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Editor-in-Chief: Tobacco Regulatory Science
Academic Community Engagement with Tobacco Industry

Has taken many forms, including and not limited to:

- Accepting funds for unrestricted research
- Conducting contract research
- Serving as experts in litigation
- Helping TobInd undermine research findings that run counter to TobInd interests (eg with media)
- Providing expertise regarding tobacco regulatory matters (research, strategic planning, etc)
- Implementation of conferences and journals
- Discussions to gain intelligence regarding TobInd activities (ie no financial support by TobInd)
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John Slade, MD
Why Should Anyone Care about Academic Engagement with the Tobacco Industry?

• History of TobInd Falsehoods, diversions, and misrepresentation
  • Creating and disseminating poor and misleading science in the past
  • Undermining solid and independent science, creating uncertainty in findings adverse to them

• Companies admit in litigation that there was tobacco industry misinformation and error

• TobInd statements about eventually moving out of the combustible business

• Creating and selling NRT and legitimate reduced harm products, but...

• They continue to challenge existing evidence accepted by the scientific community in order to meet their own objectives

Institute of Medicine, 2011

Legal finding in United States v. Philip Morris USA, Inc., et al.:

“Defendants attempted to and, at times, did prevent/stop ongoing research, hide existing research, and destroy sensitive documents in order to protect their public positions on smoking and health, avoid or limit liability for smoking and health-related claims in litigation, and prevent regulatory limitations on the cigarette industry.”

Institute of Medicine, 2011
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- History of Falsehoods, diversions, and misrepresentation
- Creating and disseminating poor and misleading science in the past
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- Has this changed? Yes, and no...
- Companies admit in litigation that there was tobacco industry misinformation and error; science seems to be more solid
- Creating and selling NRT and legitimate reduced harm products,
- TobInd statements about eventually moving out of the combustible business, but....

Market Realist:

“According to André Calantzopoulos, Philip Morris’s chief executive officer, “we aim to become the undisputed leader of the Reduced-Risk Product category with the highly ambitious objective of having RRPs ultimately replace combustible products to the benefit of adult smokers, society and our company.”

Why Should Anyone Care about Academic Engagement with the Tobacco Industry?

- History of TobInd Falsehoods, diversions, and misrepresentation
- Creating and disseminating poor and misleading science
- Undermining solid and independent science, creating uncertainty in findings adverse to them
- Has this changed? Yes, and no…
  - Companies admit in litigation that there was tobacco industry misinformation and error; science seems to be more solid
  - Creating and selling NRT and legitimate reduced harm products,
  - TobInd statements about eventually moving out of the combustible business, but…
  - But...they continue to challenge existing evidence accepted by the scientific community and strive to increase sales of combustibles globally (particularly emerging markets)
Given Past and Current Tobacco Industry Behavior, What are the Risks of Engagement?

Some examples include:

- Tobacco industry receiving public relations value from that engagement, resulting in improved public image of Tobacco Industry (TobInd).
- Risk that such engagement could change social norms and reduce pressure on the TobInd (e.g., social, political, etc.).
- Risk that current and future science-based tobacco control could be marginalized.
- Compromising personal or organizational core values, e.g., medical institution.
- Compromised science, i.e., conscious or unconscious bias.
- Conflicts of interest, or perceived conflicts of interest, that could undermine confidence in data by others.

NCI, 2007
Risks of Engaging with Tobacco Industry (Research, Publishing, Partnering)

Some examples include, but are not limited to:

• Tobacco industry receives public relations value from that engagement, resulting in improved public image of TobInd
• Academic engagement could change social norms and reduce pressure on the TobInd (eg social, political, etc)
• Risk that current and future science-based tobacco control could be marginalized
• Compromising personal or organizational core values, eg medical institution
• Compromised science, ie conscious or unconscious bias
• Conflicts of interest, or perceived conflicts of interest, that could undermine confidence in data and products (eg ENDS)
• Early e-cigarettes marketed by independent companies (2003 in China, 2006/7 in Europe and US), and often anti-tobacco oriented, had little/no funds for research, so academic engagement was minimal. Sottera lawsuit in 2010 determined that e-cigarettes are tobacco products in the U.S. By 2013/14, major tobacco companies had e-cigarettes on the market, and the competition has been fierce—the lines between ENDS products and tobacco products have been blurred, but ENDS clearly less harmful and can deliver cig-level nicotine.

• In the new regulatory environment, independent ENDS-related and tobacco industry companies will need to implement research to show reduced harm in order to stay on the market in the US; academic community is being asked to conduct research and provide guidance.

• Are the 'rules' of engagement different for tobacco companies, including those that make ENDS products, and independent companies that only make ENDS? Again, Yes and no....

Kozlowski & Abrams, 2016, Adapted from Nutt, 2014
What About ENDS/ANDS?

• In the new regulatory environment, independent ENDS-related and tobacco industry companies will need to implement research to show reduced harm in order to stay on the market in the US; academic community is being asked to conduct research and provide guidance to both groups.

• Are the ‘rules’ of engagement different for tobacco companies, including those that make ENDS products, and independent companies that only make ENDS? Again, Yes and no....
Yes...Because Many Restrictions on Engaging with Tobacco Companies Exist

Concerns about real or perceived bias, conflict of interest, TobInd efforts to expand sales of combustibles and to undermine tobacco control have led to:

- Multiple academic institutions prohibit acceptance of tobacco industry funding, eg Mayo Clinic, MD Anderson Cancer Center, Johns Hopkins School of Medicine
- Some funding agencies take acceptance of tobacco industry funding into account when deciding whether to fund, eg Cancer Research UK and NIDA
- Multiple scientific journals have elected to not accept research funded by the tobacco industry, eg Tobacco Control, PLoS Medicine, BMJ, Tobacco Regulatory Science
- Some clinical and scientific societies prohibit members from collaborating with tobacco companies, eg European Respiratory Society
- FCTC Article 5.3...” Parties shall act to protect these policies from commercial and other vested interests of the tobacco industry in accordance with national law.”
- Significant social pressure for academics to not accept TobInd funding

1 http://senate.ucsf.edu/townhallmeeting/UniversityTobaccoPolicies.pdf;
2 http://www.cancerresearchuk.org/sites/default/files/code_of_practice_on_tobacco_industry_funding.pdf;
No...Because Transparency is Needed for Both (and Pharma)

Increasing recognition that transparency and disclosure of potential conflicts are needed, but few standards exist:

- Financial and non-financial disclosure that could reflect bias
  - Institute of Medicine (IOM, 2013) recommended creation of an international standard and database
  - Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC) developed Convey, based on IOM guidelines
    - Convey includes common and tailored data, including both financial and non-financial conflicts
    - However, some criteria are not clear, and need to be included (e.g., what is a minimum threshold for accepting gifts or funds?, how many years to include, etc.)

- Research Design and Implementation Disclosure
  - New Clinicaltrials.gov criterion, includes public/private studies, requires full protocol, AEs, outcomes, baseline data, etc.

- Access to Data and Publishing Results Disclosure
  - Need consistent agreements regarding academic access to data and that there will be no restriction on publishing results

https://www.aamc.org/initiatives/convey/
Yes...Because Transparency is Needed for Both (and Pharma)

Increasing recognition that transparency and disclosure of potential conflicts are needed, but no standards exist:

- **Research Design and Implementation Disclosure**
  - New Clinicaltrial.gov criterion, includes public/private studies, requires full protocol, AEs, outcomes, baseline data, etc – this should be global
- **Access to Data and Publishing Results**
  - Need consistent agreements regarding academic access to data and that there will be no restriction on publishing results
'Rules' of Engagement: Summary and Conclusions

- Engaging financially with the tobacco industry, particularly those that sell combustibles, will continue to be problematic for many/most academics because the companies have made no fundamental changes
  - Engagement will likely be driven by personal/organizational factors, but regulatory research will likely be straight contract work with non-academic research companies
  - Mechanism involving independent grant-making organization using TobInd funds for academic research could(s) work

- But, there is potential value (in my view) for academics to engage in conversations with TobInd (e.g., attending TobInd conferences), to gain science insights not possible in any other way

- Standards for transparency and disclosure are needed to document engagement where any financial or non-financial factors might contribute to bias, and some examples exist. Because of the changing environment, ongoing discussions are warranted as laws and the environment changes. SRNT might be a good organization to lead such an effort

1Cohen, et al, Tobacco Control, 2009
Thank you!
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