Should radiologists and pathologists talk to patients?
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TO THE EDITOR: The practice of radiology and pathology has changed dramatically in the past two decades. Increased use of multidisciplinary assessments and interventional techniques has meant greater exposure of patients to radiologists and pathologists. When patients undergo investigations, they are invariably anxious, usually expect the worst, and want the result as soon as possible. Therefore, there is pressure to provide an immediate answer to the problem at hand. In most instances, it would be possible to offer a diagnosis. However, many radiologists and pathologists are reluctant to discuss investigations with patients in detail.1

During interventional procedures, radiologists and pathologists are patients only briefly; they often don’t know all the facts about them, and are not ultimately responsible for their clinical management.2 As the patient is only temporarily in the care of the radiologist or the pathologist, it is not appropriate to discuss complex issues or offer opinions and advice. Such advice may put the patient’s doctor in an awkward position, forcing the referring practitioner to follow a course of action which may not be in the best interests of the patient. At a patient’s insistence, radiologists and pathologists can sometimes indicate to someone who has a clearly benign condition that the problem under investigation is unlikely to be serious.2-4 This may be the case with screening mammography, as, in most instances, it is not cheap.

Giving bad news to a patient is not an easy task even for trained professionals. It is even harder for radiologists and pathologists who are not generally equipped to carry out such tasks. Further, neither radiology departments nor pathology laboratories are suitable settings for giving bad news, as very few support avenues are usually available to patients there.

Predicting the impact that bad news will have on a patient is extremely difficult, and radiologists and pathologists should, for compassion and for medicolegal reasons, refrain from providing immediate answers to patients.
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TO THE EDITOR: Jamrozik’s editorial1 about our report of a failed randomised controlled trial (RCT)2 in an Aboriginal medical service helps to explain why researchers might be reluctant to submit articles describing unsuccessful trials, thus limiting potential for the scientific community to learn from such experiences. The main point of our article was to describe the manifest difficulties of implementing an RCT — the evidence “gold standard” — in this type of setting. Interestingly, Jamrozik largely attributes these difficulties to incompetence or naivety (or both) on the part of the researchers and funders, rather than to complexities inherent in the study design, the setting and the intervention.

A separately funded pilot study is, in principle, a good idea, but extremely difficult to get funding for in today’s environment. Of course, we did conduct a pilot — that, in fact, was what we reported — but it is unclear how this would have helped us better estimate absolute prevalence and effect sizes for intervention and control groups, as a substantial number of participants, followed up for six months, would have been needed to do this.

Nor is it clear how taking a population approach and distributing guidelines to all drinkers rather than offering personalised advice to hazardous drinkers would have helped — firstly, because we were specifically trialling the internationally validated brief intervention, and secondly, because the effect size of the alternative approach would likely have been substantially lower.

Do we agree that the blood tests were “medicalising a social problem”?3 They were intended not only to provide robust outcome measures (a mark of a good trial),...
but also tangible evidence to clients of the health effects of alcohol, shown from previous research to be well received by Aboriginal people.\textsuperscript{1,2} They were not a requirement for participation.

Further, that we should have got around the potentially off-putting business of seeking informed consent by bypassing this step almost defies comment. While trials of some therapeutic interventions can be undertaken with patient consent by using placebos, this does not mean that where blinding is not possible patient consent should be done away with in order to avoid a Hawthorne effect!

However, we do agree with Jamrozik on one point — nothing about this study or our report could reasonably “compound any negative perceptions about Aboriginal Medical Services and Aboriginal patients”\textsuperscript{3}.


Firstly, despite what the academics may think, it is no different from the rest of us in this regard. That Aboriginal people are socially so where alcohol and family histories are concerned. That Aboriginal people are no different from the rest of us in this regard should cause no surprise.

Secondly, I find that the bulk of the medical profession reinforces this community denial by sponsoring conditions such as diabetes, hypertension, obesity, anxiety, depression and schizophrenia instead of seeing these problems as being a manifestation of alcoholism or other “alcohol misuse” until proven otherwise. Indeed, the denial is so extreme that they tend to avoid the term “alcoholism” altogether. Specialists are in even greater denial and are more often a hindrance than a help to general practitioners in this regard. As a consequence, community leaders and affected families are unable to develop effective strategies for dealing with their problems.

What they get instead is increasing health-care costs, hospital bed shortages, increasing domestic violence, more “drug problems” and more prisons.

So “GP reluctance or inability to follow through...”\textsuperscript{4} is not surprising. Indeed, denial of alcohol is so strong in the medical profession that it is harder, in my experience, to get doctors and even medical students (let alone healthcare workers) to attend open meetings of Alcoholics Anonymous and Al-Anon than it is to persuade affected people to do so.

Thirdly, general practice throughout Australia has been organised for episodic, fast-throughput care. People have become so accustomed to this that they see any attempt at a comprehensive preventive approach to illness as odd, out of place, time-consuming and even intrusive, especially where alcohol and family histories are concerned. That Aboriginal people are no different from the rest of us in this regard should cause no surprise.

In 2000, the NHMRC revised its system for assessing research applications. This involved several developments which would have taken place prior to the commencement of this application had they been instituted in 1996. Some of these include: the introduction of the Indigenous Health Research Panel (IHRP), which provides advice on cultural appropriateness, community consultation and methods in applications with an Indigenous component (most members are Aboriginal people); and the opportunity for IHRP to make stipulations upon which funding is contingent.

As a consequence, community leaders and affected families are unable to develop effective strategies for dealing with their problems.

What they get instead is increasing health-care costs, hospital bed shortages, increasing domestic violence, more “drug problems” and more prisons.

So “GP reluctance or inability to follow through...”\textsuperscript{4} is not surprising. Indeed, denial of alcohol is so strong in the medical profession that it is harder, in my experience, to get doctors and even medical students (let alone healthcare workers) to attend open meetings of Alcoholics Anonymous and Al-Anon than it is to persuade affected people to do so.
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To the Editor: The recent article by Sibthorpe et al\textsuperscript{1} and the accompanying editorial\textsuperscript{2} on the issue of the failure of an alcohol intervention trial in an Aboriginal Health Service deal with problems facing all primary care practitioners in the field of “alcohol misuse” and should not be seen as a peculiarly Aboriginal problem.

Firstly, despite what the academics may think, it is no different from the rest of us in this regard. That Aboriginal people are socially so where alcohol and family histories are concerned. That Aboriginal people are no different from the rest of us in this regard should cause no surprise.
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In 2000, the NHMRC revised its system for assessing research applications. This involved several developments which would have taken place prior to the commencement of this application had they been instituted in 1996. Some of these include: the introduction of the Indigenous Health Research Panel (IHRP), which provides advice on cultural appropriateness, community consultation and methods in applications with an Indigenous component (most members are Aboriginal people); and the opportunity for IHRP to make stipulations upon which funding is contingent.

As a consequence, community leaders and affected families are unable to develop effective strategies for dealing with their problems.

What they get instead is increasing health-care costs, hospital bed shortages, increasing domestic violence, more “drug problems” and more prisons.

So “GP reluctance or inability to follow through...”\textsuperscript{4} is not surprising. Indeed, denial of alcohol is so strong in the medical profession that it is harder, in my experience, to get doctors and even medical students (let alone healthcare workers) to attend open meetings of Alcoholics Anonymous and Al-Anon than it is to persuade affected people to do so.

Thirdly, general practice throughout Australia has been organised for episodic, fast-throughput care. People have become so accustomed to this that they see any attempt at a comprehensive preventive approach to illness as odd, out of place, time-consuming and even intrusive, especially where alcohol and family histories are concerned. That Aboriginal people are no different from the rest of us in this regard should cause no surprise.
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