Editor's Briefing

HIGHLIGHTS

One of the challenges of reshaping primary care is the ever-present fear of unintended consequences - it brings to mind the analogy of rebuilding a jumbo jet full of people in mid-flight. Do we target specific groups? The editorial by Gina Agarwal et al highlights how we might do so for older adults in social housing. Or do we concentrate on the foundation-stone of practice, the consultation? Roger Jones' editorial offers much to consider as we define our future relationships in primary care.

Articles on multimorbidity, polypharmacy, and GP deployment in EDs underline the scope for development as well as the complexities. An Analysis article takes a long look at how we protect ethnic minority populations post lockdown. All of this reshaping has to be done in the glare of the media spotlight — who are not always kind to GPs — and research by Trish Greenhalgh's team in Oxford spotlights the changing depictions of remote consultations in the press.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.3399/bjgp21X714317

LEGISLATING FOR THE FUTURE: RESHAPING LAWS

Reshaping primary care has been an abrupt, if not brutal, process in 2020 and the debates on the future direction of primary care roil. Multimorbidity is the norm and we should be mindful of the challenges of treatment burden.1 Living with a single chronic disease is hard enough and living with three or more can be all-consuming. Complexity may lie with the patient but shouldn't be designed into the system. When people struggle to access care or attend appointments we must guard against personal blame. There is a single principle we need to underpin any service redesign if we want to avoid unintentionally deepening inequalities: the more complex the patient, the simpler the healthcare pathways that are needed.

On the 27 February 2021 it will be the 50th anniversary of the publication of Tudor Hart's totemic article on the inverse care law.² Reshaping primary care has multiple competing priorities and Tudor Hart, who was largely railing against marketisation, was aware that the NHS has functioned guite well without the profit motive. He knew its limitations as well: 'Medical services are not the main determinant of mortality or morbidity; these depend most upon standards of nutrition, housing, working environment, and education, and the presence or absence

We are reshaping our own systems. In 2021 the BJGP will be providing early access to accepted manuscripts so that research doesn't linger in a virtual drawer awaiting an issue. That should happen within a matter of days of acceptance. We have just accepted our first Registered Report and we hope to see more. And we are simplifying the pathway for our research to influence and shape primary care — in 2021 we will publish all research open access so it is available to everyone. We can all acknowledge the bruising experience of 2020 and the many challenges 2021 will offer us, but we should be optimistic about our capabilities.

Tudor Hart was plain in stating there was no excuse for failure to match the greatest need with the highest standards of care."2 The focus in the BJGP in 2021 will be on action and translation into practice to help with that matching of need and standards. We already have the tools to reduce inequalities in healthcare delivery — it doesn't have to involve extra work and it is not a call for GPs to become public health doctors.

We will continue to publish research in all areas but we will be seeking articles that illuminate some neglected corners of practice. We have some ideas on these but, inevitably, because they are neglected we need your help to identify them.

Let us know, we want to hear from you!

Euan Lawson, Acting Editor, BJGP

REFERENCES

- Rosbach M, Andersen JS. Patient-experienced burden of treatment in patients with multimorbidity - a systematic review of qualitative data. PLoS One 2017; 12(6): e0179916.
- Tudor Hart J. The inverse care law. Lancet 1971: 1(7696): 405-412.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.3399/bjgp21X714329

© British Journal of General Practice 2021: 702: 1-48

ACTING EDITOR

Euan Lawson, FRCGP

DEPUTY EDITOR

David Misselbrook, MSc, MA, FRCGP

CONSULTING EDITOR

Roger Jones, DM, FRCP, FRCGP, FMedSci

ASSOCIATE EDITOR Nada Khan, MSc, DPhil, MBBS

ASSOCIATE EDITOR

Samuel Merriel, BMedSc, MSc, MRCGP

ASSOCIATE EDITOR

Thomas Round, BSc, DRCOG, MRCGP

HEAD OF PUBLISHING

Catharine Hull

SENIOR ASSISTANT EDITOR

Amanda Mav-Jones

WEB EDITOR Erika Niesner

ASSISTANT EDITOR

Moira Davies

ASSISTANT EDITOR

Tony Nixon

DIGITAL & DESIGN EDITOR

Simone Jemmott

TRAINEE ASSISTANT EDITOR Thomas Bransby

EDITORIAL ASSISTANT

Margaret Searle

EDITORIAL ADMINISTRATOR Mona Lindsay

EDITORIAL BOARD

Luke Allen, MBChB, MPH, PGCE Clin Edu

Carolyn Chew-Graham, BSc, MD, FRCGP

Hajira Dambha-Miller, MRCGP, PhD, FHEA

Graham Easton, MSc, MEd, SFHEA, FRCGP

Adam Firth, MBChB, DTM&H, DipPalMed

Benedict Hayhoe, LLM, MD, MRCGP, DRCOG, DPMSA

Jennifer Johnston, PhD, MRCGP

Brennan Kahan, BSc, MSc

Constantinos Koshiaris, BSc, MSc, DPhil

Peter Murchie, MSc, PhD, FRCGP

Obioha Ukoumunne, BSc, MSc, PhD, FHEA

Peter Schofield, BSc(Hons), MSc, PhD, PGCert

Liam Smeeth, MSc, PhD, FRCGP, FFPH

2019 impact factor: 4.190

EDITORIAL OFFICE

30 Euston Square, London, NW1 2FB. (Tel: 020 3188 7400, Fax: 020 3188 7401). E-mail: journal@rcgp.org.uk / bjgp.org / @BJGPjournal

PUBLISHED BY

PUBLISHED BY
The Royal College of General Practitioners.
Registered charity number 223106. The BJGP is published by the RCGP, but has complete editorial independence. Opinions expressed in the BJGP should not be taken to represent the policy of the RCGP unless this is specifically stated. No endorsement of any advertisement is implied

or intended by the RCGP ISSN 0960-1643 (Print) ISSN 1478-5242 (Online)



