

Groupe canadien d'endocrinologie pédiatrique

Canadian Pediatric Endocrine Group Sponsorship, Endorsement and Support Policies

CPEG will consider undertaking the development of documents such as policies, clinical practice guidelines, and position statements relevant to the field of pediatric endocrinology. In addition, CPEG will consider endorsement of similar documents developed by other organizations. CPEG will also consider providing letters of support for projects and programs relevant to the field of pediatric endocrinology.

This document details the requirements and procedure for:

- (1) the development of a CPEG initiated policy, clinical practice guideline or position statement,
- (2) the endorsement of documents created by other organizations and
- (3) requests for letters of support.

Recognizing that CPEG does not have any paid administrative support and that this work is being done by CPEG members on a volunteer basis, the timelines proposed in this document may not always be possible to meet. However, these are the timelines that will be aimed for.

(1) CPEG initiated documents such as policies, position statements, consensus statements and practice guidelines

The CPEG Executive Committee has authority to determine if the development of such a document falls under CPEG's purview.

The following process/principles will be followed regarding the development of such CPEG initiated documents:

A. Submit letter of intent (see Appendix 1 for format)

Letter of intent will be reviewed by at minimum 2 CPEG executive members. The Executive will decide whether the letter of intent is accepted (the Executive has the option to request input from general membership at this stage if warranted). If accepted, the CPEG executive will assign a point person from the executive who will also be acting as "editor" for all future related communications and action points. Timeline: 2-4 weeks depending on need for input from general membership.

B. If letter of intent accepted:



- B1. The CPEG Executive along with those who initiated the concept will develop a working group, including CPEG members and external members as appropriate, to write the document.
- B2. Working group develops draft. Draft includes declaration of Conflict of Interest (COI) for each member of the working group which can be accessed on the CPEG website.
 - B3. CPEG executive assigns a subcommittee of content experts (2 people minimum) to conduct a review of the statement. This subcommittee will include representation from Executive with this member acting as editor. The subcommittee can include individuals outside of CPEG as warranted. COI disclosure for each member is required.
 - B4. Subcommittee will review initial draft and provide feedback to the CPEG Executive through its representative on the subcommittee. Timeline for subcommittee review: 4 weeks. At this point, the full executive can decide to accept the document and move it to subsequent steps, reject the document, or request point by point revision/response based on the peer review. Timeline for full Executive decision review: 4 weeks.
 - B5. If the initial or revised document is acceptable to the Executive, it will then be posted by the point person appointed in section A for feedback from general membership. Timeline: typically 2 weeks but may be extended to 3 weeks during times of frequent holidays. At this point, an executive committee teleconference will be booked in 5-6 weeks to review summary of feedback (B6) and to come to a final decision.
 - B6. The CPEG Executive member who is acting as editor for the document then reviews and summarizes results of membership feedback to be discussed with the Executive and shared with the authors. Feedback to the authors will include specific direction to the working group from the Executive including a decision regarding next steps. Timeline for summarization of feedback to authors: 4 weeks

Decision - a) needs major revisions, b) accept with minor revisions, c) accept as is, d) reject and terminate process

If revisions are recommended, feedback will be provided to the working group and timelines will be set for revisions. Revisions will be reviewed by the appointed CPEG editor and the final decision will be made through discussion with the CPEG executive. Timeline for review of revised statement: 4 weeks.

B7. Once a document that is acceptable to the Executive has been generated it will be sent for next steps depending on the type of document.



Options would include:

- a) journal submission with standard peer review with the added step that the CPEG Executive member who is acting as Editor needs to approve the final document; co-authorship would be offered to the CPEG executive member acting as editor.
- b) further internal review only (for CPEG only statements);
- c) review by partner organizations/societies if joint statement, again with requirement that CPEG Executive member/Editor approves final document if it is altered by partner organization/society.

CPEG will endeavor to generate such documents and conduct their review without conflict of interest. Individuals with conflicts of interest (including be not limited to financial, personal, professional, or familial interests) related to the content or possible ramifications of the content proposed for endorsement will be asked to excuse themselves from the writing and review processes. If such individuals do participate, appropriate disclosures must be made to the CPEG executive.

Procedures as outlined above are important so that CPEG initiated documents are well-considered and so that the credibility and standing of CPEG is enhanced, not compromised, by the development of such documents.

(2) CPEG Endorsement Policy/Procedure

CPEG will consider the endorsement of documents such as policies, position statements, consensus statements and practice guidelines developed by other organizations if such works are pertinent to pediatric endocrinology, or in some cases pediatrics more generally.

The CPEG Executive Committee has authority to determine if an endorsement request falls under CPEG's purview and whether endorsement should be considered; if endorsement is to be considered, the Executive may choose to request broader consultation with the general membership (to be determined by the Executive on a case by case basis) and/or with content experts external to CPEG.

The following principles will be followed regarding such endorsements:

Adequate time must be provided for consideration of the endorsement.
 A minimum of 6 weeks is required. 1-2 weeks for at least 2 Executive members to

determine if request should move forward and initiate consultation with membership by, for example, posting the request/document on the CPEG portal; 2



weeks for membership to review and provide comment; 1-2 week for the executive to consider comments and make its final determination. An additional 2 weeks will be granted for this process if needed due to periods of vacation/civic holidays etc.

- Requests that do not provide adequate time for review will, in general, be rejected unless the Executive determines that circumstances/urgency warrant accelerated review.
- The CPEG executive will review member input and is granted authority to decide whether request for CPEG endorsement should be granted or not.

The Executive and membership will be asked to consider, among other aspects, the overall content, whether evidence categories were identified and utilized, whether conflicts of interest were disclosed and managed appropriately, whether appropriate stakeholders were included in the drafting of the statement/policy/guideline.

CPEG will endeavor to conduct its review without conflict of interest. Individuals with conflicts of interest (including be not limited to financial, personal, professional, or familial interests) related to the content or possible ramifications of the content proposed for endorsement will be asked to excuse themselves from the review process. If such individuals do participate in the review, appropriate disclosures must be made to the CPEG executive.

Procedures as outlined above are important so that endorsements are well-considered and so that the credibility and standing of CPEG is enhanced, not compromised, by such endorsements.

(3) Letters of support

CPEG will consider providing letters of support to projects that pertain to activities related to pediatric endocrinology and which would benefit from a letter of support for funding or approval.

The CPEG Executive Committee has the authority to determine if a letter of support will be provided. The Executive may choose to request broader consultation with the general membership (to be determined by the Executive on a case by case basis).

The request for letter of support should include

- 1) The reason for the request clearly stated (why is a letter of support from CPEG important to the success of the project)
- 2) What is being asked from CPEG (letter only, access to portal/email distribution to promote study, etc)
- 3) A copy of the scientific abstract or project summary.



The Executive reserves the right to request further details of the proposed project or to ask for broader consultation among membership if deemed necessary.

Requests should be received at least 4 weeks prior to anticipated date of reply. However, it is recommended that a longer review period be provided as the Executive may ask for more information before it provides a decision, making approval within 4 weeks not feasible.



Appendix 1 Letter of Intent - CPEG Original Statement

	4 1		
Δ	uth	ors	hin
1 N	uu	OI 3	mp

Principal Author:

Co-Authors (if determined, recognizing that the Executive may add to or delete names from this group):

	Document	Type	and	Title
--	-----------------	-------------	-----	-------

- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Document Type (Position statement, Guideline, other):
Working Title:
Joint Statement: Yes □ No □
For Joint Statements:
Joint Statement Organization:
Joint Statement Committee:
Status of Approval of Intent from partner organization: Approved Pending Not yet submitted

Rationale and Outline

The need for this document: (Maximum of 250 words) Primary Intended Outcomes: (Maximum of 250 words)

Attach Outline (Maximum of 2 pages):

Development Methods

What method(s) do you plan to use to develop the document: (Systematic /Conventional/Expert opinion/Group consensus)

Other development method(s) you plan to use: (Maximum of 250 words)

Peer Review

List any external organizations that should review the document (if any): (Maximum of 50 words)

Dissemination

Please describe your plan for dissemination (i.e. target journal and article type, other):

Conflict of Interest

Do any of the authors have a conflict of interest to disclose:

If yes, please describe: (Maximum of 250 words)

