Title: A Randomized Controlled Trial of a Digital Therapeutic Intervention for Smoking Cessation.

List of Authors: Jamie Webb[1], Sarrah Peerbux[1,2], Peter Smittenaar[1], Sarim Siddiqui[1], Yusuf Sherwani[1], Maroof Ahmed[1], Hannah MacRae[1], Hannah Puri[1], Sangita Bhalla[1], Azeem Majeed[2]

Affiliations: [1] Digital Therapeutics, Inc, San Francisco, CA, USA; [2]Imperial College London, London, UK;

Word count (excluding abstract, references, tables, and figures): 3477

Running head: Novel Digital Therapy for Smoking Cessation.

Declaration of Interest: The study was funded by the company that produced the Quit Genius digital therapeutic intervention (Digital Therapeutics, Inc). PS is a paid statistical consultant. All other authors except Azeem Majeed received a salary from or own equity in Digital Therapeutics, Inc.

Clinical trial registration: ISRCTN registry, number ISRCTN65853476 (https://www.isrctn.com/ISRCTN65853476)

Abstract

Background and Aims: Tobacco smoking remains the leading cause of preventable death and disease worldwide. Digital interventions delivered through smartphones offer a promising alternative to traditional methods, but little is known about their effectiveness. Our aim was to determine the effectiveness of Quit Genius, a novel digital therapeutic intervention for smoking cessation.

Design: Two-arm, single-blinded, parallel-group randomized controlled trial

Setting: Referrals from primary care practices

Participants: 556 Adult smokers (aged ≥18 years), smoking at least five cigarettes a day for the past year. 530 were included for the final analysis.

Intervention and comparator: Digital therapeutic intervention for smoking cessation consisting of a smartphone application delivering cognitive behavioral therapy content, one-to-one coaching, craving tools and tracking capabilities. The control intervention was Very Brief Advice along the Ask, Advise, Act model. All participants were offered nicotine replacement therapy for three months. A random half of each arm was assigned a carbon monoxide (CO) device for biochemical verification.

Measurements: The primary outcome was self-reported seven-day point prevalence abstinence at four-weeks post quit date.

Findings: 556 participants were randomized (treatment n=277, control n=279). The intention-to-treat analysis included 530 participants (n=265 in each arm; 11 excluded for randomization before trial registration, and 15 for protocol violations at baseline visit).

At four weeks post-quit date, 45% of participants in the treatment arm had not smoked in the preceding seven days, compared to 29% in control (risk ratio 1.55 [1.23, 1.96], p = 0.0002; intention-to-treat, n=530). Self-reported seven-day abstinence agreed with CO measurement (CO <10 ppm) in 96% of cases (80/83) where CO readings were available. No harmful effects of the intervention were observed.

Conclusions: The Quit Genius digital therapeutic intervention is a superior treatment in achieving smoking cessation four weeks post quit date compared to very brief advice.

Introduction

Smoking is a leading cause of preventable and premature death worldwide. It is an important risk factor for serious health problems and life-threatening diseases (1). Globally, tobacco use causes more than seven million yearly deaths (2). Moreover, the total global economic cost of smoking is more than $1.4 trillion a year (3). Smoking is, therefore, a major worldwide economic and public health concern (1-3).

In the UK, Very Brief Advice (VBA) is the recommended clinical practice on smoking cessation for all health care practitioners (4-5). It is designed to promote quit attempts and to be used opportunistically, in virtually any situation (4-5). Those interested in quitting are referred to their local Stop Smoking Services (SSS) (4). SSS typically combines face-to-face behavioral support with the option of pharmacotherapy, offered as nicotine replacement therapy (NRT) or varenicline. Similarly, in the US, smokers access free telephone services and/or tobacco cessation websites that provide access to pharmacotherapy and additional behavioral support (6).

Despite traditional smoking cessation programs demonstrating efficacy, they only help ~15% of smokers to quit long-term (7). Such programs have been shown to have limited utilization, due to scheduling, time and financial constraints (8-9). Telephone support can overcome these barriers, but reaches only ~1% of smokers annually (10). Given that support may be difficult to access, there is an urgent need for alternative solutions that are cost-effective, convenient and scalable.

Technological advancements have led to new approaches that aim to overcome the drawbacks of conventional smoking cessation programs. Digital health apps are one new approach with the potential to support behavior change (11-12). They have been used successfully across a multitude of therapeutic areas including chronic conditions (13-17) and to promote healthy behaviors (18-23).

Smartphone apps have advantages over traditional approaches including ease of accessibility, personalization of interactions with real-time feedback, scalability to large populations, and cost-effectiveness (24). In 2018, the number of mobile phone subscriptions topped eight billion globally (24). Smartphone apps have the potential to reach smokers who would not, or who are unable to, utilize traditional services.

Yet, there is a paucity of data that examines the efficacy of smartphone apps for smoking cessation. A review of mobile phone-based smoking support identified only five randomized controlled trials (RCT) that tested the effectiveness of smartphone apps with low-intensity support, with each showing limited efficacy (24). Furthermore, a recent content analysis revealed low adherence of existing smartphone apps to evidence-based treatment guidelines (25), whilst a review of the 50 most downloaded cessation apps found only two with scientific support (26).

Digital therapeutics are a new wave of digital health apps that can deliver high-intensity evidence-based therapeutic programs. Emerging evidence is encouraging and suggests that high-intensity support delivered via smartphone apps can aid smoking cessation. Yet, many

early studies suffer from limitations such as utilizing single-arm cohorts or using non-CO verified self-reported abstinence to assess intervention efficacy (21-23). To date, no RCT has been conducted on a high-intensity digital therapeutic intervention (DTI) for smoking cessation. This study aimed to determine the effectiveness of the DTI Quit Genius by measuring seven-day point prevalence abstinence at four-weeks post quit date.

Methods

Design

We conducted a two-arm, single-blinded, parallel-group, pre-registered randomized controlled trial, with four weeks, six- and 12-months follow-up. Here we report outcomes at week four only as data collection for later time-points is still ongoing. Approval was granted by the UK Research Ethics Committee (REC; reference 18/NI/0171) and this research complies with the Declaration of Helsinki.

Participants

Participants were recruited between January and November 2019. Adult smokers (aged ≥18 years) were invited to participate if they had been smoking at least 5 cigarettes a day for the past year, were not using any other form of stop smoking support, had sufficient mobile phone functionality (5th generation or higher for Apple iPhone or version 18 or higher for Android). The exclusion criteria included not speaking English, pregnancy, COPD, psychiatric medication, and a serious health condition that would substantially hinder completion of the intervention or control as determined by the study team.

Participants were recruited from primary care practices across London via SMS campaigns. Posters and leaflets at local community venues and advertisements on social media were also used. Participants randomized onto the study received £10 to offset travel expenses. Participants completed a questionnaire online or via telephone at four weeks after their quit-date (TQD) and were paid £20 for completion.

Registration

The trial was registered in the ISRCTN database on December 18, 2018 (https://www.isrctn.com/ISRCTN65853476). On July 24, 2019, we adjusted the primary outcome to equate it with the majority of trials on smoking cessation (full justification is available on the ISRCTN page). Specifically, the time window for assessing whether the participant had successfully quit was reduced from two weeks to one week. This decision was made without having analyzed trial outcomes. The 14-day point prevalence was added as a secondary outcome. Another secondary outcome ("number of quit attempts up to week four post-quit date") is reported here as "Any additional quit attempt after the quit date" because a continuous test was not appropriate on the distribution which was predominantly one quit attempt. All other adjustments to the trial registration only concerned start/end dates of recruitment and publication to account for unexpected challenges in recruitment.

Randomization and masking

Participants were randomized 1:1 (treatment:control) using a block size of four participants through a trial management system (www.curebase.com). Researchers randomizing participants were blind to allocation until they performed the randomization.

Procedures

At first contact (via phone or online), participants were provided with study information and completed a questionnaire to determine eligibility. If eligible, participants were invited to attend a baseline session where eligibility was reconfirmed and informed consent and baseline data collected. Participants were then randomized.

Treatment intervention: Quit Genius

Quit Genius is a smartphone application comprising a comprehensive digital solution informed by the principles of cognitive behavior therapy (CBT). It is a year-long program designed to support the user both before and after their quit date. Quit Genius delivers intervention components that have demonstrated efficacy in promoting smoking cessation, including self-monitoring, goal setting, encouraging medication adherence, and feedback on progress (www.quitgenius.com). The full intervention is described in Supporting Information 1.

Control group: Very Brief Advice

VBA is a simple form of advice designed to be used opportunistically. It follows the Ask, Advise, Act structure as recommended by the UK government. Participants were advised to contact their local stop smoking service to access support and medication to quit smoking. Trial assistants were trained in the delivery of VBA as per NCSCT guidelines (https://elearning.ncsct.co.uk).

Nicotine replacement therapy

Participants had the option to receive nicotine replacement products (2mg or 4mg gum and 16hr or 24hr patches) free for 12 weeks, with the first two-week supply issued at the baseline visit. Participants were allowed to purchase alternative forms of oral NRT.

Measures

Measurements were taken at baseline and at the four-week follow-up. The following variables were collected at baseline: demographic details, smoking status, smoking history, expired carbon monoxide level, Fagerstrom Test for Nicotine Dependence (FTND) (27), Smoking abstinence self-efficacy questionnaire (SASEQ) (28), Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-being Scale (WEMWBS) (29), WHOQOL-BREF (30) and the Service Use Questionnaire (SUQ) (31). At four weeks post QD, smoking status, changes in attitudes and perceptions of smoking, SASEQ, WEMWBS, and WHOQOL-BREF were collected. Expired carbon monoxide level was collected only in those participants who were assigned their own device (Smokerlyzer, coVita Inc.).

The primary outcome was self-reported seven-day point prevalence abstinence at four weeks post TQD. Secondary outcomes at week four included 14-day point prevalence abstinence, any additional quit attempts after the quit date, self-reported changes in confidence levels, knowledge, attitudes and perceptions related to smoking cessation, changes in SASEQ and WEMWBS, and satisfaction with the treatment intervention (treatment group only).

Analyses

At four-weeks, we expected to observe a seven-day abstinence rate of 25% in the treatment group and 10% in the control group. At a Type I error rate of 5% and power of 90% we required 133 participants per group (266 total). At six-months, a conservative estimate would be a 10% quit rate in the treatment group and 3% in the control group. To detect a difference with 80% power and 5% Type I error we needed to randomize 194 participants per group (388 total). Assuming a 20% dropout, and a 30% dropout at 12 months (but with similar expected quit rates), we aimed to recruit ≥500 participants.

We performed both intention-to-treat (ITT) and per-protocol (PP) analyses. ITT included all participants assigned to treatment and control, respectively, as indicated in Figure 1. PP included the subset of participants that provided answers to the self-reported outcomes at week four.

We used chi-squared tests for binary outcomes and two-sample t-tests for continuous outcomes. Those lost to follow-up at four-weeks were considered “currently smoking” for the primary outcome as well as 2-week abstinence; no additional quit attempts after the quit date; not “strongly agree” to improvements in confidence, knowledge, or attitude; and no change in self-efficacy or mental well-being from baseline.

Results

Participant flow chart

Figure 1 shows the CONSORT flowchart for the RCT.



Figure 1: CONSORT flow chart.

Participants

Participants came from a wide age range, were slightly more likely to be male than female, and about two in three self-identified as Caucasian/White (Table 1). Educational attainment ranged uniformly from secondary education up to postgraduate education, and 80% were in paid employment, of which over half were in “Managerial or professional” roles. Participants were smoking on average 14 (treatment) or 15 (control) cigarettes per day, with nicotine dependence of four out of 10 on the Fagerstrom Test for Nicotine Dependence. Most participants (85%) had previously made quit attempts, primarily going cold turkey or with the help of e-cigarettes and NRT. No substantial differences between treatment and control groups were introduced through randomization.

Table 1: Demographics and smoking history of treatment and control groups. SD: standard deviation. NRT: nicotine replacement therapy.

	Treatment	Control
Number of participants	265	265
Age (SD)	40 (12)	42 (12)
Female	46%	44%
Ethnicity		
Caucasian/White	69%	62%
Black/Caribbean/African/Black	9%	11%
Asian	7%	9%
Arab	1%	2%
Mixed	9%	9%
Other	3%	4%
Prefer not to say	2%	3%
Education		
GCSE or lower	22%	23%
A-level	25%	19%
Undergraduate degree	29%	29%
Postgraduate degree	17%	19%
PhD	2%	1%
Prefer not to say	6%	9%
In paid employment	79%	81%

Type of employment (if employed)		
Managerial or professional	60%	53%
Routine or manual	10%	15%
Intermediate	10%	9%
Other	18%	19%
Prefer not to say	1%	3%
Cigarettes per day (SD)	14 (6)	15 (7)
Fagerström Test for Nicotine Dependence (range 0-10; SD)	4 (2)	4 (2)
Any past attempt to quit smoking	84%	86%
Method previously used (if past attempts)		
Cold turkey	47%	49%
E-cigarettes	42%	42%
NRT	31%	28%
Prescription medication	11%	15%
Smartphone app	9%	10%
Hypnotherapy	4%	7%
Psychological Therapy	2%	2%

Engagement

Engagement with different facets of the DTI is shown in Table 2. By the quit date (an average 16 days after randomization) 89% of those in the treatment arm were still actively engaged. At the time of primary outcome, 74% of participants were still engaging with the app. The content consisting of education and cognitive behavioral therapy (“Essentials” 1 and 2) were consumed by 55% and 36% of participants, respectively. 69% sent at least one in-app

message to their coach, and on average people messaged their coach about once per week. Participants reported 12 diary entries to report cigarettes smoked before their quit date, and six check-ins to report cravings or lapses after their quit date.

Table 2: Engagement with the digital therapeutic program in the treatment group (intention-to-treat, n = 265). Essentials 1: program content aimed at preparation for the quit date. Essentials 2: program content intended for just after the quit date. Diary entry: registration of a cigarette smoked prior to quit date. Check-in: registration of a craving or cigarette after the quit date.

Engagement	**Value (mean (SD), [25/75] percentile)**
App opens up to week four	37 (52), [9, 43]
Days between randomization and quit date	16 (21), [9, 23]
Still active by quit date	89%
Active four weeks after quit date	74%
Completed Essentials 1	55%
Completed Essentials 2	36%
Sent 1+ messages to coach	69%
Messages to coach before quit date	3.3 (5.9), [0, 4]
Messages to coach from quit date to week four	4.2 (7.5), [0, 6]
Messages from coach before quit date	6.6 (6.3), [2, 9]
Messages from coach from quit date to week four	6.2 (5.8), [2, 9]
Number of diary entries before quit date	12 (27), [1, 12]
Number of check-ins from quit date to week four	6 (10), [0, 9]

Outcomes

Table 3 shows the primary outcome and secondary outcomes for intention-to-treat and per-protocol analyses. In the intention-to-treat analysis, those in the treatment arm were 55% more likely to report seven-day abstinence four weeks after their quit date compared to those in control (RR: 1.55, 95% CI [1.23, 1.96], 45% versus 29% quit rate). In those participants that

were assigned a CO device and claimed abstinence (treatment n=50, control n=33), the CO measurement was below 10 parts per million (ppm) for 96% (n=2) and 97% (n=1) of participants in treatment and control, respectively. Whether or not a participant was provided with a CO device did not significantly predict quit rate (p=0.29 in logistic regression with CO device and intervention main effects).

For secondary outcomes, 14-day abstinence showed greater efficacy of treatment compared to control (RR: 1.47 [1.12, 1.93]). Those in treatment were no more or less likely to have made an additional quit attempt after the initial quit date (RR: 0.79 [0.60, 1.03]). Those in the treatment arm were more likely to "strongly agree" that their knowledge of their smoking habit had improved (RR: 1.35 [1.06, 1.72]), but no such effect was observed regarding their confidence in their ability to stay smoke-free (RR: 1.29 [0.98, 1.70]) nor in terms of whether their attitude towards stopping smoking had become more positive (RR: 0.97 [0.78, 1.21]). The treatment was also not superior to control in terms of the increase in smoking self-efficacy (p = .09), nor in terms of mental well-being (p = 0.83). However, in the per-protocol analysis, which included only participants that completed their week-four outcomes, several secondary outcomes were significantly better in treatment compared to control: confidence improved more (RR: 1.33 [1.02, 1.74]), as did self-efficacy (p = .04).

Participant satisfaction with the treatment intervention was high (n=209 in the treatment group that completed the questionnaire at week four). On a scale from zero (least satisfied) to three (most satisfied): quality of the smoking cessation service: 2.4, SD=0.7; program meeting needs: 2.2, SD=0.8; helpfulness of information: 2.6, SD=0.6; helped to deal with smoking effectively: 2.4, SD=0.7; likelihood of coming back if needing to quit in the future: 2.5, SD=0.7. Asked whether the participant would recommend the digital therapeutic to a friend, 92% would do so. Participants considered the Quit Coach and the education/CBT articles to be most helpful, whereas the community element of the program was considered least helpful (Figure 2).

Finally, we examined two outcomes unregistered at trial registration. First, cigarettes smoked per day by those that failed to quit showed no difference between treatment and control (treatment: 7.9, control: 7.5 cigarettes per day). Similarly, the average % reduction in cigarettes per day, though substantial in both groups, showed no difference between groups (48.1% reduction in treatment vs 48.9% in control; p = .83).

*Table 3: Outcomes at four weeks after quit date. ITT: intention-to-treat. PP: per protocol. WEMWBS: Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Scale. SASEQ: Smoking abstinence self-efficacy questionnaire. * as measured by % of participants reporting "strongly agree".*

Outcome	Group	Treatment	Control	Statistic	Relative risk (RR) or group difference
Primary outcome					
7-day abstinence	ITT (n=530)	45% (n=118)	29% (n=76)	$\chi 2$=13.7 p=0.0002	RR: 1.55 [1.23, 1.96]

	PP (n=456)	52% (n=118)	32% (n=75)	χ2=17.8 p=2e-05	RR: 1.62 [1.29, 2.02]
Secondary outcomes					
14-day abstinence	ITT (n=530)	34% (n=91)	23% (n=62)	χ2=7.2 p=0.007	RR: 1.47 [1.12, 1.93]
	PP (n=456)	40% (n=91)	26% (n=61)	χ2=9.5 p=0.002	RR: 1.53 [1.17, 2]
Any additional quit attempt beyond initial quit-date	ITT (n=530)	26% (n=68)	32% (n=86)	χ2=2.6 p=0.10	RR: 0.79 [0.6, 1.03]
	PP (n=443)	31% (n=68)	39% (n=86)	χ2=2.5 p=0.11	RR: 0.8 [0.62, 1.04]
Knowledge improved*	ITT (n=530)	39% (n=104)	29% (n=77)	χ2=5.7 p=0.02	RR: 1.35 [1.06, 1.72]
	PP (n=443)	47% (n=104)	34% (n=76)	χ2=7.5 p=0.006	RR: 1.39 [1.1, 1.75]
Confidence improved*	ITT (n=530)	32% (n=84)	25% (n=65)	χ2=3 p=0.08	RR: 1.29 [0.98, 1.7]
	PP (n=443)	38% (n=84)	29% (n=64)	χ2=4.1 p=0.04	RR: 1.33 [1.02, 1.74]
Attitude improved*	ITT (n=530)	38% (n=100)	39% (n=103)	χ2=0 p=0.86	RR: 0.97 [0.78, 1.21]
	PP (n=443)	45% (n=100)	45% (n=101)	χ2=0 p=1.0	RR: 1 [0.82, 1.23]
Change in SASEQ (24-point scale)	ITT (n=530)	4.2 (SD: 7)	3.1 (SD: 6.7)	t(527) = 1.7 p = 0.09	1.0 [-0.161, 2.17]
	PP (n=440)	5.1 (SD: 7.4)	3.6 (SD: 7)	t(436) = 2 p = 0.04	1.4 [0.052, 2.75]
Change in WEMWBS (56-point scale)	ITT (n=530)	0.7 (SD: 7)	0.6 (SD: 6.5)	t(525) = 0.2 p = 0.83	0.13 [-1.02, 1.28]
	PP (n=440)	0.9 (SD: 7.7)	0.8 (SD: 7)	t(433) = 0.2 p = 0.88	0.11 [-1.26, 1.48]

Unregistered outcomes					
Cigarettes per day in those that failed to quit	PP (n=222)	7.9 (SD: 6.4)	7.5 (SD: 5.9)	t(180) = 0.5 p = 0.65	0.39 [-1.29, 2.06]
% reduction in cigarettes per day in those that failed to quit	PP (n=222)	48.1% (SD: 28.2)	48.9% (SD: 29.3)	t(194) = -0.2 p = 0.83	-0.83 [-8.57, 6.91]



Figure 2: Elements of the program considered most helpful by n=209 participants who completed the user satisfaction questionnaire at week four.

Discussion

Principal findings

In this RCT we assessed the efficacy of Quit Genius, a comprehensive DTI for smoking cessation. The primary outcome of self-reported seven-day abstinence at four weeks post quit date was significantly higher for the treatment group compared to a control group using VBA.

Principally, this shows the superiority of the DTI compared to the UK's typical first-line intervention for smoking cessation (4-5). We show that a digital, remote-first program is an effective method for short-term behavior change. The treatment group demonstrated a CO-verified four-week quit rate comparable with high-intensity face-to-face smoking cessation programs utilized by healthcare services in the UK (7). Our results support previous literature illustrating that high-intensity behavioral support combined with pharmacotherapy is an effective means of quitting smoking (7).

Compared with other digital interventions, the 45% (ITT) and 52% (PP) seven-day abstinence rates four weeks after the quit date compare favorably to previous digital intervention studies. Pivot, another digital program, achieved a CO-verified benchmark seven-day abstinence rate

of 32% (ITT) and 37% (PP; 21). An Acceptance and Commitment Therapy (ACT) intervention by Smartquit achieved 21% seven-day abstinence (22). Clickotine's seven-day abstinence rate of 45% was similar to that observed in the current study (23). However, all used single-arm designs rather than RCTs, and were therefore unable to distinguish between the causal effect of treatment, placebo, or underlying differences in propensity to quit in the study population (32). Finally, both Smartquit and Clickotine studies used non-CO-verified self-reported abstinence as their primary means of assessing intervention efficacy, leaving a possibility of falsely reported smoking status (22-23). This study avoided such limitations by using a two-arm, parallel-group RCT design with biochemical verification. Though short-term abstinence rates of the program studied here are promising both in absolute terms as well as compared to the control group, six- and 12-month abstinence rates will confirm whether the program is efficacious in the longer term.

Cognitive, attitudinal, and emotional improvements

Education and confidence are integral mechanisms in eliciting successful smoking cessation (33-34). In this study, treatment caused a greater improvement in knowledge of personal smoking habits compared to control. Similarly, confidence in ability to stay smoke-free was higher in treatment than control, though only statistically significantly so in participants that completed the study per protocol. No effect was found on the attitude of participants towards stopping smoking. This suggests that the DTI is an effective tool for making people aware of their habit and instilling some degree of confidence, but fails to improve a commonly negative attitude towards stopping smoking. Given that smoking cessation interventions may be enhanced by incorporating strategies that target attitude change (35), the DTI could be further improved to engender a more positive attitude towards quitting.

Self-efficacy is a robust indicator of future successful smoking abstinence (34). We observed the DTI to be superior to control in improving self-efficacy in participants that completed the study per protocol, but not when analyzed by intention-to-treat. This resembles the increase in reported confidence, indicating that the DTI enhanced users' beliefs in their capacity to quit successfully but that further developments on the DTI should focus on strengthening these outcomes.

We observed no benefit of the DTI compared to control in terms of mental well-being. In a retrospective study of the same DTI we observed a correlation between hedonic well-being and quit rates (36). In line with this, smoking cessation is typically associated with improved mental health with evidence illustrating a reduction in anxiety, depression and stress after quitting (37). Given the higher quit rates in the treatment group, we expected treatment to be superior in terms of mental well-being. However, improvements are usually demonstrated in longer-term follow-ups than the four weeks reported here (37). As such, changes in mental well-being might not yet have manifested, and our six- and 12-month outcomes will shed light on the longer-term impact of the DTI on mental well-being. There are both positive and negative effects associated with smoking and smoking abstinence that could impact mental well-being. Evidence suggests that smokers who reduce their smoking but fail to quit show more pronounced mood deterioration than those who succeed (37). Conversely, there is evidence illustrating the negative sequelae of smoking cessation, such as anxiety, insomnia and weight gain (38). Therefore, it is possible that simultaneous effects could have been active within groups, resulting in no net effect on mental well-being.

Nicotine addiction is a condition that rarely exceeds a lifetime abstinence rate of >50% per-treatment. For this reason, many smokers take 30 or more quit attempts before being successful (39). Nonetheless, a reduction in daily cigarette use predicts future behavior change: individuals who reduce their cigarette use by ~50% are more likely to see future quit attempts and greater odds of successful quitting (39). Among treatment participants who had not quit smoking, there was an average reduction of 48% in their cigarette use compared to baseline, similar to control. Digital programs can, perhaps more easily than traditional programs, leverage such data to continue to engage and encourage specific participants after a failed quit attempt, identifying an optimal time to engage when chances of quitting are highest.

Engagement

To elicit the success of any non-invasive behavioral intervention, users must actively partake in the treatment (17, 23). We assessed engagement across several elements of the DTI, and observed 74% were still using the app four weeks after their quit date. One differentiating aspect of this DTI from typical smartphone applications is the presence of human coaching. We found a consistent bidirectional flow of communication between quit coach and participant from baseline to quit date and from quit date to four-week follow-up. Of all the elements of treatment offered by the DTI, coaching was considered most helpful. This reflects previous notions that smoking cessation programmes that utilize health coaching as a means of support are effective in eliciting successful smoking abstinence (40).

Strengths and limitations

Particular strengths of this study are the randomized controlled design, preregistration of the trial and its outcomes, biochemical verification despite the remote nature of the program, and the high four-week follow-up rate. The key limitation of this study is the short follow-up period of four weeks. It is known that relapse occurs over a longer timeframe (41-43), and the current findings do not speak to the DTI's ability to avoid longer-term relapse.

Another limitation is that participants may have exaggerated their self-reported smoking abstinence. To combat this, participants were informed from study outset that regardless of smoking abstinence, they could remain on the trial and would be eligible for remuneration. Another preventative measure was the use of a measurement device to assess CO levels in the exhaled breath of the individual. Due to cost considerations, these devices were provided to a random 50% of each study arm. The near-perfect agreement (96%) between CO monitor and self-reported abstinence suggests that at least in the context of this DTI, self-report can be taken at face value.

Conclusions

A digital therapeutic intervention for smoking cessation was superior to very brief advice in achieving smoking cessation after four weeks in a biochemically verified RCT. The DTI examined here is an effective option for short-term smoking cessation. Participants were actively engaged with the DTI and were satisfied with the intervention. Nevertheless,

opportunities exist to improve mental wellbeing and attitudinal outcomes. A critical open question pertains to the long-term efficacy, which will be reported in a subsequent paper.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank the participating NHS primary care practices located across the London districts of Barnet, Camden, Ealing, Hammersmith and Fulham, Islington, Kilburn and North Kensington for their support in participant recruitment. AM is supported by the NW London NIHR Applied Research Collaboration.

References

1. Organization WH. World Health Organization Report on the Global Tobacco Epidemic, 2011: warning about the dangers of tobacco. 2011. World Health Organization: Geneva, Switzerland. 2011.
2. Organization WH. WHO report on the global tobacco epidemic 2017: Monitoring tobacco use and prevention policies. 2017. World Health Organization: Geneva, Switzerland. 2017.
3. Goodchild M, Nargis N, d'Espaignet ET. Global economic cost of smoking-attributable diseases. Tob Control. 2018;27(1):58–64.
4. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) (2013). Smoking cessation: supporting people to stop smoking. Quality Standard and Indicators. London: NICE. Available at https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/qs43/docu ments/smoking-cessation-supporting-people-to-stop-smoking-briefingpaper2. [Accessed 2020 Mar 27th].
5. McEwen A, Pooler J, Lionis C, Papadakis S, Tsiligianni I, Anastasaki M, et al. Adapting Very Brief Advice (VBA) on smoking for use in low-resource settings: experience from the FRESH AIR project. J Smok Cessat. 2019;14(3):190–194.
6. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2014. [2020-04-10]. Best Practices for Comprehensive Tobacco Control Programs—2014: Cessation Interventions https://www.cdc.gov/tobacco/stateandcommunity/best_practices/pdfs/2014/sectionA-III.pdf
7. Bauld L, Bell K, McCullough L, Richardson L, Greaves L. The effectiveness of NHS smoking cessation services: a systematic review. J Public Health. 2009 Jul 28;32(1):71–82.
8. Kotz D, Fidler J, West R. Factors associated with the use of aids to cessation in English smokers. Addiction. 2009;104(8):1403–1410.
9. Patrick H, Fujii CA, Glaser DB, Utley DS, Marler JD. A comprehensive digital program for smoking cessation: assessing feasibility in a single-group cohort study. JMIR MHealth UHealth. 2018;6(12):e11708.
10. Best Practices for Comprehensive Tobacco Control Programs: 2014. Tob Control. 2014;144.
11. Meier E, Tackett AP, Wagener TL. Effectiveness of electronic aids for smoking cessation. Curr Cardiovasc Risk Rep. 2013;7(6):464–472.
12. Murray E, Hekler EB, Andersson G, Collins LM, Doherty A, Hollis C, et al. Evaluating digital health interventions: key questions and approaches. Am J Prev Med. 2016 Nov;51(5):843–51.

13. Pal K, Eastwood SV, Michie S, Farmer AJ, Barnard ML, Peacock R, et al. Computer-based diabetes self-management interventions for adults with type 2 diabetes mellitus. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2013;(3).
14. Zhuo X, Zhang P, Kahn HS, Bardenheier BH, Li R, Gregg EW. Change in medical spending attributable to diabetes: national data from 1987 to 2011. Diabetes Care. 2015;38(4):581–587.
15. Murray E, Burns J, Tai SS, Lai R, Nazareth I. Interactive Health Communication Applications for people with chronic disease. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2005;(4).
16. Peyrot M, Rubin RR, Funnell MM, Siminerio LM. Access to diabetes self-management education. Diabetes Educ. 2009;35(2):246–263.
17. Shebib R, Bailey JF, Smittenaar P, Perez DA, Mecklenburg G, Hunter S. Randomized controlled trial of a 12-week digital care program in improving low back pain. NPJ Digit Med. 2019;2(1):1–8.
18. Harris J, Felix L, Miners A, Murray E, Michie S, Ferguson E, et al. Adaptive e-learning to improve dietary behaviour: a systematic review and cost-effectiveness analysis. Health Technol Assess Winch Engl. 2011;15(37):1–160.
19. Khadjesari Z, Murray E, Hewitt C, Hartley S, Godfrey C. Can stand-alone computer-based interventions reduce alcohol consumption? A systematic review. Addiction. 2011;106(2):267–282.
20. Bailey JV, Murray E, Rait G, Mercer CH, Morris RW, Peacock R, et al. Interactive computer-based interventions for sexual health promotion. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2010;(9).
21. Marler JD, Fujii CA, Utley DS, Tesfamariam LJ, Galanko JA, Patrick H. Initial assessment of a comprehensive digital smoking cessation program that incorporates a mobile app, breath sensor, and coaching: cohort study. JMIR MHealth UHealth. 2019;7(2):e12609.
22. Iacoviello BM, Steinerman JR, Klein DB, Silver TL, Berger AG, Luo SX, et al. Clickotine, a personalized smartphone app for smoking cessation: initial evaluation. JMIR MHealth UHealth. 2017;5(4):e56
23. Bricker JB, Mull KE, Kientz JA, Vilardaga R, Mercer LD, Akioka KJ, et al. Randomized, controlled pilot trial of a smartphone app for smoking cessation using acceptance and commitment therapy. Drug Alcohol Depend. 2014;143:87–94.
24. Whittaker R, McRobbie H, Bullen C, Rodgers A, Gu Y, Dobson R. Mobile phone text messaging and app-based interventions for smoking cessation. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2019;(10).
25. Abroms LC, Westmaas JL, Bontemps-Jones J, Ramani R, Mellerson J. A content analysis of popular smartphone apps for smoking cessation. Am J Prev Med. 2013;45(6):732–736.
26. Haskins BL, Lesperance D, Gibbons P, Boudreaux ED. A systematic review of smartphone applications for smoking cessation. Transl Behav Med. 2017;7(2):292–299.
27. Heatherton TF, Kozlowski LT, Frecker RC, FAGERSTROM K-O. The Fagerström test for nicotine dependence: a revision of the Fagerstrom Tolerance Questionnaire. Br J Addict. 1991;86(9):1119–1127.
28. Spek V, Lemmens F, Chatrou M, van Kempen S, Pouwer F, Pop V. Development of a smoking abstinence self-efficacy questionnaire. Int J Behav Med. 2013;20(3):444–449.
29. Tennant R, Hiller L, Fishwick R, Platt S, Joseph S, Weich S, et al. The Warwick-Edinburgh mental well-being scale (WEMWBS): development and UK validation. Health Qual Life Outcomes. 2007;5(1):63.

30. Group W. Development of the World Health Organization WHOQOL-BREF quality of life assessment. Psychol Med. 1998;28(3):551–558.
31. EQUIP Service Use Questionnaire: DIRUM - Database of Instruments for Resource Use Measurement [Internet]. Available from: http://www.dirum.org/instruments/details/111# [Accessed 2020 Jan 17].
32. Evans SR. Clinical trial structures. J Exp Stroke Transl Med. 2010 Feb 9;3(1):8–18.
33. Golechha M. Health Promotion Methods for Smoking Prevention and Cessation: A Comprehensive Review of Effectiveness and the Way Forward. Int J Prev Med [Internet]. 2016 Jan 11;7. Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4755211/ [Accessed 2020 Apr 2].
34. Gwaltney CJ, Metrik J, Kahler CW, Shiffman S. Self-Efficacy and Smoking Cessation: A Meta-Analysis. Psychol Addict Behav J Soc Psychol Addict Behav [Internet]. 2009 Mar ;23(1). Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3829471/ [Accessed 2020 Apr 2].
35. Lee HS, Addicott M, Martin LE, Harris KJ, Goggin K, Richter KP, et al. Implicit attitudes and smoking behavior in a smoking cessation induction trial. Nicotine Tob Res. 2017;20(1):58–66.
36. Lin Y, Tudor-Sfetea C, Siddiqui S, Sherwani Y, Ahmed M, Eisingerich AB. Effective behavioral changes through a digital mHealth app: exploring the impact of hedonic well-being, psychological empowerment and inspiration. JMIR MHealth UHealth. 2018;6(6):e10024.
37. Taylor G, McNeill A, Girling A, Farley A, Lindson-Hawley N, Aveyard P. Change in mental health after smoking cessation: systematic review and meta-analysis. Bmj. 2014;348:g1151.
38. Hajek P. Introduction: Recognition and management of some possible consequences of stopping smoking. Taylor & Francis; 2009.
39. Chaiton M, Diemert L, Cohen JE, Bondy SJ, Selby P, Philipneri A, et al. Estimating the number of quit attempts it takes to quit smoking successfully in a longitudinal cohort of smokers. BMJ Open. 2016 Jun 1;6(6):e011045.
40. Sforzo GA, Kaye M, Ayers GD, Talbert B, Hill M. Effective tobacco cessation via health coaching: an institutional case report. Glob Adv Health Med. 2014;3(5):37–44.
41. Herd N, Borland R, Hyland A. Predictors of smoking relapse by duration of abstinence: findings from the International Tobacco Control (ITC) Four Country Survey. Addiction. 2009;104(12):2088–2099.
42. Brandon TH, Lazev AB, Juliano LM. Very delayed smoking relapse warrants research attention. Psychol Rep. 1998;83(1):72–74.
43. Wetter DW, Cofta-Gunn L, Fouladi RT, Cinciripini PM, Sui D, Gritz ER. Late relapse/sustained abstinence among former smokers: a longitudinal study. Preventive Medicine. 2004 Dec 1;39(6):1156–63.