



least as difficult as calculus, but it must be learned rigorously from the moment of entry into medical school; neither basic science nor the data from clinical trials should be presented in isolation from clinical problems nor separately from a rigorous decision-making process.

**George D. Sweeney, MD**  
Faculty of Health Sciences  
McMaster University  
Hamilton, Ont.

#### References

1. Hoey J. The one and only Mrs. Jones [editorial]. *CMAJ* 1998;159(3):241-2.
2. Davidoff F. The future of scientific medicine [editorial]. *CMAJ* 1998;159(3):243-4.
3. Horton R. The grammar of interpretive medicine [editorial]. *CMAJ* 1998;159(3):245-9.
4. Panel on the General Professional Education of the Physician. *Physicians for the twenty-first century: the GPEP report*. Washington (DC): Association of American Medical Colleges; 1986.

#### [Frank Davidoff replies:]

**D**r. Sweeney has put his finger on an important "missing link" in the great chain of medical evidence: the lack of adequate teaching. For although a few controlled studies<sup>1</sup> have demonstrated the effectiveness of teaching rigorous approaches to clinical reasoning (including Bayesian analysis), the science of clinical decision-making still receives far less recognition in medical school and postgraduate curricula than it deserves. Unfortunately, enthusiasm for such teaching is dampened by the difficulty of applying our current formal decision analytic techniques at the bedside (an experienced consulting service at Tufts-New England Medical Center in Boston found that most full decision analyses of individual clinical decisions required about 2 weeks of effort by a clinical fellow [personal observation]). It may be more realistic to think of decision science as an imaging technique for visualizing medical reasoning<sup>2</sup> and employ it as we do other basic sciences

such as anatomy, rather than as a clinical science such as surgery.

Our lack of understanding of the role that basic biological knowledge actually plays, and the role it should play, in clinical work is little short of scandalous. The small number of studies that have examined this question empirically have concluded that the use of basic biological knowledge by experienced clinicians is minimal and indirect.<sup>3</sup> Sweeney is therefore quite justified, I believe, in questioning whether basic science, at least as we now teach it, is a necessary part of medical education.<sup>3</sup>

**Frank Davidoff, MD**

Editor

*Annals of Internal Medicine*  
Philadelphia, Pa.

#### References

1. Davidoff F, Goodspeed R, Clive J. Changing test ordering behaviour. A randomized controlled trial of a probabilistic reasoning approach. *Med Care* 1989;29:45-58.
2. Davidoff F. Decision analysis: an imaging technique for visualizing medical reasoning. In: Noble J, editor. *Textbook of general medicine and primary care*. Boston: Little Brown and Co; 1987. p. 27-34.
3. Davidoff F. Is basic science necessary? In: *Who has seen a blood sugar? Reflections on medical education*. Philadelphia: American College of Physicians; 1996. p. 96-100.

### Med students as emotional chameleons

**E**verybody knows about the long hours, late nights and gruelling obstacles that medical students endure, but few outside the profession are aware of the emotional challenges that accompany the medical school experience.

A few months after completing a seminar aimed at teaching the importance of empathy, listening skills and understanding a patient's social context, I watched a pathologist dissect a person who had recently died. After feeling this patient's warm heart in my hands and thinking about what his life might have been like, I asked,

"Did he have a family?" The response consisted of a furled brow and a mocking glance. Several months later, during a family medicine rotation, I was criticized for not showing enough sympathy toward a teenage girl who had recently begun taking oral contraceptives and was complaining about weight gain.

These early experiences marked the beginning of my confusion about which patients, in which specialties, I was expected to care about. During my general surgery rotation, I was told to spend less than 10 minutes assessing an alcoholic street person who had been stabbed by a prostitute. A month later, in psychiatry, I was expected to explore the psychodrama, including childhood abuse, sexual fantasies and feelings of anger and abandonment, of a depressed middle-aged man, in no less than 60 minutes.

I became increasingly unsure of when I could express my true compassion, when I would have to manufacture concern, when I was expected to offer psychological support and when I would be ridiculed for being too caring. But the exhaustion, the daily (and nightly) tasks of each rotation and the need to plan for my future prevented me from addressing these issues during medical school. Only in retrospect do I realize how I, like so many eager medical students under constant surveillance, had shuffled through medical school from one rotation to the next, feeling like an emotional chameleon.

Experiencing a variety of rotations is a fascinating part of medical school. But each specialty has distinct and unspoken expectations regarding the extent to which its practitioners should engage in patients' emotional lives, and trying to modify one's very human responses to match a specialty's subtle customs can be an odd and stressful experience. I entered a residency program in psychiatry because I enjoy dealing with patients' psychosocial issues. I hope that open



discussion about this unfortunate quirk of medical training will help students to feel less “schizophrenic” (literally, divided) and to make appropriate and satisfying career choices.

**Ariel K. Dalfen, MD**  
PGY1, Psychiatry  
University of Toronto  
Toronto, Ont.

### **CMAJ index L'index du JAMC**

The index for volume 159 (July–December 1998) of *CMAJ* will be mailed with an upcoming issue to paid subscribers and to CMA members who have requested it from the CMA Member Service Centre. Others may order single copies for \$15 (within Canada; add 7% GST/15% HST as applicable) or US\$15 (outside Canada).

Les abonnés en règle et les membres qui en ont fait la demande auprès du Centre des services aux membres recevront l'index du volume 159 (juillet à décembre 1998) du *JAMC* en même temps qu'un prochain numéro. Pour les personnes intéressées à commander l'index, il en coûte 15 \$ (au Canada; ajouter la TPS de 7 % ou la TVH de 15 %, selon le cas) ou 15 \$US (à l'extérieur du Canada).

To request the index, contact:  
Pour commander l'index, veuillez communiquer avec le

CMA Member Service Centre /  
Centre des services aux  
membres de l'AMC  
1867, prom. Alta Vista Dr.  
Ottawa ON K1G 3Y6  
tel/tél. 800 663-7336  
or/ou 613 731-8610 x2307  
fax 613 236-8864  
cmamsc@cma.ca