

REFERENCES

1. Parkes G. Handshakes and spoof publications. *Br J Gen Pract* 2007; 57: 411.
2. Jeffries D. In praise of touch. *Br J Gen Pract* 2007; 57: 80.

QOF vs NICE

As a FHO2 (Foundation Year 2 House Officer) in general practice, I recently performed an audit on smoking cessation practice at my surgery. Naturally I turned to 'Gold Standard' national guidelines to set my audit criteria. However, I was rather disturbed by the discrepancies between the 2006 QOF criteria¹ for monitoring smoking status and management of smokers and the 2006 NICE Public Health Guidance on smoking cessation.²

The NICE guidance is the first public health guidance issued on smoking cessation with the emphasis being on prevention of smoking-related complications. The guidelines advocate the use of 'Brief Interventions' (simple opportunistic advice to stop which can be performed by clinicians across the board) and early referral to smoking cessation services.

Using QOF targets we are currently identifying: 1) smokers, 2) smokers with chronic disease, 3) smokers with chronic disease who get advice/referral. We do not routinely know: 1) the smoking status of all those on GP lists every 15 months, 2) if the smoking status of non-smokers has changed, 3) if smokers without chronic disease are getting advice/being referred/being offered pharmacotherapy. As part of the 2006 guidelines, NICE publish recommended audit criteria which are poorly comparable to the QOF targets but which tackle these shortfalls mentioned. I find this particularly surprising considering that the NICE guidance preceded the publication of the GMS contract.

In the current environment where smoking-related disease, and more specifically, cardiovascular disease, is the number one burden to the NHS, I agree that we need to embrace a more comprehensive set of guidelines for the management of smoking. In order to achieve this goal, however, there needs to be some clarity and stream-lining of guidance between primary care and major clinical governing bodies. I would like to see

accelerated efforts to establish this relationship and encourage a response to this letter from both parties.

Kirsty Short

E-mail: shortiekumpel@aol.com

REFERENCES:

1. BMA. QOF2 Clinical Indicators. *Guidelines in Practice*. May 2006. (Records & Information 22; Asthma 3, 4, 5; Smoking 1, 2) London: BMA, 2006.
2. National Institute of Clinical Excellence (NICE). *Brief interventions and referral for smoking cessation in primary care and other settings. Public health intervention guidance no 1*. London: NICE, 2006.

Computer records

In Scotland, the first step towards a centralised medical database has already occurred. Described as the Emergency Care Summary (ECS), patient consent has been obtained by a single mailing to each household. Using this as an assumption of informed consent, data has been extracted from general practice clinical systems.

We had misgivings about this consent process being adequate. Considering all the options, including the possibility of an 'opt-in' mandate, we decided to mail patients individually to offer an opt-out of this information sharing.

We have so far received 287 opt-out requests for a list size of 1710. For Scotland, there have been a total of 620 opt-outs for a population already included of 5 million. Our figure of 16.5% compares to a national average of 0.01%; a factor 1330 times greater.

Our results question whether the governments' strategies of obtaining consent for the release of such information reflect proper process. Many patients refused because they were unaware that consent to allow data migration had been obtained.

There is still time to evaluate the usage of the ECS to see how often it has been used and to define the benefits of better clinical outcomes. In the final analysis, before we can obtain informed consent for these new and relatively untried programs, we need to understand the benefits for individual patients clinical outcome as well as being clear about the extent of any potential for inappropriate or malicious use of information.

A Gordon Baird

GP, Sandhead Surgery, Sandhead, Wigtownshire DG9 9JA.

E-mail: gordon.baird@nhs.net

C Mary Donnelly

GP, Sandhead Surgery

Developing primary care treatment of depression

Tylee and Walters¹ make a good case for the development of a chronic disease model for the management of depression in primary care. Some of the figures that they quote deserve further comment. It is of concern that between 30 and 50% of patients treated for depression with antidepressants in primary care do not show a response, while only 30% achieve remission. It is also of concern that only 10% of patients on antidepressants complete an adequate course. Finally, it is of concern that 76% of patients with residual symptoms relapse and that 12 months after diagnosis, 45% of patients with severe symptoms remain depressed, and 40% of patients have a relapsing remitting course over a decade. These facts clearly lead up to the statement that 40% of patients with depression are eligible for 'step 4' secondary care interventions.

It is interesting to see how these statements appear to be born out in practice. We work in a community mental health team with a catchment population of 60 000. Out of these, in 10 months 456 patients were seen in the clinic. Of these, 63 had a diagnosis of recurrent depressive disorder, 12 had psychotic depression, 28 had anxiety and depression, 73 were seen for depressive episodes, and 41 had bipolar affective disorder. Although it is clear that depressive illness makes up the bulk of the morbidity which we treat, there is clearly concern that these figures are unlikely to be equivalent to the 40% of depressed patients of our population who are eligible for secondary care services according to the figures quoted by Tylee, hence Tylee is right that many patients who are in fact eligible for treatment in secondary care are in fact treated in primary care.

How, then, are we to treat these patients adequately? Tylee is correct that a 'chronic disease management model could be developed based on the 'step care model', but this must presuppose several developments. Key to such a model must be:

- Adequate standards and guidelines for depression management.
- Adequate ongoing training of GPs and primary care nurses in depression management.
- Adequate arrangements for joint working between primary and secondary care.
- Reshaping of the shared care model in order to take account of modern understanding of the nature of depression and related illnesses.

Some of us have experience of the development of guidelines for the treatment of depression in primary care, and for some, local guideline development has led eventually to national publication.² We have also been involved in developing standards for the delivery of primary care psychiatry throughout Europe,³ which were commissioned by an umbrella organisation of patient groups in order that patients should know what to expect. However, we have also experience that guidelines do not, in themselves, change practice.

Tylee has himself led the way in developing training for primary care teams in the treatment of depression,⁴ but, despite this idea having been taken up by National Institute for Mental Health in England in various 'trailblazer' courses, we are unaware of any major national change in primary care treatment of depression as a result. This is almost certainly because such work is very labour intensive and commissioners have never, to our knowledge, provided the necessary investment. It must be born in mind that Rutz⁵ has shown that educational efforts of this sort must be delivered on an ongoing basis, rather than as a 'one-off' session.

We have designed a system⁶ whereby primary and secondary care collaborated together. A special group of experienced community psychiatric nurses were attached to both primary and secondary teams, so that they could provide a constant link between the professionals of both teams, thus providing the 'consultancy' to primary care requested by

Tylee. Drinkwater⁷ has shown that such a system in Luton provided care which was valued by both GPs and patients, but this team has ceased to exist because of financial stringency. Consistency is needed for such efforts to be successful.

Finally, it is likely that modern concepts of the depression/bipolar spectrum of illness will lead to a change in the stepped care model of depression itself. It is becoming apparent that depression itself is not one illness, but a number of illnesses within the 'bipolar spectrum'.⁸ Such illnesses include both unipolar depression, depression and anxiety, and bipolar illness, including both bipolar I and bipolar II disorder. There are indications emerging that many patients who previously might have been interpreted as 'recurrent depressive disorder' or 'resistant depression' are in fact cases of bipolar II illness. This will have important implications for the choice of treatment. For example, recent discussions regarding increased suicidality of patients on venlafaxine^{9,10} have suggested that this would be a medication which is not the best choice for bipolar II patients, because it may well induce mixed affective states.¹¹ Some mood stabilisers may become important choices in the treatment of such patients. In one study of 300 consecutive patients in an office-based private psychiatric clinic in Italy, 26% were diagnosed with bipolar II, less than 1% bipolar I, 28% depression and anxiety, 9% recurrent depression, and only 4% with major depressive episodes.⁸ If this is the case, we may well be mis-identifying many of our bipolar II patients as being unipolar, thus in part explaining some of the disappointing outcome figures quoted by Tylee. We are currently re-assessing our patients in our community mental health team in order to see if this possibility is true.¹²

Such issues will require a greater sophistication from GPs as regards diagnosis and treatment of depression.

Given all these issues, it should be feasible to develop a primary care chronic disease management model for treating depression. Crucial to this remains time which can be given to careful effort in the assessment of patients, adequate follow up, including help from nurses deployed to

primary care, and the availability of GPs with a special interest in mental health. Such GPs could perform the intermediate role which office-based private psychiatrists provide in Europe, dealing with the patients which Tylee describes as 'falling between steps 3 and 4'. Proper training is required for such doctors, which should be jointly developed by the two Colleges of Psychiatrists and General Practitioners.

Mark Aguis

Bedfordshire Centre for Mental Health
Research and Association with University of
Cambridge. E-mail: Mark.Aguis@blpt.nhs.uk

CL Murphy

Bedfordshire Centre for Mental Health
Research and Association

Alpha Win

Bedfordshire Centre for Mental Health
Research and Association

Rashid Zaman

Bedfordshire Centre for Mental Health
Research and Association

Giuseppe Tavormina

"Psychiatric Studies Centre" Provaglio d'Iseo,
Italy

REFERENCES

1. Tylee A, Walters P. We need a chronic disease management model for depression in primary care. *Br J Gen Pract* 2007; **57**: 348–350.
2. Agius M. Bedfordshire Primary Care Mental Health Guidelines. in PRIMHE Resource Pack, 2003.
3. Agius M, Martic Biocina S, Alptekin K, et al. Basic standards for management of patients with common mental illnesses in primary care. *Psychiatria Danubina* 2005; **17**: 205–221.
4. Singleton A, Tylee A. Continuing medical education in mental illness: a paradox for general practitioners. *Br J Gen Pract* 1996; **46**: 339–341.
5. Rutz W, von Knorring L, Walinder J. Long term effects of an educational program for general practitioners given by the Swedish Committee for the prevention and treatment of depression. *Acta Psychiatr Scand* 1992; **85**: 83–88.
6. Agius M, Butler J. The management of mental health in primary and secondary care. In: Cotterill L, Barr W. *Targeting in mental health — a multidisciplinary challenge*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000: 245–255.
7. Drinkwater S. *Improving mental health liaison in primary care*. Luton: University IHSR, 2003.
8. Angst J. The bipolar spectrum. *Br J Psych* 2007; **190**: 189–191.
9. Cipriani A, Geddes J, Barbui C. Venlafaxine for major depression. *BMJ* 2007; **334**: 215.
10. Rubino A, Roskell N, Tennis P, et al. Risk of suicide during treatment with Venlafaxine, citalopram, fluoxetine and dothiepin: retrospective cohort study. *BMJ* 2007; **334**: 242–245.
11. Smith D, Walters J. Bipolarity is important during treatment with antidepressants. *BMJ* 2007; **334**: 327.
12. Tavormina G, Agius M. A study of the incidence of bipolar spectrum disorders in a private psychiatric practice. *Psychiatria Danubina* [in press].