

# Association between Smoking and Unintentional Injuries among Korean Adults

# Kyu-chul Choi<sup>1</sup>, Sun A Kim<sup>2,\*</sup>, Nu Ri Kim<sup>3</sup>, and Min-Ho Shin<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Emergency Medicine, Hwasun Chonnam National University Hospital, <sup>2</sup>Department of Preventive Medicine, Chonnam National University Medical School, Hwasun, <sup>3</sup>Chonnam Regional Cardiocerebrovascular Center, Chonnam National University Hospital, Gwangju, Korea

Using a cross-sectional representative national survey, we evaluated the relationship between cigarette smoking and unintentional injuries among Korean adults. We used data from the 2009 Korean Community Health Survey. Smoking status was defined as never smokers, ex-smokers, and current smokers. Current smokers were categorized into light daily smokers (1-10 cigarettes/day), moderate daily smokers (11-20 cigarettes/day), or heavy daily smokers (≥21 cigarettes/day). We used the Poisson regression model with a robust variance estimation to estimate prevalence rate ratios (PRR) and corresponding 95% confidence interval (95% CI). After adjusting for demographic characteristics, socioeconomic variables, lifestyle variables, and health status variables, former smokers (PRR, 1.19, 95% CI 1.11-1.28), light daily smokers (PRR 1.22, 95% CI 1.13-1.32), moderate daily smokers (PRR 1.33, 95% CI 1.24-1.42), and heavy daily smokers (PRR 1.40, 95% CI 1.25-1.57) had an increased risk for unintentional injuries compared with non-smokers. In conclusion, cigarette smoking is associated with unintentional injuries in a dose-response manner in Korean adults. The findings suggest that community smoking cessation programs may reduce morbidity and mortality from unintentional injuries.

# Key Words: Smoking; Health Surveys; Cross-Sectional Studies; Public Health

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0) which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

# INTRODUCTION

Unintentional injuries are a major public health problem worldwide. Unintentional injuries are typically classified according to the means of their occurrence and include road traffic accidents, poisoning, falls, fire, and drowning.<sup>1</sup> According to the World Health Organization, more than 14,000 people experience injuries daily. More than 5 million people die each year from injuries, and about a fifth of them die from unintentional injuries.<sup>2</sup> In Korea, the number of deaths from injuries in 2012 is lower than in 2010, but still higher than the OECD average.<sup>3</sup> Unintentional injuries can affect guality of life.<sup>4</sup> Identifying risk factors can help develop a strategy to reduce the burden of unintentional injuries in the population.

Smoking rates in Korea have been steadily declining over the last 20 years, but the smoking rate among men is

Article History: Received July 13, 2018 Revised August 8, 2018 Accepted August 10, 2018

Corresponding Author: Sun A Kim Department of Preventive Medicine, Chonnam National University Medical School, 264 Seoyang-ro, Hwasun-eup, Hwasun 58128, Korea Tel: +82-61-379-2627

Fax: +82-61-379-2650 E-mail: sunakim88@daum.net

still around 40%. Furthermore, the smoking rate of Korean men is the seventh highest among OECD countries.<sup>5</sup> Smoking is known to be not only associated with chronic diseases such as several types of cancer<sup>6-10</sup> and cardiovascular disease,<sup>8,11,12</sup> but also associated with injuries.<sup>13-16</sup> Some epidemiological studies have reported that smoking is associated with injury and injury death.<sup>14,17-20</sup> In addition, previous studies on unintentional injuries have mostly been conducted in children groups, and few studies have focused on adults. Furthermore, there has been no attempt to study the association between smoking and unintentional injuries in a large nationally representative sample of Korean adults.

Thus, we aimed to evaluate the relationship between smoking status and unintentional injuries in the adult Korean population. We also examined whether higher levels of smoking were associated with a higher prevalence of unintentional injuries.

# MATERIALS AND METHODS

## 1. Subjects

This study was conducted on subjects who participated in the 2009 KCHS (Korea Community Health Survey). The KCHS was a nationwide survey to investigate health and disease statistics at the city (Si), county (Gun), and district (Gu) levels since 2008.<sup>21</sup> A total of 230,715 people participated in the study, and the final analysis included 214,621 people, excluding those who had some missing data.

#### 2. Injury definition

A questionnaire survey was conducted on accidents and poisonings that were treated at medical institutions over the prior 12 months, and were classified into 8 categories according to the cause of the accident: traffic injuries, falls, collisions, stab injuries, burns, poisoning, animal bites and other injuries. Seeing as the focus of this study was unintentional, non-fatal injuries, defined as any injuries that were not deliberately caused by another person., intentional injuries by others was excluded from the analysis.

#### 3. Smoking

Participants were classified as current, former, or nonsmokers. Those who smoked less than 100 cigarettes in their lifetime were classified as non-smokers. Current smokers were categorized into the following categories: light daily smokers (1-10 cigarettes/day), moderate daily smokers (11-20 cigarettes/day), or heavy daily smokers ( $\geq$ 21 cigarettes/day).

# 4. Covariates

The height and weight were assessed by self-report and the BMI was defined as the body weight divided by the square of the height. Marital status was classified as married, never married or no spouse (divorced/widowed/separated). Household income was divided into 4 groups according to the average monthly income of household members. Regardless of whether they graduated or not, the level of education was divided into five categories according to the schools attended to the end; elementary school, junior high school, high school, college or higher. Alcohol intake was calculated by determining the weekly drinking amount according to the number of drinks and the amount drank, and then it was classified into one or more per week or less than one week. Physical activity was categorized as the absence versus presence of vigorous or moderate physical activity more than once per week. Self-rated health was measured on a Likert scale and treated as a dichotomous variable between poor (very bad and bad) and good (fair, good, very good). Hypertension medication, diabetes medication, history of stroke, and history of coronary artery disease were assessed by self-report.

## 5. Statistical analysis

General characteristics of study participants across smoking status were compared using analysis of variance for continuous variables and chi-square tests for categorical variables. We used the Poisson regression model with robust variance estimation to estimate prevalence rate ratios and corresponding 95% Cis with sample weights. Trend testing was also conducted to assess a dose-response relationship between the smoking categories. We stratified our analysis by age, sex, BMI, residence area, household income, education levels, alcohol consumption status, exercise and self-rated health. For stratified analysis, continuous variables or those had multiple categories such as age, BMI, household income and education levels were dichotomized. All analyses were performed using software Stata version 14 (StataCorp, College Station, Texas USA). A p-values <0.05 was regarded as statistically significant.

# 6. Ethics statement

The study protocol of the KCHS was reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board of the Korean Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2010-02-CON-22-P). All participants provided informed consent.

# RESULTS

The characteristics of study participants according to their smoking habits are shown in Table 1. Of the subjects, 62.3% were non-smokers, 13.6% were former smokers, and 24.1% were current smokers. Never smokers were more likely to be women, less likely to be married, less educated, had a lower rate of alcohol consumption, and had a higher rate of exercise. Past smokers had high rates of not only medication for hypertension and diabetes, but also history of stroke and coronary artery disease and poor self-rated health. Current smokers had the highest BMI. Contrary to expectations, there was no difference in the prevalence of coronary artery disease and stroke among smokers according to the current smoking amounts. One reason for this result is that smokers may have quit after the cerebrovascular disease diagnosis.

Unintentional injuries risk increased monotonically with increasing levels of smoking. Compared with nonsmokers, former smokers (PRR, 1.30, 95% confidence interval [CI] 1.23 to 1.37), light daily smokers (PRR 1.34, 95% CI 1.25-1.42), moderate daily smokers (PRR 1.47, 95% CI 1.39-1.55), and heavy daily smokers (PRR 1.58, 95% CI 1.42-1.75) had increased risk for unintentional injuries. This association was attenuated after adjusting for confounding variables, but statistically significant remained. PRR were for former smokers (PRR 1.18, 95% CI 1.10-1.26), light daily smokers (PRR 1.22, 95% CI 1.13-1.31), moderate daily smokers (PRR 1.30, 95% CI 1.21-1.40) and heavy daily smokers (PRR 1.36, 95% CI 1.21-1.52), respectively (Table 2).

Table 3 shows the results of the stratified analyses by potential confounders. The association between smoking and unintentional injuries was more evident in younger individuals than in older individuals (p for interaction <0.001). However, the association was not different by sex, BMI, residence area, household income, education levels, alco-

		, 8	e					
	N	- D4	Current smoker	p for trend	Current smoker (cigarettes per day)			p for
	Never smoker	Past smoker			1-10	11-20	$\geq 21$	trend
N	133,622 (62.3)	29,270 (13.6)	51,607 (24.1)		19,983 (38.7)	26,041 (50.5)	5,584 (10.8)	
Sex(male), %	25,992 (19.4)	27,518 (94.0)	47,545 (92.1)	< 0.001	17,112 (85.6)	$24,\!976\ (95.9)$	5,457 (97.7)	< 0.001
Age, years	$48.8 \pm 16.9$	$55.8 \pm 15.2$	$46.0 \pm 16.6$	< 0.001	$45.4 \pm 17.0$	$46.0 \pm 13.3$	$48.0 \pm 11.1$	< 0.001
Body mass index, kg/m	$^2$ 22.7 $\pm$ 3.0	$22.5 \pm 2.9$	$23.3 \pm 3.0$	< 0.001	$22.9 \pm 3.0$	$23.4 \pm 2.9$	$23.8 \pm 3.1$	< 0.001
Marital status, %				< 0.001				< 0.001
Married	21,097 (15.8)	1,891 (6.5)	$11,076\ (21.5)$		5,342(26.7)	5,074 (19.5)	660 (11.8)	
Never married	87,066 (65.2)	24,066 (82.2)	33,535 (65.0)		11,768 (58.9)	17,697 (68.0)	4,070 (72.9)	
Divorced/widowed/ separated	25,459 (19.0)	3,313 (11.3)	6,996 (13.6)		2,873 (14.4)	3,270 (12.6)	853 (15.3)	
Household income				0.953				< 0.001
(Korean won), %								
$\leq$ 1.00 million	34,498 (25.8)	8,430 (28.8)	11,615 (22.5)		4,968 (24.9)	5,454 (20.9)	1,193 (21.4)	
1.01-2.00 million	31,361 (23.5)	6,719 (23.0)	13,931 (27.0)		5,115 (25.6)	7,214 (27.7)	1,602 (28.7)	
2.01-3.00 million	28,795 (21.5)	5,891 (20.1)	12,064 (23.4)		4,443 (22.2)	6,303 (24.2)	1,318 (23.6)	
$\geq$ 3.01 million	38,968 (29.2)	8,230 (28.1)	13,997 (27.1)		5,457 (27.3)	7,070 (27.1)	1,470 (26.3)	
Education, %				< 0.001				< 0.001
Uneducated	17,915 (13.4)	2,625 (9.0)	3,142 (6.1)		1,650 (8.3)	1,196 (4.6)	296(5.3)	
Elementary	22,835 (17.1)	5,448 (18.6)	6,206 (12.0)		2,293 (11.5)	3,073 (11.8)	840 (15.0)	
Middle school	15,235 (11.4)	4,275 (14.6)	6,523 (12.6)		2,025 (10.1)	3,540 (13.6)	958(17.2)	
High school	44,712 (33.5)	9,488 (32.4)	21,878 (42.4)		7,924 (39.6)	11,573 (44.4)	2,381 (42.6)	
More than college	32,925 (24.6)	7,434 (25.4)	13,858 (26.8)		6,091 (30.5)	6,659 (25.6)	1,108 (19.8)	
Alcohol intake	38,206 (28.6)	17,443 (59.6)	37,837 (73.3)	< 0.001	14,021 (70.2)	19,629 (75.4)	4,187 (75.0)	< 0.001
$(\geq 1 \text{ drink/wk}), \%$								
Exercise (no), %	106,395 (79.6)	21,305 (72.8)	38,386 (74.4)	< 0.001	15,200 (76.1)	19,164 (73.6)	4,022 (72.0)	< 0.001
Self-rated health	77,265 (57.8)	17,977 (61.4 )	28,115 (54.5)	< 0.001	10,475(52.4)	14,258 (54.7)	3,382 (60.6)	< 0.001
(bad), %								
Hypertension medication. %	26,195 (19.6)	8,138 (27.8)	7,127 (13.8)	< 0.001	2,753 (13.8)	3,499 (13.4)	875 (15.7)	0.029
Diabetes medication, %	8,707 (6.5)	3.193 (10.9)	3,277 (6.3)	< 0.001	1.111 (5.56)	1.631 (6.3)	535 (9.6)	< 0.001
History of stroke, %	2.370 (1.8)	1.214(4.1)	718 (1.4)	0.897	320 (1.6)	336 (1.3)	62(1.1)	0.001
History of coronary	1,217 (0.9)	675 (2.3)	469 (0.9)	< 0.001	199 (1.0)	209 (0.8)	61 (1.1)	0.609
heart disease, %	,		/				/	
Rural residence, %	58,224 (43.6)	13,049 (44.6)	22,105 (42.8)	0.033	7,805 (39.0)	11,420 (43.8)	2,884 (51.7)	< 0.001
Unintentional injury, %	6 5,400 (4.0)	1,538 (5.2)	2,983 (5.8)	< 0.001	1,080 (5.4)	1,547 (5.9)	356 (6.4)	0.002

$\mathbf{T}_{i} = \mathbf{T}_{i} = \mathbf{T}_{i}$	1 1 1 1	C 1 · /	1	1
TARLE Lieneral	characteristics	OT SIIDIPCTS	according t	o smoking status
India in Contorai	citat actor istics	or subjects	according t	o smoking status

TABLE 2. Prevalence rate ratio for unintentional injuries according to smoking status

Daily cigarette amount	Crude model	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	
Non-smoker	reference	reference	reference	reference	
Former smoker	1.30(1.23 - 1.37)	1.22(1.14-1.31)	1.20(1.12 - 1.29)	1.19(1.11-1.28)	
Current smoker					
$\leq$ 10 cigarettes per day	1.34(1.25 - 1.42)	1.25(1.16-1.35)	1.22(1.14 - 1.32)	1.22(1.13 - 1.32)	
11-20 cigarettes per day	1.47(1.39 - 1.55)	1.36(1.27 - 1.46)	1.33(1.24 - 1.42)	1.33(1.24 - 1.42)	
$\geq$ 21 cigarettes per day	1.58(1.42 - 1.75)	1.44(1.29 - 1.61)	1.40(1.25 - 1.57)	$1.40(1.25  ext{-} 1.57)$	
p for trend	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	

Data are prevalence rate ratio (95% confidence intervals). Model 1 was adjusted for age, sex, household income, marital status, education and residence type. Model 2 was further adjusted for BMI, drinking and exercise. Model 3 was further adjusted for hypertension, diabetes, history of stroke, history of coronary heart disease and self-rated health.

	Non amokon	Non amelian Fermer ameliar		Current smoker (cigarettes per day)			
	Non-smoker	Former smoker	1-10	11-20	$\geq 21$	interaction	
Sex						0.687	
Men	1.00	$1.23\ (1.14 \text{-} 1.33)$	1.20(1.11-1.31)	1.31(1.21-1.41)	1.36(1.21-1.54)		
Women	1.00	$1.23\ (1.01 \text{-} 1.50)$	$1.24\ (1.06 \text{-} 1.45)$	1.36(1.07 - 1.72)	1.88(1.07-3.32)		
Age						< 0.001	
19-49	1.00	1.20(1.08 - 1.34)	1.29(1.17 - 1.42)	1.39(1.26-1.52)	$1.46\ (1.26 \hbox{-} 1.70)$		
$\geq 50$	1.00	$1.17\ (1.07 \text{-} 1.29)$	1.08(0.96-1.22)	1.17(1.05-1.31)	1.23(1.03-1.47)		
Body mass index						0.742	
<25	1.00	1.16(1.07 - 1.26)	1.22(1.12-1.33)	1.30(1.19-1.41)	1.28(1.11-1.48)		
$\geq 25$	1.00	$1.22\ (1.07 \text{-} 1.39)$	$1.17\ (1.01 \text{-} 1.36)$	1.30(1.14-1.48)	1.51(1.24-1.82)		
Residence area						0.068	
Rural	1.00	1.16(1.06 - 1.28)	1.21(1.10-1.34)	1.39(1.27 - 1.53)	$1.39(1.19  ext{-} 1.63)$		
Urban	1.00	1.19(1.07 - 1.32)	1.23(1.09-1.38)	1.19(1.07 - 1.33)	1.32(1.12-1.55)		
Household income						0.200	
Low	1.00	1.12(1.02 - 1.23)	1.25(1.13-1.38)	1.26(1.14 - 1.39)	$1.37\ (1.18-1.60)$		
High	1.00	$1.25(1.12  ext{-} 1.39)$	1.19(1.06-1.33)	1.36(1.23-1.51)	1.34(1.13 - 1.59)		
Education						0.361	
Middle or less	1.00	1.16 (1.04-1.29)	1.14(1.01-1.30)	1.22(1.08-1.38)	1.25(1.04-1.51)		
High or more	1.00	1.18 (1.08-1.30)	1.25(1.14 - 1.38)	1.35(1.24-1.48)	1.44(1.25 - 1.67)		
Alcohol consumption						0.665	
No	1.00	1.12(1.01-1.24)	1.15(1.01-1.30)	1.22(1.08-1.38)	1.34 (1.08-1.66)		
Yes	1.00	1.25(1.14 - 1.38)	1.26 (1.14-1.38)	1.37(1.25 - 1.49)	1.41(1.23-1.62)		
Exercise						0.689	
No	1.00	1.21(1.11-1.31)	$1.22(1.12 \cdot 1.33)$	1.31(1.20-1.42)	1.40 (1.22-1.60)		
Yes	1.00	1.12(0.97 - 1.28)	1.21 (1.04-1.40)	1.30 (1.13-1.49)	1.27 (1.02-1.59)		

**TABLE 3.** Stratified analyses by potential confounders

hol consumption, or exercise.

# DISCUSSION

In this large cross-sectional study of more than 200,000 adults, we examined the association between cigarette smoking and unintentional injuries. The major finding was that cigarette smoking was associated with the risk of unintentional injuries in a dose-response manner. This association persisted after adjusting for demographic characteristics, socioeconomic variables, lifestyle variables, and health status variables. In addition, the association between smoking and unintentional injuries was more evident in younger individuals than in older individuals. To our knowledge, this is the first study to assess the association between smoking habits and unintentional injuries in the general population.

Most studies evaluating the association between smoking habits and unintentional injuries have been conducted in specific groups such as youth, worker or military.<sup>22-25</sup> A prospective study of 2,002 US army recruits demonstrated that cigarette smoking in the prior month was significantly associated with injury occurrence during their 8-week basic military training in both sexes.<sup>25</sup> In a meta-analysis of 18 studies conducted on military trainees, smoking was significantly associated with a lower-extremity overuse injury, with RR of 1.31 (95% CI 1.26-1.36). The relationship between smoking and injuries showed a dose-response relationship, with a risk for injuries higher than in non-smokers by 1.27 times for low level smokers, 1.37 times for medium level smokers and 1.71 times for high level smokers.<sup>22</sup> However, in a Finnish study of 8,219 adolescents aged 12-18, smoking was a significant risk factor for unintentional injuries in the univariate model, but its association disappeared when other health behaviors were adjusted.<sup>26</sup> So far, many studies have evaluated the association between smoking and injury death. In a Taiwan prospective study of 64,319 men, smokers had a significantly increased risk for all injury deaths (RR 1.69, 95% CI 1.39-2.05) compared to nonsmokers.<sup>27</sup> In a meta-analysis of four cohort studies showed that current smokers had a significantly higher accidental mortality rate and a relative risk ratio of 1.51 and 1.35 times greater than non-smokers, respectively.<sup>14</sup> A meta-analysis of three randomized controlled trials reported that smoking cessation was borderline significantly associated with reduced unintentional injuries (RR 0.62, 95% CI 0.26-1.50), which might be limited by a relatively small sample size or rare outcomes.<sup>17</sup>

Although the underlying mechanism by which smoking contributes to unintended injuries is not yet clear, it can be explained by the following mechanisms. First, carelessness caused by smoking can increase the risk of injury. Distraction due to smoking and blurred vision due to smoke can cause injury.<sup>27</sup> In addition, current smokers are more likely to have a car accident than non-smokers.<sup>28,29</sup> Second, smoking decreases functions such as muscle strength, agility, and walking balance, increasing the risk of injury or reducing the likelihood of survival.<sup>13,29</sup> Third, smoking is associated with other risk-taking behaviors, and smokers tend to behave more dangerously than non-smokers. Smokers have lower rates of use of driving safety belts,<sup>29,30</sup> more traffic violations, <sup>31</sup> and more drunk driving instances than non-smokers.<sup>20,32</sup> In this study, we found that former smokers had a higher risk of unintentional injuries than non-smokers. These results suggest that the relationship between smoking and unintentional injuries may be influenced by the weakening of physiological function due to smoking and personal characteristics related to smoking habits, as well as the carelessness caused by smoking. In this study, the association between smoking and unintentional injuries appeared stronger in younger than in older individuals. This seems to be due to the greater tendency of young adults to engage in risk-taking behaviors as compared to older people.<sup>3</sup>

The strength of this study is that it has been carried out in a large national representative sample. However, there are limitations. First, because this study is a cross-sectional study, it is difficult to assess the causal relationship between smoking and injury. Second, smoking assessment was based on self-reports and was not verified by other objective measures. In addition, unintentional injuries were reported by self-reports and not verified by medical records. It is possible that non-differential misclassification through self-report has attenuated true association.

In conclusion, cigarette smoking is associated with the risk of unintentional injuries in a dose-response manner. The relationship between smoking and injury is important not only for current smokers but also for nonsmokers who are exposed to environmental hazards such as respiratory diseases, cancer risks, and fires caused by exposure to tobacco smoke. If we reduce smoking rates through effective smoking cessation programs, we expect to reduce the burden of illness caused by injuries.

# CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

None declared.

# REFERENCES

- World Health Organization (WHO). Unintentional childhood injuries: children's health and the environment [Internet]. Geneva: World Health Organization, 2009 [cited 2017 May 11]. Available from: http://www.who.int/ceh/capacity/injuries.pdf.
- World Health Organization (WHO). Injuries and violence: the facts 2014. Geneva:World Health Organization, 2014 [cited 2017 May 11]. Available from: http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/ 10665/149798/9789241508018\_eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y.
- 3. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). Health at a glance: Asia/Pacific 2014 measuring prog-

ress towards universal health coverage. Paris:OECD Publishing, 2014;26-7.

- 4. Kim SI, Yeon KW, Ha EH, Woo HW, Kim YC. Quality of life, suicide ideation, and depressive symptoms in industrial injury patients. J Korean Neuropsychiatr Assoc 2001;40:416-24.
- 5. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). Health at a glance 2015: OECD indicators. Paris: OECD Publishing,2015;68-9.
- IARC Working Group on the Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans. Tobacco smoke and involuntary smoking. Lyon: IARC Press,2004;1-1438.
- U.S. Public Health Service. The health consequences of involuntary exposure to tobacco smoke: a report of the surgeon general. Rockville (MD): U.S. Department of Health and Human Services,2006;1-727.
- Centers for Disease Control (CDC). The surgeon general's 1989 report on reducing the health consequences of smoking: 25 years of progress. MMWR Suppl 1989;38:1-32.
- 9. Doll R, Hill AB. Smoking and carcinoma of the lung; preliminary report. Br Med J 1950;2:739-48.
- IARC Monographs programme on the evaluation of the carcinogenic risk of chemicals to humans. Preamble. IARC Monogr Eval Carcinog Risk Chem Hum 1986;39:13-32.
- Lakier JB. Smoking and cardiovascular disease. Am J Med 1992;93:8S-12S.
- Doll R, Peto R, Wheatley K, Gray R, Sutherland I. Mortality in relation to smoking: 40 years' observations on male British doctors. BMJ 1994;309:901-11.
- Leistikow BN, Martin DC, Jacobs J, Rocke DM. Smoking as a risk factor for injury death: a meta-analysis of cohort studies. Prev Med 1998;27:871-8.
- 14. Leistikow BN, Martin DC, Samuels SJ. Injury death excesses in smokers: a 1990-95 United States national cohort study. Inj Prev 2000;6:277-80.
- 15. Doll R, Peto R. Mortality in relation to smoking: 20 years' observations on male British doctors. Br Med J 1976;2:1525-36.
- Rogot E. Murray JL. Smoking and causes of death among U.S. veterans: 16 years of observation. Public Health Rep 1980;95:213-22.
- Leistikow BN, Shipley MJ. Might stopping smoking reduce injury death risks? A meta-analysis of randomized, controlled trials. Prev Med 1999;28:255-9.
- Sacks JJ, Nelson DE. Smoking and injuries: an overview. Prev Med 1994;23:515-20.
- English D, Holman DA. The quantification of drug caused morbidity and mortality in Australia. Canberra: Australian Govt Pub. Service, 1995;263-686.
- 20. Brison RJ. Risk of automobile accidents in cigarette smokers. Can J Public Health 1990;81:102-6.
- 21. Kang YW, Ko YS, Kim YJ, Sung KM, Kim HJ, Choi HY. Korea community health survey data profiles. Osong Public Health Res Perspect 2015;6:211-7.
- Bedno SA, Jackson R, Feng X, Walton IL, Boivin MR, Cowan DN. Meta-analysis of cigarette smoking and musculoskeletal injuries in military training. Med Sci Sports Exerc 2017;49:2191-7.
- Naus A, Engler V, Hetychova M, Vavreckova O. Work injuries and smoking. Ind Med Surg 1966;35:880-1.
- 24. Chau N, Bourgkard E, Bhattacherjee A, Ravaud JF, Choquet M,

Mur JM. Associations of job, living conditions and lifestyle with occupational injury in working population: a population-based study. Int Arch Occup Environ Health 2008;81:379-89.

- Altarac M, Gardner JW, Popovich RM, Potter R, Knapik JJ, Jones BH. Cigarette smoking and exercise-related injuries among young men and women. Am J Prev Med 2000;18:96-102.
- 26. Mattila V, Parkkari J, Kannus P, Rimpelä A. Occurrence and risk factors of unintentional injuries among 12- to 18-year-old Finns a survey of 8219 adolescents. Eur J Epidemiol 2004;19:437-44.
- Wen CP, Tsai SP, Cheng TY, Chan HT, Chung WS, Chen CJ. Excess injury mortality among smokers: a neglected tobacco hazard. Tob Control 2005;14 Suppl 1:i28-32.
- Hutchens L, Senserrick TM, Jamieson PE, Romer D, Winston FK. Teen driver crash risk and associations with smoking and drowsy driving. Accid Anal Prev 2008;40:869-76.
- 29. Grout P, Cliff KS, Harman ML, Machin D. Cigarette smoking,

road traffic accidents and seat belt usage. Public health 1983;97:95-101.

- Maron DJ, Telch MJ, Killen JD, Vranizan KM, Saylor KE, Robinson TN. Correlates of seat-belt use by adolescents: implications for health promotion. Prev Med 1986;15:614-23.
- 31. DiFranza JR, Winters TH, Goldberg RJ, Cirillo L, Biliouris T. The relationship of smoking to motor vehicle accidents and traffic violations. N Y State J Med 1986;86:464-7.
- 32. Bradstock MK, Marks JS, Forman MR, Gentry EM, Hogelin GC, Binkin NJ, et al. Drinking-driving and health lifestyle in the United States: behavioral risk factors surveys. J Stud Alcohol 1987;48:147-52.
- Rolison JJ, Hanoch Y, Wood S, Liu PJ. Risk-taking differences across the adult life span: a question of age and domain. J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci 2014;69:870-80.