

COMPLAINANT V PFIZER**Allegations about an advertisement for Mylotarg**

This case was in relation to a banner advertisement for Mylotarg that appeared on a medical education website designed for health professionals. The complainant alleged that:

1. the advertisement's clickable link to the prescribing information (PI) was broken because it did not link to the PI (breach of Clause 12.1),
2. the non-proprietary name (gemtuzumab ozogamicin) was not sufficiently prominent (breach of Clause 12.4), and
3. there had been a failure to maintain high standards (Clause 5.1).

The complainant was contactable and described themselves as a health professional.

The case preparation manager considered that the complaint met the criteria for the abridged complaints' procedure because:

1. it was likely that there had been a breach of the Code,
2. it appeared that the central facts would not be disputed, and
3. the allegations fell within the PMCPA's approved list of clauses for the abridged procedure.

The link to PI on the banner advertisement appeared to be broken and, because the non-proprietary name was small and in grey font on a white background, it was not sufficiently legible. Pfizer accepted a breach of Clauses 12.1 and 12.4 of the Code in relation to both matters.

Pfizer also accepted a breach of Clause 5.1 of the Code, due to its failure (in this isolated instance) not to withdraw and update the banner advertisement when the link to the PI was updated. This resulted in the banner advertisement appearing on the medical education provider's website without a functioning PI link. Pfizer accepted that this was a failure to maintain high standards.

Pfizer provided the required undertaking and assurances for each of these accepted breaches.

The outcome under the 2024 Code of Practice was:

Breach of Clause 5.1	Failing to maintain high standards
Breach of Clause 12.1	Failing to include the prescribing information
Breach of Clause 12.4	Failing to include the non-proprietary name of the medicine immediately adjacent to the most prominent display of the brand name

Complaint received 28 July 2025

Case completed

18 September 2025