

WHO SHOULD FUND CME?

To the editor: The editorial by Green and colleagues about the demise of Xigris raises the question of who should pay for continuing medical education (CME).¹ Although the authors recognize the problems with the marketing of Xigris, they also emphasize that it was the Surviving Sepsis Campaign, organized by Eli Lilly on behalf of its drug, that helped stimulate a change in the way that sepsis is recognized and treated. In support of this claim, they cite two articles. The first 3 (of 10) authors of one of these articles disclosed links to Lilly through speaking at scientific meetings organized by Lilly, receiving research support from Lilly, or being on a Lilly advisory board.² Conflict of interest on the part of investigators has been

shown to bias results in favour of the sponsoring company.³⁻⁵

Even if we accept that the Surviving Sepsis Campaign helped promote the treatment of sepsis, does that justify a campaign that was primarily motivated to advance the use of a drug that was questionable from the outset? More generally, should we be relying on drug companies to finance our CME when their profit motive may conflict with the best evidence?

Joel Lexchin, MD

Emergency Department, University Health Network, Toronto, ON; School of Health Policy and Management, York University, Toronto, ON

References

1. Green RS, Djogovic D, Howes D. Sepsis update: management of severe sepsis and septic shock in the emergency department after the withdrawal of Xigris. *CJEM* 2012;14:265-6.
2. Ferrer R, Artigas A, Levy MM, et al. Improvement in process of care and outcome after a multicenter severe sepsis educational program in Spain. *JAMA* 2008;299:2294-303, doi:[10.1001/jama.299.19.2294](https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.299.19.2294).
3. Friedman LS, Richter ED. Relationship between conflicts of interest and research results. *J Gen Intern Med* 2004;19:51-6, doi:[10.1111/j.1525-1497.2004.30617.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1525-1497.2004.30617.x).
4. Kjaergard LL, Als-Nielsen B. Association between competing interests and authors' conclusions: epidemiological study of randomised clinical trials published in the BMJ. *BMJ* 2002;325:249, doi:[10.1136/bmj.325.7358.249](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.325.7358.249).
5. Perlis RH, Perlis CS, Wu Y, et al. Industry sponsorship and financial conflict of interest in the reporting of clinical trials in psychiatry. *Am J Psychiatry* 2005; 162:1957-60, doi:[10.1176/appi.ajp.162.10.1957](https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.162.10.1957).