

# Comment on “Multidisciplinary teams: perceptions of professionals and oncological patients”

Zhanshuo Gu<sup>1</sup> , Peiyuan Cai<sup>2\*</sup> 

Dear Editor,

Recently we have read a research article entitled “Multidisciplinary teams: perceptions of professionals and oncological patients”<sup>1</sup>. In this study, the author obtained the satisfaction data from professionals and patients in the public and private medical institutions through survey questionnaires. Statistical methods were used to analyze the results of the data, and the conclusion was drawn that there were differences in the level of satisfaction of cancer multidisciplinary team treatment among different groups. This kind of research is of great significance to the scientific decision-making of public health and health care systems. However, due to the small number of samples and the lack of further detailed definition of sample composition, there are still some limitations in this study.

As clinicians, we have some questions and suggestions to discuss with the researchers:

First, according to the description of the article, in the process of data collection, different groups of professionals and patients related to different diseases applied different questionnaire contents. If the questionnaire used by each group is

displayed in the form of an attachment, the relevant researchers will evaluate the objectivity and preciseness of the conclusion more objectively and accurately. As mentioned above, this kind of research needs multi-center and large sample data to produce scientific significance and social value, and the accumulation of such literature data is conducive to the ongoing and deepening of the research.

Secondly, in the sample of professionals, the gender ratio is over biased. Because of the differences in psychology and tolerance between men and women, we should pay attention to the deviation of the experimental results.

Finally, patient satisfaction is a subjective-descriptive result. As clinicians, we suggest that researchers further investigate patients’ choice of follow-up treatment, which we think will be yielding more objective data and results.

## AUTHORS’ CONTRIBUTIONS

**ZG:** Data curation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Visualization, Writing – original draft. **PC:** Conceptualization, Funding acquisition, Project administration, Writing – review & editing.

## REFERENCE

1. Tanaka H, Medeiros G, Giglio A. Multidisciplinary teams: perceptions of professionals and oncological patients. *Rev Assoc Med Bras* (1992). 2020;66(4):419-23. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1806-9282.66.4.419>

<sup>1</sup>Taizhou Municipal Hospital, Department of Gastroenterology – Taizhou (Zhejiang), China.

<sup>2</sup>Taizhou Municipal Hospital, Department of Interventional Oncology – Taizhou (Zhejiang), China.

\*Corresponding author: [caipeiyuanTZH@163.com](mailto:caipeiyuanTZH@163.com)

Conflicts of interest: the authors declare there is no conflicts of interest. Funding: none.

Received on July 13, 2021. Accepted on July 19, 2021.

