

Fear or Knowledge
The Impact of Graphic Cigarette Warnings on Tobacco Product Choices

Don Kenkel, PhD
Brooks School of Public Policy
Cornell University
dsk10@cornell.edu

Alan Mathios, PhD*
Brooks School of Public Policy
Cornell University
adm5@cornell.edu

Grace Phillips
Fogelman College of Business and Economics
University of Memphis
gnphllp2@memphis.edu

Revathy Suryanarayana
Brooks School of Public Policy
Cornell University
rs2452@cornell.edu

Hua Wang, PhD
Brooks School of Public Policy
Cornell University
hw227@cornell.edu

Sen Zeng
Department of Economics
Cornell University
sz626@cornell.edu

Produced with the help of a grant to Cornell University from the Foundation for a Smoke-Free World, Inc. (FSFW), a U.S. nonprofit 501(c) (3) private foundation. This study is, under the terms of the grant agreement with FSFW, editorially independent of FSFW. The FSFW had no role in the design and conduct of the study; collection, management, analysis, or interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript; or the decision to submit the manuscript for publication. The contents, selection, and presentation of facts, as well as any opinions expressed herein are the sole responsibility of the authors and under no circumstances shall be regarded as reflecting the positions of FSFW. Through September 2023, the FSFW received charitable gifts from PMI Global Services Inc. (“PMI”), which manufactures cigarettes and other tobacco products. Independent from PMI since its founding in 2017, the Foundation continues to operate in a manner that ensures its independence from any commercial entity.

*Corresponding Author. Data necessary to replicate the results of this article are available upon request from the corresponding author.

Abstract

Requiring graphic warning labels (GWLs) on cigarette packaging has become a highly contentious unresolved legal battle about the constitutionality of compelled commercial speech. We present empirical analysis that examines how GWLs impact tobacco choices and whether such impact can be attributed to changes in knowledge of risks or emotional reactions against smoking. This distinction is of crucial importance in assessing the constitutionality of GWLs. Using an online discrete choice stated preference experiment we compare tobacco choices (cigarettes, e-cigarettes, quitting) for those presented with a GWL versus the current text warning. We find the fraction of individuals choosing cigarettes to be lower and quitting higher for the GWL group. Our findings reveal that differences between groups were driven by evocation of fear/disgust. Our analysis is relevant for the current FDA legal case and other products that might involve compelled graphic warnings or disclosures. The discrete choice experiment also provides new evidence on how cigarette prices, e-cigarette prices, and policy-manipulable e-cigarette attributes such as e-cigarette warning labels and flavor availability influence choices.

I. INTRODUCTION

One hundred and three countries require cigarette packages to carry graphic warning labels about the health consequences of smoking (WHO 2023). The United States is currently not one of them because of legal disputes about whether compelled graphic warnings violate the free speech rights of manufacturers. Requiring manufacturers to warn consumers about the health risks of smoking has been a focus of U.S. public policy for over 50 years. Soon after the 1964 Surgeon General's report highlighted the dangers of smoking, in 1965 Congress passed the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act which required cigarette packages to carry text-based warnings.¹ In 1986, the Act was amended to require cigarette packages to carry one of four warnings on a rotational basis.² In 2009, Congress passed the Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act which gave the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) regulatory authority over tobacco products and mandated that cigarette packages now include graphic warning labels about the health consequences of smoking. However, unlike the texted warnings required by earlier legislation, the proposed graphic warnings have been found by courts to be unconstitutional, violating the free speech rights of manufacturers.

Specifically, in 2012 the federal district courts ruled against FDA's first set of proposed graphic warning labels. The court ruling focused on two primary issues. First, was there sufficient evidence that graphic warning labels had a significant impact on smoking behavior? Second, were graphic warnings likely to inform consumers about the risks of smoking, or instead was the government trying to emotionally persuade consumers not to smoke - and thus had overreached its constitutional authority (*RJ Reynolds Tobacco Co. v. US Food and Drug*

¹ Public Law 89-92 July 27 1965

² Public Law 98-474 Oct 12, 1984.

Administration, 2012).³ In response to losing the case, the FDA chose not to appeal the decision, but instead redesigned the graphic warnings. In 2020, FDA proposed a new set of 11 graphic warnings designed with a narrower goal to inform consumers of some of the *lesser-known* but serious health risks of smoking. However, these redesigned warnings were also found to be unconstitutional. This time, the FDA appealed this ruling.⁴ The legal dispute continues to revolve around whether the graphic warnings are likely to be effective, and whether the compelled warnings simply convey the risks of smoking or whether, instead, they evoke emotional responses about smoking.

In this paper we contribute empirical evidence to address the fundamental legal questions in dispute. We first examine whether the proposed graphic warning labels are likely to impact tobacco choices. We then determine whether this impact is driven by emotional reactions to the warnings (fear/disgust) or by increased knowledge of the health risks of smoking. While our paper is focused on compelled warnings on tobacco products, our empirical work is relevant to other markets as well. Compelled graphic warnings are of interest for markets such as sugar sweetened beverages (Malik and Ong, 2023), gambling (Munoz et al, 2010), cannabis (Mutti-Packer et al, 2018) and food and alcohol products (Clarke et al, 2021). The Congressional Research Service (2019, p. 31) points out that Congress has enacted or considered various disclosure requirements that might raise constitutional issues about compelled commercial speech, including disclosures for registering financial securities, direct-to-consumer advertisements of pharmaceuticals, appliance energy efficiency, online platform studies of users, and public companies' climate-related risk. The legality of compelled warnings is also playing

³ R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Company Versus Food and Drug Administration, 696 F.3d 1205, 1214 (DC Cir 2012).

⁴ R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co v. U.S. Food and Drug Administration, 5th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, No. 23-40076.

out at the state level. A federal appeals court, for example, recently ruled that, based on First Amendment considerations, California cannot require the product Roundup (a weed killer at the center of many tort litigations) to include a warning label about cancer.⁵

Our study combines an online experiment about graphic warning labels with a discrete choice experiment about consumers' stated preferences between cigarettes, e-cigarettes, and quitting. In the graphic warnings experiment, half of the subjects were shown one of the new graphic labels while the other half made up the control group and were shown one of the current text warning labels. By embedding the graphic warnings experiment in a discrete choice experiment, we study the impact of graphic warning labels on cigarette purchases in a hypothetical but semi-realistic market context. Discrete choice experiments are commonly used in marketing research and economics to provide predictions of consumer demand in policy-relevant scenarios; research on their external validity reaches a consensus that subjects' stated preferences can provide valuable information and predict actual choices in markets (Carson 2014, McFadden 2017).⁶ Because of the gaps in prior research and the inherent challenges to identify the effects of graphic warning labels in market data, we believe our evidence from the discrete choice experiment makes useful contributions both to the research base and to the legal debate.

Our first contribution is to evaluate the impact on tobacco product choices of replacing the current text warning with the new graphic warnings proposed by the FDA. By comparing the stated preferences of adult smokers in the experimental and control groups, we estimate the impact of graphic warnings on tobacco product immediate choices and on six-months-from-now

⁵ *Nat'l Association of Wheat Growers v. Bonta* (9th Cir., No. 20-16758, 11/7/23)

⁶ The online Appendix (Section B) includes an entire section summarizing research on the external validity of stated preference models.

choices. We find that compared to the control group, in the group shown the graphic warnings the fraction of immediate choices to purchase cigarettes fell by 5.4 percentage points and the fraction of 6-months-from-now choices to purchase cigarettes fell by 6.8 percentage points. The fractions of immediate and 6-months-from-now choices to quit tobacco use increased by 2.8 percentage points and 5.5 percentage points, respectively. As discussed in Section II below, this finding is at odds with the Court's finding that graphic warnings are unlikely to impact the number of Americans who smoke.

Our second contribution is to analyze the mechanisms through which graphic warning labels affect tobacco product choices. Although the FDA's stated goal of the new warning labels was to provide information about lesser-known risks of smoking, we find little evidence that subjects who saw the graphic warnings were much better informed about the specific health risk featured on the label. We find strong evidence that the graphic warning label evoked the negative emotional responses of fear/disgust. In further analysis of the mechanisms, we find that the difference in fear/disgust accounts for 17 percent of the total estimated impact of graphic warnings on smokers' choices, while the difference in knowledge of the specific health risk accounts for only 3 percent. In a follow-up discrete choice experiment, we showed subjects another one of the 11 new warning labels, which we *a priori* judged to feature a less provocative image. We find little evidence that the other image was associated with better information or more fear/disgust, and we estimate smaller effects of the graphic warning label on tobacco product choices.

In addition to our two main contributions to the legal dispute on compelled graphic warnings, our third and fourth contributions are to research on tobacco regulation. Our third contribution is to study how graphic warning labels on cigarette packages affect tobacco product

choices and quitting when e-cigarettes are also available. Almost all previous studies examine the impact of cigarette warning labels either before e-cigarettes were available or do not focus on the cross impact of cigarette warning labels on e-cigarette choices. To our knowledge, we are the first study to examine how cigarette graphic warning labels will impact both cigarette and e-cigarette choices. A central question that has not been addressed in prior research is whether graphic warnings on cigarette packages encourage or discourage e-cigarette use. On the one hand, the information conveyed by graphic warnings might be generalized to all tobacco products thereby reducing demand for both cigarettes and e-cigarettes. On the other hand, graphic warnings might increase the perceived risk of cigarettes relative to e-cigarettes thereby decreasing the demand for cigarettes and increasing the demand for e-cigarettes. Our empirical estimates suggest that on net, graphic warnings on cigarette packages might tend to increase e-cigarette use, although the estimated impacts are statistically insignificant.

Our fourth contribution is to estimate how cigarette taxes, e-cigarette taxes, and policy-manipulable e-cigarette attributes influence tobacco product choices. The results allow us to compare the effects of graphic warning labels on tobacco product choices relative to other regulatory options. This analysis is relevant to whether there is a less burdensome alternative to achieve the government's interest, a relevant standard for intermediate scrutiny of compelled commercial speech. For example, based on our estimates, either the graphic warning label or a cigarette tax hike of \$3.00 decreases the probability of choosing cigarettes by 5.4 percentage points. However, our results suggest that recent policy trends towards tighter regulation of e-cigarettes might work in the opposite direction of graphic warning labels on cigarette packages. A number of states have begun to tax e-cigarettes, and some have banned popular flavors in e-cigarettes. We estimate that the combination of a \$2 e-cigarette tax and a ban on popular e-

cigarette flavors increases the probability of choosing cigarettes by 5.4 percentage points, enough to offset the estimated decrease due to graphic warning labels.

II. LEGAL DEVELOPMENTS ON GRAPHIC WARNING LABELS

The 2009 Tobacco Control Act required the FDA to develop nine full-color graphic warnings to appear on the top half of all cigarette packs sold in the United States. Five cigarette manufacturers challenged this requirement in federal district court, on the grounds that the FDA, in implementing the legislative requirement that graphic images appear on cigarette packages, would violate the tobacco companies' right to commercial free speech. When the district court ruled in favor of the cigarette manufacturers, the FDA appealed the decision to the federal appeals court, which issued a summary judgment also in favor of the cigarette manufacturers (*R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Company vs. Food and Drug Administration*, 2012).⁷ The FDA declined to appeal this ruling to the Supreme Court. Instead, in March 2020, the FDA finalized a rule which established a new set of 11 graphic warning labels. This action was again challenged by RJ Reynolds and other cigarette manufacturers in a lawsuit filed on April 3, 2020, within the U.S District Court for the Eastern District of Texas. Due to the new legal challenge the implementation of the new graphic warnings was postponed. On December 7th the courts again ruled against the FDA and granted the plaintiffs motion for summary judgment on their first amendment claim. In February 2023 FDA appealed that decision⁸ and as recently as December 2023 the Biden administration urged the federal court to allow the graphic warning labels to proceed.⁹

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ *R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co v. U.S. Food and Drug Administration*, 5th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, No. 23-40076,

⁹ See Reuters, <https://www.reuters.com/legal/government/biden-admin-urges-court-allow-graphic-warning-labels-cigarettes-2023-12-05/>

The Final Rule for the Original Proposed Images

To understand the decades-long legal dispute and its bearing on our empirical work, it is useful to examine the original proposed rule developed by FDA as well as the original final rule issued after public comment (Federal Register, 2010; Federal Register, 2011). The FDA developed its nine graphic warning labels based on its own empirical research, a review of the relative academic literature, and in response to thousands of comments submitted to FDA (Federal Register, 2011). While the FDA claimed that its own study could not firmly establish the real-world, long-term effect of the proposed images, the agency argued that there was a significant research base demonstrating that graphic images are more effective than the text-only warnings currently used in the United States. The FDA characterized this as a “strong worldwide consensus”.¹⁰ Consequently, the FDA claimed that by communicating the negative health consequences of smoking, the graphic images would deter youth onset into smoking and encourage current smokers to quit.¹¹

The Scrutiny Standard Used by the Courts

The cigarette manufacturers did not dispute the government’s constitutional authority to require health warnings on cigarette packages nor did they contest the language contained in the text portion of the graphic warning labels.¹² They argued, in part, that the graphic images proposed in the final rule shame and repulse smokers and suggest smoking is an antisocial act. The cigarette manufacturers claimed that rather than informing consumers about the health risks of smoking, the graphic warnings promote an ideological message that individuals should not

¹⁰ See Federal Register (2010) at p. 69,525

¹¹ See Federal Register (2010) at p. 69,526

¹² R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Company Versus Food and Drug Administration 696 F.3d 1205, 1214 (DC Cir 2012).

smoke. At its core, this case questions whether FDA can force the cigarette manufacturers to make commercial disclosures beyond purely factual and accurate disclosures.

The rights to refrain from speaking or express certain views are protected by the First Amendment of the constitution. Attempts by government to compel individuals to express certain views is subject to strict scrutiny by the courts (see *Wooley vs. Manyard*, 1977).¹³ These rights can also apply to commercial speech; however, courts consider intermediate levels of scrutiny in commercial speech cases. The legal question in the FDA litigation, as described in the summary judgement was “how much leeway should this Court grant the government when it seeks to compel a product’s manufacturer to convey the state’s subjective - and perhaps even ideological view—that consumers should reject this otherwise legal, disfavored product?”¹⁴

While strict scrutiny requires a compelling government interest and a narrowly tailored law to achieve that interest, intermediate scrutiny requires a lower threshold for government action. One measure of intermediate scrutiny was established in the case of *Zauderer v. Office of Disciplinary Counsel*. The *Zauderer* precedent established that the government can force commercial entities to engage in speech if the information is factual and uncontroversial, reasonably related to the government’s interest in preventing consumer deception, and not unduly burdensome (*Zauderer v. Office of Disciplinary Counsel*, 1985).¹⁵ *Central Hudson* establishes an another form of intermediate scrutiny where, in general, commercial speech should be subject to less stringent review than other types of speech (*Central Hudson Gas and Electric Company v. Public Service Commission*, 1980).¹⁶ Despite only an intermediate level of scrutiny, the *Central Hudson* standard presents a relatively high bar for government being able to

¹³ *Wooley Versus Manyard* (1977), 705, 714, 97 S. Ct. 1428 51 L.Ed.2nd 752

¹⁴ See *R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Company Versus Food and Drug Administration* (2012), page 6.

¹⁵ *Zauderer v. Office of Disciplinary Counsel* (1985), 471 U.S. 626, 105 S. Ct. 2265.

¹⁶ *Central Hudson Gas and Electric Company v. Public Service Commission* (1980). 447 U.S. 557 100, S. Ct. 2343.

force specific speech. The government must prove that its interest is substantial, that the required speech directly and materially advances that interest while also being narrowly tailored and not more expansive than necessary. This is generally considered a more difficult hurdle for the government relative to the consumer deception standard in *Zauderer*.

The district court concluded that the graphic warnings were not purely factual and non-controversial and so the *Zauderer* standard was not applied. The court found that the graphic images were in part designed to evoke an emotional response rather than just provide factual information.¹⁷ Consequently, the *Central Hudson* standard of intermediate scrutiny was used by the courts to determine the constitutionality of the graphic warning labels. In applying the *Central Hudson* standard, the court determined that the government stated interest was to “both discourage non-smokers from initiating cigarette use and to encourage current smokers to consider quitting.”¹⁸ The court then determined that the FDA did not have sufficient evidence that graphic images would materially advance their interests of reduced smoking rates. Instead, the court notes that most of the evidence FDA presented demonstrates that the graphic images affect the antecedents of behavioral change rather than change itself. In surprisingly harsh language the appellate court states that “The FDA has not provided a shred of evidence – much less the substantial evidence required by the APA – showing that the graphic warnings will directly advance its interest in reducing the number of Americans who smoke.”¹⁹

The Revision of the Graphic Images

Rather than appeal the decision, the FDA proposed new graphic warning labels and articulated a more specific government interest statement: “FDA is proposing to take this action

¹⁷ See *R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Company Versus Food and Drug Administration* (2012), page 10.

¹⁸ See *Federal Register* (2011) at page 36,630.

¹⁹ See *RJ Reynolds Tobacco Company Versus Food and Drug Administration* (2012) at page 12.

to promote greater public understanding of the negative health consequences of cigarette smoking.” (Federal Register 2019, 2020).²⁰ In response to the Court’s failure to find substantial evidence that graphic warning labels would reduce smoking, the FDA’s new stated interest avoids claiming that the goal of the government action is to reduce smoking rates. Instead, throughout the proposed rule the focus is on communicating the health consequences of smoking. Given the more narrowly defined interest, the FDA argues that the new proposed graphic warning labels are factual, accurate, advance the government interest, and are not unduly burdensome. The FDA believes that the warnings now should pass a First Amendment analysis under either *Zauderer* or *Central Hudson*.

In arguing that the new proposed graphic warning labels promote greater public knowledge the FDA relies on three key issues. First, FDA claims the current Surgeon General’s text warning is inadequate because it has not changed since 1984, does not attract attention, is not remembered, does not prompt thoughts about the risks of smoking, and there remain significant gaps in public understanding of the negative health consequences of cigarette smoking.²¹ Second, cigarette health warnings that are noticeable, lead to learning, and increase knowledge will promote public understanding of the negative health consequences of smoking. FDA argues that pictorial/graphic images are more likely to be effective, relative to the current text warning, on these dimensions.²²

Finally, FDA argues that because the current text warnings have not been updated since 1984, their content has not kept up with current research. The updated graphic warning labels present an opportunity to better educate the public about lesser-known health risks where there is

²⁰ See Federal Register (2019) at 42,734 for the proposed rule and Federal Register (2020) at 15,638 for the final rule. For the quote, see Federal Register (2019) at page 42,754.

²¹ See Federal Register (2019) pages 42,759-42,762.

²² See Federal Register (2019) pages 42,779-42,765.

low awareness and public understanding. The 11 new labels include images and statements about bladder cancer, cataracts, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, erectile dysfunction, fatal lung disease in non-smokers, harm to children, head and neck cancer, heart disease and stroke resulting from clogged arteries, reduced blood flow and amputation, stunted fetal growth, and type 2 diabetes.

FDA directly argues that these new proposed warnings are constitutional. FDA notes that the scientific literature demonstrates that smokers and nonsmokers alike have misperceptions about the health risks associated with cigarette smoking and are largely unaware of risks not mentioned in the current text warnings. FDA contends that the proposed warnings educate consumers about lesser-known health risks and thus the Zauderer standard is appropriate. FDA also indicates that the new warnings can satisfy the Central Hudson criteria as well in case they are used by the courts.

The cigarette manufacturers challenged the proposed warnings, largely on the same basic premise of their 2010 challenge.²³ They allege that, as with the originally proposed graphic warning labels, the new graphic warning labels are designed to evoke negative emotions. The cigarette manufacturers also argue there are less intrusive ways to convey information about the health risks of smoking. In a summary of their constitutional concerns, they state “The Rule requires the use of eleven new textual warnings, accompanied by eleven graphic images—such as images of a specimen cup filled with bloody urine and a pair of diseased feet with several amputated toes—that are designed to frighten, shock, and disgust adult cigarette consumers. In addition, these “warnings” must occupy the top 50% of the front *and* back of cigarette packages

²³ See R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Company vs. FDA, No. 6:20-cv 00176.

and the top 20% of cigarette advertising. These requirements cross the line into governmental anti-smoking advocacy.”²⁴

The courts once again ruled in favor of the cigarette manufacturers. The court concluded that “the label statements required by the FDA rule do not qualify for First Amendment scrutiny under *Zauderer* because they are not purely factual and uncontroversial. The court then concludes that the compelled labels do not survive scrutiny under *Central Hudson*’s tests for commercial speech regulations generally.”²⁵ In February 2023, the FDA appealed this decision.

Empirical Results that Can Shed Light on Constitutionality of New Graphic Images

Our study directly addresses empirical questions raised in the litigation. We use a graphic warning labels experiment embedded in a discrete choice experiment to directly compare smoking cessation decisions when individuals are faced with the current text warnings or one of the graphic warnings proposed by FDA. Since the graphic warnings have not yet appeared on packages, the hypothetical choices provide useful evidence on the likely impact of the new graphic warning labels, and evidence on which legal arguments have empirical support.

In the first round of litigation, the cigarette manufacturers argued that FDA did not present enough evidence that the graphic warning labels would have an impact on actual smoking decisions. Our empirical work directly estimates this impact using stated preference data and explores the mechanisms through which the graphic warning impacts choice. FDA contends that the new warnings address lesser-known health risks and exposure to the graphic warnings will improve consumer knowledge of specific health risks. Our study directly tests this by measuring whether those exposed to a graphic warning label have greater knowledge of the health risk featured in the warning compared with those exposed to the Surgeon General text

²⁴ See *R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Company vs. FDA*, No. 6:20-cv 00176, Page 1.

²⁵ See *R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Company vs. FDA*, No. 6:20-cv 00176 Opinion and Order, Page 23.

warning currently on cigarette packages. Increased knowledge of lesser-known health risks is one of the key arguments justifying the legality of the graphic warnings.

Our work also estimates the degree to which the graphic warnings generate emotional responses such as fear and disgust. The cigarette manufacturers argue that it is unconstitutional for them to be required to send messages that generate emotive negative responses to their product. In addition to respondents' risk knowledge and fear/disgust, we also investigate other mechanisms by focusing on how exposure to the graphic warning labels changes other perceptions including the expected life years lost from smoking cigarettes, expected life years lost from vaping e-cigarettes, the relative harm of e-cigarettes relative to cigarettes, the belief that nicotine in cigarettes is the substance that causes most of the cancer caused by smoking, and the belief that nicotine, on its own, can harm the developing brain of youth and young adults.

Our empirical analysis also explores the roles cigarette taxes, e-cigarette taxes, and policy-manipulable e-cigarette attributes play in tobacco product choices. Under the FDA's original 2010 rationale that graphic warning labels could reduce smoking, this part of our analysis is relevant to whether there is a less burdensome alternative to achieve the government's interest, a standard relevant under Central Hudson scrutiny. Our analysis is far from the first to study the extent to which smokers respond to cigarette taxes (DeCicca, Kenkel, and Lovenheim 2022). However, prior research on the role of e-cigarette taxes and policy-manipulable e-cigarette attributes is more limited. Under the 2009 Tobacco Control Act and the 2016 Deeming Rule FDA has direct authority to regulate e-cigarette attributes including required warnings and the availability of popular flavors and nicotine levels. Our empirical results shed light on whether FDA's actions towards e-cigarettes promote or hinder the goal of reducing smoking. However, we note that under the FDA's 2019 stated interest in promoting greater understanding of the

health consequences of smoking, FDA's authority to regulate attributes of e-cigarettes and the government's authority to tax cigarettes are not relevant to whether there are less burdensome alternatives to the proposed graphic warning labels on cigarette packages.

III. OVERVIEW OF LITERATURE

Graphic Warning Labels

A large base of prior research evaluates the impact of graphic cigarette warning labels on consumer attitudes and behaviors. The research base is mainly public health research that does not address the legal issues that are the main focus of our study. Because the research based is so large, our discussion focuses on prior research reviews and a few notable studies. Noar *et. al* (2016) conducted a meta-analysis of studies that use an experimental protocol to compare pictorial and text-only warnings. In a typical experimental protocol, subjects in a laboratory are shown different warnings and asked about their reactions. Noar et al. (2016) identified 37 studies spanning 48 independent samples. The 37 studies covered 16 different countries, with the largest number focused on the U.S., followed by Germany and Canada. Compared to text warnings, graphic warnings were found to be more effective in attracting and holding attention, eliciting cognitive and emotional reactions, driving negative attitudes toward smoking, and generating intentions not to smoke. Noar et al. (2016) note, however, that after culling through hundreds of studies to generate the 37 included in the meta-analysis, almost all the included studies focus on the precursors to behavioral change rather than smoking outcomes. Similarly, in the systematic review by Francis et al. (2017) of measures used to evaluate cigarette warning labels, emotional reactions, risk perceptions, and perceived effectiveness were the most common outcomes measured; only four studies in their review assessed actual smoking behavior.

Another set of studies evaluate changes in smoking attitudes and/or behavior after the introduction of required graphic warning labels in other countries, especially Canada and Australia. In Canada, research by Hammond (2003, 2004, 2004a, 2007, 2011) concluded that after graphic warning labels were required, consumers were more likely to notice the labels, think about quitting, and were more knowledgeable about the health consequences of smoking. In Australia, Miller et al. (2009) examine consumer responses after introduction of graphic warning labels. Initial responses indicated about 36 percent of respondents felt disgust and about half reported that the new warnings increased their own risk perception of dying of a smoking related illness. As with the experimental studies covered by Noar et al. (2016), most of the studies on Canada and Australia focused on the impact of GWLs on the precursors of tobacco use rather than on actual smoking behavior.

Monárrez-Espino et al. (2014) conducted a systematic review of studies of graphic warning labels that focus directly on smoking outcomes. Studies with outcomes not related to behavior change, such as those looking at perceptions, attitudes, reactions, knowledge, or motivation and intention to quit were excluded from their sample. Among the 2,500 published studies, 21 articles met the criteria for their meta-analysis. Based on the 21 studies, Monárrez-Espino et al. (2014) conclude that the empirical evidence for or against graphic warning labels is insufficient and that any impact would be modest. They note a large proportion of the studies show null results for cessation, smoking reduction, and attempts to quit smoking. Some recent studies do show an impact on smoking behavior. For example, Zhenhao et al. (2023) follow individuals after 4 weeks of exposure to GWLs and find impacts on smoking behavior several weeks after such exposure. Section C of the Appendix provides a more detailed overview of studies focused on graphic warning labels.

In contrast to the large body of public health research on graphic warning labels, to our knowledge research using quasi-experimental research designs from modern applied econometrics is very limited. The inherent challenges of quasi-experimental research to identify the causal effect of graphic warning labels on smoking outcomes might explain why econometric research is so limited. Requirements for health warnings on cigarette packages are set at the national level in the U.S. and other countries. As a result, the difference-in-difference approach and related quasi-experimental research designs are impossible within the U.S. and problematic to apply internationally due to differences across countries in levels and trends of smoking. An additional challenge is that graphic warning labels are often adopted simultaneously with other tobacco control policies such as cigarette tax hikes. Three studies use the difference-in-difference method to estimate the impact of Canada's 2000 implementation of graphic warning labels, using the U.S. as a control group. The courts found the FDA's (2011) difference-in-difference study of Canadian versus U.S. smoking rates unconvincing because at the same time Canada implemented graphic warning labels, Canada also increased the cigarette excise tax.²⁶ Huang, Chaloupka, and Fong (2014) conducted a similar difference-in-difference study of the 2000 Canadian graphic warning labels; Usidame et al. (2022) replicated the analysis with individual-level data. Beleche et al. (2018) provide a detailed critique of Huang, Chaloupka, and Fong (2014). Beleche et al. (2018) point out an important challenge that also applies to the study by Usidame et al. (2022): prior to the implementation of graphic warning labels in Canada in 2000, the trends in smoking rates were different in the U.S. and Canada. In the pre-graphic warning labels period from 1995 to 2000 smoking prevalence dropped by almost six percentage points in

²⁶ See *RJ Reynolds Tobacco Company versus Food and Drug Administration* (2012) at page 26.

Canada, compared to only 1.5 percentage points in the U.S. The violation of the parallel trends assumption casts doubt on the validity of the difference-in-difference estimates of the impact of graphic warning labels in Canada. Many of these studies, of course, were conducted prior to the emergence of the e-cigarette market.

Discrete Choice Experiments and External Validity of Experiments in Health Settings

Discrete choice experiments are a common and accepted method for estimating market impacts in various hypothetical market situations including electricity markets (Blass, Lach, and Manski, 2010), health insurance markets (Kesternich, Hiess, McFadden, and Winter, 2013), labor markets (Mas, Alexandre and Pallais, 2017; Maestas et al. 2023), and tobacco product markets (Kenkel, Peng, Pesko, and Wang, 2020). Given the wide use of discrete choice experiments there is a significant research base that examines their external validity – whether stated preferences in these experiments predict actual revealed choices. Section B of the Appendix reviews research on the external validity of stated preference data broadly and in particular in health-related DCEs. The main conclusion is that the external validity of stated preference data is much stronger in applications where choices are made over familiar market goods. We believe that choices by adult smokers between cigarettes, e-cigarettes and quitting qualify as familiar market goods. Section C of the Appendix also reviews the small number of economic studies that use discrete choice experiments to examine tobacco choices.

IV. CONCEPTUAL AND EMPIRICAL FRAMEWORK

Our empirical analysis is linked to the economic theory of random utility maximization. The consumer is assumed to choose between three alternatives: cigarettes, e-cigarettes, or quitting and not using either cigarettes or e-cigarettes. The consumer chooses the alternative that provides the highest utility. The consumer's utility from each alternative can be decomposed into the

representative utility explained by observed product attributes and an unobservable random component. The observed product attributes in our model include whether the cigarette has a graphic warning label (versus a text warning label), the price of the cigarette, the price of the e-cigarette, the warning message on the e-cigarette, the availability of flavored e-cigarettes, and the availability of varying nicotine levels in the e-cigarette.

The econometric specification of the equations for the probabilities that an alternative is chosen depends on the assumed distribution of the random component of utility. A widely used assumption is that the random component is i.i.d. Type 1 extreme value distributed across all alternatives and consumers, which leads to a convenient closed form conditional logit specification of the choice probabilities. For ease of interpretation, we report linear probability models of the choice probabilities. However, as reported in the Appendix we have verified that the results from our linear probability models are robust and consistent with the estimates derived from the conditional logit model and a more sophisticated mixed logit model. The general form of the estimated linear probability models is:

$$(1) \text{ Choice}_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{ Graphic Warning}_i + \beta_2 \text{ Price of Cigarette}_i + \beta_3 \text{ Price of E-Cigarette}_i + \beta_4 \text{ E-Cig Warning}_i + \beta_5 \text{ Flavor Availability}_i + \beta_6 \text{ Nicotine Content}_i + \text{Controls} + \varepsilon_i$$

We estimate six versions of equation (1). In the first three versions, the dependent variables are binary indicators of whether the subject's immediate choice was to purchase a cigarette, to purchase an e-cigarette, or to quit. In the next three versions, the dependent variables measure the subject's stated choice for six months in the future. Each equation is estimated separately, and we do not impose any cross-equation restrictions. However, because the three

choices are mutually exclusive and exhaustive, empirically the parameter estimates in the first three immediate choice equations and the next three six-months-from-now equations sum to zero. For example, if the graphic warning label is estimated to decrease the probability of choosing cigarettes, there will be an equal and opposite increase in the probability of choosing e-cigarettes and/or quitting. In equation (1) the parameters β_1 provide reduced-form estimates of the total impact of the graphic warning label on the probability of choosing cigarettes, e-cigarettes, or quitting.

Although we do not fully specify a structural model of consumer utility, in our approach we conceptualize the graphic warning label's impact on utility as being through the mechanisms of fear/disgust and knowledge, which we observe in our data, as well as unobserved mechanisms. To understand the mechanisms, we estimate models of the impact of the graphic warning label on the observed antecedents of choice. In equation (2) we examine how the graphic warning label influences emotions such as fear and disgust, and in equation (3) how the graphic warning label influences knowledge of the health risk of smoking featured in the label:

$$(2) \text{ Fear/Disgust}_i = \alpha_{f0} + \alpha_{f1} \text{ Graphic Warning}_i + \text{Controls} + \varepsilon_i$$

$$(3) \text{ Knowledge}_i = \alpha_{k0} + \alpha_{k1} \text{ Graphic Warning}_i + \text{Controls} + \varepsilon_i$$

We then re-estimate the choice equations given by (1), but we drop the Graphic Warning indicator and replace it with the Fear/Disgust and Knowledge variables:

$$(4) \text{ Choice}_i = \beta_0 + \beta_{fla} \text{ Fear/Disgust}_i + \beta_{k1b} \text{ Knowledge}_i + \beta_2 \text{ Price of Cigarette}_i + \beta_3 \text{ Price of E-Cigarette}_i + \beta_4 \text{ E-Cigarette Warning}_i + \beta_5 \text{ Flavor Availability}_i + \beta_6 \text{ Nicotine Content}_i + \text{Controls} + \varepsilon_i$$

The estimates α_{fl} and α_{k1} from equations (2) and (3) show the impacts of the graphic warning label on the subject's fear/disgust and knowledge, respectively; the estimates β_{fla} and β_{k1b} from equation (4) show the impact of fear/disgust and knowledge on the choice probabilities. Combining these estimates provides estimates of the impacts of the graphic warning labels on choices through the mechanisms of fear/disgust and knowledge: $\delta_1 = \beta_{fla} \times \alpha_{fl}$ and $\delta_2 = \beta_{k1b} \times \alpha_{k1}$. The shares of the total impact of the graphic warning labels on choices accounted for by each of the mechanisms are given by δ_1 / β_1 and δ_2 / β_1 .

In addition to fear/disgust and knowledge we also examine other possible mechanisms, including how graphic warning label influence perceptions of the relative risk of e-cigarettes and cigarettes, how the graphic warning influences expected years of life lost from smoking and vaping, and how the graphic warning influences perceptions of the harm of nicotine.

V. EMPIRICAL METHODS

The Discrete Choice Experiment and Product Attributes

We utilize a discrete choice experiment to generate data on the relationship between policy relevant product attributes and tobacco choices by adult smokers (cigarette, e-cigarette, quit). Our experimental design consisted of a 3 (cigarette price) X 3 (e-cigarette price) X 3 (nicotine levels) X 3 (flavor availability) X 4 (e-cigarette warning) design, for a total of 324 possible attribute combinations that could be presented to respondents. Each respondent was presented with 12 scenarios. Different subjects were assigned different sets of scenarios; across all subjects the DCE presented 120 of the 324 possible scenarios. The number of products,

attribute levels, and scenarios follow good practice guidelines for DCEs (Johnson et al. 2013). The assignment of scenarios to subjects was designed to maximize statistical efficiency to identify the parameters of interest.

A cigarette graphic warning label experiment was embedded into the discrete choice experiment. The graphic warning label did not vary across the scenarios in the discrete choice experiment. Instead, half of the sample was randomly assigned one of the graphic warning labels and the other half was shown one of the Surgeon General's text warnings currently required on cigarette packages. In this way, the estimated impact of the graphic warning label on a choice in one scenario is not contaminated by whether the respondent had seen or not seen the graphic warning in a prior scenario. Similarly, we can cleanly identify the impact of the graphic warning labels on our measures of fear/disgust and knowledge – which were collected later in the survey after the discrete choice experiment. The discrete choice experiment allows us to study the impact of graphic warnings in a semi-realistic market context. Discrete choice experiments tend to be more reliable when the subjects are familiar with the products and have experience making choices between them (McFadden 2017). Asking smokers to make choices about tobacco products is an almost ideal application of the discrete choice experimental method, because smokers have experience making tobacco product choices on a frequent basis.

In addition to the graphic warning label on cigarettes, the discrete choice experimental manipulations of other product attributes were also designed to shed light on policy questions. Cigarette and e-cigarette prices are influenced by government tax policies and there is continued discussion at both the state and federal level on the appropriate levels for taxes on these products. There are also policy discussions focused on limiting the nicotine content of e-cigarettes; some countries, such as the UK, already have such limitations. The FDA continues to deny marketing

approval to e-cigarettes with flavors other than tobacco, so understanding how consumers respond to the lack of availability of flavors is important.

When presented with a scenario each respondent was asked about which tobacco choice they would make. After that choice, the identical scenario reappears, and the subject is asked which choice they would make if choosing 6 months from now. This process is repeated 12 times (with a new scenario that has a different combination of product attributes), so that we collect 24 choices per individual. In terms of identifying the impact of the graphic warning label on choices we have half the sample exposed to the graphic image 24 times prior to making choices and half the sample exposed to the currently required text warning prior to making choices. For the sample assigned the text-based warning they see one of the current rotating Surgeon General warnings (SGW) required on cigarette packages. We used the text warning; “Smoking causes Lung Cancer, Heart Disease, Emphysema, and may Complicate Pregnancy.” For the sample assigned one of the new FDA graphic warning labels we used the image of amputated toes with accompanying message “Smoking Reduces Blood Flow to the Limbs, Which May Require Amputation”. This label was chosen based on our judgement that it is among the most visually provocative of the new warnings proposed by FDA. Figures 1a and 1b provide an illustration of the text warning and graphic warning presented to respondents. Between the immediate choice scenario and the 6-months-from-now scenarios, over the course of the experiment each respondent was exposed to either the text warning or the graphic warning 24 times.

The Survey Instrument and the Sample

Our sample consisted of 1,202 observations of adult smokers (aged 18 and above), each of whom was exposed to 12 scenarios and asked to report, after each of the scenarios, on which of the

three options they would select for their immediate choice and the choice they would make 6 months from now. Several observations were dropped from the analysis because the reported price they last paid for 20 cigarettes was outside any reasonable range. Our estimation sample consists of responses from 1,171 subjects each of whom contributes 12 choice outcomes for a total of 14,052 observations for each of the equations.

We utilized the survey firm SSRS to implement our survey and assign scenarios to maximize efficiency.²⁷ The survey consisted of three sections. The first section included questions focused on age, cigarette and e-cigarette use, addiction measures, how the products were purchased, intention to quit in the next 6 months, whether they attempted to quit and methods they intend to use to quit. The questions about the products being purchased enabled us to compute the price they last paid for cigarettes. These included questions regarding whether they purchased a pack, a carton, ‘loosies’ as well as what they paid for these products. We then standardized their purchase into the price each respondent paid for 20 cigarettes, which was used in the discrete choice experimental manipulations. The scenarios could include the price they paid, half the price, or twice the price.

The second section of the survey consisted of the discrete choice experiment, where respondents were presented with scenarios and choice tasks. To set the context we used the following language prior to the presentation of the scenarios:

²⁷ Survey respondents were obtained using the SSRS Probability Panel. SSRS Opinion Panel members are recruited randomly based on nationally representative ABS (Address Based Sample) design (including Hawaii and Alaska). ABS respondents are randomly sampled by MSG through the U.S. Postal Service’s Computerized Delivery Sequence (CDS), a regularly-updated listing of all known addresses in the U.S. For the SSRS Opinion Panel, known business addresses are excluded from the sample frame. Additionally, the SSRS Opinion Panel recruit hard-to-reach demographic groups via the SSRS Omnibus survey platform. The SSRS Omnibus completes more than 50,000 surveys annually with 80% cell allocation.

We are interested in smokers' choices between cigarettes and e-cigarettes. We want you to imagine that you can easily buy both cigarettes and e-cigarettes where you usually buy your cigarettes; for example, in your local grocery store, convenience store, gas station, bodega, vape shops or on the internet. Each of the cigarette and e-cigarette options on the next page can be described by several characteristics. You will see different scenarios each with different combinations of the price of your cigarette brand, the price of an e-cigarette, along with other e-cigarette product attributes (health messaging, nicotine content, flavors). Although e-cigarettes are sold in various quantities with different types of devices, we will be asking you about e-cigarette packages that are equivalent to one pack of your brand of cigarettes. For the purposes of your choices, please do not consider the price of buying the startup kit for reusable e-cigarette. For the purpose of this survey, when seeing a health-related message assume that it is a legal message in that the government has either pre-approved it or it has been determined by the regulatory authorities to be truthful and non-misleading.

The third section of the survey includes questions focused on whether the respondent noticed which product attributes were changing across the scenarios, their risk perceptions of cigarettes relative to e-cigarettes, their assessments of life expectancy loss from smoking and vaping, the level of fear/disgust when asked to recall the cigarette pack warning, knowledge of the risk featured in the graphic cigarette warning, perceptions of the harm of nicotine, and demographic variables.

Table 1 provides the descriptive statistics for the sample for the different sections of our survey. The first set of descriptive statistics verifies the balanced design of the graphic warnings label experiment (50 percent in each condition) and the balanced assignment of the e-cigarette

flavor, nicotine, and warning conditions in the discrete choice experiment. The e-cigarette price condition assignment was also balanced, but because the price conditions were \$2, \$4, or \$8, the mean e-cigarette price is higher than \$4. The average cigarette price was \$8.77. As explained above, the cigarette price manipulation was based on the price the respondent reported paying for a pack of cigarettes.

The second set of descriptive statistics are for variables that measure aspects of smoking behavior. Fifty-nine percent of smokers smoke every day with 40 percent smoking menthol cigarettes. Sixty-three percent of the sample report having ever used an e-cigarette and just over half have tried to quit smoking in the last 12 months with 66 percent intending to quit in the next 6 months. The third set of descriptive statistics provide the demographic makeup of the sample and the post discrete choice experiment perceptions of harm. The sample is 57 percent female, 77 percent white, and is on average 45 years old.

VI. RESULTS: CIGARETTE GRAPHIC IMAGE WARNING VERSUS TEXT WARNING

Linear Probability Model Results for Cigarette Graphic Image Versus Text Cigarette Warning

Table 2 presents linear probability regression models given by equation (1) for both the immediate choices and the six-months-from-now choices. The table only presents the coefficients of the experimentally manipulated variables (the notes in each table list the control variables controlled for in the regression).²⁸

Of key interest is the coefficient on the graphic warning label (GWL) variable in the various equations. For the immediate choice, the probability of choosing a cigarette is 5.4

²⁸ Section A of the Appendix shows the results when replacing the linear probability models with multinomial logit models. The estimates from the multinomial logit model are extremely similar to the estimates presented in Table 2.

percentage points lower when faced with the graphic warning label compared to the text warning. The coefficients on the graphic warning variable for the e-cigarette and the quit choices indicate that the movement away from cigarettes generated by the graphic warning label was about equally distributed to increase e-cigarette choices by 2.7 percentage points and to increase choices to quit by 2.8 percentage points.

The last three columns in Table 2 present the results for the choice respondents would make in 6 months. Compared to the estimated impacts on immediate choices, the estimates show a larger movement away from cigarettes (a drop of 7.8 percentage points) and towards quitting (an increase of 5.5 percentage points) in the six-months-from-now choices. The estimated impacts to increase e-cigarette immediate choices and six-months-from-now choices are about the same. These patterns provide a hint that some subjects might intend to use e-cigarettes in the immediate term in order to quit all tobacco products in the future.

Given the centrality of our results in Table 2 we devote an entire section of the Appendix (Section D) to discuss the sensitivity of our results to a variety of robust checks and other methods we used to estimate the model and validate the use of the stated preference data we utilize. We present results of conditional logit models instead of the linear probability models (and instead of the multinomial logit models). The coefficients from conditional logit models are difficult to compare conceptually to the coefficients from linear probability models or multinomial logit models, but the results are consistent with the graphic warning labels moving smokers away from smoking (when we compute market shares based on the conditional logit model) and towards e-cigarettes and quitting. We also estimate these models using sample restrictions that might improve the quality of the stated preference data. Some of the restrictions included excluding respondents who spent very little time on the experimental section of the

survey (speedsters), excluding those that did not notice that there was variation in the attributes when moving through the scenarios, etc. We also examine whether choices made in our experiment meet the weak axiom of revealed preferences (WARP). An example of a WARP violation with respect to the price, flavor, and nicotine attributes would be if a subject chooses e-cigarettes at a high price in one task, and in another task chooses cigarettes even though the e-cigarette price is lower, and other e-cigarette attributes and the price of cigarettes are unchanged. Out of the 12 choices a respondent made only .86 of the choices violated WARP. We also combine the stated preference choices with the revealed choices observed from the first part of the survey (prior to the experimental section) to calibrate our models.

VII. RESULTS FOR THE MECHANISMS THROUGH WHICH CIGARETTE GRAPHIC IMAGE WARNINGS INFLUENCE CHOICES

To investigate the mechanisms through which the graphic warning labels affect choices, we focus on whether the experimental variation in exposure to graphic images matter because they generate emotions such as fear and disgust or whether they matter because they generate greater knowledge of health risks. We first examine equations relating exposure to the graphic warning label to measures of fear/disgust and to measures of knowledge of the health risk in the warning (reduced blood flow to the limbs). We then estimate the effect that levels of fear/disgust and knowledge have on decisions to choose cigarettes, e-cigarettes, and quitting. The total effect of each mechanism is determined by the product of these effects. We also allow for other possible mechanisms through which the graphic warning could influence choice. These include how the graphic warning influences the perception of the harm of e-cigarettes relative to cigarettes, influences the belief that nicotine in cigarettes is the substance that causes most of the cancer caused by smoking, the perceived life expectancy loss from smoking, the perceived life

expectancy loss from vaping, and the belief that nicotine on its own, can harm the developing brain of youth and young adults. Tables 3 and 4 present the results for the fear/disgust and knowledge mechanisms because of the legal relevance of this distinction for the constitutionality arguments raised by the federal district court and the FDA. Table 5 presents the fraction of the total impact of the graphic warning on choices accounted for by each mechanism measured in our experiment.

The Effect of the Graphic Warning on Fear/Disgust and Knowledge of Risk

Table 3 present the results for the regressions corresponding to equations (2) and (3). The Fear/Disgust variable is measured based on the answer to the following question: *Think back to the scenarios that you were shown earlier in this study. In each of the scenarios, there was a warning label about smoking cigarettes. To what extent, if at all, did you feel disgust/fear as a result of the labels?* Possible answers were in a Likert scale: To a Great Extent, Somewhat, Verry Little, Not at All. The Likert scale question was asked immediately after the discrete choice experiment, where across the various scenarios subjects were shown either the graphic warning or the text warning a total of 24 times.

Table 3 reports the results of four linear probability models of the impact of the graphic warning label across the Likert scale of fear/disgust. The results are statistically significant at both ends of the Likert scale. The fraction responding “Not at All” is seven percentage points lower among subjects shown the graphic warning, while the fraction responding “To a Great Extent” is 4.2 percentage points higher. The signs and the magnitudes of the coefficients on “Very Little” and “Somewhat” are intermediate values consistent with the ends of the Likert scale, with “Very Little” being negative and “Somewhat” being positive.

The bottom part of Table 3 presents the results where knowledge of the health risk is the dependent variable. The knowledge variables are constructed based on the answer to the following question. *To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement – Smoking cigarettes reduces blood flow to the lower limbs.* Possible answers were again on a Likert scale: Strongly agree, Somewhat agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Somewhat disagree, Strongly disagree, or I don't know. The coefficient on the graphic warning variable is marginally significant in only one of the categories and this coefficient is relatively small in magnitude. Despite the fact that the text warning does not mention blood flow to the outer limbs while the graphic warning directly describes this risk, repeated exposures to the graphic warning is not associated with different levels of knowledge. Given that most subjects in both the experimental and control groups agreed that smoking causes this risk, we speculate that many subjects are pre-disposed to agree with many statements about the risks of smoking.

The Impact of Fear/Disgust and Knowledge on Choices

Table 4 presents the regressions that correspond to equation (4), where the graphic warning label variable is replaced by the mechanism variables. In terms of immediate choices, subjects who report they feel a great deal of fear/disgust are 18.1 percentage points less likely to choose cigarettes, 8.1 percentage points more likely to choose e-cigarettes, and 10 percentage points more likely to quit. Subjects who report they “somewhat” feel fear/disgust are 10 percentage points less likely to choose cigarettes, 8.1 percentage points more likely to choose e-cigarettes, and 1.9 percentage points more likely to quit. In contrast to the results for the fear/disgust variable, the coefficients on the variables measuring knowledge of the risks associated with reduced blood flow are small and mainly not statistically significant.

The Share of the Total Impact of the Graphic Warning Accounted for by the Mechanisms

Table 5 shows the shares of the total impact of the graphic warning on choices accounted for by the mechanisms. The impact of graphic warning labels on fear/disgust accounts for approximately 17 percent of the total impact of the labels on cigarette choices. The impact of graphic warning labels on knowledge of the specific health risk mentioned in the label accounts for approximately 3 percent of the total impact on cigarette choices. In general, the effects of the other changes in knowledge are also small. With respect to the e-cigarettes, the results suggest that the cigarette graphic warning labels' effects on both fear/disgust and perceptions of the relative risks of cigarettes versus e-cigarettes both play an important role to increase e-cigarette choices.

Results from a Follow-up Discrete Choice Experiment with an Alternative Graphic Warning Label

Our results suggest that fear/disgust is the main mechanism through which one of the new graphic warning labels influences stated preferences for cigarettes. We estimate that improvements in knowledge about the specific risk featured in the label – the risks that smoking plays in reducing blood flow to the limbs – play a minimal role. A limitation to our graphic warnings label experiment is that we only considered one of the eleven warning labels proposed in the FDA rulemaking process. We chose the amputation/blood flow warning as it was considered one of the more provocative warnings. The cigarette manufacturers pointed to this image and alleged that this was designed to elicit fear.²⁹ Given how central the question of fear versus knowledge is in the legal dispute, we undertook a follow-up discrete choice experiment to explore whether the results would carry over to an alternative warning label that, *ex-ante*, we believed was significantly less provocative. Figure 1C shows the original graphic warning label

²⁹ See R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Company vs. FDA, No. 6:20-cv 00176, Page 1.

used in our experiment and the alternative graphic warning label used in the follow-up. The alternative label features the face of a man with cloudy eyes and the accompanying text “Smoking causes cataracts, which can lead to blindness.”

All subjects in the follow-up discrete choice experiment were shown the cataract label. The data from the new subjects were then pooled with the control group from the original experiment who were shown the text warning. All other elements of the survey and discrete choice experiment were identical with one exception. A question was added after the choice tasks inquiring whether the respondent has knowledge about the link between smoking, cataracts, and blindness (i.e. the health risk featured in the text accompanying the graphic image of cataracts).

The follow-up discrete choice experiment was conducted about a year after the original study and should not be considered truly randomized compared to the original control group. We used a joint test of orthogonality and found a lack of balance between the new experimental group and the original control group in some observable characteristics. The estimated models use a rich set of control variables that includes these characteristics, but the results should still be interpreted with caution.

Tables 6, 7 and 8 summarize the key findings from the follow-up discrete choice experiment. Compared to the amputation/blood flow label, in the immediate choice equations in Table 7 we no longer find that those exposed to the cataract warning made statistically significantly different choices about cigarettes or quitting. The Table 6 estimated effects of the cataract graphic warning label are always substantially smaller than the Table 2 estimates of the effects of the amputation/blood flow label. The results provide some suggestive evidence that the cataracts label might lead to some movement from cigarettes to e-cigarettes.

The results in Table 7 demonstrate that the cataract warning label did not generate fear/disgust. The coefficients on the GWL cataracts variable are small and none is significantly related to levels of fear/disgust. The results in Table 8 suggest that fear/disgust continues to be strongly associated with tobacco product choices, but knowledge of the risk of cataracts is not. Taken together, the results from the follow-up discrete choice experiment with the cataract label suggest that the cataract label did not have a significant overall impact because it did not induce fear/disgust.

VIII. RESULTS FOR OTHER PRODUCT ATTRIBUTES

The results from our discrete choice experiment provide new evidence on how cigarette prices, e-cigarette prices, and policy-manipulable e-cigarette attributes influence tobacco product choices. The results are interesting in their own right and also allow us to compare the effects of graphic warning labels on cigarettes to other regulatory options.

The coefficients on the cigarette price variable are statistically significant in each of the six linear probability models reported in Table 2. For the own-price effect, a \$1 increase in the price of cigarettes results in a 1.8 percentage point decrease in the probability of choosing cigarettes (immediate choice). At the sample means, the results imply that the own-price elasticity of the probability of choosing cigarettes is -0.27, which is consistent with prior research on the own-price elasticity of cigarette demand (DeCicca, Kenkel, and Lovenheim 2022). Put differently, a \$3 per pack tax hike that is passed through to consumer prices would decrease immediate cigarette choices by as much as we estimate would result from the graphic warning labels. A \$5.20 per pack tax hike that is passed through to consumer prices would increase 6-months-from-now quitting by as much as we estimate would result from the graphic warning

labels. For context, current state excise taxes range from \$0.17 to \$4.35 per pack, plus the \$1.01 per pack federal excise tax.

The Table 2 results also provide additional evidence that cigarettes and e-cigarettes are economic substitutes. In terms of immediate choices, a \$1 increase in the price of cigarettes increases the probability of choosing e-cigarettes by one percentage point, while a \$1 increase in the price of e-cigarettes increases the probability of choosing cigarettes by 1.7 percentage points. The estimated positive cross-price elasticities contribute to the growing body of evidence that cigarettes and e-cigarettes are economic substitutes (DeCicca, Kenkel, and Lovenheim 2022).

The results from our discrete choice experiment also suggest that e-cigarette choices are responsive to the availability of flavored e-cigarettes and to the warnings on e-cigarette packages. Our results imply that in terms of immediate cigarette choices, restricting the availability of e-cigarette flavors to menthol and tobacco is equivalent to an \$0.81 e-cigarette excise tax. Compared to no warning or a warning label that states that e-cigarettes pose less risk than cigarettes, the current FDA-required warning label reduces immediate e-cigarette choices by 3.2 percentage points, equivalent to a \$1.89 e-cigarette excise tax. Our estimates about the role of e-cigarette prices and health concerns in tobacco product choices are consistent with the DCE results reported by Marti, Buckell, Maclean, and Sindelar (2019); our estimates about the role of e-cigarette flavors are consistent with the DCE results reported by Buckell, Marti, and Sindelar (2018).³⁰ Our estimates imply that, unfortunately, FDA's 2016 required e-cigarette warning labels and marketing denial orders against flavored e-cigarettes, as well as recent State e-cigarette taxes, are working to increase cigarette use and might offset any potential decrease from future graphic warnings on cigarette packages.

³⁰ Section C of the Appendix provides more discussion of prior DCEs of tobacco product choices.

IX. DISCUSSION

Using stated preference data, we find that the primary mechanism through which graphic warning labels on cigarette packages influence tobacco choices is through fear/disgust rather than changes in knowledge of the health risks. Our results pose a dilemma for the FDA. In the first round of litigation on the FDA-proposed graphic warning labels, the courts ruled against FDA arguing that FDA did not present a ‘shred of evidence’ on the direct impact of graphic images on smoking rates. Although the analysis in our study is based on stated preferences and not market data, we find statistically significant results that the impact of the graphic warning labels will be to reduce cigarette use and increase the use of e-cigarettes and quitting. However, we find that graphic cigarette warnings influence choice only because they generate fear/disgust. Yet there are significant first amendment legal issues that FDA faces if fear and disgust are the mechanisms through which graphic images operate. We note that our results are consistent with results from a meta-analysis of the experimental literature on cigarette pack graphic warnings. Noar et al. (2020) conclude that, across many studies included in the meta-analysis, graphic images impact fear and cognitive elaboration but do little to impact health risk beliefs. Our results support this conclusion, by demonstrating that the primary path through which the graphic warnings influence tobacco product choices in a semi-realistic market situation is through fear rather than knowledge.

Our results also shed new light on discussions on the costs and benefits of tobacco regulation, and on the costs of so-called “nudge” policies more generally. Anti-smoking information campaigns that nudge consumers to better decisions in their own self-interest improve social welfare (Jin et al. 2015). However, required graphic warning labels are not nudges if consumers actively dislike the labels (List et al. 2023). Our results that warning labels

mainly work through fear/disgust rather than knowledge suggest that the labels impose important costs that should be balanced against the public health benefits of reduced smoking.

Our study includes other policy-relevant findings. The effects of cigarette prices and e-cigarette prices on tobacco choices show strong own and cross-price elasticities of demand. Especially relevant are the results regarding the impact of e-cigarette prices on cigarette demand. There is emerging evidence that e-cigarettes and cigarettes are economic substitutes. Our results imply that that when faced with higher e-cigarettes prices, the probability of choosing cigarettes rises significantly. These results suggest that there can be important unintended consequences of taxing e-cigarettes, especially given our results that higher e-cigarettes price do not increase the probability of quitting. Instead, when respondents are presented with higher e-cigarette prices, we see complete substitution away from e-cigarettes toward cigarettes. Another policy relevant result can be seen by examining the results regarding cigarette prices. Higher cigarette prices lower the probability of choosing a cigarette and raises the probability of choosing both an e-cigarette and quitting. This again suggests some level of cross-price elasticity between cigarettes and e-cigarettes.

Our findings on e-cigarette flavor availability also have direct policy relevance. The FDA has now consistently denied marketing authorization to e-cigarettes, except for tobacco-flavored e-cigarettes. The denials are based on the determination that they are not appropriate for public health, based on the tradeoff between youth vaping initiation and adult smoking cessation. Results from our discrete choice experiment suggest that limiting e-cigarette flavors to only tobacco is likely to increase the probability that adult smokers will choose cigarettes instead of e-cigarettes and does not increase quitting. FDA is concerned that flavored e-cigarettes will generate youth onset into e-cigarettes. While we do not study youth behavior, we do present the

consequences on adult smokers. These estimates can be used to further evaluate and weigh the benefits and costs of eliminating flavored e-cigarettes from the market.

Our results on e-cigarette warnings suggest another possible unintended consequence of current e-cigarette regulatory policies. The current FDA warning on e-cigarettes is shown to result in a decreased probability of choosing e-cigarettes. This is as intended. However, we estimate that the decrease in the probability of choosing an e-cigarette does not result in a probability of quitting tobacco use, but instead increases the probability of choosing cigarettes. The unintended consequence is to move tobacco users from less harmful to more harmful forms of tobacco.

References

- Beleche, Trinidad, Nellie Lew, Rosemarie L. Summers, and J. Laron Kirby. 2018. Are Graphic Warning Labels Stopping Millions of Smokers? A Comment on Huang, Chaloupka, and Fong. *Econ Journal Watch: Scholarly Comments on Academic Economics* Volume 15, Issue 2, 129-157.
- Blass, A., Lach, S., & Manski, C. (2010). Using elicited choice probabilities to estimate random utility models: preferences for electricity reliability. *International Economic Review*, 51 (2), 421-440. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2354.2010.00586.x>
- Bukola, U., Meng, G., Thrasher, J.F., Thompson, M.E., Fong, G.T. & Fleischer, N.L. (2022). The Differential Impact of the 2000 Canadian Graphic Warning Label Policy on Smoking Prevalence by Sex and Education: A Difference-in-Difference-in-Difference Model. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research*, Volume 24, Issue 11, November 2022, Pages 1732–1740, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ntr/ntac122>
- Carson, R. T. (2012). Contingent valuation: A practical alternative when prices aren't available. *Journal of economic perspectives*, 26(4), 27-42.
- Central Hudson Gas and Electric Company v. Public Service Commission (1980). 447 U.S. 557 100, S. Ct. 2343.
- Clarke, N., Pechey, E., Kosīte, D., König, L.M., Mantzari, E., Blackwell, Marteau, T.M., & Hollands, G.J. (2021) Impact of health warning labels on selection and consumption of food and alcohol products: systematic review with meta-analysis, *Health Psychology Review*, 15:3, 430-453, DOI: [10.1080/17437199.2020.1780147](https://doi.org/10.1080/17437199.2020.1780147)
- Congressional Research Service (2019). *Assessing Commercial Disclosure Requirements under the First Amendment*.
- de Bekker-Grob, E. W., Donkers, B., Bliemer, M. C., Veldwijk, J., & Swait, J. D. (2020). Can healthcare choice be predicted using stated preference data?. *Social Science & Medicine*, 246, 112736.
- DeCicca, P., Kenkel, D., & Lovenheim, M. F. (2022). The economics of tobacco regulation: a comprehensive review. *Journal of economic literature*, 60(3), 883-970.
- Federal Register (2010). *Required Warnings for Cigarette Packages and Advertisements (Proposed Rule)*, 75 Fed. Reg. 69,524.
- Federal Register (2011). *Required Warnings for Cigarette Packages and Advertisements (Final Rule)*, 76 Fed. Reg. 36,628.
- Federal Register (2019). *Tobacco Products; Required Warnings for Cigarette Packages and Advertisements (Proposed Rule)*, 84 Fed. Reg. 42,754.

Federal Register (2020). *Tobacco Products; Required Warnings for Cigarette Packages and Advertisements (Final Rule)*, 85 Fed. Reg. 15,638.

Food and Drug Administration, HHS. (2011). Required Warnings for Cigarette Packages and Advertisements. Final rule. *Federal register*, 76(120), 36628-36777.

Francis, D.B., Hall, M.G., Noar, S.M. Ribisl, K.M. & Brewer, N.T. (2017) Systematic Review of Measures Used in Pictorial Cigarette Pack Warning Experiments, *Nicotine & Tobacco Research*, 19 (10) 1127–1137, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ntr/ntx082>

Hammond D., McDonald, P.W., Cameron, R., & Brown, K.S. (2003) Impact of the graphic Canadian warning labels on adult smoking behaviour,” *Tobacco Control*, 12; 391–395.

Hammond, D., McDonald, P.W., and Fong, G.T., Brown, K.S., & Cameron, R. (2004) The Impact of Cigarette Warning labels and smoke-free bylaws on smoking Cessation—evidence from former smokers,” *Canadian Journal of Public Health* 95(3); 201–204.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03403649>

Hammond, D., Fong, G.T., McDonald, P.W, Brown, K.S, & Cameron, R (2004a) Graphic Canadian cigarette warning labels and adverse outcomes: Evidence from Canadian smokers,” *American Journal of Public Health*, 94(8), 1442–1445. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.94.8.1442>

Hammond, D., Fong, G. T., Borland, R., Cummings, K. M., McNeill, A., & Driezen, P. (2007). Text and graphic warnings on cigarette packages: findings from the international tobacco control four country study. *American journal of preventive medicine*, 32(3), 202–209.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2006.11.011>

Hammond D. (2011). Health warning messages on tobacco products: a review. *Tobacco control*, 20(5), 327–337. <https://doi.org/10.1136/tc.2010.037630>

Huang, Jidong, Frank Chaloupka, and Geoffrey T. Fong. 2014. 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. doi:10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2013-051170

Jin, L., Kenkel, D., Liu, F., & Wang, H. (2015). Retrospective and Prospective Benefit-Cost Analyses of US Anti-Smoking Policies. *Journal of Benefit-Cost Analysis*, 6(1), 154-186.

Johnson, F. Reed, Lancsar, E., Marshall, D., Kilambi, V., Muehlbacher, A., Regier, D.A., Bresnahan, B.W., Kanninen, B. & Bridges, J.F.P (2013). Constructing Experimental Designs for Discrete-Choice Experiments: Report of the ISPOR Conjoint Analysis Experimental Design Good Research Practices Task Force. *Value in Health* 16: 3-13.

Kenkel, D.S., Peng, S., Pesko, M.F., & Wang, H. (2020). Mostly harmless regulation? Electronic cigarettes, public policy and consumer welfare. *Health Economics*, 29 (11), 1364-1377. <https://doi.org/10.1001/hec.4136>.

Kesternich, I., Heiss, F., McFadden, D., & Winter, J., (2013). Suit the action to the word, the word to the action: Hypothetical choices and real decisions in Medicare Part D, *Journal of Health Economics*, 32 (6), 1313-1324. ISSN 0167-6296, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhealeco.2012.11.006>.

List, John A., Matthias Rodemeier, Sutanuka Roy, and Gregory K. Sun. 2023. Judging Nudging: Understanding the Welfare Effects of Nudges versus Taxes. NBER Working Paper 31152.

List, J., Rodemeier, M., Roy, S., & Sun, G.K. (2023). Judging nudging: Understanding the welfare effects of nudges versus taxes. *NBER Working Paper 31152*.

Maestas, Nicole, Kathleen J. Mullen, David Powell, Till von Wachter, and Jeffrey B. Wenger. 2023. The value of working conditions in the United States and implications for the structure of wages. *American Economic Review* 117 (7): 2007-2047.

Malik S. & Ong, Z. Is evoking fear effective? Exploratory findings from a randomized experiment on the impacts of health warning labels on sugar-sweetened beverages. *Public Health Nutrition*. 2023:1-15. doi:10.1017/S1368980023002859

Mas, Alexandre, and Amanda Pallais. 2017. "Valuing Alternative Work Arrangements." *American Economic Review*, 107 (12): 3722-59. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.20161500>

McFadden, Daniel (2017). "Stated Preference Methods and Their Applicability to Environmental Use and Non-use Valuations." In *Contingent Valuation of Environmental Goods: A Comprehensive Critique*. Daniel McFadden and Kenneth Train, editors. Edward Elgar Publishing. Elgaronline.com.

Miller, C.L., Hill, D.J., Quester, P.G., & Hiller, J.E. (2009). "Response of mass media, tobacco industry and smokers to the introduction of graphic cigarette pack warnings in Australia," *European Journal of Public Health*, 19(6); 644-49. <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/ckp089>

Monárrez-Espino, J., Liu, B., Greiner, F., Bremberg, S., & Galanti, R. (2014). Systematic review of the effect of pictorial warnings on cigarette packages in smoking. *American Journal of Public Health* 104 (10), e11_e30, <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2014.302129>

Munoz, Y. Chabot, J.C. & Suissa, J.A (2010) Using Fear Appeals in Warning Labels to Promote Responsible Gambling Among VLT Players: The Key Role of Depth of Information Processing, *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 26, 593-609. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10899-010-9182-4>

- Mutti-Packer, S., Collyer, B., & Hodgins, D. C. (2018). Perceptions of plain packaging and health warning labels for cannabis among young adults: findings from an experimental study. *BMC public health*, 18, 1-10.
- Noar, S. M., Hall, M. G., Francis, D. B., Ribisl, K. M., Pepper, J. K., & Brewer, N. T. (2016). Pictorial cigarette pack warnings: a meta-analysis of experimental studies. *Tobacco control*, 25(3), 341–354. <https://doi.org/10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2014-051978>
- Noar, S.M., Rohde, J.A., Barker, J.O., Hall, M.J., Brewer, N.T. (2020). Pictorial Cigarette Pack Warnings Increase Some Risk Appraisals But Not Risk Beliefs: A Meta-Analysis, *Human Communication Research*, 46 (2-3), 250–272, <https://doi.org/10.1093/hcr/hqz016>
- RJ Reynolds Tobacco Company v. US Food and Drug Administration, 696 F.3d 1205, 1214 (DC Cir 2012).
- R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co v. U.S. Food and Drug Administration, 5th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, No. 23-40076, 2023
- RJ Reynolds Tobacco Company; Santa Fe National Tobacco Company, Inc.; ITG Brands, LLC; Liggett Group LLC; Neocom, Inc.; Rangila Enterprises Inc.; Rangila LLC; Sahil Ismail Inc, and Is Like You Inc.; v. US Food and Drug Administration, In the United States District Court For the Eastern District of Texas Tyler Division, Case 6:20-cv-10076-JCB (File 4/30/2020)
- U.S. Food and Drug Administration (2022) *Health effects of tobacco use*. <https://www.fda.gov/tobacco-products/public-health-education/health-effects-tobacco-use> Accessed May 25th 2022.
- US Department of Health and Human Services, Food and Drug Administration (2016). Deeming Tobacco Products To Be Subject to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as Amended by the Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act (2016. 21 CFR Parts 1100, 1140, and 1143.
- WHO - World Health Organization (2023), *WHO report on the global tobacco epidemic, 2023: Protect people from tobacco smoke*, Geneva: World Health Organization.
- Wooley vs. Manyard (1977). U.S. 705, 714, 97 S. Ct. 1428 51 L.Ed.2nd 752
- Zauderer v. Office of Disciplinary Counsel (1985), 471 U.S. 626, 105 S. Ct. 2265.
- Zhenhao, S., Wang, A.L., Audrain-McGovern, J., Lynch, K.G., Loughhead, J. & and. Langleben, D.D. "Delayed effects of cigarette graphic warning labels on smoking behavior." *medRxiv* (2024): 2024-01.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of DCE attributes, respondents' smoking history, demographics and post DCE perceptions (N = 1171)

DCE attributes of DCE # 1	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Cigarette pictorial warning (Amputation)	0.50	0.50	0	1
<i>Price</i>				
Cigarette price	8.77	6.10	0.50	40
E-cigarette price	4.67	2.49	2	8
<i>E-cigarette available flavor</i>				
Tobacco, menthol, fruit/sweet/candy	0.33	0.47	0	1
Tobacco and menthol	0.33	0.47	0	1
Tobacco only	0.33	0.47	0	1
<i>E-cigarette available nicotine level</i>				
Up to 5mg	0.33	0.47	0	1
Up to 20mg	0.33	0.47	0	1
Up to 50 mg	0.33	0.47	0	1
<i>E-cigarette warning</i>				
No warning	0.25	0.43	0	1
Are not completely risk free	0.25	0.43	0	1
Contain nicotine, which is addictive	0.25	0.43	0	1
May expose users to chemicals and toxins	0.25	0.43	0	1
<hr/>				
Smoking history				
Smoke everyday	0.59	0.49	0	1
Age of smoking initiation	18.32	6.27	7	76
Heavy smoker	0.37	0.48	0	1
Cigarette flavor: menthol	0.40	0.49	0	1
Cigarette flavor: non-menthol	0.55	0.50	0	1
Cigarette flavor: other flavor	0.02	0.14	0	1
Cigarette flavor: no usual type	0.03	0.17	0	1
Ever used e-cigarette	0.63	0.48	0	1
Tried to quit during last 12 months	0.50	0.50	0	1
Intend to quit in next 6 months	0.66	0.48	0	1
<hr/>				
Demographics				
Male	0.42	0.49	0	1
Female	0.57	0.50	0	1
Age	45.16	13.54	18	83
Age group (18-24)	0.04	0.19	0	1
Age group (25-39)	0.37	0.48	0	1
Age group (40-64)	0.49	0.50	0	1
Age group (65+)	0.10	0.30	0	1
Household size	2.80	1.69	1	19
Grade school/some high school	0.07	0.25	0	1
Completed high school	0.25	0.43	0	1
Technical school or community college	0.18	0.38	0	1

Some university, no degree	0.24	0.43	0	1
Bachelor's degree	0.18	0.38	0	1
Post-graduate degree	0.08	0.27	0	1
Household annual income above 50000 USD	0.46	0.50	0	1
Full-time employed	0.48	0.50	0	1
White	0.77	0.42	0	1

Post DCE perceptions

<i>Comparing to cigarettes, e-cigarettes are</i>				
Less harmful	0.26	0.44	0	1
Just as harmful	0.39	0.49	0	1
More harmful	0.18	0.38	0	1
Do not know	0.17	0.38	0	1
<i>Feel disgust/fear as a result of the pictorial warning</i>				
To a great extent	0.15	0.35	0	1
somewhat	0.37	0.48	0	1
very little	0.27	0.44	0	1
Not at all	0.22	0.41	0	1
<i>Believe that Smoking Cigarettes Reduces Blood Flow to the Lower Limbs</i>				
Agree	0.66	0.47	0	1
Neither agree nor disagree	0.16	0.36	0	1
Disagree	0.04	0.20	0	1
Do not know	0.14	0.35	0	1
<i>How much would you willing to pay for a case to carry cigarettes</i>				
Willing to pay for a \$5 case	0.12	0.33	0	1
Willing to pay for a \$10 case	0.10	0.30	0	1
Willing to pay for a \$20 case	0.05	0.23	0	1

Table 2. Estimation results of the main effects from linear probability models

Variables	Immediate choice today			Choice of 6 months from now			
	Cigarette	E-cigarette	Quit	Cigarette	E-cigarette	Quit	
<i>Cigarette warning</i>	GWL amputation	-0.054*** (0.019)	0.027 (0.017)	0.028* (0.016)	-0.078*** (0.019)	0.024 (0.018)	0.055*** (0.021)
<i>Price</i>	Cigarette price	-0.018*** (0.001)	0.010*** (0.001)	0.008*** (0.001)	-0.015*** (0.001)	0.007*** (0.001)	0.008*** (0.001)
	E-cigarette price	0.017*** (0.002)	-0.017*** (0.001)	-0.000 (0.001)	0.013*** (0.002)	-0.014*** (0.001)	0.002 (0.001)
<i>E-cigarette available flavor</i>	Tobacco, menthol, fruit/sweet/candy	-0.022*** (0.008)	0.027*** (0.007)	-0.005 (0.006)	-0.027*** (0.007)	0.036*** (0.007)	-0.009 (0.006)
	Tobacco and menthol	-0.026*** (0.008)	0.010 (0.007)	0.016** (0.006)	-0.023*** (0.007)	0.019*** (0.006)	0.003 (0.006)
<i>E-cigarette available nicotine level</i>	Up to 20mg	-0.004 (0.006)	0.003 (0.006)	0.002 (0.005)	-0.004 (0.006)	-0.001 (0.006)	0.006 (0.005)
	Up to 50mg	0.012* (0.007)	-0.009 (0.006)	-0.003 (0.006)	-0.000 (0.006)	-0.001 (0.006)	0.001 (0.006)
<i>E-cigarette warning</i>	Are not completely risk free	0.005 (0.008)	-0.002 (0.007)	-0.003 (0.007)	0.002 (0.008)	0.003 (0.008)	-0.005 (0.008)
	Contain nicotine, which is addictive	0.032*** (0.009)	-0.017** (0.008)	-0.015** (0.008)	0.018* (0.009)	-0.005 (0.009)	-0.013 (0.009)
	May expose users to chemicals and toxins	0.012 (0.009)	-0.018** (0.008)	0.005 (0.007)	0.005 (0.008)	-0.011 (0.008)	0.007 (0.008)
	Constant	0.628*** (0.074)	0.214*** (0.061)	0.158** (0.068)	0.731*** (0.078)	0.193*** (0.066)	0.075 (0.087)
Observations		14,052	14,052	14,052	14,052	14,052	14,052
Adjusted R-squared		0.208	0.144	0.098	0.239	0.099	0.169

Notes: Additional control variables include smoking status (being every day smoker), age of smoking initiation, heavy smokers (heavy smoker index ≥ 3), vaping status (ever used e-cigarette), quitting effort (tried to quit during last 12 months), quit intention (intend to quit in the next 6 months), gender (being male), age, household size, education (reference category is grade school/some high school), household income above 50k, full-time employed, white. The reference category of e-cigarette available flavor “tobacco only”, the reference category of e-cigarette available nicotine level is “up to 5mg”, the reference category of e-cigarette warning is “no warning”. Standard errors clustered at respondent level are in parentheses. *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$.

Table 3 The effect of GWL on mechanism variables

(A)	Feel disgust/fear as a result of the cigarettes warning label				
	Not at all	Very little	Somewhat	To a great extent	
GWL amputation	-0.070*** (0.023)	-0.009 (0.026)	0.036 (0.028)	0.042** (0.021)	
Constant	0.042 (0.102)	0.216* (0.110)	0.646*** (0.128)	0.096 (0.102)	
Observations	1,171	1,171	1,171	1,171	
Adjusted R-squared	0.038	0.013	0.036	0.019	
(B)	Smoking cigarettes reduces blood flow to the lower limbs				
	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither disagree nor agree/I do not know	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
GWL amputation	-0.013* (0.007)	-0.008 (0.009)	-0.007 (0.026)	-0.017 (0.028)	0.045 (0.027)
Constant	-0.008 (0.040)	0.088** (0.039)	0.574*** (0.121)	0.121 (0.123)	0.224* (0.121)
Observations	1,171	1,171	1,171	1,171	1,171
Adjusted R-squared	0.003	0.017	0.036	0.015	0.030

Notes: Heteroskedastic-robust standard errors are in parentheses. *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$. Other controls include e-cigarette DCE attributes (proportion of each warning), smoking history (smoking status, age of smoking initiation, heavy smoker, vaping status, quitting effort, quitting intention), and demographics (gender, age, household size, education, income, full-time employment status, race).

Table 4 Mechanism analysis

Variables		Immediate choice today			Choice of 6 months from now		
		Cigarette	E-cigarette	Quit	Cigarette	E-cigarette	Quit
<i>Price</i>	Cigarette price	-0.019*** (0.001)	0.010*** (0.001)	0.009*** (0.001)	-0.015*** (0.001)	0.007*** (0.001)	0.008*** (0.001)
	E-cigarette price	0.017*** (0.002)	-0.017*** (0.001)	0.000 (0.001)	0.013*** (0.002)	-0.014*** (0.001)	0.001 (0.001)
<i>Feel disgust/fear about the cigarette warning label</i>	Very little	-0.033 (0.024)	0.046** (0.021)	-0.013 (0.022)	-0.025 (0.028)	0.026 (0.023)	-0.000 (0.029)
	Somewhat	-0.100*** (0.024)	0.081*** (0.021)	0.019 (0.022)	-0.119*** (0.028)	0.061*** (0.024)	0.058** (0.029)
	To a great extent	-0.181*** (0.032)	0.081*** (0.027)	0.100*** (0.029)	-0.164*** (0.036)	0.042 (0.029)	0.122*** (0.038)
<i>Smoking cigarettes reduces blood flow to the lower limbs</i>	Strongly disagree	0.035 (0.068)	-0.038 (0.054)	0.003 (0.077)	0.163** (0.076)	0.025 (0.061)	-0.189** (0.085)
	Somewhat disagree	-0.002 (0.048)	-0.013 (0.049)	0.015 (0.051)	0.029 (0.056)	-0.002 (0.051)	-0.027 (0.064)
	Somewhat agree	0.046* (0.024)	-0.028 (0.021)	-0.017 (0.022)	0.046* (0.025)	-0.011 (0.022)	-0.036 (0.027)
	Strongly agree	-0.021 (0.027)	-0.016 (0.024)	0.036 (0.024)	0.018 (0.027)	-0.005 (0.025)	-0.013 (0.030)
	Constant	0.647*** (0.080)	0.211*** (0.063)	0.142* (0.075)	0.768*** (0.089)	0.187*** (0.071)	0.046 (0.098)
Observations		14,040	14,040	14,040	14,040	14,040	14,040
Adjusted R-squared		0.257	0.208	0.138	0.269	0.159	0.197

Notes: Standard errors clustered at respondent level are in parentheses. *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$. The reference category of variable disgust/fear about graphic image is “Not at all”, the reference category of variable knowledge of blood flow is “Neither disagree nor agree/I do not know”. Other controls include e-cigarette DCE attributes (flavor, nicotine level, warning), potential mechanism variables (relative harm perception, belief of nicotine, perceived life expectancy loss from smoking/vaping), smoking history (smoking status, age of smoking initiation, heavy smoker, vaping status, quitting effort, quitting intention), and demographics (gender, age, household size, education, income, full-time employment status, race).

Table 5. Mechanism explained impacts

DCE # 1	Percent of Total Impact of The Pictorial Warning on Choice δ/β					
	Immediate Choice Today			Choice of 6 months from now		
	Cigarette	E-cigarette	Quit	Cigarette	E-cigarette	Quit
Feel Disgust/Fear as a Result of seeing Cigarette Warning Label	16.62%	21.80%	12.96%	12.21%	17.46%	10.55%
Perceived Harm of E-cigarettes Relative to Cigarettes	8.97%	31.34%	-6.82%	3.99%	35.34%	-5.88%
Believe that "I smoke more than I should"	-2.87%	0.57%	-5.29%	0.29%	-1.79%	0.95%
Believe that Nicotine in Cigarettes is the Substance that Causes Most of the Cancer Caused by Smoking	4.70%	3.03%	5.88%	0.19%	7.31%	-2.06%
Nicotine, on Its Own, Can Harm the Developing Brain of Youth and Young Adults	-0.05%	0.77%	-0.63%	-0.60%	-1.72%	-0.25%
Believe that Smoking Cigarettes Reduces Blood Flow to the Lower Limbs	3.19%	1.35%	4.50%	2.51%	-1.61%	3.81%
Life Expectancy Loss from Smoking	0.11%	-2.08%	1.66%	-0.16%	-7.23%	2.06%
Life Expectancy Loss from Vaping	0.13%	6.78%	-4.56%	-0.19%	6.55%	-2.31%

Table 6. The effect of graphic warning label on choices (Cataract GWL Versus Text)

Variables		Immediate choice today			Choice of 6 months from now		
		Cigarette	E-cigarette	Quit	Cigarette	E-cigarette	Quit
<i>Cigarette warning</i>	GWL cataracts	-0.031 (0.019)	0.030* (0.017)	0.001 (0.017)	-0.033* (0.020)	0.036** (0.018)	-0.003 (0.021)
<i>Price</i>	Cigarette price	-0.018*** (0.001)	0.008*** (0.001)	0.009*** (0.001)	-0.015*** (0.001)	0.007*** (0.001)	0.008*** (0.001)
	E-cigarette price	0.014*** (0.002)	-0.018*** (0.002)	0.004*** (0.001)	0.010*** (0.002)	-0.014*** (0.002)	0.004*** (0.001)
<i>E-cigarette available flavor</i>	Tobacco, menthol, fruit/sweet/candy	-0.019** (0.008)	0.027*** (0.007)	-0.008 (0.006)	-0.028*** (0.007)	0.036*** (0.007)	-0.008 (0.006)
	Tobacco and menthol	-0.018** (0.008)	0.012* (0.007)	0.005 (0.007)	-0.019*** (0.007)	0.015** (0.007)	0.004 (0.006)
<i>E-cigarette available nicotine level</i>	Up to 20mg	-0.002 (0.006)	-0.003 (0.006)	0.005 (0.005)	-0.007 (0.006)	0.003 (0.006)	0.004 (0.005)
	Up to 50mg	0.005 (0.007)	-0.000 (0.006)	-0.005 (0.005)	-0.004 (0.006)	0.002 (0.006)	0.002 (0.006)
<i>E-cigarette warning</i>	Are not completely risk free	-0.005 (0.008)	0.005 (0.007)	-0.000 (0.007)	-0.010 (0.008)	0.007 (0.007)	0.004 (0.008)
	Contain nicotine, which is addictive	0.022** (0.009)	-0.015* (0.008)	-0.007 (0.007)	0.012 (0.009)	-0.007 (0.009)	-0.005 (0.009)
	May expose users to chemicals and toxins	0.007 (0.008)	-0.008 (0.008)	0.001 (0.007)	-0.003 (0.008)	-0.009 (0.008)	0.012 (0.008)
	Constant	0.625*** (0.076)	0.294*** (0.063)	0.081 (0.073)	0.730*** (0.080)	0.199*** (0.068)	0.071 (0.089)
Observations		13,980	13,980	13,980	13,980	13,980	13,980
Adjusted R-squared		0.212	0.168	0.093	0.242	0.134	0.156

Notes: Additional control variables include smoking status (being every day smoker), age of smoking initiation, heavy smokers (heavy smoker index ≥ 3), vaping status (ever used e-cigarette), quitting effort (tried to quit during last 12 months), quit intention (intend to quit in the next 6 months), gender (being male), age, household size, education (reference category is grade school/some high school), household income above 50k, full-time employed, white. The reference category of e-cigarette available flavor “tobacco only”, the reference category of e-cigarette available nicotine level is “up to 5mg”, the reference category of e-cigarette warning is “no warning”. Standard errors clustered at respondent level are in parentheses. *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$

Table 7: The effect of pictorial warning on mechanism variables (DCE # 2)

	Feel disgust/fear as a result of the cigarettes warning label				
	Not at all	Very little	Somewhat	To a great extent	
GWL cataracts	-0.004 (0.026)	0.008 (0.027)	0.014 (0.029)	-0.018 (0.021)	
Constant	0.125 (0.105)	0.149 (0.110)	0.552*** (0.125)	0.174* (0.091)	
Observations	1,146	1,146	1,146	1,146	
Adjusted R-squared	0.041	0.011	0.037	0.024	
	Smoking cigarettes reduces blood flow to the lower limbs				
	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither disagree nor agree/I do not know	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
GWL cataracts	-0.008 (0.008)	-0.002 (0.011)	0.041 (0.028)	0.030 (0.030)	-0.060** (0.027)
Constant	0.002 (0.044)	0.077** (0.032)	0.619*** (0.121)	0.302** (0.121)	-0.001 (0.113)
Observations	1,146	1,146	1,146	1,146	1,146
Adjusted R-squared	0.001	0.003	0.051	0.012	0.028

Notes: Heteroskedastic-robust standard errors are in parentheses. *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$. Other controls include e-cigarette DCE attributes (proportion of each warning), smoking history (smoking status, age of smoking initiation, heavy smoker, vaping status, quitting effort, quitting intention), and demographics (gender, age, household size, education, income, full-time employment status, race).



Table 8 Mechanism analysis omitting Cataract GWL

Variables		Immediate choice today			Choice of 6 months from now		
		Cigarette	E-cigarette	Quit	Cigarette	E-cigarette	Quit
<i>Price</i>	Cigarette price	-0.017*** (0.001)	0.008*** (0.001)	0.010*** (0.001)	-0.015*** (0.001)	0.007*** (0.001)	0.008*** (0.001)
	E-cigarette price	0.014*** (0.002)	-0.018*** (0.002)	0.004*** (0.001)	0.010*** (0.002)	-0.014*** (0.001)	0.004** (0.001)
<i>Feel disgust/fear about the cigarette warning label</i>	Very little	-0.063** (0.025)	0.037* (0.021)	0.026 (0.021)	0.002 (0.028)	0.029 (0.023)	-0.031 (0.029)
	Somewhat	-0.083*** (0.024)	0.042** (0.021)	0.041** (0.021)	-0.069** (0.027)	0.040* (0.023)	0.029 (0.029)
	To a great extent	-0.126*** (0.033)	0.051* (0.028)	0.075** (0.031)	-0.080** (0.036)	0.037 (0.029)	0.043 (0.039)
<i>Smoking cigarettes reduces blood flow to the lower limbs</i>	Strongly disagree	0.038 (0.062)	0.084* (0.050)	-0.122** (0.055)	0.100 (0.077)	0.145** (0.058)	-0.245*** (0.065)
	Somewhat disagree	-0.018 (0.053)	0.012 (0.046)	0.006 (0.049)	-0.020 (0.053)	0.027 (0.044)	-0.007 (0.060)
	Somewhat agree	0.031 (0.023)	-0.025 (0.021)	-0.006 (0.020)	-0.000 (0.024)	-0.027 (0.021)	0.027 (0.026)
	Strongly agree	-0.016 (0.026)	-0.008 (0.023)	0.024 (0.023)	-0.003 (0.027)	-0.011 (0.024)	0.015 (0.030)
	Constant	0.637*** (0.086)	0.307*** (0.068)	0.057 (0.077)	0.802*** (0.089)	0.173** (0.072)	0.025 (0.092)
	Observations	13,968	13,968	13,968	13,968	13,968	13,968
	Adjusted R-squared	0.250	0.226	0.121	0.271	0.203	0.183

Notes: Standard errors clustered at respondent level are in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. The reference category of variable disgust/fear about graphic image is “Not at all”, the reference category of variable knowledge of blood flow is “Neither disagree nor agree/I do not know”. Other controls include e-cigarette DCE attributes (flavor, nicotine level, warning), potential mechanism variables (relative harm perception, belief of nicotine, perceived life expectancy loss from smoking/vaping), smoking history (smoking status, age of smoking initiation, heavy smoker, vaping status, quitting effort, quitting intention), and demographics (gender, age, household size, education, income, full-time employment status, race).

Figure 1A: One of the Scenario Presentations to Respondents Who Are Randomly Assigned to the Surgeon General Cigarette Warning Label (SGWL).




Please select one option.

	Cigarettes	E-Cigarettes	Neither
PRODUCT			
PRICE	21.00 USD	2 USD	I will quit smoking cigarettes and not use e-cigarettes.
NICOTINE CONTENT	You will inhale between 22-38 mg of nicotine per pack of typical cigarettes if you smoke regulars, or between 12-20 mg of nicotine per pack if you smoke so-called mild or light cigarettes.	Various nicotine levels available, up to 50mg	
FLAVOR	Your current cigarette flavor	Available flavors are tobacco and menthol	
WARNING MESSAGE	Smoking Causes Lung Cancer, Heart Disease, Emphysema, and may Complicate Pregnancy.	E-cigarettes may expose users to chemicals and toxins at levels that have the potential to cause health effects	

>>
Finish Later

Figure 1B: One of the Scenario Presentations to Respondents Randomly Assigned to the FDA Graphic Warning Label (FDAGWL).

Please select one option.

	Cigarettes	E-Cigarettes	Neither
PRODUCT			
PRICE	20.00 USD	2 USD	
NICOTINE CONTENT	You will inhale between 22-38 mg of nicotine per pack of typical cigarettes if you smoke regulars, or between 12-20 mg of nicotine per pack if you smoke so-called mild or light cigarettes.	Various nicotine levels available, up to 20mg	I will quit smoking cigarettes and not use e-cigarettes.
FLAVOR	Your current cigarette flavor	Available flavors are tobacco, menthol, fruit/sweet/candy	
WARNING MESSAGE		This product contains nicotine, nicotine is an addictive chemical	

[>>](#)

Figure 1C: Graphic Warning Label Used in Second DCE Experiment.

Replace

With

