WWW.IJRPR.COM

International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews

Journal homepage: www.ijrpr.com ISSN 2582-7421

Therapeutic Misconception in Contemporary Clinical Research: Ethical Complexities and Evolving Solutions

Sajna Sj, Sayyedath Rabiyath Sajidabi

Department Of Pharmacy Practice, Malik Deenar College Of Pharmacy

ABSTRACT

Taking part in a clinical study is mostly for personal therapeutic gain, which is a false belief known as therapeutic misconception (TM). This is still a big moral problem in research. It gets harder and harder to spot TM as modern trials start to look more and more like regular healthcare, especially with new frameworks like adaptive study designs. This review brings together the findings of two recent studies. One, published in Bioethics (2023), looked at TM in the context of new trial methods. The other, published in the Internal Medicine Journal (2023), looked at TM that comes from combining clinical care with research, especially in oncology. All of these sources show how hard it is getting to keep care and research separate and stress the need for better ways to get consent and teach participants.

INTRODUCTION

People first talked about therapeutic misconception in the 1980s. People who are doing research sometimes think that the main goal of a study is to help them personally, when in fact it is to add to medical knowledge in general. Since it was first used in clinical trials, TM has changed a lot. It is now used more in clinical settings, especially in cancer care. It's often hard to tell the difference between standard treatment and experimentation with modern research methods, which makes it harder to follow ethical rules. This review talks about the current state of TM and how to make consent and communication more ethical by using two studies from 2023.

CONTEMPORARY DIMENSIONS OF THERAPEUTIC MISCONCEPTION

The Bioethics (2023) paper looks at TM again, this time in the context of adaptive and pragmatic trials. These studies change their plans in real time when they get new information. This could make participants think that changes are personalized treatment decisions instead of improvements to the way things are done. It can be hard to tell where treatment ends and experimentation begins when research is done in a clinical setting, especially by the participant's own healthcare providers.

The 2023 issue of the Internal Medicine Journal is about oncology, where trials are sometimes the only way for patients to get better care. Even when the scientific purpose is clear, patients with life-threatening illnesses are more likely to see experimental treatments as acts of kindness or ways to help

KEY FACTORS FUELING TM IN MODERN CLINICAL TRIALS

1. Merging of Research and Routine Care

When research is done as part of clinical care, it is becoming harder for participants to tell if recommendations are based on therapeutic judgment or study protocols. Doctors are both caregivers and researchers, which makes things even more confusing and unintentionally backs up therapeutic assumptions.

2. Complex and Evolving Trial Designs

Contemporary trials often feature advanced and unfamiliar methodologies such as:

- Adaptive trial structures
- Basket or umbrella models
- Personalized treatment arms

These designs challenge participants' understanding—not necessarily due to lack of intelligence or effort, but due to their inherent complexity.

3. Language and Presentation

The way people talk to each other has a big impact on how they see things. People might think that terms like "best available care," "precision medicine," or "compassionate access" will help them directly. How consent forms and verbal explanations are worded has a big effect on what people think will happen.

4. Emotional and Cognitive Influences

People often keep hope alive when they are going through a lot of emotional pain, like when they are sick and about to die. When people are optimistic, trust doctors, or are in emotional pain, it can be hard to think clearly. This can lead to misunderstandings, even when the study's non-therapeutic nature is clearly explained.

ETHICAL IMPACT OF THERAPEUTIC MISCONCEPTION

TM makes "informed consent" less trustworthy, which is an important part of ethical research. If people don't know what the study is about, their consent may not be a true reflection of a free, informed choice.

Additional ethical and practical consequences include:

- Emotional harm : due to unmet expectations
- Reduced trust : in medical institutions or researchers
- Non-compliance : with study requirements, affecting trial integrity

These effects create challenges not only for participants but also for ethics boards, researchers, and clinical staff working to protect participant welfare.

APPROACHES TO MINIMIZE TM

1. Enhancing Consent Clarity

Both studies stress the need to clearly outline the scientific purpose of research. Effective strategies include:

- Avoiding words that imply treatment
- Explicitly stating differences between care and research
- Offering realistic descriptions of risks and benefits

2. Training for Clinical Investigators

To be able to find and stop TM, doctors who do research need extra training. Institutional review boards (IRBs) should closely watch how recruitment materials and consent forms are made and sent out.

3. Using Interactive and Ongoing Consent Tools

The Internal Medicine Journal article advocates for dynamic consent systems, which:

- Allow continuous access to information
- Encourage revisiting and reassessing decisions over time
- Support personalized, understandable communication

These platforms are especially beneficial in studies where protocols shift, such as in adaptive designs.

4. Independent Consent Facilitators

Using professionals from outside the clinical team can help make the consent process more fair. This separation helps reduce any bias that might come from a participant's faith in their doctor.

5. Evidence-Based Consent Innovations

We need to keep doing research in the real world to find out which strategies work best to lower TM. Right now, there are tests that use simplified materials, visual aids, and digital consent models. The results of these tests are likely to change the way consent is given in the future.

CONCLUSION

Therapeutic misconception is still a big ethical issue, especially in clinical settings where trials are becoming more like regular care. As study designs get more complicated and research becomes a normal part of treatment pathways, especially in oncology, it is getting harder for both patients and providers to tell the difference between science and therapy. Recent studies show how important it is to improve the way people give their informed consent, make doctors more aware, and add platforms for flexible consent. Researchers, ethicists, clinicians, and participants will need to work together in the future to keep ethical standards high and protect patient autonomy in a field of clinical research that is changing quickly.

REFERENCES

1. Kerridge I, et al. (2023). When research becomes practice: the concept of the therapeutic misconception and challenges to consent in clinical trials. Internal Medicine Journal. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/36822606
2. Teres C, et al. (2023). Therapeutic misunderstandings in modern research: Navigating blurred boundaries between care and trial participation. Bioethics. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/bioe.13241