



Funding Randomized Controlled Trial: Is it the Time to Change our Mind? Editorial

Ahmed Farag*

Professor of General and Colorectal Surgery, Cairo University, Egypt

*Corresponding Author: Ahmed Farag, Professor of General and Colorectal Surgery, Cairo University, Egypt.

Received: May 24, 2019; Published: July 01, 2019

DOI: 10.31080/ASGIS.2019.02.0053

Funding research is considered as a major dilemma in our recent era of Randomized Controlled trials.

Some authors considered RCTs are frequently imperfect with a lot of confounding factors and in many of the studies on meta-analysis studies are discarded and many are really unreliable [1]. Ethics in randomizing patients into two treatment arms for example may be ploughed by the lack of consideration on the believe of the treating surgeon or physician on what suites the patients best. For example randomizing a condition to surgery in one arm and conservative treatment on the other arm may lead to a group of patients receiving surgery while they could have benefited from conservative treatment, which cast a shadow of ethical concern in the era of "Patient Centered Care". Those studies are recommended to be replaced by "Registry based research [2], which gives each individual patient an equal chance of conservative treatment before proceeding to surgery.

The second issue is which research to fund? In the field of basic science such as physics, when Einstein described his equation $E = mc^2$ They received it with enthusiasm, but did anyone could imagine from the first day that it will lead to the progress in science we are witnessing today?

Most of the new ideas in medicine had been received badly by the Experts on the Panels and referees in the famous Medical Journals and even verbally insulted whom introduced those techniques in public such as the work of Professor Bill Heald who invented the TME in rectal cancer Who Quoted the word of Woodrow Wilson "If You Want to Make Enemies, Try Changing Something" [3] and Haber-Gamma who introduced the watch and wait Policy in the same topic after Complete Clinical response after the Neo-adjuvant CRT. Contrary to what happened to Einstein in a more sound attitude in the basic sciences towards research.

Health authorities, Panelists and referees have to change their attitude. I think we need a new start by involving the patients and communities in the decisions and stop behave like Gods and admit-

ting that we are using the Tax Money collected from the community which is intended to go back to the community in the form of a better health care [4].

Unfortunately till now those decisions to publish or not, to accept or not and to fund or not are taken flawed by a lot of emotional superiority, Background Judgments "bias" and Personal backgrounds.

Let us have a new start by having an attitude of "Arrogance is against Science" and make the community decide with us.

Bibliography

1. Karim MD. "Systematic Reviews and Meta-analytic Methods: Not All Are Created Equal". *Diseases of the Colon and Rectum* 61.11 (2018): 1241-1242.
2. Martling A. "Quality register-based research revisited". *Colorectal Disease* 2015 The Association of Coloproctology of Great Britain and Ireland 17 (2015): 371.
3. Richard J. "A Surgical Plane: Now "Holy" In 4 Specialties". *Diseases of the Colon and Rectum* 61.9 (2018): 1003-1009.
4. Habr-Gama Angelita. "Not Taking "No" for an Answer". *Diseases of the Colon and Rectum* 61.1 (2018): 8-13

Volume 2 Issue 6 August 2019

© All rights are reserved by Ahmed Farag.