

Rigorous scientific evaluation of the overall effectiveness of implementing this type of strategy in the short and long term, although challenging, could be achieved.

J.R. (Dick) M. Smith
HIV Primary Care Physician
Winnipeg, Man.

Reference

1. Remis RS. HIV incidence among injection drug users in Vancouver [editorial]. *CMAJ* 2002;166 (7):908-9.

Principles of influence

The recent article on the principles of influence in medical practice¹ applies to other important areas related to patient care. The authors focused on patient-physician interactions, but I have found that an understanding of the same principles is very helpful in understanding interactions between pharmaceutical representatives and physicians.

Over the past 10 years I have used video and structured interaction to help explain the process of the "drug detail" to students and physicians.² For the past year, this has been enhanced by the

concepts discussed in an article by Cialdini³ on the 6 basic behaviours that influence response.

"Reciprocation" applies to gifts, favours and concessions. The impact of gifts on attitude and behaviour is well documented⁴ and may lead to bias in favour of a drug product. "Consistency" is best seen in the closing statement of an interaction, for example, "Will you be able to use product X in your practice?" An affirmative response is not irrelevant. Good data show that compliance with a request increases when agreement is acquired. In addition, "social validation" occurs through the drug company dinner. When a doctor hears that many colleagues are using a product, they are more likely to change their prescribing habits.

"Liking" is fundamental to representative-physician interaction. The skillful detailer can be described as a "stranger who co-opts the trappings of friendship."¹ This is the secret of the Tupperware party. The stranger in that situation is the seller, but the meeting is arranged by friends and conducted in the home of a friend.

Doctors, like others, respect and respond to authority figures. "Authority" is exemplified by opinion leaders. Opinions might be given during a

sponsored talk, or perhaps a name is dropped during an interaction.

Finally, there is "scarcity." Drug sampling is one way of creating that feeling. By giving out a few small samples the representative makes it seem that the medication is something new and special.

Changing behaviour is difficult. Physicians know that from their work. Changing a behaviour in doctors, such as prescribing practices, is also difficult. Understanding the process can help physicians decide what they feel is in the best interests of their patients. Being aware is the best preparation.

Neil H. Shear

Professor of Medicine
Dermatology and Clinical Pharmacology
Sunnybrook & Women's College Health
Sciences Centre
University of Toronto
Toronto, Ont.

References

1. Redelmeier DA, Cialdini RB. Problems for clinical judgement: 5. Principles of influence in medical practice. *CMAJ* 2002;166(13):1680-4.
2. Shear NH, Black F, Lexchin J. Examining the physician-detailer interaction. *Can J Clin Pharmacol* 1996;3:175-9.
3. Cialdini RB. The science of persuasion. *Sci Am* 2001;284:76-81.
4. Stelfox HT, Chua G, O'Rourke K, Detsky J. Conflict of interest in the debate over calcium-channel antagonists. *N Engl J Med* 1998;338(2):101-6.

[One of the authors responds:]

Neil Shear's letter is one more development in a memorable series of exchanges over our article.¹ We agree completely with his insights: the basic point is that advanced training in medicine does not immunize clinicians against the forces of social influence. In this response, we focus on this last issue.

Before we submitted our manuscript to *CMAJ* we had received 5 dissenting external reviews at other journals. One reviewer said, "employing tactics of social influence violates principles of biomedical ethics." Another wrote, "medicine does not usually operate this way." And a third said, "social influence techniques will ultimately undermine autonomous motivation."

We recognize that researchers have

Pour écrire à la rédaction

On peut envoyer une lettre à la rédaction par notre site web, par la poste, par messenger, par courriel (pubs@cma.ca) ou par télécopieur. Les lettres doivent compter au plus 250 mots et être signées par tous les auteurs. Les lettres se rapportant à un article publié dans le *JAMC* doivent nous parvenir dans les 2 mois de la publication de l'article en question. Le *JAMC* ne correspond qu'avec les auteurs des lettres acceptées pour publication. Les lettres acceptées seront révisées et pourront être raccourcies.

Cyberlettres

Nous encourageons les lecteurs à écrire à la rédaction par le service Cyberlettres de notre site web (www.jamc.ca). Nous visons à publier au plus tard le jour ouvrable suivant les lettres qui apportent une contribution importante à la discussion. Les lettres électroniques seront annexées à l'article pertinent du *JAMC* et on pourra les publier dans la version imprimée du *JAMC*. Pour envoyer une lettre électronique (cyberlettre), cliquez sur «Lettres électroniques : répondre à cet article» à la droite du texte HTML de tout article du *JAMC*.