

tail men, 28% by the over-all integrity of the company, 21% by medical journals, and 14% each cited the research behind the drug and the relative cost of the drug as being crucial to their decision. There were in all 17 reasons given, the least popular (1 physician, 1%) being the evaluation of the drug by the *Medical Letter*.

Regarding the utility of the detail man, 85% of general practitioners gave him a strong vote of confidence, because his new drug information was valuable to them and he could order drugs directly for dispensing physicians. The other 15% felt that in view of the abundant available literature his services could be eliminated and the resultant savings be passed on to the patient.

Questioned about drug prices, 51% of general practitioners thought that they were "about right," and 45% thought that they were "too high"; none considered them "too low." Furthermore, 24% urged a better public relations attempt to help the layman understand why drugs cost what they do. However, one physician urged the opposite course: "reduce the cost instead of spending more money to tell the patient why drugs are expensive."

Finally, the general practitioners were definitely opposed (75%) to the practice of physicians gaining a financial interest in pharmacies and drug distribution firms.

THE MEDICAL CENTER QUESTIONNAIRE

Questions 1 and 2 required a listing of material gifts from drug companies and stock ownership in them. Questions 3-5 asked for a graded evaluation of the pharmaceutical industry on its (1) record in the development and testing of new drugs, (2) margin of profit in prescription drugs, and (3) performance in disseminating information about new drugs. Questions 6 and 7 tried to assess the impact of the new Food and Drug Administration regulations concerning clinical trials in terms of general awareness and reaction. In question 8, each person was asked to compare and rate the following over-all sources of comprehensive information about new drugs: faculty and house staff, scientific meetings, scientific articles, advertisement in medical journals, mail literature from drug companies, detail men, the "Physician's Desk Reference," the *Medical Letter* and drug inserts. Question 9 asked for a correct matching of both the generic names and the therapeutic effects to the trade names of twenty common drugs.

Question 10 was multiple choice: "The pharmaceutical industry could better serve the medical profession by (1) continuing just as it is; (2) cutting prices; (3) developing more new drugs at a faster rate; (4) sponsoring more post-graduate courses; (5) distributing more educational material; (6) changing its advertising policy as follows; (7) changing its drug development policy as follows; (8) changing its detail man program as follows; (9) changing its drug sample policy as follows; or (10) other." Question 11 asked each person to assign a grade rank to the following factors as strongly affecting his opinion (good or bad) of a specific drug company: "(1) advertisements; (2) experience with its products; (3) gifts and services to you; (4) research support; (5) assistance in post-graduate and medical educational programs; (6) detail men; and (7) other."

Returns from this questionnaire were scattered, ranging from a 7% response from the second-year class to a 30% response from the fourth-year class. There were 73 questionnaires completed and returned from the 384 persons polled, an over-all 19% response.

Almost everyone had received some sort of gift from one of the drug companies. Eli Lilly and Company had donated 57 pen lights, 46 medical bags, 45 percussion hammers, 35 stethoscopes, 30 pocket notebooks, 28 tuning forks, 19 pen knives, and 18 tape measures, as well as sundry other diagnostic aids, to the 73 persons polled. Burroughs Wellcome & Company had given 18 pocket notebooks, Ciba Pharmaceutical Company had distributed 11 subscriptions to the *Ciba Symposia*, and Wyeth Laboratories had given 10 pen lights. In all, 19 drug companies were listed as donors, some only once, of generally minor and inexpensive gifts.

Of the 73 polled, six owned stock in one or more drug companies and 58 of the nonowners considered such stock to be a good financial investment.

Most answers rated the pharmaceutical industry's record in development and testing of new drugs as good (41, or 56%), its margin of profit in prescription drugs as wide (35, or 48%), and its performance in disseminating information about new drugs as good (39, or 54%). Most of the other answers were equally divided between the two evaluations nearest the mode ("very good," and "fair").