

Tables for HRG Publication #1765: Financial Conflict of Interest Disclosure and Voting Patterns at Food and Drug Administration Drug Advisory Committee Meetings

Table 1. Percentage of Meetings at Which at Least One Conflict of Interest Was Reported (n = 221) and Percentage of Conflicts of Interest by Person-Meetings (n = 3718)

	No./Total (%)				
	Product-Specific	Non-Product-Specific	Before January 31, 2002	After January 31, 2002	All Meetings
Meetings at Which ≥1 Conflict Was Reported					
Advisory committee member	78/110 (71)	68/111 (61)	39/56 (70)	107/165 (65)	146/221 (66)
Voting consultant	55/101 (54)	45/89 (51)	18/47 (38)	82/143 (57)	100/190 (53)
Advisory committee member or voting consultant	89/110 (81)	73/111 (66)	43/56 (77)	119/165 (72)	162/221 (73)
Public hearing participant	50/75 (67)	46/67 (69)	21/35 (60)	75/107 (70)	96/142 (68)
All attendees	98/110 (89)	83/111 (75)	47/56 (84)	134/165 (81)	181/221 (82)
Conflicts by Person-Meetings					
Advisory committee member	229/1032 (22)	335/925 (36)	138/457 (30)	426/1500 (28)	564/1957 (29)
Voting consultant	107/456 (23)	158/534 (30)	53/221 (24)	212/769 (28)	265/990 (27)
Advisory committee member or voting consultant	336/1488 (23)	493/1459 (34)	191/678 (28)	638/2269 (28)	829/2947 (28)
Public hearing participant	135/437 (31)	149/334 (45)	68/155 (44)	216/616 (35)	284/771 (37)
All attendees	470/1925 (24)	642/1793 (36)	259/833 (31)	853/2885 (30)	1112/3718 (30)

Table 2. Breakdown of Conflicts of Interest With Designated Monetary Values for Advisory Committee Members and Voting Consultants*

Conflict Type	No. (%)†
Consulting, \$	
0-10 000	144 (80)
10 001-50 000	31 (17)
≥50 001	4 (2)
Contracts/grants/CRADAs, \$	
0-100 000	17 (77)
100 001-300 000	1 (5)
≥300 001	4 (18)
Investments, \$	
0-5000	21 (16)
5001-25 000	73 (54)
25 001-50 000	33 (25)
50 001-100 000	7 (5)
Lecturing/honoraria, \$	
0-10 000	23 (56)
≥10 001	18 (44)
Total	376

Abbreviation: CRADA, cooperative research and development agreement.

*Individuals could have more than 1 type of conflict of interest.

†Percentage of conflicts of this type. Data for 13 "other" conflicts, 4 employment conflicts, and 1 expert witness conflict are not shown.

Table 3. Impact of 2002 Draft Guidance on Conflict of Interest Disclosure for Advisory Committee Members and Voting Consultants in Product-Specific Meetings

Measure	Before January 31, 2002, %	After January 31, 2002, %
Analysis by meeting ≥1 conflict (n = 110)	86	78
Analyses by person-meeting (n = 1488)		
Recusal*	2	1
Reason given for recusal†	0	30
Restriction	2	1
Prevalence of conflicts	27	21
Analyses by conflict (n = 416)		
Provided type of conflict‡	36	97
Specified sponsor or competitor§	70	94
Competitor company named	54	1
Specific monetary value provided	41	95

*Advisory committee members only.

†As percentage of recusals.

‡Remainder were classified as "unspecified."

§Remainder were classified as "not related," "not applicable" (for nonproduct meetings), or "not specified" (if there were no details in the transcript).

Table 4. Analyses of the Relationship Between Conflict of Interest Type and Voting Behavior (n = 76 Meetings)*

Analysis	Conflict Type		
	Index	Competitor	Any
Meeting-Level Analyses			
Voting as continuous outcome			
Spearman rho	0.16	0.10	0.13
P value	.18	.38	.26
Majority voting as dichotomous outcome,	.31	.67	.47
P value			
Impact of exclusions on vote margin toward index drug, No. of meetings			
Less favorable	14	27	31
More favorable	7	5	8
No change	1	3	4
Impact of exclusions on overall vote outcome	None	None	None
Individual-Level Analyses			
Mantel-Haenszel RR (95% CI)	0.74 (0.39-1.39)	1.20 (1.12-1.28)	1.10 (1.03-1.17)
Monte Carlo, No. of positive votes			
Observed	6.0	36.0	40.0
Expected (95% CI)	8.2 (4.5-10.5)	29.5 (23.5-34.5)	36.0 (29.5-41.5)

Abbreviations: CI, confidence interval; RR, relative risk.

*See text for definitions of different analytic methods.