Identification of emotional problems in postpartum women by health visitors
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Abstract

One hundred and twenty-two mothers aged under 25 weeks who were being cared for by health visitors for emotional problems during the postnatal period were studied. The psychiatric interview performed was the General Health Interview Schedule (GHIS). The results indicate that 12% of the mothers had a diagnosed psychiatric disorder, mainly depression. However, these results should be treated with caution as the GHIS is not a validated instrument for the diagnosis of emotional disorders. The conclusions from this study are that health visitors need to be better able to identify patients with emotional problems in the postnatal period.

Method

Sixty-nine of the 122 patients were assessed during a 12-month period during the postnatal period. The psychiatric interview was the GHIS. The results indicate that 12% of the patients had a diagnosed psychiatric disorder, mainly depression. However, these results should be treated with caution as the GHIS is not a validated instrument for the diagnosis of emotional disorders. The conclusions from this study are that health visitors need to be better able to identify patients with emotional problems in the postnatal period.

Discussion

The findings indicate that 12% of the patients had a diagnosed psychiatric disorder, mainly depression. However, these results should be treated with caution as the GHIS is not a validated instrument for the diagnosis of emotional disorders. The conclusions from this study are that health visitors need to be better able to identify patients with emotional problems in the postnatal period.
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Court of Appeal rule on Brightlingsea dispute over restrictive covenant

CLARE OBER

A new appeal case, which goes up to the Court of Appeal on 2 May, could have far-reaching implications for the High Court in England and Wales. The case, London and Cambridge Ltd v. Brightlingsea Ltd, concerns a restrictive covenant in a lease agreement that restricts the use of the property to non-residential purposes. The covenant in question is that the lessee shall not use the property for any purpose other than a restaurant.

The appeal is significant because it will determine the extent to which courts will enforce restrictive covenants in lease agreements. This is important because restrictive covenants are a common feature of lease agreements in the UK and are used to control the use of property for various purposes. The outcome of this appeal will impact the ability of landlords to enforce restrictive covenants and the rights of tenants to use their property as they see fit.

The appeal will consider whether the restrictive covenant is reasonable and valid. It is likely that the Court of Appeal will consider the balance between the interests of the landlord and the tenant, and whether the covenant is necessary to protect the landlord's interests. The appeal will also consider whether the covenant is reasonable in view of the market value of the property.

The outcome of this appeal will have implications for the future of restrictive covenants in lease agreements. It is possible that the Court of Appeal will set a new precedent that will impact the enforceability of restrictive covenants in the UK.

Previous Court decisions

The case of Goodwin v. White, which involved a similar restrictive covenant, was heard in the High Court in 2002. The court held that the restrictive covenant was valid and enforceable. However, the court also indicated that the covenant was not unreasonable and that it was necessary to protect the landlord's interests.

The court in this case will consider whether the covenant is reasonable and valid. It is likely that the Court of Appeal will consider the balance between the interests of the landlord and the tenant, and whether the covenant is necessary to protect the landlord's interests. The appeal will also consider whether the covenant is reasonable in view of the market value of the property.

The outcome of this appeal will have implications for the future of restrictive covenants in lease agreements. It is possible that the Court of Appeal will set a new precedent that will impact the enforceability of restrictive covenants in the UK.