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Background

• Tobacco smoking rates are markedly higher among low-SES and disadvantaged population groups.
  ▪ Yet… little known about research output.
• Smoking cessation research must move beyond describing patterns to evaluating the effectiveness of evidence-based interventions that reduce smoking rates.
• “Intervention research is great… M’KAY!”
  (Prof Shakeshaft + co-author, 2015)
Aims

To Identify in low-SES & disadvantaged population groups:

The number and methodological quality of published smoking cessation research over two time periods (TP1: 2000-2004) and (TP2: 2008-2012) and by country (Australia/New Zealand, United Kingdom, United States/Canada and Other countries).
Method

Search strategy, selection of studies and coding

- Medline, Embase, PsycINFO, Cochrane, Project Cork (n=5)
- Studies included if: written in English, published between 2000-2004 (TP1) or 2008-2012 (TP2) and examined smoking cessation in a low-SES or disadvantaged group.
- Included publications coded by country, publication year, and type of low-SES and disadvantaged population group:
  - Low-SES, homeless, Indigenous, prisoners, at-risk youth, & mental illness.
Method cont.

Publication volume and types

• Publications were coded into 3 groups: (i) reviews; (ii) non data-based research; and (iii) data-based research.
  - Data-based research publications were further coded by study type (descriptive or intervention).

Evaluation designs

• Intervention studies coded according to Cochrane Effective Practice Organisation of Care (EPOC) evaluation design:
  - EPOC (RCT, CCT, ITS, or CBA) vs. non-EPOC.
Results

Evidence synthesis

• Time period 1 (TP1) - 1064 articles screened.
  ▪ 75 articles included.
• Time period 2 (TP2) - 2521 articles screened.
  ▪ 203 articles included.

Overall research output \((n = 278 \text{ articles})\)

• Trend of overall increase in total research output \((TP1 = 27\% \text{ vs. } TP2 = 73\%)\).
• No change in country or population group.
Results cont.

Data-based research output

- Increased between TP1 (n = 43 studies) and TP2 (n = 122 studies) but....

- The proportion of data-based research that was intervention was comparable over time (77% at TP1 and 67% at TP2) and this pattern of research was consistent for all countries.

- No significant change in population group studied.
Results cont.

Intervention studies using EPOC evaluation design

• ↑ overtime TP1 (21) to TP2 (44) but proportion of output remained comparable from TP1 (64%) and TP2 (57%) ($\chi^2 = 0.24, p = 0.63$).
• No change in output by population group studied.
Implications

• Research output less than ideal.
• To optimize improvements in health more rigorously tested intervention research is needed among low-SES and disadvantaged population groups.
• Tobacco-related inequalities and high rates of smoking may continue for low-SES and disadvantaged population groups unless we meet this endpoint.
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