

Perception and attitudes versus medical writing skills

This issue contains two original articles focusing on the knowledge, perceptions, attitudes and thoughts among undergraduate healthcare students.^[1,2] This editorial is aimed at two broad groups, our journal readers who will learn from these articles and the authors who conduct and report such surveys. I must, therefore, begin with a cautionary note that my comments are simply to improve the quality of such work and better understanding of how to use this knowledge in daily practice. What this editorial will focus on is the perception and attitudes of the authors as well as how it will influence (empower or mislead) the readers.

- **Introduction:** This section should be brief and to the point. It should be limited to purpose and objective of the study. Specific statements that are pertinent should be supported by up to date references. Latha *et al.* have stated that there are “less than 100 pediatric oncologists” in India and “India is still far behind current international standards.”^[1] These are very strong statements and must be supported by references. Their second paragraph in the introduction describes the rationale for their study, again without a single reference. The second study among dental students of Shimla fails to specify that several such surveys have already been conducted from India, – including among dentists.^[2-6] This conveys a misleading impression to the readers and should be avoided
- **Methods (and Materials):** This should not duplicate what is already said in the introduction and should not contain results - data that are to be included in next section. The first sentence in Sneha Latha’s methods is not necessary.^[1] So also statements that the conference was attended by 240 students of which 206 participated belongs to the results section. In the Shimla article, whether the questionnaire used was developed by them or did they use a published one has not been clearly specified.^[2] The reference cited have used different questionnaires.^[3,7,8] Hence, it can be claimed that the Shimla questionnaire has been previously validated only if they used a previously published questionnaire without change, in which case due credit should be given by citing the reference of the original publication
- **Results:** Use of adjectives like “only,” “few,” “never,” “overwhelming” and “huge cost” should be avoided as a general rule and especially in the results section. The data should be provided in a neutral manner in this section without introduction author bias or perception. Also inserting words (huge) which are not part of the questionnaire betrays the bias of the authors and can be considered as flaw in the development and validation process.^[1] Vague statements like “answered correctly the basic questions about childhood cancer” should also be

avoided. Whether the answers are correct or not are the interpretation/conclusion of the authors and cannot be part of the results section. Therefore careful attention paid during proper design of the questionnaire is vital to prevent bias. For instance, the question “in which way

are you interested in supporting the pediatric oncology patients” presumes that the student being surveyed is, in fact, interested in doing so. There is no option for him/her to answer that there is no interest. As a result, there is misleading conclusion in the second last paragraph in this section in the article by Latha *et al.*^[1]

- **Discussions:** This section should start immediately by discussing the results of their own study. What is described in the introduction should neither be repeated nor be elaborated here. Other common issues in this section includes:

- Statement about developing countries without any reference from India^[9,10]
- Making comparisons to non-Indian studies, even when Indian data is available^[9-20]
- Making conclusions not supported by own results
- Failure to point out contradiction (especially as related to the results). – Knowledge lacking, but they are still able to teach their subjects
- Unnecessary and irrelevant discussion on data from other studies^[15,20,21]
- Using superlatives unnecessarily

Now I will give specific examples from these two survey manuscripts.

- “Smoking and alcohol consumption were correctly reported as risk factors by 63.5% of subjects, which is <92.4% as reported by Soares *et al.* and 94% as reported by Lachlan M Carter and 79.2% as reported by Omolara.” There are several Indian references on alcohol and tobacco as risk factors which were not cited^[9,10]
- “92.5% of the subjects educate their patients on the adverse effects of alcohol and tobacco and assist them in cessation, which is higher than 82.1% as reported by Soares *et al.*” There are several Indian references on adverse effects of alcohol and tobacco which were not cited.^[9-11,15,16] Furthermore, the contrast to the 31% of dentists educated their patients on the adverse effects of these habits as reported in the survey paper by Vijay Kumar and Suresan, should have been cited in comparison^[3]
- At one place it is mentioned, “about 1/3rd of the population disagreed that their knowledge about prevention and detection of oral cancer is current and adequate” whereas at another place in the same manuscript the authors state, “only 7.5% of the subjects reported that their knowledge regarding the prevention and detection of oral cancer is current and adequate.”^[12] Such discrepancies must be avoided by careful whetting of the manuscript before submission.
- In the same manuscript, regarding additional training and information about oral cancer, the figures is 99% at one place and 99.1% at another place. I wonder why change from zero to one decimal place was thought to be necessary by the authors^[2]
- “Out of total 118 questionnaires that were distributed only 107 were received back which means the

Access this article online
Quick Response Code:

Website: www.sajc.org
DOI: 10.4103/2278-330X.155627

response rate of the study was 90.6%.” in this statement the word “only” reflects the “modesty” of the authors. In any survey, a 90% response rate is commendable and quite impressive

- “This study is the first to assess the knowledge, attitude and practices about oral cancers” Such claims about “firsts” are usually incorrect and frowned upon by most editorial teams – with very rare exceptions
- “Worryingly low exposure” and “very few dedicated lecture classes” are subjective words, which should only be used if backed by substantial data, quoting the proper reference^[1]
- “Policy makers should make use of such studies to quantify the burden of childhood cancers in India.” The survey cannot be considered as robust data to quantify the burden of childhood cancer in India.^[1] Besides, there actually exists solid data that shows the author’s statement to be factually incorrect^[22-25]
- “Preventive activities through educating patients about the risks associated with etiological factors and smoking cessation need to be emphasized in the school curriculum to enable students to help their patients make choices for healthier lifestyles.” This conclusion is not based on the survey results or the objective of the study. How is this statement made in relation to the “school curriculum” when the survey is involving undergraduate healthcare students?
- “We in developing countries are still striving to bridge the gap between the need and availability in various sectors such as infrastructure, trained staff personnel and fund resources.” The gap of unmet need with relation to infrastructure, trained staff as well as funding exists in all countries – developed or undeveloped. There are several references to this effect.^[18-20,26,27] Such a statement would be relevant only if specific gaps are identified by the survey and then discussed
- “More than 50% of medical colleges have no facilities or expertise for treating cancer children.” Such an important statement cannot be made without citing a proper reference. There are more than 300 allopathic medical colleges and each one has a specified curriculum that is available with the concerned health university. They also require infrastructure and facilities as per norms of Medical Council of India. On the other hand, what percentage of these has facilities or expertise for treating pediatric oncology is open to conjecture. The fact may be that such facilities are not available in more than 90% of such medical colleges
- “Most of the countries have started short summer training programs for their undergraduate students to make them more knowledgeable in the field of medical oncology.” This is one more example of citing a European reference when there exists literature about such training from within India^[21,22,28]
- One of the article also refers to the need for “teaching undergraduate communication skills.” Here again there is no reference cited, whereas there exists a large body of work done in this subject from India^[29]

- References: Incomplete and outdated references are the common problem faced by the editorial team. The two survey reports in this issue are a very good example of contrasting styles. The first one has almost half (7/15) the references from India and two more are from developing countries. On the other hand, the Shimla article has only 2 of the 16 references are from India, and 6 of these were published before 2009. There are at least 20 articles from India on oral cancer and surveys in the last 4 years in PubMed – only one of which is cited.^[4-7] Furthermore, there exists at least 400 articles on tobacco and oral cancer from India in PubMed in the last 4 years, including two special issues of Indian Journal of Cancer on smokeless tobacco – only one if which is cited^[9,10]
- Tables, Figures, Graphs, Photographs, Images: The two survey articles do not have any figures, graphs, photographs or images. Their aspects will be dealt separately in a future editorial.^[30]

In summary, medical writing is a vital component of skills required in healthcare professionals. It’s formal training is often found lacking. Young healthcare professionals and students must give it the adequate attention and nurture their skills to be successful academically. The casual attitude of yesteryear is no longer acceptable.

P. M. Parikh

Department of Medical Oncology, Asian Institute of Oncology,
KJ Somaiya Hospital, Sion, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India

Correspondence to: Dr. P. M. Parikh,
E-mail: purvish1@gmail.com

References

1. Latha MS, Chitralakshmi K, Ravindran M, Angeline PR, Kannan L, Scott JX. Knowledge, attitude and awareness of childhood cancer among undergraduate medical students in South India. *South Asian J Cancer* 2015;4:75-7.
2. Fotedar S, Bhardwaj V, Manchanda K, Fotedar V, Sarkar AD, Sood N. Knowledge, attitude and practices about oral cancers among dental students in H.P Government Dental College, Shimla-Himachal Pradesh. *South Asian J Cancer* 2015;4:65-7.
3. Vijay Kumar KV, Suresan V. Knowledge, attitude and screening practices of general dentists concerning oral cancer in Bangalore city. *Indian J Cancer* 2012;49:33-8.
4. Kulkarni GV, Angadi MM, Sorganvi VM. Knowledge and attitude regarding oral cancer among college students. *Int J Innov Res Devel* 2013;2:1-9. Available from: <http://www.ijird.com>.
5. Seth T, Kotwal A, Thakur R, Singh P, Kochupillai V. Common cancer in India: Knowledge, attitudes and behaviors of Urban Slum dwellers in New Delhi. *J R Inst Public Health* 2005;119:87-96.
6. Shanmugavel A, Shive S. Oral health practices and oral cancer knowledge attitude and behaviours among college students. *World J Dent* 2010;1:141-8.
7. Soares TR, Carvalho ME, Pinto LS. Oral cancer knowledge and awareness among dental students. *Braz J Oral Sci* 13:28-33.
8. Honarmand M, Hajhosseini A, Akbari F. Oral cancer knowledge of senior dental students in Zahedan, South-East of Iran. *Asian Pac J Cancer Prev* 2014;15:3017-20.
9. Murti PR, Bonsle RB. Smokeless tobacco use in India effects on oral mucosa in smokeless tobacco on health. *Natl Inst Health* 1992;51-65.
10. Gupta PC. Mouth cancer in India: A new epidemic? *J Indian Med Assoc* 1999;97:370-3.
11. Ghoshal S, Mallick I, Panda N, Sharma SC. Carcinoma of the buccal mucosa: Analysis of clinical presentation, outcome and prognostic factors. *Oral Oncol* 2006;42:533-9.
12. Joshi P, Nair S, Chaturvedi P, Nair D, Agarwal JP, D'Cruz AK. Delay in seeking specialized care for oral cancers: Experience from a tertiary cancer center. *Indian J Cancer* 2014;51:95-7.
13. Garg P, Karjodkar F. “Catch them before it becomes too late” – Oral cancer detection. Report of two cases and review of diagnostic AIDS in *South Asian Journal of Cancer* ♦ April-June 2015 ♦ Volume 4 ♦ Issue 2

- cancer detection. *Int J Prev Med* 2012;3:737-41.
14. Kumar S, Heller RF, Pandey U, Tewari V, Bala N, Oanh KT. Delay in presentation of oral cancer: A multifactor analytical study. *Natl Med J India* 2001;14:13-7.
 15. D'cruz A, Lin T, Anand AK, Atmakusuma D, Calaguas MJ, Chitapanarux I, *et al*. Consensus recommendations for management of head and neck cancer in Asian countries: A review of international guidelines. *Oral Oncol* 2013;49:872-7.
 16. Znaor A, Brennan P, Gajalakshmi V, Mathew A, Shanta V, Varghese C, *et al*. Independent and combined effects of tobacco smoking, chewing and alcohol drinking on the risk of oral, pharyngeal and esophageal cancers in Indian men. *Int J Cancer* 2003;105:681-6.
 17. Kulkarni KP, Arora RS, Marwaha RK. Survival outcome of childhood acute lymphoblastic leukemia in India: A resource-limited perspective of more than 40 years. *J Pediatr Hematol Oncol* 2011;33:475-9.
 18. Yadav SP, Rastogi N, Kharya G, Misra R, Ramzan M, Katewa S, *et al*. Barriers to cure for children with cancer in India and strategies to improve outcomes: A report by the Indian Pediatric Hematology Oncology Group. *Pediatr Hematol Oncol* 2014;31:217-24.
 19. Nair M, Parukkutty K, Kommadath S. Effect of a new social support program by voluntary organization in pediatric oncology department in a developing country. *Pediatr Hematol Oncol* 2014;31:212-6.
 20. Jatia S, Arora B, Banavali S. Predictors of treatment refusal and abandonment and impact of personalised psycho-socioeconomic support in childhood cancer in a tertiary cancer centre in India. *Pediatr Blood Cancer* 2012;59.
 21. Newhauser WD, Scheurer ME, Faupel-Badger JM, Clague J, Weitzel J, Woods KV. The future workforce in cancer prevention: Advancing discovery, research, and technology. *J Cancer Educ* 2012;27:S128-35.
 22. Agarwal BR, Marwaha RK, Kurkure PA. Indian National Training Project Practical Paediatric Oncology (INTPPPO): 2nd National teachers meeting, consensus report. *Med Pediatr Oncol* 2002;39:251.
 23. Arora RS, Eden TO, Kapoor G. Epidemiology of childhood cancer in India. *Indian J Cancer* 2009;46:264-73.
 24. Arora B, Kanwar V. Childhood cancers in India: Burden, barriers, and breakthroughs. *Indian J Cancer* 2009;46:257-9.
 25. 21 Reports of Population and Hospital Based Cancer Registries from India. Available from: http://www.ncrpindia.org/Annual_Reports.aspx. [Last accessed on 2015 Mar 15].
 26. The State of Cancer Care in America, 2014: A Report by the American Society of Clinical Oncology. Available from: <http://www.jop.ascopubs.org/content/early/2014/03/10/JOP.2014.001386>. [Last accessed on 2015 Mar 15].
 27. Pritchard-Jones K. Children with cancer in Europe: Challenges and perspectives. *Oncol Pediatr* 2013;43:233-7.
 28. Parikh PM, Prabhash K, Arora B, Mistry K. Promoting of Oncology Training and Education in India: Lessons from our unique oncology continuing medical education project. *Indian J Med Paediatr Oncol* 2014;35:175.
 29. Parikh PM, Prabhash K, Bhattacharyya GS, Ranade AA. The patient's personality as a guide to communication strategy. In: Surbone A, editors. *New Challenges in Communication with Cancer Patients*. Springer; 2012. p. 137-43.
 30. Parikh PM. Oral and poster presentations. *J Assoc Physicians India* 1993;41:472.

How to cite this article: Parikh PM. Perception and attitudes versus medical writing skills. *South Asian J Cancer* 2015;4:55-7.
Source of Support: Nil. **Conflict of Interest:** None declared.

Author Help: Online submission of the manuscripts

Articles can be submitted online from <http://www.journalonweb.com>. For online submission, the articles should be prepared in two files (first page file and article file). Images should be submitted separately.

- 1) **First Page File:**
Prepare the title page, covering letter, acknowledgement etc. using a word processor program. All information related to your identity should be included here. Use text/rtf/doc/pdf files. Do not zip the files.
- 2) **Article File:**
The main text of the article, beginning with the Abstract to References (including tables) should be in this file. Do not include any information (such as acknowledgement, your names in page headers etc.) in this file. Use text/rtf/doc/pdf files. Do not zip the files. Limit the file size to 1 MB. Do not incorporate images in the file. If file size is large, graphs can be submitted separately as images, without their being incorporated in the article file. This will reduce the size of the file.
- 3) **Images:**
Submit good quality color images. Each image should be less than 4096 kb (4 MB) in size. The size of the image can be reduced by decreasing the actual height and width of the images (keep up to about 6 inches and up to about 1800 x 1200 pixels). JPEG is the most suitable file format. The image quality should be good enough to judge the scientific value of the image. For the purpose of printing, always retain a good quality, high resolution image. This high resolution image should be sent to the editorial office at the time of sending a revised article.
- 4) **Legends:**
Legends for the figures/images should be included at the end of the article file.