

For Immediate Release

NAD EXAMINES ADVERTISING FOR P&G'S 'SECRET CLINICAL STRENGTH' *NAD Finds All Claims at Issue Substantiated*

New York, NY – July 23, 2007 – The National Advertising Division (NAD) of the Council of Better Business Bureaus has determined that certain establishment claims and product-performance and comparative claims made by **Procter & Gamble** for its “**Secret Clinical Strength**” antiperspirant product are fully substantiated.

As part of its routine monitoring program, NAD, the advertising industry’s self-regulatory forum, requested substantiation for certain establishment claims, product performance and comparative claims made in print, and broadcast advertising, as well as on product labeling by the Procter & Gamble Company for its Secret Clinical Strength product.

Claims at issue included:

- “*Clinical Strength*”
- “*... delivers ... clinically-proven wetness protection...*”
- “*Rx Strength Wetness Defense*”
- “*...Doctor-endorsed Secret Clinical Strength gives you prescription strength wetness protection without a prescription.*”
- “*... stops wetness better than the leading invisible solid*”

NAD examined evidence that included two clinical studies in support of the company’s general product performance claims. Both studies were conducted pursuant to guidance provided by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration. In its decision, NAD noted that when making establishment claims, specific product or brand testing remains the gold standard. To this end, NAD observed that the advertiser tested its Secret Clinical Strength product, as marketed for sale.

NAD examined also two additional head-to-head studies against the leading prescription antiperspirant, consumer testing analysis in support of the superiority claim and the results of a survey of 200 primary care physicians and dermatologists who treat patients with severe underarm wetness and prescribe prescription-strength antiperspirants as part of their practice.

Following its review of the evidence in the record, NAD determined that the claims at issue were fully supported.

Procter & Gamble, in its advertiser’s statement, said the company “is supportive of, and pleased to participate in, the NAD claims review process.”

NAD's inquiry was conducted under *NAD/CARU/NARB Procedures for the Voluntary Self-Regulation of National Advertising*. Details of the initial inquiry, NAD's decision, and the advertiser's response will be included in the next *NAD Case Report*.

###

The National Advertising Review Council (NARC) was formed in 1971 by the Association of National Advertisers, Inc. (ANA), the American Association of Advertising Agencies, Inc. (AAAA), the American Advertising Federation, Inc. (AAF), and the Council of Better Business Bureaus, Inc. (CBBB). Its purpose is to foster truth and accuracy in national advertising through voluntary self-regulation. NARC is the body that establishes the policies and procedures for the CBBB's National Advertising Division (NAD) and Children's Advertising Review Unit (CARU), as well as for the National Advertising Review Board (NARB) and Electronic Retailing Self-Regulation Program (ERSP.)

NAD and CARU are the investigative arms of the advertising industry's voluntary self-regulation program. Their casework results from competitive challenges from other advertisers, and also from self-monitoring traditional and new media. The National Advertising Review Board (NARB), the appeals body, is a peer group from which ad-hoc panels are selected to adjudicate those cases that are not resolved at the NAD/CARU level. This unique, self-regulatory system is funded entirely by the business community; CARU is financed by the children's advertising industry, while NAD/NARC/NARB's sole source of funding is derived from membership fees paid to the CBBB. ERSP's funding is derived from membership fees to the Electronic Retailing Association. For more information about advertising self regulation, please visit www.narcpartners.org.