Published in final edited form as:

Clin Obes. 2017 December ; 7(6): 402. doi:10.1111/cob.12214.

Stated Conclusion About Industry Funding is Opposite to What The Paper's Data Show: Letter Regarding "Selective outcome reporting in obesity clinical trials: a cross-sectional review"

David B. Allison, PhD¹ and Diana M. Thomas, PhD²

¹Office of Energetics and Nutrition Obesity Research Center, University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, AL 35294

²Department of Mathematical Sciences, United States Military Academy, West Point, NY 10996

We were pleased to read the article by Rankin et al. [1]. Rigor, reproducibility, and transparency are important topics [2] and the issue of altering clinical trials outcomes is particularly pernicious [3]. We therefore applaud the authors for focusing on "Selective outcome reporting [as]... a form of bias" in obesity trials. In doing so and highlighting the frequency with which "major outcome discrepancies between registration and publication" occur in obesity trials, they have done the obesity field a service.

That said, accuracy in reporting is also important [e.g., 4,5] and we were struck by one statement in Rankin et al.'s paper which seems to be contradicted by their data. Specifically, Rankin et al wrote "Industry-funded trials were most likely to contain at least one major discrepancy (10/91, 10.99%)." In contrast, our reading of Rankin et al's Table 3 indicates that industry-funded trials were *least* likely to contain at least one major discrepancy. That is, of all funding sources considered, industry funded trials had the greatest fidelity in reporting outcomes commensurate with those in the study registration. In fact, the rate of reporting discrepancies in industry-funded trials was roughly 1/2 that of publically-funded trial, and roughly 1/4th that of private-(non-industry)-funded trials.

We believe Rankin et al. should clarify the discrepancy between their statement and the data they report in their Table 3.

Acknowledgments

Supported in part by NIH grants P30DK056336, R25DK099080, and R25HL124208. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health or any other organization.

Corresponding Author: David B. Allison, University of Alabama at Birmingham, School of Health Professions, Department of Nutrition Sciences, 1705 University Blvd, SHPB 677, Birmingham, AL 35294-1212. dallison@uab.edu.

Competing interests

Dr. Allison's institution has accepted funds from multiple for profit, private, and non-profit organizations for obesity and nutrition related trials.

References

1. Rankin, J., Ross, A., Baker, J., O'Brien, M., Scheckel, C., Vassar, M. Selective outcome reporting in obesity clinical trials: a cross-sectional review. *Clin Obes.* 2017 May 30. [Epub ahead of print]. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28557240>
2. Allison DB, Brown AW, George BJ, Kaiser KA. A tragedy of errors: Mistakes in peer-reviewed papers are easy to find but hard to fix. *Nature.* 2016; 530:27–29. [PubMed: 26842041]
3. Ramagopalan S, Skingsley AP, Handunnetthi L, et al. Prevalence of primary outcome changes in clinical trials registered on ClinicalTrials.gov: a cross-sectional study [version 1; referees: 3 approved]. *F1000Research.* 2014; 3:77.doi: 10.12688/f1000research.3784.1 [PubMed: 25075294]
4. Allison DB, Cope MB. Randomized controlled trials with statistically nonsignificant results. *JAMA.* 2010 Sep 1.304(9):965. author reply 965. doi: 10.1001/jama.2010.1245 [PubMed: 20810373]
5. Cope MB, Allison DB. White Hat Bias: Examples of its Presence in Obesity Research and a Call for Renewed Commitment to Faithfulness in Research Reporting. *International Journal of Obesity.* 2010; 34(1):84–8. [PubMed: 19949416]