Statistical analysis was done by standard parametric tests. Contingency tables were analysed by the χ^2 test with Yates's correction where appropriate.

INITIAL SCREENING

We used the Vita-Stat blood pressure computer (Electramed, Ireland Ltd) for initial screening, an automatic device that measures the systolic and phase V diastolic pressure in a patient in the seated position. It can accommodate a maximum of 25 patients an hour. It was manned by a technician and was available five days a week between the hours of 10 am and 4 pm. The initial screening of the 2931 patients who attended 95% of the practice population aged 30-65 years took six weeks to complete (table).

Distribution by age and sex of the attendees and non-attendees at the initial blood pressure screening using the Vita-Stat blood pressure computer

	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	Total No.
Attendees	228	198	167	169	178	170	218	1226
Men	134	114	98	106	108	127	261	1068
Women	94	84	69	63	70	43	157	158
Non-attendees	121	250	164	157	122	134	124	1327
Men	68	141	93	85	58	71	68	724
Women	53	109	71	72	64	63	56	603
Total	349	448	331	326	290	267	242	2603
Male	202	255	191	191	166	198	229	1532
Female	147	193	140	135	124	69	113	871

Prevalence of blood pressure abnormalities in patients aged 30-65 years as measured by the Vita-Stat automatic blood pressure computer

The ultimate diagnosis of hypertension was to be based on the results of three consecutive manual measurements of blood pressure with a mercury sphygmomanometer. But to choose which patients to recall for detailed observations, we used the Vita-Stat machine. The correlation between the readings obtained by the automatic blood pressure machine. The positioning of this device, whether based on systolic pressure or diastolic pressure and at what arbitrary level of pressure, has a profound effect on the workload in manual screening. The figure

shows the relation between the blood pressure and the frequency of its abnormality as measured on the Vita-Stat machine, and can be used to predict the workload required to set an arbitrary division at different levels of pressure. We had hoped to investigate further all individuals with a diastolic pressure over 90 mm Hg, but such a commitment proved too great. Manageable numbers could be accommodated only by recalling all those with a diastolic blood pressure of ≥ 93 mm Hg.

MANUAL SCREENING

Two hundred and seventy-eight patients (144 men, 134 women, 9.5% of the screened population) were recalled for a manual blood pressure measurement. This was taken with the patient seated, using a Hawksley random zero sphygmomanometer and phase V diastolic pressure was recorded. Comparative studies using a double-headed stethoscope showed a coefficient of variation of 1.4% between the readings obtained by the two observers (WPS and D.T.).

Seventy-four patients failed to attend for the first manual reading; 70 had diastolic pressures of less than 90 mm Hg and were excluded from further follow-up. Nineteen were already taking medication for hypertension. In four the pressure was so high that it was without treatment for a longer period of observation was thought to be unethical and treatment was thus started.

The remaining 104 patients (41 men, 63 women) had diastolic pressures of 93 mm Hg or more and were all recalled for two further manual readings. Eighty-eight complied with this follow-up; 17 individuals attended for only one further manual reading. Of the original group of 104 patients, 48 had mean diastolic pressures above 100 mm Hg when all available readings on a single individual were examined. In this group of 18 men and 30 women the mean systolic pressure was 172 mm Hg, range of individual readings 144-226 mm Hg and the mean diastolic pressure was 106 mm Hg, range of individual readings 95-134 mm Hg.

PATIENTS WITH NEWLY DISCOVERED HYPERTENSION

Fifty-two new hypertensive patients were discovered during this study. 48 of these after sequential manual readings and four after a single very high manual reading and a single high automatic reading. Retrospective examination of the practice records showed that during the previous 10 years 17 had had an abnormal blood pressure noted without further action being taken. Thirty-seven had consulted their general practitioner at some stage during the previous year for unrelated problems but their blood pressure was not taken. Two had a normal blood pressure recorded during the previous year and in these the development of hypertension seems to have been a new event. Twelve had been seen at a hospital in the previous year. Clearly, some patients fell into two or more of these categories.

One year after the screening procedure had been carried out the practice records were examined to see how the hypertensive patients had fared. Twenty-five were taking medication and were being reviewed regularly. Their mean systolic pressure was 156 mm Hg and their mean diastolic pressure was 92 mm Hg. Five were thought not to need medication but were still having their blood pressure reviewed regularly. The remaining 22 had defaulted from follow-up. They had never received treatment, had no further blood pressure measurements recorded in their notes, and had never consulted their general practitioner about the importance of the screening procedure.

ANALYSIS OF THE NON-ATTENDERS

Of the 5167 individuals invited to attend the initial screening, 2931 accepted and 2436 declined. The male:female ratio was 0.9:1 in the attendees and 1.2:1 in the non-attendees ($p < 0.001$). There was a uniform age distribution among the attendees, whereas there was a disproportionate number of young individuals among non-attendees ($p < 0.001$). Retrospective examination of the practice records showed that 12.5% of the attendees and 9% of the non-attendees had previously recognised hypertension. In the attendees the prevalence of newly discovered hypertension is assumed to be the same in both the attendees and non-attendees then about 45 individuals among the non-attendees would be expected to have had mean diastolic pressures above 100 mm Hg.

Of 278 individuals invited to attend the manual screening, 204 accepted and 74 declined. The male:female ratio was 0.9:1 in the attendees and 1.2:1 in the non-attendees ($p < 0.001$). There was a uniform age distribution among the attendees, whereas there was a disproportionate number of young individuals among non-attendees ($p < 0.001$). Retrospective examination of the practice records showed that 12.5% of the attendees and 9% of the non-attendees had previously recognised hypertension. In the attendees the prevalence of newly discovered hypertension is assumed to be the same in both the attendees and non-attendees then about 45 individuals among the non-attendees would be expected to have had mean diastolic pressures above 100 mm Hg.

appointing. One year after the screening programme 42 of the patients with newly discovered hypertension had defaulted from follow-up. The desire to know about their blood pressure did not seem to be motivated by an insight into the therapeutic implications of the discovery of hypertension. This attitude seems to have changed little over recent years.

The definition of hypertension used in this study (mean diastolic pressure ≥ 100 mm Hg) would be widely regarded as a level at which treatment is indicated. It may be calculated that a detected less than half the patients attending the health centre with pressures above this level, indicating the relative inefficiency of screening in the community. The simple expedients of careful selection of patients for screening, and the use of routine and routine measurements at surgery visits would have discovered three quarters of our new hypertensive patients without the need for an elaborate screening programme. Furthermore, a cross sectional study of this kind provides only an instantaneous analysis and would have to be repeated at intervals to detect the development of new cases of hypertension. Mail has attempted to predict the number of individuals whose diastolic pressure rises to over 100 mm Hg over four years.¹ The return achieved from regular screening to detect these new hypertensive patients would be small.

Blood pressure screening discovers a great many patients with "borderline" hypertension, and there is a great dilemma about what to do with this group. Ideally all should be reviewed regularly but this could be an unacceptable burden to some practices. In our study more than 1800 patients had systolic pressures greater than 150 mm Hg, but Vita-Stat readings should be interpreted in the light of evidence suggesting an exaggeration of systolic pressure measurements.²

We conclude that automatic devices to measure blood pressure tend to attract patients who are already known to have hypertension and may actively deter some individuals from seeking further help. These devices are not a short cut to efficient blood pressure screening and the better method of detection seems to be routine measurement of blood pressure at surgery visits.

We thank the other practitioners working in the Preskew Health Centre for their help and cooperation with this study. Dr R. Broadbent, Dr M. Crane, Dr C. Ogden, and Dr L. Neff. Also we are most grateful to Mr S. Chapman and ICI Pharmaceuticals for help with the organisation and computer analysis of the study.

References

1. Whetton PK, Thomson SG, Barnes GR, Malt WJ. Evaluation of the Vita-Stat Automatic Blood Pressure Recorder. *Am J Hypertens* 1983;1:17-21.
2. Evans JH. Mild Hypertension. *Lancet* Committee. Trials of the treatment of mild hypertension. An interim analysis. *Lancet* 1982;1:149-50.
3. Bannan IJ, Beevers DG, Jackson SHD. Detecting hypertension patients. *Br Med J* 1981;282:1213-5.
4. Barber JH, Hawthorne VM. Screening for mild hypertension: costs and benefits. *J Epidemiol Commun Health* 1979;33:217-21.
5. Barber JH, Beevers DG, Fife R, et al. Blood pressure screening and supervision in general practice. *Br Med J* 1979;3:83-5.
6. *Health and prevention in primary care*. London: Royal College of General Practitioners, 1981.
7. Hawthorne VM, Grayes DA, Beevers DG. Blood pressure in a Scottish town. *Br Med J* 1974;3:680-3.
8. Hawthorne VM. Possible dangers of the label hypertension. [Editorial.] *Lancet* 1972;2:547.
9. Heller RH, Rose G. Current management of hypertension in general practice. *Br Med J* 1977;3:197-200.
10. Malt WJ, Chinn S. Screening for hypertension: some epidemiological observations. *Br Med J* 1974;3:595-600.

Accepted 7 September 1983

Continuing Education

No man is an island

ALISTAIR D GRASSIE

What I do not know about continuing education in general practice causes me concern: if it has not already begun to it soon will affect the future of the profession. I have spent much of my life as a doctor constantly being vetted and measured by senior colleagues and I am now finding out the hard way how to be my own devil's advocate. It is at once interesting and unique that the *BMJ* should permit someone to ventilate their ignorances in its columns, but I hope you will see that there is a point to be made.

A doctor who takes on an isolated practice off the west coast of Scotland deserves everything that is coming to him in the way of educational deprivation. He casts himself in a mould which will ultimately leave him working in ways that could be described only as idiosyncratic. Do his patients deserve this? Beyond undergraduate training is vocational training and beyond this is the development of the doctor as a general practitioner. On Arran the latter remains haphazard and arbitrary and is left almost entirely to the individual.

My education

I can identify four main aspects where I am being reached by postgraduate education. Firstly, I am being educated by my patients. I think that in the old days this used to be called experience. The 25 year old fledgling still commands a comparable salary to his pre-employment senior partner. Seniority payments recognise experience and no more, and general practice has no system of merit awards. My age-sex register is a way in which I am being educated by my patients. Similarly, any feedback from research will provide its own educational stimulus. For knowledge of a person's phobia for needles is one fragment of the experience that will influence the course of immunisation for foreign travel.

Secondly, I am being educated by the media. There are journals in my car, cassettes in my car, and videos on offer if I had the machine to show them. Radio and television concentrate more and more of their resources on health care topics, as it seems that they attract high ratings. I have no doubt that all doctors would judge the media as their main source of topical information. I have a comprehensive reference library, which is so vital on the few occasions when the evening news rears its ugly head or on the more frequent occasions when I am stumped for an answer. My growing experience in practice and the media are the two main areas of influence in my continuing education.

Inglewood, Shiskine, Isle of Arran

ALISTAIR D GRASSIE, MB, FRCS, general practitioner

The third and fourth aspects are personal contacts and medical audit. Surprisingly, there are some slight difficulties in trying to separate these two. Personal contacts mean the usual lively social intercourse among doctors at clinical meetings, courses, and social gatherings. Medical audit, on the other hand, would presumably be the same game played on the home ground with some stealthy changes of the rules to include constructive criticism. The *Future General Practitioner* identifies three component parts of audit: gathering information about the performance of the practice and the quality of patient care that it offers; evaluation of this information; and, where appropriate, making new policies. The "evaluation of this information" is carried out either by the primary care team or by that team with some outside agency. Audit therefore attracts its enthusiasts on the one hand and its sworn enemies on the other.

The formal audit conjures up visions of the grand visitation by appointed members of our peers to pry into our patient services. We are further charged with the fear that if it is not taken up by the profession some public arm of government will do it for us. An external audit would indeed be an attractive prospect for me. But who would do the auditing? In a low income practice like mine finance dictates rigidly every aspect of practice administration. As an inducement payment practitioner and a member of its association, I know that few of us understand the complex financing of these practices. It is a curious anomaly of the history of National Health Service semantics that describes as an "inducement payment practice" one that attracts a lower income for providing more items of service per patient and continuous duty on call. Before beginning on a serious audit of my practice I would need to go on prolonged study leave to the Scottish Home and Health Department to learn the rules governing the arbitrarily applied decision. I am filled with wonder at the Health Department, which has administered the finances of this practice since the beginning of the Health Service, without ever having visited any of the incumbent doctors. Would private industry permit such a thing?

What has this to do with my continuing education? In simple terms my future development will be dictated strongly by NHS financing. Even now, if I were to take a half day off every week and employ a locum I would forfeit all my annual leave. It is becoming clear that we must audit our services accurately to show plainly what a bargain basement offer we provide. My predecessor described the inducement payment practice as a salaried service with none of the advantages of being salaried.

Financing the NHS

Only a fellow traveller would appreciate the full implications of my clinical workload. It is a very lonely feeling being in sole charge of a serious clinical problem in a small general practice hospital on an island. The buck ends here, and no amount of helpful advice from mainland colleagues over the telephone

fair pickings, as the poor souls are on holiday to forget about medicine. Students find their way here regularly and we willingly give them free accommodation at our home. They taste the flavour of remote rural practice and gain an insight into the daily domestic disruption of a doctor's life.

One of our colleagues has embarked on the task of producing a series of talks by visiting "experts" and we are determined to make this work. This "expert" will have to set aside two days of his time in the winter for one evening's talk, and he may well be asked to bring with him any necessary audiovisual aids. I would like to go a step further and suggest some sort of teaching with a mainland practice. This might be done with a teaching unit or a university department, and if it was an informal link it might promote a lively academic interchange between two completely different practices. Short term exchanges might be organised and the experiences gained mullied over afterwards by the whole primary care team. By anyone's definition this would be mutual medical audit. There is absolutely nothing original in this suggestion. Approaches were made about 10 years ago by my predecessor, but there were no takers. In fact, it was suggested that he might be pursuing my avenue of the provision of a steady supply of reliable locums. Locums in an area like mine are really no problem and I have a regular and devoted helper. An exchange of practices is not the same thing as a holiday locum.

The problems facing us here on Arran as regards continuing education must be typical of many remote practices. Our education will remain haphazard and unstructured without outside help. Despite large and comprehensive national organisations of postgraduate medical education, we remain untouched. Becoming a member of a royal college still leaves the ball firmly in the court of the individual. I am an active member of such an institution when, if I were to take one half day off a week and employ a locum, I would consume all my leave for the entire year.

This type of practice is thoroughly enjoyable and challenging and I have no intentions of leaving it, but I do hope some progress will have been made in redressing the balance in the educational aspects.

Reference

1. *The future general practitioner: learning and teaching*. London: BMA, 1972.

will change that. Most doctors would be aghast to learn that my hospital work results in a net financial loss. On a low and fixed income and with increasing costs, this personal financial pressure to the National Health Service is becoming a burden which I will soon have to shed, causing considerable penalty to my patients and resulting in a much greater cost to the NHS.

Casualties occurring in my practice area are dealt with by me, working from my surgery and local general practitioner hospital. Many casualties are transported to the hospital by me, given a x-ray examination if necessary by me, and definitive treatment by me. Often I transport them back home. This arises because there is poor local transport and only one ambulance. It would be grossly inefficient if I had, say, a patient with an ankle injury—to call the ambulance out from 20 miles away, embark the patient, follow the ambulance in my car, and, having dealt with the patient, ask the driver to make the extra distance to the hospital. I may be able to see that my contribution saves the ambulance 80 miles of travelling time, of course, it must return to its base. The convenience to the patient is naturally the foremost consideration. As I am paid only on the "bed fund" system, I cannot even cover my travelling expenses because I earn an income only if the patient occupies a bed. It may not be quite so easily seen that if I were not contributing time and personal finance to the hospital service it would cost the NHS an extra full time ambulance and driver. Carefully reasoned discussion with hospital administrative staff has so far failed to make them aware of these arithmetical progressions. It is probably time now to surrender the arguments and cut my losses by pulling out of the general practitioner hospital.

What on earth has this to do with postgraduate education? My one and only contact with colleagues on this island is at the local hospital. Financial considerations are compelling me to relinquish my hospital responsibilities and therefore further isolate me and my patients. The opportunity to discuss problems with colleagues will be lost and the public offers will be further depleted.

Having deviated somewhat cynically from the subject of audit, I must return to it once again. Surely all is not so gloomy; there must be a solution somewhere. As I see it, attendance at clinical meetings on the mainland will always be an occasional activity for the island general practitioner, and I sincerely believe that we must try to get the mountain to come to Mohammed. Informal visits by consultants on holiday are always welcome and I eagerly pick their brains. These are not

Diary of Urban Marks: 1880-1949

And so 1908 rolled on and 1909 dawned with debts hanging over my head to the tune of over £300 which was being paid off in dribbles every month as the practice increased and the money came in. Very early after I started practice I started a club for the poorer members of the community who could not afford to pay the regulation fees. The subscription to this club was one shilling per month and to the patient got advice and medicine. Everything beyond this was extra. Altogether the club brought me in about £100 yearly, but the work of bookkeeping for it was tremendous. At this time I made out my own bills and posted them every month. This took up two nights each month of clerical work in the surgery, but I had plenty of time on my hands. I adopted the idea of sending out the accounts

monthly from the very beginning and I have always found this method to pay well. People have no chance to forget they owe me. Chronic cases bills are sent just the same so that the individual has a chance to pay something on account. Later on, as the practice increased, I employed a lady clerk who did all the clerical work for me at so much per hour and after a bill had been sent six times she drew my attention to this fact. Then the bill was put into the hands of a private collector with instructions to report if the patient could pay, and I found to be able to do so he or she was promptly used for the money. If unable to pay the debt was written off but I found that I made very few bad debts, and moreover the people who were called on by the collector or were used by him on my behalf came back to me as patients.