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Disclosures and costs

• GAPP
  – All members provide their time freely.
  – ISMPP maintains the website.
• Cindy Hamilton
  – Principal of Hamilton House, Virginia Beach
  – Member of ISMPP
• Jackie Marchington
  – Employee of Caudex Medical, Oxford, part of McCann Complete Medical
  – Member of ISMPP
Overview

- What were we thinking (in the beginning)?
- Where are we now?
- What should we do in the future?
Why was GAPP started?


• HARLOTT plc: an amalgamation of the world’s two oldest professions (Sackett DL, Oxman AD. BMJ 2003;327:1442-5)

• An Inquiry by the UK House of Commons Health Select Committee into the Influence of the Pharmaceutical Industry (Williams M. 10/28/04)

• The corporate coauthor. (Fugh-Berman A. J Gen Intern Med 2005;20:546-8)

• Ghost story: at medical journals, writers paid by industry play big role; articles appear under name of academic researchers, but they often get help. (Mathews AW. Wall Street Journal 12/13/05)
Why was GAPP started (cont’d)?
Why was GAPP started (cont’d)?

• To provide a timely and credible response to influential stories about medical publication professionals

• To be a “go to” group for those needing timely input from international leaders of medical publication professionals
Who started GAPP?

• Medical publication professionals
  – Karen Woolley (global perspective)
  – Cindy Hamilton (AMWA)
  – Gene Snyder (ISMPP)
  – Adam Jacobs (EMWA)
  – Art Gertel (multiple organizations)

• Professional organizations
  – AMWA
  – EMWA
  – ISMPP
How did GAPP evolve?

Mid-2000s
- Brainstorming
- Identifying goals and objectives

2009
- “Getting Respect” (Karen Woolley’s keynote address)
- Obtaining approval/support from organizations
- Recruiting volunteers

2011
- Identifying resources
- Creating a website
Who is maintaining GAPP?

• Medical publication professionals
  – Karen Woolley
  – Cindy Hamilton
  – Jackie Marchington
  – Adam Jacobs
  – Art Gertel

• Website
  – ISMPP
What did GAPP accomplish in 2012?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-Dec-2012</td>
<td>GAPP requests changes to the Instructions to Authors from the Journal of the American Geriatric Society to clarify that professional medical writers are not ghostwriters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-Nov-2012</td>
<td>GAPP agrees with Ben Goldacre on condemning ghostwriting, but rebuts assertion that AMWA, EMWA, and ISMPP are &quot;ghostwriters' associations&quot;!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-Nov-2012</td>
<td>GAPP Editorial contribution in Current Medical Research &amp; Opinion - financial model to demonstrate how use of professional medical writers could improve results reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-Nov-2012</td>
<td>Online response to BMC Research Notes article by Lacasse et al on undisclosed corporate authorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-Sep-2012</td>
<td>Response challenging authors' assertion that professional medical writers must strive to &quot;please&quot; marketing departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-Mar-2012</td>
<td>GAPP Letter to Editor American Journal of Medicine - evidence for benefits from use of professional medical writers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Mar-2012</td>
<td>GAPP suggests changes to Instructions for Authors for Ophthamology (letter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-Feb-2012</td>
<td>GAPP responds to Forbes CardioBrief Editor's questions (website comment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-Feb-2012</td>
<td>GAPP supports full disclosure of editing and writing assistance (website comment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-Feb-2012</td>
<td>GAPP/Retraction Watch #3: reinforcing IFPMA statement on industry need to publish results of clinical trials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-Feb-2012</td>
<td>GAPP/Retraction Watch #2: value of professional medical writers in promoting publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-Feb-2012</td>
<td>GAPP/Retraction Watch #1: value of professional medical writers vs. ghostwriting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Feb-2012</td>
<td>GAPP supports U North Carolina ban on ghostwriting (website comment)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What did GAPP accomplish in 2013?

9-Dec-2013  GAPP congratulates Bosch et al on their survey, but disagrees that journals don't take ghostwriting seriously. Not distinguishing professional medical writers from ghostwriters weakens their survey findings. (letter to editor - *JAMA Intern Med*)

6-Dec-2013  Unsuccessful attempt to have GAPP banned! GAPP responded to an article about medical writers aimed at basic scientists, which recommended that basic scientists should refuse medical writing assistance. GAPP explained why refusing medical writing assistance was not an evidence-based or reasonable course of action.

10-July-2013  GAPP agrees with Almassi's assessment that ghostwriting is unethical and defines frequently confused terms. (letter to editor - *Bioethics*)

July 2013  GAPP was invited to provide a counterpoint to an article implying that authorship misconduct was an "industry problem". GAPP highlighted that misconduct occurs in academia and industry, and described recent changes industry has made to enhance publication practices.

6-Mar-2013  GAPP applauds Marcus and Oransky for considering challenges of determining authorship and defines "substantial contribution."

6-Mar-2013  GAPP makes a comprehensive, evidence-based submission to the UK Parliamentary Inquiry on Clinical Trials, stressing how professional medical writers can help address publication problems.

6-Mar-2013  GAPP challenges ACRE statements about medical writers and gains recognition from ACRE about the value and integrity of professional medical writers.

Jan - 2013  GAPP describes its mission and its accomplishments during its first year.
What did GAPP accomplish in 2012 and 2013?

• ~12 responses/year
  – Mainly letters to the editor
  – Some invited papers

Editorial
Poor compliance with reporting research results – we know it’s a problem... how do we fix it?

Global Alliance of Publication Professionals (GAPP):


www.gappteam.org/news/index.html
What else has GAPP accomplished?

– Impact on authors

![](https://twitter.com/bengoldacre/status/680308132780259330)

While the ABPI pretend that missing data isn't a problem, more ethical professionals in industry are trying to fix it. [bit.ly/QQ7yAp](https://bit.ly/QQ7yAp)

– Impact on journal editors/publishers

» Fugh-Berman recommended, but didn’t succeed, in banning medical writers access to *PLoS Biology.*
How much does GAPP cost?

- Volunteer time
  - Letters to the editor and other published responses
    - Time/response: 10–12 hours for leader + 4–6 (collective) hours for reviewers ≈ 14 hours/response
    - Total time/year: 16 hours/response x 12 responses/year = 192 hours
    - Annual time/participant: 192 hours / 5 participants = 38 hours/volunteer
      - Presentations, correspondence, and other administrative activities
  - Website maintenance
What are the benefits to ISMPP members?

• Provide rapid responses to misinformation about medical publication professionals
  – Distinguish professional medical writers from ghostwriters
  – Differentiate between anecdotal experience suggesting high prevalence of ghostwriting and survey data indicating declining prevalence
  – Emphasize contributions made by publication professionals

• Identify resources about (beneficial) role of publication professionals

• Offer model for inter-association collaboration
**Audience Question**

**How beneficial are GAPP’s efforts to you?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never heard of GAPP</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat beneficial</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficial</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very beneficial</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N = 124*
Audience Question

How can GAPP better serve publication professionals?

Expand the website’s list of talking points: 24%
Compile a database of author testimonials: 25%
Respond to a wider variety of articles: 16%
Be more proactive: 25%
Something else (ie, I’ll catch you afterwards 😊): 10%

N = 110
How can you help GAPP?

• Be a scout
  – Email: contact@GAPPTeam.org
  – Tweet: @GAPPTeam

• Refer a journalist
  – URL: www.gappteam.org

• Provide feedback

• Trust us
What has GAPP learned?

• Obtain support/commitment from multiple professional organizations
• Recruit reliable volunteers
• Plan for the future
Key Takeaways

• Help bridge the gap and be proactive
  – Document the value of your services
  – Publish your research findings

• Network within ISMPP

• Reach out to publication professionals in other organizations as well as to authors, editors, publishers, and other stakeholders
What are you going to do to collaborate with GAPP?

- Nothing: 6%
- Scout for us: 41%
- Refer journalists to us: 7%
- Provide evidence for us: 12%
- Everything except “a”!: 34%

N = 106
Thank You