Transcript – Deadly Industry: Challenging Big Tobacco – Ep.7, S.2

00:00:02:24 - 00:00:24:09

Louis

Welcome to season two of Deadly Industry: Challenging Big Tobacco from the Tobacco Control Research Group at the University of Bath, hosted by me, Louis Laurence. We are an international research group that investigates the tactics used by Big Tobacco to maximise its profits at the expense of public health. The evidence we produce helps society to hold this deadly industry to account.

00:00:24:11 - 00:00:31:01

Louis

If you enjoy listening, then please subscribe, leave us a review and share this podcast.

00:00:31:03 - 00:00:56:06

Louis

In this episode, we dive back into the murky waters of conflicts of interest in science and what happens when industries that profit from harm are allowed to shape the evidence base meant to regulate them. We introduced this hot topic back in season one of the Deadly Industry podcast, so it's worth going back and listening to that too. But today, we're going to take a closer look at how this influence operates, why it matters, and what can be done to protect scientific trust and integrity in public health.

00:00:56:10 - 00:01:17:13

Louis

I'm joined in the studio by Dr Tess Legg, a researcher at the University of Bath who has published extensively on how industries, from tobacco to food, strategically manipulate science, and also by Dr Alice Fabri, a lecturer at the University of Bath and a public health physician whose work focuses on commercial influences on health. Tess, Alice, welcome. Great to have you both here.

00:01:17:16 - 00:01:18:16

Tess

Thank you for having us.

00:01:18:16 - 00:01:19:11

Alice

Thank you.

Transcript – Deadly Industry: Challenging Big Tobacco – Ep.7, S.2

00:01:19:13 - 00:01:29:01

Louis

So I guess let's start with the kind of the broader picture here. Maybe with you Tess. How widespread is corporate sector involvement in science and why is it such a problem?

00:01:29:03 - 00:01:56:21

Tess

Yeah. Thank you. I guess to answer that question, we can look at the funding landscape of research and so the way that science and research is funded has really, really changed dramatically in the last few decades. So since the early 90s, the data show that there's been a stagnation in publicly funded science and a shift away from that

00:01:56:21 - 00:02:28:05

Tess

but this exponential growth of commercial funded science and, consequently, I think what that means then is that corporate funded science, if that is the majority, then the integrity of that science is really important. You know, I think to caveat this, with this point is important as well. So industry funded science, a lot of it has contributed to the development of, you know, new technological advancements or knowledge within society.

00:02:28:07 - 00:02:57:09

Tess

But the converse of that is that, and people listening will have heard these stories, that sometimes that hasn't been the case. So the tobacco industry's denial of smoking harms is one very good example. And I know you've discussed that on another episode. And another is the fossil fuels industry's involvement in climate denial. And I think that, you know, when people think about industries manipulating science, they might think this is something was happening decades ago.

00:02:57:09 - 00:03:30:22

Tess

So the tobacco industry started in the 1950s to, you know, try and hide the harms of its products. But I think another important part of that puzzle is that we've seen numerous, much more recent scientific scandals that have rocked corporations, and some of these have been ordered by the courts to pay billions and billions of dollars in damages because it came to light that they had the evidence that their products were harmful, that they concealed that evidence, and that they produced their own science to tell a different story.

00:03:30:24 - 00:03:59:01

Tess

And just a couple of examples of those really recent ones that you may have heard of. So one was pharmaceutical company Johnson & Johnson, whose talcum powder was contaminated with asbestos and so thousands of women in the States have found themselves with ovarian cancer due to using this product every day. And so, you know, Johnson & Johnson have been court ordered to pay billions of dollars in damages.

00:03:59:07 - 00:03:59:23

Tess

And another…

00:03:59:24 - 00:04:01:22

Louis

And so they knew about those harms, did they?

00:04:01:23 - 00:04:14:16

Tess

Well, this is exactly what the court case was about, it was about the fact that they had done their own tests on the product, that they could see that there was asbestos contaminated in the talc and that they didn't make that public.

00:04:14:18 - 00:04:21:02

Louis

So they had conducted industry science effectively, which came with useful results but they decided not to share these results.

00:04:21:03 - 00:04:25:24

Tess

Exactly. So it was about suppressing findings and conducting science in secret.

00:04:26:01 - 00:04:42:03

Louis

I suppose part of that issue then, is about how science is shared or published, and, you know how that conflicts with profit motive, I suppose. Maybe could give us a little, just brief explainer for the listener, on how scientific publishing works and why that conflicts with commercial interests sometimes.

00:04:42:03 - 00:05:11:17

Tess

Yeah, yeah, that's a good question. I think. So in those cases, it was really about, you know, conducting that science in secret and not publishing it at all. And so that then doesn't necessarily make its way into the evidence base. So the evidence base itself, traditionally the way that researchers and scientists would publish would be to publish their papers in peer reviewed academic journals and the peer review process,

00:05:11:17 - 00:05:23:00

Tess

so you'd submit a paper, the paper would go through review from your peers, perhaps two, three, four academics, and it would also go through rigorous editorial review as well.

00:05:23:00 - 00:05:25:03

Louis

Presumably that's a process that you're pretty familiar with.

00:05:25:05 - 00:05:52:18

Tess

Yeah and that's exactly it and that's how we tend to publish our findings in tobacco control and in public health. I would say that those mechanisms have changed somewhat lately. So some corporations will just self publish their work on their websites, you know, in reports or something. And another key route to publication now is people using preprint platforms.

00:05:52:20 - 00:06:19:18

Tess

So a preprint or an open science publishing platform is where you as a researcher can upload your science and it doesn't go through editorial review, it doesn't go through peer review, it doesn't necessarily have any checks and balances in terms of, you know, making sure you've said who funded

it or any other conflicts that are. So there are massive benefits to preprint platforms because it's a really, really quick way of getting scientific findings out into the public domain.

00:06:19:24 - 00:06:45:16

Tess

And there are some times where, you know, that's really important. For example, the emerging science on Covid just needed to be out there really quickly, didn't it? But there is a danger that preprint platforms can then be used by actors to get science out in the public domain and in the evidence base that looks like a scientific journal article, looks like it's been peer reviewed, but it hasn't necessarily.

00:06:45:22 - 00:06:50:19

Tess

And we've seen the tobacco industry use those preprint platforms in those ways.

00:06:51:00 - 00:07:07:05

Louis

So presumably these kind of new publishing forms introduce more of this conflict of interest risk. I think Alice let's bring you into the conversation at this point. This episode is partly about this issue of conflicts of interest with commercial interests and how that affects science. How do you guys define conflict of interest?

00:07:07:08 - 00:07:35:05

Alice

Yes, thank you. So partnership with corporations can place researchers in conflict of interest situation. And so let's try to define it together as you said. So we know the definition developed in the 90s by Professor Dennis Thompson, who wrote that a conflict of interest is a set of conditions in which professional judgment concerning the primary interests tends to be unduly influenced by a secondary interest.

00:07:35:07 - 00:08:03:07

Alice

So let's try to unpack for a moment together this definition. As you can see, it refers to conflicts between primary and secondary interests. For example, primary interests are the key and legal obligations of professionals. So if I'm a doctor, it could be the health of my patients. If I'm a researcher, my primary interest is to conduct unbiased research and to make the findings available to the community.

Transcript – Deadly Industry: Challenging Big Tobacco – Ep.7, S.2

00:08:03:09 - 00:08:33:15

Alice

Instead secondary interests are other interests, like financial interests, that can unduly influence professional judgment. And an important point that emerged from this definition is that conflict of interest is a condition, not a behaviour. This is a very important point, because it means that conflict of interest does not necessarily imply a bad behaviour and this allows us to distinguish it from active bad behaviours like corruption.

00:08:33:17 - 00:08:56:18

Alice

So it's much more subtle because conflict of interest is a set of circumstances that place the affected person in a position of potentially being influenced by those circumstances. But it is also possible to have a conflict of interest and still fulfil one's obligations. It's much more subtle than active bad behaviours like corruption.

00:08:56:19 - 00:09:05:09

Louis

So it's passive in that sense. You're in the context of a conflict of interest, even if you're, you know, trying your best to avoid it.

00:09:05:11 - 00:09:23:17

Alice

Some scholars have said that conflict of interest is like an epidemiological risk factor. So you are exposed to it, but not necessarily you will develop the disease and the disease in this case is the compromised loyalty, the biased judgment or the biased decision. So I hope this clarifies a bit.

00:09:23:23 - 00:09:24:12

Louis

Absolutely.

00:09:24:15 - 00:09:25:06

Alice

Yeah.

00:09:25:08 - 00:09:35:17

Louis

And, you know, within that definition of conflict of interest, how well understood is this with regards to these commercial actors like tobacco or other commercial determinants of health?

00:09:35:19 - 00:10:07:20

Alice

Well, we have substantial evidence that financial conflicts of interest, such as commercial sponsorship of research and of investigators, leads to systematic biases in scientific research at all stages of the research process. So conflict of interest is a source of bias. And we have evidence from the pharmaceutical area, from tobacco, from chemical area that industry funding biases human research studies towards outcomes that are favourable to the sponsor product.

00:10:07:22 - 00:10:26:12

Alice

So financial conflict of interest can be influenced research through various mechanisms like the framing of the research question, how the study is actually conducted and whether it is accurately and fully reported. So we have evidence of this impact, negative impact.

00:10:26:14 - 00:10:37:08

Louis

Is this like, just to follow up on that, the sort of compromisation aspects on research, is that understood by these industries? Is that part of the tactic?

00:10:37:10 - 00:10:51:13

Alice

Well, I think this is an important work that Tess has done during her PhD and leads us to her science for profit model. I don't know Tess if you would like to say something about this, because you have explored this quite in detail in your work.

00:10:51:15 - 00:10:56:20

Louis

Yeah. Perfect. Over to you Tess. Let's hear more about some of these different mechanisms and the kind of tactics behind them.

00:10:57:00 - 00:11:08:07

Tess

Yes. Thank you for that question. So the science for profit model, I think you've talked about it a little bit in a previous episode. So I hope you don't mind me going over that ground again.

00:11:08:07 - 00:11:09:17

Louis

No, I think it bears repeating.

00:11:09:17 - 00:11:32:23

Tess

Yeah. Thank you. And I hope to add some extra context. So it's a fairly recently developed typology and model that we worked on. And what we wanted to do was to synthesise the evidence base on corporate influence on science, because it's a really vast evidence base from all different disciplines, looking at all different industries with lots of different methods.

00:11:33:00 - 00:12:06:03

Tess

And we knew that there is knowledge and information on how diverse industries try to affect science, but it hasn't really been sort of brought together and synthesised properly in one place. So we wanted it to be accessible and usable tool. So yes, it was about how and why corporations attempt to influence science. And as I say, we looked across the data and we found that diverse industries were attempting to use science in the same ways, for the same reasons.

00:12:06:05 - 00:12:33:15

Tess

So we found information and analysed the data on eight sectors of industry. So it was the tobacco industry, but also the food industry. Pharmaceuticals, fossil fuels, gambling, alcohol and several more. And as I say, the strategies that they used were similar and the reasons were similar. And if I could just quickly talk about the reasons first.

00:12:33:15 - 00:13:02:00

Tess

So we created a model to demonstrate this. And what we found was that overwhelmingly what corporations and the third parties were trying to do was to create doubt about potential harms of

their products or their practices or sometimes about the necessity or efficacy of policy making that would affect them. Second, to offer their own industry favoured solutions.

00:13:02:02 - 00:13:27:14

Tess

So that might be an industry product or, you know, an alternative to regulation. And third, to legitimise the role of industries as credible players in science and policy making. And all of that would then lead to some ultimate outcomes, which was about weakening policy, preventing litigation against industry, and maximising the consumption or use of industry products and practices.

00:13:27:20 - 00:13:30:10

Louis

Maybe could tell us a bit more about some of the actual mechanisms.

00:13:30:12 - 00:14:00:02

Tess

Yeah, absolutely. So some of the strategies were around affecting how science is conducted and published, including manipulating design of studies. And we saw that within the lead industry and the asbestos industry, for example. And I actually have a more recent example, which sums this up really quite clearly, I think, if you don't mind me reading out a few quotes from...

00:14:00:02 - 00:14:01:05

Louis

Please do, yeah.

00:14:01:07 - 00:14:26:02

Tess

Thank you. So this was a group of researchers in Italy who decided to withdraw their involvement in a clinical trial. And the reason for that was that they had become really concerned about the level of control that the funder was demanding. And these researchers chose to bring this to light what had happened and they shared their experience in the BMJ, in the journal.

00:14:26:04 - 00:14:47:11

Tess

And this is, you know, amazing because very, very rarely do we get to see what goes on behind closed doors within these contracts, right. And so the researchers said, when we questioned some of the company's methodological choices, such as the comparator drug and sample size, it became clear that these were not open for discussion.

00:14:47:13 - 00:15:13:02

Tess

A project agreement written by GSK, who was the funder, set out dozens of pages of rules that effectively gave the drug company total control. And they go on to say the biggest issue was around transparency. GSK wanted to retain the right to refuse access to the patient outcome data and reserve the right to block publication of our analysis of that data at any time.

00:15:13:04 - 00:15:31:10

Tess

So as you can see, what appeared to be happening was that the funder wanted to control whether or not they could get at the data, what kind of analysis they were going to do, and whether or not they were even going to be allowed to publish their findings at the end of it and so they pulled the plug on that collaboration and decided not to go ahead.

00:15:31:12 - 00:15:42:20

Tess

And so I think, you know, from that, they were afforded a complete lack of academic freedom and I think that's the message there that, you know, researchers need this academic freedom to publish and to analyse the data as they see fit.

00:15:42:21 - 00:15:47:12

Louis

GSK that being GlaxoSmithKline, the major pharmaceutical company.

00:15:47:13 - 00:16:13:20

Tess

That's right, yeah. So I wanted to give you that example because that was about manipulating the design or the publication. And then I wanted to give you a different example, just quickly, because this is perhaps less well known that industry funded science can be methodologically robust. It can

be carried out by researchers who have the highest integrity, who have complete academic freedom to publish it, and so on.

00:16:13:22 - 00:16:46:10

Tess

And yet that research can still be used by industries, including harmful industries, in ways that benefit them because it distracts attention from their practices or their products. And one example is research into the so-called problem gambler. And this has been funded historically by the gambling industry. And what that does, the effect that has, is to place the blame on the individual rather than on the corporate practice themselves.

00:16:46:16 - 00:16:59:04

Louis

Yeah. I mean, you notice I mean, just anecdotally at the moment I feel like I'm bombarded by constant gambling adverts. And the message is you need to gamble safe, it's your responsibility to make sure that you're controlling your level of gambling.

00:16:59:04 - 00:17:01:00

Tess

Yeah and the messages is gamble isn't it…

00:17:01:00 - 00:17:01:14

Louis

Yeah despite there being constant…

00:17:01:17 - 00:17:17:02

Tess

The message I not don't gamble, it's just be safe while you are doing this thing which you will inevitably do. And it's the same, the alcohol industry has done similarly with the so-called problem drinker, you know, again, individualising the structural problem, I would say.

00:17:17:04 - 00:17:30:05

Louis

So these all fit within your kind of science for profit model? Yeah. Just to bring you in quickly Alice, Tess and the team have set out this model. Have you then gone on to use this model in your own research?

00:17:30:07 - 00:17:55:23

Alice

Well, we have used it also, for example, as a tool for teaching, for example, to train students or research around this topic, I think it's a very concise and well constructed model that gives students or researchers who are familiarizing with this issue a clear picture of what are the strategies and what they need to be aware of.

00:17:55:23 - 00:18:08:14

Alice

So I think it's a great teaching tool. And I know Tess is using also this as a tool to analyse, I think, industry documents right Tess to identify the strategies that have been used in certain circumstances, if I'm not wrong.

00:18:08:17 - 00:18:10:10

Tess

Yes, that's right, yeah.

00:18:10:12 - 00:18:24:22

Louis

Let's talk a bit about the solutions in that case. I mean, this is obviously a major issue, this kind of commercial influence, it doesn't sound like it's going away anytime soon. What can we do or what is being done to protect science from this kind of undue industry influence?

00:18:24:24 - 00:19:01:00

Tess

So, yes, I do think big steps have been taken over the past decades to try to protect science from undue industry influence. And a lot of that has happened in relation to the tobacco industry, I would say, because we've known for decades about this, you know, the way that the public was deceived about the harms of smoking and then of passive smoking and some of those efforts, I would say, have focused on transparency.

00:19:01:02 - 00:19:35:19

Tess

So first, ensuring that the reader of the science or the user of the science understands the origin of how that was funded or what links those authors might have to different bodies. Just one example of that would be within academic journals where there would be policies and you would need as an author to spell out two things - the funding declaration where you would spell out, you know, as it sounds, who has funded the research, and then the conflict of interest declaration, which would discuss any further connections you have to interested parties.

00:19:35:21 - 00:20:10:02

Tess

And then, you know, within, in terms of the tobacco industry, there are other steps that have been taken. So some universities have banned tobacco industry funding for their, you know, banned their researchers from receiving tobacco industry funding. Some funding agencies, such as Cancer Research UK, refuse to fund academics who have links to the tobacco industry. Some academic journals have actually gone further and completely banned tobacco industry funded work, which I feel is the right thing to do, and conference organisers and professional organisations as well,

00:20:10:02 - 00:20:25:18

Tess

some have rejected tobacco industry contributions. But I think, you know, within all of that, it has been somewhat of a piecemeal approach so far. And so we need a much more, you know, widespread and comprehensive response to what we're seeing.

00:20:25:24 - 00:20:36:04

Louis

Alice, you mentioned about this training you're doing, partly, presumably that's part of this response to try and protect science from industry influence. Maybe you could tell us a bit more about that project.

00:20:36:06 - 00:21:02:10

Alice

Yes, yes. So, I think that the top down solutions like, for example, policies and regulations need to be coupled with bottom up approaches. And I think that in this regard, the training on research integrity, on industry influence on science, should really be part of the mandatory curriculum of academic

programs. Still most students are not exposed maybe to these topics during their pre or postgraduate training.

00:21:02:10 - 00:21:32:16

Alice

So, we tried to develop and pilot a novel educational intervention on conflict of interest and corporate influence on science, for PhD students and research staff at the University of Bath. Since this topic still appears to be a neglected area. And what we tried to do, and we published the results of this experience recently in Health Promotion International, was also to assess this training and the impact that this could have on participants knowledge or attitudes or behaviours or confidence.

00:21:32:16 - 00:22:08:10

Alice

And we found that even if, of course, there's a small sample size that limited our analysis, we found that the participant knowledge of the topic significantly increased, and also participants confidence in knowing how to mitigate the risks of corporate funding. So these are, despite the limitation, there are promising results that show that even a short educational intervention could be effective in empowering individuals to make informed decision about whether to accept corporate funding and also how to navigate those funding relationships.

00:22:08:10 - 00:22:12:23

Alice

So promising results that we hope to expand with more work.

00:22:13:00 - 00:22:19:24

Louis

How much awareness is there of these kind of conflict of interests and influence issues amongst researchers?

00:22:20:01 - 00:22:57:07

Alice

Yes, I think this is one of the problems that actually complicates things is that, we as researchers, we often believe that our training as scientists will protect us from external influences. So we often think that we cannot be biased. We live in the so-called, illusion of invulnerability. However, unfortunately, this view is based on an incorrect understanding of human psychology, and there is considerable evidence from social sciences, from psychology that shows that it takes extraordinary little to bias an individual's judgment.

00:22:57:09 - 00:23:25:09

Alice

And so the evidence shows that financial relationships, for example, impose a sense of indebtedness on the recipient that can have an impact on our behaviours, whether the recipient is conscious of it or not. And so because as humans, we are basically genetically programmed to reciprocate the favours, and this obligation to directly reciprocate tends to influence behaviours, whether or not the recipient is conscious of it.

00:23:25:11 - 00:24:00:10

Alice

And there's also additional evidence, apart from this evidence that comes from psychology and social sciences, now we have also additional evidence that comes from transparency reports. So in some countries, for example, the United States, the pharmaceutical industry is required to disclose payments or gifts to physicians. And so some researchers have used these data to explore whether physicians who receive payments or gifts from pharmaceutical industry prescribe differently from physicians who do not receive those payments.

00:24:00:12 - 00:24:15:11

Alice

And several studies have shown that actually clinicians receipt of industry gifts or payments increases prescribing quantity and increases prescribing cost. So even small gifts can have an impact.

00:24:15:13 - 00:24:19:23

Louis

So that's a kind of subconscious effects then happening in these decisions.

00:24:20:00 - 00:24:31:18

Alice

Well I think bias is not a crime, it is not necessarily an intentional sign of a lack of integrity, but it's a natural human phenomenon. And so we need to be aware of it and address it.

00:24:31:20 - 00:24:37:05

Louis

So the more awareness you have of your biases, the better equipped you are to challenge that potentially.

00:24:37:08 - 00:25:05:04

Alice

I think awareness of course from is a bottom up solution to increase awareness among researchers, health professionals, policymakers about the effect that these interaction with the commercial actors can have. But at the same time, this bottom up solution needs to be coupled with top down approaches, which is to introduce regulation policies in the institutions where we work, so that we're not left alone in negotiating these and navigating these complex relationships.

00:25:05:04 - 00:25:19:16

Alice

But there is some guidance from the institutions where we work in, for example, Tess has mentioned the banning, that some institutions that decided to not accept research funding from the tobacco industry because it is too high risk in this case.

00:25:19:16 - 00:25:28:18

Louis

And so institutions then have, you know, kind of a responsibility to implement these sorts of these bottom up teaching approaches and the more top down approaches.

00:25:28:20 - 00:25:56:05

Alice

Yes, exactly, this is what I would advocate for. And for example, I think that research institutions should have policies for identifying, managing, mitigating, eliminating financial conflicts of interest and also they should enforce robust mechanisms for reviewing industry funding. For example, before engaging with a commercial entity it would be important to conduct the risk benefit assessment by the research institution.

00:25:56:07 - 00:26:29:02

Alice

For example, I had the opportunity to go to work in a research centre called Charles Perkins Centre at the University of Sydney, and they had guidelines that require basically a committee to assess any

project that involved a commercial sponsor. So they would have basically a checklist to conduct the risk benefit assessment. They would assess the alignment of the sponsor with the centre's mission, the reputational risk to the institution if they entered into this partnership.

00:26:29:04 - 00:27:00:22

Alice

The potential influence on the design, the conduct and publication of research. And I think this is an interesting model, this risk benefit assessment that could be implemented by universities and research institutes to decide whether to enter or not into these partnership. And I think that clear institutional policies in this regard would really provide also researchers with a roadmap to follow and would somehow free them from deciding on their own what is appropriate and what is not when they interact with commercial actors.

00:27:00:22 - 00:27:07:08

Alice

We have seen how complex this decision are with the, for example, the Italian example that Tess described a few minutes ago.

00:27:07:10 - 00:27:26:04

Louis

I guess that brings us on again to that sort of personal responsibility argument of, you know, researchers as well as consumers. Tess to bring it back in, we have heard from Alice about the responsibility of institutions and researchers and some of these mechanisms to challenge, influence and improve transparency. What are the limitations of this?

00:27:26:06 - 00:27:28:17

Louis

How has the industry respond to this stuff?

00:27:28:17 - 00:28:02:05

Tess

Yeah, that's exactly what I was just thinking, that is where my head wanted to go. So I think Alice is completely right. I completely agree that we need these stronger, more robust sort of research governance mechanisms within our institutions, be that, you know, universities or professional organisations or whatever it is. And I think that there has been a tendency so far to say, well, what should we do about, you know, bias in science and corporate influence on science?

00:28:02:07 - 00:28:22:10

Tess

Well, let's, just shine a light on the funding and then we'll let the readers decide. So when I say that, what I mean is these transparency initiatives. So that paper that I described earlier, you as the researcher, you would have to say who funded you and you would have to say what your conflicts of interest are.

00:28:22:10 - 00:28:52:23

Tess

And that works in a perfect world, but industries sometimes sidestep or circumvent those policies just to get round it, right. And I think one way that industries do this, and we haven't really covered this yet, is by funding third party scientific organisations in order to get their science published and out into the evidence base without it being apparent that it's necessarily, you know, funded by a commercial entity.

00:28:52:23 - 00:28:54:24

Louis

So they're obscuring the sources of funding essentially?

00:28:54:24 - 00:29:20:10

Tess

I would argue so, yeah. I mean, you know, it depends on the way you look at it. But I think, you know, one example of this, within tobacco, and I think you may have also touched on this on a previous episode, is Philip Morris International, so the world's largest transnational tobacco corporation funding a group called the Foundation for a Smoke Free World.

00:29:20:12 - 00:29:51:16

Tess

And the Foundation was set up in September 2017. And in one of our papers that Alice actually just mentioned saying that I had used the science for profit model to look at other documents, in this paper what we did was we looked at the scientific activities and outputs of the foundation across four years to see whether they were interacting with science in the same way that the tobacco industry and other industries had done historically.

Transcript – Deadly Industry: Challenging Big Tobacco – Ep.7, S.2

00:29:51:18 - 00:30:24:01

Tess

And what we found, the sort of key findings from the study, were that the Foundation and its grantees were producing scientific research and opinion which was supporting tobacco industry interests because it either sidelined tobacco control measures or endorsed tobacco industry products say. And also this science and opinion was advocating for tobacco industry involvement in science and policymaking

00:30:24:03 - 00:30:48:11

Tess

much of the time. And so all of that was, you know, entering the evidence base. But the reader and the user was very frequently not aware that it was funded by the tobacco industry. And that's why I would say that transparency initiatives are important, but not sufficient to completely solve the problem of how commercial actors seek to influence science.

00:30:48:12 - 00:30:54:01

Louis

I mean, in those cases, you'd almost need a whole list of conflicts, right? And if they're funded by them, they are funded by them.

00:30:54:06 - 00:31:07:12

Tess

And that's the thing, isn't it? It's kind of like dolls inside dolls inside dolls, because it gets complicated. Grantees fund other grantees, and it's really hard for the tobacco control or public health communities to understand all those links.

00:31:07:12 - 00:31:08:24

Louis

And that's part of the tactic.

00:31:09:04 - 00:31:10:03

Tess

Absolutely.

00:31:10:05 - 00:31:18:06

Louis

If there was just, you know, one or a group of major structural changes that could improve and protect science, what would that be for you Tess?

00:31:18:06 - 00:31:45:06

Tess

That's a really good question. I think with doing some research in this area, what I've come to realise is that it's such a complex topic and it's so multifaceted that trying to pinpoint one thing to do or even to prioritise, to think on, is really tricky. And, you know, many different parts of the scientific process are influenced by corporate actors.

00:31:45:06 - 00:32:17:19

Tess

So, you know, what is researched, how it's published, how it's interpreted, how it then goes on to be used in policy and practice. And so I think, you know, maybe it's about zooming out and thinking about how do you have interventions that affect that entire process all at once? And, one way of thinking about that is are there ways to use industry funds in an earmarked way and a mandatory way to fund truly independent science.

00:32:17:21 - 00:32:41:24

Tess

And so some people say, well look, we need this research, whether or not we need all the kind of research they do or not, we need some of this research on, say, you know, newer nicotine, tobacco and nicotine products. Well, why shouldn't the industry pay for that? And I do see some sense in that argument. But of course, we know there are massive dangers when that can happen that they can, you know, they can skew the science or they can use it for reputational gains.

00:32:42:02 - 00:33:03:00

Tess

So what some systems have tried to do is to use mandatory industry payments to fund that kind of science. And so this has happened in California and in Thailand where there are levies on the tobacco and alcohol industries, and those have been used to fund that kind of research. So, you know, that might be an important part of the puzzle.

00:33:03:00 - 00:33:09:15

Tess

But I think as those things develop, you would definitely need proper evaluation of them to see if they worked.

00:33:09:15 - 00:33:21:10

Louis

So a complex thing to implement, but if it could be done, sounds like it could be hugely useful. Alice, how about for you? What's a change, structural change or other way that you think could help improve the situation?

00:33:21:12 - 00:33:50:19

Alice

Yeah, I agree with Tess. I think the best antidote to industry influence on science would be to change the current funding model of science, and we have some examples that these innovative funding models that are based on legally mandated contributions or dedicated manufacturer taxes could be implemented to allow truly independent research on chemicals, on nutrition, on alcohol, on tobacco, on pharmaceuticals to be conducted.

00:33:50:21 - 00:33:53:05

Alice

I'm aware these solution would really require a

00:33:54:06 - 00:34:29:07

Alice

paradigm of change so these are more long term solutions. In the meanwhile, we need to focus on short term solutions. So as we've said increased transparency, strengthening conflict of interest policies, training researchers and what is important as Tess says is to generate evidence on the impact that the solution can have. Are there unintended consequences? Are there positive consequences, the impact that they generate? So that hopefully, maybe generating a body of evidence around the solution can maybe stimulate other institutions, other jurisdictions to implement them as well.

00:34:29:07 - 00:34:35:11

Alice

So do also research on these solutions that are being tried out and implemented.

Transcript – Deadly Industry: Challenging Big Tobacco – Ep.7, S.2

00:34:35:13 - 00:34:43:09

Louis

Well, it's great to hear that there is a kind of long term, hopeful goal to aim towards. Tess and Alice thank you very much for joining me today, it's been a fascinating conversation.

00:34:43:14 - 00:34:44:11

Alice

Thanks to you.

00:34:44:13 - 00:34:45:24

Tess

Thank you for having us.

00:34:46:01 - 00:35:11:07

Louis

As always, the sources for today's discussion can be found in the episode shownotes. We'll be back next week, where we'll hear from a variety of international experts to look at how industry tactics play out across multiple countries. See you next time. From the Tobacco Control Research Group, you've been listening to season two of Deadly Industry: Challenging Big Tobacco, hosted by Louis Laurence, produced by Kate White and edited by Sacha Goodwin.

00:35:11:11 - 00:35:23:04

Louis

The production manager is Jacqueline Oliver. You can email us at tobacco-admin@bath.ac.uk or find us on LinkedIn, Bluesky and X. This is a University of Bath production.