

Public Regulation and Its Impact on Cigarette Demand in Pakistan: A Critical Review

Assad Ullah Khan¹, Farman Ullah Khan², Sami Ullah Khan³, Shalil Zaman⁴ and Mansoor Khan⁵

<https://doi.org/10.62345/jads.2026.15.1.29>

Abstract

This study attempts to estimate cigarette's demand model in Pakistan. To this end, the study utilizes aggregate time series data which covers the period from 1981 to 2018. The Hausman's test statistics reject the null hypothesis of exogenous cigarette prices. That is, the test confirms that cigarette prices are endogenous in nature, suggesting that cigarette prices are influenced by public policies and market conditions. Employing Instrumental Variable (IV) method, the study finds that cigarette prices negatively influence cigarette consumption. Specifically, cigarette consumption reduces in the range of 3% to 5% to a 10% increase in cigarette prices. Moreover, individual's increases cigarette consumption in the range of 3.7% to 7.5% in response to a 10% increase in their real income. Further, increasing enrollment at public sector universities also gives rise to increased smoking. Finally, public regulations like health warnings, ban on cigarette advertisement and promotions significantly discourage smoking. The analysis recommends enforcement of public regulations to discourage smoking behavior in Pakistan.

Keywords: Public Regulations, Endogenous Cigarette Prices, Excise Taxes, Market Dynamics, Smoking Behavior.

Introduction

Cigarette smoking is a leading source of diseases including cardiovascular and lung cancer, giving rise to worldwide morbidity and mortality. Hence, to reduce the health risk of smoking, world's governments have suggested a wide range of price and non-price regulations to discourage smoking. Among regulations cigarette taxes is the most prominent, which increases the price of cigarettes and thus making it less affordable. In the same line, non-price regulations include pictorial health warnings on cigarette packets, ban on cigarette advertisements and promotions. Non-price regulations play a significant role in shaping social norms against smoking, disseminating knowledge and information about the negative health consequences of smoking. Although, both developed and developing regions are facing challenges to curb smoking, however, smoking prevalence is high in developing region compared to developed countries of the world. The declining rate of smoking in developed countries is mainly due to high tobacco taxes, coordinated and strict public regulations on cigarette advertisement and promotions. The high

¹Assistant Professor Economics, UST, Bannu, Corresponding Author Email: asadwazir82@yahoo.com

²Lecturer in Economics, GPGC, Bannu. Email: farmanbannu333@gmail.com

³Associate Professor of Economics, Govt. Collage of Management, Miranshah, NWD, KP. Email: profsami3436@gmail.com

⁴Elementary and Secondary Education Department, KP, Email: shalilzaman@gmail.com

⁵SS, Economics, E&SE Department, KP: Email. mansoorco18@gmail.com



smoking trend in developing countries is, however due to cheap tobacco prices and lack of effective implementation of smoking control measures.

Pakistan has enacted tobacco control laws, however tobacco consumption is still high due to aggressive tobacco marketing, cheap tobacco products and acceptability of smoking in various parts of the country. According to World Health Organization (WHO, 2015, 2019) 31.8% male, 5.8% female, and 19.1% adults are using tobacco products in Pakistan. More specifically, among tobacco users 17.9% male, 1% female and 9.6% adults consuming cigarettes. In the same line of reasoning, Global Adult Tobacco Survey (GATS, 2018) reports that about 24 million (19.1 %) adults in Pakistan uses tobacco in one form or the other. Among these 15.6 million adults uses smoking tobacco, 3.7 million uses water pipe or shisha, and 9.6 million adults uses smokeless tobacco. Many researchers have empirically analyzed the effects of tobacco taxation and other non-price control measures on tobacco consumption in Pakistan (Ahsan et al., 2020; Ahsan et al., 2015; Alam et al., 2008; Burki et al., 2013; GATS, 2018; Hameed & Malik, 2021a; Iqbal, Muhammad Asif Sabir, 2018; Iqbal et al., 2015; Jawaaid et al., 2020; Masud & Oyebode, 2018; Memon et al., 2022; Mushtaq et al., 2011; Saqib et al., 2018a). Majority of the past studies conducted in Pakistan, have estimated cigarette price elasticity. Empirical evidence of these studies is inconclusive. Some studies show that cigarette price elasticity is greater than unity while others have concluded that it is less than unity. The varying estimation of cigarette price elasticity might be due to incorrect model of cigarette demand. For example, (Mushtaq et al., 2011) concluded that a 10% increase in cigarette prices reduces cigarette demand by 11.7%. However, others (Ahsan et al., 2020, 2022; Durre Nayab et al., 2018; Hameed & Malik, 2021b; Iqbal, Muhammad Asif Sabir, 2018; Memon et al., 2022; Nayab et al., 2021a; Sajjad et al., 2022; SPDC Policy Report, 2022; Tobacconomics Scorecard, 2022; WHO, 2020; Zaheer et al., 2021; Zubair et al., 2022) concludes that a 10% increase in cigarette prices decreases consumption in the range between 5% to 10%. The varying result of cigarette price elasticity is possibly due to inappropriate cigarette demand model. For example, (A. Ahsan et al., 2022; Burki et al., 2013; Durre Nayab et al., 2018; Gilani & Leon, 2013; Iqbal, Muhammad Asif Sabir, 2018; Mushtaq et al., 2011) treat cigarette prices as exogenous while estimating their cigarette demand equation. However, many researchers (Chaloupka, Frank J., 1999; Franke, 1994; Powell et al., 2005) have concluded that cigarette prices are endogenous, that it is determined by both demand and supply side factors of tobacco. As empirical evidence is mixed and inconclusive, therefore this study attempts to assess the nature of cigarette prices and thus correctly estimate cigarette price elasticity in Pakistan.

Objectives of the Study

Objectives of this paper are given as under:

- (1) To determine the potential endogeneity of cigarette prices
- (2) To estimate cigarette price elasticity in Pakistan
- (3) To find whether public regulations effectively reduce smoking

Organization of the Study

The remaining sections of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 of the study presents a brief overview of cigarette production, taxation on cigarettes and cigarette affordability in Pakistan. Section 3 reviews literature relevant to the study. In section 4, the study discusses econometric model and estimation method suggested by statistical properties of the data on variables. Empirical results of the study is given by section 5. This section also discusses and compares results of this

study with relevant studies conducted in the past. Finally, section 6 concludes the result and suggests policy recommendations based on empirical results obtained in this study.

Literature Review

Many studies have thoroughly analyzed the determinants of cigarette smoking. Few researchers conclude that cigarette consumption reduces by greater than 1% in response to a 1% increase in cigarette prices while others argue that cigarette price elasticity is less than unity. Moreover, some other researchers have analyzed the effect of non-price regulations on cigarette demand. Literature gives mixed and inconclusive results about the cigarette price elasticity. This section of the paper review past studies related to the impact of cigarette prices, real income and public regulations on cigarette consumption.

To discourage smoking, past study suggests comprehensive measures including taxation and non-price public regulation on smoking (Ahsan et al., 2020; Cetin, 2017a; Colombo & Galmarini, 2022; Fichtenberg & Glantz, 2002; Goldberg et al., 2020; Golden et al., 2016; Hameed & Malik, 2021a; Koffarnus et al., 2015; Le & Jaffri, 2022; McAuliffe, 1988; Memon et al., 2022; Qureshi, 2021; Ross & Chaloupka, 2003; Titus et al., 2021, 2022; Wasserman et al., 1991). However, many researchers like (Ahmed et al., 2022; Cetin, 2017a; Del Carmen et al., 2018; John, 2008; Le & Jaffri, 2022; Memon et al., 2022; Nayab et al., 2021b, 2021a; Stoklosa et al., 2016; Teixeira, 2018) concludes that taxation on tobacco products is the most effective way of discouraging smoking. Taxation discourages smoking by making cigarette less affordable especially for low income individuals. Although the government uses cigarette taxation for increasing revenue, however, subsequently it is suggested for discouraging smoking. Economic theory advocates that taxation on cigarette and cigarette consumption are inversely associated. Advance economies have substantially reduced smoking due to effective use of tobacco control measures including high taxation and other non-price regulations. However, smoking prevalence is high in low income countries as these economies not only provide huge market for tobacco demand but also governments in these countries have not taken serious actions to control smoking. For instance, (Van Walbeek, 2005) concludes that cigarette price elasticity in developed countries is about -0.4 while it ranges from -0.4 to -0.8 in the case of developing economies. This finding is supported by (John, 2008) indicating India's cigarette price elasticity ranges from -0.4 to -0.9. In the same line, (Saffer & Chaloupka, 2000) finds that economically advanced countries reduces smoking from 2.5% to 5% to a 10% increase in cigarette prices. In Pakistan, empirical evidence about cigarette price elasticity is mixed and inconclusive. For instance (Mushtaq et al., 2011) finds cigarette price elasticity as greater than unity while (Ahmad et al., 2005; Khan & Shah, 2020; Nayab et al., 2018; Saqib et al., 2018b) find it to be less than unity.

Beside taxation on cigarettes, non-price regulation also play a vital role in discouraging smoking behavior. Non-price public regulations include health warning on cigarette packets, ban on cigarette advertisements and promotions, smoking restriction in indoor places, and restriction on sale to minors. Previous studies emphasizes that non-price public regulations are important determinants of discouraging smoking initiation and encourage quitting (Adler et al., 2023; Ali et al., 2020; Arancini et al., 2021; Everett et al., 1999; Fagbamigbe et al., 2020; Gilman et al., 2008; Hameed & Malik, 2021a, 2021b; Hammond, 2010; Joo et al., 2020; Madureira et al., 2020; Nayab et al., 2021a; Woo, 2022; Xu et al., 2015). Result of studies conducted across countries varies owing to differences in their social, cultural and economic perspectives. For instance, (Blanton et al., 2014; Farrelly et al., 2009; C. W. Lee & Kahende, 2007; Yang et al., 2011) concludes that smoke free home is associated with individual's quit smoking attempts. However, result of studies

like (Gilpin et al., 1999; Shiffman et al., 2008) finds that smoking-free home policy is linked with successful ending of smoking behavior.

For instance, (Farrelly et al., 1999; M., 2005) concludes that ban on smoking at home is significantly linked with individual's attempts to quit. On the other hand (Gilpin et al., 1999; Shiffman et al., 2008) argue that home smoking policy leads to successful cessation of cigarette smoking. Moreover, studies like (Adler et al., 2023; Bar-Zeev et al., 2021; Cardozo et al., 2019; E.-H. Lee et al., 2022; Liu et al., 2021; Mingyu et al., 2022; Mullahy, 1985; Reyes-Guzman et al., 2023; Richmond et al., 1993) smoking peers declines the probability of smoking cessation. Further, (Putte et al., 2005) concludes that smoking acceptability in a society largely influence individual's smoking behavior. For example, (Chandola et al., 2004; Manchón Walsh et al., 2007) finds that it is difficult to quit when both couple are smokers. Similarly, (Coppotelli & Orleans, 1985) argue that cessation is more likely when one's partner do not smoke cigarettes. Further, studies like (Farkas et al., 2000; Flor et al., 2021; Hao-xiang Lin et al., 2020; Haoxiang Lin et al., 2021) concludes that public restriction on smoking at work places results in a low smoking prevalence. Researchers have explored how these regulations influence smoking prevalence, particularly in countries with unique social, economic, and cultural contexts. Many researchers in developing economies, like Pakistan, have also examined the effectiveness of regulations on individual's smoking behavior (Abdulateef et al., 2016; Ali et al., 2015; Chatha, 2018; Gilani & Leon, 2013; Iqbal, Muhammad Asif Sabir, 2018; Javed et al., 2013; Khan & Shah, 2020; Memon et al., 2022; Nayab et al., 2021b; Pierce et al., 2012; Singh et al., 2023; SPDC, 2021; Zubair et al., 2022). These regulations aim to reduce cigarette consumption and thereby improve public health. For instance, (Khan et al., 2024) attempted finding predictors of quit smoking in the case of Pakistan. The analysis finds that public regulations and social and religious factors are playing important role in motivating individuals to make quit attempt. Moreover, peer smoking status, individual's commitment and past quit attempts are determinants of successful smoking cessation.

Although individual's smoking behavior have been extensively analyzed by researchers both in developed and developing countries of the world. However, these empirical studies on individual's smoking behavior suffer from certain methodological problems. For example, some studies have estimated cigarette demand while using cigarette prices as exogenous variable. (Alam et al., 2008; Burki et al., 2013; Durre Nayab et al., 2018; John, 2008; Nayab et al., 2021a; Singh et al., 2023). However, few others have critically analyzed cigarette's demand and concluded that cigarette prices are endogenous in nature (Bishop & Yoo, 1985). Furthermore, these studies have ignore the role of non-price regulations in discouraging smoking. Therefore, this study attempts to critically analyze the role of cigarette prices while estimating cigarette's demand. In addition, the analysis estimates the role of non-price regulations in limiting cigarette's demand. In the next section, the study discusses data sources of variables and method to estimate cigarette demand.

Data & Methodology

This study primarily investigates the impact of cigarette's price and non-price regulation on smoking behavior in Pakistan. Although, extensive research has empirically analyzed cigarettes demand, however, these studies give inconclusive result owing to differences in their methodology and specification of the cigarette's demand model. Therefore, this analysis attempts to correctly specify cigarette demand by incorporating all the relevant explanatory and controlled variables. The cigarette's demand model is given as under:

Cigarette Demand = f (cigarette's prices, Real Per Capita Income, University education, Regulations)

$$\ln Q_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \ln P_t + \beta_2 \ln Y_t + \beta_3 \ln E_t + \beta_4 \ln \text{Reg} + \varepsilon_t \quad (1)$$

In equation (1), Q_t shows millions of cigarette sticks, P_t is average price (17 centers) of a brand of cigarettes, Y_t is individual's real income, E_t indicates enrollment in public sector universities, Reg shows public regulations on smoking, and ε_t is residuals term.

This study analyzes cigarette's demand by utilizing aggregate time series data covering the period 1981 to 2018. The study has collected cigarette production data from Pakistan Tobacco Board (PTB). In this line, net cigarette consumption was calculated by adding net imports of cigarettes. Similarly, data on a packet of cigarette, reflecting average prices of seventeen centers of a brand, comprising 10 cigarettes were obtained from PTB. Moreover, data on Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita was obtained from World Development Indicator (WDI). To model the influence of non-price regulation, the study uses a binary variable as a proxy for the public regulations on smoking since 2002. The dummy variable has been assigned zero value from 1981 to 2001, while it takes 1 value for the year 2001 and onwards.

Hausman's Test

Few researchers have concluded that cigarette prices are jointly determined by both demand and supply equations. In other words, cigarette prices are not exogenous in cigarette demand model. Consequently, cigarette prices will be correlated with random errors, violating 'no endogeneity' assumption of the Classical Linear Regression (CLR). In such a case, the estimated parameters will be biased and inconsistent. Therefore, in the first stage this study check endogeneity of cigarette prices through Hausman's test. The Hausman test is vital in the decision of either estimating regression through Ordinary Least Square (OLS) or an Instrumental Variable (IV) method. The null and alternative of the Hausman test are given as under:

H_0 = Cigarette prices are not endogenous (OLS estimators are consistent & efficient)

H_1 = Cigarette prices are endogenous (OLS estimators are inconsistent and inefficient)

Model Specification

The analysis estimate cigarette demand equation by Instrumental Variable (IV) method. The IV method proceed as follows:

In the first step, the analysis regress cigarette prices (expected to be endogenous) on the instrument as well as all other exogenous variables of the model (reduced form equation), save the estimated residuals

$$\ln P_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \ln P_{t-1} + \beta_2 \ln Y_t + \beta_3 \ln E_t + \beta_4 \ln \text{Reg} + \varepsilon_t \quad (2)$$

Second, use the estimated residuals as an explanatory variable in the cigarette demand equation

$$\ln Q_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \ln \text{estimated} \varepsilon_t + \beta_2 \ln Y_t + \beta_3 \ln E_t + \beta_4 \ln \text{Reg} + \varepsilon_t \quad (3)$$

If coefficient of the estimated residuals from equation (3) are statistically significant, the analysis will reject the null hypothesis of no correlation between cigarette prices and error term in favor of alternative that cigarette prices are endogenous.

Results and Discussion

In the first stage, the study checks stationarity properties through Augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF) test. Result of the ADF test indicates that no single series is stationary at level, however all series are stationary by taking first difference. Below Table 3.1 shows unit test of various series:

Table 1: ADF Unit Root Test

At level (with intercept)		
Variables	T-statistics	P-value
$\ln Cig_t$	-1.209	0.660
$\ln P_t$	-0.264	0.973
$\ln Y_t$	-0.342	0.909
Reg_t	-0.870	0.787
At First Difference (with intercept)		
$\Delta \ln Cig_t$	-7.337	0.0000
$\Delta \ln P_t$	-4.962	0.0003
$\Delta \ln Y_t$	-3.612	0.010

Table 1, shows estimates of cigarette demand through Least Square (LS) method. The result shows that demand for cigarettes is negatively associated to price, specifically a 10% increase in price leads to a 4% decrease in cigarette consumption. On the contrary, Individual's higher income is positively related with cigarette consumption, meaning that individuals increases cigarette consumption by 3.3% in response to increase in real income by 10%. Positive income elasticity confirms that cigarette is a normal good. Non-price regulation and its interaction with cigarette price and real income, appears insignificant in influencing cigarette demand. Finally, enrollment in Public Sector University is significantly but positively associated with cigarette consumption. The R-square shows that this regression model explains 81.2% changes in cigarette consumption. However, the Durbon-Watson statistic (1.13) indicates that the model suffers from potential autocorrelation, which suggests further diagnostic tests to be conducted.

Table 2: Cigarette Demand Elasticity (Least Square Method)

Variables	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
Cig.Price	-0.401	0.100	-3.995	0.000
Real Income	0.332	0.131	2.533	0.016
Regulation 2002	4.178	8.915	0.469	0.642
Price*Regulation	-0.313	0.169	-1.854	0.073
Income* Regulation	-0.368	0.862	-0.427	0.673
University Education	0.695	0.131	5.300	0.000

Some researchers have critically analyzed the role of cigarette prices as exogenous factor. They argue that cigarette prices are influenced by factors which are related to demand. In other words, cigarette prices are in turn influence by market dynamics. For instance (Chaloupka & Warner, 2000) argue that based on expected consumer responses, tobacco companies change cigarette prices. Similarly, governments often raises excise taxation in response to high smoking prevalence. Higher taxation on cigarettes generate revenue for the government and subsequently discourage smoking. Increasing taxation leads to rising cigarette prices thereby make smoking less affordable. This clearly indicates that high cigarette consumption prompt governments to impose higher excise taxes which in turn results in rising cigarette prices. In the same line, (Adda & Cornaglia, 2006) concludes that smokers behave rationally. That is, individuals adjust their smoking behavior in response to price increase. This empirical evidence shows that cigarette prices are influenced by

public regulation and dynamic market conditions therefore, they are not purely exogenous in demand model. Therefore, this paper attempts to examine whether cigarette price are endogenous in nature.

Below Table 2 shows estimates of three cigarette demand models varying by inclusion of different public policy including Regulation 2002, SROs 2009, and SROs 2010. The estimated coefficient has been obtained by employing Instrumental Variable (IV) method to the data on variables covering the period 1981 to 2018.

Table 3: Cigarette Demand Elasticity (Instrumental Variable Method)

Variables	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	Coefficient	P-Value	Coefficient	P-Value	Coefficient	P-Value
Cig.Price	-0.337	0.003	-0.451	0.000	-0.455	0.000
Real Income	0.758	0.000	0.378	0.022	0.364	0.043
University Enrollment	0.282	0.000	0.660	0.000	0.673	0.000
Regulation 2002	-----	-----	-0.498	0.037	-0.514	0.043
SROs 2009	-----	-----	-----	-----	-0.034	0.840
SROs 2010	-----	-----	-0.308	0.019	-0.285	0.099

Across all models model, cigarette prices significantly reduces smoking. Specifically, the result shows that cigarette consumption declines by 3.3%, 4.5% and 4.6% to a 10% increase in cigarette price, respectively in each model. The higher magnitude price coefficient in model 2 and 3, further suggests that interaction with regulations strengthen the price sensitivity of cigarette demand. This finding is consistent with past studies who have empirically analyzed cigarette demand. For instance, prior studies like (Ahmed et al., 2022; Cheng & Estrada, 2020; Crespi et al., 2020; He et al., 2018; John, 2008; Martín Álvarez et al., 2020; SPDC, 2021; Wasserman et al., 1991) have concluded that cigarette prices negatively influence smoking. However, literature has estimated varying cigarette price elasticity owing to difference in cigarette demand model specification. For example, (Mushtaq et al., 2011) finds cigarette price elasticity as greater than unity, which is inconsistent with our analysis. On the other hand (Khan & Shah, 2020) concludes that cigarette price elasticity is less than unity. However, cigarette's demand model in both analysis were misspecified by treating cigarette prices as exogenous. In our analysis, the result of Hausman test confirms endogeneity of cigarette prices in the cigarette demand equation. Therefore, this analysis has correctly specified cigarette demand equation, and thus the estimated parameters are unbiased and consistent.

Moreover, individuals' increases smoking in response to increase in their income as it raises cigarette's affordability. The estimated coefficients on income show that when income increases by 10%, individuals increase cigarette's demand by 7.5%, 3.7% and 3.6% across the three model, respectively. The income elasticity declines across the three models, suggesting the public regulations moderates the income effect. The positive association of real income with cigarette demand explain the increasing affordability of smoking.

Further, smoking increases with the increase in enrollment at public sector universities in Pakistan. This is alarming, signaling failure of our educational institutions in properly conveying anti-smoking messages to students of this country. This finding suggests that university students may be induced to smoking by factors such as stress, social exposure, new environment and lifestyle.

Finally, the study finds very interesting result that public regulations significantly reduces smoking in Pakistan. Similar result has been found by past studies like (A. Ahsan et al., 2022; Blecher, 2008; Cetin, 2017a, 2017b; Colombo & Galmarini, 2022; Huang et al., 2014; Joann, 2022; Rasool et al., 2011; Thomson et al., 2022; Zubair et al., 2022). In this line, (Khan et al., 2024) finds that public regulations such as health warnings, and restrictions on cigarette advertisement and promotions is effective in motivating smokers to quit smoking behavior in Pakistan. Moreover (Rasool et al., 2011) argue that health warning on cigarette package is effective in reducing smoking, however, the analysis finds low compliance with public regulations for printing health warnings on cigarette packets in Pakistan.

Conclusion & Recommendations

This study attempts to empirically cigarette demand model in the case of Pakistan, using aggregate time series data covering the period from 1981 to 2018. The study finds that cigarette prices are endogenous, jointly determined by the demand and supply side factors. Employing Instrumental Variable (IV) method, the analysis finds that rising cigarette prices discourage cigarette consumption. Moreover, individuals demand more cigarettes when their real income increases, owing to increasing affordability of cigarette consumption. Similarly, increasing enrollment in public sector universities also raises cigarette demand. This is alarming situation indicating failure of our academic institutions in conveying anti-smoking message. Finally, the result shows that public regulations significantly discourage smoking. This is quite interesting result that both price and price regulations strategies are playing significant role in limiting cigarette demand.

Recommendations

Based on the empirical results obtained, this analysis following recommendations to government of Pakistan

- (1) This study suggests increasing excise taxation on cigarette to make smoking less affordable
- (2) The government should enforced implementation of public regulation particularly in the academic institutions to aware students and general masses about the danger of smoking.

Limitations and Future Research in the Area of Tobacco Consumption

Although this analysis has attempted to accurately estimate cigarette demand in Pakistan. However, there are few limitations of this study. First, the study focuses on one particular product of tobacco, that is, cigarette consumption. However, few individuals uses other products of tobacco including smokeless tobacco like Naswar, Paan, and Gutka etc. Therefore, future research be conducted to find determinants of all tobacco products.

Second, time series data is limited to model individual's response to public regulations. Therefore, analysis based on cross-sectional data will be more useful which actually model individual's response to public regulations on smoking at micro level.

References

- Abdulateef, D. S., Ali, A. J., Abdulateef, D. S., & Mohesh, M. I. G. (2016). Smoking Knowledge, Attitude, and Practices among Health Care Professionals from Sulaymaniyah City/Iraq. *Tobacco Use Insights*, 9, TUI.S38171. <https://doi.org/10.4137/tui.s38171>
- Adda, J., & Cornaglia, F. (2006). Taxes, cigarette consumption, and smoking intensity. *American Economic Review*, 96(4), 1013–1028.
- Adler, L., Arar, S. A., Yehoshua, I., Cohen, B., Alon, S. H., Shahar, A., & Zacay, G. (2023). *Smoking*

cessation – better together : A retrospective cohort study. 1–9.

- Ahmad, K., Jafary, F., Jehan, I., Hatcher, J., Khan, A. Q., Chaturvedi, N., & Jafar, T. H. (2005). Prevalence and predictors of smoking in Pakistan: Results of the National Health Survey of Pakistan. *European Journal of Cardiovascular Prevention and Rehabilitation*, 12(3), 203–208. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00149831-200506000-00003>
- Ahmed, M. U., Pulok, M. H., Hashmi, R., Hajizadeh, M., & Nargis, N. (2022). Price and Income Elasticities of Cigarette Smoking Demand in Bangladesh: Evidence from Urban Adolescents and Young Adults. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research*, 24(6), 826–833. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ntr/ntab270>
- Ahsan, A., Afin, R., Amalia, N., Hindriyani, M., Jacinda, A. R., & Kramer, E. (2022). FCTC ratification, smoking prevalence, and GDP per capita: lessons for Indonesia and the rest of the world. *Globalization and Health*, 18(1), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12992-022-00810-y>
- Ahsan, A., Wiyono, N. H., Veruswati, M., Adani, N., Kusuma, D., & Amalia, N. (2020). Comparison of tobacco import and tobacco control in five countries: lessons learned for Indonesia. *Globalization and Health*, 16(1), 65. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12992-020-00595-y>
- Ahsan, M., Saad, M., Jawed, M., Akhtar, S., Haseeb, A., Bilal, M., & Ahmed, A. (2015). Impact of tobacco health warnings on smokers in Pakistan. *Journal of the Pakistan Medical Association*, 66(1), 59–62.
- Alam, A. Y., Iqbal, A., Mohamud, K. B., Laporte, R. E., Ahmed, A., & Nishtar, S. (2008). Investigating socio-economic-demographic determinants of tobacco use in Rawalpindi, Pakistan. *BMC Public Health*, 8, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-8-50>
- Ali, F. R. M., Agaku, I. T., Sharapova, S. R., Reimels, E. A., & Homa, D. M. (2020). *Onset of Regular Smoking Before Age 21 and Subsequent Nicotine Dependence and Cessation Behavior Among US Adult Smokers*. 1–6.
- Ali, N., Jaffar, A., Anwer, M., Raza, S. M., & Ali, N. (2015). *The Economic Analysis of Tobacco Industry : A Case Study of Tobacco International Journal of Research (IJR)*. 2(3), 88–99.
- Arancini, L., Borland, R., Grande, M. Le, Mohebbi, M., Dodd, S., Dean, O. M., Berk, M., McNeill, A., Fong, G. T., & Cummings, K. M. (2021). *Age as a predictor of quit attempts and quit success in smoking cessation : findings from the International Tobacco Control Four-Country survey (2002 – 14)*. 2509–2520. <https://doi.org/10.1111/add.15454>
- Bar-Zeev, Y., Shauly-Aharonov, M., Lee, H., & Neumark, Y. (2021). Changes in smoking behaviour and home-smoking rules during the initial COVID-19 lockdown period in Israel. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(4), 1931.
- Bishop, J. A., & Yoo, J. H. (1985). “Health Scare,” Excise Taxes and Advertising Ban in the Cigarette Demand and Supply. *Southern Economic Journal*, 52(2), 402. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1059626>
- Blanton, H., Snyder, L. B., Strauts, E., & Larson, J. G. (2014). Effect of graphic cigarette warnings on smoking intentions in young adults. *PLoS ONE*, 9(5), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0096315>
- Blecher, E. (2008). The impact of tobacco advertising bans on consumption in developing countries. *Journal of Health Economics*, 27(4), 930–942. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhealeco.2008.02.010>
- Burki, S., Pasha, A., Pasha, H., John, R., Jha, P., Baloch, A., Kamboh, G., Cherukupalli, R., & Chaloupka, F. (2013). *The economics of tobacco and tobacco taxation in Pakistan*. https://tobacconomics.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/PakistanReport_May2014.pdf
- Cardozo, R. A., Feinberg, A., Tovar, A., Vilcassim, M. J. R., Shelley, D., Elbel, B., Kaplan, S., Wyka, K., Rule, A. M., & Gordon, T. (2019). A protocol for measuring the impact of a smoke-free housing policy on indoor tobacco smoke exposure. *BMC Public Health*, 19, 1–10.
- Cetin, T. (2017a). The effect of taxation and regulation on cigarette smoking: Fresh evidence from Turkey. *Health Policy*, 121(12), 1288–1295. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthpol.2017.09.015>
- Cetin, T. (2017b). The effect of taxation and regulation on cigarette smoking: Fresh evidence from Turkey. *Health Policy*, 121(12), 1288–1295.
- Chaloupka, Frank J., K. E. W. (1999). *No Title*.

- Chaloupka, F. J., & Warner, K. E. (2000). The economics of smoking. *Handbook of Health Economics*, 1, 1539–1627. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1574-0064\(00\)80042-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1574-0064(00)80042-6)
- Chandola, T., Head, J., & Bartley, M. (2004). Socio-demographic predictors of quitting smoking: How important are household factors? *Addiction*, 99(6), 770–777. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1360-0443.2004.00756.x>
- Chatha, I. A. (2018). *Policy Brief # 61*.
- Cheng, K. J. G., & Estrada, M. A. G. (2020). Elasticity of cigarette smoking demand in the Philippines after the 2012 Sin Tax Reform Act. *Preventive Medicine*, 134(February), 106042. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ypmed.2020.106042>
- Colombo, L., & Galmarini, U. (2022). Taxation and anti-smoking campaigns: Complementary policies in tobacco control. *Journal of Policy Modeling*, xxxx, 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpolmod.2022.11.006>
- Coppotelli, H. C., & Orleans, C. T. (1985). Partner Support and Other Determinants of Smoking Cessation Maintenance Among Women. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 53(4), 455–460. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.53.4.455>
- Crespi, F., Liberati, P., Paradiso, M., Scialà, A., & Tedeschi, S. (2020). Smokers are different: The impact of price increases on smoking reduction and downtrading. *Economic Modelling*, March. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econmod.2020.04.004>
- Del Carmen, G., Fuchs, A., & Genoni, M. E. (2018). The Distributional of Impacts of Cigarette Taxation in Bangladesh. In *The Distributional of Impacts of Cigarette Taxation in Bangladesh*. World Bank. <https://doi.org/10.1596/30011>
- Durre Nayab et al. (2018). *ECONOMICS OF TOBACCO TAXATION AND CONSUMPTION*.
- Everett, S. A., Ph, D., Warren, C. W., Ph, D., Sharp, D., Kann, L., Ph, D., Husten, C. G., & Crossett, L. S. (1999). *Initiation of Cigarette Smoking and Subsequent Smoking Behavior among U . S . High School Students*. 333, 327–333.
- Fagbamigbe, A. F., Desai, R., Sewpaul, R., Kandala, N., Sekgala, D., & Reddy, P. (2020). *Age at the onset of tobacco smoking in South Africa : a discrete-time survival analysis of the prognostic factors*. 1, 1–11.
- Farkas, A. J., Gilpin, E. A., White, M. M., & Pierce, J. P. (2000). Association between household and workplace smoking restrictions and adolescent smoking. *Jama*, 284(6), 717–722.
- Farrelly, M. C., Nonnemaker, J., Davis, K. C., & Hussin, A. (2009). The Influence of the National truth® Campaign on Smoking Initiation. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 36(5), 379–384. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2009.01.019>
- Fichtenberg, C. M., & Glantz, S. A. (2002). *systematic review*. 325(August 2001).
- Flor, L. S., Reitsma, M. B., Gupta, V., Ng, M., & Gakidou, E. (2021). The effects of tobacco control policies on global smoking prevalence. *Nature Medicine*, 27(2), 239–243.
- Franke, G. R. (1994). U.S. cigarette demand, 1961–1990: Econometric issues, evidence, and implications. *Journal of Business Research*, 30(1), 33–41. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0148-2963\(94\)90066-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0148-2963(94)90066-3)
- GATS. (2018). Burden of tobacco in Pakistan: Findings from global adult tobacco survey 2014. *Nicotine and Tobacco Research*, 20(9), 1138–1143. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ntr/ntx179>
- Gilani, S. I., & Leon, D. A. (2013). *Prevalence and sociodemographic determinants of tobacco use among adults in Pakistan : findings of a nationwide survey conducted in 2012*. 1–11.
- Gilman, S. E., Martin, L. T., Abrams, D. B., Kawachi, I., Kubzansky, L., Loucks, E. B., Rende, R., Rudd, R., & Buka, S. L. (2008). *Educational attainment and cigarette smoking : a causal association ? y. January*, 615–624. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ije/dym250>
- Gilpin, E. A., White, M. M., Farkas, A. J., & Pierce, J. P. (1999). Home smoking restrictions: Which smokers have them and how they are associated with smoking behavior. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research*, 1(2), 153–162. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14622299050011261>

- Goldberg, M. E., Davis, R. M., Keefe, A. M. O., Goldberg, M. E., Davis, R. M., & Keefe, A. M. O. (2020). *industry witnesses Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article : The role of tobacco advertising and promotion : themes employed in litigation by tobacco industry witnesses*. 15. <https://doi.org/10.1136/te.2006.017947>
- Golden, S. D., Farrelly, M. C., Luke, D. A., & Ribisl, K. M. (2016). Comparing projected impacts of cigarette floor price and excise tax policies on socioeconomic disparities in smoking. *Tobacco Control*, 25, i60–i66. <https://doi.org/10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2016-053230>
- Hameed, A., & Malik, D. (2021a). Assessing the Knowledge, Attitude, and Practices of Cigarette Smokers and Use of Alternative Nicotine Delivery Systems in Pakistan: A Cross-Sectional Study. *Advances in Public Health*, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/5555190>
- Hameed, A., & Malik, D. (2021b). Barriers to Cigarette Smoking Cessation in Pakistan: Evidence from Qualitative Analysis. *Journal of Smoking Cessation*, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/9592693>
- Hammond, D. (2010). *Health warning messages on tobacco products : a review*. 3. <https://doi.org/10.1136/tc.2010.037630>
- He, Y., Shang, C., & Chaloupka, F. J. (2018). The association between cigarette affordability and consumption: An update. *PLoS ONE*, 13(12), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0200665>
- Huang, J., Chaloupka, F. J., & Fong, G. T. (2014). Cigarette graphic warning labels and smoking prevalence in Canada: a critical examination and reformulation of the FDA regulatory impact analysis. *Tobacco Control*, 23(suppl 1), i7 LP–i12. <https://doi.org/10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2013-051170>
- Iqbal, Muhammad Asif Sabir, M. (2018). *Macroeconomic impacts of tobacco use in Pakistan Social Policy and Development Centre*. April 2020. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.12229.81128>
- Iqbal, N., Irfan, M., Ashraf, N., Awan, S., & Khan, J. A. (2015). Prevalence of tobacco use among women: A cross sectional survey from a squatter settlement of Karachi, Pakistan. *BMC Research Notes*, 8(1), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13104-015-1455-7>
- Javed, S., Pasha, A. G., Pasha, H. A., & John, R. (2013). *Tobacco Taxes in Pakistan*.
- Jawaaid, S. T., Waheed, A., & Siddiqui, A. H. (2020). Terms of trade and economic growth in developing country: Evidence from bilateral and commodity level analysis. *Journal of Chinese Economic and Foreign Trade Studies*, 13(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JCEFTS-07-2019-0035>
- Joann, C. (2022). *Associations of adverse childhood experiences with smoking initiation in adolescence and persistence in adulthood , and the role of the childhood environment : Findings from the 1958 British birth cohort*. 156(September 2021). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ypmed.2022.106995>
- John, R. M. (2008). Price elasticity estimates for tobacco products in India. *Health Policy and Planning*, 23(3), 200–209. <https://doi.org/10.1093/heapol/czn007>
- Joo, H., Cho, M. H., Cho, Y., Joh, H. K., & Kim, J. W. (2020). Predictors of long-term smoking cessation among smokers enrolled in a university smoking cessation program: A longitudinal study. *Medicine*, 99(5), e18994. <https://doi.org/10.1097/MD.00000000000018994>
- Khan, A. U., & Shah, A. (2020). Do Regulations on Smoking Limit Cigarette Demand? An Empirical Evidence from Pakistan. *Journal of Applied Economics and Business Studies*, 4(4), 161–186.
- Khan, A. U., Shah, A., Majeed, M. T., & Ahmad, S. (2024). Predictors of quitting smoking behavior: evidence from Pakistan. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 31(21), 30886–30901. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-024-32920-y>
- Koffarnus, M. N., Wilson, A. G., & Bickel, W. K. (2015). Effects of experimental income on demand for potentially real cigarettes. *Nicotine and Tobacco Research*, 17(3), 292–298. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ntr/ntu139>
- Le, T. T. T., & Jaffri, M. A. (2022). *The association between smoking behaviors and prices and taxes per cigarette pack in the United States from 2000 through 2019*. 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-022-13242-5>
- Lee, C. W., & Kahende, J. (2007). Factors associated with successful smoking cessation in the United States, 2000. *American Journal of Public Health*, 97(8), 1503–1509. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2005.083527>

- Lee, E.-H., Shin, S.-H., & Jeong, G.-C. (2022). Smoking awareness and intention to quit smoking in smoking female workers: secondary data analysis. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(5), 2841.
- Lin, Hao-xiang, Liu, Z., & Chang, C. (2020). The effects of smoke-free workplace policies on individual smoking behaviors in China. *Nicotine and Tobacco Research*, 22(12), 2158–2163.
- Lin, Haoxiang, Li, M., Chen, M., Liu, Y., Lin, Y., Liu, Z., Zheng, Z., & Chang, C. (2021). The association of workplace smoke-free policies on individual smoking and quitting-related behaviours. *BMC Public Health*, 21, 1–7.
- Liu, B., Dompreeh, I., & Hartman, A. M. (2021). Small-area estimation of smoke-free workplace policies and home rules in US counties. *Nicotine and Tobacco Research*, 23(8), 1300–1307.
- Madureira, J., Camelo, A., Silva, A. I., Reis, A. T., Esteves, F., Ribeiro, A. I., Teixeira, J. P., & Costa, C. (2020). The importance of socioeconomic position in smoking, cessation and environmental tobacco smoke exposure during pregnancy. *Scientific Reports*, 10(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-72298-8>
- Manchón Walsh, P., Carrillo, P., Flores, G., Masuet, C., Morchon, S., & Ramon, J. M. (2007). Effects of partner smoking status and gender on long term abstinence rates of patients receiving smoking cessation treatment. *Addictive Behaviors*, 32(1), 128–136. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2006.03.027>
- Martín Álvarez, J. M., Golpe, A. A., Iglesias, J., & Ingelmo, R. (2020). Price and income elasticities of demand for cigarette consumption: what is the association of price and economic activity with cigarette consumption in Spain from 1957 to 2016? *Public Health*, 185, 275–282. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.puhe.2020.05.059>
- Masud, H., & Oyeboode, O. (2018). Inequalities in smoking prevalence: a missed opportunity for tobacco control in Pakistan. *Journal of Public Health*, 40(2), 271–278.
- McAuliffe, R. (1988). The FTC and the Effectiveness of Cigarette Advertising Regulations. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 7(1), 49–64. <https://doi.org/10.1177/074391568800700105>
- Memon, J. A., Nasir, M., Nayab, D., Siddique, O., & Kishwar, S. (2022). *Economic burden of tobacco use in Pakistan*. 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1136/tc-2022-057726>
- Mingyu, G. U., Xingming, L. I., Tingting, Q. I. N., Kun, Q., Xinyuan, B. A. I., & Yao, W. (2022). *A study on the influencing factors of social support on the quit smoking among community smokers in Beijing, China*.
- Mullahy, J. (1985). *Cigarette smoking: habits, health concerns, and heterogeneous unobservables in a microeconomic analysis of consumer demand*. University of Virginia.
- Mushtaq, N., Mushtaq, S., Beebe, L. A., Mushtaq, N., Mushtaq, S., & Beebe, L. A. (2011). *Economics of tobacco control in Pakistan: estimating elasticities of cigarette demand*. Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.com/stable/41320190> *Economics of tobacco control in Pakistan: estimating elasticities of cigarette demand*. 20(6), 431–435.
- Nayab, D., Nasir, M., Memon, J. A., Khalid, M., & Hussian, A. (2018). *Economics of Tobacco Taxation and Consumption*. 47. <https://www.pide.org.pk/Research/Economics-of-Tobacco.pdf>
- Nayab, D., Nasir, M., Memon, J. A., & Siddique, O. (2021a). *SWITCH, REDUCE, OR QUIT: HOW DO SMOKERS RESPOND TO TOBACCO TAX INCREASES IN PAKISTAN?* April.
- Nayab, D., Nasir, M., Memon, J. A., & Siddique, O. (2021b). *THE ECONOMIC COST OF TOBACCO-INDUCED DISEASES IN*. April.
- Pierce, J. P., White, V. M., & Emery, S. L. (2012). What public health strategies are needed to reduce smoking initiation? *Tobacco Control*, 21(2), 258–264. <https://doi.org/10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2011-050359>
- Powell, L. M., Tauras, J. A., & Ross, H. (2005). *The importance of peer effects, cigarette prices and tobacco control policies for youth smoking behavior*. 24, 950–968. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhealeco.2005.02.002>
- Putte, B. Van Den, Ph, D., Yzer, M. C., Ph, D., & Brunsting, S. (2005). *Social influences on smoking*

cessation: a comparison of the effect of six social influence variables. 41, 186–193. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ypmed.2004.09.040>

- Qureshi, M. A. (2021). *Pakistan Economics Report.* 4(1), 88–100.
- Rasool, A., Ahmad, S., Farooq, U., Rasool, M., Shah, Z., Hammad, M., Utmanzai, A., Wahab, F., Sadique, I., & Ahmad, J. (2011). Compliance of anti-smoking regulations by cigarette industry in Pakistan. *Journal of Ayub Medical College, Abbottabad: JAMC*, 23(3), 94–96.
- Reyes-Guzman, C. M., Patel, M., Wang, T. W., Corcy, N., Chomenko, D., Slotman, B., & Vollinger Jr, R. E. (2023). Disparities in Smokefree and Vapefree Home Rules and Smokefree Policy Attitudes Based on Housing Type and Cigarette Smoking Status, United States, 2019. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 20(14), 6356.
- Richmond, R. L., Kehoe, L. A., & Webster, I. W. (1993). Multivariate models for predicting abstinence following intervention to stop smoking by general practitioners. *Addiction*, 88(8), 1127–1135.
- Ross, H., & Chaloupka, F. J. (2003). The effect of cigarette prices on youth smoking. *Health Economics*, 12(3), 217–230. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hec.709>
- Saffer, H., & Chaloupka, F. (2000). The effect of tobacco advertising bans on tobacco consumption. *Journal of Health Economics*, 19(6), 1117–1137.
- Sajjad, Haq, Z. ul, Iqbal, J., & Shahzad, M. F. (2022). *Understanding the Profitability, Supply, and Input Demand of.* 1–20.
- Saqib, M. A. N., Rafique, I., Qureshi, H., Munir, M. A., Bashir, R., Arif, B. W., Bhatti, K., Ahmed, S. A. K., & Bhatti, L. (2018a). Burden of tobacco in Pakistan: findings from global adult tobacco survey 2014. *Nicotine and Tobacco Research*, 20(9), 1138–1143.
- Saqib, M. A. N., Rafique, I., Qureshi, H., Munir, M. A., Bashir, R., Arif, B. W., Bhatti, K., Ahmed, S. A. K., & Bhatti, L. (2018b). Burden of tobacco in Pakistan: Findings from global adult tobacco survey 2014. *Nicotine and Tobacco Research*, 20(9), 1138–1143. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ntr/ntx179>
- Shiffman, S., Brockwell, S. E., Pillitteri, J. L., & Gitchell, J. G. (2008). Use of smoking-cessation treatments in the United States. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 34(2), 102–111.
- Singh, L., Jain, P., Kumar, C., Singh, A., Lal, P., Yadav, A., Singh, P. K., & Singh, S. (2023). *Trends in age of tobacco use initiation over time in Bangladesh, India and sectional Pakistan: analysis of cross- - nationally representative surveys.* 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2022-067875>
- SPDC. (2021). *ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS OF CIGARETTE TAXATION IN PAKISTAN: An Exploration through A CGE Model.*
- SPDC Policy Report. (2022). *Revenue and Health Implications of Cigarette Tax Policy Options in Pakistan. Figure 1,* 1–12.
- Stoklosa, M., Drope, J., & Chaloupka, F. J. (2016). Prices and e-cigarette demand: Evidence from the European Union. *Nicotine and Tobacco Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ntr/ntw109>
- Teixeira, A. P. (2018). The Government Willingness to Legislate Tobacco Control and Government Income From Tobacco Taxes in Brazil. *Journal of Global Oncology*. <https://doi.org/10.1200/jgo.18.94700>
- Thomson, B., Emberson, J., Lacey, B., Lewington, S., & Peto, R. (2022). *Association Between Smoking, Smoking Cessation, and Mortality by Race, Ethnicity, and Sex Among US Adults.* 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2022.31480>
- Titus, A. R., Xie, Y., Colston, D. C., Patrick, M. E., Elliott, M. R., Levy, D. T., Thrasher, J. F., & Fleischer, N. L. (2021). Smoke-Free Laws and Disparities in Youth Smoking in the U.S., 2001–2018. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 61(6), 841–851. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2021.05.013>
- Titus, A. R., Xie, Y., Thrasher, J. F., Levy, D. T., Elliott, M. R., Patrick, M. E., & Fleischer, N. L. (2022). *RESEARCH REPORT A longitudinal analysis of smoke-free laws and smoking initiation disparities among young adults in the United States. December 2020,* 730–738. <https://doi.org/10.1111/add.15658>
- Tobacconomics Scorecard. (2022). *Cigarette Tax Scorecard: Spotlight on Pakistan Change in*

Cigarette Affordability. October, 2020–2022.

- Van Walbeek, C. (2005). *The economics of tobacco control in South Africa.*
- Wasserman, J., Manning, W. G., Newhouse, J. P., & Winkler, J. D. (1991). The effects of excise taxes and regulations on cigarette smoking. *Journal of Health Economics*, 10(1), 43–64. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-6296\(91\)90016-G](https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-6296(91)90016-G)
- WHO. (2015). *WHO | Tobacco control in Pakistan.* <https://www.who.int/tobacco/about/partners/bloomberg/pak/en/>
- WHO. (2019). *WHO report on the global tobacco epidemic, 2019: offer help to quit tobacco use.* World Health Organization.
- WHO. (2020). *Every year people die from tobacco.* 26(1).
- Woo, J. (2022). Health and Place How place matters for smoking cessation : Barriers to smoking cessation among low-income Black women. *Health and Place*, 78(October), 102925. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2022.102925>
- Xu, X., Liu, L., Sharma, M., & Zhao, Y. (2015). Smoking-related knowledge, attitudes, behaviors, smoking cessation idea and education level among young adult male smokers in Chongqing, China. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 12(2), 2135–2149. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph120202135>
- Yang, T., Xu, X., Rockett, I. R. H., Guo, W., & Zhou, H. (2011). Health & Place Effects of household , workplace , and public place smoking restrictions on smoking cessation. *Health & Place*, 17(4), 954–960. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2011.04.003>
- Zaheer, K., Yousuf, N., & Aftab, R. (2021). *ANALYZING PAKISTAN ' S TOBACCO MARKET ,.* 4(4), 534–553.
- Zubair, F., Zhao, T., Ahmad, H., & Khanam, R. (2022). A gender-specific assessment of tobacco use risk factors: evidence from the latest Pakistan demographic and health survey. *BMC Public Health*, 22(1), 1–11.