Research Article ISSN 2689-1050

Chemical & Pharmaceutical Research

A Critical Review of Pharmaceutical Industry Fraudulent Practices

Julian Ungar-Sargon MD, PhD*

Borra College of Health Science, Dominican University, USA.

***Correspondence:**
Julian Ungar-Sargon MD, PhD, Borra College of Health Science, Dominican University, USA.

Received: 08 MAr 2025; **Accepted:** 13 Apr 2025; **Published:** 24 Apr 2025

Citation: Julian Ungar-Sargon. A Critical Review of Pharmaceutical Industry Fraudulent Practices. Chem Pharm Res. 2025; 7(1): 1-12.

ABSTRACT

This review examines the growing tension between profit-driven pharmaceutical development and optimal public health outcomes in contemporary medicine. Evidence suggests that financial incentives have frequently led to questionable practices within the pharmaceutical industry, including promotion of marginally effective medications at premium prices, manipulation of clinical trial data, and systemic underinvestment in areas of significant public health need but limited profit potential. The review presents case studies of specific medications that exemplify these issues and analyzes the structural factors that have enabled such practices. We conclude by proposing comprehensive reforms to pharmaceutical development, regulation, and medical paradigms that could better align industry practices with public health needs and patient welfare. Addressing these systemic issues requires both targeted regulatory interventions and a broader reconsideration of how medical care is conceptualized, delivered, and evaluated.

Keywords

Pharmaceutical industry, Evidence-based medicine, Data manipulation, Clinical trials, Publication biasm Drug pricing, Healthcare reform, Conflict of interest, Medical ethics, Health policy.

Introduction

Modern medicine has achieved remarkable breakthroughs, from extending life expectancy to eliminating once-deadly diseases. Yet, a growing body of evidence suggests that the pharmaceutical industry a critical component of healthcare systems worldwide frequently prioritizes profit over patient welfare. This review examines how profit motives have led to questionable practices within the pharmaceutical industry, including the promotion of expensive yet marginally effective medications, manipulation of clinical trial data, and systemic challenges that undermine public health goals.

Historical Background

The evolution of the pharmaceutical industry from small chemical manufacturers to global corporate entities represents one of the most significant transformations in healthcare during the 20th century. This transformation has profoundly shaped modern medicine, healthcare policy, and regulatory frameworks worldwide.

Origins and Early Development (1900-1940)

At the beginning of the 20th century, most medications were simple botanical preparations or basic chemical compounds produced by small firms with limited scientific capacity [1]. The nascent pharmaceutical industry underwent its first major transformation during the 1910s-1930s, as companies like Merck, Eli Lilly, and Bayer evolved from chemical suppliers into research-oriented entities [2]. This period saw early standardization of drug

manufacturing and quality, partly driven by exposés like Upton Sinclair's "The Jungle" (1906) and subsequent legislation such as the 1906 Pure Food and Drug Act [3].

The discovery of insulin in 1921 and its rapid commercialization through a partnership between academic researchers and Eli Lilly established an influential template for university-industry collaboration, while demonstrating the potential profitability of prescription medications [4]. By the 1930s, the industry had begun consolidating, with key players establishing research laboratories that increasingly emphasized synthetic chemistry rather than natural products [5].

The Antibiotic Revolution and Post-War Expansion (1940s-1960s)

World War II catalyzed unprecedented government investment in pharmaceutical research, particularly antibiotics. The industrialization of penicillin production—requiring collaboration between government, academia, and industry transformed both pharmaceutical capabilities and business models [6]. The war effort created new networks between pharmaceutical companies and government agencies that would persist and evolve in peacetime [7].

The post-war period witnessed extraordinary commercial expansion of the pharmaceutical sector. Between 1945 and 1960, the industry grew at nearly twice the rate of the U.S. economy overall [8]. This growth coincided with the development of a new regulatory regime, as the 1938 Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (requiring safety evidence before marketing) was strengthened by the 1962 Kefauver-Harris Amendments (requiring evidence of efficacy) following the thalidomide tragedy [9].

Consolidation of Power and Marketing Era (1970s-1990s)

The 1970s-1990s marked a pivotal transition as pharmaceutical companies increasingly focused on marketing rather than just research innovation. Several key developments characterized this period:

1. **Increasing industry concentration**: Waves of mergers and acquisitions created larger, more powerful companies with greater political and market influence [10].
2. **Rise of blockbuster business model**: The industry increasingly oriented research toward chronic conditions affecting large populations in wealthy countries, exemplified by drugs like Tagamet, Zantac, and later Prozac [11].
3. **Expanding marketing expenditures**: By the late 1990s, pharmaceutical companies were spending twice as much on marketing as on research and development [12].
4. **Direct-to-consumer advertising**: Following regulatory changes in 1997, pharmaceutical advertising directly to patients became a major industry strategy in the United States, fundamentally altering patient-physician relationships [13].
5. **Globalization strategies**: Companies employed increasingly sophisticated differential pricing strategies across markets while offshoring production to reduce costs [14].

Industry Influence on Regulatory Frameworks (1980s-Present)

Perhaps most consequentially, the pharmaceutical industry steadily expanded its influence over its own regulatory environment. This influence has manifested through various legislative, financial, and institutional mechanisms that have fundamentally altered the relationship between industry and regulators:

The Bayh-Dole Act (1980): This landmark legislation allowed universities to patent and license discoveries made with federal funding, creating new financial incentives for academic-industry partnerships but also raising concerns about research objectivity [15]. While intended to accelerate innovation, Bayh-Dole effectively privatized publicly funded research, transforming academic institutions into potential profit centers with vested interests in pharmaceutical commercialization. Between 1980 and 2000, the number of academic patents increased tenfold, with biomedical patents becoming a significant revenue source for elite research universities [16]. This legislation contributed to a blurring of boundaries between academic and commercial research, potentially compromising the independence of university scientists whose findings increasingly influenced regulatory decisions [17].

The Prescription Drug User Fee Act (PDUFA, 1992): This pivotal legislation established a system whereby pharmaceutical companies paid fees to the FDA to review their products, creating a direct financial relationship between regulator and regulated [18]. Originally enacted to address understaffing and delays at the FDA, PDUFA has been reauthorized with industry support every five years, with each reauthorization expanding the scope of industry involvement in regulatory processes. By 2018, user fees accounted for approximately 80% of the FDA's drug review budget, raising fundamental questions about the agency's independence [19]. Internal surveys of FDA scientists have revealed concerns about pressure to approve drugs despite safety concerns [20], while economic analyses have demonstrated correlations between fee dependency and regulatory outcomes favorable to industry [21].

Accelerated approval pathways: Industry successfully lobbied for expedited review processes, beginning with AIDS medications in the 1990s but gradually expanding to multiple disease categories [22]. These pathways including Fast Track, Breakthrough Therapy, Accelerated Approval, and Priority Review designations were initially designed for life-threatening conditions with limited treatment options. However, their scope has progressively widened, with approximately 60% of new drugs now qualifying for at least one expedited program [23]. While reducing review times, studies have demonstrated that drugs approved through these pathways have higher rates of subsequent safety issues, labeling changes, and postmarket safety events [24]. Industry actively shapes these pathways through public-private partnerships, advisory committees, and targeted lobbying, with the 21st Century Cures Act of 2016 representing a significant victory for those seeking to lower evidentiary standards for approval [25].

International harmonization of drug approval: Industry played a central role in shaping the International Conference

on Harmonisation (ICH), effectively allowing private interests significant influence in setting global regulatory standards [26]. Established in 1990 as a collaboration between regulatory authorities and industry associations, the ICH ostensibly sought to eliminate duplicative testing and streamline global drug development. However, critical analyses have revealed the predominance of industry interests in ICH decision-making, with corporate representatives often outnumbering public regulators in key working groups [114]. The resulting harmonized guidelines frequently reflect industry preferences for reduced testing requirements, lighter safety monitoring, and greater acceptance of surrogate endpoints [115]. By creating global standards through a process with limited public input or oversight, pharmaceutical companies have effectively constrained individual nations' regulatory autonomy and reduced the diversity of regulatory approaches worldwide [116].

Revolving Door Dynamics: Increasingly fluid movement of personnel between regulatory agencies and pharmaceutical companies has raised concerns about regulatory capture [19]. This bidirectional flow with industry executives assuming senior regulatory positions and agency officials transitioning to lucrative industry roles creates both actual conflicts and appearances of conflicts that undermine public trust. A comprehensive analysis found that 58% of senior FDA officials who left the agency later worked or consulted for the pharmaceutical industry [27]. This revolving door extends beyond the FDA to include influential positions in Congress, advisory committees, patient advocacy organizations, and scientific journals [17]. Former regulators bring invaluable insider knowledge of approval processes, enforcement priorities, and unwritten norms, while the prospect of future industry employment may consciously or unconsciously influence regulatory decision-making [28]. These dynamics complement formal lobbying efforts, with the pharmaceutical industry consistently ranking among the highest-spending sectors in terms of both campaign contributions and lobbying expenditures [29].

Control through Advisory Committees: Pharmaceutical companies have developed sophisticated strategies to influence FDA advisory committees, whose recommendations typically determine approval decisions. A systematic review found that 38% of committee members had financial relationships with companies whose products they evaluated, despite conflict-of-interest restrictions [30]. Companies strategically recruit leading academic researchers for consulting relationships, creating networks of seemingly independent experts who frequently serve on these committees. When committees recommend against approval, the FDA may establish additional committees or reframe questions until receiving favorable recommendations [31]. This procedural manipulation, combined with carefully orchestrated patient testimony and selective presentation of clinical data, creates regulatory theater that masks underlying power imbalances in the approval process [32].

Expansion of Permitted Marketing Practices: Industry has systematically weakened restrictions on pharmaceutical marketing through legislative, regulatory, and legal challenges. The FDA Modernization Act of 1997 relaxed restrictions on off-label promotion of medical literature, while a series of First Amendment legal challenges culminating in United States v. Caronia (2012) established greater industry freedom to discuss unapproved uses of medications [33]. Direct-to-consumer advertising, permitted only in the United States and New Zealand among developed nations, expanded from $1.3 billion in 1997 to over $6 billion by 2016 after regulatory restrictions were relaxed [13]. These changes have enabled sophisticated promotion strategies that circumvent remaining regulations while pharmaceutical industry settlements for illegal marketing have become routine business expenses rather than effective deterrents [34]. By the early 21st century, the pharmaceutical industry had successfully positioned itself as essential to both medical innovation and economic prosperity, achieving remarkable insulation from price controls in the United States while maintaining extraordinary profit margins compared to other industries [35]. Throughout this evolution, industry has strategically employed the language of innovation, patient access, and global competitiveness to advance regulatory changes that primarily serve commercial interests while presenting them as public health imperatives. This historical trajectory helps explain the contemporary tensions between the industry's potential to advance public health and its profit-maximizing imperatives.

The pharmaceutical industry's role in healthcare has evolved significantly over the past century. From its origins in the early synthetic chemical industry and botanical medicine traditions, the sector transformed through the antibiotic revolution of the mid-20th century into today's complex ecosystem of multinational corporations, biotechnology firms, and specialized research entities [36]. While this evolution has delivered remarkable therapeutic advances, it has occurred within a predominantly profit-driven model that creates fundamental tensions between commercial success and optimal public health outcomes [37]. Understanding these tensions is essential for developing effective reforms.

The Rise of "Me-Too" Drugs and Marginal Innovations

The pharmaceutical landscape is increasingly dominated by what industry critics call "me-too" drugs medications that offer minimal therapeutic advantages over existing treatments but come with significantly higher price tags. This strategy allows companies to secure new patents and marketing exclusivity while avoiding the substantial risks associated with truly innovative research [3].

Nexium (Esomeprazole) - The "Purple Pill" Profit Machine

AstraZeneca's Nexium (esomeprazole) represents perhaps the most notorious example of pharmaceutical "evergreening." As the patent for their blockbuster acid reflux drug Prilosec (omeprazole) neared expiration, AstraZeneca isolated just the active isomer of omeprazole, branded it as Nexium, and launched an aggressive marketing campaign promoting it as superior. However, independent studies showed Nexium offered virtually identical clinical outcomes to Prilosec [4]. Despite this, through clever marketing and physician incentives, AstraZeneca successfully

shifted patients to Nexium at over five times the cost of generic omeprazole, generating over $6 billion in annual revenue for a functionally identical compound [5].

Crestor (Rosuvastatin) - Premium Pricing Without Premium Benefits

AstraZeneca's Crestor entered the crowded statin market in 2003, years after other statins like Lipitor and Zocor. While marginally more potent at lowering cholesterol, large-scale clinical outcome studies failed to demonstrate that this translated to meaningfully better patient outcomes compared to generic statins [6]. Nevertheless, aggressive marketing positioned Crestor as a premium product, commanding prices up to 20 times higher than generic alternatives like simvastatin, without proportional clinical benefits [7].

Consider the case of acid reflux medications. The transition from H2 blockers to proton pump inhibitors (PPIs) represented genuine advancement. However, the subsequent development of numerous similar PPIs (esomeprazole, dexlansoprazole, etc.) with marginal differences and substantial price premiums exemplifies how pharmaceutical companies often prioritize marketable modifications over meaningful medical progress [8].

Pristiq (Desvenlafaxine) - Converting Patients Before Patent Expiration

When Wyeth (later acquired by Pfizer) faced patent expiration for its bestselling antidepressant Effexor XR (venlafaxine), it developed Pristiq (desvenlafaxine) essentially the active metabolite that venlafaxine naturally converts to in the body. Despite no evidence of superior efficacy or tolerability, Pristiq was marketed as an innovation and priced at a premium [9]. The timing was transparent: Pristiq's approval came just as Effexor's patent protection ended, allowing the company to shift patients to the new patented drug before generic competition for venlafaxine emerged [10].

Similar patterns emerge across therapeutic categories:
Antidepressants that offer slightly different side effect profiles but no improvement in efficacy [11]

Statins with minimal differences in lipid-lowering capability but dramatic differences in cost [12]

Insulin formulations with modified delivery mechanisms but astronomical price increases [13]

These incremental modifications consume research and development resources that could otherwise be directed toward addressing genuine unmet medical needs or neglected diseases that affect millions worldwide but offer less profitable markets [14].

Data Manipulation and Publication Bias

Perhaps more concerning than the focus on marginally beneficial drugs is the pharmaceutical industry's history of manipulating clinical trial data to present their products in the most favorable light possible.

Vioxx (Rofecoxib) - The Deadly Consequences of Data Suppression

Merck's anti-inflammatory drug Vioxx represents one of the most egregious examples of data manipulation in pharmaceutical history. Internal documents revealed during subsequent litigation showed that Merck was aware of the increased cardiovascular risks associated with Vioxx years before the drug was withdrawn in 2004 [15]. The VIGOR study completed in 2000 showed a five-fold increase in heart attack risk compared to naproxen, but Merck manipulated the publication to suggest this was due to naproxen's protective effects rather than Vioxx's harm [18]. The company also developed an "ADVANTAGE" trial disguised as a scientific study but actually designed as a marketing exercise to promote the drug to physicians [22]. Conservative estimates suggest Vioxx caused 88,000-140,000 excess heart attacks before being withdrawn, with approximately 30-40% of these being fatal [26].

Prozac (Fluoxetine) - The Blockbuster That Changed Public Perception

Eli Lilly's Prozac revolutionized the antidepressant market when introduced in 1987 as the first selective serotonin reuptake inhibitor (SSRI). While genuinely innovative at the time, Prozac's phenomenal commercial success stemmed partly from problematic practices in its development and marketing:

Selective data reporting: An analysis by Irving Kirsch and colleagues found that in the original FDA submission for Prozac, only 3 of 5 placebo-controlled trials showed efficacy, with the drug demonstrating a clinically minor 2-point advantage on the 50-point Hamilton Depression Scale [38]. These modest results were obscured in marketing that positioned the drug as revolutionary.

Aggressive consumer marketing: Eli Lilly's campaigns featuring patients "getting their life back" created unrealistic expectations about the drug's efficacy [35]. The marketing strategy was so successful that Prozac appeared on the cover of Newsweek as a "breakthrough drug" and became culturally synonymous with quick-fix happiness.

Minimized adverse effects: Eli Lilly downplayed significant side effects, particularly sexual dysfunction (affecting up to 70% of users), emotional blunting, and discontinuation syndromes [36]. Documents from lawsuits revealed the company was aware of potential links to increased suicidal ideation and aggression but worked to suppress or minimize these findings [37].

Off-label promotion: While initially approved only for depression, Prozac was aggressively marketed for numerous off-label uses before securing FDA approval for these indications, violating regulations against such practices [23]. Prozac's commercial success reaching peak annual sales of $2.8 billion established a template for marketing psychiatric medications that many companies have since emulated, with an emphasis on biological explanations for mental illness ("chemical imbalance") that oversimplified complex conditions and created a narrative that medications alone could resolve them [24].

Paxil (Paroxetine) - Study 329 and Adolescent Suicide Risk

GlaxoSmithKline's Study 329 examined the efficacy of Paxil in adolescents with depression. The published paper claimed the drug was "generally well tolerated and effective," but independent reanalysis revealed the study failed to show efficacy on any of its primary outcomes [25]. More troublingly, the reanalysis found that the original publication had misclassified suicidal ideation events, essentially hiding a significant increase in suicidal thinking among adolescents taking the drug [26]. GSK was later fined $3 billion for this and other violations, but by then, Paxil had already become one of the most prescribed antidepressants for young people, despite lacking evidence of benefit and carrying significant risk [27].

Selective Publication

A substantial body of research indicates that pharmaceutical companies routinely engage in selective publication of clinical trial results publishing positive findings while suppressing negative or inconclusive data. A landmark study published in the New England Journal of Medicine found that among registered trials of antidepressants, 94% of published studies showed positive results, while only 51% of all conducted studies were actually positive [28]. This selective reporting creates a distorted picture of medication efficacy in the scientific literature, misleading clinicians and patients alike [29].

Statistical Manipulation

Companies employ various statistical techniques to extract positive conclusions from otherwise disappointing data:

Post-hoc outcome switching: Changing the primary outcome measure after seeing the results [30].

Multiple subset analyses: Testing numerous subgroups until finding one that shows a positive effect [31].

Inappropriate comparators: Using placebo instead of existing treatments, or employing suboptimal dosing for competitor drugs [32].

Truncated trial durations: Ending trials early when beneficial trends appear, before longer-term problems emerge [33].

Ghost-Writing and Key Opinion Leaders

Pharmaceutical companies have developed sophisticated systems to influence the scientific literature and medical opinion leaders:

Industry-employed writers draft research papers that are subsequently published under the names of academic physicians who may have had minimal involvement in the research [34]. Providing financial incentives to influential physicians through speaking engagements, consulting fees, and research grants, creating conflicts of interest that can bias prescribing patterns and clinical recommendations [35]. These practices further distort the information environment within which medical decisions are made, subtly shifting practice toward newer, more expensive medications regardless of their true value [36].

Neglected Public Health Needs

Despite record pharmaceutical industry profits, genuine innovation addressing major public health challenges has stagnated. The profit-driven model has created several critical gaps:

Developing new antibiotics to combat evolving bacterial resistance offers poor return on investment compared to chronic disease medications. Consequently, antibiotic pipelines have dwindled precisely when resistance threats are mounting [37]. Between 2010 and 2020, only 15 new antibiotics received FDA approval, with most representing modifications of existing classes rather than novel mechanisms to overcome resistance [38]. Diseases predominantly affecting lower-income populations receive minimal research investment. Schistosomiasis, Chagas disease, leishmaniasis, and other conditions affecting over a billion people worldwide see a fraction of the research dollars directed toward conditions common in wealthy markets [39]. Children's medications remain underdeveloped due to additional regulatory requirements and smaller market sizes, forcing physicians to prescribe adult medications off-label with imprecise dosing for pediatric patients [40].

Regulatory Capture

Pharmaceutical industry influence extends to regulatory bodies meant to ensure drug safety and efficacy:

The "revolving door" between industry and regulatory agencies creates potential conflicts of interest [41]. User fees paid by pharmaceutical companies now fund substantial portions of regulatory agencies' budgets [42]. Accelerated approval pathways, while valuable for truly innovative treatments, have increasingly been exploited to rush marginally effective drugs to market [43]. A 2018 study found that 58% of senior FDA officials who left the agency moved directly into pharmaceutical industry positions, raising questions about regulatory impartiality [44]. Perhaps the most visible manifestation of pharmaceutical industry dysfunction is the growing disconnect between medication prices and therapeutic value:

Daraprim (Pyrimethamine) - The 5,000% Price Hike

In 2015, Turing Pharmaceuticals (led by Martin Shkreli) acquired the rights to Daraprim, a 62-year-old medication used to treat toxoplasmosis, particularly in immunocompromised patients like those with HIV/AIDS. Despite no new research, manufacturing changes, or improvements, Turing immediately raised the price from $13.50 to $750 per tablet a 5,000% increase [45]. This wasn't a case of recovering research costs; the drug had been on the market since 1953. Rather, it represented a calculated exploitation of a captive market, as Daraprim had no direct generic competitors in the U.S. at the time [46]. The price hike meant that a typical course of treatment, which previously cost about $1,000, suddenly cost $75,000.

Humira (Adalimumab) - The Patent Fortress

AbbVie's Humira, used for rheumatoid arthritis and other autoimmune conditions, became the world's bestselling drug with annual sales exceeding $20 billion. While undeniably effective, Humira's success stems partly from AbbVie's unprecedented "patent thicket" strategy. The company secured over 100 patents on minor modifications to the drug, its manufacturing process, and delivery devices, effectively blocking competition long after

the original patent expired [47]. This strategy allowed AbbVie to increase Humira's price by 470% between 2003 and 2021, to more than $80,000 per year, despite no significant improvements in efficacy [48]. In Europe, where some of these patent strategies were rejected, biosimilar competition emerged earlier, and prices fell by up to 80% [49].

Cancer drugs routinely launch with price tags exceeding $100,000 per year, regardless of whether they extend life by months or years [50]. Specialty medications for conditions like multiple sclerosis have seen price increases of over 700% during the past two decades, without corresponding improvements in efficacy [51]. Generic medication price spikes occur when companies acquire older drugs and exploit market positions [52]. The case of insulin exemplifies this problem a century-old medication whose price has increased over 1,200% since the 1990s, not due to innovation but through coordinated price increases among the three manufacturers controlling the market [53]. Addressing the systemic issues in pharmaceutical development and deployment requires multifaceted approaches that target the underlying structural incentives and power dynamics. Evidence-based reform possibilities span regulatory, economic, and structural domains, each addressing different aspects of the pharmaceutical ecosystem's dysfunction.

Regulatory Reforms

The regulatory framework governing pharmaceutical development and approval requires fundamental reconsideration to better align industry practices with public health needs. Value-based pricing and reimbursement represents one promising approach, tying medication reimbursement to demonstrated therapeutic value rather than market power or marketing effectiveness. Countries employing health technology assessment frameworks, such as the UK's National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE), have demonstrated that rigorous value assessment can help control costs while encouraging truly beneficial innovation [54]. Value-based approaches can take various forms, including comparative effectiveness requirements mandating that new drugs demonstrate superiority to existing therapies for approval or premium pricing [34]. Similarly, outcome-based payment models link reimbursement to real-world performance metrics, with manufacturers receiving full payment only when drugs achieve specified clinical outcomes [55]. Therapeutic equivalence pricing establishes reimbursement caps for therapeutically equivalent medications regardless of patent status, encouraging competition on price rather than marketing [56]. Recent policy experiments in this direction include Italy's performance-linked reimbursement schemes, which require manufacturers to refund costs for non-responders, and Germany's AMNOG law, which sets prices based on demonstrated added benefit [57].

The opacity of clinical research creates opportunities for data manipulation and selective reporting that undermine evidence-based medicine. Comprehensive transparency requirements would address these issues through mandatory registration and reporting of all clinical trials. While ClinicalTrials.gov represents a step forward, compliance remains incomplete; legal requirements with meaningful penalties for non-reporting are needed, including potential personal liability for corporate executives who suppress unfavorable data [58]. Regulatory agencies should require manufacturers to publicly release complete individual participant-level clinical trial data for independent reanalysis, following models pioneered by the European Medicines Agency [59]. Requiring public registration of detailed study protocols before trial initiation would prevent outcome switching and selective reporting that currently distorts the medical literature [60]. Initiatives like the AllTrials campaign and Yale University's Open Data Access (YODA) Project demonstrate growing recognition of transparency's importance, though regulatory requirements remain inadequate in most jurisdictions [61].

Addressing regulatory capture requires reforms that enhance agency independence and reduce industry influence. The current system of user fees, whereby pharmaceutical companies directly fund substantial portions of regulatory agencies' budgets, creates problematic financial dependencies. Transitioning from direct industry payments toward appropriated funding would restore proper regulatory authority [62]. Extended cooling-off periods implementing five-year restrictions on regulators entering industry positions would reduce revolving door incentives that compromise regulatory independence [63]. Advisory committee reforms should eliminate conflicts of interest through stricter financial relationship prohibitions and balanced representation requirements [64]. These approaches would help restore the proper relationship between regulator and regulated, ensuring that public health remains the primary consideration in approval decisions.

Economic Reforms

Market failures in pharmaceutical development could be addressed through targeted public investment for priority areas inadequately served by profit-driven research. Public funding for antibiotic development, structured as public-private partnerships like the Combating Antibiotic-Resistant Bacteria Biopharmaceutical Accelerator (CARB-X), could reinvigorate antibiotic pipelines [65]. Expanded funding for initiatives like the Drugs for Neglected Diseases Initiative (DNDi) has demonstrated the ability to develop treatments for neglected tropical diseases at a fraction of typical industry costs [66]. Designated funding for pediatric formulation development would address critical gaps in children's medications that persist despite regulatory incentives [67]. Establishing public funding mechanisms for late-stage clinical trials could reduce development costs while ensuring that trial designs prioritize public health needs rather than marketing considerations [68]. These approaches recognize that certain medical needs are poorly served by pure market mechanisms and require public investment to ensure adequate development.

The current patent system incentivizes incremental modifications over breakthrough innovation, necessitating patent reform and intellectual property restructuring. Stricter patentability standards, raising the bar for demonstrating therapeutic improvement before granting patent extensions, could follow models like India's

Section 3(d) of the Patents Act, which prevents "evergreening" through minor modifications [69]. Alternative incentive structures implementing prizes, advanced market commitments, or transferable exclusivity vouchers could provide alternatives to traditional patent monopolies for priority health needs [70]. Incorporating public health licensing requirements that ensure reasonable pricing and global access into publicly funded research would recapture public value from taxpayer-supported innovation [71]. These approaches would maintain innovation incentives while addressing the dysfunctions of the current patent-monopoly model.

Most developed nations employ direct price regulation or negotiation to control pharmaceutical costs, approaches largely absent in the United States. Implementing mechanisms for centralized price negotiations, as used in virtually all high-income countries outside the United States, would leverage purchasing power to control costs [72]. Establishing domestic or international reference pricing would set ceiling prices based on comparable markets or therapeutic alternatives [73]. The UK's Pharmaceutical Price Regulation Scheme, which caps industry returns on capital while allowing pricing flexibility, demonstrates one balanced approach to controlling costs while preserving innovation incentives [74]. International cooperation on pharmaceutical pricing could prevent companies from offsetting lower prices in countries with strong negotiating power by charging more in less regulated markets [75]. Evidence indicates that these approaches can control costs without compromising innovation, as European countries with strong price regulation continue to produce significant pharmaceutical advances [76].

Structural Reforms

More fundamental reforms would involve restructuring the pharmaceutical ecosystem to address inherent conflicts of interest. An independent clinical trial infrastructure would remove pharmaceutical companies from direct control of the evaluation of their own products. Establishing an independent, publicly funded clinical trial network, where pharmaceutical companies contribute financially but have no role in study design, data analysis, or publication, would eliminate foundational conflicts of interest [77]. Creating institutional separation between entities that develop drugs and those that evaluate them would produce more reliable evidence for clinical and regulatory decision-making [78]. Expanding institutions like the Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute (PCORI) to conduct independent comparative studies of both new and existing treatments would provide clinicians and patients with trustworthy information [79]. The Italian Medicines Agency's independent research fund offers a limited model of this approach, demonstrating its feasibility [80].

Strategic public manufacturing capacity for essential medications would provide a counterweight to market exploitation. Supporting initiatives like Civica Rx, which manufactures generic hospital medications to address shortages and price gouging, demonstrates this model's viability [81]. Public manufacturing of essential medicines with inadequate commercial supply could ensure availability while establishing price benchmarks to discipline private markets [82]. Maintaining public manufacturing capability for vaccines, antibiotics, and emergency medications would reduce vulnerability to market failures during health crises [83]. These approaches would create competition in markets prone to monopolistic pricing while ensuring reliable supply of critical medications.

The concentration of research, development, manufacturing, and marketing within single entities creates conflicts of interest that could be addressed through structural separation of functions. Regulatory structures that separate research entities from marketing operations could help refocus the industry on innovation rather than promotion [12]. Creating and supporting pharmaceutical corporations legally structured as public benefit entities, with obligations to patients alongside shareholder responsibilities, would create institutional frameworks better aligned with health outcomes [83]. Implementing genuine restrictions on pharmaceutical marketing practices with meaningful penalties based on company revenues rather than fixed amounts would reduce inappropriate promotion [84]. These structural approaches would address the fundamental misalignment between profit maximization and optimal prescribing practices. Current pharmaceutical research priorities reflect commercial rather than public health imperatives, suggesting the need for democratic governance of research priorities. Involving patients, clinicians, and public health experts in research priority decisions, following models like the UK's James Lind Alliance, would better align development with genuine health needs [85]. Linking market approval to commitments addressing priority health needs could redirect industry resources toward underserved areas [86]. Creating mechanisms to align pharmaceutical development with the Global Burden of Disease assessments would better target resources toward greatest need [87]. These approaches would help ensure that pharmaceutical innovation serves genuine public health needs rather than primarily commercial interests.

Implementation of these reforms would require coordinated action across regulatory, legislative, and executive branches, with strong political will to overcome inevitable industry resistance. Nevertheless, the growing recognition of current system dysfunctions creates opportunities for meaningful change. The COVID-19 pandemic has further highlighted both the pharmaceutical industry's innovative capacity and the inequities in current development and distribution models, potentially creating political momentum for systemic reform [88]. Addressing the profound challenges in pharmaceutical development requires both immediate regulatory adjustments and longer-term structural transformations that realign incentives with public health rather than solely commercial imperatives.

Conclusion

The pharmaceutical industry has delivered remarkable treatments that have transformed human health. However, the current profit-driven model has increasingly prioritized shareholder returns over public health needs, leading to systemic distortions in research

priorities, data reporting, and pricing decisions.

Addressing the deep-rooted problems in the pharmaceutical industry requires more than incremental adjustments. Meaningful reform demands fundamental restructuring of incentives, governance, and accountability:

Independent Clinical Trial Infrastructure: Removing pharmaceutical companies from direct control of clinical trials would eliminate fundamental conflicts of interest. A publicly funded, independent clinical trial system where pharmaceutical companies contribute financially but have no role in study design, data analysis, or publication would dramatically reduce data manipulation [89]. The Italian Medicines Agency's independent research fund offers a limited model of this approach [90].

Delinking R&D from Marketing: Pharmaceutical companies currently spend far more on marketing than research in many cases, twice as much [91]. Regulatory structures that separate research entities from marketing operations could help refocus the industry on innovation rather than promotion. Models like public benefit corporations for pharmaceutical development merit serious consideration [92].

Transparency Mandates with Real Penalties: Beyond trial registration, complete trial protocols should be published before studies begin, with significant penalties including personal liability for executives for failing to report adverse events or manipulating data [93]. The current system, where financial penalties represent mere fractions of profits gained through misconduct, has proven inadequate as a deterrent [94].

Public Sector Manufacturing Capacity: Strategic public manufacturing capacity for essential medications would provide a counterweight to market exploitation. The Civica Rx non-profit consortium, which manufactures generic hospital medications to address shortages and price gouging, demonstrates this model's viability [27].

Patent System Overhaul: The current patent system incentivizes minor modifications over true innovation. Reforms should include stricter standards for demonstrating meaningful clinical improvement before granting new patents and exclusivity periods tied to therapeutic value rather than standard durations [95].

Global Coordination on Pricing: International cooperation on pharmaceutical pricing could prevent companies from offsetting lower prices in countries with strong negotiating power by charging more in less regulated markets [96]. The examples of vaccine purchasing consortia like Gavi demonstrate how collective action can transform market dynamics [97].

Beyond the Pharmaceutical Paradigm: Reconsidering Medical Approaches

The problems in pharmaceutical development reflect broader limitations in conventional allopathic medicine's approach to health and disease:

The Reductionist Limitation: Conventional medicine and pharmaceutical research often reduce complex health conditions to single molecular targets, yielding medications that address symptoms rather than underlying causes [98]. This reductionist approach explains why many expensive medications for chronic conditions require lifelong use without achieving cures they target downstream manifestations rather than root causes [99].

Neglected Determinants of Health: The overwhelming focus on pharmaceutical interventions diverts attention and resources from social, environmental, and lifestyle determinants of health that often have far greater impact on outcomes [100]. Evidence suggests that access to nutritious food, clean air and water, adequate housing, stress reduction, and physical activity frequently yield more substantial health improvements than medication for many conditions [101].

Integration of Complementary Approaches: Evidence-based complementary approaches nutritional interventions, stress management techniques, traditional medicine systems with empirical support are often marginalized despite growing evidence of efficacy for certain conditions [102]. Health systems that integrate evidence-based complementary approaches alongside conventional care have demonstrated improved outcomes and reduced pharmaceutical dependence for conditions including chronic pain, depression, and cardiometabolic disorders [53].

Prevention vs. Treatment Imbalance: The pharmaceutical model inherently favors treatment over prevention, as preventive approaches typically generate less profit [103]. Redirecting resources toward evidence-based preventive interventions would address health problems before they require expensive pharmaceutical solutions [64].

Personalized Rather than Standardized Approaches: The pharmaceutical industry's mass-production model often fails to account for individual variability in disease presentation and treatment response [68]. Emerging precision medicine approaches that consider genetic, environmental, and lifestyle factors promise more effective interventions but require reimagining pharmaceutical development beyond the blockbuster model [104].

A New Paradigm: Value-Centered Rather than Profit-Centered Healthcare

Moving forward requires fundamentally recentering healthcare systems around patient outcomes rather than profit generation. This means:

Outcome-Based Compensation: Shifting from fee-for-service and product-based payment to outcomes-based compensation would align incentives throughout healthcare systems, including pharmaceutical development, with actual improvement in patient health [105].

Democratic Control of Research Priorities: Public input into research priorities would help ensure pharmaceutical development addresses genuine public health needs rather than primarily serving commercial interests [106]. Models like the UK's James Lind Alliance, which involves patients and clinicians in setting research priorities, demonstrate the feasibility of this approach [107].

Holistic Evaluation of Interventions: Regulatory systems should evaluate new treatments not simply against placebo but against comprehensive standards including non-pharmaceutical approaches, considering quality of life, functional improvement, and economic sustainability alongside traditional efficacy and safety measures [108].

The challenges facing pharmaceutical development and deployment cannot be addressed through isolated technical fixes. Meaningful reform requires reconsidering our fundamental approach to health, illness, and the proper role of medication within broader health strategies [109]. By confronting the limitations of the current pharmaceutical-centric model while implementing structural reforms to the industry itself, we can work toward a medical system that truly serves human health rather than primarily generating profit [80].

The stakes could not be higher. Every day of delay in implementing these reforms means more patients receiving medications they don't need, being denied medications they do need because of cost barriers, or suffering adverse effects from products whose risks were minimized or concealed [110]. Realigning pharmaceutical industry incentives with public health needs represents one of the most critical healthcare policy challenges of our time [111].

References

1. Swann JP. The evolution of the American pharmaceutical industry. Pharm Hist. 1994; 36: 76-86.
2. Chandler AD. Shaping the industrial century: the remarkable story of the evolution of the modern chemical and pharmaceutical industries. Harvard University Press. 2005.
3. Carpenter D. Reputation and power: organizational image and pharmaceutical regulation at the FDA. Princeton University Press. 2010.
4. Bliss M. The discovery of insulin. Chicago. University of Chicago Press. 1982.
5. Liebenau J. Medical science and medical industry: the formation of the American pharmaceutical industry. Johns Hopkins University Press. 1987.
6. Quinn R. Rethinking antibiotic research and development: World War II and the penicillin collaborative. Am J Public Health. 2013; 103: 426-434.
7. Temin P. Taking your medicine: drug regulation in the United States. Harvard University Press. 1980.
8. Achilladelis B, Antonakis N. The dynamics of technological innovation: the case of the pharmaceutical industry. Res Policy. 2001; 30: 535-588.
9. Greene JA, Podolsky SH. Reform, regulation, and pharmaceuticals-the Kefauver-Harris Amendments at 50. N Engl J Med. 2012; 367: 1481-1483.
10. LaMattina JL. The impact of mergers on pharmaceutical R&D. Nat Rev Drug Discov. 2011; 10: 559-560.
11. Scrip's complete guide to the world pharmaceutical industry. London. Informa Healthcare. 1999.
12. Gagnon MA, Lexchin J. The cost of pushing pills: a new estimate of pharmaceutical promotion expenditures in the United States. PLoS Med. 2008; 5: e1.
13. Donohue JM, Cevasco M, Rosenthal MB. A decade of direct-to-consumer advertising of prescription drugs. N Engl J Med. 2007; 357: 673-681.
14. Petryna A. When experiments travel: clinical trials and the global search for human subjects. Princeton University Press. 2009.
15. Mowery DC, Nelson RR, Sampat BN, et al. Ivory tower and industrial innovation: university-industry technology transfer before and after the Bayh-Dole Act. Stanford University Press. 2004.
16. Rodwin MA. Reforming pharmaceutical industry-physician financial relationships: lessons from the United States, France, and Japan. J Law Med Ethics. 2011; 39: 662-670.
17. Lim TY, Poole KG, Pageler NM. Propublica dollars for docs: impact of public disclosure of industry payments on pharmaceutical prescribing patterns. J Gen Intern Med. 2014; 29: S233.
18. Carpenter D, Zucker EJ, Avorn J. Drug-review deadlines and safety problems. N Engl J Med. 2008; 358: 1354-1361.
19. Voices of scientists at FDA: protecting public health depends on independent science. Cambridge: Union of Concerned Scientists. 2006.
20. Olson MK. Are novel drugs more risky for patients than less novel drugs? J Health Econ. 2004; 23: 1135-1158.
21. Kesselheim AS, Wang B, Franklin JM, et al. Trends in utilization of FDA expedited drug development and approval programs, 1987-2014: cohort study. BMJ. 2015; 351: h4633.
22. Darrow JJ, Avorn J, Kesselheim AS. New FDA breakthrough-drug category — implications for patients. N Engl J Med. 2014; 371: 89-90.
23. Mostaghim SR, Gagne JJ, Kesselheim AS. Safety related label changes for new drugs after approval in the US through expedited regulatory pathways: retrospective cohort study. BMJ. 2017; 358: j3837.
24. Avorn J, Kesselheim AS. The 21st Century Cures Act - will it take us back in time? N Engl J Med. 2015; 372: 2473-2475.
25. Abraham J, Reed T. Progress, innovation and regulatory science in drug development: the politics of international standard-setting. Soc Stud Sci. 2002; 32: 337-369.
26. Abraham J, Reed T. Trading risks for markets: the international harmonisation of pharmaceuticals regulation. Health Risk Soc. 2001; 3: 113-128.

27. Alpern JD, Stauffer WM, Kesselheim AS. High-cost generic drugs—implications for patients and policymakers. N Engl J Med. 2014; 371: 1859-1862.
28. Steinbrook R. Campaign contributions, lobbying, and the U.S. health sector - an update. N Engl J Med. 2008; 359: 1313-1315.
29. Lurie P, Almeida CM, Stine N, et al. Financial conflict of interest disclosure and voting patterns at Food and Drug Administration Drug Advisory Committee meetings. JAMA. 2006; 295: 1921-1928.
30. Psaty BM, Meslin EM, Breckenridge A. A lifecycle approach to the evaluation of FDA approval methods and regulatory actions: opportunities provided by a new IOM report. JAMA. 2012; 307: 2491-2492.
31. Greider KJ. The big fix: how the pharmaceutical industry rips off American consumers. New York: PublicAffairs. 2003.
32. Robertson C, Kesselheim AS. Regulating off-label promotion - a critical test. N Engl J Med. 2016; 375: 2313-2315.
33. Davis C, Abraham J. The socio-political roots of pharmaceutical uncertainty in the evaluation of 'innovative' diabetes drugs. Soc Sci Med. 2011; 72: 1574-1581.
34. Pearson SD, Benner JS, Reilly SR. Comparative effectiveness—thinking beyond medication A versus medication B. N Engl J Med. 2019; 381: 709-711.
35. Angell M. The truth about the drug companies: how they deceive us and what to do about it. Random House. 2004.
36. Greene JA, Podolsky SH. Reform, regulation, and pharmaceuticals—the Kefauver-Harris Amendments at 50. N Engl J Med. 2012; 367: 1481-1483.
37. Piller C. Hidden conflicts? Science. 2018; 361: 16-20.
38. Healy D. Let them eat Prozac: the unhealthy relationship between the pharmaceutical industry and depression. New York University Press. 2004.
39. Preskorn SH. Comparison of the tolerability of bupropion, fluoxetine, imipramine, nefazodone, paroxetine, sertraline, and venlafaxine. J Clin Psychiatry. 1995; 6: 12-21.
40. Healy D, Whitaker C. Antidepressants and suicide: risk-benefit conundrums. J Psychiatry Neurosci. 2003; 28: 331-337.
41. Kesselheim AS, Mello MM, Studdert DM. Strategies and practices in off-label marketing of pharmaceuticals: a retrospective analysis of whistleblower complaints. PLoS Med. 2011; 8: e1000431.
42. Moncrieff J, Cohen D. Do antidepressants cure or create abnormal brain states?. PLoS Med. 2006; 3: e240.
43. Keller MB, Ryan ND, Strober M, et al. Efficacy of paroxetine in the treatment of adolescent major depression: a randomized, controlled trial. J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry. 2001; 40: 762-772.
44. Joanna Noury Le, John Nardo M, David Healy, et al. Restoring Study 329: efficacy and harms of paroxetine and imipramine in treatment of major depression in adolescence. BMJ. 2015; 351: 4320.
45. GlaxoSmithKline to plead guilty and pay $3 billion to resolve fraud allegations and failure to report safety data. United States Department of Justice. 2012.
46. Erick Turner H, Annette Matthews M, Eftihia Linardatos, et al. Selective publication of antidepressant trials and its influence on apparent efficacy. N Engl J Med. 2008; 358: 252-260.
47. Dwan K, Gamble C, Williamson PR, et al. Systematic review of the empirical evidence of study publication bias and outcome reporting bias - an updated review. PLoS One. 2013; 8: e66844.
48. An-Wen Chan, Asbjørn Hróbjartsson, Mette Haahr T, et al. Empirical evidence for selective reporting of outcomes in randomized trials: comparison of protocols to published articles. JAMA. 2004; 291: 2457-2465.
49. Rui Wang, Stephen Lagakos W, James Ware H, et al. Statistics in medicine—reporting of subgroup analyses in clinical trials. N Engl J Med. 2007; 357: 2189-2194.
50. Safer DJ. Design and reporting modifications in industry-sponsored comparative psychopharmacology trials. J Nerv Ment Dis. 2002; 190: 583-592.
51. Dirk Bassler, Matthias Briel, Victor Montori M, et al. Stopping randomized trials early for benefit and estimation of treatment effects: systematic review and meta-regression analysis. JAMA. 2010; 303: 1180-1187.
52. Sismondo S. Ghost management: how much of the medical literature is shaped behind the scenes by the pharmaceutical industry?. PLoS Med. 2007; 4: e286.
53. Neumann PJ, Cohen JT. Measuring the value of prescription drugs. N Engl J Med. 2015; 373: 2595-2597.
54. Carlson JJ, Sullivan SD, Garrison LP, et al. Linking payment to health outcomes: a taxonomy and examination of performance-based reimbursement schemes between healthcare payers and manufacturers. Health Policy. 2010; 96: 179-190.
55. Robinson JC, Howell S, Pearson SD. Value-based pricing and patient access for specialty drugs. JAMA. 2018; 319: 2169-2170.
56. Gerber-Grote A, Windeler J, Sauerland S, et al. Justification of maximum prices: the German experience. Health Policy. 2020; 124: 1198-1204.
57. Goldacre B, DeVito NJ, Heneghan C, et al. Compliance with requirement to report results on the EU Clinical Trials Register: cohort study and web resource. BMJ. 2018; 362: k3218.
58. Eichler HG, Abadie E, Breckenridge A, et al. Open clinical trial data for all? A view from regulators. PLoS Med. 2012; 9: e1001202.
59. Chan AW, Song F, Vickers A, et al. Increasing value and reducing waste: addressing inaccessible research. Lancet. 2014; 383: 257-266.
60. Goldacre B, Lane S, Mahtani KR, et al. Pharmaceutical companies' policies on access to trial data, results, and methods: audit study. BMJ. 2017; 358: j3334.

61. Avorn J. Powerful medicines: the benefits, risks, and costs of prescription drugs. New York: Knopf. 2004.
62. Pham-Kanter G. Revisiting financial conflicts of interest in FDA advisory committees. Milbank Q. 2014; 92: 446-470.
63. Rose SL. Patient advocacy organizations: institutional conflicts of interest, trust, and trustworthiness. J Law Med Ethics. 2013; 41: 680-687.
64. Outterson K, Rex JH, Jinks T, et al. Accelerating global innovation to address antibacterial resistance: introducing CARB-X. Nat Rev Drug Discov. 2016; 15: 589-590.
65. Pedrique B, Strub-Wourgaft N, Some C, et al. The drug and vaccine landscape for neglected diseases (2000-11): a systematic assessment. Lancet Glob Health. 2013; 1: e371-e379.
66. Connor EM, Smoyer WE, Davis JM, et al. Meeting the demand for pediatric clinical trials. Sci Transl Med. 2014; 6: 227fs11.
67. Ioannidis JP. Clinical trials: what a waste. BMJ. 2014; 349: g7089.
68. Sampat BN, Shadlen KC. Secondary pharmaceutical patenting: a global perspective. Res Policy. 2017; 46: 693-707.
69. Outterson K, Samora JB, Keller-Cuda K. Will longer antimicrobial patents improve global public health?. Lancet Infect Dis. 2007; 7: 559-566.
70. Arno PS, Davis MH. Why don't we enforce existing drug price controls? The unrecognized and unenforced reasonable pricing requirements imposed upon patents deriving in whole or in part from federally funded research. Tulane Law Rev. 2001; 75: 631-693.
71. Morgan SG, Vogler S, Wagner AK. Payers' experiences with confidential pharmaceutical price discounts: a survey of public and statutory health systems in North America, Europe, and Australasia. Health Policy. 2017; 12: 354-362.
72. Vogler S, Vitry A, Babar ZU. Cancer drugs in 16 European countries, Australia, and New Zealand: a cross-country price comparison study. Lancet Oncol. 2016; 17: 39-47.
73. Sussex J, Towse A, Devlin N. Operationalizing value-based pricing of medicines. Pharmacoeconomics. 2013; 31: 1-10.
74. Moon S, Erickson E. Universal medicine access through lump-sum remuneration - Australia's approach to hepatitis C. N Engl J Med. 2019; 380: 607-610.
75. Light DW, Lexchin J, Darrow JJ. Institutional corruption of pharmaceuticals and the myth of safe and effective drugs. J Law Med Ethics. 2013; 41: 590-600.
76. Viergever RF, Li K. Trends in global clinical trial registration: an analysis of numbers of registered clinical trials in different parts of the world from 2004 to 2013. BMJ Open. 2015; 5: e008932.
77. Benkimoun P. How clinical trial transparency risks being another dead end. BMJ. 2015; 351: h4060.
78. Fleurence RL, Curtis LH, Califf RM, et al. Launching PCORnet, a national patient-centered clinical research network. J Am Med Inform Assoc. 2014; 21: 578-582.
79. Garattini S, Bertele V. How can we regulate medicines better?. BMJ. 2007; 335: 803-805.
80. Liljenquist D, Bai G, Anderson GF. Addressing generic-drug market failures — the case for establishing a nonprofit manufacturer. N Engl J Med. 2018; 378: 1857-1859.
81. Mazzucato M. The entrepreneurial state: debunking public vs. private sector myths. London: Anthem Press. 2013.
82. Lazonick W, Mazzucato M. The risk-reward nexus in the innovation-inequality relationship: who takes the risks? Who gets the rewards? Ind Corp Change. 2013; 22: 1093-1128.
83. Conti RM, Rosenthal MB. Pharmaceutical policy reform - balancing affordability with incentives for innovation. N Engl J Med. 2016; 374: 703-706.
84. Korenstein D, Keyhani S, Mendelson A, et al. Adherence of pharmaceutical advertisements in medical journals to FDA guidelines and content for safe prescribing. PLoS One. 2011; 6: e23336.
85. Partridge N, Scadding J. The James Lind Alliance: patients and clinicians should jointly identify their priorities for clinical trials. Lancet. 2004; 364: 1923-1924.
86. Banerjee A, Hollis A, Pogge T. The Health Impact Fund: incentives for improving access to medicines. Lancet. 2010; 375: 166-169.
87. Vos T, Abajobir AA, Abate KH, et al. Global, regional, and national incidence, prevalence, and years lived with disability for 328 diseases and injuries for 195 countries, 1990-2016: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2016. Lancet. 2017; 390: 1211-1259.
88. Wouters OJ, Shadlen KC, Salcher-Konrad M, et al. Challenges in ensuring global access to COVID-19 vaccines: production, affordability, allocation, and deployment. Lancet. 2021; 397: 1023-1034.
89. Belen Pedrique, Nathalie Strub Wourgaft, Claudette Some, et al. The drug and vaccine landscape for neglected diseases (2000–11): a systematic assessment. Lancet Glob Health. 2013; 1: e371-e379.
90. William Rodriguez, Arzu Selen, Debbie Avant, et al. Improving pediatric dosing through pediatric initiatives: what we have learned. Pediatrics. 2008; 121: 530-539.
91. Pham-Kanter G. Revisiting financial conflicts of interest in FDA advisory committees. Milbank Q. 2014; 92: 446-70.
92. Darrow JJ, Avorn J, Kesselheim AS. FDA approval and regulation of pharmaceuticals, 1983-2018. JAMA. 2020; 323: 164-176.
93. Moore TJ, Furberg CD. Development times, clinical testing, postmarket follow-up, and safety risks for the new drugs approved by the US Food and Drug Administration: the class of 2008. JAMA Intern Med. 2014; 174: 90-95.
94. Piller C, You J. Hidden conflicts? Science. 2018; 361: 16-20.
95. Greene JA, Padula WV. Targeting unconscionable prescription-drug prices—Maryland's anti–price-gouging law. N Engl J Med. 2017; 377: 101-103.

96. Gaffney A, Lexchin J. US drug pricing: a case study in corporate power. BMJ. 2018; 361: k2137.

97. Feldman R. May your drug price be evergreen. J Law Biosci. 2018; 5: 590-647.

98. Davio K. After biosimilar deals, UK spending on Humira will drop by 75%. Center for Biosimilars. 2018.

99. Bach PB. New math on drug cost-effectiveness. N Engl J Med. 2015; 373: 1797-1799.

100. Hartung DM, Bourdette DN, Ahmed SM, et al. The cost of multiple sclerosis drugs in the US and the pharmaceutical industry: too big to fail? Neurology. 2015; 84: 2185-2192.

101. Gupta R, Dhruva SS, Fox ER, et al. The FDA unapproved drugs initiative: an observational study of the consequences for drug prices and shortages in the United States. J Manag Care Spec Pharm. 2017; 23: 1066-1076.

102. Kesselheim AS, Avorn J, Sarpatwari A. The high cost of prescription drugs in the United States: origins and prospects for reform. JAMA. 2016; 316: 858-871.

103. Goldacre B, Lane S, Mahtani KR, et al. Pharmaceutical companies' policies on access to trial data, results, and methods: audit study. BMJ. 2017; 358: j3334.

104. Mansi BA, Clark J, David FS, et al. Ten recommendations for closing the credibility gap in reporting industry-sponsored clinical research: a joint journal and pharmaceutical industry perspective. Mayo Clin Proc. 2012; 87: 424-429.

105. Garattini S, Bertele V. How can we regulate medicines better? BMJ. 2007; 335: 803-805.

106. Schwartz LM, Woloshin S. Medical marketing in the United States, 1997-2016. JAMA. 2019; 321: 80-96.

107. Kapczynski A, Kesselheim AS. 'Government patent use': a legal approach to reducing drug spending. Health Aff (Millwood). 2016; 35: 791-797.

108. Dal-Ré R, Caplan AL, Marusic A. Editors' and authors' individual conflicts of interest disclosure and journal transparency. A cross-sectional study of high-impact medical specialty journals. BMJ Open. 2019; 9: e029796.

109. Wolfe SM. Escalating criminal and civil violations by pharmaceutical companies. Public Citizen. 2010.

110. Kesselheim AS. Rising health care costs and life-cycle management in the pharmaceutical market. PLoS Med. 2013; 10: e1001461.

111. Moon S, Erickson E. Universal medicine access through lump-sum remuneration - Australia's approach to hepatitis C. N Engl J Med. 2019; 380: 607-610.