European Journal of Mental Health
https://doi.org/10.5708/EJMH.21.2026.0065

PERSPECTIVE ARTICLE

Household Power Dynamics in Smoke- and Aerosol-Free Home Interventions

Zoltan BRYS [1,2] ✉, Fruzsina ALBERT [1,2,3], Melinda PÉNZES [1,3,4], and Vera BÉKÉS [5]

OPEN ACCESS

Affiliations
[1] Interdisciplinary Social Sciences Doctoral Program, Mental Health Sciences Division, Doctoral College, Semmelweis University, Budapest, Hungary
[2] Institute for Sociology, Centre for Social Sciences, ELTE, Budapest, Hungary
[3] Institute of Mental Health, Semmelweis University, Budapest, Hungary
[4] Department of Public Health, Albert Szent-Györgyi Medical School, University of Szeged, Szeged, Hungary
[5] Department of Educational and Counselling Psychology, McGill University, Montreal, QC, Canada

✉ Correspondence
Zoltán BRYS
Interdisciplinary Social Sciences Doctoral Program, Mental Health Sciences Division, Doctoral College, Semmelweis University
H-1085 Üllői út 26, Budapest, Hungary
Email: brys.zoltan@phd.semmelweis.hu

History
Received: 17 May 2026
Accepted: 16 October 2026
Published: 9 November 2026

Citation
Brys, Z., Albert, F., Pénzes, M., & Békés, V. (2026). Household power dynamics in smoke- and aerosol-free home interventions. *European Journal of Mental Health, 21*, e0065, 1–6.
https://doi.org/10.5708/EJMH.21.2026.0065

Introduction: Voluntary household bans on tobacco and nicotine use are effective in preventing uptake and in reducing exposure to secondhand smoke and aerosol. However, barriers to ban adoption persist, especially in disadvantaged households and with the rise of new tobacco and nicotine products.
Areas covered: This perspective article first briefly discusses the psychosocial embeddedness of tobacco and nicotine use, the role of voluntary household bans in prevention, barriers to their adoption, and existing individual-centered interventions promoting smoke- and aerosol-free homes.
Expert opinion: Tobacco and nicotine use are embedded in relational psychosocial processes. We argue that household bans typically emerge through negotiation among household members with divergent health behaviors, beliefs, and decision-making power and are implemented in a dynamic interpersonal system. Thus, a key element of successful implementation of household bans is likely the consideration of household dynamics.
Conclusion: Extending the focus from the individual to the household-level is likely to help inform future research as well as the development of smoke- and aerosol-free home interventions. In particular, greater attention to gendered household power relations and the inclusion of smoking male partners may represent promising directions for future interventions.

Keywords: smoke-free homes, voluntary rules, secondhand smoke and aerosol, family systems, gendered power differences

Introduction

Voluntary household bans on tobacco and nicotine use are important for preventing the uptake of tobacco and nicotine products and reducing exposure to harmful secondhand smoke and aerosol. In this perspective article, we argue that the adoption of such bans is embedded in gendered household power dynamics. In contrast to the dominant focus of research and interventions on individual household members, we emphasize that more effective household-level interventions should account for gendered power relations, household authority structures, and the inclusion of smoking partners.

ISSN 1788-7119 (online)
© 2026 The Authors. Published by Semmelweis University, Institute of Mental Health, Budapest.

The Role of Voluntary Household Bans in Tobacco and Nicotine Use Prevention

One of the key tasks to reduce the prevalence of tobacco and nicotine use is the prevention of uptake (Leão et al., 2018). Risk factors for uptake include genetic, socio-demographic (e.g., educational attainment, gender, socio-economic status, place of residence), psychological (e.g., expectations, self-efficacy, novelty-seeking, sensation-seeking, unrealistic optimism, neuroticism), and social (e.g., social norms, perception of smoking, access to tobacco products) factors (National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion (US) Office on Smoking and Health, 2012). As the majority of people who smoke start smoking daily before the age of 25 years, prevention is typically focused on adolescents and young adults (National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion (US) Office on Smoking and Health, 2012).

Voluntary household bans on tobacco and nicotine use are among the social norms and rules that influence the uptake of these products. As such, they offer an opportunity for early intervention in prevention. Home smoking restrictions reduce the probability of adolescent uptake (Emory et al., 2010; Wu & Chaffee, 2020). Prohibiting all forms of tobacco and nicotine use (smoking, e-cigarette use, etc.) at home also decreases the probability of initiating their use and is a more effective means of prevention than parental advice (Wu & Chaffee, 2020). A household ban on e-cigarette use has also been found to be associated with lower probability of e-cigarette use among adults (Azagba et al., 2020). Similarly, in a matched analysis of a nationally representative US youth cohort, household vaping bans were associated with lower odds of adolescent e-cigarette use (Staff et al., 2024). A complete household ban on tobacco and nicotine use is not only a tool for early prevention but also for reducing exposure to secondhand smoke and secondhand aerosol (Amalia et al., 2023; Henderson et al., 2023). In addition, a household ban on tobacco use also supports cessation efforts and prevents relapse (Hyland et al., 2009). However, the adoption of household bans is not without challenges, particularly in disadvantaged communities (Brys et al., 2025; Zhang et al., 2012) and with regard to the growing use of new and emerging tobacco and nicotine products (O'Connor et al., 2022).

Barriers to Voluntary Household Bans

In Europe and the USA, the prevalence of voluntary, indoor household smoking bans is increasing (Gallus et al., 2016; Helgertz et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2012); in 12 European countries, 70% of respondents aged 15 years or older reported a smoke-free home in 2017–2018 (Tigova et al., 2025). National-level tobacco control policies are positively associated with the prevalence of voluntary, household smoking bans in European countries (Ferketich et al., 2014). However, within societies, disadvantaged households (e.g., those with lower levels of education, single parents, members of racialized ethnic minorities, financial difficulties, or smokers) are typically late adopters of smoking bans (Gallus et al., 2016; Pandey et al., 2017; Zhang et al., 2012).

The rise of new and emerging tobacco products, such as e-cigarettes and heated tobacco products, poses a challenge to voluntary in-home bans of tobacco and nicotine use. Extensive tobacco industry interference (e.g., lobbying against regulations, the use of misleading or distorted messages, and efforts to undermine public health policies) further weakens tobacco control, including smoke- and aerosol-free policies (Matthes et al., 2023; Pénzes et al., 2024; Ralston et al., 2023). Even though aerosol from e-cigarettes and heated tobacco products is harmful (Lin et al., 2022; Perez Cornago et al., 2026), public perceptions regarding their relative harms compared with cigarettes remain inconsistent and have shifted substantially over time (Jackson et al., 2024), which may contribute to ambiguity in household smoking and vaping bans.

Interventions for Promoting Voluntary Household Bans on Tobacco Use

Despite the importance of creating smoke- and aerosol-free home environments, interventions promoting them often fail. A Cochrane review of family interventions to reduce children's exposure to environmental tobacco smoke found that only a minority of studies (26 out of 78) reported beneficial effects (Behbod et al., 2018). However, the factors that contribute to the effectiveness of such interventions have not been clearly identified (Behbod et al., 2018). In 2019, an intervention using personalized air quality feedback was developed to promote smoke-free homes to improve health outcomes in disadvantaged households (O'Donnell, Dobson, et al., 2019).

This intervention involves face-to-face sessions in which healthcare professionals guide parents using motivational strategies, non-judgmental language, and air quality monitoring and feedback (O'Donnell, Dobson, et al., 2019). Low-cost, minimal intervention programs (involving brief counseling, phone calls, and educational materials) have also been developed for disadvantaged groups and appear to be effective (Kegler et al., 2015). While existing interventions are promising, further research is necessary to understand the key components that contribute to the successful adoption of voluntary household bans.

Household Power Dynamics

Addressing tobacco use in the home calls for a shift in perspective from the individual to the family system. Except in single-adult households, decisions to introduce bans are not made by a single person; rather, they emerge through negotiation among household members who differ in their health behaviors, health beliefs, and decision-making power. A thematic synthesis of 18 qualitative studies accordingly identified social influence as one of the core themes shaping whether households establish and maintain smoke-free homes (Passey et al., 2016). In the Cochrane review by Behbod et al. (2018), 24 of the 78 studies targeted mothers only, and three invited partners to participate on an optional basis, whereas the remaining 51 did not explicitly report the involvement of other household members. Despite their importance, clean air interventions often overlook smoking male partners (O'Donnell, Angus, et al., 2019; O'Donnell et al., 2022). We also argue that a key element of success might be the consideration of household power dynamics. Although comprehensive theories of household-level health behavior that account for the complex interactions, dynamics, and collective decision-making processes within households are currently lacking, we can draw upon theories from family psychology (family systems theory; Goldenberg et al., 2017), cultural anthropology (family as a cross-cultural phenomenon, committed household members, and cultural norms), community psychiatry and nursing (community settings and empowerment), and family sociology (family roles, authority structure, and gendered power dynamics) (Bonacich et al., 1985; Kwai-Choi Lee & Collins, 2000; Pandey et al., 2017). Household health rules result from a dynamic process shaped by household composition, gendered power imbalances (Brys et al., 2025; Pandey et al., 2017), and cultural norms that legitimize these imbalances as fair (Deb et al., 2024). A recent qualitative study of women in Germany similarly concluded that maintaining a smoke-free home is embedded in social relations, gender roles, and structural constraints (Barrera et al., 2026). Household-level decision-making typically depends on each member's bargaining power and on the coalitions that members form with one another (Bonacich et al., 1985; Kwai-Choi Lee & Collins, 2000). In Chinese extended families, mothers used non-smoking relatives as mediators to reduce senior men's smoking in the home (Mao, 2015). Women typically initiate household smoking rules (Berg et al., 2015; Kegler et al., 2007), but they often lack the authority to enforce them when the primary authority figure in the household smokes (Villarreal et al., 2026). However, fathers can be motivated to create smoke-free homes when they recognize their role in protecting their children's health, and they may benefit from tailored, family-centered interventions and the cultural reinforcement of positive fatherhood norms (O'Donnell, Angus, et al., 2019; O'Donnell et al., 2022). Open marital conflict over such rules appears to be rare. In a qualitative study of 102 rural US households, Kegler et al. (2007) found that the vast majority of families reported no disagreement about household smoking restrictions and that resistance, where it occurred, took the form of complaints, negotiation, or continued smoking in the home. In Shanghai, husbands similarly responded to such requests by ignoring them (Berg et al., 2015). These findings suggest that latent, gendered asymmetries in decision-making power, rather than manifest marital conflict, may be the operative mechanism in the adoption of household bans. Children also shape these negotiations: they may actively complain about secondhand smoke, and health problems among children frequently trigger the adoption of restrictions (Kegler et al., 2007). In addition, when a community-based approach is deemed appropriate in the given cultural milieu, interventions should consider including influential, high-power male figures from the wider community, such as community leaders and facilitators, in order to increase the prevalence of smoke- and aerosol-free households (Nichter et al., 2015). Recent evidence from a systematic review of interventions involving non-smoking household members suggests that home-based interventions show promise (Nawawi et al., 2025), although intervention effectiveness remains heterogeneous. However, the role of household decision-making processes, gendered power relations, and smoking household members in intervention effectiveness remains unexplored.

Conclusion

Voluntary household bans on tobacco and nicotine use constitute a valid component of tobacco prevention, and we posit that the path to developing more effective interventions is likely to depend on a better understanding of gendered household power dynamics. Future research should investigate how gendered intra-household bargaining processes, gendered decision-making power, and sociocultural norms shape the adoption of bans. Studies should also examine how household authority structures, children's influence, and the inclusion of smoking male partners influence uptake. Findings of these studies could guide the development of the household-level, multi-actor interventions proposed here. Such voluntary, household-level interventions may also complement recently proposed legislative approaches that frame the protection of children from secondhand tobacco smoke in the home as a children's right to clean air (Semple et al., 2026).

Acknowledgements
Preliminary version of the manuscript was presented at the 3rd International Workshops on Public Policy on the 28th of June, 2022. We are grateful to Daniel Meyer (University of Wisconsin–Madison) and Elke Claessens (University of Antwerp), who provided valuable comments during the workshop.

Funding
The conceptual work behind this study was supported by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences [High-risk/high yield research on post-COVID phenomena fund, PC2022 II-5/2022].

Author contribution
Zoltan BRYS: conceptualization, interpretation, writing – original draft, writing – review and editing.
Fruzsina ALBERT: conceptualization, interpretation, writing – review and editing, project administration, funding acquisition.
Melinda PÉNZES: interpretation, writing – review and editing.
Vera BÉKÉS: interpretation, writing – review and editing.

Declaration of interest statement
The authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

Declaration on using artificial intelligence in research and manuscript preparation
The authors declare that artificial intelligence tools were used solely for language editing purposes. All outputs were reviewed and approved by the authors.

ORCID
Zoltán BRYS https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3324-2255
Fruzsina ALBERT https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1372-7164
Melinda PÉNZES https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7396-4028
Vera BÉKÉS https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3043-5155

References

Amalia, B., Fu, M., Tigova, O., Ballbè, M., Paniello-Castillo, B., Castellano, Y., Vyzikidou, V. K., O'Donnell, R., Dobson, R., Lugo, A., Veronese, C., Pérez-Ortuño, R., Pascual, J. A., Cortés, N., Gil, F., Olmedo, P., Soriano, J. B., Boffi, R., Ruprecht, A., ... Fernández, E. (2023). Exposure to secondhand aerosol from electronic cigarettes at homes: A real-life study in four European countries. *Science of The Total Environment*, *854*, Article 158668. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.158668

Azagba, S., Shan, L., & Manzione, L. (2020). Associations of home and workplace vaping restrictions with e-cigarette use among U.S. adults. *Preventive Medicine*, *139*, Article 106196. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ypmed.2020.106196

Barrera, B., Feliu, A., Espina, C., Brand, T., Zeeb, H., & Rees, V. W. (2026). Maintaining smoke-free homes in Germany: A hypothesis-generating qualitative study of women's experiences across social and household contexts. *BMJ Open*, *16*(9), Article e117651. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2026-117651

Behbod, B., Sharma, M., Baxi, R., Roseby, R., & Webster, P. (2018). Family and carer smoking control programmes for reducing children's exposure to environmental tobacco smoke. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, *2018*(1), Article CD001746. https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD001746.pub4

Berg, C. J., Zheng, P., & Kegler, M. C. (2015). Perceived benefits of smoke-free homes, the process of establishing them, and enforcement challenges in Shanghai, China: A qualitative study. *BMC Public Health*, *15*, Article 89. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-015-1428-8

Bonacich, P., Grusky, O., & Peyrot, M. (1985). Family Coalitions: A New Approach and Method. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *48*(1), 42–50. https://doi.org/10.2307/3033780

Brys, Z., Pénzes, M., Békés, V., & Albert, F. (2025). Gendered educational disparities and in-home smoking and use of electronic tobacco/nicotine devices among cohabiting couples: Findings from a Hungarian cross-sectional survey. *Tobacco Control*, Article tc-2025-059333. https://doi.org/10.1136/tc-2025-059333

Deb, A., Kusimova, T., & Hominis, O. (2024). Perpetuation of gender inequalities in households: From culture to cognition. *Journal of Cognition and Culture*, *24*(3–4), 373–409. https://doi.org/10.1163/15685373-12340193

Emory, K., Saquib, N., Gilpin, E. A., & Pierce, J. P. (2010). The association between home smoking restrictions and youth smoking behaviour: A review. *Tobacco Control*, *19*(6), 495–506. https://doi.org/10.1136/tc.2010.035998

Ferketich, A. K., Lugo, A., La Vecchia, C., Fernandez, E., Boffetta, P., Clancy, L., & Gallus, S. (2014). Relation between national-level tobacco control policies and individual-level voluntary home smoking bans in Europe. *Tobacco Control*, *25*, 60–65. https://doi.org/10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2014-051819

Gallus, S., Lugo, A., Gorini, G., Colombo, P., Pacifici, R., & Fernandez, E. (2016). Voluntary home smoking ban: Prevalence, trend and determinants in Italy. *The European Journal of Public Health*, *26*(5), 841–844. https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/ckw146

Goldenberg, I., Stanton, M., & Goldenberg, H. (2017). *Family Therapy: An Overview* (9th ed.). Cengage.

Helgertz, S., St. Claire, A. & Kingsbury, J. (2020). Statewide prevalence of smoke-free and vape-free homes, by tobacco product use, Minnesota, 2018. *Preventing Chronic Disease*, *17*, Article 200133. https://doi.org/10.5888/pcd17.200133

Henderson, E., Rodriguez Guerrero, L. A., Continente, X., Fernández, E., Tigova, O., Cortés-Francisco, N., Semple, S., Dobson, R., Tzortzi, A., Vyzikidou, V. K., Gorini, G., Geshanova, G., Mons, U., Przewozniak, K., Precioso, J., Brad, R., López, M. J., & the TackSHS project Investigators (2023). Measurement of airborne nicotine, as a marker of secondhand smoke exposure, in homes with residents who smoke in 9 European countries. *Environmental Research*, *219*, Article 115118. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2022.115118

Hyland, A., Higbee, C., Travers, M. J., Van Deusen, A., Bansal-Travers, M., King, B., & Cummings, K. M. (2009). Smoke-free homes and smoking cessation and relapse in a longitudinal population of adults. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research*, *11*(6), 614–618. https://doi.org/10.1093/ntr/ntp022

Jackson, S. E., Tattan-Birch, H., East, K., Cox, S., Shahab, L., & Brown, J. (2024). Trends in harm perceptions of e-cigarettes vs cigarettes among adults who smoke in England, 2014–2023. *JAMA Network Open*, *7*(2), Article e240582. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2024.0582

Kegler, M. C., Bundy, L., Haardörfer, R., Escoffery, C., Berg, C., Yembra, D., Kreuter, M., Hovell, M., Williams, R., Mullen, P. D., Ribisl, K., & Burnham, D. (2015). A minimal intervention to promote smoke-free homes among 2-1-1 callers: A randomized controlled trial. *American Journal of Public Health*, *105*, 530–537. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2014.302260

Kegler, M. C., Escoffery, C., Groff, A., Butler, S., & Foreman, A. (2007). A qualitative study of how families decide to adopt household smoking restrictions. *Family & Community Health*, *30*(4), 328–341. https://doi.org/10.1097/01.FCH.0000290545.56199.c9

Kwai-Choi Lee, C., & Collins, B. A. (2000). Family decision making and coalition patterns. *European Journal of Marketing*, *34*(9–10), 1181–1198. https://doi.org/10.1108/03090560010342584

Leão, T., Kunst, A. E., & Perelman, J. (2018). Cost-effectiveness of tobacco control policies and programmes targeting adolescents: A systematic review. *European Journal of Public Health*, *28*(1), 39–43. https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/ckx215

Lin, H.-C., Buu, A., & Su, W.-C. (2022). Disposable e-cigarettes and associated health risks: An experimental study. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *19*(17), Article 10633. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph191710633

Mao, A. (2015). Getting over the patriarchal barriers: Women's management of men's smoking in Chinese families. *Health Education Research*, *30*(1), 13–23. https://doi.org/10.1093/her/cyu019

Matthes, B. K., Kumar, P., Dance, S., Hird, T., Carriedo Lutzenkirchen, A., & Gilmore, A. B. (2023). Advocacy counterstrategies to tobacco industry interference in policymaking: A scoping review of peer-reviewed literature. *Globalization and Health*, *19*, Article 42. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12992-023-00936-7

National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion (US) Office on Smoking and Health. (2012). *Preventing Tobacco Use Among Youth and Young Adults: A report of the Surgeon General*. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (US). http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/nbk99237/

Nawawi, M., Balachandran, P., Janakiram, C., Sreedevi, A., Menon, J. C., & Thankappan, K. R. (2025). Effectiveness of smoke-free home-based interventions in reducing second-hand smoke exposure in children and adults: A systematic review. *Asian Pacific Journal of Cancer Prevention*, *26*(9), 3145–3156. https://doi.org/10.31557/APJCP.2025.26.9.3145

Nichter, M., Padmajam, S., Nichter, M., Sairu, P., Aswathy, S., Mini, G. K., Bindu, V. C., Pradeepkumar, A. S., & Thankappan, K. R. (2015). Developing a smoke free homes initiative in Kerala, India. *BMC Public Health*, *15*, Article 480. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-015-1815-1

O'Connor, R., Schneller, L. M., Felicione, N. J., Talhout, R., Goniewicz, M. L., & Ashley, D. L. (2022). Evolution of tobacco products: Recent history and future directions. *Tobacco Control*, *31*(2), 175–182. https://doi.org/10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2021-056544

O'Donnell, R., Angus, K., McCulloch, P., Amos, A., Greaves, L., & Semple, S. (2019). Fathers' views and experiences of creating a smoke-free home: A scoping review. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *16*(24), Article 5164. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16245164

O'Donnell, R., Dobson, R., de Bruin, M., Turner, S., Booth, L., & Semple, S. (2019). Development of a smoke-free homes intervention for parents: An intervention mapping approach. *Health Psychology Bulletin*, *3*, 67–86. https://doi.org/10.5334/hpb.20

O'Donnell, R., Mcculloch, P., Greaves, L., Semple, S., & Amos, A. (2022). What helps and what hinders the creation of a smoke-free home: A qualitative study of fathers in Scotland. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research*, *24*(4), 511–518. https://doi.org/10.1093/ntr/ntab228

Pandey, S., Murugan, V., Karki, Y. B., & Mathur, A. (2017). In-home smoking in households with women of reproductive age in Nepal: Does women's empowerment matter? *Health & Social Work*, *42*(1), 32–40. https://doi.org/10.1093/hsw/hlw057

Passey, M. E., Longman, J. M., Robinson, J., Wiggers, J., & Jones, L. L. (2016). Smoke-free homes: What are the barriers, motivators and enablers? A qualitative systematic review and thematic synthesis. *BMJ Open*, *6*, Article e010260. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2015-010260

Pénzes, M., Carnicer-Pont, D., López Luque, A. M., Koprivnikar, H., Kilibarda, B., Vasic, M., González-Marrón, A., Possenti, I., Gallus, S., Lambrou, A., Papachristou, E., Schoretsaniti, S., Carreras, G., Gorini, G., & Fernández, E. (2024). Barriers and opportunities for the expansion of smoke- and aerosol-free environment policies in Europe. *Tobacco Prevention & Cessation*, *10*, Article 52. https://doi.org/10.18332/tpc/193977

Perez Cornago, A., Sarasa Renedo, A., Jarach, C., Wollgast, J., & Maragkoudakis, P. (2026). *Health outcomes associated with the use of e-cigarettes, heated tobacco products, and nicotine pouches*. Publications Office of the European Union. https://doi.org/10.2760/0061469

Ralston, R., Godziewski, C., & Brooks, E. (2023). Reconceptualising the commercial determinants of health: Bringing institutions in. *BMJ Global Health*, *8*(11), Article e013698. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2023-013698

Semple, S., Tigova, O., Howell, R., Davie, E., Gorini, G., Turner, S. W., Vardavas, C., Clancy, L., Peruga, A., Fernández, E., & O'Donnell, R. (2026). Protecting children from second-hand tobacco smoke in the home: The need for a new approach. *Tobacco Control*, *35*(3), 412–414. https://doi.org/10.1136/tc-2024-059205

Staff, J., Mongilio, J. M., Maggs, J. L., Vuolo, M., & Kelly, B. C. (2024). Household vaping bans and youth e-cigarette use. *Addiction*, *119*(1), 74–83. https://doi.org/10.1111/add.16335

Tigova, O., Stival, C., Castellano, Y., Lugo, A., Fu, M., López, A. M., Martinez, C., Soriano, J. B., O'Donnell, R., Semple, S., López, M. J., Fernández, E., & Gallus, S. (2025). Prevalence and determinants of smoke-free homes in 12 European countries: The TackSHS Survey. *ERJ Open Research*, *11*(2), Article 00950-2024. https://doi.org/10.1183/23120541.00950-2024

Villarreal, Y. R., Northrup, T. F., Fischer, S. M., Norwood, J. S., & Stotts, A. L. (2026). Negotiating health: A qualitative analysis of home smoking rules among families with medically vulnerable infants. *Tobacco Induced Diseases*, *24*, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.18332/tid/210927

Wu, T.-S., & Chaffee, B. W. (2020). Parental awareness of youth tobacco use and the role of household tobacco rules in use prevention. *Pediatrics*, *146*(5), Article e20194034. https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2019-4034

Zhang, X., Martinez-Donate, A. P., Kuo, D., Jones, N. R., & Palmersheim, K. A. (2012). Trends in home smoking bans in the USA, 1995–2007: Prevalence, discrepancies and disparities. *Tobacco Control*, *21*(3), 330–336. https://doi.org/10.1136/tc.2011.043802