



Adolescents' reactions to, and perceptions of, dissuasive cigarettes: A focus group study in Scotland

Journal:	<i>Drugs: Education, Prevention & Policy</i>
Manuscript ID	CDEP-2019-0139.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original papers
Keywords:	Dissuasive Cigarettes, Tobacco Control, Focus Groups, Adolescents

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

ABSTRACT

The cigarette stick, as the primary form of packaging and the object of consumption, is an increasingly important marketing tool for tobacco companies. It could, however, also be used to communicate health messaging. We therefore explore adolescents' perceptions of cigarettes designed to dissuade smoking. Eight focus groups were conducted with 16-17 year-olds in Scotland ($n=36$) between November 2017 and November 2018. Groups were segmented by gender and smoking status. Participants were shown four dissuasive cigarettes; one displaying the warning 'Smoking kills'; one featuring the word 'TOXIC' and a skull and crossbones image; and two unattractively colored cigarettes (darker and lighter green). For comparison, participants were also shown a standard cigarette (white cigarette paper and imitation cork filter). All four dissuasive cigarettes were considered less attractive and more harmful than the standard cigarette, particularly among never-smokers. Some participants considered the green cigarettes to be ugly, and the on-cigarette warnings to be embarrassing and off-putting. Although reactions were mostly negative for all four dissuasive cigarettes, participants considered the on-cigarette warnings more off-putting than the green cigarettes. Participants did not generally believe that the dissuasive cigarettes would encourage cessation among established smokers, but that they may deter uptake among young people.

1 INTRODUCTION

2 As countries worldwide are increasingly adopting standardized tobacco packaging (six
3 countries to date), or introducing large pictorial health warnings on packaging (over 100
4 countries to date), the cigarette stick has assumed greater importance as a marketing tool
5 (Moodie, Hoek, Scheffels, Gallopel-Morvan & Lindorff, 2018; Moodie et al., 2019b). This is
6 perhaps best demonstrated by the significant global growth of ‘capsule’ cigarettes, which
7 contain one or more capsules in the filter that can be burst to change the flavor (Moodie,
8 Thrasher, Cho, Barnoya & Chaloupka, 2019). Other cigarette designs, such as longer and
9 slimmer cigarettes, are often perceived as stylish, particularly among female smokers
10 (Anderson, Glantz & Ling, 2005; Carpenter Wayne & Connolly, 2005; Doxey & Hammond,
11 2011). Tobacco companies have a long history of exploiting any gaps in tobacco control
12 legislation (WHO, 2009), and recent studies suggest that they are also doing so in markets with
13 standardized packaging, particularly via filter innovation (Moodie et al., 2018). For example,
14 aside from the introduction of new capsule brand variants in the United Kingdom (UK), one
15 tobacco company has introduced cigarettes with star shaped filter tips, named Sterling Dual
16 Star Edition (Figure 1).

17 [Figure 1]

18 The UK’s standardized packaging legislation requires cigarettes to have a white or
19 imitation cork filter and white paper casing (Department of Health, 2016; Moodie et al., 2019a).
20 The legislation also permits the display of a brand variant name in a standardized font just
21 below the filter, unlike in Australia and New Zealand where only an alphanumeric code can be
22 displayed (WHO, 2018). Although a ban on flavors in cigarettes, including flavor-changing
23 capsules, will take effect in May 2020, there have been no other attempts to control the design
24 of cigarettes in the UK (UK Government, 2016). There is a growing body of evidence,

1
2
3 25 however, which suggests that ‘dissuasive cigarettes’ provide a further opportunity to promote
4
5 26 cessation and reduce uptake, and can transfer some of the health messaging from the secondary
6
7 27 packaging (e.g. pictorial and written health warnings on the outer packaging) onto the actual
8
9 28 object of consumption. Suggested dissuasive designs include unattractively colored cigarettes
10
11 29 (e.g. green and yellow) and on-cigarette warnings (e.g. average minutes of life lost from
12
13 30 smoking each cigarette, smoking kills, short and long-term harms, and financial and social
14
15 31 costs) (Drovandi, Teague, Glass, & Malau-Aduli, 2019a, 2019b; Gendall, Eckert, & Louviere,
16
17 32 2016; Hassan & Shiu, 2013; Moodie, Hiscock, Thrasher & Reid, 2018).

22 33 Dissuasive cigarettes are considered a low cost opportunity to reach consumers at the
23
24 34 point of consumption (Moodie, 2018). They are supported by research with consumers,
25
26 35 marketing experts, and healthcare practitioners, with findings suggesting that they reduce the
27
28 36 appeal of smoking and intentions to try cigarettes, and increase perceptions of harm and
29
30 37 cessation (Drovandi, et al., 2019a, 2019b, 2019c; Hassan & Shiu, 2013; Hoek, Scheffels,
31
32 38 Gallopel-Morvan & Lindorff, 2019; Gendall, Eckert & Louviere, 2016; Lund & Scheffels,
33
34 39 2018; Moodie, 2016; Moodie, MacKintosh, Gallopel-Morvan, Hastings, & Ford, 2016; Moodie
35
36 40 et al., 2017b; Moodie, Hiscock, Thrasher & Reid, 2018; Moodie, Hoek; Moodie et al., 2019b;
37
38 41 Moodie, Purves, McKell & Andrade, 2015). Recent research has also suggested that the ability
39
40 42 of dissuasive cigarettes to deter young people from smoking may be enhanced through the
41
42 43 inclusion of images (e.g. skull and crossbones warning symbol), rather than just a colour or
43
44 44 text warning (Gallopel-Morvan, Droulers, & Pantin-Sohier, 2019).

50 45 There are at least five reasons why adolescents are an important target audience for
51
52 46 dissuasive cigarettes. First, adolescents have been an important target market for tobacco
53
54 47 companies for decades (Ford, Moodie, MacKintosh, & Hastings, 2013; Hastings &
55
56 48 MacFadyen, 2000; Kotnowski & Hammond 2013; MacFadyen, Hastings & MacKintosh,
57
58 49 2001), and this continues to be the case through innovations such as capsule cigarettes (Moodie

1
2
3 50 et al., 2019). Second, adolescents often obtain single cigarettes, commonly from friends or
4
5 51 family members, or by purchasing single cigarettes from retail outlets, including in countries
6
7 52 where this is not permitted (Donaghy et al., 2013; Tjelta, Ritchie & Amos, 2016; Wackowski
8
9 53 et al., 2017). In doing so, adolescents may therefore avoid the on-pack pictorial health warnings
10
11 54 or dissuasive influence of standardized packaging. Third, with prices continuing to increase in
12
13 55 many markets, single cigarettes are an increasingly affordable option for price-sensitive young
14
15 56 people. In the UK, for instance, tobacco was 30% less affordable in 2017 than in 2007 (NHS
16
17 57 Digital, 2018), and prices have continued to rise after standardized packaging was implemented
18
19 58 (Critchlow et al., 2019). Fourth, as of May 2017, a minimum pack size of 20 factory-made
20
21 59 cigarettes and 30 grams of rolling tobacco became mandatory across the EU, which has
22
23 60 removed the option of the smaller and more affordable pack sizes favored by young people
24
25 61 (e.g. 10 cigarettes or 12.5 grams of rolling tobacco) (Centre for Tobacco Control Research,
26
27 62 2012). Finally, research has found that the cigarette itself may be considered cool or stylish
28
29 63 among adolescents, particularly slim cigarettes, those with decorative designs, and capsule
30
31 64 cigarettes (Ford, Moodie, MacKintosh & Hastings, 2014; Moodie, Ford, MacKintosh &
32
33 65 Purves, 2014). It is therefore possible that this communicative power could be used to promote
34
35 66 health behaviors, while simultaneously removing an opportunity to promote tobacco brands
36
37 67 and smoking.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 68 While previous research consistently suggests that dissuasive cigarettes reduce the appeal
46
47 69 of smoking, there remain gaps in the evidence. There is limited qualitative research with
48
49 70 adolescents, despite their importance as a target audience. In addition, few studies have
50
51 71 examined the influence of dissuasive cigarettes in a market where standardized packaging is
52
53 72 mandatory (Drovandi et al., 2019a, 2019b, 2019c), or the effect of including warning images
54
55 73 on the cigarette. In this study, we therefore explore perceptions of, and responses to, four
56
57 74 dissuasive cigarette designs among adolescents in Scotland. This population is important given
58
59
60

1
2
3 75 that the Scottish Government plans to review the evidence on dissuasive cigarettes as part of
4
5 76 their current tobacco control plan (Scottish Government, 2018).
6
7
8
9 77

10 11 78 **METHODS**

12 13 14 79 **Design and sample**

15
16 80 Semi-structured focus groups were conducted with 16-17 year olds in secondary schools in
17
18 81 Scotland (Stirling, West Lothian and North Ayrshire), between November 2017 (six months
19
20 82 after standardized packaging became mandatory) and November 2018 (18 months after
21
22 83 standardized packaging became mandatory). This timeframe was determined by the speed of
23
24 84 response by local authorities and schools, and availability to conduct the groups (e.g.
25
26 85 accounting for school holidays). The focus groups covered both reactions to standardized
27
28 86 packaging (reference removed for anonymization) and alternative methods of discouraging
29
30 87 smoking uptake (e.g. dissuasive cigarettes and audio warnings on packs). Only the data related
31
32 88 to dissuasive cigarettes are reported here. In return for taking part, all participants were given
33
34 89 the opportunity to enter a ballot to win a personal computer tablet.

35
36
37
38
39 90 As with previous research on tobacco packaging, groups were segmented by gender
40
41 91 (Ford et al., 2013a; Ford et al., 2013b) and smoking status (never smoker, ever smoker)
42
43 92 (Drovandi et al., 2019a) using a pre-group questionnaire. Participants were asked how often
44
45 93 they smoked, with five response options ranging from '*I have never smoked, not even a puff or*
46
47 94 *two*' to '*I smoke every day*' (Bauld et al., 2017). Those who selected '*I have never smoked not*
48
49 95 *even a puff or two*' were categorized as never-smokers, and those who selected any other option
50
51 96 were categorized as 'ever-smokers'.
52
53
54

55
56 97 Eight focus groups were conducted, comprising three ever-smoker groups (two female,
57
58 98 one male) and five never-smoker groups (three male, two female). Due to a fault with the
59
60

1
2
3 99 recording equipment, the section on dissuasive cigarettes was not captured from one of the
4
5 100 never-smoker female groups. Therefore, only seven groups were used in the analysis, providing
6
7
8 101 a final sample of 36 participants (Table 1).
9

10 102
11
12 103 [Table 1]
13

14 104

15 105 **Materials**

16
17
18
19
20 106 Participants were exposed to, and given the **chance to handle**, five cigarettes. Four of the
21
22 107 cigarettes had designs intended to be dissuasive: (1) a cigarette with the text warning ‘smoking
23
24 108 kills’; (2) a cigarette with the text message ‘TOXIC’ and a skull and cross bones image; (3) a
25
26 109 dark green cigarette; and (4) a lighter green cigarette’ (Figure 2). The warning ‘smoking kills’
27
28 110 was chosen as this message is commonly communicated by public health bodies (e.g. World
29
30 111 Health Organization, 2019), it is frequently recalled by adolescents from the outer packaging
31
32 112 (Moodie, MacKintosh & Hastings, 2013), and it is a design used in previous dissuasive
33
34 113 cigarette research (Moodie et al., 2015; Moodie et al., 2019). **The green cigarettes were chosen**
35
36 114 **based on previous research, where they have been deemed to be unappealing (Hoek et al., 2016;**
37
38 115 **Lund & Scheffels, 2018; Moodie et al., 2018b).** We featured two green designs to examine
39
40 116 whether colour tone influenced reactions. **The ‘TOXIC’ design, a combination unique to this**
41
42 117 **study, was intended to show cigarettes as being dangerous and harmful, and therefore featured**
43
44 118 **language and iconography that is often mandated on (or associated with) other hazardous and**
45
46 119 **harmful substances (e.g. on chemicals such as bleach) (Health and Safety Executive, 2019).**
47
48
49
50 120 While pairing both an image of a skull and crossbones and the wording ‘TOXIC’ is unique to
51
52 121 this study, the image used is similar to a design previously investigated (Gallopel-Morvan et
53
54 122 al., 2019). We also included a ‘standard’ cigarette with an imitation cork filter to provide a
55
56 123 comparator to the dissuasive cigarettes.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 124 The research team made the five cigarettes using specially designed printed stickers,
4
5 125 which were applied to the cigarettes. The cigarette paper on each sticker had the wording
6
7
8 126 'Brand, King Size' below the filter in a standardised font, where the brand name would usually
9
10 127 appear, similar to how brand variant name would appear on cigarette sticks in the UK post-
11
12 128 standardised packaging. This approach is consistent with previous research on dissuasive
13
14 129 cigarettes (Moodie et al., 2017) and ensured that the presence of a recognizable brand name
15
16
17 130 did not influence perceptions or reactions.
18
19

20 131
21
22 132 [Figure 2]
23

24 133

25 134 **PROCEDURE**

26
27 135 Ethical approval was obtained from [Institution name removed for blind review]. Permission
28
29 136 to conduct the research was sought from local authorities and, once obtained, schools in those
30
31 137 jurisdictions were contacted by letter and followed up one or two weeks later with an email
32
33
34 138 and phone call. In schools that agreed to participate, potential participants were informed about
35
36 139 the study aims by the researcher or a designated teacher within the school, and provided with
37
38 140 an information sheet, privacy notice, consent forms, and also pre-group questionnaires (to
39
40
41 141 perform group segmentation).
42

43
44 142 All groups were conducted in assigned rooms at the school, and were facilitated by DM.
45
46 143 To avoid potential response bias or non-disclosure among participants, teachers were not
47
48 144 present during the groups. At the start of each group, participants were reminded that their
49
50 145 involvement was voluntary, they were free to withdraw at any time, their answers would be
51
52 146 confidential, and all data provided would be anonymized. Groups lasted between 30-45
53
54 147 minutes, with length dictated by scheduled class period in each school. Within each group,
55
56 148 approximately 15 minutes were allocated to discuss the dissuasive cigarettes, and this took
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 149 place after discussing reactions to standardized packaging (reference removed for
4
5 150 anonymization).

6
7
8 151 Before being shown any of the cigarette stimuli, the section began by asking
9
10 152 participants what they thought cigarettes look like, where they recall seeing them, and who
11
12 153 they recalling seeing with cigarettes. In the first group conducted, all five cigarettes were then
13
14 154 shown simultaneously. This, however, resulted in participants only focusing on certain
15
16 155 cigarettes, rather than gaining their perspective on all five individually. Therefore, in all other
17
18 156 groups, participants were shown the standard cigarette and ‘smoking kills’ cigarette first. They
19
20 157 were given time to look at them, pass them around, and discuss reactions. The ‘TOXIC’
21
22 158 cigarette was then passed around on its own and, finally, both green cigarettes were distributed
23
24 159 together. The dissuasive cigarettes were given out in this order so that participants were first
25
26 160 commenting on two designs that explicitly carried on-cigarette warnings (i.e. smoking kills and
27
28 161 ‘TOXIC’), followed by two designs with dissuasive colours, thus allowing participants to
29
30 162 discuss their reactions to different dissuasive approaches. All five cigarettes were brought out
31
32 163 of a standardized cigarette pack to simulate a real cigarette being taken from packs available in
33
34 164 the UK market.

35
36 165 Once all cigarettes had been distributed, participants were asked whether they liked or
37
38 166 disliked any of the cigarettes, how each cigarette made them feel about smoking, and to imagine
39
40 167 what kind of person each cigarette may be – a personification technique used in previous
41
42 168 cigarette packaging research (Ford et al., 2013a). Participants were also asked if they thought
43
44 169 people their age would find the cigarette designs appealing or unappealing, and if they thought
45
46 170 the dissuasive cigarette designs were off-putting. To help facilitate discussions, participants
47
48 171 were also asked to rank each cigarette based on appeal, harm and taste (Ford et al., 2013a).
49
50 172 Show cards were placed on the table (most appealing/least appealing, strongest tasting/weakest
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 173 tasting and most harmful/least harmful) and participants were asked to place the cigarettes
4
5 174 based on what they thought; they were encouraged to work together and discuss their decisions.
6
7
8 175

9
10 176 **ANALYSIS**

11
12 177 All groups were audio recorded and transcribed verbatim by DM. Transcripts were analyzed
13
14 178 using NVivo 11. Consistent with previous qualitative tobacco control research with adolescents
15
16 179 in the UK (Ford et al., 2013a; Moodie et al., 2019), we identified shared meaning and common
17
18 180 attitudes across the groups using the six sequential stages of thematic analysis recommended
19
20 181 by Braun and Clarke (2012). Initially, DM read over the transcripts several times to enable
21
22 182 familiarization with the groups and discussion, and checked the transcripts against the audio
23
24 183 recordings to ensure accuracy. A thematic coding framework was created in Nvivo based on
25
26 184 initial common themes identified in the transcripts. All emerging themes were subsequently
27
28 185 refined based on the framework created. DM generated the initial thematic codes (e.g.
29
30 186 dissuasive cigarettes being off-putting and embarrassing) and these were refined based on
31
32 187 discussions with NC and CM, and then organised under key headings based on the key areas
33
34 188 explored in the topic guide: (1) general perceptions of, and exposure to, cigarettes; (2) initial
35
36 189 reactions to, and perceptions of, the dissuasive cigarettes; (3) harm perceptions of dissuasive
37
38 190 cigarettes; and (4) perceived impact on smoking attitudes and behaviour of dissuasive
39
40 191 cigarettes. Matrix coding was also used in NVivo to categorize themes by smoking status and
41
42 192 gender to explore any between group differences. Concerning the cigarette sorting activity,
43
44 193 images were taken of the cigarettes only once they had been organized. This section was
45
46 194 analyzed separately by denoting the order from each group alongside the conversation from the
47
48 195 transcripts during the activity, to identify any differences between groups (e.g. smoking status
49
50 196 and gender).
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 198 **RESULTS**
4
5

6 199 **General perceptions of, and exposure to, cigarettes**
7
8

9 200 Across all groups, participants recalled seeing cigarettes frequently, with several participants
10
11 201 suggesting that they see them every day. Places where participants recalled seeing cigarettes
12
13 202 included public spaces, at home (if family members smoked), or at school (e.g. pupils or parents
14
15 203 picking up their children). Some participants mentioned that they recalled seeing the cigarette
16
17
18 204 more often than the outer packaging.
19
20

21 205
22
23

24 206 I probably see them every day, if you're walking home, you'll always see someone
25
26 207 walking with a cigarette in their hand or something (Male ever-smoker)
27
28

29 208
30
31

32 209 It depends on who you're with, really, if your family smoke you'll see them a lot, if your
33
34 210 friends smoke you'll see them a lot (Female ever-smoker)
35
36

37 211
38
39

40 212 At home, in the street, at school, at work (Female ever-smoker)
41
42

43 213
44
45

46 214 Everywhere, if I'm walking home I see someone walking their dog and they've got one
47
48 215 [a cigarette], picking their children up from school (Female never-smoker)
49
50

51 216
52
53

54 217 When asked to describe what cigarettes are like, most participants described the 'standard'
55
56 218 cigarette design (i.e. imitation cork filter and white paper). Some female ever-smokers,
57
58 219 however, were knowledgeable of different cigarette types (e.g. capsule cigarettes) and
59
60

1
2
3 220 indicated that they thought these alternative features or designs might encourage consumption.

4
5 221 Several participants, both male and female, also referred to cigarettes made with hand-rolling

6
7 222 tobacco (roll-your-own cigarettes).

8
9
10
11 223

12
13
14 224 You get white ones, you get ones with the wee Crushball [a flavor-changing capsule]

15
16 225 (Female ever-smoker)

17
18
19 226

20
21
22 227 They're like improving them cause like you get the like the wee things that you squish

23
24 228 that makes it like menthol or something... like that's encouraging people to try it cause

25
26 229 they want to know what that's like (Female never-smoker)

27
28
29
30 230

31
32 231 **Initial reactions to, and perceptions of, the dissuasive cigarettes**

33
34
35 232 In general, participants considered the explicit on-cigarette warnings to reduce the appeal of

36
37 233 smoking and to be off-putting. Specifically, both the 'TOXIC' and 'smoking kills' cigarettes

38
39 234 were deemed to be embarrassing, particularly among female ever-smokers. Some female ever-

40
41 235 smokers also considered the 'TOXIC' cigarette to be scary, and that the presence of the word

42
43 236 toxic would elicit a negative reaction, with one participant mentioning that it would give you a

44
45 237 'bad feeling'. While some participants placed slightly greater emphasis on the skull and cross

46
47 238 bones image than the word 'TOXIC', in general the image and text appeared to be viewed

48
49 239 holistically. While the 'TOXIC' cigarette was viewed negatively by most participants, there

50
51 240 was mention in one female ever-smoker group that the cigarette was cool and that it may

52
53 241 become a trend and encourage people to want to try them.

54
55
56
57
58
59 242
60

1
2
3 243 Yeah they are well more embarrassing, can you imagine Justin Bieber [popular music
4
5 244 artist] smoking a fag [colloquial term for cigarette] and it says smoking kills in red ink
6
7
8 245 on it (Female ever-smoker)
9

10
11 246
12
13
14 247 If you're seeing something with toxic on it, you're not going to want to take it (Male
15
16 248 ever-smoker)
17

18
19 249
20
21
22 250 They're scary, like it gives you a bad feeling looking at it, it says toxic on it (Female
23
24 251 ever-smoker)
25

26
27 252
28
29
30 253 Honestly, if they [toxic cigarette] came out, you'd want to buy them to see what they
31
32 254 were like (Female ever-smoker).
33

34
35 255
36

37
38 256 Initial responses towards both green cigarettes were generally negative for most participants,
39
40 257 however, there was further discussion in some groups that colored designs may have an element
41
42 258 of appeal to some consumers. Several female ever-smokers thought that the green cigarettes,
43
44 259 in particular the lighter green, were embarrassing, ugly and unattractive, compared to the
45
46 260 standard cigarette e.g. *"They're just ugly, yeah they are a lot uglier than the white ones"*
47
48 261 (Female ever-smoker). It was also suggested by several male participants that both green
49
50 262 cigarettes were horrible, bland, or dull, and that the standard cigarette (white paper and
51
52 263 imitation cork filter) was more appealing. Some male never-smokers suggested that the green
53
54 264 color, 'TOXIC' symbol and 'smoking kills' could be used together. These perceptions,
55
56 265 however, were not unanimous as some participants, particularly some female ever and never-
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 266 smokers, thought that the use of an unusual or different color, and the lack of health warnings,
4
5 267 may create some appeal, while one male ever-smoker group suggested the lighter green
6
7
8 268 cigarette was 'slightly' appealing.
9

10
11 269

12
13
14 270 They would be less attractive as well [the green cigarettes], like normal fags [white with
15
16 271 imitation cork filter] kind of appeal to like the Hollywood image (Male ever-smoker)

17
18
19 272

20
21
22 273 Yeah, they [green cigarettes] just look almost fancy, like if I saw someone with that I'd
23
24 274 think, 'oh what is that' (Female never-smoker)

25
26
27 275

28
29
30 276 The lighter green is a wee bit more like appealing than the heavy dark green (Male ever-
31
32 277 smoker)

33
34
35 278

36
37 279 But the green ones don't say anything, so like you just think it was a fancy green cigarette
38
39 280 (Female ever-smoker)

40
41
42 281

43 44 45 282 **Harm perceptions of dissuasive cigarettes**

46
47
48 283 The cigarette carrying the 'TOXIC' warning and skull and crossbones image was described as
49
50 284 a constant reminder of the harms of smoking, with both males and females suggesting that the
51
52 285 use of the skull and cross bones image reminded them of death and other dangerous substances,
53
54 286 (e.g. bleach). This perception of harm was also reflected in the show card activity, with the
55
56 287 'TOXIC' cigarette rated as being most harmful in most of the groups. Several participants,
57
58 288 mostly ever-smokers, mentioned that the 'smoking kills' message would not be as effective as

1
2
3 289 the 'TOXIC' message, with the rationale being that people are used to seeing it, possibly on
4
5 290 the outer packaging. Some participants, mostly males, also suggested that the 'smoking kills'
6
7
8 291 warning was not always clear, and may not always be seen when the cigarette is being smoked.
9

10
11 292

12
13 293 The yellow one I think really sticks out, like toxic, that wee [a slang term for small] sign
14
15 294 always reminded me death, like you get told not to touch anything like bleach and they've
16
17
18 295 got that sign on it (Female never-smoker)
19

20
21 296

22
23
24 297 You'd be like a walking warning sign ['TOXIC' cigarette] (Female ever-smoker)
25
26

27 298

28
29
30 299 I feel like the smoking kills one is pretty pointless because everyone is so used to hearing
31
32 300 that... but the toxic one I feel like that would be better (Female ever-smoker)
33
34

35 301

36
37
38 302 I feel like the warning is good but you can't always really see it [smoking kills warning]
39
40 303 very well (Male never-smoker)
41
42

43 304

44
45
46 305 When ranking the cigarettes based on harm, three of the seven groups (one female ever-smoker
47
48 306 and two male never-smoker groups) considered all cigarettes equally as harmful, including the
49
50 307 standard cigarette. In the rest of the groups the standard cigarette was ranked the least harmful
51
52 308 and the toxic cigarette the most harmful, apart from in the female never-smoker group where
53
54 309 both green cigarettes were considered the least harmful.
55
56
57
58
59 310
60

1
2
3 311 **Perceived impact of dissuasive cigarettes on smoking attitudes and behavior**
4
5

6 312 Participants generally agreed that the dissuasive cigarettes would make them feel differently
7
8 313 about smoking and would be off-putting, in particular, the 'TOXIC' cigarette and, for some
9
10 314 males, the green cigarettes.
11
12

13
14 315

15
16 316 I feel like the toxic one makes you feel worse about it [smoking] (Male never-smoker)
17
18

19
20 317

21
22 318 I think the green ones are the worst out of the bunch, because with the kind of light colors
23
24 319 you think [cigarettes with white paper], aw it's kind of normal, then you see something
25
26 320 that's like a dark green stick and your like, ew, never mind (Male never-smoker)
27
28

29
30 321

31
32
33 322 Concerning smoking attitudes and behavior among other people, most participants believed
34
35 323 that the explicit on-cigarette warnings would likely dissuade non-smokers and newer smokers.
36
37 324 Specifically, some female ever-smokers suggested that individuals might become cautious and
38
39 325 self-conscious about the impact of the cigarettes on their appearance. They also mentioned that
40
41 326 there may be an immediate effect in deterring smokers, however, this may diminish over time
42
43 327 as they may become desensitized to the messages and designs. There was a consensus, that the
44
45 328 cigarettes would have the least impact on established smokers, with some suggesting that such
46
47 329 individuals are used to seeing the warnings on the pack already, and any additional affect the
48
49 330 cigarettes may have, would fade.
50
51

52
53
54 331

55
56
57 332 Maybe first timers, it would put them off (Female never-smoker)
58
59
60

1
2
3 333
4
5
6 334

I reckon a lot of it is to do with appearance nowadays and that's not going to be good for

7
8 335 your appearance (Female ever-smoker).

9
10
11 336
12
13

14 337 Unless you've been smoking for a long time then aye [slang for yes] it would put you off

15
16 338 (Male ever-smoker)

17
18
19
20 339
21

22 340 I don't know, but I feel like for the first year they would make an impact, but once you're

23 341 walking about and every single person you see is doing it [smoking dissuasive cigarettes],

24
25 342 it would become less embarrassing. Because everyone is in the same boat (Female ever-

26
27 343 smoker)

28
29
30 344
31
32
33
34

35 345 **DISCUSSION**

36
37
38 346 Adolescents in Scotland had negative reactions towards the four dissuasive cigarette designs

39
40 347 and considered them to be embarrassing and off-putting, in particular those with explicit health

41
42 348 warnings. They suggested that dissuasive cigarettes would likely be a deterrent for susceptible

43
44 349 never-smokers and those who have just begun smoking, but that effectiveness may be limited

45
46 350 in established or long-term smokers.

47
48
49
50 351 We found that adolescents reported seeing cigarettes on a regular basis, and some

51
52 352 reported daily or almost daily exposure. They also suggested that they saw the cigarette more

53
54 353 than the outer packaging, which means they are not necessarily exposed to the pictorial

55
56 354 warnings and other health messages on standardized packs. Some participants were aware of

57
58 355 different types of cigarettes and new design features, such as capsule cigarettes. This is

1
2
3 356 consistent with past research which suggests young people notice, and pay attention to,
4
5 357 cigarette design (Abad-Vivero et al., 2016; Moodie, MacKintosh, Thrasher, McNeill &
6
7 358 Hitchman, 2018). That the cigarette stick is an increasingly important promotional tool for
8
9 359 tobacco companies, and as our findings show that adolescents in Scotland are regularly exposed
10
11 360 to cigarettes, supports the idea that the cigarette provides a high-reach opportunity to
12
13 361 communicate health messages to young people (Moodie et al., 2019).
14
15
16
17

18 362 While adolescents mostly reacted negatively to all four dissuasive designs, the cigarettes
19
20 363 which featured explicit warnings were considered the most effective and off-putting,
21
22 364 particularly the 'TOXIC' cigarette. The inclusion of a skull and cross bones image – a universal
23
24 365 sign of hazardous substances – elicited associations with harm from other dangerous chemicals
25
26 366 (e.g. bleach). This is consistent with packaging research which suggests that pictorial warnings
27
28 367 have a greater impact than text-only warnings (Hammond, 2011), and a recent qualitative study
29
30 368 which found that a cigarette with an image of a 'skull and cross bones' was considered
31
32 369 particularly dissuasive (Gallopel-Morvan et al., 2019). Nevertheless, in this study, some female
33
34 370 ever-smokers did still suggest that the potential risk factor associated with the 'TOXIC'
35
36 371 warning might encourage trial. Consistent with previous research, we also found that some
37
38 372 adolescent female ever-smokers considered the 'smoking kills' cigarette warning to be
39
40 373 embarrassing (Moodie et al., 2016). Some participants, however, mentioned this message
41
42 374 might not be as effective as the 'TOXIC' cigarette, as established smokers may have become
43
44 375 desensitized to the message through repeated exposure over time. While initial reactions to the
45
46 376 green cigarettes were generally negative, some participants (mostly females) suggested that the
47
48 377 color may be considered appealing and some male ever-smokers deemed the lighter green
49
50 378 cigarette slightly more appealing than the darker green cigarette. This is not consistent with
51
52 379 previous research where different shades of green cigarettes were considered unappealing
53
54 380 (Hoek et al., 2016; Moodie et al., 2018b), suggesting that further research into effectiveness of
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 381 dissuasive colors is required. Some male never-smokers thought a combination of different
4
5 382 dissuasive features (unappealing colour, toxic symbol and ‘smoking kills’) should be
6
7
8 383 considered. Future research should therefore build upon previous studies that have combined a
9
10 384 variety of dissuasive features (Gallopel-Morvan et al., 2019).

11
12
13 385 Participants generally agreed that the dissuasive cigarettes would put them off smoking,
14
15 386 echoing previous quantitative research with adolescents and adults (Drovandi et al., 2019a,
16
17 387 2019b; Hoek et al., 2016; Lund & Scheffels, 2018; Moodie et al., 2016). Concerning the impact
18
19 388 on others, it was consistently suggested that the cigarettes would have the strongest impact on
20
21 389 deterring newer smokers and susceptible never-smokers, and the effect would be reduced
22
23 390 among established smokers. For any impact to be sustained, and given that participants
24
25 391 mentioned desensitisation, one option could be to rotate dissuasive designs, for example in a
26
27 392 manner similar to the on-pack warnings in the European Union, which are rotated annually. It
28
29 393 would be feasible to have text-only warnings on sticks for the first year, unattractively coloured
30
31 394 cigarettes for the next year, combined (pictorial and text) warnings for the third year, and so
32
33 395 on, particularly as these designs should be considered complementary (Moodie et al., 2018b).

34
35 396 The use of a health message (or dissuasive color) on the cigarette stick is already being
36
37 397 considered by the Scottish and Canadian governments (Health Canada, 2018; Scottish
38
39 398 Government, 2018). While our study was one of the first to explore adolescents’ qualitative
40
41 399 responses to dissuasive cigarettes, survey research is needed to examine what extent, if at all,
42
43 400 reactions to dissuasive cigarettes are associated with reduced trial intentions among
44
45 401 adolescents. Research exploring dissuasive cigarettes in a naturalistic context with existing
46
47 402 smokers would also be of value, with similar studies conducted with young female smokers
48
49 403 prior to the implementation of standardized tobacco packaging (Moodie & MacKintosh, 2013).

50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 404 Concerning limitations, we recruited fewer ever-smokers than never-smokers. This may
4
5 405 have been due, in part, to participants feeling uncomfortable disclosing their smoking status,
6
7 406 or the low smoking prevalence in Scotland among younger people (Scottish Government,
8
9 407 2016). The groups were subject to time constraints to fit in with the school schedule, which
10
11 408 somewhat limited our ability to probe participants in more detail, and was the reason we
12
13 409 explored only four dissuasive cigarette designs. Future research could explore how the current
14
15 410 findings compare to cigarettes with different warnings or colours, or other dissuasive designs
16
17 411 (e.g. minutes of life lost). The sample size was small, meaning the results cannot be generalized
18
19 412 beyond this study, and one group was excluded due a technical fault with the audio recorder.
20
21 413 As groups were conducted with pupils from peer groups in a school environment, it is possible
22
23 414 that participants provided socially desirable answers, although teachers were deliberately not
24
25 415 present to limit potential concerns about disclosure. The cigarettes used in the study had no
26
27 416 branding, filter innovation (e.g. flavor-changing capsules) or filter tip design (e.g. star shaped
28
29 417 filters), which may have influenced participants' responses. Finally, the focus groups also
30
31 418 initially explored knowledge of, and response to, standardized tobacco packaging policy, where
32
33 419 participants were free to handle and open the packs (reference removed for blind review). These
34
35 420 existing discussions about the potential negative effects of smoking, health warning salience
36
37 421 and potential exposure to 'regular' cigarettes (imitation cork filter and white paper casing),
38
39 422 may have influenced how participants responded in the dissuasive cigarettes section.

40
41 423 In this study, adolescents reported frequent exposure to cigarettes and some were
42
43 424 knowledgeable about their use for promotional purposes. Participants had negative reactions
44
45 425 to the dissuasive cigarettes, particularly those with warnings, and felt that they would
46
47 426 discourage uptake among non-smokers and cessation in newer smokers. Dissuasive cigarettes
48
49 427 provide a high-reach opportunity to communicate health messages about smoking to young
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 428 people and should therefore form an important component of tobacco control policy concerning
4
5 429 the cigarette.
6

7
8 430

9
10 431 **Acknowledgement:** The authors would like to thank all of the participants and schools that
11
12 432 took part in the study.
13

14
15 433

16
17 434 **Funding:** Funding was a PhD studentship from [Institution name removed for blind review].
18

19 435

20
21 436 **Declaration of interest:** The authors have no declaration of interests to declare.
22

23
24 437

25
26 438 **REFERENCES**
27

28
29 439 Abad-Vivero, E. N., Thrasher, J. F., Arillo-Santillán, E., Pérez-Hernández, R., Barrientos-
30
31 440 Gutiérrez, I., Kollath-Cattano, C., Mejía, R. & Sargent, J. D. (2016). Recall, appeal and
32
33 441 willingness to try cigarettes with flavour capsules: assessing the impact of a tobacco product
34
35 442 innovation among early adolescents. *Tobacco Control*, 25(e2), 113-119. doi:
36
37 443 [10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2015-052805](https://doi.org/10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2015-052805).
38
39

40
41
42 444 Anderson, S. J., Glantz S. A., & Ling P. M. (2005). Emotions for sale: cigarette advertising
43
44 445 and women's psychosocial needs. *Tobacco Control*, 14(2), 127-135. doi:
45
46 446 [10.1136/tc.2004.009076](https://doi.org/10.1136/tc.2004.009076)
47

48
49
50 447 Bauld, L., MacKintosh, A., Eastwood, B., Ford, A., Moore, G., Dockrell, M., Arnott, D.,
51
52 448 Cheeseman, H., & McNeill. (2017). Young people's use of e-cigarettes across the United
53
54 449 Kingdom: findings from five surveys 2015–2017. *International Journal of Environmental*
55
56 450 *Research Public Health*, 14(9), 973. doi: [10.3390/ijerph14090973](https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph14090973).
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 451 *Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2012). Thematic analysis. In H. Cooper, P. M. Camic, D. L. Long, A.*
4
5 452 *T. Panter, D. Rindskopf, & K. J. Sher (Eds.), APA handbooks in psychology®. APA handbook*
6
7 453 *of research methods in psychology, Vol. 2. Research designs: Quantitative, qualitative,*
8
9 454 *neuropsychological, and biological (p. 57–71). American Psychological Association.*
10
11
12
13 455 *Carpenter, C.M., Wayne, G. F., & Connolly, G. N. (2005). Designing cigarettes for women:*
14
15 456 *new findings from the tobacco industry documents. Addiction, 100(6), 837-851. doi:*
16
17 457 [10.1111/j.1360-0443.2005.01072.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1360-0443.2005.01072.x)
18
19
20
21 458 *Centre for Tobacco Control Research. (2012). The packaging of tobacco products. Stirling,*
22
23 459 *Scotland: Centre for Tobacco Control Research.*
24
25
26 460 *Critchlow, N., Stead, M., Moodie, C., Angus, K., Eadie, D., & MacKintosh, A.M. (2019).*
27
28 461 *Difference between recommended retail price and sales price for tobacco products in*
29
30 462 *independent and convenience (small) retailers before and after the introduction of*
31
32 463 *standardised tobacco packaging in the UK. Tobacco control, 28(4), 449-456. doi:*
33
34 464 [10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2018-054409](https://doi.org/10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2018-054409)
35
36
37
38
39 465 *Department of Health. (2016). Guidance for retailers, manufacturers and distributors of*
40
41 466 *tobacco products, enforcement agencies and the public on changes to tobacco packaging*
42
43 467 *from 20 May 2016. Department of Health.*
44
45
46
47 468 *Donaghy, E., Bauld, L., Eadie, D., McKell, J., Pringle, B., & Amos, A. (2013). A qualitative*
48
49 469 *study of how young Scottish smokers living in disadvantaged communities get their*
50
51 470 *cigarettes. Nicotine Tobacco Research, 15, 2053-2059. doi: 10.1093/ntr/ntt095.*
52
53
54
55 471 *Drovandi, A., Teague, P.A., Glass, B., & Malau-Aduli, B. (2019a). Do health warnings on*
56
57 472 *cigarette sticks dissuade smokers and non-smokers? A focus group and interview study of*
58
59
60

1
2
3 473 Australian university students. *Psychology Research Behavioural Management*, 15(12), 361.

4
5 474 doi: [10.2147/PRBM.S193754](https://doi.org/10.2147/PRBM.S193754)

6
7
8 475 Drovandi, A., Teague, P.A., Glass, B., & Malau-Aduli, B. (2019b). Australian University

9
10 476 Student Perceptions of Health Messages on Cigarette Sticks. *Health Communication*, 1-9.

11
12 477 doi: [0.1080/10410236.2019.1567442](https://doi.org/0.1080/10410236.2019.1567442).

13
14
15 478 Drovandi, A., Teague, P.A., Glass, B., & Malau-Aduli, B. (2019c). Australian community

16
17 479 pharmacist experiences with smoking cessation and opinions of health warnings on

18
19 480 individual cigarette sticks. *International Journal of Pharmacy Practice*, 27(2), 121-130. doi:

20
21 481 [10.1111/ijpp.12470](https://doi.org/10.1111/ijpp.12470).

22
23
24 482 Doxey, J., Hammond, D. (2011). Deadly in pink: the impact of cigarette packaging among

25
26 483 young women. *Tobacco Control*, 20, 353-60. doi: [10.1136/tc.2010.038315](https://doi.org/10.1136/tc.2010.038315)

27
28
29 484 Ford, A., Moodie, C., MacKintosh, A.M. & Hastings, G. (2013a). How adolescents perceive

30
31 485 cigarette packaging and possible benefits of plain packaging. *Education and Health*, 31(2),

32
33 486 83-88.

34
35
36 487 Ford, A., Moodie, C., MacKintosh, A. M. & Hastings, G. (2013b). Adolescent perceptions of

37
38 488 cigarette appearance. *European Journal of Public Health*, 24(3), 464-468. doi:

39
40 489 [10.1093/eurpub/ckt161](https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/ckt161).

41
42
43 490 Gallopel-Morvan, K., Droulers, O., & Pantin-Sohier, G. (2019). Dissuasive cigarettes: which

44
45 491 cues are the most effective at deterring young people from smoking? *Public Health*, 174, 22-

46
47 492 30. doi: [10.1016/j.puhe.2019.05.034](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.puhe.2019.05.034).

48
49
50 493 Hammond, D. (2011). Health warning messages on tobacco products: a review. *Tobacco*

51
52 494 *control*, 20(5), 327-337. doi: [10.1136/tc.2010.037630](https://doi.org/10.1136/tc.2010.037630)

- 1
2
3 495 Hassan, L., & Shiu, E. (2013). No place to hide: two pilot studies assessing the effectiveness
4
5 496 of adding a health warning to the cigarette stick. *Tobacco Control*, 24(e1), 3-5. doi:
6
7 497 [10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2013-051238](https://doi.org/10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2013-051238).
8
9
10
11 498 Hastings, G., and MacFadyen, L. (2000). Keep smiling no one's going to die. Available:
12
13 499 <http://www.tobaccopapers.com/keepsmiling/KeepSmilingReport.pdf> [Accessed November
14
15 500 13, 2019]
16
17
18
19 501 Health Canada. (2018) *New health related labelling for tobacco products*. Health Canada.
20
21
22 502 Health and Safety Executive. (2019). *Hazard Pictograms*. Retrieved from
23
24 503 <http://www.hse.gov.uk/chemical-classification/labelling-packaging/hazard-symbols-hazard->
25
26 504 [pictograms.htm](http://www.hse.gov.uk/chemical-classification/labelling-packaging/hazard-symbols-hazard-pictograms.htm).
27
28
29
30 505 Hoek, J., Gendall, P., Eckert, C., & Louviere, J. (2016). Dissuasive cigarette sticks: the next
31
32 506 step in standardised ('plain') packaging? *Tobacco Control*, 25(6), 699-705. doi:
33
34 507 [10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2015-052533](https://doi.org/10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2015-052533).
35
36
37
38 508 Kotnowski K, Hammond D. (2013). The impact of cigarette pack shape, size and opening:
39
40 509 evidence from tobacco company documents. *Addiction*, 108(9), 1658-68. doi:
41
42 510 [10.1111/add.12183](https://doi.org/10.1111/add.12183)
43
44
45
46 511 Lund, I., & Scheffels, J. (2018). Adolescent perceptions of dissuasive sticks: A web survey
47
48 512 among 16–20 year olds in Norway. *BMC public health*, 18(1), 974. doi: [10.1186/s12889-018-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-018-5847-1)
49
50 513 [5847-1](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-018-5847-1).
51
52
53
54 514 MacFadyen, L., Hastings, G., & MacKintosh, A. M. (2001). Cross sectional study of young
55
56 515 people's awareness of and involvement with tobacco marketing. *Bmj*, 322(7285), 513-517.
57
58 516 doi: [10.1136/bmj.322.7285.513](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.322.7285.513)
59
60

- 1
2
3 517 Mitchell, D., Moodie, C., Critchlow, N., & Bauld, L. (2019). Adolescents' perceptions of
4
5 518 standardised cigarette packaging design and brand variant name post-implementation: a focus
6
7 519 group study in Scotland. *BMC public health*, *19*(1), 1227. doi: 10.1186/s12889-019-7552-0
9
10
11 520 Moodie, C. (2016). Novel ways of using tobacco packaging to communicate health messages:
12
13 521 Interviews with packaging and marketing. *Addiction Research & Theory*, *24*(1), 54-61. doi:
14
15 522 [10.3109/16066359.2015.1064905](https://doi.org/10.3109/16066359.2015.1064905).
17
18
19 523 Moodie, C. (2018). Warnings on every cigarette: extending health messaging to the
20
21 524 consumption experience. *CMAJ: Cancer Medical Association*, *190*(43), 1271-1272. doi:
22
23 525 [10.1503/cmaj.180781](https://doi.org/10.1503/cmaj.180781)
25
26
27 526 Moodie, C., Angus, K., Mitchell, D., & Critchlow, N. (2018a). How tobacco companies in
28
29 527 the UK prepared for and responded to standardised packaging of cigarettes and rolling
30
31 528 tobacco. *Tobacco Control*, *27*(e1), 85-92. doi: [10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2017-054011](https://doi.org/10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2017-054011)
33
34
35 529 Moodie, C., Ford, A., Dobbie, F., Thrasher, J. F., McKell, J., & Purves, R. (2017a). The
36
37 530 power of product innovation: Smokers' perceptions of capsule cigarettes. *Nicotine &*
38
39 531 *Tobacco Research*, *20*(9), 1157-1160. doi: [10.1093/ntr/ntx195](https://doi.org/10.1093/ntr/ntx195).
41
42
43 532 Moodie, C., Ford, A., MacKintosh, A. M., & Purves R (2014). Are all cigarettes just the
44
45 533 same? Female's perceptions of slim, coloured, aromatised and capsule cigarettes. *Health*
46
47 534 *Education Research*, *30*(1), 1-12. doi: [10.1093/her/cyu063](https://doi.org/10.1093/her/cyu063)
49
50
51 535 Moodie, C., Gendall, P., Hoek, J., MacKintosh, A. M., Best, C., & Murray, S. (2017b). The
52
53 536 response of young adult smokers and non-smokers in the United Kingdom to dissuasive
54
55 537 cigarettes: An online survey. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research*, *21*(2), 227-233. doi:
56
57 538 [10.1093/ntr/ntx261](https://doi.org/10.1093/ntr/ntx261)
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 539 Moodie, C., Hiscock, R., Thrasher, J., & Reid, G. (2018b). Perceptions of cigarette pack
4
5 540 inserts promoting cessation and dissuasive cigarettes among young adult smokers in the UK:
6
7 541 a cross-sectional online survey. *BMJ open*, 8(9), 019662. doi: [10.1136/bmjopen-2017-019662](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2017-019662)
8
9
10
11 542 Moodie, C., Hoek, J., Scheffels, J., Gallopel-Morvan, K., & Lindorff, K. (2019a). Plain
12
13 543 packaging: legislative differences in Australia, France, the UK, New Zealand and Norway,
14
15 544 and options for strengthening regulations. *Tobacco Control*, 28(5), 485-492. doi:
16
17 [10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2018-054483](https://doi.org/10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2018-054483).
18
19
20
21 546 Moodie, C., & MacKintosh, A. M. (2013). Young adult women smokers' response to using
22
23 547 plain cigarette packaging: a naturalistic approach. *BMJ open*, 3(3), e002402. doi:
24
25 [10.1136/bmjopen-2012-002402](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2012-002402).
26
27
28
29 549 Moodie, C., MacKintosh, A., Gallopel-Morvan, K., Hastings, G., & Ford, A. (2016).
30
31 550 Adolescents' perceptions of an on-cigarette health warning. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research*,
32
33 551 19(10), 1232-1237. doi: [10.1093/ntr/ntw165](https://doi.org/10.1093/ntr/ntw165)
34
35
36
37 552 Moodie, C., MacKintosh, A. M., & Hastings, G. (2015). Adolescents' response to pictorial
38
39 553 warnings on the reverse panel of cigarette packs: a repeat cross-sectional study. *Tob Control*,
40
41 554 24(e1), 93-97. doi: [10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2013-050999](https://doi.org/10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2013-050999).
42
43
44
45 555 Moodie, C., MacKintosh, A.M., Thrasher, J.F., McNeill, A., & Hitchman, S. (2018d). Use of
46
47 556 Cigarettes With Flavor-Changing Capsules Among Smokers in the United Kingdom: An
48
49 557 Online Survey (Forthcoming/Available online). doi: [10.1093/ntr/nty173](https://doi.org/10.1093/ntr/nty173)
50
51
52
53 558 Moodie, C., Purves, R., McKell, J., & de Andrade, M. (2015). Novel means of using cigarette
54
55 559 packaging and cigarettes to communicate health risk and cessation messages: a qualitative
56
57 560 study. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*, 13(3), 333-344. doi:
58
59 [10.1007/s11469-014-9530-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11469-014-9530-1).
60

- 1
2
3 562 Moodie, C., O'Donnell, R., Fleming, J., Purves, R., McKell, J., & Dobbie, F. (2019b).
4
5 563 Extending health messaging to the consumption experience: a focus group study exploring
6
7 564 smokers' perceptions of health warnings on cigarettes. *Addiction Research & Theory*, 1-7.
8
9 565 doi: 10.1080/16066359.2019.1653861.
10
11
12
13 566 Moodie, C., Thrasher, J.F., Cho, Y.J., Barnoya, J., & Chaloupka, F.J. (2019c). Flavour
14
15 567 capsule cigarettes continue to experience strong global growth. *Tobacco Control*, 28(5), 595-
16
17 568 596. doi: 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2018-054711.
18
19
20
21 569 NHS Digital. (2018). Statistics on smoking – England 2018. Retrieved from
22
23 570 [https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/statistics-on-](https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/statistics-on-smoking/statistics-on-smoking-england-2018/part-5-availability-and-affordability-of-tobacco)
24
25 571 [smoking/statistics-on-smoking-england-2018/part-5-availability-and-affordability-of-tobacco.](https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/statistics-on-smoking/statistics-on-smoking-england-2018/part-5-availability-and-affordability-of-tobacco)
26
27
28
29 572 Scollo, M., Occleston, J., Bayly, M., Lindorff, K., & Wakefield, M. (2015). Tobacco product
30
31 573 developments coinciding with the implementation of plain packaging in Australia. *Tobacco*
32
33 574 *Control*, 24(e1), 116-122. doi: 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2013-051509
34
35
36
37 575 Scottish Government. (2016). *Scottish Schools Adolescent Lifestyle and Substance Use*
38
39 576 *Survey (SALSUS) 2015*. The Scottish Government.
40
41
42
43 577 Scottish Government. (2018). *Raising Scotland's tobacco free generation: our tobacco*
44
45 578 *control action plan 2018*. Retrieved from [https://www.gov.scot/publications/raising-](https://www.gov.scot/publications/raising-scotlands-tobacco-free-generation-tobacco-control-action-plan-2018/pages/3/)
46
47 579 [scotlands-tobacco-free-generation-tobacco-control-action-plan-2018/pages/3/](https://www.gov.scot/publications/raising-scotlands-tobacco-free-generation-tobacco-control-action-plan-2018/pages/3/)
48
49
50
51 580 Tjelta, T., Ritchie, D., & Amos, A. (2016). "It's Easy to Get Fags": A Qualitative Study of
52
53 581 Disadvantaged Young People's Perspectives on Cigarette Availability and Access. *Nicotine*
54
55 582 *& Tobacco Research*, 19(12), 1434-1440. doi: 10.1093/ntr/ntw267.
56
57
58
59 583 UK Government. (2016). *Tobacco and Related Products Regulation*. UK Government.
60

- 1
2
3 584 Wackowski, O. A., Evans, K. R., Harrell, M. B., Loukas, A., Lewis, M. J., Delnevo, C. D., &
4
5 585 Perry, C. L. (2017). In Their Own Words: Young Adults' Menthol Cigarette Initiation,
6
7 586 Perceptions, Experiences and Regulation Perspectives. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research*, 20(9),
8
9 587 1076-1084.n doi: [10.1093/ntr/ntx048](https://doi.org/10.1093/ntr/ntx048)
10
11
12
13 588 World Health Organization. (2009). Tobacco industry interference with tobacco control.
14
15
16 589 World Health Organisation. (2019). Tobacco. Retrieved from [https://www.who.int/news-](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/tobacco)
17
18 590 [room/fact-sheets/detail/tobacco](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/tobacco).
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review Only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



Figure 1: Sterling Dual Star Edition

359x155mm (96 x 96 DPI)

Table 1: Gender, smoking status and number of participants in each group

Group	Gender	Smoking Status	Number of participants
1	Female	Ever-smoker	5
2	Female	Ever-smoker	5
3	Male	Ever-smoker	5
4	Male	Never-smoker	6
5	Male	Never-smoker	5
6	Male	Never-smoker	4
7	Female	Never-smoker	6

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



Figure 2: Standard cigarette (top) and the four dissuasive cigarettes (in descending order: Toxic, Smoking Kills, Dark Green, Lighter Green)

359x155mm (96 x 96 DPI)