

10 Myths about “CEJA 1”

Myth 1: “CEJA 1” prohibits all industry support for CME

- Goal: independence from industry support
- Industry support ethically is acceptable when:
 - Demonstrated need
 - Activity requires high-cost resources
 - Decision to seek/accept funding is independent, prospective
 - Decision-making process is transparent

Myth 2: “CEJA 1” prohibits participation by anyone who has financial relationships with industry

- Goal: no reliance on “conflicted experts”
- Participation by conflicted expert is ethically acceptable when:
 - Dissemination of device/technique/technology will benefit patients, public, professional community
 - Activity meets a demonstrated need

- Participation is central to success of activity
- Individual is uniquely qualified
- Steps are taken to mitigate potential influence
 - commensurate with financial interest at stake
 - including disclosure – source, nature, magnitude of interest
- Decision-making process is transparent

Myth 3: “CEJA 1” disregards
physicians’ ability to be critical
“consumers” of CME

- Goal: support well-informed exercise of judgment
- Provide key information
 - Source, nature, magnitude of financial interests at stake
 - Steps taken to mitigate potential influence

- Be able to answer key questions:
 - Why industry support is crucial to success of the activity
 - Why participation by a “conflicted expert” is crucial to success of the activity
 - Decisions rest on systematic process

Myth 4: “CEJA 1” requires CME providers to collect and disclose new kinds of information

- Goal: set robust standards for disclosure
 - Magnitude, as well as source, nature of financial interests at stake
 - Range, not specific \$ amount

- Consistent with emerging strong practice:
 - ACCME PARS requirements
 - whether commercial support received
 - how many commercial interests provided support
 - total amount of commercial support received
 - *Optional:* nature of in-kind support (if any)
 - Specialty society policies, e.g., NASS

Myth 5: “CEJA 1” doesn’t define key terms, so guidance is limited and vague

- Goal: articulate broad ethical principles and guidance relevant across contexts
- Implementation necessarily involves judgment

- Background report offers examples to guide interpretation
 - Recommendation (b)(ii): disclose “nature” of financial relationships at stake
 - Consulting arrangements, service on advisory bodies, participation in speakers bureau (report, p. 6)
 - Recommendation (b)(iii): disclose “steps taken to mitigate” potential influence
 - Individual to refrain from accepting compensation for a defined period
 - Independent review of proposed content (report, p. 7)

Myth 6: “CEJA 1” just duplicates ACCME SCS™

- Common commitment to transparency, independence, accountability
- Complementary guidance
- Important differences
 - Nature & type of guidance
 - Conceptual foundation

Nature & type of guidance

<i>ACCME SCS™</i>	<i>“CEJA 1”</i>
Focus on CME providers	Guidance for the medical profession
Operational expectations	Foundational principles Exercise of critical judgment
Appropriate use of commercial support	Industry support as exception

Conceptual foundation

ACCME SCS™	“CEJA 1”
Focus on conflicts of interest in “personal financial relationships”	Wider scope of concern -- potential influence on overall CME agenda
Single global definition -- any amount within prior 12 months	Not all equally problematic Key features to assess
Conflicts can be “resolved”	Conflicts can only be “eliminated” Potential influence must be mitigated

Myth 7: “CEJA 1” overrides the policies of state & specialty societies, even when they are more stringent

- Sets threshold for sound ethical practice across the profession
- Does not preclude more stringent “local” policies

Myth 8: “CEJA 1” disproportionately burdens CME providers who have limited resources

- Recognizes challenges to providing high quality CME
- Provides guidance for exceptional situations
- Supports thoughtful, critical decision making

Myth 9: *“CEJA 1” will make it too difficult to provide high quality CME*

- Only one of many factors in play
- Difficult to demonstrate that these recommendations are uniquely challenging
- Difficult to predict specific effect in a rapidly changing environment

Myth 10: *“CEJA 1” will drive physicians to promotional educational activities that don’t have oversight*

- Attributing a specific future outcome calls for evidence we don’t have
- ACCME SCS™ don’t appear to have had this undesired consequence
- Challenge to predict specific outcomes in complex, dynamic environment
