Disclosure of conflicts of interest and credibility for the medical profession

Dear editor

We were surprised by an unbalanced review about nalmefene for alcohol dependence, wherein the authors had stated no conflicts of interest (COIs). 1 The Editor in Chief and the Publisher were very professional when we stressed our concerns, and they must be commended. They accepted publication of a critical free evaluation based upon evidence where we also called for full disclosure of COIs. 2

The authors’ correction acknowledged several links (consultancies, honoraria, speaker fees, travel grants) for several pharmaceutical companies, including Lundbeck, which markets nalmefene. 3 However, existing links with Grey Healthcare France were not provided. Grey Healthcare is “a full-service, global, integrated communications agency”, which claims “our market-leading campaigns generate brand engagement, grow sales …”, and has among its clients Lundbeck for nalmefene. Such links should have been disclosed according to the French Sunshine Act.

Whatever the law could be, science integrity requires that all COIs, financial or otherwise, that could ever have affected a researcher’s judgment should be declared. They overcome our most basic medical commitment: to care for those who need it, and also constitute a crisis of credibility for the medical profession. 4
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