

From: [Peter Katzmarzyk](#)
To: ["Rhona Applebaum"](#); sblair@mailbox.sc.edu; K.R.Fox@bristol.ac.uk
Subject: RE: ICPAPH Abstract submissions now OPEN
Date: Thursday, February 09, 2012 8:42:33 AM

Hi Rhona,

Sounds good. I will definitely submit at least one abstract from ISCOLE, and our colleagues from Portugal and Kenya have also expressed interest in sending something in based on their regional experiences.

Peter

From: Rhona Applebaum [<mailto:rapplebaum@coca-cola.com>]
Sent: Thursday, February 09, 2012 7:24 AM
To: sblair@mailbox.sc.edu; Peter Katzmarzyk; K.R.Fox@bristol.ac.uk
Subject: Fw: ICPAPH Abstract submissions now OPEN

Hello Men--

Trust you all rec'd this email

I believe we all discussed ideas re presentations for Sydney. Post reading it appears no symposia, per se. Rather a focus on 'free' individual papers, with symposia invited by the organizers.

Also--I'm a bit nervous when I read debates, discussions characterized by 'controversial evidence'---wish there was a 'credible' stuck in btwn those two words.

Anyway--Peter--we discussed ISCOLE--go for it. See what happens

Steve--Energy Balance--again can't hurt, see what happens

Ken--we discussed Dr. Ryan and self-determination theory. Who knows--maybe there's a symposium on Behavior change

Should your 'talks' get accepted we will support travel and expenses. Hopefully you'll submit more than one. Not trying to be critical, but the process sounds like a lottery so perhaps the more you send in the better the odds.

I'll be optimistic--maybe this is the new and improved format

Lastly--you three may be invited as experts/keynote speakers. You just never know :-)

Thanks as always for all you do

Rhona

From: be active 2012 [<mailto:acsms@sma.org.au>]
Sent: Wednesday, February 08, 2012 09:27 PM
To: Rhona Applebaum

Subject: ICPAPH Abstract submissions now OPEN

Email not displaying correctly? [View it in your browser.](#)

In this email update

ICPAPH Abstract
submissions

ICPAPH 2012 Call for
papers

ACSMS & NSIPC Abstract
submissions

Thank you to our
conference partners
& supporters



ICPAPH 2012 Abstract Submissions

The ICPAPH 2012 Abstract Submission site is NOW OPEN. To submit your abstract click [here](#). **The deadline for receipt of abstracts is midnight 31 March 2012 Australian Eastern Daylight Savings Time.**

More information is available by clicking on the following links:

[Invitation](#)

[Guidelines & Selection Criteria](#)

[Research Awards](#)

ICPAPH 2012 Call for papers

ICPAPH 2012 promises to be an innovative, important exchange of science and policy work on physical activity and public health.

The format of ICPAPH 2012 will be slightly different from that used in previous Congresses, with less focus on symposia, and greater focus on oral presentations and posters from all levels of researchers, practitioners and policy makers.

At the last ICPAPH conference in Toronto in 2010, more than 70 symposium proposals were received, and 28 were selected for the program. This meant that there was less room for 'free' individual oral papers in the program. At ICPAPH 2012 in Sydney the only symposia will be those invited by the organisers; these will be organised by the active ISPAH councils. In 2012 there will be one plenary keynote speaker, additional invited keynote presentations, several 'tutorial' lectures, debates, discussion forums and workshops. All will be led by world leading experts, and will be characterised by controversial evidence and challenging issues, with lots of debate and discussion. [More...](#)

ACSMS and NSIPC Abstract Submissions



The online abstract submission site with further information and guidelines will be available shortly.

For more information or to register your expression of interest [email](#) the Conference Secretariat, visit the conference [website](#) or follow us on [twitter](#).

You are receiving this email because you attended a previous conference, you expressed your interest in upcoming conferences or you opted in at our website

[Unsubscribe](#) rapplebaum@na.ko.com from this list.

Our mailing address is:
Sports Medicine Australia
PO Box 78
Mitchell, ACT 2911

[Add us to your address book](#)

Copyright (C) 2008 Sports Medicine Australia All rights reserved.

[Forward](#) this email to a friend

[Update your profile](#)



CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

NOTICE: This message is intended for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is confidential, privileged and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any printing, copying, dissemination, distribution, disclosure or forwarding of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please contact the sender immediately and delete it from your system. Thank You.

Hill, James

From: Rhona Applebaum
Sent: Thu 11/08/2012 10:36 PM (GMT-00:00)
To: Hill, James; Peters, John C
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: This may help
Attachments: TCCC AND ICPAPH Messaging QA Sydney Meeting (4).docx

Jim/John—understand there have been questions from the media re recruitment for the study. I'm attaching Q&As we provide experts who are doing studies. The info should be of assistance if you choose to use it. We have had questions in the past asked of Steve and Sue F-T for studies we have sponsored.

Let me know if you need more.

Also—if you would like media training let me know. All our folks receive it. Attached is the Q&A we used for scientists at ICPAPH. We can tailor to your needs as well.

Rhona

Rhona S. Applebaum, PhD | VP, Chief Scientific & Regulatory Officer | The Coca-Cola Company

Email: rapplebaum@Coca-Cola.com

Twitter: [@RhonaA_CocaCola](https://twitter.com/RhonaA_CocaCola)

Office: 404-676-2177

Fax: 404-598-2177



CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

NOTICE: This message is intended for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is confidential, privileged and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any printing, copying, dissemination, distribution, disclosure or forwarding of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please contact the sender immediately and delete it from your system. Thank You.

FAQ: TCCC's Participation at the 4th International Congress on Physical Activity and Public Health (ICPAPH 2012)

Overview

From 31 October – 3 November 2012, the 4th International Congress on Physical Activity and Public Health (ICPAPH 2012) will take place in Sydney, Australia. As the Platinum Sponsor, The Coca-Cola Company (TCCC) will have a significant presence at the Congress through an exhibition stand, adjoining on-stand activation to promote exercise, sponsorship of the welcome dinner and reception as well as sponsorship of expert speakers in the areas of science on physical activity, energy balance and hydration.

However, the ICPAPH conference comes at a time when corporate sponsorship of health-related programs is being called into question by some members of the public health sector. Thus, there is the need to be prepared for questions and potential criticisms of The Coca-Cola Company's sponsorship and involvement in ICPAPH 2012.

MESSAGES:

Company Statement: The Coca-Cola Company has a long-standing commitment to advance scientific knowledge, awareness and understanding of the importance of an active, healthy lifestyle. Our commitment extends to supporting global scientific meetings and conferences where the latest research on nutrition, hydration, physical activity and energy balance is discussed.

We are proud to be a 2012 sponsor of the 4th International Congress on Physical Activity and Public Health (ICPAPH) and to sponsor some of the leading experts in their fields who will relay their research findings and points of view on emerging issues.

TALKING POINTS:

Our involvement in ICPAPH builds on our need to keep up-to-date with the latest science in Australia.

- Part of our involvement in ICPAPH is sponsoring a number of leading expert speakers in the fields of physical activity, lifestyle/behavioral changes that advance the latest science on physical activity, energy balance and hydration. These leading experts will relay their research findings and provide their **independent** points of view on emerging issues.
- We will also be conducting an on-stand activation to highlight our active, healthy lifestyle messaging and encourage delegates to engage with TCCC stand

COCA-COLA ADHERES TO THE HIGHEST ETHICAL STANDARDS WHEN SPONSORING SCIENTIFIC FORUMS AND FUNDING RESEARCH PROJECTS

- Whether we are sponsoring individual research studies, or providing financial support for events such as ICPAPH, our goal is to ensure there is absolutely no conflict of interest and that the highest level of scientific integrity is maintained.
- When we provide financial support to researchers and their institutions, this support takes the form of unrestricted grants where we have no involvement in the design of the studies and how the results will be reported.
- Our company takes very seriously the research principles established by the International Life Sciences Institute, which require that relevant parties not offer or accept remuneration geared to the outcome of a research project. This ensures there is no conflict of interest and the highest level of scientific integrity is maintained.
- We follow the same hands-off policy when supporting scientific meetings. This means we have no involvement in deliberations about the agenda, topic areas and speakers involved in the meeting.
- When we host scientific symposia in conjunction with an event like ICPAPH, our role is to invite the experts and reimburse them for their travel and expenses only. We do not have a role in their choice of topics or the information they choose to present.

Q&As

1. Why is Coca-Cola a Platinum Sponsor of ICPAPH?

- The Coca-Cola Company has a long-standing commitment to advance scientific knowledge, awareness and understanding of the importance of an active, healthy lifestyle.
- The Coca-Cola Company is committed to promoting sustainability in society as a whole, which includes supporting healthy and active lifestyles amongst consumers. In keeping with this, The Company has been a key partner of the International Congress on Physical Activity and Public Health (ICPAPH), since its inception in 2006 in Atlanta.
- Our goals are to **help advance and support** the science that underpins ICPAPH and to be a resource for health professionals and other stakeholders who are working around the world to increase physical activity levels and healthy behaviors.

2. How will you control conflicts of interest?

- Whether we are sponsoring individual research studies, or providing financial support for events like ICPAPH, our goal is to ensure there is absolutely no conflict of interest and that the highest level of scientific integrity is maintained.
- We do this by providing 'unrestricted' grants and by applying the principles developed by ILSI (International Life Sciences Institute, North America Branch) which serve as ground rules for industry-sponsored research. At the heart of these principles is the requirement that relevant parties not offer or accept remuneration geared to the outcome of a research project.

3. How can you guarantee your funding will not influence the integrity of this congress?

- Our company takes very seriously the research principles established by the International Life Sciences Institute, which require that relevant parties not offer or accept remuneration geared to the outcome of a research project. This ensures **to the extent possible that** there is no conflict of interest and the highest level of scientific integrity is maintained.
- When we provide financial support for scientific meetings, **unless we are invited to provide suggestions for panels/talks/speakers**, we have no involvement in deliberations about the agenda, topic areas and speakers involved in the meeting. **All suggestions go through approval of the program committees. None are permitted absent review and approval by the program committee.**
- Further, **when we host scientific symposia in conjunction with a congress such as ICPAPH**, our role is to invite the experts and reimburse them for their travel and expenses only. We do not have a role in their choice of topics or the information they choose to present.
- Further, **should a scientific symposia that we have suggested be accepted**, the content of the symposia are the responsibility of the speakers. We do not have a role in their choice of topics or the information they choose to present, nor do we review their presentations. We will also provide support for the speakers to attend the Conference/Congress if they so wish.

4. What about the experts taking part in your symposia? Isn't it a conflict of interest to pay them to speak at ICPAPH?

- Absolutely not. As part of our participation at ICPAPH, we will sponsor a number of leading experts on topics of great interest to the more than 2,000 scientists and members of the sports community who are attending ICPAPH. We invited the leading experts in their fields to take part in these symposia and agreed to reimburse them for their travel and expenses. The information they present and the opinions they offer **are entirely** their own.

5. Many industry critics maintain that “unrestricted grants” are not really “unrestricted.” Aren't there ties to all grants – unrestricted or not?

- No. Unrestricted grants specifically require that the funding organisation have no control over the design of the research study and the extent to which some of the grant money can be used for education, capability building, or to support emerging scientists – under the supervision and discretion of the researcher.
- It is also important to underscore that the leading scientists in their fields will not take on a project – regardless of funding source – unless it is clear that the research findings belong solely to the scientist and his or her research institution and resulting papers will be published regardless of outcome and funding source. This position is also shared by The Coca-Cola Company.

6. What is your response to the charge that industry-supported research is not of high quality?

- It is well documented that industry-supported research is of equal quality to studies funded by government and non-profit organisations. This is confirmed by a 2011 study of funding

sources and research quality, where the authors concluded that the quality of a research report “cannot be accurately predicted from the funding source after controlling for research design.”¹

- In many situations, the problem is how research studies are interpreted. This phenomenon of ‘white hat bias’ was described in a 2009 publication, which looked at sugar sweetened beverages (SSBs) and baby formula. On the specific topic of sugar sweetened beverages, the co-author stated, “less than one-third of the papers that cited the beverage studies accurately reported the overall findings.”² Likewise, a 2011 paper (Weed et al.) on the quality of reviews assessing sugar-sweetened beverages and health outcomes found the quality of the reviews was generally poor, with only a handful of moderate quality.³
- This is an ongoing challenge that many in the scientific community are working to address.

7. Why do you need to fund research anyway?

- Corporations like Coca-Cola can play an important role in supporting research that will advance the scientific knowledge, awareness and understanding of our products and the larger issues, such as obesity, that affect the use of these products. But this research is only valuable if it is conducted without conflict of interest and with absolute integrity. That is why we participated in development of the principles established by the International Life Sciences Institute for the conduct of industry-sponsored research.
- When supporting research, our fundamental purpose is to sort out ‘opinion’ from ‘truth’. If we are going to be helpful to policymakers and other stakeholders in identifying and implementing workable solutions that will reverse the tide of obesity and address other difficult public health challenges, we must always be guided by evidenced-based science.

8. So when your detractors say “industry money corrupts” are they wrong?

- We cannot speak for any company except for Coca-Cola. When it comes to money we provide, they are WRONG. We helped author and fully endorse the ILSI Guiding Principles that are intended to avoid financial conflicts and ensure scientific integrity.
- It is in our best interest to ensure results from evidence-based science are published and become part of the scientific knowledge base. We will not stand in the way of truth.

9. Do you have comments on the rising obesity in Australia and effects of soft drinks consumption on them?

- Soft drinks, alone, cannot be blamed for obesity. The fact is people consume calories (kilojoules) from many different foods and beverages, so it is impossible to attribute a complex problem like obesity to any one food, drink, or ingredient. However, all calories (kilojoules) count in maintaining a healthy weight, including those from our caloric

¹ Meyers EF, et. al. 2011. Funding Source and Research Report Quality in Nutrition Practice-Related Research. PLoS ONE 6(12): e28437. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0028437.

² MB Cope, DB Allison, International Journal of Obesity, 1 Dec 2009. On-line publication.

³ Weed, DL et al. 2011. Quality of reviews on sugar-sweetened beverages and health outcomes: a systematic review. Am J Clin Nutr 94(5):1340-1347.

beverages.

- We're acutely aware of the problems caused by the growing rate of obesity, and we are doing our bit to combat this issue.
- We provide sugar-free options for most of our sparkling beverages as well as providing water and juice varieties; we do not market our products to young children and we publicly support programs such as Exercise is Medicine Australia which encourages all Australians to participate in physical activity
- Obesity is a complex issue with many contributing factors; what's important is ensuring we all live a healthy, balanced lifestyle combining a sensible diet with physical activity.

10. What is your response to critics who charge that sponsoring sporting events and promoting sugary drinks is counter intuitive and may be worsening obesity rates in young people in the world?

- To change the way people think about nutrition and exercise, we need to work together. We recognise that obesity is a serious and complex global problem and we are doing our part by joining other stakeholders in implementing workable solutions.
- This means supporting independent research that will advance scientific knowledge, awareness and understanding of our products and the larger issues, such as obesity, that affect the use of these products. It also means funding new research on the importance of an active, healthy lifestyle and ways to encourage healthy behaviors.
- We agree that a healthy weight and lifestyle are all about balance – balancing the energy consumed in food and drink choices with the energy expended through physical activity. That's one of the reasons why the company has a long tradition of supporting sports and fitness programs throughout the world. Today, that commitment is as strong as ever.

11. Industry likes regulatory harmonisation. Why don't you support harmonised limits for added sugars, etc.? This is not a question for our speakers—reco it be deleted. This is our internal msging

- Industry supports harmonised regulations where such regulations are grounded in sound, evidence-based science. When it comes to added sugars, vs. sugars that are intrinsic to a food or beverage, there simply is no scientific basis for distinguishing one from the other. As such, there is no basis for setting regulatory limits for added sugars, harmonised or not.
- Moreover, several governmental bodies reinforce this position. This includes the European Food Safety Authority, which issued a Scientific Opinion on Dietary Reference Values for Carbohydrates and Dietary Fibre, concluding that "available data do not allow the setting of a Tolerable Upper Intake Level for total or added sugars, neither an Adequate Intake nor a

Reference Intake Range¹⁴

- Also supporting this viewpoint is the Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO), an agency of the World Health Organization. Specifically, FAO issued a Scientific Update on Carbohydrates in Human Nutrition, stating there is no convincing scientific justification of distinguishing between “free” (added) sugars and other sugars.⁵

⁴ European Food Safety Authority (EFSA). Scientific Opinion on Dietary Reference Values for carbohydrates and dietary fibre. The EFSA Journal 2010; 8(3):1462.


⁵ World Health Organization/Food and Agriculture Organization (2003). Diet, Nutrition and the Prevention of Chronic Diseases. WHO Technical Report Series 916. WHO. Geneva. Page 57.

From: [Peter Katzmarzyk](#)
To: [Rhona Applebaum](#)
Cc: [Timothy Church](#)
Subject: Re: Does Being Overweight Really Reduce Mortality? - Tobias - 2013 - Obesity - Wiley Online Library
Date: Sunday, October 20, 2013 4:37:31 PM

Hi Rhona, we could certainly pull together a nice session. We will have all of data by then and working on the primary outcome papers. We had considered the venue, but recently I decided not to go given it is very expensive and we don't have any budget for this. Also, I did not see a call for symposia so I figured it was a long way to go to present a poster!

Just getting ready to take off for Helsinki so I need to sign off.

Peter

Sent from my iPhone


On Oct 20, 2013, at 3:46 PM, "Rhona Applebaum" <rapplebaum@coca-cola.com> wrote:

Absolutely!!

But Steve, et al-- Some ideas for the ICPAPH in Brazil. Working with Pedro Halal on our 'contribution'—and of course—as it must—all sessions must go through the Program Committee. So far, thinking of...

--"What exactly is the "root cause" of obesity?"—Session Leader Greg Hand (per his volunteering ☺) thinking Dr. Sharma—as well as Karim Khan—but Greg's on point.

--Also thinking of a pre-conf on Ex is Medicine (or during the ICPAPH) if there's the necessary time. Mike Pratt has volunteered as Session Leader. With the global mix—it's a great opportunity to drive awareness and hopefully support for more EIM in more countries. Currently up to 40—only 167 to go ☺.

--Do we want to address the issue (again—it's been 4 years) on the topic of Public/Private Partnerships? Last time was with Kelly Murmetts, et al in Toronto. It's the elephant in the room—always.

--Peter/Tim—Will there be more data to share by April 8-11 2014 for an ISCOLE session?

--Steve—to keep you screaming—as you stated earlier—the cont'd ignoring of PA, as in your point re this statement by Dr. Hu ...“Although total mortality is a straightforward endpoint, epidemiologic studies of body weight and mortality are particularly prone to two major sources of bias: reverse causation and confounding by smoking [3].“ Your point--Do you think another major source of bias in these studies is that most of them completely ignore physical activity, or if they mention it, use very flawed and inaccurate PA data? Why not a

session addressing this specific point(s)? You can even have Hu on the panel—and unlike what he did at ICN—the directive will be to stick to science and not veer off to policy actions.

--Others? Obviously the key to all of this continues to be individual behavior and motivation—Ideas?

--Lastly—based on the brilliance of the IOC Consensus Statement—any thoughts/ideas catalyzing around the 5 strategies that we can do a deeper dive on—focusing on PA and NCD prevention?

1. Focus on behavioural change as the core component of all clinical programs for the prevention and management of chronic disease.
2. Establish actual centres to design, implement, study, and improve preventive programs for chronic disease.
3. Use human-centered design in the creation of prevention programs with an inclination to action, rapid prototyping and multiple iterations (see below).
4. Extend the knowledge and skills of Sports and Exercise Medicine (SEM) professionals to build new programs for the prevention and treatment of chronic disease focused on physical activity, diet and lifestyle.
5. Mobilize resources and leverage networks to scale and distribute programs of prevention.

Any and all ideas welcome!!

Rhona

Rhona S. Applebaum, PhD | VP, Chief Science & Health Officer | The Coca-Cola Company

Email: rapplebaum@Coca-Cola.com

Twitter: [@RhonaA_CocaCola](https://twitter.com/RhonaA_CocaCola)

Office: 404-676-2177

Fax: 404-598-2177

<image001.jpg><image002.jpg>

From: BLAIR, STEVEN [<mailto:SBLAIR@mailbox.sc.edu>]

Sent: Sunday, October 20, 2013 3:20 PM

To: Chip Lavie; HAND, GREG; Rhona Applebaum; dallison@uab.edu; mxp4@cdc.gov

Subject: RE: Does Being Overweight Really Reduce Mortality? - Tobias - 2013 - Obesity - Wiley Online Library

From: Peter Katzmarzyk
To: Rhona Applebaum
Subject: Re: ISCOLE
Date: Sunday, November 03, 2013 12:16:36 PM

Okay, working on it. Trying to rely on PIs already going to save costs. Might just need to pay for 2 out of 4 presenters. Will circle back with Pedro early this week.

PK

Sent from my iPhone

> On Nov 3, 2013, at 7:09 AM, "Rhona Applebaum" <rapplebaum@coca-cola.com> wrote:

>

> We will help with the travel...so full speed ahead

>

> Rhona

>

>

> Rhona S. Applebaum, PhD | VP, Chief Science & Health Officer | The Coca-Cola Company

> Email: rapplebaum@Coca-Cola.com

> Twitter: @RhonaA_CocaCola

> Office: 404-676-2177

> Fax: 404-598-2177

>

>

>

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Pedro C Hallal [<mailto:prchallal@gmail.com>]

> Sent: Friday, November 01, 2013 11:43 AM

> To: Peter Katzmarzyk; peter.katzmarzyk@pbrc.edu; Rhona Applebaum

> Subject: ISCOLE

>

> Dear Peter (cc Rhona)

>

> Rhona and I just had a phone call and decided to have a session on ISCOLE in ICPAPH as part of our sponsorship agreement. The session will last for 90 minutes and I do suggest you to think about 4-5 speakers (10 minutes each) for the session. May I also suggest you consider bringing people from low and middle income countries and not only from high income ones? China and India would be fantastic to have.

>

> Please send us the proposal by Nov 17th so that we can finalize the programme. No need for abstracts, but only title for the session, speakers and titles of each talk.

>

> Cheers, Pedro

>

>

>

>

> CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

> NOTICE: This message is intended for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is confidential, privileged and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any printing, copying, dissemination,

distribution, disclosure or forwarding of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please contact the sender immediately and delete it from your system. Thank You.

>

>

>

>

From: [Rhona Applebaum](#)
To: [Peter Katzarzyk](#); [Timothy Church](#)
Subject: Fw: Sponsorship of the 5th Int'l Congress on Physical Activity and Public Health --Rio. One man's opinion
Date: Friday, June 13, 2014 10:31:04 AM
Attachments: [KO Lancet Dec08.pdf](#)

FYI--pls see below. Sharing an internal email sent to the team

Not our/my 1st time in the cross hairs of Lancet.

There will be commentary re IsCoLe--but the science stands on its on. Will fwd Dr Binks article published in Nature to help prepare. Regardless of what Lancet does--can't ignore its impact

Rhona

From: rapplebaum@coca-cola.com
Sent: Friday, June 13, 2014 12:54 PM Coordinated Universal Time
To: Luciana Azevedo; Angela Soares; Monica Fonseca; Raul Portillo; Ilton Azevedo; Carla Cecchin; Maria de la Luz Valdes; Rafael Urrialde de Andres
Cc: Joan Prats; Rafael Fernandez Quiros; Ben Deutsch; Joanna Price; Talley Sergeant; L. Celeste Bottorff (lbottorff@coca-cola.com) <lbottorff@coca-cola.com>; Joan Koelemay; David Moran (damoran@coca-cola.com) <damoran@coca-cola.com>; Wouter Vermeulen
Subject: Sponsorship of the 5th Int'l Congress on Physical Activity and Public Health --Rio. One man's opinion

Hola Everyone (and pls share with others who need to know)

First—yes, we helped to sponsor the 5th Congress. We have been a major sponsor since this Congress started 10 years ago. Also--It is not a coincidence that this is published in the Lancet the same time as FIFA.

Second—We knew it was only a matter of time before a miscreant would write a comment re our sponsorship. I cut and pasted the article and link below. Title is rhetorical at best, “Can Coca Cola promote physical activity?” More stupid than rhetorical since the author uses it as ploy to drive his opinion.

An Evidence Based Researcher (EBR) alerted me to the fact that this individual, Thiago Hérick de Sá, “is a student of Carlos Monteiro and is trying to use a shortcut to get known by the international community - instead of good science, some words.” (NOTE: His affiliation with Monteiro says it all). Another EBR mentioned that “They have 5 references in this piece, but I don't think any of them are data-based, scientific articles. They do include Kelly Brownell's opinion!”

Anyway—wanted to bring this to your attention and also copying others to keep in the loop. Lancet often publishes pieces/commentary like this re the industry. Unsure why. Just FYI--they did this to us back in 2008 when we were meeting with folks to discuss a PA study. Lancet published the drivel of Ian Roberts (see attached). BTW—Dr. Roberts mentions both Joan Prats and I indirectly (ie via our titles (copied you Joan just to take you down memory lane ☺). Also—his comment contains a lot of misinformation. Shocker--NOT. Just so you know, the decision back in 2008 was to not

respond. We didn't want to give this person a platform, and I think our strategy here should be the same. As mentioned his motive is self-aggrandizement and with FIFA he's hoping to get traction. Again, the timing of this comment is not a coincidence.

Lastly, good to know we have our supporters. Will end on a third comment from a friend. Only wish the "culprits" as he mentioned were more worried about this wicked problem we face as a society vs their resume, personal gain and popularity... Here's what he said...

"...And to blame sweetened beverages as a 'major cause' of this obesity crisis is just so far removed from reality. It's amazing, watching the World Cup preview show yesterday I couldn't help but notice how fit all of the soccer playing youngsters in the ghettos of Rio and Sao Paulo are...those kids are lean and mean fighting machines because they are incredibly active...NOT because they don't drink sweetened beverages (we know they do!).

The vast majority of obese kids are the ones who are not playing or exercising each day...yes, they probably eat more than they should as well, but that is only exasperated by the physical inactivity! It's a horrible downward spiral for these kids and we should not deny anyone the right to help them become more physically active...whatever it takes! To actually say that some, anyone, cannot 'promote' physical activity, or 'support sports' is just absolutely ludicrous and over the top biased! It's a shame that so many who should be dedicated to actually helping the real cause would rather attack others based solely on such ideological agendas! Absolutely pitiful!

Don't give up...keep up the good fight Coca Cola!"

Happy reading and any questions --shout! And yes, we will continue to sponsor key Health and PA Congresses in the future. Have a few lined up already---Including the European Congress on Sports Science the first week in July in Amsterdam. We won't let the bastards keep us down and the minority of agenda drivers must never win out over the majority of evidence based researchers.

Rhona

PS—have shared with a few of our friends who were down involved in the Congress and strongly supported our engagement

PSS—Attn Brazil—

Can Coca Cola promote physical activity?

[Can Coca Cola promote physical activity?](#)

Original Text

[Thiago Hérick de Sá](#) 

In their *Lancet* Manifesto (March 8, p 847)¹ Richard Horton and colleagues state: "Our tolerance of neoliberalism and transnational forces dedicated to ends far removed from the needs of the vast majority of people, and especially the most deprived and vulnerable, is only deepening the crisis we

face.” I agree, and so do many colleagues in Brazil.

The Fifth International Congress on Physical Activity and Public Health, held in Rio de Janeiro, April 8–11, 2014, was sponsored by Coca Cola. This is the first time, to my knowledge, that a major conference on physical activity held in Brazil has been sponsored by an organisation whose policies, practices, or products conflict with those of public health. The sponsorship was not only financial; Coca Cola was everywhere—at side meetings, in the sponsors’ hall, giving away its products and propaganda. At a time when sweetened soft drinks are recognised by independent organisations as a major cause of the present uncontrolled obesity pandemic, which notably affects children and developing countries, such as China, India—and Brazil, this is worrying.

Big Food corporations are spending billions of US\$ on their strategy to claim that obesity is caused by physical inactivity. Their engagement with physical activity and public health organisations and professionals is part of their corporate social responsibility strategy. Their campaigns include techniques to evade regulation and to influence science,^{2, 3} using methods similar to those used by tobacco corporations in the past.⁴

Is this a kind of retribution to Latin America—where laws to protect children against ultra-processed food were implemented in Mexico, Chile, and Costa Rica, and where civil society organisations oppose Big Food corporations to limit advertising of ultra-processed products to children in Brazil?⁵

Brazil is hosting the World Cup this month, and the Olympics in 2016. Both events are committed to sponsorships from McDonald’s and Coca Cola, among others. Again, it is easy to understand why they would sponsor such events. This outrageous practice is pushed by international sports federations, putting pressure on national governments.

We cannot accept big transnational fast food and soft drinks corporations to support sports and physical activity.

I declare no competing interests. I acknowledge funding from São Paulo Research Foundation.

References

- 1 Horton R, Beaglehole R, Bonita R, Raeburn J, McKee M, Wall S. From public to planetary health: a manifesto. *Lancet* 2014; **383**: 847. [Full Text](#) | [PDF\(148KB\)](#) | [PubMed](#)
- 2 Gomez L, Jacoby E, Ibarra L, et al. Sponsorship of physical activity programs by the sweetened beverages industry: public health or public relations?. *Rev Saude Publica* 2011; **45**: 423-427. [PubMed](#)
- 3 Moodie R, Stuckler D, Monteiro C, et al. Profits and pandemics: prevention of harmful effects of tobacco, alcohol, and ultra-processed food and drink industries. *Lancet* 2013; **381**: 670-679. [Summary](#) | [Full Text](#) | [PDF\(232KB\)](#) | [PubMed](#)
- 4 Brownell KD, Warner KE. The perils of ignoring history: Big Tobacco played dirty and millions died. How similar is Big Food?. *Milbank Q* 2009; **87**: 259-294. [PubMed](#)
- 5 Jacoby E, Rivera J, Cordero S, et al. Legislation. Children. Obesity. Standing up for children’s rights in