

The definitive version is available at

www.onlinelibrary.wiley.com

Shahab, L., Hammond, D., Borland, R, Cummings, K.M., West, R. & McNeill, A. (2009). The impact of relaxing NRT licensing laws in the UK: findings from the International Tobacco Control Four Country Survey. *Addiction*, **104**, 1420-1427.

The impact of changing NRT licensing laws in the UK: findings from the International Tobacco Control Four Country Survey.

Short title: Impact of NRT licensing change

Lion Shahab^a, K. Michael Cummings^b, David Hammond^c, Ron Borland^d, Robert West^a, Ann McNeill^e

^aDepartment of Epidemiology and Public Health, University College London, London, UK

^bDepartment of Health Behavior, Roswell Park Cancer Institute; Buffalo, USA

^cDepartment of Health Studies & Gerontology, University of Waterloo; Waterloo, Canada

^dVicHealth Centre for Tobacco Control, The Cancer Council Victoria; Melbourne, Australia

^eDivision of Epidemiology and Public Health, University of Nottingham, UK

Corresponding author:

Lion Shahab, Cancer Research UK Health Behaviour Research Centre, Department of Epidemiology & Public Health, University College London, 2-16 Torrington Place, London, WC1E 6BT, UK; Phone: +44 207679 6495; Fax: +44 207813 2848

Email: lion.shahab@ucl.ac.uk

Word Count: 3712 (excluding Abstract=263)

Figures: 3

Tables: 2

The impact of changing NRT licensing laws in the UK: findings from the International Tobacco Control Four Country Survey.

Lion Shahab, K. Michael Cummings, David Hammond, Ron Borland, Robert West, Ann McNeill

ABSTRACT

Aim: To evaluate the impact of a new licence for some nicotine replacement therapy products (NRT) for cutting down to stop (CDTS), on changes in the pattern of NRT use.

Design: Quasi-experimental design comparing changes in NRT use across two waves of a population-based, replenished-panel, telephone survey conducted before and after the introduction of new licensing laws in the UK with changes in NRT use in three comparison countries (Australia, Canada and United States) without a licensing change.

Participants: 7386 and 7013 smokers and recent ex-smokers participating in the 2004 and/or 2006/7 survey.

Measurements: Data were collected on demographic and smoking characteristics as well as NRT use and access. In order to account for interdependence resulting from some participants being present in both waves, generalised estimation equations with an exchangeable correlation matrix were used to assess within-country changes and linear and logistic regressions to assess between-country differences in adjusted analyses.

Findings: NRT use was more prevalent in the UK and increased across waves in both all countries but no wave by country interaction was observed. There was no evidence that the licensing change increased the prevalence of CDTS or the use of NRT (irrespective of how it was accessed) for CDTS in the UK relative to comparison countries. There was also no evidence for a change in concurrent smoking and NRT use among smokers not attempting to stop in the UK relative to comparison countries.

Conclusion: The addition of the CDTS licence for some NRT products in the UK appears to have had very limited, if any, impact on NRT use in the first year after the licence change.

Key words: Nicotine replacement therapy, Smoking cessation, Tobacco use, Reduce-to-quit

INTRODUCTION

Nicotine Replacement Therapy (NRT) is an effective smoking cessation treatment and is currently available in six different forms in the UK (patch, gum, lozenge, microtab, inhalator or nasal spray), each providing nicotine variously through the skin, the oral or the nasal mucosal membrane.[1] NRT reduces withdrawal symptoms and urges to smoke [2] and has been shown to roughly double a smoker's chances of quitting successfully.[3] NRT is effective even with minimal behavioural support and supervision. [4]

In the UK, NRT can be purchased over the counter (OTC) from pharmacies and, with the classification of some NRT products in the general sale category, in supermarkets and at other outlets.[5] NRT also became available subsidised on prescription in the UK in 2001, which allowed smokers to purchase NRT at a reduced or no cost depending on income level.[6] In September 2005, changes in the licensing for NRT reduced the number of cautions and contra-indications for NRT and thus permit its use by pregnant smokers, adolescent smokers or smokers with heart disease. These changes were implemented as it was felt that the potential risks of NRT use among these smokers were much less than the risks associated with continued smoking.[7]

Another change to NRT licensing laws that came into effect in 2005 was to permit smokers to use two NRT products, namely nicorette gum and nicorette inhaler, to cut down the number of cigarettes smoked prior to attempting to stop smoking completely over a six month period, and with a view to stopping NRT use within a 12 month period. The change in regulation was informed by an increasing evidence base suggesting that smokers who use NRT to gradually reduce their cigarette consumption are more likely to stop smoking than smokers who try to cut down using a placebo.[8-11] The use of these NRT products for gradual cessation was advertised on TV (although the advertisement showed a smoker using NRT at work perhaps

therefore being more illustrative of use in situations of temporary abstinence) and was also indicated on the packaging. While the licensing change was applied irrespective of how NRT was accessed, it was suggested that the UK smoking cessation services should only get involved once the smoker attempted to stop smoking completely [7]. Hence NRT prescribed by the services (or indeed other prescribers) would have been more likely to have been given for quitting rather than cutting down. Any changes in NRT used for cutting down to stop (CDTS) are likely to have been most pronounced among users of NRT who obtained it OTC.

It has been previously reported that changes in licensing can lead to an increase in the use of NRT[12]. This study evaluates the effect of a new indication for NRT products to allow their use for cutting down prior to attempting to stop completely. Our analysis is based upon data from the International Tobacco Control (ITC) Four Country Survey collected before and after the introduction of the new licensing laws in the UK. For comparison purposes we also examine data on NRT usage patterns from three countries (Australia, Canada and USA) where no commensurate change in NRT labelling and usage rules occurred. We hypothesize that the UK licensing will have led to:

- 1.) An increase in the use of NRT, in particular NRT obtained OTC, in the UK relative to comparison countries.
- 2.) An increase in the incidence of smokers attempting to stop smoking gradually in the UK relative to comparison countries.
- 3.) An increase in the incidence of smokers attempting to stop smoking gradually with NRT, especially NRT obtained OTC, in the UK relative to comparison countries.

We also hypothesise that a potential side-effect of the policy change may be that:

- 4.) Smokers not attempting to stop may be more likely to concurrently use NRT in the UK relative to comparison countries and that therefore fewer smokers attempt to quit.

METHODS

Participants and study design

The ITC Four Country Survey is a yearly cohort survey that includes a representative sample of adult smokers and ex-smokers from Australia (AU), Canada (CA), the United Kingdom (UK) and the United States (US). Since 2002, six surveys have been carried out. The ITC survey assesses the impact of national-level tobacco control policies on psychosocial, behavioural and attitudinal correlates of tobacco use. The methodology has been described in detail elsewhere.[13] Briefly, participants were recruited by phone with a probability sampling method; eligible households, stratified by geographic region and community size, were randomly selected using random-digit dialling methods. Only individuals who were 18 years or older, had smoked more than 100 cigarettes in their life and at least once in the past month were included. Participants were reimbursed the equivalent of US\$10 for their time at each wave. In the five follow-up surveys, the recruited sample has been replenished to ensure a sufficient sample size (2000 per country). Ethical approval was provided by participating research institutes in the four countries. Full details of the sampling design and procedure can be found at <http://www.itcproject.org>.

A quasi-experimental design was chosen for this analysis, comparing changes in NRT use across two waves in the UK relative to comparison countries where no changes in NRT licensing had occurred. We identified participants who completed either wave 3, which was carried out before the UK licensing change (June - Dec 2004), and/or wave 5, conducted after the UK licensing change (Oct 2006 - Feb 2007). For the purpose of this analysis, participants had to be daily smokers at recruitment or recent ex-smokers (stopped < 6 months ago). A total of 7386 and 7013 adults fitting these inclusion criteria participated in waves 3 and 5 respectively, of whom 3307 (44.8% of wave 3 and 47.2% of wave 5) participated in both waves. As

waves 3 and 5 of this cohort study were treated as cross-sectional surveys, within-subject interdependence was modeled in the statistical analysis (see **Analyses**). Table 1 provides sample characteristics for each wave.

Measures

Survey questions were standardised across countries and waves but wording was adapted where necessary to account for colloquial differences. Phone interviews followed a strict protocol using Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing software to minimise bias and increase reliability.

Demographics

Age, sex, ethnicity (2 categories; “white/English-speaking at home”, “non-white/non English-speaking at home”), education level (3 categories; “low/secondary school or less”, “moderate/some postsecondary training”, “high/postsecondary degree or higher”) and annual income (3 categories: “low/under equivalent of US\$30,000“, “moderate/US\$30,000-59,999”, and “high/US\$60,000 and over”) were all assessed at recruitment and monitored for changes across waves.

Smoking Characteristics

Smoking status was determined by self-report through a series of questions assessing current and past smoking behaviour. Respondents were categorised as current smokers and ex-smokers (quit less than 1 month, 1-6 months or more than 6 months ago). Current smokers were asked about their intention to quit (Yes/No). Nicotine dependence was assessed with the heaviness-of-smoking index (HSI) which produces a range of values (0-6) that are based on summative categories of the time to first cigarette and the number of cigarettes per day.[14]

Participants were asked about their quitting behaviour, either in the past year if they were newly recruited, or since the last survey (roughly a year ago) if there were followed up. Those who had attempted to quit at least once in this time-frame (referred to here as 'quit attempters') were asked whether, on their most recent quit attempt, they had stopped smoking gradually or suddenly and whether they had used any cessation aids to do so. Irrespective of NRT use, participants who indicated that they had attempted to stop smoking and had done so by gradually reducing their consumption were defined as using 'cut-down-to-stop' (CDTS).

NRT Use

Irrespective of quit attempts, use of stop-smoking medications (including NRT) in the last year was recorded. Respondents were classified as having used NRT if they reported the use of any of the available six NRT products (patch, gum, lozenge, microtab, inhalator or nasal spray). Participants were asked whether, for the most recent use of NRT, they had used it for any of the following: to stop smoking, to reduce tobacco consumption, to cope with smoke-free environment or for other reasons. Due to a change in coding at wave 5, only those who had used NRT to stop smoking completely were also asked how they had obtained NRT (prescription, over the counter or off the shelf (OTC), from a friend). All NRT users were also asked whether they had continued to smoke while using NRT.

Whilst the licensing change applied to only two NRT products (gum and inhaler), we have included all NRT in the analysis as a.) licensing for CDTS was restricted to the products of a particular manufacturer, which were not able to differentiate; b.) NRT other than gum and inhaler are likely to have been used for CDTS; and c.) including only gum and inhaler use dramatically reduces the sample and thus power to detect statistical differences where present. However, a sensitivity analysis that was

restricted to only gum and inhaler use was carried out to validate our findings, and this showed the same trends as reported in the analysis including all NRT products.

Analyses

Data were analysed using SPSS 16.0. Unadjusted preliminary analysis was carried out to identify potential confounders for adjusted analyses (see below). Differences in continuous or dichotomous variables between countries were assessed by chi square or t-test and differences between waves by generalised estimating equations (GEE) based on a logit (for dichotomous outcomes) or identity (for continuous outcomes) link function that used an exchangeable correlation matrix to model the interdependence between waves resulting from some participants being present in both waves.

Adjusted analyses used GEE and included age, sex (in comparison countries), income (in UK), education and, where applicable, nicotine dependence (for ex-smokers HSI values were imputed from the last available data point) as covariates to determine within-country changes and age and income to determine wave-country interactions. Where appropriate, adjusted cross-sectional analyses were carried out to further elucidate wave-dependent changes using logistic or linear regressions and included age, ethnicity, education and, where applicable, nicotine dependence as covariates. In order to control for unidentified, country-specific confounders, a categorical variable specifying each individual country was also included these adjusted between-country comparisons.

RESULTS

Preliminary unadjusted analysis

Age increased from wave 3 to wave 5 in the UK and comparison countries (Table 1). This increase in age was more pronounced in comparison countries resulting in a country by wave interaction (Table 1). Overall, participants in the UK were older than

in comparison countries. In terms of sex distribution, there was a slight decrease in the proportion of men in comparison countries but not in the UK across waves, but no overall significant differences (Table 1). There were no changes in the ethnic distribution of participants between waves. Altogether, the UK was less ethnically diverse than comparison countries. The proportion of participants on a low income increased in the UK but not in comparison countries and there was a significant country by wave interaction (Table 1). The level of education also increased across waves in all countries but, overall, was lower in the UK than in comparison countries (Table 1).

Table 1 about here

There were no country by wave interactions on any of the smoking characteristics considered. Around 95% of the sample consisted of current smokers with no differences within or between countries (Table 1). Nicotine dependence (and in the UK also cigarette consumption) increased significantly from wave 3 to wave 5 in the UK and in comparison countries (Table 1) but there were no other within-country changes. Overall, smokers in the UK were less likely to intend or to have attempted to stop smoking and had carried out fewer quit attempts in the last year than current smokers in comparison countries (Table 1). There was a general trend towards increased NRT use across waves. Overall, more NRT was used in the UK than in comparison countries (see Table 1)

Adjusted analyses

1.) Impact of licence change on NRT use

Confirming unadjusted analyses, NRT use in the general population increased across waves in both the UK (Wald $\chi^2(1)=12.2$, $p<0.001$) and in comparison countries (Wald $\chi^2(1)=28.6$, $p<0.001$) but no country by wave interaction was detected. However,

among quit attempters, NRT use significantly increased only in comparison countries (Wald $\chi^2(1)=5.9$, $p=0.015$) and not in the UK (Figure 1). Again, there was no country by wave interaction. Yet, smokers attempting to quit were more likely to use NRT in the UK than in any of the other countries at both wave 3 (OR range: 1.44-2.11; 95%CI range: 1.06-2.96) and wave 5 (OR range: 1.45-1.85; 95%CI range: 1.05-2.60)

Figure 1 about here

There was also an increase in the proportion of smokers attempting to quit who obtained NRT OTC in comparison countries (Wald $\chi^2(1)=9.6$, $p=0.002$) but not in the UK (Figure 1), which resulted in a significant country by wave interaction (Wald $\chi^2(1)=5.80$, $p=0.016$). Only at wave 5 (but not wave 3) were quit attempters in the UK less likely to obtain NRT OTC compared with quit attempters from any other country (OR range: 0.38-0.56; 95%CI range: 0.25-0.87).

2.) Impact of license change on cutting down to stop smoking

Among quit attempters, there was virtually no change in the prevalence of people using CDTs in the UK or in comparison countries and no country by wave interaction were observed (Figure 2). Whilst more participants in comparison countries attempted to quit by CDTs, there were no persistent significant differences between the UK and individual countries that were present at both waves.

Figure 2 about here

3.) Impact of license change on NRT use for cutting down to stop smoking

A small increase in the use of NRT for CDTs was observed across waves in the UK and in comparison countries but this change was non-significant and no country by wave interaction was detected. Although more smokers in the UK used NRT for

CDTS (Figure 3), again there were no persistent differences between the UK and individual countries present at both waves.

Figure 3 about here

There were also no within-country changes across waves or a country by wave interaction in the proportion of quit attempters obtaining NRT OTC for CDTS (Figure 3).

4.) Impact of license change on quit attempts and concurrent smoking and NRT use among smokers not attempting to quit

Around a third of participants had attempted to stop in the last year, making an average of two to three quit attempts (Table 1). There were no changes in the proportion or number of quit attempts made within the UK or comparison countries or a country by wave interaction. Overall, however, as in unadjusted analysis UK smokers were less likely to make a quit attempt than smokers from any other country at both wave 3 (OR range: 0.65-0.80; 95%CI range: 0.55-0.97) and wave 5 (OR range: 0.66-0.80; 95%CI range: 0.54-0.98) but there were no differences between the UK and other countries in the number of quit attempts smokers made at either wave.

Concurrent smoking and NRT use among smokers not attempting to stop was not common. In the UK, there was an increase in NRT use among current smokers from wave 3 to 5 but no country by wave interaction was detected (Table 2). No data were available as to how NRT was obtained among smokers who were not attempting to quit.

Table 2 about here

In a sub-analysis of this sample, there were no changes within the UK and comparison countries in the use of NRT simply to reduce consumption (as opposed to cut-down-to-stop) or to cope with temporary abstinence in adjusted analysis and no interactions were observed (Table 2). However, as this sample was small, the power to detect any significant changes was limited in this analysis.

DISCUSSION

These data suggest that the relaxation in the licensing laws of NRT in the UK to allow NRT use for CDTs had a very limited, if any, impact on NRT consumption and quitting behaviour, in the first year after the change was introduced. NRT use is more prevalent in the UK than in comparison countries and has generally become more popular across all countries that were evaluated, which may reflect both the increasing denormalisation of public smoking and NRT becoming more accessible. However, there was no change in the use of NRT by people attempting to quit in the UK relative to comparison countries. Moreover, although the relaxation of licensing was thought to impact mainly NRT obtained over the counter, there was no change in the use of NRT obtained OTC by smokers attempting to quit in the UK from 2004 to 2007. Indeed, the use of NRT obtained OTC increased significantly in comparison countries relative to the UK. It appears that NRT use is more wide-spread in the UK but that it is more commonly purchased OTC in countries other than the UK, possibly because NRT is available relatively cheaply on prescription only in the UK and not in the comparison countries.

The prevalence of smokers attempting to stop smoking using CDTs also did not change in the UK compared with other countries and was somewhat lower in the UK, which may reflect the great emphasis that has recently been placed on complete cessation in the UK [15]. In contrast, the use of NRT for cutting down to stop was

more common in the UK but there was no change in the use of NRT (irrespective how it was obtained) for cutting down to stop during the course of this study.

The lack of positive findings may be the result of several factors. First, given that the survey covered the one-year period just after the introduction of new licensing laws, this timeframe may have been too immediate to pick up any changes in consumer behaviour. Second, the licensing change initially applied to only two products and not all brands [7]. Third, in contrast to an earlier study reporting an increase in NRT use after it was made available on prescription[12], the policy change considered here may have been too subtle to produce a notable effect. Fourth, a large number of smokers in these four countries reported using NRT to reduce cigarette consumption prior to 2005 [16]. For this reason, the already established use of NRT for reducing cigarette consumption in the UK before the licensing change may have contributed to a ceiling effect, thus reducing the potential to detect any substantial changes following the implementation of new licensing. Fifth, advertisement of the licensing change may have been insufficient to penetrate the market; approximately £1.5 million were spent on the advertising campaign for using NRT for CDTs (Johnson & Johnson, personal communication). The licensing change did not incorporate any specific promotion to educate the public or providers about how to conduct cut-down-to-stop or about its benefits. Rather, the packaging was modified and the licensing change advertised on TV, which may have been too minimal to change awareness, smoker behaviour or NRT utilisation. Indeed, it has been suggested that intensive outreach would be required before any benefit can be seen as most of the evidence supporting the use of NRT for CDTs has come from trials with considerable patient-investigator interaction.[17]

One potential negative side-effect of more relaxed NRT licensing laws is that fewer people may attempt to stop smoking altogether and instead just use NRT while

continuing to smoke. When comparing the proportion of quit attempts in the UK and comparison countries, the change in licensing does not appear to have depressed the frequency or number of quit attempts across waves. There was some evidence that people continuing to smoke were more likely to use NRT in the UK after the licensing change but this increase was not significant relative to changes observed in comparison countries.

This study had a number of limitations. Owing to its quasi-experimental design, it may be that other, potentially relevant, changes occurred in the UK or in the comparison countries that were not considered here and which could have affected results. Subtle trends such as growing 'cessation fatigue' following intensive campaigning may have confounded outcomes. Moreover, variations in the pricing of NRT across countries and the impending smoking ban in the UK may have contributed to results. Although this possibility cannot be excluded, we are not aware of any drastic changes in pricing over the period considered and the eventual introduction of a smoke ban in the UK was not announced until some time after data collection for the last wave had started. Indeed, the relaxation in NRT licensing laws in the UK was the only directly relevant legislative change implemented between waves. Furthermore, the inclusion of fairly comparable countries that – with the exception of NRT licensing - would have been exposed to similar, potentially relevant, changes across waves provides some measure of control. It can thus be reasonably assumed that differences in outcome measures in the UK relative to other countries can be attributed to the relaxation in NRT licensing in the UK that took place between waves.

Another limitation of this study is its reliance on self-report to assess smoking status, quitting behaviour and NRT use, which may have resulted in some recall bias or misreporting. However, even if this is the case, there is no reason to believe that this should have differentially biased data from the UK and comparison countries. Lastly,

owing to low numbers we were not able to look statistically at changes in the use of particular forms of NRT. This would have been useful given that the licensing change initially targeted only two products. However, it is unclear that consumers would have differentiated between products in this respect. Indeed, the sensitivity analysis, restricted to these two forms revealed similar trends suggesting that potential changes in NRT use appear to have applied to the whole range of products.

In conclusion, our data imply that over the time period covered by the two surveys, there was an overall increase in NRT use irrespective of whether people were from the UK or not. While there was no relative increase in the use of NRT for cutting down to stop, the results also suggest that making NRT available for gradual cessation has not had a detrimental effect on the proportion of quit attempts in the UK or led to an increase in the number of people attempting to stop gradually. Further research is required to substantiate these findings and evaluate their relevance for future public health policy.

Acknowledgements

The write-up of this study was supported in part by the Roswell Park Trans-disciplinary Tobacco Use Research Center (TTURC – P50 CA111236), funded by the U.S. National Cancer Institute and by Cancer Research UK.

Lion Shahab has received an honorarium for a talk and travel expenses from a pharmaceutical company making smoking cessation products. Robert West undertakes research and consultancy for developers and manufacturers of smoking cessation treatments such as nicotine replacement products.

Reference List

- (1) Molyneux A. Nicotine replacement therapy. *BMJ* 2004; **328**(7437):454-456.
- (2) Shiffman S, Ferguson SG, Gwaltney CJ, Balabanis MH, Shadel WG. Reduction of abstinence-induced withdrawal and craving using high-dose nicotine replacement therapy. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)* 2006; **184**(3-4):637-644.
- (3) Stead LF, Perera R, Bullen C, Mant D, Lancaster T. Nicotine replacement therapy for smoking cessation. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2008;(1):CD000146.
- (4) Hajek P, West R, Foulds J, Nilsson F, Burrows S, Meadow A. Randomized comparative trial of nicotine polacrilex, a transdermal patch, nasal spray, and an inhaler. *Arch Intern Med* 1999; **159**(17):2033-2038.
- (5) McNeill A, Foulds J, Bates C. Regulation of nicotine replacement therapies (NRT): a critique of current practice. *Addiction* 2001; **96**(12):1757-1768.
- (6) McNeill A, Raw M, Whybrow J, Bailey P. A national strategy for smoking cessation treatment in England. *Addiction* 2005; **100**(Suppl 2):1-11.
- (7) Medicine and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency and Committee on Safety of Medicines. *Report of the Committee on Safety of Medicines Working Group on Nicotine Replacement therapy*. 2005. London, Medicine and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency Committee.
- (8) Kralikova E, Kozak J, Rasmussen T, Cort N. The clinical benefits of NRT-supported smoking reduction. *Nicotine Tob Res* 2002; **4**:243.
- (9) Wennike P, Danielsson T, Landfeldt B, Westin A, Tonnesen P. Smoking reduction promotes smoking cessation: results from a double blind, randomized, placebo-controlled trial of nicotine gum with 2-year follow-up. *Addiction* 2003; **98**(10):1395-1402.
- (10) Batra A, Klingler K, Landfeldt B, Friederich HM, Westin A, Danielsson T. Smoking reduction treatment with 4-mg nicotine gum: a double-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled study. *Clin Pharmacol Ther* 2005; **78**(6):689-696.
- (11) Rennard SI, Glover ED, Leischow S, Daughton DM, Glover PN, Muramoto M et al. Efficacy of the nicotine inhaler in smoking reduction: A double-blind, randomized trial. *Nicotine Tob Res* 2006; **8**(4):555-564.
- (12) West R, DiMarino ME, Gitchell J, McNeill A. Impact of UK policy initiatives on use of medicines to aid smoking cessation. *Tob Control* 2005; **14**(3):166-171.
- (13) Thompson ME, Fong GT, Hammond D, Boudreau C, Driezen P, Hyland A et al. Methods of the International Tobacco Control (ITC) Four Country Survey. *Tob Control* 2006; **15 Suppl 3**:iii12-iii18.
- (14) 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 Alcohol Depend* 1994; **34**(3):211-216.

- (15) Department of Health. *Smoking kills. A White Paper on tobacco*. London: The Stationary Office, 1998.
- (16) Hammond D, Reid JL, Driezen P, Cummings KM, Borland R, Fong GT et al. Smokers' use of nicotine replacement therapy for reasons other than stopping smoking: findings from the ITC Four Country Survey. *Addiction* 2008; **103**(10):1696-1703.
- (17) Wang D, Connock M, Barton P, Fry-Smith A, Aveyard P, Moore D. 'Cut down to quit' with nicotine replacement therapies in smoking cessation: a systematic review of effectiveness and economic analysis. *Health Technol Assess* 2008; **12**(2):iii-xi, 1.

Tables

Table 1: Demographic and smoking characteristics of sample[‡]

	UK			Comparison Countries [‡]			Country by wave interaction
	Wave 3 (N=1841)	Wave 5 (N=1713)	Total (N=3554) ⁺	Wave 3 (N=5545)	Wave 5 (N=5300)	Total (N=10845) [§]	Significance
<i>Demographic data</i>							
Mean (SD) Age	47.4 (14.0)	48.6 (14.4) ^{***}	48.0 (16.3)	44.5 (14.0)	46.8 (13.6) ^{***}	45.6 (16.5)[‡]	<i>P</i> =0.005
Percent (n/N) Male	44.7 (⁸²³ / ₁₈₄₁)	43.0 (⁷³⁷ / ₁₇₁₃)	43.9 (¹⁵⁶⁰/₃₅₅₄)	44.4 (²⁴⁶⁰ / ₅₅₄₅)	42.6 (²²⁵⁸ / ₅₃₀₀) [*]	43.5 (⁴⁷¹⁸/₁₀₈₄₅)	<i>P</i> =0.945
Percent (n/N) Majority Culture	96.3 (¹⁷⁷⁰ / ₁₈₃₈)	96.1 (¹⁶⁴³ / ₁₇₁₀)	96.2 (³⁴¹³/₃₅₄₈)	87.3 (⁴⁸²⁵ / ₅₅₃₀)	87.8 (⁴⁶⁵⁰ / ₅₂₉₄)	87.5 (⁹⁴⁷⁵/₁₀₈₂₄)[‡]	<i>P</i> =0.404
Percent (n/N) Low Income	31.7 (⁵²⁸ / ₁₆₆₅)	36.7 (⁵⁷⁵ / ₁₅₆₅) ^{**}	34.2 (¹¹⁰³/₃₂₃₀)	33.2 (¹⁷²⁵ / ₅₁₉₂)	32.5 (¹⁶¹¹ / ₄₉₅₅)	32.9 (²¹⁸⁶/₁₀₁₄₇)	<i>P</i> =0.001
Percent (n/N) High level of education	11.7 (²¹³ / ₁₈₂₄)	13.3 (²²⁶ / ₁₆₉₇) ^{**}	12.5 (⁴³⁹/₃₅₂₁)	14.4 (⁷⁹⁶ / ₅₅₂₉)	16.5 (⁸⁷¹ / ₅₂₉₁) ^{***}	15.4 (¹⁰⁹⁷/₁₀₈₂₀)[‡]	<i>P</i> =0.320
<i>Smoking characteristics</i>							
Percent (n/N) Current Smokers	95.1 (¹⁷⁵⁰ / ₁₈₄₁)	94.8 (¹⁶²⁴ / ₁₇₁₃)	94.9 (³³⁷⁴/₃₅₅₄)	95.5 (⁵²⁹⁶ / ₅₅₄₅)	95.0 (⁵⁰³⁵ / ₅₃₀₀)	95.3 (¹⁰³³¹/₁₀₈₄₅)	<i>P</i> =0.734
Mean (SD) Cigarettes per day [~]	17.2 (8.8)	16.9 (9.3) ^{**}	17.1 (10.2)^a	18.0 (10.9)	18.3 (10.4)	18.2 (12.0)^{b‡}	<i>P</i> =0.067
Mean (SD) HSI [~]	2.7 (1.4)	2.6 (1.4) ^{**}	2.7 (1.6)^c	2.8 (1.5)	2.9 (1.5) ^{**}	2.8 (1.7)^{d‡}	<i>P</i> =0.341
Percent (n/N) Intending to quit [~]	61.8 (¹⁰⁶⁸ / ₁₇₂₇)	61.1 (⁹⁷² / ₁₅₉₁)	61.5 (²⁰⁴⁰/₃₃₁₈)	72.8 (³⁷⁹⁷ / ₅₂₁₆)	72.9 (³⁶⁰⁴ / ₄₉₄₄)	72.8 (⁷⁴⁰¹/₁₀₁₆₀)[‡]	<i>P</i> =0.447
Percent (n/N) Attempting to quit in last year [#]	32.7 (⁴⁰⁹ / ₁₂₅₀)	32.0 (³⁵⁷ / ₁₁₁₅)	32.4 (⁷⁶⁶/₂₃₆₅)	38.9 (¹⁴¹⁰ / ₃₆₂₁)	36.9 (¹²²⁷ / ₃₃₂₈)	37.9 (²⁶³⁷/₆₉₄₉)[‡]	<i>P</i> =0.678
Mean (SD) number of quit attempts in last year [#]	2.3 (3.2)	2.0 (2.4)	2.2 (2.9)	3.1 (12.2)	3.5 (20.0)	3.3 (17.0)[‡]	<i>P</i> =0.413
Percent (n/N) Using NRT [†] in last year	17.7 (³²⁵ / ₁₈₄₁)	22.4 (³⁸³ / ₁₇₁₃) ^{***}	19.9 (⁷⁰⁸/₃₅₅₄)	15.0 (⁸³³ / ₅₅₄₅)	19.0 (¹⁰⁰⁶ / ₅₃₀₀) ^{***}	17.0 (¹⁸³⁹/₁₀₈₄₅)[‡]	<i>P</i> =0.752

^{*}Raw data are presented and comparisons based on generalised estimating equations (GEE); ⁺824 participants contributed to both waves; [§]2483 participants contributed to both waves; [~]Australia, Canada and USA; [^]Base is current smokers; [#]Excludes participants not in previous survey; [†]NRT-Nicotine Replacement Therapy ^a6 cases missing; ^b8 cases missing; ^c35 cases missing; ^d102 cases missing; [‡] Denotes significant differences between UK and comparison countries (*p*<.025); ^{*}Denotes significant difference between waves (*p*<.025) ^{**}Denotes significant difference between waves (*p*<.01); ^{***}Denotes significant difference between waves (*p*<.001)

Table 2: Prevalence of concurrent NRT use and smoking by wave and country[‡]

	UK		Comparison countries [‡]		Country by wave interaction Significance
	Wave 3	Wave 5	Wave 3	Wave 5	
	Percent (n/N)				
Concurrent NRT use and smoking [^]	5.0 (⁴² / ₈₄₁)	8.3 (⁶³ / ₇₅₈) [*]	4.8 (¹⁰⁷ / ₂₂₁₁)	5.6 (¹¹⁸ / ₂₁₀₁)	<i>P=0.124</i>
Only to reduce smoking [§]	21.4 (⁹ / ₄₂)	34.9 (²² / ₆₃)	13.1 (¹⁴ / ₁₀₇)	18.6 (²² / ₁₁₈)	<i>P=0.408</i>
Only to cope with temporary abstinence [§]	33.3 (¹⁴ / ₄₂)	22.2 (¹⁴ / ₆₃)	26.2 (²⁸ / ₁₀₇)	42.4 (⁵⁰ / ₁₁₈)	<i>P=0.410</i>

[‡]Raw data are presented and comparisons based on generalised estimating equations (GEE) [^]Australia, Canada and USA; [^]Base: Smokers not attempting to quit; [§]Base: NRT users not attempting to stop; [‡] Denotes significant differences between countries ($p < .025$); ^{*}Denotes significant difference between waves ($p < .025$); ^{**}Denotes significant difference between waves ($p < .01$)

Figure Legend

Figure 1: [§]Base for each wave (provided in each column): smokers/recent ex-smokers with reported quit attempt since previous survey; *OTC-Over the counter; ^CC-Comparison Countries; Error bars represent 95% confidence interval of proportion

Figure 2: ⁺CDTS-Cut-down-to-stop; [§]Base for each wave (provided in each column): smokers/recent ex-smokers with reported quit attempt since previous survey; ^Comparison Countries; [°]98 Cases missing; [“]19 Cases missing; Error bars represent 95% confidence interval of proportion

Figure 3: ⁺CDTS-Cut-down-to-stop; [§]Base for each wave (provided in each column): smokers/recent ex-smokers who used CDTS;*OTC-Over the counter; ^Comparison Countries; Error bars represent 95% confidence interval of proportion

Figures

Figure 1: Prevalence of recent NRT use among quit attempters by wave and country[§]




Figure 2: Prevalence of CDTs⁺ by wave and country[§]




Figure 3: Prevalence of recent NRT use among quit attempters using CDTs⁺ by wave and country^s

