Teaching on conflicts of interest: a student-led model

Barbara Mintzes, PhD
Faculty of Pharmacy, University of Sydney
HAI-Europe Association Member
Barbara.mintzes@sydney.edu.au

Workshop: Education on pharmaceutical promotion in medical training,
Amsterdam, VU, Sept 7, 2017
Financial disclosure
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What I will cover

• Addressing the “hidden curriculum”
• American Medical Student Association (AMSA) model curriculum on conflicts of interest (COI)
• Has education been shown to be effective?
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Abstract

Background: The relationship between health professionals and the pharmaceutical industry has become a source of controversy. Physicians' attitudes towards the industry can form early in their careers, but little is known about this key stage of development.

Methods and Findings: We performed a systematic review reported according to PRISMA guidelines to determine the frequency and nature of medical students' exposure to the drug industry, as well as students' attitudes concerning pharmaceutical policy issues. We searched MEDLINE, EMBASE, Web of Science, and ERIC from the earliest available dates through May 2010, as well as bibliographies of selected studies. We sought original studies that reported quantitative or qualitative data about medical students’ exposure to pharmaceutical marketing, their attitudes about marketing practices, relationships with industry, and related pharmaceutical policy issues. Studies were separated, where possible, into those that addressed preclinical versus clinical training, and were quality rated using a standard methodology. Thirty-two studies met inclusion criteria. We found that 40%-100% of medical students reported interacting with the pharmaceutical industry. A substantial proportion of students (13%-69%) were reported as believing that gifts from industry influence prescribing. Eight studies reported a correlation between frequency of contact and favorable attitudes toward industry interactions. Students were more approving of gifts to physicians or medical students than to government officials. Certain attitudes appeared to change during medical school, though a time trend was not performed; for example, clinical students (53%-71%) were more likely than preclinical students (29%-62%) to report that promotional information helps educate about new drugs.
Medical students’ exposures and attitudes
n=32 studies in 14 countries

- Frequent exposure to marketing throughout training
- More contact in clinical than pre-clinical years
- More restrictive policies, more skepticism
- 62 to 86% felt inadequately educated on interactions

Funding of faculty members

- Pharmaceutical grants for research
- Pharmaceutical advisory board membership
- Fees for participating in clinical trials
- Honoraria for attending meetings
- Travel expenses to attend conferences
- Speaking fees for giving pharma funded talks
- Pharmaceutical consulting fees
Questionable content of an industry-supported medical school lecture series: a case study

persaud n, journal of medical ethics 2013; 0: 1-5
A need for institutional change
AAMC Task Force on Industry Funding of Medical Education

Recommendation: Medical schools and teaching hospitals should design curriculum standards and teaching materials for all phases of medical education—from medical school to residency to continuing medical education—that provide tools to educate students, residents, and faculty about the processes and disciplines of drug discovery, development, clinical testing, safety, therapeutics, and regulation.

Institute of Medicine “Conflict of Interest in Medical Research, Education, and Practice”

Recommendation 5.2: Academic medical centers and teaching hospitals should educate faculty, medical students and residents on how to avoid or manage conflicts of interest and relationships with pharmaceutical and medical device industry representatives. Accrediting organizations should develop standards that require formal education on these topics.
American Medical Students Association
## Conflict of Interest Policies at Medical Schools

| Institution | Grade | Gifts | Meals | Speaking relationships | CME | Promotional events | Scholarships and awards | Ghostwriting | Consulting | Sales reps | Device reps | Disclosure | COI curriculum | COI policy extension | Enforcement |
|-------------|-------|-------|-------|------------------------|-----|--------------------|-------------------------|--------------|------------|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------|-------------|
| Indiana University School of Medicine, Indianapolis, IN | A | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 |
| Florida International University Herbert Wertheim College of Medicine, Miami, FL | A | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 |
| Jacobs School of Medicine and Biomedical Sciences at the University at Buffalo, Buffalo, NY | A | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 |
| University of Chicago Division of the Biological Sciences The Pritzker School of Medicine, Chicago, IL | A | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 |
| Edward Via College of Osteopathic Medicine (Alabama, South Carolina, and Virginia) | A | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 | 🌐 |

**COI Policy Extension: 3**
AMSA PharmFree ScoreCard
“Just Medicine” campaign

• 2007 – first public reporting of medical faculty COI policies
• 2008 collaborated with Pew Prescription Project to develop a systematic “scorecard” with 11 domains; 4-point scale
• Annual assessments 2008 to 2013
• Influence on policy: by 2013, 26% had an A vs 5% in 2008
• In 2014, ScoreCard revised:
  – Increased from 11 to 14 domains
  – Curriculum criteria strengthened:
    “comprehensive curriculum mirroring AMSA best practices”
Medical school gift restriction policies and physician prescribing of newly marketed psychotropic medications: difference-in-differences analysis
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AMSA ScoreCard

- In 2016 (n=173): medical faculty grade A (24%); B (44%), C (16%). incomplete 16%
  - Curriculum on conflicts of interest: 25%
  - No gifts: 54%
  - No industry-funded meals: 24%
  - No Faculty on company speakers’ bureaus: 49%
Figure 1. Association between strength of medical school industry interaction policies and survey responses. Outcome comparing
Model curriculum
Smith SR, Hams M, Wilkinson W. 2013

Conflict of Interest Policy Guide for Academic Medical Centers and Medical Schools

Conflict of Interest Curriculum

1. Introduction

Teaching about conflict of interest affords medical schools and residency programs an opportunity to focus on the broader issue of professionalism (AAMC 2008). Conflict of interest is not merely about relationships with the pharmaceutical and medical device industry, but rather about the broader social compact between the profession of medicine and the public good as well as the special fiduciary relationship between doctor and patient. Focusing on conflict of interest with the pharmaceutical and medical device industry can act as a catalyst to kindle broader considerations of the proper role of physicians in putting the interests of patients above self-interest and achieving a just health care system. Faculty who teach about conflict of interest can serve as role models, eschewing inappropriate relationships with the pharmaceutical and medical device industry.

This toolkit provides a succinct overview of the competencies that learners should achieve, the educational theory supporting various pedagogical approaches, particularly appropriate points along the continuum of education for teaching, examples of actual curricula being taught, and ideas on how to evaluate the impact of the teaching. It also discusses possible institutional policies that would require medical students and residents to complete such courses.

Collaboration Pew Charitable Trust, AMSA, and National Physicians' Alliance
AMSA model curriculum

Three main learning objectives:

1) Understand the nature of conflicts of interest and how they pertain to the practice of medicine;
2) Recognize how industry can impact clinical care and develop strategies to mitigate the negative influences; and
3) Properly manage industry relations to maximize patient and societal benefit.

“Arming physicians with a healthy dose of skepticism about whatever they hear is probably one of the most powerful lessons that medical education can instill.”

- American Association of Medical Colleges (AAMC) Task Force on Industry Funding of Medical Education, 2008

AMSA model curriculum

Five recommended competencies:

1. Professionalism and conflict of interest
2. Drug and device development
3. Determining drug and device safety and efficacy
4. Marking and physician practice
5. Continuing Medical Education

Professionalism and Conflict of Interest (COI)

Competency: Explain what constitutes a conflict of interest and describe how conflicts of interest influence clinical practice and professional standards.

Rationale: COI helps explain how industry relationships overlap or conflict with a physician’s primary obligation to the patient and industry’s legal obligation to maximize shareholder value through the development and sale of pharmaceuticals or medical devices. When judging the appropriateness of interactions with industry, physicians must avoid COI whenever possible and mitigate the negative effects of unavoidable COI.

Students should understand:

- what constitutes a conflict of interest;
- how COI influences clinical care and clinical research;
- the role and effectiveness of disclosure and transparency in COI;
- the impact of COI on clinical practice guidelines and formulary development;
- how industry sponsorship influences conferences, continued medical education, and standard-setting organizations such as professional and state medical societies; and
- how to avoid, manage or minimize COI in physician-industry relationships such as speaking and consulting agreements and research contracts.
Effective Teaching Methods

• “debunking” – get students to evaluate false claims
• “putting a face on the problem” – in-person testimony from patients who were harmed
• “case-based approach” with small groups.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Point of Curricular Integration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professionalism and Conflict of Interest</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is conflict-of-interest</td>
<td>Ethics / Professionalism, Practice of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COI, clinical care and clinical research</td>
<td>Ethics / Professionalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COI, disclosure and transparency</td>
<td>Ethics / Professionalism, Pharmacology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COI, clinical practice guidelines and formularies</td>
<td>4th Yr Capstone, Ethics / Professionalism, Pharmacology, Prescription Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry sponsorship of conferences, education and organizations</td>
<td>4th Yr Capstone, CME, Ethics / Professionalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing COI in industry relationships</td>
<td>Ethics / Professionalism, MD/PhD program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drug and Device Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stages of drug and device R&amp;D</td>
<td>Pharmacology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives and financing of R&amp;D</td>
<td>Pharmacology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug R&amp;D priorities, drug cost and accessibility</td>
<td>4th Yr Capstone, Clerkships, Pharmacology, Practice of Medicine, Prescription Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug/device approval processes</td>
<td>Pharmacology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulations on off-label use</td>
<td>4th Yr Capstone, Pharmacology, Practice of Medicine, Prescription Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-marketing surveillance and the physician’s role in the FDA adverse event reporting system</td>
<td>4th Yr Capstone, Pharmacology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Determining Drug and Device Safety and Efficacy</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical appraisal of scientific information</td>
<td>4th Yr Capstone, Clerkships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict-of-Interest and clinical evidence in medicine</td>
<td>4th Yr Capstone, Clerkships, Pharmacology, Prescription Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent sources of drug information and reviews</td>
<td>4th Yr Capstone, Clerkships, Ethics / Professionalism, Pharmacology, Prescription Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How bias influences decision making</td>
<td>Ethics / Professionalism, Pharmacology, Practice of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marketing and Physician Practice</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How marketing influences physicians</td>
<td>4th Yr Capstone, Ethics / Professionalism, Practice of Medicine, Prescription Writing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How successful is the educational programme on drug promotion at your institution in meeting its goals? (n=262)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Half a day or less n=69</th>
<th>Four to nine hours n=66</th>
<th>10 or more hours n=89</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very successful</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>12 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat successful</td>
<td>26 (38%)</td>
<td>41 (62%)</td>
<td>53 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unsuccessful</td>
<td>16 (23%)</td>
<td>8 (12%)</td>
<td>10 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all successful</td>
<td>4 (6%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown/no comment</td>
<td>17 (25%)</td>
<td>12 (18%)</td>
<td>8 (9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mintzes. WHO/HAI survey, 2005
http://apps.who.int/medicinedocs/pdf/s8110e/s8110e.pdf
To What Extent Do Educational Interventions Impact Medical Trainees’ Attitudes and Behaviors Regarding Industry-Trainee and Industry-Physician Relationships?
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- 10 studies of educational interventions, 1995 to 2006
- Mainly pre-post intervention (3/10 controlled)
- Small-scale interventions, short-term outcomes
- Attitudes and knowledge

Carroll et al. Pediatrics 2007; 120: e1528
Medical Schools’ Industry Interaction Policies Not Associated With Trainees’ Self-Reported Behavior as Residents: Results of a National Survey
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ABSTRACT

Background: Medical students attending schools with policies limiting industry/student interactions report fewer relationships with pharmaceutical representatives.

Objective: To investigate whether associations between students’ medical school policies and their more limited industry interaction behaviors persist into residency.

Methods: We randomly sampled 1800 third-year residents who graduated from 120 allopathic US-based medical schools, using the American Medical Association Physician Masterfile. We surveyed them in 2011 to determine self-reported behavior and preferences for brand-name prescriptions, and we calculated the strength of their medical schools’ industry interaction policies using the 2008 American Medical Student Association and Institute on Medicine as a Profession databases. We used logistic regression to estimate the association between strength of school policies and residents’ behaviors with adjustments for class size, postresidency career plan, and concern about medical school debt.

Results: We achieved a 44% survey response rate (n = 739). Residents who graduated from schools with restrictive policies were no more or less likely to accept industry gifts or industry-sponsored meals, speak with marketing representatives about drug products, attend industry-sponsored lectures, or prefer brand-name medications than residents who graduated from schools with less restrictive policies. Residents who correctly answered evidence-based prescription questions were about 30% less likely to have attended industry-sponsored lectures (OR = 0.72, 95% CI 0.56–0.98).

Conclusions: Any effect that medical school industry interaction policies had on insulating students from pharmaceutical marketing did not persist in the behavior of residents in our sample. This suggests that residency training environments are important in influencing behavior.
In conclusion

- AMSA ScoreCard: a student-led initiative for change
- Extensive influence on institutional policy
- Education on COI embedded in broader policy shifts
- Can education change practice?

Questions or comments?
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