

Northumbria Research Link

Citation: Fitzgerald, Niamh, Angus, Kathryn, Elders, Andrew, de Andrade, Marisa, Raistrick, Duncan, Heather, Nick and McCambridge, Jim (2016) Weak evidence on nalmefene creates dilemmas for clinicians and poses questions for regulators and researchers. *Addiction*, 111 (8). pp. 1477-1487. ISSN 0965-2140

Published by: Wiley-Blackwell

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/add.13438> <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/add.13438>>

This version was downloaded from Northumbria Research Link:
<http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/id/eprint/27019/>

Northumbria University has developed Northumbria Research Link (NRL) to enable users to access the University's research output. Copyright © and moral rights for items on NRL are retained by the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. Single copies of full items can be reproduced, displayed or performed, and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided the authors, title and full bibliographic details are given, as well as a hyperlink and/or URL to the original metadata page. The content must not be changed in any way. Full items must not be sold commercially in any format or medium without formal permission of the copyright holder. The full policy is available online: <http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/policies.html>

This document may differ from the final, published version of the research and has been made available online in accordance with publisher policies. To read and/or cite from the published version of the research, please visit the publisher's website (a subscription may be required.)

Weak evidence on nalmefene creates dilemmas for clinicians and poses questions for regulators and researchers

Niamh Fitzgerald¹, Kathryn Angus¹, Andrew Elders², Marisa de Andrade³, Duncan Raistrick⁴, Nick Heather⁵ and Jim McCambridge⁶

Institute for Social Marketing, UK Centre for Tobacco Alcohol Studies, University of Stirling, Scotland, UK,¹ Glasgow Caledonian University, Glasgow, Scotland, UK,² School of Health in Social Science, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK,³ Leeds Addiction Unit, Leeds, UK,⁴ Department of Psychology, Faculty of Health and Life Sciences, Northumbria University, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK⁵ and Department of Health Sciences, University of York, York, UK⁶

ABSTRACT

Background and aims Nalmefene has been approved in Europe for the treatment of alcohol dependence and subsequently recommended by the UK National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). This study examines critically the evidence base underpinning both decisions and the issues arising. **Methods** Published studies of nalmefene were identified through a systematic search, with documents from the European Medicines Agency, the NICE appraisal and public clinical trial registries also examined to identify methodological issues. **Results** Efficacy data used to support the licensing of nalmefene suffer from risk of bias due to lack of specification of *a priori* outcome measures and sensitivity analyses, use of *post-hoc* sample refinement and the use of inappropriate comparators. Despite this evidence for the efficacy of nalmefene in reducing alcohol consumption in those with alcohol dependence is, at best, modest, and of uncertain significance to individual patients. The relevance of existing trial data to routine primary care practice is doubtful. **Conclusions** Problems with the registration, design, analysis and reporting of clinical trials of nalmefene did not prevent it being licensed and recommended for treating alcohol dependence. This creates dilemmas for primary care clinicians and commissioning organisations where nalmefene has been heavily promoted, and poses wider questions about the effectiveness of the medicines regulation system and how to develop the alcohol treatment evidence base.

Keywords Addiction, alcohol, brief intervention, nalmefene, trial regulation, vested interests.

Correspondence to: Niamh Fitzgerald, Lecturer in Alcohol Studies, Institute for Social Marketing, UK Centre for Tobacco and Alcohol Studies, University of Stirling, Stirling FK9 4LA, UK. E-mail: niamh.fitzgerald@stir.ac.uk

Submitted 30 October 2015; initial review completed 15 December 2015; final version accepted 21 April 2016

INTRODUCTION

Concerns about the value, analysis and reporting of pharmaceutical industry-sponsored clinical trials are extensive and unresolved [1–8]. Alcohol treatment trials are studies that can be characterized by complexity operating at multiple levels, including trial design and implementation, the nature of the problems and populations targeted, the interventions themselves and their delivery in different health-care settings and systems. Systematic reviews of pharmacotherapies identify few studies at low risk of bias [9], and it has been recommended that guidance available in the wider clinical trials design literature on issues such as recruitment, randomization, statistical methods and outcome evaluation be used more effectively [10].

Problems intrinsic to this area of study are compounded by problems in reporting, where adherence to Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials (CONSORT) recommendations is weak [11,12]. Conflicting evidence results, for example, with large, apparently well-conducted trials producing findings that are disappointing in light of earlier studies [13]. This makes valid interpretation and use of the evidence base challenging.

Nalmefene has been promoted heavily in primary care, having been licensed in 2013 for the treatment of alcohol dependence under unusually specific conditions (see Box 1) [14]. It was recommended by the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) in late 2014 [15], and has been controversial [16–20]. The NICE appraisal committee stated that ‘the exact

magnitude of effect [of nalmefene] was uncertain' because of 'post hoc subgroup analyses' in trials 'not powered for these analyses' ([15], pp.26–7). A recently completed systematic review concluded that 'the value of nalmefene for treatment of alcohol addiction is not established. At best, nalmefene has limited efficacy in reducing alcohol consumption' [21]. We explore the uncertainties in the available evidence, their regulatory handling and vested interests involved in order to better appreciate the issues and dilemmas arising.

Box 1 Marketing authorization for nalmefene [14].

Nalmefene is authorized for reducing alcohol consumption:

- 1 in people with alcohol dependence;
- 2 who have a high drinking risk level (defined as alcohol consumption of more than 60 g (7.5 UK units) per day for men and more than 40 g (5 UK units) per day for women, according to the World Health Organization's drinking risk levels);
- 3 without physical withdrawal symptoms, and who do not require immediate detoxification;
- 4 it should be initiated only in patients who continue to have a high drinking risk level 2 weeks after initial assessment; and
- 5 only used in conjunction with continuous psychosocial support focused on treatment adherence and reducing alcohol consumption.

THE TRIALS EVIDENCE BASE

We identified published studies on nalmefene through a systematic search (Box 2), alongside documents from the NICE appraisal [15,22–24], the European Medicines Agency (EMA) [14,25] and public trial registries [26–31]. Nalmefene has been the subject of six published trials, primarily with people who are alcohol-dependent (Table 1). These trials varied in treatment goals, nalmefene dose and regimen, and the kinds of psychosocial support provided with treatment (Table 1). The EMA assessment of nalmefene ([25], p.28) was based primarily on three Lundbeck-sponsored trials: Esense 1 [35,36], Esense 2 [36,37] and Sense [38]. Two of the three other published trials [33,34], along with three unpublished trials (Table 2), were cited as supporting the choice of dose only ([25], p.27). The NICE appraisal committee assessed data from the three Lundbeck trials because 'post-hoc analyses' of these studies formed the basis of the licensed population in the marketing authorization for nalmefene ([24], p.26).

The Lundbeck trials (Table 1) were undertaken together across Europe in 19 countries between 2008/09 and 2010/11, and published in 2013/14. Limited information is available on the 149 trial sites, which appear

Box 2 Search strategy.

Searches were made on 13 June 2014, supplemented by a repeat search on 4 December 2014 to update our database in the following:

- PubMed
- Cinahl via EBSCOHost
- HealthSource via EBSCOHost
- Web of Science Core Collection
- Google Scholar (UK)

Example search strategy (PubMed)

```
# Query
8 #4 OR #7
7 #5 AND #6
6 pubstatusaheadofprint OR (2013:2014[edat] OR
2013:2014[crdt] OR 2013:2014[dp])
5 alcohol* AND (nalmefene* OR selincro)
4 #3 AND Humans[Mesh]
3 #1 AND #2
2 Nalmefene OR Selincro OR nalmetrene
1 ('Alcohol Abstinence'[Mesh] OR 'Alcohol Deterrents'[Mesh] OR 'Alcohol Drinking'[Mesh] OR 'Alcoholic Beverages'[Mesh] OR 'Alcoholic Intoxication'[Mesh] OR 'Alcoholics'[Mesh] OR 'Alcohol-Induced Disorders'[Mesh] OR 'Alcoholism'[Mesh] OR 'Alcohol-Related Disorders'[Mesh] OR 'Binge Drinking'[Mesh]) OR alcohol*[TiAb]
```

Searches were made in the following online trials registers on 3 December 2014 using the terms: Nalmefene OR Selincro

- ClinicalTrials.gov
- European Union Clinical Trials Register
- International Standard Randomised Controlled Trial Number register
- World Health Organization International Clinical Trials Registry Platform

Results

$n = 167$ records identified by database searches on 13.6.14 (dates: inception to 13.6.14) $n = 53$ records identified by database searches on 4.12.14 (dates: 1.6.14–4.12.14) $n = 8$ records identified by reference chasing

Minus duplicates, a total of $n = 202$ discrete records were identified using the strategy above. Excluding those clearly not relevant to nalmefene for alcohol problems from title and abstract [58]; 144 journal articles, reports and conference abstracts were examined.

From these eight full papers [32–39] reporting from six trials and one pilot trial of nalmefene for alcohol consumption and 31 conference abstracts related to the same seven trials of nalmefene (30 relating to the Esense 1, Esense 2 and Sense trials; 1 relating to the Anton trial) were identified.

Table 1 Summary of trial data.

Citation, year	Study population ^a	Regimen & comparison	Country & setting	Primary outcomes	Reported findings	Funders
Mason 1999 [32] ^b	105 adults with alcohol dependence out-patients recruited through advertisements and press releases	12 w of twice-daily 10 mg/40 mg nalmefene or placebo (total daily 20 mg/80 mg/placebo)	USA (Florida) Single site: alcohol disorders research clinic	(a) Rate of relapse to heavy drinking; (b) percentage of days abstinent; (c) standard drinks per drinking day; All measured over the 12-w treatment period Heavy drinking days per month	Effect on 1 of 3 outcomes: fewer nalmefene patients (37%) relapsed to heavy drinking compared with placebo (58.8%) ($P = 0.02$) No statistically significant difference between groups	Funded by NIAAA; drug and placebo provided by IVAX Corporation
Anton, 2004 [33]	70 adults with alcohol dependence recruited through clinical referrals and advertisements	12 w of daily 5 mg/20 mg/40 mg nalmefene or placebo; both with 4 sessions of motivational enhancement therapy	USA (11 States) 13 sites: mainly university medical/research centres			Sponsored by Biotie, supported by Biotie statistician, Biotie were on study monitoring team and assisted in preparation of manuscript Study funded by Biotie and sponsor involved at all stages
Karhuvaara 2007 [34]	403 adults who had difficulty in controlling drinking with at least 18 heavy drinking days and no more than 14 consecutive abstinent days during the previous 12 w, recruited mainly through newspaper advertisements	28 w of 20 mg nalmefene/placebo taken as needed ^c ; after 2 w, the dose could be doubled or halved by investigators with some elements of BRENDA ^d	Finland 15 sites: 5 specialist treatment clinics; 6 private GP offices; 2 occupational health-care offices; 2 clinical research sites	Heavy drinking days per month	The nalmefene group had fewer heavy drinking days during the 28 w of treatment than the placebo group (final month 8.8 versus 10.6, $P = 0.0065$)	
Esense 1 [35,36]	604 adults with alcohol dependence, recruited from in and out-patient clinics including from advertisements	24 w of 18 mg of nalmefene or placebo to be taken 'as needed', both with 10 sessions of BRENDA ^d	39 sites: 4 in Austria, 11 in Finland, 16 in Germany and 8 in Sweden. Detailed descriptions of the study sites not reported	At trial registration ^e : 'Change from baseline in monthly number of heavy drinking days: Change from baseline in the total alcohol consumption (time-frame: 24 w)'	Effect on both outcomes: nalmefene group had 2.3 fewer heavy drinking days per month, (95% CI = 3.8 to -0.8, $P = 0.0021$) and 11.0 g/day less alcohol (95% CI = 16.8 to -5.1) compared with placebo	Lundbeck sponsored the trials and was involved in the study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation and in providing medical writing assistance

(Continues)

Table 1. (Continued)

Citation, year	Study population ^a	Regimen & comparison	Country & setting	Primary outcomes	Reported findings	Funders
Esense 2 [36, 37]	718 adults with alcohol dependence, recruited from both in-patient and out-patient clinics, including by advertisements	24 w of 18 mg of nalmefene or placebo to be taken as needed both with 10 sessions of BRENDA ^d	57 sites: 7 in Belgium, 3 in the Czech Republic, 16 in France, 10 in Italy, 7 in Poland, 4 in Portugal and 10 in Spain. Detailed descriptions of the study sites not reported	At trial registration ^e : 'Change from baseline in monthly number of heavy drinking days. Change from baseline in the total alcohol consumption. (time-frame: 24 w)' At trial registration ^e : 'Safety is measured by adverse events, clinical safety laboratory tests, vital signs, weight, body mass index, electrocardiograms, profile of moods states and physical examination [time-frame: 52 w]'	Effects on 1 of 2 outcomes: nalmefene group had 1.7 fewer heavy drinking days per month compared with placebo (95% CI = -3.1 to -0.4, $P = 0.012$). Paper does not report all as registered and refers to the two Esense outcomes as the co-primary implying no others. No effect of nalmefene was found for either consumption variable after 6 months; at 52 w the nalmefene group had 1.6 fewer heavy drinking days per month (95% CI = -2.9 to -0.3, $P = 0.017$) and 6.5 g less alcohol per day in the last month (95% CI = -12.5 to -0.4, $P = 0.036$) ^f	As for Esense 1
Sense [38]	675 adults with alcohol dependence, recruited from out-patient clinics, including by advertisements	52 w of 18 mg of nalmefene or placebo to be taken as needed both with 10 sessions of BRENDA ^d	60 sites: 5 in the Czech Republic, 5 in Estonia, 2 in Hungary, 4 in Latvia, 2 in Lithuania, 15 in Poland, 8 in Russia, 4 in Slovakia, 10 in Ukraine and 5 in the UK	At trial registration ^e : 'Safety is measured by adverse events, clinical safety laboratory tests, vital signs, weight, body mass index, electrocardiograms, profile of moods states and physical examination [time-frame: 52 w]'	Effects on 1 of 2 outcomes: nalmefene group had 1.7 fewer heavy drinking days per month compared with placebo (95% CI = -3.1 to -0.4, $P = 0.012$). Paper does not report all as registered and refers to the two Esense outcomes as the co-primary implying no others. No effect of nalmefene was found for either consumption variable after 6 months; at 52 w the nalmefene group had 1.6 fewer heavy drinking days per month (95% CI = -2.9 to -0.3, $P = 0.017$) and 6.5 g less alcohol per day in the last month (95% CI = -12.5 to -0.4, $P = 0.036$) ^f	As for Esense 1 & 2

^aFurther details on inclusion and exclusion criteria are available in cited trial papers. ^bThis trial was informed by an earlier pilot trial with 21 patients [39]. ^cAs needed: to be taken 1–2 h before any intake of alcohol, only when 'drinking seemed imminent' or 'a risk of drinking alcohol was perceived'. ^dBRENDA is a psychosocial intervention consisting of the following six components: (1) biopsychosocial evaluation; (2) report to the patient on assessment; (3) empathic understanding of the patient's situation; (4) needs identified collaboratively by the patient and treatment provider; (5) direct advice to the patient on how to meet those needs; (6) assess reaction of the patient to advice and adjust as necessary for best care [40]. In the Esense 1&2 and Sense trials, sessions of BRENDA were: 'approximately 15 to 30 min (except for the first session, administered at randomisation, which was approximately 30 to 40 min)' ([25], p. 29). ^eSee body of text for discussion of deficits in pre-specification of outcome measures in trial registers. ^fThese figures are for the original study population, not the unplanned subgroup analysis. NIAAA = National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism; CI = confidence interval.

Table 2 Available information on unpublished clinical trials.

Trial code	Patient population ^a	Regimen & comparison ^a	Country	Outcome information ^a	Funders
CPH-101-0701	166 patients who 'had a desire to reduce and gain better control of alcohol consumption and difficulties in controlling drinking plus a family history of alcohol problems' including some with dependence	28 w of flexible dose 10/20/40 mg nalmefene or placebo taken 'as-needed' ^b both with 'biopsychosocial assessment feedback and advice'	UK	Primary outcome: 'Monthly number of HDD' (heavy drinking days) '75% premature discontinuation for nalmefene; 68% for placebo'	Biotie
CPH-101-0399	150 patients who had 'difficulties in controlling drinking', including some with dependence	16 w of fixed daily dosing 10/40 mg/placebo	Finland	Primary outcome: 'Monthly number of HDD'	Biotie
CPH-101-0400	60 patients who had 'difficulties in controlling drinking' including some with dependence	52-w open-label, 10/20/40 mg flexible dosing, 'as-needed', uncontrolled study	Finland	Primary outcome: 'Monthly number of HDD'	Biotie

^aInformation summarized or quoted (as indicated) from manufacturer's response to request for clarification from NICE [22], pp. 14 and 16, and EMA Assessment report [25], p. 27. Additional information is redacted in the former and no other data, including outcome data, are available publicly. ^bNo information on the meaning of 'as-needed' in these trials is available publicly. HDD: heavy drinking days.

predominantly to include specialist treatment clinics and contract research organizations. Distributions of trial participants by site and recruitment method (advertisements, existing clinic patients, referral) are not reported.

Esense 1 was published first with effects favouring nalmefene (see Table 1), although differential dropout rates (53% for nalmefene versus 31% for placebo) were caused by adverse events in the nalmefene group [35]. In Esense 2 [37], a trial of identical design to Esense 1 [23], dropout rates were approximately 41 and 38%. There are reported reductions of approximately 65 and 60% in both alcohol consumption outcome measures for the nalmefene group and placebo groups, respectively, in Esense 2; an effect favouring nalmefene was reported for one of the two measures (see Table 1) [37].

Thirty-three per cent of patients in the Esense 2 trial were reported to have reduced their drinking during the assessment period prior to randomization [37]. Unplanned *post-hoc* analyses of data excluded these patients, and then statistically significant effects on both primary outcomes were reported for the remaining 'sub-group' [37]. A further 2013 report pooled this 'sub-group' data from both Esense 1 and 2 trials; at 6 months, the pooled nalmefene subgroup had 3.2 [95% confidence interval (CI) = -4.8 to -1.6, $P < 0.0001$] fewer heavy drinking days per month and 14.3 g (95% CI: -20.8 to -7.8, $P < 0.0001$) per day lower alcohol consumption compared with the pooled placebo subgroup [36].

The Sense trial [38] had a different design to the Esense trials, including a 1-year treatment duration and different primary outcomes at initial registration (Table 3). Attrition

in Sense was again high, at approximately 35% in both arms. There were no effects on efficacy outcomes at 6 months; however, effects were reported at 12 months [38]. As for Esense 2 above, a *post-hoc* subgroup analysis was conducted which excluded participants who reduced their drinking during the assessment period prior to randomization. This analysis reported effects on both drinking outcomes after both 6 and 12 months [38]. There were no differences in serious adverse events between nalmefene and placebo groups, although the most common treatment-emergent adverse events such as nausea, insomnia, dizziness, vomiting, fatigue and decreased appetite were approximately twice as common in the nalmefene group, similar to the Esense trials.

WEAKNESSES IN THE EVIDENCE BASE

Trial outcome measures were not pre-specified fully at the outset

Clinical trial protocols should be registered publicly [41,42], with all outcome measures and associated time-frames specified fully to prevent selective reporting of favourable outcomes and unacknowledged changes to pre-specified measures [43,44]. The Lundbeck trials were registered at www.clinicaltrials.gov [26–28] and www.clinicaltrialsregister.eu [29–31] prior to commencement. Amendments to the registered protocols on www.clinicaltrials.gov show that the efficacy outcomes reported (as above) for the Sense trial [28] were added as primary outcomes only after trial completion (Table 3). Registered primary outcome measures for the Esense trials were also

Table 3 Amendments to primary outcome measures [26–28].

<i>Trial</i>	<i>Original primary outcomes</i>	<i>Amendment details</i>
SENSE (NCT00811941) completed November 2010	18 December 2008: 'Measure: Safety is measured by adverse events, clinical safety laboratory tests, vital signs, weight, body mass index, electrocardiograms, profile of moods states and physical examination Time-frame: 52 w Safety issue? Yes'	Amended 9 August 2011 to: 'Measure: to evaluate the long-term safety and tolerability of as needed use of 20 mg nalmefene versus placebo using parameters such as adverse events, clinical safety laboratory tests and vital signs Time-frame: baseline to 52 w Safety issue? Yes Measure: to evaluate the effect of as needed use of 20 mg nalmefene on alcohol consumption by the monthly number of heavy drinking days (HDD) Time-frame: baseline to 24 w Safety issue? No Measure: to evaluate the effect of as-needed use of 20 mg nalmefene on the monthly total consumption Time-frame: baseline to 24 w Safety issue? No' Amended 6 August 2013 to: 'Measure: number of patients with adverse events (AEs) Time-frame: serious adverse events: 52 w and a safety follow-up (visit/telephone call) scheduled for 4 w after completion of the study or after withdrawal from the study. Other adverse events: 52 w Safety issue? Yes Description: overview of AEs Measure: percentage of patients who withdrew due to intolerance to treatment Time-frame: baseline to w 52 Safety issue? Yes Measure: change from baseline in the monthly number of HDD Time-frame: baseline and month 6 Safety issue? No Description: number of HDD over a month (28 days), where one HDD was defined as a day with alcohol consumption ≥ 60 g for men and ≥ 40 g for women. Measure: change from baseline in the monthly total alcohol consumption (TAC) Time-frame: baseline and month 6 Safety issue? No Description: TAC was defined as mean daily alcohol consumption in g/day over a month (28 days)
ESENSE 1 (NCT00811720) completed November 2010	Esense 1: 18 December 2008 Esense 2: 21 December 2008	Esense 1 and 2 amended 8 July 2013 to: 'Measure: change from baseline in the monthly number of HDD Time-frame: baseline and month 6 Safety issue? No Description: number of HDD over a month (28 days), where one HDD was defined as a day with alcohol consumption ≥ 60 g for men and ≥ 40 g for women. Measure: change from baseline in the monthly total alcohol consumption (TAC) Time-frame: baseline and month 6 Safety issue? No Description: TAC was defined as mean daily alcohol consumption in g/day over a month (28 days)
ESENSE 2 (NCT00812461) completed April 2011	Measure: change from baseline in the monthly number of heavy drinking days; change from baseline in the total alcohol consumption Time-frame: 24 w Safety issue? No'	

altered after the papers were accepted formally for publication, when definitions of 'heavy drinking days' and 'total alcohol consumption' were added (Table 3). The European Union (EU) register does not show trial amendment histories.

Licensing was based on *post-hoc* sample refinement

The licensing of nalmefene and its indication for a very specific population (Box 1) are based on efficacy data from the unplanned subgroup analyses described above, thus departing from the intention-to-treat principle [45]. Subgroup analyses normally involve pre-specifying levels of a baseline variable under investigation and testing for an interaction between the treatment and those levels, usually with a stricter level of significance [46]. What was conducted in the nalmefene trials could be described more accurately as *post-hoc* sample refinement. The information provided concerning the assessment procedures and the resulting data is not possible to evaluate in the published reports. The deleterious effects of sample refinement at study entry are well established in this field, and more broadly [47]. *Post-hoc* sample refinement should not be regarded as anything other than hypothesis-generating.

Sensitivity analyses do not provide consistent support for any effect

The NICE Evidence Review Group (ERG) noted the 'high dropout rates in the three nalmefene studies' ([24], p. 66). All randomised participants should be included in fully pre-specified [48] sensitivity analyses, even if lost to follow-up [49]. Such analyses were not identified in the publicly registered data [26–31]. A range of sensitivity analyses was performed none the less, of which multiple imputation (MI) is considered the least biased [50]. MI was performed in each Esense study for the two primary outcomes in both the total and subgroup populations; only one of four tests in each indicates a treatment effect (at $P < 0.05$) for nalmefene, and no others come close to statistical significance [23, 35–37]. The systematic review by Palpaceur and colleagues [21] used baseline observation carried forward and found no evidence of benefit in sensitivity analyses. Six members of the EMA committee considering nalmefene signed a 'Divergent Position' statement, highlighting concerns about efficacy in light of the sensitivity analyses and the small effect size ([25], p. 73).

Appropriate comparisons, external validity and cost-effectiveness issues

The Declaration of Helsinki states that new interventions must be tested against the best current proven intervention, and cautions against abuse of placebo-controlled studies [51]. In individuals with mild dependence who

have not responded to psychological intervention or who request pharmacotherapy, naltrexone (a generic drug), in conjunction with psychological treatment, is recommended by NICE for reducing drinking [52], potentially making this a reasonable comparator. Although placebo comparisons have scientific merits, and indeed are required by the US Food and Drug Administration in these types of studies, non-inferiority designs may also be appropriate, depending on the precise hypotheses being tested and the validity of the comparisons being made. Placebo run-in periods do not influence the effects of naltrexone [53], and placebo effect sizes in alcohol treatment trials have been growing over time for reasons which are not understood [54]. This appears to be an important target for study, and the construct of research participation effects [55, 56] may be useful in future.

Investigators on the Lundbeck trials refer to the 'different biochemical profile' of nalmefene and naltrexone [57]; however, differences in *in-vitro* receptor actions cannot be assumed to be clinically important [58]. Although naltrexone is associated with a risk of hepatotoxicity at very high doses (>300 mg/day), it is considered 'very unlikely' with doses of 25–50 mg per day ([52], p. 417); the risk is so low that routine liver function test monitoring is not recommended [52]. Thus, the clinical significance of any difference between the two drugs is unclear. The Institute for Quality and Efficiency in Healthcare (the German equivalent of NICE) concluded that any added benefit of nalmefene over naltrexone is unproven [59]. The lack of comparative effectiveness data prevented the NICE ERG from commenting on the relative cost-effectiveness of nalmefene and naltrexone [24]. Even if naltrexone plus psychosocial support is not widely used, as the NICE appraisal committee was informed ([15], p. 27), naltrexone is a very similar, much cheaper drug. There is also good evidence for acamprosate [60, 61] and accumulating evidence for topiramate, both also generic drugs [62].

No data are available on the adequacy of the psychosocial intervention 'BRENDA' [40] used in both arms in the Lundbeck trials. NICE guidelines [52] recommend more intensive psychosocial support over 12 weekly sessions (of cognitive-behavioural therapy, for example) in harmful drinking and mild dependence before pharmacotherapy is considered. A more intensive psychosocial intervention than BRENDA would also therefore seem an appropriate comparator, and there is a range of possible uses and combinations of medication and psychosocial interventions that could merit evaluation within more patient-centred approaches to care [63]. The NICE ERG reported that 'it believes it probable that delayed [nalmefene] treatment reserved for those who do not respond' to this optimal support 'is more cost-effective than immediate treatment for all patients' ([24], p. 118). The one published clinical trial which used a more strongly evidence-based psychosocial

intervention (motivational enhancement therapy) found no added benefit of nalmefene [33].

DILEMMAS FOR PRACTICE AND SERVICE COMMISSIONING

Nalmefene has not been tested in free-to-access primary care (in one of the early trials in Finland some participants attended private general practices after responding to advertisements [34]), so generalizability to UK primary care, and similar routine practice contexts, is unknown. The NICE technology appraisal committee did not recommend a setting for prescribing nalmefene, as such recommendations are 'outside the scope of a technology appraisal' ([15], p. 24). In the cost-effectiveness model provided by Lundbeck, 75% of prescribing is assumed to take place in primary care ([23], p. 218), and it has been promoted heavily there [64,65]. In both arms of the Lundbeck trials, the 'BRENDA' psychosocial support consisted of an initial 30–40m session followed by fortnightly and later monthly 15–30m sessions ([25], pp. 29–31), there have been long-standing implementation problems in primary care with much briefer interventions [66,67]. The specific subgroup for whom nalmefene is licensed may not be easy for clinicians to identify correctly (Box 1), and it is unclear how psychosocial support will be provided and resourced in practice. These issues also give rise to dilemmas for commissioners of services.

Proponents of nalmefene argue that it should be used widely and proactively for public health benefit [68]; however, uncertainties about efficacy, effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of nalmefene inhibit appraisal of the possibility of such benefits. As with naltrexone [69], the evidence suggests that any reduction in consumption may not persist much beyond the period when nalmefene is taken [34].

The low level of confidence possible in existing data poses dilemmas for policy and practice which are not easy to resolve. Those who look to the peer-reviewed literature may be impressed by the variety of publications favourable to nalmefene. However, many such pieces are authored or co-authored by those involved in the Lundbeck trials, in receipt of Lundbeck funding or who are company employees [68,70–82]. Others interested in the drug may access Lundbeck literature, such as the Selincro® website for health professionals, which emphasises absolute rather than relative reductions in consumption among those receiving nalmefene [83].

IS THE REGULATORY SYSTEM STRONG ENOUGH TO HANDLE WEAK EVIDENCE?

Important weaknesses in nalmefene trial registration, design, analysis and reporting hamper efforts to understand if and how it can contribute to treating alcohol problems in general practice or elsewhere. The efficacy of

nalmefene appears uncertain; a judgement of possible limited efficacy in an unusually defined and highly specific *post-hoc* subgroup should not provide the basis for licensing or recommending a drug.

The EMA has been subject to criticism about its handling of conflicts of interests regarding the pharmaceutical industry [84] and inconsistencies in its approach to the issue of active controls in trials [85]. In a UK Parliamentary Health Committee enquiry into the influence of the pharmaceutical industry, NICE acknowledged that its relationship with industry 'is one in which some degree of conflict is inevitable' ([5], p. 90) and concerns exist regarding industry influence in health technology assessment more widely [2,86]. There is ample guidance to ensure that clinical trial findings are reliable, but that does not prevent such guidance being ignored. The unusual nature of the evidence base available for nalmefene, and the regulatory handling of the uncertainties therein, raise difficult questions about the regulatory systems involved and the consequences arising for health-care resource use and patient care.

IMPLICATIONS FOR ADDICTION SCIENCE

The evidence presented on nalmefene should be understood in the wider context of alcohol treatment trials [10,12]. This suggests that the existing modest effect sizes for nalmefene [21] may reduce with further study, as has been observed for other drugs [53,87]. Independently conducted research is needed on medications for alcohol treatment, including cost-effectiveness studies and further trials in the settings in which such treatments are used or promoted. Further development of the evidence on psychosocial approaches may be even more important.

Study of funding effects has not been well developed in the addiction field [88], despite the long-standing wider recognition of the need for such study [89]. Such study should be informed appropriately by existing evidence, taking care not to make unwarranted assumptions. This investigation makes clear the need to study the involvement of the pharmaceutical industry in alcohol treatment trials and the resulting implications for the literature. Pharmaceutical companies, including Lundbeck, are involved in the Alcohol Clinical Trials Initiative, which aims to improve the evidence base [10]. Effective management of vested interests may be needed to achieve that aim, and it is important to study the extent to which this is achieved. Alcohol problems are complex, and require evidence unbiased by vested interests.

Declaration of interests

The authors declare no support from any organization for the submitted work, no financial relationships with any

organizations that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous 3 years and no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work.

Ethics statement

Ethical approval was not required for this paper.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge the helpful input on earlier drafts made by the anonymous peer reviewers and colleagues including, but not limited to: Srinivasa Vittal Katikireddi, James Nicholls, Colin Angus, James Morris and Peter Rice. N.F. and K.A. are employed by the Institute for Social Marketing, which is part of the UK Centre for Tobacco and Alcohol Studies (www.ukctas.ac.uk). Funding for UKCTAS from the British Heart Foundation, Cancer Research UK, the Economic and Social Research Council, the Medical Research Council and the National Institute of Health Research, under the auspices of the UK Clinical Research Collaboration, is gratefully acknowledged.

References

- Ioannidis J. P. A. Clinical trials: what a waste. *BMJ* 2014; **349**: g7089.
- Goldacre B. *Bad Pharma*. London: Fourth Estate; 2013.
- Ross J. S., Gross C. P., Krumholz H. M. Promoting transparency in pharmaceutical industry-sponsored research. *Am J Public Health* 2012; **102**: 72–80.
- Bonini S., Eichler H.-G., Wathion N., Rasi G. Transparency and the European Medicines Agency—sharing of clinical trial data. *N Engl J Med* 2014; **371**: 2450–2.
- House of Commons Health Committee The Influence of the Pharmaceutical Industry. London: The Stationary Office; 2005.
- Vedula S. S., Li T., Dickersin K. Differences in reporting of analyses in internal company documents versus published trial reports: comparisons in industry-sponsored trials in off-label uses of gabapentin. *PLoS Med* 2013; **10**: e1001378.
- Barbour V., Clark J., Connell L., Ross A., Simpson P., Veitch E., *et al.* Getting more generous with the truth: clinical trial reporting in 2013 and beyond. *PLoS Med* 2013; **10**: e1001379.
- Moynihan R., Doust J., Henry D. Preventing overdiagnosis: how to stop harming the healthy. *BMJ* 2012; **344**: e3502.
- Jonas D. E., Amick H. R., Feltner C., Bobashev G., Thomas K., Wines R., *et al.* Pharmacotherapy for adults with alcohol use disorders in outpatient settings: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA* 2014; **311**: 1889–900.
- Witkiewitz K., Finney J. W., Harris A. H. S., Kivlahan D. R., Kranzler H. R. Recommendations for the design and analysis of treatment trials for alcohol use disorders. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res* 2015; **39**: 1557–70.
- Ladd B. O., McCrady B. S., Manuel J. K., Campbell W. Improving the quality of reporting alcohol outcome studies: effects of the CONSORT statement. *Addict Behav* 2010; **35**: 660–6.
- Witkiewitz K., Finney J. W., Harris A. H. S., Kivlahan D. R., Kranzler H. R. Guidelines for the reporting of treatment trials for alcohol use disorders. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res* 2015; **39**: 1571–81.
- Krystal J. H., Cramer J. A., Krol W. E., Kirk G. E., Rosenheck R. A. Naltrexone in the treatment of alcohol dependence. *N Engl J Med* 2001; **345**: 1734–9.
- European Medicines Agency (EMA) Selincro: Summary of Product Characteristics (Annex 1). London: EMA; 2013.
- National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) Nalmefene for reducing alcohol consumption in people with alcohol dependence. Technology Appraisal 325. London: NICE; 2014.
- Press Association. Pill that helps reduce desire to drink alcohol available on prescription. *The Guardian*. 2014 Nov 26.
- Smith R. New drug for 'mild alcoholics' drinking two glasses of wine a night. *The Telegraph*. 2014 Oct 2; 1–4.
- Spence D. Bad medicine: nalmefene in alcohol misuse. *BMJ* 2014; **348**: g1531.
- Nalmefene for alcohol dependence. *Drug Ther Bull* 2014; **52**: 54–7.
- Stevenson M., Pandor A., Stevens J. W., Rawdin A., Rice P., Thompson J., *et al.* Nalmefene for reducing alcohol consumption in people with alcohol dependence: an evidence review group perspective of a NICE single technology appraisal. *Pharmacoeconomics* 2015; **33**: 833–47.
- Palpacuer C., Laviolle B., Boussageon R., Reymann J. M., Bellissant E., Naudet F. Risks and benefits of nalmefene in the treatment of adult alcohol dependence: a systematic literature review and meta-analysis of published and unpublished double-blind randomized controlled trials. *PLoS Med* 2015; **12**: e1001924.
- Lundbeck Limited. Nalmefene for the reduction of alcohol consumption in people with alcohol dependence (ID660): manufacturer's response to clarification letter dated 21 March 2014. Milton Keynes: Lundbeck Limited; 2014, pp 1–104.
- Limited L. Single technology appraisal (STA). In: Nalmefene for the reduction of alcohol consumption in people with alcohol: manufacturer submission of evidence by Lundbeck Limited. Lundbeck Limited: Milton Keynes; 2014.
- Stevenson M., Pandor A., Stevens J., Rawdin A., Wong R., Morgan M. *et al.* Nalmefene for reducing alcohol consumption for people with alcohol dependence: a Single Technology Appraisal: Evidence Review Group Report. Sheffield: School of Health and Related Research (SchARR); 2014.
- European Medicines Agency (EMA) Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use. Assessment report: Selincro. London: EMA; 2012.
- ClinicalTrials.gov (Bethesda MNL of M. Efficacy of Nalmefene in Patients With Alcohol Dependence (ESENSE1). National Library of Medicine. 2008. Available at: <https://clinicaltrials.gov/show/NCT00811720> (accessed 13 December 2014).
- ClinicalTrials.gov (Bethesda MNL of M. Efficacy of Nalmefene in Patients With Alcohol Dependence (ESENSE2). National Library of Medicine. 2008. Available at: <https://clinicaltrials.gov/show/NCT00812461> (accessed 13 December 2014).
- ClinicalTrials.gov (Bethesda MNL of M. Safety and Efficacy of Nalmefene in Patients With Alcohol Dependence (SENSE). National Library of Medicine. 2008. Available at: <https://clinicaltrials.gov/show/NCT00811941> (accessed 13 December 2014).
- EU Clinical Trials Register. Nalmefene Efficacy Study I: Randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, parallel-

- group, efficacy study of 20 mg nalmefene, as needed use, in patients with alcohol dependence. 2008. Available at: <https://www.clinicaltrialsregister.eu/ctr-search/trial/2007-002334-11/DE> (accessed 13 December 2014).
30. EU Clinical Trials Register. Nalmefene Efficacy Study II: Randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, parallel-group, efficacy study of 20 mg nalmefene, as needed use, in patients with alcohol dependence. 2008. Available at: <https://www.clinicaltrialsregister.eu/ctr-search/trial/2007-002563-27/PT> (accessed 13 December 2014).
 31. EU Clinical Trials Register. A 52-w, randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, parallel-group, safety, tolerability and efficacy study of nalmefene, as needed use, in patients with alcohol dependence. 2008. Available at: <https://www.clinicaltrialsregister.eu/ctr-search/trial/2007-002315-92/GB> (accessed 13 December 2014).
 32. Mason B. J., Salvato F. R., Williams L. D., Ritvo E. C., Cutler R. B. A double-blind, placebo-controlled study of oral nalmefene for alcohol dependence. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 1999; **56**: 719.
 33. Anton R. F., Pettinati H., Zweben A., Kranzler H. R., Johnson B., Bohn M. J., et al. A multi-site dose ranging study of nalmefene in the treatment of alcohol dependence. *J Clin Psychopharmacol* 2004; **24**: 421–8.
 34. Karhuvaara S., Simojoki K., Virta A., Rosberg M., Löyttyneimi E., Nurminen T., et al. Targeted nalmefene with simple medical management in the treatment of heavy drinkers: a randomized double-blind placebo-controlled multicenter study. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res* 2007; **31**: 1179–87.
 35. Mann K., Bladström A., Torup L., Gual A., van den Brink W., Bladstroem A. Extending the treatment options in alcohol dependence: a randomized controlled study of as-needed nalmefene. *Biol Psychiatry* 2013; **73**: 706–13.
 36. van den Brink W., Aubin H.-J.-J., Bladström A., Torup L., Gual A., Mann K., et al. Efficacy of as-needed nalmefene in alcohol-dependent patients with at least a high drinking risk level: results from a subgroup analysis of two randomized controlled 6-month studies. *Alcohol Alcohol* 2013; **48**: 570–8.
 37. Gual A., He Y., Torup L., van den Brink W., Mann K., Esense 2 Study Group A randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, efficacy study of nalmefene, as-needed use, in patients with alcohol dependence. *Eur Neuropsychopharmacol* 2013; **23**: 1432–42.
 38. van den Brink W., Sørensen P., Torup L., Mann K., Gual A., Sorensen P., et al. Long-term efficacy, tolerability and safety of nalmefene as-needed in patients with alcohol dependence: a 1-year, randomised controlled study. *J Psychopharmacol* 2014; **28**: 733–44.
 39. Mason B. J., Ritvo E. C., Morgan R. O., Salvato F. R., Goldberg G., Welch B., et al. A double-blind, placebo-controlled pilot study to evaluate the efficacy and safety of oral nalmefene HCl for alcohol dependence. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res* 1994; **18**: 1162–7.
 40. Starosta A. N., Lee R. E., Volpicelli J. R. The BRENDA model: integrating psychosocial treatment and pharmacotherapy for the treatment of alcohol use disorders. *J Psychiatr Pract* 2006; **12**: 80–9.
 41. Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials (CONSORT). The (CONSORT) Group checklist: item 6 study outcomes. Available at: <http://www.consort-statement.org/checklists/view/32-consort/80-outcomes> (accessed 13 December 2014).
 42. International Clinical Trials Registry Platform. WHO Trial Registration Dataset (version 1.2.1). World Health Organization. Available at: <http://www.who.int/ictrp/network/trds/en/> (accessed 13 December 2014).
 43. Dwan K., Altman D. G., Arnaiz J. A., Bloom J., Chan A.-W., Cronin E., et al. Systematic review of the empirical evidence of study publication bias and outcome reporting bias. *PLoS One* 2008; **3**: e3081.
 44. Mathieu S., Boutron I., Moher D., Altman D. G., Ravaud P. Comparison of registered and published primary outcomes in randomized controlled trials. *JAMA* 2009; **302**: 977–84.
 45. International Conference on Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Registration of Pharmaceuticals for Human Use. ICH Harmonised Tripartite Guideline: Statistical Principles for Clinical Trials, E9 Current Step 4 version. 1998 (5 February 1998). Available at http://www.ich.org/fileadmin/Public_Web_Site/ICH_Products/Guidelines/Efficacy/E9/Step4/E9_Guideline.pdf (accessed 10 May 2016).
 46. Wang R., Lagakos S. W., Ware J. H., Hunter D. J., Drazen J. M. Statistics in Medicine—Reporting of Subgroup Analyses in Clinical Trials. *N Engl J Med* 2007; **357**: 2189–94.
 47. Humphreys K., Weisner C. Use of exclusion criteria in selecting research subjects and its effect on the generalizability of alcohol treatment outcome studies. *Am J Psychiatry* 2000; **157**: 588–94.
 48. Chan A., Tetzlaff J. M., Altman D. G., Laupacis A., Gotzsche P. C., Krezla-Jeric K., et al. SPIRIT 2013 Statement: Defining Standard Protocol Items for Clinical Trials. *Ann Intern Med* 2013; **158**: 200–7.
 49. White I. R., Horton N. J., Carpenter J., Pocock S. J. Strategy for intention to treat analysis in randomised trials with missing outcome data. *BMJ* 2011; **342**: d40.
 50. Donders A. R. T., Van der Heijden G. J. M. G., Stijnen T., Moons K. G. M. Review: a gentle introduction to imputation of missing values. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2006; **59**: 1087–91.
 51. World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki: Ethical Principles for Medical Research Involving Human Subjects. *JAMA* 2013; **310**: 2191–4.
 52. National Collaborating Centre for Mental Health Alcohol-Use Disorders: The NICE Guideline on Diagnosis, Assessment and Management of Harmful Drinking and Alcohol Dependence CG115. London: NICE; 2011.
 53. Del Re A. C., Maisel N., Blodgett J., Finney J. The declining efficacy of naltrexone pharmacotherapy for alcohol use disorders over time: a multivariate meta-analysis. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res* 2013; **37**: 1064–8.
 54. Del Re A. C., Maisel N., Blodgett J. C., Willbourne P., Finney J. W. Placebo group improvement in trials of pharmacotherapies for alcohol use disorders: a multivariate meta-analysis examining change over time. *J Clin Psychopharmacol* 2013; **33**: 649–57.
 55. McCambridge J., Kypri K., Elbourne D. Research participation effects: a skeleton in the methodological cupboard. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2014; **67**: 845–9.
 56. McCambridge J., Kypri K., Elbourne D. In randomization we trust? There are overlooked problems in experimenting with people in behavioral intervention trials. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2014; **67**: 247–53.
 57. den van Brink W., Mann K., Gual A., van den Aubin H.-J. Brink and colleagues reply to Spence and Brailion. *BMJ* 2014; **348**: 26.
 58. Swift R. M. Naltrexone and nalmefene: any meaningful difference? *Biol Psychiatry* 2013; **73**: 700–1.
 59. Institute for Quality and Efficiency in Health Care (IQWiG). Nalmefene for alcohol dependence: added benefit not proven. Press release 1.12.14. 2014. Available at: <https://www.iqwig.de/en/press/press-releases/press-releases/nalmefene-for-alcohol-dependence-added-benefit-not-proven.6458.html> (accessed 10 May 2016).

60. Jonas D. E., Amick H. R., Feltner C., Bobashev G., Thomas K., Wines R., *et al.* Pharmacotherapy for adults with alcohol use disorders in outpatient settings. *JAMA* 2014; **311**: 1889.
61. Donoghue K., Elzerbi C., Saunders R., Whittington C., Pilling S., Drummond C. The efficacy of acamprosate and naltrexone in the treatment of alcohol dependence, Europe versus the rest of the world: a meta-analysis. *Addiction* 2015; **110**: 920–30.
62. Blodgett J. C., Del Re A. C., Maisel N. C., Finney J. W. A meta-analysis of topiramate's effects for individuals with alcohol use disorders. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res* 2014; **38**: 1481–8.
63. Bradley K. A., Kivlahan D. R. Bringing patient-centered care to patients with alcohol use disorders. *JAMA* 2014; **311**: 1861.
64. Lundbeck Limited. Sponsor's information: what is alcohol dependence costing your practice? Pulse Daily Email Alert 14 October 2014. Milton Keynes: Lundbeck Limited; 2014.
65. Lundbeck Limited. 2014. Available at: <https://www.alcoholreduction.co.uk> (accessed 8 January 2015).
66. Van Beurden I., Anderson P., Akkermans R. P., Grol R. P. T. M., Wensing M., Laurant M. G. H. Involvement of general practitioners in managing alcohol problems: a randomized controlled trial of a tailored improvement programme. *Addiction* 2012; **107**: 1601–11.
67. Johnson M., Jackson R., Guillaume L., Meier P., Goyder E. Barriers and facilitators to implementing screening and brief intervention for alcohol misuse: a systematic review of qualitative evidence. *J Public Health (Bangkok)* 2010; **33**: 412–21.
68. Laramée P., Brodtkorb T.-H., Rahhali N., Knight C., Barbosa C., François C., *et al.* The cost-effectiveness and public health benefit of nalmefene added to psychosocial support for the reduction of alcohol consumption in alcohol-dependent patients with high/very high drinking risk levels: a Markov model. *BMJ Open* 2014; **4**: e005376.
69. O'Malley S. S., Jaffe A. J., Chang G., Rode S., Schottenfeld R., Meyer R. E., *et al.* Six-month follow-up of naltrexone and psychotherapy for alcohol dependence. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 1996; **53**: 217–24.
70. François C., Laramée P., Rahhali N., Chalem Y., Aballéa S., Millier A., *et al.* A predictive microsimulation model to estimate the clinical relevance of reducing alcohol consumption in alcohol dependence. *Eur Addict Res* 2014; **20**: 269–84.
71. Gual A., Bruguera P., Lopez-Pelayo H. Nalmefene and its use in alcohol dependence. *Drugs Today (Barcelona)* 2014; **50**: 347–55.
72. Anderson P., Wojnar M., Jakubczyk A., Gual A., Segura L., Sovinova H., *et al.* Managing alcohol problems in general practice in Europe: results from the European ODHIN Survey of General Practitioners. *Alcohol Alcohol* 2014; **49**: 531–9.
73. Aubin H.-J., Daeppen J.-B. Emerging pharmacotherapies for alcohol dependence: a systematic review focusing on reduction in consumption. *Drug Alcohol Depend* 2013; **133**: 15–29.
74. Soyka M., Rosner S. Nalmefene for treatment of alcohol dependence. *Exp Opin Invest Drugs* 2010; **19**: 1451–9.
75. Soyka M. Nalmefene: a novel pharmacotherapeutic option for alcoholism. *Nervenarzt* 2014; **85**: 578–82.
76. Soyka M. Nalmefene for the treatment of alcohol dependence: a current update. *Int J Neuropsychopharmacol* 2014; **17**: 675–84.
77. Mann K. Pharmacotherapy of alcohol dependence: a review of the clinical data. *CNS Drugs* 2004; **18**: 485–504.
78. Kiefer F., Mann K. New achievements and pharmacotherapeutic approaches in the treatment of alcohol dependence. *Eur J Pharmacol* 2005; **526**: 163–71.
79. van Amsterdam J., van den Brink W. Reduced-risk drinking as a viable treatment goal in problematic alcohol use and alcohol dependence. *J Psychopharmacol* 2013; **27**: 987–97.
80. Bujarski S., O'Malley S. S., Lunny K., Ray L. A. The effects of drinking goal on treatment outcome for alcoholism. *J Consult Clin Psychol* 2013; **81**: 13.
81. Luquiens A., Aubin H.-J. Patient preferences and perspectives regarding reducing alcohol consumption: role of nalmefene. *Patient Prefer Adherence* 2014; **8**: 1347–52.
82. Day E., Copello A., Hull M. Assessment and management of alcohol use disorders. *BMJ* 2015; **350**: h715–h715.
83. Lundbeck Limited. What is Selincro?. Available at: <https://www.selincro.com/global/about-selincro> (accessed 16 December 2014).
84. Dalli J., Wesselius E., Goyens M., Kosioska M., Alves T. L., Schaaber J. Letter to John Dalli, European Commissioner for Health. Brussels: on behalf of the Alliance for Lobby Transparency and Ethics Regulation (ALTER-EU), the European Consumers' Organisation (BEUC), the European Public Health Alliance (EPHA), Health Action International Europe (HAI) and the International Society of Drug Bulletin; 2011.
85. Barbui C., Bighelli I. A new approach to psychiatric drug approval in Europe. *PLoS Med* 2013; **10**: e1001530.
86. Limb M. Industry has too much influence in health technology body meetings, scientists say. *BMJ* 2014; **349**: g5850.
87. Finney J. W. Regression to the mean in substance use disorder treatment research. *Addiction* 2008; **103**: 42–52.
88. McCambridge J., Hartwell G. Has industry funding biased studies of the protective effects of alcohol on cardiovascular disease? A preliminary investigation of prospective cohort studies. *Drug Alcohol Rev* 2014; **44**: 15–7.
89. Smith R. Medical journals are an extension of the marketing arm of pharmaceutical companies. *PLoS Med* 2005; **2**: e138.