medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.01.06.24300835; this version posted January 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Delayed effects of cigarette graphic warning labels on smoking behavior

Zhenhao Shi, PhD[1], An-Li Wang, PhD[2], Janet Audrain-McGovern, PhD[1], Kevin G. Lynch, PhD[1], James Loughead, PhD[1], Daniel D. Langleben, MD[1]

[1]Department of Psychiatry, University of Pennsylvania Perelman School of Medicine, Philadelphia, PA 19104

[2]Department of Psychiatry, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, NY 10029

Corresponding author: Daniel D. Langleben, MD

3535 Market St Ste 500, Philadelphia, PA 19104. Email: langlebe@pennmedicine.upenn.edu.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.01.06.24300835; this version posted January 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

ABSTRACT

Graphic warning labels (GWLs) on cigarette packs are widely employed to communicate smoking-related health risks. Most GWLs elicit high emotional arousal. Our recent study showed lower efficacy of high-arousal GWLs than low-arousal ones during 4 weeks of naturalistic exposure. Here, we conducted a secondary analysis to investigate the delayed effects of GWLs on smoking severity after the end of the 4-week exposure. In 112 adult smokers (56 high-arousal, 56 low-arousal), there was a significant reduction in the number of cigarettes smoked per day (CPD) from immediately post-exposure to 4 weeks post-exposure. The high-arousal and low-arousal groups did not differ in CPD reduction. Our study suggests lasting impact of GWLs on smoking behavior. The finding may be particularly relevant to the high-arousal GWLs, whose efficacy is not as pronounced during direct and continuous exposure.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.01.06.24300835; this version posted January 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

INTRODUCTION

Graphic cigarette warning labels (GWLs) are employed in over 100 countries to communicate smoking-related health hazards. The US legislation has also mandated GWLs, but so far the FDA has been unable to overcome courts' skepticism about GWLs' effectiveness [1 2]. Most GWLs feature aversive graphics that elicit strong emotional reaction (ER) [3]. The level of aversiveness has been a key obstacle to GWL adoption in the US [1]. Our prior studies show that high-ER GWLs are better remembered [4] but less effective than low-ER GWLs in reducing smoking under naturalistic conditions [5]. High-ER GWLs may trigger maladaptive processes, such as distress [6], avoidance [7], and reactance [8], that attenuate their efficacy. We hypothesized that discontinuing GWLs after chronic exposure may allow smokers to recover from such immediate counterproductive processes while still benefiting from the retained memory of the warnings. Here, we performed a secondary analysis [5] to investigate smoking behavior change four weeks after the completion of a month-long exposure to GWLs in a cohort of US smokers.

METHODS

168 adult smokers were exposed to high-ER (n=84) or low-ER (n=84) GWLs for four weeks and received weekly supply of cigarettes during weeks 0–4 [5]. Cigarette packages dispensed in week 0 had the current Surgeon General's text-only warning, and those in weeks 1–4 carried experimental GWLs developed by the FDA [9]. The number of cigarettes smoked per day (CPD) was measured before (week 0), during (weeks 1–3), immediately after (week 4), and four weeks after (week 8) the end of GWL exposure. A generalized estimating equation model examined the effects of group (high-ER vs. low-ER), time (week 4 vs. 8), and group×time interaction on CPD while controlling for week 0. The study protocol was approved by the University of Pennsylvania Institutional Review Board. See Shi, et al. [5] and the **Supplementary Information** for additional details on the methods.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.01.06.24300835; this version posted January 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

RESULTS

CPD at week 4 and 8 was assessed in 123 and 112 participants, respectively. Participant characteristics are summarized in **Table S1**. The group×time interaction was not significant ($\chi^2(1)=0.11$, $p=0.74$). There were significant main effects of group (high-ER vs. low-ER, log10-transformed mean±standard error=1.00±0.02 vs. 0.95±0.02, $\chi^2(1)=5.12$, $p=0.023$) and time (week 4 vs. 8, 1.02±0.01 vs. 0.93±0.02, $\chi^2(1)=10.52$, $p=0.001$) (see **Figure 1**). Alternative approaches to handling missing data yielded similar results (see the **Supplementary Information**).



Figure 1. Significant reduction in the number of cigarettes smoked per day from week 4 to week 8.

Abbreviation: ER, emotion reaction.

DISCUSSION

We found decreased smoking severity at the 8-week timepoint, i.e., four weeks after the end of a month-long GWL exposure. This effect may reflect successful assimilation of warning information through learning and memory during GWL exposure, leading to tangible behavior change in the long run [10]. The lack of group×time interaction indicates comparable smoking reduction after high-ER and low-ER GWL exposure. However, the finding may be particularly relevant to high-ER GWLs, which are less effective than low-ER ones during direct and continuous exposure [5]. While the mechanisms underlying such

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.01.06.24300835; this version posted January 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

disparity require further investigation [6-8], our finding suggests that intermittent rather than continuous exposure of smokers to high-ER GWLs may improve their efficacy.

FUNDING

This study was supported by the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA) of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the Center for Tobacco Products of the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) under award number R01DA036028 (PI: DDL); NIH/NIDA under award number K01DA051709 (PI: ZS); and the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) of the NIH under award number R00HD084746 (PI: ALW). The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the NIH or the FDA.

DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

The authors report no conflicts of interest in this work.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Zhenhao Shi: formal analysis (equal), investigation (equal), methodology (equal), software (lead), validation (lead), original draft preparation (lead), review & editing (equal). **An-Li Wang:** conceptualization (supportive), data curation (supportive), funding acquisition (supportive), project administration (supportive), supervision (supportive), review & editing (equal). **Janet Audrain-McGovern:** investigation (supportive), original draft preparation (supportive), review & editing (equal). **Kevin G. Lynch:** formal analysis (equal), investigation (supportive), methodology (equal), software (supportive), validation (supportive), original draft preparation (supportive), review & editing (equal). **James Loughead:** investigation (supportive), resources (supportive), review & editing (equal). **Daniel D. Langleben:** conceptualization (lead), data curation (lead), funding acquisition (lead), investigation (equal),

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.01.06.24300835; this version posted January 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

project administration (lead), resources (lead), supervision (lead), original draft preparation (supportive), review & editing (equal).

REFERENCES

1. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Company, et al. v. U.S. Food & Drug Administration, et al.: U.S. Court of Appeals for the DC Circuit, 2012:1205.

2. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Company, et al. v. U.S. Food & Drug Administration, et al.: U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, 2020.

3. Tobacco-Free Kids Action Fund. Global issues: warning labels (available: www.tobaccofreekids.org/what-we-do/global/warning-labels [accessed July 1, 2023]) 2021.

4. Wang A-L, Shi Z, Fairchild VP, et al. Emotional salience of the image component facilitates recall of the text of cigarette warning labels. *European Journal of Public Health* 2019;29(1):153-58.

5. Shi Z, Wang A-L, Fairchild VP, et al. Effects of emotional arousal on the neural impact and behavioral efficacy of cigarette graphic warning labels. *Addiction* 2023;118(5):914-24.

6. Brown SL, Smith EZ. The inhibitory effect of a distressing anti-smoking message on risk perceptions in smokers. *Psychology & Health* 2007;22(3):255-68.

7. Maynard OM, Attwood A, O'Brien L, et al. Avoidance of cigarette pack health warnings among regular cigarette smokers. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence* 2014;136:170-74.

8. Erceg-Hurn DM, Steed LG. Does exposure to cigarette health warnings elicit psychological reactance in smokers? *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 2011;41(1):219-37.

9. Nonnemaker J, Farrelly M, Kamyab K, et al. Experimental study of graphic cigarette warning labels (Contract No. HHSF-223-2009-10135G, RTI Project No. 0212305.007.003). RTI International, Research Triangle Park, NC, 2010.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.01.06.24300835; this version posted January 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

10. Shoots-Reinhard B, Erford B, Romer D, et al. Numeracy and memory for risk probabilities and risk outcomes depicted on cigarette warning labels. *Health Psychology* 2020;39(8):721-30.