



TOBACCO HEALTH WARNINGS: EVIDENCE OF EFFECTIVENESS

There are approximately 40 million smokers in the United States today, about half of whom will die prematurely as a result of their addiction.¹ Despite the numerous public reports on the risks of smoking, studies show that a large number of smokers have inadequate knowledge of the health effects of smoking.² While some smokers generally know that tobacco use is harmful, they underestimate the severity and magnitude of the health risks and tend to perceive other smokers to be at greater risk for disease than themselves.³ Knowledge of the health risks of smoking is even lower among people with lower income and fewer years of education because of limited access to information about the hazards of smoking.⁴

Health warnings on cigarette packs have been found to inform smokers about the health hazards of smoking, encourage smokers to quit, and prevent nonsmokers from starting to smoke. Warnings on tobacco products are an ideal way of communicating with smokers because they pair the warning directly with smoking behavior. According to the U.S. Surgeon General, "health warnings on cigarette packages are a direct, cost-effective means of communicating information on health risks of smoking to consumers."⁵ Given the reach and frequency of exposure, warnings have the potential to have a significant impact on smoking behavior. For example, a pack-a-day smoker could be exposed to the warnings more than 7,000 times per year.⁶ Consequently, warnings on cigarette packages are one of the most important sources of health information.⁷

According to the Institute of Medicine, "restrictions on package labeling are critical to reducing tobacco use and ensuring that smokers are adequately informed about the risks of smoking. Indeed, prominent health warnings on packages are among the most cost-effective forms of public health education available."⁸

Status of Tobacco Health Warnings in the United States

Health warnings were first required on cigarette packs by the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act of 1965. The current health warnings consist of four text-only messages that have appeared on cigarette packs since 1985. In the 30 years since the implementation of these warnings, their effect on smokers has drastically weakened, and the current warnings are now virtually ineffective. These warnings are small and easily overwhelmed by the designs on cigarette packages. Moreover, smokers have become habituated to the style of labels, to the point that the labels go unnoticed altogether. According to the Institute of Medicine,

"In the committee's view, the current warnings are inadequate even when measured against an informed choice standard, but they are woefully deficient when evaluated in terms of proper public health criteria."⁹

The 2009 Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act requires graphic (pictorial) health warnings to cover the top 50 percent of the front and rear panels of the cigarette package. The same warnings are required in advertising and must comprise at least 20 percent of the advertisement's area. The new law's requirements are based on the best available science and real world experience regarding graphic warnings, including best practices from other countries and the recommendations of the World Health Organization (WHO), Institute of Medicine of the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. Surgeon General and other leading health experts.

In June 2011, the FDA issued a comprehensive set of graphic warnings. Following the issuance of these warnings, tobacco companies filed two lawsuits challenging them, leading to two federal appellate court rulings. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit struck down the specific warnings proposed by the FDA. However, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit upheld the law's underlying requirement for graphic warnings, finding that the warnings "are reasonably related to the government's interest in

preventing consumer deception and are therefore constitutional." The U.S. Supreme Court declined to hear a tobacco industry appeal of the Sixth Circuit ruling, preserving the FDA's authority to develop new graphic warnings.

The FDA stated in March 2013 that it would begin developing new warnings, but over 3.5 years later it has yet to act. The FDA's failure to propose and implement new graphic health warnings on cigarette packs is a missed opportunity to reduce smoking rates in the United States. Researchers have estimated that based on Canada's experience, if the US had implemented graphic warnings in 2012 as required by law, there would have been a reduction in the number of adult smokers of between 5.3 to 8.6 million in 2013.¹⁰ A newly released study, modeling the potential impact of graphic warning labels in the United States based on evidence from other countries, estimates that graphic warning labels would reduce smoking prevalence by 5 percent within just a few years and that over a 50-year period would avert 652,800 deaths, 46,600 low-birth-weight cases, 73,600 preterm births and 1,000 cases of sudden infant death syndrome.¹¹

The FDA Act's Graphic Warning Requirements are Based on Sound Science and Experience

A comprehensive review of the evidence on the impact of health warnings found that warnings with the following characteristics are noticed more, are an important source of health information, increase knowledge about tobacco use harms and perceptions of risk and promote smoking cessation. In addition, comprehensive health warnings are effective among youth and there is evidence that they prevent smoking initiation.¹²

- Large warnings are the most effective. Warnings must be large enough to be easily noticed and read, and should be as large as possible.¹³ While the majority of countries with graphic warnings require the messages to comprise 50 percent of the overall package, evidence from countries such as Uruguay, that have increased the size of their warnings even further, has shown even greater effectiveness on all measures of effectiveness including thinking about the risks of smoking, thinking about quitting and foregoing having a cigarette "many times".¹⁴
- Warnings with pictures are more effective than text-only warnings. Pictures also increase the message's accessibility by people with low levels of literacy. Color pictures are more effective than black and white pictures.¹⁵
- Smokers report greater recall for warnings that appear on the front, compared to the side, of packages.¹⁶
- Warnings that contain a clear, direct and accurate message about the dangers of tobacco use, including messages about specific health effects, are the most effective. Messages that are worded simply and speak directly to the reader have the greatest impact.¹⁷
- Warnings need to be rotated regularly with new text and images to avoid overexposure.¹⁸
- Warnings include information for smokers who want to quit about where to find help have been shown to increase the number of smokers who try to quit.¹⁹

Tobacco Graphic Warnings Encourage Smokers to Quit and Discourage Nonsmokers from Starting to Smoke

A systematic review of studies in 20 countries found that strengthening pack warnings is associated with increased knowledge about the risks of smoking, increased quitline calls, reduced smoking consumption, increased quit attempts, increased short-term smoking cessation, and reduced smoking prevalence.²⁰

Graphic Warnings Encourage Smoking Cessation

The evidence that graphic warnings can and do work is solid and extensive. The International Tobacco Control Policy Evaluation Project ("ITC"), an international cohort study that surveys adult smokers in nineteen countries, provides much of the evidence base for health warnings. According to ITC research, adult and youth smokers report that large, comprehensive warnings reduce smoking consumption,

increase motivation to quit and increase the likelihood that they will remain abstinent following a quit attempt.²¹ ITC research shows graphic warnings are more effective than text-only warnings in leading people to think about quitting and deterring them from having a cigarette.²² Evidence from countries that have implemented graphic warnings demonstrates their impact on smoking cessation. For example:

- ITC studies of smokers in Australia, Canada, the United Kingdom and the US revealed that graphic warnings are more effective than text-only warnings at making smokers think about quitting and deterring them from having a cigarette and that larger, pictorial warnings are associated with increased quit attempts.²³
- Evidence from Canada, the first country to implement graphic warnings, shows that after controlling for price, graphic warnings significantly decreased the odds of being a smoker and significantly increased the odds of making a quit attempt.²⁴ Another study found that graphic warning labels reduced smoking rates by between 2.87 to 4.58 percentage points in Canada.²⁵
- After Singapore introduced their graphic warnings in 2004, 28 percent of the smokers surveyed reported smoking fewer cigarettes because of the warnings; 14 percent of the smokers surveyed said that they made it a point to avoid smoking in front of children; 12 percent said that they avoided smoking in front of pregnant women; and 8 percent said that they smoked less at home.²⁶
- Since Thailand introduced their second set of pictorial labels in 2006, 44 percent of smokers said the warnings made them “a lot” more likely to quit over the next month.²⁷
- In Brazil, after the introduction of new graphic warnings in 2002, 67 percent of smokers said the new warnings made them want to quit. The impact was particularly strong among less educated, lower income people.²⁸

Experimental studies testing the impact of graphic warnings have also confirmed the impact of graphic warnings on precursors to cessation behavior. A recently published clinical trial following over 2000 smokers over a 4-week period found that, compared to smokers with text-only warnings on their cigarette packs, smokers exposed to graphic warnings on their cigarette packs were 50% more likely to have quit smoking for at least a week by the end of the trial and also had increased quit attempts, intentions to quit, and foregoing of cigarettes.²⁹ A meta-analysis of the experimental literature found that graphic warnings are more effective than text-only warnings at increasing intentions to not start smoking and intentions to quit smoking.³⁰

Graphic Warnings Increase Awareness of Smoking Harms

According to ITC research, “Large, graphic warnings on cigarette packages are an effective means of increasing health knowledge among smokers [and] health warnings may also help to reduce the disparities in health knowledge by providing low-income smokers with regular access to health information.”³¹ This is important because smokers who perceive greater health risk from smoking are more likely to intend to quit and quit smoking successfully.³² Evidence from countries that have implemented graphic warnings shows greater awareness and attention to the warnings and a subsequent increase in knowledge of smoking harms. For example:

- ITC research shows that text-only warnings (as seen in the U.S.) were associated with lower levels of awareness about the health risks of smoking than prominent, graphic warnings (as seen in Canada and Australia).³³
- Smokers in countries where a warning depicts a particular health hazard of smoking were much more likely to know about that hazard and smokers who reported noticing warnings were 1.5 to 3.0 times more likely to believe in each health hazard.³⁴
- After new, large pictorial warnings were introduced in 2000, 91 percent of Canadian smokers surveyed reported having read the warning labels and demonstrated a thorough knowledge of their content. Further, smokers who read, thought about, and discussed the warning labels in

greater depth at baseline were significantly more likely to either quit, attempt to quit, or reduce their smoking at follow-up.³⁵ Additionally, 84 percent of Canadian smokers report health warnings as a source of health information, compared to only 47 percent of smokers in the US.³⁶

- A study of smokers in Australia, Canada and Mexico found that smokers from countries where graphic warnings contained information about specific tobacco-related diseases had higher knowledge of those diseases than smokers in countries that did not have information about those diseases in their graphic warnings.³⁷
- Since Thailand introduced their second set of pictorial labels in 2006, 53 percent said the pictorial warning labels made them think “a lot” about the health risks.³⁸
- After Brazil introduced new graphic warnings in 2002, 54 percent of smokers said they had changed their opinion about the health consequences of smoking.³⁹
- Data from the Global Adult Tobacco Survey (GATS) found that adults in Brazil, Egypt, India, Malaysia, Panama, Qatar, Romania, Thailand and Uruguay who noticed graphic warnings demonstrated significantly greater knowledge of tobacco harms compared to those adults who did not notice them.⁴⁰
- An investigation of the impact of the text-only Chinese labels compared to other text and pictorial labels from around the world found that larger pictorial labels were perceived to be more effective at informing about the dangers of smoking, convincing youth not to start and motivating smokers to quit.⁴¹

Graphic Warnings are Also Effective among Youth

Research also shows that graphic warnings demonstrate similar effects among youth:

- More than 90 percent of Canadian youth agree that graphic warnings on Canadian cigarette packages have provided them with information about the health effects of smoking and make smoking seem less attractive.⁴²
- Following the introduction of Australia’s graphic warnings, adolescent experimental and established smokers were more likely to think about quitting, and intentions to smoke were lower among those students who discussed the new warning labels.⁴³
- A Greek study of adolescents indicates that proposed European Union pictorial warning labels were more effective at informing about the health effects of smoking and preventing initiation than the previous text-only labels. Approximately 84 percent of non-smoking adolescents reported that the proposed EU graphic warnings were more effective than the old EU text warnings in preventing smoking initiation.⁴⁴

More than 100 countries and jurisdictions have implemented or finalized requirements for graphic warnings on cigarette packs.⁴⁵ A 2008 European Union directive requires its 28 member countries to add pictures to warnings as a way to educate smokers about the risks of continuing to smoke (each country must pass its own law to comply with this directive). These actions reflect the consensus that warning labels are effective at communicating health messages and discouraging tobacco use.

More information on graphic warnings around the world is available at
http://global.tobaccofreekids.org/en/solutions/international_issues/warning_labels/.

The Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids, November 3, 2016 / Laura Bach

¹ CDC, “Current Cigarette Smoking Among Adults - United States, 2005-2014,” *MMWR* 64(44) November 13, 2015, <http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/pdf/wk/mm6444.pdf>; U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), *The Health Consequences of Smoking. A Report of the Surgeon General*, HHS, CDC, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Office on Smoking and Health, 2004, http://www.cdc.gov/tobacco/data_statistics/sgr/2001/index.htm

- ² Rutten, LJF, et al., "Smoking knowledge and behavior in the United States: Sociodemographic, smoking status, and geographic patterns," *Nicotine & Tobacco Research*, 10(10): 1559-1570, 2008.
- ³ Weinstein, ND, et al., "Smokers' unrealistic optimism about their risk," *Tobacco Control*, 14: 55-59, 2005.
- ⁴ See e.g., Siahpush, M, et al., "Socioeconomic and country variations in knowledge of health risks of tobacco smoking and toxic constituents of smoke: results from the 2002 International Tobacco Control (ITCS) Four Country Survey," *Tobacco Control*, 15 (Suppl III): ii65-ii70, 2006.
- Rutten, LJF, et al., "Smoking knowledge and behavior in the United States: Sociodemographic, smoking status, and geographic patterns," *Nicotine & Tobacco Research*, 10(10): 1559-1570, 2008.
- ⁵ U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), *Prevention Tobacco Use Among Youth and Young Adults, A Report of the Surgeon General*, 2012, <http://www.surgeongeneral.gov/library/reports/preventing-youth-tobacco-use/index.html>
- ⁶ Hammond, D, et al., "Impact of the graphic Canadian warning labels on adult smoking behavior," *Tobacco Control* 12(4): 391-395, December 2003.
- ⁷ U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), *Prevention Tobacco Use Among Youth and Young Adults, A Report of the Surgeon General*, 2012.
- ⁸ Institute of Medicine, *Ending the Tobacco Problem: A Blueprint for the Nation*, National Academy of Sciences, 2007.
- ⁹ Institute of Medicine, *Growing Up Tobacco Free: Preventing Nicotine Addiction in Children*, National Academy of Sciences, 1994.
- ¹⁰ Huang, J, et al., "Cigarette graphic warning labels and smoking prevalence in Canada: a critical examination and reformulation of the FDA regulatory impact analysis," *Tobacco Control*, 23: i7-i12, 2014.
- ¹¹ Levy, DT, et al., "Public health benefits from pictorial health warnings on US cigarette packs: a SimSmoke simulation," *Tobacco Control*, published online November 2, 2016.
- ¹² Hammond, D, "Health warning messages on tobacco products: a review," *Tobacco Control*, published online May 23 2011.
- ¹³ Hammond, D, *Tobacco Labelling & Packaging Toolkit, A Guide to FCTC Article 11*, February 2009, <http://www.tobaccolabels.ca/toolkit>. See also, Health Canada, *The Health effects of tobacco and health warning messages on cigarette packages—Survey of adults and adult smokers: Wave 9 surveys*, Prepared by Environics Research Group, January, 2005; Cragg, Ross, & Dawson, Ltd, *Health warnings on cigarette and tobacco packs: Report on research to inform European standardization*, December 1990; Health Education Authority, *Health warnings on cigarette and tobacco packs: report on research to inform European standardization*, 1990; Action on Smoking and Health, *Tobacco product warnings: a survey of effectiveness*, 1998; Centre for Behavioural Research in Cancer, ACCV, *Health warnings and contents labelling on tobacco products*, 1992; Strahan, EJ, et al., "Enhancing the effectiveness of tobacco package warning labels: a social psychological perspective," *Tobacco Control* 11(3):183-90, 2002; AGB Spectrum Research, Ltd, *Testing the positions of health warnings on cigarette packages*, Prepared for Health Promotion Programme, Department of Health, New Zealand, 1987; Linthwaite, P, "Health warnings," *Health Educ J* 44:218-219, 1985.
- ¹⁴ Gravely, S, et al., "The impact of the 2009/2010 enhancement of cigarette health warning labels in Uruguay: longitudinal findings from the International Tobacco Control (ITC) Uruguay Survey," *Tobacco Control*, published online December 15, 2014.
- ¹⁵ Hammond, D, *Tobacco Labelling & Packaging Toolkit, A Guide to FCTC Article 11*, February 2009. See also, CRÉATEC + Market Studies, *Effectiveness of Health Warning Messages on Cigarette Packages in Informing Less-literate Smokers, Final Report*, Prepared for Communications Canada, December 2003; Millar, WJ, "Reaching smokers with lower educational attainment," *Health Rep* 8:11-9, 1996; Siahpush, M, et al., "Socioeconomic and country variations in knowledge of health risks of tobacco smoking and toxic constituents of smoke: Results from the 2002 International Tobacco Control Policy Evaluation Survey," *Tobacco Control* 15(Suppl III): iii65-iii70, 2006; Liefeld, JP, *The Relative Importance of the Size, Content and Pictures on Cigarette Package Warning Messages*, Department of Consumer Studies, University of Guelph, Prepared for Health Canada, 1999; O'Hegarty, M, et al., "Reactions of young adult smokers to warning labels on cigarette packages," *Am J Prev Med* 30(6):467-73, June 2006; Elliott & Shanahan (E&S) Research, *Developmental Research for New Australian Health Warnings on Tobacco Products Stage 2*, Prepared for The Australian Population Health Division Department of Health and Ageing, Commonwealth of Australia, August 2003; Corporate Research Associates, Creative Concept Testing for Health Warning Messages. Prepared for Health Canada, 2005; Les Etudes de Marche Createc, *Final Report: Qualitative testing of health warnings messages*, Prepared for the Tobacco Control Programme Health Canada, June 2006; BRC Marketing & Social Research, *Smoking health warnings Stage 1: The effectiveness of different (pictorial) health warnings in helping people consider their smoking-related behavior*, Prepared for the New Zealand Ministry of Health, May 2004; BRC Marketing & Social Research, *Smoking health warnings Stage 2: Optimising smoking health warnings-text graphics, size, and colour testing*, Prepared for the New Zealand Ministry of Health, August 2004; Liefeld, JP, *The Relative Importance of the Size, Content and Pictures on Cigarette Package Warning Messages*, Department of Consumer Studies, University of Guelph, Prepared for Health Canada, 1990; Environics Research Group, *Testing New Health Warning Messages for Cigarette packages: A Summary of Three Phases of Focus Group Research: Final Report*, Prepared for Health Canada, 2000; Elliott & Shanahan (E&S) Research, *Developmental Research for New Australian Health Warnings on Tobacco Products Stage 2*, Prepared for The Australian Population Health Division Department of Health and Ageing, Commonwealth of Australia, August 2003; Clemenger BBDO, *Marketing inputs to assist the development of health warnings for tobacco packaging*, Report to the Ministry of Health: Review of the Smoke-free Environments Regulations, 2004; Thrasher, JF, et al., "Smokers' reactions to cigarette package warnings with graphic imagery and with only text: A comparison between Mexico and Canada," *Salud Publica Mex* 49(Suppl 2):S233-40, 2007; Vardavas, CI, et al., "Adolescents perceived effectiveness of the proposed European graphic tobacco warning labels," *European Journal of Public Health* 19(2):212-7, 2009. Kees, J, et al., "Tests of Graphic Visuals and Cigarette Package Warning Combinations: Implications for the Framework Convention on Tobacco Control," *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing* 25(2):212-223, Fall 2006.
- ¹⁶ Hammond, D, *Tobacco Labelling & Packaging Toolkit, A Guide to FCTC Article 11*, February 2009. See also, Cragg, Ross, & Dawson, Ltd, *Health warnings on cigarette and tobacco packs: Report on research to inform European standardization*, December 1990; Centre for Behavioural Research in Cancer, ACCV, *Health warnings and contents labelling on tobacco products*, 1992; AGB Spectrum Research, Ltd, *Testing the positions of health warnings on cigarette packages*, Prepared for Health Promotion Programme, Department of Health, New Zealand, 1987; Linthwaite, P, "Health warnings," *Health Educ J* 44:218-219, 1985; Environics Research Group, Ltd, *Reactions to cigarette*

packaging formats, Prepared for the Canadian Cancer Society, Focus Canada 1999-1 March 1999; Northrup, D & Pollard, J, *Plain Packaging of Cigarettes, Event Marketing to Advertise Smoking and other Tobacco Issues: A Survey of Grade Seven and Grade Nine Ontario Students*, Toronto, Ontario: York University, 1995.

¹⁷ Hammond, D, *Tobacco Labelling & Packaging Toolkit, A Guide to FCTC Article 11*, February 2009.

¹⁸ Hammond, D, *Tobacco Labelling & Packaging Toolkit, A Guide to FCTC Article 11*, February 2009.

¹⁹ Hammond, D, *Tobacco Labelling & Packaging Toolkit, A Guide to FCTC Article 11*, February 2009.

²⁰ Noar, SM, et al., "The impact of strengthening cigarette pack warnings: Systematic review of longitudinal observational studies," *Social Science & Medicine*, 164, published online July 13, 2016

²¹ O'Hegarty, M, et al. "Reactions of young adult smokers to warning labels on cigarette packages." *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 30(6), 2006. See also, Hammond, D, *Health warnings on tobacco packages: Summary of evidence and legal challenges*, January 2008.

Shanahan, P & Elliott D, *Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Graphic Health Warnings on Tobacco Product Packaging 2008- Executive Summary*, Australian Department of Health and Ageing, 2009.

²² Hammond, D, et al., "Text and graphic warnings on cigarette packages: Findings from the international tobacco control four country study," *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 32(3):202-9, 2007.

²³ Hammond, D, et al., "Text and Graphic Warnings on Cigarette Packages: Findings from the International Tobacco Control Four Country Study," *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 32(3) 210-217, 2007. Borland, R, et al., "How reactions to cigarette packet health warnings influence quitting: findings from the ITC Four-Country survey," *Addiction* 104(4):669-75, April 2009.

²⁴ Azagba S., and Sharaf M., "The Effect of Graphic Cigarette Warning Labels on Smoking Behavior: Evidence from the Canadian Experience," *Nicotine & Tobacco Research*, March 2013.

²⁵ Huang, J, et al., "Cigarette graphic warning labels and smoking prevalence in Canada: a critical examination and reformulation of the FDA regulatory impact analysis," *Tobacco Control*, 23: i7-i12, 2014.

²⁶ Health Promotion Board – Singapore, *Graphic health warnings on tobacco packaging inspire smokers to quit the habit*.

²⁷ International Tobacco Control Policy Evaluation Project (ITC), ITC Thailand survey summary, Waterloo: Institute for Population and Social Research, Mahidol University Salaya, and Thai Health Promotion Foundation; 2009,

<http://itcconference.com/ITCWorkshopResources/ITCProjectCountryBrochures/ITCThailand4PagerV115single.pdf>.

²⁸ Costa e Silva, VL, Presentation to EU Commission on enforcement of health warnings in Brazil, Brussels, 2002.

²⁹ Brewer, NT, et al., "Effect of Pictorial Cigarette Pack Warnings on Changes in Smoking Behavior: A Randomized Clinical Trial," *JAMA Internal Medicine*, 176(7): 905-912, 2016.

³⁰ Noar, SM, et al., "Pictorial cigarette pack warnings: a meta-analysis of experimental studies," *Tobacco Control*, published online May 6, 2015.

³¹ Hammond, D, et al., "Text and graphic warnings on cigarette packages: Findings from the international tobacco control four country study," *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 32(3):202-9, 2007.

³² Romer, D & Jamieson, P., "The role of perceived risk in starting and stopping smoking," in Slovic, ed. *Smoking: risk, perception, and policy*, Thousand Oaks, California: Sage, pp. 65-80, 2001.

³³ Hammond, D, et al., "Text and graphic warnings on cigarette packages: Findings from the international tobacco control four country study," *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 32(3):202-9, 2007.

³⁴ Hammond, D, et al., "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* 15(Suppl 3):iii19-iii25, 2006.

³⁵ Hammond, D, et al., "Impact of the graphic Canadian warning labels on adult smoking behavior," *Tobacco Control* 12(4):391-395, December 2003.

³⁶ Hammond, D, et al., "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* 15(Suppl 3):iii19-iii25, 2006.

³⁷ Swayampakala, K, et al., "Pictorial health warning label content and smokers' understanding of smoking-related risks—a cross-country comparison," *Health Education Research*, 30(1): 35-45, 2014.

³⁸ International Tobacco Control Policy Evaluation Project (ITC), ITC Thailand survey summary, Waterloo: Institute for Population and Social Research, Mahidol University Salaya, and Thai Health Promotion Foundation; 2009,

<http://itcconference.com/ITCWorkshopResources/ITCProjectCountryBrochures/ITCThailand4PagerV115single.pdf>.

³⁹ Costa e Silva, VL, Presentation to EU Commission on enforcement of health warnings in Brazil, Brussels, 2002.

⁴⁰ Chiosi, JJ, et al., "Warning about the harms of tobacco use in 22 countries: findings from a cross-sectional household survey," *Tobacco Control*, published online May 17, 2015.

⁴¹ Fong, G, et al., Presentation Comparing Health Warnings in China to Health Warnings in Other Countries: An Experimental Study in four Chinese Cities, International Tobacco Control Policy Evaluation Project, 2009, <http://www.itcproject.org/keyfindi/chinalabel>.

⁴² Health Canada, *The health effects of tobacco and health warning messages on cigarette packages – survey of adults and adult smokers: Wave 9 Surveys*, Prepared by Environics Research Group, January 2005. See also, Hammond, D, "Health warnings on tobacco packages: summary of evidence and legal challenges," January 2008.

⁴³ White, V, Webster B, & Wakefield M, "Do graphic health warning labels have an impact on adolescents' smoking-related beliefs and behaviours?" *Addiction* 103(9):1562-71, 2008.

⁴⁴ Vardavas, CI, et al., "Adolescents perceived effectiveness of the proposed European graphic tobacco warning labels," *European Journal of Public Health* 19(2):212-7, 2009.

⁴⁵ Cunningham, R., "Cigarette Pack Warning Size and Use of Pictures: International Summary," Canadian Cancer Society, June 26, 2015. See also http://global.tobaccofreekids.org/en/solutions/international_issues/warning_labels/. "Finalized" indicates that all requirements and specifications necessary for implementation have been developed and approved. For example: the images and accompanying text to be used; the size, color, and placement of the image and text to be printed on the package; and the number and rotation schedule of the warnings.