Mr. GORDON. Can you give us any examples of the comparison of efficacy and safety of drugs presented in your exhibits, and would this be included in a commercial or scientific exhibit, and who would sponsor this kind of exhibit?

Dr. HUFFMAN. In commercial exhibits, of course, this information has to be given out at the time that they are talking to a doctor about a drug. They have the standard information on the drugs at the commercial exhibit. Of course that is the commercial approach.

Mr. GORDON. I am talking about scientific exhibits.

Dr. HUFFMAN. Again, the data is reviewed for subjectivity and has to include all of the adverse reactions that occurred, the contraindications, et cetera.

Dr. KELLY. If you have a generic type of material, the entire spectrum of that, whether it is produced by one, two, or four drug companies, is part of the evaluation.

Mr. GORDON. Coming back to this peer review business, you are saying also that the peer review is conducted by the PMA, as well as your committee.

Is that correct?

Dr. HUFFMAN. Actually, we are probably overemphasizing the PMA or the activity of the liaison committee from the PMA. The liaison committee of the PMA is asked to review the exhibits after they have been set up. Now this is long after the peer review, the committee review, has taken place. They are asked to review the exhibits after the setup to be sure that we have not missed a reference to a commercial brand name, or that we have not allowed someone to slip in with something that is really a blatant commercial promotion.

As Dr. Kelly said, we hope that we have safety in numbers by having a number of those companies represented on those committees, and they would be very careful to see to it that no one had violated their protocol. That comes long after the active selection process of the Committee on Scientific Programs.

Mr. GORDON. So, we have a situation where the drug industry sponsors 100 percent of the commercial exhibits, 80 percent of the scientific exhibits, and then the PMA reviews the exhibits to see if they are satisfactory.

Is that it?

Dr. KELLY. That is partially true—100 percent of the commercial exhibits; 80 percent of the scientific exhibits; but the PMA is involved after the peer review has been accomplished by the Academy for ethical content and relevancy to family practice. They are involved in a protocol relationship rather than generic one-upmanship or commercial advantage. That is their involvement.

Senator NELSON. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

Our next witness is Mr. Edward F. Calesa, president of Health Learning Systems Inc., of Bloomfield, N.J.

Mr. Calesa, the committee is very pleased to have you here this morning. Your statement will be printed in full in the record. You may present it however you desire.[1]

[1] See prepared statement of Mr. Calesa beginning at page 14050.