Concept article

The distinctions and the value of physician-scientists: a call for sustained support and nourishment

Bruno Bezerril Andrade

Escola Bahiana de Medicina de Saúde Pública (Salvador). Bahia, Brazil. Fundação Oswaldo Cruz (Salvador). Bahia, Brazil.
brunoandrade@bahiana.edu.br

ABSTRACT | CONTEXT: Physician-scientists occupy a unique and critical position at the intersection of clinical practice and scientific research, yet they are becoming increasingly rare due to systemic challenges, including time constraints, financial disincentives, and insufficient institutional support. This article explores the conceptual and historical differences between physicians, researchers, scientists, and physician-scientists, highlighting their distinct contributions to global health, policy-making, and medical innovation. Historical examples, such as Robert Koch and Virchow Rudolf, exemplify the transformative impact of physician-scientists in advancing medicine. The rise of artificial intelligence (AI) presents new opportunities and challenges for these professionals, as AI can enhance their dual roles in research and patient care. **CONCEPTUALIZATION:** However, to sustain and grow the physician-scientist workforce, significant changes are needed, including better financial incentives, protected research time, and stronger mentorship programs. Without such support, the future of medical innovation and global health may be jeopardized. This article advocates for a renewed focus on cultivating physician-scientists, emphasizing their indispensable role in bridging the gap between bench and bedside, and ensuring that scientific discoveries translate into tangible improvements in human health and well-being.

KEYWORDS: Physician-Scientist. Medical Innovation. Global Health. Artificial Intelligence in Medicine. Research Incentives.

Submitted Oct. 4th, 2024, Accepted Jan. 9th, 2025, Published Feb. 7th, 2025
J. Évid-Based Healthc., Salvador, 2025;7:e5954
http://dx.doi.org/10.17267/2675-021Xevidence.2025.e5954 | ISSN: 2675-021X
Assigned editor(s): João de Deus Barreto Segundo, Luís Cláudio Correia

How to cite this article: Andrade BB. The distinctions and the value of physician-scientists: a call for sustained support and nourishment. J Évid-Based Healthc. 2025;7:e5954. http://dx.doi.org/10.17267/2675-021Xevidence.2025.e5954

1. Introduction

In modern times, the landscape of healthcare, research, and scientific innovation is shaped by the intersection of distinct roles: the physician, the researcher, the scientist, and the elusive physician-scientist. Each profession, while interconnected, holds unique responsibilities and contributes in different ways to the advancement of human knowledge and well-being. However, it is the physician-scientist who stands at the confluence of patient care and scientific discovery—an increasingly rare and invaluable figure. This article seeks to clarify the differences among these professions and emphasize the critical need to foster the growth and sustainability of physician-scientists, a group whose decline could significantly affect the future of medicine and global health.

2. Defining roles: a historical and conceptual overview

The physician is a health professional whose primary responsibility is the direct care of patients. Rooted in the ancient traditions of Hippocrates and Avicenna, physicians apply a detailed knowledge of anatomy, pathology, and pharmacology to diagnose and treat diseases. In the 20th century, the rise of evidence-based medicine has formalized their role in using research to guide clinical decision-making[1], yet most physicians remain grounded in clinical practice rather than scientific inquiry.[2] For example, a recent study highlights that while a notable proportion of physicians are involved in research activities, the majority dedicate less than 10% of their time to such endeavors, with clinical duties remaining their primary focus.[3,4]

The researcher, on the other hand, is primarily focused on generating new knowledge through systematic investigation. Whether in a lab or field setting, researchers contribute to science by asking critical questions, conducting experiments, and analyzing data. Their goal is the discovery of novel phenomena or the development of new theories, which they then present to the broader scientific community for further exploration and application. There has been observed a substantial growth of publication output in the health sciences, with global biomedical research output increasing significantly over recent decades.[5] For instance, health sciences publications account for a major share of all scientific outputs, reflecting the strong emphasis on research dissemination in this field.[6]

At the same time, the role of researchers diverges from that of physicians, as researchers rarely interact directly with patients. Instead, they dedicate themselves to the exploration of science itself.[4] Career trajectories further illustrate this distinction: many PhD graduates transition to industry roles rather than remaining in academia. Studies indicate that doctoral graduates frequently rely on professional networks to navigate the shift from academia to industry, a trend increasingly observed in health sciences.[7] Moreover, longitudinal studies reveal that academia has seen a decline in postdoctoral academic appointments, with growing migration to industrial careers.[8] These trends underscore the evolving dynamics of research in health sciences, reflecting both the expansion of scholarly output and the changing career paths of PhD holders.

The scientist functions similarly to the researcher but with a broader scope. Scientists engage with theoretical frameworks, applying scientific methods to create, test, and refine knowledge. Figures like Galileo Galilei, Isaac Newton, and Albert Einstein come to mind as historic exemplars of scientists whose contributions shaped entire fields of knowledge, from mechanics to quantum physics.

But what, then, is a physician-scientist? In essence, physician-scientists are individuals who merge the practical skills of the clinician with the investigative mindset of the researcher. They are uniquely positioned to translate clinical problems into research questions, and research findings into medical innovations. Historical figures like Robert Koch, whose pioneering work on germ theory and the identification of the bacteria responsible for anthrax and tuberculosis laid the foundation for modern bacteriology[9,10], and Rudolf Virchow, considered the father of modern pathology[11] for his groundbreaking contributions to the understanding of cellular pathology and the role of inflammation in disease, exemplify this dual role.[12] Koch's contributions revolutionized the diagnosis and treatment of infectious diseases, while Virchow's

work bridged the gap between scientific research and clinical medicine, emphasizing the importance of understanding disease mechanisms at the cellular level.

Physician-scientists often find themselves walking a delicate balance, attempting to excel in two demanding spheres. In doing so, they offer solutions to the most pressing clinical problems and try to influence global health, policy, and medical education. Yet, despite their critical importance, physician-scientists are increasingly rare.[13-19]

3. Why are physician-scientists so rare?

There are multiple reasons for the scarcity of physician-scientists, but they all lead back to the same root issue: the lack of systemic incentives.[20-22] This scarcity is neither new nor inevitable, but it reflects a profound imbalance in how medicine and science are valued and rewarded.

3.1. Time constraints

Clinical practice demands a tremendous investment of time and energy. Physicians are expected to maintain demanding patient loads, stay abreast of new medical developments, and meet modern healthcare systems' administrative and bureaucratic expectations. To maintain a dual career in research adds an additional layer of complexity. Research is slow and labor-intensive, requiring time that is often unavailable to busy clinicians.

3.2. Lack of financial incentives

The financial rewards for clinical practice often outweigh those for research.[22-24] Physicians can expect a higher salary through patient care, while research, especially early in one's career, tends to come with lower financial returns and more precarious funding. This discrepancy discourages young medical graduates from pursuing research, as they face the immediate pressures of medical school debt and the lure of a lucrative career in practice alone.

3.3. Training pathways

The pathway to becoming a physician-scientist is long and arduous. In many countries, students interested in this career must complete both an MD and a PhD, a dual-degree process that can take upwards of a decade. For many, this is simply too long a commitment, particularly when coupled with the intense demands of residency and fellowship training.

3.4 Institutional support

Physician-scientists require institutional environments that provide mentorship, protected time for research, access to funding, and opportunities for collaboration across disciplines. Unfortunately, many medical schools and hospitals, particularly in developing countries, lack the resources to support physician-scientists in the long term.[25-29] This results in a significant brain drain, with promising physician-scientists leaving academia for more financially stable and less demanding roles.

4. The impact of physician-scientists on medicine and global health

Despite these challenges, the contributions of physician-scientists are immeasurable. Historically, they have been at the forefront of the most significant advances in medical science. Jean-Martin Charcot, for example, advanced our understanding of neurological diseases by connecting clinical observations with basic pathological research.[30-32] More recently, physician-scientists have played a key role in the development of cutting-edge treatments in immunotherapy[33], genetics, and precision medicine.[34,35]

Beyond their individual contributions, physician-scientists help bridge the gap between bench and bedside, ensuring that scientific discoveries are translated into actionable therapies that improve patient outcomes. This translational work is particularly important in global health, where the development of vaccines, treatments, and diagnostic tools can mean the difference between life and death in resource-limited settings.[36-38]

Physician-scientists are also critical in policymaking. Their unique perspective, informed by both clinical experience and scientific knowledge, positions them to advise governments and global organizations on health policies that are both scientifically sound and practically implementable. During the COVID-19 pandemic, physician-scientists were instrumental in the development of vaccines, treatment protocols, and public health guidelines. Without their input, the global response to the pandemic would likely have been slower and less effective.[39] For example, Drew Weissman, MD, PhD, won the Nobel Prize in 2023 for playing a critical role in the development of mRNA-based vaccines that revolutionized the fight against the pandemic.[40,41]

5. The role of artificial intelligence in shaping the future

Looking forward, the rise of artificial intelligence (AI) is poised to further reshape the medical landscape. AI offers immense potential for both clinicians and researchers, from improving diagnostic accuracy to accelerating drug discovery. For physician-scientists, AI can serve as a powerful tool to enhance both their clinical and research endeavors. In clinical practice, AI-driven tools can help physicians interpret complex data, allowing for more personalized and effective treatments.[42] In research, AI algorithms can sift through vast datasets, identifying patterns and connections that would be impossible for humans to detect unaided.[43]

However, while AI holds great promise, it also underscores the importance of physician-scientists. AI, by its very nature, is dependent on the quality of the data it is fed. Physician-scientists, with their dual expertise in clinical and scientific reasoning, are uniquely positioned to guide the ethical development and application of AI technologies in medicine.[44,45] Their insight is critical to ensuring that AI tools are scientifically robust and grounded in a deep understanding of human health and disease.

6. The need for incentives and support

To preserve and grow the ranks of physician-scientists, it is imperative that institutions and governments implement better incentives and support structures. This begins with financial support, particularly in the form of scholarships, grants, and fellowships that can offset the high cost of training. Protected research time is another key factor—physician-scientists need designated periods where they can focus exclusively on their research without the pressures of clinical obligations.

Moreover, mentorship plays a critical role. Physician-scientists must have access to mentors who can guide them through the complexities of balancing a dual career. This mentorship goes beyond providing technical guidance and must foster a long-term vision for navigating the complexities of a challenging yet rewarding path.

Lastly, there must be a cultural shift within medical institutions that recognizes and rewards the unique contributions of physician-scientists. Their work is more than an extension of clinical care or research; it is a distinct discipline that demands its own set of standards and rewards.

7. Conclusion: securing the future of medicine and humanity

The physician-scientist occupies a critical and increasingly endangered position in the medical and scientific communities. As we look to the future of medicine, it is clear that the need for physician-scientists will only grow. Their ability to bridge the gap between clinical practice and scientific discovery is essential for addressing the complex health challenges of the 21st century, from emerging infectious diseases to the ethical application of AI.

Without targeted support, we risk losing a generation of physician-scientists, which could have far-reaching

consequences for global health, medical innovation, and our ability to address the pressing medical issues of our time. It is time for governments, institutions, and society to recognize the critical role that physician-scientists play and to invest in their success. Only by doing so can we ensure the continued advancement of medicine and the betterment of humanity.

Acknowlegdments

The author thanks his students, whose persistent questions about the concepts discussed in this article served as the inspiration and motivation to write this essay.

Competing interests

No financial, legal, or political conflicts involving third parties (government, private companies, and foundations, etc.) were declared for any aspect of the submitted work (including but not limited to grants and funding, advisory board participation, study design, manuscript preparation, statistical analysis, etc.).

Indexers

The Journal of Evidence-Based Healthcare is indexed in DOAJ and EBSCO.

References

1. Zimerman AL. Evidence-based medicine: a short history of a modern medical movement. Virtual Mentor. 2013;15(1):71-6. https://doi.org/10.1001/virtualmentor.2013.15.1.mhst1-1301

2. Ratnani I, Fatima S, Abid MM, Surani Z, Surani S. Evidence-Based Medicine: History, Review, Criticisms, and Pitfalls. Cureus. 2023;15(2):e35266. https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.35266

3. Vyas JM, Armstrong KA. Physician-Scientist to Research-Engaged Physician-What Is in a Name? JAMA Netw Open. 2024;7(9):e2433123. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2024.33123

4. Cianciolo AT, Mitzelfelt J, Ghareeb A, Zahid MF, Akbar R, Ghias K. Physician-scientist or basic scientist? Exploring the nature of clinicians' research engagement. Adv Health Sci Educ Theory Pract. 2021;26(2):353-367. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10459-020-09988-5

5. Conte ML, Liu J, Schnell S, Omary MB. Globalization and changing trends of biomedical research output. JCI Insight. 2017;2(12):e95206. https://doi.org/10.1172/jci.insight.95206

6. Fontelo P, Liu F. A review of recent publication trends from top publishing countries. Syst Rev. 2018;7(1):147. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-018-0819-1

7. Germain-Alamartine E, Ahoba-Sam R, Moghadam-Saman S, Evers G. Doctoral graduates' transition to industry: networks as a mechanism? Cases from Norway, Sweden and the UK. Studies in Higher Education, 2020;46(12):2680–2695. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2020.1754783

8. Passaretta G, Trivellato P, Triventi M. Between academia and labour market—the occupational outcomes of PhD graduates in a period of academic reforms and economic crisis. High Educ. 2019;77:541–559. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-018-0288-4

9. Stevenson LG. Robert Koch [Internet]. Encyclopedia Britannica; 2024 [updated 2025 Feb. 01st; cited 2025 Jan. 6th. Available from: https://www.britannica.com/biography/Robert-Koch

10. Worboys M. Thomas D. Brock, Robert Koch: a life in medicine and bacteriology, Berlin, Springer, 1988, 8vo, pp. ix, 364, illus., DM 48.00 (N. American distributor: Science Tech Publishers, Madison WI). Medical History. 1990;34(3):347-348. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0025727300052613

11. Gouveia RH, Gulczynski J, Canzonieri V, Nesi G. Rudolf Virchow: 200th birth anniversary. Virchows Arch. 3032; 479:1063–1065. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00428-021-03252-w

12. Coleman W. Rudolf Virchow, Collected essays on public health and epidemiology. Med Hist. 1987;31(1):111–3. https://doi.org10.1017/S0025727300046408

13. Milewicz DM, Lorenz RG, Dermody TS, Brass LF. National Association of MD-PhD Programs Executive Committee. Rescuing the physician-scientist workforce: the time for action is now. J Clin Invest. 2015;125(10):3742-7. https://doi.org/10.1172/JCI84170

14. Williams CS, Iness AN, Baron RM, Ajijola OA, Hu PJ, Vyas JM, et al. Training the physician-scientist: views from program directors and aspiring young investigators. JCI Insight. 2018;3(23):e125651. https://doi.org/10.1172/jci.insight.125651

15. Strong MJ, Busing N, Goosney DL, Harris KA, Horsley T, Kuzyk A, et al. The Rising Challenge of Training Physician-Scientists: Recommendations From a Canadian National Consensus Conference. Acad Med. 2018;93(2):172-178. https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000001857

16. Ghosh-Choudhary S, Carleton N, Nouraie SM, Kliment CR, Steinman RA. Predoctoral MD-PhD grants as indicators of future NIH funding success. JCI Insight. 2022;7(6):e155688. https://doi.org/10.1172/jci.insight.155688

17. Ginsburg D, Mills S, Shurin S, Andrews N, Bernard G, Brass L, et al. Physician-Scientist Workforce Working Group Report. Bethesda: National Institutes of Health; 2014.

18. Tilghman S, Rockey S, Degen S, Forese L, Ginther D, Gutierrez-Hartmann A, et al. Biomedical Research Workforce Working Group Report. Bethesda: National Institutes of Health; 2012.

19. Brass LF, Akabas MH, Burnley LD, Engman DM, Wiley CA, Andersen OS. Are MD-PhD programs meeting their goals? An analysis of career choices made by graduates of 24 MD-PhD programs [Internet]. Acad Med. 2010;85(4):692–701. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20186033/

20. Daye D, Patel CB, Ahn J, Nguyen FT. Challenges and opportunities for reinvigorating the physician-scientist pipeline. J Clin Invest. 2015;125(3):883-7. https://doi.org/10.1172/JCI80933

21. Schwartz DA. Physician-scientists: the bridge between medicine and science. Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 2012;185(6):595-6. https://doi.org/10.1164/rccm.201110-1806ED

22. Garrison HH, Ley TJ. Physician-scientists in the United States at 2020: Trends and concerns. FASEB J. 2022;36(5):e22253. https://doi.org/10.1096/fj.202200327

23. Leigh JP, Tancredi D, Jerant A, Kravitz RL. Physician Wages Across Specialties: Informing the Physician Reimbursement Debate. Arch Intern Med. 2010;170(19):1728–1734. https://doi.org/10.1001/archinternmed.2010.350

24. Lakshminrusimha S, Reed AM, Cheng TL, Cunningham JM, Devaskar SU. An Approach to Compensation Plans for Physician Faculty in Academic Pediatric Departments. J Pediatr. 2023;262:113511. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpeds.2023.113511

25. Seabury SA, Jena AB, Chandra A. Trends in the Earnings of Health Care Professionals in the United States, 1987-2010. JAMA. 2012;308(20):2083–2085. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2012.14552

26. Ganesh K. The joys and challenges of being a physician-scientist. Nat Rev Gastroenterol Hepatol. 2021;18(6):365. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41575-021-00443-3

27. Permar SR, Ward RA, Barrett KJ, Freel SA, Gbadegesin RA, Kontos CD, et al. Addressing the physician-scientist pipeline: strategies to integrate research into clinical training programs. J Clin Invest. 2020;130(3):1058-1061. https://doi.org/10.1172/JCI136181

28. Gordon R. The vanishing physician scientist: a critical review and analysis. Account Res. 2012;19(2):89-113. https://doi.org/10.1080/08989621.2012.660076

29. Glickman MS. Challenges for the MD Physician-Scientist Upon Entering the Lab: From the Grand to the Practical. J Infect Dis. 2018;218(suppl_1):S25-S27. https://doi.org/10.1093/infdis/jiy085

30. Ganetzky RD. Becoming a Physician-Scientist: A View Looking Up From Base Camp. Acad Med. 2017;92(10):1373-1374. https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000001876

31. The Editors of Encyclopaedia. Jean-Martin Charcot [Internet]. Encyclopedia Britannica. Available from: https://www.britannica.com/biography/Jean-Martin-Charcot

32. Charcot JM. Lectures on the Diseases of the Nervous System. London: New Sydenham Society; 1877.

33. Kumar DR, Aslinia F, Yale SH, Mazza JJ. Jean-Martin Charcot: the father of neurology. Clin Med Res. 2011;9(1):46-9. https://doi.org/10.3121/cmr.2009.883

34. Davila ML, Brentjens RJ. CAR T cell therapy: looking back and looking forward. Nat Cancer. 2022;3(12):1418-1419. https://doi.org/10.1038/s43018-022-00484-w

35. Bose R, Ma CX. Breast Cancer, HER2 Mutations, and Overcoming Drug Resistance. N Engl J Med. 2021;385(13):1241-1243. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMcibr2110552

36. Parhiz H, Atochina-Vasserman EN, Weissman D. mRNA-based therapeutics: looking beyond COVID-19 vaccines. Lancet. 2024;403(10432):1192-1204. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(23)02444-3

37. William B. The Importance of Translational Research in Practical Applications and Interventions to Improve Healthcare [Internet]. Trans Med. 2023;13:303. Available from: https://www.longdom.org/open-access/the-importance-of-translational-research-in-practical-applications-and-interventions-to-improve-healthcare-103754.html

38. PLOS Medicine Editors. Translating translational research into global health gains. PLoS Med. 2013;10(7):e1001493. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1001493

39. Rio C, Malani P. Translating Science on COVID-19 to Improve Clinical Care and Support the Public Health Response. JAMA. 2020;323(24):2464–2465. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.9252

40. Fauci A. On Call: A Doctor's Journey in Public Service. New York: Viking; 2024.

41. The Nobel Prize. Facts on the Nobel Prize in Physiology or Medicine 2023 [Internet]. Available from: https://www.nobelprize.org/prizes/medicine/2023/weissman/facts/

42. Jha S, Topol EJ. Adapting to Artificial Intelligence: Radiologists and Pathologists as Information Specialists. JAMA. 2016;316(22):2353-2354. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2016.17438

43. Alowais SA, Alghamdi SS, Alsuhebany N, Alqahtani T, Alshaya AI, Almohareb SN, et al. Revolutionizing healthcare: the role of artificial intelligence in clinical practice. BMC Med Educ. 2023;23(1):689. http://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-023-04698-z

44. Fiske A, Henningsen P, Buyx A. Your Robot Therapist Will See You Now: Ethical Implications of Embodied Artificial Intelligence in Psychiatry, Psychology, and Psychotherapy. J Med Internet Res. 2019;21(5):e13216. https://doi.org/10.2196/13216

45. Luxton DD. Recommendations for the ethical use and design of artificial intelligent care providers. Artif Intell Med. 2014;62(1):1-10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.artmed.2014.06.004