An alternative explanation may be that, over time, case practices (with 34% of the partners from dispensing practices and 62% from fundholders) were simply less likely to stick to a static range of NSAIDs than control practices (with 50% of the partners from dispensing practices and 41% from fundholders).

By end of the April–June period, approximately 25% of the NSAID defined daily doses originated from about 10 different NSAIDs for the cases, whereas, for the controls, approximately 30% of the ddds originated from 11 or 12 different NSAIDs. Though statistically this might appear quite exciting to the authors, surely there are other markers of NSAID use that reflect a favourable prescribing pattern: a difference between the cases and controls in the actual choice of NSAID used (e.g. low toxicity verus high toxicity), the use of simple analgesics rather than NSAIDs where appropriate (e.g. in osteoarthritis), and the appropriate use of gastroprotection in high-risk patients taking NSAIDs?

MICHAEL WILCOCK

Cornwall & Isles of Scilly Health Authority
John Keay House
St Austell
Cornwall
PL25 4NQ

Reference

1. Avery AJ, Walker B, Heron T, Teasdale SJ. Do prescribing formularies help GPs prescribe from a narrower range of drugs? A controlled trial of the introduction of prescribing formularies for NSAIDS. *Br J Gen Pract* 1997; **47:** 810-814.

Summative assessment

Sir,

I write on behalf of an enthusiastic group of GP registrars who are fortunate to be part of the excellent Cleveland Vocational Training Scheme. While we all agree a compulsory form of assessment is needed, we believe summative assessment is not the answer.

Summative assessment comprises an multiple choice questionnaire in which our group obtained a 100% pass rate with little or no revision, and at that time there was a nationwide pass rate of 95%. Registrars also have to submit an audit — the concept of which the majority of us were already familiar with from our hospital training — and a video of consultations from which candidates can select their best consultations. It is clear to see that this is not going to raise standards. On the contrary, summative assessment may even lower standards; first because a number of my colleagues have now dropped out of the MRCGP examination because it is now compulsory to do summative assessment, and secondly, for registrars like ourselves who are taking both summative assessment and the MRCGP examination, so much time is spent involved with them that we lose time from the most important part of learning: patient contact and follow-through. Also, spare a thought for our GP tutors and their increased workload.

We need one form of assessment only. The MRCGP is the ideal exam for this purpose. It is one of the best postgraduate exams. It avoids the obscure, asks of us what we should know, has a very respectable pass rate, and leaves candidates with a good level of competence. Furthermore, as we have started to work for the exam, we have found not only that much of the work is interesting (especially the critical reading section), but that it is applicable to our everyday work.

General practice appears to becoming more popular again, with vocational training schemes once again staring to fill up. The introduction of cooperatives has significantly reduced out-of-hours work, and the new National Health Service (NHS) White Paper puts us very much as the driving force of the NHS. Making the MRCGP examination compulsory would not lesson GP recruitment, whereas we believe the current situation might. The two levels of assessment that currently exist are time-consuming and take away much of the enjoyment of GP training. Furthermore, general practice should not be seen as the easy option.

Change is for the good, not if we are just seen to be doing something, as we believe to be the case with the current summative assessment format, but only if that change leads to something better. We believe that with summative assessment we are selling ourselves short, and that it is time for those people who make the decisions to start listening to the growing body of people (in particular the registrars) who feel we should be setting ourselves higher standards, so that the new generation of registrars entering into the next millennium are of a high standard, joining the many excellent GPs already based in this country.

T P CUNLIFFE

Berwick Crescent Surgery
Newton Aycliffe
Co. Durham

Training in palliative care

Sir,

The questionnaire survey by Barclay *et al* (December *Journal*)[1] has shown that, although there has been an increase in training for palliative care, there are still deficiencies in the knowledge base of general practitioners.

A questionnaire study has been given to general practice registrars in the Medway and Swale area, who attend for a training afternoon at the Wisdom Hospice, looking at their training and knowledge in palliative care over an eight-year period.[2] Over this period, 40 GP registrars have visited the hospice and completed the questionnaire: 12 in 1988, 17 in 1991/92, and 11 in 1995/96. They had all been involved in the care of patients who were dying, but with different levels of training in different aspects of palliative care. Over the eight-year period, the proportion of trainees who felt that the training they had received was adequate had increased from 17% to 55%. However, the responses to the question on symptom control had not improved, and in many cases had deteriorated. Although a majority of the GP registrars knew of the frequency of administration of morphine, fewer trainees were aware that there was no maximum dose of morphine, and only 36% could correctly convert oral morphine to parenteral diamorphine.

This small study shows that, although there may be increased training in palliative care, this may not always lead to an increased knowledge of the principles of symptom control. There is a need to consider the training of GP registrars and other junior doctors, including the possibility of an attachment to a hospice unit,[3] and to ensure that all training is evaluated so that it is as effective as possible in increasing the knowledge of GPs in this important area of patient and family care.

DAVID OLIVER

The Wisdom Hospice
St Williams Way
Rochester
Kent ME1 2NU

References

1. Barclay S, Todd C, Grande G, Lipscombe J. How common is medical training in palliative care? A postal survey of general practitioners. *Br J Gen Prac* 1997; **47:** 800-805.
2. Oliver D. Training in and knowledge of terminal care in medical students and junior doctors. *Palliat Med* 1989; **3:** 293-297.
3. Lloyd-Williams M. Palliative care teaching and the vocational trainee. *Palliat Med* 1996; **10:** 80-81.