Treating desires not diseases: a pill for every ill and an ill for every pill?

David. J. Triggle

My first recollection of modern pharmaceuticals is from the winter of 1942–1943, when my younger sister, suffering from pneumonia, was treated with M&B693 from May and Baker Pharmaceuticals (http://www.may-baker.com/). The doctor and my mother sat up all night nursing her through ‘the crisis’, which she survived. Most families, at least in the rich world, have similar stories to tell of how medicines developed in the past half century have saved their lives, shortened their illnesses and have made previously terminal diseases, if not curable, then at least treatable. For all of this, academic medicine and science and, notably, the pharmaceutical industry are owed much. However, these positive attributes of the industry are in danger of being obscured by a pattern of business practices that places profit above patient, emphasizes marketing over medicine and exaggerates disorders to promote drug sales. These practices, which are compounded by the extensive, Washington-based, political lobbying that is carried out by pharmaceutical companies, contribute to the increasing wave of public distrust directed at these companies.

The 1 April 2006 issue of The British Medical Journal ran a short note by the Australian journalist Ray Moynihan describing a new disease – motivational deficiency disorder [1]. Apparently affecting one in five Australians and diagnosed by neurologist Leth Argos through both positron emission tomography scans and scoring scales, the disease was described as treatable with a new cannabinoid CB1 receptor antagonist indolebant. Several news organizations ran with this story, accepting it as authentic presumably for two main reasons. First, the story was released on 31 March (albeit 1 April in Australia), and, second, it sounds plausible. Motivational deficiency disorder fits in with restless legs syndrome, female sexual dysfunction, social anxiety disorder, intermittent explosive disorder, irritable male syndrome and other assorted contemporary ‘diseases’. It also fits well with the barrage of pharmaceutical advertising that viewers in the USA are subject to. Indeed, one knows exactly the demographics of a TV program audience by looking at the drug advertisements: advertisements for ‘leaky pipes’, insomnia and erectile enhancement means an audience of >50 years. Whether the motivational deficiency disorder hoax will be celebrated 30 years hence is uncertain, unlike the BBC hoax of 1 April 1957 on harvesting spaghetti bushes in Switzerland (http://news.bbc.co.uk/onthisday/hi/dates/stories/april/1/newsid_2819000/2819261.stm). However, both hoaxes sound plausible and come from authoritative sources.

All of the above disorders are described in the medical and pharmaceutical literature as increasingly prevalent and increasingly costly in both financial and emotional terms and all, of course, are treatable with expensive drugs. Neither are these issues limited to the human condition: there is, after all, canine separation anxiety and canine cognitive dysfunction syndrome for which the appropriate drugs, Clomicalm™ and Anipryl™, respectively, are available for man’s best friend, even when he no longer recognizes us.

A visitor from another planet might be surprised at this emphasis on ‘lifestyle’ diseases, given the readily perceived contrast between the availability of drugs for these diseases and for HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases that dominate the poor world. They might also be surprised by the contrasts that exist in putatively the richest, most powerful country in the world, where ~50 million people do without health insurance and much health care, and where the life-expectancy gap between the best-off and the worst-off exceeds 15 years [2]. They should not be surprised: medicine has become in large part, a market and the priorities and delivery of pharmaceuticals are determined in very significant part by market imperatives (Box 1).

The market and its imperatives

Markets may be efficient mechanisms for making commercial transactions, but medicine and markets have always enjoyed an uneasy relationship, trapped between Hippocratic oaths, fee-for-service, managed care, government influence and insurance companies [3]. The pharmaceutical industry, as part of medicine, is,
in a consumer-led, consumption-driven culture. The marketing of drugs is no different, save only that it requires the intermediacy of a prescription between product and consumer. Hence, contemporary media advertising emphasizes the ‘need to talk to your doctor’ and often sweetens this with either a free trial or a US$10-off coupon for the next prescription (Box 2).

**Disease classification and the Lake Wobegon phenomenon**

‘Where all the children are above average’ [Garrison Keillor (http://prairiehome.publicradio.org)]... and everyone has a definable syndrome. The common link among the lifestyle diseases discussed previously is that they fall into a rapidly expanding area of medicine that is characterized by the phenomenon of ‘disease-mongering’: the creation and/or extension of disease terminology to identify for drug remediation what is, in essence, a normal condition [17–20]. Thus, in one estimate, female sexual dysfunction might affect up to 42% of the women between the ages of 18 and 60 [21]. With this prevalence, what is described is either normal or the criteria for definition have been drawn so broadly that the classification is without either meaning or diagnostic significance. In either event the rationale for a single, effective, drug treatment is seriously undermined. A similar case might be advanced for the other diseases already listed. In each case, the boundaries of what are either plausibly or demonstrably real (but limited) pathological conditions are extended into the normal range. These issues have been discussed recently in several articles and books [17–20] (see also a series of recent articles on pharmaceutical marketing in *PloS Medicine* [http://www.plosmedicine.org]). Few would deny the underlying pathology and need for intervention in diseases such as attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), restless legs syndrome and female sexual dysfunction. Rather the argument is over the expansion and the inclusiveness of the classification, and the role that such over-extension has in unnecessary drug treatment, and in ignoring the role of other and, in many cases, more appropriate, non-drug treatments. There are several underlying reasons for this apparent shift in emphasis of direction in the industry. Companies, under the constantly heightened expectations of growth and profit increases, have adopted the ‘blockbuster’ model of drug discovery and development. However, this is not a sustainable route – nothing can increase at 10% per annum for ever [22] – and the expected innovation and productivity increases from the new technologies of genomics, informatics, combinatorial chemistry and high-throughput screening have yet to be fully realized [10,23]. Accordingly, to sustain growth companies have embarked on a series of mergers and acquisitions, the generation of
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**BOX 1**

**Janus and the pharmaceutical industry**

Similar to Janus, the pharmaceutical industry presents two faces to the world. For the scientific face, there is a deserved and profound indebtedness, both singularly and collectively, to the therapeutic molecules developed by pharmaceutical companies. Few of us, at least in the rich world, are not indebted to illness cured or life saved by modern pharmaceuticals. For the business face, which too often behaves as an asocial, greedy corporate entity, there is increasing public distrust and skepticism, a distrust that is strengthened by reports of backroom deals to keep generic drugs off the market and of FBI searches of the offices of pharmaceutical company executives [52]. Recent descriptions of financial collusion between the pharmaceutical and generic drug industries to delay the introduction of generic formulations fuel public cynicism about the motives of the principal players [53]. Michael Moore’s new agitprop movie entitled *Sicko* (now in production) will not help matters (http://www.free-press-release.com/news/200609/1157907489.html).
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**BOX 2**

**Cures in search of disorders**

‘The drug industry’s calculus in apportioning its resources is cold-blooded, but there’s no disputing that one old, fat, bald, fungus-ridden rich old man who can’t get it up counts for more than half a billion people who are vulnerable to malaria, but too poor to buy medicines they need’

non-innovative, follow-on drugs, the repackaging of existing drugs in combination form, the extension of patents, challenges to the generic drug industry, and the expansion of disease classifications and definitions through advertising to promote greater sales of existing drugs. Few doubt that the new, genomics-based technologies will pay off, but the path is likely to be longer and more expensive than was believed originally. Finally, although there is no shortage of diseases to be treated in both the rich and the poor worlds, the former are difficult because they are, to a significant part, diseases of aging, including neurodegenerative disorders, whereas the latter are difficult because the poor cannot pay for medicines.

Pharmaceutical advertising, which is currently permitted only in New Zealand and the USA, the latter under the eye of the Food and Drug Administration (FDA; http://www.fda.gov), fuels the demand [e.g. FDA oversight of direct-to-consumer advertising has limitations (http://www.fao.gov)] [24–26]. A recently published report from the Institute of Medicine of the US National Academy of Sciences (http://www.iom.edu) is not kind to the FDA, describing it as dysfunctional in several respects: ‘Some also have serious concerns that the regulator has been “captured” by the industry it regulates’ and ‘The agency needs a more nuanced set of tools to signal uncertainties, to reduce advertising that drives rapid uptake of new drugs, or to compel additional studies in the actual patient populations who take the drug after its approval’ [27].

The response of PHRMA, was, predictably, negative, preferring as it does as little government regulation as possible [28]. Unfortunately, the FDA is not the only regulatory authority that is under attack from the media and under investigation by the General Accounting Office for complaints of personnel and financial mismanagement, and for political influence over science and public health policy [29,30] [see also GAO, HHS, OIG, Waxman launch investigations into alleged oversight, morale problems at CDC. (http://www.medicalnewstoday.com)]. It is no coincidence that these two agencies find themselves under attack because the regulation and oversight that is necessary for effective health-care delivery runs counter, in many cases, to the political ideology of the Bush administration [31]. Karl Polanyi knew the consequences of this ‘Planning and control are being attacked as a denial of freedom, and the freedom that regulation creates is being denounced as unfreedom’ [32].

Those familiar cautionary words used in advertising, ‘See your doctor’, ‘between you and your doctor’ and ‘only your doctor can prescribe’ are cop-out phrases with which to deny responsibility of fanning the flames of demand. Equally misleading are the advertisements that feature media and other public personalities who are often paid for their services. Most recently, Pfizer has featured Dr Robert Jarvik, the inventor of the artificial heart, in advertisements for Lipitor™, in which he is shown vigorously rowing a racing skiff on a lake. It says little for the integrity of this advertisement that a body double was used for this sequence ([33]; http://www.lakewashingtonrowing.com/newsletters/april2006.pdf). Nonetheless, such direct-to-consumer works, judged by the profit going to industry and the attendant economic and social costs being externalized to the community at large (Box 3).

Restless legs syndrome: an ill looking for a pill?
In 2003, GlaxoSmithKline (http://www.gsk.com) had two press releases concerning restless legs syndrome, which they described as ‘a little known and often misdiagnosed disorder...can have as great an impact on the quality of life as type 2 diabetes, hypertension and acute myocardial infarction’ and ‘is keeping America...
awake at night’; (http://www.gsk.com/ControllerServlet?appid=4&pageId=402&newsid=175; http://gsk.com/press_archive/press2003/press_06102003.htm). Ropinirole was approved for use subsequently by the FDA in May 2005, noting that this condition affects 10% of the population. A subsequent study revealed a prevalence of 2.7% [39]. Woloshin and Schwartz have analyzed the literature and the media reporting around restless legs syndrome [40]. Although they do not disagree that the syndrome exists, they argue that the prevalence and seriousness have been exaggerated significantly, and that the media have accepted uncritically the claims advanced in the press releases, have generally described the syndrome and the drug in overly dramatic terms and have failed to note that the effects of ropinirole are relatively modest and that the trials concerned relatively short-term use. They conclude that, ‘the news coverage of restless legs syndrome is disturbing. It exaggerated the prevalence of disease and the need for treatment, and failed to consider the problems of over-diagnosis. In essence, the media seemed to have been co-opted into the disease mongering process’.

**Female sexual dysfunction? A pill looking for an ill?**

Subsequent to the introduction of Viagran®, there have been major efforts to expand the market for selective phosphodiesterase 5 (PDE5) inhibitors by expanding the definition of erectile dysfunction to include conditions that do not stem from organic causes, such as prostate surgery and diabetes [41]. Judged by TV advertising and sales, this has been successful. Additionally, there has been an extensive campaign for ‘pink viagra’ for the condition of female sexual dysfunction, which is reported to affect 33–43% of women [21,42]. This has not been successful to date [43]. Critical commentaries on this campaign have argued that this epidemiology has been inflated and exaggerated by a lack of understanding of the multiple causes that might lead to an unsatisfactory sex life and, that it reflects little more than an attempt to commodify female sexual behavior [44–47]. An understanding of female sexual behavior requires more than measurements of pelvic blood flow (Box 4).

**Toenail fungus: a global threat?**

One of the most entertaining, and revolting, advertisements on television today is for Digger, a cute little dermatophyte who loves to live under your toenails and proclaims ‘I’m not leaving’. Entertaining because it gets your attention for the underlying message that Lamisil™, the fourth best-selling drug from Novartis (http://www.novartis.com), is bad for Digger and good for you, but not revolting enough to make you change the channel [http://www.pharma.us.novartis.com/newsroom/pressReleases/index.jsp; Walker, R., The beast under your toe nail (http://www.slate.com)]. And that, of course, is the intention of Novartis, who have reportedly spent over US$200 million on Lamisil ads over the past 3 years [see Langreth, R. and Herper, M. (2006) Wired Magazine Pill pushers go into overdrive (http://wired.com)]. A previous version of the advertisement was banned by the FDA on the grounds that it overstated the efficacy of the drug (only 38% of patients achieve cure), minimized the risk and made claims of unsubstantiated superiority (http://www.pharmcast.com/WarningLetters/Yr2003/August2003/Novartis0803.htm). Regardless of this, advertising works and sales of Lamisil now exceed US$1 billion y⁻¹.

**Conclusions**

The pharmaceutical industry faces a set of difficult choices over the next decade. Although few doubt that the scientific advances in genomics, screening and informatics technologies in which so much has been invested will pay off, it is also clear that both the timescale and the costs are greater than anticipated. It is also clear that, ultimately, there are limits to the affordability and the extent of health care that can be provided either privately or publicly. These limits need to be dealt with, and with some urgency, particularly in the USA, where expenditure already exceeds 16% of GDP. This expenditure has not, however, made the USA the healthiest nation on Earth. On the contrary, in two key areas, infant mortality and longevity, the USA lags behind many other nations, including every country in the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), see US Census Bureau International database (http://www.census.gov/ipc/wwwidbnew.html). At the other extreme of global wealth and power, the diseases of the poor world must also receive far greater attention, on pragmatic, if not, moral grounds, because a healthier, more prosperous poor world is a partner in solving the global problems of the 21st century.

The pharmaceutical industry, thus, has two extreme alternatives. It can continue its market-based approach, relying on a progressively more difficult to maintain, ‘blockbuster’ model of drug discovery and delivery to generate its profits, affecting the poor by continuing to ignore the tropical and infectious diseases that plague them, and by hoarding and defending its intellectual property, and comforting the rich by defining more life-style diseases that afflict them and that are treatable by its products rather than by exercise, diet, public health and acceptance that we can grow old gracefully. We can, in fact, anticipate Aldous Huxley’s predicted future in his Brave New World: ‘Fortunate boys!’ said the Controller. ‘No pains have been spared to make your lives emotionally easy – to preserve you, as far as possible, from having any emotions at all.’ Perhaps the ultimate (and most cynical) extension of Huxley’s vision will be a merger between McDonalds and pharma to create McPharma selling both ‘happy pills’ and ‘happy meals’ (Box 5).

There are alternative approaches that recognize both the remarkable scientific achievements and organization of the pharmaceutical industry and marries these with the need for a more equitable, efficient delivery of pharmaceutical care. Thus, the
Nobel prize-winning economist Joseph Stiglitz has argued that the current patent system and business model of the pharmaceutical industry fails to reward innovation in crucial areas of medicine that affect the poor world. Rather than using patents as a reward for innovation, he suggests that a system of prizes might be an alternative that would give very large financial rewards for major innovative advances and small rewards only for negligible advances [48,49]. An alternative model, which has been discussed recently, is to implement open-source research using the software developments that led to open-source Linux as a model [50]. There are well-recognized differences between software development and molecule development, but there is one element in common, at least—many scientists will work for recognition according to the scientific ethos described by Robert Merton [51]. Finally, there is a global responsibility. Despite my harsh words, the pharmaceutical industry should not be the only, or even the major, whipping boy: the rich world in general carries major responsibility when we favor tax cuts and wars over aid and assistance, and promote abstinence over medicines. We are, ultimately, whether we want to be or not, our brothers’ keeper.
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