

Gordis Epidemiology

Pil J. Fri Sep 23 2022

Some questionable sections

I am using this book as a textbook for the intro Epidemiology class in a master's program. I am also a practicing physician. I found many parts of this textbook problematic, personally. Others may disagree. I will list some of the things I found here: - There are a lot of stereotyping. For example, they allege that black people are assumed to be poorer and in worse health. Perhaps true but they almost state it as a matter of fact rather than as assumptions. And the reading for today's lecture, they mention gonorrhoea and increase of it after 2016 or so. Then they say this is because of increased detection in men who have sex with men, without showing any reference. -This passage from page 24 "with regard to excess, sometimes an "interocular test" may be convincing; the difference is so clear that it hits you between the eyes." I am shocked that a textbook for graduate level course is so vague and lacking in scientific rigour. Then the discussion that follows, over two pages, (about EPO and then experimental strain of H5N1) has very little to do with the topic in hands far as I can see (endemy vs. epidemy vs. pandemy). -They also mention what I think are not such a good medical recommendations any more, such as: -the need to treat strep throat with antibiotics (there is very little evidence to suggest benefit of antibiotic treatment of strep throat in the general population) and the importance of screening women of

Reference

[Career Development, Employment, and Disability in Rehabilitation: From Theory to Practice](#)

[CCM Certification Study Guide - Certified Case Manager Exam Secrets, Full-Length Practice Test, Step-by-Step Review Video Tutorials: \[4th Edition\]](#)