Review



# Singularities and Universals: The Historical Roots of Case Reports and Clinical Trials in Biomedical Literature

Carlo Galli * and Marco Meleti

Posted Date: 20 October 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202510.1583.v1

Keywords: history of science; case reports; clinical trials; Aristotelian science; Hippocratic medicine; paradoxography; scientific revolution; biomedical literature

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.1583.v1



*Review*

# Singularities and Universals: The Historical Roots of Case Reports and Clinical Trials in Biomedical Literature

**Carlo Galli [1,*] and Marco Meleti [2]**

[1] Histology and Embryology Laboratory, Department of Medicine and Surgery, University of Parma, Via Volturno 39, 43126 Parma, Italy

[2] Department of Medicine and Surgery, Dental School, University of Parma, 43126 Parma, Italy

* Correspondence: carlo.galli@unipr.it

**Abstract**

This manuscript examines the historical underpinnings of two prominent genres in biomedical literature: the individualized case report and the systematically averaged clinical trial. Although both are fundamental to clinical science, their intellectual origins reflect divergent approaches to the study of nature. Tracing these approaches back to classical antiquity, we find Hippocratic medicine valuing detailed observations of individual patients, a focus later enriched by the Renaissance fascination with wonders and anomalies, known as paradoxography. In contrast, medieval Aristotelian science, with its emphasis on the regularities and universal laws of nature, provided a philosophical foundation for the development of population-based methodologies. We argue that these two traditions—one celebrating the exceptional case, the other seeking aggregate evidence—continued to shape scientific inquiry through the Middle Ages and into the Scientific Revolution. The dialectic between them can still be observed in modern biomedical writing: case reports give voice to rarities and novel phenomena, while clinical trials aim for reproducible, generalized knowledge. By exploring the historical, philosophical, and methodological roots of these genres, we gain insight into how scientific culture has balanced the importance of singular marvels with the necessity of robust statistical evidence. This balance remains central to contemporary medical research and practice.

**Keywords:** history of science; case reports; clinical trials; Aristotelian science; Hippocratic medicine; paradoxography; scientific revolution; biomedical literature

## 1. Charting the Poles: Singularity and Universality in Medical Knowledge

The story of medicine is, in large measure, the story of how healers arrange what they know. Hippocratic physicians once filled wax tablets with the minutiae of a single fever, convinced that every cough or chill might matter [1]; twenty-first-century investigators, by contrast, marshal randomized controlled trials that pool data from tens of thousands of volunteers [2]. Across the centuries, practice has swung between two magnetic poles: the singular life unfolding before the clinician and the abstract regularities that emerge only when many such lives are considered together. This oscillation recalls Edmund Husserl's interpretation in *The Crisis of the European Sciences* of the modern scientific science's tension between the *Lebenswelt*—the world as immediately given in lived experience—and the abstract, mathematized order that seeks to represent it [3]. In both medicine and philosophy, the move from the concrete to the formal promises universality but risks losing contact with the phenomena that first made knowledge possible. This is no idle methodological debate. It reflects the basic ways human beings try to make sense of flesh, illness, and chance. Even in an era that prizes p-values and meta-analyses, the well-crafted case report still earns attention when it reveals a presentation no textbook predicted or hints at a mechanism no algorithm has yet discerned [4].

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.1583.v1



The tug-of-war between the particular and the general reaches far back. From Aristotle to the scholastics, physicians and philosophers sought constancy—stable categories and reliable causal chains through which to read nature [5]. Yet even as they prized order, they never ceased to marvel at the irregular: the monstrous birth, the sudden recovery, the singular case that defied expectation [6]. Renaissance writers, reclaiming this fascination, compiled *paradoxographies*—catalogues of marvels and monsters—turning anomalies into objects of learned curiosity. The Hippocratic corpus had already gestured toward that balance, showing that careful narrative—attentive to climate, diet, and temperament—could illuminate disease as powerfully as general theory [7]. The mechanical worldview of Galileo and Descartes later renewed the pursuit of universal laws, but never fully silenced the intuition that every individual body is its own small cosmos [8].

These precedents helped shape the two reporting traditions that medicine still holds in tension. When a clinician confronts an unexpected rash or an inexplicable laboratory result, a single documented case can upend comfortable assumptions, spark a new hypothesis, or even unveil a previously unnamed syndrome [9]. Yet the same clinician turns to aggregate trial data when prescribing, confident that broad reproducibility will better guard patients against the seductive hazards of anecdote [10]. The coexistence of both strategies—one alert to the exceptional, the other guided by averaged effects—has shaped editorial policies, training curricula, and the hierarchies of evidence that underwrite daily care, healthcare policy, and research.

This paper threads those legacies through two literary forms that dominate biomedical discourse: the case report and the clinical trial. By following their paths through medieval lecture halls and Renaissance cabinets of curiosity, to modern journals and registries, we aim to expose both the deep kinship and the persistent friction between them. The scaffolding erected centuries ago continues to support the towers of contemporary research, reminding us that the pursuit of health has always balanced the universal promise of pattern against the revelatory power of the one unlikely story.

## 2. Between Vignette and Aggregate: Genres of Biomedical Evidence

Case reports stand at the intimate, bedside end of scientific communication [11]. They chronicle the encounter between a single patient and a clinician, weaving history, examination, investigation, treatment and outcome into a short narrative that attempts to capture lived particularity [12]. Typically, no statistics appear beyond a timeline; the authority of the paper rests on circumstantial richness—age, occupation, comorbidities, laboratory trajectories—and on the clinician's judgment that something about this individual diverges from expectation [13]. Since at least the 17th-century *Philosophical Transactions*, editors have prized such vignettes for at least one chief reason: they possess hypothesis-generating power [14]. An unexpected drug reaction, a puzzling constellation of symptoms, the first human infection with a novel virus—none of these can initially be verified in groups, because the phenomenon is still singular. The narrative therefore functions as an early-warning system, inviting the community either to replicate the observation or to fold it back into established classifications [15]. Modern guidance such as the CARE statement [16] formalizes that narrative but retains its essence: exposition of a clinical surprise in the hope that the anomaly will illuminate a wider field.

Clinical trials—and in their most stringent form, randomized controlled trials—were devised to temper the very quirks that make case reports so compelling [17]. By recruiting large numbers of participants, these studies dilute individual anomalies through sheer statistical force [18]. In an RCT, randomization, blinding, and careful power calculations ensure that outlier responses are evenly distributed across treatment arms, minimizing their undue influence [19,20]. The result is an average treatment effect: a construct that approximates the "universal" ideal traced back to Aristotle. When dozens, hundreds, or thousands of patients on a certain drug outperform those on placebo, that finding is treated as generalizable to any future patient who fits the trial's eligibility profile [21]. The rhetorical structure of the RCT reflects that ambition. Method sections dwarf the vignette-like background; patient stories are compressed into inclusion criteria; outcomes appear not as plot twists but as p-values and confidence intervals [22]. The CONSORT guidelines, first issued in 1996 and

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.1583.v1



revised in 2010, codify that impersonality, demanding flow diagrams that track subjects as interchangeable datapoints migrating through allocation and analysis [23].

Observational cohort and longitudinal studies occupy a middle ground. They forgo the experimental act of randomization yet still recruit groups large enough to model variation statistically [24]. In a prospective cohort that follows smokers and non-smokers for 20 years, no single biography dominates; each participant contributes a sliver of person-time that melds into rates and hazard ratios [25]. The STROBE statement underscores this statistical ethos, urging clarity about confounding variables and loss to follow-up so that the collective signal can rise above individual noise [26]. Where a case report proclaims "here is an exception," and an RCT declares "here is the rule," an observational study suggests "here is the tendency." The epistemic distance between tendency and rule may be narrow in mathematics, yet in clinical reasoning it maps onto a profound divide: should physicians treat the patient before them as a data point in a population curve or as a potentially unrepeatable constellation of circumstances?

Because each genre answers that question differently, their publication formats reinforce the ancient polarity between singular and universal. The case report's narrative arc mirrors Aristotle's "particular," while the RCT's statistical tables echo his "universal" by abstracting particulars into essences. Even the language betrays the divide. Case reports are often written in the active voice of the bedside narration—"we observed," "the patient improved"—[13] whereas RCTs and cohorts retreat into passive constructions that efface author and subject alike [27]. Editorial economies follow suit: high-impact journals, wedded to metrics such as impact factor and generalizability, devote most pages to trials, relegating case reports to brief communications or specialized outlets [28]. Yet the prestige hierarchy remains contingent. When new syndrome erupted—AIDS in 1981, SARS in 2003, COVID-19 in 2019—the first papers the world read were invariably case reports, because nothing else yet existed [29–31].

The dialectic is therefore methodological and temporal. Individually focused writing appears early in the life cycle of discovery, while aggregate studies emerge later to test, quantify and generalize. Precision medicine and "*n-of-1*" trial designs are beginning to collapse that chronology by embedding crossover experiments within single patients, turning the body into its own micro-cohort and blurring case narrative with controlled trial [32]. Still, the conceptual opposition endures: averaging strives for a view from nowhere; storytelling binds knowledge to a person, a place, a moment [33]. Biomedical literature needs both modes. Without aggregation, treatment would remain a litany of anecdotes; without anomalies, averages would ossify into complacent dogma. The section that follows returns to antiquity to show how this tension first arose, but the modern publishing landscape already reveals its pulse in every table of contents—from the solitary drama of a reversed anticoagulant overdose to the grand chorus of a multinational phase-III trial.

## 3. Hippocratic Observations and the Birth of Case Narratives

The origin of Western medical thought is often traced to the Hippocratic corpus, a collection of texts from the late 5th century BCE and onward [1]. Though penned by many hands, these texts together marked a decisive turn: illness became a matter of nature rather than of offended gods [34]. A notable feature within this corpus is the prominence of case histories: meticulously detailed reports of individual patients, their environments, presenting symptoms, and disease courses [35]. In the *Epidemics* narratives we glimpse real people, embedded in climate and community, their progress followed with almost diaristic care—proof that one life could illuminate the wider logic of disease [36].

Such devotion to the individual served intertwined aims [37]. By rooting theory in bedside particulars, Hippocratic authors offered practical counsel to physicians who met every variety of patient in *polis* and countryside alike [38]. At the same time, the steady accumulation of these stories became an early engine of induction: patterns emerged not from armchair speculation but from lived experience, allowing the healer to edge from the unique toward the general [39].

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.1583.v1



The humoral framework that organized Hippocratic thought—an ever-shifting balance of blood, phlegm, yellow bile and black bile—reinforced this commitment to difference [40]. Because each constitution was believed to tilt the humors in its own way, no two fevers or wounds could be read quite alike; every encounter promised a fresh nuance. That habit of close watching seeded later medical genres, legitimizing the practice of writing down what happened to just one person and treating the report as evidence rather than curiosity.

To modern readers the blend of minute observation and speculative physiology can feel disconcerting, yet the underlying lesson endures. Every patient, ordinary or bizarre, still has something to teach about the fragile human body. Contemporary case reports—now framed by sophisticated diagnostic tools—draw on the same Hippocratic impulse to capture the unexpected, trusting that tomorrow's broader theory may spring from today's singular tale.

## 4. Scholastic Order and Preternatural Anomalies

With the collapse of the Roman Empire and the rise of medieval scholasticism, Aristotelian philosophy became the dominant lens through which many forms of knowledge, including medicine, were interpreted in the Latin West [41]. Aristotle's works, transmitted through Arabic philosophers such as Avicenna and Averroes, emphasized causality, classification, and the search for universal principles [42]. In the medieval university, medicine was taught alongside natural philosophy under the guiding assumption that nature operated according to discoverable laws and hierarchies [43,44].

In this intellectual environment, the study of individual cases could at times be subsumed under the quest for the generalizable. Medical treatises often sought to reconcile practical observations with Aristotelian categories. Diseases were classified according to their characteristics, etiologies, and humoral imbalances, but the overarching aim was to fit these conditions into a coherent theoretical framework that aligned with scholastic logic [45]. When medieval physicians did record singular cases, it was frequently to illustrate a general principle rather than to highlight an exception [46].

Nonetheless, particularities did not entirely vanish. Medical commentaries on Aristotle's texts and on the Hippocratic corpus often included personal observations [47]. However, the prevailing scholastic mindset valued a universalizing approach that attempted to show how observed phenomena conformed to established philosophical doctrine [48]. The influence of authoritative figures—Galen, Avicenna, Hippocrates—further codified the notion that individual observations must be placed in the context of accepted theoretical norms.

This medieval emphasis on the universal forged a path that would eventually intersect with the dawn of modern science. The drive to categorize nature systematically, gleaned in large part from Aristotle, played a significant role in shaping the intellectual milieu of later thinkers during the Scientific Revolution [49]. Yet, even in this period, there remained an undercurrent of fascination with anomalies and exceptions, as medieval bestiaries or miracle accounts demonstrate [50]. These were often relegated to the status of curiosities or moral allegories rather than objects of rigorous study, reflecting the scholastic preference for organizing knowledge into tidy, universal categories [51]. Beyond the Latin West, 9th- and 10th-century physicians of the Islamic Golden Age cultivated a robust tradition of case-based empiricism [52]. Muḥammad ibn Zakariyyā al-Rāzī (Rhazes, 865–925) organized more than 900 patient narratives into his 23-volume *Kitāb al-Ḥāwī fī al-ṭibb* (*Comprehensive Book of Medicine*), whose Latin translation, the *Continens Rasis* of 1279, became indispensable from Salerno to Montpellier [53]. Individual fevers treated in Baghdad's *bīmāristāns* sit side by side with theoretical chapters, and this is a useful reminder that sophisticated case reporting flourished in a multilingual, pan-Mediterranean milieu, not only in Renaissance Europe. A century later Ibn Sīnā's *Canon of Medicine* (completed 1025) fused these anecdotes to an Aristotelian architecture of causes, and its authority in Parisian faculties by 1250 shows how clinicians toggled between particular and universal across cultural frontiers [54]. As these intellectual traditions converged in medieval Europe, physicians and theologians inherited a subtle lexicon for describing the limits of nature and the origins of wonder. Within this vocabulary, *mirabilia*, *miracula*, and *monstra* were distinguished by both origin and audience. *Miracula* were the works of God and thus wonderful to all; *mirabilia* issued from

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.1583.v1



hidden but natural causes and astonished only the uninstructed; and *monstra* marked nature's "error," the product of matter's resistance to form. This tripartite scheme was not merely semantic; it mapped the boundaries of legitimate inquiry. In scholastic medicine the triplet signaled degrees of explanatory reach: a monstrous birth was accidental, a marvel diagnostic, a miracle beyond art [55]. A physician could legitimately dissect a *monstrum* to trace its material cause, whereas a *miraculum* belonged to divine economy. This semantic hierarchy foreshadowed the later medical habit of treating anomalies as clues for further study rather than as portents—a crucial step toward the empirical case report.

High-medieval philosophers did not imagine an immutable, law-bound cosmos; they spoke instead of *habitus* and *inclinationes*—habits that usually guide nature yet sometimes misfire [56]. Thomas Aquinas condenses the idea in *Summa contra gentiles* III: a double-headed calf is 'accidental,' arising when matter or circumstance thwarts the artisan-like 'intention' of nature [57]. Such departures were neither diabolical nor meaningless: they occupied an intermediate, *preternatural* zone that challenged the physician and theologian alike to discover secondary causes without invoking direct divine interruption [58]. Medieval natural philosophers inherited from Aquinas a tripartite order of causality—natural, preternatural, and supernatural—that quietly structured the learned response to wonder. *Natural* effects were those that occurred "always or for the most part"; *supernatural* ones were divine miracles performed without secondary causes; and between them lay the *praeternaturale*, the realm of the rare yet still natural event (*praeter naturae ordinem*). It was here that most *mirabilia* resided: prodigious yet explicable, demanding inquiry rather than worship. The preternatural belonged neither to theology nor to routine physics but to an intermediate epistemic zone that sustained curiosity itself [55]. Marvels provoked stupor until the intellect could supply a secondary cause; only then did wonder turn into knowledge. This framework allowed medieval physicians and theologians to speak of six-fingered children, healing springs, or prophetic dreams without collapsing immediately into either credulity or impiety. Medieval collectors of *mirabilia*—from Gervase of Tilbury's *Otia imperialia* to Gerald of Wales's *Topographia Hiberniæ*—located wonders at the edges of Christendom, mapping them province by province as touchstones of cognitive surprise [59,60]. Their catalogues, grounded in personal testimony and sworn oaths, naturalized marvels without domesticating them, embedding the appetite for the extraordinary deep inside Latin natural inquiry.

While medieval Europe grappled with the tension between universals and particulars, Song-dynasty China (960–1279) saw the emergence of *yì'àn* (醫案)—medical dossiers that recorded patients' backgrounds, symptoms, and treatments [61]. Early examples, such as the *Case Records of Famous Physicians* (*Míngyī lèi'àn*), demonstrate that Chinese physicians were compiling individualized case narratives in parallel with Mediterranean traditions [62]. However, these Song-era dossiers were less formalized than the paragraph suggests; the genre matured significantly later, reaching its zenith in the problem-oriented, writer-centered *yì'àn* of the Ming (1368–1644) and Qing (1644–1912) dynasties [63].

Nevertheless, these early exemplars show that the dialectic of singularity and universality was never an exclusively European affair.

## 5. Marvels Reclaimed: Paradoxography and Early Modern Curiosity

Marsilio Ficino's *De vita libri tres*, printed in Florence on 3 December 1489, exemplified the new centrality of marvels: part pharmacology, part astral medicine, it argued that precise, individually tailored regimens could redirect planetary influences on the fragile scholar's body [64]. In tying a single patient's temperament to the cosmic order, Ficino offered a model of how the extraordinary particular might revise prevailing natural philosophy [65]. Renaissance collectors and naturalists did not abandon the scholastic tripartition but inverted its value hierarchy. Where the Middle Ages had tolerated the preternatural as marginal, humanists made it central. The *mirabilia* of nature—strange stones, monstrous births, magnetic attractions—became the preferred proofs of divine plenitude and the raw data of natural philosophy [55]. The border between natural and preternatural blurred, while

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.1583.v1



the truly supernatural (*miracula*) retreated into theology. In this cultural shift, the *monstrum* was domesticated: Aldrovandi's *Monstrorum Historia* transformed prodigies once read as omens into case histories catalogued by cause, region, and anatomy. Marvels thus re-entered medicine not as moral signs but as specimens, each demanding its own causal reconstruction. Once the scholastic distinctions had framed the moral and epistemic status of wonders, early modern thinkers inverted their hierarchy.

Across the 15th and 16th centuries, curiosity about marvels migrated from conservative universities to princely courts, private *studioli* and the newborn learned academies (most famously the Accademia dei Lincei), where a fraternity of "preternatural philosophers"—Ficino, Pomponazzi, Cornelius Agrippa, Cardano, later della Porta—treated occult properties, monstrous births and rains of blood as legitimate data [66], insisting that every spectacular particular deserved a tailored causal reconstruction [67]. Their case-by-case method pre-figures the rhetorical logic of the medical case report: one vivid anomaly, precisely described, can redraw the outlines of theory.

The Renaissance thus saw a resurgence of interest in the particular, fueled by the rediscovery of classical texts, the rise of humanism, and expanding global horizons [68]. Within this cultural milieu, paradoxography—a genre that cataloged wonders, marvels, and strange occurrences—enjoyed renewed popularity [55]. The fascination with anomalies in nature, whether in faraway lands or in one's own backyard, dovetailed with a broader curiosity about the limits of received wisdom. In medicine, this translated into a revived interest in unique cases, not simply for their entertainment value but as potential keys to unlocking nature's secrets.

Simultaneously, university-trained naturalists such as Conrad Gessner amassed *cabinets of curiosity* whose guiding principle was sheer diversity rather than classificatory neatness [69]. Daston and Park describe these collections as practicing an 'epistemology of the hunt': particulars led only to further particulars, just as today a pilot clinical observation may seed a full cohort study [55]. The cabinet thus stood midway between the isolated marvel and Bacon's later demand for systematic tables, echoing the uneasy coexistence of case narratives and population trials in modern biomedicine. Learned physicians followed suit. Antonio Benivieni's *De abditis nonnullis ac mirandis morborum et sanationum causis* (1507) assembled clinical *mirabilia*—vomited worms, congenital malformations, inexplicable cures—under the rubric of hidden natural causes [70]. For Marsilio Ficino and Pietro Pomponazzi, the marvellous no longer threatened orthodoxy but invited philosophical explanation. Their writings mark the birth of the "preternatural philosopher": the scholar who treated oddities of body and spirit as data for natural inquiry. In retrospect, Benivieni's casebook reads like a prototype of modern medical reporting, translating the vocabulary of wonder into a method of observation [55].

Paradoxographical works did have their antecedents in ancient Greek texts that recounted fantastic tales of monstrous births or extraordinary events [71], but during the Renaissance, such narratives captured the imagination of intellectuals who were increasingly willing to challenge medieval scholastic orthodoxy. Scholars like Ulisse Aldrovandi compiled encyclopedic works of natural history that blended direct observation with reported anomalies [72]. While these figures were not clinical scientists in the modern sense, their meticulous documentation and openness to the unexpected influenced contemporary and subsequent thinking about singular cases.

In medical circles, the growing interest in anatomy—exemplified by Andreas Vesalius's groundbreaking *De humani corporis fabrica*—spurred a more empirical approach to the body [72]. As dissections became more common, so did the recognition of individual variations in anatomy and pathology. This was fertile ground for the re-emergence of the study of cases as a vehicle to highlight discoveries that might not fit neatly into prevailing theoretical frameworks. For instance, physicians writing about rare diseases or unusual surgical experiences found an audience eager for firsthand accounts of the body's marvels.

When Ulisse Aldrovandi returned to Bologna after his 1549 heresy trial, he began assembling a *museo naturale* that by the early 1570s filled several rooms of the Palazzo Pubblico [72]. His visitors confronted shelves of two-headed lambs and jars of desiccated polyps—specimens later catalogued

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.1583.v1



in the post-humous *Monstrorum Historia*—and the display operated as a living index of exceptions, halfway between a narrative case note and Bacon's projected tables of instances [73]. Yet Aldrovandi pursued an almost obsessive program of measurement, illustration and cross-referencing—he aimed to catalogue some 18 000 curiosities (about 7 000 plants alone) and thereby surpass ancient authorities through orderly description.

The Renaissance's embrace of paradox and marvel also aligned with an epistemological shift. While medieval Aristotelianism sought to fit anomalies into a universal framework, Renaissance scholars were increasingly comfortable with the idea that nature might harbor innumerable exceptions, each offering a clue to understanding creation's broader design [55]. In medicine, this meant that physicians who encountered highly unusual cases—be they miraculous cures or baffling pathologies—felt justified in publishing their observations. Such writings influenced the evolution of scientific discourse by offering a complementary counterpoint to universalizing theories: the singular, the exceptional, and the wondrous.

By the late 16th century, monstrous births had become so frequent in broadsides that Sebastian Brant complained they seemed '*the common course of nature*' [55]. This inflation of singularities forced naturalists—like clinicians overwhelmed by case series—to ask whether accumulating marvels required a new kind of evidence architecture, a question Bacon would dramatize in his call for a '*history of nature erring*' [74].

Thus, paradoxography in the Renaissance era can be seen as a conduit that kept the fascination with individual phenomena alive and well. It provided both a literary model and an intellectual rationale for attending to the bizarre or the inexplicable. In so doing, it planted the seeds for a more systematic scientific engagement with anomalies, which would eventually coalesce into the modern formats of case reports, and, by contrast, large-scale studies aimed at distilling universal laws.

## 6. The Emergence of the Scientific Method and Early Clinical Trials

The intellectual debate that flourished in Europe in the 16th and 17th centuries reshaped the rules for deciding what counts as knowledge [75]. Francis Bacon urged scholars to abandon reverence for inherited dogma and rebuild understanding from the ground up, brick by empirical brick [76]. René Descartes, trusting in mathematics to expose nature's inner gears, pictured the world—and by extension the body—as a mechanism governed by universal laws. [77] In this new climate, physicians began to move beyond authoritative commentary toward more deliberate forms of testing, laying the first stones of what would eventually become the clinical trial.

James Lind's 1747 shipboard experiment on scurvy often stands as the iconic early example, even though it followed Bacon and Descartes by nearly a century [78]. By splitting sick sailors into small groups and feeding each group a different remedy, Lind treated the deck of HMS Salisbury as a floating laboratory. His method captured the age's appetite for reproducibility and side-by-side comparison, and the logic he demonstrated would ripen into the controlled designs that dominate research today [79].

Nonetheless, the fascination with the single, revealing case persisted. Physicians continued to publish detailed narratives—both to boast of a novel cure and to alert colleagues to a puzzling failure. The newly founded Royal Society, championing "matters of fact," encouraged its correspondents to share whatever they had observed, however odd. Early issues of Philosophical Transactions printed letters describing monstrous births, bizarre stones extracted from bladders, and sudden recoveries that seemed to defy explanation [80]. Such anecdotes kept alive the Renaissance conviction that the extraordinary could unlock nature's secrets. Even so, the center of gravity was shifting. Anatomists standardized dissections, pharmacologists calibrated dosages, and pathologists began to correlate lesions with symptoms, all in the hope of extracting rules that would apply across populations [81]. The Baconian ideal of piling up observations until a pattern crystallized justified efforts to pool patient data on an unprecedented scale [82]. Yet the habit of cherishing anomalies never quite faded: physicians understood that a single startling cure or disastrous reaction could signal an unrecognized principle or hazard [81].

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.1583.v1



Gradually, then, the epistemic value of singular cases changed. Instead of ending the discussion, a striking vignette more often served as a prologue, prompting calls for broader investigation. Wonders became hypotheses; anecdotes became pilot data. The Renaissance delight in marvels blended with the revolutionary hunger for universal explanation, and medicine learned to thrive on both. Out of that uneasy partnership emerged a research culture willing to balance the disciplined choreography of large trials with a continuing readiness to listen when one unexpected story demands to be heard.

## 7. Modern Consolidation: Case Reports and Clinical Trials in the 19th and 20th Centuries

By the 19th century, medicine was increasingly supported by a robust institutional framework: hospitals, laboratories, and professional societies all contributed to the shaping of how clinical knowledge was gathered and disseminated [83]. The growth of epidemiology, exemplified by John Snow's work on cholera, showcased the power of systematic observation and population-level studies [84]. Around the same time, physiological experiments by figures like Claude Bernard underscored the importance of controlled laboratory research [85]. Out of this milieu arose a clearer demarcation between anecdotal observations and structured, statistically grounded investigations [86]. Pierre Charles-Alexandre Louis's numerical method in Paris hospitals, drawing on Laplacian probability theory, quantified outcomes from hundreds of phlebotomized pneumonia patients [87]; his demonstration that blood-letting increased mortality crystallized the moral stakes of aggregation and set the stage for Bradford Hill's randomization in the 20th century [88].

In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, advances in microbiology, pathology, and pharmacology made the case for collective data even stronger [89]. The drive to standardize medical practices—spurred by professional organizations, licensing bodies, and burgeoning scientific journals—naturally favored replicable experiments over singular accounts [90]. Yet, case reports persisted as a vital literary form. They were especially significant in areas where new phenomena were being observed: for instance, in early psychology and psychiatry, where Sigmund Freud's case studies became foundational texts, illustrating the complexities of the mind before standardized psychometric tools were widely available [91].

In mainstream biomedical fields, case reports retained their value in identifying emergent diseases, rare complications, or novel treatment effects. Physicians recognized that while controlled trials could confirm efficacy and safety on a population level, the first indication of a new syndrome or atypical drug interaction often appeared in an individual patient. Journals began to organize their publications accordingly, usually with research articles backed by statistical data at the forefront, but still allowing space for shorter, focused case reports. By the mid-20th century, this dual system had solidified, mirroring the broader cultural shift toward "evidence-based medicine," a framework that prized randomized controlled trials as the gold standard but also acknowledged the heuristic value of singular anecdotes [92].

Crucially, the tension between universalization and particularization was institutionalized, rather than resolved. On one hand, randomized clinical trials expanded in size, complexity, and regulatory importance, especially after landmark studies in cardiology and oncology demonstrated the need for large patient cohorts to discern true effects [93]. On the other hand, case reports continued to serve as the early warning system of clinical practice, flagging unexpected results and steering medical thought toward new questions and new experiments [94]. Thus, the 19th and 20th centuries can be seen as a period of consolidation, where the historical dialectic found a modern equilibrium, though not without ongoing debates about the relative weight of anecdotal versus statistical evidence.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.1583.v1



## 8. Data Deluge and the N-of-1: Precision Medicine's Dual Heritage

Big-data analytics now set the tempo of biomedical discovery [95]. Meta-analyses pooling dozens of randomized trials, exhaustive systematic reviews, and population-scale genomic screens dominate leading journals, pushing statistics to center stage [96,97]. Clinicians and policymakers lean on living guidelines that distil thousands of observations into concise practice statements [98]. This enterprise advances the Aristotelian and Baconian conviction that careful measurement reveals general laws, now supported by global consortia, cloud infrastructure and algorithms able to sift petabytes of data overnight, turning variation into averages and averages into policy [99].

Yet the single patient has not disappeared beneath this avalanche. The same infrastructure that feeds mega-studies—electronic records, online registries and machine-learning signal detectors—also captures the rare and the unforeseen [100]. When an unusual genomic variant surfaces in one person, clinicians can summon collaborators on another continent within days, blending Hippocratic curiosity with high-tech reach [101]. Precision medicine, intent on tailoring therapy to each molecular fingerprint, treats such idiosyncratic data as opportunity rather than noise [102]. As technology enables increasingly granular patient profiles, the concept of an *n of 1* trial, in which a single patient undergoes different treatment regimens in a controlled sequence, gains legitimacy [103].

That duality often lands on the desks of ethics boards and regulators. Guideline developers bound to multicenter trials can clash with oncologists treating tumors whose mutations excluded them from those studies [104]. A dramatic remission achieved with an off-label drug and recorded in a case report forces a dilemma: extend the therapy quickly or wait for phase-III proof [105]. In moments like these, the Hippocratic duty to do no harm meets the scientific demand for rigor, reminding us that collective evidence and individual welfare share a fragile, negotiated border [106].

In the publishing world, the open-access movement has also facilitated the circulation of case reports [107]. Many journals maintain sections specifically devoted to case studies, enabling rapid dissemination [108]. Simultaneously, platforms for preprints and post-publication peer review have democratized the process of sharing singular clinical insights [109,110]. In this distributed ecosystem a digital ripple from one bedside can become a global conversation overnight, allowing vigilance, imagination and collective problem-solving to run alongside statistical certainty [111].

What emerges, then, is not a contest of opposites but a braided rope. Meta-analyses, living reviews and algorithm-driven guidelines pull medicine toward broadly applicable norms, while precision therapeutics and digital storytelling draw it back to the irreducible particular. Their sustained interplay keeps the discipline alert to patterns that hold for the many and to signals that flash from the few. Even in an era awash with data, progress can still pivot on a single well-documented experience, reminding us that universals survive only by listening closely to anomalies—a balance likely to deepen as new technologies stitch personal narratives to global datasets [112].

## 9. Past as Prologue: Balancing Marvels and Metrics Today

Medicine has never been content to choose between the individual and the collective. From Hippocrates' medical cases to today's multinational trials, clinicians and researchers have kept one eye on the single patient and the other on patterns that stretch across populations. That dual vision—attending to what is strikingly new while seeking what is broadly true—has driven progress for more than two millennia.

Randomized controlled trials, the modern heirs of Aristotelian logic and Baconian empiricism, give us the most reliable answers we have about average benefits and harms. Yet the humble case report, descended from Hippocratic narratives and Renaissance catalogues of marvels, still reminds us that biology loves exceptions. A single unexpected outcome can expose a blind spot in prevailing theory, inspire a fresh hypothesis, or even shift the standard of care, breaking the current paradigms [113].

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.1583.v1



Current challenges underscore why we still need both lenses. Pandemic pathogens, ultra-rare genetic conditions and precision-medicine therapies each demand vast datasets to see the signal—yet they often announce themselves in a solitary, puzzling case. Large trials tell us how most people will respond; outliers tell us why some will not, and where the next breakthrough may lie.

Seen in this light, the presence of both case reports and clinical trials in today's journals is not a leftover from an untidy past but a working illustration of how knowledge actually grows. By keeping marvels and metrics in conversation, we respect the full complexity of human health—honoring the person in front of us while refining principles that can guide care for all. History, then, is not an ornament to modern practice; it is a caution and a compass, reminding us that progress depends on balancing the universal with the particular—and on listening closely when one lone story contradicts the prevailing chorus.

**Author Contributions:** Conceptualization, C.G.; writing—original draft preparation, C.G. and M.M.; writing—review and editing, C.G. and M.M. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

**Funding:** This research received no external funding.

**Institutional Review Board Statement:** Not applicable.

**Informed Consent Statement:** Not applicable.

**Data Availability Statement:** No data were created.

**Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

## References

1. Van der Eijk, P. On 'Hippocratic' and 'Non-Hippocratic' Medical Writings. *Ancient Concepts of the Hippocratic* **2016**, 17–47.
2. Umscheid, C.A.; Margolis, D.J.; Grossman, C.E. Key Concepts of Clinical Trials: A Narrative Review. *Postgrad Med* **2011**, *123*, 194–204, doi:10.3810/pgm.2011.09.2475.
3. Husserl, E. The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology: An Introduction to Phenomenological Philosophy; Northwestern University Press: Evanston, IL, 1970;
4. Albrecht, J.; Werth, V.P.; Bigby, M. The Role of Case Reports in Evidence-Based Practice, with Suggestions for Improving Their Reporting. *J Am Acad Dermatol* **2009**, *60*, 412–418, doi:10.1016/j.jaad.2008.10.023.
5. Arlig, A.W. Universals. In *Encyclopedia of Medieval Philosophy: Philosophy between 500 and 1500*; Lagerlund, H., Ed.; Springer Netherlands: Dordrecht, 2020; pp. 1992–2000 ISBN 978-94-024-1665-7.
6. Stein, N. Causation and Explanation in Aristotle. *Philos Compass* **2011**, *6*, 699–707, doi:10.1111/j.1747-9991.2011.00436.x.
7. Kalachanis, K.; Tsagkaris, C. The Hippocratic Account of Mental Health: Humors and Human Temperament. *Mental Health: Global Challenges* **2020**, *3*, 33–37.
8. Henry, J. Metaphysics and the Origins of Modern Science: Descartes and the Importance of Laws of Nature. *Early Sci Med* **2004**, *9*, 73–114.
9. Vandenbroucke, J.P. Case Reports in an Evidence-Based World. *J R Soc Med* **1999**, *92*, 159–163, doi:10.1177/014107689909200401.
10. Sedgwick, P. Randomised Controlled Trials: Understanding Confounding. *BMJ* **2015**, h5119, doi:10.1136/bmj.h5119.
11. Vandenbroucke, J.P. In Defense of Case Reports and Case Series. *Ann Intern Med* **2001**, *134*, 330–334, doi:10.7326/0003-4819-134-4-200102200-00017.
12. Nissen, T.; Wynn, R. The Clinical Case Report: A Review of Its Merits and Limitations. *BMC Res Notes* **2014**, *7*, 264, doi:10.1186/1756-0500-7-264.
13. Lysanets, Y.; Morokhovets, H.; Bieliaieva, O. Stylistic Features of Case Reports as a Genre of Medical Discourse. *J Med Case Rep* **2017**, *11*, 83, doi:10.1186/s13256-017-1247-x.
14. Rodriguez, L.L.; Zimmerman, K.G. Learning from Cases: Advantages and Challenges. *CASE* **2021**, *5*, 89, doi:10.1016/j.case.2021.02.003.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.1583.v1




15. Morris, B.A. The Importance of Case Reports. *CMAJ* **1989**, *141*, 875–876.
16. Gagnier, J.J.; Kienle, G.; Altman, D.G.; Moher, D.; Sox, H.; Riley, D. The CARE Guidelines: Consensus-Based Clinical Case Report Guideline Development. *J Clin Epidemiol* **2014**, *67*, 46–51, doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2013.08.003.
17. Friedman, L.M.; Furberg, C.D.; DeMets, D.L.; Reboussin, D.M.; Granger, C.B. *Fundamentals of Clinical Trials*; Springer, 2015; ISBN 331918539X.
18. Julious, S.A. Sample Sizes for Clinical Trials with Normal Data. *Stat Med* **2004**, *23*, 1921–1986, doi:10.1002/sim.1783.
19. Friedman, L.M.; Furberg, C.D.; DeMets, D.L.; Reboussin, D.M.; Granger, C.B. *Fundamentals of Clinical Trials*; Springer, 2015; ISBN 331918539X.
20. Baghbaninaghadehi, F.; Armijo-Olivo, S.; Woodhouse, L. Fundamentals of Randomization in Clinical Trial. *IJANHS* **2016**, *4*, 174–187.
21. Stuart, E.A.; Bradshaw, C.P.; Leaf, P.J. Assessing the Generalizability of Randomized Trial Results to Target Populations. *Prevention Science* **2015**, *16*, 475–485, doi:10.1007/s11121-014-0513-z.
22. Simpson, F.; Sweetman, E.A.; Doig, G.S. A Systematic Review of Techniques and Interventions for Improving Adherence to Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria during Enrolment into Randomised Controlled Trials. *Trials* **2010**, *11*, 17, doi:10.1186/1745-6215-11-17.
23. Altman, D.G.; Schulz, K.F.; Moher, D.; Egger, M.; Davidoff, F.; Elbourne, D.; Gøtzsche, P.C.; Lang, T. The Revised CONSORT Statement for Reporting Randomized Trials: Explanation and Elaboration. *Ann Intern Med* **2001**, *134*, 663–694, doi:10.7326/0003-4819-134-8-200104170-00012.
24. Jepsen, P. Interpretation of Observational Studies. *Heart* **2004**, *90*, 956–960, doi:10.1136/hrt.2003.017269.
25. Steventon, A.; Grieve, R.; Sekhon, J.S. A Comparison of Alternative Strategies for Choosing Control Populations in Observational Studies. *Health Serv Outcomes Res Methodol* **2015**, *15*, 157–181, doi:10.1007/s10742-014-0135-8.
26. von Elm, E.; Altman, D.G.; Egger, M.; Pocock, S.J.; Gøtzsche, P.C.; Vandenbroucke, J.P. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) Statement: Guidelines for Reporting Observational Studies. *The Lancet* **2007**, *370*, 1453–1457, doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(07)61602-X.
27. Phadtare, A.; Bahmani, A.; Shah, A.; Pietrobon, R. Scientific Writing: A Randomized Controlled Trial Comparing Standard and on-Line Instruction. *BMC Med Educ* **2009**, *9*, 27, doi:10.1186/1472-6920-9-27.
28. Brighton, B.; Bhandari, M.; Tornetta, , Paul; Felson, D.T. Hierarchy of Evidence: From Case Reports to Randomized Controlled Trials. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* **2003**, *413*, 19–24, doi:10.1097/01.blo.0000079323.41006.12.
29. Williams, S.; Fitzner, J.; Merianos, A.; Mounts, A. The Challenges of Global Case Reporting during Pandemic A (H1N1) 2009. *Bull World Health Organ* **2013**, *92*, 60–67.
30. Wang, J.; Kaperak, C.; Sato, T.; Sakuraba, A. COVID-19 Reinfection: A Rapid Systematic Review of Case Reports and Case Series. *Journal of Investigative Medicine* **2021**, *69*, 1253–1255.
31. Carey, J.C. The Importance of Case Reports in Advancing Scientific Knowledge of Rare Diseases. *Rare diseases epidemiology* **2010**, 77–86.
32. Gabler, N.B.; Duan, N.; Vohra, S.; Kravitz, R.L. N-of-1 Trials in the Medical Literature. *Med Care* **2011**, *49*, 761–768, doi:10.1097/MLR.0b013e318215d90d.
33. Kirmayer, L.J.; Gómez-Carrillo, A.; Sukhanova, E.; Garrido, E. Narrative Medicine. In *Person Centered Medicine*; Mezzich, J.E., Appleyard, W.J., Glare, P., Snaedal, J., Wilson, C.R., Eds.; Springer International Publishing: Cham, 2023; pp. 235–255 ISBN 978-3-031-17650-0.
34. Orfanos, C. From Hippocrates to Modern Medicine. *Journal of the European Academy of Dermatology and Venereology* **2007**, *21*, 852–858, doi:10.1111/j.1468-3083.2007.02273.x.
35. Kazantzidis, G. Medicine and the Paradox in the Hippocratic Corpus and Beyond. In *Recognizing Miracles in Antiquity and Beyond*; De Gruyter, 2018; pp. 31–62.
36. *Epidemics in Context*; Pormann, P.E., Ed.; DE GRUYTER, 2012; ISBN 978-3-11-025979-7.
37. Thumiger, C. Patient Function and Physician Function in the Hippocratic Cases. G. Petridou and c. thumiger, eds., Homo Patiens: Approaches to the Patient in the Ancient World **2015**, 107–137.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.1583.v1




38. Bottalico, L.; Charitos, I.A.; Kolveris, N.; D'Agostino, D.; Topi, S.; Ballini, A.; Santacroce, L. Philosophy and Hippocratic Ethic in Ancient Greek Society: Evolution of Hospital - Sanctuaries. *Open Access Maced J Med Sci* **2019**, *7*, 3353–3357, doi:10.3889/oamjms.2019.474.
39. van Schaik, K.D. *Medical Decision Making in Greco-Roman Antiquity*; Harvard University, 2018; ISBN 9798678136152.
40. Balzer, W.; Eleftheriadis, A. A Reconstruction of the Hippocratic Humoral Theory of Health. *Journal for General Philosophy of Science* **1991**, *22*, 207–227, doi:10.1007/BF01801207.
41. Cadden, J. Western Medicine and Natural Philosophy. In *Handbook of Medieval Sexuality*; Routledge, 2013; pp. 51–80.
42. Alagab, A.H.A. The Philosophical Methodology of Aristotle and Al-Kindi: A Comparative Study. *South Asian Research Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences* **2025**, *7*, 35–41, doi:10.36346/sarjhss.2025.v07i01.010.
43. Weisheipl, J.A. Curriculum of the Faculty of Arts at Oxford in the Early Fourteenth Century. *Mediaev Stud* **1964**, *26*, 143–185, doi:10.1484/J.MS.2.305981.
44. Fletcher, J.M. Some Considerations of the Role of the Teaching of Philosophy in the Medieval Universities. *British Journal for the History of Philosophy* **1994**, *2*, 3–18, doi:10.1080/09608789408570889.
45. Modell, S.M. Aristotelian Influence in the Formation of Medical Theory. *The European Legacy* **2010**, *15*, 409–424, doi:10.1080/10848770.2010.489318.
46. Maclean, I. Evidence, Logic, the Rule and the Exception in Renaissance Law and Medicine. *Early Sci Med* **2000**, *5*, 227–256.
47. Kibre, P. Hippocratic Writings In The Middle Ages. *Bull Hist Med* **1945**, *18*, 371–412.
48. MacKinney, L.C. Medical Ethics And Etiquette In The Early Middle Ages: The Persistence Of Hippocratic Ideals. *Bull Hist Med* **1952**, *26*, 1–31.
49. Kvasz, L. On Classification of Scientific Revolutions. *Journal for General Philosophy of Science* **1999**, *30*, 201–232, doi:10.1023/A:1008317930920.
50. Salisbury, J.E. *The Beast Within*; Routledge: London, 2022; ISBN 9781003241904.
51. Friedman, J.B. *The Monstrous Races in Medieval Art and Thought*; Syracuse University Press, 2000; ISBN 0815628269.
52. Renima, A.; Tiliouine, H.; Estes, R.J. The Islamic Golden Age: A Story of the Triumph of the Islamic Civilization. In *The State of Social Progress of Islamic Societies: Social, Economic, Political, and Ideological Challenges*; Tiliouine, H., Estes, R.J., Eds.; Springer International Publishing: Cham, 2016; pp. 25–52 ISBN 978-3-319-24774-8.
53. ANSARI, A.S.B. PHILOSOPHICAL AND RELIGIOUS VIEWS OF MUḤAMMAD IBN ZAKARIYYĀ AL-RĀZĪ. *Islam Stud* **1977**, *16*, 157–177.
54. Masic, I. Thousand-Year Anniversary of the Historical Book: "Kitab al-Qanun Fit-Tibb"- The Canon of Medicine, Written by Abdullah Ibn Sina. *J Res Med Sci* **2012**, *17*, 993–1000.
55. Daston, L. Wonders and the Order of Nature 1150–1750; Zone Books, 1998; Vol. 33;.
56. Nederman, C.J. Nature, Ethics, and the Doctrine of 'Habitus': Aristotelian Moral Psychology in the Twelfth Century. *Traditio* **1990**, *45*, 87–110, doi:DOI: 10.1017/S0362152900012691.
57. Aquinas, T.; Pegis, A.C.; Anderson, J.F.; Bourke, V.J.; O'Neil, C.J. Summa Contra Gentiles 1975.
58. Wood, J.W. From Pure Nature to Wounded Nature: Aquinas on the Effects of Original Sin. *The Thomist: A Speculative Quarterly Review* **2022**, *86*, 173–217, doi:10.1353/tho.2022.0022.
59. Knight, R. WEREWOLVES, MONSTERS, AND MIRACLES: REPRESENTING COLONIAL FANTASIES IN GERALD OF WALES'S "TOPOGRAPHIA HIBERNICA." *Studies in Iconography* **2001**, *22*, 55–86.
60. Marzella, F. Tackling Mirabilia: Gervase of Tilbury, Walter Map and the Church Fathers. In; 2017; pp. 573–594.
61. Goldschmidt, A. The Evolution of Chinese Medicine: Song Dynasty, 960–1200; Routledge, 2008; ISBN 020394643X.
62. GUI, T. Rethinking Yi'an (Medical Cases) as a Tool for Narrative Medicine in China. *Chinese Medicine and Culture* **2023**, *6*.
63. Lo, V.; Stanley-Baker, M. *Routledge Handbook of Chinese Medicine*; Taylor & Francis, 2022;

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.1583.v1




64. Saif, L. Early Modern Astral Magic: Marsilio Ficino. In *The Arabic Influences on Early Modern Occult Philosophy*; Saif, L., Ed.; Palgrave Macmillan UK: London, 2015; pp. 95–123 ISBN 978-1-137-39947-2.
65. Copenhaver, B.P. Scholastic Philosophy and Renaissance Magic in the De Vita of Marsilio Ficino. *Renaiss Q* **1984**, *37*, 523–554, doi:DOI: 10.2307/2860993.
66. Stolleis, M. *Natural Law and Laws of Nature in Early Modern Europe*; Daston, L., Ed.; Routledge, 2016; ISBN 9781317089773.
67. Daston, L. The Nature of Nature in Early Modern Europe. *Configurations* **1998**, *6*, 149–172, doi:10.1353/con.1998.0014.
68. Monfasani, J. Humanism and the Renaissance. *The Oxford handbook of humanism* **2020**, 150–175.
69. Findlen, P. Inventing Nature: Commerce, Art, and Science in the Early Modern Cabinet of Curiosities. In *Merchants and marvels*; Routledge, 2013; pp. 297–323.
70. Jarcho, S. De Abditis Nonnullis Ac Mirandis Morborum et Sanationum Causis. The Hidden Causes of Disease 1955.
71. *Medicine and Paradoxography in the Ancient World*; Kazantzidis, G., Ed.; De Gruyter, 2019; ISBN 9783110661774.
72. Vai, G.B.; Cavazza, W. Ulisse Aldrovandi and the Origin of Geology and Science. In *Special Paper 411: The Origins of Geology in Italy*; Geological Society of America, 2006; pp. 43–63.
73. Aldrovandi, U. Monstrorum Historia. Cum Paralipomenis Historiae Omnium Animalium; Typis Nicolai Tebaldini, 1983;
74. Anstey, P. Francis Bacon and the Classification of Natural History. *Early Sci Med* **2012**, *17*, 11–31.
75. Goldstone, J.A. The Comparative and Historical Study of Revolutions. *Annu Rev Sociol* **1982**, *8*, 187–207.
76. Gillespie, G. Scientific Discourse and Postmodernity: Francis Bacon and the Empirical Birth of "Revision." *boundary 2* **1979**, *7*, 119–148, doi:10.2307/303080.
77. Ariew, R. The Mathematization of Nature in Descartes and the First Cartesians. The Language of Nature: Reassessing the Mathematization of Natural Philosophy in the Seventeenth Century **2016**, 20.
78. Sutton, G. Putrid Gums and 'Dead Men's Cloaths': James Lind Aboard the Salisbury. *J R Soc Med* **2003**, *96*, 605–608, doi:10.1177/014107680309601213.
79. Everett, A.W. TOO MUCH HAS BEEN MADE OF THE CONTRIBUTIONS BY JAMES LIND AND JAMES COOK TO THE CURE OF SCURVY AT SEA. *The Great Circle* **2022**, *44*, 51–75.
80. Fontes da Costa, P. The Making of Extraordinary Facts: Authentication of Singularities of Nature at the Royal Society of London in the First Half of the Eighteenth Century. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part A* **2002**, *33*, 265–288, doi:10.1016/S0039-3681(02)00012-2.
81. Saunders, J. The Practice of Clinical Medicine as an Art and as a Science. *Med Humanit* **2000**, *26*, 18–22, doi:10.1136/mh.26.1.18.
82. Vickers, B. Francis Bacon and the Progress of Knowledge. *J Hist Ideas* **1992**, *53*, 495–518, doi:10.2307/2709891.
83. Rosenberg, C.E. And Heal the Sick: The Hospital and the Patient in the 19th Century America. *J Soc Hist* **1977**, *10*, 428–447.
84. Cameron, D.; Jones, I.G. John Snow, the Broad Street Pump and Modern Epidemiology. *Int J Epidemiol* **1983**, *12*, 393–396, doi:10.1093/ije/12.4.393.
85. Noble, D. Claude Bernard, the First Systems Biologist, and the Future of Physiology. *Exp Physiol* **2008**, *93*, 16–26, doi:10.1113/expphysiol.2007.038695.
86. Normandin, S. Claude Bernard and An Introduction to the Study of Experimental Medicine: "Physical Vitalism," Dialectic, and Epistemology. *J Hist Med Allied Sci* **2007**, *62*, 495–528, doi:10.1093/jhmas/jrm015.
87. Brabin, B. The Possible Effects of Iron Loss from Bloodletting on Mortality from Pneumonia in the Nineteenth Century. *J Clin Epidemiol* **2021**, *138*, 139–146, doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2021.06.018.
88. Cox, L.A. Modernizing the Bradford Hill Criteria for Assessing Causal Relationships in Observational Data. *Crit Rev Toxicol* **2018**, *48*, 682–712, doi:10.1080/10408444.2018.1518404.
89. Worboys, M. Was There a Bacteriological Revolution in Late Nineteenth-Century Medicine? *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part C: Studies in History and Philosophy of Biological and Biomedical Sciences* **2007**, *38*, 20–42, doi:10.1016/j.shpsc.2006.12.003.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.1583.v1




90. Lachmund, J. Between Scrutiny and Treatment: Physical Diagnosis and the Restructuring of 19th Century Medical Practice. *Sociol Health Illn* **1998**, *20*, 779–801, doi:10.1111/1467-9566.00129.
91. Sealey, A. The Strange Case of the Freudian Case History: The Role of Long Case Histories in the Development of Psychoanalysis. *Hist Human Sci* **2011**, *24*, 36–50, doi:10.1177/0952695110383460.
92. Cartabellotta, A.; Montalto, G.; Notarbartolo, A. Evidence-Based Medicine. How to Use Biomedical Literature to Solve Clinical Problems. Italian Group on Evidence-Based Medicine-GIMBE. *Minerva Med* **1998**, *89*, 105–115.
93. Thiers, F.A.; Sinskey, A.J.; Berndt, E.R. Trends in the Globalization of Clinical Trials. *Nat Rev Drug Discov* **2008**, *7*, 13–14, doi:10.1038/nrd2441.
94. Albrecht, J.; Werth, V.P.; Bigby, M. The Role of Case Reports in Evidence-Based Practice, with Suggestions for Improving Their Reporting. *J Am Acad Dermatol* **2009**, *60*, 412–418, doi:10.1016/j.jaad.2008.10.023.
95. Ivanova, D. Big Biomedical Data Analytics in Support of Precision Medicine. *Mathematics and Education in Mathematics* **2024**, *53*, 18–24.
96. Batko, K.; Ślęzak, A. The Use of Big Data Analytics in Healthcare. *J Big Data* **2022**, *9*, 3, doi:10.1186/s40537-021-00553-4.
97. Hassan, M.; Awan, F.M.; Naz, A.; deAndrés-Galiana, E.J.; Alvarez, O.; Cernea, A.; Fernández-Brillet, L.; Fernández-Martínez, J.L.; Kloczkowski, A. Innovations in Genomics and Big Data Analytics for Personalized Medicine and Health Care: A Review. *Int J Mol Sci* **2022**, *23*, 4645, doi:10.3390/ijms23094645.
98. Schünemann, H.J. Using Systematic Reviews in Guideline Development. In *Systematic Reviews in Health Research*; Wiley, 2022; pp. 424–448.
99. Anjum, A.; Aizad, S.; Arshad, B.; Subhani, M.; Davies-Tagg, D.; Abdullah, T.; Antonopoulos, N. Big Data Analytics in Healthcare: A Cloud-Based Framework for Generating Insights. In *Cloud Computing: Principles, Systems and Applications*; Antonopoulos, N., Gillam, L., Eds.; Springer International Publishing: Cham, 2017; pp. 153–170 ISBN 978-3-319-54645-2.
100. Lewis, E.; Dayal, A.; Li, R. Redefining Rare Disease Care in the Digital Age: Insights and Key Takeaways from a Digital Health Symposium Focused on Empowering Rare Disease Communities. *Biomed Hub* **2024**, *9*, 38–44, doi:10.1159/000536274.
101. Watson, C. Rise of the Preprint: How Rapid Data Sharing during COVID-19 Has Changed Science Forever. *Nat Med* **2022**, *28*, 2–5, doi:10.1038/s41591-021-01654-6.
102. Sisodiya, S.M. Precision Medicine and Therapies of the Future. *Epilepsia* **2021**, *62*, doi:10.1111/epi.16539.
103. Nikanjam, M.; Kato, S.; Allen, T.; Sicklick, J.K.; Kurzrock, R. Novel Clinical Trial Designs Emerging from the Molecular Reclassification of Cancer. *CA Cancer J Clin* **2025**, *75*, 243–267, doi:10.3322/caac.21880.
104. Khan, A.; Barapatre, A.R.; Babar, N.; Doshi, J.; Ghaly, M.; Patel, K.G.; Nawaz, S.; Hasana, U.; Khatri, S.P.; Pathange, S.; et al. Genomic Medicine and Personalized Treatment: A Narrative Review. *Annals of Medicine & Surgery* **2025**, *87*, 1406–1414, doi:10.1097/MS9.0000000000002965.
105. Jeyaraman, M.; Jeyaraman, N.; Ramasubramanian, S.; Balaji, S. Navigating the Ethical Terrain: Off-Label and Experimental Treatments in Medical Case Reports. *World J Methodol* **2025**, *15*, doi:10.5662/wjm.v15.i1.94833.
106. Atkinson, S.; Bagnall, A.-M.; Corcoran, R.; South, J.; Curtis, S. Being Well Together: Individual Subjective and Community Wellbeing. *J Happiness Stud* **2020**, *21*, 1903–1921, doi:10.1007/s10902-019-00146-2.
107. Tennant, J.P.; Waldner, F.; Jacques, D.C.; Masuzzo, P.; Collister, L.B.; Hartgerink, Chris.H.J. The Academic, Economic and Societal Impacts of Open Access: An Evidence-Based Review. *F1000Res* **2016**, *5*, 632, doi:10.12688/f1000research.8460.3.
108. Danish, S.H.; Reza, Z.; Sohail, A.A. Case Reports and Their Importance in Medical Literature. *Journal of Pakistan Medical Association* **2017**, *67*, 451–453.
109. Smart, P. The Evolution, Benefits, and Challenges of Preprints and Their Interaction with Journals. *Science Editing* **2022**, *9*, 79–84, doi:10.6087/kcse.269.
110. da Silva, J.A.T. Debunking Post-Publication Peer Review. *International Journal of Education and Information Technology* **2015**, *1*, 34–37.
111. Dananjayan, S.; Raj, G.M. 5G in Healthcare: How Fast Will Be the Transformation? *Irish Journal of Medical Science (1971 -)* **2021**, *190*, 497–501, doi:10.1007/s11845-020-02329-w.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.1583.v1



112. Finlayson, S.G.; LePendu, P.; Shah, N.H. Building the Graph of Medicine from Millions of Clinical Narratives. *Sci Data* **2014**, *1*, 140032, doi:10.1038/sdata.2014.32.
113. Kuhn, T. The Nature of Scientific Revolutions. *Chicago: University of Chicago* **1970**, *197*.