Notes about this draft excerpt (Steve Silberman, May 11, 2011):

Screen shot of some early edits by [executive editor] Thomas Goetz. I agreed with Thomas that the Daniel Moerman quote was extraneous.

A further boost to placebo effects may be provided by direct-to-consumer advertising. The secret of running an effective DTC campaign, Saatchi & Saatchi’s Jim Joseph told a trade journal last year, is fostering expectations of wellness beyond what any pill could deliver. "It's tapping into people's emotions about the little things in their lives that heal them," Joseph said. "Is it time with your children? Is it a good book curled up on the couch? Is it your favorite television show? Is it a little purple pill that helps you get rid of acid reflux?"

Some researchers believe that the torrent of ads is causing a placebo "bandwagon effect" among trial volunteers.

Ironically, the main thing that may be killing big pharma's ability to manage successful trials is its own success. [I DON'T UNDERSTAND THIS STATEMENT] Many of the drugs that expanded the pharmaceutical market target the types of conditions that respond best to placebo treatment: anxiety, mild depression, persistent pain, hypertension and other chronic ailments that turn out to be intimately related to a patient's mental state.

To avoid investing millions of dollars in failure, placebo researchers say, pharmaceutical companies will need to adopt new ways of vetting drugs that take these social aspects of medicine into account. WRAP UP THE SECTION ON THIS IDEA. But until recently, independent scientists who approached big pharma with ideas for updating the 50-year-old gold standard were rebuffed.

"It was like campaign finance reform," says University of Michigan anthropologist Daniel Moerman, a leading placebo researcher in the '90s. "Whatever reform you put together, politicians and other interested parties will find ways to get around it. It was the same with clinical trials. Why did I give up? I was tired of the persistent hostility that my ideas provoked."
But why would the placebo effect seem to be getting stronger worldwide? Part of the answer may be found in the drug industry's own success in marketing its products.

Potential trial volunteers in the US have been deluged with ads for prescription medications since 1997, when the FDA amended its policy on direct-to-consumer advertising. The secret of running an effective campaign, Saatchi & Saatchi's Jim Joseph told a trade journal last year, is associating a particular brand-name medication with other aspects of life that promote peace of mind: "Is it time with your children? Is it a good book curled up on the couch? Is it your favorite television show? Is it a little purple pill that helps you get rid of acid reflux?" By evoking such uplifting associations, researchers say, the ads set up the kind of expectations that induce a formidable placebo response.

The success of those ads in selling blockbuster drugs like antidepressants and statins also pushed trials offshore as therapeutic virgins—potential volunteers who were not already medicated with one or another drug—became harder to find. The contractors that manage trials for Big Pharma have moved aggressively into Africa, India, China, and the former Soviet Union. In these places, however, cultural dynamics can boost the placebo response in other ways. Doctors in these countries are paid to fill up trial rosters quickly, which may motivate them to recruit patients with milder forms of illness that yield more readily to placebo treatment. Furthermore, a patient's hope of getting better and expectation of expert care—the primary placebo triggers in the brain—are particularly acute in societies where volunteers are clamoring to gain access to the most basic forms of medicine. "The quality of care that placebo patients get in trials is far superior to the best insurance you get in America," says psychiatrist Arif Khan, principal investigator in hundreds of trials for companies like Pfizer and Bristol-Myers Squibb. "It's basically luxury care."

Big Pharma faces additional problems in beating placebo when it comes to psychiatric drugs. One is to accurately define the nature of mental illness. The litmus test of drug efficacy in antidepressant trials is a questionnaire called the Hamilton Depression Rating Scale. The HAM-D was created nearly 50 years ago based on a study of major depressive disorder in patients confined to asylums. Few trial volunteers now suffer from that level of illness. In fact, many experts are starting to wonder if what drug companies now call depression is even the same disease that the HAM-D was designed to diagnose.

Existing tests also may not be appropriate for diagnosing disorders like social anxiety and premenstrual dysphoria—the very types of chronic, fuzzily defined conditions that the drug industry started targeting in the '90s, when the placebo problem began escalating. The neurological foundation of these illnesses is still being debated, making it even harder for drug companies to come up with effective treatments.

What all of these disorders have in common, however, is that they engage the higher cortical centers that generate beliefs and expectations, interpret social cues, and anticipate rewards. So do chronic pain, sexual dysfunction, Parkinson's, and many other ailments that respond robustly to placebo treatment. To avoid investing in failure, researchers say, pharmaceutical companies will need to adopt new ways of vetting drugs that route around the brain's own centralized network for healing.