

Re: Dental cleanings: a scam?

Source: <http://newsgroups.derkeiler.com/Archive/Rec/rec.music.classical.guitar/2009-03/msg00024.html>

- *From:* JPD <googlegroove1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sat, 28 Feb 2009 18:29:48 -0800 (PST)
-

On Feb 28, 6:27 pm, JPD <googlegroo...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Feb 28, 6:24 pm, Miguel de Maria <elegantspanishgui...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Feb 28, 12:55 pm, "h kiesel" <pls2...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

The predicament you describe – one who has compensated valvular heart disease – occurs often enough. I dare say there is little objective data that says that waiting until there are hemodynamic abnormalities to do surgery is more harmful than doing surgery when, by some criteria developed by an "opinion leader", cardiac function is still normal.

I don't know the answer. If it was me, I would probably err on the side of waiting until there was a clinical reason to proceed with surgery – of course, I would be opening myself to big-time malpractice risk if I recommended this to a patient and the outcome was not good.

I don't want to sound totally negative but it is tough ignoring the degree to which "experts"(almost always paid generous bonuses by industry)

Re: Dental cleanings: a scam?

essentially dictate "standards of care". The independent physician who uses his own wisdom and judgment to make decisions is moribund and near death.

We have come far in the treatment of certain diseases – especially those for which the treatment was required to satisfy "Koch's Postulate" – but there is much more gray than the public realizes (or would want to know, I suspect).

As an aside, I'm sure you're aware of the increasing prevalence of multi-resistant microbes; there are currently at least two gram-positive and several gram-negative organisms for which NO antibiotics are effective. The pharmaceutical industry is no longer looking for new antibiotics – not enough bang for the buck; their focus is on the treatment of risk factors which require taking a medication for a lifetime (the degree to which such drugs really alter risk is another fairly murky topic since statistics that are quoted are "relative" and not "absolute").

Sorry to run off at the mouth – hope your bother is doing well and I hope you can avoid encounters with surgeons.

Harry K

"Mark & Steven Bornfeld"
<bornfeldm...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in
message [news:6efql.225\\$gm6.5@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:6efql.225$gm6.5@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

Re: Dental cleanings: a scam?

h kiesel wrote:

Steve, this actually comes from a study published in the Journal of the AMA, Vol 301(8), pp 831–841. WSJ essentially cites this paper which looks like it is pretty well done. I would like to think the WSJ reporters did not gain from their representation of this but who knows.

Many papers dealing with the contamination(and, at times, flatly unsupported guidelines) of medical guidelines by money interests have appeared over the past 2–3 years. The "Opinion Leader" phenomenon and "ghost writing" are pretty sinister aspects of medical "research". In all fairness, I do believe that at a basic science level (as opposed to clinical) there is less chance of "massaging data" as they say, although the money interests decide what research is going to be funded and this doesn't always reflect what is most beneficial or most important.

Harry K

So—from a purely practical standpoint—if when I go for my echocardiogram in 3 weeks the cardiologist finds mitral

Re: Dental cleanings: a scam?

regurgitation, apparently
fully-compensated, do I go for a mitral
repair as my brother did, or do I
wait until I start to decompensate?
I'm the last to defend contaminated
research—I see it all the time in my
own field, and it's been spottily documented
in the pharmaceutical
industry. One wonders why rank and file
physicians have been so
complacent, but why shouldn't they be?
They're clinicians, not regulators.
"Mr Smith Goes to Washington" was on TV
last night. This discussion made
me think a bit of how an entrenched
bureaucracy can turn corrupt, and few
people are able or willing to challenge it.

Steve

"Mark & Steven Bornfeld"
<bornfeldm...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote in message
[news:Aqcql.190\\$%u5.107@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:Aqcql.190$%u5.107@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

h kiesel
wrote:

On
a
similar
note,
did
you
see
the
recent
article
in
WSJ
that
ONLY
11%
of
guidelines
put
forth

Re: Dental cleanings: a scam?

by
the
American
Heart
Association
are
based
on
scientific
data!
The
remainder
are
pure
opinion,
often
offered
by
cardiologists
who
are
paid
HANDSOMELY
for
their
"opinion".
This
should
be
disturbing
stuff
but
most
people
just
say
"ho-hum"
–
it
is
accepted
as
the
norm
anymore.

hk

Re: Dental cleanings: a scam?

I'll try to
look for
that. I
particularly
want to see
what the
medical
experts on
the WSJ
editorial
staff have to
say,
considering
their
"opinions"
are also
richly
compensated.
What are
they based
on?

Steve

"Tommy
Grand"
<howardj...@xxxxxxxx>
wrote
in
message
news:36c8c043-2246-4593-a229-61c9c9746985@xxxxxxxx

Friends,

Read
here
about
evidence-based
dentistry:
<http://www.nature.com/ebd/journal/v6/n1/full/640031>

Note
particularly

Re: Dental cleanings: a scam?

this
conclusion:

"The
research
evidence
is
not
of
sufficient
quality
to
reach
any
conclusions
regarding
the
beneficial
and
adverse
effects
of
routine
scaling
and
polishing
for
periodontal
health."

TG

--

Mark &
Steven
Bornfeld
DDS
<http://www.dentalwins.com>
Brooklyn,
NY
718-258-5001

Re: Dental cleanings: a scam?

--

Mark & Steven Bornfeld DDS

<http://www.dentaltwins.com>

Brooklyn, NY

718-258-5001- Hide quoted text -

- Show quoted text -

I was talking about this earlier, due to my witnessing the way "experts" operate not only in person, but in reading about malpractice cases.

The "standard of care" can be summed up neatly by: "whatever the doctor judges is correct". Doctors do not like to testify, as it exposes them to ridicule and places them in an unaccustomed position of having to answer to others, not to mention they have better things to do. The kind of doctors that testify in malpractice cases, on either side, are pretty much whores.

If the "standard of care" is "whatever the doctor judges", then it's going to pretty hard on the plaintiffs to get any justice. Add the bias against medical lawyers of the judges and the average jury member, and it's a very unfair system. Yet big business is pushing hard with their tort reform.

When I heard Obama endorse tort reform in one of the pablum-debates, I knew he was a sellout.

All holders of high office are sellouts. No exceptions. That's the system.

Elected holders of high office, I meant.

.