## 41 Time of visit and billing status

Organisation supporting this study: Australian Government Department of Health and Ageing
Issues: The relationship between after-hours status of a consultation and patient billing status.
Sample: 5,546 Medicare-claimable encounters, from 200 GPs; data collection period: 07/05/2002-10/06/2002 and 16/07/2002-19/08/2002.
Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

## Summary of results

Of the 5,546 Medicare-claimable consultations recorded in these data collection periods in 2002, $69.8 \%$ ( $95 \%$ CI: 65.4-74.3) were bulk billed, and $30.2 \%$ were patient billed; comparable to previous GPSCU data (June-Oct 2000, Abstract 16) with 74.4\% (95\% CI: 70.4-78.3) of general practice consultations bulk billed.
Consultations with patients aged 75+ were bulk-billed at a significantly higher rate than younger patients; those with patients aged 45-64 were bulk billed at $63.5 \%$ ( $95 \% \mathrm{CI}$ : 58.0-69.1) of Medicare-claimable encounters compared with 82.1\% (95\% CI: 76.4-87.9) of those aged 75 or more.
The DoHA definition of after-hours was used, 'standard office hours' includes weekdays 8 am to 6 pm and Saturday 8 am to 1 pm , while 'after-hours' is weekday nights 6 pm to 8 am and Saturday 1pm to Monday 8am. Of the Medicare-claimable encounters, $92.8 \%$ ( $95 \% \mathrm{CI}$ : 90.9-94.8) occurred during 'standard office hours', while the remaining $7.2 \%$ occurred 'after-hours'. The comparable results from 2 years previously were that $7.4 \%$ of consultations occurred 'after-hours'.
'After-hours' consultations had a bulk billing rate of $77.1 \%$, compared with $69.3 \%$ of consultations during 'standard office hours', and these proportions are not significantly different. Therefore, without adjusting for any other variables, billing status of patient and whether a consultation occurred 'after-hours' were not related.
Simple logistic regression modelling with billing status as the outcome found that whether the consultation occurred during 'standard office' or 'after-hours' was not related to patient billing status. However, the multiple model, including all significant descriptor variables found that 'after-hours' consultations were significantly more likely to be bulk billed than those held during 'standard office' hours (adjusted OR=1.92).
Other significant descriptors in the model were patient age, whether the patient was from a non-English-speaking background, whether they lived in an urban or rural setting, whether they held a health care card and whether they were from a low SES background. A paper fully describing these results is in preparation.

For other related abstracts see: 16 Effect of day and time of GP visit on billing method.
Further reading:
Pegram, R. W. \& Valenti, L. 2004, 'Factors influencing billing status in general practice [letter]:, Medical Journal of Australia, vol. 181, no. 2, p. 115.
The following page contains the recording form and instructions with which the data in this abstract were collected.

## PLEASE READ CAREFULLY

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about TIME OF VISIT AND BILLING STATUS.
You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

## NSTRUCTIONS

For this consultation please tick day of week

| $\square$ | Monday |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\square$ | Tuesday |
| $\square$ | Wednesday |
| $\square$ | Thursday |
| $\square$ | Friday |
| $\square$ | Saturday |
| $\square$ | Sunday |

Sunday


## FOR THE DOCTOR

If a Medicare item number is applicable to the consultation, please indicate by ticking the appropriate box whether the consultation was bulk billed to the government or whether the patient has been billed.

For this consultation please tick time of day
$\square \quad 7.00 \mathrm{am}-8.00 \mathrm{am}$
$\square \quad 1.00 \mathrm{pm}-6.00 \mathrm{pm}$
$\square \quad 1.00 \mathrm{pm}-6.00 \mathrm{pm}$
$\square \quad 6.00 \mathrm{pm}-8.00 \mathrm{pm}$
$\square \quad 8.00 \mathrm{pm}-11.00 \mathrm{pm}$
$\square \quad 11.00 \mathrm{pm}-7.00 \mathrm{am}$

If a Medicare item number has applied to this consultation please indicate method of billing
$\square \quad$ Bulk billed
$\square \quad$ Patient billed
-

## 42 Prevalence and management of chronic pain

## Organisation supporting this study: Janssen-Cilag Pty Ltd

Issues: The prevalence of chronic pain among general practice patients; the conditions causing chronic pain; the anatomical sites most affected; the managements being utilised by GPs; duration of medication usage; management of medication side effects.
Sample: 2,800 respondents from 99 GPs; data collection period: 11/06/2002-15/07/2002.
Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

## Summary of results

The age-sex distribution of respondents was similar to the distribution of the total BEACH sample with the majority ( $57.0 \%$ ) being female and $54.0 \%$ aged 45 years or over.
A total of 507 patients ( $18.1 \%, 95 \%$ CI: 15.4-20.8) were reported as having chronic pain. Prevalence was significantly higher for patients aged 45 years or more ( $25.8 \%$, $95 \% \mathrm{CI}$ : 20.531.1) than for patients aged less than 45 years ( $8.8 \%, 95 \%$ CI: 6.7-10.9). There was no significant difference between the prevalence for males ( $16.3 \%$ ) and females ( $19.5 \%$ ).
Causal conditions were identified for 490 of the 507 chronic pain sufferers. In total, 82 different causal conditions were reported, $41.8 \%$ of these ( $n=205$ ) being forms of arthritis including osteoarthritis (30.8\%), arthritis not otherwise specified (NOS) (5.9\%), and rheumatoid arthritis (5.1\%).
Anatomical sites were recorded for 472 patients. A total of 618 responses (multiple sites were affected for some patients) were recorded for 14 different body sites, those most commonly affected being the back ( $32.5 \%$ ), knee ( $12.9 \%$ ) and the neck/cervical spine ( $7.9 \%$ ).
Medication usage was recorded for 495 patients. More than two-thirds ( $70.3 \%$ ) took analgesics, either alone or with another medication. One-third (33.1\%) took NSAIDs, 8.1\% took psychotropics and $7.1 \%$ took oral sustained release morphine (OSRM).
For each medication type, the back was the main body site affected (other analgesics- $44.2 \%$; NSAIDs-45.8\%; psychotropics-30.0\%; OSRM-60.0\%). Types of arthritis were the main cause of chronic pain for patients in 3 of the medication groups (other analgesics-41.6\%; NSAIDs$60.1 \%$; psychotropics $-17.5 \%$ ). The main cause of chronic pain for patients taking OSRM was back problems ( $28.6 \%$ ) followed by malignant neoplasm (20.0\%) and musculoskeletal conditions (17.1\%).
Medication groups were similar across time periods of usage. Forty eight patients took medication to manage side effects. Of 57 medications listed, $66.7 \%(n=38)$ were laxatives and $8.7 \%(n=5)$ were omeprazole.

For other related abstracts see: 82 Prevalence and management of chronic pain.
The following page contains the recording form and instructions with which the data in this abstract were collected.

## PLEASE READ CAREFULLY

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about CHRONIC PAIN.
You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

## INSTRUCTIONS

## CONDITION \& SITE AFFECTED <br> Please write the condition you identify as the being the cause of the patient's chronic pain <br> Please write the anatomic site/s which the patient nominates as being most affected by pain.

## MEDICATION FOR PAIN MANAGEMENT

Please use the tick boxes to indicate whether the patient is currently taking any of the nominated medications for pain management. Tick more than one if applicable.

For each medication please circle an option to indicate the approximate length of time the patient has been using any type of this medication for management of pain associated with their current condition (i.e., the condition nominated in the previous question).

| If 'Yes' from what condition? | What medications (if any) are currently being used for pain management? For each please indicate the approximate duration of usage. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\square$ Oral Slow Release Morphine | wks / mths / yrs |
| The anatomic site/s most affected by pain is/are - | $\square$ Other analgesics | wks / mths / yrs |
|  | $\square$ Non-steroidal anti-inflammatories | wks / mths / yrs |
|  | $\square$ Psychotropics | wks / mths / yrs |
|  | $\square$ None of the above (Tick as many as apply) |  |

## MANAGEMENT OF SIDE EFFECTS

Please advise whether the patient is using any other medication for the management of any side effects caused by the morphine/other analgesic.

What other medication/s is the patient using for management of any side effects of the morphine/ other analgesic?
$\square$ Laxative
$\square$ Other

- None of the above


## 43 Initiation and purpose of pathology orders

Organisation supporting this study: Australian Government Department of Health and Ageing
Issues: There is scant evidence in assessing the effectiveness and appropriateness of pathology ordering by GPs. This study investigated pathology orders at general practice encounters, specifically to determine the initiation of tests (i.e. the proportion of tests suggested by the GP compared with the proportion requested by the patient); the purpose of the tests (i.e. considered investigative, monitoring or preventive by a GP); and whether or not the test was considered 'opportunistic' by the GP (e.g. the GP had decided on a full blood count for the patient, and took the 'opportunity' to have the patient's cholesterol or blood sugar checked).
Sample: 3,001 encounters from 100 GPs; data collection period: 11/06/2002-15/07/2002.
Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

## Summary of results

The age-sex distribution of respondents was similar to total BEACH sample of general practice encounters, with the majority ( $56.9 \%$ ) of encounters with female patients.
There were 491 ( $16.4 \%$ ) encounters at which 1,101 pathology test orders were placed, at a rate of 36.7 ( $95 \%$ CI: $31.4-41.9$ ) per 100 encounters and 224.2 ( $95 \%$ CI: 209.0-239.5) per 100 encounters involving pathology.
Of the 1,036 pathology tests for which the GP responded to the initiation question, $84.9 \%$ were initiated by the GP and the remainder ( $15.1 \%$ ) were requested by the patient. Among the 213 haematology test orders, 199 tests ( $93.4 \%$ ) were initiated by the GP. Of the 575 chemistry test orders, $85.9 \%$ were initiated by the GP. Within the microbiology group, $80.8 \%$ of the 151 microbiology test orders were initiated by the GP. Only $35.6 \%$ of the 45 cytopathology tests (mainly pap smear) were initiated by the GP, compared with $100 \%$ of the 20 histopathology (mainly skin histology) and 14 immunology tests.
Of the 1,047 pathology test orders for which the GP indicated the purpose of a test, approximately a half (50.8\%) were for investigative purposes, one-third (34.8\%) for monitoring purposes, and one-sixth ( $14.4 \%$ ) for preventive purposes.
Among the 577 chemistry test orders, 258 (44.7\%) tests were for monitoring purposes, $232(40.2 \%)$ were investigative and $87(15.1 \%)$ were for preventive purposes. All orders for immunology, histopathology, pregnancy and simple test were considered investigative. The 46 cytopathology tests were mainly ordered for preventive purposes ( $63.0 \%$ ) and were less likely to be used for investigative ( $19.6 \%$ ) or monitoring purposes ( $17.4 \%$ ).
Of the 920 pathology test orders for which the GP responded to the 'opportunistic' question, $18.0 \%$ were regarded as opportunistic. Approximately one-quarter ( $24.7 \%$ ) of the 518 chemistry test orders were opportunistic. In contrast, among the 139 microbiology test orders, $10(7.2 \%)$ tests were regarded as opportunistic.
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## PLEASE READ CAREFULLY

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about PATHOLOGY.
You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

## INSTRUCTIONS

## FOR THE DOCTOR

In the 'pathology' section of these forms there is room to record up to 5 different tests ordered today which are associated with the problems being managed for this patient at today's encounter.

For each of the next 30 forms, if you have ordered pathology for the patient, please complete the following questions. Only complete this section if you have ordered pathology at the encounter.


## 44 Severity of illness

## Organisation supporting this study: General Practice Statistics and Classification Unit (GPSCU)

Issues: This study was undertaken to explore the complex interrelationships between the severity of patient health problems managed at the encounter and the frequency of patient visits and length of consultation. These interrelationships cannot be explored using BEACH encounter data or Medicare data.

Sample: 6,742 encounters from 225 GPs. Data collected between 26/02/2002-01/04/2002 and 16/07/2002-19/08/2002.
Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.
Methods for this study: The Duke University Severity of Illness (DUSOI) analogue scale was used to assess the severity of each problem managed at the encounter and to calculate a total score for each encounter. ${ }^{1}$ The GP recorded the start and finish time for the encounter and determined the number of GP visits in the preceding 12 months in consultation with the patient.

## Summary of results

The age and sex distribution of the 6,742 respondents was similar to the distribution for all BEACH encounters.

The mean total DUSOI score was 5.6 ( $95 \%$ CI: 5.3-5.9) based on 5,612 scored encounters. Encounters with patients aged 65 years and over had a significant higher mean total DUSOI score (6.9, $95 \% \mathrm{CI}$ : 6.3-7.5) than all scored encounters. There was a significant positive linear relationship between total DUSOI score and number of GP visits reported in the previous 12 months ( $p<0.001$ ). Patients reporting 11 or more GP visits had the highest mean total score of 6.8 , and those reporting nil GP visits had the lowest total mean score of 4.2.

There was a significant positive linear relationship between mean total DUSOI score at the encounter and the length of consultation with the consultation length increasing by 0.5 minute for each one unit increase in DUSOI ( $p=<0.001$ ). The DUSOI range was 4.26 for consultations of less than 5 minutes to 8.80 for consultations of more than 25 minutes.

The DUSOI from the 8,118 scored problems had a mean and a median of 4.0. Significantly higher DUSOI scores were recorded for the following problems compared with the DUSOI for all problems (mean 4.0, $95 \% \mathrm{CI}$ : 3.8-4.2): depression (mean 5.4, $95 \% \mathrm{CI}$ : 5.1-5.8), back complaint (mean 5.3, $95 \% \mathrm{CI}$ : 4.8-5.7), ischaemic heart disease (mean 5.2, 95\% CI: 4.6-5.9) and fracture (mean 4.9, 95\% CI: 4.2-5.6).
Significantly lower DUSOI scores were recorded for the following problems: hypertension (mean 3.4, 95\% CI: 3.1-3.7), lipid disorder (mean 3.2, 95\% CI: 2.7-3.8), acute upper respiratory infection (mean 3.1, $95 \% \mathrm{CI}$ : 2.8-3.3), menopausal symptom/complaint (mean 3.0, $95 \%$ CI: 2.5-3.5), contact/allergic dermatitis (mean 3.0, $95 \% \mathrm{CI}$ 2.5-3.4), and solar keratosis/sunburn (mean 2.5, 95\% CI: 2.0-3.1).
1 Parkerson GR, Jr., Broadhead WE, Tse CK. The Duke Severity of Illness Checklist (DUSOI) for measurement of severity and comorbidity. J Clin Epidemiol 1993; 46:379-393.
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## PLEASE READ CAREFULLY

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about PATIENT SEVERITY OF ILLNESS
You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

## INSTRUCTIONS



## START time

Record the time the
consultation STARTED in hours and mins and circle whether the time was AM or PM
eg. 9: 10 AMDPM

## GP consultations in the previous year.

Please check with the patient and write in the approximate number of times this patient has consulted you or any other GP at this or any other practice within the past 12 months.

## SEVERITY OF ILLNESS - GP estimates for each patient*

Estimate the severity of illness for EACH problem managed at this encounter. Please mark with an 'X' the appropriate place along the line to indicate how you would rate the patient's overall severity of illness for that problem during the past week.

Lowest severity applies to the fewest symptoms and
complications, the least disability and threat to life, and the best expected response to treatment if needed. Lowest severity = ' 0 '.

Highest severity applies to the most symptoms and complications, the most disability and greatest threat to life, and the worst expected response to treatment. Highest severity = ' 10 '.
*Duke Severity of Illness Analog Scale (DUSOI-A), Parkerson et al, 1993.

## FINISH time

Record the time the consultation FINISHED in hours and mins and circle whether the time was AM or PM.
eg. |9: 28| AMD PM

How many times (approximately) has this patient consulted a GP at any practice in the last 12
months?

Severity of lllness - GP estimate for each patient. Please mark with an 'x' the appropriate place long each line to indicate how you would rate
 he patien sover sevity of illness during the past week for each oday's encounter
Lowest severity $=0$; Highest severity $=10$.


## 45 Diabetes mellitus prevalence, management and risk factors

Organisation supporting this study: AstraZeneca (Australia) Pty Ltd

Issues: Prevalence and treatment of types 1 and 2 diabetes mellitus in general practice patients; cholesterol levels in patients with diabetes; occurrence of risk factors in patients without diabetes.

Sample: 3,165 encounters from 108 GPs; data collection period: 20/08/2002-23/09/2002.
Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

## Summary of results

The age-sex distribution of respondents was similar to the distribution for all BEACH (general practice) encounters, with the majority ( $58.2 \%$ ) being female, and a quarter of patients aged over 65 years.

The prevalence of type 1 and type 2 diabetes mellitus was $1.0 \%$ ( $95 \% \mathrm{CI}: 0.5-1.3, n=30$ ) and $7.2 \%$ ( $95 \%$ CI: $5.9-8.5, n=226$ ) respectively with similar rates for male and female patients. Diabetes was most common in patients aged 65 to 74 years at $2.3 \%$ for type 1 and $18.4 \%$ for type 2.
The most common treatment regimen for type 1 diabetes patients was insulin, either alone or in combination with a diet and exercise program (41.4\%). For type 2 diabetes patients, diet and exercise alone was the most frequent treatment (33.3\%), followed by an oral anti-diabetic agent (most commonly a biguanide) either alone or in combination with diet and exercise (32.0\%).

Among the 25 type 1 diabetes patients, for whom the GPs recorded data on recent cholesterol test results, $56.0 \%$ were in the normal range and $32.0 \%$ had mixed dyslipidaemia. Recent test results for $38.0 \%$ of the 208 type 2 diabetes patients were in the normal range. Fifty-seven per cent of patients had results outside the normal range, most commonly predominant high LDL and/or total cholesterol, while almost $5.0 \%$ of patients had never been tested.
Risk factor status was recorded for 2,907 patients without diabetes. Seventy-one per cent of patients had no risk factors, $17.1 \%$ had hypertension, $14.1 \%$ central obesity, $7.7 \%$ dyslipidaemia and $2.0 \%$ had abnormal glucose. The highest prevalence of abnormal glucose and dyslipidaemia was in 65 to 74 year olds, while hypertension and central obesity were most prevalent in patients 75 years or older.

For other related abstracts see: 21 Diabetes - prevalence, management and screening, 25 Prevalence of diabetes, medications and control, 40 Type 2 diabetes mellitus, prevalence and management, 86 Diabetes Types 1 and 2 and coronary heart disease, 87 Management of cardiovascular or diabetes related conditions, 94 Type 2 diabetes - investigations and related conditions.

The following page contains the recording form and instructions with which the data in this abstract were collected.

## PLEASE READ CAREFULLY

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about DIABETES.
You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

## INSTRUCTIONS

## FOR THE DOCTOR

Please indicate by ticking the
appropriate box whether or not this
patient has ever been diagnosed as having Diabetes.
If 'Yes' proceed to the next question.
If ' No ' go to the last question

```
From recent tests, please indicate whether the patient has
- predominant high LDL or Total Cholesterol (TC)
    (LDL }\geq3.5\textrm{mmol}/\textrm{L}\mathrm{ and / or TC }\geq5.5\textrm{mmol/L
- Mixed dyslipidaemia
    (HDL }\leq1.0\textrm{mmol}/\textrm{L}\mathrm{ and / or Triglycerides (TG) }\geq2.0\textrm{mmol}/\textrm{L}\mathrm{ )
- Combined (LDL }\geq3.5\textrm{mmol}/\textrm{L}\mathrm{ and / or Total Cholesterol (TC) }\geq5.
    mmol/L
    mmol/L )
- been tested, all parameters in a normal range
- never been tested
```



> If 'NO' to diabetes, please indicate whether or not this patient has ever had, or currently has
> - an abnormal glucose test i.e. impaired fasting glucose (IFG
> or impaired glucose tolerance (IGT)
> - hypertension
> - central obesity
> - Mixed dyslipidaemia ( $H D L \leq 1.0 \mathrm{mmol} / \mathrm{L}$ and/ or Triglycerides (TG) $\geq 2.0 \mathrm{mmol} / \mathrm{L}$ )


## 46 Coronary heart disease, risk factors and lipid lowering medication

Organisation supporting this study: Merck Sharp \& Dohme (Australia) Pty Ltd
Issues: The prevalence of coronary heart disease (CHD) and risk factors for CHD among general practice patients; the proportion of patients who had had a cholesterol test; the proportion of patients on lipid lowering medication; the medications being taken and the cholesterol levels at commencement of therapy.
Sample: 3,151 encounters from 108 GPs; data collection period: 20/08/2002-23/09/2002.
Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

## Summary of results

The age-sex distribution of respondents was similar to the distribution for all BEACH encounters, with over half aged 25 to 64 years and the majority ( $59.5 \%$ ) being female.
Sixty-seven per cent of patients did not have coronary heart disease or any of six listed risk factors ( $95 \%$ CI: 63.4-69.7). A total of 224 respondents ( $7.2 \%$ ) had existing CHD. Of patients without CHD but with risk factors for CHD, $17.7 \%$ had hypertension, $7.0 \%$ family history of CHD, $5.7 \%$ family history of hypercholesterolaemia and $3.8 \%$ had diabetes. The risk factors for cerebrovascular disease and peripheral vascular disease accounted for $1.9 \%$ and $0.9 \%$ respectively.
As expected, CHD or its risk factors were more prevalent in older patients, with a significant increase between $45-64$ year olds ( $43.3 \% 95 \%$ CI: 39.3-47.3) and $65-74$ year olds ( $66.2 \% 95 \%$ CI: 60.3-72.1). The prevalence for patients over 75 years was $73.4 \%$ ( $95 \%$ CI: $68.3-78.6$ ). Risk factors were evenly spread between male and female patients. CHD was marginally more common among males ( $9.1 \%, 95 \%$ CI: $7.0-11.1$ ) than females ( $5.8 \%, 95 \% \mathrm{CI}: 4.2-7.4$ ) though the difference did not reach statistical significance.
Of the 3,098 patients who answered the question on cholesterol testing, more than half ( $52.9 \%$ ) had previously had a cholesterol test, and of the 2,726 respondents to the question on lipid lowering medication status, $12.7 \%$ were either starting or continuing such medication.
The most popular lipid lowering generic medications were Simvastatin, which accounted for $41.8 \%$ of lipid lowering medications and Atorvastatin ( $40.9 \%$ of medications). For those on lipid lowering medications the average total cholesterol at the commencement of therapy was $6.9 \mathrm{mmol} / \mathrm{L}$, the mean level of triglycerides was $2.7 \mathrm{mmol} / \mathrm{L}$ and HDL $1.5 \mathrm{mmol} / \mathrm{L}$.

[^2]The following page contains the recording form and instructions with which the data in this abstract were collected.

## PLEASE READ CAREFULLY

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about LIPID LOWERING MEDICATIONS.
You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

## INSTRUCTIONS



## 47 Management of depression and anxiety

Organisation supporting this study: Merck Sharp and Dohme (Australia) Pty Ltd
Issues: Prevalence of depressive and/or anxiety disorders in general practice patients; medications being taken for management of depression and anxiety disorders; side effects of management medications; management of side effects of antidepressant or anxiolitic medications.

Sample: 2,698 encounters for 92 GPs; data collection period 24/09/2002-28/10/2002.
Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

## Summary of results

The age-sex distribution of respondents was similar to the distribution for all BEACH (general practice) encounters, with the majority ( $58.1 \%$ ) of patients being female.
The majority of patients ( $84.3 \%, 95 \% \mathrm{CI}$ : 82.2-86.4) did not have a current anxiety or depressive disorder. The most common Depression/Anxiety disorder being experienced was 'Mixed anxiety/Depressive disorder' reported for $5.5 \%$ ( $95 \% \mathrm{CI}$ : 4.3-6.6) of respondents. Only $2.5 \%$ ( $95 \%$ CI: 1.7-3.2) of respondents were experiencing major depressive disorder. Anxiety and depressive disorders were more common among adults, there were no significant differences in the rates of anxiety or depression between the sexes.
Of those patients experiencing major depressive disorder, $90.9 \%$ ( $95 \% \mathrm{CI}$ : 84.1-97.8) were taking medication. The disorder with the lowest percentage of patients taking medication was 'Other anxiety/depressive disorder', where $45.1 \% ~(95 \% \mathrm{CI}: 31.1-59.1)$ of these patients were taking medication. The four most commonly prescribed generic medications for anxiety/depressive disorders combined were Citalopram, Sertraline, Diazepam and Venlafaxine.

Of the 169 patients taking a selective serotonin reuptake inhibitor (SSRI) or selective noradrenaline reuptake inhibitor (SNRI), 14 ( $8.3 \%$ ) were experiencing nausea and vomiting, $10(5.9 \%)$ had experienced weight gain, $9(5.3 \%)$ had experienced insomnia and $8(4.7 \%)$ had experienced sexual dysfunction as side effects of SSRI/SNRI use. There were no significant differences between side effects in impact on the patients' lives. Of the patients with side effects from SSRI/SNRI use, 24 (63.2\%) were not having their side effects managed. Of those patients having side effects managed, four were taking additional medication, eight had changed their medication and one had stopped the medication.

For other related abstracts see: 5 Depression, 23 Depression.
The following page contains the recording form and instructions with which the data in this abstract were collected.

## PLEASEREAD CAREFULLY

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about DEPRESSION.
You may tear out this page so you can access the list in Box 1 for the following section of forms.

## INSTRUCTIONS

| FOR THE DOCTOR |
| :--- |
| Please indicate by ticking the |
| appropriate box whether or not this |
| patient has any of the listed |
| depressive or anxiety disorders. |
| Use the criteria shown above in Box 1 |
| to help assess whether the patient's |
| depression is a 'MAJOR' depressive |
| disorder. |
| If 'None of the above' end questions |
| here. |

## Medications for anxiety / depressive disorder

Please write the name and form of any medications currently being used to treat this patient's anxiety or depressive disorder. Also, please indicate the regimen (i.e. strength, dose and frequency) of the medication.
Use the criteria shown above in Box to help assess whether the patient's disorder.
here.

## BOX1

Criteria for major depression* *DSM-IV (Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, 4th edition). Atleast FIVE (5) of the following symptoms for at least TWO WEEKS (symptom 1 or 2 mustbe present)
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { (1) Depressed mood } & \text { (6) Fatigue or loss of energy } \\ \begin{array}{ll}\text { (2) Loss of interest or pleasure } & \text { (7) Feelings of worthlessness or excessive guilt } \\ \text { (3) Significantappetite or weightloss or gain } & \text { (8) Impaired thinking or concentration; }\end{array}\end{array}$
(3) Significant appetite or weightloss or gain
(4) Insomnia or hypersomnia
(5) Psychomotor agitation or retardation
indecisiveness
(9) Suicidal thoughts/thoughts of death


## Ask the patient about...

## Side effects of medication

If the patient is using a Selective Seretonin Reuptake Inhibitor (SSRI) or a Serotinin Noradrenaline Reuptake Inhibitor (SNRI) please use the tick boxes to indicate whether or not the patient is experiencing any of the listed side effects from taking this medication recorded in the previous question.

Ask the patient to rank each existing side effect according to how it impacts on their quality of life. Circle a number on a scale of 1 to 5 , where 1 = the least impact and 5 = greatest impact.

## Management of side effects

Please use the tick boxes to indicate how you will attempt to manage any side effects of medication for this patient.

quality of life (tick as many as apply) ( $1=$ least impact; $5=$ greatest impact)

## If an SSRI or SNRI is

 being used:Any side effects from this medication?

If YES, ask the patient to rank the impact of each side effect on their
$\square$ No side effects $\square$ Nausea and vomitin
$\square$ Weight gain
$\square$ Insomnia$\square$ Sex $\square$ Other
her $\qquad$ ysfunction

$\qquad$ 5= greatest 12345 12345 12345 12345 | Circle to rank | How will side effects |
| :---: | :--- |
| be managed? |  |


$\square$ change med'n
$\square$ stop medication
$\square$ further lab tests
$\square$ No management

## 48 Asthma prevalence and management

Organisation supporting this study: Australian Government Department of Health and Ageing
Issues: This study investigated the prevalence of asthma in general practice patients; medications taken for asthma management; severity of asthma for adults and children at commencement of Long Acting Beta Agonist (LABA); reason for prescribing a combination product (LABA plus inhaled corticosteroid (ICS)); changes in asthma control since taking combination product; patient preference for product type; patient use of spacer device.
Sample: 2,686 encounters from 92 GPs; data collection period: 24/09/2002-28/10/2002.
Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.
Methods for this study: Asthma severity was established using the National Asthma Campaign's severity classification, which was provided on a card to participating GPs. This severity classification differs for children (aged <18 years) and adults.

## Summary of results

The age-sex distribution of respondents was similar to the distribution for all BEACH (general practice) encounters, with the majority ( $59.9 \%$ ) of patients being female.
The prevalence of asthma among the respondents was $14.5 \%$ ( $95 \%$ CI: 12.7-16.2). Prevalence was significantly higher among patients aged 5 to 14 years ( $24.0 \%, 95 \%$ CI: 17.3-30.7) compared with the patients from the other age groups ( $13.7 \%, 95 \%$ CI: $12.0-15.5$ ).
Of the 382 patients who answered the question about current medication, $29.8 \%$ were taking the combination LABA/ICS product, $22.3 \%$ were taking inhaled ICS alone, $3.7 \%$ were using both LABA and ICS ( 2 single drugs), and $3.9 \%$ were using LABA alone. The remaining respondents ( $40.3 \%$ ) were not taking these medications.
Of the 16 children taking LABA (single or combination), 8 had frequent asthma, 4 had persistent asthma and 4 had infrequent asthma, when LABA was commenced. Of the 113 adults taking LABA (single or combination), $59.3 \%$ had moderate asthma, $20.4 \%$ had severe asthma, and $20.4 \%$ had very mild to mild asthma, when LABA was commenced.
There were 109 responses to 'purpose of prescribing' the combination product. For these, $34.9 \%(n=38)$ replaced 2 products with one, $30.3 \%(n=33)$ commenced both medications at the same time, $28.4 \%(n=31)$ added LABA to therapy, and $6.4 \%(n=7)$ added ICS to therapy. Asthma control level was 'improved' for $84.4 \%$, 'same as before' for $12.8 \%$, and 'worse' for the remaining $2.8 \%$.
The majority ( $52.3 \%, n=193$ ) of patients preferred the combination product, $21.8 \%$ the single ingredient product, and the remaining $25.9 \%$ had no preference.
The question on the use of a spacer device was answered by 176 patients to whom it was relevant. Of these, $52.3 \%$ reported that they never used a spacer device and the remainder were equally likely to report its use 'always' or 'sometimes' ( $23.1 \%$ in each case).

[^3]
## PLEASE READ CAREFULLY

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about ASTHMA.
You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

## INSTRUCTIONS

## Commencement of Combination product

If the patient is using a combination product, please use the tick boxes to indicate whether it was prescribed to add Beta 2 Agonist to therapy, to add Inhaled Cortiocosteroid to therapy, to commence both medications at the same time, or to replace 2 single medications with the combined product.

## Current medications used

If 'Yes', please use the tick boxes to indicate whether any of the listed types of asthma medication are being used by this patient for their asthma management.

If none of these medications are currently being used for asthma management you may end the questions here.

## ASK ALL PATIENTS

Ask each patient if they currently suffer from asthma.

If No asthma - no further questions

Assessment of asthma control
Severity of asthma
If the patient is using a Long
Acting Beta Agonist (LABA) for
asthma management, please
indicate the severity of their
asthma at the commencement
of the LABA.

Please use the 'Severity of asthma reference card included in your research pack to estimate the severity level and tick the appropriate box to indicate the response.

Please use the tick boxes to indicate whether the control of this patient's asthma has improved, worsened or remains the same since using the combination product.

| Patient preference |
| :--- |
| Please use the tick |
| boxes to indicate |
| whether this patient |
| prefers the combination |
| product, single |
| ingredient products, or |
| has no preference. |

Please indicate how frequently the patient uses a spacer device to assist with medication delivery. If a self actuating device is used tick 'Not applicable'


## Severity of asthma reference card

## Children

| Severity* | Common features |
| :--- | :--- |
| Infrequent <br> episodic | Episodes 6-8 weeks or more apart and from 1to 2 days up to 1-2 weeks duration; usually <br> triggered by URTI or environmental allergen; attacks generally not severe; symptoms rare <br> between attacks; normal examination and lung function except when symptomatic. |
| Frequent <br> episodic | Attacks <6 weeks apart; attacks more troublesome; minimal symptoms such as exercise induces <br> wheeze between attacks; normal examination and lung function except when symptomatic; <br> commonly troubled through winter months only. |
| Persistent | Symptoms most days; nocturnal asthma > 1/wk with sleep disturbance; early morning chest <br> tightness; exercise intolerance and spontaneous wheeze; daily use of beta2 antagonist; <br> abnormal lung function; history of emergency room visits or hospital admissions. |

## Adults

| Severity* | Common features |
| :--- | :--- |
| Very mild | Episodic |
| Mild | Occasional symptoms (up to $2 /$ wk); exacerbations $>6-8$ weeks apart; normal FEV ${ }_{1}$ when <br> asymptomatic |
| Moderate | Symptoms most days; exacerbations <6-8 weeks apart which affect day-time activity and sleep; <br> exacerbations last several days; occasional emergency room visit. |
| Severe | Persistent; limited activity level; nocturnal symptoms > $1 /$ wk; frequent emergency room visits and <br> hospital admission in past year; $F E V_{1}$ may be significantly reduced between exacerbations. |

* The severity classes are adapted from the NAC Asthma Management Handbook 1998 edition, updated March 2002


## 49 Health status and management of patients on non-steroidal antiinflammatory drugs

Organisation supporting this study: Merck Sharp and Dohme (Australia) Pty Ltd
Issues: Prevalence of non-steroidal anti-inflammatory medication (NSAID) use in general practice patients; self-reported general health status of general practice patients taking NSAID medications; prevalence of rheumatoid arthritis among these patients; patient corticosteroid use among these patients; rate of hospitalisation associated with gastrointestinal problems for general practice patients taking NSAID medications; other gastrointestinal side effects for general practice patients taking NSAID medications.
Sample: 5,554 encounters from 192 GPs; data collection period 29/10/2002-21/12/2002 and 21/01/2003-24/02/2003.
Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.
Methods for this study: Current health status was reported by patients based on five listed categories: excellent, very good, good, fair and poor. Each patient was provided with a card that listed these categories.

## Summary of results

The age-sex distribution of respondents had a somewhat greater proportion of female patients ( $62.5 \%, 95 \%$ CI: 60.1-64.8) than the total BEACH (general practice) encounters (57.4\%, 95\% CI: 57.0-58.6).

NSAIDs were taken by $14.3 \%$ (792/5554) of respondents $-7.8 \%$ ( $95 \%$ CI: 6.8-8.8) were taking a cox-2 inhibitors and $6.5 \% ~(95 \%$ CI: 5.6-7.3) were taking another NSAID. Only two respondents were taking both a cox-2 inhibitor and another NSAID. Over one-third ( $37 \%$, 294/788) of respondents on NSAIDs were aged between 45 and 64 years, while the age group most likely to be on NSAIDs were respondents aged 65 years and over ( $27 \%$ of those aged over 64 years were taking an NSAID). Of those on NSAIDs $6.8 \%$ had rheumatoid arthritis and $13.0 \%$ had taken corticosteroids in the previous 12 months, most for less than 1 month's duration.
Of those on NSAIDs, $5.7 \%(44 / 796)$ had previously been hospitalised with a gastrointestinal complaint. Of those previously hospitalised most were currently on cox-2 inhibitors (34/44). A further $31 \%$ of respondents on NSAIDs had experienced some adverse gastrointestinal side effects that did not lead to hospitalisation.
Using the Standardised Calculator of Risk Events (SCORE) to assess risk of future gastrointestinal events, two-thirds of respondents on NSAIDs had a moderately increased risk of a serious GI side effect associated with taking NSAIDs (SCORE > 10). The mean risk levels for respondents on cox-2 inhibitors were significantly higher than for respondents on other NSAIDs (mean SCORE 14.6, 95\% CI: 13.9-15.2 versus 10.8 95\% CI: 10.0-11.6).

## PLEASE READ CAREFULLY <br> The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about PATIENTS ON NON-STEROIDALANTI-INFLAMMATORY MEDICATIONS. You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

## INSTRUCTIONS

## Current NSAID use <br> Please advise whether this patient is currently taking a COX 2 inhibitor or any other non-steroidal antiinflammatory (NSAID) medication. This includes any Cox 2 or NSAID medication prescribed today or at a previous encounter by you or another GP. <br> If 'No' end the questions here.

## Rheumatoid arthritis

Please indicate whether or not this patient has been diagnosed, either today or at a previous encounter, with rheumatoid arthritis.

## Duration of corticosteroid use

If 'Yes' to corticosteroid use, please use the tick boxes to indicate the approximate length of time the patient has been taking the corticosteroid

If there were several separate occasions of use, please combine them for total duration
e.g. prednisone taken for 10 days in March and 10 days is June $=20$ days in total.

## Side effects

If 'No', please advise whether or not the patient has ever experienced gastrointestinal side effects such as heartburn, stomach pain, nausea or vomiting, while taking NSAIDs.

## Hospitalisation

Please advise whether or not the patient has ever been hospitalised for stomach or intestinal problems such as bleeding or an ulcer?

If 'Yes' you should end the questions here.

Has the patient been hospitalised for a stomach or intestinal problem such as bleeding or an ulcer?

| $\square$ Yes | If 'Yes', <br> end <br> questions |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\square$ No |  |

end questions here)

If ' $N o$ ' has the patient ever had gastrointestina side effects (heartburn, stomach pain, nausea, vomiting)when taking NSAIDs? $\square$ Yes Yes

In general would you say your health is -

- Excellent?
- Very good?
- Good?
- Fair?
- Poor?


[^0]:    The following page contains the recording form and instructions with which the data in this abstract were collected.
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