

patients, into their calculations, and would have done even better to use the more sensitive ASTRO-PU<sub>s</sub>.<sup>3</sup>

In our own work on modelling prescribing costs we have considered the power of unemployment in accounting for prescribing variation and found it less than that of other variables (Table 1). Pringle and Morton-Jones' unemployment data were for 1989, and will therefore differ from ours, but even if their values are accepted it is clear that permanent sickness is a much better predictor of prescribing costs than unemployment. While it is true that permanent sickness data are collected only every 10 years, we have found (unpublished study) that there was little change, relatively, between family health services authorities, from 1981 to 1991. The 10 year gap is therefore unlikely to cause problems.

Finally, it must be emphasized that Pringle and Morton-Jones' study was conducted at family health services authority level. If, therefore, unemployment rates were to be used in the allocation of prescribing money, they would affect only the share of the national prescribing pot obtained by each family health services authority. They could not be used for distribution by family health services authority to its practices: at practice level a marker must relate to factors that can be collected at practice level. Variables that tend to average out at family health services authority level may be very important in characterizing individual practices.

Unemployment rates are available, after considerable delay, at family health services authority level, but they are neither the best, nor even very good, markers for prescribing costs.

DAVID C E F LLOYD  
CONRAD M HARRIS  
DAVID J ROBERTS

Prescribing Research Unit  
University of Leeds  
26 Clarendon Road  
Leeds LS2 9NZ

**References**

1. National Audit Office. *Repeat prescribing by general practitioners*. London: HMSO, 1993.

2. Beale N, Nethercott S. The nature of unemployment morbidity. *J R Coll Gen Pract* 1988; **38**: 200-202.
3. Roberts SJ, Harris CM. Age, sex and temporary resident originated prescribing units (ASTRO-PU<sub>s</sub>): new weightings for analysing prescribing of general practices in England. *BMJ* 1993; **307**: 485-488.

Sir,

In their study of prescribing trends, Pringle and Morton-Jones noted an inverse relationship between the number of items prescribed per patient and the net ingredient cost per item across the family health services authorities (February *Journal*, p.53). The product of these two prescribing rates (cost per item, items per patient) gives an overall prescribing cost per patient. As a measure of prescribing, cost per patient is unaffected by changes in repeat prescribing frequency and compensatory changes in prescription duration, whereas both items per patient and cost per item will reflect these changes. Misleading conclusions may arise through examining correlations between ratios which have common elements.<sup>1,2</sup> In this case, the number of prescription items appears in the numerator of one ratio and the denominator of the other, leading to the inverse relationship observed. A constant value for cost per patient but variation, however small, in items per patient would give a perfect negative correlation ( $r = -1$ ) between items per patient and cost per item. The negative correlation observed is therefore unsurprising, and results from inappropriate analytical methods rather than an underlying prescribing model in need of explanation.

Figure 1 shows family health services authority prescribing rates for the calendar year 1990, calculated using 1989 mid-year Office of Population Censuses and Surveys population estimates (the general picture is similar to that of Pringle which was based on prescribing data for a slightly earlier period). The superimposed curves indicate constant values for net ingredient cost per patient and show that Pringle's split between family health services authorities with high item cost, low

item number (group 1) and those with low item cost, high item number (group 2), is by no means a split according to low/high net ingredient cost per patient as is claimed. However, the cost per patient is, on average, lower among group 1 family health services authorities.

The unemployment variables considered may be reasonable predictors for these two groups of family health services authorities but what interpretation can be given to the groups? They do not accord with low and high overall per capita prescribing costs, which might have supported a link between ill health and unemployment. Perhaps in areas of higher employment, doctors write more repeat prescriptions of long duration because more of their patients are not exempt from prescription charges? Overall, this would give higher item cost and lower numbers of items, as in the group 1 family health services authorities. The virtue of predicting a family health services authority's group is not clear; it tells us something about how medicines are prescribed rather than how much is prescribed.

The prescribing picture is not simple, and many things, including patient demographics, product mix and practitioners' approach, contribute substantially to variation in prescribing costs. Explanatory regression models are difficult to interpret when only some of the many possible influences are included, especially as these influences are so often correlated. Those variables that are included may be acting as surrogates for others that have not been considered. Examination of patient-linked prescribing and diagnostic data may shed some light on the variation in prescribing rates, whether at family health services authority or practice level. The widespread use of computerized general practitioner record systems now make this a feasible research approach.

SARAH ROBERTS

Wolfson Unit of Clinical Pharmacology  
University of Newcastle  
Newcastle upon Tyne NE2 4HH

**References**

1. Pearson K. Mathematical contributions to the theory of evolution — on a form of spurious correlation which may arise when indices are used in the measurement of organs. *Proc R Soc Lond* 1897; **60**: 489-497.
2. Kronmal RA. Spurious correlation and the fallacy of the ratio standard revisited. *J R Stat Soc A* 1993; **156**: 379-392.

Sir,

Having worked both in Brighton (the 'affluent' south) and now in Bellshill,

**Table 1.** Pearson product moment correlation coefficients of prescribing variables.

Variable	Correlation coefficient		
	Cost <sup>a</sup> per patient	Cost <sup>a</sup> per PU	Cost <sup>a</sup> per ASTRO-PU
No access to a car <sup>b</sup>	0.35	0.41	0.48
Unemployment <sup>b</sup>	0.38	0.45	0.52
Premature SMR <sup>c</sup>	0.53	0.60	0.67
Permanent sickness <sup>b</sup>	0.73	0.77	0.79

<sup>a</sup>Net ingredient cost for 1990-91. <sup>b</sup>1991 census. <sup>c</sup>Standardized mortality ratio for ages 15-64 years from the public health common dataset 1992.




Figure 1. Prescribing rates for the family health services authorities in England for 1990. Lines indicate constant values for net ingredient cost per patient.

Lanarkshire (the 'deprived' north) I have been struck by the wide variation in patients' expectations of receiving a prescription. While Pringle and Morton-Jones' paper supports the argument that unemployment is associated with high volume, low cost treatment, they suggest that 'illness that is sensitive to the deprivation of an area is below average in ingredient costs of treatment' (February *Journal*, p.53). An alternative, and from my own experience, more likely explanation for this high volume, low cost treatment, is that unemployment is associated with exemption from increasingly expensive prescription charges.

In Bellshill the cultural norm among adults exempt from prescription charges is not only to expect a prescription for many self-limiting conditions such as viral infections and minor aches, but also to expect a prescription for their children who are teething, have a fever, nappy rash or need a nappy cream.

Patients in employment may or may not consult for minor illness. If they do, they will often find it cheaper to buy over-the-counter products, or, having consulted, they may agree not to treat minor, self-limiting illnesses. Also, in general they do

not expect a prescription for children's minor complaints.

This all consolidates my initial impressions following my return to Scotland that in Brighton many patients expected advice and reassurance, whereas in Bellshill many patients expect a prescription.

E M DUNCAN

The Surgery  
John Street  
Bellshill  
Lanarkshire ML4 1RJ

### Care of patients with non-insulin dependent diabetes and hypertension

Sir,  
McCallum offers a fascinating glimpse into the drug management of patients with non-insulin dependent diabetes and hypertension in an American practice of 7000 patients (letters, *March Journal*, p.142). I have audited the care of patients with non-insulin dependent diabetes receiving anti-

hypertensive therapy in a seven partner semi-rural training practice of 11 200 patients in Gwent, Wales.

A total of 223 patients (prevalence 2.0%) were included on the practice diabetic register on 1 January 1993. Sixty of the 198 patients with non-insulin dependent diabetes were receiving antihypertensive medication — 34 (57%) were men, 26 women (43%) and 38 (63%) were aged over 65 years.

Thirty seven of the 60 patients (62%) received monotherapy, 20 (33%) double therapy and three (5%) triple therapy compared with 41%, 39% and 20%, respectively of 41 patients in McCallum's survey. Despite the knowledge<sup>1</sup> that beta-blockers and thiazide diuretics aggravate insulin resistance, hyperglycaemia and hyperlipidaemia, 28 of the 60 patients (47%) received a beta-blocker and 23 (38%) a thiazide diuretic. Of the American patients 51% received a diuretic and a small unspecified proportion a beta-blocker.

McCallum found that 42% and 9% of 45 patients had poorly controlled systolic and diastolic blood pressure, respectively. Using similar criteria (last three recorded readings: systolic blood pressure of 160 mmHg or more, diastolic pressure of 95 mmHg or more, or both) 62% of the 60 patients were poorly controlled. In addition, only 40 patients (67%) had their last recorded HbA<sub>1</sub> level in the laboratory reference range. Overall, 45 of the 60 patients (75%) had either poor blood pressure control, poor glycaemic control or both.

If these findings are applicable to the general population, then in a hypothetical average district of 250 000 people there will be 5000 diabetic patients of whom 1350 will have both non-insulin dependent diabetes and hypertension. Of these patients, 550 to 850 (rounded figures) could have unsatisfactory blood pressure control and 1015 could have unsatisfactory blood pressure control, unsatisfactory glycaemic control or both.

Increasing use of practice based diabetic registers and their logical summation, the district diabetic register, is essential in identifying these poorly controlled hypertensive diabetic patients. Improvements in the structure, process and outcome of their care could make a substantial contribution to the reduction in mortality from coronary heart disease and stroke required by government targets, as well as reducing the considerable personal, social and economic cost of premature morbidity and mortality.

DAVID FONE

64 Chapel Road  
Abergavenny  
Gwent NP7 7DS