Exploratory Analysis of Electronic Cigarette-Related Contents on Instagram: Observational Study

¹Yankun Gao, ¹Zidian Xie, ²Li Sun, ³Chenliang Xu, ¹Dongmei Li

¹Department of Clinical & Translational Research, University of Rochester Medical Center, Rochester, NY, USA; ²Goergen Institute for Data Science, University of Rochester, Rochester, New York, USA; ³Department of Computer Science, University of Rochester, Rochester, New York, USA

Introduction

- ◆ E-cigarettes have now become the most popular tobacco product among youth in the U.S..
- Social media platforms are widely used by ecigarette companies and vape stores for marketing and promoting the sale of their products.
- ✤ Instagram has been regularly used by more than half of the U.S. youth and young adults. While the e-cigarette-related posts on Instagram are dominated by vaping-promoting images, there is another voice claiming that vaping is potentially harmful.
- * Few studies have characterized current vapingrelated content on both pro-vaping and vapingwarning groups on Instagram.

Methods

- ✤ There were 41,412 unique pro-vaping posts and 1,539 unique vaping-warning posts collected through Instagram's Application Programming Interface (API) on November 18, 2019, using popular pro-vaping and vaping-warning hashtags.
- ✤ Instagram posts and user accounts were classified into 'pro-vaping', 'vaping-warning', 'neutral-to-vaping' or 'not-related-to-vaping' by considering the visual and textual content together. Random samples in each group were selected for further analysis.
- ✤ Type of the images was categorized as: (1) advertisement; (2) catchphrase; (3) product display; (4) educational; (5) events; (6) memes; (7) news/notice; (8) vaping, and (9) others.
- ✤ Type of the user accounts included: (1) provaping community; (2) personal; (3) sponsored vapor; (4) store; (5) vaping store; (6) community; (7) vaping-warning community; (8) business organization and (9) influencer.
- ✤ The distribution of the follower count and the media count for each Instagram user account, and the like count of each post were plotted, and the median values were compared between the pro-vaping group and the vaping-warning group using Permutation Test.

Results

Table 1: The image types of the pro-vaping and vaping-warning posts.

Image Types	Pro-vaping Posts		Vaping-warning Posts	
	Ν	Percentage (%)	Ν	Percentage (%)
Advertisement	23	11.5	1	0.5
Catchphrase	0	0	16	8
Product display	163	81.5	7	3.5
Educational	1	0.5	95	47.5
Events	1	0.5	15	7.5
Memes	1	0.5	15	7.5
News/notice	1	0.5	21	10.5
Vaping activity	8	4	9	4.5
Others	2	1	21	10.5
Total	200	100	200	100





Discussion

- ✤ More posts could be collected by using pro-vaping hashtags than vaping-warning hashtags.
- * The image types of pro-vaping posts were relatively consistent, while the image types of vaping-warning posts varied a lot.
- vaping posts.
- information and increase the chance of getting 'like'.
- communities may help with the spread of information.

Conclusion

- * Instagram had been dominated by the pro-vaping content, and the pro-vaping posts and user accounts seem to have more user engagement than vaping-warning.
- * These results highlight the importance of regulating e-cigarette posts on social media, and the urgency of identifying effective communication with the public about the health effects of ecigarettes to ameliorate the epidemic of vaping in youth.

CLINICAL&TRANSLATIONAL SCIENCE INSTITUTE



Figure 2: Follower count (A) and media count (B) of the pro-vaping and vaping-warning Instagram accounts.



The pro-vaping Instagram posts had a higher median like count (22) than the vaping-warning posts (12) (P<0.001), which indicated more user engagement of pro-

The median of the number of followers of the pro-vaping group (850) were higher than the vaping-warning group (191) (*P*<0.001), which may help with the spread of

* Hashtag communities were found in both pro-vaping (e.g.: #vapefam) and vaping-warning (e.g.: #atheletesdontvape) groups. The self-identification within those

Acknowledgements

Research reported in this publication was supported by the National Cancer Institute of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) Center for Tobacco Products under Award Number U54CA228110. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the NIH or the FDA.



UNIVERSITY of ROCHESTER MEDICAL CENTER

Disclosure

- •All authors have no potential conflict of interest to declare.
- Research reported in this publication was supported by the National Cancer Institute of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the Food and Drug **Administration (FDA) Center for Tobacco Products** under Award Number U54CA228110.

CLINICAL&TRANSLATIONAL SCIENCE



