LETTERS

Role of the Clinical Standards Advisory Group

Sir Gordon Higginson sets out very clearly the membership of the Clinical Standards Advisory Group, the operation of the group, and its current remit.¹ The section with which I take issue, however, is that entitled "Emphasising the multidisciplinary approach." Anybody with any knowledge of the clinical manpower of the health service will see immediately that although the medical and nursing professions are well represented, a substantial group – namely the professions allied to medicine – are not represented. With due respect, the group cannot therefore reflect true multidisciplinary clinical standards, and if the remit areas are inspected closely, concern must be expressed that standards in cystic fibrosis and diabetes are being discussed without the input of the dietetic and physiotherapy professions.

The argument that having representatives of all the professions allied to medicine makes any group too big is undermined by the numbers and range of the medical and nursing representatives as set out in the second paragraph of the article.

So yet again, the myth that the NHS is clinically staffed only by doctors and nurses is perpetuated; this causes anger, frustration, isolation, and lowering of morale, which could so easily be avoided.

PENELOPE R ROBINSON
Chartered Society of Physiotherapy,
14 Bedford Row,
London
WC1R 4ED

- 1 Higginson G. Role of the Clinical Standards Advisory Group. *Quality in Health Care* 1992;1(suppl):S34-5.

Factors influencing default at a hospital colposcopy clinic

I read with interest the report by Gillian Sanders and colleagues.¹ I report a pilot study carried out to examine the high rate of altered appointments at the main hospital colposcopy clinic for Lothian Health Board (population 750 000). Monthly figures suggested that 26% – 38% of all appointments at the clinic were either cancelled or not attended. The pilot study was carried out to discover if this meant that the same percentage of women failed to receive adequate treatment.

One hundred consecutive general practitioner referrals of women to the clinic were examined and the progress of these women was followed throughout their attendances at the hospital. Whether they kept the first appointment sent to them, cancelled it by telephone, or did not attend for consultation was noted. Records for the clinic were not kept far

enough back to allow complete analysis of the cohort, despite studying a four year period, but some facts emerged.

In total, 590 appointments were arranged for these women over this period, of which 157(27%) were altered (percentage altered appointments for individual clinics ranged from 6% to 38%). All 100 women eventually attended the first two clinic sessions (for diagnostic colposcopy and for treatment), 98 women attended the third session (for check cervical smear) and 90 attended for colposcopic re-examination. Eighty two women had completed the course with the last appointment (cervical screening) pending, and 13 women were still due to attend for second treatments. Only five women had been lost to the system at the time of the study.

Although it was not possible to complete the attendance histories of all 100 women, the results strongly suggested that most women attended all sessions but frequently altered appointments along the way. Why this should happen was not investigated at the time. It is possible that attendance at hospital for treatment as a result of abnormal findings from a screening procedure may be viewed differently from attendance for treatment when problems have been identified by the patients themselves.

KATE MACKAY
Department of Public Health Medicine,
Lothian Health Board,
Edinburgh
EH8 9RS

- 1 Sanders G, Craddock C, Wagstaff I. Factors influencing default at a hospital colposcopy clinic. *Quality in Health Care* 1992;1: 236-40.

Prospective audit comparing ambulatory day surgery with inpatient surgery for treating cataracts

Effectiveness and efficiency are two important dimensions of quality, and randomised controlled trials are in many situations the most reliable way of assessing these dimensions¹ so the trial of two ways of providing cataract surgery described by Percival and Setty² was especially useful, and we applaud your publishing it.

But how was the hurried reader to know that this was a trial? There was no hint that patients had been randomised to the two treatment options (so greatly increasing the chances that like was being compared with like) in either the title or the structured abstract. Only the methods section made this crucial point clear. This oversight meant that an important paper might easily have been missed by a reader looking for studies free from the selection bias inherent in non-randomised studies.

RUAIRIDH MILNE
DAVID LAWRENCE
Oxford Regional Health Authority,
Headington,
Oxford
OX3 7LF

- 1 Department of Health. *Assessing the effects of health technologies*. London: DoH, 1992.

- 2 Percival SPB, Setty SS. Prospective audit comparing ambulatory day surgery with inpatient surgery for treating cataracts. *Quality in Health Care* 1992;1:38-42.

Perceptions of audit activity

Firth-Cozens and Storer have drawn attention to the difficulties of involving and engaging doctors in the audit process.¹ In the summer of 1992 the medical unit's junior doctors at St Albans City Hospital were each asked to undertake an audit project of their choice and to complete it for presentation at the end of six months.

Monthly meetings, supervised mainly by two consultants and the audit project officer, were held to guide each project design. With one exception, all the juniors (including house officers) participated. The projects which were presented at the end of January, were briefly as follows. (1) Patients' understanding of and compliance with domiciliary oxygen treatment were assessed by postal questionnaire. Results showed that the level of comprehension, and therefore compliance, was poor; consequently the patient information leaflets are being revised. (2) Case notes were audited retrospectively to determine documentation and management of hyponatraemia. Poor performance was suggested to be due to lack of knowledge among juniors. Thus the biochemistry department are reassessing the optimal method of alerting clinicians, and further teaching was suggested. (3) Reassurance among patients with normal gastroscopies was evaluated with questionnaires. A significant proportion were not reassured at two weeks; this topic is being used as a pilot project to design a study aimed at identifying such patients. (4) An audit about the satisfaction of medical patients attending the accident and emergency department showed that most were pleased with their care. Dissatisfaction seemed to be mainly related to long waiting times for ward beds. Inappropriate use of juniors in finding beds and non-adherence to the admissions policy were highlighted. (5) Patients with chronic airflow limitation and ischaemic heart disease who had a history of smoking were asked about the adequacy of information and support given by hospital doctors and other services to help stop smoking. This led to the suggestion that easily accessible information materials and regular medical advice could improve this area further.

The restriction imposed by "one in three" rotas and a six month deadline added an element of chore to the projects and also limited the ability to close the audit loop. Regular guidance on an individual basis would have been less intimidating and more helpful, as highlighted recently.¹ However, there was interest and support from most consultants and ample practical help from the audit office. The adequate financial incentive was not felt to have generated greater enthusiasm.

Nevertheless, a positive attitude for continued participation in the audit process was achieved, and we ultimately found the experience rewarding and educational.

ANISH BAHRA
St George's Hospital,
London SW17

VAL PRYDE
NAHEED AHMAD
NOAMI BRONZITE
SIAN HOWELL
ONN MIN KON
RICHARD SLACK
Audit office,
St Albans City Hospital,
St Albans
Hertfordshire
AL5 3PM

- 1 Firth-Cozens J, Storer D. Registrars' and senior registrars' perceptions of their audit activities. *Quality in Health Care* 1992;1:161-4.

Jennifer's ear: airing the issues

Dr Nick Black's editorial¹ illustrates the disingenuousness of those seeking to confirm their prejudices. The case of Jennifer's ear has little to do with the provision of services for otitis media with effusion (OME) (glue ear). Her father recently explained that her problem was one of recurrent tonsillar infections for which she needed adenotonsillectomies,² and that treatment of her ear condition was not of prime consideration. To base criticism of the current management of OME on this case is unwarranted.

The Effective Health Care bulletin advocates what practising otological surgeons already do in most instances for uncomplicated glue ear; those who ignore the current literature from their surgical peers^{3,4} are unlikely to be convinced by a paper from non-clinicians. The performance of adenoidectomy as a day case is certainly feasible and the paper by Yardley⁵ considers this, but to say he has questioned the need for inpatient care is to overstate his conclusions. The audit to 1991 showing that many health districts fail to carry out grommet insertions as day cases⁶ probably illustrates the shortcomings of data retrieval in the NHS at that time, since it has been impossible to separate those cases having grommet insertion as a single procedure from those having more extensive surgery such as adenotonsillectomy. For Black to suggest that had day case treatment been advised for Jennifer, she need not have waited for her operation is to confuse the length of an inpatient waiting list with the availability of day case surgery. Day case surgery requires exactly the same amount of operating time and surgeon availability and depends critically on access to an appropriate bed. Day case surgery does not necessarily eliminate waiting times and indeed may prolong waiting if day care facilities are limited.

The aspect of management of glue ear that remains largely ignored is the time it takes to see an otologist and to get reliable audiometry performed. This is in large

measure a reflection of the paucity of paediatric otolaryngological services.

By the time most children are seen they have had established glue ear for a considerable time and have undergone a period of unwatchful waiting. Better and quicker access to competent audiometric assessment in a properly soundproofed environment is a prerequisite to better diagnosis and supervision of the hearing loss.

P D BULL
Royal Hallamshire Hospital/
Sheffield Children's Hospital,
Sheffield

- 1 Black NA. Jennifer's ear: airing the issues. *Quality in Health Care* 1992;1:213-4.
- 2 Bennett J. Jennifer's story. *Daily Telegraph* 1993 Jan 11: 14.
- 3 Maw AR, Herod F. Otoloscopic, impedance and audiometric findings in glue ear treated by adenoidectomy and tonsillectomy: a prospective randomised study. *Lancet* 1986;i:1399-402.
- 4 Maw AR, Parker A. Surgery of the tonsil and adenoids in relation to secretory otitis media in children. *Acta Otolaryngol* (Stockh) 1988;454:202-7.
- 5 Yardley MPJ. Tonsillectomy, adenoidectomy and adenotonsillectomy: are they safe day case procedures? *J Laryngol Otol* 1992; 106:299-300.
- 6 Audit Commission. *All in a day's work: an audit of day surgery in England and Wales*. London: HMSO, 1992. (NHS occasional paper, No 4.)

AUTHOR'S REPLY - Putting aside the particular diagnosis which prompted the political debate, I do not in any way alter my views of the current management of glue ear, which remains an area of public and professional concern. The Audit Commission, which performed the audit of day surgery in 1991, was well aware of the shortcomings of the hospital episode system and therefore did not rely on it, as explained in the report Mr Bull quotes.¹ One of the several advantages of day surgery is that it is considerably cheaper than inpatient care. The resources released can be redeployed to reduce the time patients are currently having to wait. One use of such resources could be audiometry services, thus reducing waiting times for investigations of middle ear functioning.

NICK BLACK
Department of Public Health and Policy Health
Services Research Unit,
London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine,
London
WC1E 7HT

- 1 Audit Commission. *All in a day's work: an audit of day surgery in England and Wales*. London: HMSO, 1992. (NHS occasional paper, No 4.)

Clinical audit project

The clinical audit project is concerned with the development of audit in four therapeutic professions: clinical psychology, occupational therapy, physiotherapy, and speech and language therapy. Commissioned by the Department of Health, the work is being carried out by experienced social science researchers and policy analysts in health studies from two units: Maurice Kogan and Tim Packwood from the Centre for the Evaluation of Public

Policy and Practice, Brunel University, and Sally Redfern, Sarah Robinson, Ian Norman, and Anémone Kober from the Nursing Research Unit, King's College, University of London.

The aim of the project is to work with the four professions to develop and evaluate a set of models on which their audit activities could be based. The models are likely to contain components specific to each profession as well as a common core, and they will constitute a logical development of the work undertaken by Professor Charles Normand and colleagues that advocated a common framework for audit in these four professions.¹

The project's current phase - interviewing key people with knowledge of audit in these professions, selecting case studies, and devising interview schedules - is almost complete. The next phase will comprise, for each case study, interviews with people in each profession who are involved in audit activities and with members of other professions or groups whose work may impact on these activities. The data will be analysed to identify generic and specialist principles and components of audit and those issues in which there is agreement or disagreement within and between the four professions. The aim will be to produce a detailed set of draft models for audit practice for discussion with the professions.

Any enquiries about the project should be addressed to Anémone Kober, Nursing Research Unit, King's College, Waterloo Road, London SE1 8TX (tel 071 872 3060/3057; fax 071 872 3069).

MAURICE KOGAN
Centre for the Evaluation of Public Policy and Practice,
Brunel University,
Uxbridge,
Middlesex

SALLY REDFERN
Nursing Research Unit,
King's College,
Waterloo Road,
London SE1 8TX

- 1 Normand C. *Clinical audit in professions allied to medicine and related therapy professions*. Belfast: Health Care Research Unit, Queen's University, 1991. (Report to the Department of Health on a pilot study.)

BOOK REVIEWS

Evaluation Médicale des Soins Hospitaliers. Alexandra Giraud (pp 210; Ffr 250). Paris: Economica, 1992. ISBN 2-7178-2335-2

Alexandra Giraud wants hospital doctors in France to take charge of the evaluation of medical practice rather than submitting to it as an external constraint. Medically qualified, with degrees in politics (Paris) and public health (Yale), she was responsible from 1987 to 1990 for the Service for the Evaluation of Health Care