Chronic diseases (e.g., heart disease, stroke, cancer, diabetes) are the leading cause of morbidity and mortality in the United States, and tobacco use is one of the leading preventable risk factors for chronic disease. In addition to tobacco, other chronic disease risks often covary with preventable causes.1

1. Goal-setting and prevention promotion or action by using these concepts will result in a healthier population.  
2. Tobacco control efforts are coordinated by the CDC’s Tobacco Control Program (TCP) as part of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention’s (CDC) National Tobacco Control Program (NTCP).

**Study Description**

**Background**

CDC Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion website: http://www.cdc.gov/chronicdisease

**Methods**

**Results (continued)**

Overall, there were greater numbers of collaborative activities conducted within the programs (Table 1) and resourced at the point of service of the community.

**Key Facilitators of Collaboration**

Collaborative efforts were categorized into two ways: overall, there was low to medium collaboration across chronic disease programs.

**Analysis**

Data were analyzed using NVivo 10.
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