



smoking, and more than two-thirds of the population do not understand the hazards of second-hand smoke exposure [1,2].

Despite the Chinese government's efforts in tobacco control

evaluation of the videos, different presentation orders were assigned to each FGD (Table 2).

Supplementary video related to this article can be found at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.glt.2023.11.001>

2.4. Measures

The measurement tools included the quantitative rating sheet

strongly agreeing with the stated items, all the video were considered as being easily understood (92.9–98.0%) and believable (88.8–93.5%). “Gamified couple at home” [Video 4] was rated the highest on transferring new knowledge (79.8%) and prompting discussion about the video with other people (80.6%). “Gifting harm” [Video3] was rated the highest on making participants stop and think (81.4%), and on increasing motivation not to give ciga-

3. e
 Cross-validation between qualitative and quantitative analysis for the evaluation of short videos.

Themes	Quantitative results: Mean score	Qualitative discussions illustrative quotes	Interpretation of mixed methods findings
... / e s / e - ... e	Video 1: M = 4.64 Video 2: M = 4.75 Video 3: M = 4.66 Video 4: M = 4.62 Video 5: M = 4.71	"This video was a dialogue between the husband and wife, was easily understandable." "This kind of format can be easily accepted." "It's easy to understand but it was old fashioned." "This video's prominent theme is very obvious, so it's very easy for me to understand." "I think this video is easy to understand."	The comments from FGDs indicated that all the five videos were easy to understand, confirmed by the high average scores.
... / e s / e - ... e	Video 1: M = 3.85 Video 2: M = 4.00 Video 3: M = 3.99 Video 4: M = 4.09 Video 5: M = 4.01	"I think there was not any new information." "I knew all this knowledge before." "Nothing is new in this video." "The harms of smoking are usually associated with the lungs or liver, I have never link smoking with the other disease or cancers." "I learned the difference between foreign cigarette packs and domestic ones"	The comments from FGDs revealed that most of the videos don't provide much new information for the audience other Video 4. This was confirmed by the higher average score of Video 4.
... es / e s / e - ... e	Video 1: M = 3.89		

by existing evidence. Traditional formats of health communication videos and the warning messages on tobacco control have been proven to be insufficient in eliciting changes in risk perception among urban and educated population groups [25]. Therefore, Video 4 was recommended for the final production and dissemination in the anti-cigarette gift giving campaign.

Notably, Video 4 and Video 1 (Quarreled couple at home) were similar in design and script, however, the overall rating of Video 4 was higher than that of Video 1 (46.1 vs. 44.9). A possible reason drawn from qualitative study was that in Video 1, the couple used very critical words and the rhythm was too fast. Another possible

