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Seth Eckhouse began his career in archaeology working in the USA and the Middle East before pursuing a different career path. Shifting into the field of pre-hospital medicine he spent seven years as a paramedic in the civilian world, as well as four years serving with the United States Marine Corps. He is a graduate of Boston University's School of Public health (USA), where he received his Master of Public Health degree. He has been the Chief Project Officer of the ECRM for the past three years, where he was responsible for setting up and running the Secretariat and the cancer research funding surveys, and currently serves as the Director.

Grant Lewison was trained as an engineer and worked on ship research for nearly 20 years before switching to science policy at the UK Department of Trade and Industry. Following a secondment to the European Commission, where he began his studies in bibliometrics, he worked for a small consultancy company on research evaluation, and in 1993 moved to The Wellcome Trust in London. He designed and operated the Research Outputs Database of nearly half a million UK biomedical papers, all of which were looked up in libraries to determine their financial acknowledgements, on behalf of the Trust and a "club" of about 30 other funders of medical research.

In 2001 he moved to City University as Visiting Professor in the Information Science Department, where he led a bibliometrics research group, carrying out research and doing consultancy work for a wide range of clients. He left City at the end of 2005 and set up a consultancy company with Dr Philip Roe, Evaluametrics Ltd, to conduct the "evaluation of research through publication metrics".
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t is my great pleasure to present the second cancer research funding survey by the European Cancer Research Managers Forum (ECRM). Since the first survey in 2005 we have been working with Forum members to enhance the quality of the funding data and widen the scope of the project. The aims of the ECRM remain as they always have been; to provide independent intelligence to enable evidence-based policy making in cancer research with the aim, ultimately, of bringing the control and cure of all cancers a step closer for patients. The job at hand of making this a reality should not be underestimated. As Robert Weinberg succinctly put in One Renegade Cell, "cancer wreaks havoc in almost every part of the human body". Cancer is a hugely complex disease that requires a globally co-operative approach.

When the Structure of Scientific Revolutions was published in 1962 Thomas Kuhn's masterpiece was hailed by proponents as providing (among other things) an explanation for the persistent tendency of scientists to talk past each other as they operated from different paradigms. Likewise the globalisation of cancer research has spawned multiple policy paradigms across the public and commercial sectors despite the need for a common framework. Promoting a global cancer research oligopoly (competition and co-
operation) requires evidence-based policy making and a holistic vision of cancer research. The Forum hopes that the information and commentary that this second report contains will further these aims. The data presented in this survey identify much to celebrate, some issues to decry but overwhelmingly it calls for a much stronger co-operative global framework for funding cancer research.

I am as ever hugely indebted to the many Forum members who have contributed data over the last two years, and to my two co-authors Seth Eckhouse and Grant Lewison who have worked tirelessly on this project. I am also grateful to many colleagues who have taken time to review and comment on the various iterations of this report, particularly Professors John Toy (UK), Kenneth Nilsson (Sweden) and Volker Diehl (Germany) as well as Mr Nathan Gray (USA). The strengths of this report reflect the diligence of my co-authors and Forum members, any deficiencies or errors are entirely my responsibility.

Prof Richard Sullivan MD PhD
Chairman, ECRM
(Director, Clinical Programmes
\& Centres, Cancer Research UK) Executive Summary

- Non-commercial (public) funding organisations in EUROPE spent $€ 1,971$ million on the direct funding of cancer research in 2004, compared to $€ 5,158$ million by the USA. In EUROPE* this represents a $38 \%$ increase since the last survey whereas funding in the USA has remained relatively static. In addition, EUROPE has €1,364 million flowing through national healthcare systems and universities to support cancer research compared to $€ 109$ million in the USA.
- The public spend in EUROPE is evenly balanced between charitable and governmental organisations with $47 \%$ and $53 \%$ of spend, respectively. The majority of spend ( $80 \%$ ) from charitable organisations is concentrated in 14 organisations compared to 29 governmental funders. However, many countries ( $n=9$ ) still do not have a balance of governmental and charitable funding with one source or the other dominating. In comparison, governmental organisations were the dominant source of cancer research funding in the USA with $96 \%$ of all funds from just 10 federal funders.
- Direct cancer research investment by funding organisations as a \% of GDP and per capita remained higher in the USA compared to EUROPE, three and five times respectively. However, adding in the indirect funding this gap narrows (0.03\% GDP EUROPE compared to $0.06 \%$ USA and $€ 5.79$ per capita EUROPE compared to $€ 17.98$ by USA). In comparison Canada, Japan and Australia spent an estimated as $€ 8.66$, $€ 7.86$ and $€ 8.05$ per capita on cancer research.
- Global public sector cancer research funding (including indirect sources) has been estimated at $€ 14,030$ million for 2004. EUROPE spent $€ 1,155$ per incident case and $€ 1,949$ per cancer death compared to $€ 3,857$ per incident case and $€ 9,361$ per cancer death in the USA.
- We have estimated the 2004 direct spend by the top 18 pharmaceutical companies on cancer research as $€ 3,095$ million. This figure does not

[^0]include all industry (for instance biotechnology and SME).

- EUROPE and the USA are evenly matched for cancer research outputs (volume of cancer research publications) with $52 \%$ and $48 \%$ of the total output and 1.3 versus 1.4 papers per billion euro GDP. Four Member States produced over $6 \%$ of all cancer publications in this survey year.
- In both the USA and EUROPE publications in cancer research have become more clinical in the last 8 years. Over this same time period there has been a shift in 23 of the 31 countries in EUROPE towards more clinical research with some notable exceptions who producing more basic research outputs.
- As measured by volume of cancer research publications (outputs) the geographical origin of work funded by the pharmaceutical industry over the last 4 years has been dominated by EUROPE (46\% of the share) and the USA (40\%) compared to the rest of the world (13.6\%).
- With over 100 major funders in EUROPE and the USA ( $>$ €1M per annum spend), as well as a number of important representational bodies, substantial scope exists for a more co-operative approach to cancer research, particularly towards the funding of trans-national research activities and programmes.
- Over management and regulatory bureaucracy are serious threats to cancer research. Funding organisations and government policy makers must guard against these dangers and, where necessary, simplify and harmonize procedures.
- Contrary to popular beliefs, both the USA and EUROPE are significant contributors to cancer research in terms of investment, outputs and pharmaceutical activities. Therefore, the possibilities for partnerships not only exist, but are actively called for.
- Many Member States still need to increase their governmental investment in cancer research to more closely resemble the portfolios of other countries (as a percent of overall R \& D spend, even bearing in mind the relative sizes of their R \& D budgets).

Human lives are increasingly burdened by cancer. One in three will develop the disease within their lifetime, and one in four will die from it. The total number will increase with the ageing population. The World Health Organisation reported in 2002 that "The cancer burden is expected to increase by $50 \%$ in the next twenty years". The burden of cancer has wide reaching ramifications which extend beyond the personal and family to its impact on the healthcare systems and economies of countries.

In 2001, within the European Unions Sixth Framework Programme a start was made to address the organisation and co-ordination of

The Forum conducts the business of data collection and dissemination through the ECRM Secretariat. The Secretariat is now in its fourth year having already completed and published the first cancer research funding survey in 2005. The Secretariat is committed to informing the public and research community through its web-site, press releases, and Forum policy publications. All of the data collected are placed freely into the public domain.

The long-term objectives of the ECRM are also twofold: to promote better understanding and co-operation between the global funders of cancer research, and to ensure that cancer

## "By the year 2020, 10 million people will die each year from cancer" <br> - American Cancer Society

cancer research in the EU by creating the European Cancer Research Managers Forum (ECRM). This Forum, part of the European Research Area initiative, created a platform for dialogue and for policy research by bringing together cancer research managers from across the EU, with the aim of improving transparency around cancer research funding.

The ECRM's immediate goals were two-fold. One was to promote networking and co-operation between national funding bodies through policy research. The second was to provide high quality data for cancer research policy makers.
research is driven forward through the application of evidence-based policy.

## Identifying The Funders of Cancer Research in Europe

Building upon the contacts and knowledge base of the first cancer research funding survey (2003), this second year survey seeks to continue the work of mapping the funding mechanisms of cancer research, with the axium that there can be no research without funding. The ECRM Secretariat has spent the time since the publication of the first report verifying and adding to the established database, and all of these organisations were directly contacted and asked to share their 2004 direct spend ${ }^{\text {a }}$ on cancer research.

On $15^{\text {th }}$ September, 2005, the first round of contact letters was sent with a follow up letter to those organisations which had not responded on the $24^{\text {th }}$ of November. The websites of organisations were vigorously interrogated for financial information which was, in the absence of any reply, entered into the funding database. All information received was cross-checked and validate against other sources. Organisations which had still not responded were again sent a letter on the $7^{\text {th }}$ of February, 2006 with a final request for funding information.

If a funding organisation reported a spend between two amounts, the higher amount was always used. Annual direct cancer research spend does not include educational grants, non research staff salaries, physical infrastructures, spend on advocacy or service delivery. Any organization reporting spend in currencies other than Euro had the reported amount of spend converted using the web site www.xe.com, all currencies were converted within two days of receipt of the information.

On the $8^{\text {th }}$ of February, 2006, a final verification letter was sent to all organisations still in the database. This letter explained that the data collection phase of the survey was coming to an end and provided the direct spend figures in our database, along with their address and other contact information. They were informed that

[^1]they had two weeks from the posting of the letter to respond to the Secretariat with any changes in the data for their organization, or this information would be considered complete and accurate, and would be made publicly available. The information on the other organisations within that country was provided as a final verification step At the end of this two week period the funding database for the second ECRM survey was locked.

At the end of the data collection phase of the survey, 144 out of 153 identified European funding organisations had reported back to the Secretariat, giving a $96 \%$ response rate. Five organisations reported that they were unable to provide funding information due to accounting practices within their organisation.

## Funding from Trans-European Organisations

In the first survey, organisations which supported cancer research in Europe, but were not limited by Member State/national boundaries were identified. Originally, twenty organisations were included in this category due to broad criteria of inclusion. However, only one organisation, EORTC, supports direct cancer research; the reminder were primarily umbrella organisations. For this survey, the direct spend figures for EORTC were updated in exactly the same manner as the other organisations funding cancer research in Europe.

It should be noted that one other organisation in Europe directly supports cancer research The International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) ${ }^{\text {b }}$. However, due to their nature as a world-wide organisation, it was impossible to separate the European spend only.

## Identifying the Funders of Cancer Research in the USA

The methodological approach to identifying the funders of cancer research in the USA was based on the model of a previous report from 1999'. Using these identified organisations, with the addition of several new ones collected by the Secretariat, spend data was collected in a

[^2]variety of ways. Non-governmental organisations were contacted directly for their 2004 direct spend, and annual reports were also queried for this information. Where available, financial data on research expenditure from web sites were integrated into the total spend for that organisation; consideration was taken in deciding what expenditures met with the 'direct spend' criteria. Spend by individual States in the USA was taken directly from the previous survey of USA cancer research spend, and adjusted for inflationii.

Many government organisations, such as the Department of Defence and the National Cancer Institute, report their total cancer research expenditure in annual reports. For government agencies which did not report a direct spend in published documents, the RAND Corporation's RaDiUS ${ }^{\text {c }}$ (Research and Development in the United States) database was used. This database identifies (by agency) all the intramural and extramural projects or tasks in
determined, on a scale from clinical to basic, to show whether this was changing with time, and how European countries compared in this respect with the USA.

In the second phase, the leading cancer researchers world-wide were identified, together with their addresses and e-mail addresses. They were sent a short questionnaire asking about their cancer research budgets. From their responses, the mean cost per paper for each of them was determined, and thereby the total amount spent on public-domain cancer research world-wide and in selected countries by multiplication of their annual outputs by this mean cost, corrected to allow for varying health research costs in different countries. The contributions of the leading funding organizations were also determined from an examination of the funding acknowledgements on a large sample of 2003 cancer papers from different countries. This analysis also allows for the funding (usually

## "Every day 3185 Europeans die from cancer"

which the search criteria appear in the title or abstract.

At the end of data collection, amounts were converted from USD to Euro using the average exchange rate for $2004^{\text {iii. }}$

## Bibliometric Approach to Cancer Research Expenditure

This method of quantifying the cancer research spend of various organisations is based on a previously developed methodologyiv. The work was carried out in two phases. In the first of these, files of the bibliographic data on cancer research papers, 1994-2003, were compiled from the Science Citation Index (SCI) (© Thomson Scientific) on CD-ROM. These were then analyzed to show the outputs of the world and 35 countries, and compared with their health research outputs overall so as to reveal their relative commitment to cancer research. The research levels of the papers were

[^3]from governmental sources) of university and hospital papers without funding acknowledgements ${ }^{e}$. Account was also taken of the much higher expenditures of the pharmaceutical industry by fractionating their published R\&D spends in recent years by the percentage of their published papers within the sub-field of cancer research.

To calculate the bibliometric estimate of worldwide spend for 2004, the data was corrected by $+6 \%$ increased research spend per year, and an allowance of $+10 \%$ for missing papers (processed late by the SCl ). These corrections were arrived at by looking at the latest (corrected) global estimates of health R\&D spending published by the Global Forum for Health Research, as compared to the overall outputs of papers; achieving a $20 \%$ cost per paper rise over three years (assuming equal research success rates between research areas). These numbers are bourn out when viewed as cancer research's represented part in global expenditure on health R\&D using the

[^4]Manager Fortin
percentage increase above, or about $10.6 \%$ of total.

Lastly, as the bibliometric approach to worldwide cancer spend is subject to a margin of error of $\pm 5 \%$, the spend has been rounded to the nearest million Euro.

## Calculating cancer-related R\&D



Countries involved in the European aspect of the funding survey
(big pharma). [Some health research money comes from non-pharma companies, e.g., those involved with medical devices and instrumentation for diagnosis.] Since almost all big pharma companies are publicly listed, there is a requirement that they disclose their annual $R \& D$ expenditures in their annual reports, and data from these for the last five years have been compiled by the UK Department of Trade and Industry in their annual R\&D "Scoreboard" reports. For the pharmaceutical companies, over 160 are listed from 13 countries, but 32 of these are UK subsidiaries of foreign companies that have their own labs and research programmes. For the 129 Independent companies, their combined R\&D expenditure for 2001 was about $\$ 45$ billion: this is $88 \%$ of the estimated total commercial health research expenditure for that year given above. The remaining $12 \%$ will partly be accounted for by smaller pharma companies missing from the DTI list, and partly by non-pharma companies. We may reasonably assume that the pharma company total would have been about $\$ 48$ billion.

Of this total, the large majority ( $80 \%$ ) was spent by the 24

## expenditures of the pharmaceutical industry

Since it has been estimated by the Global Forum for Health Research ${ }^{\vee}$ that world-wide expenditure on health research was $\$ 106$ billion in 2001 and of this total $\$ 51$ billion was estimated to have come from industry, it is clear that a major fraction of all cancer-related research will also have come from companies, particularly the large pharmaceutical companies
largest companies whose combined R\&D expenditure was $\$ 38.7$ billion in 2001. All of these companies were represented among the addresses on cancer papers in the SCl files for the years 1999-2003. A search was also made in the SCl for all papers with an address from one or more of each of these companies in these same five years. The assumption was then made that the company's R\&D expenditure was devoted to cancer research in the proportion that its cancer papers bore to its total output of papers (both on integer counts).

For example, Pfizer had an annual average R\&D expenditure from 1999-2003 of $€ 3.58$ billion and published an average of 477 papers per year, of which 23.2 were on cancer ( $5.2 \%$ ). It was therefore estimated that its total cancer R\&D spend would have averaged at least €185 million over the period. Of this, a small amount would have gone on the work actually reported in SCI papers; much more would have been spent internally and in ways not leading to published outputs.

Each Pharma company was contacted via a letter sent to the publicly listed CEO or CFO of that organisation explaining both this report and the aims of the ECRM. The amount we calculated for their 2004 spend on cancer research was listed, and they were given the opportunity to respond to our figures; either accepting them, or providing us with a new figure, so long as there was a proper explanation to go with this number. Of all of the organisations contacted, one replied that our figure was acceptable to them and five responded that this was proprietary information, and therefore could not be shared. One organisation replied with a largely different figure from that which is in our report, but never followed up with any explanation of how they came to this amount. The remainder of the organisation failed to respond.

## Database and IT Management

The EU Cancer Forum website was produced by CombinedMedia from Dublin, Ireland using Macromedia DreamweaverMX to create the basic site structure in HTML pages. FireworksMX was used to create, edit and update images on the site and FlashMX elements were used as appropriate; e.g. Top Bar, for use on the spinning logo.

The site is physically hosted with INET7; based in the US, and mirrored in the UK. The hosting is based on Windows 2000 server running IIS and uses Coldfusion MX for the database driven elements. The database is encrypted and backed up nightly to ensure data integrity and is currently a standard MS SQL database. The hosting also provides dynamic web statistics. The site includes several database driven components including Members Login Facilities and several interactive surveys.

Behind the scenes there is a large administration and report generation system. These facilities allow dynamic graph and chart generation using ColdfusionMX. Other facilities within this administration section include more detailed access to the collected data and update/edit facilities.

Calculations such as GDPiv and per Capitav expenditure were made using ColdfusionMX, and verified with Microsoft Excel, based upon data groomed from multiple sources. At the end of this document is a compilation of all of the contact details received from this survey, as well as each organisation's annual direct spend.


## Data presented in this survey are subject to the following caveats:

- All of the data and analysis that follows are based upon the information received or in the researched from the public domain.
- This survey only addresses direct cancer research funding. A number of charitable organisations provide funding for advocacy, outreach programmes and cancer service delivery which is not included in this survey.
- It is acknowledged that the vast majority of Governmental funders of cancer research also support research into other diseases and bio-medical domains. In addition, it is acknowledged that government funding may also be under represented due to 'hidden', or non-direct, spend to hospitals and universities which is not specifically earmarked for (but is used for) cancer research.
- European Commission funding is likely to be under-represented. The data for this survey were collected during the inter-framework programme period between FP6 and FP7.


## DEFINITIONS

Charity ${ }^{\text {viii }}$ and Private, not for profit ${ }^{\text {ix }}$ -
An institution or organization for public benefit, partially or wholly exempt from taxes, and which relies (solely) upon donations for financial support, and/or an organization or institution whose securities are not offered to the public, where any and all profits or surpluses must be used to further its purposes; it is prevented from distributing its profits or assets for the benefit of particular persons whilst operating, and upon winding up.
e.g. Cancer Research U.K., The Wellcome Trust

## Government Agency ${ }^{\mathrm{x}}$ -

An administrative unit of government, supported in whole or part by public funds, charged by another official, body, or agency to make reports, investigations, or recommendations.
e.g. Medical Research Council, NIH

Direct Spend on research includes: salaries of researchers, laboratory equipment they use, and any consumables and/or other costs of the research. However, it does not include salaries of non-researchers, physical plant costs, or any other expenditure that does not produce research.

## End Notes

${ }^{i}$ McGeary M., Burstein M. Sources Of Cancer Research Funding in the United States. Prepared for the National Cancer Policy Board, Institute of Medicine. June 1999
ii "U.S. Inflation rate". GPEC Information Center. Available at: http://www.gpec.org/InfoCenter/Topics/Economy/ USInflation.html
iii "Exchange Rates". Internal Revenue Service (US). Available at: http://www.amb-usa.fr/irs/irsrates.htm
iv This work was commissioned by the Global Forum for Health Research and has been published in two recent papers:
Lewison G, Lipworth S and de Francisco A (2002) Input indicators from output measures: a bibliometric approach to the estimation of malaria research funding. Research Evaluation, 11(3), pp 155-162.
${ }^{v}$ Lewison G, Rippon I, de Francisco A and Lipworth S (2004) Outputs and expenditures on health research in eight disease areas using a bibliometric approach. Research Evaluation, 13 (3), pp 181-188.
vi Global Forum for Health Research (2004) Monitoring Financial Flows for Health Research. Geneva: GFHR.
vii "Total GDP 2004". World Development indicators database, World Bank, 15 July 2005. Available at: http:// siteresources.worldbank.org/DATASTATISTICS/Resources/ GDP.pdf
viii "Population 2004". World Development indicators database, World Bank, 15 July 2005. Available at: http:// siteresources.worIdbank.org/DATASTATISTICS/Resources/ POP.pdf
${ }^{i x}$ Inquiry into the Definition of Charities and Related Organisations, 10 November 2000. As found online at http:// www.cdi.gov.au/html/issues paper.htm
x Government Agency, 2003. As found at http:// dictionary.reference.com/search?q=government\% 20agency
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## European Direct Research Funding



Figure 1-2004 Direct Cancer Research Spend in Europe
NOTE: Graph on Log Scale

- $\quad € 1,971 \mathrm{M}$ was spent by non-commercial organisations on cancer research in Europe in 2004. This is a 38\% increase from the 2003 survey.
- The maximum spend by any country was the UK, with €783 M, minimum spend: Malta with zero.
- The UK had the largest growth from 2003-202\% (absolute increase of $€ 395$ M). Greece increased its spend by $93 \%$, Cyprus by $74 \%$.
- Iceland had the largest percent decrease with a loss of 51\% from 2003. Other decreases were Latvia (48\%), and Luxembourg (43\%), although the absolute decreases in both cases were small.
- Bulgaria failed to report on any spend for 2004, Malta spend was zero.

| Country | Spend <br> C, M |
| :--- | :---: |
| UK | 783 |
| Germany | 324 |
| France | 249 |
| Italy | 115 |
| Netherlands | 65 |
| Sweden | 61 |
| Belgium | 42 |
| Greece | 40 |
| Spain | 38 |
| Switzerland | 36 |
| Denmark | 27 |
| Norway | 24 |
| Finland | 17 |
| Ireland | 16 |
| Israel | 6.0 |
| Poland | 5.0 |
| Czech Republic | 4.4 |
| Portugal | 4.0 |
| Sovak Republic | 2.9 |
| Turkey | 2.9 |
| Hungary | 2.3 |
| Austria | 1.8 |
| Slovenia | 1.7 |
| EEstonia | 1.0 |
| Romania | 0.95 |
| Latvia | 0.64 |
| Lithuania | 0.61 |
| LCxembourg | 0.61 |
| Cyprus | 0.52 |
| Iceland | 0.08 |
| Bulgaria | NR |
| Malta | 0.0 |
| European Comm. | 90 |
| T-E Orgs | 10 |
|  |  |

European Direct Spend by Funding Organisation Type


| Organisation Type | Spend $€(M)$ | Figure 2-2004 European Direct Cancer Spend by Organisation Type |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Charitable Organisation | 879 |  |
| Government Agency | 992 |  |

- $\quad 53 \%$ of cancer research spend originates from Government agencies.
- $47 \%$ of cancer research spend originates from the Not for Profit sector (Charities/Foundations).
- 75 Charities spent $€ 879$ M.
- 79 Government Agencies spent $€ 992$ M.
- Government spend increased by $€ 378 \mathrm{M}$ from the last survey ( $38 \%$ increase).
- Charities increased their spend by $€ 209$ M ( $24 \%$ increase).
- 29 Government agencies are responsible for $80 \%$ of all Government spend, or 40\% of the identified total in Europe.
- 14 Charities are responsible for $80 \%$ of all Charity spend, or $36 \%$ of the identified total in Europe.
- Overall, only 29 organisations are responsible for $80 \%$ of total identified spend in Europe.


## Public Investment (Europe)

European Direct Spend by Organisation Type and Country


| Country | Spend <br> Charity | € (M) <br> Gov. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| UK | 396 | 387 |
| Germany | 139 | 184 |
| France | 97 | 153 |
| Italy | 61 | 54 |
| Netherlands | 47 | 18 |
| Sweden | 56 | 5.3 |
| Belgium | 11 | 31 |
| Greece | 0.16 | 39 |
| Spain | 2.4 | 36 |
| Switzerland | 18 | 18 |
| Denmark | 24 | 3.1 |
| Norway | 15 | 9.0 |
| Finland | 5.6 | 11 |
| Ireland | 1.9 | 14 |
| Israel | 2.8 | 3.2 |
| Poland | 0.16 | 4.9 |
| Czech Rep. | 0.25 | 4.1 |
| Portugal | 0.27 | 3.8 |
| Turkey | 0.43 | 2.9 |
| Slovak Rep. | 0.38 | 2.5 |
| Austria | 0.60 | 1.7 |
| Hungary | 1.5 | 0.79 |
| Slovenia | 0.00 | 1.7 |
| Estonia | 0.00 | 1.0 |
| Romania | 0.00 | 0.95 |
| Iceland | 0.22 | 0.55 |
| Latvia | 0.00 | 0.64 |
| Lithuania | 0.00 | 0.61 |
| Luxembourg | 0.32 | 0.29 |
| Cyprus | 0.52 | 0.00 |
| Bulgaria | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Malta | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |

Figure 3 - Direct spend in Europe by Country, shown as Government against Charity funding streams

- $\quad$ Seven countries have no major spend from charities supporting cancer research, three have no Governmental spending.
- The average charity spend is €27.5 M , (range €0 : €396 M), median €451 K.
- The average Government spend is $€ 31 \mathrm{M}$, (range $€ 0: € 386 \mathrm{M}$ ), median of $€ 3.5 \mathrm{M}$.
- $\quad$ The UK had the largest increases in both Charity and Government funding from 2003 as an absolute value, however Greece had the largest percentage change in Government spending (this is primarily due to more organisations reporting their spend rather than any real increase in funding).
- Iceland and Poland suffered the biggest percentage decreases in Charity funding (78\% and 97\%, respectively), and Luxembourg for Government funding (59\%).


## Spend by European Union Status



| Status | Spend $€($ M $)$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| EU 15 Member States | 1783 |
| Accession Member States | 19 |
| EFTA | 60 |
| Candidate Countries | 3.9 |
| Associate State | 6.0 |
| European Commission | 90 |

Figure 4 - Direct cancer research spend by European Union Status.

- Description of EU Status (see full list in index, page 47):
o Accession Member States - joined the EU in May, 2004.
o European Free Trade Association: Iceland, Norway, Switzerland
o Candidate Countries: Bulgaria, Romania, Turkey.
o Associate State: Israel
- Accession Countries total spend represents only 1\% of the EU-15 spend.
- EU Commission spend remains low, as data for this survey were captured prior to the start of FP7.
- Israel increased its spend by nearly $50 \%$ since the 2003 survey.
- The Accession countries was the only group to have a decreased level of spend ( $16 \%$ ), but in absolute terms this was small ( $€ 3 \mathrm{M}$ ).

USA Direct Cancer Research Spend, 2004


Figure 5 - Direct spend on Cancer Research in the USA, 2004
NOTE: Graph on Log Scale

- USA data was categorised according to a previous, 1999 survey ("Sources of Cancer Research Funding in the United States." June, 1999 [see previous citation]).
- The largest contributor to cancer research in the USA is the Federal Government through the Department of Health and Human Services, of which the National Cancer Institute is the major division.
- Governmental funding was $94 \%$ of overall USA 2004 spend, Charitable organisations contributed 6\%.

| Organisation | Direct Spend <br> Euro (M) |
| :--- | :---: |
| National Cancer Institute | 3,252 |
| National institutes of Health (not including NCI) | 1,207 |
| Department of Defence | 214 |
| States - Total | 164 |
| Howard Hughes Medical Institute | 120 |
| American Cancer Society | 105 |
| The Leukemia and Lymphoma Society | 26 |
| Komen Foundation | 24 |
| National Science Foundation | 18 |
| Department of Energy | 7.3 |
| Health and Human Services (not including NIH \& NCI) | 6.6 |
| Department of Commerce | 6.1 |
| American Institute for Cancer Research | 4.5 |
| National Comprehensive Cancer Network | 0.84 |
| Environmental Protection Agency | 0.83 |
| Cancer Research and Prevention Foundation | 0.72 |
| National Aeronautics and Space Administration | 0.35 |
| American Association for Cancer Research | 0.18 |

# Direct Cancer Research Spend per Capita 



Figure 6-2004 European Direct Cancer Spend per Capita, with USA for Comparison

- EUROPE contains 32 countries, European Commission and Trans-European organizations (see index at rear of publication for full list).
- The average spend per capita across Europe was €3.42, a 34\% increase since 2003 (Note: Switzerland was included in the 2004 calculations, but not in 2003).
- USA per capita spend was €17.61, five times greater than Europe (was $7 x$ for 2003 Survey, or a $29 \%$ decrease in this gap).

Note: this comparison includes only directly reported/ open spend, and does not take into account 'hidden spend' for cancer research as revealed through the Bibliometric approach (see figures 8 and 9 ).

| Country | Spend |
| :---: | :---: |
| United Kingdom | € 13.18 |
| Sweden | € 6.77 |
| Nowway | € 5.18 |
| Denmark | ¢ 5.03 |
| Switzerland | $€ 4.85$ |
| France | € 4.16 |
| Netherlands | $€ 4.00$ |
| Belgium | € 4.00 |
| Ireland | € 3.99 |
| Germany | € 3.92 |
| Greece | € 3.58 |
| Finland | € 3.24 |
| Italy | € 2.00 |
| Luxembourg | € 1.36 |
| Spain | € 0.92 |
| Israel | € 0.89 |
| Slovenia | € 0.83 |
| Estonia | € 0.77 |
| Cyprus | € 0.68 |
| Slovak Republic | $€ 0.54$ |
| Czech Republic | € 0.43 |
| Portugal | € 0.39 |
| Iceland | € 0.27 |
| Hungary | € 0.23 |
| Austria | € 0.22 |
| Lithuania | ¢ 0.18 |
| Poland | € 0.13 |
| Romania | € 0.04 |
| Turkey | $€ 0.04$ |
| Latvia | € 0.03 |
| Malta | $€ 0.00$ |
| Bulgaria | € 0.00 |
| EUROPE | € 3.42 |
| United States | ¢ 17.61 | Public Investment Comparisons

Direct Cancer Research Spend as Percentage of GDP


| Country | Spend |
| :--- | :---: |
| United Kingdom | $0.0455 \%$ |
| Greece | $0.0242 \%$ |
| Sweden | $0.0218 \%$ |
| France | $0.0155 \%$ |
| Germany | $0.0148 \%$ |
| Belgium | $0.0148 \%$ |
| Netherlands | $0.0140 \%$ |
| Denmark | $0.0139 \%$ |
| Switzerland | $0.0124 \%$ |
| Estonia | $0.019 \%$ |
| Norway | $0.0118 \%$ |
| Finland | $0.0113 \%$ |
| Ireland | $0.0109 \%$ |
| Slovak Republic | $0.0089 \%$ |
| Italy | $0.0086 \%$ |
| Slovenia | $0.0064 \%$ |
| Israel | $0.0064 \%$ |
| Czech Republic | $0.0051 \%$ |
| Spain | $0.0048 \%$ |
| Cyprus | $0.0042 \%$ |
| Lithuania | $0.0034 \%$ |
| Portugal | $0.0030 \%$ |
| Hungary | $0.0029 \%$ |
| Poland | $0.0026 \%$ |
| Luxembourg | $0.0024 \%$ |
| Romania | $0.0016 \%$ |
| Turkey | $0.0012 \%$ |
| Iceland | $0.0008 \%$ |
| Austria | $0.0008 \%$ |
| Latvia | $0.0006 \%$ |
| Malta | $0.0000 \%$ |
| Bulgaria | $0.0000 \%$ |
| EUROPE | $0.0177 \%$ |
| United States | $0.0551 \%$ |
|  |  |

Figure 7-2004 European Direct Cancer Spend as Percentage of GDP, with USA for Comparison

- EUROPE contains 32 countries, European Commission and Trans-European organizations (see index at rear of publication for full list).
- The average spend for EUROPE was $.0177 \%$ of GDP, which is a 14\% increase from 2003 survey.
- The average spend for the USA was $0551 \%$ of GDP, a 5\% decrease from 2003 survey.
- The USA spent three times as much as a percentage of GDP compared with EUROPE (this was 4x in 2003 Survey).

Note: this comparison includes only directly reported/open spend, and does not take into account 'hidden spend' for cancer research as revealed through the Bibliometric approach (see figures 8 and 9).

## Public Investment Comparisons

## Spend on Cancer Research as a Percentage of GDP

Figure 8 -
Comparison of cancer research spend between the USA, Europe and EU-15 Member States as a percentage of GDP.

-Directly Reported $\square$ Bibliometric Method
Spend on Cancer Research per Capita


- Figures 8 and 9 compare EU-15, EUROPE and USA public sector spend for the 2004 fiscal year using directly reported figures from funding organisations and an assessment of 'hidden' investment in cancer research through national systems (University and Healthcare) by the bibliometric approach.
- Absolute USA spend was down slightly from the 2003 survey as percentage of GDP (-5\%) but remained stable as an amount spent per capita.
- EU- 15 spend was substantially higher per capita (increase of $€ 1.24$ ), as well as a percentage of GDP (18\% increase) from 2003 survey. Global Public Sector Investment

Global Public Sector Cancer Research Spend, 2004


Figure 10- Global cancer research spend, assessed using two approaches: Bibliometric approach, and directly reported spend by funding organisations.

| Country | Bibliometric <br> Method (M) | Directly Reported <br> Spend (M) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| EUROPE | $€ 3,335$ | $€ 1,971$ |
| USA | $€ 5,277$ | $€ 5,168$ |
| Canada | $€ 276$ | Not Sought |
| Japan | $€ 1,004$ | Not Sought |
| Australia | $€ 162$ | Not Sought |
| Rest of World | $€ 981$ | Not Sought |

- Total global public sector cancer research spend for 2004 is estimated at C11,035 million.
- Spend estimated by the Bibliometric approach is $41 \%$ greater than directly reported spend from funding organisations across EUROPE, but only $2 \%$ greater in the USA.
- This 'hidden spend' (the difference between directly reported and Bibliometric approach national estimated spend) in Europe comes from infrastructure funding for cancer research through universities and health services.
- This 'directly reported spend' includes that by EORTC, as well as European Commission contributions, which together total €100M.

[^5]Cancer Research Spend by Major Pharmaceutical Companies Estimated from Bibliometric Method


Figure 11 - Cancer Research Spend by Major Pharmaceutical Companies Contributing to Public Domain Knowledge, as determined through the indirect, Bibliometric method.

| Company Name | Spend $€$ (M) |
| :--- | :---: |
| Novo Nordisk | 8.4 |
| AG Merck | 62 |
| Sanofi-Synthelabo | 106 |
| Merck | 107 |
| Wyeth | 115 |
| Schering-Plough | 120 |
| Boeh'r Ingelheim | 122 |
| Eli Lilly | 145 |
| Schering | 151 |
| Amgen | 173 |
| AstraZeneca | 173 |
| Pfizer | 195 |
| Bristol-Myers Squibb | 198 |
| GlaxoSmithKline | 199 |
| Johnson \& Johnson | 213 |
| Roche | 312 |
| Aventis | 342 |
| Novartis | 353 |

- Total major Pharma spend contributing to public domain knowledge for 2004 is $€ 3.1$ billion.
- This amount represents $8 \%$ of the worldwide BioPharmaceutical industry R\&D expenditures of €39.6 billion.
- Company declared R \& D expenditure from annual reports has been fractionated on the basis of how many of their published papers are in cancer research.

Total 2004 Major Pharma Spend - €3,095 M

## Outputs of Cancer Research

## Comparison of Public Sector Outputs

Total Public Sector Output 1994-2003


Figure 12 - Fractional count of all journal articles and papers in the survey used for Bibliometric output by Country/Region.

Cancer Research Outputs per Billion Euro GDP


Figure 13 - Fractional count of all cancer research output per billion Euro GDP .

Trends in Public Sector Outputs

| Country | \% of Total |
| :--- | :---: |
| Germany | 9.6 |
| UK | 9.1 |
| Italy | 7.3 |
| France | 6.7 |
| Netherlands | 3.6 |
| Sweden | 2.5 |
| Spain | 2.3 |
| Switzerland | 1.6 |
| Austria | 1.4 |
| Belgium | 1.3 |
| Finland | 1.1 |
| Denmark | 0.99 |
| Greece | 0.88 |
| Norway | 0.82 |
| Turkey | 0.77 |
| Poland | 0.59 |
| Czech Rep. | 0.36 |
| Hungary | 0.31 |
| Ireland | 0.26 |
| Portugal | 0.19 |
| Slovak Rep. | 0.17 |
| Slovenia | 0.12 |
| Bulgaria | 0.06 |
| Iceland | 0.05 |
| Estonia | 0.03 |
| Romania | 0.02 |
| Latvia | 0.01 |
| Lithuania | 0.01 |
| Luxembourg | 0.01 |
| Cyprus | 0.00 |
| Malta | 0.00 |
| EUROPE | 52 |
| EU15 | 47 |
| USA | 48 |
|  |  |


| Country | Pap./B GDP |
| :--- | :---: |
| Sweden | 2.2 |
| Greece | 2.1 |
| Netherlands | 2.1 |
| Finland | 1.8 |
| Turkey | 1.7 |
| Austria | 1.6 |
| Italy | 1.5 |
| Slovenia | 1.5 |
| Czech Repub. | 1.5 |
| Switzerland | 1.4 |
| Poland | 1.3 |
| UK | 1.3 |
| Belgium | 1.3 |
| Germany | 1.2 |
| Denmark | 1.2 |
| Norway | 1.1 |
| Hungary | 1.0 |
| Estonia | 0.99 |
| Spain | 0.93 |
| France | 0.93 |
| Slovak Repub. | 0.91 |
| Iceland | 0.83 |
| Malta | 0.83 |
| Bulgaria | 0.73 |
| Ireland | 0.72 |
| Portugal | 0.56 |
| Latvia | 0.51 |
| Lithuania | 0.43 |
| Cyprus | 0.17 |
| Romania | 0.14 |
| Luxembourg | 0.07 |
| EUROPE | 1.3 |
| EU-15 | 1.3 |
| USA | 1.4 |

- Outputs figure for countries/region was estimated as the average over a 9 year period (1994-2003)
- Fractional count was achieved by dividing the total credit per paper/article (one) by the number of different countries cited in the address section of the SCI.
- Journal impact factors and citation scores were not used for comparison in this report, but would be an interesting aspect of study in future reports.


## Trends in Cancer Research Outputs

Figure 14 -
Trends in cancer research outputs (\% ONC) compared to overall biomedical outputs (\%BM).


Trends in Relative Level» of Cancer Research Publications


Figure 15 -
Trends in relative level of outputs (basic to clinical), Europe and the USA.

- Mean RL score: 1 = very 'clinical' publications compared with a score of $4=$ fundamental, basic science publications.
- Output data does not include publications from Israel.
- Overall, the cancer research publications originating from the USA were more basic than the outputs from EUROPE.
- Both the USA and EUROPE publications have trended towards more clinical work over the past 8 years.
- Over this period, EUROPE published 9\% more non-commercial cancer research papers than the USA
$\diamond$ RL describes how 'fundamental', or clinical (applied) a publication is.


## Trends in Relative Level ${ }^{\dagger}$ of Cancer Research Outputs for EUROPE


$\square$ Move Towards More Basic Research Outputs $\square$ Move Towards More Clinical Research Outputs

Figure 16 - European trends in relative level of oncology research papers between 1995 and 2003, with world average for comparison.

- Mean RL score: $1=$ very 'clinical’ publications compared with a score of 4 = fundamental, basic science publications.
- Overall, the Baltic states and the other countries of Eastern Europe are publishing the most basic research.
- In the past ten years, there has been a shift towards more clinical work in 23 of 31 European countries in this survey.
† RL describes how 'fundamental', or clinical (applied) a publication is.


## Geographical Origin of Cancer Research Papers From <br> Major Pharmaceutical Companies



Figure 17 - Geographical origin of cancer research papers from one or more address of pharmaceutical companies ( $\mathrm{n}=24$ ) engaged in cancer R \& D between 1999 and 2003.

| Region | \% Total |
| :--- | :---: |
| USA | 40 |
| EU-15 | 39 |
| EUROPE | 46 |
| Japan | 8.8 |
| Rest of World | 4.9 |

- This distribution resembles that of non-commercial cancer research papers overall, except that "Rest of the World" is under-represented.
- The EU15 total (39\%) is only just less than that of the USA ( $40 \%$ ), and EUROPE as a whole is actually greater ( $46 \%$ ).
- The geographical distribution of major pharmaceutical companies headquarters is uneven, with eight of the 24 being headquartered in the USA, 6 in Japan, 3 in Germany, 2 each in France, Switzerland and the UK, and 1 in Denmark. However because they have labs in many countries, the actual geographical distribution of papers from one or more of the 24 pharmaceutical companies listed is rather more widespread.

Discussion

## What has changed since the last survey?

t is almost two years since we published the first European Cancer Research Mangers Forum (ECRM) funding survey ${ }^{1}$. The second ECRM survey has addressed some of the deficits of the first - inaccuracies in reported research funding, missed funding organisations, etc - and developed new methodologies to validate spend. The use of bibliometrics to address the latter is a valid and novel way of determining research spend based on actual output. The application of the bibliometric method in this second survey has improved our confidence around the report figures, and also thrown up some interesting findings, most notably the level of funding that flows through healthcare and university systems rather than directly from funding organisations. We have also used this method to estimate the direct annual spend of the major pharmaceutical companies involved in cancer research. This we acknowledge is controversial. All the companies in this survey were invited to report their direct spend but, unsurprisingly,

Our approach should be seen as a tool to provide reliable data around which one can construct a policy narrative.

Since the publication of the first survey we have seen its findings incorporated into a wide range of policy and research documents ${ }^{4}$. An excellent and comprehensive public and private funding survey has also been completed for brain research in Europe ${ }^{5}$. Such additional disease specific studies add to the corpus of high quality intelligence for policy makers.

In summary, this second ECRM survey has -

- Updated cancer research spend in EUROPE
- Updated cancer research spend in USA
- Estimated non-direct funding through University and Healthcare Systems in EUROPE and USA
- Estimated global cancer research funding
- Estimated major pharmaceutical direct spend on cancer research
- Described cancer research activities -


## "We are not dealing with a scientific problem. We are dealing with a political issue." <br> -Samuel Epstein, M.D.

cited business confidentiality as the main reason for not providing the data. This survey has also updated the figures for the USA which had become seriously out of date (the last official work was by the Institute of Medicine in $1997^{2}$ ).

Finally we have taken the plunge into providing output data. Again we acknowledge that there are many ways of 'describing' cancer research activity from gross volumetric assessments of publications (the approach we have taken), patents filed, impact measures (such the citation of publications in clinical management guidelines), numbers of clinical trials, etc. through to approaches based on narrative. All have their merits and deficits. We have steered clear of making any 'quality' assessments of the respective outputs of continents and countries ${ }^{3}$. This area is fraught with methodological issues, particularly between continents where the tendency of under / over citing can lead to citation (and impact) bias. In this survey we have instead used bibliometrics to probe macroproductivity and act as a surrogate for objectively describing cancer research activities.
levels of research (whether more fundamental or clinical), and volume productivity - through the use of bibliometrics.

## Cancer Research in EUROPE: towards an oligopoly

By the end of the $20^{\text {th }}$ century Europe was witness to some 2.5 million annual cancer deaths ${ }^{6}$. Although Europe comprises only one eighth of the world's population it suffers a quarter of the global burden in terms of incidence. In 2004 there were an estimated $2,886,800$ new cases of cancer with $1,711,000$ deaths ${ }^{7}$.

The notable feature of this second survey has been the estimation of cancer research funding that flows through Member State healthcare and university systems. The figures for EUROPE* are substantial and, at over a billion euro per annum, pose a major challenge to designing policy tools for promoting cancer
*Europe is defined for this report as the 31 countries listed in the appendix on page 46
research or creating strategic frameworks. 21 of Member States have increased their funding of cancer research in real terms since the last survey, 4 have not. Indeed the major policy issue is the real differences in cancer research investment between the Member States themselves, rather than the prevailing gaps in cancer research funding between EUROPE and the USA, which have been a driving force for EU policy making to date ${ }^{8}$.

A balance between charitable and governmental funding is also absent in a number of Member States. Whilst we will discuss philanthropy in greater depth in the next section it is clear that some governments are still failing to appropriately support cancer research. There are of course natural limits for a number of countries. The majority of cancer research funding is raised and spent within EU-15 Member States. For the remainder the priority for resources is cancer control programmes (such as tobacco control) not major cancer research funding ${ }^{9}$. For these countries the need for specific policy actions to ensure a limited core of high quality research within their institutions is important if these Member States have aspirations to become major locations of cancer research in the future ${ }^{10}$. Over a ten year period Germany, UK, Italy and France dominated absolute European cancer research output, however, when compared to GDP Sweden, Greece and Netherlands had the greatest output. Nearly all members of EUROPE have seen a shift towards more applied, clinical research. There are some notable exceptions to this - Spain and Denmark, for example, where the switch to more fundamental cancer research is likely to be a combination of strategic direction and / or limited funding which particularly favours less expensive fundamental research that traditionally has a quicker return on investment.

Regulatory and research policy frameworks have a major influence on the intrinsic creativity of European cancer research. However, it is debatable at current levels of spend whether cancer research funding at the EU level through the Framework Programmes and other streams will have a major impact on the rate and direction of European cancer research ${ }^{11}$. With a budget for Framework Programme 7 (2007-13) set at $€ 5,984$ million ${ }^{12}$ however, there is scope for the European Commission to have a major impact, in addition to its commitment for the European Research Council and Joint

Technology Platforms (through which the Innovative Medicine I nitiative will be funded).

The EU research policy of specific research programmes and thematic calls has been questioned ${ }^{13}$, however, the suggested solutions - networks and delegation of research programmes to specific agencies should be in addition to ring-fenced funding for cancer not as a substitute. EU research policy needs to recognise and fund core trans-EU infrastructure such as phase IV clinical trials, paediatric research networks (e.g. Innovative Therapies for Children with Cancer) and Cancer Registries to name but a few ${ }^{14}$. In all these areas European funding to cement already cooperative groups would deliver substantial added value to existing Member State support which mostly flows through highly competitive streams.

This survey underscores yet again the great number of major national and trans-national funders (more than 150), in addition to European umbrella groups such as Federation of European Cancer Societies (FECS), cancer research policy initiatives (e.g. EURoCAN plus, EUSTIR ${ }^{15}$ ), and patients groups (e.g. Europa Donna) that are involved in one way or another in cancer research. The impression is of numerous groups attempting to occupy the same political and policy ground. Presenting a co-operative front to ensure a better deal for research and cancer control programmes would seem an important but politically challenging goal ${ }^{16}$.

Despite the lessening emphasis on the Lisbon target (this is the EU achieving a spend of 3\% of GDP on science and technology) this still remains an important goal ${ }^{17}$ (EU research monies have the potential to make huge differences in some countries [Greece, Ireland], but much less in others [Germany, UK] due to the existing contributions of governments and charities operating within those countries). This survey demonstrates the substantial impact that cancer research has to play with an annual public (government and charitable) sector investment of over $€ 3.2$ billion, coupled to vibrant commercial activities and strong outputs. Sustaining this through pro-research policies, avoidance of negative, bureaucratic regulations and strong funding streams will pay handsome dividends to both patients and Europe's economic targets.

## Funding Cancer Research - the Role of Philanthropy

Charity plays a remarkable and essential role in supporting cancer research. Unsurprisingly given the fiscal dominance of the National Cancer Institute, EUROPE has a great portion of its funding through the philanthropic sector. The USA, however, dominates overall philanthropic giving with levels of nearly $2 \%$ of GDP across all charities (compared to 0.8\% UK, 0.5\% Netherlands \& Sweden and 0.3\% France ${ }^{18}$ ). In EUROPE the role of philanthropy has been belatedly recognised as an underexploited source of income for research ${ }^{19}$. However, charity is a complex phenomenon with different attitudes and giving patterns almost on a country by country basis ${ }^{20}$. Furthermore our understanding of altruism as a sociobiological phenomenon when applied to today's philanthropy, particularly those around secular causes has not been studied in any depth beyond the theoretical ${ }^{21}$. What might work at one level in a one Member State may not work in another. Other health charities, overseas aid,
major cancer research philanthropic funders in EUROPE and the USA, an analysis of their structures or strategies was beyond its scope ${ }^{24}$. It is likely that there are many organisations that raise private or public funds to support cancer service delivery - none of those have been captured by this survey. Nevertheless such information from future studies would be beneficial for promoting greater co-operation and collaboration.

European philanthropic organisations have identified three key issues for the future of this sector ${ }^{25}$,

- Greater complementarity between philanthropic and government funding
- Co-operation among philanthropic organisations across borders
- Greater understanding of the different philanthropic typologies with fit-forpurpose regulatory environment.

Inroads have been made to greater co-

## "In women breast cancer is the most common form of cancer, amounting to nearly 31\% of all incidence cases"

human welfare and heritage preservation groups are also increasing the pressure on charitable funds. Because of these inherent uncertainties philanthropy in cancer research should in policy terms be seen as additional to the overall global effort, which is mainly funded through taxation and private enterprise (industry) ${ }^{22}$.

With the influx of single, wealthy donors to philanthropic causes the talk has been of a shift into philanthrocapatalism, essentially the 'businessnification' of charity ${ }^{23}$. Whilst this might superficially appear to inject more rigour into philanthropy there is little evidence that it is the right path. Indeed, becoming more like a business in the social sector, as Jim Collins has pointed out, is unlikely to be the right route for the simple reason that most businesses are mediocre. Furthermore the transactional nature of business is not conducive to philanthropy which requires a strong social bond with its donors. Whilst this survey has identified the
operation between governmental and philanthropic funders both in Europe (the UK's NCRI and France L'INCa) and the USA (CChange) and, whilst preserving the essential independence of philanthropic funders there is little doubt this is the best model. Whilst the major philanthropic funders of cancer research have begun to co-operate and engage across national borders (particularly in tobacco control) this is an area that needs further progress. There are difficulties to this goal with issues around the culture of philanthropy in respective countries (do people only give for cancer research in their own country?), regulatory complexities of conducting trans-national research, and intellectual property, to name but a few. However, all are surmountable hurdles that need to be overcome to provide the funding frameworks for the research community to collaborate across national borders.

## Global Comparisons of Cancer Research

The ECRM survey has revealed some important differences to global cancer research funding, particularly the relative distribution between public and private sectors and funding through national healthcare and university systems.

Member State funding whilst the USA shrinks in real terms ${ }^{26}$. In comparison Japan, Canada and Australia are spending between $€ 7.86$ and €8.66 per capita on cancer research. The higher resolution of this second survey also allows comparison of spend per new case of cancer diagnosed (incidence) and per death

Whilst the USA has pursued a centrist funding model (the NCl and NIH combined are responsible for €4,459 billion or 86\% of total USA spend) EU funding is highly distributed and direct governmentally controlled streams account for only 7.1\% of funding compared to nearly 10\% embedded in healthcare and university systems, and the 6.3\% contributed by

| Source of Funding | Funding (m, €) | As a \% of <br> Estimated Global <br> Spend |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Pharmaceutical <br> Industry <br> (top 24 companies) | 3,095 | 22.1 |
| USA (Government) | 4,712 | 33.5 |
| USA (Charitable) | 456 | 3.3 |
| USA ('Locked' in <br> healthcare \& university <br> systems) | 109 | 0.8 |
| EU (Government) | 992 | 7.1 |
| EU (Charitable) | 879 | 6.3 |
| EU ('Locked' in <br> healthcare \& university <br> systems) | 1,364 | 9.7 |
| Rest of World | 2,423 | 17.2 |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{1 4 , 0 3 0}$ |  | cancer death ${ }^{28}$. philanthropic organisations. In comparison to the USA the EU is faced with the complicated task of networking and aligning diverse and in many cases 'hidden' funding streams. Policy's that fail to take this into account are doomed to failure almost from the outset. Globally cancer research is being conducted by a diverse group driven by mostly competing agendas and strategies. There is no one dominant player, although with nearly a third of global funding the USA comes close to this. This is an important point as many policy makers assume that the global funding for cancer research is overwhelmingly concentrated in the USA. Our data indicates that this is not true and the effort is truly a global one. No one country or funder has the monopoly on the mission to beat cancer.

Global levels of expenditure on cancer research as a percentage of GDP or per capita continue to show substantial differences between the USA and EUROPE, however, this gap has substantially narrowed. A major part of this is the ability of this survey to estimate the cancer research funding flowing through national healthcare and university systems in EUROPE but there has also been a real increase in some

Whilst the gap between cancer research funding in EUROPE and USA remains substantial, cancer research outputs over a ten year period have been similar with EUROPE producing more cancer research publications by a steady 4-5\% above USA since 1997. Indeed our data suggests that EUROPE is now increasing its share of global cancer research outputs with an upward trend that started in 2001, at the same time that the USA remains relatively flat. The type of research that is being conducted and then published is also changing. We have found that the published research in EUROPE to be more 'clinical' than that in the USA with a modest trend in the latter towards even 90 more clinical outputs ${ }^{29}$. Interestingly a separate study has found that globally cancer research has changed from a bipolar allegiance to either clinical or laboratory styles in the 1980's to the creation of a 'third' style by 2000 where research activity is structured by a common orientation to a translational research domain ${ }^{30}$.

The impact of regulatory policy on research funding and productivity remains, as it was for the first survey, a critical issue for all countries.

As EUROPE has recently discovered, changes to regulatory policy can have a dramatic effect on the cost of research ${ }^{31}$. Over the last decade the fashion for ever increasing regulation across all domains - clinical trials, healthcare data, human tissue - has led to an increase in the unit cost of research in the absence of any tangible social benefit of many of those regulations. Good research governance is essential but bureaucracy is absorbing too much of the global investment in cancer research ${ }^{32}$. There is an urgent need to reconsider the regulatory paradigms that have been built into a thriving industry around cancer research, and reverse this trend.

## Public and Private Investment: distinctive or complimentary?

As the OECD noted companies are increasingly making use of public research through direct funding and more collaboration with public research institutions ${ }^{33}$. Likewise in response to the high social priority given to health by a number of countries, total R\&D budgets are
this report) show that this trend has been increasing. Our estimates of cancer research spend by the major pharmaceutical companies necessarily underestimate total global spend by omission of SME and biotech firms and current spend on pivotal phase III clinical trials. However, the gross figure of just over €3 billion per annum helps place industries global contribution in perspective with other governmental and charitable funders. Industry is responsible for around a quarter of global investment in cancer research. To put the industry expenditure into perspective in 2004 global pharmaceutical R\&D expenditures reached €41 billion (c. \$56 billion) with, according to this survey, around $7 \%$ of this flowing into cancer research ${ }^{35}$. Traditionally EUROPE has been considered relatively weak in attracting industry R\&D funding, however, certainly when one considers the geographical origin of pharmaceutical industry publications EUROPE is very much an equal partner with the USA in cancer research. Indeed EUROPE attracts some $45.9 \%$ of total pharmaceutical R\&D expenditure ${ }^{36}$.
'In men, prostrate cancer is the most common form of cancer, amounting to $24 \%$ of all incidence cases"
rising with particular emphasis on cost-effective innovations. Data from this survey give a gross estimate of those countries for which cancer is a clear socio-political priority - USA, UK, Sweden, Norway, etc - based on spend per capita / \% GDP and outputs. Importantly we have found that there remains in some EU Member States substantial under funding by certain governments despite strong S\&T policies overall. The political deprioritisation and under funding of cancer research by those countries that can, a) afford it and, b) have the research workforce remains a serious concern.

Although the USA is the dominant country for commercially sponsored phase III pivotal clinical trials ${ }^{34}$ this survey has found substantial cancer research activity conducted by the pharmaceutical industry in both EUROPE and USA on the basis of the geographical origin of published cancer research papers. Much of this work ( $>50 \%$ ) is the result of collaborations with the public sector. Our data (not presented in

Nearly all major recent policy cancer research funding and policy initiatives have emphasised the public-private partnership route ${ }^{37}$. EU money is often being partnered with industry and there is a real danger that if all increases in EU cancer research funding go this way Europe's intrinsic creativity would be distorted by encouraging subsidy-seeking behaviour and essential areas of public health relevant to cancer, but not amenable to a business approach would remain orphans. Increasingly research policy has been directed to supporting the transfer of technology from knowledgegenerating organisations in the public sector (e.g. universities) to firms through the establishment of co-operative links ${ }^{38}$.

In considering the global role of industry in cancer control, it is true (as the World Health Organisation have articulated) that any new treatment is unlikely to be a 'magic bullet' and that health promotion and cancer prevention
must remain a very high priority for governmental and charitable funders ${ }^{39}$. Indeed, there is sound reason to believe that prioritysetting focused on predicted practical relevance, i.e. industrial utility should be avoided by EUROPE. Firstly most technology advances are derived from a broad base of scientific and technological fields and second, as Keith Pavitt describes, "our ability to understand the present and to predict successful future applications is very limited. In detail, predictions will often be wrong, and in broad scope it will be obvious ${ }^{40}$."

## The politics of cancer research

Whilst this survey has identified some €14 billion spent annually on global cancer research the scope of the cancer control problem is so vast that even these substantial sums are insufficient and complex socio-political decisions will still need to be made on what research is (or is not) funded. As an editorial in Science recently noted the $\$ 5$ million allocated to the Cancer Genome Atlas project could fund five National Institute of Health grants on such topics ${ }^{41}$. The constraints on the NCI budget over the last few years have forced the policy debate within the USA cancer research community. Arguments both for and against the need for more funding are being aired and serious questions are now being asked about the strategic emphasis on new drug discovery and development at the expense of more concerted action around prevention and early diagnosis ${ }^{42}$.

As research unravels the complex and complicated structure of cancer and delivers increasingly sophisticated management (from diagnosis onwards) cost has now become a dominant factor in policy making. In developed countries healthcare costs are rising so quickly that all containment strategies seem doomed to eventual failure. Indeed, and paradoxically, it is scientific research that is responsible for establishing the basis for expensive new medical interventions and thus driving health care expenditure according to Victor Fuchs of Stanford ${ }^{43}$. But of course it is research that provides the only realistic way to address this issue through the discouragement of treatments that have no efficacy and / or that are likely to cause unacceptable side effects. Whilst the prevailing fashion is for new drugs there remains tremendous scope and mileage in cancer research aimed at improving existing treatments (both surgical and pharmaceutical)
as well as health management, quality of life and prevention studies. Organisational funding strategies need to cover the broad church that makes up cancer research.

The association between cancer research activity and patient outcomes for any given healthcare system or country is a complex one. Intuitively centres, countries and continents that are research active should deliver higher standards of care to patients through the application of more effective medical technologies and the more widespread adherence to best practice / guidelines. Indeed, the data we have presented in this survey on both funding levels and outputs demonstrate some association with gross outcome measures such as survival ${ }^{44}$.

In comparison to the first survey we have not attempted to estimate the distribution of research funding by either site (breast, bowel, etc) or research domain (fundamental biology, prevention, etc.). The self reported methodology contained too many errors for it to be valid for policy makers. Some progress has been made around the use of the Common Scientific Outline to code research using a common language. However, the future utility of this approach depends on Europe adopting this important policy tool. Important questions remain about the relative efforts on various site specific cancers and research domains which can only be addressed with appropriate evidence and policy tools e.g. International Cancer Research Portfolio ${ }^{45}$ and a cooperative programme of strategic planning. The importance of transparency and openness by organisations funding cancer research to sharing this information cannot be underestimated.

Cancer research is a complex global activity aimed at controlling a complicated disease that will affect of over 15 million people by 2020. Efforts to control and cure cancer are multifaceted and subject to many interdependencies. The second ECRM survey has mapped out in greater detail the many and diverse funding streams for global cancer research as well as global outputs. Traditional research cultures compartmentalised to specific domains (laboratory or clinical), geography, and institutions are evolving to fit the global research paradigm.

However, great discoveries that will help cancer
patients and their families will only come from a climate of intellectual freedom and tolerance that fosters an atmosphere of creativity. Bureaucracy and over-management remain constant dangers to progress and never has there been a more urgent need for a 'third culture' to drive the engagement between research community and public ${ }^{46}$. Much has been achieved, and yet, much still remains to be accomplished.
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## Appendix

| Country | Name | Address | Type | Web Address | $\begin{gathered} 2004 \\ \text { Spend (m) } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Austria | Fellinger-Krebsforschung | Gemeinnütziger Verein zur Förderung der Krebsforschung Rudolfinerhaus Billrothstr. 78 A-1190 Wien | Charity |  | $€ 0.060$ |
| Austria | Fonds zur Förderung der wissenschaftlichen Forschung (FWF) | Weyringergasse $35 \mathrm{~A}-1040$ Wien | Government Agency | www.fwf.ac.at | € 1.74 |
| Belgium | Belgian Federal Science Policy Office | Rue de la Science 8 Wetenschapsstraat B-1000 Brussels | Government Agency | www.belspo.be | € 1.69 |
| Belgium | Belgian Federation against Cancer | Fédération Belge contre le Cancer Chaussée de Louvain 479 1030 Bruxelles | Charity | www.cancer.be | $€ 5.00$ |
| Belgium | Centrum voor Studie en Behandeling van Gezwelziekten Gent | Universitair Ziekenhuis Kliniek voor Radiotherapie en Kerngeneeskunde De Pintelaan 185 B-9000 Gent | Government Agency |  | $€ 0.060$ |
| Belgium | F.N.R.S. Fonds National de la Recherche Scientifique | F.N.R.S. Rue dEgmont 5 B-1000 Bruxelles | Government Agency |  | € 13.9 |
| Belgium | F.W.O. (Research Foundation Flanders) | F.W.O.-Vlaanderen Egmontstraat 5 1000 Brussels | Charity | www.sun.fwo.be | € 3.52 |
| Belgium | Flemish League against Cancer | (Vlaamse Liga tegen Kanker - Kom op tegen Kanker) Koningsstraat 217 <br> B- 1210 Brussel | Charity | www.tegenkanker.net | € 1.16 |
| Belgium | Fortis FB Verzekeringen | Wolvengracht 48 1000 Brusse | Charity | www.fortisbank.com | $€ 0.880$ |
| Belgium | Het Limburgs Kankerfonds vzw | Limburgs Universitair Centrum Universitaire Campus Gebouw A B-3590 Diepenbeek | Government Agency |  | No Response |
| Belgium | I.W.T | Instituut voor de aanmoediging van Innovatie door Wetenschap en Technologie in Vlaanderen Bischoffsheimlaan 25 <br> B-1000 Brussel | Government Agency | www.iwt.be | $€ 9.13$ |
| Belgium | King Baudouin Foundation | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Brederodestraat } 21 \\ & \text { B-1000 } \end{aligned}$ | Charity | www.kbs-frb.be | $€ 0.045$ |
| Belgium | La Région Wallonne Direction Générale des Technologies de la Recherche et de l'Energie | Avenue Prince de Liège 7 B-5100 Jambes | Government Agency |  | € 0 |
| Belgium | Televie | rue d' Egmont 5 <br> B-1000 Bruxelles | Government Agency | www.fnrs.be | $€ 6.21$ |
| Bulgaria | Ministry of Health | Public Relations Office 5 Sveta Nedelia Square Sofia 1000 | Government Agency | www.mh.government.bg |  |
| Cyprus | The Cyprus Association of Cancer Patients and Friends | 12 \& 14 Photinou Pana Street P.O.Box 23868 1687 Nicosia | Charity | www.cancercare.org.cy | € 0 |
| Cyprus | The Cyprus Anti-Cncer Society | 2 Paraskeva Ioannou Dhasoupolis 2020 Strovolos <br> P.O. Box 25296 <br> 1308 Nicosia | Charity | www.anticancersociety.org.cy | $€ 0.052$ |
| Cyprus | The Cyprus Research Promotion Foundation | P O Box 23422 | Charity | www.research.org.cy | € 0.472 |
| Czech Republic | Grant Agency of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic (GAAV) | Narodni 3 <br> 11720 Prague | Government Agency | www.gaav.kav.cas.cz | $€ 0.355$ |
| Czech Republic | Grant Agency of the Czech Republic (GACR) | Narodni 3 11000 Prague | Government Agency | www.gacr.cz | $€ 0.838$ |
| Czech Republic | Internal Grant Agency of the Ministry of Health of the Czech Republic | Palackeho nam. 4 12801 Prague | Government Agency | www.mzcr.cz | € 2.91 |
| Czech Republic | The League Against Cancer Prague | Na slupi 6 12842 Praha 2 | Charity | www.lpr.cz | € 0.250 |
| Denmark | Børnecancerfonden | Blegdamsvej 27 Postboks 847 <br> 2100 København Ø | Charity | www.boernecancerfonden.dk | $€ 0.288$ |
| Denmark | Danish Cancer Society | Kræftens Bekæmpelse Strandboulevarden 49 Kobenhavn | Charity | www.cancer.dk | € 23.2 |
| Denmark | Danish Medical Research Council | Forskningsstyrelsen Artillerivej 88 2300 København S | Government Agency | www.forsk.dk | € 3.10 |
| Denmark | Dansk Kræftforskning Fond (Danish Cancer Research Foundation) | Amerika Plads 37 2100 København Ø | Charity | www.dansk-kraeffforsknings-fond.dk | $€ 0.603$ |
| Estonia | Estonian Ministry of Education and Research | $\begin{gathered} \text { Munga } 18 \\ 50088 \text { TARTU } \end{gathered}$ | Government Agency | www.hm.ee |  |
| Estonia | Enterprise Estonia | Liivalaia 13/15 10118 Tallinn | Government Agency | www.eas.ee | $€ 0.977$ |
| Estonia | Estonian Science Foundation | $\begin{gathered} \text { Endla } 4 \\ 10142 \text { Tallinn } \end{gathered}$ | Government Agency | www.etf.ee | $€ 0.058$ |
| Finland | Cancer Society of Finland | Liisankatu 21 B FIN-00170 Helsinki | Charity | www.cancer.fi | € 4.30 |


| Country | Name | Address | Type | Web Address | $\begin{gathered} 2004 \\ \text { Spend (m) } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Finland | Finnish Cultural Foundation | P.O.Box 203 (Bulevardi 5 A) FIN-00121 Helsinki | Charity | www.skr.fi | $€ 0.300$ |
| Finland | Ministry of Social Affairs and Health | P.O.Box 33 FIN-00023 Government | Government Agency | www.stm.fi | $€ 0.030$ |
| Finland | Sigrid Juselius Foundation | Aleksanterinkatu 48 B FIN-00100 Helsinki | Charity | www.terkko.helsinki.fi | € 1.00 |
| Finland | TEKES | Finnish Funding Agency for Technology and Innovation P.O. Box 69 FI-00101 Helsinki | Government Agency | www.tekes.fi | € 10.0 |
| Finland | The Academy of Finland | Research Council for Health P.O.Box 99 (Vilhonvuorenkatu 6) FIN-00501 Helsinki | Government Agency | www.aka.fi | € 1.28 |
| France | Assistance Publique - Hôpitaux de Paris | Service de Formation contunue des médecins Assistance Public Hospital de Paris 3 Ave Victoria 75184 Paris Cedex 04 | Government Agency |  | € 20.0 |
| France | Association Franciase les Myopathies | 9 place de Rungis 75013 Paris | Charity |  | No Response |
| France | Association pour la Recherche surle Cancer | 9, rue Guy Moquet 94803 Villejuif Cedex | Charity | www.arc.asso.fr | € 23.4 |
| France | FEGEFLUC | Federation Groupements Entreprises Francaises Lutte Contre Cancer 30 rue Montgrand 13006 Marseille | Charity |  | $€ 0.698$ |
| France | Fondation de France | 40, avenue Hoche 7 5008 Paris | Charity | www.fdf.org | € 2.90 |
| France | Fondation pour la Recherche Medicale | 54, rue de Varennes 75007 Paris Cedex 07 | Charity | www.frm.org | € 4.00 |
| France | INSERM | Bureau des Contrats, DEFR INSERM 101, rue de Tolbiac 75654 Paris Cedex 13 | Government Agency | www.inserm.fr | € 48.2 |
| France | Institut Curie | 26, rue d'Ulm 75248 Paris Cedex 05 | Charity | www.curie.fr | € 38.0 |
| France | Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique (INRA) | 147, rue de l'Université 75338 Paris Cedex 07 | Government Agency | www.inra/fr | $€ 0.500$ |
| France | Le Centre national de la recherche scientifique (CNRS) | 3, rue Michel-Ange 75794 PARIS cedex 16 | Government Agency | www.cnrs.fr | € 84.0 |
| France | LEEM Recherche | 25 rue de Montevideo 75016 Paris | Government Agency | www.aftr.org | No Response |
| France | Ligue Nationale contre le cancer | 14, rue Corvisart 75013 Paris | Charity | www.ligue-cancer.asso.fr | € 27.6 |
| Germany | Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung (BMBF) | Hannoversche Straße 28-30 D 10115 Berlin | Government Agency | www.bmbf.de | € 184 |
| Germany | Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft | Kennedyallee 40 D-53175 Bonn | Charity | www.dfg.de | € 60.0 |
| Germany | Deutsche José Carreras Leukämie-Stiftung e. V. | Arcisstraße 61 D-80801 München | Charity | www.carreras-stiftung.de | € 8.15 |
| Germany | Deutsche Krebshilfe | Thomas-Mann-Str. 40 Postfach 1467 D-53111 Bonn | Charity | www.krebshilfe.de | € 61.8 |
| Germany | Wilhelm Sander-Stiftung | Goethestraße 74 D-80336 München | Charity | www.wilhelm-sanderstiftung.de | € 9.09 |
| Germany | Wilhelm-Vaillant-Stiftung | Frauenklinik der Ludwig-MaximiliansUniversität Maistraße 11 D-80337 München | Charity | www.wilhelmvaillantstiftung .de | $€ 0.124$ |
| Greece | General Secretariat of Research and Technology | 14-18 Mesogeion St 11527 Athens | Government Agency | www.gsrt.gr | € 38.7 |
| Greece | Hellenic Cancer Society | 18-20 An. Tsoha Street Athens GR- 11521 | Charity |  | $€ 0.165$ |
| Greece | Ministry of Health and Welfare | 17 Aristotelous Street 10187 Athens | Government Agency | www.ypyp.gr | No Response |
| Greece | National Hellenic Research Foundation | The Institute of Biological Research and Biotechnology 48 Vassileos Constandinou Avenue 11635 Athens | Government Agency | www.eie.gr | $€ 0.800$ |
| Hungary | Ministry of Education | Szalay u. 10-14. 1055 Budapest | Government Agency | www.om.hu | $€ 0.600$ |
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| Country | Name | Address | Type | Web Address | $\begin{gathered} 2004 \\ \text { Spend (m) } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hungary | Ministry of Health, Social and Family Affairs | Arany Janos U. 6-8 1051 Budapest | Government Agency | www.eszcsm.huleszcsm | $€ 0.190$ |
| Hungary | National Institute of Oncology | 7-9 Ráth György Street 1122 Budapest | Charity | www.oncol.hu | € 1.50 |
| Iceland | The Icelandic Science Fund, RANNIS | Laugavegi 13 <br> 101 Reykjavik | Government Agency | www.rannis.is | € 0.0003 |
| Iceland | Icelandic Cancer Society | Skogarhlid 8 105 Reykkjavik | Charity | www.krabb.is | € 0.022 |
| Iceland | The University of Iceland Research Fund | University of Iceland Sudurgata, 101 Reykjavik | Government Agency | www2.hi.is/page/ rannsoknasjodir | $€ 0.055$ |
| Ireland | Childrens Leukaemia Research Project | 1 Carraroe Avenue Donaghmeade Dublin 13 | Charity |  | $€ 0.100$ |
| Ireland | Health Research Board | 73 Lower Baggot Street Dublin 2 | Government Agency | www.hrb.ie | € 3.40 |
| Ireland | Higher Education Authority | Marine House Clanwilliam Ct Dublin 2 | Government Agency | www.hea.ie | € 7.00 |
| Ireland | Enterprise Ireland | Glasnevin Dublin 9 | Government Agency | www.enterpriseireland.com | No Response |
| Ireland | Irish Cancer Society | 5 Northumberland Road Dublin 4 | Charity | www.cancer.ie | € 1.81 |
| Ireland | Science Foundation Ireland | Wilton Park House Wilton Place Dublin 2 | Government Agency | www.sfi.ie | € 3.71 |
| Israel | Chief Scientist Office, Ministry of Health | 2 Ben Tabai St. Jerusalem 91010 | Government Agency | www.health.gov.il | € 0.368 |
| Israel | DKFZ/MOST | Ministry of Science Hakiria Hamizrachit Blgd 3 POB 49100 Jerusalem 91490 | Government Agency | www.dkfz-heidelberg.de/ israel | $€ 0.600$ |
| Israel | German-Israel Fund - GIF | 16 King Goerge St. POB 7008 Jerusalem 91070 | Government Agency | www.gifres.org.il | € 1.40 |
| Israel | Israeli Cancer Association | 7 Revivim St. POB 437 Givataim 53103 | Charity | www.cancer.org.il/ home.asp | $€ 0.813$ |
| Israel | Israel Cancer Research Fund ICRF | 9 Haluman Street Suite 205, P.O. Box 53442 Jerusalem, 91533 | Charity | www.icrfonline.org | € 1.32 |
| Israel | Israeli Ministry of Science | $\begin{aligned} & \text { POB } 49100 \\ & \text { Jerusalem } 91490 \end{aligned}$ | Government Agency | www.most.gov.il | No Response |
| Israel | Israel Science Foundation - ISF | Albert instein Sq. POB 4040 Jerusalem 91040 | Government Agency | www.isf.org.il | € 0.850 |
| Israel | The Middle East Cancer Consortium | P.O.B. 7495 Haifa 31074 | Charity | ecc.cancer.gov | € 0.692 |
| Italy | Associazione Italiana contro le Leucemie -Linfomi e Mieloma | Via Ravenna 34 00161 Roma | Charity | www.ail.it | $€ 5.82$ |
| Italy | Associazione Italiana per la Lotta al Neuroblastoma | Istituto G. Gaslini Largo <br> G. Gaslini, 5 <br> 16148 Genova | Charity | www.neuroblastoma.org | $€ 0.524$ |
| Italy | Associazione Italiana per la Ricerca sul Cancro (AIRC) | Via Corridoni 7 20122 Milano | Charity | www.ail.it | € 19.4 |
| Italy | Comitato Telethon Fondazione Onlus - Fondazione Telethon | Via G. Saliceto, 5 a 00161 Roma | Charity | www.telethon.it | € 0.496 |
| Italy | Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche | piazzale Aldo Moro 7 00185 Roma | Government Agency | www.cnr.it/sitocnr | € 19.0 |
| Italy | Fondazione Italiana per la Ricerca sul Cancro | Via Corridoni 7 20122 Milano | Charity | www.airc.it/sito/firc | € 18.2 |
| Italy | Fondazione Umberto Veronesi | Piazza Valasca 5 20122 Milano | Charity | www.fondazioneveronesi.it | € 1.49 |
| Italy | Istituto Superiore di Sanità | viale Regina Elena 299 00161 Roma | Government Agency | www.iss.it | $€ 5.85$ |
| Italy | Lega Italiana per la Lotta contro i Tumori | Via Torlonia 15 00161 Roma | Charity | www.legatumori.it | € 15.2 |
| Italy | Ministero della Salute | Dipartimento dell' Innovazione Piazzale dell'Industria, 20 00144 Roma | Government Agency | www.ministerosalute.it | € 5.20 |
| Italy | Ministero dell'Istruzione dell' Università e della Ricerca | Piazzale Kennedy 20 00144 Roma | Government Agency | www.miur.it | € 24.2 |
| Latvia | Latvian Council of Science | Akademijas laukums 1 <br> Riga 1050 | Government Agency | www.Izp.lv | € 0.064 |
| Lithuania | Institute of Oncology, Vilnius University | Santariskiu str. 1 LT-08660 Vilnius | Government Agency | www.loc.lt | $€ 0.615$ |
| Luxembourg | Centre Hospitalier de Luxembourg (CHL) | 2, rue Barblé L-1210 | Government Agency | www.chl.lu | No Response |
| Luxembourg | CRP-Santé (Centre de Recherche Publique) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18, rue Dicks } \\ & \text { B.P. } 2021 \\ & \text { L-1020 } \end{aligned}$ | Government Agency | www.sante.lu | € 0.295 |
| Luxembourg | Fondation Luxembourgoise contre le Cancer | 209, Route d'Arlon L-1150 | Charity | www.cancer.lu | $€ 0.317$ |


| Country | Name | Address | Type | Web Address | $\begin{gathered} 2004 \\ \text { Spend (m) } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Luxembourg | Fondation pour la Recherche sur le Cancer et les Maladies du Sang (FRCMS) | 2, rue Barblé L-1210 Luxembourg | Charity |  | No Response |
| Netherlands | Dutch Cancer Society | P.O. Box 75508 1070 AM Amsterdam | Charity | www.kwfkankerbestrijding.nl | € 46.7 |
| Netherlands | Ministry of Helath, Welfare and Sport | PO Box 20350 2500 EJ The Hague | Government Agency | www.minvws.nl | € 10.2 |
| Netherlands | Netherlands Genomics Initiative | Laan van Nieuw Oost Indië 300 <br> P.O. Box 93035 <br> 2509 AA The Hague | Government Agency | www.genomics.nl | € 2.92 |
| Netherlands | ZonMw (The Netherlands Organisation for Health Research and Development) | P.O. Box 93245 2509 AE The Hague | Government Agency | www.zonmw.nl | € 5.20 |
| Norway | Norwegian Cancer Society | $\begin{aligned} & \text { P.O. Box } 4 \text { Sentrum } \\ & 0101 \text { OSLO } \end{aligned}$ | Charity | www.kreftforeningen.no | € 14.7 |
| Norway | The Research Council of Norway | P.O. Box 2700 St. Hanshaugen N-0131 Oslo | Government Agency | www.forskningsradet.no | € 9.00 |
| Poland | Ministry of Education and Science | Department of International Cooperation Wspólna St. 1/3 00-529 Warsaw 53 | Government Agency | www.kbn.gov.pl | € 2.25 |
| Poland | Ministry of Health | Department of Science and Higher Education ulica Miodowa 15 00-952 Warsaw | Government Agency | www.mz.gov.pl | $€ 0.055$ |
| Poland | Polish Anti-Cancer Committee | 5 Roentgena Street 02-781 Warsaw | Charity | www.coi.waw.pl | $€ 0.163$ |
| Poland | The Maria Sklodowska-Curie Memorial Centre on Oncology | PO Box 1065 W.K. Roentgena Str. 02-781 Warsaw | Government Agency |  | € 2.55 |
| Portugal | Liga Portuguesa Contra o Cancro | Av. Columbano Bordalo Pinheiro n. ${ }^{0} 57$ $3 .{ }^{\circ}$ frente 1070-061 LISBOA | Charity | www.ligacontracancro.pt | $€ 0.270$ |
| Portugal | Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia | Av. D. Carlos I, 126, $2^{\circ}$ 1249-074 Lisboa | Government Agency | www.fct.mct.pt | € 3.77 |
| Romania | Ministry of Education, Research and Youth | Str. Gen. Berthelot 28-30 Sector 1 70738, Bucuresti | Government Agency | www.ed.ro | $€ 0.950$ |
| Slovak Republic | Cancer Research Foundation | Vlarska 7 <br> 83391 Bratislava | Charity | www.nr.sk | $€ 0.156$ |
| Slovak Republic | Science and Technology Assistance Agency of Slovak Republic | Hanulova 5/B 84101 Bratislava | Government Agency | www.apvt.gov.sk | € 1.25 |
| Slovak Republic | Slovak Academy of Sciences | Stefanikova 49 81438 Bratislava | Government Agency |  | € 1.30 |
| Slovak Republic | The League against Cancer of the SR | Spitalska 21 <br> 81232 Bratislava | Charity | www.lpr.sk | $€ 0.223$ |
| Slovenia | Ministry of Health | Stefanova 5 SI 1000 Ljubljana | Government Agency |  | $€ 0.013$ |
| Slovenia | Slovenian Research Agency | Trg OF 13 <br> SI-1000 Ljubljana | Government Agency | http://www.mszs.si | € 1.65 |
| Spain | Comunidad Autonoma de Madrid | Alcalá, 30-32 <br> Madrid 28014 | Government Agency | www.madrid.org | $€ 0.668$ |
| Spain | Asociación Española contra el Cáncer | Amador de los Rios 5 28010 Madrid | Charity | www.aecc.es | € 1.05 |
| Spain | Fundación La Caixa | Avda. Diagonal, 621. Barcelona 08028 | Charity | www.lacaixa.es | € 1.37 |
| Spain | Instituto de Salud Carlos III - FIS (Ministerio de Sanidad y Consumo) | Sinesio Delgado, 6 Madrid 28029 | Government Agency | www.msc.es | € 21.3 |
| Spain | Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia (Ministry of Education and Science) | Paseo de la Castellana, 160 Madrid 28046 | Government Agency | www.mcyt.es | € 13.6 |
| Sweden | Cancer och Trafiksakadades Riksförbund | $\begin{gathered} \text { Box } 9509 \\ \text { SE-102 } 74 \text { Stockholm } \end{gathered}$ | Charity | www.ctrf.se | $€ 0.215$ |
| Sweden | Barncancerfonden | P. O. Box 5408 S-114 84 Stockholm | Charity | www.barncancerfonden.se | € 10.3 |
| Sweden | Cancer- Och Allergifonden | Tomtebogatan 39 11338 Stockholm | Charity | www.cancerochallergifonden.se | € 6.11 |
| Sweden | Cancerfonden | David Bagares gata 5 SE-10155, Stockholm | Charity | www.cancerfonden.com | € 31.1 |
| Sweden | Gunnar Nilssons Cancerstiftelse | $\begin{gathered} \text { Box } 1027 \\ 251 \text { Helsingborg } \end{gathered}$ | Charity | www.cancerstiftelsen.com | € 4.79 |
| Sweden | Radiumhemmets forskningsfonder | Box 25 SE 17111 Solna | Charity | www.radiumhemmetsforsknings fonder.com | € 3.09 |
| Sweden | Vetenskapsrådet - Medicin | Regeringsgatan 56 10378 Stockholm | Government Agency | www.vr.se | € 5.30 |
| Switzerland | Krebsliga Schweiz | Effingsrstrasse 40 Postfach 8219 CH-3001 Bern | Charity | www.swisscancer.ch | € 3.70 |
| Switzerland | Oncosuisse | Effingerstr 40 Postfach 7021 CH-3001 Bern | Charity | www.oncosuisse.ch | € 7.77 |

Managas Fortm

| Country | Name | Address | Type | Web Address | $\begin{gathered} 2004 \\ \text { Spend (m) } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Switzerland | Schweizerischer Nationalfonds (Swiss National Science Foundation) | Wildhainweg 20 CH-3012 Bern | Government Agency | www.snf.ch | € 10.7 |
| Switzerland | Staatssekretariat für Bildung und Forschung SBF | Hallwylstrasse 4 CH-3003 Bern | Government Agency | www.sbf.admin.ch | € 7.30 |
| Switzerland | Swiss Institute for Experimental Cancer Research | Ch.des Boveresses 115 Postfach CH-1066 Epalinges | Charity | www.isrec.ch | € 6.40 |
| Turkey | Cancer Control Department of Turkish Ministry of Health | Saglik Bakanligi Mithatpasa Caddesi No:3 06410 Sihhiye, Ankara | Government Agency | www.saglik.gov.tr | € 1.23 |
| Turkey | The Scientific and Technical Council of Turkey ( TUBITAK) | Ataturk Bulvari No:221 Kavaklidere Ankara | Government Agency | www.tubitak.gov.tr | € 1.19 |
| Turkey | Turkish Association of Cancer Research and Control (TKAK) | Ataç Sokak No:21 06420 Yenisehir, Ankara | Charity | www.turkkanser.org | $€ 0.043$ |
| Turkey | Turkish Prime Ministry State Planning Organization (DPT) | Necati Bey Caddesi No:108 06100 Yücetepe, Ankara | Government Agency | www.dpt.gov.tr | € 0.453 |
| UK | Association for International Cancer Research | Madras House St. Andrews Fife, Scotland KY16 9EH | Charity | www.aicr.org.uk | € 12.3 |
| UK | Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council | Polaris House North Star Avenue Swindon SN2 1UH | Government Agency | www.bbsrc.ac.uk | € 15.9 |
| UK | Breakthrough Breast Cancer | 3rd Floor Kingsway House 103 Kingsway London WC2B 6QX | Charity | www.breakthrough.org.uk | € 9.71 |
| UK | Breast Cancer Campaign | Clifton Centre 110 Clifton Street London EC2A 4HT | Charity | www.breastcancercampaign.org | € 3.43 |
| UK | Cancer Research UK | P.O. Box 123 Lincoln's Inn Fields London WC2A 3PX | Charity | www.cancerresearchuk.org | € 297 |
| UK | Department of Health | Richmond House 79 Whitehall London SW1A 2NL | Government Agency | www.dh.gov.uk | € 204 |
| UK | Economic and Social Research Council | Polaris House North Star Avenue Swindon SN2 1UJ | Government Agency | www.esrcsocietytoday.ac.uk | $€ 5.27$ |
| UK | Leukaemia Research Fund | 43 Great Ormond Street London WC1N 3JJ | Charity | www.lff.org.uk | € 23.3 |
| UK | Ludwig Institute of Cancer Research | Horatio House 77-85 Fulham Palace Road 5th Floor South London W6 8JC | Charity | www.ludwig.ucl.ac.uk | € 5.27 |
| UK | Macmillan Cancer Relief | Cambridge House, Cambridge Grove Hammersmith London W6 OLE | Charity | www.macmillan.org.uk | € 0.591 |
| UK | Marie Curie Cancer Care | 89 Albert Embankment London SE1 7TP | Charity | www.mariecurie.org.uk | € 5.26 |
| UK | Medical Research Council | 20 Park Crescent London W1B 1AL | Government Agency | www.mrc.ac.uk | € 145 |
| UK | Northern Ireland HPSS R\&D | 12-22 Linenhall Street Belfast BT2 8BS | Government Agency | www.rdo.csa.n-i.nhs.uk/rdo | € 1.48 |
| UK | Roy Castle Lung Cancer Foundation | 200 London Road Liverpool Merseyside, L3 9TA | Charity | www.roycastle.org | € 1.77 |
| UK | Scottish Executive Health Department | St Andrew's House 3EN Edinburgh, EH1 3DG | Government Agency | www.show.scot.nhs.uk | € 16.7 |
| UK | Tenovus The Cancer Charity | 43 The Parade Cardiff CF24 3AB Wales | Charity | www.tenovus.com | $€ 1.77$ |
| UK | Wales Office of R\&D | Welsh Assembly Government 4th Floor Cathays Park Cardiff CF10 3NQ | Government Agency | www.word.wales.gov.uk | € 1.45 |
| UK | Wellcome Trust | Gibbs Building 215 Euston Road London NW1 2BE | Charity | www.wellcome.ac.uk | € 30.6 |
| UK | Yorkshire Cancer Research | 39 East Parade Harrogate HG1 5LQ | Charity | www.ycr.org.uk | € 5.38 |

NOTE:
Organisations which failed to respond are listed as 'No Response'.
Organisations which stated they were unable to provide data are left blank under Direct Spend.

| Country | Name | Comment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Belgium | Belgian Federal Science Policy Office | 2003 Data |
| Belgium | Televie | 2003 Data |
| Bulgaria | Ministry of Health | Professor Dr. Piperkova, rep from Bulgaria states no centralized/ specialized funding for CA. |
| Cyprus | The Cyprus Association of Cancer Patients and Friends | "The Cyprus Association of Cancer Patients and Friends ... had no cancer direct spend for the years 2003-2005" |
| Czech Republic | Grant Agency of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic (GAAV) | 2003 Data |
| Denmark | Danish Medical Research Council | 2003 Data |
| Estonia | Estonian Ministry of Education and Research | Unable to provide cancer research funding levels, as accounting does not differentiate from general medical science. |
| Finland | Ministry of Social Affairs and Health | 2003 Data |
| Finland | TEKES | 2003 Data |
| Finland | The Academy of Finland | 2003 Data |
| France | Assistance Publique - Hôpitaux de Paris | 2003 Data |
| France | INSERM | 2003 Data |
| France | Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique (INRA) | 2003 Data |
| Germany | Wilhelm-Vaillant-Stiftung | 2003 Data |
| Greece | National Hellenic Research Foundation | 2003 Data |
| Hungary | Ministry of Education | 2003 Data |
| Hungary | National Institute of Oncology | 2003 Data |
| Iceland | The Icelandic Science Fund, RANNIS | 2003 Data |
| Ireland | Health Research Board | 2003 Data |
| Ireland | Science Foundation Ireland | 2003 Data |
| Israel | Chief Scientist Office, Ministry of Health | Funding of Medical and bio-medical research in hospitals and research institutes in Israel |
| Israel | DKFZ/MOST | Joint German-Israel Fund with MOST, separate sponsorship in Germany |
| Israel | German-Israel Fund - GIF | Funds wide range of research, including Cancer. Public Agency, Government linked. Unable to provide financial data until next year. |
| Israel | Israel Science Foundation - ISF | We would like to emphasize that the budget allocation at the ISF is based solely on scientific merit and therefore differs every year among the various fields, disciplines and approaches. Therefore the information is valid for a given year only. |
| Italy | Associazione Italiana per la Lotta al Neuroblastoma | 2003 Data |
| Italy | Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche | The direct spend figure is actually 2005 data, and is certainly underestimated, considering that some other projects non specifically devoted to the field concerned may contain sub-projects or possible applications which could be of interest for it. |
| Italy | Lega Italiana per la Lotta contro i Tumori | 2003 Data |
| Italy | Ministero della Salute | 2003 Data |
| Italy | Ministero dell'Istruzione dell' Università e della Ricerca | Funding by the Ministry is underestimated as it does not include salaries for university researchers. Moreover, the MIUR is funding national research projects on Biomedical Sciences which include Cancer; however, these projects are not specifically itemized, so it is difficult to identified them |
| Poland | Ministry of Education and Science | Director Jedrzejczak states that the Ministry was unable to verify this information; the ECRM Secretariat has made the decision to include it. |
| Portugal | Liga Portuguesa Contra o Cancro | 2003 Data |
| Romania | Ministry of Education, Research and Youth | 2003 Data |
| Slovak Republic | Slovak Academy of Sciences | 2003 Data |
| Spain | Comunidad Autonoma de Madrid | 2003 Data |
| Spain | Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia (Ministry of Education and Science) | This level of funding does not include salaries of researchers. |
| Sweden | Barncancerfonden | Supports experimental and clinical research on children cancers. |
| Sweden | Vetenskapsrådet - Medicin | Postal address: S-103 78, Stockholm |
| Switzerland | Staatssekretariat für Bildung und Forschung SBF | Controls budget for Swiss inst. for experimental ca research, and Swiss inst. of applied ca research. |
| Turkey | Turkish Prime Ministry State Planning Organization | 2003 Data |
| UK | Economic and Social Research Council | this figure was arrived at by independent coding of award details according to the agreed CSO used by NCRI |
| UK | Ludwig Institute of Cancer Research | 2003 Data |


| Organisation | Address | Type | Web Address | 2004 Spend (m) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| American Association for Cancer Research | 615 Chestnut St., 17th Floor Philadelphia, PA 19106-4404 | Charity | www.aacr.org | €. 18 |
| American Cancer Society | Inforum, 250 Williams Street Northwest Atlanta, GA 30303 | Charity | www.cancer.org | €105.31 |
| American Institute for Cancer Research | 1759 R Street NW Washington, DC 20009 | Charity | www.aicr.org | €4.48 |
| Avon Foundation | 1345 Avenue of the Americas New York, NY 10105-0196 | Charity | www.avoncompany.com/women | €2.91 |
| Cancer Research and Prevention Foundation | 1600 Duke Street Alexandria, VA 22314 | Charity | www.preventcancer.org | €. 72 |
| Department of Agriculture | 1400 Independence Ave., S.W. <br> Washington, DC 20250 | Government Agency | www.usda.gov | $€ 4.59$ |
| Department of Commerce | 1401 Constitution Ave., NW Washington, DC 20230 | Government Agency | www.commerce.gov | €6.11 |
| Department of Defence | 1000 Defense Pentagon Washington, DC 20301 | Government Agency | www.defenselink.mil | €214.04 |
| Department of Energy | 1000 Independence Ave., SW Washington, DC 20585 | Government Agency | www.energy.gov | $€ 7.27$ |
| Environmental Protection Agency | Ariel Rios Building 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20460 | Government Agency | www.epa.gov | €. 83 |
| Howard Hughes Medical Institute | 4000 Jones Bridge Road Chevy Chase, MD 20815-6789 | Charity | www.hhmi.org | €120.47 |
| Komen Foundation | 5005 LBJ Freeway, Suite 250 Dallas, TX 75244 | Charity | www.komen.org | €23.96 |
| National Aeronautics and Space Administration | $\begin{gathered} \text { NASA Headquarters } \\ \text { Suite 5K39 } \\ \text { Washington, DC 20546-0001 } \end{gathered}$ | Government Agency | www.nasa.gov | €. 35 |
| National Cancer Institute | 6116 Executive Boulevard Room 3036A <br> Bethesda, MD 20892-8322 | Government Agency | www.cancer.gov | €3,252 |
| Health and Human Services (not including NIH \& NCI) | 200 Independence Avenue, S.W. <br> Washington, D.C. 20201 | Government Agency | www.hhs.gov | $€ 6.59$ |
| National institutes of Health (not including NCl ) | 9000 Rockville Pike Bethesda, Maryland 20892 | Government Agency | www.nih.gov | €1,207 |
| National Comprehensive Cancer Network | 500 Old York Road, Suite 250 Jenkintown, PA 19046 | Charity | www.ncen.org | €. 84 |
| National Science Foundation | 4201 Wilson Blvd Arlington, VA 22230 | Government Agency | www.nsf.gov | €17.78 |
| Prostate Cancer Foundation | 1250 Fourth Street Santa Monica, CA 90401 | Charity | www.prostatecancerfoundation.org | €2.71 |
| States | n/a | Government Agency | n/a | €164.16 |
| The Leukemia and Lymphoma Society | 1311 Mamaroneck Avenue White Plains, NY 10605 | Charity | www.leukemia-lymphoma.org | €25.72 |

## Subordinates of United States Federal Organisations with Direct Spend on Cancer Research

## Department of Agriculture:

Agriculture Research Service
Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service

## Department of Commerce:

National institute of Standards and Technology

## Department of Defense:

Defence Advanced Research Projects Agency
Department of the Air Force
Department of the Army
Office of the Secretary of Defense

## Department of Energy:

Energy Supply
Fossil Energy Research and Development
Science

## Environmental Protection Agency:

Extramural Projects

## Health and Human Services:

Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality
Centers for Disease Control
National Institutes of Health
Clinical Center
John E. Fogarty International Center
National Cancer Institute
National Center for Complementary and Alternative Medicine
National Center for Research Resources
National Eye Institute
National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute
National Human Genome Research Institute
National Institute for Nursing Research
National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases
National Institute of Arthritis Musculoskeletal, and Skin Diseases

National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering
National Institute of Child Health and Human Development
National Institute of Deafness and Other Communicative Disorders
National Institute of Dental and Craniofacial Research
National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases
National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences
National Institute of General Medical Sciences
National Institute of Mental Health
National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke
National Institute on Aging
National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism
National Institute on Drug Abuse
National Library of Medicine
Office of the Director

## National Aeronautics and Space Administration:

Exploration Systems Research and Technology
Human Systems Research and Technology

## National Science Foundation:

Biological Sciences
Computer and Information Science and Engineering
Education and Human Resources
Engineering
Geosciences
Mathematical and Physical Sciences
Office of International Science and Engineering
Social, Behavioural, and Economical Sciences

## US/European Pharma Database

Managas Fortm

| Company | Country | Address | 2004 Name (if applic.) | Web Address | $\begin{gathered} 2004 \\ \text { Spend (m) } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Novo Nordisk | Denmark | Novo Allé 2880 Bagsværd |  | www.novonordisk.com | €8.4 |
| Sanofi-Aventis | France | 174, avenue de France 75013 Paris | Aventis, Sanofi - Synthelabo | en.sanofi-aventis.com | €106, €342 |
| Boehringer Ingelheim | Germany | Corporate Headquarters Binger Str. 173 55216 Ingelheim |  | www.boehringer-ingelheim.com | €122 |
| Merck KGaA | Germany | Frankfurter Str. 250 64293 Darmstadt |  | www.merck.de | €62 |
| Schering | Germany | Bayer Schering Pharma AG <br> Müllerstr. 170-178 <br> 13353 Berlin |  | www.schering.com | €151 |
| Novartis International AG | Switzerland | $\begin{gathered} \text { Postfach } \\ \mathrm{CH}-4002 \text { Basel } \end{gathered}$ |  | www.novartis.com | €353 |
| Roche | Switzerland | Group Headquarters Grenzacherstrasse 124 CH-4070 Basel |  | www.roche.com | €312 |
| AstraZeneca | UK | 15 Stanhope Gate W1K 1LN London |  | www.astrazeneca.com | €173 |
| GlaxoSmithKline | UK | 80 Great West Road Brentford, Middlesex, TW8 9GS |  | www.gsk.com | €199 |
| Amgen | USA | One Amgen Center Drive Thousand Oaks, CA 91320-1799 |  | www.amgen.com | €173 |
| Bristol-Myers Squibb | USA | 345 Park Avenue <br> New York, New York 10154-0037 |  | www.bms.com | €198 |
| Eli Lilly and Company | USA | Lilly Corporate Center Indianapolis, Indiana 46285 |  | www.lilly.com | €145 |
| Johnson \& Johnson | USA | One Johnson \& Johnson Plaza New Brunswick, NJ 08933 |  | www.jnj.com | €213 |
| Merck \& Co., Inc. | USA | One Merck Drive P.O. Box 100 <br> Whitehouse Station, NJ 08889-0100 |  | www.merck.com | €107 |
| Pfizer | USA | 235 East 42nd Street New York, New York 10017 |  | www.pfizer.com | €195 |
| Schering - Plough | USA | 2000 Galloping Hill Road Kenilworth, N.J. 07033-0530 |  | www.schering-plough.com | €120 |
| Wyeth | USA | 5 Giralda Farms Madison, NJ 07940 |  | www.wyeth.com | €115 |

EU - 15 Countries-2004


May 2004 Enlargement (Accession) Countries-2004


Slovak Repub.
Slovenia


## European Free Trade Association (EFTA) - 2004



Candidate Countries-2004


Associate State-2004


Notes

Nethertailds Slovak Republict t Dolani Norway Whinana Lithuania Portugal
United Kingdom France

## Stovenia

$\qquad$ Italy $\leftarrow$ Ireland

## celand

# Turkey 

Austria

## Belgium



## Germany

## Cyprus

## Czech Republic*

## ECRM Secretariat

 134 Haydon Park RoadWimbledon, London SW19 8JT
United Kingdom
Tel: +44 (0) 2085433150
seth.eckhouse@ecrmforum.org
wWw.ecrmforum.org


[^0]:    * Europe is defined for this report as the 31 countries listed in the appendix on page 46

[^1]:    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Annual direct cancer research spend is defined as: salaries of researchers, laboratory equipment they use, and any consumables and/or other costs of the research. However, it does not include salaries of non-researchers, physical plant costs, or any other expenditure that does not produce research.

[^2]:    ${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Whilst IARC is primarily an epidemiology and bio-statistics unit, the WHO (its governing body) describes them as also engaging in basic sciences related to cancer.

[^3]:    ${ }^{\text {c }}$ found at https://radius.rand.org

[^4]:    ${ }^{d}$ It is probably safe to assume that the apparently unfunded papers in the European countries are in fact funded by the state in some form: this "hidden" source of funding clearly is important, and accounts for more than $40 \%$ of the total for several countries.

[^5]:    * Directly Reported Spend from funding organisations was not sought for this survey.

[^6]:    ${ }^{4}$ For example, chapter 19 Research in Judith MacKay et al. Cancer Atlas. ACS, CDC, IARC, 2005 and Anna Wagstaff's European research crisis: the cancer community must make its voice heard. Cancer World, 2005, July-Aug: 12-21.
    ${ }^{5}$ Sobocki $P$ et al. Resource allocation to brain research in Europe - a full report. Eur J Neurosci, 2006: 24(10): 1-24.
    ${ }^{6}$ Ferlay J et al. GLOBOCAN 2000 www.iarc.fr IARC Cancer Base No. 5 Lyon France.

