

practitioners (with ever shortening consulting times and working in practices with pooled lists where patients are seen on a 'first come first served' basis) are less likely to be able to apply an 'intervention' that is likely to produce the desired change.

No training package, public campaign or even ministerial exhortation is likely to overcome these difficulties, unless general practice itself is ready for the fundamental step of re-introducing a personal service which offers continuity of care and more time for the individual patient. In 1979⁴ Pereira Gray described the effects in just one practice of changing from pooled lists of patients to personal ones, which demonstrated increased patient satisfaction, gains in service efficiency, and improved effectiveness. He did not comment on the effect on practice costs, but it is obvious that the effects noted were likely to have brought considerable cost benefits.

A further problem left unanswered by Goldberg and Gater (and by Ustim and Sartorius) is that general practitioners are obliged to care for patients with mental health problems (often associated with physical health problems) that are seemingly incurable. Unlike their psychiatric colleagues, who sometimes discharge patients labelled 'personality disordered' to the care of general practice because they have no effective treatments to offer them, general practitioners are obliged to continue to care for these patients.

Counsellors now working in many general practices are beginning to support the care of these patients and other groups of patients who would benefit from an 'intervention of proven efficacy' through their psychotherapeutic skills. These enable them to build up trust and to offer care and nurture in ways likely to expedite the interventions used.

I believe that, while the present situation continues in general practice in the United Kingdom, we need to concentrate on the development of counselling services, on better training for individual counsellors, and on their deployment as part of an efficient and acceptable service that is accessible to all patients who would benefit.

GRAHAM CURTIS JENKINS

Counselling in Primary Care Trust
Majestic House
High Street
Staines TW18 4DG

References

1. Goldberg D, Gater R. Implications of the World Health Organization study of mental illness in general health care for training primary care staff. *Br J Gen Pract* 1996; **46**: 483-485.

2. Ustim TB. WHO Collaborative Study: an epidemiological survey of psychological problems in general health in 15 centres worldwide. *International Review of Psychiatry* 1994; **5**: 357-363.
3. Stuart Mr, Lieberman JA. The psychotherapeutic qualifications of the primary care physicians in: *The fifteen minute hour*, Praeger: London 1993.
4. Pereira-Gray D. The key to personal care. *J R Coll Gen Pract* 1979; **29**: 666-678.

Accessibility and availability of GPs

Sir,

The issue of the accessibility of general practitioners is important amidst a climate of increasing workload and stress in primary care. In his editorial (*August Journal*), Dr Davis suggest some strategies for increasing the provision of good accessibility for our patients.¹ Such ideas seem useful; many have been suggested before, but they fail to take into account the idiosyncrasies of our patients' behaviour.

Six months ago I became a part-time general practitioner when I took up an academic appointment. As expected, my surgeries are usually booked up a week in advance. Many patients make an appointment without having any particular medical problem that needs managing because 'it is so hard to get to see you these days, doctor'. This inefficient but it is hard not to view it as the result of creating a successful doctor-patient relationship.

Another difficulty is the variation in the definition of the word 'urgent'. Patients' perceptions of the urgency of their medical condition are drawn from a wide range of sources: the media, friends, prior experiences. Lack of education and lack of social support make it difficult for some families to 'wait and see' when their child has a rash. Well-trained staff may be able to deflect some urgent requests for appointments, but how much information should we expect a patient to offer a receptionist or nurse before a same-day slot is offered? A lengthy enquiry about the patient's condition reduces accessibility and may be seen as reducing confidentiality.

We all recognize the phenomenon of patient lists expanding to fill all available spaces. Practice nurses are also booked up in advance. An extra partner soon ceases to make a difference. Dropping outside work may create new surgery time but this would soon be engulfed at the expense of the partner's outside interests.

Research continues on frequent attenders, another source of pressure in practice,² but there is also a need to look at ways of helping patients distinguish

between 'urgent' meaning acute, and 'urgent' meaning it will wait another twenty-four hours.

JILL E THISTLETHWAITE

School of Medicine
Division of General Practice and Public Health
Medicine
University of Leeds
20 Hyde Terrace
Leeds LS2 9LN

References

1. Davis PJM. Accessibility and availability: how can we cope? [editorial] *Br J Gen Pract* 1996; **46**: 449.
2. Neal R, Dowell A, Heywood P, Morley S. Frequent attenders: Who needs treatment? [editorial] *Br J Gen Pract* 1996; **46**: 131-132.

Sir,

The pressure for same-day 'urgent' appointments has always caused stress for patients, receptionists and doctors. The Royal College of General Practitioners' information services have found only two reported studies of this, the most recent being 10 years ago.¹ This says that in four mainly suburban practices with 37 400 patients, out of 2424 consulting in one week in January 1986, 574 (22.7%) considered it essential to be seen on the day of request. Comparable figures are not easily derived from the recent West Lothian study.² If about 20% of daily consultations are 'urgent', the reasons for this, their context and content, and whether patients might be helped to become more self-reliant, merit further research.

Your editorial³ (*August Journal*) suggests ways to meet demand, including the provision of sufficient 'urgent' appointment time and the delegation of more work to nurses. Since 1990 nurses have been employed more widely in general practice.⁴ Does the work they do allow them to achieve their full potential? Many nurses, and certainly the primary care nurse practitioners now being trained at the Royal College of Nursing and elsewhere, would be able, if patients get the choice, to share 'urgent' appointments.⁵

The Yorkshire report¹ comments, 'perhaps it is an indictment of our education of patients that the upper respiratory tract infection, particularly, is still considered an emergency.' Nurses are good at listening, explaining and understanding.⁶ Perhaps they would also be more able to help patients find their own solution to 'urgent' problems, now marked 'medical', by consultation with a doctor. Many nurse-doctor pairs do this in Ontario.⁷ This may happen in Britain too. Where are the reports?