Cardiovascular Disease Prevention and Control: Interventions Engaging Community Health Workers

Summary Evidence Table - Smoking Outcomes

Author (s) (Suitability of Design)*	Outcome Name	Baseline: Mean (SD)	End of Intervention:	Change in smoking outcome (Diff. in diff of means OR absolute pct pt change)
Balcazar et al. 2010 (Greatest)	Proportion of participants who currently smokes	Intervention (n=192): 27.0% Comparison (n=136): 30.0%	4 mo. Intervention (n=192): 19.0% Comparison (n=136): 21.0%	1.0 pct pts (NS) Unfavorable direction
Becker et al. 2005 (Greatest)	Proportion of participants who currently smokes	Intervention (n=196): 37% Comparison (n=168): 43.0%	12 mo. Intervention (n=196): 31.0% Comparison (n=168): 40.0%	-3.0 pct pts (p<0.0001) Favorable direction
Hayashi et al. 2010 (Greatest)	Proportion of current smokers	Intervention (n=433): 3.9 % Comparison (n=436):4.4 %	12m Intervention (n=433): 2.5% Comparison (n=436):3.7 %	-0.7 % (P=0.56) Favorable direction
Hill et al. 2003 (Greatest)	Proportion of participants who currently smokes	Intervention (n=125): 84.0% Comparison (n=106): 76.0%	36 mo. Intervention (n=125): 70.0% Comparison (n=106): 65.0%	-3.0 pct pts (NS) Favorable direction
Plescia et al. 2008 (Greatest)	Proportion of participants who currently smokes	Intervention (n=926): 27.3 % Comparison (n=1134):21.1 %	60 mo. Intervention (n=899): 26.6 % Comparison (n= 3023): 22.3 %	-1.9 pct pts (NS) Favorable direction
Adair et al. 2012 (Least)	Proportion of participants NOT using tobacco	Intervention (n=332): 73.0%	12 mo. Intervention (n=332): 77.0%	4.0 pct pts (p=0.002) Favorable direction
Shlay et al. 2011 (Least)†	Proportion of current smokers	Intervention (n=343): 34.2%	12 mo. Intervention (n=340): 30.8%	-3.4 pct pts (NS) Favorable direction
Spinner et al. 2012 (Least)	Proportion of participants smoking	Intervention (n=435): 9.5%	2 mo. Intervention (n=423): 9.2%	-0.285 % (P>0.05) Favorable direction

* Included studies were stratified based on suitability of study designs. Study designs of greatest/moderate suitability include: individual or group randomized controlled trial, non-randomized trial, prospective cohort, case-control, and other designs that have a concurrent comparison group. Study designs least suitable include before-after studies without a comparison group.

toverall study has greatest suitability of design, but health behavior outcomes not reported for comparison group

Abbreviations:

pct pts, percentage points

NS, not significant