Exposure to second-hand tobacco smoke in Qatar: results from a population-based study

Ahmad AlMulla,1 Silva Kouyoumjian,1 Patrick Maisonneuve,2 Sohaila Cheema3 and Ravinder Mamtani3

¹Tobacco Control Center, WHO Collaborative Center, Department of Medicine, Hamad Medical Corporation, Doha, Qatar (Correspondence to: A. AlMulla: Almulla@hamad.qa). ²Division of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, IEO Istituto Europeo di Oncologia IRCSS, Milan, Italy. ³Institute for Population Health, Weill Cornell Medicine-Qatar, Doha, Qatar.

Abstract

Background: Tobacco use among women in Qatar is currently low. However, the risk of exposure to second-hand tobacco smoke among them is a pressing concern because of the high prevalence of tobacco use by men.

Aims: To describe the prevalence and risk factors for second-hand tobacco smoke exposure at home and at workplaces, schools, cafes, and restaurants in Qatar.

Methods: We analysed data from a population-based survey of 7921 adults aged \geq 18 years, conducted in Qatar between March and December 2019. The study used multilevel cluster selection and comprised government employees and university students.

Results: Among the participants, 19.3% (n = 1219) reported that smoking was allowed in their homes, 3.1% (n = 196) said it was allowed in the workplace or school, and 3.3% (n = 204) said it was allowed in cafes and restaurants. Among the women, 22.8% (n = 589) allowed smoking inside their homes, including 51.8% (n = 130) of tobacco users and 38.5% (n = 553) of those who lived with a tobacco user. Living with and being a tobacco user significantly predicted the likelihood of reporting second-hand tobacco smoke at home.

Conclusion: Second-hand tobacco smoke exposure in the home is a health concern for women and children in Qatar. This study provides baseline data for tobacco control policies and programmes, particularly in relation to the promotion of smoke-free home environments.

Keywords: smoking, tobacco use, cigarette, second-hand, women, children, home, Qatar

Citation: AlMulla A; Kouyoumjian S; Maisonneuve P; Cheema S; Mamtani R. Exposure to second-hand tobacco smoke in Qatar: results from a populationbased study. East Mediterr Health J. 2022;28(11):813–822. https://doi.org/10.26719/emhj.22.082

Received: 10/11/21; accepted: 11/08/22

Copyright © Authors 2022; Licensee: World Health Organization. EMHJ is an open access journal. This paper is available under the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial ShareAlike 3.0 IGO licence (CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO; https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/igo).

Introduction

Tobacco use is one of the most significant preventable causes of death worldwide and a modifiable risk factor for noncommunicable diseases (1). The World Health Organization (WHO) estimates that > 8 million people die annually from tobacco use. Second-hand tobacco smoke exposure causes 1.2 million deaths annually (2), mostly among women and children (3). Globally, tobacco smoking and second-hand smoke incur substantial healthcare costs and loss of productivity through morbidity and premature mortality from cardiovascular diseases, chronic respiratory diseases, and type 2 diabetes mellitus. This is true for the Gulf Cooperation Council countries: Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman, Saudi Arabia, Qatar, and the United Arab Emirates (4, 5).

Tobacco use among adults in Qatar decreased from 36.7% in 2003 to 25.2% in 2021 (6, 7). Qatar ratified the WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control (FCTC) and consequently introduced several antitobacco control measures, such as: strengthening tobacco legislation; reinforcing public smoking bans; introducing tobacco taxation; expanding smoking cessation services; and increasing prevention awareness to discourage people from smoking. The Tobacco Control Center, WHO

Collaborative Center, in Hamad Medical Corporation, Qatar, have aligned with the Qatar National Vision of 2030 and the Qatar Ministry of Public Health Strategy of 2018–2022 to work relentlessly towards further reduction in the prevalence of tobacco use.

Although tobacco use is currently low among women in Qatar (9.2%), tobacco use among men is high (36.6%) (6), and the risk to women from second-hand smoke exposure is a pressing concern. Tobacco use, including second-hand smoke exposure, increases women's risk of noncommunicable diseases, such as cardiovascular disease, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, and cancer, as well as premature delivery, stillbirth, low birth weight infants, sudden-infant death syndrome, and acute lower respiratory infections (8, 9). In Qatar, prevalence data on second-hand tobacco smoke exposure among women is limited to the 2013 Global Adult Tobacco Survey (GATS) (10). WHO recommends the development of proactive and effective public health interventions to control tobacco use; therefore, research is needed to determine the potential risk of second-hand tobacco smoke exposure for women (11) and whether this should be a public health concern in Qatar.

The objectives of this study were to: (1) report the prevalence of second-hand tobacco smoke exposure inside the home, workplaces/universities, and café/ restaurants in Qatar; (2) determine second-hand tobacco smoke exposure inside the home among women (tobacco users and nonusers) living with a smoker; and (3) identify key factors associated with second-hand tobacco smoke exposure.

Methods

Study design, population, and sampling

We used data from a nationwide, population-based cross-sectional study of adults aged \geq 18 years (nationals and expatriates) conducted in Qatar during March to December 2019. The study reference population of government employees and university students was formed using multilevel cluster selection. The government employees were selected from the health sector, ministries, and government authorities and units, and the students were selected from 4 government universities, to achieve a fair representation of Qatari adults. The study's research design was based on a systematic process to ensure replicability. The study protocol was approved by the Institutional Review Board, Medical Research Center, Hamad Medical Corporation, Qatar. The details of the methodology have been published previously (6).

Data collection

Data were collected using a self-administered questionnaire consisting of a country-adapted summarized version of GATS. The questionnaire was administered with attention to protocol adherence by trained staff to guarantee a unified procedure. Study participants were provided with an envelope that included the questionnaire along with an information sheet describing the study. To ensure anonymity and confidentiality of responses, the respondents were asked to complete the questionnaire and return it in a sealed envelope. The questionnaire included questions on: key demographic characteristics; use of all tobacco products including cigarettes, waterpipe or shisha, medwakh (traditional Arabic pipe), and cigars; whether smoking was allowed in the home (proxy for second-hand smoke exposure), workplaces/universities, cafes/restaurants; participant's attitude towards the ban on tobacco sales to minors, ban on tobacco smoking in workplaces/cafes/restaurants, and raising the price of tobacco.

Sample size and data analysis

The sample size for the survey was 7921, with an overall survey response rate of 89.7%. Data were analysed for complete responses about second-hand tobacco smoke in the home, workplaces/universities, and cafes/restaurants, and second-hand tobacco smoke exposure in the home among women. Data analysis was performed using SPSS version 27. Sample characteristics were expressed as number (%) or mean and standard deviation. The outcome variable was allowing smoking at home because this was a potential route for second-hand tobacco smoke exposure in the home among women. We used the Chi square test to evaluate the association between tobacco smoking at home and demographic characteristics including: monthly income; current tobacco use; living with a smoker at home; knowing that breathing other people's tobacco smoke causes illness in nonsmokers; banning the sales of tobacco to individuals aged < 18 years; banning smoking in workplaces and restaurants; raising the price of tobacco products; and raising the price reduces tobacco consumption. Multivariable logistic regression analyses were used to test for the risk factors associated with allowing smoking and second-hand tobacco smoke in the home by subgroups (total numbers of women, female smokers, and female nonsmokers living with a smoker in the household). Statistical significance was defined as $P \le 0.05$.

Results

Second-hand tobacco smoke exposure

Overall, 19.3% of participants (n = 1219) reported living in a household where smoking was allowed inside the home: this represented 16.9% (n = 630) of male and 22.8% (n = 589) of female participants (Table 1). When participants were asked what best described the rules inside workplaces/universities, 3.1% (n = 196) reported that smoking was allowed, 41.5% (n = 2589) that it was not allowed, and 55.4% (n = 3459) that it was allowed in designated areas. When participants were asked about what best described the rules inside cafes/restaurants that they visited frequently, 3.3% (n = 204) reported that smoking was allowed, 39.0% (n = 2425) that it was not allowed, and 57.8% (n = 3596) that it was allowed in designated areas.

Second-hand tobacco smoke exposure inside the home among women

A total of 2585 women reported on smoking rules in their homes (Table 1). Of these, 22.8% (n = 589) said smoking was allowed in their homes: 85.8% (n = 488) on a daily versus 14.2% (n = 81) on a nondaily basis (results not shown).

Less than a quarter of Qatari women (22.3%) and non-Qatari women (23.8%) reported that tobacco smoking was allowed in their homes (Table 2). Among women aged 18– 24 years, 25.3% allowed smoking inside the home, which was higher than in other age groups. Tobacco smoking was allowed in the home by 25.8% of women with secondary or less education; 23.4% of married women; 27.8% of women with monthly income of 5000–10 000 QR; 51.8% of women who were current tobacco users; 38.5% of women who reported having a smoker in the home; 24.4% of women with health problems; and 22.0% of women who thought that breathing other people's tobacco smoke caused illness in nonsmokers. Smoking was allowed in the home by 22.2% of women who thought that banning sales of tobacco to individuals aged

ble 1 Second-hand tobacco smoking rules inside the home, workplace/university, and cafes/restaurants according to gender							
	Total	Male	Female				
	n (% of total)	n (%)	n (%)				
What best describes the rules inside your home?	6307 (100)	3722 (41.8)	2585 (58.2)				
Allowed	1219 (19.3)	630 (16.9)	589 (22.8)				
Not allowed	5088 (80.7)	3092 (83.1)	1996 (77.2)				
What best describes the rules inside the workplace/university?	6244 (100)	3687 (59.0)	2557 (41.0)				
Allowed	196 (3.1)	12 (3.3)	76 (3.0)				
Not allowed	2589 (41.5)	1527 (41.4)	1062 (41.5)				
Designated areas	3459 (55.4)	2040 (55.3)	1419 (55.5)				
What best describes the rules inside the cafes/restaurants?	6225 (100)	3665 (58.9)	2560 (41.1)				
Allowed	204 (3.3)	128 (3.5)	76 (3.0)				
Not allowed	2425 (39.0)	1497 (40.8)	928 (36.3)				
Designated areas	3596 (57.8)	2040 (55.7)	1556 (60.8)				

< 18 years was important; 21.5% of women who supported smoking bans in workplaces, 21.1% of women who supported smoking bans in restaurants; 21.3% of women who supported raising the price of tobacco products; and 20.5% of women who thought that increasing the price of tobacco products would reduce consumption.

Multivariable logistic regression

Multiple logistic regression was performed to assess the impact of 10 significant variables identified in the bivariate analysis on the likelihood that women would allow smoking/second-hand smoke in the home (Table 3). The full model was found to be statistically significant, $\chi 2$ (9, N = 2139) = 82.75, P < 0.001, -2LL = 1721.44, and explained 35.5% (Nagelkerke pseudo-R2) of the variance in allowing smoking/second-hand smoke in the home (results not shown).

Only 4 of the independent variables made a significant contribution to the model. The strongest predictor for allowing tobacco smoking and second-hand tobacco smoke in the home was having a member of the household who was currently using tobacco products [adjusted odds ratio (AOR) 25.68; 95% confidence interval (CI) 16.56-39.82]. The next strongest predictor was if the female participant was herself a tobacco user (AOR 4.26; 95% CI 2.85-6.35). However, women who thought that increasing the price of tobacco products would reduce consumption were less likely to allow smoking in the home (AOR 0.71; 95% CI 0.54-0.92). Women who thought banning tobacco sales to minors was important were less likely to allow smoking in the home (AOR 0.60; 95% CI 0.35-1.0), with borderline significance compared with those who disagreed. Among female tobacco users, having a smoker in the household was a risk factor for allowing smoking and second-hand tobacco smoke in the home (AOR 10.37; 95% CI 5.10-21.10). However, those who supported banning tobacco in restaurants were less likely to allow smoking in the home (AOR 0.52; 95% CI 0.27–1.0). Female nonusers of tobacco living with a smoker and who supported banning tobacco sales to minors were less likely to allow smoking in the home (AOR 0.51; 95% CI 0.29–0.90).

Discussion

Tobacco use among women in Qatar is currently lower than global (20%) and regional rates (up to 30%) (9). In a previous population-based study, we found that tobacco use was significantly lower among Qatari women (3.0%) than non-Qatari women (19.7%) (6). Similar to GATS 2013, the proportion of tobacco use was almost 7 times less among Qatari than non-Qatari women (0.6% vs 4.6%) (10).

In Qatar, tobacco use by women had low social acceptability and stigma (7). Shisha smoking among women is more socially acceptable than tobacco smoking, and is a potential gateway for tobacco use (9,12,13). The low prevalence of tobacco use among Qatari women is likely associated with the dominant cultural norm that can be preserved and even strengthened through additional public awareness interventions. For instance, healthcare professionals can play a crucial role in increasing awareness among communities about the health risks of tobacco smoking, encouraging them to quit, or discouraging them from starting (14). A recent study found that healthcare workers in Qatar were promoting a culture that contributed to adopting nonsmoking behaviour by providing tobacco counselling and cessation interventions (15).

This study is the first to explore second-hand tobacco smoke exposure at the community level in Qatar. We found that 19.3% of adults were exposed to tobacco smoke at home. This was higher than the GATS results (16.8%) (10), but lower than worldwide exposure to second-hand smoke among female nonsmokers (35%) (16,17), as well as being lower than in other studies conducted in the region (18–20).

Understanding the factors that allow tobacco use indoors will help inform the development of tailored primary prevention interventions that take into consideration the unique gender-specific motivations

NoncontributionNoncontributi		V	All women		Woman is	Woman is active tobacco user	o user		Mo	man is no	Woman is not tobacco user		
New New <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>Smo</th> <th>oker in family</th> <th>7</th> <th>No sm</th> <th>oker in fami</th> <th>ly .</th>								Smo	oker in family	7	No sm	oker in fami	ly .
Operative contraction $\mathbf{n}(\mathbf{c})$ $$	House rules for smoking	Never allowed	Allowed	P value	Never allowed	Allowed	P value	Never allowed	Allowed	P value	Never allowed	Allowed	P value
math 106 (71.3) 590 (21.8) 116 (31.9) <th>Demographic characteristics</th> <th>u (%)</th> <th>n (%)</th> <th></th> <th>u (%)</th> <th>n (%)</th> <th></th> <th>n (%)</th> <th>u (%)</th> <th></th> <th>n (%)</th> <th>u (%)</th> <th></th>	Demographic characteristics	u (%)	n (%)		u (%)	n (%)		n (%)	u (%)		n (%)	u (%)	
anity is a first a start of the st		1996 (77.2)	589 (22.8)		121 (48.2)	130 (51.8)		821 (64.3)	431 (35.7)		1002 (97.4)	17 (2.6)	
Initial $137/73$ $34/433$ $34/433$ $34/433$ $34/433$ $34/433$ $34/433$ $34/363$ 4103 110333 110333 110333	Nationality												
orditation 126 (36) 34 (35) 34 (35) 126 (36) 126 (35) <td>Qatari</td> <td>1237 (77.7)</td> <td>354 (22.3)</td> <td>0.361</td> <td>27 (54.0)</td> <td>23 (46.0)</td> <td>0.358</td> <td>607 (66.1)</td> <td>311 (33.9)</td> <td>0.436</td> <td>563 (98.1)</td> <td>11 (1.9)</td> <td>0.500</td>	Qatari	1237 (77.7)	354 (22.3)	0.361	27 (54.0)	23 (46.0)	0.358	607 (66.1)	311 (33.9)	0.436	563 (98.1)	11 (1.9)	0.500
444576 37 11 51 0.17 56 0.16 256 100 100 0 0 44 20 200 <td>Non-Qatari</td> <td>749 (76.2)</td> <td>234 (23.8)</td> <td></td> <td>93 (46.7)</td> <td>106 (53.3)</td> <td></td> <td>211 (63.7)</td> <td>120 (36.3)</td> <td></td> <td>433 (98.6)</td> <td>6 (1.4)</td> <td></td>	Non-Qatari	749 (76.2)	234 (23.8)		93 (46.7)	106 (53.3)		211 (63.7)	120 (36.3)		433 (98.6)	6 (1.4)	
$37 (\pi_1)$ $31 (\pi_3)$ $31 (\pi_3)$ $31 (\pi_3)$ $31 (\pi_3)$ $32 (\pi_3)$ $31 (\pi$	Age												
670 (710) 200 (320) 47 (470) 53 (530) 45 (330) 47 (320) 337 (320) 337 (320) 337 (320) 337 (320) 337 (320) 337 (320) 337 (320) 337 (320) 3170 3370 3170 3270 3170 3770 <td>18-24</td> <td>387 (74.7)</td> <td>131 (25.3)</td> <td>0.177</td> <td>35 (57.4)</td> <td>26 (42.6)</td> <td>0.266</td> <td>139 (57.7)</td> <td>102 (42.3)</td> <td>0.015</td> <td>209 (100.0)</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.083</td>	18-24	387 (74.7)	131 (25.3)	0.177	35 (57.4)	26 (42.6)	0.266	139 (57.7)	102 (42.3)	0.015	209 (100.0)	0	0.083
43. (79.0) 128 (210) 24 (71) 27 (52.9) 23 (95.4) 23 (97.1) 73 (70.9) 23 (97.1) 73 (70.9) lest $47 (3.0)$ $7 (3.0)$ <	25-34	670 (77.0)	200 (23.0)		47 (47.0)	53 (53.0)		285 (66.7)	142 (33.3)		323 (98.8)	4 (1.2)	
less 47 (9a) 7 (9a) 57 (7a) 37 (7a) 116833 11633 11633	35-44	482 (79.0)	128 (21.0)		24 (47.1)	27 (52.9)		213 (69.6)	93 (30.4)		237 (97.1)	7 (2.9)	
Intersection 414 (74.2) 144 (55.8) 0.76 16 (40.9) 26 (59.4) 0.373 101 (57.3) 0.371 103 (68.5) $1(1,1)$ 3300 (77.6) 377 (24.3) 23 (56.3) 23 (56.3) 23 (56.3) 27 (73.3) 63 (68.3) 101 (7) 864 (77.6) 377 (32.3) 64 (95.3) 23 (56.3) 23 (56.3) 23 (56.3) 23 (56.3) 27 (73.3) 63 (68.3) 101 (7) 917 (76.6) 32 (33.4) 32 (34.4) 64 (56.6) 23 (56.3) 21 (57.3) 21 (45+	200 (81.0)	47 (19.0)		5 (31.1)	11 (68.8)		78 (70.9)	32 (29.1)		111 (98.2)	2 (1.8)	
rlss 44 (74.3) 144 (53.8) 0.076 8 (40.9) 26 (50.3) 137 (52.4) 139 (98.5) 31 (31.3) 86 377 (22.4) 377 (22.4) 237 (52.4) 87 (93.3) 137 (93.3) 110 (71.3) 126 (93.3) 110 (71.3) 126 (93.3) 110 (71.3) 126 (93.3) 110 (71.3) 126 (93.3) 110 (71.3) 126 (93.3) 110 (71.3) 126 (93.3) 110 (71.3) 126 (93.3) 110 (71.3) 126 (93.3) 110 (71.3) 126 (93.3) 110 (71.3) 120 (71.3)	Education												
1300 (776) 377 (2.24) 79 (49.1) 82 (5.03) 55 (6.05) 57 (12.34) 63 (6.03) 177 (3.1) 63 (6.03) 11 (17) 255 (80.5) 64 (1770) 258 (3.05) 64 (1770) 258 (3.03) 18 (4.39) 9 (6.27) 19 (17) 167 (9.82) 10 (17) 910 (766) 392 (3.34) 0.024 58 (4.96) 59 (5.04) 0.015 320 (3.26) 19 (17) 167 (9.8) 10 (13) 910 (766) 392 (3.34) 0.013 29 (5.04) 64 (5.05) 10 (17,4) 0.08 47 (90) 10 (13) 910 (766) 392 (3.34) 0.013 29 (5.04) 64 (5.01) 2.00 (3.01) 16 (5.02) 10 (13) 10 (13) 910 (760) 392 (3.34) 0.013 24 (5.1) 0.015 10 (13) 10 (13) 10 (13) 910 (710) 25 (3.30) 10 (3.31) 10 (4.31) 10 (4.31) 10 (4.31) 10 (6.32) 10 (13) 910 (710) 10 (71) 10 (71) 10 (71) 10 (71) 10 (71) 10 (71) 10 (71)	Secondary or less	414 (74.2)	144 (25.8)	0.076	18 (40.9)	26 (59.1)	0.373	191 (62.8)	113 (37.2)	0.371	193 (98.5)	3 (1.5)	0.983
e $265 (80.5)$ $64 (95)$ $23 (54.1)$ $18 (43.9)$ $69 (62.7)$ $167 (93.2)$ $167 (93.2)$ $3 (15)$ parated/divorced $258 (47.0)$ $258 (32.3)$ 0.204 $58 (47.6)$ $59 (32.3)$ $107 (93.2)$ $107 (93.2)$ $3 (16)$ parated/divorced $123 (33.1)$ $257 (32.3)$ 0.204 $58 (456)$ $61 (56)$ $10 (57)$ $10 (79)$ 11.3 u.OR $123 (33.1)$ $257 (32.3)$ $20 (43.3)$ $20 (52.3)$ $10 (57)$ $10 (57)$ $10 (57)$ $10 (57)$ $10 (56)$	University	1309 (77.6)	377 (22.4)		79 (49.1)	82 (50.9)		558 (66.8)	277 (33.2)		638 (98.3)	11 (1.7)	
B64 (7)0 58 (3,3) 0.24 58 (4)6) 59 (30,4) 0.165 320 (3,3) 12 (9,4) $3(0.6)$ paratel/divorced 123 (3,3) 22 (3,3) 22 (3,3) 220 (3,3) 220 (3,3) 45 (975) 12 (35) t_{\bullet} (Minored 123 (3,3) 22 (4,3) 64 (5/3) 50 (3,3) 56 (3,3) 56 (3,3) $1(1.8)$ t_{\bullet} (Minored 123 (3,3) 25 (13.2) 91 (3,6) 12 (3,6) 132 (3,6) 132 (3,6) 12 (3,6)	Postgraduate	265 (80.5)	64 (19.5)		23 (56.1)	18 (43.9)		69 (62.7)	41 (37.3)		167 (98.2)	3 (1.8)	
864(770) $258(320)$ 0.204 $58(496)$ $59(76)$ $528(32)$ 0.208 $59(33)$ $12(694)$ $3(6)$ $3(6)$ $991(766)$ $302(324)$ $304(374)$ $64(56)$ $5(33)$ $12(697)$ $45(97)$ $3(6)$ $113(83)$ $25(169)$ $32(34)$ $64(56)$ $5(33)$ $12(657)$ $50(73)$ $45(97)$ $45(97)$ $3(60)$ $245(76)$ $75(34)$ 0013 $20(69)$ $22(43)$ 0.427 $71(587)$ $60(43)$ $71(30)$ $72(30)$ $7(20)$ $255(72.2)$ $98(738)$ 0013 $20(64)$ $22(43)$ $22(41)$ $71(350)$ $71(30)$ $7(20)$ $721(76.2)$ $225(32)$ $9(30)$ $16(64,0)$ $2(66,7)$ $2(66,7)$ $2(66,7)$ $7(20)$ $7(20)$ $721(76.2)$ $22(31,8)$ $7(446)$ $46(57,4)$ $2(66,7)$ $7(20)$ $7(20)$ $7(20)$ $721(76.2)$ $116(82.2)$ $116(82.2)$ $116(64,0)$ $2(66,7)$ $2(66,7)$ <td>Marital status</td> <td></td>	Marital status												
	Single	864 (77.0)	258 (23.0)	0.204	58 (49.6)	59 (50.4)	0.165	320 (62.6)	191 (37.4)	0.108	472 (99.4)	3 (0.6)	0.066
ciditanced 123 (83.1) 25 (16.9) 12 (66.7) 6 (33.3) 50 (73.5) 18 (26.5) 56 (98.2) 1 (1.8) 245 (76.6) 75 (23.4) 0.013 29 (56.9) 22 (43.1) 0.427 71 (58.7) 50 (41.3) 0.018 143 (100) 0 255 (72.2) 98 (77.8) 26 (44.8) 25 (53.2) 91 (58.7) 64 (41.3) 37 (44.6) 71 (53.0) 17 (50.0) 17 (50.0) 10 (7) 721 (76.2) 255 (72.2) 98 (77.8) 26 (44.8) 25 (53.2) 91 (59.0) 17 (50.0) 70 (99.2) 10 (7) 721 (76.2) 25 (72.8) 31 (47.6) 26 (44.8) 32 (55.2) 26 (41.3) 34 (98.0) 7(2.0) 721 (76.2) 29 (99.0) 11 (56.0) 17 (35.0) 26 (41.3) 26 (72.2) 34 (98.0) 7(2.0) 146 (82.4) 31 (65.0) 16 (64.0) 2.6 (72.0) 26 (72.0) 26 (72.0) 79 (95.2) 79 (95.2) 1(4.8) 146 (82.4) 31 (65.0) 12 (62.3) 26 (72.0) 26 (72.0) 27 (93.6)	Married	991 (76.6)	302 (23.4)		49 (43.4)	64 (56.6)		446 (67.0)	220 (33.0)		465 (97.5)	12 (2.5)	
245 (76.6) $75 (33.4)$ 0.013 $29 (56.9)$ $22 (43.1)$ 0.427 $71 (58.7)$ $50 (41.3)$ $143 (100)$ 0 $255 (72.2)$ $98 (27.8)$ $26 (44.8)$ $32 (55.2)$ $91 (58.7)$ $50 (41.3)$ $135 (99.3)$ $1(07)$ $721 (76.2)$ $98 (27.8)$ $91 (58.4)$ $318 (55.0)$ $71 (35.0)$ $347 (98.0)$ $7(2.0)$ $721 (76.2)$ $29 (39.0)$ $9 (36.0)$ $16 (64.0)$ $20 (72.2)$ $80 (28.0)$ $347 (98.0)$ $7(2.0)$ $422 (81.0)$ $99 (39.0)$ $37 (44.6)$ $46 (55.4)$ $20 (72.0)$ $80 (28.0)$ $171 (35.0)$ $347 (98.0)$ $7(2.0)$ $422 (81.0)$ $91 (75.2)$ $318 (55.0)$ $171 (35.0)$ $80 (28.0)$ $170 (95.2)$ $100 (7.0)$ $146 (82.2)$ $31 (75.2)$ $80 (28.0)$ $31 (75.2)$ $26 (72.0)$ $80 (28.0)$ $7(2.0)$ $121 (48.2)$ $130 (51.8)$ $60 (01)$ $2 (70.2)$ $25 (29.8)$ $79 (55.2)$ $4(4.8)$ $183 (80.5)$ $451 (95.5)$ 40	Widowed/separated/divorced	123 (83.1)	25 (16.9)		12 (66.7)	6 (33.3)		50 (73.5)	18 (26.5)		56 (98.2)	1 (1.8)	
245 (76.6) 75 (33.4) 0.013 29 (56.9) 22 (43.1) 0.427 71 (58.7) 50 (41.3) 0.018 143 (100) 0 255 (72.2) 98 (27.8) 26 (44.8) 32 (55.2) 91 (58.7) 64 (41.3) 135 (99.3) 1(0.7) 721 (76.2) 225 (23.8) 37 (44.6) 46 (55.4) 318 (65.0) 171 (35.0) 347 (98.0) 7(2.0) 422 (81.0) 99 (90.0) 37 (44.6) 46 (55.4) 206 (72.0) 80 (28.0) 197 (95.5) 100.7) 145 (82.5) 31 (17.5) 31 (17.5) 21 (40.0) 206 (72.0) 80 (28.0) 7(2.0) 146 (82.5) 31 (17.5) 21 (40.0) 206 (72.0) 80 (28.0) 7(2.0) 121 (48.2) 130 (51.8) (0.001 2 240.0) 26 (72.0) 26 (72.0) 7(2.0) 7(2.0) 121 (48.2) 451 (19.5) (10.6) 2 206 (72.0) 26 (72.0) 7(2.0) 7(2.0) 7(2.0) 121 (48.2) 451 (19.5) (10.5) 2.6 7(2.0) 2.6 (72.0)	Monthly income, QR												
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	0-5000	245 (76.6)	75 (23.4)	0.013	29 (56.9)	22 (43.1)	0.427	71 (58.7)	50 (41.3)	0.018	143 (100)	0	0.024
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	5000-10000	255 (72.2)	98 (27.8)		26 (44.8)	32 (55.2)		91 (58.7)	64 (41.3)		135 (99.3)	1 (0.7)	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	10000-25000	721 (76.2)	225 (23.8)		37 (44.6)	46 (55.4)		318 (65.0)	171 (35.0)		347 (98.0)	7 (2.0)	
146 (82.5) 31 (175) 3 (60.0) 2 (40.0) 2 (40.0) 59 (70.2) 25 (29.8) 79 (95.2) 4 (4.8) 121 (48.2) 130 (51.8) <0.001	25000-40000	422 (81.0)	(0.61) 66		9 (36.0)	16 (64.0)		206 (72.0)	80 (28.0)		197 (99.5)	1 (0.5)	
121 (48.2) 130 (51.8) <0.001	>40000	146 (82.5)	31 (17.5)		3 (60.0)	2 (40.0)		59 (70.2)	25 (29.8)		79 (95.2)	4 (4.8)	
121 (48.2) 130 (51.8) <0.001	Tobacco user												
1859 (80.5) 451 (19.5) -	Current user	121 (48.2)	130 (51.8)	<0.001	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
883 (61.5) 553 (38.5) <0.001 57 (33.3) 114 (66.7) <0.001	Nonuser	1859 (80.5)	451 (19.5)		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
883 (61.5) 553 (38.5) <0.001 57 (33.3) 114 (66.7) <0.001	Smoker at home ^a										I	I	I
1073 (97.4) 29 (2.6) 62 (83.8) 12 (16.2)	Yes	883 (61.5)	553 (38.5)	<0.001	57 (33.3)	114 (66.7)	<0.001	I	I	I	I	I	I
	No	1073 (97.4)	29 (2.6)		62 (83.8)	12 (16.2)		1	1	I	1	1	I

Research article

	ł	All women		Woman is	Woman is active tobacco user	co user		Won	nan is not	Woman is not tobacco user		
							Sm	Smoker in family		No sn	No smoker in family	ly
House rules for smoking	Never allowed	Allowed	P value	Never allowed	Allowed	P value	Never allowed	Allowed	P value	Never allowed	Allowed	P value
Demographic characteristics	n (%)	n (%)		n (%)	u (%)		u (%)	n (%)		n (%)	n (%)	
Health problems												
Yes	682 (75.6)	220 (24.4)	0.150	36 (51.4)	34 (48.6)	0.533	453 (67.0)	223 (33.0%)	0.212	615 (98.4)	10 (1.6)	0.488
No	1170 (78.2)	327 (21.8)		78 (47.0)	88 (53.0)		304 (63.5)	175 (36.5%)		326 (97.9)	7 (2.1)	
Breathing other people's smoke cause illnesses in nonsmokers												
Yes	1750 (78.0)	495 (22.0)	0.005	98 (49.0)	102 (51.0)	0.259	723 (66.3)	367 (33.7)	0.146	891 (98.2)	16 (1.8)	0.707
No	178 (70.1)	76 (29.9)		17 (39.5)	26 (60.5)		71 (59.7)	48 (40.3)		82 (98.8)	1 (1.2)	
Banning the sales of tobacco to individuals aged < 18 years												
Yes	1833 (77.8)	522 (22.2)	0.003	109 (48.2)	117 (51.8)	0.637	760 (66.5)	382 (33.5)	0.036	921 (98.4)	15 (1.6)	0.237
No	101 (67.3)	49 (32.7)		9 (42.9)	12 (57.1)		38 (54.3)	32 (45.7)		51 (96.2)	2 (3.8)	
Banning smoking in the workplace												
Yes	1765 (78.2)	493 (21.8)	0.008	92 (50.0)	92 (50.0)	0.418	731 (65.9)	379 (34.1)	0.922	899 (98.6)	13 (1.4)	0.021
No	174 (70.7)	72 (29.3)		25 (43.9)	32 (56.1)		67 (66.3)	34 (33.7)		78 (95.1)	4 (4.9)	
Banning smoking in the restaurants												
Yes	1766 (78.9)	473 (21.1)	<0.001	81 (55.9)	64 (44.1)	0.002	732 (65.6)	384 (34.4)	0.831	910 (98.4)	15 (1.6)	0.406
No	169 (63.1)	99 (36.9)		36 (36.0)	64 (64.0)		64 (66.7)	32 (33.3)		65 (97.0)	2 (3.0)	
Raising the price of tobacco products												
Yes	1725 (78.7)	467 (21.3)	<0.001	74 (53.2)	65 (46.8)	0.071	720 (65.5)	379 (34.5)	0.918	890 (98.3)	15 (1.7)	0.602
No	196 (65.6)	103 (34.4)		45 (41.7)	63 (58.3)		65 (65.0)	35 (35.0)		80 (97.6)	2 (2.4)	
Raising the price reduces consumption												
Yes	1378 (79.5)	355 (20.5)	<0.001	61 (51.7)	57 (48.3)	0.234	562 (67.0)	277 (33.0)	0.088	722 (98.0)	15 (2.0)	0.203
No	537 (71.3)	216 (28.7)		56 (44.1)	71 (55.9)		224 (61.9)	138 (38.1)		244 (99.2)	2 (0.8)	

Research article

	All women		Woman is active user	tobacco	Woman is not toba	icco user
Characteristics					Smoker in far	nily
	Allowed smoking inside the home AOR (95% CI)	P value	Allowed smoking inside the home AOR (95% CI)	P value	Allowed smoking inside the home AOR (95% CI)	P value
Age, yr						
18-24	-	_	-	_	1.00 (Ref)	_
25-34	-	_	-	_	0.74 (0.51–1.09)	0.132
35-44	-	_	-	_	0.71 (0.46–1.01)	0.123
≥45	-	-	-	-	0.67 (0.38-1.18)	0.162
Monthly income, QR						
0-5000	1.00 (Ref)	-	-	_	1.00 (Ref)	_
5000-10 000	1.13 (0.73–1.76)	0.583	-	_	1.16 (0.67–2.0)	0.595
10 000-25 000	1.05 (0.72–1.53)	0.790	-	_	1.08 (0.67–1.75)	0.743
25 000-40 000	0.74 (0.49–1.13)	0.162	-	_	0.85 (0.50–1.46)	0.558
>40 000	0.86 (0.49–1.51)	0.595	-	_	0.97 (0.47–1.98)	0.930
Tobacco user						
Nonuser	1.00 (Ref)	-	-	_	_	_
Tobacco user	4.26 (2.85-6.35)	<0.001	-	_	-	_
Smoker at home						
None	1.00 (Ref)	_	1.00 (Ref)	_	_	_
Living with a smoker	25.68 (16.56-39.82)	<0.001	10.37 (5.10–21.10)	<0.001	-	_
Banning tobacco sales to minors is important						
No	1.00 (Ref)	_	-	_	1.00 (Ref)	_
Yes	0.60 (0.35-1.0)	0.052	-	_	0.51 (0.29–0.90)	0.020
Support banning tobacco in workplace						
No	1.00 (Ref)	_	-	_	_	_
Yes	1.07 (0.67–1.71)	0.790	-	_	-	_
Support banning tobacco in restaurants						
No	1.00 (Ref)	_	1.00 (Ref)	_	-	_
Yes	0.86 (0.54–1.38)	0.525	0.52 (0.27-1.0)	0.050	-	_
Increase price of tobacco prices reduces consumption						
No	1 (Ref)	_	-	_	-	_
Yes	0.71 (0.54–0.92)	0.009	-	_	-	_
Support raising tobacco products prices						
No	1.00 (Ref)	_	1.00 (Ref)	_	_	_
Yes	1.16 (0.76–1.76)	0.500	0.75 (0.39–1.43)	0.384	_	_
Breathing other people's smoke causes illness in nonsmokers						
No	1.00 (Ref)	_	-	_	-	-
Yes	0.72 (0.50-1.05)	0.087	-	_	_	_

Table 3 Multivariable logistic regression for allowing smoking inside the home according to women's demographic characteristics (n = 2139)

AOR = adjusted odds ratio; CI = confidence interval.

associated with allowing or prohibiting tobacco use inside the home (21). The strongest predictors of secondhand smoke in the home were having a member of the household who uses tobacco products, and if the women themselves were tobacco users, as reported in other studies (17,22,23). While this may seem intuitive, in a setting where research on smoking behaviour is nascent, it is important to be able to document smokers who are smoking in their homes and outside. Although only 22.8% of women reported that smoking was allowed in the home, 85.8% reported potential daily exposure to second-hand tobacco smoke in their homes. This reflected suboptimal efforts to enforce smoking rules and maintain a smokefree environment in the home, and/or that women did not have the power to negotiate smoke-free spaces, even within their own homes.

Designated smoking areas, which are not in line with smoke-free environments described in WHO FCTC Article 8, are a potential source of second-hand tobacco smoke, because the smoke spreads widely, both vertically and horizontally, from the designated area (24). Therefore, designated smoking areas do not provide effective protection from second-hand tobacco smoke and should not be allowed. GATS 2013 showed that 12.0% of adults who worked indoors were exposed to secondhand tobacco smoke in the workplace (10). We found that only 3.1% of adults reported that smoking was allowed in the workplace/university and 41.5% reported that smoking was not allowed, but 55.4% reported smoking in designated areas only. GATS 2013 reported that 25.9% of adults were exposed to second-hand tobacco smoke in restaurants (10), whereas we found that only 3.3% reported that smoking was allowed in restaurants but 57.8% reported that it was allowed in designated areas. There remains an urgent need for comprehensive tobacco use and second-hand tobacco smoke exposure monitoring at the national level, as recommended by WHO FCTC (25).

A lot of national tobacco control legislation has been enacted recently in Qatar, but our findings indicated that laws aimed at establishing smoke-free environments in public places may not have been effectively implemented and enforced. An example is Law no. 10 of 2016 on the control of tobacco and its derivatives in Qatar (26), which outlines the prohibition of smoking in enclosed public spaces. Other measures include a smoking ban in vehicles with children under the age of 18 years, large fines if an individual is caught smoking in an enclosed public space, and licence cancellation for cafes. The Tobacco Control Center has been providing tobacco cessation services over the telephone, including in-depth counselling, treatment planning, follow-up sessions, and psychological support for behaviour modification (27). Strengthened tobacco control has also formed part of Qatar's strong measures to contain the spread of COVID-19. Shisha smoking has been prohibited since the beginning of the pandemic. Although shisha smoking is perceived as lower risk than cigarette smoking, elevated levels of particulate pollution were found in the waterpipe cafes in Doha, Qatar, endangering air quality and public health (28). This highlights the importance of continuing to monitor shisha smoking trends and increasing awareness of its harmful health effects and subsequent exposure to second-hand tobacco smoke.

In this study, supporting an increase in the price of tobacco was predictive of not allowing smoking in the home. Female tobacco users supporting a tobacco ban in restaurants, and nonusers living with a smoker, and who were concerned about selling tobacco to minors, were also less likely to allow smoking in the home. Importantly, these findings relate to attitudes and perceptions toward tobacco control that may effectively influence smokingrelated behaviour (29). This emphasizes the need for strengthening health-related knowledge and planning effective health education programmes in family settings. The Government of Qatar should continue to take effective measures to change attitudes to smoking by promoting and enacting smoke-free legislation, to change social norms towards nonsmoking, so that second-hand tobacco smoke in the home and other smoking-related behaviours are not allowed (30).

Unlike other Gulf Cooperation Council countries, the economic cost of smoking and second-hand tobacco smoke in Qatar is estimated to be low (4, 20). There is no projected increase in tobacco use across Qatar or expansion of tobacco-related activities (such as tobacco sponsorship of sporting events), and within the FCTC framework, Qatar has committed to adopting effective measures for tobacco control (6, 10). However, our findings highlight the need for additional education and preventive programmes to emphasize the importance of maintaining a smoke-free home environment. In Qatar, antitobacco education and awareness are still not included as an integral part of the curriculum in schools and colleges. The Tobacco Control Center is predominantly responsible for the provision of smoking cessation services and raising public awareness of the dangers of tobacco use, to prevent its uptake among adolescents, particularly young women. The Center also discourages indoor smoking and exposure to second-hand tobacco smoke, because starting smoking disproportionately affects the health of women and children. Currently, the COVID-19 pandemic has accelerated the shift of these antitobacco health promotion activities online and on social media.

Further research is needed to understand the role that awareness, decision-making, self-efficacy, empowerment, and social status play in women's ability to limit their exposure and that of other household members to second-hand tobacco smoke (17). Our finding that 25.3% of women aged 18–24 years reported that smoking was allowed in the home highlights the opportunity to focus on prevention of tobacco-related illnesses among women of reproductive age and their unborn children. Integration of tobacco control programmes that focus on second-hand tobacco smoke into Qatar's maternal and child health programme could be a cost-effective strategy to educate women about the dangers of tobacco use and benefits of quitting.

Increased levels of awareness of the health risks, increased exposure to antitobacco messaging, and increased surveillance could lead to a significant increase in the adoption of household smoking bans, especially among households with no smokers (*31, 32*). Greater adoption of smoking bans could potentially influence the community and change acceptance of tobacco use and second-hand tobacco smoke exposure (*25*). There is clearly a need for education on the risks of all forms of tobacco use, bans on tobacco advertising, protection against second-hand tobacco smoke, and increased support for quitting. It is also important to empower women to take

a leading role in tobacco control, and to encourage men to take greater responsibility in protecting women and children from their personal tobacco use.

The current study adds to an emerging body of evidence on female second-hand tobacco smoke exposure in Qatar. A strength of this study was the use of data from a representative sample based on a systematic sampling technique with a large sample size using a modified version of a standardized and validated questionnaire. The limitations of our study were mainly related to the self-reported nature of the data collected because this may have underestimated smoking prevalence (33). However, the reliability of the self-report of second-hand smoke exposure was strengthened by use of a self-administered survey to assure privacy and confidentiality because sensitive issues to the local Qatari context were discussed (34). Other limitations were the cross-sectional design and lack of data from nonresponders. However, these limitations were counterbalanced by the methodological advantages.

Conclusions

Our findings make an important contribution to the current understanding of second-hand tobacco smoke exposure in Qatar. While the reported prevalence of second-hand tobacco smoke in the home was low (22.8%), the current rate of exposure represents an increased risk for women and children. Living with a tobacco user and being a tobacco user were associated with second-hand tobacco smoke exposure in the home environment. These findings could be helpful in guiding the development of contextualized sex-specific primary prevention and tobacco control interventions to promote tobacco-smoke-free homes. This is a useful starting point for understanding tobacco-related behaviour and decision-making among women in Qatar, and could help to control exposure to tobacco in Qatar and beyond.

Acknowledgement

We thank the Medical Research Center in Hamad Medical Corporation in Qatar for funding this research (MRC-Routine grant 01-17-073). We would like to thank Ross MacDonald, Librarian, Scholarly Contributions, Distributed eLibrary, Weill Cornell Medicine—Qatar for his editing services. The findings achieved herein are solely the responsibility of the authors.

Funding: This work was supported by the Medical Research Center in Hamad Medical Corporation Doha-Qatar (MRC-Routine grant 01-17-073).

Competing interests: None declared.

Exposition à la fumée secondaire de cigarette au Qatar : résultats d'une étude en population

Résumé

Contexte : La consommation de tabac chez les femmes au Qatar est actuellement faible. Cependant, le risque d'exposition à la fumée secondaire de cigarette parmi elles est une préoccupation urgente en raison de la forte prévalence du tabagisme chez les hommes.

Objectifs : Décrire la prévalence et les facteurs de risque du tabagisme passif dans les foyers et dans les lieux de travail, les écoles, les cafés et les restaurants au Qatar.

Méthodes : Nous avons analysé les données d'une enquête démographique portant sur 7921 adultes âgés de 18 ans et plus, réalisée au Qatar entre mars et décembre 2019. L'étude a utilisé la sélection en grappes à plusieurs niveaux et comprenait des employés du gouvernement et des étudiants universitaires.

Résultats : Parmi les participants, 19,3 % (n = 1219) ont déclaré qu'il était permis de fumer dans leur foyer, 3,1 % (n = 196) ont indiqué qu'il était permis de fumer sur le lieu de travail ou à l'école, et 3,3 % (n = 204) ont dit qu'il était permis de fumer dans les cafés et les restaurants. Parmi les femmes, 22,8 % (n = 589) autorisaient la consommation de tabac dans leur foyer, dont 51,8 % (n = 130) des fumeuses et 38,5 % (n = 553) de celles qui vivaient avec une personne consommant du tabac. Le fait de vivre avec une personne qui fumait et de consommer du tabac permettait de prédire de manière significative la probabilité d'exposition à la fumée secondaire dans le foyer.

Conclusion : L'exposition à la fumée secondaire dans les foyers est une préoccupation de santé pour les femmes et les enfants au Qatar. La présente étude fournit des données de référence pour les politiques et les programmes de lutte antitabac, notamment en ce qui concerne la promotion d'environnements domestiques sans tabac.

التعرض لدخان السجائر غير المباشر في قطر: نتائج دراسة سكانية

أحمد الملا، سيلفا قيومجيان، باتريك ميزونوف، سهيلة شيها، رافيندرمامتاني

الخلاصة

الخلفية: تعاطي التبغ بين النساء في قطر منخفض حاليًّا، ولكن خطر تعرُّضهن لدخان السجائر غير المباشر يمثِّل شاغلًا ملحًا بسبب الانتشار الكبير لتعاطي التبغ بين الرجال.

الأهداف: هدفت هذه الدراسة الى بيان معدل انتشار التعرض لدخان السجائر غير المباشر، وعوامل الخطر المرتبطة بذلك في المنازل وأماكن العمل والمدارس والمقاهي والمطاعم في قطر.

طرق البحث: حللنا بيانات من مسح سكاني شمل 7921 بالغًا لا تقل أعمارهم عن 18 عامًا، وأُجري في قطر في الفترة بين مارس / آذار وديسمبر / كانون الأول 2019. ولقد استخدمت الدراسة الأسلوب المتعدد المستويات لاختيار المجموعات من الموظفين الحكوميين وطلاب الجامعات.

النتائج: أفاد 19.3٪ (العدد = 121) من المشاركين، بأن التدخين مسموح به في منازلهم، وقال 3.1٪ (العدد = 196) إنه مسموح به في مكان العمل أو المدرسة، وقال 3.3٪ (العدد = 204) إنه مسموح به في المقاهي والمطاعم. ومن بين النساء، فإن 22.8٪ (العدد = 589) يسمحن بالتدخين داخل منازلهن، ومنهن 51.8٪ (العدد = 130) من متعاطيات التبغ، و 38.5٪ (العدد = 553) ممن يُقمن مع أشخاص يتعاطَون التبغ. ولقد لوحظ أن العيش مع متعاطي التبغ وتعاطي التبغ كانا عاملا تنبؤ مهمَّين باحتمال الإفادة بالتعرض للدخان غير المباشر في المنزل.

الاستنتاجات: التعرض لدخان السجائر غير المباشر في المنزل شاغل صحي للنساء والأطفال في قطر . وتوفر هذه الدراسة البيانات المرجعية لسياسات وبرامج مكافحة تعاطي التبغ، ولا سيها فيها يتعلق بالتشجيع على خلو المنازل من التدخين.

References

- 1. WHO report on the global tobacco epidemic 2019. Offer help to quit tobacco use. Geneva: World Health Organization, 2019 (https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789241516204, accessed 10 October 2022).
- 2. Tobacco [website]. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2021 (https://www.who.int/health-topics/tobacco#tab=tab_1, accessed 10 October 2022).
- 3. Women and health: today's evidence, tomorrow's agenda. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2009 (https://apps.who.int/iris/ handle/10665/44168, accessed 10 October 2022).
- 4. Koronaiou K, Al-Lawati JA, Sayed M, Alwadey AM, Alalawi EF, Almutawaa K, et al. Economic cost of smoking and secondhand smoke exposure in the Gulf Cooperation Council countries. Tob Control. 2020 Nov;30(6):680–6. https://doi.org/10.1136/tobacco-control-2020-055715 PMID:32817575
- 5. Viegi G, Maio S, Fasola S, Baldacci S. Global burden of chronic respiratory diseases. J Aerosol Med Pulm Drug Deliv. 2020 Aug;33(4):171–7. https://doi.org/10.1089/jamp.2019.1576 PMID:32423274
- AlMulla A, Mamtani R, Cheema S, Maisonneuve P, Abdullah BaSuhai J, Mahmoud G, et al. Epidemiology of tobacco use in Qatar: prevalence and its associated factors. PLoS One. 2021 Apr 15;16(4):e0250065-e. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0250065 PMID:33857248
- 7. A Al-Mulla, Bener A. Cigarette Smoking Habits among Qatari Population. Public Health Medicine. 2003;4(3):41-4.
- 8. Secondhand smoke (SHS) exposure facts [website]. Atlanta: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; 2021 (https://www.cdc. gov/tobacco/data_statistics/fact_sheets/secondhand_smoke/general_facts/index.htm, accessed 10 October 2022).
- 9. Women and tobacco use. Cairo: World Health Organization Regional Office for the Eastern Mediterranean; 2014 (http://apps. who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/204209/Fact_Sheet_TFI_2014_EN_15320.pdf;jsessionid=3EA3C45D14E349229CC42D-33524256F7?sequence=1, accessed 10 October 2022).
- 10. Global Adult Tobacco Adult Survey. Factsheet Qatar 2013 [website]. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2013 (https://www.who. int/publications/m/item/2013-gats-fact-sheet-qatar-arabic, accessed 10 October 2022).
- 11. WHO report on the global tobacco epidemic 2017. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2017 (https://apps.who.int/iris/hant dle/10665/255874, accessed 10 October 2022).
- 12. Dar-Odeh NS, Abu-Hammad OA. The changing trends in tobacco smoking for young Arab women; narghile, an old habit with a liberal attitude. Harm Reduct J. 2011;8:24. https://doi.org/10.1186/1477-7517-8-24
- 13. Alzyoud S, Kheirallah KA, Weglicki LS, Ward KD, Al-Khawaldeh A, Shotar A. Tobacco smoking status and perception of health among a sample of Jordanian students. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2014 Jul 11;11(7):7022-35. https://doi.org/10.3390/ ijerph110707022 PMID:25019264
- 14. Golechha M. Health promotion methods for smoking prevention and cessation: a comprehensive review of effectiveness and the way forward. Int J Prev Med. 2016 Jan;7:7. https://doi.org/10.4103/2008-7802.173797 PMID:26941908

- 15. AlMulla A, Kouyoumjian S, ElNakib N. Cross-sectional online survey to determine the prevalence, knowledge, attitude and practice of tobacco cessation among governmental healthcare workers in Qatar. BMJ Open. 2021 Apr 1;11(4):e044379. https://doi. org/10.1136/bmjopen-2020-044379 PMID:33795305
- 16. Oberg M, Jaakkola MS, Woodward A, Peruga A, Pruss-Ustun A. Worldwide burden of disease from exposure to second-hand smoke: a retrospective analysis of data from 192 countries. Lancet. 2011 Jan 8;377(9760):139–46. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(10)61388-8 PMID:21112082
- 17. Lin P-L, Huang H-L, Lu K-Y, Chen T, Lin W-T, Lee C-H, et al. Second-hand smoke exposure and the factors associated with avoidance behavior among the mothers of pre-school children: a school-based cross-sectional study. BMC Public Health. 2010;10(1):606. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-10-606
- Amin HS, Alomair AN, Alhammad AH, Altwijri FA, Altaweel AA, Alandejani TA. Tobacco consumption and environmental exposure among healthcare students in King Saud University in Riyadh. J Family Med Prim Care. 2020 Feb 28;9(2):657–63. https://doi.org/10.4103/jfmpc_1217_19 PMID:32318399
- 19. Weitzman M, Yusufali AH, Bali F, Vilcassim MJR, Gandhi S, Peltier R, et al. Effects of hookah smoking on indoor air quality in homes. Tob Control. 2016 Sep;26(5):586–91. https://doi.org/10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2016-053165 PMID:27798320
- 20. Alali WQ, Longenecker JC, Alwotyan R, AlKandari H, Al-Mulla F, Al Duwairi Q. Prevalence of smoking in the Kuwaiti adult population in 2014: a cross-sectional study. Environ Sci Pollut Res Int. 2021 Feb;28(8):10053–67. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-020-11464-x PMID:33161520
- 21. Jallow IK, Britton J, Langley T. Prevalence and factors associated with exposure to secondhand smoke (SHS) among young people: a cross-sectional study from the Gambia. BMJ Open. 2018 Mar 14;8(3):e019524. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2017-019524 PMID:29540414
- 22. Ghazali SM, Huey TC, Cheong KC, Li LH, Fadhli M, Yusoff M, et al. Prevalence and factors associated with secondhand smoke exposure among Malaysian adolescents. Tob Induc Dis. 2019 Mar 27;17:22. https://doi.org/10.18332/tid/102728 PMID:31582933
- 23. Phetphum C, Noosorn N. Prevalence of secondhand smoke exposure at home and associated factors among middle school students in Northern Thailand. Tob Induc Dis. 2020 Feb 18;18:11. https://doi.org/10.18332/tid/117733 PMID:32165877
- 24. Yamato H, Mori N, Horie R, Garcon L, Taniguchi M, Armada F. Designated smoking areas in streets where outdoor smoking is banned. Kobe J Med Sci. 2013 Jun 17;59(3):E93–105. PMID:24045218
- 25. Protection from exposure to second-hand tobacco smoke : policy recommendations. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2007 (https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/43677 accessed 10 October 2022).
- 26. Law No.10 of 2016 on the Control of Tobacco and its Derivatives. Qatar Ministry of Public Health; 2016 (https://www.tobaccocontrollaws.org/files/live/Qatar/Qatar%20-%20TC%20Law%202016.pdf, accessed 10 October 2022).
- 27. AlMulla A, Kouyoumjian SP. Telephone counseling and quitline service: An opportunity for tobacco use cessation during the COVID-19 pandemic. Qatar Med J. 2021 Aug 10;2021(2):25. https://doi.org/10.5339/qmj.2021.25 PMID:34405091
- 28. Al Mulla A, Fanous N, Seidenberg AB, Rees VW. Secondhand smoke emission levels in waterpipe cafes in Doha, Qatar. Tob Control. 2015 Oct;24(e3):e227-31. https://doi.org/10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2014-051717 PMID:25352562
- 29. Li Z, Yao Y, Han W, Yu Y, Liu Y, Tao Y, et al. Smoking prevalence and associated factors as well as attitudes and perceptions towards tobacco control in Northeast China. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2015 Jul 22;12(7):8606–18. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph120708606 PMID:26206569 PMCID: PMC4515736
- 30. Lim KH, Lim HL, Teh CH, Ghazali SM, Kee CC, Heng PP, et al. Is the implementation of smoke-free policies at workplaces associated with living in a smoke-free home?: Findings from a national population-based study in Malaysia. Tob Induc Dis. 2019 Jun 7;17:51. https://doi.org/10.18332/tid/100692 PMID:31516494
- 31. Dozier AM, Diaz S, Guido J, Quinones de Monegro Z, McIntosh S, Fisher SG, et al. Cohort study of smoke-free homes in economically disadvantaged communities in the Dominican Republic. Rev Panam Salud Publica. 2014 Jan;35(1):30–7. PMID:24626445
- 32. Almutairi KM. Prevalence of tobacco use and exposure to environmental tobacco smoke among Saudi Medical students in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. J Community Health. 2014 Aug;39(4):668–73. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10900-014-9900-4 PMID:24903238
- 33. Hwang JH, Kim JY, Lee DH, Jung HG, Park SW. Underestimation of self-reported smoking prevalence in Korean adolescents: evidence from gold standard by combined method. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2018 Apr 5;15(4):689. https://doi.org/10.3390/ ijerph15040689 PMID:29621167
- 34. Marcano Belisario JS, Jamsek J, Huckvale K, O'Donoghue J, Morrison CP, Car J. Comparison of self-administered survey questionnaire responses collected using mobile apps versus other methods. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2015(7):MR000042. https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.MR000042.pub2 PMID:26212714