Advance directives

Sir,

The discussion paper 'Advance directives: partnership and practicalities' (April Journal, p.169) was helpful in drawing attention to some of the serious practical limitations and dangers of the increasingly popular practice of encouraging patients to make advance directives or living wills. These would indicate that should the patient 'become so mentally or physically ill that there is no prospect of recovery, any procedures designed to prolong life should be withheld.' It is noteworthy that the paper commences with a favourable reference to an earlier paper arguing that doctors may be morally justified in assisting death. David Short has observed that the strong support given to the advanced directive by the Voluntary Euthanasia Society shows clearly that it is designed to lead to the legalization of euthanasia.

Among the objections to the advance directive hinted at in the paper is that the individual who draws up the advance directive has no basis for making an informed decision since the precise situation which he/she will face cannot be foreseen. This is why a considerable proportion of patients do not necessarily want their advance directives followed strictly. Also, an individual cannot foresee the changes taking place in his/her attitude over the years. There are many examples of people who have changed their minds when illness has struck. The healthy do not choose in the same way as the sick.

Perhaps the most serious objection to the advance directive, which escapes mention in the paper, is that it puts the onus on the public to demand medical care, including compassionate and intelligent treatment, of a quality a doctor would wish to receive, which they are entitled to expect as a right. David Short suggests that it is doctors rather than patients who should sign a declaration — a declaration that they will never knowingly administer futile treatment or prolong suffering without real hope of recovery.

A determination by doctors to pursue the highest standards of care, following the Royal College of General Practitioners’ motto Cum scientia caritas and adhering to the declaration of Geneva and the international code of medial ethics, should make advance directives unnecessary.

STEVEN BROWNE

1536 Pershore Road, Sturbridge
Birmingham B30 2NP

Evidence from the published literature shows that environmental change is the most effective method of preventing childhood accidents. Evidence exists that safety equipment such as smoke detectors, window guards, cycle helmets and infant and child car seats reduce mortality and morbidity from accidents in childhood. The primary health care team should make efforts to educate parents about environmental changes and facilitate them to make such changes, as well as lobbying on a local and national level for a safer environment.

DENISE KENDRICK

Department of Public Health
Infectious Disease Epidemiology
University Hospital
Queen’s Medical Centre
Nottingham NG7 2UH

Personal medical attendant reports

Sir,

William Hamilton’s interesting letter on personal medical attendant reports (April Journal, p.172) concluded that ‘Completing insurance forms appears to be more a problem of data retrieval than an ethical problem.’ This view is shortsighted. The existence of these reports means that some patients avoid consulting their general practitioner for particularly sensitive problems, such as concern about human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) status. There are also many reports of insurance agents advising patients not to ask to see the doctor’s report as this may delay the acceptance of the proposal.

Hamilton also quoted a study that showed that 57% of patients would have
expected their general practitioner to withhold sensitive information. Do we just ignore this? When we write these reports do we really have the fully informed consent of our patients? Hamilton’s statistics are interesting, but the ethical problems remain as great at ever.

DAVID HASLAM
35 Biggin Lane, Ramsey, Huntingdon Cambridgeshire PE17 1NB
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Assessing elderly people

Sir,

I am concerned by a statement made by McIntosh and Power in their paper on elderly people’s views of an annual screening assessment (May Journal, p.189). It is their opinion that ‘the substantial numbers in the study who perceived themselves to be in good health when rated objectively as having medium or high health risk scores must cause concern, especially when the high risk group has been shown to have a greater probability of dying in the next six months than people in the other two groups’. Unfortunately, they do not go on to make the obvious point that these deaths would probably not be preventable in most instances. Surely most medical practitioners would prefer their elderly patients to regard themselves as well and thus enjoying good health, rather than as unwell and suffering ill health. The ineffectiveness of screening elderly people has been recognized for a number of years and is at best controversial.

It is morally indefensible to carry out screening when the effect on the group whose diseases the investigators are intending to uncover is simply to make them aware of their ill health without necessarily offering the benefits of a cure. Wilson and Jungner laid down the criteria for screening in 1968 and included the requirement of successful intervention upon detecting a disease discovered by screening. Medical practitioners should be suspicious of those advocates of screening who regard it as acceptable to change the enjoyers of good health into the sufferers of ill health without offering them the hope of a cure.

JONATHAN REGGLER
The Doctors’ House
Victoria Road, Marlow,
Buckinghamshire SL7 1DN
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Formative and summative assessment

Sir,

Philip Tombleson’s editorial (May Journal, p.183) is a fine summary of the various issues relating to formative and summative assessment. Sadly, it does not indicate how progress should be made. For instance, should we be allowed to continue in the present confused state of paying lip service to the notion of formative assessment, or should the Joint Committee on Postgraduate Training for General Practice be permitted to prescribe a national package of formative assessment for regions to implement?

More interestingly, the editorial fails to address the thorny issue of what form summative assessment should take. Bearing in mind the haphazard approach to formative assessment, is there not a case that the MRCGP examination (with some modifications) would be the most appropriate means of testing achievement of competence at the end of vocational training? After all, it has the unique advantage of being a national test with a national standard. It has also been the subject of long and thorough research and refinement. It might also be worth noting that, in the current climate of change, particularly with respect to the Calman report, the introduction of the membership examination as the summative form of assessment, would bring our discipline firmly into line with the other medical specialties.

JAMIE BAHRAMI
Department of Postgraduate Medical Education
University of Leeds
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Practice nurses

Sir,

I was disappointed to read the letter by Noreen Gilhespy (May Journal, p.219). As a general practitioner my impression from talking to practice nurses is that they find it much easier working outside a hierarchical structure, that their professional development has been greatly enhanced and that they have found it much easier to obtain education and relevant qualifications for practice nursing.

In my area general practitioners and practice nurses have joint educational meetings. Nurses employed by the health board are not allowed to perform tasks such as venepuncture, as they are apparently not covered to perform such tasks. Health board employed district nurses and health visitors are allocated to a practice without having the opportunity to meet other members of the primary care team they will be joining, unlike practice nurses who are interviewed by practice doctors and therefore have an opportunity to select the doctors they will be working with. It may be that district nurses and health visitors are less involved in practice decisions and forward planning.

It seems improbable that in the present financial climate health boards and family health services authorities will want to reimburse 100% of practice nurse salaries as suggested by Gilhespy. Gilhespy’s suggestion of the appointment of nursing administrators to supervise practice nurses would further increase financial costs and remove more nurses from providing direct patient care. The money spent on these proposals would result in less being available for other essential aspects of the primary care budget.

A S CLUBB
Eskbridge Medical Centre
8a Bridge Street, Musselburgh
East Lothian EH21 5AG

Retired doctors required for research work

Sir,

After working for 10 years in the cardiac department at St Barholmew’s Hospital, London and finishing my University of London degree in cardiac research with Professor Camm, I moved to Harley Street where I set up a company involved only in cardiac research. The Medical Centre for Cardiac Research Limited was created six months ago under the directorship of Duncan Dymond, consultant cardiologist at St Barholmew’s Hospital. Owing to expansion we are looking for five retired doctors who are interested in being involved in an enthusiastic research team on a part-time basis.

MILTON MALTZ
Medical Centre for Cardiac Research Limited
48 Harley Street
London WIN 1AD