mandatory submission of FGM statistics by acute trusts [the monthly submission of data by hospitals relating to every case of FGM identified, irrespective of age, to the Department of Health]; and (c) the proposed Enhanced Dataset collection. This matters in an environment where doctors risk prosecution for not reporting appropriately.

GPs should be aware that the proposed Enhanced Dataset contains patient-identifiable information. While GMC guidance states that 'personal information can be disclosed if it is required by law',⁴ the benefits of mandatory data submission do not automatically outweigh the potential harm to the patient-doctor relationship and public trust. Our concern is that without assurance of confidentiality, FGM survivors may avoid seeking medical help in general practice, even for non-gynaecological conditions. Either a greater case needs to be made that this patient-identifiable data will prevent FGM or changes must be made to maintain confidentiality.

The classification of labial or clitoral piercings as Type 4 FGM for the purposes of the monthly statistics adds further confusion.² This has the potential to undermine the validity and purpose of the data, notwithstanding the fact that many members of the general public and FGM survivors may find it objectionable that such piercings be considered equivalent to the crime of FGM.

Lastly, it was wrong for the authors to impugn the trainee in obstetrics and gynaecology recently exonerated of FGM when suturing after childbirth as 'claiming to be ignorant of FGM' as if it were untrue, and without declaring the interest that one author had advised the prosecution. The jury's rapid decision to acquit after hearing all the evidence must be respected. Interestingly, in public discussion the breach of patient confidentiality at the heart of the story seems to have been lost.

While government involvement in FGM prevention is welcome, greater caution is required. Inadequately-considered interventions alongside intrusive surveillance within the doctor-patient relationship have the potential to cause great harm.

Joel Naftalin,
Trainee Representative to RCOG FGM Taskforce, Homerton University Hospital, London.
E-mail: joelnaftalin@hotmail.com

Susan Bewley,
Professor of Complex Obstetrics, King's College London, London.

REFERENCES

1. Mathers N, Rymer J. Mandatory reporting of female genital mutilation by healthcare professionals. *Br J Gen Pract* 2015; DOI:10.3399/bjgp15X685141
2. Health and Social Care Information Centre. *Female Genital Mutilation (FGM) Enhanced Dataset: implementation guidance*. <http://www.hscic.gov.uk/media/16782/2026122014guidance/pdf/2026122014guidance.pdf> (accessed 6 Aug 2015).
3. BBC. Democracy Live. Home Affairs Committee. 6 May 2014. <http://www.bbc.co.uk/democracylive/house-of-commons-27294322> (accessed 6 Aug 2015).
4. General Medical Council. Confidentiality. http://www.gmc-uk.org/static/documents/content/Confidentiality_-_english.pdf (accessed 6 Aug 2015)

Competing interests

SB was a paid expert for the defence in the 2015 R v Dharmasena trial.

DOI: 10.3399/bjgp15X686437

Prevalence of comorbid depression and obesity in general practice

I read with great interest the article by Carey *et al.*¹ As a co-tutor of the master thesis related to a similar topic,² I would like to respond even at this late stage.

A cross-sectional study was carried out among 56 primary care patients, mean age 48.71 years $\pm$ 10.78, 24 overweight women (BMI 25–<30 kg/m²) and 32 obese women (BMI $\geq$ 30 kg/m²), in the city of Niš (south east part of Serbia). The Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9) was used to assess depression.³ A score of $\geq$ 10 on a 27-point scale was used to define clinically-relevant depressive symptoms. Body weight and height were measured to the nearest 0.1 kg and 0.1 cm, respectively, by using standardised equipment and body mass index (BMI) was calculated as weight (kg) divided by the square of height (m²).

The prevalence of depression in our study was similar among overweight and obese participants (48.4% and 51.6% respectively) and significantly higher compared to the prevalence of depression in the general population (between 16% and 34%). However, for only one-sixth (between 12% and 16%) of the participants, a diagnosis of depression has been confirmed. The

most common symptoms of depression were overeating (74.6%) and loss of energy (69.3%). The average PHQ-9 score was 9.967 ± 4.79 , represented mild form of depression. Univariate logistic regression analysis identified the duration of obesity as a risk factor for depression and every year duration of obesity increased the risk of depression for 7.7%.

We have to bear in mind the current social circumstances that have a strong influence on the prevalence of mental disease in the countries in transition. For example, depression is the leading cause of non-fatal disease burden in Serbia. In addition, mental illness is associated with stigma in these countries, so the symptoms of depression may often be overlooked and go untreated in the GP's practice.

To conclude, PHQ-9 is a really useful screening tool for depression for all obese patients attending ambulatory care. Further studies should focus on various socioeconomic and cultural environments and barriers.

Majo Nikolic,
Associate Professor, Faculty of Medicine University of Niš, Niš, Serbia.
E-mail: mani@junis.ni.ac.rs

REFERENCES

1. Carey M, Small H, Yoong SL, *et al.* Prevalence of comorbid depression and obesity in general practice: a cross-sectional survey. *Br J Gen Pract* 2014; DOI: 10.3399/bjgp14X677482.
2. Ilic V. Prevalence of depression and anxiety among obese individuals. MSc Thesis. [in Serbian]. Niš: Faculty of Medicine University of Niš, 2014.
3. International Physical Activity Questionnaire. IPAQ research committee, 2005. http://www.phqscreener.com/overview.aspx?Screener=02_PHQ-9 (accessed 6 Aug 2015)

DOI: 10.3399/bjgp15X686449

Increasing collaboration between GPs and dental practitioners

GPs, dentists, nurses, care workers, pharmacists, and many others¹ are at the forefront of primary care. Despite differences in working conditions and

the effects of organisational pressures, I believe all of these health professionals do what they can to look after their patients' best interests by collaborating and use of effective communication.

However, I have noticed that communication between GPs and their dental counterparts can leave a lot to be desired. Some patients find it difficult to get a dental appointment (or have dental phobia!) and may attend their GP instead. This may lead to delay in dental diagnosis and treatment as well as wasted GP time.

Occasionally, however, there are some patients whose diagnoses fall beyond the scope of the general dental practitioner (GDP) and may require treatment from a specialist in oral and maxillofacial surgery or oral medicine. For example, these patients may be complaining of chronic pain from their lower jaw which could be as simple as toothache or as complicated as trigeminal neuralgia; or they may have an extra-oral swelling that could be a dental abscess² or as severe as a malignancy or ischaemic cardiovascular disease.

While a dentist could manage some of the above cases, when urgent care is required (as for tracking dental abscesses or squamous cell carcinoma), there should be easy access to an appropriate treatment pathway³ from their initial contact with a health professional, that is, their GP or GDP. Whatever the origin of the referral, the speed and appropriateness is what matters.

GPs should not be expected to know every treatment modality for toothache; an appreciation of the most common causes and diagnoses of pain in the mouth will indicate any outliers and allow for prompter referral. Dentists contact local GP practices for up-to-date lists of medication, and would be more than happy to offer an opinion or advice, so we can continue to provide the highest quality of patient care. With increasingly complex management

of patients,⁴ dental interception and preventative care are more crucial than ever.

Holly Boyes,

Foundation Dentist, St Helens.

E-mail: holly.boyes5@gmail.com

REFERENCES

1. Brody S, Omer O, McLoughlin J, Stassen L. The dentist's role within the multi-disciplinary team maintaining quality of life for oral cancer patients in light of recent advances in radiotherapy. *J Ir Dent Assoc* 2013; **59**(3): 137–146.
2. Robertson DP, Keys W, Rautemaa-Richardson R, *et al.* Management of severe acute dental infection. *BMJ* 2015; **350**: h1300.
3. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Head and neck cancer overview. <http://pathways.nice.org.uk/pathways/head-and-neck-cancer> (accessed 6 Aug 2015).
4. Georgakopoulou E, Scully C. Biological agents: what they are, how they affect oral health and how they can modulate oral healthcare. *Br Dent J* 2015; **218**(12): 671–677.

DOI: 10.3399/bjgp15X686725

GPs: needs, wants, and bonds

The workforce issues facing general practice in the UK are of concern to the profession and the public.

Opinions, facts, and research are unlikely to solve the whole breadth of confounding variables that are at play.

A public with expectations of a valued clinical service (wants) might expect its politicians to assist with the planning and provision of general practice at a time of falling enrolment (needs).

Market forces can do wonderfully creative things ... for markets. The provision of a primary medical care service with general medical practitioners may be too highly valued to be left to market forces alone. If there is to be a blend of public and private provision to ease the disparity of provision and to assist recruitment, perhaps today's students could be provided with financial assistance (bonds) in return for a period of work in an area of the country with a recognised need?

R William Howe,

GP, Lostwithiel Medical Practice, Lostwithiel.

E-mail: William.Howe@nhs.net

DOI: 10.3399/bjgp15X686737

Correction

In the July 2015 issue, the article by Yarlott L. BJGP Student Writing Competition: the results. The GP in the Digital Age. *Br J Gen Pract* 2015; DOI: 10.3399/bjgp15X685741, incorrectly listed the author's surname as 'Yarnott'. We apologise for this error. The corrected version is online. DOI: 10.3399/bjgp15X686749