LETTERS

Clinical and Population Medicine

Sir,
Few will question Professor Irwin's statement (October *Journal*, p. 593) that "the fundamental requirements of a sound university education are to make students think clearly and critically", or the importance he attaches to teaching "basic clinical skills" to medical undergraduates.

Given this stance, his belief that "there is an inherent conflict between the educational objectives of a clinical discipline... and those of a subject concerned with population medicine" is surprising. Of what does this conflict consist? Merely a conflict for curricular time; or a more significant conflict between those concerned with the medical care of individuals and those concerned with the care of populations?

"Basic clinical skills" include the "ability to think clearly and critically" about clinical problems. How is such thinking possible without a foundation of knowledge derived from the study of populations? The ability to take an appropriately selective history; to examine a patient relevantly; to investigate and prescribe judiciously; to predict accurately—all derive from observation of disease in populations. Similarly, every reliable assessment of a drug's efficacy uses epidemiological concepts and methods; and the pitfalls of generalizing from the individual clinician's experience are well recognized. The student who, in due course, is to become the doctor responsible for the clinical care of individual patients needs a sound grounding in these concepts and methods.

To postulate conflict, rather than complementarity, between the study of individuals and of populations is thus to destroy any possibility of teaching the student sound clinical method. The attempt to synthesize both disciplines is not the prerogative of a few "heroic professors" but the task of every medical undergraduate. Indeed general practice "provides an ideal opportunity to achieve properly defined educational objectives in clinical medicine" not least because it obliges the student to recognize the probabilistic character of all general practice—and to think about population characteristics from which relevant clinical probabilities are in part derived.

The justification for, and advantages of, general practice being accorded departmental status within a university—an issue which Professor Irwin juxtaposes to the issue of "conflict"—is of course an entirely separate matter.

H. J. WRIGHT
Head of Division of General Practice

I. M. STANLEY
Lecturer in General Practice
The University of Leeds
Department of Community Medicine and General Practice
Clinical Sciences Building
St James's Hospital
Leeds LS9 7TF.

Residual Coding in ICHPPC

Sir,
Robertson and Simpson are to be congratulated on a thoughtful approach to what they perceive as a problem with ICHPPC (August *Journal*, pp. 495-498). It is difficult to ascertain why their data are at variance with the data collected during the International Field Trial (300 practices in nine countries) and with recent data (Lamberts, H. Analysis of Ommoord Health Center data—personal communication). There are several possible explanations. Merging of morbidity data collected using the RCGP classification with those from the ICHPPC could result in an increased assignment of codes to residual categories because the RCGP classification contains more diagnostic titles than does the ICHPPC. Computer-assisted coding using a synonym dictionary might be responsible for the variance, and of course both unusual patient population characteristics and physician coding practices are additional possibilities. The authors are encouraged to explore these possibilities by analyses of their data.

It is unclear why the authors reject optional hierarchy, which may be employed in at least two ways. The first is to select additional diagnostic titles from the ICD that are of particular interest to the investigator. A second method is to analyse residual categories for the frequent appearance of diagnostic titles which can then be added to the diagnostic list. It is unfortunate that the authors did not provide us with a detailed analysis of those residual categories that accounted for a large percentage within each section.

Lastly, the authors might re-examine the purposes for which ICHPPC was constructed. As a tool to retrieve charts of cohorts of patients with similar problems, it will function well if the problem to be studied is contained in the diagnostic list. As noted previously, diagnostic titles of interest to the investigator can be added, if they are not present in the classification. Comparisons of morbidity profiles between practices are, of course, more difficult, because of the variables of practice demography and coding habits of health care providers. These comparisons, however, will be facilitated by the next edition of ICHPPC entitled *ICHPPC-2-Defined*, in which specific inclusion criteria are given for most of the diagnostic titles. This volume will be published early in 1983 by the Oxford University Press.

JACK FROOM
Professor of Family Medicine,
Chairman of the WONCA
Classification Committee
Department of Family Medicine
Health Sciences Center
State University of New York at ʋok
Stony Brook
Long Island
NY 11794.

Sir,
It is unfortunate that in discussing ICHPPC (August *Journal*, p. 495) Robertson and Simpson confuse its use as a classification and as a nomenclature. A classification "must be confined to a limited number of categories which will encompass the entire range of morbid conditions" ... "a specific disease entity should have a separate title in the classification only when its separation is warranted because of the frequency of its occurrence or its importance" ... "it is this element of grouping in a statistical classification that distinguishes it from a nomenclature, a list or catalogue of approved names for conditions which must be extensive in order to accommodate all conditions". (Introduction to International Classification of Diseases). ICHPPC was designed as a classification rather than a nomenclature.

Although the authors quote Clark (1974) as stating that 10 per cent is usually considered the maximum acceptable size for residual codes, there is little or no evidence to substantiate this. To a large extent this depends on the degree of sensitivity and specificity that is required of data recorded using the classification. So far, these indices have not been examined in relation to ICHPPC, although I am currently analysing the 1981 field trial of the defined version of ICHPPC. In this trial, standard clinical vignettes were coded and it is possible to determine validity and reliability, sensitivity and specificity.