

October 12, 1983

RJR

SECRET

No. 389 By KSR

Declassification _____

TO: Ms. K. V. McCaffrey

FROM: K. S. Roser

SUBJECT: PROJECT AA PRODUCT EVALUATION TOPLINE--MENTHOL PROTOTYPES

Below is a topline summary of overall appeal and four key attribute results for the three Project AA menthol prototypes. The prototypes were evaluated on a two-pack, blind, monadic basis on the NFO panel. As requested, the Benson and Hedges Lights results from recent PF product testing were also compared to the prototype and Virginia Slims Lights results among Total Category Female Smokers.

Product analyticals are attached in Exhibit I. The final report will be issued the week of October 17, and will include the prototypes' performance on all attributes.

ACTION STANDARDS

The current action standards require that the AA prototypes be rated at least at parity to Virginia Slims Lights among:

- Female 100mm FFLTM Stylish Segment smokers aged 18+,
- Female 100mm FFLTM smokers aged 18-34, and
- Female 100mm FFLTM smokers aged 35+.*

*Since the initiation of this test, this action standard age break was changed to 35-49.

RESULTS

● Overall Acceptability

All the prototypes met the Brand's action standard of parity to the Virginia Slims Lights product among each category age break and the Stylish Segment.

<u>Product</u>	<u>Stylish Segment</u> %	Among <u>Female FFLTM 100mm Smokers</u>	
		<u>Total</u>	
		<u>18-34</u> %	<u>35+</u> %
Virginia Slims Lights (4022-D)	67.6	65.1	65.2
Prototype 4022-A	66.3	60.7	63.4
Prototype 4022-B	64.1	68.9	64.8
Prototype 4022-C	68.1	66.4	66.1

83-42506

50444 3169

In addition, Virginia Slims Lights and Prototypes 4022-B and 4022-C were at parity to the Benson and Hedges Lights product among Total Category Female Smokers, and the 18-34 and 35+ age subgroups.

Prototype 4022-A was rated significantly lower than Benson and Hedges Lights among Total Category Female smokers.

<u>Product</u>	Among Female FFLTM 100mm Smokers		
	<u>Total</u>	<u>18-34</u>	<u>35+</u>
Benson & Hedges Lights (3945-A)	67.8	66.2	69.1
Virginia Slims Lights (4022-D)	65.1	65.1	65.2
Prototype 4022-A	62.4	60.7	63.4
Prototype 4022-B	66.8	68.9	64.8
Prototype 4022-C	66.0	66.4	66.1

○ = Lower than Benson and Hedges Lights

● Attribute Diagnostics

The attribute performance was similar for each prototype versus Virginia Slims Lights. All three prototypes were judged to be less smooth and mild, but stronger and harsher than Virginia Slims Lights among Female Stylish Segment Smokers. This may have resulted because the tar level of the prototypes was somewhat higher than that of Virginia Slims Lights.

Among both female category smoker groups, Prototype 4022-A was the only prototype rated as both less smooth and less mild than Virginia Slims Lights (See Exhibit II).

The prototypes' attribute performance among Total Category Female Smokers versus Benson and Hedges Lights was similar to their performance versus Virginia Slims Lights. Each prototype was less smooth and stronger than Benson and Hedges Lights. In addition, Prototype 4022-A and 4022-C were judged to be more harsh. Prototype 4022-A was also rated as less mild. (See Exhibit III)

Virginia Slims Lights was more mild, less strong and less harsh than Benson and Hedges Lights among Total Category Female Smokers. This may have resulted because the tar level of Benson and Hedges Lights was somewhat higher.

CONCLUSIONS

- All three prototypes met the action standard by being rated at parity to Virginia Slims Lights among the three action standard groups. Of the three

prototypes, Prototype 4022-C appears to be a somewhat stronger candidate, however, based on its parity ratings on mildness among category smokers aged 18-34 and smoothness among category smokers aged 35+.

- As additional information, an analysis will be issued November 7 of the AA prototypes and Virginia Slims versus Benson and Hedges among the 18-34 and 35+ subgroups of Category Female Smokers.

Kathy
Kathy S. Roser
Marketing Development Dept.

KSR:ls

Attachments

cc: Mr. L. W. Hall, Jr.
Mr. H. J. Lees
Mr. E. J. Fackelman
Mr. G. J. Totterdale
Ms. S. A. MacKinnon
Mr. R. J. Harden
Ms. K. L. Freeman
Ms. G. C. Eskridge
Ms. C. C. Davis
MDIC (MDD# 83-42506)