

## **Enhancing Behavior Change Technique Coding Methods: Identifying Behavioral Targets and Delivery Styles in Smoking Cessation Trials**

Nicola Black PhD<sup>a\*</sup>, A. Jess Williams MSc<sup>b, a</sup>, Neza Javornik MSc<sup>a</sup>, Claire Scott MSc<sup>c, a</sup>, Marie Johnston PhD<sup>a</sup>, Maarten C. Eisma PhD<sup>d, a</sup>, Susan Michie DPhil<sup>e</sup>, Jamie Hartmann-Boyce DPhil<sup>f</sup>, Robert West PhD<sup>g</sup>, Wolfgang Viechtbauer PhD<sup>h</sup>, Marijn de Bruin PhD<sup>a</sup>

- a. Health Psychology Group, Institute of Applied Health Sciences, University of Aberdeen
- b. Department of Psychology, School of Social Sciences, Nottingham Trent University
- c. Scottish Dental Clinical Effectiveness Programme, NHS Education for Scotland, Dundee Dental Education Centre
- d. Department of Clinical Psychology and Experimental Psychopathology, University of Groningen
- e. Centre for Behaviour Change, University College London
- f. Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, University of Oxford
- g. Health Behaviour Research Centre, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, University College London
- h. Department of Psychiatry and Neuropsychology, School for Mental Health and Neuroscience, Maastricht University

\* Corresponding author: Dr Nicola Black

Mail: 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Health Sciences Building, Foresterhill Campus, University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen, AB25 2ZD, UK;

Email: nicola.d.black@gmail.com;

**Acknowledgements**

We thank the authors of included studies who responded to our requests for materials on the intervention and comparator group support. These materials were crucial to achieving our current aims. We also thank the members of our advisory board panels who provided valuable input into the broader study design.

## Abstract

Background. The behavior change technique (BCT) taxonomy v1 is often used in systematic reviews for identifying active components of interventions. Its utility could be enhanced by linking BCTs to specific target behaviors and qualifying BCT delivery style. Purpose. To determine whether behavioral targets and delivery styles of BCTs can be coded reliably, and to determine the utility of coding these characteristics. Methods. As part of a large systematic review of 142 smoking cessation trials, two researchers independently coded publicly and privately held intervention and comparator group materials, specifying the behavioral target (quitting, abstinence, medication adherence, or treatment engagement) and delivery style (tailored vs. not tailored; active participation vs. passive receipt) of each BCT. Results. Researchers coded 3843 BCTs, which were reliably attributed to behavioral targets ( $AC_1 = 0.92$ , PABAK = 0.91). Tailoring ( $AC_1 = 0.80$ , PABAK = 0.74) and participation ( $AC_1 = 0.71$ , PABAK = 0.64) were also coded reliably. There was considerable variability between groups in quitting and abstinence BCTs (ranges: 0-41; 0-18) and in tailoring and participation (ranges: 0-20; 0-32), but less variability for medication adherence and treatment engagement (ranges: 0-6; 0-7). Conclusions. Behavioral targets and delivery styles of BCTs can be reliably identified and occur with sufficient frequency in smoking cessation trials for inclusion in quantitative syntheses (e.g., meta-regression analyses). Systematic reviewers could consider adopting these methods to evaluate the impact of intervention components targeting different behaviors, as well as the benefits of different BCT delivery styles.

Key words: *behavior change technique, smoking cessation, reliability, systematic review, delivery style, tailoring*

## **Enhancing Behavior Change Technique Coding Methods:**

### **Identifying Behavioral Targets and Delivery Styles in Smoking Cessation Trials**

Health risk behaviors such as tobacco smoking are important causes of disease and disability (1), health care expenditure (2), and societal costs related to loss of labor (3).

Numerous behavioral interventions have been, and continue to be, developed, evaluated, and published; however, suboptimal reporting of these interventions limits their implementation, replication, and synthesis. The behavior change technique taxonomy v1 (BCTTv1) was developed to introduce a shared language for reporting the content of behavioral interventions (4). It has also been widely adopted by both primary researchers, and by systematic reviewers as a tool for coding the behavior change techniques (BCTs) delivered in interventions and for identifying potentially effective BCTs via meta-regression analyses (e.g., 5-8). The current study examined whether the utility of the BCTTv1 as a coding tool can be extended by identifying factors that might influence the capacity of interventions to modify behavior; namely, the behavioral target and delivery style of each BCT (9).

Intervention development frameworks systematically build these features into interventions. For example, the widely used Intervention Mapping framework starts by specifying the desired behavioral outcome and the specific preparatory and supportive behaviors leading to that outcome (10). Behavioral interventions for smoking cessation—the focus of the present study—require that a person first quits smoking (behavior 1) and then remains abstinent (behavior 2; the behavioral outcome). Theoretical accounts of behavior change initiation and maintenance suggest that different factors, and thus different BCTs, will affect success in quitting compared to abstinence (11, 12). Further, smoking cessation interventions are often supplemented with pharmacotherapy, which is most likely to work if the person adheres to its recommended use (behavior 3). Similarly, for people to experience optimal benefits from the smoking cessation program in which they are participating, their

engagement in the program (behavior 4) is important. Different BCTs may be effective in influencing these four different behaviors. Additionally, the impact of BCTs on the behavioral outcome (e.g., smoking cessation at 12 months) may vary depending on the relevance of the specific behavior targeted by these BCTs (i.e., quitting, abstinence, adherence, engagement). Accordingly, to understand the active content of these interventions, it is important to examine which BCTs target which behaviors.

Intervention Mapping further specifies that how a BCT is applied will influence its effectiveness in changing behavior (10). For example, the Elaboration Likelihood Model asserts that the degree of effect of interventions on attitudes and behaviors varies along a continuum and depends on characteristics of the intervention and the participant (13). Specifically, interventions that involve participant-relevant content and that require effortful elaboration from the participant should lead to larger changes in attitudes and behaviors than those that are less relevant and require little effort to process. From this it follows that interventions that actively engage participants and are tailored to participant characteristics should produce larger changes in behavior. Indeed, results from meta-analyses support these claims (14-17). Many BCTs in the BCTTv1 are defined in such a way that they may or may not be tailored or require active participant engagement. For example, BCT 5.1 ‘information about health consequences’ may include personalized information based on the participant’s assessed health status (tailored), general health consequences (not tailored), be delivered via collaborative discussion (active), or be delivered via a leaflet (passive). These delivery styles were included in an earlier BCT taxonomy for medication adherence (18, 19) but have not yet been applied to BCTs used in smoking cessation trials. Identifying these two styles of BCT delivery (tailoring and participation) is an important step in fully specifying the active content of smoking cessation interventions.

Enhancing investigation of BCT effects by considering BCT coding in relation to

coding of behavioral targets and style of BCT delivery could benefit both evidence syntheses and intervention development and delivery. Those synthesizing evidence on interventions could not only identify the associations between BCTs and intervention effectiveness, but also identify which BCTs are effective in promoting behavior initiation versus behavior maintenance, whether intervention components targeting auxiliary behaviors such as medication adherence and treatment engagement result in better outcomes, and whether the effectiveness of BCTs varies depending on the delivery style. Those developing and delivering interventions could use these systematic reviews to gain a clearer picture of the content of effective interventions than would be offered by systematic reviews that only specify the BCTs used. This is likely to increase the replicability of effective interventions and their active components.

There is general consensus that it is important to achieve adequate inter-coder reliability on BCTs extracted from published intervention descriptions, and this has been demonstrated for the majority of BCTs included in the BCTTv1 (20). In this study we will examine whether (1) BCTs can be reliably attributed to specific target behaviors and whether the BCT delivery styles can be reliably identified, and (2) these behaviors and delivery styles are occurring with sufficient frequency to make this additional data extraction work useful for enhancing intervention replicability and meta-analyses.

## Method

### Design

This study is part of a larger, ongoing review of smoking cessation trials (IC-SMOKE; PROSPERO registration number CRD42015025251; 21). Full details, including the data, of all outputs from the IC-SMOKE project will be available on the project's Open Science Framework page (<https://osf.io/23hfv/>) upon publication.

The Cochrane Tobacco Addiction Group Specialized Register was searched for

randomized controlled trials (RCTs) assessing the impact of behavioral interventions (with or without pharmacological support) on biochemically verified smoking cessation at six months or longer. Trials were excluded if they were published before 1996 or after November 1<sup>st</sup> 2015 (the search date), were not reported in English or in peer-reviewed journals, or if the participants were aged under 18 years (21).

## Data Extraction

Data were first collected from the *publicly available materials* (e.g., the primary trial articles and appendices, but also protocols and additional publications such as intervention development papers). Additionally, a comprehensive procedure was used for contacting authors of all included trials to request additional materials describing their experimental and comparator interventions in order to obtain *privately held materials* (e.g., intervention manuals, practitioner training materials, websites, self-help materials; 21). While not pertinent to the current study as it does not allow for calculating reliability or identifying tailoring and participation, it should be noted that authors were also asked to complete a brief checklist detailing the active content delivered to the comparator group in their trial (discussed further in the discussion). Publicly available materials—besides the primary article, which was retrieved for all groups—were retrieved for 59% of groups (intervention: 61%; comparator: 56%) and privately held materials were retrieved for 45% of groups (intervention: 51%; comparator: 37%). When checklist responses are included, privately held materials/information were retrieved for 64% of groups (intervention: 63%; comparator: 65%). The procedure for retrieving additional materials took approximately eight months, with one final response received at eleven months.

Identifying BCTs, their behavioral targets, and delivery styles in these materials involved two steps: independent coding and discussion to resolve disagreements. First, two independent researchers coded materials for the presence of each of the 93 BCTs in the

BCTTv1 (4). Minor adaptations to the taxonomy were made prior to coding, including the removal of BCT 8.5 (overcorrection), as it was unclear how this would be used in this context, the addition of a BCT 4.5 (tell to act, defined as ‘tell the person to perform the target behavior’), and the inclusion of smoking cessation examples for each BCT, to enhance validity and inter-coder reliability. For efficiency, the BCT coding sheet was designed such that the additional properties could be coded without additional note taking (see definitions of these properties in Table 1 and a simplified illustration of the coding sheet in Figure 1). Researchers read the materials and each time a new BCT was identified, the BCT code and source quote were entered into the first two columns. It was possible for a single quote to contain multiple BCTs. This was followed by columns for tailoring and participation for BCTs targeting each behavior. Researchers entered a T or A into the tailoring and participation columns of the targeted behavior if the BCT was tailored or actively delivered, respectively. Smoking cessation interventions often define a formal quit date. To manage workload, coders were instructed to code a BCT no more than once for each behavior before the quit date and no more than once after the quit date (even if it occurred more frequently). Hence, a total possible  $93 \text{ (BCTs)} \times 4 \text{ (behaviors)} \times 2 \text{ (before/after quit date)} = 744 \text{ BCTs}$  could be coded per (intervention or comparator) group. Researchers were also asked to identify any BCTs that were particularly difficult to code, to inform potential sensitivity analyses. In the second step, researchers used discussion to resolve discrepancies in BCT codes. The BCT coding took approximately ten weeks, including discussion time.

[TABLE 1 AND FIGURE 1 NEAR HERE]

## Data Analysis

To examine whether the behavioral targets and delivery style of BCTs could be reliably identified, two indicators of inter-rater reliability were used: Gwet’s AC1 (22), and prevalence- and bias-adjusted kappa (PABAK; 23). AC<sub>1</sub> and PABAK were chosen because



they are more stable indicators of inter-rater reliability than is the widely used Cohen's kappa (24, 25). Results were interpreted using Altman's guidelines:  $\leq 0.20$  poor, 0.21-0.40 fair, 0.41-0.60 moderate, 0.61-0.80 good, and 0.81-1.00 very good reliability (26). These analyses were conducted on BCTs independently identified by both coders prior to resolving discrepancies in BCT coding. Analyses were conducted separately for each group type (intervention or comparator) as well as overall. This was in order to pick up any potential differences in coding ability of the content provided for the intervention and comparator groups.

To evaluate the utility of coding behavioral targets and delivery style of BCTs, we examined whether these properties occurred with sufficient frequency for inclusion in quantitative meta-regression analyses. Utility was judged according to whether researchers would be able to examine questions such as 'Does using BCTs to target behavior X (i.e., cessation, abstinence, adherence, engagement) improve outcomes (e.g., smoking cessation rates, quit attempts, medication adherence, attrition)?', 'Does tailoring intervention content improve outcomes?', and 'Does active client participation improve outcomes?'. To answer these questions, histograms were inspected to determine whether there was sufficient spread across groups in (a) the number of BCTs used to target each of quitting, abstinence, treatment engagement, and, amongst those groups who received medication, medication adherence, (b) the number of BCTs that were tailored, and (c) the number of BCTs that involved active client engagement. Variables with little spread would not be useful as predictor variables in meta-regression analyses. Histograms are presented separately by group type (intervention or comparator), as it was expected that intervention groups would tend to contain more BCTs, more tailored BCTs, and more actively delivered BCTs. Since only about half of the studies reported a quit date, for consistency between trials, quit date was removed from the dataset for this analysis, thus allowing each group to provide one BCT per target behavior (for a

possible total of 93 BCTs \* 4 behaviors = 372 BCTs per group).

## Results

### Descriptives

One hundred and forty-two studies reporting 204 intervention and 142 comparator groups were included. Included studies are listed in the supplemental materials. Through coding the publicly available and privately held materials, there were 3843 BCTs (intervention: 2860; control: 983) that were identified by both of the researchers, 725 BCTs were identified by one of the researchers but not the other (388/725 identified by researcher one but not two; 337/725 identified by researcher two but not one; this constitutes 0.3% [725/(744 BCTs \* 346 groups)] of the total number of judgements that were made by each researcher), and 4128 BCTs after discrepancies were reconciled and quit date was removed from the dataset (for reasons mentioned above). The 3843 BCTs were used for the reliability analyses and the 4128 BCTs for the utility analyses.

Table 2 presents the mean number of BCTs agreed present by both researchers, by treatment arm and targeted behavior. An average of 14.82 BCTs per intervention group and 7.78 per comparator group were coded.

[TABLE 2 NEAR HERE]

### Reliability of linking BCTs to behaviors and delivery style

As seen in Table 3a, reliability of attributing BCTs to one of four behaviors was very good (0.91-0.94). Reliability was good to very good for identifying tailoring of BCTs (0.73-0.84) and good for identifying participation in the delivery of BCTs (0.64-0.74).

During BCT coding, the two researchers identified particular difficulties with identifying the delivery style of one BCT: BCT 3.1 Social support (unspecified). When this BCT was removed ( $n = 420$  instances) from the reliability analyses, reliability for coding tailoring (0.73-0.88) and participation (0.75-0.85) improved, whereas reliability of coding the

behavioral targets remained the same (0.91-0.94; see Table 3b).

[TABLE 3 NEAR HERE]

### Utility of coding targeted behaviors and delivery style of BCTs

The degree of variability between different intervention and comparator groups in the use of BCTs is displayed in Table 2 and the histograms in Figures 2 and 3. As seen in Figure 2, between intervention groups, there was considerable variability in BCTs targeting quitting and abstinence, but minimal variability in BCTs targeting medication adherence and treatment engagement. Between comparator groups, there was considerable variability in BCTs targeting quitting, but minimal variability in BCTs targeting abstinence, medication adherence, and treatment engagement. As seen in Figure 3, there was considerable variability in tailored and active BCTs between intervention groups, but more limited variability between comparator groups.

[FIGURES 2 AND 3 NEAR HERE]

### Discussion

This study examined the reliability and utility of a BCT coding scheme that extends beyond extracting exclusively the presence or absence of a BCT in intervention descriptions. For a sample of 142 smoking cessation trials (346 intervention and comparator groups) we examined published materials and additional materials obtained from study authors. Behavioral targets and BCT delivery style could be identified with good to very good reliability. The utility of extracting these data for use in meta-regression analyses was evident for quitting and abstinence in relation to the target behaviors, and for tailoring and participation in relation to delivery styles, but less so for medication adherence and treatment engagement. Hence, this study demonstrated that extending BCT coding to include specific behavioral targets and styles of BCT delivery is feasible and adds substantial information to the coding of BCT occurrence only, which is currently the most common practice.

1 It appears useful to collect information on the style of BCT delivery and on BCTs  
2 targeting quitting and abstinence delivered to intervention groups, but less so for BCTs  
3 targeting medication adherence and treatment engagement. It might be that these techniques  
4 are infrequently used, infrequently reported, or both. If they are used but infrequently  
5 reported, this limits the ability to replicate published interventions and to synthesize evidence  
6 on effective intervention techniques. If they are infrequently used, this highlights two areas of  
7 trial and intervention development in need of improvement. Fewer than half (46%) of the  
8 intervention groups who received medication received any behavioral support to help them  
9 adhere to its intended use. Given that medication adherence remains a challenge (27), trial  
10 developers in the field of smoking cessation should consider the use of appropriate BCTs to  
11 promote adherence. Similarly, low treatment engagement leads to attrition, which can  
12 contribute to incomplete delivery of intervention content and biased estimates of intervention  
13 effectiveness (28). Trial developers should thus also consider how BCTs could be used to  
14 retain participants in the intervention and trial. Alternatively, it might be that the use of BCTs  
15 to promote treatment engagement is reactive; treatment providers might utilize BCTs only  
16 when they observe that a participant is becoming disengaged. In this case authors should  
17 capture such information in published trial reports.

18 Usual practice when conducting meta-regressions using BCTs has been to code the  
19 presence of each BCT targeting any of a cluster of final health behaviors (e.g., dietary  
20 behaviors), without identifying the delivery styles of each BCT, or disentangling which of the  
21 final health behaviors (e.g., vegetable intake, fat intake) or preparatory behaviors (e.g.,  
22 buying food, preparing food) is being targeted (e.g., 7, 8). Current findings suggest that only  
23 limited additional information would be gained if reviewers were to widely adopt the coding  
24 of behavioral targets such as medication adherence and treatment engagement (though, this  
25 could be due to poor reporting in existing trials). Comparatively, coding the use of BCTs

targeting behavior change (e.g., quitting) and behavior change maintenance (e.g., abstinence) could be a useful addition to reviews of smoking cessation trials—and reviews of interventions for other health behaviors, such as substance use, diet, and physical activity. Theoretical accounts of behavior would suggest that BCTs that shift the relative cost-benefit analysis in favor of the new behavior should promote behavior change initiation (e.g., promoting the perceived benefits and/or reducing the perceived costs should promote behavior change; 11, 12). Comparatively, behavior change maintenance could be promoted through BCTs that promote habit, resource availability and utilization, positive maintenance motives, supportive environments, and self-regulation to monitor behavior and overcome barriers (29). The coding scheme presented in the current study would allow systematic reviewers to assess (a) whether authors use theoretically supported BCTs at each stage of behavior change, and (b) whether these BCTs are effective.

Comparator groups received noticeably fewer BCTs than did intervention groups. This finding will partially reflect reality, in that intervention group support can be expected to be more intensive than comparator group support. It is plausible that this finding will also partially reflect differing reporting qualities for intervention and comparator group support. Comparator group support tends to be poorly reported and, in the case of usual care comparator groups, not manualized (18, 19). For these reasons, we have also developed a checklist based on previous work (18, 19) for collecting information from authors on the support provided to comparator groups and will be reporting on the data collected using this method elsewhere. Such information was not relevant to the current paper, as it does not allow for calculating the reliability of coding behavioral targets and delivery styles of BCTs, nor for the assessment of the delivery styles of BCTs. Nonetheless it is worth briefly mentioning that the apparent number of BCTs delivered to comparator groups increases considerably when data from this checklist are included.

Strengths of this study are the rigorous systematic review methodology applied and the use of a considerable number of unpublished intervention materials that were obtained through contacting authors. Materials from 142 trials and 346 intervention and comparator groups were coded independently by two researchers, and bias- and prevalence-corrected reliability calculations were used given the skewed distributions. Limitations of this study are that BCT coding was conducted by two trained researchers and the degree to which other teams are able to reliably extract these data has yet to be examined. Further, a single behavioral domain (smoking cessation) was examined; it may be that extracting behaviors and delivery styles in other domains is more or less difficult. Nonetheless, our findings suggest that exploring whether different behavioral targets and delivery styles can be reliably and usefully identified in other behavioral domains is warranted. Finally only the first instance (before and after quit date) was coded for each BCT. This procedure is also likely to have resulted in an underestimation of the utility of the methods described, given that fewer BCTs were coded overall. Future researchers could avoid this problem by coding for repeated delivery of BCTs, when this occurs. Despite these limitations, it is important to note that much more BCT data was collected than is the case in most systematic reviews using the taxonomy. Further, to the authors' knowledge, the data presented here provide the most comprehensive representation to date of the active content of behavioral smoking cessation interventions.

To our knowledge, this study represents the first attempt at moving the coding of BCTs delivered to intervention and comparator groups beyond presence or absence of BCTs. It presented and tested an enhanced coding scheme for characterizing this active content of behavioral interventions. The proposed extensions can be coded reliably and, on the whole, these extensions are likely to be useful to both those attempting to replicate effective interventions and those trying to synthesize the evidence on behavior change interventions.

Table 1

*Elements of the Enhanced Behavior Change Technique Coding Scheme*

Characteristic		Coding
Behavior	Quitting	BCTs used to increase the likelihood of the participant ceasing tobacco smoking (initiating a quit attempt)
	Abstinence	BCTs used to increase the likelihood of the participant maintaining their non-(tobacco-)smoker state
	Medication Adherence	BCTs used to increase the likelihood of the participant using their smoking cessation medication in appropriate dosages at appropriate times
	Treatment Engagement	BCTs used to increase the likelihood of the participant engaging with, and completing components of, the smoking cessation treatment
Tailoring	Tailored	The BCT was modified based on characteristics of the recipient
Participation	Active	The delivery of the BCT required the participant to actively participate

Table 2

*Mean (SD) Number of BCTs Coded by Targeted Behavior and Group*

	Quitting	Abstinence	Medication Adherence	Treatment Engagement	Total
Intervention	11.28 (8.35)	2.40 (3.84)	0.70 (1.26)	0.44 (1.18)	14.82 (10.85)
Comparator	6.61 (7.60)	0.64 (1.72)	0.41 (0.95)	0.12 (0.61)	7.78 (8.93)



Table 3

*Inter-Rater Reliability for Coding Targeted Behavior, Tailoring, and Participation of Behavior Change Techniques*

	Intervention		Comparator		Total	
	AC <sub>1</sub>	PABAK	AC <sub>1</sub>	PABAK	AC <sub>1</sub>	PABAK
a. All BCTs						
Behavior	0.92	0.91	0.94	0.93	0.92	0.91
Tailoring	0.78	0.73	0.84	0.78	0.80	0.74
Participation	0.69	0.64	0.74	0.66	0.71	0.64
b. All BCTs except 3.1						
Behavior	0.92	0.91	0.94	0.93	0.92	0.91
Tailoring	0.80	0.73	0.88	0.81	0.82	0.75
Participation	0.80	0.75	0.85	0.80	0.81	0.76

*Note.*  $N = 3843$  for 3a,  $N = 3423$  for 3b.

**Abbreviations**

BCT: Behavior change technique

BCTTv1: Behavior change technique taxonomy v1

PABAK: Prevalence- and bias-adjusted kappa

RCT: Randomized controlled trial

# References

1. Gakidou E, Afshin A, Abajobir AA, et al. Global, regional, and national comparative risk assessment of 84 behavioural, environmental and occupational, and metabolic risks or clusters of risks, 1990-2016. *The Lancet*. 2017;390:1345-1422.
2. Goetzel RZ, Anderson DR, Whitmer RW, et al. The relationship between modifiable health risks and health care expenditures: an analysis of the multi-employer HERO health risk and cost database. *J Occup Environ Med*. 1998;40:843-854.
3. Merrill RM, Aldana SG, Pope JE, et al. Self-rated job performance and absenteeism according to employee engagement, health behaviors, and physical health. *J Occup Environ Med*. 2013;55:10-18.
4. Michie S, Richardson M, Johnston M, et al. The behavior change technique taxonomy (v1) of 93 hierarchically clustered techniques: Building an international consensus for the reporting of behavior change interventions. *Ann Behav Med*. 2013;46:81-95.
5. Black N, Mullan B, Sharpe L: Computer-delivered interventions for reducing alcohol consumption: Meta-analysis and meta-regression using behaviour change techniques and theory. *Health Psychol Rev*. 2016;10:341-357.
6. British Websites: *BCT Taxonomy v1: Interventions*. Retrieved February 21, 2018 from [bct-taxonomy.com/interventions](http://bct-taxonomy.com/interventions)
7. Dombrowski SU, Sniehotta FF, Avenell A, et al. Identifying active ingredients in complex behavioural interventions for obese adults with obesity-related co-morbidities or additional risk factors for co-morbidities: A systematic review. *Health Psychol Rev*. 2012;6:7-32.
8. Michie S, Abraham C, Whittington C, McAteer J, Gupta S: Effective techniques in healthy eating and physical activity interventions: A meta-regression. *Health Psychol*. 2009;28:690-701.

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65
9. Peters G-JY, de Bruin M, Crutzen R: Everything should be as simple as possible, but no simpler: Towards a protocol for accumulating evidence regarding the active content of health behaviour change interventions. *Health Psychol Rev.* 2015;9:1-14.
10. Bartholomew Eldredge LK, Markham CM, Ruiter RA, Kok G, Parcel GS: *Planning health promotion programs: An Intervention Mapping approach.* San Francisco, USA: John Wiley & Sons, 2016.
11. Rothman AJ: Toward a theory-based analysis of behavioral maintenance. *Health Psychol.* 2000;19:64-69.
12. Rothman AJ, Sheeran P, Wood W: Reflective and automatic processes in the initiation and maintenance of dietary change. *Ann Behav Med.* 2009;38:4-17.
13. Petty R, Barden J, Wheeler S: The elaboration likelihood model of persuasion: Health promotions for sustained behavioral change. In R. J. DiClemente, R. A. Crosby and M. C. Kegler (eds), *Emerging theories in health promotion practice and research.* San Francisco, USA: Jossey-Bass, 2009.
14. Noar SM, Benac CN, Harris MS: Does tailoring matter? Meta-analytic review of tailored print health behavior change interventions. *Psychol Bull.* 2007;133:673-693.
15. Lustria MLA, Noar SM, Cortese J, et al. A meta-analysis of web-delivered tailored health behavior change interventions. *Journal of Health Communication.* 2013;18:1039-1069.
16. Norris SL, Engelgau MM, Narayan KV: Effectiveness of self-management training in type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care.* 2001;24:561-587.
17. Davis MK, Gidycz CA: Child sexual abuse prevention programs: A meta-analysis. *J Clin Child Psychol.* 2000;29:257-265.
18. de Bruin M, Viechtbauer W, Hospers HJ, Schaalma HP, Kok G: Standard care quality determines treatment outcomes in control groups of HAART-adherence intervention studies:

Implications for the interpretation and comparison of intervention effects. *Health Psychol.*

2009;28:668-674.

19. de Bruin M, Viechtbauer W, Schaalma HP, et al. Standard care impact on effects of highly active antiretroviral therapy adherence interventions: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Arch Intern Med.* 2010;170:240-250.

20. Michie S, Wood CE, Johnston M, et al. Behaviour change techniques: The development and evaluation of a taxonomic method for reporting and describing behaviour change interventions. *Health Technol Assess.* 2015;19:1-188.

21. de Bruin M, Viechtbauer W, Eisma MC, et al. Identifying effective behavioural components of Intervention and Comparison group support provided in SMOKing cEssation (IC-SMOKE) interventions: A systematic review protocol. *Systematic Reviews.* 2016;5:77-85.

22. Gwet KL: Computing inter- rater reliability and its variance in the presence of high agreement. *Br J Math Stat Psychol.* 2008;61:29-48.

23. Byrt T, Bishop J, Carlin JB: Bias, prevalence and kappa. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 1993;46:423-429.

24. Wongpakaran N, Wongpakaran T, Wedding D, Gwet KL: A comparison of Cohen's Kappa and Gwet's AC1 when calculating inter-rater reliability coefficients: a study conducted with personality disorder samples. *BMC Med Res Methodol.* 2013;13:61-67.

25. Chen G, Faris P, Hemmelgarn B, Walker RL, Quan H: Measuring agreement of administrative data with chart data using prevalence unadjusted and adjusted kappa. *BMC Med Res Methodol.* 2009;9:5-12.

26. Altman DG: *Practical statistics for medical research.* London, UK: CRC press, 1990.

27. Piper ME, Smith SS, Schlam TR, et al. A randomized placebo-controlled clinical trial of 5 smoking cessation pharmacotherapies. *Arch Gen Psychiatry.* 2009;66:1253-1262.

28. Higgins JP, Green S: *Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions*.

West Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons, 2011.

29. Kwasnicka D, Dombrowski SU, White M, Sniehotta F: Theoretical explanations for maintenance of behaviour change: A systematic review of behaviour theories. *Health Psychol Rev.* 2016;10:277-296.

## Figure Captions

*Figure 1.* Simplified illustration of the coding sheet used to identify behavior change techniques, their targeted behavior, and their delivery style.

*Note.* i. Code from BCTTv1 taxonomy. ii. 1 = primary article, 2 = other publicly available material, 3 = privately held material. iii. A = active versus P = passive participant. iv. T = tailored versus N = not tailored.

*Figure 2.* Histograms showing the degree of between-group variability in use of behavior change techniques, by group type and behavioral target.

*Figure 3.* Histograms showing the degree of between-group variability in use of tailored and active behavior change techniques, by group type.

Figure1

BCT <sup>i</sup>	Quote Illustrating BCT Application	Source <sup>ii</sup>	Targeted Behavior	Active <sup>iii</sup>	Tailored <sup>iv</sup>
1.1	“Counsellors worked with each participant to set a target quit date on a day that would work for that participant”	1	Quitting	A	T
10.4	“Participants who were smoke-free were congratulated and encouraged to remain smoke-free”	2	Abstinence	P	N
6.1	“Participants were shown how to correctly apply the nicotine patch”	3	Medication Adherence	P	N
1.9	“It is important that you make a commitment to review the sessions and complete the homework tasks each week”	3	Treatment Engagement	P	N

Figure 1



Figure2




Figure 2

Figure3




Figure 3

### Supplemental Materials

Studies included in review:

1. Abrantes AM, Bloom EL, Strong DR, et al. A preliminary randomized controlled trial of a behavioral exercise intervention for smoking cessation. *Nicotine Tob Res.* 2014;16(8):1094-1103.
2. Abroms LC, Boal AL, Simmens SJ, Mendel JA, Windsor RA. A randomized trial of Text2Quit: A text messaging program for smoking cessation. *Am J Prev Med.* 2014;47(3):242-250.
3. Abroms LC, Windsor R, Simons-Morton B. Getting young adults to quit smoking: A formative evaluation of the X-Pack Program. *Nicotine Tob Res.* 2008;10(1):27-33.
4. Ahluwalia JS, Okuyemi K, Nollen N, et al. The effects of nicotine gum and counseling among African American light smokers: A 2× 2 factorial design. *Addiction.* 2006;101(6):883-891.
5. Alessi SM, Petry NM. Smoking reductions and increased self-efficacy in a randomized controlled trial of smoking abstinence—contingent incentives in residential substance abuse treatment patients. *Nicotine Tob Res.* 2014;16(11):1436-1445.
6. Allen Jr B, Pederson LL, Leonard EH. Effectiveness of physicians-in-training counseling for smoking cessation in African Americans. *J Natl Med Assoc.* 1998;90(10):597-604.
7. Ames SC, Patten CA, Werch CE, et al. Expressive writing as a smoking cessation treatment adjunct for young adult smokers. *Nicotine Tob Res.* 2007;9(2):185-194.
8. Ames SC, Pokorny SB, Schroeder DR, Tan W, Werch CE. Integrated smoking cessation and binge drinking intervention for young adults: A pilot efficacy trial. *Addict Behav.* 2014;39(5):848-853.
9. An LC, Klatt C, Perry CL, et al. The RealU online cessation intervention for college smokers: A randomized controlled trial. *Prev Med.* 2008;47(2):194-199.
10. Aveyard P, Brown K, Saunders C, et al. Weekly versus basic smoking cessation support in primary care: A randomised controlled trial. *Thorax.* 2007;62(10):898-903.

11. Baker A, Richmond R, Haile M, et al. A randomized controlled trial of a smoking cessation intervention among people with a psychotic disorder. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2006;163(11):1934-1942.
12. Bakkevig O, Steine S, Hafenbrädl Kv, Lærum E. Smoking cessation: A comparative, randomised study between management in general practice and the behavioural programme SmokEnders. *Scand J Prim Health Care*. 2000;18(4):247-251.
13. Becoña E, Vázquez FL. Effectiveness of personalized written feedback through a mail intervention for smoking cessation: A randomized-controlled trial in Spanish smokers. *J Consult Clin Psychol*. 2001;69(1):33-40.
14. Bize R, Willi C, Chiolerio A, et al. Participation in a population-based physical activity programme as an aid for smoking cessation: A randomised trial. *Tob Control*. 2010;19(6):488-494.
15. Blebil AQ, Sulaiman SAS, Hassali MA, Dujaili JA, Zin AM. Impact of additional counselling sessions through phone calls on smoking cessation outcomes among smokers in Penang State, Malaysia. *BMC Public Health*. 2014;14(1):460-468.
16. Bobo JK, Mcilvain HE, Lando HA, Walker RD, Leed-Kelly A. Effect of smoking cessation counseling on recovery from alcoholism: Findings from a randomized community intervention trial. *Addiction*. 1998;93(6):877-887.
17. Bock BC, Fava JL, Gaskins R, et al. Yoga as a complementary treatment for smoking cessation in women. *J Womens Health*. 2012;21(2):240-248.
18. Bock BC, Papandonatos GD, De Dios MA, et al. Tobacco cessation among low-income smokers: Motivational enhancement and nicotine patch treatment. *Nicotine Tob Res*. 2014;16(4):413-422.
19. Borrelli B, Novak S, Hecht J, Emmons K, Papandonatos G, Abrams D. Home health care nurses as a new channel for smoking cessation treatment: Outcomes from project CARES (Community-nurse Assisted Research and Education on Smoking). *Prev Med*. 2005;41(5-6):815-821.
20. Brown J, Michie S, Geraghty AW, et al. Internet-based intervention for smoking cessation (StopAdvisor) in people with low and high socioeconomic status: A randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet Respiratory Medicine*. 2014;2(12):997-1006.

21. Brown RA, Kahler CW, Niaura R, et al. Cognitive-behavioral treatment for depression in smoking cessation. *J Consult Clin Psychol*. 2001;69(3):471-480.
22. Brown RA, Niaura R, Lloyd-Richardson EE, et al. Bupropion and cognitive-behavioral treatment for depression in smoking cessation. *Nicotine Tob Res*. 2007;9(7):721-730.
23. Brown RA, Reed KMP, Bloom EL, et al. Development and preliminary randomized controlled trial of a distress tolerance treatment for smokers with a history of early lapse. *Nicotine Tob Res*. 2013;15(12):2005-2015.
24. Brunner Frandsen N, Sørensen M, Hyldahl TK, Henriksen RM, Bak S. Smoking cessation intervention after ischemic stroke or transient ischemic attack. A randomized controlled pilot trial. *Nicotine Tob Res*. 2011;14(4):443-447.
25. Carmody TP, Delucchi K, Duncan CL, et al. Intensive intervention for alcohol-dependent smokers in early recovery: A randomized trial. *Drug Alcohol Depend*. 2012;122(3):186-194.
26. Carmody TP, Duncan C, Simon JA, et al. Hypnosis for smoking cessation: A randomized trial. *Nicotine Tob Res*. 2008;10(5):811-818.
27. Chan SS, Leung DY, Abdullah AS, et al. Smoking-cessation and adherence intervention among Chinese patients with erectile dysfunction. *Am J Prev Med*. 2010;39(3):251-258.
28. Chan SS, Leung DY, Wong DC, Lau CP, Wong VT, Lam TH. A randomized controlled trial of stage-matched intervention for smoking cessation in cardiac out-patients. *Addiction*. 2012;107(4):829-837.
29. Chen J, Chen Y, Chen P, Liu Z, Luo H, Cai S. Effectiveness of individual counseling for smoking cessation in smokers with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease and asymptomatic smokers. *Experimental and Therapeutic Medicine*. 2014;7(3):716-720.
30. Chouinard M-C, Robichaud-Ekstrand S. The effectiveness of a nursing inpatient smoking cessation program in individuals with cardiovascular disease. *Nurs Res*. 2005;54(4):243-254.
31. Ciccolo JT, Dunsiger SI, Williams DM, et al. Resistance training as an aid to standard smoking cessation treatment: A pilot study. *Nicotine Tob Res*. 2011;13(8):756-760.

32. Clark MM, Cox LS, Jett JR, et al. Effectiveness of smoking cessation self-help materials in a lung cancer screening population. *Lung Cancer*. 2004;44(1):13-21.
33. Cropsey K, Eldridge G, Weaver M, Villalobos G, Stitzer M, Best A. Smoking cessation intervention for female prisoners: Addressing an urgent public health need. *Am J Public Health*. 2008;98(10):1894-1901.
34. Dallery J, Raiff BR, Grabinski MJ. Internet-based contingency management to promote smoking cessation: A randomized controlled study. *J Appl Behav Anal*. 2013;46(4):750-764.
35. Danielsson T, Jones K, Rössner S, Westin Å. Open randomised trial of intermittent very low energy diet together with nicotine gum for stopping smoking in women who gained weight in previous attempts to quitCommentary: Results are unlikely to be as good in routine practice. *BMJ*. 1999;319(7208):490-494.
36. Davis JM, Goldberg SB, Anderson MC, Manley AR, Smith SS, Baker TB. Randomized trial on mindfulness training for smokers targeted to a disadvantaged population. *Subst Use Misuse*. 2014;49(5):571-585.
37. Dent LA, Harris KJ, Noonan CW. Randomized trial assessing the effectiveness of a pharmacist-delivered program for smoking cessation. *Ann Pharmacother*. 2009;43(2):194-201.
38. Dickson-Spillmann M, Haug S, Schaub MP. Group hypnosis vs. relaxation for smoking cessation in adults: A cluster-randomised controlled trial. *BMC Public Health*. 2013;13(1):1227-1235.
39. Elkins G, Marcus J, Bates J, Hasan Rajab M, Cook T. Intensive hypnotherapy for smoking cessation: A prospective study. *Int J Clin Exp Hypn*. 2006;54(3):303-315.
40. Ellerbeck EF, Mahnken JD, Cupertino AP, et al. Effect of varying levels of disease management on smoking cessation: A randomized trial. *Ann Intern Med*. 2009;150(7):437-446.
41. Feeney GF, McPherson A, Connor J, McAlister A, Young R, Garrahy P. Randomized controlled trial of two cigarette quit programmes in coronary care patients after acute myocardial infarction. *Intern Med J*. 2001;31(8):470-475.
42. Froelicher ES, Doolan D, Yerger VB, McGruder CO, Malone RE. Combining community participatory research with a randomized clinical trial: The

- protecting the hood against tobacco (PHAT) smoking cessation study. *Heart & Lung: The Journal of Acute and Critical Care*. 2010;39(1):50-63.
43. Gilbody S, Peckham E, Man M-S, et al. Bespoke smoking cessation for people with severe mental ill health (SCIMITAR): A pilot randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet Psychiatry*. 2015;2(5):395-402.
44. Gritz ER, Danysh HE, Fletcher FE, et al. Long-term outcomes of a cell phone-delivered intervention for smokers living with HIV/AIDS. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2013;57(4):608-615.
45. Gulliver SB, Kamholz BW, Helstrom AW, Morissette SB, Kahler CW. A preliminary evaluation of adjuncts to motivational interviewing for psychiatrically complex smokers. *Journal of Dual Diagnosis*. 2008;4(4):394-413.
46. Hajek P, Taylor TZ, Mills P. Brief intervention during hospital admission to help patients to give up smoking after myocardial infarction and bypass surgery: Randomised controlled trial. *BMJ*. 2002;324(7329):87-89.
47. Hall SM, Humfleet GL, Muñoz RF, Reus VI, Prochaska JJ, Robbins JA. Using extended cognitive behavioral treatment and medication to treat dependent smokers. *Am J Public Health*. 2011;101(12):2349-2356.
48. Hall SM, Humfleet GL, Muñoz RF, Reus VI, Robbins JA, Prochaska JJ. Extended treatment of older cigarette smokers. *Addiction*. 2009;104(6):1043-1052.
49. Hall SM, Humfleet GL, Reus VI, Muñoz RF, Cullen J. Extended nortriptyline and psychological treatment for cigarette smoking. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2004;161(11):2100-2107.
50. Hall SM, Humfleet GL, Reus VI, Munoz RF, Hartz DT, Maude-Griffin R. Psychological intervention and antidepressant treatment in smoking cessation. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 2002;59(10):930-936.
51. Hall SM, Reus VI, Munoz RF, et al. Nortriptyline and cognitive-behavioral therapy in the treatment of cigarette smoking. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 1998;55(8):683-690.
52. Hall SM, Tsoh JY, Prochaska JJ, et al. Treatment for cigarette smoking among depressed mental health outpatients: A randomized clinical trial. *Am J Public Health*. 2006;96(10):1808-1814.

53. Halpern SD, French B, Small DS, et al. Randomized trial of four financial-incentive programs for smoking cessation. *N Engl J Med*. 2015;372(22):2108-2117.
54. Hanioka T, Ojima M, Tanaka H, Naito M, Hamajima N, Matsuse R. Intensive smoking-cessation intervention in the dental setting. *J Dent Res*. 2010;89(1):66-70.
55. Hasan FM, Zagarins SE, Pischke KM, et al. Hypnotherapy is more effective than nicotine replacement therapy for smoking cessation: Results of a randomized controlled trial. *Complement Ther Med*. 2014;22(1):1-8.
56. Heil SH, Higgins ST, Bernstein IM, et al. Effects of voucher-based incentives on abstinence from cigarette smoking and fetal growth among pregnant women. *Addiction*. 2008;103(6):1009-1018.
57. Hennrikus D, Joseph AM, Lando HA, et al. Effectiveness of a smoking cessation program for peripheral artery disease patients: A randomized controlled trial. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2010;56(25):2105-2112.
58. Hennrikus DJ, Lando HA, McCarty MC, et al. The TEAM project: The effectiveness of smoking cessation intervention with hospital patients. *Prev Med*. 2005;40(3):249-258.
59. Hickman NJ, Delucchi KL, Prochaska JJ. Treating tobacco dependence at the intersection of diversity, poverty, and mental illness: A randomized feasibility and replication trial. *Nicotine Tob Res*. 2015;17(8):1012-1021.
60. Higgins ST, Heil SH, Solomon LJ, et al. A pilot study on voucher-based incentives to promote abstinence from cigarette smoking during pregnancy and postpartum. *Nicotine Tob Res*. 2004;6(6):1015-1020.
61. Higgins ST, Washio Y, Lopez AA, et al. Examining two different schedules of financial incentives for smoking cessation among pregnant women. *Prev Med*. 2014;68:51-57.
62. Hollands GJ, Whitwell SC, Parker RA, et al. Effect of communicating DNA based risk assessments for Crohn's disease on smoking cessation: Randomised controlled trial. *BMJ*. 2012;345:e4708.
63. Hughes JR, Solomon LJ, Livingston AE, Callas PW, Peters EN. A randomized, controlled trial of NRT-aided gradual vs. abrupt cessation in smokers actively trying to quit. *Drug Alcohol Depend*. 2010;111(1):105-113.



64. Humerfelt S, Eide G, Kvale G, Aaro L, Gulsvik A. Effectiveness of postal smoking cessation advice: A randomized controlled trial in young men with reduced FEV1 and asbestos exposure. *Eur Respir J*. 1998;11(2):284-290.
65. Humfleet GL, Hall SM, Delucchi KL, Dilley JW. A randomized clinical trial of smoking cessation treatments provided in HIV clinical care settings. *Nicotine Tob Res*. 2013;15(8):1436-1445.
66. Jason LA, Salina D, McMahon SD, Hedeker D, Stockton M. A worksite smoking intervention: A 2 year assessment of groups, incentives and self-help. *Health Educ Res*. 1997;12(1):129-138.
67. Kahler CW, Metrik J, LaChance HR, et al. Addressing heavy drinking in smoking cessation treatment: A randomized clinical trial. *J Consult Clin Psychol*. 2008;76(5):852-862.
68. Killen JD, Fortmann SP, Davis L, Varady A. Nicotine patch and self-help video for cigarette smoking cessation. *J Consult Clin Psychol*. 1997;65(4):663-672.
69. Lacasse Y, Lamontagne R, Martin S, Simard S, Arsenault M. Randomized trial of a smoking cessation intervention in hospitalized patients. *Nicotine Tob Res*. 2008;10(7):1215-1221.
70. Lancaster T, Dobbie W, Vos K, Yudkin P, Murphy M, Fowler G. Randomized trial of nurse-assisted strategies for smoking cessation in primary care. *Br J Gen Pract*. 1999;49(440):191-194.
71. Lando H, Rolnick S, Klevan D, Roski J, Cherney L, Lauger G. Telephone support as an adjunct to transdermal nicotine in smoking cessation. *Am J Public Health*. 1997;87(10):1670-1674.
72. Ledgerwood DM, Arfken CL, Petry NM, Alessi SM. Prize contingency management for smoking cessation: A randomized trial. *Drug Alcohol Depend*. 2014;140:208-212.
73. Leischow SJ, Muramoto ML, Cook GN, Merikle EP, Castellini SM, Otte PS. OTC nicotine patch: Effectiveness alone and with brief physician intervention. *Am J Health Behav*. 1999;23(1):61-69.
74. Leischow SJ, Ranger-Moore J, Muramoto ML, Matthews E. Effectiveness of the nicotine inhaler for smoking cessation in an OTC setting. *Am J Health Behav*. 2004;28(4):291-301.

75. Levine MD, Perkins KA, Kalarchian MA, et al. Bupropion and cognitive behavioral therapy for weight-concerned women smokers. *Arch Intern Med.* 2010;170(6):543-550.
76. Lewis SF, Piasecki TM, Fiore MC, Anderson JE, Baker TB. Transdermal nicotine replacement for hospitalized patients: A randomized clinical trial. *Prev Med.* 1998;27(2):296-303.
77. Lou P, Zhu Y, Chen P, et al. Supporting smoking cessation in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease with behavioral intervention: A randomized controlled trial. *BMC Family Practice.* 2013;14(1):91-100.
78. Maguire T, McElnay J, Drummond A. A randomized controlled trial of a smoking cessation intervention based in community pharmacies. *Addiction.* 2001;96(2):325-331.
79. Marcus BH, Albrecht AE, King TK, et al. The efficacy of exercise as an aid for smoking cessation in women: A randomized controlled trial. *Arch Intern Med.* 1999;159(11):1229-1234.
80. Marcus BH, Lewis BA, Hogan J, et al. The efficacy of moderate-intensity exercise as an aid for smoking cessation in women: A randomized controlled trial. *Nicotine Tob Res.* 2005;7(6):871-880.
81. Martin JE, Calfas KJ, Patten CA, et al. Prospective evaluation of three smoking interventions in 205 recovering alcoholics: One-year results of Project SCRAP-Tobacco. *J Consult Clin Psychol.* 1997;65(1):190-194.
82. May S, West R, Hajek P, McEwen A, McRobbie H. Randomized controlled trial of a social support ('buddy') intervention for smoking cessation. *Patient Educ Couns.* 2006;64(1):235-241.
83. McBride CM, Scholes D, Grothaus LC, Curry SJ, Ludman E, Albright J. Evaluation of a minimal self-help smoking cessation intervention following cervical cancer screening. *Prev Med.* 1999;29(2):133-138.
84. McCarthy DE, Piasecki TM, Lawrence DL, et al. A randomized controlled clinical trial of bupropion SR and individual smoking cessation counseling. *Nicotine Tob Res.* 2008;10(4):717-729.
85. McFall M, Saxon AJ, Malte CA, et al. Integrating tobacco cessation into mental health care for posttraumatic stress disorder: A randomized controlled trial. *JAMA.* 2010;304(22):2485-2493.

86. McFall M, Saxon AJ, Thompson CE, et al. Improving the rates of quitting smoking for veterans with posttraumatic stress disorder. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2005;162(7):1311-1319.
87. Miller NH, Smith PM, DeBusk RF, Sobel DS, Taylor CB. Smoking cessation in hospitalized patients: Results of a randomized trial. *Arch Intern Med*. 1997;157(4):409-415.
88. Mohiuddin SM, Mooss AN, Hunter CB, Grollmes TL, Cloutier DA, Hilleman DE. Intensive smoking cessation intervention reduces mortality in high-risk smokers with cardiovascular disease. *Chest*. 2007;131(2):446-452.
89. Molyneux A, Lewis S, Leivers U, et al. Clinical trial comparing nicotine replacement therapy (NRT) plus brief counselling, brief counselling alone, and minimal intervention on smoking cessation in hospital inpatients. *Thorax*. 2003;58(6):484-488.
90. Mueller S, Petitjean S, Wiesbeck G. Cognitive behavioral smoking cessation during alcohol detoxification treatment: A randomized, controlled trial. *Drug Alcohol Depend*. 2012;126(3):279-285.
91. Murray RL, Coleman T, Antoniak M, et al. The effect of proactively identifying smokers and offering smoking cessation support in primary care populations: A cluster-randomized trial. *Addiction*. 2008;103(6):998-1006.
92. Myles P, Hendrata M, Layher Y, et al. Double-blind, randomized trial of cessation of smoking after audiotape suggestion during anaesthesia. *Br J Anaesth*. 1996;76(5):694-698.
93. Nagle AL, Hensley MJ, Schofield MJ, Koschel AJ. A randomised controlled trial to evaluate the efficacy of a nurse-provided intervention for hospitalised smokers. *Aust N Z J Public Health*. 2005;29(3):285-291.
94. Nevid JS, Javier RA. Preliminary investigation of a culturally specific smoking cessation intervention for Hispanic smokers. *Am J Health Promot*. 1997;11(3):198-207.
95. Niaura R, Abrams DB, Shadel WG, Rohsenow DJ, Monti PM, Sirota AD. Cue exposure treatment for smoking relapse prevention: A controlled clinical trial. *Addiction*. 1999;94(5):685-695.
96. Okuyemi KS, Goldade K, Whembolua GL, et al. Motivational interviewing to enhance nicotine patch treatment for smoking cessation among homeless smokers: A randomized controlled trial. *Addiction*. 2013;108(6):1136-1144.

97. Okuyemi KS, James AS, Mayo MS, et al. Pathways to health: a cluster randomized trial of nicotine gum and motivational interviewing for smoking cessation in low-income housing. *Health Educ Behav.* 2007;34(1):43-54.
98. Ostroff JS, Burkhalter JE, Cinciripini PM, et al. Randomized trial of a presurgical scheduled reduced smoking intervention for patients newly diagnosed with cancer. *Health Psychol.* 2014;33(7):737-747.
99. Paek Y-J, Lee S, Kim Y-H, et al. Effect on smoking quit rate of telling smokers their health risk appraisal in terms of health age: A randomized control trial. *Asian Pac J Cancer Prev.* 2014;15:4963-4968.
100. Parkes G, Greenhalgh T, Griffin M, Dent R. Effect on smoking quit rate of telling patients their lung age: The Step2quit randomised controlled trial. *BMJ.* 2008;336(7644):598-600.
101. Patten CA, Martin JE, Myers MG, Calfas KJ, Williams CD. Effectiveness of cognitive-behavioral therapy for smokers with histories of alcohol dependence and depression. *J Stud Alcohol.* 1998;59(3):327-335.
102. Pbert L, Ockene JK, Zapka J, et al. A community health center smoking-cessation intervention for pregnant and postpartum women. *Am J Prev Med.* 2004;26(5):377-385.
103. Perkins KA, Marcus MD, Levine MD, et al. Cognitive-behavioral therapy to reduce weight concerns improves smoking cessation outcome in weight-concerned women. *J Consult Clin Psychol.* 2001;69(4):604-613.
104. Prapavessis H, Cameron L, Baldi JC, et al. The effects of exercise and nicotine replacement therapy on smoking rates in women. *Addict Behav.* 2007;32(7):1416-1432.
105. Prapavessis H, De Jesus S, Fitzgeorge L, Faulkner G, Maddison R, Batten S. Exercise to enhance smoking cessation: The getting physical on cigarette randomized control trial. *Ann Behav Med.* 2016;50(3):358-369.
106. Prochaska JJ, Hall SE, Delucchi K, Hall SM. Efficacy of initiating tobacco dependence treatment in inpatient psychiatry: A randomized controlled trial. *Am J Public Health.* 2014;104(8):1557-1565.
107. Prokhorov AV, Yost T, Mullin-Jones M, et al. "Look at your health": Outcomes associated with a computer-assisted smoking cessation counseling intervention for community college students. *Addict Behav.* 2008;33(6):757-771.

108. Quist-Paulsen P, Gallefoss F. Randomised controlled trial of smoking cessation intervention after admission for coronary heart disease. *BMJ*. 2003;327(7426):1254-1247.
109. Ramos M, Ripoll J, Estrades T, et al. Effectiveness of intensive group and individual interventions for smoking cessation in primary health care settings: A randomized trial. *BMC Public Health*. 2010;10(1):89-94.
110. Ratner PA, Johnson JL, Richardson CG, et al. Efficacy of a smoking-cessation intervention for elective-surgical patients. *Res Nurs Health*. 2004;27(3):148-161.
111. Reid MS, Fallon B, Sonne S, et al. Smoking cessation treatment in community-based substance abuse rehabilitation programs. *J Subst Abuse Treat*. 2008;35(1):68-77.
112. Reitzel LR, McClure JB, Cofta-Woerpel L, et al. The efficacy of computer-delivered treatment for smoking cessation. *Cancer Epidemiology and Prevention Biomarkers*. 2011;20(7):1555-1557.
113. Rigotti NA, Park ER, Regan S, et al. Efficacy of telephone counseling for pregnant smokers: A randomized controlled trial. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2006;108(1):83-92.
114. Rigotti NA, Regan S, Levy DE, et al. Sustained care intervention and postdischarge smoking cessation among hospitalized adults: A randomized clinical trial. *JAMA*. 2014;312(7):719-728.
115. Rodondi N, Collet T-H, Nanchen D, et al. Impact of carotid plaque screening on smoking cessation and other cardiovascular risk factors: A randomized controlled trial. *Arch Intern Med*. 2012;172(4):344-352.
116. Rodríguez-Artalejo F, Urdinguio PL, Guallar-Castillón P, et al. One year effectiveness of an individualised smoking cessation intervention at the workplace: A randomised controlled trial. *Occup Environ Med*. 2003;60(5):358-363.
117. Rohsenow DJ, Martin RA, Monti PM, et al. Motivational interviewing versus brief advice for cigarette smokers in residential alcohol treatment. *J Subst Abuse Treat*. 2014;46(3):346-355.
118. Rohsenow DJ, Tidey JW, Martin RA, et al. Contingent vouchers and motivational interviewing for cigarette smokers in residential substance abuse treatment. *J Subst Abuse Treat*. 2015;55:29-38.

119. Romand R, Gourgou S, Sancho-Garnier H. A randomized trial assessing the Five-Day Plan for smoking cessation. *Addiction*. 2005;100(10):1546-1554.
120. Secades-Villa R, García-Rodríguez O, López-Núñez C, Alonso-Pérez F, Fernández-Hermida JR. Contingency management for smoking cessation among treatment-seeking patients in a community setting. *Drug Alcohol Depend*. 2014;140:63-68.
121. Siddiqi K, Khan A, Ahmad M, et al. Action to stop smoking in suspected tuberculosis (ASSIST) in Pakistan: A cluster randomized, controlled trial. *Ann Intern Med*. 2013;158(9):667-675.
122. Simmons VN, Heckman BW, Fink AC, Small BJ, Brandon TH. Efficacy of an experiential, dissonance-based smoking intervention for college students delivered via the Internet. *J Consult Clin Psychol*. 2013;81(5):810-820.
123. Simon JA, Carmody TP, Hudes ES, Snyder E, Murray J. Intensive smoking cessation counseling versus minimal counseling among hospitalized smokers treated with transdermal nicotine replacement: a randomized trial. *The American Journal of Medicine*. 2003;114(7):555-562.
124. Simon JA, Solkowitz SN, Carmody TP, Browner WS. Smoking cessation after surgery: A randomized trial. *Arch Intern Med*. 1997;157(12):1371-1376.
125. Smith PM, Corso L, Brown KS, Cameron R. Nurse case-managed tobacco cessation interventions for general hospital patients: Results of a randomized clinical trial. *Can J Nurs Res*. 2011;43(1):98-117.
126. Smith SS, Jorenby DE, Fiore MC, et al. Strike while the iron is hot: Can stepped-care treatments resurrect relapsing smokers? *J Consult Clin Psychol*. 2001;69(3):429-439.
127. Smits JA, Zvolensky MJ, Davis ML, et al. The efficacy of vigorous-intensity exercise as an aid to smoking cessation in adults with high anxiety sensitivity: A randomized controlled trial. *Psychosom Med*. 2016;78(3):354-364.
128. Stein MD, Weinstock MC, Herman DS, Anderson BJ, Anthony JL, Niaura R. A smoking cessation intervention for the methadone-maintained. *Addiction*. 2006;101(4):599-607.
129. Stockings EA, Bowman JA, Baker AL, et al. Impact of a postdischarge smoking cessation intervention for smokers admitted to an inpatient

- psychiatric facility: A randomized controlled trial. *Nicotine Tob Res.* 2014;16(11):1417-1428.
130. Sykes CM, Marks DF. Effectiveness of a cognitive behaviour therapy self-help programme for smokers in London, UK. *Health Promotion International.* 2001;16(3):255-260.
131. Taylor CB, Miller NH, Herman S, et al. A nurse-managed smoking cessation program for hospitalized smokers. *Am J Public Health.* 1996;86(11):1557-1560.
132. Twardella D, Brenner H. Effects of practitioner education, practitioner payment and reimbursement of patients' drug costs on smoking cessation in primary care: A cluster randomised trial. *Tob Control.* 2007;16(1):15-21.
133. Volpp KG, Troxel AB, Pauly MV, et al. A randomized, controlled trial of financial incentives for smoking cessation. *N Engl J Med.* 2009;360(7):699-709.
134. Wewers ME, Ferketich AK, Harness J, Paskett ED. Effectiveness of a nurse-managed, lay-led tobacco cessation intervention among Ohio Appalachian women. *Cancer Epidemiology and Prevention Biomarkers.* 2009;18(12):3451-3458.
135. Whiteley JA, Williams DM, Dunsiger S, et al. YMCA Commit to Quit. *Am J Prev Med.* 2012;43(3):256-262.
136. Wiggers LC, Smets EM, Oort FJ, et al. The effect of a minimal intervention strategy in addition to nicotine replacement therapy to support smoking cessation in cardiovascular outpatients: A randomized clinical trial. *Eur J Cardiovasc Prev Rehabil.* 2006;13(6):931-937.
137. Williams GC, Deci EL. Activating patients for smoking cessation through physician autonomy support. *Med Care.* 2001;39(8):813-823.
138. Wilson JS, Fitzsimons D, Bradbury I, Elborn JS. Does additional support by nurses enhance the effect of a brief smoking cessation intervention in people with moderate to severe chronic obstructive pulmonary disease? A randomised controlled trial. *Int J Nurs Stud.* 2008;45(4):508-517.
139. Winhusen TM, Brigham GS, Kropp F, Lindblad R, Gardin JG. A randomized trial of concurrent smoking-cessation and substance use disorder treatment in stimulant-dependent smokers. *The Journal of Clinical Psychiatry.* 2014;75(4):336-343.

140. Winickoff JP, Nabi-Burza E, Chang Y, et al. Sustainability of a parental tobacco control intervention in pediatric practice. *Pediatrics*. 2014;134(5):933-941.
141. Yalcin BM, Unal M, Pirdal H, Karahan TF. Effects of an anger management and stress control program on smoking cessation: A randomized controlled trial. *The Journal of the American Board of Family Medicine*. 2014;27(5):645-660.
142. Zheng P, Guo F, Chen Y, Fu Y, Ye T, Fu H. A randomized controlled trial of group intervention based on social cognitive theory for smoking cessation in China. *J Epidemiol*. 2007;17(5):147-155.