

Susan Bombard
Northeast Aesthetic Potential, Inc.
14 Bel Air Road
Hingham, MA 02043

Dear RI Department of Health,

As a sales professional with over 20 years of experience in the medical aesthetics industry and a consumer of aesthetic services, I am writing to advocate for the continued growth and development of this thriving sector of aesthetic providers in Rhode Island. Over the course of my career, I have witnessed tremendous advancements in safety protocols, technology, and provider education, all of which have contributed to making medical aesthetics safer and more effective than ever before.

Providers are not only highly trained but also consistently supported by product and device companies that prioritize safety as a core value. These companies, many of which I have had the privilege to represent, offer rigorous training programs, ongoing education, and robust support to ensure that providers are fully equipped to deliver safe and effective outcomes. These companies know that adverse outcomes hurt their bottom line. In fact, I have personally witnessed instances where trainers refused to certify providers who required additional training to meet safety standards. This dedication underscores the industry's collective goal: safety and satisfaction for every patient.

Statistically, the safety record of medical aesthetics is impressive. According to a study published in the journal "Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery," the complication rate for non-surgical aesthetic procedures, such as botulinum toxin injections and dermal fillers, is less than 1%. Similarly, data from the American Society for Dermatologic Surgery indicates that over 10 million procedures are performed annually in the U.S., with adverse events occurring in fewer than 0.05% of cases.

I am a proud representative of Selphy! PRFM, an FDA-approved technology utilized for both medical and aesthetic use. In 15 years, not one adverse outcome has been linked to this revolutionary system. These figures highlight the exceptional safety standards achieved through stringent training, cutting-edge technology, and evidence-based practices.

As a New England representative of multiple product and device companies, I see that Rhode Island's current approach, under the Rhode Island Department of Health (RIDOH), imposes significant restrictions on the scope of practice for aesthetic providers. These limitations are unparalleled in New England, where neighboring states afford providers greater autonomy while maintaining rigorous safety standards. For example, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New Hampshire all permit broader scopes of practice without compromising patient care. This disparity places Rhode Island at a competitive disadvantage, potentially driving providers and patients to seek services elsewhere—a trend that threatens the viability of local businesses like mine.

I urge you to consider the importance of a balanced regulatory framework that prioritizes patient safety while fostering industry growth. Such an approach would align Rhode Island with other New England states, ensuring that we remain competitive and supportive of innovation in medical aesthetics. Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Susan Bombard