medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.09.24313359; this version posted September 10, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

The impact of tobacco control policies on illicit tobacco trade: A scoping review

Authors:

Isabel Meciar, MPH[1]

Coral Gartner, PhD[1]

Ariel McLay[1]

Cheneal Puljević, PhD[1*]

1. NHMRC Centre for Research Excellence on Achieving the Tobacco Endgame, School of Public Health, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia

*Corresponding author: Dr Cheneal Puljević, School of Public Health, The University of Queensland, 288 Herston Rd, Herston QLD, 4006 Australia; c.puljevic@uq.edu.au

Pre-print

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.09.24313359; this version posted September 10, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

ABSTRACT

Introduction: There are concerns that progressively stringent tobacco control policies will result in increased illicit tobacco trade (ITT). We reviewed the international evidence base to identify studies examining the impact of tobacco control polices on ITT.

Methods: Guided by JBI scoping review methodology, we searched six databases (PubMed, CINAHL, EMBASE, PsycINFO, Scopus, and Web of Science) in 2022 and 2024 for original research published in English since 2000. One reviewer screened titles and abstracts, and two reviewers screened full-text articles against inclusion criteria. We report the results according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews Checklist.

Results: We identified 60 articles examining the impact of eight tobacco control policies or combination of policies on the ITT, including tobacco tax increases or decreases (n=43); menthol bans (n=5); decreasing allowable cigarette filter ventilation levels (n=1); standardised packaging (n=5); tobacco sales bans (n=1); a substantial reduction in the number of tobacco retailers (n=1); a very low nicotine content mandate (VLNC; n=2); and multicomponent policy interventions (n=4).

Conclusions: The available evidence is predominantly focused on the impact of tobacco tax increases on the ITT, with equal numbers of studies describing an increase in the ITT or no impact on the ITT, countering claims that tobacco tax increases are the primary driver of increased ITT. Evidence on the impact of other tobacco control policies on the ITT is limited. Collaborative efforts to develop accurate and consistent methods to assess the ITT are needed.

Keywords: Tobacco Control Policies; Illicit Tobacco Trade; Illegal Tobacco Products; Public Policy; Endgame

Implications: To our knowledge, this scoping review is the first to synthesise the available evidence on the association between multiple tobacco control policies and ITT. Findings suggest that evidence for the association between tobacco tax increases and ITT is mixed, with an equal number of studies (n=18) describing an increase or no impact of this policy on ITT. Evidence for the impact of other policies was limited; the only policies with some

Pre-print

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.09.24313359; this version posted September 10, 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.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

evidence for increasing the ITT include tobacco sales bans (n=1), a concurrent tobacco sales and smoking ban (n=2), and a hypothetical VLNC standard mandate (n=2).

Pre-print

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.09.24313359; this version posted September 10, 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.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

INTRODUCTION

Tobacco smoking is a leading risk factor for preventable premature death and disability, contributing to more than 200 million deaths globally in the past 30 years.[1] Approximately one billion people worldwide smoked tobacco daily in 2019, and this figure is likely to increase in the coming decades, especially in low income countries.[1] To combat this global public health issue, efforts have been made to increase smoking cessation and reduce smoking uptake through the World Health Organization (WHO) Framework Convention on Tobacco Control (FCTC).[2] The FCTC has led to reductions in smoking prevalence in many regions of the world.[2] However, progress towards ending the tobacco epidemic remains slow, leading to calls to implement innovative policies that have the potential to permanently and rapidly reduce smoking prevalence to minimal levels (<5%), known as 'tobacco endgame' policies.[3] These endgame policies extend beyond traditional demand reduction policies (e.g., taxation, packaging, and labelling requirements) to substantial reductions in the number of tobacco retailers, banning commercial tobacco sales, very large tobacco tax increases, or mandating a very low nicotine content (VLNC) standard for cigarettes.[3,4]

As tobacco endgame policies aim to substantially restrict the accessibility, affordability, addictiveness and availability of licit tobacco products,[4] there are concerns that these policies may increase demand for illicit tobacco products.[5] The illicit tobacco trade (ITT) is defined by the WHO FCTC as "any practice or conduct prohibited by law and which relates to production, shipment, receipt, possession, distribution, sale or purchase, including any practice or conduct intended to facilitate such activity".[6] This can include various forms of tax avoidance (e.g., exceeding statutory limits on tobacco products purchased in another jurisdiction with lower or no excise taxes for personal use), or tax evasion practices (e.g., purchasing tobacco products from a jurisdiction with lower or no excise taxes to be resold in a higher tax jurisdiction or 'bootlegging').[5,7,8] These products include counterfeit cigarettes displaying a registered trademark brand without the owner's permission, illegally distributed foreign branded cigarettes, unbranded loose-leaf tobacco (known as 'chop-chop' in Australia),[9] or any other kind of counterfeit, smuggled or contraband tobacco products.[5,7,10] Studies confirm the presence of a substantial global illicit tobacco market, particularly in low- and middle-income countries.[5,11] According to WHO estimates, one in 10 cigarettes and other tobacco products consumed globally are illicit.[11] The ITT undermines public health efforts to reduce tobacco consumption by increasing the affordability and availability of tobacco products, resulting in billions of dollars of lost tobacco tax revenue.[10] For example, the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.09.24313359; this version posted September 10, 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.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

estimated value of lost tax revenue from ITT in Australia, with a daily smoking population of 2.1 million, was $2.3 billion in 2021-22.[12] This figure is likely to be a significant underestimation because the Australian Taxation Office estimate only about 1% of the total illicit domestic market is detected.[13] There are also concerns that the ITT is largely operated by organised crime syndicates[9] who capitalise on the product's high profitability to fund other large-scale crimes, such as the global arms trade, illicit drug production and terrorism.[9,14,15]

While several tobacco industry-funded studies have claimed that stronger tobacco control policies, particularly tobacco tax increases, lead to increased ITT,[16] independently-funded studies have often found the opposite.[17-19] The tobacco industry have been accused of producing inflated estimates of the size of the illicit tobacco market to lobby governments to lower tobacco tax and to oppose new tobacco control policies.[9,16,20] A systematic review of tobacco industry-funded studies of ITT concluded that these data are not reliable, noting a "fundamental lack of transparency" throughout every stage of their research processes.[16] Independent evaluations of the impacts of tobacco control policies on ITT are thus critical to ensure that reliable outcomes are reported that are free of commercial conflicts of interests. We are aware of two systematic reviews that have evaluated the relationship between tobacco control policies and the ITT. Haighton et al evaluated the relationship between the ITT and one tobacco control policy, standardised tobacco packaging, finding no association.[21] Second, a 2015 consensus report produced by the National Research Council and Institute of Medicine focused on the ITT in only one country, the United States (US).[22] As such, we conducted a scoping review to identify and synthesise international studies that describe the impacts on illicit tobacco use of any tobacco control policy intended to reduce smoking overall or to restrict the licit tobacco market, and to identify gaps in the literature to inform future research.

METHODS

This review follows the JBI methodology for scoping reviews,[23] and the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) Checklist [24] (see Supplementary Table 1). A protocol was pre-registered in Open Science Framework,[25] with the only deviations to the protocol including an additional database search that was conducted in 2024, and the addition of a third review question focusing on included studies' limitations.

Pre-print

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.09.24313359; this version posted September 10, 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.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Review questions

The following questions were addressed:

1. What are the impacts of policies that aim to reduce tobacco use (tobacco control policies) on the ITT?
2. What are the key research gaps identified by authors of studies describing the impacts of tobacco control policies on the ITT?
3. What are the limitations identified by authors of studies describing the impacts on the ITT of tobacco control policies?

Inclusion/exclusion criteria

We included original empirical research published in peer-reviewed journals in English (due to unavailability of resources for translation) since 1 January 2000, with no limit placed on study design. To be included, studies must describe the impact on the ITT of any tobacco control policy that is intended to reduce smoking in general or to restrict the licit tobacco market. We excluded studies that measured the size of the illicit tobacco market without examining the impact of any tobacco control policies, or only examined strategies to reduce ITT. We also excluded any studies that were funded by the tobacco industry, including by industry-funded organisations such as Foundation for a Smoke-Free World. Studies that were independent but included data from tobacco industry funded sources in addition to other data were included but identified as including industry data in their analysis.

Search strategy

An initial preliminary search of PubMed and Scopus databases was conducted to identify relevant search terms; these are listed in Supplementary Table 2. We searched six databases (PubMed, CINAHL, EMBASE, PsycINFO, Scopus, and Web of Science) using the search terms on 3 March 2022. A second search of the same databases was conducted on 7 May 2024 to identify new studies published since the first search was conducted.

Evidence selection

Figure 1 details the publication search and retrieval process for both searches. Each article's title and abstract was screened against the inclusion criteria by one reviewer (IM in 2022; AM in 2024) using Covidence software.[26] The full text of publications not excluded at the title and abstract screening stage was then assessed against the inclusion criteria by two of three independent reviewers (IM, CP and AM). Any disagreements that arose between the reviewers at any stage of the selection process were resolved through discussion with another author (CG).

Pre-print

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.09.24313359; this version posted September 10, 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.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Data extraction

Data extraction was conducted by IM in 2022 and AM in 2024 using an online extraction form in Covidence software,[26] and then uploaded into Microsoft Excel for editing. The extracted data table was reviewed for accuracy and consistency by the other authors (CP and CG). Extracted data for each study included article author(s) and affiliations; publication year; aim; method; location; funding source; tobacco control policy measured; policy impact on the ITT; any research gaps noted by the author(s); and study limitations.

RESULTS

In our 2022 search, from 1,068 records identified in the initial database search, 49 publications met inclusion criteria after full-text review. Our 2024 search identified a further 11 publications that met inclusion criteria after full-text review, resulting in 60 included studies (see Figure 1). Table 1 summarises these studies' findings. Full details of the included studies are summarised in Supplementary Table 3, including studies' funding sources. Forty-six (77%) publications were independently funded by government bodies and/or non-government organisations (NGOs), while 12 publications did not provide details of the funding source and two noted that they were unfunded. No included publications reported funding from tobacco or other commercial industries, but two included studies[27,28] used data published by consulting firm KPMG that were commissioned and funded by tobacco companies such as Philip Morris International. However, both studies also used other non-industry data sources in their analysis.[27,28]

Tobacco tax changes

Of the 60 included articles, 43 (72%) examined the impact of tobacco tax changes on the ITT. Of these, 16 quantitative studies found an increase in the ITT following tobacco tax increases in the United States,[29-32] Europe,[27,33] Taiwan,[34-36] Australia,[37] New Zealand,[38] Brazil,[39,40] Uruguay,[41] and Colombia.[42,43] These comprised four cross-sectional studies analysing survey data,[34-37] two analysing administrative data,[31,32] and three analysing both cross-sectional survey and administrative data,[29,30,39] three before-and-after studies analysing two waves of survey data,[40,42,43] one modelling study using panel data,[33] one longitudinal study,[41] one study involving multilevel growth modelling of administrative data and estimates of the size of the illicit market collected by KPMG,[27] and one mixed-methods study that analysed interview and administrative data.[38] Two qualitative studies also reported perceived increases in the ITT.[44,45] One used qualitative archival content analysis, and reported evidence of tobacco

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.09.24313359; this version posted September 10, 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.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

industry involvement in smuggling tobacco products across Canadian First Nations Reserves following a significant tax increase in Canada.[45] The other qualitative study used focus groups to explore the ITT in New York, with participants describing a pervasive ITT in their "low-income minority community" following a tobacco tax increase.[44] As such, a total of 18 articles (42% of the articles on this topic) describe an increase in the ITT following tobacco tax increases.

A further 18 publications found no impact on the ITT following tobacco tax increases in six West Balkan countries,[46] 28 member states of the European Union,[47] England,[48] Czech Republic,[28] France,[49] Turkey,[50] Georgia,[51] Philippines,[52] Thailand,[53] Vietnam,[54] Malaysia,[55,56] Uruguay,[57] Canada,[19] USA,[58] Malawi,[59] and South Africa.[60,61] Two of these studies reported that although there was no evidence of a significant national increase in the ITT, there was some evidence of localised cross-border tobacco purchasing and smuggling in France and the European Union.[47,49] One of these studies found that sharing a border with a non-European Economic Area country was associated with an increased likelihood of ITT.[47] These included nine studies involving a gap analysis comparing survey and administrative data,[19,47,49,52,53,55,56,58,59] (two of these studies' surveys also included littered pack collection[49,58]), four cross-sectional studies analysing survey data,[46,48,50,60] two longitudinal studies,[51,57] (one of these also analysed cigarette packs for tax stamps[51]), one cross-sectional analysis of administrative data,[61] one cross-sectional study analysing administrative and KPMG data,[28] and one study using a discrete choice experiment.[54]

Four publications reported evidence of a decrease in ITT following a tobacco tax increase in Mongolia,[62] Vietnam,[63,64] and Sierra Leone.[65] These included one before-and-after study using discarded cigarette pack collections,[62] one cross-sectional analysis of household survey data and discarded cigarette packs,[63] and two gap analyses; one analysed administrative data and two rounds of national survey data,[64] while the other analysed data from Sierra Leone's Demographic and Health Survey, customs data and newly collected data on cigarette prices.[65]

A further two studies reported mixed findings. First, a study involving a gap analysis of administrative data and four waves of national survey data reported both an increase in tobacco smuggling and a decrease in illicit tobacco consumption in Vietnam following a tobacco tax increase in 2006.[66] A further gap analysis study of administrative and national survey data conducted in five South American countries reported increased ITT in Brazil, a stable ITT in Argentina, and no evidence for an increased ITT in Chile, Colombia or Peru

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.09.24313359; this version posted September 10, 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.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

despite tobacco tax increases.[67] Finally, one cross-sectional study involving administrative data analysis found no change in the ITT following a tobacco tax *decrease* in Canada in 1994.[68]

Areas worthy of future research noted by these authors of studies assessing the impacts of tobacco tax changes include assessing trends in the validity of self-reported smoking measures,[19] investigating the effects of educational campaigns on understanding of health risks and ability to distinguish between licit and illicit cigarettes,[36] investigating individual and structural barriers to uptake of evidence-based cessation resources, especially among disadvantaged populations,[44] investigating smuggling networks' targeting of low income communities,[44] comparisons of illicit tobacco sales on reserves in Canada compared with those in the USA,[69] the degree of overall non-compliance with tobacco control laws,[40] or disentangling participants' understandings of varying terminology (e.g., black market vs illicit cigarettes).[47] Other authors mentioned the value in future research investigating the roles of race and religion,[32] price differentials,[41] more non-price policies (e.g., health warnings, advertising bans),[68] the availability of e-cigarettes and other nicotine-containing products,[38,47] formal and informal sector actors and regulation, state capacity and border entries,[65] and/or corruption, law enforcement action and organised crime networks[27] on ITT.

Limitations of these studies, as described by study authors, mainly related to difficulties in accurately estimating and evaluating the scope of the ITT,[27,33,38,42,43,49,50,52,53,56,60] with some specifically mentioning the lack of a gold-standard approach to measure the ITT.[38,66] These limitations include a lack of reliable and/or independent data sources,[27,33,35,38,46,48,52] challenges in discriminating between legal and illegal tobacco purchases[49,50,52,60,64] or between tax evasion and tax avoidance,[52,62,67] using estimates that only considered one form of illicit tobacco product or selected illicit tobacco distribution channels as a measure of the ITT,[43] an inability to verify the authenticity of tax stamps,[35,51,62] difficulties establishing a causal link between tobacco tax increases and the ITT,[28,42,65] potential measurement error or bias due to reliance on self-reported data,[19,27,35,39,40,56,57,60] small study sample size,[37,43,47,59] convenience sampling methods,[60,70] and/or an inability to generalise findings.[44,49,51,58-60,62,63] Other authors noted the difficulties of quantifying and measuring the impacts of organised criminal networks,[47,56] law enforcement,[47,64] customs and border control, and corruption[47] on ITT.

Pre-print

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.09.24313359; this version posted September 10, 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.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Menthol ban

Five studies assessed the impact of a menthol ban on ITT.[69-73] Two Canadian studies reported no impact of the policy on ITT,[69,73] one English survey reported a decrease in illicit menthol cigarette purchasing following a menthol ban,[72] and two USA-based studies involving an experimental tobacco marketplace[71] and cross-sectional surveys[70] found that some participants reported an intention to purchase illegal menthol cigarettes in the event of a hypothetical menthol ban.[70,71]

The two Canadian studies assessed the impact of the country's ban on menthol cigarettes that was implemented in all provinces between 2015 and 2018.[69,73] First, an analysis of national survey data found that only 9% of Canadians who smoked menthol cigarettes pre ban reported smoking menthol cigarettes post ban, and there was no change in the number of participants who reported illegal purchasing of menthols or other cigarettes from First Nations reserve from pre ban to post ban (51.2% vs 51.2%, p=1.00).[69] Similarly, an analysis of illicit cigarette seizure data after the menthol ban was implemented in Nova Scotia, Canada reported no impact of the policy on the ITT.[73] Next, analysis of cross-sectional survey data collected in England after a ban on the sale of menthol cigarettes was implemented in May 2020 found that past six-month purchases of menthol cigarettes from any illicit or cross border source declined from 30.1% in the last 6 months of 2020 to 17.5% in the first 6 months of 2021.[72] Finally, two USA-based studies reported on participants' intention to use illegal menthol cigarettes in the event of a hypothetical menthol ban.[70,71] A study using an experimental tobacco marketplace found that when illegal menthol cigarettes were available for purchase, participants were significantly more likely to purchase illegal menthol cigarettes compared to when menthol cigarettes were only available legally ($p<0.001$).[71] Similarly, analyses of cross-sectional survey data found that 30.2% of people who smoked menthol cigarettes (but did not use e-cigarettes) and 23.7% of people who smoked menthol cigarettes and used flavoured e-cigarettes intended to seek products from illicit channels in the event of a menthol ban.[70]

These authors noted that future research on this topic would benefit from comparing the enforcement of regulations for illicit cigarette sales on reserves in Canada versus those in the USA,[69] the effectiveness of pairing the menthol ban with increased law enforcement actions,[71] the interacting effects of cigarette features on illegal purchasing and substitution,[71] the impacts of consequences of illegal purchasing,[71] whether motivation to stop smoking is moderated by nicotine dependence among menthol smokers,[72] the long-term impacts of

Pre-print

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.09.24313359; this version posted September 10, 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.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

menthol bans on smoking cessation,[72] and the underlying mechanisms behind the association between flavour preferences and seeking products from illicit channels.[70] In terms of limitations, these authors stated that their studies were limited by self-reported data,[71,72] convenience sampling methods,[70] an inability to generalise their findings,[71] and a lack of data on pre-ban menthol cigarette use,[72] while the authors of the two USA-based studies noted the limitations inherent in measuring intended versus actual behaviours.[70,71]

Standardised packaging

Following introduction of standardised packaging laws, no evidence of an increase in the ITT was reported in four publications, including one "secret shopper" study (where fieldworkers attempt to purchase illicit tobacco from tobacco retailers), and three before-and-after studies using survey data.[17,74,75] Three of these studies were conducted in Australia,[17,18,75] and one in the United Kingdom, France, and Ireland.[74] A fifth study involving time series analysis of England's Smoking Toolkit Study data reported that the policy's implementation was associated with a 0.16% monthly decline in illicit tobacco and cross-border purchases.[76]

Research gaps noted by these authors included the lack of assessment on the impact of standardised packaging on specific forms of illicit tobacco products (i.e., counterfeit tobacco),[17,74] an inability to assess illicit status using price-based criteria,[17] and a lack of studies combining multiple data sources (e.g., audits of specialist tobacconists, tobacco consumer surveys, customs surveillance and interception data, and patterns in revenue collection data) enabling a more accurate overall estimation of the scale of the ITT in countries like Australia.[18]

These studies' limitations included limited data availability,[74] potential participant confusion in distinguishing between 'black market' or 'illicit' cigarettes,[74] an inability to generalise findings,[17,75] and a reliance on self-reported data, [17,75], while retailers involved in the secret shopper study may have been more willing to offer illicit tobacco products to known regular customers rather than the unknown research assistants.[18]

Tobacco sales ban

One cross-sectional study involving analysis of survey data reported an increase in the ITT in South Africa following a temporary tobacco sales ban introduced as part of COVID-19 restrictions in 2020.[77] These findings suggest that an abrupt tobacco sales ban with no lead-in time can result in an increase in the ITT in countries where smoking prevalence is high and a substantial ITT pre-exists.[77] The authors did not mention any research gaps, but noted that their study's findings were limited by a lack of a specific survey sampling frame, self-

Pre-print

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.09.24313359; this version posted September 10, 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.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

reported data, and the potential underrepresentation of most disadvantaged subgroups of the population and people who quit smoking during the COVID-19 lockdown.[77]

Mandatory very low nicotine content (VLNC) standard

Two USA-based studies reported a likely increase in consumer demand for illicit tobacco products if a VLNC cigarette standard was mandated.[78,79] First, in a randomised experimental study, learning about a hypothetical VLNC product standard increased consumer interest in purchasing regular nicotine content cigarettes illicitly.[78] Similarly, a study involving hypothetical cigarette purchasing tasks found that some participants were willing to purchase illicit cigarettes with normal nicotine content in a reduced-nicotine cigarette regulatory environment, but that the availability of cheaper e-cigarettes moderated this demand.[79] Research gaps noted by these authors include the impact of product availability (i.e., cigarette brand and type), demographics, and punishment severity on hypothetical illicit cigarette purchasing and alternative product substitution,[79] and the impact of campaign messages' ability to avert possible unintended consequences of a VLNC standard, or reasons for interest in illicit cigarettes.[78] Study limitations included a limited ability to generalise study findings,[78,79] and that intentions do not perfectly predict behaviour.[78]

Decreasing allowable cigarette filter ventilation levels

One USA-based study used an Experimental Tobacco Marketplace to estimate the impact of decreasing allowable cigarette filter ventilation levels.[71] The study involved a separate experiment focusing on the impacts of banning menthol cigarettes, with these findings described in the menthol ban section above. When illegal cigarettes were available, decreasing filter ventilation levels did not increase illegal cigarette purchasing. The authors recommended that future research investigates the relationship between a filter-ventilated cigarette ban and purchasing behaviour over time, the impact of banning high-ventilated cigarettes on ITT, and the interacting effects of cigarette features on illegal purchasing and substitution. Study limitations included limited generalisability of study findings, and the hypothetical nature of the task.[71]

Reduction in the number of tobacco retailers

A qualitative study involving online in-depth interviews with 24 Aotearoa (New Zealand)-based adults who smoke reported that while many participants anticipated that the country's ITT would increase following a substantial reduction in the number of tobacco retail outlets, few anticipated actually purchasing illicit tobacco products themselves, and most did not know how to purchase these products.[80] The authors recommended that should the country

Pre-print

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.09.24313359; this version posted September 10, 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.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

ratify the WHO's Protocol to Eliminate Illicit Trade in Tobacco Products, future research should investigate how effectively the intelligence received via this network assists illicit trade detection, and that the study would have benefitted from involving Māori or Pacific interviewers, who may have elicited different insights about the role the ITT plays within those communities.[80]

Multi-component policies

Four studies investigated the impact of three multi-component policies on the ITT. Two studies involving qualitative content analysis of tobacco industry and policy documents, interviews with key civil servants, and quantitative analyses of Bhutan's 2006 Youth Tobacco Survey,[81,82] reported an "immediate and long-term" increase in the ITT following the passage of the 2004 anti-tobacco legislation in Bhutan, which involved a concurrent ban on tobacco sales (that has since been lifted) and public smoking.[81,82] The author of both studies noted that data from other countries and contexts on the impacts of concurrent tobacco sales and smoking bans are needed, as well as more rigorous and industry-independent estimates of the ITT, but did not note any study limitations.[81,82]

Next, a before-and-after study involving analysis of two waves of nationally representative household survey data reported a decline in the ITT following the implementation of the 'National Tobacco Control Provisions' in Albania in 2007.[83] This multi-component legislation included tobacco advertisement bans, public information campaigns on the dangers of tobacco use, health warnings, mandatory disclosure of tobacco product ingredients, and made all public places including bars and restaurants smokefree.[83] The authors did not mention any research gaps, but noted that their study experienced participant attrition.[83] Finally, a panel household survey with three waves (2017, 2018, 2019) assessed the impact of a new tobacco control law implemented in Georgia in 2018, comprising pictorial health warnings on packs, banning smoking in almost all public places, and limits on tobacco advertising. The study found no evidence of a corresponding increase in illicit tobacco consumption.[51] The study also described the impacts of a subsequent tobacco tax increase implemented in 2019, with findings reported in the 'tax increase' section above. The authors recommended a littered pack study to overcome participant reluctance to show their cigarette packs, and mentioned that their study's findings had limited generalisability and that the authenticity of cigarette tax stamps was not tested due to limited budget.[51]

Pre-print

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.09.24313359; this version posted September 10, 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.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

DISCUSSION

This scoping review identified 60 publications that examined the impact of seven individual tobacco control policies (tobacco tax changes, a menthol ban, standardised packaging, a sales ban, a mandatory VLNC standard, decreasing cigarette filter ventilation levels, and a reduction in the number of tobacco retailers) and three multi-component interventions on the ITT. Overall, this review shows that the evidence base for the relationship between tobacco tax increases and the ITT is mixed, and that there is limited evidence for the relationship between the other tobacco control policies and the ITT.

The majority of publications (n=43; 72%) focused on the impacts of tobacco tax changes on the ITT. Equal numbers of studies (n=18; 42% of the tax-focused studies) reported an increase or no change in the ITT following a tobacco tax increase. This finding stands in contrast to claims from industry-funded studies[84,85] and some media reports (e.g., from Australia)[86,87] that increased ITT is a direct result of tobacco tax increases, with the implication that reducing tobacco taxes will reduce ITT. The one study that examined a tobacco tax decrease found no change in ITT.[68] Studies reporting an increase in the ITT were predominantly conducted in the United States, European or Southern American countries, where the ITT was often facilitated through international or interstate cross-border smuggling from lower tax jurisdictions, or internet purchasing of tax-free mail-order cigarettes.[27,29-36,39-43] Tax-induced price differentials between neighbouring jurisdictions can create incentives for consumers from states or countries with higher tobacco taxes to purchase tobacco from lower tax jurisdictions and on-sell in higher taxing jurisdictions.[32] This was particularly prevalent in areas where low-income communities resided near international or interstate borders, and/or where high levels of illicit tobacco consumption existed even before taxes were increased.[30,47,49] Some of these authors acknowledged that increased ITT cannot solely be attributed to tobacco tax increases, noting the influence of a multitude of non-price factors on the ITT such as higher population density, higher national income inequity, public sector corruption, the pervasiveness of informal economies, and the strength of tobacco control policy enforcement.[31,61,67]

We also identified four studies reporting a decrease in the ITT following tax increases in Mongolia,[62] Vietnam,[63,64] and Sierra Leone.[65] The authors of the Mongolian-based study attribute the decreased ITT to the relatively small size of the tobacco tax increase, which may contribute to a lack of demand for illicit tobacco.[62] The authors of the Vietnamese studies ascribed the decrease in ITT to intensive anti-tobacco smuggling campaigns led by national

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.09.24313359; this version posted September 10, 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.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

and provincial Steering Committees[63] or potential underreporting of tobacco use or net smuggling of tax-paid cigarettes out of the country.[64] The authors also noted that illegal cigarettes are often more expensive than legal cigarettes in Vietnam, explaining that consumers who choose illegal cigarettes typically do so due to a preference for foreign brands, perceiving these to be "more luxurious, to have superior quality and to be associated with a higher social status than their domestically produced counterparts."[63] The authors of the study conducted in Sierra Leone describe how the country's tobacco tax increase achieved its goal of decreased tobacco smoking prevalence (including smuggled cigarettes), but point to a "puzzle" in their results.[65] They note that previous research investigating non-price related drivers of ITT typically points to state enforcement capacity and the implementation of other tobacco control interventions as key drivers of a country's ITT, yet Sierra Leone's state capacity is relatively limited (especially their ability to address organised crime), the country does not have a track and trace system or tax stamps, and no new tobacco control interventions have been introduced in several years, suggesting that tobacco tax increases can be effective in reducing smoking prevalence, "even in contexts where other control measures are not fully established yet."[65]

In terms of the impacts of non-tax tobacco control policies, we found limited evidence of increased ITT following the implementation of a hypothetical VLNC standard mandate in the United States (n=2).[78,79] The authors of both studies, however, noted that intention does not necessarily translate into behaviour,[78,79] and recommended that the implementation of VLNC mandates is supplemented with key regulatory actions to prevent an increased ITT, such as encrypted tax stamps as part of a "track and trace" system for tobacco products.[78] We also found limited evidence of increased ITT following a concurrent tobacco sales and public smoking ban in Bhutan (n=2)[81,82] and a temporary tobacco sales ban implemented as part of COVID-19 restrictions in South Africa.[77] Bhutan implemented a ban on the domestic sale, use, promotion, cultivation and distribution of tobacco products in 2004.[88] However, this ban was lifted in 2020 in an attempt to reduce cross-border travel to source cigarettes during COVID-19-related border closures.[88] Even before 2020, Bhutanese government officials acknowledged a "thriving black market" for tobacco, largely influenced by cross-border smuggling from neighbouring India.[11] The authors of the study describing the impacts of South Africa's abrupt temporary tobacco sales ban implemented during the COVID-19 lockdown highlight that the demand- and supply-side preconditions for an effective sales ban were not in place,[77] meaning that increased ITT following the ban was inevitable. These

Pre-print

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.09.24313359; this version posted September 10, 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.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

preconditions include a low smoking prevalence, promotion of cessation support, a long lead-in time before implementation, a controlled illicit market, and a coinciding ban on the manufacture, transport, and distribution of tobacco.[77] South Africa's increased ITT during the ban was also likely influenced by the country's high levels of crime and corruption and inadequate law enforcement.[89]

We found four studies reporting no association between the implementation of standardised packaging and ITT in Australia, France, Ireland, and the United Kingdom,[17,18,74,75] and one recent study that actually described a decrease in England's ITT following the policy's implementation.[76] This finding aligns with those of a 2017 systematic review by Haighton et al which also found no evidence to suggest that ITT increases following the implementation of standardised packaging.[21] There was also mixed and limited evidence for the impacts of a menthol ban; two studies showed that the ban did not impact the ITT in Canada,[69,73] and one found decreased illicit menthol cigarette purchasing in England,[72] but two USA-based studies found that some participants reported an intention to purchase illegal menthol cigarettes in the event of a hypothetical menthol ban.[70,71] However, both studies' authors noted that intention does not always predict behaviour.[70,71] Similarly, there was limited evidence showing that the multi-component 'National Tobacco Control Provisions' policy, implemented in Albania in 2007, was associated with a decline in the ITT.[83] However, the study's authors also found that the policy was associated with an increase in smoking prevalence, and recommended the implementation of regular tax increases to counteract this, noting that the declining ITT should improve the effectiveness of these increased tobacco taxes.[83] There was also very limited evidence for the impacts of decreasing allowable cigarette filter ventilation, with one study finding no association between the policy and illicit tobacco purchasing,[71] and for substantially reducing the number of tobacco retailers, with one qualitative study conducted in Aotearoa/New Zealand finding that few participants anticipated purchasing illicit tobacco if the policy were implemented.[80]

The mixed findings of this review, particularly for the impact of tobacco tax increases on the ITT, may be due to context-specific differences between study sites (e.g., proximity to jurisdictions with lower tobacco tax or inadequate law enforcement), differences in measurement of the ITT between studies and differences in the data sources used (i.e., household surveys, customs seizures, customs imports and exports, tobacco consumption surveys or discarded cigarette packs).[38,39,66] Some authors also use data that have been commissioned and funded by the tobacco industry,[27,28] even though the accuracy of these data

Pre-print

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.09.24313359; this version posted September 10, 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.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

is widely contested.[20,85] A review by van Walbeek et al[90] notes that countries' highly diverse research needs related to their social and political context and their position in the tobacco epidemic are further challenges to reliably measuring the ITT. In response, we recommend multi-disciplinary collaborative efforts engaging independent researchers and government agencies to develop more credible, systematic, and consistent methods to assess the scope of the ITT, and the impact of tobacco control policies on the ITT.[90] We further recommend that studies assessing the ITT use a triangulation of credible data sources to overcome methodological limitations prevalent among studies using single data sources and/or non-nationally representative samples.[39,90]

The limited evidence on the impacts of tobacco control policies on the ITT, other than tobacco tax increases, highlights an overall need for further research on this topic, particularly research investigating the impact of tobacco endgame policies on the ITT, as these policies aim to dramatically reduce the affordability, availability and attractiveness of legal tobacco products, thus potentially inadvertently increasing demand for illicit tobacco.[3] As a priority, we recommend that future research focuses on the impact of tobacco endgame policies that have been implemented or seriously discussed, including product standards to reduce appeal or addictiveness (e.g., VLNC mandate[91]), promotion of reduced risk products such as e-cigarettes as a cigarette substitute (included in tobacco endgame policy documents in England,[92] Canada,[93] and New Zealand[91]), restrictions on the number of tobacco retailers (e.g. Hungary and the Netherlands,[94] New Zealand[91]), ending commercial tobacco sales (e.g., U.S. cities of Beverly Hills and Manhattan Beach,[95] Bhutan[96]), and a tobacco-free generation law (e.g., New Zealand,[91] Balanga City Council (Philippines)[97] and Brookline City Council (USA)[98]).

There are ongoing international efforts to combat the global ITT. For example, in recognition of the serious impacts of the global ITT, the WHO FCTC developed the Protocol to Eliminate Illicit Trade in Tobacco Products in November 2012.[6] The Protocol recommends a series of measures that governments should implement to tackle the ITT, including but not limited to the establishment of a global tracking and tracing regime, licensing, due diligence mechanisms, record keeping, and regulation of online and duty free sales to control the tobacco supply chain.[6] The Protocol also aims to enhance international cooperation to target the ITT, specifically through improved information sharing, technical and law enforcement cooperation, legal and administrative support, and extradition.[6] However, many FCTC Parties are yet to ratify the Protocol on illicit trade.[99] Further examples of individual countries'

Pre-print

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.09.24313359; this version posted September 10, 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.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

efforts to address the ITT include Australia's Parliamentary Inquiry into illicit tobacco, which concluded that an increased understanding of factors driving supply and demand is needed,[100] and the United States' National Research Council and Institute of Medicine consensus report, which recommended several measures to combat the ITT, including digital tax stamps on tobacco products and a track and trace system.[22]

Strengths and limitations

To our knowledge, this is the first study to comprehensively synthesise the peer-reviewed literature on the impacts of all tobacco control policies on the ITT. We conducted two comprehensive literature searches across six databases, covering a range of tobacco control policies implemented internationally. While we used methods to capture all relevant literature that fit our criteria, such as broad search terms and multiple databases, we may have missed some relevant publications. Furthermore, although scoping reviews do not typically include a quality of assessment of the included studies, future studies may benefit from such an assessment to assist in the interpretation of the available evidence. This review was also limited by only including peer-reviewed journal articles, thus potentially excluding relevant evidence published in grey literature sources such as government reports. Finally, while we aimed to exclude any studies funded by the tobacco industry, we may have inadvertently included studies where this funding was not disclosed. In terms of potential biases due to industry data, we included two studies that used industry-funded data (from KPMG reports) in their analyses (but not as their only data source); one reported that tobacco tax differentials across 274 European Union nations are positively correlated with an increased illicit tobacco consumption rate,[27] while the other reported no relationship between the level of tobacco taxation and the ITT in the Czech Republic.[28]

Conclusion

The majority of existing evidence describing the impact of tobacco control policies on the ITT is focused on the impacts of tobacco tax changes (n=43 studies; 72%). Of these, 18 (42%) reported an increase in the ITT, a further 18 (42%) reported no association, four (9%) reported a decrease, and two (5%) reported mixed findings following tobacco tax increases, while one (2%) reported no change in the ITT following a tobacco tax decrease. There was only limited evidence on the impact of other policies on the ITT. Policies that did not result in an increase in the ITT include standardised packaging (n=5 studies), a menthol ban (n=5), decreasing cigarette filter ventilation levels (n=1), a substantial reduction in the number of

Pre-print

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.09.24313359; this version posted September 10, 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.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

retailers (n=1), and a multicomponent intervention under the 'National Tobacco Control Provisions' (2007) in Albania. Policies with some limited evidence for increasing the ITT include tobacco sales bans (n=1), a concurrent tobacco sales and smoking ban (n=2), and a hypothetical VLNC standard mandate (n=2). Further research involving more robust, consistent, and multidisciplinary approaches is needed to better understand the impact of tobacco control policies, and in particular tobacco endgame policies, on the ITT.

Funding

CG is supported by an ARC Future Fellowship (FT220100186) and holds an NHMRC Centre of Research Excellence grant (GNT1198301). CP is supported by an ARC DECRA fellowship (DE230101131).

Declarations of competing interest

None to declare

Author Contribution Statement

Conceptualisation: Coral Gartner; **Methodology**: Coral Gartner, Cheneal Puljević, Isabel Meciar; **Literature searches and data extraction**: Isabel Meciar, Cheneal Puljević; Ariel McLay; **Formal analysis**: Isabel Meciar, Cheneal Puljević; **Writing- Original Draft**: Isabel Meciar; **Writing- Review & Editing:** Cheneal Puljević, Coral Gartner, Isabel Meciar; **Supervision:** Coral Gartner; Cheneal Puljević; **Funding acquisition:** Coral Gartner

Pre-print

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.09.24313359; this version posted September 10, 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.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

REFERENCES

1. G. B. D. Tobacco Collaborators. Spatial, temporal, and demographic patterns in prevalence of smoking tobacco use and attributable disease burden in 204 countries and territories, 1990-2019: a systematic analysis from the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. *Lancet (London, England).* 2021;397(10292):2337-2360.
2. World Health Organization. WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control. 2022; https://fctc.who.int/. Accessed 8 August 2022.
3. McDaniel PA, Smith EA, Malone RE. The tobacco endgame: a qualitative review and synthesis. *Tob Control.* 2016;25(5):594-604.
4. Puljevic C, Morphett K, Hefler M, et al. Closing the gaps in tobacco endgame evidence: a scoping review. *Tob Control.* 2022;31(2):365-375.
5. World Bank Group. *Confronting Illicit Tobacco Trade: a Global Review of Country Experiences.* Washington, DC: The World Bank;2019.
6. World Health Organization. *Protocol to Eliminate Illicit Trade in Tobacco Products.* Geneva: WHO;2013.
7. Puljevic C, King M, Meciar I, Gartner C. Smoking out Australia's growing illicit tobacco market: Current trends and future challenges. *Int J Drug Policy.* 2024;127:104424.
8. Chaloupka FJ, Edwards SM, Ross H, et al. *Preventing and Reducing Illicit Tobacco Trade in the United States.* Centers for Disease Control 2015.
9. Lauchs M, Keane R. An analysis of the Australian illicit tobacco market. *Journal of financial crime.* 2017;24(1):35-47.
10. Preece R, Neher A. The extent of the illicit cigarette market in Australia: using publicly available data in a 'top-down' approach to estimation. *World Customs Journal.* 2020;14(1).
11. World Health Organization. Illicit trade increases tobacco use. 2021; http://www.emro.who.int/noncommunicable-diseases/highlights/illicit-trade-increases-tobacco-use.html. Accessed 12 December, 2021.
12. Australian Taxation Office. *Latest estimates and findings.* Canberra: Australian Government;2024.
13. King M. Policing the illicit trade of tobacco in Australia. *Journal of financial crime.* 2019;26(1):146-161.
14. Munksgaard R, Décary-Hétu D, Malm A, Nouvian A. Distributing tobacco in the dark: assessing the regional structure and shipping patterns of illicit tobacco in cryptomarkets. *Global Crime.* 2020;22(1):1-21.
15. Coker D. Smoking May not Only be Hazardous to Your Health, but also to World Political Stability: The European Union's Fight Against Cigarette Smuggling Rings that Benefit Terrorism. *European Journal of Crime, Criminal Law and Criminal Justice.* 2003;11(4):350–376.
16. Gallagher AWA, Evans-Reeves KA, Hatchard JL, Gilmore AB. Tobacco industry data on illicit tobacco trade: a systematic review of existing assessments. *Tob Control.* 2019;28(3):334-345.
17. Scollo M, Zacher M, Coomber K, Wakefield M. Use of illicit tobacco following introduction of standardised packaging of tobacco products in Australia: results from a national cross-sectional survey. *Tobacco Control.* 2015;24(Suppl 2):II76-II81.
18. Scollo M, Bayly M, Wakefield M. Availability of illicit tobacco in small retail outlets before and after the implementation of Australian plain packaging legislation. *Tob Control.* 2015;24(e1):e45-51.

Pre-print

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.09.24313359; this version posted September 10, 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.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

19. Guindon GE, Burkhalter R, Brown KS. Levels and trends in cigarette contraband in Canada. *Tob Control.* 2016;26(5):518-525.
20. Gilmore AB, Rowell A, Gallus S, Lugo A, Joossens L, Sims M. Towards a greater understanding of the illicit tobacco trade in Europe: a review of the PMI funded 'Project Star' report. *Tob Control.* 2014;23(e1):e51-61.
21. Haighton C, Taylor C, Rutter A. Standardized packaging and illicit tobacco use: A systematic review. *Tob Prev Cessat.* 2017;3(May):13-13.
22. National Research Council. *Understanding the U.S. illicit tobacco market : characteristics, policy context, and lessons from international experiences.* Washington, District of Columbia: National Academies Press; 2015.
23. Peters M, Godfrey C, McInerney P, Munn Z, Tricco A, Khalil H. Chapter 11: Scoping Reviews (2020 version). In: Aromataris E, Munn Z, eds. *JBI Manual for Evidence Synthesis.* JBI; 2020.
24. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, et al. PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. *Ann Intern Med.* 2018;169(7):467-473.
25. Meciar I, Puljevic C, Gartner C. *The impact of tobacco control policies on the illicit tobacco trade: A scoping review.* Open Science Framework;2022.
26. Veritas Health Innovation. *Covidence systematic review software.* Melbourne, Australia.
27. Aziani A, Calderoni F, Dugato M. Explaining the Consumption of Illicit Cigarettes. *Journal of quantitative criminology.* 2020;37(3):751-789.
28. Kolářová E, Homola D. Impacts of tobacco excise duty on consumers and producers in the Czech Republic. *Adiktologie.* 2020;20(1-2):65-71.
29. Goolsbee A, Lovenheim MF, Slemrod J. Playing With Fire: Cigarettes, Taxes, and Competition from the Internet. *American economic journal Economic policy.* 2010;2(1):131-154.
30. Stehr M. Cigarette tax avoidance and evasion. *J Health Econ.* 2005;24(2):277-297.
31. Goel RK, Saunoris JW. Cigarette smuggling: using the shadow economy or creating its own? *Journal of economics and finance.* 2018;43(3):582-593.
32. Goel RK. Cigarette smuggling: price vs. nonprice incentives. *Applied Economics Letters.* 2008;15(8):587-592.
33. Schafferer C, Yeh CY, Chen SH, Lee JM, Hsieh CJ. A simulation impact evaluation of a cigarette excise tax increase on licit and illicit cigarette consumption and tax revenue in 36 European countries. *Public Health.* 2018;162:48-57.
34. Lee J-M, Chen S-H. Effect of Price and Smoking Characteristics on the Decision to Smoke Smuggled Cigarettes in Taiwan. *Public Health Rep.* 2006;121(5):618-626.
35. Tsai YW, Sung HY, Yang CL, Shih SF. The behaviour of purchasing smuggled cigarettes in Taiwan. *Tob Control.* 2003;12(1):28-33.
36. Hsieh C-J, Lee J-M. The Effect of Taxes and Rising Cigarette Prices on the Behavior of Adolescents in Taiwan Who Smoke Smuggled Cigarettes. *Journal of child & adolescent substance abuse.* 2016;25(3):222-228.
37. Farrell L, Fry T. Is Illicit Tobacco Demand Sensitive to Relative Price? *Econ Pap.* 2013;32(1):1-9.
38. Ajmal A, U VI. Tobacco tax and the illicit trade in tobacco products in New Zealand. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health.* 2015;39(2):116-120.
39. Szklo A, Iglesias RM, De Souza MC, Szklo M, De Almeida LM. Trends in Illicit Cigarette Use in Brazil Estimated From Legal Sales, 2012–2016. *Am J Public Health.* 2018;108(2):265-269.

Pre-print

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.09.24313359; this version posted September 10, 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.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

40. Iglesias RM, Szklo AS, Souza MCd, de Almeida LM. Estimating the size of illicit tobacco consumption in Brazil: findings from the global adult tobacco survey. *Tob Control.* 2017;26(1):53-59.
41. Curti D, Shang C, Chaloupka FJ, Fong GT. Tobacco taxation, illegal cigarette supply and geography: findings from the ITC Uruguay Surveys. *Tob Control.* 2019;28(Suppl 1):s53-S60.
42. Gallego JM, Llorente B, Maldonado N, Otálvaro-Ramírez S, Rodríguez-Lesmes P. Tobacco taxes and illicit cigarette trade in Colombia. *Econ Hum Biol.* 2020;39:100902-100902.
43. Maldonado N, Llorente B, Escobar D, Iglesias RM. Smoke signals: Monitoring illicit cigarettes and smoking behaviour in Colombia to support tobacco taxes. *Tob Control.* 2019;29(SUPPL_4):S243-S248.
44. Shelley D, Cantrell MJ, Moon-Howard J, Ramjohn DQ, Van Devanter N. The $5 Man: The Underground Economic Response to a Large Cigarette Tax Increase in New York City. *Am J Public Health.* 2007;97(8):1483-1488.
45. Kelton MH, Givel MS. Public Policy Implications of Tobacco Industry Smuggling Through Native American Reservations into Canada. *Int J Health Serv.* 2008;38(3):471-487.
46. Vladisavljevic M, Zubovic J, Jovanovic O, et al. Tobacco tax evasion in Western Balkan countries: tax evasion prevalence and evasion determinants. *Tob Control.* 2022;31(Suppl 2):s80-s87.
47. Filippidis FT, Chang KKC, Blackmore I, Laverty AA. Prices and illicit trade of cigarettes in the European Union: A cross-sectional analysis. *Nicotine Tob Res.* 2020;22(12):2271-2275.
48. Kuipers MAG, Partos T, McNeill A, et al. Smokers' strategies across social grades to minimise the cost of smoking in a period with annual tax increases: evidence from a national survey in England. *BMJ Open.* 2019;9(6):e026320-e026320.
49. Lakhdar CB. Quantitative and qualitative estimates of cross-border tobacco shopping and tobacco smuggling in France. *Tob Control.* 2008;17(1):12-16.
50. Kaplan B, Navas-Acien A, Cohen JE. The prevalence of illicit cigarette consumption and related factors in Turkey. *Tob Control.* 2018;27(4):442-447.
51. Little M, Ross H, Bakhturidze G, Kachkachishvili I. Analysis of the illicit tobacco market in Georgia in response to fiscal and non-fiscal tobacco control measures. *Tobacco control.* 2021;32(1):tobaccocontrol-2020-056404.
52. Lavares MP, Ross H, Francisco A, Doytch N. Analysing the trend of illicit tobacco in the Philippines from 1998 to 2018. *Tob Control.* 2021;31(6):tobaccocontrol-2020-056253.
53. Pavananunt P. Illicit cigarette trade in Thailand. *Southeast Asian J Trop Med Public Health.* 2011;42(6):1531-1539.
54. Nguyen A, Nguyen H, Nguyen NA. Brand-switching and tobacco taxation in Vietnam. *Tobacco control.* 2021;31(Suppl 2):tobaccocontrol-2021-056821.
55. Bui WKT, Ross H, Nor NM. Magnitude of illicit cigarette trade in Malaysia: empirical evidence compared with industry studies. *Tobacco Control.* 2022;33(3):5.
56. Koya RK, Branston JR, Gallagher AWA. Measuring Malaysia's Illicit Tobacco Trade: An Excise Tax Gap Analysis. *Journal of Illicit Economies and Development.* 2022;4(1):58-70.
57. Curti D, Shang C, Ridgeway W, Chaloupka FJ, Fong GT. The use of legal, illegal and roll-your-own cigarettes to increasing tobacco excise taxes and comprehensive tobacco control policies: findings from the ITC Uruguay Survey. *Tob Control.* 2015;24(Suppl 3):iii17-iii24.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.09.24313359; this version posted September 10, 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.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

58. Kurti M, Von Lampe K, Johnson J. The intended and unintended consequences of a legal measure to cut the flow of illegal cigarettes into New York City: The case of the South Bronx. *Am J Public Health.* 2015;105(4):750-756.
59. Masiya M, Robinson Z. To what extent do excise taxes affect Malawi's cigarette trade gap with Kenya and South Africa? *South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences.* 2023;26(1).
60. van der Zee K, Vellios N, van Walbeek C, Ross H. The illicit cigarette market in six South African townships. *Tob Control.* 2020;29(SUPPL_4):S267-S274.
61. van Walbeek C. Measuring changes in the illicit cigarette market using government revenue data: the example of South Africa. *Tob Control.* 2014;23(e1):e69-e74.
62. Ross H, Vellios N, Batmunkh T, Enkhtsogt M, Rossouw L. Impact of tax increases on illicit cigarette trade in Mongolia. *Tob Control.* 2019;29(SUPPL_4):S249-S253.
63. Nguyen A, Nguyen HT. Tobacco excise tax increase and illicit cigarette consumption: evidence from Vietnam. *Tob Control.* 2020;29(SUPPL_4):s275-s280.
64. Nguyen HTT, Giang LT, Pham TN. Empirical analysis on the illicit trade of cigarettes in Vietnam. *Tob Control.* 2020;29(SUPPL_4):S281-S286.
65. Gallien M, Occhiali G. No smoking gun: tobacco taxation and smuggling in Sierra Leone. *Tob Control.* 2023;32(6):729-733.
66. Nguyen MT, Denniston R, Nguyen HTT, Hoang TA, Ross H, So AD. The empirical analysis of cigarette tax avoidance and illicit trade in Vietnam, 1998-2010. *PLoS One.* 2014;9(1):e87272-e87272.
67. Paraje G. Illicit Cigarette Trade in Five South American Countries: A Gap Analysis for Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, and Peru. *Nicotine Tob Res.* 2019;21(8):1079-1086.
68. Goel RK. Cigarette demand in Canada and the US-Canadian cigarette smuggling. *Applied Economics Letters.* 2006;11(9):537-540.
69. Chung-Hall J, Fong GT, Meng G, Craig LV. Illicit cigarette purchasing after implementation of menthol cigarette bans in Canada: Findings from the 2016–2018 ITC Four Country Smoking and Vaping Surveys. *Tobacco Control: An International Journal.* 2024;33(e1):e128-e131.
70. Yang Y, Lindblom EN, Ward KD, Salloum RG. Would banning menthol cigarettes, flavored cigars, and flavored e-cigarettes prompt users to seek illicit channels for obtaining them in the United States? *Prev Med.* 2024;183:107954.
71. Freitas-Lemos R, Tegge AN, Tomlinson DC, et al. Illegal product purchasing in the experimental tobacco marketplace: Effects of menthol cigarette and cigarette ventilation ban. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 2023;253:111015.
72. Kock L, Shahab L, Bogdanovica I, Brown J. Profile of menthol cigarette smokers in the months following the removal of these products from the market: a cross-sectional population survey in England. *Tob Control.* 2023;32(e1):e121-e124.
73. Stoklosa M. No surge in illicit cigarettes after implementation of menthol ban in Nova Scotia. *Tob Control.* 2019;28(6):702-703.
74. Laverty 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):89-91.
75. Scollo M, Zacher M, Durkin S, Wakefield M. Early evidence about the predicted unintended consequences of standardised packaging of tobacco products in Australia: a cross-sectional study of the place of purchase, regular brands and use of illicit tobacco. *BMJ Open.* 2014;4(8):e005873-e005873.
76. Vincent H, Laverty AA, Brown J, Beard E, Bogdanovica I. Association between the implementation of standardised tobacco packaging legislation and illicit tobacco and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.09.24313359; this version posted September 10, 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.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

cross-border purchasing in England: a time-series analysis between 2012 and 2020. *Tob Control.* 2024.
77. Filby S, Van Der Zee K, Van Walbeek C. The temporary ban on tobacco sales in South Africa: Lessons for endgame strategies. *Tob Control.* 2021;31(6):tobaccocontrol-2020-056209.
78. Hall MG, Byron MJ, Brewer NT, Noar SM, Ribisl KM. Interest in Illicit Purchase of Cigarettes Under a Very Low Nicotine Content Product Standard. *Nicotine Tob Res.* 2019;21(Supplement_1):S128-S132.
79. Dolan SB, Bradley MK, Johnson MW. E-cigarette Price Impacts legal and Black-Market Cigarette Purchasing Under a Hypothetical Reduced-Nicotine Cigarette Standard. *Nicotine Tob Res.* 2023;25(9):1556-1564.
80. Hoek J, Graham-DeMello A, Wilson N. Perceptions of Illicit Tobacco Sources Following a Proposed Reduction in Tobacco Availability: A Qualitative Analysis of New Zealanders Who Smoke. *Nicotine Tob Res.* 2023;25(7):1348-1354.
81. Givel M. Tobacco Policymaking and Administration in Bhutan from 1991 to 2009. *International journal of public administration.* 2011;34(12):775-782.
82. Givel M. History of Bhutan's prohibition of cigarettes: Implications for neo-prohibitionists and their critics. *Int J Drug Policy.* 2011;22(4):306-310.
83. Zaloshnja E, Ross H, Levy DT. The impact of tobacco control policies in Albania. *Tob Control.* 2010;19(6):463-468.
84. PricewaterhouseCoopers. Australia's illegal tobacco market: Counting the cost of Australia's black market. 2010.
85. Smith KE, Savell E, Gilmore AB. What is known about tobacco industry efforts to influence tobacco tax? A systematic review of empirical studies. *Tob Control.* 2013;22(2):144-153.
86. Godde C. 'Pure insanity': tobacco tax hike fuelling black market. *Illawarra Mercury*2024.
87. Norman J. Fake cigarettes, firebombs and a flourishing black market. *ABC News*2024.
88. Givel M. Bhutan Banned Smoking And It Didn't Go So Well. *CodeBlue.* 30 May 2022, 2022.
89. Chelin R, Nyoni R. *No smoke without fire: South Africa's illicit cigarette trade.* Pretoria, South Africa: Institute for Security Studies;2020.
90. van Walbeek C, Blecher E, Gilmore A, Ross H. Price and tax measures and illicit trade in the framework convention on tobacco control: what we know and what research is required. *Nicotine Tob Res.* 2013;15(4):767-776.
91. Ministry of Health. *Smokefree Aotearoa 2025.* Auckland, New Zealand: Ministry of Health;2020.
92. Department of Health. *Towards a Smokefree Generation: A Tobacco Control Plan for England.* London: UK Government;2017.
93. Government of Canada. *Canada's Tobacco Strategy.* Canada: Government of Canada;2020.
94. Kong AY, Henriksen L. Retail endgame strategies: reduce tobacco availability and visibility and promote health equity. *Tob Control.* 2022;31(2):243-249.
95. McDaniel PA, Malone RE. Tobacco industry and public health responses to state and local efforts to end tobacco sales from 1969-2020. *PLoS One.* 2020;15(5):e0233417.
96. Givel MS. History of Bhutan's prohibition of cigarettes: Implications for neo-prohibitionists and their critics. *International Journal of Drug Policy.* 2011;22(4):306-310.
97. de Leon K, Sarita JT. The Philippines: Pioneering the Tobacco Endgame. *Tob Control.* 2020.

Pre-print

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.09.24313359; this version posted September 10, 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.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

98. Cromar A. Tobacco-Free Generation: Brookline passes new restriction aiming to phase out tobacco sales to young smokers. *Boston.com*2020.
99. United Nations Treaty Collection. *4. a Protocol to Eliminate Illicit Trade in Tobacco Products.* United Nations;2022.
100. Parliament of Australia. *Parliamentary Joint Committee on Law Enforcement: Illicit Tobacco.* Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia;2020.

Pre-print

Table 1. Summary of tobacco control policies' impact on the illicit tobacco trade

Tobacco control policy	Articles (n)	Location/country	Policy impact on ITT
Tobacco tax	43	USA,[29-32,58] Canada,[19,68] Europe,[27,33,47] England,[48] Czech Republic,[28] France,[49] Turkey,[50] Georgia,[51] Taiwan,[34-36] Philippines,[52] Thailand,[53] Vietnam,[54,63,64,66] Malaysia,[55,56] Mongolia,[62] Australia,[37] New Zealand,[38] Brazil,[39,40] Uruguay,[41,57] Colombia,[42,43] 5 South American countries (Brazil, Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Peru),[67] Sierra Leone,[65] Malawi,[59] South Africa.[60,61]	An increase in the ITT was identified following an increase in tobacco tax in the United States,[29-32] Europe,[27,33] Taiwan,[34-36] Australia,[37] New Zealand,[38] Brazil,[39,40] Uruguay,[41] and Colombia.[42,43] Two qualitative studies also reported perceived increases in the ITT.[44,45] No impact on the ITT following tax increases was identified in six West Balkan countries,[46] 28 member states of the European Union,[47] England,[48] Czech Republic,[28] France,[49] Turkey,[50] Georgia,[51] Philippines,[52] Thailand,[53] Vietnam,[54] Malaysia,[55,56] Uruguay,[57] Canada,[19] USA,[58] Malawi,[59] and South Africa.[60,61] No significant impact on the ITT was identified following a tax decrease in Canada in 1994.[68] A decrease in the ITT following a tax increase was found in Mongolia,[62] Vietnam,[63,64] and Sierra Leone.[65] Two studies reported mixed findings: both an increase in tobacco smuggling and a decrease in illicit tobacco consumption was reported in Vietnam following a tobacco tax increase in 2006,[66] and a study of five South American countries reported increased ITT in Brazil, a stable ITT in Argentina, and no evidence for an increased ITT in Chile, Colombia or Peru despite tobacco tax increases.[67]
Menthol ban	5	Canada,[69,73] England,[72] USA[70,71]	No increase in illicit cigarettes was identified after a ban on menthol cigarette sales in Canada.[69,73] A decrease in menthol cigarette purchases was reported after a menthol ban in England.[72] Two USA-based studies reported that some participants intended to use illegal menthol cigarettes in the event of a hypothetical ban.[70,71]
Standardised packaging	5	Australia,[17,18,75] England,[76] UK, France & Ireland[74]	No evidence of an increase in the ITT was reported in four publications analysing the early implementation phase of standardised packaging in Australia,[17,18,75] and the implementation of standardised packaging in the United Kingdom, France, and Ireland.[74] One study reported a decrease in ITT purchases following the implementation of standardised packaging in England.[76]
Sales ban	1	South Africa[77]	A significant increase in the ITT was identified following a temporary tobacco sales ban.[77]
Very low nicotine content mandate	2	USA[78,79]	Some participants are willing to purchase illicit tobacco in the event of a hypothetical VLNC mandate.[78,79]
Decreasing cigarette filter ventilation levels	1	USA[71]	When illegal cigarettes were available, decreasing filter ventilation levels did not increase illegal cigarette purchasing.[71]
Retailer reduction	1	New Zealand[80]	Although participants believed ITT would increase if number of tobacco retailers was substantially reduced, few anticipated purchasing illegal tobacco.[80]
Multi-component policies	4	Albania,[83] Bhutan,[81,82] Georgia[51]	A market decline of illicit cigarettes since 2007 was identified following the implementation of 'National Tobacco Control Provisions' in Albania.[83] An increase in the ITT was identified in Bhutan after the passage of the 2004 anti-tobacco legislation in Bhutan (concurrent tobacco sales and tobacco smoking ban).[81,82] No evidence of an increase in the ITT was reported in Georgia after the implementation of a new law comprising pictorial health warnings on packs, banning smoking in almost all public places, and limits on tobacco advertising.[51]



Figure 2. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) flow diagram.