

## Appendix

**Appendix Table 1: Inter-rater Reliability Statistics, TPackSS China, Wave 3, 2023 (N=471).**

<b>Design Element</b>	<b>Agreement (%)</b>	<b>PABAK*</b>
<b>Use of consistent colors/patterns in HWL &amp; other areas</b>		
- Front	98.3%	0.97
- Back	97.9%	0.96
<b>Branding below HWL</b>		
- Front	86.2%	0.72
- Back	86.6%	0.73
<b>Lack of text &amp; background contrast</b>		
- Front	87.2%	0.74
- Back	87.7%	0.75
<b>Use of multiple colors</b>		
HWL text		
- Front	98.5%	0.97
- Back	98.1%	0.96
HWL background		
- Front	97.7%	0.95
- Back	98.3%	0.97
<b>Other design elements</b>		
Incomplete/split HWL		
- Front	98.3%	0.97
- Back	98.7%	0.97

Notes: \*PABAK - Prevalence-adjusted and bias-adjusted kappa.

**Appendix Table 2: Use of Branding Elements by Brand Family, TPackSS China, Wave 3, 2023 (N=418\*).**

Brand Family	N	Use of Consistent Colors/Patterns in HWL & Other Areas		Branding Below HWL	
		Front** n (%)	Back** n (%)	Front** n (%)	Back** n (%)
Shuangxi	30	28 (93.3%)	28 (93.3%)	6 (20.0%)	6 (20.0%)
Yuxi	27	21 (77.8%)	21 (77.8%)	9 (33.3%)	9 (33.3%)
Nanjing	26	24 (92.3%)	25 (96.2%)	6 (23.1%)	5 (19.2%)
Yellow Crane Tower	21	20 (95.2%)	20 (95.2%)	11 (52.4%)	11 (52.4%)
Yunyan	21	19 (90.5%)	20 (95.2%)	8 (38.1%)	8 (38.1%)
Goldenleaf	18	14 (77.8%)	14 (77.8%)	8 (44.4%)	8 (44.4%)
Liqun	16	11 (68.8%)	11 (68.8%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Septwolves	15	11 (73.3%)	12 (80.0%)	1 (6.7%)	0 (0.0%)
Taishan	15	15 (100.0%)	15 (100.0%)	1 (6.7%)	1 (6.7%)
Zhongnanhai	14	14 (100.0%)	14 (100.0%)	1 (7.1%)	1 (7.1%)
Huangshan	13	12 (92.3%)	12 (92.3%)	2 (15.4%)	2 (15.4%)
Furongwang	12	12 (100.0%)	12 (100.0%)	8 (66.7%)	8 (66.7%)
Guiyan	12	11 (91.7%)	11 (91.7%)	4 (33.3%)	3 (25.0%)
Baisha	11	10 (90.9%)	10 (90.9%)	7 (63.6%)	7 (63.6%)
Pride	11	11 (100.0%)	11 (100.0%)	3 (27.3%)	3 (27.3%)
Tianzi	11	11 (100.0%)	11 (100.0%)	4 (36.4%)	4 (36.4%)
Chunghwa	10	10 (100.0%)	10 (100.0%)	10 (100.0%)	8 (80.0%)
Changbaishan	9	9 (100.0%)	9 (100.0%)	2 (22.2%)	1 (11.1%)
Honghe	9	8 (88.9%)	9 (100.0%)	1 (11.1%)	1 (11.1%)
Hongtashan	9	8 (88.9%)	8 (88.9%)	2 (22.2%)	2 (22.2%)
Jinsheng	9	9 (100.0%)	9 (100.0%)	3 (33.3%)	3 (33.3%)
Diamond	8	7 (87.5%)	7 (87.5%)	2 (25.0%)	2 (25.0%)
Peony	8	8 (100.0%)	8 (100.0%)	3 (37.5%)	3 (37.5%)
Zhenlong	8	8 (100.0%)	8 (100.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
555	7	7 (100.0%)	7 (100.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Haomao	7	7 (100.0%)	7 (100.0%)	3 (42.9%)	3 (42.9%)
Double Happiness	6	6 (100.0%)	6 (100.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Lanzhou	6	6 (100.0%)	6 (100.0%)	2 (33.3%)	2 (33.3%)
Longfengchengxiang	6	6 (100.0%)	6 (100.0%)	1 (16.7%)	1 (16.7%)
Suyan	6	6 (100.0%)	6 (100.0%)	2 (33.3%)	0 (0.0%)
Dongchongxiacao	5	5 (100.0%)	5 (100.0%)	2 (40.0%)	2 (40.0%)
Hengta	5	1 (20.0%)	1 (20.0%)	4 (80.0%)	4 (80.0%)
Marlboro	5	5 (100.0%)	5 (100.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Mevius	5	5 (100.0%)	5 (100.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Nanyang-Double Happiness	5	3 (60.0%)	3 (60.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)

Brand Family	N	Use of Consistent Colors/Patterns in HWL & Other Areas		Branding Below HWL	
		Front** n (%)	Back** n (%)	Front** n (%)	Back** n (%)
Alishan	4	1 (25.0%)	1 (25.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Esse	4	4 (100.0%)	4 (100.0%)	4 (100.0%)	3 (75.0%)
Kent	4	3 (75.0%)	3 (75.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)

Notes:\*Only brand families with at least four unique packs were shown. \*\*Significant differences in use of consistent colors/patterns in HWL and other areas and in branding below HWL were detected across brand families ( $p < 0.05$ ).