

As another new year of this century approaches

The other day a young academician gave a seminar on antilipidemic drugs. Chemical structures, biochemical properties, impact mechanism, benefits and side effects were presented in detail within the framework of scientific principles and some evidence.

The presentation was good, but the presenter had done such extensive research on this subject, which almost made media members believe everything had been explained. In fact, most of the study results were not open to question, and all the results suggest that these drugs are definitely effective. NNTs were at acceptable levels. On the other hand, it was definite that the cost of this precise information (how were such precise results obtained for biological events!) was too high and even more than many countries' budgets. I asked the following question: "When the total amount of effort and financial cost spent to produce these beneficial drugs is compared with the cost to prevent the causes of this disease, I think there appears a mistake. Do we spend as much effort trying to prevent the disease?"

It is obvious that introducing precautions also requires some effort and financial cost, but I think it will cost less than launching and producing new drugs. We should remember that a part of this problem is based on human beings because their egos always tell them to eat. Doctors tell people to eat less and nourish themselves properly. As a result, even people at a certain economic level have obesity, they are obliged to not to become fully satisfied, but at least they are not obliged to starve like Somalians. All in all, some people look for happiness with a piece of bread while some of them look for remedies for obesity. Suggesting limits and too many conditions to people without any limit to eat and satisfy their souls are a kind of punishment for them with a bad (!) living condition. Then, the punishers are beaten!

Instead of preventing hyperlipidemia, the main aim is to keep drug production in the forefront to increase the money-making and capital. I do not agree with the belief that if you leave the square

empty and do not prevent real problems, people will look for remedies by superstition or unknown herbs, and at this point drugs and finance come into play. If the ego is not taken into account for the precaution, these projects and plans cannot attain long-term success. To prevent hyperlipidemia, one should be reasonable, sensible and agree with humanity about it, and one should not use chain of command. I think expenditures on research in preventive medicine are lower than the expenditures of the pharmaceutical industry, but they may not be effective as expected.

Even though politics is placed on another side, there are some inexplicable scientific problems. The USA has exhibited its attitude toward lipids: "The mountain has labored and brought forth a mouse." Besides it appeared with new problems and arguments! The guide, located on the other side of Atlantic, presented "risk and dose concerns" and explained "what should be done and what should not be done". The old continent acted differently and preferred to make presentation on "targets for different risk groups."

The most accurate method to prevent illnesses is the treatment of factors rather than treatment of illness itself. This approach is cheaper but harder. State institutions, non-governmental organizations and international organizations should have previously taken steps to bring two other sides of the Atlantic together. As the science looks for the truth, why fathers and sons may not be agreed on the same point? Ethnic identities are almost similar. The ratio of Blacks and Hispanics in the USA is almost equal to the ratio of non-Europeans in European countries. How then is it possible that they cannot even agree to make more lipid profiles to prevent and treat hyperlipidemia?

In this chaotic environment, I wish everyone a happy 2017.

Bilgin Timuralp
Editor-in-Chief
Eskişehir-Turkey

