South & West Health Care Libraries Unit
Southampton General Hospital
Tremona Road
Southampton SO16 6YD


### References

1. Dickersin K, Scherer E, Lefebvre C. Identification of relevant studies for systematic reviews. *BMJ* 1994; **309:** 1286-1291.


## Unscheduled cervical smears

Sir,

I was interested to read the paper by Spence *et al* (September *Journal*) in which the question of the cost of unscheduled cervical smears was considered.

In our area, the local genitourinary medicine clinics are an important source of unscheduled smears. The problem is compounded by the fact that we are not informed of the results, nor are we able to obtain them on request. In order to attempt to meet our cervical smear targets we have no alternative but to offer the patient a further cervical smear. In many cases these further smears will not be clinically indicated.

JONATHAN WHARRAM

Queenstown Road Medical Practice
14 Queenstown Road
London SW8 3RX

## Research in primary care: the need to modify help-seeking behaviour

Sir,

I read with interest Professor Howie's paper on research in primary care (August *Journal*).[1] I too am concerned that current strategies may compromise the ability of 'curiosity-driven innovative' small researchers to gain the space and support needed to develop their ideas. I was, however, disappointed that he seemed resigned to this state of affairs. I feel that Howie is one of an increasing, but still small number of powerful academics in primary care who should have the ability to offer such support.

I also do not like his modification of Stott and Davis'[2] model of the potential content of a consultation, and did not feel that he justified such a modification. I agree that managing psycho-social problems is an essential part of any GP consultation. Using Stott and Davis' model, I have always assumed that components A and C from the original paper (Management of presenting problems and management of continuing problems) referred not just to physical problems, but to psychological and social difficulties. I am a little alarmed that someone as esteemed as Professor Howie could think otherwise. Indeed, when discussing these components the authors of the original paper emphasized that 'the integrated physical and psycho-social formulation is relevant to every specialty but is exceptionally important in primary care.'

Howie removes component B (modifying help-seeking behaviour) from the original model. This interests me because, since I was first introduced to the model, I have felt that practitioners have more difficulty with this part than with any other. I do not fully understand why. Again, referring to the original paper, this part of a consultation is not just about controlling workload in order to benefit the doctor; it is about patient empowerment. The aim is clearly to give people more control over their lives, to encourage them to be actively involved in their own health care, and to reduce over-medicalization. There is plenty of evidence that it can be done. Indeed, the current beliefs about health and medicine that exist in the population are a result of learning from our profession. If Professor Howie is keen to promote research in primary care, I think looking at how GPs manage component B of Stott and Davis' model would be a more suitable approach than simply removing it.

In the same edition of the *Journal* there were two original research papers on subjects very important to primary care: sore throats and deafness.[3,4] I have just finished reading Wilkin and Glendinnings' chapter in *A Primary Care Led NHS*[5] on applying research in primary care. They make a strong case for what seems obvious to me — making research more responsive and accessible to service needs. The two papers referred to could be laughable examples (were they not so tragic) of failures to do this.

Does F Dodds really believe his B-score system is usable or even understandable in the average consultation? I am not underestimating the intelligence of any of my primary care colleagues, though I am happy to admit I have struggled with Bayes theorem. The reality is, however, that in the average consultation in which someone presents with a sore throat, it is simply not feasible to use the table presented by Dobbs. If he believes it is important to identify and treat streptococcal sore throats, which is itself debatable, then a list of the top five identifying symptoms would be of far more value.

Again, Eeekhof *et al*'s paper on the value of the whisper test in diagnosing deafness is potentially very useful, but would be more valuable if it included a brief description of how to perform the test accurately.

DEBBIE LAWLOR

28 Oakfield Grove
Bradford BD9 4PY


### References

1. Howie JGR. Addressing the credibility gap in general practice: better theory, more feeling; less strategy. *Br J Gen Pract.* 1996; **46:** 479-481.
2. Stott NCH, Davis RH. The exceptional potential in each primary care consultation. *J R Coll Gen Pract* 1979; **29:** 201-205.
3. Dobbs F. A scoring system for predicting group A streptococcal throat infection. *Br J Gen Pract* 1996; **46:** 461-465.
4. Eeekhof JAH *et al.* The whispered voice: The best test for screening for hearing impairment in general practice? *Br J Gen Pract* 1996; **46:** 473-475.
5. Wilkin D, Glendinning C. Applying research. In Meads G (ed). *A Primary Care Led NHS: Putting it into practice.* London: Churchill Livingstone, 1996.


## Improving the detection of psychological disorders

Sir,

In the July *Journal* Howe describes a brief educational intervention with exciting possibilities for improving detection of psychological disorders in primary care.[1]

Howe acknowledges that there is debate regarding the value of improving detection of depression using screening questionnaires. However, there is conflicting evidence whether simply informing the physician of the presence of depression or anxiety influences the outcome of the illness. The same question may be asked of the intervention described. There was a modest improvement in the detection of psychological distress in the intervention group. Does this lead to a change in practitioner behaviour or prescribing? Is the satisfaction and outcome for these patients influenced?

The intervention, however, may well prove to be of great value for two reasons. First, physicians are more likely to commence treatment for depression when they have made the diagnosis themselves, rather than when the diagnosis has been made by a screening instrument.[2] Secondly, there is evidence that improved consultation techniques result in improved health outcomes, particularly with regard to reduced anxiety.[3] Thus, by improving