

interaction was ever about preventive services, physical examinations, or reviews of systems. Do we know how patients, doctors, and teams would like to organize regular interactions? Do we know what they want to get out of them? Can we measure the needs, expectations, services, and outcomes? What should, or could, occur at regular encounters between patients and their personal primary care physicians? As health care needs, expectations, and resources all change, we should ask the question of how best to use the time clinicians and patients have together.<sup>4</sup> Enlarge the primary care team and the questions become more complex and probably more important.

Prevention facilitators, waiting-room kiosks, and Web-based patient portals might contribute to getting services of proven value performed at recommended intervals. They might even help activate patients, improve shared decision making, and help patients change health-related behaviour. We agree that more research is needed to test such interventions and better funding will be required to implement what is demonstrated to work.

The challenge, of course, is that the processes and outcomes of greatest value might well be the hardest to measure. Interactions occur at regular or random encounters and outcomes might be seen only in the future at varying times and places. Family medicine is the specialty devoted to care of the whole patient, the whole time, and each visit is an opportunity to activate, orchestrate, and integrate. A conversation at the periodic health care visit might be the foundation for helping patients choose wisely<sup>5,6</sup> and for key decisions at later encounters in the office, emergency department, hospital, or hospice. The patient's (and family's) trust in the physician, built over routine encounters, might help avoid the unnecessary computed tomography scan for headache months or years later. Such discussions—and the relationships they help build—might help avoid low-value routine tests, inappropriate emergency department visits, or unneeded hazardous procedures. They might get the family on the same page for birth plans or end-of-life care. Just because these processes and outcomes are not easy to measure does not mean they are not important. If we leave them out of the discussion and off the research agenda, we threaten the appreciation and understanding of family medicine and primary care.

The value of family medicine and the importance of a continuous relationship with a personal physician are under attack from many quarters.<sup>7,8</sup> If we are to defend their potential, study their benefits (and harms), and pursue this shared vision, we must raise our sights to horizons beyond the silos.

The real question is not whether annual checkups are worthwhile, but how we can make scheduled visits and clinician-patient encounters as valuable as they can be.

—William R. Phillips MD MPH FAFAP  
Seattle, Wash

#### Competing interests

None declared

#### References

1. Birtwhistle R, Bell NR, Thombs BD, Grad R, Dickinson JA. Periodic preventive health visits: a more appropriate approach to delivering preventive services. From the Canadian Task Force on Preventive Health Care. *Can Fam Physician* 2017;63:824-6 (Eng), e449-51 (Fr).
2. Phillips WR. Should we abandon routine visits? *Ann Intern Med* 2016;165(7):528.
3. Ladouceur R. For the scholarly, free-thinking family physician. *Can Fam Physician* 2018;64:6 (Eng), 7 (Fr).
4. Heid M. You asked: do I really need an annual physical? *TIME* 2018 Jan 10. Available from: [time.com/5095920/annual-physical-exam](https://time.com/5095920/annual-physical-exam). Accessed 2018 Apr 10.
5. College of Family Physicians of Canada. *Family medicine. Thirteen things physicians and patients should question*. Toronto, ON: Choosing Wisely Canada; 2018. Available from: <https://choosingwiselycanada.org/family-medicine>. Accessed 2018 Apr 10.
6. *Choosing Wisely* [website]. Philadelphia, PA: American Board of Internal Medicine Foundation; 2018. Available from: [www.choosingwisely.org](http://www.choosingwisely.org). Accessed 2018 Apr 10.
7. Green LA. Will people have personal physicians anymore? Dr Ian McWhinney Lecture, 2017. *Can Fam Physician* 2017;63:909-12.
8. Phillips RL Jr. Preserving primary care robustness despite increasing health system integration. *Fam Med* 2017;49(8):591-3.

## Addressing the objections to an article

I want to respond to the objections<sup>1,2</sup> published in the April issue of *Canadian Family Physician* regarding Dr Gallagher's article "New category of opioid-related death."<sup>3</sup> Dr Gallagher is considered by palliative care physicians to be a leader nationally. She has helped physicians to prescribe opioids such as methadone safely by providing education on the Canadian Virtual Hospice with her Methadone for Pain in Palliative Care program. So, although it is fair to make points in favour of medical assistance in dying<sup>2</sup> or to ask about the extent of her opioid honoraria,<sup>1</sup> you might want to check out her curriculum vitae before trolling her. I work with elderly patients and in palliative care and I think we need to have open discussions about these topics.

—Darren K. Reimer MD CCFP(PC) FCFP  
Steinbach, Man

#### Competing interests

None declared

#### References

1. Ferguson G. Author's honoraria from opioid seller [Letters]. *Can Fam Physician* 2018;64:249.
2. Weiss ES. Taking unnecessary aim at MAID [Letters]. *Can Fam Physician* 2018;64:249.
3. Gallagher R. New category of opioid-related death. *Can Fam Physician* 2018;64:95-6 (Eng), e54-5 (Fr).

## Complexity of the opioid problem

I thank Drs Ferguson<sup>1</sup> and Weiss<sup>2</sup> for their letters in response to my article "A new category of opioid-related death,"<sup>3</sup> which was published in the February issue of *Canadian Family Physician*.

Dr Ferguson writes that the article is "touting the benefits of treating noncancer pain with opioids in the elderly by someone who has received honoraria from Purdue Pharma"<sup>1</sup> and claims it is akin to literature that he claims got the opioid crisis going. His black-and-white view of this complex situation is one of the reasons I wrote the article. I was concerned about my clinical experiences in treating pain in older adults. For a variety of reasons (fear of scrutiny of prescribing, fear of harming the patient, lack of interest) many physicians are not

educating themselves about the complexity of this problem and responding appropriately, but are merely deciding that opioids are not to be used in chronic noncancer pain. Even the national opioid guideline<sup>4</sup> clearly states that its guideline includes the safe use of opioids in noncancer pain. Furthermore, the guideline recognizes that if pain persists and is moderate to severe, a trial of opioids should be undertaken.

Dr Weiss, who also has a conflict of interest in being an advisor to Dying with Dignity Canada, accuses me of conflating lack of treatment of pain with “unfounded fears and prejudices about MAID [medical assistance in dying].”<sup>2</sup> I do not think fears are unfounded, as I have already seen cases of poor symptom management lead to decline in overall health and eventually to a request for MAID.

Pain BC, an organization of pain patients, pain practitioners, and volunteers that advocates and educates about chronic pain, held a webinar for health care professionals around the eligibility criteria for MAID because of patients’ and health care professionals’ questions about MAID for patients with chronic pain. I agree with Dr Weiss that many patients who access MAID do receive palliative care before it, but palliative care in Canada is a patchwork of services and many still do not get access to high-quality palliative care.<sup>5</sup>

I urge all physicians to take the time to understand this complex situation not as an “opioid crisis” but as a “poisoning crisis” (illicit fentanyl) in a society that does not do enough to prevent and treat the compulsion

to abuse substances, relying on mitigation of harm by reducing access to the substance. The pendulum of support for the use of opioids in pain has swung back and forth now for at least a century with collateral damage each time. Good books on the history of opioid regulation are *The American Disease* by David Musto<sup>6</sup> and *Pain: A Political History* by Keith Wailoo,<sup>7</sup> both of which I recommend to Drs Ferguson and Weiss, as well as to all other physicians.

As for Dr Ferguson’s criticism of my potential conflict of interest,<sup>1</sup> my yearly honoraria for talks about pain management for Purdue Pharma are less than 4% of my income from caring for patients.

—Romayne Gallagher MD CCFP(PC) FCFP  
Vancouver, BC

#### Competing interests

Dr Gallagher accepts honoraria for educational talks from Purdue Pharma.

#### References

1. Ferguson G. Author’s honoraria from opioid seller [Letters]. *Can Fam Physician* 2018;64:249.
2. Weiss ES. Taking unnecessary aim at MAID [Letters]. *Can Fam Physician* 2018;64:249.
3. Gallagher R. New category of opioid-related death. *Can Fam Physician* 2018;64:95-6 (Eng), e54-5 (Fr).
4. Busse JW, editor. *The 2017 Canadian guideline for opioids for chronic non-cancer pain*. Hamilton, ON: McMaster University; 2017. Available from: [http://nationalpaincentre.mcmaster.ca/documents/Opioid%20GL%20for%20CMAJ\\_01may2017.pdf](http://nationalpaincentre.mcmaster.ca/documents/Opioid%20GL%20for%20CMAJ_01may2017.pdf). Accessed 2018 Apr 17.
5. Canadian Hospice Palliative Care Association. *Fact sheet: hospice palliative care in Canada*. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Hospice Palliative Care Association; 2017. Available from: [www.chpca.net/media/557647/new\\_fact\\_sheet\\_hpc\\_in\\_canada-summer2017-final-en.pdf](http://www.chpca.net/media/557647/new_fact_sheet_hpc_in_canada-summer2017-final-en.pdf). Accessed 2018 Apr 17.
6. Musto DF. *The American disease: origins of narcotic control*. 3rd ed. New York, NY: Oxford University Press; 1999.
7. Wailoo K. *Pain: a political history*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press; 2014.

### Make your views known!

To comment on a particular article, open the article at [www.cfp.ca](http://www.cfp.ca) and click on the **eLetters** tab. eLetters are usually published online within 1 to 3 days and might be selected for publication in the next print edition of the journal. To submit a letter not related to a specific article published in the journal, please e-mail [letters.editor@cfpc.ca](mailto:letters.editor@cfpc.ca).

### Faites-vous entendre!

Pour exprimer vos commentaires sur un article en particulier, accédez à cet article à [www.cfp.ca](http://www.cfp.ca) et cliquez sur l’onglet **eLetters**. Les commentaires sous forme d’eLetters sont habituellement publiés en ligne dans un délai de 1 à 3 jours et pourraient être choisis pour apparaître dans le prochain numéro imprimé de la revue. Pour soumettre une lettre à la rédaction qui ne porte pas sur un article précis publié dans la revue, veuillez envoyer un courriel à [letters.editor@cfpc.ca](mailto:letters.editor@cfpc.ca).