All letters are subject to editing and may be shortened. General letters can be sent to bjgpdisc@rcgp.org.uk (please include your postal address for publication), and letters responding directly to *BJGP* articles can be submitted online via **eLetters**. We regret we cannot notify authors regarding publication. For submission instructions visit: bjgp.org/letters

Editor's choice

I found Mica Skilton's *Dangerous Idea*¹ published in the February *BJGP* interesting and persuasive in a context of remembering my own inept attempts to interview and examine patients in the late 1960s. The app would have been invaluable to hone some skills before experimenting on patients. However, I don't agree with the conclusion that it would replace the need for patient contact. For the provision of health service to improve, the development of empathy of providers with their patients is essential, and avoiding contact with people early in clinical training won't further that goal. However, if some of the wasteful and misdirected patient contact time is diverted to sessions of diversionary therapy or personal care of patients in activities with which a student is familiar, the relationship would benefit both parties. It will impact on the student's understanding and acceptance of people and what it means to be ill through here-and-now issues, which are relevant and focused on the patient's needs.

I have always thought my privilege of a few months employment before starting medicine, as an assistant nurse in a psychiatric institution, was one of the most influential experiences of my career for helping me to absorb the reality of other people's lives which were very different to my own. The other, was 20 years later when I worked for 2 years on a Western Pacific Island.

It's never too late to add to life experience. Good luck in your career.

Robert Craig,
Retired GP with special interest in Psychological Medicine.
E-mail: robertcraig1@bigpond.com

REFERENCE

1. Skilton M. Dangerous Ideas: Virtual GP. *Br J Gen Pract* 2015; DOI: 10.3399/bjgp15X683689.

DOI: 10.3399/bjgp15X683869

GP recruitment and retention

The government still refuses to use the word 'crisis',¹ but I suppose that is not surprising a short time before an election. I am saddened that the College seems to be in some ways acting as a mouthpiece for the Department of Health, by trying to encourage students and postgraduates into a career in general practice; a speciality that currently is broken. Fortunately, our younger colleagues can use social media and get a true picture.

My wife and I both took early retirement from general practice, in our late 50s. The strain of trying to be 'all things to all people' was just getting too much. We were worried that we would start to make mistakes by just having too many balls to juggle.

A number of things have occurred to me: did no one think that scrapping seniority payments would be a disincentive for older GPs to stay on, and that introducing a contract with an open-ended workload for no extra money was unacceptable? The complaints culture takes up too much time and effort for doctors: the GMC is an organisation out of control, which we now find, according to its own report, has been involved in the deaths of at least 28 doctors under investigation. The Retainer Scheme needs a complete overhaul; our practice refused to have retainers as the rules meant we might have to pay redundancy to a retained doctor for all their previous NHS service! GPs have had years of pay cuts now. The CQC is an added burden, and as we see from the recent fiasco over the release of misleading statistics to the public, is not fit for purpose.

Many GPs are using their own strategy now to keep their sanity; 'RLE': Retire, Locum, Emigrate. A senior colleague recently said to me that the government has taken general practice back to the 1960s. What is proposed is too little, too late, but may just possibly make the public think something is being done until the election in May.

John Glasspool,
Barge House, Timsbury, Hampshire.
E-mail: john.glasspool@gmail.com

REFERENCE

1. Jones R. New Year's Resolutions. *Br J Gen Pract* 2015; DOI: 10.3399/bjgp15X682993.

DOI: 10.3399/bjgp15X683881

Patients could provide initial differential diagnoses

The very interesting study by Kostopoulou and colleagues in the January issue¹ highlights the potential value of patients using symptom checkers and handing the results to their doctor at the start of the consultation. This would get over the current technical challenges of a system automatically producing a differential from more complex cases with multiple symptoms.

The study refers to a naturalistic trial of Isabel, a physician-triggered computerised decision support system (CDSS) that showed that junior paediatricians only sought and examined the system's advice 'around 2% of the time'. This study was carried out over 10 years ago in NHS hospitals where access to desktop computers was very poor and the use of mobile devices to access the Internet was almost non-existent. This partly explains the low rate, but the more significant issue relates to the standards set by the senior clinicians. In hospitals where Isabel is used and is easily available, and actively encouraged by senior clinicians setting a standard, we have found that it is accessed in about 10% of cases. CDSS can only be a means to help clinicians practise to a certain standard.

The Kostopoulou study is based on three cases all with just one clinical feature that made it technically easier to generate a differential diagnosis. In reality, many cases would have multiple clinical features that would necessitate a CDSS (such as Isabel) that could handle complex free text queries. The study showed significantly less improvement when the CDSS was provided 'late'. Readers may be interested to know that when we (Isabel) looked at the impact the use of Isabel had on users from

their self-reported views, in 17% of cases the user said they changed their working diagnosis after using Isabel.²

The authors state that randomised CDSS study designs are rare. Readers may, therefore, be interested in two recent such studies carried out by two US medical schools.^{3,4}

Jason Maude,

CEO and Founder, Isabel Healthcare.

E-mail: jason.mauel@isabelhealthcare.com

REFERENCES

1. Kostopoulou O, Rosen A, Round T, *et al*. Early diagnostic suggestions improve accuracy of GPs: a randomised controlled trial using computer-simulated patients. *Br J Gen Pract* 2015; DOI: 10.3399/bjgp15X683161.
2. Knight NB. *The impact on users of a web based diagnosis decision support system*. www.isabelhealthcare.com/pdf/Poster_42x72_2_cme_carle.pdf [accessed 3 Feb 2015].
3. Ames FR, Palazzolo EW, Schwartz BD, Schmid K. *Evaluation of first-year medical student use of a diagnostic decision-making resource*. www.isabelhealthcare.com/pdf/Isabel_Poster_Version_2.pdf [accessed 3 Feb 2015].
4. Carlson J, Tomkowiak J, Morrison J, Rheault W. *Does collaboration lead to fewer diagnostic errors?* www.isabelhealthcare.com/pdf/collaboration_poster_AAMC_5-28-13.pdf [accessed 3 Feb 2015].

DOI: 10.3399/bjgp15X683893

Optimising stroke prevention in patients with atrial fibrillation

We would like to thank Dr McKinnell for his comments on our recent article highlighting

the substantial underutilisation (40%) of oral anticoagulation (OAC) in patients with atrial fibrillation (AF) at risk of stroke managed in general practice.¹

We agree that presentation of HAS-BLED scores in conjunction with CHA2DS2-VASc scores would have been informative but unfortunately the data for some variables (such as, previous bleeding, International Normalised Ratio (INR) values, alcohol intake, and liver function) comprising the HAS-BLED score were not consistently available from electronic records and the GRASP-AF tool does not currently assess bleeding risk; therefore HAS-BLED could not be calculated.

'Contraindication' to anticoagulation has been used very subjectively in primary care and does not necessarily equate only to a high HAS-BLED score (≥ 3). To clarify, a HAS-BLED score of ≥ 3 is NOT a contraindication to OAC and should not be used as a reason to withhold OAC. Instead, modifiable bleeding risks should be addressed (strict blood pressure and INR control, removal of non-essential concomitant antiplatelet therapy/NSAIDs, reduced alcohol consumption if excessive) and patients reviewed more frequently. As it was not possible to calculate the HAS-BLED score we cannot determine whether or not those with a lower risk of bleeding (HAS-BLED score = 2) fell into the 'contraindicated' or 'refused' groups.

Finally, OAC is recommended for all patients with AF with a CHA2DS2-VASc score ≥ 2 and should be considered for males with a CHA2DS2-VASc score = 1;^{2,3} there is a net clinical benefit of OAC with CHA2DS2-VASc score ≥ 1 , regardless of bleeding risk.^{4,5}

Deirdre A Lane,

Senior Lecturer in Cardiovascular Health
University of Birmingham.

E-mail: deirdrelane@nhs.net

Andreas Wolff,

Whinfield Medical Practice, Darlington.

Eduard Shantsila and Gregory Y H Lip,
University of Birmingham Centre for
Cardiovascular Sciences, City Hospital,
Birmingham.

REFERENCES

1. Shantsila E, Wolff A, Lip GYH, Lane DA. Optimising stroke prevention in patients with atrial fibrillation: Application of the GRASP-AF audit tool in a general practice cohort. *Br J Gen Pract* 2015; DOI: 10.3399/bjgp15X683113.
2. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. *Atrial fibrillation: the management of atrial fibrillation*. 2014. <http://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg180> [accessed 3 Feb 2015].
3. Camm AJ, Lip GY, De Caterina R, *et al*. 2012 focused update of the ESC Guidelines for the management of atrial fibrillation: an update of the 2010 ESC Guidelines for the management of atrial fibrillation. Developed with the special contribution of the European Heart Rhythm Association. *Eur Heart J* 2012; **33**(21): 2719–2747.
4. Friberg L, Rosenqvist M, Lip GY. Net clinical benefit of warfarin in patients with atrial fibrillation: a report from the Swedish atrial fibrillation cohort study. *Circulation* 2012; **125**(19): 2298–2307. DOI: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.111.055079.
5. Banerjee A, Lane DA, Torp-Pedersen C, Lip GY. Net clinical benefit of new oral anticoagulants (dabigatran, rivaroxaban, apixaban) versus no treatment in a 'real world' atrial fibrillation population: a modelling analysis based on a nationwide cohort study. *Thromb Haemost* 2012; **107**(3): 584–589.

DOI: 10.3399/bjgp15X683905