



## City Research Online

### City, University of London Institutional Repository

---

**Citation:** Rodríguez-Lesmes, P., Góngora, P., Mentzakis, E., Buckley, N., Gallego, J. M., Guindon, E., Martínez, J. P. & Paraje, G. (2024). Would Plain Packaging and Health Warning Labels Reduce Smoking in the Presence of Informal Markets? A Choice Experiment in Colombia. *Social Science & Medicine*, 354, 117069. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2024.117069

This is the accepted version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version.

---

**Permanent repository link:** <https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/33204/>

**Link to published version:** <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2024.117069>

**Copyright:** City Research Online aims to make research outputs of City, University of London available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. URLs from City Research Online may be freely distributed and linked to.

**Reuse:** Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

---

City Research Online:

<http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/>

[publications@city.ac.uk](mailto:publications@city.ac.uk)

---

# Journal Pre-proof

Would Plain Packaging and Health Warning Labels Reduce Smoking in the Presence of Informal Markets? A Choice Experiment in Colombia

Paul Rodríguez-Lesmes, Pamela Góngora, Emmanouil Mentzakis, Neil Buckley, Juan Miguel Gallego, Emmanuel Guindon, Juan Pablo Martínez, Guillermo Paraje



PII: S0277-9536(24)00522-7

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2024.117069>

Reference: SSM 117069

To appear in: *Social Science & Medicine*

Received Date: 20 September 2023

Revised Date: 19 June 2024

Accepted Date: 21 June 2024

Please cite this article as: Rodríguez-Lesmes, P., Góngora, P., Mentzakis, E., Buckley, N., Gallego, J.M., Guindon, E., Martínez, J.P., Paraje, G., Would Plain Packaging and Health Warning Labels Reduce Smoking in the Presence of Informal Markets? A Choice Experiment in Colombia, *Social Science & Medicine*, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2024.117069>.

This is a PDF file of an article that has undergone enhancements after acceptance, such as the addition of a cover page and metadata, and formatting for readability, but it is not yet the definitive version of record. This version will undergo additional copyediting, typesetting and review before it is published in its final form, but we are providing this version to give early visibility of the article. Please note that, during the production process, errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

© 2024 Published by Elsevier Ltd.

**Title and subtitle:** Would Plain Packaging and Health Warning Labels Reduce Smoking in the Presence of Informal Markets? A Choice Experiment in Colombia

### Authors

Paul Rodríguez-Lesmes, Universidad del Rosario, [paul.rodriguez@urosario.edu.co](mailto:paul.rodriguez@urosario.edu.co) [Corresponding]

Pamela Góngora, Oxford University, [pamela.gongora@dph.ox.ac.uk](mailto:pamela.gongora@dph.ox.ac.uk)

Emmanouil Mentzakis, City, University of London, [emmanouil.mentzakis@city.ac.uk](mailto:emmanouil.mentzakis@city.ac.uk)

Neil Buckley, York University, [nbuckley@yorku.ca](mailto:nbuckley@yorku.ca)

Juan Miguel Gallego, Universidad del Rosario, [juan.gallego@urosario.edu.co](mailto:juan.gallego@urosario.edu.co)

Emmanuel Guindon, McMaster University, [emmanuel.guindon@mcmaster.ca](mailto:emmanuel.guindon@mcmaster.ca)

Juan Pablo Martínez, Universidad del Rosario, [juanpablo.martinez@urosario.edu.co](mailto:juanpablo.martinez@urosario.edu.co)

Guillermo Paraje, Universidad Adolfo Ibañez, [guillermo.paraje@uai.cl](mailto:guillermo.paraje@uai.cl)

### Corresponding author details:

Call 12C # 4-69

111711 Bogotá, Colombia

[paul.rodriguez@urosario.edu.co](mailto:paul.rodriguez@urosario.edu.co)

Phone: (57) 6012970200 Ext 4902

**Funding/Support:** This project was funded under the GADC project by the CIHR/IDRC [grant number 108442-001]. Juan Miguel Gallego and Paul Rodríguez acknowledge financial support from Fulbright - Colciencias and Colombia Científica - Alianza EFI # 60185 contract # FP44842 - 220 - 2018, funded by The World Bank through the Scientific Ecosystems, managed by the Colombian Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation (MINCIENCIAS). Guillermo Paraje acknowledges funding by ANID FONDECYT, 1201452.

**Declarations of interest:** None reported.

**Acknowledgements:** We want to express our very great acknowledgements to Leonel Eduardo Criado for his valuable research assistance in programming the survey, and to Diego Felipe Ariza for his assistance in designing graphic materials for the DCE. Also, to Daniel Araya, Gioia Buckley, David Cameron, Ana Mena, Cuong Nguyen Viet, Le Thi Thu, Nicole Vellios, and Tatiana Villacres, for their comments and multiple discussions throughout the project.

**Authors' contributions:** E.G., J.G., and G.P. coordinated the project. E.M., P.R., and N.B. designed the experiment. P.R., P.G., and J.M. collected the data and performed the analysis. All authors participated in the elaboration and revision of the manuscript.

**Ethics approval:** The original design Research Ethics Board approval was obtained for Ontario, Canada (Hamilton Integrated Research Ethics Board (HiREB); HiREB Project #: 2652). Universidad del Rosario Ethics on Research board adheres to such approval, for the fieldwork in Colombia (DVO005 833 – CS499). We confirm that all methods were carried out in accordance with relevant guidelines and regulations that is Declaration of Helsinki.

**Patients' consent:** Informed consent was obtained from all participants, following the rules and protocols of Netquest, the firm that manages the panel.

**Background:** Despite progress made by many countries on the adoption of plain tobacco packaging laws over the last years, low- and middle-income countries, with a large supply of loose cigarettes via informal vendors, remain far behind.

**Aim:** To study the potential effectiveness of plain tobacco packaging and dissuasive cigarette sticks, via willingness-to-pay estimates, when illicit cigarette options are available.

**Methods:** We conducted a discrete choice experiment (DCE) in which respondents chose licit and illicit products with three attributes: packaging (standard vs. plain packaging), stick design (branded stick vs. stick with warning), and price level. The sample, collected on 12/2021, consisted of 1,761 respondents from an internet panel involving smokers and nonsmokers. Conditional logit and latent class models were used to estimate the willingness-to-pay (WTP) to avoid restrictive packaging elements.

**Results:** Nonsmokers are willing to pay USD \$5.63 for a pack of cigarettes to avoid plain packaging, which is higher than the actual commercial price of illicit cigarettes (USD \$2.40). The WTP increases to USD \$12.14 in the presence of illicit alternatives. Smokers are also willing to pay to avoid illicit options, which they also deem riskier, and the presence of such options increases the WTP to avoid plain packaging. However, nonsmokers do not perceive the illicit option as riskier. The dissuasive stick (stick with warning) does not affect perceptions of risk and plays a small role in terms of choice for both smokers and nonsmokers.

**Conclusions:** Even in the presence of illicit tobacco alternatives, plain packaging seems to be as effective in reducing the attractiveness of tobacco products in Colombia as in other countries that have already adopted it. Given conflicting results on the case for dissuasive sticks, there is a need for more research.

## **Would Plain Packaging and Health Warning Labels Reduce Smoking in Informal Markets? A Choice Experiment in Colombia**

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

The World Health Organization (WHO) Framework Convention on Tobacco Control (FCTC) entered into force in 2005 and, over the years, has led more than 180 countries to adopt demand- and supply-side reduction measures to tackle the tobacco epidemic<sup>1,2</sup>. This includes regulation on the packing and labeling of tobacco products, as the packaging is considered one of the primary advertising channels for the tobacco industry<sup>3-5</sup>.

The FCTC has encouraged countries to adopt health-warning labels (HWLs) on tobacco product packaging and to enforce plain or standardized packaging<sup>2,6,7</sup>. The HWLs aim to warn tobacco consumers of the harmful effects of tobacco use and should be no less than 50% of the principal display area, according to the FCTC<sup>2</sup>. Plain packaging aims to eliminate the effects of advertising or promotion on the packaging and to reduce positive perceptions of smoking<sup>8,9,10</sup>. This recommendation came years after the adoption of the FCTC by WHO and is today included in the FCTC guidelines on banning of tobacco advertising, promotion, and sponsorship<sup>9</sup>. According to the 2021 Global Progress Report on the convention's implementation, 98 countries have implemented mandatory HWLs on tobacco packaging, and 18 countries have adopted and enforced plain tobacco packaging laws<sup>11</sup>.

Much evidence has supported the packaging and labeling regulations of tobacco products. Various panel studies in different countries, including Australia, Canada, The United States, and Mexico, have shown that HWLs help to improve knowledge about smoking risks<sup>12,13-18</sup>. Pictorial warnings seem to be more effective in deterring consumption than text-only<sup>19</sup>. Evidence to date also suggests that illustrations of bodily harm have a greater impact on the effectiveness of packaging as a promotional vehicle, as larger warnings are more noticeable and perceived as more effective<sup>20,16,21,22</sup>. HWLs on cigarette sticks, formally known in the literature as dissuasive cigarette sticks, have also been introduced in some countries to enhance the negative impact of standardized packaging (i.e., tobacco packaging with branding elements) and respond to industry marketing strategies on cigarette sticks<sup>23,24</sup>. This measure is especially relevant in low- and middle-income settings, where the practice of selling single sticks (loosies) through an informal economy is more prevalent<sup>25,26</sup>. Yet it is also useful for high-income countries among low socio-economic communities<sup>25</sup>.

In regards to plain packaging, independent studies suggest that this measure negatively affects expectations of cigarette taste and makes cigarettes less appealing compared to branded packaging<sup>21,27,28</sup>. In Australia, the first country to introduce this measure, studies have shown that plain packaging is associated with lower smoking appeal, more support for the policy, and more urgency to quit among adult smokers<sup>29,30</sup>. In Canada, a discrete choice experiment with smoking and nonsmoking females showed a reduced demand for tobacco packaging features typically associated with standardized packaging<sup>31</sup>. The study concluded that standardized tobacco packaging has the potential to decrease demand and reduce misleading perceptions about product harm. More broadly, the literature reviews that have assessed the effectiveness of the plain packaging policy seem to support this measure as an effective tobacco cessation policy<sup>32-34</sup>. These results are likely associated with the behavioral responses triggered by the different emotions generated by the branding elements of standardized tobacco packaging<sup>35</sup>.

Despite several studies on the effectiveness of HWLs and plain packaging, various gaps in the literature remain. While simulations support adopting plain packaging in low- and middle-income countries<sup>36</sup>, there is a scarcity of research and evaluation of the potential effectiveness of these

measures based on experimental data<sup>10,15,20</sup>. Studies in Brazil<sup>37</sup>, India<sup>15</sup>, South Africa<sup>38</sup>, and Uruguay<sup>39,40</sup> (the only country that has adopted plain packaging in Latin America) showed that appeal is smaller in plain packaging than in branded packaging. Moreover, a study in Colombia analysed how plain packaging and HWL affect visual attention and pack preferences among smokers and non-smokers.<sup>41</sup>

In fact, it is still not fully clear how the effectiveness of HWLs and plain packaging changes when illicit tobacco products are available. Exploring this is highly important as the industry argues that plain packaging will likely increase the demand for illicit cigarettes. Few studies, however, have examined the relationship between tobacco packaging and illicit trade, as well as the relationship between tobacco packaging, illicit trade, and low- and middle-income settings. Only the South Africa study conducted the latter.<sup>38,42-44</sup>

Providing evidence on the value of HWLs and plain packaging to smokers and nonsmokers is particularly relevant in low- and middle-income countries, as over 80% of the world's 1.3 billion tobacco users are concentrated in these countries<sup>45</sup>. While tobacco-attributable deaths are projected to decline by 9% between 2002 and 2030 in high-income countries, tobacco-attributable deaths are estimated to double, from 3.4 million to 6.8 million, in low- and middle-income countries<sup>46</sup>. In Colombia, for instance, although the prevalence of tobacco use has decreased over the last few years, 34,800 people die every year due to tobacco-related illnesses<sup>47</sup>. Tobacco economic cost for the country is estimated at 17 trillion Colombian pesos (COP), equivalent to 1.8% of the country's gross domestic product (GDP)<sup>48</sup>. As street vendors are the leading distribution channel of cigarettes in Colombia, measures on single sticks are particularly relevant in the country<sup>49</sup>. Since 2006, Colombia has implemented different evidence-based interventions within the WHO FCTC (e.g., increased tobacco taxes, smoke-free environments, pictorial HWLs on tobacco packaging), with a significant impact on reducing tobacco consumption in the country<sup>50</sup>. Nevertheless, the country has not yet implemented plain packaging, a component of the WHO-FCTC, and the size of pictorial HWLs covers only 30% of the packaging's surface. There is evidence that current Colombian graphic health warnings do not generate a strong emotional response, but that larger HWLs would<sup>41,51</sup>. In consequence, it is relevant to study how modifying current HWLs would impact risk perceptions and choices<sup>48</sup>.

This study aims to estimate the value of plain packaging with large HWLs and dissuasive sticks on cigarettes to Colombian adults. With this study we aim to address three questions: (i) What is the value of plain packaging with large HWLs to both smokers and nonsmokers, and to what extent are valuation differences associated with harmfulness perceptions?; (ii) What is the value of dissuasive sticks to both smokers and nonsmokers, and to what extent are valuation differences associated with harmfulness perceptions?; and (iii) How do valuations of plain packaging and dissuasive sticks change by the availability of the illicit alternative?

We implemented a stated preferences discrete choice experiment<sup>52,53</sup> in two contexts: one in which only licit options are presented to participants and a second one in which an illicit tobacco product is available. Through the two designs, we could estimate the value that smokers receive from pictorial labels and provide more robust conclusions on the WTP to avoid HWLs in Colombia. The inclusion of both smokers and nonsmokers will allow us to better inform the Ministry of Health on the potential impact of additional tobacco control measures on the general population. The experimental design, data collection, and analysis followed the Professional Society for Health Economics and Outcomes Research (ISPOR) checklist on good research practices for conjoint analysis<sup>54</sup>. Notwithstanding the similarities with Sillero-Rejon et al.<sup>41</sup>, in terms of analysing HWL for smokers and non-smokers, our study extends the setting to the existence of illicit trade and cigarettes' warnings.

The remainder of the paper is set out as follows. In Section 2, we describe the experimental design and the data collection, and we set out the model and its features. In Section 3, we present the sample characteristics and the results from the models. In Section 4, we include some discussion around the most relevant findings and the conclusions that emerged from this study.

## 2. METHODS

### *Attributes, levels, and choice task*

Discrete choice experiments (DCE) have been widely used in the tobacco literature to elicit causal effects of attributes on tobacco product choices<sup>55,56</sup>. In these experiments, respondents are presented with a set of choice scenarios, with different cigarette/packaging attribute combinations. In each scenario, respondents are asked to choose their preferred option according to the attributes or characteristics of the tobacco alternatives. Our design, involving products from illicit markets and dissuasive sticks, is based on that of Guindon, Mentzakis, and Buckley.<sup>18</sup> The original design Research Ethics Board approval was obtained for Ontario, Canada (Hamilton Integrated Research Ethics Board (HiREB); HiREB Project #: 2652). A local university Ethics on Research board adhered to such approval, for the fieldwork in Colombia (DVO005 833 – CS499).

In our experiment, packages are described by three attributes common in the literature<sup>42,56</sup>, as presented in **Table 1**. The package and cigarette stick attributes were described using two levels: one that corresponds to the current regulation in the country (standard package with HWLs covering 30% of pack's surface and branded cigarette stick) and a hypothetical one with plain packaging and a large pictorial HWL covering 100% of pack's surface, and dissuasive cigarette sticks. The package and cigarette stick characteristics of the illicit option did not vary. The price attribute of a package of 20 cigarettes varies across six and two levels for legal and illegal products, respectively. Price levels were based on the retail prices of different brands and types of 20-cigarette packs available in the Colombian market<sup>57</sup>. To set the prices of the illicit tobacco package, we used the Demand for Illicit Cigarettes Survey Colombia 2016 (DEICS-CO), which was collected by a Colombian non-governmental organization (Fundación Anáas), with the financial support of the American Cancer Society and Cancer Research UK<sup>49,58</sup>.




**Table 1.** Attributes and levels

	<b>Licit tobacco package (Lucky Strike)</b>	<b>Illicit tobacco package (a)</b>
<b>Package</b>	Standard package Plain package and a large pictorial HWL	Standard package
<b>Cigarette stick</b>	Branded With warning (dissuasive)	Branded
<b>Price in USD (b)</b>	\$ 3.14 \$ 2.61 \$ 2.37 \$ 2.16 \$ 1.97 \$ 1.79	\$ 1.84 \$ 0.79

Note: (a) Following Ross (2015)<sup>59</sup>, an illicit tobacco package is defined as a package of cigarettes produced abroad that does not fulfill all obligations from customs and sanitary authorities. (b) All prices were presented in Colombian pesos (COP) during the experiment. We use an exchange rate of COP \$3.800.

An online survey was designed to conduct the experiment. In each scenario, respondents were presented with three tobacco options and an opt-out option. A choice scenario example is presented in Figure 1. We chose one of the most popular brands in the market (Lucky Strike) as there is a brand from the illicit market (Gold Seal) which has similar colours and general design, reducing the potential impact of differences of the branded design on choices.

**Figure 1.** Example of a choice task

Package 1	Package 2	Package 3
		
\$6.800 (USD \$1.79)	\$11.950 (USD \$3.14)	\$7.000 (USD \$1.84)
<p><b>Smokers:</b> If the three presented packs were the only options available, would you buy one of the three or choose not to smoke? / <b>Nonsmokers:</b> If the three presented packs were the only options available, which one would most encourage someone like you to smoke?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="radio"/> Package 1</li> <li><input type="radio"/> Package 2</li> <li><input type="radio"/> Package 3</li> <li><input type="radio"/> <b>Smokers:</b> None of the above* / <b>Nonsmokers:</b> I wouldn't know - Other Which one?</li> </ul> <p>Which of these options do you think would pose the least risk to your health?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="radio"/> Package 1</li> <li><input type="radio"/> Package 2</li> <li><input type="radio"/> Package 3</li> <li><input type="radio"/> I wouldn't know - Other Which one?</li> </ul> <p>* For the first question about intention to purchase, respondents were instructed as follows: “choosing 'none' implies that you would choose not to smoke</p>		

### *Experimental design*

We generated one experimental design with only licit tobacco package alternatives (Design A) and a second design that includes the illicit alternative (Design B). With both designs, respondents had to choose between four alternatives. We used a D-efficient factorial design to generate the experimental scenarios in the software Ngene<sup>60</sup> ([www.choice-metrics.com](http://www.choice-metrics.com)), with priors based on a pilot with 459 participants. For Design A, the most efficient design resulted in six choice sets (D-error = 0.34), which were all presented to participants (Block 1, here onwards). For Design B, the most efficient design involved 12 choice sets (D-error = 0.22), which were blocked into two groups (Blocks 2 and 3, here onwards), aimed at minimizing potential cognitive burden and respondent fatigue<sup>61</sup>. Both designs included restrictions to avoid dominant alternatives and/or unrealistic choice sets.

Participants were randomly assigned to respond to one of three blocks, each with the corresponding six choice sets and a dominant test (seven choice tasks in total). The dominant test (the fifth choice set) was added to determine the proportion of individuals who choose an expected dominated option<sup>62</sup>. In the dominant test for Design A, the most expensive option is the plain package with the warning on the stick, the mid-price option is the plain package without such a warning, and the cheapest is the branded package. For Design B, the dominant alternative corresponds to the branded package, cheaper than the plain one, and the illicit option is at its highest price (but still cheaper than the licit options).

### *Survey, sample, and data collection*

An online survey was designed to conduct the experiment. Appendix 11 presents the questionnaire.

At the start of the interview, we told them the products available for the experiment and described their characteristics. For the case of the illicit product, we told them explicitly that it comes from illicit trade, the authorities have not verified its components, and that it does not pay taxes. In addition, while not explicitly mentioned in the experiment, it is common knowledge that in Colombia people cannot be arrested or fined for the possession of small quantities or consumption of illicit drugs such as cannabis or illicit tobacco products.

The survey consisted of four sections. Section 1 included general information about the study, the informed consent, and screening questions to either qualify or disqualify respondents. Section 2 explained the choice task and presented two examples, two practice questions, and seven choice tasks that respondents were asked to complete. In each choice task, respondents were asked to choose among cigarette packs with different branding, HWLs, and prices. Section 4 consisted of a set of socio-demographic questions, including smoking-habit questions.

The survey was piloted twice, with a sample size of 10 and 459, respectively. Wording changes were introduced after the first pilot. The dominant test and minor adjustments on prices were introduced after the second one.

The survey was conducted in December 2021 via an online panel from Netquest, a company that specializes in online survey services. In this study, we aimed to collect responses from male and female Colombians: 400 responses from smokers between 18 and 25 years old (*young smokers*, here onwards), 800 responses from smokers between 26 and 65 years old (*adult smokers*), and 500 responses from nonsmokers between 18 and 25 years old (*young nonsmokers*). Both sample sizes were larger than the minimum required<sup>55,63</sup>. However, we did not perform a sample size calculation based on expected effect sizes as there was no published study similar to ours at the moment of the

design of this study. As part of our analysis, we performed an ex-post check based on our results following Bekker-Grob et al<sup>64</sup>.

### Analysis

All data analyses for the DCE were performed in Stata (v.17SE)<sup>65</sup>. We used a conditional logistic regression (clogit) to model choice data<sup>55,66</sup>. Our clogit, a generalised linear model, considers the following linear component for explaining the specific choice probability:

$$U_j = \beta_1 \cdot Price_j + \beta_2 PlainPack_j + \beta_3 Dissuasive_j + \beta_4 None_j + \beta_5 Illicit \quad (1)$$

where  $U_j$  corresponds to choosing alternative  $j$ ,  $PlainPack_j$  is 1 for the alternative that considers an alternative with plain package and large HWL instead of the branded pack,  $Dissuasive_j$  is 1 if it includes a dissuasive stick,  $None_j$  is 1 for the opt-out alternative. For Design 2,  $Illicit$  is 1 for the illicit pack, 0 for any version the licit option. With these coefficients we compute WTP by dividing coefficients  $\beta_2, \beta_3$  and  $\beta_5$  on  $\beta_1$ . We also compute marginal effects with the predicted choice probabilities: we establish a base scenario, compute the probability, and then compute it again but changing the characteristic of interest. The percentual variation of them is the estimate of the marginal effect. For these computations, our base price is of \$2.

To account for heterogeneity and to identify subgroups of respondents with similar preference patterns<sup>68,69</sup>, we conducted a latent class analysis and estimated models with two to seven classes<sup>70</sup>. These are semi-parametric models, and as such freed the analyst from unwarranted distributional assumptions. The class membership is modelled to depend on age, gender, education (high school, technical, college dummies), and income level. The choice of the optimal number of classes remains an issue, as it is a trade-off between explanatory power, the number of additional parameters, and ease of interpretation<sup>71</sup>. We used the routine *lclogitlm*<sup>72</sup> to estimate the model coefficients and to derive the corresponding WTPs. Finally, we assigned membership to a class based on the maximum predicted probability of belonging to each of them.

## 3. RESULTS

### 3.1. Sample characteristics

The final sample size was 1,761 individuals, of which 423 were young smokers, 823 adult smokers, and 515 young nonsmokers. Sample size calculations for Design B, which has more alternatives, to achieve a power of 80% at an  $\alpha$  level of 0.05 for two-sided tests to detect the coefficients of dissuasive sticks (the smallest coefficients) found in the main analysis (see below), suggested at least 830 smokers and 453 non-smokers were required. Therefore, our experiment was large enough to detect effects as large as our observed coefficients.

Self-reported characteristics included age, sex, education level, and income. In addition, respondents reported their smoking status, whether they utilized e-cigarettes, and the number of cigarettes consumed per day. **Table 2** displays these characteristics for the three different groups of respondents: adult smokers, young smokers, and young nonsmokers. Descriptive statistics per block are presented in Supplemental material (Appendix 1). Current smokers are those who reported they smoked daily or occasionally. Among the two groups of smokers, there are several differences to highlight: (i) relative to young smokers, adult smokers were more likely to be men, were more educated, had higher income levels, were less likely to have tried quitting smoking, and smoked more often and in higher quantities (number of sticks per day); (ii) among the young, smokers were more likely to be men than nonsmokers, but were as educated and had a slightly higher income level (see Appendix 2 in Supplemental material). These differences were similar to those observed

in the literature<sup>73,74</sup>. Respondents' characteristics were balanced across the three sampling blocks, as expected (see Appendix 3 in Supplemental material).

We assessed the reliability of responses in three ways. First, of the 12,327 choices represented in the dataset, 2,302 involved a dominated option. Of these potential choices, nearly 20% resulted in the choice of the dominated option. In terms of individuals, 20.7% (N=365) of the respondents chose at least one dominated option in the study. Second, the mean response time was 19.4 minutes (median of 15 minutes); Fewer than 1% (N=20) answered the entire survey in less than 5 minutes while 2.2% took more than one hour (N=39). The DCE took on average 5.7 minutes (SD=7.1; Min=0.6; Max=127.6). Third, 96.4% of the respondents completed the entire exercise (N=1698). Most dropouts were at the end of the DCE (N=16) and at the final survey where information about income and smoking habits was requested (N=29). In light of these results, we consider responses reliable.

Respondents tended to make a choice in most of the presented scenarios, smokers opted out in around 7% of the cases and non-smokers around 9%. Not surprisingly, in the absence of the illicit option both smokers and nonsmokers tend to choose the branded packages (See Table 3, columns 1 & 2). However, the introduction of the illicit product shifts the choice shares towards this option, especially for nonsmokers.

**Table 2.** Sample characteristics

Respondent type	Adult Smokers		Young Nonsmokers		Young Smokers	
	Mean or %	SD	Mean or %	SD	Mean or %	SD
<i>Demographics</i>						
Age	41.23	10.68	22.17	2.19	22.72	1.94
Male (%)	.62	.49	.41	.49	.51	.5
<i>Education level</i>						
High school (%)	.07	.26	.28	.45	.24	.43
Technical degree (%)	.27	.44	.35	.48	.34	.47
Undergrad or higher (%)	.62	.49	.32	.47	.34	.47
<i>Income level</i>						
Low (%)	.17	.37	.33	.47	.26	.44
High (%)	.79	.4	.61	.49	.67	.47
<i>Smoking periodicity</i>						
Never (%)	0	0	.8	.4	0	0
Used to (%)	0	0	.2	.4	0	0
Occasionally (%)	.48	.5	0	0	.76	.43
Daily (%)	.52	.5	0	0	.24	.43
Age of first cigarette	18.12	6.93	N/A	N/A	16.57	4.29
Tried to stop last year (%)	.68	.47	0	0	.72	.45
<i>Tobacco product consumption</i>						
Cigarettes per day	4.29	5.82	0	0	1.89	2.58
Tried e-cigarettes (%)	.23	.42	.04	.19	.29	.46
Observations	819		514		419	

**Table 3. Choice frequencies**

	Design A		Design B	
	(Only licit alternatives)		(Licit & illicit alternatives)	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Nonsmokers	Smokers	Nonsmokers	Smokers
Opt-out	0.082	0.060	0.109	0.071
Illicit			0.448	0.202
Plain with warning sticks	0.064	0.174	0.036	0.117
Plain with not-branded sticks	0.065	0.062	0.036	0.077
Standard with warning sticks	0.362	0.377	0.160	0.241
Standard with branded sticks	0.427	0.327	0.210	0.291
Respondents	147	426	367	812

### 3.2. Logistic regression models

The average marginal effects (Panel A) and estimated WTP (Panel B) of each attribute on the choice are presented in **Table 4**. **Table 5** presents the marginal effects for choosing the product that possesses the least health risk. Predicted probabilities are reported in Appendix 4 in Supplemental material.

#### *The value of plain packaging and a large pictorial HWL without illicit options (Design A)*

The price of legal packages has the expected negative sign and is statistically significant for both smokers and nonsmokers (Table 4, Panel A, Columns 1 and 2). On average, smokers prefer branded packages (not plain packages) and would be willing to pay USD \$1.81 (WTP = -1.810, 95% CI = [-2.126, -1.494],  $P < 0.01$ ) to avoid plain packages when only legal options are available. Given that the midpoint price for a licit pack of cigarettes is \$2.37, this is a price increase of 76%. Results are roughly similar between young (WTP = -1.923, 95% CI = [-2.423, -1.423],  $P < 0.01$ ) and adult smokers (WTP = -1.707, 95% CI = [-2.095, -1.319],  $P < 0.01$  - See Appendix 6 in Supplemental material). Among nonsmokers, plain packages would discourage them to start smoking more than branded ones, and they reported a WTP of USD \$8.397 to avoid the plain package (WTP = -8.397, 95% CI = [-14.630, -2.164],  $P < 0.01$  - Table 4 Panel B, Column 1).

In regards to risk perceptions, both nonsmokers and smokers consider the branded package a safer option than the plain package (ME = -15.9 pp, 95% CI = [-21.0, -10.8],  $P < 0.01$  and ME = -10.3 pp, 95% CI = [-12.8, -7.8],  $P < 0.01$ , respectively, in Table 5, Columns 1 and 2).

*The value of dissuasive sticks without illicit options (Design A)*

When it comes to warning or dissuasive sticks, smokers seem to be more likely to choose dissuasive sticks than sticks without the health warning (extra 9.2 pp, 95% CI = [5.1, 13.3],  $P < 0.01$ ). The WTP for the warning on the sticks is USD \$0.29 (WTP = 0.299, 95% CI = [0.172, 0.426],  $P < 0.01$ ). This result is mainly driven by adult smokers, who reported being more willing to choose and pay for a cigarette with the warning label (WTP = 0.390, 95% CI = [0.233, 0.547],  $P < 0.01$  - see Appendix 6 in Supplemental material). Moreover, dissuasive sticks do not seem to have a significant impact on the perceived health risks for smokers (0.9pp, 95% CI = [-1.5, 3.3]).

On the contrary, and as expected, nonsmokers indicate that dissuasive sticks, compared to unlabeled ones, would discourage them from starting to smoke (-8.7 pp, 95% CI = [-15.3, -2.0],  $P < 0.1$ ), with an associated WTP of USD \$1.105 less (but not significant: WTP = -1.105, 95% CI = [-2.340, 0.129],  $P > 0.1$ ). In line with this result, nonsmokers perceive dissuasive sticks as riskier than unlabelled ones (extra 5.1pp, 95% CI = [-9.6, -0.6],  $P < 0.05$ ).

*Valuations when an illicit alternative is available (Design B)*

The presence of an illicit alternative seems to change valuations, particularly among nonsmokers. Columns 3 and 4 of both Tables 3 and 4 present the results for Design B. Plain packages are less likely to be chosen by smokers (ME = -20.5pp, 95% CI = [-21.9, -19.1],  $P < 0.01$ ) and nonsmokers (ME = -9.0 pp, 95% CI = [-10.3, -7.6],  $P < 0.01$ ), as before. But the main difference is that the WTP for avoiding plain packages increases from USD \$1.80 to \$3.16 for smokers (WTP = -3.168, 95% CI = [-3.721, -2.615],  $P < 0.01$ ), and from USD \$5.63 to \$12.14 for nonsmokers (WTP = -12.142, 95% CI = [-18.886, -5.398],  $P < 0.01$ ). In terms of risk perception, plain packaging maintains a significant effect (Nonsmokers, ME = -7.9pp, 95% CI = [-9.9, -5.9],  $P < 0.05$ ; Smokers, ME = 9.9pp, 95% CI = [0.07, 11.3],  $P < 0.01$ ).

In regards to dissuasive sticks, marginal effects remain statistically significant for smokers (ME = 2.8pp, 95% CI = [0.4, 5.2],  $P < 0.1$ ) but not for nonsmokers (ME = -1.2pp, 95% CI = [-2.4, -0.0002]), and WTP valuations are similar (Nonsmokers, WTP = -0.801, 95% CI = [-1.816, 0.214] Smokers, WTP = 0.217, 95% CI = [0.041, 0.393],  $P < 0.1$ ). In terms of risk perception, the dissuasive stick is no longer statistically significant for nonsmokers (ME = 0.01, 95% CI = [-0.010, 0.030]).

For the specific choice of the illicit option, smokers are 4.7 pp less likely to buy products from illicit trade (ME = -0.047, 95% CI = [-0.088, -0.006],  $P < 0.1$ ) and are willing to pay USD \$0.41 to avoid them (WTP = -0.416, 95% CI = [-0.779, -0.053],  $P < 0.1$ ), suggesting that smokers do value purchasing recognized legal tobacco products (Table 4, Column 4). This is in line with the higher perception of health risk posed by the illicit package compared to the plain package (ME = -0.043, 95% CI = [-0.074, -0.012],  $P < 0.05$  - see Table 5, Column4).

If we consider results by age, we find that the WTP is larger for young smokers than for adult smokers: USD \$0.61 vs. \$0.28, respectively (Young, WTP = -0.611, 95% CI = [-1.126, -0.096],  $P < 0.1$ ; Adult, WTP = -0.285, 95% CI = [-0.781, 0.211] - see Appendix 6 in Supplemental material). The difference is substantial according to smoking intensity, as heavy smokers do not place a negative WTP on the illicit option (WTP = 0.151, 95% CI = [-0.743, 1.045]). In contrast, we do not observe substantial differences according to income.

Among nonsmokers, the results are substantially different. They consider illicit cigarettes more likely to encourage people like them to smoke (ME = 50.8 pp, 95% CI = [43.9, 57.6],  $P < 0.01$ ), which is compatible with the positive risk perception that they have about illicit cigarettes (ME = 0.117, 95% CI = [0.052, 0.182],  $P < 0.01$ ).

**Table 4.** Conditional logit models, intention to purchase results

<i>Panel A. Marginal effects</i>	Design A (Only licit alternatives)		Design B (Licit & illicit alternatives)	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Nonsmokers	Smokers	Nonsmokers	Smokers
Price	-0.080*** (0.030)	-0.182*** (0.010)	-0.015*** (0.0064)	-0.099*** (0.007)
Plain package with 100% HWL	-0.314*** (0.087)	-0.250*** (0.013)	-0.090*** (0.007)	-0.205*** (0.007)
Dissuasive stick	-0.087** (0.053)	0.092*** (0.021)	-0.012* (0.006)	0.028* (0.012)
Illicit			0.508*** (0.035)	-0.047* (0.021)
Respondents	147	426	367	812
Log-likelihood	-990	-3,100	-2,868	-6,236
AIC	1,988	6,207	5,748	12,483
BIC	2,013	6,237	5,7840	12,523
<i>Panel B. Willingness to pay (USD)</i>				
	Design A		Design B	
	Nonsmokers	Smokers	Nonsmokers	Smokers
Plain package	-8.397*** (3.180)	-1.810*** (0.161)	-12.664*** (3.602)	-3.168*** (0.282)
Dissuasive stick	-1.105** (0.630)	0.299*** (0.065)	-0.801 (0.518)	0.217* (0.090)
Illicit option			11.237*** (3.370)	-0.416* (0.185)

Note: Standard errors in parentheses. Significance: \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*  $p < 0.1$ . Marginal effects for variable "None" are omitted from the output. For calculating the marginal effect of price on the individual's probability of choosing a cigarette package, we used the USD \$2 branded package without the dissuasive stick as the reference.

AIC: Akaike Information criterion; BIC: Bayesian information criterion

**Table 5.** Conditional logit models, risk perceptions (least risk to health), marginal effects

	Design A (Only licit alternatives)		Design B (Licit & illicit alternatives)	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Nonsmokers	Smokers	Nonsmokers	Smokers
Price	0.029 (0.023)	-0.014 (0.008)	-0.002 (0.006)	-0.019*** (0.005)
Plain package with 100% HWL	-0.159*** (0.026)	-0.103*** (0.013)	-0.079*** (0.010)	-0.099*** (0.007)
Dissuasive stick	-0.051* (0.023)	0.009 (0.012)	0.010 (0.010)	0.010 (0.008)
Illicit			0.117*** (0.033)	-0.043** (0.016)
Respondents	139	426	367	812
Log-likelihood	-1,338	-4,017	-3,452	-7,583
AIC	2,683	8,041	6,915	15,175
BIC	2,708	8,071	6,951	15,216

Note: Standard errors in parentheses. Significance: \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*  $p < 0.1$ . Marginal effects for variable "None" are omitted from the output. AIC: Akaike Information criterion; BIC: Bayesian information criterion

### 3.3. Latent class models

We expanded the analysis to detect potential unobserved heterogeneity in terms of the valuation of the packaging alternatives.

To uncover group-wise behavior, a latent class model with two classes was used for each of the two experimental designs. The WTP results are reported in Appendix 8A, and the coefficients and mean characteristics of individuals classified in each latent class according to their highest-class membership predicted probability in Appendix 8B. While goodness-of-fit criteria suggested to use more classes (Appendix 7)<sup>66,75</sup>, there were no substantial differences in terms of the characteristics associated with each additional class. Hence, we prioritized ease of explanation to present the main results.

For smokers and non-smokers in both designs, Class 1 (share of 91.9% in Design A and 51.7% in Design B) consisted of more women who were less educated than Class 2. For smokers, in terms of smoking intensity, smokers in Class 1 consumed fewer cigarettes per day, started smoking later in life, and were more likely to have tried to stop smoking the previous year. While standard errors are large, limiting our ability to draw conclusions, Class 1 had a higher WTP than Class 2 for avoiding plain packaging (Design A, WTP = 4.199, 95% CI = [-21.94, 13.543]; Design B = 2652, 95% CI = [-7.877, 2.483]), They are also the ones with a negative valuation of illicit cigarettes.

Appendix 9 shows the latent class analysis for risk perceptions. Class 1, still the one with lower smoking frequencies, perceives illicit cigarettes to be riskier than the standard branded ones. The opposite occurs for Class 2 smokers, who consider the illicit choice less risky. These Class 2 smokers also consider the presence of a dissuasive stick to indicate a less risky alternative. For nonsmokers, the class with fewer former smokers is the one that considers the illicit choice as less

risky. This reinforces the hypothesis that the presence of illicit alternatives is riskier for those individuals who do not know the market.

#### 4. ROBUSTNESS CHECK

First, we excluded from the sample people who made choices that we considered dominated alternatives (20.7% of the respondents): for a similar or cheaper price, they chose illicit cigarettes over the plain or branded package, or the plain over the branded package. Such choices are not necessarily a “mistake” or proof of choosing options randomly; they could also express specific behavioral strategies. For instance, one of the respondents commented that they “prefer” the plain package as a strategy to quit smoking faster. Panel A of Appendix 10 shows that the WTP derived from the DCE exercise presents almost no difference with respect to the main exercise.

Second, we considered only respondents who took more than 5 minutes and less than 60 minutes to complete the choice experiment (N=59). These are respondents who were most likely to have taken the time to read the instructions and to have responded conscientiously to each of the choice tasks. Panel B of Appendix 10 shows that the WTP is similar for smokers (Columns 2 and 4) but is slightly smaller for nonsmokers. In particular, the branded package valuation for Design 1 is closer to the valuation of nonsmokers in Design 2.

#### 5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This study estimates the WTP and risk perceptions that Colombian (young) nonsmokers and smokers have for plain packaging with 100% HWL and dissuasive sticks, under the presence or not of illicit market alternatives. The results contribute not only to the literature by adding features to respondents’ choice sets, but also aim to inform tobacco control policies in low- and middle-income countries. A better understanding of people’s views about tobacco packaging, brand appeal, salience of HWLs, and availability of illicit cigarettes could help policymakers design effective tobacco control policies.

In terms of the central findings, first, consistent with economic theory and the literature, both smokers and nonsmokers prefer lower prices<sup>76,77</sup>, although smokers are more price-sensitive.

Second, plain packaging with 100% HWL seems to discourage smoking, particularly among nonsmokers, for whom the marginal effect is twice the size than for smokers. The result is a WTP to avoid the plain package with 100% HWL substantially higher than the actual commercial price of the package (USD \$5.60 vs. \$2.40). These results confirm the role of plain packaging in preventing smoking initiation and are fairly aligned with the visual attention and pack preferences results for the existent study. Though not directly comparable due to reporting differences, it also finds that plain packaging leads to lower odds of trying the cigarettes<sup>41</sup>. Nevertheless, we do not find the same heterogeneity across age groups: regardless of how old the respondent was, the nonbranded feature had a fairly stable and negative effect on preferences.

Third, the presence of illicit alternatives generates important differences in the valuations. First, plain packaging with 100% HWL becomes more salient, and the marginal effect is smaller for both smokers and nonsmokers. Second, smokers are less likely to choose the illicit product than the branded packaging, but nonsmokers are more likely to choose the illicit one. This result could be explained by the lack of knowledge about tobacco products in the market, as the majority have not

smoked in the past (20%). In such a scenario, the result is expected due to the attractiveness of illicit packages relative to the legal branded or plain ones.

Fourth, we considered dissuasive sticks as a potential strategy to overcome the reduced exposure to the package strategies in the context of single-cigarette sales. Unlike plain packaging, smokers and nonsmokers seem to respond differently to dissuasive sticks. While dissuasive sticks would discourage nonsmokers from smoking, smokers reported a positive valuation for dissuasive sticks. This result for smokers is unexpected but is consistent across the three blocks of the experiment, regardless of the presence of illicit alternatives. Current literature has studied the appeal of dissuasive sticks and the odds of choosing an alternative that includes them. Both of them are lower than those of standard sticks<sup>23 24</sup>. Yet, stick presentation has not been considered jointly with the corresponding package, nor with prices, nor in middle-income countries. As such, a potential explanation is that in the presence of illicit alternatives in the market, smokers might consider a standardized stick to allow for an easy differentiation of original products from counterfeits and unknown products coming from illicit markets. Further research on the topic of dissuasive sticks is required.

Some limitations should be considered in terms of the extent of the interpretation of our results. First, as we used a convenience sampling strategy via an internet panel, the external validity might be compromised for groups that are less likely to be part of internet panels (respondents living in rural areas or less educated, for example). Also, results are likely to hold in similar cultural and institutional backgrounds (i.e., Latin America and the Caribbean), but might not be directly extrapolated elsewhere. Second, the study does not consider the role of e-cigarettes as potential substitutes in the market, especially for young individuals. Future studies could include e-cigarettes as alternatives and assess valuations and preferences among smokers and nonsmokers in the presence of illegal cigarettes. In addition, our study has a particular selection of brands. We are unable to assess if results would change substantially with smaller HWL in the plain package, or with other brands from illicit markets that have HWL like those of the branded package.

Another limitation stems from the intrinsic characteristics of choice experiments, particularly the challenge of ensuring that results truly capture participants' preferences. The theoretical scenarios employed in DCEs often complicate the assessment of stated preferences' validity. Yet, the push for validating choice experiments in healthcare, as recommended by best practice guidelines, is noteworthy<sup>78</sup>. External validity, evaluated through the alignment of estimated preferences with real-world decisions (revealed preferences), shows that DCEs can yield reliable insights, especially regarding familiar decisions, which is the case for smokers' choices in this study<sup>78,79</sup>. However, the extrapolation of findings from young non-smokers about unfamiliar products may not accurately reflect their actual decisions. While this is a limitation, it is also important to consider good research practice in stated preference studies, as data quality is not guaranteed by focusing only on reliability and validity testing. Aspects such as respondent understanding or a diverse sample are crucial to ensure the quality of the data collected.

Our results confirm the effectiveness and relevance of plain packaging as a tobacco control policy in the context of informal markets. We also show that dissuasive sticks, at least in the form presented in our study, do not change risk perceptions, and are even valued positively by smokers. We hypothesize that it becomes a device to disentangle counterfeit products, although future research could explore this behavior in depth and shed light on potential adjustments to this tobacco control strategy. Our results also show that illicit cigarettes pose a risk for nonsmokers, as perceptions of higher risk and less appeal of illicit products, which are clear for smokers, are not present for nonsmokers. From a tobacco control policy perspective, these results reinforce the need to eliminate all forms of illicit trade in tobacco products.

## REFERENCES

1. United Nations. WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control. Accessed 25 May, 2022, 2022. [https://treaties.un.org/pages/ViewDetails.aspx?src=TREATY&mtdsg\\_no=IX-4&chapter=9&clang=\\_en](https://treaties.un.org/pages/ViewDetails.aspx?src=TREATY&mtdsg_no=IX-4&chapter=9&clang=_en)
2. WHO FCTC. *The WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control: an overview*. 2021. <https://fctc.who.int/publications/m/item/the-who-framework-convention-on-tobacco-control-an-overview>
3. Wakefield M, Morley C, Horan JK, Cummings KM. The cigarette pack as image: new evidence from tobacco industry documents. *Tobacco Control*. 2002;11(suppl 1):i73. doi:10.1136/tc.11.suppl\_1.i73
4. Ford A, Moodie C, Hastings G. The role of packaging for consumer products: Understanding the move towards 'plain' tobacco packaging. *Addiction Research & Theory*. 2012/08/01 2012;20(4):339-347. doi:10.3109/16066359.2011.632700
5. Barrientos-Gutierrez I, Islam F, Cho YJ, et al. Assessing cigarette packaging and labelling policy effects on early adolescents: results from a discrete choice experiment. *Tobacco Control* ; volume 30, issue 5, page 505-514 ; ISSN 0964-4563 1468-3318. 2020-01-01 2020;doi:10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2019-055463
6. FCTC. Plain packaging meetings in Geneva to discuss legal challenges, policy design and implementation. Updated 5 October, 2017. Accessed 2 Jun, 2022 2022. <https://fctc.who.int/newsroom/news/item/05-10-2017-plain-packaging-meetings-in-geneva-to-discuss-legal-challenges-policy-design-and-implementation>
7. Tobacco Free Kids. Tobacco pack branding. Theory and practice. Accessed 1 June, 2022, 2022. <https://www.tobaccofreekids.org/plainpackaging/tools-resources/policy/tobacco-pack-branding-theory-and-practice>
8. Moodie C, Hastings G. Tobacco packaging as promotion. *Tobacco Control*. 2010;19(2):168. doi:10.1136/tc.2009.033449
9. WHO FCTC. *Guidelines for implementation Article 13*. 2013. *World Health Organization* FCTC/16.6. <https://fctc.who.int/publications/m/item/tobacco-advertising-promotion-and-sponsorship>
10. Freeman B, Watts C, Astuti PAS. Global tobacco advertising, promotion and sponsorship regulation: what's old, what's new and where to next? *Tobacco Control*. 2022;31(2):216. doi:10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2021-056551
11. WHO FCTC. *2021 global progress report on implementation of the WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control*. 2022. <https://fctc.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240041769>
12. Evans A, Peters E, Strasser A, Emery L, Sheerin K, Romer D. Graphic Warning Labels Elicit Affective and Thoughtful Responses from Smokers: Results of a Randomized Clinical Trial. 2015. p. 1.
13. Hammond D, Fong GT, McNeill A, Borland R, Cummings KM. Effectiveness of cigarette warning labels in informing smokers about the risks of smoking: findings from the International Tobacco Control (ITC) Four Country Survey. *TOBACCO CONTROL*. 2006-06-01 2006;15 Suppl 3:iii19.

14. Mutti S, Hammond D, Reid JL, Thrasher JF. The efficacy of cigarette warning labels on health beliefs in the United States and Mexico. *J Health Commun.* 2013;18(10):1180-1192. doi:10.1080/10810730.2013.778368
15. Hughes N, Arora M, Grills N. Perceptions and impact of plain packaging of tobacco products in low and middle income countries, middle to upper income countries and low-income settings in high-income countries: a systematic review of the literature. *BMJ Open.* 2016;6(3):e010391. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2015-010391
16. Thrasher JF, Pérez-Hernández R, Arillo-Santillán E, Barrientos-Gutiérrez I. Towards informed tobacco consumption in Mexico: effect of pictorial warning labels in smokers. Hacia el consumo informado de tabaco en México: efecto de las advertencias con pictogramas en población fumadora. *Salud Publica Mex.* 2012;54(3):242-253.
17. Swayampakala K, Thrasher JF, Hammond D, et al. Pictorial health warning label content and smokers' understanding of smoking-related risks—a cross-country comparison. *Health Education Research.* 2015;30(1):35-45. doi:10.1093/her/cyu022
18. Guindon GE, Mentzakis E, Buckley NJ. Cigarette packaging, warnings, prices, and contraband: A discrete choice experiment among smokers in Ontario, Canada. *Econ Hum Biol.* Jan 2024;52:101340. doi:10.1016/j.ehb.2023.101340
19. Noar SM, Hall MG, Francis DB, Ribisl KM, Pepper JK, Brewer NT. Pictorial cigarette pack warnings: a meta-analysis of experimental studies. *Tobacco Control.* 2016-05-01 2016;25(3):341-341-342. doi:10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2014-051978
20. Hammond D, Wakefield M, Durkin S, Brennan E. Tobacco packaging and mass media campaigns: research needs for Articles 11 and 12 of the WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control. *Nicotine Tob Res.* 2013;15(4):817-831. doi:10.1093/ntr/nts202
21. Hammond D, Doxey J, Daniel S, Bansal-Travers M. Impact of Female-Oriented Cigarette Packaging in the United States. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research.* 2011-07-01 2011;13(7):579.
22. Huang L-L, Thrasher JF, Reid JL, Hammond D. Predictive and External Validity of a Pre-Market Study to Determine the Most Effective Pictorial Health Warning Label Content for Cigarette Packages. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research.* 2016-05-01 2016;18(5):1376.
23. Hoek J, Gendall P, Eckert C, Louviere J. Dissuasive cigarette sticks: the next step in standardised ('plain') packaging? *Tobacco Control.* 2016;25(6):699. doi:10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2015-052533
24. van Mourik DJA, Nagelhout GE, Poole NL, et al. Non-smoking adolescents' perceptions of dissuasive cigarettes. *Addictive Behaviors Reports.* 2022/06/01/ 2022;15:100433. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.abrep.2022.100433
25. Stillman FA, Bone LR, Milam AJ, Ma J, Hoke K. Out of view but in plain sight: the illegal sale of single cigarettes. *J Urban Health.* 2014;91(2):355-365. doi:10.1007/s11524-013-9854-3
26. Chang K, Mayne E, Laverty AA, Agaku I, Filippidis FT. Cigarette prices in eight sub-Saharan African countries in 2018: a cross-sectional analysis. *BMJ Open.* 2021;11(10):e053114. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2021-053114
27. Germain D, McCarthy M, Wakefield M. Smoker sensitivity to retail tobacco displays and quitting: a cohort study. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1360-0443.2009.02714.x>. *Addiction.* 2010/01/01 2010;105(1):159-163. doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1360-0443.2009.02714.x
28. Hammond D, Dockrell M, Arnott D, Lee A, McNeill A. *Cigarette pack design and perceptions of risk among UK adults and youth.* 2009. Accessed 2022-05-05. [http://explore.bl.uk/primo\\_library/libweb/action/display.do?tabs=detailsTab&gathStatTab=](http://explore.bl.uk/primo_library/libweb/action/display.do?tabs=detailsTab&gathStatTab=)

true&ct=display&fn=search&doc=ETOCRN262232382&indx=1&recIds=ETOCRN262232382

29. Wakefield MA, Hayes L, Durkin S, Borland R. Introduction effects of the Australian plain packaging policy on adult smokers: a cross-sectional study. *BMJ Open*. 2013;3(7):e003175. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2013-003175
30. Moodie C, Hoek J, Hammond D, et al. Plain tobacco packaging: progress, challenges, learning and opportunities. *Tobacco Control*. 2022;31(2):263. doi:10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2021-056559
31. Kotnowski K, Fong GT, Gallopel-Morvan K, Islam T, Hammond D. The Impact of Cigarette Packaging Design Among Young Females in Canada: Findings From a Discrete Choice Experiment. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research*. 2016;18(5):1348-1356. doi:10.1093/ntr/ntv114
32. Stead M, Moodie C, Angus K, et al. Is Consumer Response to Plain/Standardised Tobacco Packaging Consistent with Framework Convention on Tobacco Control Guidelines? A Systematic Review of Quantitative Studies. *PLOS ONE*. 2013;8(10):e75919. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0075919
33. Lilic N, Stretton M, Prakash M. How effective is the plain packaging of tobacco policy on rates of intention to quit smoking and changing attitudes to smoking? <https://doi.org/10.1111/ans.14679>. *ANZ Journal of Surgery*. 2018/09/01 2018;88(9):825-830. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/ans.14679>
34. Drovandi A, Teague P-A, Glass B, Malau-Aduli B. A systematic review of the perceptions of adolescents on graphic health warnings and plain packaging of cigarettes. *Systematic Reviews*. 2019/01/17 2019;8(1):25. doi:10.1186/s13643-018-0933-0
35. Bogliacino F, Codagnone C, Veltri GA, et al. Pathos & Ethos: Emotions and Willingness to Pay for Tobacco Products. *PLOS ONE*. 2015;10(10):e0139542. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0139542
36. Alcaraz A, Hernández-Vásquez A, Palacios A, et al. Health and Economic Impact of Health Warnings and Plain Tobacco Packaging in Seven Latin American Countries: Results of a Simulation Model. *Nicotine Tob Res*. Oct 29 2020;22(11):2032-2040. doi:10.1093/ntr/ntaa104
37. White CM, Hammond D, Thrasher JF, Fong GT. The potential impact of plain packaging of cigarette products among Brazilian young women: an experimental study. *BMC Public Health*. 2012/09/04 2012;12(1):737. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-12-737
38. Vellios N. *Smoking cessation in South Africa: cigarette prices, plain packaging, and illicit trade*. 2022. <http://hdl.handle.net/11427/37039>
39. Harris JE, Ares G, Gerstenblüth M, Machin L, Triunfo P. Impact of plain packaging of cigarettes on the risk perception of Uruguayan smokers: an experimental study. *Tob Control*. Sep 2018;27(5):513-518. doi:10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2017-053639
40. Llambí L, Mauricio M, Barros M, Carolina P, Gonzalez P, Virginia N. Cigarette flavours and design features available near schools before plain packaging implementation in Uruguay. *Archives of Community Medicine and Public Health*. 07/31 2021:146-150. doi:10.17352/2455-5479.000155
41. Sillero-Rejon C, Mahmoud O, Tamayo RM, Clavijo-Alvarez AA, Adams S, Maynard OM. Standardised packs and larger health warnings: visual attention and perceptions among Colombian smokers and non-smokers. *Addiction*. Jun 2022;117(6):1737-1747. doi:10.1111/add.15779

42. Moodie C, Hastings G, Joossens L. Young adult smokers' perceptions of illicit tobacco and the possible impact of plain packaging on purchase behaviour. *European Journal of Public Health*. 2012;22(2):251-253. doi:10.1093/eurpub/ckr038
43. Haighton C, Taylor C, Rutter A. Standardized packaging and illicit tobacco use: A systematic review. *Tob Prev Cessat*. 2017;3:13-13. doi:10.18332/tpc/70277
44. Lavery AA, Millett C, Hopkinson NS, Filippidis FT. Introduction of standardised packaging and availability of illicit cigarettes: a difference-in-difference analysis of European Union survey data 2015–2018. *Thorax*. 2021;76(1):89. doi:10.1136/thoraxjnl-2020-215708
45. World Health Organization. WHO tobacco fact sheet. Updated 24 May, 2022. 2022. <https://www.who.int/en/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/tobacco>
46. Mathers CD, Loncar D. Projections of Global Mortality and Burden of Disease from 2002 to 2030. *PLOS Medicine*. 2006;3(11):e442. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.0030442
47. Ministerio de Salud y Proteccion Social. Colombia mantiene tendencia a la baja en consumo de tabaco. Updated 13 October, 2020. Accessed 25 May, 2022, <https://www.minsalud.gov.co/Paginas/Colombia-mantiene-tendencia-a-la-baja-en-consumo-de-tabaco.aspx>
48. United Nations Development Programme. *The Case for Investing in WHO FCTC Implementation in Colombia*. 2019. November 2019. <https://www.co.undp.org/content/colombia/es/home/library/poverty/investment-case-for-tobacco-control-in-colombia.html>
49. Maldonado N, Llorente BA, Iglesias RM, Escobar D. Measuring illicit cigarette trade in Colombia. *Tobacco Control*. 2020;29(Suppl 4):s260. doi:10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2017-053980
50. Guzman-Tordecilla DN, Llorente B, Vecino-Ortiz AI. Evaluation of the implementation of the Framework Convention on Tobacco Control (FCTC) in Colombia. *Health Policy and Planning*. 2022;37(3):349-358. doi:10.1093/heapol/czab143
51. Gantiva C, Sotaquirá M, Camacho K, Hernández-Mateus V, Restrepo-García A, Castillo K. Emotional impact of graphic health warnings on tobacco packages in Colombia. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement*. 2021;53(3): 296–303. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1037/cbs0000249>
52. Becker GM, Degroot MH, Marschak J. Measuring utility by a single-response sequential method. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bs.3830090304>. *Behavioral Science*. 1964/01/01 1964;9(3):226-232. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1002/bs.3830090304>
53. Rousu MC, Marette S, Thrasher JF, Lusk JL. The economic value to smokers of graphic warning labels on cigarettes: Evidence from combining market and experimental auction data. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*. 2014-12-01 2014;108:123-123-134. doi:10.1016/j.jebo.2014.09.003
54. Bridges JFP, Hauber AB, Marshall D, et al. Conjoint Analysis Applications in Health—a Checklist: A Report of the ISPOR Good Research Practices for Conjoint Analysis Task Force. *Value in Health*. 2011/06/01/ 2011;14(4):403-413. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jval.2010.11.013>
55. Louviere JJ, Hensher DA, Swait JD. *Stated choice methods: analysis and applications*. 2000.
56. Regmi K, Kaphle D, Timilsina S, Tuha NAA. Application of Discrete-Choice Experiment Methods in Tobacco Control: A Systematic Review. *Pharmacoecon Open*. 2018;2(1):5-17. doi:10.1007/s41669-017-0025-4

57. DANE. Certificación para cigarrillos - II semestre de 2020. . In: Estadística DANE, editor. Resolución No 0735 de 2020. Bogotá, D.C.2020.
58. Gallego JM, Llorente B, Maldonado N, Otálvaro-Ramírez S, Rodríguez-Lesmes P. Tobacco taxes and illicit cigarette trade in Colombia. *Economics & Human Biology*. 2020/12/01/ 2020;39:100902. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ehb.2020.100902>
59. Ross H. *Understanding and measuring cigarette tax avoidance and evasion: A methodological guide*. 2015. March 2015. <https://tobacconomics.org/research/understanding-and-measuring-cigarette-tax-avoidance-and-evasion-a-methodological-guide/>
60. Bliemer M, Collins A. Experimental design and choice experiments. In: D.; H, W.; G, M. RJ, eds. *Applied Choice Analysis*. Cambridge University Press; 2015:189–319.
61. Hess S, Hensher D, Daly A. Not bored yet - revisiting respondent fatigue in stated choice experiments. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*. 2012;46(3):626 - 644. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2011.11.008>
62. Inza FSM, Ryan M, Amaya-Amaya M. “Irrational” Stated Preferences: A quantitative and qualitative investigation. In: Ryan M, Gerard K, Amaya-Amaya M, eds. *Using Discrete Choice Experiments to Value Health and Health Care*. Springer Netherlands; 2008:195-215.
63. Reed Johnson F, Lancsar E, Marshall D, et al. Constructing Experimental Designs for Discrete-Choice Experiments: Report of the ISPOR Conjoint Analysis Experimental Design Good Research Practices Task Force. *Value in Health*. 2013/01/01/ 2013;16(1):3-13. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jval.2012.08.2223>
64. de Bekker-Grob EW, Donkers B, Jonker MF, Stolk EA. Sample Size Requirements for Discrete-Choice Experiments in Healthcare: a Practical Guide. *Patient*. Oct 2015;8(5):373-84. doi:10.1007/s40271-015-0118-z
65. *Stata Statistical Software: Release 17*. College Station, TX: StataCorp LP; 2018.;
66. Ryan M, Gerard K, Amaya-Amaya M. *Using discrete choice experiments to value health and health care*. Economics of non-market goods and resources. Springer; 2008.
67. Arora M, Tewari A, Nazar G, et al. Exploring Perception of Indians about Plain Packaging of Tobacco Products: A Mixed Method Research. Original Research. *Frontiers in Public Health*. 2013-September-23 2013;1doi:10.3389/fpubh.2013.00035
68. Greene WH, Hensher DA. A latent class model for discrete choice analysis: contrasts with mixed logit. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*. 2003/09/01/ 2003;37(8):681-698. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-2615\(02\)00046-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-2615(02)00046-2)
69. Hess S. Latent class structures: taste heterogeneity and beyond. *Handbook of choice modelling*. Edward Elgar Publishing; 2014.
70. Hess S. Latent class structures: Taste heterogeneity and beyond. 2014:311-329.
71. Czajkowski M, Gajderowicz T, Giergiczny M, Grotkowska G, Sztandar-Sztanderska U. Choosing the Future: Economic Preferences for Higher Education Using Discrete Choice Experiment Method. *Research in Higher Education*. 2020/06/01 2020;61(4):510-539. doi:10.1007/s11162-019-09572-w
72. Yoo HI. llogit2: An enhanced command to fit latent class conditional logit models. *The Stata Journal*. 2020;20(2):405-425. doi:10.1177/1536867x20931003
73. Hammond D. Smoking behaviour among young adults: beyond youth prevention. *Tobacco Control*. 2005;14(3):181-185. doi:10.1136/tc.2004.009621
74. DANE. *Encuesta Nacional de Consumo de Sustancias Psicoactivas (ENCSPA). Periodo de referencia 2019. 2020. Boletín Técnico*. <https://www.dane.gov.co/files/investigaciones/boletines/encspa/bt-encspa-2019.pdf>

75. Lancsar E, Fiebig DG, Hole AR. Discrete Choice Experiments: A Guide to Model Specification, Estimation and Software. *PharmacoEconomics*. 2017/07/01 2017;35(7):697-716. doi:10.1007/s40273-017-0506-4
76. Chaloupka F, Warner KE. The economics of smoking. In: Culyer AJ, Newhouse JP, eds. *Handbook of Health Economics*. Elsevier; 2000:1539-1627:chap 29.
77. Zheng Y, Zhen C, Dench D, Nonnemaker JM. U.S. Demand for Tobacco Products in a System Framework. *Health Economics*. 2017;26(8):1067-1086. doi:https://doi.org/10.1002/hec.3384
78. Rakotonarivo OS, Schaafsma M, Hockley N. A systematic review of the reliability and validity of discrete choice experiments in valuing non-market environmental goods. *Journal of Environmental Management*. 2016/12/01/ 2016;183:98-109. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2016.08.032
79. Janssen EM, Marshall DA, Hauber AB, Bridges JFP. Improving the quality of discrete-choice experiments in health: how can we assess validity and reliability? *Expert Rev Pharmacoecon Outcomes Res.* Dec 2017;17(6):531-542. doi:10.1080/14737167.2017.1389648

Few LMICs have adopted plain tobacco packaging recommendations

Illicit trade (IT) cigarettes and single sticks could reduce policy effectiveness

We designed and implemented a discrete choice experiment in Colombia (N=1,761)

The DCE has as attributes: packaging, stick design, and price level; IT and no IT

Plain packaging reduces the appeal of cigarettes even under the presence of IT