of evidence quoted in support of my comments about the effectiveness of the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) in improving standards and contributing to a reduction in health inequalities.¹ In particular to the three articles I quoted after the statement 'research has illustrated that practices in deprived localities improved performance to the level of their peers in the least deprived areas over a period of only 3 years'.

The article quoted by Campbell and others² describes the positive changes in quality of care associated with the introduction of the QOF in targeted conditions. In the discussion they quote 'an unanticipated benefit of the scheme has been a reduction in sociodemographic inequalities in health care' citing other work by the same group of researchers.³ I agree with Treasure that reference to this article would have provided a more direct link to the evidence on the timescale of improvement that he sought.

I make no excuses for quoting the editorial by Asworth⁴ as illustration of this point. The piece provides an excellent narrative summary of the QOF story, quoting the evidence again for 'the convergence between achievement in prosperous and deprived communities' and also discussing the improvements in performance for small practices.⁵

The final paper in question is an interesting attempt to link high cardiovascular QOF scores to improved cardiovascular disease (CVD) outcomes (admissions and mortality). The cross-sectional study shows a stronger association in more deprived areas suggesting that improving the quality of primary care through the QOF pay-for-performance scheme reduces the inequalities in CVD outcomes.⁶

There is now a large body of evidence supporting the view that QOF has both improved performance in the targeted clinical domains, and that performance in deprived localities has improved disproportionately. Both these factors will contribute to a reduction in health inequalities.

Sally Hull,
368–374 Commercial Road, City of London,
E1 0LS. E-mail: s.a.hull@qmul.ac.uk

REFERENCES

1. Hull S. Health inequalities affect the health of all. *Br J Gen Pract* 2010; **60**(581): 877–878.
2. Campbell SM, Reeves D, Kontopantelis E, *et al.* Effects of pay for performance on the quality of primary care in England. *N Engl J Med* 2009; **361**(4): 368–378.
3. Doran T, Fullwood C, Kontopantelis E, Reeves D. Effect of financial incentives on inequalities in the delivery of primary clinical care in England: analysis of clinical activity indicators for the quality and outcomes framework. *Lancet* 2008; **372**(9640): 728–736.
4. Ashworth M, Krodowicz M. Quality and outcomes framework: time to take stock. *Br J Gen Pract* 2010; **60**(578): 637–638.
5. Doran T, Campbell S, Fullwood C, *et al.* Performance of small practices under the UK's Quality and Outcomes Framework. *Br J Gen Pract* 2010; **60**(578): 643–648.
6. Kiran T, Hutchings A, Dhalla IA, *et al.* The association between quality of primary care, deprivation and cardiovascular outcomes: a cross-sectional study using data from the UK Quality and Outcomes Framework. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2010; **64**(10): 927–934.

DOI: 10.3399/bjgp11X561357

Confident and competent

As a newly-qualified GP, who has benefited from an extension in training from the standard 3 to 4 years I felt I should reply to the 'Competent but not confident?' article.¹

Valid arguments were presented, including the need to review the quality of the current 3-year training programmes, and tailoring them to the individual trainee needs. However, the assertion that newly-qualified GPs are 'not as well prepared as they used to be' and an extension of training will 'slow down the conveyor belt' and 'not make for better bangers' is unfounded. Rather than being less prepared than trainees in previous years, it seems more obvious that the level of preparation required to fulfil the increasingly complex clinical and managerial role of a GP has increased, thus leading to calls for an extension in training.^{2,3,4}

From my own personal experience the ST3 (registrar) year was very much focused on passing the components of the MRCGP such as the examinations and workplace-based assessments (WBPA). While these do offer an educational benchmark, I felt that they did not fully equip me for the diverse potential role of a GP including areas of research, service development, and commissioning. I, therefore, participated in a voluntary extension of

training as an 'Academic ST4', splitting my time between primary care and a university primary care department.⁵ The ability to move beyond strategic learning targeted at exams, and developing new skills in research and practice development in a supported environment has been an excellent experience and was certainly not 'always having one's hand held'.

The option to extend training by another 1 to 2 years offering varied programmes developing skills in clinical, teaching, academic, and management settings can only be encouraged. I feel this would lead to more confident GPs with an enhanced portfolio of skills to meet the challenges of the 21st century healthcare environment.

Thomas Round,
GP, Bromley-by-Bow Health Centre, Academic
Clinical Fellow, Kings College London.
E-mail: thomas.round@kcl.ac.uk

REFERENCES

1. Edgcumbe D. Competent but not confident? *Br J Gen Pract* 2010; **60**(581): 933.
2. Tooke J. Recommendation 45. *Aspiring to excellence: final report of the independent inquiry into modernising medical careers*. London: MMC, 2008.
3. Hibble A. The GP curriculum: three years, five years or life? *Educ Prim Care* 2009; **20**(2): 83–86.
4. Royal College of General Practitioners. *The business case for the extension of GP training*. London: RCGP, 2010. http://www.rcgp.org.uk/pdf/Business_Case_for_the_Extension_of_GP_Training.pdf (accessed 9 Feb 2011).
5. Allen A, Whiteford A. Extended general practice training. *BMJ Careers* 2010; **24 Nov**: <http://careers.bmj.com/careers/advice/view-article.html?id=20001664> (accessed 9 Feb 2011).

DOI: 10.3399/bjgp11X561366

Chronic daily headache: Authors' response

We thank Hamilton and Roobottom for their recent correspondence regarding our research.¹ Our conclusion that direct access CT is now the preferred choice for patients with chronic daily headache in primary care was not based upon our identification of abnormal findings or economic analysis, as suggested by Hamilton and Roobottom, but simply a reflection of the questionnaire information that was returned to us by GPs using this service.

Hamilton and Roobottom identify that we found a higher rate of imaging abnormalities in an asymptomatic

population (with MRI data) than in the headache population, and while we agree that it is therefore likely that some of the abnormalities were not relevant, we would argue that some of these abnormalities will be entirely relevant and early neuroimaging may allow earlier diagnosis and earlier treatment.

The small risk of causing harm with ionising radiation should be explained to the patient as it should be prior to any medical exposure to ionising radiation, such as breast screening. We recognise that there is the option of no investigation and no referral that clearly remains an option for primary care physicians.

In this group of patients with a 3-month history of headache, CT is adequate for the detection of symptomatic space occupying lesion. Some of the patients studied had further investigation with MRI, often for assessment of the craniovertebral junction. We recognise the potential option of initial MRI scanning for this group of patients. This would allow a greater sensitivity and avoid any exposure to ionising radiation, although there are clear financial and resource implications that would have to be studied in more depth.

Graeme C Simpson,

Department of Neuroradiology, Institute of Neurological Sciences, Southern General Hospital, Glasgow.

E-mail: gcsimpson@googlemail.com

Celestine Santosh,

Department of Neuroradiology, Institute of Neurological Sciences, Southern General Hospital, Glasgow.

REFERENCE

1. Hamilton W, Roobottom C. Chronic daily headache. *Br J Gen Pract* 2011; **61**(583): 143–144.

DOI: 10.3399/bjgp11X561375

CT and chronic daily headache

We read with interest Simpson *et al*'s paper regarding direct access computerised tomography (CT) for the investigation of chronic daily headache (CDH), and noted their conclusions that important benefits to patients and GPs were demonstrated,

through reassurance and potential cost savings.¹ We challenge these conclusions, and suggest that an alternative interpretation might be that brain imaging for CDH is a waste of NHS resources, given the exceedingly low yield of pathology, and may well cause more harm than good.

First, the study provided no evidence that patients were reassured by a normal scan. A randomised controlled trial of imaging in CDH failed to provide evidence that scans are persistently reassuring.² Indeed, although intuitively one might expect normal scans to have a therapeutic effect, neurologists and GPs commonly find the opposite — that they can reinforce anxiety and lead to a spiral of requests for further tests. Simpson *et al* do not comment on the 461 patients who were told they had an abnormal scan, and therefore, presumably not reassured, despite the incidental nature of most of the findings.

Second, while the paper emphasises the satisfaction of GPs who used the direct access service, the data were based on a sample of just 33% of questionnaires sent out (incidentally, there is an error on page 899, they quoted 23% but 996/2998 is 33%). The true denominator was 4404, not 2998, so they have extrapolated this unrepresentative small sample to the whole population, which is likely to be biased, and thus unreliable. Indeed, it is not at all clear how this denominator of 2298 was derived. Nor does their study tell us anything about the satisfaction of those who did not use the service, nor of the satisfaction of patients with CDH who were not scanned.

Third, the paper seems to encourage the notion that all patients with CDH merit scanning. We cannot agree with such an indiscriminate approach. Isolated CDH almost never indicates significant intracranial pathology — and adopting a 'scanning for all' policy undermines key aspects of primary care assessment, such as establishing the length of the history and exploring the underlying reason for attendance rather than arranging knee-jerk investigations. It also encourages headache patients to believe they need a scan. Based on their data, there is a 1 in 10 chance of an abnormal result adopting this approach (which is roughly the same frequency as for asymptomatic people, as they noted). Many

might dispute their suggestion that the abnormalities in Table 1 were 'likely to be causative' — yet at least 14 of these patients then received significant intervention, sometimes in areas for which there is no evidence at all of benefit (for example, coiling of unruptured aneurysms). While it is not possible to tell from the current study, many might wonder, therefore, whether the alleged benefit (reassurance) is negated by the harm of such uncertain intervention.

Fourth, the cost-effectiveness is much more uncertain than the authors acknowledged, and again is extrapolated from a minority response from GPs. They failed to account for the primary care time required to arrange scans, and to discuss and resolve the results with patients, nor have they factored in the very considerable costs of the interventions, which would quickly offset their suggested savings of almost £90 000.

Our interpretation of their paper would be that there is no evidence that direct access CT for CDH provides benefit, might cause significant harm, is of doubtful cost-effectiveness, and undermines a logical primary care approach to a very common problem. Resources would be better spent educating patients and doctors in the diagnosis and management of CDH, and developing better services for chronic pain.

Keith Hopcroft,

GP, Laindon Health Centre, Basildon, SS15 5TR. E-mail: keithhopcroft@supanet.com

Richard J Davenport,

Consultant Neurologist, Department of Clinical Neurosciences, Western General Hospital, Edinburgh, EH4 2XU.

REFERENCES

1. Simpson GC, Forbes K, Teasdale E, *et al*. Impact of GP direct-access for computerised tomography for the investigation of chronic daily headache. *Br J Gen Pract* 2010; **60**(581): 897–901.
2. Howard L, Wessely S, Leese M, *et al*. Are investigations anxiolytic or anxiogenic? A randomised controlled trial of neuroimaging to provide reassurance in chronic daily headache. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2005; **76**(11): 1558–1564.

DOI: 10.3399/bjgp11X561384