

Deceptive perpetrators under cover: are they on the rise

The pursuit of academic advancement in the field of medicine entails trudging through the rough terrain of medical journals. The current standard set by the Medical Council of India regarding departmental promotion in medical institutions has made publication mandatory. The need to “publish or perish” has driven academicians into a rat race where fraudulent behaviour for personal gain has reached its nadir (1). It must be accepted that many clinicians and researchers, however competent and distinguished they are in their profession, lack literary or journalistic skills. However, the current academic standards make publication mandatory for academic elevation. As a result, more and more medical professionals in academics are lured into abusive co-authorship and publication parasitism in the race to optimise “industrial standards” (2). This grey area is ventured into by the so-called “white bull” who is busy reaping the fruits of such scientific dishonesty (3). [3]

The “white bull”, adopted from Greek mythology, refers to authors who wilfully, but stealthily, enter into fraud and scientific dishonesty (3). They are mainly unscrupulous senior collaborators holding departmental positions, and have a distinct behavioural pattern. Their objective is to attain fame and monetary gain while providing minimal or no logistic support towards an article.

This was evidenced by the issue of multiple authorship, which has risen dramatically over the years (from 4.5 in 1980, 6.9 in 2000, to over 15 in 2007), even in high impact journals, leave alone the many low profile journals (4). The incidence of multiple authorship is reported to be 80% for clinical research, 59% for life science research, and 4% for hard medicine like physics and chemistry (4).

Adding spice to the current thriving practice of “authorised deception” is the payment that some journals require for publication (5). This has given journal representatives an avenue into the trade. Substandard articles gain easy access to publication, with the white bull playing the lead role of seducing editorial staff and even reviewers. Junior researchers are at the receiving end of such nepotism. Though they may be major contributors to an article, they are forced to enter into unfair deals. Any thought of “whistle blowing” is buried under the fear of retaliation, career sanctions and thus an early end to future research ambitions (3).

Research misconduct includes deliberately providing incomplete or improperly processed data, failure to follow ethical procedures, failure to obtain informed consent, breach of patient confidentiality, improper award or denial of authorship, failure to declare competing interests, duplicate submission and plagiarism. These abuses led to the laying down of various guidelines (including those of the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors and the Council of Science Editors) (5). With such guidelines and the availability of improved anti-plagiarism software, we can presume that a substantial amount of scientific fraud has been arrested. But

at the same time, the perpetrators have mutated into the form of the “white bull”, which seems to be the latest invasion into the world of scientific publication. This new form of “medical deception” needs an urgent reconsideration of existing rules on a global scale, across all faculties of medicine.

All ethical researchers should have the courage to stand up and perform the role of whistle blower whenever such a situation is encountered. Regulatory bodies should ensure protection for the whistle blower, to maintain the sanctity of scientific medical research.

Utpal De, SS Roy Chowdhury, Department of Surgery, Medical College Hospital, 88 College Street, Kolkata 700 078 INDIA e-mail utpalde@vsnl.net

References

1. Neill US. Publish or perish, but at what cost? *J Clin Invest.* 2008 Jul;118(7):2368.
2. Strange K. Authorship: why not just toss a coin? *Am J Physiol Cell Physiol.* 2008;295:567-75.
3. Kwok LS. The White Bull effect: abusive co-authorship and publication parasitism. *J Med Ethics.* 2005 Sep;31:554-6.
4. Shaban S, Aw TC. Trend towards multiple authorship in occupational medicine journals. *J Occup Med Toxicol.* 2009 Feb;4:3.
5. Dennis C. Misconduct row fuels calls for reform. *Nature.* 2004 Feb 19;427(6976):666.

Postgraduate surgical training in India

Postgraduate surgical training is supposed to be one of the toughest stages of training in medicine. While there is no doubt that surgical trainees in India get good experience in open surgery during their tenure, consultant surgeons are reluctant to train surgical postgraduate students in laparoscopic surgery.

Medical training in India commences with the MBBS of five and a half years, inclusive of a year of internship. Thereafter, candidates who clear an entrance exam can enter a three-year postgraduate training programme.

During the first year, most of the surgical trainee’s time will be taken up in attending to ward patients, writing clinical notes and doing other paperwork. During the second year of training, s/he may get hands-on surgical practice, often in emergency operation theatres under supervision of a third-year trainee or senior resident doctor. In routine operations, senior and junior consultants hardly ever allow trainees to do basic laparoscopic surgeries like cholecystectomies, appendicectomies, diagnostic laparoscopies, etc., other than holding the camera port for the consultants during these procedures. None of the government medical colleges in India has a laparoscopic set-up for emergency theatres. So the surgical candidate will not do any laparoscopic surgeries even during emergencies. Third year trainees will get limited opportunities. Overall, three valuable years of training are completed without any significant, hands-on laparoscopic training.

It does not end here. After post graduation, there is a three-year posting as senior residents (SR). SRs operate independently in emergency theatres, assisting and performing all open surgeries in routine theatres. But here again, they hardly get to perform laparoscopic surgery independently, as the bulk of these surgeries are performed by consultants. For the sake of training, they will get a few laparoscopic cholecystectomies in the final days of their senior residency. So, after six years of training, surgeons are sent out into this modern era of laparoscopic surgery without proper exposure to laparoscopic techniques. There is no fixed curriculum that stipulates a minimum number of laparoscopic procedures be assigned to candidates during their postgraduate studies or senior residency.

Why are consultants so apathetic towards their students? The answer, obvious to most trainees, is that the consultants themselves learned laparoscopy after the age of 40, so they do not want trainees to master it at a young age. Indeed, younger consultants are keener to train students in laparoscopic procedures than their older counterparts are. The introduction of just a few laparoscopic procedures in the last six months of their training will not let trainees become expert in any of the procedures.

As trainees in general surgery, we wish to ask our consultants: If we do not get hands-on experience in laparoscopic technology during postgraduate studies and senior residency, who will give us guided training once we graduate?

The answer is: no one. There are few laparoscopic training centres in India giving hands-on experience to beginners. These are generally in private hospitals, and they are very costly. A few surgeons try to learn the procedures on their own in some small hospitals. Some lucky chaps get training outside the country.

The surgical curriculum must state the year-wise goal of a surgical trainee, including the number of laparoscopic and open surgical procedures which the candidate must perform and assist in before completing postgraduate studies and during senior residency. There should be a performance evaluation before the trainee can be promoted to the next year. Surgical trainees should not get a senior residency merely on the basis of interviews; they should also have references from their tutors on their performance.

Compared to European or US surgical trainees, Indian candidates perform negligible numbers of laparoscopic surgeries. The new world is getting trained on simulators, which we can only dream of, in a third world country like ours. Yet, with the variety of cases available, we can get adequate exposure if we are given the opportunity.

Ashutosh Tandon, University College of Medical Sciences, Delhi. Flat 118, Sector 19, Shivam Khand, Vasundhara, Ghaziabad, UP 201 012 INDIA e-mail: ashu_doc81@yahoo.co.in

Wearing white coats in public places: pride or parody?

It has become increasingly common to spot doctors sporting white coats and stethoscopes at shopping malls, restaurants, grocery shops, on roads, in buses and other public places. This has become a trend, especially among medical students and junior doctors, with little insight regarding its implications. Doctors may do this because they take pride in identifying themselves as medical professionals, for convenience, or because of laziness.

Medical aprons can serve as vehicles transmitting nosocomial organisms into the community and vice versa. Numerous studies done on white coats have proven this. One such study from southern India revealed that 95% of overcoats were found positive for bacterial isolates like *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, *Klebsiella sp*, *Escherichia coli*, non-fermenting Gram-negative bacteria and *Staphylococcus aureus* (1). Wearing aprons in public places can only make things worse.

The bond between white coats and the medical profession dates back to the early 1930s. It portrays the image of a doctor in the hospital. Doctors wear white coats so that they are easily recognised by their patients and colleagues; to display cleanliness; to carry equipment and to emphasise the "doctor status" (2). Many surveys have found that patients prefer doctors with aprons (3). At the same time, the general public has always been critical of the practice that some medical professionals have of wearing aprons outside the hospital premises (4).

Although wearing white coats in public is not a crime, as there are no precise rules or regulatory guidelines regarding this issue, we feel it is completely unethical (5). The onus is upon the individual doctor or student to understand the legacy and dignity of these white coats and to decide how they want to project it. This issue should also be addressed while teaching medical ethics to undergraduate students.

Arun Babu T, Assistant Professor, Department of Paediatrics, Sri Lakshmi Narayana Institute of Medical Sciences, Osudu, Agaram Village, Puducherry, 605 502 INDIA e-mail: babuarun@yahoo.com
Sharmila V, Assistant Professor, Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Indira Gandhi Medical College and Research Institute, Puducherry, 605 010 INDIA

References

1. Srinivasan M, Uma A, Vinodhkumaradithyaa A, Gomathi S, Thirumalaikolundusubramanian P. The medical overcoat - is it a transmitting agent for bacterial pathogens? *Jpn J Infect Dis*. 2007;60(2-3):121-2.
2. Farraj R, Baron JH. Why do hospital doctors wear white coats? *J R Soc Med*. 1991;84(1):43.
3. Anvik T. Doctors in a white coat-what do patients think and what do doctors do? 3739 patients, 137 general practitioners, and 150 staff members give their answers. *Scand J of Prim Health Care*. 1990;8(2):91-4.
4. Parker-Pope T. Hospital scrubs on the subway? *New York Times* [Internet]. 2008 Sep 22. [cited 2010 Sep 25]. Available from: <http://well.blogs.nytimes.com/2008/09/22/hospital-scrubs-on-the-subway/>.
5. Jacob GP. Scrubs: what you don't see is what you get. *CMAJ*. 2009;180(9):984.