

# Tobacco Control

## Reactions to, and trial intentions for, three dissuasive cigarette designs: A cross-sectional survey of adolescents in Scotland Word Count: 3040

Journal:	<i>Tobacco Control</i>
Manuscript ID	tobaccocontrol-2020-055842.R1
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Mitchell, Danielle; Institute for Social Marketing and Health, University of Stirling, Faculty of Health Sciences and Sport Critchlow, Nathan; Institute for Social Marketing and Health, University of Stirling, Faculty of Health Sciences and Sport Moodie, Crawford; Institute for Social Marketing and Health, University of Stirling, Faculty of Health Sciences and Sport Bauld, Linda; University of Edinburgh, Usher Institute and UK Centre for Tobacco and Alcohol Studies, College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine
Keywords:	Packaging and Labelling, Prevention, Social marketing

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

This article has been accepted for publication in Tobacco Control following peer review. The definitive copyedited, typeset version Mitchell D, Critchlow N, Moodie C & Bauld L (2020) Reactions to, and trial intentions for, three dissuasive cigarette designs: a cross-sectional survey of adolescents in Scotland. Tobacco Control, 30(6), 623-629 is available online at: <https://doi.org/10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2020-055842>  
© Authors 2020. Reuse of this manuscript version (excluding any databases, tables, diagrams, photographs and other images or illustrative material included where a another copyright owner is identified) is permitted strictly pursuant to the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC-BY-NC 4.0) <http://creativecommons.org>

Figure 1: Standard cigarette and three dissuasive cigarette designs



Initial: For Review Only

1  
2  
3 **Title:** Reactions to, and trial intentions for, three dissuasive cigarette designs: A cross-sectional  
4 survey of adolescents in Scotland  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 **Authors:** Danielle Mitchell<sup>1</sup>, Nathan Critchlow<sup>1</sup>, Crawford Moodie<sup>1</sup>, Linda Bauld<sup>2,3</sup>  
11  
12  
13

14 **Affiliations:**

15  
16  
17 <sup>1</sup> Institute for Social Marketing and Health, Faculty of Health Sciences and Sport, University  
18 of Stirling, FK9 4LA, Scotland.  
19

20  
21 <sup>2</sup> Usher Institute, College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine, University of Edinburgh,  
22 Teviot Place, Edinburgh, EH8 9AG, Scotland.  
23

24  
25 <sup>3</sup>SPECTRUM Consortium, University of Edinburgh, Usher Institute, Old Medical School,  
26 University of Edinburgh, Teviot Place, Edinburgh EH8 9AG  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 **Corresponding author:** Danielle Mitchell, Institute for Social Marketing and Health, Faculty  
34 of Health Science and Sport, University of Stirling, Stirling, FK9 4LA. Email:  
35 [danielle.mitchell1@stir.ac.uk](mailto:danielle.mitchell1@stir.ac.uk) Tel: +44 (0)1786 467390  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 **Word count:** 3315

46 **Figure Count:** 1

47 **Table Count:** 3  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Abstract

**Objectives:** There has been growing academic and policy interest in opportunities to decrease the appeal of cigarette sticks, such as making them an unattractive colour or requiring them to display a health warning. We therefore explored reactions to, and trial intentions for, three ‘dissuasive’ cigarette designs among adolescents in Scotland.

**Methods:** A cross-sectional survey with 12-17 year olds in Scotland ( $n=594$ ) was conducted between November 2017 and November 2018. Participants were shown one ‘standard’ cigarette (imitation cork filter with white paper casing) and three dissuasive cigarettes: (1) a cigarette with the warning ‘smoking kills’; (2) a cigarette with the warning ‘toxic’ and a skull and cross-bones image; and (3) a dark green cigarette. Participants rated each cigarette on nine five-point reaction measures (e.g. appealing/unappealing or attractive/unattractive). A composite reaction score was computed for each cigarette, which was binary coded (overall negative reactions versus neutral/positive reactions). Participants also indicated whether they would try each cigarette (coded: Yes/No). Demographics, smoking status, and smoking susceptibility were also measured.

**Results:** More participants had negative reactions to the dark green (93% of adolescents), ‘smoking kills’ (94%) and ‘toxic’ (96%) cigarettes, compared to the standard cigarette (85%). For all three dissuasive designs, Chi-square tests found that negative reactions were more likely among younger adolescents (vs. older adolescents), never-smokers (vs. ever smokers), and non-susceptible never-smokers (vs. susceptible never-smokers). Most participants indicated that they would not try any of the cigarettes (range: 84-91%).

**Conclusion:** Dissuasive cigarettes present an opportunity to further reduce the appeal of smoking among adolescents.

**Keywords:** Dissuasive cigarettes, Survey research, Adolescent smoking, Tobacco control, Smoking cessation, Health communication

## INTRODUCTION

At least 14 countries require cigarettes to be sold in standardised (or plain) packaging.<sup>1</sup> Such legislation stipulates not only how the pack exterior and interior should look, but also the appearance of cigarette sticks. For instance, in the first five countries to fully implement standardised packaging (Australia, France, United Kingdom, New Zealand, Norway), the cigarette must be wrapped in white paper casing, the filter must be white or imitation cork, and a brand variant name or alphanumeric code must appear in a standardised font and size near to the filter.<sup>2</sup> In a separate effort to reduce the promotional power of cigarettes, some countries (Uganda, Senegal, Ethiopia, Canada, Brazil) have banned flavoured cigarettes, and these will also be banned from May 2020 across both the European Union and in the United Kingdom (UK), Turkey and Moldova.<sup>3,4</sup>

In addition to standardising elements of cigarette appearance<sup>2,5</sup> and removing opportunities to use flavouring to create appeal<sup>3,4,6,7</sup> some countries are considering additional measures to reduce the appeal of cigarette sticks.<sup>8,9</sup> For example, the Scottish Government intend to review the evidence on cigarettes that are unattractively coloured or display a health warning, often referred to as ‘dissuasive cigarettes’, as part of their tobacco control strategy.<sup>8</sup> The Canadian Government has also consulted on the inclusion of warnings on cigarettes.<sup>9</sup>

While the cigarette pack and cigarette stick provide an opportunity for tobacco companies to promote their products, research has typically focused on the promotional influence of the pack. The cigarette stick, however, can also create appeal through decorative features, colour, length and diameter.<sup>10-14</sup> With respect to whether this communicative power could be used for health promotion, two types of dissuasive cigarette designs have been examined. Firstly, research has explored reactions to unattractively coloured cigarettes, particularly different shades of green.<sup>15-19</sup> Secondly, research has explored cigarettes that feature a health warning on the stick, including ‘Smoking kills’, average minutes of life lost

1  
2  
3 from smoking each cigarette, and the short and long-term harms of smoking.<sup>16-27</sup> More recently,  
4 research has also explored including both a warning message (smoking kills) and an image  
5 (skull and cross bones).<sup>26,27</sup> Irrespective of design, dissuasive cigarettes are generally  
6 considered to reduce appeal and increase perceptions of harm, with some research suggesting  
7 that they may have the potential to encourage thoughts about quitting or prevent uptake among  
8 young people.<sup>15-27</sup>

9  
10 Only a few studies have examined how adolescents react to dissuasive cigarettes.<sup>17,20,27</sup>  
11 Adolescents are a key group because when starting to smoke they often do so with single  
12 cigarettes which they have bought, been given or have stolen, and therefore may avoid  
13 exposure to the on-pack warnings at the point of consumption.<sup>28,29,30</sup> Investigation with  
14 adolescents is particularly important in Scotland, where longer-term declines in youth smoking  
15 have recently begun to stall<sup>31</sup> and because the Scottish Government has expressed a willingness  
16 to consider implementing dissuasive cigarettes if supported by the evidence.<sup>8</sup>

17  
18  
19 In this study, we therefore examine reactions to, and trial intentions for, a standard  
20 cigarette and three dissuasive cigarettes among adolescents in Scotland: (1) An unattractively  
21 coloured cigarette; (2) A cigarette with text warning; and (3) A cigarette with text and an image.  
22 This is the first quantitative study to examine reactions to a dissuasive cigarette with both a text  
23 and image warning among adolescents, a key target for preventative measures, in a market  
24 where standardised packaging is fully-implemented.

## 25 26 27 **METHODS**

### 28 29 **Design and Recruitment**

30 A cross-sectional self-report survey was conducted with 12-17 year olds ( $n=594$ ) in secondary  
31 schools in three regions of Scotland (Central, East, and South). Data were collected between  
32 November 2017 and November 2018, covering between 6 and 18 months post-implementation  
33 of standardised packaging. Data collection took place post-implementation of standardised  
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 packaging as the survey also contained questions about how young people had reacted to the  
4  
5 new legislation (reported elsewhere). The length of data collection was determined by the speed  
6  
7 of response from local authorities and schools, and availability of schools to administer the  
8  
9 survey (e.g. avoiding school holidays and exam periods).  
10

11  
12 Before contacting schools, approval was obtained from local education authorities and,  
13  
14 once granted, schools were contacted through letters and emails, and followed up by a phone  
15  
16 call. Three schools agreed to take part. Pupils were informed about the study aim and objectives  
17  
18 (e.g. We want to find out young people's opinions and attitudes towards tobacco packaging  
19  
20 and cigarettes) by the lead researcher (DM) or a designated teacher (e.g. someone delivering  
21  
22 health and wellbeing education), and provided with participant and parental information sheets,  
23  
24 parent opt-out forms, and data privacy notices. Participants completed the survey under exam  
25  
26 style conditions (i.e. individually and in silence) during designated class times that suited each  
27  
28 school. Schools were given the option for pupils to complete either an online or physical  
29  
30 version of the survey (both identical in content and question order). All participants were able  
31  
32 to enter a ballot to win a computer tablet (an iPad) in return for participating.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

## 40 **Materials**

41  
42 Participants were shown four cigarette designs (Figure 1), consistent with those used in  
43  
44 developmental focus group research with adolescents in Scotland.<sup>27</sup> The first had an imitation  
45  
46 cork filter and white cigarette paper, as this mirrors the 'standard' cigarette design in Scotland.  
47  
48 The second cigarette was dark green, consistent with research with adults in Australia and the  
49  
50 UK,<sup>15,16,18,19</sup> and with adolescents in Norway<sup>17</sup> and Scotland.<sup>27</sup> Although this design has been  
51  
52 explored with adolescents in two studies, only one of these was quantitative, and was conducted  
53  
54 in Norway,<sup>17</sup> which means there remains a gap in empirical understanding as to how  
55  
56 adolescents react to dark green cigarettes. The third cigarette carried the warning 'Smoking  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 kills' in red writing on white cigarette paper, as used in past research with adolescents and  
4  
5 adults in Australia, the UK and Norway.<sup>16-21,27</sup> Smoking kills is also a warning regularly  
6  
7 communicated on the outer packaging, and with high recognition among adolescents.<sup>32</sup> The  
8  
9 final cigarette featured the word 'toxic' in black writing and a yellow skull and cross bones  
10  
11 image on white cigarette paper. This image (i.e. skull and crossbones) is often used on other  
12  
13 hazardous substances (e.g. chemicals such as bleach) and is used by the Health and Safety  
14  
15 executive to describe 'acutely toxic' chemicals.<sup>33</sup> The image has also been used in a study in  
16  
17 France,<sup>26</sup> and was considered to clearly communicate the harmfulness of smoking among  
18  
19 developmental focus groups with adolescents in Scotland.<sup>27</sup>  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 [Figure 1]  
27  
28  
29

## 30 Measures

### 31 *Demographics*

32  
33 Demographic variables included age, gender, ethnicity (coded: 'White British' and 'Other or  
34  
35 prefer not to say') and socioeconomic status (SES). Consistent with previous health and  
36  
37 behaviour surveys with adolescents in the UK, the Family Affluence Scale (FAS) was used to  
38  
39 provide a measure of SES.<sup>34,35</sup> Participants reported whether they have their own bedroom  
40  
41 (0=No, Yes=1); how many vehicles their family own (0=None, 1 = Yes, one, 2=Two or more);  
42  
43 how many computers their family own (0=None, 1 = One, 2 = Two, 3=More than two); and  
44  
45 how many times they have travelled on holiday with their family in the last 12 months (0=Not  
46  
47 all, 1 = Once, 2 = Twice, 3=More than twice).<sup>35</sup> Scores were summed and divided into low (0-  
48  
49 2), medium (3-5), and high SES (6-9).<sup>36</sup>  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

### 58 *Smoking status*

59  
60



1  
2  
3 Consistent with research with adolescents,<sup>37</sup> participants were shown five statements and asked  
4 to select which best described them: (1) *'I have never smoked, not even a puff or two'*; (2) *'I*  
5 *have only ever smoked once or twice but not anymore'*; (3) *'I smoke at least once a month'*;  
6 (4) *'I usually smoke between one and six cigarettes a week'*; and (5) *'I smoke more than six*  
7 *cigarettes a week'*. Those selecting the first option were categorised *'never-smokers'* and all  
8 others *'ever-smokers'*.  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

### 19 ***Smoking susceptibility***

20  
21 Among never-smokers, three items assessed susceptibility: (1) *'If one of your friends offered*  
22 *you a cigarette would you smoke it?'*; (2) *'Do you think you will smoke a cigarette at any point*  
23 *in the next year?'*; and (3) *'Do you think you will be smoking by the time you are 18?'*<sup>38</sup> All  
24 were scored on a four-point Likert scale (*1=Definitely yes, 2= Probably yes, 3= Probably not,*  
25 *4= Definitely not*). Never-smokers who selected *'Definitely not'* to all three items were  
26 categorised as *'Non-susceptible'*, with all other participants categorised as *'Susceptible'*.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

### 38 ***Reactions to cigarettes***

39  
40 Participants were asked to rate each cigarette on nine reaction measures adapted from previous  
41 research<sup>18,38,39</sup>: (1) Attractive/Unattractive and (2) Stylish/Unstylish; (3) Would be nice to be  
42 seen with/Would not be nice to be seen with; (4) Appealing to people my age/Not at all  
43 appealing to people my own age; (5) In general, my friends would approve of this cigarette/In  
44 general my friends would not approve of this cigarette; (6) In general, I would approve of my  
45 friends using this cigarette/In general, I would not approve of my friends using this cigarette;  
46 (7) Would be totally acceptable to family members/Would be totally unacceptable to family  
47 members; (8) Does look harmful to my health/Does not look harmful to my health; and (9)  
48 Would not put people off starting to smoke/Would put people off starting to smoke (henceforth  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 this measure will be referred to as ‘off-putting’). Each reaction was scored on a five-point scale  
4  
5 (e.g. 1=Not appealing to people my age – 5=Appealing to people my age). Reactions were  
6  
7 given separately for each cigarette design.  
8  
9

10 Consistent with a previous survey research exploring dissuasive cigarettes,<sup>18</sup> a  
11  
12 composite score was calculated for each cigarette across the nine reaction measures (range: 9-  
13  
14 45). There was acceptable internal reliability in composite scores for each of the four cigarettes  
15  
16 (range:  $\alpha=0.80$  to  $0.81$ ). Composite scores were binary coded based on whether the participant  
17  
18 had a negative reaction to each cigarette. As the middle possible score was 27, all participants  
19  
20 with a composite score  $\leq 26$  were classed as having a negative overall reaction, while those  
21  
22 with a score  $\geq 27$  were classed as having a neutral or positive reaction.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

### 28 **Trial intentions**

29  
30 Consistent with previous assessment of trial intentions,<sup>19</sup> participants were asked ‘*If one of your*  
31  
32 *friends offered you one of the cigarettes how likely would you be to try each?*’, with response  
33  
34 options ranging from 1=Very likely to 5=Not at all likely. Scale responses were binary coded  
35  
36 based on whether participants indicated that they would not try the cigarette (scores 4-5) versus  
37  
38 those who provided a neutral answer or suggested they would try the cigarette (scores 1-3).<sup>18</sup>  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

### 45 **Analysis**

46  
47 A total of 686 responses were collected. We excluded 73 cases for not completing the consent  
48  
49 form or for providing invalid or incomplete responses and 19 for being outwith the age range  
50  
51 of the study (those aged 11 or 18 years old). The final sample used for analysis was 594.  
52  
53

54 Data were analysed using SPSS version 23 (Chicago, SPSS Inc). Descriptive statistics  
55  
56 examined demographics, smoking status, susceptibility, and trial intentions. Descriptive  
57  
58 statistics examined mean scores for each cigarette on each of the nine reaction measures. As  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 the scale data were ordinal, Wilcoxon Signed Rank tests examined differences in reactions to  
4 each of the cigarettes. Wilcoxon Signed Rank tests were conducted across all reaction measures  
5 and for all cigarette combinations (e.g. attractiveness reactions for the 'standard' cigarette vs.  
6 the green cigarette). A Bonferroni correction was applied to account for the six multiple  
7 comparisons on each reaction variable, resulting in a revised critical value of  $p=0.008$ .

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15 Pearson Chi Square tests examined between-group differences in overall reactions  
16 (*negative vs. neutral and positive*) and trial intentions (*would not try vs. neutral and would try*).  
17 Chi-squares were run separately across all four cigarette designs for age, gender, SES group,  
18 ethnicity, smoking status, and susceptibility to smoke. As numbers in the lowest SES category  
19 were small (1.9% of total sample), we combined the low and medium categories for the  
20 purposes of analysis. We considered using multivariate logistic regressions with trial intentions  
21 for each cigarette the dependent variable and the aforementioned between-group variables as  
22 covariates.<sup>36</sup> This was not possible, however, as the proportion of participants reporting trial  
23 intentions was very low for some of the cigarette designs (see results), which meant that  
24 acceptable model fit could be not obtained for all four cigarette designs.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

#### 40 **Ethical approval**

41  
42 Ethical approval was obtained from the University of Stirling's General University Ethics  
43 Panel (GUEP273). At the beginning of the survey, participants were informed that participation  
44 would be confidential and anonymous, and consent was obtained. Once completed, participants  
45 were provided with a debrief leaflet, which included information on the harms of smoking and  
46 where to find further advice and information.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

## 56 **RESULTS**

### 57 **Sample characteristics**

Accounting for missing data on gender ( $n=1$ ), SES ( $n=5$ ), smoking status ( $n=12$ ) and susceptibility ( $n=2$ ), 35% of participants were aged 12-13 years, 35% were 14-15 years, and 29% were aged 16-17 years. Just over half were female (53%), with most categorised as high SES (75%), and 'White British' (83%). Most participants were never-smokers (87%) and, among never-smokers, the majority (67%) were non-susceptible.

### Reactions to dissuasive cigarettes versus the standard cigarette

Mean reaction scores to each of the four cigarettes were towards the negative end of each scale for all nine items ( $<3$ ) (Table 1). The exception was whether the standard cigarette was considered off-putting, with the mean score ( $M=3.21$ ;  $SD=1.59$ ) suggesting a mostly neutral reaction. Wilcoxon Signed Rank tests found significantly less negative reactions to the standard cigarette than the dissuasive cigarettes for all nine measures (all  $p<0.001$ ).

[Table 1]

### Reactions to the dissuasive cigarettes

Compared to the 'Smoking kills' cigarette, Wilcoxon Signed-Rank tests found that the 'toxic' cigarette was rated significantly more negatively on all reaction measures (all  $p<0.008$ ; except approving of friends,  $p=0.007$ , and perceived family acceptability  $p=0.003$ ) (Table 1). Compared to the green cigarette, Wilcoxon Signed Rank tests found that the 'toxic' cigarette was rated significantly more negatively for appeal, attraction, being nice to be seen with, perceived harm, and being off-putting (all  $p<0.001$ ). There were no significant differences in reactions between the green cigarette and 'smoking kills' cigarette.

### Overall reactions to cigarettes

1  
2  
3 Based on the binary coded composite reaction score, almost all participants had an overall  
4 negative reaction to the 'smoking kills' (94%), green (93%) and 'toxic' cigarette (96%). Over  
5  
6 four-fifths (85%) had a negative reaction to the standard cigarette. Chi-square tests found a  
7  
8 difference of age for all for cigarettes (range:  $p < 0.001$  to  $p = 0.007$ ) (Table 2), with the linear-  
9  
10 by-linear associations showing that negative reactions were greater among 12-13 year olds than  
11  
12 older age groups for the standard cigarette ( $\chi^2 = 7.11$ ,  $p = 0.008$ ), 'smoking kills' cigarette  
13  
14 ( $\chi^2 = 5.89$ ,  $p = 0.015$ ), green cigarette ( $\chi^2 = 10.66$ ,  $p = 0.001$ ), and 'toxic' cigarette ( $\chi^2 = 4.72$ ,  
15  
16  $p = 0.030$ ). Never-smokers were more likely to react negatively to all four cigarettes than ever-  
17  
18 smokers (all  $p < 0.001$ ). Non-susceptible never-smokers were more likely to react negatively to  
19  
20 all four cigarettes than susceptible never-smokers (all  $p < 0.001$ ). Concerning gender, females  
21  
22 were more likely to react negatively to the green cigarette than males ( $\chi^2 = 5.32$ ,  $p = 0.021$ ). For  
23  
24 ethnicity, participants categorised as 'Other or preferred not to say' were more likely to react  
25  
26 negatively to the standard cigarette than those identifying as 'White British' ( $\chi^2 = 3.68$ ,  
27  
28  $p = 0.055$ ).

29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37 [Table 2]

### 38 39 40 41 42 **Trial intentions**

43  
44 Most participants indicated that they would not try the standard (84%), 'smoking kills' (89%),  
45  
46 green (90%), and 'toxic' cigarette (91%) (Table 3). Chi-square tests found a main difference  
47  
48 of age for all four cigarettes (all  $p < 0.001$ ), with the linear-by-linear associations showing that  
49  
50 trial intentions were lower among 12-13 year olds than older age group for the standard  
51  
52 ( $\chi^2 = 14.64$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), 'smoking kills' ( $\chi^2 = 9.60$ ,  $p = 0.002$ ), green ( $\chi^2 = 12.63$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), and  
53  
54 'toxic' cigarette ( $\chi^2 = 13.32$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). Never-smokers (vs. ever-smokers) and non-susceptible  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 never-smokers (vs. susceptible) were less likely to have trial intentions for all four cigarettes  
4  
5 (all  $p < 0.001$ ). There were no differences by SES, gender, or ethnicity.  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 [Table 3]  
11  
12  
13

## 14 **DISCUSSION**

15  
16 We found that adolescents rated the three dissuasive cigarettes (featuring a text warning, text  
17 warning and symbol, or unattractively coloured) more negatively than a standard cigarette.  
18  
19 Across the cigarettes, reactions were consistently more negative for the toxic cigarette featuring  
20 the image of a skull and cross bones on all key reaction measures, including appeal,  
21 attractiveness, harmfulness and whether it was off-putting. Most adolescents had overall  
22 negative reactions to each dissuasive cigarette – particularly the toxic cigarette - with the vast  
23 majority indicating that they would not try any of these, particularly younger adolescents and  
24 non-susceptible never-smokers.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35 Our findings are consistent with research that has shown that consumers have negative  
36 reactions to dissuasive cigarettes.<sup>15-27</sup> The findings are important given that there are fewer  
37 studies with adolescents than adults, even though the potential impact would be expected to be  
38 greater with the former.<sup>19</sup> Adolescents are a population who often access single cigarettes from  
39 friends, peers or family<sup>28,29,30</sup> and, as a consequence, may avoid exposure to prominent health  
40 warnings or unattractively coloured packaging (for those countries with standardised  
41 packaging) at the point of experimentation or consumption.<sup>40</sup> As tobacco companies have a  
42 long history of using the cigarette as a communication tool,<sup>10-14</sup> and continue to do so in  
43 countries with large pictorial health warnings and/or standardised packaging (e.g. through  
44 capsule cigarettes and other novel filter designs)<sup>41,42</sup> the evidence on dissuasive cigarettes  
45 suggests that they may help to further reduce the appeal of smoking.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Combining pictorials with a concise message has been suggested to increase the  
4 chances of attention being paid to the warning, the comprehension and retention of the  
5 message,<sup>43,44</sup> and potential impact on preventing smoking initiation.<sup>44</sup> Consistent with this, we  
6 found that the cigarette with a warning ('toxic') and image (skull and crossbones) was  
7 perceived most negatively by adolescents; however, all three dissuasive cigarettes were viewed  
8 more negatively than the standard cigarette and trial intentions were low for each. As  
9 desensitisation occurs with all warnings, rotating dissuasive cigarette designs may help  
10 maximise impact. For instance, this could be achieved by requiring text warnings on cigarettes  
11 for one year, unattractively coloured cigarettes for the second year, text warnings and symbols  
12 on cigarettes for the third year, and then starting the rotation sequence again for subsequent  
13 years. This would mirror the approach used in the European Union for on-pack health  
14 warnings, where the images are replaced annually.

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31 Regarding limitations, the study was conducted in a school setting with teachers and  
32 peers present and, therefore, participants may have felt uncomfortable disclosing their smoking  
33 status or may have provided socially desirable responses. Most participants were of high or  
34 medium SES, due to a large proportion of the sample being recruited from one school in an  
35 affluent area, and the majority were never-smokers. We therefore provide very limited insight  
36 into reactions and trial intentions among those from low SES backgrounds or ever-smokers.  
37 Nevertheless, although the absolute values given may not be representative, that our findings  
38 are consistent with previous research suggests that the overall trends are likely to be  
39 generalisable to other populations. Future research using a larger and more representative  
40 sample would be able to examine to what extent reactions vary by SES (if at all) and how  
41 findings differ between never and ever-smokers (or between different levels of smoking  
42 heaviness, e.g. experimenters versus established smokers). Few participants reported trial  
43 intentions for any of the dissuasive cigarettes and therefore this distribution of responses,  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 combined with the modest sample size, meant it was not possible to use multivariate models to  
4  
5 examine the association between cigarette reactions and trial intentions while controlling for  
6  
7 other covariates (e.g. demography and smoking status). To reduce participant burden we only  
8  
9 explored three dissuasive designs. Given that the cigarettes were displayed in the same order;  
10  
11 this may have caused an order effect. Randomisation would be beneficial in future research, as  
12  
13 would research exploring how reactions vary among participants who are randomised to see  
14  
15 only one cigarette design, thus removing any bias or confounding effect from exposure to  
16  
17 multiple designs. Further research exploring alternative colours or dissuasive messages, or  
18  
19 cigarettes featuring multiple dissuasive features (e.g. a warning, unattractive colour and  
20  
21 imagery),<sup>25,26</sup> would be also beneficial.

22  
23  
24  
25  
26 In conclusion, adding dissuasive features to cigarettes, for example by making them an  
27  
28 unattractive colour or featuring a written and/or pictorial warning, elicits negative reactions  
29  
30 among adolescents in Scotland and reduces interest in trialling these. The findings therefore  
31  
32 provide support to the Scottish and Canadian Government's willingness to consider dissuasive  
33  
34 cigarettes as a future tobacco control measure.

#### 35 36 37 38 39 40 **What this paper adds:**

- 41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
- In addition to standardised packaging, there is growing interest in communicating health messages through dissuasive cigarettes.
  - Most research has focused on adults and on limited styles of dissuasive cigarettes (warning messages and unappealing colours), therefore, we examined how adolescents in Scotland reacted to three different dissuasive cigarette designs, including a cigarette with both a written warning and hazardous image.
  - Reactions to all three dissuasive cigarette designs were negative. Rotating these designs may help reduce habituation.



- 1  
2  
3 ➤ The findings demonstrate that dissuasive cigarettes would likely have the intended  
4 impact in dissuading smoking uptake among young people.  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 **Acknowledgments:** We would like to thank all schools and participants that took part in this  
11 study.  
12  
13  
14

15  
16  
17 **Funding:** PhD studentship awarded by the University of Stirling.  
18  
19  
20

21 **Declaration of interests:** No conflicts to declare.  
22  
23  
24  
25

## 26 REFERENCES

27  
28

- 29 1. Tobacco free kids, 2020. Standardised or plain tobacco packaging, international  
30 developments. Available:  
31 [www.tobaccofreekids.org/assets/global/pdfs/en/standardized\\_packaging\\_development](http://www.tobaccofreekids.org/assets/global/pdfs/en/standardized_packaging_development_s_en.pdf)  
32 [s\\_en.pdf](http://www.tobaccofreekids.org/assets/global/pdfs/en/standardized_packaging_development_s_en.pdf). [Accessed February 10, 2020]  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38 2. Moodie C, Hoek J, Scheffels J, *et al*. Plain packaging: Legislative differences in  
39 Australia, France, the United Kingdom, New Zealand and Norway, and options for  
40 strengthening regulations. *Tob Control* 2019;28:485-492.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45 3. Moodie C, Thrasher JF, Cho YJ, *et al*. Flavour capsule cigarettes continue to  
46 experience strong global growth. *Tob Control* 2019;28:595–596.  
47  
48  
49  
50 4. Moodie C, MacKintosh AM, Thrasher, JF, *et al*. Use of cigarettes with flavor-  
51 changing capsules among smokers in the United Kingdom: An online  
52 survey. *Nicotine Tob Res* 2019;21:1547-1555.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 5. World Health Organisation. Tobacco plain packaging: global status update, 2018.  
4  
5 Available: [www.who.int/tobacco/publications/industry/tobacco-plain-packaging-](http://www.who.int/tobacco/publications/industry/tobacco-plain-packaging-global-status-update/en/)  
6  
7 [global-status-update/en/](http://www.who.int/tobacco/publications/industry/tobacco-plain-packaging-global-status-update/en/) [Accessed 16 Jan, 2020]  
8  
9
- 10 6. UK Government. Tobacco and Related Products Regulations 2016. Available:  
11  
12 [www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2016/507/pdfs/uksi\\_20160507\\_en.pdf](http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2016/507/pdfs/uksi_20160507_en.pdf) [Accessed March  
13  
14 9, 2020]  
15  
16
- 17 7. European Commission. Revision of the Tobacco Products Directive, 2016. Available  
18  
19 from: [https://ec.europa.eu/health/sites/health/files/tobacco/docs/dir\\_201440\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/health/sites/health/files/tobacco/docs/dir_201440_en.pdf)  
20  
21 [Accessed 16 Jan, 2020]  
22  
23
- 24 8. Scottish Government. Raising Scotland's tobacco free generation: our tobacco control  
25  
26 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/)  
27  
28 [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/)  
29  
30 [Accessed April 6, 2020]  
31  
32
- 33 9. Health Canada. New health related labelling for tobacco products, 2018. Ottawa,  
34  
35 Canada. Government of Canada. Health Canada. Available:  
36  
37 [www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/publications/healthy-living/consultation-](http://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/publications/healthy-living/consultation-new-labelling-tobacco-what-we-heard.html)  
38  
39 [new-labelling-tobacco-what-we-heard.html](http://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/publications/healthy-living/consultation-new-labelling-tobacco-what-we-heard.html) [Accessed April 14, 2020]  
40  
41
- 42 10. Smith KC, Washington C, Welding K, *et al.* Cigarette stick as valuable  
43  
44 communicative real estate: a content analysis of cigarettes from 14 low-income and  
45  
46 middle-income countries. *Tob Control* 2017;26:604-7.  
47  
48
- 49 11. Cook BL, Wayne GF, Keithly L, *et al.* One size does not fit all: how the tobacco  
50  
51 industry has altered cigarette design to target consumer groups with specific  
52  
53 psychological and psychosocial needs. *Addiction* 2003;98:1547-61.  
54  
55
- 56 12. Doxey J, Hammond D. Deadly in pink: the impact of cigarette packaging among  
57  
58 young women. *Tob Control* 2011;20:353-60.  
59  
60

13. Ford A, Moodie C, MacKintosh AM, *et al.* Adolescent perceptions of cigarette appearance. *Eur J Public Health* 2013;24:464-8.
14. Carpenter CM, Wayne GF, Connolly GN. Designing cigarettes for women: new findings from the tobacco industry documents. *Addiction* 2005;100:837-851.
15. Hoek, J., & Robertson, C. (2015). How do young adult female smokers interpret dissuasive cigarette sticks?. *Journal of Social Marketing* 2015;5(1):21-39.
16. Hoek J, Gendall P, Eckert C, *et al.* Dissuasive cigarette sticks: the next step in standardised ('plain') packaging? *Tob Control* 2016;25:699-705.
17. Lund I, Scheffels J. Adolescent perceptions of dissuasive sticks: a web survey among 16–20 year olds in Norway. *BMC Public Health* 2018;18:974.
18. Moodie C, Gendall P, Hoek J, *et al.* The response of young adult smokers and nonsmokers in the United Kingdom to dissuasive cigarettes: An online survey. *Nicotine Tob Res* 2017;21:227-233.
19. Moodie C, Hiscock R, Thrasher J, *et al.* Perceptions of cigarette pack inserts promoting cessation and dissuasive cigarettes among young adult smokers in the UK: a cross-sectional online survey. *BMJ open* 2018;8:019662.
20. Moodie C, MacKintosh AM, Gallopel-Morvan K, *et al.* Adolescents' perceptions of an on-cigarette health warning. *Nicotine Tob Res* 2016;19:1232-1237.
21. Moodie C. Novel ways of using tobacco packaging to communicate health messages: Interviews with packaging and marketing experts. *Addict Res Theory* 2016;24:54-61.
22. Hassan L, Shiu E. No place to hide: two pilot studies assessing the effectiveness of adding a health warning to the cigarette stick. *Tob Control* 2013;24:3-5.
23. Drovandi AD, Teague PA, Glass, BD, *et al.* Australian school student perceptions of effective anti-tobacco health warnings. *Front Public Health* 2018;6:297.

- 1  
2  
3 24. Drovandi A, Teague PA, Glass B, *et al.* Australian university student perceptions of  
4 health messages on cigarette sticks. *Health communication* 2019;1-9.  
5  
6  
7  
8 25. Drovandi A, Teague PA, Glass B, *et al.* Australian community pharmacist  
9 experiences with smoking cessation and opinions of health warnings on individual  
10 cigarette sticks. *Int J Pharm Pract* 2019;27:121-30.  
11  
12  
13  
14 26. Gallopel-Morvan K, Droulers O, Pantin-Sohier G. Dissuasive cigarettes: which cues  
15 are the most effective at deterring young people from smoking?. *Public Health*  
16 2019;174:22-30.  
17  
18  
19  
20 27. Mitchell D, Moodie C, Critchlow N, *et al.* Adolescents' reactions to, and perceptions  
21 of, dissuasive cigarettes: a focus group study in Scotland. *Drugs* 2020:1-8.  
22  
23  
24 28. Donaghy E, Bauld L, Eadie D, *et al.* A qualitative study of how young Scottish  
25 smokers living in disadvantaged communities get their cigarettes. *Nicotine Tob Res*  
26 2013;5:2053-2059.  
27  
28  
29  
30 29. Tjelta T, Ritchie D, Amos A. "It's Easy to Get Fags": A Qualitative Study of  
31 Disadvantaged Young People's Perspectives on Cigarette Availability and Access.  
32 *Nicotine Tob Res* 2016;19:1434-1440.  
33  
34  
35  
36 30. Nuyts PA, Hewer RM, Kuipers M, *et al.* Youth Access to Cigarettes Across Seven  
37 European Countries: A Mixed-Methods Study. *Nicotine Tob Res* 2019;1-8.  
38  
39  
40  
41 31. Scottish Government. Scottish school's adolescent lifestyle and substance use survey  
42 (SALSUS): smoking report 2018, 2019. Available:  
43 [https://www.gov.scot/publications/scottish-schools-adolescent-lifestyle-substance-](https://www.gov.scot/publications/scottish-schools-adolescent-lifestyle-substance-use-survey-salsus-smoking-report-2018/)  
44 [use-survey-salsus-smoking-report-2018/](https://www.gov.scot/publications/scottish-schools-adolescent-lifestyle-substance-use-survey-salsus-smoking-report-2018/). [Accessed April 6, 2020]  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53 32. Moodie C., MacKintosh, AM., Hastings G. Adolescents' response to pictorial  
54 warnings on the reverse panel of cigarette packs: a repeat cross-sectional study. *Tob*  
55 *Control* 2015;24:93-97.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 33. Health and Safety Executive. Hazard Pictograms. 2019. Available:  
4  
5 [https://www.hse.gov.uk/chemical-classification/labelling-packaging/hazard-symbols-](https://www.hse.gov.uk/chemical-classification/labelling-packaging/hazard-symbols-hazard-pictograms.htm)  
6 [hazard-pictograms.htm](https://www.hse.gov.uk/chemical-classification/labelling-packaging/hazard-symbols-hazard-pictograms.htm)  
7  
8  
9
- 10 34. Boyce W, Torsheim T, Currie C, *et al.* The family affluence scale as a measure of  
11 national wealth: validation of an adolescent self-report measure. *Soc Indic Res*  
12 2006;78:473-487.  
13  
14  
15  
16
- 17 35. Moore GF, Currie D, Gilmore G, *et al.* Socioeconomic inequalities in childhood  
18 exposure to secondhand smoke before and after smoke-free legislation in three UK  
19 countries. *Journal of Public Health* 2012;34:599-608.  
20  
21  
22  
23
- 24 36. Currie C, Molcho M, Boyce W, *et al.* Researching health inequalities in adolescents:  
25 the development of the Health Behaviour in School-Aged Children (HBSC) family  
26 affluence scale. *Soc Sci Med* 2008;66:1429-1436.  
27  
28  
29  
30
- 31 37. Moodie, C., Ford, A., Mackintosh, A. M., & Hastings, G. (2011) Young people's  
32 perceptions of cigarette packaging and plain packaging: an online survey. *Nicotine &*  
33 *Tobacco Research*, 14 (1), 98-105  
34  
35  
36
- 37 38. Ford A, MacKintosh AM, Moodie C, *et al.* Cigarette pack design and adolescent  
38 smoking susceptibility: a cross-sectional survey. *BMJ open* 2013;3:e003282.  
39  
40  
41  
42
- 43 39. Brown AK, Moodie C, Hastings G, *et al.* The association of normative perceptions  
44 with adolescent smoking intentions. *J Adolesc* 2010;33:603-14.  
45  
46  
47
- 48 40. Moodie C. Warnings on every cigarette: extending health messaging to the  
49 consumption experience. *CMAJ* 2018;190:1271-E1272  
50  
51  
52
- 53 41. Moodie C, Angus K, Mitchell D, *et al.* How tobacco companies in the UK prepared  
54 for and responded to standardised packaging of cigarettes and rolling tobacco. *Tob*  
55 *control* 2018;27(e1):85-92.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 42. Scollo M, Bayly M, White S, *et al.* Tobacco product developments in the Australian  
4 market in the 4 years following plain packaging. *Tob Control* 2017;27:580-58.  
5  
6  
7  
8 43. Wogalter MS, Laughery KR, Mayhorn CB. Warnings and hazard communications. In:  
9  
10 Salvendy G, eds. Handbook of human factors and ergonomics. 2012;4:868-94.  
11  
12 44. Hammond D. Health warning messages on tobacco products: a review. *Tob Control*  
13  
14 2011;20:327-37.  
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

**Table 1:** Within-group individual reactions towards a 'standard' cigarette and three dissuasive cigarettes

	<sup>1</sup> Standard vs. Smoking kills			<sup>2</sup> Standard vs. Green			<sup>3</sup> Standard vs. Toxic			<sup>4</sup> Smoking kills vs. Green			<sup>5</sup> Smoking kills vs. Toxic			<sup>6</sup> Green vs. Toxic		
	Standard (SD)	Smoking kills (SD)	<i>p</i> <sup>1</sup>	Standard (SD)	Green (SD)	<i>p</i> <sup>1</sup>	Standard (SD)	Toxic (SD)	<i>p</i> <sup>1</sup>	Smoking kills (SD)	Green (SD)	<i>p</i> <sup>1</sup>	Smoking kills (SD)	Toxic (SD)	<i>p</i> <sup>1</sup>	Green (SD)	Toxic (SD)	<i>p</i> <sup>1</sup>
<b>Individual items</b>																		
Unappealing(1)/Appealing(5)	2.59 (1.45)	1.96 (1.19)	<0.001	2.59 (1.45)	1.95 (1.25)	<0.001	2.59 (1.45)	1.70 (1.09)	<0.001	1.96 (1.19)	1.95 (1.25)	<i>n.s.</i>	1.96 (1.19)	1.70 (1.09)	<0.001	1.95 (1.25)	1.70 (1.09)	<0.001
Unattractive(1)/Attractive(5)	2.13 (1.26)	1.58 (0.89)	<0.001	2.13 (1.26)	1.54 (1.01)	<0.001	2.13 (1.26)	1.33 (0.82)	<0.001	1.58 (0.89)	1.54 (1.01)	<i>n.s.</i>	1.58 (0.89)	1.33 (0.82)	<0.001	1.54 (1.01)	1.33 (0.82)	<0.001
Unstylish(1)/Stylish(5)	2.05 (1.39)	1.75 (1.24)	<0.001	2.05 (1.39)	1.77 (1.30)	<0.001	2.05 (1.39)	1.66 (1.25)	<0.001	1.75 (1.24)	1.77 (1.30)	<i>n.s.</i>	1.75 (1.24)	1.66 (1.25)	<0.001	1.77 (1.30)	1.66 (1.25)	<i>n.s.</i> <sup>2</sup>
Friends would not approve(1)/would approve(5)	1.88 (1.35)	1.68 (1.20)	<0.001	1.88 (1.35)	1.65 (1.17)	<0.001	1.88 (1.35)	1.58 (1.15)	<0.001	1.68 (1.20)	1.65 (1.17)	<i>n.s.</i>	1.68 (1.20)	1.58 (1.15)	<0.001	1.65 (1.17)	1.58 (1.15)	<i>n.s.</i> <sup>2</sup>
Would not approve of friends(1)/would approve(5)	1.64 (1.17)	1.55 (1.10)	<0.001	1.64 (1.17)	1.51 (1.06)	<0.001	1.64 (1.17)	1.49 (1.06)	<0.001	1.55 (1.10)	1.51 (1.06)	<i>n.s.</i>	1.55 (1.10)	1.49 (1.06)	0.007	1.51 (1.06)	1.49 (1.06)	<i>n.s.</i>
Family would not accept(1)/would accept(5)	1.40 (0.93)	1.33 (0.85)	<0.001	1.40 (0.93)	1.31 (0.85)	<0.001	1.40 (0.93)	1.30 (0.83)	<0.001	1.33 (0.85)	1.31 (0.85)	<i>n.s.</i>	1.33 (0.85)	1.30 (0.83)	0.003	1.31 (0.85)	1.30 (0.83)	<i>n.s.</i>
Would not be nice to be seen with(1)/would be nice(5)	1.69 (1.18)	1.40 (0.89)	<0.001	1.69 (1.18)	1.46 (1.02)	<0.001	1.69 (1.18)	1.33 (0.89)	<0.001	1.40 (0.89)	1.46 (1.02)	<i>n.s.</i>	1.40 (0.89)	1.33 (0.89)	<0.001	1.46 (1.02)	1.33 (0.89)	<0.001
Harmful(1)/not at all harmful	1.73 (1.17)	1.46 (1.04)	<0.001	1.73 (1.17)	1.46 (1.06)	<0.001	1.73 (1.17)	1.34 (1.0)	<0.001	1.46 (1.04)	1.46 (1.06)	<i>n.s.</i>	1.46 (1.04)	1.34 (1.0)	<0.001	1.46 (1.06)	1.34 (1.00)	<0.001
Off-putting(1)/Not at all off-putting	3.21 (1.59)	2.32 (1.41)	<0.001	3.21 (1.59)	2.27 (1.46)	<0.001	3.21 (1.59)	1.91 (1.31)	<0.001	2.32 (1.41)	2.27 (1.46)	<i>n.s.</i>	2.32 (1.41)	1.91 (1.31)	<0.001	2.27 (1.46)	1.91 (1.31)	<0.001

Notes:

All test subject to Bonferroni correction, critical value  $p=0.008$ .<sup>1</sup> Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test.<sup>2</sup> Value significant before Bonferroni correction.Range of missing data across comparisons: <sup>1</sup>5-26, <sup>2</sup>6-26, <sup>3</sup>7-27, <sup>4</sup>6-25, <sup>5</sup>7-25, <sup>6</sup>7-27.

**Table 2.** Whether participant had an overall negative reaction to the 'standard' and dissuasive cigarettes and differences by demography and smoking status

Variable	<i>Standard cigarette</i>				<i>'Smoking Kills' cigarette</i>				<i>Green cigarette</i>				<i>'Toxic' cigarette</i>			
	%	<i>n</i>	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	%	<i>n</i>	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	%	<i>n</i>	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	%	<i>n</i>	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>
<b>Overall</b>	85	445			94	492			93	480			96	497		
<b>Age</b>			15.94	<b>&lt;0.001</b>			12.84	<b>0.002</b>			16.94	<b>&lt;0.001</b>			10.03	<b>0.007</b>
12-13 years	94	151			99	161			100	156			100	160		
14-15 years	79	152			91	172			90	170			94	175		
16-17 years	83	142			93	159			91	154			95	162		
<b>Gender</b>			0.33	n.s.			0.10	n.s.			5.32	<b>0.021</b>			1.71	n.s.
Female	86	243			94	268			95	268			97	272		
Male	84	201			94	223			90	211			95	224		
<b>SES</b>			0.28	n.s.			0.10	n.s.			0.12	n.s.			0.004	n.s.
Low and Medium	84	111			95	126			93	123			96	126		
High	85	327			94	360			93	351			96	365		
<b>Ethnicity</b>			3.68	<b>0.055</b>			0.05	n.s.			0.12	n.s.			0.10	n.s.
Other/prefer not to say	78	71			95	86			92	82			96	85		
White British	86	369			94	402			93	394			96	408		
<b>Smoking status</b>			63.69	<b>&lt;0.001</b>			40.60	<b>&lt;0.001</b>			36.59	<b>&lt;0.001</b>			24.71	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Never-smoker	90	402			97	430			96	420			98	432		
Ever-smoker	53	37			77	54			76	53			85	57		
<b>Susceptibility<sup>1</sup></b>			26.70	<b>&lt;0.001</b>			10.14	<b>0.001</b>			14.28	<b>&lt;0.001</b>			11.90	<b>0.001</b>
Non-susceptible	95	296			98	307			98	302			99	307		
Susceptible	78	105			92	122			90	117			94	126		

Notes:

<sup>1</sup> Never-smokers only $\chi^2$  = Pearson Chi SquareOverall reaction: Total score across nine reaction items, binary coded into negative ( $\leq 26$ ) or neutral or positive reaction ( $\geq 27$ ).



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

**Table 3:** Participants who said they would not trial the standard and dissuasive cigarette, and differences by demography and smoking status.

Variable	Standard cigarette				'Smoking Kills' cigarette				Green cigarette				'Toxic' cigarette			
	%	n	$\chi^2$	p	%	n	$\chi^2$	p	%	n	$\chi^2$	p	%	n	$\chi^2$	p
<b>Overall</b>	84	478			89	502			90	508			91	512		
<b>Age</b>			22.12	<0.001			16.93	<0.001			24.47	<0.001			21.09	<0.001
12-13 years	94	180			96	182			98	186			98	186		
14-15 years	78	159			84	170			84	170			86	174		
16-17 years	80	139			86	150			87	152			87	152		
<b>Gender</b>			1.66	n.s.			0.03	n.s.			0.75	n.s.			0.08	n.s.
Female	82	251			88	268			91	275			91	275		
Male	86	226			89	233			89	232			90	236		
<b>SES</b>			0.43	n.s.			0.38	n.s.			0.03	n.s.			0.26	n.s.
Low and medium	82	116			87	123			89	126			89	126		
High	85	352			89	369			90	372			91	376		
<b>Ethnicity</b>			0.50	n.s.			0.97	n.s.			1.10	n.s.			1.81	n.s.
Other/prefer not to say	82	80			86	84			87	85			87	85		
White British	85	393			89	413			90	418			91	422		
<b>Smoking status</b>			155.04	<0.001			126.31	<0.001			69.95	<0.001			120.44	<0.001
Never-smoker	92	443			94	455			94	452			96	461		
Ever-smoker	34	25			49	36			62	45			55	40		
<b>Susceptibility</b>			36.21	<0.001			22.52	<0.001			20.80	<0.001			14.28	<0.001
Non-susceptible	97	327			98	329			97	327			98	330		
Susceptible	80	114			87	124			86	123			90	129		

Notes:

<sup>1</sup> Never-smokers only

$\chi^2$  = Pearson Chi Square

Trial intentions: Binary from original scale variable, No trial intentions (score 4/5) or neutral/positive trial intentions (score 1-3).