Doctors’ behaviours with antibiotic prescribing

We read the study by Colin P Bradley et al regarding the influence of patient payment on antibiotic prescribing in Irish general practice. The Republic of Ireland is one of three European countries in which antibiotic use in general practice is increasing. Eligibility for Ireland’s primary care services is determined by a means test with General Medical Service (GMS) card holders having access to GP services and medications free of charge. The remainder are private patients who pay a fee to access GP services.

We retrospectively reviewed a 2-week period in September 2011 in a practice with predominantly children and young patients presenting with symptoms that indicated a probable RTI (as in the Bradley et al study). The results were presented to the practice GPs and nurse in October and then a second 2-week period in December 2011 was then reviewed. Our results are shown in the table below.

The representation of GMS and private patients in September and December was approximately equal. Our findings show that there were more RTI presentations in December with less antibiotic prescribing overall, fewer antibiotics were prescribed to private patients in December, and higher use of delayed antibiotic prescribing.

As stated in many articles including the Bradley study, there are many external non-clinical factors that influence GPs prescribing such as patient’s expectations, time constraints, patient volume, and mode of remuneration. Our brief audit demonstrates that doctors’ behaviour can be changed by the use of data on their prescribing activities. The only intervention between September and December was a presentation of September’s results to the clinical staff. Whether this will be sustained or not will be the subject of another audit.

John Peters,
Littlepace Medical Centre, Dublin 15, Ireland.

Claire Young,
Littlepace Medical Centre, Dublin 15, Ireland. E-mail: iclaireyoung@yahoo.ca

Tom O’Dowd,
Public Health and Primary Care, School of Medicine, Trinity College Dublin, Ireland.

REFERENCES

DOI: 10.3399/bjgp12X648990

Situating general practice training in the general practice context

While I understand and agree with the long-term aim of increasing training time in the GP setting for GP trainees, I am unable to agree with some of the conclusions drawn by Goldie and Morrison.

First, the training received in hospitals by GP trainees does not occur in isolation from the general practice setting. Within our vocational training scheme for example, during the time that our trainees are in their hospital placements our main focus is on putting their experiences into the general practice context. Furthermore, in our local deanery, all trainees do 6 months in GP practices prior to their final ST3 year, and this means that members of each small group are grounded with the perspective of the world they are preparing to enter. The socialisation and cohesiveness of the STs within their small group of GP trainees seems much more important than the more transient bonds formed while on hospital placements.

Second, obstetrics aside, I am sure that there is benefit to be gained by training in many hospital jobs as it allows the building of more specialist knowledge in commonly encountered general practice problems, for instance in sexual health, ENT, or dermatology. This knowledge is subsequently disseminated through peer learning to other members of their vocational training scheme small group and to the practices they work in later.

Finally, quality assurance of hospital posts means that the hospital leads for all our jobs are visited on a rolling cycle. We discuss with our hospital colleagues how our trainees can make the most of their time in hospital training experiencing, for instance, following a patient through a primary to secondary to primary care journey, understanding what makes a good referral from the hospital point of view, and viewing the primary care interface from the secondary care perspective. Given that commissioning is likely to lead to a more focused examination of the grey area between what can be done in primary or secondary care, fully understanding the boundary from all sides is likely to put us in a much stronger position to be able to manage it to the profession’s best advantage.

Leaving aside the economic and logistical arguments of how to base training fully in primary care, arranging service provision in hospitals, or longer training in general practice, I strongly support extended training for GP STs within a primary care setting. I would, however, anticipate that an extra completion year in the GP setting after completion of MRCPG would alleviate many of the concerns raised.
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Table. Comparison of consultations for September and December 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter measured</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>December</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% RTI presentations of total consults</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% antibiotics given for RTI</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% delayed antibiotics given for RTI</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% GMS did get antibiotics</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% PP did get antibiotics</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GMS = public patients. PP = private patients.