

# Letters

The *BJGP* welcomes letters of no more than 400 words, particularly when responding to material we have published. Send them electronically to [jhowlett@rcgp.org.uk](mailto:jhowlett@rcgp.org.uk), and include your postal address and job title, or if that's impossible, by post. We cannot publish all the letters we receive, and long ones are likely to be cut. Authors should declare competing interests.

## The challenge of recruiting people with schizophrenia to trials

We appreciated the article by Abbott *et al* for its honest discussion of difficulties encountered with recruiting participants to trials.<sup>1</sup> We have also learnt much from studies with people who have a diagnosis of schizophrenia, which we would like to share. What appeared to encourage recruitment and retention was:

- service users with direct experience of schizophrenia helped to design the study and patient information leaflets and helped recruit and train researchers who interviewed patients;
- practitioners welcomed the study and clearly introduced the study to their patients;
- researchers had past or current experience of using services themselves. This can allay people's fears about being judged or bullied, especially if paranoid;
- repeated attempts were made to contact homeless people and those who were hard to reach and we asked relatives and staff to help us make contact;
- emphasis was put on the participants' role of assisting us with research in order to help future patients, rather than expectations of benefit from the intervention being tested;
- participants were reassured that those in the control group would still be interviewed regularly by the researchers, thus maintaining the social contact.
- at the end of the interview participants were given positive feedback so that they were not left feeling they had failed some test;

- participants were thanked for their time spent completing each research interview with a £10 shopping voucher;
- as well as the repeated assessments every 3 months, contact was maintained throughout the 12 months with a newsletter and cards at Christmas time.

Similar to the study reported by Abbott *et al*, our studies used occupational therapy researchers and has included primary care based work.<sup>2</sup> In our current pilot randomised controlled trial of occupational therapy for people with psychosis: 50 people were referred by care coordinators; 44 consented; the maximum number of visits to gain informed consent and complete the baseline assessment was four; all those randomised to the experimental intervention have engaged with treatment; and near the end of the 18-month study only two have dropped out of the research. What is different however, and may have made recruitment easier, is that our studies have just focused on mental health and functioning in self-care, leisure, work and relationships. They have not focused on physical health or healthy lifestyles. We agree with the authors that combining these topics with mental health may not be welcomed by potential research participants and require a great deal of sensitivity and consultation.

**Sarah Cook**  
**Eleni Chambers**  
**Julie Coleman**  
**Melanie Hart**

*Institute of General Practice,  
The School of Health and Related  
Research, University Of Sheffield*  
E-mail: [s.cook@sheffield.ac.uk](mailto:s.cook@sheffield.ac.uk)

## REFERENCE

1. Abbott M, Arthur A, Walker L, Doody G. The challenge of recruiting people with schizophrenia to a health promotion trial. *Br J Gen Pract* 2005; 55: 634–636.

2. Cook S, Howe A. Engaging people with enduring psychotic conditions in primary mental health care and occupational therapy. *British Journal of Occupational Therapy* 2003; 66(6): 236–246.

## Referrals for cataract and Action on cataracts, evidence-based guidelines

The most common referrals made to ophthalmology units are for cataract with the majority of patients referred from the optometrist via the GP.<sup>1–3</sup> Increasingly we have direct referral from optometrists. We audited our referrals for cataract to assess the information included in the referrals and the outcomes in terms of listing for surgery and reasons for not listing.

We received 412 cataract referrals over a 2-month period, of which 15% ( $n = 62$ ) were referred by the GP. Our 'gold standard' for information was taken from the document *Action on cataracts*,<sup>4</sup> in which recommendations were made that cataract was the cause of visual loss, that this visual loss resulted in a detrimental effect on the patients lifestyle and the patient was willing to have surgery. The 'gold standard' was reached in 9.7% of referrals from GPs, 8.1% only included willingness for surgery, 3.2% only included effect on lifestyle and 79% just stated the presence of cataract. The overall listing rate for GP referrals was 72.5%. Analysing the full data set of referrals revealed that referrals containing the 'gold standard' information resulted in higher listing rates (85.2% [ $P = 0.029$ ]) compared to referrals just stating the presence of cataract (75.8% [ $P = 0.716$ ]).

Of the 17 GP referred patients not listed, the most common reasons were patient declining surgery (41% [ $n = 7$ ]) and no effect on lifestyle (29% [ $n = 5$ ]). These results were consistent with the full data

set with no effect on lifestyle accounting for 41.5% ( $n = 32$ ) and a further 9.1% ( $n = 7$ ) of patients declining surgery. Other ocular pathology including macular degeneration 14% ( $n = 11$ ) and glaucoma 5% ( $n = 4$ ) accounted for relatively few patients not being listed for surgery.

GPs do not generally have access to slit lamps and fundus biomicroscopy and understandably may feel out of their depth. However, we have shown that when assessing the patient with cataract it is important to assess the effect on the patient's lifestyle and their willingness for surgery before referral, and would encourage all GPs to do this to reduce the number of patients referred prematurely for their cataract operation.

#### Stephen C Lash

Specialist Registrar, The Royal Bournemouth Hospital  
E-mail: stevelash@doctors.org.uk

#### Catherine Prendiville

Senior House Officer, The Royal Bournemouth Hospital

#### REFERENCES

1. Lash SC. Assessment of information included on the GOS 18 referral form used by optometrists. *Ophthalmic Physiol Opt* 2003; **23**(1): 21–23.
2. Pooley JE, Frost EC. Optometrists' referrals to the hospital eye service. *Ophthalmic Physiol Opt* 1999; **19** Suppl 1: S16–S24.
3. Desai P, Reidy A, Minassian DC. Profile of patients presenting for cataract surgery in the UK: national data collection. *Br J Ophthalmol* 1999; **83**: 893–896.
4. NHS Executive. *Action on cataracts: good practice guidance*. London: Department of Health, 2000. [www.dh.gov.uk/assetRoot/04/01/45/14/04014514.pdf](http://www.dh.gov.uk/assetRoot/04/01/45/14/04014514.pdf) (accessed 9 November 2005.)

## Should GPs be prescribing more vitamin D?

The problem of rickets and osteomalacia among the immigrant community living in Britain was first highlighted in 1962.<sup>1</sup> More recent studies suggest that this problem persists.

Lawson and Thomas found suboptimal vitamin D levels in 20–34% of toddlers of Asian origin.<sup>2</sup> Shaw and Pal found that 85% of patients of Asian origin attending Birmingham antenatal clinics were vitamin D deficient in winter months<sup>3</sup> and Datta *et al* found that 50% of non-

white patients attending antenatal clinics in South Wales had low vitamin D levels.<sup>4</sup>

Although supplementation of infants from racial groups is recommended, a previous study found that this occurred in less than 5% of infants.<sup>5</sup> The problem is complicated by recent NICE guidelines, which do not recommend vitamin D supplements for pregnant women.<sup>6</sup>

We undertook a postal and face-to-face questionnaire among practices in the Thames Valley area and Lambeth (this London area was chosen as their PCT has a policy of encouraging vitamin D supplementation of infants with dark skin).

Practices were asked whether they prescribed vitamin D supplements to pregnant women of Asian or African–Caribbean extraction and their infants. They were also asked to state if the approximate percentage of Asian or African–Caribbean patients was above or below 8%.

There was a 71.2% response to the 73 questionnaires sent out. In addition, 11 practices were asked face to face. Thirty-eight (67.9%) practices stated that their population was above 8% Asian or African–Caribbean (two practices did not specify).

Only two (3.4%) of the practices stated that they supplemented and this was for infants and not the mothers. Both of these practices were in Lambeth.

We were surprised at the low level of supplementation. It may be that in addition the health visitors in these practices are also prescribing vitamin D.

The recent CMO update has reiterated the need for vitamin D supplementation.<sup>7</sup>

We would recommend that a publicity campaign be started to encourage vitamin D supplementation.

#### David Metson

GP, Easthampstead Surgery,  
Bracknell RG12 7BB  
E-mail: david.metson@gp-k81087.nhs.uk

1. Dunnigan MG, Paton JJP, Haase S, *et al*. Prevention of rickets in Asian children: assessment of Glasgow campaign. *Scott Med J* 1962; **7**: 159.
2. Lawson M, Thomas M. Vitamin D concentrations in Asian children living in England: population survey *BMJ* 1999; **318**: 28.
3. Shaw NJ, Pal BR. Vitamin D deficiency in UK Asian families: activating a new concern. *Arch Dis Child* 2002; **86**: 147–149.

4. Datta S, Dunstan F, Woodhead S, *et al*. Vitamin D deficiency is very common in pregnant non-European ethnic minority women. *Arch Dis Child* 1999; **80**(suppl 1): A66.
5. Gregory JR, Collins DLD. *Report of the diet and nutrition survey*. London: HMSO, 1995.
6. National Collaborating Centre for Women's and Children's Health, NHS. *Antenatal care: routine care for the healthy pregnant woman*. London: NICE, 2003.
7. Anonymous. Meeting the need for vitamin D. *CMO Update* Summer 2005; **42**: 6.

## Continuing care

A recent edition of *SAGA Magazine* follows newspaper and television campaigns providing material about NHS funding for continuing care.<sup>1</sup>

While applauding the media's raising of awareness about the opportunity to capture the full care costs (whether in a nursing home, residential home, sheltered accommodation or the individual's own home), inadequate coverage has been given to the requirement that the person's condition must be complex, intensive, unpredictable or unstable enough to meet the criteria for the funding from the government. Individuals may not meet the criteria laid down by the relevant strategic health authority — either by dint of their mental condition, or their physical condition, or a combination of the two — it is regrettable that families' hopes may have been raised inappropriately.

In the absence (so far) of national criteria, it would be worthwhile for GPs to obtain the continuing care criteria from their strategic health authority. They will then see the detail that describes the necessary complexity, intensity, instability or unpredictability of a patient's condition.

From time to time, families pursue their case about their relative stating that the patient's GP has assured them that the criteria are met. While this may sometimes be a robust opinion, regrettably it is not always so. The task of the local panels assessing applications, and the subsequent review panels at strategic health authority level (the 'second bite of the cherry') is therefore made more complicated, if after careful and sympathetic consideration, the individual's condition falls short of fulfilling the criteria.

As chairman of two Strategic Health Authorities' Review Panels, I recognise that people will only hear what they