

**Journal of American Physicians
and Surgeons**

Mission Statement

The *Journal of American Physicians and Surgeons*, the official peer-reviewed journal of the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons (AAPS), is committed to publishing scholarly articles related to the practice of medicine and to promoting open debate and scientific integrity.

Subscriptions and Advertising

aaps@aapsonline.org

Subscription Rates:

AAPS Members (included in annual dues)

Non-members \$75 per year

Institutions \$125 per year

Students/Residents \$15 per year

Foreign \$200 per year (US currency only)



Copy Editor

Stuart Faxon

Cover Design

Rachel Eck

Typesetting and Printing

Skyline Printing Co., Inc.

Tucson, AZ

Website

www.jpands.org

Webmaster

Jeremy Snavelly

The articles published in the *Journal of American Physicians and Surgeons* represent the opinions of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official policy of the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., or the Journal.

Publication of an advertisement is not to be considered an endorsement or approval of the product or service involved by either the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., or the Journal.

POSTMASTER:

Send address changes to:

1601 N. Tucson Blvd, Suite 9

Tucson, AZ 85716

*Journal of American Physicians
and Surgeons* (ISSN 1543-4826)

is published quarterly.

Copyright ©2013

by the Association of American Physicians
and Surgeons, Inc.

Correspondence

Gun Control

I read with great interest Dr. Orient's article on "gun violence."¹ It is refreshing that such a clearly articulated and well-thought-out response to the current trend in organized medicine has been published in your journal. I was pleasantly surprised by this and laud your editorial board and the author for putting forward the version that nobody wants to talk about, but is very much real.

Manjunath Markandaya, M.B.B.S.

Baltimore, Md.

1. Orient JM. "Gun violence" as a public health issue: a physician's response. *J Am Phys Surg* 2013;18:77-83.

Environmental Tobacco Smoke

Several recent articles report that a new nationwide study,¹ commissioned by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and funded by the pharmaceutical company Pfizer, had found that smoking bans don't hurt the bottom line of bars and restaurants. As a regional director of Buckeye Liquor Permit Holders Association, I've watched friends lose their bars and some their homes under a 2006 statewide smoking ban, so I question the objectivity of this study.

First, in announcing this study in a 2011 press release, CDC Director Thomas Frieden stated as established truth that smoke-free policies "don't hurt business," and promised to use the coming study to counter the perception that smoking bans "might negatively affect restaurant and bar business."² At the time, Dr. Michael Siegel of the Boston University School of Public Health questioned "how objective the research process can be if the agency conducting the study has already drawn a conclusion."³ Imagine the pressure on these researchers to interpret the data to support the claim their boss had already made about their future findings.

This study was funded by Pfizer, which stands to profit from its anti-smoking drug Chantix when smokers can no longer light up in their favorite establishment. And the study was conducted by RTI International. In a 2010 interview, RTI CEO Victoria Franchetti-Haynes stated, "Alcoholism and smoking are all health issues in which behavioral interventions can go a long way toward reducing their impact and lowering total healthcare costs."⁴ Might that

introduce a bias?

The studies showing no economic loss to businesses are commissioned by tobacco control or government agencies, both with the same agenda. Other studies do not support their conclusions. Michael Marlow analyzed the claimed health benefits and economic impact in this journal.⁵ Some businesses show statistically significant losses.⁶ Economist Jonathan T. Tomlin of LECG critiqued the statistical methodology in various studies, concluding that there is often significant economic harm to bars and restaurants.⁷

With a pre-announced conclusion, smoking cessation product funding, and execution by a research company friendly to "behavioral interventions" for the sake of health, any hope for an objective, independent economic study was doomed from the start.

Bar owners already suffering under bans simply want a truly open-minded, independent economic investigation of smoking bans before more of these destructive laws are passed. This new CDC/Pfizer/RTI smoking ban study just can't be trusted. The CDC is yet another rogue federal agency attempting to drive policy and justify increased funding through junk science.

Pam Parker

Grove City, Ohio

1. Loomis BR, Shafer PR, van Hasselt M. The economic impact of smoke-free laws on restaurants and bars in 9 states. *Prev Chronic Dis* 2013;10:120327. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5888/pcd10.120327>.
2. CDC Foundation. Economic impact of smoke-free policies. Available at: <http://www.cdcfoundation.org/who/articles/recent/economic-impact-smoke-free-policies>. Accessed Nov 7, 2013.
3. CDC seems to know the answer before starting the research on economic effects of smoke-free bars and restaurants. *The Rest of the Story: Tobacco News Analysis and Commentary*, Dec 7, 2011. Available at: <http://tobaccoanalysis.blogspot.com/2011/12/cdc-seems-to-know-answer-before.html>. Accessed Nov 7, 2013.
4. RTI International. Placing innovation at the forefront of global economic development. *Prism*, February 2010.
5. Marlow ML. Do smoking bans reduce heart attacks? *J Am Phys Surg* 2010;15:13-14.
6. Pakko MR. Clearing the haze? New evidence on the economic impact of smoking bans. *Regional Economist*, January 2008. Available at: <http://www.stlouisfed.org/publications/re/articles/?id=3>. Accessed Nov 8, 2013.
7. Tomlin JT. The economic impact of smoking bans. *Forbes*, Jun 4, 2009. Available at: <http://www.forbes.com/2009/06/04/economic-impact-bars-restaurants-opinions-contributors-smoking-ban.html>. Accessed Nov 8, 2013.