

## LETTERS

### **Mental fitness certificates: are psychiatrists in the dock?**

Issuing mental fitness certificates is always a challenge for the psychiatrist. Employers tend to seek mental fitness certificates for employees who display unusual behaviour either at the workstation or at home, with the intention of safeguarding the working environment.

The word "cured" is seldom or never used for a patient following a psychiatric illness and the term "mentally fit" is rarely considered appropriate. Unlike patients with organic lesions, the judgement of whose medical status is supported by laboratory investigations; in the case of mentally ill patients, biological changes may not be substantially reflected by investigations. Every human being has a tendency to succumb to mental illness and the spectrum of mental illnesses is divided into sanity and insanity by a thin line. This line is almost unique to an individual and depends on factors such as culture, education, genetic make-up and family upbringing. To make a prompt judgment of the status of a person's mental illness, the psychiatrist should ideally make a longitudinal assessment of the records and reports which the patient has or the hospital concerned maintains. In the absence of this, the psychiatrist will have to completely rely on the history narrated by the patient or relatives. This is subjective and liable to change quite often.

In India, there has been a dramatic rise in the number of employers who want their employees to obtain mental fitness certificates from the psychiatrist. Giving such certificates is a daunting task for psychiatrists, especially in government hospitals, where the maintenance of records is poor and hardly any time is devoted to quality discussions with patients. Employers sometimes put undue pressure on psychiatrists for outcomes conducive to management needs. Many employers fear unwelcome legal procedures in case of untoward incidents at the workplace. Though the possibility of erring is less, the mental fitness certificate is a double-edged sword. Carrying out circumstantial/ situational analysis and setting aside quality time to interview patients will help psychiatrists to take a decision which is fair to employees and employers.

**Dhananjaya Somashekarappa**, Department of Psychiatry, ESIC Model Hospital, Rajajinagar, Bangalore INDIA; e-mail: dhanupsych@gmail.com, **Sharath Burugina Nagaraja**, Department of Community Medicine, ESIC Medical College & PGIMS, Rajajinagar, Bangalore INDIA; e-mail: sharathbn@yahoo.com, **Ritesh G Menezes**, College of Medicine, King Fahd Hospital

of the University, University of Dammam, Dammam SAUDI ARABIA (KSA) e-mail: mangalore971@yahoo.co.in

### **Putting patients first? Reflections concerning the "Consensus Framework for Ethical Collaboration"**

The "Consensus Framework for Ethical Collaboration between Patients' Organisations, Healthcare Professionals and Pharmaceutical Industry" (1) was signed by five global healthcare organisations in January 2014. These are the International Alliance of Patients' Organisations (IAPO), the World Medical Association (WMA), the International Council of Nurses (ICN), the International Pharmaceutical Federation (FIP), and the International Federation of Pharmaceutical Manufacturers and Associations (IFPMA). The framework is based on the following principles: (a) putting patients first, (b) supporting ethical research and innovation, (c) ensuring independence and ethical conduct, and (d) promoting transparency and accountability (1). Given that the document is intended to support high-quality patient care, we would like to make the following points with regard to these principles.

- (a) More recognition needs to be given to global health inequity and "structural violence" (2) must be strongly confronted. The organisations' move to forge partnerships to improve access to healthcare, especially for the most neglected diseases, is commendable, but the achievement of their objective will require the establishment of a fair international pharmaceutical policy (3). If these organisations are seeking to achieve "optimal care for all", health equity needs to be a priority. Otherwise, it is the patients from developed countries who will come first.
- (b) To support ethical research and innovation, the voice of the patients needs to be heard. The WMA's Declaration of Helsinki was updated recently. Between 2012 and 2013, four conferences and a public consultation were held in favour of it. The IFPMA made its voice heard at two meetings, but representatives of neither the IAPO, nor other patients' organisations spoke at those consultations (4).
- (c) While it is laudable to have "ensure independence and ethical conduct" as an overarching principle, the framework needs to be stricter. It is good to place limits on gifts and insist on modest refreshments and meals, but what about the "ghost management"? (5) "What policies might restrain the effects of industry sponsorship?" (5).
- (d) The principles of transparency and accountability are appropriate. The requirements to register clinical trials and