



# Unraveling the Tobacco Menace: Association of Socio-Demographic Factors and Tobacco Usage in Pakistan

5 Jawad Tariq<sup>1\*</sup>, Shamaila Athar<sup>2</sup> and Mussarat Hussain<sup>3</sup>

6 <sup>1</sup> Associate Professor, Department of Sociology & Coordinator, Population Research Center, Forman Christian College (A  
7 Chartered University), Lahore, Pakistan; [jawadtariq@fccollege.edu.pk](mailto:jawadtariq@fccollege.edu.pk)

8 <sup>2</sup> Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, Forman Christian College (A Chartered University), Lahore, Pakistan;  
9 [shamailaathar@fccollege.edu.pk](mailto:shamailaathar@fccollege.edu.pk)

10 <sup>3</sup> Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, University of Sargodha, Sargodha, Pakistan; [mussa-  
11 rat.hussain@uos.edu.pk](mailto:mussarat.hussain@uos.edu.pk)

12 \* Correspondence: [jawadtariq@fccollege.edu.pk](mailto:jawadtariq@fccollege.edu.pk)

13  
14 **Abstract: Background:** The purpose of this study was to assess the association of social and  
15 demographic factors with tobacco usage in Pakistan using secondary data from the Pakistan De-  
16 mographic and Health Survey 2017-18. **Methods:** The study used a sample of 18731 cases of  
17 population aged 15 – 49 years of which 80.3% were women and 19.7% were men. The social and  
18 demographic variables used in the analysis were age, gender, region, social organization, educa-  
19 tion, social class, marital status, number of deceased children, number of household members,  
20 number of information sources, current employment status, usage of other drugs, and belief in pa-  
21 triarchy. Data was analyzed using SPSS (v.23) and multivariate binary logistic regression analysis  
22 was conducted to predict odds of tobacco usage with respect to independent variables. A gendered  
23 analysis was also performed to assess differences in tobacco usage among men and women.  
24 **Results:** The results showed that the odds of tobacco usage were highest in 45 – 49 years' age  
25 interval (AOR = 2.71, p<.001), lower in females (AOR = 0.19, p < .001), higher in Balochistan  
26 (AOR = 2.32, p< .001), higher in urban areas (AOR = 1.15, p < .05), lower in higher education and  
27 social class groups, and higher in respondents with higher number of deceased children, usage of  
28 other drugs, and belief in patriarchy (AOR = 1.07, p < .001). **Conclusion:** The study concludes that  
29 general as well as targeted interventions for different age brackets and genders are required to end  
30 the menace of tobacco usage in Pakistan.

31 **Keywords:** Tobacco usage, Belief in patriarchy, DHS, Risk Factors, Pakistan

## 32 33 1. Introduction

34 Tobacco usage worldwide is now considered a health emergency. With a growing number of  
35 people getting involved in either smoking or the usage of tobacco is an alarming situation. World  
36 Health Organization [WHO] (2023) reported that with more than 8 million deaths annually at-  
37 tributable to tobacco use, tobacco use is still one of the major risks to public health, and tobacco  
38 control is still a top concern for global health. There is no debate over the adverse consequences  
39 related to it as it is now a global concern. This century-old practice continues to be one of human-  
40 ity's most powerful opponents in a world of medical innovation, orchestrating a symphony of  
41 avoidable deaths surreptitiously (Friel et al., 2023). As one of the leading preventable causes of  
42 premature death, tobacco is the only commercial product that, when taken as intended, kills half of  
43 its users (WHO, 2023). Beyond the relentless grasp of an individual smoker, tobacco use resonates  
44 through families, reverberates throughout societies, and sends shock waves through economies.  
45 Smoked or smokeless tobacco is consumed in a variety of ways around the world (Shaik et al.,  
46 2021). The new trend in this domain is the use of smokeless tobacco (Ghosal et al., 2021).  
47 Worldwide, a variety of smokeless tobacco products are produced (Smoke & Smoking, 2004).  
48 More than 300 million individuals worldwide consume it (Siddiqi et al., 2020). This is a developing  
49 issue in South Asia due to its cultural acceptance and popularity among women when compared to  
50 smoked tobacco (Chugh et al., 2023). WHO predicts that the 5.6 trillion cigarettes smoked yearly at  
51 the end of the 20th century will have killed close to 10 million people by the year 2030.

52 Many developing countries are experiencing an unprecedented increase in  
53 non-communicable diseases, partly as a result of changing demographics and lifestyles (Azzouzi et



Copyright: © 2023 by the authors.

This article is an open access publica-

tion under the terms and conditions of

the Creative Commons Attribution

(CC BY) license

([https://creativecommons.org/licenses/](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

[by/4.0/](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)).

al., 2022). Numerous risk factors for diabetes, heart disease, lung illnesses and cancer are caused by lifestyle choices and can be avoided globally (Balwan&Kour, 2021). Tobacco is the number one enemy when it comes to non-communicable disease risk factors (Tachfouti et al., 2014). It is a well-known contributor to cancer, as well as chronic respiratory and cardiovascular conditions (Boutayeb&Boutayeb, 2005). The history of tobacco use, the development of the tobacco business, and the strategies it employed to promote its deadly goods have all been well documented in the literature (Brown et al., 2023). In contrast, there is a more recent history around the connection between passive smoking and health (i.e., non-smokers inhaling tobacco smoke from individuals who are smoking). The mechanisms by which complex tobacco-smoke exposure results in disease have been widely investigated in the scientific literature (Samet, 2013; Apatzidou, 2022). Controlling disease requires ongoing surveillance of its causes (Dai et al., 2022). In numerous countries, surveys are regularly conducted to monitor the prevalence of smoking (Shkolnikov et al., 2020). Typically, students and general population samples are used in such surveys.

Consuming tobacco is not simply a personal decision and problem; it also poses a public health problem, burdening healthcare systems with a plethora of diseases that can be traced back to tobacco use (Leeson& Thompson, 2021). The pernicious tendrils of tobacco go deep into the pockets of nations, siphoning funds for medical expenses and losses in labor productivity (John et al., 2021). In addition to harming a smoker's health and quality of life, tobacco-related ailments cost billions of dollars in medical expenses and result in losses in human capital and productivity, placing a significant financial burden on governments and individuals (Fuchs et al., 2019). A large share of money is spent on tobacco-related expenses in low- and middle-income households' budgets than in high-income households. Small amounts of tobacco smoking by some (but not all) family members may result in a significant reduction in the family's access to basics like food, housing, and education (Nguyen et al., 2022). A long-term solution could be youth prevention however, a reduction in current smokers numbers is important for improving our country's health in the immediate future (Levy & Friend, 2002). Many of the negative health impacts of smoking can be reversed if current smokers stop (Benowitz et al., 2021). There is, therefore, a necessity to analyze the intricate web of causes supporting this avoidable disease and to enlighten paths leading to a smoke-free horizon.

The devastation caused by tobacco has no respect for geographical borders or societal boundaries (Oppong, 2020). Although the habit may be pervasive across the globe, the most harrowing tales about it frequently unfold in less developed countries (Thandra et al., 2021). Pakistan is no exception when one looks at the issue of tobacco use. In a country like Pakistan which is already struggling with issues like poverty, illiteracy, unemployment, etc. tobacco usage becomes a threat that is at a lower priority of the government due to the non-availability of funds in the health sector. The current article therefore aims to explore the association between socio-demographic factors and tobacco usage in Pakistan. Various factors play an important role in determining one's smoking habit as highlighted by several studies (Momenabadi et al., 2016). These factors comprise of but are not restricted to the region they belong to (Duncan et al., 1999), the province they live in (Nasir&Rehan, 2001), their educational level overall, and the time when they started to smoke (Rozi et al., 2007). Gender is an interesting phenomenon to look into as women are also drifting towards smoking (Zubair et al., 2022). Media plays an important role in creating awareness or marketing hence its access to an individual could be a key factor (Nizami et al., 2011; Bush et al., 2003). Employment is important as the amount of disposable income available could have a link with their autonomy leading to the habit of smoking (Stead et al., 2001). This study will therefore look at the association of social and demographic variables such as age, gender, social class, education, region, social organization, employment status, number of household members, number of information sources available, and marital status in addition to number of deceased children, usage of other drugs, and patriarchal beliefs with tobacco usage in Pakistan using data from Pakistan Demographic and Health Survey (PDHS) 2017-18.

## 2. Materials and Methods

### *Design and Sample*

The current study analyzed data from Pakistan Demographic Health Survey (PDHS) 2017-18 using 18731 cases of the population aged 15 – 49 years of which 15049 were females and 3682 were males. The complete details of PDHS including detailed methodology, design, and data can be found elsewhere (NIPS, 2019). The study was based on a secondary analysis of data so there was no need of ethical approval from any supervisory board nevertheless the data was acquired from the DHS Program website after registering and placing a request for the dataset. The datasets for males and females were separate so they were merged.

### Measures

### *Dependent variable*

The dependent variable in the study was Tobacco usage which included smoking as well as using tobacco in other ways (chewing/sniffing). Both the variables related to smoking and using tobacco in other ways were merged to create a new variable, tobacco usage, which was recoded as 0 = No, and 1 = Yes.

**Independent variables**

The independent variables (social and demographic) used in the study were age in five years intervals, gender, region, social organization, number of household members, number of information sources, number of deceased children, education, social class, marital status, current employment status, usage of other drugs, and belief in patriarchy. Age (5 years intervals), gender (female/male), region (Punjab/Sindh/KPK/Balochistan/Gilgit Baltistan/Islamabad/AJK/FATA), region (urban/rural), number of household members, education (no/primary/middle/higher), currently working (no/yes), and currently using other drugs (no/yes) were used as given in the dataset. The remaining variables were recoded as follows. The variable, number of information sources, was generated using five items in the PDHS dataset, i) frequency of reading newspapers/magazines, ii) frequency of listening to radio, iii) frequency of watching television, iv) owning a mobile phone, v) internet usage. These five items were recoded as 0 = No, 1 = Yes, to generate the construct of the number of information sources. The variable, the number of deceased children, was generated by adding two variables in the PDHS dataset, which were number of daughters who died and the number of sons who died. Marital status was recoded as 0 = Others (Widows/Separated/Divorced) and 1 = currently married. The construct of belief in patriarchy included five items available in the PDHS dataset that asked respondents whether wife beating was justified if she, i) goes out without telling her husband, ii) neglects children, iii) argues with her husband, iv) refuses sex with husband, v) burns the food. The responses to each item were recoded as 0 = No, 1 = Yes/Don't Know.

**Statistical Analysis**

The data was analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS, v. 23). Factor analysis and reliability test were conducted for the construct of belief in patriarchy followed by computing the items to generate the construct (see Table 1). For the distribution and association of categorical independent variables with tobacco usage, cross-tabulations were done and a Chi-Square Test of Association was conducted (see Table 2) and for the continuous independent variables, independent samples t-tests were conducted to assess mean differences (see Table 3). To predict tobacco usage concerning independent variables, a multivariate binary logistic analysis was carried out (see Table 4) followed by separate multivariate binary logistic analyses to present the gendered analysis of tobacco usage with respect to independent variables (see Table 5).

**3. Results**

Factor analysis and reliability analysis were conducted for the construct of belief in patriarchy. The results of factor analysis showed that all five items measuring the construct of belief in patriarchy had factor loadings greater than 0.50, representing construct validity. The value of Cronbach's alpha was greater than 0.70 which shows the internal consistency of the construct (see Table 1).

**Table 1: Validity and Reliability of Belief in Patriarchy scale, Pakistan Demographic Health Survey 2017-2018 (N=18731)**

Construct	Factor Loadings	Cronbach's Alpha
<b>Belief in Patriarchy</b>		0.89
<b>Beating justified if wife</b>		
Goes out without telling husband	0.72	
Neglects the children	0.70	
Argues with husband	0.76	
Refuses sex with husband	0.70	
Burns the food	0.60	

Table 2 below summarizes the frequency and percentage distributions of categorical independent variables with tobacco usage and non-usage. The Chi-Square Test of Association significance values are also given in the table. The results show that age, gender, region, education, social class, current employment status, and usage of other drugs were significantly associated to tobacco usage (p < .05). Out of a total of 13.8% of tobacco users in the total sample, 12.3% of tobacco users were between the ages of 25 – 49 years compared to 1.5% of tobacco users who were between the ages of 15 – 24 years. 7.0% of the tobacco users were males and 6.8% were females. The highest number of tobacco users in the sample belonged to Sindh (3.8%), followed by Balochistan (2.8%)

165  
166  
167

and Punjab (2.6%). 8.9% of the tobacco users had either no education or primary education compared to 5% of tobacco users who had middle or higher education. 13.3% of the tobacco users were married, 7.9% were currently employed, and 9.9% were not using other drugs.

168  
169

**Table 2: Frequency Distribution of Tobacco usage with respect to categorical independent variables, Pakistan Demographic Health Survey 2017- 2018 (N=18731)**

Variables	Tobacco Usage			p-value
	No usage n (%)	Usage n (%)	Total N (%)	
<b>Age (years)</b>				< .001
15 – 19	731 (3.9)	45 (0.2)	776 (4.1)	
20 – 24	2268 (12.1)	243 (1.3)	2511 (13.4)	
25 – 29	3352 (17.9)	459 (2.5)	3811(20.3)	
30 – 34	3136 (16.7)	478 (2.6)	3614 (19.3)	
35 – 39	2947 (15.7)	520 (2.8)	3467 (18.5)	
40 – 44	1995 (10.7)	402 (2.1)	2397 (12.8)	
45 – 49	1718 (9.2)	437 (2.3)	2155 (11.5)	
<b>Gender</b>				< .001
Female	13767 (73.5)	1282 (6.8)	15049 (80.3)	
Male	2380 (12.7)	1302 (7.0)	3682 (19.7)	
<b>Region</b>				< .001
Punjab	3756 (20.1)	494 (2.6)	4250 (22.7)	
Sindh	2795 (14.9)	716 (3.8)	3511 (18.7)	
Khyber Pakhtunkhwa	2647 (14.1)	234 (1.2)	2881 (15.4)	
Balochistan	1705 (9.1)	531 (2.8)	2236 (11.9)	
GilgitBaltistan	1075 (5.7)	117 (0.6)	1192 (6.4)	
Islamabad	1215 (6.5)	159 (0.8)	1374 (7.3)	
Azad Jammu Kashmir	1837 (9.8)	216 (1.2)	2053 (11.0)	
Federally Administered Tribal Areas	1117 (6.0)	117 (0.6)	1234 (6.6)	
<b>Social Organization</b>				.122
Urban	7898 (42.2)	1221 (6.5)	9119 (48.7)	
Rural	8249 (44.0)	1363 (7.3)	9612 (51.3)	
<b>Education</b>				< .001
No education	7221 (38.6)	1267 (6.8)	8488 (45.3)	
Primary (till 5 years of schooling)	2333 (12.5)	396 (2.1)	2729 (14.6)	
Middle (till 8 years)	3799 (20.3)	648 (3.5)	4447 (23.7)	
Higher (Higher than 8 years)	2794 (14.9)	273 (1.5)	3067 (16.4)	
<b>Social Class</b>				< .001
Poorest	2890 (15.4)	665 (3.6)	3555 (19.0)	
Poorer	3448 (18.4)	586 (3.1)	4034 (21.5)	
Middle	3170 (16.9)	497 (2.7)	3667 (19.6)	
Richer	3122 (16.7)	475 (2.5)	3597 (19.2)	
Richest	3517 (18.8)	361 (1.9)	3878 (20.7)	
<b>Marital Status</b>				.333
Widow/Divorced/Separated	534 (2.9)	95 (0.5)	629 (3.4)	
Married	15613 (83.4)	2489 (13.3)	18102 (96.6)	
<b>Currently Working</b>				< .001
No	12072 (64.4)	1098 (5.9)	13170 (70.3)	
Yes	4075 (21.8)	1486 (7.9)	5561 (29.7)	
<b>Using any type of drugs</b>				< .001
No	15894 (84.9)	1857 (9.9)	17751 (94.8)	
Yes	253 (1.4)	727 (3.9)	980 (5.2)	

170

171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176

The table 3 shows the mean differences of continuous independent variables with respect to tobacco usage. There was a statistically significant mean difference in number of household members with respect to tobacco usage as the results showed that the mean household members were higher for those who reported tobacco usage ( $p < .01$ ). The analysis also showed that mean information sources was higher for tobacco users compared to non-users ( $p < .001$ ). Tobacco users also had a higher mean score on belief in patriarchy compared to non-users ( $p < .001$ ).

177  
178

**Table 3: Mean Difference of Tobacco usage with respect to continuous independent variables, Pakistan Demographic Health Survey 2017-2018 (N=18731)**

Variables	Tobacco Usage			p-value
	No usage Mean (SD)	Usage Mean (SD)	Mean Difference (SE)	
Number of household members	8.42 (4.6)	8.71 (5.0)	0.29 (0.10)	.004
Number of Information sources	1.66 (1.3)	1.79 (1.4)	0.14 (0.03)	< .001
Number of deceased children	0.24 (0.6)	0.36 (0.8)	0.12 (0.01)	.882
Belief in Patriarchy	1.48 (1.9)	1.49 (1.8)	0.01 (0.04)	< .001

179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203

The results of multivariable binary logistic regression analysis are summarized in Table 4 which shows that the odds of tobacco usage statistically significantly increased with increase in age. The highest odds were present in age interval of 45 – 49 years as they were 2.71 times (AOR = 2.71, 95% CI: 1.90 – 3.85,  $p < .001$ ) more likely to use tobacco compared to 15 – 19 years. The odds for the remaining age intervals with respect to tobacco usage were also higher compared to 15 – 19 years ( $p < .05$ ). The odds of smoking were 0.19 times lower in females compared to men (AOR = 0.19, 95% CI: 0.16 – 0.23,  $p < .001$ ). The odds of tobacco usage were significantly higher in Baluchistan (AOR = 2.32, 95% CI: 1.83 – 2.94,  $p < .001$ ), Sindh (AOR = 1.96, 95% CI: 1.54 – 2.48,  $p < .001$ ), Islamabad (AOR = 1.89, 95% CI: 1.41 – 2.54,  $p < .001$ ), Punjab (AOR = 1.58, 95% CI: 1.24 – 2.01,  $p < .001$ ), and Azad Jammu Kashmir (AOR = 1.53, 95% CI: 1.17 – 2.00,  $p < .01$ ) compared to Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA). The odds of tobacco usage were 1.15 times higher in urban areas (AOR = 1.15, 95% CI: 1.02 – 1.29,  $p < .05$ ) compared to rural areas. The odds of tobacco usage declined by 0.94 times with increase in number of information sources (AOR = 0.94, 95% CI: 0.89 – 0.99,  $p < .05$ ). The analysis further showed that the odds of tobacco usage increased by 1.13 times with increase in number of deceased children (AOR = 1.13, 95% CI: 1.06 – 1.21,  $p < .001$ ). With respect to education, the odds of tobacco usage were significantly lower in those who had a middle (AOR = 0.84, 95% CI: 0.72 – 0.98,  $p < .05$ ) and higher (AOR = 0.49, 95% CI: 0.40 – 0.60,  $p < .001$ ) education compared to those who had no education and the odds were also lower in middle (AOR = 0.82, 95% CI: 0.69 – 0.96,  $p < .05$ ), richer (AOR = 0.81, 95% CI: 0.68 – 0.97,  $p < .05$ ), and richest (AOR = 0.64, 95% CI: 0.52 – 0.78,  $p < .001$ ) social class compared to poorest social class. Those who were currently working had 1.30 times (95% CI: 1.11 – 1.51,  $p < .001$ ) higher odds of tobacco usage than those who were not working. The odds of tobacco usage increased by 16.28 times if the respondents were using other drugs as well (AOR = 16.28, 95% CI: 13.81 – 19.18,  $p < .001$ ). There was also a 1.07 times higher odds of tobacco usage with increase in beliefs in patriarchy (AOR = 1.07, 95% CI: 1.03 – 1.10,  $p < .001$ ).

**Table 4. Multivariate Binary Logistic Regression to predict Tobacco usage from socio-demographic and independent variables, Pakistan Demographic Health Survey 2017 – 2018 (N = 18731)**

Variables	Tobacco Usage		p-value
	AOR	95% CI	
<b>Age (years)</b>			
15 – 19	1		
20 – 24	1.52	1.06 – 2.17	.022
25 – 29	1.66	1.17 – 2.34	.004
30 – 34	1.77	1.25 – 2.49	.001
35 – 39	2.00	1.42 – 2.83	< .001
40 – 44	2.39	1.69 – 3.40	< .001
<b>45 – 49</b>	2.71	1.90 – 3.85	< .001
<b>Gender</b>			
Female	0.19	0.16 – 0.23	< .001
Male	1		

<b>Region</b>			
Punjab	1.58	1.24 – 2.01	< .001
Sindh	1.96	1.54 – 2.48	< .001
Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KPK)	0.84	0.65 – 1.09	.180
Balochistan	2.32	1.83 – 2.94	< .001
GilgitBaltistan	0.90	0.66 – 1.23	.501
Islamabad	1.89	1.41 – 2.54	< .001
Azad Jammu Kashmir (AJK)	1.53	1.17 – 2.00	.002
Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA)	1		
<b>Social Organization</b>			
Urban	1.15	1.02 – 1.29	.019
Rural	1		
<b>Household members</b>	1.01	0.99 – 1.02	.219
<b>Information sources</b>	0.94	0.89 – 0.99	.033
<b>Deceased children</b>	1.13	1.06 – 1.21	< .001
<b>Education</b>			
No education	1		
Primary	0.87	0.75 – 1.02	.078
Middle	0.84	0.72 – 0.98	.022
Higher	0.49	0.40 – 0.60	< .001
<b>Social Class</b>			
Poorest	1		
Poorer	0.88	0.76 – 1.03	.102
Middle	0.82	0.69 – 0.96	.017
Richer	0.81	0.68 – 0.97	.021
Richest	0.64	0.52 – 0.78	< .001
<b>Marital Status</b>			
Widow/Divorced/Separated	0.82	0.63 – 1.05	.117
Married	1		
<b>Currently Working</b>			
No	1		
Yes	1.30	1.11 – 1.51	.001
<b>Using any type of drugs</b>			
No	1		
Yes	16.28	13.81 – 19.18	< .001
<b>Belief in Patriarchy</b>	1.07	1.03 – 1.10	< .001

A gendered analysis of tobacco usage with respect to socio-demographic and independent variables is summarized in Table 5. The results showed that the odds of tobacco usage increased in both genders with increase in age, with the highest odds of 2.40 times (95% CI: 1.60 – 3.61,  $p < .001$ ) for females and 5.61 times (95% CI: 2.24 – 14.00,  $p < .001$ ) for males in 45 – 49 years compared to the reference age interval of 15 – 19 years. With respect to province, the gendered analysis showed that the odds of tobacco usage in females were statistically significantly higher in all regions compared to FATA with the highest odds in Balochistan (AOR = 16.21, 95% CI: 9.30 – 28.28,  $p < .001$ ) followed by Sindh (AOR = 14.79, 95% CI: 8.46 – 25.83,  $p < .001$ ). Contrarily, the odds of tobacco usage in men were lower in all regions when compared with FATA with the lowest odds in Sindh (AOR = 0.29, 95% CI: 0.20 – 0.42,  $p < .001$ ) followed by Balochistan (AOR = 0.31, 95% CI: 0.21 – 0.45,  $p < .001$ ). The odds of tobacco usage were higher for urban men ((AOR = 1.38, 95% CI: 1.16 – 1.63,  $p < .001$ ) compared to rural men whereas so such distinction was found with respect to women. The odds of tobacco usage were higher for women with higher number of deceased children (AOR = 1.21, 95% CI: 1.11 – 1.31,  $p < .001$ ) whereas for men, the odds though higher were statistically insignificant. The odds of tobacco usage were lower for females with middle (AOR = 0.71, 95% CI: 0.56 – 0.90,  $p < .01$ ) and higher (AOR = 0.53, 95% CI: 0.38 – 0.75,  $p < .001$ ) levels of education whereas for men it was statistically significantly lower in only higher (AOR = 0.50, 95% CI: 0.37 – 0.66,  $p < .001$ ) level when compared to those who had no education. The odds of tobacco usage were not statistically significant with respect to social class in men,

204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223

224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236

however for females the odds were significantly lower in middle (AOR = 0.79, 95% CI: 0.63 – 0.99,  $p < .05$ ), richer (AOR = 0.55, 95% CI: 0.42 – 0.72,  $p < .001$ ), and richest (AOR = 0.44, 95% CI: 0.31 – 0.61,  $p < .001$ ) social classes when compared to poorest social class. With respect to marital status, the odds of tobacco usage in females were significantly lower in respondents classified as widow/divorced/separated (AOR = 0.70, 95% CI: 0.52 – 0.96,  $p < .05$ ) group compared to those who were currently married whereas no such findings were observed for men. The odds of tobacco usage were significantly higher in women who were currently employed (AOR = 1.21, 95% CI: 1.01 – 1.44,  $p < .05$ ) whereas for men the odds though higher were statistically insignificant. The odds of tobacco usage for both men (AOR = 9.03, 95% CI: 7.06 – 11.60,  $p < .001$ ) and women (AOR = 30.15, 95% CI: 23.80 – 38.30,  $p < .001$ ) who were currently using other drugs were statistically significantly higher when compared to non-user men and women, respectively. With respect to beliefs in patriarchy, the odds of tobacco usage were significantly higher in both women (AOR = 1.04, 95% CI: 1.01 – 1.08,  $p < .05$ ) and men (AOR = 1.08, 95% CI: 1.02 – 1.15,  $p < .05$ ).

**Table 5. Multivariate Binary Logistic Regression to predict Tobacco usage from socio-demographic and independent variables among Females and Males, Pakistan Demographic Health Survey 2017 – 2018 (N = 18731)**

Variables	Tobacco Usage (Female, n = 15049)			Tobacco Usage (Male, n = 3682)		
	AOR	95% CI	p-value	AOR	95% CI	p-value
<b>Age (years)</b>						
15 – 19	1			1		
20 – 24	1.39	0.93 – 2.09	.111	3.31	1.30 – 8.44	.012
25 – 29	1.62	1.10 – 2.39	.015	3.23	1.29 – 8.06	.012
30 – 34	1.71	1.16 – 2.54	.007	3.53	1.42 – 8.78	.007
35 – 39	1.59	1.07 – 2.35	.002	4.81	1.93 – 12.0	.001
40 – 44	2.18	1.45 – 3.26	< .001	5.19	2.07 – 13.0	< .001
45 – 49	2.40	1.60 – 3.61	< .001	5.61	2.24 – 14.0	< .001
<b>Region</b>						
Punjab	5.64	3.19 – 9.99	< .001	0.66	0.48 – 0.92	.015
Sindh	14.79	8.46 – 25.83	< .001	0.29	0.20 – 0.42	< .001
KPK	2.75	1.52 – 5.00	.001	0.41	0.29 – 0.58	< .001
Balochistan	16.21	9.30 – 28.28	< .001	0.31	0.21 – 0.45	< .001
GilgitBaltistan	4.01	2.16 – 7.46	< .001	0.33	0.21 – 0.52	< .001
Islamabad	5.82	3.08 – 11.00	< .001	0.89	0.59 – 1.34	.578
AJK	3.66	1.99 – 6.73	< .001	0.95	0.65 – 1.63	.779
FATA	1			1		
<b>Social Organization</b>						
Urban	0.99	0.84 – 1.16	.897	1.38	1.16 – 1.63	< .001
Rural	1			1		
<b>Household members</b>	1.01	0.99 – 1.03	.078	1.01	0.99 – 1.02	.446
<b>Information sources</b>	1.06	0.98 – 1.15	.169	0.96	0.89 – 1.04	.310
<b>Deceased children</b>	1.21	1.11 – 1.31	< .001	1.06	0.95 – 1.18	.308
<b>Education</b>						
No education	1			1		
Primary	0.88	0.70 – 1.09	.233	0.96	0.76 – 1.21	.719
Middle	0.71	0.56 – 0.90	.005	0.82	0.66 – 1.03	.085
Higher	0.53	0.38 – 0.75	< .001	0.50	0.37 – 0.66	< .001
<b>Social Class</b>						
Poorest	1			1		
Poorer	0.95	0.79 – 1.15	.597	0.87	0.68 – 1.11	.264
Middle	0.79	0.63 – 0.99	.045	0.89	0.69 – 1.16	.389
Richer	0.55	0.42 – 0.72	< .001	1.20	0.92 – 1.56	.189
Richest	0.44	0.31 – 0.61	< .001	0.80	0.60 – 1.06	.116
<b>Marital Status</b>						
Widow/Divorced/Separated	0.70	0.52 – 0.96	.024	1.01	0.57 – 1.77	.983
Married	1			1		

<b>Currently Working</b>						
No	1			1		
Yes	1.21	1.01 – 1.44	.037	1.16	0.82 – 1.65	.395
<b>Using any type of drugs</b>						
No	1			1		
Yes	30.15	23.8 – 38.3	< .001	9.03	7.06 – 11.6	< .001
<b>Belief in Patriarchy</b>						
	1.04	1.01 – 1.08	.031	1.08	1.02 – 1.15	.014

237

238

239

240

241

242

243

244

245

246

247

248

249

250

251

252

253

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

261

262

263

264

265

266

267

268

269

270

271

272

273

274

275

276

277

278

279

280

281

282

283

284

285

286

287

288

#### 4. Discussion

Many health-promoting messages encourage us to adopt healthy behaviors today to protect our health in the future by appealing to our desire to make the future better, or at least healthier (Orbell&Hagger, 2006). The study showed that several socio-demographic factors have been found to show an association as to how they are related to smoking. According to a study by Bush et al. (2003), age appeared to have an impact on how socially acceptable smoking is. It is believed it is more appropriate for elderly men and, to a lesser extent, older women to smoke openly because of the recognized standing of elders in South Asian society. In contrast, smoking among young people is typically seen as "disrespectful," especially when done in front of elders (Nichter et al., 2002). Within Pakistan, there are considerable regional differences in the prevalence of tobacco usage (Abdullah et al., 2014). In particular, Punjab stands out from the other provinces due to its significantly higher tobacco consumption rate (Saeed et al., 2021). Although to a lesser extent, the province of Sindh has the same tendency of greater tobacco use (Basit et al., 2020). These regional variations in tobacco use show the intricate interactions among cultural norms, economic variables, and tobacco product accessibility (Petti, 2009). Understanding the underlying causes of these variances can help develop anti-smoking campaigns that are specifically tailored to each region's particular problems and influences. To be more successful, efforts to reduce tobacco use must take into account both the subtle distinctions at the province level and the larger national environment (WHO, 2013).

Smoking patterns reveal a clear gender gap, with men showing a considerably higher prevalence of smoking than their female counterparts (Bauer et al., 2007). The deeply ingrained patriarchal norms that define Pakistani society may be inextricably tied to this paradox. In this setting, smoking may not only represent a personal habit but also have symbolic meanings related to masculinity and independence (Amos & Haglund, 2000). In the context of these patriarchal ideals, smoking could be seen as a sign of masculinity, an assertion of independence, or even a show of power (Ricciardelli, 2015). According to this socio-cultural perspective, resolving the disparity between smoking rates among men and women calls for a multifaceted strategy that takes into account, not only health education, but also the alteration of gender norms and the promotion of more equal practices. There is a clear difference between smokers who are employed and those who are unemployed (Nargis et al., 2019). It's noteworthy that smokers tend to be more prevalent among those without jobs than among those with jobs (Henkel, 2011). This particular pattern calls for a closer look at the complex relationship between employment status and smoking habits. The observed tendency could be ascribed to a number of variables, including the stressors and difficulties that unemployed people may encounter, which could increase their propensity to smoke as a coping technique (Perreault et al., 2017). Additionally, economic issues can be at play, with people without stable job possibly having more free time and resources to smoke (Fowler, Henry, & Marcal, 2015).

Socio-economic class happens to be another important factor. In contrast to people from the upper or middle classes, people from lower socioeconomic classes are more likely to smoke than people from higher classes (Marmot & Theorell, 2020). This pattern highlights the complex relationship between smoking habits and socioeconomic level. Economic hardships experienced by people in lower socioeconomic groups may increase their susceptibility to smoking initiation and persistence (Lynch et al., 1997). This trend may be influenced by elements including stress, a lack of resources for quitting smoking, and the attractiveness of cheap tobacco products (Gilmore et al., 2015). The reduced prevalence of smoking among the upper and middle classes, however, may be due to more awareness, better access to healthcare, and possibly a greater ability to pay for healthier lifestyle options (Woodward & Kawachi, 2000). There is a favorable link between people with high levels of smoking and strong patriarchal attitudes (Beardsworth et al., 2002). The complex relationship that exists between social and cultural factors and smoking behavior is brought into focus by this surprising correlation (Paunonen et al., 2003). The higher incidence of smoking may be



influenced by patriarchal views, which place an emphasis on conventional gender roles and power relationships (Courtenay, 2000). People who follow patriarchal norms may be more likely to smoke as a way of adhering to these principles in circumstances where smoking is seen as a sign of masculinity or independence (Mao et al., 2015). This finding highlights the need of addressing not just the physiological and financial factors that contribute to smoking but also the societal elements that shape people's perceptions and choices.

There is a strong link found between people who have lost a child and have higher smoking rates (Lauer et al., 1989). This striking association highlights the intricate interactions between smoking behaviors and severe emotional suffering (Farooqui et al., 2023). When dealing with such a devastating loss, people may turn to coping techniques or solace, and smoking may provide a momentary relief from their emotional suffering (Perissinotto et al., 2019). This tendency becomes more pronounced when more children pass away, suggesting that smoking dependence increases as people deal with mounting layers of loss. The observed link highlights the complex ways in which tobacco use and psychological health might interact. Substance use is another factor related with smoking. Drug use and smoking habits seem to go hand in hand and may be highly associated experiences. Supporting other studies, the study found that people who used other drugs exhibited frequent tobacco use (Mathers et al., 2006). This finding prompts fascinating inquiries regarding the complex interrelationships between various drug use behaviors. Exploration of the causes of this association is also necessary. It is conceivable that persons who take other drugs have similar reasons for doing so, similar views of the risks involved, or similar lifestyle preferences with who smoke (Lindbladh&Lyttkens, 2002).

## 5. Conclusions

This study brings forth insights, into the web of social and demographic factors that strongly influence tobacco consumption in Pakistan. Our analysis reveals the patterns associated with this multifaceted behavior offering a comprehensive understanding. The key findings of our study underscore the importance of considering social variables while devising targeted interventions and policies to curb tobacco use. The growing number of middle-aged adults using tobacco is a concerning issue that needs to be tackled. This might be due, to standing norms and past habits that have led older people to continue using tobacco. To effectively address this, it is crucial to create tailored awareness campaigns and educational programs targeting these age groups. These initiatives should aim to debunk myths, correct misconceptions, and highlight the health consequences associated with tobacco use. The growing number of individuals using tobacco is a concerning issue that requires attention. The significant differences, in tobacco use between genders emphasize the importance of interventions that consider gender sensitivity. Our study reveals that men and women have different factors influencing their tobacco use patterns. Although tobacco use is generally more prevalent among men, it is surprising to find usage among certain subgroups of women which calls for further investigation. Our findings suggest a diverse approach that targets different demographic segments with targeted techniques as we aim toward a tobacco-free future. Understanding and resolving these distinct trends would pave the path for a healthier, tobacco-free Pakistan for all of its citizens.

**Supplementary Materials:** None.

**Author Contributions:** All authors equally contributed to the manuscript.

**Funding:** The research was self-funded

**Institutional Review Board Statement:** Not applicable as secondary data from a publicly accessible dataset was used.

**Informed Consent Statement:** Not applicable as secondary data from a publicly accessible dataset was used.

**Data Availability Statement:** PDHS datasets are available on DHS Website

**Acknowledgments:** DHS for allowing using the dataset.

**Conflicts of Interest:** Authors declare that there is no conflict of interests. The research was self-funded.

## References

- Abdullah, A. S., Stillman, F. A., Yang, L., Luo, H., Zhang, Z., & Samet, J. M. (2014). Tobacco use and smoking cessation practices among physicians in developing countries: a literature review (1987–2010). *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 11(1), 429-455.
- Amos, A., & Haglund, M. (2000). From social taboo to "torch of freedom": the marketing of cigarettes to women. *Tobacco control*, 9(1), 3-8.
- Apatzidou, D. A. (2022). The role of cigarette smoking in periodontal disease and treatment outcomes of dental implant therapy. *Periodontology* 2000, 90(1), 45-61.

- 346 Azzouzi, S., Stratton, C., Muñoz-Velasco, L. P., Wang, K., Fourtassi, M., Hong, B. Y., ...& Hajjioui, A. (2022). The impact of the COVID-19  
347 pandemic on healthy lifestyle behaviors and perceived mental and physical health of people living with non-communicable diseases: An  
348 international cross-sectional survey. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(13), 8023.
- 349 Balwan, W. K., &Kour, S. (2021). Lifestyle Diseases: The Link between Modern Lifestyle and threat to public health. *Saudi J Med Pharm Sci*,  
350 7(4), 179-84.
- 351 Basit, A., Younus, B. B., Waris, N., &Fawwad, A. (2020).Prevalence of tobacco use in urban and rural areas of Pakistan; a sub-study from second  
352 National Diabetes Survey of Pakistan (NDSP) 2016-2017.*Pakistan Journal of Medical Sciences*, 36(4), 808.
- 353 Bauer, T., Göhlmann, S., & Sinning, M. (2007). Gender differences in smoking behavior. *Health Economics*, 16(9), 895-909.
- 354 Beardsworth, A., Bryman, A., Keil, T., Goode, J., Haslam, C., & Lancashire, E. (2002). Women, men and food: the significance of gender for  
355 nutritional attitudes and choices. *British Food Journal*, 104(7), 470-491.
- 356 Benowitz, N. L., St. Helen, G., &Liakoni, E. (2021). Clinical pharmacology of electronic nicotine delivery systems (ENDS): implications for  
357 benefits and risks in the promotion of the combusted tobacco endgame. *The Journal of Clinical Pharmacology*, 61, S18-S36.
- 358 Boutayeb, A., &Boutayeb, S. (2005). The burden of non-communicable diseases in developing countries.*International journal for equity in health*,  
359 4, 1-8.
- 360 Brown, J. L., Rosen, D., Carmona, M. G., Parra, N., Hurley, M., & Cohen, J. E. (2023).Spinning a global web: tactics used by Big Tobacco to  
361 attract children at tobacco points-of-sale.
- 362 Bush, J., White, M., Kai, J., Rankin, J., & Bhopal, R. (2003). Understanding influences on smoking in Bangladeshi and Pakistani adults: com-  
363 munity based, qualitative study. *Bmj*, 326(7396), 962.
- 364 Chugh, A., Arora, M., Jain, N., Vidyasagaran, A., Readshaw, A., Sheikh, A., ...&Dogar, O. (2023). The global impact of tobacco control policies  
365 on smokeless tobacco use: a systematic review. *The Lancet Global Health*, 11(6), e953-e968.
- 366 Courtenay, W. H. (2000). Constructions of masculinity and their influence on men's well-being: a theory of gender and health. *Social science &*  
367 *medicine*, 50(10), 1385-1401.Dai, X., Gakidou, E., & Lopez, A. D. (2022). Evolution of the global smoking epidemic over the past half  
368 century: strengthening the evidence base for policy action. *Tobacco control*, 31(2), 129-137.
- 369 Duncan, C., Jones, K., & Moon, G. (1999). Smoking and deprivation: are there neighbourhoodeffects?.*Social science & medicine*, 48(4), 497-505.
- 370 Farooqui, M., Shoaib, S., Afaq, H., Quadri, S., Zaina, F., Baig, A., ...&Younus, S. (2023). Bidirectionality of smoking and depression in adoles-  
371 cents: a systematic review. *Trends in Psychiatry and Psychotherapy*, 45, e20210429.
- 372 Fowler, P. J., Henry, D. B., &Marcal, K. E. (2015). Family and housing instability: Longitudinal impact on adolescent emotional and behavioral  
373 well-being. *Social science research*, 53, 364-374.
- 374 Friel, S., Collin, J., Daube, M., Depoux, A., Freudenberg, N., Gilmore, A. B., ...&Mialon, M. (2023). Commercial determinants of health: future  
375 directions. *The Lancet*, 401(10383), 1229-1240.
- 376 Fuchs, A., Marquez, P. V., Dutta, S., & Gonzalez Icaza, F. (2019). Is tobacco taxation regressive? evidence on public health, domestic resource  
377 mobilization, and equity improvements.
- 378 Ghosal, S., Sinha, A., Kanungo, S., &Pati, S. (2021). Declining trends in smokeless tobacco use among Indian women: findings from global adult  
379 tobacco survey I and II. *BMC Public Health*, 21(1), 1-11.
- 380 Gilmore, A. B., Tavakoly, B., Hiscock, R., & Taylor, G. (2015). Smoking patterns in Great Britain: the rise of cheap cigarette brands and roll your  
381 own (RYO) tobacco. *Journal of public health*, 37(1), 78-88.
- 382 Henkel, D. (2011). Unemployment and substance use: a review of the literature (1990-2010). *Current drug abuse reviews*, 4(1), 4-27.
- 383 John, R. M., Sinha, P., Munish, V. G., &Tullu, F. T. (2021). Economic costs of diseases and deaths attributable to tobacco use in India, 2017–2018.  
384 *Nicotine and Tobacco Research*, 23(2), 294-301.
- 385 Lauer, M. E., Mulhern, R. K., Schell, M. J., &Camitta, B. M. (1989).Long-term follow-up of parental adjustment following a child's death at home  
386 or hospital. *Cancer*, 63(5), 988-994.
- 387 Leeson, P. T., & Thompson, H. A. (2021).Public choice and public health. *Public Choice*, 1-37.
- 388 Levy, D. T., & Friend, K. (2002). A simulation model of policies directed at treating tobacco use and dependence. *Medical Decision Making*,  
389 22(1), 6-17.
- 390 Lindbladh, E., &Lyttkens, C. H. (2002). Habit versus choice: the process of decision-making in health-related behaviour. *Social science & med-*  
391 *icine*, 55(3), 451-465.
- 392 Lynch, J. W., Kaplan, G. A., &Salonen, J. T. (1997). Why do poor people behave poorly? Variation in adult health behaviours and psychosocial  
393 characteristics by stages of the socioeconomic lifecourse.*Social science & medicine*, 44(6), 809-819.
- 394 Mao, A., Bottorff, J. L., Oliffe, J. L., Sarbit, G., & Kelly, M. T. (2015). A qualitative study of Chinese Canadian fathers' smoking behaviors:  
395 intersecting cultures and masculinities. *BMC Public Health*, 15(1), 1-10.
- 396 Marmot, M., & Theorell, T. (2020). Social class and cardiovascular disease: the contribution of work. *The Psychosocial Work Environment*, 33-48.
- 397 Mathers, M., Toumbourou, J. W., Catalano, R. F., Williams, J., & Patton, G. C. (2006). Consequences of youth tobacco use: a review of pro-  
398 spective behavioural studies. *Addiction*, 101(7), 948-958.
- 399 Momenabadi, V., Hashemi, S. Y., &Borhaninejad, V. R. (2016). Factors affecting hookah smoking trend in the society: A review article. *Addiction*  
400 *& health*, 8(2), 123.
- 401 Nargis, N., Yong, H. H., Driezen, P., Mbulo, L., Zhao, L., Fong, G. T., ...&Siahpush, M. (2019). Socioeconomic patterns of smoking cessation  
402 behavior in low and middle-income countries: Emerging evidence from the Global Adult Tobacco Surveys and International Tobacco  
403 Control Surveys. *PloS one*, 14(9), e0220223.
- 404 Nasir, K., &Rehan, N. (2001).Epidemiology of cigarette smoking in Pakistan. *Addiction*, 96 (12), 1847-1854.
- 405 National Institute of Population Studies – NIPS/Pakistan and ICF. (2019). Pakistan Demographic and Health Survey 2017-18. Islamabad, Pakistan,  
406 and Rockville, Maryland, USA: NIPS and ICF. Available at: <https://dhsprogram.com/publications/publication-fr354-dhs-final-reports.cfm>
- 407 Nguyen, M. N., Nguyen, A. N., Bui, H. T., & Vu, L. H. (2022).Impoverishing effect of tobacco use in Vietnam.*Tobacco Control*, 31(Suppl 2),  
408 s146-s151.
- 409 Nichter, M., Nichter, M., Thompson, P. J., Shiffman, S., &Moscicki, A. B. (2002). Using qualitative research to inform survey development on  
410 nicotine dependence among adolescents. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 68, 41-56.
- 411 Nizami, S., Sobani, Z. A., Raza, E., Baloch, N. U. A., & Khan, J. (2011). Causes of smoking in Pakistan: an analysis of social factors. *Journal of the*  
412 *Pakistan Medical Association*, 61(2), 198.
- 413 Oppong, J. R. (2020). Globalization of communicable diseases.*International encyclopedia of human geography*, 223.
- 414 Orbell, S., &Hagger, M. (2006). Temporal framing and the decision to take part in type 2 diabetes screening: effects of individual differences in  
415 consideration of future consequences on persuasion. *Health Psychology*, 25(4), 537.

- 416 Paunonen, S. V., Haddock, G., Forsterling, F., &Keinonen, M. (2003).Broad versus narrow personality measures and the prediction of behaviour  
417 across cultures.European journal of personality, 17(6), 413-433.
- 418 Perreault, M., Touré, E. H., Perreault, N., & Caron, J. (2017). Employment status and mental health: Mediating roles of social support and coping  
419 strategies. Psychiatric Quarterly, 88, 501-514.
- 420 Perissinotto, C., Holt-Lunstad, J., Periyakoil, V. S., &Covinsky, K. (2019).A practical approach to assessing and mitigating loneliness and isolation  
421 in older adults. Journal of the American Geriatrics Society, 67(4), 657-662.
- 422 Petti, S. (2009).Lifestyle risk factors for oral cancer.Oral oncology, 45(4-5), 340-350.
- 423 Ricciardelli, R. (2015). Establishing and asserting masculinity in Canadian penitentiaries. Journal of Gender Studies, 24 (2), 170-191
- 424 Rozi, S., Butt, Z. A., &Akhtar, S. (2007). Correlates of cigarette smoking among male college students in Karachi, Pakistan. BMC Public Health,  
425 7, 1-8.
- 426 Samet, J. M. (2013). Tobacco smoking: the leading cause of preventable disease worldwide. Thoracic surgery clinics, 23(2), 103-112.
- 427 Saeed, U., Sherdil, K., Ashraf, U., Younas, I., Butt, H. J., & Ahmad, S. R. (2021).Identification of potential lockdown areas during COVID-19  
428 transmission in Punjab, Pakistan.Public health, 190, 42-51.
- 429 Shaik, F. B., Nagajothi, G., Swarnalatha, K., Kumar, C. S., Rajendra, W., &Maddu, N. (2021).Correlation between smokeless tobacco (Gutkha)  
430 and biomarkers of oxidative stress in plasma with cardiovascular effects.Heliyon, 7(2).
- 431 Shkolnikov, V. M., Churilova, E., Jdanov, D. A., Shalnova, S. A., Nilssen, O., Kudryavtsev, A., ...& Leon, D. A. (2020). Time trends in smoking in  
432 Russia in the light of recent tobacco control measures: synthesis of evidence from multiple sources. BMC Public Health, 20(1), 1-11.
- 433 Siddiqi, K., Husain, S., Vidyasagaran, A., Readshaw, A., Mishu, M. P., & Sheikh, A. (2020). Global burden of disease due to smokeless tobacco  
434 consumption in adults: an updated analysis of data from 127 countries. BMC medicine, 18(1), 1-22.
- 435 Smoke, T., & Smoking, I. (2004). IARC monographs on the evaluation of carcinogenic risks to humans. IARC, Lyon, 1, 1-1452.
- 436 Stead, M., MacAskill, S., MacKintosh, A. M., Reece, J., &Eadie, D. (2001). "It's as if you're locked in": qualitative explanations for area effects on  
437 smoking in disadvantaged communities. Health & place, 7(4), 333-343.
- 438 Tachfouti, N., Raherison, C., Obtel, M., &Nejjari, C. (2014). Mortality attributable to tobacco: review of different methods. Archives of public  
439 health, 72(1), 1-7.
- 440 Thandra, K. C., Barsouk, A., Saginala, K., Aluru, J. S., &Barsouk, A. (2021).Epidemiology of lung cancer. Contemporary Oncology/  
441 WspółczesnaOnkologia, 25(1), 45-52.
- 442 Woodward, A., &Kawachi, I. (2000). Why reduce health inequalities?. Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health, 54(12), 923-929.
- 443 World Health Organization. (2013). WHO framework convention on tobacco control: guidelines for implementation of article 5. 3, Articles 8 To  
444 14. World Health Organization.
- 445 World Health Organization. (2023). WHO report on the global tobacco epidemic, 2023: protect people from tobacco smoke.
- 446 Zubair, F., Husnain, M. I. U., Zhao, T., Ahmad, H., &Khanam, R. (2022). A gender-specific assessment of tobacco use risk factors: evidence from  
447 the latest Pakistan demographic and health survey. BMC Public Health, 22(1), 1133.