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Bias in awarding research grants

Sir,—Dr Brian Martin makes serious allegations against the National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) of Australia (30 August, p 550). I was responsible for the protracted correspondence between Dr Eva Wertheim (referred to as Dr Smith), the NHMRC, and the Commonwealth ombudsman about Dr Wertheim's unsuccessful grant application. I was not involved with Dr Wertheim but with Dr Martin for the allegations of injustice, bias, misrepresentation, and falsification he makes against the NHMRC.

The case can be summarised as follows. From 1976 to 1982 project grants were rated from 1 (poor) to 6 (excellent) by two anonymous external assessors and the applicant interviewed by a multidisciplinary regional committee, which scored each project from 1 to 6 on the basis of application and interview. Dr Wertheim applied for project grants in 1976, 1979, and 1982. When the 1976 application was not funded she requested—as is her right—a commentary from the NHMRC on her application and interview. She was happy with neither the verdict nor the NHMRC response. In 1979 her application succeeded, in 1982 it was unsuccessful, as was her application for an NHMRC fellowship. Under the newly introduced Freedom of Information Act she sought documentation of her rejected grants. Among the documents was one in which an assessor's rating had been incorrectly entered on a committee member's report form.

Dr Martin says, "Although it seems certain that an injustice was perpetrated [in Dr Wertheim's case], there is no way to prove bias." The qualifier is unsustainable and the main clause misleading. Dr Wertheim, appropriately in my opinion, not satisfied with the NHMRC's response, engaged with the ombudsman. He found that various NHMRC procedures were suboptimal (and that they have since been much improved); he criticised aspects of the way the complaints had been handled but found no evidence of injustice. There are ways in which bias can be strongly suspected on a population basis, if not proved in an individual case. If proposals written by women are much less successful than those written by men, those written by people with Central European names less (or more) successful than those written by Smith or Jones, those written by PhDs less successful than those written by medical graduates, then various sorts of bias—gender, ethnic, or clinical—may be entertained. The possibility of such biases can be examined in the NHMRC system; until such an examination is made, and dispassionately reported, the statement that bias exists is nothing more than prejudice or spleen. In fact Dr Wertheim was successful in one out of three applications, which is almost exactly the average success rate for project grant applications in 1976-82.

Dr Martin claims, "It seems reasonable to infer that the spokesperson [of the committee considering Dr Wertheim's application] misrepresented the assessors' reports to the committee." The inference here is that only the spokesperson saw the external assessors' report. This is not the case; applicants for grants are interviewed by a committee, all members of which can make their own judgments on the assessor's reports. Clearly, the spokesperson did not agree with one assessor who rated the project as 5 ("very good"); clearly, his opinion was shared by every other member of the interviewing committee.

Dr Martin says, "One assessor's rating was altered from 5 to 1." This refers to an error made by the spokesperson, who entered 1 rather than 5 in the box reserved for the assessor's mark. To alter a rating from 5 to 1 would have entailed tampering with every copy of the assessor's report, in which the box marked 5 had been ticked; proof that the assessor's rating was not altered is that the copy on the spokesperson's report could be shown to be wrong. The spokesperson makes clear that the erroneous entry had no bearing on the fate of the application.

The NHMRC, as a committee of the Department of Health, has no corporate voice; as an individual I have tried to point out the groundlessness of Dr Martin's charges. I have never been a member of NHMRC; I have served on interviewing committees and have had grants applications approved and rejected over the period in question. I share with Dr Wertheim the feeling of dismay and disbelief when an application fails. I do not, however, share with Dr Martin the feeling that this reflects injustice, bias, and falsification by those responsible for the negative decision, in a system where on average only one application in three is funded.

In his discussion Dr Martin puts the specific charges into the wider context of peer review performed in Australia by anonymous elites with unspecified (but five times reiterated) vested interests. Open institutions—like democratic government and peer review—are fertile ground for conspiracies theories; in closed societies the enemy is obvious, and there is no need to postulate any hidden forces to explain lack of success. The NHMRC system of peer review and awarding research grants is imperfect, like any human institution. The system was substantially refined between 1976 and 1982 and has become even more "user friendly." It still has some (little) way to go—for example, by providing the assessors' reports to applicants before interview. All this aside, it has emerged as a democratic and externally accountable method of ranking competing project grants in a situation where funding has been scarce and competition for limited funds fierce.

Dr Martin asks that "The discussion should encompass not only administrators and scientists but also members of the general public, all of whom have a stake in fairness and the promotion of scholarship in service to the community." Quite so; but the promotion of scholarship is not served by innuendo and insupportable allegations of injustice—all of which have been examined and dismissed by the office of the ombudsman.

JOHN W FUNDER
Medical Research Centre, Prince Henry's Hospital, Melbourne, Australia 3084

Sir,—I read with interest and concern the paper by Dr Brian Martin (30 August, p 550). He makes...
Relapse of duodenal ulcer

Sir,—Dr J Paul Miller and Mr E Brian Faragher concluded their leading article (1 November, p 1117) with the recommendation that the reported observations (and inferences therefrom) "should probably influence prescribing." Right, but how?

There are clearly two problems associated with current ulcer healing therapy. Firstly, most ulcers relapse if treatment is stopped. Even if the ulcers healed by H₂ blockers relapse more rapidly (and no generalisation is possible from currently available data), nearly 70% of patients treated with triptosan (Tri-Dol) or dicitrato bismuthate (De-Nol) relapse within one year of healing. As we have pointed out,¹ all (and any) ulcer relapse may present with a complication, and in one recent study the rate of complication during ulcer relapse was over 15% in six years and 30% if patients had previously suffered from a complication.² Since any complication may be lethal, we have concluded that it is not permissible to allow any ulcer to relapse, since it is not possible to predict which relapse is going to be dangerous.

Secondly, all relapses have to be retreated, time after time. Cimetidine and ranitidine have been used for repeated, or continuous, treatment for 10 years and five years and eight months in animals, and have not produced significant long term adverse effects. Information about the effects of repeated or long term treatment with the current bismuth containing preparations is not available either in man or animals, while ulcerations with earlier bismuth containing antacids were unsatisfactory since some patients developed encephalopathy or asthenia. It is not valuable to state that a drug "is recommended for four to eight week courses" when it is stated that at least 50% of treated patients relapse within one year and will therefore require retreatment within a year. With which drug? And what about next year? And the year after that? How much bismuth is going to have accumulated after a few years of repeated treatment? We do not know and I am not prepared to risk the matter in my patients with ulcers.

K G WORMLEY

Niwnesill Hospital,
Dundee DD1 5SY


AUTHOR'S REPLY—The conclusion from Dr Wormley's statement that "It is not permissible to allow any ulcer to relapse" is that every patient with duodenal ulcer should at the time of diagnosis be put on to lifelong maintenance treatment or undergo surgery. This may be reasonable in certain high risk groups. This policy has not been generally adopted among gastroenterologists. The H₂ antagonists currently in widespread use are both excellent drugs with very good safety records, but we do not yet know what the risk-benefit ratio would be from their universal continuous use over decades.¹ For these reasons I prefer to reserve permanent maintenance for the patient who has proved that he rapidly relapses and for high risk patients—diabetes, the elderly with other medical problems. Moreover it is not possible with any available treatment to prevent all relapses. On long term H₂ blockade the annual relapse rates are between 10 and 47%, though I would accept that such relapses are rarely accompanied by complications. Bismuth encephalopathy was associated with the prolonged use of high doses of insoluble bismuth salts.² It is apparently reversible and has never been described with a daily ingestion of less than 1 g bismuth metal. It has never been described with triptosan dicitrato bismuthate (Tri-Dol) in recommended doses, and more than 1:5 million treatments have been dispensed. The recommended daily dosage of triptosan dicitrato bismuthate contains 480 mg bismuth. It has been proposed that bismuth preparations should be discontinued if blood concentrations exceed 100 μg/l, with 50-100 μg/l being considered as an "alerting zone."³ Patients with encephalopathy have generally had levels of several hundred or several thousand μg/l, while in nearly 500 patients given therapeutic doses of triptosan dicitrato bismuthate the mean level was 70 μg/l with only two values in the alerting zone (Bader JP, De-Nol Symposium, Sao Paulo, 1986). A simple way of estimating tissue bismuth concentrations is, however, clearly desirable.

Triptosan dicitrato bismuthate is not recommended for long term maintenance, but a maintenance trial is in progress to assess its safety from this viewpoint (Porro Triptosan De-Nol Symposium, Sao Paulo, 1996). It takes about two months for urinary bismuth values to return to pretreatment levels after a course of triptosan dicitrato bismuthate, leading to the conclusion that there should be at least a two month period between successive courses (Bader JP, De-Nol Symposium, Sao Paulo, 1986).⁴

How, asks Dr Wormley, should the data summarised in our leading article influence prescribing? I suggest that it is logical to use triptosan dicitrato bismuthate for the initial treatment of newly diagnosed duodenal ulcer. Until more information is available I would adopt a conservative approach to treatment, but even if two to four to eight weekly courses of triptosan dicitrato bismuthate a year were used the trials analysed in the leading article suggest that about 60% of patients could be kept under control.

J P A MILLER

University Hospital of South Manchester,
Manchester M60 9LR