

Conflict of interest resolution

Guide for resolver

The resolver evaluates if the disclosed financial relationships are relevant for the educational content and selects the most appropriate resolution option from below:

- Disclosure of conflicts and non-bias attestation
- Altering content assignment and non-bias attestation
- Peer-review / independent content validation
- Conflict unresolvable (exclusion from event)

If you are **unfamiliar with the disclosed company**, please **conduct a search** (e.g., Google) to determine which healthcare products the company produces or sells. If necessary, ask the AO event owner to contact the faculty for further clarifications about the disclosed financial relationship.

What creates a Conflict of Interest (Col)?

All relevant **financial relationships** within the last **36 months** with an **ineligible** company and the **opportunity to impact medical education content**

Relevant financial relationship

=

Financial relationship with a company that produces, markets, re-sells, or distributes healthcare products **related to the educational content**

Examples

Disclosure

Company: Any company that produces healthcare products **NOT related to the course content**

Role: Any role

What was received: Honorarium, grants/research funding, royalties for IP patents, ownership interests, consulting fees, salary, donations (e.g. educational support, scholarship, medical equipment), non-monetary benefits (gifts)



Resolution option

Disclosure of conflicts and non-bias attestation

Rationale: If the course content is not related to the healthcare products produced by the disclosed company, there is low risk of influence on the educational content. However, there is still a potential bias and the opportunity to influence content, therefore the participants should be informed about these financial relationships.

Company: Any company that produces healthcare products **related to the course content** (e.g., J&J Medtech, Smith and Nephew, Stryker)

Role: Speaker/teacher, researcher/grant receiver

What was received: Honorarium, grant/research funding



Disclosure of conflicts and non-bias attestation

Rationale: Receiving a speaker honorarium or a research grant poses a negligible risk of influencing the course content because the benefit to the faculty does not depend on the specific content delivered in the current course. However, there is still a potential bias, therefore the participants should be informed about this financial relationship.

Disclosure

Resolution option

Company: Any company that produces healthcare products related to the course content

Role: Donation or gift receiver

What was received: Donations (e.g. educational support, scholarship, medical equipment), non-monetary benefits (gifts)



Disclosure of conflicts and non-bias attestation

Rationale: Gifts and donations pose minimal risk of influencing course content, but potential bias remains; therefore, participants should be informed of this financial relationship.

Company: Any company that produces healthcare products related to the course content (e.g. J&J, Smith and Nephew, Stryker)

Role: Consultant, advisor/medical expert

What was received: Honorarium, consulting fees



**Peer-review / independent content validation or
Altering content assignment and non-bias attestation**

Rationale: When serving as a consultant or advisor, the relationship with the company is typically strong and prolonged, presenting a significant risk of influencing the course content. To mitigate this risk, it is essential to conduct a peer review of the content, no later than during the faculty precourse.

Alternatively, if the relationship is with a small company focused on a specific and identifiable treatment area, the assigned content can be altered to a completely unrelated topic.

Company: Any company that produces healthcare products related to the course content

Role: Shareholder/investor, rights/IP holder

What was received: Royalties for IP patents, ownership interests (e.g., stocks, stock options, excluding diversified mutual funds)



Peer-review / independent content validation

Rationale: These are financial relationships whose benefits are typically tied to product sales. Consequently, the faculty member's benefit may increase depending on the nature of the content delivered. To mitigate this risk, it is essential to conduct a peer review of the content, no later than during the faculty precourse.

Company: A **start-up** developing healthcare products related to the course content. **No products are commercialized yet.**

Role: Owner, employee

What was received: Salary, other



**Peer-review / independent content validation or
Altering content assignment and non-bias attestation**

Rationale: At this stage, there are no product sales, however it is essential to mitigate the risk of bias by peer reviewing the content, no later than during the faculty precourse.

Alternatively, if the start-up focuses on a specific and identifiable treatment area, the assigned content can be altered to a completely unrelated topic.

Company: Any company that produces healthcare products related to the course content. Including **start-ups in clinical study phase**.

Role: Owner, employee

What was received: Salary, other



Conflict unresolvable (exclusion from event)

Rationale: Owners or employees of companies that produce healthcare products related to the course content are not permitted to serve as faculty or contribute to the creation of educational content. In such cases, the individual's invitation will be revoked.

[Link to resolution page](#)