

Competing interests

None declared

References

1. Crawley A, Murphy L, Regier L, McKee N. Tapering opioids using motivational interviewing. *Can Fam Physician* 2018;64:584-7 (Eng), e341-5 (Fr).
2. Miller WR, Rollnick S. *Motivational interviewing. Helping people change*. 3rd ed. New York, NY: The Guilford Press; 2012.

Provincial screening bonuses

I read with interest and agreement the article by Dickinson et al titled “Screening: when things go wrong,”¹ which encourages family doctors to have transparent and evidence-based conversations with our patients about preventive screening. Rather than simply telling our patients to complete the screening, we should engage with them in evidence-based shared decision making.

It caused me to wonder what effect provincial bonuses to family doctors might be having on these discussions with our patients. As a family doctor in Ontario, I receive a substantial annual preventive care bonus that is scaled to the percentage of my patients who have completed breast, colon, or cervical cancer screening. Patients count toward my annual bonus only if they have decided to complete their screening. When I take the time to engage my patients in a discussion of the risks and benefits of screening, those patients who ultimately decide against screening detract from my annual bonus.

What effect are provincial bonus structures like this having on our discussions with patients? As much as I

would like to think I will do the right thing for my patient regardless of how I get paid, we are all still financial actors. In my view the bonus structure incentivizes a paternalistic “just get it done” approach over the shared decision-making strategy Dickinson et al advocate for.

—Jason Booy MD CCFP
Toronto, Ont

Competing interests

None declared

Reference

1. Dickinson JA, Pimlott N, Grad R, Singh H, Szafran O, Wilson BJ, et al. Screening: when things go wrong. *Can Fam Physician* 2018;64:502-8 (Eng), e299-306 (Fr).

Correction

In the English translation of the editorial that appeared in the August issue of *Canadian Family Physician*,¹ the term *stage* should have been translated as *rotation*, rather than *clerkship*, and the term *étudiant* should have been translated as *learner*, rather than *student*.

Canadian Family Physician apologizes for the error and any confusion it might have caused.

Reference

1. Ladouceur R. Assessment of family medicine residents. *Can Fam Physician* 2018;64:560 (Eng), 561 (Fr).

Make your views known!

To comment on a particular article, open the article at 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.

Faites-vous entendre!

Pour exprimer vos commentaires sur un article en particulier, accédez à cet article à 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.