

1           **Quit attempts and tobacco abstinence in primary care patients: long-term follow-up of a**  
2           **pragmatic, two-arm cluster randomised controlled trial on brief stop-smoking advice (ABC**  
3           **versus 5As method)**

4  
5           **Authors**

6           Sabrina Kastaun<sup>1</sup> (ORCID: 0000-0002-5590-1135), Wolfgang Viechtbauer<sup>2</sup> (ORCID: 0000-0003-3463-  
7           4063), Verena Leve<sup>1</sup>, Jaqueline Hildebrandt<sup>1</sup>, Christian Funke<sup>1</sup>, Stephanie Klosterhalfen<sup>1</sup>, Diana  
8           Lubisch<sup>1</sup>, Olaf Reddemann<sup>1</sup>, Tobias Raupach<sup>3,4</sup> (ORCID: 0000-0003-2555-8097), Stefan Wilm<sup>1</sup>, Daniel  
9           Kotz<sup>1,4,5</sup> (ORCID: 0000-0002-9454-023X)

10           **Affiliations**

11           <sup>1</sup>Institute of General Practice (ifam), Centre for Health and Society (chs), Addiction Research and  
12           Clinical Epidemiology Unit, Medical Faculty of the Heinrich-Heine-University Düsseldorf, 40225  
13           Düsseldorf, Germany; <sup>2</sup>Department of Psychiatry and Neuropsychology, Maastricht University, 6200  
14           MD Maastricht, Netherlands; <sup>3</sup>Institute for Medical Education, University Hospital Bonn, 53127 Bonn,  
15           Germany; <sup>4</sup>Behavioral Science and Health, Institute of Epidemiology and Health Care, University  
16           College London, WC1E 6BLondon, UK; <sup>5</sup>Department of Family Medicine, CAPHRI School for Public  
17           Health and Primary Care, Maastricht University, 6200 MD Maastricht, The Netherlands

18  
19           **Correspondence to:** Dr. Sabrina Kastaun, Institute of General Practice, Addiction Research and  
20           Clinical Epidemiology Unit, Medical Faculty of the Heinrich-Heine-University Düsseldorf, Moorenstr.  
21           5, 40225 Düsseldorf, Germany, Tel: 0049-211-81-19527, Mail: [Sabrina.Kastaun@med.uni-](mailto:Sabrina.Kastaun@med.uni-duesseldorf.de)  
22           [duesseldorf.de](mailto:Sabrina.Kastaun@med.uni-duesseldorf.de), Twitter: @KastaunS, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5590-1135>

23  
24  
25  
26  
27

1    **ABSTRACT**

2    We developed a 3.5-h-training for general practitioners (GPs) in delivering brief stop-smoking advice  
3    according to different methods (ABC, 5As). In a pragmatic, cluster randomised controlled trial our  
4    training proved effective in increasing GP-delivered rates of such advice. In this follow-up analysis we  
5    examined the effect of ABC and 5As on patient-reported quit attempts and point prevalence abstinence  
6    at weeks 4, 12, and 26 following GP consultation.

7    Follow-up data were collected by questionnaires delivered to 1,937 smoking patients recruited before or  
8    after the training in which 69 GPs participated. At week 26, ~70% of the patients were lost to follow-up.  
9    All 1,937 smoking patients were included in an intention-to-treat analysis. Multiple imputation was used  
10   to impute missing outcome data of each follow-up and few missing data of potential confounders.

11   While the receipt of brief GP advice compared to no advice was associated with a two-fold increase in  
12   patients' attempts to quit at each follow-up and abstinence at week 26, quit attempts and abstinence rates  
13   did not differ significantly from pre- to post-training or between patients from the ABC versus the 5As  
14   group.

15   We previously reported that our training increases patient-reported rates of GP-delivered stop-smoking  
16   advice. The present follow-up analysis did not show that patients more often attempted or achieved to  
17   quit when they received advice from a trained vs. untrained GP. Future training studies should take  
18   contextual factors into account – such as access to free evidence-based cessation treatment – which might  
19   hamper the transfer of GPs' effective advice into patients' behaviour change.

20  
21    **TRIAL REGISTRATION**

22    German Clinical Trials Register, prior to the first patient in (DRKS00012786,  
23    [www.drks.de/drks\\_web/setLocale\\_EN.do](http://www.drks.de/drks_web/setLocale_EN.do)).

24  
25  
26    **KEYWORDS**

27    Tobacco addiction, primary care, general practitioner, brief advice, smoking cessation, abstinence,  
28    clinical guideline, 5As, ABC

29

## 1 INTRODUCTION

2 Due to a lack of institutional, free stop smoking services, the role of general practitioners (GPs) in  
3 Germany is of particular importance in the treatment of tobacco addiction. However, only around one  
4 fifth of smokers in Germany who consult a GP currently receive advice to quit smoking, and an even  
5 smaller minority receives a recommendation for adequate cessation treatment (e.g., nicotine replacement  
6 therapy (NRT), bupropion and varenicline) [1]. Evidence-based strategies are therefore needed to  
7 overcome barriers preventing GPs in Germany from routinely providing brief stop-smoking advice and  
8 recommendations for evidence-based cessation treatment to their smoking patients [2-5].

9 As such a strategy, we developed and pre-tested two 3.5h-trainings for GPs in delivering brief stop-  
10 smoking advice [6] aiming to address the most frequently mentioned barriers towards a routine provision  
11 of stop-smoking advice: the lack of training and skills of GPs on how to provide stop-smoking advice  
12 effectively and efficiently and the lack of time during routine consultations [7-12]. One training was  
13 designed to instruct GPs how to deliver such advice according to the 5As counselling method (ask, advice,  
14 assess, assist, arrange, including the 5Rs in patients unmotivated to quit) [2], the other training to deliver  
15 the briefer ABC method (ask, brief advice, assist) [13].

16 In a previous pragmatic, two-arm cluster randomised controlled trial (cRCT), we showed that these  
17 trainings were highly effective at increasing the patient-reported rates of GP-delivered stop-smoking  
18 advice (primary outcome) and of delivered recommendations or prescriptions of behavioural and  
19 pharmacological smoking cessation treatment (secondary outcomes) [6 14]. A comparison of the  
20 effectiveness of the ABC vs. the 5As method regarding these primary and secondary outcomes indicated  
21 that the ABC method may lead to higher rates of GP-delivered stop-smoking advice [14].

22 Evidence is strong that such advice significantly increases the rates of successful quitting, in particular  
23 when combined with pharmacological treatment [15 16], and that training health professionals in advising  
24 their smoking patients can have measurable effects on continuous abstinence [17]. Hence, by increasing  
25 GP-delivered rates of advice on quitting and on effective treatment, we expected a higher number of  
26 smoking patients to intent to and to successfully quit following our GP training. However, among the few  
27 trials on the effectiveness of training particularly GPs [17-20] or GP trainees [12] so far, only the studies  
28 of Verbiest et al. [21] and Unrod et al. [20] examined the indirect effect of such a GP training on the  
29 patients' cessation behaviour. Both studies found a positive effect of a 40min individual training [20] or  
30 respectively a one-hour 5As group training [21] on GPs counselling behaviour, but no [21] or,  
31 respectively, no clear [20] transfer of these effects on smokers' long-term quit rates, and no effects on  
32 smokers' attempts to quit [20 21]. Furthermore, studies conducted in the primary care context in Germany  
33 are lacking.

34 The present follow-up analysis of pre-specified [6], additional secondary outcomes of our above  
35 mentioned cRCT therefore examined whether our 3.5h-training for GPs has the potential to indirectly

1 increase patients' quit attempts and point prevalence abstinence rates at weeks 4, 12, and 26 following  
2 the consultation with the trained GP. Furthermore, we compared the ABC and 5As training regarding  
3 these outcomes.

## 4 **METHODS**

### 5 **Study design and participants**

6 The trial methods and primary outcome data are reported in detail elsewhere [6 14]. Here, we briefly  
7 summarise the main methods with a focus on follow-up data assessment. Between June 2017 and  
8 February 2020, we conducted a pragmatic, two-arm cRCT training GPs in delivering brief stop-smoking  
9 advice according to two different methods of giving advice – ABC and 5As – with a pre-post-design for  
10 the primary outcome as well as cluster randomisation for the comparison of both methods against each  
11 other. Ethics approval was obtained from the ethics committee at the Heinrich-Heine-University  
12 Düsseldorf, Germany (5999R), and all study participants provided written informed consent.

13 GP practices were recruited across the German federal state North Rhine-Westphalia [6 14]. A total of 52  
14 GP practices (cluster) with 69 GPs were included in the statistical analyses of the primary and some  
15 secondary outcomes. Twenty-seven practices (32 GPs) were randomised (1:1) to receive training on the  
16 ABC method, and 25 practices (37 GPs) were randomised to receive training on the 5As [14].

17 Patients were eligible to participate if aged  $\geq 18$  years, capable to provide informed consent, if they had  
18 an appointment with a study GP in person, and were current occasional or regular tobacco smokers (e.g.,  
19 cigarettes, pipe, cigars, shisha). Patients who had participated in the pre-training data collection period  
20 were ineligible to participate in the post-training period.

### 21 **Procedures (Intervention)**

22 In 2016, we had developed and pre-tested two 3.5h-trainings for GPs in delivering brief stop-smoking  
23 advice [6] according to either the 5As [2] or the briefer ABC [13] method. The development, based on  
24 the COM-B model of behaviour [22], and pilot testing have been described in the study protocol [6]. Both  
25 trainings included peer coaching (a senior researcher together with an experienced GP), lectures on  
26 tobacco addiction, on evidence-based cessation treatment, and the respective method of giving advice  
27 (ABC or 5As), followed by intensive, standardised role plays with professional actors [6].

28

### 29 **Assessment of primary and main secondary outcomes at baseline (main cRCT) [14]**

30 Data on the primary outcome (rates of GP-delivered stop-smoking advice) and on main secondary  
31 outcomes (rates of GP-delivered recommendations of behavioural counselling, NRT, varenicline or  
32 bupropion) were collected during six weeks prior to and six weeks following the GP training in smoking  
33 patients consulting these GPs, by means of questionnaire-guided, face-to-face interviews conducted by  
34 members of the study team (baseline questionnaire: [osf.io/7pmr5/](https://osf.io/7pmr5/), translated English version:  
35 [osf.io/f2p7b/](https://osf.io/f2p7b/)).

## 1 **Assessment of secondary outcomes at follow-up: quit attempts, point prevalence abstinence**

2 Patients who were smokers at baseline received a brief questionnaire by postal mail at 4, 12, and 26 weeks  
3 following their GP consultation (exemplary follow-up questionnaire at week 4: <https://osf.io/u835j/>,  
4 translated English version: <https://osf.io/8uxag/>). We pre-specified a time window for the postal dispatch  
5 of +/-1 week for the first follow-up, and of +/-2 weeks for the second and third follow-up. Patients who  
6 did not answer the first follow-up questionnaire received one reminder. We aimed to increase response  
7 rates by providing a small unconditional and non-financial incentive to the patients at each follow-up  
8 (e.g., a pen or some sweets).

9 The following secondary outcomes were collected at all three follow-up time points:

- 10 • Patient-reported rates of quit attempts since the baseline consultation with their GP.
- 11 • Patient-reported point prevalence abstinence rates since the baseline consultation with their GP,  
12 defined as the answer “*I am still not smoking*” on a question on the duration of their most recent  
13 quit attempt.

14 We decided not to analyse use of evidence-based stop-smoking treatments as a further secondary  
15 outcome, mainly because usage of such therapies is generally very low in Germany [23]. Assuming a  
16 decrease in response rates across all follow-up time points, the sample size was expected to be too small  
17 to draw reliable conclusions from such analyses.

18 In order to attenuate recall bias and to avoid overlap with multiple GP consultations or quit attempts since  
19 the baseline consultation with their GP, all questions were thoroughly phrased with reference to the  
20 respective follow-up period.

## 21 **Statistical analysis**

22 Our study was powered to detect a clinically relevant effect of an increase in patient-reported rates of GP-  
23 delivered stop-smoking advice by at least 10% (Odds Ratio (OR) of 1.77) for the evaluation of the primary  
24 endpoint [6 14]. We did not power the study for additional secondary outcomes or loss to follow-up.

### 25 *Analyses of the secondary outcomes collected at three follow-up time points*

26 Both the analysis plan (v3-3: [osf.io/36kpc/](https://osf.io/36kpc/)) and statistical code (FU\_rcode\_v2-4: [osf.io/5tfq7/](https://osf.io/5tfq7/)) were  
27 written and published prior to the analyses. Writing of the code was based on a blinded dataset; i.e., with  
28 the values of the outcome variables in a randomly shuffled order. All analyses were conducted using R  
29 version 4.0.3 [24].

30 Data were structured hierarchically in clusters (= practices), with patients within these clusters. We used  
31 mixed-effects logistic regression models to analyse the secondary outcomes: self-reported quit attempts  
32 (yes/no) and self-reported point prevalence abstinence (yes/no) at all three follow-up time points. Models  
33 were adjusted for pre-specified potential confounders measured at baseline: patients' age, sex, level of  
34 education, and time spent with and strength of urges to smoke [25]. The group variable and its interaction

1 with time (post- vs. pre-training) were added to the models as fixed effects to compare the ABC vs. the  
2 5As method. Random intercepts and slopes (for the time effect) were included at the practice level. The  
3 time effect and the interaction were analysed by means of Wald-type tests (level of significance .05).

4 All 1,937 patients who were smokers at baseline [14] were included in an intention-to-treat analysis.  
5 Multiple imputation was used to impute missing outcome data of each follow-up as well as missing data  
6 of potential confounders by chained equations (“mice-package” [26] with 20 imputed datasets and 10  
7 iterations for each dataset). Results across the imputation datasets were pooled using Rubin’s rules [27].  
8 For plausibility checks, we looked at the summary statistics with minimum and maximum values,  
9 interquartile range, mean and median across all imputed datasets per outcome. We will report ranges of  
10 imputed outcomes in percent from minimum value (min) to maximum value (max) as "min-max<sub>imputed</sub>"  
11 exemplary for the main results presented within the results section of this manuscript.

## 12 **Adherence to the protocol**

13 All planned analyses are reported in the study protocol [6] and in the analysis plan (<https://osf.io/36kpc/>).  
14 In addition to the multilevel mixed-effects logistic regression models which we ran in R using the lme4  
15 software package, we ran sensitivity analyses using two additional software packages (GLMMadaptive  
16 and glmmTMB) to increase confidence in the results.

17 We ran ancillary post-hoc analyses exploring:

- 18 a) the effect of the receipt of stop-smoking advice (yes vs. no) during the baseline consultation with  
19 the GP on the secondary outcomes at each follow-up, irrespective of the time variable (pre-post  
20 training) and the group variable (ABC or 5As training),
- 21 b) the effect of the receipt of stop-smoking advice (yes vs. no) during the baseline consultation with  
22 the GP and its interaction with the time variable (post- vs. pre-training) on the secondary  
23 outcomes at each follow-up, irrespective of group variable (ABC or 5As training), and
- 24 c) the effect of the receipt of a stop-smoking advice (yes vs. no) during the baseline consultation  
25 with the GP and its interaction with the time variable (post- vs. pre-training) and with the group  
26 variable (ABC vs. 5As training) on the secondary outcomes at each follow-up.

27 Multilevel mixed-effects logistic regression models were also used for these analyses, including random  
28 intercepts and slopes (for receipt of advice and time; the latter only in the models for b and c) at the  
29 practice level.

## 30 31 **RESULTS**

32 The flow of study participants is depicted in a previous publication of this study [14]. In brief, 1,937  
33 smoking patients (n=1,039 were interviewed prior to and n= 898 following the GP training) were eligible  
34 to receive follow-up questionnaires. Of these patients, 770 (39.8%) answered the follow-up questionnaire  
35 at week 4, 616 (31.8%) at week 12, and 558 (28.8%) at week 26. Of these responders, around 2% (1.7%

1 in week 4, 1.9% in week 12, and 2.3% in week 26) had missing data on the outcome “quit attempt”, and  
2 approximately 5% (3.7% in week 4, 7.1% in week 12, and 3.4% in week 26) of participants who had  
3 attempted to quit smoking, did not provide information on their smoking status at follow-up.

4 **Table 1** presents baseline sociodemographic and smoking characteristics of patients who participated in  
5 at least one of the three follow-up surveys (responders, n=851, 43.9%) versus those who did not  
6 participate in any follow-up (non-responders, n=1,086, 56.1%). Responders were of older age, more likely  
7 to be female, and reported the consumption of more cigarettes per day and higher urges to smoke than  
8 non-responders.

### 9 **Self-reported quit attempts and point prevalence abstinence rates**

10 Rates of attempts to quit smoking since baseline were 18.9% (min-max<sub>imputed</sub>: 16.2%-20.2%) at follow-  
11 up week 4, 26.7% (min-max<sub>imputed</sub>: 24.8%-28.3%) at week 12, and 27.3% (min-max<sub>imputed</sub>: 24.3%-31.1%)  
12 at week 26. **Table 2** shows that these rates did not differ significantly between the pre- and post-training  
13 group.

14 Point prevalence abstinence rates were 6.0% (min-max<sub>imputed</sub>: 4.4%-8.3%) at week 4, 9.2% (min-  
15 max<sub>imputed</sub>: 8.7%-13.6%) at week 12, and 11.0% (min-max<sub>imputed</sub>: 9.7%-14.9%) at week 26, and also did  
16 not differ significantly between the pre- and post-training group (**Table 2**).

17 Although the relative frequencies of reported quit attempts and point prevalence abstinence rates appeared  
18 to have increased more strongly from prior to following the training in patients whose GP had been trained  
19 according to the ABC method compared to the 5As method (adjusted ratio of the OR (aROR) between  
20 1.07 and 1.71), no statistically significant interaction could be observed for both outcomes at any of the  
21 three follow-up time points (**Table 2**).

### 22 **Ancillary analyses**

23 Results of the post-hoc analyses a) of the effect of the receipt of a stop-smoking advice (yes vs. no) and  
24 b) its interaction with the time variable (post- vs. pre-training) are reported in **Table 3**. Data showed that  
25 patients who received an advice to quit by their GP at the baseline consultation had around two times  
26 higher odds (adjusted Odds Ratio (aOR) between 1.90 and 2.01) of reporting a quit attempt at each of the  
27 three follow-up time points than patients who did not receive such an advice. Twenty-six weeks following  
28 baseline, patients who had been advised to quit smoking at baseline also had about two times higher odds  
29 of reporting abstinence from smoking than those who had not been advised to quit (aOR=2.22, 95%  
30 Confidence Interval=1.21-4.11).

31 Directions of the ORs suggest a larger increase of rates of quit attempts between pre- and post-training in  
32 patients who received advice to quit versus those who did not (aRORs between 1.27 and 1.42; **Table 3**).  
33 However, at none of the follow-ups were statistically significant interaction effects found – neither for  
34 attempt to quit nor for tobacco abstinence (all p >.05).

1 Results of the post-hoc analysis c) on the effect of the receipt of a stop-smoking advice and its three-way  
2 interaction with the time variable and the group variable (advice vs. no advice by post- vs. pre-training  
3 by ABC vs. 5As training) are not depicted in Table 3. Neither of these interaction effects was statistically  
4 significant (all  $p > .05$ ). Confidence intervals were extremely wide, making it difficult to draw reliable  
5 conclusions from these results.

6

## 7 **DISCUSSION**

8 In this follow-up analysis of a cRCT, we examined the effect of a 3.5h-training for GPs in delivering brief  
9 advice to quit to their smoking patients and compared two methods of giving such advice – ABC vs. 5As  
10 – on patients' self-reported smoking cessation behaviour – attempts to quit and point prevalence  
11 abstinence rates – at weeks 4, 12, and 26 following a routine consultation with the study GP. By means  
12 of post-hoc analyses we further explored whether GPs' advice on quitting in this study was associated  
13 with quit attempts and success of these attempts in smoking patients at follow-up.

14 Congruent with the existing evidence [15], post-hoc analyses demonstrated that GPs' advice on quitting  
15 smoking (irrespective of our training) was related to a two-fold increase in the odds of patients' attempts  
16 to quit at all follow-up time points and in self-reported, point prevalence tobacco abstinence at week 26.  
17 However, whereas our training substantially increased the rates of GP-delivered advice on quitting and  
18 recommendations of evidence-based cessation treatment (primary and secondary study outcomes  
19 published elsewhere [14]), the present follow-up analysis did not confirm a transfer of this improved GP  
20 performance on patients' short- and long-term quitting behaviour. Although relative rates and direction  
21 of the ORs indicate a stronger increase of quit attempts and abstinence rates in patients whose GPs had  
22 been trained according to ABC compared to the 5As, neither attempts to quit nor abstinence rates differed  
23 significantly from pre- to post-training or in the ABC compared to the 5As group.

24 One can only speculate about the reasons for the lack of transfer of effects measured at the GPs level to  
25 the behaviour of the patients but probable explanations might exist on two levels. First, the training  
26 provides content for GPs to advice smokers to quit but probably lacks in-depth content on how to assist  
27 smokers effectively with quitting, or because GPs cannot deliver the contents effectively to their patients.  
28 While the main results of the study [14] showed a significant increase from pre- to post-training in GP-  
29 delivered recommendation rates for evidence-based cessation treatment, the relative numbers of  
30 recommendations were still very low after the training (<8%). Possibly, GPs may have reservations about  
31 the effectiveness and side-effects of stop-smoking medication. Such worries were in fact mentioned very  
32 often by the study GPs during the training and have previously been reported by other studies [e.g., 28  
33 29]. This might have not been adequately addressed by our brief training. However, physicians' advice  
34 to quit is most effective when combined with an offer of pharmacological or behavioural treatment [30].

35 Second, contextual factors might have hampered the transfer of GPs' effective advice and support into  
36 patients' behaviour change. For example, the low usage rates of evidence-based smoking cessation

1 treatment may be due to the lack of reimbursement of costs for such treatments in the German healthcare  
2 setting [23]. Evidence shows that the usage and free availability of such treatments substantially increase  
3 the rates of quit attempts and success [31]. Although more patients were advised to quit following the GP  
4 training, only those who could and were willing to afford effective treatment might have attempted to  
5 quit. Since we did not collect socioeconomic data of patients, we cannot verify this hypothesis but recent  
6 population data from Germany showed that higher income is associated with higher odds of using  
7 medication to assist quit attempts [32].

8 In addition, limitations of the study design resulting in a small study sample at follow-up also might have  
9 influenced the results measured at the patient level.

## 10 **Limitations**

11 First, around 70% of patients were lost to follow-up across the three follow-up time points which might  
12 have affected the statistical power to detect group differences and reduce the generalisability of our  
13 results. However, by using multiple imputation methods and intention-to-treat analysis, we applied  
14 effective measures to reduce the potential for bias compared to a complete case analysis. Second, this is  
15 a secondary analysis. In a primary analysis, smoking patients would have had to be randomised into two  
16 groups (consultation following the GP training vs. consultation prior to the GP training ("care as usual")).  
17 Third, follow-up data were assessed by self-reports and tobacco abstinence lacked biochemical  
18 verification. Data are thus susceptible to biases such as memory effects or social desirability bias, which  
19 might lead to an under- or over-reporting of the respective outcomes. A fourth limitation is that we were  
20 not able to analyse patient-reported use of evidence-based stop-smoking treatments as a secondary  
21 outcome of our GP training due to the very low usage rates of such treatment in Germany [23] and the  
22 anticipated loss to follow-up. Such data would have provided a more detailed insight into the effectiveness  
23 of our training.

24 Further limitations which might have affected the results of the main cRCT also apply to the follow-up  
25 analysis including the fact that only short-term training effects on GPs behaviour were studied, that we  
26 did not video record the baseline consultation and are thus not sure whether GPs had effectively  
27 implemented the ABC or 5As method, and that the study was not designed to compare the effectiveness  
28 of both training methods directly, which could only have been done with a non-pragmatic design [1].

29 The major strength is the pragmatic nature of this study which was conducted in the real-world GP  
30 practice setting and during routine consultations, with outcome measures being assessed on both the GP  
31 and the patient level, the latter including long-term effects.

## 33 **Conclusions and policy implications**

34 Receiving brief stop-smoking advice during a routine consultation with a GP has a positive effect on  
35 patients' smoking cessation behaviour. However, our one-off 3.5-h-training session for GPs in the  
36 provision of such advice according to the ABC versus the 5As method, which substantially increased

1 advice rates on the GP level, could not further improve patients' attempts to quit smoking and long-term  
2 quit rates. Future training studies should more broadly take contextual factors into account which could  
3 hamper the transfer of GPs' effective advice and support into patients' smoking behaviour change – such  
4 as access to free evidence-based cessation treatment.

5

6

1    **Abbreviations**

2	5As	Ask, advice, assess, assist, arrange
3	ABC	Ask, brief advice, cessation support
4	cRCT	Cluster randomised controlled trial
5	CI	Confidence Interval
6	COM-B	Capability-Opportunity-Motivation-Behaviour
7	GP	General practitioner
8	NRT	Nicotine replacement therapy
9	OR	Odds Ratio
10	SD	Standard deviation
11	SUTS	Strength of Urges to Smoke Scale
12		

## 1 **DECLARATIONS**

2

### 3 **Funding**

4 The study was funded by the German Federal Ministry of Health (grant number ZMVI1-2516DSM221,  
5 Daniel Kotz). The funding sources had no role in the design and conduct of the study; collection,  
6 management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript;  
7 and the decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

8

### 9 **Competing interests**

10 DK received an unrestricted grant from Pfizer for an investigator-initiated trial on the effectiveness of  
11 practice nurse counselling and varenicline for smoking cessation in primary care in 2009 (Dutch Trial  
12 Register NTR3067). TR has received honoraria from Pfizer, Novartis, Glaxo Smith Kline, Astra Zeneca  
13 and Roche as a speaker in activities related to continuing medical education and financial support for  
14 investigator-initiated trials from Pfizer and Johnson & Johnson; all other authors declare no competing  
15 interests. No financial relationships with any organisations that might have an interest in the submitted  
16 work in the previous three years; no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced  
17 this work.

18

### 19 **Participant consent for publication**

20 All participants (patients and GPs) gave written informed consent prior to their inclusion in the study.

21

### 22 **Ethics approval**

23 The study was approved by the medical ethics committee at the Heinrich-Heine-University Düsseldorf,  
24 Germany (5999R).

25

### 26 **Authorship**

27 DK conceived the study and acquired funding for the current study together with SK and VL, and co-  
28 wrote this manuscript. SK, VL, and DK developed and conducted the GP trainings. SK coordinated all  
29 study processes, and wrote the first draft of the current manuscript. WV, statistician, prepared the  
30 statistical analysis code, and advised on all statistical analyses together with DK and SK, who conducted  
31 all analyses and interpreted the data. JH, DL, SKH, and CF were mainly involved in all study processes  
32 including recruitment, data collection, data entry and cleaning. OR, general practitioner and peer trainer,  
33 was mainly involved in the final evaluation of the training manual and the didactic methods. SW and TR  
34 gave valuable feedback at the time of designing the trial, and commented on and added to the present  
35 manuscript. All named authors contributed substantially to the manuscript and agreed on its final version.  
36 SK and DK are the guarantors. The corresponding author attests that all listed authors meet authorship  
37 criteria and that no others meeting the criteria have been omitted.

38

1    **Data sharing**

2    The data underlying this study are third-party data (de-identified participant data) and are available to  
3    researchers on reasonable request from the corresponding author (sabrina.kastaun@med.uni-  
4    duesseldorf.de). All proposals requesting data access will need to specify how it is planned to use the  
5    data, and all proposals will need approval of the trial investigator team before data release. The study  
6    protocol [6], the statistical analysis plan (v3-3: <https://osf.io/36kpc/>) and statistical code (FU\_rcode\_v2-  
7    4: <https://osf.io/5tfq7/>) have been published.

8

9

1 **SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL**

2

3 **Supplementary Material 1:**

4 Exemplary original German version of the “Follow-up Questionnaire” at week 4 for patients (Follow-  
5 upSurveyWeek4\_ABCII\_German) can be downloaded here: [osf.io/7pmr5/](https://osf.io/7pmr5/).

6

7 **Supplementary Material 2:**

8 Exemplary translated version of the “Follow-up Questionnaire” at week 4 for patients into English  
9 (Follow-upSurveyWeek4\_ABCII\_Engl) can be downloaded here: [osf.io/8uxag/](https://osf.io/8uxag/).

10

## 1 REFERENCES

- 2 1. Kastaun S, Kotz D. Brief medical advice on smoking cessation - Results of the DEBRA study  
3 [Ärztliche Kurzberatung zur Tabakentwöhnung – Ergebnisse der DEBRA Studie]. *Journal of*  
4 *Addiction Research and Practice [SUCHT]* 2019;65:34-41. doi:10.1024/0939-5911/a000574
- 5 2. Fiore MC, Jaen CR, Baker TB, Bailey WC, Bennett G, Benowitz NL, Christiansen BA, Connell M,  
6 Curry SJ, Dorfman SF, Fraser D, Froelicher ES, Goldstein MG, Hasselblad V, Healton CG,  
7 Heishman S, Henderson PN, Heyman RB, Husten C, Koh HK, Kottke TE, Lando HA, Leitzke  
8 C, Mecklenburg RE, Mermelstein RJ, Morgan G, Mullen PD, Murray EW, Orleans CT, Piper  
9 ME, Robinson L, Stitzer ML, Theobald W, Tommasello AC, Villejo L, Wewers ME, Williams  
10 C, Treati CPG. A Clinical Practice Guideline for Treating Tobacco Use and Dependence: 2008  
11 Update - A US Public Health Service report. *Am J Prev Med* 2008;35:158-76.  
12 doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2008.04.009
- 13 3. National Institute for Clinical Excellence (NICE). Smoking: acute, maternity and mental health  
14 services, Guidance PH48. 2013, <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ph48> (accessed 17 June  
15 2020).
- 16 4. Association of the Scientific Medical Societies (AWMF) [Arbeitsgemeinschaft der  
17 Wissenschaftlichen Medizinischen Fachgesellschaften (AWMF)]. S3 Guideline “Smoking and  
18 Tobacco Addiction: Screening, Diagnostics, and Treatment” [S3-Leitlinie “Rauchen und  
19 Tabakabhängigkeit: Screening, Diagnostik und Behandlung”]. AWMF-Register Nr. 076-006  
20 2021, <https://www.awmf.org/leitlinien/detail/II/076-006.html> (accessed 01 February 2021).
- 21 5. Van Schayck OCP, Williams S, Barchilon V, Baxter N, Jawad M, Katsaounou PA, Kirenga BJ,  
22 Panaitescu C, Tsiligianni IG, Zwar N, Ostrem A. Treating tobacco dependence: guidance for  
23 primary care on life-saving interventions. Position statement of the IPCRG. *NPJ Prim Care*  
24 *Respir* 2017;27:38. doi:10.1038/s41533-017-0039-5
- 25 6. Kastaun S, Leve V, Hildebrandt J, Funke C, Becker S, Lubisch D, Viechtbauer W, Reddemann O,  
26 Hempel L, McRobbie H, Raupach T, West R, Kotz D. Effectiveness of training general  
27 practitioners to improve the implementation of brief stop-smoking advice in German primary  
28 care: study protocol of a pragmatic, 2-arm cluster randomised controlled trial (the ABCII trial).  
29 *BMC Fam Prac* 2019;20:107. doi:10.1186/s12875-019-0986-8
- 30 7. Strobel L, Schneider NK, Krampe H, Beissbarth T, Pukrop T, Anders S, West R, Aveyard P,  
31 Raupach T. German medical students lack knowledge of how to treat smoking and problem  
32 drinking. *Addiction* 2012;107:1878-82. doi:10.1111/j.1360-0443.2012.03907.x
- 33 8. Twardella D, Brenner H. Lack of training as a central barrier to the promotion of smoking cessation:  
34 a survey among general practitioners in Germany. *Eur J Public Health* 2005;15:140-5.  
35 doi:10.1093/eurpub/cki123
- 36 9. Hoch E, Franke A, Sonntag H, Jahn B, Mühligh S, Wittchen H-U. Smoking cessation in primary  
37 medical care - chance or fiction? Results of the "Smoking and Nicotine Dependence Awareness  
38 and Screening (SNICAS)" study [Raucherentwöhnung in der primärärztlichen Versorgung –  
39 Chance oder Fiktion? Ergebnisse der "Smoking and Nicotine Dependence Awareness and  
40 Screening (SNICAS)"-Studie]. *Addiction medicine in research and practice [Suchtmedizin in*  
41 *Forschung und Praxis]* 2004;6:47-51. doi:
- 42 10. Raupach T, Merker J, Hasenfuss G, Andreas S, Pipe A. Knowledge gaps about smoking cessation in  
43 hospitalized patients and their doctors. *Eur J Prev Cardiol* 2011;18:334-41.  
44 doi:10.1177/1741826710389370
- 45 11. Cancer Research UK. Smoking Cessation in Primary Care: A cross-sectional survey of primary care  
46 health practitioners in the UK and the use of Very Brief Advice. 2019,  
47 [https://www.cancerresearchuk.org/sites/default/files/tobacco\\_pc\\_report\\_to\\_publish -](https://www.cancerresearchuk.org/sites/default/files/tobacco_pc_report_to_publish_full12.pdf)  
48 [full12.pdf](https://www.cancerresearchuk.org/sites/default/files/tobacco_pc_report_to_publish_full12.pdf) (accessed 02 June 2020).
- 49 12. Bobak A, Raupach T. Effect of a short smoking cessation training session on smoking cessation  
50 behaviour and its determinants among GP trainees in England. *Nicotine Tob Res*  
51 2017;10.1093/ntr/ntx241
- 52 13. Ministry of Health. The New Zealand Guidelines for Helping People to Stop Smoking. 2014,  
53 <http://www.health.govt.nz/publication/new-zealand-guidelines-helping-people-stop-smoking>  
54 (accessed 06 June 2020).
- 55 14. Kastaun S, Leve V, Hildebrandt J, Funke C, Klosterhalfen S, Lubisch D, Reddemann O, McRobbie  
56 H, Raupach T, West R, Wilm S, Viechtbauer W, Kotz D. Training general practitioners in the

- 1 ABC vs. 5As method of delivering stop-smoking advice: a pragmatic, two-arm cluster  
2 randomised controlled trial. *ERJ Open Research* 2020;00621-2020.  
3 doi:10.1183/23120541.00621-2020
- 4 15. Stead LF, Buitrago D, Preciado N, Sanchez G, Hartmann-Boyce J, Lancaster T. Physician advice  
5 for smoking cessation. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2013;10.1002/14651858.CD000165.pub4
- 6 16. Hartmann-Boyce J, Hong B, Livingstone-Banks J, Wheat H, Fanshawe TR. Additional behavioural  
7 support as an adjunct to pharmacotherapy for smoking cessation. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*  
8 2019;10.1002/14651858.CD009670.pub4
- 9 17. Carson KV, Verbiest MEA, Crone MR, Brinn MP, Esterman AJ, Assendelft WJJ, Smith BJ.  
10 Training health professionals in smoking cessation. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*  
11 2012;10.1002/14651858.CD000214.pub2
- 12 18. Girvalaki C, Papadakis S, Vardavas C, Pipe AL, Petridou E, Tsiligianni I, Lionis C, Ti TANCP.  
13 Training General Practitioners in Evidence-Based Tobacco Treatment: An Evaluation of the  
14 Tobacco Treatment Training Network in Crete (TiTAN-Crete) Intervention. *Health Educ Behav*  
15 2018;1090198118775481. doi:10.1177/1090198118775481
- 16 19. McRobbie H, Hajek P, Feder G, Eldridge S. A cluster-randomised controlled trial of a brief training  
17 session to facilitate general practitioner referral to smoking cessation treatment. *Tob Control*  
18 2008;17:173-6. doi:10.1136/tc.2008.024802
- 19 20. Unrod M, Smith M, Spring B, DePue J, Redd W, Winkel G. Randomized Controlled Trial of a  
20 Computer-Based, Tailored Intervention to Increase Smoking Cessation Counseling by Primary  
21 Care Physicians. *J Gen Intern Med* 2007;22:478-84. doi:10.1007/s11606-006-0069-0
- 22 21. Verbiest ME, Crone MR, Scharloo M, Chavannes NH, van der Meer V, Kaptein AA, Assendelft  
23 WJ. One-hour training for general practitioners in reducing the implementation gap of smoking  
24 cessation care: a cluster-randomized controlled trial. *Nicotine Tob Res* 2014;16:1-10.  
25 doi:10.1093/ntr/ntt100
- 26 22. Michie S, van Stralen MM, West R. The behaviour change wheel: a new method for characterising  
27 and designing behaviour change interventions. *Implement Sci* 2011;6:42. doi:10.1186/1748-  
28 5908-6-42
- 29 23. Kotz D, Batra A, Kastaun S. Smoking Cessation Attempts and Common Strategies Employed.  
30 *Dtsch Arztebl Int* 2020;117:7-13. doi:10.3238/arztebl.2020.0007
- 31 24. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing.  
32 4.0.3 version. Vienna: Austria: R Core Team, 2020.
- 33 25. Fidler JA, Shahab L, West R. Strength of urges to smoke as a measure of severity of cigarette  
34 dependence: comparison with the Fagerstrom Test for Nicotine Dependence and its  
35 components. *Addiction* 2011;106:631-8. doi:10.1111/j.1360-0443.2010.03226.x
- 36 26. van Buuren S, Groothuis-Oudshoorn K. mice: Multivariate Imputation by Chained Equations in R. *J*  
37 *Stat Softw* 2011;45:1-67. doi:10.18637/jss.v045.i03
- 38 27. Rubin DB. Multiple Imputation for Nonresponse in Surveys. New York: John Wiley and Sons 1987.
- 39 28. Vogt F, Hall S, Marteau TM. General practitioners' beliefs about effectiveness and intentions to  
40 prescribe smoking cessation medications: qualitative and quantitative studies. *BMC Public*  
41 *Health* 2006;6:277. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-6-277
- 42 29. van Eerd EAM, Bech Risør M, Spigt M, Godycki-Cwirko M, Andreeva E, Francis N, Wollny A,  
43 Melbye H, van Schayck O, Kotz D. Why do physicians lack engagement with smoking  
44 cessation treatment in their COPD patients? A multinational qualitative study. *NPJ Prim Care*  
45 *Respir* 2017;27:41. doi:10.1038/s41533-017-0038-6
- 46 30. Stead LF, Koilpillai P, Fanshawe TR, Lancaster T. Combined pharmacotherapy and behavioural  
47 interventions for smoking cessation. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*  
48 2016;10.1002/14651858.CD008286.pub3
- 49 31. van den Brand FA, Nagelhout GE, Reda AA, Winkens B, Evers S, Kotz D, van Schayck OCP.  
50 Healthcare financing systems for increasing the use of tobacco dependence treatment. *Cochrane*  
51 *Database Syst Rev* 2017;10.1002/14651858.CD004305.pub5
- 52 32. Kastaun S, Brown J, Kotz D. Association between income and education with quit attempts, use of  
53 cessation aids, and short-term success in tobacco smokers: A social gradient analysis from a  
54 population-based cross-sectional household survey in Germany (DEBRA study). *Addict Behav*  
55 2020;111:106553. doi:10.1016/j.addbeh.2020.106553

- 1 33. Kotz D, Brown J, West R. Predictive validity of the Motivation To Stop Scale (MTSS): a single-
- 2 item measure of motivation to stop smoking. *Drug Alcohol Depend* 2013;128:15-9.
- 3 doi:10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2012.07.012

4

1  
2  
3  
  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10

**Table 1.** Baseline characteristics of tobacco smoking patients, stratified by whether they had participated in at least one of the three follow-up surveys (responder) or not (non-responder).

	<b>Responder (n = 851)</b>	<b>Non-responder (n = 1,086)</b>	<b>Total sample (N =1,937)</b>
Age, years (mean ± SD)	50.9 ± 14.9	42.2 ± 15.6	46.1 ± 15.9
Sex			
Female	59.3% (505)	46.7% (507)	52.3% (1,012)
Male	40.7% (346)	52.9% (575)	47.6% (921)
Level of education†			
High school equiv.	22.1% (188)	22.2% (241)	22.2% (429)
Adv. techn. college equiv.	12.9% (110)	15.0% (163)	14.1% (273)
Secondary school equiv.	27.1% (231)	30.4% (330)	29.0% (561)
Junior high school equiv.	36.1% (307)	27.7% (300)	31.3% (607)
No qualification	1.8% (15)	4.6% (50)	3.4% (65)
Cigarettes/day (mean ± SD)	14.7 ± 9.9	13.8 ± 9.6	13.8 ± 9.3
Time Spent with Urges to Smoke [25]¥ (mean ± SD)	3.1 ± 1.5	2.8 ± 1.5	2.9 ± 1.5
Strength of Urges to Smoke[25]¥ (mean ± SD)	2.1 ± 1.0	2.0 ± 0.9	2.0 ± 0.9
Motivation To Stop Smoking[33] (mean ± SD)#	3.4 ± 1.8	3.2 ± 1.8	3.3 ± 1.8

Data are presented as percentage (number), unless stated otherwise. Differences when calculating the total percentage can be explained by missing data on the respective variable. †German equivalents to education levels listed in table from highest to lowest: high school equivalent (“Allgemeine Hochschulreife”), advanced technical college equivalent (“Fachhochschulreife”), secondary school equivalent (“Realschulabschluss”), junior high school equivalent (“Hauptschulabschluss”), or no qualification. ¥ Both items of the Strength of Urges to Smoke Scale (SUTS) with values ranging from 0=lowest to 6=highest urges, # Items of the Motivation to Stop Smoking Scale ranging from 1=“I don’t want to stop smoking” to 7= “I really want to stop and intend to in the next month”.

1 **Table 2.** Patient reports on secondary study outcomes (attempt to quit smoking, point prevalence abstinence) at follow-up week 4, 12, and 26, stratified  
 2 by pre-post data collection period and by training method of the GP they had consulted at baseline; and associations of these outcomes with training  
 3 (post vs. pre) and its interaction with the training method (ABC vs. 5As by post vs. pre); imputed data.

Outcome (patient-reported)	Pre-training			Post-training			aOR <sub>imputed</sub> Post vs. Pre (95% CI) <sup>†</sup>	aROR <sub>imputed</sub> ABC vs. 5As <sup>†</sup> by Post vs. Pre (95% CI)
	Pre <sub>ABC</sub>	Pre <sub>5As</sub>	Pre <sub>total</sub>	Post <sub>ABC</sub>	Post <sub>5As</sub>	Post <sub>total</sub>		
Quit attempt at week 4	19.4%	18.7%	19.0%	21.4%	15.5%	18.7%	0.95 (0.67-1.35)	1.17 (0.64-2.13)
Quit attempt at week 12	25.8%	28.1%	26.9%	30.6%	21.6%	26.5%	1.02 (0.72-1.45)	1.12 (0.65-1.93)
Quit attempt at week 26	29.1%	29.5%	29.3%	28.8%	20.5%	24.9%	0.88 (0.57-1.38)	1.07 (0.63-1.83)
Point prevalence abstinence at week 4	6.3%	5.6%	6.0%	8.8%	2.6%	5.9%	0.99 (0.50-1.97)	1.64 (0.53-5.10)
Point prevalence abstinence at week 12	9.9%	11.8%	10.9%	12.6%	0.8%	7.1%	0.70 (0.38-1.26)	1.71 (0.75-3.91)
Point prevalence abstinence at week 26	10.0%	14.1%	12.0%	13.8%	5.1%	9.7%	1.00 (0.51-1.95)	1.51 (0.62-3.67)

4 Data are presented as imputed percentages (%), adjusted Odds Ratios (aOR), and adjusted ratios of the Odds Ratios (aROR) and 95% confidence interval (95%CI) around aOR and aROR. Since multiple  
 5 imputation was used, no absolute numbers are reported within this table.

6 <sup>†</sup>Logistic regression models with a fixed effect for time (post- vs. pre training) and random intercepts and slopes (for the time effect) for the practices; for the ABC vs. 5As comparison: the group variable  
 7 (ABC vs. 5As training) and its interaction with time were added to the models as fixed effects; both models were adjusted for patients' sex, age, level of education, time spent with urges to smoke, and  
 8 strength of urges to smoke (SUTS<sup>[25]</sup>).  
 9

10

1 **Table 3** Findings from ancillary analyses of patient reports on secondary study outcomes (attempt to quit smoking, point prevalence abstinence) at  
 2 follow-up week 4, 12, and 26, stratified by whether the patient had received advice to quit smoking or not by the study GP they had consulted at  
 3 baseline; and associations of these outcomes with the receipt of such advice (advice vs. no advice) and its interaction with the time variable (advice vs.  
 4 no advice by post- vs. pre-training); imputed data.

Outcome (patient-reported)	No advice	Advice	Pre-training		Post-training		aOR <sub>imputed</sub> Advice vs. No advice (95%CI)†	aROR <sub>imputed</sub> Advice vs. No advice† by Post vs. Pre (95%CI)
			No advice	Advice	No advice	Advice		
Quit attempt at week 4	16.6%	26.6%	18.6%	21.7%	13.4%	29.2%	<b>1.90 (1.28-2.82)</b>	1.27 (0.64-2.53)
Quit attempt at week 12	23.5%	37.7%	25.9%	33.3%	19.8%	40.0%	<b>1.97 (1.32-2.92)</b>	1.42 (0.71-2.83)
Quit attempt at week 26	24.1%	38.8%	28.3%	35.7%	17.6%	40.5%	<b>2.01 (1.43-2.82)</b>	1.34 (0.71-2.53)
Point prevalence abstinence at week 4	5.7%	6.9%	6.1%	5.0%	5.0%	7.8%	1.49 (0.65-3.39)	0.95 (0.27-3.35)
Point prevalence abstinence at week 12	8.9%	10.4%	10.6%	12.8%	6.2%	9.1%	1.21 (0.63-2.33)	1.13 (0.40-3.19)
Point prevalence abstinence at week 26	9.4%	16.7%	10.9%	19.0%	7.1%	15.4%	<b>2.22 (1.20-4.11)</b>	1.04 (0.43-2.52)

5 Data are presented as imputed percentages (%), adjusted Odds Ratios (aOR), and adjusted ratios of the Odds Ratios (aROR) and 95% confidence interval (95%CI) around aOR and aROR. Since multiple  
 6 imputation was used, no absolute numbers are reported within this table; ORs printed in bold are statistically significant (p<0.05).

7 †Logistic regression models with a fixed effect for advice (advice vs. no advice) and random intercepts and slopes (for receipt of advice) for the practices; for the post- vs. pre-training comparison: the time  
 8 variable was added to the model as a fixed and random effect; both models were adjusted for patients' sex, age, level of education, time spent with urges to smoke, and strength of urges to smoke (SUTS<sup>[23]</sup>).  
 9

10