

MINI REVIEW

Editorial Process: Submission:05/21/2025 Acceptance:01/15/2026 Published:01/22/2026

Appeals of Deceit from the Tobacco Companies: Rejecting Tobacco Industry Influence in Thailand

Stephen Lorin Hamann¹, Chayanee Wongsuriyanan^{2*}, Nipapun Kungskulniti³, Suwanna Ruangkanchanasetr¹, Vijj Kasemsup¹, Passara Jongkhajornpong¹

Abstract

Introduction: The tobacco industry goes to great lengths to identify its target audience and provide incentives for tobacco use. It often does so through disinformation, purposely deceiving its customers. There is evidence that the behaviors of social movements can replace shallow appeals with genuine social motivations. While stories of communication, recognition, and mutual support can arise as anecdotal examples, the enduring strengths of a social commitment are also worth examining. **Method:** This review examines the people, events, and accomplishments of tobacco control efforts in Thailand that are vital to continuous vigilance and advocacy for social advancement, with a deep respect for how the goals of health reflect a culture of care. The focus is on exposing the long battle between the tobacco industry and tobacco control and prevention advocates, with specific examples from Thailand. **Results:** Thai culture takes a moderate, life-enhancing position anchored in fundamental conceptions of moral/ethical action in politics, religion, and economics. This position has enabled a sustained culture of care, not a cultural affectation mimicking the latest transitory political or economic trends. Thailand has persisted in visibly renewing its commitment to tobacco control campaigns and efforts, which have led to a deepened public understanding that stands firm with the goals of tobacco control. **Conclusion:** Thais have been enlisted in a great battle for health through the authenticity of their culture and have made strides in countering the predatory influences and exploitative interests of the tobacco industry. Viewing the dimensions of this battle encourages further social commitments for progress against tobacco harms.

Keywords: Tobacco industry influence- appeals- deceit- Thailand- social support

Asian Pac J Cancer Prev, 27 (1), 29-35

Introduction

It is audacious to advance an account of how the tobacco industry has appealed to society with deceitful tactics since several recognized scholars have already documented the history of industry malfeasance [1, 2]. The different contexts of these actions are worth repeating in each unique circumstance to highlight the forces and steps that have and can inspire those battling tobacco industry appeals. This narrative report considers the operative conceptions and misconceptions encountered by tobacco control advocates in Thailand, and how these have been countered by cultural commitments as well as policy development. Actions and reactions of Thai experience have resurfaced here through the World Health Organization's call to address the appeals that lie hidden worldwide.

The World Health Organization (WHO) World No Tobacco Day 2025 theme is "Unmasking the appeal: Exposing Industry Tactics on Tobacco and Nicotine

Products." This year, the campaign will focus on revealing the tactics that the tobacco and nicotine industries use to make their harmful products seem attractive [3]. This qualitative research aims to review what the tobacco industry has done and what appeal can be made to overcome what the tobacco industry is now doing. The focus is on the history of the long battle between the tobacco industry and tobacco control and prevention advocates, with specific examples from Thailand and Asia.

Selling and the Nature of Persuasion

It is common for those selling any product to appeal to the public to buy their products. However, all appeals are not the same. Some sellers lie to the public or entice or coerce the customer to buy a product. Most product sellers use the art of persuasion to entice customers to invest in their products [4].

The psychology of persuasion in sales delves into influencing customer decisions by understanding human behavior and emotions. It involves techniques to build

¹Tobacco Control Research and Knowledge Management Center, Faculty of Medicine at Ramathibodi Hospital, Mahidol University, Bangkok 10400, Thailand. ²Faculty of Health Science Technology, Chulabhorn Royal Academy, Bangkok 10210, Thailand. ³Thailand Health Promotion Institute, National Health Foundation, Bangkok 10330, Thailand. *For Correspondence: Chayanee.won@cra.ac.th

trust, overcome objections, and guide prospective customers toward making a purchase [5].

Those who wish to appeal to customers use appeals in many dimensions, including the ‘4 Ps’ of the art of selling. These include using core dimensions like product characteristics and quality, price of the product, singly or in multiple quantities, promotions that catch the attention of customer buying practices, and the place of the product, including distribution and physical placement in everyday customer environments. In addition, three service dimensions, are employed by the tobacco industry, including seller interactions (people), ease and convenience of the sales process, and physical factors such as the environment of branding, delivery, and customer feedback.

Investigative reporters, whistle-blowers, and historians have thoroughly exposed how the tobacco industry uses sales appeals to persons and institutions, including governments [1, 2, 6]. Those who have studied tobacco use and companies in recent history often refer to the ‘Tobacco Industry Playbook’, which includes appeals that the industry continues to use. These are strategies and tactics to avoid transparency and accountability and to influence potential customers, investors, and public and private institutions. The industry has been especially successful in influencing government officials, who are influenced by economic and policy arguments that have been used for years to capture control of tobacco resources and customers. These approaches and tactics have been documented extensively in revealing investigative reports and internal industry documents available through court cases that have convicted tobacco companies of deceitful disinformation [7].

Selling by persuasion is sometimes structured customer manipulation, although many aspects of the process are rational, evidence-based, and employed by sellers to maximize resource effectiveness. This pretence of rationality is where the deceit of the tobacco industry is most evident, since the industry frames their product as appropriate to targeted populations and circumstances to convince customers that smoking, a practice known to be dangerous to everyone’s health, is a great choice. Because the tobacco industry has nearly unlimited resources, it can influence public opinion to give a positive view of smoking and capture customers. One illustration of this positive framing is documented in research about how one tobacco company introduced a heated tobacco product into the marketplace.

Research report on the introduction of IQOS in Korea

In 2020, the Stanford University School of Medicine published a white paper, Global Marketing of IQOS, The Philip Morris Campaign to Popularize “Heat Not Burn” Tobacco [8]. This paper, of 313 pages, with 472 figures, 1254 advertising images, and five tables, illustrates how Philip Morris International used marketing, advertising, and social media to popularize a new product in Korea. Authors noted that advertisements for the heated tobacco product, IQOS, mirrored the imagery and slogans of traditional cigarette advertising.

However, beyond ‘traditional’ advertising, PMI

used multiple marketing techniques to flood the media environment with messages positive to IQOS. PMI used traditional media platforms and many social media platforms, including many media influencers, to normalize IQOS use.

Authors emphasized they did not have access to PMI marketing plans, but through documenting ten months of activities, they were able to show promotional methods with strategies used to secure entry into the market. For example, the report exposed what salespersons were trained to say to potential customers. These one-to-one conversations by ‘coaches and brand ambassadors’ included information on the healthfulness and utility of IQOS for smoking cessation. This information went well beyond the verified evidence of IQOS product safety and effectiveness in 2020.

PMI spent millions of dollars on a campaign to introduce and establish IQOS use in Korea. Following their promotional campaigns, Philip Morris International reported that IQOS users increased from 14 million in 2020 to 21.2 million in 2021, a significant increase. However, this figure is likely an underestimate since it does not include the increased dual users, those using both IQOS and conventional tobacco cigarettes [8]. Few in-depth investigations of this kind of intensive marketing are available, but show the multiple ways a country’s domestic communication and media environment can be manipulated to launch a new tobacco product.

Materials and Methods

Since this narrative review uses secondary sources, no measurement instruments were used. The collection of findings is from lived experience by authors with over one hundred years of experience assessing tobacco control activities inside and outside Thailand. Two authors have each worked over thirty-five years. These authors, not to mention Thai advocates quoted, had knowledge of and access to hundreds of publications from the Action on Smoking and Health Foundation, Thai Health Promotion Foundation, Tobacco Control Research and Knowledge Management Center and past reports of Thailand’s role in controlling tobacco industry appeals and influences in Thailand and the WHO South East Asia region.

Increasing Tactics of the Tobacco Industry

Typical tactics of the tobacco industry include denial of wrongdoing, distractions like ‘what about isms’ (diverting attention to others’ wrongdoing), delay, and litigation. Focusing just on one current tactic, litigation, the tobacco industry has threatened legal action against governments, individuals, information brokers, and news agencies. Litigation actions by the tobacco industry are now more common worldwide.

A recent review of tobacco litigation by and against the tobacco industry over the past 30 years focuses “on ongoing or recently decided cases.” It states, “Litigation in tobacco control falls into several classes: legal challenges brought by the tobacco industry to block implementation of tobacco control measures, public interest litigation brought by civil society to push for higher standards of

implementation of tobacco control measures and liability litigation by governments and individuals to hold the tobacco industry accountable for the harm it causes [9].”

Although investigation of Thai litigation against and to counter the tobacco industry is a limitation of what is covered here, it is understood that the industry tries to “prevent, block, delay or weaken” legal action against it and its allies. However, actions such as the 1998 Master Settlement Agreement in the United States have successfully required financial accountability from the four largest US tobacco manufacturers because of health care costs to states [10].” The US companies were required to pay \$28 billion to 46 states plus US territories. A subsequent case in Canada resulted in a \$32.5 billion settlement with Canadian tobacco companies [11].

Another example of how the tobacco industry has been made accountable was the verdict in the case, United States vs. Philip Morris in 2006 when ten tobacco companies were convicted of lying to the public regarding the hazards of smoking, addiction, nicotine levels, light cigarettes, marketing to youth, secondhand smoke, and suppression of information. They were ordered to publish corrective statements with the truth to the public in media channels appropriate to their past disinformation targets [12]. These victories as well as cases upholding Thai law on tobacco products in Thailand show that court action can be successful when legislation and administrative policies are clearly articulated. Thailand has taken a leading role in areas like graphic health warnings, illicit trade and cross-border advertising and played a key role in the development of Article 5.3 Guidelines of the WHO - FCTC, which deals with tobacco industry interference in tobacco control policy [13].

Results

Turning to the Thai Example

The Tobacco Control Research and Knowledge Management Center (TRC), Mahidol University, was established in 2005 to drive tobacco control in Thailand more effectively. As a research agency, it produces and manages valuable accumulated knowledge for researchers and the public. It published a book in 2016 summarizing 25 years of Thai Tobacco Control from 1992 to 2017. This Thai language volume documented 33 legislative and other actions taken by the Thai Government and other tobacco control agencies that had important consequences for Thailand’s rapid tobacco control progress, including the reduction in the smoking prevalence [13]. Following this review, Thailand passed new legislation in 2017, which made vital changes to initiatives for tobacco control. For example, the Tobacco Products Control Act of 2017 (TPCA) changes some definitions of key terms. It establishes the National Tobacco Control Committee, which proposes policies, monitors compliance, and coordinates efforts across related sectors. It also restricts sales to those under 20, from vending machines and online sales. It bans advertising and marketing communications related to tobacco products. Detailed provisions for control officers and their responsibilities and authority to assess penalties and fines are specified to ensure

regulatory adherence. It includes provisions for appointing committees to handle violations and vital direction for committees at the provincial level in Thailand [14].”

Despite the continuous effort of the Thai Government and many civil society networks in Thailand, the tobacco industry continues to assert its influence through allies in and out of Government. Research has documented challenges to the 2017 Tobacco Products Control Act using farming interests against the new law, and past third-party allies have been used when upgrades to provisions of tobacco control regulations have been proposed [15]. Given these direct and indirect challenges, Thailand has successfully adopted tobacco control measures.

For example, Thailand turned a high-level trade dispute into a motivator for legislative action for tobacco control. Thailand opposed Philip Morris International, which was expanding its influence into Asia. By 1989, it had used the threat of US trade sanctions to force open the tobacco markets in Japan, Taiwan, and Korea. Thailand argued its case against such trade before the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) dispute tribunal. However, it lost the case and opened its market to US tobacco manufacturers in 1990 [16]. However, the decision indicated that Thailand could still use various other provisions such as taxation, advertising bans, and warnings on tobacco products to blunt the anticipated impact of new products. Consequently, Thailand passed two of the most comprehensive tobacco control laws and established a coordinating agency for Thai tobacco control. This legislation was a watershed moment that established Thailand as a leader in tobacco control in the WHO South East Asia region [17]. Ruth Roemer, who documented tobacco control legislation for WHO in her regular updates of legislation worldwide, noted that Thailand’s action was the first comprehensive legislation in the region [18].

Thailand’s effort in the US trade dispute was headed by a small group of government and civil society agencies upholding a position for health against a powerful, predatory industry from the US. So, has Thailand been able to sustain itself against the actions of the tobacco industry?

Since Thailand lost the trade dispute through the US 301 provision of GATS on the introduction of foreign tobacco products, it has sustained tobacco control efforts, and achieved some landmark achievements; Thailand was:

- The first country in the WHO SE Asia region to pass two laws establishing comprehensive tobacco product and non-smoker protection in 1992.
- In 1996, the first country of the WHO SE Asia region mandating a tax rate on cigarettes that increased with consumer spending power
- Thailand is a leader in health promotion, establishing the Thai Health Promotion Foundation, which provides funds for tobacco control through a special tax on tobacco and alcohol attached to the excise tax amount to address Non-Communicable Diseases (NCDs).
- The first country in the WHO SE Asia region to ban point of sale display of cigarettes in retail stores in 2005.
- In 2006, the country with the largest health warning labels, with 85% on cigarette packs’ front and back faces.
- The first country in the WHO SE Asia region to

achieve 100% smoke-free public places in 2010.

- In 2017, the country became the first to ban smoking in bars and pubs as part of its secondhand smoke protections.

- The first country of the WHO SE Asia region to mandate plain packaging, cigarette packs without distinguishing logos or colors in 2018.

- In 2017, designated as an FCTC Knowledge Hub for FCTC Article 5.3, which prohibits the tobacco industry's interference in tobacco control policy.

In short, Thailand has adopted strong positions taxing tobacco products, established a fund and foundation on health promotion (Thai Health), mandated large tobacco warning labels on cigarette packs, banned point of sale displays of cigarettes in retail shops, strengthening smoke-free laws in public places to 100% coverage, adopted plain packaging requirements on cigarette packs, and advanced guidelines and actions on Article 5.3 of the WHO FCTC with an FCTC Knowledge Hub of Article 5.3 established in 2017. This Article 5.3 Knowledge Hub is a joint effort between the FCTC Secretariat and Thammasat University School of Global Studies [17].

How has Thailand been able to accomplish these actions for tobacco control?

In 1980, Nigel Gray and Mike Daube set forth several objectives for effective tobacco control programs in a technical report. One of these objectives involves establishing *"a realistic view, which is that cigarettes are both unnecessary and hazardous."* This objective is a positive appeal by those wishing to chart a course against the predatory stance already visible in past tobacco industry actions. It is important to show how this was done through appealing to the cultural norms of Thai society. Thai health professional actions, religious core principles, advocacy for trade fairness, legal principles against advertising and promotion, and activism for legal enforcement as an example to youth are five examples from 1986 to 2020. Gray and Daube emphasized the policy and actions of tobacco control programs:

- "to change the behavior of smokers and maintain that of non-smokers;

- to change the cultural background of society against which cigarette smoking is often viewed as a status symbol, and as mentioned above, to establish the realistic view, which is that cigarettes are both unnecessary and hazardous;

- to change the economic and legislative climate so that cigarettes are less available, pressures promoting smoking are ceased, and education programs are supported;

- to change the cigarette smoked so that it is less harmful;

- to establish non-smoking as the norm, and to ensure the right of the non-smoker to clean air [19]."

Examining these objectives, we find that many actions in Thailand have played a role, but the cultural dimension is underestimated in how tobacco company appeals are opposed.

Thai health professionals' actions

In 1987, the Thai Rural Doctors Society mobilized

250 doctors all over Thailand to sponsor a run to collect signatures on a petition to move actions for smoke-free public places forward. Over seven days and through a 3,000 km. Run, volunteer health professionals collected over 6 million signatures in favor of smoke-free public places. *"This was recorded as the biggest public consensus on a public health issue ever organized. The signatures were then presented to the speaker of the Thai Parliament in Bangkok to inform the Parliament of the people's needs [16]."* These efforts continued through the National Alliance for a Smokefree Thailand. It initially included only health professional groups, but now has expanded its membership to over 900 associations and agencies with health-related goals.

Advocacy for trade fairness

Thailand is recognized for its opposition to the introduction of foreign tobacco products, which was litigated through US trade provisions from Big Tobacco companies wishing to dominate Asian tobacco markets. When Thailand objected and fought this effort from 1988 to 1990, it was notable since Japan, Taiwan, and Korea had granted the entry of foreign tobacco products due to the threat of trade sanctions. Eventually, the GAT ruled in 1990 that Thailand must open its market to foreign tobacco companies. However, Thailand understood how it might counter this decision by passing legislation against advertising, promotion, and sponsorship, instituting pack warning labels, and increasing cigarette taxes to discourage all tobacco use. Thus, this defeat in trade became the beginning of expanded efforts to coordinate and legislate actions to control tobacco use. All societal interests participated in this initiative, bringing a confluence of economic, political, and cultural forces to understand and stand against all tobacco companies, foreign and domestic [20].

Two advocates were central to this effort. Hatai Chitanondh, now 96, founded the Thai Health Promotion Institute and published more than 120 books and reports documenting the advocacy against the tobacco industry. Prakit Vathesatogkit took on the movement against the tobacco industry, traveling to Europe and the United States to defend the Thai position against the international tobacco trade. He also founded the Action on Smoking and Health Foundation, which launched over 240 actions for tobacco control between 1974 and 2023. Their selfless actions generated more health advocates and agencies, multiplying tobacco control activities and successes [16, 20].

Religious core principles

Early in the life of the advocacy civil society organization, the Action on Smoking and Health Foundation, a media campaign emphasized how Buddhist monks and authorities opposed tobacco use because of Buddhist principles. This opposition was evident in action by head monks in Buddhist Wats around the country and in declarations against tobacco use as a drug. Despite efforts to claim tobacco control advocates were trying to use religion for their agenda, evidence from several Southeast Asian monks' conclaves showed that this was a

consensus decision by monks, not from outside advocacy influences. This stance was meaningful to many smokers who subsequently quit smoking once they understood the religious origin of this position by Buddhist authorities. Research found that “Religion can be a culturally relevant vehicle to complement other tobacco control efforts [21].”

Legal principles against tobacco advertising, promotion, and sponsorship

In the 1980s, tobacco companies sought market share through sports sponsorship. First, they supported local and regional activities, but later, they emphasized popular international sports activities. The fight against these activities required vigilance by tobacco control authorities and the eventual passage of stronger legal provisions against sports and educational, school, and student sponsorships. Tobacco companies exploited loopholes and a lack of clarity in restrictions on tobacco promotion to use corporate social responsibility (CSR) arguments to establish a positive reputation for their companies and products.

The Thai Health Professionals Group’s nationwide petition run for health, which collected six million signatures, “aimed to break the link between tobacco companies and sports or arts sponsorship. This petition helped raise public awareness of tobacco and supported the Government’s efforts to control tobacco use. Thailand successfully countered tobacco company efforts to use sports sponsorship for promotion through strict regulations, vigilant monitoring, and strong public support [22].”

Warning labels on cigarette packs and retail point-of-sale advertising

Thailand mandated 50% warning labels on cigarette packs by 2004 and by 2014 had 85% graphic warning labels, the largest in the world at that time. In addition, the display of cigarette packs at the point of sale was banned in Thailand in 2005, with resistance to this ban broken by a public boycott of corporate reluctance to comply with it. This display ban was a significant step for tobacco control in Thailand, making it the first Asian country to implement it. On December 14, 2018, Thailand again made history. It became the first country in Asia, and the first low and middle-income country in the world to adopt plain packaging for tobacco products, a tough tobacco control measure [23].

Some tobacco control provisions were challenged in court, but were upheld. In 2014, the Supreme Administrative Court ruled that the implementation of graphic health warning regulations should not be suspended as sought by the tobacco industry, as the requirements were not beyond the scope of the law and were issued to protect the people and the youth [24].

Activism for developing a culture of tobacco control: an example to youth

The participation of a wide range of actors who have recognized the importance of tobacco control has led to many victories individually and collectively. One example is the work of a single former health

worker who dedicated himself to actions through Thai legal mechanisms available for compliance with laws on smoking and the promotion of tobacco products to children. After he retired from government service, this knowledgeable citizen documented violations of tobacco control law, mainly as they apply to cigarette advertising and use in government buildings and schools. By filing complaints with documentation of violations, he got enforcement through the police in over 1400 locations throughout Thailand. He gained attention for his zeal in objecting to and following up on violations of tobacco control restrictions [25].

Over four decades of advocacy work in Thailand, the Action on Smoking and Health Foundation, led by Dr. Prakit Vathesatogkit, has continued to enlist public support for actions against tobacco use. *“People do not follow dense information and messages advising them to quit smoking, but they identify with personal accounts. Initially, he used some pulmonary disease patients and affected families as case studies. As the movement caught on, we were lucky that movie actors, famous monks, and other public figures got involved. Their stories of quitting tobacco addiction played a crucial role in building momentum for the movement,”* he stated.

“Thailand’s a global model for tobacco control, and is based on close cooperation between the Ministry of Public Health, the Thai Health Promotion Foundation (ThaiHealth), and a very active coalition of non-governmental organizations guided by a unique generation of creative civil society leaders [17].”

As youth witnessed wins against the tobacco industry’s lies and policy manipulations, they have realized that their actions can impact public and private positions against the exploitative tactics of the tobacco industry. Youth involvement has been formalized by establishing an advocacy organization, the Thailand Youth Institute. It is an independent non-profit organization established in 2011 to support health policies for children and youth. In 2023, it established five plans, including reducing new smokers and smoking and e-cigarette use. The Thai Health Foundation funds it, and the Institute is active throughout Thailand [26].

Support for laws, advocacy, and enforcement does not flow from individual successes but from an overall support based in a culture of care and fairness. For example, the 2001 establishment of the Thai Health Promotion Foundation through a special tax added to excise tax assessments on tobacco and alcohol products led efforts to address non-communicable diseases (NCDs) in Thailand. Through this innovation of a tax added to excise assessments, Thailand has supported and funded programs for tobacco and alcohol control, nutrition, and road safety, as well as research to ensure these programs are evidence-based and effective [27].

The tobacco industry continues to double down on efforts to sell cigarettes while claiming alternative tobacco products are harm-reducing and are their replacement for the cigarettes they continue to market aggressively [28]. Thailand has counted on three strengths: knowledge management, policy development, and civil society support. Social actors have evaluated past and present

tobacco control and are looking for additional forces to counter tobacco industry influences.

Conclusion

Coordination, Decentralization, Technological Innovation

New coordination provisions in the 2017 Tobacco Product Control Act include a provision allowing the National Tobacco Product Control Board (NTPCB) to recommend amendments to the Ministry of Public Health's announcements every two years from the Act's effective date or in a shorter period if necessary. This provision provides for coordination and decentralization of responses between the Ministry and Provincial Committees dealing with tobacco industry actions [14].

Smoking is a non-communicable disease (NCD) risk factor that was affected by the establishment of ThaiHealth. *"The prevalence of adult smoking decreased from 25.5% in 2001 to 17.4% in 2021. Although funding by ThaiHealth is relatively small compared to the Thai Government's health budget, its coordinating actions have ensured "secure and sustainable financing for broader public health and population-based approaches to address NCD risk factors, strengthened communities, built health literacy, and promoted health [29]."*

A recent evaluation of Thailand's National Tobacco Control Strategy (NTCS) provides a review of six areas. It offers important insights to strengthen Thailand's NTCS, examining coordination, systematic monitoring, capacity development, policy dissemination, allocation of adequate funds, and promoting innovations. It and other reviews of tobacco control activities have provided knowledge for improving policies and actions of the tobacco control infrastructure in Thailand [30].

Technological innovation is vital to continued success. It will likely include artificial intelligence (AI) innovations in most tobacco control programs. An upcoming webinar on June 17, 2025, by the Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco (SRNT) provides a 'Travel Scholars Report on Innovative Global Research Using Generative AI in Tobacco Control'. It suggests that "AI can be used in tobacco control surveillance to improve monitoring, enforcement, and intervention efforts. For example, by analyzing large datasets, AI can identify patterns and trends related to smoking behavior, detect tobacco promotion on social media, and help target interventions for specific individuals or populations [31]."

An appeal of care that coordinates activities, decentralizes advocacy and enforcement, and utilizes new technologies to become more aware and responsive to the tobacco industry's deceptive and illegal operations brings promise to Thailand's stance against the tobacco industry's interference. It is a culture of awareness and push back by society as a whole that can overcome the deceitful appeals that the tobacco and e-cigarette industries keep launching. There is no quick fix to the relentless pursuit of industry policies for profits. People power is the antidote to this assault, a culture that leaves no harm unaddressed.

Author Contribution Statement

SLH: conceptualization, formal analysis, methodology,

administration, resources, supervision, validation, writing-original draft preparation. CW and NK: conceptualization, formal analysis, methodology, visualization, writing-review and editing, VK and SR: funding acquisition, investigation, writing-review and editing. PJ: review and editing, administration. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Acknowledgements

We acknowledge the information provided by Prof. Dr.Prakit Vathesatogkit, Dr.Hatai Chitanondh, and the Director of the Thailand Health Promotion Institute, Assoc.Prof.Dr.Naowarut Charoenca

Funding statement

This study was partially supported by the Tobacco Control Research and Knowledge Management Center (TRC).

If any scientific Body approved it/ if it is part of an approved student thesis

There was no scientific body approved. It is not a part of an approved student thesis.

How the ethical issue was handled (name the ethical committee that approved the research)

There is no ethical committee reviewed the manuscript since no human subjects were involved.

Conflict of interest

There is no conflict of interest stated by any authors.

Abbreviations

WHO: World Health Organization

IQOS: I-Quit-Ordinary-Smoking

PMI: Philip Morris International

TRC: Tobacco Control Research and Knowledge Management Center

TPCA: Tobacco Products Control Act

GATS: General Agreement on Trade in Services

SE Asia: South East Asia region

NCDs: Non-Communicable Diseases

WHO-FCTC: WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control

CSR: Corporate Social Responsibility

NTPCB: National Tobacco Product Control Board

NTCS: National Tobacco Control Strategy

AI: Artificial Intelligence

SRNT: Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco

References

1. Brandt AM. The cigarette century: the rise, fall, and deadly persistence of the product that defined America. Cambridge, MA: Basic Books; 2007.
2. Proctor RN. Golden holocaust: origins of the cigarette catastrophe and the case for abolition. Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press; 2011.
3. World Health Organization. World No Tobacco Day: Unmasking the appeal. 11 Nov 2024. Accessed May 5; 2025. Available from: <https://www.who.int/news-room/detail/11-11-2024-no-tobacco-day>

tobacco-day-2025--unmasking-the-appeal

4. Azma S. A Case Study in Unethical Communication from Big Tobacco. Fancy Comma Blog; 23 Mar 2024. Available from:<https://fancycomma/2024/03/23/a-case-study-in-unethical-communication-from-big-tobacco>
5. Bianco G. Persuasion and Deception in Sales. Nutshell Blog; 11 Jul 2025. Available from:<https://www.nutshell.com/blog/sales-persuasion-vs-deception>
6. Taylor P. The smoke ring: tobacco, money & multinational policies. New York: Pantheon Books; 1985.
7. Tobacco Control Legal Consortium. The Verdict is in: findings from United States v. Philip Morris. Saint Paul, MN: Tobacco Control Legal Consortium; 2006.
8. Jackler RK, Ramamurthi D, Axelrod A, Jung JK, Louis-Ferdinand NG, Reidel JE, Yu AWY, Jackler LM, Chau C. Global Marketing of IQOS: The Philip Morris Campaign to Popularize “Heat Not Burn” Tobacco. SRITA White paper; 21 Feb 2020. Available from:<http://tobacco.stanford.edu/iqosanalysis>
9. Zhou S, Ricafort E, Bressler D, Devotsu RK. Litigation in tobacco control: past, present and future. *Tobacco Control*. 2022;31(2):291-5.
10. Public Health Law Center. Master Settlement Agreement; Accessed May 9, 2025. Available from:<https://www.publichealthlawcenter.org/topics/commercial-tobacco-control/master-settlement-agreement>
11. CBC News. Ontario court approves major \$32.5B tobacco settlement. 6 Mar 2025. Accessed Apr 29, 2025. Available from: <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/ontario-tobacco-settlement-approval-1.7477141>
12. Lee K, Kao W. The Framework Convention on Tobacco Control: Contributions by five Asian countries. In: Lee K, Pang T, Tan Y, editors. *Asia's Role in Governing Global Health*. New York: Routledge; 2013. p. 114-134.
13. Tobacco Control Research and knowledge Management Center. Summary of 25 years Thailand tobacco control 1992-2017 (in Thai). Bangkok: Tobacco Control Research and knowledge Management Center; 2017.
14. Action on Smoking and Health Foundation. *Tobacco Products Control Act, B.E. 2560*. Bangkok, Thailand: Action on Smoking and Health Foundation; 2017. Accessed May 2, 2025. Available from:https://www.ashthailand.or.th/en/content_attachment/attach/new_thai_law.pdf
15. Charoenca N, Limstit P, Pipattanachat V. Exposing Philip Morris' tricks of interfering with Thai tobacco control laws and policies. Bangkok: Tobacco Control Research and Knowledge Management Center; 2016.
16. Supawongse C. Two decades of tobacco-consumption control in Thailand: Success and challenges. Bangkok: Tobacco Control Research and knowledge Management Center; 2007.
17. Vathesatogkit P. The 38th Aree Valayasevee Speech on May 2025: 4 decades on the path to a smoke-free Thai society. Bangkok: Mahidol University Faculty of Medicine Ramathibodi Hospital; 2025.
18. Roemer R. Legislative action to combat the world tobacco epidemic; with a chapter by Richard A. Daynard. 2nd ed. World Health Organization; 1993. Available from:<https://iris.who.int/handle/10665/37823>
19. Gray N, Daube M. Guidelines for smoking control. 2nd ed. UICC technical report series no. 52; 1980.
20. Chitanondh H. Defeat in Trade, Victory in Health. Bangkok: Thailand Health Promotion Institute, The National Health Foundation; 2001.
21. Yong HH, Hamann SL, Borland R, Fong GT, Omar M. Adult smokers' perception of the role of religion and religious leadership on smoking and association with quitting: A comparison between thai buddhists and malaysian muslims. Soc Sci Med. 2009;69(7):1025-31. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2009.07.042>.
22. Charoenca N, Mock J, Kungskulniti N, Preechawong S, Kojetin N, Hamann SL. Success counteracting tobacco company interference in thailand: An example of fctc implementation for low- and middle-income countries. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2012;9(4):1111-34. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph9041111>.
23. World Health Organization. Thailand leads crusade against tobacco. 14 Dec 2018. Accessed May 6, 2025. Available from: <https://www.who.int/southeastasia/news/feature-stories/detail/thailand-leads-crusade-against-tobacco>
24. JT International (Thailand) v. Minister of Public Health, Supreme Administrative Court, Order No. 269/2557, 29 May 2014. Accessed May 6, 2025. Available from: <https://www.tobaccocontrollaws.org/litigation/decisions/th-00000000-jti-international-thailand-v.->
25. Charoenca N, Kungskulniti N, Pipattanachat V, Pitayarangsarit S, Hamann S, Mock J. The implementation activist: How one determined person with a camera has achieved enforcement of smoke-free laws throughout thailand. *Asian Pac J Cancer Prev*. 2021;22(S2):19-34. <https://doi.org/10.31557/apjcp.2021.22.S2.19>.
26. Thailand Youth Institute. Web Statement in Thai of Five Plans launched in 2023. Accessed 10 May 2025. Available from: <https://tyithailand.or.th>
27. Siwaraksa P. The birth of the Thai Health Fund. 2nd ed. Bangkok: The Thai Health Promotion Foundation; 2002.
28. Assunta M. ASEAN Tobacco Watch, Cigarettes still very profitable for Philip Morris. 9 May 2025. Accessed May 10, 2025. Available from: <https://tobaccowatch.seatca.org/index.php/2025/05/09/cigarettes-still-very-profitable-for-philip-morris/>
29. World Health Organization. Two decades of WHO FCTC implementation in the South-East Asia Region. Technical Document. 22 Sep 2024. Accessed May 6, 2025. Available from: <https://www.who.int/publications/item/9789290229568>
30. Phetphum C, Wangwonsin A, Keeratisiroj O, Jariya W. Qualitative evaluation of thailand's national tobacco control strategy 2022-2027: Challenges and suggestions for policy implementation. *Tob Induc Dis*. 2025;23. <https://doi.org/10.18332/tid/203935>.
31. SRNT Webinar Announcement. Personal communication; 13 May 2025.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial 4.0 International License.