Correction

Dunlop SM, Dobbins T, Young JM, *et al.* Impact of Australia's introduction of tobacco plain packs on adult smokers' pack-related perceptions and responses: results from a continuous tracking survey. *BMJ Open* 2014;4:e005836.

An error in coding resulted in 428 ineligible cases being included in this study. These ineligible cases were part of a concurrent pilot study of recruitment via mobile phone. The coding error was applied to the descriptive statistics and regression analyses, but not the time-series analyses. The correction of this error does not change the results or conclusions of the study, but for clarification, the following corrections are noted:

1. The sample size in the 'Participants' section of the Abstract should be 15 375.
2. In the Method section, 'Analyses for this study are limited to smokers interviewed between April 2006 and May 2013 (total n=15 745)' should read 'Analyses for this study are limited to smokers interviewed between April 2006 and May 2013 (total n=15 375)'.
3. In the Results section, 'the increase in cognitive and emotional responses occurred after 3 months (cognitive: from 13% in September 2012 to 20% in January 2013; emotional: from 13% to 27%)' should read 'the increase in cognitive and emotional responses occurred after 3 months (cognitive: from 13% in September 2012 to 21% in January 2013; emotional: from 13% to 29%)'.

Table 1 Sample characteristics from the Cancer Institute's Tobacco Tracking Survey (CITTS) April 2006 to May 2013 (smokers only; n=15 375)

	N	Per cent
Sex		
Female	8126	50
Male	7249	50
Age (years)		
18–29	2265	21
30–55	8260	48
55+	4848	31
Socioeconomic status		
Low	6443	41
Moderate	3951	27
High	4808	33
Smoking frequency		
Daily	13659	88
Weekly	917	6
Less than weekly	799	6
Smoking		
Low	5871	41
Moderate	5705	38
High	3384	22
Quit attempts in past 12 months		
None	9189	60
At least one	5975	40
Year		
2006	1600	10
2007	2289	15
2008	2094	13
2009	2135	14
2010	2146	14
2011	2157	14
2012	2126	13
2013	828	5

Ns are unweighted, per cents are weighted for age, sex and regional residence.

Table 3 Results from linear regression models predicting Graphic Health Warning Impact and Negative Pack Perceptions from month of interview in the plain packaging and comparison periods

	Comparison period (2011–2012)					Plain packaging period (2012–2013)				
	M	(SD)	β	95% CI	p Value	M	(SD)	β	95% CI	p Value
GHW impact										
Month										
August/September	NA					2.67	(0.93)	Ref		
October/November	2.57	(0.90)	Ref			2.75	(0.97)	0.01	−0.15	0.21
December/January	2.62	(0.99)	−0.01	−0.25	0.21	2.86	(1.18)	0.09	0.05	0.50
February/March	2.77	(0.89)	0.10	−0.19	0.58	2.75	(1.17)	0.06	−0.11	0.41
April/May	2.67	(0.96)	−0.01	−0.52	0.48	2.79	(1.22)	0.03	−0.12	0.29
Negative pack perceptions										
Month										
August/September	NA					3.95	(0.76)	Ref		
October/November	4.03	(0.60)	Ref			3.96	(0.75)	0.03	−0.45	1.10
December/January	4.11	(0.64)	0.06	−0.43	1.46	4.47	(0.65)	0.25	2.52	4.06
February/March	4.08	(0.59)	0.03	−1.40	1.88	4.56	(0.63)	0.31	2.58	4.38
April/May	4.03	(0.69)	0.07	−1.61	2.80	4.67	(0.58)	0.34	3.82	5.20

Models controlled for demographics (sex, age, SES), smoking characteristics (frequency and level of smoking, 12 m quitting history), antismoking advertising activity (TARPs) and recent increases in cigarette costliness (% increase in past 12 weeks); M's and SD's are unweighted.

β , Standardised coefficient; GHW, Graphic Health Warnings; M, mean (range 1–5); NA, not applicable; SES, socioeconomic status; TARP, Target Audience Rating Points.

4. In the Results section, 'Compared with the preplain packaging period (August/September 2012), scores on the scale were significantly higher in immediate postplain packaging period (December/January) and in the 5–6 month postplain packaging period (April/May). These effects were independent of any differences between the samples on sociodemographic or smoking characteristics, antismoking advertising activity, or increases in cigarette costliness' should read 'Compared with the preplain packaging period (August/September 2012),

Figure 1 Monthly proportions of smokers strongly agreeing that: (A) the graphic warnings encourage me to stop smoking (cognitive response); (B) with the graphic warnings, each time I get a cigarette out I worry that I should not be smoking (emotional response); (C) they make me feel that I should hide or cover my packet from the view of others (avoidant response) and (D) the only thing I notice on my cigarette pack is the graphic warnings (warning salience).

Figure 2 Monthly proportions of smokers strongly disagreeing that their cigarette pack is: (A) attractive; (B) says something good about me to other smokers; (C) influences the brand I buy; (D) makes my brand stand out from other brands; (E) is fashionable and (F) matches my style.

scores on the scale were significantly higher in immediate postplain packaging period (December/January). This effect was independent of any differences between the samples on sociodemographic or smoking characteristics, antismoking advertising activity, or increases in cigarette costliness'.

- In the Results section, 'says something good about them (from 27% to 76%), influences the brand they buy (from 27% to 77%), makes their brand stand out (from 22% to 78%), is fashionable (from 27% to 80%)' should read 'says something good about them (from 27% to 78%), influences the brand they buy (from 27% to 79%), makes their brand stand out (from 22% to 81%), is fashionable (from 27% to 82%)'.

Figure 3 Monthly mean score for Graphic Health Warning Impact and Negative Pack Perceptions.

Corrected versions of tables 1 and 3, figures 1–3, supplementary figures 1 and 2 are below. The corrected versions of the figures result in minor changes to estimates for some data points, with no change in overall patterns of the data.

CrossMark

BMJ Open 2015;5:e005836. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2014-005836corr1