Reducing Tobacco Use and Secondhand Smoke Exposure: Quitline Interventions

Summary Evidence Table: Provision of Free Evidence-Based Tobacco Cessation Medications to Promote Quitline Use

Study	Intervention	Population Characteristics	Effect Measure	Reported Baseline	Reported Effect	Value Used in Summary (95%CI)	Follow- up Time
Author (Year): An et al. (2006) Study Design (Suitability): Controlled Before and After (Greatest) Quality of Execution (Limitations): Good (1)	Location: Minnesota, USA Intervention: Proactive counseling + 8 wks of Free NRT. In Sept 2002 offered 8 wk supply of free nicotine patches or gum to callers who enrolled in the multisession program Time: Pre-NRT 9/2001-8/2002 During 9/2002-5/2003 Comparison: Proactive counseling only Callers to quitline before the	Participants selected from list of callers before and after introduction of NRT. >= 18 yrs, smoked>=5 cigs/day; planned to quit within 30 days; no contraindications to NRT Recruited Pre-NRT: N=380 NRT: N=373 Total: 753 Completed 6 months Pre-NRT: 56.8% (216) NRT: 58.7% (219)	Calls to quitline (avg monthly) Self-reported continuous 30 day abstinence Self-reported 7 day point prevalent abstinence	Control: 155 10% 10.8%	Intervention: 679 18.2% 21.7%	Absolute difference: 524 (323 to 725) Relative change: 338.1% Absolute difference: 8.2 pct pts (3.1-13.4) P=0.001 10.9 pct pts (5.5-16.3) P<0.001	6 months 6 months 6 months
Author (Year): Bauer et al. (2006) Study Design (Suitability): Controlled Before and After (Greatest) Quality of Execution (Limitations): Fair (3)	Introduction of NRT Location: NY (Erie and Niagara Counties) Intervention: NRT voucher for 2 wk supply of nicotine patches or gum Time: July-Aug 2003 Comparison: 515 No NRT callers from 2001 survey who had called quitline	Adults>=18; smoked >=10 or more cigarettes per day; residents of the 2 counties; and had no contraindications to to nicotine patch or gum. Recruitment via a press announcement urging smokers to call the quitline to get a voucher for a free 2-week supply of nicotine patches or gum (NRT)	(average per	Comparison 180 12% 1.0	Intervention 4440 21.9% 1.77	Absolute Difference +4260 Relative Change +2366.7% Absolute difference: 9.9 pct pts ARR: 1.77 (1.17- 2.68)	4-6 months 4-6 months 4-6 months

Study	Intervention	Population Characteristics	Effect Measure	Reported Baseline	Reported Effect	Value Used in Summary (95%CI)	Follow- up Time
		2461 received NRT vouchers 732 enrolled post 515 pre- NRT Total 1247					
Author (Year): Bush et al. (2008) Study Design (Suitability):	Location: Oregon, USA Intervention: Single counseling call + mailed quit kit + free 2-week starter supply of NRT (patch)	Quit line callers with insurance >= 18 yrs; OR residents, spoke English, smoked >=5 cigarettes/day, had a valid telephone number,	Calls to quitline** (average per month)	Comparison 257	Intervention 2592	Absolute Difference +2335 Relative Change +908.6%	6 months
Controlled Before and After (Greatest) Quality of Execution (Limitations):	Time: Oct-Dec 2004 Comparison: Single counseling call (30 min) + mailed a quit kit	had insurance Compared free NRT with pre-initiative (no NRT) Valid Phone #s (N) Pre 546	Self-reported 30 day continuous abstinence prevalence at 6 months	8.1%	15.1%	7.0 pct pts	6 months
(Limitations): Fair (2)		Post 1210 Total = 1756	Self-reported 30 day continuous abstinence at 6 months (odds)	OR: 1.0	OR: 2.1	OR: 2.1 (1.5-3.0) P=0.0001	6 months
Author (Year): Campbell et al. (2008)	Montana evaluated promotion of an enhanced quitline service	Smokers in Montana For call volume: quitline callers	Calls to quitline (average per month)	4 week NRT group 397	6 week NRT group 712	Absolute Difference +315 Relative Change 79.3%	6 months
Study Design (Suitability): Controlled Before and After (Greatest) Quality of Execution (Limitations): benefit—4wks Montana, USA Intervention: 5 Proactive quitline calls were initially given to callers to the quitlines and then 6 wks of fre NRT mailed if they qualified fo medications	Callers to Montana Quitline who were >=18 yrs, currently smoke >=10 cigs/day, willing to quit in next 7days and will take f/u call and no contraindications for NRT	Self-reported 7 day point prevalent abstinence at 6 months	9%	12%	Absolute difference: 3 pct pts	6 months	

Study	Intervention	Population Characteristics	Effect Measure	Reported Baseline	Reported Effect	Value Used in Summary (95%CI)	Follow- up Time
Fair (4)	Time: Jan-Nov 2006 (4 wk NRT) Dec 2006-June 2007 (6 wk NRT) Comparison: 5 proactive phone counseling (5 sessions) and 4 wks of free NRT mailed to tobacco users;	Completed calls 6 mos n=314 (4wks) n=583 (6wks)	Odds of abstinence	OR: 1.0	OR: 1.51	OR: 1.51 (1.07-1.66)	6 months
Author (Year): Cummings et al. (2006a) Study Design (Suitability): Controlled Before and After	Location: New York City, USA Intervention: Proactive counseling + Free 6 wk course of nicotine patches + a self-help stop-smoking guide; and a list of local services for smoking cessation.	Smokers had to be at least 18 years of age, residents of NYC, not using NRT or bupropion, agree to attempt to quit in the week after the screening call, have smoked ten or more cigarettes per day for at	And OR	Comparison 9.2%	Intervention 27.9%	Absolute Difference +18.7pct pts OR:4.26 CI: 2.48 to 7.32	months
(Greatest) Quality of Execution (Limitations): Fair (3)	Time: Intervention Period: Apr-May 2003 Pre -Intervention Survey: Jan-Jul 2002 Comparison: Proactive counseling + a self-help stop-smoking guide; and a list of local services for smoking cessation.	least one year, and agree to be contacted for follow- up Completed 4 Mos: Intv: (1597) 884 Ctrl: (446) Completed 12 Mos: Intv: 581 Ctrl: 206	Self-reported 7- day point prevalent abstinence And OR	22.3%	33.2%	10.9 pct pts	months
Author (Year): Cummings et al. (2006b) Study Design (Suitability): Controlled Before and After (Greatest)	Location: 4 studies in New York State Used the state's Smokers' Quitline to screen and register eligible smokers for the free medication Time: Intervention Period:	Control Group Period: 02/2001 Follow-up Survey done in 07/2001 (5 months after enrollment) Study Population: >= 18 yrs, smoked>=10 cigs/day; planned to quit within 7 days; agree to a	Calls to quitline (average per month)	316	A 2 wk voucher 1248 B 1 wk Mail 1572	Absolute Difference +996 Relative Change +395% Absolute Difference +1256 Relative Change +398%	4 months

Study	Intervention	Population Characteristics	Effect Measure	Reported Baseline	Reported Effect	Value Used in Summary (95%CI)	Follow- up Time
Quality of Execution (Limitations): Fair (2)	Intv A: 02/17/2004- 03/03/2004 Intv B: 12/30/2003- 03/01/2004 Intv C: 12/30/2003- 02/28/2004 Intv D: 04/02/2003- 05/14/2003 Intervention A: Proactive counseling + Stop Smoking Guide + 2 wks of Free NRT patch voucher Intervention B: Proactive counseling + Stop Smoking Guide + 1 wk of Free NRT patch Intervention C: Proactive counseling + Stop Smoking Guide + 2 wks of Free NRT patch Intervention D: Proactive counseling + Stop Smoking Guide + 6 wks of Free NRT patch Intervention D: Proactive counseling + Stop Smoking Guide + 6 wks of Free NRT patch Comparison: 515 Participants in 2001 survey calling Quitline who had received counseling support and a free cessation guide but no NRT IMPORTANT NOTE: Control group in this study makes it different from Miller 2005 and Cummings 2006a; this was a 2001 control. Location: Oregon, USA	follow-up phone call, no contraindications to NRT use Recruited GRPS Intv Ctrl 2wk Vch 500 515 1wk ML 500 515 2wk ML 500 515 6wk ML 834 515 Quit line callers with	day point prevalent abstinence	2208 No NRT 9.9% Comparison	C 2 wk Mail 3724 D 6 wk Mail 28852 A 2 wk voucher 25.1% B 1 wk Mail 19.7% C 2 wk Mail 22.7% D 6 wk Mail 21.6%	Absolute Difference +3484 Relative Change +1452% Absolute Difference +26644 Relative Change +1207% Absolute difference:	6
Deprey et al. (2009)	Intervention:	insurance	(average per month)	306.7	2163.7	+1856.3	months

Study	Intervention	Population Characteristics	Effect Measure	Reported Baseline	Reported Effect	Value Used in Summary (95%CI)	Follow- up Time
Study Design (Suitability): Controlled Before and After (Greatest) Quality of Execution (Limitations): Good (1)	Single counseling call + mailed quit kit + free 2-week starter supply of NRT (patch) Time: Pre: Mar-May 2004 Post: Oct-Dec 2004 Comparison: Single counseling call (30 min) + mailed a quit kit	>= 18 yrs; OR residents, spoke English, smoked >=5 cigarettes/day, had a valid telephone number, had insurance Compared free NRT with pre-initiative (no NRT) Pre: 920 Post: 6491 Total = 7411				Relative Change 605%	
Author (Year): Fellows et al. (2007) Study Design (Suitability): Controlled Before and After (Greatest) Quality of Execution (Limitations): Good (1)	Intervention: Single counseling call + mailed quit kit + free 2-week starter supply of NRT (patch) Time: Oct-Dec 2004 Comparison: Single counseling call (30 min) + mailed a quit kit	Quit line callers with insurance >= 18 yrs; OR residents, spoke English, smoked >=5 cigarettes/day, had a valid telephone number, had insurance Compared free NRT with pre-initiative (no NRT) Eligible (N): Pre 1018 Post 1574 Enrolled (n): Pre 320 Post 639	Calls to quitline (average per month) Self-reported 30 day continuous abstinence prevalence at 6 months	Comparison 536 Comparison 8.2% CI: 6.1% to 10.3%	Intervention 1137 Intervention 15.7% CI: 13.7% to 17.8%	Absolute Difference +602 Relative Change 112.3% 7.5 pct pts	6 months
Author (Year): Maher et al. (2007) Study Design (Suitability): Controlled Before and After (Greatest)		Study Population: 18-29 yrs; planned to quit within 30 days; no contraindications to NRT Total # recruited: Not stated Pre Enhancement (n): 114 During Enhancement (Post) (n): 218	Calls to quitline (average per month)	21%	38%	Calls increased dramatically among 18–29-year-old smokers during the enhancement period, and then decreased to 2004 levels after the enhancement stopped. Absolute difference:	3 months

Study	Intervention	Population Characteristics	Effect Measure	Reported Baseline	Reported Effect	Value Used in Summary (95%CI)	Follow- up Time
Quality of Execution (Limitations): Fair (4)	Type modalities of NRT distribution were not stated.		Self-reported 7 day continuous abstinence			17 pct pts P=0.014	
	Comparison: Proactive counseling only (# of sessions not clearly stated) Callers to quitline before introduction of enhancement						
Author (Year): Miller et al. (2005) Study Design (Suitability): Controlled Before and After (Greatest) Quality of Execution (Limitations): Fair (2)	Intervention: Proactive counseling + Free 6 wk course of nicotine patches + a self-help stop-smoking guide; and a list of local services for smoking cessation. Comparison: Proactive counseling only + a self-help stop-smoking guide; and a list of local services for smoking cessation. IMPORTANT NOTE: Control group in this study is different from Cummings 2006a, Also the Sample sizes are different	Smokers had to be at least 18 years of age, residents of NYC, not using NRT or bupropion, agree to attempt to quit in the week after the screening call, have smoked ten or more cigarettes per day for at least one year, and agree to be contacted for follow-up Intervention Period: 4/2/2003-5/14/2003 Post Intervention Survey: 10/31/2003-11/19/2003 Contacted Intv: 1357; Ctrl: 174 Completed 6 Mos	Self-reported 7- day point prevalent abstinence And OR	Comparison 6%	Intervention 33%	Absolute Difference +27 pct pts AOR: 8.8 CI: 4.4 to 17.8 P<0.0001	6 months
Author (Year): Miller et al. (2009) Study Design (Suitability):	Intervention: Standard service (Multi-session counseling) + 75% Subsidized NRT (# of weeks supplied not	Intv: 1305; Ctrl: 159 A random sample of selected from the two lowest socioeconomic quintiles of the South Australian electoral roll.	Calls to quitline (average per month)	Calls/Month 112	Calls/Month 333	Absolute Difference +221 Relative Change +197.3%	12 months
Individual Randomized Trial (Greatest)	stated). Time: Oct-Dec 2005	Study Population: >=18 years; current smokers; smoked>= 10 cigarettes per day; willing to receive telephone support for	Self-reported 7 day point prevalent abstinence	25.7%	39.7%	Absolute difference: 14 pct pts P≤0.001	3 months

Study	Intervention	Population Characteristics	Effect Measure	Reported Baseline	Reported Effect	Value Used in Summary (95%CI)	Follow- up Time
Quality of Execution (Limitations): Fair (3)	Comparison: Standard service (Multi-session counseling) only	quitting; and willing to participate in three follow-up interviews by phone; low SES; no contraindications to NRT	Self-reported 7 day point prevalent abstinence	21.2%	30.9%	9.7 pct pts P≤0.001	6 months
		use. Initial Sampling generated: n=111 comparison response n=249 Intervention response	Self-reported 7 day point prevalent abstinence	19.1%	22.3%	3.2 pct pts NS	months
		Due to initial limited responses, additional sampling methods were done by adding letters of invitation into free community newspapers: 150,000 copies each for intervention and comparison group.					
		This finally produced samples below which were used in the analysis: Intervention (n): 1000					
A salls and (Manage)	La cathaga Ohia 116A	Control (n): 377	Calla ha andh	N. NOT	Danibard NDT	Al I - I - D'CC	
Author (Year): Tinkelman et al.	Location: Ohio, USA	Random sample of quitline callers	Calls to quit line	No NRT 2351	3606	Absolute Difference +1255	6 months
(2007) Study Design	Intervention: Proactive multi session counseling + initial 4 wks of	N= 10,009 (pre-) N= 13,233 (post)	(average calls/month)			P<0.0001 Relative Change +53.4%	
(Suitability): Controlled Before and After	Free NRT + extra 4 wks of NRT Quitline callers ready-to-quit	Total = 23242 6 month f/u	Self-reported 7 day point	No NRT 11.2%	Received NRT 20.2%		
(Greatest)	offered 4 week supply of nicotine patches + proactive multi-session counseling.	n=4657 Pre-NRT n=5715 Post NRT	prevalence abstinence	(10.3-12.1)	(19.2-21.2)		

Study	Intervention	Population Characteristics	Effect Measure	Reported Baseline	Reported Effect	Value Used in Summary (95%CI)	Follow- up Time
Execution	Another 4 week supply is available if they stay in counseling Time: Jul 2005 – Apr 2006	Total 10372	Self-reported 7 day point prevalent abstinence (OR)	Pre-NRT 1.0	Post-NRT OR: 1.28 (1.15-1.43)		
	Comparison: Multiple Proactive counseling Only Not-ready-to-quit Quitline callers Multiple proactive counseling (No NRT offered)		Self-reported 7 day point prevalent abstinence (OR)	No NRT 1.0	NRT OR: 2.18 (1.97-2.42)		

Abbreviations

Ctrl, control
Intv, intervention
Mos, months
NRT, nicotine replacement therapy
OR, odds ratio
pct pts, percentage points
SES, socioeconomic status