

**Group: Felipe, Emily, Yu-Feng, Zhou.**

## **Case No. 2: Industry Sponsored Research**

There are two conflicts in this case. A potential one is the possibility of positive bias towards the drug since the company sponsored this study. There is also the real conflict in the failure of the researcher to indicate that the study was funded by the company. These are conflicts of interest under the policy. The researcher is responsible for the study that can generate revenue to the company. Also this is a public service since the medication will be sold to the general public.

The conflicts fall on the category of scientific and academic conflict of interest. The researcher was responsible to give scientific testimony about the results of the study and resources from the University were used for the gain of the company.

We can begin saying that under the University's policy the disclosure of the sponsoring of the company is required.

To develop a remedy we would like to take a look at how the experiment was designed. If there are no issues with this, a way of dealing with the conflict would be assigning the task of re-analyzing the data to another researcher. It is important that this new person will do a "blinded" analysis, i.e., take out the labels in the data so that it would not be possible to recognize what treatment corresponds to the new drug.

Possibly the worst way of dealing with the conflict would be invalidating the experiment without considering its design and implementation. However, if the experiment design shows positive bias toward the company the results might be invalid and this should be reported.

A final thing should be noted. The case seems to be accusing the general public of more naiveté than they possess. There is no reason to believe that a study for a product was not funded by the company of the product. However, for legal reasons it might be better to always state this.