

# Opinions Vary Widely on Financial Disclosures

BY MICHELE G. SULLIVAN  
Mid-Atlantic Bureau

Officials in charge of disclosing financial interests in research agree that disclosure is important, but are confused about how to do so effectively and appropriately, Kevin P. Weinfurt, Ph.D., and his colleagues reported.

Their survey of 42 such officials revealed widely varying opinions on when disclosure should be made, the financial limits that should trigger it, and how much information to share with prospective research subjects, said Dr. Weinfurt of the department of psychiatry at Duke University, Durham, N.C., and his coinvestigators.

"Part of their struggle relates to a lack of clarity regarding the ultimate goals of disclosure," the researchers wrote. "There is also a lack of systematic data regarding

About 80% of respondents said disclosure should include the name of the funding source, but some said the name of the source wasn't as important as a description of it.

how potential research participants can and will use such information in their decision-making" (J. Law Med. Ethics 2006;34: 581-91).

The study was based on detailed personal interviews with eight investigators, 23 review board chairs, and 14 conflict of interest committee chairs. The survey was designed to elicit respondents' understandings of how disclosure is done at their institutions and their thoughts on the importance of disclosure, including its risks and benefits to the institution and research subjects.

More than half of those interviewed agreed that disclosure should occur under all circumstances; the rest said disclosure would depend on the degree of the financial relationship. The most commonly expressed reason for disclosing a financial relationship was to facilitate better-informed decision making for potential subjects. Other reasons included trust and transparency issues, reducing liability risk, and managing public perception of the institution.

About 80% of respondents said the disclosure should include the name of the funding source. But some said the name of the company or organization wasn't as important as a description—whether it was a nonprofit organization, pharmaceutical company, or government body, for instance.

They also differed on whether the amount of financial interest should be disclosed. Conflict of interest committee chairs were most likely to want to share this information (93%), while investigators were least likely (63%). Those who expressed concern about disclosing the amount felt that level of detail could become cumbersome or confusing in the informed consent statement, and that research subjects might overestimate the impact that particular amounts might actually have on research outcomes. There

was no consensus on what amount should trigger disclosure—the lower limit ranged from \$1 to \$50,000.

There was general agreement that the nature of the relationship should be disclosed, but no agreement about whether the disclosure should explain the possible impact of those relationships. Again, concern about overcomplicating the consent statement seemed to be at the root of these issues. Some respondents said the disclosure should include an explanation of how

an unscrupulous investigator might alter the research results.

Most respondents dismissed the idea that disclosure could lower enrollment. There was little sympathy among the group for researchers who complained that full disclosure was an invasion of their financial privacy.

There was also concern about how to best highlight disclosure information without overemphasizing its importance or potential risk to a study's integrity. Some

respondents said their consent form highlights the information in bold type, while others place it strategically in the document—at the very beginning, for example. Many also emphasized that the informed consent process should include a discussion of conflict of interest, not just a read-through of the document.

"Our data suggest that it will be difficult to achieve agreement on the issue of substantial understanding of financial interests," the researchers concluded. ■

## YOUR PATIENTS PUT THEIR TRUST IN YOU. BUT WHO CAN YOU TRUST?

The chances of facing a malpractice suit as a Psychiatrist are greater than ever today.

Let one of America's largest and most trusted providers of mental health professional liability insurance protect you.

With more than 100,000 policyholders, over 30 years of experience and the best claims specialists and legal counsel available, the American Professional Agency, Inc. provides members of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry a reliable, top-quality professional liability insurance program at very reasonable rates. Don't trust your practice or your future to anyone else. For a personal quote, including a special discount for AACAP members, call toll free or visit us online.

**SPECIAL DISCOUNT FOR AACAP MEMBERS!**

### COVERAGE HIGHLIGHTS

- Separate limits of liability (per claim and annual aggregate) for each named insured on group policies (very important for managed care providers).
- \$5,000 legal fee reimbursement for licensing board/governmental hearings at no additional cost.
- \$250 per diem (up to \$5,000) for income loss due to court/deposition appearances.
- Coverage for electroconvulsive therapy and hypnosis included at no additional cost.
- 10% Claims free discount. (Not available in AK, AZ, FL, NE, PA, CO, WA).
- 5% Risk management discount.
- Quarterly payment option and much more.



Endorsed By:  
AMERICAN ACADEMY OF  
CHILD & ADOLESCENT  
PSYCHIATRY



1 - 8 0 0 - 4 2 1 - 6 6 9 4    w w w . a m e r i c a n p r o f e s s i o n a l . c o m  
Ask for the Psychiatry Department