The authors reported no conflicts of interest.

The *Journal* policy requires editors and reviewers to disclose conflicts of interest and to decline handling or reviewing manuscripts for which they may have a conflict of interest. The editors and reviewers of this article have no conflicts of interest.

REPLY: MALPRACTICE LITIGATION: THE UNMEASURED COMPLICATION

Reply to the Editor:

We read with interest the letter from Luc and Lee¹ and thank them for sharing their thoughts about the importance and timeliness of our article.² We wholeheartedly agree with their assessment and it is our hope that ours, and other similar articles in the future, will inspire us as health care providers to consider the benefits of consulting and utilizing medical law findings in our own practices. We particularly appreciate and concur with the assertion that by “embracing the intersection of medicine, ethics, and law” we can better achieve the optimal outcomes we seek, while meeting, and arguably, exceeding, the standard of care that our patient population—and the law itself—demands. Ultimately, this vital knowledge stands to provide superior protection for not only our patients, but for health care providers. We further appreciate the recommendation of considering one’s specific state’s case law, and believe that doing so would be an excellent mechanism for retrieving information more germane, and at times binding, to cases that may arise in our own practices.

It is certainly not enough to merely consider how a case turns, although this point is critical and should be examined and understood. But, we must also understand why the cases were initiated, how the litigation could have been avoided, and what findings were considered relevant and persuasive to the courts for us to best prepare ourselves regarding these matters and, ideally, prevent them.

Krystal R. Ikonomidis, JD, BSN

John S. Ikonomidis, MD, PhD

Division of Cardiothoracic Surgery

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Chapel Hill, NC

Supported by National Institutes of Health/National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute (grant Nos. R01HL102121 and 1R21HL148363).

References

1. Luc JGY, Lee R. Malpractice litigation: the unmeasured complication. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg*. 2022;164:e95.
2. Palaniappan A, Sellke F. Medical malpractice litigations involving aortic dissection. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg*. October 29, 2020 [Epub ahead of print].

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtcvs.2020.12.097>

REPLY: MEDICOLEGAL RESEARCH: A KEY TO THE LOCKED DOOR OF PATIENT EXPECTATIONS

Reply to the Editor:

We have read the commentaries on our article concerning medical malpractice litigation related to aortic dissection,¹ and we thank all of the authors for their continued discussion of a topic of importance to cardiothoracic surgeons.

The commentary from Mick and Girardi² interlinks the role of the snow leopard as an exemplar of aortic conditions to the complexity and lethality of aortic dissection. Their interpretation of the data we presented as the “tip of the iceberg” is appropriate, and we hope that this medicolegal research encourages legal database providers to raise their legal reporting standards so that more information is available to clinical providers. Having more data at our disposal will allow physicians to not only be more cognizant of legal liability, but also serves as another platform for physicians to understand the values that matter most to patients, and more specifically, which values, when unsatisfied, are likely to lead to the filing of a malpractice suit.

The commentary from Ikonomidis and Ikonomidis³ also supports the continued discussion of our work and provides more context for the role of Westlaw as a legal database for future medicolegal research. We appreciate the insight and thank the authors for their acute understanding of our primary goal to unearth the reasons why medical malpractice litigations are filed. The further granularity in the litigations that the authors of the commentary request is unfortunately not consistently reported across litigations, but we can certainly consider this for smaller subsets of litigations. For instance, the granularity of reporting for a medical malpractice litigation in 1 US state could vary from another US state because of dissimilar reporting practices or varying quality of local commercial vendors that the Westlaw legal database contracts to obtain the relevant court documents. However, this dialogue paves a path to expect more granular data from legal research providers across all jurisdictions in the future.

The commentary from Luc and Lee⁴ sets the tone for how medicolegal research should be presented and employed by those within our field to drive forward the specialty as a whole. We are fortunate to have individuals with technical backgrounds and experience within the legal domain