

## *Supplementary Material Table of Contents*

### Supplemental Materials File S1

1. Methodologies for Targeted Chemical Characterization of Aerosol
  - 1.1. Analysis of Primary Constituents
  - 1.2. Analysis of Water by Karl Fischer
  - 1.3. Analysis of Carbonyls
  - 1.4. Analysis of Nicotine Degradants
  - 1.5. Analysis of Tobacco Specific Nitrosamines (TSNAs)
  - 1.6. Analysis of Organic Acids
  - 1.7. Analysis of Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs)
  - 1.8. Analysis of Glycidol
  - 1.9. Analysis of Metals
  - 1.10. Analysis of Aromatic Flavourants
  - 1.11. Analysis of pH in Aerosol
    - 1.11.1. Table 1. Chemical Characterization Methodologies
    - 1.11.2. Figure 1. Example Aerosol Collection Apparatus
2. Chemical Analyses of Aerosol Condensates for Biological Analysis
  - 2.1. Primary Constituents
  - 2.2. Organic Acids (Benzoic Acid)
  - 2.3. Carbonyl Compounds
3. Methodologies for Targeted Chemical Characterization of Combustible Cigarette Smoke
  - 3.1. Glycidol
4. Comparison to Combustible Cigarettes
  - 4.1. 1-EOL Yield Calculation
    - 4.1.1. Equation 1. Calculation of JUUL2 System 1-EOL ENDS Aerosol Yield Normalized to Nicotine
  - 4.2. Background Subtraction
    - 4.2.1. Table 2. Background Subtraction Approach for Aerosol Samples
5. Limit of Detection and Quantification
  - 5.1. Determination of Limit of Detection and Quantification
    - 5.1.1. Equation 2. Method Detection Limit Calculation
    - 5.1.2. Equation 3. Per Collection LOD and LOQ Calculation
    - 5.1.3. Equation 4. Per Puff LOD and LOQ Calculations
  - 5.2. Approximation of LOD or LOQ Results
    - 5.2.1. Table 3. Numeric Imputation of Limit of Detection and Limit of Quantitation Values
6. Aerosol Comparison Reporting Methodology
  - 6.1. Percent Difference
    - 6.1.1. Equation 2 Calculation of Percent Difference
7. Stability Trends and Analysis
  - 7.1. Primary Constituents, Organic Acids, and pH
  - 7.2. Thermal Degradants

- 7.3. Esters and Alcohols
- 7.4. Nicotine Degradants
- 7.5. Metals
- 7.6. VOCs
- 7.7. TSNAs

## Supplemental Materials File S2

1. Per Collection Limits Summary
  - 1.1. Virginia Tobacco 18 mg/mL Non-Intense Per Collection Limit of Detection and Quantification Values
  - 1.2. Virginia Tobacco 18 mg/mL Intense Per Collection Limit of Detection and Quantification Values
  - 1.3. Crisp Menthol 18 mg/mL Non-Intense Per Collection Limit of Detection and Quantification Values
  - 1.4. Crisp Menthol 18 mg/mL Intense Per Collection Limit of Detection and Quantification Values
  - 1.5. Polar Menthol 18 mg/mL Non-Intense Per Collection Limit of Detection and Quantification Values
  - 1.6. Polar Menthol 18 mg/mL Intense Per Collection Limit of Detection and Quantification Values
  - 1.7. Autumn Tobacco 18 mg/mL Non-Intense Per Collection Limit of Detection and Quantification Values
  - 1.8. Autumn Tobacco 18 mg/mL Intense Per Collection Limit of Detection and Quantification Values
  - 1.9. Ruby Menthol 18 mg/mL Non-Intense Per Collection Limit of Detection and Quantification Values
  - 1.10. Ruby Menthol 18 mg/mL Intense Per Collection Limit of Detection and Quantification Values
  - 1.11. Summer Menthol 18 mg/mL Non-Intense Per Collection Limit of Detection and Quantification Values
  - 1.12. Summer Menthol 18 mg/mL Intense Per Collection Limit of Detection and Quantification Values

## Supplemental Materials File S3

1. Non-Intense and Intense Per Collection Analytical Stability Results
  - 1.1. Virginia Tobacco 18 mg/mL Non-Intense Per Collection Analytical Stability Results
  - 1.2. Virginia Tobacco 18 mg/mL Intense Per Collection Analytical Stability Results
  - 1.3. Crisp Menthol 18 mg/mL Non-Intense Per Collection Analytical Stability Results
  - 1.4. Crisp Menthol 18 mg/mL Intense Per Collection Analytical Stability Results
  - 1.5. Polar Menthol 18 mg/mL Non-Intense Per Collection Analytical Stability Results
  - 1.6. Polar Menthol 18 mg/mL Intense Per Collection Analytical Stability Results
  - 1.7. Autumn Tobacco 18 mg/mL Non-Intense Per Collection Analytical Stability Results
  - 1.8. Autumn Tobacco 18 mg/mL Intense Per Collection Analytical Stability Results

- 1.9. Ruby Menthol 18 mg/mL Non-Intense Per Collection Analytical Stability Results
- 1.10. Ruby Menthol 18 mg/mL Intense Per Collection Analytical Stability Results
- 1.11. Summer Menthol 18 mg/mL Per Collection Analytical Stability Results
- 1.12. Summer Menthol 18 mg/mL Intense Per Collection Per Collection Analytical Stability Results

## Supplemental Materials File S4

- 1. Non-Intense and Intense (mg/mg) Nicotine Normalized Analytical Stability Results
  - 1.1. Virginia Tobacco 18 mg/mL Non-Intense mg/mg Nicotine Normalized Analytical Stability Results
  - 1.2. Virginia Tobacco 18 mg/mL Intense Nicotine Normalized Analytical Stability Results
  - 1.3. Crisp Menthol 18 mg/mL Non-Intense Nicotine Normalized Analytical Stability Results
  - 1.4. Crisp Menthol 18 mg/mL Intense Nicotine Normalized Analytical Stability Results
  - 1.5. Polar Menthol 18 mg/mL Non-Intense Nicotine Normalized Analytical Stability Results
  - 1.6. Polar Menthol 18 mg/mL Intense Nicotine Normalized Analytical Stability Results
  - 1.7. Autumn Tobacco 18 mg/mL Non-Intense Nicotine Normalized Analytical Stability Results
  - 1.8. Autumn Tobacco 18 mg/mL Intense Nicotine Normalized Analytical Stability Results
  - 1.9. Ruby Menthol 18 mg/mL Non-Intense Nicotine Normalized Analytical Stability Results
  - 1.10. Ruby Menthol 18 mg/mL Intense Nicotine Normalized Analytical Stability Results
  - 1.11. Summer Menthol 18 mg/mL Non-Intense Nicotine Normalized Analytical Stability Results
  - 1.12. Summer Menthol 18 mg/mL Intense Nicotine Normalized Analytical Stability Results
  - 1.13. Non-Intense (ISO 3308:2012) Combustible Reference Cigarette Constituent Values
  - 1.14. Intense (ISO 20778:2018) Combustible Reference Cigarette Constituent Values

## Supplemental Materials File S5

- 1. Percent Difference to Combustible Cigarettes
  - 1.1. Virginia Tobacco 18 mg/mL Non-Intense Percent Difference to Combustible Cigarettes
  - 1.2. Virginia Tobacco 18 mg/mL Intense Percent Difference to Combustible Cigarettes
  - 1.3. Crisp Menthol 18 mg/mL Non-Intense Percent Difference to Combustible Cigarettes
  - 1.4. Crisp Menthol 18 mg/mL Intense mg/mg Percent Difference to Combustible Cigarettes
  - 1.5. Polar Menthol 18 mg/mL Non-Intense Percent Difference to Combustible Cigarettes
  - 1.6. Polar Menthol 18 mg/mL Intense Percent Difference to Combustible Cigarettes
  - 1.7. Autumn Tobacco 18 mg/mL Non-Intense Percent Difference to Combustible Cigarettes
  - 1.8. Autumn Tobacco 18 mg/mL Intense Percent Difference to Combustible Cigarettes
  - 1.9. Ruby Menthol 18 mg/mL Non-Intense Percent Difference to Combustible Cigarettes
  - 1.10. Ruby Menthol 18 mg/mL Intense Percent Difference to Combustible Cigarettes
  - 1.11. Summer Menthol 18 mg/mL mg/mg Percent Difference to Combustible Cigarettes

- 1.12. Summer Menthol 18 mg/mL Intense Percent Difference to Combustible Cigarettes
- 1.13. Average Non-Intense and Intense Percent Difference to Combustible Cigarettes
- 1.14. Statistical Comparison of Non-Intense 1R6F COA Values to Quantifiable Non-Intense JUUL2 Virginia Tobacco Constituents
- 1.15. Statistical Comparison of Intense 1R6F COA Values to Quantifiable Intense JUUL2 Virginia Tobacco Constituents

## Supplemental Materials File S6

1. In Vitro Methodologies for Toxicological Characterization of Aerosol
  - 1.1. Cell Culture
  - 1.2. S9 Metabolic Activation System
  - 1.3. Neutral Red Uptake (NRUI) Cytotoxicity (OECD Guideline 129)
    - 1.3.1. Table 1. Neutral Red Uptake Dosing
  - 1.4. Ames Reverse Mutation Assay (OECD Guidance 471)
    - 1.4.1. Table 2. Ames Treatment Groups
  - 1.5. Micronucleus (MN) Assay (OECD Guidance 487)
  - 1.6. Condensate Stability
    - 1.6.1. Table 3. Concentrations of Water and Primary Constituents in Condensates Measured 4 and 8 Weeks After Production Expressed as Percentage of Analyte Concentration at week 0.
2. Supplemental Biological Results
  - 2.1. Figure 1. BALB/c 3T3 and A549 Cytotoxicity of Intense and Non-intense ENDS Aerosol (reported as ACM) and 3R4F Smoke Condensates (reported as TPM), Measured in the NRU Assay. The Dotted Line Represented the 70% Relative Viability Cut-Off Defining Cytotoxicity.
  - 2.2. Figure 2. Ames assay results in *S. typhimurium* strains with and without metabolic activation conditions in which no increase in revertant counts were observed.
  - 2.3. Table 4. Vehicle and Positive Control Mean and SD Revertant Counts/Plate for Ames Assays of all JUUL2 products.
  - 2.4. Figure 2. Mean MN Response (Left Panel) and Cytotoxicity (Right Panel) Of JUUL2 Aerosol Condensates (Non-Intense Puffing Regime) and 3R4F (Non-Intense Puffing Regime) Condensate in the MN Assay at the Short Term (4h) Without (Top) and With Metabolic Activation (Bottom) and Long Term (27h) Treatments Without Metabolic Activation (Middle).
  - 2.5. Table 5. Vehicle and Positive Control Mean and SD Micronucleus Counts in MN Assays for all JUUL2 products.