BABE is a beautiful science but why is it very infrequently used in oncology?
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As Editor in Chief of the Journal of Bioequivalence and Bioavailability (BABE) I see many papers that show beautiful examples of how, using laboratory tests and small clinical studies, one drug is shown to be as effective as another drug in treating a certain malady. But in oncology, my field of endeavour, clinical trials that can take a decade are needed. This clearly delays progress toward developing new and improved therapies. Why it is that BABE is not more useful in oncology? I published an editorial in a European journal in July 2014 that suggests at least one reason. There seems to be a serious and fundamental flaw in our understanding of how tumors grow. This is traceable to work done in the 1960s and 1970s. In order to make use of BABE, there needs to be a fairly detailed knowledge of the disease process. I will present a short discussion of this subject and what this may lead to. Perhaps there may be a future for BABE in oncology.
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