315   50.9  5,215  51.1  3,976  52.0

2 Age
   10–14 years old  4,237  34.2  4,024  39.4  3,067  40.1
   15–19 years old  5,047  40.7  3,884  38.0  2,776  36.3
   20–24 years old  3,122  25.2  2,303  22.6  1,811  23.7

3 Marital status
   Unmarried      11,339  91.4  8,420  84.4  5,509  72.8
   Married        1,067   8.6  1,553  15.6  2,059  27.2

4 Occupation
   Informal work   1,859  15.2  1,413  13.8  1,177  15.4
   Pupils/Students 8,678  70.9  6,736  66.0  3,193  41.7
   Others          1,708  14.0  2,061  20.2  3,284  42.9

5 Household income
   Poor and near poor  3,393  27.8  2,815  35.8  1,633  38.2
   Middle or higher income  8,794  72.2  5,040  64.2  2,643  61.8

6 Education level
   High school or lower level  10,876  89.4  8,510  83.4  4,431  57.9
   College/university degree or higher  1,284  10.6  1,700  16.7  3,223  42.1

7 Setting
   Rural          6,397  51.9  5,291  51.8  4,018  53.9
   Urban          5,925  48.1  4,920  48.2  3,433  46.1

Health behaviors and status

8 Family members’ smoking
   No            5,395  43.5  4,332  42.4  3,737  48.8
   Yes           7,011  56.5  5,875  57.6  3,916  51.2

9 Close-friends’ smoking
   No            6,494  55.7  4,719  47.1  4,064  53.1
   Yes           5,156  44.3  5,303  52.9  3,588  46.9
10 Family members’ drinking
No 7,841 63.2 6,702 65.7 6,173 81.2
Yes 4,565 36.8 3,503 34.3 1,434 18.9

11 Harmful drinking
No 8,483 75.3 7,227 72.6 5,519 73.2
Yes 2,783 24.7 2,735 27.5 2,019 26.8

12 Depression
No 10,740 86.57 7,436 72.82 5,873 76.73
Yes 1,666 13.43 2,775 27.18 1,781 23.27

3.2. Prevalence of Current Smokers, new Smokers and Quit Smoking

The prevalence of current smokers, new smokers, and quitters among youths in CHILILAB increased overtime. The prevalence of current smokers increased slightly from 11.2% in round 1 (2006) to 17.6% in round 3 (2013). Across all demographic background but not education levels, there was a significant increase in rate of new smokers among youths (Table 2). Smoking rate among females, for example, had doubled among female during the study period. Smoking prevalence fell among youths who attended college/university degree. Two sub-groups of youths did not experience increase in prevalence rate, those aged 15 to 19 and those who had informal work. Similar to rate of new smokers, quit rate amongst youths increased from 27.5% in round 2 (2009) to 31.4% in round 3 (2013). The trend rate of quitters, however, was mixed among sub-groups of demographic variables. Three sub-groups with a significant increase in quitters were youths aged 15–19 years old (23.9% to 32.6%), and pupils/students (40.3% to 57.6%). Only one sub-group, youths aged 10–14 years old, had a significant decrease rate of quitters. The remaining sub-groups had quite small changes of quitters overtime.
Table 2. Distribution of Smoking Initiation and Smoking Cessation among Youths by Demographic Background and Health behaviours and status: Three Rounds of Survey 2006–2013 in CHILILAB DESS.

| Variable (N, %) | Current Smokers | New Smokers | Quitters |
|----------------|-----------------|-------------|----------|
| **Years**      | 2006 2009 2013  | 2009 2013 2009 2013 | 2009 2013 |
| Total          | 1,350 1,304 1,279 | 553 559 222 276 | 11.2 13.6 17.6 7.0 9.6 27.5 31.4 |

Demographic background

| 1. Sex          | Male          | 1,274 1,285 1,228 | 541 534 180 | 265 |
|                |              | 21.5 28 36.3      | 15.7 24.6 23.7 | 30.6 |
|                | Female        | 76 19 51          | 12 25 42   | 11  |
|                |              | 1.3 0.4 1.3       | 0.3 0.7   | 93.3 84.6 |

| 2. Age         | 10–14 years old | 93 149 350 | 126 252 60 | 56 |
|                | 2.2 3.9 12 | 3.6 9.6 80.0 | 49.6 |
|                | 15–19 years old | 549 609 507 | 307 207 78 | 130 |
|                | 11.2 16.9 19.3 | 10.3 10.2 | 23.9 32.6 |
|                | 20–24 years old | 708 546 422 | 120 100 84 | 90 |
|                | 23.8 24.9 24.6 | 8.7 8.8 | 20.7 24.5 |

| 3. Marital status | Unmarried | 1,219 1,051 856 | 505 444 183 | 199 |
|                  | 11.1 13.3 16.4 | 7.5 10.4 | 29.7 37.3 |
|                  | Married       | 131 242 417 | 41 109 37 | 73 |
|                  | 12.7 16.2 21.2 | 4.1 7.6 | 20.0 21.4 |

| 4. Occupation    | Informal work | 444 414 357 | 132 118 61 | 60 |
|                  | 25 30.7 32 | 15.1 15.6 21.0 | 22.3 |
|                  | Pupils/Students | 537 469 254 | 290 183 96 | 57 |
|                  | 6.4 7.5 8.4 | 5.1 6.7 | 40.3 57.6 |
|                  | Others        | 342 421 668 | 131 258 65 | 159 |
|                  | 20.9 21.5 21.4 | 9.7 11.1 | 23.4 31.1 |

| 5. Household income | Poor and near poor | 417 365 349 | 150 149 66 | 52 |
|                     | 12.8 13.7 22.3 | 6.9 12.1 | 29.1 23.5 |
|                     | Middle or higher income | 913 553 394 | 241 172 105 | 94 |
|                     | 10.7 11.6 15.8 | 6.1 8.6 | 31.1 35.1 |
|   | Education level               |                    |                    |                    |   |     |     |
|---|------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---|-----|-----|
|   | High school or lower level   | 1,106              | 1,017              | 883                | 441| 383 | 192 |
|   |                              | 10.5               | 12.7               | 21                 | 6.6| 11.6| 30.3|
|   | College/university degree or higher | 226             | 287                | 396                | 112| 176 | 30  |
|   |                              | 18.4               | 18.3               | 13                 | 9.2| 7.1 | 17.3|
|   | Setting                      | 745                | 710                | 780                | 308| 366 | 138 |
|   | Rural                        | 12.1               | 14.1               | 20.2               | 7.4| 11.6| 29.7|
|   | Urban                        | 599                | 594                | 467                | 245| 193 | 84  |
|   |                              | 10.4               | 13                 | 14.5               | 6.6| 7.3 | 24.6|

### Health behaviors and status

#### Family members’ smoking

|   | No   | 469  | 480  | 512  | 210  | 229  | 112  | 153 |
|---|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|
|   | Yes  | 881  | 823  | 767  | 342  | 330  | 110  | 123 |
|   |      | 12.8 | 14.9 | 20.8 | 7.6  | 11.3 | 22.3 | 25.0|

#### Close-friends’ smoking

|   | No   | 207  | 157  | 270  | 76   | 127  | 80   | 142 |
|---|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|
|   | Yes  | 1,082| 1,126| 1,008| 469  | 432  | 135  | 134 |
|   |      | 21.5 | 22.9 | 30.0 | 12.4 | 17.5 | 20.7 | 21.7|

#### Family members’ drinking

|   | No   | 469  | 480  | 512  | 329  | 416  | 158  | 233 |
|---|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|
|   | Yes  | 881  | 823  | 767  | 223  | 137  | 64   | 42  |
|   |      | 12.8 | 15.0 | 20.8 | 8.2  | 13.0 | 22.4 | 23.3|

#### Harmful drinking

|   | No   | 310  | 373  | 508  | 178  | 248  | 124  | 182 |
|---|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|
|   | Yes  | 818  | 812  | 703  | 319  | 288  | 93   | 88  |
|   |      | 30.2 | 33.0 | 38.0 | 18.3 | 23.1 | 19.3 | 20.1|

#### Depression

|   | No   | 1145 | 926  | 998  | 383  | 440  | 160  | 227 |
|---|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|
|   | Yes  | 205  | 378  | 281  | 170  | 119  | 62   | 49  |
|   |      | 12.6 | 14.5 | 16.9 | 8.0  | 8.9  | 27.6 | 26.5|
3.3. Factors Associated with Smoking Initiation and Cessation

The final random-effects binary logistic model confirmed the determinants of new smokers and quitters among youths (Table 3). Among 6 demographic variables, only two demographic variables (sex and occupation) showed a differential effect smoking initiation, whereas being female was the strongest protective factor against initiating smoking (OR = 0.02, CI: 0.01–0.04). In term of smoking cessation, four variables showing a significant association (sex, age, marital status, and occupation). The odds of successfully quitting smoking increased among female youths (OR = 7.79, CI: 3.16–19.20) and youths who were students (OR = 1.95, CI: 1.18–3.22) or youths who had other work (OR = 1.56, CI: 1.06–2.31). Older youths (OR = 0.34) and married youths (OR = 0.55, CI: 0.36–0.83) were associated with a lower likelihood of smoking cessation.

In terms of health behaviours and status behaviours, three variables family members’ smoking status, close friends’ smoking status, and harmful drinking were associated with both smoking initiation and successfully smoking cessation. Among these variable, youths who had smoking close friends had the greatest likelihood of initiating smoking (OR = 3.43, CI: 2.63–4.48) and failed quitting (OR = 0.33, CI: 0.22–0.47). Harmful drinking was also a potent determinant of smoking status as high odds of initiating smoking (OR = 2.89, CI: 2.26–3.68) and failed quitting (OR = 0.43, CI: 0.30–0.59).

Table 3. Results of Random-Effects Logit Models for Smoking Initiation and Smoking Cessation by Demographic Background and Health behaviours and status: Three Rounds of Survey 2006–2013 in CHILILAB DESS.

| Variables          | New Smokers |          |          | Quitters |          |          |
|--------------------|-------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
|                    | OR          | Lower CI | Upper CI | OR       | Lower CI | Upper CI |
| Demographic background |            |          |          |          |          |          |
| 1 Sex              |             |          |          |          |          |          |
| Male               | Ref         | -        | -        | Ref      | -        | -        |
| Female             | 0.02 *      | 0.01     | 0.04     | 7.79 *   | 3.16     | 19.20    |
| 2 Age              |             |          |          |          |          |          |
| 10–14 years old    | Ref         | -        | -        | Ref      | -        | -        |
| 15–19 years old    | 1.15        | 0.89     | 1.47     | 0.34 *   | 0.20     | 0.57     |
| 20–24 years old    | 0.83        | 0.55     | 1.24     | 0.34 *   | 0.19     | 0.61     |
| 3 Marital status   |             |          |          |          |          |          |
| Unmarried          | Ref         | -        | -        | Ref      | -        | -        |
| Married            | 1.28        | 0.85     | 1.93     | 0.55 b   | 0.36     | 0.83     |
| 4 Occupation       |             |          |          |          |          |          |
| Informal work      | Ref         | -        | -        | Ref      | -        | -        |
|                | Pupils/Students | Others   |
|----------------|----------------|----------|
|                | 0.20<sup>c</sup> | 0.14     | 0.28     | 1.95<sup>a</sup> | 1.18     | 3.22     |
|                | 0.65<sup>b</sup> | 0.47     | 0.88     | 1.56<sup>a</sup> | 1.06     | 2.31     |

5 **Household income**

|                | Poor and near poor | Middle or higher income |
|----------------|--------------------|-------------------------|
|                | Ref                | Ref                     |
|                | -                  | -                       |
|                | 0.88               | 0.71                    |
|                | 1.09               | 0.73                    |
|                | 1.04               | 0.55                    |
|                | 1.49               | 1.28                    |

6 **Education level**

|                | High school or lower level | College/university degree or higher |
|----------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------|
|                | Ref                       | Ref                                |
|                | -                         | -                                  |
|                | 1.01                      | 0.75                                |
|                | 1.36                      | 0.84                                |
|                | 0.84                      | 0.55                                |
|                | 1.28                      |                                     |

**Health behaviors and status**

7 **Family members’ smoking**

|                | No | Yes |
|----------------|----|-----|
|                | Ref| 1.26<sup>a</sup> | 1.01 | 1.56 | 0.49<sup>c</sup> | 0.35 | 0.70 |

8 **Close-friends’ smoking**

|                | No     | Yes     |
|----------------|--------|---------|
|                | Ref    | 3.43<sup>c</sup> | 2.63 | 4.48 | 0.33<sup>c</sup> | 0.22 | 0.47 |

9 **Family members’ drinking**

|                | No | Yes |
|----------------|----|-----|
|                | Ref | 1.05 | 0.84 | 1.32 | 0.89 | 0.59 | 1.32 |

10 **Harmful drinking**

|                | No | Yes |
|----------------|----|-----|
|                | Ref | 2.89<sup>c</sup> | 2.26 | 3.68 | 0.43<sup>c</sup> | 0.30 | 0.59 |

11 **Depression**

|                | No | Yes |
|----------------|----|-----|
|                | Ref | 0.91 | 0.72 | 1.16 | 0.89 | 0.60 | 1.32 |

<sup>a</sup>: represents statistically significant at $p$-value <0.05; <sup>b</sup>: represents statistically significant at $p$-value <0.01; <sup>c</sup>: represents statistically significant at $p$-value < 0.001.

**Abbreviations:** OR: Odd ratio; Ref: Reference group.
4. Discussion

This study used pooled data from 3 rounds of a longitudinal survey in the CHILILAB DESS in a northern province in Vietnam to analyse the determinants of smoking initiation and cessation among youths in Vietnam. This study, to our best knowledge, is the first longitudinal analysis with regards to smoking initiation and cessation among youths aged 10–24 years in Vietnam. We found increase trend of smoking initiation (7.0% to 9.6%) and smoking cessation (27.5% to 31.4%) overtime among a representative sample of youths for peri-urban areas in Vietnam. Smoking initiation and cessation was the result of multifactorial influences of demographic and health behaviours and status. Two demographic variables (sex and occupation) exerted influences on both smoking initiation and smoking cessation while age and marital status were strong determinants of failed quitting. Furthermore, we found family members’ smoking status, close friends’ smoking status, and harmful drinking were associated with higher likelihoods of both smoking initiation and smoking cessation.

4.1. Determinants of Smoking Initiation and Cessation amongst Youths in Vietnam

We found an inverse association of youths with older age and married youths to smoking cessation among youths. Consistent with this finding, previous studies reports that smokers initiated their smoking habit before the age of 19 [18,19]. Smokers who have longer lifetime tobacco use appeared to have lower likelihood of changing their smoking status [20]. Furthermore, other studies also stress a substantial increase in initiating smoking during the transition from adolescence to young adulthood [18,19]. The high smoking rate and low quit rate amongst older youths (15–19 years old and 20–24 years old) were worry some. These suggested that tobacco control initiatives in Vietnam should target at youths in their very early ages (10–14 years old) and unmarried youths.

Sex and occupation were also potent determinants of both smoking initiation and smoking cessation. Smoking has been repeatedly highlighted as the most pressing health problems in Vietnam but for males only [6,21]. Our analysis highlighted concerns regarding female smoking, given that smoking prevalence has doubled among females during our study period. The increase trend of smoking among females has been also raised in previous reports in South-east Asian countries [19,22]. In terms of occupation, smoking initiation was significantly lower among youths having informal work (15.6%) than students (6.7%) and youths having other work (11.1%). Moreover, the two latter groups (students and other work) were two times more likely to quit smoking. Similarly, other studies present that unemployed youths have significantly higher levels of smoking than students [23,24].

Peer and parental smoking increase the risk of smoking among youths [25–27]. Although both peer influence and parental influence played an important role in determining the adolescents’ smoking, close-friends’ smoking status was the most important predictor to smoking initiation and
cessation in our study. These findings are consistent with previous studies reporting that the impacts of peer smoking increase over lifetime to youths in Western culture [25]. Young non-smokers who have smoking friends were more likely to initiate smoking and difficulty quitting smoking than youths without any smoking friends [25,27,28]. These findings are different from a previous study among students in high school in Taiwan stating that parental influence, as a whole, is more important than peer influence [29]. This implied a change in the role of parents regarding to smoking initiation and cessation of youths. One reason could be that parents have low levels of communication with their adolescents [30]. Moreover, our study also highlighted the co-occurrence of smoking and alcohol drinking and supported the negative association between alcohol drinking and successful smoking cessation. This finding is consistent with other studies showing that smokers are much more likely to be alcohol drinkers and that alcohol drinker is less likely to quit smoking [24,31,32]. This suggested that anti-smoking interventions should be integrated with anti-drinking interventions.

4.2. Suggestions to Establish Smoking Prevention and Cessation Program amongst Youths in Vietnam

Socioeconomic disadvantages, regarding to educational attainment and economic status, have been reported to be potential predictors of smoking behaviours amongst youths in previous studies [7,20]. Lower educational attainment, for example, is associated with more likelihood of smoking initiation and less likelihood of quitting smoking [20,33]. This is consistent with our results suggesting that background variables, which were, age, sex, education, and marital status, were likely to influence smoking initiation and cessation amongst youths in Vietnam. We, however, did not find a significant association between household income and smoking initiation and cessation. This could be partly explained because of the easy accessibility and low price which make cigarettes becoming more affordable overtime in Vietnam [34,35]. Taxes on cigarettes might need to be further increased in Vietnam.

Combined all our findings related to determinants of smoking initiation and cessation, our study implied that strategic interventions should consider the individual factors of sex, age, marital status and occupation, health risk behaviour (alcohol consumption), and peer and family members’ tobacco smoking and alcohol drinking. This agrees with other reports showing that anti-smoking interventions should not only focus in school-based approach but also include community-based interventions covering other harmful behaviours and targeting out-of-school adolescents [18,36]. Further, prevention of smoking initiation in early adolescents should be a priority considering the lower likelihood of smoking cessation among older youths and extremely negative effects of smoking on their health later in life.
4.3. Methodological Considerations

The advantages of our study were the use of a large sample, representative institutional sampling frame, and retrospective cohort. Thus, the determinants of smoking initiation and cessation among youths in Chi Linh could represent all youths in similar peri-urban settings in Vietnam. Our findings, however, may not be generalized for youths living in extremely hard-to-reach areas and ethnic minority youths due to a small proportion of these groups in our survey (<0.5%). Besides, selection bias could occur in our study as a result of loss to follow-up. We lost about 20–25% of respondents in each following round due to sickness, relocation, or loss of interest in our study. The follow-up rate in our study was 61%, suggesting an acceptable follow-up rate [37].

5. Conclusions

Our findings have shown an increasing trend in smoking initiation and smoking cessation overtime among a cohort sample of youths in a northern province in Vietnam. The problems of smoking initiation and cessation among youths in our study could represent all youths in peri-urban in Vietnam. Demographic background (older youths, male, unmarried youths, and youths having informal work) and health behaviours and status (youths who had smoking family members and/or smoking close friends, and had harmful drinking) were more likely to initiate smoking and more difficult to quit smoking. Among these variables, close-friends’ smoking status was the most important variable predicting smoking behaviour amongst youths. Our findings suggested that anti-smoking interventions should involve peer intervention, integrate with the reduction of other unhealthy behaviours such as alcohol drinking, and focus on adolescents in their very early age (10–14 years old).

Authors’ contributions

LTV designed the study and coordinated the data collection. DMD and LTV engaged in data analysis. DMD and HVM drafted the manuscript and revised it in collaboration with LTV. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank collectors and the participants in this study in Chi Linh, a peri-urban district in Hai Duong province, Vietnam. This study was completed with financial support from the Ford Foundation.
Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

References

1. World Health Organization (2015) Tobacco.
2. Duc DM, Vui le T, Quynh NT, et al. (2016) Changes in Co-Occurrence of Smoking and Harmful Drinking among Youth: a Study from the Chi Linh Demographic–Epidemiological Surveillance System in Vietnam, 2006–2013. *Asian Pac J Cancer Prev* 17 Suppl: 55-63.
3. Tercyak KP, Goldman P, Smith A, et al. (2002) Interacting effects of depression and tobacco advertising receptivity on adolescent smoking. *J Pediatr Psychol* 27: 145-154.
4. Chaiton MO, Cohen JE, O'Loughlin J, et al. (2009) A systematic review of longitudinal studies on the association between depression and smoking in adolescents. *BMC Public Health* 9: 356.
5. World Health Organization (1999) Programming for adolescent health and development: report of a WH.
6. Bui TV, Blizzard L, Luong KN, et al. (2015) Declining Prevalence of Tobacco Smoking in Vietnam. *Nicotine Tob Res* 17: 831-838.
7. Hu T, Mao Z, Liu Y, et al. (2005) Smoking, standard of living, and poverty in China. *Tob Control* 14: 247-250.
8. Ross H, Trung DV, Phu VX (2007) The costs of smoking in Vietnam: the case of inpatient care. *Tob Control* 16: 405-409.
9. Bui LN, Nguyen NTT, Tran LK, et al. (2013) Risk factors of burden of disease: a comparative assessment study for evidence-based health policy making in Vietnam. *Lancet* 381: S23.
10. Vietnam Ministry of Health (2010) Global Adult Tobacco Survey (GATS) Viet Nam 2010. Hanoi: Vietnam Ministry of Health.
11. Minh HV, Ngan TT, Mai VQ, et al. (2016) Tobacco Control Policies in Vietnam: Review on MPOWER Implementation Progress and Challenges. *Asian Pac J Cancer Prev* 17 Suppl: 1-9.
12. National Assembly (2012) Law on Prevention and Control of Tobacco Harms. Hanoi: Vietnam's National Assembly.
13. Vietnam Ministry of Health (2013) Joint Circular Guiding the Labeling, Printing of Health Warnings on Tobacco Packages. Hanoi: Vietnam Ministry of Health.
14. General Statistic Office of Vietnam (2015) The 1/4/2014 time-point population change and family planning survey: Major findings. Hanoi.
15. Tran BH, Nguyen HT, Ho HT, et al. (2013) The Chi Linh Health and Demographic Surveillance System (CHILILAB HDSS). *Int J Epidemiol* 42: 750-757.
16. Thanh ND, Quyen BT, Tien TQ (2016) Validation of a Brief CES-D Scale for Measuring Depression and Its Associated Predictors among Adolescents in Chi Linh, Hai Duong, Vietnam. AIMS Public Health 3: 448-459.
17. Thanh ND, Linh LC (2010) Validity and reliability of the depression scale for the youth and adolescent and related factors in Chi Linh district, Hai Duong province. Vietnam J Public Health 16: 33-41.
18. Lantz P, Jacobson P, Warner K, et al. (2000) Investing in youth tobacco control: a review of smoking prevention and control strategies. Tob Control 9: 47-63.
19. Morrow M, Barraclough S (2003) Tobacco control and gender in south-east Asia. Part II: Singapore and Vietnam. Health Promot Int 18: 373-380.
20. Yang JJ, Song M, Yoon HS, et al. (2015) What Are the Major Determinants in the Success of Smoking Cessation: Results from the Health Examinees Study. PLoS One 10: e0143303.
21. Nguyen LT, Rahman Z, Emerson MR, et al. (2012) Cigarette smoking and drinking behavior of migrant adolescents and young adults in Hanoi, Vietnam. J Adolesc Health 50: S61-67.
22. Hoang VM, Phan TH, Ly NK, et al. (2010) Prevalence of and Susceptibility to Cigarette Smoking Among Female Students Aged 13 to 15 Years in Vietnam, 2007. Prev Chronic Dis 7: A11.
23. Anderson P (2006) Global use of alcohol, drugs and tobacco. Drug Alcohol Rev 25: 489-502.
24. Johnson PB, Boles SM, Vaughan R, et al. (2000) The co-occurrence of smoking and binge drinking in adolescence. Addict Behav 25: 779-783.
25. Kobus K (2003) Peers and adolescent smoking. Addiction 98 Suppl 1: 37-55.
26. Gilman SE, Rende R, Boergers J, et al. (2009) Parental smoking and adolescent smoking initiation: an intergenerational perspective on tobacco control. Pediatrics 123: e274-281.
27. Yeh MY (2006) Factors associated with alcohol consumption, problem drinking, and related consequences among high school students in Taiwan. Psychiatry Clin Neurosci 60: 46-54.
28. Flay BR, Hu FB, Siddiqui O, et al. (1994) Differential influence of parental smoking and friends' smoking on adolescent initiation and escalation of smoking. J Health Soc Behav 35: 248-265.
29. Wen C, Tsai S, Cheng T, et al. (2005) Role of parents and peers in influencing the smoking status of high school students in Taiwan. Tob Control 14: i110-i115.
30. Kaljee LM, Green M, Lerdoon P, et al. (2011) Parent-youth communication and concordance between parents and adolescents on reported engagement in social relationships and sexually intimate behaviors in Ha Noi and Khanh Hoa Province, Viet Nam. J Adolesc Health : Off Publ Soc Adolesc Med 48: 268-274.
31. Jackson KM, Colby SM, Sher KJ (2010) Daily patterns of conjoint smoking and drinking in college student smokers. Psychol Addict Behav 24: 424-435.
32. Dierker L, Lloyd-Richardson E, Stolar M, et al. (2006) The proximal association between smoking and alcohol use among first year college students. Drug Alcohol Depend 81: 1-9.
33. Freedman KS (2012) Smoking initiation among young adults in the United States and Canada, 1998–2010: A systematic review. *Prev Chronic Dis* 9.

34. Laxminarayan R, Deolalikar A (2004) Tobacco initiation, cessation, and change: evidence from Vietnam. *Health Econ* 13: 1191-1201.

35. Guindon GE (2014) The impact of tobacco prices on smoking onset in Vietnam: duration analyses of retrospective data. *Eur J Health Econ* 15: 19-39.

36. Backinger CL, Fagan P, Matthews E, et al. (2003) Adolescent and young adult tobacco prevention and cessation: current status and future directions. *Tob Control* 12 Suppl 4: Iv46-53.

37. Kristman V, Manno M, Cote P (2004) Loss to follow-up in cohort studies: how much is too much? *Eur J Epidemiol* 19: 751-760.

© 2017 Duong Minh Duc, et al., licensee AIMS Press. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0)