Tobacco imagery in entertainment media: evolution of tobacco-free movies and television programmes rules in India

Amit Yadav ,1,2 Stanton A Glantz 1


Handling editor Eduardo Gómez
► Additional material is published online only. To view please visit the journal online (http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2020-003639).

ABSTRACT

Introduction Tobacco imagery in films and television increased in India after it ended conventional tobacco advertising in 2004. The Ministry of Health and Family Welfare (MoHFW) introduced rules to eliminate this tobacco imagery in 2005 which took effect in amended form in 2012. This study presents the enablers and barriers in development and implementation of the regulations to curb tobacco imagery in films and television in India.

Method We reviewed legislation, evolving regulations, parliamentary questions, judicial decisions, Bollywood trade publications and relevant news articles from 2003 to 2019 and interviewed key informants.

Results Based on the WHO reports and civil society demands, the MoHFW issued a complete ban on tobacco imagery in movies and television programmes in 2005. The Ministry of Information and Broadcasting (MoIB) joined the film industry in opposing the rules. A filmmaker challenged the rules in court, which ruled that they violated constitutional freedoms. On appeal by MoHFW, the Supreme Court allowed the rules to take effect. Continuing opposition by MoIB and the film industry weakened the rules and delayed implementation until 2012. As of 2020, rather than a ban, all films with tobacco imagery require strong editorial justification, 100s of antitobacco messages produced by the MoHFW, and a static health warning at the bottom of screen during tobacco imagery display. In 2015, less than 48% of movies had tobacco imagery compared with 89% in 2005.

Conclusions Although, not a ban, MoHFW, supported by local advocates and WHO, issued regulations that resulted in a substantial drop in on-screen tobacco imagery and increased exposure to antitobacco messages. India’s experience informs WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control parties as they develop and implement policies to curb tobacco imagery in entertainment media.

Key questions

What is already known?
► Tobacco imagery in film and television programs causes youth tobacco use.
► The tobacco industry has a history of using film and television to promote its products.
► India implemented regulations to reduce the amount and impact of tobacco presentation in films and on television.

What are the new findings?
► The Ministry of Health and Family Welfare with support from WHO and non-governmental organizations passed regulations for comprehensive tobacco-free movie and film rules in India.
► Film industry and the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting fought the rules, weakening and delaying implementation for more than 7 years, until 2012.
► There was a substantial reduction in tobacco imagery in movies in India after the rules went into effect and broad dissemination of antitobacco advertising accompanying films and television that still contain smoking images.

What do the new findings imply?
► The detailed analysis of policy-making process that led to the Indian rules presents a lesson for the other countries for regulating tobacco imagery in films and television.
► It is important to engage with stakeholders, including WHO, civil society, sympathetic filmmakers and politicians to support the regulations while being cautious of the motion picture and television companies, their unions and rating agencies.
► A detailed guideline for effective implementation of the regulations by all stakeholders should always follow any regulation to assist effective enforcement.

INTRODUCTION

India's film industry produces 1500–2000 movies yearly that reach 2.2 billion moviegoers in India as well as a sizeable worldwide audience.1 Indians also watch movies on television (TV), satellite and on-demand platforms. Aware of the promotional value of tobacco imagery in films2–7 tobacco companies have used smoking by major film stars to help construct a pro-tobacco culture across Asia.8 Although tobacco kills more than 1.35 million Indians every year, it is home to nearly
270 million tobacco users with more than 28% adults using tobacco in some form. Additionally, about 15% youth between 13 and 15 years of age use tobacco while more than 5500 youth initiate tobacco use every day. The Ministry of Information and Broadcasting (MoIB) is the nodal ministry for regulating films and TV programmes in India. MoIB enforces the Cinematograph Act, 1952 which prohibits ‘glamorisation’ of tobacco and smoking in movies (without defining the term) and the Cable Television Networks Amendment Act, 2000, which bans tobacco advertising on cable TV. Active efforts to regulate tobacco use in Indian film started in 2001 when the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare (MoHFW), the nodal ministry for health, introduced the Cigarettes and Other Tobacco Products Act (COTPA) that was signed into law in May 2003. COTPA Section 5 (1) states, ‘no person shall take part in any advertisement which directly or indirectly suggests or promotes the use of consumption of cigarettes or any other tobacco products (emphasis added).’ The law also prohibits smoking in public places, sale of tobacco products to and by minors and within 100 yards of educational institutions and mandates pictorial health warnings covering 85% of the principal display area, both front and back, of all tobacco products.

Nevertheless, adolescents are more likely to start smoking if exposed to on-screen tobacco imagery. Research in India shows that high levels of smoking in Indian movies and frequent displays of tobacco brands on-screen influence youth uptake. In 2005, the MoHFW issued regulations prohibiting tobacco appearances in movies and TV programmes. Film industry and MoIB opposition weakened the rules and delayed the implementation until 2012. Nevertheless, MoHFW, with support from non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and the WHO secured strong regulations that were followed by a drop in tobacco use in films as well as an increase in public exposure to antitobacco messages.

METHODS

We used the ‘standards for reporting qualitative research’ reporting guidelines (online supplemental file) to prepare a policy history and analysis of the development of India’s regulations of tobacco use in film and TV for the period 2003 to 2019. Relevant Indian laws and regulations on films, cinema, TV and tobacco control were searched from https://www.indiacode.nic.in/.

Parliamentary questions posed by members of parliament (MPs) to relevant ministers between 1 January 2003 and 24 July 2019 were searched from https://parliamentofindia.nic.in/ with key words ‘movie,’ ‘film,’ ‘cinema’ and ‘TV’ and identified 298 relevant questions. We searched the www.smokefreemovies.ucsf.edu database for India-specific information and identified 37 media stories. We then conducted snowball searches from this initial list in other film and tobacco industry trade publications for collating information on movie rules in India from 2003 to 2019, which yielded another 30 media stories.

We searched https://indiankanoon.org and https://www.tobaccocontrollaws.org for information on litigation and judicial observations regarding India’s movie rules, which yielded 17 judicial decisions. Information available on the Central Board of Film Certification (CBFC), the MoIB agency charged with reviewing and certifying films, website https://www.cbfcindia.gov.in was searched in December 2020.

Stakeholders whose names appeared in the literature review and media reports in respect of film rules in India were contacted for interviews to both validate and substantiate the findings from the review and to fill in the information gaps. Stakeholders were asked to share their experience of development and implementation of the movie rules in India and what according to them were the enablers and barriers in the process which have been included in our analysis. The stakeholders included the WHO India Office, civil society representatives and the concerned officials in relevant government departments. Interviews were conducted over telephone except one that was conducted in person. Interviews were recorded and professionally transcribed. Officials from the MoHFW, WHO India Office, MoIB and CBFC did not respond to the email requests for interviews. Representatives from the film industry were not contacted for this study because we could not identify contact information beyond their social media accounts.

Data collection and analysis took place from July 2019 to April 2020. We used the information we collected to prepare a detailed timeline and history of the developments and events relating to films and TV rules in India (online supplemental table S1). A much more detailed report on the events presented and analysed in this paper is also available.

Patient and public involvement

This paper does not report a clinical study, so no patients were involved. This paper described the public and political process to develop and implement India’s films and TV tobacco depiction rules. While the public was not involved in the development and design of the study, several public players were interviewed. Involvement paragraph as a subsection within the methods section of their papers. We will make the published paper available to the media, health authorities and public health advocates to disseminate it to people and organisations who can act on the information and recommendations in the paper.

RESULTS

Initial push to ban on-screen tobacco imagery (2003–04)

WHO highlighted its campaign against on-screen tobacco promotion with the 2003 World No Tobacco Day’s theme ‘Tobacco-free film, tobacco-free fashion.’ As part of
this event, WHO collaborated with the University of California, San Francisco Smokefree Movies project in November 2002 to call on Hollywood and Bollywood to end their promotion of tobacco.\(^7\) In February 2003, WHO released a report documenting tobacco presentation in 76% of the Indian movies released between 1991 and 2002 and 89% in 2005. During 1991–2002, 16% of movies with tobacco imagery had brand placements and 62 tobacco brand exposures were recorded, with the highest brand exposure being ITC’s Wills brand.\(^7\) Tobacco brand placement increased threefold to 46% in 2005 after implementation of the advertising ban under COTPA, wherein over 90% of all brand appearances were Philip Morris (Marlboro) and ITC (Wills and Gold Flake).\(^6\)

Several MPs cited the WHO report\(^7\) when asking the Government what it was doing about tobacco presentation in films and TV.\(^26\)\(^27\) The MoIB responded that the CBFC was preventing glamorisation of tobacco use in films.\(^26\) The MoHFW acknowledged the report’s recommendations to protect youth from tobacco imagery in movies, that COTPA required a total prohibition on all forms of direct and indirect advertising and that the Government intended to use World No Tobacco Day to highlight tobacco’s ill effects and advocate to eliminate tobacco imagery in films.\(^27\) At the main World No Tobacco Day 2003 event in New Delhi, the Health Minister called for support from the media community and several actors, producers, directors and others spoke against tobacco consumption and promotion.\(^28\)

Several NGOs also promoted the movie rules and defended their necessity (online supplemental table S1). Tobacco control activists and students, led by Delhi-based NGO HRIDAY, pressed for a ban on on-screen tobacco depictions.\(^29\)\(^30\) The Cancer Patient Aid Association, a Mumbai-based NGO which also contributed to WHO’s report, said that the findings were, ‘not to chastise film stars, but to sensitise them to the fact that they exert a huge impact on people’ and recruited several actors to create antismoking advertisements.\(^31\)

Early in 2004, MoHFW issued regulations to implement COTPA,\(^32\) including provisions banning direct and indirect advertising of tobacco products. The Ministry also released a comprehensive report on tobacco control in November 2004\(^44\) that, among other things, linked tobacco use to films.\(^33\)

**Civil society campaigns for tobacco-free movies (2005)**

The year 2005 started with HRIDAY student representatives sending open letters to the CBFC chairperson seeking a tobacco imagery ban in Indian films.\(^34\) Salaam Bombay Foundation, a Mumbai-based NGO, released an analysis of four popular movies from 2004 to 2005 that found the films collectively had 27 minutes of tobacco imagery, worth INR116 million (US$2.7 million) in advertising.\(^35\)

On 21 March 2005 actor Vivek Oberoi, who had been honoured with a World No Tobacco Day award by WHO in 2004, accepted the Red and White Bravery Award from Godfrey Phillips, Philip Morris International’s Indian affiliate. The Cancer Patient Aid Association called on Oberoi to reverse his decision to accept the award\(^36\) and the Burning Brain Society, a Chandigarh-based NGO, sued Godfrey Phillips for sponsoring the awards in violation of COTPA and called on Oberoi to return the award.\(^37\)\(^38\) Burning Brain Society also wrote to MoHFW and MoIB ministers and the CBFC chairman urging them to stop tobacco imagery in movies and broadcast media.\(^39\)\(^40\)

**First tobacco-free movies rules: notification and challenges (2005)**

On 31 May 2005, MoHFW announced the tobacco-free movie and TV regulations.\(^41\) Effective 1 August 2005, the rules prohibited tobacco imagery in new movies and TV programmes and required old movies and TV programmes to have a health warning scroll at the bottom of the screen during any display of tobacco imagery. Displays of brands or logos in films, TV, print, outdoor and electronic media was prohibited (online supplemental table S2).\(^41\)

Several filmmakers and actors attacked the regulation using rhetoric employed by Hollywood.\(^42\) The CBFC chairman called it a hasty decision, raised concerns about tobacco depiction in period and gangster movies, and said the ban would be difficult to enforce,\(^43\) especially for movies that were complete or nearing completion.\(^44\) The Film and TV Producers Guild of India called for self-regulation and argued that the Cinematograph Act was sufficient.\(^45\)

The publisher of *The Hindu*, a major newspaper, challenged the rules in Madras High Court. A leading film director, who was considered a known ally of the tobacco industry,\(^46\) also challenged the rules in Bombay High Court. The cases were consolidated before the Delhi High Court.\(^47\)

**Discord between MoIB and MoHFW (2005)**

Against this background, two MPs asked MoIB and MoHFW about the demand to ban smoking scenes in film and if there was a difference of opinion between them.\(^48\) MoIB responded that the film rules were under examination in consultation with MoHFW and that the film industry opposed the directive because some of the provisions would be difficult to implement.\(^48\) MPs also asked if MoIB was pressuring MoHFW to ease the regulations.\(^49\)\(^50\) The MoIB minister denied that MoIB was pressuring MoHFW, but said that the ‘MoHFW have been requested to look into some of the implementation aspects of the notification in light of the reservations expressed by the film industry.’\(^49\)\(^50\)

Indian tobacco control NGOs published a two-page advertisement in *Screen*, one of India’s leading entertainment newspapers, on 17 August 2005, supporting the rules with the headline ‘Why Indian films will lead the world on 2 October, 2005,’ that summarised the scientific
The newly appointed MoIB minister, actor-politician MH Ambareesh, opposed limiting tobacco imagery in movies and asked, ‘If heroes stop smoking, will people not smoke?’ The media largely favoured the MoIB and accused the government of high-handedness and behaving like a ‘nanny state.’

**Efforts by and focused on film stars (2007–2008)**

In February 2007, several actors announced that they had stopped smoking. The Cancer Patient Aid Association worked with the actors who became brand ambassadors for MoHFW’s antismoking campaigns although some smoked in their subsequent movies.

In January 2008, Health Minister Ramadoss asked prominent actors to not smoke in movies. In response Shah Rukh Khan, a major movie star, asserted creative freedom should be allowed in cinema and arts. NGOs sent Khan letters urging him to use his platform for the public good.

In May 2008, Health Minister Ramadoss appealed to Indian film stars, especially Shahrukh Khan and Amitabh Bachchan, not to smoke or drink in movies to avoid inspiring youth initiation. Bachchan criticised Ramadoss as ‘overzealous’ and another filmmaker called him ‘juvenile.’ Actor Rajinikanth supported Ramadoss and committed not to smoke in real life or on film, and released two successful movies without smoking. The Minister hoped Bollywood leaders would follow in Rajinikanth’s footsteps, but other filmmakers refused to agree that smoking or drinking in movies stimulated those behaviours in real life.

**The Delhi High Court quashes the rule but Supreme Court allows it to take effect (2008-09)**

In February 2008, two Delhi High Court judges delivered divided rulings. One ruled that tobacco product advertisements were not constitutionally protected speech and that restrictions on electronic media and cinematographic film were reasonable and justified. The other ruled that COTPA did not give MoHFW power to make rules about films or TV and a blanket ban on smoking scenes in films and TV encroached on film-makers’ creativity and free artistic expression.

The chief justice referred the case to an additional judge for final adjudication.

On 25 January 2009, the Delhi High Court quashed the movie rules as beyond COTPA’s scope and inconsistent with the speech, expression and trade rights under India’s Constitution. The third judge ruled that CBFC guidelines were adequate and nothing more was required or permissible under COTPA or the Constitution.

The MoHFW appealed the decision to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court issued an interim stay on the Delhi High Court judgement on 2 April 2009, which meant that the movie rules could go into effect.

However, by this time Minister Ramadoss had resigned and Ghulam Nabi Azad was appointed as the new Health Minister. In response to a parliamentary question
regarding showing smoking scenes in films and TV, Azad responded, ‘Action is in progress to implement the Rules notified in October 2006.’ In contrast, MoIB incorrectly stated that the 2006 film rules could not enter effect since the appeal was pending in the Supreme Court.

More advocacy efforts by MoHFW and civil society (2009–2011)

The WHO released its first report *Smoke-free movies: From evidence to action* in 2009 which highlighted that Indian films were depicting more tobacco imagery following implementation of COTPA in 2003. The report also suggested that the tobacco companies could be using increased placement of tobacco use in movies as a way to compensate for COTPA restrictions on traditional advertising. In 2011, WHO released a second edition of the report highlighting the conflict between the MoHFW and MoIB. Failing to reach consensus with MoIB on the October 2006 rules, MoHFW started extensive negotiations with the MoIB to amend the rules.

Under mounting pressure from WHO, NGOs and increasing scientific evidence, MoHFW partnered with WHO and the Salam Bombay Foundation to organise a workshop in September 2011 to sensitise members of the CBFC, its Regional Centres and some filmmakers on the need to restrict tobacco use in the films and TV programmes.

Third amendment to the movie rules (2011)

On 27 October 2011, MoHFW issued a modified notification on regulating tobacco imagery on-screen effective 14 November 2011. These rules required U/A certification (parental guidance for children below the age of 12 years) for any tobacco presentation in films. Further, it required a 20 s antitobacco disclaimer and 30 s antitobacco advertisement produced by the MoHFW before and during intermission in addition to the on-screen warning scroll during on-screen depiction of tobacco (online supplemental table S2).

A month later representatives of the film industry met with MoIB, the Ministry of Law and Justice, and CBFC to discuss the alleged difficulties and challenges in implementing the new rules. No one from the MoHFW was invited to attend the meeting, but the MoIB Minister called the Health Minister during the meeting and presented the difficulties the CBFC and the film industry claimed.

The MoIB advised the CBFC and its Regional Boards to implement and monitor the rules, while MoIB asserted that the 2006 film rules could not enter effect since the appeal was pending in the Supreme Court.

Kerala High Court and Supreme Court direct full compliance with rules (2012)

On 26 March 2012, in response to a petition filed by the Kerala Voluntary Health Services regarding COTPA implementation in the state of Kerala, the High Court of Kerala directed the national government, State of Kerala and the CBFC to ‘ensure that no scenes are depicted in films, tele-serials and other visual media which would violate the provisions of COTPA and its allied Rules.’ On 27 April 2012, the Supreme Court made its 2 April 2009 interim stay on the Delhi High Court’s order permanent.

MoIB ignored both courts while filmmakers continued to depict tobacco imagery. Although CBFC partially observed the regulations, it wrote MoIB expressing practical difficulties in implementing the provisions. In response, the MoIB Director (Films) wrote the chief executive officer of CBFC saying they should advise filmmakers to display only a 20 s antismoking message at the beginning and end of films, and a static antismoking message during any smoking scene (online supplemental table S2).

Fourth and final amendment to the movie rules (2012)

In September 2012, MoHFW and MoIB agreed that films would not be rated for smoking scenes (not even a U/A certification) and that MoHFW would provide the disclaimer and advertisements to CBFC for filmmakers to use at the time of application for certification. MoHFW issued the final regulations effective on 2 October 2012 (online supplemental table S2). On 21 September 2012, MoHFW released a set of disclaimer and health spots to be used in films and TV programmes with tobacco imagery (figures 1 and 2).

In September 2013, MoHFW released two new anti-tobacco advertisements (figure 3) to be displayed at the beginning and middle of movies featuring tobacco imagery that would replace the earlier ones. The new advertisements were dubbed in 16 Indian languages for pan India coverage. MoHFW also placed a national advertisement on 2 October in leading newspapers (figure 4).

Figure 1 The static disclaimers to be displayed at the beginning and middle of films containing tobacco use produced by the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare in 2011. In addition to the images, an announcer reads the message.
Filmmakers fail to block the static message and MoHFW-produced antitobacco advertisements (2012–2020)

The film industry, through the Film and TV Producers Guild of India, resisted on-screen static health warning messages (figure 5).102 Filmmaker Aurag Kashyap refused to add the static health warning message to his movie Ugly (2013, DAR Motion Pictures) and when refused certification103 he sued CBFC in the Bombay High Court challenging the rules especially the static messages98 on the grounds that it prevented enjoyment of the movie as a piece of art.104 105

The Court, following the July 2013 direction of the Supreme Court,106 refused to act on the lawsuit against the CBFC.98 Early in 2014, several filmmakers argued they, not the MoHFW, should produce and control antitobacco messages.107 108 In response109 NGOs wrote to MoHFW that Bollywood had conflicted with public health, that current film rules were effective in countering tobacco use in films, and that the government should not succumb to pressure from the film industry.110 Dr V Shanta, Chairman Adyar Cancer Institute, Chennai, also sent a letter to the Prime Minister on 23 April 2015 requesting that smoking scenes in movies be banned and the MoIB be directed to strictly implement the rules immediately in all movies.111

In June 2016, an MoIB Expert Committee constituted earlier in the year112 recommended repealing of the MoHFW movie rules and replacing them with a static audio visual message only at the beginning of films. It also suggested self-production of small antitobacco advertisements by filmmakers to be screened in cinema halls and on TV channels.113–115 However, no changes were made and the rules remained in effect as of December 2020.

WHO commends tobacco-free movies in India (2016)

In February 2016, WHO released the third edition of its report Smoke-free movies: From evidence to action25 that highlighted India’s success. The report stated that by mandating ‘warnings about tobacco harms through public service announcements, disclaimers and static messages, the Government of India has been able to accrue valuable air time for public health messaging and has been able to raise tobacco control awareness among the masses.’ The head of the WHO’s Tobacco-Free Initiative applauded government’s effort and recommended a rating system that awarded an ‘adult’ rating for movies, TV and other entertainment products containing tobacco imagery.116
Evaluation of the movie rules (2017)

A report that analysed contents of 245 top grossing Bollywood movies from 2006 to 2017 for tobacco presentation revealed that, in 2015 less than 48% of top-grossing movies had tobacco imagery, compared with 89% in 2005. In 2017, at the National Consultation on Tobacco-free Films Policy held in Mumbai, the MoHFW released a study conducted by Vital Strategies with support from the WHO India Office. Key stakeholders from government, media and NGOs participated in the consultation. The study found that 99% of movies with tobacco imagery released in 2015 implemented at least one element of the film rules while 27% implemented all three elements. Seventy-nine per cent of films with tobacco showed the disclaimer, 97% included the MoHFW antitobacco advertisements and 86% included the static health warning during smoking scenes. Moviegoers felt that the rules were easy to understand, increased concerns about tobacco’s harms and prompted tobacco cessation attempts. Twenty-two per cent of TV programmes had tobacco imagery, of which 71% were broadcast at times of minor viewership (prime time) and only 4% of them implemented at least two out of the three rules requirements. None of the TV programmes implemented all three elements of the rules. One of the reasons for lack of compliance in TV was lack of broadcasters’ sensitisation to the regulations.

A study conducted in the state of Karnataka (data collected between July 2017 and January 2018) concluded that ‘children in southern India who had seen films containing tobacco imagery are no more likely to smoke than those who had not, indicating that the tobacco control messaging mandated by Indian law may be attenuating the effect of tobacco imagery in films on smoking uptake.’

Tobacco imagery in live streaming platforms (2017–2020)

During 2017, while the MoHFW worked to maintain tobacco-free films and TV rules compliance, online media streaming services flooded the internet with tobacco imagery. MoHFW objected to the Telecom Regulatory Authority of India about the blatant violations of the film rules and asked it to prevent violation of the regulations by the online streaming companies. Because streaming platforms were not yet regulated, MoHFW started examining WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control (FCTC) Article 13, which forbids cross-border advertisements of tobacco products. By early 2019, the Internet and Mobile Association of India, the mobile industry’s key lobbying body, created a voluntary regulatory mechanism for its members. It informed MoIB regarding the development of a ‘Code of Best Practices for Online Curated Content Providers’ including its complaint mechanism. Such voluntary codes do not work and therefore, the internet and Mobile Association of India should instead be required to implement the existing film rules.

No formal process for considering ‘editorial justification’ (2012–2020)

Although movie rules had been in effect for 6 years, in August 2018 the CBFC Chief Executive Officer admitted that a formal process vetting ‘editorial justification’ claims for tobacco imagery in films still did not exist. Our detailed review of the documents available online from the CBFC’s website as of 24 December 2020 revealed that no formal procedure for seeking or documenting ‘editorial justification’ existed. The forms used to apply for film certification require many details about the film but did not ask questions regarding tobacco content.

While state health departments and NGOs reported movie rules violations (online supplemental table S1), the MoIB minister told Parliament on 28 June 2019 that antitobacco advertisements were mandatory and all films and TV programmes with tobacco imagery must adhere to the regulations, while Doordarshan (National Public TV channel) runs scrolling warnings (text that moves across the screen superimposed on the image) instead of static warnings during on-screen depiction of tobacco.

DISCUSSION

WHO reports, civil society advocacy, and many MP supported Health Minister Ramadoss and subsequent Health Ministers’ efforts to get the film rules implemented and prevent depiction of tobacco imagery in movies and TV programmes in India. Ramadoss not only introduced the initial rules in 2005 but also negotiated for MoIB’s support and implementation of the regulations. He went all out in support of the rules, including filing court cases and arguing before the inter-ministerial committees as well. He called on film stars to stop using tobacco on and off screen. NGOs responded to his call and supported the movie rules and later also reported violations of the regulations (online supplemental table S1).

Indian parliamentarians remained engaged and generally supportive of MoHFW and raised 298 questions during 2003–2019 about regulation of tobacco in movies and TV. Of these 142 (48%) raised concern about tobacco imagery or called for regulation of film and TV content, compared with only 43 (14%) that were negative; the remaining 113 (38%) were neutral.

In a world first, beginning October 2012, Indian movies with tobacco imagery were required to display a total of 100s of MoHFW-produced antitobacco disclaimers and advertisements before films and during intermissions, along with an antitobacco static health warning on-screen during all tobacco depictions. This compliance translated into about 23 hours of exposure to MoHFW antitobacco messaging that year.

Presence of the tobacco industry

After COTP’s ban on conventional advertising in 2004, the amount of tobacco imagery in Indian movies...
increased. The tobacco industry also sponsored events and publications closely related to the film industry, including film magazines, cinema awards and concerts by Bollywood stars.

Although the tobacco industry continued benefiting from tobacco imagery in movies, it kept a low public profile during the battle over India’s film rules. However, film industry arguments against the rules were similar to the tobacco industry’s response to any effective tobacco control effort globally or in India, namely that the proposed regulations would not work, that the regulations violated fundamental rights, and that the film industry is not responsible for tobacco use among adolescents, youth or adults.

Blocking age-rating films and TV with tobacco
The film industry with MoIB’s support blocked age-based restrictions to prevent youth exposure to tobacco imagery in films and TV programmes. As a result, youth-rated movies in India continue to contain tobacco images as of March 2020, more in the regional movies than the national languages. While under the initial regulations films and TV programmes with tobacco imagery were not to be broadcast at a time with high viewership below 18 years old, with the film industry pressure the amended 2012 rules dropped these conditions, leaving millions of youth exposed to tobacco presentations (online supplemental table S2). Future regulations in India and other countries adopting similar regulations should insist on age-based restriction on tobacco imagery in movies and TV programmes.

The fight within the government
Due to lack of consultation with MoIB and CBFC before notifying the rules in 2005, the MoIB responded hostilely, siding with filmmakers in their legal challenge to the regulations while delaying and diluting the regulations. Even after agreeing to the final movie rules in 2012, the agencies under MoIB resisted enforcing the regulations. As of April 2020, the CBFC lacked procedures for filmmakers to submit ‘editorial justification’ for tobacco imagery, and we could not locate any formal records from the Board making any decisions on this matter. While MoIB and its agencies resist to ensure full compliance with the film rules under COTPA, such resistance should be dealt by the MoHFW at inter-ministerial committees and through training and sensitisation of non-health stakeholders.

Key lessons for India and other countries
Effective enforcement remains a challenge for MoHFW. MoHFW, civil society and policy-makers need to be cautious of film industry attempts to self-produce disclaimers. MoHFW needs to continue to seek assistance from the Prime Ministers’ Office to better engage MoIB to sensitize and train staff and board members of CBFC and other self-regulatory bodies on the significance of the tobacco regulations to improve compliance. Although antitobacco disclaimers, advertisements and static health warnings are translated in all regional languages of the country, multiple region-specific disclaimers, advertisements and static messages should be produced with local characters and testimonials by MoHFW and supplied through CBFC to filmmakers on a rotating basis.

The rules have reduced, but not completely prevented films and TV programmes from becoming tobacco advertising vehicles in India, and worldwide due to the global distribution of Indian films. Arguments against restrictions on depiction of tobacco use in films continue to be made in various countries including the UK, the European Union and Germany in response to regulation of tobacco presentation in movies. Countries developing policies to prevent tobacco promotions through entertainment media as part of implementing FCTC Article 13 could learn from India’s experience and preempt tobacco and film industry counteraction, insulating themselves from long policy battles. The success story of movie rules in India also benefitted from the positive response from the Supreme Court of India for implementation of the COTPA provisions and its rules. This prevented any possibility of adverse orders in subsequent challenges to the film rules. Constitutional freedom of speech and expression has been raised against the film rules in India, which may not be relevant for countries where such freedom is not part of their constitution.

Limitations
This study only presents information available from the literature and sources publicly available and some details might not be recorded or available in public documents. Although the study captures filmmakers and actors’ public statements and media impressions towards the movie rules, in-person interviews would have been beneficial.

CONCLUSION
After a long battle, India implemented comprehensive regulations to restrict tobacco imagery in films and TV. Since implementation, tobacco imagery in films dropped and public exposure to antitobacco messages has grown. Implementation of the MoHFW regulations lies with MoIB and CBFC, which should ensure compliance with the rules especially requiring ‘editorial justification’ in films with tobacco presentation and issue detailed guidelines to TV broadcasters, all its regional boards and filmmakers to increase compliance.

Cinematograph Act and the Cable Television Network Regulations should be amended to incorporate COTPA provisions on tobacco presentation in movies and TV. Filmmakers should submit details of tobacco imagery present in a film submitted for certification, require legally binding declarations from filmmakers that they did not receive financial, non-financial, or sponsorship support from the tobacco industry and replace self-regulation of TV and streaming services with binding regulations.
Considering the Indian experience, the WHO FCTC Working Group on Article 13[147] which is developing an addendum to existing guidelines[148] for implementing advertising and promotion restrictions to more explicitly address entertainment media, should include adult content ratings for films with tobacco imagery, require filmmakers and broadcasters to attest that their productions are free of tobacco industry influence, and should future-proof all measures to stop tobacco promotion in entertainment media by covering rapidly evolving digital distribution technologies.
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## Tobacco Imagery in Entertainment Media: Evolution of Tobacco-Free Movies and Television Programs Rules in India

Amit Yadav, Stanton A Glantz

### Online Supplement File: Tables S1 and S2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NGOs</th>
<th>MoHFW</th>
<th>MoB</th>
<th>Parliament Questions</th>
<th>Film Industry</th>
<th>Film Industry supporting</th>
<th>Litigation</th>
<th>Scientific evidence</th>
<th>Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2003 | HRIDAY meets President, Prime Minister and Health Minister in support of stronger COTPA regulations after its enactment.  
Cancer Patients Aid Association (CPAA) contributes to the WHO’s report on Bollywood. | Enactment of COTPA.  
Health Minister Shushma Swaraj calls for support from all walks of life including media and film producers for COTPA to be effective. | MoB fails to respond to Parliamentary question on banning smoking scenes in films and did not reference COTPA at all. | Ten questions (F=5, N=5) raised on smoking ban on movies, advertisement codes, ban on tobacco ads in TV and movies, violation of censorship provisions. Specific questions on WHO Bollywood report. | Mahesh Bhatt on the WHO Report: “tobacco companies, not movie stars, were to blame.”  
Screenwriter and director Sanjay Chhel say “Censorship should be handled properly. You can’t ban smoking and drinking.” | Several actors and filmmakers pledge their support to COTPA and a curb on tobacco use and promotion.  
Shashi Kapoor, Urmila Matondkar and Vivek Oberoi take part in MoHFW produced anti-tobacco advertisements. | Madihya Pradesh High Court directed filmmakers and the Central Board of Film Certification (CBFC) to follow the guidelines laid under the Cinematograph Act which requires scenes that encourage, justify or glamourise consumption of tobacco or smoking are not shown. | Indian films strongly influence teenage perceptions and smoking behaviours.  
WHO Report on Indian Cinema: Bollywood’ Victim or Ally? highlights the relationship between tobacco and the Indian film industry, and the effects of onscreen smoking on youth. | | |
| 2004 | Public health advocates at Asia Pacific Conference on Tobacco or Health in Kyongju, Korea call for an end to all forms of direct and indirect advertising of tobacco.  
Health Minister Ramadoss vows to strictly enforce COTPA provisions. | Issues rules for implementation of COTPA including ban on direct and indirect advertising of tobacco in film and TV.  
Health Minister Ramadoss vows to strictly enforce COTPA provisions. | Five questions (F=1, N=3, A=1) including on censorship of films and advertisement through media. | | | Media images, including satellite TV and films give impression to Indian students that three-quarters of male and female youth in the West smoked. | | MoHFW Tobacco Control India Report highlights display of tobacco brands in movies. | |
| 2005 | NGOs sends open letters to MoHFW, MoB and CBFC calling on them to ban tobacco imagery in movies and calling out actors and movies with tobacco imagery.  
Addressing the concerns raised by | Issues notification imposing complete ban on tobacco imagery in movies on 31 May 2005.  
Requests MoHFW look into implementation | Supports filmmakers’ challenge to the MoHFW regulations in Delhi High Court.  
Requests MoHFW look into implementation | Thirteen questions (F=10, N=1, A=2) mostly on the ban on smoking scenes in films, advertising codes and ban on smoking in movies. Question on difference | Filmmaker Shekhar Kapur, who helmed the 1997 Oscar-nominated film Elizabeth, says “The Indian government has always thought themselves able to do whatever they feel is | Vivek Oberoi forced by NGOs to return the award.  
Actor Salman Khan, during the actor doctor cricket match, | Madihya High Court directs CBFC to follow its guidelines while certifying films. | Ban on tobacco use in films and television represents sound public health policy. | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NGOs</th>
<th>MoHFW</th>
<th>MoIB</th>
<th>Parliament Questions</th>
<th>Film Industry opposing</th>
<th>Film Industry supporting</th>
<th>Litigation</th>
<th>Scientific evidence</th>
<th>Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>NOTE Goa sends a legal notice to actor Amitabh Bachchan as the poster of his movie <em>Family: Ties of Blood</em> had his character shown with a cigar.11</td>
<td>MoHFW honours with Luther Terry Award at the World Conference on Tobacco or Health.34, 35</td>
<td>In a compromise with MoIB, MoHFW allows tobacco imagery in new movies with editorial justification and ‘A’ certification.36</td>
<td>States that the announcement of rules was premature and impossible to implement without destroying cinematic beauty and artistic control.38</td>
<td>Seventeen questions (F=8, N=9) including on ban on smoking scene in movies, violation of program and advertising code by TV and media and misleading advertising.</td>
<td>Amitabh Bachchan issues an apology for appearing in posters of movie <em>Family Ties of Blood</em> with a cigar.41</td>
<td>Due to ongoing matter in the Delhi High Court the date of implementatio for the regulations keeps extending.42</td>
<td>WHO supported report Tobacco in Movies and Impact on Youth.43</td>
<td>M/s Kasturi and Sons, publisher of The Hindu, a major newspaper, and filmmaker Mahesh Bhatt, challenged the rule in courts. The cases are transferred to Delhi High Court for adjudication.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supplemental material

Table S1: Timeline of the development and implementation of the film rules in India

Chairman of Consumer Coordination Council and HRIDAY applaud MoHFW’s decision to ban tobacco imagery in movies.19

UCSF Prof Stanton Glantz conducts workshop in Mumbai to help NGOs take on smoking in Indian movies.17

CPAA in Mumbai organizes a cricket match between actors and doctors for a ‘No Tobacco Campaign’.18

NGOs publish a two-page advertisement in Screen, one of India’s leading entertainment newspapers supporting tobacco-free films in India.19

---

2006

NOTE Goa sends a legal notice to actor Amitabh Bachchan as the poster of his movie *Family: Ties of Blood* had his character shown with a cigar.11

CPAA writes actor Shahrkush Khan asking him to come on TV and talk about adverse effects of smoking.12

HRIDAY starts monitoring depiction of tobacco use in Bollywood films.53

---

2006

MoIB, MoHFW modifies the rules in Nov 2005 to add a provision for creation of a steering committee to look into specific violations of the ban on direct and indirect advertising of tobacco products.21

aspects of the notification in light of the reservations expressed by the film industry.23, 24

between the MoHFW and MoIB and whether the MoHFW was under pressure to dilute regulations also raised.

necessary to curtail artistic freedoms.25

CBFC chairperson Sharmila Tagore calls the ban on tobacco imagery in movies "a decision taken in haste and very unaesthetic in taste."26

Actor Vivek Oberoi accepts the Red and White Bravery Award from Godfrey Philips, Philip Morris’s Indian affiliate.27

Mahesh Bhatt said "It is unblinking arrogance... It [the ban] is a dreadful recall of the Emergency*..."28

* Period from 25 June 1975 to 21 March 1977 when Prime Minister Indira Gandhi declared state of emergency in India that included suspension of civil liberties.

---

2006

Amitabh Bachchan issues an apology for appearing in posters of movie *Family Ties of Blood* with a cigar.41

Due to ongoing matter in the Delhi High Court the date of implementatio for the regulations keeps extending.42

Tobacco use in movies increases significantly to 89% of all movies released in 2004 and 2005.44

76% of the movies containing tobacco depict either the male or the female lead consuming tobacco.45

96% of the people feel that banning tobacco will not affect the
Table S1: Timeline of the development and implementation of the film rules in India

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NGOs</th>
<th>MoHFW</th>
<th>MoIB</th>
<th>Parliament Questions [Favorable (F), Neutral (N), Against (A)]</th>
<th>Film Industry opposing</th>
<th>Film Industry supporting</th>
<th>Litigation</th>
<th>Scientific evidence</th>
<th>Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Indian Society Against Smoking and Asha Parivar organize workshop on smokefree movies with youth peer leaders. Youth appeal to moviegoers not to watch movie Don which has a smoking scene and organize a poster exhibition discussing adverse effects to tobacco use and smoking in movies in theatre waiting areas.44,45 CPAA works with filmmakers and actors on movie No Smoking to inspire smokers to quit.46 NOTE Goa, sends Shah Rukh Khan a legal notice stating that he violated COTPA’s bans on smoking in public places.47</td>
<td>MoIB Minister says government’s anti-smoking drive would be supported by ensuring checks on media content that might encourage smoking.48 MoIB unveils a draft Content Code under the proposed Broadcast Services Regulation Bill proposing A category for tobacco scene on TV.49,50 Six questions (F=2, N=3, A=1) including monitoring of TV content, misleading advertising and regulation of internet protocol TV.</td>
<td>Broadcasting industry opposes the Broadcast Services Regulation Bill as an instrument of muzzling a free media and backs existing self-regulation.51 Shah Rukh Khan seen smoking live by millions of TV viewers during the Hindustan Times Summit in Delhi and a T20 cricket match in Mumbai.52,53 Mr Khan threatens NGO with a defamation suit for sending him the legal notice.54,55</td>
<td>Actor Saif Ali Khan makes a new year’s resolution to stop smoking.56 Actor Jackie Shroff give up smoking to portray the role of Sai Baba, and says government’s decision to ban smoking scenes would act as a deterrent for directors.57 Director Anurag Kashyap and actors John Abraham and Milind Soman work in movie No Smoking.58</td>
<td>Delhi High Court withholds delivering judgement on the case after completing all hearings.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>National and international experts express concern over the delay in implementing effective tobacco control measures in India.60 NGOs sends letters protesting Mr. Khan’s statement about creative freedom.61</td>
<td>Health Minister requests Bollywood and regional movie stars quit smoking on and off the screen.62 India hosts the 2nd meeting of the Working Group on elaboration of guidelines for implementation of the WHO FCTC Article 13.63 Health Minister informs parliament about strong evidence linking Withdraws exemption for surrogate advertising of tobacco brand extensions.64</td>
<td>Fifteen questions (F=7, N=4, A=4) including on demand for censoring TV. Health Minister’s call to film personality to desist smoking in public, regulating content on TV and ban on surrogate advertising.</td>
<td>Film industry refused to agree that smoking and drinking in movies provoked people to use such products in real life.65 Mr. Khan claimed that a huge amount of creative freedom should be allowed in cinema and arts.66 CBFC officer claims drop in smoking scenes in movies and supports self-regulation for actors’ smoking on and off screen.67</td>
<td>Actor Rajnikanth committed not to smoke in reel and real life.68 Two judges of the Delhi High Court deliver split verdict. Matter referred to a single judge for final decision.69,70</td>
<td>One third smoking among children due to tobacco imagery in movies.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table S1: Timeline of the development and implementation of the film rules in India

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NGOs</th>
<th>MoHFW</th>
<th>MoIB</th>
<th>Parliament Questions [Favorable (F), Neutral (N), Against (A)]</th>
<th>Film Industry opposing</th>
<th>Film Industry supporting</th>
<th>Litigation</th>
<th>Scientific evidence</th>
<th>Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>MoHFW appealed before the Supreme Court of India against the Delhi High Court judgement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Denial of the influence of television and cinema on children.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MOIB ignores Supreme Court’s stay and tells parliament that the matter is sub-judice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thirteen questions (F=8, N=3, A=2) including on monitoring content on television influencing children, court challenge to movie rules, guidelines for preventing smoking scene in film, regulating content on TV, misleading advertising, and ban on advertising of alcohol and tobacco.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Single judge in Delhi High Court strikes down movie rules and against COTPA and the Constitution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supreme Court of India stayed the decision of the Delhi High Court.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WHO 1st report Smoke-free movies: from evidence to action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>HRIDAY sends Sharukh Khan a letter along with nicotine patches and a factsheet on tobacco cessation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MOHFW issues modified film rules to be implemented from 14 November 2011. Films with tobacco imagery to get ‘U/A’ certification, anti-tobacco disclaimer, anti-tobacco advertising and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advises CBFC and its Regional Boards to maintain status quo, i.e. ignore MoHFW notification.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Holds discussion with MoHFW to revise the rules.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Informs parliament that statutory warnings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advise CBFC and CBFC to express difficulties and challenges in implementing the new regulations. Ready to implement partially.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Representatives of film industry meet with MoIB, law ministry, and CBFC to express difficulties and challenges in implementing the new regulations. Ready to implement partially.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scriptwriter Rekha Nigam says: &quot;Hands of Bollywood are bloodied...there are thousands ways of showing a character than showing smoking.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adolescents exposed to on-screen tobacco use more than twice likely to use tobacco.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WHO 2nd report Smoke-free movies: from evidence to action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table S1: Timeline of the development and implementation of the film rules in India

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NGOs</th>
<th>MoHFW</th>
<th>MoIB</th>
<th>Parliament Questions [Favorable (F), Neutral (N), Against (A)]</th>
<th>Film Industry opposing</th>
<th>Film Industry supporting</th>
<th>Litigation</th>
<th>Scientific evidence</th>
<th>Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>NGOs including SBF urges film industry and CBFC to avoid depicting tobacco scenes in movies.56</td>
<td>scrolling health warning.47, 48</td>
<td>are already being put in films. Less and less films have smoking scenes now. TV serials also run anti-smoking scroll.56</td>
<td>regulation of media and TV content.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Voluntary Health Association of India (VHAI) writes to MoIB for implementation of the movie rules.44</td>
<td>MoHFW amends the film rules to take effect from 2 October 2012. No certification for tobacco imagery retain anti-tobacco disclaimer, anti-tobacco advertising change from scrolling to static health warning. 46</td>
<td>Issues a guideline to CBFC as a compromise to be followed in the interim until an agreed upon regulation is notified.59</td>
<td>Twenty four questions (F=10, N=7, A=7) including on violation of broadcasting norms, negative impact of movies, compliance with movie rules, difference between MOHFW and MoIB, depiction of smoking and alcohol in films and TV. Content monitoring and regulation on TV and media and misleading advertising.</td>
<td>Madhur Bhandarkar, “Kareena is seen smoking in 50% of my film (Heroine) and if we were to put a disclaimer every time she smokes, it would be jarring for the audience.” 98</td>
<td>Kerala High Court directs compliance with the movie rules in the state.106</td>
<td>Delhi High Court exempts film Heroine from displaying static health warnings during on screen smoking.99</td>
<td>The instances of females consuming tobacco in movies increased showing tobacco companies using movies as a vehicle.102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Actors Gul Panag launches an anti-tobacco campaign – No more tobacco in the 21st Century – supported by PHFI and HRIDAY.103</td>
<td>Releases a new set of two anti-smoking health spots Child and Dhuan to be shown in theaters together with any film with smoking.104</td>
<td>Places a national advertisement marking one year of implementation of MOIB informs parliament that it was implementing the regulations for all films and tele-serials where smoking scenes are depicted.106</td>
<td>Twenty nine questions (F=13, N=11, A=5) including on Mudgal Committee Report, surrogate and misleading advertisement, depiction of smoking scene in film and TV, adverse effect of tobacco use, monitoring and regulation of TV and media</td>
<td>Kulmeet Makkar of Film and Television Producers Guild says anti-smoking messages should be pleasant and aesthetic, without affecting creativity.107</td>
<td>Supreme Court directs compliance with all COTPA provisions, including movie rules.112</td>
<td>50% youth-rated movies contain tobacco imagery.116</td>
<td>Report of the committee of experts examines issues of certification under the Cinematograph Act 1952. As the matter was sub-judge before the Hon'ble Supreme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BMJ Publishing Group Limited (BMJ) disclaims all liability and responsibility arising from any reliance placed on this supplemental material which has been supplied by the author(s).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NGOs</th>
<th>MoHFW</th>
<th>MoIB</th>
<th>Parliament Questions</th>
<th>Film Industry opposing</th>
<th>Film Industry supporting</th>
<th>Litigation</th>
<th>Scientific evidence</th>
<th>Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>NGOs report violation of movie rules to state enforcement authorities (mostly in the department of health).</td>
<td>Constitutes committee to recommend amendments to COTPA.</td>
<td>Forwards request from the Film and Television Producers Guild of India to MoHFW urging that film producers be given the prerogative to make standardized anti-tobacco audio disclaimer and that visual advertisement be shown only in the beginning of the film and not in the middle or during the exhibition of a film.</td>
<td>Thirty one questions (F=15, N=15, A=1) including on adverse effects of tobacco use, regulation of advertisements of tobacco and alcohol, misleading ads, movie ratings, prosecutions under COTPA, content monitoring and regulation of TV and media.</td>
<td>Filmmakers write MoHFW stating that film producers be given the prerogative to make standardized audio visual's providing anti-tobacco health warning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Madras High Court directs filmmakers that &quot;Glamorization of drinking and smoking should be avoided especially by the popular heroes in films, as drinking is a social evil spoiling individuals.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>NGO HRIDAY, PHFI, VHAI, SBF and health professionals write to MoHFW that interests of Bollywood are in direct contrast to public health goals.</td>
<td>Proposed draft amendments to COTPA to strengthen provision including on content regulation, deaths from tobacco, efforts on</td>
<td>Twenty five questions (F=13, N=11, A=1) including on content regulation, deaths from tobacco, efforts on</td>
<td>Actor Dhanush was again seen smoking in the film Maari.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bombay High Court refuses relief to Anurag Kashyap from depiction of static warning during on screen tobacco presentation in his film Ugly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table S1: Timeline of the development and implementation of the film rules in India

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NGOs</th>
<th>MoHFW</th>
<th>MoIB</th>
<th>Parliament Questions [Favorable (F), Neutral (N), Against (A)]</th>
<th>Film Industry opposing</th>
<th>Film Industry supporting</th>
<th>Litigation</th>
<th>Scientific evidence</th>
<th>Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>HRIDAY writes MoIB and MoHFW opposing posters for the feature film <em>Dishoom</em> showing popular actor John Abraham smoking a cigarette.</td>
<td>Constitutes Committee headed by filmmaker Shyam Benegal to lay down norms for film certification while protecting artistic and creative expression.</td>
<td>Twenty five questions (F=7, N=11, A=7) including on use of tobacco, deaths due to tobacco, content regulation and censorship of TV, Shyam Benegal committee report, youth addiction to smoking, adverse effects of tobacco use, ban on smoking scene on films and TV and violation of program code.</td>
<td>The Shyam Benegal committee recommends repealing the existing regulations and replacing them with a static visual at the beginning of the film.</td>
<td>Bombay High Court directs compliance with Section 5B of Cinematograph Act and the guidelines for CBFC, i.e. not glamourize smoking or tobacco use in movies.</td>
<td>Adolescents who go for films also wish to do the same either as a curiosity or imitation of their favorite stars.</td>
<td>Third WHO report on Smoke-free movies: from evidence to action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2017
Health professionals complain against tobacco use in online streaming services. NGOs complain against violation of the film rules to state enforcement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NGOs</th>
<th>MoHFW</th>
<th>MoIB</th>
<th>Parliament Questions [Favorable (F), Neutral (N), Against (A)]</th>
<th>Film Industry opposing</th>
<th>Film Industry supporting</th>
<th>Litigation</th>
<th>Scientific evidence</th>
<th>Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Health professionals complain against tobacco use in online streaming services.</td>
<td>COTPA draft amendment withdrawn. Working closely with MoIB as well as with Film and Television Industry to ensure</td>
<td>Suggests filmmakers make their own anti-smoking ads. Told Parliament that the Internet and Mobile Association of India (IAMAI) was creating voluntary</td>
<td>Twenty one questions (F=15, N=3, A=3) including on content on TV, misleading advertising, high tobacco use, ban on smoking scene on national TV, Shyam Benegal Committee</td>
<td>Film industry calls itself vulnerable and demands removal of the static message during tobacco scenes.</td>
<td>CBFC chairperson Pahlaj Nihalani said, “We feel the superstars who are followed by millions and who set an example in societal behaviour must not be shown</td>
<td>Madras High Court direct strict compliance with the provision of Cinematograph Act and the</td>
<td>WHO Supported evaluation report on implementatio n of the film rules released at the National Consultation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NGOs report violation of movie rules to state enforcement authorities (mostly in the department of health).

Former Health Minister Anbumani Ramadoss requests Dhanush stop onscreen smoking.

Litigation
Scientific evidence
Reports

2016
HRIDAY writes MoIB and MoHFW opposing posters for the feature film *Dishoom* showing popular actor John Abraham smoking a cigarette.

HRIDAY submits representation in favour of film rules before the Shyam Benegal Committee.

Former health minister Anbumani Ramadoss opposes the recommendations of the Shyam Benegal Committee.

NGOs report violation of film rules to state enforcement authorities (mostly in the department of health).

2017
Health professionals complain against tobacco use in online streaming services.

NGOs complain against violation of the film rules to state enforcement

Conflict with public health. Write to Prime Minister opposing MoIB suggestion to remove the warning scroll.

NGOs report violation of movie rules to state enforcement authorities (mostly in the department of health).

Former Health Minister Anbumani Ramadoss requests Dhanush stop onscreen smoking.

Tobacco control, corruption in CBFC, menace of bidi smoking, steps to curb tobacco use, misleading and surrogate ads.

Tobacco advertising in films and TV.

Tobacco control, corruption in CBFC, menace of bidi smoking, steps to curb tobacco use, misleading and surrogate ads.

Bombay High Court directs compliance with Section 5B of Cinematograph Act and the guidelines for CBFC, i.e. not glamourize smoking or tobacco use in movies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NGOs</th>
<th>MoHFW</th>
<th>MoIB</th>
<th>Parliament Questions</th>
<th>Film Industry opposing</th>
<th>Film Industry supporting</th>
<th>Litigation</th>
<th>Scientific evidence</th>
<th>Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Karnataka state tobacco control cell takes note of film rule violation by Telugu language film 'Smart Shankar'. It organizes further sensitization programs for film producers, distributors and Chamber members to reduce rule violations.</td>
<td>CBFC CEO, speaking at a training workshop, shares that there is no formal process for judging claims of “editorial justification” for tobacco imagery.</td>
<td>CBFC CEO supports Shyam Benegal Committee recommendations will be implemented after further consultations.</td>
<td>Twenty two questions (F=14, N=6, A=2) including on misleading advertising, guidelines for advertising in TV and cinema halls, advertising code, monitoring of TV content and ill effects of tobacco use.</td>
<td>CBFC CEO supports Shyam Benegal Committee recommendations.</td>
<td>CBFC CEO acknowledges the impact of tobacco imagery on tobacco use initiation among adolescents.</td>
<td>HRIDAY report on assessment of compliance with rules suggests decline in number of movies with tobacco presentation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>NGOs complain to state enforcement authorities (mostly in the department of health) against violation of the film rules.</td>
<td>Tells parliament that anti-tobacco advertisements are mandatory and that all films and television programs with tobacco imagery must adhere to the regulations.</td>
<td>Ten questions (F=1, N=7, A=2) including on deaths due to tobacco use, surrogate advertising, monitoring TV channels, code for streaming platforms and Shyam Benegal committee report.</td>
<td>Actor Vijay seen smoking in film ‘Sarkar’.</td>
<td>Actor Vijay and his team apologize upon complaint and had the posters removed and replaced with posters without tobacco imagery.</td>
<td>Tobacco content common in films classified as suitable for viewing by children, more among regional than national languages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table S2: Evolution of the movie and TV tobacco depiction rules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date of Notification</td>
<td>31-May-05</td>
<td>30-Nov-05</td>
<td>31-May-06</td>
<td>20-Oct-06</td>
<td>27-Oct-11</td>
<td>2-Aug-12</td>
<td>21-Sep-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of enforcement</td>
<td>1-Aug-05</td>
<td>1-Jan-06</td>
<td>Up to the Central Government</td>
<td>14-Nov-11</td>
<td>2-Aug-12</td>
<td>2-Oct-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptions to ban on tobacco imagery in film (F) and television (TV)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary from artistic point of view with strong editorial justification</td>
<td>FTV</td>
<td>FTV</td>
<td>FTV</td>
<td>FTV</td>
<td>FTV</td>
<td>FTV</td>
<td>FTV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old</td>
<td>FTV</td>
<td>FTV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>FTV</td>
<td>FTV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual historical figure who actually smoked or era</td>
<td></td>
<td>FTV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows dangers of tobacco use</td>
<td></td>
<td>FTV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live coverage on TV</td>
<td></td>
<td>TV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>FTV-A for new and foreign</td>
<td>FTV-A for new and foreign</td>
<td>FTV-U/A for new and foreign</td>
<td>FTV-No new and foreign film to be certified by CBFC unless it complies with COTPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No brand or product placement or close ups</td>
<td></td>
<td>FTV</td>
<td>FTV</td>
<td>FTV</td>
<td>FTV</td>
<td>FTV</td>
<td>FTV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirements for Anti-tobacco Disclaimer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FTV new and foreign</td>
<td>FTV new and foreign</td>
<td>FTV new and foreign</td>
<td>FTV new and foreign</td>
<td>FTV new and foreign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Ill effects of tobacco use by actor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ill effects of tobacco use by actor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ill effects of tobacco use by actor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ill effects of tobacco use by actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Minimum 20 seconds</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 seconds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Beginning, middle and end</td>
<td></td>
<td>Beginning, middle and end</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility of production and display</td>
<td>Filmmaker and broadcaster</td>
<td></td>
<td>Filmmaker and broadcaster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MoHFW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirements for anti-tobacco health spots (advertisement)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement</td>
<td>FTV old and foreign</td>
<td>FTV old and foreign</td>
<td>FTV all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FTV all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum duration</td>
<td>30 seconds</td>
<td>30 seconds</td>
<td>30 seconds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of display</td>
<td>Beginning, middle and end of the film. For TV one spot of 30 seconds or two spots of 15 seconds for first 30 minutes. An additional one 30 second spot or two 15 second spots for each incremental 30 minutes</td>
<td>Beginning, middle and end of the film. For TV on spot of 30 seconds or two spots of 15 seconds for first 30 minutes and additional one 30 seconds or two 15 seconds spots for each incremental 30 minutes</td>
<td>Beginning and middle of film or TV program</td>
<td>Beginning and middle of film or TV program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Same language or as of dubbing or sub-title. Not specified for old films</td>
<td>Same language or as of dubbing or sub-title. Not specified for old films</td>
<td>MoHFW to provide to CBFC</td>
<td>MoHFW to provide to CBFC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility of production and display</td>
<td>Filmmaker to include in master print. For old films owner/manager of cinema hall or theatre. Broadcaster for TV</td>
<td>Filmmaker to include in master print. For old films owner/manager of cinema hall or theatre. Broadcaster for TV</td>
<td>Filmmaker for new films. Owner/manage r of cinema hall or theatre for old films and broadcasters for TV</td>
<td>Filmmaker for new films. Owner/manage r of cinema hall or theatre for old films and broadcasters for TV</td>
<td>MoHFW to provide to CBFC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved by</td>
<td>MoHFW</td>
<td>MoHFW</td>
<td>MoHFW</td>
<td>MoHFW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Warning Requirements</td>
<td>FTV old</td>
<td>TV old</td>
<td>FTV new and foreign</td>
<td>Old TV new film and TV</td>
<td>FTV old and new</td>
<td>FTV new</td>
<td>Old TV and New FTV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Scroll</td>
<td>Scroll</td>
<td>Scroll</td>
<td>Scroll</td>
<td>Static</td>
<td>Static</td>
<td>Static</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement</td>
<td>Bottom of the screen</td>
<td>Bottom of the screen</td>
<td>Bottom of the screen</td>
<td>Bottom of the screen</td>
<td>Bottom of the screen</td>
<td>Bottom of the screen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>During the period of such display</td>
<td>One minute before and till one minute after the tobacco scene</td>
<td>During the period of such display for old TV. One minute before and till one minute after the tobacco scene</td>
<td>During the period of such display</td>
<td>During the period of such display</td>
<td>During the period of such display</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>&quot;Smoking causes cancer&quot; or &quot;smoking kills&quot; for smoking form and &quot;tobacco causes cancer&quot; or &quot;tobacco kills&quot; for smokeless form</td>
<td>Same text</td>
<td>Same text for old TV. Not specified for new film and TV</td>
<td>Same text</td>
<td>Same text</td>
<td>Same text</td>
<td>Same text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colour</td>
<td>Black font on white background legible and readable</td>
<td>Same as first notified</td>
<td>Same as first notified for old TV. Not specified for new film and TV</td>
<td>Same as first notified</td>
<td>Same as first notified</td>
<td>Not specified for old TV. Same as first notified for new film and TV</td>
<td>Same as first notified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Same language as used in film or the TV program</td>
<td>Same language or as of dubbing or sub-title</td>
<td>Same language or as of dubbing or sub-title for old TV. Not specified for new film and TV</td>
<td>Same language or as of dubbing or sub-title</td>
<td>Same language or as of dubbing or sub-title</td>
<td>Same language or as of dubbing or sub-title</td>
<td>Same language or as of dubbing or sub-title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other requirements</td>
<td>Timing of telecast</td>
<td></td>
<td>When least viewership &lt;18 years for TV</td>
<td>When least viewership &lt;18 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print outdoor and electronic media</td>
<td>Crop or mask brand names and logos of tobacco products to ensure that they are not visible</td>
<td>Crop or mask brand names and logos of tobacco products except in case of live or deferred live telecast of event held in other countries</td>
<td>Crop or mask brand names and logos of tobacco products except in case of live or deferred live telecast of event held in other countries</td>
<td>Crop or mask brand names and logos of tobacco products except in case of live or deferred live telecast of event held in other countries</td>
<td>Crop or mask brand names and logos of tobacco products except in case of live or deferred live telecast of event held in other countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotional Material and posters</td>
<td>Non depiction of tobacco products or their use</td>
<td>Non depiction of tobacco products or their use</td>
<td>No depiction of tobacco products or their use</td>
<td>No depiction of tobacco products or their use</td>
<td>License of cinema hall or theatre or broadcaster may be cancelled or suspended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issued By</td>
<td>Bhavani Thayagarajan, Joint Secretary, MoHFW</td>
<td>Bhavani Thayagarajan, Joint Secretary, MoHFW</td>
<td>Bhavani Thayagarajan, Joint Secretary, MoHFW</td>
<td>Keshav Desiraju, Additional Secretary, MoHFW</td>
<td>Director Films, MoIB</td>
<td>Shakuntala D Gamlin, Joint Secretary, MoHFW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary purpose</td>
<td>Rule-6 and 7 introduce the movies rules</td>
<td>Amendment of the Rules</td>
<td>Constitution of Committee to screen film and TV programs to filter out tobacco.</td>
<td>Amendment of the Rules</td>
<td>Amendment of the Rules</td>
<td>Interim direction on compliance with COTPA rules to CBFC</td>
<td>Amendment of the Rules</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BMJ Publishing Group Limited (BMJ) disclaims all liability and responsibility arising from any reliance placed on this supplemental material which has been supplied by the author(s).
References


   http://www.takingontobacco.org/event/ida05/inltr.pdf (accessed September 9)
   http://smokefreemovies.ucsf.edu/ourads/textonly_India01.html (accessed September 14)
   https://indiankanoon.org/doc/1327029/ (accessed
   https://frontline.thehindu.com/other/article30205268.ece (accessed 13)


58. Agencies CNN-IBN. Panaji Small Things Make Man Great, NGO Reminds SRK. 
   make-man-great-ngo-reminds-srk-281723.html (accessed September 17)

59. Press Trust of India. Mumbai, India. Blogger Bachchan Takes on Ramadoss over 
   https://www.hindustantimes.com/india/blogger-bachchan-takes-on-ramadoss/story-
   sXSsUtnqgRFtJKondROU6N.html (accessed September 17)

60. World Health Organization. Geneva, Switzerland Elaboration of Guidelines for 

61. Parliament of India Rajya Sabha. Appeal of Health Minister to a Famous Film 
   Panabka Lakshmi, Minister of State for Health and Family Welfare Government of India. 

62. Parliament of India rajya Sabha. Smoking Habits. Unstarred Question No 1622, 
   Answered on 14th March 2008, by Smt. Panabka Lakshmi, Minister of State for Health 


64. Ministry of Information and Broadcasting Government of India. New Delhi The Cable 

65. CNN-IBN. New Delhi Ramadoss Unmoved by Devgan's Churchill Comments. 
   ramadoss-ramadoss-on-ajay-devgans-winston-churchill-comment-289409.html (accessed 
   September 18)

   https://www.hindustantimes.com/entertainment/smoking-in-films-is-creative-liberty-
   srk/story-cD4ueByjMxsRuJ3D6WDGaP.html (accessed September 16)

67. Dubey B. Mumbai, India Ramadoss Huff's, Shah Rukh Puffs. Times Of India. 29 January 
   2008. 
   http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/Mumbai/Ramadoss_huffs_Shah_Rukh_puffs/articleshow
   /2739181.cms (accessed September 17)

   https://www.indiatoday.in/latest-headlines/story/ramadosss-comments-on-film-industry-
   juvenile-25394-2008-05-18 (accessed December 19)

   https://mumbaimirror.indiatimes.com/mumbai/cover-story/smoke-on-the-
   slaughter/articleshow/15811765.cms (accessed September 26)

70. Press Trust of India. Chennai Ramadoss Uses Rajni to Stub out Amitab, SRK. 


89. Delhi High Court. UTV Software Communications Pvt Ltd vs Union of India and Ors. 2012. https://indiankanoon.org/doc/68065552/ (accessed October 08)


128. HRIDAY. New Delhi Submission of Observations Related to Depiction of Tobacco Use in Films for Consideration by the Esteemed Shyam Benegal Committee. HRIDAY. 2016. [https://smokefreemovies.ucsf.edu/sites/smokefreemovies.ucsf.edu/files/Inputs%20to%20SBC%20on%20smoking%20rules_HRIDAY-complete.pdf](https://smokefreemovies.ucsf.edu/sites/smokefreemovies.ucsf.edu/files/Inputs%20to%20SBC%20on%20smoking%20rules_HRIDAY-complete.pdf) (accessed December 20)


136. Tobacco Control Division. New Delhi Withdrawal of ’Cigarettes and Other Tobacco Products (Prohibition of Advertisement and Regulation of Trade and Commerce, Production, Supply and Distribution) Amendment Bill, 2015’. Ministry of Health and


