

Case Notes

New decisions. Practical understanding.

PMCPA CASE DIGEST

Selected recent reports | 4-minute read

Three decisions to sharpen your next review: scientific news, portfolio claims and sponsored content.

IN THIS EDITION

01

Eli Lilly

BREACH

02

Chiesi

NO BREACH

03

Organon

MIXED RULINGS

01 / MEDIA & PRE-LICENCE COMMUNICATION

When scientific news becomes promotion

Eli Lilly | CASE/0685/08/25

BREACH - UPHOLD ON APPEAL

A BBC article on Phase 3 results for investigational medicine orforglipron followed a press release supplied by Lilly. The Appeal Board assessed the release itself, including executive quotations, launch language and its foreseeable public audience.

It found that the cumulative language went beyond factual reporting and promoted the medicine before marketing authorisation. The Panel's breach rulings were upheld on appeal.

[Read the official PMCPA report](#)

THE RULING

3.1 Promotion before marketing authorisation

5.1 Failure to maintain high standards

2 Discredit upon, and reduced confidence in, the industry

KIARO PRACTICAL TAKEAWAY

Review quotations, headlines and launch language alongside the data. Ask whether the overall message reports research or creates anticipation of treatment availability.

Related learning: Audience & channel / Claims & substantiation

Context. Responsibility. Evidence.

02 / CLAIMS & CONTEXT

Read the portfolio claim in context

Chiesi | CASE/0801/11/25

NO BREACH

Two respiratory website statements were challenged as implying that Clenil was licensed for COPD and had formulation or device characteristics it did not possess. The Panel considered the complete wording and webpage context. It found the statements described the portfolio collectively; wording about formulations was qualified by reference to the latest products. The alleged misleading implications were not established.

NO BREACH

6.1 Misleading information or claims

11.2 Promotion outside the authorisation

5.1 and 2 High standards; industry confidence

KIARO TAKEAWAY

Separate attributes of the portfolio from attributes of each medicine. This is a contextual decision, not blanket permission for broad claims.

Read the official PMCPA report

Related learning: Product knowledge / Claims & substantiation

03 / SPONSORSHIP & ACCOUNTABILITY

Look beyond the sponsorship label

Organon | CASE/0765/10/25

MIXED RULINGS

Organon sponsored a healthcare organisation's website containing an Emgality indication outside its UK authorisation at the time. The Panel found that off-label discussion was foreseeable from the funding request and that sponsor benefits exceeded acknowledgement. It concluded the arrangement was not strictly arm's length and held Organon responsible for the content.

BREACH / NO BREACH

Breach: 11.2 and 5.1 - the identified webpage promoted an unlicensed indication; high standards were not maintained.

No breach: 11.2 - a separate clinical-trial allegation lacked evidence.

No breach: 2 - the threshold for particular censure was not established.

KIARO TAKEAWAY

Before agreeing support, examine the funding request, foreseeable content and sponsor benefits. Check whether the evidence supports an arm's length arrangement.

Read the official PMCPA report

Related learning: Product knowledge / Audience & channel

Illustrative selection of recent reports, not a complete monthly register. All rulings use the 2024 Code. Kiara takeaways are editorial interpretation. Decisions depend on their facts; read the linked official reports. Sources checked 15 October 2026.