

# Review of: "[Commentary] When 'Ignorance is Bliss' in Medicine"

David Leavesley<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Agency for Science, Technology and Research (A\*STAR)

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

The commentary "When 'Ignorance is Bliss' in Medicine" by Vijayaraghavan Padmanabhan is a brief, subjective, opinion piece expressing the author's philosophy of managing disease in patients, an opinion obviously informed by their own training and experiences.

As a reader, what do I get from this commentary?

This commentary is scant in evidence that substantiates the author's opinion. Padmanabhan recommends that medical practitioners self-indulge in "*Regular practice of meditation... (as this is) a valuable adjunct for the practice of medicine*". Sure, but please convince me. What is your evidence that this leads to better patient outcomes than my current approach?

Padmanabhan explains that "*the 'inner self' or 'pure consciousness' has... healing qualities*", and shares "*this healing 'inner self' is within the conscious reach of every individual in the waking state, through the practice of meditation*". It is not clear to this uninformed reader how a clinician practicing meditation is "*...within the... reach of every individual*"?

What am I missing?

I accept that many (not all!) patients find that the osteopathic approach of 'treat the patient as a whole', rather than the allopathic approach of 'treat the disease', delivers measurable patient benefit! Please convince me; what is the evidence "*'pure consciousness' has... healing qualities*"? How does '*pure consciousness*' deliver better outcomes for my patients than do my current clinical strategies?