sicians through the dissemination of research material. It is awarded in our academy on the basis of relevance to family practice, legibility, and scientific accuracy associated with ethical content. This is in opposition to the commercial exhibit, which is a mechanism for soliciting support for our annual meeting and which is paid for.

Our scientific exhibits we accept no remuneration directly for, and also the scientific exhibits are unsolicited, whereas we do solicit the commercial exhibits. Scientific exhibits, in general, are picked because of their relevance to family practice, and they are picked because of content. If they fail to meet these, we through our committee, or our subcommittee of our scientific assembly, suggest changes in the format, but not in the basic content of the material, to meet a format of application which we have. This is attached in the testimony as exhibit A.

The second point that you requested us to respond to is sponsorship of our scientific exhibits. This sponsorship can vary. It varies from private industry, universities, armed forces. As mentioned by Dr. Crout in his discussion of the 28th, also from pharmaceutical firms. The figure that Dr. Crout cited in his earlier testimony, of 80 percent of scientific exhibits being sponsored by drug firms upon our review, appears to be reasonable.

The third point that you asked us to address is who prepares the scientific exhibits. This is a multifaceted approach also. The individual exhibitor may prepare his own exhibit. In the 1975 academy meeting, the scientific assembly's excellence award was won by an individual who prepared and printed his own material on a poster board situation. Or, the preparation of the exhibit can also come from individuals, such as universities, in concert with the exhibitor, or in some instances pharmaceutical firms supplying economic support for the researcher and then assisting in the development of the format.

The other modality is, of course, the commercial exhibiting companies which prepare the exhibit on a protocol based on the desires based on the particular exhibitor and physician.

You asked relative to the editorial review, we have a subcommittee that reviews all scientific requests. As previously stated, we asked them to adopt to our format, without changing the content. If they cannot adopt to the format as established by the academy, we recommend that they not attend.

We have rejected because of this very fact. We have had some problems in the past, and this year we are in the process of working a review situation prior to the opening of the exhibits with the PMA, and this is outlined in our testimony.

I must stress at this point in time that the protocal relative to this will be the protocol established by the academy, and not the protocol established by the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association.

Mr. GORDON. May I ask a question at this point?

Dr. KELLY. Yes, sir.

Mr. GORDON. What is the function of the PMA? I am not sure I get that.

Dr. KELLY. Well, relative to our testimony, the PMA has been asked to critique the scientific exhibits prior to opening our Con-