management by health professionals hindered by a 'language barrier'.5

Peter Campion,

Emeritus Professor of Primary Care Medicine, University of Hull. E-mail: P.D.Campion@hull.ac.uk

REFERENCES

- Seale C, Rivas C, Kelly M. The challenge of communication in interpreted consultations in diabetes care: a mixed methods study. Br J Gen Pract 2013; DOI: 10.3399/bjqp13X663082.
- Burnett A. Meeting the health needs of refugee and asylum seekers in the UK an information and resource pack for health workers. London: Department of Health, 2002. http://webarchive. nationalarchives.gov.uk/+/www.dh.gov.uk/ en/Publicationsandstatistics/Publications/ PublicationsPolicyAndGuidance/DH_4010199 (accessed 29 Apr 2013).
- 3. Department of Health, Equality and Human Rights Group. Guidance on developing local communication support services and strategies. London: DoH, 2004. http://www.dh.gov.uk/prod_ consum_dh/groups/dh_digitalassets/@dh/@en/ documents/digitalasset/dh_4082350.pdf (accessed 29 Apr 2013).
- 4. Tribe R. Asylum 4: working with interpreters. The Psychologist 2007; 20(3): 159-161.
- 5. Kai J. Enhancing consultations with interpreters: learning more about how. Br J Gen Pract 2013; **63(607):** 66-67.

DOI: 10.3399/bjgp13X668069

Don't shoot the messenger: the problem of whistleblowing in general practice

We agree that there are unique problems for GPs in whistleblowing.1 However, over 5 years we found whistleblowing on 43 occasions (42% of the total) to be the commonest presentation of clinical poor performance in our district.2 We attribute this to having experienced people available locally who are trusted to handle concerns seriously, confidentially, and discretely.

Although action is needed to enhance whistleblowing, this must be accompanied by annual reporting of numbers of whistleblowing incidents in each district so that we may know whether there are indeed trusted people available everywhere. The lessons of several national inquiries must not be lost during times of major NHS changes.

Steve Cox,

GP, St Helens, Merseyside, WN4 0XD. E-mail: Steve.cox@sthelensccg.nhs.uk

John Holden,

GP, St Helens, Merseyside, WN4 0XD.

REFERENCES

- 1. Mathers N, Sillitoe L. Don't shoot the messenger: the problem of whistleblowing in general practice. Br J Gen Pract 2013; DOI: 10.3399/bjgp13X665459.
- 2. Cox SJ, Holden JD. Presentation and outcome of clinical poor performance in one health district over a five-year period: 2002-2007. Br J Gen Pract 2009; 59(562): 344-348.

DOI: 10.3399/bjgp13X668050

Sharing control of appointment length with patients in general practice

We read with great interest the excellent recent paper by Sampson et al1 and note their finding that doctors and patients still shared concern about the accuracy with which patients can judge their own consultation length.^{2,3,4}

We recently examined patients' ability to choose between 10- and 20-minute appointment lengths. For 1 week patients were routinely asked whether they would like an appointment of 10 or 20 minutes, 10 minutes being the standard length. Appointment times were measured from the time the doctor went to fetch the patient until the patient left the consulting room.

A total of 101 consultations were studied. and of these, 91 patients requested a 10-minute consultation and 10 (10%) requested 20 minutes. Of patients choosing a consultation length of 10 minutes, consultations lasted a mean of 11.24 minutes (median 11.1, minutes, range 2-33 minutes). Of patients choosing 20 minutes, consultations lasted a mean of 18.14 minutes (median 18, range 6.47-24 minutes). Our study was carried out in a single practice and conducted by researchers who were the GPs of the participating patients, and there was no attempt at blinding, so that doctor knowledge of the consultation rate could have altered the length of consultations. Nevertheless, our findings add to the evidence base that patients are capable of choosing a consultation length of either 10 or 20 minutes with a reasonable degree of accuracy.

We would also like to emphasise the difference between consultation length (that is, time between patient being called/ entering and leaving the consultation room) and consultation frequency (time between one patient entering and the next patient entering, or number of patients booked per hour). Reading records before a patient enters and writing up the previous patient's records takes at least 2 minutes. In our practice patients are booked at a rate of five per hour, which we feel equates to a consultation length of 10 minutes. Our findings support previous suggestions that patients are able predict their consultation length, and suggest that only 10% of patients request a longer consultation, and also the recent BJGP editorial questioning the appropriateness of the 10-minute consultation.⁵ We also call for some consistency of definition of appointment length, as opposed to consultation frequency.

Robert Lambourn,

GP. Wooler. Northumberland. E-mail: robert.lambourn@gmail.com

Joanne Richardson,

ST3 GPStR, Wooler, Northumberland.

Elizabeth Batley,

GP, Wooler, Northumberland.

Caroline Douglas,

Practice Manager, Wooler, Northumberland.

REFERENCES

- Sampson R, O'Rourke J, Hendry R, et al. Sharing control of appointment length with patients in general practice: a qualitative study. Br J Gen Pract 2013; DOI: 10.3399/bjgp 13X664234.
- Harrison AT. Appointment systems: feasibility of a new approach. Br Med J (Clin Res Ed) 1988; **294(6585):** 1465-1466.
- 3. Lowenthal L, Bingham E. Length of consultation: how well do patients choose? JR Coll Gen Pract 1987; **37(304):** 498-499.
- Lambourn R. Can patients choose appointment length? Br J Gen Pract 2003; 53(497): 969-970.
- Silverman J, Kinnersley P. Calling time on the 10-minute consultation. Br J Gen Pract 2012; **62(596):** 118-119.

DOI: 10.3399/bjgp13X668096