Letter to Editor, Boston Herald; Published 06/15/98, p.22

## Taking Doc's license only the first step

The findings of scientific misconduct against Dr. Andrew Friedman were published in the Federal Register on May 1, 1996 – why is it two years (and many patients) later that the [MA.] medical board "acted" ("Noted doc loses license for falsifying med data," June 2)?

Friedman's "falsified and fabricated data" pertains to Lupron. Friedman was a lead investigator and a paid lecturer for this drug on behalf of its manufacturer. Not surprisingly, during Friedman's tenure as director of Brigham & Women's IVF (in vitro fertilization) program, the written instructions for IVF changed from "Lupron is only prescribed to persons with certain diagnoses" to "Lupron is widely prescribed".

Knowing a physician's monetary ties with a drug company is impossible yet critical. How can informed consent take place if there is financial motivation to bias the data or treatment? Were Friedman's patients informed Lupron has neurological effects and is considered chemotherapy?

Two of 150 articles by Friedman were questioned. In 1995 I cited the "manipulated figures" of a third Friedman study in testimony supporting a bill to regulate the treatment of infertility. The bill, I said, "would not be necessary if fertility clinics and fertility doctors were honest, but this is simply not so."

What about the untold numbers of studies and articles that have referenced Friedman's bogus data? Removing Friedman was easy – try removing the data from the published literature.

Lynne Millican, R.N., West Roxbury