

they can no longer afford because premiums rise with age. They expect the same service now that they have more need of health care, from the NHS. This may lead to a higher rate of requests for referral to secondary care. It can take a lot of time, patience, and repeated visits to try to educate this group to have more realistic expectations of the service and to keep patients away from unnecessary and expensive secondary care.

In conclusion, we believe that population age, the availability of family support, rurality, and patient expectations may have as much, if not more, of an influence on GP workload as population deprivation. Furthermore, any reduction in GP funding may lead to an inadequate gatekeeper role and increased use of expensive secondary care. We're all GPs and we're all in at the deep end paddling hard to keep afloat.

**Karen Steven,**

GP, Monifieth Medical Practice, Victoria Street, Monifieth, Angus DD5 4LX.  
E-mail: karen@arnhall.eclipse.co.uk.

**Catherine Jackson,**

Professor of Primary Care Medicine and Director of Clinical Studies, University of St Andrews, Fife.

**REFERENCES**

1. Watt G. GPs at the Deep End. *Br J Gen Pract* 2011; **61**(582): 66–67.
2. Salisbury C, Johnson L, Purdy S, et al. Epidemiology and impact of multi-morbidity in primary care: a retrospective cohort study. *Br J Gen Pract* 2011; DOI: 10.3399/bjgp11X548929.

DOI: 10.3399/bjgp11X567216

**Author's response**

What is the NHS for? Steven and Jackson give several examples, based on 'idyllic, rural' north-east Fife, including counselling for patients no longer able to afford private medicine, home visiting across the country miles, providing extra support for older patients whose offspring live far way, and the

general increased needs of older patients.<sup>1</sup>

All these types of issue, variously reflecting needs and demands, can keep GPs busy, but in the same way that the purpose of the NHS is not just to pay staff, neither is it just to be sure that staff are busy.

It is no news to anyone that increasing age is the main driver of consultation rates in general practice, whether in affluent or deprived areas. Successive GP contracts have been weighted to reflect this. But while GPs serving affluent areas have to cope with the multiple morbidity of ageing, GPs serving very deprived areas are dealing with higher levels of multiple morbidity and social complexity at every age after childhood. GP contracts and workload studies have taken little account of this, partly because workload can only increase so much, and after that, both practitioners and patients have to adapt to what is possible. The maldistribution of GP manpower in the UK, that is worse in England than in Scotland, is an established fact and not a hypothesis.<sup>2</sup> The 'Deep End' title implies the consequent depth of unmet need within everyday general practice in deprived areas.

Many of the issues that concern general practice in the Deep End are similar to those affecting all practices, including the challenges of ageing populations. One reason for focusing on the Deep End is that life expectancy is unnecessarily short in very deprived areas, and as Julian Tudor Hart has shown, well-organised, mainstream general practice can make an important difference. General practice could be better supported to improve health and narrow health inequalities in very deprived areas — not just a 'laudable aim', but a major policy objective of all political parties. This is not the only purpose of the NHS, as Dr Steven and Professor Jackson describe, but the case deserves a hearing, and respect.

**Graham Watt,**

Professor of General Practice, University of Glasgow, on behalf of the Deep End Steering Group.  
E-mail: Graham.Watt@glasgow.ac.uk

**REFERENCES**

1. Steven K, Jackson C. GPs at the Deep End [letter]. *Br J Gen Pract* 2011; **61**(585): 293–294.
2. House of Commons Committee of Public Accounts. *Tackling inequalities in life expectancy in areas with the worst health and deprivation. Third Report of Session 2010–2011.* HC 470. London: The Stationery Office.

DOI: 10.3399/bjgp11X567225

**Asymptomatic COPD and NICE guidelines**

The continuing discrepancy between national and international guidance is unhelpful for patients, doctors, policy makers, and researchers because the Global initiative for chronic Obstructive Lung Disease (GOLD) does not require the presence of subjective symptoms (cough, sputum production, shortness of breath), whereas NICE guidance states that symptoms are a requirement for diagnosis and classification of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD).<sup>1</sup> Why does the National Institute of Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE) persist with this discrepancy when there is substantial evidence that reported symptoms are unreliable for diagnosis?

For example, among 5000 people from those included in the Third National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey in the US, 70% of those with undiagnosed early airways obstruction, and up to 50% of undiagnosed stage 3 chronic obstructive pulmonary disease denied having cough or phlegm, and 40% denied a wheeze.<sup>1</sup> A longitudinal study of over 2000 patients with COPD, from 12 countries, found that 'among subjects with severe airflow obstruction, a substantial proportion did not report symptoms'. About 40% of those in the GOLD severe category denied being breathless (modified MRC dyspnoea scale 0 [10%] or 1 [30%]).<sup>2</sup> Likewise, among a large population survey in China of 20 000 people over 40 years of age, 8% were found to have COPD of whom 35% had no symptoms (they said 'no' to the questions: 'do you have cough, phlegm,

wheeze, or breathlessness?').<sup>3</sup>

In the UK, there are a total of over 800 000 (prevalence 1.5%) people on general practice COPD registers (Quality and Outcomes Framework data).<sup>4</sup>

However, cross-sectional studies and extrapolation of data indicate that the actual prevalence should be nearer to 4%. More than half of the people with COPD are currently not identified.<sup>5,6</sup> The main conclusion is that symptoms are unreliable and the availability of spirometry for all those at risk remains the only way to identify those missing millions.

Until NICE comes fully into line within criteria for diagnosis and is prepared to ignore unreliable subjective symptom scoring, then these figures are unlikely to improve and a state of confusion and uncertainty will remain.

**Gary Parkes,**

GP/Researcher, *The Limes Surgery, Hoddesdon, Herts.*

E-mail: parkesko@hotmail.co.uk

## REFERENCES

- O'Reilly J, Jones MM, Parnham J, *et al.* Management of stable chronic obstructive pulmonary disease in primary and secondary care: summary of updated NICE guidance. *BMJ* 2010; **340**: c3134.
- Agusti A, Calverley PM, Celli B, *et al.* Characterisation of COPD heterogeneity in the ECLIPSE cohort. *Respir Res* 2010; **11**: 122.
- Lu M, Yao WZ, Zhong NS, *et al.* Asymptomatic patients of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease in China. *Chin Med J (Engl)* 2010; **123**(12): 1494–1499.
- NHS. *Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) for April 2008 — March 2009, England numbers on QOF disease registers and raw prevalence rates, England.* <http://www.ic.nhs.uk/> (accessed 15 Feb 2011).
- Van Schayck CP, Loozen JMC, Wagena E, *et al.* Detecting patients at a high risk of developing chronic obstructive pulmonary disease in general practice: cross sectional case finding study. *BMJ* 2002; **324**(7350): 1370.
- Shahab L, Jarvis MJ, Britton J, West R. Prevalence, diagnosis and relation to tobacco dependence of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease in a nationally representative population sample. *Thorax* 2006; **61**(12): 1043–1047.

DOI: 10.3399/bjgp11X567234

## Screening for atrial fibrillation

I was reading with interest the article of Lewis *et al* about the use of a new gadget

for the detection of atrial fibrillation in general practice.<sup>1</sup> The diagnosis of atrial fibrillation is very important, but do we need to invest in further instruments to screen for atrial fibrillation?

I think a cardiac auscultation should be part of a consultation, especially in the high older risk group. I diagnosed people in their 50s with atrial fibrillation who consulted me for their phimosis or for losing weight. Initially amused about the cardiac auscultation they were very thankful when I explained that their heart rhythm, if not treated, could cause serious problems in the future, for example, stroke.

Despite having had several consultations as a patient with several GPs in my life, no one checked my blood pressure or did auscultate my heart as yet (despite me being in my 50s). We have to come back to the physical examination that is more cost-effective and a quick screening tool when it is combined with prior adequate training and clinical reasoning. Not only are rhythm disturbances important, but structural heart disease can be asymptomatic, for example, in aortic regurgitation, despite being a serious cardiac abnormality.

Normal physical examination can exclude valvular regurgitation in asymptomatic patients, and no echocardiogram is necessary. If GP colleagues feel rusty regarding cardiac auscultation there are very good websites available to update oneself with murmurs and rhythms, or one could sit in with a cardiology colleague. One good heart sound tutorial, that is available free on the internet is 'Blaufuss Multimedia — Heart Sounds and Cardiac Arrhythmias'.<sup>2</sup>

I hope that we are all listening to the patient more. This is not meant only for the soul, but applies to the body as well.

**Bernard Klemenz,**

*Northern Road Surgery, 56 Northern Road, Cosham, PO6 3DS.*

E-mail: bernard@doctors.org.uk

## REFERENCES

- Lewis M, Parker D, Weston C, Bowes M. Screening for

atrial fibrillation; sensitivity and specificity of a new methodology. *Br J Gen Pract* 2011; **61**(582): 38–39.

- Blaufuss A. *Cardiac examinations/heart sounds.* <http://www.blaufuss.org/> (accessed 7 Mar 2011).

DOI: 10.3399/bjgp11X567243

## Integrated medicine

Brien *et al* interviewed 35 patients who were using complementary and alternative medicine (CAM) in parallel with orthodox medicine.<sup>1</sup> They state that 'there has been no direct research into how individuals use CAM and OM (orthodox medicine) in relation to each other ...'. This may not be entirely correct. In 1997, we published a survey of 3384 arthritis sufferers and analysed the data of 496 patients using both orthodox medicine and CAM.<sup>2</sup> Our results suggested that orthodox medicine was generally perceived as more effective but the therapeutic encounters with providers of CAM were perceived as more satisfying. For instance, 64% of patients felt that CAM clinicians spent enough time with them, while, for orthodox doctors, the figure was only 45%. Brien *et al* show that, predictably, patients use CAM and orthodox medicine in 'different ways'. I suggest that our 1997 findings<sup>2</sup> go some way in explaining why.

**Edzard Ernst,**

*Peninsula Medical School, Exeter.*

E-mail: ernst@pms.ac.uk

## REFERENCES

- Brien SB, Bishop FL, Riggs K, *et al.* Integrated medicine in the management of chronic illness: a qualitative study. *Br J Gen Pract* 2010; DOI: 10.3399/bjgp11X556254
- Resch KL, Hill S, Ernst E. Use of complementary therapies by individuals with 'arthritis'. *Clin Rheumatol* 1997; **16**(4): 391–395.

DOI: 10.3399/bjgp11X567252

## Medical migrants

The article by Simpson and Esmail in the