Audit of influenza vaccination in primary care

National guidelines advocate the seasonal vaccination of at-risk groups against circulating influenza viruses. However, on 22 November 2005, the Secretary of State for Health reported a shortage of influenza vaccine. The Secretary suggested that this was due, in part, to vaccination of the worried-well concerned about bird ‘flu, but no evidence was offered to support this argument. Given the considerable morbidity and mortality associated with influenza, we believed it essential to audit the allocation of vaccine. Our aim was to determine whether the proportion of those vaccinated, who were not at risk, had significantly increased in 2005 compared to 2004.

We audited a population of 51,253 from seven general practices concerned with undergraduate education in the Bradford Metropolitan Area. Patient databases were queried to identify those who had received the vaccine between 1 August–21 November 2005. These records were further queried to determine the proportion that met the at-risk criteria. The search was then repeated for the same period in 2004, using guidelines in force at that time.

In 2005, 7962 vaccines were administered by the seven general practices (15.7% of all patients). This was unchanged from 2004, when 8176 vaccines (15.9%) were administered. The number of vaccines given to those not at risk was 608 of 8176 (7.4%, standard error [SE] = +/-1.85) in 2004 and 479 of 7963 (6.0%, SE = +/-1.81) in 2005, that is, a non-significant decrease of 1.4% from 2004 to 2005.

These observations are not necessarily generalisable to the rest of England and Wales. Nonetheless, locally, the data indicate that the shortage was not due to increased vaccination of the worried-well in 2005. Preliminary surveillance for England estimates that vaccine uptake in the over 65s was >74% in 2005–2006, compared to 72% in 2004–2005. This suggests that increased uptake of vaccine in the at-risk groups put pressure on vaccine stocks in 2005. When there is insufficient vaccine to protect vulnerable patients, is it satisfactory that 6.0% of vaccine is given to those not at risk? While opinions may vary on the acceptability of this figure, there exists room for improvement. In view of this, the authors have two recommendations to avoid future shortages: first, vaccine should not be administered to those not at risk until all the at-risk patients have been immunised. Second, there should be sufficient capacity such that all at-risk patients can be immunised irrespective of fluctuations in uptake by other groups.
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Lay support for breastfeeding

The paper by Muirhead and colleagues is one of three lay support intervention studies in Britain to report no significant effect on breastfeeding duration.

However, it would be premature to conclude that lay support interventions are ineffective. The studies suggest several reasons for lack of effectiveness: low uptake for a variety of reasons; strong cultural barriers to breastfeeding that could not be overcome by lay support; and a lack of commitment to lay support by local health professionals. Evaluation of 35 UK peer support schemes have identified the need for sensitive negotiation of the boundaries and relationships between health professionals and lay supporters, to aid cross referral and avoid ‘dumping’ on volunteers.

All three studies evaluate a model where training, varying in amount, content and style, enables lay supporters to develop some breastfeeding ‘expertise’, over and above their defining characteristic of having breastfed a baby. Although central to the intervention, the authors do not discuss the effect of different training, and there is a need to evaluate theoretical models underpinning peer support training. An action research model of health professionals working together with untrained breastfeeding
mothers to offer peer coaching, mainly through groups, was effective in improving breastfeeding rates.  

In the current climate it is tempting to see lay interventions as a solution to health service shortfalls rather than opportunities for partnership to improve the quality of care. These process issues deserve more investigation and are likely to arise in other expert patient and lay initiatives.
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A taxonomy of general practice

Kieran Sweeney and Iona Heath try to give some theoretical basis for the enduring features of general practice but don’t make it easy because of where they start. In the case history, Mrs B’s GP uses the first part of the consultation to rehearse the evidence for various interventions to improve her biochemistry. It would, perhaps, be better to start with the history, which, if it includes something about Mrs B’s ideas, concerns and expectations, might lead the GP to comfort and care before considering ‘a cure’ — or in this case secondary prevention. This could lead to better communication, the patient telling her story and the GP responding appropriately with his, using evidence from research judiciously and sensitively applied.

Wilfrid Treasure  
Muirhouse Medical Group, 1 Muirhouse Avenue, Edinburgh EH4 4PL  
E-mail: Wilfrid.Treasure@lothian.scot.nhs.uk

**REFERENCE**

Hazardous drinking and a general practice: plenty of optimism but not there yet

I read with interest the editorial in April’s *British Journal* entitled *Hazardous drinking and the NHS.* This article does not address the fundamental issue facing our practice with regard to hazardous drinking at the present time.

In November 2004 I attended the RCGP course *Complexities and Controversies — Managing Alcohol Problems in Primary Care*. I came away convinced of the need to take action within our practice. McCambridge et al highlight the evidence of the harm moderate alcohol consumption is causing. Similarly, the evidence that brief intervention is effective is overwhelming. The practice incorporated FAST screening into the annual reviews of patients with chronic disease. Our practice nurses undertook brief intervention training and were keen to develop their expertise in this field. Having identified hazardous drinkers with chronic diseases I assumed some would welcome intervention but this has not been our experience. Of the hundreds identified, single figures have accepted brief intervention.

The work with heavy-use and dependent drinkers continues as usual.

The mere mention of alcohol within the chronic disease clinics provokes the defensive reply ‘so you think I’m an alcoholic’. Within this setting, measurement of BMIs is acceptable and produces some response, and with smoking, simply asking about smoking status provokes ‘I really must give up’.

Using Prochaska’s stages of change model, alcohol appears to be firmly within the precontemplation arena. This perhaps explains why with alcohol there has not been a progression from screening into treatment. How is this gap to be bridged?
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Discussion forum
The eBJGP now has its own discussion forum. If you have a comment to make on anything that we have published or a topic you would like to raise, consider adding something to the discussion forum rather than sending us a letter.