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Introduction

This report summarizes the 2008 U.S. Public Health Service (PHS) Clinical Practice Guideline, *Treating Tobacco Use and Dependence* (“2008 Update”) and provides an evidence-based blueprint for clinicians and healthcare systems to treat the deadly chronic disease of tobacco addiction effectively. The importance of such a blueprint is clear—clinicians and healthcare delivery systems have unparalleled access to American smokers; over 70% of smokers visit a clinician each year and most of them report wanting to quit. Half of all smokers alive today—more than 20 million Americans—will be killed prematurely by a disease directly caused by their tobacco use, making the treatment of tobacco dependence the chief medical and public health challenge of our time.

This guideline concludes that tobacco use presents a rare confluence of circumstances: (1) a highly significant health threat,1 (2) a disinclination among clinicians to intervene consistently,2 and (3) the presence of effective interventions. This last point is buttressed by evidence that tobacco-dependence interventions, if delivered in a timely and effective manner, significantly reduce the smoker’s risk of suffering from smoking-related disease.3–10 Indeed, it is difficult to identify any other condition that presents such a mix of lethality, prevalence, and neglect, despite effective and readily available interventions.

Although tobacco use is still an enormous threat, the story of tobacco control efforts over the last half century is one of remarkable progress and promise. In 1965, current smokers outnumbered former smokers three-to-one.11 Over the past 40 years, the rate of quitting has so outstripped the rate of initiation that, today, there are more former smokers than current smokers.12 Moreover, 40 years ago, smoking was viewed as a habit rather than a chronic disease. No scientifically validated interventions were available for the treatment of tobacco use and dependence and it had little place in healthcare delivery. Today, numerous effective treatments exist, and tobacco-use assessment and intervention are considered to be requisite duties of clinicians and healthcare delivery entities. Finally, every state now has a telephone quitline, increasing access to effective treatment.

This 2008 Update builds substantially on prior findings published in the 1996 and 2000 guidelines.13 The scant dozen years since the first guideline was released yielded impressive improvements in the treatment of tobacco addiction. In 1997, only 25% of managed healthcare plans covered any tobacco-dependence treatment; this figure approached 90% by 2003,14 although coverage often includes provisions that serve as barriers to its use (e.g., large co-pays). Numerous states added Medicaid coverage for tobacco-dependence treatment since the publication of the first guideline so that by 2005, 72% offered coverage for at least one guideline-recommended treatment.14–16 In 2002, the Joint Commission (formerly, JCAHO), which accredits some 15,000 hospitals and healthcare programs, instituted an accreditation requirement for the delivery of evidence-based tobacco-dependence interventions for patients with diagnoses of acute myocardial infarction, congestive heart failure, or pneumonia. Finally, Medicare, the Veteran’s Health Administration, and the U.S. military now provide coverage for tobacco-dependence treatment. Such policies and systems changes are paying off in terms of increased rates of clinical assessment and treatment of tobacco use.

This 2008 Update serves as a benchmark of the progress made and the challenges that remain. It should reassure clinicians, policymakers, funding agencies, and the public that tobacco use is amenable to both scientific analysis and to clinical interventions. This history of remarkable progress should encourage renewed efforts by clinicians, policymakers, and researchers to help those who remain dependent on tobacco. Adherence to the recommendations in this 2008 Update will provide such help, ensuring that every smoker who visits a healthcare setting in America can receive an effective treatment for tobacco dependence.

Background

The Clinical Practice Guideline for Treating Tobacco Use and Dependence: 2008 Update (2008 Update) is the result of a collaboration among eight governmental and nonprofit organizations: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ); CDC; National Cancer Institute (NCI); National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute; National Institute on Drug Abuse; Robert Wood Johnson Foundation; the Legacy Foundation; and the Center for Tobacco Research and Intervention at the University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and Public Health. The 2008 Update was developed by a panel of 24 scientists and clinicians supported by liaisons from the sponsoring organizations, consultants, and staff. The goal of the guideline is to complete a comprehensive review and analysis of the extant scientific evidence and to identify evidence-based clinical treatments for tobacco dependence.

This article is intended to serve as a primer for effective clinic-based tobacco-intervention treatments. Readers interested in more details regarding the literature review, data-analytic methods, and the consensus process may refer to the updated guideline,17 which is also located on the AHRQ website (www.ahrq.gov). Both this article and the 2008 Update target two principal audiences: first, clinicians including clinicians for whom tobacco-dependence treatment is just one of many activities and second, healthcare administrators, insurers, and purchasers who have the capacity to implement systems changes that support and encour-
age tobacco-dependence treatments, including reimbursing for these cost-effective treatments.

The 2008 Update is generally consistent with the 2000 guideline. Its conclusions and recommendations are also consistent with those made by other organizations including: the American Psychiatric Association, the American Medical Association, the American Dental Association, the American Nurses Association, the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, the Institute of Medicine, the United Kingdom Guideline, and the Cochrane Collaboration (www.cochrane.org/index.htm).

While generally consistent with the 2000 guideline, the 2008 Update reveals considerable progress made in tobacco research over the brief period separating these two publications. Tobacco dependence is increasingly recognized as a chronic disease, one that typically requires ongoing assessment and repeated intervention. In addition, the updated guideline offers the clinician many more effective treatment strategies than were identified in the original guideline. There are now seven different first-line effective medications in the smoking cessation pharmacopoeia, and some combinations of medications are highly effective, allowing the clinician and patient many different options. In addition, recent evidence provides even stronger support for counseling (both when used alone and with other treatments) as an effective tobacco-cessation strategy; counseling adds to the effectiveness of tobacco-cessation medications, quitline counseling is an effective intervention with a broad reach, and counseling increases tobacco cessation among adolescent smokers. There is also new evidence that motivational interventions increase quit attempts among smokers currently uninterested in making a quit attempt.

There is increasing evidence that the success of any tobacco-dependence treatment strategy cannot be divorced from the healthcare system in which it is embedded. The 2008 Update contains new evidence that healthcare policies significantly affect the likelihood that smokers will receive effective tobacco-dependence treatment and successfully stop tobacco use. For instance, making tobacco-dependence treatment a covered benefit of insurance plans increases the likelihood that a tobacco user will receive treatment and quit successfully. Data strongly indicate that effective tobacco interventions require coordinated interventions. Just as the clinician often must intervene with his or her patient as a member of a treatment team, so must the healthcare administrator, insurer, and purchaser foster and support tobacco intervention as an integral element of healthcare delivery. Insurers and healthcare administrators should ensure that clinicians have the support and training to deliver consistent, effective intervention to tobacco users.

The 2008 Update also casts into stark relief those areas in which more progress is needed. There is a need for innovative and more effective counseling strategies. In addition, although adolescents appear to benefit from counseling, there is also a clear need for more effective interventions and options for use with children, adolescents, and young adults. Smoking prevalence remains discouragingly high in certain populations such as in those with low SES/low educational attainment, some American Indian populations, and individuals with psychiatric disorders including substance use disorders. New techniques and treatment delivery strategies may be required before the needs of these groups are adequately addressed. Also, much of the available data come from randomized clinical trials occurring in research settings. It is imperative that new research examines how effective treatments can be implemented in real-world clinical settings. Finally, new strategies are needed to create consumer demand among tobacco users for effective treatments; there has been little increase in the proportion of smokers who make quit attempts and too few smokers who do try to quit take advantage of evidence-based treatment that can double or triple their odds of success. New research and communication efforts must impart greater hope, confidence, and increased access to treatments so that tobacco users in ever-greater numbers attempt tobacco cessation, use effective therapies, and achieve abstinence. To succeed, all of these areas require adequate funding if we are to reach the Healthy People 2010 goals and objectives relative to tobacco.

Evidence Synthesis: Overview of the Guideline Development Procedures

Figure 1 provides an overview of the guideline development process. Since the panel was asked to update, rather than completely revise, the 2000 Treating Tobacco Use and Dependence Guideline, the panel’s first task was to identify those topics that merited specific meta-analyses based on their importance and the availability of relevant literature, ideally, with some published since 1999. Consultations with panel members and outside experts generated a list of 64 topics from which the panel selected 11 to be meta-analyzed for the 2008 Update (see Table 1). For each of these topics, the literature since 1999 (approximately 2700 articles identified by electronic searches of 11 databases) was examined for relevance to each of the 11 topics to be addressed through meta-analyses. Articles that were relevant were coded for possible use in meta-analyses if they: (1) reported the results of a placebo/comparison-controlled trial evaluating a tobacco-use assessment or treatment randomized on the patient level; (2) provided follow-up results at least 5 months after the quit date; (3) were published in a peer-reviewed journal; (4) were published between January 1, 1999, and December 31, 2007; and (5) were published in English.
These criteria result in limitations including the exclusion of findings not published (publication bias) and the exclusion of non-English language findings. Exceptions were made for research about topics for which randomization at the patient level was not possible—such as systems interventions, which often randomized clinics or providers; and interventions for adolescents, which often randomized classrooms or schools.

For systems research, articles using such higher-level randomization were included only if the data analysis addressed this design feature. Two independent raters coded features of all articles accepted for possible use in the meta-analyses. A third reviewer compared the two independent reviews and adjudicated any discrepancies. A fourth independent review was conducted before final acceptance for meta-analysis. Where possible, efficacy analyses used point-prevalence abstinence data that reflected the intent-to-treat principle. Except for pregnancy studies, all follow-up data reflected smoking status at 6 months following the quit day (>5 months minimum) and included both biochemically confirmed and self-reported data when biochemically verified data were not available. Pregnancy analyses examined pre-natal and post-natal outcomes separately and included only biochemically confirmed data. Finally, all the randomized control trials identified for the 1996 and 2000 guidelines were examined anew and included in the new meta-analyses if they were relevant. Random-effects logistic regression was used for meta-analysis. A listing of the articles used in the meta-analyses can be found on the AHRQ website (www.ahrq.gov/).

The results of the new meta-analyses and other relevant data (e.g., meta-analyses from the original guideline, other published meta-analyses, background, and review articles) were presented to the guideline panel, which examined the findings and made requests for additional data and analyses as needed. The preponderance of the literature considered addressed smoking reflecting the fact that most tobacco users in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Topics chosen by the 2008 Update panel for updated meta-analyses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of proactive quitlines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of combining counseling and medication relative to either counseling or medication alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of varenicline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of various medication combinations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of long-term medication use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of tobacco use interventions for individuals with low socioeconomic status/limited formal education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of tobacco use interventions for adolescent smokers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of tobacco use interventions for pregnant smokers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of tobacco use interventions for individuals with psychiatric disorders including substance use disorders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of providing tobacco use interventions as a health benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of systems interventions, including provider training and the combination of training and systems interventions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the U.S. are smokers. The guideline panel considered this as they reached consensus and made qualifications in recommendations for nonsmoker tobacco uses as appropriate with the result that the guideline applies to all tobacco users, not just smokers. The guideline panel generated consensus recommendations from the findings and assigned strength-of-evidence ratings to each recommendation. Ratings reflected the quality and amount of evidence supporting a recommendation and can be found in the 2008 Update.

A draft of the 2008 Update was reviewed by more than 90 external experts in the field of tobacco research and treatment and made available for public comment through a notice in the Federal Register. Over 1700 comments were received and considered; modifications were made accordingly.

**Key Guideline Recommendations**

Figure 2 presents a model for treating tobacco use and dependence. It underscores the chronic and often relapsing nature of tobacco dependence emphasizing the message that clinicians need to persist in efforts to provide evidence-based treatments.

**Assessing Tobacco Use**

The first step in treating tobacco use and dependence is to identify tobacco users. At least 70% of smokers see a physician each year, and almost one third see a dentist. Smokers also see physician assistants; nurse practitioners; nurses; respiratory, physical, and occupational therapists; pharmacists; counselors; and other clinicians. Therefore, virtually all clinicians are in a position to intervene with patients who use tobacco. Moreover, 70% of smokers report wanting to quit and almost two thirds of smokers who relapse want to try quitting again within 30 days. Finally, smokers cite a physician’s advice to quit as an important motivator to stop smoking. These data suggest that most smokers are interested in quitting, clinicians and health systems are frequently in contact with smokers, and clinicians have high credibility with smokers. Further, effective identification of tobacco-use status not only opens the door for successful interventions (e.g., physician advice), but it guides clinicians to identify appropriate interventions based on patients’ tobacco-use status and willingness to quit.
Table 2. Brief strategies to help the Patient Willing to Quit Tobacco Use - The 5A’s

Strategy A1. Ask—Systematically identify all tobacco users at every visit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Strategies for implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implement an officewide system that</td>
<td>Expand the vital signs to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ensures that, for EVERY patient at</td>
<td>include tobacco use or use an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVERY clinic visit, tobacco-use</td>
<td>alternative universal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>status is queried and documented.</td>
<td>identification system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>VITAL SIGNS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blood Pressure: _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pulse: ___ Weight: ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Temperature: ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respiratory Rate: ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tobacco Use: Current Former</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never (circle one)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategy A2. Advise—Strongly urge all tobacco users to quit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Strategies for implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In a clear, strong, and personalized manner, urge every tobacco user to quit.</td>
<td>Advice should be:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Clear—“It is important that you quit smoking (or using chewing tobacco) now and I can help you.” “Cutting down while you are ill is not enough.” “Occasional or light smoking is still dangerous.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Strong—“As your clinician, I need you to know that quitting smoking is the most important thing you can do to protect your health now and in the future. The clinic staff and I will help you.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Personalized—Tie tobacco use to current symptoms and health concerns, and/or its social and economic costs, and/or the impact of tobacco use on children and others in the household. “Continuing to smoke makes your asthma worse and quitting may dramatically improve your health.” “Quitting smoking may reduce the number of ear infections your child has.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategy A3. Assess—Determine willingness to make a quit attempt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Strategies for implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assess every tobacco user’s</td>
<td>Assess patient’s willingness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>willingness to make a quit attempt</td>
<td>to quit: “Are you willing to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at this time.</td>
<td>give quitting a try?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● If the patient is willing to make a quit attempt at this time, provide assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ If the patient will participate in an intensive treatment, deliver such a treatment or link/refer to an intensive intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ If the patient is a member of a special population (e.g., adolescent, pregnant smoker, racial/ethnic minority), consider providing additional information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ If the patient clearly states he or she is unwilling to make a quit attempt at this time, provide an intervention shown to increase future quit attempts (see “For the Patient Unwilling to Make a Quit Attempt at This Time” and Table 7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategy A4. Assist—Aid the patient in quitting (provide counseling and medication)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Strategies for implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help the patient with a quit plan.</td>
<td>A patient’s preparations for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>quitting:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Set a quit date. Ideally, the quit date should be within 2 weeks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Tell family, friends, and coworkers about quitting and request understanding and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Anticipate challenges to the upcoming quit attempt, particularly during the critical first few weeks. These include nicotine withdrawal symptoms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Remove tobacco products from your environment. Prior to quitting, avoid smoking in places where you spend a lot of time (e.g., work, home, car). Make your home smoke-free.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommend the use of approved</td>
<td>Recommend the use of medications found to be effective in this guideline. Explain how these medications increase quitting success and reduce withdrawal symptoms. The first-line medications include: bupropion SR, nicotine gum, nicotine inhaler, nicotine lozenge, nicotine nasal spray, nicotine patch and varenicline and second-line medications include: clonidine and nortriptyline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medication, except where</td>
<td>contraindicated or with specific populations for which there is insufficient evidence of effectiveness (i.e., pregnant women, smokeless tobacco users, light smokers and adolescents). (See Tables 4–6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 2 (continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Strategies for implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy A4. Assist—Aid the patient in quitting (provide counseling and medication)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Provide practical counseling (problem-solving/skills training). (See Table 3) | *Abstinence.* Striving for total abstinence is essential. Not even a single puff after the quit date.  
*Past quit experience.* Identify what helped and what hurt in previous quit attempts.  
Build on past success.  
*Anticipate triggers or challenges in upcoming attempt.* Discuss challenges/triggers and how patient will successfully overcome them (e.g., avoid triggers, alter routines).  
*Alcohol.* Since alcohol is associated with relapse, the patient should consider limiting/abstaining from alcohol while quitting. (Note that reducing alcohol intake could precipitate withdrawal in alcohol-dependent individuals.)  
*Other smokers in the household.* Quitting is more difficult when there is another smoker in the household. Patients should encourage housemates to quit with them or not smoke in their presence. |
| Provide intra-treatment social support. (See Table 3) | Provide a supportive clinical environment while encouraging the patient in his or her quit attempt. “My office staff and I are available to assist you.” “I’m recommending treatment that can provide ongoing support.” |
| Provide supplementary materials, including information on quitlines. | **Sources:** Federal agencies, nonprofit agencies, national quitline network (1-800-QUIT-NOW), or local/state/tribal health departments/quitlines  
**Type:** Culturally/racially/educationally/age appropriate for the patient.  
**Location:** Readily available at every clinician’s workstation. |
| **Strategy A5. Arrange—Ensure follow-up contact** |
| Arrange for follow-up contacts, either in person or via telephone | **Timing.** Follow-up contact should begin soon after the quit date, preferably during the first week. A second follow-up contact is recommended within the first month. Schedule further follow-up contacts as indicated.  
**Actions during follow-up contact.** For all patients, identify problems already encountered and anticipate challenges in the immediate future. Assess medication use and problems. Remind patients of quitline support (1-800-QUIT-NOW). Address tobacco use at next clinical visit (treat tobacco use as a chronic disease) (see Table 8).  
For patients who are abstinent, congratulate them on their success.  
If tobacco use has occurred, review circumstances and elicit recommitment to total abstinence. Consider use of or link to more intensive treatment (see “For the Patient Who Has Recently Quit” and Table 9). |

*Repeated assessment is not necessary in the case of the adult who has never used tobacco or has not used tobacco for many years, and for whom this information is clearly documented in the medical record.*  
*Alternatives to expanding the vital signs are tobacco-use status stickers on all patient charts or to indicate tobacco use status using electronic medical records or computer reminder systems.*

**Brief Clinical Interventions**

Brief interventions can be provided by any clinician but are most relevant to clinicians who treat a wide variety of patients and face severe time constraints. Interventions as brief as 3 minutes can increase cessation rates significantly. In addition, these interventions can be used with all populations, including adolescents, pregnant women, older smokers, smokers with medical co-morbidities, smokers with mental illness, and racial and ethnic minorities. Brief interventions are effective for three types of patients: current tobacco users now willing to make a quit attempt, current tobacco users unwilling to make a quit attempt at this time, and former tobacco users who have recently quit. The goal is to ensure that every patient who uses tobacco is identified and offered at least a brief intervention at each clinical visit.

For the patient willing to quit. Given that so many tobacco users visit a clinician each year, it is important that clinicians be prepared to intervene with tobacco users who are willing to quit. Meta-analyses in the 2008 Update clearly show that counseling and medication work best when used together: outcomes improve when counseling is added to medications and outcomes improve when medications are added to counseling. However, medication and counseling are each effective alone, and should be provided even if the tobacco user is not interested in combined therapy. Whenever possible, smokers who are willing to quit should be provided both. However, special considerations about using medications exist when they are medically contraindicated or with populations for which there is insufficient evidence of effectiveness (i.e., pregnant women, smokeless tobacco users, light smokers, and adolescents).

The 5A’s is a model that presents the five major steps in providing a brief intervention in the primary care setting (see Table 2). These steps are: (1) ask the patient if he or
she uses tobacco, (2) advise him or her to quit, (3) assess willingness to make a quit attempt, (4) assist those who are willing to make a quit attempt, and (5) arrange for follow-up contact to prevent relapse. These strategies are designed to be brief, requiring 3 minutes or less of direct clinician time. Office systems that institutionalize tobacco-use assessment and intervention will foster the adoption of these strategies. While the 5A’s are consistent with those recommended by the NCI\textsuperscript{42,43} and the American Medical Association,\textsuperscript{20} as well as others,\textsuperscript{18,44–47} the clinical situation may suggest delivering these intervention components in an order or format different from that presented.\textsuperscript{38,48–51}

Effective counseling interventions. Table 3 describes the common elements of practical counseling: problem solving/skills training and support during treatment (intra-treatment support). These elements can be used in brief interventions but also form the foundation for more intense interventions. In addition, the 2008 Update completed new meta-analyses of tobacco quitlines, finding them to be effective as a treatment for tobacco dependence.

Effective medication interventions. Table 4 describes general guidelines for using medications, and Table 5 provides prescribing instructions for the seven FDA-approved first-line medications. In addition, for the first time, the 2008 guideline panel conducted an inclusive meta-analysis of medication regimens that complements the inclusive meta-analysis of psychosocial interventions that was conducted for the 2000 guideline. Results of this inclusive meta-analysis are shown in Table 6. The 2008 guideline panel also conducted a meta-analysis that compared all medications with the nicotine patch (nicotine replacement therapy; NRT). The nicotine patch was selected as a comparison condition since a greater number of study arms were available for this condition than for any other, and because this condition was of representative, mid-range effectiveness relative to other conditions. For this meta-analysis, a conservative Hochberg\textsuperscript{73} adjustment to the alpha level was used so that only treatments that were substantially different in effectiveness would be found to be significantly different. The a posteriori tests resulted in three treatment conditions being statistically more effective than the nicotine patch—2 mg/day varenicline and the combination of long-term patch + ad libitum NRT (gum or spray) (Table 7).

For the patient unwilling to make a quit attempt at this time. For patients not ready to make a quit attempt at this time, clinicians should use a brief intervention designed to promote the motivation to quit. Patients...
unwilling to make a quit attempt during a visit may lack information about the harmful effects of tobacco use and the benefits of quitting, may lack the required financial resources, may have fears or concerns about quitting, or may be demoralized because of previous relapse.\textsuperscript{24–27} Such patients may respond to brief motivational interventions consistent with motivational interviewing strategies,\textsuperscript{78} which is a directive, patient-centered counseling intervention.\textsuperscript{79} There is evidence that such strategies are effective in increasing future quit attempts\textsuperscript{80–84}; however, it is unclear that motivational interviewing strategies are successful in boosting abstinence among individuals motivated to quit smoking.\textsuperscript{84–86}

Clinicians employing motivational interviewing techniques focus on exploring a tobacco user’s feelings, beliefs, ideas, and values regarding tobacco use in an effort to uncover any ambivalence about using tobacco.\textsuperscript{79,87,88} Once ambivalence is uncovered, the clinician selectively elicits, supports, and strengthens the patient’s \textit{change talk} (e.g., reasons, ideas, needs for eliminating tobacco use) and \textit{commitment language} (e.g., intentions to take action to change smoking behavior such as not smoking in the home). Motivational interviewing researchers have found that having a patient use his or her own words to commit to change is more effective than clinician exhortations, lectures, or arguments for quitting which tend to build, rather than lessen, patient resistance to change.\textsuperscript{87}

The four general principles that underlie motivational interviewing are: (1) express empathy, (2) develop discrepancy, (3) roll with resistance, and (4) support self efficacy.\textsuperscript{78,88,89} Since this is a specialized technique, it may be beneficial to have a member of the clinical staff receive training in motivational interviewing. The content areas that should be addressed in a motivational counseling intervention can be captured by the 5Rs: relevance, risks, rewards, roadblocks, and repetition (see Table 8). Research suggests that addressing the 5Rs enhances future quit attempts.\textsuperscript{79,90}

\textbf{For the patient who has recently quit.} Smokers who have recently quit face a high risk of relapse. Although most relapse occurs early in the quitting process,\textsuperscript{91–95} some relapse occurs months or even years after the quit date.\textsuperscript{92,94–96} Numerous studies have been conducted to identify treatments that can reduce the likelihood of future relapse. These studies attempt to reduce relapse either by including special counseling or therapy in the cessation treatment, or by providing additional treatment to smokers who have previously quit. In general, such studies have failed to identify either counseling or medication treatments that are effective in lessening the likelihood of relapse,\textsuperscript{97} although there is some evidence that special mailings can reduce the likelihood of relapse.\textsuperscript{98,99} Thus, at present, the best strategy for producing high long-term abstinence rates appears to be use of the most effective cessation treatments available, that is, the use of evidence-based cessation medication during the quit attempt and relatively intense cessation counseling (e.g., four or more sessions that are 10 minutes or more in length).

If a clinician encounters a tobacco user who recently quit, the clinician might reinforce the patient’s success at quitting, review the benefits of quitting, and assist the patient in resolving any residual problems arising from quitting. Such expressions of interest and involvement on the part of the clinician might encourage the patient to seek additional help with cessation should she or he ultimately relapse. When the clinician encounters a patient who is abstinent from tobacco and is no longer engaged in cessation treatment, the clinician may wish to acknowledge a patient’s success in quitting. The abstinent former smoker may also experience problems related to cessation that deserve treatment in their own right. Table 9 presents some of these common problems and possible responses.

\section*{Intensive Clinical Interventions}

Intensive tobacco-dependence treatment can be provided by any suitably trained clinician. The evidence presented in the 2008 Update shows that intensive tobacco-dependence treatment is more effective than brief treatment. Intensive interventions (i.e., more-comprehensive treatments that may occur over multiple visits for longer periods of time and may be provided by more than one clinician) are appropriate for any tobacco user willing to participate in them; neither their effectiveness nor cost effectiveness is limited to a subpopulation of tobacco users (e.g., heavily dependent smokers).\textsuperscript{100–106} In addition, patients, even those not ready to quit, have reported increased satisfaction with their overall health care as tobacco-counseling intensity increases.\textsuperscript{107,108} Table 10 presents the components of an intensive intervention.

The advent of state tobacco quitlines available through a national network at 1-800-QUIT-NOW (1-800-784-8669) means that intensive, specialist-delivered interventions are now available to smokers on an unprecedented basis. The 2008 Update identified that telephone counseling such as that provided through a quitline is effective, as have other reviews.\textsuperscript{109} In addition to providing their own clinical tobacco-dependence interventions, clinicians, and health systems can take advantage of this availability by implementing systems that regularly refer patients to quitlines either directly or via using fax referrals (e.g., “fax-to-referral” referral procedures).\textsuperscript{110–114}

\section*{Clinician Training}

Training in tobacco-use interventions should not only transmit essential treatment skills but also inculcate the
**Table 4. General clinical guidelines for prescribing medication for treating tobacco use and dependence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who should receive medication for tobacco use? Are there groups of smokers for whom medication has not been shown to be effective?</td>
<td>All smokers trying to quit should be offered medication, except where contraindicated or for specific populations for which there is insufficient evidence of effectiveness (i.e., pregnant women, smokeless tobacco users, light smokers and adolescents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the first-line medications recommended in this guideline update?</td>
<td>All seven of the FDA-approved medications for treating tobacco use are recommended: bupropion SR, nicotine gum, nicotine inhaler, nicotine lozenge, nicotine nasal spray, the nicotine patch and varenicline. The clinician should consider the first-line medications shown to be more effective than the nicotine patch alone: 2 mg/day varenicline or the combination of long-term nicotine patch use + ad libitum NRT. Unfortunately, there are no well accepted algorithms to guide optimal selection among the first-line medications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there contraindications, warnings, precautions, other concerns, and side effects regarding the first-line medications recommended in this guideline Update?</td>
<td>All seven FDA-approved medications have specific contraindications, warnings, precautions, other concerns, and side effects. Please refer to FDA package inserts for this complete information and FDA updates and to the individual drug tables in the 2008 Update and Table 5 (See information below regarding second-line medications.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What other factors may influence medication selection?</td>
<td>Pragmatic factors may also influence selection such as insurance coverage or out-of-pocket patient costs, likelihood of adherence, dentures when considering the gum, or dermatitis when considering the patch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a patient’s prior experience with a medication relevant?</td>
<td>Prior successful experience (sustained abstinence with the medication) suggests that the medication may be helpful to the patient in a subsequent quit attempt, especially if the patient found the medication to be tolerable and/or easy to use. However, it is difficult to draw firm conclusions from prior failure with a medication. Some evidence suggests that retreating relapsed smokers with the same medication produces small or no benefit while other evidence suggests that it may be of substantial benefit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What medications should a clinician use with a patient who is highly nicotine dependent?</td>
<td>The higher dose preparations of nicotine gum, patch, and lozenge have been shown to be effective in highly dependent smokers. Also, there is evidence that combination NRT therapy may be particularly effective in suppressing tobacco withdrawal symptoms. Thus it may be that NRT combinations are especially helpful to highly dependent smokers or those with a history of severe withdrawal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is gender a consideration in selecting a medication?</td>
<td>There is evidence that NRT can be effective with both genders, however, evidence is mixed as to whether NRT is less effective in women than men. This may encourage the clinician to consider use of another type of medication with women such as bupropion SR or varenicline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are cessation medications appropriate for light smokers (i.e., &lt;10 cigarettes/day)?</td>
<td>As noted above, cessation medications have not been extensively evaluated in light smokers. However, if NRT is used with light smokers, clinicians may consider reducing the dose of the medication. No adjustments are necessary when using bupropion SR or varenicline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When should second-line agents be used for treating tobacco dependence?</td>
<td>Consider prescribing second-line agents (clonidine and nortriptyline) for patients unable to use first-line medications because of contraindications or for patients for whom the group of first-line medications has not been helpful. Assess patients for the specific contraindications, precautions, other concerns, and side effects of the second-line agents. Please refer to FDA package inserts for this information and to the individual drug tables in the 2008 Update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which medications should be considered with patients particularly concerned about weight gain?</td>
<td>Data show that bupropion SR and nicotine replacement therapies, in particular 4 mg nicotine gum and 4 mg nicotine lozenge, delay, but do not prevent, weight gain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there medications that should be especially considered in patients with a past history of depression?</td>
<td>Bupropion SR and nortriptyline appear to be effective with this population, but nicotine replacement medications also appear to help individuals with a past history of depression.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should nicotine replacement therapies be avoided in patients with a history of cardiovascular disease?</td>
<td>No. The nicotine patch in particular has been demonstrated as safe for cardiovascular patients. See individual drug tables in 2008 Update and FDA package inserts for more complete information.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 (continued)

May tobacco-dependence medications be used long-term (e.g., up to 6 months)?
Yes. This approach may be helpful with smokers who report persistent withdrawal symptoms during the course of medications, who have relapsed in the past after stopping medication, or who desire long-term therapy. A minority of individuals who successfully quit smoking use ad libitum NRT medications (gum, nasal spray, inhaler) long-term. The use of these medications for up to 6 months does not present a known health risk and developing dependence on medications is uncommon. Additionally, the FDA has approved the use of bupropion SR, varenicline and some NRT medications for 6 month use.

Is medication adherence important?
Yes. Patients frequently do not use cessation medications as recommended (e.g., they don’t use them at recommended doses or for recommended durations) and this may reduce their effectiveness.

May medications ever be combined?
Yes. Among first-line medications, evidence exists that combining the nicotine patch long-term (> 14 weeks) with either nicotine gum or nicotine nasal spray, the nicotine patch with the nicotine inhaler, or the nicotine patch with bupropion SR, increases long-term abstinence rates relative to placebo treatments. Varenicline is not recommended in combination with NRT.

Table 5. Suggestions for the clinical use of pharmacotherapies for smoking cessation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pharmacotherapy</th>
<th>Precautions, contraindications</th>
<th>Adverse effects</th>
<th>Dosage</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Availability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First line</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustained release bupropion hydrochloride</td>
<td>History of seizure, History of eating disorders</td>
<td>Insomnia, Dry mouth, Seizures</td>
<td>150 mg every morning for 3 days, then 150 mg twice daily (begin treatment 1–2 weeks pre-quit)</td>
<td>7–12 weeks, Maintenance up to 6 months</td>
<td>Prescription only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicotine gum</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mouth soreness, Dyspepsia</td>
<td>1–24 cigarettes/day; 2 mg gum (up to 24 pieces/day)</td>
<td>Up to 12 weeks</td>
<td>OTC only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicotine inhaler</td>
<td>Local irritation of mouth and throat</td>
<td></td>
<td>6–16 cartridges/day</td>
<td>Up to 6 months</td>
<td>Prescription only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicotine lozenge</td>
<td>Nausea/Heartburn</td>
<td></td>
<td>Time to 1st cigarette &gt; 30 min: 2 mg lozenge</td>
<td>Up to 12 weeks</td>
<td>OTC only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicotine nasal spray</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nasal irritation</td>
<td>Between 4–20 lozenges/day</td>
<td>3–6 months</td>
<td>Prescription only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicotine patch</td>
<td>Local skin reaction, Insomnia</td>
<td>Ex. 21 mg/24 hrs, 14 mg/24 hrs, 7 mg/24 hrs, Ex. 15 mg/16 hrs</td>
<td>4 weeks, then 2 weeks, 8 weeks</td>
<td>Prescription and OTC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varenicline</td>
<td>Significant kidney disease, Patients on dialysis</td>
<td>Nausea/Trouble sleeping, Abnormal or vivid/strange dreams, Depressed mood and other psychiatric symptoms</td>
<td>0.5 mg/day for 3 days, 0.5 mg twice/day for 4 days, Then, 1 mg twice/day (Begin treatment one week pre-quit)</td>
<td>3–6 months</td>
<td>Prescription only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The information contained in this table is not comprehensive. See package inserts for additional information including safety information. OTC, over the counter.
belief that tobacco-dependence treatment is a standard of good clinical practice. Such training has been shown to be cost effective. For clinicians-in-training, most clinical disciplines currently neither provide training, nor require competency, in tobacco-use interventions, although this is slowly improving. One survey of U.S. medical schools found that most medical schools (69%) did not require clinical training in tobacco-dependence treatment. The NCI’s Prevention and Cessation Education in Medical Schools (PACE) reported that, in 2004, about 36% of medical school courses offered about 10 hours of tobacco-related teaching over 4 years and that PACE has developed competencies for graduating medical students. Similarly, the American Association of Dental Schools has guidelines recommending tobacco-use cessation clinical activities (TUCCA) education for dental and dental hygiene students; as many as 70% or more of dental schools reported some clinical training in this area.

A meta-analysis in the 2008 Update found that training clinicians increases the percentage of smokers who receive treatment, such as a discussion of benefits/obstacles to quitting, medication, and the provision of support. Further, combining clinician training with a charting system, such as chart reminder stickers or treatment algorithms attached to the chart, increases rates of tobacco-use assessment, setting a quit date, providing materials, and arranging for follow-up. Thus, clinician training, especially when coupled with other systems changes such as reminder systems, increases the rates at which clinicians engage in tobacco interventions that reliably boost tobacco cessation.

### Economic Aspects of Tobacco and Health Systems Interventions

Smoking exacts a substantial financial burden on the U.S. A recent report of the U.S. CDC estimated that tobacco dependence costs the nation more than $96 billion per year in direct medical expenses and $97 billion in lost productivity. Given these substantial costs, research has focused on the economic impact and cost effectiveness of tobacco-cessation interventions.

Cost effectiveness can be measured in a variety of ways, including cost per quality-adjusted-life-year saved (QALY); cost per quit; healthcare costs and utilization pre- and post-quit; and return on investment (ROI) for coverage of tobacco-dependence treatment. Numerous analyses have estimated the cost per QALY saved resulting from use of effective tobacco-dependence interventions. In general, evidence-based tobacco-use interventions compare quite favorably with other prevention and chronic disease interventions such as treatment of hypertension and mammography screening when using this criterion. Specific analyses have estimated the costs of tobacco-use treatment to range from a few hundred to a few thousand dollars per QALY saved.

### Table 6. Effectiveness and abstinence rates for various medications and medication combinations compared to placebo at 6-months post-quit (n=86 studies)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medication</th>
<th>Number of arms*</th>
<th>Estimated OR (95% CI)</th>
<th>Estimated abstinence rate (95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monotherapies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varenicline (2 mg/day)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.1 (2.5, 3.8)</td>
<td>33.2 (28.9, 37.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicotine nasal spray</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3 (1.7, 3.0)</td>
<td>26.7 (21.5, 32.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High dose nicotine patch (&gt;25 mg)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3 (1.7, 3.0)</td>
<td>26.5 (21.3, 32.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term nicotine gum (&gt;14 weeks)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.2 (1.5, 3.2)</td>
<td>26.1 (19.7, 33.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varenicline (1 mg/day)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1 (1.5, 3.0)</td>
<td>25.4 (19.6, 32.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicotine inhaler</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.1 (1.5, 2.9)</td>
<td>24.8 (19.1, 31.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clonidine</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1 (1.2, 3.7)</td>
<td>25.0 (15.7, 37.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bupropion SR</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.0 (1.8, 2.2)</td>
<td>24.2 (22.2, 26.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicotine patch (6–14 weeks)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.9 (1.7, 2.2)</td>
<td>23.4 (21.3, 25.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term nicotine patch (&gt;14 weeks)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.9 (1.7, 2.3)</td>
<td>23.7 (21.0, 26.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nortriptyline</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.8 (1.3, 2.6)</td>
<td>22.5 (16.8, 29.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicotine gum (6–14 weeks)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.5 (1.2, 1.7)</td>
<td>19.0 (16.5, 21.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination therapies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patch (long-term; &gt;14 weeks) + ad lib NRT (gum or spray)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6 (2.5, 5.2)</td>
<td>36.5 (28.6, 45.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patch + bupropion SR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5 (1.9, 3.4)</td>
<td>28.9 (23.5, 35.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patch + nortriptyline</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3 (1.3, 4.2)</td>
<td>27.3 (17.2, 40.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patch + inhaler</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2 (1.3, 3.6)</td>
<td>25.8 (17.4, 36.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patch + second generation antidepressants (paroxetine, venlafaxine)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0 (1.2, 3.4)</td>
<td>24.3 (16.1, 35.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medications not shown to be effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRIs)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0 (0.7, 1.4)</td>
<td>13.7 (10.2, 18.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naltrexone</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5 (0.2, 1.2)</td>
<td>7.3 (3.1, 16.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The term “arms” refers to the separate treatment or control groups comprised by the analyzed studies.*
A substantial body of research has investigated the effect of tobacco-use treatment on healthcare costs. A synthesis of these findings suggest that: (1) among individuals who quit tobacco use, healthcare costs typically increase during the year in which smokers quit, and then decline progressively, falling below those of continuing smokers for one to 10 years after quitting; (2) in general, smokers’ healthcare costs begin to rise in the time period immediately prior to quit attempts; and (3) higher healthcare utilization predicts smoking cessation among smokers with and without chronic diseases. These findings suggest that quitting smoking often occurs in response to serious and expensive health problems. Such research also suggests that increases in healthcare costs, including hospitalizations during the year of quitting, may be a cause rather than a consequence of successful smoking cessation.

Return on investment (ROI) is a frequently used tool to estimate the amount of time it takes for an expenditure to earn back some or all of its initial investment. Studies have documented that tobacco-dependence treatments provide a timely return on investment when considered by the employer. Such analyses have concluded that providing coverage for tobacco-use treatment for employees often produces substantial net financial savings through increased healthcare savings, increased productivity, reduced absenteeism, and reduced life insurance payouts. Managed care organizations (MCOs) often assess the per-member per-month (PMPM) cost of a benefit; the PMPM for tobacco-use treatment has been assessed in a variety of settings. In general, the PMPM for tobacco-use treatments have been low relative to other covered benefits, ranging from about $0.20 to about $0.80 PMPM.

From both a health and economic perspective, health systems (healthcare administrators, insurers, and purchasers), should promote the treatment of tobacco dependence. Several institutional policies would facilitate these interventions such as:

- Implementing a tobacco-user identification system in every clinic.
- Providing adequate training, resources, and feedback to ensure that providers consistently deliver effective treatments.
- Dedicating staff to provide tobacco-dependence treatment and to assess the delivery of this treatment in staff performance evaluations.
- Promoting hospital policies that support and provide tobacco-dependence services.
- Including tobacco-dependence treatments (both counseling and medication) identified as effective in this guideline, as paid or covered services for all subscribers or members of health insurance packages. Meta-analyses in the 2008 Update found that compared to not having tobacco-use treatment as a covered benefit, individuals with the benefit were more likely to receive treatment, make a quit attempt, and attain abstinence from smoking.
- Including measures of outcome (e.g., use of cessation treatment, short- and long-term abstinence rates) in addition to measures of treatment provision in standard ratings and measures of overall health quality (e.g., National Committee for Quality Assurance [NCQA], Health Plan Employer Data and Information Set [HEDIS]).

### Guideline Recommendations Regarding Special Populations and Special Topics

Because specific populations have higher tobacco-use prevalence rates, reaching these populations is a key challenge for effectively treating tobacco dependence. The 2008 Update panel concluded that the interventions found to be effective in this guideline are effective in a variety of populations including those with health disparities. In addition, many of the studies supporting

| Table 7. Effectiveness and abstinence rates of medications relative to the nicotine patch (n=86 studies) |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Medication                          | Number of arms* | Estimated odds ratio (95% CI) |
| Nicotine patch (reference group)    | 32              | 1.0             |
| **Monotherapies**                   |                 |                 |
| Varenicline (2 mg/day)              | 5               | 1.6 (1.3, 2.0)  |
| Nicotine nasal spray                | 4               | 1.2 (0.9, 1.6)  |
| High dose nicotine patch (>25 mg; standard or long-term) | 4 | 1.2 (0.9, 1.6) |
| Long-term nicotine gum (>14 weeks) | 6               | 1.2 (0.8, 1.7)  |
| Varenicline (1 mg/day)              | 3               | 1.1 (0.8, 1.6)  |
| Nicotine Inhaler                    | 6               | 1.1 (0.8, 1.5)  |
| Clonidine                           | 3               | 1.1 (0.6, 2.0)  |
| Bupropion SR                        | 26              | 1.0 (0.9, 1.2)  |
| Long-term nicotine patch (>14 weeks) | 10          | 1.0 (0.9, 1.2)  |
| Noriptryptiline                     | 5               | 0.9 (0.6, 1.4)  |
| Nicotine Gum                        | 15              | 0.8 (0.6, 1.0)  |
| **Combination therapies**           |                 |                 |
| Patch (long-term; >14 weeks) + NRT (gum or spray) | 3 | 1.9 (1.3, 2.7) |
| Patch + bupropion SR                | 3               | 1.3 (1.0, 1.8)  |
| Patch + noriptryptiline             | 2               | 0.9 (0.6, 1.4)  |
| Patch + inhaler                     | 2               | 1.1 (0.7, 1.9)  |
| Second-generation antidepressants & Patch | 3                | 1.0 (0.6, 1.7)  |
| **Medications not shown to be effective** |                 |                 |
| Selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRIs) | 3 | 0.5 (0.4, 0.7)  |
| Naltrexone                          | 2               | 0.3 (0.1, 0.6)  |

*The term “arms” refers to the separate treatment or control groups comprised by the analyzed studies.

NRT, nicotine replacement therapy
these interventions comprised diverse samples of tobacco users. As a result, the panel concluded that the interventions identified as effective in the 2008 Update should be recommended for use by all individuals who use tobacco except when medication use is contraindicated or with specific populations in which medication use has not been shown to be effective (pregnant women, smokeless tobacco users, light smokers, and adolescents). This recommendation applies to a broad population of smokers including HIV-positive smokers, hospitalized smokers, lesbian/gay/bisexual/transgender smokers, those with low SES/limited formal education, smokers with medical co-morbidities, older smokers, smokers with psychiatric disorders including substance use disorders, racial and ethnic minorities, and women smokers. The 2008 Update contains detailed discussion about treatments for these populations as well as discussion of special topics such as addressing weight gain after quitting.

Conclusions

In summary, the 2008 tobacco guideline update panel’s major conclusions and recommendations are:

1. Tobacco dependence is a chronic disease that often requires repeated intervention and multiple attempts to quit. However, effective treatments exist that can significantly increase rates of long-term abstinence.
2. It is essential that clinicians and healthcare delivery systems consistently identify and document tobacco use status and treat every tobacco user seen in a healthcare setting.
3. Tobacco dependence treatments are effective across a broad range of populations. Clinicians should encourage every patient willing to make a quit attempt to use the counseling treatments and medications recommended in this guideline.

4. Brief tobacco-dependence treatment is effective. Clinicians should offer every patient who uses tobacco at least the brief treatments shown to be effective in this guideline.

5. Individual, group, and telephone counseling are effective and their effectiveness increases with treatment intensity. Two components of counseling are especially effective and clinicians should use these when counseling patients making a quit attempt:
   - Practical counseling (problem-solving/skills training)
   - Social support delivered as part of treatment

6. There are numerous effective medications for tobacco dependence, and clinicians should encourage their use by all patients attempting to quit smoking, except when medically contraindicated or with specific populations for which there is insufficient evidence of effectiveness (i.e., pregnant women, smokeless tobacco users, light smokers, and adolescents).
   - Seven first-line medications (five nicotine and two non-nicotine) reliably increase long-term smoking abstinence rates:
     - Bupropion SR
     - Nicotine gum
     - Nicotine inhaler
     - Nicotine lozenge
     - Nicotine nasal spray
     - Nicotine patch
     - Varenicline
   - Clinicians should also consider the use of certain combinations of medications identified as effective in this guideline.

7. Counseling and medication are effective when used by themselves for treating tobacco dependence. However, the combination of counseling and medication is more effective than either alone. Thus, clinicians should encourage all individuals making a quit attempt to use both counseling and medication.

8. Telephone quitline counseling is effective with diverse populations and has broad reach. Therefore, clinicians and healthcare delivery systems should both ensure patient access to quitlines and promote quitline use.

9. If a tobacco user is currently unwilling to make a quit attempt, clinicians should use the motivational treatments shown in this guideline to be effective in increasing future quit attempts.
10. Tobacco dependence treatments are both clinically effective and highly cost effective relative to interventions for other clinical disorders. Providing coverage for these treatments increases quit rates. Insurers and purchasers should ensure that all insurance plans include the counseling and medication identified as effective in this guideline as covered benefits.
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