

Estimating prognosis is a poor use of physicians' time

Dr Ladouceur's editorial in the August issue noted that family physicians are often asked to provide an opinion about a patient's prognosis, including how long a person's disability will last, how long a person will need home care, and how long a person can remain independent in the community.¹ He cited Downar et al,² who followed patients whose doctors estimated they would probably die within a year. Two-thirds of the patients survived longer than a year. Dr Ladouceur concluded that physicians cannot predict a patient's prognosis and wrote, "The most absurd aspect of this story is that ... physicians remain the most reasonably apt to establish prognosis."¹

Defending the Affordable Care Act in the United States, Sommers et al cited evidence indicating that the expansion of Medicaid (allowing people to go to a doctor) decreased the chance of dying, particularly from heart disease, infection, and cancer.³ About 280 people need access to medical care to prevent 1 death during 1 year.² Millions of Canadians do not have a family doctor, partly because doctors are too busy filling out forms to take new patients.

I agree with the spirit of Dr Ladouceur's editorial. I think it is absurd that bureaucrats demand we do something (ie, estimate prognosis) that cannot be done with the current state of knowledge. Our time would be better spent looking after patients.

—Robert W. Shepherd MD CCFP
Victoria, BC

Competing interests

None declared

References

- Ladouceur R. What's the prognosis, Doc? *Can Fam Physician* 2017;63:584 (Eng), 585 (Fr).
- Downar J, Goldman R, Pinto R, Englesakis M, Adhikari NKJ. The "surprise question" for predicting death in seriously ill patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *CMAJ* 2017;189(13):E484-93.
- Sommers BD, Gawande AA, Baicker K. Health insurance coverage and health—what the recent evidence tells us. *N Engl J Med* 2017;377(6):586-93. Epub 2017 Jun 21.

Strategy to diminish nonresponse

Neimanis et al report that 36% of all requests from primary care physicians for specialist consultation in Hamilton, Ont, were not responded to by the end of their study's follow-up time of 5 to 7 weeks.¹ This experience is likely mirrored, anecdotally, in many communities. Emergency physicians also make elective specialist referrals and run into similar problems. Furthermore, as an emergency physician, I often see people who come to the emergency department thinking they can work around the problems of non-response for a consultation or a prolonged wait for either a consultation or diagnostic procedure. As frustrating as these encounters are, these patients are

simply trying to make an uncertain, unresponsive system work for them. Neimanis et al shed descriptive light on the problem of nonresponse to a request for consultation. However, most of the suggestions to solve the problem, including those from the Canadian Medical Association "toolbox,"² are general and not helpful.

I use the following strategy to diminish non-response for an elective consultation from a specialist. When I make a referral, I write out the name of the specialist for the person and tell him or her that he or she should receive a call from the specialist's office regarding an appointment time by a certain date (usually about 1 week). If he or she does not hear from the specialist's office, he or she is to call the office and ask if the specialist received the referral. If the office did not receive the referral, the person phones the emergency department and asks for the referral letter to be faxed again. If the specialist's office acknowledges receipt of the referral, then the person should ask when the appointment is. If the consultation date has not been fixed, then the person should ask by what date the specialist's office will notify them about the consultation. If he or she has not heard by that date, call again and go through the same procedure. I emphasize to the patient to be polite but insistent in pinning down dates. Patients should try to be perceived as just seeking information they deserve to have. The squeaky wheel gets the grease.

Patients can generally handle waiting for an appointment when they know when it will be. They can adjust their expectations or seek a referral to a different consultant if the wait time seems excessive. What is difficult and frustrating is the uncertainty of not knowing when or even if a consultation will be booked. I am amazed when I see people who tell me they were referred 6 months ago to someone, whose name they never knew or have forgotten, and they have not heard back from their family physician or the specialist about when the consultation will take place. Their faith in the system

Top 5 recent articles read online at cfp.ca

- Clinical Review:** Management of impetigo and cellulitis. *Simple considerations for promoting appropriate antibiotic use in skin infections* (August 2017)
- Letters:** Time off work (August 2017)
- Tools for Practice:** Trouble sleeping: spend less time in bed? (August 2017)
- Commentary:** Figure 8 strategy. *Practical guide to finding your niche in a community engagement initiative* (August 2017)
- Child Health Update:** Topiramate for pediatric migraine prevention (July 2017)(June 2017)

is touching but naïve. They patiently wait politely for a telephone call that might never come.

Until patients and primary care physicians indicate that nonresponse to a request for consultation is unacceptable, we enable this behaviour to continue.

—Don Eby MD CCFP(EM) FCFP
Owen Sound, Ont

Competing interests

None declared

References

1. Neimanis I, Gaebel K, Dickson R, Levy R, Goebel C, Zizzo A, et al. Referral processes and wait times in primary care. *Can Fam Physician* 2017;63:619-24.
2. Canadian Medical Association. *Referral and consultation process toolbox*. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Medical Association; 2016. Available from: www.cma.ca/En/Pages/referrals-consultation.aspx. Accessed 2017 Aug 23.

Correction

In the article “Assessing family history of chronic disease in primary care,”¹ which appeared in the January issue of *Canadian Family Physician*, errors were inadvertently included. The corrections appear below.

The proportion of patients self-reporting a family history (FH) of colorectal cancer (CRC) was reported incorrectly. The results portion of the abstract should have read as follows:

Among patients with positive FH, the following proportions of patients had that FH recorded in the EMR [electronic medical record] compared with the questionnaire: diabetes, 24% in the EMR versus 36% on the questionnaire, $\kappa=0.466$; coronary artery disease, 35% in the EMR versus 22% on the questionnaire, $\kappa=0.225$; breast cancer, 21% in the EMR versus 22% on the questionnaire, $\kappa=0.241$; and CRC, 12% in the EMR versus 26% on the questionnaire, $\kappa=0.510$.

This also affected the “Comparison of FH collection methods” section. Additionally, McNemar tests should have been used to compare EMR and self-report data;

this affected the *P* value for an FH of breast cancer (BC). This section should have read as follows:

Slightly more than 20% of women were identified as having an FH of BC by either EMR (21%) or self-report (22%, *P*=.74). The proportion of patients with an FH of CRC was 12% in the EMR and 26% by self-report (*P*<.001).

The “Analysis” section should have read as follows:

Two-sided Fisher exact tests were used to examine differences between elevated and average risk patients (based on FH) in appropriate screening variables. Cohen κ statistics were used to determine concordance of the data sources. The McNemar test was used to compare ascertainment of FH information from the EMR compared with self-report.

Some numbers were inadvertently transposed in **Table 3**. The correct version of the table is reproduced here.

Two-sided Fisher exact tests should have been used to examine differences between elevated- and average-risk patients. This affected the *P* values reported in **Table 4**. The correct version of the table is reproduced here.

The authors apologize for the errors and any confusion they might have caused.

Des erreurs se sont glissées dans l'article intitulé « Assessing family history of chronic disease in primary care »¹, publié dans le numéro du *Médecin de famille canadien* de janvier. Les corrections apparaissent ci-après:

La proportion de patients qui ont signalé eux-mêmes avoir des antécédents familiaux (AF) de cancer colorectal (CCR) a été incorrectement rapportée. Dans le résumé, la section des résultats aurait dû se lire comme suit:

Table 3. Concordance between FH from EMR data and self-reported FH

CONDITION	FH FROM EMR DATA	SELF-REPORTED FH		κ STATISTIC* (95% CI)
		NO	YES	
Diabetes (n = 775)	No	459	134	0.466 (0.40–0.53)
	Yes	41	141	
Coronary artery disease (n = 775)	No	433	73	0.225 (0.15–0.30)
	Yes	175	94	
Breast cancer (women only, n=555)	No	365	73	0.241 (0.15–0.34)
	Yes	69	48	
Colorectal cancer (n = 775)	No	571	114	0.510 (0.44–0.58)
	Yes	5	85	

EMR—electronic medical record, FH—family history.

*Strength of agreement³⁰: <0 = less than chance; 0.01–0.20 = slight agreement; 0.21–0.40 = fair agreement; 0.41–0.60 = moderate agreement; 0.61–0.80 = substantial agreement; and 0.81–0.99 = almost perfect agreement.