

Disclosure statement

경희의대 소아청소년과
배종우
(의편협 출판윤리위 간사)

Disclosure statement의 번역

- 이해관계 선언 ?
- 이해관계 관련 선언 ?
- 미확정

예시를 봅시다

예 1: 학회 발표

- 제목: Manuscripts Preparation and the Process of Peer-Reviewed Publication
- 소속: The Editors of The Journal of Pediatrics
- 발표자: William F. Ballsteri, MD, Stephan R, Daniels, MD, PhD, Alan H, Jobs, MD, PhD, Sarah S, Long, MD, Thomas R, Welch, MD, Robert W. Wilmott, MD.
- 발표학회: 2009년 Pediatric Academic Societies 학회 (미국, 발티모어, 2009년 5월1일-5일)
- Disclosure Statements
Stephan R. Daniels, MD, PhD, Sarah S. Long, MD, Thomas R. Welch, MD, and Robert W. Wilmott, MD, have no relevant financial relationships to disclose or conflicts of interest to resolve.

제59차 대한소아과학회 추계학술대회 구연발표

이해관계 선언

홍길동, 김진규, 김승호, 김희갑 (저자 전부)은 본 발표 내용에서 다음과 같은 이해관계의 내용이 있음을 밝힙니다. (사람이나 기관의 재정적 관계, 사적인 관계, 연구경쟁 관계, 지적 관심사에서 특별히 선언해야 할 내용을 구체적으로 기술한다)

Disclosure Statements

Hong GD, Kim JK, Kim SH, and Kim HK have no relevant financial relationships to disclose or conflicts of interest to resolve.

예 2: 의학잡지

Paul Rutgeerts P, Severine Vermeire S, Gert Van Assche GV: [Biological Therapies for Inflammatory Bowel Diseases](#). Gastroenterology 2009;136: 1182-1197

Conflicts of interest

The authors disclose no conflicts.

Funding

Professor Rutgeerts consults, has received research support, and has lectured for Centocor, Schering Plough, Union Chimique Belge Brussels Belgium, and Abbott; and consulted for Elan-Biogen, PDL, Avidia, Bristol Myers Squibb, Millenium Pharmaceuticals, Genetech, Novimmune, and Cheocentrix. Dr Van Assche has received research support from Abbott; honoraria or speaking fees from UCB, Schering-Plough, and Abbott; and consulted for Novartis, Centocor, and Schering-Plough. Dr Vermeire has received research support from UCB (Chair); and honoraria/speaking fees from UCB, Abbott, and Schering-Plough.

Douglas K.R: [Narrow-Band Imaging Without Optical Magnification for Histologic Analysis of Colorectal Polyps](#) Gastroenterology 2009;136: 1174-1181

Conflicts of interest

The author discloses the following: Dr Rex received research support and is a member of the speakers bureau for Olympus America Corporation.

Effectiveness and Cost-Effectiveness of Vaccination Against Pandemic Influenza (H1N1) 2009

Nayer Khazeni, MD, MS; David W. Hutton, MS; Alan M. Garber, MD, PhD; Nathaniel Hupert, MD, MPH; and Douglas K. Owens, MD, MS

Background: Decisions on the timing and extent of vaccination against pandemic (H1N1) 2009 virus are complex.

Objective: To estimate the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of pandemic influenza (H1N1) vaccination under different scenarios in October or November 2009.

Design: Compartmental epidemic model in conjunction with a Markov model of disease progression.

Data Sources: Literature and expert opinion.

Target Population: Residents of a major U.S. metropolitan city with a population of 8.3 million.

Time Horizon: Lifetime.

Perspective: Societal.

Interventions: Vaccination in mid-October or mid-November 2009.

Outcome Measures: Infections and deaths averted, costs, quality-adjusted life-years (QALYs), and incremental cost-effectiveness.

Results of Base-Case Analysis: Assuming each primary infection causes 1.5 secondary infections, vaccinating 40% of the population in October or November would be cost-saving. Vaccination in October would avert 2051 deaths, gain 69 679 QALYs, and save \$469 million compared with no vaccination; vaccination in Novem-

ber would avert 1468 deaths, gain 49 422 QALYs, and save \$302 million.

Results of Sensitivity Analysis: Vaccination is even more cost-saving if longer incubation periods, lower rates of infectiousness, or increased implementation of nonpharmaceutical interventions delay time to the peak of the pandemic. Vaccination saves fewer lives and is less cost-effective if the epidemic peaks earlier than mid-October.

Limitations: The model assumed homogenous mixing of case-patients and contacts; heterogeneous mixing would result in faster initial spread, followed by slower spread. Additional costs and savings not included in the model would make vaccination more cost-saving.

Conclusion: Earlier vaccination against pandemic (H1N1) 2009 prevents more deaths and is more cost-saving. Complete population coverage is not necessary to reduce the viral reproductive rate sufficiently to help shorten the pandemic.

Primary Funding Source: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality and National Institute on Drug Abuse.

Ann Intern Med. 2009;151:829-839.

For author affiliations, see end of text.

This article was published at www.annals.org on 6 October 2009.

www.annals.org

Author Contributions: Conception and design: A.O. Berg, M.A. Baird, J.R. Botkin, P.A. Fishman, G.P. Jarvik, S. Millon-Underwood, T.M. Morgan, S.R. Schimmel.

Analysis and interpretation of the data: A.O. Berg, J.R. Botkin, D.A. Driscoll, P.A. Fishman, R.A. Hiatt, G.P. Jarvik, S. Millon-Underwood, T.M. Morgan, J.J. Mulvihill, T.I. Pollin, S.R. Schimmel, W.M. Vollmer, J.K. Williams.

Drafting of the article: A.O. Berg, M.A. Baird, J.R. Botkin, D.A. Driscoll, P.A. Fishman, P.D. Guarino, R.A. Hiatt, G.P. Jarvik, S. Millon-Underwood, T.M. Morgan, J.J. Mulvihill, T.I. Pollin, S.R. Schimmel, W.M. Vollmer, J.K. Williams.

Critical revision of the article for important intellectual content: A.O. Berg, M.A. Baird, J.R. Botkin, D.A. Driscoll, P.D. Guarino, R.A. Hiatt, G.P. Jarvik, S. Millon-Underwood, T.M. Morgan, J.J. Mulvihill, T.I. Pollin, S.R. Schimmel, W.M. Vollmer, J.K. Williams.

Final approval of the article: A.O. Berg, M.A. Baird, J.R. Botkin, D.A. Driscoll, P.A. Fishman, P.D. Guarino, R.A. Hiatt, G.P. Jarvik, S. Millon-Underwood, T.M. Morgan, J.J. Mulvihill, T.I. Pollin, S.R. Schimmel, W.M. Vollmer, J.K. Williams.

Statistical expertise: P.D. Guarino, T.M. Morgan, S.R. Schimmel.

Administrative, technical, or logistic support: A.O. Berg, T.M. Morgan, S.R. Schimmel.

Collection and assembly of data: A.O. Berg, P.A. Fishman, G.P. Jarvik, S. Millon-Underwood, T.M. Morgan, S.R. Schimmel.

Disclaimer: The opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality.

Acknowledgment: The authors thank Supriya Janakiraman, Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality Task Officer; Gurvaneet Randhawa; members of the Technical Expert Panel; Alfred Berg, Panel Chair; Wylie Burke; Lisa Madlensky; and Louise Acheson, who were instrumental in defining the parameters of this review. They also thank Lynda Booker, Mary Gauld, Homa Keshavanz, Jinhui Ma, Maureen Rice, Laura Cross-Bardell, and Silvia Visentin for their work in preparing the report and assistance with this manuscript.

Grant Support: By the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (contract 290-02-0020).

Potential Conflicts of Interest: *Honoraria:* B.J. Wilson (McMaster Evidence-based Practice Center), N. Qureshi (McMaster Evidence-based Practice Center), J. Little (McMaster Evidence-based Practice Center), J.C. Carroll (McMaster Evidence-based Practice Center), J. Allanson (McMaster Evidence-based Practice Center).

Disclaimer: Recommendations made by the USPSTF are independent of the U.S. government. They should not be construed as an official position of the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality or the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Acknowledgment: The authors thank the reviewers for their extremely thorough and helpful reviews and suggestions.

Grant Support: By the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (1 F32 HS018003-01A1; Dr. Khazeni), the National Institute on Drug Abuse (2 R01 DA15612-016; Dr. Owens), a Stanford Graduate Fellowship (Mr. Hutton), and the Department of Veterans Affairs (Drs. Owens and Garber).

Potential Conflicts of Interest: None disclosed.

Reproducible Research Statement: An annotated version of the model is available in Appendix 1 (available at www.annals.org) so that others can test the authors' findings and conclusions.

Requests for Single Reprints: Nayer Khazeni, MD, MS, Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine, Stanford University Medical Center, 300 Pasteur Drive, H3143, Stanford, CA 94305.

Potential Conflicts of Interest: *Consultancies:* J.J. Mulvihill (Intergenetics). *Stock ownership or options (other than mutual funds):* J.J. Mulvihill (Intergenetics). *Grants received:* J.J. Mulvihill (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Health Resources and Services Administration). *Grants pending:* J.J. Mulvihill (American College of Medical Genetics).

Potential Conflicts of Interest: *Consultancies:* F.K.L. Chan (Pfizer, Otsuka). *Honoraria:* F.K.L. Chan (Pfizer, Takeda, AstraZeneca). *Grants pending:* F.K.L. Chan (Takeda). *Patents pending:* J.J.Y. Sung (Nycomed). *Others:* F.K.L. Chan (chairman of the steering committee for Condor).

Potential Conflicts of Interest: *Grants received:* H.C. Yeh (NIDDK), B.B. Duncan (Brazilian National Research Council), N.Y. Wang (NIDDK, National Center for Research Resources), F.L. Brancati (NIDDK).

Potential Conflicts of Interest: *Employment:* S.M. Teutsch (Merck & Co.). *Honoraria:* L.M. Kern (Lifetime Healthcare). *Stock ownership or options (other than mutual funds):* S.M. Teutsch (Merck & Co.).

Potential Conflicts of Interest: To assure the integrity of the ACIP, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services has taken steps to assure that there is technical compliance with ethics statutes and regulations regarding financial conflicts of interest. Concerns regarding the potential for the appearance of a conflict are addressed, or avoided altogether, through both pre-and postappointment considerations. Individuals with particular vaccine-related interests will not be considered for appointment to the committee. Potential nominees are screened for conflicts of interest, and if any are found, they are asked to divest or forgo certain vaccine-related activities. In addition, at the beginning of each ACIP meeting, each member is asked to declare his or her conflicts.

Members with conflicts are not permitted to vote if the conflict involves the vaccine or biologic being voted upon. Members of the ACIP have disclosed the following: *Grants received:* J. Englund (MedImmune, Sanofi Pasteur, Novartis); W.A. Keitel (Novartis). *Payments made to Tufts Medical Center for participation in clinical trials:* C.H. Meissner (MedImmune, Wyeth).

Corresponding Author: Carol Friedman, DO, Immunization Services Division, National Center for Immunization and Respiratory Diseases, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 1600 Clifton Road Northeast, Mailstop E52, Atlanta, GA 30333; e-mail, caf7@cdc.gov.

Potential Conflicts of Interest: *Board membership:* S.A. Flanders (Society of Hospital Medicine [serves as president]) *Employment:* S.A. Flanders (University of Michigan). *Consultancies:* J.B. Froehlich (Pfizer, Sanofi-Aventis). *Honoraria:* J.B. Froehlich (Sanofi-Aventis, Pfizer, Merck/Schering-Plough). *Expert testimony:* J.B. Froehlich (testified for the defense in case of malpractice regarding vascular disease diagnosis). *Grants received:* J.B. Froehlich (Mardigian Foundation, Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan, The Fibromuscular Dysplasia Society of America, W.L. Gore & Associates). *Grants pending:* J.B. Froehlich (Sanofi-

예 3: 교과서, 서적

- Chapter별 저자들:

Potential conflict of interest 기재

이해관계 (conflict of interest)

논문의 출판과 관련된 사람(저자, 편집인, 전문가심사자, 출판인 등) 또는 기관이 특정 논문에 재정적인 이익이 걸려 있거나 사적인 특별한 관련이 있는 경우를 말한다. 이러한 이해관계는 과학성을 생명으로 하는 학술논문의 출판과 관련된 판단에 자칫 왜곡을 유발할 수 있는 가능성이 있기 때문에 특히 경계의 대상이 된다. 어떠한 이해관계에 의한 영향도 학술관련 판단에서 모두 배제되어야 한다

이해관계 형성 여건

- 정도가 미미한 수준부터 매우 심각한 단계까지 **넓은 범주에** 걸쳐 있으며, 저자나 출판 관련자가 어떠한 이해관계가 있어서 실제로 어떻게 영향을 받았는가 여부보다 어떠한 **이해관계에 연루되었다는 사실 자체가 중요**

이해관계의 유형 (ICMJE)

- 사람이나 기관의 재정적인 관계
- 사적인 관계(겸직, 학문적인 경쟁, 지적소유권 경쟁 등)
- 연구의 경쟁
- 지적인 관심사

- 재정적인 관계(financial relationship)

가장 흔하고 또 발견하기가 비교적 쉬운 유형이다. 저자 또는 저자 소속 기관이 특정 기관, 회사, 단체 등으로부터 지속적으로 재정적인 지원을 받거나 직접 연구비를 지원받아 수행한 연구결과물을 출판하는 경우가 해당된다. 그 외에도 고용, 자문, 주식보유, 강연료나 자문료, 유료 증언 등의 경우도 재정적인 관계에 의한 영향을 줄 수 있다. 물론 편집인, 전문가심사자, 출판인 등도 재정적인 관계가 있어 출판 여부의 판단에 영향을 줄 수 있기 때문에, 이러한 관계가 있으면 반드시 공개할 의무가 있다

- 사적인 관계(personal relationship)

재정적인 관계 외에 저자나 전문가 심사자가 사적인 관계를 갖는 경우이다. ICMJE는 그 예로 겸직(dual commitments), 이익 경쟁(competing interests) 또는 지적재산권 경쟁(competing loyalties)을 열거하고 있다.

- 연구 경쟁(academic competition)

이는 특히 경쟁관계에 있는 연구자들이 저자와 전문가심사자의 관계로 마주하게 되는 경우에 그러하다. 이는 특히 전문가심사(peer review)에서 필요한 윤리वाद도 직결된다.

- 지적인 관심사(intellectual passion)

특히 편집인이나 심사자가 개인적인 관심사나 취향에 의하여 판단함으로써 공정성을 잃을 수도 있다. 이러한 경우에 해당하면 과학적인 판단에 관여하지 않는 것이 가장 좋은 방법이다.

이해관계의 대상자

저자, 편집인, 전문가심사자, 출판인 등 논문 출판과 관련된 모든 과정의 사람이나 그들의 소속 기관이 여기에 해당한다. 저자는 심각한 과학적 사기와 같은 출판윤리의 위배가 아니더라도 얻는 결과의 정리와 분석에서 이해관계에 의하여 특정 제품이나 회사에 유리하도록 논문을 작성할 수 있다. 전문가심사자의 경우 대부분이 해당 학술지의 저자이고 또 독자이기 때문에 학술지에 끼치는 영향이 크다. 논문의 출판 과정에서 저자와 대립하거나 또는 유착하여 객관적인 판단을 하는 데에 영향을 줄 수 있다. 또한 저자의 이익을 가로챌 수도 있다.

이해관계의 대책과 예방

- ICMJE가 2008년도에 개정한 통일양식은 모든 논문출판 관련자들이 **이해관계를 고지하도록 각 학술지에 지침으로 제시하고 있다.** 즉, 이해관계가 있다는 사실보다 이를 숨기는 것을 실제 문제로 삼는다는 의미이다. 대부분의 학술지가 이러한 **이해관계의 가능성이 있는 모든 사실을 있으면 통보하고, 없으면 없다고 선언하기를 요구하고 있다.** 편집인이나 전문가심사자 중의 누구라도 만약 이해관계에 연루된 논문이 있는 경우, 가급적 어떠한 판정에 관여하지 않는 것이 바람직하다.