PROCESS IS HELPFUL, BUT THE PROCUREMENT PROBLEM PERSISTS

Reply to the Editor:

We are grateful to Tam and colleagues for identifying process as important in resolving disagreements between surgeons and administrators. We suggest that such collaborative efforts would be most productive if guided by prospectively defined, well-formatted, ethically sound, generally accepted processes, through which disputes between hospital administration and physicians can be justly adjudicated.

Daniels’ framework, executed through multicentric decision analysis, may offer a suitable pathway to prevent or resolve serious and often emotional disagreements. We thank Tam and colleagues for noting these approaches.

We have a caveat, however, related to our vignette describing a surgeon’s dilemma. Such a sophisticated collaborative process may be followed and may include input from our hypothetical surgeon, but if a conclusion is reached that is contrary to the surgeon’s input, and she cannot with integrity implant an alternative heart valve that she believes, in her heart of hearts, to be inferior to her own choice, what should she do then? We find ourselves right back where we started.
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