



Orthopaedic educational grants to fellowship and residency programs—with independence and transparency.

[omegamedicalgrants.org](http://omegamedicalgrants.org)

## Addressing conflicts of interest

OMeGA is committed to its mission of administering orthopaedic graduate medical education (GME) grants without conflicts of interest. There are four categories of bias that are addressed:

**Institutional bias** – Bias for an institution with which one is or has been associated.

**Industry conflict** – Bias for a particular company that has provided incentives of any kind.

**Region or reputation bias** – Bias for a specific country, part of the country, state or city.

**Diversity bias** – Bias against a fellow’s gender, race or country of origin.

As a newly established organization, OMeGA had the unique opportunity to create processes that worked to eliminate or reduce bias in all four categories. Please e-mail [info@omegamedicalgrants.org](mailto:info@omegamedicalgrants.org) with any questions or suggestions of how we can further improve.

Institutional bias	Industry conflict	Region or reputation bias	Diversity bias
--------------------	-------------------	---------------------------	----------------

### OMeGA Board of Directors selection process

	Institutional bias	Industry conflict	Region or reputation bias	Diversity bias
Potential members (speaking for themselves and their immediate family members) verify their eligibility on an annual basis.	✗	✗		
Verify that they have no “Financial Interest” in any orthopaedic medical device manufacturer. “Financial Interest” shall mean ownership or personal compensation arrangements such as employment, consulting, speaking, or development relationships. Ownership of less than 5% in publicly traded securities and mutual funds in an orthopaedic medical device manufacturer will not be considered a Financial Interest.		✗		
Disclose all leadership roles in orthopaedic fellowship or residency programs and educational institutions that may apply for a grant, recusing him/herself from consideration of grant applications made by institutions with which the individual has been associated in the last two (2) years. “Leadership Role” is defined to include a department chair or other position that involves financial decision making within the orthopaedic department of an institution in the previous two (2) years.	✗			
Disclose any other financial or other personal considerations that may compromise, or may have the appearance of compromising, the individual’s ability to serve as an objective evaluator of GME programs.	✗	✗	✗	
Bi-annual checks against available medical device company lists of identified consultants.		✗		
Names are checked annually against the AAOS conflicts list.		✗		

### OMeGA Review Committee (RC) selection process

	Institutional bias	Industry conflict	Region or reputation bias	Diversity bias
Sub-specialty societies are invited to nominate non-conflicted RC candidates with no mandate or expressed preference for any regional, institutional or other demographic characteristic.	✗	✗	✗	✗
Potential members (speaking for themselves and their immediate family members) verify their eligibility on an annual basis.		✗		
Verify that they have no “Financial Interest” in any orthopaedic medical device manufacturer. “Financial Interest” shall mean ownership or personal compensation arrangements such as employment, consulting, speaking, or development relationships. Ownership of less than 5% in publicly traded securities and mutual funds in an orthopaedic medical device manufacturer will not be considered a Financial Interest.		✗		
Disclose all leadership roles in orthopaedic fellowship or residency programs and educational institutions that may apply for a grant, recusing him/herself from consideration of grant applications made by institutions with which the individual has been associated in the last two (2) years.	✗			
Disclose any other financial or other personal considerations that may compromise, or may have the appearance of compromising, the individual’s ability to serve as an objective evaluator of GME programs.	✗	✗	✗	

- Institutional bias** – Bias for an institution with which one is or has been associated.
- Industry conflict** – Bias for a particular company that has provided incentives of any kind.
- Region or reputation bias** – Bias for a specific country, part of the country, state or city.
- Diversity bias** – Bias against a fellow’s gender, race or country of origin.

**OMeGA Review Committee selection process** *continues*

	Institutional bias	Industry conflict	Region or reputation bias	Diversity bias
RC members are not required to be members of any professional medical organization.	✗			
Bi-annual checks against medical device company lists of identified consultants.		✗		
Names are checked annually against the AAOS conflicts list.		✗		

**In the application review process**

Grant recipients agree to AdvaMed and PhRMA guidelines.		✗		
Automated quarterly system checks applicants against OIG list of disallowed institutions.	✗			
Unbiased application evaluation based on objective orthopaedic criteria, thorough knowledge of academic environment and merit.	✗	✗	✗	
Grants are not awarded on the use, order, or purchase of (or the recommendation to use, order or purchase) any products or services of any specific medical device manufacturer.		✗		
Two or three reviewers review each application separately.	✗	✗	✗	
Reviewer scores and rankings are tracked on a master sheet by number, not by name.	✗		✗	
Scoring sheet records program’s history of promoting women and under-represented minorities.				✗
Sub-specialty review group discusses each application, talk about the similarities and differences in their rankings and come to a consensus ranking.	✗	✗	✗	
Blinded presentation by sub-specialty review group with grading explanations, conclude with the group’s recommendation for ranking and grant amounts.	✗	✗	✗	✗
Questions from the review committee oblige the sub-specialty review group to defend their position. (This process also stimulates further food for thought to the other groups.) This process is completed all nine sub-specialty fellowship categories.	✗	✗	✗	✗
The board reviews recommendations for all nine sub-specialty categories in the aggregate. Using their collective expertise, they review for any skewed distribution including geographic mix, established versus start-up programs and/or too many grants to specific institutions.	✗	✗	✗	✗

**Once the grant is awarded**

Grant recipients agree again to AdvaMed and PhRMA guidelines.	✗	✗	✗	✗
Fellow names are collected in the first milestone reports in order to track demographic trends. Specific names are not shared with outside parties.	✗	✗	✗	✗
Programs names are announced through print and electronic communication channels. Specific company donors are not assigned to individual grant recipient programs to help maintain the arms-length distance between industry and academic program while the grant is in-force.		✗		
Quarterly reports from funded programs provide updates to confirm continued non-bias.		✗		

Go to [omegamedicalgrants.org](http://omegamedicalgrants.org) for more information.