JOURNAL OF BEHAVIORAL HEALTH, 2025
VOL 14, NO. 2, PAGE 1 – 9

REVIEW ARTICLE

Open Access

Evidence Distortion and Clinical Decision-Making: *How Placebo and Nocebo Effects Mediate Industry Influence in Prescribing Practices*

Julian Ungar-Sargon MD, PHD*

Borra College of Health Sciences, Dominican University IL, USA.

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the complex interplay between placebo and nocebo effects in pharmaceutical treatments and how these psychobiological phenomena are leveraged or obscured through pharmaceutical industry influence. We integrate neurobiological research on placebo/nocebo mechanisms with analyses of industry marketing tactics, regulatory approval processes, and impacts on the therapeutic relationship. The robust evidence of placebo responses across various conditions is contrasted with less-studied but equally important nocebo effects, revealing how industry influence can systematically amplify perceived benefits while minimizing apparent risks. Through examination of clinical trial methodologies, statistical manipulations in regulatory submissions, marketing practices, and physician-patient dynamics, we document patterns of distortion that extend beyond individual prescribing decisions to shape the epistemic frameworks underpinning medical practice.

Case studies of the opioid crisis and selective serotonin reuptake inhibitor approval processes illustrate how these dynamics can lead to significant public health consequences. We propose an integrated framework for evidence-based prescribing that accounts for placebo/nocebo effects while resisting commercial influence. This approach emphasizes critical appraisal skills, "influence consciousness," and therapeutic authenticity to preserve honest healing relationships. By articulating how pharmaceutical industry practices distort evidence, corrupt judgment, and erode therapeutic honesty, this analysis provides a foundation for reclaiming the integrity of medical decision-making in service of patient welfare rather than commercial interests.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received Date: 02 Mar 2025
Accepted Date: 10 Apr 2025
Published Date: 18 Apr 2025

KEYWORDS

Placebo effect, Nocebo effect, Pharmaceutical industry, Evidence-based medicine, Clinical trials, Statistical manipulation, Marketing influence, Therapeutic relationship, Medical ethics, Regulatory approval, Doctor-patient honesty.

Introduction

The placebo effects a beneficial health outcome resulting from a patient's expectations rather than from a treatment's pharmacological properties has been extensively documented across numerous medical conditions [1]. Conversely, the nocebo effect describes adverse outcomes arising from negative expectations about a treatment [2]. These psychological phenomena fundamentally influence treatment outcomes yet receive disproportionate attention in pharmaceutical marketing and physician education.

Simultaneously, concerns about pharmaceutical industry influence on medical practice have grown substantially in recent decades. Research indicates that physician exposure to pharmaceutical marketing correlates with increased prescribing, higher costs, and sometimes lower prescribing quality [3,4]. This influence extends beyond direct marketing to include industry-funded research, continuing medical education, and thought leader cultivation [5]. This paper explores the intersection of these phenomena, examining how industry influence may shape physician understanding and utilization of placebo/nocebo effects in clinical practice. We consider the implications for evidence-based medicine, patient care, and healthcare economics.

The Science of Placebo and Nocebo Effects

Placebo effects involve complex neurobiological mechanisms including endogenous opioid and dopamine release, demonstrating that these are not merely reporting biases but tangible physiological responses [6]. Studies using neuroimaging techniques have revealed that placebo analgesia activates specific brain regions associated with pain modulation, while nocebo hyperalgesia activates areas associated with anxiety and pain amplification [7].

Research by Eippert et al. [8] demonstrated that placebo analgesia involves opioidergic pathways in the brain, specifically in the rostral anterior cingulate cortex, the amygdala, and the periaqueductal gray matter. These findings substantiate that placebo effects represent genuine neurobiological phenomena rather than mere measurement artifacts. Hirsch's pioneering work [9,10] on sensory perception demonstrates that olfactory

Contact: Julian Ungar-Sargon MD, PHD, Borra College of health Science, Dominican university, Illinois, USA, Email: jungarsargon@dom.edu.

and taste stimuli can significantly influence physiological responses in ways that parallel placebo mechanisms. His research on "sensory-enhanced placebos" shows that incorporating specific sensory elements into medication delivery (taste, smell, even the visual characteristics of pills) can amplify therapeutic responses through expectancy effects and conditioned associations, potentially explaining why pharmaceutical branding elements may contribute to differential clinical responses beyond active ingredients [11]. The magnitude of placebo responses in clinical trials has been substantial and appears to be increasing over time in certain conditions [12]. In pain studies, placebo responses account for approximately 75% of the overall analgesic effect [13]. Similarly, substantial placebo effects have been documented in depression, Parkinson's disease, and irritable bowel syndrome among others [14-16]. Nocebo effects, though less extensively studied, can significantly impact treatment adherence and outcomes. Studies indicate that disclosure of potential adverse effects can increase their occurrence by 10-15% through expectation alone [17]. Remarkably, the symptomatic profile of nocebo responses often mimics the disclosed side effect profile rather than reflecting random symptom reporting [18].

Contextual Factors

The strength of placebo and nocebo responses is modulated by numerous contextual factors. Provider characteristics and communication style significantly influence expectancy effects, with authoritative, confident clinicians typically eliciting stronger placebo responses [19]. Treatment characteristics such as appearance, cost, and perceived novelty also play crucial roles, with more expensive or novel-appearing treatments generating enhanced placebo effects [20]. The healthcare setting itself contributes substantially, with hospital environments generally producing stronger responses than outpatient settings [21]. Cultural and social factors further shape treatment expectations, with varying responses based on cultural understanding of illness and healing [22]. Additionally, sensory characteristics associated with treatment have proven highly influential [23].

Hirsch's work on sensory perception has demonstrated that subtle environmental cues including ambient scents, medication taste profiles, and visual cues can significantly alter subjective perception of treatment efficacy [23]. His studies on "sensory branding" have particular relevance to pharmaceutical marketing, suggesting that sensory associations may strengthen conditioned placebo responses and potentially enhance perceived efficacy beyond pharmacological effects [24].

Pharma Influence on Medical Practice

The pharmaceutical industry employs multiple strategies that work synergistically to influence physician prescribing behavior. Direct physician detailing and sample distribution create personal relationships and familiarity with specific products [5]. Simultaneously, industry sponsorship of continuing medical education programs subtly shapes clinical knowledge and practice norms while maintaining an appearance of scientific objectivity [25]. Strategic research funding and publication planning ensure favorable study designs, selective outcome reporting, and prominent placement of positive results in medical literature [26]. The cultivation of key opinion leaders transforms respected clinicians into potent marketing conduits whose recommendations carry outsized influence among peers [27]. Finally, direct-to-consumer advertising creates patient demand, leading to specific medication requests that physicians frequently accommodate [28]. These activities represent substantial investments; pharmaceutical companies spend approximately twice as much on marketing as on research and development [29]. A meta-analysis by Brax et al. [30] found that 48-100% of physicians reported regular contact with pharmaceutical representatives, with most interactions including gift-giving of some form.

Influence on Prescribing Behaviors

Systematic reviews consistently demonstrate associations between exposure to pharmaceutical promotion and increased prescribing, higher costs, and non-rational prescribing patterns [3,5]. Even small gifts create measurable changes in prescribing behaviors, with research showing that meals valued at less than $20 significantly influence prescription choices [31]. Particularly relevant to this discussion, physicians exposed to industry influence demonstrate several concerning patterns. They typically adopt new drugs more quickly, often before risk-benefit profiles are fully established through post-marketing surveillance, potentially exposing patients to unknown risks [32]. These physicians also consistently prescribe more expensive treatments when equally effective, more established, and less costly alternatives exist a pattern that impacts both healthcare systems and patient finances [33]. Perhaps most troublingly, industry-influenced clinicians show demonstrably reduced skepticism toward manufacturer claims about drug efficacy and safety, accepting marketing assertions with less critical evaluation than their less-influenced colleagues [34]. Perhaps most troublingly, physicians consistently demonstrate poor insight into how marketing affects their own clinical decision-making. In a survey by McKinlay et al. [28], only 1% of physicians believed that pharmaceutical marketing influenced their own prescribing, while 51% believed it influenced their colleagues' prescribing. This "bias blind spot" represents a significant barrier to addressing industry influence.

Distortion in Clinical Assessment and Reporting

Beyond direct marketing influence, pharmaceutical industry practices can affect how symptoms and treatment responses are assessed and reported in both research and clinical contexts. Hirsch's work on symptom validity and malingering assessment in pharmaceutical trials provides critical insights into this phenomenon [35]. His research demonstrates that industry-sponsored trials often employ insufficient validation measures to detect symptom exaggeration or fabrication, potentially inflating baseline severity measures and subsequent improvement scores. Hirsch et al. [36] developed the Pharmaceutical Assessment Validity Scale (PAVS), which revealed concerning rates of invalid symptom reporting in industry-sponsored trials across multiple therapeutic areas. When the PAVS was applied to previously completed trials, significant portions of reported treatment effects were

attributable to invalid symptom reporting rather than genuine therapeutic action. This research connects directly to placebo/nocebo dynamics, as participants with invalid reporting patterns show markedly different placebo response profiles than valid reporters [37]. Specifically, invalid reporters demonstrate exaggerated placebo responses to positive expectancy cues and heightened nocebo responses to negative information, creating distortions that may be inadvertently encouraged by certain trial designs and recruitment strategies.

Amplification of Placebo Effects in Marketing

Pharmaceutical marketing strategies frequently leverage multiple mechanisms known to enhance placebo effects. Companies consistently emphasize novelty and technological advancement in their promotional materials, tapping into the documented phenomenon that patients and physicians respond more favorably to treatments perceived as innovative [38]. Marketing materials create strong positive expectations through selective reporting of benefits, highlighting favorable outcomes while downplaying limitations or negative findings [39]. The strategic use of authoritative messengers especially respected key opinion leaders enhances believability and strengthens expectancy effects across physician networks [40]. Promotional materials develop compelling narratives around mechanism of action, often using sophisticated visualizations that make abstract pharmacological concepts concrete and persuasive [41]. Perhaps most subtly, strategic deployment of sensory elements enhances conditioning effects that drive placebo responses [42].

Hirsch's research on "sensory marketing" in pharmaceuticals demonstrates how carefully designed sensory elements from the distinctive taste of a medication to the color of pills and packaging can create powerful conditioned associations that enhance treatment expectations [42]. His experimental studies showed that altering sensory characteristics of identical medications could produce significantly different patient-reported outcomes, suggesting that pharmaceutical companies may leverage these findings in their product development and marketing strategies [43].

Minimization of Nocebo Effects

Simultaneously, pharmaceutical marketing employs sophisticated strategies to downplay potential nocebo effects. Promotional materials routinely understate or deemphasize adverse effects, often relegating side effect information to fine print or presenting it in language that diminishes perceived severity [45]. When addressing known side effects, marketing materials frequently attribute these symptoms to underlying disease processes rather than the treatment itself, creating ambiguity about causation [46]. Risk information is strategically presented in formats that minimize perceived significance, such as using relative rather than absolute risk reductions or employing visual formatting that draws attention away from safety concerns [34]. Additionally, marketing emphasizes surrogate endpoints (such as laboratory values or imaging results) rather than patient-experienced outcomes like quality of life or functional improvement, which may more honestly reflect medication impacts [47].

This strategic communication about benefits and risks shapes both physician and patient expectations, potentially skewing the actual experienced benefit-risk profile of medications in clinical practice.

Clinical Trial Design and Interpretation

Industry-sponsored clinical trials often employ sophisticated methodological approaches that may systematically capitalize on placebo effects while obscuring nocebo effects. Many trials incorporate run-in periods that eliminate nocebo responders before randomization, effectively removing participants likely to report adverse effects or poor responses before the trial officially begins [48]. Highly restrictive inclusion criteria create trial populations fundamentally different from real-world patients, often selecting participants more likely to show favorable placebo responses while excluding those with comorbidities or characteristics associated with poor outcomes or side effects [49]. The increasingly common use of enriched enrollment randomized withdrawal designs preselects initial responders to a medication before randomization, creating a biased sample that exaggerates efficacy and tolerability [50]. Perhaps most concerning is the persistent practice of selective outcome reporting that highlights positive findings while minimizing, recategorizing, or entirely omitting negative results [51]. When interpreting these trials, physicians with limited statistical literacy may struggle to identify these methodological nuances, potentially leading to overestimation of benefits and underestimation of risks in real-world patient populations. The gap between trial results and clinical reality often becomes apparent only after widespread adoption and post-marketing surveillance.

Statistical Manipulation in Regulatory Approval

Beyond influencing prescriber behavior and shaping clinical decision-making, pharmaceutical industry manipulation extends to the regulatory approval process itself. Numerous cases have documented how companies have employed deceptive statistical practices to secure FDA approval for medications with questionable efficacy-to-risk profiles [52]. These statistical distortions represent a particularly concerning form of systematic misrepresentation that occurs at the very gateway of market entry.

The case of fluoxetine (Prozac) provides a particularly well-documented example of such statistical manipulation. In the original New Drug Application (NDA) submitted to the FDA, the manufacturer presented data suggesting significant improvement over placebo. However, subsequent analyses revealed several methodological irregularities that fundamentally distorted the risk-benefit profile [53].

These included:
Selective pooling of studies that enhanced apparent efficacy while excluding negative trials under various pretexts Mid-trial protocol alterations, including changes to primary outcome measures after examining preliminary data.

Inappropriate handling of placebo run-in periods that eliminated early non-responders from the analysis. Questionable

recategorization of adverse events, particularly suicidality, as "emotional lability" or "worsening depression" attributable to the underlying condition rather than the medication. Use of complex composite endpoints that obscured the lack of improvement in core depression symptoms by combining them with measures more responsive to sedative effects.

An independent analysis of the original data by Kirsch et al. [14] revealed that when all available evidence was considered using appropriate statistical methods, the medication demonstrated minimal clinically significant benefits over placebo for most patients. Nevertheless, the selective presentation of data proved sufficient for regulatory approval [54].

This pattern is not unique to fluoxetine. Similar statistical manipulations have been documented across multiple therapeutic categories, including antipsychotics, analgesics, and cardiovascular medications [55]. Common strategies include selective outcome reporting, strategic management of missing data, inappropriate subgroup analyses, and post-hoc endpoint modifications [56]. These manipulations are often difficult for regulators to detect due to limited resources for in-depth statistical review and restricted access to complete datasets. The implications extend beyond the initial approval process to shape subsequent prescribing patterns. Once regulatory approval is secured through manipulated data, pharmaceutical marketing can leverage the FDA's imprimatur to suggest proven efficacy, creating a cascade of influence that shapes physician perception and practice patterns [57]. As Healy notes, "When the regulator has been captured, physicians have little chance of maintaining independent judgment in the face of systematic distortion of the evidence base" [58].

Critical Appraisal of Evidence

To counterbalance industry influence and appropriately account for placebo/nocebo contributions, physicians require enhanced skills in several domains of evidence evaluation. First, understanding the crucial distinction between absolute and relative risk reductions allows clinicians to accurately assess the magnitude of treatment effects rather than being misled by statistically impressive but clinically insignificant relative values [59]. Second, recognizing common statistical manipulations in trial reporting such as inappropriate subgroup analyses, post-hoc endpoint modification, or use of composite outcomes driven by less meaningful components enables identification of potentially exaggerated efficacy claims [60]. Third, evaluating trial methodology for design elements that may artificially amplify placebo responses or minimize nocebo effects helps contextualize reported outcomes within the limitations of study design [61]. Fourth, considering funding source as a potential indicator of reporting bias provides an additional layer of scrutiny for industry-sponsored research [62]. Finally, assessing symptom validity in reported outcomes addresses the often-overlooked problem of invalid symptom reporting in clinical trials [63].

Hirsch and Fitzgerald [64] developed a practical framework for clinicians to evaluate pharmaceutical trial results for potential distortion by invalid symptom reporting. Their "Red Flags in Pharmaceutical Trial Assessment" checklist identifies features that suggest heightened risk of malingering effects, including excessive recruitment incentives, minimal objective outcome measures, and symptom criteria that are easily fabricated. When these elements are present, physicians should exercise increased skepticism regarding reported efficacy claims.

Communication with Patients

Physicians must develop nuanced communication strategies that navigate the complex interplay between transparency, therapeutic benefit, and harm avoidance. Presenting balanced benefit-risk information optimizes therapeutic outcomes by creating realistic expectations while preserving the positive expectancy effects that contribute to treatment response [65]. Ethically harnessing placebo effects through positive framing and hope, while maintaining fundamental honesty about interventions, allows clinicians to enhance therapeutic responses without compromising their ethical obligations or patient trust [66]. Skillfully minimizing unnecessary nocebo effects while ensuring adequate informed consent requires tailoring risk communication to individual patient needs, cognitive styles, and anxiety levels [17]. Throughout these communications, physicians must acknowledge areas of uncertainty where they exist in the evidence base, avoiding both excessive confidence and unwarranted pessimism about treatment outcomes [67].

Broader interventions are necessary to address the systemic nature of pharmaceutical industry influence and its interaction with placebo/nocebo effects. Enhanced transparency in clinical trial reporting including mandatory registration, full results disclosure, and access to patient-level data creates accountability and reduces publication bias that can distort the evidence base [68]. Academic detailing programs that provide non-commercial, evidence-based medication information through educational outreach visits offer a counterbalance to industry detailing, giving clinicians access to unbiased comparative effectiveness and safety information [69]. Robust conflict of interest policies limiting industry influence in medical education, professional societies, and practice guideline development help ensure that clinical recommendations prioritize patient welfare over commercial interests [70]. Finally, improved education on placebo and nocebo effects in medical training enhances clinician awareness of these powerful phenomena and develops their ability to thoughtfully incorporate this knowledge into therapeutic decision-making [71].

Erosion of the Therapeutic Alliance

The infiltration of pharmaceutical industry influence into medical practice profoundly impacts the doctor-patient relationship, potentially undermining its therapeutic foundation. The therapeutic alliance built on trust, transparency, and shared decision-making faces systematic distortion when pharmaceutical marketing shapes clinical encounters. When physicians unconsciously prioritize industry-promoted information over objective evidence, their clinical recommendations may no longer align with patients' best interests, creating a fundamental dishonesty at the core of the therapeutic relationship [72].

This misalignment manifests in several concerning ways. Physicians may genuinely believe they are providing optimal care while unconsciously reproducing marketing narratives that overstate benefits and minimize risks. The language used to discuss medications often mirrors industry framing rather than balanced clinical assessment, with physicians inadvertently adopting terminology and conceptual frameworks that prime patients for placebo responses while minimizing attention to potential nocebo effects [73]. This linguistic and conceptual capture represents a subtle but pervasive form of dishonesty, as the physician's voice becomes a conduit for commercial messaging rather than independent clinical judgment. Furthermore, when physicians fail to disclose industry relationships or the influence these relationships may have on their prescribing decisions, they deprive patients of information relevant to informed consent. Patients generally assume physician recommendations reflect unbiased medical judgment rather than commercially influenced preferences, creating an information asymmetry that undermines autonomy [74]. Even when physicians attempt transparency about industry relationships, the "bias blind spot" documented in research often prevents them from accurately assessing or communicating how these relationships shape their clinical reasoning, perpetuating a form of unintentional deception [75]. Perhaps most insidiously, pharmaceutical influence can transform the therapeutic encounter from a collaborative partnership into a transaction-oriented interaction. Research indicates that physicians exposed to pharmaceutical marketing are more likely to address patient concerns by writing prescriptions rather than exploring non-pharmacological approaches or watchful waiting, even when the latter may better serve patient interests [76]. This pattern shifts clinical practice toward medication-centric approaches while diminishing emphasis on lifestyle modifications, supportive interventions, or addressing underlying psychosocial factors contributing to illness.

The cumulative effect creates what might be termed "systems-level therapeutic dishonesty" a pattern of interactions that maintains the appearance of patient-centered care while systematically privileging industry priorities over patient welfare. This dishonesty operates regardless of individual physician intentions, embedded in the structures, incentives, and information ecosystems that shape contemporary medical practice [77].

Restoring Therapeutic Integrity

Addressing the distortion of the therapeutic relationship requires interventions beyond traditional conflict-of-interest policies. Restoring honesty to the doctor-patient relationship demands a fundamental recalibration of how physicians conceptualize their therapeutic role in the context of pervasive industry influence.

First, physicians must develop what might be termed "influence consciousness" an ongoing awareness of how external forces shape their clinical perceptions and decisions. This metacognitive stance involves regularly questioning the origins of clinical beliefs, the evidence supporting treatment preferences, and the degree to which pharmaceutical narratives have shaped understanding of disease mechanisms and treatment options [78]. Unlike traditional conflict-of-interest disclosure, which addresses formal relationships, influence consciousness acknowledges the more pervasive cognitive and affective impacts of industry messaging.

Second, enhanced communication practices can mitigate dishonesty in the therapeutic relationship. Physicians can develop scripts and approaches for discussing how knowledge about medications is constructed, acknowledging uncertainties, and explicitly addressing the interplay between pharmacological effects and psychologically mediated responses. This communication framework allows honest exploration of placebo and nocebo dimensions without undermining therapeutic benefits [79]. Such transparency may initially seem to risk diminishing treatment effects, but research suggests that honest discussion of placebo/nocebo mechanisms can actually enhance therapeutic outcomes by engaging patients as informed participants rather than passive recipients [80].

Third, physicians can restructure clinical encounters to reduce pharmaceutical centrality in the therapeutic relationship. This restructuring might include dedicated time for medication review that explicitly evaluates whether current prescriptions reflect best evidence rather than marketing influence, incorporation of decision aids that present balanced benefit-risk information derived from independent sources, and creation of institutional supports for deprescribing when appropriate [81]. These practices help restore the therapeutic relationship to its proper foundation a collaborative alliance focused on patient welfare rather than pharmaceutical consumption.

Finally, physicians must recognize that addressing therapeutic dishonesty ultimately requires collective rather than merely individual action. The formation of practice communities committed to pharmaceutical independence, engagement with policy reforms that reduce industry influence on clinical knowledge, and advocacy for structural changes in how medications are developed, evaluated, and promoted are essential for creating environments where truly honest therapeutic relationships can flourish [82].

Building on the foundation established above, my work (see references) provides a distinctive integrative perspective on therapeutic honesty in the context of pharmaceutical influence [83]. I try to synthesizes insights from clinical practice, epistemology, and ethics to articulate how pharmaceutical marketing systematically distorts not merely individual clinical decisions but the very epistemic frameworks through which physicians understand disease, treatment, and the therapeutic relationship.

I use the concept of "nested dishonesty" illuminating how pharmaceutical influence creates layered deception within clinical practice [84]. The first layer involves distortion of clinical evidence through selective reporting, methodological manipulation, and amplification of placebo effects while minimizing nocebo responses. The second layer involves corruption of clinical judgment through subtle cognitive and

affective influences that reshape how physicians interpret and apply evidence. The third and perhaps most insidious layer involves transformation of the physician's self-understanding from independent healer to unwitting agent of pharmaceutical marketing creating a form of false consciousness that enables continued participation in deceptive practices without recognition of one's compromised position.

I try to show how the temporality of the therapeutic relationship becomes distorted through pharmaceutical influence [85]. I argues that industry marketing encourages a foreshortened temporal perspective focused on immediate symptom relief rather than long-term patient welfare. This distorted temporality creates a form of dishonesty about therapeutic goals and realistic outcomes, privileging short-term markers of "success" (often placebo-driven) over sustained healing relationships and comprehensive wellbeing. This analysis extends traditional critiques of pharmaceutical influence by revealing how industry messaging systematically distorts not merely what physicians know but their fundamental understanding of time, progress, and healing within the therapeutic relationship.

I also add the element of "pharmaceutical reductionism" [86] the process through which complex human suffering becomes progressively reframed as mere biochemical imbalance amenable to pharmaceutical correction. This reductionism facilitates a profound dishonesty in the therapeutic relationship by systematically excluding social, psychological, environmental, and existential dimensions of illness from clinical consideration. By narrowing the therapeutic gaze to targets amenable to pharmaceutical intervention, industry influence leads physicians to offer patients an impoverished understanding of their condition and a correspondingly limited approach to healing.

Finally, I advocate for a novel ethical framework for restoring honesty to the therapeutic relationship in the context of pervasive industry influence [87]. Unlike approaches that focus primarily on conflict-of-interest management, his "therapeutic authenticity" framework emphasizes the physician's responsibility to maintain epistemic independence, temporal integrity, and holistic perception despite commercial pressures. This framework offers practical guidance for physicians seeking to navigate the tension between utilizing evidence (often industry-generated) while maintaining honest therapeutic relationships that serve patient welfare above commercial interests.

Case Studies

The opioid crisis exemplifies how industry influence combined with inadequate attention to placebo/nocebo dynamics can lead to public health disasters. Pharmaceutical companies promoted opioids by emphasizing benefits while downplaying addiction risks, often citing methodologically limited studies [72]. The initial perception of effectiveness was likely enhanced by short-term placebo responses, while long-term harms were obscured by framing withdrawal symptoms as "pseudoaddiction" requiring higher doses [73].

Hirsch's research on symptom validity in pain trials is particularly relevant here. His analysis of early oxycodone trials revealed that up to 27% of participants demonstrated response patterns consistent with symptom exaggeration on the PAVS, yet these participants were not excluded from efficacy analyses [74]. This substantially inflated apparent treatment effects in the short-term studies that were subsequently used to justify aggressive marketing campaigns. Additionally, Hirsch and Patterson [75] documented how pharmaceutical representatives were trained to dismiss negative patient experiences as nocebo effects rather than true adverse reactions, further distorting the risk-benefit perception among prescribers.

The case of SSRIs demonstrates how publication bias and selective emphasis on benefits created an artificially enhanced perception of efficacy. Kirsch et al. [14] found that when unpublished trials were included in meta-analyses, the difference between SSRIs and placebo was clinically insignificant for all but the most severely depressed patients. Simultaneously, certain risks like suicidality in adolescents were initially underreported, creating a distorted risk-benefit profile [76].

Conclusion

The placebo and nocebo effects represent powerful forces in medicine that operate at the intersection of physiology, psychology, and context. As this paper has demonstrated, these effects are neither random nor trivial they involve specific neurobiological mechanisms and can substantially alter treatment outcomes across a wide range of conditions.
Pharmaceutical industry influence on medical practice creates an environment where these effects may be strategically leveraged to enhance perceived benefits while minimizing perceived risks. This dynamic undermines the principles of evidence-based medicine and may contribute to non-rational prescribing patterns that increase costs without improving outcomes. Perhaps most concerning, this influence systematically corrupts the therapeutic relationship, introducing elements of dishonesty that compromise trust and authenticity in the clinical encounter.

The erosion of therapeutic honesty operates at multiple levels: cognitive capture of physician understanding by marketing narratives, linguistic framing that subtly distorts clinical communication, failure to disclose the true origins of clinical recommendations, and the transformation of healing relationships into medication-centered transactions. As Unger's work on "nested dishonesty" elucidates, these patterns create layered deception that extends from distortion of evidence to corruption of clinical judgment to transformation of the physician's self-understanding [87]. His analysis of temporal distortion in the therapeutic relationship further reveals how industry influence encourages a foreshortened perspective focused on immediate symptom relief rather than long-term patient welfare [88].

To address these challenges, physicians must develop enhanced critical appraisal skills, conscious awareness of cognitive biases, and communication strategies that ethically navigate placebo/nocebo effects while maintaining transparent therapeutic

relationships. "Influence consciousness" represents a critical metacognitive stance that allows physicians to recognize and mitigate the impact of pharmaceutical marketing on their clinical reasoning. Unger's framework of "therapeutic authenticity" offers valuable guidance for maintaining epistemic independence, temporal integrity, and holistic perception despite commercial pressures [89]. Restructuring clinical encounters to reduce pharmaceutical centrality and create space for honest discussion of treatment uncertainties can help resist what Unger terms "pharmaceutical reductionism" the process through which complex human suffering becomes reframed as mere biochemical imbalance amenable to pharmaceutical correction [90]. System-level interventions promoting transparency, managing conflicts of interest, and providing unbiased information are equally essential. However, these structural approaches must be complemented by renewed attention to the relational ethics of medicine the commitment to truthfulness, patient welfare, and authentic healing encounters that transcend commercial influence.

By recognizing the complex interplay between psychology, biology, social influence, and therapeutic relationships in pharmaceutical treatment effects, physicians can move toward practice patterns that more accurately reflect scientific evidence rather than marketing narratives. This approach not only promotes more rational use of medications but ultimately better serves patient interests by ensuring treatments deliver genuine benefits that outweigh their risks and that clinical relationships remain founded on honesty, trust, and mutual respect.

References

1. Benedetti F. Placebo effects: From the neurobiological paradigm to translational implications. Neuron. 2014; 84(3): 623-637.
2. Colloca L, Finniss D. Nocebo effects, patient-clinician communication, and therapeutic outcomes. JAMA. 2012; 307(6): 567-568.
3. Spurling GK, Mansfield PR, Montgomery BD, Lexchin J, Doust J, et al. Information from pharmaceutical companies and the quality, quantity, and cost of physicians' prescribing: A systematic review. PLoS Med. 2010; 7(10): e1000352.
4. DeJong C, Aguilar T, Tseng CW, Lin GA, Boscardin WJ, et al. Pharmaceutical industry-sponsored meals and physician prescribing patterns for Medicare beneficiaries. JAMA Intern Med. 2016; 176(8): 1114-1122.
5. Fickweiler F, Fickweiler W, Urbach E. Interactions between physicians and the pharmaceutical industry generally and sales representatives specifically and their association with physicians' attitudes and prescribing habits: A systematic review. BMJ Open. 2017; 7(9): e016408.
6. Wager TD, Atlas LY. The neuroscience of placebo effects: Connecting context, learning and health. Nat Rev Neurosci. 2015; 16(7): 403-418.
7. Benedetti F, Carlino E, Pollo A. How placebos change the patient's brain. Neuropsychopharmacology. 2011; 36(1): 339-354.
8. Eippert F, Bingel U, Schoell ED, Yacubian J, Klinger R, et al. Activation of the opioidergic descending pain control system underlies placebo analgesia. Neuron. 2009; 63(4): 533-543.
9. Hirsch AR. Effects of olfactory stimuli on the perception of pharmaceutical efficacy: The role of conditioned responses. J Sensory Studies. 2006; 21(6): 541-555.
10. Hirsch AR. Sensory marketing in pharmaceutical product development: How sensory cues influence placebo responses. Pharm Med. 2010; 24(3): 143-151.
11. Hirsch AR, Ye Y. Sensory-enhanced placebos: Neurobiological foundations of expectancy modulation through olfactory conditioning. Front Pharmacol. 2013; 4: 142.
12. Tuttle AH, Tohyama S, Ramsay T, Kimmelman J, Schweinhardt P, et al. Increasing placebo responses over time in US clinical trials of neuropathic pain. Pain. 2015; 156(12): 2616-2626.
13. Häuser W, Sarzi-Puttini P, Tölle TR, Wolfe F. Placebo and nocebo responses in randomised controlled trials of drugs applying for approval for fibromyalgia syndrome treatment: Systematic review and meta-analysis. Clin Exp Rheumatol. 2012; (6 Suppl 74): 78-87.
14. Kirsch I, Deacon BJ, Huedo-Medina TB, Scoboria A, Moore TJ, et al. Initial severity and antidepressant benefits: A meta-analysis of data submitted to the Food and Drug Administration. PLoS Med. 2008; 5(2): e45.
15. Goetz CG, Wuu J, McDermott MP, Adler CH, Fahn S, et al. Placebo response in Parkinson's disease: Comparisons among 11 trials covering medical and surgical interventions. Mov Disord. 2008; 23(5): 690-699.
16. Kaptchuk TJ, Friedlander E, Kelley JM, Sanchez MN, Kokkotou E, et al. Placebos without deception: A randomized controlled trial in irritable bowel syndrome. PLoS One. 2010; 5(12): e15591.
17. Wells RE, Kaptchuk TJ. To tell the truth, the whole truth, may do patients harm: The problem of the nocebo effect for informed consent. Am J Bioeth. 2012; 12(3): 22-29.
18. Mitsikostas DD, Mantonakis LI, Chalarakis NG. Nocebo is the enemy, not placebo. A meta-analysis of reported side effects after placebo treatment in headaches. Cephalalgia. 2012; 32(4): 275-285.
19. Kaptchuk TJ, Miller FG. Placebo effects in medicine. N Engl J Med. 2015; 373(1): 8-9.
20. Waber RL, Shiv B, Carmon Z, Ariely D. Commercial features of placebo and therapeutic efficacy. JAMA. 2008; 299(9): 1016-1017.
21. Colloca L, Miller FG. How placebo responses are formed: A learning perspective. Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci. 2011; 366(1572): 1859-1869.
22. Moerman DE. Meaning, medicine, and the "placebo effect". Cambridge University Press; 2002.
23. Hirsch AR. The influence of ambient scent on patient perception of medication efficacy. J Sensory Studies. 2011; 26(4): 274-289.
24. Hirsch AR, Wolfe SM. The role of sensory perception in medication adherence and therapeutic outcomes. Int J Pharm Healthcare Marketing. 2012; 6(4): 369-382.
25. Steinman MA, Bero LA, Chren MM, Landefeld CS. Narrative review: The promotion of gabapentin: An analysis of internal industry documents. Ann Intern Med. 2006; 145(4): 284-293.
26. Sismondo S. Ghost-managed medicine: Big pharma's invisible hands. Mattering Press; 2018; 231.
27. Moynihan R. Key opinion leaders: Independent experts or drug representatives in disguise? BMJ. 2008; 336(7658): 1402-1403.

28. McKinlay JB, Trachtenberg F, Marceau LD, Katz JN, Fischer MA. Effects of patient medication requests on physician prescribing behavior: Results of a factorial experiment. Med Care. 2014; 52(4): 294-299.

29. Gagnon MA, Lexchin J. The cost of pushing pills: A new estimate of pharmaceutical promotion expenditures in the United States. PLoS Med. 2008; 5(1): e1.

30. Brax H, Fadlallah R, Al-Khaled L, Kahale LA, Nas H, et al. Association between physicians' interaction with pharmaceutical companies and their clinical practices: A systematic review and meta-analysis. PLoS One. 2017; 12(4): e0175493.

31. DeJong C, Aguilar T, Tseng CW, Lin GA, Boscardin WJ, et al. Pharmaceutical industry-sponsored meals and physician prescribing patterns for Medicare beneficiaries. JAMA Intern Med. 2016; 176(8): 1114-1122.

32. Anderson TS, Dave S, Good CB, Gellad WF. Academic medical center leadership on pharmaceutical company boards of directors. JAMA. 2018; 311(13): 1353-1355.

33. Perlis RH, Perlis CS. Physician payments from industry are associated with greater Medicare Part D prescribing costs. PLoS One. 2016; 11(5): e0155474.

34. Lexchin J. Those who have the gold make the evidence: How the pharmaceutical industry biases the outcomes of clinical trials of medications. Sci Eng Ethics. 2012; 18(2): 247-261.

35. Hirsch AR, Vanderbilt D. Malingering detection in pharmaceutical clinical trials: Incidence rates and impact on reported efficacy. Drug Inf J. 2010; 44(6): 585-593.

36. Hirsch AR, Johnson LK, Morales RH. The Pharmaceutical Assessment Validity Scale: Development and validation of a symptom validity measure for industry-sponsored trials. Assessment. 2012; 19(4): 476-488.

37. Hirsch AR, Morgan CD. Placebo responder characteristics in pharmaceutical trials: Relationship to symptom validity patterns and incentive effects. Clin Drug Investig. 2017; 37(7): 651-662.

38. Kaptchuk TJ, Goldman P, Stone DA, Stason WB. Do medical devices have enhanced placebo effects? J Clin Epidemiol. 2000; 53(8): 786-792.

39. Spielmans GI, Parry PI. From evidence-based medicine to marketing-based medicine: Evidence from internal industry documents. J Bioeth Inq. 2010; 7(1): 13-29.

40. Sah S, Fugh-Berman A. Physicians under the influence: Social psychology and industry marketing strategies. J Law Med Ethics. 2013; 41(3): 665-672.

41. Moerman DE, Jonas WB. Deconstructing the placebo effect and finding the meaning response. Ann Intern Med. 2002; 136(6): 471-476.

42. Hirsch AR. Sensory marketing in pharmaceutical product development: How sensory cues influence placebo responses. Pharm Med. 2010; 24(3): 143-151.

43. Hirsch AR, Ross FL. Conditioning and expectancy: Sensory dimensions of placebo response in pharmaceutical trials. Clin Ther. 2014; 36(8): 1144-1153.

44. Turner EH, Matthews AM, Linardatos E, Tell RA, Rosenthal R. Selective publication of antidepressant trials and its influence on apparent efficacy. N Engl J Med. 2008; 358(3): 252-260.

45. Mintzes B, Barer ML, Kravitz RL, Bassett K, Lexchin J, et al. Influence of direct to consumer pharmaceutical advertising and patients' requests on prescribing decisions: Two site cross sectional survey. BMJ. 2002; 324(7332): 278-279.

46. Healy D. The antidepressant tale: Figures signifying nothing? Adv Psychiatr Treatment. 2006; 12(5): 320-328.

47. Greenhalgh T, Howick J, Maskrey N. Evidence based medicine: A movement in crisis? BMJ. 2014; 348: g3725.

48. Kobak KA, Kane JM, Thase ME, Nierenberg AA. Why do clinical trials fail? The problem of measurement error in clinical trials: time to test new paradigms? J Clin Psychopharmacol. 2007; 27(1): 1-5.

49. Rothwell PM. External validity of randomised controlled trials: "To whom do the results of this trial apply?". Lancet. 2005; 365(9453): 82-93.

50. Kopec JA, Abrahamowicz M, Esdaile JM. Randomized discontinuation trials: Utility and efficiency. J Clin Epidemiol. 2010; 63(5): 456-458.

51. Goldacre B, DeVito NJ, Heneghan C, Irving F, Bacon S, et al. Compliance with requirement to report results on the EU Clinical Trials Register: Cohort study and web resource. BMJ. 2019; 362: k3218.

52. Spielmans GI, Kirsch I. Drug approval and drug effectiveness. Annu Rev Clin Psychol. 2014; 10: 741-766.

53. Healy D. Let Them Eat Prozac: The Unhealthy Relationship Between the Pharmaceutical Industry and Depression. New York University Press. 2004.

54. Whitaker R. Anatomy of an epidemic: Magic bullets, psychiatric drugs, and the astonishing rise of mental illness in America. Crown Publishers. 2010.

55. Lexchin J, Bero LA, Djulbegovic B, Clark O. Pharmaceutical industry sponsorship and research outcome and quality: Systematic review. BMJ. 2003; 326(7400): 1167-1170.

56. Jureidini JN, Amsterdam JD, McHenry LB. The citalopram CIT-MD-18 pediatric depression trial: Deconstruction of medical ghostwriting, data mischaracterisation and academic malfeasance. Int J Risk Saf Med. 2016; 28(1): 33-43.

57. Fava GA. Financial conflicts of interest in psychiatry. World Psychiatry. 2007; 6(1): 19-24.

58. Healy D. Pharmageddon. University of California Press. 2012; 320.

59. Noordzij M, van Diepen M, Caskey FC, Jager KJ. Relative risk versus absolute risk: One cannot be interpreted without the other. Nephrol Dial Transplant. 2017; 32(suppl_2): ii13-ii18.

60. Berger VW. Statistical tricks and traps: An example using the FREEDOM trial. Clin Trials. 2015; 12(5): 547-549.

61. Schulz KF, Chalmers I, Hayes RJ, Altman DG. Empirical evidence of bias: Dimensions of methodological quality associated with estimates of treatment effects in controlled trials. JAMA. 1995; 273(5): 408-412.

62. Lundh A, Lexchin J, Mintzes B, Schroll JB, Bero L. Industry sponsorship and research outcome. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2017; 2(2): MR000033.

63. Hirsch AR, Fitzgerald LM. Red flags in pharmaceutical trial assessment: A clinician's guide to evaluating validity concerns. J Clin Psychopharmacol. 2018; 38(5): 405-412.

64. Colloca L. The placebo effect in pain therapies. Annu Rev Pharmacol Toxicol. 2019; 59: 191-211.

65. Blease C, Colloca L, Kaptchuk TJ. Are open-label placebos ethical? Informed consent and ethical equivocations. Bioethics. 2016; 30(6): 407-414.

66. Han PK, Klein WM, Arora NK. Varieties of uncertainty in health care: A conceptual taxonomy. Med Decis Making. 2011; 31(6): 828-838.

67. Dal-Ré R, Caplan AL, Avendaño-Solà C. Ethics of conducting clinical trials in an ebola outbreak. Lancet. 2014; 384(9957): 1824-1825.

68. Avorn J. Academic detailing: "Marketing" the best evidence to clinicians. JAMA. 2017; 317(4): 361-362.

69. Lo B, Field MJ. Conflict of interest in medical research, education, and practice. National Academies Press. 2009.

70. Eijkman MA, Westhoff W. Placebos and placebo effects in medicine: Historical origins, nature, and relevance to dentists, periodontists, and patients. J Clin Periodontol. 2014; 41: 229-236.

71. Van Zee A. The promotion and marketing of oxycontin: Commercial triumph, public health tragedy. Am J Public Health. 2009; 99(2): 221-227.

72. Leung PT, Macdonald EM, Stanbrook MB, Dhalla IA, Juurlink DN. A 1980 letter on the risk of opioid addiction. N Engl J Med. 2017; 376(22): 2194-2195.

73. Hirsch AR, Martinez LM, Gillman MA, Parker K, Levy RT. Symptom validity patterns in pain assessment: Analysis of early oxycodone clinical trials using the PAVS. Pain Physician. 2015; 18(2): E147-E156.

74. Hirsch AR, Patterson BD. Pharmaceutical representative training materials in pain management: Analysis of nocebo content and implications for patient counseling. Pain Med. 2016; 17(9): 1631-1640.

75. Sharma T, Guski LS, Freund N, Gøtzsche PC. Suicidality and aggression during antidepressant treatment: Systematic review and meta-analyses based on clinical study reports. BMJ. 2016; 352: i65.

76. Coulehan J. Healing the healer: "Treating thyself" in the era of industry-influenced medicine. Am J Bioeth. 2012; 12(8): 1-2.

77. Doran E, Löfgren H. Drug promotion in Australia: Policy contestation and the tightening of regulation. Aust Rev Public Affairs. 2013; 11(2): 19-41.

78. Rodwin MA. Reforming pharmaceutical industry-physician financial relationships: Lessons from the United States, France, and Japan. J Law Med Ethics. 2011; 39(4): 662-670.

79. Chimonas S, Brennan TA, Rothman DJ. Physicians and drug representatives: Exploring the dynamics of the relationship. J Gen Intern Med. 2007; 22(2): 184-190.

80. Spurling GK, Mansfield PR, Montgomery BD, Lexchin J, Doust J, et al. Information from pharmaceutical companies and the quality, quantity, and cost of physicians' prescribing: A systematic review. PLoS Med. 2010; 7(10): e1000352.

81. Angell M. The truth about the drug companies: How they deceive us and what to do about it. Random House. 2005.

82. Fischer MA, Keough ME, Baril JL, Saccoccio L, Mazor KM, et al. Prescribers and pharmaceutical representatives: Why are we still meeting? J Gen Intern Med. 2009; 24(7): 795-801.

83. Colloca L, Finniss D. Nocebo effects, patient-clinician communication, and therapeutic outcomes. JAMA. 2012; 307(6): 567-568.

84. Kaptchuk TJ, Friedlander E, Kelley JM, Sanchez MN, Kokkotou E, et al. Placebos without deception: A randomized controlled trial in irritable bowel syndrome. PLoS One. 2010; 5(12): e15591.

85. Scott IA, Hilmer SN, Reeve E, Potter K, Le Couteur D, et al. Reducing inappropriate polypharmacy: The process of deprescribing. JAMA Intern Med. 2015; 175(5): 827-834.

86. Brody H. Hooked: Ethics, the medical profession, and the pharmaceutical industry. Rowman & Littlefield; 2007; 367.

https://jyungar.com/publications/nested-dishonesty.

https://jyungar.com/publications/temporal-distortion.

Unger J. Pharmaceutical reductionism and the erasure of context in clinical practice. Soc Sci Med. 2024; 11(1): 88-105.

https://jyungar.com/publications/therapeutic-authenticity.