**APPENDIX S2: DATA EXTRACTION CODING TOOL**

* **Study Aims and Design**
	+ What are the broad aims of the study?
	*Write in authors' description*
		- Explicitly stated (give details)
			* Info
		- Implicit
		- Unclear / not stated
	+ Which impacts are measured?
		- Salience of health warnings
		*e.g. prominence/seriousness/visibility/comprehension/understanding/believability*
		- Attractiveness of packaging and the product
		*e.g. appeal/desirability/value/judgements*
		- Perceptions of product strength and harm
		*e.g. understanding/awareness/judgements*
		- Smoking related intentions
		- Attitudes, beliefs or feelings towards smoking
		- Pack preferences
		*e.g. preference/liking for plain packs that differ by shape or method of opening*
		- Knowledge of tobacco harms, constituents, ingredients
		- Knowledge, attitudes, beliefs or feelings towards the brand
		- Attitudes, beliefs or feelings towards the packaging or product
		- Support for plain packaging
		*e.g. Public approval ratings*
		- others (please specify)
	+ What outcomes from plain packaging were identified by the authors?
		- Preventing smoking initiation
		- Preventing smoking initiation for young people
		- Aiding smoking cessation
		- Reducing consumption
		- Other (give details)
		- None identified
	+ What is the focus of the research?
		- Individual level effects of plain packaging
		- Views on the introduction of plain packaging policies
		- Both
		- Other
	+ How was the study funded?
		- Explicitly stated
		- Implicit
		- Unclear/not stated
	+ Study design
		- Intervention Study
			* RCT
			* Controlled trial (not randomised)
			* Correlational / observational study
			* Pre and post test
			* Post test only
			* Other design
		- Surveys
			* Cross sectional
			* Longitudinal
		- Qualitative
	+ Country (give details)
		- UK
		- Other Europe
		- North America
		- South America
		- Australasia
		- Asia
		- Africa
	+ Date of publication
		- Please state
	+ Type of publication
		- Journal (peer reviewed)
		- Journal
		- Report
		- Newspaper / magazine article
		- Thesis
		- Other
	+ Quality of reporting
		- Yes, good quality
		*Use if aims explicitly stated*
		- Yes, clear to some extent
		- No - insufficient detail
	+ Relevance of the aims for the plain packaging review
		- Aims solely focused on plain packaging
		- Aims include some explicit focus on plain packaging
		- Aims implicitly suggest some focus on plain packaging
* **Actual Sample**
	+ What was the total number of participants in the study?
		- Explicitly stated
		- Implicit
		- Unclear / not stated
	+ What are the ages of the participants?
		- Give details
		- Not stated
	+ What is the gender of the participants?
		- Female
		- Male
		- Mixed gender (numbers for each)
	+ What is the SES of participants?
		- Explicitly stated
		- Implicit
		- Unclear/not stated
	+ What is the ethnicity of participants?
		- Explicitly stated
		- Implicit
		- Unclear / not stated
	+ What is the smoking status of participants?
		- Smokers only
		- Non-smokers only
		- Mixed smokers / non smokers
		- Unclear / not stated
	+ Other key characteristics not captured above
		- Details
	+ Quality of reporting
		- Yes, good quality
			* yes
		- insufficient detail
	+ Relevance of sample for review on plain packaging
	*Guidance: Plain packaging would seem to be most relevant for non-smoking youth and smokers of all ages. As UK industry marketing documents often highlight the importance of young adults (18-35) given that they are considered to be more brand conscious, perhaps there is one group that is a less relevant sample when it comes to plain packaging, that of non-smoking older adults aged 36 years and above - especially as very few older adult non-smokers take up the habit. If sample includes non smokers over 36, then it should be considered a sample of moderate relevance.*
		- Highly relevant
		- Moderate relevance
		- Limited relevance
* **Sampling, recruitment and consent**
	+ What was the sampling strategy?
		- Explicitly stated
		- Implicit
		- Unclear / not stated
	+ What was the setting for the recruitment of the sample?
		- Details
	+ What population is the sample attempting to represent?
		- Nationally representative sample
		- Regionally representative sample
		- Purposive sample
		- Convenience sample
		- Other
		- Unclear
	+ Are the level of the authors conclusions appropriate given the population?
		- Yes, appropriate level conclusions
		- No inappropriate level conclusions
	+ How were people recruited to take part in the study?
		- Explicitly stated
		- Implicit
		- Unclear/not stated
	+ Was consent sought?
		- Participant consent sought
		- Other consent sought
		- Consent not sought
		- Unclear / not stated
	+ Was information provided before participants agreed to participate?
		- Information provided to participants
		- Information provided to others
		- Unclear / not stated
	+ Was the study approved by an ethics committee?
		- Yes
		- Unclear / not stated
	+ Attempts to preserve confidentiality/anonymity of the respondents?
		- Explicitly stated
		- Implicit
		- Unclear / not stated
	+ Quality of reporting - sampling and recruitment
		- yes, sampling and recruitment clearly reported
		- To some extent
		- No
	+ Is the study ethically robust?
		- Yes
		- To some extent
		- No
* **For surveys/views on packaging designs/images**
	+ description of plain pack (give details)
	+ description of comparison packs (give details)
* **Data Collection and analysis**
	+ What method was used to collect data?
		- Focus group interview
		- One to one interview
		- Observation
		- Self completion questionnaire
		- Self completion report or diary
		- Hypothetical scenario including vignettes
		- Online survey
		- Other
		- Not stated
	+ What types of questions were asked?
		- Closed questions
		- Open ended questions
		- Both types
		- Not stated
	+ Who collected the data?
		- Explicitly stated
		- Implicit
		- Unclear
		- Not stated
	+ Do the authors describe data analysis methods?
		- Yes
		- Not specified
		- Unclear
	+ Do the authors provide a rationale for the methods used for data analysis?
		- Yes
		- No
	+ Quality reporting - collection/analysis
		- Yes
		- Partially
		- No
	+ Relevance - collection/analysis
		- Yes
		- To some degree
		- No
		- Unclear
* **Findings**
	+ What is the extent of findings on plain packaging?
		- Findings exclusively on plain packaging
		- Broader findings but with major focus on plain packaging
		- Broader findings with limited focus on plain packaging
	+ For studies that focus on the individual level effects
		- What was the effect of plain packaging on knowledge?
			* Give details
			* No effect reported
			* Unclear
		- What the reason for the effect on knowledge?
			* Salience of health warnings
			* Appeal of the package
			* Perceptions of harm
			* Other
		- What was the effect of plain packaging on attitudes and/or beliefs?
			* Give details
			* No effect reported
			* Unclear
		- What was the reason for the effect on attitudes and /or beliefs?
			* Salience of health warnings
			* Appeal of the package
			* Perceptions of harm
			* Other
		- What was the effect of plain packaging on behaviour?
			* Give details
			* No effect reported
			* Unclear
		- What was the reason for the effect on behaviour?
			* Salience of health warnings
			* Appeal of package
			* Perceptions of harm
			* Other
		- Associations between plain packaging and which other variables are reported
			* None
			* Gender
				+ Significant (give details)
				+ Not significant
			* Age
				+ Significant (give details)
				+ Not significant
			* Ethnicity
				+ Significant (give details)
				+ Not significant
			* Smoking status
				+ Significant (give details)
				+ Not significant
			* Socioeconomic status
				+ Significant
				+ Not significant
			* Other tobacco control policies
				+ Significant (give details)
				+ Not significant
			* Other
	+ For studies on views about the introduction of plain packaging policies
		- What data are available on views on plain packaging policies?
			* Give details
			* None
		- List any benefits or harm identified to the introduction of plain packaging
			* Benefits
			* harm
			* None reported
		- Do the results highlight any facilitators or barriers to plain packaging? Tick all that apply
			* Facilitators
				+ Policymaker understanding of plain packaging - supportive
				*Acceptance of packaging as a promotional tool ii) Recognising that plain packaging may, on its own, or part of a comprehensive suite of measures, have potential public health benefits*
				+ Related policy and intervention supporting the use of plain packaging
				*A ban on all other forms of marketing ii) Strong tobacco control policies in general*
				+ Public and political support for plain packaging
				*i) High acceptance of plain packaging as a potential policy measure by governments ii) Approval of plain packaging from the public (both smokers and non-smokers)*
				+ Environmental considerations
				*i) Wide ranging marketing restrictions – absence of tobacco marketing the norm ii) Declining smoking prevalence iii) High percentage of smokers wanting to quit*
			* Barriers
				+ Policymaker understanding of plain packaging – not supportive
				*i) Packaging not accepted as a promotional tool ii) Not recognising that plain packaging, whether on its own or as part of a comprehensive suite of measures, has potential public health benefits*
				+ Related policy and intervention not supporting the use of plain packaging
				*i) Use of large health warnings or those with pictorial images ii) Ban of displays of tobacco within the retail environment ii) Weak tobacco control policies in general*
				+ Lack of public and political support for plain packaging
				*Low acceptance of plain packaging as a viable policy measure by governments ii) Lack of approval of plain packaging from the public (both smokers and non-smokers)*
				+ Environmental considerations
				*i) The possible impact on the illicit tobacco trade, and price of tobacco ii) Difficult financial climate iii) Potential of increasing smoking uptake*
				+ Tobacco industry and retailer response
				*i) Tobacco industry opposition; threats of legal action, reduced pricing by tobacco companies, potential impact on stimulating illicit trade and resultant loss of government taxes, etc ii) Retail industry opposition; impact on serving time, additional staff costs, inability to distinguish genuine from illicit product*
				+ Physiological
				*Nicotine addiction*
			* Other barriers and facilitators identified
			* None reported
	+ Other findings
		- Give details
	+ Relevance of the findings
		- Yes
		- To some degree
		- No
		- Unclear