



MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF SMOKE FREE POLICY IN MEDAN CITY: CASE STUDY OF MEDAN CITY

Putra Apriadi Siregar

Universitas Islam Negeri Sumatera Utara, Jl. William Iskandar Ps. V, Medan Estate, Kec.

Percut Sei Tuan, Kabupaten Deli Serdang, Sumatera Utara 20371, Indonesia

putraapriadisiregar@uinsu.ac.id

ABSTRACT

A smoke-free policy (SFP) has existed since 2014; after seven years of implementing smoke-free policy (SFP), it turns out that the implementation of the policy is not implemented properly where there are still many smokers, there are cigarette advertisements in SFP, butts are also still often found. This study aims to find out how the smoke-free policy (SFP) works in Medan City.. This study uses a cross-sectional study with a quantitative approach. The objects in this study are 160 places categorized as SFP based on regulations in the city of Medan. Data were collected by observing the SFP checklist. The results of this study indicate that there is still the smell of cigarette smoke in the SFP building in 19 (11%) places. There are still 64 smoking-free areas found by visitors who smoke around the SFP building. There are still cigarette advertisements in the SFP in 9 places, cigarette sellers in 28 places, and cigarette butts are still found in 41 places. The results of this study showed that the most violations of the smoking-free area policy occurred in child play station facilities (30.7%), public facilities (38.8%) and workplaces (50%). The smoking-free policy was most adhered to by health facilities (75%) and educational facilities (56%). The smoke-free policy (SFP) in Medan City has not implemented the concept of an SFP, especially related to the prohibition on cigarette advertising which has not been completely implemented, the ban on cigarette advertising at the SFP location has only been implemented in educational institutions and offices, such as banks and plazas.

Keywords: facilities; regulation; smoke free policy (SFP); smoking

INTRODUCTION

Even though nearly everyone is aware of the risks of cigarettes, the prevalence of smoking continues to climb (P. A. Siregar, 2015). In Indonesia, smoking is an extremely prevalent practice. In 2018, statistics from the Basic Health Research indicated that 24.3% of Indonesians smoked daily, and 4.6% smoked sometimes. In Indonesia, smoking is prevalent across all age groups; according to 2018 statistics from basic health research, 2.5% of children aged 5 to 9 years reported smoking for the first time, while 23.1% of children aged 10 to 14 years old reported smoking for the first time (Kementerian Kesehatan RI, 2018a).

Everyone has the right to health, which includes the right to breathe healthy air in order to achieve a certain level of health, even though some individuals pollute the air by engaging in smoking behaviours anywhere, including in public places where children, toddlers, the elderly, and pregnant women are highly susceptible to disease (Nasution, 2020; Veruswat, 2020). A smoke-free policy in public areas sterilizes the air, one of the measures to reduce air pollution caused by chemical-containing cigarette smoke (Nasution, 2022; S. F. Siregar, 2021).

In 2018, researchers in Indonesia surveyed the city of Semarang and discovered 3,453 outdoor cigarette ads, of which 74% were within 300 meters of schools (Nurjanah, 2020). Using both outdoor tobacco marketing and smoking behavior data, a 2019 study indicated that students at schools with a medium or high density of outdoor tobacco advertising were up to 2.16 times more likely to smoke than those at schools with a low density of outdoor tobacco advertising (Handayani, 2021)

The Indonesian government has begun preventing smoking habits through initiatives that promote WHO's MPOWER initiative, such as drafting a policy on Guidelines for smoke-free policy (SFP) and expecting other nations likewise to adopt a smoke-free policy (SFP). The Indonesian government has enacted a smoke-free policy (SFP) rule to decrease exposure to secondhand smoke and regulate the prevalence of smokers. It is anticipated that the presence of smoke-free policy (SFP) laws will manage smoking-permitted and smoking-free zones. Educational institutions, places of worship, employment, public transit, playgrounds, and health facilities are examples of facilities that feature a smoke-free policy (SFP) (Kementerian Kesehatan RI, 2018b).

Public spaces are a scope of smoke-free policy (SFP) defined in regional legislation. Public spaces are all closed areas accessible to the general public and areas that may be utilized for community activities that the government administers, the private sector, or the community. Article 7 letter g defines *public spaces* as modern and traditional marketplaces, tourist attractions, entertainment venues, hotels, restaurants and restaurants, recreation areas, sports facilities, bus stops, public transportation terminals, freight transport terminals, ports, and airports (Pemerintah Kota Medan, 2014).

Numerous variables impact the execution of a smoke-free policy (SFP). For instance, the West Aceh District Health Office has conducted several socialization efforts on No Smoking Areas, including a contest to design billboards and banners highlighting the dangers of smoking, health promotion, and the distribution of 42 standing banners to 42 Regional Work Units in Aceh Barat Regency. Educational institutions are required to give counselling to both students and instructors on no-smoking area laws to ensure that they are understood and enforced, as well as to be more forceful in enforcing the rules against smoking in the school environment (Hutapea, 2017; Pangulimang, 2016; Nurhayati, 2022).

To minimize smoking habit, it is necessary to create a no-smoking area, despite the fact that teens oppose the existence of Smoke free policy (SFP); thus, education and socialization are essential. 8, 9 Students and special officers do not supervise smoke-free zones, thus the implementation of Smoke free policy (SFP) in health care institutions falls into the category of being inadequate. In 2014, Medan City became one of the Indonesian regions to issue a Smoke free policy (SFP) under Medan City Regional Regulation No. 3. The presence of a Smoke free policy (SFP) in Medan City has no effect on the smoking habits of the locals. smoke-free Even though the goals of establishing a smoke-free area include raising awareness that smoking is harmful to health, reducing the number of smokers and middle-class novice smokers, achieving healthy and clean air quality free of cigarette smoke, and reducing morbidity and/or mortality by changing the behavior of the community and staff in the Medan City Government to live a healthy life. This study seeks to determine the monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of Medan City Regulation No. 34 of 2014 regarding Smoke free policy (SFP) in public facilities (health service facilities, teaching and learning places, children's playgrounds, places of worship, public transportation, and places of worship). work and public venues) in the city of Medan.

To minimize smoking habit, it is necessary to create a no-smoking area, despite the fact that teens oppose the existence of Smoke free policy (SFP); thus, education and socialization are essential (Susanti, 2019; Wiyarti, 2020). Students and special officers do not supervise smoke-free zones, thus the implementation of Smoke free policy (SFP) in health care institutions falls into the category of being inadequate (Marchel, 2019).

In 2014, Medan City became one of the Indonesian regions to issue a Smoke free policy (SFP) by Regional Regulation No. 3 of 2014. The presence of a Smoke free policy (SFP) in Medan City has no effect on the smoking habits of the locals. smoke-free Even though the goals of establishing a smoke-free area include raising awareness that smoking is harmful to health, reducing the number of smokers and middle-class novice smokers, achieving healthy and clean air quality free of cigarette smoke, and reducing morbidity and/or mortality by changing the behavior of the community and staff in the Medan City Government to live a healthy life. This study aims to determine the monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of Medan City Regulation No. 34 of 2014 regarding Smoke free policy (SFP) in public facilities (health service facilities, teaching and learning places, children's playgrounds, places of worship, public transportation, places of worship) in Medan City.

METHOD

This study employs a quantitative and qualitative cross-sectional design. This study's population is classified as Public Facilities in the Smoke-free policy (SFP). The sample was taken from the Regulation of the Mayor of Medan No. 34 of 2014 regarding the Smoke-free policy (SFP), which included 160 facilities, including health service facilities, teaching and learning facilities, children's playgrounds, places of worship, public transportation, workplaces, and public areas. This research used an observation guide (checklist) with questions to evaluate the implementation of the Smoke-free policy (SFP) regulation in the city of Medan.

In selected facilities that should apply Medan City Regulation No. 34 of 2014 concerning the Smoke-free policy (SFP), observations will be made regarding the application of Medan City Regulations No. 34 of 2014 concerning the Smoke-free policy (SFP) in their locations. The following data will be tabulated descriptively and will show the percentage of facilities that apply Medan City Regulation No. 34 of 2014 concerning the Smoke-free policy (SFP) relative to the percentage of facilities that allow smoking. This information will be disseminated by outlining the frequency and percentage of Smoke free policy (SFP) facilities that apply the Medan City Regulation No. 34 of 2014 concerning the Smoke-free policy (SFP), and cross-tabulation will be performed between SFP facilities and variables for the application of the Smoke-free policy (SFP). Data analysis was conducted by displaying facility compliance frequency and percentage distribution in implementing the smoke-free area policy in Medan City using the JASP 16 application. This study will also display a mapping of facility compliance in implementing a no-smoking area policy using QGIS 3.0.

RESULTS

Table 1.
 Monitoring Public Facilities in the Smoke-Free Policy (SFP) of Medan City

Variable (N=160)	Yes		No	
	f	%	f	%
People Smoking	34	21,25	126	78,75
Special Place to Smoke	13	8	147	92
Signs of no Smoking	95	59	65	41
Cigarette Smoke	19	12	141	88
Cigarette Ash or Lighter Holders	6	3,75	154	96,25
Cigarette Butts	42	26	118	74
Guests/Users of Smoking	64	40	96	60
Cigarette Ads	9	6	151	94
Cigarette Seller	28	17,5	132	82,5

Observations related to the smoke-free policy (SFP) in Medan City were carried out in 160 public facilities under Medan City Regulation No.34 of 2014 concerning smoke-free policy (SFP). Based on the results of the study showed that out of 160 facilities of the Smoke-free policy (SFP) that were observed, 34 facilities (21.25%) were found to be people smoking, and 126 (78.75%) were not found to be smoking people. There was 13 Smoke-free policy (SFP) that found signs of no smoking (8%) and no signs of no smoking in as many as 147 facilities (92%). The Smoke-free policy (SFP) facilities found that they smelled cigarette smoke in as many as 19 facilities (12%) and facilities that did not smell cigarette smoke in as many as 141 facilities (88%). The Smoke-free policy (SFP) facilities found/provided with cigarette ash or matches were six facilities (3.75%) and facilities that were not found/provided with cigarette ash or lighters as many as 154 facilities (96.25%).

Smoke-free policy (SFP) facilities found cigarette butts in as many as 41 facilities (26%), and 119 cigarette butts (74%) were found. Smoke-free policy (SFP) facilities found by guests/users of the facility are smoking as many as 64 facilities (40%), and facilities that are not found by guests/users of the facility are smoking as many as 96 facilities (60%). The Smoke-free policy (SFP) facilities found cigarette advertisements were nine facilities (3.75%) and facilities that were not found with cigarette advertisements, as many as 151 facilities (96.25%). The Smoke-free policy (SFP) facilities found by cigarette sellers were 28 facilities (17.5%), and facilities that cigarette sellers did not find were 132 facilities (82.5%). There were 13 facilities found in the Smoke-free policy (SFP) and 147 facilities found in smoking places (92%).

Tabel 2.
 Compliance rates of smoke-free policy in Medan City

Smoke-free facilities	Compliance rates of smoke-free policy							Compliance with all 6
	N	Cigarette Buts	No smoking	No sale	No advert	No smoke	No ashtrays	
Health facility	28	27	28	24	28	28	28	21
Fasilitas Educational facility	25	23	23	24	25	23	25	14
Child play station	13	4	5	8	12	10	13	4
Place of worship	15	12	15	13	15	15	14	11
Public facility	36	36	24	23	28	29	31	14
Public transport vehicle	9	9	3	9	9	4	9	4
Workplace	34	34	28	31	34	32	34	17



Figure 1: Mapping facilities that comply (sign green) and did not comply (sign red) with smoke-free policy in the city of Medan

The results of this study showed that the most violations of the smoking-free area policy occurred in child play station facilities (30.7%), public facilities (38.8%) and workplaces (50%). The smoking-free policy was most adhered to by health facilities (75%) and educational facilities (56%).

DISCUSSION

One of the policies to protect the public from exposure to cigarette smoke is to implement Smoke-free policy (SFP). The Smoke-free policy (SFP) application in public places is expected to maintain the health of active and passive smokers so that passive smokers feel comfortable in a smoke-free environment. The Smoke-free policy (SFP) implementation is inseparable from the commitment of the Regional Head; this commitment can be seen in routine monitoring activities and warnings to residents who do not heed these regulations.

Based on the results of the study, out of 160 facilities with a Smoke-free policy (SFP) that were observed, 34 facilities (21.25%) were found to be smoking, and there were no signs of no smoking in as many as 147 facilities (92%). Facilities for Smoke-free policy (SFP) which smelled of cigarette smoke were 19 facilities (12%), and facilities found/provided with cigarette ash or lighters were six facilities (3.75%). Smoke-free policy (SFP), which found 41 cigarette butts (26%) and facilities found by guests/users of facilities smoking as many as 64 facilities (40%). Smoke-free policy (SFP) facilities that found cigarette advertisements were nine facilities (6%), and Smoke-free policy (SFP) facilities found by cigarette sellers were 28 facilities (17.5%), facilities found by cigarette sellers were 132 facilities (82.5%) and facilities for Smoke-free policy (SFP) which found special smoking areas as many as 13 facilities (8%).

They are providing information about the dangers of smoking and socializing Smoke-free policy (SFP) is important; this is done to increase public knowledge about the Smoke-free policy (SFP) program. Good knowledge about the Smoke-free policy (SFP) will make people in Smoke-free policy (SFP) comply with the facility's no-smoking rules (Maharrani, 2015). For example, the implementation of the Smoke-free policy (SFP) policy at the Pandanaran Health Center in Semarang City can be said to be quite good, but there are still people who smoke in the Smoke-free policy (SFP) area. The Smoke-free policy (SFP) at the Pandanaran Health Center in Semarang City is one of the factors causing this problem (Fernando, 2016).

To achieve the Smoke-free policy (SFP) goals and objectives, the implementing officers conduct various activities such as outreach activities and campaigns on the Smoke-free policy (SFP), installing stickers, and providing a special smoking area in the office environment (Wahyuti, 2019; Goel S, 2018). However, the lack of socialization carried out by implementers to all designated Smoke-free policies (SFP) and the absence of a Regent Regulation regarding technical implementation instructions have made policy implementers not yet form a monitoring team for Smoke-free policy (SFP) so that violations still occur. The North Sumatra Provincial Government often visits to coordinate in various ways with Medan Haji Hospital, but no concrete action has been given against the action against Smoke-free policy (SFP) until now. The supervisor only warned the security guard as a security officer (P. A. Siregar, 2021). Many leaders of Smoke-free policy (SFP) facilities still do not know that their facilities are included in the Smoke-free policy (SFP) facilities; this will impact the implementation of Smoke-free policy (SFP) in these facilities (Yunarman, 2020; Asyary, 2018).

The application of the Regional Regulation on Smoke-free policy (SFP) in Medan City has not been optimal; this can be seen from the violations committed by the community or managers of public facilities even though the Regional Regulation on Smoke-free policy (SFP) in Medan

City has been issued since 2014. Implementing Medan City Regulation No. 34 of 2014 concerning Smoke-free policy (SFP) is facing quite difficult challenges because of the lack of community discipline. Moreover, the local regulation on Smoke-free policy (SFP) application in public facilities is still weak, especially in privately-owned offices and teaching and learning places such as universities. Many violations of the Smoke-free policy (SFP) in shopping centres, hotels and educational establishments, including many state-owned and private institutions, were also disobedient and violated the regulations Medan No.34 of 2014 concerning smoke-free policy (SFP) includes public transportation, public places, children's playgrounds, educational places and workplaces.

The city of Medan, an area that has established a Smoke-free policy (SFP) since 2014, seems to be less concerned about the issue of Smoke-free policy (SFP). Smoke-free policy (SFP) Supervision activities are still very difficult to find in Medan City. This can be seen from the fact that many still do not know about Medan City Regulation No. 34 of 2014 concerning the Smoke-free policy (SFP), so they continue to smoke under the Smoke-free policy (SFP). Medan City Regulation No. 34 of 2014 concerning Smoke-free policy (SFP) also has not implemented the concept of Smoke-free area, especially related to the prohibition of placing cigarette advertisements in its entirety, the ban on cigarette advertisements for Smoke-free policy (SFP) locations has only been implemented in educational institutions and offices, such as banks and plazas. Cigarette advertisements are still easy to find along roads in Medan City and around office areas and educational institutions; there are still many cigarette advertisements, especially outdoor (non-mass) advertisements, even though it is public places that should not be allowed have cigarettes advertisements under regulations.

The Smoke-free policy (SFP) application is carried out through outreach to the public using presentation media, billboards, sticker banners, leaflets, publications in the mass media, and community groups. However, it has not reached public facilities visited by smokers, so smokers do not know the area their smoking area is one of the Smoke-free policies (SFP). The application of a Smoke-free policy (SFP) requires the support of various parties or stakeholders. To determine the success of the Smoke-free policy (SFP), monitoring and evaluation need to be carried out so that various interventions can be implemented. The application of a Smoke-free policy (SFP) without commitment and support from various parties will be difficult to implement, and a Smoke-free policy (SFP) can also protect passive smokers while the application of a Smoke-free policy (SFP) allows reducing active smokers.

Even though there are stickers/writings/posters ordering people not to smoke, people can still be seen smoking in the Smoke-free policy (SFP). In this case, the team tasked with overseeing the no-smoking area policy must monitor smokers who smoke in the Smoke-free policy (SFP). Availability of resources is one of the important factors in implementing a policy (Salehudin, 2020). The availability of adequate personnel to carry out socialization and supervise the implementation of a policy will contribute greatly to achieving a policy, including the Smoke-free policy (SFP) policy So that people's smoking behaviour. The forms of support in implementing the Smoke-free policy (SFP) vary according to their respective duties and functions. The principal, as the highest leader in the school, is an example for school residents, such as not smoking in school, not selling cigarettes, and providing socialization, coaching, and supervision.

The disobedience of officers and visitors to the Smoke-free policy (SFP) regulations is due to the absence of applicable initiatives and sanctions, so they cannot have a deterrent effect on violators of the rules that implement this Smoke-free policy (SFP) policy not going well (Ehan,

2015). The health office must coordinate with various parties with the power to enforce the community and facility managers who violate policies in facilities designated as Smoke-free policy (SFP) facilities. Sanctions from the government and the management of Smoke-free policy (SFP) facilities will greatly impact the Smoke-free policy (SFP) implementation in Medan City.

During the five years of the Medan City Regulation No. 34 of 2014 concerning Smoke-free policy (SFP), however, its implementation is still very far from expectations. Medan City Regulation No. 34 of 2014 concerning Smoke-free policy (SFP) states that there are sanctions if promoting cigarettes in Smoke-free policy (SFP) if minor violations will receive administrative sanctions in the form of a written or verbal warning, and a warrant or warning. Smoking in the Smoke-free policy (SFP) will be punished with imprisonment for 3 (three) days or a maximum penalty. In enforcing the Regional Regulation on Smoke-free policy (SFP), an evaluation should be carried out by the Regional Government of the City of Medan so that the regulation can be maximized and the purpose of establishing a Smoke-free policy (SFP) can occur. The Smoke-free policy (SFP) regulates smokers not to smoke in eight non-smoking areas to protect passive smokers from exposure to cigarette smoke and prevent the birth of new smokers, especially beginners. The Regional Regulation on Smoke-free policy (SFP) enforcement must be optimized by providing strict sanctions and rewards for those who care or violate them. Good and strict policy support is policy support carried out with high target group commitment, policy support that has sanctions for violators, and these sanctions are carried out with full commitment by the target, and Sanctions for students in the form of a written warning (Thurston, 2019); .

Law 36 of 2009 has an explanatory article that speaks of two places, such as in the workplace and other public places, every area of the Smoke-free policy (SFP) should provide a smoking room. However, in Medan City, only a few facilities that implement a Smoke-free policy (SFP) do not provide smoking rooms; this makes smokers found smoking in areas or designated smoke-free areas. Many people still smoke under the Smoke-free policy (SFP); it is assumed that law enforcement in implementing the Medan City Regulation No. 34 of 2014 concerning Smoke-free policy (SFP) is still not implemented, and even government-owned agencies have smoking employees in the area. Smoke-free policy (SFP). Weak Smoke-free policy (SFP) implementation in Medan City cannot be separated from law enforcement that is not running well. This is due to the lack of officers in the field and the lack of budget. In terms of the lack of officers being an obstacle, the operating budget for typing (minor crimes) is also not small. The local government regulation of the Smoke-free policy (SFP) application is considered one of the important efforts in controlling the consumption of tobacco products. The city of Medan should be clean from cigarette smoke, from the household environment to public spaces. Therefore, the participation of citizens must not smoke under the Smoke-free policy (SFP), and if they encounter people who smoke under the Smoke-free policy (SFP), they are expected to report to the team of leaders of the Medan City Smoke-free policy (SFP).

CONCLUSION

The implementation of the Smoke free policy (SFP) in Medan City is still not carried out; this can be seen from the many facilities that have become the Smoke free policy (SFP) in Medan City; there are still people smoking, the smell of cigarette smoke, cigarette butts and cigarette ashtrays in smoke-free areas. Medan City Regulation No.34 of 2014 concerning Smoke free policy (SFP) has also not implemented the concept of non-smoking areas, especially related to the prohibition of cigarette advertising has not been implemented thoroughly the ban on

cigarette advertisements for Smoke free policy (SFP) locations has only been implemented in educational institutions and offices, such as banks and plazas.

The city of Medan, an area that has established a Smoke-free policy (SFP) since 2014, seems to be less concerned about the issue of a Smoke-free policy (SFP). Smoke-free policy (SFP) Supervision activities are still very difficult to find in Medan City. This can be seen from the fact that many still do not know about Medan City Regulation No. 34 of 2014 concerning the Smoke-free policy (SFP), so they continue to smoke under the Smoke-free policy (SFP). The Medan City Government must immediately crack down on facilities that violate the Smoke-free policy (SFP) By-laws in Medan City, especially regarding the presence of people who smoke in Smoke-free policy (SFP) facilities and cigarette sellers at the Smoke-free policy (SFP) facility. Does it mean that sanctions exist? However, the implementation of the enforcement does not yet exist. So that people get the right to breathe clean air without cigarette smoke in Medan City. Smoke-free policy (SFP) facilities in Medan City must have the courage to fully implement Smoke-free policy (SFP) regulations so that visitors get the right to breathe clean air without cigarette smoke.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Researchers would like to thank the Ministry of Religious Affairs through Universitas Islam Negeri Sumatera Utara (UINSU) for providing grant assistance in this study. Researchers would like to thank the Medan City government for helping the smooth running of this research, and all facility managers included in the Smoke-Free Area (SFA) in Medan city.

REFERENCE

- Asyary, A. (2018). Compliance study of hotel and nightclub smoke-free zones in Bogor City, Indonesia. *Tob Prevalence Cessat*, 4(25), 1–3. <https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.18332/tobprevalence/2018-04-01>
- Ehan. (2015). Implementasi Kebijakan Pemerintah Tentang Penetapan Kawasan Tanpa Rokok Studi pada Rumah Sakit Umum Daerah Undata Propinsi Sulawesi Utara'. *Jurnal Katalogis*, 3(6), 58–67.
- Fernando, R. (2016). Implementasi Kebijakan Kawasan Tanpa Rokok Di Puskesmas Pandanaran Kota Semarang. *Journal Of Public Policy And Management Review*, 5(2), 1–13.
- Goel S, S. D. (2018). Compliance with Smoke-Free Legislation and Smoking Behaviour: Observational Field Study from Punjab, India. *Tob Control*, 27(4), 407–413. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2016-053559>
- Handayani, N. (2021). The Implementation of Semarang City Local Government Regulation Number 3 of 2013 Concerning Tobacco-Free Areas. *Annals of Tropical Medicine and Public Health*, 24(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/http://doi.org/10.36295/ASRO.2021.24114>
- Hutapea, C. (2017). Hubungan Antara Pengetahuan Dan Sikap Dengan Tindakan Terhadap Kebijakan Kawasan Tanpa Rokok Pada Siswa Di SMP Kristen Tateli. *KESMAS*, 6(3), 1–13.
- Kementerian Kesehatan RI. (2018a). *Laporan Nasional Riskesdas 2018*. Jakarta : Kementerian Kesehatan RI.
- Kementerian Kesehatan RI. (2018b). *Pedoman Penerapan Kawasan Tanpa Rokok*.

Kementerian Kesehatan RI.

- Maharrani. (2015). Studi Implementasi Kebijakan Larangan Merokok Di Universitas Andalas Tahun 2012. *Jurnal Kesehatan*, 9(1), 3–9.
- Marchel, Y. A. (2019). Implementasi Kawasan Tanpa Rokok Sebagai Pencegahan Merokok Pada Remaja Awal. *Jurnal Promkes*, 7(2), 144–155.
- Nasution, F. (2020). Persepsi Pesan Gambar Pada Bungkus Rokok Dan Perilaku Merokok Remaja Di Kota Medan. *Scientific Periodical of Public Health and Coastal*, 2(2), 107–117. <https://doi.org/10.30829/contagion.v2i2.8530>
- Nasution, F. (2022). Implementation of the smoke-free policy in Medan City, Indonesia: Compliance and challenges. *International Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 13(30), 1–6. https://doi.org/10.4103/ijpvm.IJPVM_106_20
- Nurhayati. (2022). Exposure to Outdoor Tobacco Advertisements Near Home is Associated with Smoking among Youth in Indonesia. *The Asian Pacific Journal of Cancer Prevention (APJCP)*, 23(7), 2179–2183. <https://doi.org/10.31557/APJCP.2022.23.7.2179>
- Nurjanah. (2020). Density of tobacco advertising around schools. *Int J Tuberc Lung Dis*, 24(1), 674–680. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.5588/ijtld.19.0574>
- Pangulimang. (2016). Perilaku Pelajar Tentang Kebijakan Kawasan Tanpa Rokok di SMA Negeri 1 Siau Timur Kabupaten Kepulauan Siau Tagulandang Biaro. *Ikmas*, 8(3), 1–10.
- Pemerintah Kota Medan. (2014). *Peraturan Walikota Medan No 35 Tahun 2014 tentang Petunjuk Teknis Pelaksanaan Peraturan Daerah Kota Medan Nomor 3 Tahun 2014 Tentang Kawasan Tanpa Rokok*.
- Salehudin, W. (2020). Implementasi Kebijakan Kawasan Tanpa Rokok Oleh Dinas Kesehatan Kabupaten Berau Di Kecamatan Tanjung Redeb. *EJournal Administrasi Publik*, 8(4), 4584–4594.
- Siregar, P. A. (2015). *Determinan Perilaku Merokok Siswa Sekolah Dasar di Desa Simatahari Kecamatan Kota Pinang Kabupaten Labuhan Batu Selatan*. Universitas Sumatera Utara.
- Siregar, P. A. (2021). Implementasi Peraturan Gubernur Nomor 35 Tahun 2012 Tentang Kawasan Tanpa Rokok: Studi Kasus Di Rumah Sakit Umum Haji. *INOVASI: Jurnal Politik Dan Kebijakan*, 18(2251–263).
- Siregar, S. F. (2021). The Effect of Image Message Perception on Cigarette Background and The Intention to Stop Smoking Teenagers. *Communicare : Journal of Communication Studies*, 8(1), 41–50. <https://doi.org/10.37535/101008120213>
- Susanti, Y. (2019). Hubungan Antara Perilaku Merokok Pelajar Dengan Kebijakan Kawasan Tanpa Rokok. *Jurnal Ilmiah Permas*, 9(3), 207–212.
- Thurston. (2019). A randomized controlled efficacy trial of a smoking prevention programme with Grade 8 students in high schools?. *International Journal of Educational Research. Elsevier*, 93(1), 23–32.
- Veruswat, M. (2020). Perceived community support about the implementation of a smoke-free

- environment regional regulations in the Tegal municipality. *Family Medicine & Primary Care Review*, 22(3), 222–227. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.5114/fmPCR.2020.98250>
- Wahyuti, W. (2019). Monitoring Compliance and Examining Challenges of a Smoke-free Policy in Jayapura, Indonesia. *J Prev Med Public Health*, 52(6), 427–432. <https://doi.org/10.3961/jpmph.19.240>
- Wiyarti, W. (2020). Faktor-Faktor yang Berhubungan dengan Penerapan Kawasan Tanpa Rokok (KTR) di UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta Tahun 2019. *Media Penelitian Dan Pengembangan Kesehatan*, 30(3), 225–232.
- Yunarman, S. (2020). Compliance with Smoke-Free Policy and Challenges in Implementation: Evidence from Bengkulu, Indonesia. *Asian Pac J Cancer Prev*, 21(9), 2647–2651. <https://doi.org/10.31557/APJCP.2020.21.9.2647>