Trust deficit in medical Journals : The need to confront conflicts of Interest with unprecedented transparency

An Awakening Call to the Guardians of Medical Science

Dr.Venkatesan Sangareddi, Former professor of cardiology Madras medical college,Chennai .India

Medical science stands as a cornerstone of human progress, its findings directly impacting health, policy, and the very quality of life. The trust placed in medical research is, therefore, sacred. Yet, this trust is increasingly vulnerable, threatened by the pervasive and often subtle influence of conflicts of interest (COI). While the scientific community has made strides in acknowledging and requiring disclosure of COIs, particularly from authors, the current measures are proving insufficient. This article serves as an urgent awakening call to all medical journal publishers, regardless of their prestige or impact factor, to recognize their complicity in this vulnerability and to adopt a new paradigm of transparency that extends to every participant in the publication process, including themselves, and even to the industries that fund the research.

Why Conflicts of Interest Are Insisted Upon for Authors – And Why It's No Longer Enough

The insistence on authors declaring conflicts of interest stems from a fundamental understanding of human nature and the scientific method. The rationale is clear:

- **Potential for Bias:** Whether conscious or, more often, unconscious, financial, personal, or intellectual ties can subtly (or overtly) influence research design, data collection, analysis, interpretation, and the emphasis placed on certain findings. A researcher receiving significant funding from a pharmaceutical company, for instance, might inadvertently design a trial that favors that company's drug or interpret ambiguous results in a more positive light [1].
- **Protecting the Scientific Record:** The primary goal is to safeguard the integrity and objectivity of published research. If the scientific record is skewed by undisclosed or unmanaged biases, its reliability diminishes, leading to flawed clinical decisions and misallocation of resources [2].
- **Empowering Readers:** Disclosure is intended to arm readers with critical context. Knowing about a potential COI allows a clinician or policymaker to apply a more critical lens to the presented evidence, considering alternative interpretations or seeking independent corroboration.
- **Historical Context and Industry Influence:** The history of medicine is replete with examples where commercial interests have distorted research, suppressed negative findings, or engaged in "ghostwriting" to promote products [3, 4]. Disclosure policies arose as a direct response to these documented abuses.

However, the current practice of merely appending a COI statement, often buried in a footnote or at the end of an article, is increasingly recognized as inadequate. This "simple declaration" approach suffers from several critical flaws:

- **Passive Burden on the Reader:** It places the entire onus on the reader to interpret the complex web of interests and assess their potential impact. Most readers, especially busy practitioners, lack the time, expertise, or inclination to perform this intricate analysis for every paper.
- **Persistence of Unconscious Bias:** Disclosure, while important, does not magically eliminate the unconscious biases that can influence researchers. The human mind is adept at rationalizing decisions, even when influenced by competing interests [5].
- **Subtle Erosion of Trust:** When the public and even other scientists perceive a pattern of industry-favorable results from conflicted research, regardless of disclosure, it chips away at the overall trust in medical science [6].
- **"Ethical Licensing":** Some argue that disclosure can inadvertently serve as an "ethical license," where authors feel they have fulfilled their ethical duty by disclosing, thereby potentially feeling less constrained in their interpretation or presentation of findings [7].

The time has come to move beyond passive disclosure to active, transparent, and graded warnings that truly serve the reader and the integrity of science.

Extend COI Disclosure to Publishers, Editors, and Peer Reviewers

The pursuit of objective truth in medical science is a collaborative endeavor, and potential conflicts of interest are not confined to the authors alone. Every individual and entity involved in the publication pipeline holds a position of influence, and thus, a potential for bias. It is high time for a serious debate and, ultimately, mandatory disclosure for these critical stakeholders. This is, in essence, a call to acknowledge and manage the "conflict of interest for the publishers" themselves, and for the individuals who embody the journal's authority.

Journal Editors: The Ultimate Gatekeepers

Editors wield immense power. They decide which manuscripts proceed to peer review, select reviewers, guide revisions, and make final acceptance or rejection decisions. Their potential conflicts, therefore, are particularly impactful:

- **Personal Relationships:** Editors may have close ties (friendships, mentorships, rivalries) with authors, which could lead to preferential treatment or undue scrutiny.
- **Financial Interests:** Editors might hold stock in, consult for, or receive speaking fees from companies whose products are featured in submitted manuscripts.
- **Intellectual Biases:** Editors, as active researchers themselves, may have strong intellectual investments in particular theories, methodologies, or research areas, potentially leading to a biased assessment of competing or contradictory work.
- **Managing Their Own Submissions:** When editors submit their own research to their journal, an inherent and obvious conflict arises, requiring stringent, independently managed review processes [8].

For the integrity of the editorial process, editors must not only declare these conflicts but also **recuse themselves** from any decision-making process where a conflict exists or could be perceived. Their declarations should be publicly accessible on the journal's website, regularly updated, and include both financial and non-financial interests [9].

Peer Reviewers : The honestly guilty experts

Peer reviewers are the unsung heroes of scientific quality control, providing expert, independent evaluation. Their potential for bias, though often unacknowledged by readers, is significant:

- **Competitive Interests:** A reviewer might be working on similar research, creating an incentive to delay or criticize a competitor's manuscript.
- **Collaborative Ties:** Reviewers might have current or past collaborations with authors, leading to an overly lenient or favorable review.
- **Financial Interests:** Like authors and editors, reviewers can have financial ties to companies whose products are discussed in the manuscript.
- **Intellectual Bias:** Reviewers may hold strong intellectual positions that make them unfairly critical of research that challenges their established views.
- **Misuse of Confidential Information:** Reviewers gain privileged access to unpublished data and ideas. An undisclosed COI could tempt them to exploit this information.

It must be mandatory for peer reviewers to declare all potential conflicts of interest at the time of invitation. If a significant conflict exists, they should recuse themselves. Journals should also implement systems to detect potential conflicts (e.g., recent co-authorship, shared institutional affiliations) and ensure that reviews are not influenced by such ties [10].

Publishers: The Commercial Imperative

Beyond individual conflicts, the commercial interests of the publishing entities themselves represent a significant, yet often overlooked, area of potential conflict. Publishers are businesses, and their goals of profitability, high impact factors, and extensive reprint sales can subtly influence editorial decisions:

- **Revenue from Reprints and Advertising:** Journals can generate substantial income from selling reprints of articles (especially industry-sponsored trials) and from advertising. This creates a potential incentive to publish content that attracts such revenue, regardless of its scientific merit or potential for bias [11].
- **Impact Factor Chasing:** The relentless pursuit of a higher impact factor can pressure editors to prioritize studies that are likely to be highly cited, which may sometimes align with industry-funded "positive" results.
- **"Ghost Management":** Just as there is "ghostwriting," there can be "ghost management" where commercial interests subtly influence the editorial process without explicit declaration [3].

To address this, publishers must commit to:

- **Strict Separation of Editorial and Business Functions:** Editorial decisions must be made solely on scientific merit, completely insulated from advertising or reprint sales departments.
- **Transparency of Revenue Sources:** Publishers should consider greater transparency regarding the proportion of their revenue derived from industry-related activities.

- **Adherence to Ethical Guidelines:** Publishers must actively enforce and uphold the highest ethical standards across all their journals, ensuring that commercial interests never compromise scientific integrity.

Why Industries are allowed to escape from the conflict ?

For too long, the focus of COI disclosure has primarily been on the researchers, while the industries funding the research have largely operated with less scrutiny regarding their intentions and influence. If science is sacred, then the sources that fund it must also be held to the highest standards of transparency. It is imperative that industries are compelled to declare their true intentions behind funding research and the extent of their influence on the authors and publishers.

This would involve:

- **Declaration of Intent:** When an industry funds a study, they should be required to publicly state the primary purpose of that funding. Is it genuine scientific inquiry, product development, market positioning, or something else?
- **Disclosure of Influence on Design and Conduct:** Industries should be mandated to disclose their exact role in the study's design, methodology, data collection, and analysis. Did they provide the protocol? Did they have veto power over any aspects? Did they control the raw data?
- **Transparency of Data Access:** It should be a non-negotiable requirement that independent researchers have full and unfettered access to all raw data, regardless of the funding source. Any restrictions must be explicitly declared and justified.
- **Disclosure of "Spin" and Selective Reporting:** Industries should be held accountable for any "spin" in the presentation of findings or for selective reporting of outcomes [12]. This would require greater oversight of their internal reporting practices.
- **Elimination of Ghostwriting:** The practice of "ghostwriting," where industry-paid writers draft manuscripts that are then attributed to academic authors, must be explicitly prohibited and severely penalized [4]. Industries should declare any involvement of medical writing agencies and their funding.
- **Financial Ties to Publishers:** Industries should also declare any significant financial relationships they have with specific journals or publishing houses (e.g., large advertising contracts, bulk reprint purchases). This would shed light on potential conflicts at the publisher level.

By mandating these disclosures from industry, the scientific community can gain a more complete picture of potential biases, allowing for more informed interpretation of research findings and fostering greater accountability.

How to grade conflict of Interest ?

To truly empower readers and uphold the sacred trust in medical science, a radical shift in how conflicts of interest are presented is necessary. Moving beyond mere footnotes, medical journals should implement a **prominent, graded warning system** for conflicts of interest, akin to the hazard warnings on tobacco products. This "Sentinel System" would provide an immediate and clear indication of the potential for bias.

Here's how such a system could work, with attractive, intuitive grading:

The "Integrity Indicator" - A Sentinel color coding System

Imagine a small, standardized icon or box prominently displayed near the article's title and author list, perhaps in a color-coded format:

- **Green Light (Minimal Concern)**
  - **Indicator:** A green shield icon or "Low Likelihood of Bias" statement.
  - **Criteria:** Funding from independent, non-profit, or government sources. No significant financial ties of authors to relevant commercial entities. Editors and reviewers have declared no significant conflicts.
  - **Meaning:** This research appears to have minimal identifiable conflicts of interest that would likely influence its objectivity.
- **Yellow Light (Moderate Concern)**
  - **Indicator:** A yellow triangle icon or "Intermediate Likelihood of Bias" statement.
  - **Criteria:** Industry funding present, but authors' financial ties are minor or indirect. Or, some non-financial conflicts exist (e.g., strong intellectual alignment with a particular approach). Editor or reviewer recusal was necessary for some aspects but not pervasive.
  - **Meaning:** This research has identifiable conflicts of interest that *could* subtly influence its objectivity. Readers are advised to interpret findings with caution and consider the disclosed relationships.
- **Red Light (Substantial Concern)**
  - **Indicator:** A red octagon icon or "Substantial Likelihood of Bias" statement.
  - **Criteria:** Direct industry funding of a product trial where lead authors have significant financial ties (e.g., employment, substantial stock ownership, major consultancy fees) to the sponsoring company. Evidence of restricted data access. Article type is highly influential (e.g., clinical guideline, systematic review with conflicted authors in key roles).
  - **Meaning:** This research has significant, direct conflicts of interest that carry a substantial likelihood of influencing its objectivity. Readers are strongly advised to exercise extreme caution in interpreting these findings and seek independent verification.

- It goes without saying , the red lighted research should be rejected outright and should have no place in any journals.

Final message

The integrity of medical science is paramount. For too long, conflicts of interest have operated in the shadows or been relegated to inconspicuous footnotes, subtly undermining the very foundation of trust upon which medical progress relies. The time for incremental change is over.

It is an urgent awakening call for medical journal publishers to embrace a new era of radical transparency. This means not only demanding comprehensive COI declarations from authors but also extending this mandatory requirement to every individual and entity that influences

the publication process: the editors, the peer reviewers, and crucially, the industries that fund the research. Furthermore, the adoption of a prominent, graded "Sentinel System" for conflicts of interest would provide an indispensable tool for readers, actively guiding their critical evaluation of published evidence.

By taking these bold steps, the medical publishing community can reclaim the sacred trust placed in science, ensuring that the pursuit of truth remains uncompromised, and that medical advancements truly serve the well-being of all.

References

1. Lundh A, Lexchin J, Mintzes B, Schroll JB, Bero L. Industry sponsorship and research outcome. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2017 Feb 16;2(2):MR000033. doi: 10.1002/14651858.
2. Loannidis JPA. Why most published research findings are false. PLoS Med. 2005;2(8):e124.
3. Sismondo S. Ghost management: how much of the medical literature is shaped behind the scenes by the pharmaceutical industry? PLoS Med. 2007 Sep;4(9):e286.
4. Brandt AM. Inventing conflicts of interest: a history of tobacco industry tactics. Am J Public Health. 2012;102(1):63-71.
5. Bekelman JE, Li Y, Gross CP. Scope and impact of financial conflicts of interest in biomedical research: a systematic review. JAMA. 2003;289(4):454-465.
6. Oostrom T. Funding of clinical trials and reported drug efficacy. J Polit Econ. 2024;132(2):3298-3333.
7. Cain DM, Loewenstein G, Moore DA. The dirt on coming clean: Perverse effects of disclosing conflicts of interest. J Legal Stud. 2005;34(1):1-25.
8. International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. Recommendations for the Conduct, Reporting, Editing, and Publication of Scholarly Work in Medical Journals [Internet]. [cited 2025 July 25]. Available from: www.icmje.org/recommendations/
9. Committee on Publication Ethics. Code of Conduct and Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors [Internet]. [cited 2025 July 25]. Available from: publicationethics.org/resources/guidelines-new/code-conduct-and-best-practice-guidelines-journal-editors
10. World Association of Medical Editors. Conflict of Interest in Peer-Reviewed Medical Journals: The WAME Position on a Challenging Problem
11. Lundh A, Barbateskovic M, Hróbjartsson A, Gøtzsche PC. Conflicts of interest at medical journals: the influence of industry-supported randomised trials on journal impact factors and revenue – cohort study. PLoS Med. 2010;7(10):e1000354.
12. Boutron I, et al. “Spin” in published biomedical literature: A methodological systematic review. PLoS Biol. 2017;15(9):e2002173.