

Peer Review

Review of: "Hidden Ethical Conflicts: The Need for Progress in Evidence-based Medicine - A Living Review"

Anne Katrin Schlag¹

1. Drug Science, United Kingdom, Imperial College London, United Kingdom

A super interesting, well-presented, and well-argued commentary, clearly outlining the limitations of RCTs and offering inventive ways to alleviate their shortcomings. The authors clearly outline that experimental studies can only provide part of the information needed to make real-life healthcare decisions.

In line with Cochrane and Hill's request, it is shown that the experimental proof of healthcare services is not sufficient to make decisions in everyday care, and that a new concept is required, based on ethical and moral principles, to make the best healthcare decisions.

Medical cannabis may serve as a helpful practical example; please see: <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/psychiatry/articles/10.3389/fpsyt.2022.1027159/full>

I would also suggest that the authors add a table of abbreviations, of which there are many. Also, RWE is (usually) used for Real World Evidence, so it would be helpful to distinguish.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.