

Supplemental Table 1. Detailed description of methodological steps used to collect and analyze study data from focus group participants.

Methodological step	Description of approach
Purposive sampling approach to recruitment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Enumerated urban and rural subdistricts in each region using poverty map data provided by the World Bank, 2016 for Bangladesh 2. Purposively selected one urban and one rural sub-district per region based on the following criteria: (a) population size \geq 100,000 individuals; (b) approximately 50% of population lives in poverty; (c) feasible to travel to sub-district for recruitment 3. Purposively selected 3-6 neighborhoods, known as wards, within each sub-district based on travel feasibility 4. Recruiters visited first selected ward, mapped a block of 60 households, identified a random starting point, and visited every other dwelling to recruit and enroll individuals via eligibility survey; only one participant [age 18 years and older] per household was recruited and every other household visited to reduce likelihood that participants in a focus group were family or direct neighbors 5. Recruitment proceeded to the next 2-5 wards until all focus group quotas filled
Development of structured discussion guide and pack ranking activities	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Study authors LC and SS prepared a draft of the discussion guide using a discussion guide fielded in a prior study conducted at Johns Hopkins (see https://tobaccocontrol.bmj.com/content/30/3/293.abstract) as an example 2. Study authors ABMR and MIS reviewed discussion guide and provided suggested changes to adapt questions to the Bangladesh context 3. Study author JEC conducted a final review of the guide and provided feedback on how to streamline questions 4. Study author ABMR translated final guide and trained all moderators, allowing for time to ask clarifying questions and pilot test the guide and pack ranking activity; minor changes were made to improve the flow of pack ranking, add in SLT terms specific to Sylhet dialect 5. Two focus groups were conducted to assess how the guide worked with participants; the guide worked well and no changes were made 6. Remaining 26 focus groups were conducted using the guide which contained the following questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perceived attractiveness of existing zordha and gul packs >>Participants view zordha and gul products and place on own attractiveness scale.<< a) How would you group these products in terms of product attractiveness? b) Why do these products belong together as the most attractive products? What features do they share that make them more appealing or attractive than other products? <i>Probe:</i> Shape? Material? Size? Color? Imagery? Descriptors? Flavoring/taste? Quality? Price? c) What is the most important attribute of a zordha or gul product pack that contributes to its attractiveness? (e.g. shape, colors, design, price) d) How do these groups of packs differ? What features do they share that make them less attractive versus the other products? <i>Probe:</i> Shape? Material? Size? Color/shine? Imagery? Descriptors? Flavoring/taste? Quality? Price? e) Would anyone group these packs in a different way? Why? Noticeability of health warning labels on current zordha and gul packs >>Participants view zordha and gul products and place on own noticeability scale.<< a) How would you group these packs in terms of how much you notice the health warning label? b) Why do the warning labels on these packs stand out more? What makes them more noticeable? <i>Probe:</i> Warning label placement on pack? Color? Image type? Image quality (sharp, blurry, etc.)? c) Why do the warning labels on these packs stand out the least? What makes them less noticeable? <i>Probe:</i> Warning label placement on pack? Color? Image type? Image quality (sharp, blurry)? d) Would anyone rank these packs differently? Why? Perceived harmfulness of current zordha and gul packs >>Participants view zordha and gul products and place on own harmfulness scale.<< a) How would you group these packs in terms of harmfulness? b) Why are these packs grouped as the most harmful? And the least harmful? (e.g. descriptors, color/shine, images, flavor, product type etc.) c) Does anyone disagree with this grouping? What packs would you move around? d) How does the type of health warning label on the pack influence your grouping? e) How does the placement or visibility of the health warning label on the packs influence your grouping?

	<p>Perceived attractiveness and harm perceptions of proposed standardized packaging</p> <p>>>Ask participants to take out their standard zordha and gul<<</p> <p>a) Compared to the existing products, how attractive or appealing do you find Product Z (zordha)? Why? How would you rate it on the scale? Now, Product G (gul) – how attractive or appealing do you find Product G compared to existing packs? Why? Rating? <i>Probe</i>: Shape? Material? Size? Price? Quality? Warning labels? Other factors (e.g., color, imagery, descriptors, flavoring/taste)?</p> <p>b) Compared to the existing products, how noticeable is the warning label on Product Z (zordha)? Why? How would you rate it on the scale? Now Product G (gul)? How noticeable is the warning label on Product G compared to existing packs? Why? Rating? <i>Probe</i>: Warning label placement on pack? Color? Image type? Image quality (sharp, blurry, etc.)?</p> <p>c) How harmful is Product Z (zordha) compared to the existing zordha products we looked at? Why? How would you rate it on the scale? How harmful is Product G (gul) compared to the existing gul products? Why? How would you rate it on the scale? <i>Probe</i>: What features make Product Z (zordha) or Product G (gul) seem more or less harmful?</p> <p>d) <i>Follow-up (if not discussed)</i>: To what extent, does the placement of the warning labels on Product Z (zordha) and Product G (gul) influence how harmful these products seem?</p>
Data processing	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> All focus groups were audio recorded using two audio recording devices. Professional transcriptionists hired by Bangladesh Center for Communication Programs (BCCP) transcribed audio recordings into Bangla Staff at BCCP who were fluent in Bangla and English translated Bangla transcripts into English Study author ABMR reviewed the English transcripts against the Bangla transcripts to confirm accuracy of translation
Codebook development and coding strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Study author LC developed a codebook of 24 <i>a priori</i> codes based on the content of the discussion guide questions and an initial review of all 28 English transcripts (version1) Study authors SS, LK, ABMR provided feedback on the initial codebook and some code definitions were revised (version2) Study authors LC, SS, LK applied <u>version2</u> codebook to two English transcripts and met to review coding, make refinements to code definition and instructions on how to use the code, and add example quotes that fit the code; no new codes added (version3) Study authors LC, SS, LK applied <u>version3</u> of the codebook to the same two English transcripts and met to review coding and make further refinement to the code definitions, instructions, and examples; no new codes added (version4) Study authors LC, SS, LK applied <u>version4</u> to three new English transcripts to assess inter-rater reliability; LC, SS, LK met to discuss IRR results and any discrepancies in coding, as well as make final refinement to codebook; no new codes added (version5) Study author LC assigned English transcripts to coding team based on region: SS coded 8 Sylhet transcripts; LK coded 8 Khulna transcripts; LC coded 12 Dhaka transcripts Study authors LC, SS, LK applied the final <u>version5</u> of the codebook (see Supplemental Table 2) to assigned transcripts; coding was completed independently over three weeks
Data analysis	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Study author LC reviewed coded data excerpts first for familiarity; no notes were taken Study author LC reviewed coded excerpts a second time, taking notes on themes starting to appear across transcripts, paying attention to similarities and differences by tobacco use status, region, urbanicity, and gender Study author LC reviewed coded excerpts a third time, adding more details and nuances to notes to flesh out the major themes and how groups are similar or different across tobacco use status, region, urbanicity, and gender Study author LC shared notes with other coders SS, LK and coauthor ABMR to assess whether findings ‘rang true’; no changes made Study author LC reviewed coded excerpts a fourth time to confirm analysis, add additional detail to notes, and select exemplar quotes Study author LC worked back and forth between written notes/analysis and coded excerpts to see if there were any patterns in how certain codes worked together (e.g., HWL placement and HWL image) and added in patterns observed into written notes/analysis Study author LC wrote up results into a manuscript narrative using sub-headers to organize by topic area All coauthors reviewed results, asked clarifying questions, and study author LC revised content to improve readability