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## The Great American Smokeout — November 21, 1996

Since 1977, the American Cancer Society (ACS) has sponsored the Great American Smokeout to foster community-based activities that encourage smokers to stop smoking for at least 24 hours. This year, the Great American Smokeout is Thursday, November 21. The primary goal of this year's event is to prevent initiation of tobacco use among children and adolescents.

Most smokers began smoking as teenagers (1); each day, approximately 6000 young persons try a cigarette and approximately 3000 become daily smokers (Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, unpublished data, 1994). Among persons who have ever smoked daily, $82 \%$ began smoking before age 18 years (1). In August 1996, the Executive Branch of the federal government announced the nation's first comprehensive program to prevent children and adolescents from smoking cigarettes or using smokeless tobacco (2).

Events this year will include a program to encourage high school-aged children to sign a Great American Smokeout pledge promising to stay smoke-free or to try to quit smoking during the Great American Smokeout. In addition, ACS volunteers will conduct smoking-cessation and -prevention activities for persons of all ages at shopping malls, worksites, hospitals, military installations, and other locations.

Additional information is available from the ACS, telephone (800) 227-2345 or (404) 320-3333; CDC, telephone (800) 232-1311 or (770) 488-5705; or the ACS Great American Smokeout website on the World Wide Web (http://www. cancer.org).
Reported by: American Cancer Society, Atlanta. Office on Smoking and Health, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, CDC.
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## State-Specific Prevalence of Cigarette Smoking United States, 1995

State-specific variation in the prevalence of cigarette smoking contributes to differences in the mortality patterns of smoking-related diseases, such as lung cancer, coronary heart disease, chronic bronchitis, and emphysema (1). In 1990, approximately 400,000 deaths were attributable to smoking: the median percentage of deaths attributable to smoking in all states was $19.2 \%$ (range: $13.4 \%$ in Utah to $24.0 \%$ in Nevada) (1). State-specific surveillance of the prevalence of cigarette smoking can be used to direct and evaluate public health interventions to reduce smoking and the burden of smoking-related diseases on society. In June 1996, the Council of State and Territorial Epidemiologists (CSTE) recommended that cigarette smoking be added to the list of conditions designated as reportable by states to CDC (2). This report responds to the CSTE recommendation and summarizes state-specific prevalences of cigarette smoking by U.S. adults in 1995. During 1995, the prevalence of smoking varied among states and ranged from 13.2\% (Utah) to 27.8\% (Kentucky).

The 1995 Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS)—a state-based, random-digit-dialed telephone survey of the noninstitutionalized U.S. population aged $\geq 18$ years-was conducted in 50 states and was used to determine self-reported cigarette smoking among adults. Respondents were asked "Have you smoked at least 100 cigarettes in your entire life?" and "Do you smoke cigarettes now?" Current smokers were persons who reported having smoked $\geq 100$ cigarettes during their lifetimes and who smoke now. Every-day smoking was determined by asking current smokers "On how many of the past 30 days did you smoke cigarettes?" A quit attempt was determined by asking current every-day smokers "During the past 12 months, have you quit smoking for one day or longer?" Data from the 50 states were weighted to represent state populations and used to produce point estimates; 95\% confidence intervals were calculated using SUDAAN.

During 1995, the median prevalence of current smoking was $22.4 \%$; state-specific prevalences ranged from $13.2 \%$ (Utah) to $27.8 \%$ (Kentucky) (Table 1). Range endpoints were higher for men ( $16.4 \%$ to $31.6 \%$ ) than for women ( $10.0 \%$ to $27.8 \%$ ); however, state-specific prevalences were significantly higher for men than for women in only eight states (Alabama, Arizona, Georgia, Illinois, Missouri, North Carolina, Ohio, and Utah). Among current smokers, reported every-day smoking during the preceding 30 days ranged from $79.7 \%$ (New Jersey) to $92.9 \%$ (Oklahoma) (Table 2). The percentage of every-day smokers who reported having quit for $\geq 1$ day during the previous year ranged from $32.4 \%$ (Georgia) to $59.4 \%$ (Hawaii) (Table 2).
Reported by the following BRFSS coordinators: J Durham, MPA, Alabama; P Owen, Alaska; B Bender, Arizona; J Senner, PhD, Arkansas; B Davis, PhD, California; M Leff, MSPH, Colorado; M Adams, MPH, Connecticut; F Breukelman, Delaware; C Mitchell, District of Columbia; D McTague, MS, Florida; E Pledger, MPA, Georgia; J Cooper, MA, Hawaii; C Johnson, MPH, Idaho; B Steiner, MS, Illinois; N Costello, MPA, Indiana; P Busick, Iowa; M Perry, Kansas; K Asher, Kentucky; R Meriwether, MD, Louisiana; D Maines, Maine; A Weinstein, MA, Maryland; D Brooks, MPH, Massachusetts; H McGee, MPH, Michigan; N Salem, PhD, Minnesota; S Loyd, Mississippi; J Jackson-Thompson, PhD, Missouri; P Smith, Montana; S Huffman, Nebraska; E DeJan, MPH, Nevada; K Zaso, MPH, New Hampshire; G Boeselager, MS, New Jersey; W Honey, New Mexico; T Melnik, DrPH, New York; G Lengerich, VMD, North Carolina; J Kaske, MPH, North Dakota; R Indian, MS, Ohio; N Hann, MPH, Oklahoma; J Grant-Worley, MS, Oregon; L Mann, Pennsylvania; J Hesser, PhD, Rhode Island; J Ferguson, DrPh, South Carolina; M Gildemaster, South Dakota; D Ridings, Tennessee; R Diamond, MPH, Texas; R Giles, Utah; R McIntyre,
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TABLE 1. Prevalence of current cigarette smoking among adults,* by state and sex United States, Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, 1995

| State ${ }^{\dagger}$ | Men |  | Women |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | (95\% CI ${ }^{\text {§ }}$ ) | \% | (95\% CI) | \% | (95\% CI) |
| Alabama | 30.0 | ( $\pm 3.9 \%$ ) | 19.7 | ( $\pm 2.6 \%$ ) | 24.5 | ( $\pm 2.3 \%)$ |
| Alaska | 26.5 | ( $\pm 4.7 \%$ ) | 23.3 | ( $\pm 4.0 \%$ ) | 25.0 | ( $\pm 3.1 \%)$ |
| Arizona | 26.8 | ( $\pm 4.5 \%)$ | 19.1 | ( $\pm 3.1 \%)$ | 22.9 | ( $\pm 2.7 \%$ ) |
| Arkansas | 26.8 | ( $\pm 3.6 \%)$ | 23.8 | ( $\pm 2.7 \%$ ) | 25.2 | ( $\pm 2.2 \%$ ) |
| California | 17.5 | ( $\pm 2.2 \%$ ) | 13.6 | ( $\pm 2.3 \%)$ | 15.5 | ( $\pm 1.6 \%$ ) |
| Colorado | 22.2 | ( $\pm 3.2 \%)$ | 21.4 | ( $\pm 2.7 \%$ ) | 21.8 | ( $\pm 2.1 \%)$ |
| Connecticut | 21.0 | ( $\pm 3.3 \%)$ | 20.6 | ( $\pm 2.7 \%$ ) | 20.8 | ( $\pm 2.1 \%)$ |
| Delaware | 27.5 | ( $\pm 3.3 \%)$ | 23.6 | ( $\pm 2.7 \%$ ) | 25.5 | ( $\pm 2.1 \%$ ) |
| Florida | 24.9 | ( $\pm 2.5 \%$ ) | 21.6 | ( $\pm 2.0 \%$ ) | 23.1 | ( $\pm 1.6 \%$ ) |
| Georgia | 24.3 | ( $\pm 3.0 \%$ ) | 16.9 | ( $\pm 2.3 \%)$ | 20.5 | ( $\pm 1.9 \%)$ |
| Hawaii | 18.8 | ( $\pm 3.0 \%$ ) | 16.8 | ( $\pm 2.6 \%$ ) | 17.8 | ( $\pm 2.0 \%$ ) |
| Idaho | 20.4 | ( $\pm 2.5 \%)$ | 19.2 | ( $\pm 2.1 \%)$ | 19.8 | ( $\pm 1.6 \%$ ) |
| Illinois | 26.6 | ( $\pm 2.9 \%$ ) | 19.9 | ( $\pm 2.1 \%)$ | 23.1 | ( $\pm 1.8 \%$ ) |
| Indiana | 28.5 | ( $\pm 2.8 \%$ ) | 26.0 | ( $\pm 2.6 \%$ ) | 27.2 | ( $\pm 1.9 \%$ ) |
| lowa | 24.8 | ( $\pm 2.4 \%$ ) | 21.7 | ( $\pm 1.9 \%)$ | 23.2 | ( $\pm 1.5 \%$ ) |
| Kansas | 24.0 | ( $\pm 3.0 \%$ ) | 20.1 | ( $\pm 2.5 \%)$ | 22.0 | ( $\pm 2.0 \%$ ) |
| Kentucky | 28.8 | ( $\pm 3.2 \%$ ) | 26.9 | ( $\pm 2.5 \%)$ | 27.8 | ( $\pm 2.0 \%$ ) |
| Louisiana | 26.3 | ( $\pm 3.8 \%)$ | 24.2 | ( $\pm 3.0 \%$ ) | 25.2 | ( $\pm 2.5 \%)$ |
| Maine | 26.9 | ( $\pm 4.1 \%$ ) | 23.2 | ( $\pm 3.5 \%$ ) | 25.0 | ( $\pm 2.6 \%$ ) |
| Maryland | 22.4 | ( $\pm 2.0 \%$ ) | 20.1 | ( $\pm 1.6 \%$ ) | 21.2 | ( $\pm 1.3 \%$ ) |
| Massachusetts | 22.5 | ( $\pm 3.3 \%)$ | 21.0 | ( $\pm 2.8 \%$ ) | 21.7 | ( $\pm 2.2 \%$ ) |
| Michigan | 26.3 | ( $\pm 2.9 \%)$ | 25.2 | ( $\pm 2.4 \%)$ | 25.7 | ( $\pm 1.9 \%)$ |
| Minnesota | 22.5 | ( $\pm 2.2 \%)$ | 18.6 | ( $\pm 1.7 \%$ ) | 20.5 | ( $\pm 1.4 \%)$ |
| Mississippi | 27.6 | ( $\pm 4.0 \%$ ) | 20.9 | ( $\pm 2.9 \%)$ | 24.0 | ( $\pm 2.5 \%$ ) |
| Missouri | 28.0 | ( $\pm 4.0 \%$ ) | 20.9 | ( $\pm 2.9 \%)$ | 24.3 | ( $\pm 2.5 \%)$ |
| Montana | 22.5 | ( $\pm 3.8 \%)$ | 19.8 | ( $\pm 3.1 \%)$ | 21.1 | ( $\pm 2.5 \%)$ |
| Nebraska | 24.8 | ( $\pm 3.4 \%)$ | 19.3 | ( $\pm 2.5 \%$ ) | 21.9 | ( $\pm 2.1 \%$ ) |
| Nevada | 24.8 | ( $\pm 3.6 \%)$ | 27.8 | ( $\pm 3.2 \%$ ) | 26.3 | ( $\pm 2.4 \%)$ |
| New Hampshire | 21.9 | ( $\pm 3.8 \%)$ | 21.0 | ( $\pm 3.0 \%$ ) | 21.4 | ( $\pm 2.4 \%$ ) |
| New Jersey | 21.6 | ( $\pm 4.5 \%)$ | 17.0 | ( $\pm 2.8 \%$ ) | 19.2 | ( $\pm 2.6 \%$ ) |
| New Mexico | 22.7 | ( $\pm 4.4 \%$ ) | 19.7 | ( $\pm 3.2 \%$ ) | 21.2 | ( $\pm 2.7 \%)$ |
| New York | 23.6 | ( $\pm 3.1 \%$ ) | 19.6 | ( $\pm 2.3 \%)$ | 21.5 | ( $\pm 1.9 \%)$ |
| North Carolina | 30.2 | ( $\pm 2.8 \%)$ | 21.8 | ( $\pm 2.1 \%$ ) | 25.8 | $( \pm 1.7 \%)$ |
| North Dakota | 24.9 | ( $\pm 3.2 \%$ ) | 20.5 | ( $\pm 2.9 \%)$ | 22.7 | ( $\pm 2.1 \%)$ |
| Ohio | 31.6 | ( $\pm 4.7 \%$ ) | 21.0 | ( $\pm 3.2 \%$ ) | 26.0 | ( $\pm 2.8 \%)$ |
| Oklahoma | 21.6 | ( $\pm 3.3 \%)$ | 21.7 | ( $\pm 3.0 \%$ ) | 21.7 | ( $\pm 2.2 \%$ ) |
| Oregon | 22.9 | ( $\pm 2.7 \%$ ) | 20.8 | ( $\pm 2.3 \%)$ | 21.8 | ( $\pm 1.8 \%$ ) |
| Pennsylvania | 26.0 | ( $\pm 2.7 \%$ ) | 22.5 | ( $\pm 2.5 \%)$ | 24.2 | ( $\pm 1.8 \%$ ) |
| Rhode Island | 24.0 | ( $\pm 3.4 \%)$ | 25.4 | ( $\pm 3.1 \%)$ | 24.7 | ( $\pm 2.3 \%)$ |
| South Carolina | 24.6 | ( $\pm 3.2 \%$ ) | 23.0 | ( $\pm 2.8 \%)$ | 23.7 | ( $\pm 2.1 \%)$ |
| South Dakota | 22.8 | ( $\pm 3.0 \%$ ) | 20.9 | ( $\pm 2.8 \%)$ | 21.8 | ( $\pm 2.1 \%)$ |
| Tennessee | 27.9 | ( $\pm 3.4 \%)$ | 25.2 | ( $\pm 2.6 \%)$ | 26.5 | ( $\pm 2.1 \%)$ |
| Texas | 27.1 | ( $\pm 3.9 \%$ ) | 20.4 | ( $\pm 2.8 \%)$ | 23.7 | ( $\pm 2.4 \%)$ |
| Utah | 16.4 | ( $\pm 2.9 \%$ ) | 10.0 | ( $\pm 1.8 \%)$ | 13.2 | ( $\pm 1.7 \%)$ |
| Vermont | 24.9 | ( $\pm 3.0 \%$ ) | 19.5 | ( $\pm 2.5 \%)$ | 22.1 | ( $\pm 1.9 \%)$ |
| Virginia | 23.7 | ( $\pm 3.5 \%)$ | 20.5 | ( $\pm 2.7 \%$ ) | 22.0 | ( $\pm 2.3 \%)$ |
| Washington | 20.0 | ( $\pm 2.3 \%)$ | 20.3 | ( $\pm 2.0 \%$ ) | 20.2 | ( $\pm 1.5 \%)$ |
| West Virginia | 24.8 | ( $\pm 3.0 \%$ ) | 26.5 | ( $\pm 2.5 \%)$ | 25.7 | ( $\pm 2.0 \%$ ) |
| Wisconsin | 24.5 | ( $\pm 3.5 \%$ ) | 19.3 | ( $\pm 2.6 \%)$ | 21.8 | ( $\pm 2.2 \%$ ) |
| Wyoming | 22.1 | ( $\pm 2.8 \%)$ | 21.9 | ( $\pm 2.3 \%)$ | 22.0 | ( $\pm 1.8 \%)$ |
| Range | 16.4-31 |  | 10.0-27 |  | 13.2-27 |  |
| Median | 24.7 |  | 20.9 |  | 22.4 |  |
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TABLE 2. Percentage of current adult smokers who smoked every day* and percentage of every-day smokers who quit smoking for $\geq 1$ day $^{\dagger}$, by state - United States, Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, 1995

| State ${ }^{\text {§ }}$ | Smoked every day |  | Quit smoking for $\geq 1$ day |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | (95\% CIII) | \% | (95\% CI) |
| Alabama | 88.5 | ( $\pm 3.4 \%$ ) | 42.5 | ( $\pm 5.9 \%$ ) |
| Alaska | 88.8 | ( $\pm 3.8 \%$ ) | 55.9 | ( $\pm 7.6 \%$ ) |
| Arizona | 88.3 | ( $\pm 4.0 \%$ ) | 48.7 | ( $\pm 6.9 \%)$ |
| Arkansas | 89.8 | ( $\pm 2.7 \%$ ) | 46.0 | ( $\pm 5.5 \%)$ |
| California | 81.3 | ( $\pm 3.9 \%)$ | 52.3 | ( $\pm 6.4 \%)$ |
| Colorado | 81.9 | ( $\pm 4.2 \%)$ | 47.0 | ( $\pm 5.9 \%$ ) |
| Connecticut | 88.8 | ( $\pm 3.3 \%)$ | 48.3 | ( $\pm 6.1 \%)$ |
| Delaware | 90.3 | ( $\pm 3.1 \%$ ) | 50.5 | ( $\pm 5.1 \%)$ |
| Florida | 87.3 | ( $\pm 2.8 \%)$ | 46.4 | ( $\pm 4.1 \%)$ |
| Georgia | 89.8 | ( $\pm 3.1 \%)$ | 32.4 | ( $\pm 5.0 \%$ ) |
| Hawaii | 84.5 | ( $\pm 4.4 \%)$ | 59.4 | ( $\pm 6.4 \%)$ |
| Idaho | 91.1 | ( $\pm 2.5 \%)$ | 42.1 | ( $\pm 4.8 \%)$ |
| Illinois | 86.1 | ( $\pm 3.2 \%$ ) | 43.1 | ( $\pm 4.6 \%)$ |
| Indiana | 89.0 | ( $\pm 2.8 \%)$ | 41.2 | ( $\pm 4.2 \%)$ |
| lowa | 87.0 | ( $\pm 2.6 \%$ ) | 40.4 | ( $\pm 3.9 \%)$ |
| Kansas | 83.7 | ( $\pm 3.8 \%)$ | 38.1 | ( $\pm 5.3 \%)$ |
| Kentucky | 89.0 | ( $\pm 2.6 \%)$ | 38.8 | ( $\pm 4.4 \%)$ |
| Louisiana | 83.3 | ( $\pm 4.1 \%$ ) | 50.7 | ( $\pm 6.0 \%$ ) |
| Maine | 88.6 | ( $\pm 4.2 \%)$ | 34.6 | ( $\pm 5.7 \%)$ |
| Maryland | 84.6 | ( $\pm 2.6 \%$ ) | 42.9 | ( $\pm 3.7 \%$ ) |
| Massachusetts | 86.3 | ( $\pm 4.0 \%$ ) | 56.5 | ( $\pm 5.9 \%)$ |
| Michigan | 83.2 | ( $\pm 3.3 \%)$ | 46.2 | ( $\pm 4.6 \%)$ |
| Minnesota | 84.5 | ( $\pm 2.7 \%$ ) | 42.1 | ( $\pm 4.1 \%)$ |
| Mississippi | 84.2 | ( $\pm 4.5 \%$ ) | 48.5 | ( $\pm 6.0 \%$ ) |
| Missouri | 89.3 | ( $\pm 3.5 \%$ ) | 45.2 | ( $\pm 6.4 \%$ ) |
| Montana | 89.2 | ( $\pm 4.2 \%$ ) | 41.5 | ( $\pm 6.8 \%$ ) |
| Nebraska | 88.3 | ( $\pm 3.4 \%$ ) | 41.5 | ( $\pm 5.8 \%$ ) |
| Nevada | 88.0 | ( $\pm 3.3 \%)$ | 45.1 | ( $\pm 5.7 \%$ ) |
| New Hampshire | 87.1 | ( $\pm 4.3 \%)$ | 44.6 | ( $\pm 6.9 \%)$ |
| New Jersey | 79.7 | ( $\pm 6.1 \%)$ | 43.2 | ( $\pm 8.4 \%)$ |
| New Mexico | 82.2 | ( $\pm 5.4 \%)$ | 47.4 | ( $\pm 7.6 \%$ ) |
| New York | 88.5 | ( $\pm 3.0 \%$ ) | 47.3 | ( $\pm 5.2 \%)$ |
| North Carolina | 88.7 | ( $\pm 2.5 \%$ ) | 47.9 | ( $\pm 4.1 \%$ ) |
| North Dakota | 88.1 | ( $\pm 3.3 \%)$ | 40.5 | ( $\pm 5.4 \%)$ |
| Ohio | 90.6 | ( $\pm 3.5 \%$ ) | 45.2 | ( $\pm 6.8 \%)$ |
| Oklahoma | 92.9 | ( $\pm 3.3 \%)$ | 38.6 | ( $\pm 6.0 \%$ ) |
| Oregon | 84.3 | ( $\pm 3.2 \%$ ) | 37.0 | ( $\pm 4.7 \%$ ) |
| Pennsylvania | 83.7 | ( $\pm 3.0 \%$ ) | 42.0 | ( $\pm 4.8 \%)$ |
| Rhode Island | 86.0 | ( $\pm 3.9 \%$ ) | 45.5 | ( $\pm 5.8 \%)$ |
| South Carolina | 87.6 | ( $\pm 3.1 \%$ ) | 42.9 | ( $\pm 5.5 \%$ ) |
| South Dakota | 90.7 | ( $\pm 3.0 \%$ ) | 41.7 | ( $\pm 5.6 \%$ ) |
| Tennessee | 91.1 | ( $\pm 2.6 \%$ ) | 38.1 | ( $\pm 4.7 \%$ ) |
| Texas | 83.8 | ( $\pm 4.0 \%$ ) | 51.0 | ( $\pm 6.4 \%)$ |
| Utah | 85.2 | ( $\pm 5.2 \%$ ) | 44.0 | ( $\pm 6.9 \%)$ |
| Vermont | 85.1 | ( $\pm 3.4 \%$ ) | 37.5 | ( $\pm 5.2 \%$ ) |
| Virginia | 83.9 | ( $\pm 4.2 \%$ ) | 41.3 | ( $\pm 5.9 \%)$ |
| Washington | 86.1 | ( $\pm 2.8 \%$ ) | 45.6 | ( $\pm 4.5 \%)$ |
| West Virginia | 91.8 | ( $\pm 2.3 \%)$ | 40.6 | ( $\pm 4.4 \%)$ |
| Wisconsin | 83.3 | ( $\pm 4.2 \%$ ) | 49.3 | ( $\pm 6.1 \%)$ |
| Wyoming | 86.5 | ( $\pm 3.3 \%)$ | 40.1 | ( $\pm 4.8 \%$ ) |
| Range | 79.7-92.9 |  | 32.4-59.4 |  |
| Median | 87.2 |  | 43.6 |  |

* During the preceding 30 days.
${ }^{\dagger}$ During the preceding 12 months.
${ }^{\S}$ No data were available for the District of Columbia.
${ }^{〔}$ Confidence interval.
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PhD, Vermont; J Stones, Virginia; K Wynkoop-Simmons, PhD, Washington; F King, West Virginia; E Cautley, MS, Wisconsin; M Futa, MA, Wyoming. Council of State and Territorial Epidemiologists. Epidemiology Br, Office on Smoking and Health, and Behavioral Surveillance Br, Div of Adult and Community Health, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, CDC.
Editorial Note: The findings in this report are a milestone for public health surveillance in the United States: these findings document the first time surveillance for a behavior—rather than a disease or illness—has been nationally reportable (2). Although the wide state-specific variation in prevalence of cigarette smoking may reflect, in part, differences in sociodemographic characteristics (e.g., age, race, and educational level), previous reports indicated that variations persisted even after estimates were standardized to adjust for these differences (3). Despite some state-specific variations in prevalences, smoking patterns across most states were similar for men and women, indicating that the historically observed gap between men and women has decreased substantially.

Compared with previous years, prevalences of smoking decreased in some states while remaining relatively stable in others (4). For example, from 1984 to 1995, the prevalence declined from $26 \%$ to $16 \%$ in California, but remained consistently low in Utah (16\% to 13\%). Only Utah has achieved the national health objective for the year 2000 of reducing the prevalence of cigarette smoking among adults to no more than 15\% (objective 3.4) (5); this objective has been nearly achieved in California. Successful state efforts may reflect a combination of factors including community-based tobacco-control programs, antitobacco use media campaigns, and enactment and enforcement of policies to restrict and prevent tobacco use (6).

Prevalences of reported every-day smoking and quitting smoking for $\geq 1$ day may be related to factors that influence current smoking prevalence, including physician advice to quit smoking, smoke-free indoor-air policies, the price of cigarettes, and counter-advertising campaigns. For example, prevalences of tobacco use and the amount of tobacco consumed may vary substantially in relation to the price of tobacco products (5) -price increases may prompt current smokers to quit and deter young persons from starting, accounting for the prevention of premature deaths and resulting in savings of billions of dollars in health-care costs (1,5).

The findings in this report are subject to at least two limitations. First, prevalence estimates may be underestimated because data were collected through telephone interviews; previous studies indicate substantial differences in the characteristics of persons who reside in households without a telephone compared with those who reside in households with a telephone (7). Second, these estimates were only for adults and did not include persons aged <18 years. However, to adequately assess the impact of cigarette smoking, data about the prevalence of smoking among young persons also should be considered. Data about youth tobacco use during 1995 are available in 31 states; of these, 22 can produce generalizable state estimates (8).

The national health objectives for the year 2000 have established measurable goals for reducing the prevalence of cigarette smoking, preventing young persons from initiating smoking, encouraging smokers to quit, and developing public policies that are less supportive of tobacco use (5). Public health measures necessary to achieve the objective of reducing smoking in all states include individual-based interventions (e.g., services to help smokers quit), and population-based interventions (e.g., public health policies that prevent nicotine addiction and promote quitting smoking) $(5,9)$.
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## Cigarette Smoking Before and After an Excise Tax Increase and an Antismoking Campaign Massachusetts, 1990-1996

In November 1992, residents of Massachusetts approved a ballot petition (Question 1) that increased the tax on each pack of cigarettes from $26 \phi$ to $51 \phi$ beginning January 1, 1993, and requested that the legislature spend the proceeds on tobacco control and health education. The Massachusetts Tobacco Control Program (MTCP), administered by the Massachusetts Department of Public Health (MDPH), was established in response to the approval of the petition. In October 1993, MTCP initiated a statewide mass-media antismoking campaign. In early 1994, the program began funding local boards of health and school health and other youth programs to promote policies to reduce public exposure to environmental tobacco smoke and to restrict youth access to cigarettes. Efforts also included support to health education programs, primarycare providers, and other services to help smokers quit. Through June 1996, MTCP expenditures totaled $\$ 116$ million, including $\$ 43$ million for the mass-media campaign (1). To assess the effects of the excise tax increase and the antismoking campaign on cigarette smoking in Massachusetts, CDC and MDPH analyzed data about the number of packs of cigarettes taxed per capita and the prevalence of cigarette smoking during the period preceding (1990-1992) and following (1993-1996) implementation of the ballot petition. This report summarizes the findings of the assessment and compares trends in cigarette consumption (i.e., purchases) in Massachusetts, in California (where a voter-mandated cigarette tax increase in January 1989 funded a statewide antismoking campaign that began in April 1990 [2]), and in the 48 remaining states and the District of Columbia combined. The findings suggest that the number of packs
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of cigarettes taxed per capita declined substantially in Massachusetts after implementation of the ballot petition.

For each full calendar year from 1990 through 1995, taxable cigarette consumption for Massachusetts, California, and the other states and the District of Columbia combined was derived from monthly reports from the Tobacco Institute on tax receipts for wholesale cigarette deliveries (3). Taxable consumption for 1996 was estimated as twice the cumulative values for January-June. Per capita rates (in packs/year) were based on the resident population aged $\geq 18$ years in each state (4).

Data on the average retail price of a pack of cigarettes in Massachusetts at 4-week intervals during 1990-1995 were based on bar-code scanning data provided by Information Resources, Inc. (5). Data were obtained for a seven-county region (including the Boston and Worcester metropolitan areas) that represented $83 \%$ of Massachusetts residents based on 1990 census estimates. The observed retail prices of cigarettes were adjusted for inflation by using the consumer price index for urban workers in the Boston metropolitan area (6).

Data from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) for 1990 through 1995 (the most recent year for which data were available) were used to estimate the annual prevalence of cigarette smoking among adults in Massachusetts, California, and the remaining participating states combined. The BRFSS is a population-based, random-digit-dialed telephone survey of the noninstitutionalized U.S. population aged $\geq 18$ years. The District of Columbia and seven states (Alaska, Arizona, Kansas, Nevada, New Jersey, Rhode Island, and Wyoming) were excluded because they did not participate in BRFSS 1 or more years during 1990-1995 (7 ; CDC, unpublished data, 1995). Because sampling errors for annual BRFSS estimates precluded precise year-to-year comparisons, 3-year average prevalences were estimated for 1990-1992 and 1993-1995. A current smoker was defined as any respondent who answered "yes" to the following two questions: "Have you smoked at least 100 cigarettes in your entire life?" and "Do you smoke cigarettes now?" Estimates were weighted based on the number of telephones per household and the age, sex, and racial/ethnic composition of the residents of the individual states. The prevalence of smoking for the remaining participating states combined was computed as a population-weighted average of the prevalences estimated for the 41 states that participated in BRFSS every year during 1990-1995. SESUDAAN was used to calculate 95\% confidence intervals (Cls).

During 1990-1992, taxable per capita consumption of cigarettes by adults declined $6.4 \%$ in Massachusetts, $11.0 \%$ in California, and $5.8 \%$ in the 48 remaining states and the District of Columbia combined (Table 1). In Massachusetts, from 1992 (the year before implementation of the petition) to 1996, taxable per capita consumption declined by $19.7 \%$ (from 117 packs to 94 packs) (Table 1); in California and the remaining states, per capita consumption declined by $15.8 \%$ and $6.1 \%$, respectively.

Immediately after the Massachusetts petition became effective on January 1, 1993, the real price of cigarettes increased sharply but subsequently declined (Figure 1). In response to increasing sales of discount brands, in April 1993 one U.S. cigarette manufacturer announced a nationwide, $40 \phi$-per-pack price discount on its major premium brand, and in May, another manufacturer matched the discount on its major premium brands. In August, all manufacturers announced a permanent wholesale price reduction of $39 \not \subset$ per pack on all premium-brand cigarettes (8). As a result of
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TABLE 1. Number of packs of cigarettes purchased per adult,* by year - selected U.S. sites, 1990-1996 ${ }^{\dagger}$

| Year | Massachusetts | California | 48 Remaining states <br> and the <br> District of Columbia |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1990 | 125 | 100 | 139 |
| 1991 | 120 | 92 | 134 |
| 1992 | 117 | 89 | 131 |
| 1993 | 102 | 88 | 125 |
| 1994 | 101 | 73 | 127 |
| 1995 | 98 | 76 | 125 |
| $1996^{\S}$ | 94 | 75 | 123 |

*Aged $\geq 18$ years.
${ }^{\dagger}$ Based on reports of tax receipts for wholesale cigarette deliveries.
${ }^{\S}$ Estimated as twice the cumulative values for January-June.
Source: The Tobacco Institute.

FIGURE 1. Real price of cigarettes,* by month and year — Massachusetts, 1990-1995 ${ }^{\dagger}$


* Per pack. Adjusted to 1990 dollars.
$\dagger$ Based on bar-code scanning data for a seven-county region (including the Boston and Worcester metropolitan areas) that represented $83 \%$ of Massachusetts residents based on 1990 census estimates.

Source: Information Resources, Inc.
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these nationwide price reductions, by the end of October the real price of cigarettes in Massachusetts had declined to the 1992 level (Figure 1).

The prevalence of current smoking among adults in Massachusetts was 23.5\% ( $95 \% \mathrm{Cl}= \pm 1.4 \%$ ) during the 3 years before implementation of the petition (1990-1992) and $21.3 \%$ ( $95 \% \mathrm{Cl}= \pm 1.2 \%$ ) during the 3 years after implementation (1993-1995). In comparison, the prevalence of adult smoking declined 2.7\% in California (from 20.1\% [95\% $\mathrm{Cl}= \pm 0.9 \%$ ] during $1990-1992$ to $17.4 \%$ [ $95 \% \mathrm{Cl}= \pm 0.9 \%$ ] during 1993-1995) and $0.8 \%$ in the 41 other BRFSS participating states combined (from $24.1 \%$ [ $95 \% \mathrm{Cl}= \pm 0.3 \%$ ] during 1990-1992 to $23.4 \%$ [ $95 \% \mathrm{Cl}= \pm 0.2 \%$ ] during 1993-1995).
Reported by: JE Harris, MD, Massachusetts General Hospital, and Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Boston; GN Connolly, DMD, D Brooks, MPH, Massachusetts Dept of Public Health. B Davis, PhD, California State Dept of Health Svcs. Epidemiology Br, Office on Smoking and Health, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, CDC.
Editorial Note: The findings in this report indicate that, in Massachusetts, the number of packs of cigarettes taxed per capita decreased significantly during 1992-1996, following implementation of a ballot petition to increase the excise tax on cigarettes and initiate an antismoking campaign. This change was similar to decreases in California (9), the only other state to have initiated an extensive statewide antismoking campaign in conjunction with an increase in cigarette taxes. However, complexities related to the accurate measurement of changes in smoking prevalence among adults in Massachusetts require further study to determine the combined impact of the excise tax increase and antismoking campaign on adult smoking prevalence in the state.

Although some smokers in states that implement increased cigarette excise taxes may attempt to avoid higher prices by purchasing cigarettes in neighboring states with lower prices, the $19.7 \%$ decline in per capita consumption of cigarettes in Massachusetts during 1992-1996 probably reflects the effects of the tax increase and antismoking campaign rather than increased cross-border purchases by Massachusetts smokers. During 1993-1994, cigarette excise taxes in Connecticut and Rhode Island were increased to levels comparable with those in Massachusetts; however, in New Hampshire, the real price of cigarettes declined during 1992-1993, and taxable cigarette consumption increased by 17 million packs (3). Increased taxable consumption in New Hampshire may reflect either a real upward trend in smoking by state residents or increased cross-border purchases by Massachusetts smokers. However, even if the 17 million-pack increase were attributed entirely to cross-border purchases by Massachusetts smokers, the decline in per capita consumption in Massachusetts during 1992-1996 would have been reduced to $17.0 \%$.

The findings in this report are subject to at least two limitations. First, the estimates of per capita consumption were based on tax receipts at the wholesale level and not the actual number of cigarettes consumed. Distributors may delay or advance cigarette shipments in anticipation of announced wholesale price changes or excise tax increases. Such shifting of wholesale deliveries may produce year-to-year changes in tax receipts that do not reflect actual changes in per capita consumption. However, temporal trends in taxable consumption over a period of several years probably reflect actual consumption more accurately. Second, a decline in the number of cigarettes taxed in a single state may result in an overestimation of the actual decline in consumption if resident smokers increase their out-of-state purchases. However, the data on taxable per capita cigarette consumption in Massachusetts and three adjacent
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states suggest the increased purchase of cigarettes by Massachusetts smokers in neighboring New Hampshire was not a major source of the reported decline in per capita consumption in Massachusetts.

Increases in the price of cigarettes can reduce per capita consumption and the prevalence of smoking (10). In Massachusetts, however, the tax-induced increase in cigarette price was soon offset by coincidental national, industrywide price reductions that began during the spring of 1993. While real cigarette prices returned to pre-1993 levels, per capita consumption in Massachusetts continued to decline. This finding suggests that a tax increase combined with an antismoking campaign can be more effective in reducing per capita consumption than a tax increase alone. MTCP plans additional evaluations of this preliminary finding, including changes in smoking prevalence among adults and further comparisons with findings from California and other states.
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## Projected Smoking-Related Deaths Among Youth United States

On August 23, 1996, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) issued a regulation restricting the sale and distribution of cigarettes and smokeless tobacco to children and teenagers to reduce the number of youth who use these products and to reduce the life-threatening consequences associated with tobacco use (1). Despite widespread efforts to educate U.S. youths about the health consequences associated with smoking (2), the prevalence of smoking among this group has been increasing since 1992 (3). To assess the need for continued public health efforts to prevent nicotine addiction, CDC used a model including data from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) to project the future impact of smoking on the health of children and teenagers. This report presents the findings of the analysis, which indicate that, if current tobacco-use patterns persist, an estimated 5 million persons who were aged 0-17 years in 1995 will die prematurely from a smoking-related illness.

State-specific data on the prevalence of current smoking among adults aged 1830 years in all 50 states and the District of Columbia were obtained from the BRFSS for 1994 and 1995 (4). Current smokers were respondents who reported having smoked 100 cigarettes during their lifetimes and who reported currently smoking. Because the prevalence of smoking in a birth cohort peaks during early adulthood (2), the average prevalence of smoking among adults aged 18-30 years for each state during 19941995 was used to estimate the future prevalence of smoking during early adulthood for the birth cohorts currently aged 0-17 years. The number of persons aged $0-17$ years in 1995 in each state was obtained from U.S. census reports (5) and was multiplied by the estimated prevalence of future smoking to calculate the estimated number of youths who may become regular smokers in each state. Overall, the estimated number of future smokers among the cohort of persons who were aged 0-17 years in 1995 was $16,620,878$ for the United States (range: 15,398 [District of Columbia] to $1,446,550$ [California]) (Table 1).

The projected number of smoking-related deaths among youth smokers was based on the combined estimates of young adult smokers who continue to smoke throughout their lifetimes and estimates of premature death attributable to smoking among continuing smokers (6) and among those who quit after age 35 years (7). Based on data from the 1986 National Mortality Followback Survey (NMFS), 55\% (95\% confidence interval $[\mathrm{Cl}]= \pm 1 \%$ ) of persons who had ever smoked $\geq 100$ cigarettes during their lifetimes continued to smoke until 1 year before their deaths, and $45 \%$ ( $95 \% \mathrm{Cl}= \pm 1 \%$ ) quit smoking earlier in their adult lives (CDC, unpublished data, 1995). Based on data from long-term cohort studies, an estimated $50 \%$ of deaths among continuing smokers will be attributable to smoking ( 6 ). Although estimates of the number of smokingattributable deaths among former smokers range from $10 \%$ to $37 \%$, a conservative estimate of $10 \%$ was used in this analysis ( 7 ; CDC, unpublished data, 1996). The future probability of smoking-attributable mortality (PSAM) among youth was computed to be PSAM=[(0.55 $\times 0.5)+(0.45 \times 0.1)]=0.32$. Estimates for the variance of the two smoking-attributable fractions ( $50 \%$ and $10 \%$ ) within the PSAM were computed from the Cancer Prevention Study II (8). These two variances were combined with the variances for the probabilities of continued smoking or quitting using a Taylor Series approximation method, which yielded an estimate of 0.00422 of the relative error of the
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TABLE 1. Prevalence of current smoking among adults aged 18-30 years* and projected number of persons aged $0-17$ years who will become smokers ${ }^{\dagger}$ and die prematurely as adults because of a smoking-related illness, by state - United States, 1995

| State | Prevalence of current smoking among persons aged 18-30 years |  | No. ${ }^{\text {I }}$ | Persons aged 0-17 years |  | Projected no. deaths |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Projected smokers |  |
|  | \% | (95\% Cl ${ }^{\text {§ }}$ ) |  | No. | (95\% CI) |  |
| Alabama | 24.1 | ( $\pm 3.4 \%$ ) |  | 1,080,145 | 260,639 | $( \pm 36,465)$ | 83,404 |
| Alaska | 29.7 | ( $\pm 4.8 \%$ ) | 189,253 | 56,246 | $( \pm 9,006)$ | 17,999 |
| Arizona | 25.8 | ( $\pm 4.6 \%)$ | 1,193,270 | 307,864 | $( \pm 54,337)$ | 98,516 |
| Arkansas | 24.0 | ( $\pm 3.5 \%$ ) | 649,521 | 155,690 | $( \pm 22,994)$ | 49,821 |
| California | 16.5 | ( $\pm 2.0 \%$ ) | 8,793,616 | 1,446,550 | $( \pm 176,420)$ | 462,896 |
| Colorado | 27.7 | ( $\pm 3.6 \%$ ) | 981,200 | 271,694 | $( \pm 35,093)$ | 86,942 |
| Connecticut | 22.0 | ( $\pm 3.5 \%$ ) | 797,733 | 175,501 | ( $\pm 27,690$ ) | 56,160 |
| Delaware | 29.0 | ( $\pm 3.3 \%)$ | 178,826 | 51,806 | $( \pm 5,968)$ | 16,578 |
| District of Columbia | 13.4 | ( $\pm 4.3 \%)$ | 114,652 | 15,398 | ( $\pm 4,887)$ | 4,927 |
| Florida | 27.5 | ( $\pm 2.8 \%)$ | 3,371,328 | 928,464 | $( \pm 93,582)$ | 297,108 |
| Georgia | 21.3 | ( $\pm 3.0 \%$ ) | 1,923,594 | 409,726 | ( $\pm 57,900$ ) | 131,112 |
| Hawaii | 20.9 | ( $\pm 3.0 \%$ ) | 309,262 | 64,574 | $( \pm 9,353)$ | 20,664 |
| Idaho | 21.9 | ( $\pm 3.0 \%$ ) | 347,924 | 76,230 | ( $\pm$ 10,517) | 24,394 |
| Illinois | 26.0 | ( $\pm 3.2 \%$ ) | 3,125,894 | 813,670 | ( $\pm 99,723)$ | 260,374 |
| Indiana | 30.0 | ( $\pm 3.1 \%$ ) | 1,487,359 | 439,515 | ( $\pm 46,329$ ) | 140,645 |
| lowa | 23.1 | ( $\pm 2.7 \%$ ) | 724,511 | 167,507 | ( $\pm 19,326$ ) | 53,602 |
| Kansas | 22.2 | ( $\pm 3.5 \%)$ | 692,761 | 153,862 | $( \pm 23,936)$ | 49,236 |
| Kentucky | 28.2 | ( $\pm 3.3 \%)$ | 972,708 | 274,693 | $( \pm 32,116)$ | 87,902 |
| Louisiana | 26.7 | ( $\pm 3.5 \%)$ | 1,239,214 | 331,366 | ( $\pm 43,742)$ | 106,037 |
| Maine | 32.0 | ( $\pm 4.9 \%)$ | 304,895 | 97,536 | ( $\pm 14,792)$ | 31,211 |
| Maryland | 21.1 | ( $\pm 2.0 \%$ ) | 1,271,966 | 267,876 | ( $\pm 25,759)$ | 85,720 |
| Massachusetts | 23.1 | ( $\pm 3.4 \%)$ | 1,431,854 | 330,186 | ( $\pm 48,366$ ) | 105,659 |
| Michigan | 28.6 | ( $\pm 3.1 \%$ ) | 2,519,455 | 721,572 | ( $\pm 78,357)$ | 230,903 |
| Minnesota | 24.3 | ( $\pm 2.2 \%$ ) | 1,245,492 | 303,153 | ( $\pm 27,294)$ | 97,009 |
| Mississippi | 20.0 | ( $\pm 3.5 \%)$ | 761,909 | 152,610 | ( $\pm 26,343$ ) | 48,835 |
| Missouri | 26.9 | ( $\pm 4.3 \%)$ | 1,381,552 | 372,052 | ( $\pm 59,197)$ | 119,057 |
| Montana | 19.9 | ( $\pm 4.3 \%)$ | 236,134 | 47,014 | ( $\pm 10,151$ ) | 15,045 |
| Nebraska | 25.0 | ( $\pm 3.6 \%)$ | 443,297 | 110,913 | $( \pm 15,842)$ | 35,492 |
| Nevada | 24.8 | ( $\pm 3.4 \%)$ | 398,586 | 98,770 | $( \pm 13,716)$ | 31,606 |
| New Hampshire | 25.2 | ( $\pm 4.0 \%$ ) | 294,969 | 74,303 | $( \pm 11,886)$ | 23,777 |
| New Jersey | 21.6 | ( $\pm 3.8 \%$ ) | 1,963,523 | 423,728 | $( \pm 74,663)$ | 135,593 |
| New Mexico | 20.9 | ( $\pm 4.1 \%$ ) | 500,099 | 104,271 | ( $\pm 20,422)$ | 33,367 |
| New York | 26.0 | ( $\pm 3.1 \%$ ) | 4,536,862 | 1,179,584 | $( \pm 141,545)$ | 377,467 |
| North Carolina | 28.8 | ( $\pm 3.0 \%$ ) | 1,799,119 | 517,786 | $( \pm 53,965)$ | 165,692 |
| North Dakota | 22.5 | ( $\pm 3.2 \%$ ) | 170,445 | 38,350 | $( \pm 5,367)$ | 12,272 |
| Ohio | 31.2 | ( $\pm 4.6 \%$ ) | 2,859,848 | 891,129 | $( \pm 131,262)$ | 285,161 |
| Oklahoma | 22.7 | ( $\pm 5.2 \%$ ) | 878,039 | 199,490 | ( $\pm 45,586)$ | 63,837 |
| Oregon | 24.1 | ( $\pm 2.9 \%)$ | 797,040 | 191,688 | $( \pm 23,220)$ | 61,340 |
| Pennsylvania | 29.5 | ( $\pm 2.9 \%)$ | 2,909,302 | 857,371 | ( $\pm 84,342$ ) | 274,359 |
| Rhode Island | 30.9 | ( $\pm 5.9 \%)$ | 237,611 | 73,446 | ( $\pm 13,931$ ) | 23,503 |
| South Carolina | 22.0 | ( $\pm 3.0 \%$ ) | 944,384 | 208,142 | ( $\pm 28,621$ ) | 66,606 |
| South Dakota | 22.1 | ( $\pm 3.3 \%)$ | 206,436 | 45,705 | $( \pm 6,715)$ | 14,626 |
| Tennessee | 25.1 | ( $\pm 2.9 \%$ ) | 1,310,297 | 329,147 | $( \pm 38,256)$ | 105,327 |
| Texas | 21.5 | ( $\pm 3.6 \%$ ) | 5,400,417 | 1,158,389 | $( \pm 192,545)$ | 370,685 |
| Utah | 16.1 | ( $\pm 2.5 \%$ ) | 674,618 | 108,883 | $( \pm 16,797)$ | 34,843 |
| Vermont | 26.3 | ( $\pm 3.4 \%$ ) | 146,760 | 38,613 | $( \pm 4,914)$ | 12,356 |
| Virginia | 26.3 | ( $\pm 3.5 \%$ ) | 1,612,527 | 423,288 | ( $\pm 56,079$ ) | 135,452 |
| Washington | 23.8 | ( $\pm 2.5 \%$ ) | 1,418,404 | 336,871 | ( $\pm 34,770)$ | 107,799 |
| West Virginia | 28.6 | ( $\pm 3.3 \%)$ | 421,868 | 120,443 | $( \pm 13,970)$ | 38,542 |
| Wisconsin | 27.0 | ( $\pm 3.8 \%$ ) | 1,353,205 | 365,907 | $( \pm 51,333)$ | 117,090 |
| Wyoming | 23.2 | ( $\pm 4.3 \%$ ) | 136,268 | 31,669 | $( \pm 5,812)$ | 10,134 |
| Total | NA | NA | 68,739,952 | 16,620,878 | $( \pm 219,091)$ | 5,318,681 |

* Obtained from Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System data for 1994 and 1995, except for Rhode Island for 1995 and the District of Columbia for 1994.
${ }^{\dagger}$ Based on 1995 population data and the prevalence of current smoking among adults aged 18-30 years.
${ }^{\S}$ Confidence interval.
IObtained from 1995 census data.
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PSAM. To reflect the uncertainty of the multiple assumptions about future smoking and mortality patterns, this error estimate for the PSAM was increased by a factor of 2.5 , yielding an estimated standard error of 0.0106 .

Based on application of this PSAM to the state-specific estimates of potential smokers, the overall number of potential future smoking-attributable deaths among persons aged 0-17 years during 1995 was 5,318,681 for the United States (range: 4927 [District of Columbia] to 462,896 [California]) (Table 1). Based on the estimated PSAM variance and the state-specific sampling errors from the BRFSS estimates of smoking prevalence, the estimated number of smoking-related deaths for the United States overall was predicted to vary by $\leq 160,000$ deaths.
Reported by the following BRFSS coordinators: J Durham, MPA, Alabama; P Owen, Alaska; B Bender, Arizona; J Senner, PhD, Arkansas; B Davis, PhD, California; M Leff, MSPH, Colorado; M Adams, MPH, Connecticut; F Breukelman, Delaware; C Mitchell, District of Columbia; D McTague, MS, Florida; E Pledger, MPA, Georgia; J Cooper, MA, Hawaii; C Johnson, MPH, Idaho; B Steiner, MS, Illinois; N Costello, MPA, Indiana; P Busick, lowa; M Perry, Kansas; K Asher, Kentucky; R Meriwether, MD, Louisiana; D Maines, Maine; A Weinstein, MA, Maryland; D Brooks, MPH, Massachusetts; H McGee, MPH, Michigan; N Salem, PhD, Minnesota; S Loyd, Mississippi; J Jackson-Thompson, PhD, Missouri; P Smith, Montana; S Huffman, Nebraska; E DeJan, MPH, Nevada; K Zaso, MPH, New Hampshire; G Boeselager, MS, New Jersey; W Honey, New Mexico; T Melnik, DrPH, New York; G Lengerich, VMD, North Carolina; J Kaske, MPH, North Dakota; R Indian, MS, Ohio; N Hann, MPH, Oklahoma; J Grant-Worley, MS, Oregon; L Mann, Pennsylvania; J Hesser, PhD, Rhode Island; J Ferguson, DrPh, South Carolina; M Gildemaster, South Dakota; D Ridings, Tennessee; R Diamond, MPH, Texas; R Giles, Utah; R McIntyre, PhD, Vermont; J Stones, Virginia; K Wynkoop-Simmons, PhD, Washington; F King, West Virginia; E Cautley, MS, Wisconsin; M Futa, MA, Wyoming. P Mowery, MA, J Shulman, PhD, Battelle Memorial Institute, Baltimore, Maryland. Epidemiology Br, Office on Smoking and Health, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, CDC.
Editorial Note: The findings in this report indicate that, if current patterns of smoking behavior persist, an estimated 5 million U.S. persons who were aged $0-17$ years in 1995 could die prematurely from smoking-related illnesses. These projected patterns of smoking and smoking-related deaths could result in an estimated $\$ 200$ billion (in 1993 dollars) in future health-care costs (i.e., $\$ 12,000$ per smoker) (9) and approximately 64 million years of potential life lost (i.e., 12-21 years per smoking-related death) $(6,9,10)$, underscoring the need for intensifing efforts to prevent smoking initiation among youth.

The projection method used in this analysis is subject to at least three limitations. First, although this method has been recommended for estimating future tobaccorelated deaths in developed countries (6), alternative methods may be more precise (e.g., life-table procedures used to project future disease-specific outcomes, particularly lung cancer). Second, this method assumes that future smoking patterns and smoking-related disease rates will be similar to those observed in recent generations. However, future patterns may differ: for example, the estimates of future smoking prevalence in this analysis may be underestimated because smoking prevalences among teenagers have been increasing in recent years (3). Third, the estimated risks for smoking-attributable death and the smoking-attributable fractions among quitters (i.e., $10 \%$ ) and continuing smokers (i.e., $50 \%$ ) are based on studies of adults who began smoking during the mid 1900s ( 6,7 ). More recent data indicate that relative risks of smoking for more recent birth cohorts of both men and women have been increasing rather than decreasing (8). Factors related to changes in the intensity and duration of smoking may account in part for the substantial increase in the relative risks of
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smoking from the 1960s to the 1980s (e.g., relative risks of lung cancer increased from 11.4 to 22.4 for men and from 2.7 to 11.9 for women) (8). These increases in risk occurred despite changes in the composition of tobacco products commonly smoked, including the widespread adoption of filter-tipped, potentially lower "tar" cigarettes (8). While future changes in tobacco products could reduce health risks associated with smoking, smoking intensity and duration are likely to remain the major predictors of future risk (8). Therefore, unless U.S. persons who were aged $0-17$ years during 1995 and who are current or potential smokers alter their future smoking behavior relative to patterns of previous generations (e.g., smoke fewer cigarettes per day or quit earlier in life), the relative risks of smoking probably will remain high.

FDA has issued regulations to restrict youth access to tobacco and to reduce the appeal of cigarette advertising among youths and has issued a proposal to require a program to educate youths about the health consequences associated with tobacco use (1). Because smoking-related deaths are preventable (1,9), public health efforts should emphasize both prevention of smoking initiation in the youngest birth cohorts (2) and cessation as early as possible among youth who already have started smoking ( 6,7 ).

## References

1. Kessler DA, Witt AM, Barnett PS, et al. The Food and Drug Administration's regulation of tobacco products. N Engl J Med 1996;335:988-94.
2. US Department of Health and Human Services. Preventing tobacco use among young people: a report of the Surgeon General. Atlanta, Georgia: US Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, CDC, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Office on Smoking and Health, 1994.
3. Johnston L, Bachman J, O'Malley P. Cigarette smoking among American teens rises again in 1995. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan News and Information Service, December 11, 1995.
4. Frazier EL, Franks AL, Sanderson LM. Behavioral risk factor data. In: CDC. Using chronic disease data: a handbook for public health practitioners. Atlanta, Georgia: US Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, CDC, 1992.
5. Bureau of the Census. Population estimates and population distribution branches. Washington, DC: US Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration, Bureau of the Census, 1995.
6. Peto R, Lopez AD, Boreham J, et al. Mortality from smoking in developed countries, 1950-2000: indirect estimates from national vital statistics. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.
7. Mattson ME, Pollack ES, Cullen JW. What are the odds that smoking will kill you? Am J Public Health 1987;77:425-31.
8. Thun MJ, Day-Lally CA, Calle EE, Flanders WD, Heath CW. Excess mortality among cigarette smokers: changes in a 20-year interval. Am J Public Health 1995;85:1223-30.
9. US Department of Health and Human Services. For a healthy nation: returns on investment in public health. Washington, DC: US Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, 1995.
10. CDC. Cigarette smoking-attributable mortality in years of potential life lost—United States, 1990. MMWR 1993;42:645-9.

## Outbreak of Escherichia coli 0157:H7 Infections Associated with Drinking Unpasteurized Commercial Apple Juice British Columbia, California, Colorado, and Washington, October 1996

On October 30, 1996, the Seattle-King County Department of Public Health and the Washington State Department of Health reported an outbreak of Escherichia coli O157:H7 infections epidemiologically associated with drinking Odwalla brand unpasteurized apple juice or Odwalla juice mixtures containing apple juice from a coffee shop chain, grocery stores, or other locations. A case was defined as hemolytic uremic syndrome (HUS) or a stool culture yielding E. coli O157:H7 in a person who became ill after September 30, 1996, and drank Odwalla juice within 10 days before illness onset. As of November 6, British Columbia, California, Colorado, and Washington had reported a total of 45 cases.

The median age of the 28 case-patients for whom information was reported was 5.0 years (range: $1-41$ years); 15 ( $54 \%$ ) were male. HUS was diagnosed in 12 persons; none have died. One case of $E$. coli $0157: \mathrm{H} 7$ infection occurred in a child who had onset of illness in Illinois after drinking implicated juice in Washington. Another patient with E. coli 0157:H7 infection, not included in the total, acquired illness by secondary transmission from a patient with juice-associated infection. E. coli O157:H7 isolates cultured from a previously unopened container of Odwalla apple juice had a DNA "fingerprint" pattern (restriction fragment length polymorphism) indistinguishable from case-related isolates.

Odwalla, Inc., has completed a voluntary nationwide recall of all its products containing apple juice. Odwalla juice was distributed to British Columbia, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Texas, and Washington.
Reported by: Dept of Environmental Health, Univ of Washington, Seattle; Seattle-King County Dept of Public Health, Seattle; Washington State Dept of Health. California State Dept of Health Svcs. Colorado Dept of Public Health and Environment. British Columbia Centre for Disease Control, Vancouver; Laboratory Centre for Disease Control, Health Canada, Ottawa, Ontario. Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition and Office of Regulatory Affairs, Food and Drug Administration. Foodborne and Diarrheal Diseases Br, Div of Bacterial and Mycotic Diseases, National Center for Infectious Diseases, CDC.
Editorial Note: Investigations are ongoing to determine the extent of the outbreak and the specific mechanisms of contamination. Health-care providers should consider infection with E. coli 0157:H7 in patients with diarrheal illness who were residents of or travelers to British Columbia, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Texas, or Washington during October and may have consumed Odwalla brand apple juice or Odwalla juice mixtures containing apple juice. Possible cases should be reported to local and state health departments.

FIGURE I. Selected notifiable disease reports, comparison of provisional 4-week totals ending November 2, 1996, with historical data - United States

$\square$ Beyond Historical Limits
*Ratio of current 4-week total to mean of 154 -week totals (from previous, comparable, and subsequent 4 -week periods for the past 5 years). The point where the hatched area begins is based on the mean and two standard deviations of these 4-week totals.

TABLE I. Summary - provisional cases of selected notifiable diseases, United States, cumulative, week ending November 2, 1996 (44th Week)

|  | Cum. 1996 |  | Cum. 1996 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Anthrax | - | HIV infection, pediatric*§ | 216 |
| Brucellosis | 71 | Plague | 5 |
| Cholera | 3 | Poliomyelitis, paralytic ${ }^{\\|}$ | - |
| Congenital rubella syndrome | 1 | Psittacosis | 38 |
| Cryptosporidiosis* | 1,888 | Rabies, human | 1 |
| Diphtheria | 1 | Rocky Mountain spotted fever (RMSF) | 634 |
| Encephalitis: California* | 98 | Streptococcal toxic-shock syndrome* | 12 |
| eastern equine* | 2 | Syphilis, congenital** | 225 |
| St. Louis* | - | Tetanus | 23 |
| western equine* | - | Toxic-shock syndrome | 116 |
| Hansen Disease | 93 | Trichinosis | $\begin{array}{r}17 \\ \hline\end{array}$ |
| Hantavirus pulmonary syndrome* ${ }^{\dagger}$ | 19 | Typhoid fever | 297 |

[^1]* Not notifiable in all states.
$\dagger$ Updated weekly from reports to the Division of Viral and Rickettsial Diseases, National Center for Infectious Diseases (NCID).
${ }^{\S}$ Updated monthly to the Division of HIV/AIDS Prevention, National Center for HIV, STD, and TB Prevention (NCHSTP), last update September 24, 1996.
IThree suspected cases of polio with onset in 1996 has been reported to date.
** Updated quarterly from reports to the Division of STD Prevention, NCHSTP.

TABLE II. Provisional cases of selected notifiable diseases, United States, weeks ending November 2, 1996, and November 4, 1995 (44th Week)

| Reporting Area | AIDS* |  | Chlamydia <br> Cum. <br> 1996 | Escherichia coli 0157:H7 |  | Gonorrhea |  | Hepatitis C/NA,NB |  | Legionellosis |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\mathrm{NETSS}^{\dagger}$ | PHLIS $^{\text { }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Cum. } \\ 1996 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Cum. } \\ & 1995 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Cum. } \\ 1996 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Cum. } \\ 1996 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Cum. } \\ 1996 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Cum. } \\ & 1995 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Cum. } \\ 1996 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Cum. } \\ & 1995 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Cum. } \\ & 1996 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Cum. } \\ 1995 \end{gathered}$ |
| UNITED STATES | 51,611 | 59,568 |  | 320,933 | 2,336 | 1,232 | 253,683 | 332,606 | 2,803 | 3,395 | 820 | 994 |
| NEW ENGLAND | 2,065 | 2,843 | 14,107 | 316 | 78 | 5,893 | 6,543 | 100 | 105 | 62 | 30 |
| Maine | 32 | 82 | 762 | 21 |  | 53 | 78 |  |  | 2 | 5 |
| N.H. | 66 | 77 | 397 | 38 | 38 | 80 | 95 | 8 | 12 | 3 | 2 |
| Vt . | 18 | 28 | U | 33 | 30 | 42 | 54 | 33 | 11 | 4 | - |
| Mass. | 997 | 1,236 | 5,951 | 142 | 10 | 1,882 | 2,300 | 53 | 75 | 26 | 19 |
| R.I. | 129 | 205 | 1,626 | 15 | - | 431 | 452 | 6 | 7 | 27 | 4 |
| Conn. | 823 | 1,215 | 5,371 | 67 | - | 3,405 | 3,564 | - | - | N | N |
| MID. ATLANTIC | 14,243 | 16,207 | 35,716 | 199 | 43 | 29,157 | 36,927 | 264 | 403 | 197 | 172 |
| Upstate N.Y. | 1,855 | 1,972 | N | 137 | 16 | 5,601 | 8,183 | 207 | 206 | 66 | 47 |
| N.Y. City | 7,855 | 8,416 | 15,878 | 13 | - | 8,618 | 14,714 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 5 |
| N.J. | 2,905 | 3,868 | 4,873 | 49 | 5 | 4,197 | 3,468 | - | 158 | 12 | 27 |
| Pa. | 1,628 | 1,951 | 14,965 | N | 22 | 10,741 | 10,562 | 56 | 38 | 109 | 93 |
| E.N. CENTRAL | 4,076 | 4,438 | 69,813 | 535 | 356 | 48,821 | 66,807 | 378 | 292 | 237 | 297 |
| Ohio | 871 | 878 | 15,152 | 157 | 94 | 10,964 | 20,758 | 32 | 13 | 91 | 133 |
| Ind. | 498 | 467 | 8,863 | 80 | 48 | 5,751 | 7,843 | 8 | 12 | 41 | 71 |
| III. | 1,808 | 1,871 | 20,567 | 204 | 84 | 15,193 | 17,554 | 60 | 75 | 9 | 31 |
| Mich. | 685 | 917 | 17,623 | 94 | 70 | 13,223 | 15,046 | 278 | 192 | 75 | 29 |
| Wis. | 214 | 305 | 7,608 | N | 60 | 3,690 | 5,606 | - | - | 21 | 33 |
| W.N. CENTRAL | 1,221 | 1,393 | 23,325 | 533 | 338 | 10,613 | 16,843 | 111 | 75 | 46 | 70 |
| Minn. | 226 | 302 | 2,702 | 240 | 219 | U | 2,430 | 3 | 4 | 8 | 6 |
| lowa | 72 | 91 | 3,700 | 115 | 88 | 976 | 1,335 | 49 | 13 | 10 | 20 |
| Mo. | 626 | 642 | 10,164 | 61 | - | 7,000 | 9,664 | 33 | 18 | 9 | 14 |
| N. Dak. | 10 | 5 | 2 | 16 | 15 | - | 26 | - | 5 | - | 3 |
| S. Dak. | 10 | 17 | 878 | 22 | - | 122 | 187 | - | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Nebr. | 83 | 93 | 2,084 | 49 | 4 | 786 | 955 | 7 | 20 | 12 | 16 |
| Kans. | 194 | 243 | 3,795 | 30 | 12 | 1,729 | 2,246 | 19 | 14 | 5 | 8 |
| S. ATLANTIC | 13,079 | 15,350 | 46,319 | 122 | 63 | 81,328 | 92,536 | 219 | 210 | 127 | 155 |
| Del. | 232 | 265 | 1,148 | 1 | 2 | 1,231 | 1,928 | 1 | - | 11 | 2 |
| Md. | 1,961 | 2,287 | 5,879 | N | 8 | 12,415 | 11,447 | 3 | 7 | 27 | 25 |
| D.C. | 1,001 | 896 | N | - | - | 3,626 | 4,005 | - | - | 8 | 4 |
| Va . | 896 | 1,203 | 9,711 | N | 31 | 7,703 | 9,186 | 15 | 18 | 19 | 21 |
| W. Va. | 88 | + 94 | -1 | N | 3 | 455 | 583 | 9 | 44 | 1 | 4 |
| N.C. | 677 | 898 | - | 38 | 12 | 16,111 | 20,669 | 44 | 49 | 10 | 31 |
| S.C. | 667 | 815 | - | 9 | 7 | 9,007 | 10,271 | 27 | 19 | 5 | 30 |
| Ga. | 1,867 | 1,998 | 9,798 | 30 | - | 15,396 | 17,076 | U | 15 | 3 | 14 |
| Fla. | 5,690 | 6,894 | 19,782 | 32 | - | 15,384 | 17,371 | 120 | 58 | 43 | 24 |
| E.S. CENTRAL | 1,749 | 1,917 | 26,753 | 65 | 52 | 29,581 | 34,510 | 485 | 850 | 40 | 51 |
| Ky. | 309 | 243 | 5,741 | 13 | 8 | 3,592 | 3,996 | 27 | 29 | 5 | 10 |
| Tenn. | 647 | 763 | 11,452 | 29 | 41 | 10,137 | 11,761 | 349 | 819 | 19 | 24 |
| Ala. | 470 | 520 | 7,105 | 12 | 3 | 11,312 | 14,159 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 6 |
| Miss. | 323 | 391 | U | 11 | - | 4,540 | 4,594 | 104 | U | 13 | 11 |
| W.S. CENTRAL | 5,138 | 5,152 | 32,800 | 69 | 12 | 25,197 | 46,626 | 402 | 295 | 19 | 21 |
| Ark. | 207 | 223 | - | 13 | 3 | 2,722 | 4,874 | 14 | 6 | 2 | 6 |
| La. | 1,177 | 901 | 6,331 | 6 | 4 | 6,980 | 9,320 | 186 | 162 | 2 | 3 |
| Okla. | 189 | 235 | 6,355 | 12 | 1 | 4,120 | 4,988 | 69 | 47 | 5 | 4 |
| Tex. | 3,565 | 3,793 | 20,114 | 38 | 4 | 11,375 | 27,444 | 133 | 80 | 10 | 8 |
| MOUNTAIN | 1,533 | 1,822 | 13,808 | 196 | 91 | 5,784 | 8,081 | 486 | 411 | 43 | 104 |
| Mont. | 33 | 20 | - | 25 | - | 32 | 61 | 16 | 14 | 1 | 4 |
| Idaho | 32 | 41 | 1,289 | 34 | 13 | 91 | 123 | 93 | 45 | - | 2 |
| Wyo. | 5 | 13 | 491 | 11 | 9 | 33 | 46 | 152 | 173 | 6 | 12 |
| Colo. | 406 | 571 | - | 70 | 36 | 1,077 | 2,413 | 53 | 61 | 8 | 38 |
| N. Mex. | 139 | 148 | 3,350 | 11 | - | 795 | 916 | 64 | 44 | 2 | 4 |
| Ariz. | 461 | 550 | 5,529 | N | 22 | 2,864 | 3,191 | 68 | 43 | 18 | 9 |
| Utah | 144 | 113 | 1,332 | 30 |  | 252 | 230 | 22 | 11 | 3 | 15 |
| Nev. | 313 | 366 | 1,817 | 15 | 11 | 640 | 1,101 | 18 | 20 | 5 | 20 |
| PACIFIC | 8,506 | 10,446 | 58,292 | 301 | 199 | 17,309 | 23,733 | 358 | 754 | 49 | 94 |
| Wash. | 538 | 779 | 7,757 | 97 | 72 | 1,720 | 2,335 | 49 | 189 | 6 | 20 |
| Oreg. | 359 | 387 | 4,562 | 84 | 39 | 527 | 684 | 7 | 35 | 1 | - |
| Calif. | 7,440 | 9,013 | 43,797 | 116 | 78 | 14,383 | 19,641 | 120 | 456 | 37 | 69 |
| Alaska | 28 | 62 | 1,040 | 4 | 2 | 366 | 588 | 3 | 2 | 1 | - |
| Hawaii | 141 | 205 | 1,136 | N | 8 | 313 | 485 | 179 | 72 | 4 | 5 |
| Guam | 4 | - | 168 | N | - | 31 | 89 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| P.R. | 1,792 | 1,951 | N | 17 | U | 327 | 521 | 84 | 195 | - | - |
| V.I. | 17 | 30 | N | N | U |  |  | - | - | - | - |
| Amer. Samoa | - | - | - | N | U | - | 29 | - | - | - |  |
| C.N.M.I. | 1 | - | N | N | U | 11 | 51 | - | 5 | - | - |
| N : Not notifiable | U: Unavailable |  | -: no reported cases C.N.M.I.: Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Updated monthly to the Division of HIV/AIDS Prevention, National Center for HIV, STD, and TB Prevention, last updatSeptember 24, 1996.† National Electronic Telecommunications System for Surveillance.§Public Health Laboratory Information System. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## TABLE II. (Cont'd.) Provisional cases of selected notifiable diseases, United States, weeks ending November 2, 1996, and November 4, 1995 (44th Week)

| Reporting Area | Lyme Disease |  | Malaria |  | Meningococcal Disease |  | Syphilis(Primary \& Secondary) |  | Tuberculosis |  | Rabies, Animal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Cum. } \\ & 1996 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Cum. } \\ & 1995 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Cum. } \\ 1996 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Cum. } \\ 1995 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Cum. } \\ 1996 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Cum. } \\ & 1995 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Cum. } \\ & 1996 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Cum. } \\ & 1995 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Cum. } \\ 1996 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Cum. } \\ & 1995 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Cum. } \\ 1996 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Cum. } \\ & 1995 \end{aligned}$ |
| UNITED STATES | 11,946 | 9,521 | 1,277 | 1,148 | 2,713 | 2,559 | 9,167 | 14,003 | 15,703 | 17,927 | 5,753 | 6,711 |
| NEW ENGLAND | 3,657 | 1,845 | 60 | 43 | 121 | 128 | 156 | 315 | 378 | 426 | 618 | 1,334 |
| Maine | 50 | 24 | 7 | 6 | 11 | 10 |  | 2 | 37 | 11 | 90 | 46 |
| N.H. | 43 | 22 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 22 | 1 | 1 | 14 | 17 | 51 | 131 |
| V t. | 15 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 10 |  | - | 1 | 2 | 123 | 162 |
| Mass. | 315 | 130 | 21 | 15 | 51 | 42 | 68 | 58 | 182 | 240 | 96 | 387 |
| R.I. | 461 | 297 | 7 | 4 | 13 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 27 | 41 | 35 | 291 |
| Conn. | 2,773 | 1,364 | 18 | 16 | 35 | 38 | 84 | 250 | 117 | 115 | 223 | 317 |
| MID. ATLANTIC | 7,184 | 6,232 | 354 | 319 | 244 | 312 | 367 | 708 | 2,735 | 3,638 | 1,249 | 1,715 |
| Upstate N.Y. | 3,854 | 3,199 | 75 | 58 | 75 | 85 | 63 | 76 | 356 | 439 | 929 | 1,021 |
| N.Y. City | 266 | 394 | 191 | 175 | 33 | 48 | 106 | 319 | 1,315 | 2,034 | - | - |
| N.J. | 1,443 | 1,585 | 59 | 63 | 55 | 71 | 88 | 139 | 612 | 654 | 109 | 299 |
| Pa. | 1,621 | 1,054 | 29 | 23 | 81 | 108 | 110 | 174 | 452 | 511 | 211 | 395 |
| E.N. CENTRAL | 70 | 404 | 111 | 144 | 373 | 357 | 1,311 | 2,420 | 1,714 | 1,658 | 88 | 93 |
| Ohio | 44 | 25 | 13 | 11 | 137 | 102 | 487 | 787 | 249 | 231 | 12 | 12 |
| Ind. | 23 | 16 | 13 | 17 | 54 | 51 | 174 | 286 | 155 | 155 | 8 | 14 |
| III. | 3 | 17 | 35 | 71 | 102 | 91 | 364 | 916 | 900 | 863 | 23 | 15 |
| Mich. | - | 5 | 36 | 24 | 40 | 66 | 142 | 253 | 318 | 330 | 31 | 37 |
| Wis. | U | 341 | 14 | 21 | 40 | 47 | 144 | 178 | 92 | 79 | 14 | 15 |
| W.N. CENTRAL | 147 | 163 | 47 | 24 | 213 | 159 | 313 | 651 | 391 | 491 | 453 | 329 |
| Minn. | 65 | 80 | 20 | 4 | 25 | 26 | 51 | 37 | 90 | 121 | 25 | 25 |
| Iowa | 19 | 13 | 3 | 3 | 44 | 29 | 17 | 40 | 55 | 54 | 211 | 115 |
| Mo. | 23 | 44 | 10 | 8 | 89 | 60 | 202 | 536 | 162 | 189 | 17 | 29 |
| N. Dak. | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | - | - | 6 | 3 | 58 | 27 |
| S. Dak. |  | - | - | 2 | 10 | 6 | - | - | 17 | 21 | 105 | 87 |
| Nebr. | 5 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 19 | 15 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 20 | 5 | 5 |
| Kans. | 34 | 20 | 9 | 3 | 23 | 22 | 32 | 26 | 48 | 83 | 32 | 41 |
| S. ATLANTIC | 606 | 600 | 262 | 232 | 545 | 437 | 3,201 | 3,505 | 2,960 | 3,203 | 2,392 | 1,893 |
| Del. | 78 | 45 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 36 | 15 | 20 | 49 | 64 | 81 |
| Md. | 366 | 381 | 74 | 62 | 66 | 36 | 563 | 416 | 255 | 337 | 548 | 383 |
| D.C. | 3 | 3 | 7 | 16 | 10 | 7 | 115 | 96 | 112 | 89 | 9 | 11 |
| Va. | 46 | 50 | 42 | 52 | 54 | 58 | 336 | 522 | 234 | 255 | 528 | 377 |
| W. Va. | 11 | 22 | 5 | 4 | 12 | 8 | 3 | 10 | 50 | 60 | 88 | 104 |
| N.C. | 63 | 65 | 27 | 15 | 67 | 71 | 935 | 968 | 435 | 376 | 602 | 420 |
| S.C. | 6 | 16 | 12 | 1 | 52 | 54 | 322 | 505 | 290 | 278 | 79 | 114 |
| Ga. | 1 | 13 | 26 | 36 | 125 | 94 | 565 | 656 | 547 | 607 | 254 | 247 |
| Fla. | 32 | 5 | 66 | 45 | 157 | 103 | 326 | 317 | 1,017 | 1,152 | 220 | 156 |
| E.S. CENTRAL | 69 | 65 | 34 | 24 | 204 | 178 | 2,090 | 2,854 | 1,069 | 1,229 | 191 | 256 |
| Ky. | 23 | 13 | 7 | 3 | 27 | 40 | 131 | 157 | 196 | 272 | 38 | 26 |
| Tenn. | 20 | 28 | 14 | 10 | 55 | 70 | 713 | 756 | 320 | 380 | 75 | 87 |
| Ala. | 7 | 8 | 6 | 8 | 74 | 36 | 474 | 552 | 356 | 344 | 75 | 134 |
| Miss. | 19 | 16 | 7 | 3 | 48 | 32 | 772 | 1,389 | 197 | 233 | 3 | 9 |
| W.S. CENTRAL | 108 | 99 | 38 | 48 | 298 | 306 | 1,202 | 2,818 | 1,985 | 2,634 | 331 | 556 |
| Ark. | 24 | 8 | - | 2 | 33 | 31 | 127 | 450 | 163 | 202 | 28 | 45 |
| La. | 5 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 54 | 47 | 442 | 876 | 175 | 284 | 15 | 42 |
| Okla. | 21 | 42 | - | 1 | 33 | 37 | 156 | 159 | 143 | 326 | 27 | 28 |
| Tex. | 58 | 42 | 32 | 40 | 178 | 191 | 477 | 1,333 | 1,504 | 1,822 | 261 | 441 |
| MOUNTAIN | 7 | 12 | 54 | 56 | 156 | 182 | 116 | 187 | 518 | 560 | 135 | 167 |
| Mont. | - | - | 7 | 3 | 6 | 2 | - | 4 | 14 | 10 | 20 | 42 |
| Idaho | 1 | - | - | 1 | 22 | 10 | 4 | - | 7 | 14 | - | 3 |
| Wyo. | 2 | 3 | 7 | - | 3 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 27 | 25 |
| Colo. | - | - | 22 | 25 | 36 | 45 | 23 | 98 | 73 | 68 | 41 | 9 |
| N. Mex. | 1 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 24 | 33 | 1 | 6 | 72 | 70 | 6 | 6 |
| Ariz. | - | 1 | 7 | 10 | 38 | 53 | 71 | 43 | 206 | 264 | 30 | 55 |
| Utah | 1 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 15 | 15 | 2 | 4 | 39 | 37 | 4 | 15 |
| Nev. | 2 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 12 | 16 | 13 | 31 | 101 | 93 | 7 | 12 |
| PACIFIC | 98 | 101 | 317 | 258 | 559 | 500 | 411 | 545 | 3,953 | 4,088 | 296 | 368 |
| Wash. | 14 | 10 | 20 | 21 | 90 | 80 | 6 | 13 | 219 | 230 | 6 | 14 |
| Oreg. | 20 | 17 | 19 | 18 | 103 | 92 | 11 | 20 | 133 | 111 | 4 | 3 |
| Calif. | 63 | 74 | 267 | 206 | 353 | 313 | 393 | 510 | 3,382 | 3,523 | 278 | 344 |
| Alaska | - | , | 3 | 3 | 8 | 11 |  | 2 | 59 | 65 | 8 | 7 |
| Hawaii | 1 | - | 8 | 10 | 5 | 4 | 1 | - | 160 | 159 | - | - |
| Guam | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 35 | 96 | - | - |
| P.R. | - | - | - | 1 | 4 | 23 | 112 | 254 | 63 | 162 | 40 | 37 |
| V.I. | - | - | - | 2 | - |  |  |  | - | - | - |  |
| Amer. Samoa | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4 | - | - |
| C.N.M.I. | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | 1 | 9 | - | 31 | - | - |

N : Not notifiable

TABLE III. Provisional cases of selected notifiable diseases preventable by vaccination, United States, weeks ending November 2, 1996, and November 4, 1995 (44th Week)

| Reporting Area | H. influenzae, invasive |  | Hepatitis (viral), by type |  |  |  | Measles (Rubeola) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | A |  | B |  | Indigenous |  | Imported $^{\dagger}$ |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Cum. } \\ & \text { 1996* } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Cum. } \\ 1995 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Cum. } \\ & 1996 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Cum. } \\ & 1995 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Cum. } \\ & 1996 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Cum. } \\ & 1995 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 1996 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cum. } \\ & 1996 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 1996 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Cum. } \\ & 1996 \end{aligned}$ |
| UNITED STATES | 859 | 963 | 23,797 | 25,357 | 8,187 | 8,390 | 1 | 414 | - | 46 |
| NEW ENGLAND | 25 | 38 | 345 | 269 | 165 | 190 | - | 11 | - | 4 |
| Maine | - | 3 | 18 | 27 | 2 | 7 | U | - | U | - |
| N.H. | 9 | 10 | 21 | 11 | 17 | 19 | - | - | - | - |
| Vt. | 1 | 2 | 10 | 5 | 11 | 5 | - | 1 | - | 1 |
| Mass. | 13 | 12 | 169 | 114 | 57 | 74 | - | 9 | - | 3 |
| R.I. | 2 | 5 | 20 | 32 | 9 | 8 | - | - | - | - |
| Conn. | - | 6 | 107 | 80 | 69 | 77 | - | 1 | - | - |
| MID. ATLANTIC | 153 | 145 | 1,590 | 1,614 | 1,240 | 1,180 | - | 23 | - | 5 |
| Upstate N.Y. | 45 | 37 | 382 | 406 | 293 | 321 | - | - | - | - |
| N.Y. City | 32 | 34 | 502 | 776 | 502 | 355 | - | 9 | - | 3 |
| N.J. | 48 | 24 | 285 | 239 | 209 | 318 | - | 3 | - | - |
| Pa. | 28 | 50 | 421 | 193 | 236 | 186 | - | 11 | - | 2 |
| E.N. CENTRAL | 143 | 163 | 1,980 | 2,783 | 841 | 948 | - | 6 | - | 7 |
| Ohio | 81 | 84 | 662 | 1,554 | 112 | 93 | - | 2 | - | 3 |
| Ind. | 15 | 20 | 303 | 162 | 132 | 195 | - | - | - |  |
| 1 II . | 32 | 40 | 483 | 568 | 220 | 247 | - | 2 | - | 1 |
| Mich. | 8 | 17 | 381 | 326 | 316 | 345 | - | - | - | 3 |
| Wis. | 7 | 2 | 151 | 173 | 61 | 68 | - | 2 | - | - |
| W.N. CENTRAL | 41 | 74 | 2,131 | 1,664 | 376 | 547 | - | 20 | - | 2 |
| Minn. | 25 | 42 | 111 | 166 | 54 | 54 | - | 16 | - | 2 |
| Iowa | 6 | 3 | 314 | 71 | 67 | 42 | - | - | - | - |
| Mo. | 7 | 22 | 1,016 | 1,162 | 179 | 373 | - | 3 | - | - |
| N. Dak. | - | - | 116 | 22 | 2 | 4 | - | - | - | - |
| S. Dak. | 1 | 1 | 42 | 61 | 5 | 2 | - | - | - | - |
| Nebr. | 1 | 3 | 194 | 46 | 40 | 31 | - | - | - | - |
| Kans. | 1 | 3 | 338 | 136 | 29 | 41 | - | 1 | - | - |
| S. ATLANTIC | 165 | 188 | 1,210 | 988 | 1,265 | 1,104 | - | 5 | - | 9 |
| Del. | 2 | - | 15 | 9 | 7 | 8 | - | 1 | - | - |
| Md. | 53 | 60 | 214 | 192 | 257 | 220 | - | - | - | 2 |
| D.C. | 6 | - | 35 | 24 | 30 | 21 | U | 1 | U | - |
| Va . | 9 | 28 | 151 | 182 | 120 | 97 | - | - | - | 3 |
| W. Va. | 9 | 7 | 13 | 22 | 24 | 48 | U | - | U | - |
| N.C. | 23 | 26 | 142 | 92 | 277 | 254 | - | 3 | - | 1 |
| S.C. | 4 | 2 | 46 | 42 | 81 | 47 | U | - | U | - |
| Ga . | 37 | 60 | 150 | 53 | 32 | 62 | - | - | U | 2 |
| Fla. | 22 | 5 | 444 | 372 | 437 | 347 | - | - | - | 1 |
| E.S. CENTRAL | 26 | 10 | 1,100 | 1,711 | 719 | 725 | - | 2 | - | - |
| Ky. | 4 | 4 | 41 | 41 | 54 | 61 | - | - | - | - |
| Tenn. | 12 | - | 710 | 1,421 | 418 | 569 | - | 2 | - | - |
| Ala. | 9 | 5 | 166 | 76 | 62 | 95 | - | - | - | - |
| Miss. | 1 | 1 | 183 | 173 | 185 | U | - | - | - | - |
| W.S. CENTRAL | 35 | 57 | 5,002 | 3,807 | 1,108 | 1,189 | - | 26 | - | 2 |
| Ark. | , | 6 | +436 | , 507 | 67 | 1, 58 | - | 2 | - | - |
| La. | 4 | 1 | 164 | 127 | 126 | 199 | - | - | - | - |
| Okla. | 28 | 21 | 2,088 | 1,020 | 59 | 147 | - | - | - | - |
| Tex. | 3 | 29 | 2,314 | 2,153 | 856 | 785 | - | 26 | - | 2 |
| MOUNTAIN | 88 | 101 | 3,802 | 3,534 | 980 | 725 | - | 153 | - | 5 |
| Mont. | - | - | 104 | 137 | 14 | 19 | - | - | - | - |
| Idaho | 1 | 3 | 211 | 287 | 79 | 84 | - | 1 | - | - |
| Wyo. | 35 | 7 | 31 | 99 | 38 | 26 | - | 1 | - | - |
| Colo. | 14 | 16 | 410 | 450 | 119 | 112 | - | 4 | - | 3 |
| N. Mex. | 10 | 12 | 323 | 716 | 360 | 268 | - | 17 | - | - |
| Ariz. | 12 | 25 | 1,511 | 966 | 219 | 104 | - | 8 | - | - |
| Utah | 8 | 10 | 876 | 630 | 82 | 62 | - | 117 | - | 2 |
| Nev. | 8 | 28 | 336 | 249 | 69 | 50 | U | 5 | U | - |
| PACIFIC | 183 | 187 | 6,637 | 8,987 | 1,493 | 1,782 | 1 | 168 | - | 12 |
| Wash. | 4 | 9 | 566 | 745 | 86 | 166 | - | 51 | - | - |
| Oreg. | 25 | 25 | 750 | 2,392 | 98 | 106 | - | 10 | - | - |
| Calif. | 150 | 148 | 5,220 | 5,655 | 1,283 | 1,486 | 1 | 37 | - | 5 |
| Alaska | 2 | 1 | 36 | 43 | 14 | 11 | - | 63 | - | - |
| Hawaii | 2 | 4 | 65 | 152 | 12 | 13 | - | 7 | - | 7 |
| Guam | - | - | 2 | 7 | - | 4 | U |  | U | - |
| P.R. | 1 | 3 | 115 | 92 | 359 | 550 | - | 7 | - | - |
| V.I. | - | - | - | 8 | - | 15 | U | - | U | - |
| Amer. Samoa | - | - | - | 6 | - | - | U | - | U | - |
| C.N.M.I. | 10 | 11 | 1 | 24 | 5 | 22 | U | - | U | - |
| N : Not notifiable | U: Unavailable -: no reported cases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

TABLE III. (Cont'd.) Provisional cases of selected notifiable diseases preventable by vaccination, United States, weeks ending November 2, 1996, and November 4, 1995 (44th Week)

| Reporting Area | Measles (Rubeola), cont'd. |  | Mumps |  |  | Pertussis |  |  | Rubella |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Cum. } \\ & 1996 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Cum. } \\ & 1995 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 1996 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Cum. } \\ & 1996 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Cum. } \\ & 1995 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 1996 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Cum. } \\ 1996 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Cum. } \\ 1995 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 1996 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Cum. } \\ & 1996 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Cum. } \\ & 1995 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| UNITED STATES | 460 | 287 | 5 | 536 | 715 | 162 | 4,632 | 3,807 | - | 201 | 111 |
| NEW ENGLAND | 15 | 10 | - | 2 | 11 | 48 | 984 | 571 |  | 27 | 47 |
| Maine | - | - | U | - | 4 | U | 20 | 42 | U |  | - |
| N.H. | - | - | - | - | 1 | 14 | 117 | 45 | - |  | 1 |
| Vt. | 2 | - | - | - | - | 11 | 119 | 67 | - | 2 | - |
| Mass. | 12 | 3 | - | 2 | 2 | 23 | 669 | 387 | - | 21 | 8 |
| R.I. | - | 5 | - | - | 1 | - | 30 | 4 | - | - | - |
| Conn. | 1 | 2 | - | - | 3 | - | 29 | 26 | - | 4 | 38 |
| MID. ATLANTIC | 28 | 12 | - | 76 | 105 | 1 | 400 | 341 | - | 11 | 14 |
| Upstate N.Y. | - | 1 | - | 24 | 24 | 1 | 237 | 176 | - | 4 | 4 |
| N.Y. City | 12 | 5 | - | 16 | 16 | - | 29 | 48 | - | 4 | 8 |
| N.J. | 3 | 6 | - | 2 | 17 | - | 16 | 17 | - | 2 | 2 |
| Pa . | 13 | - | - | 34 | 48 | - | 118 | 100 | - | 1 | - |
| E.N. CENTRAL | 13 | 15 | , | 91 | 140 | 22 | 514 | 482 | - | 3 | 3 |
| Ohio | 5 | 2 | 1 | 40 | 47 | 5 | 238 | 140 | - | - | - |
| Ind. | - | - | - | 9 | 9 | 10 | 83 | 49 | - | - | - |
| III. | 3 | 2 | - | 20 | 38 | 5 | 148 | 103 | - | 1 | - |
| Mich. | 3 | 5 | - | 21 | 46 | 2 | 40 | 63 | - | 2 | 3 |
| Wis. | 2 | 6 | - | 1 | - | - | 5 | 127 | - | - | - |
| W.N. CENTRAL | 22 | 2 |  | 18 | 40 | 29 | 348 | 244 | - | - | - |
| Minn. | 18 | - | 1 | 6 | 4 | 28 | 279 | 125 | - | - | - |
| lowa | - | - | - | 2 | 9 | 1 | 18 | 10 | - | - | - |
| Mo. | 3 | 1 | - | 7 | 22 | - | 34 | 59 | - | - | - |
| N. Dak. | - | - | - | 2 | 1 | - | 1 | 8 | - | - | - |
| S. Dak. | - | - | - | 2 | - | - | 4 | 11 | - | - | - |
| Nebr. | - | - | - | - | 4 | - | 8 | 10 | - | - | - |
| Kans. | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | - | - | 15 | 21 | - | - | - |
| S. ATLANTIC | 14 | 16 | - | 90 | 103 | 23 | 530 | 310 | - | 93 | 9 |
| Del. | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | 13 | 10 | - | - | - |
| Md. | 2 | 1 | - | 25 | 30 | 19 | 198 | 39 | - | - | 1 |
| D.C. | 1 | - | U | 1 | - | U | 2 | 6 | U | 2 | - |
| Va . | 3 | - | - | 12 | 21 | - | 71 | 19 | - | 2 | - |
| W. Va. | - | - | U | - | - | U | 2 | - | U | - | - |
| N.C. | 4 | - | - | 20 | 16 | - | 100 | 110 |  | 78 | 1 |
| S.C. | - | - | U | 6 | 11 | U | 38 | 25 | U | 1 | - |
| Ga . | 2 | 3 | - | 3 | 8 | - | 17 | 24 | - | - | 7 |
| Fla. | 1 | 12 | - | 23 | 17 | 4 | 89 | 77 | - | 10 | 7 |
| E.S. CENTRAL | 2 | - | - | 21 | 11 | - | 136 | 267 | - | 2 | 1 |
| Ky. | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | 84 | 24 | - | - | - |
| Tenn. | 2 | - | - | 3 | 4 | - | 20 | 206 | - | - | 1 |
| Ala. | - | - | - | 3 | 4 | - | 23 | 35 | - | 2 | - |
| Miss. | - | - | - | 15 | 3 | - | 9 | 2 | N | N | N |
| W.S. CENTRAL | 28 | 32 | - | 31 | 47 | 6 | 115 | 276 | - | 3 | 7 |
| Ark. | - | 2 | - | 2 | 7 | - | 12 | 36 | - | - | - |
| La. | - | 18 | - | 13 | 12 | - | 9 | 19 | - | 1 | - |
| Okla. | - | - | - | - | - | 6 | 17 | 31 | - | - | - |
| Tex. | 28 | 12 | - | 16 | 28 | - | 77 | 190 | - | 2 | 7 |
| MOUNTAIN | 158 | 70 | - | 21 | 30 | 5 | 372 | 545 | - | 7 | 4 |
| Mont. | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | 33 | 3 | - | - | - |
| Idaho | 1 | 2 | - | - | 3 | - | 102 | 99 | - | 3 | - |
| Wyo. | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | 6 | 1 | - | - | - |
| Colo. | 7 | 26 | - | 3 | 2 | 5 | 98 | 88 | - | 2 | - |
| N. Mex. | 17 | 31 | N | N | N | - | 60 | 113 | - | - | - |
| Ariz. | 8 | 10 | - | 1 | 2 | - | 27 | 153 | - | 1 | 3 |
| Utah | 119 | - | - | 2 | 11 | - | 19 | 27 | - | - | 1 |
| Nev. | 5 | 1 | U | 15 | 11 | U | 27 | 61 | U | 1 | - |
| PACIFIC | 180 | 130 | 3 | 186 | 228 | 28 | 1,233 | 771 | - | 55 | 26 |
| Wash. | 51 | 19 | - | 19 | 12 | 2 | 543 | 279 | - | 2 | 1 |
| Oreg. | 10 | 1 | - | - | - | - | 34 | 54 | - | 1 | - |
| Calif. | 42 | 108 | 3 | 137 | 195 | 25 | 624 | 389 | - | 49 | 20 |
| Alaska | 63 | - | - | 3 | 12 | - | 4 | 1 | - | - | - |
| Hawaii | 14 | 2 | - | 27 | 9 | 1 | 28 | 48 | - | 3 | 5 |
| Guam | - | - | U | 5 | 4 | U | 1 | 2 | U | - | 1 |
| P.R. | 7 | 3 |  | 1 | 2 | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | - |
| V.I. | - | - | U |  | 3 | U | - | - | U | - | - |
| Amer. Samoa | - | - | U | - | - | U | - | - | U | - | - |
| C.N.M.I. | - | - | U | - | 1 | U | - | - | U | - | - |

TABLE IV. Deaths in 121 U.S. cities,* week ending November 2, 1996 (44th Week)

| Reporting Area | All Causes, By Age (Years) |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{I}} \mathbf{I}^{\dagger}$ <br> Total | Reporting Area | All Causes, By Age (Years) |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { P\&I }^{\dagger} \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { All } \\ \text { Ages } \end{gathered}$ | >65 | 45-64 | 25-44 | 1-24 | <1 |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { All } \\ \text { Ages } \end{gathered}$ | >65 | 45-64 | 25-44 | 1-24 | <1 |  |
| NEW ENGLAND | 526 | 368 | 99 | 36 | 13 | 10 | 27 | S. ATLANTIC | 1,160 | 751 | 211 | 125 | 41 | 32 | 78 |
| Boston, Mass. | 143 | 93 | 30 | 12 | 5 | 3 | 6 | Atlanta, Ga. | 144 | 93 | 21 | 15 | 5 | 10 | 9 |
| Bridgeport, Conn. | 33 | 20 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 1 |  | Baltimore, Md. | 182 | 115 | 36 | 24 | 4 | 3 | 16 |
| Cambridge, Mass. | 21 | 13 | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 | Charlotte, N.C. | 85 | 57 | 16 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| Fall River, Mass. | 30 | 24 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  | - | Jacksonville, Fla. | 154 | 104 | 30 | 9 | 6 | 5 | 12 |
| Hartford, Conn. | 52 | 35 | 12 | 2 | 1 | 2 | - | Miami, Fla. | 105 | 60 | 19 | 17 | 5 | 4 | - |
| Lowell, Mass. | 30 | 22 | 6 | 2 |  |  |  | Norfolk, Va. | 56 | 36 | 9 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| Lynn, Mass. | U | U | U | U | U | U | U | Richmond, Va. | 72 | 42 | 18 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 5 |
| New Bedford, Mass. | 18 | 17 |  | - |  |  |  | Savannah, Ga. | 50 | 33 | 10 | 6 | - | 1 | 7 |
| New Haven, Conn. | 30 | 22 | 5 | 2 | - | 1 | 2 | St. Petersburg, Fla. | 51 | 37 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 3 |
| Providence, R.I. | 57 | 42 | 13 | 1 |  | 1 | 3 | Tampa, Fla. | 152 | 112 | 28 | 9 | 3 |  | 14 |
| Somerville, Mass. | 5 | 4 | 1 | - | - | - | 1 | Washington, D.C. | 109 | 62 | 18 | 21 | 7 | 1 | 5 |
| Springfield, Mass. | 22 | 19 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 4 | Wilmington, Del. | U | U | U | U | U | U | U |
| Waterbury, Conn. | 23 | 18 | 3 | 2 | - |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Worcester, Mass. | 62 | 39 | 13 | 6 | 4 |  | 6 | E.S. CENTRAL | 723 119 | 477 | 160 36 | 54 | 16 | 14 | 61 |
| MID. ATLANTIC | 2,377 | 1,678 | 418 | 200 | 41 | 40 | 114 | Chattanooga, Tenn. | 88 | 61 | 14 | 8 | 1 | 4 | 5 |
| Albany, N.Y. | 33 | 22 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | Knoxville, Tenn. | 75 | 49 | 20 | 5 | 1 | - | 11 |
| Allentown, Pa. | 27 | 21 | 5 | 1 | - |  | - | Lexington, Ky. | 63 | 41 | 17 | 4 | 1 | - | 8 |
| Buffalo, N.Y. | 106 | 81 | 13 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 8 | Memphis, Tenn. | 153 | 107 | 30 | 11 | 3 | 2 | 12 |
| Camden, N.J. | 28 | 18 | 5 |  | 5 |  | - | Mobile, Ala. | 54 | 35 | 12 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| Elizabeth, N.J. | 8 | 6 | - | 2 | - |  | 1 | Montgomery, Ala. | 50 | 34 | 8 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 7 |
| Erie, Pa.§ | 42 | 31 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | Nashville, Tenn. | 121 | 80 | 23 | 13 | 2 | 3 | 12 |
| Jersey City, N.J. | 50 | 36 | 6 | 7 | 1 |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| New York City, N.Y. | 1,236 | 862 | 234 | 108 | 14 | 18 | 47 | W.S. CENTRAL Austin, Tex. | 1,397 75 | 883 48 | 285 15 | 135 8 | 61 | 33 4 | 59 3 |
| Newark, N.J. | 41 | 22 | 6 | 8 | 3 | 2 | 4 | Austin, Tex. Baton Rouge, La. | 75 25 | 48 | 15 7 | 8 | 1 | 4 | 3 2 |
| Paterson, N.J. | 19 | 15 | 2 | 1 |  | 1 |  | Baton Rouge, La. Corpus Christi, Tex. | 67 | 17 | 20 |  | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| Philadelphia, Pa. | 400 | 270 | 70 | 41 | 10 | 9 | 19 | Corpus Christi, Tex. Dallas, Tex. | 195 | 127 | 33 | 21 | 9 | 1 | 3 5 |
| Pittsburgh, Pa.§ | 67 | 51 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 3 | Dallas, Tex. | 195 86 | 127 | 33 7 | 21 8 | 9 | 5 | 5 |
| Reading, Pa. | 16 | 13 | 2 | 1 |  | - | 5 | El Paso, Tex. Ft. Worth, Tex. | 86 91 | 63 62 | 7 16 | 8 | 6 5 | 2 | 1 |
| Rochester, N.Y. | 131 | 99 | 23 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 11 | Ft. Worth, Tex. | 91 319 | 174 | 16 80 | 37 | 19 | 1 | 28 |
| Schenectady, N.Y. | 21 | 17 | 4 | - | - | - |  | Houston, Tex. Little Rock, Ark. | 319 53 | 174 37 | 80 | 17 1 | 19 2 | 1 | 28 |
| Scranton, Pa.§ Syracuse, N.Y. | 27 79 | 23 | 14 | 3 | - | 3 | 2 | Little Rock, Ark. | 53 94 | 58 | 18 | 11 | 6 | 1 | 2 |
| Syracuse, N.Y. Trenton, $\mathrm{N} . \mathrm{J}$. | 79 24 | 62 | 11 5 | 3 | - | 3 | 7 2 | New Orieans, ${ }^{\text {San Antonio, }}$ Tex. | 204 | 129 | 40 | 21 | 8 | 6 | 8 |
| Trenton, N.J. | 24 | 17 | 5 | 1 | 1 | - | 2 | Shreveport, La. | 61 | 34 | 17 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Yonkers, N.Y. | U | U | U | U | U | U | U | Tulsa, Okla. | 127 | 93 | 20 | 11 | 1 | 2 | 5 |
| E.N. CENTRAL | 2,107 | 1,438 | 379 | 177 | 56 | 55 | 131 | MOUNTAIN | 870 | 583 | 162 | 77 | 23 | 23 | 47 |
| Akron, Ohio | 40 | 28 | 7 | 4 | - | 1 | 2 | Albuquerque, N.M. | 101 | 68 | 22 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Canton, Ohio | 31 | 28 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | 10 | Colo. Springs, Colo. | 51 | 30 | 10 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| Chicago, III. | 387 | 222 | 97 | 35 | 13 | 18 | 21 | Denver, Colo. | 123 | 85 | 24 | 8 | 2 | 4 | 8 |
| Cincinnati, Ohio | 179 | 130 | 26 | 11 | 4 | 8 | 13 | Las Vegas, Nev. | 124 | 80 | 28 | 7 | 6 | 2 | 11 |
| Cleveland, Ohio | 141 | 89 | 31 | 17 | 2 | 2 | 1 | Ogden, Utah | 20 | 14 | 4 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 |
| Columbus, Ohio | 184 | 143 | 25 | 11 | 4 | 1 | 9 | Phoenix, Ariz. | 181 | 117 | 24 | 25 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Dayton, Ohio | 120 | 92 | 20 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 15 | Pueblo, Colo. | 20 | 15 | 1 | 2 | - | - | 1 |
| Detroit, Mich. | 185 | 108 | 36 | 33 | 5 | 3 | 5 | Salt Lake City, Utah | 109 | 71 | 21 | 11 | 3 | 3 | 13 |
| Evansville, Ind. | 48 | 36 | 7 | 3 | - | 2 | 4 | Tucson, Ariz. | 141 | 103 | 26 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| Fort Wayne, Ind. | 58 | 40 | 11 | 4 | 3 | - | 5 | PACIFIC | 1,560 | 1,054 | 291 | 129 | 49 | 37 | 113 |
| Gary, Ind. | 26 | 13 | 5 | 4 | 4 | - | 1 | Berkeley, Calif. | , 21 | 1, 13 | 5 | 3 |  |  | 1 |
| Grand Rapids, Mich. | 71 | 55 | 11 | 4 | 1 | 7 | 12 | Fresno, Calif. | 47 | 33 | 8 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Indianapolis, Ind. | 222 | 143 | 40 | 22 | 10 | 7 | 10 | Glendale, Calif. | 27 | 21 | 2 | 2 | 2 | - | 5 |
| Madison, Wis. | $\cup$ | U | U | U | U | U | U | Honolulu, Hawaii | 72 | 52 | 12 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 7 |
| Milwaukee, Wis. | 127 | 101 | 17 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 10 | Long Beach, Calif. | 53 | 30 | 9 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 9 |
| Peoria, III. | 46 | 34 | 5 | 4 | - | 3 | 1 | Los Angeles, Calif. | 507 | 339 | 104 | 41 | 18 | 5 | 14 |
| Rockford, III. | 40 | 27 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Pasadena, Calif. | 28 | 21 | 2 | 3 | - | 2 | 3 |
| South Bend, Ind. | 50 | 34 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 1 | - | Portland, Oreg. | 109 | 74 | 20 | 12 | 2 | 1 | 8 |
| Toledo, Ohio | 100 | 75 | 19 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 6 | Sacramento, Calif. | U | U | U | U | U | U | U |
| Youngstown, Ohio | 52 | 40 | 6 | 4 | - | 2 | 3 | San Diego, Calif. | 131 | 78 | 26 | 12 | 7 | 8 | 19 |
| W.N. CENTRAL | 848 | 599 | 149 | 52 | 21 | 15 | 42 | San Francisco, Calif. | 106 | 66 | 26 | 11 | 2 | 1 | 13 |
| Des Moines, lowa | 129 | 97 | 24 | 5 | 3 | , | 5 | San Jose, Calif. | 176 | 121 | 37 | 10 | 4 | 4 | 15 |
| Duluth, Minn. | 31 | 24 | 6 | - | - | 1 | 3 | Santa Cruz, Calif. | 26 | 19 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Kansas City, Kans. | 33 | 23 | 6 | 4 | - | - | - | Seattle, Wash. | 137 | 96 | 18 | 12 | 7 | 4 | 7 |
| Kansas City, Mo. | 108 | 67 | 18 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 2 | Spokane, Wash. Tacoma, Wash. | 47 73 | 38 53 | $\begin{array}{r}7 \\ \hline\end{array}$ |  | - | 2 | 4 |
| Lincoln, Nebr. | 42 | 29 | 9 | 3 | - | 1 | 2 | Tacoma, Wash. | 73 | 53 | 11 | 6 | - | 3 | 4 |
| Minneapolis, Minn. | 163 | 117 | 28 | 8 | 7 | 2 | 17 | TOTAL | 11,568 | 7,831 | 2,154 | 985 | 321 | 259 | 672 |
| Omaha, Nebr. | 88 | 67 | 13 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| St. Louis, Mo. | 99 | 67 | 17 | 11 | 2 | 2 | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| St. Paul, Minn. | 65 | 49 | 9 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wichita, Kans. | 90 | 59 | 19 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

${ }^{*}$ Mortality data in this table are voluntarily reported from 121 cities in the United States, most of which have populations of 100,000 or more. A death is reported by the place of its occurrence and by the week that the death certificate was filed. Fetal deaths are not included.
${ }^{\dagger}$ Pneumonia and influenza.
${ }^{\S}$ Because of changes in reporting methods in these 3 Pennsylvania cities, these numbers are partial counts for the current week. Complete counts will be available in 4 to 6 weeks.
TTotal includes unknown ages.
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[^0]:    *Persons aged $\geq 18$ years who reported having smoked $\geq 100$ cigarettes and who reported smoking now.
    ${ }^{\dagger}$ No data were available for the District of Columbia.
    ${ }^{\S}$ Confidence interval.

[^1]:    -: no reported cases

