

## **VIDEO TWO**

**Question:** One of the items that's under continuing scrutiny and a source of continuing debate is R&D and marketing expense. Do you think that the industry has done a good job of explaining...

**Answer:** No, I don't think we've done a terrific job of that and I think one of the things the industry has done over time that has not been helpful is the way in which we as an industry, and Pfizer's certainly no exception, have done television commercials. You know when direct to consumer advertising was first permitted, there was a, a real seriousness about the ads, a real science orientation of balance about the risks and the benefits and over time I think we got a little bit away from that and some of the ads are much less serious in that regard, much less balanced. We're doing everything we can do to rectify that and to get ourselves back into a much more responsible position. But I think one of the things that contributed to your question is it created a view of the industry on the part of the consumers and policymakers that we were more of a marketing operation than a science operation and that we were spending so much money on marketing that we could reduce the prices of our drugs more than we do, and that's actually not economically factual. I think we have, to some extent, ourselves to blame for how we did that. So, the answer to your question is no, I don't think we do a great job of that and that's another area that we have to get better at.