



THE ROYAL  
AUSTRALIAN AND NEW ZEALAND  
COLLEGE OF PSYCHIATRISTS

## **The Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists**

### Ethical Guideline # 5

# **THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PSYCHIATRISTS AND THE HEALTH CARE INDUSTRY**

## **SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

This ethical guideline recognises that, apart from pharmaceutical companies, the health care industry also includes other commercial interests, such as manufacturers and distributors of other agents and devices used in the treatment of patients, providers of services such as pathology and radiology, and operators of private hospitals and funders of other services. This guideline therefore deals with the relationship between psychiatrists and commercial interests in the health care industry in the broadest sense.

Psychiatrists working in both public and private settings might consider providing a declaration of interest in commercial entities involved in the health care industry by suitable signage in the waiting area or consulting rooms. Examples of possible notices are attached to this guideline as an appendix.

### **Clinical trials**

Psychiatrist investigators should consider the aim and objects of the study, the risks to patients involved, the nature of informed consent obtained from the participants/subjects, and whether patients' privacy and confidentiality can be assured. Payment should not be made directly to the psychiatrist but to the institution where the research is undertaken. All research projects must be approved by the relevant institutional Human Research Ethics Committee. Decisions concerning publication of results should be made by the investigator and not by the sponsoring company.

### **Attendance at meetings**

Sponsorship to attend a scientific meeting with which the psychiatrist is already involved in a significant capacity has the approval of the College, but such sponsorship should be by the organisers of the meeting and should be

**Issued:** May 2003 (GC2003/1. R28).  
**Amended:** August 2008 (GC2008/03. R33)  
**Currency:** Until withdrawn

acknowledged. Where sponsorship is offered to attend a meeting at which the psychiatrist is not making a formal contribution the possibility of potential future conflict of interest may exist. Such an imputation may also extend to pharmaceutical and other health care industry company sponsorship of the psychiatrist's attendance at meetings, and psychiatrists must avoid any secrecy regarding the source and extent of such sponsorship.

### **Support for meetings**

Where the support of companies is sought for meetings, psychiatrists should maintain an even handed approach and be careful not to favour one company over others as a matter of policy.

### **Gifts and entertainment**

Benefits or subsidies received from pharmaceutical and other health care companies must leave psychiatrists' independence of judgment unaffected. Psychiatrists should err on the side of rejection of gifts. All such arrangements and gifts should be open and transparent.

### **Drug samples**

The acceptance of free drug samples that clinically might inappropriately influence the choice of prescribing is not recommended. Distribution of drug samples to patients must not involve material gain to the psychiatrist.

### **Remuneration for services**

Psychiatrists are entitled to remuneration for services provided to the pharmaceutical industry and/or to other companies in the health care field as consultants, researchers, educators, and/or employees. In all such cases the relationship should be public knowledge, and should be declared both in publications and when speaking at meetings.

### **Duality of interest**

Pecuniary interests in a pharmaceutical or other health care company must not influence the psychiatrist's clinical practice. Membership of an Advisory Board of a pharmaceutical or other health care company must be declared as appropriate and should not influence the psychiatrist's clinical practice,

### **Students, trainees and continuing medical education**

Training programmes should include discussions concerning the role of the pharmaceutical industry and other providers of agents and devices used in the treatment of patients, dualities and potential conflicts of interest, the unbiased evaluation and interpretation of industry-sponsored material, and the practices of mentors in shaping the attitudes and behaviour of students and psychiatrists-in-training.

## 1 BACKGROUND

Psychiatrists are engaged in the treatment of disease and the conduct of research directed toward improvements in treatment; the pharmaceutical industry is also engaged in the development and promotion of new therapeutic agents. In spite of the overlap in their aims and, there are psychiatrists who feel uncomfortable about their relationships with the pharmaceutical industry. In addition, uneasiness has been expressed in the community about the propriety of these relationships.

Possible reasons for these concerns arise out of the fact that both groups are paid for what they do, and conflicting interests can arise in this context. The number of drugs available has increased greatly in recent years, and this has made the industry more competitive. The recruitment of patients in industry-sponsored clinical trials is also increasing and psychiatrists are not infrequently called upon to assist with recruitment to these trials.

Of particular concern to psychiatrists are the promotional activities of the pharmaceutical industry. These can take many forms, including overt advertising and the provision of gifts and perquisites to individual doctors or to their employing institutions. It is important to recognise that although psychiatrists are the targets for advertising and promotional activities of pharmaceutical companies, they are not the consumers of the products. Indeed, psychiatrists can be considered to act on behalf of their patients, and their relationships are guided by ethical considerations and subject to laws governing, amongst other things, the prescribing of drugs.

Some doctors assume that they are somehow immune from skilled advertising techniques. While psychiatrists are trained to make rational decisions, they may be no more resistant than other members of the community to expertly designed promotions that are created to appeal to emotions and to tap into personal values and biases.

This Guideline is advisory. It is acknowledged that psychiatrists hold a variety of views and opinions concerning ethics, and that judgment frequently depends on individual circumstances. Nevertheless, the principles expressed in this Guideline are considered to be relevant to all College Fellows and psychiatrists-in-training.

### 1.1 Psychiatrists and the pharmaceutical industry

The responsibilities of psychiatrists to their patients in relation to pharmaceutical companies include:

- to use existing, approved drugs in the most effective and appropriate way as part of treatment and care,
- to monitor their use and report adverse reactions,
- to participate in post-marketing surveillance of new medications,
- to keep up to date with scientific developments in their field, including information about new therapeutic agents and changed information about established ones,
- to consider the implications of new technologies and pharmaceutical agents for the community as a whole and contribute to discussion about the most appropriate use of resources, and

|   |
|---|
| <p><b>Issued:</b> May 2003 (GC2003/1. R28).<br/><b>Amended:</b> August 2008 (GC2008/03. R33)<br/><b>Currency:</b> Until withdrawn</p> |
|---|

- where appropriate, to engage directly in research into new medications or into new applications of existing ones, or contribute to and/or support such research.

In the context of these activities psychiatrists will be exposed to, and may develop relationships with pharmaceutical companies. From time to time, this exposure will require psychiatrists to make decisions about the nature and extent of such relationships. On occasions, they may raise the possibility of conflicts of interest, such as those between their responsibilities to their patients and personal gain, or between clinical responsibilities and responsibilities as researchers.

It is necessary to stress the importance of consultation with industry. These discussions take place within the context of the respective self-regulatory codes of conduct of psychiatrists and members of the pharmaceutical industry. Both psychiatrists and pharmaceutical companies are also subject to laws and regulations governing the prescription of drugs and in some cases the conduct of research.

It is also important to stress the need for openness and transparency in dealings between psychiatrists and pharmaceutical companies. This will require disclosure of financial or other arrangements to institutions, ethics committees, patients, potential research subjects and others. Such disclosures do not in themselves imply the existence of conflicts of interest, but merely allow public scrutiny of dualities of interest to ensure that such conflicts do not develop.

The College is committed to ensuring that all of these considerations are taken into account in the organisation of all meetings under the auspices of the College and, most particularly, the annual Congress. The College is committed to negotiating and liaising with pharmaceutical companies to ensure appropriate best possible ethical practice in relation to sponsorships and promotions associated with College meetings.

## 2 GUIDELINES

The RANZCP acknowledges that the pharmaceutical industry is a major contributor to patient care and education, medical research, and postgraduate and continuing medical education. The College believes that the important relationship between its Fellows and the industry must be maintained at the highest professional standard. In view of the potential for competing influences, it has developed this ethical guideline. It is hoped that this will assist psychiatrists and psychiatrists-in-training in achieving and maintaining the highest quality of individual and community health care. It is expected that psychiatrists and psychiatrists-in-training shall adhere at all times to the Code of Ethics of the College. It is recognised that guidelines of this sort must assume the commonsense and integrity of College Fellows while at the same time articulating community standards.

Furthermore they must be available for public scrutiny and subject to revision from time to time in response to changes in ethical issues and attitudes. Accordingly, active debate and discussion about them within the College is strongly encouraged.

|  |
|--|
| <p><b>Issued:</b> May 2003 (GC2003/1. R28.<br/> <b>Amended:</b> August 2008 (GC2008/03. R33)<br/> <b>Currency:</b> Until withdrawn</p> |
|--|

## 2.1 Clinical trials, including commissioned research projects

### 2.1.1 Responsibilities of psychiatrist investigators

Each investigator should consider:

- i Whether the proposed study is to address important scientific questions, or whether it is a promotion to familiarise doctors with the medication, a device to encourage a particular brand usage, or a commercial undertaking merely to permit registration of a drug.
- ii Whether the discomfort and inconvenience, or maybe risks, to which patients are to be exposed are reasonable, taking into account the nature of the project, the patient population to be studied, and the likely benefits.
- iii Whether patients will be able to consent freely to participation, or whether consent issues are satisfactorily addressed in other ways.
- iv Whether patients' privacy and confidentiality can be assured.
- v Whether the information to be provided to patients includes an adequate description of the nature of the project and any potential risks or discomfort associated with it.
- vi Resource issues, including the cost of the study to the institution (investigations, bed usage and staff time) and expected demands imposed on researchers.
- vii Proposed methods for monitoring the conduct of the trial and obligations imposed on researchers to ensure that the trial remains in accordance with various guidelines published by the NHMRC, the Health Research Council (HRC), the Therapeutic Goods Administration and other relevant bodies.

### 2.1.2 Payments to investigators, departments or institutions

If an investigator derives any personal or financial benefit from the conduct of a pharmaceutical company sponsored clinical trial this should be transparent and with the full knowledge of the Ethics Committee. Payments per capita should be similarly approved by the Ethics Committee. However, adequate compensation should be provided for personal expenses arising from the trial, including reimbursement of practice expenses.

The amount of compensation must reasonably relate to income or time lost and should be administered under a formal contractual arrangement that is open to scrutiny. All remuneration should be paid into a fund used to finance the execution of the study. Other uses of these monies must adhere to institutional requirements.

Any research project conducted by private practitioners should include an investigator with an institutional affiliation and be assessed by a Research Ethics Committee associated with that institution. Funds associated with the

|  |
|--|
| <p><b>Issued:</b> May 2003 (GC2003/1. R28.<br/> <b>Amended:</b> August 2008 (GC2008/03. R33)<br/> <b>Currency:</b> Until withdrawn</p> |
|--|

project should be distributed in accordance with the requirements of the ethics committee and conform to the normal requirements of the institution. The nature of the compensation to be paid to the investigators should be declared in the plain language statement provided to potential volunteers.

Grants of money or equipment by pharmaceutical and other companies to hospitals, health care centres and universities specifically for the purposes of research are generally acceptable but should always be made to the institution and not to individuals, and should be appropriately acknowledged in research and other publications. If the donation is linked to, or contingent upon, a clinical trial or specific research project, a formal contractual arrangement that is open to scrutiny should be in place.

### **2.1.3 Notification to appropriate Human Research Ethics Committees**

All research projects involving human subjects must be assessed by a Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) that is constituted according to national guidelines such as those contained in the appropriate NHMRC (Australia) and HRC (New Zealand) codes as amended from time to time.

Since payments to investigators, departments and institutions have ethical implications, the ethics committee must be made aware of financial arrangements for clinical trials, including proposed payments to researchers and research participants and the provision of other resources required to carry out the study.

Proposed payments to participants should be approved by the appropriate ethics committee.

### **2.1.4 Publication of results**

The investigator and the ethics committee should ensure that decisions concerning publication of the results of the proposed studies are the responsibility of the investigators and not solely the sponsoring company.

It is important that negative, as well as positive, results are published. Investigators should endeavour to publish both positive and negative results.

With multi-centre trials, a committee of the investigators, together with the sponsoring company, should be responsible for the analysis of the results and preparation of the results for publication.

Financial and other support should be acknowledged in publications, as should any other association with sponsoring companies.

### **2.1.5 Responsibilities of psychiatrists as members of ethics committees**

Psychiatrists may be called upon to become members of ethics committees or Research or Drug Committees and should be ready to make their particular expertise available when asked to do so.

The ethics committee may be asked to consider a variety of applications that have been developed jointly by the investigator and a pharmaceutical company as a local project, or part of a multicentre trial. Psychiatrists should absent themselves from discussions concerning research projects in which they are personally involved. Where a committee is to discuss a project involving a company with which a psychiatrist has a present or previous relationship that could raise the possibility of a conflict of interest, this must be openly declared.

Ethics committees have a responsibility to ensure that trials are conducted in accordance with national standards, as set out in various statements, including the NHMRC Code on Human Experimentation. The main principle to be followed is that the likely benefits of the proposed experimentation are reasonable in terms of any risks or potential discomfort to participants, and that consent for participation is freely given. The questions that should be addressed by ethics committees naturally overlap with those mentioned above for psychiatrists. They include:

- i What is the regulatory status of the agents to be used in the study?
- ii Is the design of the study appropriate to its aims and objectives? Is the study likely to provide an answer to the questions being asked? Are doses and duration of therapy consistent with those used in previous applications of the medication?
- iii Does the protocol include a clear statement of the number of participants to be enrolled in the study, the proposed method of recruitment and selection of participants?
- iv Do pre-clinical and clinical data indicate that the risks associated with the proposed use of the drug or device are acceptable? What procedures are proposed for monitoring safety? What are the criteria according to which the trial is to be stopped in the event of new data regarding safety or efficacy becoming available?
- v How is consent to be obtained? Have special provisions been made for the protection of vulnerable groups or individuals? Will participants be adequately informed about the implications for existing treatments that they might be receiving?
- vi Are there resource issues that might affect the conduct of the trial or its outcomes? Do researchers face potential conflicts of interest? Are relevant dualities of interest to be disclosed to potential participants?

## 2.2 Pharmaceutical industry sponsored travel and attendance at meetings

The pharmaceutical industry provides sponsorship both for organising meetings and to psychiatrists for attending them. While this sponsorship is provided with the expressed aim of contributing to continuing education, the manner in which it is provided may leave the reasons for its provision open to other interpretations. The ideal manner for the industry to provide sponsorship is through an independently organised scientific meeting for

|  |
|--|
| <p><b>Issued:</b> May 2003 (GC2003/1. R28.<br/> <b>Amended:</b> August 2008 (GC2008/03. R33)<br/> <b>Currency:</b> Until withdrawn</p> |
|--|

which the costs of bringing in invited speakers are defrayed by the funds provided by industry. The contractual relationship should ideally be between the organisers of the meeting and the pharmaceutical company, not the individual. This is to ensure that organisers of the meeting are choosing speakers for clinical and scientific relevance rather than a desired relationship with a psychiatrist by the pharmaceutical company.

In circumstances in which an individual is funded, the main issues with ethical implications that need to be considered by a psychiatrist are that:

- the sponsorship must be clearly linked to education,
- the psychiatrist has recognised expertise in the relevant topic, and presents his or her own teaching materials,
- there should be no loss of professional independence through accepting the sponsorship offered, and
- the psychiatrist should have no reservation regarding the sponsorship being publicly scrutinised.

Psychiatrists should be wary of using material that they had not themselves developed.

### **2.2.1 Attendance at a meeting at which the psychiatrist is making a formal contribution**

Sponsorship may be offered to an individual psychiatrist to travel to a meeting in which he or she is already involved as speaker, chairperson or in some other significant capacity (e.g., organising the subsequent meeting). Where this is for the scientific meeting of a specialist society and, for example, where the arrangement has been made by the organisers of the meeting, this form of sponsorship recognises the standing of the individual and has the full support of the College.

With such sponsorship, actual payment to the individual should be made by the organisers of the meeting, and not by the sponsor. The sponsorship should be acknowledged, and should be at a reasonable level as judged by the organisers of the meeting.

Particular care must be taken for meetings that are not regular meetings of the College or specialist societies, especially if there is no independent organising committee and the meeting is organised by a pharmaceutical company. It must be recognised that the invitation almost certainly arises from the fact that the company considers the psychiatrist's contribution will be to the company's benefit. In addition, the lack of an independent organising committee may call into question the independence of the speaker. If undertaken, support for such travel should always be declared to the hospital, university or other relevant bodies.

Psychiatrists who are invited speakers should take care to their presentation is not biased towards the interests of the sponsor more than is warranted by the scientific data.



### **2.2.2 Attendance at a meeting at which the psychiatrist is not making a formal contribution**

Accepting sponsorship from a company to attend a meeting at which the psychiatrist is not making a formal contribution will inevitably raise the possibility that the individual could be compromised by a conflict of interest in subsequent decisions about products of the sponsoring company.

Psychiatrists should be careful at all times to avoid this potential imputation and to be as transparent as possible in all circumstances.

### **2.2.3 Types of meetings for which pharmaceutical company support is provided**

In addition to support for clinical and scientific meetings organised nationally or internationally by independent organising committees, pharmaceutical companies provide sponsorship to psychiatrists to participate in a variety of meetings. These include:

- launches of pharmaceutical products,
- local meetings of specialist groups that usually have an independent organiser or organising committee, and
- hospital grand rounds and departmental scientific meetings.

While these meetings usually have a clearly defined primary educational aim, they are open to the suspicion of unethical interaction between psychiatrists and the pharmaceutical industry. Psychiatrists involved in organising or attending such meetings need to have a high level of awareness of this risk. They should ensure they are in a position to meet any allegations of unethical behaviour through avoiding any secrecy regarding the source and extent of sponsorship.

## **2.3 Support for meetings and other educational activities**

All of the following can be legitimate extensions of a mutually advantageous liaison between psychiatrists and pharmaceutical or other companies in the health care industry. Where the support of companies is sought for meetings psychiatrists should maintain an even handed approach and be careful not to favour one company over others as a matter of policy.

### **2.3.1 The supporting pharmaceutical company selects and sponsors both the speaker(s) and the meeting**

Under these circumstances it is appropriate that the supporting company issues invitations in its own name, that it supplies the venue for the meeting, that it supports the speaker and meets other costs. It should not be or purport to be under the auspices of the psychiatrist. If the topic is likely to be of interest to a significant number of Fellows of the College, then it is appropriate to provide information through the College, its Boards, Faculties, Sections and Special Interest Groups or other sources separate from the company.

### **2.3.2 The company provides a speaker and support for a meeting primarily organised by the psychiatrist**

A pharmaceutical company may offer to provide a speaker for a meeting organised by the psychiatrist.

The overriding principle for acceptance of such offers should be that any meeting sponsored by the psychiatrist must have the program arranged by the psychiatrist responsible.

Use can be made of visiting speakers, but care should always be exercised in acceptance of such offers to ensure that an unbiased presentation is to be made. Companies may be disinclined to sponsor speakers unless it is known that they are likely to support the objectives of the company. If areas are known to be contentious, care must be taken to ensure that there is an appropriate balance of speakers canvassing alternative views.

It may be appropriate for the company to further support the meeting by payment for the venue, satchels, refreshments etc, but such support must be made clear on all invitations and publicity for the meeting, and the guidelines for travel of individual psychiatrists to such a meeting should apply (see above).

### **2.3.3 The psychiatrist approaches a pharmaceutical company to supply a speaker**

The psychiatrist may approach a pharmaceutical company to support a meeting by supplying a speaker.

If the company chooses the speaker, the principles of support are the same as if the company had offered the speaker. If the speaker is not chosen by the company, appropriate acknowledgment should be made of the support given by the company.

A contractual arrangement should be entered into with the agreement of both bodies. The terms of the arrangement should be fully understood by all parties, e.g., the use of the names of the speakers for publicity purposes.

### **2.3.4 Seeking support from pharmaceutical companies**

Companies may be approached to support scientific meetings in such ways as supplying dinners, programs or satchels as well as taking part in an exhibition of pharmacological or other products.

Such support is appropriate providing that it is never contingent upon alterations in the program, speakers or other aspects of the format of the meeting.

In these circumstances, appropriate acknowledgment must always be given, but this should be by reference to the logo of the company rather than by the endorsement of a single product.

In general terms, the following principle should apply:

The psychiatrist should not accept or acknowledge sponsorship that could damage the public standing or reputation for independence of the profession in the eyes of:

- peers, colleagues and co-workers,
- the general public,
- members of parliament,
- the media.

The question should always be asked, and be capable of comfortable answer: "Can this presentation stand on its own without the financial support and influence of an outside body?"

#### **2.4 Promotional material and entertainment provided to psychiatrists**

Benefits or subsidies received from pharmaceutical companies must leave psychiatrists' independence of judgment unimpaired. Arrangements between psychiatrists and pharmaceutical companies should be open and transparent. Where the possibility of a conflict of interest could be raised, either in clinical practice or in research, they should be declared openly to patients and the employer.

Judgments about ethical decisions of this nature are fundamental to the practice and professionalism of psychiatrists. For this reason, psychiatrists must judge for themselves what is and is not acceptable, but should err on the side of rejection of promotional materials such as pens, desk caddies, etc... Service oriented items may on occasions be acceptable, e.g., patient counselling or teaching aids. It is recognised that judgment on these matters may sometimes be difficult. In specific cases it may be helpful to discuss issues that arise with colleagues, institutional representatives, or an ethics committee.

#### **2.5 Drug Samples**

Drug samples are packages containing pharmaceutical products distributed by manufacturers or their agents to doctors. These samples are commonly starter packs that may be provided to patients who need to commence treatment immediately. The provision of samples that may appear to be a service is in many circumstances a marketing exercise intended to accustom the clinician to prescribing a particular product, or to establish a cohort of patients on a long term treatment with a particular medication.

The acceptance of free samples that clinically might inappropriately influence the choice of prescribing is not recommended.

Distribution of drug samples to patients must not involve material gain to the psychiatrist.

## 2.6 Remuneration for services

Psychiatrists are entitled to remuneration for services provided to the pharmaceutical industry as consultants, researchers, educators/teachers, and/or employees. In all such cases the relationship should be public knowledge. Psychiatrists should not request or accept a fee or equivalent consideration from pharmaceutical companies in exchange for seeing their representatives in a promotional or similar capacity.

### 2.6.1 Consultancy

An individual psychiatrist may act as a consultant for a pharmaceutical company. This may be in general terms or in relationship to a particular product. The arrangement should be that of any business undertaking. If a psychiatrist acts as a consultant to the industry, this information should be public knowledge, and be appropriately reported to and recognised by all relevant committees. Psychiatrists should declare their consultancy role with a pharmaceutical company when speaking at meetings.

### 2.6.2 Research and development

New discoveries by psychiatrists and the development of new drugs, therapeutic devices or other agents should be encouraged, and those involved in these activities should be able to be rewarded for this work.

### 2.6.3 Employment

Psychiatrists are not precluded by any of these guidelines from direct employment in the pharmaceutical industry. This employment should be transparent.

## 2.7 Duality of Interest

### 2.7.1 Pecuniary interests

Psychiatrists should take care in having interests in pharmaceutical companies that might conflict with their professional responsibilities.

A psychiatrist should take care that his or her financial interest in a pharmaceutical company or another company in the health care industry does not influence his or her clinical practice.

Pecuniary interests most likely to influence a psychiatrist include:

- share holdings, board membership,
- paid employment, including consultancy, advisory board membership, commissioned fee-paid work, paid speaker, paid expert adviser,
- fellowship, research grant, education grant,
- considerations concerning travel and attendance at conferences funded by the company, as discussed above.

Other interests that may influence a psychiatrist include:

- clinical trials sponsored by a pharmaceutical company,
- other research, safety testing, and
- expert advice (non-paid).

In all cases, if a psychiatrist or close family member has such a duality of interest in a pharmaceutical company, it should be declared to appropriate committees. In the same way, psychiatrists should declare relevant pecuniary and other interests before commencement of any presentation, educational seminar or any other professional setting, e.g., educational and/or scientific meetings.

### **2.7.2 Advisory Boards**

It is appropriate for a psychiatrist to become a member of or chair an Advisory Board established by a pharmaceutical company. Such a board might be set up to give advice to the company about a particular drug or technique or a group of products, and opinion leaders will usually be sought. Board activity may involve all aspects of product development, from preclinical studies to marketing.

It is likely that membership of such a board will encourage a feeling of commitment to a product as well as a feeling of reciprocity and friendship towards the pharmaceutical company and its representatives. Close involvement with a pharmaceutical company should not in any way influence a psychiatrist's clinical practice.

Membership of an Advisory Board poses a question of duality of interest. Board members must declare involvement of this sort in appropriate circumstances, for example to ethics committees considering clinical trials of products of that particular company or a competitor and at scientific and educational meetings.

### **2.7.3 'Advertorials'**

Psychiatrists, particularly those who are seen as opinion leaders by members of the pharmaceutical industry, may be asked to make public comments supporting a particular product. This is of particular concern if the psychiatrist has a commercial arrangement with a pharmaceutical company.

Promoting commercial interests in the guise of editorial comment is unacceptable. This proscription does not preclude legitimate support for particular efficacy. In such cases evidence for the claimed efficacy should be outlined, and only proper drug names, and not trade names, should be used. The endorsement of products that contribute to public health, such as vaccines or sunscreens, is permitted, and in all cases direct payment or other arrangement should be openly declared in the advertisement.

## 2.8 Education and training

In relation to students and trainees, as well as continuing medical education programmes, training programmes should include discussions concerning the role of the pharmaceutical industry and other companies in the health care field, dualities and potential conflicts of interest, and the unbiased evaluation and interpretation of industry-sponsored material. The role of institutional policies and the practices of individual clinicians, teachers and mentors in shaping the attitudes and behaviour of students and psychiatrists-in-training should be recognised in the development of curricula.

**This document is a revision of the RACP *Guidelines for ethical relationships between the Medical Profession and Industry (3rd edition, 2006)*, ensuring its relevance for psychiatrists. The RANZCP acknowledges the significant work of the RACP Ethics Committee and Guidelines Working Party, in particular the Chairman Dr Paul Komesaroff (FRACP).**

**The RANZCP thanks RACP for making its intellectual material available in this way.**

## REFERENCES

- Brodkey AC. The role of the pharmaceutical industry in teaching psychopharmacology: a growing problem. *Academic Psychiatry* 2005; 29:222-229.
- Christensen RC, Tueth MJ. Pharmaceutical companies and academic departments of psychiatry: a call for ethics education. *Academic Psychiatry* 1998; 22:135-137.
- Freidin J, Prior N, Sara G. CME and the pharmaceutical industry: towards a more ethical relationship. *Australasian Psychiatry* 2002; 10:108-110.
- Komesaroff PA, Kerridge IH. Ethical issues concerning the relationships between medical practitioners and the pharmaceutical industry. *Med J Aust* 2002; 176:118-121.
- Komesaroff PA, Dodds S, McNeill P, Skene L. (eds): Human Research Ethics Handbook 2002; NHMRC: Canberra. Available at <http://www.nhmrc.gov.au/publications/hrecbook/misc/downloads.htm> > Accessed 24 March 2008.
- Medicines Australia. Code of Conduct. Edition 15, adopted 20 June 2006, amendments adopted on 21 August 2007. Available at <http://www.medicinesaustralia.com/au/pages/page16.asp> > Accessed 24 March 2008.
- Mohl PC. Psychiatric training program engagement with the pharmaceutical industry: an educational issue, not strictly an ethical one. *Academic Psychiatry* 2005; 29:215-221.
- Rogers WA, Mansfield PR, Braunack-Mayer, Jureidini JN. The ethics of pharmaceutical industry relationships with medical students. *Med J Aust* 2004; 180:411-414.
- Ruff TA, Haikal-Mukhtar H. Doctors, drugs, information and ethics: a never-ending story. *Med J Aust* 2005; 183:73-74.
- Sara G, Prior N. Drug companies and CME: prohibition, declaration or engagement? *Australasian Psychiatry* 2000; 8:195-198.
- Sara G, Prior N. Views of psychiatrists and trainees on drug company involvement in CME activities. *Australasian Psychiatry* 2001; 9:101-105.
- Steiner JL et al. Developing ethical guidelines for pharmaceutical company support in an academic mental health center. *Psychiatric Services* 2003; 54:1079-1080, 1089.
- The Royal Australasian College of Physicians. Guidelines for ethical relationships between physicians and industry (third edition) 2006. Available at <http://www.racp.edu.au/index.cfm?objectid=3F6DF395-2A57-5487-D38612607111F38E> > Accessed 24 March 2008.
- Wazana A. Physicians and the pharmaceutical industry. Is a gift ever just a gift? *JAMA* 2000; 283:373-380.

|   |
|---|
| <p><b>Issued:</b> May 2003 (GC2003/1. R28).<br/> <b>Amended:</b> August 2008 (GC2008/03. R33)<br/> <b>Currency:</b> Until withdrawn</p> |
|---|

**APPENDIX**

Some of the doctors in this practice occasionally receive promotional materials from, and/or attend educational meetings supported by, companies in the pharmaceutical industry. We take great care not to allow these activities to unduly influence our treatment choices. If you are concerned about this issue your doctor is very happy to discuss it further with you. Just ask.



Dr... sometimes receives support from pharmaceutical companies, for instance for educational purposes. Whilst your doctor takes great care not to allow these activities to unduly influence treatment choices, you may still have some questions about this. Please feel free to ask your doctor for further information about this.