

# Chapter 4

## Management of Nicotine Addiction

---

**Introduction** 97

**Methods for Managing Nicotine Addiction** 100

Self-Help Manuals 100

Efficacy 100

Relevant Process Measures 101

Summary 102

Minimal Clinical Interventions 102

Efficacy 104

Relevant Process Measures 105

Summary 105

Intensive Clinical Interventions 105

Problem Solving/Skills Training 106

Rapid Smoking 107

Other Aversive-Smoking Strategies 108

Cue Exposure 108

Nicotine Fading 109

Motivational Rewards 110

Social Support 110

Weight Control 111

Hypnosis 112

Acupuncture 112

Summary of Intensive Clinical Interventions 112

Pharmacologic Interventions 113

Nicotine Polacrilex 113

Transdermal Nicotine 116

Nicotine Nasal Spray 118

Nicotine Inhaler 120

Bupropion 121

Clonidine 122

Nortriptylene 123

Other Antidepressants and Anxiolytics 124

Summary of Pharmacologic Interventions 124

Large-Scale Public Health Programs 125

Media-Based Programs 125

Worksite Programs 126

Community Programs 127

Statewide Programs 128

Summary of Large-Scale Public Health Programs 128

**Contemporary Issues in Research on Tobacco Addiction** 128

Epidemiologic Concerns and Clinical Issues 128

Nicotine Dependence 129

Stages of Change 129

Negative Affect 130

Sex-Specific Differences	130
Withdrawal Symptoms	130
Weight Gain	131
Early Relapse	131
Dose-Response	131
Treatment Components	132
Individualized Treatment	132
Dissemination and the Role of the Clinician	132
Cost-Effectiveness	133
<b>Conclusions</b>	134
<b>References</b>	135

## Introduction

---

Preventing tobacco addiction among young people and promoting abstinence among current smokers are the final common denominators for public health strategies to reduce smoking prevalence. Although prevention efforts are increasingly regarded as the most promising long-term approach for reducing tobacco use (Lynch and Bonnie 1994; U.S. Department of Health and Human Services [USDHHS] 1994), about 1.2 million youths become regular smokers each year in the United States—adding to the millions of adult smokers who are candidates for addiction management (Leventhal et al. 1991; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC] 1998; see “Trends in Tobacco Use Among Young People” in Chapter 3). Effective treatments do exist for smoking cessation, and they are available for both the clinical and the public health context (Fiore et al. 1996). These treatments compose an important modality in the effort to eradicate tobacco use. Many of the adverse health effects of tobacco use are reversible by cessation (USDHHS 1989)—a fact important to the millions of adults who already smoke, as well as to the large numbers of young people who continue to take up smoking.

Since the 1964 release of the first Surgeon General’s report on the health consequences of smoking, the prevalence of cigarette smoking among adults in the United States has decreased by 41 percent, falling from 42.2 percent in 1965 to 24.7 percent in 1997 (Giovino et al. 1994; CDC 1999a). Although these data represent significant progress in the public health campaign against tobacco use, the steady decline of 0.5 percentage points per year observed from 1965 to 1985 has lessened in recent years. In 1997, approximately 48 million adult Americans smoked; the prevalence was higher among men (27.6 percent) than among women (22.1 percent) and among American Indians and Alaska Natives (34.1 percent) than among blacks (26.7 percent), whites (25.3 percent), Hispanics (20.4 percent), or Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders (16.9 percent) (Table 4.1). Smoking prevalence was also lower among college graduates (11.6 percent) than among high school dropouts (35.4 percent) and higher among those below the poverty level (33.3 percent) than above it (24.6 percent) (CDC 1999a). Since smoking prevalence did not decline at a more rapid rate than that observed in the past few years, the *Healthy People 2000* goal of an adult smoking prevalence of 15 percent or less by the year 2000 (USDHHS 1991) was

not met. Unless smoking prevalence declines at a more rapid rate than that observed in the past, we will not achieve the *Healthy People 2010* goal of an adult smoking prevalence of 12 percent or less by the year 2010 (USDHHS 2000).

Considered over the time frame of the last 30 years, however, smoking cessation has increased dramatically. Self-reported data from 1997 suggest that almost 50 percent (44 million) of people who have ever smoked have successfully quit smoking (Thomas and Larsen 1993). In 1991, the earliest year for which socioeconomic data are available, the prevalence of smoking cessation was greater among male, white, older, more educated, and wealthier persons (Table 4.2) (Giovino et al. 1994). An encouraging finding from the 1993 National Health Interview Survey was that most (70 percent) current adult smokers were interested in quitting. Such interest was higher among women, African Americans, and younger persons (Thomas and Larsen 1993).

Cessation represents a desired end result to what is usually a lengthy, demanding, and often frustrating undertaking. Data on cessation should be interpreted in light of the fact that for every successful attempt to quit using tobacco, many more attempts fail. Although millions of Americans say they want to quit smoking, studies suggest that only about 6 percent of persons who try to quit smoking at any given time are successful for more than one month (CDC 1993a). Research into tobacco cessation seeks tools that will translate the desire to quit into prolonged abstinence from tobacco. Such treatments hold a greater potential for immediate public health returns than do prevention methods, and cessation treatments may also be cost-effective (see “Cost-Effectiveness” later in this chapter).

In the course of this chapter, the terms “smoking cessation” and “management of tobacco addiction” are used interchangeably. Though the former is the more familiar, the latter better conveys a more rigorous and systematized approach to a complex addiction behavior. Value judgments on the impact of a particular modality should be interpreted within a qualitative system for judging costs and benefits. A small impact may be viewed favorably if achieved with minimal intervention. More intense intervention may have a larger impact, but may not be justified by the resources it requires.

**Table 4.1. Percentage of adults aged ≥18 years who were current cigarette smokers,\* by sex, race/ethnicity, education, age, and poverty status—United States, National Health Interview Survey, 1997**

Characteristic	Men (n = 15,361)		Women (n = 20,455)		Total (n = 35,816)	
	%	(95% CI) <sup>†</sup>	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)
<b>Race/Ethnicity<sup>‡</sup></b>						
White, non-Hispanic	27.4	(± 1.0)	23.3	(± 0.8)	25.3	(± 0.7)
Black, non-Hispanic	32.1	(± 2.4)	22.4	(± 1.7)	26.7	(± 1.4)
Hispanic	26.2	(± 2.1)	14.3	(± 1.4)	20.4	(± 1.4)
American Indian/Alaska Native <sup>§</sup>	37.9	(± 13.7)	31.3	(± 8.8)	34.1	(± 7.7)
Asian American/Pacific Islander	21.6	(± 4.4)	12.4	(± 3.5)	16.9	(± 2.7)
<b>Education (years)<sup>Δ</sup></b>						
≤8	29.9	(± 3.0)	15.1	(± 2.2)	22.5	(± 1.9)
9–11	41.3	(± 3.1)	30.5	(± 2.4)	35.4	(± 2.0)
12	31.8	(± 1.7)	25.7	(± 1.3)	28.4	(± 1.0)
13–15	27.4	(± 1.7)	23.1	(± 1.4)	25.1	(± 1.1)
≥16	13.0	(± 1.2)	10.1	(± 1.0)	11.6	(± 0.8)
<b>Age (years)</b>						
18–24	31.7	(± 2.8)	25.7	(± 2.4)	28.7	(± 1.9)
25–44	31.2	(± 1.3)	26.1	(± 1.1)	28.6	(± 0.8)
45–64	27.6	(± 1.5)	21.5	(± 1.3)	24.4	(± 1.0)
≥65	12.8	(± 1.4)	11.5	(± 1.1)	12.0	(± 0.9)
<b>Poverty status<sup>¶</sup></b>						
At or above	27.3	(± 1.0)	21.8	(± 0.8)	24.6	(± 0.7)
Below	38.7	(± 2.8)	29.8	(± 1.9)	33.3	(± 1.7)
Unknown	23.4	(± 2.0)	18.2	(± 1.5)	20.5	(± 1.2)
<b>Total</b>	<b>27.6</b>	<b>(± 0.9)</b>	<b>22.1</b>	<b>(± 0.7)</b>	<b>24.7</b>	<b>(± 0.6)</b>

\*Persons who reported having smoked at least 100 cigarettes during their lifetime and who reported currently smoking every day or some days. Excludes 300 respondents with unknown smoking status.

<sup>†</sup>95% confidence interval.

<sup>‡</sup>Excludes 74 respondents of unknown, multiple, and other racial/ethnic categories.

<sup>§</sup>Wide variances on estimates reflect the small sample sizes.

<sup>Δ</sup>Persons aged ≥25 years. Excludes 305 respondents with unknown years of education.

<sup>¶</sup>Published 1996 poverty thresholds from the Bureau of the Census are used in these calculations.

Source: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 1999a.

**Table 4.2. Percentage of adults\* who abstained from smoking cigarettes in the previous year, by sex, race/ethnicity, age, education, and poverty status—United States, National Health Interview Survey, 1991<sup>†</sup>**

Characteristic	Abstinence for ≥1 day		Maintenance among abstainers		Maintenance <sup>‡</sup> among all persons who were daily smokers 1 year earlier*	
	%	(95% CI <sup>§</sup> )	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)
<b>Sex</b>						
Male	42.6	(40.8–44.4)	13.8	(12.0–15.6)	5.8	(5.0–6.6)
Female	41.5	(40.0–43.0)	13.7	(12.0–15.4)	5.6	(4.9–6.3)
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>						
White <sup>Δ</sup>	40.3	(39.0–41.6)	14.0	(12.6–15.4)	5.6	(5.0–6.2)
Black <sup>Δ</sup>	48.7	(45.2–52.2)	7.9	(5.1–10.7)	3.8	(2.4–5.2)
Hispanic	52.1	(46.4–57.8)	16.3	(10.3–22.2)	8.5	(5.2–11.8)
American Indian/ Alaska Native	53.3	(39.7–67.0)		NA <sup>¶</sup>		NA <sup>¶</sup>
Asian American/ Pacific Islander	45.0	(33.7–56.3)		NA <sup>¶</sup>		NA <sup>¶</sup>
<b>Age (years)</b>						
18–24	56.7	(52.9–60.5)	14.0	(9.9–18.1)	7.9	(5.6–10.3)
25–44	43.4	(41.8–45.0)	12.7	(11.0–14.4)	5.4	(4.7–6.1)
45–64	36.1	(33.9–38.3)	14.1	(11.4–16.8)	5.0	(4.0–6.0)
≥65	35.7	(32.2–39.2)	19.4	(14.6–24.2)	6.8	(5.1–8.5)
<b>Education (years)</b>						
<12	36.5	(34.1–38.9)	12.9	(10.2–15.6)	4.7	(3.7–5.7)
12	42.5	(40.8–44.2)	12.8	(10.9–14.7)	5.3	(4.5–6.1)
13–15	46.9	(44.2–49.6)	14.3	(11.4–17.2)	6.6	(5.2–8.0)
≥16	45.9	(42.5–49.3)	18.8	(14.9–22.7)	8.5	(7.0–10.0)
<b>Poverty status**</b>						
At or above	42.7	(41.4–44.0)	14.8	(13.4–16.3)	6.2	(5.6–6.8)
Below	42.9	(39.5–46.3)	7.5	(4.7–10.3)	3.2	(2.0–4.4)
Unknown	35.2	(31.2–39.2)	12.6	(8.3–16.9)	4.4	(2.9–6.0)
<b>Total</b>	<b>42.1</b>	<b>(40.9–43.3)</b>	<b>13.8</b>	<b>(12.5–15.1)</b>	<b>5.7</b>	<b>(5.2–6.3)</b>

\*Persons aged ≥18 years who reported having smoked at least 100 cigarettes in their lifetime and smoked cigarettes daily 1 year earlier and who provided information of their current smoking status.

<sup>†</sup>Sample size = 9,703; race/ethnicity variable excludes 34 respondents of other, unknown, or multiple race; education variable excludes 24 respondents of unknown education level.

<sup>‡</sup>Abstinence from smoking cigarettes for at least 1 month at the time of the survey. Excludes 92 respondents who were abstinent from cigarettes for <1 month or for whom duration of abstinence was unknown.

<sup>§</sup>Confidence interval.

<sup>Δ</sup>Excludes persons of Hispanic origin.

<sup>¶</sup>Sample sizes too small to derive reliable estimate.

\*\*Poverty statistics are based on definitions developed by the Social Security Administration, which includes a set of income thresholds that vary by family size and composition.

Source: National Center for Health Statistics, public use data tape, 1991.

## Methods for Managing Nicotine Addiction

---

Historically, the great majority of smokers (more than 90 percent) who successfully quit smoking did so “on their own”—that is, without the assistance of formal cessation programs (USDHHS 1989; Fiore et al. 1990). With the advent of new treatments, including pharmaceuticals, more smokers (20 percent) are using some form of assistance when trying to quit (Zhu et al. 2000). The success rate among this large group of unassisted quitters is half that observed for those who use some form of assistance. Although more than 1 million smokers quit each year, 75–80 percent relapse within six months (Carmody 1992). Those who quit may relapse at any time (even after a period of years), and a substantial portion of quitters go through cycles of quitting and relapse (Cohen et al. 1989a). Given this complex context in which the natural history of smoking occurs (an important leitmotif in the management of tobacco addiction), it is difficult to assign a single number to the proportion who quit on their own. Nonetheless, in the current environment of declining prevalence, the end result of this cyclic process, and of all the interventional efforts brought to bear on it, is that each year about 3–5 percent of smokers quit for a year, for longer, or for good.

The success of smoking cessation methods should be evaluated in terms of both process and outcome measures. *Process measures* are designed to assess those variables that are affected by treatments and that influence outcomes. Ideally, process measures should target the specific change mechanisms that treatments are intended to influence. For instance, if a treatment is intended to provide smokers with coping skills, process measures might assess a patient's ability to anticipate and generate appropriate responses to stresses. If a treatment is intended to promote cessation by reducing withdrawal symptoms, then a withdrawal symptom scale might be used as a process measure. Clinically significant *outcome measures* include attempts at quitting and abstinence success. Withdrawal symptom severity and concomitants of cessation attempts, such as weight gain, may be viewed as outcomes as well.

Some of the efficacy evaluations reported here incorporate the results of published meta-analyses. Meta-analysis is a statistical technique that assesses the impact of a variable (or, in this context, a treatment) across a set of related investigations (Dickersin and Berlin 1992). Meta-analyses may present a more

objective assessment of accumulated research findings than do traditional narrative reviews (e.g., Cooper and Rosenthal 1980) and can be useful for identifying study or treatment characteristics that are associated with differences in study outcomes (Dickersin and Berlin 1992). Meta-analyses of smoking cessation treatments have used different techniques for estimating the size of treatment effects. The precise methods used to calculate and pool these estimates vary (for detailed descriptions, see Fleiss 1981 and Cooper and Hedges 1994). In both meta-analyses and individual studies, the most frequently encountered measures are the odds ratio (an estimate of the relative risk for the outcome in control versus treatment groups) and some form of effect size (difference in effect between treatment and control groups).

### Self-Help Manuals

Because of the size of the population who try quitting on their own, the broad dissemination of materials that can help them in their efforts—without requiring them to participate in a formal cessation program—may be a potent strategy at the national level for decreasing the prevalence of smoking (Glynn et al. 1990a; Curry 1993). A wide array of self-help strategies has been developed for smoking cessation (Curry 1993). This section discusses the efficacy of written manuals, the most extensively investigated self-help materials (Curry 1993). The discussion is limited to studies of such manuals distributed to relatively small populations of smokers. Self-help materials delivered to large populations are discussed later in the chapter in association with nonprint messages and programs (self-help or supervised) included in mass media and community-based efforts.

### Efficacy

In a review of the research literature on self-help manuals, the median long-term prevalence of cessation associated with manual-based interventions was about 5 percent (Curry 1993). This proportion is lower than those of face-to-face cessation programs (Schwartz 1987; Lichtenstein and Glasgow 1992; Lando 1993). Furthermore, recent evidence suggests that self-help manuals, when used by themselves, may produce negligible

increases in long-term cessation (Gritz et al. 1992; Petersen et al. 1992; Gomel et al. 1993; Fiore et al. 2000).

Because self-help manuals can be distributed, at low cost, to very large numbers of smokers, even relatively small cessation success could translate into large numbers of successful quitters. Since 30–40 percent of smokers each year make a serious effort to quit, self-help aids could have a vast influence on public health (Hatziandreu et al. 1990; CDC 1993b, 1999b). The available evidence suggests that self-help manuals work better for smokers who are less dependent on nicotine, more motivated, and more confident of quitting (Curry 1993), but the relationship between motivation and success is complex. Less addicted smokers may be less likely to seek formal treatment (Fiore et al. 1990; Zhu et al. 2000) and are therefore an apt audience for self-help manuals. More addicted smokers are more likely to seek formal self-help programs (Wagner et al. 1990) but may be less successful in quitting (Schoenbach et al. 1992). Thus, in view of both their uncertain effectiveness and their potential to be cost-effective, it is important to determine whether self-help manuals have a consistent, albeit small, benefit.

Although many self-help manuals have been developed, there is little evidence that they differ in their effectiveness (Cummings et al. 1988; Glynn et al. 1990a; Curry 1993). Accordingly, an Expert Advisory Panel convened by the National Cancer Institute (NCI) has recommended that public health professionals try to increase the availability of existing manuals rather than refine them or develop new ones (Glynn et al. 1990a). The committee also concluded that if new materials are deemed necessary, they should, at a minimum, contain the following components: (1) information about the social and health effects of smoking; (2) specific strategies and exercises for quitting; and (3) specific strategies and exercises to avoid relapse and, in the event of relapse, to try quitting again (Glynn et al. 1990a).

Manuals tailored to special populations of smokers, such as pregnant women, older adults, African Americans, and Hispanics, have been developed and tested (Windsor et al. 1985; Glynn et al. 1990b; Davis et al. 1992; USDHHS 1998). Although manuals targeted to specific populations have not had consistently greater success than generic manuals at helping members of relevant populations quit (Curry 1993; Rimer et al. 1994), such manuals have the potential to reach smokers missed by traditional materials (Curry 1993).

It appears that combining multiple types of self-help materials (manuals, videotapes, etc.) does not improve long-term cessation rates. A meta-analysis of 21 studies using multiple types of self-help without person-to-person contact found no significant difference

between multiple types of self-help and no self-help at all (Fiore et al. 2000).

Reading level has been increasingly recognized as an important attribute of self-help manuals. Since the early 1970s, trends in smoking prevalence have been different for those with differing levels of educational attainment (Pierce et al. 1989). Smoking prevalence has dropped sharply among persons with a college education (10.1 percentage points between 1974 and 1985) but has declined only marginally among high school dropouts (2.1 percentage points during the same period). Concerns about literacy have led to the recommendation that self-help materials for smoking cessation be written at no more than a seventh-grade reading level (Glynn et al. 1990a), although this level may be too high in some situations.

Adjuncts to self-help manuals, such as telephone counseling (Orleans et al. 1991; Curry et al. 1992; Lando et al. 1992), hot lines (Ossip-Klein et al. 1991), and personalized feedback (Curry et al. 1991; Prochaska et al. 1993), have also been evaluated. These adjunctive interventions have met with varying success (Curry 1993). For example, self-help treatments that include nicotine gum as well as smoking cessation manuals have not had greater long-term efficacy than the manuals alone (Harackiewicz et al. 1988; Killen et al. 1990b). Computer-generated personalized feedback (Curry et al. 1991) and telephone outreach, however, have improved cessation success (Orleans et al. 1991; Lando et al. 1992; Prochaska et al. 1993; Strecher et al. 1994). At present, research suggests that such adjuvants materially improve the effectiveness of self-help manuals.

Adjunctive interventions that require financial and personnel resources, however, may undercut the potential population impact of self-help interventions. The addition of other components to self-help manuals may also mark the point at which the self-help modality merges with more formal assistance, which, as mentioned earlier, have not appealed to as large a population of smokers motivated to quit. But at least one such treatment, proactive telephone counseling (as opposed to reactive approaches, such as help lines smokers must call), appears to be effective when used as an adjuvant (Fisher et al. 1993).

### Relevant Process Measures

Most studies of self-help manuals lack process measures, and the specific measures used across studies vary considerably (Curry 1993). Two distinct process measures, manual reading and manual use, have been assessed in some studies of self-help manuals for smoking cessation. Reading measures simply ask

smokers whether they read most or all of the manual. Use measures assess the extent to which smokers performed the specific exercises recommended in the manual. In theory, persons who actually read a manual or practice manual-recommended exercises should be more successful than those who merely possess a manual. Curry (1993) concluded that although reading has sometimes been related to program success, use has been more consistently related to improved outcomes. Further work is needed to determine with some certainty whether the information conveyed by the manuals, rather than nonspecific motivational effects, is responsible for their efficacy.

### Summary

Although self-help manuals have had only modest and inconsistent success at helping smokers quit, manuals can be easily distributed to the vast population of smokers who try to quit on their own each year. Adjuvant behavioral interventions, particularly proactive telephone counseling, may increase the effect of self-help materials. Process measures are not routinely incorporated into self-help investigations, but the available process data suggest that persons who not only have a self-help manual but also perform the exercises recommended in the manual are more likely to quit smoking.

### Minimal Clinical Interventions

Minimal clinical interventions are those that can be delivered briefly to smokers by health care professionals during the course of a regular health care encounter. These strategies may be as simple as advising smokers to quit, or they may be as complex as using computers to tailor the intervention to the individual smokers. Minimal clinical interventions could have a great influence at a national level on smoking cessation, but they have been underused. Findings from a 1985 (Ockene et al. 1987), a 1991 (CDC 1993b), and a 1992 national survey (Tomar et al. 1996) suggest that nearly 70 percent of American smokers (nearly 36 million) make at least one outpatient health care visit each year; however, only 40–52 percent of the smokers in the surveys reported that during the preceding year they had been advised by a health care professional to quit smoking. In a separate study, 48.8 percent of 2,710 current smokers had been advised by their physician to stop smoking or to smoke less (Frank et al. 1991). More than 50 percent of adult smokers in the United States saw a dentist in 1992, but fewer than 25 percent

of those who saw a dentist in the preceding year reported that the dentist had advised them to quit smoking (Tomar et al. 1996). Among adult users of smokeless tobacco, 18 percent reported that they had ever been advised by a dentist and 15 percent had ever been advised by a physician to quit (Tomar et al. 1996).

Many clinicians may believe that they are not equipped to help smokers quit (Wells et al. 1984; Glynn 1988) or that a physician can help a smoker quit (Ockene et al. 1988a). Training programs for clinicians have been developed to address this problem (Ockene et al. 1988b; Cummings et al. 1989a,b; Duncan et al. 1991; Manley et al. 1991; Strecher et al. 1991); however, data suggest that simply training clinicians may not be effective (Dietrich et al. 1992; Carney et al. 1995; Klein et al. 1995). However, implementing reminder systems in the clinic has been shown to triple clinician intervention with smokers (Fiore et al. 1996, 2000). Some evidence suggests that the delivery of these minimal clinical interventions is becoming more common (Gilpin et al. 1992).

Surveys suggest that smokers who are white, female, older, better educated, or ill, or who smoke more cigarettes per day are more likely than others to receive clinical advice to quit (Ockene et al. 1987; Frank et al. 1991; Gilpin et al. 1992; CDC 1993b). At present, clinicians apparently do not ensure that all of their patients who smoke receive cessation advice and assistance, in part because of structural and policy issues (such as reimbursement) related to medical care delivery. Nonetheless, such efforts might be more common if clinicians were trained to view smoking as a chronic disease, marked by periods of remission and relapse, rather than as an acute disorder (Fiore and Baker 1995).

Researchers have shown that institutional changes can increase the systematic delivery of minimal clinical interventions for smoking cessation. For example, brief physician training, availability of nicotine gum, and patient chart stickers documenting smoking status can increase the amount of time physicians spend in cessation counseling and increase successful cessation by a factor of 2 to 6 (Cohen et al. 1989b; Ockene et al. 1991). One proposed change is to expand patient vital signs to include an assessment of tobacco use (Fiore 1991). This simple institutional change has been shown to increase markedly the proportion of patients who report that their health care providers asked and counseled them about smoking cessation (Fiore et al. 1995; Robinson et al. 1995).

Finally, institutional changes are critical for prompting more clinicians to play a role in smoking cessation. Currently, clinicians are only sporadically



reimbursed for clinical and pharmacologic treatments to help patients quit smoking (Group Health Association of America, Inc. 1993; Schauffler and Parkinson 1993). Appropriate reimbursement may be essential to ensuring greater clinical attention to tobacco addiction (Schauffler and Parkinson 1993; Fiore and Baker 1995; Kaplan et al. 1995).

The Public Health Service-sponsored Clinical Practice Guideline *Treating Tobacco Use and Dependence* has recommended that health care professionals use the “five A’s” to help their patients quit smoking: (1) *ask* about smoking, (2) *advise* all smokers to quit, (3) *address* willingness to make a quit attempt,

(4) *assist* patients who want to quit, and (5) *arrange* follow-up visits (Manley et al. 1991; Glynn and Manley 1993; Orleans et al. 1993; Houston et al. 1994; Fiore et al. 2000). These recommendations, based on a comprehensive review of the empirical literature, constitute a proscriptive algorithm for clinical interventions (see the text box).

Additional follow-up visits, at increasing intervals, with patients who continue not to smoke have been associated with greater long-term abstinence (Kottke et al. 1988; Wilson et al. 1988; Orleans et al. 1991). Patients who have relapsed should be helped to quit again at follow-up visits and subsequent visits.

### The Five A’s

To help their patients quit smoking, clinicians can use the “five A’s” approach: (1) *ask* patients about smoking, (2) *advise* all smokers to quit, (3) *assess* willingness to make a quit attempt, (4) *assist* those who want to quit, and (5) *arrange* follow-up visits with those trying to quit (Glynn and Manley 1993). These brief clinician interventions, which are described in this text box, can be completed within two to three minutes at each visit and have been associated with a cessation prevalence of 5 percent (Glynn 1988) to 8 percent (Kottke et al. 1988).

All patients seen in a primary care setting should be routinely *asked* about their smoking status. One means of institutionalizing the identification of smokers is to expand the vital signs to include smoking status (Fiore 1991). Another means is to use stickers or other markers to clearly identify charts and prompt clinicians to help their patients who smoke quit (Cohen et al. 1989b; Ockene et al. 1991).

All patients who smoke should be *advised* to quit. This advice should be clearly stated and personalized. After giving this advice, clinicians should *assess* whether smokers desire to quit at the present time. Clinicians should provide motivational materials and messages to those not willing to quit. These patients should be asked about smoking and advised to quit at all subsequent visits.

Clinicians should *assist* patients who want to quit. The clinician should work together with the patient to set a date to quit (preferably within two weeks of the clinic visit) and should provide the

patient with practical advice about how to quit and self-help materials.

Clinicians should determine whether the patient is likely to require adjunctive help and whether the patient is a candidate for pharmacotherapy. Pharmacotherapy should be considered for all patients motivated to make a quit attempt, except in the presence of specific contraindications (Fiore et al. 2000). The choice may take into account previous patient experience, preferences, and other factors (see “Pharmacologic Interventions,” later in this chapter). Clinicians should also present other treatment options to their patients who want to quit. In particular, patients should be made aware of community cessation resources (such as those offered by the American Cancer Society and the American Lung Association) and of intensive clinical interventions (see “Intensive Clinical Interventions,” later in this chapter) available in the community. The primary care clinician, however, should continue to monitor and assist those patients who elect to undergo intensive treatments.

Clinicians should *arrange* for a follow-up visit to discuss smoking cessation within two weeks of the chosen date to quit. Researchers have documented that scheduling follow-up visits or making follow-up telephone calls improves cessation success (Kottke et al. 1988; Wilson et al. 1988; Ockene et al. 1991, 1992; Orleans et al. 1991). Follow-up visits should be arranged whether the patient has been referred to another clinic or treated by the primary care clinician.

Modifications in treatment, including a discussion of more intensive efforts, should be considered for relapsing patients at each iteration.

An area of current active research in minimal interventions is the use of computer-tailored messages for individual smokers who want to quit. Computer software that approximates deductive or inductive human reasoning has been proposed as an efficient and cost-effective mechanism for this modality (Velicer et al. 1993). In a large trial of one such system, interactive computer reports plus individualized manuals produced higher current abstinence (20 percent) and prolonged abstinence (11 percent) than did standard manuals, individualized manuals alone, or personalized counselor calls (Prochaska et al. 1993). Similarly, analyses of two separate controlled trials found that computer-tailored letters generated significantly greater cessation proportions in groups receiving them than in control groups (Strecher et al. 1994). Although these mechanisms have not been extensively evaluated, they are a promising avenue for further investigation.

### **Efficacy**

Kottke and colleagues (1988) performed a meta-analysis of 39 smoking cessation trials conducted in medical practice settings. Most of these trials involved relatively minimal interventions, but some more intensive treatments were included. Participants had a mean of 4.8 (standard deviation =  $\pm 4.4$ ) contacts with these clinic-based programs. The major conclusion of this analysis was that success increased with the number of intervention modalities employed, the number of health care professionals involved in the effort, and the number of follow-up assessments. Duration of follow-up (as opposed to number of follow-ups) was not predictive of success. Using diverse techniques may be a key characteristic of successful clinic-based smoking cessation programs (Fiore et al. 2000). A successful program might be one in which face-to-face counseling or advice is given; dates for quitting are set; pamphlets are distributed; reminders by telephone are made; smokers are advised and counseled on quitting by physicians, nurses, and other health professionals; and multiple clinic visits or telephone calls are made after the smoker's quitting day. In the meta-analysis by Kottke and colleagues (1988), cessation assistance delivered by nonphysicians tended to be slightly more effective than that performed by physicians, but a more recent meta-analysis (Fiore et al. 2000) found no difference in effectiveness between physicians and nonphysicians. Both individual and group counseling was effective (Fiore et al. 2000).

The meta-analysis by Kottke and colleagues (1988) also suggested, however, that complex interventions are not necessary for clinic-based success. Compared with smokers who received no assistance, smokers who received help consisting of advice only or brief counseling had a 13.1-percentage point increase in cessation 6 months after treatment and a 3.8-percentage point increase after 12 months. Comparable estimates for smokers whose only treatment was to receive written self-help materials from health care professionals were 1.6 percent at 6 months and 2.0 percent at 12 months. The impact of brief intervention is illustrated in one study by Russell and colleagues (1979), who found that providing advice in a primary care setting produced a biochemically confirmed increase in abstinence of 3.3 percentage points; when smokers were told they would be followed up and when self-help materials were distributed in conjunction with the advice, the resulting one-year increase in abstinence was 5.1 percentage points.

Trials postdating the meta-analysis of Kottke and colleagues (1988) have also indicated that brief clinical interventions have a small but reliable impact on smoking cessation success (Cummings et al. 1989a; Risser and Belcher 1990; Taylor et al. 1990; Ockene et al. 1991, 1994; Weissfeld and Holloway 1991; Hollis et al. 1993; Strecher et al. 1994). A meta-analysis of seven studies found that physician advice to quit increases cessation by 30 percent (Fiore et al. 2000). The consistency of these findings over a considerable time span and in multiple settings lends credence to the usefulness of minimal interventions.

Smokeless tobacco use may be particularly amenable to minimal clinical interventions, especially in dental office settings. Oral lesions caused by smokeless tobacco are quite common among users of these products (Ernster et al. 1990; Tomar et al. 1997) and provide the opportunity for the dentist to point out the direct adverse health effects of smokeless tobacco. Several trials have examined the efficacy of minimal clinical interventions in smokeless tobacco cessation.

In a randomized trial conducted in a dental health maintenance office clinic to test a minimal clinical intervention, Stevens and colleagues (1995) reported significantly higher smokeless tobacco quit rates in the intervention group than in the usual-care group at both 3 months (32.2 vs. 21.3 percent) and 12 months (33.5 vs. 24.5 percent). In a randomized clinical trial conducted in private dental offices, Severson and colleagues (1998) also found that a minimal intervention significantly increased smokeless tobacco quit rates in the intervention group compared with rates in the usual-care group at 3 months (17.8 vs. 8.8

percent) and 12 months (10.2 vs. 3.3 percent). A minimal intervention trial for smokeless tobacco use among college athletes, which included dental examinations to demonstrate oral lesions, 15–20 minutes of counseling by dental hygienists, and follow-up telephone calls, found that three-month biochemically assayed quit rates were 24 percent in the intervention group and 16 percent in the control group (Masouredis et al. 1997).

### Relevant Process Measures

Although minimal clinical interventions provide smokers with some practical advice about quitting, their primary purpose is to increase smokers' motivation to quit. Specific process measures—such as measures of this motivation—are seldom incorporated into minimal clinical interventions. The nonspecific measures some investigators use do not associate clinical success with changes (such as greater awareness of disease risk or enhanced belief in one's ability to quit). Nonetheless, the available evidence suggests that minimal clinical interventions can enhance smokers' desire and intention to quit (Russell et al. 1979), decrease the number of cigarettes smoked per day (Folsom and Grimm 1987), and increase the number of attempts to quit smoking (Folsom and Grimm 1987; Cummings et al. 1989b; Strecher et al. 1991). In addition, patients have reported that physicians trained to perform more intensive interventions are more helpful than physicians without such training (Ockene et al. 1991).

### Summary

Substantial evidence suggests that minimal clinical interventions (e.g., a health care provider's repeated advice to quit) foster smoking cessation and that the more multifactorial or intensive interventions produce the best outcomes. These findings highlight the importance of cessation assistance by clinicians, who have a unique access to more than 70 percent of smokers each year. Moreover, minimal clinical interventions have been found to be effective in increasing smokers' motivation to quit and are cost-effective (see "Cost-Effectiveness," later in this chapter). However, research has not clarified fully the specific elements of minimal interventions that are most important to clinical success nor the specific types of changes they produce in smokers that lead to abstinence.

## Intensive Clinical Interventions

Intensive clinical interventions (sometimes called "formal" or "organized" cessation treatments) are multisession counseling programs involving extensive contact between a health care provider and a smoker. The value of intensive interventions has been questioned because they are more expensive and reach fewer smokers than self-help and minimal clinical interventions do (Chapman 1985). However, more intensive interventions continue to attract interest because they are more successful at helping people quit smoking (Schwartz 1987). Despite their comparatively high cost, they are cost-effective (Elixhauser 1990), and they may be especially well-suited for treating the most addicted smokers (Lichtenstein and Glasgow 1992; Orleans 1993).

Intensive clinical interventions may be characterized by structure and content. Structural variables include providers' credentials and training; individual, telephone, or group format; session length; total number of sessions; and duration of follow-up. Relatively little research into intensive treatments has been designed to assess the effects of different structural variables (Lichtenstein and Glasgow 1992). Increased patient contact results in better outcomes (Lando 1981; Decker and Evans 1989; Lichtenstein and Glasgow 1992; Fiore et al. 2000). In a meta-analysis of research on the nicotine patch (Fiore et al. 1994c), researchers found that the following counseling features were associated with significant increases in six-month abstinence rates: counseling being a main reason for clinician-patient contact, at least weekly clinician-patient meetings during the first 4 weeks of treatment, and more than six clinician-patient meetings in the first 12 weeks of treatment. A more recent meta-analysis that was not restricted to nicotine patch studies (Fiore et al. 2000) found that quitting success increased with increasing contact time (up to 90 minutes of total contact) and that there was a dose-response relationship between number of sessions and treatment efficacy (Fiore et al. 2000). Thirty to 90 minutes of total counseling and four or more sessions were two to three times more effective in producing long-term smoking cessation than no contact controls. This research supports the notion that in general, as the intensity of clinician-patient counseling increases, so does the long-term effectiveness of treatment.

Because so little information is available on how structural variables affect intensive treatment outcomes, this section concentrates on a review of content variables. Content refers to the specific information, materials, and techniques to which smokers are

exposed during the course of treatment. The various contents of intensive smoking cessation interventions are not easy to evaluate, partly because the methodological quality of clinical trials tends to differ across content areas. For example, trials of relatively unorthodox treatments, such as acupuncture and hypnosis, tend to use shorter follow-up periods than assessments of efforts involving pharmacologic and behavioral treatments (Schwartz 1987; Ter Riet et al. 1990); inflated efficacy estimates may thus result for unorthodox treatments. These methodological concerns are handled here by limiting the review primarily to studies reporting outcomes with at least five months of follow-up.

Another problem in evaluating the content of intensive interventions is that the evolution of treatments over the past 40 years prevents a cumulative assessment of specific intensive interventions. Moreover, changing research interests and methodologies make it difficult to integrate findings from over the entire period. For instance, pharmacotherapies have changed greatly during this period and are now incorporated routinely into intensive treatments. In addition, treatment response may be affected by changes in the nature of the smoking population; for instance, compared with 40 years ago, a higher proportion of today's smokers are women. Methodological and statistical changes have also altered the nature of the studies themselves: sample sizes are larger to increase statistical power, and biochemical confirmation of abstinence is now routine, as is the application of the "intent to treat" principle in analyses. Because of these refinements, early cessation research is now often neglected, perhaps because it is difficult to integrate with newer work. On the other hand, some apparently effective methods, such as rapid smoking, have often not been evaluated by newer methods. The older literature on such strategies is included selectively in this review.

A related problem, complicating the interpretation of relatively recent research, arises from what Lichtenstein and Glasgow (1992) have referred to as a shift from a "clinical" to a "public health" (p. 518) orientation among smoking cessation researchers. This shift has resulted in a dearth of theory-driven research into intensive interventions. In fact, one observer has suggested that the long-term research trajectory favors modifying established models over applying innovation in the basic approach to treatment (Shiffman 1993b). Recent emphasis on public health has also produced a research climate that favors the evaluation of treatment packages and minimal interventions over treatment components (Lichtenstein and Glasgow 1992). One reason for this shift is the high cost and

large sample sizes required to evaluate individual components. Thus clinical trials rarely allow assessment of a given treatment's independent contribution. Smoking cessation trials now tend to combine specific treatment components into multicomponent interventions. Moreover, within the same study, not only may groups receive different treatment packages but the packages may differ in their structural components.

Finally, the question of selection bias remains a challenge to interpreting the literature on intensive interventions. Investigators typically recruit highly motivated volunteers to serve as subjects, because the efficacy of intensive interventions can be tested only if the patients under study actually receive the entire treatment. Efficacy estimates derived from this atypical population may not be appropriate for making predictions about the larger population of smokers. The principal types of intensive interventions must be evaluated in the context of these limitations stemming from the nature of the available evidence.

### **Problem Solving/Skills Training**

Various strategies try to impart to smokers the knowledge and skills necessary to cope with cessation—that is, both to attain and to maintain abstinence when confronted with withdrawal symptoms or the temptation to smoke (Marlatt and Gordon 1985; Curry and McBride 1994). This approach (hereafter referred to as problem solving/skills training) springs from the observation that most relapse efforts seem to be associated with a finite number of factors, such as alcohol use, negative affect (e.g., depression), and the presence of others smoking (Shiffman 1982; Baer and Lichtenstein 1988; Brandon et al. 1990). Problem solving/skills training tries to help people who have recently quit smoking anticipate these "high-risk" situations and learn to cope with them when they arise. Such interventions also train participants to cope with withdrawal symptoms, replace positive reinforcements they had linked to smoking, and meet other challenges that might be encountered during or after an attempt to quit smoking.

General problem solving/skills training targets challenges that occur early in the quitting process (e.g., withdrawal discomfort). Because newly abstinent smokers often return to regular smoking (Curry and McBride 1994), one specialized type of intervention teaches skills to help the former smoker maintain abstinence (Marlatt and Gordon 1985). These interventions also train former smokers to prevent any relapse from becoming a long-term return to smoking. Former smokers are encouraged to view relapses as a normal

part of the quitting process rather than as an indication of failure (Curry et al. 1988).

Another type of problem solving/skills training focuses on coping with the immediate negative affects of quitting smoking. The growing body of research on dysphoria (feeling unhappy or unwell) after smoking cessation (Glassman et al. 1988; Covey et al. 1990; Brandon 1994; Hall et al. 1994) suggests that strategies that help smokers who have just quit resist negative moods may be particularly successful (Shiffman 1993b). However, a recent meta-analysis (Fiore et al. 2000) did not find that interventions that targeted negative affect improved cessation rates. These interventions were used with the general population as well as smokers with a history of depression. It is possible that the results might be more positive if the studies were restricted to high-risk populations.

### *Efficacy*

Because nearly every state-of-the-art smoking cessation program contains elements of problem solving/skills training (Curry and McBride 1994), the technique is difficult to assess as an individual treatment. Some investigators have failed to uncover evidence that this technique increases cessation success relative to comparison groups (Curry et al. 1988; Emmons et al. 1988; Omenn et al. 1988; Minneker-Hügel et al. 1992; Zelman et al. 1992). Other studies have found beneficial effects, but these benefits have often been modest and have come only through protracted treatment (Hall et al. 1984b; Davis and Glaros 1986; Goldstein et al. 1989; Stevens and Hollis 1989). Even in studies that report success in long-term abstinence through skills training, the overall relapse curves for treatment subjects have paralleled those for comparison groups (Glasgow and Lichtenstein 1987; Goldstein et al. 1989; Stevens and Hollis 1989; Mermelstein et al. 1992; Minneker-Hügel et al. 1992; Gruder et al. 1993). A recent meta-analysis (Fiore et al. 2000) of 104 studies, however, reported that problem solving/skills training increased quitting success by 50 percent. Some evidence suggests that problem solving/skills training may be particularly useful for female smokers (Curry et al. 1988), those who smoke fewer cigarettes (Hall et al. 1984b), those who smoke to cope with emotional stress (O'Connor and Stravynski 1982), and those who are less prone to negative affect (Zelman et al. 1992).

Although multicomponent skills-training programs have sometimes included information about managing the dysphoria associated with smoking cessation (Tiffany et al. 1986; Kristeller et al. 1993), relevant behavioral interventions have only recently

begun (Hall et al. 1994). Initial results suggest that such strategies are promising, but these findings require replication and extension.

In sum, the evidence on problem solving/skills training suggests a beneficial impact (Fiore et al. 2000). Such training can offer practical strategies about quitting and inculcate desired coping skills.

### *Relevant Process Measures*

Skills training rests heavily on two assumptions: (1) coping skills will help former smokers remain abstinent in the face of temptation, and (2) smokers can be taught these skills. Some cross-sectional research (Shiffman 1984) and skills-training intervention trials (Hall et al. 1984b; Davis and Glaros 1986; Zelman et al. 1992) have suggested that coping strategies help avert relapse. The available evidence also indicates that patients given skills training acquire coping skills (Hall et al. 1984b; Davis and Glaros 1986; Zelman et al. 1992), and there is evidence that the level of skill acquisition predicts long-term abstinence (Zelman et al. 1992). Although the results of one trial suggest that coping skills are not retained for very long (Davis and Glaros 1986), consistent self-monitoring of smoking during treatment is associated with longer-term maintenance (Kamarck and Lichtenstein 1988); this finding suggests the importance of behavioral characteristics that foster maintenance.

One of the goals of skills training is to encourage relapsed former smokers to renew their efforts to quit smoking. Curry and colleagues (1988) found evidence that smokers who had received skills training were more likely to try quitting again if they relapsed.

### *Rapid Smoking*

Rapid-smoking strategies typically require that smokers inhale deeply from a cigarette about every six seconds until they become nauseated. In theory, this aversive conditioning transforms the subject's perception of smoking from a pleasurable activity into an unpleasant one, thereby making it easier for smokers to give up cigarettes.

Medical complications produced by rapid smoking can include elevations in heart rate, blood pressure, and carboxyhemoglobin blood levels as well as electrocardiogram abnormalities (Horan et al. 1977). Because of these potential problems, candidates for rapid smoking should be selected carefully (Lichtenstein and Glasgow 1977). Older persons and persons with cardiovascular or pulmonary conditions are generally excluded from rapid-smoking strategies,

but some evidence suggests that rapid smoking can be conducted with these persons if appropriate precautions are taken (Hall et al. 1984a).

### *Efficacy*

The 1988 Surgeon General's report on smoking and health (USDHHS 1988) reviewed the literature on rapid smoking and reached two conclusions: (1) although its effectiveness is variable when used alone, rapid smoking yields moderately high long-term abstinence success (40 percent of subjects were abstinent 6–12 months after treatment) when incorporated in multicomponent behavioral interventions, and (2) auxiliary treatment factors, such as patient expectations, patient-therapist rapport, and admonitions not to smoke between sessions, can influence how successful rapid-smoking strategies are. Few rapid-smoking trials have appeared since the 1988 report.

The mid-1980s advent of pharmacologic treatments for smoking cessation greatly reduced research interest in rapid smoking. Pharmacologic aids, such as nicotine gum, appear as efficacious as rapid smoking (Zelman et al. 1992) and are probably more acceptable to smokers and program administrators. Nonetheless, the doubling of long-term success associated with rapid smoking (Fiore et al. 2000) suggests that it may remain an option for smokers who are unable to quit through other methods and for whom such aversive conditioning is acceptable.

### *Relevant Process Measures*

Rapid smoking is intended to produce aversive conditioned responses to stimuli associated with smoking (USDHHS 1988). The technique reliably produces tachycardiac responses to cigarettes, and the magnitude of these responses is directly related to treatment outcome (Tiffany et al. 1986; Zelman et al. 1992). More easily observable variables, such as the number of cigarettes smoked during a rapid-smoking session or the degree of nausea reported by patients, have not been shown to be consistently related to outcome (USDHHS 1988).

### **Other Aversive-Smoking Strategies**

Three other techniques intended to produce aversion to cigarettes have been investigated: satiation therapy, rapid puffing, and focused smoking. Concern over the safety of rapid smoking (Horan et al. 1977) was partly responsible for investigation of these alternative aversion techniques. Some evidence suggests that they are less unpleasant and less risky than rapid smoking (Glasgow et al. 1981; Tiffany et al. 1986).

Satiation therapy requires that patients smoke many more cigarettes per day than they normally do, usually about twice as many (Best et al. 1978). Rapid puffing is similar to rapid smoking, but patients are instructed not to inhale cigarette smoke (Tiffany et al. 1986). Focused smoking requires patients to smoke for an extended period of time at a normal rate while concentrating on the negative sensations smoking produces (Lowe et al. 1980).

### *Efficacy*

Satiation therapy alone produces relatively little cessation success (15 percent at one year) (Lando 1982), but the technique may be more effective when incorporated into multicomponent programs (USDHHS 1988). Focused smoking and rapid puffing produce long-term abstinence rates that are equivalent to, or slightly lower than, those produced by rapid smoking (USDHHS 1988; Fiore et al. 2000). Because these techniques do not appear to result in significant tachycardiac responses (USDHHS 1988), their efficacy is probably accounted for by mechanisms other than aversive conditioning.

### **Cue Exposure**

Cue exposure therapy is based on the premise that smokers become conditioned to certain cues or contextual signals correlated with smoking behavior. When persons who have recently quit smoking are exposed to these cues, they are motivated to begin smoking again (Rohsenow et al. 1990–91; Brandon et al. 1995). In cue exposure therapy, persons trying to quit smoking are repeatedly exposed to these signals in a therapeutic context in which smoking is prohibited; the resulting reduced association between smoking and previous cues is hypothesized to reduce some of the temptation for relapse that former smokers will face in the natural environment.

Because cue exposure therapy has produced promising results with other addictive disorders (Monti et al. 1993), several researchers have suggested that such strategies be developed for smoking cessation (Hodgson 1989; Heather and Bradley 1990). These strategies may be particularly important for women, whose responsiveness to nicotine replacement therapy appears to be less than that of men (Perkins 1996). Women may be less controlled by nicotine and more influenced by nonnicotine factors (sensory stimuli, environmental factors) (Perkins et al. 1999) and may therefore respond better than men to behavioral approaches.

### *Efficacy*

Studies conducted to date that have evaluated cue exposure have failed to find significant differences in outcome between cue exposure and comparison interventions (Lowe et al. 1980; Raw and Russell 1980; Göttestam and Melin 1983; Corty and McFall 1984). However, clinical research on cue exposure for smoking cessation is sparse, and interpretation of most existing trials is hampered by methodological flaws (Brandon et al. 1995).

### *Relevant Process Measures*

Environmental associations with cigarette smoking can be strong enough to provoke the desire to smoke (Herman 1974; Rickard-Figueroa and Zeichner 1985; Tiffany and Hakenewerth 1991). These provoked responses may affect treatment outcome (Niaura et al. 1989). However, because cue reactivity has not been assessed in existing clinical trials of cue exposure therapy, it is impossible to determine whether such interventions extinguish motivational responses to smoking-related cues.

### **Nicotine Fading**

Nicotine fading is based on the assumption that withdrawal symptoms will be lessened through a gradual reduction of nicotine intake (Foxy and Brown 1979; McGovern and Lando 1991). Nicotine fading can be accomplished either by progressively switching to brands of cigarettes yielding less nicotine or by using a series of graduated filters (McGovern and Lando 1991). Once the lowest nicotine level is reached, cessation is attempted. Nicotine fading should be distinguished from cigarette fading, in which the number of cigarettes smoked per day is gradually reduced. Cigarette fading has generally not been shown to be an effective smoking cessation technique; participants generally reach a level beyond which they find it difficult to reduce cigarette consumption (Lando 1993; Fiore et al. 2000).

### *Efficacy*

Foxy and Brown (1979) reported that 4 of 10 subjects who tried nicotine fading had quit smoking at 18 months, but subsequent investigations have found more modest long-term results (usually around 20 percent) (Beaver et al. 1981; Lando and McGovern 1985; Burling et al. 1989). Some evidence suggests that nicotine fading can increase abstinence success independently within a larger smoking cessation program

(Burling et al. 1989). In a community setting where participants were allowed to select their treatment, about 25–30 percent of those who chose multicomponent interventions containing nicotine fading achieved long-term abstinence (Lando et al. 1990; Lando 1993). Brand switching and graduated filters have produced equivalent outcomes (McGovern and Lando 1991). Cinciripini and colleagues (1995) found that 44 percent of persons using a combined nicotine fading and skills-training package were abstinent from nicotine at one year, a proportion significantly higher than that produced by matched conditions.

### *Relevant Process Measures*

Nicotine fading is presumed to exert its effects by gradually weaning smokers from nicotine, thereby reducing withdrawal symptoms. Reductions in nicotine intake and withdrawal indexes are thus the process measures of primary importance to nicotine fading. One early study suggests that nicotine fading reduces the severity of withdrawal symptoms (West et al. 1984a,b).

The process measure of reduced nicotine intake is problematic, because smokers' nicotine consumption seldom matches a given brand's machine-rated nicotine yields (McMorrow and Foxy 1983). Smokers are able to compensate for reduced nicotine yield by adjusting how they smoke—by inhaling more strongly, holding smoke in longer before exhaling, inhaling more frequently, or smoking the cigarette closer to its high-yield butt (Benowitz et al. 1983; Kozlowski et al. 1988). Smokers can also compensate for nicotine fading by blocking the air inlet holes on the filters that are used to decrease nicotine intake (McGovern and Lando 1991). The best available evidence indicates that although nicotine consumption is indeed reduced by nicotine fading, the extent of these reductions is smaller than would be expected (i.e., based on machine ratings); apparently, some compensatory smoking occurs (Lando 1993). For example, one study (McGovern and Lando 1991) compared two nicotine fading regimens, brand switching and graduated filter use, each of which was designed to reduce nicotine intake by 80 percent by the final stage. Each regimen significantly reduced nicotine consumption but by far less than 80 percent: brand switching reduced intake by 42.5 percent and graduated filters by 55.2 percent.

Lando and McGovern (1985) suggested that nicotine fading increases smokers' self-efficacy by providing them with a series of concrete steps that are mastered before cessation. Self-efficacy does increase during the fading process (McGovern and Lando 1991),

although no more than with comparison treatments (Burling et al. 1989). Moreover, increased self-efficacy has not been shown to predict treatment outcome for nicotine fading (McGovern and Lando 1991).

### **Motivational Rewards**

Strategies that use motivational rewards are rooted in operant conditioning theory. These efforts are designed to provide reasons for remaining abstinent to smokers who have just quit—reasons more tangible and immediate than the important but delayed outcomes that typically motivate cessation attempts (e.g., improvements in health). In a typical motivational rewards intervention, the provider collects a deposit from each participant at the outset of treatment and refunds a portion of this sum at each follow-up assessment at which the participant demonstrates abstinence (Paxton 1983). Other variations of this technique have used nonmonetary rewards (Lando 1982), punished smokers for every cigarette smoked (Murray and Hobbs 1981), instructed participants to reward themselves for abstinence (Tiffany et al. 1986), and rewarded participants who had reduced their carbon monoxide levels (Stitzer and Bigelow 1985). Curry and colleagues (1991) used a theoretical framework that tested intrinsic motivation (personalized feedback) against extrinsic motivation (financial incentive). Abstinence at 3 and 12 months was two times higher in the intrinsically motivated groups.

### **Efficacy**

When used alone, motivational rewards foster relatively high abstinence success in the short term, but these gains do not appear to be durable (Antonuccio et al. 1992). Participants often return to smoking after the term of the contract expires (Paxton 1980, 1981). Attempts to prolong abstinence by varying factors such as duration and frequency of reward have generally been unsuccessful (Paxton 1981, 1983). Multicomponent treatments using motivational rewards have sometimes fared better than comparison treatments, but these comparisons are generally confounded by other factors (Jason et al. 1990; Lando et al. 1990) and may lead to type II errors. A meta-analysis of 62 studies comparing components of behavioral controls found that motivational rewards (contingency contracting) did not significantly alter long-term cessation rates (Fiore et al. 2000). In the final results of the Minnesota Heart Health Program, the failure of community education methods (which included motivational rewards for smoking cessation) to produce results that exceeded

secular trends is an important demonstration of the difficulties in evaluating such modalities (Lando et al. 1995).

### **Relevant Process Measures**

The process measures most relevant to this strategy are presumably motivational; making rewards contingent on abstinence should increase a smoker's resolution to remain abstinent. However, motivational measures have been neglected in research on this intervention. Many programs require participants to administer their own rewards or punishments. Evaluations of these strategies should routinely assess how well participants take on this responsibility; to date, evaluations have not made this assessment.

### **Social Support**

Social support interventions try to ease the smoking cessation process by enlisting the support of significant persons in smokers' lives (extratreatment social support) and by providing support from clinicians (intratreatment social support). Both strategies may range from intense and pervasive to relatively minimal and limited. Intensive extratreatment social support may train participants to elicit aid and support of family and friends, whereas training clinicians to communicate caring, concern, and encouragement increases intratreatment social support. Increasing the cohesiveness of smoking cessation groups can enhance both forms of social support (Hajek et al. 1985; Lando and McGovern 1991). At the basic level, the simple use of a group rather than an individual format can be viewed as a social support intervention.

### **Efficacy**

Strategies that add social support to pharmacologic treatment appear to significantly increase long-term quit rates compared to treatments without social support, although some intensive interventions have reported mixed results (Glasgow et al. 1986; McIntyre-Kingsolver et al. 1986). A recent meta-analysis of 19 studies (Fiore et al. 2000) reported that interventions to increase social support in the smoker's environment increase long-term cessation by 50 percent. A meta-analysis of 50 studies (Fiore et al. 2000) reported that within-treatment social support increased cessation by 30 percent. The importance of intratreatment social support may well be reflected in the finding that individual and group counseling are both much more effective than no contact interventions (Kottke et al. 1988; Fiore et al. 1996).



### **Relevant Process Measures**

Studies of intensive social support interventions have regularly included measures of smokers' perceived support. These investigations have found that the amount of support a smoker perceives is directly related to outcome (Malott et al. 1984; Glasgow et al. 1986; McIntyre-Kingsolver et al. 1986; Gruder et al. 1993), but the trials have typically failed to find evidence that the support itself has increased this perception (Malott et al. 1984; Glasgow et al. 1986). In one study that found social support intervention to be effective, the strategy was itself associated with an increase in received support (Gruder et al. 1993). Moreover, this increase in support was statistically related to the differential outcome. Because support measures have rarely been incorporated into the evaluation of group treatments for smoking cessation, little is known about whether group formats enhance perceived support and about what influence such support has on treatment outcome (Hajek et al. 1985).

### **Weight Control**

Most people who quit smoking gain weight (Klesges et al. 1989), and this effect may be greater for women than for men (Williamson et al. 1991; Fant 1996). This effect has been hypothesized to result from nicotine's ability to modify various mechanisms in the central nervous system that regulate body weight (Schwid et al. 1992; Perkins 1993). Apprehension about weight gain may serve as a barrier to cessation attempts, especially among young women (Gritz et al. 1989). Cessation strategies that address this barrier have only recently begun to be assessed.

### **Efficacy**

Two important trials have examined the contribution of a weight control component to a multicomponent smoking cessation program. One study (Hall et al. 1992) compared a specialized weight control program with both a nonspecific weight control program and a standard program. Patients in the specialized group learned behavioral self-management, reduced their caloric intake under the direction of a dietitian, and received an individualized activity plan from an exercise counselor. Patients in the nonspecific group attended several group sessions devoted to discussing weight-related issues. Results showed that participants in both of these weight control programs were less likely to be abstinent after one year (21 percent success for both groups combined) than participants treated with the standard protocol (35 percent success).

Another study (Pirie et al. 1992) examined the effects of adding nicotine gum, weight control counseling, both, or neither to a standardized smoking cessation program in a sample of women who had indicated that they were concerned about postcessation weight gain. After 12 months, the group that added nicotine gum to the standard program had much greater success (44.4 percent had quit smoking) than the groups that added weight control counseling to the standard package (27.8 percent success for the group that added weight control only and 27.6 percent success for the group that added both weight control and nicotine gum). However, the standard package alone was the least successful program (19.4 percent had quit smoking) and was viewed by participants as less appealing than the weight control component (Pirie et al. 1992).

A meta-analysis of six studies (Fiore et al. 2000) that looked at the effect of dieting and physical activity on smoking cessation did not find that these interventions increased cessation success. A recent single study (Marcus et al. 1999) found that vigorous physical activity increased quit rates.

### **Relevant Process Measures**

Weight gain has not been a consistent predictor of smoking relapse (Gritz et al. 1989), and it has predicted abstinence as well (Hall et al. 1986; Gritz et al. 1989; Hughes et al. 1991b). Nonetheless, actual control of weight is an important process measure for weight control interventions—the primary purpose of which is relapse prevention—because they explicitly assume that preventing weight gain will boost abstinence rates (Hall et al. 1992; Pirie et al. 1992). Neither published trial of weight control interventions found differences in weight gain among abstinent subjects across treatment conditions (Hall et al. 1992; Pirie et al. 1992). One of the studies (Hall et al. 1992) found evidence for lower caloric intake in specialized weight control interventions, especially among women, but failed to find differences in activity levels across treatment conditions. In sum, despite the intuitive appeal of weight control interventions to promote smoking cessation, there is mixed evidence relating such interventions to cessation success (Fiore et al. 2000). Hall and colleagues (1992) suggested that such interventions may interfere with cessation. However, Marcus and colleagues (1999) found that a vigorous exercise intervention increased quit rates while contributing to weight management. Pharmacotherapies, including bupropion sustained release (SR) and nicotine gum, may help to delay weight gain after cessation (Emont and Cummings 1987; Doherty et al. 1996; Jorenby et al. 1999).

## Hypnosis

Some smokers try hypnosis therapy to help them quit (Schwartz 1987). Strategies for hypnosis interventions include direct hypnotic suggestions to quit, suggestions intended to produce aversion to smoking, and training in self-hypnosis to reinforce formal treatment (Simon and Salzberg 1982).

### *Efficacy*

The methodological shortcomings of hypnosis research make it difficult to estimate the value of this therapy for smoking cessation (Schwartz 1987). Reviewers have noted that, in general, hypnosis is not very effective when used alone, but it may be useful as part of a multicomponent intervention in which subjects see a therapist many times (Holroyd 1980; Schwartz 1987). In methodologically sound studies, hypnosis often fails to outperform comparison techniques, such as self-help strategies (Rabkin et al. 1984; Lambe et al. 1986). Hypnosis techniques may work best for the relatively small proportion of people highly susceptible to hypnosis (Barabasz et al. 1986; USDHHS 1988). Since the late 1980s, there have been only two trials of hypnosis in smoking cessation, with inconclusive results. Johnson and Karkut (1994) conducted an uncontrolled clinical trial of hypnosis plus aversion treatment and reported about 90 percent abstinence at three months. A similar uncontrolled study of 226 smokers reported a 23-percent abstinence at two years (Spiegel et al. 1993). A recent review of hypnosis by the Cochrane group (Abbot et al. 2000) found insufficient evidence to support hypnosis as a treatment for smoking cessation.

### *Relevant Process Measures*

Appropriate process measures for studies of hypnosis are those that assess the various means of hypnotic induction and the motivational changes that are presumed to accrue from them. Because measures have rarely been collected, little is known about the mechanisms of hypnotic treatments for smoking cessation (Holroyd 1980; Schwartz 1987; USDHHS 1988).

## Acupuncture

The typical acupuncture treatment for smoking cessation involves the insertion of needles or staples into the outer ear, but a number of other techniques have been investigated (Schwartz 1988). The most commonly cited rationale for using acupuncture is that it relieves the discomfort of nicotine withdrawal.

### *Efficacy*

The available evidence suggests that acupuncture is no more effective in smoking cessation than placebo treatments (Schwartz 1987). For example, Schwartz (1988) reviewed eight studies in which acupuncture at a theoretically appropriate site was contrasted with acupuncture at a placebo site. Only one of these studies found greater success among participants undergoing the procedure with theoretically appropriate sites (MacHovec and Man 1978). A recent meta-analysis of five studies (Fiore et al. 2000) found that acupuncture was no more effective than placebo.

### *Relevant Process Measures*

Acupuncture is commonly presumed to exert its effects by easing tobacco withdrawal. At present there is no evidence that acupuncture is capable of relieving withdrawal symptoms associated with smoking cessation (Clavel et al. 1987; Schwartz 1987; USDHHS 1988).

## Summary of Intensive Clinical Interventions

Intensive programs serve an important function in the nation's efforts to reduce smoking, despite the resources the programs demand and the relatively small population of smokers who use them. Such programs may be particularly useful in treating smokers who find it most difficult to quit.

Because intensive smoking cessation programs differ in structure and content, evaluation is often hampered by variation in methodology and by a lack of research addressing specific treatment techniques. Because few studies have chosen to isolate single treatments, assessment of the effectiveness of specific approaches is difficult. Nonetheless, skills training, rapid smoking, and both intratreatment and extratreatment social support have been associated with successful smoking cessation. When such treatments are shown to be effective, they are usually part of a multifactorial intervention. Little clear evidence has implicated particular psychological, behavioral, or cognitive mechanisms as the agents of change. The specific impact of intensive interventions may be masked by the efficacy of several multicomponent programs, some of which have achieved cessation proportions of 30–50 percent (Lando 1993).

Thus, in their positive effect on smoking cessation and long-term abstinence rates (Kottke et al. 1988; Fiore et al. 1994a), intensive interventions seem little different from other forms of counseling or psychotherapy. With intensive interventions, as with counseling, it is difficult to attribute the efficacy to

specific characteristics of the interventions or to specific change mechanisms (Luborsky et al. 1975; Elkin et al. 1989).

## Pharmacologic Interventions

At first look, nicotine replacement therapy appears to be the treatment of a disease with its cause. The rationale, however, is well established. Observations on the beneficial effects of nicotine replacement in abstinent smokers were first made in 1967 (Lucchesi et al. 1967), and the process has its medical precedent in the use of methadone for opiate dependence. Nicotine use, in the form of 10 or more cigarettes a day, provides continuous neuroexposure (Benowitz 1993). The resulting tolerance and physical dependence produce classic withdrawal symptoms (USDHHS 1988). As Benowitz (1993) has summarized, "Nicotine replacement therapy serves primarily to break the daily addiction cycle by relieving withdrawal symptoms, thereby facilitating behavioural modification that is necessary for permanent smoking cessation" (p. 158). However, as will be discussed later in this chapter, recent data suggest that nicotine replacement may be effective without behavioral support or counseling. A number of candidate delivery systems have now been extensively evaluated with clear and consistent results. In addition, nonnicotine pharmacotherapies for treatment of tobacco use are now available.

### Nicotine Polacrilex

Nicotine polacrilex (nicotine gum) was approved by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) for use as an aid to smoking cessation in a 2-mg dose in 1984 and in a 4-mg dose in 1994. The nicotine in the gum is bound to an ion-exchange resin. Chewing the gum liberates the nicotine, which is absorbed through the buccal mucosa. Currently, both doses of nicotine polacrilex are approved for use as over-the-counter preparations by adults. The package insert instructs patients to use the gum as needed with the constraint that they not exceed a daily dose of 20 pieces of 4-mg gum or 30 pieces of 2-mg gum.

### *Efficacy*

With more than 50 studies on its efficacy, nicotine gum is the most extensively investigated pharmacologic treatment for smoking cessation. This body of research has been summarized by several major meta-analyses (Lam et al. 1987; Cepeda-Benito 1993; Silagy et al. 1994; Tang et al. 1994). The most recent

meta-analysis (Fiore et al. 2000) is summarized in Table 4.3. All meta-analyses found the gum to be effective in helping smokers quit.

Lam and colleagues (1987) performed a meta-analysis of nine randomized, controlled trials of the 2-mg nicotine gum. These authors performed separate analyses on the trials conducted in specialized smoking cessation clinics and on those conducted in general medical settings. In the specialized clinics, cessation success was greater with nicotine gum than with placebo gum. In general medical practice settings, however, nicotine gum was no more successful than placebo gum; both types of gum were more successful than usual care. The authors suggested that participants at the specialized cessation clinics had greater success because such participants may have been more motivated to quit and may have received more intensive adjuvant behavioral support than those at the generalized settings. The authors also speculated that patients who seek treatment in specialized clinics may be more physically dependent on nicotine and thus more likely to benefit from nicotine replacement than the average patient seen in a general medical clinic.

Cepeda-Benito (1993) performed a meta-analysis of 33 trials of the 2-mg gum. As in the review by Lam and colleagues (1987), the trials were categorized according to whether the adjuvant behavioral support was intensive or brief and according to whether the control group used placebo gum or no gum. Pooled estimates of efficacy were derived for short-term (0–8 weeks after treatment) and long-term ( $12 \pm 2$  months) outcome measures within each category. Effect sizes were not systematically related to the type of control treatment used but were related to the intensity of behavioral support provided. When used in intensive interventions, the gum was associated with greater abstinence success than the control treatments at both long-term and short-term follow-up. When used in brief behavioral interventions, however, the gum outperformed the control interventions only at short-term follow-up. The author concluded that nicotine gum is an effective aid to smoking cessation but questioned its long-term value in the absence of adjuvant psychosocial support.

In the context of a larger review of available nicotine replacement therapies, Tang and colleagues (1994) performed a meta-analysis of 28 randomized, controlled trials of the 2-mg gum and 6 randomized, controlled trials of the 4-mg gum. The authors found that among participants recruited through advertisements to attend specialized cessation clinics, the 2-mg gum was associated with an 11-percent increase in success over control treatments. However, among

smokers who were directly invited to participate in a general smoking cessation trial conducted by a non-specialist physician, the 2-mg gum increased abstinence success by only 3 percentage points over control conditions. Consistent with the analysis by Lam and colleagues (1987), the authors suggested that these findings reflect (1) the greater motivation of the smokers who referred themselves (i.e., responded to advertisements instead of being directly invited), (2) the greater degree of nicotine dependence in the self-referred group, and (3) the more extensive encouragement and more detailed instructions provided by

therapists in the specialized settings in which the self-referred smokers were treated.

Six of the 28 trials of the 2-mg gum (Fagerström 1982, 1984; Jarvik and Schneider 1984; Areechon and Punnotock 1988; Hughes et al. 1989b; Jensen et al. 1990) reported abstinence success as a function of nicotine dependence as assessed by the Fagerström Tolerance Questionnaire (described later in this chapter). The authors aggregated these data and found that the 2-mg gum improved cessation success by 16 percentage points among smokers scoring high (indicating considerable nicotine dependence) on the

**Table 4.3. Meta-analyses of efficacy (estimated odds ratio and abstinence rates) for seven pharmacotherapies used in tobacco dependence treatment**

Pharmacotherapy	Number of study groups	Estimated odds ratio (95% CI)*	Estimated abstinence rate (95% CI)
<b>Bupropion SR<sup>†</sup> (n = 2<sup>‡</sup>)</b>			
Placebo	2	1.0	17.3
Bupropion SR	4	2.1 (1.5, 3.0)	30.5 (23.2, 37.8)
<b>Nicotine gum, 2 mg (n = 13)</b>			
Placebo	16	1.0	17.1
Nicotine gum	18	1.5 (1.3, 1.8)	23.7 (20.6, 26.7)
<b>Nicotine inhaler (n = 4)</b>			
Placebo	4	1.0	10.5
Nicotine inhaler	4	2.5 (1.7, 3.6)	22.8 (16.4, 29.2)
<b>Nicotine nasal spray (n = 3)</b>			
Placebo	3	1.0	13.9
Nicotine spray	3	2.7 (1.8, 4.1)	30.5 (21.8, 39.2)
<b>Transdermal nicotine (the nicotine patch) (n = 27)</b>			
Placebo	28	1.0	10.0
Transdermal nicotine	32	1.9 (1.7, 2.2)	17.7 (16.0, 19.5)
<b>Clonidine (n = 5)</b>			
Placebo	6	1.0	13.9
Clonidine	8	2.1 (1.4, 3.2)	25.6 (17.7, 33.6)
<b>Nortriptyline (n = 2)</b>			
Placebo	3	1.0	11.7
Nortriptyline	3	3.2 (1.8, 5.7)	30.1 (18.1, 41.6)

\*Confidence interval.

<sup>†</sup>SR = sustained release.

<sup>‡</sup>Number of studies.

Source: Fiore et al. 2000.

questionnaire but produced only a 2-percentage point increase among smokers whose scores indicated low levels of nicotine dependence.

When data from the 4-mg gum trials (Puska et al. 1979; Kornitzer et al. 1987; Tønnesen et al. 1988a,b; Blöndal 1989; Hughes et al. 1990a) were aggregated, the influence of nicotine dependence paralleled that seen in trials using the lower dose. Among smokers highly dependent on nicotine, those who used the 4-mg gum had a 21-percent greater success at cessation than those using the 2-mg gum. In contrast, among smokers low in nicotine dependence, those who used the 4-mg gum had an 18-percent lower success than those using the 2-mg gum. Highly dependent participants using the 4-mg gum had a 35-percent greater success than those using the placebo gum, but this comparative improvement was only 5 percent greater among less dependent participants.

Tang and colleagues (1994) concluded that nicotine gum is an effective aid to smoking cessation and suggested that its efficacy is a direct function of the dependence of the smoker. On the basis of their review of other nicotine replacement therapies (including the nicotine patch), the authors concluded that the 4-mg gum is the most effective form of nicotine replacement for highly dependent smokers.

Silagy and colleagues (1994) examined 42 nicotine gum trials in their meta-analysis of nicotine replacement interventions. To compute effect sizes for each analysis, the authors combined data from the longest follow-up assessments (mainly 12 months) from available trials, regardless of gum dose or type of control treatment. Across all 42 trials, 42 percent of participants using nicotine gum quit smoking, whereas only 18 percent of participants in the control groups, who used either placebo gum or no gum, succeeded in quitting. The pooled odds ratio (OR) for the gum-to-control comparison across all trials was 1.61 (95 percent confidence interval [CI], 1.46–1.78). Differences between gum and control conditions did not vary according to the intensity of adjuvant behavioral support.

Fiore and colleagues (1990) conducted a meta-analysis of 13 randomized controlled trials of 2-mg nicotine gum therapy with at least five months of follow-up (Table 4.3). Nicotine gum treatment was associated with a 50-percent increase in quit rates (23.7 percent quit rate vs. 17.1 percent) in the control group. There were too few studies done in the over-the-counter setting to allow meta-analysis of the over-the-counter effect of nicotine gum.

Taken together, these meta-analyses suggest that nicotine chewing gum is an effective aid to smoking cessation. This conclusion continues to be borne out as evidence continues to accumulate. In an ongoing project, Silagy and colleagues (1999) have been regularly searching medical databases for new nicotine replacement trials, recalculating effect sizes as new data sources are identified, and frequently publishing the updated meta-analyses. In the most recent edition of this meta-analysis, the pooled gum-to-control OR was estimated at 1.63. That in most settings nicotine-containing gum is associated with greater cessation success than placebo gum suggests that the gum's efficacy is due to its pharmacologic properties. Some evidence indicates that the efficacy of the 2-mg gum depends on the presence of intensive adjuvant behavioral support. The meta-analysis by Silagy and colleagues (1994) suggests that nicotine gum may be beneficial even without intensive adjuvant therapy. In this analysis, however, because 2-mg and 4-mg gum studies are combined, definitive conclusions about the efficacy of either dose alone in the absence of behavioral support cannot be drawn. This finding underscores the importance of selecting those smokers for whom nicotine gum is likely to be beneficial. The available evidence suggests that traditional measures of nicotine dependence may be a useful basis for selecting gum candidates. Both doses of the gum appear to be of greater value to smokers who are more dependent on nicotine. The 4-mg gum may be particularly effective for the most dependent smokers.

### *Relevant Process Measures*

Nicotine gum is presumed to exert its effects by replacing a portion of the nicotine that smokers usually obtain through smoking; in therapy, the gum ameliorates aversive tobacco withdrawal (Benowitz 1991; Hughes 1993). Some evidence suggests that nicotine gum reliably reduces some withdrawal symptoms.

Patients receiving the 2-mg nicotine gum have consistently reported having less total withdrawal discomfort than patients treated with placebo gum (Jarvis et al. 1982; Hughes et al. 1984, 1989a, 1991b; Gross and Stitzer 1989; Hatsukami et al. 1991). However, studies have found that withdrawal severity is not consistently related to smoking relapse (West 1992; Hughes 1993), and the withdrawal suppression produced by nicotine gum appears to be somewhat independent of its efficacy. Moreover, the suppression reported seems to accrue through the lessening of a relatively small subset of withdrawal symptoms (Hughes et al. 1990b). The 2-mg gum consistently alleviates symptoms such as

anxiety and irritability but does not appear to reliably ameliorate craving, hunger, sleep disturbance, or difficulty concentrating (West et al. 1984a,b; Gross and Stitzer 1989; Hughes et al. 1989a, 1990a; Hatsukami et al. 1991). One trial (Hughes et al. 1990a) has found that the 4-mg gum was no more effective than the 2-mg gum either in suppressing total withdrawal severity or in relieving any of the individual symptoms of withdrawal. Future research must explore whether these counterintuitive findings are a result of poor measurement of withdrawal severity or whether other mechanisms explain how nicotine gum produces clinical success (Hughes 1993).

### *Effect on Postcessation Change in Body Weight*

Evidence suggests that the 2-mg gum is capable of delaying, but not preventing, postcessation weight gain. Early in the cessation process, smokers given the 2-mg gum tend to gain less weight than smokers treated with placebo gum (Gross et al. 1989). During this period, weight gain among the 2-mg gum users is inversely related to the amount of gum used (Emont and Cummings 1987; Fagerström 1987; Killen et al. 1990a; Nides et al. 1994). However, differences in weight gain between smokers using the 2-mg gum, using placebo gum, and using no gum (Gross et al. 1989; Nides et al. 1994) disappear when follow-up is conducted after gum therapy has ended.

Relatively little is known about the weight-related effects of the 4-mg gum. Early trials did not show it to diminish weight gain any more than either the 2-mg gum (Kornitzer et al. 1987; Tønnesen et al. 1988a) or the placebo gum (Puska et al. 1979; Tønnesen et al. 1988a). These trials, however, tended to use different weight measures and more distal end points than the typical trial with 2-mg gum, and one trial used a mixed-dose regimen (Tønnesen et al. 1988a). A more recent study, however, reported that nicotine gum suppressed weight gain with greater suppression occurring with the 4-mg dose (Doherty et al. 1996). Analysis of salivary cotinine showed that smokers who replaced a greater percentage of their baseline cotinine levels gained less weight.

### *Side Effects and Likelihood of Inappropriate Use*

Common side effects reported by the 2-mg gum users include mouth soreness, hiccups, indigestion, jaw ache, and unpleasant taste (American Medical Association [AMA] 1993; Tang et al. 1994). Most of these symptoms are relatively mild and transient, and many can be resolved by correcting the user's chewing technique. Symptoms observed less frequently (in

less than 2 percent of patients) include irritability, lightheadedness, headache, excessive salivation, and anorexia (AMA 1993). Moreover, absorption of nicotine from the gum is highly dependent on the pH of the mouth (Henningfield et al. 1990). Because nicotine is inactivated by an acidic environment, patients are urged to refrain from eating or drinking anything but water for 30 minutes before using the gum. Approximately 10–25 percent of successful abstainers continue to use the gum for one year or longer (Hajek et al. 1988; Hughes 1988; Hughes et al. 1991a). Although discontinuance of use should be encouraged, continued use confers a substantial reduced health risk compared to a return to smoking. The 4-mg gum appears to have similar side effects, but it may produce slightly more dyspepsia and hiccuping than does the 2-mg gum (Tønnesen et al. 1988a,b).

### **Transdermal Nicotine**

In 1991, the FDA approved the use of transdermal nicotine patches as an aid to smoking cessation. Nicotine patches contain a reservoir of nicotine that diffuses through the skin and into the wearer's bloodstream at a constant rate. Patients are usually instructed to apply one patch each day. Specific dosing regimen may vary.

All currently marketed brands are designed to deliver approximately 0.9 mg per hour of nicotine over the weaning period. Most are intended for 24-hour wear and deliver 21–22 mg of nicotine; one is intended for waking hours wear (16 hours per day) and delivers 15 mg of nicotine. Full-strength patches typically produce serum nicotine levels similar to trough levels of serum nicotine in moderate to heavy smokers (Mulligan et al. 1990). On July 3, 1996, the FDA approved the transdermal nicotine patch for over-the-counter sales at a dose of 15 mg for use as part of a comprehensive behavioral program of smoking cessation, although the FDA's prescription does not provide a clear statement of the constituents of such a program. Since that time, all varieties of nicotine patches have become available over the counter, some as "house brands."

### *Efficacy*

Several meta-analyses of the efficacy of the nicotine patch have been published (Po 1993; Fiore et al. 1994c; Gourlay 1994; Silagy et al. 1994; Tang et al. 1994; Fiore et al. 2000). Each meta-analysis has concluded that the patch is an effective aid to smoking cessation.

Po (1993) combined data from 11 nicotine patch trials and found that persons using the nicotine patch had greater cessation success than persons using a

placebo patch. This finding held for both short-term follow-up (3–10 weeks; combined OR = 3.10 [95 percent CI, 2.65–3.62]) and long-term follow-up (6–12 months; combined OR = 2.26 [95 percent CI, 1.80–2.86]). Gourlay (1994) pooled the results of six trials and found that the nicotine patch produced greater cessation success than a placebo patch at all follow-up assessments (2–3 months, 6 months, and 12 months; all pooled ORs were between 2.2 and 2.4 [95 percent CI, 1.6–3.4]). Tang and colleagues (1994) conducted a meta-analysis of six patch trials. Overall, at long-term (12-month) follow-up, persons using nicotine patches had a 9-percent (6–13 percent) greater success at cessation than did persons using placebo patches. Nicotine patches were found to be more effective among self-referred subjects than among invited subjects and slightly more effective among smokers who were more dependent on nicotine. Silagy and colleagues (1994) combined data from nine patch trials and found that at long-term (12-month) follow-up, nicotine patches were associated with a combined OR of 2.07 (95 percent CI, 1.64–2.62) when compared with control conditions (placebo patches or no patch). Secondary analyses indicated that the patch's relative efficacy was not affected by the intensity of adjuvant support. Fiore and colleagues (1994c) examined 17 nicotine patch trials and found a combined OR of 2.6 (95 percent CI, 2.2–3.0) at the end of the treatment and 3.0 (95 percent CI, 2.4–3.7) at 12-month follow-up. More intensive adjuvant support was found to produce higher abstinence rates at six months (26.5 vs. 19.5 percent for low-intensity interventions) but did not increase the relative advantage of nicotine patches over placebo patches. The 16- and 24-hour patches were found to be equally effective. Neither weaning nor extending treatment beyond eight weeks was found to improve outcome. A recent meta-analysis (Fiore et al. 2000) of 27 studies reported that transdermal nicotine increased long-term cessation by 90 percent (Table 4.3). A meta-analysis of three studies reported that over-the-counter nicotine patch use increased successful long-term cessation by 80 percent (Fiore et al. 2000).

These meta-analyses strongly indicate that the nicotine patch is an effective aid to smoking cessation. This conclusion is buttressed by the findings of a continuing, regularly updated review of the existing research literature on transdermal nicotine (Silagy et al. 1999). In the most recent release of this evolving meta-analysis, Silagy and colleagues (1999) found a pooled patch-to-control OR of 1.84 (95 percent CI, 1.60–2.10). The data continue to suggest that 16- and 24-hour patches are equivalent in efficacy, that there is no advantage associated with weaning or tapering of patch

dose, and that the relative efficacy of the patch is fairly independent of the intensity of adjuvant therapy. Nicotine patches have been consistently found to outperform placebo patches regardless of dosing regimen and in a variety of investigational settings. For example, a study of "real-world" use of the patch—based on a follow-back of older persons who had filled patch prescriptions—produced a self-reported cessation proportion of 29 percent at six months (Orleans et al. 1994). The patch is more effective than placebo treatment when paired with only brief support, and it is associated with the higher long-term success when paired with more intensive counseling or behavioral interventions (Fiore et al. 1994b). Though the nicotine patch does increase success rates when used with minimal formal counseling, many nicotine patch clinical trials involve frequent follow-up assessments. Such contacts might boost success rates obtained with the patch. In support of this possibility, Jorenby and colleagues (1995b) found that the combination of nicotine patch treatment plus frequent assessments produced follow-up outcomes equivalent to the nicotine patch plus intensive behavioral therapy. Further assessment of this issue is important, as frequent follow-up contact does not usually accompany nicotine patch use outside of clinical trials (Cummings et al. 1994; Swartz et al. 1995). A meta-analysis of three studies of over-the-counter nicotine patches, however, indicated that patch therapy was superior to placebo (Fiore et al. 2000).

#### *Effects on Discomfort of Nicotine Withdrawal*

Some evidence suggests that the nicotine patch reduces overall measures of nicotine withdrawal discomfort (Daughton et al. 1991; Transdermal Nicotine Study Group 1991; Jorenby et al. 1996), but this finding has not been consistent (Abelin et al. 1989; Tønnesen et al. 1991; Merz et al. 1993). Use of the nicotine patch has been repeatedly found to reduce the craving for cigarettes (Abelin et al. 1989; Rose et al. 1990; Tønnesen et al. 1991; Transdermal Nicotine Study Group 1991; Merz et al. 1993; Sachs et al. 1993; Westman et al. 1993; Fiore et al. 1994b; Levin et al. 1994; Jorenby et al. 1996), but other symptoms of nicotine withdrawal are affected less reliably (Palmer et al. 1992). In a study designed to clarify the impact the patch has on withdrawal symptoms, the patch reliably reduced craving, anxiety, and irritability but did not alleviate depressed mood, restlessness, or sleep disruption (Jorenby et al. 1996). The authors noted that with or without the patch, most withdrawal symptoms disappeared within three to four weeks.

### **Effect on Postcessation Change in Body Weight**

Nicotine patches can attenuate postcessation weight gain while they are in use (Abelin et al. 1989; Sachs et al. 1993; Jorenby et al. 1995a; Dale et al. 1998), but this short-term effect has not always been observed (Rose et al. 1990; Tønnesen et al. 1991; Transdermal Nicotine Study Group 1991; Fiore et al. 1994b). Moreover, studies that follow up effects after treatment has ended have not found that persons who used the nicotine patch gained less weight than those who used a placebo patch (Tønnesen et al. 1991).

### **Side Effects and Likelihood of Inappropriate Use**

Most side effects of nicotine patch use are relatively mild; less than 5 percent of patients need to discontinue patch therapy because of side effects (Hughes and Glaser 1993). Minor skin irritation at the patch site is reported by 30–50 percent of patch users and can be relieved by moving the patch to another site. Insomnia is reported by 1–23 percent of patch users (AMA 1993). Comparatively rare side effects include headache, dizziness, fatigue, gastrointestinal distress, sweating, limb pain, and palpitations (Palmer et al. 1992). Studies have found little evidence that people will inappropriately use transdermal nicotine systems (Palmer et al. 1992; Hughes 1993; Jorenby et al. 1995b).

The risks associated with using the nicotine patch during pregnancy are largely unknown. Nicotine itself poses risks to the fetus, including neurotoxicity (Slotkin 1998), and pregnant women should first be encouraged to quit without pharmacotherapy. Because exposure to nicotine through maternal use of the patch probably poses less danger to the fetus than does continued maternal smoking (Hackman et al. 1999), however, nicotine replacement therapy may be indicated for pregnant women who are unable to quit smoking (Benowitz 1991; Lewis and Fiore 1994). However, if a decision is made to use nicotine replacement therapy during pregnancy, the physician should consider monitoring blood nicotine levels, using doses at the low end of the effective range, and choosing intermittent delivery systems (such as nicotine gum) (Fiore et al. 2000). The issue is under active investigation.

Continued smoking while using the patch may be a significant problem. In an observational study of self-reported patch use, almost one-half the respondents stated that they smoked while using the patch; 20 percent of the respondents did so every day (Orleans et al. 1994). A small number of adverse cardiovascular events were reported in patients who continued to smoke while using the patch. When these events received much attention from the popular press,

several analyses, including one by an FDA advisory committee, have documented no association between nicotine replacement therapy and cardiovascular events even in patients who continue to smoke intermittently (Working Group for the Study of Transdermal Nicotine in Patients with Coronary Artery Disease 1994; Joseph et al. 1996; Benowitz and Gourlay 1997; Mahmarian et al. 1997). Caution should be used, however, for patients with acute cardiovascular disease (immediately post-myocardial infarction or in the presence of serious arrhythmias or serious or accelerating angina pectoris).

### **Relevant Process Measures**

Like nicotine gum, the nicotine patch is intended to reduce tobacco withdrawal symptoms (Palmer et al. 1992; Glover 1993b; Hughes and Glaser 1993). Although the nicotine patch appears to reduce withdrawal severity, particularly craving for cigarettes, withdrawal suppression may or may not be responsible for the patch's efficacy (Hughes 1993). For example, one trial failed to reveal reliable differences in withdrawal severity between persons using nicotine patches and those using placebo patches (Merz et al. 1993); the trial nevertheless found that participants who used the nicotine patch were nearly twice as likely to quit smoking. Another trial employing two doses of transdermal nicotine found that the higher-dose patch produced significantly greater cessation success than the lower-dose patch, even though both doses provided about the same amount of relief from withdrawal symptoms (Transdermal Nicotine Study Group 1991; Hughes 1993). Clearly, other potential mechanisms of the patch's action, as well as the action of nicotine replacement therapy in general, need to be explored.

### **Nicotine Nasal Spray**

Nicotine nasal spray was approved for prescription use in the United States in March 1996. The spray consists of a pocket-sized bottle and pump assembly, which is fitted to a nozzle designed for insertion into the nose. Each metered spray delivers 0.5 mg of nicotine to the nasal mucosa. The recommended dose is 1 mg, or one 0.5-mg spray per nostril, as needed (Sutherland et al. 1992).

### **Efficacy**

A number of clinical trials have assessed the efficacy of the nicotine nasal spray as an aid to smoking cessation. Sutherland and colleagues (1992) found that



26 percent of participants given nicotine nasal spray were abstinent after one year, compared with only 10 percent of participants given placebo. Hjalmarson and colleagues (1994) found similar results in a placebo-controlled trial; at one-year follow-up, abstinence rates were 27 percent and 15 percent, respectively, for participants given active spray or placebo. Schneider and colleagues (1995) again replicated this effect, finding continuous abstinence rates of 18 percent and 8 percent among participants given active or placebo spray. Another study (Blöndal et al. 1997) did not find a significant difference in abstinence rates between active spray and placebo groups at one year (25 vs. 17 percent); active spray was associated with higher abstinence rates at six months and earlier in this trial.

Recently, Blöndal and colleagues (1999) provided all participants in a second trial with active nicotine patches, then studied the incremental efficacy of adding nasal spray therapy to the patch regimen in a double-blind, placebo-controlled fashion. Results showed that participants given the active spray were more likely to be abstinent after one year than participants given placebo (27 vs. 11 percent). Participants given active spray had a higher rate of abstinence than participants given placebo a full six years after the start of treatment (16 vs. 9 percent), but this effect was only marginally significant. Taken together, the results of these studies suggest that nicotine nasal spray is an aid to smoking cessation. A meta-analysis by Silagy and colleagues (1999) reported a pooled spray-to-control OR of 2.27, and a recent meta-analysis (Fiore et al. 2000) reported an OR of 2.7 (30.5 percent long-term abstinence rate) (Table 4.3).

#### *Effect on Discomfort of Nicotine Withdrawal*

Evidence regarding the nicotine nasal spray's effects on nicotine withdrawal discomfort is sparse. The results of two studies suggest that the spray may be useful for coping with craving, but may not be effective in alleviating other withdrawal symptoms. One study (Sutherland et al. 1992) found that, compared with participants using placebo spray, participants treated with nicotine spray reported having less total withdrawal discomfort during the 48 hours immediately after smoking cessation and reported less craving for cigarettes during this period. After 48 hours, however, the two groups reported equivalent levels of withdrawal discomfort and craving. When craving did arise, the nicotine spray was consistently rated more effective than the placebo spray.

The other study (Hjalmarson et al. 1994) found that during the first 48 hours of smoking cessation,

users of nicotine spray reported somewhat less severe withdrawal discomfort than placebo users, but this effect was not statistically significant. The severity of craving was found to be similar across both groups, but the nicotine spray was more helpful in quelling craving than the placebo spray was. Other clinical trials have not reported comparisons between active and placebo spray groups with regard to withdrawal measures (e.g., Schneider et al. 1995; Blöndal et al. 1999).

#### *Effect on Postcessation Change in Body Weight*

The limited evidence available suggests that the nicotine nasal spray may be capable of delaying, but not preventing, postcessation weight gain. In one of the trials (Sutherland et al. 1992), participants were allowed to use the spray they were assigned for as long as one year. Weight effects in that study differed as a function of duration of spray use: abstinent subjects who had continued to use the nicotine spray for the entire year of the study had gained significantly less weight than subjects still using the placebo spray. However, change in body weight was equivalent for abstinent patients who had stopped using either type of spray during the year.

Another study (Hjalmarson et al. 1994) failed to find any statistically significant differences in weight gain between participants using nicotine spray and those using placebo spray. The authors observed, however, that participants still using nicotine spray at the 12-month follow-up tended to gain less weight than both participants continuing to use a placebo spray and participants who had stopped using the nicotine spray before that time.

#### *Side Effects and Likelihood of Inappropriate Use*

Unpleasant side effects are common with the nasal spray. Between 75 and 100 percent of nasal spray users reported experiencing irritant effects, such as runny nose, sneezing, throat irritation, nasal irritation, watering eyes, and coughing (Sutherland et al. 1992; Hjalmarson et al. 1994; Schneider et al. 1995). Some authors have reported that these sensory irritation effects are actually viewed as desirable by many smokers and have suggested that they may help bridge the gap between cigarette smoking and nicotine replacement (Glover 1993a; Schneider 1993). Less common side effects, present in 15–25 percent of users, include nausea, sweating, headache, dizziness, and cold hands and feet.

Because the spray rapidly delivers nicotine to the user, the potential for inappropriate use (e.g., using more often or at a higher dose than recommended) is

high. The results of both clinical trials lend some credence to these speculations. Sutherland and colleagues (1992) found that 43 percent of abstinent study participants who had been given the nicotine spray chose to continue using it for the entire year of the study; moreover, mean plasma nicotine concentrations increased over the follow-up period among participants who continued to use the spray. Participants in the trial conducted by Hjalmarson and colleagues (1994) were explicitly encouraged to begin weaning themselves from the spray (whether nicotine or placebo) after three months. Nonetheless, 30 percent of abstinent participants who had been given the nicotine spray continued to use it after one year. Schneider and colleagues (1995) required that participants in their trial use the spray daily for six weeks, then allowed participants to use spray for up to six months postcessation as needed. Thirty-two percent of participants given active spray continued using it daily for six months, compared with 13 percent of participants given placebo. The authors also reported that some continuous abstainers assigned to active spray reported being concerned that they were dependent upon the spray at six months postcessation. However, a substantial proportion of these individuals remained abstinent many months after drug weaning.

#### **Relevant Process Measures**

Nicotine nasal spray, like other nicotine replacement products, is intended to aid smoking cessation by relieving withdrawal symptoms. Although the spray has been found effective in promoting cessation, its circumscribed impact on total withdrawal severity suggests that withdrawal relief is not itself responsible for the spray's usefulness. The spray's documented ability to alleviate craving may be what makes it an effective smoking cessation treatment. More research is needed to advance definitive conclusions about the spray's mechanism of action.

#### **Nicotine Inhaler**

In May 1997, the FDA approved the nicotine inhaler for prescription use. The inhaler consists of a plastic tube, about the size of a cigarette, that contains a plug impregnated with nicotine. Menthol is added to the plug to reduce throat irritation. Smokers are instructed to puff on the inhaler as they would on a cigarette. An average puff delivers approximately 13  $\mu\text{g}$  of nicotine (about 1/80th the amount of nicotine contained in an average cigarette puff), which is absorbed primarily by the buccal route (Glover 1993a;

Tønnesen et al. 1993). Each inhaler contains enough nicotine for approximately 300 puffs. Smokers are instructed to use between 6 and 16 inhalers per day.

#### **Efficacy**

A handful of published trials have examined the efficacy of the nicotine inhaler as an aid to smoking cessation. Tønnesen and colleagues (1993) found that 17 percent of participants randomized to active inhalers had quit smoking at six months, compared with 8 percent of participants given placebo. Corresponding rates at one year were 15 vs. 5 percent. Schneider and colleagues (1996) found active-placebo abstinence rates of 17 vs. 9 percent and 13 vs. 8 percent at six months and one year, respectively. These differences were not significant in the Schneider trial, although active inhalers were superior to placebo at all follow-ups through three months postcessation. Hjalmarson and colleagues (1997) found continuous abstinence rates of 35 percent and 28 percent for active inhaler users at 6 and 12 months, compared with 19 percent and 18 percent, respectively, among placebo users. Active-placebo comparisons were statistically significant at all follow-ups in this trial. The most recent edition of a regularly updated meta-analysis of nicotine replacement products (Silagy et al. 1999) found an inhaler-to-control pooled OR of 2.08, and another recent meta-analysis of four studies (Fiore et al. 2000) reported a pooled OR of 2.5 (Table 4.3).

Taken together, the results suggest that the nicotine inhaler is an effective aid to smoking cessation. However, the findings of Schneider and colleagues (1996) suggest that the inhaler may be most useful for producing initial abstinence and that additional interventions may be needed to prevent relapse among users of the inhaler.

#### **Effects on Discomfort of Nicotine Withdrawal**

Limited information is available regarding the effects of the nicotine inhaler on nicotine withdrawal symptoms. Two studies (Schneider et al. 1996; Hjalmarson et al. 1997) showed that active inhaler use was associated with decreased craving during the first several days of the quit attempt but not thereafter. Hjalmarson and colleagues (1997) assessed a wide array of withdrawal symptoms across the cessation attempt, but did not find any effects of active inhalers on these other than the fleeting effects on craving. However, this may have been influenced by a floor effect, as mean withdrawal scores were very low in both groups across all assessments.

### *Side Effects and Likelihood of Inappropriate Use*

The most common side effects associated with inhaler use are throat irritation and coughing. These are reported by between 20 to 50 percent of active inhaler users and are less common among placebo inhaler users (Tønnesen et al. 1993; Schneider et al. 1996; Hjalmarsen et al. 1997). Other less common side effects include nausea, bad taste in the mouth, dizziness, gastrointestinal disturbances, and oral burning or smarting. Few (0–9 percent) active inhaler users have withdrawn from clinical trials or stopped using the inhaler because of side effects. The potential for inappropriate use appears to be fairly low, with between 2 to 16 percent of active inhaler users continuing to use the device at six months postcessation in clinical trials allowing unrestricted inhaler use (Tønnesen et al. 1993; Schneider et al. 1996; Hjalmarsen et al. 1997).

### *Effect on Postcessation Change in Body Weight*

Two placebo-controlled inhaler trials have examined postcessation weight gain (Tønnesen et al. 1993; Hjalmarsen et al. 1997). Neither study found evidence that active inhaler use prevented or reduced weight gain among successful quitters.

### *Relevant Process Measures*

The nicotine inhaler is thought to act by relieving withdrawal symptoms (Glover 1993a; Leischow 1994), but little published evidence to date supports this contention. It is often suggested that the inhaler may be effective because it more closely resembles smoking than other pharmacotherapies do, replacing some of the orosensory and behavioral aspects of smoking (Glover 1993a; Tønnesen et al. 1993; Leischow 1994; Schneider et al. 1996; Hjalmarsen et al. 1997).

Schneider and colleagues (1996) asked participants to rate their assigned inhalers relative to their usual brand of cigarettes in terms of sensory effects, preference, and satisfaction. Results showed that participants given the active inhaler rated their devices more highly than did participants given placebo. However, the absolute magnitude of the ratings revealed that the inhalers did not compare very favorably to cigarettes in either group. The mechanism of action of the nicotine inhaler would seem to require further scrutiny.

### **Bupropion**

Bupropion is an atypical antidepressant that is believed to work by blocking neurotransmitter reuptake in noradrenergic and dopaminergic sites in

the central nervous system (Ascher et al. 1995). Anecdotal reports of spontaneous smoking cessation in patients prescribed bupropion for depression, coupled with a growing appreciation of the importance of negative affect and clinical depression in smoking maintenance (Hall et al. 1994; Piasecki et al. 1997) have recently stimulated clinical investigations of a sustained-release bupropion preparation as an aid to smoking cessation. These investigations led to the approval of a smoking cessation indication for bupropion by the FDA in 1997. The typical dosing regimen for smoking cessation consists of 150 mg sustained-release bupropion per day for three days, followed by 150 mg twice a day thereafter. Therapy is initiated one to two weeks before the target quit date and is generally continued for three months.

### *Efficacy*

Two large-scale clinical trials of bupropion's efficacy as a smoking cessation aid have been published to date. Hurt and colleagues (1997) compared three doses of bupropion (100 mg, 150 mg, and 300 mg) with placebo. Abstinence rates in the 150-mg and 300-mg groups were significantly higher than those of the placebo group at 12 months. All active treatment groups were found to have higher abstinence rates than the placebo group at earlier end points. Jorenby and colleagues (1999) studied active and placebo patches and active and placebo bupropion in a 2 x 2 factorial design. Abstinence rates after one year showed no difference between patch-only and placebo groups (16 percent and 15 percent, respectively). Both placebo and patch treatments were associated with higher abstinence rates when given with bupropion. Thirty percent of the bupropion-only group (150 mg twice a day) were abstinent at 12 months, whereas 36 percent of participants given active patches and bupropion were counted as abstinent.

A recent meta-analysis (Fiore et al. 2000) of two studies reported a pooled OR of 2.1 and an estimated abstinence rate of 30.5 percent (Table 4.3). Thus, the available evidence suggests that bupropion is an effective aid to smoking cessation, and that it may improve quit rates over those observed with conventional nicotine replacement therapies, although further studies will be needed to demonstrate such efficacy.

### *Effect on Discomfort of Nicotine Withdrawal*

The evidence concerning bupropion's ability to suppress withdrawal symptoms is somewhat mixed. Hurt and colleagues (1997) found that their groups using 150 mg and 300 mg reported withdrawal

symptoms that were equivalent to those reported by placebo participants. Individuals assigned to the 100-mg group, however, reported withdrawal that was significantly worse than that among either the placebo group or the other bupropion groups. The authors suggested that this effect may have arisen because the 100-mg dose produced side effects similar to withdrawal symptoms but was not strong enough to reduce true withdrawal symptoms. Jorenby and colleagues (1999) found that all three groups receiving active treatments compared with the placebo group reported reduced withdrawal. The group given both active patches and active bupropion reported the most consistent withdrawal relief. Further research is needed to characterize the reliability and magnitude of bupropion effects on withdrawal symptoms.

### *Relevant Process Measures*

Although nicotine replacement therapies are strongly predicated on the assumption that nicotine will relieve withdrawal symptoms, withdrawal relief represents only one of several rationales for using bupropion as a smoking cessation aid. One hypothesis is that bupropion may selectively reduce depressive symptoms after cessation. However, both trials mentioned previously excluded individuals with current major depression. Both clinical trials (Hurt et al. 1997; Jorenby et al. 1999) also included multiple assessments of postcessation depressive symptomatology, and neither found any differences among treatment groups on these measures. These findings suggest that bupropion does not work through its antidepressant effects per se in relatively healthy clinical trial participants.

Bupropion moderates dopaminergic activity in the central nervous system, and dopaminergic circuits are known to play a role in drug reinforcement (Nutt 1997). This raises the possibility that bupropion may exert its effects by replacing positive reinforcement associated with smoking (Hurt et al. 1997). To date, there is no evidence directly bearing on this hypothesis, and it is clear that this process is not easily studied in clinical trials. Laboratory-based pharmacokinetic and neuroimaging studies should be performed to explore this hypothesis.

### *Effects of Postcessation Change in Body Weight*

Hurt and colleagues (1997) found evidence for a dose-response effect among continuous abstainers, suggesting that participants given the highest doses gained less weight after quitting. Moreover, the disparities between treatment groups in terms of weight

gain increased across time while medication was dispensed. At six-month follow-up, 17 weeks after participants went off the assigned medication, no differences in weight gain were observed. These comparisons were limited to a small subsample of continuous abstainers. In the Jorenby and colleagues (1999) trial, members of all active treatment groups tended to gain less weight than did placebo participants over the first seven weeks of cessation. Weight gain suppression was greatest for the combined patch-bupropion group. However, none of the groups differed in weight gain after seven weeks after quitting. Together, the results of these trials suggest that bupropion treatment may delay, but not prevent, postcessation weight gain.

### *Side Effects*

In both clinical trials, two side effects were reported more commonly among participants given bupropion than among those given placebo. Dry mouth was reported by 10 to 15 percent of bupropion users, and insomnia was reported by about 30 to 40 percent of bupropion users. Bupropion may increase the risk of seizure and is thus contraindicated for individuals who are seizure prone, such as individuals with a history of alcoholism or alcohol abuse, eating disorder, seizure disorder, or using MAO inhibitors. No seizures were reported in either clinical trial, but participants with risk factors for seizure were excluded from each before enrollment.

### *Clonidine*

Clonidine is a centrally acting  $\alpha_2$ -adrenergic agonist that dampens sympathetic nervous system activity. Clonidine is most commonly used in the management of hypertension; it has not been approved by the FDA as an aid to smoking cessation. Clonidine is available for prescription in oral and transdermal forms; both of these preparations have been investigated in smoking cessation trials. Smokers using clonidine as an aid to smoking cessation are generally started on the drug several days before quitting and are maintained on a fixed daily dose for several weeks.

### *Efficacy*

Covey and Glassman (1991) conducted a meta-analysis of nine early trials of clonidine for smoking cessation. They found that persons given clonidine were more successful at quitting than those given a placebo (OR = 2.36). Five of the nine trials assessed outcome after the therapy was discontinued; only one

(Glassman et al. 1988) showed a significant overall advantage for clonidine. Clonidine trials using adjunctive behavioral therapy were associated with greater relative success (OR = 4.2) than were trials in which treatment essentially consisted of dispensing the drug (OR = 1.7). Trials using transdermal clonidine produced somewhat greater relative success (OR = 3.2) than did trials using oral clonidine (OR = 2.2). The two trials that analyzed efficacy according to sex found clonidine to be much more effective, relative to placebo, among women (OR = 11.0) than among men (OR = 0.9). There is no obvious explanation for this finding.

Since the Covey and Glassman (1991) meta-analysis, several large-scale clonidine trials have appeared (Prochazka et al. 1992; Glassman et al. 1993; Hilleman et al. 1993; Niaura et al. 1996). These studies indicated a therapeutic effect for clonidine, with some evidence suggesting that clonidine was more effective among women (Glassman et al. 1993; Hilleman et al. 1993) and among those most dependent on nicotine (Glassman et al. 1993).

A recent meta-analysis (Fiore et al. 2000) of five clinical trials reported a pooled OR for long-term effectiveness of 2.1 (25.6 percent abstinence rate) (Table 4.3). In these studies, the clonidine dose ranged from 0.1 mg to 0.75 mg per day and was delivered either orally or transdermally. Because of the side effects, the lack of a specific dosing regimen, the problems with abrupt discontinuation of the drug, and the lack of FDA approval, clonidine has been recommended as a second-line agent for smoking cessation (Fiore et al. 2000).

#### *Effect on Discomfort of Nicotine Withdrawal*

An early report (Glassman et al. 1984) that clonidine could reduce tobacco withdrawal symptoms, especially craving, spurred the initial investigations of clonidine's usefulness in smoking cessation. Since that report, evidence for this effect has been mixed. Clonidine- and placebo-treated patients have had equivalent levels of withdrawal severity (Wei and Young 1988; Franks et al. 1989; Gourlay et al. 1994). Studies have fairly consistently found that clonidine diminishes the specific symptom of craving (Glassman et al. 1984; Ornish et al. 1988; Prochazka et al. 1992; Gourlay et al. 1994), and some studies have found some effects on withdrawal symptoms, such as anxiety and irritability (Ornish et al. 1988; Prochazka et al. 1992).

#### *Side Effects*

Unpleasant side effects are commonly associated with clonidine use (Gourlay et al. 1994), and as many

as 25 percent of patients may discontinue clonidine therapy because of them (Covey and Glassman 1991). The most frequently observed symptoms are dry mouth, fatigue, and dizziness. Local skin irritation is common with transdermal clonidine therapy. The incidence of side effects appears to be dose dependent (Gourlay et al. 1994). Care must also be taken to discontinue clonidine gradually to prevent rebound hypertension. No published clinical trials have assessed the effect of clonidine on postcessation weight gain.

#### *Relevant Process Measures*

Clonidine is presumed to exert its effects by ameliorating withdrawal discomfort (Glassman et al. 1984; Franks et al. 1989). Although a few studies have found that clonidine reduces withdrawal discomfort, findings from a well-designed, large-scale multicenter trial (Prochazka et al. 1992) have suggested that this effect does not necessarily lead to greater abstinence.

#### *Nortriptyline*

Nortriptyline is a tricyclic antidepressant that blocks reuptake of norepinephrine and serotonin. As with clonidine, smoking cessation is not an FDA-approved indication for nortriptyline; its primary indication is for the treatment of depressive symptoms. It is a prescription medication and is available in generic form. In smoking cessation studies conducted to date, treatment was initiated 2–4 weeks before the target quit date with gradual titration of dose.

#### *Efficacy*

Two studies have assessed the efficacy of nortriptyline for smoking cessation. Hall and colleagues (1998) conducted a 2 (nortriptyline vs. placebo) × 2 (history vs. no history of major depression) × 2 (cognitive behavioral vs. health education therapy) trial that produced a 24-percent sustained abstinence rate in nortriptyline users compared with 12 percent in the placebo group. There was no difference in cessation rates as a function of previous history of major depression. In a straight comparison of nortriptyline to placebo, Prochazka and colleagues (1998) found cessation rates at six months of 14 percent in participants given nortriptyline and 3 percent in participants given placebo. A meta-analysis (Fiore et al. 2000) of these two studies reported a pooled OR of 3.2 and a 30.1-percent abstinence rate (Table 4.3). Both studies provide clear evidence of nortriptyline's therapeutic effect.

### **Effect on Discomfort of Nicotine Withdrawal**

The Hall and colleagues (1998) study assessed both nicotine withdrawal symptoms and negative affect in the first eight days following the target quit date. There were no significant differences between the drug therapy groups on nicotine withdrawal severity, suggesting that as with many of the other smoking cessation pharmacotherapies, withdrawal relief may not be the primary mechanism of action. The negative affect measure, however, increased in the first three days in the placebo group and declined in the nortriptyline group. This suggests that a negative affect assessment may be more sensitive to some of nortriptyline's therapeutic effects than a conventional nicotine withdrawal symptom scale.

### **Side Effects**

Tricyclic antidepressants are known to produce a number of side effects, including sedation and various anticholinergic effects. In the smoking cessation studies, commonly reported side effects included dry mouth (64–74 percent), lightheadedness (49 percent), shaky hands (23 percent), and blurry vision (16 percent) (Hall et al. 1998; Prochazka et al. 1998).

### **Other Antidepressants and Anxiolytics**

Investigators have begun to explore the potential use of other antidepressants and anxiolytics as pharmacologic aids to smoking cessation, because population-based epidemiologic samples have found that depression and anxiety are associated with cigarette smoking (Breslau et al. 1991; Kendler et al. 1993). Research has also shown that smokers with a history of depression are more likely to experience depressive symptoms (Covey et al. 1990) and to relapse after quitting (Glassman et al. 1988; Anda et al. 1990) than are smokers without such a history. Some anxiolytics (Glassman et al. 1984; Hilleman et al. 1992) have been shown to ameliorate symptoms of tobacco withdrawal, and preliminary smoking cessation trials using antidepressants (Edwards et al. 1989) and anxiolytics (Hilleman et al. 1994) have yielded encouraging results. Among the drugs that have been studied or hypothesized to be useful for smoking cessation are bupropion hydrochloride, doxepin hydrochloride, and fluoxetine hydrochloride. Although promising, this avenue of research is not yet developed enough to permit the multipart discussion given to other pharmacologic agents in this chapter.

### **Summary of Pharmacologic Interventions**

Abundant evidence confirms that both nicotine gum and the nicotine patch are effective aids to smoking cessation. The efficacy of nicotine gum may depend on the amount of behavioral counseling with which it is paired. The 4-mg dose may be the better pharmacologic treatment for heavy smokers or for those highly dependent on nicotine. The nicotine patch appears to exert an effect independent of behavioral support, but absolute abstinence rates increase as more counseling is added to patch therapy. Nicotine nasal spray and nicotine inhalers are effective aids for smoking cessation, although their mechanisms of action are not entirely clear. All nicotine replacement therapies produce side effects, but these are rarely severe enough that patients must discontinue use. Nicotine nasal spray appears to have greater potential for inappropriate use than other nicotine replacement therapies. Nicotine replacement therapies, especially the gum and the patch, have been shown to delay but not prevent weight gain. All nicotine replacement therapies are thought to work in part by reducing withdrawal severity. The available evidence suggests that they do ameliorate some elements of withdrawal, but the relationship between withdrawal suppression and clinical outcome is inconsistent.

Bupropion is the first nonnicotine pharmacotherapy for smoking cessation to be studied in large-scale clinical trials. Results suggest that bupropion is an effective aid to smoking cessation. In addition, bupropion has been demonstrated to be safe when used jointly with nicotine replacement therapy. In the only direct comparison with a nicotine replacement product, bupropion achieved quit rates about double those achieved with the nicotine patch. Bupropion appears to delay but not prevent postcessation weight gain. The available literature contains inconsistent evidence regarding bupropion-mediated withdrawal relief. Bupropion does not appear to work by reducing postcessation depressive symptomatology, but its mechanism of action in smoking cessation remains unknown. Further research is needed to characterize bupropion's central nervous system effects, particularly to assess whether the drug partially replaces smoking-related positive reinforcement.

Evidence suggested that clonidine is capable of improving smoking cessation rates. Clonidine is hypothesized to work by alleviating withdrawal symptoms. Although clonidine may reduce craving for cigarettes after cessation, it does not consistently ameliorate other withdrawal symptoms, and its effects on weight gain are unknown. Unpleasant side effects are common with clonidine use.

Antidepressants and anxiolytics are potentially useful agents for smoking cessation. At present, only nortriptyline appears to have consistent empirical evidence of smoking cessation efficacy. However, tricyclic antidepressants produce a number of side effects, including sedation and various anticholinergic effects.

## Large-Scale Public Health Programs

The shift in recent years from a clinical to a public health perspective in smoking cessation research has led to an increased emphasis on developing and evaluating cost-effective strategies that can be widely disseminated (Lichtenstein and Glasgow 1992). This emphasis is reflected in the proliferation of research on self-help manuals (see "Self-Help Manuals," earlier in this chapter and "Community Programs," later in this chapter) and on media- and community-based interventions (Flay 1987; Gruman and Lynn 1993).

As is true for self-help strategies, media-, worksite-, and community-based programs have promise because they can potentially reach many smokers who may try to quit without formal, face-to-face assistance (Fiore et al. 1990). Moreover, some evidence suggests that less educated smokers profit from media campaigns at least as much as more highly educated smokers do (Macaskill et al. 1992). (Other large-scale interventions—educational [Chapter 3] and social [Chapter 7]—are discussed separately.)

Investigators have evaluated an array of such programs, but methodological variations across the individual trials have hampered comparisons among studies (Flay 1987; Schwartz 1992). Moreover, methodological challenges compromise how research on these programs may be interpreted. For instance, ongoing coverage of smoking and its health consequences in the general media may alter the effect of research-based media information. Similarly, secular trends and events that could individually affect large populations of smokers (e.g., the introduction of a new nicotine replacement product) may alter the impact—and complicate the assessment—of media campaigns conducted around the time of such events. Such challenges may account for the inconsistencies seen in this area of research.

## Media-Based Programs

Media used to transmit smoking cessation messages have included television (Brannon et al. 1989; Korhonen et al. 1992; Mudde and De Vries 1999), radio (Farquhar et al. 1990; COMMIT Research Group 1991), the telephone (Ossip-Klein et al. 1991; Pierce et

al. 1992), newspapers (Cummings et al. 1987), and the mail (Gritz et al. 1992; McFall et al. 1993).

The intensity of media-based programs has varied greatly, and these variations may be related to program success. For example, one study (Gritz et al. 1992) evaluated a minimal mail-based intervention. The investigators mailed self-help smoking materials to a sample of nonvolunteer women who smoked and who belonged to a health maintenance organization. The intervention had no impact; at no point during the 18-month follow-up period were women who had received the materials more likely to quit smoking or report changes in their motivation to quit than women who had not. In contrast, a more intense media campaign evaluated in another study (Orleans et al. 1991) yielded encouraging findings, albeit among treatment volunteers. The investigators tested the impact of adding telephone calls from a smoking cessation counselor to an intervention that mailed self-help manuals to the volunteers. After 16 months, abstinence from smoking was reported by 23.0 percent of the volunteers who had received adjuvant telephone counseling and by 15.2 percent of those receiving the self-help materials alone.

Mass media campaigns of intermediate intensity, such as televised programs (Flay et al. 1989), generally produce modest increases in abstinence—increases that fall short of the moderate effect of telephone counseling found among volunteers (Orleans et al. 1991). The influence of intermediate-intensity interventions is difficult to determine precisely, because the results of individual trials may be affected by the peculiarities of the specific communities in which they are tested and (as previously discussed) by concurrent changes in secular attitudes toward smoking behavior. These problems are compounded by the designs of communitywide and mass media programs frequently failing to include matched control communities for comparison. Although more intensive interventions appear to increase cessation over time (Flay 1987), the absence of well-controlled experimental media trials limit any conclusions about a dose-response relationship for media-based programs.

The content of various media-based programs can be divided into three categories: (1) programs that present information about the negative health effects of smoking and exposure to secondhand smoke and attempt to motivate smokers to quit; (2) programs that promote the performance of simple cessation-related activities, such as calling a hot line, requesting self-help materials, or enrolling in a smoking cessation contest; and (3) programs that mimic intensive clinical interventions (Flay 1987). In general, informational

or motivational campaigns can be effective in changing smokers' attitudes, but the effect of such campaigns on behavior is not clear, in part because of the paucity of well-controlled trials that yield a consistent pattern of findings. Research suggests that other types of campaigns have greater potential than informational programs to influence smoking behavior, especially if the campaign has multiple components and intense exposure (Flay 1987; CDC 1996, 1999b; Pierce et al. 1998).

### Worksite Programs

For many years, advocates for tobacco control have been enthusiastic about worksite-based programs, because worksites appear to furnish an ideal setting: a contained audience, an opportunity for smoker participation, an environment in which to convey coherent and consistent messages, and an opportunity to tie individual smoking cessation to overarching institutional policy. Much of the early work in this area provided some justification for the enthusiasm (USDHHS 1986; Glasgow 1987; Fielding and Piserchia 1989), but more recent data, described later in this section (Glasgow et al. 1995; Sorensen et al. 1996), give pause.

The main components of smoking cessation efforts in the workplace are nonsmoking policies and specific assistance for cessation attempts (Gruman and Lynn 1993). The evolution of worksite smoking policies, intimately tied to concerns about the health effects of environmental tobacco smoke (ETS) (Eriksen 1986; USDHHS 1986), is described in some detail in Chapter 5. Although early assessment suggested that restrictive policies had little effect on smoking outside of work (Glasgow 1987; Rigotti 1989; Tager 1989), most recent studies have demonstrated either reductions in daily consumption of cigarettes (Stillman et al. 1990; Borland et al. 1991; Jeffery et al. 1994) or increases in smoking cessation (Stave and Jackson 1991; Patten et al. 1995; Longo et al. 1996). As described in Chapter 5 (see "Clean Indoor Air Regulation"), there is persistent movement toward increasing restrictions in public workplaces.

The strategies for smoking cessation within workplaces are largely those discussed earlier in this chapter: self-help, physician's advice, and formal treatment (Gruman and Lynn 1993). As of 1989, about one-half of worksites that sponsored cessation activities offered self-help materials (Fielding and Piserchia 1989). Although initial dropout rates were high, 20–26 percent of participants had quit smoking by 6–12 months after the worksite programs had begun (Orleans and Shipley 1982; Glasgow 1987). Such proportions compare favorably with those observed in general populations. Physician's advice to quit

smoking was a component of only about 15 percent of the company programs, but in a number of studies, this modality seemed to exert an effect similar to that observed in general populations: 15–30 percent of participants had quit smoking at the one-year follow-up (Gruman and Lynn 1993). The programs offering formal treatment appeared to produce results at the worksite that were similar to those found for such programs outside the workplace.

A special feature of worksite cessation programs is the opportunity to provide incentives, such as competitions. Several studies have documented some efficacy in this approach. For example, in one study, 33 percent of participating workers and 25 percent of all workers remained abstinent at work (Glasgow 1987). In a second study, the use of a competition was associated with significantly greater success at quitting than was reported for persons not participating in the competition (Klesges et al. 1988). In a review of incentive programs, from 15 to 60 percent of participants quit smoking; the average was around 40 percent (Gruman and Lynn 1993). Some disadvantages of incentives are that (1) determining the award may be difficult, (2) employees may falsely claim cessation, and (3) non-smokers may feel slighted (Fiore et al. 1996). On a population basis, incentives have not been found to be effective. In these settings, incentives may be most attractive to smokers who were going to attempt quitting in any case (Chapman et al. 1993).

In contrast, a trial of the Take Heart program, which involved 26 heterogeneous worksites, a low-cost intervention, random assignment, and use of worker and management steering committees, failed to produce short-term improvements in smoking cessation that exceeded the secular trend (Glasgow et al. 1995). These results were particularly disheartening in view of the methodological strengths of the study and the diversity of the workplace settings. The authors offer a number of potential reasons for the lack of impact: the cessation activities may have been inappropriate; the behaviors may have been more resistant to change than previously assumed; workers may have had insufficient "ownership" of the project; secular trends may have been so strong that they canceled out a modest effect; the variability among worksites may have been too great; and, in general, worksite programs may not work.

Similar negative findings were observed by Sorensen and colleagues (1996) in an even larger trial of 111 worksites randomized to sites receiving or not receiving the cessation program. The Working Well Trial involved more than 28,000 workers in 16 states and compared seven-day abstinence, six-month



abstinence, and changes in smoking prevalence for both types of worksites. Changes occurred in the direction hypothesized, but they were small and non-significant; for example, the six-month abstinence rate was only 1.5 percent higher in the program group. Similarly, the program sites showed a nonsignificant trend toward greater adoption of smoking bans. The authors observed that the overall cessation proportions at both types of sites compared favorably with those in other worksite programs. The lack of difference may have resulted from the higher than expected cessation at control sites, which is a phenomenon reflecting a general increase in antismoking awareness.

These studies postdate recent reviews of worksite cessation efforts. Several early reviews expressed optimism about the value of worksite programs but did not provide a quantitative assessment (Hallett 1986; Bibeau et al. 1988). In a detailed meta-analysis of 20 worksite programs involving 34 comparisons, Fisher and colleagues (1990) found that the mean weighted effect size was significantly positive and that an average of 13 percent of participants had quit smoking after treatment. Although modest, these effects provide some quantitative basis for the enthusiasm for worksite programs. The addition of the two recent large projects (Glasgow et al. 1995; Sorensen et al. 1996) may well alter the meta-analytic balance.

Although the worksite setting has aforementioned features favorable to large-scale programs (including the importance of adding to a generalized reduction in exposure to ETS), the strategy cannot be recommended without qualification. Nonetheless, the role of such activities, perhaps enlightened by further targeted research, may be important in multicomponent efforts at smoking cessation.

### Community Programs

Results from a number of long-term trials of communitywide programs have recently appeared. (See Chapter 7 for a more detailed discussion of these projects in the context of approaches used in the 1990s.) These trials typically incorporate mass media strategies into larger health education programs. Some, such as the Stanford Five-City Project (Farquhar et al. 1990), the Minnesota Heart Health Program (Perry et al. 1992; Luepker et al. 1994), and the Pawtucket Heart Health Program (Elder et al. 1986; Carleton et al. 1995), have been aimed at modifying smoking, as well as other risk factors for cardiovascular disease. Final reports suggest that these trials have met with little success in promoting smoking cessation.

The Stanford Five-City Project (Farquhar et al. 1990; Fortmann et al. 1993) tested an intensive multimedia approach, including television, radio, newspaper, and mass-distributed printed materials. All materials contained information about modifiable risk factors for cardiovascular disease. The average resident of a community receiving the program was exposed to more than 500 educational episodes over the course of the five-year program. By the end of this period, smoking prevalence—the only risk factor on which an impact could be demonstrated—had declined 13 percent more in the program communities than in the control ones. The Minnesota Heart Health Program failed to demonstrate an appreciable impact (Lando et al. 1995). The Pawtucket Heart Health Program had little impact on smoking behavior; its first attempt at a smoking cessation program prompted only 11 smokers to quit (Elder et al. 1986, 1987). The final results confirmed the lack of impact (Carleton et al. 1995).

One ambitious community project—COMMIT (Community Intervention Trial for Smoking Cessation)—focused on smoking cessation and on policy strategies to reduce prevalence (COMMIT Research Group 1991; Gruman and Lynn 1993). In 1986, the NCI began COMMIT, the largest randomized smoking intervention trial in the world. The design of COMMIT included 11 pairs of matched communities—10 from across the United States and 1 in Canada. One community from each pair was randomly selected to be the site in which volunteers and local agencies carried out COMMIT's 58 mandated program activities. Designed to augment existing community-based efforts to reduce smoking, these activities occurred between 1988 and 1992.

The primary end point for COMMIT was smoking cessation among heavy smokers. Main goals included increasing the priority of smoking as a public health issue, increasing the community's ability to influence smoking behavior, strengthening the community's existing economic and policy factors designed to discourage smoking, and fortifying social norms and values that stressed nonsmoking (Gruman and Lynn 1993). Main strategies included training health care providers to routinely assess and manage nicotine dependence, working with community institutions and private organizations to create smoke-free environments, increasing the availability and visibility of smoking cessation services, and using the mass media and schools to educate communities about the dangers of tobacco use.

Results of COMMIT indicate that even intensive community-based programs may not have a demonstrable impact on smoking behavior (COMMIT

Research Group 1995a,b). Declines in smoking prevalence were no greater in program communities than in control communities (COMMIT Research Group 1995b). Although the overall populations in the program communities became more aware of available resources for smoking cessation, the prevalence of smoking cessation among persons who smoked more than 25 cigarettes per day did not differ between program (18.0 percent) and control communities (18.7 percent). Persons who smoked fewer than 25 cigarettes per day were significantly more likely to quit in program communities than in control communities (30.6 vs. 27.5 percent), and that result was attributable to success among light smokers with less than a college education (COMMIT Research Group 1995a).

### Statewide Programs

Recent statewide initiatives have integrated tobacco policy and smoking cessation programs. Although Minnesota was the first state to implement a statewide initiative to reduce tobacco use, California has provided what is perhaps the most ambitious example. Massachusetts has also conducted a similar statewide effort based on a tax increase and incorporating a mass media campaign, policy initiatives, and smoking cessation services. These initiatives and others are discussed in detail in Chapter 7.

The state findings are promising. If this success is replicated by other states that adopt a dedicated increase in cigarette excise taxes, or that are able to use resources from settlements with the tobacco industry,

statewide and nationwide initiatives may play an important role in achieving the public health goal of reducing smoking prevalence among U.S. adults to less than 12 percent by the year 2010 (USDHHS 2000).

### Summary of Large-Scale Public Health Programs

Community- and media-based programs have the potential to reach large numbers of smokers who are reluctant to seek formal treatment. Such programs could greatly influence smoking prevalence in the United States. The results from major randomized trials and community-based efforts are thus especially disappointing. Though these projects have set new standards for such research and have produced numerous ancillary results of interest, the overall conclusions suggest that even large-scale, well-funded programs may have difficulty promoting changes in smoking behavior. Similarly, the results to date from numerous worksite cessation projects suggest either no impact or a small net effect. On the other hand, results of the California and Massachusetts initiatives (see Chapter 7) suggest that tobacco taxes may be an effective means of funding efforts to reduce tobacco use. The states that have devoted money obtained from Medicaid settlements with the tobacco industry have also had considerable success in implementing a comprehensive approach (Chapter 7). Their results suggest that the disappointing outcomes from research programs may be related to the reach and penetration of these programs and the isolated context in which they were conducted.

## Contemporary Issues in Research on Tobacco Addiction

---

### Epidemiologic Concerns and Clinical Issues

Because smoking cessation research has focused more on improving standard paradigms than on innovative approaches (Shiffman 1993b), much of the current energy is directed to pursuing well-trod paths. But current directions have an internal logic, because no new paradigms loom large. Established approaches are perhaps unfairly criticized for lacking innovation. As the foregoing discussion demonstrated, valid methods for treating nicotine addiction are available, but

they must be better understood and can be improved. Despite considerable research on smoking cessation during the past 40 years, the essential elements or combination of elements necessary for successful programs are difficult to extract. In a number of key areas, however, careful research can sharpen interpretation of existing results and provide direction for future investigation and perhaps even innovation.

## Nicotine Dependence

Dependence, a central construct in research on drug abuse, has been defined as “self-administration of a psychoactive drug in a manner that demonstrates that the drug controls or strongly influences behavior” (USDHHS 1988, p. 248). Evidence strongly suggests that most smokers are dependent on nicotine (USDHHS 1988). However, most researchers agree that individual smokers differ in the degree to which they are dependent (Fagerström 1978; McMorrow and Foxx 1983; Pomerleau et al. 1983; Shiffman 1989; Killen et al. 1992; Niaura et al. 1994). Some occasional smokers may not meet the criteria for physical dependence (Shiffman et al. 1991). These differences in degree of nicotine dependence have important implications for treatment and research.

Flaws in the assessment of nicotine dependence have impeded progress toward understanding its role in smoking cessation. For example, nicotine dependence consists of both physical and behavioral components (USDHHS 1988). However, most smoking cessation researchers have used the term to refer to physical dependence exclusively. Although items in two widely used nicotine-dependence assessment instruments (the Fagerström Tolerance Questionnaire and its successor, the Fagerström Test for Nicotine Dependence) assess the extent to which nicotine controls behavior, the instruments are intended to measure physical dependence (Fagerström 1983; Fagerström and Schneider 1989; Heatherton et al. 1991). Other investigators have measured dependence by how much nicotine smokers typically self-administer (Hurt et al. 1994) or by the severity of withdrawal symptoms (Brigham et al. 1990–91); these two measures are typically not highly correlated with each other, and neither is highly correlated with the Fagerström questionnaires (Kenford et al. 1994). Furthermore, the scales themselves, especially the Fagerström Tolerance Questionnaire, suffer from psychometric limitations (Lichtenstein and Mermelstein 1986; Pomerleau et al. 1989; Tate and Schmitz 1993). In sum, tobacco research is hampered by an inadequate conceptualization of nicotine dependence and an inadequate assessment of the nicotine dependence construct.

Because widely used dependence instruments such as the Fagerström questionnaire are thought to measure physical dependence, it has been hypothesized that they can help identify patients who would benefit from nicotine replacement therapies (Fagerström and Schneider 1989) or from higher doses of these therapies. The evidence for this assertion is mixed, with support somewhat more consistent for the nicotine

gum than for the nicotine patch (Abelin et al. 1989; Fagerström and Schneider 1989; Transdermal Nicotine Study Group 1991; Killen et al. 1992; Kenford et al. 1994; Niaura et al. 1994; Tang et al. 1994). To the extent that current measures capture variation in dependence, they would be expected to predict outcome in trials not using nicotine replacement and in groups of subjects treated with placebo nicotine replacement. Although this hypothesized correlation between dependence measures and outcome has been found in several studies (Fagerström and Schneider 1989), the correlations have tended to be weak (Gritz et al. 1991; Kozlowski et al. 1994) and have usually been significant only at relatively short-term follow-up points (Hall and Killen 1985; Pinto et al. 1987; Gritz et al. 1991; Nørregaard et al. 1993). Specialized assessments of nicotine dependence are not recommended in current treatment guidelines, and pharmacotherapy is recommended for all tobacco users interested in quitting. The one exception is that highly dependent smokers may derive more benefit from 4-mg (as compared with 2-mg) nicotine gum (Fiore et al. 2000).

Other measures of nicotine dependence have been developed, but these have fared no better than the Fagerström questionnaire. For example, the Heaviness of Smoking Index, a derivative, offers no advantage in predicting cessation (Kozlowski et al. 1994). Older measures of smoking motives, such as the Horn-Waingrow Reasons for Smoking Scale (Horn and Waingrow 1966) and McKennell’s occasion for smoking scales (McKennell 1970), have good psychometric properties but questionable construct validity (Shiffman 1993a).

Continued reconceptualization of nicotine dependence and improved consensus on mechanisms for measuring it are critical issues for future study. Stronger ties to generic issues of substance abuse—already begun but not discussed in detail here (see Orleans and Slade 1993)—can facilitate such research and improve recognition of behavioral mechanisms that are common to the use of all addictive substances.

## Stages of Change

Smokers differ in their motivation to quit smoking, and these differences are thought to affect treatment prognosis. The transtheoretical model, advanced by Prochaska and DiClemente (1983), provides a theoretical structure for assessing these differences and has greatly influenced smoking cessation research in recent years. Briefly, the model proposes that smokers go through a series of stages (not necessarily linearly) on the way to achieving prolonged abstinence from smoking: not thinking seriously about quitting in the

next six months, thinking seriously about quitting in the next six months, planning to quit in the next month, actually trying to quit, and trying to remain abstinent. If relapse occurs, smokers return to an earlier stage in the model. It is hypothesized that smokers in the initial stages are less ready to quit and thus less likely to profit from traditional treatments (see Orleans 1993 for a more detailed discussion).

Some evidence supports the notion that smokers in earlier stages of change fare worse in smoking cessation than do smokers in later stages (DiClemente et al. 1991; Kristeller et al. 1992; Ockene et al. 1992; Rohren et al. 1994). The finding of interactions between treatment assignment and stage membership (Prochaska et al. 1993) has led to the recommendation that clinical protocols for smoking cessation be based on stage assessments (Abrams 1993; Orleans 1993; Velicer et al. 1993; Hughes 1994).

Evidence is not available, however, that linking motivational stage to a stage-appropriate strategy leads to better outcomes than do nontailored interventions of equal intensity (see Prochaska et al. 1993; Fiore et al. 2000), perhaps because motivation to change is more a continuum than a set of discrete states (Lichtenstein et al. 1994). Nonetheless, the stages-of-change model has considerable theoretical and empirical appeal as a typology that is easy to use in day-to-day decision making (Wiggins 1988). Further refinement and clarification of this model, coupled with continued assessment of its relationship to smokers' probability of quitting, is a potentially fruitful research area.

### Negative Affect

A negative affective reaction to quitting tobacco use (Baker et al. 1987; Brandon 1994; Hall et al. 1994) may be an important predictor of relapse (Shiffman 1982; Brandon et al. 1990; Piasecki et al. 1997). As mentioned previously, depressed persons are less likely to quit smoking successfully than persons without a history of depression (Glassman et al. 1988; Anda et al. 1990), and depressed persons suffer an increase in symptoms after quitting (Covey et al. 1990; Hall et al. 1991). These related findings have special importance because the frequency of clinical depression among smokers may exceed that among nonsmokers (Frederick et al. 1988; Hall et al. 1991; Brandon 1994).

The role of adverse psychological states—even mild conditions—in prolonging smoking and impeding cessation is an important avenue for further investigation. For example, depressed or otherwise affectively disturbed persons may require special

interventions to succeed in smoking cessation; at least two studies have identified behavioral treatments that have boosted success rates among such persons (Zelman et al. 1992; Hall et al. 1994). As noted, antidepressants and anxiolytics have been proposed as smoking cessation aids and are undergoing clinical trials because of their ability to ameliorate negative affects.

### Sex-Specific Differences

Some studies (Pomerleau et al. 1991; Kenford et al. 1993; Swan et al. 1993), but not all (Derby et al. 1994; Whitlock et al. 1997; Gritz et al. 1998), have suggested that women find it more difficult than men to quit smoking. The quit ratio (the proportion of persons who have quit smoking out of those who ever smoked) has increased at the same rate or at a faster rate among women than men in recent years (Fiore et al. 1989; Giovino et al. 1994; Husten et al. 1996). An extensive review of difference in nicotine effects between men and women (Perkins et al. 1999) cites complex differences in psychological and biologic aspects in the maintenance of nicotine self-administration. Women may differ from men in the response to withdrawal, possibly mediated by menstrual cycle phase (Perkins et al. 2000), as well as a variety of nonnicotine effects (Perkins et al. 1999). For example, although the same treatments benefit both women and men, some treatments (e.g., nicotine replacement therapies) may be less efficacious in women (Perkins 1996; Wetter et al. 1999; Fiore et al. 2000). Other reviews of this phenomenon (Fant et al. 1996; Christen and Christen 1998) confirm the need for further exploration of such differences.

A further difference between men and women may be related to genetic factors, particularly differences by sex in the metabolism of nicotine (Messina et al. 1997; Tyndale et al. 1999). These studies have focused on differences in the roles of enzymes involved in the metabolism of nicotine to cotinine (enzymes CYP2A6 and CYP2D6). The considerable variability in nicotine metabolism appears to be due to variable expression of CYP2A6 (Messina et al. 1997) and may play a role, as yet undefined, in gender response to therapeutic modalities. Other researchers, using studies of twins, have postulated that genetic factors may play a role in predicting which cigarette smokers progress to long-term addiction, an effect that may be stronger for men than for women (Heath et al. 1998).

### Withdrawal Symptoms

The vast majority of smokers become physically dependent on nicotine, and these persons commonly

display several withdrawal symptoms when deprived of the substance (Shiffman and Jarvik 1976; USDHHS 1988; Hughes et al. 1991b). Conventional wisdom holds that two persons who have different degrees of nicotine dependence will have different degrees of withdrawal severity when they quit smoking (Fagerström 1978; Gritz et al. 1991; Hughes 1993). Withdrawal symptoms are presumed to give a conflicting (and often canceling) motivation to people who have otherwise been motivated to quit (West 1984; Hughes et al. 1991b). The severity of the withdrawal is thus expected to be a strong predictor of eventual relapse (Gritz et al. 1991; West 1992; Hughes 1993). Some research suggests that the various discomforts of abstinence are valid indicators of eventual relapse (Baker et al. 1987; Anda et al. 1990; Hughes 1992; Zelman et al. 1992). Despite the intuitive appeal of this proposed association, other studies have found an inconsistent relationship between withdrawal severity and relapse (Hughes et al. 1984; Hughes and Hatsukami 1986; Stitzer and Gross 1988; West et al. 1989; Transdermal Nicotine Study Group 1991; Prochazka et al. 1992; West 1992; Hughes 1993). Interpretation of this literature remains complicated because researchers use different instruments to assess withdrawal, sometimes reporting total withdrawal discomfort and other times reporting results on a symptom-by-symptom basis, and because they assess symptomatology at different time points. Improved assessment of withdrawal and consensual definitions, coupled with epidemiologic assessment, may better clarify the critical connection between the withdrawal syndrome and the likelihood of relapse. Recent studies demonstrate that there is considerable between-subject variability in the time course of smoking withdrawal and suggest that more consistent links between withdrawal and relapse may be found if this variability is systematically assessed (Piasecki et al. 1998).

### Weight Gain

As noted earlier in the discussion of specific modalities, weight gain is a common concomitant of smoking cessation (Klesges et al. 1989). The average smoker gains 5–10 pounds after cessation, and a small percentage of smokers gain more than 25 pounds (Klesges et al. 1989; Williamson et al. 1991). The concern that smokers express about gaining weight may be great enough to prevent them from attempting to quit (Klesges et al. 1988; Gritz et al. 1989; French et al. 1992). Similarly, persons who quit smoking and who do subsequently gain weight may be more likely to relapse (Wack and Rodin 1982; Hall et al. 1986). Two

prospective studies, however, found that concern about weight did not predict cessation success (French et al. 1995; Jeffery et al. 1997). Innovative strategies have failed to reduce weight gain or to improve abstinence rates among persons concerned about gaining weight (Hall et al. 1992; Pirie et al. 1992). Because weight change is a complex metabolic phenomenon (about which there is a considerable epidemiologic and biologic literature, not reviewed here) that is subject to the interplay of behavioral and pharmacologic influences, further research on the behavior and physiological mechanisms that produce postcessation weight gain may suggest new strategies for dealing with this problem and may provide insights into mechanisms of addiction.

### Early Relapse

Three recent reports from four trials of the nicotine patch have found that any smoking during the first two weeks of using either the nicotine or the placebo patch is a strong predictor of relapse at long-term follow-up (Hurt et al. 1994; Kenford et al. 1994; Stapleton et al. 1995). For example, Kenford and colleagues (1994) analyzed data from two patch trials. In both trials, large proportions (97.1 and 83.3 percent) of patients treated with the nicotine patch who smoked during the second week of treatment had relapsed by the six-month follow-up. Early relapse may predict longer-term failure—regardless of the cessation strategy, if any—because physiological and behavioral forces may present their most significant challenges to smokers during the first two weeks they try to quit. Strategies that could shepherd smokers through the first two weeks without a single cigarette might be expected to improve treatment outcome. According to another view, most lapses during the first two weeks of treatment merely identify those smokers who will find it difficult to quit no matter what the intervention. Even if given adjunctive interventions to help them pass this two-week period without smoking, these smokers would be expected to relapse soon after these adjuncts were withdrawn. Research on treatments for persons who are strongly addicted and likely to relapse early (should they attempt cessation at all) is a great challenge for cessation research.

### Dose-Response

More intense interventions yield better outcomes (Kottke et al. 1988; Lichtenstein and Glasgow 1992; Fiore et al. 1994c, 2000). Although this general relationship has not been precisely explained, outcomes

may be influenced by a host of structural factors, including session length, session frequency, total number of sessions, and number and types of treatment modalities (e.g., telephone contacts and individual vs. group formats).

More specific issues must be clarified, such as determining what level of adjuvant behavioral support is most cost-effective when used with pharmacotherapy. However, a central question surrounding the use of intensive interventions is whether a greater proportion of smokers can be motivated to enroll in such treatment. Debate over whether program refinements can improve outcomes may be moot, from a public health perspective, if most smokers continue to shy away from—or cannot afford to spend the time or money needed for—intensive interventions (Fiore et al. 1990; Lichtenstein and Hollis 1992). A final area for dose-response research concerns the optimal dose for nicotine replacement. Two recent studies (Jorenby et al. 1995b; Hughes et al. 1999) have found that doubling the normal patch dose does not improve cessation outcomes. There may be some benefit, however, to combining different smoking cessation pharmacotherapies (Blöndal et al. 1999; Jorenby et al. 1999), including two different nicotine pharmacotherapies (Fiore et al. 2000).

### Treatment Components

Defining the individual impact of treatment components will require controlled trials that systematically manipulate individual treatment components against a background of constant treatment intensity. As Lichtenstein and Glasgow (1992) have noted, smoking cessation researchers have largely abandoned this line of research because most comparison studies (though not all; see Stevens and Hollis 1989) failed to find significant treatment effects. Nonetheless, until the combined effects of treatment components can be determined, empirical design of multicomponent treatments will be difficult.

### Individualized Treatment

Investigators have become increasingly interested in seeking interactions between treatment content and smokers' characteristics. Identifying such interactions would allow individual smokers to be given specific interventions to maximize their chances of attaining long-term abstinence. Although subject-by-treatment interactions have been obtained (Zelman

et al. 1992; Niaura et al. 1994), these relationships remain too elusive to suggest an overall strategic theory. Research that incorporates unconfounded comparisons of specific ingredients may suggest algorithms for matching patient and treatment. In view of the increasing presence of the computer in many people's lives, computer-assisted tailored treatments warrant further exploration. Some tailoring and individualization may be appropriate for older smokers whose other medical problems and pharmacologic treatment must be given special consideration (Rimer and Orleans 1993). Currently, however, there is insufficient evidence to recommend individually tailored interventions (Fiore et al. 2000).

An alternative to treatment matching is the strategy of offering smokers increasingly more intensive treatments as they continue to have trouble quitting (Abrams 1993; Orleans 1993), despite the risk that this strategy will reinforce failure. There is insufficient evidence, however, to recommend such a stepped-care approach (Fiore et al. 2000). Research must first reveal hierarchies of treatment as well as determine when patients should be given more intensive interventions.

### Dissemination and the Role of the Clinician

Because self-help and minimal clinical interventions are likely to continue to be the preferred method of cessation for most smokers, innovative strategies must be developed to improve efficacy and delivery (Cohen et al. 1989b; Orleans et al. 1991; Fiore et al. 1995). Some of the most effective of the minimal clinical interventions include the institutionalization of system changes as core components of health care (Glynn and Manley 1993; Fiore et al. 2000). For example, having a screening system in place to identify smokers triples clinician intervention (Fiore et al. 2000).

Dissemination is intimately tied to the willingness of clinicians to advise their patients about smoking. An important area for ongoing research is the investigation of strategies that foster this behavioral role not only among physicians but also among a broad range of health care providers, including dentists, nurses, pharmacists, chiropractors, psychologists, physician assistants, and pulmonary technicians. But it is unlikely that behavioral modification for clinicians would be sufficient to produce the required dissemination. Reimbursement policies, financial incentives, and underlying institutional support are all critical for the effective management of tobacco addiction through clinical interventions (Kaplan et al. 1995; Rothenberg et al. 1998).

## Cost-Effectiveness

Ultimately, the test of clinical modalities for treatment of nicotine addiction will be their survival in the current environment of cost containment and managed care. Private insurers are unlikely to embrace such treatment unless “they are convinced that there is a market for such a product and that it is viable financially” (Schauffler and Parkinson 1993, p. 189). For public insurers, demonstration of cost-effectiveness has become the de facto standard for adoption of new technology (G. Wilensky, cited in Schauffler and Parkinson 1993, reference 17), though some may insist on cost-savings, a strict standard of proof, for preventive practices.

Smoking cessation has been called the “gold standard” of cost-effective interventions (Eddy 1992). A number of studies (and several reviews [Elixhauser 1990; CDC 1992; Tsevat 1992]) have addressed issues of cost-effectiveness in behavioral counseling. Cummings and colleagues (1989c) calculated that the cost-effectiveness of brief office counseling during a routine visit ranges from \$705 to \$988 per year of life saved for men and from \$1,204 to \$2,058 for women. The use of nicotine gum increases the cost-effectiveness fourfold. Oster and colleagues (1986) performed a similar study incorporating nicotine gum with brief office counseling. The costs per year of life saved ranged from \$4,113 to \$6,465 for men and from \$6,880 to \$9,473 for women. Both studies noted that these costs compare favorably with those derived for other widely accepted preventive practices. Altman and colleagues (1987) found that self-help materials cost \$22–144 per person who quit, a cessation contest costs \$129–239, and a cessation class costs \$235–399. In the setting of acute myocardial infarction, Krumholtz and colleagues (1993) concluded that a nurse-managed smoking cessation program after myocardial infarction was cost-effective, particularly when compared with other modalities. (These studies are not necessarily reported in standardized dollars and are then only roughly comparable.)

An analysis of the cost-effectiveness of implementing the 1996 Agency for Health Care Policy and Research-sponsored Clinical Practice Guideline *Smoking Cessation* reported that cost per quality-adjusted-life-year saved ranged from \$1,108 to \$4,542. This compares very favorably with \$61,744 for annual mammography for women aged 40–49 years and \$23,335 for hypertension screening in 40-year-old men (Cromwell et al. 1997).

Because smoking during pregnancy is associated with lower birth weight, which in turn has been linked to various adverse outcomes of pregnancy, cessation of

smoking in pregnancy has been the subject of a number of economic analyses. Several of these have been performed in a managed care setting. Using patients in a study performed by the Maxicare Research and Educational Foundation, Ershoff and colleagues (1990) weighed the intervention’s programmatic costs against the smoking-related increased costs of medical care incurred by mothers who continue smoking and by their infants. The program consisted of an initial interview, smoking counseling by a health educator, and a series of self-help books mailed to participants. The nonsmoking message was reinforced at prenatal care visits. The investigators concluded that in a health maintenance organization of 100,000 members, the cost savings from the cessation program was \$13,432, the net benefit was \$9,202, and the benefit-to-cost ratio was 3.17:1.

Windsor and colleagues (1988) compared three cessation protocols for women in public health maternity clinics: standard care, standard care combined with use of a cessation manual developed by the American Lung Association, and standard care combined with the use of that manual and a pregnancy-specific manual. At the end of pregnancy, smoking cessation had been achieved by 2 percent, 6 percent, and 14 percent, respectively, of women in the three groups. The investigators calculated cost-effectiveness as the cost per patient divided by the percentage who quit. The respective values were \$104.00, \$118.83, and \$50.93. In a second study (Windsor et al. 1993), the treatment group in a multicomponent intervention involving counseling and support had a cessation rate of 14.3 percent, and the control group had a rate of 8.5 percent. Under varying assumptions, the economic analysis found that benefit-to-cost ratios ranged from 6.72:1 to 17.18:1 and that estimated savings from statewide use of the program ranged from \$247,296 to \$699,240.

Marks and colleagues (1990) estimated the benefits that would accrue from shifting low-birth-weight infants into the normal-birth-weight category, from averting deaths attributable to prematurity, and from avoiding the long-term costs associated with the care of premature infants. They concluded that the ratio of savings to costs would be as high as 6:1. If long-term costs were omitted, the ratio would still be \$3.31 for each \$1 spent. Finally, in a somewhat different approach to the problem, Shipp and colleagues (1992) tried to identify the break-even point for the cost of a smoking cessation program. Under general circumstances, the break-even cost was \$32 per pregnant woman, but this cost varied from \$10 to \$237, depending on the probability of adverse outcomes in various populations.

As Schauffler and Parkinson (1993) point out, economic analyses of smoking cessation are often based on hypothetical populations, start with different assumptions about prevalence and intervention effectiveness, and differ in their estimation of outcomes. Although initial results are encouraging, considerable work is needed to codify the results and make them appealing to insurers and employers. In a recent survey, only 8.6 percent of large corporations in California had even considered using smoking status in their risk ratings, and only 2.2 percent had implemented such a rating. About 20 percent of companies offered plans that covered smoking cessation services (Schauffler and Parkinson 1993). Perhaps observations comparing long-term hospitalized care of smokers and nonsmokers will alter this policy. A recent study estimated that helping one smoker to quit reduces anticipated medical costs associated with acute myocardial infarction and stroke by \$893 over seven years (Lightwood and Glantz 1997). Wagner and colleagues (1995) point out that smokers have consistently

increasing rates of hospitalization over five to six years of follow-up. In contrast, smokers who quit have increased hospitalization during the year in which they quit (probably associated with the medical reason—e.g., emphysema—for quitting in many cases); this rate declines thereafter. The authors note that the cost savings that accrue from reduced utilization would more than pay for effective cessation interventions within three to four years.

The alteration of terminology—from “smoking cessation” to “treatment of nicotine dependence”—acknowledges the need to make cessation activity consonant both with modern medical practice and with the current climate for health care delivery. The current body of evidence suggests that efficacious and cost-effective therapeutic modalities are available and that such consonance can be achieved. Further investigation not only of theoretical cost-effectiveness but also of actual use-effectiveness will have considerable impact on institutionalizing the treatment of nicotine addiction.

## Conclusions

---

1. Tobacco dependence is best viewed as a chronic disease with remission and relapse. Even though both minimal and intensive interventions increase smoking cessation, most people who quit smoking with the aid of such interventions will eventually relapse and may require repeated attempts before achieving long-term abstinence. Moreover, there is little understanding of how such treatments produce their therapeutic effects.
2. There is mixed evidence that self-help manuals are an efficacious aid to smoking cessation. Because these materials can be widely distributed, such strategies may have a significant public health impact and warrant further investigation.
3. Programs using advice and counseling—whether minimal or more intensive—have helped a substantial proportion of people quit smoking.
4. The success of counseling and advice increases with the intensity of the program and may be improved by increasing the frequency and duration of contact.
5. The evidence is strong and consistent that pharmacologic treatments for smoking cessation (nicotine replacement therapies and bupropion, in particular) can help people quit smoking. Clonidine and nortriptylene may have some utility as second-line treatments for smoking cessation, although they have not been approved by the FDA for this indication.



## References

---

- Abbot NC, Stead LF, White AR, Barnes J, Ernst E. Hypnotherapy for Smoking Cessation (Cochrane Review); The Cochrane Library, Issue 2, 2000; Oxford: Update Software;<<http://www.update-software.com/cochrane.htm>>; accessed June 13, 2000.
- Abelin T, Buehler A, Müller P, Vesanen K, Imhof PR. Controlled trial of transdermal nicotine patch in tobacco withdrawal. *Lancet* 1989;1(8628):7–10.
- Abrams DB. Treatment issues: towards a stepped-care model. *Tobacco Control* 1993;2(Suppl):S17–S29.
- Altman DG, Flora JA, Fortmann SP, Farquhar JW. The cost-effectiveness of three smoking cessation programs. *American Journal of Public Health* 1987;77(2):162–5.
- American Medical Association. *Drug Evaluations Annual 1994*. Chicago: American Medical Association, 1993.
- Anda RF, Williamson DF, Escobedo LG, Mast EE, Giovino GA, Remington PL. Depression and the dynamics of smoking: a national perspective. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 1990;264(12):1541–5.
- Antonuccio DO, Boutillier LR, Ward CH, Morrill GB, Graybar SR. The behavioral treatment of cigarette smoking. In: Hersen M, Eisler RM, Miller PM, editors. *Progress in Behavior Modification*. Vol. 28. Sycamore (IL): Sycamore Publishing Company, 1992:120–81.
- Areechon W, Punnotok J. Smoking cessation through the use of nicotine chewing gum: a double-blind trial in Thailand. *Clinical Therapeutics* 1988;10(2):183–6.
- Ascher JA, Cole JO, Colin J-N, Feighner JP, Ferris RM, Fibiger HC, Golden RN, Martin P, Potter WZ, Richelson E, Sulser F. Bupropion: a review of its mechanism of antidepressant activity. *Journal of Clinical Psychiatry* 1995;56(9):395–401.
- Baer JS, Lichtenstein E. Classification and prediction of smoking relapse episodes: an exploration of individual differences. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1988;56(1):104–10.
- Baker TB, Morse E, Sherman JE. The motivation to use drugs: a psychobiological analysis of urges. In: Dienstbier RA, Rivers PC, editors. *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation 1986: Alcohol and Addictive Behavior*. Vol. 34. Lincoln (NE): University of Nebraska Press, 1987: 257–324.
- Barabasz AF, Baer L, Sheehan DV, Barabasz M. A three-year follow-up of hypnosis and restricted environmental stimulation therapy for smoking. *International Journal of Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis* 1986; 34(3):169–81.
- Beaver C, Brown RA, Lichtenstein E. Effects of monitored nicotine fading and anxiety management training on smoking reduction. *Addictive Behaviors* 1981;6(4):301–5.
- Benowitz NL. Nicotine replacement therapy during pregnancy. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 1991;266(22):3174–7.
- Benowitz NL. Nicotine replacement therapy: what has been accomplished—can we do better? *Drugs* 1993; 45(2):157–70.
- Benowitz NL, Gourlay SG. Cardiovascular toxicity of nicotine: implications for nicotine replacement therapy. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology* 1997;29 (7):1422–31.
- Benowitz NL, Hall SM, Herning RI, Jacob P III, Jones RT, Osman A-L. Smokers of low-yield cigarettes do not consume less nicotine. *New England Journal of Medicine* 1983;309(3):139–42.
- Best JA, Owen LE, Trentadue L. Comparison of satiation and rapid smoking in self-managed smoking cessation. *Addictive Behaviors* 1978;3(2):71–8.
- Bibeau DL, Mullen KD, McLeroy KR, Green LW, Foshee V. Evaluations of workplace smoking cessation programs: a critique. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 1988;4(2):87–95.
- Blöndal T. Controlled trial of nicotine polacrilex gum with supportive measures. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 1989;149(8):1818–21.

- Blöndal T, Franzon M, Westin A. A double-blind randomized trial of nicotine nasal spray as an aid in smoking cessation. *European Respiratory Journal* 1997; 10(7):1585–90.
- Blöndal T, Gudmundsson LJ, Olafsdottir I, Gustavsson G, Westin A. Nicotine nasal spray with nicotine patch for smoking cessation: randomised trial with six year follow up. *British Medical Journal* 1999;318(7179):285–8.
- Borland R, Owen N, Hocking B. Changes in smoking behaviour after a total workplace smoking ban. *Australian Journal of Public Health* 1991;15(2):130–4.
- Brandon TH. Negative affect as motivation to smoke. *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 1994;3(2):33–7.
- Brandon TH, Piasecki TM, Quinn EP, Baker TB. Cue exposure treatment in nicotine dependence. In: Drummond DC, Tiffany ST, Glautier S, Remington B, editors. *Addictive Behaviour: Cue Exposure Theory and Practice*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1995:211–28.
- Brandon TH, Tiffany ST, Obremski KM, Baker TB. Postcessation cigarette use: the process of relapse. *Addictive Behaviors* 1990;15(2):105–14.
- Brannon BR, Dent CW, Flay BR, Smith G, Sussman S, Pentz MA, Johnson CA, Hansen WB. The Television, School, and Family Project. V. The impact of curriculum delivery format on program acceptance. *Preventive Medicine* 1989;18(4):492–502.
- Breslau N, Kilbey MM, Andreski P. Nicotine dependence, major depression, and anxiety in young adults. *Archives of General Psychiatry* 1991;48(12):1069–74.
- Brigham J, Henningfield JE, Stitzer ML. Smoking relapse: a review. *International Journal of the Addictions* 1990–91;25(9A and 10A):1239–55.
- Burling TA, Marotta J, González R, Moltzen JO, Eng AM, Schmidt GA, Welch RL, Ziff DC, Reilly PM. Computerized smoking cessation program for the worksite: treatment outcome and feasibility. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1989;57(5):619–22.
- Carleton RA, Lasater TM, Assaf AR, Feldman HA, McKinlay S, and the Pawtucket Heart Health Program Writing Group. The Pawtucket Heart Health Program: community changes in cardiovascular risk factors and projected disease risk. *American Journal of Public Health* 1995;85(6):777–85.
- Carmody TP. Preventing relapse in the treatment of nicotine addiction: current issues and future directions. *Journal of Psychoactive Drugs* 1992;24(2):131–58.
- Carney PA, Dietrich AJ, Freeman DH Jr., Mott LA. A standardized-patient assessment of a continuing medical education program to improve physicians' cancer-control clinical skills. *Academic Medicine* 1995;70(1):52–8.
- Centers for Disease Control. Public health focus: effectiveness of smoking-control strategies—United States. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* 1992; 41(35):645–7, 653.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Physician and other health-care professional counseling of smokers to quit—United States, 1991. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* 1993a;42(44):854–7.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Smoking cessation during previous year among adults—United States, 1990 and 1991. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* 1993b;42(26):504–6.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Cigarette smoking before and after an excise tax increase and an antismoking campaign—Massachusetts, 1990–1996. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* 1996;45(44):966–70.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Incidence of initiation of cigarette smoking—United States, 1965–1996. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* 1998; 47(39):837–40.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Cigarette smoking among adults—United States, 1997. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* 1999a;48(43):993–6.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Decline in cigarette consumption following implementation of a comprehensive tobacco prevention and education program—Oregon, 1996–1998. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* 1999b;48(7):140–3.
- Cepeda-Benito A. Meta-analytical review of the efficacy of nicotine chewing gum in smoking treatment programs. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1993;61(5):822–30.
- Chapman S. Stop-smoking clinics: a case for their abandonment. *Lancet* 1985;1(8434):918–20.

- Chapman S, Smith W, Mowbray G, Hugo C, Egger G. Quit and win smoking cessation contests: how should effectiveness be evaluated? *Preventive Medicine* 1993; 22(3):423–32.
- Christen JA, Christen AG. *The Female Smoker: From Addiction to Recovery*. Indianapolis (IN): Indiana University Nicotine Dependence Program, 1998.
- Cinciripini PM, Lapitsky L, Seay S, Wallfisch A, Kitchens K, Van Vunakis H. The effects of smoking schedules on cessation outcome: can we improve on common methods of gradual and abrupt nicotine withdrawal? *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1995;63(3):388–99.
- Clavel F, Benhamou S, Flamant R. Nicotine dependence and secondary effects of smoking cessation. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine* 1987;10(6):555–8.
- Cohen S, Lichtenstein E, Prochaska JO, Rossi JS, Gritz ER, Carr CR, Orleans CT, Schoenbach VJ, Biener L, Abrams D, DiClemente C, Curry S, Marlatt GA, Cummings KM, Emont SL, Giovino G, Ossip-Klein D. Debunking myths about self-quitting: evidence from 10 prospective studies of persons who attempt to quit smoking by themselves. *American Psychologist* 1989a; 44(11):1355–65.
- Cohen SJ, Stookey GK, Katz BP, Drook CA, Smith DM. Encouraging primary care physicians to help smokers quit: a randomized, controlled trial. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 1989b;110(8):648–52.
- COMMIT Research Group. Community Intervention Trial for Smoking Cessation (COMMIT): summary of design and intervention. *Journal of the National Cancer Institute* 1991;83(22):1620–8.
- COMMIT Research Group. Community Intervention Trial for Smoking Cessation (COMMIT): I. Cohort results from a four-year community intervention. *American Journal of Public Health* 1995a;85(2):183–92.
- COMMIT Research Group. Community Intervention Trial for Smoking Cessation (COMMIT): II. Changes in adult cigarette smoking prevalence. *American Journal of Public Health* 1995b;85(2):193–200.
- Cooper H, Hedges LV, editors. *The Handbook of Research Synthesis*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1994.
- Cooper HM, Rosenthal R. Statistical versus traditional procedures for summarizing research findings. *Psychological Bulletin* 1980;87(3):442–9.
- Corty E, McFall RM. Response prevention in the treatment of cigarette smoking. *Addictive Behaviors* 1984; 9(4):405–8.
- Covey LS, Glassman AH. A meta-analysis of double-blind placebo-controlled trials of clonidine for smoking cessation. *British Journal of Addiction* 1991;86(8): 991–8.
- Covey LS, Glassman AH, Stetner F. Depression and depressive symptoms in smoking cessation. *Comprehensive Psychiatry* 1990;31(4):350–4.
- Cromwell J, Bartosch WJ, Fiore MC, Hasselblad V, Baker T. Cost-effectiveness of the clinical practice recommendations in the AHCPR guideline for smoking cessation. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 1997;278(21):1759–66.
- Cummings KM, Biernbaum RM, Zevon MA, Deloughry T, Jaén CR. Use and effectiveness of transdermal nicotine in primary care settings. *Archives of Family Medicine* 1994;3(8):682–9.
- Cummings KM, Emont SL, Jaén C, Sciandra R. Format and quitting instructions as factors influencing the impact of a self-administered quit smoking program. *Health Education Quarterly* 1988;15(2):199–216.
- Cummings KM, Sciandra R, Markello S. Impact of a newspaper mediated quit smoking program. *American Journal of Public Health* 1987;77(11):1452–3.
- Cummings SR, Coates TJ, Richard RJ, Hansen B, Zahnd EG, VanderMartin R, Duncan C, Gerbert B, Martin A, Stein MJ. Training physicians in counseling about smoking cessation: a randomized trial of the “Quit for Life” program. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 1989a; 110(8):640–7.
- Cummings SR, Richard RJ, Duncan CL, Hansen B, Vander Martin R, Gerbert B, Coates TJ. Training physicians about smoking cessation: a controlled trial in private practices. *Journal of General Internal Medicine* 1989b;4(6):482–9.
- Cummings SR, Rubin SM, Oster G. The cost-effectiveness of counseling smokers to quit. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 1989c;261(1):75–9.

- Curry SJ. Self-help interventions for smoking cessation. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1993; 61(5):790–803.
- Curry SJ, Louie D, Grothaus L, Wagner EH. Written personalized feedback and confidence in smoking cessation. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors* 1992;6(3): 175–80.
- Curry SJ, Marlatt GA, Gordon J, Baer JS. A comparison of alternative theoretical approaches to smoking cessation and relapse. *Health Psychology* 1988;7(6):545–56.
- Curry SJ, McBride CM. Relapse prevention for smoking cessation: review and evaluation of concepts and interventions. *Annual Review of Public Health* 1994; 15:345–66.
- Curry SJ, Wagner EH, Grothaus LC. Evaluation of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation interventions with a self-help smoking cessation program. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1991;59(2):318–24.
- Dale LC, Schroeder DR, Wolter TD, Croghan IT, Hurt RD, Offord KP. Weight change after smoking cessation using variable doses of transdermal nicotine replacement. *Journal of General Internal Medicine* 1998; 13(1):9–15.
- Daughton DM, Heatley SA, Prendergast JJ, Causey D, Knowles M, Rolf CN, Cheney RA, Hatlelid K, Thompson AB, Rennard SI. Effect of transdermal nicotine delivery as an adjunct to low-intervention smoking cessation therapy: a randomized, placebo-controlled, double-blind study. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 1991; 151(4):749–52.
- Davis JR, Glaros AG. Relapse prevention and smoking cessation. *Addictive Behaviors* 1986;11(2):105–14.
- Davis SW, Cummings KM, Rimer BK, Sciandra R, Stone JC. The impact of tailored self-help smoking cessation guides on young mothers. *Health Education Quarterly* 1992;19(4):495–504.
- Decker BD, Evans RG. Efficacy of a minimal contact version of a multimodal smoking cessation program. *Addictive Behaviors* 1989;14(5):487–91.
- Derby CA, Lasater TM, Vass K, Gonzalez S, Carleton RA. Characteristics of smokers who attempt to quit and of those who recently succeeded. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 1994;10(6):327–34.
- Dickersin K, Berlin JA. Meta-analysis: state-of-the-science. *Epidemiologic Reviews* 1992;14:154–76.
- DiClemente CC, Prochaska JO, Fairhurst SK, Velicer WF, Velasquez MM, Rossi JS. The process of smoking cessation: an analysis of precontemplation, contemplation, and preparation stages of change. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1991;59(2):295–304.
- Dietrich AJ, O'Connor GT, Keller A, Carney PA, Levy D, Whaley FS. Cancer: improving early detection and prevention. A community practice randomised trial. *British Medical Journal* 1992;304(6828):687–91.
- Doherty K, Militello FS, Kinnunen T, Garvey AJ. Nicotine gum dose and weight gain after smoking cessation. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1996; 64(4):799–807.
- Duncan C, Stein MJ, Cummings SR. Staff involvement and special follow-up time increase physicians' counseling about smoking cessation: a controlled trial. *American Journal of Public Health* 1991;81(7):899–901.
- Eddy DM. David Eddy ranks the tests. *Harvard Health Letter* 1992;17(9):10–1.
- Edwards NB, Murphy JK, Downs AD, Ackerman BJ, Rosenthal TL. Doxepin as an adjunct to smoking cessation: a double-blind pilot study. *American Journal of Psychiatry* 1989;146(3):373–6.
- Elder JP, McGraw SA, Abrams DB, Ferreira A, Lasater TM, Longpre H, Peterson GS, Schwertfeger R, Carleton RA. Organizational and community approaches to community-wide prevention of heart disease: the first two years of the Pawtucket Heart Health Program. *Preventive Medicine* 1986;15(2):107–17.
- Elder JP, McGraw SA, Rodrigues A, Lasater TM, Ferreira A, Kendall L, Peterson G, Carleton RA. Evaluation of two community-wide smoking cessation contests. *Preventive Medicine* 1987;16(2):221–34.
- Elixhauser A. The costs of smoking and the cost effectiveness of smoking-cessation programs. *Journal of Public Health Policy* 1990;11(2):218–37.

- Elkin I, Shea MT, Watkins JT, Imber SD, Sotsky SM, Collins JF, Glass DR, Pilkonis PA, Leber WR, Docherty JP, Fiester SJ, Parloff MB. National Institute of Mental Health Treatment of Depression Collaborative Research Program: general effectiveness of treatments. *Archives of General Psychiatry* 1989;46(11):971-82.
- Emmons KM, Emont SL, Collins RL, Weidner G. Relapse prevention versus broad spectrum treatment for smoking cessation: a comparison of efficacy. *Journal of Substance Abuse* 1988;1(1):79-89.
- Emont SL, Cummings KM. Weight gain following smoking cessation: a possible role for nicotine replacement in weight management. *Addictive Behaviors* 1987;12(2):151-5.
- Eriksen MP. Workplace smoking control: rationale and approaches. *Advances in Health Education Promotion* 1986;1(A):65-103.
- Ernster VL, Grady DG, Greene JC, Walsh M, Robertson P, Daniels TE, Benowitz N, Siegel D, Gerbert B, Hauck WW. Smokeless tobacco use and health effects among baseball players. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 1990;264(2):218-24.
- Ershoff DH, Quinn VP, Mullen PD, Lairson DR. Pregnancy and medical cost outcomes of a self-help prenatal smoking cessation program in a HMO. *Public Health Reports* 1990;105(4):340-7.
- Fagerström K-O. Measuring degree of physical dependence to tobacco smoking with reference to individualization of treatment. *Addictive Behaviors* 1978;3(3-4):235-41.
- Fagerström K-O. A comparison of psychological and pharmacological treatment in smoking cessation. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine* 1982;5(3):343-51.
- Fagerström K-O. Tolerance, withdrawal and dependence on tobacco and smoking termination. *International Review of Applied Psychology* 1983;32(1):29-52.
- Fagerström K-O. Effects of nicotine chewing gum and follow-up appointments in physician-based smoking cessation. *Preventive Medicine* 1984;13(5):517-27.
- Fagerström K-O. Reducing the weight gain after stopping smoking. *Addictive Behaviors* 1987;12(1):91-3.
- Fagerström K-O, Schneider NG. Measuring nicotine dependence: a review of the Fagerström Tolerance Questionnaire. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine* 1989;12(2):159-82.
- Fant R, Everson D, Dayton G, Pickworth WB, Henningfield JE. Nicotine dependence in women. *Journal of the American Medical Womens Association* 1996;51(1-2):19-20, 22-4, 28.
- Farquhar JW, Fortmann SP, Flora JA, Taylor CB, Haskell WL, Williams PT, Maccoby N, Wood PD. Effects of communitywide education on cardiovascular disease risk factors: the Stanford Five-City Project. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 1990;264(3):359-65.
- Fielding JE, Piserchia PV. Frequency of worksite health promotion activities. *American Journal of Public Health* 1989;79(1):16-20.
- Fiore MC. The new vital sign: assessing and documenting smoking status. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 1991;266(22):3183-4.
- Fiore MC, Bailey WC, Cohen SJ, Dorfman SF, Goldstein MG, Gritz ER, Heyman RB, Jaén CR, Kottke TE, Lando HA, Mecklenburg RE, Mullen PD, Nett LM, Robinson L, Stitzer ML, Tommasello AC, Villejo L, Wewers ME. *Treating Tobacco Use and Dependence*. Clinical Practice Guideline. Rockville (MD): US Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, 2000.
- Fiore MC, Bailey WC, Cohen SJ, Dorfman SF, Goldstein MG, Gritz ER, Heyman RB, Holbrook J, Jaen CR, Kottke TE, Lando HA, Mecklenburg R, Mullen PD, Nett LM, Robinson L, Stitzer ML, Tommasello AC, Villejo L, Wewers ME. *Smoking Cessation*. Clinical Practice Guideline No. 18. Rockville (MD): US Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Agency for Health Care Policy and Research, 1996. AHCPR Publication No. 96-0692.
- Fiore MC, Baker TB. Smoking cessation treatment and the Good Doctor Club [editorial]. *American Journal of Public Health* 1995;85(2):161-2.
- Fiore MC, Jorenby DE, Baker TB. Treating nicotine dependence: clinical guidelines for the 1990s. *Journal of Smoking-Related Disorders* 1994a;5(Suppl 1):157-61.

- Fiore MC, Jorenby DE, Schensky AE, Smith SS, Bauer R, Baker TB. Smoking status as the new vital sign: effect on assessment and intervention in patients who smoke. *Mayo Clinic Proceedings* 1995;70(3):209–13.
- Fiore MC, Kenford SL, Jorenby DE, Wetter DW, Smith SS, Baker TB. Two studies of the clinical effectiveness of the nicotine patch with different counseling treatments. *Chest* 1994b;105(2):524–33.
- Fiore MC, Novotny TE, Pierce JP, Giovino GA, Hatziandreu EJ, Newcomb PA, Surawicz TS, Davis RM. Methods used to quit smoking in the United States: do cessation programs help? *Journal of the American Medical Association* 1990;263(20):2760–5.
- Fiore MC, Novotny TE, Pierce JP, Hatziandreu EJ, Patel KM, Davis RM. Trends in cigarette smoking in the United States: the changing influence of gender and race. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 1989; 261(1):49–55.
- Fiore MC, Smith SS, Jorenby DE, Baker TB. The effectiveness of the nicotine patch for smoking cessation: a meta-analysis. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 1994c;271(24):1940–7.
- Fisher EB Jr, Lichtenstein E, Haire-Joshu D, Morgan GD, Rehberg HR. Methods, successes, and failures of smoking cessation programs. *Annual Review of Medicine* 1993;44:481–513.
- Fisher KJ, Glasgow RE, Terborg JR. Work site smoking cessation: a meta-analysis of long-term quit rates from controlled studies. *Journal of Occupational Medicine* 1990;32(5):429–39.
- Flay BR. Mass media and smoking cessation: a critical review. *American Journal of Public Health* 1987;77(2): 153–60.
- Flay BR, Gruder CL, Warnecke RB, Jason LA, Peterson P. One year follow-up of the Chicago Televised Smoking Cessation Program. *American Journal of Public Health* 1989;79(10):1377–80.
- Fleiss JL. *Statistical Methods for Rates and Proportions*. 2nd ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1981.
- Folsom AR, Grimm RH Jr. Stop smoking advice by physicians: a feasible approach? *American Journal of Public Health* 1987;77(7):849–50.
- Fortmann SP, Taylor CB, Flora JA, Jatulis DE. Changes in adult cigarette smoking prevalence after 5 years of community health education: the Stanford Five-City Project. *American Journal of Epidemiology* 1993;137(1): 82–96.
- Fox RM, Brown RA. Nicotine fading and self-monitoring for cigarette abstinence or controlled smoking. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis* 1979;12(1): 111–25.
- Frank E, Winkleby MA, Altman DG, Rockhill B, Fortmann SP. Predictors of physicians' smoking cessation advice. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 1991;266(22):3139–44.
- Franks P, Harp J, Bell B. Randomized, controlled trial of clonidine for smoking cessation in a primary care setting. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 1989; 262(21):3011–3.
- Frederick T, Frerichs RR, Clark VA. Personal health habits and symptoms of depression at the community level. *Preventive Medicine* 1988;17(2):173–82.
- French SA, Jeffery RW, Klesges LM, Forster JL. Weight concerns and change in smoking behavior over two years in a working population. *American Journal of Public Health* 1995;85(5):720–2.
- French SA, Jeffery RW, Pirie PL, McBride CM. Do weight concerns hinder smoking cessation efforts? *Addictive Behaviors* 1992;17(3):219–26.
- Gilpin E, Pierce J, Goodman J, Giovino G, Berry C, Burns D. Trends in physicians' giving advice to stop smoking, United States, 1974–87. *Tobacco Control* 1992; 1(1):31–6.
- Giovino GA, Schooley MW, Zhu B-P, Chrismon JH, Tomar SL, Peddicord JP, Merritt RK, Husten CG, Eriksen MP. Surveillance for selected tobacco-use behaviors—United States, 1900–1994. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* 1994;43(SS-3):1–43.
- Glasgow RE. Worksite smoking cessation: current progress and future directions. *Canadian Journal of Public Health* 1987;78(6):S21–S27.
- Glasgow RE, Klesges RC, O'Neill HK. Programming social support for smoking modification: an extension and replication. *Addictive Behaviors* 1986;11(4):453–7.

- Glasgow RE, Lichtenstein E. Long-term effects; behavioral smoking cessation interventions. *Behavior Therapy* 1987;18(4):297–324.
- Glasgow RE, Lichtenstein E, Beaver C, O'Neill K. Subjective reactions to rapid and normal paced aversive smoking. *Addictive Behaviors* 1981;6(1):53–9.
- Glasgow RE, Terborg JR, Hollis JF, Severson HH, Boles SM. Take Heart: results from the initial phase of a work-site wellness program. *American Journal of Public Health* 1995;85(2):209–16.
- Glassman AH, Covey LS, Dalack GW, Stetner F, Rivelli SK, Fleiss J, Cooper TB. Smoking cessation, clonidine, and vulnerability to nicotine among dependent smokers. *Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics* 1993;54(6):670–9.
- Glassman AH, Jackson WK, Walsh BT, Roose SP, Rosenfeld B. Cigarette craving, smoking withdrawal, and clonidine. *Science* 1984;226(4676):864–6.
- Glassman AH, Stetner F, Walsh BT, Raizman PS, Fleiss JL, Cooper TB, Covey LS. Heavy smokers, smoking cessation, and clonidine: results of a double-blind, randomized trial. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 1988;259(19):2863–6.
- Glover ED. The nicotine vaporizer, nicotine nasal spray, combination therapy, and the future of NRT: a discussion. *Health Values* 1993a;18(3):22–8.
- Glover ED. What can we expect from the nicotine transdermal patch? A theoretical/practical approach. *Health Values* 1993b;17(2):69–79.
- Glynn TJ. Relative effectiveness of physician-initiated smoking cessation programs. *Cancer Bulletin* 1988;40(6):359–64.
- Glynn TJ, Boyd GM, Gruman JC. Essential elements of self-help/minimal intervention strategies for smoking cessation. *Health Education Quarterly* 1990a;17(3):329–45.
- Glynn TJ, Boyd GM, Gruman JC. *Self-Guided Strategies for Smoking Cessation: A Program Planner's Guide*. Bethesda (MD): US Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, National Institutes of Health, National Cancer Institute, 1990b. NIH Publication No. 91-3104.
- Glynn TJ, Manley MW. *How to Help Your Patients Stop Smoking: A National Cancer Institute Manual for Physicians*. Bethesda (MD): US Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, National Institutes of Health, National Cancer Institute, 1993. NIH Publication No. 93-3064.
- Goldstein MG, Niaura R, Follick MJ, Abrams DB. Effects of behavioral skills training and schedule of nicotine gum administration on smoking cessation. *American Journal of Psychiatry* 1989;146(1):56–60.
- Gomel M, Oldenburg B, Simpson JM, Owen N. Work-site cardiovascular risk reduction: a randomized trial of health risk assessment, education, counseling, and incentives. *American Journal of Public Health* 1993;83(9):1231–8.
- Götestam KG, Melin L. An experimental study of covert extinction on smoking cessation. *Addictive Behaviors* 1983;8(1):27–31.
- Gourlay S. The pros and cons of transdermal nicotine therapy. *Medical Journal of Australia* 1994;160(3):152–9.
- Gourlay S, Forbes A, Marriner T, Kutin J, McNeil J. A placebo-controlled study of three clonidine doses for smoking cessation. *Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics* 1994;55(1):64–9.
- Gritz ER, Berman BA, Bastani R, Wu M. A randomized trial of a self-help smoking cessation intervention in a nonvolunteer female population: testing the limits of the public health model. *Health Psychology* 1992;11(5):280–9.
- Gritz ER, Carr CR, Marcus AC. The tobacco withdrawal syndrome in unaided quitters. *British Journal of Addiction* 1991;86(1):57–69.
- Gritz ER, Klesges RC, Meyers AW. The smoking and body weight relationship: implications for intervention and postcessation weight control. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine* 1989;11(4):144–53.
- Gritz ER, Thompson B, Emmons K, Ockene JK, McLerran DF, Nielsen IR. Gender differences among smokers and quitters in the Working Well Trial. *Preventive Medicine* 1998;27(4):553–61.
- Gross J, Stitzer ML. Nicotine replacement: ten-week effects on tobacco withdrawal symptoms. *Psychopharmacology* 1989;98(3):334–41.

Gross J, Stitzer ML, Maldonado J. Nicotine replacement: effects on postcessation weight gain. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1989;57(1):87–92.

Group Health Association of America, Inc. *HMO Industry Profile: 1993 Edition*. Washington: Group Health Association of America, Inc., 1993.

Gruder CL, Mermelstein RJ, Kirkendol S, Hedeker D, Wong SC, Schreckengost J, Warnecke RB, Burzette R, Miller TQ. Effects of social support and relapse prevention training as adjuncts to a televised smoking-cessation intervention. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1993;61(1):113–20.

Gruman J, Lynn W. Worksite and community intervention for tobacco control. In: Orleans CT, Slade J, editors. *Nicotine Addiction: Principles and Management*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993:396–411.

Hackman R, Kapur B, Koren G. Use of the nicotine patch by pregnant women [letter]. *New England Journal of Medicine* 1999;341(22):1700.

Hajek P, Belcher M, Stapleton J. Enhancing the impact of groups: an evaluation of two group formats for smokers. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology* 1985; 24(4):289–94.

Hajek P, Jackson P, Belcher M. Long-term use of nicotine chewing gum: occurrence, determinants, and effect on weight gain. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 1988;260(11):1593–6.

Hall RG, Sachs DPL, Hall SM, Benowitz NL. Two-year efficacy and safety of rapid smoking therapy in patients with cardiac and pulmonary disease. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1984a;52(4):574–81.

Hall SM, Ginsberg D, Jones RT. Smoking cessation and weight gain. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1986;54(3):342–6.

Hall SM, Killen JD. Psychological and pharmacological approaches to smoking relapse prevention. In: Grabowski J, Hall SM, editors. *Pharmacological Adjuncts in Smoking Cessation*. NIDA Research Monograph 53. Rockville (MD): US Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration, National Institute on Drug Abuse, 1985:131–43.

Hall SM, Muñoz R, Reus V. Smoking cessation, depression and dysphoria. In: Harris L, editor. *Problems of Drug Dependence 1990: Proceeding of the 52nd Annual Scientific Meeting of the Committee on Problems of Drug Dependence, Inc.* Research Monograph 105. Rockville (MD): US Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration, National Institute on Drug Abuse, 1991:312–4. DHHS Publication No. (ADM) 91-1753.

Hall SM, Muñoz RF, Reus VI. Cognitive-behavioral intervention increases abstinence rates for depressive-history smokers. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1994;62(1):141–6.

Hall SM, Rugg D, Tunstall C, Jones RT. Preventing relapse to cigarette smoking by behavioral skill training. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1984b; 52(3):372–82.

Hall SM, Tunstall CD, Vila KL, Duffy J. Weight gain prevention and smoking cessation: cautionary findings. *American Journal of Public Health* 1992;82(6):799–803.

Hall SM, Reus VI, Muñoz RF, Sees KL, Humfleet G, Hartz DT, Frederick S, Triffleman E. Nortriptyline and cognitive-behavioral therapy in the treatment of cigarette smoking. *Archives of General Psychiatry* 1998;55(8): 683–90.

Hallett R. Smoking intervention in the workplace: review and recommendations. *Preventive Medicine* 1986; 15(3):213–31.

Harackiewicz JM, Blair LW, Sansone C, Epstein JA, Stuchell RN. Nicotine gum and self-help manuals in smoking cessation: an evaluation in a medical context. *Addictive Behaviors* 1988;13(4):319–30.

Hatsukami D, McBride C, Pirie P, Hellerstedt W, Lando H. Effects of nicotine gum on prevalence and severity of withdrawal in female cigarette smokers. *Journal of Substance Abuse* 1991;3(4):427–40.

Hatziandreu EJ, Pierce JP, Lefkopoulou M, Fiore MC, Mills SL, Novotny TE, Giovino GA, Davis RM. Quitting smoking in the United States in 1986. *Journal of the National Cancer Institute* 1990;82(17):1402–6.

Heath AC, Madden PAF, Martin NG. Statistical methods in genetic research on smoking. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research* 1998;7(2):165–86.



- Heather N, Bradley BP. Cue exposure as a practical treatment for addictive disorders: why are we waiting? [guest editorial] *Addictive Behaviors* 1990;15(4):335-7.
- Heatherton TF, Kozlowski LT, Frecker RC, Fagerström K-O. The Fagerström Test for Nicotine Dependence: a revision of the Fagerström Tolerance Questionnaire. *British Journal of Addiction* 1991;86(9):1119-27.
- Henningfield JE, Radzius A, Cooper TM, Clayton RR. Drinking coffee and carbonated beverages blocks absorption of nicotine from nicotine polacrilex gum. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 1990;264(12):1560-4.
- Herman CP. External and internal cues as determinants of the smoking behavior of light and heavy smokers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 1974;30(5):664-72.
- Hilleman DE, Mohiuddin SM, Delcore MG. Comparison of fixed-dose transdermal nicotine, tapered-dose transdermal nicotine, and bupropion in smoking cessation. *Journal of Clinical Pharmacology* 1994;34(3):222-4.
- Hilleman DE, Mohiuddin SM, Delcore MG, Lucas BD Jr. Randomized, controlled trial of transdermal clonidine for smoking cessation. *Annals of Pharmacotherapy* 1993;27(9):1025-8.
- Hilleman DE, Mohiuddin SM, Del Core MG, Sketch MH Sr. Effect of bupropion on withdrawal symptoms associated with smoking cessation. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 1992;152(2):350-2.
- Hjalmarsen A, Franzon M, Westin A, Wiklund O. Effect of nicotine nasal spray on smoking cessation: a randomized, placebo-controlled, double-blind study. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 1994;154(22):2567-72.
- Hjalmarsen A, Nilsson F, Sjöström L, Wiklund O. The nicotine inhaler in smoking cessation. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 1997;157(15):1721-8.
- Hodgson, RJ. Resisting temptation: a psychological analysis. *British Journal of Addiction* 1989;84(3):251-7.
- Hollis JF, Lichtenstein E, Vogt TM, Stevens VJ, Biglan A. Nurse-assisted counseling for smokers in primary care. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 1993;118(7):521-5.
- Holroyd J. Hypnosis treatment for smoking: an evaluative review. *International Journal of Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis* 1980;28(4):341-57.
- Horan JJ, Hackett G, Nicholas WC, Linberg SE, Stone CI, Lukaski HC. Rapid smoking: a cautionary note. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1977;45(3):341-3.
- Horn D, Waingrow S. Some dimensions of a model for smoking behavior change. *American Journal of Public Health* 1966;56(12):21-6.
- Houston TP, Eriksen MP, Fiore M, Jaffe RD, Manley M, Slade J. *Guidelines for Diagnosis and Treatment of Nicotine Dependence: How to Help Patients Stop Smoking*. Chicago: American Medical Association, 1994.
- Hughes JR. Dependence potential and abuse liability of nicotine replacement therapies. In: Pomerleau OF, Pomerleau CS, editors. *Nicotine Replacement: A Critical Evaluation*. Progress in Clinical and Biological Research. Vol. 261. New York: Alan R. Liss, 1988:261-77.
- Hughes JR. Tobacco withdrawal in self-quitters. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1992;60(5):689-97.
- Hughes JR. Risk-benefit assessment of nicotine preparations in smoking cessation. *Drug Safety* 1993;8(1):49-56.
- Hughes JR. An algorithm for smoking cessation. *Archives of Family Medicine* 1994;3(3):280-5.
- Hughes JR, Glaser M. Transdermal nicotine for smoking cessation. *Health Values* 1993;17(2):25-31.
- Hughes JR, Goldstein MG, Hurt RD, Shiffman S. Recent advances in the pharmacotherapy of smoking. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 1999;281(1):72-6.
- Hughes JR, Gulliver SB, Amori G, Mireault GC, Fenwick JF. Effect of instructions and nicotine on smoking cessation, withdrawal symptoms and self-administration of nicotine gum. *Psychopharmacology* 1989a;99(4):486-91.
- Hughes JR, Gust SW, Keenan R, Fenwick JW, Skoog K, Higgins ST. Long-term use of nicotine vs placebo gum. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 1991a;151(10):1993-8.

- Hughes JR, Gust SW, Keenan RM, Fenwick JW. Effect of dose on nicotine's reinforcing, withdrawal-suppression and self-reported effects. *Journal of Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics* 1990a;252(3):1175–83.
- Hughes JR, Gust SW, Keenan RM, Fenwick JW, Healey ML. Nicotine vs placebo gum in general medical practice. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 1989b;261(9):1300–5.
- Hughes JR, Gust SW, Skoog K, Keenan RM, Fenwick JW. Symptoms of tobacco withdrawal: a replication and extension. *Archives of General Psychiatry* 1991b;48(1): 52–9.
- Hughes JR, Hatsukami D. Signs and symptoms of tobacco withdrawal. *Archives of General Psychiatry* 1986;43(3):289–94.
- Hughes JR, Hatsukami DK, Pickens RW, Krahn D, Malin S, Luknic A. Effect of nicotine on the tobacco withdrawal syndrome. *Psychopharmacology* 1984;83(1): 82–7.
- Hughes JR, Higgins ST, Hatsukami D. Effects of abstinence from tobacco: a critical review. In: Kozlowski LT, Annis HM, Cappell HD, Glaser FB, Goodstadt MS, Israel Y, Kalant H, Sellers EM, Vingilis ER, editors. *Research Advances in Alcohol and Drug Problems*. Vol. 10. New York: Plenum Press, 1990b:317–98.
- Hurt RD, Dale LC, Fredrickson PA, Caldwell CC, Lee GA, Offord KP, Lauger GG, Marušić Z, Neese LW, Lundberg TG. Nicotine patch therapy for smoking cessation combined with physician advice and nurse follow-up: one-year outcome and percentage of nicotine replacement. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 1994;271(8):595–600.
- Hurt RD, Sachs DP, Glover ED, Offord KP, Johnston JA, Dale LC, Khayrallah MA, Schroeder DR, Glover PN, Sullivan CR, Croghan IT, Sullivan PM. A comparison of sustained-release bupropion and placebo for smoking cessation. *New England Journal of Medicine* 1997;337(17):1195–1202.
- Husten CG, Chrismon JH, Reddy MN. Trends and effects of cigarette smoking among girls and women in the United States, 1965–1993. *Journal of the American Medical Women's Association* 1996;51(1&2):11–8.
- Jarvik ME, Schneider NG. Degree of addiction and effectiveness of nicotine gum therapy for smoking. *American Journal of Psychiatry* 1984;141(6):790–1.
- Jarvis MJ, Raw M, Russell MAH, Feyerabend C. Randomised controlled trial of nicotine chewing-gum. *British Medical Journal* 1982;285(3):537–40.
- Jason LA, Jayaraj S, Blitz CC, Michaels MH, Klett LE. Incentives and competition in a worksite smoking cessation intervention. *American Journal of Public Health* 1990;80(2):205–6.
- Jeffery RW, Boles SM, Strycker LA, Glasgow RE. Smoking-specific weight gain concerns and smoking cessation in a working population. *Health Psychology* 1997;16(5):487–9.
- Jeffery RW, Kelder SH, Forster JL, French SA, Lando HA, Baxter JE. Restrictive smoking policies in the workplace: effects on smoking prevalence and cigarette consumption. *Preventive Medicine* 1994;23:78–82.
- Jensen EJ, Schmidt E, Pedersen B, Dahl R. Effect of nicotine, silver acetate, and ordinary chewing gum in combination with group counselling on smoking cessation. *Thorax* 1990;45(11):831–4.
- Johnson DL, Karkut RT. Performance by gender in a stop-smoking program combining hypnosis and aversion. *Psychological Reports* 1994;75(2):851–7.
- Jorenby DE, Hatsukami DK, Smith SS, Fiore MC, Allen S, Jensen J, Baker TB. Characterization of tobacco withdrawal symptoms: transdermal nicotine reduces hunger and weight gain. *Psychopharmacology* 1996;128(2): 130–8.
- Jorenby DE, Keehn DS, Fiore MC. Comparative efficacy and tolerability of nicotine replacement therapies. *CNS Drugs* 1995a;3(3):227–36.
- Jorenby DE, Leischow SJ, Nides MA, Rennard SI, Johnson JA, Hughes AR, Smith SS, Muramoto ML, Daughton DM, Doan K, Fiore MC, Baker TB. A controlled trial of sustained-release bupropion, a nicotine patch, or both for smoking cessation. *New England Journal of Medicine* 1999;340(9):685–91.

- Jorenby DE, Smith SS, Fiore MC, Hurt RD, Offord KP, Croghan IT, Hays JT, Lewis SF, Baker TB. Varying nicotine patch dose and type of smoking cessation counseling. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 1995b; 274(17):1347–52.
- Joseph AM, Norman SM, Ferry LH, Prochazka AV, Westman EC, Steele BG, Sherman SE, Cleveland M, Antonnucio DO, Hartman N, McGovern PG. The safety of transdermal nicotine as an aid to smoking cessation in patients with cardiac disease. *New England Journal of Medicine* 1996;335(24):1792–8.
- Kamarck TW, Lichtenstein E. Program adherence and coping strategies as predictors of success in a smoking treatment program. *Health Psychology* 1988;7(6): 557–74.
- Kaplan RM, Orleans CT, Perkins KA, Pierce JP. Marshaling the evidence for greater regulation and control of tobacco products: a call for action. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine* 1995;17(1):3–14.
- Kendler KS, Neale MC, MacLean CJ, Heath AC, Eaves LJ, Kessler RC. Smoking and major depression: a causal analysis. *Archives of General Psychiatry* 1993;50(1): 36–43.
- Kenford SL, Fiore MC, Jorenby DE, Smith SS, Wetter DW, Baker TB. Predicting smoking cessation: who will quit with and without the nicotine patch. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 1994;271(8):589–94.
- Kenford SL, Fiore MC, Wetter DW, Jorenby DE, Smith SS, Baker TB. Predicting success in nicotine patch treatment. Poster presented at the Society of Behavioral Medicine, Fourteenth Annual Scientific Sessions; Mar 10–13, 1993; San Francisco.
- Killen JD, Fortmann SP, Kraemer HC, Varady A, Newman B. Who will relapse? Symptoms of nicotine dependence predict long-term relapse after smoking cessation. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1992;60(5):797–801.
- Killen JD, Fortmann SP, Newman B. Weight change among participants in a large sample minimal contact smoking relapse prevention trial. *Addictive Behaviors* 1990a;15(4):323–32.
- Killen JD, Fortmann SP, Newman B, Varady A. Evaluation of a treatment approach combining nicotine gum with self-guided behavioral treatments for smoking relapse prevention. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1990b;58(1):85–92.
- Klein JD, Portilla M, Goldstein A, Leininger L. Training pediatric residents to prevent tobacco use. *Pediatrics* 1995;96(2):326–30.
- Klesges RC, Brown K, Pascale RW, Murphy M, Williams E, Cigrang JA. Factors associated with participation, attrition, and outcome in a smoking cessation program at the workplace. *Health Psychology* 1988;7(6): 575–89.
- Klesges RC, Meyers AW, Klesges LM, La Vasque ME. Smoking, body weight, and their effects on smoking behavior: a comprehensive review of the literature. *Psychological Bulletin* 1989;106(2):204–30.
- Korhonen HJ, Niemensivu H, Piha T, Koskela K, Wiiro J, Johnson CA, Puska PA. National TV smoking cessation program and contest in Finland. *Preventive Medicine* 1992;21(1):74–87.
- Kornitzer M, Kittel F, Dramaix M, Bourdoux P. A double blind study of 2 mg versus 4 mg nicotine-gum in an industrial setting. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research* 1987;31(2):171–6.
- Kottke TE, Battista RN, DeFries GH, Brekke ML. Attributes of successful smoking cessation interventions in medical practice: a meta-analysis of 39 controlled trials. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 1988; 259(19):2882–9.
- Kozlowski LT, Pope MA, Lux JE. Prevalence of the misuse of ultra-low-tar cigarettes by blocking filter vents. *American Journal of Public Health* 1988;78(6): 694–5.
- Kozlowski LT, Porter CQ, Orleans CT, Pope MA, Heatherton T. Predicting smoking cessation with self-reported measures of nicotine dependence: FTQ, FTND, and HSI. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence* 1994; 34(3):211–6.
- Kristeller JL, Merriam PA, Ockene JK, Ockene IS, Goldberg RJ. Smoking intervention for cardiac patients: in search of more effective strategies. *Cardiology* 1993;82(5):317–24.

- Kristeller JL, Rossi JS, Ockene JK, Goldberg R, Prochaska JO. Processes of change in smoking cessation: a cross-validation study in cardiac patients. *Journal of Substance Abuse* 1992;4(3):263-76.
- Krumholtz HM, Cohen BJ, Tsevat J, Pasternak RC, Weinstein MC. Cost-effectiveness of a smoking cessation program after myocardial infarction. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology* 1993;22(6):1697-702.
- Lam W, Sze PC, Sacks HS, Chalmers TC. Meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials of nicotine chewing-gum. *Lancet* 1987;2(8549):27-30.
- Lambe R, Osier C, Franks P. A randomized controlled trial of hypnotherapy for smoking cessation. *Journal of Family Practice* 1986;22(1):61-5.
- Lando HA. Effects of preparation, experimenter contact, and a maintained reduction alternative on a broad-spectrum program for eliminating smoking. *Addictive Behaviors* 1981;6(2):123-33.
- Lando HA. A factorial analysis of preparation, aversion, and maintenance in the elimination of smoking. *Addictive Behaviors* 1982;7(2):143-54.
- Lando HA. Formal quit smoking treatments. In: Orleans CT, Slade J, editors. *Nicotine Addiction: Principles and Management*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993:221-44.
- Lando HA, Hellerstedt WL, Pirie PL, McGovern PG. Brief supportive telephone outreach as a recruitment and intervention strategy for smoking cessation. *American Journal of Public Health* 1992;82(1):41-6.
- Lando HA, McGovern PG. Nicotine fading as a nonaversive alternative in a broad-spectrum treatment for eliminating smoking. *Addictive Behaviors* 1985;10(2):153-61.
- Lando HA, McGovern PG. The influence of group cohesion on the behavioral treatment of smoking: a failure to replicate. *Addictive Behaviors* 1991;16(3-4):111-21.
- Lando HA, McGovern PG, Barrios FX, Etringer BD. Comparative evaluation of American Cancer Society and American Lung Association smoking cessation clinics. *American Journal of Public Health* 1990;80(5):554-9.
- Lando HA, Pechacek TF, Pirie PL, Murray DM, Mittelmark MB, Lichtenstein E, Nothwehr F, Gray C. Changes in adult cigarette smoking in the Minnesota Heart Health Program. *American Journal of Public Health* 1995;85(2):201-8.
- Leischow SJ. The nicotine vaporizer. *Health Values* 1994;18(3):4-9.
- Leventhal H, Keeshan P, Baker T, Wetter D. Smoking prevention: towards a process approach. *British Journal of Addiction* 1991;86(5):583-7.
- Levin ED, Westman EC, Stein RM, Carnahan E, Sanchez M, Herman S, Behm FM, Rose JE. Nicotine skin patch treatment increases abstinence, decreases withdrawal symptoms, and attenuates rewarding effects of smoking. *Journal of Clinical Psychopharmacology* 1994;14(1):41-9.
- Lewis SF, Fiore MC. Nicotine replacement therapy: is pregnancy a contraindication? *Journal of Respiratory Diseases* 1994;15(1):15-6.
- Lichtenstein E, Glasgow RE. Rapid smoking: side effects and safeguards. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1977;45(5):815-21.
- Lichtenstein E, Glasgow RE. Smoking cessation: what have we learned over the past decade? *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1992;60(4):518-27.
- Lichtenstein E, Hollis J. Patient referral to a smoking cessation program: who follows through? *Journal of Family Practice* 1992;34(6):739-44.
- Lichtenstein E, Lando HA, Nothwehr F. Readiness to quit as a predictor of smoking changes in the Minnesota Heart Health Program. *Health Psychology* 1994;13(5):393-6.
- Lichtenstein E, Mermelstein RJ. Some methodological cautions in the use of the Tolerance Questionnaire. *Addictive Behaviors* 1986;11(4):439-42.
- Lightwood JM, Glantz SA. Short-term economic and health benefits of smoking cessation: myocardial infarction and stroke. *Circulation* 1997;96(4):1089-96.

- Longo DR, Brownson RC, Johnson JC, Hewett JE, Kruse RL, Novotny TE, Logan RA. Hospital smoking bans and employee smoking behavior: results of a national survey. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 1996;275(16):1252–7.
- Lowe MR, Green L, Kurtz SMS, Ashenberg ZS, Fisher EB Jr. Self-initiated, cue extinction, and covert sensitization procedures in smoking cessation. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine* 1980;3(4):357–72.
- Luborsky L, Singer B, Luborsky L. Comparative studies of psychotherapies. Is it true that “Everyone has won and all must have prizes”? *Archives of General Psychiatry* 1975;32(8):995–1008.
- Lucchesi BR, Schuster CR, Emley GS. The role of nicotine as a determinant of cigarette smoking frequency in man with observations of certain cardiovascular effects associated with the tobacco alkaloid. *Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics* 1967;8(6):789–96.
- Luepker RV, Murray DM, Jacobs DR Jr, Mittelmark MB, Bracht N, Carlaw R, Crow R, Elmer P, Finnegan J, Folsom AR, Grimm R, Hannan PJ, Jeffrey R, Lando H, McGovern P, Mullis R, Perry CL, Pechacek T, Pirie P, Sprafka JM, Weisbrod R, Blackburn H. Community education for cardiovascular disease prevention: risk factor changes in the Minnesota Heart Health Program. *American Journal of Public Health* 1994;84(9):1383–93.
- Lynch BS, Bonnie RJ, editors. *Growing Up Tobacco Free: Preventing Nicotine Addiction in Children and Youths*. Washington: National Academy Press, 1994.
- Macaskill P, Pierce JP, Simpson JM, Lyle DM. Mass media-led antismoking campaign can remove the education gap in quitting behavior. *American Journal of Public Health* 1992;82(1):96–8.
- MacHovec FJ, Man SC. Acupuncture and hypnosis compared: fifty-eight cases. *American Journal of Clinical Hypnosis* 1978;21(1):45–7.
- Mahmarijan JJ, Moyé LA, Nasser GA, Nagueh SF, Bloom MF, Benowitz NL, Verani MS, Byrd WG, Pratt CM. Nicotine patch therapy in smoking cessation reduces the extent of exercise-induced myocardial ischemia. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology* 1997;30(1):125–30.
- Malott JM, Glasgow RE, O’Neill HK, Klesges RC. Co-worker social support in a worksite smoking control program. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis* 1984;17(4):485–95.
- Manley M, Epps RP, Husten C, Glynn T, Shopland D. Clinical interventions in tobacco control: a National Cancer Institute training program for physicians. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 1991;266(22):3172–3.
- Marcus BH, Albrecht AE, King TK, Parisi AF, Pinto BM, Roberts M, Niaura RS, Abrams DB. The efficacy of exercise as an aid for smoking cessation in women: a randomized controlled trial. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 1999;159(11):1229–34.
- Marks JS, Koplan JP, Hogue CJ, Dalmat ME. A cost-benefit/cost-effectiveness analysis of smoking cessation for pregnant women. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 1990;6(5):282–9.
- Marlatt GA, Gordon JR, editors. *Relapse Prevention: Maintenance Strategies in the Treatment of Addictive Behaviors*. New York: Guilford Press, 1985.
- Masouredis CM, Hilton JF, Grady D, Gee L, Chesney M, Hengl L, Ernster V, Walsh MM. A spit tobacco cessation intervention for college athletes: three-month results. *Advances in Dental Research* 1997;11(3):354–9.
- McFall SL, Michener A, Rubin D, Flay BR, Mermelstein RJ, Burton D, Jelen P, Warnecke RB. The effects and use of maintenance newsletters in a smoking cessation intervention. *Addictive Behaviors* 1993;18(2):151–8.
- McGovern PG, Lando HA. Reduced nicotine exposure and abstinence outcome in two nicotine fading methods. *Addictive Behaviors* 1991;16(1–2):11–20.
- McIntyre-Kingsolver K, Lichtenstein E, Mermelstein RJ. Spouse training in a multicomponent smoking-cessation program. *Behavior Therapy* 1986;17(1):67–74.
- McKinnell AC. Smoking motivation factors. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology* 1970;9(Pt 1):8–22.
- McMorrow MJ, Foxx RM. Nicotine’s role in smoking: an analysis of nicotine regulation. *Psychological Bulletin* 1983;93(2):302–27.

- Mermelstein RJ, Karnatz T, Reichmann S. Smoking. In: Wilson PH, editor. *Principles and Practice of Relapse Prevention*. New York: Guilford Press, 1992.
- Merz P-G, Keller-Stanislawski B, Huber T, Woodcock BG, Rietbrock N. Transdermal nicotine in smoking cessation and involvement of non-specific influences. *International Journal of Clinical Pharmacology, Therapy and Toxicology* 1993;31(10):476–82.
- Messina ES, Tyndale RF, Sellers EM. A major role for CYP2A6 in nicotine C-oxidation by human liver microsomes. *Journal of Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics* 1997;282:277–85.
- Minneker-Hügel E, Unland H, Buchkremer G. Behavioral relapse prevention strategies in smoking cessation. *International Journal of the Addictions* 1992;27(5):627–34.
- Monti PM, Rohsenow DJ, Rubonis AV, Niaura RS, Sirota AD, Colby SM, Goddard P, Abrams DB. Cue exposure with coping skills treatment for male alcoholics: a preliminary investigation. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1993;61(6):1011–9.
- Mudde AN, De Vries H. Reach and effectiveness of a national mass media-led smoking cessation campaign in the Netherlands. *American Journal of Public Health* 1999;89(3):346–50.
- Mulligan SC, Masterson JG, Devane JG, Kelly JG. Clinical and pharmacokinetic properties of a transdermal nicotine patch. *Clinical Pharmacology Therapeutics* 1990;47(3):331–7.
- Murray RG, Hobbs SA. Effects of self-reinforcement and self-punishment in smoking reduction: implications for broad-spectrum behavioral approaches. *Addictive Behaviors* 1981;6(1):63–7.
- Niaura R, Abrams DB, Monti PM, Pedraza M. Reactivity to high risk situations and smoking cessation outcome. *Journal of Substance Abuse* 1989;1(4):393–405.
- Niaura R, Brown RA, Goldstein MG, Murphy JK, Abrams DB. Transdermal clonidine for smoking cessation: a double-blind randomized dose–response study. *Experimental and Clinical Psychopharmacology* 1996;4(3):285–91.
- Niaura R, Goldstein MG, Abrams DB. Matching high- and low-dependence smokers to self-help treatment with or without nicotine replacement. *Preventive Medicine* 1994;23(1):70–7.
- Nides M, Rand C, Dolce J, Murray R, O'Hara P, Voelker H, Connett J. Weight gain as a function of smoking cessation and 2-mg nicotine gum use among middle-aged smokers with mild lung impairment in the first 2 years of the Lung Health Study. *Health Psychology* 1994;13(4):354–61.
- Nørregaard J, Tønnesen P, Petersen L. Predictors and reasons for relapse in smoking cessation with nicotine and placebo patches. *Preventive Medicine* 1993;22(2):261–71.
- Nutt DJ. The neurochemistry of addiction. *Human Psychopharmacology* 1997;12(Suppl 2):S53–S58.
- Ockene J, Kristeller JL, Goldberg R, Ockene I, Merriam P, Barrett S, Pekow P, Hosmer D, Gianelly R. Smoking cessation and severity of disease: the Coronary Artery Smoking Intervention Study. *Health Psychology* 1992;11(2):119–26.
- Ockene JK, Aney J, Goldberg RJ, Klar JM, Williams JW. A survey of Massachusetts physicians' smoking intervention practices. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 1988a;4(1):14–20.
- Ockene JK, Hosmer DW, Williams JW, Goldberg RJ, Ockene IS, Biliouris T, Dalen JE. The relationship of patient characteristics to physician delivery of advice to stop smoking. *Journal of General Internal Medicine* 1987;2(5):337–40.
- Ockene JK, Kristeller J, Goldberg R, Amick TL, Pekow PS, Hosmer D, Quirk M, Kalan K. Increasing the efficacy of physician-delivered smoking interventions: a randomized clinical trial. *Journal of General Internal Medicine* 1991;6(1):1–8.
- Ockene JK, Kristeller J, Pbert L, Hebert JR, Luippold R, Goldberg RJ, Landon J, Kalan K. The Physician-Delivered Smoking Intervention Project: can short-term interventions produce long-term effects for a general outpatient population? *Health Psychology* 1994;13(3):278–81.

- Ockene JK, Quirk ME, Goldberg RJ, Kristeller JL, Donnelly G, Kalan KL, Gould B, Greene HL, Harrison-Atlas R, Pease J, Pickens S, Williams JW. A residents' training program for the development of smoking intervention skills. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 1988b; 148(5):1039–45.
- O'Connor KP, Stravynski A. Evaluation of a smoking typology by use of a specific behavioural substitution method of self-control. *Behaviour Research and Therapy* 1982;20(3):279–88.
- Omenn GS, Thompson B, Sexton M, Hessol N, Breitenstein B, Curry S, Michnich M, Peterson A. A randomized comparison of worksite-sponsored smoking cessation programs. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 1988;4(5):261–7.
- Orleans CS, Shipley RH. Worksite smoking cessation initiatives: review and recommendations. *Addictive Behaviors* 1982;7(1):1–16.
- Orleans CT. Treating nicotine dependence in medical settings: a stepped-care model. In: Orleans CT, Slade J, editors. *Nicotine Addiction: Principles and Management*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993:145–61.
- Orleans CT, Glynn TJ, Manley MW, Slade J. Minimal-contact quit smoking strategies for medical settings. In: Orleans CT, Slade J, editors. *Nicotine Addiction: Principles and Management*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993:181–220.
- Orleans CT, Slade J, editors. *Nicotine Addiction: Principles and Management*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Orleans CT, Resch N, Noll E, Keintz MK, Rimer BK, Brown TV, Snedden TM. Use of transdermal nicotine in a state-level prescription plan for the elderly: a first look at "real-world" patch users. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 1994;271(8):601–7.
- Orleans CT, Schoenbach VJ, Wagner EH, Quade D, Salmon MA, Pearson DC, Fiedler J, Porter CQ, Kaplan BH. Self-help quit smoking interventions: effects of self-help materials, social support instructions, and telephone counseling. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1991;59(3):439–48.
- Ornish SA, Zisook S, McAdams LA. Effects of transdermal clonidine treatment on withdrawal symptoms associated with smoking cessation: a randomized, controlled trial. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 1988;148(9):2027–31.
- Ossip-Klein DJ, Giovino GA, Megahed N, Black PM, Emont SL, Stiggins J, Shulman E, Moore L. Effects of a smokers' hotline: results of a 10-county self-help trial. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1991; 59(2):325–32.
- Oster G, Huse DM, Delea TE, Colditz GA. Cost-effectiveness of nicotine gum as an adjunct to physician's advice against cigarette smoking. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 1986;256(10):1315–8.
- Palmer KJ, Buckley MM, Faulds D. Transdermal nicotine: a review of its pharmacodynamic and pharmacokinetic properties, and therapeutic efficacy as an aid to smoking cessation. *Drugs* 1992;44(3):498–529.
- Patten CA, Gilpin E, Cavin SW, Pierce JP. Workplace smoking policy and changes in smoking behavior in California: a suggested association. *Tobacco Control* 1995;4(1):36–41.
- Paxton R. The effects of a deposit contract as a component in a behavioural programme for stopping smoking. *Behaviour Research and Therapy* 1980;18(1):45–50.
- Paxton R. Deposit contracts with smokers: varying frequency and amount of repayments. *Behaviour Research and Therapy* 1981;19(2):117–23.
- Paxton R. Prolonging the effects of deposit contracts with smokers. *Behaviour Research and Therapy* 1983; 21(4):425–33.
- Perkins KA. Weight gain following smoking cessation. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1993; 61(5):768–77.
- Perkins KA. Sex differences in nicotine versus nonnicotine reinforcement as determinants of tobacco smoking. *Experimental and Clinical Psychopharmacology* 1996;4(2):166–77.
- Perkins KA, Donny E, Caggiula AR. Sex differences in nicotine effects and self-administration: review of human and animal evidence. *Nicotine and Tobacco Research* 1999;1(4):301–15.

- Perkins KA, Levine M, Marcus M, Shiffman S, D'Amico D, Miller A, Keins A, Ashcom J, Broge M. Tobacco withdrawal in women and menstrual cycle phase. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 2000;68(1):176–80.
- Perry CL, Kelder SH, Murray DM, Klepp K-I. Communitywide smoking prevention: long-term outcomes of the Minnesota Heart Health Program and the Class of 1989 Study. *American Journal of Public Health* 1992;82(9):1210–6.
- Petersen L, Handel J, Kotch J, Podedworny T, Rosen A. Smoking reduction during pregnancy by a program of self-help and clinical support. *Obstetrics & Gynecology* 1992;79(6):924–30.
- Piasecki TM, Fiore MC, Baker TB. Profiles in discouragement: two studies of variability in the time course of smoking withdrawal symptoms. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology* 1998;107(2):238–51.
- Piasecki TM, Kenford SL, Smith SS, Fiore MC, Baker TB. Listening to nicotine: negative affect and the smoking withdrawal conundrum. *Psychological Science* 1997;8(3):184–9.
- Pierce JP, Anderson DM, Romano RM, Meissner HI, Odenkirchen JC. Promoting smoking cessation in the United States: effect of public service announcements on the Cancer Information Service telephone line. *Journal of the National Cancer Institute* 1992;84(9):677–83.
- Pierce JP, Fiore MC, Novotny TE, Hatziaandreu EJ, Davis RM. Trends in cigarette smoking in the United States: educational differences are increasing. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 1989;261(1):56–60.
- Pierce JP, Gilpin E, Emery SL, White MM, Rosbrook B, Berry C. Has the California Tobacco Control Program reduced smoking? *Journal of the American Medical Association* 1998;280(10):893–9.
- Pinto RP, Abrams DB, Monti PM, Jacobus SI. Nicotine dependence and likelihood of quitting smoking. *Addictive Behaviors* 1987;12(4):371–4.
- Pirie PL, McBride CM, Hellerstedt W, Jeffery RW, Hatsukami D, Allen S, Lando H. Smoking cessation in women concerned about weight. *American Journal of Public Health* 1992;82(9):1238–43.
- Po ALW. Transdermal nicotine in smoking cessation: a meta-analysis. *European Journal of Clinical Pharmacology* 1993;45(6):519–28.
- Pomerleau CS, Majchrzak MJ, Pomerleau OF. Nicotine dependence and the Fagerström Tolerance Questionnaire: a brief review. *Journal of Substance Abuse* 1989;1(4):471–7.
- Pomerleau CS, Pomerleau OF, Garcia AW. Bio-behavioural research on nicotine use in women. *British Journal of Addiction* 1991;86(5):527–31.
- Pomerleau OF, Fertig JB, Shanahan SO. Nicotine dependence in cigarette smoking: an empirically-based, multivariate model. *Pharmacology, Biochemistry and Behavior* 1983;19(2):291–9.
- Prochaska JO, DiClemente CC. Stages and processes of self-change of smoking: toward an integrative model of change. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1983;51(3):390–5.
- Prochaska JO, DiClemente CC, Velicer WF, Rossi JS. Standardized, individualized, interactive, and personalized self-help programs for smoking cessation. *Health Psychology* 1993;12(5):399–405.
- Prochazka AV, Petty TL, Nett L, Silvers GW, Sachs DPL, Rennard SI, Daughton DM, Grimm RH Jr, Heim C. Transdermal clonidine reduced some withdrawal symptoms but did not increase smoking cessation. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 1992;152(10):2065–9.
- Prochazka AV, Weaver MJ, Keller RT, Fryer GE, Licari PA, Lofaso D. A randomized trial of nortriptyline for smoking cessation. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 1998;158(18):2035–9.
- Puska P, Björkqvist S, Koskela K. Nicotine-containing chewing gum in smoking cessation: a double blind trial with half year follow-up. *Addictive Behaviors* 1979;4(2):141–6.
- Rabkin SW, Boyko E, Shane F, Kaufert J. A randomized trial comparing smoking cessation programs utilizing behaviour modification, health education or hypnosis. *Addictive Behaviors* 1984;9(2):157–73.
- Raw M, Russell MAH. Rapid smoking, cue exposure and support in the modification of smoking. *Behaviour Research and Therapy* 1980;18(5):363–72.



- Rickard-Figueroa K, Zeichner A. Assessment of smoking urge and its concomitants under an environmental smoking cue manipulation. *Addictive Behaviors* 1985;10(3):249–56.
- Rigotti NA. Trends in the adoption of smoking restrictions in public places and worksites. *New York State Journal of Medicine* 1989;89(1):19–26.
- Rimer BK, Orleans CT. Older smokers. In: Orleans CT, Slade J, editors. *Nicotine Addiction: Principles and Management*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993:385–95.
- Rimer BK, Orleans CT, Fleisher L, Cristinzio S, Resch N, Telepchak J, Keintz MK. Does tailoring matter? The impact of a tailored guide on ratings and short-term smoking-related outcomes for older smokers. *Health Education Research* 1994;9(1):69–84.
- Risser NL, Belcher DW. Adding spirometry, carbon monoxide, and pulmonary symptom results to smoking cessation counseling: a randomized trial. *Journal of General Internal Medicine* 1990;5(1):16–22.
- Robinson MD, Laurent SL, Little JM Jr. Including smoking status as a new vital sign: it works! *Journal of Family Practice* 1995;40(6):556–61.
- Rohren CL, Croghan IT, Hurt RD, Offord KP, Marušić Z, McClain FL. Predicting smoking cessation outcome in a medical center from stage of readiness: contemplation versus action. *Preventive Medicine* 1994;23(3):335–44.
- Rohsenow DJ, Niaura RS, Childress AR, Abrams DB, Monti PM. Cue reactivity in addictive behaviors: theoretical and treatment implications. *International Journal of the Addictions* 1990–91;25(7A and 8A):957–93.
- Rose JE, Levin ED, Behm FM, Adivi C, Schur C. Transdermal nicotine facilitates smoking cessation. *Clinical Pharmacology & Therapeutics* 1990;47(3):323–30.
- Rothenberg R, Koplan JP, Cutler C, Hillman AL. Changing pediatric practice in a changing medical environment: factors that influence what physicians do. *Pediatric Annals* 1998;27(4):241–50.
- Russell MAH, Wilson C, Taylor C, Baker CD. Effect of general practitioners' advice against smoking. *British Medical Journal* 1979;2(4):231–5.
- Sachs DPL, Säwe U, Leischow SJ. Effectiveness of a 16-hour transdermal nicotine patch in a medical practice setting, without intensive group counseling. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 1993;153(16):1881–90.
- Schauffler HH, Parkinson MD. Health insurance coverage for smoking cessation services. *Health Education Quarterly* 1993;20(2):185–206.
- Schneider NG. Nicotine nasal spray. *Health Values* 1993;18(3):10–4.
- Schneider NG, Olmstead R, Mody FV, Doan K, Franzon M, Jarvik ME, Steinberg C. Efficacy of a nicotine nasal spray in smoking cessation: a placebo-controlled, double-blind trial. *Addiction* 1995;90(12):1671–82.
- Schneider NG, Olmstead R, Nilsson F, Mody FV, Franzon M, Doan K. Efficacy of a nicotine inhaler in smoking cessation: a double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *Addiction* 1996;91(9):1293–1306.
- Schoenbach VJ, Orleans CT, Wagner EH, Quade D, Salmon MAP, Porter CQ. Characteristics of smokers who enroll and quit in self-help programs. *Health Education Research* 1992;7(3):369–80.
- Schwartz JL. *Review and Evaluation of Smoking Cessation Methods: The United States and Canada, 1978–1985*. Bethesda (MD): US Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, National Institutes of Health, National Cancer Institute, Division of Cancer Prevention and Control, 1987. NIH Publication No. 87-2940.
- Schwartz JL. Evaluation of acupuncture as a treatment for smoking. *American Journal of Acupuncture* 1988;16(2):135–42.
- Schwartz JL. Methods of smoking cessation. *Medical Clinics of North America* 1992;76(2):451–76.
- Schwid SR, Hirvonen MD, Keesey RE. Nicotine effects on body weight: a regulatory perspective. *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition* 1992;55(4):878–84.
- Severson HH, Andrews JA, Lichtenstein E, Gordon JS, Barckley MF. Using the hygiene visit to deliver a tobacco cessation program: results of a randomized clinical trial. *Journal of the American Dental Association* 1998;129(7):993–9.

- Shiffman S. Relapse following smoking cessation: a situational analysis. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1982;50(1):71–86.
- Shiffman S. Coping with temptations to smoke. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1984;52(2):261–7.
- Shiffman S. Tobacco “chippers”—individual differences in tobacco dependence. *Psychopharmacology* 1989;97(4):539–47.
- Shiffman S. Assessing smoking patterns and motives. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1993a;61(5):732–42.
- Shiffman S. Smoking cessation treatment: any progress? *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1993b;61(5):718–22.
- Shiffman S, Cassileth BR, Black BL, Buxbaum J, Celentano DD, Corcoran RD, Gritz ER, Laszlo J, Lichtenstein E, Pechacek TF, Prochaska J, Scholefield PG. Needs and recommendations for behavior research in the prevention and early detection of cancer. *Cancer* 1991;67(3 Suppl):800–4.
- Shiffman SM, Jarvik ME. Smoking withdrawal symptoms in two weeks of abstinence. *Psychopharmacology* 1976;50(1):35–9.
- Shipp M, Croughan-Minihane MS, Petitti DB, Washington AE. Estimation of the break-even point for smoking cessation programs in pregnancy. *American Journal of Public Health* 1992;82(3):383–90.
- Silagy C, Mant D, Fowler G, Lodge M. The effectiveness of nicotine replacement therapies in smoking cessation. *Online Journal of Current Clinical Trials*, Jan 14, 1994;3:Document No. 113.
- Silagy C, Mant D, Fowler G, Lancaster T. Nicotine Replacement Therapy for Smoking Cessation (Cochrane Review) [abstract]; The Cochrane Library, Issue 1, 1999; Oxford: Update Software;<<http://www.update-software.com/cochrane.htm>>; accessed: May 12, 1999.
- Simon MJ, Salzberg HC. Hypnosis and related behavioral approaches in the treatment of addictive behaviors. In: Hersen M, Eisler RM, Miller PM, editors. *Progress in Behavior Modification*. Vol. 132. New York: Academic Press, 1982:51–78.
- Slotkin TA. Fetal nicotine or cocaine exposure: which one is worse? *Journal of Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics* 1998;285(3):931–45.
- Sorensen G, Thompson B, Glanz K, Feng Z, Kinne S, DiClemente C, Emmons K, Heimendinger J, Probart C, Lichtenstein E. Work site-based cancer prevention: primary results from the Working Well Trial. *American Journal of Public Health* 1996;86(7):939–47.
- Spiegel D, Frischholz EJ, Fleiss JL, Spiegel H. Predictors of smoking abstinence following a single-session restructuring intervention with self-hypnosis. *American Journal of Psychology* 1993;150(7):1090–7.
- Stapleton JA, Russell MAH, Feyerabend C, Wiseman SM, Gustavsson G, Säwe U, Wiseman D. Dose effects and predictors of outcome in a randomized trial of transdermal nicotine patches in general practice. *Addiction* 1995;90(1):31–42.
- Stave GM, Jackson GW. Effect of a total work-site smoking ban on employee smoking and attitudes. *Journal of Occupational Medicine* 1991;33(8):884–90.
- Stevens VJ, Hollis JF. Preventing smoking relapse, using an individually tailored skills-training technique. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1989;57(3):420–4.
- Stevens VJ, Severson H, Lichtenstein E, Little SJ, Leben J. Making the most of a teachable moment: a smokeless-tobacco cessation intervention in the dental office. *American Journal of Public Health* 1995;85(2):231–5.
- Stillman FA, Becker DM, Swank RT, Hantula D, Moses H, Glantz S, Waranch HR. Ending smoking at the Johns Hopkins medical institutions. An evaluation of smoking prevalence and indoor air pollution. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 1990;264(12):1565–9.
- Stitzer ML, Bigelow GE. Contingent reinforcement for reduced breath carbon monoxide levels: target-specific effects on cigarette smoking. *Addictive Behaviors* 1985;10(4):345–9.
- Stitzer ML, Gross J. Smoking relapse: the role of pharmacological and behavioral factors. In: Pomerleau OF, Pomerleau CS, editors. *Nicotine Replacement: A Critical Evaluation*. New York: Alan R. Liss, 1988:163–84.

- Strecher VJ, Kreuter M, Den Boer DJ, Kobrin S, Hoppers HJ, Skinner CS. The effects of computer-tailored smoking cessation messages in family practice settings. *Journal of Family Practice* 1994;39(3):262–70.
- Strecher VJ, O'Malley MS, Villagra VG, Campbell EE, Gonzalez JJ, Irons TG, Kenney RD, Turner RC, Rogers CS, Lyles MF, White ST, Sanchez CJ, Stritter FT, Fletcher SW. Can residents be trained to counsel patients about quitting smoking? Results from a randomized trial. *Journal of General Internal Medicine* 1991;6(1):9–17.
- Sutherland G, Stapleton JA, Russell MAH, Jarvis MJ, Hajek P, Belcher M, Feyerabend C. Randomised controlled trial of nasal nicotine spray in smoking cessation. *Lancet* 1992;340(8815):324–9.
- Swan GE, Ward MM, Carmelli D, Jack LM. Differential rates of relapse in subgroups of male and female smokers. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 1993;46(9):1041–53.
- Swartz SH, Ellsworth AJ, Curry SJ, Boyko EJ. Community patterns of transdermal nicotine use and provider counseling. *Journal of General Internal Medicine* 1995;10(12):656–62.
- Tager IB. Health effects of involuntary smoking in the workplace. *New York State Journal of Medicine* 1989;89(1):27–31.
- Tang JL, Law M, Wald N. How effective is nicotine replacement therapy in helping people to stop smoking? *British Medical Journal* 1994;308(6920):21–6.
- Tate JC, Schmitz JM. A proposed revision of the Fagerström Tolerance Questionnaire. *Addictive Behaviors* 1993;18(2):135–43.
- Taylor CB, Houston-Miller N, Killen JD, DeBusk RF. Smoking cessation after acute myocardial infarction: effects of a nurse-managed intervention. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 1990;113(2):118–23.
- Ter Riet G, Kleijnen J, Knipschild P. A meta-analysis of studies into the effect of acupuncture on addiction. *British Journal of General Practice* 1990;40(338):379–82.
- Thomas RM, Larsen MD. *Smoking Prevalence, Beliefs, and Activities by Gender and Other Demographic Indicators*. Rockville (MD): Gallup Organization, 1993.
- Tiffany ST, Hakenewerth DM. The production of smoking urges through an imagery manipulation: psychophysiological and verbal manifestations. *Addictive Behaviors* 1991;16(6):389–400.
- Tiffany ST, Martin EM, Baker TB. Treatments for cigarette smoking: an evaluation of the contributions of aversion and counseling procedures. *Behaviour Research and Therapy* 1986;24(4):437–52.
- Tomar SL, Husten CG, Manley MW. Do dentists and physicians advise tobacco users to quit? *Journal of the American Dental Association* 1996;127(2):259–65.
- Tomar SL, Winn DM, Swango GA, Giovino GA, Kleinman DV. Oral mucosal smokeless tobacco lesions among adolescents in the United States. *Journal of Dental Research* 1997;76(6):1277–86.
- Tønnesen P, Fryd V, Hansen M, Helsted J, Gunnensen AB, Forchammer H, Stockner M. Effect of nicotine chewing gum in combination with group counseling on the cessation of smoking. *New England Journal of Medicine* 1988a;318(1):15–8.
- Tønnesen P, Fryd V, Hansen M, Helsted J, Gunnensen AB, Forchammer H, Stockner M. Two and four mg nicotine chewing gum and group counselling in smoking cessation: an open, randomized, controlled trial with a 22 month follow-up. *Addictive Behaviors* 1988b;13(1):17–27.
- Tønnesen P, Nørregaard J, Mikkelsen K, Jørgensen S, Nilsson F. A double-blind trial of a nicotine inhaler for smoking cessation. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 1993;269(10):1268–71.
- Tønnesen P, Nørregaard J, Simonsen K, Säwe U. A double-blind trial of a 16-hour transdermal nicotine patch in smoking cessation. *New England Journal of Medicine* 1991;325(5):311–5.
- Transdermal Nicotine Study Group. Transdermal nicotine for smoking cessation: six-month results from two multicenter controlled clinical trials. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 1991;266(22):3133–8.
- Tsevat J. Impact and cost-effectiveness of smoking interventions. *American Journal of Medicine* 1992;93(Suppl 1A):43S–47S.

Tyndale RF, Pianezza ML, Sellers EM. A common genetic defect in nicotine metabolism decreases risk for dependence and lowers cigarette consumption. *Nicotine and Tobacco Research* 1999;1(Suppl 2):S63–S67.

US Department of Health and Human Services. *The Health Consequences of Involuntary Smoking. A Report of the Surgeon General*. Rockville (MD): US Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Centers for Disease Control, Center for Health Promotion and Education, Office on Smoking and Health, 1986. DHHS Publication No. (CDC) 87-8398.

US Department of Health and Human Services. *The Health Consequences of Smoking: Nicotine Addiction. A Report of the Surgeon General*. Rockville (MD): US Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Centers for Disease Control, Center for Health Promotion and Education, Office on Smoking and Health, 1988. DHHS Publication No. (CDC) 88-8406.

US Department of Health and Human Services. *Reducing the Health Consequences of Smoking: 25 Years of Progress. A Report of the Surgeon General*. Atlanta: US Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Centers for Disease Control, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Office on Smoking and Health, 1989. DHHS Publication No. (CDC) 89-8411.

US Department of Health and Human Services. *Healthy People 2000: National Health Promotion and Disease Prevention Objectives*. Washington: US Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, 1991. DHHS Publication No. (PHS) 91-50212.

US Department of Health and Human Services. *Preventing Tobacco Use Among Young People: A Report of the Surgeon General*. Atlanta: US Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Office on Smoking and Health, 1994.

US Department of Health and Human Services. *Tobacco Use Among U.S. Racial/Ethnic Minority Groups—African Americans, American Indians and Alaska Natives, Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, and Hispanics: A Report of the Surgeon General*. Atlanta: US Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Office on Smoking and Health, 1998.

US Department of Health and Human Services. *Healthy People 2010* (Conference edition, in two volumes). Washington: US Department of Health and Human Services, 2000.

Velicer WF, Prochaska JO, Bellis JM, DiClemente CC, Rossi JS, Fava JL, Steiger JH. An expert system intervention for smoking cessation. *Addictive Behaviors* 1993;18(3):269–90.

Wack JT, Rodin J. Smoking and its effects on body weight and the systems of caloric regulation. *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition* 1982;35(2):366–80.

Wagner EH, Curry SJ, Grothaus L, Saunders KW, McBride CM. The impact of smoking and quitting on health care use. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 1995;155:1789–95.

Wagner EH, Schoenbach VJ, Orleans CT, Grothaus LC, Saunders KW, Curry S, Pearson DC. Participation in a smoking cessation program: a population-based perspective. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 1990;6(5):258–66.

Wei H, Young D. Effect of clonidine on cigarette cessation and in the alleviation of withdrawal symptoms. *British Journal of Addiction* 1988;83(10):1221–6.

Weissfeld JL, Holloway JL. Treatment for cigarette smoking in a Department of Veterans Affairs outpatient clinic. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 1991;151(5):973–7.

Wells KB, Ware JE Jr, Lewis CE. Physicians' attitudes in counseling patients about smoking. *Medical Care* 1984;22(4):360–5.

West R. The “nicotine replacement paradox” in smoking cessation: how does nicotine gum really work? [editorial] *British Journal of Addiction* 1992;87(2):165–7.

West RJ. Psychology and pharmacology in cigarette withdrawal. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research* 1984;28(5):379–86.

West RJ, Hajek P, Belcher M. Severity of withdrawal symptoms as a predictor of outcome of an attempt to quit smoking. *Psychological Medicine* 1989;19(4):981–5.

- West RJ, Jarvis MJ, Russell MAH, Carruthers ME, Feyerabend C. Effect of nicotine replacement on the cigarette withdrawal syndrome. *British Journal of Addiction* 1984a;79(2):215–9.
- West RJ, Russell MA, Jarvis MJ, Feyerabend C. Does switching to an ultra-low nicotine cigarette induce nicotine withdrawal effects? *Psychopharmacology* 1984b; 84(1):120–3.
- Westman EC, Levin ED, Rose JE. The nicotine patch in smoking cessation: a randomized trial with telephone counseling. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 1993;153 (16):1917–23.
- Wetter DW, Kenford SL, Smith SS, Fiore MC, Jorenby DE, Baker TB. Gender differences in smoking cessation. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1999; 67(4):555–62.
- Whitlock EP, Vogt TM, Hollis JF, Lichtenstein E. Does gender affect response to a brief clinic-based smoking intervention? *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 1997;13(3):159–66.
- Wiggins JS. *Personality and Prediction: Principles of Personality Assessment*. Malabar (FL): Robert E. Krieger Publishing Company, 1988.
- Williamson DF, Madans J, Anda RF, Kleinman JC, Giovino GA, Byers T. Smoking cessation and severity of weight gain in a national cohort. *New England Journal of Medicine* 1991;324(11):739–45.
- Wilson DM, Taylor DW, Gilbert JR, Best JA, Lindsay EA, Willms DG, Singer J. A randomized trial of a family physician intervention for smoking cessation. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 1988;260(11): 1570–4.
- Windsor RA, Cutter G, Morris J, Reese Y, Manzella B, Bartlett EE, Samuelson C, Spanos D. The effectiveness of smoking cessation methods for smokers in public health maternity clinics: a randomized trial. *American Journal of Public Health* 1985;75(12):1389–92.
- Windsor RA, Lowe JB, Perkins LL, Smith-Yoder D, Artz L, Crawford M, Amburgy K, Boyd NR Jr. Health education for pregnant smokers: its behavioral impact and cost benefit. *American Journal of Public Health* 1993; 83(2):201–6.
- Windsor RA, Warner KE, Cutter GR. A cost-effectiveness analysis of self-help smoking cessation methods for pregnant women. *Public Health Reports* 1988;103(1):83–8.
- Working Group for the Study of Transdermal Nicotine in Patients with Coronary Artery Disease. Nicotine replacement therapy for patients with coronary artery disease. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 1994;154(9):989–95.
- Zelman DC, Brandon TH, Jorenby DE, Baker TB. Measures of affect and nicotine dependence predict differential response to smoking cessation treatments. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1992;60(6): 943–52.
- Zhu S-H, Melcer T, Sun J, Rosbrook B, Pierce JP. Smoking cessation with and without assistance: a population-based analysis. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 2000;18(4):305–11.

