¿WHAT IS THE PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRY AFRAID OF?

Editorial

AUTHORS:
Hirsch, Roberto R; Carvallo, Héctor E.
Editors

doi.org/10.55634/5.1.3

One of the most common claims is that pharmaceutical companies have little incentive to seek inexpensive cures because it is more profitable to keep patients on long-term treatment than to cure them outright.
The core criticism is that the pharmaceutical industry's business model rewards long-term treatments rather than definitive cures.
The reasoning is as follows:
A patient who takes a medicine for 20 years generates substantially more revenue than one who is cured after a single treatment.
Pharmaceutical companies are profit-making businesses that are accountable to shareholders.
Consequently, they may have stronger incentives to invest in chronic conditions than in permanent cures.
The strongest accusation: "companies prefer chronic patients to cured patients"
The argument generally runs as follows:
Suppose there are two treatments.

Treatment A:
$ 500 per month;
taken for 30 years.
Total revenue:
$ 180,000.

Treatment B:
a one-off cure;
single payment.
If the cure were sold for $ 20,000, total revenue would be considerably lower.

From a purely financial perspective, long-term treatment could therefore generate greater profits.
This economic observation is logically valid.

Main documented criticisms

1. The patent system directs research towards the most profitable diseases

Pharmaceutical patents generally last around 20 years from the date of filing.
This encourages companies to prioritise diseases that:

- affect large populations;
- command high prices;
- provide stable, long-term markets.

As a result, major investment is directed towards conditions such as:

- hypertension;
- diabetes;
- high cholesterol;
- arthritis;
- depression.

By contrast, diseases affecting poorer populations or very small patient groups tend to receive significantly less private investment.

2. Neglected diseases

A well-recognised phenomenon concerns so-called "neglected diseases".
These include conditions such as:

- sleeping sickness;
- leishmaniasis;
- Chagas disease;
- schistosomiasis.

These illnesses predominantly affect low-income populations.
Because these markets have limited purchasing power, private investment has historically been much lower.
This criticism is supported by substantial evidence.

3. Investment in minor modifications of existing medicines

Companies may find it more profitable to develop:

- a new formulation;
- a different dosage;

- an extended-release version;
- a combination of two established medicines.

Such modifications may qualify for new patents.
Critics often refer to these products as "me-too drugs".

4. Marketing expenditure versus research

For many years, critics argued that some large pharmaceutical companies spent as much, or even more, on marketing than on research and development.
Marketing expenditure may include:

- advertising;
- scientific conferences;
- promotional activities aimed at healthcare professionals;
- pharmaceutical sales representatives;
- public communication campaigns.

Although the proportions vary between companies, this criticism has been documented in numerous analyses.

5. Influence over clinical trials

Another common criticism concerns industry-sponsored research.
Critics argue that:

- many clinical trials are funded by the companies developing the products;
- negative findings are less likely to be published;
- study designs may sometimes favour positive outcomes.

6. Conflicts of interest

Criticism has also focused on relationships between:
pharmaceutical companies; doctors; universities; professional medical societies.
Examples include:

- sponsorship of conferences;
- speaker fees;
- consultancy payments;
- research grants.

These relationships may influence clinical decision-making.

7. Medicalization

Another important criticism concerns the medicalisation of normal aspects of life.
Examples include:

- menopause;
- extreme shyness;
- reduced sexual desire;
- ageing;
- certain mild mood disorders.

Broadening disease definitions may increase the number of people receiving medical treatment.

8. High medicine prices

Many innovative medicines are sold at extremely high prices.
Pharmaceutical companies argue that these prices are necessary to recover the costs of:

- research;
- unsuccessful development programmes;
- clinical trials;
- manufacturing.

Prices may substantially development costs and restrict access to treatment.

Cases that fuel public suspicion

Public distrust has also been reinforced by genuine historical cases involving pharmaceutical companies.
Examples include:

- companies found to have concealed adverse effects;
- selective presentation of research findings;
- substantial financial penalties for unlawful marketing practices;
- dramatic price increases unrelated to production costs.

Such cases understandably contribute to public scepticism regarding corporate motives.

The view of health economists

Many health economists argue that there is a conspiracy to suppress cures.
Instead, they argue that the problem lies in the incentive structure.
According to this view:

- companies respond rationally to economic incentives;
- profitability strongly influences which research projects receive funding;
- consequently, some areas of medical research remain underfunded.

From this perspective, the issue is systemic rather than conspiratorial.

The available evidence may be summarised as follows:

Well supported by evidence:

Market incentives strongly influence research priorities.

More profitable diseases receive greater investment.

Neglected diseases have historically been underfunded.

Conflicts of interest and documented cases of corporate misconduct occur.

Pharmaceutical companies, like other commercial enterprises, seek to maximise profits.

Overall, the strongest criticism is that the existing economic model may steer research towards more profitable areas while leaving other important medical needs relatively neglected. The claim that "it is better to keep patients chronically ill than to cure them" describes a possible financial incentive, but it does not in itself constitute evidence of a deliberate or coordinated strategy to prevent the development or dissemination of cures.

In short: pharmaceutical industry is not afraid of challenges, as long as they don't reduce its enormous profits...