SSF Interesting Spine Case Discussion Series
Disclosure Summary – Tuesday, August 13, 2024

The following planners and presenters, in the past 24 months, have/had a financial relationship with an ineligible company: *(S=Speaker; P=Planner)*

Jens R. Chapman, M.D (P): Advisor: Globus Medical; Fellowship Grant Support: Globus Medical; Consultant: Xtant
Rod J. Oskouian, Jr. M.D. (P): Consultant: Alphatec Spine, Globus Medical, SeaSpine, Stryker, Spineart, Medtronic, DePuy Synthes, Blue Ocean Spine; Royalties: Stryker, Globus Medical; Fellowship Grant Support: Globus Medical
Jack Zigler, M.D. (P): Consultant: Medtronic (relationship ended), Orthofix (relationship ended), Simplify Medical (relationship ended), Centinel Spine, Aesculap, Globus/NuVasive, SI-Bone; Patent Holder: Zimmer Spine
Elizabeth Lord, M.D. (S): Grant or research support: SI-Bone; Consultant: Medtronic, Globus Medical; Speakers Bureau: Implanet

All the relevant financial relationships listed for these individuals have been mitigated.

The following planners and presenters in the past 24 months, have/had no financial relationship with an ineligible company: *(S=Speaker; P=Planner)*

Matthew Vincent, M.D. (S); **Alex Upfill-Bronw, M.D.** (S); **Gerrit Lewik, M.D.** (P); **Julius Gerstmeyer, M.D.** (P); **Linda Sahlin, B.A.** (P**)**

Purpose: The information provided addresses several requirements of the Accreditation Council for Continuing Medical Education (ACCME) to help **ensure independence** in CME activities. Everyone in a position to control the content of a CME activity must disclose **ALL** financial relationships with an ineligible company to the CME provider. This information must be disclosed to participants prior to the beginning of the activity. Also, CME providers must mitigate current conflicts of interest prior to the educational activity.

Definitions: "Financial relationships" are those whose relationships in which the individual benefits by receiving a salary, royalty, intellectual property rights, consulting fee, honoraria, ownership interest (e.g., stocks, stock options or other ownership interest, excluding diversified mutual funds), or other financial benefit.

The ACME defines **ineligible companies** as those whose primary business is producing marketing, selling, reselling, or distributing healthcare products used by or on patients. Among the exemptions to this definition are government organizations non healthcare-related companies and nonprofit organizations that do not advocate for ineligible companies. Circumstances create a **"conflict of interest**" when an individual has an opportunity to affect the CME contact about products or services of an ineligible company with which they have a financial relationship.

ACCME focuses on financial relationships with ineligible companies in the 24-month period preceding the time that the individual is being asked to assume a role controlling content of the CME activity. ACCME has not set a minimal dollar amount for relationships to be significant. Inherent in any amount is the incentive to maintain or increase the value of the relationship.

For CME Mitigation Purposes the ACCME defines **"relevant financial relations**hips" as financial relationships in any amount occurring within the past 24 months that create a conflict of interest.

CME Activity Planning Committee Members: if a conflict of interest exists, the Planning Committee member must withdraw from the planning committee unless the conflict can be mitigated. Mitigation may be made by one of the following methods: (1) Peer review of CME content will be conducted at another oversight level to assure balance; (2) Change in focus of course so the activity does not include information related to products or services about which the Planning Committee has a conflict; (3) Severing relationship(s) between the member and any related ineligible company; (4) Others to be determined by the SSF CME committee.

CME Activity Planners: When a conflict of interest exists, the planning committee must address the conflict by one of the following methods: (1) Review content to be presented by speaker in advance to ensure content balance; (2) Change topic so the presentation is not related to products or services where a conflict exists; (3) Select a different presenter without may related relationship with an ineligible company; (4) Include presentations by other faculty to provide an overall balance to the content of the course; (5) Limit or specify the sources for recommendations that the presenter can use.

Each speaker is required to give a balanced, evidenced-based presentation based on published research. No conclusions or recommendations without external validation may be made by a speaker with a conflict of interest.

SSF Interesting Spine Case Discussion Series
Tuesday, August 13, 2024

Hosted by the University of California, Los Angeles

Topic: Minimally Invasive Deformity Surgery

Agenda

5pm	**Welcome & Overview** *Elizabeth Lord, M.D.*
5:05pm	**Interesting Spine Case Review** *Alex Upfill-Brown, M.D. &* *Matthew Vincent, M.D.*
5:50pm	**Open Discussion**
6pm	**Adjourn**

Series Objectives
By attending this course, the participant will provide better patient care through an increased ability to:
• Apply current evidence-based practices to provide improved outcomes for patients undergoing treatment for spine-related conditions
• Recognize improved management of spine-related conditions based upon interactions with colleagues including shared perspectives, expertise and experiences

Series Description
The SSF Interesting Spine Case Discussion Series brings together renowned institutions from around the nation to spark debate on interesting spine cases. Experts in the field provide a brief didactic lecture with updates on new and innovative developments in the world of spine care to illustrate their topic. Physicians from leading institutions share interesting and challenging cases and participants can contribute thoughts and recommendations regarding appropriate non-surgical and surgical treatment for spinal conditions.

Evaluation and Outcomes
At the end of each session, attendees will complete a survey to evaluate the conference, list examples of concepts learned and describe ways in which the material presented will impact their practice.

Planning Committee
Jens R. Chapman, M.D.
Rod J. Oskouian, Jr., M.D.
Jack Zigler, M.D.
Julius Gerstmeyer, M.D.
Gerrit Lewik, M.D.
Linda Sahlin, B.A.

Accreditation
SSF is accredited by the Accreditation Council for Continuing Medical Education (ACCME) to provide continuing medical education for physicians.

AMA PRA Category 1 Credits™
SSF designates this live activity for a maximum of 24 *AMA PRA Category 1 Credit(s)™.* Physicians should claim only the credit commensurate with the extent of their participation in the activity.

Each session is designated for 1 *AMA PRA Category 1 Credit™.*

Acknowledgments
Grant Support: Spineart

The planning committee gratefully acknowledges grant support
for this conference from

Spineart