Request for Proposal (RFP) for Independent Medical Education (IME)

Subcutaneous Immune Checkpoint Inhibitors

Therapeutic Area	Subcutaneous Immune Checkpoint Inhibitors
Sub-area of Interest	Knowledge, Competency
Intended Learners	Oncologists, Physician Assistants, Nurse Practitioners, Oncology Pharmacists, and Oncology Nurses
Budget	$300,000
Geographic Coverage	United States and Global
References	Supportive citations are provided beginning on page 4.
Submission Deadline	Sunday, September 27, 2026,11:59pm Eastern
Submission	www.msdgrant.com
Submission code	SCIO2026

MSD

Background

Our values represent the core of our character and guide every decision and action we take, leading with patients first. We support quality IME for healthcare professionals (HCPs) designed to improve patient health outcomes, across a variety of scientific areas. Global Medical Proficiency and External Affairs (GMPEA) aims to be the world class industry leader collaborating with professional organizations to support innovative IME, advancing knowledge, competence, and performance of HCPs to help improve patient care and health outcomes. Education which allows for reinforcement of the learning objectives is key to long-term performance optimization, as is the incorporation of tools and ongoing reminders for HCPs that help them apply their knowledge. The best way to improve patient care is through the application of relevant and appropriate medical education.

While overall age-adjusted mortality rates due to cancer trended downward annually between 2020 and 2024,[1,2] cancer continues to be one of the leading causes of mortality in the United States (U.S.) and worldwide. The American Cancer Society is projecting approximately 2.1 million new cancer diagnoses and approximately 625,000 deaths related to cancer in the U.S. in 2026.[1] By 2050, the estimated number of new cancer diagnoses globally is predicted to be 32.6 million cases – a 74% increase from the number of cases in 2022.[3] The introduction of immune checkpoint inhibitors (ICI) over the past decade is a major advancement in cancer care for a variety of cancer types.[4,5] Traditionally, ICI administration relies on intravenous (IV) infusions, which use infusion-chair time, pharmacy aseptic capacity, and nursing resources.[6,7,8] Subcutaneous (SC) oncology therapies are emerging as a promising alternative to traditional IV therapies, offering comparable efficacy, pharmacokinetics, and safety profiles.[9] HCPs face challenges in understanding the current clinical landscape of SC ICIs along with the current clinical evidence supporting the integration of SC ICIs into patient care, including institutional workflow adjustments, patient preferences, and managing potential adverse events (AEs).[6,8,10,11]

Identified Educational Gap(s)

The GMPEA team at Our Company identified several practice gaps surrounding SC ICIs through published literature, Educational Needs Assessments (ENAs), and outcomes of supported IME programs. These gaps can be effectively addressed through IME for HCPs working to advance patient health outcomes across a variety of disciplines. Our Company would like to support the following educational and practice gaps:

- The need for oncology HCPs to incorporate a multidisciplinary and interprofessional approach towards shared decision making when evaluating ICI treatment options with patients diagnosed with cancer[8,9,10]
- The need for Oncologists, Physician Assistants (PAs), Nurse Practitioners (NPs), Oncology Pharmacists, and Oncology Nurses to understand the clinical evidence supporting the use of SC ICIs compared to IV ICIs in cancer treatment[6,7,8,9]
- The need for the multidisciplinary team (MDT) to increase their knowledge and competence regarding the clinical workflow and protocols with SC ICI administration[7,8,10,11]
- The need for Oncologists, PAs, NPs, Oncology Pharmacists, and Oncology Nurses to improve their knowledge and competence about practical considerations and best practices for identifying appropriate patients to receive SC ICIs [6,7,9,10,11]
- The need for the Oncology MDT to have better awareness of increased treatment preference for SC ICI administration versus IV ICI administration among patients[9, 12, 13,14,15]
- The need for Oncologists, Oncology Pharmacists, and Oncology Nurses to continue to appropriately recognize and manage potential AEs with SC ICI administration[7,9]

Our Company is looking to support education to narrow or close these gaps; however, depending on the needs identified by the providers, the education may not be able to address all these educational gaps in a single proposal.

Eligibility Criteria

- Professional associations and medical societies, healthcare institutions, medical education companies, and other organizations committed to improving the quality of healthcare delivered to individuals, through the education of HCPs, may apply for this grant.
- The applicant must be an accredited provider in good standing by the Accreditation Council for Continuing Medical Education (ACCME), American Nursing Credentialing Center (ANCC), American Council for Pharmacy Education (ACPE), or have Joint Accreditation for interprofessional continuing education.
- The selected grant recipient will need to attest to the terms, conditions, and purposes of the independent educational grant as described in Our Company's Letter of Agreement, and comply with current ethical codes and regulations.

Prioritization of Grant Applications

Our Company will evaluate all complete grant applications and will give priority to those most likely to independently validate the aforementioned educational and performance gaps specific to the needs of specific cohorts of learners. Proposals should be built around the educational or performance need (including an identification of current knowledge or practice of targeted learners contrasted with ideal knowledge and practice), supported with aligned learning objectives, constructed with appropriate instructional design and adult learning theory, and evaluated using Moore's scale of educational effectiveness. Our Company encourages application submission to additional commercial supporters with similar scientific interests.

Our Company appreciates the complexity of education required for HCPs to help improve patient health outcomes. In our experience, collaboration between medical education providers may yield better educational outcomes by enabling multi-modal education and developing tools and resources for a broader group of learners.

Terms and Conditions

The selected grant recipient shall be bound by the terms and conditions found in the Our Company's Letter of Agreement.

References

1. SEER Cancer Statistics Factsheets: Common Cancer Sites. National Cancer Institute. Bethesda, MD. https://seer.cancer.gov/statfacts/html/common.html. Accessed 29 May 2026.
2. National Cancer Institute Cancer Statistics. https://www.cancer.gov/about-cancer/understanding/statistics. Accessed 29 May 2026.
3. Cancer Atlas Fourth Edition. June 2025, https://pressroom.cancer.org/2025CancerAtlasReport. Accessed 29 May 2026.
4. Khaki, AR, et al. Beyond the point: Learning from outcomes after inpatient immune checkpoint inhibitor therapy. 2025. *JCO Oncology Practice*. 21(8). https://doi.org/10.1200/OP-25-00213. Accessed 22 May 2026.
5. Vafaei S, Zekiy AO, Khanamir RA, et al. Combination therapy with immune checkpoint inhibitors (ICIs); a new frontier. *Cancer Cell Int*. 2022;22(1):2.
6. Albiges L, Bourlon MT, Chacon M, et al. Subcutaneous versus intravenous nivolumab for renal cell carcinoma. *Ann Oncol,* 2024; 36, 99-107
7. Burotto M, Zvirbule Z, Mochalova A, et al. IMscin001 Part 2: a randomised phase III, open-label, multicentre study examining the pharmacokinetics, efficacy, immunogenicity, and safety of atezolizumab subcutaneous versus intravenous administration in previously treated locally advanced or metastatic non-small cell lung cancer and pharmacokinetics comparison with other approved indications. *Ann Oncol*. 2023;34(8):693-702.
8. Inoue Y. Subcutaneous delivery of immune checkpoint inhibitors: new route replacing intravenous administration? *Transl Lung Cancer Res*. 2024;13(4):947-951.

9. George S., et al. Systemic literature review of intravenous versus subcutaneous administration of oncology therapies: A clinic, economic and patient perspective. *Cancer Treat Rev*. 139 (2025) 102974.
10. Anderson KC, Landgren O, Arend RC, Chou J, Jacobs IA. Humanistic and economic impact of subcutaneous versus intravenous administration of oncology biologics. *Future Oncol*. 2019;15(28):3267-3281.
11. McCloskey C, Ortega MT, Nair S, Garcia MJ, Manevy F. A systematic review of time and resource use costs of subcutaneous versus intravenous administration of oncology biologics in a hospital setting. *Pharmacoecon Open*. 2023;7(1):3-36.
12. Skalicky A, Bennett B, Raimbourg J, et al. Patient experience of medication administration and development of a Patient Experience and Preference Questionnaire (PEPQ) for patients with advanced or metastatic cancer. *Front Pharmacol*. 2024;15:1310546.
13. Pivot X, Gligorov J, Muller V, et al. Preference for subcutaneous or intravenous administration of trastuzumab in patients with HER2-positive early breast cancer (PrefHer): an open-label randomised study. *Lancet Oncol*. 2013;14(10):962-970.
14. Moeller J, Green MD, Ramnath N. Pros and cons of subcutaneous (SC) versus intravenous (IV) administration of immune checkpoint inhibitors in non-small cell lung cancer. *Transl Lung Cancer Res*. 2024;13(6):1444-1449.
15. O'Shaughnessy J, Sousa S, Cruz J, et al. Preference for the fixed-dose combination of pertuzumab and trastuzumab for subcutaneous injection in patients with HER2-positive early breast cancer (PHranceSCa): a randomised, open-label phase II study. *Eur J Cancer*. 2021; 152:223-232.
16. Moore DE, Green JS, Gallis HA. Achieving desired results and improved outcomes: integrating planning and assessment throughout learning activities. *J Contin Educ Health Prof*. 2009;29(1):1-15.