

# 1 Delayed effects of cigarette graphic warning labels on smoking behavior

2  
3 Zhenhao Shi, PhD<sup>1</sup>, An-Li Wang, PhD<sup>2</sup>, Janet Audrain-McGovern, PhD<sup>1</sup>, Kevin G. Lynch, PhD<sup>1</sup>, James Loughead,  
4 PhD<sup>1</sup>, Daniel D. Langleben, MD<sup>1</sup>

5  
6 <sup>1</sup>Department of Psychiatry, University of Pennsylvania Perelman School of Medicine, Philadelphia, PA 19104  
7 <sup>2</sup>Department of Psychiatry, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, NY 10029

## 9 SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

### 11 Statistical analysis

12 CPD was first log<sub>10</sub>-transformed due to high right-skewness and then entered in the generalized estimating  
13 equation (GEE) model with identity link and robust/sandwich standard errors to test the effects of group, time, and  
14 group×time interaction while controlling for baseline, using the R package “geepack”<sup>1</sup>. Marginal means were  
15 estimated using the R package “emmeans”. Missing values for CPD at baseline were imputed by substitution with  
16 values collected upon enrollment given no statistical difference between the two time points (Wilcoxon signed-rank  
17 test, p=0.85).

### 19 Participant characteristics

20 Participant characteristics are summarized in **Table S1** as well as in Shi, et al.<sup>2</sup>. There was no difference in  
21 baseline characteristics between the high-ER and low-ER groups (ps>0.19). Attrition rate at week 4 and week 8 did  
22 not differ between the high-ER and low-ER groups ( $\chi^2(1)=0.27$  & 0.00, p=0.60 & 1.00).

### 24 Handling of missing CPD data

25 GEE modeling assumes that responses were missing completely at random (MCAR)<sup>3</sup>. To assess the  
26 sensitivity of the inferences to missingness mechanisms, we performed similar analyses using linear mixed effects  
27 (LME) modeling and inverse-probability-weighted GEE (IPW-GEE) modeling, which assume missing at random  
28 (MAR), where the missing values may depend on observed variables.

29 Using the “lme4” and “lmerTest” packages in R, we fitted an LME model using restricted maximum  
30 likelihood estimation. Statistical significance was evaluated using the Satterthwaite approximation for degrees of  
31 freedom<sup>4</sup>. Similar to the GEE results, the group×time interaction was not significant (F(1,110)=0.37, p=0.54), and  
32 there were significant main effects of group (F(1,122)=4.94, p=0.028) and time (F(1,112)=12.89, p<0.001).

33 We fitted two IPW-GEE models to handle missing CPD at week 4 and week 8. The probability (*p*) of  
34 missing data was calculated using a logistic regression model that included baseline characteristics as predictors  
35 (see **Table S1**). For each participant, the weight was calculated as  $A/p+(1-A)/(1-p)$ , where *A*=1 if post-treatment  
36 data were missing and *A*=0 otherwise. The weights were subsequently truncated to the middle 95% of the  
37 distribution to minimize the impact of extreme weights<sup>5</sup>. Similar to the GEE results, the IPW-GEE model that  
38 accounted for missing CPD at week 4 showed that the group×time interaction was not significant ( $\chi^2(1)=0.32$ ,  
39 p=0.57), and there were significant main effects of group ( $\chi^2(1)=5.57$ , p=0.018) and time ( $\chi^2(1)=8.97$ , p=0.002).  
40 Likewise, the IPW-GEE model that accounted for missing CPD at week 8 showed that the group×time interaction  
41 was not significant ( $\chi^2(1)=0.19$ , p=0.67), and there were significant main effects of group ( $\chi^2(1)=7.27$ , p=0.007) and  
42 time ( $\chi^2(1)=11.65$ , p<0.001).

### 44 References

- 45 1. Halekoh U, Højsgaard S, Yan J. The R package geepack for generalized estimating equations. *Journal of*  
46 *Statistical Software* 2006;15(2):1-11.
- 47 2. Shi Z, Wang A-L, Fairchild VP, et al. Effects of emotional arousal on the neural impact and behavioral efficacy  
48 of cigarette graphic warning labels. *Addiction* 2023;118(5):914-24.
- 49 3. Molenberghs G, Verbeke G. Models for discrete longitudinal data. New York, NY: Springer 2005.

- 1 4. Luke SG. Evaluating significance in linear mixed-effects models in R. *Behavior Research Methods*  
2 2017;49(4):1494-502. doi: 10.3758/s13428-016-0809-y
- 3 5. Cole SR, Hernán MA. Constructing inverse probability weights for marginal structural models. *American*  
4 *Journal of Epidemiology* 2008;168(6):656-64.

5  
6  
7 **Table 1.** Participant characteristics

<b>Characteristics</b>	<b>High-ER (n=84)</b>	<b>Low-ER (n=84)</b>
<b>Sex</b>		
Male, No. (%)	45 (53.57)	46 (54.76)
Female, No. (%)	39 (46.43)	38 (45.24)
<b>Age (year)</b>		
Mean (SD)	29.51 (9.68)	28.13 (8.36)
Median (IQR)	28.00 (21.00–35.00)	26.00 (22.00–32.25)
<b>Race</b>		
Caucasian, No. (%)	45 (53.57)	47 (55.95)
African American, No. (%)	22 (26.19)	19 (22.62)
Asian, No. (%)	7 (8.33)	7 (8.33)
Multiracial/other, No. (%)	10 (11.90)	11 (13.10)
<b>Ethnicity</b>		
Hispanic, No. (%)	11 (13.10)	5 (5.95)
Non-Hispanic, No. (%)	73 (86.90)	79 (94.05)
<b>Handedness</b>		
Left, No. (%)	13 (15.48)	11 (13.10)
Right, No. (%)	66 (78.57)	68 (80.95)
Both, No. (%)	5 (5.95)	5 (5.95)
<b>Age of initiation (year)</b>		
No. of participants	83	84
Mean (SD)	16.55 (3.46)	17.45 (4.32)
Median (IQR)	16.00 (15.00–18.00)	17.00 (15.00–18.00)
<b>Fagerström Test for Nicotine Dependence score</b>		
No. of participants	82	83
Mean (SD)	4.59 (2.58)	4.42 (2.43)
Median (IQR)	5.00 (3.00–6.75)	5.00 (3.00–6.00)
<b>Number of cigarettes per day, week 0</b>		
No. of participants	84	83
Mean (SD)	13.43 (8.34)	12.31 (6.62)
Median (IQR)	12.00 (8.00–18.00)	10.00 (7.00–18.00)
<b>Number of cigarettes per day, week 4</b>		
No. of participants	60	63
Mean (SD)	13.47 (8.35)	10.22 (6.91)
Median (IQR)	12.00 (7.75–18.00)	9.00 (6.00–12.50)
<b>Number of cigarettes per day, week 8</b>		
No. of participants	56	56
Mean (SD)	10.28 (7.33)	9.37 (6.60)
Median (IQR)	9.00 (5.00–14.13)	8.75 (3.88–12.63)
<b>Abbreviations:</b> ER, emotion reaction; SD, standard deviation; IQR, interquartile range.		