

questions this may be of little interest but in studies investigating triggers of acute conditions or assessing direct toxic effects of pharmacological agents, timing is important and inconsistencies in the accuracy of an event date could be cause for concern.

In acute conditions (for example, myocardial infarction) with definite event dates, differences between the electronic record and the GP's own notes have a straightforward interpretation of simple errors in the recording of the date. However, when validating the timing of non-acute conditions the authors of validation studies should state whether the GP was asked to provide the date when the index of suspicion was first raised or the date of a definite diagnosis, to enable interpretation of any differences.

The relative lack of data on this aspect of validation and the resulting uncertainty in the timing of acute events highlight the benefits of linkage of the GPRD with other datasets. As discussed in both of our papers, linkage to disease registries could bring additional information with which to validate the diagnosis and its timing. For some conditions this may negate the need to obtain additional information from the GPs that, as we both point out, is expensive and limits the number of patients validated to a selected and potentially unrepresentative group.

Emily L Herrett,

London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, Keppel Street, London, WC1E 7HT. E-mail: emily.herrett@lshtm.ac.uk

Sara L Thomas,

London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London.

Liam Smeeth,

London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London.

REFERENCES

1. Khan NF, Harrison SE, Rose PW. Validity of diagnostic coding within the General Practice Research Database: a systematic review. *Br J Gen Pract* 2010; **60(572)**: e128-136.
2. Herrett E, Thomas SL, Schoonen WM, *et al*. Validation and validity of diagnoses in the General Practice Research Database: a systematic review. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* 2010; **69(1)**: 4-14.

DOI: 10.3399/bjgp11X583092

GPs at the Deep End

I am a GP working in a deprived urban area in Ireland. I would like to express my enormous appreciation of the Deep End series that has been running in the Journal since January. I would describe it as having been thrown a lifeline, if that's not overstretching the analogy. To see one's experience named and, indeed, validated in this way has been very liberating. It must be a bit like a patient with an uncommon illness finding a support group. One of the many insights of the work has been to point out that it is not just governments who do not appreciate the issues, but our own unions, colleges, and indeed GP colleagues.

This was eloquently demonstrated by the letter from Steven and Jackson in the April Journal.¹ This is a critical time for general practice in both the UK and Ireland as funding mechanisms come under review. Here in Ireland the average capitation payment in newer deprived suburban areas is 60% of the norm, because it is based on age (despite the greater than twofold mortality). It would be good to have some tools we could use to accurately describe and quantify the nature of the work, as opposed to the health outcomes that are well documented.

We need to persuade the sources of funding, and society as a whole, that it makes sense to address not just health inequality, but inequality of health service provision.

Edel McGinnity,

Riverside Medical Centre, Mulhuddart, Dublin 15. E-mail: edelmcg@iol.ie

REFERENCE

1. Steven K, Jackson C. GPs at the Deep End. *Br J Gen Pract* 2011; **61(585)**: 293-294.

DOI: 10.3399/bjgp11X583083

GPs' views in five European countries of interventions to promote prudent antibiotic use

The paper by Tonkin-Crine *et al* illustrates

the views of GPs regarding interventions to promote prudent antibiotic use.¹ It was demonstrated that GPs preferred educational meetings where comparison with colleagues reassured them that prudent antibiotic prescribing was possible, and appreciated having evidence-based guidelines to follow.

To follow on from this, if one were to look at the quarter of the population visiting their GP with respiratory tract infections each year, it becomes apparent why a large proportion of antibiotic prescribing is in primary care. Despite guidelines advising against their routine use, in 2000 antibiotics were prescribed to 49% of those with an upper respiratory tract infection (URTI).²

The natural history of an untreated sore throat is resolution by day 3 in 40%, and by day 7 in 85%. Antibiotics reduce the duration of symptoms by just 16 hours, while the number needed to treat to prevent one sore throat at day 3 was fewer than six, at week 1 it was 21.² There is no benefit of antibiotics for the common cold and although there is a protective effect against serious complications³, over 4000 courses are needed to prevent one complication.⁴ In addition, antibiotics cause many side effects, and communities build resistance to them.⁵ Therefore, with insufficient evidence of the benefit to warrant the use of antibiotics, why do GPs continue to prescribe them for the common and uncomplicated URTI?

Possible explanations for varied GP prescribing behaviour is the GPs' own fear of complications developing, along with their lack of certainty in their decision to prescribe.⁶ As patients expect to receive antibiotics,⁷ supported by Tonkin-Crine *et al*, along with 85% of patients believing that antibiotics relieve symptoms,⁸ a further explanation could be that GPs are unwilling to challenge patient health beliefs. As suggested by the GPs involved in Tonkin-Crine *et al*'s article, the use of educational materials for patients with public campaigns could reduce demand.

Therefore, is it ethical to prescribe antibiotics for URIs? If a GP is concerned about complications developing, prescribing antibiotics is aimed to manage the fear within the doctor, rather than to treat the patient. This will expose the patient to unwanted side effects where they ultimately feel worse. In addition, by prescribing antibiotics GPs are increasing patient attendance rates and are using up scarce resources in an already financially stricken NHS, on balance doing more