

Title 1: Randomized controlled trials, the gold standard with? *

Johan Blakkisrud

June 6, 2017

Aim

Randomized Controlled Trials (RCTs) is by a majority of the medical community considered as the "gold standard" for medical research. This essay is aiming to see if RCTs also are ethically sound.

Introduction

Definition

Definition from Meriam-Webster

Historical origins

Scurvy and lime juice - aye matey!

Use today

Numbers, form and distribution, from sugar and salt to surgical intervention.

Ethical problems?

Contemporary views

How is RCTs generally regarded?

Contemporary discussions (laymen, the community)

What do the media and the general public think?

Contemporary discussions (medical community)

How is regarded by the medical professionals, doctors and other scientists?

*Strongly depends of what I reach, "beauty flaws", "a false cry of saving", "without the means to end all discussion"

Contemporary discussions (ethical scholars)

Are there a philosophical discussion? Have they reached any conclusions? Are they correct?

In the frameworks of "big" ethical schools

Who have the biggest problem with RCTs, and should we care?

Ethical resolutions?

Solutions to the problems (if any)

Is it all hopeless?

Conclusion (possibly vague)

References

- [1] Bolland, Mark J. and Avenell, Alison and Gamble, Greg D. and Grey, Andrew Systematic review and statistical analysis of the integrity of 33 randomized controlled trials *Neurology* 87 23 2391-2402 2016
- [2] Dunn, P. James Lind (1716-94) of Edinburgh and the treatment of scurvy *Archives of Disease in Childhood Fetal and Neonatal Edition* 76 1 F64-F65 1997
- [3] Savulescu, Julian and Wartolowska, Karolina and Carr, Andy Randomised placebo-controlled trials of surgery: ethical analysis and guidelines *Journal of Medical Ethics* 42 12 776-783 2016