

BMJ Open

Conflict of interest between Professional Medical Societies and industry: an analysis of the Italian Medical Societies' websites

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2016-011124
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	12-Jan-2016
Complete List of Authors:	<p>Fabbri, Alice; Università degli Studi dell'Insubria, Centre of Research in Medical Pharmacology; Università degli Studi di Bologna, Centre for International Health, Department of Medical and Surgical Sciences</p> <p>Gregoraci, Giorgia; Università degli Studi di Udine, Institute of Hygiene and Clinical Epidemiology, Department of Medical and Biological Sciences;</p> <p>Nihes - Netherlands Institute for Health Sciences</p> <p>Tedesco, Dario; Università degli Studi di Bologna Dipartimento di Scienze Biomediche e NeuroMotorie; Italian Medical Residents Committee of the Italian Society of Hygiene, Preventive Medicine and Public Health (S.It.I.)</p> <p>Ferretti, Filippo; Università degli Studi di Roma La Sapienza, Department of Public Health and Infectious Diseases; Italian Medical Residents Committee of the Italian Society of Hygiene, Preventive Medicine and Public Health (S.It.I.)</p> <p>Gilardi, Francesco; Università degli Studi di Roma Tor Vergata, Department of Biomedicine and Prevention; Italian Medical Residents Committee of the Italian Society of Hygiene, Preventive Medicine and Public Health (S.It.I.)</p> <p>Iemmi, Diego; Università degli Studi di Milano, Department of Biomedical Sciences for Health; Italian Medical Residents Committee of the Italian Society of Hygiene, Preventive Medicine and Public Health (S.It.I.)</p> <p>Lisi, Cosima; Università degli Studi di Roma La Sapienza, Department of Public Health and Infectious Diseases</p> <p>Lorusso, Angelo; Università degli Studi di Bologna, Centre for International Health, Department of Medical and Surgical Sciences</p> <p>Natali, Francesca; Università degli Studi di Bologna, Centre for International Health, Department of Medical and Surgical Sciences</p> <p>Shahi, Edit; Università degli Studi di Milano, Department of Biomedical Sciences for Health; Italian Medical Residents Committee of the Italian Society of Hygiene, Preventive Medicine and Public Health (S.It.I.)</p> <p>Rinaldi, Alessandro; Università degli Studi di Roma La Sapienza, Department of Public Health and Infectious Diseases; Italian Medical Residents Committee of the Italian Society of Hygiene, Preventive Medicine and Public Health (S.It.I.)</p>
Primary Subject Heading:	Public health
Secondary Subject Heading:	Health policy, Ethics
Keywords:	Conflict of interest, Pharmaceutical industry, Medical Societies

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

For peer review only

**Conflict of interest between Professional Medical Societies and industry:
an analysis of the Italian Medical Societies' websites**

Authors

Alice Fabbri^{1,2}, Giorgia Gregoraci^{3,4}, Dario Tedesco^{5,6}, Filippo Ferretti^{6,7}, Francesco Gilardi^{6,8},
Diego Iemmi^{6,9}, Cosima Lisi⁷, Angelo Lorusso², Francesca Natali², Edit Shahi^{6,9}, Alessandro
Rinaldi^{6,7}

1. Centre of Research in Medical Pharmacology, University of Insubria, Varese, Italy
2. Centre for International Health, Department of Medical and Surgical Sciences, University of Bologna, Bologna, Italy
3. Institute of Hygiene and Clinical Epidemiology, Department of Medical and Biological Sciences, University of Udine, Udine, Italy
4. Netherlands Institute for Health Sciences, Rotterdam, The Netherlands
5. Department of Biomedical and NeuroMotor Science, University of Bologna, Bologna, Italy
6. Italian Medical Residents Committee of the Italian Society of Hygiene, Preventive Medicine and Public Health (S.It.I.)
7. Department of Public Health and Infectious Diseases, La Sapienza University, Rome, Italy
8. Department of Biomedicine and Prevention, University of Rome Tor Vergata, Rome, Italy
9. Department of Biomedical Sciences for Health, University of Milan, Milan, Italy

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Corresponding author

Alice Fabbri, MD

Centre of Research in Medical Pharmacology, University of Insubria, Viale Ottorino Rossi, Varese, Italy.

E-mail: afabbri@studenti.uninsubria.it; alealifab@gmail.com

Telephone: +39 3489154907

Keywords: conflict of interest, medical societies, pharmaceutical industry

Word count: 3197

ABSTRACT

Objective To describe how Italian medical societies interact with pharmaceutical and medical device industries through an analysis of the information available on their websites.

Design Cross sectional study.

Setting Italy.

Participants One hundred and fifty-four medical societies registered with the Italian Federation of Medical-Scientific Societies.

Main outcome measures Indicators of industry sponsorship (presence of industry sponsorship in the program of the last medical societies' annual conference; presence of manufacturers' logos on the homepage; presence of industry sponsorship of satellite symposia during the last annual conference).

Results One hundred and thirty-one Italian medical societies were considered. Of these, 4.6% had an ethical code covering relationships with industry on their websites, while 45.6% had a statute that mentioned the issue of conflict of interest, and 6.1% published the annual financial report. With regard to industry sponsorship, 64.9% received private sponsorship for their last conference, 29.0% had manufacturers' logos on their webpage, while 35.9% had industry-sponsored satellite symposia at their last conference. The presence of an ethical code on the societies' websites was associated with both an increased risk of industry sponsorship of the last conference (RR 1.36, 95% CIs 1.15 to 1.61 after adjustment) and with presence of industry logo on the societies' websites (RR 1.36, 95% CIs 1.15 to 1.61 after adjustment). No association was observed with the other indicators of governance and transparency.

Conclusions This survey shows that industry sponsorship of Italian medical societies' conferences is common, while the presence of a structured regulatory system is not. Disclosure of the amount of industry funding to medical societies is scarce. The level of transparency therefore needs to be improved and the whole relationship between medical societies and industry should be further disciplined in order to avoid any potential for conflict of interest.

STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

- To our knowledge, this is the first assessment of the relationship between Italian medical societies and pharmaceutical and medical device industries.
- A systematic approach was used to explore the medical societies' websites; data on societies' policies on governance and transparency were independently collected by two coders.
- With regard to the limitations, we relied only on information disclosed in the medical societies' websites without any further Internet searches, nor we performed a quality assessment of websites.
- The study has an Italian focus and we acknowledge that an international comparison would have been fundamental in order to ensure generalizability to our findings.

INTRODUCTION

Professional Medical Societies play an important role in advancing the quality of medical care through the development of clinical practice guidelines that shape clinical practice, dissemination of information through the publication or sponsorship of a journal, funding of research projects and the organization of educational conferences and continuing medical education (CME) events.[1,2] Moreover, medical societies advocate for the interest of their practitioners as the “voice of the profession”.[3]

Both pharmaceutical and medical device industries extensively fund several activities carried out by medical societies.[1,2] Industries especially subsidize annual meetings and CME events, purchasing advertising spaces, funding physicians’ attendance to these courses and sometimes, as the Institute of Medicine (IOM) points out, influencing the “choice of topics and content”.[4]

During the past decades, an extensive literature has investigated the relationship between physicians and both pharmaceutical and medical device industries and has shown that some kinds of interaction could unduly influence professional judgments leading to the potential for bias and conflict of interest (COI).[4,5] A growing body of literature has also investigated the issue of conflict of interest applied to medical societies rather than to individual physicians and some researchers have made important recommendations for change.[1-3,6-8] Particularly, strong recommendations have been made with regard to industry sponsorship of congresses due to the possibility for the sponsor to bias the educational content of the event thus influencing doctors’ prescribing habits.[1] Changes have been proposed also for the organisation of satellite symposia: current recommendations suggest to clearly mark them as industry sponsored sessions and keep them separated both in space and time from the main event they parallel.[1]

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

104 Following these recommendations, several medical societies have adopted specific institutional
105 policies governing their relationships with industry.[9-12]
106 However, these are mainly US-based articles and case studies while little is known about the
107 relationships between industry and medical societies in Europe, and particularly in Italy where
108 this topic is still a grey area of research.
109 The present study aims therefore at describing how Italian medical societies interact with
110 pharmaceutical and medical device industries through an analysis of the information available on
111 their websites. In particular we aim to provide a description of the societies’ policies on
112 transparency and governance and of the extent of industry sponsorship on their activities.
113 Furthermore, we explore possible associations between medical societies’ policies and practices.

116 **METHODS**

117 *Study design and data collection*

118 In order to explore the relationship between Italian medical societies and pharmaceutical and
119 medical device industries, we carried out a cross-sectional study. We searched the websites of all
120 medical societies registered with the Italian Federation of Medical-Scientific Societies (FISM)
121 between January and September 2014. The Federation includes societies operating in the medical
122 or scientific field that are involved in research or professional medical education activities and
123 have been operating in Italy at the national level for at least 3 years.[13]
124 From each website we collected the following information (yes/no questions):
125 • the presence of an ethical code, defined as a statement specifically regulating medical
126 societies’ behavior in case of industry sponsorship;

- whether the medical societies' statute mentioned the issue of COI;
- the publication of the annual financial report on the website;
- the presence of pharmaceutical or medical device companies' logos on the homepage;
- the presence of pharmaceutical or medical device industry sponsorship in the program of the last medical societies' annual conference;
- the presence of industry sponsorship of satellite symposia during the last annual conference.

With regard to the last two criteria, by last annual conference we meant an event that had been organized within the previous 12 months; this was also considered a proxy of how updated the websites were.

Data were independently extracted by five trained medical residents in Public Health and one trained Medical student, with duplicate independent coding of all data. A systematic approach was used to explore the websites and collect data on the medical societies' policies on governance and transparency. After the data collection, coders met to resolve disagreements and reach consensus. Statistical analyses were performed using the final information obtained after consensus. All analyses were performed using Stata 12.1 SE.

Statistical analyses

Our main purpose was to provide a detailed descriptive analysis of the relationship between Italian medical societies and the pharmaceutical and medical device industries. Categorical variables were described using frequency tables. Cross tabulations were performed for evaluating possible associations between industry sponsorship in the program of the last congress, industry sponsorship of satellite symposia and presence of manufacturers' logos on medical societies'

1
2
3 150 websites using chi-square or Fisher exact test, as appropriate.
4
5
6 151 As a second step, we aimed to explore the relationship between medical societies' regulatory
7
8 152 systems in terms of policies on governance and transparency (i.e. the presence of an ethical code,
9
10 153 the presence of a statute covering relations with industry, the publication of the annual financial
11
12 154 report on the website) and their consequent behaviors. Our main outcome was the presence of
13
14 155 pharmaceutical or medical device industry sponsorship in the program of the last annual
15
16 156 conference. Moreover, while recognizing that the conference sponsorship might be considered a
17
18 157 stronger sign of corporate influence, satellite symposia - whether not sufficiently regulated as
19
20 158 proposed by Rothman - might as well undermine the scientific integrity of the main meeting they
21
22 159 parallel.[1] Therefore we performed sensitivity analyses evaluating the presence of industry
23
24 160 sponsorship in the program of the last annual conference either/or of satellite symposia.
25
26
27 161 As a secondary outcome we explored the relationship between medical societies' regulatory
28
29 162 systems and the presence of industry logos on medical societies' websites. Possible predictors
30
31 163 were the presence of an ethical code, of a statute regulating COI and the publication of the
32
33 164 annual financial report on the website.
34
35
36 165 Medical societies were divided into three main categories (surgical – those for which the main
37
38 166 activity is a surgical intervention on the patient, i.e. cardio-surgery; clinical – those for which the
39
40 167 main activity is to provide non-surgical treatment to the patients, i.e. cardiology; services – those
41
42 168 for which the main activity is to support/make possible the activities of the previous areas, i.e.
43
44 169 radiology, hygiene and public health), according to the official definition provided by the Italian
45
46 170 Ministry of Education, Universities and Research [14], which were used as adjustment variables.
47
48 171 We performed stratified analyses within each specialty in order to identify possible differences
49
50 172 between the three groups. Because of the high prevalence of industry sponsorship in the program
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

of the last annual conference, we used Poisson regression to estimate relative risks.[15] Results are presented as RR with 95% CI.

RESULTS

A detailed description of the medical societies included in the survey can be found in Table 1.

Table 1. Description of Professional Medical Societies included in the survey

	<i>All sample (n=131)</i>	<i>Only services (n=42)</i>	<i>Only medical (n=59)</i>	<i>Only surgical (n=30)</i>
	%	%	%	%
Transparency and governance				
Ethical code covering relations with industry	4.6	2.4	3.4	10.0
Statute covering relations with industry	45.6	38.1	54.2	40.0
Annual financial report on website	6.1	4.8	5.1	10.0
Industry sponsorship				
Manufacturers' logos on the website	29.0	23.8	25.4	43.3
Industry sponsorship in the program of the last annual conference	64.9	57.1	69.5	66.7
Industry sponsorship of satellite symposia	35.9	40.5	39.0	23.3

Industry sponsorship in the program of the last annual conference OR satellite symposia	67.2	61.9	71.2	66.7
Type of society				
Services	32.1	--	--	--
Clinical	45.0	--	--	--
Surgical	22.9	--	--	--

Type of societies

In 2013, 154 Medical Societies were registered with FISM, 23 of which were excluded from our analysis because information on the outcome was not available (i.e. the website was not accessible or it was not possible to retrieve a detailed program of the last annual conference). Of the remaining 131, 42 (32.1%) were from the services, 59 (45.0%) from the clinical and 30 (22.9%) from the surgical area.

Transparency and governance

Only 4.6% of the medical societies had an ethical code covering relations with industry on their websites, while less than half (45.6%) of the statutes mentioned the issue of COI, and only 6.1% published the annual financial report.

Industry sponsorship

Almost one third (29.0%) of medical societies had manufacturers' logos on their webpage, with the highest frequency registered in the surgical category (43.3%). Two thirds (67.7%) of medical

societies had either their last conference or satellite symposia sponsored by industry; in particular 64.9% of these had a private sponsorship of their last conference, while 35.9% had industry-sponsored satellite symposia at their last conference. Satellite symposia were always organized within the conference, and were held either in series or parallel to the main session. This means there was no clear separation in time, as mentioned by Rothman.[1] As for the separation in space, in most cases it was impossible to retrieve this information from the conference program, since locations were not always listed.

We observed an association between having industry sponsorship of the last conference and of satellite symposia (chi-square test: $p < 0.0001$), but not between having a private sponsorship of the last conference and the presence of manufacturers' logos on the websites ($p = 0.132$).

Relationship between medical societies' policies and funding of annual meetings

Table 2 summarizes the findings of an exploratory analysis on the association between medical societies' policies on transparency and governance and the industry sponsorship of their last annual conference.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

221 Table 2. Relative risks of having pharmaceutical or medical device industry sponsorship in the
222 program of the last medical societies’ annual conference

	<i>All sample (n=131)</i>		<i>Only services (n=42)</i>		<i>Only clinical (n=59)</i>		<i>Only surgical (n=30)</i>	
	<i>adjusted</i>		<i>adjusted</i>		<i>adjusted</i>			
	<i>crude RR</i>	<i>RR</i>	<i>crude RR</i>	<i>RR</i>	<i>crude RR</i>	<i>RR</i>	<i>crude RR</i>	<i>adjusted RR</i>
Ethical code	1.39 (1.23-1.57)	1.36 (1.15-1.61)	1.74 (1.33-2.28)	1.13 (0.92-1.40)	1.23 (1.07-1.41)	1.17 (1.02-1.34)	1.29 (1.03-1.63)	1.50 (0.93-2.41)
Statute	1.16 (0.91-1.47)	1.13 (0.90-1.42)	1.67 (0.94-2.94)	1.93 (1.14-3.28)	0.86 (0.67-1.12)	0.89 (0.71-1.12)	1.18 (0.74-1.89)	1.31 (0.76-2.25)
No annual financial report on website	1.29 (0.67-2.48)	1.31 (0.69-2.48)	1.28 (0.31-.32)	1.34 (0.50-3.58)	1.71 (0.42-6.96)	1.71 (0.39-7.53)	1.17 (0.50-2.73)	1.31 (0.55-3.10)
Type of society								
Services	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Clinical	1.40	1.36	-	-	-	-	-	-

	(1.05-1.87)	(1.04-1.78)				
Surgical	1.31	1.32	-	-	-	-
	(0.94-1.84)	(0.93-1.86)				

Within the whole sample, interestingly the presence of an ethical code on the societies' websites was associated with an increased risk of industry sponsorship of the last conference (crude RR 1.39, 95% CIs 1.23 to 1.57; RR 1.36, 95% CIs 1.15 to 1.61 after adjustment). The presence of a statute covering relations with industry showed no association with the risk of having the last conference sponsored by industry when looking at both the crude (RR 1.16, 95%CIs 0.91 to 1.47) and the adjusted RR (1.13, 95%CIs 0.90 to 1.42). The absence of the annual financial report on the website did not show any association with industry sponsorship of the last conference either (crude RR 1.29, 95%CIs 0.67 to 2.48; adjusted RR 1.31, 95%CIs 0.69 to 2.48). Compared to societies in the services field, an increased risk was observed for clinical (adjusted RR 1.36, 95%CIs 1.04 to 1.78) but not for surgical societies (RR 1.32, 95%CIs 0.93 to 1.86). Finally, we observed no specific pattern between the presence of a statute covering relations with industry, the presence of an ethical code, or financial transparency, and the risk of industry sponsorship within each type of society, despite finding an increased risk of industry sponsorship associated with the presence of an ethical code within the clinical group, and with the presence of a statute within the services group.

When we repeated the analysis using the composite outcome "private sponsorship of the last

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

241 conference or satellite symposia”, no major differences were observed (Supplementary Table 1).

242 However, RRs were generally lower, possibly indicating a misclassification of the outcome.

243

244 Supplementary Table 1. Relative risks of having pharmaceutical or medical device industry

245 sponsorship in the program of the last medical societies’ annual conference or satellite symposia

246

	<i>All sample (n=131)</i>		<i>Only services (n=42)</i>		<i>Only clinical (n=59)</i>		<i>Only surgical (n=30)</i>	
			<i>adjusted</i>		<i>adjusted</i>			
	<i>crude RR</i>	<i>adjusted RR</i>	<i>crude RR</i>	<i>RR</i>	<i>crude RR</i>	<i>RR</i>	<i>crude RR</i>	<i>adjusted RR</i>
Ethical code	1.34 (1.20-1.50)	1.35 (1.14-1.58)	1.60 (1.25-2.04)	0.92 (0.67-1.26)	1.20 (1.06-1.36)	1.15 (1.02-1.29)	1.29 (1.03-1.63)	1.42 (0.88-2.29)
Statute	1.24 (0.98-1.56)	1.22 (0.98-1.51)	1.94 (1.15-3.29)	1.90 (1.12-3.21)	0.90 (0.70-1.15)	0.90 (0.72-1.12)	1.18 (0.74-1.89)	1.25 (0.73-2.15)
No annual financial report on website	1.34 (0.70-2.57)	1.38 (0.74-2.55)	1.28 (0.31-5.32)	1.34 (0.50-3.58)	1.71 (0.42-9.96)	1.71 (0.39-7.53)	1.17 (0.50-2.73)	1.31 (0.55-3.10)
Type of society								
Services	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-

Clinical	1.32 (1.02-1.72)	1.25 (0.96-1.62)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Surgical	1.21 (0.89-1.66)	1.21 (0.88-1.66)	-	-	-	-	-	-

Relationship between medical societies' policies and presence of manufacturers' logos on the website

Table 3 shows the results of an exploratory analysis on the association between medical societies' policies on transparency and governance and the presence of manufacturers' logos on their websites. We observed similar findings as for industry sponsorship of the last annual conference. The presence of an ethical code and the absence of a financial report on the website were associated with an increased risk of having industry logos on the website, while no association was observed in presence of a statute covering relations with industry.

Table 3. Relative risks of having manufacturers' logos on medical societies' websites.

	<i>All sample (n=131)</i>		<i>Only services (n=42)</i>		<i>Only clinical (n=59)</i>		<i>Only surgical (n=30)</i>	
	<i>crude RR</i>	<i>adjusted RR</i>	<i>crude RR</i>	<i>adjusted RR</i>	<i>crude RR</i>	<i>adjusted RR</i>	<i>crude RR</i>	<i>adjusted RR</i>
Ethical code	1.79	1.36	4.55	4.67	2.11	1.91	0.72	0.61

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

	(0.76-4.21)	(1.15-1.61)	(2.54-8.17)	(1.69-12.91)	(0.48-9.27)	(0.41-8.88)	(0.13-3.88)	(0.11-3.42)
Statute	0.97	1.13	1.67	1.36	0.96	0.91	0.71	0.61
	(0.53-1.75)	(0.90-1.42)	(0.42-6.52)	(0.31-5.87)	(0.38-2.41)	(0.37-2.29)	(0.27-1.91)	(0.23-1.63)
No annual financial report on website	>10 ⁶ (>10 ⁶ ->10 ⁶)*	>10 ⁶ (>10 ⁶ ->10 ⁶)*	>10 ⁶ (>10 ⁵ ->10 ⁶)*	>10 ⁶ (>10 ⁵ ->10 ⁶)*	>10 ⁶ (>10 ⁵ ->10 ⁶)*	>10 ⁶ (>10 ⁵ ->10 ⁶)*	NC	NC
Type of society								
Services	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Clinical	1.09 (1.54-2.18)	1.36 (1.04-1.78)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Surgical	1.82 (0.92-3.60)	1.32 (0.93-1.86)	-	-	-	-	-	-

* No societies with an available annual financial report had a logo on their website.

NC: non calculable because of 0 count cells

DISCUSSION

To our knowledge, this is the first assessment of the relationship between Italian medical societies and pharmaceutical and medical device industries. We provided an overview of the type of industry support and of the policies implemented by medical societies in order to face the issue of COI, showing how common is the industry sponsorship of medical events and how uncommon is the presence of a structured regulatory system.

Transparency

According to the data presented in Table 1, there seems to be a general lack of transparency: only 6.1% of all the societies included in our study shared information on their financing. Since medical societies are not required to disclose this information, the amount of industry funding is often unknown. Full disclosure and complete transparency in the relationship between industry and medical societies is a fundamental step for the credibility of both of them and the USA Physician Payments Sunshine Act sets an interesting precedent.[16] We therefore urge Italian governmental agencies to require a public disclosure of manufacturers' funding to physicians, medical societies and health care providers and strictly monitor the completeness, accuracy and accessibility of the information provided.

However, even if transparency is the main strategy internationally adopted to face the issue of COI, it seems to have some limits. According to our data, even when medical societies are more transparent this doesn't seem to have an impact on their consequent behaviors in terms of industry sponsorship of their conferences.

1
2
3 290 This leads to a reflection on the limits of the strategies to address COI that focus merely on
4
5
6 291 transparency. Even if the disclosure makes others aware of the presence of a COI, it doesn't
7
8 292 seem to be a sufficient protection and according to some authors, it might also have "*significant*
9
10 293 *adverse effects*" through several mechanisms such as creating the wrong feeling that once the
11
12 294 COI is declared, there is no need to manage it.[12,17] As Loewenstein points out, the issue to be
13
14 295 considered "*should not be whether to disclose but how to ensure that disclosure has its intended*
15
16 296 *effects*".[17]
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 297
29 298
30
31
32
33
34
35 299 *Relationship between policies and practices*
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 300 We conducted an exploratory analysis on the association between medical societies' policies and
48
49 301 their consequent behaviors in terms of industry sponsorship in the program of the last annual
50
51 302 conference and presence of manufacturers' logos on their websites. We found that the presence
52
53 303 of an ethical code is associated with both industry sponsorship in the program of the last annual
54
55 304 conference and with presence of manufacturers' logos on the societies' websites, while we
56
57 305 observed no association with the presence of a statute covering relations with industry.
58
59 306 There could be two different interpretations of these data and due to the cross-sectional nature of
60
307 our study that is not meant to establish causal relationships, none of them can be excluded.
308
309 On one hand, it seems that the societies with higher level of industry sponsorship of their
310
311 conferences are more likely to have ethical codes, and this might be expected because having
312
these relationships with manufacturers, they could feel a need to govern them. Therefore, the
regulation might be a consequence of their relationship with industry. Whatever the direction, it
seems that the presence of a regulation or ethical code is not a protective factor with regard to

industry sponsorship. There could be different explanations for this phenomenon: firstly, codes and regulations may not be stringent or effective enough to prevent - or at least manage - the COI. Secondly, there may be a lack of monitoring and vigilant enforcement of these guidelines once they are developed. It is also worth pointing out that we evaluated whether medical societies mentioned the issue of COI but didn't analyse how they conceived it, therefore there might be a different meaning for conflict of interest in their ethical codes or statutes. However, although it was not an objective of this study, it is worth emphasizing that in reviewing medical societies' statutes and ethical codes we generally found no clear definitions of COI and except for a few cases with very detailed regulation, there was usually a quite general reference to the issue.

Therefore, looking at the consequent behavior of medical societies (e.g. the private sponsorship of their conferences) the following question emerges: is there any perception that private sponsorship of a medical education event itself creates a conflict of interest? As several authors state, COI is a condition and not necessarily a behavior and the bias created by COI is often very subtle, unconscious and unintentional.[18] Using the medical education events as a case study, a growing amount of literature has shown that industry-sponsored educational events are biased toward the product of the sponsor and might influence physicians' prescribing habits.[19,20]. According to our data, it does not seem that the industry-sponsorship of societies' medical education events is perceived by these societies as a conflict of interest situation that might undermine their integrity and independence.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

336 *What can be done*

337 Public disclosure of financial relationships between physicians, medical societies, health care

338 providers and manufacturers is of course a needed step and we call upon our Government to

339 make it a mandatory requirement. However, in order to face such a problem we need to be bold

340 enough to rethink the whole relationship between physicians and industry. We understand this

341 will require a huge cultural change but it is time to start demythologizing some of the most

342 accepted paradigms like the idea that it is not possible to organize medical education events

343 without any industrial sponsorship.[21] There are already examples of medical societies who

344 have made interesting and bold attempts both at the national and at the international

345 level.[9,10,12] With regard to Italy, it is worth highlighting that the Pediatricians' Cultural

346 Association (Associazione Culturale Pediatri, ACP), the Italian Society of Migration Medicine

347 (Società Italiana Medicina delle Migrazioni, SIMM) and the Italian Secretariat of Medical

348 Students, the biggest association of Medical students in Italy, have adopted stringent ethical

349 codes on COI and have been organizing their annual conferences without industry-

350 sponsorship.[22-24] These few but extremely positive examples could provide a template for

351 other medical societies to transform their mode of operation and to “*reduce commercialism and*

352 *restore professionalism to our medical meetings*”.[8]

353

354 *Limitations*

355 Our study has a number of limitations. First of all, this is a cross-sectional study, and as so it is

356 not intended for establishing causal relationships. We can only describe the associations we

357 observed but we cannot exclude they are spurious, nor we can state whether industry sponsorship

358 is the result of the absence of an ethical code regulating COI or vice versa. Moreover, we

20

decided to rely only on information disclosed in the medical societies' websites without any further Internet searches, nor we performed a quality assessment of websites. It is possible that those who designed a low quality or not well structured website were more likely to underestimate the importance of publishing an ethical code or a statute, but actually had one, rather than those who set up a well structured or better updated website. Therefore we cannot exclude a certain amount of imprecision in our results. Moreover, we didn't quantify the proportion of funding given by industry on the total amount of funds, which could be an important indicator of their independence from the sponsor. Finally, in order to group the medical societies, we used the categorization provided by the Italian Ministry of Education, Universities and Research. The societies analysed in our survey cover a wide range of medical specialties and in particular, the societies belonging to the "service" category are quite heterogeneous (e.g. Public Health Societies, Anesthesiologists' or Radiology Societies). This heterogeneity may have affected some comparisons among the different categories and may have been responsible for the observed lower risk of industry sponsorship in the "services" category, where we grouped many societies, which probably base their existence on stronger ethical values.

CONCLUSIONS

The interaction between medical societies and industry has come under increasing scrutiny over the last decades. While recognizing the importance of appropriate forms of collaboration between physicians and pharmaceutical industries, we strongly believe that, as Schofferman states, the potential values of these collaborations do not mitigate their potential risks: these

relationships “are conflicted by their very nature and have the potential to create unconscious bias that might influence patient care”.[12]

We hope our analysis of the current Italian medical societies’ relationship with industry might be a first step in order to stimulate a reflection on this controversial issue in our country. In this perspective, we aim to use this survey as an advocacy tool for a debate that we, as residents and doctors in training, would like to launch among our medical societies.

388

389

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Sara Ferioli, Elena Garavelli, Morena Martinese, Antonius Soumelis and Giulia Silvestrini for their assistance in the data collection and their suggestions in the preparation of this manuscript. We especially thank Prof Barbara Mintzes (University of Sydney) for her useful comments on the first draft of the manuscript. We also thank Prof Marco Cosentino (University of Insubria), Dr Angelo Stefanini (University of Bologna), and Dr Adriano Cattaneo (Nograzie group) for their support and general counseling on the topic.

We also would like to acknowledge that the collaboration among the researchers involved in this project was facilitated by the Italian Medical Residents Committee of the Italian Society of Hygiene, Preventive Medicine and Public Health (S.It.I.). The Committee promotes professional, cultural and personal development of the Italian Medical Residents in Public Health and stimulates collaborations among the Italian postgraduate Schools.

402

403

CONTRIBUTORS

AF, DT, FN, AL, FG, AR conceived the study. AR designed the data collection tool and coordinated the data collection. FF, FG, DI, CL, ES, AR collected the data. GG, AR, AF planned the statistical analysis and GG analysed the data. AF, GG, AR wrote the first draft of the paper. DT, FN, AL contributed to the writing of the paper. All authors critically revised the manuscript and approved the final version. AF is guarantor.

FUNDING

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

COMPETING INTERESTS

All authors have completed the ICMJE disclosure form at www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf (available on request from the corresponding author) and declare: no support from any organisation for the submitted work; no financial relationships with any organisations that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous three years. DT, FF, DI, AR, GG, FG, ES are members of the Italian Society of Hygiene, Preventive Medicine and Public Health (S.It.I.). S.It.I is one of the medical societies that were evaluated in our research.

ETHICAL APPROVAL

Not required.

1
2
3 425
4
5
6 426 DATA SHARING
7
8
9
10 427 The dataset is available as Supplementary File.
11
12
13 428
14
15 429
16
17
18
19 430
20
21 431 REFERENCES
22
23 432
24
25
26 433 1.Rothman DJ, McDonald WJ, Berkowitz CD et al. Professional Medical Associations and Their
27
28 434 Relationships With Industry. A Proposal for Controlling Conflict of Interest.
29
30 435 JAMA2009;301(13):1367-1372.
31
32
33 436
34
35 437 2.Schofferman J. The Medical–Industrial Complex, Professional Medical Associations, and
36
37 438 Continuing Medical Education Pain Medicine2011; 12: 1713–1719.
38
39
40 439
41
42 440 3.Camilleri M, Parke DW 2nd. Perspective: Conflict of interest and professional organizations:
43
44 441 considerations and recommendations. Acad Med. 2010;85:85-91.
45
46
47 442
48
49 443 4.Lo B, Field M, editors. Institute of Medicine: Conflict of Interest in Medical Research,
50
51 444 Education, and Practice. Washington DC. The National Academies Press Institute of Medicine.
52
53
54 445 2009.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 446
- 447 5.Lexchin J. Interactions between physicians and the pharmaceutical industry: what does the
- 448 literature say? CMAJ.1993;149(10):1401-7.
- 449
- 450 6.Coyle SL. Physician–Industry Relations. Part 2: Organizational Issues. Ann Intern Med.
- 451 2002;136:403-406.
- 452 7.Dalsing MC. Industry working with physicians through professional medical associations. J
- 453 Vasc Surg. 2011;54:41S-6S.
- 454 8.Kassirer JP. Professional Societies and Industry Support: what is the quid pro quo?
- 455 Perspectives in Biology and Medicine. 2007; 50:7-17.
- 456 9.Hutchins JC, Rydell CM, Griggs RC, Sagsveen M, Bernat JL. American Academy of
- 457 Neurology policy on pharmaceutical and device industry support. Neurology. 2012;78;750-754 .
- 458 10.Minter RM, Angelos P, Coimbra R et al. Ethical Management of Conflict of Interest:
- 459 Proposed Standards for Academic Surgical Societies. J Am Coll Surg. 2011;213: 677–682.
- 460 11.Council for Medical Specialty Societies. Code for Interactions with Companies. April 2015.
- 461 Available: [http://107.180.5.136/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/CMSS-Code-for-Interactions-with-](http://107.180.5.136/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/CMSS-Code-for-Interactions-with-Companies-Approved-Revised-Version-4.13.15-with-Annotations-FINAL.pdf)
- 462 [Companies-Approved-Revised-Version-4.13.15-with-Annotations-FINAL.pdf](http://107.180.5.136/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/CMSS-Code-for-Interactions-with-Companies-Approved-Revised-Version-4.13.15-with-Annotations-FINAL.pdf)
- 463 12.Schofferman JA, Eskay-Auerbach ML, Sawyer LS, Herring SA, Arnold PM, Muehlbauer EJ.
- 464 Conflict of interest and professional medical associations: the North American Spine Society
- 465 experience. The Spine Journal. 2013;13: 974–979.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

13. Italian Federation of Medical-Scientific Societies (FISM). The FISM statute is available at:
http://www.fism.it/cm/navigatore.jhtml?param1_1=N116cd41e995b96df0aa. The complete list
of medical societies belonging to the Federation is available at:
http://www.fism.it/cm/navigatore.jhtml?param1_1=N1156174839debd2c050. (Accessed April,
28th 2015).

14. Italian Ministry of Education, Universities and Research. Bando per l'ammissione alle Scuole
di specializzazione in Medicina a.a. 2013/14. Available: [http://attiministeriali.miur.it/anno-](http://attiministeriali.miur.it/anno-2014/agosto/dm-08082014.aspx)
2014/agosto/dm-08082014.aspx (Accessed April, 28th 2015).

15. Barros AJD, Hirakata VN. Alternatives for logistic regression in cross-sectional studies: an
empirical comparison of models that directly estimate the prevalence ratio. BMC Medical
Research Methodology. 2003, 3:21.

16. Physician Payments Sunshine Provisions in Health Care Reform. Patient Protection and
Affordable care Act. 111 Congress HR 3590. 2010:111–48.

17. Loewenstein G, Sah S, Cain DM. The unintended consequences of conflict of interest
disclosure. JAMA. 2012;307:669–70.

18. Thompson D. Understanding financial conflict of interest. N Engl J Med. 1993;329:573-576.

19. Wilson B. Continuing medical education programs being placed under closer scrutiny.
CMAJ. 2010;182:E683–4.

20. Steinman M, Baron RB, Marlow B. Is continuing medical education a drug-promotion tool?
Can Fam Physician. 2007;53:1650–3.

- 1
2
3 486 21.Pisacane A. Rethinking continuing medical education. BMJ. 2008; 337; 490-91.
4
5
6
7 487 22.Associazione Culturale Pediatri, Impegno di autoregolamentazione nei rapporti con
8
9 488 l'industria. Approvato con emendamenti nell'Assemblea dei soci dell'11/10/2013. Available:
10
11 489 www.acp.it (Accessed April, 28th 2015).
12
13
14 490 23.Regolamento interno della Società Italiana di Medicina delle Migrazioni. Available:
15
16 491 http://www.simmweb.it/fileadmin/documenti/Simm_x_news/2012/2012.Regolamento_SIMM.pdf
17
18 492 f (Accessed April, 28th 2015).
19
20
21
22 493 24.Policy Statement. Rapporti fra SISM e case farmaceutiche. Approvato ed adottato dal XXXIX
23
24 494 Congresso Nazionale del SISM, 5 - 8 novembre 2009, Calanovella Mare, Messina. Available:
25
26 495 <http://www.nazionale.sism.org/la-nostra-policy> (Accessed April, 28th 2015).
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Number	Medical Societies	Categories	Presence of et	Logos on the	Annual Financia	Industry spons
1	Academy of Emergency	medical	absent	absent	absent	present
2	Associazione Dermatolo	medical	absent	absent	absent	present
3	Associazione Italiana di /	medical	absent	absent	absent	present
4	Associazione Italiana di (medical	absent	absent	absent	present
5	Associazione Italiana di (medical	absent	absent	present	missing
6	Associazione Italiana Ga	medical	missing	present	absent	missing
7	Associazione Italiana Ne	medical	absent	present	absent	present
8	Associazione Italiana Pe	medical	missing	missing	missing	missing
9	Associazione Italiana per	medical	absent	absent	absent	present
10	Associazione Italiana Pn	medical	absent	absent	absent	present
11	Associazione Italiana Ulc	medical	absent	absent	present	present
12	Associazione Medici Dial	medical	absent	absent	absent	present
13	Associazione Medici Enc	medical	absent	present	absent	present
14	Associazione Nazionale	medical	absent	absent	absent	present
15	Associazione Neurologic	medical	absent	absent	absent	present
16	Associazione Societa' Sc	medical	absent	absent	absent	missing
17	Collegio Reumatologi Os	medical	absent	absent	absent	missing
18	Federazione Centri per la	medical	absent	present	absent	present
19	Federazione Italiana Ass	medical	absent	present	absent	present
20	Federazione Italiana dell	medical	absent	absent	absent	present
21	Federazione Italiana Mex	medical	absent	absent	absent	missing
22	Gruppo Italiano per lo St	medical	absent	absent	absent	present
23	Gruppo Oncologico dell'I	medical	absent	present	absent	present
24	International Italian Socie	medical	absent	absent	absent	present
25	Lega Italiana contro l'Epi	medical	absent	absent	absent	absent
26	Societa' Italiana dell'Ipert	medical	absent	absent	absent	present
27	Societa' Italiana dell'Oste	medical	absent	absent	absent	present
28	Societa' Italiana di Allerg	medical	absent	absent	absent	missing
29	Societa' Italiana di Analis	medical	absent	present	absent	present
30	Societa' Italiana di Andro	medical	absent	absent	absent	present
31	Societa' Italiana di Cardic	medical	absent	present	absent	present
32	Societa' Italiana di Chem	medical	absent	absent	absent	present
33	Societa' Italiana di Derm:	medical	absent	absent	absent	present
34	Societa' Italiana di Derm:	medical	present	absent	absent	present
35	Societa' Italiana di Derm:	medical	absent	absent	absent	missing
36	Societa' Italiana di Diabe	medical	absent	present	absent	present
37	Societa' Italiana di Ecogr	services	absent	absent	absent	absent
38	Societa' Italiana di Emafe	services	absent	absent	absent	absent
39	Societa' Italiana di Ematr	medical	absent	present	absent	present
40	Societa' Italiana di Gastr	medical	absent	absent	absent	present
41	Societa' Italiana di Gerial	medical	absent	absent	absent	present
42	Societa' Italiana di Geror	medical	absent	absent	absent	present
43	Societa' Italiana di Malati	medical	absent	absent	absent	present
44	Societa' Italiana di Medic	medical	absent	present	absent	present
45	Societa' Italiana di Medic	medical	present	present	absent	present
46	Societa' Italiana di Medic	medical	absent	absent	present	absent
47	Societa' Italiana di Nefrol	medical	absent	absent	absent	present
48	Societa' Italiana di Neon:	medical	absent	absent	absent	present
49	Societa' Italiana di Neurc	medical	absent	absent	absent	present
50	Societa' Italiana di Omec	medical	absent	absent	absent	missing
51	Societa' Italiana di Pedia	medical	absent	present	absent	present

53	Societa' Italiana di Reum medical	absent	absent	absent	absent
54	Societa' Italiana per la Pr medical	absent	absent	absent	absent
55	Societa' Italiana per le M medical	absent	absent	absent	absent
56	Societa' Italiana per lo St medical	absent	absent	absent	absent
57	Societa' Italiana per lo St medical	absent	present	absent	present
58	Societa' Italiana Talassei medical	absent	absent	absent	present
60	Societa' Italiana di Endos medical	absent	present	absent	absent
61	Accademia Italiana di Str surgical	absent	absent	absent	present
62	Associazione Chirurghi C surgical	present	absent	absent	present
63	Associazione Italiana di (surgical	absent	absent	absent	present
64	Associazione Ostetrici G surgical	absent	absent	absent	present
65	Associazione Urologi Ital surgical	absent	absent	absent	present
66	Cenacolo Odontostomati surgical	absent	present	absent	present
67	Ortopedici Traumatologic surgical	absent	absent	absent	present
68	Societa' di Endoscopia C surgical	absent	present	absent	missing
69	Societa' Italiana di Angio surgical	absent	present	absent	missing
70	Societa' Italiana di Chirur surgical	absent	absent	absent	present
71	Societa' Italiana di Chirur surgical	absent	absent	present	absent
72	Societa' Italiana di Chirur surgical	absent	present	absent	present
73	Societa' Italiana di Chirur surgical	present	present	absent	present
74	Societa' Italiana di Chirur surgical	absent	absent	absent	present
75	Societa' Italiana di Chirur surgical	absent	absent	absent	missing
76	Societa' Italiana di Chirur surgical	absent	present	absent	absent
77	Societa' Italiana di Diagn surgical	missing	absent	absent	absent
78	Societa' Italiana di Ecogr surgical	absent	absent	absent	absent
79	Societa' Italiana di Endos surgical	absent	present	absent	absent
80	Societa' Italiana di Flebol surgical	absent	present	absent	present
81	Societa' Italiana di Ginec surgical	absent	present	absent	present
82	Societa' Italiana di Neurc surgical	absent	absent	present	present
83	Societa' Italiana di Oftaln surgical	absent	present	absent	absent
84	Societa' Italiana di Ortopi surgical	present	absent	absent	present
85	Societa' Italiana di Otorin surgical	absent	present	absent	missing
86	Societa' Italiana di Urodir surgical	absent	absent	absent	present
87	Societa' Italiana di Uroloq surgical	absent	present	absent	present
88	Societa' Oftalmologica Ita surgical	absent	absent	present	present
89	Associazione Scientifica medical	absent	absent	absent	absent
90	Societa' Nazionale di Agi medical	absent	absent	absent	present
91	Associazione Italiana di I services	absent	present	absent	absent
92	Associazione Italiana di I services	absent	present	absent	present
93	Associazione Italiana di I services	absent	absent	absent	present
94	Associazione Italiana di I services	absent	absent	absent	present
95	Associazione Italiana di I services	absent	absent	absent	absent
96	Associazione Italiana di I services	absent	present	absent	present
97	Associazione Italiana Dis services	absent	present	absent	present
98	Associazione Italiana Do services	absent	absent	absent	present
99	Associazione Medica Ital services	absent	absent	absent	present
100	Associazione Medico-Giu services	absent	present	absent	present
101	Associazione Microbioloq services	absent	absent	absent	present
102	Associazione Nazionale services	absent	absent	absent	missing
103	Associazione Nazionale services	absent	absent	absent	absent
104	Associazione Nazionale services	absent	absent	absent	absent
105	Centro Italiano di Sessuc services	absent	absent	absent	absent

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

106	Federazione delle Assoc services	absent	present	absent	present
107	Federazione Italiana dell services	absent	absent	absent	absent
108	Fondazione GIMBEwww services	absent	absent	absent	absent
109	Societa' Italiana Anestes services	absent	absent	absent	absent
110	Societa' Italiana di Agopi services	absent	absent	absent	absent
111	Societa' Italiana di Anest services	absent	absent	absent	present
112	Societa' italiana Audioolog services	absent	present	absent	present
113	Societa' Italiana di Biochi services	absent	absent	absent	present
114	Societa' italiana di citolog services	absent	absent	absent	absent
115	Societa' Italiana di Cure l services	absent	absent	absent	present
116	Societa' Italiana di Diagn surgical	absent	present	absent	present
117	Societa' Italiana di Farmæ services	absent	absent	present	present
118	Societa' Italiana di Igiene services	absent	absent	absent	absent
119	Societa' Italiana di Medic surgical	absent	absent	absent	present
120	Societa' Italiana di Medic medical	absent	absent	absent	absent
121	Societa' Italiana di Medic services	absent	absent	present	absent
122	Societa' Italiana di Medic services	absent	absent	absent	present
123	Societa' Italiana di Medic services	absent	present	absent	present
124	Societa' Italiana di Medic services	absent	absent	absent	present
125	Societa' Italiana di Nutriz services	absent	absent	absent	present
126	Societa' Italiana di Radio services	present	present	absent	present
127	Societa' Italiana di Riabili services	absent	absent	absent	present
128	Societa' Italiana di Tossic services	absent	absent	absent	absent
129	Societa' Italiana di Virolo services	absent	absent	absent	present
130	Societa' Italiana Multidisc services	absent	absent	absent	present
131	Societa' Italiana Sistemi services	absent	absent	absent	present
132	Societa' Scientifica Italiar services	absent	present	absent	absent
133	Societa' Scienze Farmac services	absent	absent	absent	absent

Year last a	Industry sponsor	Statute mentionin	Industry sponsorship in the program of the last annual conference
2013	assente	absent	present
2014	assente	missing	present
2014	presente	present	present
2013	presente	present	present
missing	missing	absent	missing
missing	missing	missing	missing
2013	assente	present	present
missing	missing	missing	missing
2013	presente	present	present
2013	assente	present	present
2013	presente	present	present
2013	presente	absent	present
2013	presente	absent	present
2014	presente	present	present
2012	presente	absent	present
missing	missing	present	missing
missing	missing	present	missing
2013	presente	absent	present
2014	presente	absent	present
missing	assente	absent	present
missing	missing	absent	missing
2013	presente	absent	present
2013	presente	absent	present
2013	presente	present	present
2014	assente	present	absent
2013	presente	present	present
2013	presente	present	present
missing	missing	absent	missing
2013	assente	absent	present
2014	presente	present	present
2013	presente	present	present
2014	assente	absent	present
2013	assente	absent	present
2014	presente	absent	present
missing	missing	absent	missing
2014	presente	present	present
2013	presente	present	present
2013	assente	absent	absent
2013	presente	present	present
2014	assente	absent	present
2014	presente	present	present
2013	assente	present	present
2012	assente	missing	present
2013	presente	present	present
2012	assente	present	present
2014	assente	absent	absent
2013	assente	present	present
2013	assente	present	present
2013	assente	absent	present
missing	assente	absent	missing
2014	assente	present	present

1			
2			
3			
4	2014	assente	present
5	2014	assente	present
6	2014	assente	present
7	2014	presente	present
8	2013	assente	present
9	2013	assente	absent
10	2014	assente	absent
11	2014	assente	present
12	2013	presente	absent
13	2014	presente	present
14	2014	assente	absent
15	2014	presente	absent
16	2014	assente	present
17	2014	assente	present
18	2013	assente	missing
19	missing	assente	absent
20	2013	assente	absent
21	2013	assente	present
22	2014	assente	absent
23	2014	assente	absent
24	2014	assente	present
25	2014	assente	present
26	2013	assente	absent
27	2014	assente	present
28	2013	assente	absent
29	2014	assente	absent
30	2014	assente	absent
31	2014	assente	missing
32	2014	presente	absent
33	2014	assente	present
34	2014	assente	absent
35	2014	assente	absent
36	2014	assente	present
37	2014	assente	present
38	2014	presente	present
39	2013	assente	absent
40	2013	presente	present
41	2013	assente	present
42	2013	assente	present
43	2012	assente	absent
44	2013	presente	present
45	2013	presente	present
46	2013	presente	absent
47	2013	assente	absent
48	2013	presente	present
49	2013	assente	missing
50	2014	assente	present
51	2012	assente	missing
52	2013	assente	missing
53	2013	presente	absent
54	missing	missing	missing
55	2013	assente	absent
56	2013	assente	absent
57	2010	assente	present
58			
59			
60			

2013	presente	absent	present
2013	assente	missing	absent
2014	assente	absent	absent
2012	assente	absent	absent
2013	assente	absent	absent
2013	presente	present	present
2013	presente	present	present
2013	presente	present	present
2011	assente	present	absent
2013	presente	absent	present
2011	assente	present	present
2013	presente	present	present
2013	presente	present	present
2013	presente	missing	present
2013	assente	present	absent
2013	assente	absent	absent
2013	presente	present	present
2013	assente	absent	present
2013	presente	present	present
2013	presente	absent	present
2012	presente	present	present
2013	assente	present	present
2012	assente	absent	absent
2012	assente	absent	present
2012	assente	absent	present
2013	assente	absent	present
2013	assente	missing	absent
2014	assente	absent	absent

1
2
3 either/or of satellite symposia
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

BMJ Open

Conflict of interest between Professional Medical Societies and industry: a cross-sectional study of Italian Medical Societies' websites

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2016-011124.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	15-Mar-2016
Complete List of Authors:	<p>Fabbri, Alice; Università degli Studi dell'Insubria, Centre of Research in Medical Pharmacology; Università degli Studi di Bologna, Centre for International Health, Department of Medical and Surgical Sciences</p> <p>Gregoraci, Giorgia; Università degli Studi di Udine, Institute of Hygiene and Clinical Epidemiology, Department of Medical and Biological Sciences</p> <p>Tedesco, Dario; Università degli Studi di Bologna Dipartimento di Scienze Biomediche e NeuroMotorie; Italian Medical Residents Committee of the Italian Society of Hygiene, Preventive Medicine and Public Health (S.It.I.)</p> <p>Ferretti, Filippo; Università degli Studi di Roma La Sapienza, Department of Public Health and Infectious Diseases; Italian Medical Residents Committee of the Italian Society of Hygiene, Preventive Medicine and Public Health (S.It.I.)</p> <p>Gilardi, Francesco; Università degli Studi di Roma Tor Vergata, Department of Biomedicine and Prevention; Italian Medical Residents Committee of the Italian Society of Hygiene, Preventive Medicine and Public Health (S.It.I.)</p> <p>Iemmi, Diego; Università degli Studi di Milano, Department of Biomedical Sciences for Health; Italian Medical Residents Committee of the Italian Society of Hygiene, Preventive Medicine and Public Health (S.It.I.)</p> <p>Lisi, Cosima; Università degli Studi di Roma La Sapienza, Department of Public Health and Infectious Diseases</p> <p>Lorusso, Angelo; Università degli Studi di Bologna, Centre for International Health, Department of Medical and Surgical Sciences</p> <p>Natali, Francesca; Università degli Studi di Bologna, Centre for International Health, Department of Medical and Surgical Sciences</p> <p>Shahi, Edit; Università degli Studi di Milano, Department of Biomedical Sciences for Health; Italian Medical Residents Committee of the Italian Society of Hygiene, Preventive Medicine and Public Health (S.It.I.)</p> <p>Rinaldi, Alessandro; Università degli Studi di Roma La Sapienza, Department of Public Health and Infectious Diseases; Italian Medical Residents Committee of the Italian Society of Hygiene, Preventive Medicine and Public Health (S.It.I.)</p>
Primary Subject Heading:	Public health
Secondary Subject Heading:	Health policy, Ethics
Keywords:	Conflict of interest, Pharmaceutical industry, Medical Societies



For peer review only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

**Conflict of interest between Professional Medical Societies and industry:
a cross-sectional study of Italian Medical Societies' websites**

Authors

Alice Fabbri^{1,2}, Giorgia Gregoraci³, Dario Tedesco^{4,5}, Filippo Ferretti^{5,6}, Francesco Gilardi^{5,7},
Diego Iemmi^{5,8}, Cosima Lisi⁶, Angelo Lorusso², Francesca Natali², Edit Shahi^{5,8}, Alessandro
Rinaldi^{5,6}

1. Centre of Research in Medical Pharmacology, University of Insubria, Varese, Italy
2. Centre for International Health, Department of Medical and Surgical Sciences, University of
Bologna, Bologna, Italy
3. Institute of Hygiene and Clinical Epidemiology, Department of Medical and Biological Sciences,
University of Udine, Udine, Italy
4. Department of Biomedical and NeuroMotor Science, University of Bologna, Bologna, Italy
5. Italian Medical Residents Committee of the Italian Society of Hygiene, Preventive Medicine and
Public Health (S.It.I.)
6. Department of Public Health and Infectious Diseases, La Sapienza University, Rome, Italy
7. Department of Biomedicine and Prevention, University of Rome Tor Vergata, Rome, Italy
8. Department of Biomedical Sciences for Health, University of Milan, Milan, Italy

1
2
3 23 **Corresponding author**

4
5
6
7 24 Alice Fabbri, MD

8
9
10 25 Centre of Research in Medical Pharmacology, University of Insubria, Viale Ottorino Rossi, Varese,
11
12 26 Italy.

13
14
15
16 27 E-mail: afabbri@studenti.uninsubria.it; alealifab@gmail.com

17
18
19
20 28 Telephone: +39 3489154907

21
22
23 29

24
25
26
27 30 Keywords: conflict of interest, medical societies, pharmaceutical industry

28
29
30 31 Word count: 4044

31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT

Objective To describe how Italian medical societies interact with pharmaceutical and medical device industries through an analysis of the information available on their websites.

Design Cross sectional study.

Setting Italy.

Participants One hundred and fifty-four medical societies registered with the Italian Federation of Medical-Scientific Societies.

Main outcome measures Indicators of industry sponsorship (presence of industry sponsorship in the program of the last medical societies' annual conference; presence of manufacturers' logos on the homepage; presence of industry sponsorship of satellite symposia during the last annual conference).

Results One hundred and thirty-one Italian medical societies were considered. Of these, 4.6% had an ethical code covering relationships with industry on their websites, while 45.6% had a statute that mentioned the issue of conflict of interest, and 6.1% published the annual financial report. With regard to industry sponsorship, 64.9% received private sponsorship for their last conference, 29.0% had manufacturers' logos on their webpage, while 35.9% had industry-sponsored satellite symposia at their last conference. The presence of an ethical code on the societies' websites was associated with both an increased risk of industry sponsorship of the last conference (RR 1.22, 95% CIs 1.01 to 1.48 after adjustment) and of conferences either/or satellite symposia (RR 1.22, 95% CIs 1.02 to 1.48 after adjustment) but not with the presence of manufacturers' logos on the websites (RR 1.79, 95% CIs 0.66 to 4.82 after adjustment). No association was observed with the other indicators of governance and transparency.

Conclusions This survey shows that industry sponsorship of Italian medical societies' conferences is common, while the presence of a structured regulatory system is not. Disclosure of the amount of industry funding to medical societies is scarce. The level of transparency therefore needs to be improved and the whole relationship between medical societies and industry should be further disciplined in order to avoid any potential for conflict of interest.

STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

- To our knowledge, this is one of the first assessments of the relationship between Italian medical societies and pharmaceutical and medical device industries.
- A systematic approach was used to explore the medical societies' websites; data on societies' policies on governance and transparency were independently collected by two coders.
- With regard to the limitations, we relied only on information disclosed in the medical societies' websites without any further Internet searches, nor we performed a quality assessment of websites.
- The study has an Italian focus and we acknowledge that an international comparison would have been fundamental in order to ensure generalizability to our findings.

INTRODUCTION

Professional Medical Societies play an important role in advancing the quality of medical care through the development of clinical practice guidelines that shape clinical practice, dissemination of information through the publication or sponsorship of a journal, funding of research projects and the organization of educational conferences and continuing medical education (CME) events.[1,2] Moreover, medical societies advocate for the interest of their practitioners as the “voice of the profession”. [3]

Both pharmaceutical and medical device industries extensively fund several activities carried out by medical societies.[1,2] Industries especially subsidize annual meetings and CME events, purchasing advertising spaces, funding physicians’ attendance to these courses and sometimes, as the Institute of Medicine (IOM) points out, influencing the “choice of topics and content”. [4]

During the past decades, an extensive literature has investigated the relationship between physicians and both pharmaceutical and medical device industries and has shown that some kinds of interaction could unduly influence professional judgments leading to the potential for bias and conflict of interest (COI).[4,5] A growing body of literature has also investigated the issue of conflict of interest applied to medical societies rather than to individual physicians and some researchers have made important recommendations for change.[1-3,6-8] Particularly, strong recommendations have been made with regard to industry sponsorship of congresses due to the possibility for the sponsor to bias the educational content of the event thus influencing doctors’ prescribing habits.[1] Changes have been proposed also for the organisation of satellite symposia: current recommendations suggest to clearly mark them as industry sponsored sessions and keep them separated both in space and time from the main event they parallel.[1] Following these recommendations, several medical societies have adopted specific institutional policies

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

governing their relationships with industry.[9-12] However, these are mainly US-based articles and case studies while little is known about the relationships between industry and medical societies in Europe, and particularly in Italy where this topic is still quite a grey area of research. To our knowledge, only one study recently published has investigated the level of transparency of Italian medical societies, focusing on obstetrical and gynaecological associations. Vercellini and colleagues found out that transparency regarding sponsorship and competing interests was almost non existent.[13]

The present study aims at describing how Italian medical societies interact with pharmaceutical and medical device industries through an analysis of the information available on their websites. In particular we aim to provide a description of the societies’ policies on transparency and governance and of the extent of industry sponsorship on their activities. Furthermore, we explore possible associations between medical societies’ policies on transparency and governance and their practices in terms of industry sponsorship of educational events.

METHODS

Study design and data collection

In order to explore the relationship between Italian medical societies and pharmaceutical and medical device industries, we carried out a cross-sectional study. We searched the websites of all medical societies registered with the Italian Federation of Medical-Scientific Societies (FISM) between January and September 2014. The Federation includes societies operating in the medical or scientific field that are involved in research or professional medical education activities and have been operating in Italy at the national level for at least 3 years.[14] It is also worth

mentioning that Italian medical societies are regulated by a Law Decree approved by the Ministry of Health in May 2004.[15] These are some of the criteria Italian medical societies need to meet in order to be officially recognised by the Ministry of Health:

- operating at the national level and physically present in at least 12 Italian regions;
- representing at least 30% of the health professionals working in that particular field;
- being a non-profit organisation;
- presence of a statute;
- organization of CME activities, collaboration with the Ministry of Health, funding of research projects, development of guidelines in collaboration with other institutions being listed among the main activities of the society.

From each medical societies website we collected the following information (yes/no questions):

- whether the medical societies' statute mentioned the issue of COI (by statute we meant the official document that contains the rules of conduct of the society, describes its organizational structure and states its purposes);
- the presence of an ethical code, defined as a document specifically developed to regulate medical societies' behavior in case of industry sponsorship;
- the publication of the annual financial report on the website;
- the presence of pharmaceutical or medical device companies' logos on the homepage;
- the presence of pharmaceutical or medical device industry sponsorship in the program of the last medical societies' annual conference;
- the presence of industry sponsorship of satellite symposia during the last annual conference.

With regard to the last two criteria, by last annual conference we meant an event that had been organized within the previous 12 months; this was also considered a proxy of how updated the websites were. In order to define industry sponsorship we looked at whether the manufacturers' names and/or logos were explicitly listed as "sponsors" in the program of the conference. Data were independently extracted by five trained medical residents in Public Health and one trained Medical student, with duplicate independent coding of all data. A systematic approach was used to explore the websites and collect data on the medical societies' policies on governance and transparency. After the data collection, coders met to resolve disagreements and reach consensus. Statistical analyses were performed using the final information obtained after consensus. All analyses were performed using Stata 12.1 SE.

Statistical analyses

Our main purpose was to provide a detailed descriptive analysis of the relationship between Italian medical societies and the pharmaceutical and medical device industries. Categorical variables were described using frequency tables. Cross tabulations were performed for evaluating possible associations between industry sponsorship in the program of the last congress, industry sponsorship of satellite symposia and presence of manufacturers' logos on medical societies' websites using chi-square or Fisher exact test, as appropriate.

As a second step, we aimed to explore the relationship between medical societies' regulatory systems in terms of policies on governance and transparency (i.e. the presence of an ethical code, the presence of a statute covering relations with industry, the publication of the annual financial report on the website) and their actual behaviors. Our main outcome was the presence of pharmaceutical or medical device industry sponsorship in the program of the last annual

1
2
3 167 conference. Moreover, while recognizing that the conference sponsorship might be considered a
4
5 168 stronger sign of corporate influence, satellite symposia - whether not sufficiently regulated as
6
7
8 169 proposed by Rothman - might as well undermine the scientific integrity of the main meeting they
9
10
11 170 parallel.[1] Therefore we performed sensitivity analyses evaluating the combined outcome of
12
13 171 having industry sponsorship in the program of the last annual conference either/or of satellite
14
15 172 symposia.

16
17
18 173 As a secondary outcome we explored the relationship between medical societies' regulatory
19
20 174 systems and the presence of industry logos on medical societies' websites. Possible predictors
21
22 175 were the presence of an ethical code, of a statute regulating COI and the publication of the
23
24 176 annual financial report on the website.

25
26
27 177 Medical societies were divided into three main categories (surgical – those for which the main
28
29 178 activity is a surgical intervention on the patient, i.e. cardio-surgery; clinical – those for which the
30
31 179 main activity is to provide non-surgical treatment to the patients, i.e. cardiology; services – those
32
33
34 180 for which the main activity is to support/make possible the activities of the previous areas, i.e.
35
36 181 radiology, hygiene and public health, forensic medicine), according to the official definition
37
38 182 provided by the Italian Ministry of Education, Universities and Research [16], which was used as
39
40 183 adjustment variable (categorical) together with the societies' dimension (continuous). We
41
42 184 performed stratified analyses within each specialty in order to identify possible differences
43
44
45 185 between the three groups. Our hypothesis was that pharmaceutical and medical device industries
46
47 186 would target their marketing activities to certain medical specialties more than others, for
48
49 187 example the societies belonging to the clinical and surgical specialties - where doctors have more
50
51 188 prescribing power - might have more financial ties with manufacturers compared to the service
52
53
54 189 category.

Because of the high prevalence of industry sponsorship in the program of the last annual conference, we used Poisson regression to estimate relative risks.[17] Results are presented as RR with 95% CI.

RESULTS

A detailed description of the medical societies included in the survey can be found in Table 1.

Table 1. Description of Professional Medical Societies included in the survey

	<i>All sample (n=131)</i>	<i>Only services (n=42)</i>	<i>Only medical (n=59)</i>	<i>Only surgical (n=30)</i>
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Transparency and governance				
Ethical code covering relations with industry	6 (4.6)	1 (2.4)	2 (3.4)	3 (10.0)
Statute covering relations with industry	60 (45.8)	16 (38.1)	32 (54.2)	12 (40.0)
Annual financial report on website	8 (6.1)	2 (4.8)	3 (5.1)	3 (10.0)
Industry sponsorship				
Manufacturers' logos on the	38 (29.0)	10 (23.8)	15 (25.4)	13 (43.3)

website				
Industry sponsorship in the program of the last annual conference	85 (64.9)	24 (57.1)	41 (69.5)	20 (66.7)
Industry sponsorship of satellite symposia	47 (35.9)	17 (40.5)	23 (39.0)	7 (23.3)
Industry sponsorship in the program of the last annual conference OR satellite symposia	88 (67.2)	26 (61.9)	42 (71.2)	20 (66.7)
Dimension				
<500 affiliates	55 (42.0)	19 (45.2)	18 (30.5)	18 (60.0)
501-1000 affiliates	20 (15.3)	6 (14.3)	13 (22.0)	1 (3.3)
1001-2000 affiliates	19 (14.5)	7 (16.7)	12 (20.3)	0 (0.0)
2001-4000 affiliates	11 (8.4)	4 (9.5)	2 (3.4)	5 (16.7)
>4000 affiliates	8 (13.7)	1 (2.4)	4 (6.7)	3 (10.0)

199

200

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Type of societies

In 2013, 154 Medical Societies were registered with FISM, 23 of which were excluded from our analysis because information on the outcome was not available (i.e. the website was not accessible or it was not possible to retrieve a detailed program of the last annual conference). No differences were observed between the included and the excluded societies ($p=0.565$ for the type of society, $p=1.000$ for the presence of an ethical code, $p=0.600$ for the presence of the annual financial report on their website, $p=0.334$ for the presence of manufacturers' logos on their website, $p=0.251$ for the society dimension. Because of the absence of the program of the last annual conference, neither this outcome nor the presence of industry-sponsored satellite symposia could be tested). With regard to the 131 medical societies included in our study, 42 (32.1%) were from the services, 59 (45.0%) from the clinical and 30 (22.9%) from the surgical area. A detailed description of the medical specialties represented in each group is provided in Supplementary File 2. With regard to the dimension, 57.3% of the societies had less than 1000 affiliates.

Transparency and governance

Only 4.6% of the medical societies had an ethical code covering relations with industry on their websites, while less than half (45.6%) of the statutes mentioned the issue of COI, and only 6.1% published the annual financial report.

Industry sponsorship

Almost one third (29.0%) of medical societies had manufacturers' logos on their webpage, with the highest frequency registered in the surgical category (43.3%). Two thirds (67.7%) of medical

societies had either their last conference or satellite symposia sponsored by industry; in particular 64.9% of these had industry sponsorship of their last conference, while 35.9% had industry-sponsored satellite symposia at their last conference. Satellite symposia were always organized within the conference, and were held either in series or parallel to the main session. This means there was no clear separation in time, as mentioned by Rothman.[1] As for the separation in space, in most cases it was impossible to retrieve this information from the conference program, since locations were not always listed.

We observed an association between having industry sponsorship of the last conference and of satellite symposia (chi-square test: $p < 0.0001$), but not between having a private sponsorship of the last conference and the presence of manufacturers' logos on the websites ($p = 0.132$).

Relationship between medical societies' policies and funding of annual meetings

Table 2 summarizes the findings of an exploratory analysis on the association between medical societies' policies on transparency and governance and the industry sponsorship of their last annual conference.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

243 Table 2. Relative risks of having pharmaceutical or medical device industry sponsorship in the
244 program of the last medical societies’ annual conference
245

	Main model		Stratified analysis					
	All sample (n=131)		Only services (n=42)		Only clinical (n=59)		Only surgical (n=30)	
	crude RR	adjusted RR	crude RR	adjusted RR	crude RR	adjusted RR	crude RR	adjusted RR
Ethical code	1.39 (1.23-1.57)	1.22 (1.01-1.48)	1.74 (1.33-2.28)	0.66 (0.42-1.04)	1.23 (1.07-1.41)	1.28 (1.04-1.59)	1.29 (1.03-1.63)	1.33 (0.88-2.01)
Statute	1.16 (0.91-1.47)	1.17 (0.89-1.53)	1.67 (0.94-2.94)	1.48 (0.81-2.70)	0.86 (0.67-1.12)	0.86 (0.59-1.23)	1.18 (0.74-1.89)	1.28 (0.74-2.19)
No annual financial report on website	1.29 (0.67-2.48)	1.22 (0.72-2.08)	1.28 (0.31-.32)	1.80 (0.65-4.94)	1.71 (0.42-6.96)	1.65 (0.33-8.19)	1.17 (0.50-2.73)	0.95 (0.67-1.32)
Dimension of society	1.14 (1.06-1.22)	1.13 (1.05-1.21)	1.29 (1.09-1.53)	1.28 (1.02-1.61)	1.09 (0.98-1.21)	1.11 (0.01-6.03)	1.08 (0.99-1.18)	1.08 (0.25-1.67)
Type of society								
Services	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-

Clinical	1.40 (1.05-1.87)	1.22 (0.89-1.78)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Surgical	1.31 (0.94-1.84)	1.32 (0.94-1.84)	-	-	-	-	-	-

Within the whole sample, interestingly the presence of an ethical code on the societies' websites was associated with an increased risk of industry sponsorship of the last conference (crude RR 1.39, 95% CIs 1.23 to 1.57; RR 1.22, 95% CIs 1.01 to 1.48 after adjustment). The presence of a statute covering relations with industry showed no association with the risk of having the last conference sponsored by industry when looking at both the crude (RR 1.16, 95%CIs 0.91 to 1.47) and the adjusted RR (1.17, 95% CIs 0.89 to 1.53). The absence of the annual financial report on the website did not show any association with industry sponsorship of the last conference either (crude RR 1.29, 95%CIs 0.67 to 2.48; adjusted RR 1.22, 95% CIs 0.72 to 2.08). Interestingly the society dimension was associated with an increased risk of industry sponsorship of the last conference (crude RR 1.14, 95% CIs 1.06 to 1.22; RR 1.13, 95% CIs 1.05 to 1.21 after adjustment), while no association was observed with the type of society.

Finally, we observed no specific pattern between the presence of a statute covering relations with industry, the presence of an ethical code, or financial transparency, and the risk of industry sponsorship within each type of society, despite finding an increased risk of industry sponsorship

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

associated with the presence of an ethical code within the clinical group.

When we repeated the analysis using the composite outcome “private sponsorship of the last conference or satellite symposia”, no major differences were observed (Supplementary File 1).

Relationship between medical societies’ policies and presence of manufacturers’ logos on the website

Table 3 shows the results of an exploratory analysis on the association between medical societies’ policies on transparency and governance and the presence of manufacturers’ logos on their websites. No association with presence of manufacturers’ logos was observed either in presence of an ethical code or of a statute covering relations with industry.

Table 3. Relative risks of having manufacturers’ logos on medical societies’ websites.

	Main model		Stratified analysis					
Ethical code	All sample (n=131)		Only services (n=42)		Only clinical (n=59)		Only surgical (n=30)	
	crude RR	adjusted RR	crude RR	adjusted RR	crude RR	adjusted RR	crude RR	adjusted RR
	1.79 (0.76-4.21)	1.79 (0.66-4.82)	2.27 (0.49-9.93)	10.52 (0.53-206.83)	2.11 (0.48-9.27)	2.72 (0.61-12.19)	0.72 (0.13-3.88)	0.92 (0.27-3.14)
Statute	0.97 (0.53-1.75)	1.21 (0.62-2.35)	1.67 (0.42-6.52)	1.64 (0.31-8.59)	0.96 (0.38-2.41)	1.16 (0.33-4.07)	0.71 (0.27-1.91)	0.84 (0.33-2.12)

No annual financial report on website	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC
Dimension of society	0.96 (0.77-1.19)	0.92 (0.72-1.19)	1.03 (0.69-1.55)	0.74 (0.28-1.96)	1.19 (0.83-1.69)	1.27 (0.84-1.91)	0.78 (0.56-1.09)	0.74 (0.27-3.13)	
Type of society									
Services	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Clinical	1.09 (1.54-2.18)	1.97 (0.41-2.32)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Surgical	1.82 (0.92-3.60)	1.99 (0.89-4.43)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

NC: non calculable because of 0 count cells: no societies with an available annual financial report showed a logo on their website.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

DISCUSSION

To our knowledge, this is one of the first assessments of the relationship between Italian medical societies and pharmaceutical and medical device industries. We provided an overview of the type of industry support and of the policies implemented by medical societies in order to face the issue of COI, showing how common is the industry sponsorship of medical events and how uncommon is the presence of a structured regulatory system.

Transparency

According to the data presented in Table 1, there seems to be a general lack of transparency: only 6.1% of all the societies included in our study shared information on their financing. Since medical societies are not required to disclose this information, the amount of industry funding is often unknown. Full disclosure and complete transparency in the relationship between industry and medical societies is a fundamental step for the credibility of both of them and the USA Physician Payments Sunshine Act sets an interesting precedent.[18] Italy does not currently have transparency laws that are similar to the Sunshine Act. However, it is worth noticing that the European Federation of Pharmaceutical Industries and Associations (EFPIA), the representative body of the pharmaceutical industry in Europe, adopted a “Disclosure Code” in 2013.[19] According to the Code, starting from 2016 EFPIA member companies will make public details of certain payments made to healthcare professionals and healthcare organisations. While supporters of industry self-regulation welcome this effort, some authors point out that self-regulatory transparency measures might be a tactic the pharmaceutical industry is pursuing to prevent government-imposed transparency.[20] We therefore urge Italian governmental agencies

to require a public disclosure of manufacturers' funding to physicians, medical societies and health care providers and strictly monitor the completeness, accuracy and accessibility of the information provided.

However, even if transparency is the main strategy internationally adopted to face the issue of COI, it seems to have some limits. According to our data, even when medical societies are more transparent this doesn't seem to be associated with a decreased level of industry sponsorship of their conferences (see the following paragraph for further discussion on the relationship between policies and practices). This leads to a reflection on the limits of the strategies to address COI that focus merely on transparency. Even if the disclosure makes others aware of the presence of a COI, it doesn't seem to be a sufficient protection and according to some authors, it might also have "significant adverse effects" through several mechanisms such as creating the wrong feeling that once the COI is declared, there is no need to manage it.[12,21] As Loewenstein points out, the issue to be considered "should not be whether to disclose but how to ensure that disclosure has its intended effects".[21]

Relationship between policies and practices

We conducted an exploratory analysis on the association between medical societies' policies and their consequent behaviors in terms of industry sponsorship in the program of the last annual conference and presence of manufacturers' logos on their websites. We found that the presence of an ethical code on the societies' websites is associated with both an increased risk of industry sponsorship of the last conference and of conferences either/or satellite symposia but not with the presence of manufacturers' logos on the websites. No association was observed with the other indicators of governance and transparency.

1
2
3 325 There could be two different interpretations of these data and due to the cross-sectional nature of
4
5
6 326 our study that is not meant to establish causal relationships, none of them can be excluded.
7
8 327 On one hand, it seems that the societies with higher level of industry sponsorship of their
9
10 328 conferences are more likely to have ethical codes, and this might be expected because having
11
12 329 these relationships with manufacturers, they could feel a need to govern them. Therefore, the
13
14 330 regulation might be a consequence of their relationship with industry. However, another possible
15
16 331 explanation might be that the societies with an ethical code tend to be more transparent, and thus
17
18 332 are more likely to disclose industry sponsorship when it actually occurs.
19
20 333 Whatever the direction, it seems that the presence of a regulation or ethical code does not
21
22 334 decrease the level of industry sponsorship. There could be different explanations for this
23
24 335 phenomenon: firstly, codes and regulations may not be stringent or effective enough to prevent -
25
26 336 or at least manage - the COI. Secondly, there may be a lack of monitoring and vigilant
27
28 337 enforcement of these guidelines once they are developed. It is also worth pointing out that we
29
30 338 evaluated whether medical societies mentioned the issue of COI but did not analyse how they
31
32 339 conceived it, therefore there might be different definitions of conflict of interest in their ethical
33
34 340 codes or statutes. However, although it was not an objective of this study, it is worth
35
36 341 emphasizing that in reviewing medical societies' statutes and ethical codes we generally found
37
38 342 no clear definitions of COI and except for a few cases with very detailed regulation, there was
39
40 343 usually a quite general reference to the issue.
41
42 344 Looking at the actual behavior of medical societies, namely how common is the industry
43
44 345 sponsorship of their conferences, it is worth questioning whether there is any perception that
45
46 346 industry sponsorship of an educational event itself creates a conflict of interest. As several
47
48 347 authors state, COI is a condition and not necessarily a behavior and the bias created by COI is

often very subtle, unconscious and unintentional.[22] A growing amount of literature has also shown that industry-sponsored educational events are biased toward the product of the sponsor and might influence physicians' prescribing habits.[23,24]. Looking at how common is the industry sponsorship of medical events in our sample, it does not seem that this is perceived as a conflict of interest situation that might undermine the integrity and independence of medical societies.

Finally, our initial hypothesis that societies in the services field might be less prone to industry-sponsorship was not confirmed. According to our data, the number of society members is a more important determinant of industry sponsorship of medical events, as might be expected because it provides a larger target audience.

What can be done

Public disclosure of financial relationships between physicians, medical societies, health care providers and manufacturers is of course a needed step and we call upon our Government to make it a mandatory requirement. However, in order to face such a problem we need to be bold enough to rethink the whole relationship between physicians, medical societies and industry.

Several proposals and recommendations have already been made, from total ban on manufacturers' funding, to thresholds for the level of industry sponsorship that can be considered acceptable, to pooled funds administered through a central repository.[1,12] With regard to educational events, committees in charge of program content should be completely free of financial ties to industry, no manufacturers' logos should appear on the conference materials, and conference organizers should clearly label any industry-sponsored symposia.[1]

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

371 We recognize that all these proposals - both the softer and the more stringent ones - will require a
372 huge cultural change but it is time to start demythologizing some of the most accepted paradigms
373 like the idea that it is not possible to organize medical education events without any industrial
374 sponsorship.[25] There are already examples of medical societies who have made interesting and
375 bold attempts both at the national and at the international level.[9,10,12] With regard to Italy, it
376 is worth highlighting that the Pediatricians' Cultural Association (Associazione Culturale
377 Pediatri, ACP), the Italian Society of Migration Medicine (Società Italiana Medicina delle
378 Migrazioni, SIMM) and the Italian Secretariat of Medical Students (Segretariato Italiano
379 Studenti di Medicina, SISM), the biggest association of Medical students in Italy, have adopted
380 stringent ethical codes on COI and have been organizing their annual conferences without
381 industry-sponsorship.[26-28] These few but extremely positive examples could provide a
382 template for other medical societies to transform their mode of operation and to “*reduce*
383 *commercialism and restore professionalism to our medical meetings*”.[8]

385 *Limitations*

386 Our study has a number of limitations. First of all, this is a cross-sectional study, and as so it is
387 not intended for establishing causal relationships. We can only describe the associations we
388 observed but we cannot exclude they are spurious, nor we can state whether industry sponsorship
389 is the result of the absence of an ethical code regulating COI or vice versa. Moreover, we
390 decided to rely only on information disclosed in the medical societies' websites without any
391 further Internet searches, nor we performed a quality assessment of websites. It is possible that
392 those who designed a low quality or not well structured website were more likely to
393 underestimate the importance of publishing an ethical code or a statute, but actually had one,

rather than those who set up a well structured or better updated website. Therefore we cannot exclude a certain amount of imprecision in our results. Moreover, we didn't quantify the proportion of funding given by industry on the total amount of funds, which could be an important indicator of their independence from the sponsor. Also, in order to group the medical societies, we used the categorization provided by the Italian Ministry of Education, Universities and Research. As previously mentioned, our hypothesis was that the influence of pharmaceutical and medical device industries may be stronger on those societies where the prescribing power of doctors is higher (i.e. clinical and surgical specialties). However, this was not confirmed. Finally, the results of our exploratory analyses (Tables 2, 3 and Supplementary File 1) are somewhere heterogeneous. It seems like the presence of regulations (e.g. the ethical code) has a certain association with industry sponsorship of annual conferences (Table 2) and with the organization of industry-funded conferences either/or satellite symposia (Supplementary File 1), but not with the presence of manufacturers' logos on societies websites (Table 3). It might be that showing manufacturers' logos is not perceived as a possible source of COI, and is therefore not regulated, or conversely since it is not regulated, there is no perceived need to eliminate the logos from the websites. We think this point requires further investigation in order to examine the kinds of financial relationships that may be hidden behind the presence of manufacturers' logos on medical societies' websites.

With regard to the generalizability, our study focused on Italian medical societies, and particularly only on those affiliated to the Italian Federation of Medical-Scientific Societies. It is possible that these societies are more virtuous than those not affiliated to the Federation, or the other way round, therefore we cannot conclude that this situation is common to all Italian medical societies. However, Italian medical societies voluntarily decide to become members of

the Federation, therefore we are quite confident of our results. Despite these limitations, and considering the data from previous studies [1,2], we believe that our results may be relevant also to other countries.

CONCLUSIONS

The interaction between medical societies and industry has come under increasing scrutiny over the last decades. While recognizing the importance of appropriate forms of collaboration between physicians and pharmaceutical industries, we strongly believe that, as Schofferman states, the potential values of these collaborations do not mitigate their potential risks: these relationships “are conflicted by their very nature and have the potential to create unconscious bias that might influence patient care”.[12]

We hope our analysis of the current Italian medical societies’ relationship with industry might be a first step in order to stimulate a reflection on this controversial issue in our country. In this perspective, we aim to use this survey as an advocacy tool for a debate that we, as residents and doctors in training, would like to launch among our medical societies.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Sara Ferioli, Elena Garavelli, Morena Martinese, Antonius Soumelis and Giulia Silvestrini for their assistance in the data collection and their suggestions in the preparation of this manuscript. We especially thank Prof Barbara Mintzes (University of Sydney) for her useful

comments on the first draft of the manuscript. We also thank Prof Marco Cosentino (University of Insubria), Dr Angelo Stefanini (University of Bologna), and Dr Adriano Cattaneo (Nograzie group) for their support and general counseling on the topic.

We also would like to acknowledge that the collaboration among the researchers involved in this project was facilitated by the Italian Medical Residents Committee of the Italian Society of Hygiene, Preventive Medicine and Public Health (S.It.I.). The Committee promotes professional, cultural and personal development of the Italian Medical Residents in Public Health and stimulates collaborations among the Italian postgraduate Schools.

CONTRIBUTORS

AF, DT, FN, AL, FG, AR conceived the study. AR designed the data collection tool and coordinated the data collection. FF, FG, DI, CL, ES, AR collected the data. GG, AR, AF planned the statistical analysis and GG analysed the data. AF, GG, AR wrote the first draft of the paper. DT, FN, AL contributed to the writing of the paper. All authors critically revised the manuscript and approved the final version. AF is guarantor.

FUNDING

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

1
2
3 461 COMPETING INTERESTS
4

5
6 462 All authors have completed the ICMJE disclosure form at www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf
7
8 463 (available on request from the corresponding author) and declare: no support from any
9
10 464 organisation for the submitted work; no financial relationships with any organisations that might
11
12 465 have an interest in the submitted work in the previous three years. DT, FF, DI, AR, GG, FG, ES
13
14 466 are members of the Italian Society of Hygiene, Preventive Medicine and Public Health (S.It.I.).
15
16 467 S.It.I is one of the medical societies that were evaluated in our research.
17
18
19
20
21 468

22
23
24 469 ETHICAL APPROVAL
25

26
27 470 Not required.
28
29
30
31 471

32
33 472 DATA SHARING
34

35
36 473 There are no data in addition to those presented in this report. The dataset is available upon
37
38 474 request from the corresponding author.
39
40
41
42
43 475

44
45
46 476
47
48 477 REFERENCES
49

50
51 478
52
53 479 1. Rothman DJ, McDonald WJ, Berkowitz CD et al. Professional Medical Associations and
54
55 480 Their Relationships With Industry. A Proposal for Controlling Conflict of Interest.
56
57
58
59
60

481 JAMA2009;301(13):1367-1372.

482
483 2. Schofferman J. The Medical–Industrial Complex, Professional Medical Associations, and
484 Continuing Medical Education Pain Medicine2011; 12: 1713–1719.

485
486 3. Camilleri M, Parke DW 2nd. Perspective: Conflict of interest and professional organizations:
487 considerations and recommendations. Acad Med. 2010;85:85-91.

488
489 4. Lo B, Field M, editors. Institute of Medicine: Conflict of Interest in Medical Research,
490 Education, and Practice. Washington DC. The National Academies Press Institute of Medicine.
491 2009.

492
493 5. Lexchin J. Interactions between physicians and the pharmaceutical industry: what does the
494 literature say? CMAJ.1993;149(10):1401-7.

495
496 6. Coyle SL. Physician–Industry Relations. Part 2: Organizational Issues. Ann Intern Med.
497 2002;136:403-406.

498 7. Dalsing MC. Industry working with physicians through professional medical associations. J
499 Vasc Surg. 2011;54:41S-6S.

500 8. Kassirer JP. Professional Societies and Industry Support: what is the quid pro quo?
501 Perspectives in Biology and Medicine. 2007; 50:7-17.

502 9. Hutchins JC, Rydell CM, Griggs RC, Sagsveen M, Bernat JL. American Academy of

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Neurology policy on pharmaceutical and device industry support. *Neurology*. 2012;78;750-754 .

10. Minter RM, Angelos P, Coimbra R et al. Ethical Management of Conflict of Interest: Proposed Standards for Academic Surgical Societies. *J Am Coll Surg*. 2011;213: 677–682.

11. Council for Medical Specialty Societies. Code for Interactions with Companies. April 2015. Available: <http://107.180.5.136/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/CMSS-Code-for-Interactions-with-Companies-Approved-Revised-Version-4.13.15-with-Annotations-FINAL.pdf>

12. Schofferman JA, Eskay-Auerbach ML, Sawyer LS, Herring SA, Arnold PM, Muehlbauer EJ. Conflict of interest and professional medical associations: the North American Spine Society experience. *The Spine Journal*. 2013;13: 974–979.

13. Vercellini P, Vigano’ P, Frattaruolo MP, Somigliana E. Proliferation of gynaecological scientific societies and their financial transparency: an Italian survey. *BMJ Open* 2016;6: e008370.

14. Italian Federation of Medical-Scientific Societies (FISM). The FISM statute is available at: http://www.fism.it/cm/navigatore.jhtml?param1_1=N116cd41e995b96df0aa. The complete list of medical societies belonging to the Federation is available at: http://www.fism.it/cm/navigatore.jhtml?param1_1=N1156174839debd2c050. (Accessed April, 28th 2015).

15. Italian Ministry of Health, Decree 31 May 2004. Available at: http://www.gazzettaufficiale.it/atto/serie_generale/caricaDettaglioAtto/originario?atto.dataPubblicazioneGazzetta=2004-07-02&atto.codiceRedazionale=04A06700&elenco30giorni=false

- (Accessed February, 24th 2016)
16. Italian Ministry of Education, Universities and Research. Bando per l'ammissione alle Scuole di specializzazione in Medicina a.a. 2013/14. Available: <http://attiministeriali.miur.it/anno-2014/agosto/dm-08082014.aspx> (Accessed April, 28th 2015).
17. Barros AJD, Hirakata VN. Alternatives for logistic regression in cross-sectional studies: an empirical comparison of models that directly estimate the prevalence ratio. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*. 2003, 3:21.
18. Physician Payments Sunshine Provisions in Health Care Reform. Patient Protection and Affordable care Act. 111 Congress HR 3590. 2010:111–48.
19. EFPIA Code on disclosure of transfers of value from pharmaceutical companies to healthcare professionals and healthcare organisations. 24 June 2013.
20. Campbell DJ, Sharkey BP. EFPIA leads the self-regulation charge to try to avoid government-imposed transparency. *Lexology*, July 24 2013.
21. Loewenstein G, Sah S, Cain DM. The unintended consequences of conflict of interest disclosure. *JAMA*. 2012;307:669–70.
22. Thompson D. Understanding financial conflict of interest. *N Engl J Med*. 1993;329:573-576.
23. Wilson B. Continuing medical education programs being placed under closer scrutiny. *CMAJ*. 2010;182:E683–4.
24. Steinman M, Baron RB, Marlow B. Is continuing medical education a drug-promotion tool? *Can Fam Physician*. 2007;53:1650–3.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

543 25. Pisacane A. Rethinking continuing medical education. BMJ. 2008; 337; 490-91.

544 26. Associazione Culturale Pediatri, Impegno di autoregolamentazione nei rapporti con
545 l'industria. Approvato con emendamenti nell'Assemblea dei soci dell'11/10/2013. Available:
546 www.acp.it (Accessed April, 28th 2015).

547 27. Regolamento interno della Società Italiana di Medicina delle Migrazioni. Available:
548 http://www.simmweb.it/fileadmin/documenti/Simm_x_news/2012/2012.Regolamento_SIMM.pdf
549 f (Accessed April, 28th 2015).

550 28. Policy Statement. Rapporti fra SISM e case farmaceutiche. Approvato ed adottato dal XXXIX
551 Congresso Nazionale del SISM, 5 - 8 novembre 2009, Calanovella Mare, Messina. Available:
552 <http://www.nazionale.sism.org/la-nostra-policy> (Accessed April, 28th 2015).

553

Supplementary File 1. Relative risks of having pharmaceutical or medical device industry sponsorship in the program of the last medical societies' annual conference or satellite symposia

	Main model		Stratified analysis					
	All sample (n=131)		Only services (n=42)		Only clinical (n=59)		Only surgical (n=30)	
	crude RR	adjusted RR	crude RR	adjusted RR	crude RR	adjusted RR	crude RR	adjusted RR
Ethical code	1.34 (1.20-1.50)	1.22 (1.02-1.48)	1.60 (1.25-2.04)	0.63 (0.41-1.00)	1.20 (1.06-1.36)	1.24 (1.03-1.49)	1.29 (1.03-1.63)	1.33 (0.88-2.01)
Statute	1.24 (0.98-1.56)	1.23 (0.95-1.60)	1.94 (1.15-3.29)	1.66 (0.94-2.91)	0.90 (0.70-1.15)	0.91 (0.65-1.27)	1.18 (0.74-1.89)	1.28 (0.75-2.19)
No annual financial report on website	1.34 (0.70-2.57)	1.25 (0.75-2.09)	1.28 (0.31-5.32)	1.86 (0.71-4.86)	1.71 (0.42-9.96)	1.68 (0.36-7.78)	1.17 (0.50-2.73)	0.94 (0.67-1.32)
Dimension of society	1.13 (1.06-1.20)	1.11 (1.04-1.19)	1.28 (1.09-1.50)	1.25 (1.01-1.55)	1.06 (0.96-1.17)	1.07 (0.96-5.52)	1.08 (0.99-1.18)	1.08 (0.99-1.17)
Type of society								
Services	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Clinical	1.32	1.18	-	-	-	-	-	-

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

	(1.02-1.72) (0.89-1.57)				
Surgical	1.21 1.26	- -	- -	- -	
	(0.89-1.66) (0.92-1.74)				

For peer review only

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
1
1
1
1
1
1
1
1
1
2
2
2
2
2
2
2
2
2
3
3
3
3
3
3
3
3
3
4
4
4
4
4
4
4
4
4
4
5
5
5
5
5
5
5
5
5
5
6

Specialty	Type of society
Emergency Medicine	Clinical
Dermatology	Clinical
Cardiology	Clinical
Oncology	Clinical
Oncology	Clinical
Gastroenterology	Clinical
Neurology	Clinical
Gastroenterology	Clinical
Oncology	Clinical
Pneumology	Clinical
Internal Medicine	Clinical
Diabetology	Clinical
Endocrinology	Clinical
Cardiology	Clinical
Neurology	Clinical
General Practice	Clinical
Rheumatology	Clinical
Haematology	Clinical
Omeopathy	Clinical
Gastroenterology	Clinical
Paediatrics	Clinical
Gastroenterology	Clinical
Oncology	Clinical
Plastic surgery	Clinical
Neurology	Clinical
Internal Medicine	Clinical
Internal Medicine	Clinical
Internal Medicine	Clinical
Physiatry	Clinical
Andrology	Clinical
Cardiology	Clinical
Pharmacology	Clinical
Dermatology	Clinical
Dermatology	Clinical
Diabetology	Clinical
Haematology	Clinical
Gastroenterology	Clinical
Geriatry	Clinical
Geriatry	Clinical
Infectivology	Clinical
Internal Medicine	Clinical
Pneumology	Clinical
Haematology	Clinical
Nefrology	Clinical
Paediatrics	Clinical
Neuropsychiatry	Clinical
Omeopathy	Clinical
Paediatrics	Clinical
Rheumatology	Clinical
Cardiology	Clinical
Pneumology	Clinical
Neurology	Clinical
Haematology	Clinical
Haematology	Clinical
Gastroenterology	Clinical
Internal Medicine	Clinical
General Practice	Clinical
Others	Clinical
Cardiology	Services
Haematology	Services
Nutrition	Services
Medical Physics	Services
Nuclear Medicine	Services
Pathology	Services
Occupational Medicine	Services
Radiology	Services
Nutrition	Services
Others	Services
Biological Medicine	Services
Forensic Medicine	Services
Microbiology	Services
Medical Psychology	Services
Occupational Medicine	Services
Nutrition	Services
Sexology	Services
Hygiene and Preventive Medicine	Services
Acupuncture	Services
Hygiene and Preventive Medicine	Services
Anesthesiology	Services
Acupuncture	Services
Anesthesiology	Services
Audiology	Services
Biological Medicine	Services
Pathology	Services
Palliative Care	Services
Pharmacology	Services
Hygiene and Preventive Medicine	Services
Occupational Medicine	Services
Pathology	Services
Others	Services
Physiatry	Services
Nutrition	Services
Radiology	Services
Physiatry	Services
Pharmacology	Services
Microbiology	Services
Hygiene and Preventive Medicine	Services
Hygiene and Preventive Medicine	Services
Others	Services
Pharmacology	Services
Dentistry	Surgical
Surgery	Surgical
Ophthalmology	Surgical
Gynecology	Surgical
Urology	Surgical
Dentistry	Surgical
Orthopaedics	Surgical
Gynecology	Surgical
Vascular surgery	Surgical
Surgery	Surgical
Cardiosurgery	Surgical
Surgery	Surgical
Orthopaedics	Surgical
Maxillo-facial surgery	Surgical
Plastic surgery	Surgical
Vascular surgery	Surgical
Gynecology	Surgical
Gynecology	Surgical
Surgery	Surgical
Vascular surgery	Surgical
Gynecology	Surgical
Neurosurgery	Surgical
Ophthalmology	Surgical
Orthopaedics	Surgical
Ear, Nose and Throat	Surgical
Urology	Surgical
Urology	Surgical
Ophthalmology	Surgical
Radiology	Surgical
Esthetic Medicine	Surgical
Omeopathy	Services
Cardiology	Services
Sports Medicine	Services
Cardiology	Services
Emergency Medicine	Services
Internal Medicine	Services
Haematology	Services
Internal Medicine	Services
Emergency Medicine	Services
Dentistry	Surgical
Surgery	Surgical
Orthopaedics	Surgical
Anesthesiology	Clinical
Radiology	Clinical
Internal Medicine	Clinical
Pharmacology	Clinical
Nutrition	Clinical
Others	Clinical
Radiology	Clinical
Psychiatry	Clinical
Omeopathy	Clinical

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

STROBE 2007 (v4) Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies*

Section/Topic	Item #	Recommendation	Reported on page #
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study’s design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	Page 3
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	Page 3
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	Page 5,6
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	Page 6
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	Page 6
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	Page 6,7
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	Page 6,7
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	Page 7,8
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	Page 6-8
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	Page 8
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	Page 6 and page 12
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	Page 8,9
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	Page 8,9
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	Page 9
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	Page 12
		(d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	N/A
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	Page 9
Results			

Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	Page 12
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	The study did not involve human subjects. However, the reasons for exclusion of some medical societies are explained in page 12
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	N/A
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	We analysed medical societies and their characteristics are described in Page 11, 12 and Supplementary File 2.
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	Page 12
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	Page 10- 12
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	Page 9
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	N/A
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	N/A
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	Page 16 and Supplementary File 1
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	Page 18
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	Page 22-24
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from	Page 18-23

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

		similar studies, and other relevant evidence	
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	Page 23-24
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	Page 25

*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.

Correction: Conflict of interest between professional medical societies and industry: a crosssectional study of Italian medical societies' websites

Fabbri A, Gregoraci G, Tedesco D, *et al.* Conflict of interest between professional medical societies and industry: a crosssectional study of Italian medical societies' websites. *BMJ Open* 2016;6:e011124.

In the Methods section it states: *'It is also worth mentioning that Italian medical societies are regulated by a Law Decree that was approved by the Ministry of Health in May 2004.'* However, the Decree was revoked by the Constitutional Court on 9th October 2006 (Judgment n. 328).

Open Access This is an Open Access article distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution Non Commercial (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which permits others to distribute, remix, adapt, build upon this work non-commercially, and license their derivative works on different terms, provided the original work is properly cited and the use is non-commercial. See: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

BMJ Open 2016;6:e011124corr1. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2016-011124corr1



CrossMark