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Except for those fascicles, which are not up for us to control, maybe other non-societal organs, but equally competent, such as the Regional Medical Board, the Ethics Commission of the Paulista Medical Association, or even ANVISA (the Brazilian equivalent of the FDA), could contribute to this. In my understanding, the latter, among all of them, has more responsibility for overseeing: quality of drugs; their pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics; the pertinent bibliography that attest the scientific reputability of the author; the hospital department he/she belongs to and whether it is trustworthy; and lastly, whether it was approved by the Ethics Commission of universities and departments for the promotion of excellence in clinical trials. We should not forget that fascicles, as a source of consultation, are also seductive, not to mention a partnership that the sales force of some pharmaceutical companies, a minority, surreptitiously expect from physicians to prescribe their drug in exchange of favors.

What has been said about those fascicles also applies to journals, as a source of information of Medical Societies, but with more stringency, as we carry on our shoulders an immense responsibility to determine what is ethical and what is not. We live under the same medical ethics, without the most remote possibility of separating ethics in the practice of medicine from the one in physician’s field and, therefore, apply also in medical publications. Influenced by them, physicians with a poor information supply, located in places far from large centers, with communication difficulties, could endanger a large population. Note that patients, and not physicians, are the ones endangered by the effects of drugs. They do ask us whether they are being used as guinea pigs, and I believe they are, because each patient represents a new accumulated experience. When biologicals were introduced in the treatment of rheumatic diseases, they were greeted with great enthusiasm and, only later, it became known that they were more effective when used in association with methotrexate or leflunomide, but did not always present a good response, and there were cases which required the use of another biological agent. It has always been the same for other medications, among them corticosteroids and, more recently, anti-COX2 drugs.

As for the publication of clinical trials, I do not consider them to be different from others. However, the expression “conflict of interest”, which by definition refers to situations in which economical or other aspects of personal interest could compromise or appear to compromise the judgment or decision of a professional in his administrative, managerial, teaching, research, assistance, or other activities, was created several years ago. Therefore, it does not apply only to merely economical aspects. Personally, I cannot distinguish an ethical from a possible non-ethical article because I assume that the latter would not be approved by a competent editorial board, as it would jeopardize the probity of the said journal, according to an old French saying – *il ni a pas de science sans conscience*. Thus, medical journals have an impact, to a lesser or higher degree, depending on their scientific level. As an example, I could mention the Lancet, the New England Journal of Medicine, Arthritis and Rheumatism, Annals of Rheumatic Diseases, Annals of Internal Medicine, and etc. As a matter of fact, they have been publishing clinical trials, especially on this new class of drugs, the biological agents. When I stated that the concept of ethics is mutable, I also recall mentioning conscience, which is not and has a literally absolute character and it is in no way subordinated to any type of conflict of interest. Note that when a Clinical Trial is submitted to the Editorial Board of the Brazilian Journal of Rheumatology, it has presumably been assessed by several ethical and scientific borders, from isolation of a molecule to *in vitro*, *in vivo*, and *ex-vivo* assays, phase three in *anima mobile*, and so forth. The Pharmaceutical Industry is the most interested of all in verifying the efficacy and tolerability of a drug and the drugs that do not meet those requisites can cause irreparable damage in the form of indemnifications, suspended profits, a fall in their stocks, etc. We have already mentioned all other frontiers and, in summary, like international borders, I cannot see the inconvenient in publications of any nature, investigational, observational, and clinical trials, as long as they are ethical and dictated by one’s conscience. Regulation of their publication is mandatory.
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