

1 **The illicit cigarette market in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC):**
2 **findings from a cross-sectional study of empty cigarette packs**

3

4 Noreen Dadirai Mdege^{1,2,3*}, Christelle Tchoupe^{4,5}, Retselisitsoe Pokothoane^{3,6}, Didier
5 Mirindi⁵, Christus Cito Miderho⁷, Kelley Sams³, Patrick Shamba³, Emmanuel
6 Kandate⁵, Patrice Milambo⁸, Hana Ross⁹

7

8 ¹Department of Health Sciences, Faculty of Science, University of York, York, United
9 Kingdom

10 ²Centre for Research in Health and Development, York, United Kingdom

11 ³Development Gateway: An IREX Venture, Washington DC, USA

12 ⁴Laboratory for Survey & Research for Development, 12606 Douala-Bonanjo,
13 Cameroon

14 ⁵Research Initiatives for Social Development, Bukavu, DRC

15 ⁶Research Unit on the Economics of Excisable Products (REEP), School of
16 Economics, University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa

17 ⁷Département d'Agro-Vétérinaire, Institut Supérieur Pédagogique de Bukavu
18 (ISP/Bukavu), Bukavu, DRC

19 ⁸Programme National de Lutte Contre la Toxicomanie et les Substance Toxiques,
20 Ministère de la Santé Publique, Hygiène et Prévoyance Sociale, Kinshasa, DRC

21 ⁹University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa

22

23 *Corresponding author

24 Email: noreen.mdege@york.ac.uk (NDM)

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

25 **Abstract**

26 This study aimed to estimate the proportion of cigarettes consumed in the Democratic
27 Republic of the Congo (DRC) that are illicit and the extent of cigarette tax evasion; and
28 to identify the origins of and factors associated with illicit cigarettes. Data were
29 collected from May 15 to June 9, 2023. Stratified, multistage sampling was used to
30 select 32 health areas from which empty cigarette packs were collected. Each
31 collected pack was examined and classified as licit if it complied, or illicit if it did not
32 comply, with the DRC's tax stamp or written health warning requirements, or the
33 requirements to have a notice indicating the prohibition of sale by/to minors or
34 information on tar and nicotine content. We reported frequencies as numbers and
35 percentages, and means for continuous variables. We performed regression analysis
36 and used adjusted odds ratios (aOR) and their 95% confidence intervals (CI) to
37 measure associations. 8.6% of the 10622 empty cigarette packs collected were illicit.
38 All of the illicit packs were also identified as having evaded cigarette tax.
39 Approximately 8.0% of the collected packs did not comply with written health warning
40 requirements, 5.6% did not indicate the prohibition of sale by/to minors, and 4.5% did
41 not have information on tar and nicotine content. Packs from low-income areas were
42 more likely to be illicit than those collected from high-income areas (aOR 1.90; [95%
43 CI: 1.48-2.43]). The likelihood of being an illicit cigarette increased with increasing
44 susceptibility to armed conflict/insecurity. Packs from border provinces were less likely
45 to be illicit than those from non-border provinces (aOR 0.48; [95% CI: 0.25-0.90]). Our
46 results show that the illicit cigarette trade market in the DRC is currently small, and
47 most illicit cigarettes are imported from other countries. There is a need to secure the
48 cigarette supply chain, including strengthening border controls.

49

51 **Background**

52 In 2017-2018, 18% of men and 2% of women aged 15 to 49 years used tobacco in the
53 Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), and 13% and <1% smoked cigarettes,
54 respectively [1]. The DRC has progressively developed and implemented regulatory
55 measures aimed at reducing the consumption of tobacco products over the past three
56 decades. These include prohibiting the advertising, promotion and sponsorship of
57 tobacco, tobacco products and their derivatives; banning smoking in public places;
58 mandating written health warnings on tobacco products; and tobacco taxation,
59 although this is at 38.7% of the retail price, and falls short of the recommended 75%
60 [2].

61

62 In 2004, the country signed the World Health Organization Framework Convention on
63 Tobacco Control (WHO FCTC) which provides evidence-based policy interventions to
64 address the tobacco epidemic and its consequences, and ratified the treaty in 2005
65 [3]. In addition, the country also signed the Protocol to Eliminate Illicit Trade in Tobacco
66 Products in 2013 in recognition of the importance of combating illicit trade in tobacco
67 products by securing the supply chain, although this is yet to be ratified [4]. The illicit
68 trade of tobacco products undermines tobacco control and public health by increasing
69 access to the products, often cheaper ones, and thereby increasing consumption [5-
70 8]. The Protocol to Eliminate Illicit Trade in Tobacco Products covers measures such
71 as track and trace systems, licensing, due diligence, and issues related to internet-
72 and telecommunication-based sales, tobacco product transactions in free zones and
73 international transit, and duty-free sales [9].

74

75 The DRC shares its borders with nine countries: the Republic of Congo, Uganda,
76 Burundi, Rwanda, Tanzania, the Central African Republic, Sudan, Zambia and Angola.
77 The DRC has experienced persistent social and political instability throughout its
78 recent history which contributes to porous borders and increases its susceptibility to
79 the illegal importation of cigarettes from neighbouring countries. However, the extent
80 of illicit cigarette trade in the DRC has not been investigated before, so its size, trend
81 and characteristics are not documented or well understood. This hampers tobacco
82 control decision making, and is particularly important because the tobacco industry
83 often uses illicit tobacco trade as a reason to oppose effective tobacco control
84 measures such as tax increases [10]. This study, therefore, aimed to 1) estimate the
85 proportion of cigarettes consumed that are illicit, 2) estimate the extent of cigarette tax
86 evasion, 3) identify the origins of illicit cigarettes, and 4) identify factors associated
87 with illicit cigarettes.

88

89 **Methods**

90 **Study design**

91 We conducted a national-level, cross-sectional study in which empty cigarette packs
92 were collected [11, 12] from three types of collection points: stationary retailers, mobile
93 retailers, and garbage bins/streets. Stationary retailers sell from the same location
94 (e.g., shops, kiosks, and stalls), while mobile retailers are itinerant and sell cigarettes
95 on the move. By law, the sale of single cigarette sticks is not prohibited in the DRC
96 and is highly prevalent, which makes it possible to collect empty cigarette packs from
97 retailers. We also collected average cigarette retail price information for each brand
98 from retailers.

99 **Study setting**

100 The sampling of study locations was based on the structure of the DRC health pyramid
101 which spans from provinces, to health zones (HZs) within provinces, to health areas
102 (HAs) within HZs. We stratified the 26 provinces of the DRC into four groups based on
103 the level of porosity, i.e., border/non-border status and susceptibility to armed
104 conflict/insecurity. Stratum 1 had two provinces with very high-porosity (i.e., at the
105 border and highly susceptible to armed conflict); stratum 2 had one province with high-
106 porosity (at the border and the capital); stratum 3 included 14 provinces with
107 intermediate-porosity (i.e., border provinces that are not subject to armed conflicts);
108 and stratum 4 consisted of nine provinces with low-porosity (i.e., non-border provinces
109 with no particular security issues) (S1 Fig). We randomly sampled provinces from each
110 stratum with the number of provinces to be drawn from each stratum being
111 proportional to the weight of the stratum. The total number of provinces included in the
112 study was eight: one province each from stratum 1 (Ituri) and 2 (Kinshasa), four
113 provinces from stratum 3 (Haut-Katanga, Kasai-Central, Kwango, Nord-Ubangui), and
114 two provinces from stratum 4 (Tshopo and Sankuru).

115

116 For each sampled province, we grouped the HZs into two strata, i.e., urban and rural,
117 and we randomly sampled one HZ from each of the strata. The third level of sampling
118 involved randomly sampling two HAs from each participating HZ (S2 Fig). This yielded
119 a total of 32 HAs as sites for data collection (S1 Table).

120

121 **Criteria for identifying illicit empty cigarette packs**

122 By law, there are a number of requirements regarding what should be on a cigarette
123 pack sold in the DRC. These include a notice on the ban on the sale of tobacco to

124 minors and by minors, written health warnings, brand identifiers, information on tar
125 and nicotine content, and an affixed tax stamp. In addition, misleading names, words
126 or logos, for example, those that are likely to create confusion or give the impression
127 that a particular brand can promote fitness and well-being in general, are prohibited.
128 We conducted semi-structured one-on-one discussions and workshops with key
129 tobacco control stakeholders in the DRC, including the Programme National de Lutte
130 Contre la Toxicomanie et les Substance Toxiques (National Program for the Control
131 of Drug Addiction and Toxic Substances), Direction Générale des Douanes & Accises
132 (Directorate-General of Customs and Excise), and the Société Industrielle et
133 Commerciale des Produits Alimentaires (Industrial and Commercial Company of Food
134 Products), to agree on the definition of an illicit cigarette pack. From consensus with
135 these tobacco control stakeholders, an empty cigarette pack was classified as illicit if
136 it met any of the following criteria:

- 137 ● *cigarette tax evasion/non-compliance with tax stamp requirements* (i.e., no tax
138 stamp, has a duty-free stamp but collected from a retailer who is unauthorised to
139 sell duty-free cigarettes, or has the wrong stamp). Every cigarette pack in the DRC
140 should have a tax stamp that is orange if for locally manufactured cigarettes that
141 are intended for domestic consumption, grey for imported cigarettes, or green for
142 cigarettes intended for duty-free shops.
- 143 ● *non-compliance with written health warning requirements* (no written health
144 warnings on the two main sides, or has written health warnings in a language other
145 than French). Every pack of cigarettes must bear at least two of the following four
146 health warnings in French: “Smoking is harmful to health”, “Tobacco seriously
147 harms your health”, “Be careful, smoking kills”, or “Smoking is highly addictive”.

- 148 ● *absence of the notice indicating the prohibition of sale by/to minors.* By law, each
149 pack of cigarettes must bear the words “Prohibited for sale to minors and by
150 minors.” This notice must be printed in bold, indelible, and visible capital letters,
151 with a height of at least two millimetres, on the top of the right side of the pack.
- 152 ● *no information on tar and nicotine content.* Tar and nicotine content information
153 should be on the right side of each pack, and cover at least 20% of the side.

154

155 During data collection, we found that some empty cigarette packs had a yellow tax
156 stamp. This is an old stamp that was used for both imported and locally manufactured
157 cigarettes, and according to the Direction Générale des Douanes & Accises, cigarettes
158 imported after a transitional period of 60 days from April 15, 2022 should not bear this
159 stamp. However, there is a lack of clarity on whether those manufactured in the DRC,
160 or those imported before the transition period but are still on the shelves in the DRC
161 can still have the yellow stamp. In addition, there was recognition from some key
162 tobacco control stakeholders that the transition from yellow stamps is not yet complete.

163

164 **Data collection**

165 Data were collected from May 15 to June 9, 2023. We aimed to collect at least 10,000
166 empty cigarette packs in total from the eight provinces. This quantity was based on
167 information from similar studies [12, 13]. Data were collected by a team of 40 data
168 collectors and eight supervisors. The team was trained in the study protocol and data
169 collection process, including the recruitment of retailers, and the collection of empty
170 cigarette packs from retailers and garbage bins/streets. The team was also trained on
171 the use of data collection instruments, in particular, the questionnaires that were
172 programmed on tablets, and the Distance Meter application for measuring distance to

173 ensure that the data were collected only from the demarcated data collection grid.
174 Considering the size of the DRC, training took place in two phases: 1) the training of
175 the eight supervisors (one supervisor per province) from April 3 to 6, 2023; and 2) the
176 training of data collectors by the supervisors from April 10 to May 14, 2023. Pilot tests
177 were carried out in each province after the completion of classroom training.

178

179 **Empty cigarette pack collection**

180 Data collectors identified the centre of economic activity in an HA (e.g., the main
181 market) to serve as the starting point for data collection. They then collected empty
182 cigarette packs from consenting retailers and garbage bins/streets within a ~100m x
183 100m square grid (in urban areas) or a circle grid of ~800m in diameter (in rural areas)
184 around the starting point [14]. For the collection of packs from retailers, data collectors
185 approached retailers within the grid and informed them about the study. Those who
186 were interested in study participation were provided with written study information and
187 requested to provide verbal consent if they agreed to participate. Consenting retailers
188 were supplied with a prelabelled bag the same day and asked to deposit all empty
189 cigarette packs from single stick sales in the bag. The bags with empty packs were
190 retrieved the following day. Each collection bag had a unique identifier to distinguish
191 between retailers, HAs, HZs, provinces, and types of collection point (i.e., stationary
192 retailers, mobile retailers, and garbage bins/streets).

193

194 **Data extraction from empty cigarette packs**

195 Data were recorded using a questionnaire programmed in SurveyCTO [15]. We
196 recorded area-level information including the province, porosity stratum, HZ, HA,
197 rural/urban, and area-level income group. Retailer-level information included the type

198 of retailer and total number of packs collected (including by brand). For each empty
199 cigarette pack, we extracted information that included the brand name, manufacturer,
200 and country of origin. We also recorded whether the pack had a tax stamp, whether
201 the tax stamp was a DRC mandated stamp, and the colour of the stamp. We recorded
202 whether the pack had a written health warning, how many, the position and wording
203 of each warning, the language; whether the health warnings were printed in bold
204 capital letters, with black on a contrasting white background, and covered 30% of the
205 two main presentation areas of the pack; and whether the background reserved for
206 health warnings was framed by a distinctive black outline printed in bold. The collected
207 information also included whether the nicotine and tar content were stated, the location
208 of this information on the pack and whether it covered 20% of the side on which it was
209 located. We also collected information on whether the pack had the phrase
210 "PROHIBITED FOR SALE TO AND BY MINORS"; whether this was printed in bold
211 capital letters, indelible and visible, and was at least 2 mm high on the top right side
212 of the pack.

213

214 **Quantitative survey with retailers**

215 We used an interviewer-administered questionnaire to collect cigarette retail price data
216 from those retailers provided the empty cigarette packs. The questionnaire also
217 collected information on where retailers source their cigarettes, the brands of
218 cigarettes they sell, the sale and purchase prices of cigarettes, and the socio-
219 demographic characteristics of the retailers. The questionnaire was also programmed
220 in SurveyCTO [15].

221

222 The questionnaires used for this study were informed by literature reviews and
223 guidelines/toolkits for measuring the illicit trade of tobacco products [14, 16]. The
224 questionnaires were pretested before use and revised for clarity and relevance.

225

226 **Data analysis**

227 Our primary analysis considered packs with yellow stamps as legal if they did not meet
228 any other ‘illicit’ criteria. We conducted descriptive statistics to estimate the overall
229 proportion of empty cigarette packs (the proportion of cigarettes consumed) that was
230 illicit, as well as by type of collection point, province, porosity stratum, rural/urban,
231 area-level income group, imported/locally manufactured, brand and country of origin.
232 Additionally, the proportion of illicit packs was calculated based on each of the specific
233 criteria, i.e., cigarette tax evasion/ non-compliance with tax stamp requirements, non-
234 compliance with written health warning requirements, absence of the notice indicating
235 the prohibition of sale by/to minors and no information on tar and nicotine content. The
236 extent of tax evasion was determined by focusing on the proportion of cigarette packs
237 that did not have a tax stamp, had the wrong tax stamp or had a duty-free stamp but
238 were obtained from a retailer that is not authorised to sell duty-free cigarettes. The
239 frequencies were reported as numbers and percentages. We also calculated the
240 average retail price for a cigarette pack by brand.

241

242 We used logistic regression to examine the factors associated with being an illicit
243 cigarette pack, using adjusted odds ratios (aOR) and their 95% confidence intervals
244 (CI) as measures of association. We considered the following independent variables
245 based on literature that suggest their association with the prevalence of illicit cigarette
246 consumption [17, 18]: border/non-border province, area-level income status

247 (low/high), urban/rural health zone, collection point (stationary retailer/mobile
248 retailer/garbage bin or street), porosity stratum, country of origin, province, cigarette
249 manufacturer, cigarette brand, and whether the cigarettes were flavoured or not. Due
250 to high multicollinearity between some explanatory variables, we dropped three
251 independent variables: country of origin and province which were strongly correlated
252 with porosity stratum, and cigarette brand which was strongly correlated with country
253 of origin. High- and very high-porosity strata were combined into one category in the
254 regression analysis. Statistical significance was set at the 0.05 level. The analyses
255 were performed using STATA Version 17.0 [19].

256

257 We conducted sensitivity descriptive analyses in which we considered all imported
258 packs with a yellow stamp to be illicit.

259

260 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

261 Ethics approval was obtained from the National Health Ethics Committee of the
262 Ministry of Health of the DRC on May 3, 2023 (approval number
263 443/CNES/BN/PMMF/2023). The participating retailers were provided with study
264 information, including the study objectives, the procedures for participation, and the
265 right to abstain from participation in the study or to withdraw consent to participate at
266 any time without reprisals. They provided written informed consent to participate in the
267 study before taking part.

268

269

270 **Results**

271 **General characteristics of the empty cigarette packs**

272 A total of 10,622 empty cigarette packs were collected, of which 67.0% (7,116) were
273 from stationary retailers, 14.3% (1,522) were from mobile retailers and 18.7% (1,984)
274 were from garbage bins/streets (Table 1). Kwango province had the highest number
275 of packs collected (1,813; 17.1%) whilst the lowest number was from Sankuru province
276 583 (5.5%). Very high-porosity provinces contributed 13.9% (1,479) of the packs
277 collected, whilst high-porosity provinces contributed 16.4% (1,740), intermediate-
278 porosity provinces contributed 53.7% (5,702) and low-porosity provinces contributed
279 16.0% (1,701).

280

281 **Table 1. Proportion of illicit empty packs by type of collection point, porosity**
 282 **and province**

Porosity	Type of collection point							
	Stationary retailer		Mobile retailer		Garbage bins/ street		Total	
	Illicit	Total	Illicit	Total	Illicit	Total	Illicit	Total
Province	n(%)		n(%)		n(%)		n(%)	
Very-high								
Ituri	428 (32.1)	1,333	0 (0.00)	29	40 (34.2)	117	468 (31.6)	1,479
High								
Kinshasa	49 (5.3)	918	10 (1.9)	524	32 (10.7)	298	91 (5.2)	1,740
Intermedi	127	3,702	21	941	50	1,059	198	5,702
ate	(3.4)		(2.2)		(4.7)		(3.5)	
Haut-	3 (0.7)	424	0 (0.00)	129	6 (1.7)	361	9 (1.0)	914
Katanga								
Kasaï-	12 (1.4)	878	3 (0.9)	326	3 (1.6)	183	18 (1.3)	1,387
Central								
Kwango	49 (5.6)	879	18 (3.7)	486	38 (8.5)	448	105 (5.8)	1,813
Nord-	63 (4.1)	1,521	0 (//)	0	3 (4.5)	67	66 (4.2)	1,588
Ubangi								
Low	93	1,163	3	28	63	510	159	1,701

	(8.0)		(10.7)		(12.4)		(9.35)	
Sankuru	90	387	3	10	58	186	151	583
	(23.3)		(30.0)		(31.2)		(25.9)	
Tshopo	3	776	0	18	5	324	8	1,118
	(0.4)		(0.0)		(1.5)		(0.7)	
Total	697	7,116	34	1,522	185	1,984	916	10,622
	(9.8)		(2.2)		(9.3)		(8.6)	(100)

283

284 When considering urban/rural classification, this was 74.5% (7,918) and 25.5% (2,704)
 285 of the packs, respectively (Table 2). 67.1% (7,130) of the packs came from low-income
 286 areas and 32.9% (3,492) came from high-income areas. 45.5% (4,834) of the packs
 287 were of cigarettes manufactured in the DRC, and the rest were of imported cigarettes.
 288 Four brands, i.e., the Equateur, Monte Carlo, Master, and Pall Mall accounted for
 289 66.6% of the packs collected. None of the collected cigarette packs had a duty-free
 290 stamp.

291

292 **Table 2. Proportion of illicit empty packs by rural/urban, area-level income**
 293 **group, brand and country of origin**

	Total packs collected	Number of illicit packs	Proportion of illicit packs
Urban/rural			
Rural	2,704	219	8.1
Urban	7,918	697	8.8
Area-level income group			
High-income	3,492	357	10.2
Low-income	7,130	559	7.8
Brand			
Supermatch	894	465	52.0
Oris	532	380	71.4
Pall Mall	1,238	16	1.3
Monte Carlo	1,914	14	0.7
Stella	546	8	1.5
Business	147	8	5.4
Caesar	120	1	0.8
Ambassade	240	1	0.4
Elite	525	0	0.0
Equateur	2109	0	0.0
Master	1809	0	0.0
Portsman	262	0	0.0
Other brands	286	23	8.0

Country of origin			
DRC	4834	0	0.0
Uganda	403	400	99.3
United Arab Emirates	743	389	52.4
South Sudan	64	64	100
Kenya	2.108	26	1.2
India	16	16	100
Tanzania	2.178	14	0.6
South Africa	162	2	1.2
Angola	36	1	2.8
Zimbabwe	72	0	0.0
Other country	6	4	66.7
Total	10,622	916	8.62

294

295 **Proportion of empty cigarette packs that were illicit**

296 Overall, 8.6% (916) of the collected packs met at least one of the four criteria and were
 297 therefore classified as illicit (Table 1). 9.8% of packs from stationary retailers were
 298 illicit, and this was 2.2% of those collected from mobile retailers and 9.3% of those
 299 collected from garbage bins/streets. By province, the proportion of illicit cigarette packs
 300 ranged from 0.7% in Tshopo to 31.6% in Ituri. Very high-porosity provinces had the
 301 highest proportion of illicit cigarette packs of 31.6%, whilst this was 5.2% for those
 302 from high-porosity provinces, 3.5% for those from intermediate-porosity provinces and
 303 9.4% for those from low-porosity provinces. 8.1% of the packs collected in rural areas
 304 were illicit, whilst this was 8.8% for urban areas (Table 2). 7.8% of packs from low-

305 income areas and 10.2% of those from high-income areas were illicit. All of the illicit
306 packs were of imported cigarettes, meaning that 15.8% of imported packs were illicit.
307 When considering the different brands, 0% of Elite, Equateur, Master and Portsman
308 were illicit, whilst Supermatch and Oris had the highest proportions of illicit packs, at
309 52.0% and 71.4% respectively.

310
311 None of the packs originating from the DRC and Zimbabwe were illicit, whilst 100% of
312 those originating from South Sudan and India were illicit (Table 2). This was 99.2% of
313 those from Uganda, 52.4% of those from the United Arab Emirates, 2.8% of those
314 from Angola, 1.2% of those from South Africa, 1.2% of those from Kenya and 0.6% of
315 those originating from Tanzania.

316
317 All of the illicit packs did not comply with tax stamp requirements and were therefore
318 classified as having evaded cigarette tax (Table 3). Approximately 8.0% of the
319 collected packs did not comply with written health warning requirements. Of the 9774
320 packs that complied with written health warning requirements, 0.3% (33) had the
321 message "*Smoking is harmful to health*", 31.7% (3,101) had "*Tobacco seriously harms*
322 *your health*", 73.1% (7,142) had "*Smoking is highly addictive*", and none had the
323 message "*Be careful, smoking kills.*" 5.6% of all collected packs did not indicate the
324 prohibition of sale by/to minors, and 4.5% did not have information on tar and nicotine
325 content.

326

327

328 **Table 3. Proportion of illicit empty packs by type of collection point and illicit criteria**

Criteria	Type of collection point							
	Stationary retailer		Mobile retailer		Garbage bins/streets		Total	
	Illicit n (%)	Total	Illicit n (%)	Total	Illicit n (%)	Total	Illicit n (%)	Total
Tax stamp requirements	697 (9.8)	7,116	34 (2.2)	1,522	185 (9.3)	1,984	916 (8.6)	10,622
Written health warning	656 (9.2)	7,116	29 (1.9)	1,522	163 (8.2)	1,984	848 (8.0)	10,622
Notice of prohibition of sale to and by minors	505 (7.10)	7,116	6 (0.4)	1,522	87 (4.4)	1,984	598 (5.6)	10,622
Tar and nicotine content	435 (6.11)	7,116	0 (//)	1,522	47 (2.4)	1,984	482 (4.5)	10,622

329

330

331 When considering all imported packs with yellow stamps as illicit, 51.5% of the
332 collected packs met at least one of the four criteria and were therefore classified as
333 illicit. All of the illicit packs did not comply with tax stamp requirements and were
334 therefore classified having evaded cigarette tax. The proportions that met the other
335 criteria for illicit were similar to those found when considering all packs with yellow
336 stamps as legal packs. The proportion of illicit cigarettes by source, province, province
337 porosity stratum, urban/rural, area-level income group, brand, and country of origin for
338 the sensitivity analyses are provided in S2 to S4 Tables.

339

340 **Cigarette pack retail prices**

341 Cigarette pack retail price data were collected from 1236 retailers. The average retail
342 price of a pack of cigarettes by brand varied from 1309 to 3185 Congolese Francs
343 (~US\$0.50 to ~US\$1.15) (Table 4). Some brands that had a high proportion of illicit
344 cigarette packs, such as Oris, had some of the highest average retail prices for a pack,
345 whilst some where all packs were judged as legal, e.g., Elite, Equateur and Master,
346 had some of the lowest prices.

347

348

349 **Table 4. Average selling price of a pack of cigarettes by brand**

Average retail price per pack of cigarettes in Congolese Francs	
Brands	
Oris	3185
Ambassade	2216
Stella	2183
Business	1946
Caesar	1891
Pall Mall	1819
Portzman	1688
Monte Carlo	1676
Supermatch	1632
Master	1596
Equateur	1554
Elite	1156
Other brands	1309
Total	1765

350

351 **Factors associated with being an illicit cigarette pack**

352 Empty cigarette packs from low-income areas were more likely to be illicit (aOR 1.90;
353 [95 CI: 1.48 - 2.43]) than those collected from high-income areas (Table 5). Cigarette
354 packs sold in intermediate-porosity (aOR 3.36; [95% CI: 1.72 - 6.57]) and high-porosity
355 (aOR 17.15; [95% CI: 7.48 - 39.31]) strata were more likely to be illicit than those in
356 the low-porosity stratum.

357 **Table 5. Factor associated with illicit cigarette packs**

Variables	Overall Illicit Cigarette	
	Adjusted Odds Ratio	95% Confidence Interval (CI)
Area-level income group (ref: high income)		
Low income	1.896	(1.482 - 2.426)
Rural/urban (ref: rural)		
Urban	1.188	(0.878 - 1.607)
Porosity stratum (ref: low-porosity)		
Intermediate-porosity	3.361	(1.720 - 6.567)
High-porosity	17.15	(7.478 - 39.31)
Border/non-border province (ref: non-border)		
Border	0.478	(0.252 - 0.904)
Collection point (ref: stationary retailer)		
Garbage bins/streets	1.860	(1.380 - 2.507)
Mobile retailer	0.432	(0.275 - 0.680)
Manufacturer (ref: other manufacturers)		
British American Tobacco (BAT)	0.0188	(0.0121 - 0.0294)
Congo Tobacco Company Sarl (CTC)	0.000573	(0.0001 - 0.00409)
Oriental General Trading Inc	4.598	(3.166 - 6.678)
Tanzania Cigarette Public Limited Company	0.00571	(0.00323 - 0.0101)
Cigarette flavour (ref: no)		
Yes	1.839	(1.219 - 2.774)

358

359 Cigarette packs from border provinces were less likely to be illicit (aOR 0.48; [95% CI:
360 0.25 - 0.90]) than those from non-border provinces. Cigarette packs collected from
361 mobile retailers were less likely to be illicit (aOR 0.43; [95% CI: 0.28 - 0.68]), while
362 those collected from the garbage bins/streets were more likely (aOR 1.90; [95% CI:
363 1.38 - 2.51]) to be illicit, than those collected from the stationary retailers. Cigarette
364 packs that were flavoured were more likely to be illicit than those that were not
365 flavoured (aOR 1.84; [95% CI: 1.22 - 2.77]). There was no statistically significant
366 difference between those collected from urban and rural HZs with regard to the
367 likelihood of being illicit (aOR 1.19; [95% CI: 0.88 - 1.61]). The odds of being illicit when
368 considering the different cigarette manufacturers are also shown in Table 5.

369

370 The relationships between each of the independent variables and three of the illicit
371 criteria (i.e., cigarette tax evasion/non-compliance with tax stamp requirements, non-
372 compliance with written health warning requirements, or absence of the notice
373 indicating the prohibition of sale by/to minors) were similar to those between the each
374 of the independent variables and overall illicit classification in both magnitude and
375 direction (Table 6). The only differences were for 1) rural/urban HZs where packs from
376 urban HZs were more likely not to have the notice indicating the prohibition of sale
377 by/to minors than those from rural HZs (aOR 2.928; [95% CI: 2.022 - 4.240]); and 2)
378 for porosity stratum where the association was stronger for high-porosity stratum (aOR
379 278.9; [95% CI: 81.66 - 952.5]).

380

381

382 **Table 6. Factors associated with illicit cigarettes by criteria**

Variable	Non-compliance with tax stamp requirements Adjusted Odds Ratio (95% CI)	Non-compliance with written health warning requirements Adjusted Odds Ratio (95% CI)	Absence of the notice indicating the prohibition of sale by/to minors Adjusted Odds Ratio (95% CI)
Area-level income group (ref: high income)			
Low income	1.90 (1.49 - 2.44)	1.89 (1.46 - 2.45)	2.12 (1.65 - 2.71)
Rural/urban (ref: rural)			
Urban	1.20 (0.89 - 1.63)	1.29 (0.93 - 1.78)	2.93 (2.02 - 4.24)
Porosity stratum (ref: low-porosity)			
Intermediate-porosity	3.43 (1.74 - 6.73)	4.53 (2.04 - 10.08)	6.30 (2.21 - 17.93)
High-porosity	17.64 (7.64 - 40.77)	28.27 (10.94 - 73.03)	278.9 (81.66 - 952.5)
Border/non-border province (ref: non-border)			
Border	0.47 (0.24 - 0.89)	0.34 (0.16 - 0.72)	0.014 (0.004 - 0.042)
Collection point (ref : stationary retailer)			
Garbage bins/streets	1.87 (1.39 - 2.53)	1.75 (1.28 - 2.37)	1.02 (0.72 - 1.44)
Mobile retailer	0.44 (0.28 - 0.69)	0.47 (0.29 - 0.75)	0.12 (0.05 - 0.32)
Manufacturer (ref: other manufacturers)			

British American Tobacco (BAT)	0.019 (0.012 - 0.030)	0.0088 (0.0046 - 0.0170)	0.0028 (0.0008 - 0.0098)
Congo Tobacco Company Sarl (CTC)	-	0.0006 (0.0001 - 0.0045)	-
Oriental General Trading Inc	4.601 (3.17 - 6.71)	3.59 (2.46 - 5.25)	0.76 (0.53 - 1.10)
Tanzania Cigarette Public Limited Company	0.0058 (0.0033 - 0.0102)	0.0009 (0.0002 - 0.0037)	0.0007 (0.0001 - 0.0053)
Cigarette flavour (ref: no)			
Yes	1.88 (1.25 - 2.85)	2.52 (1.57 - 4.07)	1.68 (0.97 - 2.94)

383
384

385 Discussion

386 From our primary analysis, in the DRC, illicit cigarettes constitute approximately 8.6%
387 of the total cigarette market base. All of the illicit packs did not comply with tax stamp
388 requirements and were therefore classified as having evaded cigarette tax. 8.0% of
389 the collected packs did not comply with written health warning requirements. 5.6% of
390 all collected packs did not indicate the prohibition of sale by/to minors, and 4.5% did
391 not have information on tar and nicotine content. The chance of being an illicit cigarette
392 pack was higher for packs collected from low-income neighbourhoods than those from
393 high-income neighbourhoods, and increased with increasing level of province porosity

394 (i.e., susceptibility to armed conflict/insecurity). Flavoured cigarette packs were more
395 likely to be illicit than those for unflavoured cigarettes. Packs that were collected from
396 garbage bins/streets were more likely, whilst those collected from mobile retailers were
397 less likely, to be illicit than those collected from stationary retailers. Those collected
398 from border provinces were less likely to be illicit than those collected from non-border
399 provinces. There was no statistically significant difference in the likelihood of being an
400 illicit pack between those collected from urban HZs and those from rural HZs.

401

402 Other Sub-Saharan African country studies have shown that illicit cigarettes constitute
403 8.6% of the cigarette market in the Gambia [20] and 12.2% in Zambia [21]), which is
404 consistent with our findings. Global estimates suggest that on average, the illicit
405 cigarette trade market share is ~17% for low-income countries [10]. Other Sub-
406 Saharan African countries, however, have reported higher illicit trade market shares,
407 for example Ghana (20%) [11], Ethiopia (45.4%) [22] and South Africa (54%) [23]. This
408 could be because, in these countries, illegal cigarettes are on average cheaper than
409 legal purchases, whereas our results suggest an opposite trend in the DRC with illegal
410 cigarettes, all of which were imported, being more expensive on average than legal
411 cigarettes. In addition, contrary to findings from other Sub-Saharan African country
412 studies [11, 22], packs that were collected from border provinces were less likely to be
413 illicit than those collected from non-border provinces. This could suggest better
414 enforcement and compliance monitoring in border than non-border provinces in the
415 DRC.

416

417 We also found that the yellow stamp, an old stamp that was used for both imported
418 and locally manufactured cigarettes, which should have been phased out in 2022, is

419 currently still being used in the DRC. If all imported packs with the yellow stamps are
420 considered illicit, 51.5% of the cigarette market base becomes illicit.

421

422 The majority of the packs carried the written health warning “*Smoking is highly*
423 *addictive*”, whilst none had the message “*Be careful, smoking kills.*” Well-designed
424 health warnings and messages on tobacco product packages reduce tobacco
425 consumption by increasing public awareness of the negative health effects of tobacco
426 use. However, the tobacco industry is known to undermine the effectiveness of health
427 warnings in many ways, including through the use of weak message content and
428 opposing strengthened warnings [24].

429

430 **Policy and practice implications**

431 Our main analysis suggests that illicit cigarette trade in the DRC is low. However, there
432 is still a need to secure the cigarette supply chain to counter the supply of illicit
433 cigarettes in the DRC. In particular, there is a need to strengthen border controls,
434 resolve the issue of the old yellow stamp, establish a secured track and trace system
435 for cigarettes, and strengthen enforcement and compliance monitoring both centrally
436 and at the provincial level. The DRC should also strengthen its political commitment
437 to combating illicit cigarette trade by ratifying the WHO Protocol on Illicit Tobacco
438 Trade. In addition, there is a need to strengthen health warning requirements by
439 ensuring strong message content on all cigarette packs.

440

441 **Implications for future research**

442 There is a need to continuously monitor illicit cigarette trade over time in the DRC in
443 order to facilitate timely action, and enable the evaluation of the impact of any new

444 tobacco control measures (e.g., tax and price measures), where necessary. Regular
445 monitoring can, for example, help counter the tobacco industry's narrative that
446 increasing taxes result in considerable increases in illicit cigarette trade. Our study
447 suggests that non-compliance with cigarette tax stamp requirements is a good
448 indicator of whether a cigarette pack is legal/illicit in the DRC. This means that, if the
449 required data are available, regular monitoring could be more efficiently achieved by
450 measuring the difference between consumption and tax paid sales (i.e., gap analysis)
451 [14].

452
453 Different health warnings are applicable to, and resonate with, different people [24]. It
454 is therefore important to investigate the effectiveness of the different health warnings
455 that are being used in the DRC to ensure that those that are used are the most
456 effective. This should include the evaluation of their effectiveness in deterring young
457 people from initiating smoking, and motivating those who smoke to quit.

458

459 **Strengths and limitations**

460 This study is the first of its kind to estimate the illicit cigarette market share in the DRC.
461 Although our study was limited to eight out of the 26 provinces of the DRC, we
462 employed stratified, multistage random sampling to enhance the representativeness
463 and generalizability of the findings. Our study relied on retailers providing us with
464 empty cigarette packs, and it is possible that some retailers did not provide us with all
465 their illegal packs, leading to underestimation of the illicit cigarette market share [11].
466 We tried to mitigate this by concealing our specific interest in illicit cigarette packs: at
467 informed consent, we told retailers that we were interested in the characteristics of the
468 packs. We also compensated retailers with 2,000 Congolese Francs (~US\$1) for the

469 time they spent gathering the cigarette packs. These procedures were approved by
470 the ethics committee. Our reporting followed the Strengthening the Reporting of
471 Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) checklist for cross-sectional studies
472 [25], and the data used in the writing of this article is publicly available [26].

473

474 **Conclusions**

475 Our study found that 8.6% of the cigarette packs collected were illicit, and most of the
476 illicit cigarettes were imported from other countries. There is a need to secure the
477 cigarette supply chain to counter the supply of illicit cigarettes in the DRC. This
478 includes strengthening border controls and enforcement and compliance monitoring,
479 and establishing a secured track and trace system for cigarettes. Ratifying the WHO
480 Protocol on Illicit Tobacco Trade will strengthen the DRC's political commitment to
481 combating illicit cigarette trade.

482

483 **Acknowledgements**

484 This research was carried out within the framework of the Tobacco Control Data
485 Initiative (TCDI). TCDI is a project that encompasses six African nations (the
486 Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, Kenya, Nigeria, South Africa, and
487 Zambia). Its objective is to comprehend the tobacco-related data requirements of
488 these countries, assess existing data, pinpoint gaps in available tobacco data, gather
489 new data to address those gaps, and create tools to assist policymakers in utilising
490 crucial data more effectively for shaping tobacco policies. The initiative is spearheaded
491 by Development Gateway: an IREX Venture (DG), a global nonprofit organisation
492 specialising in data-driven development, in collaboration with the University of Cape

493 Town's Research Unit on the Economics of Excisable Products (REEP). We would
494 like to express our deep gratitude to the Ministère de la Santé Publique, Hygiène et
495 Prévoyance Sociale of the DRC and, specifically, the Programme National de Lutte
496 Contre la Toxicomanie et les Substance Toxiques for their exceptional commitment to
497 the realisation of this study. We also thank the cigarette retailers who collected and
498 provided us with the cigarette packs that were analysed in this study; and the field
499 investigators who collected them from the retailers and examined them to extract the
500 study data. Our gratitude also goes to members of the Study Steering Committee for
501 their guidance and advice throughout the study

502

503 REFERENCES

- 504 1. INS. Enquête par grappes à indicateurs multiples, 2017-2018, rapport de
505 résultats de l'enquête. Kinshasa: République Démocratique du Congo; 2019.
- 506 2. World Health Organization. WHO report on the global tobacco epidemic, 2021:
507 addressing new and emerging products. Geneva: World Health Organization;
508 2021.
- 509 3. United Nations Treaty Collection. Chapter IX: Health. 4. WHO Framework
510 Convention on Tobacco Control, Geneva, 21 May 2003.
511 [https://treaties.un.org/pages/ViewDetails.aspx?src=TREATY&mtdsg_no=IX-](https://treaties.un.org/pages/ViewDetails.aspx?src=TREATY&mtdsg_no=IX-4&chapter=9&clang=en)
512 [4&chapter=9&clang=en](https://treaties.un.org/pages/ViewDetails.aspx?src=TREATY&mtdsg_no=IX-4&chapter=9&clang=en). Accessed 05 Jul 2024.
- 513 4. United Nations. Treaty collections: 4. a Protocol to Eliminate Illicit Trade in
514 Tobacco Products.
515 [https://treaties.un.org/Pages/ViewDetails.aspx?src=TREATY&mtdsg_no=IX-4-](https://treaties.un.org/Pages/ViewDetails.aspx?src=TREATY&mtdsg_no=IX-4-a&chapter=9&clang=en)
516 [a&chapter=9&clang=en](https://treaties.un.org/Pages/ViewDetails.aspx?src=TREATY&mtdsg_no=IX-4-a&chapter=9&clang=en). Accessed 05 Jul 2024.

- 517 5. Guindon GE, Tobin S, Yach D. Trends and affordability of cigarette prices: ample
518 room for tax increases and related health gains. *Tob Control*. 2002;11:35-43.
519 <https://doi.org/10.1136/tc.11.1.35>.
- 520 6. Felsing R, Groman E. Price policy and taxation as effective strategies for
521 tobacco control. *Front Public Health*. 2022;10:851740.
522 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2022.851740>.
- 523 7. Paraje G, Stoklosa M, Blecher E. Illicit trade in tobacco products: recent trends
524 and coming challenges. *Tob Control*. 2022;31:257-62. doi:
525 <https://doi.org/10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2021-056557>.
- 526 8. Bader P, Boisclair D, Ferrence R. Effects of tobacco taxation and pricing on
527 smoking behavior in high risk populations: a knowledge synthesis. *Int J Environ*
528 *Res Public Health*. 2011;8:4118-39. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph8114118>.
- 529 9. World Health Organization. Protocol to Eliminate Illicit Trade in Tobacco
530 Products. 2013. <https://fctc.who.int/protocol/overview>. Accessed 08 Apr 2024.
- 531 10. Joossens L, Merriman D, Ross H, Raw M. The impact of eliminating the global
532 illicit cigarette trade on health and revenue. *Addiction*. 2010;105:1640-9.
533 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1360-0443.2010.03018.x>.
- 534 11. Singh A, Ross H, Dobbie F, Gallagher A, Kinnunen T, Logo DD, et al. Extent of
535 illicit cigarette market from single stick sales in Ghana: findings from a cross-
536 sectional survey. *BMJ Open*. 2023;13:e062476. [https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2022-062476)
537 [2022-062476](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2022-062476).
- 538 12. John RM, Ross H. Illicit cigarette sales in Indian cities: findings from a retail
539 survey. *Tob Control*. 2018;27:684-8. [https://doi.org/10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2017-](https://doi.org/10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2017-053999)
540 [053999](https://doi.org/10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2017-053999).

- 541 13. Barker DC, Wang S, Merriman D, Crosby A, Resnick EA, Chaloupka FJ.
542 Estimating cigarette tax avoidance and evasion: evidence from a national sample
543 of littered packs. *Tob Control*. 2016;25 Suppl 1:i38-i43.
544 <https://doi.org/10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2016-053012>.
- 545 14. Stoklosa M, Paraje G, Blecher E. A toolkit on measuring illicit trade in tobacco
546 products. *A Tobacconomics and American Cancer Society Toolkit*. Chicago, IL:
547 Tobacconomics, Health Policy Center, Institute for Health Research and Policy,
548 University of Illinois at Chicago; 2020.
- 549 15. Dability Inc. SurveyCTO. 2024. <https://www.surveycto.com/>. Accessed 08 Apr
550 2024.
- 551 16. Institute for Global Tobacco Control. Assessing compliance with tobacco
552 packaging and labeling regulations. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Bloomberg
553 School of Public Health; 2020.
- 554 17. Aziani A, Calderoni F, Dugato M. Explaining the consumption of illicit cigarettes. *J*
555 *Quant Criminol*. 2021;37(3):751-89. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10940-020-09465-7>.
- 556 18. van der Zee K, Vellios N, van Walbeek C, Ross H. The illicit cigarette market in
557 six South African townships. *Tobacco Control*. 2020;29 Suppl 4:s267.
558 <https://doi.org/10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2019-055136>.
- 559 19. StataCorp LLC. Stata. 2024. <https://www.stata.com/>. Accessed 08 Apr 2024.
- 560 20. Chisha Z, Janneh ML, Ross H. Consumption of legal and illegal cigarettes in the
561 Gambia. *Tob Control*. 2020;29 Suppl 4:s254-s9.
562 <https://doi.org/10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2019-055055>.
- 563 21. Zyambo C, Phiri MM, Mwamulela W, Zulu R, Maka M, Camara A, et al. Illicit
564 cigarette trade and tax evasion in Zambia: findings from the Tobacco Control
565 Data Initiative 2023. *BMJ Open*. 2024.

- 566 22. Dauchy E, Ross H. Is illicit cigarette market a threat to tobacco control in
567 Ethiopia? *Nicotine Tob Res.* 2022;24:1228-33.
568 <https://doi.org/10.1093/ntr/ntac021>.
- 569 23. Vellios N, van Walbeek C, Ross H. Illicit cigarette trade in South Africa: 2002-
570 2017. *Tob Control.* 2020;29 Suppl 4:s234-s42.
571 <https://doi.org/10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2018-054798>.
- 572 24. Cunningham R. Tobacco package health warnings: a global success story. *Tob*
573 *Control.* 2022;31:272-283. <https://doi.org/10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2021-056560>.
- 574 25. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gotsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP.
575 The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology
576 (STROBE) Statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. *J Clin*
577 *Epidemiol.* 2008;61:344-349. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2007.11.008>.
- 578 26. Development Gateway: An IREX Venture. The illicit cigarette market in the DRC:
579 datasets from a cross-sectional study of empty cigarette packs [Data set].
580 Zenodo. 2024. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12359650>.
581
582

583 **Supporting information**

584 **S1 Fig. Provinces by strata**

585 **S2 Fig. Illustration of sampling provinces, health zones and health areas by**
586 **stratum**

587 **S1 Table. Participating health zones and health areas by province and**
588 **urban/rural classification**

589 **S2 Table. Proportion of illicit empty packs by type of collection point, porosity**
590 **and province with all imported yellow stamps as illicit**

591 **S3 Table. Proportion of illicit empty packs by rural/urban, area-level income**
592 **group, brand and country of origin with all imported yellow stamps as illicit**

593 **S4 Table. Proportion of illicit empty packs by type of collection point and illicit**
594 **criteria with all imported yellow stamps as illicit**

595