

Title: Providing an e-cigarette starter kit for smoking cessation and reduction as adjunct to usual care to smokers with a mental health condition: Findings from the ESCAPE feasibility study

Authors: Dimitra Kale^{1*}, Emma Beard¹, Anna-Marie Marshall², Jodi Pervin³, Qi Wu³, Elena Ratschen³, Lion Shahab¹

¹Department of Behavioural Science and Health, University College London, London, UK

²Helen McArdle Nursing and Care Research Institute, University of Sunderland, Sunderland, UK

³Department of Health Sciences, University of York, York, UK

*Corresponding author: Dimitra Kale; Department of Behavioural Science and Health, 1-19 Torrington Place, University College London, London, United Kingdom, WC1E 7HB;

dimitra.kale.09@ucl.ac.uk

Keywords: smoking cessation, vaping, mental illness, randomised controlled trial, e-cigarette, harm reduction

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

Abstract

Background: Smoking rates in the UK have declined steadily over the past decades, masking considerable inequalities, as little change has been observed among people with a mental health condition. This trial sought to assess the feasibility and acceptability of supplying an electronic cigarette (e-cigarette) starter kit for smoking cessation as an adjunct to usual care for smoking cessation, to smokers with a mental health condition treated in the community, to inform a future effectiveness trial.

Methods: This randomised controlled feasibility trial, conducted March-December 2022, compared the intervention (e-cigarette starter kit with a corresponding information leaflet and demonstration with Very Brief Advice) with a 'usual care' control at 1-month follow-up. Participants were ≥ 18 years, receiving treatment for any mental health condition in primary or secondary care in three Mental Health Trusts in Yorkshire and one in London, UK. They were also willing to address their smoking through either cessation or reduction of cigarette consumption. The agreed primary outcome measure was feasibility (consent $\sim 15\%$ of eligible participants; attrition rate $< 30\%$). Acceptability, validated sustained abstinence and $\geq 50\%$ cigarette consumption reduction at 1-month, were also evaluated and qualitative interviews conducted to further explore acceptability in this population.

Results: Feasibility targets were partially met; of 201 eligible participants, 43 (mean age = 45.2, SD = 12.7; 39.5% female) were recruited (21.4%) and randomised (intervention: 48.8%, n=21; control: 51.2%, n=22). Attrition rate was 37.2% at 1-month follow-up and was higher (45.5%) in the control group. At follow-up (n=27), 93.3% (n=14) in the intervention group and 25.0% (n=3) in the control group reported e-cigarette use. The intervention was well received with minimal negative effects. In intention-to-treat analysis, validated sustained abstinence at 1-month was 2/21 (9.5%) and 0/22 (0%) and at least 50% reduction in

cigarette consumption 13/21 (61.9%) and 3/22 (13.6%), for the intervention and control group, respectively. Qualitative analysis of participant interviews (N=5) showed the intervention was broadly acceptable, but they also highlighted areas of improvements for the intervention and trial delivery.

Conclusions: Offering an e-cigarette starter kit to smokers with a mental health condition treated in the community was acceptable and largely feasible, with harm reduction outcomes (i.e. switching from cigarette smoking to e-cigarette use and substantial reduction in cigarette consumption) favouring the intervention. The findings of the study will be used to help inform the design of a main trial.

Trial Registration:

Registry: ISRCTN

Registration number: ISRCTN17691451

Date of registration: 30/09/2021

Background

Despite smoking prevalence in the UK general population declining steadily over the past five decades, now standing at ~14% (1), little change has been observed among people with a mental health condition (2, 3), who are still more than twice as likely to be smokers as the general population (4). Combined with high levels of nicotine dependence (5), which result in generally high cigarette consumption, this leads to substantially increased risks of smoking-related morbidity and premature mortality in people with a mental health condition (2). Although people with a mental health condition are similarly motivated (6) and able (7) to quit smoking as those without a mental health condition, quitting smoking can be difficult due to limited access to support and high dependence. Thus, there is a clear need to develop better and more tailored support strategies to aid smoking cessation in this population. Electronic cigarettes (e-cigarettes), which deliver nicotine without most of the harmful substances in tobacco smoke, have been recognised as a potentially helpful tool for smoking cessation (8).

E-cigarette use (vaping) is increasingly being recorded by stop smoking services in the UK (9), and may be more appealing to people with a mental health condition, who are more likely to have tried vaping and be current users than smokers in the general population (10). Potential reasons for this include that e-cigarettes are relatively cheap compared with cigarettes and other cessation treatment (11) and that they offer a simple stand-alone treatment that is intuitive to use. Furthermore, since e-cigarettes simulate the sensory input from cigarettes and allow users to control the dose (unlike most nicotine replacement

therapies (NRTs)), they may appeal to more dependent smokers who have hitherto struggled to quit with existing cessation treatments (12). Thus, e-cigarettes may offer a potential solution to reduce smoking and encourage cessation in mental health care settings by functioning as a safer alternative to cigarettes (13).

In the general population, accumulating evidence suggests that e-cigarettes are as effective as, or even more effective than, NRT in aiding smoking cessation, both from randomised controlled trials (RCTs) (14) and real-world studies (15). In addition, there are small observational studies, which support their use for people with a mental health condition. Work carried out in Italy (16), the US (17) and Australia (18) found that e-cigarettes are potentially effective for smoking cessation and reduction among smokers with a serious mental health condition. More recently, a UK pilot study investigating the utility of e-cigarettes as a harm reduction intervention in people with psychotic disorders reported a significant reduction in average number of cigarettes smoked per day between baseline and 6-week follow-up, supporting the notion of e-cigarettes as a useful harm reduction tool for this population (19). These studies did not find any evidence that e-cigarettes had adverse effects on mental health, further underlining their utility as a safe smoking cessation aid for smokers with a mental health condition. However, while these preliminary results are encouraging, to date no adequately powered RCT has assessed the effectiveness of e-cigarettes as a long-term harm reduction and smoking cessation tool for people with a mental health condition.

The overall aim of this research was to undertake a feasibility study to evaluate the feasibility and acceptability of supplying e-cigarette starter kits, along with brief verbal and

written advice on e-cigarette use, as an adjunct to usual care for smoking cessation in smokers with a mental health condition treated in the community prior to undertaking a full RCT (E-cigarettes for Smoking Cessation And reduction in People with mEntal illness (ESCAPE trial)). The following research objectives were specified:

1. Assess the feasibility of conducting a full RCT by estimating recruiting (eligible patients who were invited to take part in the study), consenting (those who consented to participate), attrition rates as well as treatment adherence in the intervention group, and contamination in the control group.
2. Investigate the acceptability of trial procedures and the intervention in terms of written materials, verbal content and e-cigarette provided.
3. Explore signals pertaining to the potential efficacy of the intervention.

Methods

Study design

This was a feasibility study using an RCT design, comparing the intervention (an e-cigarette starter kit, brief demonstration, verbal and written information on e-cigarette use as an adjunct to usual care) and control (usual care) at 1-month follow-up. Participants were recruited between March and December 2022. The recruitment stopped at December 2022 due to funding constraints and planned timelines to enable review and progression to the full trial. Additionally, we conducted qualitative interviews to explore the experience of service users and researchers delivering the intervention to refine the intervention accordingly. Ethical approval was granted by the NHS HRA (REC ref:21/NE/0202).

Participants

Trust researchers identified potential participants via health records prior to attendance at their annual care programme approach review or physical health screening appointment. Potential participants were then sent participant information sheets about the study by their trust one week prior to their appointment. Before their appointment, a trust researcher approached them to assess their interest in the study and eligibility. As interest and motivation to participate in smoking cessation studies can fluctuate (20), those who declined on the first occasion were offered participation in the study up to a total of three times, through a letter, follow-up call, and, if possible, a text message. Following the eligibility check, the trust researcher briefly explained the trial and consented participants. Only eligible, consented participants were then asked to complete a brief baseline questionnaire and randomisation occurred after completion of baseline questionnaire. The baseline questionnaire could be completed either on paper or online via REDCap links.

Inclusion/exclusion criteria

Participant inclusion criteria were: i) aged 18 and over, ii) self-reported current (in the past 7 days) cigarette smoking, iii) a diagnosis of a mental health condition and currently receiving treatment for this in primary or secondary care (community mental health teams) validated by their health care records and, iv) a willingness to address their smoking behaviour either by attempting to quit, or by reducing their cigarette consumption. Participants were excluded if they: i) had an inpatient admission in the last three months, ii) self-reported current regular (at least weekly) use of e-cigarette, iii) self-reported participation in other smoking cessation study, iv) were receiving current treatment for comorbid drug or alcohol

problems, v) had a diagnosis of Alzheimer’s disease or dementia, and vi) were pregnant or breastfeeding.

Setting

Participants were recruited from three Mental Health Trusts in Yorkshire and one in London, UK.

Randomisation

The intervention allocation was determined by computer block-randomisation to ensure that each trial site had an equal proportion of intervention and control group participants. Randomisation occurred after consent to take part in the study had been obtained via opening of consecutively numbered opaque envelopes containing information about allocation. The allocation slip was also double folded, and envelope sealed with a signature on the envelope sealed flap. Allocation was concealed until after completion of the baseline questionnaire. Researchers informed the participant and the clinical team of allocation.

Blinding

Participants and researchers and clinical staff administering the intervention could not be blinded due to the nature of the intervention and study design. As follow-up questionnaires differed for intervention and control groups, outcome assessment was only blinded to researchers for questionnaires self-completed online rather than over the phone. However, the study’s statistician was blinded to participants’ allocation.

Control group

Control group participants received usual care from their clinician. While we did not explicitly assess what this entailed (given that we would not have had power to analyse specific differences), as per u NICE guideline NG209 (21), at a minimum standard this would involve evidence-based Very Brief Advice to stop smoking, comprising the three As (Ask and record smoking status; Advice on the best way of quitting and; Act on patient response to build confidence (22, 23)) and referral to in-house or external specialist stop smoking services. In-house and external specialist stop smoking services may offer more tailored behavioural support for smoking cessation, including advice and information on smoking cessation aids such as NRT. However, we did not collect data on how many participants were referred to stop smoking services or on the specific details of the usual care offered by the participating trusts in the feasibility trial. As part of the intervention, all participants, irrespective of their motivation to stop, were encouraged by the trust researcher to consider quitting and to set up a target quit date within a week after randomisation, and those who did not wish to set a target quit date were encouraged to reduce cigarette consumption.

Intervention group

Intervention group participants were offered an e-cigarette starter kit comprising of a third-generation e-cigarette (Aspire PocketX) with a four-week supply of a choice of: a) nicotine strength e-liquid (3 options: 6mg/ml, 10mg/ml, 18mg/ml) and b) flavours (3 options: tobacco, fruit, menthol) as an adjunct to usual care. They also received a verbal explanation and demonstration, along with an information leaflet on how to use the e-cigarette. This was delivered by a clinical member of staff in the context of a pre-existing clinical appointment. The information leaflet included details on what an e-cigarette is, what to

expect from it, how to set it up, and how to use it correctly (a copy of the information leaflet is provided in the Supplementary files). All participants, irrespective of their motivation to stop, were encouraged to consider quitting and to set a target quit date within a week after randomisation. Participants were asked to start using the e-cigarettes as soon as possible and to seek out local or online vape shops to obtain further e-liquid, suited to their individual needs and flavour preference. Participants who did not wish to set a target quit date were encouraged to use the e-cigarette to reduce cigarette consumption as soon as possible.

Data collection

Questionnaires at baseline and follow-up were initially administered by researchers either online (data were captured and managed by the REDCap electronic data system) (24, 25) or in person at the site using a paper-based version. The options of completion via telephone and home visit were added in July 2022.

Follow-up

At 1-month after randomisation participants were asked to complete another brief questionnaire, either online or via telephone. Participants were followed up with up to three reminders to complete the 1-month follow-up.

To support engagement, all participants (both in intervention and control group) received a £10 love2shop voucher for completing the baseline assessment and a £10 love2shop voucher for completing the 1-month follow-up assessment.

Measures

Baseline measures

Mental health diagnosis obtained from health care records. All the other measures were self-reported. Sociodemographic characteristics included age, sex, ethnicity, employment status and education attainment.

Smoking-related characteristics included nicotine dependence measured by the Strength of Urges to Smoke Scale (26) and number of cigarettes smoked per day, motivation to quit measured by the Motivation to Stop Scale (27), age started smoking, smoking duration, past year quit attempts and ever vaping as smoking cessation aid. Mental health condition symptoms were assessed using the Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9) (28) and Generalised Anxiety Disorder (GAD-7) scale (29).

Outcome measures

Feasibility

To assess recruitment and consenting rates, we recorded the number of eligible people who were invited, and the number who consented to take part. We sought to consent a minimum of ~15% of eligible participants. As this is a harder to reach population, this is slightly lower than the consenting rate typical in clinical trials in general patient populations in the UK (30). We also assessed recruitment rates at each Trust. We sought to recruit around six participants per Trust per month to ensure a reasonable timeframe for delivery of a full RCT. Attrition rate was measured by recording the proportion of participants who fail to complete the 1-month follow-up assessment. To achieve a sufficiently robust effect estimate, which can be affected by high attrition rates in intention-to-treat analyses (31), we

sought an attrition rate below 30%, which is typical for smoking cessation trials in this population (32). Finally, adherence to treatment and contamination was measured by recording the proportion of participants who used/were using an e-cigarette at 1-month follow-up in the intervention and control groups, respectively.

Acceptability of trial procedures and the intervention

To assess acceptability of the trial procedures and intervention, qualitative interviews were conducted with a sample of five participants and five researchers delivering the intervention. An interview protocol (Supplementary Table 1) was designed to gain insights into participants' and researchers' experience with the trial, the intervention, and barriers and facilitators of success, both in terms of trial procedures and the intervention content. All participants at baseline were asked if they agree to be interviewed after the 1-month follow-up. Of those who agreed, five attended an interview; two from the control group and three from the intervention group (three were females and two males). Similarly, all researchers were asked if they agreed to be interviewed after the 1-month follow-up, and five mental health nurses (all female) from two trusts attended an interview. All interviews were conducted over the telephone by three researchers from the University of York, lasted between 20 and 40 minutes, were audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim. Interviewees received £10 for participating in the interviews.

Further, among participants in the intervention group, acceptability of the intervention in terms of written materials, verbal content and e-cigarette provided was measured at 1-month follow-up with a questionnaire based on other acceptability-related research

conducted in this population ((33) ; 14-items (Table 2), answer options 5-point Likert-scale from 1=not at all to 5=extremely).

Changes in mental health symptoms and experience of adverse events

Additionally, we assessed changes in participants' mental health symptoms (PHQ-9 (28) and GAD-7 (29)), general mood and physical symptoms (MPSS, (34, 35)), and experience of adverse events based on previous vaping trials (12).

Potential efficacy

To explore signals of potential intervention efficacy at 1-month follow-up, we recorded: i) CO validated (<10ppm) sustained abstinence for weeks 2-4 from enrolment date or target quit date (for those who set a date within one week of enrolment), equivalent to the standard measure in UK stop smoking services (36); ii) point prevalence (24h) abstinence; and iii) the proportion achieving 50% smoking reduction, a common outcome measure used in vaping cessation studies (37). At the 1-month follow-up, we also assessed how many participants had set a quit date in the past month and how many had used NRT during that time.

Health economics

To identify appropriate instruments and assess the feasibility of collecting health economic data, we collected resource use data for delivering the intervention and usual care, using both trial records and a bespoke service use questionnaire. The EQ-5D-5L questionnaire was administered to collect data that enable the estimation of the quality-adjusted life year, which is the most commonly used health outcome measure in economic evaluations (38, 39).

Sample size

The target sample size for this randomised controlled feasibility trial was 72, with 36 participants allocated to each group. In a full RCT, we would assume an effect size of OR (odds ratio) of 1.9 (pooled estimate based on e-cigarette vs placebo e-cigarette trials: (16, 40) for the outcome of 1-month continuous abstinence rate. This would result in an absolute predicted risk difference of 8.2%, assuming a 1-month abstinence rate in the control group of 11.4% (based on EAGLES trial (41)) and 19.6% in the intervention group. The feasibility sample size would be sufficient to produce a one-sided confidence interval that excludes an 8.0% difference in the event of a zero effect of the intervention on abstinence at 1 month, assuming 11.0% reported abstinence in each of the two groups. The estimate obtained in the feasibility trial is not used to directly estimate the intervention effect but to determine whether proceeding to a trial is worthwhile, based on the one-sided confidence interval approach (42). Because the target sample size was not achieved, this analytic approach could not be followed. As recommended by our trial statistician based on relevant literature (43), several two-sided confidence intervals of different precision were therefore calculated instead.

Analyses

Baseline characteristics and relevant follow-up measures (adverse events, mood and physical symptoms) are summarised using percentages and frequencies for categorical variables and means and standard deviations for continuous variables and the groups (intervention vs control). Differences between groups were compared using t-tests, Mann Whitney U tests, or Fisher's Exact test as appropriate. Alpha was set to 0.05.

To assess feasibility, we present frequency and percentages for the number of eligible smokers who i) were invited to take part and consented/completed the baseline assessment; ii) were recruited at each trust per month; iii) attended and completed the 1-month follow-up; iv) had used or were using an e-cigarette at 1-month follow-up. The feasibility criteria as cited earlier were i) consent ~15% of eligible participants; ii) recruit ~6 participants/Trust/month; iii) attrition rate <30%.

To assess acceptability of the trial procedures and intervention, interview data were analysed using a deductive Thematic Analysis (44) approach, and the analysis was informed by the topic guide. Additionally, acceptability of the intervention among participants in the intervention group is summarised using frequencies and percentages.

Differences between groups in sustained and point prevalence smoking abstinence at 1-month follow-up was assessed using the one-sided confidence interval approach (42). This analysis was based on the assumption that the sample identified in the sample size calculation, $n=72$, were recruited. One-sided 80% confidence intervals were derived. If the upper confidence interval excludes 8% (the clinically significant effect in the sample size calculation) difference, then it could be concluded that the difference between the two groups was 0. However, as this study did not reach the sample size of $n=72$, this planned confidence interval approach could be flawed as the study was underpowered. Thus, in an unplanned analysis, several two-sided confidence intervals of different lengths were calculated to determine at which level a treatment effect might be present (43).

Generalised linear models (with intervention allocation specified as between-group factor and time as within-group factor) was used to determine reductions in cigarette consumption and changes in mental health measures from baseline to 1-month follow-up. Analyses of smoking-related outcomes followed the intention-to-treat principle with treating those lost to follow-up as smokers/not having changed their consumption. Additionally, we also undertook a complete case analysis. Data were analysed in SPSS 28.0

To estimate the cost of the intervention and usual care, the quantity of each type of healthcare resource used during the trial period was valued by attaching a corresponding unit cost obtained from either the ESCAPE trial or established national sources (45-48). The total costs were summed and divided by the number of participants to calculate the mean cost for each group. Costs were expressed in British pounds (£) at 2021/2022 prices.

Results

Baseline participants' characteristics

All participants had a diagnosed mental health condition and were receiving treatment in primary or secondary care, as indicated by their health records. However, we have exact diagnoses for only some participants: 13 with depression, five with bipolar disorder, four with psychosis, seven with schizophrenia, one with persistent delusional disorder, and one with personality disorder with antisocial traits. We were unable to retrieve the exact mental health diagnoses of the remaining participants. We did not obtain any information regarding the specific treatments they were receiving. Table 1 shows participants' characteristics overall and as a function of group assignment. The average age of participants was 45.2 (Standard Deviation (SD)=12.7), the majority were male (60.5%) and of white ethnicity

(76.7%). Post-16 educational qualifications were held by 16.3%, and 27.9% were employed.

In terms of general and mental health, the average PHQ-9 and GAD-7 scores was 12.3

(SD=6.7) and 9.2 (SD=6.2) respectively, suggesting moderate depression and anxiety. For

smoking-related characteristics, participants had smoked for an average of 23.7 years

(SD=13.6), starting at an average age of 18.0 years (SD=9.0). They smoked an average of

19.6 cigarettes per day (SD=10.9), and their mean motivation to stop smoking was 5.2

(SD=1.7). Regarding past year smoking cessation efforts, 37.2% had attempted to quit, with slightly more in the control group (40.9%) than in the intervention group (33.3%).

Additionally, 27.9% had used e-cigarettes for smoking cessation in the past year, with similar proportions in both groups. Additionally, 37.2% had attempted to quit and 27.9% had used e-cigarettes for smoking cessation in the past year.

Feasibility

Recruitment and consenting

Two hundred and one smokers with a mental health condition treated in the community were eligible and invited to participate. Of these 43 (21.4%) consented, completed baseline assessment, and were randomised (21 to the intervention group and 22 to the control group; figure 1). The overall monthly recruitment rate was below expectation (six participants/Trust/month) at 1.95 participants per month per Trust; however, this rate differed greatly between sites, from three participant per month at one of the Yorkshire sites to only 0.5 participants per month at the London site.

Attrition

Overall attrition rate was 37.2% (n=16) at 1-month follow-up, and attrition was higher in the control (45.5%; n=10) than intervention (28.6%; n=6) group.

Adherence to treatment and contamination

Of participants followed-up at 1-month (n=27), 14 (93.3%) in the intervention group reported using the e-cigarette in the last month, while three (25.0%) participants of the control group also reported e-cigarette use at follow-up.

Acceptability of trial procedures and the intervention

Qualitative assessment of intervention and trial procedures acceptability

Four main themes depicted in Table 3 were derived, with further details provided below.

1. Improvements to trial's materials and procedure

Three participants felt that the questionnaires were too long, and one would have liked more time to complete them. Researchers also reported that the questions were repetitive. Participants felt that researcher support was helpful during questionnaire completion. In-person and telephone contact were preferred over online engagement and letters, and researchers reported that in-person assistance was often required for questionnaire completion. Clinical staff outside of the team were reported to have relayed incorrect information to potential participants about the trial, describing it as smoking cessation support rather than research, which evidently impacted the expectations of some of the participants. This suggests more training may be required across all staff groups at sites.

2. Evidence of intervention acceptability

Participants found the intervention appointment, which included communication with the clinician and the offer of an e-cigarette starter kit, acceptable. They felt that these components had a positive impact on their willingness and motivation to change their smoking behaviour. Researchers and clinicians also echoed that they felt that participants were generally satisfied with the intervention. Participants reported that they found the information leaflet useful but did not tend to look at it again after the initial appointment. Researchers also felt that the leaflet was comprehensive and explanatory enough for participants in this population.

3. Improvements to the intervention

Clinicians felt that they did not have adequate time to deliver the intervention. Therefore, at one research site, research staff stepped in to do this and at another, researchers mentioned receiving a lot of questions about the e-cigarette afterwards. Participants with no e-cigarette experience felt that they required more assistance with getting to grips with the e-cigarette. This was also reported by two of the researchers. The findings suggest that on-going support/contact is therefore important, and participants also expressed that they would like ongoing support between intervention and follow-up. A sense of rejection and worry about not receiving an e-cigarette starter kit was mentioned a number of times. Researchers, clinicians, and participants reported that those allocated to the control group, who therefore did not receive an e-cigarette, felt disappointed. Additionally, most participants expressed worry that they would not receive an e-cigarette before randomization took place..

4. Issues with the e-cigarette

Two participants believed that e-cigarettes are too expensive to continue after the trial finishes. The interviewed intervention participants mentioned some difficulties with the e-cigarette after leaving the appointment. One researcher reported that people did not seem to like tobacco-flavoured e-liquid.

Quantitative assessment of intervention acceptability Table 2 shows that participants in the intervention provided high ratings for satisfaction of using the e-cigarettes, using e-cigarettes around friends and family, and highly rated the e-cigarette in terms of size, shape, feel and branding (all ratings >4 on 5-point scale). However, flavours were rated lower. One third of participants found the e-cigarette burdensome and nearly half reported a problem in using it. Both written and verbal information provided was generally deemed helpful and most participants said the intervention was the right length and two thirds of participants reported having positive experience taking part in the trial.

Mental health symptoms

There were no significant differences in changes in GAD-7 between baseline and follow-up between groups (Supplementary Table 3). For the changes in PHQ-9, the 80% CIs suggest a difference between groups for the change of item 9 between baseline and follow-up. There was a reduction in thoughts ‘that you would be better off dead or hurting yourself in some way’ in the intervention group but not in the control group. No other significant differences in PHQ-9 items were found (Supplementary Table 3).

Mood and physical symptoms, and adverse events

Constipation, irritable feeling and restlessness were higher in the intervention than control group (Supplementary Table 4). Overall adverse events in the past month at follow-up was low for both control and intervention group participants. However, the 80% CIs suggest a higher number of participants reporting nausea, irritation, depression, restlessness, increased appetite, dry mouth and throat, and wheezing in the intervention compared with the control group (Supplementary Table 4).

Potential efficacy

CO validated sustained abstinence rates at 1-month follow-up

Planned analysis

No participants in the control group and 9.5% (n=2) in the experimental group reported CO validated sustained abstinence rates at 5 weeks with missing equalling smoking using intention to treat. Based on a confidence interval approach, this percentage difference (with upper 80% CI 15.0%) would suggest possible efficacy and evidence to proceed to the full trial.

In the complete case analysis, no participants in the control condition and 13.3% (n=2) in the experimental condition reported CO validated sustained abstinence rates at 5 weeks. Based on a confidence interval approach, this percentage difference (with upper 80% CI 21.1%) would suggest possible efficacy and evidence to proceed to the full trial.

Unplanned analysis

For the intention to treat analysis, the 90% confidence interval (-3.1% to 25.1%), 85% confidence interval (-0.9% to 22.7%) and 80% confidence interval (-0.7% to 20.9%) crossed

both 0 and the clinically significant difference, this gives inconclusive evidence. The 75% confidence interval (1.9% to 19.4%) excludes 0 and crosses the clinically significant difference, at this level there is evidence of a treatment difference which is potentially clinically important. Only a 20% confidence interval or lower is wholly above or equal to a clinically significant difference, suggesting at this level that there is the clinically meaningful difference in smoking cessation between the groups.

For complete case analysis, the 90% confidence interval (-7.1% to 33.3%), 85% confidence interval (-3.5% to 28.2%), 80% confidence interval (-0.9% to 28.2%) crossed both 0 and the clinically significant difference, this gives inconclusive evidence. The 75% confidence interval (0 excludes 0 and crosses the clinically significant difference, at this level there is evidence of a treatment difference which is potentially clinically important. Only a 45% confidence interval or lower is wholly above or equal to the clinically significant difference, suggesting at this level that there is a clinically meaningful difference in smoking cessation between the groups.

Point prevalence (24h) abstinence

In the intention to treat analysis with missing equal to smoking, 4.6% (n=1) of the participants in the control condition reported point prevalence abstinence, while 28.6% (n=6) in the experimental condition. This gives a percentage difference of 24.0% (with upper 80% CI of 33.3%). The 95% confidence interval (1.3% to 45.7%) excluded 0 indicating a difference between the two groups.

In the complete case analysis, 8.3% (n=1) of the participants in the control condition reported point prevalence abstinence, while 40.0% (n=6) in the experimental condition. This gives a percentage difference of 31.7% (with upper 80% CI of 43.5%). The 90% confidence interval (3.6% to 53.4%) excluded 0 indicating a difference between the two groups. The 95% confidence interval (-2.1% to 58.9%) did not excluded 0 indicating inconclusive evidence for a difference.

Smoking reduction

In the intention to treat analysis with missing equal to no change, 13.6% (n=3) of the participants in the control condition reported at least a 50% reduction in cigarette consumption, while 61.9% (n=13) in the experimental condition. This gives a percentage difference of 48.3% (with upper 80% CI of 58.1%). The 95% confidence interval (19.5% to 67.7%) excluded 0 indicating a difference between the two groups.

In the complete case analysis, 25.9% (n=3) of the participants in the control condition reported at least a 50% reduction in cigarette consumption, while 86.7% (n=13) in the experimental condition. This gives a percentage difference of 61.2% (with upper 80% CI of 72.2%). The 95% confidence interval (24.3% to 80.4%) excluded 0 indicating a difference between the two groups.

Set-up quit date and NRT use. At the 1-month follow-up, 77.8% (n=21) of the participants who were followed up had set a quit date; 93.3% (n=14) in the experimental condition and 58.3% (n=7) in the control condition. Among those who were followed up, 7.4% (n=2) reported using NRT in the past month, with one participant from each condition.

Health economics

Based on the instruments used in the feasibility study, the estimated cost per participant was £160 for the intervention group and £24 for the control group. For the intervention group, costs included £129 per participant for training, which covered the development of training materials, time spent by trainers and trainees, travel, and consumables. The cost of products for the trial was £11.48 for the device and £0.98 per bottle of e-liquid. Additionally, participants received a five-minute consultation with a clinician on using the e-cigarettes and a bespoke information leaflet, costing £8 to produce. The total mean intervention cost, excluding training expenses, was £31 per participant in the intervention group. For the control group, the mean cost of pharmacotherapies for smoking cessation was estimated at £4 per participant. The mean cost per participant for community smoking cessation aids, such as consultations with a GP or attending an NHS Stop Smoking Services session, was £20. Smokers in the control group incurred a mean cost of £24 per participant during the 1-month follow-up period. Supplementary Table 5 provides a detailed breakdown of intervention costs for both groups.

The health economics analysis confirms that it is possible to collect data from this population in preparation for a full RCT, including using a shortened version of the instruments employed.

Discussion

This feasibility RCT aimed to assess the feasibility and acceptability of providing an e-cigarette starter kit (with additional support on how to use the e-cigarettes) to smokers with

mental health condition as an adjunct to their usual care in UK primary and secondary care settings. While the target sample size was not achieved, raising questions over the feasibility of our approach, our findings provide preliminary evidence that the trial and intervention were broadly acceptable to participants and health professionals delivering the treatment, well tolerated, achieving good consenting and adherence rates, with limited contamination. In addition, our exploration of preliminary effect size indicated potential efficacy, as continuous and point prevalence abstinence and reductions in cigarette consumption were more pronounced in the intervention than control group. However, event rates were low, which reduced the precision of estimates, and different confidence intervals were calculated to determine the level at which a treatment effect might be present. The cost of the intervention was in line with similar smoking cessation treatments in this population (49).

As expected, our sample scored moderately to highly on measures of anxiety and depression, though GAD-7 and PHQ-9 scores remained stable or declined slightly from baseline to follow-up, suggesting that mental health condition does not necessarily worsen during a quit attempt and may potentially improve. However, given the small sample size and the short follow-up period of one month, where withdrawal symptoms may still be present, these findings should be interpreted with caution. Such findings, though, align with previous research which has demonstrated that stopping smoking is associated with an improvement in mental health condition symptoms (4). Health professionals working with people with mental health conditions are often concerned about worsening mental health outcomes, and this has been a key barrier to both starting discussions around smoking behaviour change, and also implementing smoking cessation programmes for this

population (50). While health professionals should find this growing body of evidence reassuring, indicating that smoking cessation does not counter progress with other mental health symptoms in adults with mental health conditions, further research with larger sample sizes and longer follow-up periods is needed to confirm these findings.

This feasibility study also highlighted some problems in terms of the practicality of conducting a trial within community mental health teams and associated research procedures, failing to achieve the desired recruitment rate, with attrition higher than other smoking cessation studies in this or similar populations (16, 19, 33). Quantitative analysis and the qualitative interviews provided further insights into potential barriers to undertaking a full RCT to evaluate the intervention in this setting.

In terms of study processes and design, recruitment was the biggest challenge. The number of eligible participants varied considerably across sites, with some having small caseloads per clinician and low numbers of new referrals, meaning recruitment sources were exhausted quickly. There were numerous sites where clinicians had no availability to book in trial participants for several weeks, while some patients at the involved sites were only seen once per year by their clinicians and did not appear to have the commonly expected engagement with services, or rapport with the clinicians. The latter also could have impacted the attrition rate. To address these issues, several mitigation strategies to improve recruitment have been proposed (Supplementary Table 6), based on review of previous research (33, 51, 52). In addition, more realistic recruitment targets may need to be adopted for future trials in this setting.

Lastly, attrition was higher than expected. Participants reported being disappointed and feeling negatively affected in terms of their mental health when learning they had been randomised to the control group. We are mindful that many patients in our population may have tried to quit smoking unsuccessfully for a long time and may therefore be hopeful to receive the active intervention, especially the e-cigarette device itself. Consequently, it would be equitable to offer control group participants the e-cigarette kit for free together with a video link and a leaflet at their last follow-up appointment to address disappointment and attrition in this group, which was higher than the intervention group as this would also serve as an additional incentive.

In terms of intervention content and delivery, the qualitative data indicated that some patients found the technicalities involved in using the e-cigarette challenging and would have appreciated further support. Additionally, the intervention group had higher mood and physical symptom scores compared to the control group. These differences may be due to vaping and the process of smoking cessation or switching from cigarettes to e-cigarettes. This aligns with previous research indicating that smokers often experience adverse side effects from vaping (53). In light of this, it would be preferable for future work with this population to move from a tank-based model (which was the only evidence-based model at the time of the project proposal) to a pod-based model, as this has the advantage of being substantially easier to use. It is also tamper-proof and thus offers fewer opportunities for potential misuse. Additionally, unpublished consumer research by the University of East Anglia, conducted as part of a trial assessing the effectiveness of e-cigarette provision in emergency care settings, showed that a pod device received high ratings for ease of use and satisfaction (52, 54). Further, the qualitative findings indicated that five minutes of time

factored in for the delivery of the intervention was insufficient. Future studies should therefore consider allowing more time for the delivery of brief interventions, given these particular challenges and to offer additional support (e.g., a ‘telephone helpline’ staffed by our researchers). Relatedly, if pod instead of tank devices are used, this likely will free up time, as these are easier to use, thus can be demonstrated more quickly, and simpler, thus requiring less additional support.

Strengths and Limitations

To our knowledge, this is the first study in the UK to explore the feasibility and acceptability of supplying an e-cigarette starter kit as a long-term harm reduction and smoking cessation tool to people with mental health condition treated in the community as adjunct to usual care. This study used robust quantitative and qualitative methodology to evaluate the feasibility of delivering the intervention, which was well received with minimal negative effects. However, there were several limitations. First, we did not meet our original target recruitment rate, which affected our ability to draw firm conclusion about potential efficacy. Second, and relatedly, recruitment and attrition rate posed challenges and differed substantially across sites. This is an important finding, which will assist us in carefully selecting suitable sites in a future main trial. Third, event rates were low, reducing precision of estimates. Fourth, follow-up rates differed between treatment groups. However, findings from complete case analysis were consistent with the primary analysis. Fifth, the assessment of adherence to treatment was based on a crude measure of the proportion of participants who were using an e-cigarette at 1-month follow-up. We will consider a more rigorous assessment for the full trial. Sixth, even though the mental health diagnoses of participants were taken from their health records, we were not able to record the exact

mental health diagnosis of some participants. Our difficulties to obtain standard baseline data relating to participants' diagnoses despite exhaustive attempts involving all relevant sites indicate that researchers may want to be mindful of practical difficulties possibly caused by staffing and capacity issues in UK NHS mental health contexts post Covid.

Conclusions

Overall, findings from this feasibility study demonstrate that offering an intervention comprising of an e-cigarette starter kit, brief demonstration, verbal and written advice to smokers with mental health condition treated in the community is broadly acceptable and may be beneficial for participants in terms of harm reduction outcome such as switching from cigarette smoking to e-cigarette use and substantial reduction in cigarette consumption, with minimal negative effects. Findings also identified a number of barriers to undertaking a trial in this setting. These insights can be used to inform the design of future harm reduction trials in similar contexts.

References

1. Buss V, West R, Kock L, Kale D, Brown J. Smoking in England. Annual Trends on smoking in England from the Smoking Toolkit Study <https://smokinginengland.info/graphs/annual-findings> 2023 [
2. Physicians RCo, Psychiatrists RCo. Smoking and Mental Health. London; 2013 March 2013.
3. Richardson S, McNeill A, Brose LS. Smoking and quitting behaviours by mental health conditions in Great Britain (1993-2014). *Addict Behav.* 2019;90:14-9.

4. Taylor E, Brose LS, McNeill A, Brown J, Kock L, Robson D. Associations between smoking and vaping prevalence, product use characteristics, and mental health diagnoses in Great Britain: a population survey. *BMC Medicine*. 2023;21(1):211.
5. Williams JM, Ziedonis D. Addressing tobacco among individuals with a mental illness or an addiction. *Addict Behav*. 2004;29(6):1067-83.
6. Siru R, Hulse GK, Tait RJ. Assessing motivation to quit smoking in people with mental illness: a review. *Addiction*. 2009;104(5):719-33.
7. Peckham E, Brabyn S, Cook L, Tew G, Gilbody S. Smoking cessation in severe mental ill health: what works? an updated systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Psychiatry*. 2017;17(1):252.
8. Psychiatrists RCo. The prescribing of varenicline and vaping (electronic cigarettes) to patients with severe mental health 2018 [Available from: <https://www.rcpsych.ac.uk/improving-care/campaigning-for-better-mental-health-policy/position-statements/position-statements-2018>].
9. McNeill A, Simonavičius E, Brose LS, Taylor E, East K, Zuikova E, et al. Nicotine vaping in England: an evidence update including health risks and perceptions, September 2022. A report commissioned by the Office for Health Improvement and Disparities. London. Office for Health Improvement and Disparities 2022 29 September 2022.
10. Cummins SE, Zhu S-H, Tedeschi GJ, Gamst AC, Myers MG. Use of e-cigarettes by individuals with mental health conditions. *Tobacco Control*. 2014;23(suppl 3):iii48-iii53.
11. Jackson SE, Shahab L, Kock L, West R, Brown J. Expenditure on smoking and alternative nicotine delivery products: a population survey in England. *Addiction*. 2019;114(11):2026-36.

12. Hajek P, Etter JF, Benowitz N, Eissenberg T, McRobbie H. Electronic cigarettes: review of use, content, safety, effects on smokers and potential for harm and benefit. *Addiction*. 2014;109(11):1801-10.
13. Ratschen E. Electronic cigarettes in mental health settings - solving a conundrum? *Psychiatr Bull* (2014). 2014;38(5):226-9.
14. Hartmann-Boyce J, Lindson N, Butler AR, McRobbie H, Bullen C, Begh R, et al. Electronic cigarettes for smoking cessation. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2022;11(11):Cd010216.
15. Beard E, West R, Michie S, Brown J. Association between electronic cigarette use and changes in quit attempts, success of quit attempts, use of smoking cessation pharmacotherapy, and use of stop smoking services in England: time series analysis of population trends. *BMJ*. 2016;354:i4645.
16. Caponnetto P, Auditore R, Russo C, Cappello GC, Polosa R. Impact of an electronic cigarette on smoking reduction and cessation in schizophrenic smokers: a prospective 12-month pilot study. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2013;10(2):446-61.
17. Pratt SI, Sargent J, Daniels L, Santos MM, Brunette M. Appeal of electronic cigarettes in smokers with serious mental illness. *Addict Behav*. 2016;59:30-4.
18. O'Brien B, Knight-West O, Walker N, Parag V, Bullen C. E-cigarettes versus NRT for smoking reduction or cessation in people with mental illness: secondary analysis of data from the ASCEND trial. *Tob Induc Dis*. 2015;13(1):5.
19. Hickling LM, Perez-Iglesias R, McNeill A, Dawkins L, Moxham J, Ruffell T, et al. A pre-post pilot study of electronic cigarettes to reduce smoking in people with severe mental illness. *Psychol Med*. 2019;49(6):1033-40.
20. West R, Brown J. A theory of addiction. *Theory of Addiction*2013. p. 229-56.

21. NICE. Tobacco: preventing uptake, promoting quitting and treating dependenceSmoking Cessation in secondary care: acute, maternity and mental health services. : National Institute for Health and Clinicael Excellence; 2021 [Available from: PHG51NG209. 20132021, <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng209http://guidance.nice.org.uk/PHG/51>: .
22. Aveyard P, Begh R, Parsons A, West R. Brief opportunistic smoking cessation interventions: a systematic review and meta-analysis to compare advice to quit and offer of assistance. *Addiction*. 2012;107(6):1066-73.
23. Michie S, Churchill S, West R. Identifying evidence-based competences required to deliver behavioural support for smoking cessation. *Ann Behav Med*. 2011;41(1):59-70.
24. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research electronic data capture (REDCap)--a metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research informatics support. *J Biomed Inform*. 2009;42(2):377-81.
25. Harris PA, Taylor R, Minor BL, Elliott V, Fernandez M, O'Neal L, et al. The REDCap consortium: Building an international community of software platform partners. *J Biomed Inform*. 2019;95:103208.
26. Fidler JA, Shahab L, West R. Strength of urges to smoke as a measure of severity of cigarette dependence: comparison with the Fagerström Test for Nicotine Dependence and its components. *Addiction*. 2011;106(3):631-8.
27. Kotz D, Brown J, West R. Predictive validity of the Motivation To Stop Scale (MTSS): a single-item measure of motivation to stop smoking. *Drug Alcohol Depend*. 2013;128(1-2):15-9.

28. Gilbody S, Richards D, Barkham M. Diagnosing depression in primary care using self-completed instruments: UK validation of PHQ-9 and CORE-OM. *Br J Gen Pract*. 2007;57(541):650-2.
29. Spitzer RL, Kroenke K, Williams JB, Löwe B. A brief measure for assessing generalized anxiety disorder: the GAD-7. *Arch Intern Med*. 2006;166(10):1092-7.
30. Moorcraft SY, Marriott C, Peckitt C, Cunningham D, Chau I, Starling N, et al. Patients' willingness to participate in clinical trials and their views on aspects of cancer research: results of a prospective patient survey. *Trials*. 2016;17:17.
31. Belita E, Sidani S. Attrition in Smoking Cessation Intervention Studies: A Systematic Review. *Can J Nurs Res*. 2015;47(4):21-40.
32. Curtin L, Brown RA, Sales SD. Determinants of attrition from cessation treatment in smokers with a history of major depressive disorder. *Psychol Addict Behav*. 2000;14(2):134-42.
33. Gilbody S, Peckham E, Bailey D, Arundel C, Heron P, Crosland S, et al. Smoking cessation for people with severe mental illness (SCIMITAR+): a pragmatic randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Psychiatry*. 2019;6(5):379-90.
34. West R, Hajek P. Evaluation of the mood and physical symptoms scale (MPSS) to assess cigarette withdrawal. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)*. 2004;177(1-2):195-9.
35. West R, Ussher M, Evans M, Rashid M. Assessing DSM-IV nicotine withdrawal symptoms: a comparison and evaluation of five different scales. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)*. 2006;184(3-4):619-27.
36. Department of Health. Local Stop smoking services: Service delivery and monitoring guidance – 2011/12 London: Department of Health; 2011.

37. Moore D, Aveyard P, Connock M, Wang D, Fry-Smith A, Barton P. Effectiveness and safety of nicotine replacement therapy assisted reduction to stop smoking: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ*. 2009;338:b1024.
38. Hernández Alava M, Pudney S, Wailoo A. Estimating the Relationship Between EQ-5D-5L and EQ-5D-3L: Results from a UK Population Study. *Pharmacoeconomics*. 2023;41(2):199-207.
39. NICE. NICE health technology evaluations: the manual 2022.
40. Bullen C, Howe C, Laugesen M, McRobbie H, Parag V, Williman J, Walker N. Electronic cigarettes for smoking cessation: a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet*. 2013;382(9905):1629-37.
41. Anthenelli RM, Benowitz NL, West R, St Aubin L, McRae T, Lawrence D, et al. Neuropsychiatric safety and efficacy of varenicline, bupropion, and nicotine patch in smokers with and without psychiatric disorders (EAGLES): a double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled clinical trial. *Lancet*. 2016;387(10037):2507-20.
42. Cocks K, Torgerson DJ. Sample size calculations for pilot randomized trials: a confidence interval approach. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2013;66(2):197-201.
43. Lee EC, Whitehead AL, Jacques RM, Julious SA. The statistical interpretation of pilot trials: should significance thresholds be reconsidered? *BMC Medical Research Methodology*. 2014;14(1):41.
44. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*. 2006;3(2):77-101.
45. Curtis LA, Burns A. Unit Costs of Health & Social Care 2020. Unit Costs of Health and Social Care. Kent: PSSRU, University of Kent; 2020

46. Jones K, Weatherly H, Birch S, Castelli A, Chalkley M, Dargan A, et al. Unit Costs of Health and Social Care 2022 Manual. Personal Social Services Research Unit University of Kent & Centre of Health Economics University of York.; 2022.
47. NHS Business Services Authority. Prescription Cost Analysis – England 2020/21. 2021.
48. NICE. NICE cost impact statement: QOF indicator for smoking.; 2011.
49. Mattock R, Owen L, Taylor M. The cost-effectiveness of tailored smoking cessation interventions for people with severe mental illness: a model-based economic evaluation. *eClinicalMedicine*. 2023;57.
50. Smith CA, McNeill A, Kock L, Ahmed Z, Shahab L. Mental health professionals' perceptions, judgements and decision-making practices regarding the use of electronic cigarettes as a tobacco harm reduction intervention in mental healthcare: A qualitative focus group study. *Addict Behav Rep*. 2019;10:100184.
51. Holliday R, Preshaw PM, Ryan V, Sniehotta FF, McDonald S, Bauld L, McColl E. A feasibility study with embedded pilot randomised controlled trial and process evaluation of electronic cigarettes for smoking cessation in patients with periodontitis. *Pilot and Feasibility Studies*. 2019;5(1):74.
52. Pope I, Clark LV, Clark A, Ward E, Belderson P, Stirling S, et al. Cessation of Smoking Trial in the Emergency Department (COSTED): a multicentre randomised controlled trial. *Emerg Med J*. 2024;41(5):276-82.
53. Kale D, Tattan-Birch H, Brown J, Cox S, Dawkins L, Goniewicz ML, et al. Examining acute psychopharmacological effects of nicotine vaping versus heated tobacco products in a randomised crossover study of product naïve adult smokers. *Scientific Reports*. 2023;13(1):22676.

54. Belderson P, Ward E, Pope I, Notley C. Selecting an e-cigarette for use in smoking cessation interventions: sharing learning from the COSTED trial. . <https://osf.io/xpv6s2023>.

List of abbreviation

NRT: Nicotine Replacement Therapy

RCT: Randomised Controlled Trial

OR: Odds Ratio

CI: Confidence Intervals

SD: Standard Deviation

Ethics approval and consent to participate

Ethical approval for the study was granted by National Health System UK (NHS) Health Research Authority (REC ref:21/NE/0202). Informed consent was obtained from all participants.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Competing interests

LS has received honoraria for talks, unrestricted research grants and travel expenses to attend meetings and workshops from manufactures of smoking cessation medications (Pfizer; J&J) and has acted as paid reviewer for grant awarding bodies and as a paid consultant for health care companies. All authors declare no financial links with tobacco companies, e-cigarette manufacturers, or their representatives.

Funding

This work was supported by Yorkshire Cancer Research (Y433). DK receives salary support from Cancer Research UK (PRCRPG-Nov21\100002). For the purpose of Open Access, the author has applied a CC BY public copyright licence to any Author Accepted Manuscript version arising from this submission. Funders were not involved in the collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of data; writing of the report; or in the decision to submit the report for publication.

CrediT authorship contribution statement

DK: Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing; EB: Formal analysis; Writing – review & editing; AM: Data curation; Formal analysis; Writing – review & editing; JP: Formal analysis; Writing – review & editing; QW: Formal analysis; Writing – review & editing; ER: Conceptualization, Writing – review & editing, Funding acquisition; LS: Conceptualization, Writing – review & editing, Funding acquisition.

Availability of data and materials

The datasets used and/or analysed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Figure 1. CONSORT flowchart




Figure 1. CONSORT flowchart of participant recruitment

Table 1: Characteristics of participants overall and as function of group at baseline

Characteristic	Overall (n=43)	Control group (n=22)	Intervention group (n=21)
Sociodemographic			
Age, M (SD)	45.2 (12.7)	42.9 (12.6)	47.7 (12.6)
Female sex, % (n)	39.5 (17)	36.1 (8)	42.9 (9)
White ethnicity, % (n)	76.7 (33)	72.7 (16)	81.0 (17)
Post-16 educational qualifications, % (n)	16.3 (7)	13.6 (3)	19.0 (4)
Employed, % (n)	27.9 (12)	45.5 (10)	9.5 (2)
General and Mental Health characteristics			
PHQ-9, M (SD)	12.3 (6.7)	10.5 (6.7)	14.2 (7.5)
GAD-7, M (SD)	9.2 (6.2)	7.9 (5.2)	10.6 (7.1)
Smoking-related characteristics			
Years smoked, M (SD)	23.7 (13.6)	23.5 (11.9)	24.0 (15.5)
Age started smoking, M (SD)	18.0 (9.0)	15.4 (3.6)	20.6 (11.9)
Strength of urges to smoke, M (SD)	3.4 (1.0)	3.4 (1.0)	3.5 (1.1)
Time spent with urges, M (SD)	3.4 (1.4)	3.7 (1.3)	3.1 (1.5)
Cigarettes smoked per day, M (SD)	19.6 (10.9)	20.0 (12.8)	19.1 (8.9)
Motivation to stop smoking, M (SD)	5.2 (1.7)	4.8 (1.6)	5.6 (1.7)
Past year quit attempt, % (n)	37.2 (16)	40.9 (9)	33.3 (7)
Past year e-cig use for smoking cessation, % (n)	27.9 (12)	27.3 (6)	28.6 (6)

Motivation to stop was measured with the motivation to stop scale (scores 1-7) with higher score presenting higher motivation to quit cigarette smoking.

Strength of urges to smoke (scores 0-6) with higher score presenting higher strength of urges to smoke.

Time spent with urges (scores 0-6) with higher score presenting more time spent with urges.

PHQ-9: scores represent: 0-5 mild, 6-10 moderate, 11-15 moderately severe, >15 severe depressive symptoms.

GAD-7: Scores represent: 0-5 mild, 6-10 moderate, 11-15 moderately severe, 15-21 severe anxiety.

Table 2: Acceptability of the intervention among participants in the intervention group

	Intervention group (n=21)
Item	M(SD)
How much do you like using the e-cigarette? ^a	4.1 (1.2)
Are you comfortable using the e-cigarette around friends and family? ^a	4.1 (1.3)
Are you happy with the following characteristics of the e-cigarette? ^a	4.5 (0.7)
<i>Size</i>	4.4 (0.8)
<i>Shape</i>	4.4 (0.8)
<i>Feel</i>	4.4 (0.8)
<i>Branding</i>	
How much do you like the flavours given? ^a	3.5 (1.3)
Did you find the verbal advice helpful? ^a	4.1 (1.0)
Did you find the leaflet helpful? ^a	3.8 (1.3)
Did you find it easy to remember the information provided by the clinician? ^a	3.9 (0.9)
	% (n)
Were you comfortable with the amount of time it took your clinician to explain the e-cigarette to you? - Yes	71.4 (15)
In general, did you find it a burden to use the e-cigarette? – No	66.7 (14)
Did you have any problems using the e-cigarette? – No	57.1 (12)
Overall, I had a positive experience taking part in the trial – Yes	66.7 (14)

^a 5-point Likert scale, range 1=not at all to 5= extremely, M=mean, SD=Standard Deviation

Table 3. Qualitative interviews: Themes and related codes of qualitative analysis.

Theme	Related codes	Related quotes
1. Improvements to the trial's materials and procedure	Unhappy with questionnaire content and length	<p>P5(I): Felt uncomfortable completing the questionnaires.</p> <p>P5(I): Felt uncomfortable answering question about mental health.</p> <p>P5(I): Questionnaire long and questions repetitive.</p> <p>P5(I): Did not understand why we asked questions unrelated to smoking - should explain better.</p> <p>P3(I): Didn't expect so many questions.</p> <p>P3(I): Surprised by questionnaire content and length.</p> <p>P4(I): Would like more time to complete the questionnaire.</p> <p>R2: I found that some of the questions on the on the follow up. I've kind of tend to repeat. Being a bit repetitive. They definitely are repetitive. They've had a few comments. That kind of oh, haven't you already asked me this?</p>
	Researcher's support helpful during questionnaire completion	<p>P2(C): I liked that researcher helped me complete the questionnaire.</p> <p>P3(I): Help to complete the questionnaire is important due to the length.</p> <p>R1: There was a preference for in person data collection... there were some issues with the content or the questionnaires that they struggled with. They felt it was repetitive and lengthy.</p> <p>R3: A lot of people what they've wanted to do it online. However, did explain that in secondary care in person assistance was usually required.</p> <p>R2: In reality they end up being done with a researcher because it's too much. It's too much for them to do independently.</p>
	Views of interactions with clinical staff	<p>P1(C): Need to be clearer with patients about what we are offering from the start of communication.</p> <p>P1(C): Mental Health teams told patients this was smoking cessation support rather than research.</p> <p>P1(C): CPN relayed ESCAPE incorrectly as support rather than research.</p>
	Initial contact preferences – telephone	<p>P3(I): Did not read letter.</p> <p>P3(I): Phone call from researcher fundamental in decision to take part.</p> <p>P3(I): Requires spoken explanation - preferred over online or post "sinks in better".</p> <p>R3: Some people are not very tech savvy and would rather have the option of reading to it themselves and make it a decision. Other people like to speak to people, I think at the moment people the majority would perhaps appreciate speaking to somebody.</p> <p>R5: The letters definitely didn't have much of an impact. We didn't get anyone replying back to them.</p>

2. Evidence of intervention acceptability	Happy with clinician appointment	<p>P3(I): Yeah, I mean they were there to support me.</p> <p>P3(I): Yeah, she was because like she explained to me how to use it and I explained like using something like this seemed to help.</p> <p>P4 (I): I think this support was good, the communication was good, and it was helpful.</p>
	Positive experience/feelings towards e-cigarette(s)	<p>P3(I): It's been good it's been good it's given me more positivity...I haven't been craving I've not been craving as much.</p> <p>P3(I): I'd say the benefits it's making me want to quit.</p> <p>P3(I): Not only that cold weather's coming now and I'd rather sit in me house and smoke me vape.</p> <p>P4(I): It was a good quality e-cigarette. I have had poor quality ones, but this was a good one.</p> <p>P4(I): The e-cigarette is better for health. For safety wise it's good as well the e-cigarette.</p> <p>P5(I): it's a good device.</p> <p>R1: For the liquid and e-cig there seemed to be a good choice.</p> <p>R1: The e-cigarette looked nice, it looks expensive, so I think they liked the look of it.</p>
	The leaflet was useful	<p>P3(I): I did find it useful.</p> <p>P4(I): No, I didn't use it because she explained to me how to use it and how to charge it and I have experience of my own which I had in the past so I know how to use it.</p> <p>R1: It was really comprehensive.</p>
	Overall experience positive	<p>P3(I): It's given me more positivity.</p> <p>P3(I): You know it's given me encouragement.</p> <p>P4(I): It was good, a good experience.</p> <p>P5 (I): The process itself is a fantastic idea um I can't fault the fact of what's been done.</p> <p>R3: All I know is that from. You know the people of going to study. They've been wanting to stop smoking, and I found it useful in one way, either way, you know, and I've had I've had really positive feedback.</p> <p>R2: From the follow up as well. and people have found it really useful. And what I found interesting is that actually it's almost like the idea. And the concept of using an e-cigarette and the fact that I guess I'm picking up on it's the fact that the health professional is giving someone any cigarette and saying that it's, you know it's a helpful and useful and safe thing to do. It's really powerful, because I think quite a lot of people just need that reassurance.</p>
3. Improvements to the intervention	Rejection and worry due to randomisation	<p>P1(C): It is really interesting because as a result of my mental health issues and past traumas and things, because I didn't get the vape and the interaction it actually had the</p>

		<p>opposite effect with me. I actually ended up smoking that week a lot more, it was like a sense of rejection.</p> <p>P1(C): When they explained to me what it actually was I was on tenterhooks whether or not I was going to get this vape and then I got the appointment with Kim and I didn't get the vape and when I didn't I was so disappointed.</p> <p>P1(C). The conversations I have had with practitioners and you have helped. Although with one of the practitioners, when I didn't get the vape I was disappointed that I was just going to get left again and for me I have been signed up with smoking cessation support but have never heard anything so it was like rejection all over again because I wasn't informed enough in the first instance I know it is a research project but when I first got referred I wasn't aware of that.</p> <p>P3(I): The thing what was worrying me before that and they explained that what if she opened envelope and it wasn't so where do I go from there.</p> <p>P5(I): In order for the if you weren't to get picked then I would imagine cause I'm not going to lie if I hadn't got picked I'd have prob- I'd have been on a right you know I'd have been really bad and sad.</p> <p>R1: I think a couple were upset at follow-up. There was one that was really upset. I was quite surprised because I thought I had managed it well. I talk a lot about it and try to manage their expectations. They might feel that they don't want to say it at the time. I hope that we managed it as best we could, it's just one of those things. I think the voucher was a good idea and that helped and dividing it and giving half at baseline softened the blow.</p>
	<p>More help using the e-cigarette required</p>	<p>P3(I): She gave me it we did the set up and things like that but she didn't actually turn it on... so when I got home and I tried to do things cause she had to check it three times and I got it didn't work it made me a little bit frustrated but after talking to (consultant's name) again I took it in and- and she got it up and running whereas I think if it happened again or she for somebody else I'd say set it up for her.</p> <p>P3(I): If they go more into it with you and have you do a trial with different things and show you how to use the apparatus then I think it might have been better"</p> <p>P5(I): Like I said I'm not able to get the effects of what this device is meant to do... I don't obviously want to get her in trouble or anything but no I wasn't sure I wasn't sure how to use the device.</p> <p>R2: Doing real deep in inhalations, and then coughing and feeling a bit put off by that. And so, they were using it like</p>

		<p>a cigarette. So, I don't know whether there was kind of a placing a little bit more emphasis on how you use it, and maybe how you set it up in the intervention, I think people would find that helpful.</p> <p>R3: There are a lot of questions, and I think it would. I don't think. Is it the actual saying, talking about stopping, smoking can be done in 5 min, but the actual vape itself felt quite personal. So, I had a heck of a lot of questions.</p>
	On-going support/contact important	<p>P1(C): For me it's not about the e-cigarette, it's about the support for stopping smoking because that's what's worked for me in the past.</p> <p>P1(C): For me, the thing that I think will help is having that ongoing support... Just to add again with it being mental health services, we don't always absorb information. No disrespect, clinicians were fantastic but maybe we need reminders of the important stuff. I think a telephone call maybe 3-5 days after would be really good.</p> <p>P4(I): Maybe she could have seen me again or catch-up with me to see how I was doing with my smoking or something.</p>
4. Issues with the e-cigarette	Side effects of e-cigarette	<p>P3(I): It made back of my throat burn.</p> <p>P3(I): Negative effects coughing.</p>
	Ongoing cost of e-cigarette is problematic	<p>P2(C): Tobacco cheaper than e-cigarette.</p> <p>P2(C): E-cigarettes are too expensive, can't afford ongoing cost.</p> <p>P4(I): E-liquid expensive and would not be able to afford this or the e-cigarette without being given one for the trial.</p>
	Difficulty using the e-cigarette at home	<p>P3(I): Couldn't work out how to use e-cigarette at home.</p> <p>P3(I): Revisited clinician to understand how to use e-cigarette.</p> <p>P4(I): Takes time to get used to the difference, e-cigarette very different to smoking, it is awkward when you start.</p> <p>P5(I): Got liquid in mouth.</p>
	The e-cigarette is not very good	<p>P5(I): E-cigarette isn't very good.</p> <p>P5(I): Disappointed - faulty device.</p> <p>P5(I): Would prefer a different device.</p> <p>P5(I): Device not good compared to others on the market.</p> <p>R2: People don't seem to like tobacco flavour. So, not keen on that.</p>

P=participant; I=intervention; C=control; R=researcher

Supplementary material

Supplementary Table 1. Interview topic guide.

	MAIN QUESTION	PROMPTS/FOLLOW-UP
OPENING QUESTIONS:	Tell us a little about yourself.	Age, whereabouts in the UK they live, if they work etc.
OPENING QUESTIONS, SMOKING HISTORY:	Ask the participant about their smoking history.	when and why they started etc.
1. SMOKING RELATED OPENING QUESTIONS	a) Have your smoking habits changed since taking part in the study?	-If so how? If not why not?" -Why participant relapsed?
	b) Have you previously tried to quit smoking?	-If yes, please can you describe what methods you used? -How did this attempt using e-cigarettes compare? -if no previous attempt, how was this time different?
2. INTERVENTION CONTENT AND DELIVERY (<i>for participants to the intervention group only</i>)	a) Overall, was being offered an e-cigarette helpful?	-did they use it? Why? Positives? Negatives?
	b) Did you understand how to use the e-cigarette and obtain additional liquid?	-Prompts: explanation from clinician; time taken, leaflet content, how did they get most of their info, clinician/leaflet both. How could the format of the information be improved.
	c) Did you find the leaflet useful?	-Why? Was it revisited – in what circumstances
	d) In your opinion was the clinician the best person to offer the e-cigarette and advice?	-Why? How could this be improved?

	e) Effects on usual care	-Was there an impact on your appointment and care received? What would help remove this impact?
3. INTERVENTION EFFECTS (for participants to the intervention group only)	a) What benefits did you get from using the e-cigarette if you used it.	-Prompts: health, social, financial... Were there any negative effects?
	b) Which flavours and strengths worked best for you	Why? any flavours they would prefer?
	c) Would you recommend this type of support for other people with a mental illness	-If so, why not? If not, why not? -Anything in particular that would increase or reduce likelihood of recommending
4. RECRUITMENT & CONSENT	a) Thinking back to when you decided to take part, were there any aspects that you think could be improved?	-Prompt – letter, follow-up text or phone call, sufficient information provided, contact with the research team, ease of communication, and choices offered.
5. DATA COLLECTION	a) Which method did you choose to complete the questionnaires	-Why did you choose that method?
	b) Did you require any support to complete the questionnaire	-If so what?
	c) Please tell us how acceptable the questionnaire was to you?	-Prompt - length, did the questions seem appropriate
	d) If you were to need to complete the questionnaire again, is there any way that it could be improved	

6. CLOSING QUESTIONS	a) In general, how was your experience of participating in this research study?	-Prompts – previous research experience, what could be improved, what worked
	b) Why did you decide to take part in this study?	
	c) Is there anything else you would like to add about participating in this study?	
Thank the participant for their time.		

Supplementary Table 2: Group differences with scaled confidence intervals (complete case analysis)

Measure	CO validated sustained abstinence	Point prevalence (24h) abstinence	Smoking reduction
95% CI	-18.7%, 41.6%	-2.1%, 58.9%	24.3%, 80.4%
90% CI	-7.1%, 33.3%	3.6%, 53.4%	
80% CI	-0.9%, 28.2%		

Supplementary Table 3: Changes in GAD-7 and PHQ-9 items between baseline and follow-up

	Control group M (SD)	Intervention group M (SD)	80% CI for mean difference
GAD-7 items			
1. Feeling nervous, anxious or on edge	0.3 (1.7)	0.3 (1.1)	-0.9, 0.5
2. Not being able to stop or control worrying	0.6 (1.6)	0.9 (1.2)	-0.9, 0.5
3. Worrying too much about different things	0.4 (1.7)	0.8 (1.6)	-1.2, 0.5
4. Trouble relaxing	0.2 (1.5)	0.5 (1.4)	-1.0, 0.4
5. Being so restless that it is hard to sit still	0.6 (1.2)	0.5 (1.5)	-0.6, 0.7
6. Becoming easily annoyed or irritable	0.3 (0.6)	0.2 (1.3)	-0.4, 0.5
7. Feeling afraid as if something awful might happen	0.8 (1.3)	0.4 (1.1)	-0.2, 1.1

GAD-7 overall score	3.2 (8.3)	3.5 (6.6)	-4.2, 3.6
PHQ-9 items			
1. Little interest or pleasure in doing things	0.3 (0.9)	0.4 (0.9)	-0.6, 0.3
2. Feeling down, depressed, or hopeless	0.6 (0.9)	0.3 (1.0)	-0.2, 0.8
3. Trouble falling or staying asleep, or sleeping too much	-0.3 (1.2)	0.3 (1.1)	-1.1, 0.1
4. Feeling tired or having little energy	0.3 (1.2)	0.3 (1.4)	-0.6, 0.7
5. Poor appetite or overeating	0.4 (1.6)	0.7 (1.5)	-1.0, 0.5
6. Feeling bad about yourself – or that you are a failure or have let yourself or your family down	0.6 (1.8)	0.3 (1.2)	-0.6, 1.1
7. Trouble concentrating on things, such as reading the newspaper or watching television	0.3 (1.5)	0.0 (0.8)	-0.4, 0.9
8. Moving or speaking so slowly that other people could have noticed. Or the opposite.	0.3 (1.2)	0.3 (1.4)	-0.6, 0.7
9. Thoughts that you would be better off dead, or hurting yourself in some way	0.2 (0.4)	-0.2 (0.9)	0.1, 0.7
PHQ-9 overall score	2.2 (8.1)	1.6 (6.5)	-3.3, 4.4

M=Mean, SD=Standard Deviation, CI=Confidence Intervals

Supplementary Table 4: General mood and physical symptoms and adverse events as function of group assignment

	Control group M (SD)	Intervention group M (SD)	80% CI for mean difference
Mood and Physical symptoms			
Mouth sore	1.1 (0.3)	1.2 (0.8)	-0.4, 0.2
Constipation	1.3 (0.9)	1.9 (1.1)	-1.0, 0.0
Cough	1.3 (0.7)	1.3 (0.6)	-0.3, 0.3
Depression	2.2 (1.3)	2.7 (1.7)	-1.3, 0.2
Irritable	2.0 (0.9)	2.9 (1.3)	-1.4, -0.3
Anxious	2.3 (1.1)	2.5 (1.4)	-0.9, 0.3

Restless	1.6 (1.0)	2.3 (1.6)	-1.4, -0.1
Hungry	1.5 (1.0)	2.0 (1.1)	-1.0, 0.0
Poor concentration	2.3 (1.1)	2.7 (1.4)	-1.1, 0.2
3Poor sleep	-1.9 (1.1)	2.4 (1.6)	-1.2, 0.2
	% (n)	% (n)	80% CI for % difference
Adverse events			
Nausea	9.1 (2)	23.8 (5)	0.8, 29.2
Throat/mouth irritation	9.1 (2)	14.3 (3)	-7.9, 18.6
Irritation	18.2 (4)	38.1 (8)	2.3, 36.1
Depression	22.7 (5)	42.9 (9)	1.8, 36.8
Restlessness	9.1 (2)	28.6 (8)	12.6, 44.0
Poor concentration	27.3 (6)	38.1 (8)	-7.4, 28.2
Increased appetite	4.6 (1)	23.8 (5)	5.7, 33.2
Light headedness	9.1 (2)	14.3 (3)	-7.9, 18.6
Disturbed sleep	18.2 (4)	28.6 (6)	-6.2, 26.5
Dry mouth and throat	9.1 (2)	23.8 (5)	0.8, 29.2
Shortness of breath	18.2 (4)	19.1 (4)	-14.4, 16.3
Headache	18.2 (4)	19.1 (4)	-14.4, 16.3
Wheezing	0.0 (0)	9.5 (2)	0.7, 20.9
Cough	18.2 (4)	14.3 (3)	-18.4, 10.9
Phlegm	22.7 (5)	14.3 (3)	-23.4, 7.0
Other	0.0 (0)	4.8 (1)	-3.0, 14.7

Answer options 5-point Likert scale, range 1=not at all to 5= extremely, M=mean, SD=Standard Deviation, CI=Confidence Interval

Supplementary Table 5. Breakdown of intervention cost

Cost component	Cost per participant
Intervention group	
Training	
Preparation of training materials	£17
Staff cost (trainer) for face-to-face sessions	£29

Cost component	Cost per participant
Intervention group	
Training	
Staff cost (trainees) for both face-to-face training and NCSTS online training	£82
Consumables	£1
Total training cost	£129
Brief consultation	£3
Bespoke information leaflet	£8
e-cigarette	
Device	£11
e-liquid	£9
Total intervention cost (without training)	£31
Total intervention cost (with training)	£160
Control group	
Pharmacotherapies for smoking cessation	£4
Primary care related to smoking cessation	£20
Total smoking cessation cost	£24

Supplementary Table 6. Recruitment issues and mitigation strategies

Issue	Mitigation
1. Some Trust sites proved unsuitable to support the study after the trial commenced (e.g., seeing patients solely in their homes, not on site; not having spaces/rooms for patients and researchers to meet).	Identify and enrol only Trusts/sites which can support the study (as per protocol).
2. Small caseloads per clinician and low numbers of new referrals: recruitment sources were exhausted quickly at some sites.	Determine case load size and average number of new referrals to gauge how many clinicians per Trust should be engaged as a minimum.
3. Primary care: clinician had no availability to book in trial participants for several weeks.	Participating sites should be able to confirm that they can accommodate trial patients within 2-3 weeks.
4. Exclusion criteria relatively restrictive, specifically regarding 'patients currently also receiving treatment for a substance abuse disorder'.	Consider revising criterion to include patients receiving treatment for drug and alcohol use, unless it is the primary diagnosis.
5. Identification of participating sites was overall fairly opportunistic - better opportunities for recruitment, e.g., via	Develop a list of criteria or requirements for Trusts to sign up to before joining the

weekly clozapine clinics, were likely missed.	study and identify suitable sites using a checklist.
6. Sites offering comprehensive smoking cessation support as standard care were excluded.	Include sites irrespective of usual care standard, if other requirements to support recruitment are met (this being a pragmatic trial).
7. Best recruiting Trust: 3 participants/month (original target for full RCT: 8/month over 19 months).	Adjust target and increase number of Trusts involved based on an estimated recruitment rate of 3 participants/trust
8. Attrition rate	Add text messages as a mean of follow-up and use non-contingent incentives.



CONSORT checklist of information to include when reporting a pilot or feasibility trial

Section/Topic	Item No	Checklist item	Reported on page No
Title and abstract			
	1a	Identification as a pilot or feasibility randomised trial in the title	1
	1b	Structured summary of pilot trial design, methods, results, and conclusions (for specific guidance see CONSORT abstract extension for pilot trials)	2-3
Introduction			
Background and objectives	2a	Scientific background and explanation of rationale for future definitive trial, and reasons for randomised pilot trial	4-5
	2b	Specific objectives or research questions for pilot trial	5-6
Methods			
Trial design	3a	Description of pilot trial design (such as parallel, factorial) including allocation ratio	6
	3b	Important changes to methods after pilot trial commencement (such as eligibility criteria), with reasons	n/a
Participants	4a	Eligibility criteria for participants	7
	4b	Settings and locations where the data were collected	7
	4c	How participants were identified and consented	6-7
Interventions	5	The interventions for each group with sufficient details to allow replication, including how and when they were actually administered	8-9
Outcomes	6a	Completely defined pre-specified assessments or measurements to address each pilot trial objective specified in 2b, including how and when they were assessed	10-13
	6b	Any changes to pilot trial assessments or measurements after the pilot trial commenced, with reasons	n/a
	6c	If applicable, prespecified criteria used to judge whether, or how, to proceed with future definitive trial	10-13

Sample size	7a	Rationale for numbers in the pilot trial	13
	7b	When applicable, explanation of any interim analyses and stopping guidelines	n/a
Randomisation:			
Sequence generation	8a	Method used to generate the random allocation sequence	7-8
	8b	Type of randomisation(s); details of any restriction (such as blocking and block size)	7-8
Allocation concealment mechanism	9	Mechanism used to implement the random allocation sequence (such as sequentially numbered containers), describing any steps taken to conceal the sequence until interventions were assigned	7-8
Implementation	10	Who generated the random allocation sequence, who enrolled participants, and who assigned participants to interventions	6-7
Blinding	11a	If done, who was blinded after assignment to interventions (for example, participants, care providers, those assessing outcomes) and how	8
	11b	If relevant, description of the similarity of interventions	7-8
Statistical methods	12	Methods used to address each pilot trial objective whether qualitative or quantitative	12-13
Results			
Participant flow (a diagram is strongly recommended)	13a	For each group, the numbers of participants who were approached and/or assessed for eligibility, randomly assigned, received intended treatment, and were assessed for each objective	34. figure 1
	13b	For each group, losses and exclusions after randomisation, together with reasons	16
Recruitment	14a	Dates defining the periods of recruitment and follow-up	6, 9
	14b	Why the pilot trial ended or was stopped	n/a
Baseline data	15	A table showing baseline demographic and clinical characteristics for each group	34, Table 1
Numbers analysed	16	For each objective, number of participants (denominator) included in each analysis. If relevant, these numbers should be by randomised group	15-22

Outcomes and estimation	17	For each objective, results including expressions of uncertainty (such as 95% confidence interval) for any estimates. If relevant, these numbers should be by randomised group	15-22
Ancillary analyses	18	Results of any other analyses performed that could be used to inform the future definitive trial	15-22
Harms	19	All important harms or unintended effects in each group (for specific guidance see CONSORT for harms)	19
	19a	If relevant, other important unintended consequences	n/a
Discussion			
Limitations	20	Pilot trial limitations, addressing sources of potential bias and remaining uncertainty about feasibility	25
Generalisability	21	Generalisability (applicability) of pilot trial methods and findings to future definitive trial and other studies	23-25
Interpretation	22	Interpretation consistent with pilot trial objectives and findings, balancing potential benefits and harms, and considering other relevant evidence	22-25
	22a	Implications for progression from pilot to future definitive trial, including any proposed amendments	23-25
Other information			
Registration	23	Registration number for pilot trial and name of trial registry	3
Protocol	24	Where the pilot trial protocol can be accessed, if available	n/a
Funding	25	Sources of funding and other support (such as supply of drugs), role of funders	26
	26	Ethical approval or approval by research review committee, confirmed with reference number	6, 26

*We strongly recommend reading this statement in conjunction with the CONSORT 2010 Explanation and Elaboration for important clarifications on all the items. If relevant, we also recommend reading CONSORT extensions for cluster randomised trials, non-inferiority and equivalence trials, non-pharmacological treatments, herbal interventions, and pragmatic trials. Additional extensions are forthcoming: for those and for up to date references relevant to this checklist, see www.consort-statement.org.

Supplementary Table 7. Behaviour change techniques (BCTs) included in the intervention, coded against a 44-item taxonomy of BCTs used in behavioural smoking cessation interventions.

Specific focus on behaviour (B) and addressing motivation (M)	BCTs present	Instantiation in Intervention arm
BM1. Provide information on consequences of smoking and smoking cessation	Yes	Leaflet
BM2. Boost motivation and self-efficacy		
BM3. Provide feedback on current behaviour		
BM4. Provide rewards contingent on successfully stopping smoking		
BM5. Provide normative information about others' behaviour and experiences		
BM6. Prompt commitment from the client here and then		
BM7. Provide rewards contingent on effort or progress		
BM8. Strengthen ex-smoker identity		
BM9. Identify reasons for wanting and not wanting to stop smoking		
BM10. Explain the importance of abrupt cessation		
BM11. Measure expired-air carbon monoxide (CO) concentration		
Specific focus on behaviour (B) and maximizing self-regulatory capacity/skills (S)		
BS1. Facilitate barrier identification and problem solving	Yes	Leaflet
BS2. Facilitate relapse prevention and coping		
BS3. Facilitate action planning/develop treatment plan		
BS4. Facilitate goal setting	Yes	Verbal advice
BS5. Prompt review of goals		
BS6. Prompt self-recording		
BS7. Advise on changing routine		
BS8. Advise on environmental restructuring		

BS9. Set graded tasks		
BS10. Advise on conserving mental resources		
BS11. Advise on avoiding social cues for smoking		
Promote adjuvant activities (A)		
A1. Advise on stop-smoking medication		
A2. Advise on/facilitate use of social support		
A3. Adopt appropriate local procedures to enable clients to obtain free medication		
A4. Ask about experiences of stop smoking medication that the smoker is using		
A5. Give options for additional and later support	Yes	Verbal advice
General aspects of the interaction (R) focusing on the delivery of the intervention (D)		
RD1. Tailor interactions appropriately	yes	verbal advice
RD2. Emphasize choice	yes	verbal advice /leaflet
General aspects of the interaction (R) focusing on information gathering (I)		
RI1. Assess current and past smoking behaviour	yes	baseline questionnaire
RI2. Assess current readiness and ability to quit	yes	baseline questionnaire
RI3. Assess past history of quit attempts	yes	baseline questionnaire
RI4. Assess withdrawal symptoms		
General aspects of the interaction (R) focusing on general communication (C)		
RC1. Build general rapport		
RC2. Elicit and answer questions	yes	verbal advice
RC3. Explain the purpose of CO monitoring		
RC4. Explain expectations regarding treatment programme	yes	verbal advice/leaflet

RC5. Offer/direct towards appropriate written materials	yes	leaflet
RC6. Provide information on withdrawal symptoms		
RC7. Use reflective listening		
RC8. Elicit client views		
RC9. Summarize information/confirm client decisions	yes	verbal advice
RC10. Provide reassurance		

Intervention leaflet



How can this booklet help?

Your Stop Smoking Advisor has given you an e-cigarette. Here we tell you why and give you tips on how to use it. Please read it at home.

It's **easy to get started** as everything you need is included in your **beginner's kit**. In this booklet we'll talk you through:

- What is an e-cigarette
- What to expect from it
- How to set up your e-cigarette and
- How to use it correctly.

Show this booklet to your friend, family or carer, as they can offer a helping hand too.

So why not give e-cigarettes a go?

What's included?

Page 3 **What is an electronic cigarette?**

Page 9 **How to use your e-cigarette**

Page 15 **Maintaining your e-cigarette**

Page 17 **Where to get e-liquid**



2

Who uses e-cigarettes?

Almost **3 million people** use e-cigarettes in the UK – over half of these have now given up smoking.

What's in it for me?

- By **switching** to an e-cigarette, you are **greatly reducing the number of harmful chemicals** you are taking into your body.
- Lots of people find it more **enjoyable** than smoking!
- You may find that you're able to **taste things a bit better** again and that your **sense of smell improves**.
- You may also find that you're **saving a lot more money** by switching from cigarettes to your e-cigarette (see page 16 for how much you can expect to save).

Are e-cigarettes safer than smoking cigarettes?

Absolutely, when compared with smoking.

- There's **good, reliable scientific** evidence that e-cigarettes are a lot safer than cigarettes.
- Evidence shows that they are a **convenient way** for people to quit smoking.

4



Did you know... ?

People usually smoke cigarettes for nicotine. Nicotine is the stuff that makes you keep going back for more, but it's the tar and other harmful chemicals in tobacco smoke that causes the damage to your health.

What is an electronic cigarette?

(also known as 'e-cigarette')

- **E-cigarettes** are electronic devices that deliver nicotine in a vapour rather than in smoke.
- It is called **'vaping'** rather than smoking as there is no burning involved. The vapour can be inhaled in much the same way as smoke from a cigarette.
- The device is powered by a battery that heats a solution known as an e-liquid, that typically contains nicotine, propylene glycol (PG), vegetable glycerol (VG), plus flavours. All of these except nicotine are commonly used in foods.
- It's a much **cleaner** and **safer** way to get the hit you usually get from a cigarette.

By contrast, cigarette smoke contains over 5000 chemicals, many of which are poisonous and worsen your health.

Getting the nicotine without the other chemicals can really help your health!

3

- Major health authorities such as Public Health England, the Royal College of Physicians, the Royal College of GPs and charities like Cancer Research UK all **support** the use of e-cigarettes in adults.

- Using an e-cigarette is not completely without risk – very few things in life are entirely risk-free! But we do know that e-cigarettes are **much less harmful** than if you were to continue to smoke.
- Don't always believe what you read in the papers about exploding e-cigarettes! These are rare cases where people have not used their e-cigarette correctly (e.g. overcharged the battery) or they have bought one from a bad supplier.
- We have **tried and tested** the one included in your kit, and it's **fantastic for beginners**.

Is it similar to smoking?

- E-cigarettes give you nicotine the same way that a cigarette or roll-up does.
- You breathe in the vapour into your mouth and lungs and then blow it out again.
- But one puff on a cigarette gives you a bigger hit, which means you need to **learn** a new way to use an e-cigarette with more puffs to give you what you need.

5

How do I get started?

It's not as complicated as it looks! We have given you all you need in your kit to get you started.

What's included in your free kit:



- One Aspire PocketX all-in-one e-cigarette with built-in battery (you can get e-cigarettes in many different colours)
- A 0.6 ohm coil (also known as a cartridge) already installed for you
- One spare 1.2 ohm coil
- One micro USB charging cable
- A mouthpiece
- A manufacturer's user manual
- E-liquids

6

To get you started, we have given you three different flavours of e-liquids to choose from. These are just a selection of the many different types you can buy. There are lots of places you can purchase your e-liquid from; see end of booklet for some suggestions

What is the e-cigarette made up of?

This is the **mouthpiece** from which you vape

This is the **tank** where the e-liquid goes. The coil fits inside the tank

This is the **on/off button**



7

What is a coil/cartridge?

- A coil head or cartridge is made up of a coil of wire that heats up when an electric current is passed through it (like a very small electric heater).
- The coil is surrounded by cotton, which acts as a wick to bring e-liquid from the tank to the coil, where it evaporates to create the vapour.
- Coils come in different resistances measured in 'ohms'. They each produce a different vaping experience for the user.

What does e-liquid look like?

The e-liquid is in a small bottle with a screw-on cap. The liquid itself looks clear or slightly coloured. The liquid is poured into the tank of your e-cigarette.

Make sure you store your e-liquid with the cap screwed firmly on and out of reach of any children or pets.



8

How to use your e-cigarette

How to fill the e-cigarette with e-liquid:

Step 1

Unscrew the **top cap** from the tank

There is a **coil** already attached to the top cap



Step 2

Open a bottle of **e-liquid**. Pour the e-liquid carefully into the **tank**

Fill up to the line where it says **MAX**, but do not **over-fill** the tank beyond this line



Step 3

Screw the **mouthpiece, top cap** with the attached coil back into the tank securely. Do not **over-tighten** the top cap. If the top cap is too tight, when you remove it to re-fill the tank, the coil can unscrew as well.

Wait for **5-10 minutes** for the wick to **soak up the e-liquid**.



TOP TIP: Wipe away any spilled e-liquid with a dry cloth/tissue.

9

Turning the e-cigarette on/off

To turn the device on, press the on/off button 5 times. The button will flash 3 times to indicate when the device is on.

To turn the device off, press the on/off button 5 times. Again, the button will flash 3 times to indicate that the device is off.



Charging the e-cigarette

The on/off button will change colour depending on how much battery life is left.

The light around the button is **BLUE** when there is over 30% of battery power remaining.

The light around the button is **RED** when there is less than 30% power remaining.

How long does the battery last when charged?

When this device is fully charged, it will normally last for around 30 minutes of actual use. While this doesn't seem like much, it is the equivalent of almost 300 individual 6 second draws.

USB slot for charging the battery. Attach wire here



TOP TIP: Always charge your device at the end of the day. Your kit includes a USB wire and plug. This can be attached into a computer for charging. Otherwise, use the plug provided with the wire to attach to a mains socket. The slot for charging your device is at the base of the e-cigarette.

USE THE 3-PIN PLUG PROVIDED IN YOUR KIT TO CHARGE THE DEVICE.

Some smartphone or tablet chargers are **UNSAFE** for this device as the battery will be exposed to too high a current. If you use your own charger, make sure it does not provide an output of more than 800mA.

10

11

Your first use of the e-cigarette

So you've just filled the e-cigarette with e-liquid, screwed the top cap on and clicked the on button 5 times. You're ready to get going..

- As with most new things, it will probably seem a little strange the first time you use an e-cigarette – the weight and size of the device are different to a tobacco cigarette etc. – so you should be ready for this.
- Remember it took you time to learn to smoke a cigarette properly and you need to learn to vape too. It's not the same technique as smoking so be patient and keep going. Almost everyone gets there if they stick with it.
- Also, the vapour will probably affect a slightly different part of your throat than tobacco smoke which, at first, might confuse your body and make you cough (much like you probably did when you first smoked a tobacco cigarette), but this only lasts for a short time until your body adjusts to the change, so persevere.
- As you use the e-cigarette, you will notice that the level of the e-liquid in the tank will drop. When the level starts to reach the bottom of the glass "window", this is the time to refill the tank, to prevent burning the cotton wicks inside the coil.



- You may find that one or more of the flavours of e-liquid that we've given you aren't to your taste. After all not everyone likes Brussels sprouts either! Again, don't let this put you off. e-liquid comes in a wide **variety of flavours**. Trying different flavour/concentration combinations will help you work out what suits you best!

Most popular flavours

- According to research, the most popular e-liquid flavours are **tobacco, fruit and mint-menthol** flavour.
- Other popular flavours are **chocolate, coffee and vanilla**.

Davies et al. (2010)

Nicotine Strength - the number of milligrams of nicotine per millilitre in a bottle.

How soon after waking do you have your first cigarette?	Recommended nicotine concentration
within 5 minutes	18 mg/ml
6-30 minutes	12 or 18 mg/ml
31-60 minutes	6 or 12 mg/ml
After 60 minutes	6 mg/ml

12

13

How do you vape?

When you vape, the air will flow more freely through an e-cigarette than it does through a cigarette. If you puff on it the same way, you'll get too much vapour and it'll make you cough. **Breathe in slowly** – don't draw on your e-cigarette as hard as you do a cigarette.

Where can I get help?

Vape websites

There are a number of online forums where you can chat and ask questions to other e-cigarette users.

They may be able to recommend websites and vape shops, or provide advice and tips on using e-cigarettes. Some you could try are:

<http://ukvapers.org/>

<http://www.planetofthevapes.co.uk/>

Videos

You might like to try searching for NCSCT videos on YouTube for more great advice and information.

14

Maintaining your e-cigarette

What needs to be replaced, when it needs replacing and how much it costs.

You don't need to replace your e-cigarette every time you vape. It's yours to keep forever (or until the battery packs in, which isn't likely to be any time soon).

The two things that you will need to replace from time to time are the coils (sometimes called cartridges) and the **e-liquid** itself.

Coils

- How often you will need to replace these will depend a lot on how much you use the device, but a general rule of thumb, a coil will last you around **4 weeks** (you'll notice when it's time, because the amount of flavour you taste will start to drop off).
- Coils are **cheap** to replace and are available in most local vape shops and online (see end of booklet for where to get these from).

TOP TIP: For your Aspire PockeX e-cigarette, you can even buy the 0.6 ohm and 1.2 ohm coils online in a pack of 5. There are also other coils that are compatible with your device (e.g. you can use the 'Aspire Nautilus X' e-cigarette coils in 1.5 ohm/1.8 ohm as well). Just like e-liquids, the type of coil you use comes down to personal preference.

15

How long does e-liquid last?

Because e-liquid comes in different strengths, it's not quite as accurate to say how long a bottle will last you but, as an example, from a 10 ml bottle of e-liquid at 12mg/ml strength you will get the same amount of nicotine as from roughly 60 regular tobacco cigarettes.

How does it compare to how much I pay for cigarettes?

The main cost of an e-cigarette is the **device** itself – which you are getting for **free!**

The average cost of a bottle of e-liquid is around £3 – £4, which would usually last as long as 3 packs of pre-made tobacco cigarettes. This is the equivalent of one third of the average price of just one pack of pre-made cigarettes.

Once every month or so, you'll need to buy a new coil, which usually costs between £2 – £3.

The only additional cost is the electricity it takes to charge the device, which should be less than £1 per month.

Smoking a pack of cheap brand cigarettes each day costs around £10. The same amount of vaping would cost around £1.50.

16

Where can I get these replacements from?

Vape shops

- Did you know that you can buy your e-cigarette and the replacement coils and e-liquids from a 'vape shop'?
- Vape shops are specialists in all things e-cigarette. The people who run the shops are often helpful and can offer you advice on what e-liquid might suit your taste.
- They stock a wide variety of e-liquid flavours, from tobacco flavour to blueberry, mixed berries to menthol! They might even let you try them in store before you buy them.

They also offer technical help on how to set up and use your device. So if you ever get stuck, pop into a local store for a helping hand.

Online retailers

Another convenient way of getting your coils and e-liquids from is from the internet.

- It's a good way of buying your e-liquids in bulk, and having them delivered straight to your door.
- It's really cheap to buy them online too. If you need help purchasing these from the internet, ask your friend, family or carer to help.

17