

Senator NELSON. I did not have a chance, because I just got your testimony this morning, to go all the way through it.

Did you cover all of the major points within your prepared text?

Dr. KELLY. Yes, sir.

Senator NELSON. All right.

Thank you very much, gentlemen, for taking the time to come. I do appreciate it.

Mr. Gordon has some questions.

Mr. GORDON. The previous witness, Mr. Scherago, stated that early in the history of organized sciences it became apparent that a system of assuring the authenticity of a scientific work appearing in society journals was essential; that to protect themselves scientists established the peer review doctrine. In its simplest form this doctrine says that no piece of scientific research can be considered valid unless it has been reviewed by at least two recognized authorities in the field of science involved. Furthermore these reviewers can have no financial or academic involvement in the work reviewed, and in most cases are to remain unknown to the performer of the work.

Do you follow this peer review procedure for your scientific exhibits?

Dr. KELLY. For the scientific exhibits?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Dr. KELLY. The peer review is done by the subcommittee, yes, sir.

Mr. GORDON. That is two independents, as outlined by Mr. Scherago—two independent experts who are not involved at all financially?

Dr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Gordon, with your permission, I would like to answer that.

I happen to have been Chairman of the Committee on Scientific Programs. When we introduced a means of evaluating the scientific exhibits, we did so in a very careful and uniform manner to be conducted by the Committee on Scientific Programs.

The scientific exhibits that we do select in the final analysis are selected based on a standard set of criteria which we established in 1969, and these are reviewed carefully by at least two members of the Committee on Scientific Programs. In many cases the entire committee has seen some of these exhibits and can give their impressions or opinions. But we have at least two reviewers on the committee to complete an evaluation form on every scientific exhibit.

Mr. GORDON. But they are not independent reviewers—they are two people from the committee itself. This is quite different from what Mr. Scherago described as the peer review doctrine.

Dr. HUFFMAN. That is correct.

Actually, peer review for a publication is a different sort of thing, and is another subject. We have peer review there which is outside peer review.

Mr. GORDON. Do you know of any scientific exhibits paid for by the drug firm which was unfavorable to the use of a drug—any drug at all?

Do you recall?

Dr. KELLY. No, sir, I do not.

[Dr. Huffman nods negatively.]