thinking better in the UK.

In summary it is difficult to agree that the primary aim of education should be to postpone first intercourse. Indeed, a recent review of sexual health education interventions quoted an American study which aimed to postpone first intercourse; the results were disapointing.[6] In principle it is a laudable aim, but in practice there is little to suggest that it can achieved by the primary care team. In addition we are wary of the potential side-effect of this approach which might encourage judgemental attitudes towards teenagers who have the courage to approach their primary care team for advice; furthermore the teenager may feel discouraged to attend a general practitioner or other primary care team member if the team is perceived to be excessively disapproving of teenage sex. We feel it is more practical to support teenagers to make sensible choices regarding their own sexuality without pushing them one way or the other.

LIONEL D JACOBSON
CLARE E WILKINSON

Department of General Practice
University of Wales College of Medicine
Health Centre
Maelfa
Cardiff CF3 7PN

References

1. Jacobson LD, Wilkinson C. Review of teenage health care: time for a new direction. *Br J Gen Pract* 1994; **44:** 420-424.
2. Jones EF, Forrest JD, Goldman N, *et al.* Teenage pregnancy in developed countries: determinants and policy implications. *Fam Plann Perspect* 1985; **17:** 53-63.
3. Voydanoff P, Donnelly B. *Adolescent sexuality and pregnancy.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1990.
4. Hudson F, Ineichen B. *Taking it lying down: sexuality and teenage motherhood.* Basingstoke: Macmillan Publishing, 1991.
5. Forum for Family Planning. *Can we learn from the Dutch? Report of a conference held in January 1994.* Cambridge: Organon Laboratories, 1994.
6. Oakley A, Fullerton D, Holland J, *et al.* Sexual health education interventions for young people: a methodological review. *BMJ* 1995; **310:** 158-162.

Health checks for elderly people

Sir,

We read with interest the paper by Chew and colleagues looking at the views and experiences of people aged 75 years and over with regard to the annual health check (December *Journal,* p.567). The authors report that 31% of their sample of elderly people reported having had a health check in the two years from 1990 to 1992, while 93% of respondents reported being in favour of them. This anomaly, a much higher level of approval than uptake, was also revealed in a trainee project undertaken by one of us (S D) which looked at patient expectation and experience of the annual health check for those aged 75 years and over.

The study practice is a relatively affluent, largely rural practice in Kent which on 31 October 1990 had 185 people aged between 75 and 80 years eligible for the health check (7% of the practice population). Every sixth eligible patient on an alphabetical list was visited by S D in February or March 1990 in order to discover their attitude towards the checks before the check became a term of service of April 1990. The same patients were revisited by S D during the period April 1992 to January 1993, that is after they could have had two health checks. Each person was asked if they approved of annual checks and, at revisit, if they had taken up the offer of a visit.

Of 31 eligible patients, 22 were visited by a S D in 1990, of whom 18 were revisited in 1992 (two had died, one had moved away, and one chose not to be interviewed again). Of the 22 elderly patients visited in 1990, 18 considered annual checks to be a good idea and four were ambivalent. Of those 18 who were visited again in 1992, 16 thought annual checks were a good idea while two were ambivalent. Only three, however, claimed to have had a health check. According to the other 15 elderly patients who reported having not had a health check, one had misunderstood the letter inviting them for a health check, four had not received a letter, six felt 'fit enough' and four saw the doctor regularly. According to practice records, five of the 18 patients had, in fact, had health checks. The uptake rate among the sample of 18 people was 28% with a whole practice uptake rate of 21.5% of 441 elderly people in 1990–91 and 13.3% of 459 in 1991–92.

As with all trainee projects, this one created more questions than it answered. It does, however, suggest that patient approval of a scheme does not guarantee a high uptake. When asked why they did not accept the invitation for a health check, the most frequent response was that it was a good idea but the respondent was too well to need it. While a patient's response to an invitation may be closely related to the manner of invitation, there is an important comment to make about Chew and colleagues' point regarding health service planning and consumer preference. Not only should the fact that elderly people value annual health checks be taken into account, but also reasons why they value them should be sought.

SIMON J DUNN

St Anne's Surgery
161 Station Road
Herne Bay
Kent CT6 5NF

MARTIN H PORTER

Tithe Yard Surgery
Church Square
Lenham, Kent

GPs and voluntary organizations

Sir,

People suffering with chronic diseases and their carers usually require many years of support, advice and information. Although general practitioners are in a key position to provide these services they often find it hard to do so because of time constraints. General practitioners should be encouraged to share the role of support of patients and their carers with a voluntary organization.

As a consultant in old age psychiatry and former national chairman of the Alzheimer's Disease Society (1987–94), I was interested in exploring this issue with reference to dementia and the Alzheimers Disease Society. A survey was undertaken in 1993 of the 55 general practitioners in my catchment area. I visited each of the 30 practices and saw 44 out of the 55 general practitioners and asked for information on the following: size of practice list; estimated number of people with dementia in the practice; whether the general practitioner referred people to the Alzheimers Disease Society; and whether the general practitioner referred people to other voluntary organizations.

Practice list size varied from 1000 patients to 10 500 patients. Nineteen practices had a list size of between 1000 and 4000 patients.

Only 30% of the general practitioners gave what could be considered a reasonable estimate of the number of people with dementia in their practice (matching the approximate number one would predict knowing the size of the list and assuming the list corresponded with a cohort of a general population across all ages). Most respondents (70%) had great difficulty with the concept of dementia as a diagnosis and how to arrive at such a diagnosis. Only 18% of respondents had ever referred a family to the Alzheimers Disease Society. Half of the doctors had referred three or more people to voluntary organizations ever and the other half had referred one or two patients (39%) or had never referred a patient (11%).

Two quite separate issues emerge from this study. The first is the problem of the