

Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation

Farley, A.C., Hajek, P., Lycett, D. and Aveyard, P.

Published version deposited in CURVE June 2013

Original citation & hyperlink:

Farley, A.C., Hajek, P., Lycett, D. and Aveyard, P. (2012) Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation. The Cochrane Library, volume 1. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD006219.pub3</u>

Copyright © and Moral Rights are retained by the author(s) and/ or other copyright owners. A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge. This item cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder(s). The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

CURVE is the Institutional Repository for Coventry University
<u>http://curve.coventry.ac.uk/open</u>

Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation (Review)

Farley AC, Hajek P, Lycett D, Aveyard P



This is a reprint of a Cochrane review, prepared and maintained by The Cochrane Collaboration and published in *The Cochrane Library* 2012, Issue 1

http://www.thecochranelibrary.com



TABLE OF CONTENTS

HEADER	1
ABSTRACT	1
PLAIN LANGUAGE SUMMARY	2
BACKGROUND	3
OBJECTIVES	4
METHODS	4
RESULTS	6
Figure 1	10
DISCUSSION	12
AUTHORS' CONCLUSIONS	15
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	15
REFERENCES	16
CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDIES	38
DATA AND ANALYSES	104
Analysis 1.1. Comparison 1 Pharmacological interventions versus placebo for post cessation weight control: weight change,	
Outcome 1 Mean weight change (kg) at end of treatment.	111
Analysis 1.2. Comparison 1 Pharmacological interventions versus placebo for post cessation weight control: weight change.	
Outcome 2 Mean weight change (kg) at 6 months.	112
Analysis 1.3. Comparison 1 Pharmacological interventions versus placebo for post cessation weight control: weight change.	
Outcome 3 Mean weight change (kg) at 12 months	113
Analysis 2.1 Comparison 2 Pharmacological interventions versus placebo for post cessation weight control: smoking	115
cessation Outcome 1 Abstinence at 6 months	114
Analysis 2.2. Comparison 2. Pharmacological interventions versus placebo for post constaint weight control: smalking	114
cessation Outcome 2 Abstinence at 12 months	115
Analysis 3.1. Comparison 3. Bahavioural weight management interventions versus advice or no intervention, weight change	11)
Analysis 5.1. Comparison 5 behavioural weight management interventions versus advice of no intervention, weight change,	116
Andreis 2.2. Communication 2. Bub mission local bub more strategic and s	110
Analysis 5.2. Comparison 5 Benavioural weight management interventions versus advice of no intervention: weight change,	117
	11/
Analysis 5.5. Comparison 5 Benavioural weight management interventions versus advice of no intervention: weight change,	110
	110
Analysis 4.1. Comparison 4 behavioural weight management interventions versus advice or no intervention: smoking	110
cessation, Outcome l'Abstinence at 6 months.	119
Analysis 4.2. Comparison 4 Behavioural weight management interventions versus advice or no intervention: smoking	120
cessation, Outcome 2 Abstinence at 12 months.	120
Analysis 5.1. Comparison 5 CB1 to accept moderate weight gain versus no behavioural weight advice: smoking cessation,	101
	121
Analysis 5.2. Comparison 5 CB1 to accept moderate weight gain versus no behavioural weight advice: smoking cessation,	100
Outcome 2 Abstinence at 12 months.	122
Analysis 6.1. Comparison 6 CB1 to accept moderate weight gain versus no behavioural weight advice: weight change,	100
Outcome I Mean weight change (kg) at end of treatment.	123
Analysis 6.2. Comparison 6 CB1 to accept moderate weight gain versus no behavioural weight advice: weight change,	
Outcome 2 Mean weight change (kg) at 6 months.	124
Analysis 6.3. Comparison 6 CBT to accept moderate weight gain versus no behavioural weight advice: weight change,	
Outcome 3 Mean weight change (kg) at 12 months.	125
Analysis 7.1. Comparison 7 All types of antidepressant versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change, Outcome 1	
Mean weight change (kg) at end of treatment.	126
Analysis 7.2. Comparison 7 All types of antidepressant versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change, Outcome 2	
Mean weight change (kg) at end of treatment: dose response.	127
Analysis 7.3. Comparison 7 All types of antidepressant versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change, Outcome 3	
Mean weight change (kg) at 6 months	128
Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation (Review)	i

Analysis 7.4. Comparison 7 All types of antidepressant versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change, Outcome	4
Mean weight change (kg) at 6 months: dose response.	129
Analysis 7.5. Comparison 7 All types of antidepressant versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change, Outcome	5
Mean weight change (kg) at 12 months.	130
Analysis 7.6. Comparison 7 All types of antidepressant versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change, Outcome	6
Mean weight change (kg) at 12 months: dose response.	131
Analysis 8.1. Comparison 8 Exercise interventions versus no exercise for smoking cessation: weight change, Outcome 1	
Mean weight change (kg) at end of treatment	132
Analysis 8.2. Comparison 8 Exercise interventions versus no exercise for smoking cessation: weight change, Outcome 2	5
Mean weight change (kg) at 12 months.	133
Analysis 9.1. Comparison 9 All types of NRT versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change, Outcome 1 Mean	
weight change (kg) at end of treatment.	134
Analysis 9.2. Comparison 9 All types of NRT versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change, Outcome 2 Mean	
weight change (kg) at end of treatment: patch v spray.	135
Analysis 9.3. Comparison 9 All types of NRT versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change, Outcome 3 Mean	
weight change (Kg) at end of treatment: lozenge v gum.	136
Analysis 9.4. Comparison 9 All types of NRT versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change, Outcome 4 Mean	
weight change (kg) at end of treatment: dose response.	137
Analysis 9.5. Comparison 9 All types of NRT versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change, Outcome 5 Mean	
weight change (kg) at 6 months.	138
Analysis 9.6. Comparison 9 All types of NRT versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change. Outcome 6 Mean	
weight change (kg) at 6 months; patch v spray.	139
Analysis 9.7. Comparison 9 All types of NRT versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change, Outcome 7 Mean	
weight change (kg) at 6 months: lozenge v gum.	140
Analysis 9.8. Comparison 9 All types of NRT versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change. Outcome 8 Mean	
weight change (kg) at 12 months.	141
Analysis 9.9. Comparison 9 All types of NRT versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change. Outcome 9 Mean	
weight change (kg) at 12 months: lozenge v gum.	142
Analysis 9.10. Comparison 9 All types of NRT versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change. Outcome 10 Mea	n
weight change (kg) at 12 months: dose response.	143
Analysis 9.11. Comparison 9 All types of NRT versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change. Outcome 11 Mea	ne
weight change (kg) at 12 months: longer course vs. shorter.	144
Analysis 10.1. Comparison 10 Varenicline versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change. Outcome 1 Mean weig	ht
change (kg) at end of treatment.	145
Analysis 10.2. Comparison 10 Varenicline versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change. Outcome 2 Mean weig	ht
change (kg) at 6 months	146
Analysis 10.3. Comparison 10 Varenicline versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change. Outcome 3 Mean weig	ht
change (kg) at 12 months	146
Analysis 11.1. Comparison 11 Varenicline versus bupropion: weight change. Outcome 1 Mean weight change (kg) at et	nd
of treatment.	147
Analysis 12.1. Comparison 12 Varenicline versus NRT: weight change. Outcome 1 Mean weight change (kg) at end of	:
treatment.	147
WHAT'S NEW	147
HISTORY	148
CONTRIBUTIONS OF AUTHORS	148
DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	148
SOURCES OF SUPPORT	148
INDEX TERMS	149
midlar relation of the termination of t	14)

[Intervention Review]

Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation

Amanda C Farley¹, Peter Hajek², Deborah Lycett¹, Paul Aveyard¹

¹Primary Care Clinical Sciences, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK. ²Wolfson Institute of Preventive Medicine, Queen Mary's School of Medicine and Dentistry, London, UK

Contact address: Paul Aveyard, Primary Care Clinical Sciences, University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, Birmingham, West Midlands, B15 2TT, UK. p.n.aveyard@bham.ac.uk.

Editorial group: Cochrane Tobacco Addiction Group.

Publication status and date: New search for studies and content updated (no change to conclusions), published in Issue 1, 2012. Review content assessed as up-to-date: 7 October 2011.

Citation: Farley AC, Hajek P, Lycett D, Aveyard P. Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2012, Issue 1. Art. No.: CD006219. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD006219.pub3.

Copyright © 2012 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

ABSTRACT

Background

Most people who stop smoking gain weight. There are some interventions that have been designed to reduce weight gain when stopping smoking. Some smoking cessation interventions may also limit weight gain although their effect on weight has not been reviewed.

Objectives

To systematically review the effect of: (1) Interventions targeting post-cessation weight gain on weight change and smoking cessation.

(2) Interventions designed to aid smoking cessation that may also plausibly affect weight on post-cessation weight change.

Search methods

Part 1 - We searched the Cochrane Tobacco Addiction Group's Specialized Register and CENTRAL in September 2011.

Part 2 - In addition we searched the included studies in the following "parent" Cochrane reviews: nicotine replacement therapy (NRT), antidepressants, nicotine receptor partial agonists, cannabinoid type 1 receptor antagonists and exercise interventions for smoking cessation published in Issue 9, 2011 of the Cochrane Library.

Selection criteria

Part 1 - We included trials of interventions that were targeted at post-cessation weight gain and had measured weight at any follow up point and/or smoking cessation six or more months after quit day.

Part 2 - We included trials that had been included in the selected parent Cochrane reviews if they had reported weight gain at any time point.

Data collection and analysis

We extracted data on baseline characteristics of the study population, intervention, outcome and study quality. Change in weight was expressed as difference in weight change from baseline to follow up between trial arms and was reported in abstinent smokers only. Abstinence from smoking was expressed as a risk ratio (RR). We used the most rigorous definition of abstinence available in each trial. Where appropriate, we performed meta-analysis using the inverse variance method for weight and Mantel-Haenszel method for smoking using a fixed-effect model.

Main results

Part 1: Some pharmacological interventions tested for limiting post cessation weight gain (PCWG) resulted in a significant reduction in WG at the end of treatment (dexfenfluramine (Mean difference (MD) -2.50kg, 95% confidence interval (CI) -2.98 to -2.02, 1 study), phenylpropanolamine (MD -0.50kg, 95% CI-0.80 to -0.20, N=3), naltrexone (MD -0.78kg, 95% CI-1.52 to -0.05, N=2). There was no evidence that treatment reduced weight at 6 or 12 months (m). No pharmacological intervention significantly affected smoking cessation rates.

Weight management education only was associated with no reduction in PCWG at end of treatment (6 or 12m). However these interventions significantly reduced abstinence at 12m (Risk ratio (RR) 0.66, 95% CI 0.48 to 0.90, N=2). Personalised weight management support reduced PCWG at 12m (MD -2.58kg, 95% CI -5.11 to-0.05, N=2) and was not associated with a significant reduction of abstinence at 12m (RR 0.74, 95% CI 0.39 to 1.43, N=2). A very low calorie diet (VLCD) significantly reduced PCWG at end of treatment (MD -3.70kg, 95% CI-4.82 to-2.58, N=1), but not significantly so at 12m (MD -1.30kg, 95% CI-3.49 to 0.89, N=1). The VLCD increased chances of abstinence at 12m (RR 1.73, 95% CI 1.10 to 2.73, N=1). There was no evidence that cognitive behavioural therapy to allay concern about weight gain (CBT) reduced PCWG, but there was some evidence of increased PCWG at 6m (MD 0.74, 95% CI 0.24 to 1.24). It was associated with improved abstinence at 6m (RR 1.83, 95% CI 1.07 to 3.13, N=2) but not at 12m (RR 1.25, 95% CI 0.83 to 1.86, N=2). However, there was significant statistical heterogeneity.

Part 2: We found no evidence that exercise interventions significantly reduced PCWG at end of treatment (MD -0.25kg, 95% CI-0.78 to 0.29, N=4) however a significant reduction was found at 12m (MD -2.07kg, 95% CI-3.78 to-0.36, N=3).

Both bupropion and fluoxetine limited PCWG at the end of treatment (bupropion MD -1.12kg, 95% CI-1.47 to-0.77, N=7) (fluoxetine MD -0.99kg, 95% CI-1.36 to-0.61, N=2). There was no evidence that the effect persisted at 6m (bupropion MD -0.58kg, 95% CI-2.16 to 1.00, N=4), (fluoxetine MD -0.01kg, 95% CI-1.11 to 1.10, N=2) or 12m (bupropion MD -0.38kg, 95% CI-2.00 to 1.24, N=4). There were no data on WG at 12m for fluoxetine.

Overall, treatment with NRT attenuated PCWG at the end of treatment (MD -0.69kg, 95% CI-0.88 to-0.51, N=19), with no strong evidence that the effect differed for the different forms of NRT. There was evidence of significant statistical heterogeneity caused by one study which reported a 4.3kg reduction in PCWG due to NRT. With this study removed, the difference in weight change at end of treatment was -0.45kg (95% CI-0.66 to-0.27, N=18). There was no evidence of an effect on PCWG at 12m (MD -0.42kg, 95% CI-0.92 to 0.08, N=15).

We found evidence that varenicline significantly reduced PCWG at end of treatment (MD -0.41kg, 95% CI-0.63 to-0.19, N=11), but this effect was not maintained at 6 or 12m. Three studies compared the effect of bupropion to varenicline. Participants taking bupropion gained significantly less weight at the end of treatment (-0.51kg (95% CI-0.93 to-0.09kg), N=3). Direct comparison showed no significant difference in PCWG between varenicline and NRT.

Authors' conclusions

Although some pharmacotherapies tested to limit PCWG show evidence of short-term success, other problems with them and the lack of data on long-term efficacy limits their use. Weight management education only, is not effective and may reduce abstinence. Personalised weight management support may be effective and not reduce abstinence, but there are too few data to be sure. One study showed a VLCD increased abstinence but did not prevent WG in the longer term. CBT to accept WG did not limit PCWG and may not promote abstinence in the long term. Exercise interventions significantly reduced weight in the long term, but not the short term. More studies are needed to clarify whether this is an effect of treatment or a chance finding. Bupropion, fluoxetine, NRT and varenicline reduce PCWG while using the medication. Although this effect was not maintained one year after stopping smoking, the evidence is insufficient to exclude a modest long-term effect. The data are not sufficient to make strong clinical recommendations for effective programmes to prevent weight gain after cessation.

PLAIN LANGUAGE SUMMARY

Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation

When giving up smoking, most people put on weight. Many smokers are concerned about this and say it may put them off making an attempt quit. Some studies show that weight gain also leads to people resuming smoking after an initially successful quit attempt. On the other hand, there are good reasons to believe that trying to limit weight gain may reduce the chance of stopping smoking. Several

drug and behavioural programmes to limit post cessation weight gain have been tested. Of the drug treatments, naltrexone showed the most promise, but there were no data on its effects on weight once drug treatment stopped and there was not enough evidence to judge its effects on long term quitting. Weight management education alone did not limit weight gain and may undermine cessation. Weight management education with personalised support giving feedback on personal goals and a personal energy prescription limited weight gain and there was no evidence that it undermined cessation. Intermittent use of a VLCD improved cessation success and weight gain in the short term but not in the longer term.

Some smoking cessation treatments also limited weight gain. Bupropion, fluoxetine, NRT and varenicline all limited weight gain during treatment, however the effects on weight gain reduction were smaller after the treatment had stopped and there was insufficient evidence to be sure that these effects persisted in the long-term. There was some evidence to suggest that exercise reduced post cessation weight gain but more studies are needed to clarify whether this was a chance finding. The effects of all interventions were modest in relation to the average weight gain that follows stopping smoking.

BACKGROUND

Although smoking cessation is associated with substantial health benefits, it is usually accompanied by weight gain (Klesges 1997). In the USA it is estimated that 80 percent of people who quit smoking gain weight (USDHHS 1990). Studies have found that on average women gain more weight than men. Among people who sustained quitting for five years, O'Hara 1998 found that women gained 5.2 kg in year one and a mean of 3.4 kg in years one to five, while men gained a mean of 4.9 kg in year one and a mean of 2.6 kg in years one to five. As well as gaining more weight, a large cohort study showed that 13% of women compared with 10% of men had a major weight gain greater than 13kg (Williamson 1991). Weight gain in people who sustained quitting for eight years has been shown to be 9kg (7kg above those who continued to smoke during this time), with 42% of people gaining over 10kg (Lycett 2011). This weight gain can have health consequences, with the incidence of diabetes being higher in smokers that quit smoking than continue with it, an effect that appeared to be explained by weight gain (Davey Smith 2005; Yeh 2010). Weight gain also reduces some of the benefits of quitting smoking on lung function (Chinn 2005).

Among smokers there is a high prevalence of concerns about postcessation weight gain, and it has been cited as a primary reason for putting off quit attempts, especially in women (Clark 2004; Klesges 1989; Klesges 1992). Weight consciousness has been found to predict current smoking (Weekley 1992), and weight gain experienced during or after smoking cessation has been associated with relapse (Klesges 1988; Klesges 1989; Klesges 1992). However there is inconsistent evidence that fear of weight gain or actual weight gain after quitting does in fact lead to relapse. An equal number of studies show that it does (1 Copeland 2006; Pomerleau 2001; Meyers 1997; Clark 2006) and does not (Killen 1996; Hutter 2006; Mizes 1998; Fidler 2009), and methodological differences make it hard to draw a conclusion one way or the other.

Some smoking cessation interventions have been developed to promote smoking cessation and simultaneously control weight gain in challenging populations, such as weight-concerned smokers. They include behavioural interventions, such as exercise and energy restriction or healthy eating advice. Dietary interventions might serve to encourage reluctant quitters to try to stop smoking if they can be reassured that weight gain might be limited (Filozof 2004). However, it is possible that such interventions might also risk undermining the success of the quit attempt (1 Hall 1992). There is evidence that hunger and cigarette cravings are related, and that hunger can undermine quit efforts (1 Hall 1992) and that hunger increases urges to smoke in current smokers (Cheskin 2005). Additionally, early weight gain has also been found to be associated with successful cessation (Gritz 1988; Hall 1986; Hughes 1991). This suggests interventions that limit dietary intake may potentially reduce smoking cessation success and the adage that smokers should stop smoking first and then diet and not do these concurrently has become common in smoking cessation clinics.

There are a range of other treatments for smoking cessation that have been developed independently of concerns about weight gain, with the sole aim of assisting smoking cessation. Some of these, such as nicotine replacement therapy, antidepressants, varenicline and exercise might plausibly influence weight gain as well as smoking cessation. The effects of these interventions on smoking cessation are evaluated in the relevant Cochrane reviews, but the effects on weight gain are summarised only in the exercise intervention review (Ussher 2008). The effects of these medications on weight gain will therefore be included in this review.

In this review, we examine the effect of interventions on weight gain in abstinent smokers only, for several reasons. Firstly, if we included those who were not abstinent mean weight gain would

be reduced. This is because people who try to become abstinent but fail after a few days do not gain weight, while those who relapse to smoking seem to lose the weight they gained previously (O'Hara 1998; Lycett 2011). Thus the average weight gain of a mixed population of abstinent and non-abstinent smokers would not reflect the weight gain of either. Secondly, this effect could bias trial results. If an intervention increased abstinence rates, it is very likely that it would appear to increase weight gain, regardless of whether it actually suppressed weight gain or had no effect. Thirdly, those who return to smoking tend not attend clinics for follow up. Authors typically only report weight data in abstinent smokers and imputing missing data on this weight is problematic. We have so little data on the weight trajectory of people who try and fail to achieve abstinence. It is likely that the weight will depend on time since relapse and that simple practices as used in weight loss trials, such as last observation forward or baseline observation carried forward, are likely to be misleading. For these reasons, we eschew the intention to treat approach which is typically used in the Tobacco Addiction Review Group's reviews. This issue has been discussed elsewhere (Parsons, 2009b; Spring 2011a; Parsons 2011; Spring 2011b).

OBJECTIVES

To review the evidence from two kinds of trials:

Primary objectives

(i) Part 1 - The effects of interventions specifically designed to limit weight gain on two outcomes: weight gain (at end of treatment, 6 and 12 months), and smoking cessation (at 6 and 12 months).

(ii) Part 2 - The effects of antidepressants, exercise, nicotine replacement therapy,varenicline and rimonabant on weight gain (at end of treatment, 6 and 12 months).

METHODS

Criteria for considering studies for this review

Types of studies

Randomized controlled trials

Types of participants

Adult smokers attempting to quit smoking.

Types of interventions

Part 1 - Interventions that are designed specifically to limit post cessation weight gain.

Part 2 - Smoking cessation interventions that are not designed primarily to limit post cessation weight gain but which might plausibly influence it, i.e. antidepressants, exercise, nicotine replacement therapy (NRT), rimonabant and varenicline.

Types of outcome measures

There are two primary outcome measures: (i) Smoking status six months or more after quitting (ii) Mean (SD) change in body weight (kg) from baseline to follow up in abstainers only.

Both outcomes will be fully examined for studies that fit the criteria for Part 1. For Part 2 studies, effects of these interventions on smoking are reported in the parent Cochrane reviews and therefore we will only report the effects of interventions on weight change.

Search methods for identification of studies

Part 1 - We searched the Cochrane Tobacco Addiction Group's Specialized Register of trials in September 2011, using the following search terms in title, abstract or keywords: food, calorie restrict*, intake, diet*, body mass index (BMI), Quetelet, waisthip ratio (WHR), weight, body-weight, weight-changes. At the search date the specialized register included reports of trials indexed in MEDLINE to update 20110826, EMBASE to 2011 week 33, PsycINFO to 20110822 and Web of Science, together with hand searching of specialist journals, conference proceedings, online registers of controlled trials and reference lists of previous trials and overviews. In addition, we performed citation searches of studies included in part 1 to exhaust possibilities of finding published weight data.

Part 2 - We searched the following Cochrane reviews: Antidepressants for smoking cessation (latest search, Jul 2009) Hughes 2007, Exercise interventions for smoking cessation (latest search, July 2008) Ussher 2008, Nicotine replacement therapy for smoking cessation (latest search, Oct 2007) Stead 2008, Cannabinoid type 1 receptor antagonists (rimonabant) for smoking cessation (latest search, Jan 2011) Cahill 2011a and Nicotine receptor partial agonists for smoking cessation (latest search, Oct 2010) Cahill 2011b published in Issue 9 2011 of the Cochrane library. The text of references listed as included studies were searched except for the nicotine receptor partial agonists for smoking cessation review where we were only interested in trials of varenicline. In addition we searched the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL) Issue 4, 2011 to identify trials relevant to the Part 2 reviews published since the last update. Thie following strategies were used:

Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation (Review)

Copyright $\textcircled{\sc c}$ 2012 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

(smoking OR smoking cessation OR Tobacco) AND (nicotine OR nicotine replacement therapy OR lozenge OR patch OR gum OR inhaler OR microtab OR nasal spray)

(smoking OR smoking cessation OR Tobacco) AND (antidepressant\$ OR bupropion OR zyban)

(smoking OR smoking cessation OR Tobacco) AND (varenicline OR nicotine partial agonist OR champix OR chantix)

Data collection and analysis

Two people independently identified studies that fulfilled the inclusion criteria and extracted data. Any discrepancies were discussed and resolved. Papers published in a foreign language were translated into English. Where weight gain had been measured but not reported at all or in full we contacted authors or sponsors for clarification. If we were unable to successfully contact an author or sponsor, studies were excluded from the review.

For studies in Part 1, we extracted data on baseline characteristics, the intervention, smoking, weight data relevant to study quality. Where possible we extracted smoking outcomes as continuous biochemically confirmed abstinence, however we accepted less strict definitions if confirmed continuous abstinence was not available. We checked that, for smoking abstinence estimates, participants lost to follow up were coded as smokers and therefore all randomised participants were included in the denominator and if not we corrected abstinence rates for this. Abstinence rates and their corresponding risk ratio (95% CI) were reported at 6 and 12 months of follow up. For studies in Part 2, we extracted data on weight gain only.

The absolute mean (SD) difference in body weight (kg) from baseline to follow up by trial arm was used as a summary statistic for the treatment effect on weight. Mean weight change was estimated in those abstinent from smoking only.

In some studies mean (SD) weight change by trial arm was not reported in full. When the standard deviations for the changes in body weight were not present, we used various different methods to calculate them using standard formulas depending on the information available. This was mainly derived from confidence intervals and standard errors. To calculate standard deviations of the changes in weight from their associated confidence intervals for studies with large sample size, we used the following formula: SD = ($\sqrt{(n)} \times$ (upper limit - lower limit)) /standard error wide For studies with 95% confidence intervals for difference in means we divided by 3.92 standard errors wide. If sample size was less than 60, the 3.92 standard error wide was replaced with numbers specific to both the t-distribution and the group sample size minus 1.

To calculate standard deviation from standard error we used the follow formula:

SD=SE x $\sqrt{(n)}$

When the absolute mean differences in body weight were not reported explicitly, we calculated them by subtracting the baseline mean weights from the post-intervention mean weights for the intervention and control groups. SDs were calculated by using an estimated correlation coefficient of 0.99, which describes how similar the baseline and finishing weight were across participants. This was estimated in abstinent smokers from raw data that we have collected from a trial to prevent weight gain on smoking cessation (Parsons 2009) and from any other included studies that report standard deviations for mean weight at baseline, final measurement, and changes in means. To estimate the correlation coefficient for the intervention and control groups from other studies reporting starting and finishing means with SDs, we used the following formula:

r = (SD (B)2 + SD (F)2 - SD (C)2) / (2 X SD(B) X SD (F)).

[where r= correlation coefficient, SD= standard deviation for the changes in means, B= baseline, F= final measurement, and C= change in mean weight measurement.]

The imputed correlation coefficient was used to calculate the missing standard deviations for changes in means for the intervention and control groups by using the following formula:

 $SD(C) = \sqrt{((SD(B)2 + SD(F)2) - (2 X r X SD(B) X SD(F)))}$

Part 2 - As data have already been extracted on the participants, interventions and study quality in the Cochrane reviews included in Part 2 we extracted only data about weight gain. Weight data was extracted using the same approach as described in Part 1.

In some studies in Part 1 and 2, more than one trial arm had been compared with a control arm. Where appropriate, to create one comparison intervention arm we combined outcome data. For smoking we added together the numerator and denominator from each arm. Weight outcomes from more than one trial arm were calculated using the following formulas:

 $Mean_c = ((Mean1^*n1) + (Mean2^*n2))/(n1+n2)$

Standard deviation= $\sqrt{\text{var}_c}$

 $\sqrt{\text{var}_{c}} = (\text{sumsq}_{c} - (n_{c} * (\text{Mean}_{c}^{2})))/(n_{c}-1)$

 $sumsq_c = (((n1-1)^*(var1 + ((n1/n1-1))^*(mean1^2) + ((n2-1)^*(var2 + ((n2/n2-1))^*(mean2^2))$

Key: Mean_c = Combined mean, sumsq=sum of squares

For studies in Part 1, we rated the potential for bias of included trials on methods of randomisation, allocation concealment and blinding following methods described in the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (Handbook 2005). This had already been performed for studies in Part 2 in the parent reviews.

Smoking cessation outcome data are given based on the number of quitters in the treatment and control groups divided by the total number of participants receiving treatment and reported as a risk ratio with 95% confidence intervals. A risk ratio greater than 1.0 indicates that more people quit in the treatment group than in the control group. Therefore, effective interventions appear to the right of the axis on the meta-analysis graph. We used the Mantel-Haenszel fixed-effect method for smoking cessation outcomes where appropriate. Weight change outcome data are given as the difference in mean weight change between the intervention and

Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation (Review) Copyright © 2012 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

control arms and estimates were combined using the inverse variance method where appropriate. The I² statistic was used to investigate statistical heterogeneity, given by the formula $[(Q-df)/Q] \times 100\%$, where Q is the chi-squared statistic and 'df' is its degrees of freedom.

RESULTS

Description of studies

See: Characteristics of included studies; Characteristics of excluded studies.

Interventions specifically designed to address post cessation weight gain

We found 16 trials which matched our inclusion criteria for the first part of the review. Two of these studies contributed data to both Parts 1 and 2 of the review (1 Cooper 2005; 1 Spring 1995). All studies recruited community volunteers who wanted to stop smoking and avoid weight gain. Nine studies recruited women only (1 Cooper 2005; 1 Copeland 2006; 1 Danielsson 1999; 1 Klesges 1990;1 Levine 2010 1 Perkins 2001; 1 Pirie 1992; 1 Spring 1995; 1 Spring 2004) and the remainder included smokers of both sexes (1 Hall 1992;1 Hankey 2009; 1 Klesges 1995; 1 Norregaard 1996; 1 O'Malley 2006; 1 Parsons 2009; 1 Toll 2010). Participants averaged 20-25 cigarettes per day with the exception of four studies where mean consumption was higher at between 26-32 (Hall 1992; 1 O'Malley 2006;1 Pirie 1992 and 1 Spring 1995). Mean baseline weight and/or body mass index (BMI) was reported in all but three studies (1 Klesges 1990; 1 Klesges 1995; 1 Toll 2010) and ranged between 64-76 kg/BMI 23-29.

Seven studies compared the effects of pharmacological interventions to placebo on smoking cessation and post cessation weight change. Pharmacological interventions included: 8.33 mg Phenylpropanolamine gum 16 pieces/day for 8 weeks (1 Cooper 2005), 9 pieces/day for 2 weeks (1 Klesges 1990) and up to 10 pieces/ day for 4 weeks (1 Klesges 1995), 20 mg Ephedrine plus 200 mg caffeine 3/day for 12 weeks (1 Norregaard 1996), 100, 50 and 25 mg/day Naltrexone for 6 weeks (1 O'Malley 2006) and 30 mg/day Dexfenfluramine for 12 weeks (1 Spring 1995). This study also examined the efficacy of 40 mg/day of fluoxetine for preventing weight gain (1 Spring 1995). As the other fluoxetine studies were included in Part 2 of the reviews, this comparison is described in Part 2.

Six studies assessed the effects of multi component behavioural interventions to prevent weight gain added to usual smoking cessation support. In three studies the intervention consisted of education on weight management. This was education on healthy eating, increasing physical activity and behavioural change strategies such as self monitoring (Hall 1992;1 Hankey 2009; 1 Pirie 1992). Although, one study advised all participants to reduce energy intake by 100-300kcal/day depending on how much they smoked and increase activity to one hour of walking three times a week, this was general advice given to the group and no feedback was given. (1 Pirie 1992). One of these studies (1 Hankey 2009) gave advice appropriate to "stage of change". These have been classified as "weight management education" interventions. Three studies additionally included feedback on personal goals and a personal energy prescription (500kcal deficit of energy requirement calculated from age, gender, weight and activity level of individuals (Hall 1992; 1 Perkins 2001) or a 150-300kcal deficit based on individuals' food diaries (food was prepared and provided to participants in this study) (1 Spring 2004). These have been classified as "personalised weight management support" interventions. We considered the behavioural interventions to be compared to a "no weight intervention" arm, if participants received no intervention targeted at weight management (1 Pirie 1992) or if the control arm included minimal weight intervention given to appease the participants (1 Hall 1992, good nutrition and exercise information pack not aimed at post cessation weight gain given to participants, 1 Spring 2004, last session (Wk16) spent talking about weight loss strategies, 75/107 randomised participants attended) rather than a specifically designed to have an effect.

One study tested the efficacy of a very low calorie diet (VLCD). In this study, participants in the intervention and control group both received the weight management education as well as usual smoking cessation support. Both groups were also advised to follow a 1600kcal diet, while the intervention group received two, two week blocks of a VLCD provided free of charge. Treatment took place in a specialist obesity treatment centre (1 Danielsson 1999). Cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT) to address concern about weight gain is aimed at ameliorating concern and promoting abstinence, not at reducing weight gain as such, but we included these studies. 1 Perkins 2001 tested the effect of CBT to promote acceptance of modest weight gain added to standard smoking cessation counselling compared to usual smoking cessation support only. 1 Levine 2010 tested the effect of CBT and bupropion separately and in combination added to standard smoking cessation counselling.

1 Spring 2004 tested whether it was better to quit first then address weight gain or whether the two could occur concurrently. In this study participants, all participants received 16 weeks of smoking cessation support (target quit day,week 5) and in addition were randomised to a concurrent personalised weight management support programme (weeks 1-8) or personalised weight management support programme sequential to quitting (weeks 9-16). In the third arm participants did not receive a personalised weight management support programme but the final session focused on weight management education. 75/107 participants enrolled in the control arm were present for the final session. Finally, one study compared the effect of group to individual

relapse prevention follow up sessions on smoking cessation and weight change after a 2 week smoking cessation programme (1 Copeland 2006). As there was no control group without the weight advice, the study is not included in the meta analyses below.

Smoking cessation therapy was provided for all participants in all studies of pharmacological and behavioural interventions. The duration, number and format of sessions of the behavioural therapy varied from brief individual advice for two weeks to hour-long group sessions conducted over 16 weeks, but the content was similar including the following components: cognitive behavioural skills such as anticipating and planning for high risk situations, coping skills, relapse prevention and benefits of quitting smoking. In four studies all participants were also supplied with NRT (1 Copeland 2006; 1 Danielsson 1999;1 Hankey 2009;1 O'Malley 2006) and in 1 Pirie 1992 two of the four comparison arms received NRT.

Nine studies (1 Cooper 2005; 1 Copeland 2006; 1 Danielsson 1999; Hall 1992;1 Hankey 2009; 1 Norregaard 1996; 1 Perkins 2001; 1 Pirie 1992; 1 Spring 2004) reported smoking as an outcome at six and/or 12 months. Smoking was either recorded as point prevalence (1 Cooper 2005, 1 Hall 1992) or prolonged or continuous abstinence (all others). Continuous abstinence was defined as 'not a single puff since quit date'. Definitions of prolonged abstinence varied, but mainly allowed for a grace period for the two first weeks after quit day or for small lapses that did not lead to full relapse. All studies apart from one (1 O'Malley 2006) reported biochemically confirmed rates. All 15 studies reported weight gain as an outcome at end of treatment, and some reported weight at six and/or 12 months.

Interventions not specifically designed to address post cessation weight gain

We found 53 individual trials from the lists of included studies in the parent reviews which matched our inclusion criteria for the second part of the review and had extractable data. Two of these studies also contributed data to the first part of the review (2 NRT Cooper 2005;2 NRT Pirie 1992). We included 4/11 exercise studies, 12/67 antidepressant studies (2 AD Gonzales 2006; 2 AD Jorenby 2006; 2 AD Nides 2006 also appear in varenicline list), 28/133 nicotine replacement therapy studies, and 12/15 varenicline studies. We were unable to obtain published or unpublished data from the authors of any studies in the cannabinoid receptor antagonists parent review. One additional study was identified through the update search (2 NRT Pack 2008). Participants were adult smokers who were typically volunteers from the community (although some studies recruited participants from a primary care setting and one study recruited hospitalised patients). All were motivated to quit smoking and smoked an average of 20-30 cigarettes per day. Twenty three studies reported baseline weight/BMI which was within healthy weight to slightly overweight (with mean BMI of 24-25 or mean weight no greater than 85 kg) the remaining 33 studies did not report baseline weight or BMI. As these were populations intent on smoking cessation only, they are likely to be smokers of typical body weight. One study, recruited participants based on cigarette consumption, smoking an average of 17-18 (2 NRT Shiffman 2002A) and 25-26 (2 NRT Shiffman 2002B) cigarettes per day.

Twelve studies from the antidepressant parent review were included in this review, three of which compared bupropion to varenicline as well as placebo and therefore also appear in the list of included studies for varenicline (2 VA Gonzales 2006; 2 VA Jorenby 2006; 2 VA Nides 2006). Overall, ten studies compared weight change in participants treated with bupropion to placebo (2 AD Gonzales 2006; 2 AD Hurt 1997; 2 AD Jorenby 2006; 2 AD Nides 2006;2 AD Piper 2007; 2 AD Rigotti 2006; 2 AD Simon 2004;2 AD Simon 2009; 2 AD Uyar 2007; 2 AD Zellweger 2005) and two studies compare fluoxetine to placebo (2 AD Niaura 2002; 2 AD Saules 2004). 2 AD Saules 2004 tested fluoxetine versus placebo, but both intervention and control arms used NRT, but we included it in the analyses with other fluoxetine versus placebo studies. One other study examined the efficacy of fluoxetine versus placebo (1 Spring 1995). It was not included in the parent Cochrane review because smoking cessation at 6 months was not reported, but was identified and included here.

All bupropion studies administered 300 mg/day and 2 AD Hurt 1997 also included a 100 mg/day and 150 mg/day arm. For the main comparison, the 300 mg/day arm is used for the Hurt study and the lower dose arms are used to compare to the standard 300 mg/day treatment to the lower dose arms . Two fluoxetine studies compared two dosing levels (30 mg & 60 mg/day (2 AD Niaura 2002) and 20 mg & 40 mg/day (2 AD Saules 2004)) which were combined for the main comparison and the lower doses and higher doses were compared in a separate comparison to examine for a dose dependent effect. One other study examined 40 mg fluoxetine versus placebo (1 Spring 1995). The treatment period for all antidepressant studies ranged from seven weeks to 14 weeks with a run in to quit day of one to four weeks.

Four studies provided data from the exercise interventions parent review. In all four studies, participants in the treatment arm received an exercise component in parallel with cognitive behavioural treatment for smoking cessation, which was supplemented with nicotine replacement therapy in 2 EX Ussher 2003 and 2 EX Bize 2010. The exercise component included supervised exercise in three studies. 2 EX Marcus 1999 tested three supervised exercise sessions/week for 12 weeks, 30-40 mins resting heart rate plus 60-85% heart reserve, 2 EX Marcus 2005 tested one supervised, four unsupervised exercise sessions/week for eight weeks, at least 30 minutes at resting heart rate plus 45-59% heart reserve and 2 EX Bize 2010 tested moderate-intensity (40-60% of maximal aerobic power) group-based cardiovascular (CV) activity under the supervision of a trained monitor for 45 minutes weekly for nine weeks. In contrast, 2 EX Ussher 2003 compared the effect of seven weeks of exercise counselling to participants receiving a

smoking cessation intervention with brief health education.

Eleven studies provided data on weight change whilst using a patch compared with placebo (2 NRT Abelin 1989; 2 NRT CEASE 1999; 2 NRT Ehrsam 1991; 2 NRT Fiore 1994A; 2 NRT Fiore 1994B; 2 NRT Gourlay 1995, 2 NRT Richmond 1994, 2 NRT Sachs 1993; 2 NRT Stapleton 1995; 2 NRT Tonnesen 1991; 2 NRT TNSG 1991) and one study provided data comparing three different dosing regimes (11 mg, 22 mg and 44 mg) (2 NRT Dale 1995) which has been included in a separate comparison. Dosing regimes in the nine placebo controlled studies varied although usually contained a mixture of participants treated with either a lower dose patch (e.g. 14 or 15 mg) and/or a higher dose patch (e.g. 21/22 or 25 mg) for those who were more addicted or opted for higher doses.

Five studies provided data on weight change whilst using NRT gum, in two cases compared to placebo (2 NRT Garvey 2000 2 NRT Hjalmarson 1984), and in three cases compared to no gum (1 Cooper 2005, 2 NRT Gross 1995, 1 Pirie 1992). In two studies, participants used 2 mg with ad libitum dosing instructions (2 NRT Hjalmarson 1984, 1 Pirie 1992). One study asked participants to chew 10-12 pieces daily (1 Cooper 2005). In 2 NRT Gross 1995, participants were given 2 mg gum but then randomised to instruction to chew seven, 15, or 30 pieces daily. 2 NRT Garvey 2000 randomised smokers to placebo, 9-15 pieces of 2 mg gum, or 9-15 pieces of 4 mg gum. Treatment length varied from eight weeks to one year, with a median of 12 weeks.

There were two placebo controlled studies of nicotine nasal spray up to 40 mg/day (2 NRT Hjalmarson 1994; 2 NRT Sutherland 1992). There were two placebo controlled study of up to 6 months usage of nicotine inhaler (2 NRT Hjalmarson 1997; 2 NRT Tonnesen 1993), two placebo controlled studies of nicotine lozenge 2 mg for smokers of a lower daily consumption (2 NRT Shiffman 2002A) and 4 mg for smokers of higher daily consumption (2 NRT Shiffman 2002B), one placebo controlled study of 2 mg nicotine sublingual tablet (2 NRT Wallstrom 2000), one placebo controlled study of nicotine inhaler added to 15 mg nicotine patch (2 NRT Blondal 1999), one placebo controlled study of 16hr/15 mg nicotine patch added to nicotine inhaler (2 NRT Bohadana 2000) versus inhaler alone (and this was therefore included in the patch versus placebo comparison), one placebo controlled study of nicotine patch added to nicotine gum (2 NRT Puska 1995) versus gum alone and this was included in the patch versus placebo condition. The median length of treatment for all NRT studies was 12 weeks (range 4-52). Fifteen studies included a period after treatment for reducing the dose (2 NRT Abelin 1989; 2 NRT Blondal 1999; 2 NRT Ehrsam 1991; 2 NRT Fiore 1994B; 2 NRT Garvey 2000; 2 NRT Gross 1995; 2 NRT Lerman 2004; 2 NRT Hjalmarson 1997; 2 NRT Puska 1995; 2 NRT Sachs 1993; 2 NRT Shiffman 2002A; 2 NRT Shiffman 2002B; 2 NRT Stapleton 1995; 2 NRT Tonnesen 1991; 2 NRT Wallstrom 2000).

One study directly compared the effectiveness of nicotine lozenge

with nicotine gum (2 NRT Pack 2008) and one study directly compared nicotine patch to nicotine spray (2 NRT Lerman 2004). Three studies allowed direct comparisons between different NRT doses (2 NRT CEASE 1999; 2 NRT Dale 1995; 2 NRT Gross 1995).

Twelve studies in the nicotine receptor antagonist parent review reported weight change when using varenicline. Eleven studies were placebo controlled and included a 2 mg/daily arm, 2 VA Nakamura 2007, 2 VA Nides 2006 and 2 VA Oncken 2006 also randomised participants to 0.3 mg and/or 1 mg/daily with or without titration. We compared these lower doses to higher doses in a comparison of dose response.

One study compared 2 mg/daily varenicline to a 21 mg patch tapering to 7 mg (2 VA Aubin 2008). As mentioned above, 2 VA Gonzales 2006; 2 VA Jorenby 2006; 2 VA Nides 2006 also compared varenicline with bupropion. Two of the twelve studies were phase II trials (2 VA Nides 2006; 2 VA Oncken 2006). The treatment phase lasted for 12 weeks in six studies (2 VA Aubin 2008; 2 VA Gonzales 2006; 2 VA Jorenby 2006; 2 VA Nakamura 2007; 2 VA Oncken 2006; 2 VA Tonstad 2006; 2 VA Tsai 2008) and six weeks in one study (2 VA Nides 2006). In Tonstad 2006, all participants received a 12 week course of open-label treatment with varenicline, and successful quitters were randomised to an additional 12 weeks of varenicline or placebo and the effect of an extra 12 weeks of treatment is explored in a separate comparison. This was combined with the other studies where the 12 weeks of varenicline/placebo was given in the first 12 weeks of abstinence, not the second. All studies used a one week medication run in period before the target quit day.

Weight change from baseline in all of the studies included in the second part of the review was measured in abstainers only. Definition of abstinence varied between studies as in the first part of the review and is noted in the table of characteristics of included studies. In most studies, all participants received some form of smoking cessation behavioural support in addition to the pharmacotherapy/exercise therapy and details are outlined in the table of characteristics of included studies. Some of the end of treatment data and longer term follow-up data were received through personal communication with authors and this is also noted in characteristics of included studies.

Risk of bias in included studies

We extracted information about randomisation, allocation concealment, blinding and measurement of abstinence and assessed the potential for bias in each domain (Figure 1). No studies were found to have used biased methods of randomisation or allocation concealment however a large proportion of studies didn't report the method of generating the random allocation sequence (31/72 studies) or allocation concealment (44/72 studies) in enough detail for likelihood of bias to be assessed. As the majority of these studies were published before the CONSORT statement guidelines

were issued, it is likely that this is due to lack of reporting rather than bias. Given the nature of the behavioural interventions and exercise interventions, blinding was not possible for these studies and therefore there was some potential for bias. However, in 1 Perkins 2001 participants were blinded to their allocation until after they had completed baseline information. The degree to which unblinding occurred was reported in a further two studies. 1 Norregaard 1996 found that 68% of the treatment group and 63% of the placebo group had correctly guessed their allocation to active or placebo NRT and 2 NRT Tonnesen 1993 46% on active treatment and 58% on placebo treatment guessed correctly, indicating guessing was no better than chance. A more serious potential for bias concerns the weight management interventions in the group of 'behavioural treatment' studies. Six out of the seven studies recruited women concerned about post-cessation weight gain. It is feasible that in these 'open label' studies women allocated to 'no weight help' interventions were more likely to drop out. Six studies out of all included in the review measured weight change in abstinent participants measured using point prevalence criteria. This was defined as being abstinent at the time of follow up in one study (1 Cooper 2005/2 NRT Cooper 2005) and abstinent for seven days previous to follow up in the remaining five studies (1 Hall 1992; 2 AD Piper 2007; 2 AD Rigotti 2006; 2 NRT Fiore 1994A; 2 NRT Fiore 1994B). Whether abstinence was biochemically validated or unvalidated, this was deemed as demonstrating a high risk of bias as smoking prior to the seven day period would reduce potential weight gain. Six studies were rated as being unclear in terms of bias introduced by abstinence measurement. This was because in three studies abstinence was measured as prolonged or continuous (i.e. participants need to be completely abstinent from two weeks after their quit day or from their quit day, respectively) but was not biochemically validated (1 O'Malley 2006; 2 AD Nides 2006/2 VA Nides 2006; 2 NRT Lerman 2004), in two study the definition of abstinence was not reported (1 Hankey 2009; 2 NRT Ehrsam 1991) and in one study although participants were only counted as abstinent if their exhaled CO levels were below 11 ppm at follow up, they were able to smoke up to three cigarettes per week (2 NRT Abelin 1989).

Figure 1. Methodological quality summary: review authors' judgements about each methodological quality item for each included study.



Effects of interventions

Effect of pharmacological interventions to prevent post cessation weight gain on weight and smoking cessation

There was evidence that dexfenfluramine (mean difference (MD) -2.50 to 95% confidence interval (CI) -2.98 to -2.02), one study), phenylpropanolamine (PPA) (MD -0.50 kg, 95% CI -0.80 to -0.20, three studies) and naltrexone (MD -0.78 kg, 95% CI -1.52 to -0.05, two studies) reduced weight gain at the end of treatment (Analysis 1.1) but no evidence that ephedrine and caffeine (MD -1.30 kg, 95% CI -2.87 to 0.27 kg, one study) or chromium (MD -0.81 kg, 95% CI -3.05 to 1.43, one study) did so. No pharmacological intervention significantly reduced weight gain at six or 12 months, but this was examined only for chromium, ephedrine and caffeine, and PPA. (Analysis 1.2 and Analysis 1.3). There was no evidence that these pharmacological interventions either increased or decreased quit rates at six or 12 months, but the wide confidence intervals mean the estimates were imprecise (Analysis 2.1; Analysis 2.2).

Effect of behavioural interventions to prevent post cessation weight gain on weight and smoking cessation

There was no evidence at any follow up that weight management education alone reduced weight gain (At EOT MD -0.04 kg, 95% CI -0.57 to 0.50, two studies; at 6 months MD 0.89 kg, 95% CI -0.78 to 2.55, two studies; and 12 months MD -0.21 kg, 95% CI -2.28 to 1.86, two studies (Analysis 3.1; Analysis 3.2; Analysis 3.3)). Interventions providing weight management education only compared with no intervention showed no difference in quit rate at six months (RR 1.02, 95% CI 0.80 to 1.31, three studies, Analysis 4.1). At 12 months, however, the intervention significantly reduced success in quitting (RR 0.66, 95% CI 0.48 to 0.90, two studies, Analysis 4.2).

Personalised weight management support programmes significantly reduced weight gain at end of treatment (MD -1.11 kg, 95% CI -1.93 to -0.29, 3 studies, Analysis 3.1) and this effect was strengthened at 12 months (MD -2.58 kg, 95% CI -5.11 to -0.05), two studies, Analysis 3.3). However, one study (1 Spring 2004) provided data at six months and showed no difference in weight change between a personalised weight management support programme and no intervention (MD 0.40 kg, 95% CI -2.54 to 3.34, Analysis 3.2). The within study comparison from 1 Hall 1992 suggested that personalised weight management support is more effective than weight management education only at end of treatment (-MD 1.12 kg, 95% CI -2.17 to -0.07, Analysis 3.1) and at 12 months (MD -2.49 kg, 95% CI -5.51 to 0.53, Analysis 3.3). Personalised weight management support had no effect on quit rate at six months (RR 0.88, 95% CI 0.54 to 1.43, two studies, Analysis 4.1) or at 12 months (RR 0.79, 95% CI 0.47 to 1.33, two studies, Analysis 4.2) although confidence intervals were wide.. The single study (1 Danielsson 1999) that incorporated an intermittent very low calorie diet into a weight management education intervention showed a significant reduced weight gain at end of treatment (MD -3.70 kg, 95% CI -4.82 to -2.58, Analysis 3.1). At 12 months the effect was smaller and not significant (MD -1.30 kg, 95% CI -3.49 to 0.89, Analysis 3.3). This intervention was associated with a significant improvement in abstinence at 12 months (RR 1.73, 95% CI 1.10 to 2.73, Analysis 4.2).

Effect of CBT to accept post cessation weight gain on weight and smoking cessation

There was mixed evidence for the effect of CBT to reduce weight gain concerns showing no reduction in weight gain at end of treatment (MD -0.18 kg, 95% CI -0.56 to 0.20, two studies, I² 92%, Analysis 6.1) or at 12 months (MD 0.13 kg, 95% CI -0.72, 0.98, two studies, I² 71%, Analysis 6.3). However, there was evidence of significantly increased weight in the CBT group at 6 months (MD 0.74 kg, 95% CI 0.24 to 1.24, 2 studies, I² 82%, Analysis 6.2). CBT significantly increased the quit rate at 6 months (RR 1.70, 95% CI 1.13 to 2.56, 2 studies, I² 57%, Analysis 5.1) but not at 12 months (RR 1.25, 95% CI 0.83 to 1.86, 2 studies, I² 26%, Analysis 5.2). One study (1 Levine 2010) tested CBT added to treatment with bupropion (300 mg/day), and found no evidence of reduced weight gain or increased abstinence in those who received CBT and bupropion treatment compared to those who received bupropion treatment with no additional CBT for weight concerns. (Analysis 4.1; Analysis 4.2; Analysis 3.1; Analysis 3.2; Analysis 3.3). However, there was evidence of significantly increased weight gain at six months (MD 0.86 kg, 95% CI 0.30 to 1.42 kg, 1 study). There was significant statistical heterogeneity when combining studies as the effects seen in each study differed markedly, with 1 Perkins 2001 finding a significant effect of CBT on weight reduction at end of treatment, six and 12 months and increased quit rates at six months and 1 Levine 2010 finding no such effects at any time point, but finding significant weight gain in the CBT arm at six months.

Effect of antidepressants on post cessation weight gain

Bupropion (300 mg/day) limited post cessation weight gain compared with placebo at the end of treatment (MD -1.12 kg, 95% CI -1.47 to -0.77, seven studies, Analysis 7.1). At six and 12 months the reduction in weight was lower than at end of treatment and

it was not significant (MD -0.87 kg, 95% CI -2.21 to 0.47, four studies, Analysis 7.3 and MD -0.38 kg, 95% CI -2.00 to 1.24, four studies, Analysis 7.5). There was no evidence of a dose dependent response for bupropion at end of treatment, six or 12 months (Analysis 7.2, Analysis 7.4, Analysis 7.6).

Fluoxetine reduced weight gain at end of treatment (MD -0.99 kg, 95% CI -1.36 to -0.61, two studies, Analysis 7.1). At six months, the effect was smaller and not significant (MD -0.19 kg, 95% CI - 1.10 to 0.71, two studies, Analysis 7.3), Two studies of fluoxetine randomised participants to higher and lower doses as well as to placebo (2 AD Niaura 2002 to 60 mg and 30 mg and 2 AD Saules 2004 to 40 mg or 20 mg). There was no evidence that higher doses were more effective at six months and in fact people randomised to 60 mg had significantly greater weight gain at six months than people randomised to 30 mg, an effect not seen in the 40 mg versus 20 mg comparison (Analysis 7.4).

Effect of exercise interventions on post cessation weight gain

Neither individual nor pooled data for the three trials of exercise programmes showed any reduction in weight gain at the end of the programme (Analysis 8.1), with a summary estimated mean difference of -0.25 kg (95% CI -0.78 to 0.29). However, three studies provided data at 12 months follow up which when pooled showed a significant reduction in weight gain favouring treatment (Analysis 8.2), with a summary estimate of -2.07 kg (95% CI - 3.78 to -0.36).

Effect of nicotine replacement therapy (NRT) on post cessation weight gain

Participants taking any type of NRT gained less weight than placebo referents at the end of treatment (MD -0.69 kg, 95% CI -0.88 to -0.51, 19 studies, I2=82%). Statistical heterogeneity was due to one study 2 NRT Abelin 1989 which showed a 4.3 kg difference between weight gain in the treatment and control arm. When this study was removed, statistical heterogeneity reduced to 0% and the overall estimate decreased but remained statistically significant (MD -0.46 kg, 95% CI -0.66 to -0.27, Analysis 9.1). Estimates of difference in weight gain for different types of NRT were similar: gum MD -0.58 kg (95% CI -1.02 to -0.13.4 studies), patch (without Abelin 1989) MD -0.45 kg (95% CI -0.70 to -0.20, 10 studies), inhaler MD -0.37 kg (95% CI -1.19 to 0.45, two studies), sublingual tablet MD -0.48 kg (95% CI -0.99 to 0.03, 2 studies), intranasal spray (+ patch) MD 0.90 kg (95% CI -1.54 to 3.34, one study). There was some evidence that there was less weight gain at the end of treatment in participants using the lozenge compared to those using patch (MD -2.45 [-4.43, -0.47], 1 study), although this difference didn't remain in the long term. Overall, weight gain was less for those taking NRT at six and 12 months although not significantly (MD -0.37 kg, 95% CI -0.88 to 0.14, 9 studies Analysis 9.5 and MD -0.42 kg, 95% CI -0.92 to 0.08, 15 studies, Analysis 9.8). 2 NRT Lerman 2004 compared patch to spray and found no significant difference in weight gain at end of treatment or six months (Analysis 9.2; Analysis 9.5). Longer courses of NRT with 15 mg or 25 mg patches were not associated with reduced weight gain at 12 months Analysis 9.11. Four trials compared the effects of different doses of NRT. 2 NRT Garvey 2000 compared 4 mg and 2 mg NRT gum to placebo, 2 NRT Dale 1995 compared 44 mg, 22 mg and 11 mg patches to placebo, and 2 NRT Gross 1995 compared different numbers of 2 mg NRT gum per day. There was no significant dose dependent difference in weight gain at the end of treatment (Analysis 9.4) or at 12 months (Analysis 9.10).

Effect of rimonabant on post cessation weight gain

We were unable to obtain mean weight change data with confidence intervals for rimonabant on post cessation weight gain. All weight related findings that have been reported have been summarised by the parent Cochrane review (Cahill 2011a) which indicates that rimonabant may reduce weight gain during treatment by a small amount. However, the FDA did not authorise the use of rimonabant and the European Medicines Agency and Food and Drug Administration have withdrawn marketing authorisation because they concluded the benefits of rimonabant did not outweigh the risks.

Effect of varenicline on post cessation weight gain

There was no evidence that 1 mg of varenicline reduced weight gain more than placebo (MD -0.12 kg, 95% CI -0.68 to 0.43, three studies) but there was evidence that 2 mg daily did reduce weight gain (MD -0.41 kg, 95% CI -0.63 to -0.19, 11 studies) (Analysis 10.1). Only one study provided data at six months, showing no evidence of effect (MD 0.41 kg, 95% CI -0.79 to 1.61, Analysis 10.2) and two studies at 12 months, also showing no evidence of an effect (MD 1.11 kg, 95% CI -0.75 to 2.98, Analysis 10.3). Three studies compared treatment with bupropion to varenicline. Participants taking varenicline gained significantly more weight at the end of treatment (MD 0.51 kg, 95% CI 0.09 to 0.93, Analysis 11.1). There was no evidence that weight gain differed in the one trial of varenicline versus NRT (2 VA Aubin 2008, Analysis 12.1).

DISCUSSION

Since the first version of this review was published in 2009, we have found five additional trials and received data from the authors of a further trial fitting criteria for part 1, and there are now 16 trials of interventions specifically designed to limit post cessation weight gain. Although a range of pharmacological interventions

were tested, none showed evidence that weight gain was prevented in the longer term. Behavioural interventions were more promising. Personalised weight management support, which included weight management education with both feedback on personal goals and a personal energy prescription, showed reduced weight gain at one year, but the estimate of effect was very imprecise covering both substantial benefit and a clinically irrelevant benefit. There was no evidence that detailed weight management education without personalised assessment, planning and feedback reduced weight gain and at least some evidence that this may have reduced smoking cessation rates. The earlier version of this review suggested that CBT to accept moderate weight gain increased abstinence, and limited long term post cessation weight gain however, a subsequently published trial was not as promising. When the two trials were combined, although smoking cessation rates were still significantly increased at six months, there was a significant increase in weight gain at six months, and no effects on either weight or quitting at 12 months. However, statistical heterogeneity was high. Eight new trials were identified during the update that fitted the criteria for Part 2 of this review (three bupropion studies, four varenicline studies and an NRT study that compare lozenge to gum preparations). In total, we examined evidence for five different interventions used to support smoking cessation that might incidentally reduce weight gain on cessation. There was strong evidence that four of these, NRT, bupropion, fluoxetine, and varenicline all reduced weight gain by about 0.5 kg (NRT and varenicline) and about 1 kg (fluoxetine and bupropion) by the end of the usual treatment period. A few of the trials recorded weight at later follow ups, and there was no evidence that these pharmacotherapies attenuated weight gain when assessed then but there is insufficient evidence to exclude an effect. There was some evidence that nicotine nasal spray did so at one year and it is perhaps notable that spray was available for the whole year for participants in these trials. One behavioural intervention, exercise to assist smoking cessation, showed no evidence that it reduced weight gain during the exercise programme but, perhaps surprisingly given this finding, there was evidence of reduced weight gain at one year.

Pharmacotherapy to limit weight gain

To date, six pharmacological interventions (phenylpropanolamine (PPA), ephedrine + caffeine, naltrexone, dexfenfluramine, fluoxetine and chromium) have been combined with standard smoking cessation treatment to test their effect on post cessation weight gain compared with smoking cessation treatment alone. None have shown evidence of a long-term effect on weight gain and therefore none can be recommended for use in clinical practice. There was however promising evidence that PPA, dexfenfluramine, and naltrexone prevent weight gain in the short term. Dexfenfluramine has been withdrawn from use because it causes serious problems and the dose of PPA allowed for use is lower than the dose tested in these trials. Naltrexone, which is used in treatment of other substance use dependence, is promising, although the effect on weight gain is modest.

Behavioural programmes to limit weight gain

English smoking cessation guidelines from NICE make no specific recommendations about preventing post cessation weight gain, while US guidance recommends either bupropion, NRT, or exercise as interventions. A common perception is that concurrent behavioural treatment for smoking and weight undermines smoking cessation and advice is to establish smoking cessation before tackling weight (McEwan 2006). Some of the reason for this is the evidence from laboratory studies which show increased urges to smoke during periods of food restriction (Cheskin 2005, Leeman 2010). With one possible exception, our review revealed no evidence to reinforce this fear.

US guidelines do not discuss the role of dietary interventions, which are the mainstay of weight control interventions in other contexts. Our review suggested that weight management programmes did not generally undermine smoking cessation. At six months no interventions showed strong evidence that cessation was reduced and at 12 months, only one intervention did. This was weight management education without personalised support. Given there was no evidence that cessation was undermined at six months, these data are hard to interpret. Nevertheless there was no evidence that this kind of non personalised weight management education reduced weight gain and such general advice cannot be recommended. The other similar but more intensive personalised weight management support programmes look the most promising of all interventions we reviewed, but the effect estimate is imprecise and requires confirmation. These interventions differed but all included personal goal setting, monitoring and feedback on progress. Other elements that may have contributed to success were degree of personalised energy restriction, or providing food to help with adherence. Although it would be possible to manipulate one element at a time, the commonalities of these data with those in the weight loss field suggest that all elements are likely to be important ingredients in the success of the intervention. It is also worth noting that the point estimates for abstinence both suggested that cessation was less likely in those receiving this intervention, though not significantly so. Further trials of this approach are required for confirmation. The other dietary approach that showed distinct promise was the VLCD. There was evidence that use early on in cessation increased abstinence in the long-term and clear evidence of a short-term reduction in weight gain and non-significant evidence of a reduction in weight at one year. In this study, the control arm was advised to adhere to a 1600kcal/ day diet, which creates an energy deficit, therefore this may have masked the full effect of the VLCD in the intervention arm. However, this was one trial that advertised for participants and whether this kind of demanding intervention would be popular with many

Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation (Review) Copyright © 2012 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

people trying to stop smoking remains to be seen.

Physical activity or exercise programmes were included in Part 2 of our review because they were aimed at increasing cessation. There is strong evidence that exercise reduces cravings to smoke. (Taylor 2007). In most trials of interventions in weight management, the difference between intervention and control is most marked at end of treatment and declines over follow up. In this context, it is puzzling that there was no evidence of effectiveness of exercise on weight at end of programme, but there was at 12 month follow up. This might either represent a chance finding or reflect the fact that the programme encouraged people to go on exercising after it had finished. Further evidence is required before we can be confident that physical activity programmes provide an effective intervention.

There is a caveat regarding the open label design of the above behavioural intervention studies. With the exception of 1 Hall 1992, they all enrolled women who had problems with weight gain on cessation and were therefore looking to be enrolled in weight control programmes. Such participants may have been more likely to default from the control programme than when allocated the active intervention that they presumably wanted, especially in studies such as 1 Danielsson 1999 and 1 Spring 2004 where this included free meals. The open label design is unavoidable in this field, but it is important to note that it could bias the smoking abstinence results in favour of the intervention. Another possible explanation of the positive result of the very low calorie diet is that it induced ketosis, which may have suppressed hunger (Johnstone 2008) and nicotine withdrawal.

Reducing fears about weight gain through CBT

CBT to address weight gain concerns increased weight and improved quit rates at six months, but there was no evidence of any effect at 12 months. The results of the two studies that have tested this approach varied significantly. Thus, further trials of this intervention are required before it can be recommended as a treatment programme for weight concerned smokers wanting to stop smoking.

Pharmacotherapy for smoking cessation

We found evidence that antidepressants, nicotine replacement therapy, and varenicline attenuate weight gain during the treatment phase, however there was insufficient evidence that the effect persisted in the longer term. The evidence suggested that for antidepressants, fluoxetine and bupropion, and for varenicline, the weight of those allocated to active intervention was the same as that for placebo in the longer term. The picture was more complicated for long term effects of NRT. The strongest effect at 12 months was seen in trials of nasal spray and inhaler, however in these trials participants were allowed to use the NRT preparation for up to a year. Taking these data together, they seem to indicate that the effect of pharmacotherapies is seen during treatment and that those who use pharmacotherapy catch up with accelerated weight gain once treatment is withdrawn. Data from within trials, 2 NRT Sutherland 1992, and an observational study (Hajek 1988) strengthens the conclusion that the possible long-term effect of NRT depends upon long-term use. The difference in weight between long-term users and non-users was several kilograms in these studies, but little is known regarding possible adverse effects of long term use of NRT. Although we found no dose response effects in trials where participants were randomised to a higher or lower dose of NRT, there is preliminary data from records of NRT actually consumed that weight gain is associated with the dose of NRT used (Ferguson 2011).

Methodological considerations

Several features of our review merit comment. First, we encountered studies of fluoxetine in Part 1 and Part 2 of the review. The study of fluoxetine in Part 1 was excluded from the parent Cochrane review because it did not incorporate at least a six-month follow up. It was included in the Part 1 search because the aim was to reduce weight gain. This means that it is possible that we did not include some other studies of fluoxetine that were not specifically aimed at reducing weight gain and did not incorporate a six- or 12-month follow up. There is no reason to imagine that excluding them would create a bias, however. Second, in this update but not in the original version of our review, we added 2 VA Tonstad 2006 to our main analysis of the effect of varenicline on weight gain. In this trial, participants had taken 12 weeks of varenicline before the abstinent participants were randomised to a further 12 weeks or placebo. Thus this study examines weight gain in months three to six of a quit attempt, not months zero to three as in the other studies. We could see no strong reason to imagine that this would bias the analysis. Weight gain is less rapid in months three to six (O'Hara 1998) so, if anything, it is likely that taking varenicline would prevent less weight gain during this later period than during the former. However, the statistical significance of the result is sensitive to whether the Tonstad study is included or excluded from the meta-analysis.

We split the behavioural interventions for weight control in part one of the review into two categories: those that provided weight management education only, and those that provided personalised weight management support. This split was chosen based on metaanalysis evidence that healthy eating and physical activity interventions combining self-monitoring with at least one other technique derived from control theory, (such as specific goal setting, feedback on progress or review of goals set) are significantly more effective than those that do not (Michie 2009).

As noted in the introduction, the data here relate to weight gain in abstinent smokers only. It is practically difficult to follow up non-abstinent smokers as they have no motive to attend smoking cessation clinics and thus authors do not usually provide data

on continuing smokers. However, most people gain weight on cessation and most people make repeated attempts to quit. It is possible that this leads to incremental weight gain and it would be useful if data could be collected on this.

AUTHORS' CONCLUSIONS

Implications for practice

• Weight management education may reduce abstinence and is not effective at controlling weight and should not be used.

• Personalised weight management support programmes, incorporating both feedback on personal goals and a personal energy prescription may reduce weight gain and there is no strong evidence they reduce abstinence. Further research is required to examine whether these effects can be replicated, and if the effect can be generalised to all smokers, not just those specifically concerned about gaining weight. Until then they should be used cautiously, ideally in research.

• Very low calorie diets may increase abstinence and prevent weight gain in the short-term at least, but these conclusions are based on a single trial only.

• The evidence showed that CBT to allay concerns about weight gain does not reduce weight gain or increase abstinence in the long term. There was significant heterogeneity between the findings of two studies of this approach.

• There is mixed evidence that exercise limits post cessation weight gain but further research is required to show conclusively that it is beneficial.

• Nicotine replacement therapy, bupropion, fluoxetine and varenicline all reduce weight gain in the short term, but patients need to be told that it is unclear whether they reduce weight gain in the long term.

• The long-term effect of all combined smoking cessation and weight control interventions on weight gain is small at best, less than 1 kg, compared with the weight gain at one year (about 5 kg) and is of borderline clinical relevance. The only possible exceptions are personalised dietary and exercise interventions which may reduce this weight gain by half.

Implications for research

• It is important to know whether the effects of personalised weight management support programmes and very low calorie diets can be replicated and if the effect is confirmed, whether it can be generalised to all smokers trying to stop or whether the effect is specific to smokers concerned about weight gain.

• Further studies of CBT to reduce weight concerns are required to clarify its effect on weight gain and smoking cessation, as the two studies carried out to date vary significantly in their estimation of effect and there was some evidence of increased weight gain at six months.

• Further studies of exercise interventions are needed. The finding that an intervention aimed at increasing exercise levels had no effect initially but somehow affected weight on year later seems counterintuitive as adherence to exercise regimes usually decline rather than increase with time.

• Future trials of interventions for limiting post cessation weight gain should report mean weight change, standard deviation for the weight change and the number contributing to the mean in biochemically confirmed continuous or prolonged abstinent participants only rather than in those abstinent for only one week. Weight change in those who continue to smoke should be reported separately.

• Trials of current and future pharmacotherapies for smoking cessation should measure weight change, reporting mean weight change, standard deviation of the change and numbers contributing to the mean, separating abstinent from smoking participants as described above.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank the Cochrane Tobacco Addiction Review Group for their support and advice. Specifically the content of the table of included studies in part two of this review is mainly populated by data extracted by the authors of the parent reviews (Lindsay Stead, Kate Cahill, Michael Ussher) and statistical advice was given by Rafael Perera. We also thank Cynthia Pomerleau and colleagues, and Michael Ussher, for reading and commenting on earlier drafts of this protocol. We would also like to thank the many authors of the primary studies that responded to our requests for data.

REFERENCES

References to studies included in this review

1 Cooper 2005 {published data only}

Cooper TV, Klesges RC, Debon MW, Zbikowski SM, Johnson KC, Clemens LH. A placebo controlled randomized trial of the effects of phenylpropanolamine and nicotine gum on cessation rates and postcessation weight gain in women. *Addictive Behaviors* 2005;**30**:61–75. Cooper TV, Montgomery GV, Debon MW, Zbikowski SM, Klesges RC, Johnson KC. The effects of PPA and nicotine gum on cessation rates and post cessation weight gain in women [POS3-46]. Abstract Book. Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco 9th Annual Meeting, New Orleans, LA. 2003.

1 Copeland 2006 {published data only}

Copeland AL, Martin P, Geiselman PJ, Rash CJ, Kendzor DE. Smoking cessation for weight-concerned women: Group vs individually tailored, dietary and weight-control follow up session. *Addictive Behaviors* 2006;**31**:115–27.

1 Danielsson 1999 {published data only}

Danielsson T, Rossner S. Smoking cessation rates improved by an intensive weight control program (Conference summary). *Addiction* 1998;**93**:913.

* Danielsson T, Rossner S, Westin A. Open randomised trial of intermittent very low energy diet together with nicotine gum for stopping smoking in women who gained weight in previous attemps to quit. *BMJ* 1999;**319**(7208):490–94.

1 Hall 1992 {published data only}

* Hall SM, Tunstall CD, Vila KL, & Duffy J. Weight gain prevention and smoking cessation: cautionary findings. *American Journal of Public Health* 1992;**82**(6):799–803.

1 Hankey 2009 {published data only}

* Hankey CR, Leslie WS, Koshy PR, Mackenzie M, Murray H, Boyle S, Lean MEJ. Food choice and changes in body weight and shape in those attempting smoking cessation. *FDA report: University of Glasgow* 2009;**Food Standards** Agency Project NO 902025.

Koshy P, Mackenzie M, Leslie M, Hankey C. Eating the elephant in slices or in one go: views of participants in a smoking cessation intervention trial on multiple behaviour changes as sequential or concurrent tasks. *Obesity reviews* 2010;**conference**:(var. pagings): 294.

Leslie W, Koshy P, Mackenzie M, Murray H, lean M, Hankey C. Food choice and changes in body weight in those attempting smoking cessation: A cluster randomised controlled study. *Obesity Reviews* 2010:(var. pagings): 294.

1 Klesges 1990 {published data only}

Klesges RC, Klesges LM, Meyers AW, Klem ML, Isbell T. The effects of phenylpropanolamine on dietary intake, physical activity, and body weight after smoking cessation. *Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics* 1990;**47**(6):747–54.

1 Klesges 1995 {published data only}

Klesges RC, Klesges LM, DeBon M, Shelton ML, Isbell TR, Klem ML. Effects of phenylpropanolamine on withdrawal symptoms. *Psychopharmacology* 1995;**119**(1):85–91.

1 Levine 2010 {published data only}

Levine MD, Perkins KA, Kalarchian MA, Cheng Y, Houck PR, Slane JD, Marcus MD. Bupropion and cognitive behavioural therapy for weight-concerned women smokers. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 2010;**170**(6):543–550.

1 Norregaard 1996 {published data only}

Norregaard J, Jorgensen S, Mikkelsen KL, Tonnesen P, Iversen E, Sorensen T, Soeberg B, Jakobsen BJ. The effects of ephedrine plus caffeine on smoking cessation and postcessation weight gain. *Clinical Pharmacology & Therapeutics* 1996;**60**(6):679–86.

1 O'Malley 2006 {published data only}

O'Malley S, Cooney J, Krishnan-Sarin S, Mckee S, Meandzija B, Dubin J. A dose ranging study of naltrexone augmentation of transdermal nicotine patch: smoking, weight and alcohol outcomes (POS1-064). Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco 10th Annual Meeting.. Phoenix, Arizona, February 18–21, 2004:50.

* O'Malley SS, Cooney JL, Krishnan-Sarin S, Dubin JA, McKee SA, Cooney NL, et al.A controlled trial of naltrexone augmentation of nicotine replacement therapy for smoking cessation. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 2006;**166**:667–74.

1 Parsons 2009 {published data only}

Parsons AC, Ingram J, Inglis J, Aveyard P, Johnstone E, Brown K, et al.A proof of concept randomised placebo controlled factorial trial to examine the efficacy of St John's Wort for smoking cessation and chromium to prevent weight gain on smoking cessation. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence* 2009;**102**:116–22.

1 Perkins 2001 {published data only}

Perkins KA, Marcus MD, Levine MD, D'Amico D, Miller A, Broge M, Ashcom J, Shiffman S. Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy to reduce weight concerns improves smoking cessation outcome in weight-concerned women. *Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology* 2001;**69**(4):604–13.

1 Pirie 1992 {published data only}

Pirie PL, McBride CM, Hellerstedt WL, Jeffery RW, Hatsukami DK, Allen S, et al.Smoking cessation in women concerned about weight. *American Journal of Public Health* 1992;**82**:1238–43.

1 Spring 1995 {published data only}

Spring B, Wurtman J, Wurtman R, El-Khoury A, Goldberg H, McDermott J, et al.Efficacies of dexfenfluramine and fluoxetine in preventing weight gain after smoking cessation. *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition* 1995;**62**:1181–7.

1 Spring 2004 {published data only}

Spring B, Doran N, Pagoto S, Schneider K, Pingitore R, Hedeker D. Randomised controlled trial of behavioural smoking and weight control treatment: effect of concurrent

versus sequential intervention. Journal of counselling and clinical psychology 2004;**72**(5):785–796.

1 Toll 2010 {published data only}

Toll BA, White M, Wu R, Meandzija B, Jatlow P, Makuch R, O'Malley SS. Low-dose naltrexone augmentation of nicotine replacement for smoking cessation with reduced weight gain: A randomised trial. *Drug and alcohol dependence* 2010;**111**:200–206.

2 AD Gonzales 2006 {published data only}

Gonzales D, Rennard SI, Nides M, Oncken C, Azoulay S, Billing CB, et al.Varenicline, an alpha4beta2 nicotinic acetylcholine receptor partial agonist, vs sustained-release bupropion and placebo for smoking cessation: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA* 2006;**296**:47–55.

2 AD Hurt 1997 {published and unpublished data}

Dale LC, Glover ED, Sachs DP, Schroeder DR, Offord KP, Croghan IT, et al.Bupropion for smoking cessation: predictors of successful outcome. *Chest* 2001;**119**: 1357–1364.

Glaxo Wellcome. Presentation for FDA approval of Bupropion sustained release for smoking cessation. Dr J. Andrew Johnston December 10 1996.

Hayford KE, Patten CA, Rummans TA, Schroeder DR, Offord KP, Croghan IT, et al.Efficacy of bupropion for smoking cessation in smokers with a former history of major depression or alcoholism. *British Journal of Psychiatry* 1999; **174**:173–8.

Hurt RD, Glover ED, Sachs DPL, et al.Bupropion for smoking cessation: A double-blind, placebo-controlled dose response trial [Abstract]. *Journal of Addictive Diseases* 1996; **15**:137.

* Hurt RD, Sachs DPL, Glover ED, Offord KP, Johnston JA, Dale LC, et al.A comparison of sustained-release bupropion and placebo for smoking cessation. *New England Journal of Medicine* 1997;**337**:1195–202.

Johnston JA, Fiedler-Kelly J, Glover ED, Sachs DP, Grasela TH, DeVeaugh-Geiss J. Relationship between drug exposure and the efficacy and safety of bupropion sustained release for smoking cessation. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research* 2001;**3**:131–40.

2 AD Jorenby 2006 {published data only}

Jorenby DE, Hays JT, Rigotti NA, Azoulay S, Watsky EJ, Williams KE, et al.Efficacy of varenicline, an alpha4beta2 nicotinic acetylcholine partial agonist vs placebo or sustained-release bupropion for smoking cessation: a randomised controlled trial. *JAMA* 2006;**296**:56–63.

2 AD Niaura 2002 {published and unpublished data}

Borrelli B, Niaura R, Keuthen NJ, Goldstein MG, Depue JD, Murphy C, et al.Development of major depressive disorder during smoking-cessation treatment. *Journal of Clinical Psychiatry* 1996;**57**:534–8.

Borrelli B, Papandonatos G, Spring B, Hitsman B, Niaura R. Experimenter-defined quit dates for smoking cessation: adherence improves outcomes for women but not for men. *Addiction* 2004;**99**:378–85.

Borrelli B, Spring B, Niaura R, Hitsman B, Papandonatos G. Influences of gender and weight gain on short-term relapse to smoking in a cessation trial. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 2001;**69**:511–15.

* Borrelli B, Spring B, Niaura R, Kristeller J, Ockene JK, Keuthen NJ. Weight suppression and weight rebound in exsmokers treated with fluoxetine. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1999;**67**:124–31.

Cook JW, Spring B, McChargue DE, Borrelli B, Hitsman B, Niaura R, et al.Influence of fluoxetine on positive and negative affect in a clinic-based smoking cessation trial. *Psychopharmacology* 2004;**173**:153–9.

Doran N, Spring B, Borrelli B, McChargue D, Hitsman B, Niaura R, Hedeker D. Elevated positive mood: a mixed blessing for abstinence. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors* 2006;**20**:36–43.

Hitsman B, Spring B, Borrelli B, Niaura R, Papandonatos GD. Influence of antidepressant pharmacotherapy on behavioral treatment adherence and smoking cessation outcome in a combined treatment involving fluoxetine.. *Experimental & Clinical Psychopharmacology* 2001;**9**: 355–62.

Mizes JS, Sloan DM, Segraves K, Spring B, Pingatore R, Kristeller J. Fluoxetine and weight-gain in smoking cessation - examination of actual weight-gain and fear of weight-gain [abstract]. *Psychopharmacology Bulletin* 1996;**32**:491. Niaura R, Goldstein M, Spring B, Keuthen N, Kristeller J, DePue J, et al.Fluoxetine for smoking cessation: A multicenter randomized double blind dose response study. Society for Behavioral Medicine Annual Meeting; April 18 1997; San Francisco, CA.

Niaura R, Spring B, Borrelli B, Hedeker D, Goldstein MG, Keuthen N, et al.Multicenter trial of fluoxetine as an adjunct to behavioral smoking cessation treatment. *Journal* of Consulting and Clinical Psychology 2002;**70**:887–96. Swan GE, Jack LM, Niaura R, Borrelli B, Spring B. Subgroups of smokers with different success rates after treatment with fluoxetine for smoking cessation [abstract]. Nicotine & Tobacco Research 1999;**1**:281.

2 AD Nides 2006 {published and unpublished data}

* Nides M, Oncken C, Gonzales D, Rennard S, Watsky EJ, Anziano R, et al.Smoking cessation with varenicline, a selective alpha4beta2 nicotinic receptor partial agonist: Results from a 7-week, randomized, placebo- and bupropion-controlled trial with 1-year follow-up. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 2006;**166**:1561–8.

Oncken C, Watsky E, Reeves K, Anziano R. Varenicline is efficacious and well tolerated in promoting smoking cessation: results from a 7-week, randomized, placeboand bupropion-controlled trial. Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco 11th Annual Meeting, 20-23 March 2005, Prague, Czech Republic. 2005.

2 AD Piper 2007 {published data only}

Piper ME. Bupropion alone and in combination with nicotine gum: Efficacy, medication and moderation.

Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering 2007;**9**:947–54.

* Piper ME, Federman EB, McCarthy DE, Bolt DM, Smith SS, Fiore MC, et al.Efficacy of bupropion alone and in combination with nicotine gum. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research* 2007;**9**(9):947–54.

Piper ME, Federman EB, Smith SS, Fiore MC, Baker TB. Efficacy of bupropion SR alone and combined with 4-mg nicotine gum (PA2-2). Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco 10th Annual Meeting February 18-21, Phoenix, Arizona 2004;**18**.

Piper ME, Federmen EB, McCarthy DE, Bolt DM, Smith SS, Fiore ME, et al. Using mediational models to explore the nature of tobacco motivation and tobacco treatment effects. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology* 2008;**117**:94–105.

2 AD Rigotti 2006 {published and unpublished data}

Rigotti N, Thorndike A, Regan S, Pasternak R, Chang Y, McKool K, et al.Safety and efficacy of bupropion for smokers hospitalized with acute cardiovascular disease [abstract]. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research* 2005;7:682. Rigotti NA, Thorndike AN, Regan S, McKool K, Pasternak RC, Chang Y, et al.Bupropion for smokers hospitalized with acute cardiovascular disease. American Journal of Medicine 2006; Vol. 119:1080–1087.

Thorndike A, Rigotti N, Regan S, Pasternak R, McKool K, Emmons K, et al.Depression and relapse to smoking in patients hospitalized with acute cardiovascular disease [POS3-094]. Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco 11th Annual Meeting, 20-23 March, Prague, Czech Republic. 2005.

2 AD Saules 2004 {published and unpublished data}

Saules KK, Schuh LM, Arfken CL, Reed K, Kilbey MM, Schuster CR. Double-blind placebo-controlled trial of fluoxetine in smoking cessation treatment including nicotine patch and cognitive-behavioral group therapy. *American Journal on Addictions* 2004;14:438–46. Schuh LM, Downey KK, Hopper JA, Tancer M, Schuster CR. Fluoxetine in smoking cessation treatment. College on Problems of Drug Dependence Annual Meeting, San Juan, Puerto Rico 2000.

2 AD Simon 2004 {published and unpublished data}

Caplan BJ. The "bupropion for smoking cessation" trial from a family practice perspective. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 2005;**165**:470.

* Simon JA, Duncan C, Carmody TP, Hudes ES. Bupropion for smoking cessation: a randomized trial. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 2004;**164**:1797–803.

Simon JA, Duncan C, Carmody TP, Hudes ES. Bupropion for smoking cessation: a randomized trial. National Conference on Tobacco or Health, November 19-22. San Francisco, California. 2002.

Simon JA, Duncan C, Carmody TP, Hudes ES. Bupropion plus nicotine replacement no better than replacement alone. *Journal of Family Practice* 2004;**53**:953–4.

2 AD Simon 2009 {published data only}

Simon JA, Duncan C, Huggins J, Solkowitz S, Carmody TP. Sustained-release bupropion for hospital-based smoking cessation: a randomized trial. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research* 2009;**11**(6):663–9.

2 AD Uyar 2007 {published data only}

Uyar M, Bayram N, Filiz A, Elbek O, Topcu A, Dikensoy O, et al.Comparison of nicotine patch and bupropion in treating tobacco dependence. *European Respiratory Journal* 2005;**26 (Suppl 49)**(388s).

* Uyar M, Filiz A, Bayram N, Elbek O, Herken H, Topcu A, et al.A randomized trial of smoking cessation. Medication versus motivation. *Saudi Medical Journal* 2007;**28**(6): 922–6.

2 AD Zellweger 2005 {published and unpublished data}

Puska P, Brath H, Astbury C, Hider AE. Zyban is an effective and well tolerated aid to smoking cessation in a healthcare professionals population - a multi-country study. Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco 3rd European Conference, September 2001, Paris, France. 2001:45. Zellweger JP, Blaziene A, Astbury C, Hider A, Hogue S. Bupropion hydrochloride sustained release is an effective and well tolerated aid to smoking cessation in a healthcare professionals population - a multicountry study. Abstract and presentation at 11th Annual meeting of European Respiratory Society, Berlin, September 22-26 2001. European Respiratory Journal 2001;18 (Suppl 33):166s. * Zellweger JP, Boelcskei PL, Carrozzi L, Sepper R, Sweet R, Hider AZ. Bupropion SR vs placebo for smoking cessation in health care professionals. American Journal of Health Behavior 2005;29:240-9.

2 EX Bize 2010 {published and unpublished data}

* Bize R, Willi C, Chiolero A, Stoianov R, Payot S, Locatelli I, Cornuz J. Participation in a population-based physical activity programme as an aid for smoking cessation: a randomised trial. *Tobacco Control* 2010;**19**(6):488–94. Cornuz J, Willi C, Chiolero A, Payot S, Stolanov R, Bize R. Physical activity as an aid to smoking cessation: A randomised controlled trial of sedentary adult smokers. *Journal of General Internal Medicine* 2007;**22(s1)**:107.

2 EX Marcus 1999 {published data only}

Marcus B, Albrecht A, King T, Parisi A, Pinto B, Roberts M, et al. The efficacy of exercise as an aid for smoking cessation in women. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 1999; **159**:1229–34.

2 EX Marcus 2005 {published data only}

Marcus BH, Lewis BA, Hogan J, King TK, Albrecht AE, Bock B, et al. The efficacy of moderate-intensity exercise as an aid for smoking cessation in women: A randomized controlled trial. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research* 2005;7(6): 871–80.

2 EX Ussher 2003 {published data only}

Ussher M, West R, McEwan A, Taylor A, Steptoe A. Efficacy of exercise counselling as an aid for smoking cessation: a randomised controlled trial. *Addiction* 2003;**98**:523–532. Ussher M, West R, McEwan A, Taylor A, Steptoe A. Efficacy of exercise counselling as an aid to smoking cessation: A

randomised controlled trial. European Conference of the Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco. 2001. Ussher M, West W, McEwen A, Taylor AH, Steptoe A. Randomised controlled trial of physical activity counselling as an aid to smoking cessation: 12 month follow-up. *Addictive Behaviors* 2007;**32**:3060–4.

2 NRT Abelin 1989 {published data only}

* Abelin T, Buehler A, Muller P, Vesanen K, Imhof PR. Controlled trial of transdermal nicotine patch in tobacco withdrawal. *Lancet* 1989;1(8628):7–10. Abelin T, Ehrsam R, Buhler-Reichert A, Imhof PR, Muller P.

Thommen A. Effectiveness of a transdermal nicotine system in smoking cessation studies. *Methods and Findings in Experimental and Clinical Pharmacology* 1989;**11**:205–14. Muller P, Abelin T, Ehrsam R, Imhof P, Howald H, Mauli D. The use of transdermal nicotine in smoking cessation. *Lung* 1990;**168**:445–53.

2 NRT Blondal 1999 {published and unpublished data}

* Blondal T, Gudmundsson LJ, Olafsdottir I, Gustavsson G, Westin A. Nicotine nasal spray with nicotine patch for smoking cessation: randomised trial with six year follow up. *BMJ* 1999;**318**:285–9.

Blondal T, Ludviksdottir D, Gudmundsson L, Olafsdottir I, Gustavsson G, Westin A. Efficacy of nicotine nasal spray added to transdermal nicotine patches in smoking cessation [Abstract]. Proceedings of the 10th World Conference on Tobacco or Health; Aug 24-28; Beijing, China. 1997:48.

2 NRT Bohadana 2000 {published and unpublished data}

Bohadana A, Nilsson F, Rasmussen T, Martinet Y. Gender differences in quit rates following smoking cessation with combination nicotine therapy: influence of baseline smoking behavior. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research* 2003;**5**(1): 111–6.

* Bohadana A, Nilsson F, Rasmussen T, Martinet Y. Nicotine inhaler and nicotine patch as a combination therapy for smoking cessation - A randomized, doubleblind, placebo-controlled trial. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 2000;**160**:3128–34.

Bohadana AB, Nilsson F, Martinet Y. Nicotine inhaler and nicotine patch: a combination therapy for smoking cessation [abstract]. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research* 1999;1(2): 189.

2 NRT CEASE 1999 {published and unpublished data}

Tonnesen P, Paoletti P, Gustavsson G, Russell MA, Saracci R, Gulsvik A, et al.Higher dosage nicotine patches increase one-year smoking cessation rates: Results from the European CEASE trial. *European Respiratory Journal* 1999; **13**:238–46.

2 NRT Cooper 2005 {published data only}

Cooper TV, Klesges RC, Debon MW, Zbikowski SM, Johnson KC, Clemens LH. A placebo controlled randomized trial of the effects of phenylpropanolamine and nicotine gum on cessation rates and postcessation weight gain in women. *Addictive Behaviors* 2005;**30**:61–75. Cooper TV, Montgomery GV, Debon MW, Zbikowski SM, Klesges RC, Johnson KC. The effects of PPA and nicotine gum on cessation rates and post cessation weight gain in women [POS3-46]. Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco 9th Annual Meeting, New Orleans, LA. 2003.

2 NRT Dale 1995 {published and unpublished data}

Dale LC, Hurt RD, Offord KP, Lawson GM, Croghan IT, Schroeder DR. High-dose nicotine patch therapy - percentage of replacement and smoking cessation. *JAMA* 1995;**274**:1353–8.

Dale LC, Schroeder DR, Wolter TD, Croghan IT, Hurt RD, Offord KP. Weight change after smoking cessation using variable doses of transdermal nicotine replacement. *Journal of General Internal Medicine* 1998;**13**:9–15.

2 NRT Ehrsam 1991 {published data only}

Abelin T, Ehrsam R, Buhler-Reichert A, Imhof PR, Muller P, Thommen A. Effectiveness of a transdermal nicotine system in smoking cessation studies. *Methods and Findings in Experimental and Clinical Pharmacology* 1989;**11**:205–14. Abelin T, Ehrsam R, Imhof P Muller P, Howald H. Clinical experience with a transdermal nicotine system in healthy nicotine-dependent smokers. In: Wilhemsen L editor(s). *Smoking as a cardiovascular risk factor - new strategies for smoking cessation*. Hogrefe & Huber, 1991:35–46. Ehrsam RE, Buhler A, Muller P, Mauli D, Schumacher PM, Howald H, et al.Weaning of young smokers using a transdermal nicotine patch [German] [Entwohnung junger Raucher mit Hilfe eines transdermalen Nikotinpflasters]. *Schweizerische Rundschau fur Medizin Praxis* 1991;**80**: 145–50.

Muller P, Abelin T, Ehrsam R, Imhof P, Howald H, Mauli D. The use of transdermal nicotine in smoking cessation. *Lung* 1990;**168**:445–53.

2 NRT Fiore 1994A {published and unpublished data}

Elan Pharmaceutical Research Corp. NDA 19-983 for Approval of PROSTEP. Study 90-03 1992.

* Fiore MC, Kenford SL, Jorenby DE, Wetter DW, Smith SS, Baker TB. Two studies of the clinical effectiveness of the nicotine patch with different counseling treatments. *Chest* 1994;**105**:524–33.

Kenford SL, Fiore MC, Jorenby DE, Smith SS, Wetter D, Baker TB. Predicting smoking cessation. Who will quit with and without the nicotine patch. *JAMA* 1994;**271**: 589–94.

2 NRT Fiore 1994B {published and unpublished data}

* Fiore MC, Kenford SL, Jorenby DE, Wetter DW, Smith SS, Baker TB. Two studies of the clinical effectiveness of the nicotine patch with different counseling treatments. *Chest* 1994;**105**:524–33.

2 NRT Garvey 2000 {published and unpublished data}

Doherty K, Militello FS, Kinnunen T, Garvey AJ. Nicotine gum dose and weight gain after smoking cessation. *Journal* of *Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1996;**64**:799–807. Ferguson SG, Shiffman S, Rohay JM, Gitchell JG, Garvey AJ. Effect of compliance with nicotine gum dosing on weight gained during a quit attempt. *Addiction* 2011;**106** (651-56).

* Garvey AJ, Kinnunen T, Nordstrom BL, Utman CH, Doherty K, Rosner B, et al.Effects of nicotine gum dose by

Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation (Review)

Copyright $\textcircled{\sc c}$ 2012 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

level of nicotine dependence. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research* 2000;**2**:53–63.

Nordstrom BL, Kinnunen T, Utman CH, Garvey AJ. Longterm effects of nicotine gum on weight gain after smoking cessation. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research* 1999;**1**:259–68.

2 NRT Gourlay 1995 {published data only}

Gourlay SG, Forbes A, Marriner T, Pethica D, McNeil JJ. Double blind trial of repeated treatment with transdermal nicotine for relapsed smokers. *BMJ* 1995;**311**(7001): 363–6.

2 NRT Gross 1995 {published data only}

Gross J, Johnson J, Sigler L, Stitzer ML. Dose effects of nicotine gum. *Addictive Behaviors* 1995;**20**:371–81.

2 NRT Hjalmarson 1984 {published and unpublished data} Hjalmarson AI. Effect of nicotine chewing gum in smoking cessation. A randomized, placebo-controlled, double-blind study. JAMA 1984;252:2835–8.

2 NRT Hjalmarson 1994 {published data only}

Hjalmarson AI, Franzon M, Westin A, Wiklund O. Effect of nicotine nasal spray on smoking cessation. A randomized, placebo-controlled, double-blind study. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 1994;**154**:2567–72.

2 NRT Hjalmarson 1997 *{published data only}* Hjalmarson A, Nilsson F, Sjostrom L, Wiklund O. The

nicotine inhaler in smoking cessation. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 1997;**157**:1721–8.

2 NRT Lerman 2004 *{published and unpublished data}*

Lerman C, Jepson C, Wileyto EP, Epstein LH, Rukstalis M, Patterson F, et al.Role of functional genetic variation in the dopamine D2 receptor (DRD2) in response to bupropion and nicotine replacement therapy for tobacco dependence: results of two randomized clinical trials. *Neuropsychopharmacology* 2006;**31**(1):231–42.

* Lerman C, Kaufmann V, Rukstalis M, Patterson F, Perkins K, Audrain McGovern J, et al.Individualizing nicotine replacement therapy for the treatment of tobacco dependence: a randomized trial. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 2004;**140**:426–33.

Lerman C, Tyndale R, Patterson F, Wileyto EP, Shields PG, Pinto A, et al.Nicotine metabolite ratio predicts efficacy of transdermal nicotine for smoking cessation. *Clinical Pharmacology & Therapeutics* 2006;**79**:600–8.

Lerman C, Wileyto EP, Patterson F, Rukstalis M, Audrain-McGovern J, Restine S, et al. The functional mu opioid receptor (OPRM1) Asn40Asp variant predicts short-term response to nicotine replacement therapy in a clinical trial. *Pharmacogenomics Journal* 2004;**4**(3):184–92.

Malaiyandi V, Lerman C, Benowitz NL, Jepson C, Patterson F, Tyndale RF. Impact of CYP2A6 genotype on pretreatment smoking behaviour and nicotine levels from and usage of nicotine replacement therapy. *Molecular Psychiatry* 2006;**11** (4):400–409.

Patterson F, Jepson C, Kaufmann V, Rukstalis M, Audrain-McGovern J, Kucharski S, et al.Predictors of attendance in a randomized clinical trial of nicotine replacement therapy with behavioral counseling. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence* 2003;**72**:123–31.

2 NRT Pack 2008 {published data only}

Pack QR, Jorenby DE, Fiore MC, Jackson T, Weston P, Piper M, Backer T. A comparison of the nicotine lozenge and nicotine gum: An effectiveness randomized controlled trial. *Wisconsin Medical Journal* 2008;**107**(5):237–43.

2 NRT Pirie 1992 {published data only}

Pirie PL, McBride CM, Hellerstedt WL, Jeffery RW, Hatsukami DK, Allen S, et al.Smoking cessation in women concerned about weight. *American Journal of Public Health* 1992;**82**:1238–43.

2 NRT Puska 1995 {published and unpublished data}

Puska P, Korhonen HJ, Vartiainen E, Urjanheimo EL, Gustavsson G, Westin A. Combined use of nicotine patch and gum compared with gum alone in smoking cessation: a clinical trial in North Karelia. *Tobacco Control* 1995;4: 231–5.

2 NRT Richmond 1994 {published and unpublished data}

Richmond RL, Harris K, de Almeida Neto A. The transdermal nicotine patch: results of a randomised placebocontrolled trial. *Medical Journal of Australia* 1994;**161**: 130–5.

Richmond RL, Kehoe L, Neto ACdA. Effectiveness of a 24-hour transdermal nicotine patch in conjunction with a cognitive behavioural programme: One year outcome. *Addiction* 1997;**92**:27–31.

2 NRT Sachs 1993 {published data only}

* Sachs DPL, Sawe U, Leischow SJ. Effectiveness of a 16hour transdermal nicotine patch in a medical practice setting, without intensive group counseling. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 1993;**153**:1881–90.

 2 NRT Shiffman 2002A *[published and unpublished data]* Dresler CM, Shiffman S, Strahs KR. Safety profile of the new nicotine polacrilex lozenge (PO1 36). Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco 8th Annual Meeting: Savannah, Georgia. 2002.
 Shiffman S. Nicotine lozenge efficacy in light smokers. Drug & Alcohol Dependence 2005;77:311–4.

Shiffman S. Use of more nicotine lozenges leads to better success in quitting smoking. *Addiction* 2007;**102**:809–14. * Shiffman S, Dresler CM, Hajek P, Gilburt SJ, Targett DA, Strahs KR. Efficacy of a nicotine lozenge for smoking cessation. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 2002;**162**:1267–76. Shiffman S, Dresler CM, Rohay JM. Successful treatment with a nicotine lozenge of smokers with prior failure in pharmacological therapy. *Addiction* 2004;**99**:83–92.

2 NRT Shiffman 2002B *{published and unpublished data}* Shiffman S, Dresler CM, Hajek P, Gilburt SJ, Targett DA, Strahs KR. Efficacy of a nicotine lozenge for smoking cessation. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 2002;**162**:1267–76.

2 NRT Stapleton 1995 {published and unpublished data} Russell MAH, Stapleton JA, Feyerabend C, Wiseman SM, Gustavsson G, Sawe U, et al.Targeting heavy smokers in general practice: randomised controlled trial of transdermal nicotine patches. BMJ 1993;306(6888):1308–12. * Stapleton JA, Russell MAH, Feyerabend C, Wiseman SM, Gustavsson G, Sawe U, et al.Dose effects and predictors

of outcome in a randomized trial of transdermal nicotine patches in general practice. *Addiction* 1995;**90**:31–42.

2 NRT Sutherland 1992 {published data only}

Stapleton JA, Sutherland G, Russell MAH. How much does relapse after one year erode effectiveness of smoking cessation treatments? Long term follow up of randomised trial of nicotine nasal spray. *BMJ* 1998;**316**(7134):830–1. * Sutherland G, Stapleton JA, Russell MAH, Jarvis MJ, Hajek P, Belcher M, et al.Randomised controlled trial of nasal nicotine spray in smoking cessation. *Lancet* 1992;**340**: 324–9.

2 NRT TNSG 1991 {published data only}

Daughton DM, Fortmann SP, Glover ED, Hatsukami DK, Heatley SA, Lichtenstein E, et al. The smoking cessation efficacy of varying doses of nicotine patch delivery systems 4 to 5 years post-quit day. *Preventive Medicine* 1999;**28**: 113–8.

Gross J, Stitzer ML, Maldonado J. Nicotine replacement: effects of postcessation weight gain. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical psychology* 1989;**57**(1):87–92.

Swan GE, Jack LM, Ward MM. Subgroups of smokers with different success rates after use of transdermal nicotine. *Addiction* 1997;**92**:207–17.

* Transdermal Nicotine Study Group. Transdermal nicotine for smoking cessation. Six-month results from two multicenter controlled clinical trials. Transdermal Nicotine Study Group. *JAMA* 1991;**266**:3133–8.

2 NRT Tonnesen 1991 {published and unpublished data}

Mikkelsen KL, Tonnesen P, Norregaard J. Three-year outcome of two- and three-year sustained abstainers from a smoking cessation study with nicotine patches. *Journal of Smoking-Related Disorders* 1994;**5**:95–100.

Norregaard J, Tonnesen P, Petersen L. Predictors and reasons for relapse in smoking cessation with nicotine and placebo patches. *Preventive Medicine* 1993;**22**:261–71.

Tonnesen P, Norregaard J, Sawe U. Two-year outcome in a smoking cessation trial with a nicotine patch. *Journal of Smoking-Related Disorders* 1992;**3**:241–5.

* Tonnesen P, Norregaard J, Simonsen K, Sawe U. A double-blind trial of a 16-hour transdermal nicotine patch in smoking cessation. *New England Journal of Medicine* 1991;**325**:311–5.

Tonnesen P, Norregaard J, Simonsen K, Sawe U. A doubleblind trial of nicotine patches in smoking cessation [Danish] [En dobbeltblind undersogelse af nikotinplaster ved rygeafvaenning]. *Ugeskrift for Laeger* 1992;**154**:251–4.

2 NRT Tonnesen 1993 *[published and unpublished data]* Tonnesen P, Norregaard J, Mikkelsen K, Jorgensen S, Nilsson F. A double-blind trial of a nicotine inhaler for smoking cessation. *JAMA* 1993;269:1268–71.

2 NRT Wallstrom 2000 {published data only}

Pharmacia, Upjohn. *Nicorette Nicotine Microtab Monograph*. Chester: Adis International, 1998:Adis International, 1998. Wallstrom M, Nilsson F, Hirsch JM. A double-blind placebo controlled clinical evaluation of a nicotine sublingual tablet in smoking cessation [abstract]. European Respiratory Journal 1997; Vol. 10, issue Suppl 25:440S. * Wallstrom M, Nilsson F, Hirsch JM. A randomized double-blind placebo-controlled clinical evaluation of a nicotine sublingual tablet in smoking cessation. *Addiction* 2000;**95**(8):1161–71.

2 VA Aubin 2008 {published and unpublished data}

Aubin HJ, Bobak A, Britton JR, Oncken C, Billing CB, Gong J, et al.Varenicline versus transdermal nicotine patch for smoking cessation: Results from a randomised, openlabel trial. Thorax 2008.

2 VA Gonzales 2006 {published data only}

Gonzales D, Rennard SI, Nides M, Oncken C, Azoulay S, Billing CB, et al.Varenicline, an alpha4beta2 acetylcholine nicotinic acetylcholine receptor partial agonist, vs sustainedrelease bupropion and placebo for smoking cessation. *JAMA* 2006;**296**(1):47–55.

2 VA Jorenby 2006 {published data only}

Jorenby DE, Hays JT, Rigotti NA, Azoulay S, Watsky EJ, Williams KE, et al.Efficacy of varenicline, an alpha4beta2 acetylcholine receptor partial agonist, vs placebo or sustained-release bupropion. *JAMA* 2006;**296**(1):56–63.

2 VA Nakamura 2007 {published data only}

Nakamura M, Oshima A, Fujimoto Y, Maruyama N, Ishibashi T, Reeves KR. Efficacy and tolerability of nicotinic varenicline, an alpha4beta2 acetylcholine receptor partial agonist, in a 12-week, randomized, placebo-controlled, dose-response study with 40-week follow-up for smoking cessation in Japanese smokers. *Clinical Therapeutics* 2007; **29**(6):1040–56.

2 VA Niaura 2008 {published data only}

Niaura R, Hays JT, Jorenby DE, Leone FT, Pappas JE, Reeves KR, et al. The efficacy and safety of varenicline for smoking cessation using a flexible dosing strategy in adult smokers: a randomized controlled trial. *Current Medical Research and Opinion* 2008;**24**(7):1931–41.

2 VA Nides 2006 {published and unpublished data}

Nides M, Oncken C, Gonzales D, Rennard S, Watsky EJ, Anziano R, et al.Smoking cessation with varenicline, a selective alpha4beta2 nicotinic receptor partial agonist. Archives of Internal Medicine 2006; Vol. 166:1561–8. Oncken C, Watsky E, Reeves K, et al.Varenicline is efficacious and well tolerated in promoting smoking cessation: Results from a 7-week, randomised, placeboand bupropion-controlled trial. Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco 11th annual meeting, 20-23 March 2005; Prague, Czech Republic. 2005 (abstract). 2005.

2 VA Oncken 2006 {published data only}

Oncken C, Gonzales D, Nides M, Rennard S, Watsky E, Billing CB, et al.Efficacy and safety of the novel selective nicotinic acetylcholine receptor partial agonist, varenicline, for smoking cessation. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 2008; **166**:1571–7.

2 VA Rigotti 2010 {published data only}

Ockene I, Salmoirago-Blotcher E. Varenicline for smoking cessation in patients with coronary heart disease [editorial]. *Circulation* 2010;**121**(2):188–90.

* Rigotti NA, Pipe AL, Benowitz NL, Arteaga C, Garza D, Tonstad S. Efficacy and safety of varenicline for smoking cessation in patients with cardiovascular disease. *Circulation* 2010;**121**(2):221–9.

2 VA Tashkin 2011 {published data only}

Tashkin DP, Rennard S, Hays JT, Ma W, Lawrence D, Lee TC. Effects of varenicline on smoking cessation in mild-to-moderate COPD: a randomised controlled trial. *Chest* 2011;**139**(3):591–9.

2 VA Tonstad 2006 {published data only}

Tonstad S, Tonnesen P, Hajek P, Williams KE, Billing CB, Reeves KR. Effect of maintenance therapy with varenicline on smoking cessation. *JAMA* 2006;**296**(1):64–71.

2 VA Tsai 2008 {published data only}

Tsai ST, Cho HJ, Cheng HS, Kim CH, Hsueh KC, Billing CB Jr, et al.A randomised, placebo-controlled trial of varenicline, a selective alpha4beta2 nicotinic acetylcholine receptor partial agonist, as a new therapy for smoking cessation in Asian smokers. *Clinical Therapeutics* 2008;**29** (6):1027–39.

2 VA Wang 2009 {published data only}

Fagerstrom K, Nakamura M, Cho H, Tsa S, Wang C, Davis S, et al.Varenicline treatment for smoking cessation in Asian populations: a pooled analysis of placebo-controlled trials conducted in six Asian countries. *Current Medical Research and Opinion* 2010;**26**(9):2165–73.

* Wang C, Xiao D, Chan KPW, Pothirat C, Garza D, Davis S. Varenicline for smoking cessation: A placebo-controlled randomised study. *Respirology* 2009;**14**(3):384–92.

References to studies excluded from this review

1 Ames 2007 {published data only}

Ames SC, Ames GE, Stevens SR, Patten C, Werch C, Schroeder DR. Expressive writing as a treatment adjunct to reduce weight gain in young adult smokers undergoing smoking cessation (PA3-6). Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco 13th Annual Meeting. Austin, Texas, Feb 21–24, 2007.

1 Chaney 2008 {published data only}

Chaney SE, Sheriff S. Weight gain among women during smoking cessation: testing the effects of a multifaceted program. *American Association of Occupational Health Nurse Journal* 2008;**56**(3):99–105.

1 Hughes 1997 {published data only}

Hughes JR, Hatsukami DK. Effects of three doses of transdermal nicotine on post-cessation eating, hunger and weight. *Journal of Substance Abuse* 1997;**9**:151–9.

1 Jeffery 1990 {published data only}

Jeffery RW, Hellerstedt WL, Schmid TL. Correspondence programs for smoking cessation and weight control: a comparison of two strategies in the Minnesota Heart Health Program. *Health Psychology* 1990;**9**(5):585–98.

1 Killen 1990 {published data only}

Killen JD, Fortmann SP, Newman B. Weight change among participants in a large sample minimal contact smoking relapse prevention trial. *Addictive Behaviors* 1990;**15**(4): 323–332.

1 King 2006 {published data only}

King A, de Wit H, Riley RC, Cao D, Niaura R, Hatsukami D. Efficacy of naltrexone in smoking cessation: a preliminary study and an examination of sex difference. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research* 2006;8(5):671–82.

1 Lagrue 1994 {published data only}

Lagrue G, Auclair J, Cormier S, Grimaldi B, Demaria C, Banzet MN. A study of the effects of dexfenfluramine on weight and eating behavior after smoking cessation by overweight patients. *Semaine des Hopitaux* 1994;**70**:23–24.

1 Leischow 1992 {published data only}

Leischow SJ, Sachs DPL, Bostrom AG, Hansen MD, Sachs DP. Effects of differing nicotine-replacement doses on weight gain after smoking cessation. *Archives of Family Medicine* 1992;1(2):233–237.

1 Love 2011 {published data only}

Love SJ, Sheffer CE, Bursac Z, Prewitt TE, Krukowski RA, West DS. Offer of a weight management program to overweight and obese weight-concerned smokers improves tobacco dependence treatment outcomes. *American Journal on Addictions* 2011;**20**(1):1–8.

1 Patterson 2006 {published data only}

Patterson F, Wileyto EP, Ray R, Lerman C. Examiniation of post cessation weight gain (POS2-85). Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco 12th Annual Meeting. Orlando, Florida, Feb 15–18 2006.

1 Pomerleau 1991 {published data only}

Pomerleau OF, Pomerleau CS, Morrell EM, Lowenbergh JM. Effects of fluoxetine on weight gain and food intake in smokers who reduce nicotine intake. *Psychoneuroendocrinology* 1991;**16**(5):433–440.

1 Rohsenow 2007 {published data only}

Rohsenow DJ, Monti PM, Hutchinson KE, Swift RM, Mackinnon SV, Sirota AD, Kaplan GB. High Dose transdermal nicotine and naltrexone: effects on nicotine withdrawal, urges, smoking and effects of smoking. *Experimental and Clinical Psychopharmacology* 2007;**15**(1): 81–92.

1 Spring 1991 {published data only}

Spring B, Wurtman J, Gleason R, Wurtman R, Kessler K. Weight gain and withdrawal symptoms after smoking cessation: A preventive intervention using d-Fenfluramine. *Health Psychology* 1991;**10**(3):216–223.

1 Toll 2008 {published data only}

Toll BA, Leary V, Wu R, Salovey P, Meandzija B, O'Malley SS. A preliminary investigation of naltrexone augmentation of bupropion to stop smoking with less weight gain. *Addictive Behaviors* 2008;**33**(1):173–9.

1 Wilcox 2010 {published data only}

Wilcox CS, Oskooilar N, Erickson JS, Billes SK, Katz BB, Tollefson G, et al.An open label study of naltrexone and

bupropion combination therapy for smoking cessation in overweight and obese subjects. *Addictive Behaviors* 2010;**35** (3):229–34.

2 AD Ahluwalia 2002 {published data only}

Ahluwalia JS, Harris KJ, Catley D, Okuyemi KS, Mayo MS. Sustained-release bupropion for smoking cessation in African Americans: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA* 2002;**288**:468–74.

Boardman T, Catley D, Mayo MS, Ahluwalia JS. Selfefficacy and motivation to quit during participation in a smoking cessation program. *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine* 2005;**12**:266–72.

Catley D, Harris KJ, Okuyemi KS, Mayo MS, Pankey E, Ahluwalia JS. The influence of depressive symptoms on smoking cessation among African Americans in a randomized trial of bupropion. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research* 2005;7:859–70.

Harris KJ, Ahluwalia JS, Catley D, Okuyemi KS, Mayo MS, Resnicow K. Successful recruitment of minorities into clinical trials: the Kick It at Swope project. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research* 2003;**5**:575–84.

Harris KJ, Okuyemi KS, Catley D, Mayo MS, Ge B, Ahluwalia JS. Predictors of smoking cessation among African-Americans enrolled in a randomized controlled trial of bupropion. *Preventive Medicine* 2004;**38**:498–502. Okuyemi KS, Ahluwalia JS, Ebersole Robinson M, Catley D, Mayo MS, Resnicow K. Does menthol attenuate the effect of bupropion among African American smokers?. *Addiction* 2003;**98**:1387–93.

2 AD Aubin 2004 {published data only}

Aubin HJ, Lebargy F, Berlin I, Bidaut-Mazel C, Chemali-Hudry J, Lagrue G. Efficacy of bupropion and predictors of successful outcome in a sample of French smokers: a randomized placebo-controlled trial. *Addiction* 2004;**99**: 1206–18.

Lebargy F, Aubin HJ, Lagrue G, Bidaut-Mazel C, Chemali-Hudry J, Poulain L. A placebo-controlled, double-blind study of Zyban LP: An effective and well-tolerated aid to smoking cessation - preliminary results (POS4-69). Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco 9th Annual Meeting February 19-22 New Orleans, Louisiana. 2003.

2 AD Berlin 1995 {published data only}

Berlin I, Said S, Spreux Varoquaux O, Launay JM, Olivares R, Millet V, et al.A reversible monoamine oxidase A inhibitor (moclobemide) facilitates smoking cessation and abstinence in heavy, dependent smokers. *Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics* 1995;58:444–52.
Berlin I, Spreux Varoquaux O, Said S, Launay JM. Effects of past history of major depression on smoking characteristics, monoamine oxidase-A and -B activities and withdrawal symptoms in dependent smokers. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence* 1997;45:31–7.

2 AD Blondal 1999 {published data only}

Blondal T, Gudmundsson LJ, Tomasson K, Jonsdottir D, Hilmarsdottir H, Kristjansson F, et al. The effects of fluoxetine combined with nicotine inhalers in smoking cessation - a randomized trial. *Addiction* 1999;**94**:1007–15.

2 AD Brown 2006 {published data only}

David SP, Brown RA, Papandonatos GD, Kahler CW, Lloyd-Richardson EE, Munafo MR, et al.Bupropion interacts with DRD2-TAQ1A genotype and craving to influence smoking cessation (RPOS 3-34). Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco 12th Annual Meeting February 15-18, Orlando, Florida. 2006.

David SP, Niaura R, Papandonatos GD, Shadel WG, Burkholder GJ, Britt DM, et al.Does the DRD2-Taq1 A polymorphism influence treatment response to bupropion hydrochloride for reduction of the nicotine withdrawal syndrome?. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research* 2003;**5**:935–42. David SP, Papandonatos GD, Munafo MR, McCaffery JM, Lerman C, Lloyd-Richardson EE, et al.DRD2-TAQ1A genotypic moderation of bupropion treatment efficacy for smoking cessation at 6-month follow-up [abstract]. *Nicotine* & Tobacco Research 2005;**7**:704.

2 AD Cinciripini 05 {published data only}

Cinciripini PM, Tsoh JY, Friedman K, Wetter D, Cinciripini LG, Skaar KL. A placebo controlled evaluation of venlafaxine for smoking cessation: preliminary findings [Abstract A18]. Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco Annual Meeting; Mar 27-29 1998;,New Orleans, Louisiana. 1998.

Cinciripini PM, Tsoh JY, Wetter DW, Lam C, de Moor C, Cinciripini L, et al.Combined effects of venlafaxine, nicotine replacement, and brief counseling on smoking cessation. *Experimental and Clinical Psychopharmacology* 2005;**13**:282–92.

Cinciripini PM, Wetter D, Minna J, et al. The effects of brief counseling, transdermal nicotine replacement and antidepressant therapy on smoking cessation among smokers carrying the DRD2 A1 allele (PA3A). Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco Annual Meeting; Mar 5-7 1999; San Diego, California. 1999.

Cinciripini PM, Wetter DW, Tomlinson GE, Tsoh JY, de Moor CA, Cinciripini LG, et al.The effects of the DRD2 polymorphism on smoking cessation and negative affect: Evidence for a pharmacogenetic effect on mood. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research* 2004;**6**:229–39.

2 AD Collins 2004 {published data only}

Collins B, Wileyto P, Patterson F, Rukstalis M, Audrain-McGovern J, Kaufmann V, et al.Gender differences in smoking cessation in a placebo-controlled trial of bupropion with behavioral counseling. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research* 2004;**6**:27–37.

Collins BN, Niaura R, Wileyto EP, Patterson F, Brown RA, Audrain J. Gender differences in smoking relapse in a behavioral counseling + placebo-controlled bupropion trial (PA2-5). Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco 8th Annual Meeting; February 20-23; Savannah, Georgia. 2002.

Lerman C, Jepson C, Wileyto EP, Epstein LH, Rukstalis M, Patterson F, et al.Role of functional genetic variation in the dopamine D2 receptor (DRD2) in response to bupropion and nicotine replacement therapy for tobacco dependence: results of two randomized clinical trials.

Neuropsychopharmacology 2006;31:231-42.

Lerman C, Niaura R, Collins BN, Wileyto P, Audrain MJ, Pinto A, et al.Effect of bupropion on depression symptoms in a smoking cessation clinical trial. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors* 2004;**18**:362–6.

Lerman C, Roth D, Kaufmann V, Audrain J, Hawk L, Liu AY, et al.Mediating mechanisms for the impact of bupropion in smoking cessation treatment. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence* 2002;**67**:219–23.

Lerman C, Shields PG, Wileyto EP, Audrain J, Hawk LH Jr, Pinto A, et al.Effects of dopamine transporter and receptor polymorphisms on smoking cessation in a bupropion clinical trial. *Health Psychology* 2003;**22**:541–8. Lerman C, Shields PG, Wileyto EP, Audrain J, Pinto A, Hawk L, et al.Pharmacogenetic investigation of smoking cessation treatment. *Pharmacogenetics* 2002;**12**:627–34. Wileyto EP, Patterson F, Niaura R, Epstein LH, Brown RA, Audrain-McGovern J, et al.Recurrent event analysis of lapse and recovery in a smoking cessation clinical trial using bupropion. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research* 2005;**7**:257–68. Wileyto P, Patterson F, Niaura R, Epstein L, Brown R, Audrain-McGovern J, et al.Do small lapses predict relapse to smoking behavior under bupropion treatment?. *Nicotine* & *Tobacco Research* 2004;**6**:357–66.

2 AD Covey 2002 {published data only}

Covey LS, Glassman AH, Stetner F, Rivelli S. A trial of sertraline for smokers with past major depression. Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco Meeting. Arlington, VA (http://www.srnt.org/events/abstracts99/index.htm) 2000.

Covey LS, Glassman AH, Stetner F, Rivelli S, Stage K. A randomized trial of sertraline as a cessation aid for smokers with a history of major depression. *American Journal of Psychiatry* 2002;**159**:1731–7.

2 AD Covey 2007 {published data only}

Covey, L. S, Glassman, A. H, Jiang, H, Fried, J, Masmela, J, LoDuca, C, Petkova, E, & Rodriguez, K. A randomized trial of bupropion and/or nicotine gum as maintenance treatment for preventing smoking relapse. *Addiction* 2007; **102**:1292–1302.

2 AD Da Costa 2002 {published data only}

Costa C, Younes R, Lourenco M. Smoking cessation: A randomized double-blind study comparing nortriptyline to placebo [abstract]. *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine* 2001;**163**(5 Suppl):A354. da Costa CL, Younes RN, Lourenco MT-C. Stopping smoking: a prospective, randomized, double-blind study comparing nortriptyline to placebo. *Chest* 2002;**122**:403–8.

2 AD Dalsgareth 2004 {published data only}

Dalsgarð OJ, Vestbo J. A multicenter, randomised, doubleblind, placebo-controlled 6 month trial to evaluate efficacy and tolerability of bupropion hydrochloride sustained release (SR) tablets as treatment for nicotine dependency in healthcare workers and as an aid to smoking cessation (ZYB30009). Poster and oral presentation. European Congress on Tobacco or Health, Warsaw, Poland, 20-22 June 2002. 2002.

Dalsgareth OJ, Hansen NC, Søes-Petersen U, Evald T, Høegholm A, Barber J, et al.A multicenter, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, 6-month trial of bupropion hydrochloride sustained-release tablets as an aid to smoking cessation in hospital employees. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research* 2004;**6**:55–61.

2 AD Evins 2001 {published data only}

Evins AE, Cather C, Rigotti NA, Freudenreich O, Henderson DC, Olm Shipman CM, et al. Two-year follow-up of a smoking cessation trial in patients with schizophrenia: increased rates of smoking cessation and reduction. *Journal of Clinical Psychiatry* 2004;**65**:307–11. Evins AE, Mays VK, Rigotti NA, Tisdale T, Cather C, Goff DC. A pilot trial of bupropion added to cognitive behavioral therapy for smoking cessation in schizophrenia. *Nicotine Tobacco Research* 2001;**3**:397–403.

2 AD Evins 2005 {published data only}

Evins AE, Cather C, Culhane M, Freudenreich O, Rigotti NA, Goff DC. Smoking cessation in schizophrenia: A double blind placebo controlled trial of bupropion SR added to cognitive behavioral therapy. *Biological Psychiatry* 2004;**55**:806.

Evins AE, Cather C, Deckersbach T, Freudenreich O, Culhane MA, Olm-Shipman CM, et al.A double-blind placebo-controlled trial of bupropion sustained-release for smoking cessation in schizophrenia. *Journal of Clinical Psychopharmacology* 2005;**25**:218–25.

Evins AE, Deckersbach T, Cather C, Freudenreich O, Culhane MA, Henderson DC, et al.Independent effects of tobacco abstinence and bupropion on cognitive function in schizophrenia. *Journal of Clinical Psychiatry* 2005;**66**: 1184–90.

2 AD Evins 2006 {published data only}

Evins AE, Cather C, Culhane M, Birnbaum AS, Horowitz J, Hsieh E, et al.A placebo-controlled study of bupropion SR added to high dose nicotine replacement therapy for smoking cessation or reduction in schizophrenia (POS2-104). Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco 12th Annual Meeting; February 15-18, Orlando, Florida. 2006.

2 AD Evins 2008 {published data only}

Evins, A. E, Culhane, M. A, Alpert, J. E, Pava, J, Liese, B. S, Farabaugh, A, & Fava, M. A controlled trial of bupropion added to nicotine patch and behavioral therapy for smoking cessation in adults with unipolar depressive disorders. *Journal of clinical psychopharmacology* 2008;**28**:660–666.

2 AD Ferry 1992 {published data only}

Ferry LH, Robbins AS, Scariati PD, et al.Enhancement of smoking cessation using the antidepressant bupropion hydrochloride [abstract 2670]. *Circulation* 1992;**86**(4 Suppl 1):I–671.

2 AD Ferry 1994 {published data only}

Ferry LH, Burchette RJ. Efficacy of bupropion for smoking cessation in non depressed smokers [Abstract]. *Journal of Addictive Diseases* 1994;**13**(4):249.

2 AD George 2002 {published data only}

George TP, Vessicchio JC, Termine A, Bregartner TA, Feingold A, Rounsaville BJ, et al.A placebo controlled trial of bupropion for smoking cessation in schizophrenia. *Biological Psychiatry* 2002;**52**:53–61.

2 AD GlaxoSmithK SMK20001 {published data only}

GlaxoSmithKline Clinical Trials Register. Study No: SMK 20001. A Multi-Center, Double-Blind, Double-Dummy, Placebo-Controlled, Randomized, Parallel Group, Dose Response Evaluation of a New Chemical Entity (NCE) and ZYBAN (bupropion hydrochloride) Sustained Release (300mg/day) versus Placebo As Aids to Smoking Cessation.. http--ctr.glaxowellcome.co.uk-Summary-bupropion-II: SMK20001.pdf (accessed 23rd August 2006).

2 AD Gonzales 2001 {published data only}

Gonzales D, Nides M, Ferry LH, Segall N, Herrero L, Modell J, et al.Retreatment with bupropion SR: results from 12-month follow-up (RP-83). Rapid Communication Poster Abstracts. Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco 8th Annual Meeting, February 20-23 Savannah, Georgia.. 2002.

Gonzales DH, Nides MA, Ferry LH, Kustra RP, Jamerson BD, Segall N, et al.Bupropion SR as an aid to smoking cessation in smokers treated previously with bupropion: A randomized placebo-controlled study. *Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics* 2001;**69**:438–44.

2 AD Haggsträm 2006 {published data only}

Haggsträm FM, Chatkin JM, Sussenbach-Vaz E, Cesari DH, Fam CF, Fritscher CC. A controlled trial of nortriptyline, sustained-release bupropion and placebo for smoking cessation: preliminary results. *Pulmonary Pharmacology & Therapeutics* 2006;**19**:205–9.

2 AD Hall 1998 {published data only}

Haas AL, Munoz RF, Humfleet GL, Reus VI, Hall SM. Influences of mood, depression history, and treatment modality on outcomes in smoking cessation. *Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology* 2004;**72**:563–70. Hall SM, Reus VI, Munoz RF, Sees KL, Humfleet G, Hartz DT, et al.Nortriptyline and cognitive-behavioral therapy in the treatment of cigarette smoking. *Archives of General Psychiatry* 1998;**55**:683–90.

2 AD Hall 2002 {published data only}

Hall SM, Humfleet G, Maude-Griffin R, Reus VI, Munoz R, Hartz DT. Nortriptyline versus bupropion and medical management versus psychological intervention in smoking treatment (PA 5A). Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco 7th Annual Meeting March 23-23 Seattle, Washington. 2001:31.

Hall SM, Humfleet GL, Reus VI, Munoz RF, Hartz DT, Maude-Griffin R. Psychological intervention and antidepressant treatment in smoking cessation. *Archives of General Psychiatry* 2002;**59**:930–36.

Hall SM, Lightwood JM, Humfleet GL, Bostrom A, Reus VI, Munoz R. Cost-effectiveness of bupropion, nortriptyline, and psychological intervention in smoking cessation. Journal of Behavioral Health Services & Research 2005;**32**:381–92.

2 AD Hall 2004 {published data only}

Hall SM, Humfleet GL, Reus VI, Munoz RF, Cullen J. Extended nortriptyline and psychological treatment for cigarette smoking. *American Journal of Psychiatry* 2004;**161**: 2100–7.

2 AD Hatsukami 2004 {published data only}

Hatsukami DK, Rennard S, Patel MK, Kotlyar M, Malcolm R, Nides MA, et al.Effects of sustained-release bupropion among persons interested in reducing but not quitting smoking. *American Journal of Medicine* 2004;**116**:151–7. Rennard S, Hatsukami D, Malcolm R E, Patel MK, Jamerson BD, Dozier G. Zyban (bupropion HCL SR) vs placebo as an aid to smoking reduction among smokers unwilling and unable to quit smoking (PO4 77). Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco 7th Annual Meeting March 23-23 Seattle, Washington. 2001:117.

2 AD Hays 2001 {published data only}

Abel GA, Hays JT, Decker PA, Croghan GA, Kuter DJ, Rigotti NA. Effects of biochemically confirmed smoking cessation on white blood cell count. *Mayo Clin Proc* 2005; **80**:1022–28.

Cox LS, Patten CA, Niaura RS, Decker PA, Rigotti N, Sachs DPL, et al.Efficacy of bupropion for relapse prevention in smokers with and without a past history of major depression. *Journal of General Internal Medicine* 2004;**19**: 828–34.

Durcan MJ, Deener G, White J, Johnston JA, Gonzales D, Niaura R, et al. The effect of bupropion sustainedrelease on cigarette craving after smoking cessation. *Clinical Therapeutics* 2002;**24**:540–51.

Durcan MJ, Johnston JA, White J, Gonzales D, Sachs DP, Rigotti N, Niaura R. Bupropion SR for relapse prevention: a "slips-allowed" analysis. *American Journal of Health Behavior* 2004;**28**(5):456–63.

Gonzales D, Bjornson W, Durcan MJ, White JD, Johnston JA, Buist AS, et al. Effects of gender on relapse prevention in smokers treated with bupropion SR. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 2002;**22**:234–39.

Hays JT, Hurt RD, Rigotti NA, Niaura R, Gonzales D, Durcan MJ, et al.Sustained-release bupropion for pharmacologic relapse prevention after smoking cessation. A randomized, controlled trial. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 2001;**135**:423–33.

Hurt RD, Wolter TD, Rigotti N, Hays JT, Niaura R, Durcan MJ, et al.Bupropion for pharmacologic relapse prevention to smoking - Predictors of outcome. *Addictive Behaviors* 2002;**27**(4):493–507.

Rigotti N, Thorndike AN, Durcan MJ, White JD, Johnston AJ, Niaura R, et al.Attenuation of post-cessation weight gain in smokers taking bupropion: The effect of gender. Abstract Book. Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco 6th Annual Meeting; Feb 18-20 2000; Arlington VA. 2000.

2 AD Hertzberg 2001 {published data only}

Hertzberg MA, Moore SD, Feldman ME, Beckham JC. A preliminary study of bupropion sustained-release for

smoking cessation in patients with chronic posttraumatic stress disorder. *Journal of Clinical Psychopharmacology* 2001; **21**:94–8.

2 AD Holt 2005 {published data only}

Holt S, Timu-Parata C, Ryder-Lewis S, Weatherall M, Beasley R. Efficacy of bupropion in the indigenous Maori population in New Zealand. *Thorax* 2005;**60**:120–23.

2 AD Hurt 2003 {published data only}

Hurt RD, Croghan GA, Sloan JA, Krook JE, Silberstein PT. Bupropion for relapse prevention after nicotine patch therapy [PA 5B abstract]. Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco 7th Annual Meeting, March 23-23 2001, Seattle, Washington. 2001:32.

Hurt RD, Krook JE, Croghan IT, Loprinzi CL, Sloan JA, Novotny PJ, et al.Nicotine patch therapy based on smoking rate followed by bupropion for prevention of relapse to smoking. *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 2003;21:914–20.

2 AD Killen 2000 {published data only}

Killen JD, Fortmann SP, Schatzberg A, Hayward C, Varady A. Onset of major depression during treatment for nicotine dependence. *Addictive Behaviors* 2003;**28**:461–70. Killen JD, Fortmann SP, Schatzberg AF, Hayward C, Sussman L, Rothman M, et al.Nicotine patch and paroxetine for smoking cessation. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 2000;**68**:883–9.

2 AD Killen 2004 {published data only}

Killen JD, Robinson TN, Ammerman S, Hayward C, Rogers J, Samuels D. Major depression among adolescent smokers undergoing treatment for nicotine dependence. *Addictive Behaviors* 2004;**29**:1517–26.

Killen JD, Robinson TN, Ammerman S, Hayward C, Rogers J, Stone C, et al.Randomized clinical trial of the efficacy of bupropion combined with nicotine patch in the treatment of adolescent smokers. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 2004;**72**:729–35.

2 AD Killen 2006 {published data only}

Killen JD, Fortmann SP, Murphy GM Jr, Hayward C, Arredondo C, Cromp D, et al.Extended Treatment With Bupropion SR for Cigarette Smoking Cessation. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 2006;**74**(2):286–94.

2 AD Myles 2004 {published data only}

Myles PS, Leslie K, Angliss M, Mezzavia P, Lee L. Effectiveness of bupropion as an aid to stopping smoking before elective surgery: a randomised controlled trial. *Anaesthesia* 2004;**59**:1053–8.

2 AD Piper 2004 {published data only}

Piper ME, Federman EB, Bolt DM, Smith SS, Fiore MC, Baker TB. Mediators of bupropion treatment effects (PA5-6). Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco 12th Annual Meeting February 15-18, Orlando, Florida.. 2006: 27.

Piper ME, Federman EB, Smith SS, Fiore MC, Baker TB. Efficacy of bupropion SR alone and combined with 4mg gum (PA2-2). Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco 10th Annual Meeting February 18-21, Phoenix, Arizona. 2004:18.

2 AD Piper 2009 {published data only}

* Piper, M. E, Smith, S. S, Schlam, T. R, Fiore, M. C, Jorenby, D. E, Fraser, D, & Baker, T. B. A randomized placebo-controlled clinical trial of 5 smoking cessation pharmacotherapies. *Archives of general psychiatry* 2009;**66**: 1253–1262.

Smith, S. S, McCarthy, D. E, Japuntich, S. J, Christiansen, B, Piper, M. E, Jorenby, D. E, Fraser, D. L, Fiore, M. C, Baker, T. B, & Jackson, T. C. Comparative effectiveness of 5 smoking cessation pharmacotherapies in primary care clinics. *Archives of internal medicine* 2009;**169**:2148–2155.

2 AD Prochazka 1998 {published data only}

Prochazka AV, Weaver MJ, Keller RT, Fryer GE, Licari PA, Lofaso D. A randomized trial of nortriptyline for smoking cessation. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 1998;**158**:2035–9.

2 AD Prochazka 2004 {published data only}

Prochazka AV, Kick S, Steinbrunn C, Miyoshi T, Fryer GE. A randomized trial of nortriptyline combined with transdermal nicotine for smoking cessation. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 2004;**164**:2229–33. Prochazka AV, Reyes R, Steinbrunn C, Miyoshi T. Randomized trial of nortriptyline combined with transdermal nicotine for smoking cessation (PO3 26). Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco 7th Annual

Meeting, March 23-23 2001, Seattle, Washington. 2001:

73.2 AD Rovina 2009 {published data only}

Rovina, N, Nikoloutsou, I, Katsani, G, Dima, E, Fransis, K, Roussos, C, & Gratziou, C. Effectiveness of pharmacotherapy and behavioral interventions for smoking cessation in actual clinical practice. *Therapeutic advances in respiratory disease* 2009;**3**:279–287.

2 AD Selby 2003 {published data only}

GlaxoSmithKline Clinical Trials Register. Study No: ZYB40001. A randomized, double-blind, placebocontrolled, 12-week smoking cessation trial of Zyban (150 mg bid) in adult smokers previously treated with Zyban. http--ctr.glaxowellcome.co.uk-Summary-bupropion-IV ZYB40001.pdf (accessed 23rd August 2006). Selby P, Ainslie M, Stepner N, Roberts J. Sustained-release bupropion (Zybanr) is effective in the re-treatment of relapsed adult smokers. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2003; **167**(7):A47.

Selby P, Brands B, Stepner N. Retreatment with ZYban SR: 52 week follow-up of a Canadian Multicentre trial (POS3-63). Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco 9th Annual Meeting, February 19-22, New Orleans. 2003. Selby P, Brosky G, Baker R, Lertzman M, Dakin P, Roberts J. Zyban is effective in the retreatment of relapsed adult smokers (PO4 68). Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco 7th Annual Meeting March 23-23 Seattle Washington. 2001:114.

2 AD Swan 2003 {published data only}

Catz S, Jack LM, Swan GE, McClure J. Adherence to bupropion SR in a smoking cessation effectiveness trial (POS2-77). Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco

12th Annual Meeting February 15-18, Orlando, Florida. 2006.

Jack LM, Swan GE, Thompson E, Curry SJ, McAfee T, Dacey S, Bergman K. Bupropion SR and smoking cessation in actual practice: methods for recruitment, screening, and exclusion for a field trial in a managed-care setting. *Preventive Medicine* 2003;**36**:585–93.

Javitz HS, Swan GE, Zbikowski SM, Curry SJ, McAfee TA, Decker DL, et al.Cost-effectiveness of different combinations of bupropion SR dose and behavioral treatment for smoking cessation: a societal perspective. *American Journal of Managed Care* 2004;**10**:217–26. McAfee T, Zbikowski SM, Bush T, McClure J, Swan G, Jack LM, Curry S. The effectiveness of bupropion SR and phone counseling for light and heavy smokers (PA2-1). Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco 10th Annual Meeting February 18-21, Phoenix, Arizona. 2004. Swan GE, Jack LM, Curry S, Chorost M, Javitz H, McAfee T, Dacey S. Bupropion SR and counseling for smoking cessation in actual practice: Predictors of outcome. *Nicotine* & *Tobacco Research* 2003;**5**:911–21.

Swan GE, Javitz HS, Jack LM, Curry SJ, McAfee T. Heterogeneity in 12-month outcome among female and male smokers. *Addiction* 2004;**99**:237–50. Swan GE, McAfee T, Curry SJ, Jack LM, Javitz H, Dacey S, Bergman K. Effectiveness of bupropion sustained release for smoking cessation in a health care setting: a randomized trial. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 2003;**163**:2337–44. Swan GE, Valdes AM, Ring HZ, Khroyan TV, Jack LM, Ton CC, et al.Dopamine receptor DRD2 genotype and smoking cessation outcome following treatment with bupropion SR. *Pharmacogenomics Journal* 2005;**5**:21–9.

2 AD Tashkin 2001 {published data only}

Patel MK, Tashkin DP, Kanner RE, Bailey WC, Buist A, Anderson PJ, et al.A multicenter evaluation of the effects of bupropion hydrochloride sustained release tablets (Bup SR) versus placebo in a population of smokers with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (PO130). 11th World Conference on Tobacco or Health; Aug 6-11 2000; Chicago, ILL. 2000; Vol. 1:118.

Tashkin D, Kanner R, Bailey W, Buist S, Anderson P, Nides M, et al.Smoking cessation in patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease: a double-blind, placebocontrolled, randomised trial. *Lancet* 2001;**357**:1571–75.

2 AD Tonnesen 2003 {published data only}

Bolliger CT, Gilljam H, Lebargy F, van Spiegel PI, Edwards J, Hider A, et al.Bupropion hydrochloride (Zyban) is effective and well tolerated as an aid to smoking cessation - a multicountry study. Abstract and presentation at 11th Annual meeting of European Respiratory Society, Berlin, September 22-26 2001. *European Respiratory Journal* 2001; **18 (Suppl 33)**:12s.

Tonnesen P, Tonstad S, Hjalmarson A, Lebargy F, van Spiegel PI, Hider A, et al.A multicentre, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, 1-year study of bupropion SR for smoking cessation. *Journal of Internal Medicine*

2003;254:184-92.

Tonstad S, Aaserud E, Hjalmarson A, Peiffer G, van der Molen T, Hider, et al.Zyban is an effective and well tolerated aid to smoking cessation in a general smoking population - a multi-country study. Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco 3rd Europe Conference, September 19-22 2001, Paris, France 2001:46.

2 AD Tonstad 2003 {published data only}

McRobbie H, Brath H, Astbury C, Hider A, Sweet R. Bupropion hydrochloride sustained release (SR) is an effective and well tolerated aid to smoking cessation in smokers with cardiovascular disease 12 month follow-up phase data (ZYB40014). Abstract and presentation at European Respiratory Society meeting, 14-18 September 2002, Stockholm, Sweden. 2002.

Tonstad S, Farsang C, Klaene G, Lewis K, Manolis A, Perruchoud AP, et al.Bupropion SR for smoking cessation in smokers with cardiovascular disease: a multicentre, randomised study. *European Heart Journal* 2003;**24**: 946–55.

van Spiegel PI, Lewis K, Seinost G, Astbury C, Hider A, Sweet R. Bupropion hydrochloride (Zyban) is an effective and well tolerated aid to smoking cessation in smokers with cardiovascular disease - a multicountry study. Abstract and presentation at 11th Annual meeting of European Respiratory Society, Berlin, September 22-26. *European Respiratory Journal* 2001;**18**((Suppl 33)):13s.

2 AD Uyar 2005 {published data only}

Uyar M, Bayram N, Filiz A, Elbek O, Topçu A, Dikensoy O, et al.Comparison of nicotine patch and bupropion in treating tobacco dependence. *European Respiratory Journal* 2005;**26**(Suppl 49):388s.

2 AD Wagena 2005 {published data only}

Wagena EJ, Knipschild PG, Huibers MJ, Wouters EF, van Schayck CP. Efficacy of bupropion and nortriptyline for smoking cessation among people at risk for or with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 2005;**165**:2286–92.

2 EX Hill 1985 {published data only}

Hill JS. Effect of a program of aerobic exercise on the smoking behaviour of a group of adult volunteers. *Canadian Journal of Public Health* 1985;**76**:186–6.

2 EX Hill 1993 {published data only}

Hill RD, Rigdon M, Johnson S. Behavioural smoking cessation treatment for older chronic smokers. *Behavioural therapy* 1993;24:321–9.

2 EX Kinnunen 2008 {unpublished data only}

Kinnunen T, Leeman RF, Korhonen T, Quiles ZN, Terwal DM, Garvey AJ, et al.Exercise as an adjunct to nicotine gum in treating tobacco dependence among women. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research* 2008;**10**:689–703.

Quiles ZN, Leeman RF, Molinelli L, et al.Exercise as a behavioural adjunct to nicotine gum for smoking cessation - preliminary findings (PO 42).. Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco 8th Annual Meeting. Savannah, Georgia, February 20–23, 2002; Vol. 59.

2 EX Marcus 1991 {published data only}

Marcus BH, Albrecht AE, Niaura RS, Abrams DB, Thompson PD. Usefulness of physical exercise for maintaining smoking cessation in women. *American Journal* of *Cardiology* 1991;**68**:406–7.

2 EX Marcus 1995 {published data only}

Marcus BH, Albrecht AE, Niaura RS, Taylor ER, Simkin LR, Feder SI, et al.Exercise enhances the maintenance of smoking cessation in women. *Addictive Behaviours* 1995; **20**:87–92.

2 EX Martin 1997 {published data only}

Martin JE, Kalfas KJ, Patten CA. Prospective evaluation of three smoking interventions in 205 recovering alcoholics: One-year results of project SCRAP-Tobacco. *Journal of consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1997;**65**:190–4. Patten CA, Martin JE, Calfas KJ, Brown SA, Schroeder DR. Effect of three smoking cessation treatments on nicotine withdrawal in 141 abstinent alcoholic smokers. *Addictive Behaviours* 2000;**25**:301–6.

Patten CA, Martin JE, Calfas KJ, Wolter TD. Behavioural treatment for smokers with a history of alcoholism: predictors of successful outcome. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 2001;**69**(5):796–801.

2 EX Prapavessis 2007 {unpublished data only}

Prapavessis H. The effects of exercise and nicotine replacement therapy on smoking rates in women. Eighth International Congress of Behavioural Medicine. Mainz, Germany, 2004.

Prapavessis H, Cameron I, Baldi JC, Robinson S, Borrie K, Harper T, et al. The effects of exercise and nicotine replacement therapy on smoking rates in women. *Addictive Behaviors* 2007;**32**:1416–32.

2 EX Russell 1988 {published data only}

Russell PO, Epstein LH, Johnson JJ, Block DR, Blair E. The effects of exercise as maintenance for smoking cessation. *Addictive Behaviours* 1988;**13**:215–8.

2 EX Taylor {published data only}

Taylor CB, Houston-Miller N, Haskell WL, Debusk RF. Smoking cessation after acute myocardial infarction: The effects of exercise training. *Addictive Behaviours* 1988;**13**: 215–8.

2 NRT Ahluwalia 1998 {published data only}

Ahluwalia JS, McNagny SE, Clark WS. Smoking cessation among inner-city African Americans using the nicotine transdermal patch. *Journal of General Internal Medicine* 1998;**13**:1–8.

2 NRT Ahluwalia 2006 {published data only}

Ahluwalia JS, Okuyemi K, Nollen N, Choi WS, Kaur H, Pulvers K, et al. The effects of nicotine gum and counseling among African American light smokers: A 2 x 2 factorial design. *Addiction* 2006;**101**:883–91.

Nollen NL, Mayo MS, Sanderson CL, Okuyemi KS, Choi WS, Kaur H, et al.Predictors of quitting among African American light smokers enrolled in a randomized, placebocontrolled trial. *Journal of General Internal Medicine* 2006; **21**:590–5.

Okuyemi KS, Cox LS, Nollen NL, Snow TM, Kaur H, Choi W, et al.Baseline characteristics and recruitment strategies in a randomized clinical trial of African-American light smokers. *American Journal of Health Promotion* 2007; **21**:183–91.

2 NRT Areechon 1988 {published data only}

Areechon W, Punnotok J. Smoking cessation through the use of nicotine chewing gum: a double-blind trial in Thailand. *Clinical Therapeutics* 1988;**10**:183–6.

2 NRT Blondal 1989 {published data only}

Blondal T. Controlled trial of nicotine polacrilex gum with supportive measures. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 1989; **149**:1818–21.

2 NRT Blondal 1997 {published data only}

Blondal T, Franzon M, Westin A. A double-blind randomized trial of nicotine nasal spray as an aid in smoking cessation. *European Respiratory Journal* 1997;**10**:1585–90. Blondal T, Olafsdottir I, Gunnarsdottir R, Franzon M, Westin A. Controlled trial of nicotine nasal spray as an aid to stopping smoking [abstract]. *European Respiratory Journal* 1993;**6**(Suppl 17):631S.

2 NRT Bolin 1999 {published data only}

Bolin LJ, Antonuccio DO, Follette WC, Krumpe P. Transdermal nicotine: the long and the short of it. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors* 1999;**13**:152–6.

2 NRT Br Thor Soc 83 {published data only}

Research Committee of the British Thoracic Society. Comparison of four methods of smoking withdrawal in patients with smoking related diseases. Report by a subcommittee of the Research Committee of the British Thoracic Society. *British Medical Journal* 1983;**286**(6365): 595–7.

2 NRT Buchkremer 88 {published data only}

Buchkremer G, Bents H, Horstmann M, Opitz K, Tolle R. Combination of behavioral smoking cessation with transdermal nicotine substitution. *Addictive Behaviors* 1989; **14**:229–38.

Buchkremer G, Bents H, Minneker E, Opitz K. Longterm effects of a combination of transdermal nicotine administration with behavior therapy for smoking cessation [Langfristige Effekte einer Kombination von transdermaler Nikotinzufuhr mit Verhaltenstherapie zur Raucherentwohnung]. *Nervenarzt* 1988;**59**:488–90.

2 NRT Bullen 2010 {published data only}

Bullen, C, Howe, C, Lin, R. B, Grigg, M, Laugesen, M, McRobbie, H, Glover, M, Walker, N, Wallace, B. M, Whittaker, R, & Rodgers, A. Pre-cessation nicotine replacement therapy: pragmatic randomized trial. *Addiction* 2010;**105**:1474–1483.

2 NRT Campbell 1987 {published data only}

Campbell IA, Lyons E, Prescott R. Do nicotine chewinggum and postal encouragement add to doctors' advice. *Practitioner* 1987;**231**:114–7.

2 NRT Campbell 1991 {published data only}

Campbell IA, Prescott RJ, Tjeder-Burton SM. Smoking cessation in hospital patients given repeated advice plus nicotine or placebo chewing gum. *Respiratory Medicine* 1991;**85**:155–7.

2 NRT Campbell 1996 {published data only}

Burton S, Campbell IA, Prescott RJ. Nicotine patches versus placebo in 235 hospital patients [abstract 191]. Abstracts from the 8th World Conference on Tobacco or Health, Mar 30-Apr 3; Buenos Aires, Argentina. 1992.

Campbell IA, Prescott RJ, Tjeder-Burton SM. Transdermal nicotine plus support in patients attending hospital with smoking-related diseases: a placebo-controlled study. *Respiratory Medicine* 1996;**90**:47–51.

2 NRT Cinciripini 96 {published data only}

Cinciripini PM, Cinciripini LG, Wallfisch A, Haque W. Behavior therapy and the transdermal nicotine patch: Effects on cessation outcome, affect, and coping. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1996;**64**:314–23. Cinciripini PM, Wetter DW, Fouladi RT, Blalock JA, Carter BL, Cinciripini LG, et al. The effects of depressed mood on smoking cessation: mediation by postcessation selfefficacy. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 2003; **71**:292–301.

2 NRT Clavel 1985 {published data only}

Clavel F, .Benhamou S. Tobacco withdrawal. Comparison of the efficacy of various methods. Intermediate results of a comparative study [French] [Désintoxcation tabagique. Comparison de l'efficacité de differentes méthodes. Résultats intermédiaires d'une étude comparative]. *Presse Médicale* 1984;**13**:975–7.

Clavel F, Benhamou S, Company Huertas A, Flamant R. Helping people to stop smoking: randomised comparison of groups being treated with acupuncture and nicotine gum with control group. *British Medical Journal* 1985;**291**: 1538–9.

2 NRT Clavel-Cha '92 {published data only}

Clavel-Chapelon F, Paoletti C, Benhamou S. A randomised 2 x 2 factorial design to evaluate different smoking cessation methods. *Revue d'Epidemiologie et de Sante Publique* 1992; **40**:187–90.

2 NRT Croghan 2003 {published data only}

Croghan GA, Hurt RD, Croghan IT, Sloan J, Novotny P, Loprinzi C. Comparison of a 15 mg transdermal nicotine patch alone versus nicotine nasal spray alone versus both for smoking cessation. *Journal of Addictive Diseases* 1998;**17**: 121.

Croghan GA, Sloan JA, Croghan IT, Novotny P, Hurt RD, DeKrey WL, et al.Comparison of nicotine patch alone versus nicotine nasal sparay alone versus a combination for treating smokers: A minimal intervention, randomized multicenter trial in a nonspecialized setting. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research* 2003;**5**(2):181–7.

2 NRT Croghan 2007 {published data only}

Croghan, I. T, Hurt, R. D, Dakhil, S. R, Croghan, G. A, Sloan, J. A, Novotny, P. J, Rowland, K. M, Bernath, A, Loots, M. L, Le-Lindqwister, N. A, Tschetter, L. K,

Garneau, S. C, Flynn, K. A, Ebbert, L. P, Wender, D. B, & Loprinzi, C. L. Randomized comparison of a nicotine inhaler and bupropion for smoking cessation and relapse prevention. *Mayo Clinic.proceedings.Mayo Clinic.* 2007;**82**: 186–195.

2 NRT Daughton 1991 {published data only}

Daughton DM, Heatley SA, Prendergast JJ, Causey D, Knowles M, Rolf CN, et al.Effect of transdermal nicotine delivery as an adjunct to low-intervention smoking cessation therapy. A randomized, placebo-controlled, double-blind study. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 1991;**151**:749–52. Daughton DM, Heatley SA, Prendergast JJ, Causey D, Knowles M, Rolf CN, et al.Effects of transdermal nicotine as an adjunct in smoking cessation therapy. A doubleblind randomized study controlled with placebo [Italian] [Effetti del rilascio transdermico di nicotina come terapia di supporto per lo svezzamento dal fumo di sigaretta. Uno studio randomizzato in doppio cieco con controlli trattati con placebo.]. *Archivio Monaldi* 1992;**47**:17–29.

2 NRT Daughton 1998 {published data only}

Daughton D, Susman J, Sitorius M, Belenky S, Millatmal T, Nowak R, et al. Transdermal nicotine therapy and primary care. Importance of counseling, demographic, and participant selection factors on 1-year quit rates. The Nebraska Primary Practice Smoking Cessation Trial Group. *Archives of Family Medicine* 1998;7:425–30.

2 NRT Dautzenberg 01 {published data only}

Dautzenberg B, Peiffer G, Toulouse F, Yvinec MJ, Jacob N, Kienzler JL. Randomized trial assessment of nicotinell lozenge 1mg, a new oral nicotine replacement therapy. Abstract Book. Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco 3rd European Conference, Paris. 2001:55. Dautzenberg B, Ruff F, Vaucher M, Maillon P, Jacob N, Kienzler JL, et al.First demonstration of the good efficacy/ safety ratio of Nicotinell(r) 1mg Lozenge (NL 1mg), a new form of nicotine substitution, by randomised clinical trial. *European Respiratory Journal* 2001;**18 Suppl 33**:12s.

2 NRT Davidson 1998 {published data only}

Davidson M, Epstein M, Burt R, Schaefer C, Whitworth G, McDonald A. Efficacy and safety of an over-the-counter transdermal nicotine patch as an aid for smoking cessation. *Archives of Family Medicine* 1998;7:569–74.

2 NRT Etter 2009 {published data only}

Etter, J. F, Huguelet, P, Perneger, T. V, & Cornuz, J. vol. Nicotine gum treatment before smoking cessation: a randomized trial. *Archives.of internal.medicine* **169**: 1028–1034.

2 NRT Fagerstrom 82 {published data only}

Fagerstrom KO. A comparison of psychological and pharmacological treatment in smoking cessation. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine* 1982;**5**:343–51. Fagerstrom KO. Tolerance, withdrawal and dependence on tobacco and smoking termination. *International Review of Applied Psychology* 1983;**32**:29–52.

2 NRT Fagerstrom 84 {published data only}

Fagerstrom KO. Effects of nicotine chewing gum and follow-up appointments in physician-based smoking cessation. *Preventive Medicine* 1984;13:517–27.

2 NRT Fee 1982 {published data only}

Fee WM, Stewart MJ. A controlled trial of nicotine chewing gum in a smoking withdrawal clinic. *Practitioner* 1982;**226**: 148–51.

2 NRT Fortmann 1995 {published data only}

Fortmann SP, Killen JD. Nicotine gum and self-help behavioral treatment for smoking relapse prevention results from a trial using population-based recruitment. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1995;**63**: 460–8.

2 NRT Garcia 1989 {published data only}

Quilez Garcia C, Hernando Arizaleta L, Rubio Diaz A, Estruch Riba J, Fornes Ramis MV. Treatment for smoking with nicotine gum in primary care. A double blind trial [Spanish] [Tratamiento del tabaquismo, con chicle de nicotina, en atencion primaria. Estudio a doble ciego]. *Revista Clinica Espanol* 1993;**192**(4):157–61.

Quilez Garcia C, Hernando Arizaleta L, Rubio Diaz A, Granero Fernandez EJ, Vila Coll MA, Estruch Riba JSO. Double-blind study of the efficacy of nicotine chewing gum for smoking cessation in the primary care setting [Spanish] [Estudio doble ciego de la eficacia del chicle de nicotina en la deshabituacion tabaquica dentro del ambito de la atencion primaria]. *Atencion Primaria* 1989;**6**:719–26.

2 NRT Gilbert 1989 {published data only}

Gilbert JR, Wilson DM, Best JA, Taylor DW, Lindsay EA, Singer J, et al.Smoking cessation in primary care. A randomized controlled trial of nicotine-bearing chewing gum. *Journal of Family Practice* 1989;28:49–55.

2 NRT Glavas 2003a {published data only}

Glavas D, Rumboldt M, Rumboldt Z. Smoking cessation with nicotine replacement therapy among health care workers: randomized double-blind study. *Croatian Medical Journal* 2003;44:219–24.

2 NRT Glavas 2003b {published data only}

Glavas D, Rumboldt Z. Smoking cessation using the transdermal nicotine system [Croatian] [Odvikavanje od pusenja transdermalnim nikotinskim sustavom]. *Lijecnicki Vjesnik* 2003;**125**(1-2):8–12.

2 NRT Glover 2002 {published data only}

Glover E, Glover P, Franzon M, Sullivan R, Cerullo C. Safety and efficacy of a nicotine sublingual tablet for smoking cessation [abstract]. Smoke Free 21st Century, 2nd European Conference on Tobacco or Health; Las Palmas de Gran Canaria. 1999.

Glover ED, Franzon M, Sullivan CR, Cerullo CL. A nicotine sublingual tablet for treating tobacco dependence [Abstract]. Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco 3rd Europe Conference, Paris September 2001 Abstract Book. 2001:48.

* Glover ED, Glover PN, Franzon M, Sullivan CR, Cerullo CC, Howell RM, et al.A comparison of a nicotine sublingual

tablet and placebo for smoking cessation. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research* 2002;**4**:441–50.

Glover ED, Glover PN, Franzon M, Sullivan R, Sullivan P, Howell R, et al.A nicotine sublingual tablet for smoking cessation: 6-month data [Abstract]. Proceedings of the 10th World Conference on Tobacco or Health; Aug 24-28 Beijing, China. 1997.

2 NRT Goldstein 1989 {published data only}

Goldstein MG, Niaura R, Follick MJ, Abrams DB. Effects of behavioral skills training and schedule of nicotine gum administration on smoking cessation. *American Journal of Psychiatry* 1989;**146**:56–60.

2 NRT Hall 1985 {published data only}

Hall SM, Tunstall C, Rugg D, Jones R, Benowitz N. Nicotine gum and behavioral treatment in smoking cessation. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1985;**53**:256–8.

2 NRT Hall 1987 {published data only}

Hall SM, Tunstall CD, Ginsberg D, Benowitz NL, Jones RT. Nicotine gum and behavioral treatment: a placebo controlled trial. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1987;**55**:603–5.

2 NRT Hall 1996 {published data only}

Hall SM, Munoz RF, Reus VI, Sees KL, Duncan C, Humfleet GL, et al.Mood management and nicotine gum in smoking treatment - a therapeutic contact and placebo-controlled study. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1996;**64**:1003–9.

2 NRT Hand 2002 {published data only}

Hand S, Edwards S, Campbell IA, Cannings R. Controlled trial of three weeks nicotine replacement treatment in hospital patients also given advice and support. *Thorax* 2002;**57**:715–8.

2 NRT Harackiewicz 1988 {published data only}

Harackiewicz JM, Blair LW, Sansone C, Epstein JA, Stuchell RN. Nicotine gum and self-help manuals in smoking cessation: an evaluation in a medical context. *Addictive Behaviors* 1988;**13**:319–30.

2 NRT Hatsukami 2007 {published data only}

Hatsukami, D, Mooney, M, Murphy, S, LeSage, M, Babb, D, & Hecht, S. Effects of high dose transdermal nicotine replacement in cigarette smokers. *Pharmacology*, *Biochemistry & Behavior* 2007;**86**:132–139.

2 NRT Hays 1999 {published data only}

Hays JT, Croghan GA, Offord KP, Hurt RD, Schroeder DR, Wolter TD, et al.Over-the-counter nicotine patch therapy for smoking cessation: Results from randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled and open label trials. *American Journal of Public Health* 1999;**89**:1701–7. Hays JT, Croghan GA, Offord KP, Wolter TD, Nides MA, Davidson M. Over-the-Counter (OTC) transdermal nicotine patch therapy [abstract]. *Journal of Addictive Diseases* 1997;**16**:136.

Hays JT, Croghan IT, Offord KP, Hurt RD, Schroeder DR, Wolter TD, et al.Over the counter 22mg nicotine patch therapy for smoking cessation: results from randomized

double-blind placebo-controlled and open label trials. Abstract Book. Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco 5th Annual Meeting, San Diego (CA) 1999.

2 NRT Herrera 1995 {published data only}

Herrera N, Franco R, Herrera L, Partidas A, Rolando R, Fagerstrom KO. Nicotine gum, 2 and 4 mg, for nicotine dependence. A double-blind placebo-controlled trial within a behavior modification support program. *Chest* 1995;**108**: 447–51.

2 NRT Hilleman 1994 {published data only}

Hilleman DE, Mohiuddin SM, Delcore MG. Comparison of fixed-dose transdermal nicotine, tapered-dose transdermal nicotine, and buspirone in smoking cessation. *Journal of Clinical Pharmacology* 1994;**34**(3):222–4.

2 NRT Huber 1988 {published data only}

Huber D. Combined and separate treatment effects of nicotine chewing gum and self-control method. *Pharmacopsychiatry* 1988;**21**:461–2.

2 NRT Hughes 1989 {published data only}

Hughes JR, Gust SW, Keenan RM, Fenwick JW, Healey ML. Nicotine vs placebo gum in general medical practice. *JAMA* 1989;**261**:1300–5.

2 NRT Hughes 1990 {published data only}

Hughes JR, Gust SW, Keenan RM, Fenwick JW. Effect of dose on nicotine's reinforcing, withdrawal-suppression and self-reported effects. *Journal of Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics* 1990;**252**:1175–83.

2 NRT Hughes 1991 {published data only}

Hughes JR, Wadland WC, Fenwick JW, Lewis J, Bickel WK. Effect of cost on the self-administration and efficacy of nicotine gum: a preliminary study. *Preventive Medicine* 1991;**20**:486–96.

2 NRT Hughes 1999 {published data only}

Hughes JR, Lesmes GR, Hatsukami DK, Richmond RL, Lichtenstein E, Jorenby DE, et al.Are higher doses of nicotine replacement more effective for smoking cessation?. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research* 1999;**1**:169–74.

2 NRT Hughes 2003 {published data only}

Hughes JR, Novy P, Hatsukami DK, Jensen J, Callas PW. Efficacy of nicotine patch in smokers with a history of alcoholism. *Alcoholism-Clinical and Experimental Research* 2003;**27**:946–54.

2 NRT Hurt 1990 {published data only}

Hurt RD, Lauger GG, Offord KP, Kottke TE, Dale LC. Nicotine-replacement therapy with use of a transdermal nicotine patch-a randomized double-blind placebocontrolled trial. *Mayo Clinic Proceedings* 1990;**65**:1529–37.

2 NRT Hurt 1994 {published data only}

Hurt RD, Dale LC, Fredrickson PA, Caldwell CC, Lee GA, Offord KP, et al.Nicotine patch therapy for smoking cessation combined with physician advice and nurse follow-up: One-year outcome and percentage of nicotine replacement. *JAMA* 1994;**271**:595–600.

2 NRT ICRF 2007 {published data only}

David SP, Munafo MR, Murphy MF, Walton RT, Johnstone EC. The serotonin transporter 5-HTTLPR polymorphism and treatment response to nicotine patch: follow-up of a randomized controlled trial. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research* 2007;**9**(2):225–231.

Imperial Cancer Research Fund General Practice research Group. Randomised trial of nicotine patches in general practice: results at one year.. *BMJ* 1994;**308**:1476–7. Imperial Cancer Research Fund General Practice Research Group. Effectiveness of a nicotine patch in helping people stop smoking: results of a randomised trial in general practice.. *BMJ* 1993;**306**:1304–8.

Johnstone EC, Yudkin Pl, Hey K, Roberts SJ, Welch SJ, Murphy MF, et al.Genetic variation in dopaminergic pathways and short-term effectiveness of the nicotine patch. *Pharmacogenetics* 2004;**14**(2):83–90.

Yudkin P, Hey K, Roberts S, Welch S, Murphy M, Walton R. Abstinence from smoking eight years after participation in randomised controlled trial of nicotine patch. *BMJ* 2003; **327**(7405):28–29.

Yudkin P, Munafo M, Hey K, Roberts S, Welch S, Johnstone E, et al. Effectiveness of nicotine patches in relation to genotype in women versus men: randomised controlled trial. *BMJ* 2004;**328**(7446):989–90.

2 NRT Jamrozik 1984 {published data only}

Jamrozik K, Fowler G, Vessey M, Wald N. Placebo controlled trial of nicotine chewing gum in general practice. *British Medical Journal* 1984;**289**:794–7.

2 NRT Jarvis 1982 {published data only}

Jarvis MJ, Raw M, Russell MAH, Feyerabend C. Randomised controlled trial of nicotine chewing-gum. *British Medical Journal* 1982;**285**:537–40.

2 NRT Jensen 1991 {published data only}

Jensen EJ, Schmidt E, Pedersen B, Dahl R. Effect of nicotine, silver acetate, and ordinary chewing gum in combination with group counselling on smoking cessation. *Thorax* 1990;**45**:831–4.

Jensen EJ, Schmidt E, Pedersen B, Dahl R. Effect on smoking cessation of silver acetate, nicotine and ordinary chewing gum. Influence of smoking history. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)* 1991;**104**:470–4. Jensen EJ, Schmidt E, Pedersen B, Dahl R. The effect of

nicotine, silver acetate, and placebo chewing gum on the cessation of smoking. The influence of smoking type and nicotine dependence. *International Journal of the Addictions* 1991;**26**:1223–31.

2 NRT Jorenby 1995 {published data only}

Jorenby DE, Smith SS, Fiore MC, Hurt RD, Offord KP, Crogham IT, et al.Varying nicotine patch dose and type of smoking cessation counseling. *JAMA* 1995;**274**:1347–52.

2 NRT Jorenby 1999 {published data only}

Durcan MJ, White J, Jorenby DE, Fiore MC, Rennard SI, Leischow SJ, et al.Impact of prior nicotine replacement

therapy on smoking cessation efficacy. *American Journal of Health Behaviors* 2002;**26**:213–20.

Jamerson BD, Nides M, Jorenby DE, Donahue R, Garrett P, Johnston JA, et al.Late-term smoking cessation despite initial failure: an evaluation of bupropion sustained release, nicotine patch, combination therapy, and placebo. *Clinical Therapeutics* 2001;**23**:744–52.

Jorenby DE, Leischow SJ, Nides MA, Rennard SI, Johnston JA, Hughes AR, et al.A controlled trial of sustained-release bupropion, a nicotine patch, or both for smoking cessation. *New England Journal of Medicine* 1999;**340**:685–91.

2 NRT Joseph 1996 {published data only}

Joseph AM, Antonnucio DO. Lack of efficacy of transdermal nicotine in smoking cessation. *New England Journal of Medicine* 1999;**341**:1157–8. Joseph AM, Norman SM, Ferry LH, Prochazka AV, Westman EC, Steele BG, et al.The safety of transdermal nicotine as an aid to smoking cessation in patients with

cardiac disease. *New England Journal of Medicine* 1996;**335**: 1792–8.

2 NRT Kalman 2006 {published data only}

Kalman D, Denison H, Penk W, Peer J, Kresman D, Monti P. Early findings from a treatment study of heavy smokers in alcohol recovery (PO2 34). Abstract Book. Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco 7th Annual Meeting March 23-23 Seattle, Washington. 2001:61.

Kalman D, Kahler CW, Garvey AJ, Monti PM. High-dose nicotine patch therapy for smokers with a history of alcohol dependence: 36-week outcomes. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment* 2006;**30**:213–7.

Kalman D, Kahler CW, Tirch D, Kaschub C, Penk W, Monti PM. Twelve-week outcomes from an investigation of high-dose nicotine patch therapy for heavy smokers with a past history of alcohol dependence. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors* 2004;**18**:78–82.

Kalman D, Tirch D, Penk W, Denison H. An investigation of predictors of nicotine abstinence in a smoking cessation treatment study of smokers with a past history of alcohol dependence. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors* 2002;**16**: 346–9.

Kalman D, Tirch D, Penk W, Kaschub C. Preliminary findings from a treatment study of heavy smokers in alcohol recovery: end of treatment outcomes (PO2 38). Abstract Book. Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco 8th Annual Meeting February 20-23 Savannah, Georgia. 2002: 58.

2 NRT Killen 1984 {published data only}

Killen JD, Maccoby N, Taylor CB. Nicotine gum and selfregulation training in smoking relapse prevention. *Behavior Therapy* 1984;**15**:234–48.

2 NRT Killen 1990 {published data only}

Fortmann SP, Killen JD, Telch MJ, Newman B. Minimal contact treatment for smoking cessation. A placebo controlled trial of nicotine polacrilex and self-directed relapse prevention: initial results of the Stanford Stop Smoking Project. *JAMA* 1988;**260**:1575–80. Killen JD, Fortmann SP, Newman B, Varady A. Evaluation of a treatment approach combining nicotine gum with self-guided behavioral treatments for smoking relapse prevention. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1990;**58**:85–92.

2 NRT Killen 1997 {published data only}

Killen JD, Fortmann SP, Davis L, Varady A. Nicotine patch and self-help video for cigarette smoking cessation. *Journal* of Consulting and Clinical Psychology 1997;**65**:663–72.

2 NRT Killen 1999 {published data only}

Killen JD, Fortmann SP, Davis L, Strausberg L, Varady A. Do heavy smokers benefit from higher dose nicotine patch therapy?. *Experimental and Clinical Psychopharmacology* 1999;7:226–33.

2 NRT Kornitzer 1987 {published data only}

Kornitzer M, Kittel F, Dramaix M, Bourdoux P. A double blind study of 2 mg versus 4 mg nicotine-gum in an industrial setting. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research* 1987; **31**:171–6.

2 NRT Kornitzer 1995 {published data only}

Kornitzer M, Boutsen M, Dramaix M, Thijs J, Gustavsson G. Combined use of nicotine patch and gum in smoking cessation: a placebo-controlled clinical trial. *Preventive Medicine* 1995;**24**:41–7.

Kornitzer M, Boutsen M, Thijs J, Gustavsson G. Efficiency and safety of combined use of nicotine patches and nicotine gum in smoking cessation: a placebo controlled doubleblind trial [abstract]. *European Respiratory Journal* 1993;**6** (Suppl 17):630S.

2 NRT Kralikova 2002 {published data only}

Kralikova E, Kozak J, Rasmussen T, Cort N. The clinical benefits of NRT-supported smoking reduction. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research* 2002;4:243.

2 NRT Kralikova 2009 {published data only}

Kralikova, E, Kozak, J. T, Rasmussen, T, Gustavsson, G, & Le, H. J. Smoking cessation or reduction with nicotine replacement therapy: a placebo-controlled double blind trial with nicotine gum and inhaler. *BMC.public health*, 2009;**9**:433.

2 NRT Leischow 1996 {published data only}

Leischow SJ, Nilsson F, Franzon M, Hill A, Otte P, Merikle EP. Efficacy of the nicotine inhaler as an adjunct to smoking cessation. *American Journal of Health Behavior* 1996;**20**: 364–71.

2 NRT Leischow 1999 {published data only}

Leischow SJ, Muramoto ML, Cook GN, Merikle EP, Castellini SM, Otte PS. OTC nicotine patch: effectiveness alone and with brief physician intervention. *American Journal of Health Behavior* 1999;**23**:61–9.

2 NRT Leischow 2004 {published data only}

Leischow SJ, Ranger-Moore J, Muramoto ML, Matthews E. Effectiveness of the nicotine inhaler for smoking cessation
in an OTC setting. *American Journal of Health Behavior* 2004;**28**:291–301.

Leischow SJ, Ranger-Moore J, Muramoto ML, Matthews E. The safety and effectiveness of the nicotine inhaler for smoking cessation in an over-the-counter setting (POS4-78). Abstract Book. Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco 9th Annual Meeting, New Orleans, LA. 2003:100.

2 NRT Lewis 1998 {published data only}

Lewis SF, Piasecki TM, Fiore MC, Anderson JE, Baker TB. Transdermal nicotine replacement for hospitalized patients: A randomized clinical trial. *Preventive Medicine* 1998;**27** (2):296–303.

2 NRT Llivina 1988 {published data only}

Salvador Llivina T, Marin Tuya D, Gonzalez Quintana J, Iniesta Torres C, Castellvi Barrera E, Muriana Saez C, et al.Treatment of smoking: efficacy of the use of nicotine chewing gum. Double-blind study [Spanish] [Tratamiento del tabaquismo: eficacia de la utilizacion del chicle de nicotina. Estudio a doble ciego]. *Medicina Clinica Barcelona* 1988;**90**:646–50.

2 NRT Malcolm 1980 {published data only}

Malcolm RE, Sillett RW, Turner JA, Ball KP. The use of nicotine chewing gum as an aid to stopping smoking. *Psychopharmacology Series* 1980;**70**:295–6.

2 NRT Marshall 1985 {published data only}

Marshall A, Raw M. Nicotine chewing gum in general practice: effect of follow up appointments. *British Medical Journal* 1985;**290**:1397–8.

2 NRT McGovern 1992 {published data only}

McGovern PG, Lando HA. An assessment of nicotine gum as an adjunct to Freedom from Smoking cessation clinics. *Addictive Behaviors* 1992;**17**:137–47.

2 NRT Molyneux 2003 {published data only}

Molyneux A, Lewis S, Leivers U, Anderton A, Antoniak M, Brackenridge A, et al.Clinical trial comparing nicotine replacement therapy (NRT) plus brief counselling, brief counselling alone, and minimal intervention on smoking cessation in hospital inpatients. *Thorax* 2003;**58**(6):484–8.

2 NRT Moolchan 2005 {published data only}

Franken FH, Pickworth WB, Epstein DH, Moolchan ET. Smoking rates and topography predict adolescent smoking cessation following treatment with nicotine replacement therapy. *Cancer Epidemiology, Biomarkers & Prevention* 2006;**15**:154–7.

Moolchan ET, Robinson ML, Ernst M, Cadet JL, Pickworth WB, Heishman SJ, et al.Safety and efficacy of the nicotine patch and gum for the treatment of adolescent tobacco addiction. *Pediatrics* 2005;**115**(4):e407–e414.

Robinson ML, Schroeder JR, Moolchan ET. Adolescent smokers screened for a nicotine replacement treatment trial: Correlates of eligibility and enrollment. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research* 2006;**8**:447–54.

2 NRT Mori 1992 {published data only}

Mori T, Shimao T, Yulchiro G, Namiki M, Hyachi T. A clinical trial of nicotine chewing gum for smoking cessation

[abstract 428]. 8th World Conference on Tobacco or Health; Buenos Aires, Argentina 1992.

2 NRT Muller 1990 {published data only}

Muller P, Abelin T, Eshram R, Imhof P, Howald H, Mauli D. The use of transdermal nicotine in smoking cessation. *Lung* 1990;**168**:445–53.

2 NRT Nakamura 1990 {published data only}

Nakamura M, Saito J, Oshima A, Miyamoto M, Matushita A, Endo S. Effect of nicotine chewing gun in smoking cessation classes. The Global War. Proceedings of the 7th World Conference on Tobacco and Health; Perth, Western Australia. Perth: Health Department of Western Australia, 1990:665–7.

2 NRT Nebot 1992 {published data only}

Nebot M, Cabezas C. Does nurse counseling or offer of nicotine gum improve the effectiveness of physician smoking-cessation advice?. *Family Practice Research Journal* 1992;**12**:263–70.

2 NRT Niaura 1994 {published data only}

Niaura R, Goldstein MG, Abrams DB. Matching high and low-dependence smokers to self-help treatment with or without nicotine replacement. *Preventive Medicine* 1994; **23**:70–7.

2 NRT Niaura 1999 {published data only}

Niaura R, Abrams DB, Shadel WG, Rohsenow DJ, Monti PM, Sirota AD. Cue exposure treatment for smoking relapse prevention: A controlled clinical trial. *Addiction* 1999;**94** (5):685–96.

2 NRT Ockene 1991 {published data only}

Ockene JK, Kristeller J, Goldberg R, Amick TL, Pekow PS, Hosmer D, et al.Increasing the efficacy of physiciandelivered smoking interventions: a randomized clinical trial. *Journal of General Internal Medicine* 1991;**6**:1–8. Ockene JK, Kristeller J, Pbert L, Hebert JR, Luippold R, Goldberg RJ, et al.The physician-delivered smoking intervention project: can short-term interventions produce long-term effects for a general outpatient population?. *Health Psychology* 1994;**13**:278–81.

2 NRT Oncken 2007 {published data only}

Oncken C, Cooney J, Feinn R, Lando H, Kranzler HR. Transdermal nicotine for smoking cessation in postmenopausal women. *Addictive Behaviors* 2007;**32**: 296–309.

Oncken C, Cooney J, Lando H, Feinn R, Kranzler H. Transdermal nicotine for smoking cessation in postmenopausal women (POS1-045). Abstract Book. Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco 11th Annual Meeting, Prague. 2005.

2 NRT Otero 2006 {published data only}

Otero UB, Perez CA, Szklo M, Esteves GA, dePinho MM, Szklo AS, et al.Randomized clinical trial: effectiveness of the cognitive-behavioral approach and the use of nicotine replacement transdermal patches for smoking cessation among adults in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil [Portugese] [Ensaio clinico randomizado: efetividade da abordagem cognitivo–comportamental e uso de adesivos transdermicos

de reposicao de nicotina, na cessacao de fumar, em adultos residentes no Municipio do Rio de Janeiro, Brasil]. *Cadernos de Saude Publica* 2006;**22**:439–49.

2 NRT Page 1986 {published data only}

Page AR, Walters DJ, Schlegel RP, Best JA. Smoking cessation in family practice: the effects of advice and nicotine chewing gum prescription. *Addictive Behaviors* 1986;**11**:443–6.

2 NRT Paoletti 1996 {published data only}

Paoletti P, Fornai E, Maggiorelli F, Puntoni R, Viegi G, Carrozzi L, et al.Importance of baseline cotinine plasma values in smoking cessation: results from a double blind study with nicotine patch. *European Respiratory Journal* 1996;**9**:643–51.

2 NRT Peng 2007 {published data only}

Peng, R. L, Wang. S. L. 2007. Nicotine sublingual tablet for smoking cessation in 115 cases: a double-blind randomized placebo-controlled clinical trial. *Journal of Clinical Rehabilitative. Tissue Engineering. Research* 2007;**11**: 10443–10446.

2 NRT Perng 1998 {published data only}

Perng RP, Hsieh WC, Chen YM, Lu CC, Chiang SJ. Randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study of transdermal nicotine patch for smoking cessation. *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine* 1999;**159** (3SS):A735.

Perng RP, Hsieh WC, Chen YM, Lu CC, Chiang SJ. Randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study of transdermal nicotine patch for smoking cessation. *Journal* of the Formosan Medical Association 1998;97:547–51.

2 NRT Piper 2007 {published data only}

Piper ME, Federman EB, Bolt DM, Smith SS, Fiore MC, Baker TB. Mediators of bupropion treatment effects (PA5-6). Abstract Book. Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco 12th Annual Meeting, Orlando, FL. 2006:27. Piper ME, Federman EB, McCarthy DE, Bolt DM, Smith SS, Fiore MC, et al.Efficacy of bupropion alone and in combination with nicotine gum. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research* 2007;**9**:947–54.

Piper ME, Federman EB, Smith SS, Fiore MC, Baker TB. Efficacy of bupropion SR alone and combined with 4-mg gum (PA2-2). Abstract Book. Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco 10th Annual Meeting, Phoenix, AZ. 2004:18.

2 NRT Puska 1979 {published data only}

Puska P, Bjorkqvist S, Koskela K. Nicotine-containing chewing gum in smoking cessation: a double blind trial with half year follow-up. *Addictive Behaviors* 1979;**4**:141–6.

2 NRT Richmond 1993 {published data only}

Richmond R, Heather N. General Practitioner interventions for smoking cessation: past results and future prospects. *Behaviour Change* 1990;7:110–9.

Richmond RL, Makinson RJ, Giugni AA, Webster IW. General Practitioner smoking interventions in Australia: results of studies over the past ten years. The Global War, Proceedings of the 7th World Conference on Tobacco and Health. Perth, Western Australia. Perth: Health Department of Western Australia, 1990:657–60. Richmond RL, Makinson RJ, Kehoe LA, Giugni AA, Webster IW. One-year evaluation of three smoking cessation interventions administered by general practitioners. *Addictive Behaviors* 1993;**18**:187–99.

2 NRT Rose 1994 {published data only}

Rose JE, Behm FM, Westman EC, Levin ED, Stein RM, Ripka GV. Mecamylamine combined with nicotine skin patch facilitates smoking cessation beyond nicotine patch treatment alone. *Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics* 1994;**56**:86–99.

Rose JE, Westman EC, Behm FM. Nicotine/mecamylamine combination treatment for smoking cessation [published erratum appears in Drug Development Research 1997;40: 215]. Drug Development Research 1996;**38**:243–256.

2 NRT Rose 1998 {published data only}

Rose JE, Behm FM, Westman EC. Nicotine-mecamylamine treatment for smoking cessation: the role of pre-cessation therapy. *Experimental and Clinical Psychopharmacology* 1998;**6**:331–43.

Rose JE, Westman EC, Behm FM. Nicotine/mecamylamine combination treatment for smoking cessation [published erratum appears in Drug Development Research 1997;40: 215]. *Drug Development Research* 1996;**38**:243–56.

2 NRT Rose 2006 {published data only}

Rose JE, Behm FM, Westman EC, Kukovich P. Precessation treatment with nicotine skin patch facilitates smoking cessation. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research* 2006;**8**:89–101.

2 NRT Rose 2009 {published data only}

Rose, J. E, Herskovic, J. E, Behm, F. M, & Westman, E. C. Precessation treatment with nicotine patch significantly increases abstinence rates relative to conventional treatment. *Nicotine.and Tobacco.Research* 2009;**11**:1067–1075.

2 NRT Roto 1987 {published data only}

Roto P, Ojala A, Sundman K, Jokinen K, Peltomakl R. Nicotine gum and withdrawal from smoking. *Suomen Laakarllehtl* 1987;**36**:3445–8.

2 NRT Russell 1983 {published data only}

Russell MA, Merriman R, Stapleton J, Taylor W. Effect of nicotine chewing gum as an adjunct to general practitioner's advice against smoking. *British Medical Journal (Clinical Research Ed.)* 1983;**287**:1782–5.

2 NRT Schneider '85A {published data only}

Jarvik ME, Schneider NG. Degree of addiction and effectiveness of nicotine gum therapy for smoking. *American Journal of Psychiatry* 1984;**141**:790–1. Schneider NG, Jarvik ME. Nicotine gum vs. placebo gum: comparisons of withdrawal symptoms and success rates. *NIDA Research Monograph* 1985;**53**:83–101. Schneider NG, Jarvik ME, Forsythe AB, Read LL, Elliott ML, Schweiger A. Nicotine gum in smoking cessation: a placebo-controlled, double-blind trial. *Addictive Behaviors* 1983;**8**:253–61.

2 NRT Schneider '85B {published data only}

Schneider NG, Jarvik ME. Nicotine gum vs. placebo gum: comparisons of withdrawal symptoms and success rates. *NIDA Research Monograph* 1985;**53**:83–101. Schneider NG, Jarvik ME, Forsythe AB, Read LL, Elliott ML, Schweiger A. Nicotine gum in smoking cessation: a placebo-controlled, double-blind trial. *Addictive Behaviors* 1983;**8**:253–61.

2 NRT Schneider 1995 {published data only}

Schneider NG, Olmstead R, Mody FV, Doan K, Franzon M, Jarvik ME, et al.Efficacy of a nicotine nasal spray in smoking cessation: a placebo-controlled, double-blind trial. *Addiction* 1995;**90**:1671–82.

2 NRT Schneider 1996 {published data only}

Schneider NG, Olmstead R, Nilsson F, Mody FV, Franzon M, Doan K. Efficacy of a nicotine inhaler in smoking cessation: a double-blind, placebo controlled trial. *Addiction* 1996;**91**:1293–306. Schneider NG, Olmstead R, Nilsson F, Mody FV, Franzon M, Doan K. Efficacy of a nicotine inhaler in smoking cessation: A double-blind, placebo-controlled trial

[abstract]. Addiction 1997;**92**:630.

2 NRT Schnoll 2010 {published data only}

Schnoll, R. A, Martinez, E, Tatum, K. L, Glass, M, Bernath, A, Ferris, D, & Reynolds, P. Nicotine patch vs. nicotine lozenge for smoking cessation: an effectiveness trial coordinated by the Community Clinical Oncology Program. *Drug and alcohol dependence* 2010;**107**:237–243. Schnoll, R. A, Patterson, F, Wileyto, E. P, Heitjan, D. F, Shields, A. E, Asch, D. A, & Lerman, C. Effectiveness of extended-duration transdermal nicotine therapy: a randomized trial. *Annals of internal.medicine* 2010;**152**: 144–151.

2 NRT Schuurmans 04 {published data only}

Schuurmans MM, Diacon AH, van Biljon X, Bolliger CT. Effect of pre-treatment with nicotine patch on withdrawal symptoms and abstinence rates in smokers subsequently quitting with the nicotine patch: a randomized controlled trial. *Addiction* 2004;**99**:634–40.

Schuurmans MM, Diacon AH, van Biljon X, Westin A, Landfeldt B, Bolliger CT. Effect of pre-treatment with nicotine patch on withdrawal symptoms in smokers subsequently quitting with the nicotine patch: a double-blind randomised controlled trial [https://www.ersnetsecure.org/public/prg congres.abstract? wwwipresentation=6711). European Respiratory Society Annual Congress, Stockholm. 2002.

2 NRT Segnan 1991 {published data only}

Segnan N, Ponti A, Battista RN, Senore C, Rosso S, Shapiro SH, et al.A randomized trial of smoking cessation interventions in general practice in Italy. *Cancer Causes and Control* 1991;**2**:239–46.

Senore C, Battista RN, Ponti A, Segnan N, Shapiro SH, Rosso S, et al. Comparing participants and nonparticipants in a smoking cessation trial: Selection factors associated with general practitioner recruitment activity. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 1999;**52**:83–9.

Senore C, Battista RN, Shapiro SH, Segnan N, Ponti A, Rosso S, et al.Predictors of smoking cessation following physicians' counseling. *Preventive Medicine* 1998;**27**: 412–21.

2 NRT Shiffman 2009 {published data only}

Shiffman, S, Ferguson, S. G, & Strahs, K. R. Quitting by gradual smoking reduction using nicotine gum: a randomized controlled trial. *American journal of preventive medicine* 2009;**36**:96–104.

2 NRT Sonderskov 97 {published data only}

Sonderskov J, Olsen J, Meillier L, Overvad OK, Sabroe S. [The effect of transdermal nicotine patches in smoking cessation. A randomized trial in pharmacy customers in Denmark] [Danish]. Ugeskrift for Laeger 1999;**161**:593–7. Sonderskov J, Olsen J, Sabroe S, Meillier L, Overvad K. Nicotine patches in smoking cessation: A randomized trial among over- the-counter customers in Denmark. American Journal of Epidemiology 1997;**145**:309–18.

2 NRT Stapleton 2011 {published data only}

Stapleton, J. A, Sutherland. G. Treating heavy smokers in primary care with the nicotine nasal spray: randomized placebo-controlled trial. *Addiction* 2011;**106**:824–832.

2 NRT Tonnesen 1988 {published data only}

Tonnesen P, Fryd V, Hansen M, Helsted J, Gunnersen AB, Forchammer H, et al.Effect of nicotine chewing gum in combination with group counseling on the cessation of smoking. *New England Journal of Medicine* 1988;**318**:15–8.

2 NRT Tonnesen 2000 {published data only}

Tonnesen P, Mikkelsen KL. Smoking cessation with four nicotine replacement regimes in a lung clinic. *European Respiratory Journal* 2000;**16**:717–22.

2 NRT Tonnesen 2006 {published data only}

Pbert L. Nurse-conducted smoking cessation in patients with COPD, using nicotine sublingual tablets and behavioral support. *Chest* 2006;**130**:314–6. Tonnesen P, Mikkelsen K, Bremann L. Nurse-conducted smoking cessation in patients with COPD using nicotine sublingual tablets and behavioral support. *Chest* 2006;**130**: 334–42.

2 NRT Veaugh-Geiss 2010 {published data only}

Veaugh-Geiss, A. M, Chen, L. H, Kotler, M. L, Ramsay, L. R, & Durcan, M. J. Pharmacokinetic comparison of two nicotine transdermal systems, a 21-mg/24-hour patch and a 25-mg/16-hour patch: a randomized, open-label, single-dose, two-way crossover study in adult smokers. *Clinical therapeutics* 2010;**32**:1140–1148.

2 NRT Villa 1999 {published data only}

Villa RS, Alvarez ABD, Hermida JRF. Effectiveness of a multicomponent program to quit smoking with and without nicotine chewing gum [Spanish] [Eficacia de un programa multicomponente para dejar de fumar con y sin chicle de nicotina]. *Psicologia Conductual* 1999;7:107–18.

2 NRT Westman 1993 {published data only}

Westman EC, Levin ED, Rose JE. The nicotine patch in smoking cessation. A randomized trial with telephone counseling. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 1993;**153**: 1917–23.

2 NRT Wisborg 2000 {published data only}

Wisborg K, Henriksen TB, Jespersen LB, Secher NJ. Nicotine patches for pregnant smokers: A randomized controlled study. *Obstetrics & Gynecology* 2000;**96**(6): 967–71

2 NRT Wong 1999 {published data only}

Wong GY, Wolter TD, Croghan GA, Croghan IT, Offord KP, Hurt RD. A randomized trial of naltrexone for smoking cessation. *Addiction* 1999;**94**:1227–37.

2 NRT Zelman 1992 {published data only}

Zelman DC, Brandon TH, Jorenby DE, Baker TB. Measures of affect and nicotine dependence predict differential response to smoking cessation treatments. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1992;**60**: 943–52.

2 RM STRATUS-EU 2006 {published data only}

Cinciripini PM, Aubin HJ, Dale LC, Niaura R, Anthenelli RM, Robinson J. Pooled analysis of three short-term, randomised, double blind, placebo controlled trials with rimonabant 20mg/d smoking cessation [PI-TS-01].. Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco 8th European Conference. Kusadasi Turkey, Sept 2006.

2 RM STRATUS-US 2006 {published data only}

Anthenelli RM, Depres JP. Effects of rimonabant in the reduction of major cardiovascular risk factors. Results from the STRATUS-US trial (smoking cessation in smokers motivated to quit) and the RIO-LIPIDS Trial (weight reducing and metabolic effects in over-weight/obese patients with dyslipidemia.. American College of Cardiology Annual Scientific Session. March 2004.

Boyd ST, Fremming BA. Rimonabant - a selective CB1 antagonist. *Annals of Pharmacotherapy* 2005;**39**:684–90. Cinciripini PM, Aubin HJ, Dale LC, Niaura R, Anthenelli RM, Robinson J. Pooled analysis of three short-term, randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled trials with rimonabant 20mg/d in smoking cessation. Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco 8th European Conference. Kusadasi, Turkey, Sept 2006.

2 RM STRATUS-WW 2005 {published data only}

Niaura R. Long-term maintenance of abstinence from smoking with rimonabant: results from the STRATUS Worldwide trial. 1 year efficacy/safety results.. American Thoracic Society Conference. 2005.

Niaura R. Long-term maintenance of abstinence from smoking with rimonabant: results from the STRATUS Worldwide trial. 6 month efficacy/safety results [POS1-054]. American Thoracic Society Conference. 2004.

2 VA Hajek 2011 {published data only}

Hajek, P, McRobbie, H. J, Myers, K. E, Stapleton, J, & Dhanji, A. R. Use of varenicline for 4 weeks before quitting smoking: decrease in ad lib smoking and increase in smoking cessation rates. *Archives.of internal.medicine* 2011; **171**:770–777.

2 VA Tsukahara 2010 {published data only}

Tsukahara, H, Noda, K, & Saku, K. A randomized controlled open comparative trial of varenicline vs nicotine patch in adult smokers: efficacy, safety and withdrawal symptoms (the VN-SEESAW study). *Circulation journal : official journal of the Japanese.Circulation Society* 2010;74: 771–778.

2 VA Williams 2007 {published and unpublished data}

Reeves K, Watsky E, Williams K, Azoulay S, Billing B, Gong J. The safety of varenicline taken for 52 weeks for smoking cessation. [RPOS3-54]. 2008. Williams KE, Reeves KR, Billing CB, Pennington AM, Gong J. A double-blind study evaluating the long-term safety of varenicline for smoking cessation. Current Medical Research and Opinion 2007; Vol. 23, issue 4:793–801.

VA Carson 2010 {published data only}

Carson, K. V, Brinn, M. P, Smith, B. J, Garside, C. G, Goldsworthy, S. J, Fitridge, R. A, Esterman, A. J, Litt, J. C, Horowitz, J. D, Koblar, S. A, Jannes, J. I. M, & Veale, A. J. Varenicline tartrate and counselling versus counselling alone in a randomised controlled trial for inpatient smoking cessation: 3 month interim results [abstract]. *Respirology* 2010;**15**:p. A30.

Additional references

Cahill 2011a

Cahill K, Ussher M. Cannabinoid type 1 receptor antagonists (rimonabant) for smoking cessation. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2011, Issue 3. [DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD005353.pub3]

Cahill 2011b

Cahill K, Stead LF, Lancaster T. Nicotine receptor partial agonists for smoking cessation. *Cochrane Database* of Systematic Reviews 2011, Issue 2. [DOI: 10.1002/ 14651858.CD006103.pub5]

Cheskin 2005

Cheskin LJ, Hess JM, Henningfield J, Gorelick DA. Calorie restriction increases cigarette use in adult smokers. *Psychopharmacology* 2005;**179**:430–436.

Chinn 2005

Chinn S, Jarvis D, Melotti R, Luczynska C, Ackermann-Liebrich U, Anto JM, et al.Smoking cessation, lung function, and weight gain: a follow-up study. *Lancet* 2005; **365**:1629–35.

Clark 2004

Clark MM, Decker PA, Offord KP, Patten CA, Vickers KS, Croghan IT, et al.Weight concerns among male smokers. *Addictive Behaviors* 2004;**29**(8):1637–41.

Clark 2006

Clark MM, Hurt RD, Croghan IT, Patten CA, Novotny P, Sloan JA, et al. The prevalence of weight concerns in a smoking abstinence clinical trial.. *Addictive Behaviors* 2006; **31**(7):1142–1152.

Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation (Review)

 $\textbf{Copyright} @ \textbf{2012} \textbf{ The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley \& Sons, \textbf{Ltd.} \\$

Davey Smith 2005

Davey Smith G, Bracha Y, Svendson KH, Neaton JD, Haffner SM, Kuller LH. Incidence of type II diabetes in the Randomized Multiple Risk Factor Intervention Trial. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 2005;**142**:313–322.

Ferguson 2011

Ferguson SG, Shiffman S, Rohay JM, Gitchell JG, Garvey AJ. Effect of compliance with nicotine gum dosing on weight gained during a quit attempt. *Addiction* 2011;**106** (651-56).

Fidler 2009

Fidler J, West R. Self-perceived smoking motives and their correlates in a general population sample. *Nicotine and Tobacco Research* 2009;**11**(10):1182–88.

Filozof 2004

Filozof C, Fernandez Pinilla MC, Fernandez-Cruz A. Smoking cessation and weight gain. *Obesity Reviews* 2004; **5**:95–103.

Gritz 1988

Gritz ER, Carr CR, Marcus AC. Unaided smoking cessation: the Great American Smokeout and new year's day quitters. *Journal of Psychosocial Oncology* 1988;**6**:217–34.

Hajek 1988

Hajek P, Jackson P, Belcher M. Long-term use of nicotine chewing gum. Occurrence, determinants, and effect on weight gain.. *Journal of American Medical Association* 1988; **260**:1593–1596.

Hall 1986

Hall SM, Ginsberg D, Jones RT. Smoking cessation and weight gain. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1986;**45**(3):342–6.

Hall 1992

Hall SM, Tunstall CD, Vila KL, Duffy J. Weight gain prevention and smoking cessation: cautionary findings. *American Journal of Public Health* 1992;**82**(6):799–803.

Hughes 1991

Hughes JR, Gust SW, Skoog K, Keenan RM, Fenwick JW. Symptoms of tobacco withdrawal: a replication and extension. *Archives of General Psychiatry* 1991;**84**(1):52–9.

Hughes 2007

Hughes JR, Stead LF, Lancaster T. Antidepressants for smoking cessation. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2007, Issue 1. [DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD000031.pub3]

Hutter 2006

Hutter HP, Moshammer H, Neuberger M. Smoking cessation at the workplace: 1 year success of short seminars.. *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health* 2006;**79**(1):42–48.

Johnstone 2008

Johnstone AM, Horgan GW, Murison SD, Bremner DM, Lobley GE. Effects of a high-protein ketogenic diet on hunger, appetite, and weight loss in obese men feeding ad libitum. *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition* 2008;**87**(1): 44–55.

Killen 1996

Killen JD, Fortmann SP, Kraemer HC, Varady AN, Davis L, Newman B. Interactive effects of depression symptoms, nicotine dependence, and weight change on late smoking relapse. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1996; **64**(5):1060–1067.

Klesges 1988

Klesges RC, Brown K, Pascale RW, Murphy M, Williams E, Cigrang JA, et al.Factors associated with participation, attrition and outcome in a smoking cessation program at a workplace. *Health Psychology* 1988;7:575–89.

Klesges 1989

Klesges RC, Meyers AW, Klesges LM, La Vasque M. Smoking, body weight and their effects on smoking behavior: A comprehensive review of the literature. *Psychological Bulletin* 1989;**106**:204–30.

Klesges 1992

Klesges RC, Schumaker SA. Understanding the relations between smoking and body weight and their importance to smoking cessation and relapse. *Health Psychology* 1992;**11** (1):1–3.

Klesges 1997

Klesges RC, Winders SE, Meyers AW, Eck LH, Ward KD, Hultquist CM, et al.How much weight gain occurs following smoking cessation? A comparison of weight gain using both continuous and point prevalence abstinence. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1997;**65**: 286–91.

Leeman 2010

Leeman RF, O'Malley SS, White MA, McKee SA. Nicotine and food deprivation decrease the ability to resist smoking. *Psychopharmacology* 2010;**212**(1):25–32.

Lycett 2011

Lycett D, Munafo M, Johnstone E, Murphy M, Aveyard P. Associations between weight change over 8 years and baseline body mass index in a cohort of continuing and quitting smokers. *Addiction* 2011;**106**:1188–96.

McEwan 2006

McEwen A, Hajek P, McRobbie H, West R. Manual of Smoking Cessation. A Guide for Counsellors and Practitioners.. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing 2006.

Meyers 1997

Meyers AW, Klesges RC, Winders SE, Ward KD, Peterson BA, Eck LH. Are weight concerns predictive of smoking cessation? A prospective analysis. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1997;**65**(3):448–52.

Michie 2009

Michie S, Abraham C, Whittington C, McAteer J, Gupta S. Effective techniques in healthy eating and physical activity interventions: A meta-regression.. *Health Psychology* 2009; **28**(6):690–701.

Mizes 1998

Mizes JS, Sloan DM, Segraves K, Spring B, Pingitore R, Kristeller J. The influence of weight-related variables on smoking cessation. *Behavior Therapy* 1998;**29**(3):371–85.

O'Hara 1998

O'Hara P, Connett JE, Lee WW, Nides M, Murray R, Wise R. Early and late weight gain following smoking cessation in the Lung Health Study. *American Journal of Epidemiology* 1998;**148**(9):821–30.

Parsons 2009

Parsons A, Ingram J, Inglis J, Aveyard P, Johnstone E, Brown K, et al.A proof of concept randomised placebo controlled factorial trial to examine the efficacy of St John's Wort for smoking cessation and chromium to prevent weight gain on smoking cessation. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence* 2009;**102** (1-3):116–22.

Parsons 2011

Parsons A, Lycett D, Aveyard P. Response to Spring et al: What is the best method to assess the effect of combined interventions for smoking cessation and post cessation weight gain?. *Addiction* 2011;**106**:675–76.

Parsons, 2009b

Parsons A, Lycett D, Aveyard P. Behavioural interventions to prevent weight gain on smoking cessation: A response. *Addiction* 2009;**104**:2119–20.

Pomerleau 2001

Pomerleau CS, Zucker AN, Stewart AJ. Characterizing concerns about post-cessation weight gain: results from a national survey of women smokers. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research* 2001;**3**(1):51–60.

Spring 2011a

Spring B, McFadden HG, Rademaker AW, Hitsman B. Behavioual interventions to promote smoking cessation and prevent weight gain: A reply. *Addiction* 2011;**106**:674–75.

Spring 2011b

Spring B, Rademaker AW, Mcfadden HG, Hitsman B. Reducing bias in systematic reviews of behavioral interventions? A response to Parsons et al. *Addiction* 2011; **106**:676–78.

Stead 2008

Stead L, Perera R, Bullen C, Mant D, Lancaster T. Nicotine replacement therapy for smoking cessation. *Cochrane*

Database of Systematic Reviews 2008, Issue 1. [DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD000146.pub3]

Taylor 2007

Taylor AH, Ussher MH, Faulkner M. The acute effects of exercise on cigarette cravings, withdrawal symptoms, affect and smoking behaviour: a systematic review. *Addiction* 2007;**102**(4):534–543.

USDHHS 1990

United States Department of Health and Human Services. *The health benefits of smoking cessation*. Washington DC: Government Printing Office, 1990.

Ussher 2008

Ussher M, Taylor A, Faulkner G. Exercise interventions for smoking cessation. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2008, Issue 4. [DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD002295.pub3]

Weekley 1992

Weekley CK, Klesges RC, Reyle G. Smoking as a weightcontrol strategy in a university population. *Addictive Behaviors* 1992;**17**:259–71.

Williamson 1991

Williamson DF, Madans J, Anda RF, Kleinman JC, Giovino GA, Byers T. Smoking cessation and severity of weight gain in a national cohort. *New England Journal of Medicine* 1991;**324**(11):739–45.

Yeh 2010

Yeh HC, Duncab PB, Schmidt MI, Brancati FL. Smoking, smoking cessation, and risk for type 2 diabetes mellitus a cohort study. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 2010;**152**:10–17.

References to other published versions of this review

Parsons 2009c

Parsons AC, Shraim M, Inglis J, Aveyard P, Hajek P. Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2009, Issue 1. [DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD006219.pub2]

* Indicates the major publication for the study

CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDIES

Characteristics of included studies [ordered by study ID]

1 Cooper 2005

Methods	Country: USA Recruitment: community volunteers
Participants	439 weight concerned female smokers (>= 10 CPD) Av.age 38, av.cpd 23, av baseline weight 64-66kg
Interventions	 Phenylpropanolamine (PPA) gum 8.33mg 16 pieces/d 8w, weaning last 3 wks Nicotine gum (2mg), 10-12 pieces/day recommended, for 8 wks, weaning last 3 wks. Placebo gum All participants received x13 1hr weekly cognitive behavioural group sessions focused on smoking and weight. Ppts cut down weeks 1-4 by 25% and quit week 5
Outcomes	1. PP abstinence at 12m (Validation: CO<10ppm) 2. Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in abstainers at 6m and 12m
Notes	PP abstinence defined as validated self report of no smoking at the time of the assessment

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Methods not described
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	All group facilitators and participants were blind to treatment conditions
Definition of abstinence	High risk	Weight measured in self report point preva- lent abstainers

1 Copeland 2006

Methods	Country: USA Recruitment: Community volunteers
Participants	79 women smokers motivated to quit and weight concerned (at least 10 CPD for 1yr) av CPD 20.1, av FTND score 4, av BMI 24

1 Copeland 2006 (Continued)

Interventions	All participants completed a smoking cessation programme (6 sessions over 2w) involving smoking cessation and relapse prevention advise and given an 8w supply of NRT. Randomised to follow up in either individual or group format: Six follow up relapse prevention sessions including psychological, dietary, and exercise components over 38 weeks
Outcomes	 Continuous abstinence at 6 months (Validation: CO<=10ppm) Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in continuous abstainers at 6m

Notes

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	"Statisticians generated the random assign- ment sequence for follow up condition"
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	"Therapists were blind to participant fol- low-up treatment condition assignment until the last meeting of the cessation pro- gram."
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated continuous abstainers

1 Danielsson 1999

Methods	Country: Sweden Recruitment: community volunteers
Participants	287 weight concerned female smokers age range 30-60 >=10cpd, av CPD 20, av BMI 26
Interventions	 Nicotine gum (2 or 4 mg) with moderate behavioural advice: 11 sessions (45 min) in 16 weeks in combination with behavioural weight control programme and intermittent very low energy diet as total food replacement ((Nutrilett 1.76 MJ/day), two week periods (weeks 1 and 2, 7 and 8, 13 and 14). All participants were recommended a standardised balanced diet of about 6.7 MJ/day. Control group received the same as intervention but without the very low energy diet
Outcomes	1. Prolonged abstinence 12m (Validated: CO<10ppm) 2. Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in prolonged abstainers at 6m

1 Danielsson 1999 (Continued)

Notes	Prolonged abstinence defined as "completely and continuously stopped from week 2 onwards"	
Risk of bias		
Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Open consecutive randomisation (in the order their questionnaires were received at the clinic)
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	High risk	Open study
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated prolonged abstainers

1 Hall 1992

Methods	Country: USA Recruitment: community volunteers
Participants	180 smokers, 27% F, av age 39-42, av CPD 26-32, av baseline weight 67-73kg
Interventions	Participants received treatments in groups. All groups completed 2 week behavioural smoking cessation programme. Participants were randomly assigned to follow up group for weight management: 1. Innovative intervention - individualised multifactorial intervention including exercise, daily weight monitoring, individual energy prescription to result in 2lb/week weight loss if weight was gained(based on weight, age, gender, activity level), healthy eating advice and behavioural advice to manage triggers for uncontrolled eating (4w) 2. Standard treatment condition - given an information pack on good nutrition and exercise not targeted for SC induced weight gain at end of 2w SC programme
Outcomes	 Point prevalence abstinence at 6 and 12m (Validation: CO < 10.5 at 6,12 and 26w, Cotinine blood levels below 50 ng/ml at 12 m) Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in abstainers at end of treatment and 12 months
Notes	Non individualised weight programme arm also in this study that has not been used I thought we did use this to compare individual with general (nutritional, exercise and behavioural eduction delivered in group sessions)

Risk of bias

1 Hall 1992 (Continued)

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Method not described
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	High risk	Open study
Definition of abstinence	High risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated point prevalent abstainers

1 Hankey 2009

Methods	Country: Scotland Recruitment: Smokers at a smoking cessation clinic	
Participants	138 smokers, 75.4% female, av baseline weight 76.2 (18.1) kg, av age 50yrs, av BMI 28.2 (5.5), av CPD, 25.2 (12.6)	
Interventions	 (1) 24wk dietary stage of change based interventions focusing advice and self monitoring of physical activity (ppts given pedometers), portion control, fruit and vegetable intake and fat intake for 4 weeks post quit. Also included bolster session at weeks 8, 12, 16 and 20 post quit. No individual targets set (2) No dietary intervention Both conditions were embedded within a smoking cessation clinic that followed the Maudsley model 	
Outcomes	 Abstience at 6m (validation: CO monitoring). Definition of abstinence or CO level not given Mean (SD) weight change (KG) in abstainers at end of treatment and 12 months 	
Notes		
Risk of bias		

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	computer generated
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Randomisation carried out via an interac- tive voice response system

1 Hankey 2009 (Continued)

Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	High risk	Not possible
Definition of abstinence	Unclear risk	Definitions of abstinence and biochemical verification not given
1 Klesges 1990		
Methods	Country: USA Recruitment: Community volunteers	
Participants	57 adult female smokers who had previously experienced post cessation weight gain, av age 27, av 22.4 CPD, mean CO 49.8ppm	
Interventions	 PPA gum 8.33mg 9/day 2w Placebo gum All participants received a "brief but intensive stop-smoking intervention" and were offered a cash reward and opportunity to win prizes if they were successful at quitting for 2 weeks 	
Outcomes	1. Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in continuous abstinent smokers at end of treatment (Validation: CO <=7ppm)	
Notes	Intervention only 2 weeks long. No 6 month follow up.	
Risk of bias		
Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Method not described
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Double blind

Definition of abstinence Low risk Weight measured in biochemically validated continuous abstainers

1 Klesges 1995

Methods	Country: USA Recruitment: community volunteers
Participants	107 male and female smokers, age between 18-60, CPD 20+, CO>15ppm
Interventions	 PPA gum 8.33mg up to 10 pieces/day 4w Placebo gum same regime All participants received one 30 min session on smoking cessation and relapse prevention
Outcomes	1. Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in continuous abstainers at end of treatment (validation: CO<8ppm)
Notes	No 6 months follow up data

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Independent randomisation
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	"Neither the investigators nor the subjects knew which gum contained the active in- gredients"
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated continuous abstainers

1 Levine 2010

Methods	Country: USA Recruitment: community volunteers
Participants	349 weight concerned women smokers, aged between 18-65yrs,motivated to quit smoking, av 20.7cpd, av age 42
Interventions	 weight concerns CBT + bupropion 300mg/day2. weight concerns CBT + placebo3. Standard cessation counselling + bupropion 300mg/day Standard cessation counselling + placebo CBT was delivered weekly for Buproprion/placebo was taken for 26 wks
Outcomes	 Prolonged abstinence at end of treatment and 6m (Validatio: CO <!--= 8ppm, or urinary cotinine <15µg/L)</li--> Mean (SD) weight change (kg) at 12w, 6m and 12m
Notes	

Risk of bias

5		
Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Block randomisation sequence
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Double blind
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated prolonged abstainers

1 Norregaard 1996

Methods	Country: Denmark Recruitment: Community volunteers
Participants	225 smokers who wanted to quit without gaining weight, 65% F, av BMI 23-24, av age 38-39, av 20 CPD
Interventions	 20mg Ephedrine plus 200mg caffeine combination 3/day 12w then decreased until 39w. TQD -first session. Eight visits were scheduled for the 52-week study period (at the beginning of the study and after weeks 1, 3, 6, 12, 26, 39, and 52). Placebo All participants given advice on how to quit smoking and prevent weight gain (inc booklet about low fat food)
Outcomes	 Prolonged abstinence at 6 and 12m (validation: CO<10ppm) Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in prolonged abstainers at end of treatment, 6 and 12m
Notes	Prolonged abstinence defined as no smoking after week 1 post quit
Risk of bias	

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Minimisation
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described

1 Norregaard 1996 (Continued)

Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	"Blinding was incomplete because 68% in the ephedrine plus caffeine-treated group and 63% in the placebo group correctly guessed their treatment at trial termination (p < 0.001)"
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated prolonged abstainers

1 O'Malley 2006

Methods	Country: USA Recruitment: Community volunteers
Participants	400 smokers, 46% F, av BMI 27-28, av 26-29 CPD, av age 45-47
Interventions	 Naltrexone 25mg 6w Naltrexone 50mg 6w Naltrexone 100mg 6w Placebo All participants also given 6w supply of 21mg patches and 6 sessions of behavioral support (1x45mins, 5x15mins)
Outcomes	1. Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in continuous abstainers at end of treatment (validation: exhaled CO<10ppm)
Notes	Arms 1-3 combined for the main comparison No 6 month follow up data

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Block randomisation, stratified by sex after the first 150 participants
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Random sequence was provided to the pharmacist, who assigned participants
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	All were blinded to the treatment assign- ment
Definition of abstinence	Unclear risk	Weight measured in continuous abstainers, validation unclear

1 Parsons 2009

Methods	Country: UK Recruitment: community volunteers
Participants	143 smokers, 63% female, av age 45.5 (12.4) years, av baseline weight 75.1 (17.8) kg, av 20(8) CPD
Interventions	 St John's Wort ((Jarsin preparation (LI 160, Lichtwer Pharma, Berlin, Germany), standard hypericin content 0.12% - 0.28%)) 900mg daily and chromium polynicotinate 400micrograms daily for 14w SJW active, Chromium placebo SJW placebo, Chromium active SJW placebo, Chromium placebo All participants received 7w of behavioural counselling with TQD coinciding with the 3rd visit
Outcomes	1. Prolonged abstinence at end of treatment (validated: CO<10ppm) and 6m (self report) 2. Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in prolonged abstainers at end of treatment and 6m

Notes

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	independent statistician prepared an excel spreadsheet using Stata to generate two lists of randomly sequenced blocks of 2, 4, or 6, which were passed to the medication pack- ing company
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Lists were used to package together medi- cation of SJW or placebo and CR or placebo, which were allocated in sequence to participants in clinic.
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Participants, therapists, and outcome asses- sors were blind to the treatment allocation.
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated prolonged abstainers

1 Perkins 2001

Methods	Country: USA Recruitment: community volunteers
Participants	219 weight concerned women av age 44, av body weight 69kg, mean 21 CPD
Interventions	 Weight control - Programme to attenuate weight gain, with a 500kcal deficit of the energy required to maintain baseline weight. behavioural support (stimulus control tech- niques), self monitoring and constructive feedback. 10x 90min sessions over 7 weeks2. Standard - No additional support given for weight, session time used to talk about smok- ing cessation CBT - therapy to promote the acceptance of modest weight gain, reduce concerns and encourage healthy eating. All participants received standard CB SC counselling at each session
Outcomes	1. Continuous abstinence 6 and 12m (validation: CO =8ppm)<br 2. Mean (SD) weight change (kg) for continuous abstainers 6 and 12m

Notes

Risk	01	fЬ	ias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	After a sufficient number of participants to form a group recruited, group assigned to a treatment condition
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	"Participants did not learn of their treat- ment condition assignment until the first treatment session, after all baseline infor- mation had been received"
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated continuous abstainers

1 Pirie 1992

Methods	Country: USA Recruitment: community volunteers
Participants	417 women smokers, av CPD 25-27, av age 42-44, av BMI 23-24, 30-40% expressed great weight concern
Interventions	 Group SC therapy plus weight control programme (general calorie restriction 100- 300kcal based on cigarette consumption, increased exercise to 1hour daily walking, encouraged to self monitor, acceptance of weight gain) Group SC therapy only

1 Pirie 1992 (Continued)

Outcomes	1. Continuous abstinence at 6 and 12m (Validation: expired CO =10ppm)<br 2. Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in continuous abstainers at 6 and 12m
Notes	2 additional arms in the study that haven't been used in this review- SC therapy + 2mg nicotine gum ad lib and SC therapy + weight control programme + 2mg NRT ad lib

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Method not stated
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	High risk	Not possible due to nature of the interven- tions
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated continuous abstainers

1 Spring 1995

Country: USA Recruitment: community volunteers		
144 female weight concerned smokers, av age 41, av CPD 27, av BMI 23-25		
 Dexfenfluramine 30mg/day 12w Fluoxetine 40mg/day 12w Placebo All participants received weekly group behavioural support for first 4w and fortnightly support for remaining 8w 		
1. Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in prolonged abstainers at end of treatment (validation: CO <10ppm)		
No 6 months follow up data Prolonged abstinence defined as validated continuous abstinence after a 2 week grace period Fluoxetine arm used in first part of review as taken specifically to prevent post cessation weight gain and this study is not included in the parent antidepressant review		
Risk of bias		

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement

1 Spring 1995 (Continued)

Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Method not stated
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	"All subjects received identical packets of three pills"
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated prolonged abstainers

1 Spring 2004

Methods	Country: USA Recruitment: community volunteers	
Participants	315 mildly weight concerned women, av age 42.7 (10.3) yrs, av 20.3 (9.5) CPD, av BMI 27.4 (7.6)	
Interventions	 Early diet group. Diet during 1-8w of t system foods: high-carbohydrate, low-fat, b energy intake from food diaries minus 150 after the treatment programme session Late diet group. Diet during 9-16w of tr 3. Control. Final smoking cessation group s All participants received 16 weekly cognitiv port sessions 	reatment programme (Pre-packaged Nutri/ balanced diet based on baseline precessation kcal per day). Ppts led on a 30 minute walk eatment programme session focused on weight loss strategies e behavioural smoking cessation group sup-
Outcomes	1. Mean (SD) weight change (kg) at end of treatment and 6m in continuous abstainers (validation: CO =10ppm)</td	
Notes		
Risk of bias		
p;		

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Block randomisation
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	not applicable

1 Spring 2004 (Continued)

Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated continuous abstainers
1 Toll 2010		
Methods	Country: USA Recruitment: community volunteers	
Participants	127 weight concerned smokers, 28.5% males, mean BMI 28.4±6.16, mean 25.5±10.76 expired CO,	
Interventions	 (1) 25-mg naltrexone daily beginning the week before quitting continuing until 26w (2) placebo All ppts received 21mg patches 6wks and then 14mg 2wks, starting on quit day. All received CBT for weight concerns weekly for 4 wks, bimonthly twice and then monthly 	
Outcomes	 Point prevalence abstinence at end of treatment (26w) Mean (SD) weight change (kg) at end of treatment (26w) in continuous abstainers (validation: CO <10ppm) 	
Notes		

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Block stratified for gender, sequence pro- vided by author and given to pharmacist
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	Not described
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated continuous abstainers

2 AD Gonzales 2006

Methods	Country: USA Recruitment: community volunteers
Participants	1025 smokers 55% female (Placebo), 48% female (Bup); av age 45, av CPD not specified

2 AD Gonzales 2006 (Continued)

Interventions	 Varenicline 1mg x2/day for 12w Bupropion 300 mg/day for 12w Placebo All participants received brief individual counselling at visits w1-7, 9, 12, + telephone counselling at 4 and 5m
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in prolonged abstainers at end of treatment (validation: CO <10ppm)
Notes	Prolonged abstinence defined as complete abstinence from weeks 9-12 Arm 2 compared with 3 (same study as 4 VA Gonzales)

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Randomization: computer generated se- quence 1:1:1
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Participants were randomised according to a predefined central computer sequence
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Double blind
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated continuous abstainers

2 AD Hurt 1997

Methods	Country: USA, multi-centre Recruitment: community volunteers
Participants	615 smokers, 55% F, av age 44, av CPD 27
Interventions	 Bupropion 100 mg/day for 7w, begun 1w before TQD Bupropion 150 mg/day Bupropion 300 mg/day Placebo All participants received physician advice, S-H materials, and brief individual counselling by study assistant at each visit
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in continuous abstainers at end of treatment (email com- munication), 6 (email communication) and 12 m (email communication) (Validation: CO < 11ppm)

2 AD Hurt 1997 (Continued)

Notes

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Stratified by site, method not specified
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Double blind
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated continuous abstainers

2 AD Jorenby 2006

Methods	Country: USA, multi centre Recruitment: community volunteers
Participants	1027 smokers, 41% F, av age 42, av CPD 22
Interventions	 Bupropion 300mg for 12 w + placebo varenicline Varenicline 2mg for 12 w + placebo bupropion Placebo bupropion + placebo varenicline All participants received brief (< 10 min) individual counselling at each weekly assessment for 12w & 5 follow-up visits. One telephone call 3 days after quit day
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in prolonged abstainers at end of treatment (validation: CO < 10ppm)
Notes	Prolonged abstinence defined as validated self reported abstinence w 8-12 Arm 1 and 3 in main comparison (same study as VA Jorenby 2006)

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Centralised, computer-generated
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	"SItes used an electronic system to assign participants to treatment"

2 AD Jorenby 2006 (Continued)

Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Double blind
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated prolonged abstainers
2 AD Niaura 2002		
Methods	Country: USA, multi-centre, 16 sites Recruitment: Community volunteers	
Participants	989 smokers, 61% F, av age 42 av CPD 28	
Interventions	 Fluoxetine 30 mg for 10w, starting 2w before TQD Fluoxetine 60 mg for 10w, starting 2w before TQD Placebo All arms: 9 sessions (60-90 mins) individual CBT. Included coping skills, stimulus control techniques and relapse prevention 	
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in continuous abstainers at end of treatment (Validation: CO less than 8ppm and salivary cotinine less than 20ng/ml)	
Notes		
Risk of bias		
Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Method not stated
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Not described
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Double blind
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated continuous abstainers

2 AD Nides 2006

Methods	Country: USA, multi-centre, 7 sites Recruitment: Volunteers (phase II study)
Participants	638 smokers, 51% F, av age 41, av CPD 20, av BMI 25-27
Interventions	 Varenicline 0.3mg 1/d for 6w, + 1wk placebo Varenicline 1.0mg 1/d for 6w, + 1wk placebo varenicline 1.0mg 2/d for 6w, + 1wk placebo Bupropion 150mg 2/d (titrated in wk 1) for 7 wks Placebo tablets 2/d for 7 wks All participants received up to 10 mins counselling at 7 weekly clinic visits, 12 & 24w
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in continuous abstainers at end of treatment (validation: CO = 10ppm) (email communication)</td
Notes	Continuous abstinence defined as self reported quit from target quit day with biochemical validation. Arms 1-3 and 5 in main comparison (same study as 3 VA Nides 2006)

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Computer-generated list
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	"Investigators assigned medication to sub- jects in numerical order of acceptance into the study" from computer generated list
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Double blind
Definition of abstinence	Unclear risk	Weight measured in self report prolonged abstainers

2 AD Piper 2007

Methods	Setting: USA Recruitment: volunteers
Participants	608 smokers of 10 CPD; 58% F, av. age 42, av CPD 22, no details of depression history
Interventions	 Nicotine gum (4 mg) and bupropion (300 mg) Placebo gum and bupropion Double placebo All arms: 3x 10 min counselling over 3 weeks

2 AD Piper 2007 (Continued)

	(validation: CO<10ppm)
	from email communication)
Outcomes	1. Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in point prevalent abstainers at end of treatment (data

Notes

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Block randomisation
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	methods not stated
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Double blind
Definition of abstinence	High risk	Weight measured in biochemically validated point prevalent abstainers

2 AD Rigotti 2006

Methods	Country: USA Recruitment: hospital patients with cardiovascular disease
Participants	248 smokers, 31% F, av age 56, av CPD 21-23.
Interventions	 Bupropion 300 mg for 12w Placebo All participants received multi component CBT cessation & relapse prevention programme 30-45 mins and 5 X10 min post-discharge contacts (2 days,1,3,8, 12w)
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in point prevalence abstainers at end of treatment (email communication) and 12m (email communication) (Validation: <=20ng/ml cotinine)
Notes	Point prevalence abstinence defined as validated self report of no smoking in previous 7 days

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Computer-generated stratified

2 AD Rigotti 2006 (Continued)

Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	"The study pharmacist used the computer generated sequence, concealed from enrol- ment staff, to assign participants to study arm."
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Double blind
Definition of abstinence	High risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated point prevalent abstainers

2 AD Saules 2004

Methods	Country: USA Recruitment: community volunteers
Participants	150 smokers, 20% history of MDD 55% F, av age 40
Interventions	 Fluoxetine 40 mg for 14w, nicotine patch for 10w Fluoxetine 20 mg for 14w, nicotine patch for 10w Placebo & nicotine patch All participants received CBT 6 sessions.
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in continuous abstainers at 6 months (email communi- cation) (Validation: CO<10ppm)

Notes

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Double blind
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated continuous abstainers

2 AD Simon 2004

Methods	Country: USA Recruitment: outpatients
Participants	244 smokers, 79% veterans, 15% F, Av age 50, Av CPD 24, av BMI 26-28
Interventions	 Bupropion 300 mg for 7w, nicotine patch for 2m Placebo bupropion, nicotine patch for 2m All participants received 3m of CBT counselling, S-H materials and telephone follow- up counselling
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in continuous abstainers at 12m (email communication) (Validation: salivary cotinine of less than 15ng/ml)
Notes	
Risk of bias	

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Computer-generated
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Participants allocated according to com- puter generated list
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	"All study personnel engaged in providing interventions to participants were blinded to treatment assignment"
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated continuous abstainers

2 AD Simon 2009

Methods	Setting: San Francisco Veterans Affairs Medical Center, USA Recruitment: hospitalised volunteers
Participants	85 inpatient smokers, 3.5% female, av age 56 yrs, av BMI 27.5, av CPD 16
Interventions	 Bupropion 300 mg for 7w Placebo All ppts received Individual cognitive behavioural 30-60 min during hospital stay + 5 phone calls at w1, w3, w5, w8, w12, recycling encouraged.
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in continuous abstainers at 6m (data from email com- munication) Validation: saliva cotinine <15 ng/ml

2 AD Simon 2009 (Continued)

Notes

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	used a computer algorithm to generate a random list of treatment assignments
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	All study personnel engaged in providing interven- tions to participants were blinded to treatment assignment.
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	All study personnel engaged in providing interven- tions to participants were blinded to treatment assignment.
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated continuous abstainers

2 AD Uyar 2007

Methods	Setting: cessation clinic, Turkey Recruitment: cessation clinic patients	
Participants	131 smokers; 81% M, av. age 36, av baseline weight 70-75kg, av ftnd score 3.9-4.8	
Interventions	 Bupropion 300mg for 7 weeks (150 mg daily for the first 3 days, then 150 mg twice daily for 6 weeks) Nicotine patch 21mg for 6 weeks incl tapering Advice and follow up only All arms: Brief counselling and booklet on consequences of smoking with follow up for 24 weeks 	
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in continuous abstainers at 24 weeks (data from email communication) Validation: CO levels <10 ppm	
Notes		
Risk of bias		
Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement

2 AD Uyar 2007 (Continued)

Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	Not described
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated continuous abstainers

2 AD Zellweger 2005

Methods	Country: 12 European countries, 26 centres Recruitment: volunteers, healthcare professionals (qualified practising physician or nurse)
Participants	667 smokers (>= 10 CPD) (excludes 1 centre enrolling 20 people, and 3 people who took no medication) 64% female, av CPD 23
Interventions	 Bupropion SR 300 mg/day for 7w Placebo All participants received brief (10-15 min) motivational support at weekly clinic visits and telephone support one day before TQD, 3 days after TQD, monthly during follow up
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in prolonged abstainers at end of treatment (email com- munication), 6m (email communication) and 12m (email communication) (Validation: CO <= 10 ppm)
Notes	Prolonged abstinence defined as continuous abstinence from week 4

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	3:1 ratio
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Double blind

2 AD Zellweger 2005 (Continued)

Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated prolonged abstainers
2 EX Bize 2010		
Methods	Country: Switzerland Recruitment: Community volunteers	
Participants	481, av age 42, av CPD 27, sedentary: < 150 mins moderate intensity physical activity per week and <60 mins vigorous intensity activity, av BMI 24-25	
Interventions	 Intervention: moderate-intensity group-based CV activity, 45 mins, weekly for 9 weeks + 15 mins cessation counselling for 9 weeks (including NRT prescription) Control: 9 weeks of 15 mins per week cessation counselling (including NRT prescription) + Health Education for equal time as exercise intervention (not exercise) Exercise started 5 weeks before quit date 	
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in continue (Validation: CO <10ppm)	ous abstainers at end of treatment and 12m
Notes		

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Remotely and randomly generated by a computer.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Secured by means of sealed envelopes
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	High risk	Not possible
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated continuous abstainers

2 EX Marcus 1999

Methods	Country: USA Recruitment: not described
Participants	20 women, av age 39, av CPD 28, av BMI 24-27.

2 EX Marcus 1999 (Continued)

Interventions	 CV equipment: group, facility 30-45 min, 60-85% HR max, 3 times/week for 12 weeks + cessation programme (twice a week for 4 weeks) Cessation programme only (twice a week for 4 weeks)
Outcomes	Mean weight change (kg) in continuous abstainers at end of treatment (8w) and at 60w (validation: CO <8ppm and cotinine level less than 57 nmol/L [10ng/ml])
Notes	

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Computer generated
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	"randomisation code for group assignment was generated by a computer code"
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	High risk	Not possible
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated continuous abstainers

2 EX Marcus 2005

Methods	Country: USA Recruitment: community volunteers
Participants	217 women, mean age 43, mean CPD 21 exercise <= 90 mins /wk.
Interventions	 1x 1hr facility (group) session + 4x 30min session home (individual) or facility (group) , 45-59% HR reserve or 50%-69% maximum HR, goal: 165 min/week for 8w plus 8w of cognitive behavioural smoking cessation therapy Smoking cessation therapy as 1. once/week for 8 weeks + health education once/week for 8 weeks Exercise began before quit date, time in therapy matched for two groups
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in continuous abstainers at end of treatment (Validation: saliva cotinine < 10ng/ml, CO < 8ppm)
Notes	Published paper of Marcus 2003a conference abstract (included study in exercise inter- ventions parent review)
Risk of bias	

2 EX Marcus 2005 (Continued)

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Computer-generated
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	"Group assignment was based on a ran- domisation code generated by a computer software program"
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	High risk	Not possible
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated continuous abstainers

2 EX Ussher 2003

Methods	Country: UK Recruitment: community volunteers
Participants	309 sedentary smokers, 60% Female, av age 43, av CPD 22, av BMI 25-26
Interventions	 Exercise counselling (once a week for 7 weeks) + cessation programme (once a week for 7 weeks). Cessation programme as 1. once/week for 7 weeks + brief health education once/week for 7 weeks
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in continuous abstainers at end of treatment
N	

Notes

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Computer generated
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Allocated in order of attendance
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	High risk	Not possible
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated continuous abstainers

2 NRT Abelin 1989

Methods	Country: Switzerland Recruitment: 21 Primary care clinics
Participants	199 primary care patients 40% female, av.age 41, av.cpd 27
Interventions	 Nicotine patch, 24hr, 12 wk with weaning; 21mg smokers of >20 CPD, 14 mg for <20 CPD Placebo patch Participants did not receive any psychological support
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in prolonged abstainers at end of treatment (Validation: CO content 0-11ppm)
Notes	Abstainence defined as participants who smoked 0-3 cigarettes per week with validation

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Method not stated
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Double blind
Definition of abstinence	Unclear risk	Participants were allowed to smoke up to 3 cigarettes per week

2 NRT Blondal 1999

Methods	Country: Iceland Recruitment: community volunteers
Participants	237 smokers 67% F, av.age 41-43, av. tobacco use 25g/day
Interventions	 Nicotine nasal spray (NNS) (0.5mg/dose) + 15mg nicotine patches for 3m, weaning over further 2m. NNS could be continued for 1 yr Placebo nasal spray + 15 mg nicotine patches on same schedule
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in continuous abstainers at end of treatment (email communication) and 12m (email communication) (Validation: CO<11ppm)
Notes	
Risk of bias	

2 NRT Blondal 1999 (Continued)

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Computer-generated code at pharmacy
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	"participants allocated their treatment by generated randomisation code at a local pharmacy"
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Double blind
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated continuous abstainers

2 NRT Bohadana 2000

Methods	Country: France Recruitment: community volunteers
Participants	400 smokers, 18-70 yrs, 51% F, Av CPD: Group 1 26.1, Group 2 23.5; FTND>6
Interventions	1: Nicotine inhaler, 26wks, combined with nicotine patch (15 mg/16hr) for first 6wks, placebo patch for next 6wks 2: Nicotine inhaler, 26wks, placebo patch for first 12wks All received brief counselling and support from investigator at each visit
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in prolonged abstainers at end of treatment (email com- munication) and 12 m (email communication) (Validation: CO<10ppm)
Notes	Prolonged abstinence defined as validated self report from two weeks

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Computer-generated code
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	"sealed randomisation envelopes were pro- vided for each subject and were held by the hospital pharmacy, which was responsible for dispensing medication"
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Double blind

2 NRT Bohadana 2000 (Continued)

Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated prolonged abstainers
2 NRT CEASE 1999		
Methods	Country: Multicentre - 36 clinic centres in 17 European countries Recruitment: community volunteers	
Participants	3575 smokers 48% female, av age 41, av C	PD 27, av weight 71-73 kg
Interventions	Factorial design compared 2 patch doses and (16hr), duration of active treatment 28 wh fading) 1. 25mg patch for 28 wks (L-25) 2. 25mg patch for 12 wks (S-25) 3. 15mg patch for 28 wks (L-15) 4. 15mg patch for 12 wks (S-15) 5. Placebo All participants received brief advice & self	l 2 treatment durations. Dose 15mg or 25mg ks (incl 4 wk fading) or 12 wks (incl 4 wk help brochure
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in prolonged munication) and 12m (email communication	d abstainers at end of treatment (email com- on) (validation: CO <10ppm)
Notes	Prolonged abstinence defined as validated s Doses and durations collapsed in main anal	elf report from 2w lyses.

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Stratified only by centre
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	"A computer-generated allocation list was prepared centrally and allocated subjects to treatment numbers"
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Double blind
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated prolonged abstainers

2 NRT Cooper 2005

Methods	Country: USA Recruitment: community volunteers
Participants	439 weight concerned female smokers (>= 10 CPD) Av.age 38, av.cpd 23, av baseline weight 64-66kg
Interventions	 Phenylpropanolamine (PPA) gum 8.33mg 16 pieces/d 8w, weaning last 3 wks Nicotine gum (2mg), 10-12 pieces/day recommended, for 8 wks, weaning last 3 wks Placebo gum All participants received x13 1hr weekly cognitive behavioural group sessions focused on smoking and weight. Ppts cut down weeks 1-4 by 25% and quit week 5
Outcomes	1. PP abstinence at 12m (Validation: CO<10ppm) 2. Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in abstainers at 6m and 12m
Notes	PP abstinence defined as validated self report of no smoking at the time of the assessment Although these treatments are specifically tested for their effect on smoking and on weight gain the NRT arm is included in the second part of the review as it is included in the parent Cochrane review

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Method not stated
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	All group facilitators and participants were blind to treatment conditions
Definition of abstinence	High risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated point prevalent abstainers

2 NRT Dale 1995

Methods	Country: USA Recruitment: community volunteers and smoking clinic attenders
Participants	71 smokers stratified according to light, moderate and heavy smoking rates. 56% female, av.age 48, av.cpd 26, av weight 79.4kg
Interventions	 1.11mg/24hr nicotine patch 2.22mg/24hr nicotine patch 3.44mg/24hr nicotine patch 4. Placebo patch for 1 wk followed by 11 or 22mg patch for 7 wks

2 NRT Dale 1995 (Continued)

	Duration of patch use 8 wks. High level of support including 6 day inpatient stay	
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in continuous abstainers at end of treatment (email communication) and 12m (email communication) (Validation: Blood cotinine)	
Notes		
Risk of bias		
Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Method not stated
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Double blind
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated continuous abstainers

2 NRT Ehrsam 1991

Methods	Country: Switzerland Recruitment: university (primary care)
Participants	112 smokers Av.age 26, av.cpd 23
Interventions	1. Nicotine patch (21 or 14mg/24hr, 9 wks, tapered) 2. Placebo patch
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in abstainers at the end of treatment
Notes	
Risk of bias	

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described
2 NRT Ehrsam 1991 (Continued)

Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	Not described
Definition of abstinence	Unclear risk	Not described

2 NRT Fiore 1994A

Methods	Country: USA Recruitment: community volunteers
Participants	88 smokers, av CPD 28-31, av age 42-44yrs, av weight 79-81kg
Interventions	 Nicotine patch (22mg/24hr, 8 wks, no weaning) Placebo patch All participants received intensive group counselling.
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (Kg) in point prevalence abstainers at end of treatment (email communication) (Validation: CO <10ppm)
Notes	Point prevalence abstinence was defined as validated self report abstinence for 7 days prior to measurement. Different participants to Fiore 1994B added in separately in the main comparison

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Pregenerated computer sequence
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Double blind
Definition of abstinence	High risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated point prevalent abstainers

2 NRT Fiore 1994B

Methods	Country: USA Recruitment: community volunteers
Participants	112 smokers, av age 43-45yrs, av weight 72-73kg

2 NRT Fiore 1994B (Continued)

Interventions	1. Nicotine patch (22mg/24hr, 6 wks incl weaning) 2. Placebo patch All participants received x8 weekly 10-20 min individual counselling
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in point prevalence abstainers at end of treatment (email communication) (Validation: CO <10ppm)
Notes	Point prevalence abstinence was defined as validated self report abstinence for 7 days prior to measurement. Different participants to Fiore 1994A added in separately in the main comparison

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Pregenerated computer sequence
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Double blind
Definition of abstinence	High risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated point prevalent abstainers

2 NRT Garvey 2000

Methods	Country: USA Recruitment: community volunteers
Participants	608 smokers, aged>20 51% female, av.cpd 23, av weight (males) 80-81kg, av weight (female) 64-69
Interventions	 4mg nicotine gum (recommended 9-15 pieces), weaning from 2m + weaning 2mg nicotine gum, use as 1. Placebo gum All received brief counselling (5-10 mins) at each study visit (1, 7, 14, 30 days, 2, 3, 6, 9, 12m)
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in prolonged abstainers at end of treatment (email com- munication) (Validation: CO<= 8ppm)
Notes	Prolonged abstinence defined as participants who had not returned to smoking for 7 or more consecutive days or episodes 4 + 2mg doses combined in main comparison.

2 NRT Garvey 2000 (Continued)

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Method not stated, stratified by high- and low-dependence
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Double blind
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated prolonged abstainers

2 NRT Gourlay 1995

Methods	Country: Australia Recruitment: community volunteers
Participants	629 smokers (>15 CPD) who had relapsed after transdermal nicotine and behavioural counselling in an earlier phase of the study. Minimal additional support
Interventions	 Nicotine patch 30cm2 (21mg/24 hr) for 4 wks, 20cm2 (14mg/24 hr) for 4 wks, 10cm2 (7mg/24 hrs) for 4 wks. Placebo patch
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in continuous abstainers at end of treatment (Validation: expired CO<9ppm)
Notes	

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Treatments were randomly allocated to study numbers by using a 1:1 ratio within blocks of 10
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Double blind

2 NRT Gourlay 1995 (Continued)

Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated continuous abstainers
2 NRT Gross 1995		
Methods	Country: USA Recruitment: community volunteers	
Participants	177 smokers, 51% female, av. age 42, av.cpd 33, av. FTND score 7.8	
Interventions	 Nicotine gum (2mg), tapered from wk 12. Active gum groups further randomised to chew 7, 15 or 30 pieces of gum per day. No gum All participants received 1 pre-quit group counselling session, 14 clinic visits in 10 wks 	
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in prolonged CO<=10ppm)	d abstainers at end of treatment (Validation:
Notes	Prolonged abstinence defined as validated se Long-term abstinence rates not affected by collapsed for comparison with no gum cond	If reported abstinence (allowed up to 3 cigs) y amount of gum chewed, so these groups dition

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Method not stated
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Not possible
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated prolonged abstainers

2 NRT Hjalmarson 1984

Methods	Country: Sweden Recruitment: smoking cessation clinic
Participants	206 smokers, 56% female, av.age 42, av. CPD 24

2 NRT Hjalmarson 1984 (Continued)

Interventions	 Nicotine gum (2mg) (no restrictions on amount or duration of use) Placebo gum All participants received 6 group sessions of SC behavioural support in 6 wks
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight gain (kg) in continuous abstainers at 6 months (email communication) (Validation: CO<10ppm)

Notes

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Randomized by therapy group.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	Unclear if enroller blind, but therapists blind
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated continuous abstainers

2 NRT Hjalmarson 1994

Methods	Country: Sweden Recruitment: smoking cessation clinic	
Participants	248 smokers, 57% female, av.age 45, av. CPD 22, av weight (male) 77-83kg, av weight (female) 64-66kg	
Interventions	 Nicotine nasal spray (0.5 mg/spray) used as required up to 40 mg/day for up to 1 yr Placebo spray All participants received x8 45-60 min group sessions over 6 wks with clinical psychologist 	
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in continuous abstainers at 12m (Validation: CO<10ppm)	
Notes		
Risk of bias		
Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement

2 NRT Hjalmarson 1994 (Continued)

Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Method not described
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Treatment allocater not blinded if more than 1 participant from the same house- hold so that they could be given same med- ication
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Therapists and participants
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated continuous abstainers

2 NRT Hjalmarson 1997

Methods	Country: Sweden Recruitment: smoking cessation clinic
Participants	247 smokers, 64% female, av.age 48, av.cpd 21
Interventions	 Nicotine Inhaler (recommended minimum 4/day, tapering after 3m, use permitted to 6m) Placebo inhaler All participants attended 8 group meetings over 6 wks
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in prolonged abstainers end of treatment and 12 months (Validation: CO<10ppm)
Notes	Prolonged abstainers defined as validated self reported abstinence from week 2

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Participants assigned a number on attend- ing first group session. Numbers on a list randomising to medication. Participants from the same household randomised to same treatment
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Treatment allocater not blinded if more than 1 participant from the same house- hold so that they could be given same med- ication

2 NRT Hjalmarson 1997 (Continued)

Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Participant and therapist blinded
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated prolonged abstainers

2 NRT Lerman 2004	
Methods	Country: USA Recruitment: community volunteers and referrals
Participants	350 smokers (includes 51 who withdrew before treatment) 54% F, av.age 46, av. CPD 21
Interventions	 Nicotine patch (21 mg/24hr) for 8 wks incl tapering Nicotine nasal spray (8-40 doses/day, max 5/hr) for 8 wks, tapering over final 4 wks All participants received 7x90 min behavioural group counselling sessions. TQD in wk 3
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in unvalidated continuous abstainers
Notes	For prolonged abstinence, relapse was defined as 7 consecutive days of smoking at any point during follow-up period

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Computer-generated, operated by data manager.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	After allocation only outcome assessors blind
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	Not described
Definition of abstinence	Unclear risk	Weight measured in self report continuous abstainers

2 NRT Pack 2008

Methods	Country: USA Recruitment: community volunteers 2x2 factorial design
Participants	408 smokers, 56%F, ave age 40-44yrs, ave CPD 22-24
Interventions	 Nicotine lozenge + 4 calls from Wisconsin Tobacco Quit Line Nicotine gum + 4 calls from Wisconsin Tobacco Quit Line Nicotine lozenge + Self help brochure Nicotine gum + Self help brochure Participants were treated with 8w of NRT. F/U at 8wks, 6m and 12m
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in 7-day point prevalence abstainers at end of treatment, 6m, 12m
Notes	Weight data from arms 1&2 and 3&4 were combined for the analysis

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	Not described
Definition of abstinence	High risk	Weight measured in CO validated point prevalent abstainers

2 NRT Pirie 1992

Methods	Country: USA Recruitment: community volunteers
Participants	417 women smokers. Av CPD 25-27. av BMI 23-25
Interventions	 Group therapy 8w Group therapy plus weight control programme 8w Group therapy plus nicotine gum 8w Group therapy plus weight control programme and nicotine gum 8w Gum type: 2mg ad lib 8 week treatment period + 3 months supply
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in continuous abstainers end of treatment, 6 and 12m (Validation: expired CO <=10ppm)

2 NRT Pirie 1992 (Continued)

Notes

Group 3 compared with group 1. Group 1, 3 and 4 compared in first part of review

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	Not described
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated continuous abstainers

2 NRT Puska 1995

Methods	Country: Finland Recruitment: community volunteers
Participants	300 volunteers aged 20-65, smoking >10 CPD for >3 yrs, no serious illness
Interventions	 Nicotine patch (15mg/16hrs, 12 wks+ 6 wks taper) plus nicotine gum (2mg at least 4 daily) Placebo patch plus nicotine gum (same regimen)
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in prolonged abstainers at end of treatment (email com- munication) and 12m (email communication) (Validation: CO<10ppm)
Notes	Prolonged abstinence defined as verified continuously lapse free abstinence after week 1

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Double blind

2 NRT Puska 1995 (Continued)

Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated prolonged abstainers
2 NRT Richmond 1994		
Methods	Country: Australia Recruitment: community volunteers	
Participants	315 smokers, av. CPD 29.	
Interventions	 Nicotine patch (24 hr, 22mg/24 hr, 10 wks incl tapering) Placebo patch All participants received group smoking cessation behavioural support 	
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in prolonge munication), 6 months (email communicat (Validation: CO =10ppm)</td <td>d abstainers at end of treatment (email com- ion) and 12 months (email communication)</td>	d abstainers at end of treatment (email com- ion) and 12 months (email communication)
Notes	Prolonged abstainers were defined as contin ceding the assessment point at 12 months	nuous abstinence for a sustained period pre-
Risk of bias		

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Double blind
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated prolonged abstainers

2 NRT Sachs 1993

Methods	Country: USA Recruitment: community volunteers
Participants	220 adult smokers. Av. CPD 28-9, av weight 72-76kg
Interventions	1. Nicotine patch (15mg/16hr, 12 wks + 6 wks tapering) 2. Placebo patch All participants received physician advice at 8 visits during treatment period

2 NRT Sachs 1993 (Continued)

Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in continuous abstainers at 6m (Validation: CO <10ppm)	
Notes		
Risk of bias		
Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Method not stated
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Double blind
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated continuous abstainers

2 NRT Shiffman 2002A

Methods	Country: USA & UK (15 sites) Recruitment: community volunteers, low dependence (time to first cigarette >30mins)
Participants	917 smokers, 58% Female, Av age 41, av CPD 17-18, av weight 74-76kg
Interventions	 Nicotine lozenge, 2mg. Recommended dose 1 every 1-2 hrs, min 9, max 20/day for 6 wks, decreasing 7-12 wks, available as needed 13-24 wks Placebo lozenge, same schedule All participants received brief advice at 4 visits.
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in prolonged abstainers at end of treatment (email com- munication), 6 (email communication) and 12 months (email communication) (Vali- dation: CO<=10ppm)
Notes	Prolonged abstinence defined as sustained from 2 wks, no slips allowed

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Method not stated
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described

2 NRT Shiffman 2002A (Continued)

Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Double blind	
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated prolonged abstainers	
2 NRT Shiffman 2002B			
Methods	Country: USA & UK (15 sites) Recruitment: community volunteers, high dependence (time to first cigarette <30mins)		
Participants	901 smokers, 55% Female, av age 43-44, av	901 smokers, 55% Female, av age 43-44, av CPD 25-26	
Interventions	 Nicotine lozenge, 4mg. Recommended dose 1 every 1-2 hrs, min 9, max 20/day for 6 wks, decreasing 7-12 wks, available as needed 13-24 wks Placebo lozenge, same schedule 		
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in prolonged abstainers at end of treatment (email com- munication), 6 (email communication) and 12 months (email communication) (Vali- dation: CO<=10ppm)		
Notes			
Risk of bias			
Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Method not stated	
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described	
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Double blind	
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated prolonged abstainers	
2 NRT Stapleton 1995			
Methods	Country: UK Recruitment: General practice patients		

1200 smokers Av. CPD 23-4, av weight 71-72kg

Participants

2 NRT Stapleton 1995 (Continued)

Interventions	 Nicotine patch standard dose (15mg/16 hr for 18 wks) Nicotine patch with dose increase to 25mg at 1 wk if required Placebo patch group The nicotine patch groups were further randomised to gradual tapering or abrupt with- drawal from wk 12 All participants received physician advice & brief support at 1, 3, 6, 12 wks
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in prolonged abstainers at end of treatment (email com- munication) and 12m (email communication) (Validation: CO <10ppm)
Notes	Prolonged abstinence defined as validated self reported abstinence from week 2. The dose increase after 1 wk did not affect cessation, 1+2 vs 3 in main comparison

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Computer-generated list
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	"Study subjects were assigned a treatment according to a computer generated list compiled in blocks of six"
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Double blind
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated prolonged abstainers

2 NRT Sutherland 1992

Methods	Country: UK Recruitment: Smoking cessation clinic patients
Participants	227 male and female smokers. Av. CPD 25-27, av age 38-41yrs, av weight women 62-64kg, av weight men 75-77kg
Interventions	1. Nicotine nasal spray, maximum 40 mg/day 2. Placebo spray All participants received 4 wks of group support
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in prolonged abstainers at 12 months (Validation: CO <10ppm)

2 NRT Sutherland 1992 (Continued)

Notes	Prolonged abstinence defined as validated self reported no smoking from the start of the
	last week of group treatment to the 12 months follow up

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Drew card with A or P for active or placebo allocation
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	"Subjects and therapist were blind to spray assignment"
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated prolonged abstainers

2 NRT TNSG 1991

Methods	Country: USA (9 sites) Recruitment: community volunteers (treated at smoking cessation clinics)
Participants	808 smokers 60% female, av.age 43, av. CPD 31, av weight 72.4 kg
Interventions	 Nicotine patch (21mg /24 hr, 6 wks+) Nicotine patch 14mg Placebo patch All participants received group smoking cessation behavioural support
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in continuous abstainers at end of treatment (6w) (Vali- dation: CO <9ppm)
Notes	2 trials pooled and data relating to a 7mg patch group used in only 1 trial omitted

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Method not stated
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described

2 NRT TNSG 1991 (Continued)

Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Double blind
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated continuous abstainers

Methods	Country: Denmark Recruitment: community volunteers
Participants	289 smokers 70% F, av.age 45, av. CPD 22
Interventions	1. Nicotine patch (15mg/16 hr for 12 wks with tapering) 2. Placebo patch All participants receive brief behaviour support at clinic visits
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in prolonged abstainers at end of treatment (email com- munication) and 12m (email communication) (validation: CO <=10ppm)
Notes	Prolonged abstinence was defined as validated self report abstinence after 1 week of quitting

2 NRT Tonnesen 1991

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	According to a computer generated ran- domisation code
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	"packages labelled with consecutive num- bers from computer-generated random code"
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Double blind
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated prolonged abstainers

2 NRT Tonnesen 1993

Methods	Country: Denmark Recruitment: community volunteers	
Participants	286 smokers, av CPD 20 60% F, av.age 39	
Interventions	 Nicotine inhaler (2-10/day) up to 6m Placebo inhaler All participants received brief advice at 8 clinic visits, 0, 1, 2, 3, 6,12, 24, 52 wks) 	
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in continuous abstainers at end of treatment (email communication) and 12m (email communication) (Validation: expired CO<10ppm)	
Notes		
Risk of bias		
Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Computer-generated randomisation code
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	"participants were randomly assigned ac- cording to code generated by a computer"

		column to code generated by a computer
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Double blind
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated continuous abstainers

2 NRT Wallstrom 2000

Methods	Country: Sweden Recruitment: community volunteers
Participants	247 smokers (>= 10 CPD) 59% female, av.age 45, av. CPD 18-20, av weight (male) 80-81kg, av weight (female) 66-67kg
Interventions	 Nicotine sublingual tablet 2mg. Recommended dosage 1 tab/hr for smokers with FTND < 7, 2 tabs/hr for scores >= 7. After 3m treatment, tapering period of 3m if necessary Placebo tablet All participants received brief 5 mins counselling at study visits
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in prolonged abstainers at 12 months (Validation: CO<10ppm)

2 NRT Wallstrom 2000 (Continued)

Notes		
1 10100		

Prolonged abstinence defined as complete abstinence from wk 2

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Computer assignment
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	"Subjects were randomised to receive either active or placebo treatment using a com- puter program"
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Double blind
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated prolonged abstainers

2 VA Aubin 2008

Methods	Country: Belgium, France, Netherlands, UK, USA Recruitment: smoking cessation clinics or community volunteers
Participants	Healthy adults, Mean age 42.9yr, 50.8% female, Mean CPD 22.7
Interventions	 Varenicline 1mg x2/day for 12 wks, titrated 1st wk. Nicotine patch (21mg wks 2-6, 14mg wks 7-9, 7mg wks 10-11). No placebo control group. All participants received <i>Clearing the Air</i> S-H booklet at baseline, and brief counselling (=<10 mins) at each clinic visit or by phone
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in prolonged abstainers at end of treatment (email com- munication) (Validation: CO<=10ppm)
Notes	Prolonged abstainers defined as completely quit from week 9.

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Central computer-generated sequence.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Central allocation

2 VA Aubin 2008 (Continued)

Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	High risk	Open label design
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated prolonged abstainers

2 VA Gonzales 2006

Methods	Country: USA Recruitment: community volunteers
Participants	1025 smokers 55% F (Placebo), 48% F (Bup); av age 45, av CPD not specified
Interventions	 Varenicline 1mg x2/day for 12w Bupropion 300 mg/day for 12w Placebo All participants received brief individual counselling at visits w1-7, 9, 12, + telephone counselling at 4 and 5m
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in prolonged abstainers at end of treatment (validation: CO <10ppm)
Notes	Prolonged abstinence defined as complete abstinence from weeks 9-12 Arm 1 compared with 3 (same study as 3 AD Gonzales)

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Computer generated sequence 1:1:1
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Participants were randomised according to a predefined central computer sequence
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Double blind
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated prolonged abstainers

2 VA Jorenby 2006

Methods	Country: USA, multicentre Recruitment: community volunteers
Participants	1027 smokers, 41% F, av age 42, av CPD 22
Interventions	 Bupropion 300mg for 12 w + placebo varenicline Varenicline 2mg for 12 w + placebo bupropion Placebo bupropion + placebo varenicline All participants received brief (< 10 min) individual counselling at each weekly assessment for 12w & 5 follow-up visits. One telephone call 3 days after quit day
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in prolonged abstainers at end of treatment (validation: CO < 10ppm)
Notes	Prolonged abstinence defined as validated abstinence w 9-12. Arm 1 and 3 in main comparison

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Centralised, computer-generated
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	"SItes used an electronic system to assign participants to treatment"
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Double blind
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated prolonged abstainers

2 VA Nakamura 2007

Methods	Country: Japan Recruitment:community volunteers
Participants	619 healthy smokers, aged 20-75, smoking >=10cpd. 1 ppt excluded from ITT denom- inator as withdrew prior to treatment. Demographic data only supplied for nicotine-de- pendent group (515/618): 75% male, mean age 39.8, mean CPD 24, mean Fagerstrom score 5.6
Interventions	 Varenicline 0.25mg x 2/day 12w Varenicline 0.50mg x 2/day 12w Varenicline 1.00mg x 2/day 12w Placebo tablet x 2/day 12w

2 VA Nakamura 2007 (Continued)

	All participants received S-H booklet <i>Clearing the Air</i> at baseline, + brief counselling (= <10 mins) at each clinic visit	
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in prolonged abstainers at end of treatment (validation: CO <=10ppm)	
Notes	Prolonged abstinence defined as continuous abstinence during weeks 9-12	
Risk of bias		
Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Computer-generated random number lists
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	'randomised to 1 of the 4 treatment groups in a 1:1:1:1 ratio using a central procedure'
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	'double-blinding of subjects and investiga- tors was maintained throughout the study'
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated prolonged abstainers

2 VA Niaura 2008

Methods	Country: USA Setting: 5 research centres	
Participants	320 healthy adult volunteers, aged 18-65, smoking >=10cpd. 52% M, 91% white, mean age 42, mean CPD 22, mean Fagerström score 5.4	
Interventions	 (1) Varenicline tartrate 12w (Week 1: titrated from 0.5 to 1.0 mg/day) followed by a self-regulated flexible schedule (Weeks 2-12: 0.5-2.0 mg/day). (2) Placebo 	
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in continuous abstainers at end of treatment (12w). (Validation: CO =10ppm)</td	
Notes	Continuous abstinence defined as self report abstinence weeks 4-12 with biochemical validation	
Risk of bias		
Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement

2 VA Niaura 2008 (Continued)

Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	randomly permuted blocks and a pseudo- random number generator
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	participants were assigned in a 1:1 ratio to varenicline treatment or placebo in the nu- merical order that they were accepted to the study
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	double blind
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated continuous abstainers

2 VA Nides 2006

Methods	Country: USA, multi-centre, 7 sites Recruitment: Volunteers (phase II study)
Participants	638 smokers, 51% F, av age 41, av CPD 20, av BMI 25-27
Interventions	 Varenicline 0.3mg 1/d for 6w, + 1wk placebo Varenicline 1.0mg 1/d for 6w, + 1wk placebo Varenicline 1.0mg 2/d for 6w, + 1wk placebo Bupropion 150mg 2/d (titrated in wk 1) for 7 wks Placebo tablets 2/d for 7 wks All participants received up to 10 mins counselling at 7 weekly clinic visits, 12 & 24w
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in continuous abstainers at end of treatment (validation: CO = 10ppm) (email communication)</td
Notes	Continuous abstinence defined as self reported quit from target quit day with biochemical validation. Arms 1-3 and 5 in main comparison (same study as 3 AD Nides 2006)

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Computer-generated list
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	"Investigators assigned medication to sub- jects in numerical order of acceptance into the study" from computer generated list"

2 VA Nides 2006 (Continued)

Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Double blind
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated continuous abstainers

2 VA Oncken 2006

Methods	Country: USA Recruitment: community volunteers
Participants	647 smokers, 50.5% female, av CPD 21, av age 42-44yrs, av BMI 26-28
Interventions	 Varenicline 0.5mg nontitrated (2/d for 12 wks) Varenicline 0.5mg titrated (wk1 1/d, wks 2-12 2/d) Varenicline 1.0mg nontitrated (2/d for 12 wks) Varenicline 1.0mg titrated (0.5mg 1/d for 3 days, 0.5mg 2/d for 4 days, 1.0mg 2/d wks 2-12) placebo tablets 2/d 12 wks All participants received S-H booklet at baseline, + brief (<=10mins) counselling at weekly clinic visits throughout treatment phase
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in continuous abstainers at end of treatment (validation: CO <= 10ppm)

Notes

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	"Subjects and investigators were blinded to the study drug treatment assignment"
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated continuous abstainers

2 VA Rigotti 2010

Methods	Country: 15 countries in Europe, Asia, Americas Setting: 39 research centres
Participants	714 adult smokers, aged 35-75, smoking at least 10cpd, with stable CVD and motivated to quit. 79% male, 80% white, mean CPD 22, mean Fagerström 5.6
Interventions	 Varenicline 1.0 mg 2/d for 12 wks, preceded by 1wk titrated dose. Placebo tablets as above. Both groups received brief (10mins) counselling at weekly clinic visits throughout treatment phase, and phone call 3d post-TQD
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in week 9-12 continuous abstainers at end of treatment (12w) and 12 months (12m) (Validation: expired CO =10 ppm).</td

Notes

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	The study sponsor conducted the random- ization centrally using a computer gener- ated list that prespecified the order of treat- ment allocation
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	see above
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Double-blind (participants and study im- plementation). Cardiovascular outcomes "were reviewed separately and adjudicated under blinded conditions by an indepen- dent event committee made up of 3 board- certified cardiologists"
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated prolonged abstainers from 9 weeks

2 VA Tashkin 2011

Methods	Country: USA (17 centres), Spain (3 centres), France (4 centres), Italy (3 centres) Setting: 27 research centres.
Participants	504 adult smokers with mild-to-moderate COPD, aged 35+, smoking 10+ CPD, mo- tivated to quit; allocated to varenicline (250), or placebo (254). 62% male, mean age 57, CPD 24-25, Fagerström score 5.9-6.2., av BMI 26.6 (SD5.5)

2 VA Tashkin 2011 (Continued)

Interventions	 Varenicline 1.0 mg 2/d for 12 wks, preceded by 1wk titrated dose. Placebo tablets as above. Both groups received SC educational booklet, + brief (10mins) counselling at weekly clinic visits throughout treatment phase, and phone call 3d post-TQD
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change at in continuous abstainers end of treatment (12w) and 12m (Validation: CO =10ppm)</td

Notes

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Methods not described
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Methods not described
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	double blind
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated prolonged abstainers from week 9

2 VA Tonstad 2006

Methods	Country: USA (6 centres) and 'international' (18 centres, across Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, UK) Recruitment: smoking cessation clinics
Participants	1210 successful quitters (62.8% of initial cohort) following a 12-wk open-label course of varenicline for smoking cessation. 51% female, av age 45, av CPD 21
Interventions	 Varenicline 1mg x2/day for 11 wks after 1wk titrated dosage Placebo tablets, same regime Participants had already received 12w of varenicline. All participants received brief counselling (<=10 mins) at each clinic visit throughout treatment phase (wks 13-24). Treatment phase clinic visits were at wks 13, 14, 16, 20 and 24
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in continuous abstainers at 6 months (validation: CO <=10ppm)
Notes	Continuous abstinence was defined as validated complete abstinence during week 13-24

2 VA Tonstad 2006 (Continued)

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Computer-generated lists stratified by cen- tre, x4 random block design
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	computer generated sequence used for al- location of participants
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Double blind
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated prolonged abstainers from week 13

2 VA Tsai 2008

Methods	Country: Taiwan and Korea Recruitment: community volunteers
Participants	250 healthy adult volunteers, motivated to quit, aged 18 to 75; allocated to varenicline (126), or placebo (124). 11% female, av age 40.3, BMI >15 or <38 or weight >45.5 kg, av CPD 24
Interventions	 Varenicline 1.0mg x 2/day 12w 1st w titrated Placebo tablet x 2/day 12w All participants received a smoking cessation booklet <i>Clearing the Air</i> at baseline + brief counselling (=<10 mins) at each clinic visit
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in prolonged abstainers at end of treatment (validated: CO <=10ppm)
Notes	Prolonged abstinence is defined as validated complete abstinence during weeks 9-12

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Permutated blocks (block=4)
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	web- and telephone-based assignment
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias)	Low risk	Subjects, investigators, study staff and sponsor personnel blind to treatment

2 VA Tsai 2008 (Continued)

All outcomes		
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated prolonged abstainers
2 VA Wang 2009		
Methods	Setting: Not described Country: China (10 sites), Singapore (3 sites), Thailand (2 sites)	
Participants	333 healthy adult volunteers, aged 18 to 75;97% male, mean age 39, BMI >15 and <38 or weight >45.5 kg, mean CPD 20, mean Fagerström score 5.4	
Interventions	 Varenicline 1.0mg x 2/day Placebo tablet x 2/day Treatment period 12 wks, 1st wk titrated dosage. All participants received a smoking cessation booklet at baseline, + brief counselling (10 mins) at each clinic visit, except for wks 5 and 7, when counselling was conducted by phone. 	
Outcomes	Mean (SD) weight change (kg) in continue 6 months (Validation: CO =10ppm)</td <td>ous abstainers at end of treatment (12w) and</td>	ous abstainers at end of treatment (12w) and
Notes		

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	eligible subjects were randomised in a 1:1 ratio
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	not described
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	double blind
Definition of abstinence	Low risk	Weight measured in biochemically vali- dated prolonged abstainers from week 9

Characteristics of excluded studies [ordered by study ID]

Study	Reason for exclusion
1 Ames 2007	Not an intervention designed specifically to tackle post cessation weight gain
1 Chaney 2008	Exercise intervention excluded by parent cochrane review
1 Hughes 1997	Effect of NRT on post cessation weight gain, not identified in NRT parent review
1 Jeffery 1990	Study testing effect on intervention on weight control in general rather than on post cessation control
1 Killen 1990	Effect of minimal contact smoking relapse prevention trial with NRT, not included in parent review
1 King 2006	Weight only measured at end of 1 month (2 month intervention)
1 Lagrue 1994	Intervention on overweight patients only
1 Leischow 1992	Unable to obtain full data
1 Love 2011	Patients not randomised
1 Patterson 2006	Not an intervention designed to address weight gain
1 Pomerleau 1991	Excluded from antidepressant parent review.
1 Rohsenow 2007	No weight data
1 Spring 1991	Unable to obtain data
1 Toll 2008	Participants not randomised to experimental or control conditions
1 Wilcox 2010	Uncontrolled trial
2 AD Ahluwalia 2002	Unable to obtain full data
2 AD Aubin 2004	Unable to obtain full data
2 AD Berlin 1995	No weight data
2 AD Blondal 1999	No weight data
2 AD Brown 2006	No weight data
2 AD Cinciripini 05	No weight data
2 AD Collins 2004	No weight data

2 AD Covey 2002	No weight data
2 AD Covey 2007	All participants received 8 weeks of open label bupropion and NRT
2 AD Da Costa 2002	No weight data
2 AD Dalsgareth 2004	Unable to obtain full data
2 AD Evins 2001	Unable to obtain full data
2 AD Evins 2005	No weight data
2 AD Evins 2006	No weight data
2 AD Evins 2008	less than 6 months follow up
2 AD Ferry 1992	No weight data
2 AD Ferry 1994	No weight data
2 AD George 2002	No weight data
2 AD GlaxoSmithK SMK20001	No weight data
2 AD Gonzales 2001	No weight data
2 AD Haggsträm 2006	No weight data
2 AD Hall 1998	No weight data
2 AD Hall 2002	No weight data
2 AD Hall 2004	No weight data
2 AD Hatsukami 2004	No weight data
2 AD Hays 2001	Unable to obtain full data
2 AD Hertzberg 2001	No weight data
2 AD Holt 2005	No weight data
2 AD Hurt 2003	No weight data
2 AD Killen 2000	No weight data

2 AD Killen 2004	No weight data
2 AD Killen 2006	No weight data
2 AD Myles 2004	No weight data
2 AD Piper 2004	No weight data
2 AD Piper 2009	No weight data
2 AD Prochazka 1998	No weight data
2 AD Prochazka 2004	No weight data
2 AD Rovina 2009	No weight data
2 AD Selby 2003	No weight data
2 AD Swan 2003	No weight data
2 AD Tashkin 2001	No weight data
2 AD Tonnesen 2003	Unable to obtain full data
2 AD Tonstad 2003	Unable to obtain full data
2 AD Uyar 2005	Unable to obtain full data
2 AD Wagena 2005	No weight data
2 EX Hill 1985	No weight data
2 EX Hill 1993	No weight data
2 EX Kinnunen 2008	Unable to get data
2 EX Marcus 1991	No weight data
2 EX Marcus 1995	No weight data
2 EX Martin 1997	No weight data
2 EX Prapavessis 2007	Unable to get data
2 EX Russell 1988	No weight data
2 EX Taylor	No weight data

2 NRT Ahluwalia 1998	No weight data
2 NRT Ahluwalia 2006	No weight data
2 NRT Areechon 1988	No weight data
2 NRT Blondal 1989	No weight data
2 NRT Blondal 1997	Unable to obtain full data
2 NRT Bolin 1999	No weight data
2 NRT Br Thor Soc 83	No weight data
2 NRT Buchkremer 88	No weight data
2 NRT Bullen 2010	Participants took medication before quit day
2 NRT Campbell 1987	No weight data
2 NRT Campbell 1991	No weight data
2 NRT Campbell 1996	No weight data
2 NRT Cinciripini 96	No weight data
2 NRT Clavel 1985	No weight data
2 NRT Clavel-Cha '92	No weight data
2 NRT Croghan 2003	No weight data
2 NRT Croghan 2007	No weight data
2 NRT Daughton 1991	No weight data
2 NRT Daughton 1998	No weight data
2 NRT Dautzenberg 01	No weight data
2 NRT Davidson 1998	No weight data
2 NRT Etter 2009	Participants took medication before the quit date
2 NRT Fagerstrom 82	No weight data

2 NRT Fagerstrom 84	No weight data
2 NRT Fee 1982	No weight data
2 NRT Fortmann 1995	No weight data
2 NRT Garcia 1989	No weight data
2 NRT Gilbert 1989	No weight data
2 NRT Glavas 2003a	No weight data
2 NRT Glavas 2003b	No weight data
2 NRT Glover 2002	Unable to obtain full data
2 NRT Goldstein 1989	No weight data
2 NRT Hall 1985	No weight data
2 NRT Hall 1987	No weight data
2 NRT Hall 1996	No weight data
2 NRT Hand 2002	No weight data
2 NRT Harackiewicz 1988	No weight data
2 NRT Hatsukami 2007	Less than 6 months follow up
2 NRT Hays 1999	No weight data
2 NRT Herrera 1995	No weight data
2 NRT Hilleman 1994	No weight data
2 NRT Huber 1988	No weight data
2 NRT Hughes 1989	No weight data
2 NRT Hughes 1990	No weight data
2 NRT Hughes 1991	No weight data
2 NRT Hughes 1999	No weight data

2 NRT Hughes 2003	No weight data
2 NRT Hurt 1990	No weight data
2 NRT Hurt 1994	No weight data
2 NRT ICRF 2007	No weight data
2 NRT Jamrozik 1984	No weight data
2 NRT Jarvis 1982	No weight data
2 NRT Jensen 1991	No weight data
2 NRT Jorenby 1995	No weight data
2 NRT Jorenby 1999	Unable to obtain full data
2 NRT Joseph 1996	No weight data
2 NRT Kalman 2006	No weight data
2 NRT Killen 1984	No weight data
2 NRT Killen 1990	No weight data
2 NRT Killen 1990 2 NRT Killen 1997	No weight data
2 NRT Killen 1990 2 NRT Killen 1997 2 NRT Killen 1999	No weight data No weight data Unable to obtain full data
2 NRT Killen 1990 2 NRT Killen 1997 2 NRT Killen 1999 2 NRT Kornitzer 1987	No weight data No weight data Unable to obtain full data Unable to obtain full data
2 NRT Killen 1990 2 NRT Killen 1997 2 NRT Killen 1999 2 NRT Kornitzer 1987 2 NRT Kornitzer 1995	No weight data No weight data Unable to obtain full data Unable to obtain full data No weight data
2 NRT Killen 1990 2 NRT Killen 1997 2 NRT Killen 1999 2 NRT Kornitzer 1987 2 NRT Kornitzer 1995 2 NRT Kralikova 2002	No weight data No weight data Unable to obtain full data Unable to obtain full data No weight data No weight data
2 NRT Killen 1990 2 NRT Killen 1997 2 NRT Killen 1999 2 NRT Kornitzer 1987 2 NRT Kornitzer 1995 2 NRT Kralikova 2002 2 NRT Kralikova 2009	No weight data No weight data Unable to obtain full data Unable to obtain full data No weight data No weight data Participants could reduce smoking or quit smoking
2 NRT Killen 1990 2 NRT Killen 1997 2 NRT Killen 1999 2 NRT Kornitzer 1987 2 NRT Kornitzer 1995 2 NRT Kralikova 2002 2 NRT Kralikova 2009 2 NRT Leischow 1996	No weight data No weight data Unable to obtain full data Unable to obtain full data No weight data No weight data No weight data Participants could reduce smoking or quit smoking No weight data
2 NRT Killen 1990 2 NRT Killen 1997 2 NRT Killen 1999 2 NRT Kornitzer 1987 2 NRT Kornitzer 1995 2 NRT Kralikova 2002 2 NRT Kralikova 2009 2 NRT Leischow 1996 2 NRT Leischow 1999	No weight data No weight data Unable to obtain full data Unable to obtain full data No weight data No weight data Participants could reduce smoking or quit smoking No weight data No weight data
2 NRT Killen 1990 2 NRT Killen 1997 2 NRT Killen 1999 2 NRT Kornitzer 1987 2 NRT Kornitzer 1995 2 NRT Kralikova 2002 2 NRT Kralikova 2009 2 NRT Leischow 1996 2 NRT Leischow 1999 2 NRT Leischow 2004	No weight data No weight data Unable to obtain full data Unable to obtain full data Unable to obtain full data No weight data No weight data Participants could reduce smoking or quit smoking No weight data No weight data No weight data
2 NRT Killen 1990 2 NRT Killen 1997 2 NRT Killen 1999 2 NRT Kornitzer 1987 2 NRT Kornitzer 1995 2 NRT Kornitzer 1995 2 NRT Kralikova 2002 2 NRT Kralikova 2009 2 NRT Leischow 1996 2 NRT Leischow 1999 2 NRT Leischow 2004 2 NRT Lewis 1998	No weight data No weight data Unable to obtain full data Unable to obtain full data Unable to obtain full data No weight data No weight data Participants could reduce smoking or quit smoking No weight data

2 NRT Malcolm 1980	No weight data
2 NRT Marshall 1985	No weight data
2 NRT McGovern 1992	No weight data
2 NRT Molyneux 2003	No weight data
2 NRT Moolchan 2005	No weight data
2 NRT Mori 1992	No weight data
2 NRT Muller 1990	No weight data
2 NRT Nakamura 1990	No weight data
2 NRT Nebot 1992	No weight data
2 NRT Niaura 1994	No weight data
2 NRT Niaura 1999	No weight data
2 NRT Ockene 1991	No weight data
2 NRT Oncken 2007	No weight data
2 NRT Otero 2006	No weight data
2 NRT Page 1986	No weight data
2 NRT Paoletti 1996	No weight data
2 NRT Peng 2007	Less than 6 months follow up
2 NRT Perng 1998	No weight data
2 NRT Piper 2007	No weight data
2 NRT Puska 1979	No weight data
2 NRT Richmond 1993	No weight data
2 NRT Rose 1994	No weight data
2 NRT Rose 1998	No weight data

2 NRT Rose 2006	No weight data
2 NRT Rose 2009	Participants took medication before quit day
2 NRT Roto 1987	Unable to obtain full data
2 NRT Russell 1983	No weight data
2 NRT Schneider '85A	No weight data
2 NRT Schneider '85B	No weight data
2 NRT Schneider 1995	No weight data
2 NRT Schneider 1996	No weight data
2 NRT Schnoll 2010	No weight data
2 NRT Schuurmans 04	No weight data
2 NRT Segnan 1991	No weight data
2 NRT Shiffman 2009	Not abrupt quitting
2 NRT Sonderskov 97	No weight data
2 NRT Stapleton 2011	Less than 6 months follow up
2 NRT Tonnesen 1988	No weight data
2 NRT Tonnesen 2000	No weight data
2 NRT Tonnesen 2006	No weight data
2 NRT Veaugh-Geiss 2010	No weight data
2 NRT Villa 1999	No weight data
2 NRT Westman 1993	No weight data
2 NRT Wisborg 2000	No weight data
2 NRT Wong 1999	No weight data
2 NRT Zelman 1992	No weight data
2 RM STRATUS-EU 2006	Unable to obtain data

2 RM STRATUS-US 2006	Unable to obtain data
2 RM STRATUS-WW 2005	Unable to obtain data
2 VA Hajek 2011	Participants took medication before quit day
2 VA Tsukahara 2010	No weight data for abstainers
2 VA Williams 2007	No weight data
VA Carson 2010	Less than 6 months follow up

DATA AND ANALYSES

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Mean weight change (kg) at end of treatment	8		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
1.1 Dexfenfluramine versus placebo	1	33	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-2.5 [-2.98, -2.02]
1.2 Phenylpropanolamine versus Placebo	3	112	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.50 [-0.80, -0.20]
1.3 Ephedrine + Caffeine versus Placebo	1	40	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-1.30 [-2.87, 0.27]
1.4 Naltrexone versus Placebo	2	179	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.78 [-1.52, -0.05]
1.5 Chromium versus placebo	1	15	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.81 [-3.05, 1.43]
2 Mean weight change (kg) at 6 months	3		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
2.1 Phenylpropanolamine versus Placebo	1	38	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-2.06 [-5.56, 1.44]
2.2 Ephedrine + caffeine versus placebo	1	32	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.70 [-2.72, 1.32]
2.3 Chromium versus placebo	1	9	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-3.87 [-12.01, 4.27]
3 Mean weight change (kg) at 12 months	2		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
3.1 Phenylpropanolamine versus placebo	1	38	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-1.04 [-5.03, 2.95]
3.2 Ephedrine + Caffeine versus placebo	1	24	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.20 [-1.84, 4.24]

Comparison 1. Pharmacological interventions versus placebo for post cessation weight control: weight change

Comparison 2. Pharmacological interventions versus placebo for post cessation weight control: smoking cessation

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Abstinence at 6 months	5		Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
1.1 Phenylpropanolamine gum versus placebo	1	295	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.38 [0.76, 2.53]
1.2 Ephedrine + Caffeine versus placebo	1	225	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.06 [0.53, 2.11]
1.3 Naltrexone versus placebo	2	557	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.01 [0.72, 1.43]
1.4 Chromium versus placebo	1	143	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.48 [0.12, 1.84]
2 Abstinence at 12 months	3		Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
2.1 Phenylpropanolamine gum versus placebo	1	295	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.48 [0.80, 2.73]

Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation (Review)

Copyright © 2012 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
2.2 Ephedrine + Caffeine	1	225	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.44 [0.60, 3.48]
versus Placebo				
2.3 Naltrexone versus placebo	1	385	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.25 [0.67, 2.31]

Comparison 3. Behavioural weight management interventions versus advice or no intervention: weight change

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Mean weight change (kg) at end of treatment	5		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
1.1 Weight management education versus no weight intervention	2	140	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.04 [-0.57, 0.50]
1.2 Personalised weight management support versus no weight intervention	3	121	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-1.11 [-1.93, -0.29]
1.3 Personalised weight management support versus weight management education	1	47	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-1.12 [-2.17, -0.07]
1.4 VLCD + advice versus advice	1	121	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-3.7 [-4.82, -2.58]
1.5 Early versus late personalised weight management support	1	41	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.4 [-1.32, 4.12]
2 Mean weight change (kg) at 6 months	3	118	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.59 [0.33, 2.86]
2.1 Weight management education verses no weight intervention	2	81	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.89 [-0.78, 2.55]
2.2 Personalised weight management support versus no weight intervention	1	15	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.40 [-2.54, 3.34]
2.3 Early versus late personalised weight management support	1	22	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	4.2 [1.63, 6.77]
3 Mean weight change (kg) at 12 months	4		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
3.1 Weight management education versus no weight intervention	2	61	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.21 [-2.28, 1.86]
3.2 Personalised weight management support versus no weight intervention	2	40	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-2.58 [-5.11, -0.05]
3.3 Personalised weight management support versus weight management education	1	17	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-2.49 [-5.51, 0.53]

62

Comparison 4. Behavioural weight management interventions versus advice or no intervention: smoking cessation

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Abstinence at 6 months	4		Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
1.1 Weight management education versus no intervention	3	660	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.02 [0.80, 1.31]
1.2 Personalised weight management support versus no intervention	2	254	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.88 [0.54, 1.43]
1.3 Personalised weight management support versus weight management education	1	104	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.81 [0.40, 1.65]
2 Abstinence at 12 months	4		Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
2.1 Weight management education versus no intervention	2	522	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.66 [0.48, 0.90]
2.2 Personalised weight management support versus no intervention	2	254	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.79 [0.47, 1.33]
2.3 Personalised weight management support versus weight management education	1	104	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.96 [0.46, 2.02]
2.4 VLCD + advice versus advice	1	287	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.73 [1.10, 2.73]

Comparison 5. CBT to accept moderate weight gain versus no behavioural weight advice: smoking cessation

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Abstinence at 6 months	2	496	Odds Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.70 [1.13, 2.56]
1.1 No additional pharmacotherapy treatment	2	301	Odds Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.83 [1.07, 3.13]
1.2 With bupropion	1	195	Odds Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.53 [0.81, 2.89]
2 Abstinence at 12 months	2	496	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.25 [0.83, 1.86]
2.1 No additional pharmacotherapy	2	301	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.51 [0.81, 2.79]
2.2 With bupropion	1	195	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.06 [0.62, 1.81]

Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation (Review)

Copyright © 2012 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Mean weight change (kg) at end of treatment	2	164	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.18 [-0.56, 0.20]
1.1 With no additional pharmacotherapy	2	105	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.01 [-0.57, 0.55]
1.2 With bupropion	1	59	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.33 [-0.86, 0.20]
2 Mean weight change (kg) at 6 months	2	101	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.74 [0.24, 1.24]
2.1 With no additional pharmacotherapy	2	55	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.31 [-0.75, 1.37]
2.2 With bupropion	1	46	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.86 [0.30, 1.42]
3 Mean weight change (kg) at 12 months	2	76	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.13 [-0.72, 0.98]
3.1 With no additional pharmacotherapy	2	44	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.82 [-2.68, 1.04]
3.2 With bupropion	1	32	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.38 [-0.57, 1.33]

Comparison 6. CBT to accept moderate weight gain versus no behavioural weight advice: weight change

Comparison 7. All types of antidepressant versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Mean weight change (kg) at end of treatment	9		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
1.1 Bupropion versus placebo	7	869	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-1.12 [-1.47, -0.77]
1.2 Fluoxetine versus placebo	2	144	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.99 [-1.36, -0.61]
2 Mean weight change (kg) at end of treatment: dose response	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
2.1 Bupropion: 300mg/day v 150mg/day placebo	1	44	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.60 [-1.89, 0.69]
2.2 Bupropion: 300mg/day v 100mg/day placebo	1	37	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.60 [-1.86, 0.66]
3 Mean weight change (kg) at 6 months	6		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
3.1 Bupropion versus placebo	4	218	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.87 [-2.21, 0.47]
3.2 Fluoxetine versus placebo	2	124	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.01 [-1.11, 1.10]
4 Mean weight change (kg) at 6 months: dose response	3		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
4.1 Bupropion: 300mg/day v 150mg/day	1	40	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.10 [-2.76, 2.96]
4.2 Bupropion: 300mg/day v 100mg/day	1	29	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-2.10 [-6.22, 2.02]
4.3 Fluoxetine: 40mg v 20mg	1	34	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.47 [-1.82, 2.76]
4.4 Fluoxetine: 60mg v 30mg	1	49	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	3.00 [1.67, 4.33]

5 Mean weight change (kg) at 12 months	4		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
5.1 Bupropion versus placebo	4	252	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.38 [0.00, 1.24]
6 Mean weight change (kg) at 12 months: dose response	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
6.1 Bupropion: 300mg/day v 150mg/day	1	33	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.20 [-4.81, 5.21]
6.2 Bupropion: 300mg/day v 100mg/day	1	24	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-2.0 [-8.04, 4.04]

Comparison 8. Exercise interventions versus no exercise for smoking cessation: weight change

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Mean weight change (kg) at end of treatment	4	404	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.25 [-0.78, 0.29]
1.1 Exercise + SC versus SC only	4	404	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.25 [-0.78, 0.29]
2 Mean weight change (kg) at 12 months	3	182	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-2.07 [-3.78, -0.36]
2.1 Exercise + SC versus SC only	3	182	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-2.07 [-3.78, -0.36]

Comparison 9. All types of NRT versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Mean weight change (kg) at end	19	2600	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.69 [-0.88, -0.51]
1.1 Gum versus placebo	4	345	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.58 [-1.02, -0.13]
1.2 Patch versus placebo	10	1619	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.82 [-1.06, -0.58]
1.3 Inhaler versus placebo	2	111	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.37 [-1.19, 0.45]
1.4 Sub-lingual tablet versus	2	478	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.48 [-0.99, 0.03]
placebo				
1.5 Intranasal spray versus placebo	1	47	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.90 [-1.54, 3.34]
2 Mean weight change (kg) at end of treatment: patch v spray	1	154	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.30 [-1.76, 1.16]
3 Mean weight change (Kg) at end of treatment: lozenge v gum	1	54	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-2.45 [-4.43, -0.47]
4 Mean weight change (kg) at end of treatment: dose response	4	1038	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.22 [-0.04, 0.48]
4.1 4mg vs 2mg gum	1	161	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.10 [-0.61, 0.41]
4.2 22mg vs 11mg patch	1	15	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.40 [-2.65, 1.85]

4.3 44mg vs 22mg patch	1	24	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.20 [-1.99, 1.59]
4.4 25mg patch vs 15mg	1	497	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.40 [0.04, 0.76]
patch- 8 week treatment course				
4.5 25mg patch vs 15mg	1	299	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.20 [-0.57, 0.97]
patch- 22 weeks treatment				
4.6 15x2mg gum vs 7x2mg	1	24	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.59 [-0.27, 3.45]
gum				
4.7 30x2mg gum vs 15x2mg	1	18	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.27 [-1.83, 1.29]
gum				
5 Mean weight change (kg) at 6	9	771	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.37 [-0.88, 0.14]
months				
5.1 Gum versus placebo	2	103	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.83 [-2.35, 0.69]
5.2 Patch versus placebo	4	282	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.31 [-1.09, 0.47]
5.3 Inhaler versus placebo	1	57	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.60 [-1.98, 0.78]
5.4 Sub-lingual tablet versus	2	329	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.19 [-1.09, 0.72]
placebo				
6 Mean weight change (kg) at 6	1	103	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	2.0 [-0.72, 4.72]
months: patch v spray				
7 Mean weight change (kg) at 6	1	40	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-2.35 [-5.34, 0.64]
months: lozenge v gum				
8 Mean weight change (kg) at 12	15	1334	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.42 [-0.92, 0.08]
months				
8.1 Gum versus placebo	1	49	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.07 [-3.07, 2.93]
8.2 Patch versus placebo	6	770	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.23 [-0.90, 0.45]
8.3 Intranasal spray versus	3	122	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-1.55 [-3.09, -0.00]
placebo				
8.4 Inhaler versus placebo	2	90	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-1.03 [-2.23, 0.17]
8.5 Sub-lingual tablet versus	3	303	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.27 [-0.99, 1.54]
placebo				
9 Mean weight change (kg) at 12	1	33	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-3.31 [-9.77, 3.15]
months: lozenge v gum				
10 Mean weight change (kg) at 12	2	423	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.24 [-0.49, 0.96]
months: dose response				
10.1 22mg patch vs 11mg	1	7	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-3.90 [-10.74, 2.94]
10.2 44mg patch vs 11mg	1	12	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-2.2 [-10.12, 5.72]
10.3 25mg patch vs 15mg- 8	1	198	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.60 [-0.43, 1.63]
week treatment course				
10.4 25mg patch vs 15mg- 22	1	206	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.0 [-1.04, 1.04]
weeks treatment course				
11 Mean weight change (kg) at	1	404	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.24 [-0.97, 0.48]
12 months: longer course vs.				
shorter				
11.1 22 weeks vs 8 weeks	1	222	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.5 [-1.46, 0.46]
25mg patch				
11.2 22 weeks vs 8 weeks	1	182	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.10 [-1.00, 1.20]
15mg patch				

Comparison 10. Varenicline versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Mean weight change (kg) at end of treatment	11		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
1.1 1mg versus placebo	3	254	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.12 [-0.68, 0.43]
1.2 2mg versus placebo	11	2008	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.41 [-0.63, -0.19]
2 Mean weight change (kg) at 6 months	1	105	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.41 [-0.79, 1.61]
3 Mean weight change (kg) at 12 months	2	151	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.11 [-0.75, 2.98]

Comparison 11. Varenicline versus bupropion: weight change

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Mean weight change (kg) at end	3	598	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.51 [0.09, 0.93]
of treatment				

Comparison 12. Varenicline versus NRT: weight change

No. of No. of No. of studies participants		Statistical method	Effect size	
1 Mean weight change (kg) at end	1	319	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.05 [-0.58, 0.48]

Analysis 1.1. Comparison I Pharmacological interventions versus placebo for post cessation weight control: weight change, Outcome I Mean weight change (kg) at end of treatment.

Review: Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation

Comparison: I Pharmacological interventions versus placebo for post cessation weight control: weight change

Outcome: I Mean weight change (kg) at end of treatment

Study or subgroup	Treatment		Control		Mean Difference	Weight	Mean Difference
,	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixed,95% CI	-	IV,Fixed,95% CI
Dexfenfluramine versus	placebo						
I Spring 1995	18	I (0.7)	15	3.5 (0.7)	-	100.0 %	-2.50 [-2.98, -2.02]
Subtotal (95% CI)	18		15		•	100.0 %	-2.50 [-2.98, -2.02]
Heterogeneity: not applic	able						
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 10.22 (P < 0.00	0001)					
2 Phenylpropanolamine v	ersus Placebo						
I Cooper 2005	16	0.59 (3.04)	22	1.81 (2.18)		3.0 %	-1.22 [-2.97, 0.53]
Klesges 990	15	0.04 (1.07)	12	0.72 (1.04)		14.2 %	-0.68 [-1.48, 0.12]
I Klesges 1995	19	0.34 (0.54)	28	0.78 (0.61)		82.8 %	-0.44 [-0.77, -0.11]
Subtotal (95% CI)	50		62		•	100.0 %	-0.50 [-0.80, -0.20]
Heterogeneity: Chi?? = 0.	97, df = 2 (P = 0	0.61); I?? =0.0%					
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 3.23 (P = 0.00	2)					
3 Ephedrine + Caffeine v	ersus Placebo						
l Norregaard 1996	27	0.2 (2.22)	13	1.5 (2.45)		100.0 %	-1.30 [-2.87, 0.27]
Subtotal (95% CI)	27		13			100.0 %	-1.30 [-2.87, 0.27]
Heterogeneity: not applic	able						
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 1.62 (P = 0.11)						
4 Naltrexone versus Place	ebo	21.410	14	4.4.(4.2)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	42.00	
	8	3.1 (4.1)	14	4.4 (4.2)	_	4.2 %	-1.30 [-4.89, 2.29]
I O'Malley 2006	123	1.14 (1.94)	34	1.9 (1.98)		95.8 %	-0.76 [-1.51, -0.01]
Subtotal (95% CI)	131		48		•	100.0 %	-0.78 [-1.52, -0.05]
Heterogeneity: Chi?? = 0.	08, df = 1 (P = 0	0.77); I?? =0.0%					
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 2.09 (P = 0.036)	š)					
5 Chromium versus place	bo						
I Parsons 2009	4	0.98 (1.88)		1.79 (2.15)		100.0 %	-0.81 [-3.05, 1.43]
Subtotal (95% CI)	4		11			100.0 %	-0.81 [-3.05, 1.43]
Heterogeneity: not applic	able						
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 0.71 (P = 0.48)						
Test for subgroup differen	nces: Chi?? = 48.6	53, df = 4 (P = 0	0.00), 1?? =929	%			
				F.	-4 -2 U 2	4	
				Fa	vours u eaument Favour	S COTILI OI	

Analysis I.2. Comparison I Pharmacological interventions versus placebo for post cessation weight control: weight change, Outcome 2 Mean weight change (kg) at 6 months.

Review: Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation

Comparison: I Pharmacological interventions versus placebo for post cessation weight control: weight change

Outcome: 2 Mean weight change (kg) at 6 months

Mea Difference	Weight	Mean Difference		Maga (SD)	Control	Maap(SD)	eatment	Study or subgroup Tr
TV,FIXED,7376 C		V,FIXEU,73% CI		riean(SD)	IN	riean(SD)	IN	
% -2.06 [-5.56, 1.44	100.0 %		•	3.7 (3.8)	22	1.64 (6.36)	Placebo 16	I Phenylpropanolamine versus I Cooper 2005
6 -2.06 [-5.56, 1.44	100.0 %				22		16 (P = 0.25)	Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: not applicable Test for overall effect: Z = 1.15
6 -0.70 [-2.72, 1.32	100.0 %		_	3.8 (2.97)	10	3.1 (2)	olacebo 22	2 Ephedrine + caffeine versus p I Norregaard 1996
6 _0 70 [_2 72 1 32	100.0 %		-	~ /	10		22	Subtatal (95% CI)
	100.0 /0		_		10		(P = 0.50)	Heterogeneity: not applicable Test for overall effect: Z = 0.68 3 Chromium versus placebo
-3.87 [-12.01, 4.27	→ 100.0 %		•	8.59 (4.09)	6	4.72 (6.59)	3	I Parsons 2009
6 -3.87 [-12.01, 4.27	— 100.0 %			i	6 64), I?? =0.0%	, df = 2 (P = 0.	3 (P = 0.35) Chi?? = 0.88,	Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: not applicable Test for overall effect: Z = 0.93 Test for subgroup differences: C

Copyright © 2012 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Analysis 1.3. Comparison I Pharmacological interventions versus placebo for post cessation weight control: weight change, Outcome 3 Mean weight change (kg) at 12 months.

Review: Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation

Comparison: I Pharmacological interventions versus placebo for post cessation weight control: weight change

Outcome: 3 Mean weight change (kg) at 12 months

Study or subgroup	Treatment		Control		Dit	Mean ference	Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fix	ed,95% Cl		IV,Fixed,95% CI
l Phenylpropanolamine ve	ersus placebo							
I Cooper 2005	16	0.82 (7.14)	22	1.86 (4.58)	• •		100.0 %	-1.04 [-5.03, 2.95]
Subtotal (95% CI)	16		22				100.0 %	-1.04 [-5.03, 2.95]
Heterogeneity: not applica	able							
Test for overall effect: Z =	0.51 (P = 0.61)							
2 Ephedrine + Caffeine ve	ersus placebo							
l Norregaard 1996	18	5.9 (3.56)	6	4.7 (3.19)		+	100.0 %	1.20 [-1.84, 4.24]
Subtotal (95% CI)	18		6				100.0 %	1.20 [-1.84, 4.24]
Heterogeneity: not applica	able							
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 0.77 (P = 0.44)							
Test for subgroup differen	ces: Chi?? = 0.77	, df = 1 (P = 0.3	8), I?? =0.0%					
					-4 -2	0 2 4	ł	
				Fav	ours treatment	Favours cont	rol	

Analysis 2.1. Comparison 2 Pharmacological interventions versus placebo for post cessation weight control: smoking cessation, Outcome 1 Abstinence at 6 months.

Review: Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation

Comparison: 2 Pharmacological interventions versus placebo for post cessation weight control: smoking cessation

Outcome: I Abstinence at 6 months

Study or subgroup	Treatment	Control	Risk Ratio	Weight	Risk Ratio
	n/N	n/N	M-H,Fixed,95% Cl		M-H,Fixed,95% CI
I Phenylpropanolamine gum	versus placebo	14/140		100.0.0/	
I Cooper 2005	22/14/	16/148		100.0 %	1.38 [0.76, 2.53]
Subtotal (95% CI)	147	148	-	100.0 %	1.38 [0.76, 2.53]
Total events: 22 (Treatment),	16 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: not applicable	V (D - 0.20)				
2 Ephedrine + Caffeine versus	s placebo				
Norregaard 1996	22/152	10/73		100.0 %	1.06 [0.53, 2.11]
Subtatal (05% CI)	152	73	-	100.0.%	106[053 211]
Total events: 22 (Treatment)	152	/3		100.0 %	1.00 [0.55, 2.11]
Heterogeneity: not applicable					
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.1$	6 (P = 0.88)				
3 Naltrexone versus placebo	. ,				
I O'Malley 2006	57/292	20/93	-	61.2 %	0.91 [0.58, 1.43]
1 Toll 2010	23/87	19/85	-	38.8 %	1.18 [0.70, 2.01]
Subtotal (95% CI)	379	178	+	100.0 %	1.01 [0.72, 1.43]
Total events: 80 (Treatment),	39 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: Chi?? = 0.55, c	df = 1 (P = 0.46); 1?? = 0	0.0%			
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.0$	08 (P = 0.94)				
4 Chromium versus placebo	2/72	(70			
I Parsons 2009	3//3	6/70		100.0 %	0.48 [0.12, 1.84]
Subtotal (95% CI)	73	70		100.0 %	0.48 [0.12, 1.84]
Total events: 3 (Treatment), 6	(Control)				
Heterogeneity: not applicable	(D - 0.29)				
lest for overall effect: Z – 1.0	17 (P – 0.28)				
			0.05 0.2 5 20		
			Eavours control Eavours treatment	t	
				-	
Subtotal (95% CI) Total events: 80 (Treatment), 1 Heterogeneity: Chi?? = 0.55, c Test for overall effect: Z = 0.0 4 Chromium versus placebo I Parsons 2009 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events: 3 (Treatment), 6 Heterogeneity: not applicable Test for overall effect: Z = 1.0	379 39 (Control) df = 1 (P = 0.46); 1?? =(18 (P = 0.94) 3/73 73 (Control) 17 (P = 0.28)	178 0.0% 6/70 70	0.05 0.2 5 20 Favours control Favours treatment	100.0 % 100.0 %	1.01 [0.72, 1.43] 0.48 [0.12, 1.84] 0.48 [0.12, 1.84]

Analysis 2.2. Comparison 2 Pharmacological interventions versus placebo for post cessation weight control: smoking cessation, Outcome 2 Abstinence at 12 months.

Review: Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation

Comparison: 2 Pharmacological interventions versus placebo for post cessation weight control: smoking cessation

Outcome: 2 Abstinence at 12 months

Study or subgroup	Treatment	Control	Risk Ratio	Weight	Risk Ratio
	n/N	n/N	M-H,Fixed,95% Cl		M-H,Fixed,95% CI
I Phenylpropanolamine gum	versus placebo				
I Cooper 2005	22/147	15/148		100.0 %	1.48 [0.80, 2.73]
Subtotal (95% CI)	147	148	-	100.0 %	1.48 [0.80, 2.73]
Total events: 22 (Treatment),	15 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: not applicable					
Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.2$	24 (P = 0.21)				
2 Ephedrine + Caffeine versu	s Placebo				
Norregaard 1996	18/152	6/73		100.0 %	1.44 [0.60, 3.48]
Subtotal (95% CI)	152	73		100.0 %	1.44 [0.60, 3.48]
Total events: 18 (Treatment),	6 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: not applicable					
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.8$	81 (P = 0.42)				
3 Naltrexone versus placebo					
I O'Malley 2006	43/292	11/93		100.0 %	1.25 [0.67, 2.31]
Subtotal (95% CI)	292	93	-	100.0 %	1.25 [0.67, 2.31]
Total events: 43 (Treatment),	II (Control)				
Heterogeneity: not applicable					
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.6$	69 (P = 0.49)				

0.1 0.2 0.5 1 2 5 10

Favours control Favours treatment

Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation (Review) Copyright © 2012 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Analysis 3.1. Comparison 3 Behavioural weight management interventions versus advice or no intervention: weight change, Outcome I Mean weight change (kg) at end of treatment.

Review: Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation

Comparison: 3 Behavioural weight management interventions versus advice or no intervention: weight change

Outcome: I Mean weight change (kg) at end of treatment

Study or subgroup	Treatment	Mean(SD)	Control	Mean(SD)	Mean Difference WEixed 95% Cl	Weight	Mean Difference IVEixed 95% CI		
	11	Tiedil(3D)	IN	T leal(JD)	10,1 IXEd,7578 CI		10,11Xed,75% C1		
I Weight management ed	lucation versus n	o weight interve	ntion	0 (7 (1 00)		47.0.00			
T Pine 1992	39	0.5 (1.85)	49	0.67 (1.83)		47.8 %	-0.17 [-0.94, 0.60]		
Hall 1992	21	1.2 (1.18)	31	1.12 (1.54)		52.2 %	0.08 [-0.66, 0.82]		
Subtotal (95% CI)	60		80		+	100.0 %	-0.04 [-0.57, 0.50]		
Heterogeneity: Chi?? = 0.2	2I, df = I (P = C)	.65); I?? =0.0%							
Test for overall effect: Z =	0.14 (P = 0.89)								
2 Personalised weight mar	nagement suppo	rt versus no wei	ght intervent	tion	_				
I Spring 2004	21	2.44 (2.77)	10	3.71 (1.66)		27.3 %	-1.27 [-2.84, 0.30]		
Perkins 2001	17	2.6 (3.4)	16	3.7 (3)		14.1 %	-1.10 [-3.28, 1.08]		
Hall 1992	26	0.08 (2.4)	31	1.12 (1.54)		58.7 %	-1.04 [-2.11, 0.03]		
Subtotal (95% CI)	64		57		•	100.0 %	-1.11 [-1.93, -0.29]		
Heterogeneity: Chi?? = 0.06, df = 2 (P = 0.97); I?? =0.0%									
Test for overall effect: Z =	2.66 (P = 0.007	'9)							
3 Personalised weight mar	nagement suppo	rt versus weight	managemen	t education					
Hall 992	26	0.08 (2.4)	21	1.2 (1.18)		100.0 %	-1.12 [-2.17, -0.07]		
Subtotal (95% CI)	26		21		-	100.0 %	-1.12 [-2.17, -0.07]		
Heterogeneity: not applica	able								
Test for overall effect: Z =	2.09 (P = 0.037	')							
4 VLCD + advice versus a	advice		50			100.0.0/			
I Danielsson 1999	68	-2.1 (3.37)	53	1.6 (2.9)		100.0 %	-3.70 [-4.82, -2.58]		
Subtotal (95% CI)	68		53			100.0 %	-3.70 [-4.82, -2.58]		
Heterogeneity: not applica	able								
Test for overall effect: Z =	6.48 (P < 0.000	01)							
5 Early versus late person	alised weight ma	nagement suppo	ort						
I Spring 2004	21	2.44 (2.77)	20	1.04 (5.58)		→ 100.0 %	1.40 [-1.32, 4.12]		
Subtotal (95% CI)	21		20			- 100.0 %	1.40 [-1.32, 4.12]		
Heterogeneity: not applica	able								
Test for overall effect: Z =	.0 (P = 0.3)								
Test for subgroup differen	ces: Chi?? = 37.0	0, df = 4 (P = 0	.00), I?? =899	%					
					-4 -2 0 2	4			
				Favo	ours treatment Favours co	ntrol			

Analysis 3.2. Comparison 3 Behavioural weight management interventions versus advice or no intervention: weight change, Outcome 2 Mean weight change (kg) at 6 months.

Review: Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation

Comparison: 3 Behavioural weight management interventions versus advice or no intervention: weight change

Outcome: 2 Mean weight change (kg) at 6 months

Study or subgroup	Treatment		Control		Mean Difference	Weight	Mean Difference
, , ,	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixed,95% CI	0	IV,Fixed,95% CI
l Weight management edu	cation verses n	o weight intervent	ion				
I Hankey 2009	23	3.9 (3.1)	18	2.7 (3.7)		35.1 %	1.20 [-0.93, 3.33]
I Pirie 1992	25	4.09 (4.17)	15	3.7 (4.17)		22.3 %	0.39 [-2.28, 3.06]
Subtotal (95% CI)	48		33			57.5 %	0.89 [-0.78, 2.55]
Heterogeneity: Chi?? = 0.22	2, df = 1 (P = 0.1)	.64); I?? =0.0%					
Test for overall effect: Z =	I.04 (P = 0.30)						
2 Personalised weight mana	agement suppor	rt versus no weigh	t interventic	n			
I Spring 2004	11	6 (3.3)	4	5.6 (2.24)		18.4 %	0.40 [-2.54, 3.34]
Subtotal (95% CI)	11		4			18.4 %	0.40 [-2.54, 3.34]
Heterogeneity: not applicab	ble						
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0$	0.27 (P = 0.79)						
3 Early versus late personal	ised weight mai	nagement support		10(202)		2419/	4 20 5 1 / 2 / 77 1
1 Spring 2004	11	6 (3.3)	11	1.8 (2.83)		24.1 %	4.20 [1.63, 6.77]
Subtotal (95% CI)	11		11			24.1 %	4.20 [1.63, 6.77]
Heterogeneity: not applicab	ble D D D - D D D D	4					
Test for overall effect: $\angle = 1$	3.20 (P = 0.001) 70	4)	49			100 0 %	1 50 [0 22 2 96]
Heterogeneity: $Chi?? = 5.50$) $df = 3 (P = 0)$	4) - 122 = 45%	40			100.0 70	1.37 [0.33, 2.80]
Test for overall effect: $7 = 2$	2.48 (P = 0.013))					
Test for subgroup difference	es: Chi?? = 5.28,	, df = 2 (P = 0.07)	, I?? =62%				
0		, ,		I			
				-4	-2 0 2 4		
				Favours e>	perimental Favours contro	bl	

Analysis 3.3. Comparison 3 Behavioural weight management interventions versus advice or no intervention: weight change, Outcome 3 Mean weight change (kg) at 12 months.

Review: Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation

Comparison: 3 Behavioural weight management interventions versus advice or no intervention: weight change

Outcome: 3 Mean weight change (kg) at 12 months

Study or subgroup	Treatment		Control		Diffe	Mean rence	Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixed	1,95% CI		IV,Fixed,95% CI
l Weight management eo	ducation versus n	o weight interve	ention					
I Hall 1992	7	3.35 (2.38)	4	3.61 (3.99)			57.4 %	-0.26 [-2.99, 2.47]
l Pirie 1992	25	4.43 (4.95)	15	4.57 (4.96)			42.6 %	-0.14 [-3.31, 3.03]
Subtotal (95% CI)	32		29				100.0 %	-0.21 [-2.28, 1.86]
Heterogeneity: Chi?? = 0.0	00, $df = 1 (P = C)$.96); ?? =0.0%						
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 0.20 (P = 0.84)							
2 Personalised weight ma	nagement suppo	rt versus no wei	ght intervent	ion				
Hall 992	10	0.86 (3.95)	14	3.61 (3.99)	· ·	_	61.8 %	-2.75 [-5.97, 0.47]
Perkins 2001	9	5.4 (3.3)	7	7.7 (4.7)	•		38.2 %	-2.30 [-6.40, 1.80]
Subtotal (95% CI)	19		21				100.0 %	-2.58 [-5.11, -0.05]
Heterogeneity: Chi?? = 0.0	03, df = 1 (P = 0	.87); l?? =0.0%						
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 2.00 (P = 0.046)						
3 Personalised weight ma	nagement suppo	rt versus weight	managemen	t education				
Hall 992	10	0.86 (3.95)	7	3.35 (2.38)	•	_	100.0 %	-2.49 [-5.51, 0.53]
Subtotal (95% CI)	10		7			_	100.0 %	-2.49 [-5.51, 0.53]
Heterogeneity: not applic	able							
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 1.62 (P = 0.11)							
4 VLCD + advice versus	advice							
I Danielsson 1999	38	2.5 (5.55)	24	3.8 (3.23)		_	100.0 %	-1.30 [-3.49, 0.89]
Subtotal (95% CI)	38		24			-	100.0 %	-1.30 [-3.49, 0.89]
Heterogeneity: not applic	able							
Test for overall effect: Z =	= I.I6 (P = 0.24)							
Test for subgroup differen	nces: Chi?? = 2.61	, df = 3 (P = 0.4	H6), I?? =0.0%					
						1	1	
					-4 -2 0	2 4	4	
				Fav	ours treatment	Favours cont	rol	

Analysis 4.1. Comparison 4 Behavioural weight management interventions versus advice or no intervention: smoking cessation, Outcome 1 Abstinence at 6 months.

Review: Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation

Comparison: 4 Behavioural weight management interventions versus advice or no intervention: smoking cessation

Outcome: I Abstinence at 6 months

Study or subgroup	Experimental	Control	Risk Ratio	Weight	Risk Ratio
	n/N	n/N	M-H,Fixed,95% Cl		M-H,Fixed,95% Cl
I Weight management educa	tion versus no interventio	on			
Hall 1992	3/5	19/54	•	20.4 %	0.72 [0.40, 1.31]
I Hankey 2009	23/68	18/70		→ I9.6 %	1.32 [0.78, 2.21]
I Pirie 1992	55/206	55/211	— — —	60.0 %	1.02 [0.74, 1.41]
Subtotal (95% CI)	325	335	-	100.0 %	1.02 [0.80, 1.31]
Total events: 91 (Experimenta	al), 92 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: Chi?? = 2.20, o	df = 2 (P = 0.33); I?? =9%	Ś			
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.1$	6 (P = 0.87)				
2 Personalised weight manage	ement support versus no	intervention			
Hall 1992	11/53	19/54	·	68.1 %	0.59 [0.31, 1.12]
Perkins 2001	13/72	9/75		→ 31.9 %	1.50 [0.69, 3.30]
Subtotal (95% CI)	125	129		100.0 %	0.88 [0.54, 1.43]
Total events: 24 (Experimenta	al), 28 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: Chi?? = 3.30, o	df = I (P = 0.07); I?? =70	%			
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.5$	I (P = 0.61)				
3 Personalised weight manage	ement support versus we	ight management	education		
Hall 1992	11/53	13/51		100.0 %	0.81 [0.40, 1.65]
Subtotal (95% CI)	53	51		100.0 %	0.81 [0.40, 1.65]
Total events: 11 (Experimenta	al), 13 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: not applicable					
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.5$	57 (P = 0.57)				
				1	
			0.5 0.7 1 1.5	2	
			Favours control Favours e	xperimental	

Analysis 4.2. Comparison 4 Behavioural weight management interventions versus advice or no intervention: smoking cessation, Outcome 2 Abstinence at 12 months.

Review: Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation

Comparison: 4 Behavioural weight management interventions versus advice or no intervention: smoking cessation

Outcome: 2 Abstinence at 12 months

Study or subgroup	Experimental n/N	Control n/N	Risk Ratio M-H,Fixed,95% Cl	Weight	Risk Ratio M-H,Fixed,95% Cl
I Weight management educat	tion versus no interventio	on			
Hall 992	11/51	19/54	← ■	24.0 %	0.61 [0.32, 1.16]
l Pirie 1992	39/206	59/211	•	76.0 %	0.68 [0.47, 0.97]
Subtotal (95% CI)	257	265		100.0 %	0.66 [0.48, 0.90]
Total events: 50 (Experimenta	l), 78 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: Chi?? = 0.07, d	If = I (P = 0.79); I?? = 0.00)%			
Test for overall effect: $Z = 2.6$	I (P = 0.0092)				
2 Personalised weight manage	ment support versus no	intervention			
I Hall 1992	11/53	19/54	← <mark>→→</mark>	73.3 %	0.59 [0.31, 1.12]
Perkins 2001	9/72	7/75	_	26.7 %	1.34 [0.53, 3.41]
Subtotal (95% CI)	125	129		100.0 %	0.79 [0.47, 1.33]
Total events: 20 (Experimenta Heterogeneity: Chi?? = 2.03, d Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.8$	l), 26 (Control) If = 1 (P = 0.15); I? =51 9 (P = 0.37)	%			
3 Personalised weight manage	ment support versus we	ight management	education		
I Hall 1992	11/53	11/51	••	100.0 %	0.96 [0.46, 2.02]
Subtotal (95% CI)	53	51		100.0 %	0.96 [0.46, 2.02]
Total events: 11 (Experimenta Heterogeneity: not applicable Test for overall effect: Z = 0.1 4 VLCD + advice versus advic 1 Danielsson 1999	I), (Control) 0 (P = 0.92) ce 38/137	24/150		100.0 %	1.73 [1.10, 2.73]
Subtotal (95% CI)	137	150		100.0 %	1.73 [1.10, 2.73]
Total events: 38 (Experimenta Heterogeneity: not applicable Test for overall effect: $Z = 2.3$	1), 24 (Control) 7 (P = 0.018)	190			1.75 [1.10, 2.75]
			0.5 0.7 I I.5 2 Favours control Favours expe	rimental	

Analysis 5.1. Comparison 5 CBT to accept moderate weight gain versus no behavioural weight advice: smoking cessation, Outcome I Abstinence at 6 months.

Review: Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation

Comparison: 5 CBT to accept moderate weight gain versus no behavioural weight advice: smoking cessation

Outcome: I Abstinence at 6 months

.

Study or subgroup	Treatment	Control		Odds Ratio	Weight	Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	M-H,F	ixed,95% Cl		M-H,Fixed,95% Cl
I No additional pharmacothe	rapy treatment					
I Levine 2010	11/87	10/67			27.9 %	0.83 [0.33, 2.08]
Perkins 2001	40/72	23/75			28.3 %	2.83 [1.44, 5.56]
Subtotal (95% CI)	159	142		-	56.2 %	1.83 [1.07, 3.13]
Total events: 51 (Treatment), 2	33 (Control)					
Heterogeneity: Chi?? = 4.45, c	f = 1 (P = 0.03); I?? = 1	78%				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 2.2$	I (P = 0.027)					
2 With bupropion						
I Levine 2010	34/106	21/89		-	43.8 %	1.53 [0.81, 2.89]
Subtotal (95% CI)	106	89		-	43.8 %	1.53 [0.81, 2.89]
Total events: 34 (Treatment), 2	21 (Control)					
Heterogeneity: not applicable						
Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.3$	I (P = 0.19)					
Total (95% CI)	265	231		-	100.0 %	1.70 [1.13, 2.56]
Total events: 85 (Treatment),	54 (Control)					
Heterogeneity: Chi?? = 4.64, c	If = 2 (P = 0.10); I?? = 1	57%				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 2.5$	3 (P = 0.011)					
Test for subgroup differences:	Chi?? = 0.18, df = 1 (F	P = 0.67), I?? =0.0%				
			0.2 0.5	2 5		

Favours experimental

Favours control

Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation (Review) Copyright © 2012 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Analysis 5.2. Comparison 5 CBT to accept moderate weight gain versus no behavioural weight advice: smoking cessation, Outcome 2 Abstinence at 12 months.

Review: Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation

Comparison: 5 CBT to accept moderate weight gain versus no behavioural weight advice: smoking cessation

Outcome: 2 Abstinence at 12 months

Study or subgroup	Treatment	Control	Risk Ratio	Weight	Risk Ratio M-H Fixed 95% Cl
	11/1 N	101 1			1 H 1,1 Xed,7576 Ci
I No additional pharmacothe	rapy				
I Levine 2010	8/87	7/67		22.3 %	0.88 [0.34, 2.31]
Perkins 200	15/72	7/75		19.4 %	2.23 [0.97, 5.15]
Subtotal (95% CI)	159	142	-	41.7 %	1.51 [0.81, 2.79]
Total events: 23 (Treatment),	14 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: Chi?? = 2.04, d	df = 1 (P = 0.15); 1?? = 5	51%			
Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.3$	81 (P = 0.19)				
2 With bupropion					
I Levine 2010	24/106	19/89		58.3 %	1.06 [0.62, 1.81]
Subtotal (95% CI)	106	89	-	58.3 %	1.06 [0.62, 1.81]
Total events: 24 (Treatment),	19 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: not applicable					
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.2$	2 (P = 0.83)				
Total (95% CI)	265	231	-	100.0 %	1.25 [0.83, 1.86]
Total events: 47 (Treatment),	33 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: Chi?? = 2.72, d	df = 2 (P = 0.26); I?? =	26%			
Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.0$	08 (P = 0.28)				
Test for subgroup differences:	Chi?? = 0.72, $df = 1$ (F	° = 0.40), I?? =0.0%			
			0.2 0.5 2 5		

Favours control

Favours treatment

Analysis 6.1. Comparison 6 CBT to accept moderate weight gain versus no behavioural weight advice: weight change, Outcome 1 Mean weight change (kg) at end of treatment.

Review: Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation

Comparison: 6 CBT to accept moderate weight gain versus no behavioural weight advice: weight change

Outcome: I Mean weight change (kg) at end of treatment

Study or subgroup	Treatment		Control		l Differ	Mean rence	Weight	Mean Difference
, , ,	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixed	1,95% CI	-	IV,Fixed,95% CI
l With no additional phar	macotherapy							
Levine 2010	29	5.49 (1.29)	13	3.77 (1.42)		∎→	18.1 %	1.72 [0.82, 2.62]
Perkins 2001	40	1.1 (1.4)	23	2.2 (1.4)			28.6 %	-1.10 [-1.82, -0.38]
Subtotal (95% CI)	69		36		-		46. 7 %	-0.01 [-0.57, 0.55]
Heterogeneity: Chi?? = 22	94, df = 1 (P<0	.00001); I?? =96%						
Test for overall effect: Z =	0.03 (P = 0.98)							
2 With bupropion								
I Levine 2010	43	4.98 (0.79)	16	5.31 (0.96)		-	53.3 %	-0.33 [-0.86, 0.20]
Subtotal (95% CI)	43		16		-		53.3 %	-0.33 [-0.86, 0.20]
Heterogeneity: not applica	able							
Test for overall effect: $Z =$	I.23 (P = 0.22)							
Total (95% CI)	112		52		-	•	100.0 %	-0.18 [-0.56, 0.20]
Heterogeneity: Chi?? = 23	.61, df = 2 (P<0	.00001); I?? =92%						
Test for overall effect: $Z =$	0.92 (P = 0.36)							
Test for subgroup differen	ces: Chi?? = 0.67	, df = 1 (P = 0.4)), I?? =0.0%					
					-2 -1 0	1 2		
				Favour	s experimental	Favours conti	rol	

Analysis 6.2. Comparison 6 CBT to accept moderate weight gain versus no behavioural weight advice: weight change, Outcome 2 Mean weight change (kg) at 6 months.

Review: Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation

Comparison: 6 CBT to accept moderate weight gain versus no behavioural weight advice: weight change

Outcome: 2 Mean weight change (kg) at 6 months

Study or subgroup	Treatment N	Mean(SD)	Control N	Mean(SD)	Mean Difference IV,Fixed,95% Cl	Weight	Mean Difference IV,Fixed,95% CI
I With no additional phar	macotherapy	. /		. ,			
I Levine 2010	19	3.81 (1.17)	7	2.71 (1.4)		18.3 %	1.10 [-0.06, 2.26]
Perkins 2001	20	2.9 (2.6)	9	6.4 (3.5)	••••••	3.8 %	-3.50 [-6.05, -0.95]
Subtotal (95% CI)	39		16			22.1 %	0.31 [-0.75, 1.37]
Heterogeneity: Chi?? = 10	.32, df = 1 (P =	0.001); I?? =90%					
Test for overall effect: Z =	0.57 (P = 0.57)						
2 With bupropion							
I Levine 2010	36	3.96 (0.62)	10	3.1 (0.85)		77.9 %	0.86 [0.30, 1.42]
Subtotal (95% CI)	36		10		*	77 .9 %	0.86 [0.30, 1.42]
Heterogeneity: not applica	able	0					
lest for overall effect: $\angle =$	2.99 (P = 0.002	8)	26		•	100 0 04	074[024 124]
Heterogeneity: $Chi^{??} = []$	/3	0 004) · 1?? =82%	20			100.0 %	0./4[0.24, 1.24]
Test for overall effect: $7 =$	2.91 (P = 0.003)	7)					
Test for subgroup differen	ces: Chi?? = 0.81	df = 1 (P = 0.3	7), I?? =0.0%				
					-4 -2 0 2	4	
				Favou	rs experimental Favours co	ntrol	

Analysis 6.3. Comparison 6 CBT to accept moderate weight gain versus no behavioural weight advice: weight change, Outcome 3 Mean weight change (kg) at 12 months.

Review: Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation

Comparison: 6 CBT to accept moderate weight gain versus no behavioural weight advice: weight change

Outcome: 3 Mean weight change (kg) at 12 months

Study or subgroup	Treatment		Control		Mean Difference	Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixed,95%	CI	IV,Fixed,95% CI
I With no additional pha	rmacotherapy						
I Levine 2010	17	5.38 (1.85)	5	5.05 (2.16)		- 16.5 %	0.33 [-1.76, 2.42]
Perkins 200	15	2.5 (4.2)	7	7.7 (4.7)	·	4.3 %	-5.20 [-9.28, -1.12]
Subtotal (95% CI)	32		12			20.8 %	-0.82 [-2.68, 1.04]
Heterogeneity: Chi?? = 5.	59, df = 1 (P = 0	.02); l?? =82%					
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 0.86 (P = 0.39)						
2 With bupropion							
I Levine 2010	25	4.85 (0.97)	7	4.47 (1.18)		79.2 %	0.38 [-0.57, 1.33]
Subtotal (95% CI)	25		7		-	79.2 %	0.38 [-0.57, 1.33]
Heterogeneity: not applic	able						
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 0.78 (P = 0.43)						
Total (95% CI)	57		19		-	100.0 %	0.13 [-0.72, 0.98]
Heterogeneity: Chi?? = 6.	86, df = 2 (P = 0	.03); I?? =71%					
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 0.30 (P = 0.76)						
Test for subgroup differer	nces: Chi?? = 1.26	, $df = 1$ (P = 0.2	26), I?? =21%				
					<u> </u>	ı	
					-4 -2 0	2 4	
				Favours	experimental Favo	ours control	

Analysis 7.1. Comparison 7 All types of antidepressant versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change, Outcome I Mean weight change (kg) at end of treatment.

Review: Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation

Comparison: 7 All types of antidepressant versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change

Outcome: I Mean weight change (kg) at end of treatment

Study or subgroup	Treatment		Control		Mean Difference	Weight	Mean Difference
, , ,	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixed,95% CI	0	IV,Fixed,95% CI
I Bupropion versus placeb	0						
2 AD Nides 2006	22	1.68 (1.92)	10	4 (2.18)		4.9 %	-2.32 [-3.89, -0.75]
2 AD Hurt 1997	38	1.5 (2)	16	2.9 (1.9)		9.6 %	-1.40 [-2.53, -0.27]
2 AD Piper 2007	69	1.3 (6.2)	26	2.6 (2.3)		4.2 %	-1.30 [-3.01, 0.41]
2 AD Jorenby 2006	102	1.88 (3.4)	60	3.15 (4.1)		8.1 %	-1.27 [-2.50, -0.04]
2 AD Rigotti 2006	31	1.2 (3.9)	25	2.4 (3.6)		3.1 %	-1.20 [-3.17, 0.77]
2 AD Zellweger 2005	248	1.32 (1.8)	66	2.32 (1.64)	-	59.0 %	-1.00 [-1.45, -0.55]
2 AD Gonzales 2006	95	2.12 (1.8)	61	2.92 (3.94)		11.0 %	-0.80 [-1.85, 0.25]
Subtotal (95% CI)	605		264		•	100.0 %	-1.12 [-1.47, -0.77]
Heterogeneity: Chi?? = 3.2	I, df = 6 (P = 0	0.78); I?? =0.0%					
Test for overall effect: Z =	6.30 (P < 0.00	001)					
2 Fluoxetine versus placeb 2 AD Niaura 2002	o 73	1.3 (1.4)	46	2.6 (1.8)		37.2 %	-1.30 [-1.91, -0.69]
L Spring 1995	10	27 (05)	15	35(07)	-	62.8 %	-0.80 [-1.27 -0.33]
	02	217 (010)	(1	515 (017)	•	100.0.0/	
Subtotal (95% CI)	83	1 201): 122 = 3.8%	61		•	100.0 %	-0.99 [-1.30, -0.01]
Test for overall effect: Z =	5.18 (P < 0.00	001)					
Test for subgroup difference	:es: Chi?? = 0.2	7, df = 1 (P = 0.	60), I?? =0.0%	Ś			
			,			1	
					-4 -2 0 2	4	

Favours treatment Favours control

Analysis 7.2. Comparison 7 All types of antidepressant versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change, Outcome 2 Mean weight change (kg) at end of treatment: dose response.

Review: Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation

Comparison: 7 All types of antidepressant versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change

Outcome: 2 Mean weight change (kg) at end of treatment: dose response

Study or subgroup	Higher dose		Lower dose		Diff	Mean erence	Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixe	ed,95% Cl		IV,Fixed,95% CI
I Bupropion: 300mg/day	v 150mg/day plac	ebo						
2 AD Hurt 1997	28	2.3 (2.4)	16	2.9 (1.9)			100.0 %	-0.60 [-1.89, 0.69]
Subtotal (95% CI)	28		16				100.0 %	-0.60 [-1.89, 0.69]
Heterogeneity: not applic	able							
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 0.91 (P = 0.36)							
2 Bupropion: 300mg/day	v 100mg/day plac	ebo						
2 AD Hurt 1997	21	2.3 (2)	16	2.9 (1.9)			100.0 %	-0.60 [-1.86, 0.66]
Subtotal (95% CI)	21		16				100.0 %	-0.60 [-1.86, 0.66]
Heterogeneity: not applic	able							
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 0.93 (P = 0.35)							
Test for subgroup differer	nces: Chi?? = 0.0, d	df = (P = .00)	, I?? =0.0%					
					-2 -1	0 1	2	
				Favour	experimental	Favours con	trol	

Analysis 7.3. Comparison 7 All types of antidepressant versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change, Outcome 3 Mean weight change (kg) at 6 months.

Review: Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation

Comparison: 7 All types of antidepressant versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change

Outcome: 3 Mean weight change (kg) at 6 months

Study or subgroup	Treatment		Control		Dif	Mean ference	Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fix	ed,95% Cl		IV,Fixed,95% CI
I Bupropion versus place	00							
2 AD Uyar 2007	13	0.9 (3)	5	2.5 (2.2)	←	<u> </u>	28.0 %	-1.60 [-4.13, 0.93]
2 AD Simon 2009	6	0.5 (19.71)	13	1.69 (15.23)	،		0.6 %	-1.19 [-19.00, 16.62]
2 AD Hurt 1997	19	4.5 (4.7)	9	5.5 (5.4)			10.5 %	-1.00 [-5.11, 3.11]
2 AD Zellweger 2005	117	3.35 (2.82)	36	3.86 (5)		-	60.9 %	-0.51 [-2.22, 1.20]
Subtotal (95% CI)	155		63		-		100.0 %	-0.87 [-2.21, 0.47]
Heterogeneity: Chi?? = 0.5	50, df = 3 (P = 0	0.92); I?? =0.0%						
Test for overall effect: Z =	: 1.28 (P = 0.20)							
2 Fluoxetine versus placeb	00							
2 AD Saules 2004	34	3.09 (3.43)	9	6.16 (4.45)	←∎	-	12.4 %	-3.07 [-6.20, 0.06]
2 AD Niaura 2002	49	5.13 (2.8)	32	4.7 (2.54)	-	-	87.6 %	0.43 [-0.75, 1.61]
Subtotal (95% CI)	83		41			-	100.0 %	-0.01 [-1.11, 1.10]
Heterogeneity: Chi?? = 4.2	21, df = 1 (P = 0).04); ?? =76%						
Test for overall effect: Z =	0.01 (P = 0.99)							
Test for subgroup differen	ces: Chi?? = 0.96	df = 1 (P = 0.3)	33), I?? =0.0%					
					-4 -2	0 2	4	
				Fav	vours treatment	Favours cont	trol	

Analysis 7.4. Comparison 7 All types of antidepressant versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change, Outcome 4 Mean weight change (kg) at 6 months: dose response.

Review: Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation

Comparison: 7 All types of antidepressant versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change

Outcome: 4 Mean weight change (kg) at 6 months: dose response

Study or subgroup	Higher dose		Lower dose		Mean Difference	Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixed,95% CI		IV,Fixed,95% CI
I Bupropion: 300mg/day	v 150mg/day						
2 AD Hurt 1997	19	4.5 (4.7)	21	4.4 (4.5)		100.0 %	0.10 [-2.76, 2.96]
Subtotal (95% CI)	19		21			100.0 %	0.10 [-2.76, 2.96]
Heterogeneity: not applic	able						
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 0.07 (P = 0.95)						
2 Bupropion: 300mg/day	v 100mg/day				_		
2 AD Hurt 1997	19	4.5 (4.7)	10	6.6 (5.7)		100.0 %	-2.10 [-6.22, 2.02]
Subtotal (95% CI)	19		10			100.0 %	-2.10 [-6.22, 2.02]
Heterogeneity: not applic	able						
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 1.00 (P = 0.32)						
3 Fluoxetine: 40mg v 20m	Jg						
2 AD Saules 2004	15	3.35 (3)	19	2.88 (3.8)		100.0 %	0.47 [-1.82, 2.76]
Subtotal (95% CI)	15		19			100.0 %	0.47 [-1.82, 2.76]
Heterogeneity: not applic	able						
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 0.40 (P = 0.69)						
4 Fluoxetine: 60mg v 30m	ng 						
2 AD Niaura 2002	25	6.6 (2.65)	24	3.6 (2.06)		100.0 %	3.00 [1.67, 4.33]
Subtotal (95% CI)	25		24			100.0 %	3.00 [1.67, 4.33]
Heterogeneity: not applic	able						
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 4.43 (P < 0.0000)))					
Test for subgroup differen	ices: Chi?? = 9.25,	df = 3 (P = 0.0))3), I?? =68%				
						1	
				Favours	experimental Favours	control	
				Turbar 5		control	

Analysis 7.5. Comparison 7 All types of antidepressant versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change, Outcome 5 Mean weight change (kg) at 12 months.

Review: Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation

Comparison: 7 All types of antidepressant versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change

Outcome: 5 Mean weight change (kg) at 12 months

Study or subgroup	Treatment		Control		Diff	Mean erence	Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixe	ed,95% Cl		IV,Fixed,95% CI
I Bupropion versus placel	00							
2 AD Rigotti 2006	20	5.6 (8.2)	15	6.9 (5.2)	• •		13.2 %	-1.30 [-5.75, 3.15]
2 AD Zellweger 2005	117	4.15 (4.18)	36	4.45 (6.12)			57.1 %	-0.30 [-2.44, 1.84]
2 AD Simon 2004	17	2.72 (6.7)	23	2.94 (3.86)			20.7 %	-0.22 [-3.77, 3.33]
2 AD Hurt 1997	16	6.1 (7.9)	8	6 (5.4)	4	• •	9.0 %	0.10 [-5.28, 5.48]
Subtotal (95% CI)	170		82				100.0 %	-0.38 [-2.00, 1.24]
Heterogeneity: Chi?? = 0.2	21, df = 3 (P = 0	0.98); I?? =0.0%						
Test for overall effect: Z =	0.46 (P = 0.65)							
					<u> </u>			
					-4 -2	0 2 4		
				Fav	ours treatment	Favours contr	ol	

Analysis 7.6. Comparison 7 All types of antidepressant versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change, Outcome 6 Mean weight change (kg) at 12 months: dose response.

Review: Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation

Comparison: 7 All types of antidepressant versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change

Outcome: 6 Mean weight change (kg) at 12 months: dose response

Study or subgroup	Higher dose		Lower dose		Dif	Mean ference	Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fix	ed,95% Cl		IV,Fixed,95% CI
l Bupropion: 300mg/day	v 150mg/day							
2 AD Hurt 1997	16	6.1 (7.9)	17	5.9 (6.7)	•		100.0 %	0.20 [-4.81, 5.21]
Subtotal (95% CI)	16		17				100.0 %	0.20 [-4.81, 5.21]
Heterogeneity: not applic	able							
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 0.08 (P = 0.94)							
2 Bupropion: 300mg/day	v 100mg/day							
2 AD Hurt 1997	16	6.1 (7.9)	8	8.1 (6.7)	•		100.0 %	-2.00 [-8.04, 4.04]
Subtotal (95% CI)	16		8				100.0 %	-2.00 [-8.04, 4.04]
Heterogeneity: not applic	able							
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 0.65 (P = 0.52)							
Test for subgroup differer	nces: Chi?? = 0.30,	df = 1 (P = 0.58)	8), I?? =0.0%					
							1	
					-4 -2	0 2	4	
				Favour	s experimental	Favours con	trol	

Analysis 8.1. Comparison 8 Exercise interventions versus no exercise for smoking cessation: weight change, Outcome I Mean weight change (kg) at end of treatment.

Review: Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation

Comparison: 8 Exercise interventions versus no exercise for smoking cessation: weight change

Outcome: I Mean weight change (kg) at end of treatment

Study or subgroup	Treatment		Control		Diffe	Mean erence	Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixe	d,95% Cl		IV,Fixed,95% CI
Exercise + SC versus	SC only							
2 EX Marcus 1999	24	3.03 (3.45)	13	5.36 (6.94)	← +		1.8 %	-2.33 [-6.35, 1.69]
2 EX Marcus 2005	12	3.86 (5.66)	16	4.56 (5.05)	•		1.7 %	-0.70 [-4.75, 3.35]
2 EX Bize 2010	107	2.5 (4.14)	115	2.7 (2.14)		—	36.9 %	-0.20 [-1.08, 0.68]
2 EX Ussher 2003	61	1.8 (1.9)	56	2 (1.9)		F	59.6 %	-0.20 [-0.89, 0.49]
Total (95% CI)	204		200		•	•	100.0 %	-0.25 [-0.78, 0.29]
Heterogeneity: Chi?? =	I.II, df = 3 (P =	= 0.77); l?? =0.0%	5					
Test for overall effect: Z	C = 0.91 (P = 0.3)	36)						
Test for subgroup differ	ences: Not appl	icable						
					-4 -2 () 2 4	ł	
				Fa	vours treatment	Favours cont	rol	

Analysis 8.2. Comparison 8 Exercise interventions versus no exercise for smoking cessation: weight change, Outcome 2 Mean weight change (kg) at 12 months.

Review: Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation

Comparison: 8 Exercise interventions versus no exercise for smoking cessation: weight change

Outcome: 2 Mean weight change (kg) at 12 months

Study or subgroup	Treatment		Control		Diffe	Mean rence	Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixed	1,95% CI		IV,Fixed,95% CI
I Exercise + SC versus	SC only							
2 EX Bize 2010	59	4.4 (6.91)	70	6.2 (4.18)			71.8 %	-1.80 [-3.82, 0.22]
2 EX Marcus 1999	15	8.92 (8.9)	6	5.76 (12.6)		+	2.4 %	3.16 [-7.88, 14.20]
2 EX Ussher 2003	14	3.9 (5.3)	18	7.2 (4.1)			25.8 %	-3.30 [-6.66, 0.06]
Total (95% CI)	88	- 0.49), 122 0.0%	94		•		100.0 %	-2.07 [-3.78, -0.36]
Test for overall effect: 2	7 = 2.37 (P = 0.0)) 8)						
Test for subgroup differ	rences: Not appl	icable						
					-10 -5 0	5 10		
				Favour	s experimental	Favours contro	bl	

Analysis 9.1. Comparison 9 All types of NRT versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change, Outcome I Mean weight change (kg) at end of treatment.

Review: Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation

Comparison: 9 All types of NRT versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change

Outcome: I Mean weight change (kg) at end of treatment

Study or subgroup	Treatment		Control		Mean Difference	Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixed,95% CI		IV,Fixed,95% CI
I Gum versus placebo							
2 NRT Cooper 2005	24	2.19 (4.14)	22	3.6 (3.82)	← +	0.7 %	-1.41 [-3.71, 0.89]
2 NRT Pirie 1992	34	0.49 (1.82)	15	. (.8)		2.9 %	-0.61 [-1.71, 0.49]
2 NRT Garvey 2000	161	0.95 (1.6)	47	1.5 (1.65)		12.5 %	-0.55 [-1.08, -0.02]
2 NRT Gross 1995	35	2.07 (2.26)	7	2.49 (1.54)		1.9 %	-0.42 [-1.78, 0.94]
Subtotal (95% CI)	254		91		-	17.9 %	-0.58 [-1.02, -0.13]
Heterogeneity: Chi?? = 0.57,	df = 3 (P = 0.9	90); I?? =0.0%					
Test for overall effect: $Z = 2.5$	55 (P = 0.011)						
2 Patch versus placebo	72	01(18)	45	44(22)		60%	430[507 353]
2 NRT Florens 1001	22	1.22 (1.7)	15			0.0 %	- 1.30 [-3.07; -3.33]
Z INRT Enrsam 1991	22	1.23 (1.7)	11	1.9 (1.5)		2.7 %	-0.67 [-1.81, 0.47]
2 NRT TNSG 1991	332	2 (1.9)	68	2.6 (1.5)		20.9 %	-0.60 [-1.01, -0.19]
2 NRT Fiore 1994A	26	2.6 (1.8)	17	3.2 (2.6)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1.8 %	-0.60 [-2.02, 0.82]
2 NRT Richmond 1994	55	2.62 (2.68)	22	3.15 (3.63)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1.3 %	-0.53 [-2.20, 1.14]
2 NRT CEASE 1999	497	1.7 (2.1)	147	2.2 (2.3)		20.5 %	-0.50 [-0.92, -0.08]
2 NRT Fiore 1994B	21	2.6 (1.91)	11	2.8 (1.56)		2.3 %	-0.20 [-1.43, 1.03]
2 NRT Gourlay 1995	21	1.9 (3.1)	6	1.9 (3.1)	4	• 0.4 %	0.0 [-2.81, 2.81]
2 NRT Tonnesen 1991	43	2.6 (2.1)	7	2.5 (1.9)		1.5 %	0.10 [-1.44, 1.64]
2 NRT Stapleton 1995	155	3.1 (2.9)	41	2.8 (2.3)		5.0 %	0.30 [-0.54, 1.14]
Subtotal (95% CI)	1244		375		•	62.5 %	-0.82 [-1.06, -0.58]
Heterogeneity: Chi?? = 92.55	, df = 9 (P<0.0	0001); I?? =90%					
Test for overall effect: $Z = 6.7$	74 (P < 0.0000	1)					
2 NRT Tonnesen 1993	36	33(2)	18	38(19)		30%	-0.50[-1.59_0.59]
2 NRT Hialmarson 1997		17(16)	22	19(27)		23%	-0.20 [-1.45 05]
	71	(1.0)	40	(2)		5 0 0	0.27 [1.10, 0.65]
Heterogeneity Chill = 0.13	/I	72): 122 =0.0%	40			5.2 %	-0.3/ [-1.19, 0.45]
- leterogeneity. Chill: - 0.15,	Gi = 1 (i = 0.7	<i>z</i> _j , –0.076				ц	

-2 - | 0 Т Favours treatment Favours control

2

(Continued ...)

(... Continued)

Treatment	Mean(SD)	Control N	Mean(SD)	Diffe IV,Fixed	Mean rence 1,95% Cl	Weight	Mean Difference IV,Fixed,95% Cl
88 (P = 0.38)							
cebo							
158	2.74 (2.68)	63	3.59 (2.72)			5.6 %	-0.85 [-1.64, -0.06]
158	2.32 (2.57)	99	2.54 (2.68)			8.0 %	-0.22 [-0.88, 0.44]
316		162		-		13.7 %	-0.48 [-0.99, 0.03]
df = 1 (P = 0.2)	3); I?? =30%						
85 (P = 0.064)							
ebo							
29	6.5 (5.6)	18	5.6 (2.9)			0.6 %	0.90 [-1.54, 3.34]
29		18				0.6 %	0.90 [-1.54, 3.34]
72 (P = 0.47)							
1914		686		•		100.0 %	-0.69 [-0.88, -0.51]
df = 18 (P<0.	00001); I?? =82%	, ,					
$P \le 0.0000$	1)						
Chi?? = 4.22, o	df = 4 (P = 0.38)	, I?? =5%					
				-2 -1 0	I 2		
			Favo	ours treatment	Favours contr	ol	
	Treatment N (P = 0.38) (cebo) 158 158 316 df = 1 (P = 0.2) (P = 0.064) 29	Treatment N Mean(SD) 18 (P = 0.38) cebo 158 2.74 (2.68) 158 2.32 (2.57) 316 df = 1 (P = 0.23); I ? =30% 29 6.5 (5.6) 29 22 (P = 0.47) 1914 df = 18 (P<0.00001); I ? =82% 24 (P < 0.00001) Chi?? = 4.22, df = 4 (P = 0.38)	Treatment Control N Mean(SD) N 18 (P = 0.38)	Treatment Control N Mean(SD) N Mean(SD) 18 (P = 0.38)	Treatment Control Diffe N Mean(SD) N Mean(SD) IV,Fixed 18 (P = 0.38) (ebo 158 2.74 (2.68) 63 3.59 (2.72) (P = 0.23); IN 158 2.32 (2.57) 99 2.54 (2.68) (P = 0.23); IN (P = 0.23); IN </td <td>Treatment Control Difference N Mean(SD) N Mean(SD) IV,Fixed,95% CI 18< (P = 0.38)</td> (P = 0.38) (P = 0.38) (P = 0.38) (P = 0.38) 158 2.74 (2.68) 63 3.59 (2.72) (P = 0.23); IP (P = 0.47) (P = 0.38), IP (P = 0.28); IP (P = 0.28	Treatment Control Difference N Mean(SD) N Mean(SD) IV,Fixed,95% CI 18< (P = 0.38)	Treatment Control Mean (SD) N Mean(SD) Weight N Mean(SD) N Mean(SD) N/Fixed,95% Cl Weight 188 2.74 (2.68) 63 3.59 (2.72) 5.6 % 158 2.32 (2.57) 99 2.54 (2.68) 80 % 316 162 13.7 % 13.7 % $df = 1$ (P = 0.23); I? = 30% 5.6 (2.9) 0.6 % 29 6.5 (5.6) 18 5.6 (2.9) 0.6 % 29 18 0.6 % 0.6 % 1914 686 686 100.0 % $df = 18$ (P<0.00001); I? =82%

Analysis 9.2. Comparison 9 All types of NRT versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change, Outcome 2 Mean weight change (kg) at end of treatment: patch v spray.

Review: Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation

Comparison: 9 All types of NRT versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change

Outcome: 2 Mean weight change (kg) at end of treatment: patch v spray

Patch N	Mean(SD)	Spray N	Mean(SD)		C IV,F	N Viffere ixed,	1ean ence 95% Cl	Weight	Mean Difference IV,Fixed,95% CI
82	1.5 (4.4)	72	1.8 (4.8)					100.0 %	-0.30 [-1.76, 1.16]
82		72				+		100.0 %	-0.30 [-1.76, 1.16]
able									
0.40 (P = 0	0.69)								
ces: Not app	olicable								
						_			
				-10	-5	0	5 10		
Favour							Favours contr	bl	
	Patch N 82 82 able : 0.40 (P = C ces: Not app	Patch <u>N</u> Mean(SD) 82 I.5 (4.4) 82 able : 0.40 (P = 0.69) ces: Not applicable	Patch Spray N Mean(SD) N 82 1.5 (4.4) 72 82 72 72 able : 0.40 (P = 0.69) : ces: Not applicable :	Patch Spray N Mean(SD) N Mean(SD) 82 1.5 (4.4) 72 1.8 (4.8) 82 72 able 50.40 (P = 0.69) 50.40 (P	Patch Spray N Mean(SD) N Mean(SD) 82 1.5 (4.4) 72 1.8 (4.8) 82 72 able 60.40 (P = 0.69) 60.40 (P	Patch Spray D N Mean(SD) N Mean(SD) IV,F 82 1.5 (4.4) 72 1.8 (4.8) 82 72 able : 0.40 (P = 0.69)	Patch Spray Differ N Mean(SD) N Mean(SD) IV,Fixed, 82 1.5 (4.4) 72 I.8 (4.8) Image: specific structure 82 72 Image: specific structure Image: spec	Patch Spray Mean Difference N Mean(SD) N Mean(SD) IV,Fixed,95% CI 82 1.5 (4.4) 72 1.8 (4.8) Image: Comparison of the system of th	Patch Spray Difference Weight N Mean(SD) N Mean(SD) IV/Fixed,95% CI 82 1.5 (4.4) 72 1.8 (4.8) IOU0.0 % 82 72 IOU0.0 % IOU0.0 % able :0.40 (P = 0.69) IOU0.0 % IOU0.0 % ces: Not applicable -10 -5 0 5 10 Favours experimental

Analysis 9.3. Comparison 9 All types of NRT versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change, Outcome 3 Mean weight change (Kg) at end of treatment: lozenge v gum.

Review: Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation

Comparison: 9 All types of NRT versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change

Outcome: 3 Mean weight change (Kg) at end of treatment: lozenge v gum

Study or subgroup	lozenge		gum		Mean Difference		Weight	Mean Difference			
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixed,95% CI					IV,Fixed,95% CI	
2 NRT Pack 2008	31	1.36 (2.86)	23	3.81 (4.17)			+			100.0 %	-2.45 [-4.43, -0.47]
Total (95% CI)	31		23				•			100.0 %	-2.45 [-4.43, -0.47]
Heterogeneity: not applicable											
Test for overall effect: Z	Z = 2.43 (P =	0.015)									
Test for subgroup differ	ences: Not ap	plicable									
							_				
					-100	-50	0	50	100		
				Favou	ırs exper	rimental		Favours	control		

Analysis 9.4. Comparison 9 All types of NRT versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change, Outcome 4 Mean weight change (kg) at end of treatment: dose response.

Review: Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation

Comparison: 9 All types of NRT versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change

Outcome: 4 Mean weight change (kg) at end of treatment: dose response

Study or subgroup	higher dose		lower dose		Mean Difference	Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixed,95% CI		IV,Fixed,95% CI
l 4mg vs 2mg gum							
2 NRT Garvey 2000	86	0.9 (1.8)	75	(1.47)		27.2 %	-0.10 [-0.61, 0.41]
Subtotal (95% CI)	86		75		-	27.2 %	-0.10 [-0.61, 0.41]
Heterogeneity: not applic	able						
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 0.39 (P = 0.70)						
2 22mg vs 11mg patch		- (P)	_				
2 NRT Dale 1995	8	3 (2)	/	3.4 (2.4)		1.4 %	-0.40 [-2.65, 1.85]
Subtotal (95% CI)	8		7			1.4 %	-0.40 [-2.65, 1.85]
Heterogeneity: not applic	able						
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 0.35 (P = 0.73)						
3 44mg vs 22mg patch	17	20(22)	0	2 (2)		22.0/	
Z INRT Dale 1995	16	Z.8 (Z.3)	8	3 (2)		Z.Z 70	-0.20 [-1.99, 1.39]
Subtotal (95% CI)	16		8			2.2 %	-0.20 [-1.99, 1.59]
Heterogeneity: not applic	able						
lest for overall effect: $\angle =$	= 0.22 (P = 0.83)						
4 Zomg patch vs Tomg pa	itch- 8 week treat	ment course	290	15(21)		50 5 Ø/	040[004_076]
Z NICI CLASE 1777	207	1.7 (Z)	270	1.3 (2.1)		JZ.J /0	0.40 [0.04, 0.78]
Subtotal (95% CI)	207		290		•	52.5 %	0.40 [0.04, 0.76]
Heterogeneity: not applic	able						
5 25mg patch vs. 15mg pa	- 2.15 (P – 0.031) atch 22 weeks tre)					
2 NRT CEASE 1999	157	3.2 (3.1)	142	3 (3.6)		11.9 %	0.20 [-0.57, 0.97]
Subtatal (05% CI)	157	()	1/2	- ()		110%	
Heterogeneity: not applic	able		142			11.9 70	0.20[-0.3/, 0.9/]
Test for overall effect: 7 =	= 0.51 (P = 0.61)						
6 15x2mg gum vs 7x2mg	gum						
2 NRT Gross 1995	12	2.81 (1.91)	12	1.22 (2.68)		2.0 %	1.59 [-0.27, 3.45]
Subtotal (95% CI)	12		12			2.0 %	1.59 [-0.27, 3.45]
Heterogeneity: not applic	able						
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 1.67 (P = 0.094))					
7 30x2mg gum vs 15x2m	g gum						
2 NRT Gross 1995	11	2.22 (1.81)	7	2.49 (1.54)		2.8 %	-0.27 [-1.83, 1.29]
					-2 -1 0 1 2		
					Higher dose Lower dose		(Continued)
							(

(... Continued)

Study or subgroup	higher dose	lo	ower dose		Mean Difference		Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixe	ed,95% Cl		IV,Fixed,95% CI
Subtotal (95% CI)	11		7				2.8 %	-0.27 [-1.83, 1.29]
Heterogeneity: not applic	able							
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 0.34 (P = 0.74)							
Total (95% CI)	49 7		541			•	100.0 %	0.22 [-0.04, 0.48]
Heterogeneity: Chi?? = 5	.44, df = 6 (P = 0.	49); ?? =0.0%						
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 1.64 (P = 0.10)							
Test for subgroup differer	nces: Chi?? = 5.44,	df = 6 (P = 0.49),	1?? =0.0%					
					-2 -1	0 2		
					Higher dose	l ower dose		

Analysis 9.5. Comparison 9 All types of NRT versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change, Outcome 5 Mean weight change (kg) at 6 months.

Review: Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation

Comparison: 9 All types of NRT versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change

Outcome: 5 Mean weight change (kg) at 6 months

Study or subgroup	Treatment		Control		Diffe	Mean erence	Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixe	ed,95% Cl		IV,Fixed,95% CI
I Gum versus placebo								
2 NRT Hjalmarson 1984	36	1.34 (3.6)	18	2.58 (3.2)	←∎		7.3 %	-1.24 [-3.13, 0.65]
2 NRT Pirie 1992	34	3.61 (4.18)	15	3.7 (4.18)	•		4.1 %	-0.09 [-2.63, 2.45]
Subtotal (95% CI)	70		33				11.4 %	-0.83 [-2.35, 0.69]
Heterogeneity: Chi?? = 0.5 I,	df = 1 (P = 0.4)	8); I?? =0.0%						
Test for overall effect: $Z = I$.	07 (P = 0.28)							
2 Patch versus placebo								
2 NRT Sachs 1993	38	4.3 (3.5)	13	5.8 (2.8)	←∎		7.4 %	-1.50 [-3.39, 0.39]
2 NRT Richmond 1994	45	3.16 (4.84)	19	4.09 (4.87)	• • •		3.8 %	-0.93 [-3.54, 1.68]
2 NRT Puska 1995	41	3.8 (3.3)	31	4.3 (2.9)			12.7 %	-0.50 [-1.94, 0.94]
2 NRT Bohadana 2000	50	3.1 (3.2)	45	2.7 (2.6)		-	19.2 %	0.40 [-0.77, 1.57]
Subtotal (95% CI)	174		108		-		43.1 %	-0.31 [-1.09, 0.47]
Heterogeneity: Chi?? = 3.23,	df = 3 (P = 0.3)	6); l?? =7%						
							1	
					-2 -1 (0 I	2	

Favours treatment Favours control

(Continued ...)

Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation (Review)

Copyright © 2012 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

(... Continued)

Study or subgroup	Treatment	Maan (SD)	Control	Maan/CD)	Diffe	Mean erence	Weight	Mean Difference
		riedii(3D)	IN	Fileari(SD)	IV,I IXE	u,7576 CI		1v,i ixed,75% Ci
lest for overall effect: $Z = 0.7$	8 (P = 0.44)							
3 Inhaler versus placebo								
2 NRT Hjalmarson 1997	35	3.8 (2.4)	22	4.4 (2.7)			13.7 %	-0.60 [-1.98, 0.78]
Subtotal (95% CI)	35		22				13.7 %	-0.60 [-1.98, 0.78]
Heterogeneity: not applicable								
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.8	5 (P = 0.39)							
4 Sub-lingual tablet versus pla	cebo							
2 NRT Shiffman 2002B	106	4.66 (3.78)	46	5 (4.64)			11.3 %	-0.34 [-1.86, 1.18]
2 NRT Shiffman 2002A	111	3.24 (3.76)	66	3.34 (3.67)			20.5 %	-0.10 [-1.23, 1.03]
Subtotal (95% CI)	217		112				31.8 %	-0.19 [-1.09, 0.72]
Heterogeneity: Chi?? = 0.06, c	df = 1 (P = 0.8)	0); I?? =0.0%						
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.4$	0 (P = 0.69)							
Total (95% CI)	496		275		-	-	100.0 %	-0.37 [-0.88, 0.14]
Heterogeneity: Chi?? = 4.45, c	df = 8 (P = 0.8)	I); I?? =0.0%						
Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.4$	I (P = 0.16)							
Test for subgroup differences:	Chi?? = 0.64, c	lf = 3 (P = 0.89)), ?? =0.0%					
					-2 -1 ()	2	
				Favo	urs treatment	Favours con	trol	

Analysis 9.6. Comparison 9 All types of NRT versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change, Outcome 6 Mean weight change (kg) at 6 months: patch v spray.

Review: Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation

Comparison: 9 All types of NRT versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change

Outcome: 6 Mean weight change (kg) at 6 months: patch v spray

ed,95% CI
72, 4.72]
, 4.72]

Analysis 9.7. Comparison 9 All types of NRT versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change, Outcome 7 Mean weight change (kg) at 6 months: lozenge v gum.

Review: Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation

Comparison: 9 All types of NRT versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change

Outcome: 7 Mean weight change (kg) at 6 months: lozenge v gum

Study or subgroup	lozenge	gum				Mean Difference				Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Mean(SD) N Mean(SD) IV,Fixed,95% CI		,95% CI			IV,Fixed,95% CI			
2 NRT Pack 2008	22	3.95 (5.26)	18	6.3 (4.4)			+			100.0 %	-2.35 [-5.34, 0.64]
Total (95% CI)	22		18				•			100.0 %	-2.35 [-5.34, 0.64]
Heterogeneity: not app	licable										
Test for overall effect: Z	Z = 1.54 (P = 9	0.12)									
Test for subgroup differ	rences: Not ap	plicable									
							_				
					-100	-50	0	50	100		
					Favours	lozenge		Favours	gum		
Analysis 9.8. Comparison 9 All types of NRT versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change, Outcome 8 Mean weight change (kg) at 12 months.

Review: Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation

Comparison: 9 All types of NRT versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change

Outcome: 8 Mean weight change (kg) at 12 months

Study or subgroup	Treatment		Control		Mean Difference	Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixed,95% CI		IV,Fixed,95% CI
I Gum versus placebo							
2 NRT Pirie 1992	34	4.5 (4.95)	15	4.57 (4.94)		2.7 %	-0.07 [-3.07, 2.93]
Subtotal (95% CI)	34		15			2.7 %	-0.07 [-3.07, 2.93]
Heterogeneity: not applicab	le						
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0$	0.05 (P = 0.96)						
2 Patch versus placebo 2 NRT Richmond 1994	34	5 25 (5 09)	17	6.04 (4.97)		29%	-079[-37 2 3]
	24	5.25 (5.07)	24	(5 (2 2)		2.7 /0	0.00[0.10]2.00]
2 INRT Puska 1995	36	5.9 (3.9)	26	6.5 (3.3)		1.1 %	-0.60 [-2.40, 1.20]
2 NRT Bohadana 2000	39	4.8 (3.7)	28	5.1 (2.7)		10.6 %	-0.30 [-1.83, 1.23]
2 NRT CEASE 1999	404	4.9 (3.7)	70	5.06 (3.8)		26.9 %	-0.16 [-1.12, 0.80]
2 NRT Stapleton 1995	76	5.4 (4.69)	18	5.51 (4.8)		4.1 %	-0.11 [-2.57, 2.35]
2 NRT Tonnesen 1991	18	4.2 (3.9)	4	3 (3)		→ 2.1 %	1.20 [-2.25, 4.65]
Subtotal (95% CI)	607		163		•	54.2 %	-0.23 [-0.90, 0.45]
Test for overall effect: Z = 0 3 Intranasal spray versus pla 2 NIPT Sutherland 1992	0.66 (P = 0.51) cebo	2 (4)	14	5 9 (2 9)		25 %	2001 545 0151
2 NRT Sutherland 1992	13	3 (4)	14	5.8 (2.9)	←	3.5 %	-2.80 [-5.45, -0.15]
2 NRT Blondal 1999	29	6.5 (5.6)	4	8.3 (4.2)	·	2.8 %	-1.80 [-4.80, 1.20]
2 NRT Hjalmarson 1994	34	4.7 (3.9)	18	5 (4.5)		4.1 %	-0.30 [-2.76, 2.16]
Subtotal (95% CI)	76		46			10.4 %	-1.55 [-3.09, 0.00]
Heterogeneity: Chi?? = 1.87	, df = 2 (P = 0.3	9); I?? =0.0%					
Test for overall effect: $Z = I$.96 (P = 0.050)						
4 Inhaler versus placebo	25	4 5 (2 0)	22	E ((2 2)		140.90	
Z INKI Hjaimarson 1777	22	4.3 (2.7)	22	5.6 (2.2)		14.0 %	-1.10 [-2.43, 0.23]
2 NRT Tonnesen 1993	24	4.4 (5.3)	9	5.1 (2.8)		3.2 %	-0.70 [-3.50, 2.10]
Subtotal (95% CI)	59		31		-	17.2 %	-1.03 [-2.23, 0.17]
Heterogeneity: Chi?? = 0.06	df = 1 (P = 0.8)	:0); I?? =0.0%					
1 Sub-lingual tablet versus p	.67 (P – 0.094) Iacebo						
e eae ingua abier versus p							
					-4 -2 0 2	4	
				Favo	ours treatment Favours co	ontrol	
							(Continued

Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation (Review) Copyright 0 2012 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

							(Continued)
Study or subgroup	Treatment		Control		Mean Difference	Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixed,95% CI		IV,Fixed,95% CI
2 NRT Wallstrom 2000	45	5.37 (3.5)	37	5.8 (6)		5.2 %	-0.43 [-2.62, 1.76]
2 NRT Shiffman 2002B	67	6.61 (5.76)	28	7.01 (7.22)		2.7 %	-0.40 [-3.41, 2.61]
2 NRT Shiffman 2002A	82	4.8 (5.52)	44	3.8 (4.62)		7.5 %	1.00 [-0.81, 2.81]
Subtotal (95% CI)	194		109		-	15.5 %	0.27 [-0.99, 1.54]
Heterogeneity: Chi?? = 1.21,	df = 2 (P = 0.5	5); I?? =0.0%					
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0$.	.42 (P = 0.67)						
Total (95% CI)	970		364		•	100.0 %	-0.42 [-0.92, 0.08]
Heterogeneity: Chi?? = 8.68,	df = 14 (P = 0.	85); I?? =0.0%					
Test for overall effect: $Z = I$.	.65 (P = 0.098)						
Test for subgroup differences	s: Chi?? = 4.53, d	df = 4 (P = 0.34)), ?? = 2%				
						1	
					-4 -2 0 2	4	

Analysis 9.9. Comparison 9 All types of NRT versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change, Outcome 9 Mean weight change (kg) at 12 months: lozenge v gum.

Favours treatment

Favours control

Review: Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation

Comparison: 9 All types of NRT versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change

Outcome: 9 Mean weight change (kg) at 12 months: lozenge v gum

Study or subgroup	Experimental N	Mean(SD)	Control N	Mean(SD)	t Differ IV,Fixed	Mean rence ,95% Cl	Weight	Mean Difference IV,Fixed,95% CI
2 NRT Pack 2008	19	2.86 (12.43)	14	6.17 (6.17)			100.0 %	-3.31 [-9.77, 3.15]
Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: not app Test for overall effect: <i>i</i> Test for subgroup diffe	19 plicable Z = 1.00 (P = 0.3 prences: Not applie	I) cable	14		•		100.0 %	-3.31 [-9.77, 3.15]
					-100 -50 0 Favours lozenge	50 I Favours gurr	00	

Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation (Review) Copyright 0 2012 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Analysis 9.10. Comparison 9 All types of NRT versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change, Outcome 10 Mean weight change (kg) at 12 months: dose response.

Review: Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation

Comparison: 9 All types of NRT versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change

Outcome: 10 Mean weight change (kg) at 12 months: dose response

Study or subgroup	High dose patch		Low dose patch		Mean Difference	Weight	Mean Difference
, , ,	N	Mean(SD)	N	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixed,95% CI	0	IV,Fixed,95% CI
22mg patch vs mg							
2 NRT Dale 1995	2	4.6 (0.1)	5	8.5 (7.8)	•	1.1 %	-3.90 [-10.74, 2.94]
Subtotal (95% CI)	2		5			1.1 %	-3.90 [-10.74, 2.94]
Heterogeneity: not appli	cable						
Test for overall effect: Z	= 1.12 (P = 0.26)						
2 44mg patch vs 11mg							
2 NRT Dale 1995	7	6.3 (5.4)	5	8.5 (7.8)	• •	→ 0.8 %	-2.20 [-10.12, 5.72]
Subtotal (95% CI)	7		5			- 0.8 %	-2.20 [-10.12, 5.72]
Heterogeneity: not appli	able						
Test for overall effect: Z	= 0.54 (P = 0.59)						
3 25mg patch vs 15mg-	3 week treatment co	ourse					
2 NRT CEASE 1999	4	5.3 (3.7)	84	4.7 (3.6)		49.8 %	0.60 [-0.43, 1.63]
Subtotal (95% CI)	114		84		-	49.8 %	0.60 [-0.43, 1.63]
Heterogeneity: not appli	cable						
Test for overall effect: Z	= 1.15 (P = 0.25)						
4 25mg patch vs 15mg- 2	22 weeks treatment	course					
2 NRT CEASE 1999	108	4.8 (3.6)	98	4.8 (4)		48.2 %	0.0 [-1.04, 1.04]
Subtotal (95% CI)	108		98		-	48.2 %	0.0 [-1.04, 1.04]
Heterogeneity: not appli	able						
Test for overall effect: Z	= 0.0 (P = 1.0)						
Total (95% CI)	231		192		-	100.0 %	0.24 [-0.49, 0.96]
Heterogeneity: Chi?? = 2	.45, df = 3 (P = 0.48	8); 1?? =0.0%					
Test for overall effect: Z	= 0.64 (P = 0.52)						
Test for subgroup differe	nces: Chi?? = 2.45, d	f = 3 (P = 0.4)	8), I?? =0.0%				
						1	

-4 -2 0 2 4

Higher dose Lower dose

Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation (Review) Copyright © 2012 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Analysis 9.11. Comparison 9 All types of NRT versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change, Outcome 11 Mean weight change (kg) at 12 months: longer course vs. shorter.

Review: Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation

Comparison: 9 All types of NRT versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change

Outcome: II Mean weight change (kg) at 12 months: longer course vs. shorter

Study or subgroup	Long course		Short course		Mean Difference	Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixed,95% CI		IV,Fixed,95% CI
22 weeks vs 8 weeks 2	5mg patch						
2 NRT CEASE 1999	108	4.8 (3.6)	4	5.3 (3.7)		56.9 %	-0.50 [-1.46, 0.46]
Subtotal (95% CI)	108		114			56.9 %	-0.50 [-1.46, 0.46]
Heterogeneity: not applic	cable						
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 1.02 (P = 0.31)						
2 22 weeks vs 8 weeks I	5mg patch						
2 NRT CEASE 1999	98	4.8 (4)	84	4.7 (3.6)		43.1 %	0.10 [-1.00, 1.20]
Subtotal (95% CI)	98		84			43.1 %	0.10 [-1.00, 1.20]
Heterogeneity: not applic	cable						
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 0.18 (P = 0.86)						
Total (95% CI)	206		198			100.0 %	-0.24 [-0.97, 0.48]
Heterogeneity: Chi?? = 0.	.65, df = 1 (P = 0.	42); I?? =0.0%					
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 0.65 (P = 0.5I)						
Test for subgroup differer	nces: Chi?? = 0.65,	df = I (P = 0.1)	42), I?? =0.0%				

-2 -1 0 Longer courses Shorter courses

1 2

Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation (Review) Copyright © 2012 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Analysis 10.1. Comparison 10 Varenicline versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change, Outcome 1 Mean weight change (kg) at end of treatment.

Review: Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation

Comparison: 10 Varenicline versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change

Outcome: I Mean weight change (kg) at end of treatment

Study or subgroup	Experimental		Control		Mean Difference	Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixed,95% CI		IV,Fixed,95% CI
I Img versus placebo							
2 VA Nakamura 2007	71	1.38 (2.02)	51	1.48 (1.57)	-	76.1 %	-0.10 [-0.74, 0.54]
2 VA Nides 2006	14	2.14 (2.28)	10	4 (2.28)		9.0 %	-1.86 [-3.71, -0.01]
2 VA Oncken 2006	94	2.94 (3.65)	14	2.14 (2.36)		14.9 %	0.80 [-0.64, 2.24]
Subtotal (95% CI)	179		75		+	100.0 %	-0.12 [-0.68, 0.43]
Heterogeneity: Chi?? = 4.9	P7, df = 2 (P = 0.0)	08); I?? =60%					
lest for overall effect: $\angle =$ 2 2mg versus placebo	0.44 (P = 0.66)						
2 VA Gonzales 2006	155	2.37 (2.76)	61	2.92 (3.94)		4.3 %	-0.55 [-1.63, 0.53]
2 VA Jorenby 2006	151	2.89 (2.94)	60	3.15 (4.11)		3.8 %	-0.26 [-1.40, 0.88]
2 VA Nakamura 2007	84	1.37 (1.55)	51	1.48 (1.57)		16.9 %	-0.11 [-0.65, 0.43]
2 VA Niaura 2008	32	4 (4.5)	9	3.8 (1.9)		1.3 %	0.20 [-1.79, 2.19]
2 VA Nides 2006	24	1.96 (2.3)	10	4 (2.28)		1.8 %	-2.04 [-3.73, -0.35]
2 VA Oncken 2006	50	2.79 (4.03)	14	2.14 (2.36)		1.8 %	0.65 [-1.02, 2.32]
2 VA Rigotti 2010	161	2.2 (2.7)	48	1.7 (2.6)		7.0 %	0.50 [-0.35, 1.35]
2 VA Tashkin 201 I	103	2.5 (2.8)	22	3.6 (2.9)		2.8 %	-1.10 [-2.43, 0.23]
2 VA Tonstad 2006	425	0.8 (2.13)	301	1.51 (2.31)	-	45.8 %	-0.71 [-1.04, -0.38]
2 VA Tsai 2008	75	1.29 (2.42)	40	1.59 (1.7)		8.6 %	-0.30 [-1.06, 0.46]
2 VA Wang 2009	82	1.58 (2.75)	50	1.38 (2.51)		6.0 %	0.20 [-0.72, 1.12]
Subtotal (95% CI)	1342		666		•	100.0 %	-0.41 [-0.63, -0.19]
Heterogeneity: Chi?? = 17.	.25, df = 10 (P =	0.07); I?? =42%					
Test for overall effect: Z =	3.59 (P = 0.0003)	33) IS I (D. 0.03					
lest for subgroup difference	ces: $Chi?? = 0.86$,	df = 1 (P = 0.35)	s), I!! =0.0%				
					-4 -2 0 2	4	
				Favours	experimental Favours co	ntrol	

Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation (Review) Copyright 0 2012 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Analysis 10.2. Comparison 10 Varenicline versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change, Outcome 2 Mean weight change (kg) at 6 months.

Review: Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation

Comparison: 10 Varenicline versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change

Outcome: 2 Mean weight change (kg) at 6 months



Analysis 10.3. Comparison 10 Varenicline versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change, Outcome 3 Mean weight change (kg) at 12 months.

Review: Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation

Comparison: 10 Varenicline versus placebo for smoking cessation: weight change

Outcome: 3 Mean weight change (kg) at 12 months

Study or subgroup	Experimental N	Mean(SD)	Control N	Mean(SD)	Diff IV,Fixe	Mean ference ed,95% Cl	Weight	Mean Difference IV,Fixed,95% CI
2 VA Rigotti 2010	67	5.2 (4.4)	26	3.9 (4.8)	_		- 76.8 %	1.30 [-0.82, 3.42]
2 VA Tashkin 2011	44	5.7 (9.3)	14	5.2 (5.2)			→ 23.2 %	0.50 [-3.37, 4.37]
Total (95% CI)	111		40		-		100.0 %	1.11 [-0.75, 2.98]
Heterogeneity: Chi?? =	0.13, df = 1 (P = 0	.72); I?? =0.0%						
Test for overall effect: Z	= 1.17 (P = 0.24)							
Test for subgroup differ	ences: Not applicat	ble						
					-4 -2	0 2	4	
				Favours	experimental	Favours c	ontrol	

Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation (Review) Copyright © 2012 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Analysis 11.1. Comparison 11 Varenicline versus bupropion: weight change, Outcome 1 Mean weight change (kg) at end of treatment.

Review: Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation

Comparison: II Varenicline versus bupropion: weight change

Outcome: I Mean weight change (kg) at end of treatment

-

-

Study or subgroup	Varenicline		Bupropion			Diff	Mean erence	Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)		IV,Fixe	ed,95% Cl		IV,Fixed,95% CI
2 AD Gonzales 2006	155	2.37 (2.76)	95	2.12 (1.8)		_	-	54.4 %	0.25 [-0.32, 0.82]
2 AD Nides 2006	24	1.96 (2.3)	22	1.68 (1.92)			-	11.7 %	0.28 [-0.94, 1.50]
2 AD Jorenby 2006	151	2.89 (2.94)	151	1.88 (3.4)				- 33.9 %	1.01 [0.29, 1.73]
Total (95% CI)	330		268				-	100.0 %	0.51 [0.09, 0.93]
Heterogeneity: Chi?? = 2.8	2, df = 2 (P = 0).24); ?? =29%							
Test for overall effect: $Z =$	2.40 (P = 0.01	6)							
Test for subgroup difference	ces: Not applica	ble							
								i	
					-2	-1	0 1	2	

Favours varenicline Favours bupropion

Analysis 12.1. Comparison 12 Varenicline versus NRT: weight change, Outcome 1 Mean weight change (kg) at end of treatment.



Interventions for preventing weight gain after smoking cessation (Review) Copyright © 2012 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

WHAT'S NEW

Last assessed as up-to-date: 7 October 2011.

Date	Event	Description
23 November 2011	New citation required but conclusions have not changed	Change of name for one author (Amanda Parsons is now Amanda Farley), one new author added (DL), and two authors of previous version removed (see Contri- butions of Authors)
23 November 2011	New search has been performed	Twelve additional studies added. Conclusions largely unchanged

HISTORY

Protocol first published: Issue 4, 2006 Review first published: Issue 1, 2009

Date	Event	Description
24 April 2008	Amended	Converted to new review format.
14 July 2006	New citation required and major changes	Substantive amendment

CONTRIBUTIONS OF AUTHORS

Mujahed Shraim (MS) wrote and submitted the review protocol, and extracted data for Part 1 studies. Jennie Inglis (JS) extracted data for Part 2 studies. Both contributed to the first version of the review only, published in 2009. MS and Amanda Parsons (AP) carried out searches for the first part of the review and AP, Deborah Lycett (DL), MS and JI independently identified relevant studies and extracted data. AP drafted the review. DL, Paul Aveyard and Peter Hajek gave conceptual and editorial support.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Paul Aveyard and Amanda Parsons are authors of a study included in this review testing the effect of St John's wort and chromium supplements on smoking cessation and post cessation weight gain. The trial was funded by Cancer Research UK and the supplements were bought from the manufacturer. Paul Aveyard has done consultancy work for pharmaceutical and biotechnology companies that has led to payments to him and his institution. This includes work for companies providing smoking cessation medication, including McNeil, Xenova and Pfizer.

SOURCES OF SUPPORT

Internal sources

• University of Birmingham, UK.

Paid the salary of Amanda Parsons, Jennie Inglis and Paul Aveyard

Mujahed Sharim studied for a masters in public health at the University and completed part of the work as part of his masters project • UKCTCS, UK.

Paid the doctoral stipend of Deborah Lycett and contributed to the salaries of Amanda Parsons and Paul Aveyard. The UK Centre for Tobacco Control Studies is a UKCRC Public Health Research: Centre of Excellence. Funding from British Heart Foundation, Cancer Research UK, Economic and Social Research Council, Medical Research Council, and the National Institute of Health Research, under the auspices of the UK Clinical Research Collaboration, is gratefully acknowledged.

• Queen Mary's University of London, UK.

Paid the salary of Peter Hajek

• National Institute of Health Research, UK.

Contributed to the salary of Paul Aveyard

External sources

• No sources of support supplied

INDEX TERMS

Medical Subject Headings (MeSH)

*Weight Gain [drug effects]; Antidepressive Agents [therapeutic use]; Benzazepines [administration & dosage]; Exercise; Nicotine [administration & dosage]; Nicotinic Agonists [administration & dosage]; Piperidines [administration & dosage]; Pyrazoles [administration & dosage]; Randomized Controlled Trials as Topic; Smoking Cessation [*methods]

MeSH check words

Female; Humans; Male