1990. And it is of very high affinity, making it active in the ng/mL range, exactly as requested by McLachlan and Rapoport. The remaining criteria—that the monoclonal should be inactive after preadsorption with the TSH receptor but active after fine purification, and that expression of recombinant protein derived from the heavy-chain and light-chain genes should also produce a thyroid-stimulating immunoglobulin—have not been addressed in the current report, but seem likely to be met.

So is the final proof of the existence of thyroid-stimulating immunoglobulin after a journey of 47 years of anything more than academic interest? Almost certainly the answer is yes. First, it might lead to a new generation of assays for thyroid-stimulating immunoglobulin in which competition for labelled TSH is replaced by competition for specific monoclonal antibodies.10 If a sensitive assay can be developed, it should have close to 100% specificity for Graves’ disease and replace all other antibody tests, such as antithyroid peroxidase and antithyroglobulin, in this condition. Second, it should finally allow us to understand how such antibodies, even in the monomeric Fab form, can activate the TSH receptor. Such understanding of the biology and biology-hormone receptors may lead to new small-molecule agonists and antagonists not only for thyroid disease but also for hypogonadism and infertility (via the closely related receptors for luteinising and follicle-stimulating hormones). And it may prove possible to clone a potent human TSH-receptor-blocking antibody which might provide a rapid initial treatment for thyrotoxicosis. Third, the finding may lead to a better understanding of the pathogenesis of Graves’ disease. How is it that the spontaneous development of such agonist antibodies, unique in autoimmune diseases, occurs so frequently (almost 1 in 100 of the population)? Does the agonist activity itself, once it appears, promote autoimmunity in a positive feedback loop? Most intriguingly, cloning of agonist TSH-receptor autoantibodies might reveal antibodies that contribute to thyroid eye-disease, the most mysterious manifestation of Graves’ disease, and perhaps lead to inhibitors for these antibodies. And finally, agonist antibodies may prove a useful therapeutic agent in their own right, such as to enhance iodine-131 uptake in thyroid cancers. Many of the holy grails of biological science, from the structure of DNA to the nature of the T-cell antigen receptor, have been found. Thankfully, so is the final proof of the existence of thyroid-stimulating immunoglobulin after a journey of 47 years of anything more than academic interest.

**Medicine, the arts, and the humanities**

“Knowledge is limited. Imagination encircles the world”

Albert Einstein

Medical and scientific developments and innovations, with their attendant social and ethical consequences, rely on a multidisciplinary involvement of science and humanities. The practice of medicine furthermore involves knowledge and skills based on education and experience in both. The arts and humanities can also contribute ways of reconceptualising medicine itself. Stephen Pattison1 and Robin Downie2 recently discussed what medical humanities is, what it might and might not be able to do, and what they hope it will not do. “Medicine and health . . . are human concerns in the widest sense”, according to Pattison. Study of the humanities may not be able to make clinicians more humane, says Downie, but it can foster a depth of human and humane understanding, knowledge, and experience.

Arts and humanities approaches are intrinsic to society’s understanding of medicine. Bodies, minds, emotions, and relationships are explored and expressed through the arts and humanities as well as science; academically and intellectually, as well as personally. Do the sciences not also rely for their effectiveness on understanding, critical analysis, meaning, discernment, interpretation, visualisation, and creativity, all fostered by subjects traditionally considered to be based on humanities and arts?4

The humanities are reflective and disciplined inquiries that involve the recording and interpretation of the range of human experience. The medical humanities encompass history, literature, philosophy, ethics, theology, sociology, anthropology, and possibly law. These disciplines offer a multifaceted view. They value the aesthetic as well as reason, focus on meaning as well as emotion, and explore ambiguity, uncertainty, and complexity as well as theoretical lucidity. They offer understanding through synthesis as well as analysis—all integral elements of medicine. Educationally, the medical humanities can enable and develop critical conceptualisation and analysis of personal and professional values, and the reflective and reflective capacities of empathy, collegiality, and teamwork. All these approaches can foster critical evaluation and effective understanding of patients’ unique narratives and needs.5,7

Medical consultation is a complex communication, both verbal and physical, involving issues of risk, values, and ethics. The clinician brings tacit understandings and personal experience, as well as professional expertise and knowledge. Patients bring broken bodies or minds. But often more than the body or mind is broken: patients’ understanding of themselves and the
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certainty of their lives is often also disrupted and disturbed. Together, clinician and patient can co-construct a curative and healing narrative that involves medical and healthcare interventions, and mental and emotional understandings, which can help the patient constructively rebuild their life, or prepare for death. A recent UK Government directive states that: “The greatest challenges for society . . . are all ones in which the arts and humanities, and science and technology need each other . . . [Medical] education is about understanding and imagination, as well as training and skills”. Medical humanities is responding fast, and all involved in the field are asked to join a dialogue of its nature and effects.

Medical practitioners work with people through the biggest dramas of life: birth, death, disablement, and life-altering disease. Such work also brings anxiety, harassment, frustration, and disillusionment. Some of these intimate and privileged encounters inevitably include extraordinary comedy as well as tragedy. The treatment and care of ill and often distressed people constantly confronts practitioners with fundamental questions about the meaning and sanctity of life and the problem of suffering. A sound grounding in the arts and humanities can enable an effectively critical, humane, and ethical response.

For the medical humanities to continue to be of real use, they need to retain an intrinsic value, and not become “instrumental technologies” (as a mere means to promoting, for example, communication skills). An interdisciplinary breadth, inclusivity, vigour, and spirit of intellectual inquiry is needed. Pattison and Downie also caution against pitfalls into which medical ethics has fallen: “routinisation, exclusivism, narrowing, specialisation, and professionalisation”, which could result in the elimination of “radically different approaches to the big questions and issues of life.” Medical humanities, like all other disciplines, is rooted in imaginative inquiry.

A dynamic communication between humanities, arts, and science can offer a challenge to medicine, as well as to the humanities. Developmental change is neither comfortable nor easy. Medical humanities, with the richness it has to offer practice as well as academic and intellectual pursuit and education, could support a rounded development of medical care, able to respond with cutting-edge research, as well as to human needs—social, ethical and scientific.

GB is involved in the first conference of the UK Association for the Medical Humanities, Durham University, July 21–22, 2003. I acknowledge the support of Brian Hurwitz.

Gillie Bolton
School of Humanities, King’s College, London WC2R 2LS, UK
(e-mail: gillie.bolton@kcl.ac.uk)


Ombudsman’s seventh report

Four complaints were referred directly to the ombudsman in the past 12 months. One, relating to one individual’s allocation of travel funds by The Lancet, fell outside the ombudsman’s remit. The other three cases are summarised in the panel.


Case 1
Author of rejected letter alleged bias and possible lack of integrity on the part of the journal. No deficiencies identified in editorial process. Editorial decisions are not open to the ombudsman’s scrutiny. Rejected.

Case 2
Delay of 17 months between receipt of manuscript and final editorial decision. Major defects found in editorial process consequent on prolonged absence of member of editorial staff through sickness and failure of manuscript-tracking system in the office. Failure partly mitigated by misdirection of some correspondence by authors and the journal’s difficulty in finding appropriate external reviewers. Measures taken to ensure that similar gross failures do not occur again. Upheld.

Case 3
Delay of 4 months between submission of manuscript to The Lancet Oncology and editorial response, requesting revision. Revised manuscript rejected. Editorial processing confirmed to be slow, but problems encountered in finding external assessors prepared to review text. Initial editorial opinion eventually based on one external opinion and detailed inhouse assessment; judged to be sensible compromise. Subsequent editorial decision to reject revised version falls outside ombudsman’s remit. Rejected.

The ombudsman’s last report noted The Lancet’s protracted handling of letters responding to previous published papers. The editorial process has now been shortened.

Richard Carter
c/o The Lancet, London NW1 7SY, UK