Salesperson, marketer or educator

Learn to connect every claim with the evidence it actually describes. This route covers product status, audience interpretation, testimonials and research-use language, with a practical way to keep qualifications attached across channels.



Julian / fictional visitor

YOUR LEARNING JOURNEY

Create a claim-to-source ledger that keeps educational content accurate and makes unsupported promises easy to spot. Keep the source attached when the claim is adapted for another channel or audience.

Identify the evidence, connect it to the wording and overall impression, then examine the intended-use example.

FTC guidance addresses express and implied claims. Testimonials, education labels and research-use disclaimers do not automatically remove marketing obligations or create a legal safe harbor.

Open the current online guide

Sources and related guides remain accessible on the website. All role paths are open to every reader.

Portrait: fictional illustration, not a real patient, professional reviewer or endorsement. This handbook provides education, not individual medical or legal advice.

Contents

Read in order for a foundation, or use the linked contents to find a specific topic. Page numbers refer to this edition.

SUGGESTED START

1. Read a claim without losing its limits
2. Explain a claim with its evidence attached
3. Intended use: read the whole presentation

Continue with the reading path and books, then record your findings in the learning worksheet.

Read a claim without losing its limits / 3

Know which product the evidence describes / 4

Pharmacy types / 5

Explain a claim with its evidence attached / 5

What “gray market” leaves unexplained / 6

Intended use: read the whole presentation / 8

Reading path and books / 8

Examples in practice / 9

Questions and explanations / 10

Glossary / 11

Learning worksheet / 12

Read a claim without losing its limits

Begin with one answerable question. “Does it improve wellbeing?” covers many different things. Pain, sleep, muscle strength, a blood measurement and hospital admission are separate outcomes. Write the exact substance, the people studied, the comparison and the outcome before deciding whether a finding answers your question.

An online experience is a report of what someone noticed. It can identify questions worth investigating, including possible harms. It usually cannot separate the substance from changes in training, food, other treatments, expectations or the natural course of a problem. Many similar posts still do not create a controlled comparison. Popularity and scientific certainty are different measurements.

Laboratory and animal experiments can investigate mechanisms and generate hypotheses. Human observational studies examine associations in real settings, with potential differences between groups. Randomized comparisons are designed to reduce those differences, but their usefulness still depends on execution, size, follow-up and the outcomes measured. The study design must fit the question; a small trial is not automatically a complete safety record.

Keep benefit and harm in the same notes. Record how many people were observed, how long they were followed, what events occurred and whether investigators considered them related to treatment. An event after treatment does not by itself establish causation. Conversely, an uncertain causal connection is not a reason to erase a serious event.

When reading numbers, retain the denominator. A hypothetical change from 2 in 100 to 1 in 100 is a one-percentage-point absolute reduction and a 50% relative reduction. Both descriptions concern the same comparison. Ask for uncertainty around estimates and whether the result was planned or selected from many analyses. A headline alone rarely supplies all of this.

Worked learning example

A post says a two-compound “stack” improved recovery. Studies of each ingredient separately cannot establish the effects or risks of that combination. Record the stack claim as a question, then look for research on that exact combination, outcome and population. An absent study means the question remains unanswered.

READ THE SOURCE

Testing Treatments - free evidence-literacy book

Know which product the evidence describes

A molecule name is a starting point, not a complete product description. Record the active ingredient, chemical form, formulation, route, manufacturer or compounder and the document date. Products using similar names may differ in ways that matter. A result for one preparation does not automatically establish the performance of another.

FDA approval concerns a particular drug product and its authorized labeling. A facility registration, product listing or National Drug Code does not mean FDA has approved the product. A company can have legitimate paperwork for one activity without every product or claim being authorized.

Compounded drugs are prepared under a different framework and are not FDA-approved. They can serve particular patient needs, but FDA does not review each compounded product for safety, effectiveness and quality before marketing in the way it reviews approved medicines.

Investigational means a product or use is being studied; it does not mean success is established. Research-use labeling concerns a claimed purpose and cannot establish suitability for human use. Keep regulatory status, analytical quality and clinical evidence as three separate entries. None can substitute for the other two.

Build a simple comparison: what the paper studied, what the official label describes, and what the current document or service names. Mark missing information rather than filling it with a brand assumption. This comparison is useful for a patient preparing questions and for a professional reviewing a brochure.

Worked learning example

Two documents use the same ingredient name. One describes an approved finished medicine; the other describes bulk powder with a laboratory report. The shared name does not make the powder an approved medicine. Ask what each document actually establishes before carrying claims between them.

READ THE SOURCE

FDA - Is It Really FDA Approved?

FDA - Compounding and FDA: Questions and Answers

Pharmacy types

Section 503A covers compounding for an identified individual patient, including by a pharmacist in a state-licensed pharmacy, subject to its conditions. Section 503B covers registered outsourcing facilities that remain subject to current good manufacturing practice (CGMP), a system of manufacturing quality requirements. These facilities can supply office stock for healthcare providers without an individual prescription, subject to applicable conditions. Neither pathway makes a compounded product FDA-approved. Registration is not approval of the facility’s products. The linked Pharmacist guide explains the differences in more depth.

Sources for this addition checked October 31, 2026.

READ THE SOURCE

FDA - 503A and 503B provisions

FDA - Compounding questions and answers

Continue: Pharmacist guide

Explain a claim with its evidence attached

A reader receives a message from the complete presentation: headline, image, testimonial, spoken words and qualifications. Write down the actual impression before judging the evidence. A document titled “education” can still communicate a product benefit or sales claim.

Keep a claim ledger with the exact wording, intended audience, primary source and relevant limits. Record the population, product, outcome and date. Attach a decision: supported as written, needs narrowing, or unanswered. This makes review repeatable when a sentence moves from a website to a printed handout.

Use plain language without removing uncertainty. Explain an unfamiliar term when it first appears. Put a consequential limitation beside the claim it qualifies. A small disclaimer elsewhere cannot repair an unsupported headline. Separate community reports from controlled evidence and company statements from independently established findings.

Give each document a content owner, version and review date. Preserve sources and consequential limitations when adapting it for another audience. Keep a change record so later readers can identify which claim changed and why.

Worked learning example

An illustrated handout combines a vial photograph with “clinically proven recovery” while its citation is an animal experiment. The evidence does not support that human claim. A useful revision describes the animal study and its limits directly, and removes the unsupported promise.

Changed claims about presentation checked against FTC guidance October 31, 2026.

READ THE SOURCE

FTC - Health Products Compliance Guidance

What “gray market” leaves unexplained

“Gray market” is a loose conversational label, not a quality grade or a legal conclusion. It can blur several different issues: an unapproved product promoted for human use, an authentic product outside a documented supply chain, a counterfeit identity, misleading research labeling, or a preparation that does not meet a compounding pathway’s conditions. Name the actual question before deciding what a document or testimonial proves.

A research-use statement describes a claimed purpose; it does not automatically settle intended use. In a March 31, 2026 warning letter to Gram Peptides, FDA explained that website evidence established intended human use despite research-only and not-for-human-consumption disclaimers. This is an example of FDA’s stated enforcement findings, not a final court judgment or a claim about the company’s later status. The broader lesson is to read the surrounding claims and presentation, not a disclaimer in isolation.

Counterfeit and unapproved are also different concepts. Counterfeit identity concerns a product falsely represented as authentic. Unapproved status concerns the absence of applicable approval. Lawfully compounded medicines are themselves not FDA-approved, so “unapproved” alone does not describe every applicable legal condition. Conversely, calling something compounded does not establish that it meets those conditions. Classification requires the exact product, source, claims and regulatory context.

Chemical names require precision. On its current GLP-1 concerns page, FDA states that retatrutide and cagrilintide cannot be used in compounding under federal law. The same page distinguishes semaglutide sodium and acetate from the active ingredient in approved medicines and says the agency is unaware of a lawful basis for their compounding use. These are product-specific statements, reviewed October 31, 2026; do not generalize them to every peptide, salt or jurisdiction.

A separate FDA clarification dated April 1, 2026 discusses restrictions on preparations that are essentially copies of commercially available drugs. It explains that adding another active ingredient does not automatically avoid those restrictions. That dated statement should remain dated: it is not an independently checked live shortage-database result. An April 30, 2026 announcement proposing exclusion of three GLP-1 substances from the 503B bulks list was a proposal, not a final decision.

For an educational review, record exactly what is known: the named item, original source, date, claimed use and unresolved identity or quality questions. Distinguish a reported adverse event from proven causation and a compelling anecdote from a controlled study. Neither a disclaimer nor a dramatic personal story turns an uncertain product into a verified clinical option.

Illustrative case: “research only” beside human promises

A page says research only while its surrounding language promises personal recovery or weight loss. A reader should record the tension between those messages and examine the applicable rules. The footer alone cannot answer whether the product is being marketed for human use.

READ THE SOURCE

FDA - Gram Peptides Warning Letter, March 31, 2026

FDA - Concerns with Unapproved GLP-1 Drugs

FDA - Compounding Questions and Answers

FDA - Compounding Clarification, April 1, 2026

FDA - Proposed 503B Exclusions, April 30, 2026

Intended use: read the whole presentation

FDA’s March 31, 2026 Gram Peptides warning letter considered benefit claims despite research-only and non-human-use disclaimers. It also cited bacteriostatic water offered alongside injectable peptide products as evidence of the water’s intended use with them. The lesson is specific: labeling, claims and surrounding sales context can supply evidence of intended use; a disclaimer does not erase the rest of the page.

Make an evidence map with columns for exact words, surrounding imagery or context, implied audience and supporting source. Review the combination rather than treating the footer as decisive. This letter documents FDA’s stated concerns about that recipient; it is not a new finding about every business with a similar page.

Worked learning example - fictional

A fictional page calls a material “research only” while promising personal recovery. The map records both statements and the contradiction in audience. Removing a single benefit sentence would not settle the assessment if the remaining presentation still conveys the same human-use purpose.

Sources for this addition checked October 31, 2026.

READ THE SOURCE

FDA - Gram Peptides warning letter, March 31, 2026

Reading path and books

1. Define the claim

Translate broad phrases into an outcome that can be checked against a study.

2. Check product status

Avoid transferring an approval to a different formulation, indication or product.

3. Review emerging-compound language

Make research-stage uncertainty as visible as the interesting mechanism.

Continue in the Church Library

Choose the level that fits your background. Book links lead to the Library, where reading options and any affiliate disclosures are shown.

Testing Treatments - Evans, Thornton, Chalmers and Glasziou

Start with fair comparisons and uncertainty. The library entry includes an official free reading option. Published in 2011; use current official sources for regulatory questions.

The Art of Statistics - David Spiegelhalter

Go deeper into denominators, uncertainty and interpreting data. Read alongside the actual study rather than using a statistical slogan as a verdict.

Browse all Library rooms

Examples in practice

These examples identify published resources and their uses; they are not evaluated services.

FTC health-claims guidance

Read the worked regulatory examples to see how the full impression of a message is assessed.

Questions and explanations

What would the audience reasonably believe this message says?

The message includes the headline, visual, testimonial and qualification together. Assess the ordinary takeaway rather than defending each sentence in isolation. For example, a relaxed athlete beside “recover like never before” can imply a human performance benefit even when the paragraph cites only laboratory work. Narrow the message to what the evidence establishes and make any consequential limitation prominent.

Read the source: health products compliance guidance

Does the approval actually cover the item and use described?

Compare the claim with the official record for the exact product, formulation and indication. A manufacturer’s registration or an ingredient appearing in an approved medicine is not approval of the advertised item. For example, a compounded preparation cannot be called an FDA-approved generic merely because its ingredient name resembles an approved product. Keep product identity and status explicit throughout the campaign, including images and captions.

Read the source: it really fda approved

Read the source: compounding and fda questions and answers

Are animal findings or early results being presented as established human benefits?

Label the species, study stage and measured outcome before describing the result. Early findings can be interesting without being established treatment benefits. For example, a cellular mechanism or improved outcome in an animal model should be described as that experiment, not rewritten as “helps people recover faster.” If human relevance remains uncertain, preserve that uncertainty in the main claim rather than hiding it in a footnote.

Read the source: health products compliance guidance

Glossary

Comparator
The reference group or intervention against which an outcome is compared, such as placebo or another treatment.

Endpoint
An outcome defined for a study. A biological measurement and a patient-important outcome are not necessarily the same thing.

Formulation
The composition and presentation of a product, including ingredients beyond the active substance.

Adverse event
An unwanted medical occurrence during observation; occurrence does not itself establish a causal connection to treatment.

Investigational
Under investigation. This describes research status, not proof of safety or benefit.

Gray market
An informal description of uncertain or unauthorized distribution channels, not a regulatory approval category.

Learning worksheet

Claim-to-source ledger

Use these prompts to record what you understand, what remains uncertain and which source could answer the question.

Learning prompt	Filled-in fictional example
Claim-to-source ledger	Fictional example: Headline: “proven recovery in people.” Source: animal experiment. Revision: describe the animal finding and its limits; remove the unsupported human promise.

Copy the headline, image implication, testimonial or spoken claim.

Attach a primary source and identify its population, product and endpoint.

Write the limitations needed to preserve the meaning of the evidence.

Record a reviewer, revision date and decision to retain, narrow or remove the claim.

Educational information, not individualized medical or legal advice.

Explore another perspective in the Community Center