

# Re: IDSA GUIDELINES ATTEMPT TO NARROW THE DEFINITION OF LYME DISEASE AND PROMOTE A LEGAL STANDARD OF CARE THAT CAN BE USED BY INSURANCE COMPANIES AND STATE MEDICAL BOARDS

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.med.diseases.lyme/2006-11/msg00741.html>

---

- *From:* "the 3rd Man" <[sir\\_der05@xxxxxxxxx](mailto:sir_der05@xxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* 28 Nov 2006 09:59:07 -0800
- 

Greatcod wrote:

Jesus, 3rdMan, doctors do not and will never do what lawyers do--read the law on a case by case basis.

First, Cod, no, I ain't Jesus...(that's some other guy blaspheming). (Just joking).

They don't have time. They memorize

the basics on a lot of things, diagnosis, treatment, medication side effects, and then they get out there and guess. That's their job; they are never going to demand of each other that they know the details. There is far too much to know--how many Lyme journal articles--3,000??..and 8 million articles in Pub Med about various aspects of medicine.

Yes, but what I am really suggesting here is WHO is LEGALLY responsible for a patient's care.

What all the Lyme advocates seem to want to do is to hold the researchers responsible.

And that's wrong legally, and wrong tactically, in my opinion.

LOOK...everyone seems to acknowledge the fact that most GPs do NOT understand the intricacies and subtleties of the ELISA/Blot. AS you, yourself have acknowledged, most will end inquiry if one or the other

Re: IDSA GUIDELINES ATTEMPT TO NARROW THE DEFINITION OF LYME DISEASE AND PROMOTE A LEGAL STANDARD OF CARE THAT CAN BE USED BY INSURANCE COMPANIES AND STATE MEDICAL BOARDS

THE DEFINITION OF LYME DISEASE AND PROMOTE A LEGAL STANDARD OF CARE THAT CAN BE USED BY INSURERS

is deemed 'negative'.

So, if you really want to help people...WHY don't you expend your energies in efforts to counter what the LDA claims is language that suggests you must

Re: IDSA GUIDELINES ATTEMPT TO NARROW THE DEFINITION OF LYME DISEASE AND PROMOTE A LEGAL STANDARD OF CARE THAT CAN BE USED BY INSURERS