

significantly enhance the available opportunities. In the case of HIV, the foundation of academic research has enabled the pharmaceutical industry to enter this field with more and improving drug classes. New drugs in turn help further academic research, by providing essential tools to elucidate disease pathways. Successful collaboration amongst key stakeholders to fight a life-threatening disease, can also dramatically improve the innovation cycle time (Figure 5).

It is highly likely that the pace of change will further accelerate. If these developments continue at the current pace, they might well lead to fundamental changes in what constitutes pharmaceutical R&D within the next few decades. Spotting those scientific opportunities with the greatest promise for future success, within the many influences that bear on the industry, and using them as ingredients for strategic change, has to be at the heart of R&D strategy today.

References

- 1 Drews, J. (2003) Strategic trends in the drug industry. *Drug Discov. Today* 8, 411–420
- 2 Capdeville, R. *et al.* (2002) Gleevec (STI571, Imatinib), a rationally developed, targeted anticancer drug. *Nat. Rev. Drug Discov.* 1 (7), 493–502
- 3 AstraZeneca (2003) AstraZeneca receives FDA approval for new cancer drug Iressa (gefitinib). (<http://www.iressa-us.com>)
- 4 Schumpeter, J.A. (1934) *The Theory of Economic Development*, Harvard University Press
- 5 Grant, R.M. (2002) *Contemporary Strategy Analysis* (4th edn), Blackwell
- 6 Schmid, E.F. and Smith, D.A. (2002) Discovery, innovation and the cyclical nature of the business – a bright future for the pharmaceutical industry. *Drug Discov. Today* 7, 563–568
- 7 Gilmartin, R.V. (2002) Closing remarks at annual business briefing: 'We see no shortage of opportunities for new medicines. The flow of new discoveries industry-wide tends to be somewhat cyclical.' http://www.merck.com/newsroom/executive_speeches/121002a.html
- 8 Frank, R.G. (2003) New estimates of drug development costs. *J. Health Econ.* 22, 325–330
- 9 Lipinski, C.A. *et al.* (1997) Experimental and computational approaches to estimate solubility and permeability in drug discovery. *Adv. Drug Deliv. Rev.* 23, 3–25
- 10 Smith, D.A. *et al.* (2001) Pharmacokinetics and metabolism in drug design. *Methods and Principles in Medicinal Chemistry* 13, 99–121
- 11 Beresford, A.P. *et al.* (2002) The emerging importance of predictive ADME simulation in drug discovery. *Drug Discov. Today* 7, 109–116
- 12 Reynolds, T. (2003) The search for reasons behind drug approval slump. *Dialogos news* (<http://www.preclinica.com>)
- 13 Achilladelis, B. (1999) Innovation in the Pharmaceutical Industry. In *Pharmaceutical Innovation: Revolutionizing Human Health*, (Landau, R. *et al.*, eds), p.18–20, Chemical Heritage Foundation, Philadelphia, USA
- 14 Earl, M.J. and Hopwood, A.G. [1981] From Management Information to Information Management, In *The Information Systems Environment North-Holland*, Henry C. Lucas *et al.*, Amsterdam

Erratum

In the 1st December 2003 issue of *Drug Discovery Today* (Vol. 8, No. 23; 1085–1093), in the article entitled 'Confocal optics microscopy for biochemical and cellular high-throughput screening', by Lenka Zemanová *et al.*, the author affiliations should have read:

Lenka Zemanová¹

Andreas Schenk¹

G. Ulrich Nienhaus^{1,2}

¹Department of Biophysics

University of Ulm

D-89069 Ulm, Germany

²Department of Physics

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Urbana, IL 61801, USA

Martin J. Valler

Ralf Heilker

Department of Integrated Lead Discovery

Boehringer Ingelheim Pharma GmbH & Co. KG

Department of Integrated Lead Discovery

Birkendorfer Strasse 65

D-88397 Biberach an der Riss, Germany

We would like to apologize for any confusion that this might have caused.