1 **Pharmaceutical Payments to Japanese Certificated Hematologists: A Retrospective** 2 **Analysis of Personal Payments from Pharmaceutical Companies between 2016 and** 3 **2019**

4

5 **Authors:**

6 Eiji Kusumi, MD^{1†}; Anju Murayama^{2,3,*†}; Sae Kamamoto^{2,4,†}; Moe Kawashima^{2,5};
7 Makoto Yoshida²; Hiroaki Saito, MD, PhD⁶; Toyooki Sawano, MD, PhD⁷; Erika
8 Yamashita²; Tetsuya Tanimoto, MD⁸; Akihiko Ozaki, MD, PhD⁹

9

10 [†] Authors equally contributed to this study

11 ^{*} Corresponding author

12

13 **Affiliations:**

14 ¹Department of Internal Medicine, Navitas Clinic Shinjuku, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo, Japan

15 ²Medical Governance Research Institute, Minato-ku, Tokyo, Japan

16 ³Tohoku University School of Medicine, Sendai City, Miyagi, Japan

17 ⁴Hamamatsu University School of Medicine, Hamamatsu, Shizuoka, Japan

18 ⁵Fukushima Medical University, Fukushima city, Fukushima, Japan

19 ⁶Department of Gastroenterology, Sendai Kosei Hospital, Sendai City, Miyagi, Japan

20 ⁷Department of Surgery, Jyoban Hospital of Tokiwa Foundation, Iwaki City, Fukushima,

21 Japan

22 ⁸Department of Internal Medicine, Navitas Clinic, Tachikawa City, Tokyo, Japan

23 ⁹Department of Breast Surgery, Jyoban Hospital of Tokiwa Foundation, Iwaki City,

24 Fukushima, Japan

25

26 **Correspondence**

27 Anju Murayama

28 Medical Governance Research Institute, Minato-ku, Tokyo, 1087505, Japan

29 Telephone: 81-90-6321-6996

30 Email address: ange21tera@gmail.com

31 **Word count: 3267 words**

32 **Number of Tables: 2**

33 **Number of Figures: 3**

34

35

36 **Funding sources:**

37 This study was funded in part by the Medical Governance Research Institute. This non-

38 profit enterprise receives donations from pharmaceutical companies, including Ain

39 Pharmacies, Inc., other organizations, and private individuals. This study also received

40 support from the Tansa (formerly known as the Waseda Chronicle), an independent non-

41 profit news organization dedicated to investigative journalism. None of the entities

42 providing financial support for this study contributed to the design, execution, data

43 analyses, or interpretation of study findings and the drafting of this manuscript.

44 **Abstract**

45 **Background:** A growing and significant financial relationship exist between physicians
46 and pharmaceutical companies. However, little is known about the characteristics and
47 trends of personal payments from pharmaceutical companies to hematologists. This
48 study was aimed to evaluate the financial relationship between hematology specialists
49 and pharmaceutical companies in Japan between 2016 and 2019.

50 **Methods:** Descriptive analyses were performed to evaluate personal payments from 92
51 major pharmaceutical companies to all board-certificated hematologists in Japan.
52 Furthermore, trend of payments over four years were evaluated by generalized
53 estimating equations.

54 **Results:** Among the 4,183 hematology specialists, 2,706 (64.7%) received a total of
55 US\$36,291,434 (¥3,955,766,292). The personal payments were worth \$13,411 (standard
56 deviation: \$34,856) on average, with a median of \$2,471 (Interquartile range:
57 \$851 – \$9,677) over the four-year period, respectively. Only the top 10% of specialists
58 accounted for 76.8% of the total payments. The average payment values constantly
59 increased from \$4,259 to \$5,574 between 2016 and 2019, with a significant mean

60 annual increase rate of 11.2% (95%CI: 9.1% □ 13.4%). The proportion of hematology
61 specialists with payments also slightly increased by 1.8% (95%CI: 0.6% □ 3.0%) per
62 year.

63 **Conclusions:** Most Japanese board-certified hematology specialists received substantial
64 personal payments. These payments are becoming increasingly more prevalent and
65 greater among hematology specialists.

66

67 **Main text**

68 **Introduction**

69 Although collaboration between healthcare professionals, patients, and pharmaceutical
70 companies has played a significant role in the development of novel drugs and a better
71 understanding of diseases (ref.[1, 2]), proper management of conflicts of interest (COIs)
72 is currently one of the most fundamental concerns of all healthcare professionals
73 (ref.[3]), as financial COIs between healthcare sectors and pharmaceutical companies
74 could jeopardize patient-centered care. Indeed, the financial relationship between the
75 healthcare sector and pharmaceutical companies might affect physician prescribing
76 patterns (ref.[4-6]), recommendations in clinical guidelines (ref.[7-11]), and conducting
77 and reporting of clinical research (ref.[12, 13]). These concerns and motivation to
78 increase transparency in financial COIs has led to the creation of transparency initiatives
79 worldwide (ref.[14, 15]), including in Japan. The Japan Pharmaceutical Manufacturers
80 Association (JPMA), the largest pharmaceutical trade organization in Japan, requires all
81 JPMA member companies from 2013 onwards to voluntarily publish all payments made
82 to healthcare professionals and healthcare organizations (ref.[16]).

83

84 In the field of hematology, a wide variety of therapeutic strategies and novel therapies
 85 (ref.[17-19]), including chemotherapy, targeted therapy, and hematopoietic stem cell
 86 transplantation for the treatment of hematological cancers, have brought significant
 87 therapeutic benefits to patients and attracted considerable attention from pharmaceutical
 88 companies, resulting in intense marketing by pharmaceutical companies. The financial
 89 relationships of hematologists and oncologists with pharmaceutical companies as
 90 compared to other specialists have increased in recent years (ref.[20-22]). In addition,
 91 Japanese hematology guideline authors receive an average of \$25,471 to \$49,693 in
 92 personal payments from pharmaceutical companies (ref.[23]), one of the largest average
 93 payments among guideline authors in several specialties (ref.[11, 24, 25]). Considering
 94 the current pharmaceutical marketing strategy and the sizable evidence indicating that
 95 pharmaceutical marketing could influence physician prescription patterns (ref.[5, 26,
 96 27]), the elucidation and proper management of the financial relationships between
 97 pharmaceutical companies and hematologists are important.

98

99 This study aims to elucidate the prevalence of board-certified hematologists receiving
100 payments from pharmaceutical companies, the magnitude of the payments, and the
101 payment trend in recent years.

102

103 **Methods**

104 **Participants**

105 This study considered all hematologists certified by the Japanese Society of Hematology,
106 as of October 10, 2021, as hematology specialists. The Japanese Society of Hematology
107 was established in 1937 and is the most prestigious and largest medical professional
108 society in hematology in Japan, with 7,744 members as of October 8, 2021. The
109 Japanese Society of Hematology is the sole professional medical society authorized to
110 certify hematology specialists in Japan. The list of names of the hematology specialists
111 is publicly available on the society's webpage and was last updated on July 7, 2021
112 (<http://www.jshem.or.jp/modules/senmoni/>).

113

114 Certification of hematologists by the Japanese Society of Hematology

115 The Japanese Society of Hematology is the sole society in Japan authorized to certify
 116 hematology specialists. As of October 2021, to be certificated as a hematology specialist,
 117 physicians are required to meet all of the following six requirements: (1) submission of
 118 clinical records for 15 inpatients as an attending physician, including at least three cases
 119 of erythrocyte disease, three cases of leukocyte disease, two cases of thrombosis and
 120 hemostasis, and one case of immunology and blood transfusion; (2) must be listed as the
 121 first author of at least two academic articles or conference presentations; (3) must have
 122 completed at least six years of clinical practice training after having acquired a medical
 123 license and at least three years of specialized training in hematology at an institution
 124 accredited by the Japanese Society of Hematology; (4) must have a board certification
 125 in internal medicine issued by the Japanese Society of Internal Medicine or in pediatrics
 126 issued by the Japan Pediatric Society; (5) must be a registered member of the Japanese
 127 Society of Hematology for at least three years; and (6) must clear the written
 128 examination for the hematology specialists conducted by the Japanese Society of
 129 Hematology.

130

131 **Data collection**

132 The names, affiliations, and addresses of all hematology specialists were disclosed and

133 collected from the Japanese Society of Hematology webpage on October 10, 2021.

134 Payment data of all healthcare professionals and healthcare organizations regarding

135 lecturing, writing, and consulting were collected for the period 2016-2019 from 92

136 pharmaceutical companies belonging to the JPMA. After collecting the payment data, a

137 single unified database was developed, as described previously (ref.[24, 28]). JPMA

138 requires the member companies to disclose only the payment concerning lecturing,

139 writing, and consulting, along with the individuals' names and affiliations; therefore,

140 these payment categories could be analyzed on an individual specialist basis. Personal

141 payments, such as those for lecturing, writing, and consulting, are directly and widely

142 paid to specialists by pharmaceutical companies. (ref.[6, 28-31]) Considering the nature

143 of payments, only the personal payments concerning lecturing, writing, and consulting

144 were included in this study.

145

146 We scanned for specialist names in the payment database and extracted the payment
147 data from the payment database of hematology specialists. The extracted data included
148 the recipient names, affiliations, monetary amount, number of payment cases, payment
149 category, and names of the respective pharmaceutical companies. To remove payment
150 data of different persons with similar names in the database, we checked and compared
151 the affiliations, affiliation addresses, and recipient specialties between the data from the
152 Japanese Society of Hematology and the pharmaceutical companies. For payments to
153 specialists whose affiliations reported by the pharmaceutical company differed from
154 those reported by the society, we manually searched the name of the specialists on the
155 internet and collated other data from official institutional webpages and other sources to
156 verify their identity. We also excluded payments that could not be verified from the
157 analysis. The detailed procedure has been previously described (ref.[24, 28]).

158 Furthermore, the lists of drugs newly approved for hematological diseases between
159 2015 and 2020 were collected from the webpage of the Pharmaceuticals and Medical
160 Devices Agency, which is the official agency for reviewing drugs in Japan.

161

162 **Analysis**

163 Descriptive analyses of payment values and the number of cases were performed per
 164 specialist and per pharmaceutical company. Average and median payments, cases, and
 165 number of companies making payments per specialist were calculated based only on the
 166 number of specialists receiving payments each year, as in other studies. (ref.[20, 29, 30,
 167 32]) As several companies such as Shire Japan and Baxalta did not disclose the number
 168 of payment cases, the payments from these companies were excluded from the analysis
 169 of the number of cases, while the payment values were included in the analysis. To
 170 examine the concentration of payments to individual specialists, the Gini index and
 171 shares of the value of payments held by the top 1%, 5%, 10%, and 25% of specialists
 172 were calculated. The Gini index ranges from 0 to 1, and the greater the Gini index, the
 173 greater the disparity in the distribution of payments on a specialist basis, as mentioned
 174 previously. (ref.[24, 25]) Payment distribution was also examined geographically.

175

176 Further, to examine the trend of payments from pharmaceutical companies to specialists
 177 from 2016 to 2019, the population-averaged generalized estimating equation negative

178 binomial regression model for the trend of payment value and the linear generalized
 179 estimating equation model log linked with binomial distribution for the trend of
 180 numbers of specialists with payments were used. The relative ratios of the average
 181 annual increase in payments per specialist to the number of specialists with payments
 182 were used to report the results.

183 The year of payments was set as an independent variable, and the proportion of
 184 physicians receiving payments, number of payments, and payment values were set as
 185 dependent variables. (ref.[20, 33, 34]) As several pharmaceutical companies
 186 disaffiliated from the JPMA and newly joined the JPMA, among all 92 companies, there
 187 were 18 companies without payment data over the four years. Thus, the average and
 188 median payments for each year and the trend of payments were calculated based on
 189 payments from all 92 companies and 74 companies with payment data for the four years
 190 between 2016 and 2019.

191

192 To adjust for inflation and to make the payment value comparable, Japanese yen (¥) was
 193 converted into US dollars (\$) using the 2019 average monthly exchange rate of ¥109.0

194 per \$1. All analyses were conducted using Microsoft Excel (version 16.0; Microsoft

195 Corp.) and Stata (version 15; StataCorp).

196

197 **Ethical approval**

198 This study was approved by the Ethics Committee of the Medical Governance Research

199 Institute. As this study is a retrospective analysis of publicly available information,

200 informed consent was waived and direct contact with the society was allowed by the

201 Ethics Committee of the Medical Governance Research Institute.

202

203 **Results**

204 *Overview of payments*

205 We identified 4,183 hematology specialists certified by the Japanese Society of

206 Hematology as of October 10, 2021. Our payment database recorded 1,474,653

207 payment cases and \$996,291,009 (¥108,595,720,027) in total monetary value from 92

208 pharmaceutical companies between 2016 and 2019.

209 Of the 4,183 specialists, 2,706 (64.7%) received a total of US\$36,291,434
 210 (¥3,955,766,292) corresponding to 47,863 cases from 71 (77.2%) pharmaceutical
 211 companies between 2016 and 2019 (Table 1). The payment cases and values to the
 212 hematology specialists occupied 3.2% and 3.6% of total cases and values, respectively.
 213 A total of 82.5% (\$29,951,526) of the total payments were for lecturing, followed by
 214 13.5% from consulting (\$4,890,255), 3.9% from writing (\$1,398,729), and 0.1% from
 215 others (\$50,924). The average monetary value per case was \$758, ranging from \$736 for
 216 lecturing to \$922 for consulting.

217

218 ***Payments per specialists***

219 The hematology specialists received personal payments worth \$13,411 (Standard
 220 deviation (SD): \$34,856) on average and a median of \$2,471 (Interquartile range (IQR):
 221 \$851–\$9,677) over the four-year period. The average and median number of cases over
 222 the four years was 17.7 (SD: 35.9) and 5.0 (IQR:2.0–17.0) cases per specialist,
 223 respectively. The average number of companies making payments per specialist was 5.5
 224 (SD: 5.2; median: 4.0; IQR: 2.0–8.0; and range: 1.0–32.0) (Table 1).

225 For the concentration of payments, 4.2% and 1.9% of hematology specialists received
 226 more than \$50,000 and \$100,000, respectively. The Gini index for the four-year
 227 cumulative payments per specialist was 0.856, indicating that the distribution of the
 228 total payments per specialist was highly skewed. Top 1%, 5%, 10% and 25% of
 229 specialists occupied 26.0% (95% confidence interval (CI): 23.1%–28.9%), 61.0%
 230 (95%CI: 58.2%–63.7%), 76.8% (95%CI: 74.8%–78.8%), and 93.3% (95%CI:
 231 92.6%–94.0%) of total payments, respectively (Figure 1).

232

233 ***Payment trend between 2016 and 2019***

234 Regarding the payment trend of all 71 companies through the four years, annual total
 235 payments increased from \$7,700,346 (839,337,686) in 2016 to \$10,279,218
 236 (¥1,120,434,752) in 2019. In addition, payments per specialist and the number of
 237 specialists with payments increased from \$4,259 (SD: \$9,291) and 1,808 (43.2%) in
 238 2016 to \$5,574 (SD: \$11,688) and 1,844 (44.1%) in 2019, respectively. The relative
 239 annual increase rates were 1.112 (95%CI: 1.091–1.134; $p < 0.001$) in payments per
 240 specialist and 1.018 (95%CI: 1.006–1.030; $p = 0.003$) for specialists with payments,

241 indicating that the payment values and number of specialists increased by 11.2%

242 (95%CI: 9.1% □ 13.4%) and 1.8% (95%CI: 0.6% □ 3.0%) each year (Table 2).

243 Of 74 companies collecting payments data over four years, there were 64 companies

244 with the four-years payment data. Limiting to the payments from the 64 companies,

245 both the average and median payment values also constantly increased from \$4,259

246 (SD: \$9,291) and \$1,241 (IQR: \$511 □ \$3,442) to \$5,536 (SD: \$11,557) and \$1,633

247 (IQR: \$613 □ \$4,760) between 2016 and 2019, respectively. The relative annual change

248 rate for payments per specialist and number of specialists with payments also

249 significantly increased by 11.2% (95%CI: 9.1% □ 13.4%) and 1.8% (95%CI:

250 0.6% □ 3.0%), respectively, each year.

251 Furthermore, the annual change rate was higher among those with greater four-year

252 cumulative payments, such as those receiving \$1,000–\$10,000 at 12.8% (95%CI:

253 9.5% □ 16.1%; $p < 0.001$), \$10,000–\$50,000 at 13.7% (95%CI: 10.4% □ 17.1%; $p <$

254 0.001), and \$50,000–\$100,000 at 13.8% (95%CI: 8.1% □ 19.8%; $p < 0.001$), while those

255 with payments of more than \$100,000 had a lower annual increase rate of 8.1%

256 (95%CI: 4.2% □ 11.1%; $p < 0.001$).

257

258 *Payment by pharmaceutical companies*

259 Among 71 pharmaceutical companies making payments to specialists, payments from
 260 the top 10 companies accounted for 70.8% of the total payments (\$ 25,236,750)
 261 between 2016 and 2019 (Figure 2). The payment types for each of the top 10 paying
 262 companies are shown in Figure 3. Four among the 10 companies, namely, Takeda
 263 Pharmaceutical, Chugai Pharmaceutical, Janssen Pharmaceutical, and Novartis Pharma,
 264 increased their payments to hematology specialists. A total of 673 drugs were newly
 265 approved and introduced between 2015 and 2020 in Japan. Among these indicators, 211
 266 (31.4%) were from the top 10 companies, and of these, 52 drugs (24.6%) were for
 267 hematological diseases (Supplemental Material 1).

268

269 *Geographical payment distribution*

270 Geographical differences were observed in the distribution of the number of hematology
 271 specialists. Based on the prefecture, payments from pharmaceutical companies
 272 (Supplemental Material 2A) to hematology specialists per one million of the population

273 ranged from 18.2 in Aomori Prefecture to 64.4 in Kyoto (Supplemental Material 2B).

274 The average payment values per specialist were the highest in Tochigi Prefecture

275 (\$15,806) and lowest in Kumamoto Prefecture (\$3,178) (Supplemental Material 2D).

276

277 **Discussion**

278 This study demonstrated that 3.6% (\$ 36,291,434) of total personal payments

279 concerning lecturing, consulting, and writing from all major pharmaceutical companies

280 to healthcare professionals were distributed to board certified hematology specialists,

281 who accounted for 1.3% (4,183 out of 327,210) of total physicians in Japan, according

282 to the latest survey by the Japanese Ministry of Health, Labor and Welfare in

283 2018(ref.[35]). Among all Japanese board-certified hematology specialists, 64.7%

284 received an average of \$13,411 in personal payments between 2016 and 2019, with an

285 annual average increase rate of 11.2 %. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first

286 study to assess the distribution and the trend of financial relationships between board-

287 certified hematologists and pharmaceutical companies. Although our study could have

288 limitations such as underreported payments due to the limited category of personal

289 payments in Japan, there were important similarities and differences between our
290 findings and those of the previous studies.

291

292 Previous studies in the United States demonstrated that 80.2% of hematologists and
293 oncologists received general payments averaging \$6,166 (\$2,055 in one year) between
294 2015 and 2017. (ref.[31]) Another study by Marshall et al. reported that 63.0% of
295 medical oncologists, including pediatric hematologists/oncologists and
296 hematologist/oncologists, received \$7,750 in average general payment in 2014 (ref.[22]),
297 and, in the six years between 2014 and 2019, 84.6% (13,190 out of 15,585) of medical
298 oncologists received \$38,601 (6,434 in one year) in average general payment per
299 physician (ref.[20]). Another study by Ozaki et al. evaluated pharmaceutical payments
300 among Japanese board-certified oncologists, and they found that 70.6% of certified
301 oncologists received an average of \$4,982 in annual personal payments. (ref.[28]) Our
302 study showed that the average personal payments ranged from \$4,259 to \$5,574 and the
303 proportion of (mention specialist type) specialists with payments ranging from 40.2% to
304 45.3% in a single year were fewer than those in the United States and less than the

305 average proportion of Japanese hematologists and oncologists.

306

307 Meanwhile, in other specialties, the average total payments per physician, such as

308 general, research, and ownership payments, were \$907 among pediatricians in 2014

309 (ref.[36]); \$4,183 (\$2,091 per year) among psychiatrists between 2016 and 2017

310 (ref.[37]); \$3,433 (\$1,144 in one year) in general payments among obstetricians and

311 gynecologists between 2013 and 2015 (ref.[38]); from \$1,795 in 2014 to \$2,227 in 2017

312 among board certificated nephrologists (ref.[39]); \$3,260 among orthopedic surgeons in

313 2013 (ref.[40]); \$4,177 among dermatologists in 2014 (ref.[30]); \$25,960 (\$5,191 per

314 year) among ophthalmologists between 2013 and 2017 (ref.[41]); \$16,914 (\$5,638 per

315 year) among cardiologists between 2014 and 2016 (ref.[42]); \$38,664 (\$6,444 per year)

316 among rheumatologists between 2014 and 2019 (ref.[43]); and \$7,263 among

317 neurologists in 2015. (ref.[44]) Comparing these findings, the Japanese board

318 certificated hematologists might have similar or greater financial relationships with

319 pharmaceutical companies than other specialists in the United States and Japan.

320

321 This study showed that only a very small proportion of hematology specialists received
 322 the majority of personal payments from pharmaceutical companies. As previous studies
 323 have found (ref.[25, 30, 41-43]), pharmaceutical companies have concentrated their
 324 payments on a small number of physicians with extensive clinical and research
 325 experience. These specialists, or “key opinion leaders,” (ref.[45]) who had substantial
 326 financial relationships with pharmaceutical companies, played a significant role in
 327 delivering information about newer drugs, novel findings from clinical trials, and drug
 328 related risks, to healthcare professionals at conferences for continuing medical
 329 education sponsored by pharmaceutical companies (ref.[46]). We should note that while
 330 the financial relationships of specialists with pharmaceutical companies might help to
 331 rapidly unroll novel drugs with greater benefits (ref.[26, 46]), it could also increase
 332 healthcare costs when the specialists prescribe brand name drugs (ref.[4, 47]) or drugs
 333 whose benefits are unproven (ref.[48, 49]).

334

335 Further, regarding the trend of payments, we found that total and average payments
 336 increased significantly every year, with an 11.2% yearly increase in average payments.

337 This trend of increasing payments to physicians was also observed among oncologists
338 in the United States. Marshall et al. found that since the launch of the US Open Payment
339 Database, the total and annual average payment value per physician declined by -1.7%
340 and -0.6%, respectively (ref.[34]). However, pharmaceutical companies increasingly
341 prioritized the payments to hematologists and oncologists, with a 4.9% and 1.7% annual
342 increase in total value and average payments (ref.[20]). Furthermore, although the
343 disclosure of personal payments from pharmaceutical companies to healthcare
344 professionals and healthcare organizations was intended to improve transparency rather
345 than curb the financial relationships, our findings indicate that disclosure itself did not
346 sufficiently decrease the financial relationships between pharmaceutical companies and
347 hematology specialists in Japan, as corroborated by previous studies in the United States.

348

349 Companies' payment trends would provide further understanding of the increase in the
350 average payments and proportion of specialists with payments among Japanese
351 hematology specialists. The top 10 companies expanded their indications in the field of
352 hematology, ranging from one to 11 new indications per company. While the payment

353 from Celgene, the largest paying company, remained stable, four companies, namely,
 354 Takeda Pharmaceutical, Chugai Pharmaceutical, Janssen Pharmaceutical, and Novartis
 355 Pharma, remarkably increased their payments to the hematology specialists between
 356 2016 and 2019. As a drug target, multiple myeloma accounted for the largest proportion
 357 (17 out of 52 indications), which may explain the recent trend of increasing payments.
 358 In fact, all the companies mentioned above, except Chugai Pharmaceutical, have
 359 developed newly approved drugs for multiple myeloma. In addition to multiple
 360 myeloma, Novartis made the largest total payments of \$1,323,027 in 2019, when the
 361 chimeric antigen receptor T cells, tisagenlecleucel (KYMRIA[®]), was granted approval
 362 for the treatment of B-cell precursor acute lymphoblastic leukemia and large B-cell
 363 lymphoma and was priced at about 32 million JPY (equal to about 300,000 USD),
 364 covered by the Japanese public health insurance. Regarding Chugai Pharmaceutical,
 365 emicizumab (HEMLIBRA, approved in 2018 for congenital blood coagulation factor 8
 366 deficiency) may account for the increased payment.

367

368 This study has several limitations. First, our payment database was constructed by

369 manually collecting payment data from 92 pharmaceutical companies and repeatedly
370 crosschecking it for any errors by two or more persons. Despite careful and repeated
371 checks, the inclusion of errors by our study team and pharmaceutical companies
372 reporting data could not be ruled out. However, the publicly disclosed payment database
373 (<https://db.tansajp.org/en>) welcomed inquiries from the recipients of payments and
374 pharmaceutical companies reporting any errors in the data, and the payment database
375 was checked and revised for each inquiry. These procedures minimized the inclusion of
376 errors in this study. In addition, payment data concerning meals, education, travel, and
377 accommodations were not disclosed with the individual names of recipients by
378 pharmaceutical companies in Japan (ref.[16]). Thus, these payment data are not
379 analyzable. Considering that such payment categories like meals were the most
380 prevalent among physicians (ref.[30, 42, 48]), this study underreports the prevalence
381 and magnitude of financial relationships between hematology specialists and
382 pharmaceutical companies in Japan. However, this study highlights the magnitude and
383 prevalence of financial relationships between pharmaceutical companies and Japanese
384 hematologists.

385

386 In conclusion, this study found that between 2016 and 2019, 64.7% of Japanese board-
387 certified hematology specialists received an average of \$13,411 in personal payments as
388 the reimbursement for lecturing, consulting, and writing. Only a small proportion of
389 hematology specialists received the vast majority of payments from pharmaceutical
390 companies. Furthermore, these personal payments from pharmaceutical companies were
391 increasingly more prevalent and greater among Japanese hematology specialists.

392

393

394 **Acknowledgement**

395 The authors thank the Tansa (formerly known as Waseda Chronicle) for providing
396 payment data and Editage (www.editage.com) for English language editing. Also, we
397 appreciate Mr. Souto Nagano, an undergraduate student at the University of Tokyo
398 Faculty of Letters; Mr. Kohki Yamada, a medical student at the Osaka University
399 School of Medicine; and Ms. Megumi Aizawa, a graduate student at the Department of
400 Industrial Engineering and Economics, School of Engineering, Tokyo Institute of

401 Technology, for their dedicated contribution on collecting and cross-checking the

402 payment data.

403 This study was funded in part by the Medical Governance Research Institute. This non-

404 profit enterprise receives donations from pharmaceutical companies, including Ain

405 Pharmacies, Inc., other organizations, and private individuals. This study also received

406 support from the Tansa (formerly known as the Waseda Chronicle), an independent non-

407 profit news organization dedicated to investigative journalism. None of the entities

408 providing financial support for this study contributed to the design, execution, data

409 analyses, or interpretation of study findings and the drafting of this manuscript.

410 For the financial conflicts of interest, Dr. Kusumi received personal fees from Otsuka

411 Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd outside the scope of the submitted work. Dr. Saito received

412 personal fees from TAIHO Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd outside the scope of the submitted

413 work. Drs. Ozaki and Tanimoto received personal fees from Medical Network Systems

414 outside the scope of the submitted work. Dr. Tanimoto also received personal fees from

415 Bionics Co. Ltd, outside the scope of the submitted work. Regarding non-financial

416 conflicts of interest among the study authors, all are engaged in ongoing research

417 examining financial and non-financial conflicts of interest among healthcare
 418 professionals and pharmaceutical companies in Japan. Individually, Anju Murayama,
 419 Hiroaki Saito, Toyooki Sawano, Tetsuya Tanimoto, and Akihiko Ozaki have contributed
 420 to several published studies assessing conflicts of interest and quality of evidence
 421 among clinical practice guideline authors in Japan and the United States. Among their
 422 previous articles, the authors have self-cited several articles in this study to gain deeper
 423 insights and explain the context of financial conflicts of interest among healthcare
 424 professionals in Japan. Dr. Kusumi was a hematology specialist board certificated by
 425 the Japanese Society of Hematology. The other authors have no example conflicts of
 426 interest to disclose.

427

428 **Author Contributions:**

429 EK was responsible for study concept, data collection, statistical analysis, and drafting
 430 and reviewing of the manuscript. AM was responsible for study concept and design,
 431 data collection, statistical analysis, and drafting and reviewing of the manuscript. SK
 432 was responsible for study concept and design, data collection, statistical analysis, and

433 drafting of the manuscript. MK contributed to study concept, data collection, and
 434 drafting of the manuscript. MY contributed to study concept, data collection, and
 435 drafting of the manuscript. HS contributed to study concept and design, drafting of the
 436 manuscript, and critically reviewing of the manuscript. TS contributed to study concept
 437 and design, drafting of the manuscript, and critically reviewing of the manuscript. EY
 438 contributed to study concept and design, and critically reviewing of the manuscript.

439 TT conducted to study concept and design, drafting of the manuscript, and study
 440 supervision. AO conducted study concept and design, statistical analysis, drafting of the
 441 manuscript, and study supervision. All authors had full access to all the data in the study
 442 and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

443

444 **Competing interests:**

445 For the financial conflicts of interest, Dr. Kusumi received personal fees from Otsuka
 446 Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd outside the scope of the submitted work. Dr. Saito received
 447 personal fees from TAIHO Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd outside the scope of the submitted
 448 work. Drs. Ozaki and Tanimoto received personal fees from Medical Network Systems
 449 outside the scope of the submitted work. Dr. Tanimoto also received personal fees from
 450 Bionics Co. Ltd, outside the scope of the submitted work. Regarding non-financial
 451 conflicts of interest among the study authors, all are engaged in ongoing research
 452 examining financial and non-financial conflicts of interest among healthcare
 453 professionals and pharmaceutical companies in Japan. Individually, Anju Murayama,
 454 Hiroaki Saito, Toyooki Sawano, Tetsuya Tanimoto, and Akihiko Ozaki have contributed
 455 to several published studies assessing conflicts of interest and quality of evidence
 456 among clinical practice guideline authors in Japan and the United States. Among their
 457 previous articles, the authors have self-cited several articles in this study to gain deeper
 458 insights and explain the context of financial conflicts of interest among healthcare
 459 professionals in Japan. Dr. Kusumi was a hematology specialist board certificated by

460 the Japanese Society of Hematology. The other authors have no example conflicts of

461 interest to disclose.

462

463

464

465 **References**

- 466 1. Wouters OJ, McKee M, Luyten J. Estimated Research and Development Investment
467 Needed to Bring a New Medicine to Market, 2009-2018. *JAMA* 2020;323(9):844-853.
- 468 2. Rubin EH, Gilliland DG. Drug development and clinical trials—the path to an
469 approved cancer drug. *Nature Reviews Clinical Oncology* 2012;9(4):215-222.
- 470 3. Medicine AFABol, Medicine A-AFACoP-ASol, European Federation of Internal M.
471 Medical professionalism in the new millennium: a physician charter. *Ann Intern Med*
472 2002;136(3):243-6.
- 473 4. DeJong C, Aguilar T, Tseng C-W, *et al.* Pharmaceutical Industry–Sponsored Meals
474 and Physician Prescribing Patterns for Medicare Beneficiaries. *JAMA Internal Medicine*
475 2016;176(8):1114-1122.
- 476 5. Mitchell AP, Trivedi NU, Gennarelli RL, *et al.* Are Financial Payments From the
477 Pharmaceutical Industry Associated With Physician Prescribing? : A Systematic Review. *Ann*
478 *Intern Med* 2020; 10.7326/m20-5665.
- 479 6. Hartung DM, Johnston K, Cohen DM, *et al.* Industry Payments to Physician
480 Specialists Who Prescribe Repository Corticotropin. *JAMA Network Open* 2018;1(2):e180482-
481 e180482.
- 482 7. Nejstgaard CH, Bero L, Hrobjartsson A, *et al.* Association between conflicts of
483 interest and favourable recommendations in clinical guidelines, advisory committee reports,
484 opinion pieces, and narrative reviews: systematic review. *BMJ* 2020;371:m4234.
- 485 8. Murayama A, Ozaki A, Saito H, *et al.* Are Clinical Practice Guideline for Hepatitis C
486 by the American Association for the Study of Liver Disease and Infectious Diseases Society of
487 America Evidence-based? Financial Conflicts of Interest and Assessment of Quality of Evidence
488 and Strength of Recommendations. *Hepatology* 2021;n/a(n/a).
- 489 9. Johnson L, Stricker RB. Attorney General forces Infectious Diseases Society of
490 America to redo Lyme guidelines due to flawed development process. *J Med Ethics*
491 2009;35(5):283-8.
- 492 10. Coyne DW. Influence of Industry on Renal Guideline Development. *Clinical Journal*
493 *of the American Society of Nephrology* 2007;2(1):3-7.
- 494 11. Hashimoto T, Murayama A, Mamada H, *et al.* Evaluation of Financial Conflicts of
495 Interest and Drug Statements in the Coronavirus Disease 2019 Clinical Practice Guideline in
496 Japan. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2021; 10.1016/j.cmi.2021.11.019.

- 497 12. Lundh A, Lexchin J, Mintzes B, *et al.* Industry sponsorship and research outcome.
498 Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2017;2(2):MR000033.
- 499 13. Wilson JM. Lessons learned from the gene therapy trial for ornithine
500 transcarbamylase deficiency. Mol Genet Metab 2009;96(4):151-7.
- 501 14. Pham-Kanter G. Act II of the Sunshine Act. PLoS Med 2014;11(11):e1001754.
- 502 15. Silverman E. Everything you need to know about the Sunshine Act. BMJ : British
503 Medical Journal 2013;347:f4704.
- 504 16. Ozaki A, Saito H, Senoo Y, *et al.* Overview and transparency of non-research
505 payments to healthcare organizations and healthcare professionals from pharmaceutical
506 companies in Japan: Analysis of payment data in 2016. Health Policy 2020;124(7):727-735.
- 507 17. Zhou J, Vallejo J, Kluetz P, *et al.* Overview of Oncology and Hematology Drug
508 Approvals at US Food and Drug Administration Between 2008 and 2016. JNCI: Journal of the
509 National Cancer Institute 2019;111(5):449-458.
- 510 18. Mato AR, Shah NN, Jurczak W, *et al.* Pirtobrutinib in relapsed or refractory B-cell
511 malignancies (BRUIN): a phase 1/2 study. Lancet 2021;397(10277):892-901.
- 512 19. Awasthi R, Pacaud L, Waldron E, *et al.* Tisagenlecleucel cellular kinetics, dose, and
513 immunogenicity in relation to clinical factors in relapsed/refractory DLBCL. Blood Advances
514 2020;4(3):560-572.
- 515 20. Tarras ES, Marshall DC, Rosenzweig K, *et al.* Trends in Industry Payments to
516 Medical Oncologists in the United States Since the Inception of the Open Payments Program,
517 2014 to 2019. JAMA Oncology 2021;7(3):440-444.
- 518 21. Pokorny AMJ, Bero LA, Moynihan R, *et al.* Industry payments to Australian medical
519 oncologists and clinical haematologists: a cross-sectional analysis of publicly-available
520 disclosures. Intern Med J 2020;n/a(n/a).
- 521 22. Marshall DC, Moy B, Jackson ME, *et al.* Distribution and Patterns of Industry-Related
522 Payments to Oncologists in 2014. JNCI: Journal of the National Cancer Institute 2016;108(12).
- 523 23. Harada K, Ozaki A, Saito H, *et al.* Financial payments made by pharmaceutical
524 companies to the authors of Japanese hematology clinical practice guidelines between 2016
525 and 2017. Health Policy 2021;125(3):320-326.
- 526 24. Murayama A, Ozaki A, Saito H, *et al.* Pharmaceutical company payments to
527 dermatology Clinical Practice Guideline authors in Japan. PLoS One 2020;15(10):e0239610.
- 528 25. Yamamoto K, Murayama A, Ozaki A, *et al.* Financial conflicts of interest between
529 pharmaceutical companies and the authors of urology clinical practice guidelines in Japan. Int

- 530 Urogynecol J 2021;32(2):443-451.
- 531 26. Mitchell AP, Winn AN, Dusetzina SB. Pharmaceutical Industry Payments and
- 532 Oncologists' Selection of Targeted Cancer Therapies in Medicare Beneficiaries. JAMA Internal
- 533 Medicine 2018;178(6):854-856.
- 534 27. Mitchell AP, Winn AN, Lund JL, *et al.* Evaluating the Strength of the Association
- 535 Between Industry Payments and Prescribing Practices in Oncology. The Oncologist
- 536 2019;24(5):632-639.
- 537 28. Ozaki A, Saito H, Onoue Y, *et al.* Pharmaceutical payments to certified oncology
- 538 specialists in Japan in 2016: a retrospective observational cross-sectional analysis. BMJ Open
- 539 2019;9(9):e028805.
- 540 29. Tringale KR, Marshall D, Mackey TK, *et al.* Types and Distribution of Payments From
- 541 Industry to Physicians in 2015. JAMA 2017;317(17):1774-1784.
- 542 30. Feng H, Wu P, Leger M. Exploring the Industry-Dermatologist Financial Relationship:
- 543 Insight From the Open Payment Data. JAMA Dermatol 2016;152(12):1307-1313.
- 544 31. Inoue K, Blumenthal DM, Elashoff D, *et al.* Association between physician
- 545 characteristics and payments from industry in 2015-2017: observational study. BMJ Open
- 546 2019;9(9):e031010.
- 547 32. Tringale KR, Hattangadi-Gluth JA. Types and Distributions of Biomedical Industry
- 548 Payments to Men and Women Physicians by Specialty, 2015. JAMA Intern Med
- 549 2018;178(3):421-423.
- 550 33. Marshall DC, Tarras ES, Rosenzweig K, *et al.* Trends in Financial Relationships
- 551 Between Industry and Radiation Oncologists Versus Other Physicians in the United States from
- 552 2014 to 2018. International Journal of Radiation Oncology*Biography*Physics 2021;109(1): 15-25.
- 553 34. Marshall DC, Tarras ES, Rosenzweig K, *et al.* Trends in Industry Payments to
- 554 Physicians in the United States From 2014 to 2018. JAMA 2020;324(17):1785-1788.
- 555 35. Ministry of Health LaW. Survey of Physicians, Dentists and Pharmacists 2018. In:
- 556 Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare; 2018.
- 557 36. Parikh K, Fleischman W, Agrawal S. Industry Relationships With Pediatricians:
- 558 Findings From the Open Payments Sunshine Act. Pediatrics 2016;137(6):e20154440.
- 559 37. Rhee TG, Wilkinson ST. Exploring the Psychiatrist-Industry Financial Relationship:
- 560 Insight from the Open Payment Data of Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. Adm
- 561 Policy Ment Health 2020;47(4):526-530.
- 562 38. Muffly TM, Giamberardino WL, Guido J, *et al.* Industry Payments to Obstetricians

563 and Gynecologists Under the Sunshine Act. *Obstetrics & Gynecology* 2018;132(1).

564 39. Pakanati AR, Kovvuru K, Thombre V, *et al.* Industry Payments to Nephrologists in
565 the United States. *Cureus* 2021;13(8):e17057.

566 40. Cvetanovich GL, Chalmers PN, Bach BR, Jr. Industry Financial Relationships in
567 Orthopaedic Surgery: Analysis of the Sunshine Act Open Payments Database and Comparison
568 with Other Surgical Subspecialties. *JBJS* 2015;97(15).

569 41. Slentz DH, Nelson CC, Lichter PR. Characteristics of Industry Payments to
570 Ophthalmologists in the Open Payments Database. *JAMA Ophthalmology* 2019;137(9):1038-
571 1044.

572 42. Annapureddy A, Murugiah K, Minges KE, *et al.* Industry Payments to Cardiologists.
573 *Circulation: Cardiovascular Quality and Outcomes* 2018;11(12):e005016.

574 43. Putman MS, Goldsher JE, Crowson CS, *et al.* Industry Payments to Practicing US
575 Rheumatologists, 2014–2019. *Arthritis & Rheumatology* 2021;73(11):2138-2144.

576 44. Ahlawat A, Narayanaswami P. Financial relationships between neurologists and
577 industry. *Neurology* 2019;92(21):1006.

578 45. Moynihan R. Key opinion leaders: independent experts or drug representatives in
579 disguise? *BMJ* 2008;336(7658):1402-3.

580 46. Inoue K, Figueroa JF, DeJong C, *et al.* Association Between Industry Marketing
581 Payments and Prescriptions for PCSK9 (Proprotein Convertase Subtilisin/Kexin Type 9)
582 Inhibitors in the United States. *Circulation: Cardiovascular Quality and Outcomes*
583 2021;14(5):e007521.

584 47. Yeh JS, Franklin JM, Avorn J, *et al.* Association of Industry Payments to Physicians
585 With the Prescribing of Brand-name Statins in Massachusetts. *JAMA Internal Medicine*
586 2016;176(6):763-768.

587 48. Inoue K, Tsugawa Y, Mangione CM, *et al.* Association between industry payments
588 and prescriptions of long-acting insulin: An observational study with propensity score matching.
589 *PLOS Medicine* 2021;18(6):e1003645.

590 49. Goupil B, Balusson F, Naudet F, *et al.* Association between gifts from pharmaceutical
591 companies to French general practitioners and their drug prescribing patterns in 2016:
592 retrospective study using the French Transparency in Healthcare and National Health Data
593 System databases. *BMJ* 2019;367:l6015.

594

596 **Table 1. Summary of personal payments from pharmaceutical companies to**
597 **hematology specialists certified by the Japanese Society of Hematology between**
598 **2016 and 2019**
599

Variables	
Total	
Payment values, US\$ (%)	36,291,434 (3.6)
Cases, n (%)	47,863 (3.2)
Companies, n (%)	71 (77.2)
Average per specialist (SD)	
Payment values, US\$	13,411 (34,856)
Cases, n	17.7 (35.9)
Companies, n	5.5 (5.2)
Median per specialist (IQR)	
Payment values, US\$	2,471 (851–9,677)
Cases, n	5 (2–17)

Companies, n	4 (2□8)
Range	
Payment values, US\$	46□528,038
Cases, n	0□487
Companies, n	0□32
Physicians with specific payments, n (%)	
Any payments	2,706 (64.7)
Payments >US\$500	2,392 (57.2)
Payments >US\$1,000	1,947 (46.6)
Payments >US\$5,000	980 (23.4)
Payments >US\$10,000	666 (15.9)
Payments >US\$50,000	175 (4.2)
Payments >US\$100,000	78 (1.9)
Gini index	0.856
Category of payments	
Lecturing	
Payment value, US\$ (%)	29,951,526 (82.5)

Cases, n (%)	40,686 (85.0)
Consulting	
Payment value, US\$ (%)	4,890,255 (13.5)
Cases, n (%)	5,302 (11.1)
Writing	
Payment value, US\$ (%)	1,398,729 (3.9)
Cases, n (%)	1,816 (3.8)
Other	
Payment value, US\$ (%)	50,924 (0.1)
Cases, n (%)	59 (0.1)

600

601

Table 2. Trend of personal payments from pharmaceutical companies to the hematology specialists board certified by the Japanese Society of Hematology between 2016 and 2019

Variables	2016	2017	2018	2019	Relative yearly change ratio (95%CI)	P value	Four-years combined total
All pharmaceutical companies							
Total payments , US\$ (¥)	7,700,346 (839,337,686)	8,266,798 (901,080,935)	10,045,073 (1,094,912,919)	10,279,218 (1,120,434,752)	□	□	35,949,597 (3,955,766,292)
Average payments (SD), US\$	4,259 (9,291)	4,918 (10,677)	5,306 (11,403)	5,574 (11,688)	1.112 (1.091□1.134)	<0.001	13,411 (34,856)
Median payments	1,241 (511□3,442)	1,343 (525□4,087)	1,504 (525□4,628)	1,629 (613□4,839)			2,471 (851□9,677)

(IQR), US\$							
Payment range, US\$	46□106,834	46□167,828	46□148,942	52□140,947	□	□	46□528,038
Physicians with specific payments, n (%)							
Any payments	1,808 (43.2)	1,681 (40.2)	1,893 (45.3)	1,844 (44.1)	1.018 (1.006□1.030)	0.003	2,706 (64.7)
Payments >US\$500	1,444 (34.5)	1,373 (32.8)	1,577 (37.7)	1,570 (37.5)	1.040 (1.027□1.054)	<0.001	2,374 (56.8)
Payments >US\$1,000	1024 (24.5)	998 (23.9)	1,178 (28.2)	1159 (27.7)	1.055 (1.039□1.071)	<0.001	1,945 (46.5)
Payments >US\$5,000	331 (7.9)	360 (8.6)	454 (10.9)	446 (10.7)	1.117 (1.088□1.146)	<0.001	975 (23.3)
Payments >US\$10,000	187 (4.5)	208 (5.0)	239 (5.7)	253 (6.0)	1.109 (1.071□1.149)	<0.001	660 (15.8)
Payments	15 (0.36)	20 (0.5)	26 (0.6)	24 (0.57)	1.169 (1.033□1.323)	0.014	172 (4.1)

>US\$50,000							
Payments	2 (0.048)	2 (0.048)	4 (0.096)	5 (0.12)	1.420 (0.940 □ 2.147)	0.096	75 (1.8)
>US\$100,000							
Gini index	0.876	0.885	0.870	0.872	□	□	0.856
Pharmaceutical companies with 4-years payment data ^a							
Total payments ,	7,700,346	8,266,798	10,045,073	10,142,157	□	□	35,972,679
US\$ (¥)	(838,940,102)	(884,814,326)	(1,091,772,525)	(11,05,495,102)			(3,921,022,055)
Average payments (SD), US\$	4,259 (9,291)	4,918 (10,677)	5,306 (11,403)	5,536 (11,557)	1.112 (1.091 □ 1.134)	<0.001	13,333 (34,685)
Median payments (IQR), US\$	1,241 (511 □ 3,442)	1,343 (525 □ 4,087)	1,504 (523 □ 4,628)	1,633 (613 □ 4,760)			2,470 (851 □ 9,500)
Payment range, US\$	46 □ 106,834	46 □ 167,828	0 □ 148,942	0 □ 137,882	□	□	46 □ 528,038

Physicians with
specific payments, n
(%)

Any payments	1,808 (43.2)	1,681 (40.2)	1,893 (45.3)	1,844 (44.1)	1.018 (1.006□1.030)	0.003	2,698 (64.5)
Payments >US\$500	1,444 (34.5)	1,373 (32.8)	1,577 (37.7)	1,570 (37.5)	1.040 (1.027□1.054)	<0.001	2,383 (57.0)
Payments >US\$1,000	1,024 (24.5)	998 (23.9)	1,178 (28.2)	1,159 (27.7)	1.055 (1.039□1.071)	<0.001	1,938 (46.3)
Payments >US\$5,000	331 (7.9)	360 (8.6)	454 (10.9)	446 (10.7)	1.117 (1.088□1.146)	<0.001	973 (23.3)
Payments >US\$10,000	187 (4.5)	208 (4.8)	239 (5.7)	253 (6.0)	1.109 (1.071□1.149)	<0.001	659 (15.8)
Payments >US\$50,000	15 (0.36)	20 (0.48)	26 (0.62)	24 (0.57)	1.169 (1.033□1.323)	0.014	174 (4.2)
Payments >US\$100,000	2 (0.048)	2 (0.048)	4 (0.096)	5 (0.12)	1.420 (0.940□2.147)	0.096	77 (1.8)

Gini index	0.876	0.885	0.870	0.872	□	□	0.857
------------	-------	-------	-------	-------	---	---	-------

605 Abbreviations: standard deviation (SD); interquartile range (IQR); and the United States (US); and 95% confidence interval (95%CI)

606 ^a7 pharmaceutical companies were excluded because the companies did not disclose or we could not collect the four-years payment data between 2016 and

607 2019.

608

Figure 1. Concentration of payment to individual hematology specialists

Figure 2. Total payments from top 10 largest paying pharmaceutical companies between 2016 and 2019

Figure 3. Category and distribution of payments by top 10 largest paying pharmaceutical companies