

The Academy received correspondence from the *NY Times* stating they would consider my submission but I had to reduce the number of words to 150. The following is our edited version.

To the editor:

In his June 13 Op-Ed article, Professor Carlet, showed his ignorance of continuing medical education (CME) by combining issues concerning pharmaceutical funding of CME.

His innuendo, physicians receive CME credits directly from pharmaceutical companies, exhibits his shocking lack of knowledge concerning certified CME vs. promotion. The FDA considers lectures and honorarium paid directly by pharmaceutical companies as promotion not education.

When an activity is developed and certified by an Accredited CME provider (a for-profit or non-profit organization, university, hospital, or medical society), it must adhere to unyielding criteria and standards. The standards are even more rigid when a pharmaceutical company provides the grant funding. The company can have no influence on the content or selection of faculty.

Finally, Dr. Carlet's own institution accepts pharmaceutical support for CME activities to pay for "all or part of the costs of a CME activity*..." It appears this is another case of "the pot calling the kettle black."



President and Founder
American Academy of CME
A 501(c)(3) not-for-profit medical education foundation

*www.tufts.edu/med/docs/about/offices/occe/PROGRAMPOLICIESANDPROCEDURESMANUAL.doc (page 9)