## Varenicline versus nicotine replacement therapy for long-term smoking cessation: an observational study using the Clinical Practice Research Datalink

Neil M Davies,<sup>1,2,3\*</sup> Amy E Taylor,<sup>2,4</sup> Gemma MJ Taylor,<sup>5</sup> Taha Itani,<sup>1,6</sup> Tim Jones,<sup>7</sup> Richard M Martin,<sup>1,2,7</sup> Marcus R Munafò,<sup>1,6</sup> Frank Windmeijer<sup>1,8</sup> and Kyla H Thomas<sup>2</sup>

- <sup>1</sup>Medical Research Council Integrative Epidemiology Unit, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK
- <sup>2</sup>Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK
- <sup>3</sup>Department of Public Health and Nursing, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway
- <sup>4</sup>National Institute for Health Research Biomedical Research Centre, University Hospitals Bristol NHS Foundation Trust, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK
- <sup>5</sup>Department of Psychology, University of Bath, Bath, UK
- <sup>6</sup>UK Centre for Tobacco and Alcohol Studies, School of Experimental Psychology, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK
- <sup>7</sup>National Institute for Health Research Collaboration for Leadership in Applied Health Research and Care West, University Hospitals Bristol NHS Foundation Trust, Bristol, UK
- <sup>8</sup>Department of Economics, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK

\*Corresponding author neil.davies@bristol.ac.uk

**Declared competing interests of authors:** Neil M Davies, Amy E Taylor, Taha Itani and Marcus R Munafò report a grant from the Global Research Awards for Nicotine Dependence, which is an Independent Competitive Grants Programme supported by Pfizer Inc. (New York, NY, USA), the maker of varenicline. Marcus R Munafò reports grants from Rusan Pharma Ltd (Mumbai, India), and non-financial support from GlaxoSmithKline (Brentford, UK) outside the submitted work. Richard M Martin was a member of the Independent Scientific Advisory Committee of the Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency, which approves applications for Clinical Practice Research Datalink studies.

Published February 2020 DOI: 10.3310/hta24090

# **Plain English summary**

Varenicline vs. nicotine replacement therapy for smoking cessation Health Technology Assessment 2020; Vol. 24: No. 9 DOI: 10.3310/hta24090

NIHR Journals Library www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

# **Plain English summary**

Smoking is the number one avoidable cause of ill health and death. Experiments suggest that more smokers will quit after being given the drug varenicline than with any other smoking cessation treatment. However, most of the experiments used to license varenicline had a relatively short follow-up (< 1 year) and did not necessarily recruit participants who were representative of smokers seen in a general practice in the UK, who tend to be older, are sicker and more likely to have neuropsychiatric illnesses.

In this study, we investigated the outcomes of 287,079 patients prescribed varenicline or nicotine replacement therapy (e.g. nicotine patches and gum). We followed each patient for up to 4 years after they received their prescriptions and matched their data to information on deaths from the Office for National Statistics and hospital admissions. We investigated how often these patients subsequently attended their general practitioner, and how often they received a diagnosis of myocardial infarction, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, depression or anxiety in primary care.

We found that patients who were prescribed varenicline were much more likely to quit smoking up to 4 years after they received treatment and subsequently attended their general practitioner less frequently. These findings were robust across the three different analysis methods we used. We also found that patients prescribed varenicline were much less likely to be ill or to die than those prescribed nicotine replacement therapy. However, these results may be because the patients who were prescribed varenicline were much healthier before they received the prescription. Therefore, these differences in health are unlikely to be caused by taking varenicline or quitting smoking.

In conclusion, varenicline helped patients quit smoking, but there was little causal evidence that prescribing patients varenicline causally reduced rates of mortality or morbidity compared with prescribing nicotine replacement therapy.

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2020. This work was produced by Davies *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This issue may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts (or indeed, the full report) may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

### **Health Technology Assessment**

ISSN 1366-5278 (Print)

ISSN 2046-4924 (Online)

Impact factor: 3.819

Health Technology Assessment is indexed in MEDLINE, CINAHL, EMBASE, The Cochrane Library and the Clarivate Analytics Science Citation Index.

This journal is a member of and subscribes to the principles of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) (www.publicationethics.org/).

Editorial contact: journals.library@nihr.ac.uk

The full HTA archive is freely available to view online at www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/hta. Print-on-demand copies can be purchased from the report pages of the NIHR Journals Library website: www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

#### Criteria for inclusion in the Health Technology Assessment journal

Reports are published in *Health Technology Assessment* (HTA) if (1) they have resulted from work for the HTA programme, and (2) they are of a sufficiently high scientific quality as assessed by the reviewers and editors.

Reviews in *Health Technology Assessment* are termed 'systematic' when the account of the search appraisal and synthesis methods (to minimise biases and random errors) would, in theory, permit the replication of the review by others.

#### **HTA programme**

Health Technology Assessment (HTA) research is undertaken where some evidence already exists to show that a technology can be effective and this needs to be compared to the current standard intervention to see which works best. Research can evaluate any intervention used in the treatment, prevention or diagnosis of disease, provided the study outcomes lead to findings that have the potential to be of direct benefit to NHS patients. Technologies in this context mean any method used to promote health; prevent and treat disease; and improve rehabilitation or long-term care. They are not confined to new drugs and include any intervention used in the treatment, prevention or diagnosis of disease.

The journal is indexed in NHS Evidence via its abstracts included in MEDLINE and its Technology Assessment Reports inform National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidance. HTA research is also an important source of evidence for National Screening Committee (NSC) policy decisions.

#### This report

The research reported in this issue of the journal was funded by the HTA programme as project number 14/49/94. The contractual start date was in September 2015. The draft report began editorial review in May 2019 and was accepted for publication in October 2019. The authors have been wholly responsible for all data collection, analysis and interpretation, and for writing up their work. The HTA editors and publisher have tried to ensure the accuracy of the authors' report and would like to thank the reviewers for their constructive comments on the draft document. However, they do not accept liability for damages or losses arising from material published in this report.

This report presents independent research funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR). The views and opinions expressed by authors in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the NHS, the NIHR, NETSCC, the HTA programme or the Department of Health and Social Care. If there are verbatim quotations included in this publication the views and opinions expressed by the interviewees are those of the interviewees and do not necessarily reflect those of the authors, those of the NHS, the NIHR, NETSCC, the HTA programme or the Department of Health and Social Care.

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2020. This work was produced by Davies *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This issue may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts (or indeed, the full report) may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

Published by the NIHR Journals Library (www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk), produced by Prepress Projects Ltd, Perth, Scotland (www.prepress-projects.co.uk).

### Editor-in-Chief of Health Technology Assessment and NIHR Journals Library

Professor Ken Stein Professor of Public Health, University of Exeter Medical School, UK

### **NIHR Journals Library Editors**

**Professor John Powell** Chair of HTA and EME Editorial Board and Editor-in-Chief of HTA and EME journals. Consultant Clinical Adviser, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE), UK, and Senior Clinical Researcher, Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, University of Oxford, UK

**Professor Andrée Le May** Chair of NIHR Journals Library Editorial Group (HS&DR, PGfAR, PHR journals) and Editor-in-Chief of HS&DR, PGfAR, PHR journals

**Professor Matthias Beck** Professor of Management, Cork University Business School, Department of Management and Marketing, University College Cork, Ireland

Dr Tessa Crilly Director, Crystal Blue Consulting Ltd, UK

Dr Eugenia Cronin Senior Scientific Advisor, Wessex Institute, UK

Dr Peter Davidson Consultant Advisor, Wessex Institute, University of Southampton, UK

Ms Tara Lamont Director, NIHR Dissemination Centre, UK

Dr Catriona McDaid Senior Research Fellow, York Trials Unit, Department of Health Sciences, University of York, UK

Professor William McGuire Professor of Child Health, Hull York Medical School, University of York, UK

Professor Geoffrey Meads Professor of Wellbeing Research, University of Winchester, UK

Professor John Norrie Chair in Medical Statistics, University of Edinburgh, UK

**Professor James Raftery** Professor of Health Technology Assessment, Wessex Institute, Faculty of Medicine, University of Southampton, UK

Dr Rob Riemsma Reviews Manager, Kleijnen Systematic Reviews Ltd, UK

Professor Helen Roberts Professor of Child Health Research, UCL Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health, UK

Professor Jonathan Ross Professor of Sexual Health and HIV, University Hospital Birmingham, UK

**Professor Helen Snooks** Professor of Health Services Research, Institute of Life Science, College of Medicine, Swansea University, UK

Professor Ken Stein Professor of Public Health, University of Exeter Medical School, UK

**Professor Jim Thornton** Professor of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, University of Nottingham, UK

Professor Martin Underwood Warwick Clinical Trials Unit, Warwick Medical School, University of Warwick, UK

Please visit the website for a list of editors: www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/about/editors

Editorial contact: journals.library@nihr.ac.uk