Caitlin Weiger, MHS, Connie Hoe, PhD, MSW, Joanna Cohen, PhD

**Background**
- Tobacco industry interference in policy making poses a huge threat to tobacco control efforts.
- The vast majority of smokers reside in LMICs, making industry interference in LMICs a substantial problem.

**Methods**
- A cross-case analysis design was employed to compare commonalities and differences in tobacco industry tactics across two case studies, one covering the passage and implementation of large health warning labels (HWLs) in India and the other studying the passage and implementation of higher tobacco taxes in the Philippines.

**Results**

**The Philippines**
- Attempts to collaborate with and/or sway advocates

**The Philippines and India:**
- Wrote letters and made presentations to policy makers to lobby their positions
- Paid for news stories opposing tobacco control legislation and supporting industry arguments
- Publicly questioned scientific evidence (i.e. the link between tobacco use and cancer)
- Used front group demonstrations to protest the legislation

**Conclusions**
- It is clear that the industry uses similar tactics across countries, even when the tobacco control policy varies.
- The industry, however, does not replicate its tactics exactly in each case and more data are needed to identify when some tactics, such as litigation, are most likely to be used.
- The identification of common industry tactics can help advocates organize their strategy to anticipate industry tactics and more successfully mount campaigns for successful tobacco control legislation.
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