

The following paragraphs discuss in greater detail several common or problematic relationships between manufacturers and physicians, including "switching" arrangements, consulting and advisory payments, payments for detailing, business courtesies and other gratuities, and educational and research activities.

- *Switching* arrangements. As noted in the OIG's 1994 Special Fraud Alert (59 FR 65372; December 19, 1994), product conversion arrangements (also known as "switching" arrangements) are suspect under the anti-kickback statute. Switching arrangements involve pharmaceutical manufacturers offering physicians or others cash payments or other benefits each time a patient's prescription is changed to the manufacturer's product from a competing product. This activity clearly implicates the statute, and, while such programs may be permissible in certain managed care arrangements, manufacturers should review very carefully any marketing practices utilizing "switching" payments in connection with products reimbursable by federal health care programs.

- *Consulting and advisory payments.* Pharmaceutical manufacturers frequently engage physicians and other health care professionals to furnish personal services as consultants or advisers to the manufacturer. In general, fair market value payments to small numbers of physicians for *bona fide* consulting or advisory services are unlikely to raise any significant concern. Compensating physicians as "consultants" when they are expected to attend meetings or conferences primarily in a passive capacity is suspect.

Also of concern are compensation relationships with physicians for services connected directly or indirectly to a manufacturer's marketing and sales activities, such as speaking, certain research, or preceptor or "shadowing" services. While these arrangements are potentially beneficial, they also pose a risk of fraud and abuse. In particular, the use of health care professionals for marketing purposes—including, for example, ghost-written papers or speeches—implicates the anti-kickback statute. While full disclosure by physicians of any potential conflicts of interest and of industry sponsorship or affiliation may reduce the risk of abuse, disclosure does not eliminate the risk.

At a minimum, manufacturers should periodically review arrangements for physicians' services to ensure that: (i) The arrangement is set out in writing; (ii) there is a legitimate need for the services; (iii) the services are provided;

(iv) the compensation is at fair market value; and (v) all of the preceding facts are documented prior to payment. In addition, to further reduce their risk, manufacturers should structure services arrangements to comply with a safe harbor whenever possible.

- *Payments for detailing.* Recently, some entities have been compensating physicians for time spent listening to sales representatives market pharmaceutical products. In some cases, these payments are characterized as "consulting" fees and may require physicians to complete minimal paperwork. Other companies pay physicians for time spent accessing web sites to view or listen to marketing information or perform "research." All of these activities are highly suspect under the anti-kickback statute, are highly susceptible to fraud and abuse, and should be strongly discouraged.

- *Business Courtesies and Other Gratuities.* Pharmaceutical companies and their employees and agents often engage in a number of other arrangements that offer benefits, directly or indirectly, to physicians or others in a position to make or influence referrals. Examples of remunerative arrangements between pharmaceutical manufacturers (or their representatives) and parties in a position to influence referrals include:

- Entertainment, recreation, travel, meals, or other benefits in association with information or marketing presentations; and
- Gifts, gratuities, and other business courtesies.

As discussed above, these arrangements potentially implicate the anti-kickback statute if any one purpose of the arrangement is to generate business for the pharmaceutical company. While the determination of whether a particular arrangement violates the anti-kickback statute depends on the specific facts and circumstances, compliance with the PhRMA Code with respect to these arrangements should substantially reduce a manufacturer's risk.

- *Educational and Research Funding.* In some cases, manufacturers contract with physicians to provide research services on a fee-for-service basis. These contracts should be structured to fit in the personal services safe harbor whenever possible. Payments for research services should be fair market value for legitimate, reasonable, and necessary services. Research contracts that originate through the sales or marketing functions—or that are offered to physicians in connection with sales contacts—are particularly suspect. Indicia of questionable research include, for example, research initiated or

directed by marketers or sales agents; research that is not transmitted to, or reviewed by, a manufacturer's science component; research that is unnecessarily duplicative or is not needed by the manufacturer for any purpose other than the generation of business; and post-marketing research used as a pretense to promote product. Prudent manufacturers will develop contracting procedures that clearly separate the awarding of research contracts from marketing or promotion of their products.

In addition, pharmaceutical manufacturers also provide other funding for a wide range of physician educational and research activities. Manufacturers should review educational and research grants to physicians similarly to educational and research grants to purchasers (described above). As with grants to purchasers, the OIG recognizes that many grant-funded activities are legitimate and beneficial. When evaluating educational or research grants provided by manufacturers to physicians, manufacturers should determine if the funding is based, in any way, expressly or implicitly, on the physician's referral of the manufacturer's product. If so, the funding plainly implicates the anti-kickback statute. In addition, the manufacturer should determine whether the funding is for *bona fide* educational or research purposes. Absent unusual circumstances, grants or support for educational activities sponsored and organized by medical professional organizations raise little risk of fraud or abuse, provided that the grant or support is not restricted or conditioned with respect to content or faculty.

Pharmaceutical manufacturers often provide funding to other sponsors of continuing medical education (CME) programs. Manufacturers should take steps to ensure that neither they, nor their representatives, are using these activities to channel improper remuneration to physicians or others in a position to generate business for the manufacturer or to influence or control the content of the program.¹¹ In addition, manufacturers and sponsors of educational programs should be mindful of the relevant rules and regulations of the Food and Drug Administration. Codes of conduct promulgated by the CME industry may provide a useful starting point for manufacturers when reviewing their CME arrangements.

(3) Relationships with Sales Agents. In large part, a pharmaceutical manufacturer's commitment to an effective fraud and abuse compliance program can be measured by its