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Industry Support of Research and Conflict of Interest

To the Editor:—The recent editorial in Anesthesiology addressing “Unresolved Issues Relating to Peer Review, Industry Support of Research, and Conflict of Interest” was timed appropriately, as clinical income is decreasing among academic anesthesiology departments and dependence upon research funds from industry will likely increase.

Young faculty with research interests will continue to need sources of funding to initiate projects and generate preliminary data to apply for support from competitive granting agencies. Traditionally, clinical income has supported otherwise unfunded research endeavors. Now, funds from industry certainly will play a more dominant role in the development of the careers of young academicians, as well as the development of our specialty.

An additional unresolved issue is one that can be thought of as “the tail wagging the dog.” With mounting pressures to obtain external funding, individuals no longer will be guided to explore original ideas that they consider to be of intellectual and scientific interest but will be motivated first to obtain funding (by any available route) and only then address the issues and questions posed by the source of the funding. An extreme example would be when university faculty are handed funding and protocols to complete but have not provided input toward the development of such protocols.

Cooperation between industry and universities should be mutually productive and allow for intellectual and scientific input from both ends. Clearly, survival of the academic physician will largely depend on industry. But industry should remember that its successes have been magnified greatly by advances made within the academic community that resulted while exploring original ideas. Continued support by industry of foundations such as the Foundation for Anesthesia Education and Research seems to be an ideal way to support original research ideas in academic anesthesiology. Little will motivate a researcher as much as allowing individuals to create original ideas and then giving them the opportunity to develop these ideas.
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Motivation, Bias, and Scientific Integrity

To the Editor:—The editorial by Saidman1 discusses important implications of conflict of interest to the criticism of scientific work and to the admissibility of submissions to Anesthesiology. Had I written the editorial, I might have approached the problem from a different perspective, one of motivation as well as bias.

As suggested in the editorial, conflict of interest is important because it entails a potential bias that may compromise the scientific objectivity of the influenced person. I agree with the editorial that conflict of interest and motivation come in many guises. As the editorial suggests, the investigator may be motivated by a relationship with a commercial enterprise or by competition from another investigator. However, motivation goes beyond that. We accept, almost without thought, that most investigators have an inevitable bias: they are owners of a hypothesis, a point of view. We accept that investigators are “out to prove a point.” We accept that certain results may please technicians and their leaders, and that, furthermore, the jobs of both technician and leader may depend on those results. We accept the fact that the threat of “publish or perish” may motivate investigators to take shortcuts or to fabricate data, but find it unacceptable if the investigators actually do so.

As the “senior, experienced, and respected investigator” referred to by Saidman, I would like to describe some of the motives underlying the studies2,3 that prompted the editorial. First, as the editorial notes, I have been “one of those most responsible for the clinical and laboratory characterization of the pharmacology of desflurane,” an anesthetic that in the future may compete with sevoflurane. This parental role imposes a considerable bias, one difficult to warn the unwary reader about and one more dangerous to complete scientific objectivity than my ties to Ohmeda would create. It parallels the bias of the owner of a hypothesis.

My second motivation was that I never want to be found wrong about anything. One of my favorite collaborations was with my friend Eric Wahrenbruck and one California grey whale, in which we studied uptake of inhaled anesthetics in relation to body size.4 No one could repeat or challenge that experiment. Unfortunately, an experiment such as the one described in the reports by Gonowski et al.2,3 does
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