Health inequalities in primary care

I was very pleased to read Chris Weatherburn’s reply and to feel that my article may have prompted consideration of some important issues. However, the thought that I may be guilty of ‘vague political rhetoric’ and peddling abstract ideals prompts me to reply. Additionally, and less egotistically, I feel compelled to counter the implication that we, as GPs, are already doing all we can to tackle health inequalities.

Social injustices will not get resolved in the consulting room. However, as I tried to point out, injustices can be exacerbated by our failure to acknowledge social determinants of our patients’ health and behaviour. Or, as Dr Weatherburn more positively suggests, injustices may be ameliorated by efforts to empathise and respond to our patients’ needs. But we can do more than that. Outside the clinic, the RCGP can advocate politically, commissioners can maintain this issue on their agenda, and researchers can provide evidence for decision-makers. The rest of us would do well to consider our own values and priorities, for, to a considerable extent, we are prepared to put social justice before self-interest.

Events this year have not been encouraging.

In March, Julian Tudor Hart had to remind us that progressive taxation was a fairer way of funding the health service than means-tested patient charges (co-payments).

In May, Alan Milburn highlighted the palpable unfairness ‘limiting access to careers in medicine for people from poor backgrounds’. Medicine has made far too little progress and shown far too little interest in the issue of fair access,’ he said, warning of a society of ‘entrenched palpable unfairness’ limiting access to health care careers.

In June, the BMA’s strike action prompted The Daily Telegraph to cynically quote back to us the words of RCGP President Iona Heath: ‘Dr Heath has written [that] people motivated by “economic self-interest” are “indifferent to the fate of others”. I wonder whether she will be going on strike...’

As members of a profession committed to improving people’s wellbeing I feel certain that we are capable of making more positive contributions toward resolving health and wealth inequities in the future. My article was intended to prompt discussion rather than to claim to define solutions. Nonetheless, it is apparent to me that while the problem of wealth and health inequality worsens, any amount of complacency is not an answer.

Andrew Moscrop,
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Possible increased potency of current levothyroxine

Last year one brand of generic thyroxine marketed by Teva was withdrawn by the MHRA. This followed reports of concerns about its effectiveness, including those highlighted by the Vision users group. Since then we have seen an increase in patients with abnormally high T4 levels and suppressed TSH levels in our practice.

An audit comparing thyroid results last year when Teva thyroxine was available and the present time shows a significant rise in T4 levels in some patients who have remained on the same dose of thyroxine throughout.

There may be several reasons for this, including increased potency of current generic thyroxine, changes in concordance, changes in drug interactions, and changes in laboratory testing.

Maria Khan,
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Hypertension

With the latest update in NICE hypertension guidelines and health and safety concerns with the use of mercury, electronic sphygmomanometers are now very widespread for the detection, diagnosis and monitoring of raised blood pressure. At our recent annual recalibration check, seven electronic sphygmomanometers were checked in The Project Surgery against a standard mercury column. Five were found to be within ‘acceptable’ tolerance of +/-5 mmHg of true at 100 and 200 mmHg, and two were found to be unacceptably inaccurate, one at 8% inaccurate and one 13% inaccurate and were replaced.

Given that therapeutic choices are made on very small changes on blood pressure reading, and we are invited by NICE to use unmaintained home blood pressure monitoring in diagnosis, even small systemic errors in manometer calibration can have a huge impact on individual patient care.

The only universally accurate manometer one can use to measure blood pressure is a mercury column. Until such time as gravity changes a vertical column of 100 mm of mercury will always be 100 mmHg. On our automated machines before their annual check what was said to be 100 mmHg could have been anything from 92 to 113 mmHg. How can I advise patients when the basic data is so poor? Even the so-called ‘accurate’ machines can be 5 mmHg out.

I wonder if in our rush to electronic devices we have sacrificed accuracy in favour of convenience. If one adds to this issues around monitors usually being supplied with a ‘standard’ cuff which is too small for the standard UK arm, and automated sphygmomanometers being unsuitable to detect pre-eclampsia or use in atrial fibrillation, is it now time for a rethink our basic surgery equipment? Is the need for a mercury spillage kit too high a price to pay for correct data?

Petre Jones, MRCGP, FAcMEd, GP, Trainer, Associate Director of Postgraduate GP Education, The Project Surgery, 10 Lettsom Walk, Piastown, E13 0LN.

Audit awareness among practices

As a past co-chair of Quality Practice Award I have read many submissions from practices where the criterion requested has been to carry out an audit. I have been continually surprised by the lack of awareness of basic audit methodology demonstrated by these practices aspiring to this gold standard award. This is especially concerning as the ability to carry out a full audit once every 5 years is a requirement for revalidation.

There was a very large range of posters at the recent RCGP conference in Glasgow that were placed into categories. One such category was ‘audit’. Being aware of the poor awareness of audit methodology among QPA candidate practices, I decided to do an audit of the posters in the ‘audit’ category.

Criterion 1. An audit should have clear criteria and standards described.

Standard: 100%

Criterion 2. An audit should have a second data collection to show whether change has been successful or not.

Standard: 100%

Data collection 1 October 2012

There were 18 posters in the ‘Audit’ category.

Criterion 1. Of the 18 posters, seven (39%) described criteria and standards (this was allowing as a positive result, any attempt to state the aspect of good practice being measured, and a level of achievement towards that aspect even if the words ‘criteria’ and ‘standards’ were not used).

Criterion 2. Of the 18 posters, only three (17%) went as far as providing a second data collection.

Analysis of data collection 1

Most of the posters were surveys and, although describing interesting pieces of work, were not audits. These had been wrongly classified as audits for the conference. Does this indicate a lack of audit awareness among those in the RCGP responsible for the poster display?

Change

There needs to be much more learning about audit methodology and that this needs to be across the entire primary care workforce. We could find audit to be a major issue for revalidation if this is not addressed. Of course, my audit fails my own test of being an audit as I have not enacted change personally. But I do look forward to the Data Collection 2 in Harrogate next autumn.

Ken McLean, Carronbank Medical Practice, Denny, Stirlingshire, FK6 6GD.

E-mail: x@btinternet.com

DOI: 10.3399/bjgp12X659222

Corrections

The author list was incomplete in the article: Keynejad M et al. Medical ethics debate: access to NHS resources. Br J Gen Pract 2012; DOI: 10.3399/bjgp12X65446. The full author list should have read: Isaac Awalt, Medical Student, King’s College London; Guy Bower, Medical student, St George’s University of London; Roxanne Keynejad, Foundation Year 1 Doctor, St Helier Hospital; Vongai Madanire, Medical student, St George’s University of London; Alice Michell, Medical student, St George’s University of London; Daniel Thompson, Medical student, King’s College London; Mark Yao, Medical student, King’s College London.

DOI: 10.3399/bjgp12X654696. The full author list should have read: Isaac Awalt, Medical Student, King’s College London; Guy Bower, Medical student, St George’s University of London; Roxanne Keynejad, Foundation Year 1 Doctor, St Helier Hospital; Vongai Madanire, Medical student, St George’s University of London; Alice Michell, Medical student, St George’s University of London; Daniel Thompson, Medical student, King’s College London; Mark Yao, Medical student, King’s College London.
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The first publication of the following article was not the latest version: Eborall, et al. Influences on the uptake of diabetes screening: a qualitative study in primary care. Br J Gen Pract 2012; DOI: 10.3399/bjgp12X630106. The latest version is now online. We apologise for this error.

DOI: 10.3399/bjgp12X659240