ORIGINAL ARTICLE



Cross-sectional study on the relationship between body mass index and smoking, and longitudinal changes in body mass index in relation to change in smoking status: The Tromsø Study

M. SNEVE¹ & R. JORDE^{1,2}

¹Medical Department B, University Hospital of North Norway, Tromsø, Norway, and ²Institute of Clinical Medicine, University of Tromsø, Tromsø, Norway

Abstract

Aims: To evaluate the effects of smoking and other lifestyle factors on body mass index (BMI), and changes in BMI in relation to changes in smoking status. *Methods:* A cross-sectional study was performed on 10,920 males (3937 smokers) and 12,090 females (4343 smokers) who participated in the fourth Tromsø Study (performed in 1994–95). A longitudinal study was performed on 2364 males (732 smokers in 1994–95) and 2738 females (942 smokers in 1994–95) who participated in both the fourth and the fifth Tromsø studies (performed in 2001). *Results:* In the cross-sectional study, current smokers of both genders had a lower BMI (25.0 ± 3.4 vs. 25.5 ± 3.2 kg/m² in males, and 23.9 ± 3.9 vs. 25.3 ± 4.6 kg/m² in females, p<0.01), a lower degree of physical activity, and a higher consumption of coffee and alcohol than never-smokers. We found a U-shaped relationship between number of cigarettes smoked per day and BMI. In the longitudinal study, continuing smokers had a smaller increase in BMI than those who gave up smoking. In those who gave up smoking, there was a significant, positive relationship between number of cigarettes smoked per day and BMI. Smoking cessation is associated with an increase in weight as compared to those who continue smoking.

Key Words: Alcohol, body mass index, cigarette smoking, coffee, obesity, physical activity

Background

In the Western world there is an epidemic of obesity, and worldwide more than 1.6 billion adults are overweight and at least 400 million are obese according to World Health Organization criteria [1]. The cause is multifactorial, with changes in dietary habits and more sedentary lifestyles being the most important contributors. Body weight is also affected by smoking, and most [2–6], but not all [7], studies show that smokers are leaner than nonsmokers. Furthermore, smokers appear to gain weight after smoking cessation [2,3,8], which for some is an argument for not quitting smoking [9].

If the effect on weight was due to a direct effect of smoking on food intake, metabolism and/or physical activity, one would expect to find the lowest body weight among those smoking the highest number of cigarettes daily. However, in some studies, a U-shaped relationship between smoking and body weight has been reported [10-13], and if this is true, it should be taken into consideration when relating smoking and body weight.

The Tromsø Study is a prospective follow-up study of entire birth cohorts and random samples in the municipality of Tromsø in northern Norway, with cardiovascular diseases and risk factors as the main focus [14]. The fourth Tromsø Study was conducted in 1994–95 (for simplicity, 1994 in the following) and the fifth in 2001. Body mass index (BMI) was measured, and a questionnaire on lifestyle factors, including smoking habits, was filled in. A large

 (Accepted 29 August 2007)
 © 2008 the Nordic Societies of Public Health DOI: 10.1177/1403494807088453

Correspondence: Monica Sneve, Medical Department B, University Hospital of North Norway, PO Box 101, 9038 Tromsø, Norway. Tel: + 47 776 26000. Fax: + 47 776 26863. E-mail: monica.sneve@unn.no

database was therefore available for evaluating relationships between smoking habits and BMI.

Aims

We wanted to evaluate the effects of smoking and other lifestyle factors on BMI, and to explore the effects on BMI of change in smoking status between the fourth and the fifth Tromsø studies.

Material and methods

Subjects

In the fourth Tromsø Study in 1994, all men and women born earlier than 1970 and, according to the

population registry, living in the municipality of Tromsø were invited by letter to participate. In addition, all subjects aged 55–74 years and 5–10% random samples in the 25–54-year and 75–85-year age groups were invited to return for a second phase of the study, with comprehensive examinations including carotid ultrasound, echocardiography, and bone densitometry [15]. One reminder was sent to those who did not respond to the first invitation. In total, 35,443 subjects were invited and 27,158 attended, and complete data sets regarding the variables included in the present study were available for 23,010 subjects (Figure 1).

In the fifth Tromsø Study in 2001, all men and women older than 29 years, living in the municipality of Tromsø, and who had participated in the



Figure 1. Flow chart of the study population in the fourth Tromsø Study in 1994 and the fifth Tromsø Study in 2001.

second phase of the fourth Tromsø Study in 1994, or who had reached 30, 40, 45, 60 or 70 years of age during 2001, were invited to participate. Thus, 10,353 persons were invited, of whom 8130 attended. Complete data sets were available for 5102 subjects who had participated in both the fourth (1994) and the fifth (2001) Tromsø studies (Figure 1).

All subjects filled in a questionnaire regarding health, smoking status, physical activity in spare time, and alcohol and coffee consumption [16]. The questions regarding smoking were: "Do you smoke cigarettes daily?"; "Do you smoke cigars/cigarillos daily?"; "Do you smoke a pipe daily?"; "If you smoked previously, how many years is it since you quitted?"; and "How many cigarettes do you or did you smoke daily?"

The Regional Ethics Committee approved the studies, and all participants gave written informed consent.

Variables

We classified the subjects in the cross-sectional study as current smokers, ex-smokers or non-smokers of cigarettes. In the longitudinal study, the subjects were classified as current smokers or current nonsmokers. Those who were smokers in 1994 (according to the questionnaire in 1994) but not in 2001 were classified as "quitted smoking", and those who did not smoke in 1994 but were smoking in 2001 were classified as "started smoking". Those smoking cigars, cigarillos or a pipe only, or in addition to cigarettes, were excluded, as there were no questions regarding number of cigars, cigarillos or pipes smoked per day. A distinction between ordinary cigarettes and hand-rolled cigarettes was not made.

The physical activity score was calculated as the sum of hours of light and heavy physical activity in spare time per week, with heavy physical activity given double weight. Coffee consumption was calculated as the sum of cups of all types of coffee (boiled, filtered or other type) drunk per day. Alcohol consumption was calculated as the number of glasses of alcohol (adding glasses of spirits, beer and wine) consumed in 2 weeks, assuming an equal amount of alcohol in each glass. Thus, one glass of spirits (40 ml), one glass of beer (330 ml) or one glass of red wine (120 ml) is equivalent to 13 g of alcohol.

Height and weight were measured with the subject wearing light clothing and no shoes. BMI was defined as weight (kg) divided by height squared (m^2) .

Statistical analyses

The normal distribution was evaluated by visual inspection of histograms with normal curves,

normality plots (Q–Q plots), and determination of skewness and kurtosis. BMI and change in BMI (see below) were considered to be normally distributed, whereas the other variables were not, and nor did they assume a normal distribution after log transformation.

An initial regression analysis with a general linear model with BMI as the dependent variable and smoking status (current smoker and current non-smoker) and gender as factors, and age, physical activity score and coffee and alcohol consumption as independent variables, revealed a significant interaction (p < 0.01) between smoking status and gender. Where appropriate, the analyses are therefore done separately for each gender and for smokers/non-smokers.

When comparing current smokers, ex-smokers and never-smokers regarding BMI, we used a general linear model with variables similar to those used in the initial regression analysis. Linear trends across subgroups for BMI were evaluated with a similar regression model. For variables without a normal distribution, we used the Kruskal–Wallis test for k independent samples, and the Mann–Whitney test as post-hoc test. When comparing more than two groups, we always chose a reference group.

For evaluation of individual predictors of BMI in the cross-sectional data, we used a linear regression model with age, number of cigarettes smoked daily, physical activity score, coffee consumption and alcohol consumption as potential predictors. The appropriateness of the model was verified by plotting the residuals against each variable and inspecting the plot for even distribution throughout the variable range. Correlations between BMI and the predictor variables were evaluated by Spearman's rho (ρ).

In the analyses of the longitudinal data, change in variables was calculated as the value in 2001 minus the value in 1994.

When multiple comparisons were performed, a Bonferroni correction was used. Unless otherwise stated, all data are given as mean \pm standard deviation. A *p*-value <0.05 was considered to be statistically significant. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS 13.0) was used for all analyses (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA).

Results

Cross-sectional data from the fourth Tromsø Study

The characteristics of the participants are shown in Table I. In both genders, current smokers had lower BMI, lower degrees of physical activity and higher consumption of coffee and alcohol than both exsmokers and never-smokers. Among the males, ex-smokers had significantly higher BMI than

		S	moking status		Number o	f cigarettes smoke	ed per day (currer	it smokers)
		Current smoker	Ex-smoker	Never smoker	1-5	6-10	11-20	>20
Aales	N	3937	3600	3383	411	1215	1985	326
	Age (years)	$45.5\pm13.3^{\rm a}$	$53.6 \pm 14.8^{ m b}$	$41.9\pm12.7^{ m c}$	$49.1\pm16.4^{\rm a}$	$45.9\pm14.5^{ m d}$	$44.3\pm12.0^{\rm d}$	46.4 ± 10.3
	Body mass index (kg/m^2)	$25.0\pm3.4^{\mathrm{a,e}}$	$26.3 \pm 3.3^{ m b,f}$	$25.5 \pm 3.2^{c,g}$	$24.9\pm3.3^{\mathrm{a}}$	24.6 ± 3.2	25.2 ± 3.5	$25.9\pm3.3^{ m d,h}$
	Number of cigarettes smoked daily	13.7 ± 6.9	0	0	4.1 ± 1.2	8.9 ± 1.4	16.1 ± 3.1	28.5 ± 6.9
	Physical activity score	$3.8\pm3.4^{ m a}$	$4.1\pm3.4^{ m b}$	$4.7\pm3.6^{\circ}$	$4.0\pm3.3^{\mathrm{a}}$	3.8 ± 3.3	3.8 ± 3.4	$2.7\pm3.0^{ m d}$
	Coffee consumption (cups/day)	$7.7\pm4.7^{ m a}$	$5.6\pm3.5^{ m b}$	$4.2\pm3.3^{\circ}$	$4.9\pm2.8^{ m a}$	$6.6\pm3.7^{\mathrm{d}}$	$8.5\pm4.6^{ m d}$	$10.9 \pm 7.0^{ m d}$
	Alcohol consumption (glasses/2 weeks)	$7.4\pm9.0^{ m a}$	$5.4\pm6.8^{ m b}$	5.1 ± 6.1	5.6 ± 6.4	5.8 ± 6.6	$8.2\pm9.4^{ m d}$	$11.1\pm13.6^{ m d}$
emales	Ν	4343	2932	4815	714	1970	1555	104
	Age (years)	$44.7\pm13.1^{\rm a}$	$48.3\pm14.6^{ m b}$	50.0 ± 17.5	$45.9\pm15.5^{\mathrm{a}}$	44.6 ± 13.4	44.0 ± 11.5	47.5 ± 10.8
	Body mass index (kg/m ²)	$23.9\pm3.9^{\mathrm{a,e}}$	$25.2 \pm 4.1^{ m b,f}$	25.3 ± 4.6	$24.1\pm3.9^{\mathrm{a}}$	23.8 ± 3.9	24.0 ± 4.0	25.1 ± 4.7
	Number of cigarettes smoked daily	10.7 ± 5.3	0	0	4.1 ± 1.2	8.7 ± 1.5	15.0 ± 3.0	28.2 ± 5.8
	Physical activity score	$3.2\pm2.7^{\mathrm{a}}$	$3.5\pm2.9^{ m b}$	3.5 ± 2.9	3.2 ± 2.7	3.3 ± 2.8	3.1 ± 2.8	$2.4{\pm}2.6^{ m d}$
	Coffee consumption (cups/day)	$6.2\pm3.5^{\mathrm{a}}$	$4.5\pm2.8^{ m b}$	$3.4\pm2.6^{\circ}$	$4.3\pm2.4^{ m a}$	$5.9 \pm 3.1^{ m d}$	$7.2\pm3.8^{ m d}$	$9.0\pm5.8^{ m d}$
	Alcohol consumption (glasses/2 weeks)	$3.3\pm4.5^{\mathrm{a}}$	$2.9\pm4.1^{ m b}$	$1.2\pm3.1^{\circ}$	$2.6\pm3.9^{\mathrm{a}}$	$3.0\pm3.9^{ m d}$	$3.9 \pm 5.0^{ m d}$	$6.5 \pm 7.7^{\mathrm{d}}$

never-smokers. Regarding physical activity score, coffee consumption, and alcohol consumption, the ex-smokers had values in between those of the current smokers and never-smokers. In both genders, never-smokers had higher BMI than those smoking one to five cigarettes per day. Looking at current smokers separately, those smoking one to five cigarettes daily had lower BMI, were more physically active, and drank less coffee and alcohol than those smoking 21 or more cigarettes daily (Table I). There was a U-shaped relationship between BMI and the number of cigarettes smoked daily, where never-smokers and heavy smokers had BMI at the same level, as shown graphically in Figure 2.

In the multiple linear regression models with BMI as the dependent variable, we found, in both genders and in all smoking class subgroups, age and coffee consumption to be positively associated with BMI, and physical activity to be negatively associated with BMI. However, the relationship between alcohol consumption and BMI differed between the genders. When all subjects were evaluated together, non-smoking was positively associated with BMI. In the current smokers, the number of cigarettes smoked per day was significantly positively associated with BMI (Table II).

Relationship between BMI category and lifestyle factors

When current smokers, ex-smokers and neversmokers were grouped according to BMI level, those with normal weight (BMI 20–25 kg/m²) were, as expected, younger and more physically active than



Figure 2. Mean body mass index (BMI) (error bars 95% confidence intervals) of males and females among never-smokers and current smokers in 1994 grouped in relation to the number of cigarettes smoked per day in 1994.

smokers; ${}^{g}\rho < 0.01$ vs. ex-smokers; ${}^{h}\rho < 0.01$ vs. 1–5 cigarettes per day (general linear model with age, physical activity score,

coffee consumption and alcohol consumption as covariates)

		Current	smokers			Ex-sm	okers			Never-	-smokers		Smok	xers and no	on-smokers	
	$\frac{\text{Male}}{(n=39)}$	s 37)	Fema (n=43	ules (43)	$\frac{\text{Males}}{(n=360)}$	(0	Fema. $(n=29)$	les 32)	$\frac{\text{Male:}}{(n=338)}$	3)	Fem: $(n=48$	lles (15)	Males $(n=10,92)$	20)	Femal $(n=12,0)$	es 190)
	φ	β	θ	β	θ	β	φ	β	φ	β	φ	β	σ	β	θ	β
Age (years) Cigarettes smoked per	0.08^{a} 0.12^{a}	0.04 ^c 0.12 ^e	0.19^{a} 0.03	0.14^{e} 0.05^{d}	0.06 ^a	0.03	0.31 ^a	0.26 [°]	0.16 ^a	0.11 ^e	0.34^{a}	0.22°	0.14^{a}	0.08°	0.30 ^a	0.22 ^e
day Coffee (cups/	0.05^{a}	0.00	0.05 ^a	0.01	0.09 ^a	0.09 ^e	0.10^{a}	0.09 ^e	0.13^{a}	0.08^{e}	0.18^{a}	0.09 ^e	0.05ª	0.08°	0.05 ^a	0.06 ^e
day) Physical	-0.03	-0.02	-0.06^{a}	-0.03°	-0.10^{a}	-0.09 ^e	-0.15^{a}	-0.09°	-0.14^{a}	-0.11^{e}	-0.24^{a}	-0.13^{e}	-0.08^{a}	-0.08°	-0.14^{a}	-0.09 ^e
activity score Alcohol	0.02	-0.02	-0.08^{a}	-0.05°	-0.02	0.01	-0.16^{a}	-0.06°	0	0.05 ^d	-0.25^{a}	-0.11^{e}	-0.02	0.03 ^d	-0.18^{a}	-0.07 ^e
(glasses/2 weeks) Smoking													0.14^{a}	0.16°	0.16 ^a	0.14 ^e
$\mathrm{status}^{\mathrm{b}}$	0.0)2	0.0	03	0.0	0	0.0)1	0.0	4	0.	13	0.0	4	0.10	

Table II. Spearman's correlation coefficient (ρ) and standardized regression coefficient β from the linear regression model with body mass index (BMI) as dependent variable in the fourth

Downloaded from http://sjp.sagepub.com at Universitetsbiblioteket i Tromso on June 7, 2008 © 2008 Associations of Public Health in the Nordic Countries Regions. All rights reserved. Not for commercial use or unauthorized distribution.

Body mass index and smoking 401

$\frac{BMI \leq 20.0}{Current smokers}$	IVI	lales			Fer	nales	
Current smokers 180	BMI 20.0–25.0	BMI 25.0–30.0	BMI ≥30.0	BMI ≤ 20.0	BMI 20.0–25.0	BMI 25.0–30.0	BMI ≥30.0
	1913	1536	308	510	2460	1036	337
Age (years) $48.9 \pm 16.8^{\rm b}$	44.3 ± 13.3	$46.4\pm12.7^{\rm c}$	$46.5\pm12.4^{ m c}$	43.3 ± 14.0	43.3 ± 12.4	$47.3\pm13.3^{ m c}$	$48.9\pm13.7^{ m c}$
Cigarettes per day $11.7 \pm 5.9^{\rm b}$	13.2 ± 6.3	$14.3\pm7.5^{\circ}$	$15.0\pm7.0^{ m c}$	10.6 ± 5.2	10.5 ± 5.0	11.1 ± 5.7	11.2 ± 6.4
Physical activity score 3.1 ± 2.9^{a}	3.9 ± 3.4	3.8 ± 3.4	$3.3 \pm 3.3^{ m b}$	3.2 ± 2.9	3.3 ± 2.8	$3.0{\pm}2.6^{ m b}$	$2.6\pm2.6^{\circ}$
Coffee (cups/day) 6.9 ± 3.9	7.6 ± 4.7	7.9 ± 4.9	7.8 ± 4.5	6.1 ± 3.4	6.1 ± 3.6	6.3 ± 3.4	6.3 ± 3.8
Alcohol (glasses/2 weeks) 6.1 ± 8.3^{b}	7.6 ± 9.6	7.3 ± 8.2	7.5 ± 8.8	$3.1\pm4.3^{ m b}$	3.6 ± 4.5	$3.2\pm4.7^{ m c}$	$2.3 \pm 4.0^{ m c}$
Ex-smokers							
<u>N</u> 48	1220	1891	441	165	1471	923	373
Age (years) $61.7 \pm 17.9^{\rm b}$	52.3 ± 15.9	$53.9\pm14.3^{ m b}$	$54.6\pm13.2^{ m b}$	$42.1\pm14.5^{ m b}$	45.2 ± 13.4	$51.3 \pm 14.4^{ m b}$	$56.1\pm14.9^{ m b}$
Physical activity score $3.0\pm3.4^{\rm b}$	4.6 ± 3.5	$4.0\pm3.4^{ m b}$	$3.3 \pm 2.9^{\rm b}$	$3.3\pm2.9^{ m b}$	3.9 ± 3.1	$3.2 \pm 2.6^{\rm b}$	$2.6\pm2.4^{ m b}$
Coffee (cups/day) 4.9 ± 4.0	5.2 ± 3.3	$5.9\pm3.5^{ m b}$	$5.9\pm4.2^{\mathrm{a}}$	$3.6\pm2.6^{ m b}$	4.4 ± 2.8	4.6 ± 2.8	$4.9\pm2.8^{ m b}$
Alcohol (glasses/2 weeks) $3.6\pm6.1^{\rm b}$	5.4 ± 6.2	5.4 ± 7.1	5.5 ± 7.1	2.9 ± 4.2	3.3 ± 4.4	$2.7\pm3.7^{ m b}$	$1.9\pm3.5^{ m b}$
Never-smokers							
<u>N</u> 55	1584	1440	304	326	2342	1451	969
Age (years) 40.4 ± 13.9	40.2 ± 12.1	$43.3\pm12.8^{ m b}$	$44.9\pm13.1^{\rm b}$	$41.9\pm15.8^{ m b}$	45.9 ± 16.2	$54.3 \pm 17.5^{ m b}$	$58.3\pm16.4^{ m b}$
Physical activity score 4.8 ± 3.8	5.1 ± 3.7	$4.5\pm3.5^{ m b}$	$3.8 \pm 3.2^{\rm b}$	4.2 ± 3.2	4.0 ± 3.0	$3.1 \pm 2.7^{\rm b}$	$2.4\pm2.5^{ m b}$
Coffee (cups/day) 4.0 ± 4.5	3.8 ± 3.1	$4.5\pm3.4^{ m b}$	$4.6\pm3.6^{ m b}$	$2.7\pm2.4^{ m b}$	3.2 ± 2.5	$3.7\pm2.5^{ m b}$	$4.1\pm2.8^{ m b}$
Alcohol (glasses/2 weeks) 4.6 ± 7.7	5.0 ± 5.5	5.2 ± 6.5	5.3 ± 7.1	2.4 ± 3.4	2.3 ± 3.2	$1.5\pm3.0^{ m b}$	$0.8\pm2.0^{ m b}$

402 M. Sneve & R. Jorde

		Mal	es			Fema	les	
	Smoker i	n 1994	Non-smoker	in 1994	Smoker	in 1994	Non-smoker	in 1994
₽. õ	Smoker n 2001	Non-smoker in 2001	Non-smoker in 2001	Smoker in 2001	Smoker in 2001	Non-smoker in 2001	Non-smoker in 2001	Smoker in 2001
N	552	180	1570	62	727	215	1736	60
Age (years) in 1994 52.6	$.6\pm11.5^{\mathrm{a}}$	54.7 ± 11.2	$55.8\pm11.5^{\circ}$	50.2 ± 12.6	50.6 ± 11.6	51.3 ± 11.6	$54.1\pm11.5^{ m d}$	47.2 ± 11.7
Body mass index (kg/m^2) in 1994 25.3	3 ± 3.3	25.4 ± 3.3	26.3 ± 3.0	26.3 ± 2.4	24.0 ± 3.4	24.8 ± 4.4	25.6 ± 4.0	25.2 ± 3.1
Number of cigarettes per day in 13.8 1994	.8±7.4	12.2 ± 6.4	0	0	11.2 ± 5.4	8.9 ± 4.8	0	0
Physical activity score in 1994 3.7	$.7 \pm 3.1$	3.6 ± 3.1	4.3 ± 3.3	3.5 ± 2.9	3.1 ± 2.8	3.0 ± 2.6	3.5 ± 2.7	3.9 ± 2.6
Coffee consumption (cups/day) in 8.0 1994	0 ± 4.2	7.6 ± 5.1	$5.2\pm3.1^{ m d}$	6.4 ± 2.8	$6.7\pm3.4^{ m b}$	5.8 ± 2.9	$4.2\pm2.4^{ m d}$	5.6 ± 3.0
Alcohol consumption (glasses/2 7.0 weeks) in 1994	$.0 \pm 8.6^{a}$	5.4 ± 6.0	5.0 ± 5.8	5.4 ± 4.9	3.6 ± 4.5	2.9 ± 3.7	2.6 ± 3.3	3.8 ± 6.3

Table V. Change in lifestyle factors from 1994 to 2001 (value in 2001 minus value in 1994) in males and females in relation to smoking status in 2001.

	В	ody n	nass i	index	and	smok	ing	403
	Started smoking	$60\\0.1\pm2.1$	8.5 ± 4.5	-0.2 ± 3.4	-0.4 ± 2.9	0.2 ± 4.2		er (Mann-Whitney
les	Unchanged non-smoker	$1736 \\ 1.2 \pm 1.9^{c}$	0	0.4 ± 3.0	-0.7 ± 2.0	0.2 ± 3.4		anged non-smok
Fema	Quitted smoking	215 2.3±2.3	-8.9 ± 4.8	0.4 ± 2.7	-1.4 ± 2.6	-0.3 ± 3.4		ıged smoker vs. unch
	Unchanged smoker	$727 0.8 \pm 2.1^{b,d}$	-0.8 ± 3.9	0.3 ± 3.2	-0.9 ± 2.8^{a}	0.1 ± 4.4		$^{d}p < 0.01$, unchan
	Started smoking	$\begin{array}{c} 62\\ 0\pm1.7\end{array}$	10.8 ± 5.4	-0.1 ± 2.9	0 ± 2.9	-0.9 ± 4.7		oker vs. started smoking;
	Unchanged non-smoker	$\frac{1570}{0.8\pm1.5^{\rm c}}$	0	0.2 ± 3.6	-0.8 ± 2.7	-0.2 ± 5.9		unchanged non-sm
Males	Quitted smoking	$\frac{180}{1.6\pm2.0}$	-12.2 ± 6.4	0.3 ± 3.5	-2.0 ± 4.5	-0.9 ± 4.8		l smoking; $^{\circ}p < 0.001$,
	Unchanged smoker	552 $0.5\pm1.7^{ m b,d}$	-1.9 ± 5.2	0.2 ± 3.7	$-0.6\pm5.6^{\rm b}$	-0.7 ± 8.6		ged smoker vs. quittec
		N Change in body mass index	(kg/m ²) Change in number of	cigarettes per day Change in physical activity	score Change in coffee	consumption (cups/day) Change in alcohol	consumption (glasses/2 weeks)	^a <i>p</i> <0.01, ^b <i>p</i> <0.001, unchan test).

Males N Change i (kg/m ²			Quitted smoking			Started smoking	
Males N Change i (kg/m ²		Previously >10 cigarettes daily	Previously 6–10 cigarettes daily	Previously 1–5 cigarettes daily	1–5 cigarettes daily	6–10 cigarettes daily	> 10 cigarettes daily
Change i (kg/m ²		85	71	22	10	29	23
) ,	n body mass index	$2.01\pm2.08^{ m a,d}$	1.37 ± 1.94	1.03 ± 1.45	0.18 ± 2.00	-0.37 ± 1.74	0.34 ± 1.58
Change i	n physical activity score	0.54 ± 3.38	-0.05 ± 3.42	1.06 ± 3.90	0.07 ± 1.42	-0.39 ± 3.29	0.14 ± 3.02
Change i (cups/c	n coffee consumption ay)	-2.64 ± 5.86	-1.64 ± 2.70	-0.72 ± 1.67	-1.29 ± 2.26	-0.37 ± 2.35	1.00 ± 3.56
Change i (glasse	n alcohol consumption	-0.97 ± 5.60	-1.01 ± 4.04	-0.49 ± 4.10	-3.43 ± 4.20	-0.85 ± 5.59	0.10 ± 3.33
Females N	×	56	100	58	19	27	14
Change i (kg/m ²	n body mass index	$3.24 \pm 2.59^{ m c,d}$	$2.37\pm2.13^{ m b}$	1.40 ± 1.97	0.53 ± 1.57	0.09 ± 2.01	-0.52 ± 2.69
Change i	n physical activity score	0.43 ± 2.30	0.72 ± 2.85	-0.16 ± 2.60	0.99 ± 3.16	-0.71 ± 3.42	-0.61 ± 3.32
Change i (cups/c	n coffee consumption ay)	-2.30 ± 3.40^{a}	-1.34 ± 2.21	-0.72 ± 1.97	0.80 ± 2.37	-0.81 ± 2.99	$-1.43\pm2.77^{\mathrm{a}}$
Change i (glasse	n alcohol consumption \2 weeks)	-0.07 ± 3.00	-0.59 ± 3.09	0.19 ± 3.93	0.18 ± 4.27	0.09 ± 3.72	0.45 ± 5.37

404 M. Sneve & R. Jorde

those who were obese $(BMI > 30 \text{ kg/m}^2)$ (Table III). In currently smoking males, there was an increase in number of cigarettes smoked with increasing BMI category, but, as in the linear regression model, this was less pronounced in smoking females (Table III).

Longitudinal study

The characteristics of the participants in 1994 in relation to smoking status in the fourth (1994) and in the fifth (2001) Tromsø studies are shown in Table IV.

In both genders, continuing non-smokers were older and drank less coffee in 1994 than those who had started smoking after 1994. Men who had quitted smoking were older and drank less alcohol in 1994 than continuing smokers. Women who had quitted smoking drank less coffee in 1994 than continuing smokers (Table IV).

Relationship between change in smoking status and lifestyle factors

In all subgroups of gender and smoking status, there was an increase in BMI from 1994 to 2001. However, in both genders, those who continued smoking had a smaller increase in BMI than those who quitted smoking after 1994. Furthermore, those who had started smoking after 1994 had a smaller increase in BMI than those who remained non-smokers. In both genders, the continuous smokers had a smaller increase in BMI than the continuous non-smokers. In all groups, there was a decrease in coffee consumption from 1994 to 2001, but the decrease was less in continuing smokers than in those who quitted smoking after 1994 (Table V).

Relationship between changes in number of cigarettes smoked and lifestyle factors

In those who quitted smoking after 1994, there was in both genders a positive relationship between number of cigarettes smoked in 1994 and increase in BMI. Furthermore, females who smoked more than 10 cigarettes in 1994 before quitting had a higher reduction in coffee consumption than those smoking one to five cigarettes in 1994 (Table VI).

In those who started smoking after 1994, there was in females a negative non-significant relationship between number of cigarettes smoked and change in BMI (Table VI).

Discussion

In the present study, we found current smokers to have lower BMI than ex-smokers and never-smokers, which is consistent with most other studies [2–6]. As expected [4,5,17], the current smokers had less healthy lifestyles, with lower physical activity, and higher consumption of coffee and alcohol than neversmokers, with the ex-smokers having values in between. However, adjusting for these covariates in a multiple linear regression model did not abolish smoking status as a strong predictor of BMI, and in this model current smoking appeared as a stronger predictor of BMI than physical activity.

When current smokers were considered separately, there was a U-shaped relationship between number of cigarettes smoked and BMI, with the lowest BMI being seen in those smoking 6-10 cigarettes per day, and the highest in those smoking more than 20 cigarettes per day. Heavy smokers had similar BMI as never-smokers. This U-shaped relationship has also been reported previously [10-13], and must be taken into account when considering the relationship between smoking and measures of body fat or its distribution. In this respect, smokers should not be considered as a homogeneous group, but should be divided into subgroups according to number of cigarettes smoked. Similarly, current non-smokers should be divided in ex-smokers and never-smokers.

In the longitudinal study, we found a few predictors of change in smoking status. Those who quitted smoking were older than those who continued smoking, and those who started smoking were younger than those who remained non-smokers. These changes were paralleled in coffee consumption, and if coffee consumption can be taken as an indictor of an unhealthy lifestyle, a healthy lifestyle in 1994 predicted a better smoking status in 2001.

As previously reported [2], those who quitted smoking had an increase in BMI as compared to those who continued smoking, and those who started smoking had a reduction in BMI compared to those who remained non-smokers. Furthermore, there was a significant, positive association between increase in BMI after quitting smoking and previous number of cigarettes smoked per day. Again, these changes in BMI were paralleled by changes in coffee consumption.

There is no simple explanation of why smokers tend to have lower BMI than non-smokers, why there is a U-shaped relationship between number of cigarettes smoked and BMI, why there is weight gain after smoking cessation, and why this weight gain is positively related to number of cigarettes previously smoked. One explanation could be that smoking, on the one hand, reduces appetite and increases the metabolic rate [18], and on the other, is associated with an unhealthy lifestyle causing weight gain. Thus, in light smokers the first effect might be relatively unopposed by minor lifestyle changes, whereas in heavy smokers an unhealthy lifestyle outweighs the effects of smoking on appetite and metabolic rate.

For lifestyle, our data support this hypothesis, as the physical activity was inversely related to number of cigarettes smoked, and coffee and alcohol consumption were positively related to number of cigarettes smoked. In this respect, it is noteworthy that in those who quitted smoking, the subsequent increase in BMI, which was positively related to number of cigarettes previously smoked, was unopposed by an increase in physical activity or change in alcohol consumption. Furthermore, the ex-smoking males had higher BMI than the never-smokers, which again demonstrates that smoking is not just one single bad habit, but is a part of a generally unhealthy lifestyle.

At least in short-term experiments, nicotine appears to increase the metabolic rate by 5–7% [19,20]. Most studies also indicate an appetite-suppressant effect of nicotine [21,22], which may even lower the body weight set point [23]. Furthermore, caffeine augments the thermogenic effect [20,24,25] and appetite reduction [22] caused by nicotine. This is particularly relevant, as we found a striking parallel between number of cigarettes smoked and coffee consumption, including a reversal of the coffee-drinking pattern with smoking cessation.

Our study has several limitations. First, the study is based on smoking and lifestyle habits reported in a questionnaire, and for some of these variables, in particular alcohol consumption, underreporting may have occurred. Several of the subjects did not answer all questions in the questionnaires, and therefore had to be excluded from the analyses, which could have resulted in a selection bias favouring younger subjects and those with higher education. The number of smokers in the cross-sectional study from 1994 was 36% among men, whereas in the longitudinal study 31% of the men smoked at baseline. Accordingly, smokers were less likely to attend the fifth Tromsø study in 2001 than non-smokers were. However, as can be seen from Tables I and IV, the lifestyle factors (number of cigarettes smoked, physical activity score, coffee consumption, and alcohol consumption) were similar in the smokers in the cross-sectional and longitudinal studies. It is therefore unlikely that the selection bias, favouring non-smokers, has a major impact on the results. Furthermore, we did not include socioeconomic status in our analyses, which may be of relevance for the relationship between smoking and BMI [26]. It should also be emphasized that cross-sectional data can provide only weak evidence for associations, and thus conclusions regarding causality cannot be drawn. On the other hand, our study has considerable strength because of the large number of participants in the Tromsø Study and the high attendance rate.

Conclusions

We have found a strong relationship between smoking habits, lifestyle factors, and BMI. In particular, there was a U-shaped relationship between the number of cigarettes smoked per day and BMI, where the BMI of never-smokers and heavy smokers was similar. This U-shaped relationship should be taken into consideration when evaluating the relationship between BMI and smoking. In this respect, smokers cannot be considered as a homogeneous group.

Acknowledgements

The present study was supported by a grant from the Northern Norway Regional Health Authority. We are grateful to the Tromsø Study for giving us access to the data material, and to Tom Wilsgaard for help with the statistical analyses.

References

- Available at: www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs311/en/ index.html.
- [2] Flegal KM. Epidemiologic aspects of overweight and obesity in the United States. Physiol Behav 2005;15:599–602.
- [3] Perkins KA, Espstein LH, Stiller RL, Sexton JE, Jacob RG. Metabolic effects of nicotine in smokers and non-smokers. NIDA Res Monogr 1989;95:469–70.
- [4] Kvaavik E, Meyer HE, Tverdal A. Food habits, physical activity and body mass index in relation to smoking status in 40–42 year old Norwegian women and men. Prev Med 2004;38:1–5.
- [5] Lahti-Koski M, Pietinen P, Heliovaara M, Vartiainen E. Associations of body mass index and obesity with physical activity, food choices, alcohol intake, and smoking in the 1982– 1997 FINRISK Studies. Am J Clin Nutr 2002;75:809–17.
- [6] Shimokata H, Muller DC, Andres R. Studies in the distribution of body fat. III. Effects of cigarette smoking. JAMA 1989;261:1169–73.
- [7] Cooper TV, Klesges RC, Robinson LA, Zbikowski SMA. Prospective evaluation of the relationships between smoking dosage and body mass index in an adolescent, biracial cohort. Addict Behav 2003;28:501–12.
- [8] Chinn S, Jarvis D, Melotti R, Luczynska C, Ackermann-Liebrich U, Anto JM, et al. Smoking cessation, lung function, and weight gain: a follow-up study. Lancet 2005;365:1629–35.
- [9] Camp DE, Klesges RC, Relyea G. The relationship between body weight concerns and adolescent smoking. Health Psychol 1993;12:24–32.
- [10] Khosla T, Lowe CR. Obesity and smoking habits. BMJ 1971;4:10–13.
- [11] Istvan JA, Cunningham TW, Garfinkel L. Cigarette smoking and body weight in the Cancer Prevention Study I. Int J Epidemiol 1992;21:849–53.

- [12] Killen JD, Fortmann SP, Telch MJ, Newman B. Are heavy smokers different from light smokers? A comparison after 48 hours without cigarettes. JAMA 1988;260:1581–5.
- [13] Molarius A, Seidell JC, Kuulasmaa K, Dobson AJ, Sans S. Smoking and relative body weight: an international perspective from the WHO MONICA Project. J Epidemiol Community Health 1997;51:252–60.
- [14] Thelle DS, Førde OH, Try K, Lehmann EH. The Tromsø heart study. Methods and main results of the cross-sectional study. Acta Med Scand 1976;200:107–18.
- [15] Jorde R, Sundsfjord J, Haug E, Bonaa KH. Relation between low calcium intake, parathyroid hormone, and blood pressure. Hypertension 2000;35:1154–9.
- [16] Jorde R, Svartberg J, Sundsfjord J. Serum parathyroid hormone as a predictor of increase in systolic blood pressure in men. J Hypertens 2005;23:1639–44.
- [17] Canoy D, Wareham N, Luben R, Welch A, Bingham S, Day N, et al. Cigarette smoking and fat distribution in 21,828 British men and women: a population-based study. Obes Res 2005;13:1466–75.
- [18] Hofstetter A, Schutz Y, Jequier E, Wahren J. Increased 24hour energy expenditure in cigarette smokers. N Engl J Med 1986;314:79–82.
- [19] Collins LC, Walker J, Stamford BA. Smoking multiple highversus low-nicotine cigarettes: impact on resting energy expenditure. Metabolism 1996;45:923–6.

- [20] Jessen AB, Toubro S, Astrup A. Effect of chewing gum containing nicotine and caffeine on energy expenditure and substrate utilization in men. Am J Clin Nutr 2003;77:1442–7.
- [21] LaCroix AZ, Guralnik JM, Berkman LF, Wallace RB, Satterfield S. Maintaining mobility in late life. II. Smoking, alcohol consumption, physical activity, and body mass index. Am J Epidemiol 1993;137:858–69.
- [22] Jessen A, Buemann B, Toubro S, Skovgaard IM, Astrup A. The appetite-suppressant effect of nicotine is enhanced by caffeine. Diabetes Obes Metab 2005;7:327–33.
- [23] Cabanac M, Frankham P. Evidence that transient nicotine lowers the body weight set point. Physiol Behav 2002;76:539–42.
- [24] Collins LC, Cornelius MF, Vogel RL, Walker JF, Stamford BA. Effect of caffeine and/or cigarette smoking on resting energy expenditure. Int J Obes Relat Metab Disord 1994;18:551–6.
- [25] Perkins KA, Sexton JE, Epstein LH, DiMarco A, Fonte C, Stiller RL, et al. Acute thermogenic effects of nicotine combined with caffeine during light physical activity in male and female smokers. Am J Clin Nutr 1994;60:312–19.
- [26] Dennis BH, Pajak A, Pardo B, Davis CE, Williams OD, Piotrowski W. Weight gain and its correlates in Poland between 1983 and 1993. Int J Obes Relat Metab Disord 2000;24:1507–13.