American Psychiatric Association

1000 Wilson Boulevard Suite 1825 Arlington, VA 22209 Telephone 703.907.7300 Fax 703.907.1085 E-mail apa@psych.org Internet www.psych.org

Board of Trustees 2011-2012

John M. Oldham, M.D. President Dilip V. Jeste, M.D. President-Elect Roger Peele, M.D. Secretary David Fassler, M.D. Treasurer

Carol Ann Bernstein, M.D. Alan F. Schatzberg, M.D. Nada L. Stotland, M.D., M.P.H. Past Presidents

Joyce A. Spurgeon, M.D. Frederick J. Stoddard Jr., M.D. James E. Nininger, M.D. Brian Crowley, M.D. John J. Wernert III, M.D. James A. Greene, M.D. Marc David Graff, M.D. William M. Womack, M.D. Sarah Johnson, M.D. Alik S. Widge, M.D., Ph.D *Trustees*

Assembly 2011-2012

Ann Marie T. Sullivan, M.D. Speaker R. Scott Benson, M.D. Speaker-Elect Melinda L. Young, M.D. Recorder

Staff

James H. Scully Jr., M.D. Medical Director and CEO

Paul T. Burke Interim Executive Director, American Psychiatric Foundation March 15, 2012

Statement for John M. Oldham, M.D., President of the American Psychiatric Association:

In their article, "A Comparison of *DSM-IV* and *DSM-5* Panel Members' Financial Associations with Industry: A Pernicious Problem Persists," which appeared in the March issue of the journal Public Library of Science, and which ABC and other news outlets quoted, Cosgrove and Krimsky question the work of *DSM-5*'s volunteer Task Force and Work Group members because of publicly disclosed relationships with the pharmaceutical industry. Although we appreciate that Cosgrove and Krimsky acknowledge the commitment the American Psychiatric Association (APA) has already made to reducing potential financial conflicts of interest, we strongly disagree with their analysis and presentation of APA's publicly available disclosure documents. Specifically, the Cosgrove-Krimsky article does not take into account the level to which *DSM-5* Task Force and Work Group members have minimized or divested themselves from relationships with the pharmaceutical industry.

In 2012, 72 percent of the 153 members report <u>no</u> relationships with the pharmaceutical industry during the previous year. The scope of the relationships reported by the other 28 percent of member varies:

- 12 percent reported grant support only, including funding or receipt of medications for clinical trial research;
- 10 percent reported consultations including advice on the development of new compounds to improve treatments; and
- 7 percent reported receiving honoraria.

Additionally, since there were no disclosure requirements for journals, symposia or the *DSM-IV* Task Force at the time of the 1994 release of *DSM-IV*, Cosgrove and Krimsky's comparison of *DSM-IV* and *DSM-5* Task Force and Work Group members is not valid. In assembling the *DSM-5*'s Task Force and Work Groups, the APA's Board of Trustees developed an extensive process of written disclosure of potential conflicts of interest. These disclosures are required of all professionals who participate in the development of *DSM-5*. An independent APA committee reviews these disclosure documents, which are updated annually or whenever a member's financial interests change. Individuals are only permitted to serve on a work group or the Task Force if they are judged to have no significant financial interests.

The Board of Trustees' guiding principles and disclosure policies for DSM panel members require annual disclosure of any competing interests or potentially conflicting relationships with entities that have an interest in psychiatric diagnoses and treatments. In addition, all Task Force and Work Group members agreed that, starting in 2007 and continuing for the duration of their work on *DSM-5*, each member's total annual income derived from industry sources would not exceed \$10,000 in any calendar year. This standard is more stringent than requirements for employees at the National Institutes of Health and for members of advisory committees for the Food and Drug Administration. And since their participation in *DSM-5* began, many Task Force members have gone to greater lengths by terminating many of their industry relationships.

Potential financial conflicts of interest are serious concerns that merit careful, ongoing monitoring. The APA remains committed to reducing potential bias and conflicts of interest through our stringent guidelines.

Sc Oshan

