Tobacco Use and Secondhand Smoke Exposure: Retailer Education to Restrict Minors' Access to Tobacco Products – Without Reinforcement

Summary Evidence Table

Study	Intervention and comparison elements	Population	Effect measure	Reported baseline	Reported effect	Value used in summary [a]	Follow-up time
Author (Year): Gemson et al. (1998) **Study Period:** 1993–1994 **Design Suitability:** Greatest **Design:** Group randomized trial **Quality of Execution:** Fair (2 limitations) **Evaluation Setting:** Community-wide	**Location:** New York City (Central Harlem), NY **Intervention:** (one of 2 arms) Retailer education **Comparison:** No education or enforcement (usual care)	**Study Population:** Licensed tobacco-selling retailers in the community **Sample Size:** N = 181 at BL N = 152 at F/U	Proportion of retailers selling tobacco products (single cigs or packs) on youth test purchase attempts Education group Comparison group	 100% 94.5%	 77.1% 89.1%	 –27.5 pct points p <0.05	12 mo
Author (Year): Schofield et al. (1997) **Study Period:** 1992 **Design Suitability:** Greatest **Design:** Group randomized trial	**Location:** Australia, New South Wales, U.K. **Intervention:** Retailer education 2 arms: A: Letter only B: Letter plus face-to-face meeting **Comparison:** usual care (included government letter of notification to all	**Study Population:** Tobacco-selling retailers in New South Wales **Sample Size:** n = 272	1) Proportion of retailers requiring proof of age (ID) at test purchase attempt: Letter only group Letter plus meeting Comparison 2) Retailer attitude ("Thinks legislation can be enforced") Letter only group Letter plus meeting Comparison	 12.0% 22.3% 8.6% 39.7% 41.9% 52.9%	 38.8% 43.6% 39.5% 36.8% 43.5% 39.7%	 –4.9 pct points –9.6 pct points Ovrl btwn grp diff (x^2 = 9.5, p = 0.15) +10.3 pct points +15.1 pct points	6 mo

Quality of Execution: Fair (4 limitations) **Evaluation Setting:** ommunity-wide	retailers about the new legislation)		3) Retailer knowledge about the legal age for buying tobacco products Letter only group Letter plus meeting Comparison	 98.6% 96.8% 98.1%	 97.2% 98.4% 94.2%	Ovrl btwn grp diff (x^2 = 5.3, p = 0.50) +2.5 pct points +5.5 pct points Ovrl btwn grp diff (p = 0.69)	
Author (Year): Skretny et al. (1990) **Study Period:** Not reported **Design Suitability:** Greatest **Design:** Group randomized trial **Quality of Execution:** Fair (4 limitations) **Evaluation Setting:** Community-wide	**Location:** Buffalo, NY **Components:** Retailer education **Comparison:** No intervention	**Study Population:** Tobacco-selling retailers **Sample Size:** N = 120 I: n=62 stores C: n=58 stores	Proportion of retailers selling tobacco products on youth test purchase attempts	C = 86%	I = 77% (Note: post-intervention only comparison)	–9.0 pct points p = 0.55	2 weeks

[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

C, control or comparison group

CI, confidence interval

cigs, cigarettes

comp, comparison

edu, education

F/U, follow-up

gr, grade

I or int, intervention

max, maximum

min, minimum

mo, month(s)

NR, not reported

NS, not significant

OR, odds ratio

ovrl btwn grp diff, overall between group difference

pct points, percentage points

pop, population