

1           **Title: Awareness and perceptions among members of a**  
2           **Japanese cancer patient advocacy group concerning the**  
3           **financial relationships between the pharmaceutical industry**  
4           **and physicians: a mixed-methods analysis of survey data**

5  
6           **Running head: Japanese patient perception on financial relationship**

7  
8           **Authors**

9           Anju Murayama,<sup>1,†,\*</sup> Yuki Senoo,<sup>1,†</sup> Kayo Harada,<sup>1,†</sup> Yasuhiro Kotera,<sup>2</sup> Hiroaki Saito,<sup>3</sup>  
10          Toyoaki Sawano,<sup>4</sup> Yosuke Suzuki,<sup>1</sup> Tetsuya Tanimoto,<sup>1,5</sup> Akihiko Ozaki<sup>6</sup>

11          <sup>†</sup> Equally contributed to the work.

12          \* Corresponding author

13  
14          **Affiliations**

15          <sup>1</sup> Medical Governance Research Institute, Minato-ku, Tokyo, Japan

16          <sup>2</sup> Human Sciences Research Centre, University of Derby, Derby, Derbyshire, United  
17          Kingdom

18          <sup>3</sup> Department of Gastroenterology, Sendai Kousei Hospital, Sendai, Miyagi, Japan

19          <sup>4</sup> Department of Surgery, Jyoban Hospital of Tokiwa Foundation, Iwaki, Fukushima,  
20          Japan

21          <sup>5</sup> Department of Internal Medicine, Navitas Clinic Kawasaki, Tokyo, Japan

22          <sup>6</sup> Department of Breast Surgery, Jyoban Hospital of Tokiwa Foundation, Iwaki,  
23          Fukushima, Japan

24  
25          **Corresponding author**

26          Anju Murayama, Medical Governance Research Institute, Minato-ku, Tokyo, Japan

27          Email address: [ange21tera@gmail.com](mailto:ange21tera@gmail.com)

28          Telephone: 81-90-6321-6996

29  
30          **Conflicts of interest**

31          Dr. Saito receives personal fees from Taiho Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd. outside the scope of  
32          the submitted work. Dr. Ozaki receives personal fees from Medical Network Systems  
33          outside the scope of the submitted work. Dr. Tanimoto receives personal fees from

1

34 Medical Network Systems and Bionics Co. Ltd. outside the scope of the submitted work.

35 The remaining authors declare no conflicts of interest.

36

37 **Funding**

38 This study was funded in part by the Medical Governance Research Institute. This  
39 non-profit enterprise receives donations from pharmaceutical companies, including Ain  
40 Pharmaciez, Inc., other organizations, and private individuals. This study also received  
41 support from the Waseda Chronicle, an independent non-profit news organization  
42 dedicated to investigative journalism.

43

44 **Keywords**

45 conflict of interest, ethics, Japan, financial relationship, patient-centered care,  
46 pharmaceutical industry

47

48 **Abstract (247 words)**

49 **Objectives**

50 Financial conflicts of interest (FCOI) between pharmaceutical companies (Pharma) and  
51 healthcare domains may unduly influence physician-led clinical practice and  
52 patient-centered care. However, the extent of awareness and perceptions of FCOI among  
53 Japanese cancer patients remains unclear. This study aimed to assess these factors and  
54 their impacts on physician trustworthiness among Japanese cancer patients.

55

56 **Methods**

57 A cross-sectional study using self-administered surveys was conducted on a Japanese  
58 cancer patient advocacy group with 800 registered members from January to February  
59 2019. Main outcome measures included awareness and perceptions of physician-Pharma  
60 interactions, their impact on physician trustworthiness, and attitudes towards FCOI  
61 among professions. We also performed thematic analyses on additional comments  
62 responders provided in the surveys.

63

64 **Results**

65 Among the 524 invited members, 96 (18.3%) completed the questionnaire. Of these, 69  
66 (77.5%) were cancer patients. The proportion of participants aware of such interactions  
67 ranged from 2.1% to 65.3%, depending on the interaction type. Participants were  
68 generally neutral on how the interactions would affect physician trustworthiness. A large  
69 proportion of participants agreed that these interactions were unethical, could influence  
70 physicians' prescribing behavior leading to unnecessary prescriptions, and negatively  
71 affect physician trustworthiness. Qualitative responses (n=56) indicated that patients  
72 expected physicians to use sound ethical judgment and avoid accepting incentives.  
73 Participants were also concerned about their treatment and the undue influence of FCOI  
74 on physicians.

75

76 **Conclusion**

77 Most participants were aware of at least one FCOI between Pharma and physicians and  
78 perceived them negatively. Further efforts to regulate FCOI appear necessary to protect  
79 patient-centered care.

80 **Abbreviations:**

81 **FCOI: Financial conflicts of interest; United States (US); Pharma: Pharmaceutical**

82 **companies**

83 **Main text**

84 **Introduction**

85 In recent years, patient-centered care has widely been considered a key component of  
86 healthcare delivery. Defined as one of the Six Domains of Healthcare Quality introduced  
87 by the National Academy of Medicine,[1] patient-centered care focuses on delivering  
88 healthcare respecting patient preferences, needs, and values. Therefore, financial  
89 conflicts of interest (FCOI) between pharmaceutical companies (Pharma) and healthcare  
90 domains are of significant concern, mainly due to potential bias in patient care and  
91 medical institutions' operation.[2-6] Key criteria of patient-centered care include full  
92 transparency and fast delivery of information.[7-9] In the world today, there are  
93 transparency initiatives such as the Sunshine Act and Open Payments Database in the  
94 United States (US),[10-12] Transparency in Healthcare in France,[5] Euro for Doctors  
95 and LeitlinienWatch in Germany,[13, 14] Disclosure UK in the United Kingdom,[15-17]  
96 Disclosure Australia in Australia,[18, 19] and Money Database in Japan,[2, 20, 21], all of  
97 which emphasize improving transparency and raising awareness of FCOI among patients  
98 and the general public to achieve excellent patient-centered care.

99

100 However, there remains an ongoing controversy about whether these transparency  
101 initiatives improve the general awareness of FCOI.[10, 12, 22] A previous qualitative  
102 study conducted before these initiatives reported that most cancer clinical trial  
103 participants had a positive or neutral view of physicians receiving research funding from  
104 Pharma.[23] Moreover, there has been little improvement in awareness of FCOI even  
105 after the launch of transparency initiatives.[10, 22, 24] Rather, it has been reported that  
106 public trust in healthcare professionals dropped following the launch of these  
107 initiatives.[25] These findings demonstrate the limited effect on the awareness of FCOI  
108 by these transparency initiatives.

109

110 Nonetheless, recent discussions on this issue have not considered specific populations  
111 with a higher interest in this topic, including patients with critical illnesses or their  
112 caregivers. Among patient populations, cancer patients are particularly important, given  
113 the critical nature of the disease and its burden,[26] as well as the development of  
114 numerous novel and expensive therapeutics.[27, 28] Since novel anticancer drugs are

115 potentially highly profitable, these agents' development remains among Pharma's highest  
116 priorities.[29] Therefore, these findings suggest the importance for cancer patients to  
117 understand FCOI among Pharma and healthcare domains.

118

119 The issues surrounding FCOI are of particular relevance in Japan due to its universal  
120 health coverage and the fact that its pharmaceutical market is the third-largest globally,  
121 after the US and China.[30] In 2018, anticancer drugs' annual pharmaceutical sales  
122 exceeded 1.24 trillion Japanese yen (JPY; 11 billion US dollars [USD]), accounting for  
123 12% of Japan's total annual pharmaceutical sales. Despite an overall decline in Japan's  
124 pharmaceutical sales, the oncology drug market continues to expand and is projected to  
125 exceed 13 billion USD by 2025.[31] There also has been progress in terms of Japanese  
126 transparency initiatives. Along with several non-profit organizations, the Japan  
127 Pharmaceutical Manufacturer Association has, since it first developed transparency  
128 guidelines in 2011,[32] led efforts to improve transparency in Pharma and healthcare  
129 domains' financial relationships. For instance, since 2013, all Japan Pharmaceutical  
130 Manufacturer Association members have voluntarily disclosed payments to physicians



131 on their respective websites following established transparency guidelines.[32] Also,  
132 Japanese non-profit organizations, including the Medical Governance Research Institute  
133 and Waseda Chronicle, have developed the Money Database. This database enables the  
134 general public to learn about financial relationships among individual pharmaceutical  
135 companies and healthcare sectors.[2, 33-36] While these organizations disclose  
136 information regarding industry payments made to physicians, how Japanese cancer  
137 patients perceive the information remains unclear.

138

139 In sum, the present study's purpose was to examine awareness of physician-Pharma  
140 interactions and their impact on physicians' trust while also appraising perceptions of  
141 these payments among Japanese cancer patients.

142

143 **Methods:**

144 *Study setting, design, and participants*

145 The study population consisted of 524 individuals of the Cancer Treatment Society for  
146 Citizens, a support group for cancer patients established in 2004 with 800 registered

147 members. In response to increasing trends towards second opinions in oncology,[37] this  
148 support group aids patients in determining the most appropriate treatment by offering  
149 referrals with radiation oncologists certified by both the Japan Radiology Society and the  
150 Japanese Society for Radiation Oncology. Along with the referral service for second  
151 opinions, the Cancer Treatment Society for Citizens also offers educational programs and  
152 publishes articles by cancer specialists on its website to promote general awareness of  
153 contemporary cancer research and treatment options.

154

#### 155 ***Data collection***

156 Data collection occurred from January 9 to February 10, 2019, using the structured  
157 questionnaire. The printed survey questionnaire was distributed to all 524 Cancer  
158 Treatment Society members for Citizens registered on the society's mailing list with the  
159 society's quarterly newsletter on January 9, 2019. Members that agreed to participate in  
160 the study completed the questionnaire and returned it, as requested, via the enclosed  
161 self-addressed, stamped envelope by February 10, 2019. To mitigate the response biases,  
162 the authors were not directly involved in the survey distribution or collection.

163

164 ***Survey sheet***

165 We compiled our cross-sectional questionnaire survey, taking into account previous  
166 studies and the local context of Japanese cancer care.[38, 39] The survey included 51  
167 questions covering the following items: 1) the status of disease progression and  
168 demographic characteristics such as gender, education level, and medical history; 2)  
169 awareness of the physician-Pharma interactions, including physician receipt of gifts,  
170 payments and research rewards from Pharma (e.g., “*Do you know that some physicians*  
171 *would receive pamphlets or leaflets concerning products manufactured by*  
172 *pharmaceutical companies from their sales representatives?*”) on a three-point Likert  
173 scale (*Yes, No, or Not sure*); 3) influence of the interactions’ on trust (e.g., “*How would*  
174 *your trust in your physician be influenced if your physician received pamphlet or leaflet*  
175 *with information about the products from a pharmaceutical sales representative?*”) on a  
176 five-point Likert scale; 4) perception of trust and regulation on the interactions (e.g.,  
177 “*Stricter regulations about gifts, meals, and honoraria from pharmaceutical companies*  
178 *to physicians are needed.*”) on a five-point Likert scale; 5) attitude towards the industrial

179 payments across professions (e.g., “*It is problematic for physicians to receive gifts, meals,*  
180 *and other entertainment from pharmaceutical sales representatives.*”) on a five-point  
181 Likert scale; and 6) an open-ended question about participants’ perception on the FCOI  
182 between Pharma and physicians (“*Please freely describe your thoughts about*  
183 *non-research-related offerings from Pharma to a physician (e.g., gifts, free meals,*  
184 *monetary incentives for a lecture)*”). The survey questions are described in greater detail  
185 in the Supplementary Methods (Supplementary Material 1).

186

### 187 ***Data analysis***

188 The initial descriptive analysis included the patients' sociodemographic and clinical  
189 variables and all questions concerning participant awareness, influence on trust in  
190 physicians, perceptions, and attitudes towards FCOI.

191

192 Next, to assess the association between awareness (outcome variable 1) and the impact of  
193 physician-Pharma interaction on physicians' trustworthiness (outcome variable 2) and  
194 each participant’s sociodemographic and clinical factors, we constructed logistic

195 regression models for trust in physicians. We re-categorized the following variables as  
196 appropriate and set them as predictor variables: annual income, highest educational  
197 qualification, medical history, type of business, hospital types, cancer stage, year of  
198 diagnosis, experience with cancer recurrence, experience with pharmacotherapy,  
199 experience with radiotherapy, and experience with surgical treatments. Further in the  
200 logistic analysis, to assess the factors related to participant awareness and to ensure  
201 statistical stability, the awareness status was re-categorized into two groups with the  
202 outcome variable set as those who responded "Yes" to one or more of the 11 questions  
203 about awareness, and those who responded "No" or "Not sure" to all questions. Similarly,  
204 the relationship between influence on physicians' trust and the predictor variables was  
205 also assessed using logistic regression analysis. In the analysis of the influence on trust in  
206 physicians, the variables measuring physicians' trust were aggregated into two types, with  
207 the outcome variable set as those who reported "*decreased trust in physicians*" or  
208 "*slightly decreased trust in physicians*" on at least one question, and the other respondents.  
209 In both analyses, multicollinearity was of no concern (VIFs < 10).

210

211 These data analyses were informed by similar previous studies reported by Ammous et al.  
212 and Green et al.[38, 40] All analyses, including descriptive statistics, were performed  
213 using Stata version 15 (STATA Corp., College Station, TX, United States). Conversion of  
214 JPY to USD used the 2019 average monthly exchange rate of 109.0 JPY per USD.

215

216 Lastly, participants' responses to the open-ended questions regarding perception on FCOI  
217 were analysed thematically, following Braun and Clarke.[41]

218

### 219 *Ethics approval*

220 The Institutional Review Board of Medical Governance Research Institute granted ethics  
221 approval of this study (MG2018-07-0928), adhering to the Ministry of Health Labour and  
222 Welfare and The Ministry of Education guidelines, Culture, Sports, Science, and  
223 Technology in Japan.

224

## 225 **Results**

### 226 *Participants*

227 All surveys returned by February 10, 2019, were considered. Of the 524 eligible survey  
228 participants, 96 completed the questionnaire (completion rate=18.3%). Table 1 presents  
229 participant sociodemographic and clinical characteristics. Respondents were  
230 predominantly male (67.7%, 63/93), older than 70 years (52.3%, 49/94), and 53.8%  
231 (50/93) had educational attainment of a bachelor's degree or higher. Further, 55.9%  
232 (52/93) were unemployed, and about half (46.5%, 40) had an annual household income of  
233 over \$36,697, roughly the average of Japanese households in 2018. Of the 89 respondents  
234 providing primary disease status, 69 (77.5%) were cancer patients, and 20 (22.5%) were  
235 non-cancer patients (e.g., family members of cancer patients).

236

237 **Table 1. Demographic features of the study population.**

238

<b>Variables</b>	
<b>Gender, N (%)</b>	
Male	63 (67.7)
Female	30 (32.3)
Missing	3
<b>Age category, N (%)</b>	
≤60	15 (16.0)
61-70	30 (31.9)
71-80	38 (40.4)
81-90	11 (11.7)
Missing	2
<b>Annual family income, N (%)</b>	
< 2 million JPY (< 18,349 USD)	6 (7.0)
2-4 million JPY (18,349-36,697 USD)	40 (46.5)
4-6 million JPY (36,697-55,046 USD)	14 (16.3)
6-8 million JPY (55,046-73,394 USD)	12 (14.0)
8-10 million JPY (73,394-91,743 USD)	5 (5.8)
>10 million JPY (>91,743 USD)	9 (10.5)
Missing	10
<b>Type of business, N (%)</b>	

Unemployed	52 (55.9)
Self-employed	15 (16.1)
Full-time job	11 (11.8)
Part-time job	7 (7.5)
Other	8 (8.6)
Missing	3
<b>Educational background, N (%)</b>	
Less than high school graduate	1 (1.1)
High school graduate	27 (29.0)
Associate degree or diploma	15 (16.1)
Bachelor's degree or more (bachelor, master and doctoral degree)	50 (53.8)
Missing	3
<b>Type of cancer, N (%)</b>	
Not cancer patient	20 (22.5)
Prostate cancer	24 (27.0)
Lung cancer	5 (5.6)
Breast cancer	5 (5.6)
Colorectal cancer	4 (4.5)
Gastric cancer	4 (4.5)
Other type of cancer	27 (30.3)
Missing	7
<b>Cancer's stage, N (%)*</b>	
Stage 1	23 (35.9)
Stage 2	16 (25.0)
Stage 3	10 (15.6)
Stage 4	5 (7.7)
Unclear	10 (15.6)
Missing	5
<b>Year of diagnosis, N (%)*</b>	
2018	4 (5.8)
2017	6 (8.7)
2016	3 (4.4)
2015	4 (5.8)
Before 2015	52 (75.4)
<b>Hospital, N (%)*</b>	
Cancer hospital	20 (29.4)
National university	9 (13.2)
Private university	9 (13.2)
National municipal hospital	10 (14.7)
Private municipal hospital	11 (16.2)
Other hospital	9 (13.2)
Missing	1
<b>Previous cancer recurrence*</b>	
Yes	13 (20.0)
No	47 (72.3)
Not clear	5 (7.7)
Missing	4
<b>Count of previous cancer reoccurrence, N (%)</b>	
1	6 (42.9)
2	2 (14.3)
3	1 (7.1)
6	1 (7.1)
7	1 (7.1)
10	1 (7.1)
Unknown	2 (14.3)
<b>Treatment which you have ever had, N (%)**· **</b>	



Anticancer drug	22 (16.5)
Molecularly targeted drug	5 (3.8)
Hormone therapy	23 (17.3)
Radiation therapy	37 (27.8)
Surgery	39 (29.3)
Other	4 (3.0)
Never	3 (2.3)
<b>Treatment which you have now, N (%)** **</b>	
Anticancer drug	2 (2.9)
Molecularly targeted drug	2 (2.9)
Hormone therapy	10 (14.5)
Radiation therapy	2 (2.9)
Other	11 (15.9)
Not having	42 (60.9)

239 \* The denominator was the number of people with any type of cancer. (n=69)

240 \*\* Multiple answers were possible.

241 Abbreviations: JPY; Japanese yen, USD; US dollar

242

243 Of the 69 participants self-identifying as cancer patients, 75.4% (52/64) received their

244 diagnosis before 2015. Further, 30.9% (21/68) of these participants primarily received

245 treatment at a municipal hospital, while 60.9% (42/69) did not actively receive any

246 treatment during the survey period. Lastly, 39 (56.5%) reported previous pharmaceutical

247 treatments for cancer, including anticancer drugs, molecularly targeted drugs, or hormone

248 therapy.

249

## 250 **Quantitative findings**

### 251 *Awareness of physician-Pharma interactions*

252 Figure 1 presents the participants' awareness of physician-Pharma interactions. The

253 proportion of the participants aware of these interactions ranged from 2.1% to 65.3%,  
254 depending on the type of interaction. The interaction with the largest proportion of  
255 participant awareness was pamphlets and leaflets (65.3%), followed by stationery  
256 (64.2%) and free drug samples (53.1%). In contrast, the participants were the least aware  
257 of possession of stocks (2.1%). Although Japanese companies belonging to the Japan  
258 Pharmaceutical Manufacturer Association have disclosed payments to healthcare sectors  
259 since 2013, only 10.5% (10/95) of the survey responders were aware of such disclosure.  
260 Overall, 80.2% (77/96) of participants were aware of at least one physician-Pharma  
261 interaction. Detailed results of awareness by participant demographic characteristics are  
262 shown in Supplementary Material 5. None of the sociodemographic and clinical variables  
263 in the logistic regression analysis significantly predicted awareness of physician-Pharma  
264 interactions ( $p \geq 0.05$ ) (Supplementary Material 6).

265

266 **Figure 1. Participants' awareness of interactions between physicians and**  
267 **pharmaceutical companies.**

268

269 ***Influence of physician-Pharma interactions on trust in physicians***

270 Figure 2 shows the impact of physician-Pharma interactions on patients' trust in  
271 physicians. Although participants overwhelmingly responded that most  
272 physician-Pharma interactions neither increased nor decreased their trust in physicians,  
273 81.2% (58.3% decrease in trust, 22.9% slightly decreased trust) agreed that stock  
274 ownership would negatively impact their trust in physicians. Additionally, accepting  
275 either honoraria for registering patients in industry-sponsored research (52.1% decrease  
276 in trust, 26.0% slightly decreased trust) or lecture fees (31.6% decrease in trust, 30.5%  
277 slightly decreased trust) also substantially impacted participant perceptions. Interestingly,  
278 few participants reported that indirect gifts, such as accepting free samples of prescription  
279 drugs (12.8% decrease in trust, 25.5% slightly decreased trust), would reduce trust in  
280 physicians. On the other hand, participation in industry-sponsored research generally  
281 appeared to increase physician trustfulness by 13.6% (increased trust 2.1%, slightly  
282 increased trust 11.5%) among participants. Overall, 90.6% of participants marked  
283 decreased trust or slightly decreased trust on at least one question. Associations between  
284 participant demographic characteristics and trust in physicians are shown in

285 Supplementary Material 7. Our regression analysis revealed that none of the  
286 sociodemographic or clinical variables significantly predicted whether patients' trust in  
287 physicians would decrease or not ( $p \geq 0.05$ ) (Supplementary Material 8).

288

289 **Figure 2. Influence of physician-Pharma interactions on trust in physicians.**

290

291 *Perception on physician-Pharma interactions*

292 Figure 3 details the reported perceptions on a series of statements regarding  
293 physician-Pharma interactions and regulations associated with each. Overall, a  
294 substantial proportion of participants either agreed or slightly agreed that gifts from  
295 pharmaceutical companies have a significant influence on physicians' prescription  
296 behavior (35.8% agree, 38.9% slightly agree). A similar proportion viewed such gifts as  
297 unethical (31.6% agree, 30.5% slightly agree), contributing to unnecessary prescriptions  
298 (34.7% agree, 37.9% slightly agree), and negatively influencing patients' trust in  
299 physicians (38.9% agree, 31.6% slightly agree). And while many participants  
300 acknowledged the need to regulate physician-Pharma interactions, more concluded that

301 there should be greater self-regulation by industry (60.0% agree, 26.3% slightly agree) or  
302 physicians (60.2% agree 24.7% slightly agree) as opposed to legal regulation (45.3%  
303 agree, 29.5% slightly agree).

304

305 **Figure 3. Participants' perceptions on statements regarding interactions between**  
306 **physicians and pharmaceutical companies and regulations associated with them.**

307

308 Figure 4 shows participants' perceptions on acceptable amounts and frequency of  
309 non-research payments from Pharma to physicians. In total, 75.9% of the participants  
310 considered an interaction worth 10,000 JPY (91.7 USD) or below as acceptable, and  
311 92.8% believed that the annual amount should be less than 1 million JPY (9,174 USD).  
312 Further, 77.8% of the participants considered one interaction every few months as  
313 acceptable.

314

315 **Figure 4. Participants' perception of acceptable amounts and frequency of**  
316 **non-research payments from pharmaceutical companies to physicians.**

317

318 *Attitude towards various professional FCOI.*

319 Figure 5 shows the participants' perceptions towards potential FCOI in various  
320 professions, including court judges, referees, politicians, physicians, and business  
321 professionals. Overall, a larger percentage of participants considered it problematic for  
322 court judges, politicians, or referees to receive gifts and meals from lawyers (agree 92.6%,  
323 slightly agree 6.3%), lobbyists (agree 75.5%, slightly agree 20.2%), or players (agree  
324 89.4%, slightly agree 4.3%), respectively, than for physicians to accept gifts from Pharma  
325 (agree 58.5%, if slightly agree 23.3%).

326

327 **Figure 5. Participant attitude about conflicts of interest among various**

328 **professionals.**

329

330 **Qualitative findings**

331 *Open-ended responses*

332 A thematic analysis of the survey's open-ended question, responded to by 56 (58.3%) of

333 the participants, identified four themes: 1) Perception towards the FCOI, 2) Concerns  
334 about the participant's treatment, 3) Reasons for physician-Pharma interactions and 4)  
335 Possible solutions from the patient's perspective.

336

337 **Theme 1: Perception towards the FCOI**

338 The majority of respondents agreed that physicians should not receive honoraria except  
339 for research purposes. However, even the receipt of honoraria for research purposes was  
340 conditioned on the premise that such awards would not interfere with physicians' ability  
341 to deliver high-quality patient-centered care.

342

343 “Never permit benefits except for research purposes. Pharmaceutical companies,  
344 including those who are involved in research, should realize that the pharmaceutical  
345 companies are responsible for the lives of people. We don't want doctors to accept one  
346 penny of honorarium.”

347

348 Further, concerning lecture fees, a few participants appeared to consider that physicians

349 deserve to receive payment to some extent due to the physicians' efforts in preparing for  
350 the lecture.

351

352 “Physicians are busy and time-restricted, so I think it’s reasonable for them to receive it  
353 (a lecture fee). But I disagree with any other kind of benefit-sharing between them,  
354 because that may hinder optimal selection of the prescription.”

355

356 The majority of respondents wanted the financial transactions to be minimized, except for  
357 reasonable research payments. This is in line with the results from our quantitative  
358 analysis. For example, more than half of the participants considered non-research  
359 benefits of less than 100,000 JPY (917 USD) per year to be appropriate.

360

## 361 **Theme 2: Concerns about the participant's treatment**

362 Many participants expressed concerns about the influence of physician-Pharma  
363 interactions on treatment decisions and the treatment they receive. Participants mostly  
364 wanted doctors to treat patients based on their authentic judgment and not be influenced



365 by these interactions.

366

367 “Doctors are also human, and if they are incentivized, then they may have to make a  
368 judgment that is favored by a pharmaceutical company. I've heard of such things, and I  
369 think doctors should put their patients first, as cliché as it may sound. Patients trust  
370 their doctors and put their lives in doctor’s hands. I hope that not all doctors are in favor  
371 of Pharma.”

372

373 “My former doctor used to go to ‘study meetings’ a lot. To treat my advanced cancer,  
374 this doctor strongly recommended a medicine that he had just learned about in these  
375 study meetings. Although I trusted him to treat me, having learned about the financial  
376 relationships between physicians and pharmaceutical industry in this research, now I  
377 would have made different decisions about his recommendations.”

378

379 In alignment with our quantitative analysis results, many participants expressed concern  
380 about the influence of physician-Pharma interactions on physician’s prescription

381 decisions in general. Additionally, several participants voiced unease about their  
382 physicians and the treatments they received.

383

### 384 **Theme 3: Reasons of physician-Pharma interactions**

385 Many participants concluded that a lack of physician ethical norms could cause FCOI  
386 between Pharma and healthcare sectors.

387

388 “I think it comes down to the ethics and morality of each physician.”

389

390 Besides physicians' morality, two participants raised the current government policy for  
391 science as an ongoing issue of physician-Pharma interactions. They indicated that the  
392 decline in the national budget for scientific research led to the financial dependence on  
393 Pharma.

394

395 “I think there is also a problem with the way the Japanese government funds basic  
396 research, alongside physician ethics and morality, if we want to ensure that

397 (healthcare) is not controlled by pharmaceutical companies.”

398

399 In contrast to Themes 1 and 2, neither of these two potential reasons were clarified in the  
400 quantitative results.

401

#### 402 **Theme 4: Possible solutions from the patient perspective**

403 The open-ended responses about possible solutions for FCOI comprised three main  
404 positions: improving public awareness of physician-Pharma interactions, strengthening  
405 legal or public FCOI regulation, and educating healthcare professionals on ethical norms.

406

407 Several participants suggested possible solutions for the FCOI between Pharma and  
408 healthcare sectors. Improving public awareness of physician-Pharma interactions was the  
409 idea suggested most often.

410

411 Also, regulating the FCOI by professional associations or law was suggested by several  
412 participants while also acknowledging the need for receipts for transport, meals, and

413 honoraria relating to lectures and research. These comments also supported the  
414 quantitative results that more than three-fourths of the participants agreed with some form  
415 of regulation.

416

417 “If [doctors] give a lecture, [doctors] may get transportation, food, and honorarium. It  
418 is generally an acceptable amount of money. If the basis on which pharmaceutical  
419 companies decide the concrete amount of the payments to physicians is unclear, the  
420 criteria should be decided by the professional association or academic society, taking  
421 into account the age and experience of the speaker.”

422

423 On the other hand, a few participants insisted a regulatory regime for physician-Pharma  
424 interactions based on each physician's morality rather than on legal or public regulation.

425 This would further indicate the need for the education of physicians on the perspective of  
426 ethical norms.

427

428 **Discussion**

429 In this study, we investigated the awareness and perceptions of FCOI between Pharma  
430 and physicians among members of a Japanese cancer patient advocacy group  
431 demographically representative of the general Japanese cancer patient population.[42]  
432 We primarily found that most of the participants were aware of physician-Pharma  
433 interactions, although the extent of the awareness differed based on the nature of the  
434 interaction. We also found that participants mainly considered these interactions  
435 influential on clinical practice and agreed to the need for further regulation of  
436 physician-pharma interactions.

437

438 Although the awareness of the interactions in this study, such as receipt of stationeries  
439 (64.2%), travel fees (35.8%), lecture fees (25.3%), and disclosure of payments from  
440 Pharma to the healthcare sector (10.5%), were within the scope of previous studies  
441 (55–76%, 17–33.7%, 20–46%, 7.3–18.8%, respectively),[12, 22, 24, 38, 43, 44] the  
442 awareness of receiving drug samples (53.1%) was significantly lower than studies in the  
443 US (87–93.9%).[43, 45] In contrast, the awareness of physicians conducting research for  
444 Pharma (47.4%), receipt of meals (50.5%), and receipt of textbooks (45.3%) were higher

445 than US and Lebanese studies (23–32%, 22–37%, 35–37%), respectively.[38, 40, 43] The  
446 underlying reasons for such differences among countries are not obvious. Still,  
447 stationaries and educational gifts, which could be present in clinicians’ offices, were more  
448 likely to be recognized than personal payments for lectures, travel, or accommodations, a  
449 trend which we observed previously.[43, 45-47]  
450  
451 One of the most interesting findings from this study was that despite ongoing disclosure  
452 efforts since 2013, only about 10% of participants knew major Japanese Pharma  
453 disclosed payments to physicians. Even so, the proportion of participants who were aware  
454 of such disclosures was within the range reported for previous studies conducted in the  
455 US (7.3%-18.8%).[12, 22, 24, 44] Nevertheless, this study's participants may have had a  
456 more robust general interest in awareness of FCOI between Pharma and healthcare  
457 sectors. The qualitative study's findings also revealed a lack of attentiveness on this issue,  
458 suggesting a need for proper countermeasure. Notably, during the study period on  
459 January 15, 2019, the Money Database was made publicly available in Japan. Since then,  
460 several academic papers and media reports have documented the financial relationships

461 among Pharma and various healthcare sectors. [20, 34-36, 48-50] This potentially  
462 contributed to a recent increase in public attention to the issue of FCOI in Japan and  
463 warrants a follow-up study to further evaluate this issue.  
464  
465 This survey also demonstrated that most of the participants considered the presence of  
466 FCOI with Pharma as harming participants' trust in physicians. Interestingly, although the  
467 results of the qualitative analyses indicated that a majority of respondents believed FCOI  
468 relating to research were acceptable when framed in the context of physicians  
469 participating in Pharma sponsored research, our quantitative findings noted a larger  
470 proportion of the participants (25%) reporting a decrease of trust in physicians than those  
471 who reported an increase of trust (13.6%). Further, 78.1% of the participants indicated a  
472 loss of trust when physicians received Pharma payments for participating in a clinical  
473 trial. This finding starkly contrasts with previous studies in other countries where the  
474 receipt of payments for lectures or conducting Pharma sponsored research were viewed  
475 as a positive symbol of good physicians by the public.[23, 51, 52]. Given that clinical  
476 trials can have positive consequences, including improving management strategies of

477 specific conditions or expanding the treatment options of patients participating in clinical  
478 trials, this apparent skepticism of clinical trials among the Japanese public warrants  
479 attention. Nonetheless, FCOI between Pharma and physicians may cause bias in  
480 reporting research findings [53, 54] or medical scandals.[55] Thus, proper control of  
481 FCOI must accompany research involving Pharma.

482

483 In this study, more than three-quarters of participants considered general FCOI with  
484 Pharma to be influential in physician prescription in a certain way. The observed value  
485 (75.9%) was the highest in several previous studies reported in other countries, ranging  
486 from 29% in Turkey to 75.6% in Canada.[38, 43-45, 56, 57] Also, more participants  
487 agreed that physician-Pharma interactions would increase healthcare costs (72.6%) more  
488 so than other studies (33%–67.3%).[43] A possible reason for this may relate to the study  
489 population comprising cancer patients or their advocates. Essentially, this population is  
490 characterized by more significant health risks with few treatment alternatives outside of  
491 seeing a physician, [58-60] and associated regular and long-term care[61, 62], leading to  
492 greater familiarity and trust in their physicians.[58]



493

494 Aspects of Japanese culture likely also contribute to our findings. In particular, the  
495 Japanese medical profession has traditionally been held sacred, with physicians  
496 considered above reproach due to their ethos. Often more so than in other countries.  
497 Moreover, there exists a deep sense of shame and extreme disdain associated with  
498 improper behavior.[63, 64] Consequently, physicians with inappropriate financial  
499 entanglements may be seen as a kind of “defilement,” leading to distrust or disgust of  
500 such physicians by Japanese patients more strongly than among those in other countries.

501

502 More than 80% of participants answered that gifts accepted by physicians from Pharma  
503 were problematic. However, compared to other fields, fewer people considered accepting  
504 gifts in the medical field as more problematic than the legal, athletic, and political fields  
505 and less problematic compared to the general business world. This trend was similar to  
506 that observed in the US.[40] However, our study showed that more participants  
507 considered the physician-Pharma interactions to be unethical than their counterparts in  
508 the US (58.5% unethical and 22.3% somewhat unethical in our study versus 44%

509 unethical and 15% somewhat unethical in the US).[40] Although we were unable to find  
510 an international comparison of physicians' public perception related to ethical norms, our  
511 findings indicated that a greater percentage of the Japanese public might expect  
512 physicians to be ethical than the general public in other countries.

513

#### 514 **Clinical implementation**

515 In completing the questionnaires, participants provided several key perspectives in their  
516 quantitative and open-ended qualitative responses to properly improve patient-centered  
517 care and manage FCOI between Pharma and healthcare sectors.

518

519 As our previous studies revealed, the current framework for regulating FCOI between  
520 Pharma and healthcare sectors in Japan still has room for improvement, particularly  
521 regarding transparency.[20, 21, 35, 36, 65] Regarding FCOI, we observed among cancer  
522 patients a consensus that physicians, professional associations, and Pharma should  
523 exhibit higher ethical standards and self-regulate their FCOI rather than rely on  
524 government regulation. This perspective has important repercussions for future

525 discussions on improving the transparency of FCOI in the Japanese healthcare system.

526 One likely countermeasure would be developing voluntary disclosure databases initiated

527 by professional organizations akin to Disclosure UK or Disclosure Australia.[9, 66]

528 Another option would include the rigorous and legally binding FCOI disclosure standards

529 established by the Sunshine Act and the Open Payment database in the US or the

530 Transparency in Healthcare database in France.[5, 10-12]

531

532 Second, our survey elucidated that nearly 20% of participants were unaware of many

533 kinds of physician-Pharma interactions despite representing a population with a high

534 level of interest in medical issues. Given that numerous studies showed that FCOI

535 between Pharma and healthcare sectors influence patient treatment [6, 67, 68] and that

536 many patients wanted to know about these conflicts [12, 52, 69-71], it is noteworthy that

537 patients could benefit significantly from knowledge about FCOI before choosing doctors

538 and treatments.[44, 52, 72] Therefore, we suggest the possibility of exploring seminars

539 focusing on direct communications with the general public to build stronger relationships

540 between Pharma, healthcare sectors, and patients and to gain patient trust.[73] One study

541 from Australia showed that small-sized workshops help improve patient knowledge  
542 about FCOI.[74]  
543  
544 In the meantime, the potential for increasing patient awareness of FCOI between Pharma  
545 and healthcare sectors may disrupt the long-standing, trusting relationship between  
546 patients and their physicians. As Kanter previously hypothesized,[72] our results suggest  
547 that patients with long-term and severe diseases like cancer would lose faith in their  
548 physicians over FCOI. Moreover, these concerns extended to a physician’s judgment of  
549 treatment options wherein some participants expressed similar concerns about the  
550 treatment they received. Specifically, this raises concerns about the general awareness of  
551 FCOI between Pharma and healthcare sectors, which could lead to some patients  
552 declining effective treatments suggested by their physicians. Therefore, careful  
553 consideration should be paid in communicating with patients about FCOI between  
554 Pharma and healthcare sectors.  
555  
556 Third, some participants suggested that there was a need to educate physicians about

557 FCOI. According to Medical Professionalism in the New Millennium: A Physician  
558 Charter, maintaining trust by managing FCOI is one of the fundamental responsibilities  
559 for all physicians.[75] However, only one-third of Japanese medical schools undergo  
560 formal training on FCOI between Pharma and healthcare sectors.[76] Most  
561 physician-Pharma interactions are rooted in the first year of a physician's training, after  
562 which physicians are continuously exposed to such interactions.[77, 78] For this reason,  
563 few physicians question these interactions or their influence on their clinical practice, and  
564 some physicians are not honest with their patients about FCOI.[76, 79-82] For example,  
565 more than 98% of Japanese medical students have financial interactions with  
566 Pharma.[83] Also, several studies revealed that junior physicians, more so than senior  
567 physicians, were more likely to accept interactions with Pharma[84, 85] and consider  
568 them appropriate and valuable.[85] Therefore, we would suggest that all medical schools  
569 establish a curriculum on FCOI addressing these relationships' undue influence on  
570 clinical practice[6, 68, 86] and their impact on patient trust and care.[72] Given that even  
571 preclinical medical students can interact with Pharma, it might be advisable for this  
572 curriculum to be implemented early, by the second or third year in Japan.[76, 87, 88]

573

574 **Limitations**

575 Our study has several limitations. First, it is worth noting that the response rate was  
576 relatively low at 18.3%. Many questions and the sensitive nature of the topic may have  
577 caused candidates to evade answering questions. The base response rate suggests that  
578 only candidates with a relatively strong interest in or problematic awareness of FCOI  
579 between Pharma and healthcare professionals may have participated in this study. Second,  
580 our study was conducted among the members of a cancer patient advocacy organization,  
581 many of whom have much more contact with Pharma and healthcare professionals than  
582 the general public and presumably greater interest in medical issues. Further, compared to  
583 Japan's general cancer population in 2015, the current study population tended to be more  
584 male but with a similar age distribution.[42] Therefore, this study should be interpreted  
585 with caution about whether the results reflect the general Japanese public's attitudes.  
586 Nevertheless, this study's findings mirror existing perceptions among cancer patients  
587 towards the FCOI of physicians. Third, we did not collect data on the physicians who  
588 oversaw the participants' treatments as cancer patients. Other unexamined confounding

589 factors, such as physician specialty, details of their FCOI with Pharma, would influence  
590 the differences of participant awareness and perception of physician-Pharma  
591 interactions.[12, 24, 57] Despite the limitations, to the best of our knowledge, this is the  
592 first study to examine the awareness and perceptions of physician-Pharma interactions  
593 among non-healthcare professionals in Japan. The opinions of cancer patients and the  
594 supporting public could help explore appropriate FCOI management methods in Japan  
595 and other countries.

596

## 597 **Conclusion**

598 While most participants were aware of some FCOI between healthcare sectors and  
599 Pharma in Japan, its extent differed much depending on the interactions. Participants also  
600 reported a significantly decreased trust in physicians who received personal gifts and  
601 payments than those accepting office-use related gifts. In addition, several participants  
602 expected that physicians should be highly ethical, minimize FCOI outside of research,  
603 and assume that FCOI disproportionately influences a physicians' clinical practice,  
604 increases healthcare costs, and lowers patients' trust in physicians. Further steps are

605 required to improve patient awareness of FCOI, patient trust, and transparency in  
606 healthcare. These include improving public awareness with seminars focusing on direct  
607 physician-patient communication, more patient-oriented regulation of FCOI, and  
608 educating medical students and physicians about FCOI.

609

610

## 611 **References**

- 612 1. Institute of Medicine Committee on Quality of Health Care in A.  
613 Crossing the Quality Chasm: A New Health System for the 21st Century.  
614 Washington (DC): National Academies Press (US)  
615 Copyright 2001 by the National Academy of Sciences. All rights reserved. ;  
616 2001.
- 617 2. Ozaki A, Saito H, Senoo Y, Sawano T, Shimada Y, Kobashi Y, et al.  
618 Overview and transparency of non-research payments to healthcare  
619 organizations and healthcare professionals from pharmaceutical companies  
620 in Japan: Analysis of payment data in 2016. Health Policy.  
621 2020;124(7):727-35. Epub 2020/05/23. doi:  
622 10.1016/j.healthpol.2020.03.011. PubMed PMID: 32439213.
- 623 3. Fickweiler F, Fickweiler W, Urbach E. Interactions between  
624 physicians and the pharmaceutical industry generally and sales  
625 representatives specifically and their association with physicians'  
626 attitudes and prescribing habits: a systematic review. BMJ Open.  
627 2017;7(9):e016408. Epub 2017/10/01. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2017-016408.  
628 PubMed PMID: 28963287; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC5623540.
- 629 4. Ozieranski P, Csanadi M, Rickard E, Tchilingirian J, Mulinari S.



- 630 Analysis of Pharmaceutical Industry Payments to UK Health Care  
631 Organizations in 2015. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2019;2(6):e196253. Epub 2019/06/22.  
632 doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2019.6253. PubMed PMID: 31225896; PubMed  
633 Central PMCID: PMC6593961.
- 634 5. Goupil B, Balusson F, Naudet F, Esvan M, Bastian B, Chapron A, et  
635 al. Association between gifts from pharmaceutical companies to French  
636 general practitioners and their drug prescribing patterns in 2016:  
637 retrospective study using the French Transparency in Healthcare and  
638 National Health Data System databases. *BMJ*. 2019;367:16015. Epub  
639 2019/11/07. doi: 10.1136/bmj.16015. PubMed PMID: 31690553; PubMed Central  
640 PMCID: PMC6830500 at [www.icmje.org/coi\\_disclosure.pdf](http://www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf) and declare: no  
641 financial relationships with any organisations that might have an interest  
642 in the submitted work in the previous three years; AC reports personal fees  
643 and non-financial support from Roche, personal fees and non-financial  
644 support from Novartis Pharma, and personal fees from Congres colloques  
645 conventions, outside the submitted work; no other relationships or  
646 activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work.
- 647 6. Brax H, Fadlallah R, Al-Khaled L, Kahale LA, Nas H, El-Jardali F,  
648 et al. Association between physicians' interaction with pharmaceutical  
649 companies and their clinical practices: A systematic review and  
650 meta-analysis. *PLoS One*. 2017;12(4):e0175493. Epub 2017/04/14. doi:  
651 10.1371/journal.pone.0175493. PubMed PMID: 28406971; PubMed Central  
652 PMCID: PMC5391068.
- 653 7. Catalyst N. What Is Patient-Centered Care? *NEJM Catalyst*.  
654 2017;3(1).
- 655 8. Institute of Medicine. Conflict of Interest in Medical Research,  
656 Education, and Practice. Lo B, Field MJ, editors. Washington, DC: The  
657 National Academies Press; 2009. 436 p.
- 658 9. Moynihan R, Bero L, Hill S, Johansson M, Lexchin J, Macdonald H,  
659 et al. Pathways to independence: towards producing and using trustworthy  
660 evidence. *BMJ*. 2019;367:16576. Epub 2019/12/05. doi: 10.1136/bmj.16576.  
661 PubMed PMID: 31796508.

- 662 10. Kanter GP, Loewenstein G. Evaluating Open Payments. JAMA.  
663 2019;322(5):401-2. doi: 10.1001/jama.2019.8171.
- 664 11. Santhakumar S, Adashi EY. The Physician Payment Sunshine Act:  
665 Testing the Value of Transparency. JAMA. 2015;313(1):23-4. doi:  
666 10.1001/jama.2014.15472.
- 667 12. Stein GE, Kamler JJ, Chang JS. Ophthalmology Patient Perceptions  
668 of Open Payments Information. JAMA Ophthalmology. 2018;136(12):1375-81.  
669 doi: 10.1001/jamaophthalmol.2018.4167.
- 670 13. Stoll M, Hubenschmid L, Koch C, Lieb K. Voluntary disclosures of  
671 payments from pharmaceutical companies to healthcare professionals in  
672 Germany: a descriptive study of disclosures in 2015 and 2016. BMJ Open.  
673 2020;10(9):e037395. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2020-037395.
- 674 14. Napierala H, Schäfer L, Schott G, Schurig N, Lempert T. Management  
675 of financial conflicts of interests in clinical practice guidelines in  
676 Germany: results from the public database GuidelineWatch. BMC Medical  
677 Ethics. 2018;19(1):65. doi: 10.1186/s12910-018-0309-y.
- 678 15. Mulinari S, Ozieranski P. Disclosure of payments by pharmaceutical  
679 companies to healthcare professionals in the UK: analysis of the  
680 Association of the British Pharmaceutical Industry's Disclosure UK  
681 database, 2015 and 2016 cohorts. BMJ Open. 2018;8(10):e023094. doi:  
682 10.1136/bmjopen-2018-023094.
- 683 16. Adlington K, Godlee F. Disclosure UK: transparency should no longer  
684 be an optional extra. BMJ. 2016;354:i3730. doi: 10.1136/bmj.i3730.
- 685 17. Ozieranski P, Rickard E, Mulinari S. Exposing drug industry funding  
686 of UK patient organisations. BMJ. 2019;365:11806. Epub 2019/05/28. doi:  
687 10.1136/bmj.11806. PubMed PMID: 31122928; PubMed Central PMCID:  
688 PMCPMC6529850 interests and declare the following: SM and PO's work on the  
689 study reported in this paper was supported by the grant "What can be learnt  
690 from the new pharmaceutical industry payment disclosures?" awarded by the  
691 Swedish Research Council for Health, Working Life and Welfare (FORTE  
692 #2016-00875). ER's work was funded through the above grant. The funding  
693 body has played no part in the design or conduct of this analysis. We have

- 694 no other competing interests to declare.
- 695 18. Transparency Reporting [Internet]. Medicines Australia. 2019  
696 [cited October 28, 2020]. Available from:  
697 <https://www.disclosureaustralia.com.au/search/>.
- 698 19. Pokorny AMJ, Bero LA, Moynihan R, Mintzes BJ. Industry payments  
699 to Australian medical oncologists and clinical haematologists: a  
700 cross-sectional analysis of publicly-available disclosures. *Intern Med J.*  
701 2020;n/a(n/a). Epub 2020/08/04. doi: 10.1111/imj.15005. PubMed PMID:  
702 32744396.
- 703 20. Sawano T, Ozaki A, Saito H, Shimada Y, Tanimoto T. Pharmaceutical  
704 Company Payments to Japanese Government Drug Regulation Committee Members.  
705 *Clin Pharmacol Ther.* 2020;108(5):1049–54. Epub 2020/05/19. doi:  
706 10.1002/cpt.1892. PubMed PMID: 32420619.
- 707 21. Murayama A, Ozaki A, Saito H, Sawano T, Shimada Y, Yamamoto K, et  
708 al. Pharmaceutical company payments to dermatology Clinical Practice  
709 Guideline authors in Japan. *PLoS One.* 2020;15(10):e0239610. Epub  
710 2020/10/14. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0239610. PubMed PMID: 33048952;  
711 PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7553305 Pharmaciez. Also Dr. Saito received  
712 personal fees from TAIHO Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd. outside the scope of the  
713 submitted work. Drs. Ozaki and Tanimoto received personal fees from Medical  
714 Network Systems outside the scope of the submitted work. This donation from  
715 Ain Pharmaceiz does not alter our adherence to PLoS ONE policies on sharing  
716 data and materials.
- 717 22. Kanter GP, Carpenter D, Lehmann L, Mello MM. Effect of the public  
718 disclosure of industry payments information on patients: results from a  
719 population-based natural experiment. *BMJ Open.* 2019;9(2):e024020. Epub  
720 2019/03/04. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2018-024020. PubMed PMID: 30826793;  
721 PubMed Central PMCID: PMC6398799.
- 722 23. Hampson LA, Agrawal M, Joffe S, Gross CP, Verter J, Emanuel EJ.  
723 Patients' views on financial conflicts of interest in cancer research  
724 trials. *N Engl J Med.* 2006;355(22):2330–7. Epub 2006/12/01. doi:  
725 10.1056/NEJMsa064160. PubMed PMID: 17135586.

- 726 24. Pham-Kanter G, Mello MM, Lehmann LS, Campbell EG, Carpenter D.  
727 Public Awareness of and Contact With Physicians Who Receive Industry  
728 Payments: A National Survey. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*.  
729 2017;32(7):767-74. doi: 10.1007/s11606-017-4012-3.
- 730 25. Kanter GP, Carpenter D, Lehmann LS, Mello MM. US Nationwide  
731 Disclosure of Industry Payments and Public Trust in Physicians. *JAMA*  
732 *Network Open*. 2019;2(4):e191947-e. doi:  
733 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2019.1947.
- 734 26. Siegel RL, Miller KD, Jemal A. Cancer statistics, 2019. *CA: A Cancer*  
735 *Journal for Clinicians*. 2019;69(1):7-34. doi: 10.3322/caac.21551.
- 736 27. Ayyar BV, Arora S, O' Kennedy R. Coming-of-Age of Antibodies in  
737 Cancer Therapeutics. *Trends in Pharmacological Sciences*.  
738 2016;37(12):1009-28. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tips.2016.09.005>.
- 739 28. Lagassé HAD, Alexaki A, Simhadri VL, Katagiri NH, Jankowski W,  
740 Sauna ZE, et al. Recent advances in (therapeutic protein) drug development.  
741 *F1000Res*. 2017;6:113-. doi: 10.12688/f1000research.9970.1. PubMed PMID:  
742 28232867.
- 743 29. Tay-Teo K, Ilbawi A, Hill SR. Comparison of Sales Income and  
744 Research and Development Costs for FDA-Approved Cancer Drugs Sold by  
745 Originator Drug Companies. *JAMA Network Open*. 2019;2(1):e186875-e. doi:  
746 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2018.6875.
- 747 30. Aitken M, Kleinrock M, Simorellis A, Nass D. The global use of  
748 medicine in 2019 and outlook to 2023. USA: IQVIA. 2019.
- 749 31. Fuji Keizai Management Co. Ltd. Ethical pharmaceutical data book  
750 2018-2019. 2019 June 5. Report No.
- 751 32. Japan Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association. Transparency  
752 guideline for the relation between corporate activities and medical  
753 institutions [in Japanese] 2018 [cited 2019 December 14]. Available from:  
754 [http://www.jpma.or.jp/english/policies\\_guidelines/transparency\\_guideli](http://www.jpma.or.jp/english/policies_guidelines/transparency_guideline.html)  
755 [ne.html](http://www.jpma.or.jp/english/policies_guidelines/transparency_guideline.html).
- 756 33. "Money for Docs" database [Internet]. Waseda Chronicle  
757 the Medical Governance Research Institute. 2020. Available from:

- 758 <https://db.wasedachronicle.org/>.
- 759 34. Saito H, Ozaki A, Kobayashi Y, Sawano T, Tanimoto T. Pharmaceutical  
760 Company Payments to Executive Board Members of Professional Medical  
761 Associations in Japan. *JAMA Intern Med.* 2019;179(4):578–80. Epub  
762 2019/02/05. doi: 10.1001/jamainternmed.2018.7283. PubMed PMID: 30715087;  
763 PubMed Central PMCID: PMC6450293.
- 764 35. Ozaki A, Saito H, Onoue Y, Sawano T, Shimada Y, Somekawa Y, et al.  
765 Pharmaceutical payments to certified oncology specialists in Japan in 2016:  
766 a retrospective observational cross-sectional analysis. *BMJ Open.*  
767 2019;9(9):e028805. Epub 2019/09/09. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2018-028805.  
768 PubMed PMID: 31494604; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC6731803.
- 769 36. Saito H, Ozaki A, Sawano T, Shimada Y, Tanimoto T. Evaluation of  
770 Pharmaceutical Company Payments and Conflict of Interest Disclosures Among  
771 Oncology Clinical Practice Guideline Authors in Japan. *JAMA Netw Open.*  
772 2019;2(4):e192834. Epub 2019/04/27. doi:  
773 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2019.2834. PubMed PMID: 31026027; PubMed Central  
774 PMCID: PMC6487566.
- 775 37. Hillen MA, Medendorp NM, Daams JG, Smets EMA. Patient-Driven Second  
776 Opinions in Oncology: A Systematic Review. *Oncologist.*  
777 2017;22(10):1197–211. Epub 2017/06/12. doi:  
778 10.1634/theoncologist.2016-0429. PubMed PMID: 28606972.
- 779 38. Ammous A, Bou Zein Eddine S, Dani A, Dbaibou J, El-Asmar JM, Sadder  
780 L, et al. Awareness and attitudes of the Lebanese population with regard  
781 to physician-pharmaceutical company interaction: a survey study. *BMJ Open.*  
782 2017;7(3):e013041. Epub 2017/04/02. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2016-013041.  
783 PubMed PMID: 28363922; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC5387964.
- 784 39. National Cancer Center Center for Cancer Control and Information  
785 Services. Summary report of hospital-based cancer registry in 2018. Online:  
786 2019 December. Report No.
- 787 40. Green MJ, Masters R, James B, Simmons B, Lehman E. Do gifts from  
788 the pharmaceutical industry affect trust in physicians? *Fam Med.*  
789 2012;44(5):325–31. Epub 2012/10/03. PubMed PMID: 23027114.

- 790 41. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology.  
791 Qualitative Research in Psychology. 2006;3(2):77-101. doi:  
792 10.1191/1478088706qp063oa.
- 793 42. Hori M, Matsuda T, Shibata A, Katanoda K, Sobue T, Nishimoto H,  
794 et al. Cancer incidence and incidence rates in Japan in 2009: a study of  
795 32 population-based cancer registries for the Monitoring of Cancer  
796 Incidence in Japan (MCIJ) project. Japanese Journal of Clinical Oncology.  
797 2015;45(9):884-91. doi: 10.1093/jjco/hyv088.
- 798 43. Fadlallah R, Nas H, Naamani D, El-Jardali F, Hammoura I, Al-Khaled  
799 L, et al. Knowledge, Beliefs and Attitudes of Patients and the General  
800 Public towards the Interactions of Physicians with the Pharmaceutical and  
801 the Device Industry: A Systematic Review. PLOS ONE. 2016;11(8):e0160540.  
802 doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0160540.
- 803 44. Lopez J, Naved BA, Pradeep T, Pineault K, Purvis T, Macmillan A,  
804 et al. What Do Plastic Surgery Patients Think of Financial Conflicts of  
805 Interest and the Sunshine Act? Annals of Plastic Surgery.  
806 2019;82(6):597-603. doi: 10.1097/sap.0000000000001756. PubMed PMID:  
807 00000637-201906000-00003.
- 808 45. Jastifer J, Roberts S. Patients' Awareness of and Attitudes toward  
809 Gifts from Pharmaceutical Companies to Physicians. International Journal  
810 of Health Services. 2009;39(2):405-14. doi: 10.2190/HS.39.2.j.
- 811 46. Blake RL, Jr., Early EK. Patients' attitudes about gifts to  
812 physicians from pharmaceutical companies. J Am Board Fam Pract.  
813 1995;8(6):457-64. Epub 1995/11/01. PubMed PMID: 8585404.
- 814 47. Mainous AG, 3rd, Hueston WJ, Rich EC. Patient perceptions of  
815 physician acceptance of gifts from the pharmaceutical industry. Arch Fam  
816 Med. 1995;4(4):335-9. Epub 1995/04/01. doi: 10.1001/archfami.4.4.335.  
817 PubMed PMID: 7711920.
- 818 48. Saito H, Ozaki A, Sawano T, Shimada Y, Yamamoto K, Suzuki Y, et  
819 al. Pharmaceutical Company Payments to the Professors of Orthopaedic  
820 Surgery Departments in Japan. JBJS. 2020;102(9):e39. doi:  
821 10.2106/jbjs.19.01005. PubMed PMID: 00004623-202005060-00017.

- 822 49. Saito H, Tani Y, Ozaki A, Sawano T, Shimada Y, Yamamoto K, et al.  
823 Financial ties between authors of the clinical practice guidelines and  
824 pharmaceutical companies: an example from Japan. *Clin Microbiol Infect.*  
825 2019;25(11):1304-6. Epub 2019/08/12. doi: 10.1016/j.cmi.2019.07.025.  
826 PubMed PMID: 31401175.
- 827 50. Harada K, Ozaki A, Saito H, Sawano T, Yamamoto K, Murayama A, et  
828 al. Financial payments made by pharmaceutical companies to the authors of  
829 Japanese hematology clinical practice guidelines between 2016 and 2017.  
830 *Health Policy.* 2021;125(3):320-6. Epub 2021/01/03. doi:  
831 10.1016/j.healthpol.2020.12.005. PubMed PMID: 33386174.
- 832 51. Fisher CG, DiPaola CP, Noonan VK, Bailey C, Dvorak MFS.  
833 Physician-industry conflict of interest: public opinion regarding  
834 industry-sponsored research. *Journal of Neurosurgery: Spine SPI.*  
835 2012;17(1):1. doi: 10.3171/2012.4.Spine11869.
- 836 52. DiPaola CP, Dea N, Noonan VK, Bailey CS, Dvorak MFS, Fisher CG.  
837 Surgeon-industry conflict of interest: survey of North Americans' opinions  
838 regarding surgeons consulting with industry. *The Spine Journal.*  
839 2014;14(4):584-91. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spinee.2013.06.028>.
- 840 53. Melander H, Ahlqvist-Rastad J, Meijer G, Beermann B. Evidence  
841 based medicine--selective reporting from studies sponsored by  
842 pharmaceutical industry: review of studies in new drug applications. *BMJ.*  
843 2003;326(7400):1171-3. Epub 2003/05/31. doi: 10.1136/bmj.326.7400.1171.  
844 PubMed PMID: 12775615; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC156459.
- 845 54. Lexchin J, Bero LA, Djulbegovic B, Clark O. Pharmaceutical industry  
846 sponsorship and research outcome and quality: systematic review. *BMJ.*  
847 2003;326(7400):1167-70. Epub 2003/05/31. doi: 10.1136/bmj.326.7400.1167.  
848 PubMed PMID: 12775614; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC156458.
- 849 55. Mullard A. Mediator scandal rocks French medical community. *The*  
850 *Lancet.* 2011;377(9769):890-2. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(11)60334-6.
- 851 56. Holbrook A, Lexchin J, Pullenayegum E, Campbell C, Marlow B, Troyan  
852 S, et al. What do Canadians think about physician-pharmaceutical industry  
853 interactions? *Health Policy.* 2013;112(3):255-63. Epub 2013/05/29. doi:

- 854 10.1016/j.healthpol.2013.04.020. PubMed PMID: 23711633.
- 855 57. Niforatos JD, Chaitoff A, Mercer MB, Yu P-C, Rose SL. Association  
856 Between Public Trust and Provider Specialty Among Physicians With Financial  
857 Conflicts of Interest. *Mayo Clinic Proceedings*. 2019;94(12):2467-75. doi:  
858 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mayocp.2019.07.009>.
- 859 58. Gidman W, Ward P, McGregor L. Understanding public trust in  
860 services provided by community pharmacists relative to those provided by  
861 general practitioners: a qualitative study. *BMJ Open*. 2012;2(3):e000939.  
862 doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2012-000939.
- 863 59. Ward P, Coates A. 'We shed tears, but there is no one there to  
864 wipe them up for us': narratives of (mis)trust in a materially deprived  
865 community. *Health*. 2006;10(3):283-301. doi: 10.1177/1363459306064481.  
866 PubMed PMID: 16775016.
- 867 60. Hall MA, Dugan E, Zheng B, Mishra AK. Trust in Physicians and  
868 Medical Institutions: What Is It, Can It Be Measured, and Does It Matter?  
869 *The Milbank Quarterly*. 2001;79(4):613-39. doi:  
870 <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0009.00223>.
- 871 61. Luhmann N, Gambetta D. Trust: making and breaking cooperative  
872 relations. Familiarity, confidence, trust: problems and alternatives New  
873 York: Basil Blackwell. 1988:94-107.
- 874 62. Luhmann N. Trust: A mechanism for the reduction of social  
875 complexity. *Trust and power: Two works by Niklas Luhmann*. 1979:1-103.
- 876 63. Benedict R. The chrysanthemum and the sword; patterns of Japanese  
877 culture. 1946.
- 878 64. Yanagida K. A Vulgar Man's View of Life (<Feature> What Ruth  
879 Benedict's *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword* offers). *The Japanese journal*  
880 *of ethnology*. 1950;14(4):p.290-7. doi:  
881 [https://doi.org/10.14890/minkennewseries.14.4\\_290](https://doi.org/10.14890/minkennewseries.14.4_290).
- 882 65. Yamamoto K, Murayama A, Ozaki A, Saito H, Sawano T, Tanimoto T.  
883 Financial conflicts of interest between pharmaceutical companies and the  
884 authors of urology clinical practice guidelines in Japan. *Int Urogynecol*  
885 *J*. 2021;32(2):443-51. Epub 2020/11/06. doi: 10.1007/s00192-020-04547-3.



886 PubMed PMID: 33151353.

887 66. Fudman D, Feuerstein JD. The Call for Greater Transparency in  
888 Conflicts of Interest. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2018;1(8):e186342. Epub 2019/01/16.  
889 doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2018.6342. PubMed PMID: 30646322.

890 67. Spurling GK, Mansfield PR, Montgomery BD, Lexchin J, Doust J,  
891 Othman N, et al. Information from pharmaceutical companies and the quality,  
892 quantity, and cost of physicians' prescribing: a systematic review. *PLoS*  
893 *Med*. 2010;7(10):e1000352. Epub 2010/10/27. doi:  
894 10.1371/journal.pmed.1000352. PubMed PMID: 20976098; PubMed Central  
895 PMCID: PMCPMC2957394 BM, JL, NO, and AV are members of Healthy Skepticism  
896 Inc. Healthy Skepticism is an international nonprofit research, education,  
897 and advocacy association with the main aim of reducing harm from misleading  
898 health information. PRM is the director of Healthy Skepticism Inc., and  
899 is mostly unpaid. PRM's wife and two of his daughters are part-time  
900 employees of Healthy Skepticism Inc. JL is a member of the management  
901 committee of Healthy Skepticism.

902 68. Mitchell AP, Trivedi NU, Gennarelli RL, Chimonas S, Tabatabai SM,  
903 Goldberg J, et al. Are Financial Payments From the Pharmaceutical Industry  
904 Associated With Physician Prescribing? : A Systematic Review. *Ann Intern*  
905 *Med*. 2020. Epub 2020/11/24. doi: 10.7326/m20-5665. PubMed PMID: 33226858.

906 69. Wen L. Patients can't trust doctors' advice if we hide our  
907 financial connections with drug companies. *BMJ : British Medical Journal*.  
908 2014;348:g167. doi: 10.1136/bmj.g167.

909 70. Tattersall MH, Dimoska A, Gan K. Patients expect transparency in  
910 doctors' relationships with the pharmaceutical industry. *Med J Aust*.  
911 2009;190(2):65-8. Epub 2009/02/25. PubMed PMID: 19236290.

912 71. Edwards D, Ballantyne A. Patient awareness and concern regarding  
913 pharmaceutical manufacturer interactions with doctors. *Intern Med J*.  
914 2009;39(3):191-6. Epub 2009/04/23. doi: 10.1111/j.1445-5994.2008.01887.x.  
915 PubMed PMID: 19383067.

916 72. Pham-Kanter G. Act II of the Sunshine Act. *PLoS Med*.  
917 2014;11(11):e1001754. Epub 2014/11/05. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1001754.

- 918 PubMed PMID: 25369363; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4219660.
- 919 73. Ozaki A, Murayama A, Saito H, Sawano T, Harada K, Senoo Y, et al.  
920 Transparency Is Not Enough: How Can We Improve the Management of Financial  
921 Conflicts of Interest Between Pharma and Healthcare Sectors? *Clin Pharmacol*  
922 *Ther.* 2020. Epub 2020/12/31. doi: 10.1002/cpt.2126. PubMed PMID: 33377498.
- 923 74. Moynihan R, Fabbri A, Parker L, Bero L. Mixed methods evaluation  
924 of workshops for citizen health advocates about financial conflicts of  
925 interests in healthcare. *BMJ Open.* 2020;10(5):e034195. doi:  
926 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-034195.
- 927 75. Medicine AFABoI, Medicine A-AFACoP-ASoI, European Federation of  
928 Internal M. Medical professionalism in the new millennium: a physician  
929 charter. *Ann Intern Med.* 2002;136(3):243-6. Epub 2002/02/06. doi:  
930 10.7326/0003-4819-136-3-200202050-00012. PubMed PMID: 11827500.
- 931 76. Saito S, Maeno T, Miyata Y, Maeno T. Medical students' attitudes  
932 toward interactions with the pharmaceutical industry: a national survey  
933 in Japan. *BMC Medical Education.* 2018;18(1):286. doi:  
934 10.1186/s12909-018-1394-9.
- 935 77. Evans DV, Desnick L, Keys T. Pharma Exposure Occurs Early in  
936 Training and More Often in Rural Clinical Sites. *Academic Medicine.*  
937 2016;91(1).
- 938 78. Fitz MM, Homan D, Reddy S, Griffith CHI, Baker E, Simpson KP. The  
939 Hidden Curriculum: Medical Students' Changing Opinions toward the  
940 Pharmaceutical Industry. *Academic Medicine.* 2007;82(10):S1-S3. doi:  
941 10.1097/ACM.0b013e31813e7f02. PubMed PMID: 00001888-200710001-00001.
- 942 79. Saito S, Mukohara K, Bito S. Japanese Practicing Physicians'  
943 Relationships with Pharmaceutical Representatives: A National Survey. *PLOS*  
944 *ONE.* 2010;5(8):e12193. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0012193.
- 945 80. Cain DM, Detsky AS. Everyone's a Little Bit Biased (Even  
946 Physicians). *JAMA.* 2008;299(24):2893-5. doi: 10.1001/jama.299.24.2893.
- 947 81. Lea D, Spigset O, Slørdal L. Norwegian medical students' attitudes  
948 towards the pharmaceutical industry. *Eur J Clin Pharmacol.*  
949 2010;66(7):727-33. Epub 2010/03/20. doi: 10.1007/s00228-010-0805-6.

- 950 PubMed PMID: 20300742.
- 951 82. Iezzoni LI, Rao SR, DesRoches CM, Vogeli C, Campbell EG. Survey  
952 shows that at least some physicians are not always open or honest with  
953 patients. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 2012;31(2):383-91. Epub 2012/02/11. doi:  
954 10.1377/hlthaff.2010.1137. PubMed PMID: 22323169.
- 955 83. Saito S, Maeno T, Miyata Y, Maeno T. Follow-up survey of Japanese  
956 medical students' interactions with the pharmaceutical industry. *PLOS ONE*.  
957 2018;13(11):e0206543. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0206543.
- 958 84. Montastruc F, Moulis G, Palmaro A, Gardette V, Durrieu G,  
959 Montastruc J-L. Interactions between medical residents and drug companies:  
960 a national survey after the Mediator® affair. *PLoS One*. 2014;9(10):e104828.
- 961 85. Hodges B. Interactions with the pharmaceutical industry:  
962 experiences and attitudes of psychiatry residents, interns and clerks. *Cmaj*.  
963 1995;153(5):553-9. Epub 1995/09/01. PubMed PMID: 7641153; PubMed Central  
964 PMCID: PMCPMC1487391.
- 965 86. Inoue K, Figueroa JF, Orav EJ, Tsugawa Y. Association between  
966 industry payments for opioid products and physicians' prescription of  
967 opioids: observational study with propensity-score matching. *Journal of*  
968 *Epidemiology and Community Health*. 2020;74(8):647-54. doi:  
969 10.1136/jech-2020-214021.
- 970 87. Civaner MM. A follow-up study on the effects of an educational  
971 intervention against pharmaceutical promotion. *PLOS ONE*.  
972 2020;15(10):e0240713. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0240713.
- 973 88. Austad KE, Avorn J, Kesselheim AS. Medical Students' Exposure to  
974 and Attitudes about the Pharmaceutical Industry: A Systematic Review. *PLOS*  
975 *Medicine*. 2011;8(5):e1001037. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1001037.

976

977

978 **Acknowledgement**

979 Authors appreciate Dr. Derek Hagman for professional English language editing and

980 constructive opinions for this study.

981

982 **Author contributions**

983 We describe contributions to the paper using the CRediT taxonomy provided above.

984 Conceptualization: all authors;

985 Data curation: A.M.;

986 Formal analysis: A.M.;

987 Funding acquisition: A.O.;

988 Investigation: all authors; Methodology: all authors;

989 Project Administration: A.O., and T.T.;

990 Supervision: A.O., and T.T.;

991 Visualization: A.M., A.O., and T.T.;

992 Writing – Original Draft: Y.S., A.M., K.H.;

993 Writing – review & editing: A.M., Y.K., T.T., and A.O.

994 All authors revised the manuscript critically for important intellectual content, gave final

995 approval of the revision to be published, and agreed to be accountable for all the aspects  
996 of the study.

997

998 **Conflicts of interest**

999 Dr. Saito receives personal fees from Taiho Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd. outside the scope of  
1000 the submitted work. Dr. Ozaki receives personal fees from Medical Network Systems  
1001 outside the scope of the submitted work. Dr. Tanimoto receives personal fees from  
1002 Medical Network Systems and Bionics Co. Ltd. outside the scope of the submitted work.  
1003 The remaining authors declare no financial conflicts of interest. Anju Murayama, Yuki  
1004 Senoo, Kayo Harada, Hiroaki Saito, Toyoaki Sawano, Tetsuya Tanimoto, and Akihiko  
1005 Ozaki report a number of studies on conflicts of interest in Japan.

1006

1007 **Funding**

1008 This study was funded in part by the Medical Governance Research Institute. This  
1009 non-profit enterprise receives donations from pharmaceutical companies, including Ain  
1010 Pharmaciez, Inc., other organizations, and private individuals. This study also received

1011 support from the Tansa (formerly known as Waseda Chronicle), an independent  
1012 non-profit news organization dedicated to investigative journalism. Ain Pharmacies had  
1013 no role in the design and conduct of the study, the collection, management, analysis, and  
1014 interpretation of the data, the preparation, review, and approval of the manuscript, or the  
1015 decision to submit the manuscript for publication. Tansa was engaged in the collection  
1016 and management of the payment data, but had no role in the design and conduct of the  
1017 study, the analysis and interpretation of the data, the preparation, review and approval of  
1018 the manuscript, or the decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

1019

## 1020 **Supporting information:**

### 1021 **Supplementary Method**

#### 1022 ***Variables***

1023 *Sociodemographic factors.* Sociodemographic factors included age, sex, highest educational attainment  
1024 (*less than high school graduate; high school graduate; associate degree or diploma; or bachelor's degree*  
1025 *or more*), employment status (*full time job; self-employed; part-time job; unemployed; or other*), and  
1026 annual income (*<2 million JPY (<18,349 USD); 2-4 million JPY (18,349-36,697 USD); 4-6 million JPY*  
1027 *(36,697-55,046 USD); 6-8 million JPY (55,046-73,394 USD); 8-10 million JPY (73,394-91,743 USD); or*  
1028 *>10 million JPY (>91,743 USD).*

1029

1030 *Primary diagnosis.* We asked participant's primary disease and categorized it into seven types: *non-cancer;*  
1031 *prostate cancer; lung cancer; breast cancer; colorectal cancer; gastric cancer; and other kinds of cancer.*

1032

1033 *Clinical factors relating to cancer (only for cancer patients).* For cancer patients, we collected data on

1034 clinical characteristics including disease stage (*Stage I, Stage II, Stage III, Stage IV, or unclear*), year of  
1035 diagnosis (*2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, or before 2015*), type of hospital in which participant received  
1036 treatment (*Cancer hospital, national university hospital, private university hospital, national municipal*  
1037 *hospital, private municipal hospital, or other hospital*), the treatment participants had been receiving (*no*  
1038 *active treatment, anticancer drug, molecularly targeted drug, immune checkpoint inhibitor, hormonal*  
1039 *therapy, radiation therapy, or other therapy*), treatments participants had ever received (*no active treatment,*  
1040 *anticancer drug, molecularly targeted drug, immune checkpoint inhibitor, hormonal therapy, radiation*  
1041 *therapy, surgery, or other therapy*), and disease recurrence (*yes, no, not clear, or other*).

1042

1043 *Awareness of physician-Pharma interactions.* To assess awareness of physician-Pharma interactions, we  
1044 evaluated awareness of 11 types of interactions, including pamphlets and leaflets, stationeries, textbooks  
1045 and articles, free drug samples, free meals travel and accommodations, lecture fees, disclosure program of  
1046 the payment from Pharma to physicians, conduct of research for Pharma, outsourcing expenses, and  
1047 possession of stocks. Consequently, we used the following question, “*Do you know that some physicians*  
1048 *would receive pamphlet and leaflet concerning products manufactured by pharmaceutical companies from*  
1049 *their sales representatives?*” on a three-point Likert scale (*Yes, No, or Not sure*). Other items are listed in  
1050 Supplementary Material 2.

1051

1052 *Influence on trust in physicians.* We assessed the impact on trust in physicians over 11 types of interactions  
1053 including, pamphlets and leaflets, stationeries, textbooks and articles, free drug samples, free meals, travel  
1054 and accommodations, lecture fees, conduct of research for Pharma, outsourcing expenses, possession of  
1055 stocks, and insider trading. Consequently, we used the following question, “*How would your trust in your*  
1056 *physician be influenced if your physician received pamphlet or leaflet with information about the products*  
1057 *from a pharmaceutical sales representative?*” on a five-point Likert scale (*Increase of trust in physicians,*  
1058 *Slight increase of trust in physicians, Neither increase nor decrease of trust in physicians, Slight decrease*  
1059 *of trust in physicians, or Decrease of trust in physicians*). Other items are listed in Supplementary Material  
1060 3.

1061

1062 *Perception on physician-Pharma interaction.* We evaluated participants’ perception of physician-Pharma  
1063 interactions by assessing whether to agree with the following statements. 1) “*Payments from*  
1064 *pharmaceutical companies would influence physician prescription pattern.*” 2) “*Payments from*  
1065 *pharmaceutical companies would increase unnecessary prescriptions and healthcare costs.*” 3) “*A receipt*  
1066 *of payments from pharmaceutical companies would be acceptable as long as its amount is small.*” 4)

1067 “Physician’s receipts of gifts, meals and honoraria from pharmaceutical companies are unethical.” 5)  
1068 “Physician’s receipts of gifts, meals, and honoraria from pharmaceutical companies would undermine the  
1069 trust in physicians.” 6) “More rigorous internal regulation of gifts, meals, and honoraria from  
1070 pharmaceutical companies to physicians is needed among pharmaceutical companies.” 7) “More rigorous  
1071 internal regulation of gifts, meals, and honoraria from pharmaceutical companies to physicians is needed  
1072 among physicians.” 8) “More rigorous legal regulation of gifts, meals, and honoraria from pharmaceutical  
1073 companies to physicians is needed.” On a five-point Likert scale (*Agree, Slightly agree, Neither agree nor*  
1074 *disagree, Slightly disagree, or Disagree*). Further, for participants who agree or slightly agree with the third  
1075 statement, we additionally asked the closet amount of money which they think is acceptable on a four-point  
1076 scale (*1,000 JPY (9.2 USD) or below, 1,000-3,000 JPY (9.2-27.5 USD), 3,000-10,000 JPY (27.5-91.7 USD),*  
1077 *or other*). For participants who agreed or slightly agreed with either of sixth, seventh or eighth statement,  
1078 we additionally asked the monetary value (*100 thousand JPY (917 USD) or below, 100 thousand-1 million*  
1079 *JPY (917-9174 USD), 1-5 million JPY (9,174-45,872 USD), 5-10 million JPY (45,872-91,743 USD, or*  
1080 *10-30 million JPY (91,743-275,229 USD))* and frequency (*twice a week, once a week, once every two weeks,*  
1081 *once a month, or once every few months*) of the financial interaction with the Pharma. (Supplementary  
1082 Material 4)

1083  
1084 *Attitude towards various professional FCOI.* Attitude towards various professional FCOI was assessed by  
1085 using the following five statements. 1) “*It is problematic for judges to receive gifts, meals, and other*  
1086 *entertainment from the trial attorney in charge.*” 2) “*It is problematic for sports referees to receive gifts,*  
1087 *meals, and other entertainment from the players of the games they are assigned to.*” 3) “*It is problematic*  
1088 *for politicians to receive gifts, meals, and other entertainment from lobbyists.*” 4) “*It is problematic for*  
1089 *physicians to receive gifts, meals, and other entertainment from pharmaceutical sales representatives.*” 5)  
1090 “*It is problematic for business people to receive gifts, meals, and other entertainment from their customers.*”  
1091 On a five-point Likert scale (*Agree, Slightly agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Slightly disagree, or*  
1092 *Disagree*).

1093  
1094 *An open-ended question about participants’ perception of FCOI between Pharma and physicians.* To dig  
1095 deeper into participants’ perceptions on FCOI between Pharma and physicians, we investigated responses  
1096 to an open-ended question: “*Please freely describe your thoughts about non-research-related offerings*  
1097 *from Pharma to a physician (e.g., gifts, free meals, monetary incentives for a lecture).*” The responses to  
1098 this question were analyzed separately through qualitative analysis.

1099



1100 **Supplementary Material 2. List of questions regarding awareness of physician-Pharma interactions.**

1101

1102 **Supplementary Material 3. List of questions regarding influence on trust in physicians.**

1103

1104 **Supplementary Material 4. List of questions regarding perception on physician-Pharma**  
1105 **interactions.**

1106

1107 **Supplementary Material 5. Demographic breakdown on the number and percent of participants**  
1108 **who were aware of at least one physician-Pharma interaction.**

1109

1110 <sup>1</sup>The analysis included only participants with cancer. Abbreviations: JPY; Japanese yen, USD; US dollar,  
1111 Pharma; Pharmaceutical Company.

1112

1113 **Supplementary Material 6. Logistic regression analysis of participants' awareness of**  
1114 **physician-Pharma interactions.**

1115

1116 <sup>1</sup>The analysis included only participants with cancer. Abbreviations: JPY; Japanese yen, Pharma;  
1117 Pharmaceutical Company, Ref; reference value.

1118

1119 **Supplementary Material 7. Number and percent of participants who reported decreased trust in at**  
1120 **least one physician-Pharma interaction by participant demographics.**

1121

1122 <sup>1</sup>The analysis included only participants with cancer. Abbreviations: JPY; Japanese yen, Pharma;  
1123 Pharmaceutical Company.

1124

1125

1126 **Supplementary Material 8. Logistic regression analysis of the influence of physician-Pharma**  
1127 **relationships on participants' trust.**

1128

1129 <sup>1</sup>The analysis included only participants with cancer. There were no statistically significant differences  
1130 between the influence of physician-pharmaceutical company relationships on participants' trust and each  
1131 variable. Abbreviations: JPY; Japanese yen, Pharma; Pharmaceutical Company.

1132

1133

1) Pamphlet and leaflet

2) Stationery

3) Textbook and article

4) Free drug sample

5) Meals

6) Travel and accommodation fees



7) Lecture fees


8) Disclosure of payments from pharmaceutical companies to healthcare domains

9) Participation in research operated by pharmaceutical companies


10) Honoraria for registering patients in clinical trials sponsored by pharmaceutical companies

11) Possession of stocks








Proportion (%)




- 1) Payments from pharmaceutical companies would influence physician prescription pattern.
- 2) Payments from pharmaceutical companies would increase unnecessary prescriptions and healthcare cost.
- 3) A receipt of payments from pharmaceutical companies would be acceptable as long as its amount is small.
- 4) Physician's receipts of gifts, meals and honoraria from pharmaceutical companies are unethical.
- 5) Physician's receipts of gifts, meals and honoraria from pharmaceutical companies would undermine the trust in physicians.
- 6) More rigorous internal regulation of gifts, meals, and honoraria from pharmaceutical companies to physicians is needed among pharmaceutical companies.
- 7) More rigorous internal regulation of gifts, meals, and honoraria from pharmaceutical companies to physicians is needed among physicians.
- 8) More rigorous legal regulation of gifts, meals, and honoraria from pharmaceutical companies to physicians is needed.




What is the closest amount of money that you consider as a small amount




What is the closest approximation to the annual total amount of non-research benefits from pharmaceutical companies to physicians that you consider to be acceptable?




What is the closest thing to the frequency of non-research benefits from pharmaceutical companies to physicians that you consider acceptable?



- 1) It is problematic for judges to receive gifts, meals, and other entertainment from the trial attorney in charge.
- 2) It is problematic for sport referees to receive gifts, meal, and other entertainment from the players of the games they are assigned to.
- 3) It is problematic for politicians to receive gifts, meals, and other entertainment from lobbyists.
- 4) It is problematic for physicians to receive gifts, meals, and other entertainment from pharmaceutical sales representatives.
- 5) It is problematic for business people to receive gifts, meals, and other entertainment from their customers.




Proportion (%)




Agree



Slightly agree



Neither agree nor disagree



Slightly disagree



Disagree