Doctors and pharmacists — working together

Sir,
We wish to comment on Michael Drury's editorial on improving and increasing links between general practitioners and community pharmacists (March *Journal,* p.91). It is not entirely true to say that hospital drug information services are available only to hospital doctors. These services, organized at district and regional levels, have long provided a service, usually an enquiry answering service, to general practitioners and community pharmacists.

Limited publicity for regional services is given in the *British national formulary.* At the South Western Regional Drug Information Centre approximately 15% of our enquiries came from the community in 1990, and we are increasingly being called upon for advice on PACT (prescribing analyses and cost).

Professor Drury's observation that it is time that general practitioners had access to an information and advisory service on medicines and prescribing is undoubtedly correct. However, we do not agree that it should be provided by either the community pharmacist or the drug information pharmacist. One possible scenario is that the local community pharmacist and general practitioner liaise and are jointly supported by the drug information service.

However, the future funding of such a service is a crucial issue. While district health authorities have in the past funded their own district drug information services, it is unlikely that after April 1991 self governing trusts and directly managed units will be willing to fund an expanded service to primary care professionals from their own budgets. The regional health authorities now have new responsibilities for monitoring prescribing issues in hospital and in primary care so some may see the need to fund such a service, perhaps provided by the regional drug information centres. General managers in family health services authorities may also be convinced of the need for such a service as a contribution to the 'Improving prescribing' scheme and therefore provide funding. There is, however, the question of where the funding would be allocated in some of the family health services authorities which contain two or more district health authorities. It is unlikely that one single pattern of funding will emerge.

There is no doubt that hospital drug information pharmacists are enthusiastic to help general practitioners and community pharmacists, and it is likely that such enterprises will prove beneficial to patient care. Unfortunately, before significant progress can be made the funding issue needs to be pursued and clarified locally.

TREVOR BESWICK

South Western Regional Drug Information Centre
Level 3, Bristol Royal Infirmary
Marlborough Street
Bristol BS2 8HW

D N ELLIOTT

South Western Regional Health Authority
King Square House
King Square
Bristol BS2 8EF

Community care for people with mental handicap

Sir,
I was greatly encouraged to read the editorial on community care for people with mental handicap (January *Journal,* p.2). In particular, I would agree with the point about the trivialization of significant medical problems in comparison with the more gross but untreatable mental handicap.

Dr Howells comments on the limited opportunity for general practitioners to meet people with mental handicap. This fact combined with the small amount of time usually given to undergraduate teaching about mental handicap (I myself have half a day to cover the entire subject for each intake of medical students) leaves the average general practitioner with a very limited grounding in the subject. In my own district there are a few practices which are very active in making referrals, while others are never heard from.

Also of importance is the fact that, while general practitioners might expect to have approximately six patients per 2000 with severe mental handicap in their practices, the number with all degrees of mental handicap including the mild and moderate ranges would be much higher. The needs of this more able group are in many ways just as difficult to address, as their communication skills, while superficially adequate, are often insufficiently sophisticated to convey a full picture of their psychiatric or medical distress.

I have been conducting a study over the last three years on people with mental handicap who present at my clinic with depressive illness. Perhaps one of the most interesting findings about this group is that on the whole the features with which they present are towards the more severe end of the spectrum. It could be, therefore, that as with medical problems in general, those with less severe depressive illnesses are going unnoticed. It was also of interest in my sample of 34 people that about one third of the referrals came from general practitioners and, although it is hard to make judgements on the basis of a small number, general practitioners seemed no more likely than other sources of referral (social services settings, schools and family) to identify the presenting problem as depression. At present I am also in the early stages of planning a whole population survey on the prevalence of depressive disorders in people with mental handicap and would be most interested to hear any comments from readers about this.

Finally, it is of note that Dr Howell's editorial was brought to my attention by a general practitioner colleague, who works part time with me as a clinical assistant, a good illustration of the benefits of dialogue between consultant and general practitioner.

ANTHONY KEARNS

Academic Department of Psychiatry
Royal Free Hospital
London

Management of myocardial infarction

Sir,
We read with interest the editorial by Dr Clifford Kay on the management of myocardial infarction in the community (March *Journal,* p.89) and applaud the objectives of the study to be carried out by the Royal College of General Practitioner's Manchester research unit.

We have also been interested in the treatment of patients with chest pain before admission to hospital. In a recent survey we assessed 72 patients admitted consecutively by local family practitioners with a diagnosis of presumed cardiac chest pain. We found the following diagnoses: myocardial infarction 24 patients (33%); probable cardiac ischaemia (no infarction) 36 (50%); and other diagnoses 12 (17%).

Only 13 patients (18%) had been treated with aspirin before admission. This compares with 25 patients (35%) that were given parenteral opiates.

There is now excellent evidence that mortality in patients with myocardial infarction is reduced by thrombolytic therapy.[1,2] This is not yet proven in acute coronary insufficiency (crescendo angina), although there is a reduction in the episodes of ischaemic pain.[3]

Aspirin, however, has been shown to reduce mortality in both myocardial infarction[1] and crescendo angina.[4,5] In myocardial infarction the benefits of combining aspirin with thrombolysis are more than purely additive when given in the first five hours.[6]