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ABSTRACT

Background Exposure to visual posts featuring e-cigarette products on social media is associated with increased e-cigarette use among US adolescents. Instagram is the largest source of e-cigarette social media marketing, where influencers—for example, bloggers, brand ambassadors—post promotional materials. This study analysed the network of e-cigarette brands and influencers on Instagram, characterising the most central players in e-cigarette social media marketing.

Methods We tracked influencers with public profiles on Instagram who posted promotional e-cigarette content in 2020, had over 1000 followers and high user engagement rate (ratio of likes and comments to followers) of 1%–25% per post. By conducting a social network analysis, we identified the most central (highly involved in promotional activities) influencers and e-cigarette brands. The number of the influencers’ followers aged 13–17 years old and the age verification practices restricting youth access were also assessed.

Results There is a highly interconnected network of engaging e-cigarette influencers (n=55) worldwide who collaborated with over 600 e-cigarette brands in 2020. The Asian and US influencers had five to six times more teenage followers compared with the European influencers. 75% of the influencers did not restrict youth access to their promotional content on Instagram. The brands Vapootech, Innokin, Geekvape, Lost Vape, Smok and Vaporesso collaborated with the largest number of influencers (mean n=20).

Conclusions It is important to understand associations among influencers and e-cigarette use behaviours, especially youth, to inform effective public health communication and potential policies that could regulate social media marketing sponsored by e-cigarette companies.

INTRODUCTION

E-cigarette consumption among youth around the world is a public health concern.1–4 In 2020, more than 3.5 million teenagers in the USA used e-cigarettes. During 2019–2020, the use of low-priced disposable e-cigarette devices increased approximately 1000% from 2.4% to 26.5% among US high school current e-cigarette users.1 In addition, more than 8 in 10 teenage e-cigarette users in the USA reported consuming flavoured e-cigarettes. E-cigarettes can harm the adolescent brain, may be associated with respiratory symptoms and may contribute to increased susceptibility to tobacco addiction.1–4,7 Exposure to visual posts featuring e-cigarette products on social media, including promotional content, has been associated with increased e-cigarette use among US adolescents.1,3,5–11 More positive e-cigarette attitudes and lower perceived danger of e-cigarette use.12

Instagram, one of the most popular social media platforms among adolescents with approximately 1 billion users worldwide in 2021,13 is considered the second largest source of social media marketing,14 including e-cigarettes. The platform is home to content from e-cigarette stores, brands, distributors and social media influencers15—e-cigarette use among adolescents in the USA can harm the adolescent brain,25 yet, influencer marketing on social media has not been studied extensively. We located no previous studies that used social network analysis to investigate brand-influencer promotion of tobacco products on social media. The social
network framework shifts the focus from studying individual traits to analysing interactions, relationships and communications. Social network analysis captures distribution of a specific content (eg, promotional posts on social media) and identifies users who are responsible for distribution of this content. For example, Himelboim and Golan analysed the role of social media influencers in diffusion of social media beer advertising on Twitter. The study identified primary influencers (highly retweeted users), bridges (connector hubs who spread information from followers of one influencer to another) and isolates (low-influence users with limited individual contributions to content distribution, but with substantial cumulative influence).

A social network is formed when connections (‘ties’) are created among social actors (‘nodes’), such as individuals (eg, social media influencers) and organisations (eg, e-cigarette brands). Therefore, one way to capture brand–influencer relationships is to examine the number of ties or connections between brands and influencers. These connections are measured by degree centrality, a commonly used measure in social network analysis, which is the number of ties a node has to other nodes. Nodes that have more ties are considered more central, that is, important and influential since they can play a key role in content distribution. For example, if an e-cigarette brand collaborates with multiple influencers, the content they promote on social media may potentially reach a larger network of the influencers’ followers. Similarly, influencers who collaborate with multiple e-cigarette brands might expose their social media followers, including youth, to a wider variety of tobacco-related content. Considering potential exposure to harmful content, social network analysis merits consideration in tobacco control regulation of industry marketing tactics.

This study is the first to analyse the network of e-cigarette brand–influencers on Instagram, providing a global view of potential collaboration among US and international influencers. The study aimed to: (1) identify the most engaging e-cigarette influencers on Instagram in 2020; and (2) conduct a social network analysis to characterise connections between the most central influencers and e-cigarette brands these influencers promoted on Instagram.

### MATERIALS AND METHODS

#### Data collection

In October–December 2020, we used a commercial social media listening platform Meltwater to track Instagram influencers with public profiles and over 1000 followers who posted promotional content that included the most frequently used e-cigarette hashtag and keyword ‘vape’. Using this search term, we identified 260 influencers who posted about e-cigarettes in English in 2020 (posts were collected over the whole year both prospectively and retrospectively).

#### Identifying the most engaging e-cigarette influencers

Of the 260 influencers’ profiles, we selected 55 influencers who met all of the following criteria considered metrics of good performance and high engagement: (1) having more than 1000 followers; (2) having at least 2.1 ratio of the number of followers to the number of users who an influencer follows; (3) having high engagement rate (1%–25% per post) based on the engagement rate benchmarks on Instagram frequently cited by social media analysts (ie, 6-month average engagement rate per post, which is a sum of ‘likes’ and comments divided by the number of followers); (4) posting e-cigarette promotional content at least once a month over 12 months in 2020.

#### Characterising e-cigarette influencers and their promotional content

We collected the following influencer profile metrics (Table 1):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable (metric)</th>
<th>Description/operationalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Username</td>
<td>Instagram username of an influencer who posted e-cigarette-related content in 2020 and used hashtags and keywords described in Section 2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male/female (based on Instagram images featuring an influencer in the collected dataset)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geolocation</td>
<td>A location (country) (a) directly identified in an influencer’s Instagram profile or captions to posts; or (b) inferred from a phone number or a flag emblem provided in the profile or a language used in captions/comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of followers</td>
<td>Number of users who follow an influencer on Instagram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of followed users</td>
<td>Number of users followed by an influencer on Instagram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of followers aged 13–17 years old</td>
<td>Information about followers’ age range is a standard Instagram feature made visible by those influencers who provided access to their demographic data to Meltwater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement rate</td>
<td>Six-month average engagement rate per post is a sum of the number of ‘likes’ and the number of comments divided by the number of followers (range: 1–25)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Collected by the authors and coders

Profile self-identification

Frequency of posting of e-cigarette content

Total number of posts

Number of e-cigarette-related posts

E-cigarette brand name

Table 1 | Metrics collected about social media influencers (n=55) who posted promotional e-cigarette content on Instagram in 2020 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provided by Meltwater</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Username</td>
<td>Instagram username of an influencer who posted e-cigarette-related content in 2020 and used hashtags and keywords described in Section 2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male/female (based on Instagram images featuring an influencer in the collected dataset)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geolocation</td>
<td>A location (country) (a) directly identified in an influencer’s Instagram profile or captions to posts; or (b) inferred from a phone number or a flag emblem provided in the profile or a language used in captions/comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of followers</td>
<td>Number of users who follow an influencer on Instagram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of followed users</td>
<td>Number of users followed by an influencer on Instagram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of followers aged 13–17 years old</td>
<td>Information about followers’ age range is a standard Instagram feature made visible by those influencers who provided access to their demographic data to Meltwater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement rate</td>
<td>Six-month average engagement rate per post is a sum of the number of ‘likes’ and the number of comments divided by the number of followers (range: 1–25)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Collected by the authors and coders

Profile self-identification

Example: blogger, artist, public figure

Frequency of posting of e-cigarette content

Example: once a month, weekly, daily posting of e-cigarette-related content in 2020

Total number of posts

Total number of posts an influencer had on any topic in 2020

Number of e-cigarette-related posts

Number of e-cigarette-related posts an influencer had in 2020

E-cigarette brand name

E-cigarette brand names disclosed in captions to an influencer’s posts on Instagram
of collaboration with an e-cigarette brand that discloses either monetary compensation or non-monetary rewards (eg, ‘a product provided by X brand in exchange for Y service’); and (b) the placement of this disclosure at the top of the Instagram caption (which is relevant for mobile devices when longer descriptions get truncated and users need to click ‘more’ to view the complete caption text, \( \text{figure 1B,C}. \) The coders also reviewed non-e-cigarette promotional posts \((N=1992)\) to document other topics featured in the influencers’ 2020 Instagram posts.

**Social network analysis method**

We conducted a social network analysis\(^26\,27\) to describe connections between e-cigarette brands and the most engaging e-cigarette influencers \((n=55)\) by identifying the most central brands and influencers in the network. The primary metric we use is degree centrality,\(^27\) which represents the number of e-cigarette brands an influencer partners with and the number of influencers an e-cigarette brand partners with. We used a two-mode network,\(^28\,29\) which characterises ties existing between two distinct types of nodes (eg, e-cigarette brands and e-cigarette influencers), but not ties within brands or within influencers. We treated e-cigarette brands as a primary (tie-creating) mode of nodes and e-cigarette influencers as a secondary mode of nodes. We justified this classification based on the assumption that e-cigarette brands could be considered more responsible for creating ties with influencers by inviting them to collaborate on product promotion. We also classified e-cigarette brands as a primary mode since we identified them in this manuscript: this information may be valuable for the FDA that periodically issues warning letters to specific tobacco brands in an attempt to regulate their promotional activity. We de-identified influencers (the secondary mode) by masking their Instagram usernames, in compliance with the Institutional Review Board protocol.

We colour-coded geographical region USA as red, Asia as green, Europe as blue and ‘Other’ as pink represented by one influencer from South Africa and one from Brazil. We defined the North America region as the USA, because only one influencer from Canada met the inclusion criteria; the rest were from the USA.

**Descriptive statistics**

For descriptive analysis, we divided e-cigarette brands into three categories based on their degree centrality, that is, the number of influencers with whom they collaborated. The categories included e-cigarette brands that were connected to: (1) more than 10 influencers (the maximum was one brand that worked with 27 influencers); (2) 5–10 influencers; and (3) 1–4 influencers. For each of these three categories, we provided the average number of the US, Asian and European influencers’ followers, including the number of teenage (13–17 years old) followers, and the average engagement rate (table 1) to assess popularity of the influencers’ e-cigarette content in their network.

Similarly, we divided the influencers into three categories based on their degree centrality (high, mid-range and low degree centrality). Among these three categories, we compared self-identification of the influencers in their profile descriptions (eg, ‘influencer’, ‘blogger’, ‘public figure’), compliance of their posts with the FTC requirements for sponsorship disclosures,\(^30\,31\) and the diversity of their promotional content (if they posted exclusively about e-cigarettes or about other topics as well). Coders also documented the number of brands’ followers, including teenage followers (13–17 years old), and whether the brands and influencers had age-gating notifications (eg, this content is for 18+ or 21+ audience) on their Instagram profiles. In addition, our 20-year-old and 17-year-old coders attempted to follow these e-cigarette brands and influencers on Instagram for the purpose of this study.

Cohen’s kappa for the initial inter-rater reliability (IRR) ranged from 0.87 to 0.95. Differences in coding were discussed and reconciled by the coders until the final IRR for all categories reached 0.95.

**Inferential statistics**

The one-way analysis of variance test followed by the Tukey Honest Significant Differences test for pairwise comparison were conducted to estimate mean differences in the number of followers and engagement rates among the three groups based on the influencers’ geolocation (USA vs Asia vs Europe). The social network and statistical analysis were conducted in R.

**RESULTS**

**Social network of e-cigarette brands and influencers**

The 55 most engaging e-cigarette influencers collaborated with 640 e-cigarette brands that the influencers disclosed in their Instagram captions. In the full network of 640 brands, 5 (9%) of the influencers had the highest degree centrality, collaborating with 60–90 e-cigarette brands, 34 (61%) had mid-range degree centrality, 27 (49%) had low degree centrality.
centrality, collaborating with 11–50 brands, and 16 (30%) had low degree centrality, collaborating with 10 or fewer brands.

To simplify the social network visualisation, we restricted the social network analysis to the e-cigarette brands that collaborated with five or more influencers (n=45 brands, n=52 influencers; figure 2).

Figure 2 shows a highly interconnected network comprised of e-cigarette brands that promoted their e-cigarette products in 2020 on Instagram via influencers from all over the world, primarily from the USA, Indonesia, Germany, France, Malaysia and Italy. We identified 18 influencers from the USA (red), 12 from Asia (green), 20 from Europe (blue) and 2 influencers from South Africa and Brazil (pink). The full distribution of the influencers’ country-wide geolocation in our dataset is presented in online supplemental figure 1.

The influencers with the highest degree centrality (larger circles located near the centre, figure 2) were primarily from Asia followed by the USA. The influencers with lower degree centrality (smaller circles located further away from the centre) represented all three regions, but the majority were from Europe and the USA.

E-cigarette brands with the highest degree centrality collaborated with predominantly the same influencers

Twelve e-cigarette brands (table 2)—big China-based manufacturers and worldwide distributors of e-cigarette products—had the highest degree centrality, collaborating with the largest number of influencers (17–27). Proximity of the squares representing these e-cigarette brands (figure 2) indicates that they mostly collaborated with the same influencers (sharing more than 70% of them). These e-cigarette manufacturers also collaborated with Asian influencers who had the highest degree centrality (ie, they collaborated with 10–18 brands in the restricted network of 45 brands), and with European and US influencers who had lower degree centrality (they collaborated with 5–10 brands in the restricted network of 45 brands).

E-cigarette brands with mid-range degree centrality collaborated with the European influencers who were distinct from those working with the most central brands

Thirty-three e-cigarette brands (table 2)—manufacturers, distributors and retailers from China, the USA, and the UK—had mid-range degree centrality (collaborating with 6–10 influencers) or low degree centrality (collaborating with five influencers). Brands with mid-range degree centrality hired predominantly the same US and Asian influencers as did the most central e-cigarette brands but had distinct European influencers who did not collaborate with the most central brands.

E-cigarette brands and influencers with the low degree centrality appeared to be relatively disconnected

Peripheral brands with low degree centrality, located away from the centre (figure 2), were more ‘contained’ in their niche market rarely sharing influencers. These e-cigarette brands partnered with US and European influencers with relatively small degree centrality (collaborating with 1–5 e-cigarette brands in the restricted network of 45 brands). These brands also collaborated
slightly less frequently with Asian influencers compared with the more central brands.

**Descriptive and inferential statistics**

**Influencers’ followers and engagement**

The number of influencers with whom the brands collaborated appeared to be very right-skewed. Twelve brands collaborated with more than 10 and up to 27 influencers, 33 brands collaborated with 5–10 influencers, and most of the brands (n=595 brands) collaborated with 1–4 influencers (table 2).

Across all categories (table 2), on average, Asian and US influencers had about five times more followers overall and about six times more under 18-year-old followers compared with European influencers (p<0.05). The e-cigarette content posted by Asian influencers was about three times more engaging than the content posted by US and European influencers (p<0.05).

**Influencers’ profiles**

All the influencers included in our analysis typically described themselves in their Instagram profiles as 'public figure', 'brand ambassador', 'promoter', 'video creator', 'artist', 'photographer', 'blogger', 'model' or 'fitness lover'. The word ‘influencer’ was rarely used (only by two influencers). Gender representation was almost equally split between male and female: 50% of them (27) were female. Sixty per cent of the influencers mentioned e-cigarette brands they collaborated with on their Instagram profiles, included descriptions such as 'promotion', 'sponsored', 'endorsements', 'collaboration', or provided their contact phone or email for business inquiries. Influencers with the highest degree centrality had on average 103,000 followers (SD=74,100, range=2100–221,400). This was three times the number of followers of the influencers with mid-range and lower degree centrality (p<0.05). On average, 4% of the most central influencers’ followers were 13–17 years old, which was three times the number of teenage followers (1%) of the less central influencers.

**Sponsorship disclosures**

Only 5% of the influencers’ posts had sponsorship disclosures fully compliant with the FTC requirements, that is, positioned at the very top of a caption or had a description of the type of collaboration, for example, 'a product provided by X brand in exchange for Y service'.

**Variety of content posted by e-cigarette influencers**

Twenty percent of the influencers (11 out of 55) posted exclusively e-cigarette-related promotional content, while the majority—80% (44)—had other promotional topics featured in their posts besides e-cigarettes, including cannabis (CBD) products, fashion, nicotine chewing gums or pouches, and beauty products (figure 3). Still, most of the posts (N=9280) of almost all the influencers were e-cigarette related (online supplemental figure 2).

We found that more than 60% of the e-cigarette brands (n=45) had no age-gating restrictions for followers, although about 40% stated that their posts were only for age-appropriate (18+ or 21+) users. Similarly, 41 out of 55 (75%) of the influencers had no age-restricting notifications. Our 20-year-old and 17-year-old coders were able to follow over 60% of the brands and all the influencers.

**DISCUSSION**

Despite FDA’s actions against any e-cigarette ads targeting youth in 2020, and the Instagram ban on sponsored e-cigarette content in 2021, in 2020 influencers were still collaborating with e-cigarette companies and promoting specific brand-related content on the youth-popular social media site, Instagram. This cross-sectional study analysed Instagram user profiles of 55 e-cigarette brands that collaborated with 1–4 influencers:

**Table 2** Characteristics of e-cigarette brands (N=640) by the number of influencers they collaborated with, the influencers’ user engagement and the number of the influencers’ followers on Instagram in 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geolocation of influences</th>
<th>Average number of influencers per brand</th>
<th>Average number of influencers’ followers/SD/Range</th>
<th>Average number of influencers’ followers &lt;18 years old (% of total average followers)/SD/Range</th>
<th>Average influencers’ engagement rate*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Followers</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Followers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100,793</td>
<td>67,651</td>
<td>32,833–153,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>91,160</td>
<td>56,892</td>
<td>4421–146,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23,241</td>
<td>13,911</td>
<td>8708–43,387</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **33 mid-tier and peripheral e-cigarette brands that collaborated with 5–10 influencers:** |
| Heartfly, Nasty Juice, Smoant, Aspire, Dotmod, Uwell, Mione, Thevape, Heaven Gifts, Dovpo, Vapefly, Rinco, Ruthless Ejuice, Moti, Famovape, Hotcig, Joytech, Maskking, Popvapor, Suvorin, Twistediquid, Univape, Vafflecrom, Vape Dinner Lady, Vape Uno, Vapelustion, Loaded Juice, Nevoks, Riot Squad Eliquids, Solacevapor, Teslacig, Vaportech, Vaptio |

| USA                       | 2                        | 88,021   | 67,751              | 6187–221,400               | 3238     | 4%(26%)             | 3107               | 0–6714              | 2.79               |
| Asia                      | 3.5                      | 102,546  | 40,418              | 40,650–140,868             | 5074     | 5%(41%)             | 3271               | 1494–8280           | 7.41               |
| Europe                    | 3                        | 27,297   | 14,991              | 9899–50,161                | 360      | 1%(23%)             | 266                | 0–1003              | 3.38               |

**595 e-cigarette brands† that collaborated with 1–4 influencers:**

USA, Brazil and South Africa were excluded from the table, because only two influencers were from these countries.

*The engagement rate represents a 6-month average engagement rate per post, which is calculated as a sum of the number of likes and the number of comments divided by the number of followers.

†The list of the 595 brand names that were not included in the social network analysis (figure 2) and that collaborated with one to four influencers is available in the online supplemental appendix.

**Original research**

**Table 2** Characteristics of e-cigarette brands (N=640) by the number of influencers they collaborated with, the influencers’ user engagement and the number of the influencers’ followers on Instagram in 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geolocation of influences</th>
<th>Average number of influencers per brand</th>
<th>Average number of influencers’ followers/SD/Range</th>
<th>Average number of influencers’ followers &lt;18 years old (% of total average followers)/SD/Range</th>
<th>Average influencers’ engagement rate*</th>
</tr>
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<tbody>
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<td></td>
<td>Followers</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Followers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100,793</td>
<td>67,651</td>
<td>32,833–153,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>91,160</td>
<td>56,892</td>
<td>4421–146,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23,241</td>
<td>13,911</td>
<td>8708–43,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>33 mid-tier and peripheral e-cigarette brands that collaborated with 5–10 influencers:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heartfly, Nasty Juice, Smoant, Aspire, Dotmod, Uwell, Mione, Thevape, Heaven Gifts, Dovpo, Vapefly, Rinco, Ruthless Ejuice, Moti, Famovape, Hotcig, Joytech, Maskking, Popvapor, Suvorin, Twistediquid, Univape, Vafflecrom, Vape Dinner Lady, Vape Uno, Vapelustion, Loaded Juice, Nevoks, Riot Squad Eliquids, Solacevapor, Teslacig, Vaportech, Vaptio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| USA                       | 2                        | 88,021   | 67,751              | 6187–221,400               | 3238     | 4%(26%)             | 3107               | 0–6714              | 2.79               |
| Asia                      | 3.5                      | 102,546  | 40,418              | 40,650–140,868             | 5074     | 5%(41%)             | 3271               | 1494–8280           | 7.41               |
| Europe                    | 3                        | 27,297   | 14,991              | 9899–50,161                | 360      | 1%(23%)             | 266                | 0–1003              | 3.38               |

**595 e-cigarette brands† that collaborated with 1–4 influencers:**

USA, Brazil and South Africa were excluded from the table, because only two influencers were from these countries.

*The engagement rate represents a 6-month average engagement rate per post, which is calculated as a sum of the number of likes and the number of comments divided by the number of followers.

†The list of the 595 brand names that were not included in the social network analysis (figure 2) and that collaborated with one to four influencers is available in the online supplemental appendix.
engaging influencers with at least 1000 followers and characterized their connections with over 600 e-cigarette brands to promote e-cigarette-related content.

The social network analysis in this study provided a methodology that may be relevant for tobacco control policy regulators such as the FDA to identify the connections among e-cigarette companies that use brand ambassadors and influencers to post youth-attracting content. By applying the social network method, we discovered a highly dense and intertwined brand-influencer network. E-cigarette brands often hire the same influencers from all over the world, primarily from the USA, Indonesia, Germany, France and Malaysia. International borders on social media are absent. E-cigarette international content could reach US audiences, since influencers from different countries comment on and ‘like’ each other’s Instagram posts, potentially exposing their followers to broader e-cigarette promotional materials.

The social network analysis also allowed us to distinguish the network of influencers used by the most central versus less central e-cigarette brands. The most central brands are large China-based manufacturers and worldwide distributors of a variety of e-cigarette products, including flavoured disposable devices. In 2020, they collaborated with up to 27 US and international influencers (especially Indonesian and Malaysian) with a large number of followers. Less central brands appeared to be smaller manufacturers, distributors and retailers that concentrated more on their respective local markets (US, Asian or European).

The study described the potential reach of the influencers based on their engagement, followers and geolocation. Asian influencers had the highest engagement rate compared with US and European influencers, or European Union (EU) policies (eg, EU Tobacco Products Directive and the Tobacco and Related Products Regulations).41 42 Moreover, Instagram seems not to diligently adhere to its own age-gating policy, despite stating on their Instagram profiles that their content is for the 18+ or 21+ audience. Instagram’s age-gating feature on Instagram (restricting youth access), despite stating on their Instagram profiles that their content is for the 18+ or 21+ audience. Instagram seems not to diligently adhere to its own age-gating policy, despite stating on their Instagram profiles that their content is for the 18+ or 21+ audience. Instagram seems not to diligently adhere to its own age-gating policy, despite stating on their Instagram profiles that their content is for the 18+ or 21+ audience. Instagram seems not to diligently adhere to its own age-gating policy, despite stating on their Instagram profiles that their content is for the 18+ or 21+ audience. Instagram seems not to diligently adhere to its own age-gating policy, despite stating on their Instagram profiles that their content is for the 18+ or 21+ audience. Instagram seems not to diligently adhere to its own age-gating policy, despite stating on their Instagram profiles that their content is for the 18+ or 21+ audience. Instagram seems not to diligently adhere to its own age-gating policy, despite stating on their Instagram profiles that their content is for the 18+ or 21+ audience. Instagram seems not to diligently adhere to its own age-gating policy, despite stating on their Instagram profiles that their content is for the 18+ or 21+ audience. Instagram seems not to diligently adhere to its own age-gating policy, despite stating on their Instagram profiles that their content is for the 18+ or 21+ audience. Instagram seems not to diligently adhere to its own age-gating policy, despite stating on their Instagram profiles that their content is for the 18+ or 21+ audience. Instagram seems not to diligently adhere to its own age-gating policy, despite stating on their Instagram profiles that their content is for the 18+ or 21+ audience. Instagram seems not to diligently adhere to its own age-gating policy, despite stating on their Instagram profiles that their content is for the 18+ or 21+ audience. Instagram seems not to diligently adhere to its own age-gating policy, despite stating on their Instagram profiles that their content is for the 18+ or 21+ audience. Instagram seems not to diligently adhere to its own age-gating policy, despite stating on their Instagram profiles that their content is for the 18+ or 21+ audience. Instagram seems not to diligently adhere to its own age-gating policy, despite stating on their Instagram profiles that their content is for the 18+ or 21+ audience. Instagram seems not to diligently adhere to its own age-gating policy, despite stating on their Instagram profiles that their content is for the 18+ or 21+ audience. Instagram seems not to diligently adhere to its own age-gating policy, despite stating on their Instagram profiles that their content is for the 18+ or 21+ audience. Instagram seems not to diligently adhere to its own age-gating policy, despite stating on their Instagram profiles that their content is for the 18+ or 21+ audience. Instagram seems not to diligently adhere to its own age-gating policy, despite stating on their Instagram profiles that their content is for the 18+ or 21+ audience. Instagram seems not to diligently adhere to its own age-gating policy, despite stating on their Instagram profiles that their content is for the 18+ or 21+ audience. Instagram seems not to diligent
of promoted e-cigarette and other tobacco products among different racial/ethnic groups to address disparities in tobacco product exposure on social media.

Limitations
Since accessing the Instagram Application Programming Interface directly became impossible for non-commercial parties after 2016, we used a commercial social media listening platform Meltwater for data collection. Although Meltwater, based on their agreement with Instagram, provides access to a rich dataset of over 10 million influencers with public profiles who post on a variety of topics, the sample from which we selected e-cigarette influencers might have been not truly random.

It is not possible to say with absolute certainty that all posts made by influencers were truly sponsored, since some influencers may also upload content that they were not incentivised to post about. This may overstate the number of sponsored posts, as well as complicate enforcement efforts.47

We only conducted a descriptive analysis and looked at the most frequently used measure in social network analysis, degree centrality. We did not assess the effect of exposure to promotional content on followers or product users.

Finally, we only reviewed the posts’ accounts and captions written in English. Translating and analysing captions to e-cigarette promotional posts in other languages could be a direction for future research.

CONCLUSIONS
Instagram is home to many social influencers with widespread audiences, including youth, high levels of engagement and a highly interconnected, dense social network. The influencers often post promotional images and videos of e-cigarette products without disclosing their incentive arrangements with e-cigarette brands. This type of marketing deserves closer research and policy attention to reduce tobacco product influence, especially among youth. Even if policies were to enforce disclosure requirements more strongly, youth and non-users of e-cigarettes could still be exposed to non-compliant content posted by influencers from other countries. Similarly, when e-cigarette influencers from different countries react to (comment on or ‘like’) each other’s posts, they potentially expose their respective audiences to each other’s promotional content. Social media influencer marketing is no longer dominated by mega-influencers with millions of followers, but is powered by an interconnected global network of micro-influencers48 49 (with 1000–100 000 followers) who collaborate with multiple industries and multiple brands, including tobacco. Large e-cigarette brands also have a global network of smaller distributors and retailers whose products are promoted by influencers. While it may be difficult for public health officials to regulate this interconnected global network, improved monitoring of how social media sites implement and enforce their own restrictions on tobacco-related content may help overcome this hurdle.
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