Debate & Analysis

How can general practice respond to the needs of street-based prostitutes?

The 2015 RCGP publication *Health Inequalities*¹ reflected on evidence from the 2010 Marmot Review,² which concluded that, in England, people living in the poorest neighbourhoods will, on average, die 7 years earlier than people living in the richest. Furthermore, the average difference in disability-free life is 17 years; thus, people in poorer areas not only die sooner, but they will also spend more of their shorter lives with a disability.

SPECIFIC NEEDS OF WOMEN INVOLVED IN SBP

Health inequalities are not simply a difference in health outcomes, but also a difference in health outcomes *combined with* barriers to accessing the healthcare system. In addition to physical barriers such as opening hours, location, and transport, there are other barriers contributing to this exclusion, including patient perceptions of services and expectations of what will be offered if they seek help, staff attitudes to patients, and communication difficulties.

Women involved in street-based prostitution (SBP) are an underserved group and their health is a source of international concern.³ These women are a high-risk population, and street-based workers are at greater risk than their parlour-based counterparts due to an increased prevalence of intravenous drug use and poorer engagement with health care.⁴ Women have specific health needs relating to their lifestyle and occupation,⁵ as they are more likely to use drugs, have a less stable home environment, and experience occupational violence.⁴ Women involved in SBP often have chaotic lifestyles and complex socioeconomic backgrounds,^{5,6} factors that may have initially led them into prostitution.⁷ The standardised mortality ratio for those involved in prostitution in the US is three times greater than that of the general population.⁸ Women commonly experience social exclusion and stigma related to their occupation,^{6,9} and belonging to a marginalised group subject to socioeconomic disadvantages is in itself detrimental to health.²

Women involved in SBP also suffer physical, as well as the better documented psychosocial, comorbidities.¹⁰ We reported that women involved in SBP have poor knowledge of their physical conditions and how to optimally manage them. Their

"Women commonly experience social exclusion and stigma related to their occupation, and belonging to a marginalised group subject to socioeconomic disadvantages is in itself detrimental to health."

chaotic lifestyle, and limited perceptions of the seriousness of their health problems, resulted in help-seeking at a time of crisis and often resorting to the use of unscheduled care. Their help-seeking, however, was also influenced recursively by previous negative experiences at a number of different levels. Access to primary care was described as difficult due to barriers in the system (the need for an address, the telephone system) and in personal interactions with GPs. Women felt both that the 10-minute consultation did not allow for the discussion of multiple problems and that they were judged negatively by the GP, often fearing the disclosure of their occupation. Women described the valuable support obtained from third-sector support workers, who, as well as responding to needs associated with their occupation, acted as advocates in help-seeking for their physical and mental health needs. Such workers provided help and advice through supporting the navigation of a complex healthcare system.¹⁰

CONTINUITY OF CARE, COMMISSIONING, AND THE THIRD SECTOR

The 2015 RCGP publication¹ made two recommendations that are particularly relevant to improving the care of women involved in SBP:

'Focus on incentivising ways of working that promote continuity of care in areas where patients would benefit most from a

continuous therapeutic relationship with their GP — particularly areas where a high number of patients are living with multiple morbidities.'

'Fund outreach programmes to help often excluded groups such as those with mental health problems, learning disabilities and the homeless to access general practice.'

Few women in our study¹⁰ reflected positively on relationships with general practice, or described an ongoing therapeutic relationship with one supportive GP. Primary care was failing these women.

The concealed nature of the industry makes commissioning specific services for this patient group challenging, and women may not wish to access a service that would mean disclosure of the nature of their work; however, being able to access a specific service might improve access to care, enabling women to avoid disclosure to all but a specialist team of practitioners.

Much of the work that GPs can do to make a difference in reducing health inequalities needs to be taken forward in collaboration with, or signposting to, other professionals. This should include the third sector (or so-called 'voluntary services'), which plays a key role in supporting people in groups from underserved populations, but which all too often are commissioned on a short-term basis, and thus work in a state of uncertainty.¹¹

In the report by the Primary Care

"Much of the work that GPs can do to make a difference in reducing health inequalities needs to be taken forward in collaboration with, or signposting to, other professionals."

“... recommendations around better use of technology to promote access and increasing the length of primary care consultations would potentially offer currently underserved groups (such as women involved in SBP) the opportunity to access improved and more acceptable care.”

Workforce Commission,¹² the message was clear that:

‘... primary care needs to change. It will still be based around the GP practice holding responsibility for the care of its registered patients, but practices will have a stronger population focus and an expanded workforce. Many existing healthcare professionals will develop new roles, and patients will be seen more often by new types of healthcare professional such as physician associates. Clinical staff will have better administrative support and, when needed, healthcare professionals will be able to spend more time with their patients to discuss and plan their care.’

Much was made in this report of strengthening the role of pharmacists, increasing recruitment to practice nurse and physician associate posts, and highlighting patient demographics with particular needs. However, there was little focus on the role the third sector plays in supporting patients. Proposed new workforce models have not included third-sector services, and without these some patients will not be served appropriately by primary care.

However, the recommendations around better use of technology to promote access and increasing the length of primary care consultations would potentially offer currently underserved groups (such as women involved in SBP) the opportunity to access improved and more acceptable care. Taking into account the important role of third-sector organisations and integrating them within the broader primary care teams suggested by the Commission document would provide innovative, accessible services for patients with a broader range of needs.

Can primary care rise to the challenge of offering acceptable, patient-centred care to currently underserved groups, such as women involved in SBP? Will

clinical commissioning groups forward-plan sufficiently to ensure integration of responsive health, social, and third-sector services?

Anna Kathryn Taylor,
Medical Student, Faculty of Health Sciences,
University of Bristol, Bristol.

Emma Mastrocola,
GP Trainee, Health Education South West, Vantage
Office Park, Bristol.

Carolyn A Chew-Graham,
Professor of General Practice Research, GP
(Manchester), Research Institute, Primary Care
and Health Sciences, Keele University, Keele,
Staffordshire.

Funding

Emma Mastrocola was supported by an award from the Scientific Foundation Board of the Royal College of General Practitioners, which covered financial reimbursement for participants, travel expenses for Emma, and stationery costs.

Provenance

Freely submitted; externally peer reviewed.

Competing interests

The authors have declared no competing interests.

DOI: 10.3399/bjgp16X685501

ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE

Anna Kathryn Taylor
Medical Student, Faculty of Health Sciences,
University of Bristol, Senate House, Tyndall Avenue,
Bristol, BS8 1TH, UK.
E-mail: at0012@bristol.ac.uk

REFERENCES

1. Royal College of General Practitioners. *Health inequalities*. London: RCGP, 2015. <http://www.rcgp.org.uk/Policy/RCGP-policy-areas/-/media/Files/Policy/A-Z-policy/2015/Health%20Inequalities.ashx> (accessed 4 May 2016).
2. Marmot M. *Fair society, healthy lives* [the Marmot Review]. 2010. <http://www.instituteofhealthequity.org/projects/fair-society-healthy-lives-the-marmot-review> (accessed 4 May 2016).
3. Rekart ML. Sex-work harm reduction. *Lancet* 2005; **366**(9503): 2123–2134.
4. Jeal N, Salisbury C. Health needs and service use of parlour-based prostitutes compared with street-based prostitutes: a cross-sectional survey. *BJOG* 2007; **114**(7): 875–881.
5. Jeal N, Salisbury C, Turner K. The multiplicity and interdependency of factors influencing the health of street-based sex workers: a qualitative study. *Sex Transm Infect* 2008; **84**(5): 381–385.
6. Mellor R, Lovell A. The lived experiences of UK street-based sex workers and the health consequences: an exploratory study. *Health Promot Int* 2012; **27**(3): 311–322.
7. Kurtz SP, Surratt HL, Kiley MC, Inciardi JA. Barriers to health and social services for street-based sex workers. *J Health Care Poor Underserved* 2005; **16**(2): 345–361.
8. Wong WC, Holroyd EA, Gray A, Ling DC. Female street sex workers in Hong Kong: moving beyond sexual health. *J Womens Health (Larchmt)* 2006; **15**(4): 390–399.
9. Jeal N, Salisbury C. A Health needs assessment of street-based prostitutes: cross-sectional survey. *J Public Health (Oxf)* 2004; **26**(2): 147–151.
10. Mastrocola E, Taylor AK, Chew-Graham CA. Access to healthcare for long-term conditions in women involved in street-based prostitution: a qualitative study. *BMC Fam Pract* 2015; **16**: 118.
11. Holder H. *Role of the voluntary sector in providing commissioning support*. Research report. London: Nuffield Trust, 2013. <http://www.england.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/role-vol-sect-css1.pdf> (accessed 4 May 2016).
12. Primary Care Workforce Commission. *The future of primary care. Creating teams for tomorrow*. Health Education England, 2015. <https://www.hee.nhs.uk/sites/default/files/documents/The%20Future%20of%20Primary%20Care%20report.pdf> (accessed 4 May 2016).