Introduction

Opening remarks to catch reader’s interest

Opening would talk about the deaths count due to opiods and how it could’ve been prevented

Thesis Statement (belongs at end of Introduction paragraph).

It is very unethical for doctors and the medical industry to be accepting “free money” to promote the medications due to the medication may not be the best of choice but was influenced by the lunch and the compulsion of promoting their brand so they keep coming back. (could fix up a little bit)

Supporting Paragraphs 2, 3, 4 (Body) evidence/supporting

2. Topic Sentence / Transition for Topic 2: A major issue is that the doctor or hospital would recommend a medication brand for the patient to buy even if it is maybe not the best of choice due to cost or effectiveness.

A. A study showed that doctor was swayed to prescribe the more expensive brand medication names even when cheaper generic ones would work just fine, it is ethical for one to recommend what they think is best, not what they are paid to say is best.

B. A doctor should only be recommending brands that he/she trust and worked with for many years over some company that gave them free lunch a few hours ago.

C. It only takes a few hundreds of dollar a year for a medication company to do this but study have showed that it could rakes in thousands.

D. this break the basic ethic of beneficence where one must provide with the intent of doing good for the patient involve.

3. Topic Sentence / Transition for Topic 3: A doctor might appeal more to a brand because they want to keep receiving the same benefits such as free lunch.

A. A doctor’s job is to recommend the correct medication and to diagnose and save lives, not be swayed by some lunch money.

B1. Even if lunch may not seem like it cost a lot but if a doctor later thinks about how he got a free lunch from prescribing a medication he is influenced by the action of the company.

B2.even if it does not seem like a lot hundreds of dollar a month could add up and some doctor were even happy because it helped with their employee happiness of receiving free foods everyday (almost) and the free samples that they get from the company so they don’t have to buy it themselves.

B3. This break the basic principles of medical ethics of autoomy where ones must be free of coercion and coaxing when making a decisions.

C. If a medication is powerful and has deadly effect and is promoted by doctors, it could cause mass deaths because surely the company isn’t only promoting it to one single doctor, some company even have up to 90,000 representatives.

D. Some restaurant already capitalized on the business by creating a lunch-ordering program and other company started opening up rewards program for pharmaceutical representative.

E. Some university like \_\_\_ already banned such system which was worth nearly 3 billion dollars and some do expect the government to start banning paid lunch by promoters

4. Conclusion

A. Summary and restatement of the thesis topic.

Free lunch has caused doctor and hospitals to promote medication that isn’t the best option just because they want small benefits like free lunch…. If we do not limit the amount of time a company can visit a place, then this problem will continues and we will not see the end of it.

Opioid deaths have been steady since 2017 with the average of 46 thousand deaths a year (Drugabuse, 2020). There is a relation between the deaths in the opioid crisis of 2017 and the promotion of some medications that was misleading and costed lives. The act of visiting a doctor’s office or hospital to promote a medication and basically bribing the doctors to prescribe the medication, with promises of money or other goods, have been around for years now. Even with laws reducing what the company can do to promote them, the activity is still around today in the form of buying them lunch regularly. For that reason, it is very unethical for doctors and the medical industry to be accepting “free money” to promote the medications due to the medication may not be the best of choice but was influenced by the action and the compulsion of promoting their brand so they keep coming back.

One major issue with this is that the doctor or hospital then would be recommending/coercing the medications to their patients, which is not a good idea. One study showed that doctors was swayed to prescribe a more expensive brand medication names even when cheaper generic ones would work just fine. This break their ethic of beneficence of providing with the intent of doing good for the patient, not doing good for themselves. A doctor should only be recommending brands that he/she trust and has worked with for many years over some company that gave them free lunch a few hours ago. And this isn’t only happening in a few places, there have been all different kind of companies opening just because of how the market in this system work. Pharmaceutical company would order lunch from a lunch-ordering company in bulk and send them out to the many offices around them to keep the bribe going. Many lunch-ordering companies even offers rewards program for the pharmaceutical representative, incentivizing continuous exploit.

Second major issue is that a doctor or hospital would continue to recommend the medication, because they want to keep receiving the same benefits. Even if it does not seem like a lot, hundreds of dollar a month could add up to thousands, and some doctor were even happy because it helped with their employee happiness of receiving free foods everyday (almost) and the free samples that they get from the company, so they don’t have to buy it themselves. This break the basic principles of medical ethics of autonomy where ones must be free of coercion and coaxing when deciding. A doctor’s job is to recommend the correct medication and to diagnose and save lives, not be swayed by some lunch money. And imagine this happening to as many as 90,000 offices just from one single company. Some university like University of Michigan already banned such system, which was worth nearly 3 billion dollars and some do expect the government to start banning paid lunch by promoters.

Free lunch has caused doctor and hospitals to promote medication that isn’t the best option just because they want small benefits like free lunch. If we do not limit the amount of time a company can visit a place or just ban them outright, then this problem will continue and we might see a repeat of the 2017 opioid deaths crisis.

https://www.drugabuse.gov/drug-topics/trends-statistics/overdose-death-rates#:~:text=Any%20opioid%20includes%20prescription%20opioids,in%202018%20with%2046%2C802%20deaths.