

Desensitisation to cigarette package graphic health warnings:

a cohort comparison between London and Singapore

Table E1: Demographic data – smokers; London and Singapore

	All (n=112)	London (n=57)	Singapore (n=55)	X ² /one-way ANOVA (p-value)
Age, mean (SD)	53.6 (15.6)	51.5 (15.7)	55.8 (15.4)	0.147
Male, n (%)	83 (74%)	38 (67%)	45 (82%)	0.067
Female, n (%)	29 (26%)	19 (33%)	10 (18%)	
Chinese	40 (36%)	0 (0%)	40 (73%)	<0.001
White	45 (40%)	45 (79%)	0 (0%)	<0.001
Asian/Asian other	21 (19%)	7 (12%)	14 (25%)	0.074
Black/ Black other	5 (4%)	5 (9%)	0 (0%)	0.025
Mixed	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	0.307

Table E2: Demographic data – non-smokers; London and Singapore

	All (n=154)	London (n=106)	Singapore (n=48)	X ² /one-way ANOVA (p-value)
Age, mean (SD)	54.9 (17.6)	52.8 (19.0)	59.7 (13.1)	0.026
Male, n (%)	84 (55%)	50 (48%)	33 (69%)	0.013
Female, n (%)	70 (45%)	56 (52%)	15 (31%)	
Chinese	33 (21%)	0 (0%)	33 (69%)	<0.001
White	84 (55%)	84 (79%)	0 (0%)	<0.001
Asian/Asian other	24 (16%)	10 (9%)	14 (29%)	0.002
Black/ Black other	9 (6%)	9 (8%)	0 (0%)	0.037
Mixed	4 (3%)	3 (3%)	1 (2%)	0.787

Table E3: Spearman coefficient and Mann-Whitney/ Kruskal-Wallis testing for participant demographic data (age, gender, ethnicity, occupation and smoking status) on the main outcome measures: awareness of smoking risks, emotional response to, and processing of GHWL

Demographic	Knowledge	Emotion			Process	
		Total	Fear	Disgust		Avoid
Age (r/ p)	.063	-.160	-.181	-.092	-.081	-.149
	.308	.009	.003	.134	.189	.009
Gender (z/ p)	1.292	.830	.146	.704	.899	1.246
	.071	.495	1.000	.705	.395	.090
Ethnicity (x ² / p)	53.324	8.572	11.669	16.738	4.530	26.618
	.000	.127	.040	.005	.476	.001
Occupation	.028	-.124	-.103	-.054	-.128	.048
	.657	.046	.095	.381	.039	.439
Smoking status (z/ p)	.956	1.117	1.995	.946	.043	.706
	.320	.165	.001	.332	1.000	.701

Table E4: Results of Kruskal-Wallis testing the relationship between ethnicity the awareness of smoking related diseases

Race	n	Knowledge (mean rank)	Processing (mean rank)
Caucasian	129	100.30	151.25
Chinese	73	168.28	100.49
Malay	14	194.32	96.71
Indian	27	153.06	120.06
Black/ black other	14	105.43	143.96
Mixed/other	9	158.81	160.94

Table E5: Percentage of participants that chose to prevent or treat each health risk when only one could be chosen: London (L) vs Singapore (S) overall, and by smoking status

	All			Non-smokers			Smokers		
	S	L	p-value	S	L	p-value	S	L	p-value
Prevention (only one)									
Heart disease	17%	21%	0.320	17%	25%	0.303	16%	16%	0.934
Stroke	12%	8%	0.317	11%	10%	0.961	13%	4%	0.073
Blindness	13%	16%	0.455	6%	14%	0.169	18%	19%	0.880
Mouth & throat cancer	1%	10%	0.004	0%	10%	0.022	2%	9%	0.102
Lung cancer	52%	44%	0.158	64%	40%	0.006	42%	49%	0.438
Treatment (only one)									
Heart disease	19%	23%	0.525	21%	25%	0.662	18%	19%	0.880
Stroke	13%	6%	0.067	13%	8%	0.412	13%	2%	0.024
Blindness	13%	20%	0.137	6%	20%	0.035	18%	19%	0.880
Mouth & throat cancer	1%	7%	0.019	0%	8%	0.039	2%	5%	0.326
Lung cancer	49%	43%	0.371	57%	38%	0.023	40%	51%	0.248

Table E6: Emotional response after viewing GHWL: Overall response, and all non-smokers vs all smokers

	All respondents	Non-smokers	Smokers	P value
Experienced fear	137/266 (52%)	95/154 (62%)	41/112 (37%)	<0.001
Experienced disgust	183/266 (69%)	114/154 (74%)	68/112 (61%)	0.021
Avoiding looking at labels	76/266 (29%)	41/154 (27%)	34/112 (30%)	0.504

Table E7: Processing of GHWL based on the mean (standard deviation) of a score on a nominal scale from 1 to 5: Overall response, and all smokers vs all non-smokers

	All respondents	Non-smokers	Smokers	P value
How carefully read GHWL messages (/5) (SD)	2.06 (1.20)	1.97 (1.23)	2.19 (1.16)	0.152
How often read GHWL messages (/5) (SD)	2.05 (1.23)	2.01 (1.30)	2.09 (1.13)	0.617
How often thought about GHWL messages (/5) (SD)	2.14 (1.29)	2.18 (1.35)	2.08 (1.22)	0.551
Ever talked about GHWLs (/5) (SD)	1.95 (1.31)	2.09 (1.40)	1.75 (1.16)	<0.043
Ever thought about GHWLs when not in sight (/5) (SD)	1.58 (1.03)	1.58 (1.10)	1.58 (0.93)	0.982
Ever kept a GHWL (/5) (SD)	1.16 (0.74)	1.13 (0.59)	1.13 (0.59)	0.664