

February 5, 1944

19

Dr. R. M. Andre,
Supervisor, Medical Section,
The Industrial Commission of Ohio,
Columbus 15, Ohio.

Dear Dr. Andre:

I am sending to you herewith two reports giving my opinion after review of the records of Oliver Pearson, O.D. 32126, and Jacob Wagner, O.D. 33061.

I regret that on account of the protracted absence from the country it has been impossible for me to review these records as promptly as I should have wished.

I suspect you will find my opinions not too definite or satisfactory. This may well be especially the case in the report dealing with the record of Jacob Wagner. I could easily have said in both these reports that my own recommendation on these cases in the absence of better information, would be to accept the opinion of the doctor (Dr. Jerome Gross) that these men had lead intoxication at the time he examined them. This, as you will recognize, is largely a matter of faith, and since I have no way of judging the validity of Dr. Gross' opinions, from the professional point of view, I would have to leave it at that. I realize that this is an unsatisfactory situation and I am writing this letter not for the purpose of excusing myself in arriving at a tentative conclusion, but rather to emphasize what you already know, namely, that the information provided by doctors in connection with these claims is inadequate. I think a step forward has been made in requiring the submission of blood smears as well as the results of analyses carried out on the blood or urine or both. However, there is no proof that a smear so submitted represents the blood of the particular patient in question. Moreover, the analytical data may be misleading because of the unreliability of the methods of analysis, and the methods of handling the samples. You will note that I am not at all convinced of the validity of the analytical information in these two cases. My reasons for doubt may not convince less experienced people, but in my opinion, it is necessary to give expression to an opinion when such doubt

Dr. R. M. Andre - (2) - February 5, 1944

exists. It is my feeling that the evidence required of physicians in these cases is still inadequate. I think the best evidence would be a copy of the examination record, in which the doctor sets down his findings and his conclusions arrived at from the findings. Such a work would permit one to evaluate the clinical findings and to review the record in an intelligent fashion. In the absence of such a record, there is really very little to review. A decision in such a case as I have indicated in these records, is largely based on faith. If it is the policy of the industrial commission to accept the opinions of doctors, largely unsupported, then there is no occasion for insisting upon further evidence. However, if it is the policy to require the doctor to prove his case, then the medical record should be required, for it is the most pertinent information that can be obtained.

This advice, of course, is unsolicited, but I think it is justified following a review of two such unsatisfactory case records.

Cordially yours,

Robert A. Kenoe, M. D.

RAK ef

Enc.

of physiat-
be best
in which

THE INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION OF OHIO SHEET NO.
COLUMBUS 15, OHIO

DR R A KENOE
COLLEGE OF MEDICINE
EDEN AVE
CINCINNATI 19 OHIO

ACCT. NO. O. D.
WARRANT NO. 4162

THE ATTACHED WARRANT IS IN PAYMENT
OF SERVICES ENUMERATED BELOW.

PREVIOUS BALANCE	RISK No.	CLAIMANT'S AND DOCTOR'S NAMES	HEARING DATE	DAY INJ.			CLAIM No.	FEE	NEW BALANCE
				MO.	DAY	YR.			
	1735	OLIVER PEARSON	FEB 21 44	8	6	43	232126	10 00	
	1736	JACOB WAGNER	FEB 24 44	9	16	43	33061	10 00	20 00
		DR RA KENOE							

IN ORDER TO AVOID ERRORS IN ISSUING WARRANTS IN PAYMENT OF MEDICAL FEES, IN ADDITION
TO SIGNING BILLS, REPORTS, ETC., TYPEWRITE OR IMPRINT WITH RUBBER STAMP YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS

A-127-30M-9-43

KE 0019761

N19891.01