CLINICAL CONTENT REVIEW AND VALIDATION FORM

WITH PHARMACOTHERAPEUTIC CONTENT REVIEW

* Reviews must be completed and returned to the activity coordinator at least <u>48 hours prior</u> to the start of the activity*

Name of Reviewer:
Degrees:
Title:
Organization/University:
Name of Activity or RSS Series:
Type of Activity (Conference, RSS, Enduring):
Date of Activity:
Faculty/Author Disclosures (List or attach COI report):

***Instructions to Reviewer*:** As an independent reviewer for the UW-Madison ICEP, your role is to ensure that the educational content in the education is fair and balanced, and that any clinical content presented supports safe, effective patient care *and addresses pharmacotherapeutics*. Review the attached educational materials in order to confirm that:

1) All recommendations for patient care are based on current science, evidence, and clinical reasoning.

2) All recommendations present a fair and balanced view of diagnostic and therapeutic options.

3) All scientific research referred to, reported, or used in support or justification of a patient care recommendation must conform to the generally accepted standards of experimental design, data collection, analysis, and interpretation.

4) New and evolving topics for which there is a lower (or absent) evidence base are clearly identified as such within the education and individual presentations.

5) The faculty does not advocate for, or promote, practices that are not, or not yet adequately based on current science, evidence, and clinical reasoning.

6) The faculty does not advocate for, or promote, unscientific approaches to diagnosis or therapy, or recommendations, treatment or manners of practicing healthcare that are determined to have risks or dangers that outweigh the benefits or are known to be ineffective in the treatment of patients.

7) Overall, the content is designed to be free of commercial or other types of bias.

   a. Content does NOT contain any marketing produced by or for an ineligible company,* including corporate or product logos, trade names or product group messages. Generic or scientific names of medications and medical devices are used wherever possible and practical to promote impartiality. If a trade name of a medication/device is used, the first reference for all medications/devices discussed in the activity should include the generic name together with the trade name, and subsequent references should use only the generic name.

8) The UW-Madison ICEP Chair is the final arbiter of whether the disclosed conflicts of interest have been resolved.

Additional Pharmacotherapeutic Review Guidance:

9) Pharmacotherapeutic content may include, but is not limited to drug specific information, safe prescribing practices, safe medication administration, prescribing methodologies, new regulations or similar content.

10) Critically review the conclusions inferred from studies presented to confirm that patient treatment recommendations represent the standard of practice withing the medical profession in the United States.

*Ineligible companies are those whose primary business is producing, marketing, selling, re-selling, or distributing healthcare products used by or on patients.

Instructions: After carefully reviewing the PowerPoint presentation and/or other educational materials provided by the faculty or author and considering their relationship(s) with ineligible companies, answer the questions below. Please provide a thorough explanation when requested.

1. Is this activity free of commercial bias (i.e., content that promotes the products or business lines of an ACCME-defined ineligible company)?
   Yes
   No (If No, recommend changes)

2. Are recommendations for patient care based on current science, evidence, and clinical reasoning, while giving a fair and balanced view of diagnostic and therapeutic options?
   Yes
   No (If No, recommend changes)

3. Does all scientific research referred to, reported, or used in this educational activity support or justification of a patient care recommendation conform to the generally accepted standards of experimental design, data collection, analysis, and interpretation?
   Yes
   No (If No, recommend changes)

4. Does the faculty advocate for, or promote, practices that are not, or not yet, adequately based on current science, evidence and clinical reasoning?
   Yes (If yes, recommend changes)
   No

5. Does the faculty advocate for or promote unscientific approaches to diagnosis or therapy, or recommendations, treatment, or manners of practicing healthcare that are determined to have risks or dangers that outweigh the benefits or are known to be ineffective in the treatment of patients?
   Yes (If yes, recommend changes)
   No

6. Does the content contain any marketing produced by or for an ineligible company,* including corporate or product logos, trade names or product group messages?
   Note: If a trade name of a medication/device is used, the first reference for all medications/devices discussed in the activity should include the generic name together with the trade name, and subsequent references should use only the generic name.
   Yes (If yes, recommend changes)
   No

7. Are new and evolving topics for which there is a lower (or absent) evidence base, clearly identified as such within the content?
   Yes
   No (If No, recommend changes)

8. Are the learners presented with any other forms of bias or promotion that should be mitigated?
   Yes (If yes, recommend changes)
   No

9. Should any content (text, articles, videos, images, etc.) be removed, edited or redacted due to HIPAA or Copyright concerns?
    Yes (list them and explain why)
    No

10. Does this presentation included pharmacotherapeutic content defined as drug specific information, safe prescribing practices, safe medicine administration, prescribing methodologies, new regulations or similar content?
    Yes
    No
    If yes, how much of the content to be presented addresses pharmacotherapeutic content?

    Select one:
        25%
        50%
        75%
        100%

11. Do you have any other concerns or comments about this presentation?
    Yes (list and explain why)
    No

_____   _____
            Reviewer's Signature   Date (at least 48 hrs. prior to activity)