A guide to deciphering the internal codes used by the tobacco industry

Many tobacco control researchers and advocates are now aware of the value of the internal tobacco industry documents made public as a result of the state attorney generals’ Master Settlement Agreement. A growing body of document based research provides dramatic insight into industry initiatives and strategies. These published studies also provide countless examples of the secret language commonly used by the tobacco industry internally. As observed in Philip Morris' Dictionary of tobacco terminology: “Every specialized field has its own language”.

The language of the internal documents is frequently comprised of project names, acronyms, abbreviations, numerical identifiers, and other coded terms, presented without any clear indication of their definitions or meanings. These coded terms can make the task of document research very daunting: like trying to learn a foreign language without an instructor or reference dictionary.

Familiarity with the codes used internally by the manufacturers is critical to successfully conducting document research and interpreting internal industry activities. Although individual efforts have described the codes relevant to particular topics of research, no single research group has sought to identify the full extent and types of code languages used by the industry or the patterns governing internal codes. Many tobacco companies do maintain internal lists of terms. For example, over a dozen Philip Morris documents are devoted solely to providing their personnel with guides to the company’s extensive acronyms, abbreviations, codes, and terminology. Ultimately, however, the majority of terms and project names are not covered in internal lists, and understanding the meaning of internal codes necessitates both careful research as well as recognition of the common patterns and conventions employed throughout this terminology.

A critical role for tobacco control researchers to develop and share information that can facilitate and expedite future research. A recent monograph, A guide to deciphering the internal codes used by the tobacco industry, available on the Harvard School of Public Health website (http://www.hsph.harvard.edu/php/pr/tcrtp/home.html), identifies and describes a number of industry code lists and highlights different types of industry codes, both formal and informal, ranging from acronyms to “catchy” names, from numerical coding and letter patterning to signs of the zodiac and the names of world rivers. This monograph is part of a larger research project funded through a grant from the National Cancer Institute (CA87477-05 from the National Cancer Institute).

This research was funded through R01 grant CA87477-05 from the National Cancer Institute.
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Adult’s perceptions about whether tobacco companies tell the truth in relation to issues about smoking

The tobacco industry has long denied or played down the risks of smoking, addiction, and passive smoking in Australia. A survey commissioned by Phillip Morris in 1993 indicated that most Australian opinion leaders and the general public have an unfavourable opinion of the company, even less favourable than that of Americans. Faced by a rising tide of litigation, the tobacco industry has attempted to change their image over the past decade to one of a “socially responsible” corporate citizen.

Unlike in the USA, where the tobacco industry have engaged in extensive corporate image advertising and campaigns directed at youth and parents, in Australia, tobacco companies have focused on more subtle strategies and image advertising and campaigns directed at youth and parents, in Australia, tobacco companies have focused on more subtle approaches. For example, Philip Morris attempted to administer a series of workshops for Australian schoolteachers on how to encourage children to “say no to illicit drugs, underage smoking, drinking alcohol and bullying.” British American Tobacco (Australia) uses their website to boast of “substantial donations” to charities such as Lifeline and Mission Australia, while in 1999, Philip Morris listed itself in a corporate promotional brochure as sponsoring the Red Nose Day Foundation (supporting research on sudden infant death syndrome). During this period of “corporate re-imagining”, the tobacco industry also appeared prominently in the Australian news media. The Rolah McCabe trial in 2002 generated a great deal of press coverage and debate about the liability of the tobacco industry for smoking related illnesses and about their conduct in light of the Victorian Supreme Court finding that British American Tobacco had subverted the discovery process by deliberately destroying thousands of documents. To gain insight into how adults in the Australian state of Victoria perceive the tobacco industry, data from representative population surveys were analysed.

Participants were asked: “In relation to issues about smoking, do you think tobacco companies...always tell the truth; mostly tell the truth; mostly do not tell the truth, or never tell the truth?”

Table 1 shows that, in 2004, less than 1% of Victorian adults reported they thought that tobacco companies always tell the truth. The majority of adults (79%) reported that they thought tobacco companies either never or mostly do not tell the truth in relation to issues about smoking. Smokers (23%) were significantly more likely than former smokers (11%) and never smokers (16%) to believe that tobacco companies always or mostly tell the truth (p < 0.01). However, smokers were quite polarised in their views, with 32% of smokers also reporting that tobacco companies never tell the truth.

The percentage of adults who think tobacco companies mostly do not or never tell the truth has increased in a linear fashion from 2002 (75%) to 2003 (77%) to 2004 (79%) (p < 0.001). This level of distrust is comparable to South Australian adults’ perceptions in 1998, when 80% of respondents and 74% of smokers thought tobacco companies mostly did not or never told the truth about smoking and health, children and smoking, and addictiveness of tobacco. Although distrust was high in 2002, findings indicate that the Australian public is becoming increasingly wary of the tobacco industry and remain unimpressed by industry attempts to paint themselves as model corporate citizens.

Table 1 Perceptions of truth telling by tobacco companies in 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of Truth Telling</th>
<th>Total (n = 2997)</th>
<th>Smokers* (n = 638)</th>
<th>Former Smokers† (n = 835)</th>
<th>Never Smokers (n = 1524)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never tell the truth</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly do not tell the truth</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly tell the truth</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always tell the truth</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/can’t say/refused</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data weighted by age and sex according to Australian Bureau of Statistics population Census data for 2001.

*Smokers include those who smoke daily, weekly or less than weekly.
†Former smokers include those who had smoked at least 100 cigarettes or an equivalent amount of tobacco in their lifetime.
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Selling or promotion?

In Australia, the Tobacco Advertising Prohibition Act (1992) bans most forms of tobacco advertising and promotion. In response to restrictions, the tobacco industry has resorted to “below the line” activities such as event promotions at music festivals, fashion parades, private parties, sporting events, bars, and nightclubs. At these events, tobacco products are promoted under the guise of “selling”. It is important to expose these promotional activities as they may constitute breaches of the Act.

An audit of the heavily advertised large youth music events in Perth found that the tobacco industry was actively promoting tobacco products at these events. At the single indoor event, cigarettes were sold via a vending machine and there were no promotional activities. At the eight outdoor events, cigarettes were sold in tents set up as “chill-out” areas in which chairs were provided for people to relax. The tents were staffed by young women selling tobacco products, ancillary products, and merchandise (for example, beer holders bearing the Rizla cigarette paper logo). At two events (“cigarette girls”, dressed in Peter Stuyvesant brand colours, walked around the venues with trays of cigarettes for sale.

Approximately half of the events were not restricted to those aged 18 years and over, thus exposing patrons aged under 18 years to the promotional activities of the tobacco companies. Not only do youth music events provide direct access to a primary target market for tobacco companies, but they also allow the marketers to build brand images by associating their brands with a youthful pop culture.

Smoking becomes a part of the enjoyable experience of the music and fun atmosphere of the events, thus reinforcing the behaviour of current smokers and building more positive attitudes towards smoking among experimenters and non-smokers.

The state government of Western Australia recently introduced legislation which, if enacted, will assist in controlling the promotion of tobacco products at events. Specifically, the proposed Tobacco Products Control Bill 2005 will ban the mobile selling of tobacco products (currently not considered to be promotion, and permitted as “selling”). It also contains provisions to prohibit the sale or supply of tobacco products via temporary premises at events that are expected to attract significant numbers of people aged under 18 years. This proposed new legislation will further restrict the marketing opportunities of tobacco companies.

Response to E Yano and S Chapman

Professor Eiji Yano raises a number of issues in his letter1 which responded to my editorial. Here I reply to the main points raised.

Studies of environmental tobacco smoke (ETS) exposure and lung cancer commonly identify a group of self reported non-smoking women and then compare risk according to the smoking habits of the husband. If some true smokers are erroneously included among the female subjects, an apparent relationship of spousal smoking with lung cancer may persist even when no true effect of ETS exists. This has been mathematically demonstrated (for example, Lee and Forey), with attempts to correct for it made by major independent authoritative reviews of the evidence on passive smoking and lung cancer.2 The magnitude of the bias depends (among other things) on the extent to which women who smoke are classified as non-smokers. It can also be shown mathematically3 that a given rate of misclassification of smokers as non-smokers is a much more important cause of bias than is the same rate of the reverse misclassification, of non-smokers as smokers. Since such reverse misclassification is also implausible, adult women having little reason to claim erroneously to be smokers, the major reviews4,5 have all ignored its minor effects.

Given that in the Japanese spousal study (using a urinary cotinine/creatinine ratio (CCR) above 100 ng/mg as an index of true smoking) the reverse misclassification rate (8/298 = 2.7%) was much lower than the misclassification rate itself (28/98 = 28.6%), it becomes abundantly clear that reverse misclassification is not relevant to the passive smoking/lung cancer issue. It is difficult to understand why Yano places such emphasis on it.

Yano1 states that I am “confused with the calculation formula” and that my “definition of misclassification was obtained by dividing those with > 100 ng/mg CCR (n = 28) by self reported non-smokers (n = 318)”. It appears that Yano himself is confused. I had previously made it clear6 that the denominator should not be 318, but 98, the number of women with a CCR value indicative of smoking (or perhaps 106, if it also includes those women who claimed to smoke but had a CCR < 100 ng/ml).

The misclassification rate calculation is clearly based on CCR > 100 ng/ml, not only indicating smoking. Such a wide cut-off is widely used9, though may be subject to some error, and was the best technique available at the time. Most smokers admit to smoking, so that self report has some validity as an indicator of true smoking status, but this does not help us estimate the magnitude of the misclassification bias. The observed lack of correlation in the Japanese spousal study between CCR in non-smokers (with CCR < 100 ng/ml) and other indices of ETS exposure suggests that inaccuracy in CCR measurement at low levels may be important. However, such inaccuracy may not be relevant to the misclassification rate calculation, which merely attempts to use CCR to distinguish smokers from non-smokers. Over half the self reported non-smokers with values over 100 ng/ml actually had values of 1000 ng/mg, and it would be very surprising indeed if errors in CCR measurement were so huge that these women were really non-smokers.

Though I would be happy to see results of further studies using up to date, state of the art chemical methods to detect nicotine metabolites in self reported non-smokers, the conclusion I reached in 1995 that misclassification rates are much higher in Japanese than in...
Western populations seems to be correct. I note that the existence of high misclassification rates in Asian women has in fact been independently confirmed.

Yano states that he used his data without his consent. As far as I am aware, the data never belonged to Yano. The study had been funded by the industry which had carried out the cotinine analyses (blind of self reported smoking status). I had originally proposed that the study be done, following conduct of a similar study in England, which the industry supported at my request, the results of which I reported. The original intention had been for Yano to be a major author, but problems arose because his interpretation of the findings differed materially from mine, due to his misunderstanding of the complexities of misclassification. Discussions took place between Yano and Proctor, who played an important role in the planning and organisation of the study on behalf of the tobacco companies who funded it; I was told that these discussions led to Yano deciding not to be a co-author and that he understood that the work would be published by others.

I had assumed that Proctor would keep Yano informed about the status of the publication and was surprised Yano did not find out about the paper, published in 1995, until some seven or eight years later. Clearly, one of us should have kept him informed, and for this I apologise. In his original article, Yano states that “at no stage in my discussions with Proctor was Lee’s name or role ever mentioned”. This is surprising inasmuch as the study proposal stated that I would assist in reviewing the study design and in interpreting the data. Was Yano really unaware of the previous literature on misclassification, in which I figured prominently (see Lee) when conducting a study, a major aim of which concerned the determination of misclassification rates? Chapman considers that “it is hard to imagine a more flagrant example of attempted ghost authorship”. It is difficult to see why Chapman sees the publication as ghost authorship at all, when I proposed the study, helped in its design, and then published it. The study was a joint enterprise, as I saw it, and it is perfectly normal for some of the scientists involved in a study to write a draft for others to agree to. It would clearly have been better had a version of the study been published, with Yano as the sole author, been published. However, Yano’s failure to understand the mathematics of misclassification made this impossible. There was no agreement I am aware of that Yano had sole rights to authorship. Had I not published the paper it seems that the findings would never have appeared in the public domain at all. Did Yano also have sole rights to suppress the findings?

At the end of the day it is interesting that, though the evidence of high misclassification rates in Japanese women has been independently confirmed, the relevance of this to the ETS/lung cancer relationship has been ignored in recent major reviews of ETS and lung cancer. For example, Hackshaw et al. (International Agency for Research on Cancer) have demonstrated the major biasing effect of this finding in detail elsewhere.
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Should a paper with erroneous interpretations based on invalid measurements be published?

In response to Mr Lee’s comment which follows previous responses and my paper, I offer further comments to resolve an apparent misunderstanding of the validity and reliability of cotinine/creatinine ratio (CCR) measurement and its mishandling of the formula of misclassification. I also express concerns about the extent of scientific integrity in his reporting of the Japanese spousal study, including his authorship.

As I demonstrated, all indices of nicotine exposure (ambient room, personal sampler monitors, and urine cotinine) were well correlated but correlated poorly with CCR, raising doubts about the validity of the CCR measurement. Yet Lee maintains that CCR measurement in this study was the gold standard for distinguishing true smokers from falsely reporting smokers.

There are several possibilities about why the CCR measurement may have been invalid and unreliable in this study. In 1991 when I sent the urine samples to the RJ Reynolds laboratory (where the measurement was performed), I was informed that the ice sent with the sample had sublimated before it reached the laboratory. This suggests that the sample was not maintained at low temperature before analysis. Cotinine measurement is temperature sensitive; measurement after the sample is exposed to high temperature can make the measurement inaccurate.

As I calculated, the misclassification and reverse misclassification is dependent on the prevalence of smoking. With only a slight (3%) inaccuracy in CCR measurement, he can thereby easily get more than three times higher (21% v 6%) ‘misclassification’ in a population with lower smoking prevalence, such as with Asian women.

After a long discussion between Proctor and me, Proctor finally understood and accepted my point on the misclassification formula. Our final draft of the misclassification formula which Proctor sent to me on 9 November 1992 with my name as a sole author, clearly mentioned the high proportion of misclassification in both sides (self reported non-smoking subjects with high CCR and self reported smokers with low CCR).

Lee insists that reverse misclassification is relatively unimportant in his “abundant” mathematical publications. However, I note that it seems to have reality. For example, using 28/106 as the misclassification rate of self reported smokers in his original study, having quietly switched to 28/98 for this rate after I pointed out his conclusion. Despite his claim that reverse misclassification is implausible, it was observed as a fact.

Lee states that as far as he is aware “the data never belonged to Yano”. He should be aware that I developed the questionnaire, and I directed the study and all aspects of it. I supervised the survey at the study area (Shizuoka), erroneously referred to in Lee’s paper as “Shizoka”. I planned and ordered the data input, performed the data analysis, and wrote the paper to protect myself from the experience of possible sample damage (from dry ice sublimation) by the commercial
The recent publication of The millennium development goals and tobacco control: an opportunity for global partnership

Written by Katherine M Esson, Stephen R Leeder. Published by World Health Organization, 2005. ISBN 92 4 159287 7

MDGs and tobacco: a glimmer of hope—but only if matched by dollars.

Many agencies and governments have great expectations for the poverty reduction targets of the millennium development goals (MDGs). These were adopted at the Millennium Summit of the United Nations in New York on September 24, 2000 with the aim to “ensure that all people, by 2015, live a life free from poverty.” The eight goals of the MDGs are specifically targeting issues regarded as critical to progress in reducing poverty including eradicating poverty, achieving universal education, promoting gender equality, reducing child mortality, improving maternal health, combating HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases, and ensuring environmental sustainability. As conceived, the MDGs had a strong focus on poverty reduction, but the aim to improve health outcomes for marginalised people was virtually silent on tobacco control.
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