

Participant ¹	Notes ² on Reasons for Estimated Prevalence of...	
	Smoking in Adults	Trying Smoking in Children
1	Change here will be smaller than for children by virtue of the greater exposure. There's some evidence of plain packaging increasing desire to quit. Estimates here are over and above underlying trend. At worst, it will stay the same. The greatest benefit will accrue after two years. I see plain packaging as part of an overall strategy, and the sum of parts may be greater than the individual contribution, as they are all moving together, and it makes it hard to disaggregate the effects of one part.	There will be a reduction - plain packaging will break down brand awareness. I'm not convinced that there'll be much impact in 2 years – the greater impact will be after this, with the cohort of children who have been less exposed. Potentially, after 2 years it could be as high as a 1% reduction, with those aged under-10, under-11 coming through. The peak onset of smoking is around 13 (12-14). After two years, the gains are considerable, but there'll be much greater gains later on and then you'll see the real benefit.
2	Having worked in the field, I am aware of the multiplicity of factors affecting uptake and cessation, and therefore affecting prevalence, in both adults and children. And I'm also aware of the multiplicity of change going on at any one time, and how difficult it therefore is to assume the other factors would be held constant. In [REDACTED] [my experience of working on] this type of thing, the greatest effect we could ever hope to achieve was 1-2% per annum, it's never moved faster from my recollection. I expect it would impact on adults less than on uptake, and uptake is not shown well in prevalence figures until some years after - change is relatively slow.	It's very hard to assume everything stays constant – my experience suggests things never stay the same. Firstly, it seems from the evidence - and I'm pleased to see from the review that there's a large number of studies that seem pretty strongly relevant - that children will be more sensitive, as we would have expected, so there'll be larger results here than amongst adults. Secondly, we've always known that in order to tackle kids' smoking, we need to tackle adults'. There's a vast influence from attacks on the normality of smoking for adults when they filter down to kids trying to be grown up. This is much more effective than policies directly targeting kids.

¹ Numbers do not equate to those in the published manuscript.

² Notes were taken by the interviewer during the interview as part of the process of eliciting quantitative estimates of the impact on smoking prevalence of standardised packaging of tobacco. They comprise the gist of the reasoning provided and should not be considered a verbatim record of the interview.

3	<p>I expect a fairly modest effect but still an important one. The attraction of the pack is likely to be important in experimentation with smoking rather than with habitual smokers. So it will encourage giving up smoking. Half a percentage point here is a big achievement.</p>	<p>Plain packaging is not going to make things worse, it will put people off. I expect a modest effect but you never know. The distribution of confidence is not normal – large tail regarding the extent of the effect. It is conceivable that the prevalence could fall dramatically – e.g. halve the number trying smoking – but I think that’s very unlikely.</p>
4	<p>I expect a minimal effect, but don't expect it to go up. Most adults have quite established smoking habits. Plain packaging is likely to make it slightly harder to seek out favourite brands, but I expect that the tobacco industry will find some way of making sure people can still recognise them. I don't expect it to make them question their smoking behaviour.</p>	<p>I expect a larger effect here, as children don't have ingrained habits. Changing the wrappers to make them less attractive is akin to selling magazines under-the-counter or in brown bags. Relatively well-behaved kids will probably be less likely to try smoking, although not so certain for the more rebellious kids. Also, some percentage may get tobacco from other sources rather than shops. But I think it'll make cigarettes generally less attractive. It’s likely to have more impact on those starting smoking - stop them being enticed into the habit.</p>

5	<p>I sense the opportunity for plain packaging was some years ago. It will absorb a lot of money (e.g. legal fees) that could be spent on other tobacco control measures – finding another way to reduce brand identity and create ‘plain packs’. If plain packaging comes in, there would be increased publicity, etc. There’s effects of both plain packaging and the introduction of plain packaging. Studies looking at plain packaging now look at hypothetical packs, or ask small groups to use mock-ups, which leads to different concerns than it would in reality. Packaging per se is only one part of it – the publicity itself could increase smoking cessation. A proportion of smokers can be distinguished as brand-image conscious, others just go for cheapest brand. If people are heavily addicted, the packet won’t matter, so plain packaging won’t have an impact on these people – heroin doesn’t come in a pack, it’s just about the hit. Also, these people have the greater rate of relapse if they try to quit. Amongst others – social, lighter smokers – is where this will have the impact. It won’t have much of an accelerant effect, it will add to this but not a great deal. If the size of the warning on the packs also increases, it will decrease the branding impact. I can’t see smoking making any great recovery - status quo is the worst outcome. Tobacco companies could lower prices, and if the government takes a while to increase tax, there may be a temporary increase in consumption but probably not any more smokers.</p>	<p>There wouldn’t be much change. Smoking is declining – I’m not sure this would add considerably to the rate of decline. Cigarette packs are now out-of-sight [REDACTED], with just the brands listed up there in plain fonts. Previous research on kids showed this didn’t make a difference in choice studies. There’ll be cumulative effects of out-of-sight policies, plain packaging is only part of this. Also, kids don’t buy packs. We still have TV, movies glamorising smoking, although only the baddies tend to smoke now – rebellious associations. There could be weird effects – there’s a number of attributes, e.g. exclusiveness, in the studies that didn’t show effects. I’m sure that kids feel plain packaging looks less attractive.</p>
---	--	--

6	<p>I think it might work in terms of moving on – there’ll be more impact in transition, how people engage with cigarettes and branding. I think plain packaging will definitely have an impact – both immediate and longer term – with a shift in social norms that will continue over next few years. I don’t really know as we don’t have any data. I expect not much impact on adults – but if there’s a lot of media stuff around it, that would have an effect. We’ve never seen a decline of 6% or more in prevalence of smoking. I’m assuming with adults – drawing on experience with smoke-free legislation – you would have both the impact of the intervention and the media coverage raising tobacco as an issue. The impact will be on those trying to quit – raising the number of quit attempts – this fits in with review, and the research on perceptions and negative thoughts around smoking. It would be a smaller percentage than the impact on the young. I’d expect longer term larger effects as cohorts move through – two years is a short time period. [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED] Declines tend to be through never smokers rather than quitters, so I’m a bit pessimistic about the effect. But there have also been no mass media campaigns recently – depending on scale of this, it could have large impact.</p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED] I expect this [the current decline] to continue, plus the effect of plain packaging. There’s also a decline in ever smoking – this has come down quite considerably in past 2 years, though the data is self-report so perhaps there’s a desirability effect. I expect a cohort effect given we’re looking at ever trying smoking, so already only got 2 years of a new cohort coming through. It could have some effect – and impact in terms of social norm change through coverage.</p>
---	---	--

7	<p>I think that adults are addicted to smoking and within 2 years they will not be motivated to quit. Warning labels are already prominent so plain packaging won't change this much. It's hard to see the effects of lower uptake of smoking in kids in adult prevalence figures and in 2 years – this is likely to show up down the road. Kids and uptake are likely to be the most affected as appeal is reduced.</p>	<p>It would go down but not by that much – [redacted] [there's] very little marketing as it is – the pack's really the only thing left that kids will have had some, but not much, exposure to, so I would only expect a marginal effect.</p>
8	<p>I think the effect is likely to be quite modest, particularly at 2 years. There may be some unintended consequences, e.g., increased smuggling, but I think that's a pretty low probability. Looking through the evidence, I suspect the biggest impact will be on young people. It'll be on uptake, which tends to have a bigger effect in the longer term, and be pretty modest in the short term. Plain packaging may promote some adult smokers to quit, and help them stay quit, so I think there'll be some immediate effect. My experience of tobacco control suggests that however good we think a policy is, it's not a silver bullet, and it doesn't have a huge effect – instead it's incremental, gradually nudging down prevalence.</p>	<p>From just looking at the evidence, all the ways that plain packaging has been looked at – attractiveness of product, smoking-related beliefs and behaviours – most indicate greater effects in children, so I'm more certain plain packaging would have an effect here. If we look at adult smokers – addicted smokers – they're likely to be less interested in the packaging, and more on getting their hit, so are more likely to carry on smoking – plain packaging by itself is not going to make a great difference. Plain packaging is likely to impact on not starting smoking – to have more of an effect on uptake and experimentation.</p>

9	<p>I think the effect will be on conditioned responses of adults – so there'll be a slightly greater effect here. I think the probability of a reverse effect is fairly minimal. I think the probability of a dramatic effect is also fairly minimal.</p>	<p>I doubt plain packaging will have much direct influence on children – it'll have more influence indirectly – through what it does to older folk – whether there are cigarettes lying around the house. Are kids attracted by colourful packages? I'm not sure how big this factor might be. All measures tend to have marginal effects. It'll have an effect, but all measures are incremental. The thing is with using 'other things being equal' [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] other things [are] going on at the same time. [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] In tobacco research, we don't usually do this [spend a lot of time trying to estimate the effects of individual interventions] but accept that things happen at the same time. Other things intervene – e.g., changes in taxes. Fundamentally, the percentage of smokers is going down and it is not clear if we've reached the lowest level it will ever go. The anti-tobacco campaign is much too focused on getting cigarettes out rather than encouraging NRT. [redacted] [redacted] I can't imagine banning tobacco would help, though that looks like the way we're eventually heading.</p>
---	---	---

10

I'm fairly confident the drop off won't be too large – people are more interested in what's inside the packet. But it's not stand-alone - continuing to increase excise tax alongside would be more effective – people are very responsive to price, particularly given the social gradient. It would be a very nasty jolt to introduce along with an increase (20%+) in price – would lead to a really sharp decline, but packaging alone won't do that – warning labels alone won't be sufficient. 80% of smokers wouldn't smoke if they had their life again – but quit attempts are often not serious. [REDACTED] when excise increases kick in [REDACTED], quit attempts occur. People are satiating physiological need, but we also need to start looking at it from a marketing perspective – smoking is seen as relieving stress, having social aspects – we're not communicating with smokers in salient language. Smokers have remarkable strategies for self-exemption when it comes to graphic warnings – plain packaging won't be enough, but it will push those at the tipping point over.

Young people find packages extremely distasteful and off-putting – this is where the difference will come. There'll probably be at least a reduction of a third – but I think there'll be much more effect, I expect a dramatic change. Kids are very responsive to branding – the whole cache of smoking – looking cool, grown up – is very important in starting to play with it. Plain packaging strips them of this – they won't want to display this in front of peers. This loss of benefit comes through strongly [REDACTED] internationally, as indicated in the review.

11	<p>If price decreases or stays the same, plain packaging could have adverse effects on smoking prevalence. Also smuggling could be facilitated. But both these issues are addressable and government policy needs to consider this. The effect on purchasing decisions will be less than with children. Again, this is a relatively small effect, and one of many factors. The effect may not even be detectable in a large survey. It's very difficult to detect changes in the short-term - we didn't really detect the effect of the ban in public places or the ad ban. The important effect may be in the long-term or cumulatively. This estimate was based on the current limited evidence, but also many years of looking at smoking prevalence and how difficult it is to shift smoking prevalence by any single policy.</p>	<p>It's likely to have an effect - making branding less attractive, and a number of beneficial effects on consumer perceptions. However, it's likely to be a modest effect as there are many other factors also at work, and the main drivers are probably SES, household characteristics. Over the last decade smoking rates have been declining - perhaps due to other tobacco control policies (ad ban) and the lower prevalence of smoking in adults. It would be naïve to think that this is the magic ingredient in tobacco control rather than one element among many others. It is likely that this will take place within a different world for tobacco companies. As is already happening following the ad ban, there is a shift to economy, ultra-low price tobacco, with premium brands losing market share. The market is more driven by price than it used to be, and this would be reinforced by plain packaging. It would be difficult to invest in branding, and there would be a proliferation of low cost brands. Pricing could defeat the aims of the policy, so fiscal policy is needed to make sure this doesn't occur.</p>
----	---	---

12

Industry won't just do nothing. There's no question that we're forcing packaging into the ugliest ever seen. There'll be effects on appeal – I don't think people are confused about harm per se but believe they can smoke for a while without quitting. Surveys don't represent a significant proportion of population - changes in the way people label themselves mean with the changed patterns of smoking, people no longer see themselves as smokers. No effect on quitting currently. The abundance of pharmaceuticals may have led to the drop in quitting. Initiation is also dropping everywhere. There's a change in the pattern of smoking – with more lighter smokers (per capita sales of cigarettes are down but cigarette sales are the same). [REDACTED] smoking rates seem to be in freefall, but this is an industry that knows how to respond to crises. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [Previously] all predictors suggested that smoking rates in adolescents would double, but then the tobacco industry stopped the [REDACTED] campaign and there was a 30% decline in smoking. Our best predictors account for very little of the variance. It's a major issue, and change in behaviour is possible if tobacco industry don't react (e.g. make it 'cool'). This is only one element of marketing. It takes ten years to see an effect on initiation, and I'm not expecting cessation effects from this. The largest change anywhere is around 1% per year, it will be ½% if we're lucky. When [REDACTED] [price was ramped up], there was a dramatic effect on adolescents. I don't expect prevalence to go up, but it takes a long time to turn around social norms on smoking, which is already happening. From the current trend, the maximum change from interventions would be a doubling of the current trend – plain packaging wouldn't be the max, so I'm giving it 50%, usually have around 0.2 standard error around figures.

There's a twofold difference in school/home surveys. The figures from schools are more like 45% - the number of the cohort that have ever tried smoking is 50-100% higher than those for current use – so I'm taking the real estimate as more like 40%. I think from here this will probably come down – probably currently coming down fairly quickly – 2% per year. I'm using the same logic as with adults – this is not the most powerful intervention. For kids though it could double the rate to 4% per year. I would think that without plain packaging it would be 36% and with plain packaging would be 34%. A 25% drop in starting rate in 2 years would be dramatic so if it fell to lower than 30% I would be very surprised, and if there was no change, I'd be very surprised.

13	<p>It is plausible that prevalence could remain constant, but it is extremely unlikely. With comprehensive tobacco control measures, we tend to see a reduction in smoking prevalence of around 1 percentage point per year. Most realistic for here is a ½ percentage point reduction, as we continue to add to control measures, such as with plain packaging. Plain packaging is a small but important measure.</p>	<p>I can be more confident over the effects here than with overall prevalence, given evidence from review and [redacted] [a previous] study. Plain packaging will act along with other control measures, which we are confident will stay in place, and we should see greater impact here.</p>
14	<p>It's most likely to be around a 5-15% drop. Same argument as with children but I expect a smaller effect as we're talking about people who are already addicted. Otherwise the logic's pretty much the same.</p>	<p>This is a complete wild guess. I think there would be an effect – to reduce initiation. I think it's most likely to be in the range of 10-30%, it's hard to believe more than a 30% drop, and 10% is a sizeable effect. It is inconceivable that this could have an effect greater than halving – lots of other factors come into play. Other strong interventions, e.g. clean indoor air policies, have effects in this range. If for no other reasons than companies fighting this so hard, I'd expect some effect.</p>
15	<p>It's much harder to predict for adults than for children. I expect the impact to be with regard to initiation and cessation, so I expect much less change in smoking prevalence. Again if prices were to drop – this is the only countervailing factor – that could act against it. Rates are also falling for other reasons – and this can lead to a herd effect and encourage quitting.</p>	<p>It's hard to believe plain packaging would increase prevalence. Although the tobacco industry is fairly clever in subverting – e.g. by reducing price, findings other ways around – as with warning labels when they sold merchandise that kids could use to hold cigarettes. But governments can legislate to prevent this. I'm basing my estimates on ranges seen in the past with regard to changes in policy campaigns. If the evidence holds up in terms of actual behaviour, we could see similar levels of impact. Tobacco companies are very concerned so it could be even more effective.</p>

16	Likely to be quite small, as we found with the ban on smoking in public places. Smoking rates come down about 0.4% per year currently. It feels like this is an important issue, but sometimes you just don't know the level of impact this will have. At the end of the day it's a guess.	There are some compelling arguments of a likely effect from the review, amongst children in particular, and I think it will definitely have some effect. I am less confident in making this choice than with adults, as I know less about the impacts of other policies on children trying smoking, so there's uncertainty here - a 7% change would represent a lot of children, although I know there have been some reasonable changes in the numbers of children trying smoking previously.
17	Plain packaging is a great idea – I think it will have an effect but it's hard to know what that effect will be until it's in place somewhere. Coloured packaging is attractive and therefore it is assumed that plain packaging will be less appealing. It should help people who have tried to quit stay stopped, and not be tempted by elements of the packaging. It should stop brand identification. It's likely to be particularly influential for children.	We have to weigh up the effects of peer pressure vs. plain packs, which may appear scarier, with warnings being more visible. However, if children try smoking with just one stick rather than buying a pack then it's harder to know how large a difference it will make.
18	Price is important – this could trump plain packaging – price is the most sensitive of tobacco control measures [REDACTED]. It is implausible that plain packaging is the only thing to occur within two years. I don't think prevalence would go up – the worst case is that it might stay the same. It depends on the number of younger smokers reflected in the current prevalence rate. The effect will be a failure to replace older smokers with younger ones - recruitment will be affected with a failure to attract young smokers, whereas for well-established smokers there'll be less impact.	I wouldn't expect no change – I'd be very surprised if there's no change at all. This is the group that is most likely to be affected, so we're isolating the group with the major impact here. There'd be greater impact along with other factors – e.g. crackdown on selling to minors.

19	<p>Smoking prevalence is fairly stable, and the rate of decline is currently decreasing. Additional interventions will incrementally add to the decline. Prevalence is also affected by random fluctuations. Anything more than a 2 percentage point change is hard to achieve. With the general trend and a new measure, think it will be about 3 percentage points, then need to allow for random fluctuations, given the short period (2 years). I don't think that there will be any long-term increase in prevalence (any short-term novelty effects will disappear after about 6 months).</p>	<p>The proportion trying smoking is much more unstable, at least in recent years. There's also some signs that it's increasing in some groups. With this less clear, more complex secular trend, impact may be weaker (if there's some trend in the other direction). Again I don't think that there will be any long-term increase in prevalence (any short-term novelty effects will disappear after about 6 months).</p>
20	<p>The evidence is only suggestive – and less suggestive for adults than children – so I don't think plain packaging will have a big impact. I think it will target younger smokers (“16-24” age group) – who have perhaps less developed brand loyalty and may be more susceptible. I don't think it will have much impact on the more-established smokers.</p>	<p>With other things being constant, and from looking at the report, there's not any overwhelming or strong evidence – tangential or suggestive evidence from eye-tracking and self-reported intentions – so this is guesswork, I don't think we could attribute large movements in experimentation to a single policy.</p>

21	<p>The impact on prevalence is an issue the tobacco industry raises – the real issue is informed consent – we have to let people know the side effects of smoking tobacco. Packaging is a distraction – it’s inappropriate to market produce that kills people with fancy colours – we don’t do it with other things that kill people, or with prescription drugs that have side effects. Governments shouldn’t need evidence for the impact on prevalence – they have a responsibility to make warnings more effective. It’s very difficult to estimate how it might go up – in addition, there might be synergistic effects – e.g. combined with tax increases – or incremental effects. Plain packaging will have an impact – in particular, on people’s thoughts about quitting. But it’s suggested to be implemented with larger warnings, and we have to separate this out here. It depends on how you do plain packaging – if you do all the most effective methods or not. Compared to taxation or getting cigarettes out of corner stores, I don’t imagine as big an effect – not by itself, but it won’t happen by itself, it will work together with other policies.</p>	<p>I don’t think the prevalence will go up. Kids are more influenced by branding so this could be affected more than adults’. But most children get their first cigarette from a friend – but they would have seen the packs around. Also there’s a social network of smoking – if other kids are carrying plain packs, kids may be less likely to start, and then they are less likely to offer other kids cigarettes and you get a circular effect.</p>
22	<p>The prevalence of children’s smoking doesn’t factor heavily in this estimate, and the policy is primarily aimed at children, so the estimate for the effect on adults is less – hence the narrower range and higher lower bound. This could remain the same within 2 years but I would expect to see it come down over time.</p>	<p>I’m going on extrapolation from other policy measures aimed at children. I understand that children’s smoking has been declining over the past 4-5 years, so it’s unlikely for that to change to have an upward swing. Plain packaging is a measure aimed at children but 2 years is a short time frame (5 years would be easier to estimate), and the effect is likely to be mainly seen over a longer time frame, although some effect should be evident in 2 years.</p>

23	<p>The systematic review is outstanding – a very useful document, but one issue not addressed is a potential unintended consequence – that of prices going up. Plain packaging diminishes the differentiation between brands – and the pricing tiers of premium, discount, etc., that we have currently may diminish with the lack of differentiation. There’s also the potential for increased smuggling. The potential exists for bad things to happen but these are unlikely. Plain packaging is an important measure, with the potential to impact on the branding of products. It may take a while to manifest itself. My estimates were made in relation to those from other population-based interventions - price increases, educational campaigns, clean indoor air acts. I think it’s in the ballpark of smoke-free policies, but possibly more effective as it’s a dynamic, social norming change. Exposure will be really diminished unless the tobacco industry gets round it. The potential negative is due to the possible price decreases.</p>	<p>The potential benefit is larger in kids, and will accentuate over time past two years as fewer kids are growing up in an environment with branding. Pricing is still an issue as kids are more price sensitive. Reducing advertising has greater effect in kids.</p>
----	--	---

24	<p>The task is almost impossible - I don't think any sane individual can make, with any degree of confidence, an estimate for something that has never been done before. Estimating the magnitude of the effect is extremely difficult – no one has provided the magnitude of the effect for health warnings, which have actually been implemented. The effect won't be detectable in surveys – it will push it down – a decline in prevalence probably in the order of 1%. There'll be a reduction in the uptake of regular smoking in the 15+ age group. There'll be a considerably larger decline than previously seen. There'll be a small impact on cessation among the under 40s. Above 40, people tend to be heavily addicted, and there won't be much impact. If price stays constant, there'll be a bigger effect. I'm hopeful it will have positive effects, and think it will. We have to take into account the policy environment – the warning size is due to increase at around the same time, and the volume of anti-smoking ads [REDACTED] has recently gone up. I can see a couple of scenarios where this could backfire - these are unlikely but plausible – not inconceivable.</p>	<p>The percentage of children ever trying smoking has been coming down considerably as the result of recent activity. It is unclear if the residual build-up of factors will mean this will continue to come down independently of other measures being put in place or whether we have achieved whatever we can in terms of current policies. Plain packaging's impact on this measure will depend on the mix of ever-trying smokers – those who are trying for life disturbance reasons vs. the percentage who smoke because it's interesting or because lots of people do it. The latter group will decline due to plain packaging. There won't be terribly much effect in ever smoking except in older kids. Older kids who uptake later on in process in particular will decline – it won't be a fashionable thing. There'll be a decline but not a huge decline among the very young. Uptake in young kids is not driven as much by social normative factors rather than by feeling bad. Plain packaging is likely to have greater impact further down the track, with those who have socially-related reasons for smoking. There's a net set of forces pushing down but that's not important for this set of kids.</p>
----	--	---

25	<p>The thing is for smoking prevalence to change substantially in two years, rather mega things have to happen. The proportion of smokers succeeding in stopping if trying is around 2½-3%, so even if every smoker tried, that's only 3% of 21% change in prevalence. A ½-1% change in prevalence is incredibly difficult to achieve. The mechanism for plain packaging is likely to impact uptake of smoking. The proportion of people taking up smoking in terms of the total population is very small. Secondly, there are legitimate concerns that if price is not raised at the same time, then there's no premium for higher cost cigarettes so people gravitate to lower cost brands, and we get a kind of reverse price elasticity effect – a modest upward pressure. Plain packaging must be introduced with a substantial price increase targeting lower cost brands. We have to consider cost and price raises here – there's an interaction between different interventions – when looking at tobacco control we need to see interventions in concert with each other, or it makes it harder to come up with sensible answers.</p>	<p>I think if plain packaging has an effect it will largely be in take up – by making it less attractive, denying the tobacco industry a chance to promote cigarettes. If there's an effect, it will be downward but could be counteracted by price. The effect will be seen in transitions to smoking rather than in those attempting smoking. The net pressure will be downwards but it's very hard to say how far, as tobacco industry are clever devils – already thinking up ways of defeating this that are hard to legislate against, e.g. selling containers for packs, with which you can express your identity and brands. So there's a fair amount of uncertainty, but on balance, I expect small downward pressure.</p>
----	---	---

26	<p>This is all guesswork - no basis or empirical evidence. I expect the trajectory to continue downwards (around ¾- 1 ½ % per year). Adults will be less affected than the young – adults are very brand loyal, and not purchasing for semiotic signalling reasons. The policy is not primarily directed at adults but at potential future smokers. As an aside - plain packaging is still multi-coloured, with graphic warning boxes, so it won't be cheaper to produce.</p>	<p>Again this is all guesswork - no basis or empirical evidence. I would expect after 2 years there would be very little effect – those who will be 14 in two years' time will have had 12 years to see cigarettes in regular packaging. A child who's 19 [REDACTED] has never seen any tobacco ads. It is likely effects will be generational. I assume longitudinal trends would continue as there's no historical precedence of them rising. Smoking rates are the lowest they've ever been. I've never seen double figures for any policies, a 1.5% change being exceptional – plain packaging is not going to wipe smoking out. The tobacco industry rejoice with similar margins. We need very large sensitivity to detect change in this short timeframe.</p>
----	---	--

27

This is an unrealistic proposition as plain packaging isn't happening in isolation but as part of a substantial comprehensive approach - [REDACTED] price increases, major changes to funding programmes, curbs to internet advertising, easier access to NRT. Action has been developing over a number of years, in a programme that moves in fits and starts. Looking at change after 2 years in tobacco control is not right. We have to see this in the much broader context of everything else - e.g., the electoral system – the next [REDACTED] election is likely in [REDACTED], we are highly unlikely to have a tax increase before then, but this is highly likely in the first budget of the new government. I cannot give these figures in isolation. (Whoever it is) will include a [REDACTED] increase in tobacco tax. Plain packaging will have an impact in further reducing smoking - particularly in kids, but as part of a comprehensive approach. The impact will be significantly greater with the additional media campaigns. It is inconceivable that it could increase the prevalence of smokers, or that prevalence remains stable. If tobacco companies halved the price it could increase, but that would be short-lived as government would sort it out in tax. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] I'm very confident we will get there [meet the aims of the package of measures in terms of reducing smoking prevalence], and possibly further. This is one element - other policies will be implemented later and keep the momentum going. I would expect there to be some immediate impact of plain packaging, and also longer term results.

This would boost the decline in children trying smoking – there are already substantial changes underway, so not so far to go here. There may be bit of a turbo charge here but it's hard to know (surveys of kids smoking are only every [REDACTED] years, and are not going to be monitored). Again, it is totally inconceivable that it could lead to an increase in children trying smoking.

28	<p>This is based on no data, it's uncharted territory and so guesswork. I would be extremely surprised if it increased, less sure about the size of the effect. I would expect a good effect initially, as it would push smoking into being more unglamorous, but although people prefer colourful nicely packaged things as suggested in the review, if they have no choice but the drab packaging they'll get used to it. In eastern Europe, packaging used to all be dull but the prevalence of smoking was very high. Brand preference is likely to be lessened. Hopefully, it will encourage some people to quit during the initial phase. Marketing people may have a better idea, and the tobacco industry is very opposed, so they must have their reasons. One way it could have a greater impact is if nicotine alternatives are able to be packaged and promoted as they like, to allow them to compete better with cigarettes.</p>	<p>Again, this should make smoking less glamorous. However, it is possible, but extremely unlikely, that plain packaging enhances smoking as a sign of rebellion, on the border of illegality, and increase the numbers trying smoking.</p>
29	<p>This is not really the whole picture, as really there'll be more than this one intervention. My estimates are based on thinking of other previous interventions [REDACTED] and they've always had a very small effect. I think we tend to overestimate the effect of these policies when we think about them.</p>	<p>I think there'll be much more of an effect on initiation. Although, as I said with the adults, we just don't tend to see big changes. I made these estimates bearing in mind the difficulties in making any large change in behaviour. From the review, it suggested that children will view plain packaging as more unappealing. There'll be more impact in initiation than for current smokers.</p>

30	<p>This is so difficult – most interventions don’t have a massive effect in two years, but we see it come down a little bit by a little bit. I’m not sure how big an effect plain packaging will have on quitting and uptake. It could have a big effect on uptake and a different effect on quitting, all of which come through to the prevalence figures, but uptake takes a while to come through. It takes a long time for uptake to trickle through into prevalence change. I am expecting the prevalence to be going down anyway, though this is just the effect of plain packaging. In reality other things are driving down smoking, so it’s very difficult to estimate the magnitude of the effect and to separate out plain packaging – we don’t live in a vacuum. This is one of a series of controls – smoking prevalence is going down anyway and plain packaging will help it along.</p>	<p>I’ve been looking at the trends as it is – I’m thinking along the lines of effect sizes from other interventions. I would expect more of an effect here – relative risk of 1.2-1.3, perhaps up to 1.5.</p>
31	<p>This is very difficult – I’ve less certainty in particular for my best guess – as it is very difficult to pinpoint, especially for the specific time frame. I’m very confident the prevalence will decrease, but less sure as to the extent of the effect. I personally believe it’s impossible to predict specific numbers with any precision. Similarly to the impact on children, there’s a potential time lag. I expect a modest effect initially, which would accrue over time - it’s not a discrete measure with only an initial impact. Particularly I would expect an effect with younger smokers.</p>	<p>Essentially there’s no chance of an increase. A decrease is highly likely but it’s difficult to say how far. I wouldn’t expect a very large impact immediately following implementation, but a modest decrease initially, then accruing over time. It’s particularly difficult to estimate over a discrete time period like this – as with other marketing bans. Unlike other interventions, this is about removing information and many youths will have already been exposed to this for a long time – so there’ll be a hangover effect.</p>

32	<p>Two years is a fairly short time period, given that this is a highly addictive product – I expect a fairly modest effect – beyond two years we’re likely to see more impact, as we see a denormalisation effect of this significant policy. From my knowledge of the impact of graphic warnings [REDACTED], the impact of warning labels is fairly modest. Plain packaging has 2 primary effects – firstly, it takes away the marketing venue for the tobacco industry on the packs. Secondly, it potentially increases the impact of graphic warnings. Plain packaging enhances the modest effect of warning labels and also has the potentially great impact from loss of advertising – e.g. by reducing positive association with products. Moreover, there’ll be less differentiation between products and less opportunities for consumers to pick a product to match their personality. So there’ll be a little push on prevalence. In addition, consumer choices will be more homogeneous, while the overall attractiveness of the package will go down.</p>	<p>My best guess here is slightly less than adults as less is known about the impact of plain packaging on youth experimentation – this is not a chronic behaviour but a single event, so predicted with greater variability and more uncertainty. It’s undoubtedly the case that when youth gets offered a cigarette this is a social moment, and the pack is not salient to the individual or even necessarily present – e.g. a friend or sibling offers them a cigarette they’re already consuming, and factors like peer pressure come into play. Mechanisms that drive ‘first puff’ are more influenced by the immediate social situation rather than brand, so it’s not equivalent to the adult situation. If we’re looking at the prevalence of smoking in youth, I’d expect it to be comparable if not greater impact than for first puff – mechanisms here are, e.g., how positive they feel about brands.</p>
33	<p>When these kind of changes come in, it's a relatively major effect in that it radically changes the way cigarette packets look, and perceptions may be that these are less attractive. The effect is likely to be in the form of instigating people to try and quit, as with the smoking ban, which had an effect of around ½ - 1%, although it had an initially larger effect and then rebounded. It’s likely to be a small one-off effect on smoking prevalence, with it taking years for effects to really feed through into smoking prevalence.</p>	<p>I wouldn't think there'd be a large effect. Fluctuations by chance mean that it may be larger. Children smoke cigarettes often not from the packets, but are often getting these from a social source, so I don't see this as a major effect. On the other hand, plain packaging is likely to make cigarettes less attractive overall - and perhaps less children will bother to try and get hold of them. It’s more likely to affect the percentage of these children that take up smoking behaviour.</p>