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Don’t regulate — abolish
Hans Peter Dietz

TO THE EDITOR: I would like to congratulate Tattersall and Kerridge on their recent editorial covering the issue of industry influence in medical education.1 Like the authors, I was dismayed on seeing the Australian Medical Association statement to the press regarding the recently revised Australian Competition and Consumer Commission guidelines for disclosure of industry support. Industry supports medical education because it pays, and we would be well advised to remain aware of this basic fact.

It amazes me that anyone could subscribe to the view that doctors need industry freebies to remain informed of new therapeutic options in this age of electronic media. We are constantly inundated with information — the issue is to choose reliable, unbiased data. As a rule, industry-sponsored sources of information should be regarded as potentially biased and therefore suspect. In my view, direct industry sponsorship of continuing medical education activities is inappropriate and should not just be regulated, but abolished altogether.

Competing interests: I have received speakers’ fees from GE Medical Systems and American Medical Systems.

Hans Peter Dietz, Associate Professor
Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Nepean Clinical School, University of Sydney, Nepean Hospital, Sydney, NSW.
hpdietz@bigpond.com


Disclosure needs to include the extent of a relationship
Charles M Fisher

TO THE EDITOR: Tattersall and Kerridge make the argument that any interaction between industry and clinicians must, of necessity, compromise the decision as to the appropriateness of the particular treatment prescribed.1

The more common situation is that interactions do exist, and this is covered by a process of disclosure of, for example, honoraria or shareholdings. However, this situation is also inadequate, in that the extent of the potential for influence is not disclosed (eg, the size of the honoraria, or the volume of shares held in the company). This is also relevant when it comes to evaluating potential conflicts of interest in medical publications.

As the authors note, the health care industry is complex, and interactions do occur between clinicians and industry. In this situation, full and frank disclosure — rather than the mere indication that a relationship exists — is far more appropriate.

Charles M Fisher, Head
Department of Vascular Surgery, Royal North Shore Hospital, Sydney, NSW.
cfisher@nsscabs.health.nsw.gov.au


Drug company sponsored symposia fulfil an important educational role
Ian S Collins

TO THE EDITOR: I am critical of the article by Tattersall and Kerridge.1 In my opinion, the article comprises a series of pompous announcements from an ivory tower, which hint without actually saying that doctors who attend educational symposia organised by pharmaceutical companies, and who subsequently order the product, are acting improperly. As I see them, the facts are quite otherwise.

Medical practitioners have an obligation to do their best for their patients by giving them the most appropriate treatment available, and to keep up to date with their profession. Both these objectives can be achieved by educational symposia organised by the research-based pharmaceutical companies, which introduce new concepts in medicine as well as new products.

Research-based pharmaceutical companies play a major role in the development of modern therapeutics through the introduction of new drugs. The development and manufacture in commercial quantities of life-saving compounds in the future, such as, for instance, the new biological agents and the new anticancer drugs that we need so urgently, would not be possible but for the pharmaceutical industry. One cannot imagine this important work being done by other agencies, such as the universities or the government. The Australian Government, in fact, sold its own pharmaceutical company (Commonwealth Serum Laboratories, now CSL Ltd) some years ago. Doctors attend educational symposia run by pharmaceutical companies so as to obtain information that will be useful for their patients, not because they can get a few free drinks and a dinner. The suggestion to this effect is offensive.

I note that one of the authors is Director of the Centre for Values, Ethics and the Law in Medicine. I would value his opinion on doctors who advertise directly to the public, such as the eye surgeons who advertise repeatedly on talkback radio, and the promoters of alarming cardiovascular articles that predict catastrophes if one does not apply to the sponsors of the program. To criticise doctors for prescribing products promoted at educational symposia while allowing these other examples to flourish without criticism is, to my mind, hypocritical.

Ian S Collins, Physician
Sydney, NSW.
igrane@ozemail.com.au


Should doctors appear in advertisements?
Adrian M J Pokorny

TO THE EDITOR: A new trend of doctors appearing in television advertisements is emerging in this country. This has occurred with some impetus over the past year, and now involves not just everyday medical practitioners, but highly regarded public figures. The ethical implications of such advertisements are worthy of some thought.

There has been no formal discussion regarding these issues, and the New South Wales Medical Board does not cover it specifically within the Code of professional conduct.1 This has allowed medical practitioners to
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Doctors behaving badly?
A recent editorial discussed the issue of interactions between doctors and pharmaceutical companies (MJA 2006; 185: 299-300). The reactions ranged from agreement to offence.

TO THE EDITOR: I am critical of the article by Tattersall and Kerridge.1 In my opinion, the article comprises a series of pompous announcements from an ivory tower, which hint without actually saying that doctors who attend educational symposia organised by pharmaceutical companies, and who subsequently order the product, are acting improperly. As I see them, the facts are quite otherwise.

Medical practitioners have an obligation to do their best for their patients by giving them the most appropriate treatment available, and to keep up to date with their profession. Both these objectives can be achieved by educational symposia organised by the research-based pharmaceutical companies, which introduce new concepts in medicine as well as new products.

Research-based pharmaceutical companies play a major role in the development of modern therapeutics through the introduction of new drugs. The development and manufacture in commercial quantities of life-saving compounds in the future, such as, for instance, the new biological agents and the new anticancer drugs that we need so urgently, would not be possible but for the pharmaceutical industry. One cannot imagine this important work being done by other agencies, such as the universities or the government. The Australian Government, in fact, sold its own pharmaceutical company (Commonwealth Serum Laboratories, now CSL Ltd) some years ago. Doctors attend educational symposia run by pharmaceutical companies so as to obtain information that will be useful for their patients, not because they can get a few free drinks and a dinner. The suggestion to this effect is offensive.

I note that one of the authors is Director of the Centre for Values, Ethics and the Law in Medicine. I would value his opinion on doctors who advertise directly to the public, such as the eye surgeons who advertise repeatedly on talkback radio, and the promoters of alarming cardiovascular articles that predict catastrophes if one does not apply to the sponsors of the program. To criticise doctors for prescribing products promoted at educational symposia while allowing these other examples to flourish without criticism is, to my mind, hypocritical.

Ian S Collins, Physician
Sydney, NSW.
igrane@ozemail.com.au

participate in the advertisements with no
guilt about the possible ethical flaws of their
actions. This is perhaps a premature
response, as there are several areas where the
ethics are potentially questionable.

The first is the creation of a conflict of
interest. The idea of a doctor being sponsored
by a drug company is covered, to some extent,
by the Code.1 As is well understood, a medical
practitioner must declare to a patient any
financial dealings he or she has with a
company involved in the treatment of that patient.2
For the described commercials, the drugs are
invariably over-the-counter general medica-
tions, like analgesics or vitamin supplements.
A medical practitioner may recommend these
frequently, and it would be difficult to explain
to each patient the nature of the doctor's
connection to the drug company while main-
taining the high level of integrity and trust
expected within modern practice.

Then there is the nature of the advertise-
ments themselves. Medical practitioners can
be seen advocating specific products for use
by their patients, their families and some-
times even themselves. They display their
medical qualifications as a reason for con-
sumers to trust them, playing on the esteem
and regard in which doctors are still held in
large parts of the community. This is a big risk
to take, especially when considering the
questionable benefit of some of the treat-
ments being advocated.

I believe that the practice is poor for the
public image of doctors and, even if ethically
tolerable, it may be prudent for it to be
openly frowned upon by the profession.
However, the profession may consider it
completely acceptable. What is lacking is a
frank and open discussion on the ethics
involved.

Acknowledgements: Many thanks to Dr Charles
Douglas of the University of Newcastle for his help
discussing this issue.

Adrian M J Pokorny, Medical Student
University of Newcastle, Newcastle, NSW.
adrian.pokorny@studentmail.newcastle.edu.au

Matters Arising

Misleading title
Padraic J Grattan-Smith

To the Editor: I would like to comment
on two articles that appeared recently in the
MJA.

“Doctors behaving badly?”1 was an anticli-
max. It was not, as would be expected, an
exposure of misconduct by doctors, but dealt
with the potential conflict of interest that
occurs when they interact with the pharma-
ceutical industry. No evidence of doctors
“behaving badly” was provided, yet a solution
to this potential problem was proposed —
“disclosure” (ie, yet more paperwork), accom-
panied by a disclaimer that this was unlikely to
work.

This is an important issue, but the content
of the article cannot justify such a misleading
title. I can only assume it was the result of
editorial intervention, in which case there is
some hypocrisy at work, given that the inside
front cover and the outside back cover of the
same issue of the Journal are taken up with
full-page drug advertisements, and within, a
$10,000 prize was offered for the best original
research article published in the Journal (spon-
sored by a drug company).

The second article, From the Editor’s Desk
“Tilting at titles”,2 which cited the dreaded
Australian values, suggested that titles such as
“doctor” should be trashed altogether and
replaced by an introduction such as “Hello,
I’m Jean Smith. I am a urologist and together
we will confront your prostate problem” — a
statement that is unlikely to give great con-
dience to the average digger.

Doctor Samuel Johnson put this argument to
rest in 1775:3

What is implied by the term Doctor is well
known. It distinguishes him to whom it
was granted, as a man who has attained
such knowledge of his profession as quali-
fies him to instruct others. A Doctor of
Law is a man who can form lawyers by his
precepts. A Doctor of Medicine is a man
who can teach the art of curing diseases.

My concern is that there appears to be an
editorial assumption that doctors are preoccu-
pied with titles and are willing to treat patients
unethically for a few glasses of Kooyong Pinot
Noir and a good feed. This might be good
press, but not in the MJA. Perhaps some
disclosure is required.

To return to Johnson:

There are but two reasons for which a
physician can decline the title of Doctor of
Medicine, because he supposes himself
disgraced by the doctorship, or supposes
the doctorship disgraced by himself.

Padraic J Grattan-Smith, Paediatric
Neurologist
Sydney Children’s Hospital, Sydney, NSW.
padraic.grattan-smith@sesihs.health.nsw.gov.au

2 Van Der Weyden M. From the Editor’s desk: tilting at titles. Med J Aust 2006; 185: 297.
3 Boswell J. Life of Johnson. Oxford: Oxford Univer-

Doctors behaving badly?
Martin HN Tattersall and
Ian H Kerridge

In reply: We agree with Dietz that unbiased
sources of information about new therapeutic
options are increasing, and many are available
electronically. Virtual Mentor, the American
Medical Association’s ethics journal, has sug-
gested reducing drug company influence on
doctors’ prescribing by stopping companies
paying for continuing medical education,1
and the Australian Competition and Consumer
Commission is exposing this issue.

Fisher recommends full and frank disclo-
 sure of links with industry, but he does not state
to whom these disclosures should be made.
The revised Royal Australasian College of
Physicians guidelines recommend that
employing hospitals create a Conflict of Inter-
est Committee to receive employees’ declara-
tions, and to advise when a duality of interest
may be construed as a conflict of interest.2

The Box shows the disclosure statement that one of
us displays in his consulting room, copies of
which are sent to referring doctors when let-
ters are written about patients.

Grattan-Smith felt the title of our article was
misleading. However, the title is stated as a
question precisely because the assessment of
professional behaviour, and particularly the
assessment of possible conflicts of interest, is
a matter of considerable dispute. It is clear that
the relationships that doctors have with indus-
try may constitute bad behaviour in the eyes of
some, including the editorial writer in the
Sydney Morning Herald.3 We do not, as Fisher
suggests, contend that interaction with the
pharmaceutical industry inevitably compro-
mises prescribing decisions, but agree with
him that full and frank disclosure, rather than
the simple notification that a relationship
exists, offers at least some reassurance that
the possibility of influence is being acknowledged
and managed.

Correspondents: Please submit letters (no more than
400 words and 5 references) electronically via
Editorial Manager at www.editorialmanager.com/mja/.
Authors who cannot access the Editorial Manager
submission system may submit letters by email to:
medjaust@ampco.com.au or ph (02) 9652 6666

References
1 New South Wales Medical Board. Code of profes-
nswmb.org.au/index.pl?page=44 (accessed Sep
2006).
2 Kerridge I, Lowe M, McPhee J. Ethics and law for
the health professions. 2nd ed. Sydney: Federation
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Example of a disclosure statement displayed in the consulting room and enclosed with letters about patients

Disclosure of interests that might influence my prescribing and treatment of cancer patients

Pharmaceutical companies

I have received no honoraria or financial support for more than 10 years from pharmaceutical companies for:
• serving on advisory boards
• consultancies
• providing patients’ data relating to drug use
• enrolling patients in a clinical trial
• speaking at a company-sponsored event

During the past 10 years I have not:
• received financial or other support from pharmaceutical companies for my research activities or staff
• received travel, registration, accommodation or other support from pharmaceutical companies for me or my staff to attend regional, national, or international conferences or meetings
• received research support from pharmaceutical companies
• received personal gifts from pharmaceutical companies
• attended company-sponsored meetings, launches of new drugs

I am not a principal investigator on trials supported by pharmaceutical companies.

I do not accept eligible patients to consider entry on some pharmaceutical company sponsored trials, but I derive no personal financial benefit.

I do not accept free samples of drugs from pharmaceutical companies.

I do not welcome visits from representatives of pharmaceutical companies.

Martin Tattersall

It is public perception that counts

Martin B Van Der Weyden

IN REPLY: Grattan-Smith is obviously concerned about “Doctors behaving badly?” as an appropriate title for the editorial by Tattersall and Kerridge. He is also agitated by my column From the Editor’s Desk “Tilting at titles.”

The editorial’s title was not the result of Machiavellian machinations — its creation belongs entirely with the editorialists. Grattan-Smith may not feel that accepting pharmaceutical company largesse is bad behaviour, but the public sees it otherwise, as evidenced by the unprecedented coverage of the “Roche affair” in The Australian, the Sydney Morning Herald, and the BMJ. The public comments were not flattering: “the gluttony of the whole thing was mind blowing” and its defence by doctors was “in poor taste and displays the supreme arrogance of the privileged.”

The public and most doctors expect the relationships between the pharmaceutical industry and doctors to be open and transparent. We believe this to be the case with the pharmaceutical advertisements in the Journal, and the MJA/Wyeth Prize. Our advertising policy prevents pharmaceutical companies from placing advertisements within or adjacent to articles that might have relevance to the drug being advertised. Wyeth generously donates $10,000 each year to the authors of the best original research published by the Journal on the understanding that Wyeth has no input to the selection process. Research has already been independently peer reviewed for publication before being considered for the prize, and the winner is decided by the Journal staff and the members of our independent Content Review Committee.

Grattan-Smith’s concern with my column was its questioning of the title “doctor”, which apparently is now a source of confusion for patients in busy hospitals. He cites Samuel Johnson’s concept of a doctor and quite rightly so. Physicians of his time had every right to call themselves Doctors. They were graduates from Oxford and Cambridge who pursued a long, formal and inflexible course. It began with a Masters in the liberal arts, proceeding through the Licentiate and then a Doctorate in Medicine by dissertation. These doctors were the epitome not only of scholarship but also of elitism. Those with moderate means were barred from pursuing medicine at Oxford and Cambridge, as were non-conforming Protestants and Roman Catholics. It took the Scottish medical schools in Edinburgh and Glasgow to break down the English citadel.

In our times, the use of the title “doctor” by medical practitioners is a privilege granted by the community and the state, and has to be earned and sustained by open professional conduct. A closeted freebie of “a few glasses of Kooyong Pinot Noir and a good feed” is what most of the public perceives as doctors behaving badly, and it is perception that counts.