tobacco control. The laboratories for this great experiment are the states and local communities; the studies are being conducted by health advocates using tools of advocacy and media.

Now is the time to continue those studies. Now is the time for the National Cancer Institute to build on the foundation of ASSIST and move to the next level of tobacco control research.
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The future of NCI's smoking research agenda

Stan Glantz has joined a small chorus beseeching the National Institutes of Health in general and the NCI in particular to greatly expand its tobacco control research agenda. As usual, Glantz does it provocatively and artfully and puts forth his own proposed agenda.

Glantz is correct in asserting that the NCI has not had a programmatic tobacco research programme since the Smoking and Tobacco Control Program developed by Joe Cullen culminated in the ASSIST programme. It is also hard to avoid the implications of the huge discrepancy Glantz noted between the impact of tobacco on cancer morbidity and mortality and the proportion of the NCI's budget devoted to tobacco control research. The NCI may well feel that, given the relatively large expenditures for the COMMIT and ASSIST community and state-level trials, tobacco research has been taken care of and it is time to move on to other risk factors. I strongly agree with Glantz's argument that such a move would be greatly premature and unfortunate. There are major gaps in our knowledge about tobacco control that need to be addressed via research. Given the size of its budget and its prior history, the NCI should take the lead in developing a plan for tobacco research.

Glantz's particular "wrinkle" is to argue for large population studies that would take off from the accomplishments of ASSIST and capitalise on variation in state activities—which exist in part because some states are now engaged in tobacco control funded by dedicated tax monies—to learn about the relative effectiveness of population-level tobacco control interventions. Glantz has, in effect, drafted the essentials of a persuasive Request for Proposals (RFP) that the NCI might issue. It is an RFP that would likely have an expensive price tag attached. Such research would be worth paying for, given the mortality and morbidity stakes that are involved. Some of the elements in Glantz's RFP are consistent with research directions that I proposed in a paper that was commissioned by the NCI. Both Glantz's recommendations and mine could and should be addressed through investigator-initiated proposals. I would urge investigators to take on portions of Glantz's agenda. Building upon the accomplishments of ASSIST, however, requires that ASSIST submit its methods and results for review by the scientific community. As Glantz notes, the CDC has important evaluation expertise to contribute, and state health divisions are getting into the act as they monitor the smoking control programmes supported by dedicated tax monies. But the NCI retains primary responsibility for advancing the science of population-based tobacco control. Glantz is correct in noting that innovative methodologies will be needed to tease out causation in population studies where experimental control may be quite limited. Let us hope that NCI's newly reorganised Division of Cancer Control and Population Science takes the latter part of its new name seriously.

EDWARD LICHTENSTEIN
Oregon Research Institute,
1715 Franklin Boulevard,
Eugene, Oregon 97403-1983, USA;
email: ed@ori.org


Tobacco control in the United States: the next generation of demonstration and research projects

As noted in the above commentary by Glantz, the landscape for tobacco control in the United States is changing dramatically due to unprecedented leadership in our national government, state-based efforts to increase tobacco taxes and to sue tobacco companies, and local measures to restrict the use of and access to tobacco. Based largely on the favourable evaluation results of the NCI's ASSIST trial, Glantz calls for a new NCI-coordinated programme (SCIENCE) for tobacco control research and development.

It is worth noting that the primary goal of ASSIST is to "reduce smoking prevalence