

closer integration really understand the functions of primary and secondary care. Certainly, there is little evidence that Honigsbaum,<sup>2</sup> really grasped the role of the generalist, although earlier commentators, such as Margaret Stevens,<sup>3</sup> seemed to have more insight into the issues. I suspect that advocates of integration see the two sectors as existing on a single continuum, with primary care at the 'simple task' end of the production line and hospital-based care at the 'complex task' end. This world view dictates that closer integration is a desirable task and an easy one to undertake.

I think that this stance represents a fundamental misunderstanding of the complementarity of the two sectors. Primary care is a philosophically, structurally and functionally distinct part of the health system. The differences are not historical accidents, or examples of professional protectionism. On the contrary, the emphasis that a primary care practitioner places on generalism, holism, coordination and the capacity to deal with uncertainty, benefits patients and the health system in the same way as the specialised, reductionist and episodic modus operandi of the hospital practitioner.

For everyone's benefit, let's celebrate the differences, rather than attempt to eliminate them.

MARTIN N MARSHALL

Professor of General Practice  
National Primary Care Research and  
Development Centre, University of  
Manchester.  
E-mail: martin.marshall@man.ac.uk

### References

1. Jewell D. Learning from Kaiser (part 2). Is integration the answer? *Br J Gen Pract* 2004; **54**: 571-573.
2. Honigsbaum F. *The division in British medicine: a history of the separation of general practice from hospital care 1911-1968*. London: Kogan Page, 1979.
3. Stevens R. *Medical practice in modern England*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1966.

### New concepts in screening

Dr Muir Gray's account of screening ignores possible harmful effects of screening healthy people.<sup>1</sup> Some of

these are obvious, such as the example he cites of perforation of the bowel during colonoscopy. Others are much harder to recognise. For instance, it is difficult to believe that the emphasis on finding disease could not be having an effect on the nation's consciousness of health and suffering. The implicit message is that life is fraught with dangers called diseases, and it's doctors that can help you dodge them. We already live in a health-obsessed, or rather disease-obsessed, over-medicalised culture: any conversation overheard in the high street will tell you that. Combine this with the boredom and stress that also characterises our society and you have a potent cocktail for anxiety focused on disease. We are then in danger of mistaking life for an obstacle course — a process of dodging diseases by having health checks. This is hardly healthy. How much screening and the whole risk factor story contributes to this we cannot know: Dr Muir Gray does call for better knowledge. In the meantime, if we must screen for some of the obstacles on life's journey, it behoves us to place at least equal emphasis on helping people towards a life well lived. Perhaps you ask: is that our job? If our first priority is to do no harm, then it must be.

WILLIAM HOUSE

General Practitioner and Trustee of  
British Holistic Medical Association

DAVID PETERS

General Practitioner and Trustee of  
British Holistic Medical Association,  
St Augustine's Practice, 4 Station  
Road, Keynsham, Bristol BS31 2BN.  
Email: William.house@gp-L81045.nhs.uk

### Reference

1. Gray JAM. New concepts in screening. *Br J Gen Pract* 2004; **54**: 292-298.

### Chlamydia screening in primary care

Pippa Oakeshott recommends referral to genitourinary medicine (GUM) for partner notification,<sup>1</sup> but we would question how feasible this would be in the context of a national chlamydia screening programme. There is much

concern about the long waiting times for GUM appointments<sup>2</sup> so an alternative would be for partner notification to be performed in primary care. Opportunistic screening for chlamydia is routinely performed in this practice.<sup>3</sup> Over a 6-month period a trained health visitor undertook the role of partner notification and results showed that partner notification was completed in 10 out of 11 cases. By contrast, since the service was withdrawn and people had to travel to a GUM department, only 22 out of 40 detected cases received any partner notification. Our conclusion is that partner notification is feasible in primary care if resourced properly.

CAOIMHIN TOBIN

General Practitioner  
White Rose Surgery, South Elmsall,  
West Yorks WF9 2RD.  
E-mail: caoimhin@doctors.org.uk

AMY MAMMEN-TOBIN

Specialist Registrar Genitourinary  
Medicine, Leeds General Infirmary.

### References

1. Oakeshott P. Chlamydia screening in primary care. *Br J Gen Pract* 2004; **54**: 491-493.
2. Adler M. Sexual health. *BMJ* 2003; **327**: 62-63.
3. Tobin C, Aggarwal R, Clarke J. Chlamydia trachomatis: opportunistic screening in primary care. *Br J Gen Pract* 2001; **51**: 565-566.

### Advanced Access

We welcome the recent evaluation of Advanced Access as reported in the Journal.<sup>1</sup> We were interested to read that telephone triage was regarded as the most and the least successful intervention. In our study on telephone triage the practice did not 'advertise' the operation of a triage service.<sup>2</sup> Mostly it was unnecessary to triage patients due to the ready availability of appointments. Only when all available appointments were taken was it necessary to fall back to negotiation with the patient. Had all patients been triaged it is possible that some patients would have made a habit of accessing care by telephone rather than by seeking appointments.

In relation to the impact on older patients we recently surveyed 900 patients receiving telephone consulta-