

Community Mobilization When Coordinated with Additional Interventions

Summary Evidence Table

Study	Intervention and comparison elements	Population	Effect measure	Reported baseline	Reported effect	Value used in summary ^a	Follow-up time
<p>Author (Year): Altman et al. (1991)</p> <p>Study Period: 1988</p> <p>Design Suitability: Moderate</p> <p>Design: Time series</p> <p>Quality of Execution: Fair (3 limitations)</p> <p>Evaluation Setting: Community-wide</p>	<p>Location: 7 towns in Santa Clara County, CA</p> <p>Intervention: Community mobilization plus retailer education</p> <p>Comparison: Before-and-after</p>	<p>Study Population: Retailers selling tobacco products</p> <p>Sample Size: N = 442 stores and vending machines</p>	Proportion of retailers selling tobacco on youth test purchase attempts	74%	59%	-18 pct points 95% CI (-4, -31)	12 mo
<p>Author (Year): Altman et al. (1999)</p> <p>Study Period: 1991–1994</p> <p>Design Suitability: Greatest</p> <p>Design: Group randomized trial</p> <p>Quality of Execution: Fair (3 limitations)</p> <p>Evaluation Setting: Community-wide</p>	<p>Location: Monterey County, CA</p> <p>Intervention: Community mobilization plus retailer education</p> <p>Comparison: Usual care</p>	<p>Study Population: A: Students in grades 7, 9, and 11</p> <p>Sample Size: N = 1274 (median [eligible] students per grade)</p> <p>B: Retailers selling tobacco products N = NR</p>	<p>1) Student self-reported tobacco use in the previous 30 days (mail survey)</p> <p>7th grade 9th grade 11th grade</p> <p>2) Student self-reported purchase of tobacco products in previous 3 mo (mail survey)</p> <p>7th grade 9th grade 11th grade</p> <p>3) Proportion of retailers selling</p>	<p>I = 13% C = 15%</p> <p>I = 18% C = 15%</p> <p>I = 24% C = 10%</p> <p>I = 10.1% C = 10.8%</p> <p>I = 18.6% C = 8.7%</p> <p>I = 19% C = 8.8%</p> <p>I = 75% C = 64%</p>	<p>I = 25% C = 27%</p> <p>I = 17% C = 19%</p> <p>I = 27% C = 25%</p> <p>I = 15% C = 19.5%</p> <p>I = 7.6% C = 16.6%</p> <p>I = 29.4% C = 23%</p> <p>I = 0% C = 39%</p>	<p>0 pct points -5 pct points -2 pct points (11th gr post only comp)</p> <p>-3.8 pct points -3.1 pct points -4.1 pct points (11th gr post only comp)</p>	34 mo

			tobacco on youth test purchase attempts		p <0.001	-50 pct points	
<p>Author (Year): Biglan et al. (2000; 1995; 1996)</p> <p>Study Period: 1991–1995</p> <p>Design Suitability: Greatest</p> <p>Design: Group randomized trial</p> <p>Quality of Execution: Fair (3 limitations)</p> <p>Evaluation Setting: Community-wide</p> <p><i>Note: Biglan 1995 was time series comparison (moderate suitability)</i></p>	<p>Location: 16 communities in Oregon</p> <p>Intervention: Community mobilization plus retailer education plus school-based education</p> <p>Comparison: School-based education only</p>	<p>Study Population and Sample Size:</p> <p>A: Rural communities in OR N = 16</p> <p>B: 7th and 9th grade students (~2100 students in each grade per annual survey)</p> <p><u>Biglan 1995:</u></p> <p>C: Retailers selling tobacco products in 4 communities N = 1597 purchase attempts in 74 stores over study period</p>	<p>1) Student self-reported tobacco use measured as a weekly smoking index</p> <p>2) Student self-reported awareness of efforts to prevent illegal sales</p> <p>3) Parent's perceived community support for tobacco access restrictions</p> <p><u>Biglan 1995:</u></p> <p>4) Proportion of retailers willing to sell tobacco products on youth test purchase attempts</p>	<p>I = 10.5% C = 8.0%</p> <p>NR (negative slope)</p> <p>NR</p> <p>62%</p>	<p>I = 12.0% C = 3.9%</p> <p>NR (positive slope)</p> <p>NR</p> <p>24%</p>	<p>-3.8 pct points 95% CI (0.2, 7.3)</p> <p>p = 0.0026</p> <p>p = 0.006 (yr 4) p = NS (yr 5)</p> <p>-38 pct points Analysis: Slope: NS Intercept: p = .038</p>	<p>4 years NR</p>
<p>Author (Year): Chapman et al. (1994)</p> <p>Study Period: 1992–1993</p> <p>Design Suitability: Greatest</p> <p>Design: Other design with a concurrent comparison group</p> <p>Quality of Execution:</p>	<p>Location: 6 suburbs in Sydney, Australia</p> <p>Intervention: Community mobilization plus retailer education</p> <p>Comparison: Community mobilization</p>	<p>Study Population: Retailers selling tobacco products (note: study group restricted to subset who sold cigarettes to minors at BL)</p> <p>Sample Siz:</p> <p>N = 99 I: n = 50 C: n = 49</p>	<p>Proportion of retailers selling cigarettes on youth test purchase attempts</p> <p>Note: Test minors 12–13 yrs of age</p>	<p>I = 100% C = 100%</p>	<p>I = 31% C = 60% $\chi^2 = 8.14$ (1df) p = 0.004</p>	<p>-29 pct points 95% CI (8, 50)</p>	<p>3 mo</p>

Restricting Minors' Access to Tobacco Products: Community Mobilization – Evidence Table

<p>Fair (4 limitations)</p> <p>Evaluation Setting: Community-wide</p>							
<p>Author (Year): Feighery et al. (1991)</p> <p>Study Period: 1988–1990</p> <p>Design Suitability: Moderate</p> <p>Design: Time series</p> <p>Quality of Execution: Fair (3 limitations)</p> <p>Evaluation Setting: Community-wide</p>	<p>Location: 4 communities in northern California</p> <p>Intervention: 2 arms A: Community mobilization plus retailer education B: Community mobilization plus retailer education plus enforcement</p> <p>Comparison: Before-and-after</p>	<p>Study Population and Sample Size: A: Suburban communities in CA N = 4 B: Tobacco-selling retailers N = 104 in F/U sample</p>	<p>Proportion of retailers selling tobacco on youth test purchase attempts</p> <p>A: mobilization plus education 77%</p> <p>B: mobilization plus education plus active enforcement 75%</p> <p>Note: Active enforcement was added to the program following the initial intervention evaluation</p>		<p>65%</p> <p>35%</p>	<p>-12 pct points 95% CI (1, -24) p >0.05 (NS)</p> <p>-40 pct points, 95%CI(-26,-55) p <0.0001</p>	<p>4 mo</p> <p>2 yrs</p>
<p>Author (Year): Forster et al. (1998)</p> <p>Study Period: 1993–1996</p> <p>Design Suitability: Greatest</p> <p>Design: Group randomized trial</p> <p>Quality of Execution: Fair (3 limitations)</p> <p>Evaluation Setting: Community-wide</p>	<p>Location: 14 rural communities in Minnesota</p> <p>Intervention: Community mobilization plus city ordinances plus enforcement</p> <p>Comparison: Usual care (incl. concurrent media coverage of youth access issues and retailer education efforts conducted by retailers' organizations and the tobacco industry)</p>	<p>Study Population: A: communities in MN</p> <p>Sample Size: N = 14 (randomized to condition) B: Students in grades 8–10 N = 6014 at BL N = 6269 at F/U</p>	<p>1) Student self-reported monthly tobacco use prevalence I = 21.5% C = 20%</p> <p>2) Student smokers self-reported commercial source of most recent cigarette (by gender) I = (M) 28.5% (W) 17.3% C = (M) 24% (W) 18%</p> <p>3) Student perception of high availability of cigarettes from commercial sources I = 79.8% C = 80.1%</p> <p>4) Proportion of youth test purchase attempts that were successful I = 38.8% C = 41.9%</p>	<p>I = 24.9% C = 29%</p> <p>I = (M) 19.5%; (W) 14.3% C = (M) 27.2% (W) 20.5%</p> <p>I = 77.2% C = 83.9%</p> <p>I = 4.9% C = 12.5%</p>	<p>-6.7 pct points 95%CI (-15, +1.5)</p> <p>Men: -12.2 pct pts 95%CI (-21.4, -3.0) Women: -5.5 pct pt 95%CI (-15, +3.8)</p> <p>-6.4 pct points 95%CI (-13.6,-0.1)</p> <p>-4.5 pct points 95%CI (-18.7, 9.7)</p>	<p>32 mo</p>	

Restricting Minors' Access to Tobacco Products: Community Mobilization – Evidence Table

<p>Author (Year): Jason et al. (1996a)</p> <p>Study Period: 1989–1994</p> <p>Design Suitability: Moderate</p> <p>Design: Time series</p> <p>Quality of Execution: Fair (4 limitations)</p> <p>Quality of Execution: Community-wide</p>	<p>Location: Woodbridge, IL</p> <p>Intervention: City ordinance plus community mobilization plus retailer education plus enforcement</p> <p>Comparison: Before-and-after</p>	<p>Study Population and Study Sample: A: Tobacco-selling retailers N = 19–30 B: 7–8th grade students in one local school N = 680 at BL N = 639 at F/U</p>	<p>1) Student self-reported regular tobacco use</p> <p>2) Proportion of retailers selling tobacco on youth test purchase attempts</p>	<p>16%</p> <p>79%</p>	<p>5%</p> <p>11%</p>	<p>–11 pct points</p> <p>–68 pct points</p>	<p>2 yrs</p> <p>6 yrs</p>
<p>Author (Year): Junck et al. (1997)</p> <p>Study Period: 1994–1995</p> <p>Design Suitability: Moderate</p> <p>Design: time series</p> <p>Quality of Execution: Fair (4 limitations)</p> <p>Quality of Execution: Community-wide</p>	<p>Location: Manley, Australia</p> <p>Intervention: Community mobilization plus retailer education</p> <p>Comparison: Before-and-after</p>	<p>Study Population: All tobacco-selling retailers in Manley</p> <p>Sample Size: N = 54</p>	<p>Proportion of retailers selling cigarettes on youth test purchase attempts by level of enforcement</p> <p>Note: Results based on a single purchase attempt. Sales rates were higher (85% at baseline) when up to 3 purchase attempts were made</p>	<p>52%</p>	<p>14%</p>	<p>–38 pct points</p>	<p>10 mo</p>
<p>Author (Year): Wildey et al. (1995)</p> <p>Study Period: 1990–1991</p> <p>Design Suitability: Greatest</p> <p>Design: Group non-randomized trial</p>	<p>Location: 6 communities in San Diego, CA</p> <p>Intervention: Community mobilization plus retailer education</p> <p>Comparison: Community mobilization</p>	<p>Study Population and Sample Size: A: Communities N = 6 B: Tobacco-selling retailers in study communities N = 292 at BL</p>	<p>Proportion of retailers willing to sell tobacco on youth test purchase attempts</p>	<p>I = 69.9% C = 65%</p>	<p>I = 32% p <0.001 C = 56%</p>	<p>–28.9 pct points</p>	<p>11 mo</p>

Quality of Execution: Fair (3 limitations)		N = 236 at F/U					
Quality of Execution: Community-wide							

^a This is the value used to summarize the evidence and to develop the recommendation. We converted measurements of “retailers refusing to sell” to measurements of “retailers willing to sell” for consistency.

Abbreviations

- | | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| BL, baseline | min, minimum |
| C, control or comparison group | mo, month(s) |
| CI, confidence interval | NR, not reported |
| cigs, cigarettes | NS, not significant |
| comp, comparison | OR, odds ratio |
| edu, education | ovrl btwn grp diff, overall between group difference |
| F/U, follow-up | pct points, percentage points |
| gr, grade | pop, populations |
| I or int, intervention | W, women |
| M, men | yrs, years |
| max, maximum | |