

Corruption PowerPoint Script

- ❖ Slide 1:
 - Introduction

- ❖ Slide 2: Preface
 - Drug-Company Payments Mirror Doctors' Brand-Name Prescribing
 - Drug Companies & Doctors: A Story of Corruption by The New York Review of Books

- ❖ Slide 3:
 - Biederman \$1.6 million in consulting and speaking fees between 2000 and 2007. Two of his colleagues received similar amounts.

- ❖ Slide 4:
 - Schatzberg controlled more than \$6 million worth of stock in Corcept Therapeutics, a company he cofounded that is testing mifepristone—the abortion drug otherwise known as RU-486—as a treatment for psychotic depression.
 - At the same time, Schatzberg was the principal investigator on a National Institute of Mental Health grant that included research on mifepristone for this use and he was coauthor of three papers on the subject.
 - We can see that there is a high level of conflicting interests with his approach

- ❖ Slide 5:
 - Nemeroff was the principal investigator on a five-year \$3.95 million National Institute of Mental Health grant—of which \$1.35 million went to Emory for overhead—to study several drugs made by GlaxoSmithKline.
 - Emory was required to report amounts over \$10,000 per year to the National Institutes of Health
 - Nemeroff failed to disclose approximately \$500,000 he received from GlaxoSmithKline

- ❖ Slide 6: Map of U.S.
 - According to a study conducted by ProPublica, nationally about three quarters of doctors across five common medical specialties received at least one payment from a company in 2014. In Nevada, that number was over 90 percent. In Vermont, it was less than 24 percent.

- ❖ Slide 7:
 - Many are paid consultants, speakers at company-sponsored meetings, ghost-authors of papers written by drug companies or their agents,⁴ and ostensible “researchers” whose contribution often consists merely of putting their patients on a drug and transmitting some token information to the company. Still more doctors are recipients of free meals and other out-and-out gifts. In addition, drug companies subsidize most meetings of professional organizations and most of the continuing medical education needed by doctors to maintain their state licenses.

❖ Slide 8:

- pharmaceutical industry has gained enormous control over how doctors evaluate and use its own products. Its extensive ties to physicians, particularly senior faculty at prestigious medical schools, affect the results of research, the way medicine is practiced, and even the definition of what constitutes a disease.
- companies continue to sponsor clinical trials, sometimes to get FDA approval for additional uses, sometimes to demonstrate an advantage over competitors, and often just as an excuse to get physicians to prescribe such drugs for patients.
- sponsors often prefer using medical schools, in part because the research is taken more seriously, but mainly because it gives them access to highly influential faculty physicians—referred to by the industry as “thought-leaders” or “key opinion leaders” (KOLs).
- medical school department chairs receive compensation from companies through departmental salaries or personal income.
- company employees or their agents often design the studies, perform the analysis, write the papers, and decide whether and in what form to publish the results. Sometimes the medical faculty who serve as investigators are little more than hired hands, supplying patients and collecting data according to instructions from the company

❖ Slide 9:

- ProPublica analyzed the prescribing patterns of doctors who wrote at least 1,000 prescriptions in Medicare's drug program, known as Part D. Across five common specialties, as doctors received more money from drug and device companies, they tended to prescribe a higher percentage of brand-name drugs.

❖ Slide 10:

- Retroactive encouragement to make shifts to brand names.
- A large amount of pressure placed on doctors to use brand names.
- Brand names work well, I am not trying to say brand name drugs are bad, they are often just more expensive than their generic versions which are usually just as effective.

❖ Slide 11:

- Many drugs that are assumed to be effective are probably little better than placebos, but there is no way to know because negative results are hidden.
 - A review of seventy-four clinical trials of antidepressants, for example, found that thirty-seven of thirty-eight positive studies were published.⁸ But of the thirty-six negative studies, thirty-three were either not published or published in a form that conveyed a positive outcome.
- ❖ They found that on average, placebos were 80 percent as effective as the drugs. The difference between drug and placebo was so small that it was unlikely to be of any clinical significance.

- ❖ sponsor’s drug may be compared with another drug administered at a dose so low that the sponsor’s drug looks more powerful. Or a drug that is likely to be used by older people will be tested in young people, so that side effects are less likely to emerge. A common form of bias stems from the standard practice of comparing a new drug with a placebo
- ❖ They also directly shape the way medicine is practiced, through their influence on practice guidelines issued by professional and governmental bodies, and through their effects on FDA decisions
 - In a survey of two hundred expert panels that issued practice guidelines, one third of the panel members acknowledged that they had some financial interest in the drugs they considered.
 - Of the 170 contributors to the most recent edition of the American Psychiatric Association’s *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (DSM), ninety-five had financial ties to drug companies.
- ❖ Slide 12:
 - drug companies have perfected a new and highly effective method to expand their markets. Instead of promoting drugs to treat diseases, they have begun to promote diseases to fit their drugs
 - companies give them serious-sounding names along with abbreviations.
 - Some examples, heartburn is now “gastro-esophageal reflux disease” or GERD; impotence is “erectile dysfunction” or ED; premenstrual tension is “premenstrual dysphoric disorder” or PMMD; and shyness is “social anxiety disorder”
 - They pay academic experts to put their names on articles extolling drugs for other uses.
 - They fund conferences at which these drugs and their uses are promoted
- ❖ Slide 13:
 - ninety-five had financial ties to drug companies
 - “There was very little systematic research, and much of the research that existed was really a hodgepodge—scattered, inconsistent, and ambiguous. I think the majority of us recognized that the amount of good, solid science upon which we were making our decisions was pretty modest.”
 - Serves as a basis for a multitude of diagnoses and information provided to patients.
- ❖ Slide 14:
 - Before a new drug can enter the market, its manufacturer must sponsor clinical trials to show the Food and Drug Administration that the drug is safe and effective, usually as compared with a placebo or dummy pill. The results of all the trials (there may be many) are submitted to the FDA, and if one or two trials are positive—that is, they show effectiveness without serious risk—the drug is usually approved, even if all the other trials are negative. Drugs are approved only for a specified use—for example, to treat lung cancer—and it is illegal for companies to promote them for any other use.
 - Many of these clinical trials are structured in a way to promote success as was mentioned in the previous slides. With a cloak and dagger approach with showing positive results, but hiding or shading negative results.

❖ Slide 15, 16, 17,18,19:

- The previous slides paint pharmaceutical companies in a bad light. Although a few of their actions are debatable, they are extremely important and are a large source of up to date information for doctors.
 - All the statistics provided in these next few slides were retrieved from research conducted by ProPublica
 - 94% of doctors said information provided by pharmaceutical companies is up to date and timely
 - Pharmaceutical Companies also sponsor a variety of activities. 94% of doctors said sponsoring clinical trials to research and develop new treatments was useful. 93% of doctors said providing physicians with information about new prescription drug treatments was useful. 89% of doctors said making grants to support Continuing Medical Education course was useful. 88% of doctors said making research grants to doctors, hospitals, and medical schools was useful. 81% of doctors said sponsoring education programs featuring physician speakers was useful
 - 8 in 10 doctors say pharmaceutical companies and their reps are useful sources of information.
- All the above information aside ProPublica also found, when evaluating the factors physicians consider in prescribing, about 7 in 10 doctors used some of the information provided by pharmaceutical companies. This came in second to last in factors utilized in prescribing. With doctors own clinical knowledge, and patient's situation and response to medicine being the primary factors (10 of 10 doctors)

❖ Slide 20:

- The growing financial dependence of the medical profession on the pharmaceutical industry is profoundly detrimental to sound public, medical, and scientific policy.
- Drug-intensive treatment is favored, “there is a drug that will solve fix this problem” ...vs changes in life style or other treatment methods. Th belief that new drugs are better drugs, encouraging relationships with big pharma
- Hospitals should focus on education and top of the line research to help the sickest of and those who will become sick in society.
- Reform of the whole system, changes in FDA drug approval process, separation of medical institutions from industry money, though there are positive benefits to financial support for research from companies it should not come with ties
- The articles in this powerpoint specifically the one by The New York Review of Books focuses on psychiatric drugs, however, the information and trends are applicable to general prescription habits and doctors of all disciplines.
- There is a website created by ProPublica where you can look up your doctor and see all the payments he has received from companies and for what the money was given.

Works Cited

Angell, Marcia. "Drug Companies & Doctors: A Story of Corruption." *The New York Review of Books*, <http://www.nybooks.com/articles/2009/01/15/drug-companies-doctorsa-story-of-corruption/#fn-16>. Accessed 23 April 2017.

Jones, Ornstein, and Mike Tigas. "Doctors Who Get More Drug-Company Cash Prescribe More Brand-Name Drugs." *npr*, <http://www.npr.org/sections/health-shots/2016/03/17/470679452/drug-company-payments-mirror-doctors-brand-name-prescribing>. Accessed 23 April 2017.

"Dollars for Docs." *ProPublica*, <https://projects.propublica.org/docdollars/>. Accessed 23 April 2017.

KRC Research. "Survey of Physicians About Pharmaceutical and Biotech Research Company Activities and Information." *KRC Research*, 2011. pdf. http://phrma-docs.phrma.org/sites/default/files/pdf/krcsurveyofphysicians_1.pdf.