

1 **Mapping the African Tobacco Control Network**

2

3 Scott J. Leischow, Ph.D.; College of Health Solutions; Arizona State University; Phoenix,  
4 Arizona; USA

5 Olalekan Ayo-Yusuf, Ph.D.; Sefako Makgatho Health Sciences University; Pretoria, South  
6 Africa

7 Janet Okamoto, Ph.D.; Susan G. Komen Foundation; Dallas, Texas; USA

8 Mary Warner, D.B.H., PA-C; Department of Physician Assistant Studies; School of Medicine  
9 and Health Sciences; George Washington University; Washington, D.C.; USA

10 Jenny E. Twesten, M.P.H.; The Bizzell Group; New Carrollton, Maryland; USA

11 Chad Stecher, Ph.D.; College of Health Solutions; Arizona State University; Phoenix, Arizona;  
12 USA

13 Thomas W. Valente, Ph.D.; Department of Population and Public Health Sciences; Keck School  
14 of Medicine; University of Southern California; Los Angeles, California; USA

15 Mark Parascandola, Ph.D.; Center for Global Health; National Cancer Institute; National  
16 Institutes of Health; Bethesda, Maryland; USA

17

18 **Corresponding Author**

19 Scott J. Leischow, Ph.D., College of Health Solutions; Arizona State University, Mailcode 9020;  
20 425 North 5<sup>th</sup> Street; Phoenix, Arizona; USA

21 Email: [scott.leischow@asu.edu](mailto:scott.leischow@asu.edu)

22

23 Word Count: 3,554

24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

Keywords: Africa, tobacco control, network, MPOWER, research

**Author Contributions**

Scott J. Leischow, Ph.D.: Developed and coordinated the project, interpreted the results, and contributed to the writing

Olalekan Ayo-Yusuf, Ph.D.: Contributed approaches to assessing the network and contributed to the writing

Janet Okamoto, Ph.D.: Led the development of the instrument, managed implementation, and analyzed data

Mary Warner, D.B.H., PA-C: Contributed results interpretation and contributed to the writing

Jenny E. Twesten, M.P.H.: Contributed to the editing and writing and coordinated the NCI implementation components

Chad Stecher, Ph.D.: Undertook data analysis, interpreted the results, and contributed to the writing

Thomas W. Valente, Ph.D.: Contributed to the study design, including network analytic methods, and interpreted the results

Mark Parascandola, Ph.D.: Contributed to the study design and implementation and contributed to the writing

## 44 **ABSTRACT**

### 45 **Background**

46 To understand the state of tobacco control efforts across Africa, a first-ever survey was  
47 implemented to assess the nature and activities of tobacco control stakeholders across the  
48 African continent.

49

### 50 **Methods**

51 A survey in English, Arabic, and French was made available to individuals and  
52 organizations to assess the types and scope of tobacco control efforts and experience with  
53 tobacco control programs based on FCTC articles/MPOWER components.

54

### 55 **Results**

56 There were 219 respondents from 32 African and 6 non-African countries. Research and  
57 advocacy were the most reported activities, and several organizations emerged as network nodes  
58 for connecting tobacco control efforts across multiple African countries. The most common  
59 FCTC articles/MPOWER components worked on were (W) warning about the dangers of  
60 tobacco (58%), (M) monitor tobacco use and policies (49%), and (P) protection against  
61 secondhand smoke exposure (47%). Significant between-country differences were also found on  
62 some FCTC articles/MPOWER components: (1) (R) price and tax measures [Articles 6 and 15]  
63 (F=1.57, p=0.048), (2) industry interference [Article 5.3] (F=1.62, p=0.038), and (3)  
64 economically viable alternatives to tobacco growing [Article 17] (F=1.94, p=0.007).

65

### 66 **Discussion**

67           This study found a broad and robust tobacco control network across Africa, with multiple  
68 organizations serving those networks and having overlapping collaborations. There is  
69 considerable variability in tobacco control priorities and networking, and multiple barriers were  
70 identified to expanding the network and to fostering increased tobacco control efforts. The  
71 results point to important directions for increasing collaboration across FCTC articles/MPOWER  
72 components to improve tobacco control efforts; potential research opportunities, including an  
73 analysis of tobacco industry activities, an exploration of ways to help people quit tobacco, and  
74 approaches to elevate the cost of tobacco; and a solid tobacco control network foundation on  
75 which to build. However, exploring creative approaches to increase research most relevant to  
76 specific countries and their cultural characteristics is essential.

77

## 78 INTRODUCTION

79 In sub-Saharan Africa, the mean prevalence of current tobacco use is around 10%. [1]  
80 Although overall prevalence of tobacco use is lower in African countries than in some other parts  
81 of the world, the African region is one of only two World Health Organization (WHO) regions  
82 (along with the Eastern Mediterranean region, which includes African countries) in which  
83 tobacco use prevalence has been increasing and is projected to continue to grow. [2] This trend  
84 reflects the impact of rapid population growth, economic growth, and growing tobacco  
85 consumption among young people. At the same time, transnational tobacco companies are  
86 aggressively marketing their products on the continent and are using legal, financial, and  
87 political strategies to counter tobacco control efforts. [3,4] Although tobacco farming has been  
88 promoted by the tobacco industry and some African countries as a means to alleviate poverty and  
89 a reason to oppose tobacco control legislation, studies show that tobacco growing has many  
90 negative consequences for the health and economic well-being of farmers. [2,5,6] Moreover, the  
91 concurrent rise in non-communicable diseases resulting from acute and chronic tobacco use  
92 threatens the fiscal sustainability of African health systems. [7]

93 The WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control (FCTC) created actionable goals  
94 aimed at reducing the supply of and demand for tobacco products. [8] A total of 51 out of 54  
95 African countries ratified the treaty. [9] The WHO MPOWER package includes six evidence-  
96 based strategies for tobacco control aimed at improving public health: (1) monitor tobacco use  
97 and policies, (2) protect people from secondhand smoke, (3) offer help to quit smoking, (4) warn  
98 about the dangers of tobacco, (5) enforce bans on tobacco advertising and promotion, and (6)  
99 raise taxes on tobacco products. [8] Together the WHO FCTC articles and MPOWER  
100 components provide a framework and a shared lexicon for developing, implementing, and

101 categorizing tobacco control policies and programs. Furthermore, Article 5.3 of the FCTC and  
102 related guidelines provide a framework for governmental and non-governmental organizations to  
103 act in a way that protects public health policies from tobacco industry influence.

104 Like other public health endeavors, the implementation of tobacco control strategies are  
105 most effective when multisector, transnational tobacco control networks collaborate to advocate  
106 for the implementation of evidence-based tobacco control policies, neutralize the tobacco  
107 industry's influence, garner funding for research and programs, and create best practices to be  
108 shared with colleagues and governments.[10–13] Successful collaboration is predicated on  
109 effective communication and committed partnerships among a network of advocates,  
110 policymakers, funders, public health practitioners, and researchers.[14] However, there is limited  
111 information on the nature of the regional tobacco control networks in general and the African  
112 regional networks in particular. The aims of this project were therefore to: (1) map the African  
113 tobacco control community; (2) investigate the characteristics of individuals, organizations, and  
114 countries in the resultant African tobacco control network; (3) identify the FCTC articles and  
115 MPOWER components on which tobacco control actors focus; and (4) identify barriers to  
116 fostering tobacco control across the African continent. The results of this study will provide  
117 valuable information to help tobacco control networks on the African continent more effectively  
118 support tobacco control efforts in the region.

119

## 120 **METHODS**

121 This project was a follow-up to the 2015 Tobacco Control in the African Continent:  
122 Research to Practice pre-conference workshop at the African Organization for Research and  
123 Training in Cancer (AORTIC) Conference in Marrakech, Morocco. The goal of the workshop

124 was to identify research and dissemination science efforts that could advance African tobacco  
125 control practices and policies in a feasible and responsible way. Building on the workshop, the  
126 network analysis was undertaken to understand the nature of and collaborations among those  
127 involved with tobacco control across Africa.

128

## 129 **Instrument Design**

130 The specific research questions were drawn primarily from network-analysis studies  
131 dedicated to improving tobacco control efforts that have been previously implemented by  
132 members of the research team[15–20] and that were informed by participants of the 2015 World  
133 Conference on Tobacco or Health[20] as well as standard network research design.[21]  
134 Researchers at the Mayo Clinic, U.S. National Cancer Institute (NCI), Arizona State University,  
135 and University of Southern California developed the survey in collaboration with the WHO  
136 Regional Offices in Africa and the Eastern Mediterranean and the Center for Tobacco Control in  
137 Africa (CTCA).

138 The survey was translated into three languages: English, Arabic, and French. Certified  
139 translations were obtained by the Mayo Clinic and NCI for the Arabic and French translations.  
140 The first page of the survey explained, in all three languages, the goal, aims, and rationale for the  
141 study. Survey respondents were able to choose their preferred language for survey completion.

142 The survey included demographic questions, such as age, education, and organizational  
143 affiliation; areas of tobacco control focus and research by FCTC article; and the types and scope  
144 of the individual respondent's tobacco control efforts and their connections to other individuals  
145 and/or organizations. Tobacco control efforts worked on and researched were categorized by  
146 MPOWER components and FCTC articles that are particularly relevant for Africa (e.g., industry

147 interference, farming). The survey assessed the network of individuals with whom each  
148 respondent worked, elicited suggestions for research priorities, and prompted for barriers to  
149 current tobacco control efforts. A copy of the full questionnaire is available on request.

150

## 151 **Study Implementation**

152 The Mayo Clinic researchers obtained institutional review board (IRB) approval and  
153 managed survey data collection. We contacted several organizations known to be active in  
154 tobacco control in Africa to obtain the names of potential respondents or to request distribution  
155 via their listservs, recruited from an existing listserv of past participants of the AORTIC  
156 Conference tobacco control workshop, and contacted corresponding authors of published  
157 research articles focused on tobacco control efforts in Africa. The solicitation specified that we  
158 were interested in surveying individuals conducting tobacco control activities in Africa.

159 A snowball sampling methodology was used, whereby the survey asked participants to  
160 share the email addresses of as many as five collaborators so that we could contact them to  
161 participate in the survey. All respondents had the same 3-week contact schedule of initial email  
162 solicitation, 1-week reminder email, and final reminder email. The first wave of the  
163 survey was sent to more than 400 individuals in spring 2018, and data were collected into fall  
164 2018 to allow for saturation. Because of the survey deployment methodology, the number of  
165 individuals who received the survey is unknown, due to posts of the survey link on tobacco  
166 control listservs; thus, the research team was unable to calculate a response rate. To incentivize  
167 and encourage participation, respondents were entered into a drawing, on completion of the  
168 survey, for a 1-year membership to the Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco. The  
169 drawing provided as many as 50 people with 1-year memberships (valued at \$3,000).



170

## 171 **Consent Process**

172           This project involved no more than minimal risk to participants, was approved by the  
173 Mayo Clinic IRB, and met all requirements of the Helsinki Agreement.

174

## 175 **Patient and Public Involvement**

176           We did not include the public in the design of the study, but we did include members of  
177 the public in the conduct of the study because we used a snowball approach to circulating the  
178 survey that involved sharing the survey with a broad array of individuals. Once the paper is  
179 published, we will involve members of the public in the dissemination process because we will  
180 share it with the survey participants and others—and will encourage them to share it with others.

181

## 182 **Analytic Methods**

183           Two networks were constructed based on the organizations that respondents reported  
184 working with on tobacco control. First, a country-level network was mapped by creating a  
185 network link or connection between a respondent’s country of residence and each country where  
186 an organization that is listed as a collaborator on tobacco control efforts is located. Each reported  
187 collaboration was given an equal weight, and the number of reported collaborations between two  
188 countries was used as a measure of network connection strength between the countries. This  
189 country-level network was then visualized using the Davidson-Harel layout algorithm in the  
190 “igraph” package in R, where network links between countries were given an equal weight, and  
191 network nodes (i.e., countries) were sized by the country’s number of collaborations with other  
192 countries (i.e., network degree).

193           The second network was constructed at the organization level based on the name of the  
194 organizations listed as collaborators on tobacco control. Similar to the country-level network, a  
195 network link was formed between a respondent’s organization and each organization that was  
196 listed as a collaborator on tobacco control efforts. This organization-level network was also  
197 visualized using the Davidson-Harel layout algorithm in the “igraph” package in R, and network  
198 nodes (i.e., organizations) were sized by the organization’s number of collaborations (i.e.,  
199 network degree).

200

## 201 **RESULTS**

### 202 **Respondent Demographic Data Overall**

203           The respondents included 219 individuals from 32 countries in Africa and 6 countries  
204 outside the African continent. Respondents reported working in tobacco control for a mean of  
205 10.5 years (min=0, max=42, stdev=7.7), with many holding master’s, medical, or doctoral  
206 degrees. Respondents were affiliated with a wide array of organization types based on their self-  
207 reported responses. The affiliations most represented were those from academic institutions  
208 (n=71, 32%), followed by non-profit organizations (n=32, 15%), governmental organizations  
209 (n=23, 10%), medical centers (n=21, 10%), voluntary organizations (n=18, 8%), advocacy  
210 groups (n=16, 7%), research institutions (n=17, 8%), other (n=12, 5%), consulting organizations  
211 (n=5, 2%), and intergovernmental organizations (n=4, 2%). The role in tobacco control most  
212 frequently reported by individual respondents was research (n=58, 33.7%), followed by  
213 advocacy (n=26, 15.1%), other (n=24, 14.0%), capacity-building (n=18, 10.5%), patient care  
214 (n=16, 9.3%), policy development (n=14, 8.1%), legal/law enforcement (n=12, 7.0%), and  
215 community-based program (n=4, 2.3%).

216

## 217 **Connectivity by Country**

218           The average number of total connections for each country was 18.8 (min=1, max=83,  
219 stdev=23.2), while the average monthly connections was 5.2 (min=0, max=28, stdev=6.4). When  
220 only including African countries, the average number of between-country connections was 22.3  
221 (min=1, max=81, stdev=23.0), while the average monthly connections was 6.3 (min=0, max=28,  
222 stdev=6.3). As indicated in Figure 1, there were 45 unique countries represented, and the top 10  
223 countries with the most connections were the United States (n=83), Kenya (n=81), Nigeria  
224 (n=79), South Africa (n=79), Uganda (n=63), Zambia (n=57), Rwanda (n=30), Togo (n=26),  
225 Burkina Faso (n=25), and Tunisia (n=22). Other frequently cited non-African connections were  
226 to individuals or organizations in Canada (n=20), Switzerland (n=17), United Kingdom (n=12),  
227 Jordon (n=4), and France (n=3). In addition, there were multiple countries with one or two  
228 connections.

229

## 230 **Collaborating Organizations**

231           As indicated in figure 2, the most commonly linked organizations in Africa included the  
232 African Tobacco Control Alliance (ATCA) (based in Togo, n=32), Center for Tobacco Control  
233 in Africa (based in Uganda, n=18), African Capacity Building Foundation (based in Zimbabwe,  
234 n=14), and International Institute for Legislative Affairs (based in Kenya, n=11). The most  
235 frequent collaborations involving organizations outside of Africa included the WHO (n=31),  
236 Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids (n=26), and Framework Convention Alliance (n=15).

237

## 238 **FCTC Articles/MPOWER Components**

239 We asked respondents which FCTC articles/MPOWER components were the focus of  
240 their work and/or research. As indicated in Figure 3, the FCTC articles most commonly worked  
241 on were (1) warn about the dangers of tobacco (W, Articles 11 and 12) (58%), (2) monitor  
242 tobacco use and policies (M, Article 20) (49%), and (3) protect against secondhand smoke  
243 exposure (P, Article 8) (47%). These top three FCTC article categories aligned with those who  
244 reported conducting research as well. (See Figure 3.) “Other” articles worked on included  
245 Articles 5.3, 9 and 10, and 16; similarly, other articles researched included Articles 5.3 and 9 and  
246 10 and economic impacts.

247 In addition, we examined whether the FCTC articles/MPOWER components worked on  
248 varied by the country in which the respondent worked. Working on certain specific FCTC  
249 articles/MPOWER components differed by country; that is, some indicated that their country  
250 worked on the following articles, and others did not: (1) raise taxes on tobacco products [R,  
251 Articles 6 and 15] ( $F=1.57$ ,  $p=0.048$ ), (2) industry interference [Article 5.3] ( $F=1.62$ ,  $p=0.038$ ),  
252 and (3) alternatives to tobacco growing [Article 17] ( $F=1.94$ ,  $p=0.007$ ).

253 The top priorities for FCTC articles/MPOWER-related research were similar across  
254 countries for some FCTC articles/MPOWER components. Respondents from different African  
255 countries indicated that the following FCTC articles/MPOWER components were important  
256 research priorities: (1) protecting people from tobacco smoke [P, Article 8], (2) warning about  
257 the dangers of tobacco [W, Articles 11 and 12], (3) enforcing bans on tobacco advertising and  
258 promotion [E, Article 13], (4) offering help to quit smoking [O, Article 14], and (5) monitoring  
259 tobacco use and policies [M, Article 20].

260

261 **Barriers to Tobacco Control in Africa**

262 Respondents were asked to rank on a scale of 1 to 10 “the barriers you face when  
263 conducting tobacco control activities.” In order, the most commonly identified barriers to  
264 tobacco control across African countries were weak funding (mean=7.9), industry interference  
265 (mean=7.3), research not perceived as a priority (mean=6.9), lack of training (mean=6.7), lack of  
266 coordination (mean=6.2), and governmental commitment (mean=6.1).

267

## 268 **DISCUSSION**

269 The goal of this study was to explore the nature and extent of collaborative relationships  
270 dedicated to tobacco control across Africa. Indeed, this first-ever analysis of tobacco control  
271 collaboration efforts across Africa demonstrates that there are extensive collaborations and that  
272 several key organizations function as network nodes. In addition, we found differences in focus  
273 on addressing specific FCTC articles/MPOWER components. The three FCTC  
274 articles/MPOWER components most commonly cited as a focus of activity were: (1) (W) warn  
275 about the dangers of tobacco use, (2) (M) monitor tobacco use and policies (epidemiology and  
276 surveillance), and (3) (P) protect from secondhand smoke exposure. Alternative livelihoods for  
277 tobacco workers (Article 17), reducing industry influence on public health policies (Article 5.3),  
278 and raising the price of tobacco (e.g., via taxes [Articles 6 and 15]) were the least common.  
279 Funding was identified as the top barrier to implementing FCTC articles/MPOWER components,  
280 followed by tobacco industry interference and the lack of a priority on research.

281 The fact that respondents reported limited activity around alternative livelihoods, industry  
282 interference, and tobacco taxation is surprising. Tobacco taxation is among the most cost-  
283 effective tobacco control interventions and can result in economic benefits to governments.[2,22]  
284 Yet, advancing tobacco tax policies can be challenging, as finance ministries may not prioritize

285 tobacco control policies. Additionally, tobacco companies frequently lobby governments to  
286 oppose tobacco tax increases using erroneous arguments about illicit trade.[2] There have been  
287 successful case studies of assisting tobacco farmers to move to other crops. However, there is  
288 considerable variability in the economics of tobacco farming across countries, and some African  
289 countries, such as Malawi, are highly dependent on tobacco growing as a source of livelihoods.  
290 The challenges in moving away from tobacco dependence are complex and subject to global  
291 markets and local supply chains.[23] Further efforts in research and collaboration in tobacco  
292 control across the continent could help address the challenges in advancing tobacco price  
293 increases and in finding alternative livelihoods.

294 Article 5.3 was also not among the highest priority research areas identified at the time of  
295 this survey, but tobacco industry interference was ranked high as a barrier to tobacco control  
296 activities in the African region. Hence, an increased focus on activities to mitigate the risk of  
297 industry interference is essential. Recent efforts in Africa have begun to address Article 5.3. The  
298 Africa Centre for Tobacco Industry Monitoring and Policy Research, an initiative based in South  
299 Africa, has developed capacity for addressing and preventing industry interference in  
300 collaboration with partners, such as ATCA.[24] This initiative was in its infancy at the time of  
301 the survey, and a future follow-up survey would help us understand the impact of this initiative's  
302 work.

303 A range of barriers were highlighted by respondents, including the lack of funding,  
304 industry interference, and the lack of prioritization and training for tobacco control efforts.  
305 Private philanthropies, the U.S. National Institutes of Health (NIH), and cancer advocacy  
306 organizations have provided some funding for specific African tobacco control and research  
307 efforts. However, preventing an increase in tobacco use in African countries will require

308 sustained investment from more diverse sources, including from African institutions. Existing  
309 tools, such as the WHO OneHealth Costing Tool[25] and United Nations Development Program  
310 Tobacco Control Investment Case Studies,[26] could help demonstrate the return on investment  
311 of tobacco control efforts and help make the case to governments for devoting additional  
312 resources to tobacco control programs and policies.

313 Reducing some of the identified barriers and making tobacco control effective requires  
314 coalitions or networks that are dedicated, are data-driven, and have clear goals that can be  
315 achieved. It is clear from the results of this survey that an extensive network dedicated to tobacco  
316 control exists in Africa and is widely spread across most African countries. At the same time, as  
317 Figure 2 demonstrates, we also found considerable variability in engagement and connection.  
318 Some of those who responded to the survey had multiple ties to other tobacco control colleagues,  
319 yet many did not. This variability can be addressed and improved by organizations that function  
320 as knowledge “brokers” who can foster communication across the full network; provide training  
321 where appropriate; share new research and practice results that can benefit other members of the  
322 network; and in general, function as a hub to best ensure that the network can be optimized and  
323 can achieve a high degree of shared situational awareness.[27]

324 Fortunately, there are organizations that have this function, as can be seen in Figure 2.  
325 Although it appears that there are multiple highly central organizations (e.g., ATCA, CTCA), it  
326 is not clear what roles each of these central organizations is playing in the larger network. In  
327 some organizational networks, there exists a “network administrative organization” (NAO) that  
328 serves as a central knowledge broker.[19] An NAO serves as a core connector in the network,  
329 often by virtue of its funding or some administrative decision that creates a central function as

330 the hub of the network. One follow-up of this survey that would benefit tobacco control efforts in  
331 Africa would be to characterize the roles of these centrally located organizations.

332 The network data make it clear that there is considerable variability in tobacco control  
333 network connectivity. Our study results show that there is an elaborate and active tobacco control  
334 network in Africa; at the same time, even greater coordination is possible. Thus, future efforts to  
335 improve tobacco control in Africa would benefit by greater strategic coordination among those  
336 central organizations to best ensure that they are linked in a way that can achieve the greatest  
337 outcomes in multiple countries. Such coordination is certainly a challenge when there are  
338 multiple funders with different priorities as well as significant variations in culture, language,  
339 resources, and governmental structures among African countries. Such variability makes  
340 increased network building and communication more challenging but at the same time more  
341 important. The tobacco industry has the resources to develop tailored approaches for each  
342 country that present a challenge for tobacco control activities to counter in the absence of  
343 effective coordination and communication among those in the tobacco control community.

344 However, the lack of tobacco control research as a priority and the perception of an  
345 unclear research agenda suggest that solidification of the research network could mitigate these  
346 barriers. Recent efforts to develop a research agenda and common tobacco control framework for  
347 Africa are important steps in this direction.[28] At the same time, the perceived lack of  
348 governmental commitment to tobacco control is complex and multifaceted. The lack of  
349 governmental commitment may reflect governance structures that fail to prioritize health and  
350 social well-being or to ensure policy coherence and focal points for tobacco control.[29]  
351 Furthermore, government priorities may lie elsewhere as countries address infectious diseases or



352 other economic priorities; for example, communicable, maternal, perinatal, and nutritional  
353 conditions made up nearly 60% of lost daily adjusted life years in sub-Saharan Africa.[30]

354       There are multiple limitations regarding this study. First, the survey was sent to a large  
355 number of people, in part because a snowball approach was used, so we do not know how  
356 representative this sample is of those involved with tobacco control. In particular, because we  
357 included corresponding authors of research articles published over the past 20 years, we likely  
358 oversampled researchers and missed many tobacco control advocates and others who do not  
359 publish. Moreover, we do not know how many people received the request and chose not to  
360 respond, and we recognize that a snowball approach introduces bias in the sample because  
361 individuals are recommending the survey to those who they know. However, because we worked  
362 with major organizations involved with tobacco control efforts in Africa, we are confident that  
363 the results are meaningful, even if incomplete. Second, these data represent a snapshot in time in  
364 2018 and do not necessarily reflect the current state of tobacco control efforts and collaborations.  
365 However, these data provide an important foundation for understanding the nature of the tobacco  
366 control community from the time that the survey was completed and can serve as a valuable  
367 resource to foster increased collaboration and to identify new areas of priority. Third, because  
368 this survey was conducted in 2018, we recognize that the network has changed since then.  
369 Members of our team are implementing a follow-up to this survey, so these data will serve as a  
370 baseline to assess the tobacco control network changes over time. Fourth, distinctions between  
371 institutions and activities are often not as distinct as responses might appear. For example, some  
372 respondents at academic institutions may conduct research and be activists, so the categorical  
373 responses may not always be as distinct as they would appear to be from the results.

374

375 **DATA AVAILABILITY**

376 Data are available on request.

377

378 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

379 The authors would like to thank the participants of the 2015 Tobacco Control in the African

380 Continent: Research to Practice pre-conference workshop at the AORTIC Conference in

381 Marrakech, Morocco, for catalyzing this project. The authors are grateful to the survey

382 respondents from the tobacco control community in Africa for their participation.

383

384 **COMPETING INTERESTS**

385 Dr. Leischow has been funded in the past year by Achieve Life Sciences to conduct a smoking

386 cessation research study and to provide guidance on their research program, and he has received

387 medications from Pfizer in support of an NIH-funded smoking cessation study. The views and

388 opinions expressed in this paper are those of the authors only and do not necessarily represent the

389 views, official policy, or position of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

390

391

392 **REFERENCES**

393 1. World Health Organization. WHO global report on trends in prevalence of tobacco use

394 2000–2025. 3rd ed. 2019. Available at: [https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/who-global-](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/who-global-report-on-trends-in-prevalence-of-tobacco-use-2000-2025-third-edition)

395 [report-on-trends-in-prevalence-of-tobacco-use-2000-2025-third-edition](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/who-global-report-on-trends-in-prevalence-of-tobacco-use-2000-2025-third-edition). Accessed March 28,

396 2021.

- 397 2. National Cancer Institute and World Health Organization. The economics of tobacco and  
398 tobacco control. Tobacco Control Monograph No. 21. NIH Publication No. 16-CA-8029A.  
399 Bethesda, MD: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of  
400 Health, National Cancer Institute, and Geneva, CH: World Health Organization; 2016.
- 401 3. Crosbie E, Defrank V, Egbe CO, Ayo-Yusuf O, Bialous S. Tobacco supply and demand  
402 strategies used in African countries. *Bull World Health Organ.* 2021;99(7): 539–540.  
403 doi:10.2471/BLT.20.266932.
- 404 4. STOP: A Global Tobacco Industry Watchdog. Buying influence and advantage in Africa: an  
405 analysis of British American Tobacco’s questionable payments. STOP and University of  
406 Bath, September 2021. Available at: [https://bat-uncovered.exposetobacco.org/wp-](https://bat-uncovered.exposetobacco.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/Buying-Influence-Advantage-in-Africa.pdf)  
407 [content/uploads/2021/09/Buying-Influence-Advantage-in-Africa.pdf](https://bat-uncovered.exposetobacco.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/Buying-Influence-Advantage-in-Africa.pdf).
- 408 5. Hu T, Lee AH. Commentary: tobacco control and tobacco farming in African countries. *J*  
409 *Public Health Policy.* 2015;36(1): 41–51. <https://doi.org/10.1057/jphp.2014.47>.
- 410 6. Magati P, Lencucha R, Li Q, Drope J, Labonte R, Appau, A, et al. Costs, contracts and the  
411 narrative of prosperity: an economic analysis of smallholder tobacco farming livelihoods in  
412 Kenya. *Tob Control.* 2019;28(3): 268–273.
- 413 7. Nyaaba GN, Stronks K, de-Graft Aikins A, Kengne AP, Agyemang C. Tracing Africa’s  
414 progress towards implementing the non-communicable diseases global action plan 2013–  
415 2020: a synthesis of WHO country profile reports. *BMC Public Health.* 2017;17(1): 297.  
416 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-017-4199-6>.
- 417 8. World Health Organization. WHO report on the global tobacco epidemic, 2021: addressing  
418 new and emerging products. 2021. Available at:  
419 <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/343287>.

- 420 9. van Walbeek C, Chisha Z. We unpack what some African countries are doing about tobacco  
421 control. October 20, 2021. Available at: [https://theconversation.com/we-unpack-what-some-](https://theconversation.com/we-unpack-what-some-african-countries-are-doing-about-tobacco-control-169842)  
422 [african-countries-are-doing-about-tobacco-control-169842](https://theconversation.com/we-unpack-what-some-african-countries-are-doing-about-tobacco-control-169842). Accessed January 24, 2022.
- 423 10. Brenya E. An overview of a regionalist approach to tobacco control in Africa. *Africa Dev.*  
424 2013;38(1–2): 107–132.
- 425 11. Crosbie E, Sosa P, Glantz SA. Defending strong tobacco packaging and labelling regulations  
426 in Uruguay: transnational tobacco control network versus Philip Morris International. *Tob*  
427 *Control*. 2018;27(2): 185–194.
- 428 12. Mamudu H, Subedi P, Alamin A, Veeranki SP, Owusu D, Poole A, et al. The progress of  
429 tobacco control research in sub-Saharan Africa in the past 50 years: a systematic review of  
430 the design and methods of the studies. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2018;15(12): 2732.  
431 <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph15122732>.
- 432 13. Valente TW, Pitts SR, Wipfli H, Vega Yon GG. Network influences on policy  
433 implementation: evidence from a global health treaty. *Soc Sci Med*. 2019;222: 188–197.
- 434 14. Wisdom JP, Juma P, Mwagomba B, Ndinda C, Mapa-Tassou C, Assah F, et al. Influence of  
435 the WHO framework convention on tobacco control on tobacco legislation and policies in  
436 sub-Saharan Africa. *BMC Public Health*. 2018;18(Suppl 1): 954. doi:10.1186/s12889-018-  
437 5827-5.
- 438 15. Provan KG, Leischow SJ, Keagy J, Nodora J. Research collaboration in the discovery,  
439 development, and delivery networks of a statewide cancer coalition. *Eval Program Plan*.  
440 2010;33(4): 349–355.

- 441 16. Leischow SJ, Luke DA, Mueller N, Harris JK, Ponder P, Marcus S, et al. Mapping U.S.  
442 government tobacco control leadership: networked for success? *Nicotine Tob Res.*  
443 2010;12(9): 888–894.
- 444 17. Harris JK, Provan KG, Johnson KJ, Leischow, SJ. Drawbacks and benefits associated with  
445 inter-organizational collaboration along the discovery – development – delivery continuum: a  
446 cancer research network case study. *Implement Sci.* 2012;7: 69. doi:10.1186/1748-5908-7-  
447 69.
- 448 18. Leischow SJ, Provan K, Beagles J, Bonito J, Ruppel E, Moor G, et al. Mapping tobacco  
449 quitlines in North America: signaling pathways to improve treatment. *Am J Public Health.*  
450 2012;102(11): 2123–2128. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2011.300529.
- 451 19. Mercken L, Saul JE, Lemaire RH, Valente TW, Leischow SJ. Coevolution of information  
452 sharing and practice implementation among North American tobacco cessation quitlines. *Am*  
453 *J Public Health.* 2015;105(9): 1814–1822.
- 454 20. Leischow SJ, Okamoto J, McIntosh S, Ossip DJ, Lando HA. Network analysis of global  
455 tobacco control collaboration: data from the World Conference on Tobacco or Health  
456 (WCTOH). *BMC Public Health.* 2017;17(1): 338. doi: 10.1186/s12889-017-4234-7.
- 457 21. Valente TW. *Social networks and health: models, methods, and applications.* Oxford, UK:  
458 Oxford University Press; 2010.
- 459 22. Chaloupka FJ, Yuekli A, Fong GT. Tobacco taxes as a tobacco control strategy. *Tob Control.*  
460 2012;21: 172e180. doi:10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2011-050417.
- 461 23. Lencucha R, Moyo T, Labonte R, Drope J, Appau A, Makoka D. Shifting from tobacco  
462 growing to alternatives in Malawi? A qualitative analysis of policy and perspectives. *Health*  
463 *Policy Plan.* 2020;35(7): 810–818. <https://doi.org/10.1093/heapol/czaa057>.

- 464 24. Africa Centre for Tobacco Industry Monitoring and Policy Research. February 2022 bulletin.  
465 Available at: <https://www.atim.co.za/>. Accessed March 16, 2022.
- 466 25. World Health Organization. Cost effectiveness and strategic planning (WHO-CHOICE)  
467 OneHealth tool. 2013. Available at: <https://www.who.int/choice/onehealthtool/en/>. Accessed  
468 March 28, 2021.
- 469 26. United Nations Development Program. Investment case for tobacco control in Madagascar.  
470 2019. Available at: [https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/hiv-](https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/hiv-aids/investment-case-for-tobacco-control-in-madagascar.html)  
471 [aids/investment-case-for-tobacco-control-in-madagascar.html](https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/hiv-aids/investment-case-for-tobacco-control-in-madagascar.html). Accessed March 28, 2021.
- 472 27. National Cancer Institute. Greater than the sum: systems thinking in tobacco control.  
473 Tobacco Control Monograph No. 18. NIH Publication No. 06-6085. Bethesda, MD: U.S.  
474 Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health, National Cancer  
475 Institute, April 2007.
- 476 28. Center for Tobacco Control in Africa. Tobacco control research agenda for Africa. 2020.  
477 Available at: [https://ctc-africa.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/Tobacco-Control-Research-](https://ctc-africa.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/Tobacco-Control-Research-Agenda-Africa.pdf)  
478 [Agenda-Africa.pdf](https://ctc-africa.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/Tobacco-Control-Research-Agenda-Africa.pdf). Accessed March 28, 2021.
- 479 29. Drope J, Lencucha R, Magati P, Small R. Tobacco control governance in sub-Saharan  
480 Africa: implementing Article 5.2(a) of the World Health Organization Framework  
481 Convention on Tobacco Control. New York, NY: United Nations Development Programme,  
482 2016.
- 483 30. World Health Organization. A heavy burden: the indirect cost of illness in Africa.  
484 Brazzaville, Congo: WHO Regional Office for Africa, 2019. License: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0  
485 IGO. Available at: <https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/312173/312173-eng.pdf>.  
486 Accessed April 14, 2022.



488 **FIGURES**

489

490 Figure 1. Map of Country-Level Network Connections of Collaborations on Tobacco Control in

491 Africa

492

493

494

495 Figure 2. Organizations Engaged in Tobacco Control in Africa

496

497 *Note:* Nodes are sized on in-degree or the number of incoming ties.

498


499

500 Figure 3. FCTC Articles and MPOWER Components Worked on and Researched by  
501 Respondents

502


503 *Note:* The number to the right of the MPOWER category corresponds to the FCTC article  
504 number.






medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.18.22282513>; this version posted November 18, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. This article is a US Government work. It is not subject to copyright under 17 USC 105 and is also made available for use under a CC0 license.

Figure 1



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.18.22282513>; this version posted November 18, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. This article is a US Government work. It is not subject to copyright under 17 USC 105 and is also made available for use under a CC0 license.

Figure 2



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.18.22282513>; this version posted November 18, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. This article is a US Government work. It is not subject to copyright under 17 USC 105 and is also made available for use under a CC0 license.

Figure 3