Patient-based substudies from BEACH: abstracts and research tools 1999–2006

Australian GP Statistics and Classification Centre

The Australian Institute of Health and Welfare is Australia's national health and welfare statistics and information agency. The Institute's mission is *better information and statistics for better health and wellbeing*.

The Australian General Practice Statistics and Classification Centre (previously Unit) is a collaborating unit of the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare and the University of Sydney, situated within the Family Medicine Research Centre at Westmead Hospital. It fulfils the obligation of the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare to collect statistics regarding general practitioners, their patients and their patients' care.

Contributors

Other members of the BEACH research team who have contributed extensively to the research reported in this document:

Janice Charles	Julie O'Hallorar
Salma Fahridin	Ying Pan
Christopher P Harrison	Lisa Valenti

Stephanie Knox

The contribution to the reported research made by past members of the BEACH team is also acknowledged:

Anthea Ng (SAND substudies 2003–2005)	Brynley Hull (SAND substudies 1999–2000)
Matt Hou (SAND substudies 2000–2003)	Kevin McGeechan (SAND substudies 1999-2000)
Zoe Kelly (SAND substudies 1999–2001)	Geoffrey P Sayer (SAND substudies 1999–2000)
Alice Bhasale (SAND substudies 1999–2000)	Sharon Scahill (SAND substudies 1999–2000)
Fiona Horn (SAND substudies 1999–2000)	

Recent related publications

Britt H, Miller GC, Charles J, Pan Y, Valenti L, Henderson J, Bayram C, O'Halloran J, Knox S 2007. General practice activity in Australia 2005–06. General practice series no. 19. AIHW cat. no. GEP 19. Canberra: Australian Institute of Health and Welfare.

Britt H, Miller GC, Knox S, Charles J, Pan Y, Henderson J, Bayram C, Valenti L, Ng A, O'Halloran J 2005. General practice activity in Australia 2004–05. General practice series no. 18. AIHW cat. no. GEP 18. Canberra: Australian Institute of Health and Welfare.

Knox S, Britt H, Pan Y, Miller GC, Bayram C, Valenti L, Charles J, Henderson J, Ng A, O'Halloran J 2005. Locality matters: the influence of geography on general practice activity in Australia 1998–2004. General practice series no. 17. AIHW cat. no. GEP 17. Canberra: Australian Institute of Health and Welfare.

Britt H, Miller GC, Knox S, Charles J, Valenti L, Pan Y, Henderson J, Bayram C, O'Halloran J, Ng A 2004. General practice activity in Australia 2003–04. General practice series no. 16. AIHW cat. no. GEP 16. Canberra: Australian Institute of Health and Welfare.

Please note that as with all statistical reports there is the potential for minor revisions of data in this report over its life. Please refer to the online version at <www.aihw.gov.au>.

GENERAL PRACTICE SERIES Number 20

BEACH

Bettering the Evaluation And Care of Health

Patient-based substudies from BEACH: abstracts and research tools 1999–2006

Australian GP Statistics and Classification Centre

Helena Britt, Graeme C Miller, Joan Henderson, Clare Bayram

July 2007

A joint report by the University of Sydney and the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare

AIHW cat. no. GEP 20

© Australian Institute of Health and Welfare and the University of Sydney 2007

This work is copyright. Apart from any use as permitted under the *Copyright Act 1968*, no part may be reproduced without prior written permission from the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. Requests and enquiries concerning reproduction and rights should be directed to the Head, Business Promotion and Media Unit, Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, GPO Box 570, Canberra ACT 2601.

This publication is part of the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare's General Practice Series, from the Australian General Practice Statistics and Classification Centre, a collaborating unit of the University of Sydney and the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. A complete list of the Institute's publications is available from the Institute's website <www.aihw.gov.au>.

ISSN 1442-3022 ISBN 978 1 74024 704 7

Suggested citation

Britt H, Miller GC, Henderson J, Bayram C 2007. Patient-based substudies from BEACH: abstracts and research tools 1999–2006. General practice series no. 20. AIHW cat. no. GEP 20. Canberra: Australian Institute of Health and Welfare.

Keywords: Australia, Delivery of Health Care/statistics & numerical data, Epidemiology/instrumentation, Family Practice/statistics & numerical data, Health Care Surveys/methods, Incidence, Prevalence, Questionnaires.

Australian Institute of Health and Welfare

Board Chair Hon. Peter Collins, AM, QC

Director

Penny Allbon

Any enquiries about or comments on this publication should be directed to:

The Australian General Practice Statistics and Classification Centre University of Sydney Acacia House Westmead Hospital Westmead NSW 2145 Phone: 61 2 9845 8151 Fax: 61 2 9845 8155 Email: gpstats@fmrc.org.au

Published by the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare

Foreword

General practice remains the cornerstone of Australia's health service. One has only to look at countries that do not have general practice or something similar, to see what a shambles follows. One of the troubling features about health care in the US is that primary care is often provided by specialists, at specialist rates and with concomitant use of special investigations. At the other end of socioeconomic spectrum, sub-Saharan African countries struggle to dispense medication for HIV and malaria because of a lack of primary care capacity.

Given the importance of general practice, then, it is refreshing to read the following studies that have emerged from the productive collaboration of the investigators with general practitioners in Australia. Many pharmaceutical companies, health departments and other interest groups have supported the studies. The sheer diversity of sponsorship, combined with the constancy of the research methods, diminishes the risk of biased results.

The BEACH substudies presented in this report address many aspects of health and health care of patients attending general practice. The data gathering has been appropriately parsimonious and economical of practitioners' time, but within those constraints information is remarkably rich. Whether the point in question is asthma (study 104) or cultural background of patients attending general practice (study 95), each study summary provides clear, concise and helpful insights on which we may base strategies for assisting general practitioners the better to care for their patients or to do other things in the health service that could assist them and their patients. I defy anyone to pick up this volume and find a boring study!

The investigators who have conducted these studies deserve a sustained round of applause. Research of this sort requires strength of vision and great good will. Any research program that has run for over 10 years is truly astonishing and deserves an award for longevity. I also applaud the generosity of the sponsors and research team in making the tested research implements freely available. It is interesting to observe the growth in precision, focus and feasibility that has occurred over the two decades since their first national study in 1990–91

I saw BEACH when it began and it has matured wonderfully. I congratulate the research workers and commend this fine report to all who have an interest in general practice in Australia.

Stephen Leeder AO, MD, PhD, BSc (Med), FRACP, FAFPHM, FFPH(UK) Professor of Public Health and Community Medicine Director, Australian Health Policy Institute University of Sydney

Acknowledgments

The Australian General Practice Statistics and Classification Centre (formerly the General Practice Statistics and Classification Unit) wishes to thank the general practitioners who participated in BEACH between April 1999 and December 2006, the period covered by the abstracts in this report. Over this period there were approximately 8,500 participants, representing about 7,000 individual general practitioners. This publication would not have been possible without their valued cooperation and effort in providing the data.

We also thank the following organisations for their financial support and their contribution to the ongoing development of the BEACH program since it began in April 1998:

- AstraZeneca Pty Ltd (Australia) (1998–2006)
- Roche Products Pty Ltd (1998–2006)
- Janssen-Cilag Pty Ltd (2000–2006)
- Merck, Sharp and Dohme (Australia) Pty Ltd (2002–2006)
- Pfizer Australia (2003–2006)
- National Prescribing Service (2005–2006)
- Abbott Australasia (2006)
- Sanofi-Aventis Australia Pty Ltd (2006)
- Australian Government Department of Health and Ageing (1998–2004)
- National Occupational Health and Safety Commission (1998-2000)
- Australian Government Department of Veterans' Affairs (1998–2000)
- Aventis Pharma Pty Ltd (1998–2002).

Some financial support for the program was also provided by:

- Australian Government Department of Veterans' Affairs (2004–2006).
- The Office of the Australian Safety and Compensation Council, Department of Employment and Workplace Relations (2004–2006).

We acknowledge the support of the Royal Australian College of General Practitioners, the Australian Medical Association, the Australian Divisions of General Practice, the Australian College of Rural and Remote Medicine, and the Consumers Health Forum, and the contribution of their representatives to the BEACH Advisory Board.

The authors are grateful to all members of the BEACH team, both past and present, whose work has contributed to the research reported here and whose names are listed in the front of this report. We are grateful for the editing and coordination of this report by Clare Bayram and the IT support of Timothy Chambers and the administrative support of Gervaise Woods. We also recognise the general practitioner recruitment staff (particularly Errol Henderson and Jan Fitzgerald), and data entry staff.

We appreciate the cooperation of the Primary Care Division of the Australian Government Department of Health and Ageing in regularly supplying general practitioner random samples and national Medicare data.

Ethics approval for the BEACH study was obtained by the Human Ethics Committee of the University of Sydney and the Ethics Committee of the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. Ethics approval for all the substudies reported here was obtained from the Ethics Committee of the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, on behalf of the Institute and the University of Sydney.

Contents

For	ewo	ord	v
Acl	knov	wledgments	vi
1	Int	roduction	1
	1.1	Using this publication	3
	1.2	Interpreting the prevalence estimates	4
	1.3	Background	5
		SAND substudies	5
2	Me	thods	8
	2.1	BEACH	8
	2.2	SAND-Supplementary Analysis of Nominated Data	9
		The development of the tools for SAND substudies	9
		Statistical methods	11
		Classification of data	12
3	Les	ssons learnt	13
	3.1	Rules of thumb in SAND tool design	13
	3.2	Methodological issues	19
4	SA	ND substudies conducted continually since April 2000	20
	4.1	Body mass index of adults	20
	4.2	Body mass index of children	21
	4.3	Smoking	21
	4.4	Alcohol consumption	22
	4.5	Length of consultation	23
5	Ab	stracts and research tools	28
	1	Allergic rhinitis	
	2	Anxiety/stress, consultation time, level of education	30
	3	Asthma	32
	4	Cardiovascular disease	35
	5	Depression	37
	6	Employment status and workers' compensation claims	
	7	Health service utilisation, lifestyle status and chronicity	41
	8	Hormone replacement therapy (HRT)	43
	9	Influenza and absenteeism	45
	10	Length of consultation; after-hours arrangements; co-morbidity	47
	11	Patient employment status and occupation	
	12	Smoking & passive smoking in general practice patients	

13	Perceived stress	54
14	Co-medications	57
15	Lipid lowering medication	59
16	Effect of day and time of GP visit on billing method	61
17	Private prescription products	63
18	Drugs for the treatment of peptic ulcer and reflux	65
19	Osteoporosis	67
20	Screening and management of blood cholesterol	70
21	Diabetes – prevalence, management and screening	72
22	Asthma – prevalence, severity and management	75
23	Depression	78
24	Gastro-oesophageal reflux disease (GORD) in general practice patients	80
25	Prevalence of diabetes, medications and control	82
26	Prevalence of diagnosed hypertension and difficulties in treatment	84
27	Prevalence and management of influenza	86
28	Prevalence of Alzheimer's disease and dementia	89
29	Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) and acid suppressant use	92
30	Lipid lowering medications and coronary heart disease	94
31	Prevalence and severity of chronic heart failure	96
32	Patient use of after-hours medical services	98
33	Prevalence and management of cardiovascular risk factors	100
34	Gastro-oesophageal reflux disease (GORD)	102
35	Smoking status of adults and their attempts to quit	104
36	Patient use of complementary therapies	107
37	Prevalence of common morbidities in patients encountered in general practice	109
38	Prevalence of chronic heart failure, management and control	111
39	Severity of asthma, medications and management	113
40	Type 2 diabetes mellitus, prevalence and management	116
41	Time of visit and billing status	118
42	Prevalence and management of chronic pain	120
43	Initiation and purpose of pathology orders	122
44	Severity of illness	124
45	Diabetes mellitus prevalence, management and risk factors	126
46	Coronary heart disease, risk factors and lipid lowering medication	128
47	Management of depression and anxiety	130
48	Asthma prevalence and management	132
49	Health status and management of patients on non-steroidal anti-inflammatory	
	drugs	135
50	Risk factors of patients on lipid lowering medications [interim report] See Abstr	act 67

51	Use of proton pump inhibitors for gastrointestinal problems	138
52	Language and cultural background of patients	140
53	Smoking status of adults and their attempts to quit	142
54	Secondary prevention of heart attack or stroke	145
55	Patient weight, perception of weight and weight loss	147
56	Prevalence, cause and severity of adverse pharmacological events	150
57	Prevalence and management of chronic heart failure in general practice	
	patients	152
58	Lipid lowering medications: patient eligibility under the PBS	154
59	Hypertension management and control in general practice patients	156
60	Prevalence of GORD and associated proton pump inhibitor use	158
61	Prevalence of chronic illnesses identified as National Health Priority Areas among general practice patients	160
62	Use of proton pump inhibitors by general practice patients	162
63	Asthma – prevalence, management and medication side-effects	164
64	Current use of statins by general practice patients	167
65	Language and cultural background of general practice patients	169
66	Anti-psychotic medication use by general practice patients	171
67	Risk factors of patients on lipid lowering medications	173
68	Patient weight, perception of weight and weight loss in adults	175
69	Patient weight, methods and medications tried for weight loss in adults	178
70	Inhaled corticosteroid use for asthma management	181
71	Patient BMI, morbidity and medication use in adults	184
72	Contraception use among female general practice patients aged 16-44 years	186
73	Warfarin use in patients with qualifying morbidity	188
74	Smoking and passive smoking in the home	190
75	Prevalence, management and investigations for chronic heart failure	192
76	Patients with risk factors for metabolic syndrome	194
77	Heart failure – underlying causes and medication management	196
78	NSAID & acid suppressant use in general practice patients	198
79	Hypertension and dyslipidaemia – comorbidity and management in general practice patients	200
80	Employment status and workers compensation claims in general practice patients	202
81	Prevalence and indications for gabapentin use by patients attending general practice	205
82	Prevalence and management of chronic pain	207
83	Prevalence and management of migraine	210
84	Menopausal status, symptoms and treatment of women aged 18 and over	212

8	5	Management of osteoporotic fractures in general practice patients	215
8	6	Diabetes Types 1 and 2 and coronary heart disease	217
8	7	Management of cardiovascular or diabetes related conditions	219
8	8	Arthritis rates and NSAID use in general practice patients	221
8	9	Estimates of the prevalence of chronic illnesses identified as Health Priority Areas among patients attending general practice	223
9	0	Prevalence, management and investigations for chronic heart failure in general practice patients	225
9	1	Prevalence and management of gastrointestinal symptoms	227
9	2	Prevalence of metabolic syndrome	229
9	3	Sexual dysfunction – premature ejaculation	231
9	4	Type 2 diabetes – investigations and related conditions	234
9	5	Cultural background of patients attending general practice	236
9	6	Inhaled corticosteroid use for asthma management	238
9	7	Statin medication use among high CHD risk patients attending general practice .	241
9	8	Management of hypertension and angina in general practice patients	243
9	9	Lipid management in patients with high risk conditions	245
1	00	Gastrointestinal symptoms in patients attending general practice	247
1	01	Types of medicine use and patient use of medicines list	250
1	02	Alzheimer's disease or dementia in patients attending general practice	252
1	03	Cardiovascular risk in patients attending general practice	254
1	04	Asthma management and medication use among patients attending general practice	256
Refe	ren	ce list	258
Gloss	sar	y	261
Abbr	ev	iations	263
Subj	ect	bibliography	264

1 Introduction

This publication includes abstracts for, and research tools used, in 104 general practice substudies conducted as part of the BEACH (Bettering the Evaluation and Care of Health) national study of general practice between April 1999 and December 2006.

These substudies are usually patient-based though a few investigate issues related to the general practitioner (GP). Most investigate the prevalence of a selected morbidity among the respondents and the current management of that morbidity. Some also investigate status of the disease under current management while others cover past management and reasons for change in management.

The subjects of these substudies are largely morbidity based. The GPs ask the questions of the patient but when completing the forms may also use their own knowledge of the patient and the patient's health record (where it is available) in addition to the patient responses. These studies may therefore provide a more reliable measure of prevalence and management than is usually available from patient self-report alone.

All these substudies have been approved by the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) Ethics Committee (on behalf of the Institute and the University of Sydney).

BEACH is a continuous national study of general practice activity that began in April 1998. It is a paper-based data collection program which requires a random sample of GPs to each complete a one-page structured data form for 100 patient encounters (for more details see Chapter 2—Methods). Each year there are about 1,000 GPs involved in the BEACH program, providing an annual database of about 100,000 encounter records.

At the bottom of every encounter recording form is a section called SAND (Supplementary Analysis of Nominated data). SAND substudies investigate aspects of patient health or health care delivery in general practice not covered by the encounter-based data. It is the research tools from, and results of, these SAND substudies that form the content of this report.

Each GP's pack of 100 forms includes 3 separate SAND substudies. A group of 40 forms in every recording pad measure consultation length and selected patient health risk behaviours (body mass index, smoking and alcohol consumption). Every participating GP completes these, when possible, so the sample size for each of these topics is 30,000–40,000 per year (depending on whether all age groups are included in the topic). The results for these standard subjects are presented in each BEACH annual report, but are also summarised in Chapter 4 of this report.

For other SAND substudies, the usual sample is approximately 3,000 forms from about 100 participating GPs. We can therefore conduct up to 20 additional substudies per year. However, sometimes the topic is repeated to increase the statistical power of the substudy, so sample sizes for these changing topics range from about 3,000 to 12,000 patients from 90 to 400 participating GPs.

Encounter data collected in BEACH provides a reliable overview of the content of GPpatient encounters, the morbidity managed and the treatments provided on that occasion. However, at the encounter the GP does not always manage all the patient's health problems at a single encounter. For example, a patient with multiple morbidity (e.g. diabetes, ischaemic heart disease, osteoarthritis and asthma), will not necessarily have all these managed at a recorded encounter. Therefore the absence of a problem being managed does not suggest it is not present in the patient. In contrast, the SAND substudies ask about the presence or absence of one or more specific diseases, risk factors or health behaviours, regardless of whether the problem was managed at the encounter. Current management, past management and current disease control level can also be investigated for those who have the disease/risk factor.

The advantages of SAND substudies are:

- The data needed for a reliable response can be gained from the patient, plus the GP and where available, the patient's health record.
- The substudies can be conducted as an addition to an ongoing program, at far less cost than would be incurred if each study was undertaken independently.
- Data from the substudies can be readily cross-analysed with information available in the encounter form about the patient (e.g. age, sex, Commonwealth concession card status, Indigenous status etc.), and the GP characteristics (collected through the GP Profile questionnaire completed by each GP participant).

Since BEACH began in 1998 there have been 172 substudies – in addition to the standard topics of length of consultation and patient risk factor status. Those conducted in the first year of BEACH (1998–99) were reported in *Measures of health and health care delivery in general practice in Australia* available from <www.fmrc.org.au/publications/Books3.htm>.¹ These topics are cross referenced in the subject bibliography of this report, so the reader is aware of subjects covered in the other publication, but they are not reproduced here. Some topics have been repeated in two or more data periods and in most cases interim reports are not provided as abstracts. In total there are therefore 104 abstracts presented in Chapter 5.

With such a large number of substudies it is not possible to publish a full paper on each. To date we have published an abstract for each SAND study on our website <www.fmrc.org.au> and on the National Library's archive PANDORA <http://nla.gov.au/nla.arc-14007>, in parallel with the release of the BEACH annual report each year. The topics are wide ranging and the results would therefore be of interest to a broad range of researchers, some of whom may be unaware of the availability of the abstracts. Further, on the web we do not provide the research tools developed for each SAND topic.

We hope that this report will assist GPs, GP divisions/networks, and other researchers by providing them with a wide range of tools that have demonstrated acceptability and utility, that are useable in the confines of general practice patient encounters, and which have already been approved by recognised ethics committees. We also believe that the results will be of interest to anyone studying morbidity and its management in general practice, or researchers planning a study to be undertaken in the future. For those preparing research protocols for studies based in general practice, the prevalence estimates provided in these abstracts will be particularly useful, as they give the researcher an indication of the likely number of patients who have the disease of interest, who are passing through the GPs' surgery. This allows them to better estimate the required GP sample size and project time required for recruitment of patients with the morbidity of interest.

1.1 Using this publication

This report includes four major sections and a subject bibliography.

- (1) Methods including a summary of the BEACH methods and a description of the methods used in the SAND substudies are provided in Chapter 2. Where additional methods have been used for an individual SAND substudy these are described in the specific abstract for that SAND topic.
- (2) Lessons we have learnt during the development and conduct of over 170 substudies, and some interesting methodological issues are discussed in Chapter 3.
- (3) Chapter 4 contains a summary of results from 2000 to 2006 for:
 - length of consultation for Medicare claimable A1 items of service and
 - patient self-reported risk behaviours, including:
 - body mass index (BMI) (calculated from self-reported height and weight)
 - current smoking status
 - usual alcohol intake.

These are the four topics surveyed consistently since April 2000, included on 40 of the 100 encounter forms in every participating GP's research pack. Though the results are reported in the BEACH annual report in December each year (rather than as abstracts on the web), we felt that a summary of these results should be included in this report for completeness.

- (4) In Chapter 5 Abstracts and research tools, the 104 SAND abstracts and their research tools are presented in order of their data collection period.
 - The abstracts are single page summaries of the topic, rather than abstracts of the type produced for conference presentations or journal papers. They do not include an introduction/background, nor a discussion or conclusion. They have a standard structure using the following headings:
 - Organisation supporting this study
 - Issues
 - Sample
 - Method
 - Additional methods for this study (where applicable)
 - Summary of results.

When reading this report it would be useful to keep the following points in mind:

- In any one SAND substudy the denominator changes frequently, reflecting the step down approach of most SANDs from broader to more specific subjects. We have aimed to include a statement of these changing denominators in each SAND abstract but admit this has been done better in later rather than in earlier years.
- Keep in mind that where missing data are greater than 5% the reliability of the result is in question (see Chapter 3–Lessons learnt).
- Each abstract is identified by a number, from 1-104, so the lower the abstract number, the older the study.
- Each abstract is followed by a copy of the questions asked in that SAND study and the instructions given to the GP for completing them (the research tools).

In practise, this instruction sheet and example form is on green paper, and designates the beginning of a new SAND topic within the recording pack. It alerts the GP to the change of topic for the bottom section of the form, so she/he can tear out the instruction sheet from the pad and keep it for reference during the next set of encounters. The SAND topic is then included as part of the normal encounters for the next 30 (or 40 in the case of patient risk factors) SAND forms.

- Where additional tools were used in the conduct of a SAND substudy, these are also presented in the pages following the SAND abstract. Such additional tools include:
 - patient cards, where a number of options and/or definitions are offered for patient selection (e.g. the asthma severity levels patient card for Abstract 3)
 - other patient cards such as the Standard Drinks Chart shown to the patient by the GP in assessing usual alcohol intake (Chapter 4, Section 4.4)
 - option cards given to the patient when a number of options are available (in a pick list), thus saving the GP reading out all the options to each patient. Two examples of these are the smoking cessations methods (Abstract 53), and the methods used for weight loss attempts (Abstract 55).
- Any text or footnotes that have been added to the original abstract published on our website are in italics in the majority these provide more details about the methods used in that SAND.
- At the bottom of each abstract other related abstracts are listed, and where peerreviewed articles have been published using the data or on that topic, the paper(s) are cited.
- The subject bibliography. Each abstract has been designated a series of logical keywords. These have been used to create a subject bibliography (see page 264). One abstract can be listed under multiple subject headings: for example you will find SAND substudies about *hypertension* are listed in the bibliography under *Hypertension*, *National Health Priority Areas, Cardiovascular, Circulatory, Management, Prevalence, and Risk factor.* Where a study was conducted in the first year of the BEACH program (1998–99) and therefore published elsewhere,¹ it is listed in the subject bibliography, but is not included as an abstract in this report.

1.2 Interpreting the prevalence estimates

Most SAND substudies provide an estimate of the prevalence of a condition(s) among patients attending general practice. This means that they measure the number of patients who have the condition, among those who happened to see their GP during the SAND recording period.

SAND substudies do not measure disease prevalence among the total Australian population, because not everyone attends a GP. Approximately 85% of the population visit a GP at least once in any given year, (personal communication, Australian Government Department of Health and Ageing, August 2002), but the remaining 15% who do not attend have no chance of being selected in a SAND subsample.

These studies also do not measure the prevalence of the condition among the population of general practice patients (i.e. the population of patients who attend a GP at least once). In BEACH the unit of selection is the GP, who completes information for a cluster of patient encounters. Patients who attend more frequently have a higher chance of being 'selected'

than those who attend fewer times in a year. Each SAND sample therefore is not a random sample of all patients who attend at least once.

SAND data can be used to estimate the prevalence of a condition among all general practice patients, but you have to adjust the raw results for the GP attendance rates of each age group of patients, using Medicare Benefits Schedule (MBS) data (see Abstract 89).

1.3 Background

General practitioners are the first port of call in the Australian health care system. They act as gatekeepers to the secondary and tertiary sectors, and in 2006 they conducted more than 90 million consultations, most of which were claimed through Medicare Australia (the national health insurance system).² The BEACH program provides information about the content of these GP-patient encounters and the services and treatments provided by GPs to the Australian community.

The BEACH program is the only continuous randomised study of general practice activity in the world, and the only national program that provides direct linkage of management actions to the problem under management. It relies on the participation of an ever-changing random sample of about 20 GPs per week (about 1,000 per year), with each GP providing details about 100 consecutive patient encounters. The database therefore incorporates details of approximately 100,000 encounters per year. To date BEACH has involved approximately 9,000 participants (representing more than 7,500 individuals), providing details for approximately 900,000 GP-patient encounters.

The BEACH encounter form (see example at the end of this chapter) provides information about some characteristics of the patient, tells us the problems managed by the GP at the encounter, and how she/he manages each problem. It gives a cross sectional view of morbidity and its management rather than longitudinal patient-based view. By their nature the encounter data do not provide estimates of disease prevalence. They describe how often a morbidity is managed in general practice and how it is managed.

However, the program also facilitates collection of information about other aspects of the health of general practice patients through a continuous series of subsample studies, known as SAND (Supplementary Analysis of Nominated Data).

The SAND substudies allow us to measure prevalence and management of a selected disease among a sample of patients attending general practice, utilising the GPs clinical knowledge of the patient, patient recall and patient notes to provide more reliable information.

SAND substudies

Since BEACH began in April 1998 a section on the bottom of each encounter form has been allocated to investigate other aspects of patient health or health care delivery not covered by the consultation-based information. These substudies are referred to as SAND. Each organisation supporting the BEACH program has access to two subsamples of 3,000 encounter forms per year in which questions can be asked on a subject or subjects of their choice. This means that through the BEACH program we have the potential to study 20 different topics each year at marginal additional program cost. Detailed methods for SAND can be found in Section 2.2.

Population health and health improvements resulting from interventions and strategies need to be monitored. General practice is commonly identified as a significant intervention point for health care and health promotion because GPs have considerable exposure to the health of the population. As about 85% of the population visit a GP at least once in any single year (personal communication, Australian Government Department of Health and Ageing, August 2002), general practice would appear to provide a suitable basis from which to monitor many aspects of the health of the population.

Gaining reliable estimates of morbidity prevalence in the Australian population is important for health promotion and health services planning. The real prevalence of any morbidity in a population is difficult to establish due to unrecognised and untreated cases that by definition cannot be enumerated, except perhaps by population-wide screening programs. Estimates from tertiary health services data such as hospital separations mostly deal with more severe cases, and health services data are often counted as treatment events (or episodes) rather than individual cases.³

The National Health Survey (NHS) provides estimates of population prevalence based on self-reported morbidity from a representative sample of the Australian population using a structured interview to elicit health related information from participants. Surveys are currently conducted every 3 years.⁴ Such community surveys have the advantage of estimating health states among the general population—including those who do not attend a general practitioner. However, self-report relies heavily on the patient's knowledge and recall, and has been demonstrated to be susceptible to misclassification, due to lack of clinical corroboration of diagnoses.⁵ The assistance of a medical practitioner in recording a patient's health problems should go some way to reducing under-reporting and misclassification found in patient self-report alone.^{5,6}

The concept of asking the GP to collect patient-based data about a sample of the patients they encountered while recording for the BEACH program was conceived by Geoffrey Sayer (a PhD student and staff member of the centre at the time) in 1997, with input from Janice Charles and Alice Bhasale. One aspect of Sayer's thesis was to investigate the extent to which the inclusion of the patient risk factor questions in SAND influenced the content of the encounter – whether completing the SAND section on patient risk factors, led the GP to give more attention in the encounter to the health risk behaviours asked of the patient – therefore jeopardising the validity of the encounter data recorded. He found no statistically significant effect.⁷

These substudies clearly demonstrate that it is possible to gain a large amount of reliable information in a relatively small space, with the addition of a single instruction sheet for each topic, and (where required) a patient card listing response options or defining specific morbidity. They also show that such brief surveys are acceptable and feasible for a GP to complete in the limited time of GP-patient encounters and that patients find it acceptable for GPs to ask such questions.

E	START Time	Date of enco	unter Date	of Bir		⁶	Sex M	F	Pat	ient F	Postcode	New Patient Health Care/Benefits Car Veterans Affairs Card NESB Aboriginal Torres Strait Islander	Yes / No	PAT PAT Med Item (if ap 1 2 3	TENT SE TENT NO licare n Nos: oplicable)	EN BY T SEE W - SI	GP N BY forkers tate Go o charg	GP comp p wt/Othe ge	aid	
l l	Diagnosis/ Problem ① :				Pr Ne	oblem	Old I	us _V	/ork	П	Diagnos Problem	sis/ n②:			Pr Ne	oblem	Statu	us v	/ork	
Ī	Drug Name AND Forn	n for this problem	Strength of product	Dose	Frequency	No. of Rpts	ОТС	GP Supply	Drug	status Cont.	Drug Name	AND Form for this problem	Strength of product	Dose	Frequency	No. of Rpts	отс	GP Supply	Drug	status Cont
Ŀ											1.									
É	2.										2.									<u> </u>
3	3.			<u> </u>			_				3.			 		<u> </u>	<u> </u>			<u> </u>
4	<u>1.</u> Procedures othe	r fra af maa mfa	oouncolling th		ault for thi						4.			<u> </u>						
ľ	-rocedures, othe	er treatments,	Prac _	lis con	Suit for this	s propi	em	F	Prac	_	Procedu	res, other treatments, cou Pr	ac	us con	sult for thi	s probl	em	F	rac	_
Ŀ	1.		Nurse? 📙	2.				1	lurse	?⊔	1. Dia marca	Ni i-4	urse? 📙	2.			~ · ·	Ń	lurse'	2
J	Diagnosis/ Problem (3) :				Pr Ne	oblem	Old I	us _N	/ork		Problem	15/ 14):			Pr Ne	w 🗌		IS W I re	′ork lated	
Ī	Drug Name AND Forn	n for this problem	Strength of	Dose	Frequency	No. of	OTC		Drug	status	Drug Name	AND Form for this problem	Strength of	Dose	Frequency	No. of	отс	GP Supply	Drug s	tatus
	1.					1.000		Gappiy	New		1.							Sept.7	INCW	Com.
	2.										2.									
	3.										3.									
	4.										4.									
- 1	Procedures, othe	er treatments,	counselling th	is con	sult for this	s probl	em	-)roo		Procedures, other treatments, counselling this consult for this problem									
Ŀ	1.		Nurse?	2.				5	lurse	? 🗖	1.		urse? 🛛	2.				5	lurse	2
	NEW REFERRALS	S, ADMISSION	S Problem(s)	IMAG	ING/Other	tests B	odv sit	te P	robler	n(s)	PATHOLO	DGY Pr	oblem(s)	PATH	OLOGY (c	ont)		E	robler	<u>n(s)</u>
	1		1 2 3 4	1.				1	2	34	1	1	2 3 4	4. <u> </u>				_1	2	34
	ייי <u> </u>		1 2 3 4	2				1	2	34	2	1	2 3 4	э. <u> </u>				1	Z	\$ 4
ŀ	2		1234	<u> </u>				<u> </u>	-	• •	3	I	2 3 4							
	SAND questions are inserted here																			

BEACH (Bettering the Evaluation And Care of Health) - Morbidity and Treatment Survey - National OBEACH General Provide Classification Unit University of Systems 1996 DOC ID

2 Methods

2.1 BEACH

The BEACH program is a continuous national study of general practice activity in Australia. It uses details of about 100,000 encounters between GPs and patients (about a 0.11% sample of all general practice encounters) from an ever changing random sample of 1,000 recognised practising GPs. The methods are described in detail in *General practice activity in Australia* 2005–06.⁸

In summary:

- each year BEACH involves a random sample of approximately 1,000 GPs
- the GP sample is a rolling (ever-changing) sample
- approximately 20 GPs participate each week, for 50 weeks a year
- each GP can be selected only once per RACGP (Royal Australian College of General Practitioners) quality assurance triennium
- each GP records details about 100 doctor-patient encounters of all types
- information is recorded by the GPs on structured paper encounter forms
- each GP participant also completes a questionnaire about themselves and their practice
- the program generates records for about 100,000 encounters per year.

Random samples of GPs who claimed at least 375 general practice Medicare items of service in the previous 3 months are regularly drawn from Medicare Australia data by the Primary Care Division of the Australian Government Department of Health and Ageing (DoHA).

- We approach the randomly selected GPs by letter, posted to the address provided by DoHA.
- Over the following 10 days we use the electronic telephone books to check the telephone numbers generated from the Medicare data. This is necessary because many of the telephone numbers provided from the Medicare data are incorrect.
- We then telephone the GPs in the order in which their letters were posted and, referring to the approach letter, ask whether they will participate.
- On initial telephone contact with the practice we often find that the selected GP has moved elsewhere, but is still in practice. Where forward address and/or telephone number can be obtained, we try to contact the GPs at their new address.
- GPs who agree to participate are set an agreed recording date several weeks ahead.
- We send a research pack to each participant about 10 days before the planned start date.
- A telephone reminder is made to each GP in the first days of the agreed recording period this also provides the GP with an opportunity to ask any questions they have about the recording process.
- We follow-up non-returns by regular telephone calls for up to 3 months after the set recording time.

• Participating GPs earn up to 60 Clinical Audit points towards their quality assurance (QA) requirements through the RACGP. As part of this QA process, each receives an analysis of his or her results compared with those of nine other de-identified GPs who recorded at approximately the same time. Comparisons with national averages are also provided. In addition, GPs receive some educational material related to the identification and management of patients who smoke or consume alcohol at hazardous levels.

Previous work has demonstrated the reliability of the methods adopted in BEACH.^{5,6,9-14}

Detailed methods are described in all BEACH annual reports, the most recent of which is *General practice activity in Australia* 2005–06 and can be downloaded from <www.fmrc.org.au/publications/Books3.htm>.8

2.2 SAND—Supplementary Analysis of Nominated Data

A section on the bottom of each recording form investigates aspects of patient health or health care delivery in general practice not covered by the consultation-based data. Each component covers a specific topic, and involves a line of questioning that is asked of the patient and/or the GP in addition to the encounter-based information.

- In every GP's pack of 100 forms there are 40 forms that contain questions about patient risk factors: patient height and weight (used to calculate body mass index, BMI), alcohol intake and smoking status (patient self-report), and start time and finish time of the encounter (for calculation of and the length of consultation measured by recorded finish time minus recorded start time for Medicare claimable A1 items of service).
- The remaining 60 forms in each pack are divided into two blocks of 30. Different questions are asked of the patient/GP in each block of 30 forms and these vary throughout the year.
- The annual BEACH data collection period is broken down into 10 five-week periods of recording and new SAND substudies are introduced (unless the topic is to be repeated) at the end of a five-week block.
- With the exception of the standard risk factor SAND substudies that run throughout the year, other topics run for a five-week period collecting information from about 100 GPs (20 recording per week), with a potential sample size of about 3,000 patient encounters in each topic.
- The order of SAND sections in the GP recording pack is rotated, so that the 40 patient risk factor forms may appear first, second or third in the pad. Rotation of ordering of the components ensures there is no order effect on the quality of the information collected.

Each organisation supporting the BEACH program has access to a subsample of 6,000 encounter forms per year (or two subsamples of 3,000 each) in which to insert a series of questions on a subject or subjects of their choice.

The development of the tools for SAND substudies

Organisations supporting the BEACH program financially are given set dates for the two blocks they can use in the coming BEACH year. Consideration is given to any specified seasonal needs (such as studies of patient influenza vaccination status which are of more value in winter than in January before the annual round of vaccinations). Organisations are actively encouraged to select subjects that will arise with sufficient frequency in the sample to make the study worthwhile. For example, while prostate cancer is an increasingly important risk for men's health, asking questions about its management among males attending general practice would provide a very small sample of respondents since: 60% of the respondents in the 3,000 sample would be female (and therefore not asked the question); of the remaining 1,200 males encountered by the GP in that sample, only about 220 would be aged 45 years or over (on average). Since those at highest risk are patients aged 75 years and over, and GPs are advised against routine screening for prostate cancer, the chances of picking up more than a couple of cases are minimal.

The organisation sends their nominated topic and a series of research questions to the SAND coordinator in the BEACH team. Sometimes the research questions could be seen as a 'wish list' and the challenge is to design a SAND substudy that will answer as many of these questions as possible within the limited space available and without demanding too much of the GP.

The characteristics of tools that can be used within the confines of the GP-patient encounter, by GPs pressed with time issues, are brevity, face validity and simplicity. The tool should be easy to administer verbally and quick to complete.

The SAND coordinator works with the representatives of the organisation to refine the objectives to a workable level, and prepares an initial draft of questions and instructions. It then becomes an iterative process between the researchers and the client organisation. At various stages of development input is gained from other members of the research team. The analysts' comments are useful to ensure that at the end of the process, the data can be analysed in a manner that will satisfactorily answer the research questions. The view of the database manager is important in ensuring that the new SAND database can be built in a manner that assists the coding staff. Coder training staff views are useful in picking up questions which have the potential to generate wide ranging responses and present coders with problems in reliable data entry. Often the input of the Medical Director is required to ensure that the final set of questions and its accompanying instructions will 'make sense' to the GP in a clinical setting. Throughout this process the research team use their extensive experience to hypothesise the many likely responses to the questions and revise response options as appropriate.

By the time the questions are completed and ready to be sent to the Ethics Committee for approval, an average of five drafts will have been developed over a period of about 4 weeks.

The final tools, (and where appropriate the rationale for this SAND study) are then sent to the AIHW Ethics Committee for approval (on behalf of the Institute and the University of Sydney) prior to printing and distribution to the GPs.

Wherever possible we try to use questions and definitions that have been validated and published elsewhere. For example, the definitions for severity of asthma in adults and in children (Abstract 96) rely on the severity classifications produced by the National Asthma Council. If all the questions utilise internationally or nationally accepted published tools, there is no need to apply for Ethics approval. However this is rarely the case.

The relationship of the SAND substudies to the data elements collected in the total BEACH program is graphically presented in Figure 1. It demonstrates that the SAND data can be cross analysed with data about the GP, the patient, or the content of the encounter.



Statistical methods

The analysis of the SAND substudies included in this report were conducted with SAS version 6.12¹⁵ for all studies conducted between 1999–00 and 2004–05. Topics investigated since then were analysed using SAS 9.1.¹⁶

The BEACH study is a random sample of GPs, each providing data about a cluster of patients on a specific topic. We use the patient as the unit of inference when the data are analysed and interpreted. However, the cluster sampling study design violates the simple random sample (SRS) assumption of equal probability of selection of a patient, because the

probability of a patient being included is a function of the probability of the GP being selected.¹⁷ Cluster samples also violate the assumption of independence of observations, as there is an inherent relationship between patients sampled in the same cluster. Therefore the certainty that the sample estimates reflect the true underlying population values is reduced by cluster sampling, and decreases the precision of prevalence or management estimates. When a study design other than SRS is used, analytical techniques that consider the study design must be employed.

In this report, the standard error calculations used in the 95% confidence intervals accommodate the single-stage clustered study design according to Kish's description of the formulae.¹⁸ SAS version 9.1 includes procedures that calculate the robust standard error to adjust for the intra-cluster correlation of the cluster sample. In contrast, SAS version 6.12 is limited in its capacity to calculate the standard error for the current study design, so additional programming was required to incorporate these formulae, in earlier years.

Classification of data

If recorded in free text in a SAND substudy, the following data elements are classified according to the International Classification of Primary Care – Version 2 (ICPC-2), a product of the World Organization of Family Doctors (Wonca):¹⁹

- problems managed
- clinical treatments (e.g. counselling, advice) and therapeutic procedures
- referrals to specialists and allied health providers, pathology and imaging tests ordered.

Pharmaceuticals recorded in free text in SAND substudies are coded and classified according to an in-house classification, the Coding Atlas for Pharmaceutical Substances (CAPS).

- This is a hierarchical structure that facilitates analysis of data at a variety of levels, such as medication class, medication group, generic composition, brand name. Strength and regimen are independent fields which, when combined with the CAPS code, allows us to derive prescribed daily dose for any prescribed medication or group of medications.
- CAPS is mapped to the Anatomical Therapeutic Chemical (ATC)²⁰ classification which is the Australian standard for classifying medications at the generic level. The ATC has a hierarchical structure with five levels. For example:
 - Level 1: C Cardiovascular system
 - Level 2: C10–Serum lipid reducing agents
 - Level 3: C10A Cholesterol and triglyceride reducers
 - Level 4: C10AA HMG CoA reductase inhibitors
 - Level 5: C10AA01 Simvastatin (the generic drug).

3 Lessons learnt

It is relatively rare for a research team to have the opportunity to conduct so many studies with the same basic methodology, among the same population, over such a long period. We have learnt many things over the last nine years in the SAND substudies and we have developed a number of rules of thumb when designing SAND research tools. We freely admit that the later SANDs are far better than the earliest SANDs, as we have moved through a continuous quality improvement program over the years.

In SAND substudies we are using the GP as an expert interviewer of his/her patient and are utilising his/her knowledge of the patient rather than relying purely on patient recall. The GP is an ideal person to ask patients about their health and health issues. Patients expect GPs to ask them questions about their health and their health behaviours and (we hypothesise) are likely to be more honest with their GP than with an interviewer (unknown to the respondent) approaching them for self-reported health information.

Some GPs have reported that some patients appear relieved when asked for specific information about their, for example, alcohol intake, as if this had concerned them but they had not raised it with their GP, or had not made their consumption levels clear to their GP on earlier occasions. Others report that they find completing the patient risk behaviours SAND provides them with an 'excuse' to raise these issues with their patients.

However, while some of the SAND substudies may assist the GP in initiating discussion with their patient about a specific topic, the GPs time must always be considered. If the additional time needed to ask the questions is too great they will simply drop out of the BEACH study altogether.

In an environment of increasing workforce shortages, many GPs are strapped for time. The tools we design for SAND must therefore be brief, simple to administer verbally and quick to complete. However, they must also provide valid and reliable results.

3.1 Rules of thumb in SAND tool design

Remember your research impacts on a busy GP's day

Completing the questions on the SAND form can sometimes be difficult for the GP. We tell GPs to leave the SAND section blank if they feel unable to ask the questions of a particular patient. This approach considers the nature of general practice, for example:

- the patient may not be seeing their regular GP and may not be comfortable answering specific health questions not related to the problems managed at the encounter
- the type of encounter (e.g. telephone encounter) and the parallel need for patient agreement for their data to be included in the BEACH program may make completion of the questions impossible
- the morbidity being managed (e.g. crisis situation such as suicide attempt, relationship breakdown, acute bereavement) may mean it is inappropriate for the GP to ask the SAND questions, which are not related to the crisis under management
- the patient (e.g. the cognitively impaired) may not be competent to give informed consent to the use of their data, or to answer the questions being asked.

Impact on GP time

In any study using GPs to complete information about clinical activity or about patients, the participating GPs are being very generous in giving their time to the study. If you ask for too much it can result in GP overload and withdrawal from the study.

Each GP has three sets of SAND forms across their 100 BEACH forms. Therefore we have to consider the GP workload in terms of the combined effect of the three SAND topics. Some topics require the GP to ask every patient encountered all questions in that SAND. Examples include *Patient cultural background* (Abstract 95) and *Prevalence of chronic illnesses identified as National Health Priority Areas* (Abstract 61). Other SAND surveys have a filter question that limits the remainder of the questions to those who say 'Yes' to the first question. Examples are: *Prevalence and management of chronic pain* (Abstract 82) and *Lipid management in patients with high risk conditions* (Abstract 99).

In the 40 patient risk factor SAND forms in each GP's research pack (see Chapter 4), start and finish times for the consultations, and patient-reported height and weight are required for all patients and the alcohol and smoking questions are asked of all patients aged 18 years or more. We try to ensure that in a research pack we do not include two other SAND topics that require all questions to be asked of all patients, so that the GP will get at least one SAND topic that relies on a filter question, thus reducing the overall workload.

Filter questions

When possible, for the topic under investigation we use a filter question to identify the patients of interest who meet certain criteria. For patients who have been identified (for example, patients with a specific condition) GPs are asked to complete additional questions. For patients who do not meet the criteria for inclusion, GPs are instructed to end the questions. Examples of filter questions are provided in Box 1.

Box 1: Examples of filter questions used as the first question in a SAND survey

Does this patient have Type 2 diabetes?			Does this patient have any of the following risk				
	Yes	factors? (Tick all that apply)					
	No \rightarrow end questions		Existing CHD				
			Diabetes mellitus				
			Familial hypercholesterolaemia				
			Elevated cholesterol				
			Family history of CHD				
			Peripheral vascular disease				
			None of the above \rightarrow end questions				

Enumerating and describing not judging or criticising

The BEACH study aims to describe what is really happening in general practice. We therefore try to avoid creating scenarios where the GP might feel that his/her management is being questioned or judged. The last thing we want (for both data reliability and continued participation) is for clinicians to feel they have to justify their management. For example, the box at the top of the GP instructions for *Prevalence, cause and severity of adverse pharmacological events* (Abstract 56), emphasises that this SAND is an investigation of the impact of pharmacological adverse events in the community, and that the GP may be unaware of the event, either because the patient did not inform them, or the event was related to a medication provided elsewhere. The study is not asking about clinician error or seeking to assign blame anywhere or to anyone for the adverse event.

Not intruding on the GP-patient relationship

When designing a SAND the relationship between the GP and patient is always considered.

A simple example is our choice not to ask patients aged between 14 and 17 years the SAND questions on current smoking status and usual alcohol consumption. While it is certainly legal for the GP to ask such questions of patients in this age group we believe that they would often be intrusive on the GP-patient relationship. Teenagers show a massive decrease in attendances with GPs at about 15 years of age (boys more so than girls)²¹ so this is a patient group that should be encouraged to build a relationship with their GP. Such questions (purely for research purposes) may well challenge the likelihood of further visits.

In other SANDs, such as the study on the prevalence of premature ejaculation (Abstract 93) we specifically tell the GP to stop the questions 'if you feel at any stage that these questions intrude too greatly on your relationship with this patient'.

Sensitive topics

Some topics covered in SAND can be sensitive. With practice we have learnt that in these cases we should provide the GPs with information about the issue and the reason we are investigating. For example, for the study on premature ejaculation (Abstract 93), we provided background information about the lack of data generally available on this topic.

Some questions may appear somewhat invasive if asked directly so in such circumstances we have found it best to 'couch' the sensitive issue as one part of multiple categorical options with tick boxes. For example, *Management of depression and anxiety* (Abstract 47) in the third question, the research interest really centred on the possible effect of the specified medications on sexual function. Rather than ask a direct question on this possible effect, we 'buried' it among a series of six possible effects, softening the question asked of the patient.

The question of patient honesty

Sometimes we need to find out whether a patient is doing something that they are not supposed to be doing. The question might then arise as to the likelihood of an honest patient response. We therefore avoid using questions where honesty may be compromised.

Again the questions about smoking status and alcohol consumptions among patients of 14–17 years are good examples. We are uncertain of the likelihood of receiving an honest answer from these young people if they are accompanied by a parent/relative/carer or where the GP is the usual doctor seen by other members of their family.

The way you ask the question has a direct effect on the result

The use of tick boxes versus free text

Whenever possible we use categorical response variables (tick box options) rather than open ended questions requiring free text entry. This provides a more reliable response. For example in the first study on patient comorbidity (*Prevalence of common morbidities in patients encountered in general practice,* Abstract 37) we simply asked the GP to list in free text all (up to 12) 'other significant diagnoses/problems... not managed at today's encounter'. In later studies (e.g. *Prevalence of chronic illnesses identified as National Health Priority Areas among general practice patients,* Abstract 61) we asked 'Does this patient have any of the following conditions which require ongoing management?' and offered a series of tick boxes of morbidities related to the National Health Priority Areas (categorical responses). We believe the later method generated more reliable results, which demonstrated repeatability in a later study (*Estimates*)

of the prevalence of chronic illnesses identified as Health Priority Areas among patients attending general practice, Abstract 89).

Three different measures of the prevalence of asthma among general practice patients

The structure of the question (described above), combines with the independent influence of the SAND topic, on the final results. For example, we have undertaken 10 SAND studies that include a filter question on whether or not the patient has asthma, to generate estimates of asthma prevalence among patients attending general practice.

Sample sizes range from 2,500 to 11,300 respondents. These are summarised in Table 1.

- Between March 1999 and December 2004 there were six SAND studies that used a filter question. GPs were instructed to ask each patient if they *'currently suffer from asthma?'* The six studies produced remarkably consistent results, even without age-sex standardisation for minor difference in the age-sex distribution of the respondents in each sample. Prevalence of asthma was consistently estimated to be between 12.8% and 14.7%, with no significant differences between results, as judged by overlapping 95% confidence intervals around the estimates (see Abstracts 3, 22, 39, 48, 63, 70).
- In the midst of this 1999–2004 period, we ran a SAND which asked the GP to describe in free text the patient's major comorbidity not managed at the encounter, including: *'chronic illnesses or other health problems that requires continuing management or surveillance; past problems with may need consideration in future care; any significant health influencing social problems'*. Spaces were provided for up to 12 free text descriptors (Abstract 37). The estimated prevalence for asthma was significantly lower at 8.8% (95% CI: 8.1–9.5).
- In late 2003–early 2004 we again investigated the issue of comorbidity using categorical tick box responses for a list of selected national health priority areas (including asthma). The GP was asked: 'Does this patient have any of the following conditions which require ongoing management'. This method generated an asthma prevalence estimate of 11.4% (95% CI: 10.5–12.3) (Abstract 61). Using the same method in 2005 we gained an estimate of 10.7% (95% CI: 9.8–11.6) (Abstract 89).

Method	Abstract no.	Page	Number of respondents	Data collection period	Estimated prevalence (95% CI)
Filter question	3	32	4,285	03/99–06/99	14.7 (13.3–16.1)
Filter question	22	75	5,495	11/00-01/01	12.8 (11.4–14.3)
Free text—Comorbidity	37	109	11,342	08/01–03/02	8.0 (95% CI: NA)
Filter question	39	113	3,070	04/02-05/02	13.9 (12.0–15.7)
Filter question	48	132	2,686	09/02-10/02	14.5 (12.7–16.2)
Categorical (NHPAs)	61	160	8,911	08/03–01/04	11.4 (10.4–12.3)
Filter question	63	164	2,527	09/03-10/03	14.5 (12.6–16.1)
Filter question	70	181	7,919	09/04-12/04	13.0 (11.9–14.0)
Categorical (NHPAs)	89	223	9,156	07/05–11/05	10.7 (9.8–11.6)
Filter question	96	238	5,911	02/06-06/06	11.6 (10.6–12.7)

Table 1: Summary of methods, samples and results for asthma prevalence across multiple SANDs

Note: NHPAs-National Health Priority Areas; NA-not available.

• Most recently, in mid-2006 we repeated the asthma filter question (Abstract 96) and gained a similar result 11.6 (10.6–12.7) to previous asthma SAND substudies with filter

questions but one that is suggesting a trend towards lower prevalence of asthma among patients attending general practice. It will be interesting to see if this trend continues.

We conclude that the use of a filter question centred on the topic of asthma provides a slightly higher estimate of prevalence than the inclusion of asthma as one of many morbidities with tick boxes provided, and that free text recording of comorbidity present in the patient gives the lowest prevalence estimate. Considering the relative consistency of the results, we would regard the free text recording of comorbidity as less reliable than the other two approaches.

Structures to assist in counting the true level of missing data

The structure of the questions should ensure that a response is possible from all who should answer it, even if the response is 'Don't know'. For example: if you only offer 'Yes' and 'No', where the information is not available the GP will leave it blank. If you offer 'Don't know' in addition to the other options, where the information is not available the GP can tick this option, thus reducing the size of the missing data. Such methods allow a better estimate of the true size of missing data. Keep in mind that where missing data for a question are greater than 5% the reliability of the result is in question.

Questions on clinical opinion

In SAND we sometimes ask GPs to make a judgement based on their clinical opinion rather than based on, for example, formal guideline objectives. Judging a patient's progress based purely on guidelines does not consider the rest of the patients 'health picture'. The patient may have other complex morbidities or personal history which means that they may not meet the guideline targets for management but in the GPs clinical opinion are meeting targets that are as good as could be expected in that patient. This is a wholistic approach rather than a clinical trial approach. An example can be found in *Diabetes Types 1 and 2 and coronary heart disease* (Abstract 86) where the question on the adequacy of the current control of the patient's cholesterol relies on clinical opinion.

The need for definitions

In many cases the diagnostic label applied to a problem is clinical opinion rather than proven by tests, or by strict application of definitions (many of which have been designed in secondary and tertiary care). If asking whether the patient has been managed for depression in the previous 12 months, there is no point in providing a DSM-IV (Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, 4th edition) definition of depression – the patient either has, or has not, been managed for depression in the past 12 months, however it was defined at the time by the GP, a psychologist or a psychiatrist.

At other times providing a definition is essential to gain internal consistency among GP responses. For example in *Prevalence and management of chronic pain* (Abstract 42) we relied purely on the GP's clinical judgement in deciding whether or not the patient suffered from 'chronic pain'. When trying to publish the results internationally we were criticised for not selecting and providing the GPs with any one of a myriad of available definitions of 'chronic pain'. In Abstract 82 we repeated this topic and included a definition of 'chronic pain' to gain more reliable results.

We also provide definitions for disease attributes when there are standard definitions available. Abstract 48 is an example. We provided definitions for asthma severity among children and among adults, using the National Asthma Council's severity classification.

Questions that are not answered well

Some questions we have tried are answered poorly compared with others. These include:

- Questions that require the GP to look back over their clinical notes to find the answer. For example, lipid levels prior to starting medication – the patient may have started medication for lipid treatment more than 5 years ago and locating the record of the lipid level at the start of medication treatment may be difficult. Further, the patient may have started on treatment when at another practice and records may not be available to the current GP. Reliability of patient recall of such a result would probably be poor.
- Medication regimen information (i.e. complete dosage information). This is well recorded in the encounter form but not in the SAND form (unless the medication was prescribed today). Though the medication name appears to be easily recalled by the GP or patient, strength and dosage information are poorly reported. We hypothesise that this is because the GP may not be the prescribing doctor and the patient does not recall the details. Alternatively the GP may need to look through past notes to find the regimen data.
- Questions on duration of condition or duration of a treatment or medication, for example, *How long ago was the patients diagnosed with condition x? Specify number and circle weeks/months/years*. Depending on the time that has lapsed, if the data are not in the medical record the recall of the patient or the GP may be limited. If the research question can be answered with multiple choice, then use this option (e.g. <1 year, 1–3 years, > 3 years) as reliability will be far greater.

Always remember that in the current Australian health care system a single patient may have multiple complex problems, may see multiple GPs and may be managed simultaneously by many health professionals. Do not assume that a complete health record for the patient is available to the GP.

Use of a suitable timeline for patient/GP recall

Length of accurate recall by patients and GPs can be limited. 'Within the last 6 months', 'during the last 12 months' or 'in the past' will provide results with varying degrees of accuracy. However, the most suitable recall time period will depend on the subject under investigation. For example: a question on whether the patient had been hospitalised could be asked for the previous 12 months, as it is a reasonably major event in anyone's life and therefore likely to be recalled. It also has a high chance of being in the patient's medical record.

However, when asking about the grade of pain suffered by people with chronic pain (see Abstract 82), we limited the time period to the last week. Using a 12 month recall period here would require the patient to try and average all his/her ups and downs in pain levels over a 1 year period and would be highly unreliable.

Inadequate planning with insufficient space on the form

In a few SANDs we have asked about current medication for the morbidity of interest and allowed space for only one medication to be recorded. On receipt of the completed forms we found a number where the GP had recorded two medications by squeezing them into the allotted space. This means that at least two spaces should have been provided. However, having limited the GPs to one, we cannot assume that those who recorded only one, did so

even in cases where multiple were involved. Such errors lead us to question the validity of the final result about medications for that SAND.

Is general practice an appropriate setting for the subject?

Not every subject of patient health and lifestyle is appropriate to investigate in a GP-based study of this type. There is one SAND study not reported in this book because it failed. The subject of the SAND was the amount and type of physical activity performed by the patient in the week prior to this encounter. So many patients reported that they had no exercise in the previous week, due to ill health, that we rejected the study as inappropriate. A question on average exercise levels over the previous month may have been more productive.

3.2 Methodological issues

Test-re-test reliability of the SAND studies

Where a SAND question has been repeated on a number of occasions we have an opportunity to investigate test-re-test reliability of the measure among different groups of GPs asking the questions of different sets of patients. If the method is to be regarded as reliable, prevalence estimates of a morbidity should remain constant, except where there has (in truth) been a change in the prevalence of the morbidity in the population at large.

Henderson et al. compared estimates of asthma prevalence generated from four SAND studies conducted in four different 5-week periods between March 1999 and October 2002. They demonstrated no significant difference in the estimated prevalence of asthma and no significant differences in severity levels over time for either adults or children.²²

Similarly, Miller et al. demonstrated consistent results among three SAND studies that investigated adverse drug events experienced by responding patients over the previous 6 months. The subject was repeated twice because we were surprised by the result in the first SAND block – that 10% of patients seen by the recording GPs had experienced an adverse pharmacological event during the previous 6 months. The repeats produced the same result, demonstrating the reliability of the method.²³

Recording effect

It is possible that asking SAND questions about a specific topic will affect the frequency of management of that problem at the encounter, and/or the management actions at the encounter for the morbidity studied in the SAND. This has been investigated for the patient risk behaviours: weight (BMI), alcohol and smoking, to test whether asking these questions results an in increased likelihood of them being managed at the encounter. This investigation found no significant effect.⁷ However, through our observation of the data we believe it may influence GPs' encounter behaviour in certain circumstances, though probably only for the encounters including that SAND topic. For example, we hypothesise that asking for the most recent HbA1c result for a patient with diabetes, and the time since that last test was done, may increase the chance that the GP will order a HbA1c at that encounter for the patients who have not had this tested for more than 6 months. We plan to undertake further analysis to determine if a range of SAND substudies influence the content of that encounter.

4 SAND substudies conducted continually since April 2000

Issues: Four topics have been included in all research packs for all GPs, since 1 April 2000. These are:

- patient-reported height and weight, from which patient BMI is calculated separately for adults and for children
- patient-reported current smoking status (adults aged 18 years and over)
- patient-reported alcohol consumption (adults aged 18 years and over)
- length of consultation for encounters claimable as A1 Medicare items of service (in minutes).

Results for these studies are reported every year in each annual BEACH report^{8,24-28} and are only summarised here.

Sample: GP completion of questions about the three patient risk measures and start and finish times for the encounter was requested in 40 encounter forms out of every 100 forms completed by each GP from April 2000 to March 2006. Although the patient risk factor questions were asked of subsamples of patients in 1999–00, all three questions were not asked of the same patient until 2000–01. The results presented here are limited to the study years of 2000–01 to 2005–06 as the three questions were asked of the same patient subsample.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

4.1 Body mass index of adults

Sample: Patients aged 18 years and over, total sample from 2000 to 2006=191,580 comprising: *n*=31,957 in 2000–01; *n*=31,789 in 2001–02; *n*=32,367 in 2002–03; *n*=31,890 in 2003–04; *n*=30,476 in 2004–05; *n*=33,101 in 2005–06.

Methods for this study: The BMI for an individual is calculated by dividing weight (kilograms) by height (metres) squared. Metric conversion tables (feet and inches; stones and pounds) were provided to the GP.

In 2005–06 the WHO recommendations²⁹ for BMI groups were adopted. These specify that a person with a BMI:

- less than 18.5 is underweight
- greater than or equal to 18.5 and less than 25 is normal
- greater than or equal to 25 and less than 30 is overweight
- of 30 or more is obese.

This has affected the division between underweight and normal weight, which in previous reports was set at a BMI of 20, but is now set at 18.5. For more detailed data refer to *General practice activity in Australia* 2005–06⁸ in which the BMI data for previous years have been recalculated according to the WHO criteria.

Results: The proportion of patients classed as overweight or obese has remained relatively steady over time with between 54.3% and 57.0% of patients classed as overweight or obese. From 2000–01 to 2005–06 there was a statistically significant increase in the proportion of adults classed as obese from 20.2% (95% CI: 19.5–20.8) to 22.2% (95% CI: 21.5–22.9). There was no change in the proportion of patients classified as overweight (34.1% compared with 34.6%).

These results are consistent with those of the 1999–00 AusDiab study³⁰ and the results reported for each BEACH year from 2000–01 onwards.²⁷ They are also broadly consistent with the Australian Bureau of Statistics 2001 figures from the National Health Survey of 58% of adults aged 18 years or more being overweight or obese.³¹

For other related abstracts see: 55 Patient weight, perception of weight and weight loss, 68 Patient weight, perception of weight and weight loss in adults, 69 Patient weight, methods and medications tried for weight loss in adults, 71 Patient BMI, morbidity and medication use in adults.

Further reading:

Charles, J., Britt, H., & Knox, S. 2006, 'Patient perception of their weight, attempts to lose weight and their diabetes status', *Australian Family Physician*, vol. 35, no. 11, pp. 925–928.

4.2 Body mass index of children

Sample: Children aged between 2 and 17 years, total sample from 2000–06=21,066, comprising: *n*=3,831 in 2000–01, *n*=3,692 in 2001–02; *n*=3,579 in 2002–03; *n*=3,301 in 2003–04; *n*=3,184 in 2004–05; *n*=3,479 in 2005–06.

Methods for this study: Metric conversion tables (feet and inches; stones and pounds) were provided to the GP.

The standard BMI calculation described above is not appropriate for children. Cole et al. developed a method which calculates the age-sex-specific BMI cut-off levels for overweight and obesity specific to children.³² This method, based on international data from developed Western cultures, is applicable in the Australian setting. There are three categories defined for childhood BMI: underweight/normal, overweight and obese.

Results: There has been no change in the proportion of children classed as overweight/obese since 2000–01, when 13.6% (95% CI: 11.0–16.2) were classed as obese and 17.8% (95% CI: 16.2–19.4) as overweight, in total 31.4% (29.4–33.4) being overweight or obese. In 2005–06 the results demonstrated that 11.9% (95% CI: 10.6–13.2) were classed as obese, and 18.6% (95% CI: 17.2–19.9) as overweight, a total of 20.5% (95% CI: 28.6–32.3) being overweight or obese. For more detailed data about BMI of children attending general practice refer to *General practice activity in Australia* 2005–06.⁸

4.3 Smoking

Sample: Patients aged 18 years and over, total sample 2000–06=194,312, comprising: *n*=32,124 in 2000–01, *n*=31,966 in 2001–02; *n*=32,651 in 2002–03; *n*=32,718 in 2003–04; *n*=31,295 in 2004–05; *n*=33,558 in 2005–06.

Methods for this study: Respondents were limited to adults aged 18 years and over because there are concerns about approaching the younger patient group to ask for information on smoking for survey purposes. In addition, the reliability of this information from patients aged 14–17 years may be compromised if a parent is present.

Results: The proportion of adults attending general practice who are daily smokers has decreased from 19.3% (95% CI: 18.5–20.1) in 2000–01 to 17.1% (95% CI: 16.3–17.8) in 2005–06. For more detailed data about the smoking status of patients attending general practice refer to *General practice activity in Australia* 2005–06.⁸

For other related abstracts see: 12 Smoking and passive smoking in general practice patients, 35 Smoking status of adults and their attempts to quit, 53 Smoking status of adults and their attempts to quit, 74 Smoking and passive smoking in the home.

Further reading:

Doran, C. M., Valenti, L., Robinson, M., Britt, H., & Mattick, R. P. 2006, 'Smoking status of Australian general practice patients and their attempts to quit', *Addict.Behav.*, vol. 31, no. 5, pp. 758–766.

Valenti, L., Charles, J., & Britt, H. 2005, 'Passive smoke in Australian homes: 1999 to 2004 [letter]', Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 387–388.

Degenhardt L, Knox S, Barker B, Britt H, Shakeshaft A. The management of alcohol, tobacco and illicit drug use problems by general practitioners in Australia. *Drug Alcohol Rev* 2005; 24(6):499–506.

4.4 Alcohol consumption

Sample: Patients aged 18 years and over, total sample 2000–06=190,130 comprising: *n*=31,543 in 2000–01; *n*=31,559 in 2001–02; *n*=32,140 in 2002–03; *n*=31,721 in 2003–04; *n*=30,414 in 2004–05; *n*=32,753 in 2005–06.

Methods for this study: Respondents were limited to adults aged 18 years and over because there are concerns about approaching the younger patient group to ask for information on alcohol consumption for survey purposes. In addition, the reliability of this information from patients aged 14–17 years may be compromised if a parent is present.

To measure alcohol consumption, BEACH uses three items from the WHO Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT),³³ with scoring for an Australian setting.³⁴ Together, these three questions assess 'at-risk' alcohol consumption in adult patients. The scores for each question range from zero to four. A total (sum of all three questions) score of five or more for males or four or more for females suggests that the person's drinking level is placing him or her at risk.³⁴ A standard drinks chart is provided to each GP to help the patient identify the number of standard drinks consumed.

Results: There has been a statistically significant increase in the proportion of adults reporting at-risk levels of alcohol consumption from 24.1% (95% CI: 23.3–24.9) in 2000–01 to 25.9% (95% CI: 25.0–26.8) in 2005–06. For more detailed data about alcohol consumption refer to *General practice activity in Australia* 2005–06.⁸

Further reading:

Proude, E. M., Britt, H., Valenti, L., & Conigrave, K. M. 2006, 'The relationship between self-reported alcohol intake and the morbidities managed by GPs in Australia', *BMC Fam Pract*, vol. 7, p. 17.

Degenhardt L, Knox S, Barker B, Britt H, Shakeshaft A. The management of alcohol, tobacco and illicit drug use problems by general practitioners in Australia. *Drug Alcohol Rev* 2005; 24(6):499–506.

4.5 Length of consultation

Sample: Encounters for which an A1 Medicare item of service was claimable, a total of encounters 196,346 encounters 2000–06, comprising: *n*=30,961 in 2000–01, *n*=35,104 in 2001–02, *n*=34,886 in 2002–03, *n*=31,863 in 2003–04, *n*=30,683 in 2004–05, *n*=32,849 in 2005–06.

Methods for this study: GPs were asked to record the encounter start-time and finish-time in hours and minutes. Consultation length was calculated only for A1 Medicare-claimable consultations, as finish time minus start time in minutes.

Results: The length of A1 Medicare-claimable encounters has remained steady over time. In 2000–01 the mean length of these encounters was 14.8 minutes (95% CI: 14.5–15.1) and the median length was 13.0 minutes. In 2005–06 the mean length was 14.9 minutes (95% CI: 14.6–15.1) and median length was 13.0 minutes.

For other related abstracts see: 2 Anxiety/stress, consultation time, level of education, 10 Length of consultation; after-hours arrangements; co-morbidity.

Further reading:

Bindman A.B., Forrest C., Britt H., Crampton P., Majeed A. 2007, 'Diagnostic scope of and exposure to primary care physicians in Australia, New Zealand and the United States: cross sectional analysis of results from three national surveys', *British Medical Journal* (Epub ahead of print).

Britt, H., Valenti, L., & Miller, G. 2002, 'Time for care. Length of general practice consultations in Australia', *Australian Family Physician*, vol. 31, no. 9, pp. 876–880.

Britt, H., Valenti, L., Miller, G. C., & Farmer, J. 2004, 'Determinants of GP billing in Australia: content and time', *Medical Journal of Australia*, vol. 181, no. 2, pp. 100–104.

Britt, H. C., Valenti, L., & Miller, G. C. 2005, 'Determinants of consultation length in Australian general practice', *Medical Journal of Australia*, vol. 183, no. 2, pp. 68–71.

The following pages contain:

- the recording form and instructions with which the data in this chapter were collected
- the standard drinks chart provided to the GPs
- the metric conversion tables provided to the GPs.

PLEASE READ CAREFULLY

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **TIME OF CONSULTATION**, & **PATIENT RISK FACTORS** (BMI, smoking & alcohol).

You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following 40 forms.





24

BEACH

Weight Conversion Chart - Stone/pounds (st Ibs) - Kilograms (kg)

Weight		Weight		Weight		Weight		Weight		Weight	
st lbs	ka	st lbs	ka	st lbs	ka	st lbs	ka	st lbs	ka	st lbs	ka
1'	6	4'	25	7'	44	10'	64	13'	83	16'	102
1'1"	7	4'1"	26	7'1"	45	10'1"	64	13'1"	83	16'1"	102
1'2"	7	4'2"	26	7'2"	45	10'2"	64	13'2"	83	16'2"	103
1'3"	8	4'3"	27	7'3"	46	10'3"	65	13'3"	84	16'3"	103
1'4"	8	4'4"	27	7'4"	46	10'4"	65	13'4"	84	16'4"	103
1'5"	9	4'5"	28	7'5"	47	10'5"	66	13'5"	85	16'5"	104
1'6"	ğ	4'6"	28	7'6"	47	10'6"	66	13'6"	85	16'6"	104
1'7"	10	4'7"	29	7'7"	48	10'7"	67	13'7"	86	16'7"	105
1'8"	10	4'8"	29	7'8"	48	10'8"	67	13'8"	86	16'8"	105
1'9"	10	4'9"	29	7'9"	49	10'9"	68	13'9"	87	16'9"	106
1'10"	11	4'10"	30	7'10"	40	10'10"	68	13'10"	87	16'10"	106
1'11"	11	4'11"	30	7'10	40	10'11"	68	13'11"	88	16'11"	107
1'12"	12	4'12"	31	7'12"	50	10'12"	69	13'12"	88	16'12"	107
1'13"	12	4'12"	31	7'12"	50	10'12"	69	13'12"	88	16'12"	108
2	12	415	30	8'	51	1013	70	14'	80	17'	108
2'1"	13	5'1"	32	0 9'1"	51	1111	70	1411	80	17'1"	100
21	14	5'2"	32	9'0'	52	11'2"	70	141	09	17'1	100
22	14	5'2"	33	0 Z 9'2"	52	11'2"	71	142	90	17'2"	109
23	14	53	34	0.0	52	110	72	14-3	90	17.5	110
24	15	04 5'5"	34	04	53	114	72	14 4	91	174	110
20	15	50	34	00	53	110	72	140	91	17.0	110
20	15	50	34	00	54	110	73	140	92	170	444
27	10	57	30	0 /	54	117	73	14 /	92	177	440
20	10	50	30	00	54	110	73	14.8	93	17.0	112
29	17	59	30	09	55	119	74	14.9	93	179	112
2.10	17	5.10.	30	8.10.	55	11.10"	74	14.10.	93	17.10.	112
211"	18	5111	37	8'11"	00	11.11"	70	14.11.	94	17.11.	113
2.12"	18	5112"	37	8'12"	56	11.12"	75	14.12"	94	17.12"	113
2.13"	19	5.13.	38	8.13.	57	11.13"	76	14.13.	95	17.13"	114
3	19	6.	38	9.	57	12	76	15'	95	18.	114
3.1.	20	6'1"	39	9'1"	58	12.1.		15'1"	96	18'1"	115
3.2.	20	6.2.	39	9'2"	58	12.2.	11	15'2"	96	18'2"	115
3'3"	20	6'3"	39	9'3"	59	12'3"	78	15'3"	97	18'3"	116
3'4"	21	6'4"	40	9'4"	59	12'4"	78	15'4"	97	18'4"	116
3'5"	21	6'5"	40	9'5"	59	12'5"	78	15'5"	98	18'5"	117
3'6"	22	6'6"	41	9'6"	60	12'6"	79	15'6"	98	18'6"	117
3'7"	22	6'7"	41	9'7"	60	12'7"	79	15'7"	98	18'7"	117
3'8"	23	6'8"	42	9'8"	61	12'8"	80	15'8"	99	18'8"	118
3'9"	23	6'9"	42	9'9"	61	12'9"	80	15'9"	99	18'9"	118
3'10"	24	6'10"	43	9'10"	62	12'10"	81	15'10"	100	18'10"	119
3'11"	24	6'11"	43	9'11"	62	12'11"	81	15'11"	100	18'11"	119
3'12"	24	6'12"	44	9'12"	63	12'12"	82	15'12"	101	18'12"	120
3'13"	25	6'13"	44	9'13"	63	12'13"	82	15'13"	101	18'13"	120

BEACH

Height	t		Heig	ht		Heig	ht	
•	ft in	cm		ft in	cm		ft in	cm
1'		30	3'		91	5'		152
	1"	33		1"	94		1"	155
	2"	36		2"	97		2"	157
	3"	38		3"	99		3"	160
	4"	41		4"	102		4"	163
	5"	43		5"	104		5"	165
	6"	46		6"	107		6"	168
	7"	48		7"	109		7"	170
	8"	51		8"	112		8"	173
	9"	53		9"	114		9"	175
	10"	56		10"	117		10"	178
	11"	58		11"	119		11"	180
2'		61	4'		122	6'		183
	1"	64		1"	124		1"	185
	2"	66		2"	127		2"	188
	3"	69		3"	130		3"	191
	4"	71		4"	132		4"	193
	5'	74		5"	135		5"	196
	6"	76		6"	137		6"	198
	7"	79		7"	140		7"	201
	8"	81		8"	142		8"	203
	9"	84		9"	145		9"	206
	10"	86		10"	147		10"	208
	11"	89		11"	150		11"	211

Height Conversion Table - Feet/inches (ft in) - Centimetres (cm)
STANDARD DRINKS

Because drinks vary a lot in strength, it is useful to know how much alcohol is in each common drink. A STANDARD DRINK is one which contains about 10 grams of alcohol. In the table below, you can see that common servings of different kinds of alcoholic drinks in fact contain about the same amount of alcohol.



5 Abstracts and research tools

1 Allergic rhinitis

Organisation supporting this study: AstraZeneca (Australia) Pty Ltd

Issues: Point prevalence allergic rhinitis; current treatment; previous treatment.

Sample: 4,077 encounters from 102 GPs; data collection period: 17/08/1999 – 20/09/1999.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Methods for this study: GPs were asked to ascertain (either by asking the patient or from their knowledge of the patient) whether the patient currently had allergic rhinitis.

If the patient did have allergic rhinitis the GP was asked to determine if the patient was currently taking medication for the problem; if so, which medications; and what previous medications had been used and for how long, to manage their allergic rhinitis.

Summary of results

The age-sex distribution of the respondents was similar to that of the total BEACH sample. The majority of the respondents were females (57.5%).

The point prevalence of allergic rhinitis among the survey population was 18.7% (95% CI: 16.5–20.9). The highest prevalence was among people aged 25–44 years old (24.4%) and the prevalence of allergic rhinitis was similar for males and females (17.0% and 20.0%, respectively).

Among people with allergic rhinitis, 34.4% of people were currently using medication to manage the condition. Roughly half (49.6%) of those currently taking medication used nasal corticosteroid. The most common generic medication was budesonide topical nasal, used by 30.9% of those using medication for allergic rhinitis.

Antihistamines were the most common medication previously used by people with allergic rhinitis. Of people who had previously used antihistamines, 32.4% had used them for over 1 year.

Among people currently using nasal corticosteroids, 40.8% had previously used antihistamines and 13.1% had used no previous medication.

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

INSTRUCTIONS

This form has been filled in as an example.

29



2 Anxiety/stress, consultation time, level of education

Organisation supporting this study: Commonwealth Department of Veterans' Affairs **Issues:** Prevalence of stress and anxiety in general practice and Veterans' Affairs patients; seeking help; level of education; consultation time.

Sample: 3,684 encounters from 100 GPs; data collection period: 18/01/2000 – 18/02/2000. **Method:** Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Methods for this study: There were two components to this SAND. One provided information on patients relating to level of stress and anxiety while the other concerned level of education and length of consultation. The effects of stress and anxiety on the patient and help seeking behaviour were investigated for patients who reported experiencing stress or anxiety in the previous 12 months. The highest level of education obtained by the patient and the length of time each consultation had taken were reported.

Summary of results

Female patients made up 59.4% of the 3,684 respondents, a finding similar to that of the total sample. The age distribution of patients also corresponded with that of the total BEACH sample, with 21.0% of patients aged less than 25 years, and approximately 26% in each of the age groups 25–44, 45–64 and 65 years or older.

Forty per cent (95% CI: 36.8–43.0) of respondents reported experiencing a period of anxiety or stress lasting 2 weeks or more in the previous 12 months. This rate was similar to prevalence reported by those patients who indicated they held a Department of Veterans' Affairs health card (39.6 %, 95% CI: 27.2–52.0). Females (44.6 %, 95% CI: 39.9–49.3) were more likely to have experienced anxiety or stress than males (33.0 %, 95% CI: 28.3–37.8). The highest prevalence of stress and anxiety was among females aged 45–64 years (55.6%, 95% CI: 43.5–67.7).

Among the 1,470 patients who had experienced anxiety or stress, a significant proportion reported that sleep had been affected (79.1 %, 95% CI: 75.8–82.3), and more than half felt their relationships had been affected (55.1 %, 95% CI: 51.0–59.2). Seventy-five per cent (95% CI: 71.5–78.6) of patients who had experienced stress/anxiety had sought help or treatment. Patients were significantly more likely to have sought help from general practitioners (57.9%, 95% CI: 53.6–62.2) than from other health professionals (16.3%, 95% CI: 13.9–18.7) or from family/friends (33.5%, 95% CI: 28.5–38.6).

The average length of these consultations was 16.6 minutes (95% CI: 15.2–18.1). Consultations ranged from approximately 12 minutes for patients in the 5–14 age group to 18 minutes for patients over the age of 75 years.

The highest level of education reached by these patients was most commonly lower secondary school. Patients with TAFE/post secondary other than university level apparently had the longest consultations, but no significant differences were found in consultation length between patients with different levels of education.

For other related abstracts see: 10 Length of consultation; after-hours arrangements; co-morbidity, 13 Perceived stress, 16 Effect of day and time of GP visit on billing method, 41 Time of visit and billing status, 47 Management of depression and anxiety and Section 4.5 Length of consultation. Further reading:

Bindman A.B., Forrest C., Britt H., Crampton P., Majeed A. 2007, 'Diagnostic scope of and exposure to primary care physicians in Australia, New Zealand and the United States: cross sectional analysis of results from three national surveys', *British Medical Journal* (Epub ahead of print).

Britt, H., Valenti, L., & Miller, G. 2002, 'Time for care. Length of general practice consultations in Australia', *Australian Family Physician*, vol. 31, no. 9, pp. 876–880.

Britt, H., Valenti, L., Miller, G. C., & Farmer, J. 2004, 'Determinants of GP billing in Australia: content and time', *Medical Journal of Australia*, vol. 181, no. 2, pp. 100–104.

Britt, H. C., Valenti, L., & Miller, G. C. 2005, 'Determinants of consultation length in Australian general practice', *Medical Journal of Australia*, vol. 183, no. 2, pp. 68–71.

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **CONSULTATION TIME, EDUCATION, ANXIETY & SMOKING.** You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

INSTRUCTIONS

This page has been filled in as an example (see below).



31

3 Asthma

Organisations supporting this study: AstraZeneca (Australia) Pty Ltd and Aventis Pharma Pty Ltd

Issues: The prevalence of asthma in the general practice patient population; its severity; current medications for asthma; their effectiveness and any adverse effects of medications.

Sample: 4,285 encounters for 213 GPs; data collection period: 30/03/1999 – 07/06/1999

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Methods for this study: Levels of severity of asthma for children and adults were listed on a patient card with descriptions of each level. Severity classes for children included infrequent episodic, frequent episodic, and persistent. For adults, the severity classes were very mild, mild, moderate and severe. The severity levels were adapted from the National Asthma Council Asthma Management Handbook 1998.

Summary of results

The age-sex distribution of the respondents was similar to the distribution for BEACH overall, with the majority (55.8%) of patients being female.

The prevalence of asthma among the 4,285 respondents was 14.7% (95% CI: 13.3–16.1). The highest prevalence was found among patients aged 5 to 14 years (26%, 95% CI: 14.2–37.8). Among children (aged<18) with asthma, 68.5% had infrequent asthma, 21.0% had frequent and 4.9% had persistent asthma. Among adults, 32.9% had very mild asthma, 27.3% had mild asthma, 27.7% had moderate and 7.9% had severe asthma. There was no gender difference in the distribution of asthma severity for children or adults.

Ninety per cent (90.3%, 95% CI: 87.7–93.0) of patients with asthma used some form of medication to manage their asthma. Eighty-three per cent of these patients used reliever medications, 49% used preventer medications and 7% used controller medications. Use of relievers alone was the most common treatment regimen and salbutamol inhaler was the most common single medication used. Twenty-one per cent of patients taking medication used a spacer device, 30% using a small device and 68% using a large device.

Treatment regimens differed by the severity of asthma among children and adults. Relievers alone were the most common regimen for children with infrequent asthma and adults with very mild asthma. Relievers and preventers were most common among children with frequent or persistent asthma and adults with mild or moderate asthma. Ipratropium plus other medications was most common among adults with severe asthma. Salbutamol inhalers were the most common single medication used by patients in all severity categories, except children with persistent asthma who were more frequently prescribed salbutamol nebules.

Among patients taking medication, the effectiveness of the current regimen was rated 5 (effective) on a scale of 1–5 for 46.4% (95% CI: 40.8–51.9). Patients taking relievers only medications were most likely (60.4%) to have a rating of 5 for effectiveness of the medication. Multivariate logistic modelling showed that severity of asthma was associated with effectiveness of treatment but the treatment regimen was not. Seventy-one per cent of patients taking medication reported no adverse effects of the current regimen. Adverse effects were most likely for patients taking ipratropium alone (45%). The most common adverse effect reported was tremor/shakes followed by palpitations. Multivariate logistic modelling showed that severity of asthma was associated with adverse effects of treatment but that medication regimen was not.

For other related abstracts see: 22 Asthma – prevalence, severity and management, 39 Severity of asthma, medications and management, 48 Asthma prevalence and management, 63 Asthma-prevalence, management and medication side-effects, 70 Inhaled corticosteroid use for asthma management, 96 Inhaled corticosteroid use for asthma management, 104 Asthma management and medication use among patients attending general practice.

Further reading:

Henderson, J., Knox, S., Pan, Y., & Britt, H. 2004, 'Changes in asthma management in Australian general practice', *Prim.Care Respir.J*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 138–143.

Childre	en la
Severity*	Common features
Infrequent episodic	Episodes 6-8 weeks or more apart and from 1 to 2 days up to 1-2 weeks duration; usually triggered by URTI or environmental allergen; attacks generally not severe; symptoms rare between attacks; normal examination and lung function except when symptomatic.
Frequent episodic	Attacks <6 weeks apart; attacks more troublesome; minimal symptoms such as exercise induces wheeze between attacks; normal examination and lung function except when symptomatic; commonly troubled through winter months only.
Persistent	Symptoms most days; nocturnal asthma > 1/wk with sleep disturbance; early morning chest tightness; exercise intolerance and spontaneous wheeze; daily use of beta2 antagonist; 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 asymptomatic
Moderate	Symptoms most days; exacerbations <6-8 weeks apart which affect day-time activity and sleep; exacerbations last several days; occasional emergency room visit.
Severe	Persistent; limited activity level; nocturnal symptoms > 1/wk; frequent emergency room visits and

Note that your research pack

for easy reference.

contains a card copy of these tables

INSTRUCTIONS

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.

> **CHILDREN** Severity* Common features Infrequent episodic Episode 6-8 weeks or more apart; attacks generally not severe; symptoms rare between attacks; normal examination and lung function except when symptomatic. Frequent episodic Attacks < 6 weeks apart; attacks more troublesome; increasing symptoms between attacks; normal examination and lung function except when symptomatic. Persistent Symptoms most days; nocturnal asthma > 1/wk; attacks 4-6 weeks apart; daily use of beta2 agonist; 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, when asymptomatic. Moderate Symptoms most days; exacerbations < 6-8 weeks apart which affect day-time activity and sleep; exacerbations last several days; occasional emergency room visit. Severe Persistent; limited activity level; nocturnal symptoms > 1/wk; frequent emergency room visits and hospital admissions in past year; FEV, may be significantly reduced between exacerbations. *Severity categories are adapted from the NAC Asthma Management Handbook, 1998 Edition Current medications used: Effectiveness of current regimen: Describe the current medications used in the treatment Circle on the scale the effectiveness of the current of asthma listing dose and regimen. medication regimen used in the treatment of the patient's asthma. The medication form (metered dose inhaler/ dry powder inhaler / nebules) for each listed drug should be circled. Adverse effects of current regimen: Circle on the scale the level of adverse effect ('withdraw' indicates the patient will cease the drug due Spacer device used: ASK ALL PATIENTS to adverse effects). Ask each patient if they currently Is any spacer device used? If so, tick whether it is a large or small volume spacer suffer from asthma. List up to two adverse effects (if any) experienced by and circle a number(s) to indicate the drug(s) for which the patient with the current regimen, regardless of the f NO asthma - no further guestions. the spacer is used. (Multiple response allowed). effect's severity. Current drug(s) Dose Regimen Form* Effectiveness of current regimen (circle) FOR ALL PATIENTS Severity of asthma MDI/DPI/NEB Asthma? Yes No →End Ask the patients with asthma about Effective 2 MDI / DPI / NEB Not effective the severity of their asthma (see Severity tables above): Child Adult Adverse effects of current regimen (circle) 3. MDI / DPI / NEB Very mild Mild Infrequent 🗌 Frequent *MDI=metered dose inhaler DPI=dry powder inhaler NEB=nebules →

> > Spacer device used: Large vol. For drug(s) 1/2/3

None Small vol. For drug(s) 1/2/3 1

Moderate 🗌

Severe

Persistent

B11L

Minor

2.

Withdraw

None

4 Cardiovascular disease

Organisation supporting this study: Aventis Pharma Pty Ltd

Issues: Prevalence of selected cardiovascular disease; recent cardiologist consultations and hospital admissions for these cardiovascular diseases (CVDs); current medication. **Sample:** 2,119 encounters from 106 GPs; data collection period: 17/07/1999 – 16/08/1999 **Method:** Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Summary of results

The age-sex distribution of the respondents was similar to the expected distribution for general practice, with the majority (58.8%) of patients being female.

One in four (26.0 %, 95% CI: 22.5–29.6) respondents had been diagnosed at some time with hypertension, congestive cardiac failure, stroke, or ischaemic heart disease (IHD) (including IHD with or without angina, myocardial infarction). Prevalence in males (25.1%) and females (26.8%) was similar. CVD was more prevalent in males aged 45–64 years than in women in this age group but in elderly patients (75+years) it was more prevalent in women than in men. The condition of highest prevalence was hypertension (20.6%, 95% CI: 17.4–23.7) followed by IHD of any type (8.5%, 95% CI: 6.0–10.9). Within the IHD group stable angina was the most prevalent condition (4.9%, 95% CI: 2.11–7.6). The prevalence of Congestive Cardiac Failure (CCF) was estimated to be 3.9% but the small sample size generated wide confidence intervals (0.0–8.4). The same could be said of the prevalence estimates for stroke (2.1%, 95% CI: 0.0–7.5). As expected, the prevalence of each condition increased with age.

Of the 551 patients with a CVD 24.3% (95% CI: 18.9–29.7) had seen a cardiologist in the previous 12 months and 15.8% (95% CI: 8.5–213.1) had been admitted to hospital in the previous year for the condition.

Fifteen per cent of these 551 respondents had an angiogram at some point and 8.0% had undergone a coronary artery bypass graft (CABG).

Ace inhibitors were the most common medication group, being taken by 37.0% of CVD patients and a third of these were taking no other medication for their CVD. Aspirin was also taken by about one-third of respondents with CVD (33.4 %, 95% CI: 28.5–38.3).

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

INSTRUCTIONS

Has the patient ever been diagnosed with any of the options shown.	In the past 12 months for the condition(s)	s, Has the patient had any of the treatments listed?	Which cardiovascular medication(s) is the patient currently taking?	
 Tick one or more boxes to indicate the condition(s) with which the patient has been diagnosed. You may tick as many boxes as apply to the patient. NB. Ischaemic heart disease may refer to stable angina, unstable angina, myocardial infarction or other ischaemic heart disease not specified. If the patient does not have any of these conditions, NO FURTHER questions need be asked. 	 described, has the patient had: a cardiologist consultation a hospital admission for this problem. <i>Tick one or more boxe</i>. 	 (entrer during a hospital admission or as an outpatient) indicate which treatment(s) the patient has had (at <u>any</u> time). Tick one or more boxes 	nt	
Patient ever diagnosed with (✓ one of Ischaemic heart disease Stable angina Unstable angina Myocardial infarction Hypertension Congestive cardiac failure Stroke If NONE of the above - END here	in the past 12 Himmonths (for this condition/s), has the patient had: Himmonths (for this the condition/s), has the patient had: Immonths Cardiologist Aimmonths Immonths Cardiologist Simmonths Immonths Consult Cardiologist Immonths Consult Immonths Immonths Hospital Immonths Immonths Admission Immonths	las the patient had any of hese treatments: Which card taking? (Tick one or more) (Tick one or more) Nitrate-subl angiogram Nitrate-subl angloplasty Beta blocke cachannel Cachannel brombolysis Diuretic lot known Diuretic	iovascular medication(s) is the patient currently k one or more) ingual spray/tablet ACE inhibitors nsdermal / oral A2 antagonists rr Blocker Channel opener Warfarin Heparin (UFH / LMWH) B14L	

5 Depression

Organisation supporting this study: Commonwealth Department of Health and Aged Care (Pharmaceutical Branch)

Issues: The point prevalence of depression in general practice patients, the types of depression and methods of management by GPs.

Sample: 8,333 encounters for 309 GPs; data collection periods: 13/07/1999 – 17/08/1999, 26/10/1999 – 30/11/1999, 22/02/2000 – 27/03/2000.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Methods for this study: 'Major depressive disorder' was defined according to DSM-IV (Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, 4th edition) criteria to provide guidance for general practitioners reporting this condition.

Summary of results

The age-sex distribution of the respondents was similar to the expected distribution for general practice in BEACH, with the majority (59.4%) of patients being female.

The prevalence of depression among the respondents was 14.4% (95% CI: 13.1–15.7). The prevalence of depression for females (16.2%, 95% CI: 14.7–17.7) was significantly higher than for males (11.8%, 95% CI: 9.6–14.0). The highest prevalence rate of depressive disorder was among patients aged 45–64 year (20.3%, 95% CI: 18.4–22.4).

For nearly half (44.0%) of the patients reported by the GP as having depression, the GP classified the depression as a major depressive disorder. This represents a prevalence of major depression of 6.4% for the total sample. Prevalence of major depression among females was 7.1%, (95% CI: 6.0–8.3) and males 5.3% (95% CI: 3.2–7.4), indicating that there was less difference between males and females in prevalence rates of major depression compared with rates of depression overall.

Of all those with depression, 61% were receiving medication (with or without counselling), 25% were receiving counselling only, and 7% were receiving no treatment. Of those with major depression 85% were receiving medication and 2% were receiving no treatment.

89% of medications taken for depression were antidepressants. The most common medication (generic) reported was sertraline, which accounted for 19.1% of medications for depression and 21.4% of medications for major depression. Selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors was the most common subgroup of antidepressants recorded, accounting for 49% of medications.

For those respondents who were currently taking antidepressant medication, a GP had initiated the course of medication in the majority of cases (72.9%).

Counselling was provided by a GP in 48.5% of cases where the respondents were reported to have depression.

For other related abstracts see: 23 Depression, 47 Management of depression and anxiety.

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **DEPRESSION and SMOKING STATUS.** You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

INSTRUCTIONS

<u>BOX 1</u>

This form has been filled in	Criteria for major depression* *DSM-IV (Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, 4th edition).	
as an example.	At least FIVE (5) of the following symptoms for at least TWO WEEKS (symptom 1 or 2 must be present):	
	 Depressed mood Loss of interest or pleasure Significant appetite or weight loss or gain Insomnia or hypersomnia Psychomotor agitation or retardation Sugnificant appetite or weight loss or gain Significant appetite or weight loss or gain Significant appetite or weight loss or gain Significant appetite or weight loss or gain Insomnia or hypersomnia Supersonal Supersonal	Indicate the current treatment for the patient's depression. <i>Tick <u>ONE</u> or <u>MORE</u> of the following</i>
		options.
	If you believe the patient's depression is a MAJOR depressive disorder according to the criteria shown above in Box 1 - tick 'yes' If NO - tick 'No' and describe the type of depression that in your opinion the patient is suffering from. For example • depression & anxiety (not <u>major</u>) • manic-depression • chronic mild depression • adjustment disorder with depressed mood	Medications If the patient is taking medication: • write the medication name(s) • indicate whether the medication was initiated by a GP or specialist (circle response). Counselling / therapy: Who is providing the counselling or therapy ? You may circle more than one option if necessary. No treatment - if the patient is not currently receiving any treatment, tick this option.
	Does this patient currently have a depressive disorder? \checkmark Yes \square No \rightarrow If No, End here \checkmark Medication (name	pression currently being treated?
	Is this a major depressive disorder?	GP Specialist
	/f NOHow would you describe it?(specify)	GP / Specialist
	Mild depression and anxiety Counselling / there	apy GP / Specialist / Other
	No treatment	B17L

6 Employment status and workers' compensation claims

Organisation supporting this study: National Occupational Health and Safety Commission

Issues: Employment status; work-related problems and workers' compensation claims **Sample:** 8,833 encounters from 221 GPs; data collection period: 21/09/1999 – 26/11/1999 **Method:** Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Summary of results

The age-sex distribution of the respondents was similar to the expected distribution of general practice patients, with 51% in the 25–64 age group and the majority of patients (59%) being female.

Of the 8,833 respondents, 52.3% were not in the labour force. Those not in the labour force were mainly retirees (27.0%) and those engaged in home duties (12.9%).

The problems managed at encounter were analysed in relation to total encounters, employment status and workers' compensation claims. Hypertension was the most common problem managed in the total sample (at a rate of 7.7 per 100 encounters, 95% CI: 6.7–8.7). Upper respiratory tract infection (URTI) was the most common problem managed for employed persons (6.4, 95% CI: 5.0–7.7), though this rate was lower than the URTI rate in the total sample. Common problems managed at a higher rate for employed persons than for all persons were back complaints (3.2 per 100 encounters, 95% CI: 0.7–5.6 compared with 2.9, 95% CI: 2.1–3.6) and sprains/strains (2.6, 95% CI: 0.8–4.4 compared with 1.7, 95% CI: 1.0–2.5). Overlapping confidence intervals show no significant differences were found.

Back complaint was managed at the higher rate of 3.9 per 100 encounters with self-employed persons, compared with a rate of 2.9 per 100 total encounters. Malignant neoplasms of the skin were also more often managed among the self employed, at a rate of 2.8 per 100 encounters (compared with 0.9 per 100 encounters in the total data), but numbers were small at this level of analysis precluding statistical comparisons.

Of the 8,833 encounters, 272 (3.1%) included the management of at least one problem that was work-related. A workers' compensation claim was made for 182 (67.0%) of the work-related encounters. Back complaint was the most common problem managed at an encounter where a workers' compensation claim was made.

Of the 90 respondents who stated they had a work-related problem but did not make a claim, only 50 gave a reason why a claim was not made. The most common reason given was 'not serious enough' (22.0%). The 'other' category made up 48% of reasons for not claiming, and an examination of this category showed that most of the reasons given (18% of all reasons) were that respondents were 'self employed'. Another 18% of patients gave 'not covered by employer' as their reason for not making a claim.

For other related abstracts see: 80 Employment status and workers compensation claims in general practice patients, 11 Patient employment status and occupation.

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about EMPLOYMENT STATUS, WORKERS' COMPENSATION CLAIMS & SMOKING.

INSTRUCTIONS

Ŀ	Г	\geq		
5	-	-		
r			٦.	



IF NO worker's compensation

7 Health service utilisation, lifestyle status and chronicity

Organisation supporting this study: Commonwealth Department of Veterans' Affairs

Issues: GP visits; hospital admissions; medications taken; independent living; institutionalisation

Sample: 2,124 encounters from 106 GPs; data collection period: 08/06/1999 – 09/07/1999 **Method:** Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Summary of results

The age-sex distribution of patients was similar to that of the total BEACH sample.

At least one prescribed medication had been taken routinely in the past 6 months by 69.6% of the respondents. Between one and three medications had been taken routinely by 47.0% of respondents. Almost two-thirds of respondents (60.8%) had routinely taken at least one over-the-counter (OTC) medication. Relatively more older patients were routinely taking either prescribed and/or OTC medications. The proportion of females who routinely took at least one prescribed medication was 74.2% compared with 63.1% of males. Similarly, a greater proportion of females (43.3%) than of males (32.3%) had routinely taken at least one OTC medication over the past 6 months.

The majority of respondents (52.1%) had visited a GP on between one and four occasions in the preceding 6 months. Again, elderly patients reported more GP visits, with 41.5% of patients aged over 75 years visiting the GP between five and eight times. At least one admission to hospital in the previous 6 months was reported by 18.0% of respondents. Allied health consultations were reported by 17.3% of respondents, while 37.2% had visited a specialist at least once in the past 6 months.

Of the 2,124 respondents, 11.5% were dependent on a carer, with a high proportion of patients aged 75 and over being dependent. Almost 3.0% of respondents resided in an institution.

At least one indicator of chronicity (e.g. falls, cognitive impairment, social isolation, incontinence) was reported for 19.8% of respondents. One indicator only was reported for 64.0% of respondents, with three or more reported for 10%. The prevalence of all indicators of chronicity increased with age. Falls/poor mobility was reported for 7.5%, and 6.0% were reported to be cognitively impaired. There were 5.6% who were socially isolated and 2.3% incontinent. Amongst those who were dependent on carers and others, and particularly for those living in institutions, individual indicators were more often reported, especially falls/poor mobility (21.7% and 66.7%) and cognitive impairment (14.0% and 53.7%). Almost one-third of the 54 patients living in institutions (30.8%) had been taking seven or more medications routinely in the past 6 months.

GPs reported that there were health plans for a relatively small number of respondents, with around 1% having either Department of Veterans'Affairs health care plan or another health care plan.

For other related abstracts see: 37 Prevalence of common morbidities in patients encountered in general practice.

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **PATIENT USE OF HEALTH CARE AND DEPENDENCE.** You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

INSTRUCTIONS

These questions refer to the past 6 months.
Write a <u>number</u> in the space provided for:
•How many medications they take/ have taken on a routine basis.
•Please distinguish between OTC (over the counter) and prescribed medications.

ASK ALL PATIENTS

- •The number of times they have visited any GP. •The number of times they have visited a
- I he number of times they have visited a specialist.
- •The number of hospital admissions.
- Tick the appropriate box for:
- •The number of times they have consulted an allied health professional (AHP).

Patient lifestyle:

Choose ONE option to describe the patient's lifestyle at the moment.

Health Care plans

Indicate whether the patient has a Department of Veterans' Affairs care plan or any other co-ordinated care plan.

Present status:

As far as you are aware, do any of the following options apply to the patient?

Please note that 'incontinent' applies to normally continent individuals (ie not infants).

		•	•
In the PAST 6 MONTHS:		Patient lifestyle:(Tick ONE only)	Present Status - GP assessment B13L
No. of medications routinely taken:	Prescribed	Living in the community independently	(Multiple response allowed)
	OTC I I	Dependent on carer/other: in the community	Falls/ poor mobility?
No. of GP visits:		Living in an institution	Cognitive impairment/ psychiatric
No. of specialist visits:		Does the patient have either of :	problem?
Hospital admissions:		DVA Health Care Plan	Socially isolated, carer stress,
No. AHP Consults: 0 1-5	6-10 11+	Other Co-ordinated Care plan	Incontinent?

8 Hormone replacement therapy (HRT)

Organisation supporting this study: Aventis Pharma Pty Ltd

Issues: Menopausal status among female patients; proportion taking hormone replacement therapy (HRT).

Sample: 2,063 encounters (females aged 18 years +); data collection period: 30/11/1999 – 14/01/2000

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Methods for this study: GPs were asked to ascertain (either by asking the patient or from their knowledge of the patient) for female patients aged 18 and over, whether the patient was premenopausal, perimenopausal or post menopausal. The GP was also asked to determine whether the patient had previously had a hysterectomy or experienced menopausal symptoms, was currently on HRT and (if so), whether they were taking HRT for symptom management, to avoid bone loss, for cardiovascular protection, or for another reason, which they were asked to specify.

Summary of results

Four thousand encounter forms were completed with the HRT questions. The age and sex distribution of these respondents were similar to those for general practice as a whole. The majority of respondents (59.3%) were females, with 2,063 of these aged 18 years and over.

Six per cent of the women in this subsample were perimenopausal. Thirty-two per cent of these women were aged between 40 and 59 years. Three hundred and thirty-three women (16.1% of respondents) had a past history of menopausal symptoms and 362 (17.6%, 95% CI: 15, 20.1) had had a hysterectomy.

Eleven per cent of respondents were taking HRT. The use of HRT was most common in perimenopausal women and among women aged 50 to 59 years. Among women with a history of menopausal symptoms the proportion taking HRT was 37.5%.

The most common single reason for taking HRT was symptom management (62.7%) followed by bone loss avoidance (50.4%) and cardiovascular protection (23.3%). Even when all the reasons for taking HRT were combined, symptom management only remained the most common reason, followed by the combination of all three reasons – symptom management, bone loss avoidance and cardiovascular protection (19.0%).

Oestrogen alone was the most common HRT used by women irrespective of menopausal status. Almost half of the 34 perimenopausal women on HRT were taking oestrogens alone.

For other related abstracts see: 84 Menopausal status, symptoms and treatment of women aged 18 and over. The following page contains the recording form and instructions with which the data in this abstract were collected.

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **HORMONE REPLACEMENT THERAPY and SMOKING.** You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

INSTRUCTIONS



44

9 Influenza and absenteeism

Organisation supporting this study: Roche Products Pty Ltd

Issues: Prevalence (previous 12 months), days of absence from work/study, days off advised, hospitalisation, medical certificate given at consultation.

Sample: 4,228 encounters from 106 GPs, data collection period: 04/05/1999 – 07/06/1999

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Summary of results

The age-sex distribution of the respondents was similar to the expected distribution for general practice, with the majority (56.9%) of patients being female.

The prevalence of influenza in the previous 12 months among the respondents was 14.9% (95% CI: 11.2–18.6). The highest prevalence was found among patients aged 15 to 24 years (22.3%, 95% CI: 16.9–27.7), there was no difference between males and females in the prevalence of influenza.

One in five (19.8%, 95% CI: 15.1–24.4) patients who were working/studying reported having had influenza in the previous 12 months. Forty-four per cent of these patients reported having 3 or more days absent from work, 33% reported having less than 3 days absent, and 23% had not had any days absent.

Only 1.6% (95% CI: 0.0–11.8) of patients in work/study had been hospitalised due to influenza in the previous 12 months. In comparison, 3.5% (95% CI: 0.0–9.9) of all patients (irrespective of employment status) had been hospitalised.

For 53 of the patients, influenza was a problem being managed at the current encounter. On average the patient had already had 1 day absent for influenza when seen by the GP and the GP advised a further 1.6 days off at the consultation. Thus the average number of days taken off work/study for influenza was 2.6 days.

A medical certificate was given at 7.8% (95% CI: 5.8–9.8) of the encounters in this sub–sample of encounters. Among those for whom influenza was managed at the encounter, 52.8% (95% CI: 40.2–65.4) were issued a medical certificate.

For other related abstracts see: 27 Prevalence and management of influenza.

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **INFLUENZA, ABSENTEEISM & SMOKING STATUS.** You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

INSTRUCTIONS

INFLUENZA These questions ask about influenza and should be asked of all patie	nts (or carers on their behalf).	Absence due to problems managed at today's consult. These questions refer to the problems managed at	
Ask the patient if they have had influenza in the past 12 months? Use the following definition of influenza to determine whether the patient had influenza or another condition. Definition of Influenza* a) viral culture or serological evidence of influenza virus infection, or b) Influenza epidemic, plus four of the criteria in (c), or c) six of the following: • sudden onset (within 12 hours) • cough • rigors or chills • four	Absence due to influenza. 1. Ask the patient how many days the patient was absent from work or study due to influenza? Write the number in the space provided. • Include halfdays as .5 days. • If no absences, write '0'. OR If the patient is NOT working or studying tick the appropriate box	 Indicate if the patient is usually in paid work, studying (including school) or neither, by ticking ONE box. Note that if the patient is not working or studying, the following questions about work absence need not be answered. If patients • usually work or study <u>AND</u> are currently absent because of the problems managed at today's encounter: Write the number of days already absent up until and including today. (Include half-days, and write nil as '0') 	
 prostration and weakness myalgia, widespread aches and pains no significant respiratory physical signs other than redness of nasal mucous membrane and throat influenza in close contacts *Definition used by the Australian Sentinel Practice Research Network.	2. Ask the patient if they have been hospitalised due to influenza. <i>Write the number of days in</i> <i>hospital.</i> <i>If not hospitalised, write '0'</i> .	 4. If you advised them to take time off at today's encounter, write the number of days in the box provided. Include half-days as .5 days. Again, indicate the <u>relevant problem(s)</u>, by circling one or more number. 5. Was a medical certificate provided at today's consultation? <i>Tick Yes or No.</i> 	Smoking status Ask ALL patients aged 18yrs+: Which of the four categories best describes their smoking status? Tick one box.
This form has been filled in as an example. Number of da from work/stuinfluenza? Number of da as a result of	ent (or carer): i influenza Yes ♥ No □ If imonths? ys absent 2 • (days absent) dy due to or □ Not working or studying He influenza? (days in hospital)	the patient usually in paid work or study? Paid work I Study Neit currently absent from work/study for problems managed to ow many days have they been absent so far? or which problem(s)?	Her □ day. • 5 • 5 Her □ day. • 5 Her □ • 5 Her □ • 5 • 5 Her □ • 5 • 5 • 6 • 7 • 7 • 7 • 7 • 7 • 7 • 7 • 7

10 Length of consultation; after-hours arrangements; co-morbidity

Organisation supporting this study: Commonwealth Department of Health and Aged Care (General Practice)

Issues: Length of consultation; after-hours arrangements; co-morbidity

Sample: 6,328 encounters from 210 GPs; data collection periods: 08/06/1999 – 13/07/1999 and 17/08/1999 – 21/09/1999

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Summary of results

The age-sex distribution of the patients was similar to the expected distribution of general practice patients, with the majority of patients (57.2%) being female.

Of the 210 participating GPs, 71.9% were male and 53.9% were aged 35–54 years. Most of the GPs worked 6–10 sessions per week (65.9%) and had graduated in medicine in Australia (70.2%). Solo practitioners accounted for 22.8% of the sampled GP population.

The median length for the 5,803 direct consultations (patient is seen) was 12 minutes, and the mean was 14.7 minutes (95% CI: 14.1–15.4). The median consultation length for male and female patients was similar at 11 and 12 minutes respectively. The median consultation length increased with patient age; patients under 15 having a median of 10 minutes, and those aged 45 years or more had a median of 14 minutes.

Three-quarters (77.7%) of direct consultations were between 5 and 19 minutes duration. Only 1.7% of direct consultations were of less than 5 minutes duration, and 2.7% were of 40 or more minute's duration. Of all direct and indirect consultations, the vast majority (93.9%) were held between the hours of 08:00 and 18:00.

At 7.3% of encounters, GPs stated that there were 'special' after-hours arrangements for that particular patient. One in five of these patients (20.5%) were aged 75 years or more. There was no apparent difference in the types of problems being managed at this encounter for these patients when compared with the problems managed for patients with 'normal' after-hours arrangements.

There were 338 encounters (5.7%) at which the GP reported that this service was provided when the practice was closed. These out-of-practice-hours services were provided by 79 (37.6%) of the 210 GPs. Only 22.5% of the consultations provided when the surgery was closed were between the hours of 18:00–23:00, with the majority (71.9%) being provided between the hours of 08:00–18:00. The consultations when the surgery was closed were longer (11.2% were 40 minutes or more) than all direct consultations (2.7% were 40 minutes or more). The patients seen when the surgery was closed were older (24.3% were aged 75 or older) than patients in the total study (13.1% aged 75 or older).

GPs indicated a variety of arrangements for their normal provision of after-hours service. Sixty-five GPs (31%) used a deputising service alone, while 87 (41%) of GPs used a deputising service together with another arrangement. The next most common arrangement was for 59 GPs (28%) who stated that their practice arranged their own after-hours service. Only two of the 210 GPs had no after-hours service arrangement. None of the GPs in rural or remote areas used a deputising service.

The length of consultation increased with the number of co-morbidities (requiring on-going management or surveillance) not managed at this encounter. Of patients with no unmanaged

co-morbidities, 6.8% (95% CI: 5.7–7.8) had a consultation of 30 minutes or longer, compared with 18.7% (95% CI: 8.1–29.3) of patients with four unmanaged co-morbidities.

Similarly, the length of consultation increased with the number of problems managed at this encounter. For patients with 1, 2, 3 and 4 problems managed there were respectively 5.7% (95% CI: 4.7–6.8), 8.3% (95% CI: 7.1–9.5), 13.5% (95% CI: 10.6–16.4) and 20.1% (95% CI: 11.5–28.8) of consultations which were 30 minutes or longer.

For other related abstracts see: 2 Anxiety/stress, consultation time, level of education, 32 Patient use of after-hours medical services, 37 Prevalence of common morbidities in patients encountered in general practice, 61 Prevalence of chronic illnesses identified as National Health Priority Areas among general practice patients, 89 Estimates of the prevalence of chronic illnesses identified as Health Priority Areas and Section 4.5 Length of consultation.

Further reading:

Bindman A.B., Forrest C., Britt H., Crampton P., Majeed A. 2007, 'Diagnostic scope of and exposure to primary care physicians in Australia, New Zealand and the United States: cross sectional analysis of results from three national surveys', *British Medical Journal* (Epub ahead of print).

Britt, H., Valenti, L., & Miller, G. 2002, 'Time for care. Length of general practice consultations in Australia', *Australian Family Physician*, vol. 31, no. 9, pp. 876–880.

Britt, H., Valenti, L., Miller, G. C., & Farmer, J. 2004, 'Determinants of GP billing in Australia: content and time', *Medical Journal of Australia*, vol. 181, no. 2, pp. 100–104.

Britt, H. C., Valenti, L., & Miller, G. C. 2005, 'Determinants of consultation length in Australian general practice', *Medical Journal of Australia*, vol. 183, no. 2, pp. 68–71.

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **TIME OF CONSULTATION, CO-MORBIDITY & AFTER-HOURS SERVICES.** You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

INSTRUCTIONS



49

11 Patient employment status and occupation

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

Issues: Employment status, occupation, problems managed for retirees, unemployed and occupational groups

Sample: 4,385 encounters from 110 GPs; data collection period: 30/03/1999 – 30/04/1999

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Summary of results

The age and sex distribution of the respondents was similar to the expected distribution of general practice patients, with the majority (58.1%) being female.

Of the 4,385 respondents, 59.8% were not in the labour force. Those not in the work force were mainly retirees (22.9%) and students (19.7%).

The main industries that the respondents in the work force were currently employed in were retail trade (15.4%), manufacturing (11.8%) and health and community services (11.7%).

Current occupation was analysed using the Australian Standard Classification of Occupations (ASCO) major groups, subgroups and individual occupations. Current occupation by major group showed most patients describing themselves as 'intermediate clerical/sales/service' workers (20.0%), followed by 'professionals' (17.3%). The most common current occupations at the ASCO 6 digit level were 'sales assistant' (8.0%), 'general clerk' (6.7%) and 'school teacher' (2.8%).

Problems managed at the consultation were analysed in relation to the occupation group and employment status of the patient and compared with problems managed at all patient encounters from the same period.

For all respondents, the most common problems managed were immunisation, upper respiratory tract infection and hypertension. Hypertension was managed at a lower rate for employed patients than for all respondents but managed at a significantly greater rate for retirees (17.0 per 100 encounters, CI: 13.0–20.9) than for all respondents (6.9 per 100, CI: 5.4–8.4). Back complaints were managed at an apparently higher rate amongst labourers (5.4 per 100 encounters) than amongst all respondents (2.2) but number of encounters with labourers were too small to test for significance. Likewise, depression (4.1) was managed at an apparently higher rate for generating the professionals than for all respondents (2.9).

For other related abstracts see: 6 Employment status and workers' compensation claims, 80 Employment status and workers compensation claims in general practice patients.

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

INSTRUCTIONS

Occupation and work activities

Ask patients (aged 15 years or more) each of the four questions about occupation and work. Two examples are shown below.

Example 1: Chris has worked fo	or many years as a factory worker in a clothing	
Current occupation:	DUMPES WAVER	
Industry of current employ	ment: Olationa	
Main lifetime occupation:	There. Cubring	
Main work activity:	Process worker	
Wall Work activity.	Making clotning	
Example 2: The second, Pat wa retrenched. Current occupation: Industry of current employ	ns the manager of a retail outlet until recently being unemployed ment: Nome	
Main lifetime occupation:	Manager	
Main work activity.	Running naraware store	
Patient's current employment status	NB: Main work activity may be thought of	Smoking status
Ask all patients aged 15 years or over, how they would describe their current employment status	in their work. The aim of this question is to help us clarify occupation.	18yrs+: Which of the four
(Including part-time and casual employment)	Work activity usually relates to current occupation. However, if the patient is retired or unemployed, then work activity	categories best describes their smoking status?
Select ONE category only.	relates to their main lifetime occupation.	Tick one box.
+		\downarrow

Hours in paid employment		+			\downarrow	\downarrow	
Ask all patients how many hours they	P/	ATIENTS 15yrs+: How would you describe you	ir current e	employment status?	What is your current occupation?	If patient is 18+yrs:	
would spend in paid jobs each week, on average.	Er	mployed by other	vork due to		In what industry are you currently employed	P Smokes daily	극
(Including casual work).	H	ome duties	ify)	9 neartir problems	What was/is your main lifetime occupation?	Previous smoker	₫
Write the number of hours in the box shown.	→ Hr	low many <i>hours</i> do you normally spend		1	What was/is your main work activity?	Neversmoked	
	in	all paid jobs each week?		hrs per week		B115	

51

12 Smoking & passive smoking in general practice patients

Organisation supporting this study: General Practice Statistics and Classification Unit **Issues:** Exposure to passive smoke at home; current smoking status; proportion of daily smokers who attempted to quit.

Sample: 3,784 encounters from 197 GPs; data collection period: 30/11/1999 – 18/02/2000. **Method:** Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Summary of results

The age-sex distribution of the patients was similar to the expected distribution of general practice patients, with the majority of patients (59.7%) being female.

When asked about smoking in the home, one-third of respondents (32.9%, 95% CI: 29.3–36.4) reported 'people are not permitted to smoke anywhere'. A further 38.7% (95% CI: 35.0–42.4) indicated 'smoking is permitted outside only', and in 5.0% 'people are permitted to smoke in certain areas only'. 'Smoking in the home occasionally' was allowed by 10.4% of respondents and 13.0% (95% CI: 11.4–14.5) said 'people frequently smoke in the house'.

These results show that in over two-thirds of patient households there was no passive smoke in the home (71.6%, 95% CI: 69.4–73.8). In a further 15.4% of household there was limited passive smoke (where smoking is permitted only in certain areas, or smoking in the home is only occasional), and in 13.0% (95% CI: 11.4–14.5) there was unlimited passive smoke.

Patients aged 18 years and over were asked to indicate their smoking status. About half (49.5%) had never smoked and 27.8% were previous smokers. Daily smokers accounted for 18.2% of the patients and a further 4.5% reported smoking occasionally.

There was no passive smoke in the home of 30.1% of daily smoker households (95% CI: 26.2–34.0), 45.1% (95% CI: 35.3–55.0) of occasional smokers' households, and 84.5% (95% CI: 82.2–86.8) of never smokers' households.

Adult daily smokers were asked about their quit and reduction attempts during the previous 12 months. Of the 578 adult daily smokers, data on their quit/reduction attempts was available for 553. They could indicate more than one quit/reduction option attempted. Just over one in ten (10.3%, 95% CI: 7.8–12.9) had successfully given up smoking for 1 month or more (but subsequently started again), and almost one-third (31.5%, 95% CI: 26.7–36.3) had a failed quit attempt during the past 12 months. About one in five adult daily smokers (19.4%, 95% CI: 14.9–23.8) had changed brand of cigarettes to a lower tar or nicotine brand, and about a quarter (26.4%, 95% CI: 21.8–31.1) had reduced the number of cigarettes smoked a day during the previous 12 months.

In the previous 12 months: four in ten adult daily smokers (39.4%, 95% CI: 34.2–44.7) attempted to quit smoking; over a third (36.4%, 95% CI: 30.9–41.8) attempted to reduce smoking effects by changing brand and/or reducing the number of cigarettes smoked; 26.9% tried to quit but did not try to reduce smoking; 23.9% attempted to reduce but not to quit; 12.5% tried both quitting and reduction; 36.7% (95% CI: 31.5–41.9) did not attempt to quit or reduce smoking.

For other related abstracts see: 35 Smoking status of adults and their attempts to quit, 53 Smoking status of adults and their attempts to quit, 74 Smoking and passive smoking in the home and Section 4.3 Smoking. Further reading:

Valenti, L., Charles, J., & Britt, H. 2005, 'Passive smoke in Australian homes: 1999 to 2004 [letter]', Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 387–388.

Doran, C. M., Valenti, L., Robinson, M., Britt, H., & Mattick, R. P. 2006, 'Smoking status of Australian general practice patients and their attempts to quit', *Addict.Behav.*, vol. 31, no. 5, pp. 758–766.

Degenhardt L, Knox S, Barker B, Britt H, Shakeshaft A. The management of alcohol, tobacco and illicit drug use problems by general practitioners in Australia. *Drug Alcohol Rev* 2005; 24(6):499–506.

The shaded section in the following forms asks questions about **SMOKING**.

PLEASE FILL IN <u>QUESTIONS</u> FOR <u>ALL</u> PATIENTS SEEN. Note: The home smoking question is asked of all patients, but smoking status is only asked of <u>patients over 18</u>.

INSTRUCTIONS

This form has been filled in as an example.

53

NB The term 'smoking' here is used to mean tobacco smoking of any kind, including cigarettes, pipes, and cigars.

				as"Daily smokers".	as "previous smo	<u>skers "</u> .
ASK THE PATIENT				In the past 12 months, has	About when did the	e
Which category best describes their home situation ?		<u>IE PATIENT</u> 18 years:		the patient tried any of the options listed ?	patient last smoke tobacco?	
If the patient is a child, their carer may answer the question about the child's home situation.		/hich category best escribes their noking status?		Tick as many of the options listed as apply.	Fill in the month an that the patient qui smoking (approxin	<u>nd year</u> i <u>t</u> nately).
Tick one box. ↓	<u>Tick one</u>	<u>∍ box.</u> ↓				
To the patient: Which of the following describes your home situation? People are not permitted to smoke anywhe Smoking is permitted outside only People are permitted to smoke in certain areas only People occasionally smoke in the house People frequently smoke in the house	g best To Ware Y yo Sn Sn Pro Ne	• the patient if 18 hich best describe our smoking status noke daily noke occasionally evious smoker ever smoked	+: ss D D D	If <i>daily smoker</i> . In the last 12 mo Successfully given up smoking (for month)? Tried to give up unsuccessfully? Changed to a cigarette brand with k nicotine content? Reduced the amount of tobacco you in a day? None of these	nths, have you: more than a when di smoke to (approxir wer tar or smoke month B18L	us smoker: d you last bacco? mately) 98 year

Only for patients who

described themselves

Only for patients who

described themselves

13 Perceived stress

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

Issues: Perceived stress in general practice patients in Australia

Sample: 2,891 encounters from 90 GPs; data collection period: 22/02/2000 – 27/03/2000

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Methods for this study: A four-item version of the Cohen Perceived Stress Scale (PSS) Instrument was used to measure the degree to which the patient regarded situations in their life as stressful.¹ *This was provided on a card to patients at the encounter.*

Summary of results

A Perceived Stress Scale (PSS) score was calculated for 2,891 patients over the age of 15, seen by 90 randomly selected GPs in March 2000. The PSS score ranges from zero, indicating no perceived stress, to sixteen, which indicates the highest level of perceived stress.

Of the 2,891 respondents aged over 15 years, 12.6% were aged between 16 and 24 years of age. The majority of patients (61.3%) were aged between 25 and 64 years of age, and 26.1% were 65 years or older, and likely to be retired from the workforce. Almost two-thirds (64.2%) of respondents were female.

The mean PSS score for all responding patients was 5.0 (95% CI: 4.7–5.2). The mean PSS score for male patients (4.7) did not differ significantly from that of female patients (5.1). However, significant differences in PSS score were apparent between different age groups. Respondents aged 65 to 74 and 75 years or older (i.e. those likely to be retired) had significantly lower PSS scores than patients aged 25–64.

A review of the literature did not locate any published grading of PSS scores to indicate the severity of stress. We therefore classified a PSS score between 9 and 16 as 'high' perceived stress, as a score above 8 indicates that a patient perceives their life to be stressful more than just 'sometimes'. All other patients (PSS score of between zero and 8) were classified as 'low' perceived stress for ease of reference.

A comparison of the patient demographics of 'high' and 'low' perceived stress was conducted. There were no significant differences in the age distribution, sex, non-Englishspeaking background (NESB) status or rurality of respondents with 'high' perceived stress and those with 'low' perceived stress. However, patients with 'high' perceived stress were more likely to hold a health care card than those with 'low' perceived stress.

1. Cohen S, Kamarck T, Mermelstein R. A global measure of perceived stress. J Health Soc Behav. 1983 Vol. 24:385–396.

For other related abstracts see: 2 Anxiety/stress, consultation time, level of education.

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

INSTRUCTIONS

This form includes four items about stress, and one smoking question.

You will need to read each question to the patient and ask for their response.

A patient response card has been included in your pack.

You may give the *response card* to the patient to assist them in making their response.

			Ask pa	tients aged 18yrs+:
Ask all patients aged 16 and over: Ask the patient how often, in the last r experienced each of the items descri	nonth, they have bed.		Which catego their si	of the four ries best describes moking status?
Circle <u>ONE</u> option for each question.			Tick of	ne box.
Ask patients 16vrs and ove	r: IN THE LAST MONTH. how	often have vou felt		▼ If patient is 18+vrs:
<u>Unable</u> to control the important things in your life?	Difficulties were piling up so high that you could not overcome them?	Confident about your ability to handle your personal problems?	That things were going your way?	Smokes daily
Never 1 Almost never 2 Sometimes 3 Fairly often 4 Very often 5	Never 1 Almost never 2 Sometimes 3 Fairly often 4 Very often 5	Never 1 Almost never 2 Sometimes 3 Fairly often 4 Very often 5	Never 1 Almost never 2 Sometimes 3 Fairly often 4 Very often 5	Previous smoker

Smoking status

Ask patients 16yrs and over: IN THE LAST MONTH, how often have you felt								
Unable to control the	Difficulties were piling up	Confident about your	That things were going					
life?	overcome them?	personal problems?	your way ?					
Never 1	Never 1	Never 1	Never 1					
Almost never 2	Almost never 2	Almost never 2	Almost never 2					
Sometimes 3	Sometimes 3	Sometimes 3	Sometimes 3					
Fairly often 4	Fairly often 4	Fairly often 4	Fairly often 4					
Very often 5	Very often 5	Very often 5	Very often 5					

14 Co-medications

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

Issues: This substudy investigated the extent to which the medications received at the encounter (prescribed, supplied or advised for over-the-counter purchase), reflect the total medications currently used by the patient. It assessed: the proportion of patients taking medications not received at the encounter ('other medications'); the number and type of other medications; the relationship between encounter medication, other medication and all co-medication; and GP knowledge of patient other medications.

Sample: 12,318 respondents from 211 GPs; data collection period: 28/03/2000 – 05/06/2000 **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 58.5% being female. Respondents who had no encounter or other medication made up 17.2% of all respondents. Over two-thirds (69.5%) received encounter medication. Almost half (43.4%) indicated they were currently using at least one other medication. One-third (30.1%) had encounter medication and were currently using other medication. Females were significantly more likely to be using at least one other medication (47.5%, 95% CI: 43.3–51.6) than were males (37.7%, 95% CI: 33.9–41.6). The likelihood of use of other medication increased with age. The highest prevalence of use was among female patients aged 75 years and over (65.8%). One other medication was being used by 28.9%, 19.2% used two medications, 12.5% three medications, and 22.2% four or more medications.

There were in total 27,764 co-medications (encounter medication plus other medication) recorded, an average of 2.25 per respondent or an average of 3.2 per respondent who was taking at least one medication (n=8,569). Other medications accounted for half (49.4%) of all co-medications. This suggests that data on encounter medications represent half the total medications being used by patients

The difference between the numbers of co-medications and encounter medications ranged from 0.1 medications in male infants to a maximum mean of 3.7 medications in elderly women (75 years +). Encounter medication for male infants far more closely represents their co-medication than that recorded at encounters with elderly women.

The largest proportion of other medications were cardiovascular which accounted for 21.3% of the total, followed by those acting on the central nervous system (13.0%) and those for nutrition and metabolism (10.7%). Other medications accounted for 86.3% of medications for nutrition, 61.4% of urogenital co-medications, 60.1% of anti-neoplastics, 60.0% of contraceptives hormones and 58.3% of cardiovascular medications. In contrast, over 90% of the antibiotics were prescribed at that encounter.

The GP stated they were aware that their patient was using 86.6% of other medications. Awareness was highest for cardiovascular medications (98.2% aware), lowest for vitamins (34.8% aware) and minerals and tonics (67.4% aware).

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

INSTRUCTIONS



15 Lipid lowering medication

Organisation supporting this study: Commonwealth Department of Health and Ageing (Pharmaceutical Benefits Branch).

Issues: This substudy investigated the proportion of general practice patients receiving lipid lowering medications and for those on lipid lowering therapy the prevalence of coronary heart disease (CHD) and risk factors for CHD. The types of medications used for lipid lowering therapy and the levels of cholesterol for different risk factors were examined.

Sample: 5,669 patients from 189 GPs; data collection periods: 06/06/2000 – 10/07/2000, 15/08/2000 – 18/09/2000.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Summary of results

The age-sex distribution of the respondents was similar to the distribution for BEACH overall, with the majority, (57.7%) of patients being female.

Overall, 10.2% of respondents were taking lipid lowering drugs (n=576) at the time of the encounter. Rates of lipid lowering drug therapy were comparable for males (11.0%) and females (9.5%). Patients aged 45 years and over were more likely than younger patients to be on lipid lowering therapy. Those most likely to be on lipid lowering drugs were aged between 65 and 74 years (27.2%).

Five per cent of respondents on lipid lowering therapy (29/530) were commencing therapy at the encounter. There were 564 medications used for lipid lowering therapy, very few patients using more than one lipid lowering medication. The most common generic medication used was simvastatin, accounting for 40% of all lipid lowering medications, followed by atorvastatin (36.5%) and pravastatin (13.5%). CHD was reported as present in 35.0% (n=203) of those on lipid lowering therapy.

Hypertension was the most common risk factor, reported by 55.0% (n=317) of those on lipid lowering therapy. Hypertension without CHD was reported for 31.3% of those on lipid lowering therapy. One in six (16.3%, n=94) of those on lipid lowering therapy had diabetes, 26.2% (n=151) had a family history of hypercholesteraemia and 23.7% (n=137) had a family history of coronary heart disease. One in ten (10.6%, n=61) had peripheral vascular disease. Sixteen per cent (n=91) of those on lipid lowering therapy did not report any of the listed risk factors/conditions.

For those commencing therapy the mean cholesterol level of the most recent test was 6.9 mmol/L. For those continuing therapy the mean cholesterol level at the start of therapy was 7.2 mmol/L.

There were few differences in cholesterol levels for patients with different risk factors, although those with coronary heart disease had started therapy at lower levels of cholesterol (mean 6.9 mmol/L) than those without coronary heart disease (mean 7.4 mmol/L, p < 0.001).

For other related abstracts see: 20 Screening and management of blood cholesterol, 30 Lipid lowering medications and coronary heart disease, 46 Coronary heart disease, risk factors and lipid lowering medication, 58 Lipid lowering medications: patient eligibility under PBS, 64 Current use of statins by general practice patients, 67 Risk factors of patients on lipid lowering medications, 79 Hypertension and dyslipidaemia – comorbidity and management in general practice patients, 97 Statin medication use among high CHD risk patients attending general practice, 99 Lipid management in patients with high risk conditions.

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

INSTRUCTIONS



16 Effect of day and time of GP visit on billing method

Organisation supporting this study: Commonwealth Department of Health and Aged Care (General Practice Branch).

Issues: This substudy investigated the effect of day and/or time of the GP-patient consultation on billing method (bulk billed versus patient billed).

Sample: 5,201 Medicare claimable encounters from 196 GPs; data collection period: 06/06/2000 – 10/07/2000 and 19/09/2000 – 23/10/2000.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Summary of results

For the 5,201 Medicare claimable encounters, three-quarters (74.3%) were bulk billed and the remainder (25.6%) were patient billed.

Patients aged 65 years and over were bulk-billed significantly more often than younger patients. The difference was most striking when comparing the 45–64 with the 75+ age group, who were bulk billed at 68.1% (95% CI: 63.1–73.0) and 86.7% (95% CI: 83.0–90.5) of Medicare-claimable encounters respectively.

The billing method (bulk or patient billed) was related to the day of the encounter (X^{2}_{6} =41.5, p<0.001). Encounters on Saturday (n=248) were significantly more likely to be bulk billed (84.7%) than encounters on Tuesday (n=1,413, 69.9% bulk billed). More generally, the billing method and whether the encounter was during the week or on the weekend were significantly related (X^{2}_{1} =15.0, p<0.001). Weekend consultations (n=274) were more likely to be bulk billed (84.3%) than weekday consultations (n=4,927, 73.8% bulk billed).

Most encounters on any day (55.4%) were during the 8am–1pm ('morning') session, 38.3% were during the 1pm–6pm ('afternoon') session, and 6.4% were 'over-night' (6pm–8am). Billing method was significantly related to time of consultation (X^{2}_{2} =9.0, *p*<0.001). If an encounter was during the 'afternoon' session, it was significantly less likely to be bulk billed (72.2%) than if it was 'over-night' (77.3% bulk billed).

Billing method was significantly related to the combination of day (weekday or weekend) and time (morning, afternoon or over-night) of the encounter ($X_{25}=26.7$, p<0.001). Weekend morning sessions (n=227) were significantly more likely to be bulk billed (87.2%), than weekend afternoon sessions (n=32, 71.9% bulk billed) and weekend over-night sessions (n=14, 71.4% bulk billed).

Weekend morning encounters (n=227) had the highest bulk billing rate (87.2%), followed by weekday over-night encounters (n=316, 77.5% bulk billed). The lowest bulk billing rates were on weekend afternoon (n=32, 71.8%) and weekend over-night encounters (n=14, 71.4%).

For other related abstracts see: 41 Time of visit and billing status.

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 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.

INSTRUCTIONS

FOR THE DOCTOR

62


17 Private prescription products

Organisation supporting this study: Roche Products Pty Ltd

Issues: This substudy investigated the proportion of patients receiving, or being considered for, private prescription products, and the conditions for which the products were being considered. Reasons why these products were or were not being prescribed, were also examined.

Sample: 5,222 respondents from 192 GPs; data collection period: 11/07/2000 – 14/08/2000 and 19/09/2000 – 23/10/2000

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Summary of results

The age and sex distribution of the 5,222 respondents was similar to those for BEACH as a whole, the majority of respondents (59.8%) being female.

GPs prescribed or considered prescribing a private prescription product for 647 (12.4%) of the 5,222 respondents. Eleven per cent of male patients and 13.3% of female patients were prescribed or considered for a private prescription product.

The conditions for which private prescription products were most frequently prescribed or considered were obesity, female contraception, acne, back pain, arthritis, immunisation and osteoarthritis. Other conditions for which these products were prescribed or considered included pain, asthma, insomnia, migraine and anxiety.

GPs discussed the probable cost of the private prescription product with 464 (79.2%) of the 647 respondents considered for a private prescription product, prior to prescribing. Multiple responses were allowed, and for the majority of patients the GP had indicated one (64.9%) or two (15.9%) reasons for prescribing. The most common reason given by GPs for prescribing a private prescription product (for 346 (53.5%) of the 647 respondents) was that no equivalent PBS product was available. Other reasons given by GPs for prescribing a private prescription product, in order of frequency, were: at doctor's initiative (n=163, 25.2%), at patient's request (n=124, 19.2%), doctor believed patient could pay (n=69, 10.7%), patient privately insured (n=33, 5.1%) and other (n=30, 4.6%).

The most frequent response for electing not to prescribe a private prescription product, which would have been a suitable treatment for the patient's condition, was that the patient could not pay (n= 55, 8.5% of 647 respondents). Other reasons include: a non drug therapy used instead (n=23, 3.6%), other (n=22, 3.4%) and therapy available on PBS (n=15, 2.3%).

The patient's capacity to pay for treatment is a major consideration for GPs in the management of a variety of problems.

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

INSTRUCTIONS



18 Drugs for the treatment of peptic ulcer and reflux

Organisation supporting this study: AstraZeneca (Australia) Pty Ltd

Issues: This substudy investigated patients who were currently taking omeprazole or other proton pump inhibitors (PPIs), histamine receptor antagonists (H₂RAs) or cisapride. Concurrent use of H₂RAs and antacids, the relationship between endoscopy and medication choice, and between diagnostic finding and medication choice were examined. The life prevalence of peptic ulcer disease and use of Helicobactor (H. pylori) eradication therapy were assessed independently of the other questions.

Sample: 95 GPs responded to questions on behalf of 2,856 patients; data collection period: 11/07/2000 – 14/08/2000

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Summary of results

The age-sex distribution of patients at encounters was similar to the distribution of the BEACH sample, with the majority (59.9%) of patients being female.

Of the 2,856 patients, 8.3% (n=236) were currently taking at least one PPI, H₂RA, or cisapride. The majority of these were taking H₂RAs (61.4%, 145/236), followed by omeprazole (28.4%), other PPIs (9.3%) and cisapride (5.5%).

Of the 133 respondents on H₂RAs who responded to a question on level of antacid use, 51.7% had never used antacids in conjunction with H₂RA medication. Twenty-two per cent (22.1%, 32/133) used antacids infrequently (<once per week) and more frequent use was reported by 18.0% (9.0% >once per week; 9.0% 'daily' use).

Of the 224 patients who were currently taking these medications and also indicated endoscopy status, 164 (73.2%) had undergone an endoscopy. It was common for patients currently taking omeprazole (92.5%, 62/67) and other PPIs (86.4%, 19/22) to have undergone an endoscopy. However, 37.2% (54/145) of those on H₂RAs had never undergone an endoscopy.

The predominant diagnosis on endoscopy was reflux oesophagitis (39.4%, 65/164), followed by ulcerative oesophagitis (21.8%, 36/164). Peptic ulcer disease (PUD) was diagnosed for 14.5% (24/164).

The most common diagnosis (post endoscopy) for patients on H_2RAs was reflux oesophagitis (39.3%, 33/84), while for those on omeprazole, reflux oesophagitis (40.3%, 25/62) and ulcerative oesophagitis (40.3%) were most common.

Of the total sample less than one in twenty (4.4%, n=125) reported having been diagnosed with PUD at some time. Of these, 39% had received H. pylori eradication therapy. For the 71 patients who had not, it was 'not considered appropriate' for 24 (32.4%), and the opportunity to undergo an H. pylori test was 'not available' to 27.

For other related abstracts see: 24 Gastro-oesophageal reflux disease (GORD) in general practice patients, 34 Gastro-oesophageal reflux disease (GORD), 51 Use of proton pump inhibitors for gastrointestinal problems, 60 Prevalence of GORD and associated proton pump inhibitor use, 62 Use of proton pump inhibitors by general practice patients, 91 Prevalence and management of gastrointestinal symptoms, 100 Gastrointestinal symptoms in patients attending general practice.

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **GASTRO-OESOPHAGEAL REFLUX DISEASE AND PEPTIC ULCER DISEASE.** You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

INSTRUCTIONS



19 Osteoporosis

Organisation supporting this study: Aventis Pharma Pty Ltd

Issues: This substudy examined patients with risk factors for osteoporosis and whether any patients had sustained fractures after minor trauma. The screening and diagnosis of osteoporosis, and medications being used to treat the disease, were also investigated.

Sample: 2,710 respondents from 90 GPs; data collection period: 15/08/2000 – 18/09/2000

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Methods for this study: The One-Minute Osteoporosis Risk Test designed by the International Osteoporosis Foundation was used as a risk factor list provided to patients on a card. Risk factors included family or personal history of fracture following minor trauma, menopause prior to 45 years of age or amenorrhoea (women), low testosterone (men), long term corticosteroid use, height loss >5cm, regular heavy alcohol use, coeliac or Crohn's disease.

Summary of results

The age-sex distribution of respondents was similar to the distribution for BEACH as a whole, with the majority (57.5%) of patients being female.

One in five (22.2%) of the 2,710 respondents reported having one or more risk factor for osteoporosis, such as early menopause or prolonged corticosteroid use. In gender specific terms, 17.1% of males and 22.4% of females had risk factors. The presence of risk factors increased steadily with age from 1.25% of patients aged 15–24 to almost half of those aged 75 years or more.

Of the 2,332 patients who responded to the question on fractures following minor trauma, 134 (5.8%) had at some time suffered such fractures, and they made up 3.2% of male and 7.5% of female respondents. Again, these proportions increased with age up to 20.0% of those aged 75 years or over. One hundred and five patients responded to the question on how many fractures they had suffered, and 90 of these (85.0%) reported having sustained one or two fractures, with the most common fracture sites being the wrist and the vertebral column. Patients who reported having risk factors were more likely to have sustained fractures.

The question on screening for osteoporosis was answered by 2,016 patients and 249 (12%) had previously been screened for osteoporosis either by x-ray or bone mineral density scan (BMD). Of these, 95 (40.0%) had been diagnosed with osteoporosis.

Eighty-four respondents, 90.0% of patients diagnosed with osteoporosis, were taking medication for that disease. Calcitriol accounted for almost 30.0% of these medications, followed by calcium carbonate (27.4%) and alendronate (17.7%). A greater proportion of medications had been initiated by a GP (69.0%) than by a specialist (31.0%).

For other related abstracts see: 85 Management of osteoporotic fractures.

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **RISK FACTORS FOR OSTEOPOROSIS.** You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

INSTRUCTIONS



Please read this card and tell your doctor if you answer 'yes' to 1 or more of the questions. You do not have to tell the doctor which questions you have answered 'yes' to, unless you wish to do so.

The One-Minute Osteroporosis Risk Test**

- 1. Have either of your parents broken a hip after a minor bump or fall?
- 2. Have you broken a bone after a minor bump or fall?
- 3. For Women: Did you undergo menopause before the age of 45?
- 4. For women: Have your periods stopped for 12 months or more (other than because of pregnancy)?
- 5. For Men: Have you ever suffered from impotence, lack of libido or other symptoms related to low testosterone levels?
- 6. Have you taken corticosteroids tablets (cortisone, prednisone, etc) for more than 6 months?
- 7. Have you lost more that 5 cm (2 inches) in height?
- Do you regularly drink heavily (in excess of safe drinking limits)? (Safe = 4 standard drinks daily for men, 2 daily for women)*
- 9. Do you suffer frequently from diarrhoea (caused by problems such as coeliac disease or Crohn's disease)?

* * Test designed by the International Osteoporosis Foundation

* Pols R.G. & Hawkes D.V (1992) Is there a safe level of daily consumption of alcohol for men and women? Australian Government Publishing service, Canberra

20 Screening and management of blood cholesterol

Organisation supporting this study: AstraZeneca (Australia) Pty Ltd

Issues: This substudy investigated the proportion of general practice patients having existing coronary heart disease (CHD) or risk factors for CHD, the proportion who had their blood cholesterol tested and the treatments used in the management of 'high cholesterol level' and the effectiveness of different management in decreasing cholesterol level.

Sample: 2,905 respondents from 97 GPs; data collection period: 24/10/2000 - 27/11/2000

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Methods for this study: Risk factors included: existing coronary heart disease, diabetes, familial hypercholesteraemia; family history of coronary heart disease, hypertension and peripheral vascular disease.

Summary of results

The age-sex distribution of respondents was similar to the distribution for BEACH overall, with the majority (58.5%) of patients being female.

Over one-third (37%) of the 2,905 respondents had at least one risk factor related to CHD.

Overall, more than half (55.0%) of the 2,771 patients who responded to the question on cholesterol tests, stated that their cholesterol had been tested. Of the 1,027 patients who had one or more risk factors for high cholesterol and responded to the question about initial cholesterol test, 14.0% had never had a cholesterol test.

The mean cholesterol level for those with one or more risk factors (n=834) was 5.88 mmol/L compared with 5.35 mmol/L for those with no risk factors (n=604). Of the 764 respondents using some form of treatment(s) for 'high cholesterol level', 61.3% were relying on diet/exercise only, 23.3% were on both diet/exercise and any statin medication, and 13.6% were using any statin medication only.

Among 415 respondents who were under cholesterol management and had both initial and most recent cholesterol levels recorded, a significant decrease in cholesterol levels was found for those using both diet/exercise and any statin ($t_{224}=9.7$, p<0.001), or using any statin alone ($t_{111}=-7.9$, p<0.001), compared with those using diet/exercise only. There was no significant difference between those using diet/exercise and any statin compared with those using any statin alone in the extent of cholesterol reduction ($t_{225}=0.2$, p=0.82).

There was a significant reduction in cholesterol levels for those using any statin compared with those on diet/exercise only (t_{386} =11.6, p<0.001). Patients using any statin had a significantly greater decrease in cholesterol levels than those not using any statin (t_{402} =10.8, p<0.001).

For other related abstracts see: 15 Lipid lowering medication, 30 Lipid lowering medications and coronary heart disease, 46 Coronary heart disease, risk factors and lipid lowering medication, 58 Lipid lowering medications: patient eligibility under PBS, 64 Current use of statins by general practice patients, 67 Risk factors of patients on lipid lowering medications, 79 Hypertension and dyslipidaemia – comorbidity and management in general practice patients, 97 Statin medication use among high CHD risk patients attending general practice, 99 Lipid management in patients with high risk conditions.

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **PATIENT BLOOD CHOLESTEROL LEVELS & MANAGEMENT.** You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

INSTRUCTIONS



21 Diabetes—prevalence, management and screening

Organisation supporting this study: Aventis Pharma Pty Ltd

Issues: This substudy investigated the prevalence, management and risk factors for diabetes in general practice patients. Blood glucose screening for patients with risk factors for diabetes was also examined.

Sample: 2,810 respondents from 95 GPs; data collection period: 24/10/2000 - 27/11/2000

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Methods for this study: A risk factor list provided to patients on a card was based on information from the International Diabetes Institute and the Diabetes Association. Risk factors included ethnic background, family members with diabetes, age > 50, history (females) of gestational diabetes, babies >4.5kg at birth, multiple miscarriages/still births, personal history of central obesity, hypertension and lipid disorders.

Summary of results

The age and sex distribution of these respondents was similar to those for BEACH as a whole, the majority of respondents (57.3%) being female.

The prevalence of diagnosed diabetes in this patient population was 7.2% (n=201), patients with Type 1 diabetes comprising 1.1% (n=32) while 6.0% (n=169) of patients had Type 2 diabetes. On average, diabetic patients were older (mean age 65.7 yrs) than non diabetic patients (mean age 43.3 yrs).

Medication was part of the treatment regime for 75.6% (n=152) of the 201 diagnosed diabetic patients, and 71.1% (n=133) of these medications were initiated by the GP. The most common generic medications used in the management of diabetes for these patients were metformin, gliclazide, glibenclamide and insulin products. A diet program was part of the treatment regime for 84.1% (n=169) of patients, while 62.7% (n=126) of patients used an exercise program as part of the treatment regime.

One in four respondents (n=759, 27%) had not been diagnosed with diabetes, but were identified as having two or more risk factors for diabetes. Of these patients 706 (93.0%) had previously had their blood glucose levels tested. The GPs nominated 179 patients (23.6%) with two or more risk factors for diabetes who would have their blood glucose tested as a result of this encounter, 26 (14.3%) of these being tested for the first time.

For 90 (50.3%) of the 179 patients who were to be tested as a result of this encounter, the GPs nominated that they would implement a diet program for the patient if the test results indicated hyperglycaemia. Exercise programs would be introduced by GPs for 67 (37.3%) patients if test results indicated hyperglycaemia, while 13 (7.5%) of these patients would be referred to a specialist on indication of hyperglycaemia.

As 93% of patients with two or more risk factors for diabetes had already been tested for hyperglycaemia, it would appear that GPs are playing a pro-active role in screening for diabetes among the general practice population. Diet plans and exercise programs are the preferred initial management option for newly diagnosed hyperglycaemic patients.

For other related abstracts see: 25 Prevalence of diabetes, medications and control, 40 Type 2 diabetes mellitus, prevalence and management, 45 Diabetes mellitus prevalence, management and risk factors, 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 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



Please read this card and tell your doctor if you answer 'yes' to 2 or more of the questions. If you do not understand some of the risk factors, please ask your doctor to tell you what they mean.

Diabetes Risk Factors **

- 1. Is your family background Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander, Pacific Islander, Chinese, Southern European or from the Indian sub-continent?
- 2. Does either of your parents, or any of your brothers or sisters have Type 2 Diabetes?
- 3. Are you over 50 years of age?
- 4. For Women: Have you ever had gestational diabetes (i.e. while you were pregnant), a history of babies born heavier than 4.5 kg, multiple miscarriages or stillbirths?
- 5. Do you:
 - carry a lot of excess weight around your waist and stomach area (central obesity)?
 - have high blood pressure (hypertension)?
 - have a blood lipid (fat) disorder (dyslipidaemia)?

** McMarty DL, Zimmet P, Dalton A, Segal L & Wellborn TA. (1996) The Rise and Rise of Diabetes in Australia, 50-51. International Diabetes Institute & Diabetes Association.

22 Asthma—prevalence, severity and management

Organisation supporting this study: General Practice Statistics and Classification Unit

Issues: This substudy investigated the prevalence of asthma in general practice patients, and the severity of asthma using the National Asthma Campaign's severity classification. For those asthmatic patients, management of asthma, the effectiveness and adverse effects of treatment were examined.

Sample: 5,495 respondents from 95 GPs; data collection periods: 28/11/2000 – 15/01/2001. **Method:** Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Methods for this study: Levels of severity of asthma for children and adults were listed on a patient card with descriptions of each level. Severity classes for children included infrequent episodic, frequent episodic, and persistent. For adults, the severity classes were very mild, mild, moderate and severe. The severity levels were adapted from the NAC Asthma Management Handbook 1998.

Summary of results

The age-sex distribution of the respondents was similar to the distribution for BEACH overall, with the majority (58.5%) of patients being female.

The prevalence of asthma among the respondents was 12.8% (95% CI: 11.4–14.3). Asthma was significantly more prevalent in patients aged 5 to 14 (22.2%, 95% CI: 14.4–29.9) than in the total sample. Of the 118 children (age <18) with asthma who responded to the severity question, 74.6% had infrequent asthma, 20.3% had frequent and 5.1% had persistent asthma. Among 543 adults (age>18) with asthma who responded to the severity question, 70.0% had very mild or mild asthma, 24.5% had moderate asthma and 5.5% had severe asthma.

Of the 132 asthmatic children (age<18) 39.4% had an asthma action/management plan, while 27.1% of asthmatic adults (age>18) (n=547) had such a plan. Nine out of ten patients with asthma (90.8%, n=704) were taking medications for asthma. Of asthma patients, 82.0% used reliever medications, 48.7% preventer medications and 7.8% controller medications.

The distribution of treatment regimen for asthma varied with asthma severity levels. Reliever alone was the most common regimen among the 88 children with infrequent asthma (53.4%) and among the 232 adults with very mild asthma (62.1%). The combination of relievers and preventers was most common among the children with frequent asthma (15/24), children with persistent asthma (4/6), adults with mild asthma (46.6%, 69/148), adults with moderate asthma (63.9%, 85/133), and adults with severe asthma (63.3%, 19/30).

For the 614 respondents taking medications for their asthma, GPs rated the effectiveness of the current treatment regimen as 5 (effective) in 54.9% of cases. Reliever medications alone (270 patients) had the highest proportion (64.1%) of a '5' rating for the effectiveness of current treatment regimen. Of the 602 patients on asthma medications, 82.9% had no adverse effect from current treatment regimen. Patients only taking reliever medications, recorded the highest proportion (90.0%, n=259) of 'no adverse effect' of current treatment regimen.

For other related abstracts see: 3 Asthma, 39 Severity of asthma, medications and management, 48 Asthma prevalence and management, 63 Asthma-prevalence, management and medication side-effects, 70 Inhaled corticosteroid use for asthma management, 96 Inhaled corticosteroid use for asthma management, 104 Asthma management and medication use among patients attending general practice.

Further reading:

Henderson, J., Knox, S., Pan, Y., & Britt, H. 2004, 'Changes in asthma management in Australian general practice', *Prim.Care Respir.J*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 138–143.

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.



Severity of asthma reference card

Children	
Severity*	Common features
Infrequent episodic	Episode 6-8 weeks or more apart; attacks generally not severe; symptoms rare between attacks; normal examination and lung function except when symptomatic.
Frequent episodic	Attacks < 6 weeks apart; attacks more troublesome; increasing symptoms between attacks; normal examination and lung function except when symptomatic.
Persistent	Symptoms most days; nocturnal asthma > 1/wk; attacks 4-6 weeks apart; daily use of beta2 agonist; 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 asymptomatic.						
Moderate	Symptoms most days; exacerbations < 6-8 weeks apart which affect day-time activity and sleep; exacerbations last several days; occasional emergency room visit.						
Severe	Persistent; limited activity level; nocturnal symptoms > 1/wk; frequent emergency room visits and hospital admissions in past year; FEV ₁ may be significantly reduced between exacerbations.						

* The severity classes are adapted from the NAC Asthma Management Handbook 1998 edition.

23 Depression

Organisation supporting this study: Commonwealth Department of Health and Ageing (Pharmaceutical Benefits Branch)

Issues: This substudy examined the GP perceived rate of depression managed among general practice respondents, and the rates of management of different types of depression.

Sample: 5,624 respondents for 196 GPs; data collection period: 16/01/2001 – 26/03/2001.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Methods for this study: 'Major depressive disorder' was defined according to DSM-IV (Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, 4th edition) criteria to provide guidance for GPs reporting this condition.

Summary of results

Males were slightly under-represented in the SAND sample (39.8 %, 95% CI: 37.9–41.7) compared with the expected distribution for BEACH (42.7%, 95% CI: 42.0–43.5).

The GPs recorded managing depression at 12.1% of encounters (*n*=682). Depression was noted for 13.8% of females (95% CI: 11.4–16.2) and 9.4% of males (95% CI: 95% CI: 6.3–12.5). Among adults aged 45–64, 16.6% were managed for depression (95% CI: 12.1–21.2) compared with 9.3% of young people aged 15–24 (95% CI: 0.6–18.0). Differences in sex specific and age specific rates however, were not significant, possibly due to the relatively small numbers in certain age groups.

The most frequent type of depression was 'depression with anxiety disorder', seen in 4.0% (n=223) of SAND respondents, followed by 'chronic mild depression' (3.5%, n=196) and 'adjustment disorder with depressed mood' (2.9 %, n=162). 'Major depression' was seen in 2.6% (n=147) of SAND respondents. Alcohol/drug related depression (n=28) and bipolar disorder (n=7) were very infrequently managed among SAND respondents.

In this SAND analysis GPs reported managing depression at 3–4 times the rate normally reported at BEACH encounters (3.4 depression problems per 100 encounters). The discrepancy between SAND and BEACH in the management rates of depression, suggests that GPs perceived many more of their patients as depressed than they explicitly managed for depression. It is also possible that GPs consider GP-patient encounters as involving implicit management of depression, regardless of the explicit problems managed. Some GPs may have perceived depression as part of the patient problem with which they were dealing, or as an inherent part of the patient's disease complex, and not as a separate problem managed in the encounter. This study suggests that depression is recognised in general practice patients far more frequently than suggested by GPs' explicit recording of depression as a diagnosed problem under management.

For other related abstracts see: 5 Depression, 47 Management of depression and anxiety.

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

INSTRUCTIONS

79

<u>BOX 1</u>

Criteria for major depression* *DSM-IV (D	iagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, 4th edition).
At least FIVE (5) of the following symptoms for	at least TWO WEEKS (symptom 1 or 2 must be present):
(1) Depressed mood	(6) Fatigue or loss of energy
(2) Loss of interest or pleasure	(7) Feelings of worthlessness or excessive guilt
(3) Significant appetite or weight loss or gain	(8) Impaired thinking or concentration;
(4) Insomnia or hypersomnia	indecisiveness
(5) Psychomotor agitation or retardation	(9) Suicidal thoughts/thoughts of death

If you believe the patient's depression is a MAJOR depressive disorder according to the criteria shown above in Box 1 please tick the corresponding box to Please indicate whether indicate this. depression is one of the problems you are managing for this patient Otherwise, please tick the appropriate box which today. best describes the type of depression the patient is suffering from. You may tick more than one box if If 'Yes' please continue on to the more than one description applies. If none of these next question. options apply, please choose 'other' and write a brief description. If 'No' end questions here. Is depression one of the other (please describe) Major depression problems being managed at Depression associated with If 'Yes' how anxiety or anxiety disorder today's encounter? would you Adjustment disorder with depressed mood describe this (e.g., generalised Yes 🛛 continue depressive Chronic mild depression anxiety panic, phobia, obsessive compulsive etc) episode? Alcohol / drug induced No end questions here BL29B

24 Gastro-oesophageal reflux disease (GORD) in general practice patients

Organisation supporting this study: Janssen-Cilag Pty Ltd

Issues: This substudy was designed to gain further understanding of patients in general practice who have been diagnosed with gastro-oesophageal reflux disease (GORD) and the specific medications used in its treatment. Other elements such as medication regimen, patient level of satisfaction with medication effectiveness, and the person who initiated treatment were also explored.

Sample: 93 GPs responded to questions on behalf of 2,767 patients; data collection period: 20/02/2000 – 26/03/2001

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Summary of results

The age-sex distribution of patients in this sample was similar to the distribution of the total BEACH sample. Females were represented at 60% of encounters. Patients aged between 25 and 64 years represented over half the sample (51.9%).

The estimated point prevalence of GORD in general practice for this sample was 15.6% (n=433). For the majority of these patients, GORD had been diagnosed at a previous encounter (86.4%, n=374). The prevalence of GORD was most common among patients aged 65 or over, approximately 30% of whom had been diagnosed with GORD. The prevalence of GORD did not differ between males and females.

Seventy-eight per cent (n=339) of patients with diagnosed GORD (n=433) indicated taking medications (n=364) specifically for GORD. Very few patients were taking more than one medication (7.08%, 24/339).

Over half of the medications that were currently being taken by patients were H₂-receptor antagonists (H₂Ras) (53.6%, 195/364) followed by proton pump inhibitors (PPIs) (29.1%, 106/364). Analysis of medications at the generic level indicated that Ranitidine was the most common generic medication being taken (37.6%, 137/364).

Seventy-five per cent (n=254) of medications for which a drug regimen was recorded (n=337) were taken by patients on a 'daily' basis as opposed to an 'as required' (prn) basis.

An indication of whether each medication was initiated by a GP, specialist or other source was provided for 329 medications. The GP was the most common source of medication prescriptions (58.4%) and approximately one-third (32.5%) of medications were initiated by a medical specialist.

Patients were also asked to specify their level of satisfaction with each medication using a scale from 1 (unsatisfied) to 5 (very satisfied). A large proportion of patients were at least satisfied ('4'-34.7%; '5'-44.3%), and 20.8% were less satisfied ('3'-12.5%; '2'-3.4%; '1'-4.9%).

For other related abstracts see: 18 Drugs for the treatment of peptic ulcer and reflux, 34 Gastro-oesophageal reflux disease (GORD), 51 Use of proton pump inhibitors for gastrointestinal problems, 60 Prevalence of GORD and associated proton pump inhibitor use, 62 Use of proton pump inhibitors by general practice patients, 91 Prevalence and management of gastrointestinal symptoms, 100 Gastrointestinal symptoms in patients attending general practice.

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **GASTRO-OESOPHAGEAL REFLUX DISEASE & MEDICATIONS.** You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

INSTRUCTIONS

FOR THE DOCTOR									
These questions refers to any pa has been diagnosed with gastro- oesophageal reflux disease ei	tient who This question re to treat their ref	This question refers to medication/s currently being taken by the patient to treat their reflux disease.							
or at a previous encounter. If 'Yes' to either option please co	ontinue the	Medication - please write the name of reflux medication in the space provided. There is room to write up to 3 medications.					<u>Medication regimen</u> - if the patient has been instructed to take any of their reflux medications on a daily basis, please ask the patient to nominate an option from those listed which best describes how often the		
If <u>NO</u> - questions <u>END</u> here.	Regimen - alor indicate whethe or only when re	Regimen - along side the medication name please circle a response to indicate whether the patient has been advised to take the medication daily or only when required (p.r.n.) to treat symptoms.							
	Initiated by - a whether the pat prescription fro recommendatio	Initiated by - along side the regimen please circle a response to indicate whether the patient originally began taking this medication as a result of a prescription from a GP, a prescription from a specialist, or a recommendation from another source (if the medication is an 'over-the- counter' preparation)					medicatio	on is act	ually being taken.
	Patient satisfa with the effectiv where 1 is uns	Patient satisfaction - please ask the patient to rate how satisfied they are with the effectiveness of each medication by circling a response from 1 to 5, where 1 is unsatisfied and 5 is very satisfied.							Previous medications - please write the names of any medications the patient has previously used for the
									treatment of their reflux disease.
★ Has this patient been diagnosed	What medication is currently	being taken for tre	atment? 🔲 N	ne			For 'daily' regin	ien	Which medications have
with gastro-oesophageal reflux disease?	<u>Medication</u>	edication Regimen Initiated by Satisfaction			1	medication is a taken:	ctually	you previously used for this condition?	
Yes - at this encounter	1	_ Daily / p.r.n	GP/Spec'st/other	1 2	34	5		day	1
Yes - at a previous encounter	2	_ Daily / p.r.n	GP/Spec'st/other	1 2	34	5	□ > one pe	r day	2
No end questions BL30C	3	Daily / p.r.n	GP/Spec'st/other	1 2	3 4	5	⊔ <one pe<="" td=""><td>r day</td><td>3</td></one>	r day	3

25 Prevalence of diabetes, medications and control

Organisation supporting this study: Aventis Pharma Pty Ltd

Issues: The prevalence of diagnosed diabetes and the specific medications used in its treatment; hypoglycaemic attacks in diabetic patients including the number of attacks, action taken because of the attacks and the number of days off work due to the attacks over the past 12 months.

Sample: 2,810 encounters from 95 GPs; data collection period: 01/05/2001 – 11/06/2001.

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 the majority (56.7%) being female. Patients aged 25–44 years accounted for 28.1% of the sample.

The prevalence of diagnosed Type 1 diabetes in this sample was estimated to be 0.8% (95% CI: 0.0–2.7), and the prevalence of diagnosed Type 2 diabetes was 6.0% (95% CI: 4.6–7.3). On average, patients with diagnosed diabetes were older (66.5 years, 95% CI: 63.6–69.4) than patients without diabetes (42.4 years, 95% CI: 40.2–44.6).

All patients with Type 1 diabetes were currently using insulin, with the majority (54.6%) taking intermediate/long acting insulin only. Only 7.9% of patients with Type 2 diabetes were currently using insulin. Non-insulin diabetic medication (defined as sulfonylurea, metformin, glitazone or repaglinide) was being taken by 71.3% (95% CI: 63.7–79.0) of patients with Type 2 diabetes. Of these medications, metformin (50.6%) and sulfonylurea (41.5%) were the most commonly prescribed for patients with Type 2 diabetes. Almost a third (31.8%) of patients with Type 1 diabetes and almost half (43.3%) of those with Type 2 diabetes were also taking anti-hypertensive medication.

The proportion of patients with diabetes who indicated having any hypoglycaemic attacks in the previous 12 months was 11.0% (n=20), 13 (65.0%) of these reporting between one and three hypoglycaemic attacks in the previous 12 months.

Of the 20 patients who had hypoglycaemic attack/s during the previous 12 months, 17 provided information on where they sought treatment. Eight visited their GP as a result of an attack, three visited a community nurse, three attended casualty, three were hospitalised and none had a glucagon injection. Only one of the six working age patients with diabetes who had hypoglycaemic attack/s in the previous 12 months had any time off work as a result.

For other related abstracts see: 21 Diabetes – prevalence, management and screening, 40 Type 2 diabetes mellitus, prevalence and management, 45 Diabetes mellitus prevalence, management and risk factors, 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 shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **DIABETES MELLITUS.** You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

INSTRUCTIONS



26 Prevalence of diagnosed hypertension and difficulties in treatment

Organisation supporting this study: AstraZeneca (Australia) Pty Ltd

Issues: Prevalence of diagnosed hypertension in general practice and degree of difficulty of treatment; current medication used; medication changes in the past year; previous medications used.

Sample: 2,746 respondents from 93 GPs; collection period: 12/06/2001 – 16/07/2001.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Summary of results

The age-sex distribution of patients was similar to the distribution of the total BEACH sample, with the majority (58.9%) being female. Patients aged over 65 years accounted for 26.6% of the sample.

The prevalence of hypertension among the respondents was 23.2% (95% CI: 20.6–25.8). Of the 638 hypertensive patients, 539 had simple hypertension and 99 had complicated hypertension, demonstrating a prevalence of 19.6% for simple hypertension and 3.6% for complicated hypertension. Prevalence did not differ for males, but female patients aged 65 years or more were significantly more likely to have hypertension (53.1%, 95% CI: 43.8–62.4), compared with the overall prevalence.

The GPs stated that it was easy to control the hypertension of 42.8% of patients with simple hypertension but only 5.2% of those with complicated hypertension. They found it difficult or very difficult to control 12.8% of simple and 54.6% of complicated hypertension.

Of the 630 patients with hypertension who answered the questions on medications, only 7.3% were not currently taking any medication, while just over half (54.6%) were taking one medication. The remaining 38.1% were taking two or more medications. Patients with complicated hypertension were taking more medications than those with simple hypertension, and 70.4% of patients with complicated hypertension reported using two or more hypertension medications. The most common current medications were atenolol (10.7% of all current medications), amlodipine (7.1%) and irbesartan (6.9%).

Among the 587 patients who responded to the question about change of medication, over a quarter (27.3%) reported that their hypertension medication(s) had been changed in the past 12 months. Change in medication was reported by a quarter (25.8%) of patients with simple hypertension, and almost half of patients (49.4%) with complicated hypertension. Of the 372 previous medications recorded for all patients with hypertension, enalapril maleate was the most common (8.6%). It was followed by irbesartan (7.3%), atenolol (7.3%) and indapamide (6.7%).

For other related abstracts see: 59 Hypertension management and control in general practice patients, 79 Hypertension and dyslipidaemia – comorbidity and management in general practice patients, 98 Management of hypertension and angina in general practice patients.

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

INSTRUCTIONS



27 Prevalence and management of influenza

Organisation supporting this study: Roche Products Pty Ltd

Issues: This study was designed to gain a better understanding of the prevalence and management of influenza in general practice patients. Topics explored included the prevalence of influenza vaccinations; the annual incidence of influenza in general practice patients and their immediate families; the impact on their daily activities; medications used for management; from whom treatment was sought.

Sample: 2,784 respondents from 94 GPs; data collected between 12/06/2001 – 16/07/2001.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Methods for this study: Patients were provided with an information card outlining the symptoms of influenza compiled with advice from the Australian Influenza Working Party. Symptoms included sudden onset of fever, chills, body aches and pains, headache, dry cough and fatigue. This card also included an explanation of the scale of impact on daily activities used.

Summary of results

The age-sex distribution of respondents was similar to the distribution for all BEACH (general practice) encounters, with the majority of patients (57.5%) being female and aged 25–44 (25.2%, 95% CI: 22.8–27.6) or 45–64 (25.1%, 95% CI: 22.8–27.4) years.

One-third of respondents had received an influenza vaccination in the previous 12 months. The rates for males and females were equivalent. Among adults the vaccination rate increased significantly with age, from 15.1% of 25–44 year olds to 82.8% of respondents aged 75 years and over.

Less than 10% of respondents reported experiencing influenza in the last 12 months. Of the influenza sufferers, half sought treatment from a GP, whilst one-quarter did not seek any advice or treatment. Two-thirds of those who had suffered influenza reported that it interfered moderately to greatly with their daily activities.

One-quarter of respondents who had suffered influenza had not taken any medications. Of the remainder, 46% had taken one medication only. The most common medication was paracetamol (24.0%, n=71).

Forty-three per cent of respondents who had experienced influenza reported another member of the family also having influenza in the previous 12 months.

For other related abstracts see: 9 Influenza and absenteeism.

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

INSTRUCTIONS



Influenza

**** SYMPTOM CHECKLIST**

Sudden onset of ...

- fever 38 decrees C. or more, and/or
- ♦ chills
- body aches and pains possibly also ...
- headache
- dry cough
- fatigue

IMPACT ON DAILY ACTIVITIES

 Not at all - you were able to carry out your normal daily routine

 Slightly - you were unable to carry out some of your normal daily activities

 Moderately - you were unable to carry out at least half of your normal daily activities

 Greatly - you were unable to carry out most of your normal daily activities.

 ** compiled with advice from the Australian Influenza Working Party

28 Prevalence of Alzheimer's disease and dementia

Organisation supporting this study: Janssen-Cilag Pty Ltd

Issues: Prevalence of Alzheimer's disease and dementia in adult general practice patients; prevalence of current cognitive impairment, difficulties with daily living or behaviour changes in patients not diagnosed with Alzheimer's disease or dementia; proportion of patients who (in the GP's opinion) were likely to have dementia or the early signs of Alzheimer's; proportion of patients who had taken a Mini Mental Health Assessment (MMHA).

Sample: 2,194 encounters (with adults) from 88 GPs; data collection period: 17/07/2001 – 20/08/2001.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Methods for this study: Patients were provided with an information card outlining the signs of cognitive impairment, examples of difficulties with daily living and examples of behavioural changes.

Summary of results

The age and sex distributions of the respondents was similar to the distribution for BEACH overall. The prevalence of diagnosed Alzheimer's disease in this adult general practice patient population was 1.6% (95% CI: 0.0–4.4), and the prevalence of diagnosed dementia was 2.4% (95% CI: 0.0–5.4).

Of adult patients not diagnosed with dementia, 4.2% displayed cognitive impairment, 4.9% encountered difficulties with daily living and 5.6% experienced behavioural changes. Only 1.4% of patients displayed all three of the above symptoms, while 2.7% had two of the three symptoms, and 5.0% displayed one symptom.

A MMHA had been used for only 2.4% of the 2,046 patients without diagnosed dementia or Alzheimer's for whom a response to this question was provided. MMHA use was rare (0.9% assessed) for patients with no symptoms of dementia but more common (51.7% assessed) with patients who had all three dementia symptoms.

GPs were asked whether it was likely that patients without diagnosed dementia actually had signs of dementia or early Alzheimer's. GPs indicated that 59 patients (2.9%) were likely to have dementia not yet diagnosed, and 20 patients (1.0%) were likely to have early Alzheimer's, as yet not diagnosed. Combined, GPs indicated that 63 patients (3.1%) were likely to have undiagnosed dementia and/or early Alzheimer's and more than half of these patients were aged 75 years or more. By far the majority of these expressed opinions were based on clinical opinion rather than on results of a MMHA.

For other related abstracts see: 102 Alzheimer's disease or dementia in patients attending general practice.

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **DEMENTIA / ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE.** You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

INSTRUCTIONS



Dementia / Alzheimer's

**** SYMPTOM CHECKLIST**

Cognitive impairment ...

- * forgetting to pay bills
- * misplacing car keys, or
- * word finding difficulties.

Difficulties with daily living ...

- * meal preparation,
- * telephoning,
- * housework,
- * difficulty in handling finances and correspondence

Behavioural changes ...

- * depression,
- anxiety,
- * mood swings,
- * delusions and hallucinations,
- * aggression and agitation.

**based on NSW Alzheimer's Association symptom list

29 Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) and acid suppressant use

Organisation supporting this study: AstraZeneca (Australia) Pty Ltd

Issues: This substudy was designed to investigate non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) and acid suppressant use by general practice patients. Specifically, the use of NSAIDS, Cox-2 inhibitors and acid suppressants by patients with upper gastro-intestinal (UGI) problems was explored.

Sample: Responses were recorded by 88 GPs for 2,551 patients; data collection period: 16/07/2001 – 20/08/2001.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Summary of results

The age-sex distribution of patients in this sample was similar to the distribution of the total BEACH sample, with the majority (58.8%) being female. Patients aged between 25 and 64 years represented over half the sample (53.2%).

One in seven (13.9%) of the 2,551 respondents were currently taking a non-steroidal antiinflammatory drug (NSAID). Of those who reported NSAID use, 46.6% (n=165) were using a Cox-2 inhibitor alone; 38.7% (n=137) were using another NSAID alone; 5.1% were using aspirin alone; 1.1% were using both a Cox-2 and aspirin; and 0.9% were using aspirin with another NSAID.

Among the 325 patients for whom the type of NSAID was specified, Cox–2 inhibitors were the most commonly used (59.4%). Regimen was recorded for 132 of those using Cox–2 inhibitors, 59.1% of whom listed continual use and the remainder (40.9%) were taking them when required.

A total of 422 respondents using NSAIDS answered the UGI questions. The prevalence of UGI in these patients was estimated at 75.4% (CI: 69.7–81.0). At least one UGI problem was listed by 38.8% of the 165 patients using Cox–2 inhibitors; 25.4% of the 138 other NSAID users, and 32.3% of the 130 taking low dose aspirin.

Of the 422 respondents with at least one UGI problem, three-quarters (75.4%) were using acid suppressant medication. For the 480 patients currently taking NSAID and/or aspirin, almost one in three (30.2%) were using acid suppressant medications.

Acid suppressants were used prophylactically by 39.1% of the 307 patients using acid suppressants, the remainder using these medications only when required for symptom relief.

For other related abstracts see: 78 NSAID & acid suppressant use in general practice patients, 88 Arthritis rates and NSAID use in general practice patients, 49 Health status and management of patients on non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs.

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **NSAID and ACID SUPPRESSANT USE**. You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

INSTRUCTIONS

Patient use of NSAIDs and / ofPlease indicate by ticking the apbox/es whether this patient is oftaking a non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID) ardose aspirin. If the 'non-specNSAID option is ticked, please ofname of the NSAID being used.Tick as many options as apply.Please circle an option from thecontinually.Please circle an option to indicate on theproximate length of time (m)the patient has been taking thismedication.	or Aspirin opropriate urrently nd / or low cific' write the ne 'taken' ired or cate the onths) that	Symp Pleas box w exper for, s proble Tick a	otoms of Upper GI Problems se indicate by ticking the appropria whether the patient is currently riencing, or currently being tre symptoms of upper gastro-intest ems.	te ated iinal	Acid Suppressant Medication Please indicate whether this patient is currently taking any acid suppressant medication (either prescribed or over- the-counter). If 'YES' please specify these medications in the spaces provided. Please circle an option from the 'taken' column to indicate whether the medications are taken as required or for prophylactic purposes. Please circle an option to indicate the approximate length of time (months) that the patient has been taking each			
Is this patient currently taking - a non-steroidal taken	\$ (DIA	Does this patient have, or are they being treated for, symptoms of upper GI problems such as -	Is this patient taking any acid suppressant medication (eg PPI's, H2RAs, misprostol, OTC preparations etc)					
YES - non-specific pm / continually	<3 / 3-6 / 6-12 / >12		dyspepsia / indigestion	🗆 YES (ple	ase specify)	taken	for how many months	
(which one?)			reflux symptoms / heartburn	1		pm / prophylactically	<3 / 3-6 / 6-12 / >12	
and / or low dose aspirin?			ulcer (duodenal, peptic)	_		and for a large the day of the set		
YES for how many months	<3 / 3-6 / 6-12 / >12			2		pm / prophylactically	<3/3-6/6-12/>12	
■ NONE of the ABOVE		BL34C	none of the above	П NO				

30 Lipid lowering medications and coronary heart disease

Organisation supporting this study: Commonwealth Department of Health and Ageing

Issues: This substudy investigated the proportion of general practice patients receiving lipid lowering medications. For those taking lipid lowering medication therapy the prevalence of coronary heart disease (CHD) and risk factors for CHD were also investigated. The types of medications used for lipid lowering therapy and the levels of cholesterol for different risk factors were examined.

Sample: 2,661 respondents from 90 GPs; data collected between 21/08/2001 - 24/09/2001.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Methods for this study: Risk factors for CHD included: diabetes mellitus, familial hypercholesteraemia; family history of coronary heart disease (1st degree relative <60 yrs of age), hypertension and peripheral vascular disease.

Summary of results

The age-sex distribution of respondents was similar to the distribution for BEACH overall, with the majority (58.6%) of patients being female.

More than 1 in 10 (12.6%) respondents indicated they were currently taking lipid lowering medications. The sex-specific rate of lipid lowering medication use was similar for males and females. The highest age-specific rate of lipid lowering medication use was for the age group 65–74 years. However, 36.1% of respondents taking lipid lowering medications were aged between 45 and 64 years of age.

Most respondents on lipid lowering medications were continuing therapy (n=292), while very few were starting medication therapy at the current encounter (n=12).

For those on a lipid lowering medication 41.1% had existing coronary heart disease (CHD), a further 25.9% had one of the listed risk factors for CHD, 21.1% had more than one of the listed risk factors, and 9.2% had none of the listed risk factors, although these may have had high cholesterol (not familial) which was not included on the CHD risk factor list. Approximately 2.7% did not provide information on risk factors.

For those without CHD, hypertension was the most common risk factor (30.1% of respondents on lipid medication therapy).

There were 330 medications listed for lipid lowering therapy. Statins accounted for nearly all the listed medications. Atorvastatin accounted for 41.5% of lipid lowering medications, prescribed for 42.1% of respondents on lipid lowering therapy.

For other related abstracts see: 15 Lipid lowering medication, 20 Screening and management of blood cholesterol, 46 Coronary heart disease, risk factors and lipid lowering medication, 58 Lipid lowering medications: patient eligibility under PBS, 64 Current use of statins by general practice patients, 67 Risk factors of patients on lipid lowering medications, 79 Hypertension and dyslipidaemia – comorbidity and management in general practice patients, 86 Diabetes Types 1 and 2 and coronary heart disease, 97 Statin medication use among high CHD risk patients attending general practice, 99 Lipid management in patients with high risk conditions.

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

INSTRUCTIONS



31 Prevalence and severity of chronic heart failure

Organisation supporting this study: Roche Products Pty Ltd

Issues: The prevalence of mild, moderate or severe chronic heart failure (CHF) in general practice patients; the medications used for management; whether current treatment provided adequate control of CHF; clinical investigations used to diagnose CHF and the proportion of CHF patients referred to a specialist.

Sample: 2,618 encounters from 89 GPs; data collection period: 25/09/2001 – 29/10/2001. **Method:** Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Summary of results

The prevalence of diagnosed chronic heart failure (CHF) in the general practice patient population was estimated to be 3.5% (95% CI: 2.0–5.1). Mild CHF had been diagnosed in 2.0% of general practice patients, while 1.0% and 0.5% had been diagnosed with moderate and severe CHF respectively. In male patients, 4.0% (95% CI: 0.0–8.7) were diagnosed with CHF compared with 3.1% (95% CI: 0.9–5.3) of female patients. Patients aged 75 + had the highest age-specific rates, with 20.6% diagnosed with CHF.

The medications most commonly used for the control of CHF were frusemide, followed by digoxin and perindopril, used by 58.7%, 22.8% and 16.3% of patients respectively.

GPs were satisfied that the current treatment provided satisfactory control of CHF in all patients with mild and moderate CHF. GPs felt that four out of 13 (30.8%) patients with severe CHF were not having their CHF adequately controlled by their medications.

The majority (80.0%) of patients diagnosed with CHF had, at some point, been referred to a cardiac specialist. Of these, 51.4% were referred more than 3 years ago, 19.4% were referred between 1 and 3 years ago and 29.2% were referred less than a year ago. All 13 patients with severe CHF had been referred to a cardiac specialist.

The most common clinical investigations used to diagnose CHF were 'diagnostic imaging/radiology – general' (which includes chest x-ray), 'diagnostic imaging/radiology cardiovascular' (which includes echocardiography) and 'cardiovascular electrical tracings' (which includes ECG). The three groups respectively accounted for 39.1%, 34.9% and 17.2% of all clinical investigations undertaken. GPs ordered 47.0% of clinical investigations used to diagnose CHF, while cardiac specialists ordered the remaining 53.0%.

For other related abstracts see: 75 Prevalence, management and investigations for chronic heart failure, 90 Prevalence, management and investigations for chronic heart failure, 38 Prevalence of chronic heart failure, its management and control, 57 Prevalence and management of chronic heart failure in general practice patients.

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

INSTRUCTIONS



32 Patient use of after-hours medical services

Organisation supporting this study: Commonwealth Department of Health and Ageing

Issues: This substudy investigated the proportion of general practice patients who received any after-hours medical service in the previous 12 months. The study further examined what facility/service provider was used; how many times each facility/service provider was used; how many times payment was required, and how much the patient was required to pay prior to any subsequent Medicare claim.

Sample: 2,544 respondents from 88 GPs; data collected between 30/10/2001 – 3/12/2001. **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 (59.3%) of patients being female.

Of the 2,544 respondents, 595 (23.4%, 95% CI: 20.2–26.5) had received after-hours medical services in the past 12 months. These services included attendance at an emergency department (public or private), a GP visit from the patient's usual practice, a deputising service, a co-operative service, or a service from a GP where the patient was uncertain of the service provider. Attendance at after-hours services was most common among patients aged 1–4 years (46.4%), and least common in children aged less than 1 year (18.0%).

Of the 595 patients who had received after-hours medical services during the past 12 months, 590 indicated one or more service types used. More than half (59.7%) had attended a public emergency department, 9.0% a private emergency department, 16.4% a GP from their current practice, 14.2% a deputising service, 6.6% a co-operative service, and 6.6% a service from an unspecified GP (multiple response was allowed).

These 590 patients reported after-hours service attendance on 664 occasions. For 624 of these visits, the patient recorded the frequency with which they had been asked to pay for each service type or how much they had been asked to pay usually. Of these 624 patient-service type combinations, 95 (15.2%) were usually charged more than \$30 and 25 (4.0%) were charged \$1–30. Altogether, 121 patients (19.4%) had been asked to pay for after-hours services on at least one occasion. None of those who attended a public emergency department was asked to pay for after-hours services.

For other related abstracts see: 10 Length of consultation; after-hours arrangements; co-morbidity.
The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **AFTER HOURS SERVICES.** You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

INSTRUCTIONS



66

33 Prevalence and management of cardiovascular risk factors

Organisation supporting this study: Aventis Pharma Pty Ltd

Issues: This study was designed to measure the prevalence of cardiovascular risk factors in general practice patients. The issue explored was whether those with risk factors were using any preventive therapies to manage them, and if so which medications were being prescribed.

Sample: 3,108 encounters from 105 GPs. Data collected between 04/12/2001 – 21/01/2002.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Methods for this study: A list of risk factors for cardiovascular disease included: hypertension, high total cholesterol (>5.2 mmol/L), low HDL (<0.9 mmol/L), current smoker, microalbuminuria, evidence of previous vascular disease, none of the above. A list of cardiovascular conditions included: hypertension, coronary artery disease, peripheral vascular disease, stroke (including previous), diabetes (any type), none of the above.

Summary of results

The age-sex distribution of respondents was similar to the distribution for all BEACH (general practice) encounters, with the majority (58.3%) of patients being female.

The prevalence of at least one cardiovascular risk factor in this general practice patient population was 39.5% (95% CI: 36.4–42.5), the majority (58.8%) having only one risk factor. The most prevalent cardiovascular risk factor was hypertension (25.7%, 95% CI: 23.1–28.4), followed by high cholesterol (17.8%, 95% CI: 15.8–19.8). The most common risk factor/combination of risk factors was hypertension only, which was found in 365 (29.9%) patients. Other common risk factor combinations were hypertension and high cholesterol, followed by current smoker only, which were the risk profiles of 17.9% and 13.7% of patients respectively.

Almost a third (31.5%, 95% CI: 28.6–34.5) of patients had at least cardiovascular disease. The most common cardiovascular disease was hypertension (alone or in combination), diagnosed for 26.0% (n=796) of the 3,063 patients who provided these data. Other cardiovascular diseases were considerably less common, with 7.9% of patients having coronary artery disease and 7.6% having diabetes. Of those 796 patients with hypertension 49.6% had no other cardiovascular disease.

Of the 966 patients with at least one cardiovascular disease, 72.0% were prescribed at least one preventive medication by their GP. The three most common medications prescribed were aspirin (13.4% of preventers), atorvastatin (7.3%) and simvastatin (6.8%). Of patients with at least one of the listed cardiovascular diseases, 43.2% (95% CI: 39.2–47.1) were taking an ACE inhibitor. The majority of ACE inhibitors prescribed were for management of hypertension (76.9%), but other indications included elevated blood pressure (4.8%), IHD (4.5%) and heart failure (3.3%).

For other related abstracts see: 103 Cardiovascular risk in patients attending general practice.

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **CARDIOVASCULAR RISK FACTORS**, **CONDITIONS AND PREVENTIONS** You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.



34 Gastro-oesophageal reflux disease (GORD)

Organisation supporting this study: Janssen-Cilag Pty Ltd

Issues: Prevalence of gastro-oesophageal reflux disease (GORD) in general practice patients; medications used for treatment of GORD; medication regimen; patient level of satisfaction with medication effectiveness; initiator of prescribed treatment; and changes in medication during the past 12 months.

Sample: 3,018 respondents from 102 GPs; data collection period: 04/12/2001 – 21/01/2002 **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 the majority (57.1%) of patients being female.

The prevalence of diagnosed GORD in this population was estimated to be 19.9% (n=599, 95% CI: 16.8–22.9). The proportion of patients with GORD who had been diagnosed at the current encounter was 12.5% (n=75), while 87.5% (n=524) had been diagnosed at a previous encounter. The prevalence of GORD increased significantly with age, being far higher in older patients (34.3% of 65+ age group) than in younger patients (3.4% of under 25 age group). There was no significant difference in the rates of GORD between males (20.7%) and females (19.2%).

Of the patients with GORD, 80.0% (*n*=479) were currently taking medication for its management. The majority of these patients (96.7%) were taking one medication only.

Proton pump inhibitors (PPIs) made up 51.1% of the total GORD medications. The most common (generic) medication taken for GORD was omeprazole, which accounted for 34.1% of all GORD medications, followed by ranitidine (28.7%).

Three-quarters (75.0%) of those taking GORD medications reported that a daily regimen had been recommended, while 25.0% were taking their GORD medications as required (prn). Over two-thirds (69.1%) of GORD medications had been initiated by the GP, while specialists initiated 25.2% of medications. Of the patients taking GORD medication, 18.9% (n=99) had changed their medication over the previous 12 months. The medications previously taken were most commonly ranitidine (50.3%, n=74) and omeprazole (15.0%, n=22). Forty-eight per cent of patients were completely satisfied with their GORD medication while 4.2% said they were dissatisfied.

For other related abstracts see: 18 Drugs for the treatment of peptic ulcer and reflux, 24 Gastro-oesophageal reflux disease (GORD) in general practice patients, 51 Use of proton pump inhibitors for gastrointestinal problems, 60 Prevalence of GORD and associated proton pump inhibitor use, 62 Use of proton pump inhibitors by general practice patients, 91 Prevalence and management of gastrointestinal symptoms, 100 Gastrointestinal symptoms in patients attending general practice.

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **GASTRO-OESOPHAGEAL REFLUX DISEASE & MEDICATIONS.** You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

FOR THE DOCTOR						
These questions refers to any pa has been diagnosed with gastro oesophageal reflux disease e	tient who <i>This question</i> <i>patient to trea</i>	refers to medica t their reflux dise	ation/s currently bei ase.	ng taken by the		
or at a previous encounter. If 'Yes' to either option please c questions. If <u>NO</u> - questions <u>END</u> here.	ontinue the <u>Medication</u> - pl provided. There <u>Regimen</u> - alon indicate whethe or only when red	ease write the nar e is room to write up ng side the medica er the patient has b quired (p.r.n.) to tre	ne of reflux medication i p to 3 medications. tion name please circle een advised to take the eat symptoms.	n the space a response to medication daily	Changed medica indicate, by tickin box, whether or n reflux medicatio changed in the p	ation - please g the appropriate ot the patient's on has been ast 12 months. ESTIONS here.
	whether the pat prescription froi recommendatio counter' prepara <u>Patient satisfa</u> with the effectiv where 1 is unsa	ient originally bega m a GP, a prescrip in from another sou ation). <u>ction</u> - please ask eness of each mea atisfied and 5 is ve	an taking this medication tion from a specialist, or urce (if the medication is the patient to rate how dication by circling a res ery satisfied.	an 'over-the- satisfied they are ponse from 1 to 5,		Previous medications - If 'YES' to the previous question, please write the names of any reflux
						medications the patient used prior to that change.
Has this patient been diagnosed with gastro-oesophageal reflux disease?	What medication is currently <u>Medication</u>	being taken for tre <u>Regimen</u>	eatment? DNo Initiated by	one <u>Patient</u> Satisfaction	Has this patient's reflux medication	Which medication/s has the patient previously used for this condition?
Yes - at this encounter	1	_ Daily / p.r.n	GP/Spec'st/other	1 2 3 4 5	the past 12 months	1
Yes - at a previous encounter	2	_ Daily / p.r.n	GP/Spec'st/other	1 2 3 4 5	□ Yes	2
■ No → end questions BL38C	3	Daily / p.r.n	GP/Spec'st/other	1 2 3 4 5	□ No → end questions	3

35 Smoking status of adults and their attempts to quit

Organisation supporting this study: Commonwealth Department of Health and Ageing

Issues: The smoking status of adult patients and their levels of success, the methods used by current and former smokers in attempts to quit, the time since they last smoked or last attempted to quit were examined.

Sample: 5,823 encounters with patients aged 18 and over, from 231 GPs; data collection period: 21/01/2002 – 01/04/2002.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Methods for this study: A Quit Smoking Key List with 12 quitting methods, including 'cold turkey', nicotine patches and bupropion (Zyban), was made available to patients to indicate which methods they had used to quit (former smokers) or attempt quitting (current smokers).

Summary of results

The majority of patients aged 18 or more had never smoked (51.7%, 95% CI: 49.6–53.8). Former daily smokers accounted for 19.5% of patients (95% CI: 18.2–20.9), followed by current daily smokers, representing 18.6% (95% CI: 17.1–20.1). Former occasional smokers and current occasional smokers accounted for 6.8% and 3.4% of patients respectively. Grouping daily and occasional together, former smokers accounted for 26.3% (95% CI: 24.8–27.9) and current smokers 22.0% (95% CI: 20.2–23.7) of patients.

Female patients were significantly more likely than males never to have smoked (59.9% compared with 37.2%). Significantly more male patients were current daily (23.7%) and former daily (29.5%) smokers, compared with female patients (15.8% and 13.9% respectively). Levels of occasional smoking were similar for male and female patients.

There were 1,473 former smokers who indicated a quitting method from the Key list, and 91.9% of these indicated using only one method. Of these, the most frequent single method used was 'cold turkey' (89.0%) followed by nicotine patches (3.5%). Bupropion had been used by 26 patients (1.8%), of whom 17 used only this method.

Of the 1,280 current smokers, 53.3% had tried to quit smoking during the previous 5 years, and the majority (82.6%) of these had used only one method. The most frequently used methods were 'cold turkey' (62.9%) followed by nicotine patches (26.3%) and Bupropion (12.9%).

Of the 1,703 patients who had tried to quit 'cold turkey' (+/- other methods) 75.7% (95% CI: 73.1–78.3) reported they were not currently smoking. Of the 348 who tried using nicotine replacement therapy (i.e. patches/gum/inhaler) (+/- other methods), one-third had quit (37.4% 95% CI: 31.1–43.7). Of the 85 who tried to quit with bupropion, one in four (23.4%, 95% CI: 5.9–40.9) were not currently smoking but the small numbers involved rendered this estimate somewhat unreliable (as shown by the wide confidence intervals).

For other related abstracts see: 12 Smoking and passive smoking in general practice patients, 53 Smoking status of adults and their attempts to quit, 74 Smoking and passive smoking in the home and Section 4.3 Smoking. Further reading:

Doran, C. M., Valenti, L., Robinson, M., Britt, H., & Mattick, R. P. 2006, 'Smoking status of Australian general practice patients and their attempts to quit', *Addict.Behav.*, vol. 31, no. 5, pp. 758–766.

Valenti, L., Charles, J., & Britt, H. 2005, 'Passive smoke in Australian homes: 1999 to 2004 [letter]', Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 387–388.

Degenhardt L, Knox S, Barker B, Britt H, Shakeshaft A. The management of alcohol, tobacco and illicit drug use problems by general practitioners in Australia. *Drug Alcohol Rev* 2005; 24(6):499–506.

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **PATIENT SMOKING STATUS AND ATTEMPTS TO STOP SMOKING** *You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.*

INSTRUCTIONS



105

CURRENT SMOKING STATUS

Please describe your smoking status

- Current smoker daily.
- □ Current smoker occasional.
- □ Former smoker daily
- □ Former smoker occasional.
- □ Never smoked

QUIT SMOKING KEY LIST

Listed below are methods available to assist smokers to stop smoking. In this study, 'smoking' includes all tobacco products.

1. 'Cold Turkey' i.e. immediate cessation with

no method of assistance

- 2. Nicotine patches
- 3. Nicotine gum
- 4. Nicotine inhaler
- 5. Hypnotherapy
- 6. Herbal preparations
- 7. Support / counselling eg 'SmokeStop', 'Quitline'
- 8. Zyban (Bupropion)
- 9. Other medication
- 10. Self-help material e.g. quit smoking manual
- 11. GP assistance other than above eg counselling
- 12. Other methods not listed above

36 Patient use of complementary therapies

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

Issues: The prevalence of complementary therapy use among general practice patients; the conditions for which complementary therapies are used; the patient perceived benefits of complementary therapy use; the attitude to complementary therapy use as a treatment in the future.

Sample: 5,567 respondents from 193 GPs; data collection period: 16/01/2001 – 19/02/2001 and 27/03/2001 – 30/04/2001.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Summary of results

The age-sex distribution of patients was similar to the distribution of the total BEACH sample with the majority (58.3%) being female. Patients aged 45–64 years accounted for 29.4% of the sample.

The proportion of patients indicating use of complementary/alternative therapies during the previous 12 months was 21.9% (95% CI: 19.7–24.0). Almost half (46.7%, 95% CI: 43.2–50.1) indicated they would consider using complementary/alternative therapies in the future, while 51.7% (95% CI: 48.3–55.2) had not used complementary therapies in the previous 12 months and would not consider using them in the future.

Of the 1,216 patients who indicated having used a complementary therapy, 40.3% (95% CI: 35.6–44.9) had used chiropractic therapy, 31.6% (95% CI: 26–37.2) had used naturopathy (which includes herbal medicine), 22.7% and 20.8% had used remedial massage and acupuncture respectively.

In 89.5% of problems managed with chiropractic therapy, the problem was musculoskeletal. Problems managed with naturopathy were more general in nature (33.5% of problems), including preventive/health maintenance and general weakness/tiredness. Remedial massage and acupuncture were mainly used for musculoskeletal problems, both at a rate of 68.5% of problems managed by that therapy.

For other related abstracts see: 101 Types of medicine use and patient use of medicines list. The following page contains the recording form and instructions with which the data in this abstract were collected.

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **COMPLEMENTARY / ALTERNATIVE THERAPIES.** You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.



37 Prevalence of common morbidities in patients encountered in general practice

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

Issues: The prevalence of significant morbidity affecting general practice patients irrespective of whether or not the morbidity was managed at the encounter; the number of times general practice patients consult a GP annually.

Sample: 11,342 respondents from 378 GPs; data collection period: 21/08/2001 – 31/12/2001 and 22/01/2002 – 30/03/2002.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Methods for this study: Visit frequency and morbidity were directly standardised against the known age-sex distribution of all patients who attended general practice in Australia between April 2000 and March 2001.

Summary of results

The age-sex distribution of patients was similar to the distribution of the total BEACH sample with the majority (59.1%) being female. Patients aged 25–44 years (26.7%) or 45–64 years (25.1%) accounted for more than half of the sample, with the mean patient age being 46 years.

The most common morbidities were hypertension (19.5% of respondents), depression (10.2%), lipid disorder (9.1%) and asthma (8.0%). After direct standardisation the estimated prevalence rates for the general practice population were hypertension 13.5% (95% CI: 12.5–14.4), depression 9.5% (95% CI: 8.6–10.3), asthma 8.8% (95% CI: 8.1–9.5) and lipid disorders 6.9% (95% CI: 6.2–7.6).

The respondents attended a GP on average 8.8 times per year. The age-sex standardised average was 7.8 visits per year (95% CI: 7.4–8.2), increasing among older adults. The standardised mean number of annual visits for all reasons was 13.0 (95% CI: 12.0–14.1) for patients with diagnosed diabetes, 12.6 (95% CI: 11.7–13.5) for patients with depression, 9.2 (95% CI: 8.5–9.9) for patients with asthma and 6.1 (95% CI: 5.5–6.6) for patients with current upper respiratory tract infection.

For other related abstracts see: 7 Health services utilisation, lifestyle status and chronicity, 61 Prevalence of chronic illnesses identified as National Health Priority Areas among general practice patients, 89 Estimates of the prevalence of chronic illnesses identified as Health Priority Areas.

Further reading:

Knox, S. A. & Britt, H. 2004, 'The contribution of demographic and morbidity factors to self-reported visit frequency of patients: a cross-sectional study of general practice patients in Australia', *BMC.Fam Pract.*, vol. 5, no. 1, p. 17.

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

GP consultations in year.	the previous		
Please check with the in the approximate nu patient has consulted GP at this or any othe the past 12 months.	patient and write nber of times this you or any other practice within Plea prob cons	morbidity ase write in any other significant present or past health blems of this patient that were not managed at this isultation e.g chronic illnesses or other health problems that require continuing management or surveillance; past problems which may need consideration in future care e.g. mastectomy; any significant health influencing social problems e.g. marital disharmony. enter any problem you would include in a health summar	у.
How many times (approximately) has this patient consulted a GP at any practice in the last 12 months? BLISSC	other significant oses / problems his patient have are not being ged at today's unter? 4	5 6 7 8	9 10 11 12

38 Prevalence of chronic heart failure, management and control

Organisation supporting this study: Roche Products Pty Ltd

Issues: Chronic heart failure (CHF) is a condition with high mortality and a major burden in public health. This study investigated the prevalence of chronic heart failure (CHF) in general practice patients; management being used to treat CHF; whether the management was initiated by general practitioners or specialists; referrals to a cardiac specialist; clinical investigations being used to diagnose CHF; initiation of the clinical investigation of CHF.

Sample: 3,082 encounters from 106 GPs; data collection period: 02/04/2002 – 06/05/2002.

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 (60.4%) of encounters with female patient and 18.7% of encounters with patient aged 65 years or over.

Of the 3,082 respondents, 3.2% (95% CI: 2.2–4.1) were diagnosed with CHF. Among these respondents, 51 (1.7%) were diagnosed with mild CHF, while 33 (1.1%) and 13 (0.4%) were diagnosed with moderate and severe CHF respectively. Patients aged 75 years or more had the highest age-specific-rate, 21.6% being diagnosed with CHF.

Diuretics were the most commonly used medication group in treating CHF, being taken by 64.9% of CHF patients. These were followed by ACE inhibitors (single or combination) (32.0%) and cardiac glycosides (10.5%). At generic level, frusemide was most commonly used in 52.6% of CHF patients, and was followed by digoxin and potassium chloride, being used in 20.6% and 11.3% of CHF patients respectively. Of the 182 medications being used to treat CHF, 51.6% was initiated by a GP and 48.4% by a specialist.

GPs indicated that on average increasing survival, relieving symptoms, and improving quality of life were equally important in managing CHF.

Of the 92 CHF patients who responded to the referral question, 81.5% were referred to a cardiac specialist at some point of time. Among these CHF patients, 24 (26.1%) were referred in the previous 12 months, 15 (16.3%) between 1 and 3 years ago, and 36 (39.1%) more than 3 years ago.

In order to diagnose CHF, chest x-ray had been used in 71.1% of CHF patients, echocardiogram (ECHO) had been used in 69.1%, and electrocardiogram (ECG) in 60.8%. GPs ordered 60.3% of chest x-rays, 19.0% of ECHO tests and 52.0% of ECGs, while specialists ordered the remaining tests.

For other related abstracts see: 31 Prevalence and severity of chronic heart failure, 57 Prevalence and management of chronic heart failure in general practice patients, 75 Prevalence, management and investigations for chronic heart failure, 90 Prevalence, management and investigations for chronic heart failure.

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



39 Severity of asthma, medications and management

Organisation supporting this study: AstraZeneca (Australia) Pty Ltd

Issues: The prevalence and severity of asthma managed in the general practice patient population; the use of asthma medications; asthma management tools; and patient confidence in predicting changes in their asthma.

Sample: 3,070 encounters from 105 GPs; data collection period 02/04/2002 – 06/05/2002

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 13.9% (95% CI: 12.0–15.7, *n*=426). Patients aged 5–14 years had the highest prevalence of asthma (26.3%, 95% CI: 15.1–37.4), this was significantly higher than all other age groups (12.9%, 95% CI: 11.0–14.8).

Among 312 adult patients (18 years and over) with asthma, 35.9% had very mild, 31.4% had mild, 27.2% had moderate and 5.5% had severe asthma. Of the 97 children (aged <18 years) with asthma, 82.5% had infrequent asthma, 15.5% had frequent and 2.1% persistent asthma.

Of the 426 patients with asthma, 87.8% were currently taking asthma medications, at an average rate of 142.7 medications per 100 asthma patients. Reliever medications were the most common medication used to treat asthma, being taken by 85.9% of asthma patients. These were followed by preventer medications (34.5%), combination medications (16.7%) and symptom controllers (5.2%). The use of relievers alone (37.8%) was the most common treatment regimen for asthma patients, followed by a combination of relievers and preventers (24.4%). The most common medication taken for asthma was salbutamol which was used by 70.0% of patients with asthma, followed by fluticasone/salmeterol (16.7%). Of the 298 patients using salbutamol, 62.8% had been using it for more than 6 months. Almost one-third (30.4%) of patients reported decreased use of relievers in the past 6 months.

Among the asthma patients, 150 (35.2%) used at least one asthma management tool (note that multiple response was allowed), 120 (28.2%) had an asthma action/management plan, 50 (11.7%) used asthma symptom diary cards, and 43 (10.1%) used asthma drug diary cards. Of the 108 asthma action/management plan users who responded to the question about the frequency of use of this plan, 66.7% reported using it less than monthly, 22.2% monthly, 8.3% weekly and 2.8% daily.

The patients with asthma were asked to rate their confidence in predicting changes in asthma due to weather, exercise etc. on a scale of 1 (confident) to 5 (not confident). The mean score of confidence was 2.5 for the 398 asthma patients who responded to the question.

For other related abstracts see: 3 Asthma, 22 Asthma – prevalence, severity and management, 48 Asthma prevalence and management, 63 Asthma-prevalence, management and medication side-effects, 70 Inhaled corticosteroid use for asthma management, 96 Inhaled corticosteroid use for asthma management, 104 Asthma management and medication use among patients attending general practice.

Further reading:

Henderson, J., Knox, S., Pan, Y., & Britt, H. 2004, 'Changes in asthma management in Australian general practice', *Prim.Care Respir.J*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 138-143.

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 Current medications used Please list the current asthma medications being used by this patient for the management of their asthma. ASK ALL PATIENTS Please include the name & form, strength, dose & frequency for each, and circle an option to indicate Ask each patient if they currently whether the patient has been taking this medication for suffer from asthma. more than 6 months or less than 6 months e.g. If No asthma - no further questions Asthma self monitoring What asthma medication is currently being used? Name & Form Dose Strength Freq 6mth duration Please ask the patient how 1. Pulmicort Turb 400mcg 800mcg bd (more) less confident they are at 2. more / less monitoring their own asthma eg Ask the patient whether the use of their reliever predicting changes due to medication has increased, decreased or not changed weather, exercise etc. Circle a number to indicate the degree of in the past 6 months. Tick the appropriate box to indicate their response. confidence they feel. Severity of asthma Asthma management tools If 'YES' please ask the patient with Ask the patient if they use any of the asthma about the severity of their listed asthma management tools asthma. Show them the 'Severity and use the tick boxed to indicate of asthma reference card' their response. Please circle an included in your research pack and tick the appropriate box to option to indicate how frequently they refer to these tools. indicate their response. If 'Yes' how severe is the Does this How confidently can you What asthma medication is currently being used? How often do you use an asthma management tool? asthma? (See cards) patient suffer predict changes in your Name & Form Strength Dose Freq 6mth duration Action/management plan _____ daily / weekly / monthly / less asthma due to weather. from Asthma? Severity more / less 1. exercise etc? Adult Yes Child Symptom diary cards daily / weekly / monthly / less more / less 2. ☐ Infrequent ☐ Very mild ☐ Frequent ☐ Mild ☐ Persistent ☐ Moderate выяс ☐ Severe No Drug diary cards daily / weekly / monthly / less more / less 1 2 3 4 5 Other daily / weekly / monthly / less In the past 6 mths use of reliever medication has Confident Not confident Moderate End questions increased decreased no change Never

Severity of asthma reference card

Childre	n
Severity*	Common features
Infrequent episodic	Episodes 6-8 weeks or more apart and from 1 to 2 days up to 1-2 weeks duration; usually triggered by URTI or environmental allergen; attacks generally not severe; symptoms rare between attacks; normal examination and lung function except when symptomatic.
Frequent episodic	Attacks <6 weeks apart; attacks more troublesome; minimal symptoms such as exercise induces wheeze between attacks; normal examination and lung function except when symptomatic; commonly troubled through winter months only.
Persistent	Symptoms most days; nocturnal asthma > 1/wk with sleep disturbance; early morning chest tightness; exercise intolerance and spontaneous wheeze; daily use of beta2 antagonist; 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 asymptomatic
Moderate	Symptoms most days; exacerbations <6-8 weeks apart which affect day-time activity and sleep; exacerbations last several days; occasional emergency room visit.
Severe	Persistent; limited activity level; nocturnal symptoms > 1/wk; frequent emergency room visits and hospital admission in past year; FEV_1 may be significantly reduced between exacerbations.

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

40 Type 2 diabetes mellitus, prevalence and management

Organisation supporting this study: Roche Products Pty Ltd

Issues: The prevalence of type 2 diabetes among general practice patients; the treatments being utilised for type 2 diabetes management; HbA1c levels and regularity of testing; frequency of GP consultations for diabetes management.

Sample: 2,876 respondents from 97 GPs; data collection period: 07/05/2002 – 10/06/2002.

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 (58.8%) being female and those aged 25–44 and 45–64 years accounting for 23.6% and 26.3% of the patient population respectively.

A total of 205 patients (7.1%, 95% CI: 5.6–8.7) had confirmed type 2 diabetes. Prevalence for patients aged 65–74 years was 17.6% (95% CI: 8.9–26.2), while patients aged 45–64 and those aged 75 or more had similar rates (11.0%, 95% CI: 4.7–17.3 and 12.4%, 95% CI: 0.0–26.4 respectively). There were no significant differences between any of these age groups. There was also no significant difference between the prevalence for males (8.0%, 95% CI: 4.3–11.8) and for females (6.2%, 95% CI: 3.5–8.9).

Diet and/or exercise was the most commonly used treatment, being utilised by 75.9% of patients with type 2 diabetes, either alone or in combination with other methods. Metformin was the current treatment for 50.7%, sulfonylurea for 33.5% and insulin for 16.3% of patients with type 2 diabetes. Almost half (44.3%) of the patients with type 2 diabetes used one treatment method only, 35.0% used two treatment methods, and the remaining 20.7% used between 3 and 5 treatments. Diet/exercise in combination with one or more medications was used by 50.3% of patients with type 2 diabetes, diet/exercise alone was used by 25.6%, and medication(s) alone was used by 24.1%.

The most recent HbA1c level was available for 182 of the 205 patients with type 2 diabetes. The mean HbA1c level for these patients was 7.3% (95% CI: 7.0–7.6), the median was 7.0% with a range of 5.1% to 13.2%. Patients using only one treatment method had a mean HbA1c level of 6.8% (95% CI: 6.6–7.1) while those using 2 treatments and 3–5 treatments had mean levels of 7.5% (95% CI: 7.1–8.0) and 7.7% (95% CI: 7.2–8.2) respectively. Patients using diet/exercise only had a mean HbA1c level of 6.4% (95% CI: 6.2–6.5) which was significantly lower than the mean level for patients using medication(s) only (7.6%, 95% CI: 7.0–8.1) and those using diet/exercise plus medication(s) (7.6%, 95% CI: 7.2–8.0). The average number of months since their last HbA1c test was 3.6 (95% CI: 3.0–4.2) with a median of 3 and a range 0.03–22 months. The average number of GP visits during the previous 12 months for patients with type 2 diabetes was 6.6 (95% CI: 5.5–7.6) visits with a median of 5 visits and a range of 0 to 30 visits.

For other related abstracts see: 21 Diabetes – prevalence, management and screening, 25 Prevalence of diabetes, medications and control, 45 Diabetes mellitus prevalence, management and risk factors, 94 Type 2 diabetes – investigations and related conditions, 86 Diabetes Types 1 and 2 and coronary heart disease, 87 Management of cardiovascular or diabetes related conditions.

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **TYPE 2 DIABETES.** You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

FOR THE DOCTOR Please indicate by tick	ing the appropriate box					
Type 2 diabetes.	ient has confirmed					
If 'Yes' continue to the	next question.			HBA	1C TESTING	GP CONSULTATIONS
lf 'No' end the questi	ons here.	Plaasa writ	to in the space	Pleas	se write in the space	you determine the
		provided th	ne patient's	provid	ded the approximate	of times they have
	DIABETES MANAGEMENT	HbA1c lev recent tes	el at their most t.	patie	nt's HbA1c was last	consulted you or any other GP about their
	Please use the tick boxes to indicate how the patient's diabetes is currently being managed.			recen Pleas indica	d i.e. when the most at test occurred. se circle an option to ate whether days,	diabetes in the past 12 months. Please include today's
	Tick as many options as apply.			week	s or months.	estimate.
	If you tick the box labled 'other' please write the type of management being used in the space provided.					
Ļ			Ļ		Ļ	Ļ
Does this patient have confirmed type 2	If 'Yes' what treatment is currently being u this patient's diabetes? (<i>Tick as many op</i>	sed to manage otions as apply)	What was the pat most recent HbA	tient's \1c	How long since their HbA1c was last tested?	Approximately how many times in the past 12 months
alabetes?	diet / exercise		level?			you or any other GP about
Yes - continue ->	sulfonyurea			97		today's visit)
No - end questions	glitazone other			70	days/wks/mths (Please circle)	times
BL42B	insulin 🗆 none of the ab	ove			(

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% 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 8am to 6pm and Saturday 8am to 1pm, while 'after-hours' is weekday nights 6pm to 8am and Saturday 1pm to Monday 8am. Of the Medicare-claimable encounters, 92.8% (95% 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 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.



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% CI: 20.5– 31.1) 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 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.



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.

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.

ONE option)

INSTRUCTIONS

FOR THE DOCTOR In the 'pathology' section of these forms there is room to PURPOSE OF TEST record up to 5 different tests ordered today which are associated with the problems being managed for this For each pathology test ordered at today's consultation, please circle an option to indicate patient at today's encounter. whether the purpose of the test was to For each of the next 30 forms, if you have ordered investigate / diagnose a new condition, to monitor **OPPORTUNISTIC TESTS** pathology for the patient, please complete the following an existing condition, or for prevention / screening questions. Only complete this section if you have purposes. Please circle an option to ordered pathology at the encounter. indicate whether any of today's Pathology Purpose of test tests were 'opportunistic' - for eg Test 1 (investigative) monitoring / preventive example, having decided on a Test 2 investigative (monitoring) preventive full blood count for the patient, INITIATION OF TESTS did you take the 'opportunity' For each of these tests, please circle an option to have their cholesterol or to indicate whether the test was suggested by blood sugars checked? you or requested by the patient. Test 1 - Yes /No eg. eg. Pathology Initiated by Test 2 - Yesy No GP (patient) Test 1 **GP**/ patient Test 2 Pathology Initiated by Pathology Purpose of test If pathology tests For each pathology test Test 1 - Yes / No Were any of were ordered Test 1 GP / patient ordered today, please Test 1 investigative / monitoring / preventive today's tests Test 2 - Yes / No today please indicate whether the Test 2 GP / patient Test 2 investigative / monitoring / preventive 'opportunistic' Test 3 - Yes / No indicate whether purpose of the test was Test 3 GP / patient e.g. cholesterol Test 3 investigative / monitoring / preventive each test was investigative/diagnostic for Test 4 - Yes / No Test 4 GP / patient added to full suggested by you Test 4 investigative / monitoring / preventive a new condition; monitoring Test 5 - Yes / No blood count? Test 5 or requested by the GP / patient of an existing condition; or Test 5 investigative / monitoring / preventive (please circle patient. (please circle for prevention/screening.

(please circle ONE option for each test)

BL43C

ONE option

123

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% 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% CI: 3.8–4.2): depression (mean 5.4, 95% CI: 5.1–5.8), back complaint (mean 5.3, 95% 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% CI: 2.8–3.3), menopausal symptom/complaint (mean 3.0, 95% CI: 2.5–3.5), contact/allergic dermatitis (mean 3.0, 95% 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.

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



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.



How many times (approximately)	Severity of Illness - GP estimate for each patient. Please mark with an 'X' the appropriate place	Diagnosis/Problem 1	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	FINISH Time
has this patient consulted a GP	along each line to indicate how you would rate the patient's overall severity of illness during the	Diagnosis/Problem 2	°	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 1	10	
at any practice in the last 12	past week for each problem being managed at today's encounter.	Diagnosis/Problem 3	°	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	AM / PM
months?	Lowest severity = 0; Highest severity = 10.	Diagnosis/Problem 4	°	1	2	3	4	s	6	7	8	9	10	(please circle) BL44B

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% 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 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

127



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% 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 mmol/L, the mean level of triglycerides was 2.7 mmol/L and HDL 1.5 mmol/L.

For other related abstracts see: 15 Lipid lowering medication, 20 Screening and management of blood cholesterol, 30 Lipid lowering medications and coronary heart disease, 58 Lipid lowering medications: patient eligibility under PBS, 64 Current use of statins by general practice patients, 67 Risk factors of patients on lipid lowering medications, 79 Hypertension and dyslipidaemia – comorbidity and management in general practice patients, 86 Diabetes Types 1 and 2 and coronary heart disease, 97 Statin medication use among high CHD risk patients attending general practice, 99 Lipid management in patients with high risk conditions.

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



129

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% 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% 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% 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% 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 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.



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).

For other related abstracts see: 3 Asthma, 22 Asthma – prevalence, severity and management, 39 Severity of asthma, medications and management, 63 Asthma-prevalence, management and medication side-effects, 70 Inhaled corticosteroid use for asthma management, 96 Inhaled corticosteroid use for asthma management, 104 Asthma management and medication use among patients attending general practice.

Further reading:

Henderson, J., Knox, S., Pan, Y., & Britt, H. 2004, 'Changes in asthma management in Australian general practice', *Prim.Care Respir.J*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 138-143.

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

Patient preference If the patient is using a combination product, please use Please use the tick the tick boxes to indicate whether it was prescribed to ASK ALL PATIENTS boxes to indicate add Beta 2 Agonist to therapy, to add Inhaled Cortiowhether this patient costeroid to therapy, to commence both medications Ask each patient if they currently prefers the combination at the same time, or to replace 2 single medications suffer from asthma. product, single with the combined product. ingredient products, or If No asthma - no further questions has no preference. Assessment of asthma control Please use the tick boxes to indicate Severity of asthma Current medications used whether the control of this patient's asthma has improved, worsened If the patient is using a Long If 'Yes', please use the tick or remains the same since using Acting Beta Agonist (LABA) for boxes to indicate whether any Please indicate the combination product. asthma management, please of the listed types of asthma how frequently the indicate the severity of their medication are being used by patient uses a asthma at the commencement Changes in dose of ICS in this patient for their asthma spacer device to Combination Product use of the LABA management. assist with medication If the patient is using a combination If none of these medications Please use the 'Severity of product, please advise whether you delivery. If a self are currently being used for asthma reference card' have changed the dose of inhaled actuating device is asthma management you included in your research pack used tick 'Not cortioco-steroid in response to the may end the questions to estimate the severity level patient's condition. This may be by applicable'. here. and tick the appropriate box to changing the puffs per dose or indicate the response. prescribing a different strength combination. In response to asthma If Combination product is Since starting the If 'Yes' their current If LABA used how severe Patient uses Does this Patient prefers medication is used, was it pescribed to control, dose of the patient suffer was the asthma when LABA Combination spacer device Combination Inhaled Cortiosteroid Long Acting Beta product asthma commenced? (See cards) from Asthma? add LABA to therapy Always product Agonist (LABA) in the combination control level is:-Yes 🗲 Child Adult add ICS to therapy Inhaled Corticoproduct has: Sometimes Single ☐ Infrequent ☐ Very mild Worse steroid (ICS) start both medications No ingredient Never Frequent Mild at the same time Combination Same product Decreased Not Persistent Moderate product (LABA + ICS) replace 2 single drugs with combined product No preference applicable End questions Severe Not changed None of above - END BL46C

Severity of asthma reference card

Childre	n
Severity*	Common features
Infrequent episodic	Episodes 6-8 weeks or more apart and from 1to 2 days up to 1-2 weeks duration; usually triggered by URTI or environmental allergen; attacks generally not severe; symptoms rare between attacks; normal examination and lung function except when symptomatic.
Frequent episodic	Attacks <6 weeks apart; attacks more troublesome; minimal symptoms such as exercise induces wheeze between attacks; normal examination and lung function except when symptomatic; commonly troubled through winter months only.
Persistent	Symptoms most days; nocturnal asthma > 1/wk with sleep disturbance; early morning chest tightness; exercise intolerance and spontaneous wheeze; daily use of beta2 antagonist; 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 asymptomatic
Moderate	Symptoms most days; exacerbations <6-8 weeks apart which affect day-time activity and sleep; exacerbations last several days; occasional emergency room visit.
Severe	Persistent; limited activity level; nocturnal symptoms > 1/wk; frequent emergency room visits and hospital admission in past year; FEV 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).

For other related abstracts see: 29 Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDS) and acid suppressant use, 78 NSAID & acid suppressant use in general practice patients, 88 Arthritis rates and NSAID use in general practice patients. The following page contains the recording form and instructions with which the data in this abstract were collected.

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **PATIENTS ON NON-STEROIDAL ANTI-INFLAMMATORY MEDICATIONS.** You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

INSTRUCTIONS



136

In general would you say your health is -

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

51 Use of proton pump inhibitors for gastrointestinal problems

Organisation supporting this study: Janssen-Cilag Pty Ltd

Issues: Proton pump inhibitors (PPI) are frequently used in the management of gastrointestinal (GI) disease. This study measured the number of patients on PPIs for GI problems (as defined by the GP), the numbers prescribed for new GI problems, the types of PPIs prescribed currently or in the past, whether initiated by GPs or specialists and if supplied as samples.

Sample: 2,648 encounters from 91 GPs; data collection period: 03/12/2002 - 20/01/2003.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Summary of results

The age-sex distribution of respondents was similar to the expected distribution for general practice encounters, with the majority (58.4%) of patients being female.

Of the 2,648 respondents, the GP indicated that 10.4% (95% CI: 8.6–12.2, n=275) of patients were currently taking a PPI for a GI problem. These patients were significantly older (mean age 63.3 years) than patients not taking PPIs (mean age 46.8 years). There was no difference in gender of patients taking PPIs (42.1% male) compared with those who were not (41.6% male).

Of the 275 patients currently on a PPI for gastrointestinal problem/s, 9.1% (95% CI: 0–18.5, n=25) were diagnosed with the problem/s at the reported encounter (i.e. a new problem). The remaining 90.9% had their gastrointestinal problem diagnosed previously.

Only one medication (the current PPI) was prescribed for almost two-thirds of patients (62.2%; 171 patients). One previous medication had been prescribed for 31.3% of patients and two previous medications for 6.6%.

The most common current PPI for GI problems was Omeprazole (42.6%), followed by Pantoprazole (26.2%) and Esomeprazole (17.1%). The 'new generation' Rabeprazol and Esomeprazole account for 48% of PPIs for new GI problems, compared with 20.4% of current PPIs for old GI. Omeprazol comprised 16% of PPIs prescribed for new problems compared with 45.2% for old GI problems.

Of the 397 medication listed, 64.2% were initiated by a GP, 31.0% by a specialist.

GPs stated they had given sample packs of the current PPI medication to 13.8% of patients (38), and samples of previous medications to 3.6% (10 patients).

For other related abstracts see: 18 Drugs for the treatment of peptic ulcer and reflux, 24 Gastro-oesophageal reflux disease (GORD) in general practice patients, 34 Gastro-oesophageal reflux disease (GORD), 60 Prevalence of GORD and associated proton pump inhibitor use, 62 Use of proton pump inhibitors by general practice patients, 91 Prevalence and management of gastrointestinal symptoms, 100 Gastrointestinal symptoms in patients attending general practice.

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **PROTON PUMP INHIBITORS for GASTROINTESTINAL PROBLEMS.** You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

INSTRUCTIONS



139

52 Language and cultural background of patients

Organisation supporting this study: Australian Government Department of Health and Ageing

Issues: Previous research suggests that health surveys are inclined to under-enumerate persons from culturally diverse and in particular, Indigenous backgrounds. This study aimed to validate the routine BEACH questions on language background and Indigenous status, using more extensive questions that focussed on the patient's cultural background.

Sample: 8,943 encounters with 294 GPs; data collection period: 03/12/2002 - 05/05/2003.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Methods for this study: Based on the 2001 Census questions, patients were asked about their country of birth, parents' countries of birth, whether the patient was of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander origin and what language was spoken at home.

Summary of results

Sixty-one per cent of respondents were female (95% CI: 59.0–62.7) compared with BEACH (57.4%, 95% CI: 57.0–58.6%).

Two hundred and four (2.4%, 95% CI: 1.3–3.4) respondents identified as of either Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander origin, twice the rate routinely recorded in BEACH (April 2001 – March 2003 unweighted, 1.2%, 95% CI: 0.8–1.6,). Although not statistically significant this increased identification rate provides some evidence that the structured question may be more successful in identifying Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander respondents in general practice.

Seventeen per cent of respondents reported speaking a language other than English at home (95% CI: 14.5–19.6), more than twice the rate routinely identified in BEACH (7.5%, 95% CI: 6.5–8.5). However, the SAND question is broader and includes those who speak mainly English plus another language, while the routine BEACH question only includes those who mainly speak a language other than English. Languages were classified according to the Australian Classification of Languages 1997 (*source:* Australian Bureau of Statistics). After English, Southern European languages (Italian, Greek, French, Spanish etc.) were the most common group of languages, spoken by 5.5% of respondents.

Three-quarters of respondents (75.3%) were born in Australia and two out of five respondents (41%) had at least one parent born overseas.

For other related abstracts see: 65 Language and cultural background of general practice patients, 95 Cultural background of patients attending general practice.

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

INSTRUCTIONS



141

53 Smoking status of adults and their attempts to quit

Organisation supporting this study: Australian Government Department of Health and Ageing

Issues: The smoking status of adult patients, the methods used by current and former smokers in attempts to quit and the success of these methods, and time since they last smoked or last attempted to quit were examined. This is a follow-up to abstract No. 35.

Sample: 2,510 encounters with patients aged 18 and over, from 97 GPs; data collection period: 25/02/2003 – 30/03/2003.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Methods for this study: A Quit Smoking Key List with 12 quitting methods, including 'cold turkey', nicotine patches and Bupropion, was made available to patients to indicate which methods they had used to quit (former smokers) or attempt quitting (current smokers).

Summary of results

The greater proportion of patients aged 18 or more had never smoked (49.9%, 95% CI: 46.5–53.3). Former daily smokers accounted for 22.6% of patients (95% CI: 20.0–25.1), followed by current daily smokers, representing 17.1% (95% CI: 15.0–19.3). Former occasional smokers and current occasional smokers accounted for 7.1% and 3.4% of patients respectively. Grouping daily and occasional together, former smokers accounted for 29.6% (95% CI: 27.0–32.3) and current smokers 20.5% (95% CI: 18.1–22.8) of patients.

Female patients were significantly more likely than males never to have smoked (58.0% compared with 36.3%). Significantly more male patients were former daily smokers (32.4%) then female patients (16.6%). Levels of occasional smoking were similar for male and female patients.

There were 734 former smokers who indicated a quitting method from the Key list, and 92.8% of these indicated using only one method. Of these, the most frequent single method used was 'cold turkey' (89.4%) followed by nicotine patches (3.5%). Bupropion was used by 10 former smokers (1.4%), of whom 6 used only this method.

Of the 514 current smokers, 55.4% had tried to quit smoking during the previous 5 years, the majority (74.1%) using only one method. The most frequently used methods were 'cold turkey' (59.6%) followed by nicotine patches (31.9%) and Bupropion (13.7%).

Of the 814 patients who had tried to quit 'cold turkey' (+/- other methods) 80.2% (95% CI: 76.7–83.7) reported they were not currently smoking. Of the 164 who tried using nicotine replacement therapy (i.e. patches/gum/inhaler) (+/- other methods), one-third had quit (36.6%, 95% CI: 27.2–46.0). Of the 47 who tried to quit with Bupropion, one in four (21.3%, 95% CI: 1.0–41.5) were not currently smoking but due to small numbers this estimate is somewhat unreliable (as shown by the wide confidence intervals).

For other related abstracts see: 12 Smoking and passive smoking in general practice patients, 35 Smoking status of adults and their attempts to quit, 74 Smoking and passive smoking in the home and Section 4.3 Smoking.

Further reading:

Doran, C. M., Valenti, L., Robinson, M., Britt, H., & Mattick, R. P. 2006, 'Smoking status of Australian general practice patients and their attempts to quit', *Addict.Behav.*, vol. 31, no. 5, pp. 758–766.

Valenti, L., Charles, J., & Britt, H. 2005, 'Passive smoke in Australian homes: 1999 to 2004 [letter]', Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 387–388.

Degenhardt L, Knox S, Barker B, Britt H, Shakeshaft A. The management of alcohol, tobacco and illicit drug use problems by general practitioners in Australia. *Drug Alcohol Rev* 2005; 24(6):499–506.

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **PATIENT SMOKING STATUS AND ATTEMPTS TO STOP SMOKING** *You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.*

INSTRUCTIONS



CURRENT SMOKING STATUS

Please describe your smoking status

- Current smoker daily.
- □ Current smoker occasional.
- □ Former smoker daily
- □ Former smoker occasional.
- □ Never smoked

QUIT SMOKING KEY LIST

Listed below are methods available to assist smokers to stop smoking. In this study, 'smoking' includes all tobacco products.

- 1. 'Cold Turkey' i.e. immediate cessation with no method of assistance
- 2. Nicotine patches
- 3. Nicotine gum
- 4. Nicotine inhaler
- 5. Hypnotherapy
- 6. Herbal preparations
- 7. Support / counselling eg 'SmokeStop', 'Quitline'
- 8. Zyban (Bupropion)
- 9. Other medication
- 10. Self-help material e.g. quit smoking manual
- 11. GP assistance other than above eg counselling
- 12. Other methods not listed above

54 Secondary prevention of heart attack or stroke

Organisation supporting this study: Australian Government Department of Health and Ageing

Issues: This study investigated the proportion of general practice patients with a cardiovascular risk factor; the proportion of patients with at least one risk factor who are taking anti-platelet or coagulant medication for secondary prevention of heart attack or stroke; the reasons for non-use of these medications for secondary prevention by patients with cardiovascular risk factors.

Sample: 2,833 encounters from 97 GPS; data collection period: 25/02/2003 – 30/03/2003 **Method:** Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Summary of results

The age-sex distribution of respondents was similar to the expected distribution for general practice encounters, with the majority (59.7%) of patients being female.

Of the respondents, 34.7% (95% CI: 30.7–38.6) had at least one cardiovascular risk factor – 22.2% had one risk factor and 12.4% had two or more risk factors. The most common risk factor was hypertension reported by 25.7% of patients. The second most common risk factor was 'other risk factors' (8.2%) followed by stable/unstable angina (4.1%).

Of the patients with at least one risk factor (n=982), 58.0% were on at least one anti platelet/anti-coagulant medication, the majority taking only one medication (56.6%). The most common medication taken by patients to manage their risk factor(s) was aspirin (taken by 46.0% of the 982 risk factor patients). The second most common medication was warfarin (5.4%), followed by clopidogrel (4.7%).

Of the 412 patients who had at least one risk factor and indicated that they were not taking anti-platelet/anti-coagulants, 86% had a reason for not taking a preventative medication. Of the risk factor patients who were not currently taking a preventative medication (n=412), 45.9% were not doing so because it was not clinically indicated, 15.8% because the patient had a history of PUD or GORD, and 11.7% listed 'other' reasons.

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **SECONDARY PREVENTION OF HEART DISEASE & STROKE** You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

INSTRUCTIONS

These questions relate to the use of aspirin and other anti-coagulation therapy for the secondary prevention of heart attack and stroke in high-risk patients. Our aim is to identify patients with risk factors; estimate the prevalence of patients taking aspirin, aspirin like medications or herbal preparations with similar anti-coagulant effects; and to estimate the proportion of patients with stated intolerance or allergy to aspirin or similar medications.

Patient risk fao heart attack or	ctors for r stroke.	<i>Medications</i> Please tick the box beside any anti-	Reasons for non-use of anti-platelet or anti-
Please use the ti indicate whether	ick boxes to or not this	platelet or anti-coagulant medications currently being taken by this patient for secondary prevention	coagulant medication for secondary prevention
risk factors or of for heart attack	comorbidities cor stroke.	of heart attack or stroke. Include prescribed and over the counter medications such as aspirin or	If the patient is not currently taking an anti-platelet / anti- coagulant medication or other
Tick as many bo	xes as apply.	herbal preparations used for anti- coagulant effects eg garlic, ginger, ginseng, feverfew, ginkgo,	preparation for secondary prevention, please use the tick boxes to indicate the main
listed risk factors the QUESTIONS	s, please END S HERE.	chamomile, bromelain (ask the patient about any over the counter preparations so that these may be	reason/s for non-use by this patient.
		included). Tick as many boxes as apply.	If you tick the 'other' box, please write the reason beside it in the space provided
¥		₩	<u> </u>
Does this patient have any of the	se risk factors for heart attack/stroke?	Which medications are currently being taken?	Despite presence of risk factors, aspirin or
HypertensionAtrial fibrillation	Previous CABGsPrevious PTCA	Aspirin Warfarin Dipyridamole Heparin	anti-coagulants are not taken because of:- History of PUD or GORD Expected adverse effect on GIT
AMI Stroke/TIA Stable/unstable anging	Other (please specify risk factor)	Dipyridamole Low mol. weight heparin with aspirin Danaparoid	 Concurrent NSAID therapy Other adverse effect including hypersensitivity
Peripheral vascular disease	□ None of above ⇒ END QUESTONS	Clopidogrel Herbal prep Ticlopidine None of the above	Not clinically indicated Other

55 Patient weight, perception of weight and weight loss

Organisation supporting this study: Roche Products Pty Ltd

Issues: Body mass index (BMI) of patients aged 18 years and over; patient perception of overweight; weight loss attempts and methods; the proportion who have type 2 diabetes.

Sample: 2,969 respondents from 99 GPs with 2,612 respondents aged 18 or over; data collection period: 01/04/2003 – 05/05/2003.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Methods for this study: A card listing methods of weight loss was provided to patients to assist with answering these questions.

Summary of results

The age distribution of the sample was similar to that of patients at all BEACH encounters but under 18 year-olds were removed from these calculations. Female patients made up 60.9%, a slightly larger proportion than the average. Response rates (and therefore denominators) for the following questions varied.

Underweight patients accounted for 8.8% of respondents (95% CI: 7.4–10.2), 35.1% (95% CI: 32.6–37.7) were within normal range, 33.6% (95% CI: 31.2–35.9) were overweight and 22.5% (95% CI: 20.3–24.8) were obese. Overall, almost half saw themselves as overweight and over a third had attempted to lose weight in the previous 12 months. Diet and/or exercise was the most common method tried and the most frequently reported as successful in all weight groups. The prevalence of type 2 diabetes was 8.8% (95% CI: 7.4–10.3) among respondents.

In the underweight group, 5.5% (95% CI: 2.4–8.6) considered themselves to be overweight and approximately 9% had made at least one recent weight loss attempt. Type 2 diabetes prevalence was 2.4% (95% CI: 0.0–4.8). In the normal weight group, 18.4% (95% CI: 15.5–21.4) considered themselves to be overweight and approximately 20% had made at least one recent weight loss attempt. Type 2 diabetes prevalence was 3.9% (95% CI: 2.6–5.2).

In the overweight group, 58.5% (95% CI: 54.1–63.0) considered themselves to be overweight and approximately 41% had made a recent weight loss attempt. The prevalence of type 2 diabetes in this group was estimated to be 9.5% (95% CI: 7.3–11.7). In the obese group, 90.3% (95% CI: 88.1–92.6) considered themselves to be overweight and approximately 66% had made at least one weight loss attempt during the previous 12 months. Over 60% reported trying diet and/or exercise and almost 30% had received GP advice. Weight loss programs were tried by almost 17% and meal plans by about 14% of respondents. Only 8.7% (95% CI: 6.0–11.4) had tried prescribed medication for weight loss in the previous 3 years. The prevalence of type 2 diabetes in this group was estimated to be 18.1% (95% CI: 14.5–21.6).

BMI calculations for patients with type 2 diabetes showed 2.3% (95% CI: 0.0–4.7) were underweight, 15.7% (95% CI: 10.9–20.5) were normal, 35.9% (95% CI: 29.5–42.4) were overweight and 46.1% (95% CI: 38.6–53.6) were obese. Nearly two-thirds considered themselves overweight and over half had made at least one recent weight loss attempt.

For other related abstracts see: 68 Patient weight, perception of weight and weight loss in adults, 69 Patient weight, methods and medications tried for weight loss in adults, 71 Patient BMI, morbidity and medication use in adults and Section 4.1 Body mass index of adults.

Further reading:

Charles, J., Britt, H., & Knox, S. 2006, 'Patient perception of their weight, attempts to lose weight and their diabetes status', *Australian Family Physician*, vol. 35, no. 11, pp. 925–928.

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **PATIENT WEIGHT and WEIGHT LOSS**. You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

INSTRUCTIONS



Weight loss methods

Please tick the box beside any weight loss methods the patient has tried in the past 3 years in an attempt to lose weight.

Tick as many boxes as apply.

* Weight loss programs e.g. Jenny Craig, Weight Watchers, Gutbusters, Gloria Marshall etc.

* Meal Plans e.g. Lite N Easy, Easy Slim, Nu-Shape etc.

* Over-the-counter (OTC) Products available from pharmacies, supermarkets, health food stores etc, e.g.Slimfast, Optifast, Cenovis NutriPlan etc.

* Diet and/or exercise program e.g. commencing a structured diet plan other than those listed above and / or commencing an exercise program not usually undertaken such as walking, jogging, or participating in some other physical activity for the purpose of losing weight.

* Specific advice sought from the GP to help with weight loss or acting on advice offered by the GP.

* **Prescribed medication** e.g. Xenical, Reductil, Duromine, Tenuate etc prescibed for weight loss.

* Specific advice sought from a Specialist or Dietitian for the purpose of losing weight.

* Any other method not listed e.g. seeking advice from a pharmacist, herbalist etc, for the purpose of losing weight.

56 Prevalence, cause and severity of adverse pharmacological events

Organisation supporting this study: Australian Government Department of Health and Ageing

Issues: The proportion of general practice patients who have experienced an adverse event resulting from the use of a medication during the preceding 6 months. The number, main cause and severity of these adverse events was investigated.

Sample: 8,215 encounters from 282 GPs; data collection period: 06/05/2003 – 09/06/2003, 15/07/2003 – 18/08/2003 and 20/01/2004 – 23/02/2004.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Summary of results

GPs reported that 852 patients (10.4%. 95% CI: 9.4–11.4) had experienced an adverse event in response to using a medication in the past 6 months. Older patients aged 45–64, 65–74 and 75+ were significantly more likely to have experienced an adverse medication event (12.4%, 15.4% and 15.3% respectively) than younger patients. Also, female patients (11.4%, 95% CI: 10.1–12.6) were significantly more likely than male patients (8.9%, 95% CI: 7.7–10.0) to have experienced a medication related adverse event in the previous 6 months.

Of those experiencing an adverse event the majority (83.5%) had experienced only one adverse event, with 10.7% and 5.8% experiencing two and three or more adverse events respectively. From a list of nine reasons, 89.7% of patients specified only one reason for their most recent adverse event(s), with another 9.4% and 0.9% indicating two and three reasons respectively.

The most frequently specified reason for the most recent adverse event(s) was recognised side effect (65.7% of all reasons), followed by drug sensitivity (11.8%) and allergy (11.0%).

GP 'severity' ratings for the adverse event(s) were collected July/August 2003 and January/February 2004 only. Of the 580 patients indicating an adverse event from 5,500 encounters, severity rating was available for 551 patients. Over half of patients (53.9%, 95% CI: 48.3–59.5) were rated as having a 'mild' event(s), with another 35.8% (95% CI: 31.1–40.4) rated as 'moderate'. A 'severe' rating was given to 55 patients (10.0%, 95% CI: 6.9–13.1).

For 76 of 327 patients (23.2%, 95% CI: 17.4–29.1) GPs classified the adverse event as preventable. Adverse events were listed as preventable for 19.9% of 'mild' events, 25% of 'moderate' events and 32% of 'severe' events. The severity specific rates were not significantly different due to small numbers and wide confidence intervals.

Further reading:

Miller, G. C., Britth, H. C., & Valenti, L. 2006, 'Adverse drug events in general practice patients in Australia', *Medical Journal of Australia*, vol. 184, no. 7, pp. 321–324.

Miller, G. C., Britt, H. C., Valenti, L., & Knox, S. 2006, 'Adverse drug events: counting is not enough, action is needed [letter]', *Medical Journal of Australia*, vol. 184, no. 12, p. 646.

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

INSTRUCTIONS



57 Prevalence and management of chronic heart failure in general practice patients

Organisation supporting this study: Roche Products Pty Ltd

Issues: Prevalence and severity of chronic heart failure (CHF) among general practice patients; types of management (whether the management was initiated by a GP or specialist, and the main objective of management); proportion of patients referred to a cardiac specialist; clinical investigations used to diagnose CHF.

Sample: 2,641 encounters from 91 GPs; data collection period: 06/05/2003 - 09/06/2003.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Summary of results

The age-sex distribution of respondents was similar to the distribution of patients at all BEACH encounters, with the majority (56.6%) of patients being female.

The prevalence of CHF in this general practice patient population was estimated to be 4.5% (95% CI: 3.3–5.8). Mild CHF was diagnosed in 2.3% of patients, while 1.9% and 0.4% were diagnosed with moderate and severe CHF respectively. Males were more likely to be diagnosed with CHF (4.9% of male patients) than females (4.4% of female patients). Patients aged 75 years and over had the highest age-specific rate of CHF (17.9%).

The medications most commonly used for the control of CHF were Frusemide (28.0% of CHF medications), followed by Digoxin (10.1%), Ramipril (7.1%) and Spiractolone (7.1%). Pharmacological treatment was more likely to be initiated by a specialist (59.4% of medications) than by a GP (40.6%).

GPs considered the factors of 'symptom management' and 'quality of life' to be equally important in the management of CHF, but significantly more important than 'survival'.

The majority (83.5%) of patients diagnosed with CHF had been referred to a cardiac specialist; 69.6% of those with mild CHF, 95.9% with moderate CHF and 100% of patients with severe CHF.

Chest x-ray had been used to diagnose CHF in 78.3% of cases, ECHO had been used in 69.2% of cases and ECG in 66.7% of cases. GPs had ordered 50.6% of chest x-rays, 15.8% of ECHO and 41.6% of ECG, with cardiac specialists ordering the rest.

For other related abstracts see: 31 Prevalence and severity of chronic heart failure, 38 Prevalence of chronic heart failure, its management and control, 75 Prevalence, management and investigations for chronic heart failure, 77 Heart failureunderlying causes and medication management, 90 Prevalence, management and investigations for chronic heart failure.

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

INSTRUCTIONS



58 Lipid lowering medications: patient eligibility under the PBS

Organisation supporting this study: Merck Sharp and Dohme (Australia) Pty Ltd

Issues: Lipid lowering medications (LLMs) are increasingly prescribed for the management of hyperlipidaemia and cardiovascular disease. Eligibility for the Pharmaceutical Benefits Schedule (PBS) subsidy is restricted to patients meeting at least one of four criteria defined in the PBS. This study measured the number of patients on LLMs, their prescribed medication and dose regimen and the proportion of patients eligible for PBS subsidy under each criteria.

Sample: 2,732 encounters from 93 GPs; data collection period: 10/06/2003 - 14/07/2003.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Summary of results

The age distribution of respondents was similar to the expected distribution for general practice encounters. There was a small but significant difference in the sex distribution, with females making up 61.1% (95% CI: 58.2–64.0) compared with 57.4% (95% CI: 56.7–58.1) in the total sample.

Of the 2,732 respondents, the GP indicated that 12.5% (n=341) were currently taking a LLM. No patient under the age of 15 was taking a LLM. The rate of LLM use increased with age until it peaked with patients aged 65–74 years (33.5%). Male patients were 1.5 times more likely to use LLM (16.1%, 95% CI: 13.4–18.8) than female patients (10.2%, 95% CI: 8.5–12.0). The highest use of LLM was in male patients aged between 65 and 74 years (38.5%).

Atorvastatin was the most common, being used by 50% of patients taking a LLM. The next most common was simvastatin (34.4%). Pravastatin was used by 12.6% of patients. Gemfibrozil and fluvastatin were rarely used, together being used by only 3% of patients on a LLM. While atorvastatin had the highest maximum daily dose taken of the three top LLMs, it had the lowest average (26.3 mg) daily dose taken. Conversely, while pravastatin had the lowest maximum dose taken (40 mg) it had the highest average daily dose taken (31.6 mg), with over half the patients taking it at the maximum recorded dose (40 mg).

While respondents were allowed to indicate more than one eligibility criterion for the prescription of an LLM, virtually all respondents recorded only one criterion. For all patients taking a LLM, 40.1% met criterion one for PBS eligibility, 49.7% met criterion two, only 11.3% met criterion three and even less criterion four (1.0%). Only two patients (0.7%) who were on a LLM were recorded as being ineligible according to the PBS criteria.

Patients taking pravastatin had the highest proportion of eligibility through criterion one compared with patients on the other common LLMs. Patients on atorvastatin had the highest proportion of eligibility through criteria two and four compared with patients on the other common LLMs. Patients on simvastatin had the highest proportion of eligibility through criterion three compared with patients on the other common LLMs.

For other related abstracts see: 15 Lipid lowering medication, 20 Screening and management of blood cholesterol, 30 Lipid lowering medications and coronary heart disease, 46 Coronary heart disease, risk factors and lipid lowering medication, 64 Current use of statins by general practice patients, 67 Risk factors of patients on lipid lowering medications, 79 Hypertension and dyslipidaemia – comorbidity and management in general practice patients, 97 Statin medication use among high CHD risk patients attending general practice, 99 Lipid management in patients with high risk conditions.

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

ABOUT THE PATIENT Please advise whether this patient is tak lipid lowering medication which was pres- either today or at a previous encounter. If 'YES' please write the name and regin the lipid lowering medication. If 'NO' lipid lowering medication is being this patient, end the questions here.	ing a scribed nen of taken by	PATIENT CF The list below eligibility for under the Pf From this list patient prese lipid lowering Tick as man	RITERIA FOR ELIGIBILITY w are the qualifying critering r subsidised lipid lowering narmaceutical Benefits So please advise which risk ented with at the commenc medication therapy. y as apply.	(a for patient g medications heme. factors the ement of their		
Is this patient currently taking a lipid lowering medication? ☐ Yes - please specify <u>Name & Form Strength Dose Frequency</u> No → END QUESTIONS	Under which qualifying criteria was/is the patient eligible for subsidy? (Tick as many as apply) 1 Existing CHD and cholesterol > 4.0 mmol/l	2 Cholesterol > 6.5 mmol/L OR Cholesterol > 5.5 mmol/L and HDL <1.0 mmol/L	 Diabetes Mellitus Familial hypercholesterolaemia Family history of CHD (1º relative<60yo) Hypertension (include treated patients) 	3 Cholesterol OR Triglyceride AND ONE C Male 35 to Post menop woman up	I > 7.5 mmol/L 4□ ⇒ >4.0 mmol/L ⊃F □ 75 pausal 5□ to 75 vrs	Cholesterol > 9.0 mmol/L OR Triglyceride >8.0 mmol/L Not eligible

59 Hypertension management and control in general practice patients

Organisation supporting this study: Australian Government Department of Health and Ageing

Issues: The prevalence of hypertension (either controlled or uncontrolled), proportion of patients with hypertension taking a combination angiotensin converting enzyme (ACE) inhibitor/diuretic or angiotensin II antagonist (A2RA)/diuretic, length of time on the combination medication, who initiated the combination medication, control of blood pressure after taking this combination.

Sample: 2,647 respondents from 92 GPs; data collection period: 10/06/2003 – 14/07/2003. **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 the majority (59.5%) of patients being female.

Of the 2,647 respondents, 23.8% had either controlled or uncontrolled hypertension. Among the 611 hypertension patients who responded to the question about combination product use, one in five (20.0%, n=123) were taking either an ACE inhibitor/diuretic (9.5%, n=58) or an A2RA/diuretic (10.6%, n=65).

Of the 123 patients taking a combination medication, 122 reported the duration of its usage. The majority (82.8%) of these 122 patients had been using the combination for more than 3 months and the remaining (17.2%) had been using it for less than 3 months.

The majority (86.1%) of the combination medications were reported as initiated by a GP and the remaining combination medications (13.9%) by a specialist. GPs indicated that blood pressure was well controlled for the majority (81.8%) of patients since commencing their combination medication, and was too high for the remaining 18.2%.

Of 117 respondents, 94.9% had used at least one medication for hypertension prior to commencing the combination products. More than one previous medication could be recorded for each patient. More than half (52.1%) of these patients had previously used an ACE inhibitor, 27.4% had used an A2RA, 17.9% a beta-blocker, and 15.4% a diuretic.

The GP reported that for 83.5% of patients currently taking a combination product and previously using medication other than a combination product, their blood pressure had been too high on previous medication. The remainder (16.5%) had been well controlled on previous medication.

The reasons for prescribing the combination medication were to improve blood pressure control (66.7%), to simplify therapy (29.3%), and to add a second drug (17.1%) for the care of 123 patients currently taking a combination medication. More than one reason could be chosen per patient.

For other related abstracts see: 26 Prevalence of diagnosed hypertension and difficulties in treatment, 79 Hypertension and dyslipidaemia – comorbidity and management in general practice patients, 98 Management of hypertension and angina in general practice patients.

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **COMBINATION THERAPIES IN HYPERTENSION.** You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

INSTRUCTIONS

Hypertensio	n									
Please advise whether or not this patient has Hypertension (controlled or uncontrolled) as a problem currently under management, i.e. the patient takes medication for the management of hypertension which was prescribed either today or at a previous encounter, by you or by another doctor.		nt has ed) nent, is	Current BP control How well controlled is the patient's blood pressure since commencing the combination medication?		Previous BP control How well controlled was the patient's blood pressure while managed with the previous medication?		Reasons for prescribing combination medication			
	Management Is the patient currently taking a combination ACE inhibitor/ diuretic or A2RA/diuretic? For your convenience, a list of these medications can be found on the 'Patient Health Status Information Section - Instructions' (green single sheet) in your research pack. If 'No' you should end the questions here. If 'Yes' continue - please advise the duration of usage of the combination medication and who initiated this combination treatment i.e. a GP (yourself or another GP) or a specialist.			f	Previous medication Please advise which medications the patient had taken prior to commencing the combination medication. Tick as many boxes as apply.				Please advise the main reasons for the decision to prescribe a combination ACE inhibitor/diuretic or A2RA/ diuretic for this patient. Tick as many options as apply. If you do not know the reason for prescribing, tick the 'don't know' box.	
					/				/	
Does this patient currently have hypertension? (either controlled or uncontrolled) Yes No	Is the patient taking a combination product? □ ACE/diuretic □ A2RA/diuretic □ neither → END QUESTIONS	The patient has been taking the combination ACE/divretic or A2RA/divretic for - C < 3 months C > 3 months	The combination therapy was initiated by a GP Specialist	Blood F is curre Co Too Too	Pressure ntly II ntrolled b high b low	Prior to ta product, a diu a bet amile an AC an AC an AC none no pro	iking the combination did the patient take - retic ta-blocker oride CE inhibitor 2RA of the above revious treatment	The pat blood j on <u>prev</u> treatma co D Too	ient's pressure <u>rious</u> ent was Il ntrolled o high o low	Combination product was prescribed - for simpler therapy to add a second drug to reduce adverse effects to improve BP control to reduce cost to patient don't know

157

60 Prevalence of GORD and associated proton pump inhibitor use

Organisation supporting this study: AstraZeneca (Australia) Pty Ltd

Issues: The prevalence of gastro-oesophageal reflux disease (GORD) in patients attending general practice; severity of GORD in these patients; the proportion of patients with GORD being treated with proton pump inhibitors (PPIs); treatment of GORD using PPIs, including medications utilised, duration of use, and effectiveness of the medication.

Sample: 2,538 respondents from 88 GPs; data collection period: 15/07/2003 – 18/08/2003. **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 of patients (60.7%) being female. Patients aged between 25 and 44 years accounted for 26.7% of the sample, and 25.5% of the patients were aged 45–64 years.

GORD was reported in 412 patients (16.2%, 95% CI: 14.1–18.4). Prevalence was higher in patients aged 65–74 years (30.0%) and those aged 75+ (30.2%) than in those aged 45–64 years (19.8%) or 25–44 years (12.6%).

Of the 412 patients with GORD, 241 (59.1%, 95% CI: 52.6–65.5) were currently being treated with PPIs. The GP rated the majority (54.9%) as having 'moderate' GORD when initially diagnosed, while 21.7% of patients had 'mild' GORD, and 23.4% had 'severe' GORD. The severity of GORD was estimated by endoscopy alone for 51.6% of patients, while a doctor's opinion was the only estimation for 42.2% of patients. A combination of endoscopy and doctor's opinion was used in only 6.3% of patients.

Omeprazole (35.7% of patients, 95% CI: 27.5–43.9) was the most common generic PPI medication currently being used to treat GORD, followed by pantoprazole (24.0%) and esomeprazole (19.3%). The majority of patients had been using their current PPI medication between one and 6 months (40.6%, 95% CI: 31.8–49.3). Over 20% of patients had been using their current PPI for 7–12 months (22.1%, 95% CI: 15.5–28.8).

There were 84 patients who had taken another PPI or other GORD medication prior to their current medication. The majority of these patients had taken ranitidine (40.5%, 95% CI: 29.5–51.5) or omeprazole (16.7%, 95% CI: 8.4–25.0).

Almost 90% of patients reported that their current PPI provided adequate symptom control (88.2%, 95% CI: 83.6–92.8). However, 29.6% of patients (95% CI: 21.8–37.3) reported a recurrence of GORD symptoms while being treated with a PPI. This was most common in patients with severe GORD (48.9%, 95% CI: 34.9–63.0). Only 14.7% of patients were taking other medications for symptom control of GORD in conjunction with PPIs. The most common of these was mylanta (50.0% of other medications).

For other related abstracts see: 18 Drugs for the treatment of peptic ulcer and reflux, 24 Gastro-oesophageal reflux disease (GORD) in general practice patients, 34 Gastro-oesophageal reflux disease (GORD), 51 Use of proton pump inhibitors for gastrointestinal problems, 62 Use of proton pump inhibitors by general practice patients, 91 Prevalence and management of gastrointestinal symptoms, 100 Gastrointestinal symptoms in patients attending general practice.

□ No 🖙 END

QUESTIONS

QUESTIONS

BL54B

Dr's opinion of symptoms

endoscopic assessment

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about PROTON PUMP INHIBITORS for GASTRO-OESOPHAGEAL REFLUX **DISEASE.** You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

INSTRUCTIONS



symptoms while on the PPI?

No

Yes

D No

159

61 Prevalence of chronic illnesses identified as National Health Priority Areas among general practice patients

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

Issues: What proportion of general practice patients have chronic conditions which require ongoing management by their GP, in particular those health problems identified as National Health Priority Areas (Cardiovascular health, asthma, arthritis, depression, diabetes).

Sample: Patients at 8,911 encounters from 299 GPs; data collection periods: 19/08/2003 – 22/09/2003 and 28/10/2003 – 19/01/2004

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Methods for this study: The GP was presented with a list of morbidities and asked: 'Does this patient have any of the following conditions which require ongoing management?'

Crude rates for each problem were calculated as the proportion of the patient sample with each listed morbidity.

Estimates of the prevalence of each morbidity in the general practice sub-population were obtained by weighting each patient age group by the mean number of annual GP visits for that age group (MBS unpublished data).

Summary of results

The sex distribution of the SAND sample was similar to the total BEACH sample, however the SAND substudy sampled a significantly larger proportion of patient aged 75 years and over (17.0 95% CI: 15.4–18.6) compared with the total BEACH sample (12.7%, 95% CI: 11.9–13.4).

Crude rates: Around 30% of patients sampled had a diagnosed cardiovascular problem, of which ischaemic heart disease was the most common (11.0%). Eighteen per cent of patients had uncomplicated hypertension. Asthma was recorded for more than one in ten patients (11.4%, 95% CI: 10.5–12.3). Nine per cent of patients had diagnosed diabetes, 7.3% Type 2 diabetes (NIDDM). Osteoarthritis was common among the patients sampled (20.0%). Fifteen per cent of patients had depression recorded as a health problem.

Adjusted rates: After weighting for the age-sex distribution of the sample against the population of general practice patients, the adjusted prevalence estimates were generally lower than the crude sample rates. In particular cardiovascular disease (19.0%) and osteoarthritis (11.9%), which are related to older age were less prevalent after adjustment. The estimated prevalence of asthma (11.6%) and depression (13.5%) were largely unaffected by adjustment.

Conclusion: By adjusting for age we calculated what might be a better estimate of the prevalence of diagnosed health problems among all general practice patients after taking into account the frequency of GP visits related to age.

For other related abstracts see: 37 *Prevalence of common morbidities in patients encountered in general practice,* 89 *Estimates of the prevalence of chronic illnesses identified as Health Priority Areas.*

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **CO-MORBIDITY AND CHRONIC DISEASE**. You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

INSTRUCTIONS

Co-morbidity and chronic disease

The aim of these questions is to determine the prevalence of **co-morbidity** and some of the **chronic illnesses** or **conditions** in the **National Goals** and **Targets** priority areas.

Most of the conditions listed below require continual management or surveillance and may need consideration in future care.

Please use the tick boxes to indicate whether the patient has any of the listed conditions even if you have already managed one of these problems today. Tick as many as apply.

If the patient **does not** have any of these conditions or problems, please tick the box marked **'none of these conditions'**.



62 Use of proton pump inhibitors by general practice patients

Organisations supporting this study: Janssen-Cilag Pty Ltd and the Australian Government Department of Health and Ageing

Issues: The proportion of general practice patients who are taking, or have taken, a proton pump inhibitor (PPI) medication; the conditions for which patients are being prescribed a PPI; whether different PPIs (or regimens) are being prescribed at different stages of the disease process; which PPI medications are being taken by patients with gastro-oesophageal reflux disease (GORD) at various stages of the disease process.

Sample: 5,245 encounters from 182 GPs; data collection period: 19/08/2003 – 27/10/2003. **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 the majority of patients (59.5%) being female. Patients aged 65 years and over accounted for 27.9% of the sample.

The proportion of general practice patients who had either taken a PPI in the past 12 months or were commencing a PPI was 13.4% (95% CI: 11.9–14.9). There were 733 conditions for which a PPI was prescribed. Oesophageal reflux accounted for 58.9% of these conditions (95% CI: 54.6–63.3), almost a quarter were oesophagitis (23.6%, 95% CI: 19.6–27.6), 10.5% (95% CI: 7.9–13.1) were peptic ulcer disease, and the remainder (7.0%, 95% CI: 5.0–8.9) were conditions other than those listed.

The stage of the condition for which a PPI was prescribed was recorded for 669 patients. Four out of five patients (80.0%, 95% CI: 76.7–83.2) were on maintenance treatment, 16.0% were having initial treatment or were in the healing phase, and the remainder (4.0%) were at other stages of disease.

Both initial and maintenance PPI medications were recorded for 313 patients. Of these, 90.1% (n=282) had the same PPI (at the generic level), while 9.9% (n=31) had different PPIs for initial and maintenance treatment. Of the 438 initial PPI medications, 46.4% were omeprazole, 21.2% were pantoprazole, 17.6% were esomeprazole, 7.8% were lansoprazole, and 7.1% were rabeprazole.

The proportion of patients who were on initial treatment for GORD was 14.4% (n=61). There were 206 initial PPI medications recorded with a specific strength for oesophageal reflux. Of these, omeprazole 20 mg was the most common at 42.7% (n=88). Pantoprazole 40 mg (22.3%, n=46) and esomeprazole 40 mg (13.6%, n=28) followed. The proportion of patients who were on maintenance treatment for oesophageal reflux was 81.4%. There were 299 PPI maintenance medications recorded with a specific strength for GORD. Omeprazole 20 mg was the most common (44.2%, n=132), followed by pantoprazole 40 mg (17.1%, n=51) and esomeprazole 20 mg (12.0%, n=36).

For other related abstracts see: 18 Drugs for the treatment of peptic ulcer and reflux, 24 Gastro-oesophageal reflux disease (GORD) in general practice patients, 34 Gastro-oesophageal reflux disease (GORD), 51 Use of proton pump inhibitors for gastrointestinal problems, 60 Prevalence of GORD and associated proton pump inhibitor use, 91 Prevalence and management of gastrointestinal symptoms, 100 Gastrointestinal symptoms in patients attending general practice.

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **PROTON PUMP INHIBITORS for GASTRO-INTESTINAL DISEASE.** You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

INSTRUCTIONS



63 Asthma—prevalence, management and medication side-effects

Organisation supporting this study: Merck Sharp and Dohme (Australia) Pty Ltd

Issues: The prevalence and severity of asthma among general practice patients; the medications being utilised for asthma management; side effects of asthma medications.

Sample: 2,527 respondents from 87 GPs; data collection period: 23/09/2003 – 27/10/2003.

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 of the total BEACH sample with the majority (56.6%) being female and those aged 25–44 and 45–64 years accounting for 24.3% and 27.0% of the patient population respectively.

A total of 367 patients (14.5%, 95% CI: 12.6–16.4) had asthma. No significant differences emerged in asthma prevalence for patients across age groups. There was also no significant difference between the prevalence for males (12.7%, 95% CI: 10.4–15.0) and females (15.9%, 95% CI: 13.5–18.2).

The majority of asthma cases were reported in the least severe categories for both adults and children. One in four children (23.0%) with asthma had frequent or persistent asthma, while 28.0% of adult asthma sufferers had asthma rated as moderate or severe.

Of the 367 patients with asthma, 52 (14.2%) were not currently taking any asthma medication. Salbutamol was the most common asthma medication, accounting for 45.1% (n=223) of all asthma medications. The fluticasone/salmeterol combination was the second most frequently used, accounting for 14.8% (n=73) of asthma medications. Budesonide, fluticasone propionate and terbutaline each accounted for approximately 7.5% of asthma medications being taken by these patients.

Of the 353 patients who provided responses about corticosteroid use, 17.9% (n=63) had been prescribed oral corticosteroids in the previous 12 months. Of the 337 patients who responded to the hospitalisation question, 7.7% (n=26) had been hospitalised for asthma during the previous 12 months.

Thirty-seven (11.8%) of the 315 patients taking at least one asthma medication reported a side effect. The most common side effect was hoarseness of voice (reported by 18 patients), most of these (n=13) being reported as mild. Sixteen patients reported 'other' side effects, the majority (8) of these being rated as moderate in severity. Height reduction was reported by 5 patients, 2 of which were rated as severe. Oral candidiasis was reported by 4 patients (all mild), and adrenal suppression was reported by 3 patients (all rated as moderate).

For other related abstracts see: 3 Asthma, 22 Asthma – prevalence, severity and management, 39 Severity of asthma, medications and management, 48 Asthma prevalence and management, 70 Inhaled corticosteroid use for asthma management, 96 Inhaled corticosteroid use for asthma management, 104 Asthma management and medication use among patients attending general practice.

Further reading:

Henderson, J., Knox, S., Pan, Y., & Britt, H. 2004, 'Changes in asthma management in Australian general practice', *Prim.Care Respir.J*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 138–143.

Persistent

BL56B

☐ Moderate □ Severe

3.

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



asthma

□ Yes □ No □ Unsure

other

(please specify)

mild / moderate / severe

(please circle)

Severity of asthma reference card

Childre	n
Severity*	Common features
Infrequent episodic	Episodes 6-8 weeks or more apart and from 1 to 2 days up to 1-2 weeks duration; usually triggered by URTI or environmental allergen; attacks generally not severe; symptoms rare between attacks; normal examination and lung function except when symptomatic.
Frequent episodic	Attacks <6 weeks apart; attacks more troublesome; minimal symptoms such as exercise induces wheeze between attacks; normal examination and lung function except when symptomatic; commonly troubled through winter months only.
Persistent	Symptoms most days; nocturnal asthma > 1/wk with sleep disturbance; early morning chest tightness; exercise intolerance and spontaneous wheeze; daily use of beta2 antagonist; 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 asymptomatic
Moderate	Symptoms most days; exacerbations <6-8 weeks apart which affect day-time activity and sleep; exacerbations last several days; occasional emergency room visit.
Severe	Persistent; limited activity level; nocturnal symptoms > 1/wk; frequent emergency room visits and hospital admission in past year; FEV ₁ may be significantly reduced between exacerbations.

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

64 Current use of statins by general practice patients

Organisation supporting this study: AstraZeneca (Australia) Pty Ltd

Issues: The proportion of patients currently using statins, cholesterol level at the commencement of statin therapy, proportion of patients have existing cardiovascular disease or risk factors for cardiovascular disease, initial statin regimen and duration of usage at the commencement of statin, current statin regimen and duration of usage, most recent cholesterol levels since the commencement of statin, GPs' clinical opinion on control of their patients' cholesterol levels.

Sample: 3,202 respondents from 109 GPs; data collection period: 02/12/2003 – 19/01/2004. **Method:** Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Summary of results

The sex distribution of the sample was similar to that of total BEACH encounters, with the majority (59.0%) of female patients. Patients aged 1–24 years made up 17.1%, lower than national average (21.2%) during April 2002 – March 2003 BEACH period.

Of the 3,202 respondents, 14.4% (n=462) were currently taking a statin, most commonly by patients aged 65–74 years (35.1%). The use of statin was significantly more likely in male (17.5%, 95% CI: 14.7–20.3) than in female patients (12.3%, 95% 10.2–14.4).

At the time of commencing statins, mean total cholesterol (TC) was 6.84 mmol/L, the mean of higher density lipoprotein (HDL) was 1.34 mmol/L, the mean of low density lipoprotein (LDL) 4.44 mmol/L, and the mean of triglycerides (TG) 2.44 mmol/L. After commencing statins, mean TC was 4.80 mmol/L, mean HDL 1.45 mmol/L, mean LDL 2.57 mmol/L, and mean TG was 1.83 mmol/L.

Of the 432 current statin users responding to the risk factor question, 66.9% had hypertension, 41.7% had existing coronary heart disease, and 24.5% had diabetes mellitus. None of the listed risk factors were recorded for 18.1% of the respondents. (Multiple response was allowed).

Details of initial treatment were available for 366 statin users. Of these, atorvastatin (42.4%), simvastatin (39.6%) and pravastatin (15.0%) accounted for 97.0% of initial medications.

Details of current statin medication were available for 398 statin users. There were 398 statins in the current treatment. Atorvastatin (47.0%), simvastatin (38.9%) and pravastatin (13.3%) remained the most common and accounted for 99.2% in total.

GPs reported that cholesterol level was adequately controlled for the majority (69.9%) of the 419 current statin users responding to management plan question. The remainder (30.1%, n=126) were the patients whose cholesterol level was not sufficiently controlled. Of these 126 patients, GPs had other management plans for 61.9%, increased the dose of statin for 37.3%, changed the statin being used for 6.4% and had additional therapy for 4.0%.

Of the 73 other managements proposed for patients whose cholesterol was not adequately controlled, 28.8% were lifestyle changes, which included change of diet, weight loss, or exercise.

For other related abstracts see: 15 Lipid lowering medication, 20 Screening and management of blood cholesterol, 30 Lipid lowering medications and coronary heart disease, 46 Coronary heart disease, risk factors and lipid lowering medication, 58 Lipid lowering medications: patient eligibility under PBS, 67 Risk factors of patients on lipid lowering medications, 79 Hypertension and dyslipidaemia – comorbidity and management in general practice patients, 97 Statin medication use among high CHD risk patients attending general practice, 99 Lipid management in patients with high risk conditions.

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **PATIENTS TAKING STATIN MEDICATION.** You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

INSTRUCTIONS



65 Language and cultural background of general practice patients

Organisation supporting this study: Australian Government Department of Health and Ageing and General Practice Statistics and Classification Unit (GPSCU)

Issues: Previous research suggests that health surveys are inclined to under-enumerate persons from culturally diverse and in particular, Indigenous backgrounds. This study aimed to validate the routine BEACH questions on language background and Indigenous status, using more extensive questions that focussed on the patient's language and cultural background.

Sample: 311 GPs and 9245 patients surveyed between 20/01/2004 - 03/05/2004.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Methods for this study: Based on the 2001 census questions, patients were asked about their country of birth, parents' countries of birth, whether the patient was of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander origin and what language was spoken at home. Languages were classified according to the Australian Classification of Languages 1997 (Australian Bureau of Statistics).

Summary of results

Fifty-eight per cent of respondents were female which is comparable with the total BEACH sample. There was a somewhat greater proportion of patients aged 65 years and over in the SAND sample (28.5%) compared with the BEACH sample (23.0%).

Two hundred and forty-one (2.6%, 95% CI: 1.5–3.7) respondents identified as of either Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander origin. In the sixth year of BEACH, GPs who did not participate in the cultural and language SAND study asked patients the routine BEACH question on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander origin and recorded encounters with Indigenous patients at 2.1% (95% CI: 1.3–2.8, unweighted) of their encounters. This routine BEACH rate was substantially higher than recorded in previous BEACH years where the sample rate of Indigenous encounters was around 1.0% (unweighted).

Nearly 16% of respondents reported speaking a language other than English at home (15.8%, 95% CI: 13.6–17.9), more than twice the rate routinely identified in BEACH (7.5%, 95% CI: 6.5–8.5). However, the SAND question is broader and includes those who speak mainly English plus another language, while the routine BEACH question only includes those whose main language is NOT English. After English, Southern European languages (Italian, Greek, French, Spanish etc) was the most common group of languages, spoken by 6.5% of respondents.

More than three-quarters of respondents (77.1%) were born in Australia and two out of five respondents (39.5%) had at least one parent born overseas.

For other related abstracts see: 52 Language and cultural background of patients, 95 Cultural background of patients attending general practice.

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

INSTRUCTIONS



170
66 Anti-psychotic medication use by general practice patients

Organisation supporting this study: Janssen-Cilag Pty Ltd

Issues: The prevalence of anti-psychotic medication use (current or in the last 12 months), indications for anti-psychotic medication, length of time on anti-psychotic medications, GP perceived patient compliance in taking anti-psychotic medications, who is responsible for the management of the condition for which these medications are/were taken.

Sample: 3,338 patients from 117 GPs; data collection period: 24/02/2004 – 29/03/2004.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Summary of results

The sex distribution of respondents was similar to the distribution of the total BEACH sample with the majority (58.4%) being female. The sample was slightly older than average, with a significant over representation of patients aged 75 years or more and fewer young people aged less than 15 years.

A total of 71 patients (2.1%, 95% CI: 1.5–2.7) were currently taking, or had taken in the previous 12 months, anti-psychotic medication. There was no significant difference between the proportion of males (2.3%, 95% CI: 1.4–3.3) and females (2.0%, 95% CI: 1.3–2.8) taking anti-psychotic medication.

For these 71 patients, the most common indication for anti-psychotic medication was schizophrenia (n=26, 36.6%), followed by behavioural disturbance in dementia (n=12, 16.9%), bipolar mania (n=11, 15.5%) and schizoaffective disorder (n=10, 14.1%).

A total of 84 anti-psychotic medications were recorded. The most common was olanzapine, taken by 23 patients and accounting for 27.4% of these medications. Fewer than one in ten patients were taking risperidone (8 patients, 9.5% of medications) or haloperidol (7 patients, 8.3% of medications). Those on olanzapine had been taking this medication for an average 30 months, those on risperidone for an average 22 months and those on haloperidol for an average of almost 7 years. Only 12 patients had been prescribed another anti-psychotic prior to their most recent medication. Olanzapine was also the most common of these (n=3).

GPs thought the majority of their patients were compliant (n=55, 88.3% of the 66 responses to this question) in taking their anti-psychotic medication. They thought that 11 patients (16.7%) were partially compliant. None of the patients were thought to be non-compliant in taking their medication.

Responses were received for 69 patients regarding who managed them for their condition. The GP was involved in the management of almost all (94.2%) of these patients, most often in combination with a specialist/psychiatrist (47.8%) but often alone (34.8%). Only 8 patients (11.6%) were being managed by a community team in collaboration with the GP.

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **PATIENTS TAKING ANTIPSYCHOTIC MEDICATIONS.** You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

INSTRUCTIONS

FOR THE DOCTOR Is this patient currently taking, or have they take the past 12 months, an antipsychotic medicatio will they be commencing an antipsychotic as a of today's consultation? If 'Yes' to any please continue to the next question If 'NO' you should end the questions here.	n in n <u>OR</u> esult	Patient compliance This question applies to currently taking antips: Please use the tick bo opinion of the patient regard to their medica	to patients who a ychotic medicatio xes to provide yo t' s compliance , i ition usage.	re on. our in
Indication for antipsychotic medication If 'Yes' please advise the condition for which the antipsychotic was indicated. If the indication is not one of those listed, please write the indication beside the box marked 'other' in the space provided.	Medication management Please write the name and form of the most r antipsychotic taken by this patient in line 1. Ple indicate the regimen (i.e. strength, dose and of the medication and the duration of usage (or years - please circle as appropriate). If two different antipsychotics, or two strenge same antipsychotic were/are prescribed, pleat these details in line 2. If the patient was previously treated with anti agents other than the current or most recer- please provide these details in line 3.	ecent ase frequency) in months yths of the se provide psychotic it therapy,	Patie Please to adv provia for the condit patien antips	nt management e use the tick boxes rise which care ders are responsible e management of the tion for which this at is / was taking the sychotic.
Has/is this patient taken/ taking antipsychotic medication - □ YES - now or in the past 12 mths □ YES - starting today □ No ⇔ END BLOOB QUESTIONS	The most recent antipsychotic used for treatment w Name & Form Strength Dose Freq Du 1.	as - In taking t ration of use psychotic mths/yrs patient to mths/yrs Well a /as - Partia mths/yrs Non c	he anti- medication, elieve this be - compliant ully compliant	 this patient managed by - GP only GP & specialist/ psychiatrist Specialist/psychiatrist only GP & community team Other

172

67 Risk factors of patients on lipid lowering medications

Organisation supporting this study: Australian Government Department of Health and Ageing and the Australian General Practice Statistics and Classification Centre (AGPSCC)

Issues: Proportion of patients currently taking lipid lowering medications. Risk factors for cardiovascular disease and blood cholesterol levels at the start of lipid therapy among patients on lipid lowering medications.

Sample: 10,233 respondents from 353 GPs. Data collection periods: 29/10/2002 – 2/12/2002, 28/10/2003 – 01/12/2003, 30/03/2004 – 07/06/2004.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Summary of results

The age distribution of the sample of patients was similar to the age distribution for the BEACH annual encounters. The proportion of respondents who were female (60.5%, 95% CI: 58.8–62.2) was significantly higher than that of the annual BEACH (2003–2004) encounters (57.4%, 95% CI: 56.7–58.2).

Of the 10,233 respondents, 1,302 (12.7%, 95% CI: 11.8–13.7) were currently using lipid lowering medication. The use of lipid lowering medication was significantly higher among patients aged 65 years or over (28.0%, 95% CI: 26.0–30.1) compared with those aged less than 65 years (7.6%, 95% CI: 6.8–8.4). The use of lipid lowering medication was significantly higher in males (15.8%, 95% CI: 14.3–17.2) than in females (10.7%, 95% CI: 9.7–11.7).

Of those on lipid lowering medications nearly half (47.5%) had existing cardiovascular disease at the start of therapy: 25.2% had diabetes, 3.5% had renal failure, 37.2% were overweight/obese and 31.7% had a family history of heart disease. One in eight (13.6%) had none of the listed risk factors at the start of therapy.

The mean age at the start of lipid medication therapy was 61 years. The mean length of lipid lowering medication use was 5.3 years. The mean total cholesterol at the start of therapy was 7.0 mmol/L and the mean HDL cholesterol reading was 1.5 mmol/L. The mean systolic blood pressure reading at the start of therapy was 140 mmHg and the mean diastolic blood pressure reading was 82 mmHg.

For other related abstracts see: 15 Lipid lowering medication, 20 Screening and management of blood cholesterol, 30 Lipid lowering medications and coronary heart disease, 46 Coronary heart disease, risk factors and lipid lowering medication, 58 Lipid lowering medications: patient eligibility under PBS, 64 Current use of statins by general practice patients, 79 Hypertension and dyslipidaemia – comorbidity and management in general practice patients, 97 Statin medication use among high CHD risk patients attending general practice, 99 Lipid management in patients with high risk conditions.

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

INSTRUCTIONS

This study is looking at the **whole cardiovascular risk** for patients when they commenced medication treatment for high lipids. Please try to record the patient's status when they commenced therapy - not the current levels which indicate how they have improved under care. If you don't know the pre-treatment levels for cholesterol and BP, please leave these blank.



174

68 Patient weight, perception of weight and weight loss in adults

Organisation supporting this study: Australian General Practice Statistics and Classification Centre (AGPSCC)

Issues: Body mass index (BMI) of patients aged 18 years and over; patient perception of overweight; weight loss attempts and methods; the proportion who have type 2 diabetes.

Sample: 2,116 respondents aged 18 years or over from 82 GPs; data collection period: 04/05/2004 – 07/06/2004.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Methods for this study: A card listing methods of weight loss was provided to patients to assist with answering these questions.

Summary of results

The age distribution of the sample was similar to that of adult patients at all BEACH encounters. Female patients made up 61.7%, a slightly larger proportion than the average. Response rates (and therefore denominators) for the following questions varied.

Underweight patients accounted for 7.2% of respondents (95% CI: 5.8–8.5), 36.3% (95% CI: 33.5–39.1) were within normal range, 33.4% (95% CI: 30.8–35.9) were overweight and 23.2% (95% CI: 20.5–25.9) were obese. Overall, almost half saw themselves as overweight and over a third had attempted to lose weight in the previous 12 months. Diet and/or exercise was the most common method tried and the most frequently reported as successful in all weight groups. The prevalence of type 2 diabetes was 8.3% (95% CI: 6.7–10.0) among respondents.

In the underweight group, 3.6% considered themselves to be overweight and 9.8% had made at least one recent weight loss attempt. Type 2 diabetes prevalence was 4.6% in this group. In the normal weight group, 15.5% considered themselves to be overweight and 20.4% had made at least one recent weight loss attempt. Type 2 diabetes prevalence was 3.9%.

In the overweight group, 59.6% considered themselves to be overweight and 43.2% had made a recent weight loss attempt. The prevalence of type 2 diabetes in this group was estimated to be 8.7%. In the obese group, 87.5% considered themselves to be overweight and 61.1% had made at least one weight loss attempt during the previous 12 months. There were 56.6% who reported trying diet and/or exercise and 26.2% had received GP advice. Weight loss programs were tried by 17.5% and meal plans by 13.3% of respondents. Only 7.9% had tried prescribed medication for weight loss in the previous 3 years. The prevalence of type 2 diabetes in this group was estimated to be 14.2%.

BMI calculations for patients with type 2 diabetes showed 3.8% (95% CI: 1.0–6.6) were underweight, 20.3% (95% CI: 11.9–28.6) were normal, 35.4% (95% CI: 28.8–42.1) were overweight and 40.5% (95% CI: 33.8–47.3) were obese. Nearly two-thirds considered themselves overweight and over half had made at least one recent weight loss attempt.

For other related abstracts see: 55 Patient weight, perception of weight and weight loss, 69 Patient weight, methods and medications tried for weight loss in adults, 71 Patient BMI, morbidity and medication use in adults and Section 4.1 Body mass index of adults.

Further reading:

Charles, J., Britt, H., & Knox, S. 2006, 'Patient perception of their weight, attempts to lose weight and their diabetes status', *Australian Family Physician*, vol. 35, no. 11, pp. 925–928.

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **PATIENT WEIGHT and WEIGHT LOSS.** You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

INSTRUCTIONS



Weight loss methods

Please tick the box beside any weight loss methods the patient has tried in the past 3 years in an attempt to lose weight.

Tick as many boxes as apply.

* Weight loss programs e.g. Jenny Craig, Weight Watchers, Gutbusters, Gloria Marshall etc.

* Meal Plans e.g. Lite N Easy, Easy Slim, Nu-Shape etc.

* Over-the-counter (OTC) Products available from pharmacies, supermarkets, health food stores etc, e.g.Slimfast, Optifast, Cenovis NutriPlan etc.

* Diet and/or exercise program e.g. commencing a structured diet plan other than those listed above and / or commencing an exercise program not usually undertaken such as walking, jogging, or participating in some other physical activity for the purpose of losing weight.

* Specific advice sought from the GP to help with weight loss or acting on advice offered by the GP.

* **Prescribed medication** e.g. Xenical, Reductil, Duromine, Tenuate etc prescibed for weight loss.

* Specific advice sought from a Specialist or Dietitian for the purpose of losing weight.

* Any other method not listed e.g. seeking advice from a pharmacist, herbalist etc, for the purpose of losing weight.

69 Patient weight, methods and medications tried for weight loss in adults

Organisation supporting this study: Roche Products Pty Ltd

Issues: Body mass index (BMI) of patients aged 18 years and over; patient perception of overweight; weight loss attempts and methods; products and medications tried for weight loss.

Sample: 1,721 adult respondents from 70 GPs; data collection period: 08/06/2004 – 19/07/2004.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Methods for this study: A card listing methods of weight loss was provided to patients to assist with answering these questions.

Summary of results

The age distribution of the adult sample was similar to that of patients at all BEACH encounters. Female patients made up 60.9%, a slightly larger proportion than the average. Response rates (and therefore denominators) for the following questions varied.

BMI calculation was possible for 1,701 respondents – 6.5% (95% CI: 5.2–7.7) were underweight, 35.3% (95% CI: 32.2–38.4) were within normal range, 32.9% (95% CI: 30.3–38.4) were overweight and 25.4% (95% CI: 22.0–28.7) were obese. Almost half perceived themselves as overweight and 40.0% had attempted to lose weight in the previous 12 months. Diet/exercise was the method most frequently tried, and was the method reported as the most successful in all weight groups. Respondents had tried 47 over-thecounter or prescribed weight loss medications in total, 25.0% of these being Orlistat (mean duration of use 2.4 months). Sibutramine (19.2%) was used for a mean duration of 3.5 months and Phentermine (17%) for a mean of 2.1 months.

Of those underweight (*n*=106), 6.6% considered themselves overweight and 5.5% had made at least one recent weight loss attempt. Five underweight patients had tried diet/exercise programs in the previous 12 months. In the normal weight group (*n*=586), 18.4% considered themselves to be overweight and 20.2% (of 519 respondents) had made at least one recent weight loss attempt. Diet/exercise had been tried by 17.4%, and was again the most successful method (53.6% of 97 respondents). Ten weight loss medications were tried by this group.

In the overweight group (*n*=545), 60.0% considered themselves to be overweight and approximately 47% (of 519 respondents) had made a recent weight loss attempt. Diet/ exercise, again reported as the most successful method, had been tried by 38.7%, 11.3% had received GP advice, 4.9% had tried meal plans, and 4.7% had tried a weight loss program in the previous year. Ten weight loss medications were tried by this group also. In the obese group (*n*=425), 89.3% considered themselves to be overweight and approximately 65% had made at least one weight loss attempt during the previous 12 months. Over 50.0% reported trying diet/exercise, 20.1% had received GP advice, 10.4% had tried a weight loss program, 9.2% had tried meal plans and 5.9% had tried prescribed medications. Diet/exercise was again reported to be the most successful method. There were 25 weight loss medications recorded for this group, 28.0% of which were Orlistat, which was used for a mean duration of almost 3 months.

For other related abstracts see: 55 Patient weight, perception of weight and weight loss, 68 Patient weight, perception of weight and weight loss in adults, 71 Patient BMI, morbidity and medication use in adults and Section 4.1 Body mass index of adults.

Further reading:

Charles, J., Britt, H., & Knox, S. 2006, 'Patient perception of their weight, attempts to lose weight and their diabetes status', *Australian Family Physician*, vol. 35, no. 11, pp. 925–928.



The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **PATIENT WEIGHT and WEIGHT LOSS.** You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

INSTRUCTIONS

Please tick the box beside any weight loss ASK THE PATIENT ALL methods the patient has tried in the past 12 the following questions months in an attempt to lose weight. Effectiveness of methods Tick as many boxes as apply. Self assessment Using the scale beside each * Weight loss programs e.g. Jenny Craig, Weight weight loss method, circle a Watchers, Gutbusters, Gloria Marshall etc. In their own opinion. number to represent how does the patient effective the patient considered Meal Plans e.g. Lite N Easy, Easy Slim, Nu-Shape etc. consider himself/herself each method/s tried, where:-* Over-the-counter (OTC) Products available from to be overweight? pharmacies, supermarkets, health food stores etc, 1 = most successful e.g.Slimfast, Optifast, Cenovis NutriPlan, Fat Blaster, Trim 2 = somewhat successful It, Opti Slim, Sure Slim, Exo Fat, Chitosan etc. 3 = undecided Diet and/or exercise program e.g. commencing a 4 = not very effective and Patient height & Weight loss attempts structured diet plan other than those listed above and / or 5 = not at all effective. weiaht commencing an exercise program not usually undertaken such as walking, joining a gym, jogging, or participating in How often in the past 12 some other physical activity for the purpose of losing What is the patient's months has this patient Product use and weiaht. height (without shoes)? attempted to lose duration of usage What is their weight Specific advice sought from the GP to help with weight weight? This includes loss or acting on advice offered by the GP. (unclothed)? If an over-the-counter commencing new diets, meal replacement product or a prescribed * Prescribed medication e.g. Xenical, Reductil, Duromine, (You are NOT REQUIRED Tenuate etc prescibed for weight loss. (NB. Xenical S3 programs, exercise medication was used to to weigh or measure the since 1st May 2004). attempt weight loss, please programs, joining patient, but if the patient is advise which products/ organisations, or Specific advice sought from a Specialist or Dietitian for unsure, vou may either do the purpose of losing weight. seeking specific advice medications were tried and so or take information from approximately how long with the objective of the medical records.) * Any other method not listed e.g. seeking advice from a they were used. losing weight. pharmacist, herbalist etc, for the purpose of losing weight. \downarrow (circle 1 for most effective, 5 for least effective Ask the patient their Ask the patient... If OTC products or prescribed In the past Weight loss programs 5 In the past 12 months how 2 3 4 medication were used, which 12 months Do you consider Meal Plans 4 5 2 3 often have you attempted Height one/s and for how long? which weight vourself to be OTC products (pharmacy/retail) 5 to lose weight? 2 3 4 1 loss methods Product/med'n Duration (mths) cm [overweight? Diet and/or exercise program 2 3 4 5 Never have you GP advice 2 4 5 3 Once Weight tried? Please Prescribed medication 4 5 1 2 3 □ Yes □ 2-4 times kg I rank their Specialist/dietitian advice 1 2 3 4 5 5 or more times 🗆 No effectiveness Other 1 2 3 4 5 BL63B

Weight loss methods

70 Inhaled corticosteroid use for asthma management

Organisation supporting this study: Australian Government Department of Health and Ageing

Issues: Prevalence of asthma in general practice patients and distribution of current severity; proportion with asthma taking any asthma medication, proportion taking inhaled corticosteroids (ICS) and current regimen; proportion adequately managed on ICS; proportion of patients with ICS dosage altered since resolution of last exacerbation and reason for alteration.

Sample: 7,919 respondents from 269 GPs; data collection period: 08/06/2004 – 19/07/2004 and 28/09/2004 – 06/12/2004.

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 and sex distributions of respondents were similar to the distribution for all general practice encounters, with the majority (59.4%) of patients being female.

Of 7,919 respondents, 1,030 had asthma. Patients aged 5–14 were significantly more likely to have asthma (24.2%, 95% CI: 19.8–28.6) than all patients in the sample (13.0%, 95% CI: 11.9–14.1). Female and male patients were not significantly different in their rate of asthma.

One in ten (10.9%) asthma patients reported they did not take any asthma medication. About half (47.7%) took only one medication, and another 35.1% took two medications to manage asthma.

The medications most frequently used to manage asthma were short acting beta agonists (67.0% of patients with asthma), combination (long acting beta agonist and inhaled corticosteroid) product (36.7%) and inhaled corticosteroid (22.0%). Long acting beta agonists (single formulation) were taken by 4.2% of patients.

Of the 1,030 patients with asthma, medication data were available for 1,022. Of these, over half (57.2%) were taking an inhaled corticosteroid (ICS), alone or as a combination product. More than 4 in 5 asthma patients (83.5%) were taking a reliever (beta agonist alone or in combination). Of all patients with asthma over half (52.7%) were taking a reliever and preventer, while a further 30.7% were taking a reliever only. Relatively few asthma patients were taking a preventer only (4.5%).

Severity of asthma in children was low, with 78.0% having infrequent asthma, 14.4% having frequent and 7.6% persistent asthma. In adults, severity was also low with about one-third each having very mild (37.1%) or mild (34.0%) asthma. Only 24.0% had moderate and 5.0% severe asthma.

Of asthma patients taking an ICS, half were taking fluticasone/salmeterol (50.6%), followed by fluticasone propionate (17.3%), budesonide (13.7%) and budesonide/eformoterol (12.8%).

GPs indicated that most asthma patients taking an ICS (85.6%) were adequately managed by the current ICS dose. Only 8.4% of asthma patients on an ICS were not adequately managed, and in another 6.0% they were unsure if the ICS dosage was adequately managing asthma.

The ICS dose was not altered since last asthma exacerbation for 58.0% of asthma patients on an ICS. Over half (51.6%) gave stability of the asthma as the reason for not altering the

dosage. A further 14.9% decreased their ICS dosage since last exacerbation and 9.8% stopped the ICS.

For other related abstracts see: 3 Asthma, 22 Asthma – prevalence, severity and management, 39 Severity of asthma, medications and management, 48 Asthma prevalence and management, 63 Asthma-prevalence, management and medication side-effects, 96 Inhaled corticosteroid use for asthma management, 104 Asthma management and medication use among patients attending general practice.

Further reading:

Henderson, J., Knox, S., Pan, Y., & Britt, H. 2004, 'Changes in asthma management in Australian general practice', *Prim.Care Respir.J*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 138–143.

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

Severity of asthma reference card

Children

Severity*	Common features
Infrequent episodic	Episodes 6-8 weeks or more apart and from 1to 2 days up to 1-2 weeks duration; usually triggered by URTI or environmental allergen; attacks generally not severe; symptoms rare between attacks; normal examination and lung function except when symptomatic.
Frequent episodic	Attacks <6 weeks apart; attacks more troublesome; minimal symptoms such as exercise induces wheeze between attacks; normal examination and lung function except when symptomatic; commonly troubled through winter months only.
Persistent	Symptoms most days; nocturnal asthma > 1/wk with sleep disturbance; early morning chest tightness; exercise intolerance and spontaneous wheeze; daily use of beta2 antagonist; 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 asymptomatic						
Moderate	Symptoms most days; exacerbations <6-8 weeks apart which affect day-time activity and sleep; exacerbations last several days; occasional emergency room visit.						
Severe	Persistent; limited activity level; nocturnal symptoms > 1/wk; frequent emergency room visits and hospital admission in past year; FEV ₁ may be significantly reduced between exacerbations.						
* The severity classes are adapted from the NAC Asthma Management Handbook 1998 edition, updated March 2002							

182

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

INSTRUCTIONS



71 Patient BMI, morbidity and medication use in adults

Organisation supporting this study: Merck Sharp and Dohme (Australia) Pty Ltd

Issues: The proportion of general practice patients who are underweight, in a normal weight range, overweight or obese *according to their body mass index (BMI)*; the selected conditions for which adult patients are being prescribed a medication; the types of medications that are being prescribed for these conditions; the duration of each of the conditions since diagnosis.

Sample: 1,913 adult respondents (18 years and over) from 75 GPs; data collection period: 20/07/2004 – 23/08/2004.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Summary of results

The age-sex distribution of the adult respondents was similar to the distribution for all adult BEACH encounters, with the majority of patients (57.1%) being female. Patients aged 45–64 years accounted for 26.8% of the sample.

In this analysis, the standard method of BMI was applied to adults (aged 18+ years) only. Therefore, the sample size was 1,913 adult patients. Of the 1,735 patients for when BMI could be calculated, more than half (56.8%, 95% CI: 51.0–62.5) were overweight or obese and 7.6% (95% CI: 6.1–9.0) were underweight. One-third (35.7%, 95% CI: 32.8–38.6) had a normal BMI.

Of 1,913 adult respondents, one-quarter (25.4%) were taking a prescribed medication for hypertension, 12.1% for elevated cholesterol, 11.5% for osteoarthritis, 8.9% for depression, 7.3% for cardiovascular disease (CVD) or peripheral vascular disease (PVD), and 6.1% were taking a prescribed medication for diabetes type 2.

There were 649 prescribed medications for hypertension in adult patients. Perindopril and irbesartan were the most common medications (10.5% and 10.3% respectively). They were followed by ramipril (9.2%) and atenolol (8.9%).

Of 411 adult patients taking a prescribed medication for hypertension and responding to the question about duration of hypertension since diagnosis, 84.9% had suffered from hypertension for more than 24 months, 4.9% for about 24 months and 6.3% for approximately 12 months. The remainder (3.9%) had hypertension newly diagnosed.

In the overweight or obese adult respondents (n=985), about one-third (32.0%) were taking a prescribed medication for hypertension, 15.8% for elevated cholesterol, 14.2% for osteoarthritis, 10.0% for depression, 8.6% for diabetes type 2, and 8.5% for CVD or PVD.

Of the 750 underweight or normal weight adult respondents, 18.0% were taking a prescribed medication for hypertension, 9.2% for osteoarthritis, 7.9% for depression, 7.3% for elevated cholesterol, 6.3% for CVD or PVD, and 2.4% for diabetes type 2.

Overweight or obese adult patients were more likely to be taking a prescribed medication for hypertension, elevated cholesterol, and diabetes type 2, when compared with their underweight or normal weight adult counterparts.

For other related abstracts see: 55 Patient weight, perception of weight and weight loss, 68 Patient weight, perception of weight and weight loss in adults, 69 Patient weight, methods and medications tried for weight loss in adults and Section 4.1 Body mass index of adults.

Further reading:

Charles, J., Britt, H., & Knox, S. 2006, 'Patient perception of their weight, attempts to lose weight and their diabetes status', *Australian Family Physician*, vol. 35, no. 11, pp. 925–928.

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **PATIENT CONDITIONS and MEDICATION USE.** You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

INSTRUCTIONS

<u>ASK THE PATIENT</u> ALL the following questions



185

72 Contraception use among female general practice patients aged 16–44 years

Organisation supporting this study: Janssen-Cilag Pty Ltd

Issues: The prevalence of contraception use in female patients aged 16 years or more and the type of contraception used; where an oral contraception pill (OCP) was prescribed for contraception, the name of OCP used; the type of prescription for the OCP, and the patient reported level of compliance with the OCP regimen.

Sample: 536 female patient respondents (aged 16 to 44 years) from 76 GPs; data collection period: 13/07/2004 – 30/10/2004.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Summary of results

Five hundred and thirty-six women aged 16 to 44 years answered the questions on contraception. Nearly half (49.8, 95% CI: 42.9–56.8) were on a form of contraception. Of those on contraception, the majority were using an oral contraceptive (63.2%), 8.7% (23/266) were using implants, 5.3% (14/266) were using pharmacological injections, and 15.0% (40/266) were using condoms. Only 2 women were using diaphragms for contraception.

Just over half of young female patients aged 16–24 years were using a form of contraception (56.1%). Slightly fewer than half the women aged 25 to 44 years were using a contraceptive (47.4%). Women aged 25–44 years were less likely to be using oral contraceptives (27.8%, 95% CI: 22.3–33.4) than younger women (40.8%, 95% CI: 33.5–48.2).

Nearly one-quarter (24.4%) of women on oral contraceptives reported obtaining the contraceptive through private prescription. For private prescriptions the most common medication was cyptroterone/ethinyloestradiol (51.3%), followed by drospirenone/ethinylestradiol (20.5%) and levonorgestrel/ethinyloestradiol (20.5%). The most common oral contraceptive medications overall were levonorgestrel/ethinyloestradiol (63.3%), cyproterone/ethinyloestradiol (13.9%) and norethisterone/ethinyloestradiol (7.8%). Over half of the patients on oral contraceptives.

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

INSTRUCTIONS



73 Warfarin use in patients with qualifying morbidity

Organisation supporting this study: AstraZeneca (Australia) Pty Ltd

Issues: The prevalence of conditions (or history of conditions) indicating anticoagulants as appropriate therapy; the proportion of these patients taking warfarin; the reasons for not taking warfarin for those conditions.

Sample: 2,572 respondents from 89 GPs; data collection period: 24/08/2004 – 27/09/2004.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Summary of results

The age and sex distribution of this subsample was similar to the annual BEACH sample. Three per cent (n=79) had/had a history of atrial fibrillation, 1.3% (n=33) had/had a history of stroke, 1.2% (n=32) transient ischaemic attack, 1.2% (n=30) deep vein thrombosis and 0.7% (n=17) had/had a history of pulmonary embolism. Multiple listed conditions were allowed for a patient.

The majority of the 2,572 respondents, 93.2%, (95% CI: 91.4–95.0) had none of the listed conditions, and 159, 6.2% (95% CI: 4.5–7.9), had/had a history of one. Only 16 patients, 0.6% (95% CI: 0.3–1.0), had/had a history of two conditions.

Of 173 patients having/with a history of at least one listed condition and for whom age could be calculated, more than three-quarters (77.5%) were aged 65 years and over, 16.2% were between 45 and 64 years, and 6.4% were 25–44 years old. Of 173 patients having/with a history of at least one of the listed conditions and their sex recorded, about half (49.1%) were male.

Of 174 patients having/with a history of at least one of the listed conditions, 52.3% (95% CI: 39.3–65.3) were currently taking warfarin. Of 78 patients having/with a history of atrial fibrillation and responding to the question about warfarin use, 69.2% were currently taking warfarin. Among 17 patients having/with a history of pulmonary embolism, 14 (82.4%) were using warfarin. Of 30 patients having/with a history of deep vein thrombosis and responding to the warfarin use question, 70% (*n*=21) were currently taking warfarin.

Patients having/with a history of stroke or transient ischaemic attack, were less likely to use warfarin. Of 33 patients having/with a history of stroke and responding to the warfarin use question, eight (24.2%) were taking warfarin. Among 32 patients having/with a history of transient ischaemic attack and responding to this question, four (12.5%) were using warfarin.

Of 83 patients having/with a history of at least one of the listed conditions and responding to the question about reason(s) for not using warfarin (multiple response allowed), 30.1% (*n*=25) indicated that the risk of bleeding outweighs risk reduction, four (4.8%) indicated there were contraindications, three (3.6%) recorded drug interactions, eight (9.6%) were due to patient preference, nine (10.8%) patients were unable to cope with monitoring/dose adjustment, 47 (56.6%) were using anti-thrombotics other than warfarin, and 22 (26.5%) suggested other reasons.

There were 42 anti-thrombotics other than warfarin being used for the listed conditions. Of these aspirin was most common (54.8%, n=23), followed by clopidogrel (n=7, 16.7%) and aspirin +dipyridamole (n=6, 14.3%).

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

INSTRUCTIONS



74 Smoking and passive smoking in the home

Organisation supporting this study: Australian General Practice Statistics and Classification Centre (AGPSCC)

Issues: Exposure to tobacco smoke in the home environment (all patients); the current smoking status of adult patients; attempts of daily smokers to quit or reduce tobacco use; years since quitting for previous smokers.

Sample: 2,789 respondents from 96 GPs; data collection period: 24/08/2004 – 27/09/2004.

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 the majority of patients (57.1%) being female. Patients aged 45–64 years accounted for 28.1% of the sample.

When asked about smoking in the home, almost half the respondents (47.8%) indicated 'smoking is permitted outside only' and a further one-third (32.2%) indicated that 'people are not permitted to smoke anywhere'. Smoking was permitted only in certain areas inside the home in 4.5% of respondents' households, in the house occasionally in 5.8%, or in the house frequently in 9.7% of households.

So, in the majority of households there was no passive smoke in the home (80.1%, 95% CI: 77.2–83.0). In a further 10.3% (95% CI: 8.3–12.3) of households there was limited passive smoke (where smoking is permitted only in certain areas, or smoking in the home is only occasional), and in 9.7% (95% CI: 7.8–11.6) of households there was unlimited passive smoke.

Patients aged 18 years and over were asked to indicate their smoking status. About half (49.1%) had never smoked, and 28.5% were previous smokers. Daily smokers accounted for 17.9% of the responding patients and a further 4.5% reported smoking occasionally.

Of the 434 adult daily smokers, data on their quit/reduction attempts during the previous 12 months was available for 420. Each could indicate more than one quit/reduction option attempted. Only 7.4% had successfully given up smoking for 1 month or more (but subsequently started again), and one-third (33.1%) had a failed quit attempt during the past 12 months. About one in ten adult daily smokers (11.2%) had changed to a lower tar or nicotine brand cigarette, and about a quarter (23.1%) had reduced the average number of cigarettes smoked per day.

In the previous 12 months: over one-third of adult daily smokers (37.9%) had attempted to quit smoking by either quitting for 1 month or more (then starting again) and/or having an unsuccessful quit attempt; over a quarter of all adult daily smokers (28.1%) had attempted to reduce smoking effects by changing brand and/or reducing the number of cigarettes smoked.

For other related abstracts see: 12 Smoking and passive smoking in general practice patients, 35 Smoking status of adults and their attempts to quit, 53 Smoking status of adults and their attempts to quit and Section 4.3 Smoking. Further reading:

Valenti, L., Charles, J., & Britt, H. 2005, 'Passive smoke in Australian homes: 1999 to 2004 [letter]', Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 387–388.

Doran, C. M., Valenti, L., Robinson, M., Britt, H., & Mattick, R. P. 2006, 'Smoking status of Australian general practice patients and their attempts to quit', *Addict.Behav.*, vol. 31, no. 5, pp. 758–766.

Degenhardt L, Knox S, Barker B, Britt H, Shakeshaft A. The management of alcohol, tobacco and illicit drug use problems by general practitioners in Australia. *Drug Alcohol Rev* 2005; 24(6):499–506.

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

INSTRUCTIONS

PLEASE NOTE:

The home smoking question is asked of <u>all</u> patients, but smoking status is only asked of patients <u>18 years of age and over</u>.

The term 'smoking' here is used to mean tobacco smoking of any kind, including cigarettes, pipes and cigars.

191



75 Prevalence, management and investigations for chronic heart failure

Organisation supporting this study: Roche Products Pty Ltd

Issues: Prevalence and severity of chronic heart failure (CHF) among patients attending general practice; types of management (whether the management was initiated by a GP or specialist, and the main objective of management); proportion of patients referred to a cardiac specialist; clinical investigations used to diagnose CHF.

Sample: 2,735 respondents from 95 GPs; data collection period: 28/09/2004 - 01/11/2004.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Summary of results

The age-sex distribution of respondents was similar to the distribution of patients at all BEACH encounters, with the majority (60.4%) of patients being female.

The prevalence of CHF among the 2,735 respondents was estimated to be 4.2% (95% CI: 3.1–5.2). Mild CHF was diagnosed in 2.2% of patients, while 1.4% and 0.6% were diagnosed with moderate and severe CHF respectively. Of male patients, 4.8% were diagnosed with CHF compared with 3.7% of female patients. Patients aged 75 years and over had the highest age-specific rate of CHF (18.1%).

The medications most commonly used for the control of CHF were frusemide (30.3% of CHF medications), followed by digoxin (8.8%), ramipril (8.0%) and perindopril (5.6%). Specialists initiated 59.4% of CHF medications and GPs initiated the remainder (40.6%).

GPs used a scoring system (1=most important to 3=least important) to rank the factors they considered most important in the management of CHF. The factors of 'symptom management' (score 1.4, 95% CI: 1.2–1.6) and 'quality of life' (score 1.6, 95% CI: 1.4–1.8) were rated equally important in the management of CHF, and these were significantly more important than 'survival' (score 2.2, 95% CI: 2.0–2.4).

The majority (85.1%) of patients diagnosed with CHF had been referred to a cardiac specialist: 46.7% were referred more than 3 years ago, 21.5% were referred between 1 and 3 years ago, and the remainder (16.8%) had been referred during the previous 12 months.

Multiple investigations could be used in diagnosing CHF. Chest x-ray had been used in diagnosing CHF in 71.9% of cases, ECHO had been used in 74.6% of cases and ECG in 65.8% of cases. GPs had ordered 60.8% of chest x-rays, 25.3% of ECHOs and 56.7% of ECGs, with cardiac specialists ordering the rest.

For other related abstracts see: 31 Prevalence and severity of chronic heart failure, 38 Prevalence of chronic heart failure, its management and control, 57 Prevalence and management of chronic heart failure in general practice patients, 77 Heart failure-underlying causes and medication management, 90 Prevalence, management and investigations for chronic heart failure.

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

INSTRUCTIONS



76 Patients with risk factors for metabolic syndrome

Organisation supporting this study: Merck Sharp and Dohme (Australia) Pty Ltd

Issues: Prevalence of the following risk factors in patients attending general practice. All patients: triglycerides >150 mg/dL (1.68 mmol/L); blood pressure >130/85 mmHg; fasting glucose >110 mg/dL (6.1 mmol/L).

Males: waist circumference >102 cm (>40 ins); HDL cholesterol <40 mg/dL (1.03 mmol/L). Females: waist circumference >88 cm (>35 ins); HDL cholesterol <50 mg/dL (1.29 mmol/L).

Sample: 2,845 encounters from 96 GPs; data collection period: 02/11/2004 - 06/12/2004.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Summary of results

The age-sex distribution of 2,845 respondents was similar to the distribution for all BEACH encounters, with the majority of patients (58.1%) being female.

None of the risk factors were present in 57.2% of the sample. One in five patients (22.7%) had one listed risk factor, 10.9% had two, 5.6% had three, 2.7% had four, and 1.1% (n=30) had all five.

However of the 674 male patients without any risk factors 81% did not know or had never been tested for at least one factor. This represented 45% of the 1,190 male patients surveyed. Only one-third of male patients (33.0%) knew their status on all five factors. Of the 1,654 female patients with no recorded risk factors, 89% did not know their status for at least one factor. Only one-third (31.8%) of female patients knew their status on all five factors. The number of risk factors present increased with age.

Among the 1,190 male respondents, 23.6% had blood pressure >130/>85 mmHg, 18.8% had a waist circumference >102 cm, 18.1% had triglyceride levels >150 mg/dL, 10.7% had HDLC <40 mg/dL and 10.3% had fasting glucose >110 mg/dL.

Among the 1,654 female respondents, one in five (20.7%) had blood pressure >130/>85 mmHg. Nearly one-quarter (23.3%) had a waist circumference of >88 cm and 14.9% had triglyceride levels >150 mg/dL, 7.6% had HDLC <50 mg/dL and 13.4% had fasting glucose >110 mg/dL.

Considering these results in terms of the number of patients for whom status was known: 26.9% of 1,275 females had blood pressure >130/>85 mmHg; 36.2% of 1,065 females had a waist circumference >88 cm; 29.3% of 873 females had triglyceride levels >150 mg/dL; 17.7% of 713 females had HDLC <50 mg/dL; 13.4% of 941 females had fasting glucose >110 mg/dL; 32.9% of 851 males had blood pressure >130/>85 mmHg; 28.7% of 780 males had a waist circumference >102 cm; 33.8% of 637 males had triglyceride levels >150 mg/dL; 23.5% of 541 males had HDLC <40 mg/dL and 18.9% of 646 males had fasting glucose >110 mg/dL.

Of the total respondents, 9.3% had metabolic syndrome defined as 3 or more of the nominated risk factors (4.8% males and 4.5% of females). For males, 392 had been tested for all risk factors and 103 (31.3%) had metabolic syndrome defined as 3 or more of the nominated risk factors. For females, 525 had been tested for all risk factors and 102 (19.4%) had metabolic syndrome defined as 3 or more of the nominated risk factors.

For other related abstracts see: 92 Metabolic syndrome and ethnic origin.

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **PATIENT RISK FACTORS for METABOLIC SYNDROME.** You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

INSTRUCTIONS

Ask <u>ALL</u> of the <u>next 30 PATIENTS</u> the following questions

in the order in which the patients are seen.

Please <u>DO NOT</u> select patients to suit the topic being investigated.

The first three questions are for all patients.

The last two questions are slightly different for male and female patients because health risks occur at different levels for males and females when assessing abdominal obesity and HDL (high density lipoprotein) cholesterol.

For each risk factor, if you do not know a level because the patient is someone you have not seen before, or if the patient has never been tested, please tick the 'don't know / never tested' option.

Does this patient have any of the following:-		Yes	No	Don't know / never tested	(Male patients) Waist circumference >102 cm (>40 ins)	Yes	No □	Don't know / never tested
	Triglycerides >150 mg/dL (1.68 mmol/L)				HDL cholesterol <40 mg/dL (1.03 mmol/L)			
	Blood pressure >130/>85 mmHg				(Female patients) Waist circumference >88 cm (>35 ins))			
BL67C	Fasting glucose >110 mg/dL (6.1 mmol/L)				HDL cholesterol <50 mg/dL (1.29 mmol/L)			

77 Heart failure—underlying causes and medication management

Organisation supporting this study: Janssen-Cilag Pty Ltd

Issues: The prevalence of heart failure in patients attending general practice; severity of heart failure in these patients; the underlying causes of heart failure; the health professional who initially diagnosed the heart failure; current medication management, and the rate of hospitalisation of patients with heart failure.

Sample: 2,660 respondents from 91 GPs; data collection period: 07/12/2004 – 17/01/2005. **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 of patients (56.3%) being female. Patients aged over 75 years accounted for 16.9% of the sample.

The severity of heart failure was defined using the New York Heart Association Classification. There were 4 classes, Class I (least severe) to Class IV (most severe). Class I heart failure was diagnosed in 2.1% of general practice patients, while 2.7%, 0.9% and 0.2% were diagnosed with Class II, III and IV heart failure respectively.

The prevalence of diagnosed heart failure in the general practice patient sample was 6.1% (95% CI: 4.7–7.6) (n=163). In male patients, 6.3% had been diagnosed with heart failure compared with 5.9% of female patients. Patients aged 75+ had the highest age-specific rates, with 23.3% diagnosed with heart failure.

Multiple responses were allowed to the question about the underlying causes of heart failure. A total of 241 causes were given. Of the 163 patients with heart failure, 93 (57.1%) had hypertension and 89 (54.6%) had ischaemic heart disease as the underlying cause(s) of heart failure. Twenty (12.3%) had acute myocardial infarction, and 39 (23.9%) had causes other than the three above-mentioned conditions.

Initial diagnosis of heart failure was made by a GP for 61.9% of patients, by a cardiologist for 33.1%, and the remaining patients (5.0%) were diagnosed by an 'other health professional'.

For each heart failure patient, up to five medications for heart failure could be recorded by the GP. Three or more medications for heart failure were taken by one-third (33.8%) of heart failure patients. On average each patient took two medications for heart failure. There were a total of 338 medications listed for the 163 heart failure patients.

The medication most commonly used for the control of heart failure was frusemide, followed by digoxin, perindopril, and carvedilol (23.1%, 9.8%, 7.4% and 5.9% of heart failure medications respectively).

Of the 153 heart failure patients responding to the question about hospitalisation for heart failure, the majority (83.0%) had not been hospitalised in the past 12 months. Eighteen (11.8%) were hospitalised for decompensated/exacerbated heart failure, four (2.6%) were hospitalised for medication change, and nine (5.9%) were hospitalised for other reasons.

For other related abstracts see: 31 Prevalence and severity of chronic heart failure, 38 Prevalence of chronic heart failure, its management and control, 57 Prevalence and management of chronic heart failure in general practice patients, 75 Prevalence, management and investigations for chronic heart failure, 90 Prevalence, management and investigations for chronic heart failure, failure.

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

INSTRUCTIONS

Ask ALL of the next 30 PATIENTS the following questions

in the order in which the patients are seen.

Please DO NOT select patients to suit the topic being investigated.

Heart failure Please indicate by ticking the appropriate box whether this patient currently has heart failure at a level classified as follows:-Class I - patients with no limitation of activities; they suffer no Hospitalisations symptoms from ordinary activities. Medications If the patient was hospitalised Class II - patients with slight, mild limitation of activity; they are Please advise which medication/s because of their heart failure comfortable with rest or with mild exertion during the previous 12 months. Class III - patients with marked limitation of activity; they are this patient is taking for heart failure please incidated the reason comfortable only at rest management, including the name Class IV - patients who should be at complete rest, confined to & form, the strength, dose and using the tick boxes. Tick as bed or chair, any physical activity brings on discomfort and symptoms frequency of use for each many reasons as apply. occur at rest. (New York Heart Association Classificaton) medication. In the spaces provided, please If 'No' you should end the auestions here. write in the number of times the patient was hospitalised and the length of stay (in days) for their Underlying cause(s) Initial diagnosis most recent hospitalisation. Please advise who initially diagnosed If 'YES' please advise the heart failure in this patient (i.e., GP / underlying cause(s) of cardiologist / other health professional). this patient's heart failure. How many times has this patient been hospitalised Underlying cause(s) of Heart failure medications currently taken are? Does this patient suffer Heart failure was because of their heart failure in the past 12 months? initially diagnosed by: the heart failure are: from heart failure? Name & Form Strength Dose Frequency Most recent GP GP No. of times Yes - Class I Hypertension □ None Length of stay 1. Yes - Class II IHD Decompensated/ 2. davs Yes - Class III exacerbated AMI Other health 3. Yes - Class IV professional:-Other:-Medication change days 4. Yes - Class unknown Other days 5. \square No \rightarrow End questions (please specify) (please specify) (please specify) BL68B

78 NSAID & acid suppressant use in general practice patients

Organisation supporting this study: AstraZeneca (Australia) Pty Ltd

Issues: Proportion of patients taking non-specific non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs, COX-2 inhibitors or aspirin, the indications for their use, therapeutic regimen and duration of therapy; proportion also taking an acid suppressant medication, their therapeutic regimen and duration of therapy; proportion of patients on all NSAIDs with existing or pre-existing gastrointestinal disorders; the relationship of acid suppressant and NSAID use and the reason for that relationship.

Sample: 2,783 respondents from 96 GPs; data collection period: 07/12/2004 – 17/01/2005 **Method:** Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Summary of results

The age and sex distributions of respondents were similar to the distribution for all BEACH (general practice) encounters, with the majority (56.2%) of patients being female.

Three-quarters (75.8%) of the patients were not on any NSAID or aspirin medication. Eleven per cent were taking aspirin, 7.7% were taking a non-specific NSAID and 6.9% were taking a COX-2 inhibitor. Regimens combining two or more of the medications were uncommon (1.3% of patients).

Non-specific NSAIDS were most commonly (71.0%) used as necessary. However most (52.8%) patients had been taking them for over 12 months with 16.3% taking NSAIDs continuously for more than 12 months. Most (54.0%) COX-2 inhibitors were used continuously and 34.0% had been used continuously for over 12 months. Almost all (89.2%) patients reported in this study as taking aspirin were taking it continuously and most (82.1%) for more than 12 months.

A quarter (25.0%) of 144 patients were taking non-specific NSAIDs for various forms of arthritis while this was the indication for almost three-quarters (70.8%) of the 127 patients taking COX-2 inhibitors. In contrast 9 out of 10 (90.2%) of 204 patients were on aspirin for preventive care.

About one-third (31.5%) of NSAID patients had at least one gastrointestinal (GI) condition. The vast majority (27.8%) of these were GI symptoms with small numbers of peptic ulcers (3.4%) or GI bleeds (2.2%).

Almost a third of patients on NSAIDS were taking acid suppression medication (32.0%). The rate of acid suppression medication use was significantly higher for those on COX-2 inhibitors (40.9%, 95% CI: 33.0–48.8), than for those on non-specific NSAIDS (22.1%, 95% CI: 16.2–28.0) but not statistically different from the rate for patients on aspirin (34.2%, 95% CI: 27.6–40.8).

The most common acid suppression medication was a proton pump inhibitor (65.2% of listed medications) followed by H2RA inhibitors (17.8%) and antacids (17.0%). Acid suppressants were most commonly taken for treatment of GI symptoms with smaller numbers being taken for prevention of symptoms (16.0%). Almost a third (31.6) of acid suppressants were being taken for reasons unrelated to NSAID therapy.

For other related abstracts see: 49 Health status and management of patients on non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs, 88 Arthritis rates and NSAID use in general practice patients, 29 Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDS) and acid suppressant use.

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **NSAID and acid supressant use.** You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

INSTRUCTIONS

Ask ALL of the next 30 PATIENTS the following questions

in the order in which the patients are seen.

Please DO NOT select patients to suit the topic being

investigated.

Medication use

Please indicate by ticking the appropriate box whether this patient is currently taking a NSAID and/or aspirin and write in the space provided the reason for the NSAID/ aspirin use.

NB - selective Cox-2 NSAIDs include coxibs (Celebrex) AND meloxicam (Mobic)

Please circle an option to advise whether the NSAID and/or aspirin is taken as required (prn) or continually and the duration of usage (in months). Include any NSAID and/or aspirin that will be commenced following today's consultation.

If <u>no</u> NSAID or aspirin is being taken you should tick the box marked 'None of the above' and end the questions here.

If a NSAID and/or aspirin <u>is</u> being taken please advise whether the patient is also taking any acid suppressant medication, either prescribed or an over-the-counter (OTC) preparation. Write in the space provided the name of the acid suppressant and circle an option to indicate whether it is being taken as required or continually, and the duration of usage (in months).

Conditions

Please use the tick boxes to indicate the patient's status regarding the listed conditions.

Circle an option to advise whether this condition currently exists or is one of which the patient has a history.

Related medication use

If the patient's acid suppression use is related to their NSAID / aspirin use, please use the tick boxes to indicate the reason.

	\mathbf{v}				\checkmark	∨
	Medication	<u>Reason</u>	<u>Taken</u>	For how many months?	Departicle methods to many of the	Is the acid suppression use related to
Is this patient taking any	Non-specific NSAID		pm/continually	<3 / 3-6 / 6-12 / >12	following?	the patient's NSAID/aspirin use?
of the following	Cox-2 NSAID		pm/continually	<3 / 3-6 / 6-12 / >12		Yes - treatment of GI symptoms
medications? \rightarrow	Aspirin		pm/continually	<3 / 3-6 / 6-12 / >12	GI Bleeding existing/history of	Yes - prevention of GI symptoms
	None of the above -	\rightarrow End questions	(please circle)	(please circle)	Peptic ulcer existing/history of	\square Yes - treatment of ulcer or bleed
If so, are they also taking			pm/continually	<3 / 3-6 / 6-12 / >12	GI symptoms existing/history of	☐ Yes - prevention of ulcer or bleed
medication (prescribed	Yes		pm/continually	<3 / 3-6 / 6-12 / >12	(eg dyspepsia, reflux) (please circle)	□ other
or OIC) (please specily) →	□ No		(please circle)	(please circle)	None of the above	No (please specify)

79 Hypertension and dyslipidaemia—comorbidity and management in general practice patients

Organisation supporting this study: Pfizer Australia Pty Ltd

Issues: The prevalence of diagnosed hypertension and/or dyslipidaemia in patients attending general practice; comorbidities experienced by patients with diagnosed hypertension and/or dyslipidaemia; current medications used to treat diagnosed hypertension and/or dyslipidaemia; other treatments used for diagnosed hypertension and/or dyslipidaemia.

Sample: 2,874 respondents from 97 GPs; data collection period: 18/01/2005 – 21/02/2005.

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 of patients (56.9%) being female. Respondents aged between 45 and 64 years accounted for 29.3% of the sample, and 27.2% of the respondents were aged 65 years or more.

Diagnosed hypertension was present in 1,050 patients (28.1%, 95% CI: 25.1–31.0), while 24.0% of patients had diagnosed dyslipidaemia (95% CI: 20.9–27.0). Both conditions were present in 423 of these patients (15.2% of the 2,789 encounters where the status of both conditions was known). Just over one-third of patients (36.7%) had either hypertension and/or dyslipidaemia.

The presence of listed comorbidities was questioned for patients with diagnosed hypertension and/or dyslipidaemia. Of the 832 respondents diagnosed with hypertension and/or dyslipidaemia who completed the question on comorbidities, half (49.9%) did not have any of the listed conditions (49.9%). The most common condition listed as a comorbidity was diabetes (27.0%), followed by ischaemic heart disease (21.9%). Heart failure (8.1%), peripheral vascular disease (6.5%), stroke (6.3%) and renal disease (5.5%) were less common.

Details regarding the use of 14 specified medications were also asked of patients with diagnosed hypertension and/or dyslipidaemia. Four of the medications listed were lipid lowering medications, and 10 were anti-hypertensives. The majority of patients with hypertension and/or dyslipidaemia who responded to the question on medications (n=1,032) were taking only one medication (39.9%), while 31.3% of patients were taking two of the medications listed. There were 12.2% of patients not taking any of the listed medications.

Of the listed lipid lowering medications, the most frequently used was atorvastatin (23.7%). Other statins were used by 24.0% of patients. The most commonly used anti-hypertensives were ACE inhibitors (31.3%), followed by beta-blockers (17.3%) and angiotensin-2 receptor antagonists (13.2%).

For the 126 patients not taking medications for the treatment of hypertension and/or dyslipidaemia, the most common reasons for non-medication (multiple response allowed) were treatment of the condition with diet (82.5%), followed by treatment with exercise (53.2%).

For other related abstracts see: 15 Lipid lowering medication, 20 Screening and management of blood cholesterol, 26 Prevalence of diagnosed hypertension and difficulties in treatment, 30 Lipid lowering medications and coronary heart disease, 46 Coronary heart disease, risk factors and lipid lowering medication, 58 Lipid lowering medications: patient eligibility under PBS, 59 Hypertension management and control in general practice patients, 64 Current use of statins by general practice patients, 67 Risk factors of patients on lipid lowering medications, 97 Statin medication use among high CHD risk patients attending general practice, 98 Management of hypertension and angina in general practice patients, 99 Lipid management in patients with high risk conditions.

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

INSTRUCTIONS

Ask ALL of the next 30 PATIENTS the following questions

in the order in which the patients are seen.

Please DO NOT select patients to suit the topic being investigated.

	Hypertension and / or dys	lipidaemia				
	Please indicate by ticking th whether this patient currentl hypertension and / or dysli	e appropriate box y has diagnosed ipidaemia				
	If neither condition has be either today or previously, yo questions here.	en diagnosed, ou should end the	Me Ple wh	edications ease use the tick boxes to advise hich medication/s this patient is prently taking for hypertension	N If oi	lon-use of medication the patient has hypertension r dyslipidaemia but is NOT aking a medication for
		Other co-morbidity Please advise whether the patient also has any of the listed conditions. Tick as many as apply. If the patient has none of these conditions, please tick the box labelled		dyslipidaemia. Tick as many as ply.	fc n lf W T	The reason is not listed, please write it in the space provided. Tick as many as apply.
		none of the above'.]	\downarrow		
D	oes this patient have diagnosed	If 'yes' to either, do they also have: Tick o	all patient's current r	medications for hypertension or dyslip	idaemia	If the patient is taking NO medication
	- Hypertension	Diabetes - type I or II Ischaemic heart disease Peripheral vascular disease	atorvastatin other statin fibrate	 ACE inhibitor combination AT2 antagonist AT2 combination 	one \rightarrow	for hypertension or dyslipidaemia, why not? (fick as many I treated with diet asapply)
	- Dyslipidaemia 🛛 Yes 🗌 No	Renal disease I Stroke (current or history) I Heart failure I	bile acid sequestra diuretic beta-blocker	ant amlodipine (fick o other DHP CCB as app non-DHP CCB	s many y]	 treated with exercise intolerance to medication Other
lf	neither, end questions here	□ None of the above □	ACE inhibitor	other (including alpha-block	er)	(please specify) BL69B

80 Employment status and workers compensation claims in general practice patients

Organisation supporting this study: Australian General Practice Statistics and Classification Centre (AGPSCC) on behalf of the National Occupational Health and Safety Commission

Issues: Types of problems managed for patients aged 15 years and over from different workforce categories and industries; work-related problems; workers' compensation claim status of work-related problems; reasons for not claiming workers' compensation for work-related problems.

Sample: 5,513 respondents aged 15 years and over from 211 GPs; data collection period: 18/01/2005 – 28/03/2005.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Methods for this study: A card listing the industries of employment was provided to participating GPS. Patients were asked to select the industry in which they are currently employed.

Summary of results

The age-sex distribution of patients was the same as the average BEACH results for 2003–2004, with the majority (57.4%) being female. Employment data were recorded for 5,486 patients aged 15 years and over, and 41.5% (95% CI: 38.9–44.2) of them were employed or self-employed.

Of the 2,205 currently employed or self-employed patients who answered the question on industry of employment, 19.1% (95% CI: 17.2–21.1) worked in health and community services, 11.1% (95% CI: 8.7–13.4) worked in manufacturing and 10.1% (95% CI: 8.6–11.6) were in the retail trade.

A total of 3,095 problems were managed for the employed/self-employed patients, most commonly skin or musculoskeletal problems which together made up about one-quarter of these problems. Musculoskeletal problems were the most common problems managed for patients working in the manufacturing, transport, construction and recreational services industries, while skin problems were most common for those in health and community services and the retail industry. Respiratory problems were the most common for government, defence and education workers.

There were 235 work-related problems managed, accounting for 5.7% of the total. Almost one-third of skin injuries managed for these patients were work-related as were almost 30.0% of back complaints and sprains/strains. One-quarter of fractures and acute stress reactions managed for these patients were work-related.

Of the 235 work-related problems, almost 70.0% were managed at workers' compensation claimable encounters. The most common of these problems was back complaint, followed by sprain/strain. At encounters not covered by workers' compensation, the most common work-related problem managed was complete medical examination, followed by acute stress reaction.

For the 67 problems that were managed at encounters where a workers' compensation claim was not made, GPs recorded 37 reasons for not claiming. Most frequently the reason given was 'not serious enough'. Less frequently the reason was that the patient was self-employed. *For other related abstracts see: 6 Employment status and workers' compensation claims, 11 Patient employment status and occupation.*

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

INSTRUCTIONS

Ask <u>ALL</u> of the <u>next 30 PATIENTS</u> the following questions

in the order in which the patients are seen.

Please DO NOT select patients to suit the topic being

investigated.

	Patient employment statusIndustry of Please giv Industry of card from kit and asi the indust are currer (either self employed the tick bo patient's re employment status.Ask all patients 15 years of age and over, how they would describe their current employment status.For indust tick box lis from this li and write		Industry of en Please give th Industry of en card from you kit and ask the the industry in are currently (either self-em employed by a the tick boxes patient's respond For industries tick box list, se from this list - and write it in labelled 'othe	mploymenthe patient the mploymentur research em to advise in which they employed or another). Use to indicate the onse.not on the elect a number →not he box1 - 5 are listed in the s 6. Mining 7. Electricity, Gas & Wate 8. Wholesale Trade 9. Retail Trade 10. Accommodation, Cafes Restaurants 11. Communication Servic 12. Finance & Insurance 13. Property & Business S 14. Government Administra 15. Education 16. Cultural & Recreationa			below y Defence	Workers' compensation claims If the patient had a work-related problem managed at today's encounter but has NOT made or WILL NOT make a workers' compensation claim for that problem, please advise the reason for <u>not</u> claiming.	
]		
Wh	at is this patient's current emp	oloyment status?		If currently		1. Manufacturing	If no workers	Not serious enough	
	Employee	Student (n	ot employed)	employed or		2. Health & Community Services	compensatio	ade Self-employed	
	Self-employed Retired			self-employed,		3. Transport and Storage	for a work rel	lated D Covered by other means	
	Student and employed	Not workin	g due to health	is the patient		4. Construction	managed too	day, (eg employer paid)	
	Unemployed			mainly	Ц	5. Agriculture, Forestry & Fishing	what was the	Didn't know I could claim	
	Home duties		(please specify)	working?		Other (please enter number from card)	claiming?	□ Other (please specify)	

203

Industry of employment

- 1. Manufacturing
- 2. Health & community services
- 3. Transport & storage
- 4. Construction
- 5. Agriculture
- 6. Mining
- 7. Electricity, gas & water supply
- 8. Wholesale trade
- 9. Retail trade
- 10. Accommodation, cafes & restaurants
- 11. Communication services
- 12. Finance & insurance
- 13. Property & business services
- 14. Government administration & defence
- 15. Education
- 16. Cultural & recreational services
- 17. Personal & other services

81 Prevalence and indications for gabapentin use by patients attending general practice

Organisation supporting this study: Pfizer Australia Pty Ltd

Issues: The rate of gabapentin use in general practice patients; indications for gabapentin use; clinician initiating treatment with gabapentin; use of private prescriptions for gabapentin.

Sample: 3,095 respondents from 105 GPs; data collection period: 22/02/2005 – 28/03/2005. **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 the majority of patients (56.7%) being female. Patients aged 45–64 years accounted for 29.3% of the sample.

The proportion of respondents who were using gabapentin was small, GPs indicating that only 18 of 3,095 patients (0.6%) were currently taking gabapentin. The rates of gabapentin use did not differ between the sexes, being 0.5% among males and 0.7% among females.

Further details from patients on gabapentin were only provided for 6 of the 18 patients.

Epilepsy was being managed with gabapentin for two of the six patients and neuropathic pain for five of the six patients (one patient had both conditions). One of the patients with epilepsy had their gabapentin treatment initiated by a neurologist, and the other by a pain specialist. The medications taken prior to gabapentin included carbamazepine (Tegretol) and sodium valproate (Epilim). Gabapentin was not prescribed as first line treatment for either patient with epilepsy. Data on whether the prescription was private was available for one of the two patients with epilepsy. This patient was not given gabapentin on a private prescription.

Among the five patients with neuropathic pain, data on who initiated the gabapentin therapy were available for four patients; gabapentin treatment was initiated by a neurologist for one patient, by a pain specialist for two patients and by a GP for one patient. Medications taken prior to gabapentin included carbamazepine (Tegretol), amitriptyline (Endep), doxylamine and sodium valproate (Epilim). Gabapentin was prescribed as first line treatment for one patient with neuropathic pain, by the neurologist. Data on whether the prescription was private was available for four of the five patients with neuropathic pain. Only one of the four prescriptions for gabapentin was a private prescription.

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

INSTRUCTIONS

Ask ALL of the next 30 PATIENTS the following questions

in the order in which the patients are seen.

Please DO NOT select patients to suit the topic being investigated.



206
82 Prevalence and management of chronic pain

Organisation supporting this study: Janssen-Cilag Pty Ltd

Issues: Prevalence of chronic pain among patients attending general practice; conditions causing chronic pain; anatomical sites most affected; severity of chronic pain; managements being utilised by GPs; clinical opinion of GPs on adequacy of pain management for patients with chronic pain.

Sample: 3,211 respondents from 109 GPs; data collection period: 29/03/2005 - 02/05/2005.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Methods for this study: Chronic pain was defined as 'pain experienced every day for 3 months in the 6 months prior to this consultation'.¹ Severity was ranked using Chronic Pain Grades.²

Summary of results

The age-sex distribution of respondents was similar to the distribution of patients at all BEACH encounters, with the majority (55.6%) of patients being female and 59.9% aged 45 years or over.

Of the 3,211 respondents, 586 (18.3%, 95% CI: 15.8–20.7) suffered from chronic pain. Prevalence was significantly higher for patients aged 45 years and over (25.1%) than for patients aged less than 45 years (8.6%). There was no significant difference between male (15.7, 95% CI: 13.1–18.2) and female (20.4%, 95% CI: 17.2–23.6) patients.

Conditions causing chronic pain were recorded at 535 encounters. More than one condition could be reported and a total of 538 recordings of 69 different causal conditions were listed. Osteoarthritis (29.0%), back problems (17.4%), arthritis NOS (10.8%), musculoskeletal problems (6.0%) and varieties of cancer (4.1%) were conditions most often listed.

Anatomical sites were reported for 502 patients. More than one site could be detailed and a total of 633 recordings of 14 different body sites were reported. Sites most commonly affected by chronic pain were the back (33.3%), knee (15.2%), neck/cervical spine (6.8%), and hip (6.8%).

Of the 570 patients for whom severity of chronic pain was reported, 30.0% had grade I pain (low disability, low intensity), 37.0% had grade II pain (low disability, high intensity), 23.2% had grade III pain (high disability, moderately limiting), and 9.8% had grade IV pain (high disability, severely limiting).

Medications and/or treatments for chronic pain management and/or side effects of pain medication were reported for 579 patients. A total of 838 recordings of 33 different medications and/or treatments were reported. Over one-third (35.1%) took non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDS)/Cox-2s, a similar proportion used weaker opioids (32.0%), and simple analgesics were taken by 29.7%. Other treatments included herbal analgesics, and physiotherapy. Forty nine patients (8.5%) were taking no medication for pain management. GPs offered an opinion on adequacy of pain management for 40 of these 49 patients, reporting that pain was adequately managed for 33 of them (82.5%). Adequacy of pain management was reported for 506 patients using medication and/or other management. GPs reported that pain was adequately managed for 75.1% of these patients.

1 Blyth FM et al. 2001. Pain 89(2–3):127–34.

2 Von Korff M et al. 1992. Pain 50(2):133–49.

For other related abstracts see: 42 Prevalence and management of chronic pain.

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

Ask ALL of the next 30 PATIENTS the following questions

in the order in which the patients are seen.

Please DO NOT select patients to suit the topic being investigated.

Chronic pain

Please indicate by ticking the appropriate box whether this patient suffers from **chronic pain** (*defined*as 'pain* experienced every day for three months in the six months prior to this consultation').

If \mathbf{no} chronic pain has been experienced you should \mathbf{end} the $\mathbf{questions}$ here.

*Blyth FM et al. 2001. Pain 89(2-3):127-134

Medication for pain management and medication side effects

Please use the tick boxes to indicate whether the patient is **currently taking** any of the **nominated medications for pain management**, or to **relieve side effects of pain medication** (eg laxatives, acid suppressants etc). Tick as many as apply.

Beside the box labelled 'other' you may write in other medication/s (not listed) or other forms of treatment used for chronic pain management instead of / as well as medication e.g. acupuncture

If **no medication** is being taken for pain management please tick the box labelled 'no medication'.

Beside each medication please **circle an option** to advise whether the medication was **initiated** by a GP (yourself or another) or a specialist, and the **approximate duration of usage in months or years**.



Management of menopausal symptoms & related health risks -

Reasons for medication use

Please circle as many as apply.

- 1. menopausal symptom management;
- 2. prevention of osteoporosis
- 3. treatment of osteoporosis
- 4. cardiovascular protection
- 5. breast cancer prevention
- 6. vaginal atrophy
- 7. decreased sexual interest
- 8. other reason please **specify** this in the space provided.

Severity of Chronic Pain -Chronic Pain Grades

- I. low disability low intensity
- II. low disability high intensity
- III. high disability moderately limiting
- IV. high disability severely limiting

83 Prevalence and management of migraine

Organisation supporting this study: Janssen-Cilag Pty Ltd & Australian General Practice Statistics and Classification Centre (AGPSCC)

Issues: Prevalence of migraine among patients attending general practice; frequency of migraine attacks; current and previous prophylaxis medications; current acute medications.

Sample: 5,663 respondents from 191 GPs; data collection period: 07/06/2005 – 11/07/2005 and 29/11/2005 – 16/01/2006.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Summary of results

The age-sex distribution of respondents was similar to that of patients at all BEACH encounters. Of the 5,663 respondents, 649 (11.5%, 95% CI: 10.0–12.9) suffered from migraine attacks. Prevalence of migraine was significantly higher among female respondents (14.9%, 95% CI: 13.0–16.7) than among males (6.1%, 95% CI: 4.7–7.4).

Almost two-thirds (64.3%) of migraine sufferers experience less than 1 migraine per month. About one in ten sufferers experience 1, 2 or 3+ migraines per month (12.8%, 10.5% and 12.3% respectively). Reported number of migraine attacks per month was similar for males and females.

Only 8.3% (95% CI: 6.0–10.6) of migraine patients were on current prophylaxis medication. Patients with 2 or more migraines per month (22.1%) were significantly more likely to be taking prophylaxis medication than those having less than 1 migraine per month (2.3%). As migraine frequency increased, rates of current prophylaxis medication use increased (trend test; *p* <0.0001), the most frequently used being pizotifen followed by propranolol.

Previous prophylaxis medication had been used by 15.0% of general practice migraine patients. The most frequently used previous prophylaxis medication was pizotifen, followed by propranolol. The most common reason for discontinuation of prophylaxis medication was lack of efficacy (45.8%), followed by side effects (28.1%). Of the 96 patients who took previous prophylaxis medications, only 16 (16.7%) were switched onto another prophylaxis. Therefore, the majority of these patients (83.3%) were not taking second line prophylaxis when the first prophylaxis medication failed.

In contrast, four in five (79.3%, 95% CI: 75.2–83.5) general practice migraine patients currently use acute medication as needed for migraine. About three-quarters (72.9%) of migraine sufferers having less than 1 migraine per month were taking acute medication, compared with around 90% of those with 1, 2 or 3+ migraines per month. As migraine frequency increased, rates of current acute medication use increased (trend test; p=0.0044). The most frequently used acute medications were paracetamol, paracetamol/codeine, ibuprofen and sumatriptan.

Overall, less than 10% of migraine patients were currently on prophylaxis medication, with most on pizotifen or propranolol. In contrast, most used acute medication as needed.

Further reading:

Stark, R.J., Valenti, L., Miller, G.C. 2007, 'Management of migraine in Australian general practice', *Med J Aust*. [In press].

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

INSTRUCTIONS

Ask <u>ALL</u> of the <u>next 30 PATIENTS</u> the following questions

in the order in which the patients are seen.

Please DO NOT select patients to suit the topic being investigated.

Migraine Please indicate by ticking the appropriate box whether this patient suffers from migraine attacks, either initally diagnosed today or at a previous encounter in the past 12 months or more than 12 months ago (by you or by another GP). If 'No' you should end the questions here.		oropriate om or more another ions	Current migraine medication Please write the name and regimen of the current prophylaxis medictation being taken by the patient to prevent migraine. If no prophylaxis medication is currently being taken please tick the box labelled 'none'.		Previous prop If the patient was prior to the one regimen of the p the tick boxes to discontinued. If discontinuation write the main si If no prophylaxis one, or if prophyl please tick the bo	bhylaxis medication a taking a different prophe currently taken, please previous prophylactic m advise why this medicat a occurred because of sid de effect/s experienced in medication was taken pr laxis medication is not be ox labelled 'none'.	ivlactic medication e write the name and nedication and use tion was le effects , please n the space provided. rior to the current reing taken at all ,	
Migrain If 'Yes' pl approxim the patie experien during a	e frequency ease advise the late number o nt would usuall ce a migraine month.	e f times ly episode	In the space below, please write the nam regimen of any medication (oral, nasals injection) taken during an acute attack or 'rescue' medication taken acutely for breakthrough migraine. If no acute or rescue medication is usually please tick the box labelled 'none'.	e and spray or as y taken		Patients medicat Please at patient co service, episode,	s seeking rescue tion dvise how frequently the onsults a GP or an after hours at the time of a migraine for rescue medication.	
Does the patient suffer from migraine attacks? ☐ Yes - diagnosed ☐ today ☐ in past 12 mths ☐ > 12 mths prior ☐ No → end 8178c questions	If 'Yes' C migraine frequency per month	Current proph Name & Form		Previous prop Name & form Reason for d ack of ef cost withdraw successfi	hylaxis medication (if a <u>strength</u> <u>Dose</u> free iscontinuation was:- ficacy side ef <i>[please spec</i>] al after dother	cany) was: NONE cany) was: NONE cany Duration of use	Does the patient consult GP/Out of Hours Service at the time of migraine for rescue medication? Never /almost never (0-20%) Some of the time (21-40%) Half of the time (41-60%) Most of the time (61-80%) Always/almost always (81-100%)	

84 Menopausal status, symptoms and treatment of women aged 18 and over

Organisation supporting this study: Pfizer Australia Pty Ltd

Issues: The proportion of female general practice patients aged 18+ years who are pre-, perior postmenopausal; the proportion of these patients who have a history of hysterectomy and/or menopausal symptoms; patients experiencing specific menopausal symptoms or having an associated risk factor; pharmacotherapy associated with menopausal symptoms.

Sample: 1,590 female respondents aged 18 and over from 106 GPs; data collection period: 29/03/2005 – 02/05/2005.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Summary of results

The majority of female patients aged 18 years or more at encounters with the GP were postmenopausal (59.8%, 95% CI: 55.2–64.3), with another third being premenopausal (33.3%). Only 110 of the 1,590 women (6.9%) were perimenopausal. Of 1,365 respondents to the question about hysterectomy status, 19.5% had had a hysterectomy.

There were 27.8% of patients who had a history of menopausal symptoms. From a list of eight menopausal symptoms (hot flushes, sleep disturbance, excessive sweating, dyspareunia, urinary incontinence, osteoporosis, decreased sexual interest and vaginal atrophy), 68.2% of perimenopausal patients were experiencing symptoms (8.0% had one symptom and 60.2% two or more symptoms). Of postmenopausal women, 63.3% were experiencing symptoms (26.4% had one symptom and 36.9% two or more symptoms). The symptoms most frequently experienced were hot flushes (28.3% of all peri/postmenopausal patients), followed by sleep disturbance (26.2%), vaginal atrophy (26.0%), decreased sexual interest (20.8%) and osteoporosis (18.5%). Excessive sweating (13.9% of all peri/postmenopausal patients), urinary incontinence (10.4%) and dyspareunia (6.7%) were less common.

From a list of 3 risk factors associated with menopause (osteoporosis, cardiovascular and breast cancer risk), just over one-third (35.2%) of perimenopausal patients were currently at risk of one condition, 8.0% at risk of two conditions, and 2.3% at risk of all three conditions. For postmenopausal patients the figures were 31.4% at risk of one condition, 14.3% at risk of two, and 2.75 at risk of all three conditions. For 30.6% of peri/postmenopausal patients, cardiovascular risk was indicated. For 27.3%, a risk of osteoporosis was indicated, and for 9.2%, a risk of breast cancer was recorded.

The most frequently prescribed medication for these patients was alendronate, which accounted for 10% of all medications recorded at these encounters. Calcium carbonate, oestrogen, oestriol topical vaginal, oestradiol pessaries, and oestradiol/norethisterone were also among the most common medications.

For other related abstracts see: 8 Hormone replacement therapy (HRT).

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **MANAGEMENT OF MENOPAUSAL SYMPTOMS & RELATED HEALTH RISKS.** You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

INSTRUCTIONS

Ask the <u>next 30 PATIENTS</u> the following questions, where appropriate, in the order in which the patients are seen.

Please DO NOT select patients to suit the topic being investigated

i.e. if the patient is **NOT** female and 18+ years, you may <u>leave this</u> section BLANK.

This form has been filled in as an example

For all female patients aged 18 years and over

Menopausal status: please indicate the patient's menopausal status.

Past history:

 has the patient had a hysterectomy?
 does the patient have a past history of *any* menopausal symptoms (such as those listed in Box 2 below)? That is, have they had symptoms in the past, but do not have them anymore.

Symptoms and health risks associated with menopause

Please advise whether the patient **is experiencing** or **at risk** of any of the listed symptoms or health risks associated with menopause. Tick as many as apply.

Medication for menopausal symptom or health risk management

Medication: Is the patient taking, either **prescribed** or **purchased over-the-counter**, any medication or product for management of symptoms or health risks associated with menopause. Please write the **name & form** of the medication, its **strength, dose** and **frequency**.

Initiated by: please circle an option to indicate whether the medication was **initially prescribed / recommended** by a GP (yourself or another); an obstetrician/gynaecologist; an orthopaedic specialist; an endocrinologist; or some other specialist (please specify type of specialist in the space

Reason for medication use: beside each medication, please advise the menopause symptoms or associated health risks for which the medication is being taken. To do this, please read the numbered options on the key list and circle the number which corresponds to the reason/s for use of each medication. The key list (at right) is also printed on the laminated card in your research kit.

- Key list for 'reason for medication use' (this list is also on the laminated card in your research kit)
 1. menopausal symptom management;
 2. prevention of osteoporosis
 3. treatment of osteoporosis
 4. cardiovascular protection
 5. breast cancer prevention
- vaginal atrophy
- 7. decreased sexual interest
 8. other reason please specify this in
- the space provided. NB. If more than one reason per

medication, circle as many as apply.

FEMALES 18yrs+: menopausal status?	Is the patient experiencing	/ at risk of any of the following?	Medication/s for m	nenopausal symptor	m or health risk management	is/are: (see key list on card -
Premenopausal	Interpretent to the second	(fick as many as apply)	<u>Name</u> & <u>Form</u>	<u>Strength</u> Dose	Freq Initiated by (please	circle] Reason for use [please circle]
Perimenopausal	🗹 sleep disturbances	decreased sexual interest vaginal atrophy	Livial Tab	2.5mg I tab	od GPObsGyn/Orth.Spec	/Endo/ () 2 3 4 5 6 7 8* (*specify)
Postmenopausal The patient has a part history of:	excessive sweating				GP/ObsGyn/Orth.Spec	/Endo/ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8*
Hysterectomy	dyspareunia	cardiovascular risk			GP/ObsGyn/Orth.Spec	/Endo/ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8*
Menopausal symptoms (Yes) No	urinary incontinence	breast cancer risk			other (specify)	$\frac{(^{rspecity})}{(Endo(12345678^*))}$
BL71C	osteoporosis	no symptoms / risk factors			other (specify)	(*specify)

Management of menopausal symptoms & related health risks -

Reasons for medication use

Please circle as many as apply.

- 1. menopausal symptom management;
- 2. prevention of osteoporosis
- 3. treatment of osteoporosis
- 4. cardiovascular protection
- 5. breast cancer prevention
- 6. vaginal atrophy
- 7. decreased sexual interest
- 8. other reason please **specify** this in the space provided.

Severity of Chronic Pain -Chronic Pain Grades

- I. low disability low intensity
- II. low disability high intensity
- III. high disability moderately limiting
- IV. high disability severely limiting

85 Management of osteoporotic fractures in general practice patients

Organisation supporting this study: Roche Products Pty Ltd

Issues: The proportion of general practice patients who currently have, or have a history of, osteoporotic fractures; the proportion of these patients taking medication for the problem; the proportion who have ceased taking osteoporosis medication; the proportion enrolled in a patient support program; the current management status of patients.

Sample: 3,071 respondents from 105 GPs; data collection period: 03/05/2005 - 06/06/2005.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Summary of results

The age-sex distribution of respondents was the same as the distribution for all BEACH encounters in 2004–05, with the majority of patients (60.2%, 95% CI: 57.0–63.4) being female. More than half of the patients were aged 45 years or over.

Of the 3,071 respondents, 170 (5.5%, 95% CI: 4.2–6.9) had current or previous osteoporotic fracture/s. Prevalence increased significantly with age to 23.2% among patients aged 75 years and over. More female patients (7.9%, 95 % CI: 6.0–9.9) had osteoporotic fracture(s) than male patients (2.0%, 95% CI: 1.2–2.8). Of the patients with current or previous osteoporotic fracture, 79.3% were taking a prescribed osteoporosis medication and one in six (17.4%) was enrolled in a patient support or information program for osteoporosis.

Current management status was reported for 163 of the 170 respondents with current or previous osteoporotic fracture/s. Of these, 72.4% (n=118) were continuing their osteoporosis medication, and 11.0% (n=18) were no longer taking prescribed osteoporosis medication. Eleven patients (6.8%) had never had and were not starting any osteoporosis medication, and 11 (6.8%) were commencing a first prescription.

Data about the period since osteoporosis medication ceased was available for 16 of the 18 patients no longer taking prescribed osteoporosis medication. Of these 16 patients, 10 had ceased the medication for 1 year or longer.

The likelihood of commencing another osteoporosis medication was provided for 17 of 18 patients no longer taking prescribed osteoporosis medication. GPs indicated that eight patients were unlikely to commence another osteoporosis medication.

For other related abstracts see: 19 Osteoporosis.

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **PATIENTS WITH OSTEOPOROTIC FRACTURE/S.** You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

INSTRUCTIONS

Ask ALL of the next 30 PATIENTS the following questions

in the order in which the patients are seen.

Please **DO NOT** select patients to suit the topic being investigated.



216

86 Diabetes Types 1 and 2 and coronary heart disease

Organisation supporting this study: Merck Sharp & Dohme (Australia) Pty Ltd

Issues: Prevalence of diabetes types 1 and 2 and coronary heart disease (CHD); total cholesterol level and management for these patients; indicators of statin intolerance; management regimens for these patients.

Sample: 3,099 patient encounters from 105 GPs; data collection period: 03/05/2005 – 06/06/2006.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Summary of results

The age and sex distribution of all patient encounters was the same as the distribution for all BEACH encounters in 2004–05, with the majority (59.1%) of patients being female.

Of the 3,099 respondents 455 patients (14.7%, 95% CI: 12.5–16.8) had either diabetes (type 1 or 2) and/or CHD: 26 (0.8%, 95% CI: 0.3–1.4) had diagnosed type 1 diabetes, 239 (7.7%, 95% CI: 6.4–9.0) had type 2 diabetes, and 257 (8.3%, 95% CI: 6.5–10.1) had CHD. Both diabetes and CHD were present in 66 respondents (2.1%, 95% CI: 1.5–2.7).

The most recent cholesterol levels were provided for 412 of the 455 patients with diabetes and/or CHD. Their mean cholesterol level was 4.7 mmol/L (95% CI: 4.6–4.8), the median was 4.6 mmol/L and the range was 2.1 to 9.9 mmol/L.

Information on whether the cholesterol level was adequately managed was provided for 404 of the 455 patients with diabetes and/or CHD. In the clinical opinion of their GP, 7 in 10 (68.8%, 95% CI: 63.3–74.3) patients with diabetes (either type 1 or 2) and/or CHD currently had their cholesterol adequately controlled. Adequate control had been achieved for 65.1% of all patients with diabetes, 76.1% of all patients with CHD, and 81.7% of patients with both diabetes and CHD.

Of the 455 patients with diabetes and/or CHD, medication management information was provided for 429. Of these, 63.4% (95% CI: 57.1–69.7) were currently taking a statin, and 1.6% (95% CI: 0.3–3.0) were taking a fibrate. No patients were taking a cholestyramine. A further 35.2% of patients with diabetes and/or CHD were not taking any of these medications. The most frequently used statins were atorvastatin (45.5% of patients with diabetes and/or CHD) and simvastatin (40.1% of patients with diabetes and/or CHD). One-quarter (24.7%) of patients with diabetes were managed with diet and exercise only, with the remainder being treated with diet and exercise plus medication.

Information about tolerance problems was provided for 261 of the 272 patients taking statins, and 18 (6.9%) of these had experienced some intolerance in relation to their statin use. Muscle pain (myalgia), nausea and coordination problems were the most common problems experienced.

For other related abstracts see: 21 Diabetes – prevalence, management and screening, 25 Prevalence of diabetes, medications and control, 30 Lipid lowering medications and coronary heart disease, 40 Type 2 diabetes mellitus, prevalence and management, 45 Diabetes mellitus prevalence, management and risk factors, 46 Coronary heart disease, risk factors and lipid lowering medication, 87 Management of cardiovascular or diabetes related conditions, 94 Type 2 diabetes – investigations and related conditions.

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **PATIENTS WITH DIABETES AND / OR CORONARY HEART DISEASE.** You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

INSTRUCTIONS

Ask ALL of the next 30 PATIENTS the following questions

in the order in which the patients are seen.

Please DO NOT select patients to suit the topic being investigated.



87 Management of cardiovascular or diabetes related conditions

Organisation supporting this study: AstraZeneca (Australia) Pty Ltd

Issues: The prevalence of hypertension; left ventricular hypertrophy; coronary heart failure; microalbuminura; diabetes and impaired glucose, among patients attending general practice the proportion of these patients taking medications for the management of these conditions; and their current medication regimen; level of control with current medication regimen; changes to medication regimen resulting from the current encounter.

Sample: 3,015 patient encounters with 104 GPs; data collection period: 07/06/2005 – 11/07/2005.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Summary of results

The age-sex distribution of the respondents was similar to the distribution for all BEACH encounters, with the majority of patients (59.1%, 95% CI: 56.2–62.0) being female. Patients aged 45–64 accounted for 27.4% of the sample and those aged 65 or more years for 23.2%.

Of the 3,015 respondents 837 (27.7%, 95% CI: 24.9–30.6) had at least one of the listed conditions: 3.5% having hypertension; 7.9% diabetes; and 3.0% coronary heart failure. Left ventricular hypertrophy (2.1%), impaired glucose (1.3%) and microalbuminuria (1.0%) were less prevalent. One in five patients had only one of the listed conditions (19.4%), while 8.4% had two or more of the conditions.

Detail of the current medications used for the listed conditions were provided for 821 of the 837 patients with one or more of these conditions. Of these, 94.4% were taking at least one of the medication types listed: 42.6% were taking an ACE inhibitor (ramipril and perindopril being the most common); 35.3% were taking a diuretic; and 32.3% were taking an angiotensin II receptor blocker (irbesartan being the most common). One-quarter of patients were taking either a calcium channel blocker (24.7%) or a beta blocker (23.1%).

The GPs clinical opinion of the level of control of the patient's condition was provided for 7764 patients for whom medication was recorded. For 88.2% of patients, the GP felt that the current medication regimen was adequately controlling the patient's cardiovascular or diabetes related condition.

Details of any changes made in medication regimen at the current encounter were provided for 789 patients. At the current encounter, new or additional medication was prescribed for 5.2% of patients with at least one cardiovascular or diabetes related condition, and changes in the dose for existing medication was ordered for 2.3% of patients.

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, 45 Diabetes mellitus prevalence, management and risk factors, 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 shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **PATIENTS WITH CARDIOVASCULAR AND DIABETES ASSOCIATED CONDITIONS.**

Change in medication resulting

Please advise whether, as a result of

🛛 No change

BL73C

□ No

from this encounter

INSTRUCTIONS

□ None of the above → end □ None

Ask ALL of the next 30 PATIENTS the following questions

in the order in which the patients are seen.

Please DO NOT select patients to suit the topic being investigated.

(please specify)

5.

Cardiov Please ir patient h cardiov If the pat should e	vascular and di ndicate by ticking t nas any of the list ascular disease tient does not hav and the questions	iabetes associated conditions the appropriate box/es whether this ed condtions associated with or diabetes. re any of these conditions, you there.		Medication real Please write the regimen details provided, for eac being taken by the advised in the p	gimen e medication in the spaces th of the medica his patient, as previous quest	ations tion.	today's encour medication for conditions has Changes to me medications b time, new med addition to the medications pro- from the current dosage of an e	nter, the the previ been ch dication i eing pres ications p current r escribed t regimen xisting m	patient's iously listed ianged. include new scribed for the first prescribed in egimen, new to replace one n, or a change in iedication.	
	Current me (NB - 'Current today's cons Please advise prescribed m question. If the patient I has not been conditions pri at this consu	edications nt' medication includes medication be sultation) e whether the patient is currently taking nedications for the conditions advise that a prescribed medication for a for to today's consultation, and will n ultation, please tick the box labelled	eing taken prior to ng any of the listed sed in the previous ed conditions and any of these not be starting one 'none'.			Conditi Please a clinical HT / LVH Diabtes / is adequ current	ion control advise whether, in yo opinion, the patient I / CHF / Microalbum / Impaired glucose co uately controlled by medication regime	ur 's inuria / ondition / their n.		
\downarrow		\downarrow		1					\downarrow	
Does this patie Hypertens Left ventri Coronary Microalbu Diabetes Impaired g	ient have any of:- sion icular hypertrophy heart failure uminuria glucose	If 'Yes' the patient's current therapy is:- ("current" = prior to today] ACE inhibitors Calcium Channel Blocker β-Blocker Diuretic Angiotensin II Receptor Blocker Other 	The patient's current Name & Form 1. 2. 3. 4.	medication regimen i <u>Shength</u>	for these condit <u>Dose Fre</u>	ions is:-	In your clinical opinion does this medication regimen adequately control the patient's condition?	As a resu has this new/ada medicati	Jit of today's consultation patient been prescribed Jitional/changed ion for these conditions? - new / additional medication - changed dose	n, 1 ?

88 Arthritis rates and NSAID use in general practice patients

Organisation supporting this study: Pfizer Australia Pty Ltd

Issues: The proportion of general practice patients with arthritis; proportion of these that are on NSAIDs; current NSAID regimen and duration of use; proportion with dyspepsia and/or anaemia; therapy for dyspepsia and/or anaemia; proportion with other possible causes of anaemia.

Sample: 3,076 patient encounters with 104 GPs; data collection period: 12/07/2005 – 15/08/2005

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Summary of results

The age and sex distributions of respondents were similar to the distribution for all BEACH (general practice) encounters, with the majority (62.5%) of patients being female.

Of the 3,076 respondents 26.5%, (95% CI: 23.4–29.7) had diagnosed arthritis: 23.6% had osteoarthritis, 0.9% rheumatoid arthritis, and 2.7% 'other' arthritis. There was no difference in the prevalence of diagnosed arthritis among male and female patients.

Of the 816 arthritis patients, 807 reported NSAID status. Over 40% of these (43.9%, 95% CI: 39.4–48.3) used an NSAID for arthritis during the previous 12 months. The most commonly used were celecoxib (27.5%), meloxicam (23.8%) and diclofenac (20.3%).

The median reported prescribed daily dose (PDD) for celecoxib was 200 mg and for meloxicam was 15 mg. The mean duration of NSAID use was 20.8 weeks. Almost a third of patients (28.3%) were taking the NSAID medication continually rather than intermittently.

Of the 354 arthritis patients on NSAID during the previous year, 347 answered the question about dyspepsia. Of these, 156 (45.0%, 95% CI: 38.7–51.3) had dyspepsia over that 12 month period. However, the dyspepsia and the taking of NSAIDs were only linked in time for 73.3% of these patients. The rates of dyspepsia did not differ between arthritis patients taking Cox-2 inhibitors, meloxicam and other non-selective NSAIDs.

Of the 156 arthritis patients on NSAIDs with dyspepsia, 154 responded to the question on medication taken for the dyspepsia. More than four in five (81.8%) of these patients were taking a medication for dyspepsia, the most common being omeprazole, esomeprazole and pantoprazole. The median PDD for omeprazole and esomeprazole was 20.0 mg. The mean duration of dyspepsia medication use was 31.2 weeks. Two-thirds (65.6%) of patients on dyspepsia medication were taking the medication continually.

Only 26 arthritis patients on NSAIDs (representing 8.0% of the 326 respondents to this question, 95% CI: 4.6–11.4) had anaemia during the previous 12 months. Half of these were taking a medication for anaemia, the most common ferrous sulphate + folic acid (n=6). Of all 354 arthritis patients on NSAIDs, 13.3% had another chronic disease which may cause anaemia, 10.5% having a hiatus hernia, 0.9% being vegetarian and 0.3% pregnant.

For other related abstracts see: 29 Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDS) and acid suppressant use, 49 Health status and management of patients on non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs, 78 NSAID & acid suppressant use in general practice patients.

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

INSTRUCTIONS

Ask ALL of the next 30 PATIENTS the following questions

in the order in which the patients are seen.

Please DO NOT select patients to suit the topic being investigated.



Please indicate by ticking the appropriate box whether this patient has **osteoarthritis**, **rheumatoid arthritis** or **arthritis** (unspecified).

222



Medication for dyspepsia and / or anaemia Please write the name, regimen and duration of use of any medication taken by the patient for treatment of dyspepsia or anaemia, either currently,

or for the management of their most recent episode.

Please advise whether the medication was taken

intermittently or continuously.

89 Estimates of the prevalence of chronic illnesses identified as Health Priority Areas among patients attending general practice

Organisation supporting this study: Australian General Practice Statistics and Classification Centre (AGPSCC)

Issues: The prevalence among patients attending general practice, of chronic conditions that require ongoing management by their GP, in particular those health problems identified as National Health Priority Areas.

Sample: 9,156 respondents from 305 GPs; data collected from 12/07/2005 – 19/09/2005 and 25/10/2005 – 28/11/2005.

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 the majority of patients being female (60.7%).

The crude sample morbidity rates showed that of the 9,156 patients sampled approximately 30% had a diagnosed cardiovascular problem, of which ischaemic heart disease was the most common (9.5%). Eighteen per cent of respondents had uncomplicated hypertension. One in five had osteoarthritis (20.0%) and one in ten had asthma (10.7%, 95% CI: 9.8–11.6). Psychological problems were common (24.7%), with depression recorded for 14.2% of respondents and anxiety for 10.7%. Diabetes was reported for 8.3%, the majority being type 2 diabetes (7.2%).

The crude sample morbidity rates were adjusted for visit frequency related to age and sex, by weighting the SAND sample against the age-sex distribution of the population of Australians who visited a GP at least once in the 12 months from April 2004 to March 2005 (MBS unpublished data). This method adjusted the estimates for any over-representation related to age and sex. The adjusted rates may give a better estimate of the prevalence of selected morbidity among all patients attending general practice in a 12 month period, with less bias towards those who attend more frequently. Crude rates on the other hand can be interpreted as prevalence rates among patients found in the GP's waiting room at any one time.

The estimated prevalence after adjustment was generally lower than the crude sample rates. In particular cardiovascular disease (21.8%), arthritis (16.4%) and diabetes (6.5%), which are related to older age, were significantly less prevalent after adjustment. The estimated prevalence of asthma (10.6%) and psychological problems (21.8%) were largely unaffected by adjustment.

These adjusted rates are likely to be more accurate (as the diagnosis is made by a GP), than other studies relying on self-reported morbidity (such as the National Health Survey). The results were consistent across multiple subsamples suggesting reliability of method. The prevalence of important chronic conditions in the general practice population can be estimated relatively reliably and economically by using an existing study that regularly samples general practice patients across Australia and by adjusting for the effect of visit frequency bias in the sample.

For other related abstracts see: 37 *Prevalence of common morbidities in patients encountered in general practice,* 61 *Prevalence of chronic illnesses identified as National Health Priority Areas among general practice patients.*

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about CO-MORBIDITY AND CHRONIC DISEASE.

You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

INSTRUCTIONS

Ask ALL of the next 30 PATIENTS the following questions

in the order in which the patients are seen.

Please **DO NOT** select patients to suit the topic being investigated.

Co-morbidity and chronic disease

The aim of these questions is to determine the prevalence of **co-morbidity** and some of the **chronic illnesses** or **conditions** in the **National Goals and Targets** priority areas.

Most of the conditions listed below require continual management or surveillance and may need consideration in future care.

Please use the tick boxes to indicate whether the patient has any of the listed conditions even if you have already managed one of these problems today. Tick as many as apply.

If the patient **does not** have any of these conditions or problems, please tick the box marked **'none of these conditions'**.



90 Prevalence, management and investigations for chronic heart failure in general practice patients

Organisation supporting this study: Roche Products Pty Ltd

Issues: The proportion of general practice patients with chronic heart failure (CHF); its severity and management; who initiated therapy; objectives of management; proportion referred to a specialist; investigations ordered to diagnose CHF.

Sample: 2,859 encounters from 98 GPs; data collection period: 16/08/2005 – 19/09/2005. **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 the majority (57.8%) of patients being female.

The prevalence of chronic heart failure (CHF) in this general practice patient sample was 4.1% (95% CI: 2.8–5.3). In male patients, 4.7% were diagnosed with CHF compared with 3.6% of female patients. Patients aged 75+ had the highest age-specific rates, with 19.8% diagnosed with CHF. CHF was classified as mild in 50.0% of these 116 patients, moderate in 28.5% and severe in 21.6%.

Medication data were provided for 112 of the CHF patients. Medications most commonly used for the management of CHF were diuretics (33.6% of all listed medications), followed by anti-hypertensives (31.0%), beta-blockers (13.7%) and cardiac glycosides (8.0%). The diuretic commonly used was frusemide (median reported prescribed daily dose (PDD) 40 mg). The most common anti-hypertensive medications were perindopril (median PDD 4 mg), ramipril (median PDD 5 mg) and irbesartan (median PDD 300 mg), and the beta-blocker commonly used was carvedilol (median PDD 25 mg). Digoxin had a median PDD of 0.125 mg. Sixteen (66.7%) of the 24 patients with severe CHF were on three or more CHF medications, while only 8 (4.3%) of the 56 patients with mild CHF were on three or more CHF medications.

Pharmacological treatment was initiated by a GP (47.1% of CHF medications) or by a specialist (52.9%) at similar rates.

GPs considered the factors of 'symptom management' and 'quality of life' significantly more important than 'increased survival' as an objective of management.

The majority (80.2%) of patients diagnosed with CHF had been referred to a cardiac specialist; 38.7% were initially referred more than 3 years ago; 21.7% were referred between 1 to 3 years ago; and 19.8% were referred during the previous 12 months.

Multiple investigations could be reported as being used in diagnosing CHF. Chest X-ray was used to diagnose CHF in 72.3% of cases, echocardiography was used in 63.4% of cases and ECG in 58.9% of cases. GPs ordered 64.9% of chest X-rays, 13.4% of echocardiography and 59.3% of ECGs, with cardiac specialists ordering the rest.

For other related abstracts see: 31 Prevalence and severity of chronic heart failure, 38 Prevalence of chronic heart failure, its management and control, 57 Prevalence and management of chronic heart failure in general practice patients, 75 Prevalence, management and investigations for chronic heart failure, 77 Heart failure-underlying causes and medication management.

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

INSTRUCTIONS



91 Prevalence and management of gastrointestinal symptoms

Organisations supporting this study: AstraZeneca (Australia) Pty Ltd and the Australian General Practice Statistics and Classification Centre (AGPSCC)

Issues: Prevalence/taking medication for: dyspepsia, heartburn, reflux/regurgitation, epigastric pain (multiple response allowed); frequency and severity of symptoms and impact on patients' quality of life (current/prior to medication) (multiple response allowed); underlying condition causing GI symptoms; management and level of symptom control.

Sample: 5,310 patient encounters from 181 GPs; data collection period: 20/9/2005 – 24/10/2005 and 29/11/2005 – 16/01/2006.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Summary of results

The age-sex distribution of all patient encounters was the same as the distribution for all BEACH encounters in 2004–05, with the majority (59.0%) of patients being female.

Of the 5,310 patients, 1,444 (27.2%, 95% CI: 25.1–29.3) suffered from or took medication for at least one listed GI symptom. Prevalence did not differ between the sexes but the prevalence of one or more listed GI symptom increased significantly with age, from 3.0% among patients aged less than 15 years to 41.3% among patients aged 75 years and more (p < 0.0001).

Of the 1,442 patients with GI symptom(s), two-thirds (62.1%) had a single listed symptom; about a quarter (23.6%) experienced reflux/regurgitation, one-fifth (21.4%) heartburn, 9.9% dyspepsia, and 7.3% epigastric pain as their only GI symptom. There were 132 patients (9.2%) who had both heartburn and reflux.

One in five patients with reflux or epigastric pain reported daily frequency of symptoms, and 16.3% of patients reported the reflux or epigastric pain as severe. Approximately 16% of patients with either dyspepsia or heartburn experienced symptoms daily, and more than one in ten patients in each group reported their symptom as severe.

Of the 1,294 respondents on impact on their quality of life, 41.2% reported diet restrictions, 35.9% disrupted sleep, and 27.8% feeling unwell/worn out. About one-third (32.4%) reported that their GI symptoms did not impact on their life in any of the ways listed.

GPs specified the underlying cause of the symptoms for 1,358 patients: gastro-oesophageal reflux disease was specified for about half (51.0%) and the cause was not known for 21.4%.

Current management of GI symptoms was reported for 1,421 patients: 21.3% were receiving no treatment, proton pump inhibitors were used by 47.6% and antacids by 22.0%.

GPs estimated the level of symptom control with current management for 1,050 patients receiving treatment for their GI symptoms. GI symptoms were well controlled for 76.4% of these patients, partly controlled for 19.9%, and poorly controlled for the remainder (3.7%).

For other related abstracts see: 18 Drugs for the treatment of peptic ulcer and reflux, 24 Gastro-oesophageal reflux disease (GORD) in general practice patients, 34 Gastro-oesophageal reflux disease (GORD), 51 Use of proton pump inhibitors for gastrointestinal problems, 60 Prevalence of GORD and associated proton pump inhibitor use, 62 Use of proton pump inhibitors by general practice patients, 100 Gastrointestinal symptoms in patients attending general practice.

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **PATIENTS WITH GASTRO-INTESTINAL SYMPTOMS.** You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

INSTRUCTIONS

Ask ALL of the next 30 PATIENTS the following questions

in the order in which the patients are seen.

Please DO NOT select patients to suit the topic being investigated.

Gastro-intestinal symptoms Please indicate by ticking the appropriate box/es whether this patient regularly suffers from, or takes acid suppressant medication to control, any of the listed upper gastro-intestinal symptoms. Please use the tick boxes below each symptom to advise the frequency and severity of symptoms for the patient. For patients taking acid suppressant medication, please advise the frequency and severity of symptoms medication.	Impact of symptoms on the patient Please use the tick boxes to advise how the symptoms impact on the patient's quality of life. Please tick as many as apply.	symptoms are cu If a Proton pump taken, please spec provided. If the current mana those listed, please 'other' and write th space provided. Please tick as mar	rrently being managed. inhibitor (PPI) is being cify which in the space gement is not one of e tick the box labelled he management in the hy as apply.
medication. If the patient does not have any of these symptoms, you should end the questions here.	Underlying Please use the underly symptoms. not one of t the box labe underlying o provided. Please tick	g cause of symptoms the tick boxes to advise ing cause of the patient's f the underlying cause is hose listed, please tick illed 'other' and write the ause in the space as many as apply.	Symptom control Where treatment has been undertaken for upper gastro-intestinal symptoms, please use the tick boxes to advise how well controlled the patient's symptoms have been since the current treatment commenced.
\downarrow	\downarrow ——		\downarrow \downarrow
Does this patient suffer from, or take medication for, any of the following symptoms? Please advise frequency and severity of symptoms (prior to medication use if once per week Dyspepsia Heartburn Reflux/regurgital Image: Strain of the following symptoms? Please advise frequency and severity of symptoms (prior to medication use if once per week Image: Strain of the following once per week Image: Strain	tion Epigastric pain eek < once per week	ior Underlying cause of symptoms is? no unknown pi GORD H2 peptic ulcer An NSAID use Re diet / lifestyle (e	t management is? b treatment PIRA (please specify) tlacid eg stop NSAID) ber (please specify) controlled partly controlled
$BI768 \square NO \rightarrow end \square severe \square severe \square severe$	severe none of the above		controlled

Current management of symptoms

Please use the tick boxes to advise **how** this patient's upper gastro-intestinal

228

92 Prevalence of metabolic syndrome

Organisations supporting this study: Merck Sharp and Dohme (Australia) Pty Ltd and the Australian General Practice Statistics and Classification Centre (AGPSCC)

Issues: Prevalence of metabolic syndrome (as defined by the International Diabetes Federation) among patients attending Australian general practice.

Sample: 5,594 patient encounters from 193 GPs; data collection period: 20/09/2005 – 28/11/2005.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Methods for this study: Methods for this study: Metabolic syndrome is defined by the International Diabetes Federation (IDF) as central obesity plus two or more of four factors: (i) raised triglycerides or treatment for this lipid abnormality, (ii) raised blood pressure or treatment for hypertension, (iii) raised fasting plasma glucose or previously diagnosed type 2 diabetes and (iv) reduced HDL cholesterol or treatment for this lipid abnormality. Central obesity is defined according to IDF as waist circumference ≥94cm for Europid men and ≥80cm for Europid women, with ethnicity specific values for other groups.

Summary of results

The age-sex distribution of respondents was similar to the distribution for all BEACH (general practice) encounters, with the majority (58.8%) of patients being female.

The prevalence of central obesity in this general practice patient group was 43.7% (95% CI: 41.1–46.4). Central obesity rates did not differ between male and female patients (42.0% and 45.2% respectively).

Just under one-third (29.6%) of respondents with central obesity had raised triglycerides (>150 mg/dL (1.7 mmol/L)) or specific treatment for this lipid abnormality. Significantly more male patients had raised triglycerides or lipid treatment (34.5%) than females (26.5%).

Close to half (46.1%) of the respondents had raised blood pressure (≥130/85 mmHg) or treatment for previously diagnosed hypertension.

One-quarter (24.1%) of the respondents had raised fasting plasma glucose (\geq 100 mg/dL (5.6 mmol/L)) or previously diagnosed type 2 diabetes. Significantly more male patients had raised fasting plasma glucose (27.7%) than females (21.7%).

One-quarter (24.1%) of respondents had reduced HDL cholesterol (<40 mg/dL (1.03 mmol/L) for males or <50 mg/dL (1.29 mmol/L) for females) or specific treatment for this lipid abnormality. Significantly more male patients had reduced HDL cholesterol or lipid treatment (29.3%) then females (20.8%).

Of all 5,402 general practice patients surveyed, 842 (15.6%, 95% CI: 14.0–17.2) had metabolic syndrome, while 3,845 (71.2%) did not meet the IDF definition for metabolic syndrome. A further 715 (13.2%) had not been tested for enough of the four metabolic syndrome factors to be classified.

For other related abstracts see: 76 Patients with risk factors for metabolic syndrome.

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **PATIENT RISK FACTORS for METABOLIC SYNDROME.** You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

INSTRUCTIONS

Ask ALL of the next 30 PATIENTS the following questions

in the order in which the patients are seen.

Please DO NOT select patients to suit the topic being

investigated.

Risk factors

If "Yes" please answer the following questions about the patient's triglyceride, HDL cholesterol, blood pressure and fasting plasma glucose levels.

Waist circumference

If possible, please measure the patient's waist circumference with a tape measure. If the patient's waist circumference exceeds the nominated measurement (according to the patient's gender) please tick the 'Yes' box and write the measurement in the space provided.

If 'No' you should end the questions here.

Some of these questions are slightly different for male and female patients because health risks occur at different levels for males and females, and for patients of differing ethnicity, when assessing abdominal obesity and HDL (high density lipoprotein) cholesterol.

For each risk factor, if you do not know a level, are unable to determine whether the patient is currently taking specific treatment for the risk factor, or if the patient has never been tested for the risk factor, please tick the 'don't know / never tested' option.

* The values and qualifiers used in this survey are in accordance with the International Diabetes Federation (IDF) Worldwide definition of the metabolic syndrome.

Patient background

Ethnic group specific risks are similar for people of the same ethnic background wherever they are found. In order to best assess the risk for this patient, please use the tick boxes to advise their continent of origin.

V	\checkmark				\checkmark
Is this patient's waist	* If 'Yes' does the patient also have any of the following:-	Vas	No	Don'tknow/	* This patient's continent of origin was:-
circumference		163	NO	never tested	Europe/UK/North America/Australia
\geq 85 cm (males) or	Raised Triglycerides \geq 150 mg/dL (1.7 mmol/L) or specific treatment for this lipid abnormality				South Asia/Pacific region
\geq 75 cm (females)?	Raised blood pressure \geq 130/ \geq 85 mmHg or treatment of previously diagnosed hypertension				🗖 China
	Raised fasting plasma alucose ≥100 ma/dL (5.6 mmol/L) or previously diagnosed type 2 diabetes				Japan
	(Artica) Roducod HDL chalesterel < 40 mg/dL (103 mmol/L) as specific tradment for this linid chaemality.	_			South or Central America
$\square \square \square \rightarrow \text{end}$	(Males) Reduced HDL cholesieror <40 mg/dL (1.05 mmol/L) or specific fredmention mis lipid abnormality	-			🛛 Sub-Saharan Africa
BL76C questions	(Females) Reduced HDL cholesterol <50 mg/dL (1.29 mmol/L) or specific treatment for this lipid abnormality	yЦ			Eastern Mediterranean/Middle East

93 Sexual dysfunction—premature ejaculation

Organisation supporting this study: Janssen-Cilag Pty Ltd

Issues: Prevalence of premature ejaculation (PE) in general practice patients/their partners; sources of advice utilised by patients/partners of patients experiencing PE; remedies tried as management of PE.

Sample: 2,186 patient encounters from 90 GPs; data collection period: 17/01/2006 – 20/02/2006.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Methods for this study: Participating GPs were provided with a card that contained information about PE, a clinical definition and examples of questions that identify patients with PE.

Summary of results

The age-sex distribution of all patient encounters was the same as the distribution for all BEACH encounters in 2004–05, with the majority (55.6%) of patients being female. The questions about sexual dysfunction-premature ejaculation (PE) were asked only of patients aged 18 years and over.

There were 2,186 patients aged 18 years and older, who responded to one or more questions on PE. Two-thirds (66.6%; n=1,455) were sexually active, 31.0% were not currently sexually active and 2.4% had never been sexually active. A significantly larger proportion of males (71.3%, 95% CI: 67.7–74.8) than females (62.9%, 95% CI: 58.3–67.5) were sexually active. The proportion of patients aged 25 to 44 years who were sexually active (88.1%, 95% CI: 85.4–90.8) was significantly higher than the proportion in other groups.

Of the 1,455 sexually active patients, 1,450 reported the duration of their current relationship. More than half (53.7%) had been in their current relationship for more than 10 years, a quarter (25.0%) for 2–10 years, 15.0% for less than 2 years, and the remainder (6.2%) were not currently in a relationship.

Sixteen of the 1,455 patients did not respond to questions about their/their partner's experience of PE. Of the 1,439 respondents, 18.4% (95% CI: 14.2–22.5, n=264) stated that they or their partners had experienced PE. A smaller proportion of female patients (13.0%, 95% CI: 9.6–16.5) reported their partners having PE than male patients (24.0%, 95% CI: 18.3–29.7) reported having PE.

Of the 264 patients who reported experiencing PE, 10 did not report on the number of occasions PE was experienced. Of the remaining 254 respondents, 61.4% had experienced PE on 1–25% of occasions, 19.7% on 26–50% of occasions and the remaining 18.9% had experienced PE on more than 50% of occasions.

Of 257 respondents who reported where help/advice was sought, 28.4% had sought help for the problem. The most common sources of help/advice were a GP (18.7%), their partner (5.8%) and other health professionals (4.7%). Of the 212 respondents who reported the remedies tried for PE, 37.7% had tried at least one of those listed. The most common remedy was prescribed medications (16.0%) followed by behavioural treatment (13.7%) and alcohol/drugs (9.9%). Physical remedies (e.g. more than one condom) were used by 8.5% of patients, 7.6% had used over-the-counter products, 4.3% had used herbal remedies and 1.4% used a nasal spray.

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **SEXUAL DYSFUNCTION - PREMATURE EJACULATION.** You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

INSTRUCTIONS

Ask ALL of the next 30 PATIENTS the following questions

in the order in which the patients are seen.

Please **DO NOT select patients** to suit the topic being investigated.

IMPORTANT!! - Please read the laminated card in your pack before commencing this section



Elaculation (PE)

*Clinical definition: DSM-IV-TR diagnostic criteria for Premature

A. Persistent or recurrent ejaculation with minimal sexual stimulation before, on, or shortly after penetration and before the person wishes it. Clinicians must take

into account factors that affect duration of the excitement phase, such as age, novelty of the sexual partner or situation, and recent frequency of sexual activity.

C. The premature ejaculation is not due exclusively to the direct effects of a

B. The disturbance causes marked distress or interpersonal difficulty.

For the Doctor...

Premature (early, rapid) ejaculation (PE) is the most common type of male sexual dysfunction. It affects between 14% and 30% of males >18 years of age.¹⁻³

The personal nature of the condition and the hesitancy of both patients and clinicians to raise the topic means that only a small proportion of those affected seek or receive help.⁴

The purpose of this research is to determine the prevalence of PE in general practice patients, whether patients have sought help for the problem, and what help, if any, has been provided.

It is important to capture this information for general practice patients. We recommend that you explain to the patient from the outset that these questions are about sexual dysfunction and not about other sexual health issues such as sexually transmitted diseases. In order to assess whether the patient meets the DSM-IV-TR criteria for defining premature ejaculation, you should ask them the questions on the other side of this card.

However, if you feel at any stage that these questions intrude too greatly on your relationship with this patient, please stop the questions and just return the form with the shaded section incomplete for this topic.

Thank you for your generosity.

- Patrick DL, Althof SE, Pryor JL, Rosen R, Rowland DL et al. Premature ejaculation: an observational study of men and their partners. J Sex Med 2005; 2:358-67
- Laumann EO, Paik A, Rosen R. Sexual dysfunction in the United States. JAMA 1999; 281:537-44.
- Nicolosi A, Laumann EO, Glasser DB, Moreira ED Jnr, Paik A, Gingell C. Sexual behaviour and sexual dysfunctions after age 40: the global study of sexual attitudes and behaviours. Urology 2004; 63:991-7
- Aschka C, Himmel W, Ittner E, Kochen MM. Sexual problems of male patients in family practice. J Fam Pract 2001; 50:773-8.

*Clinical definition: DSM-IV-TR diagnostic criteria for Premature | Ejaculation (PE)

A. Persistent or recurrent ejaculation with minimal sexual stimulation before, on, or shortly after penetration and before the person wishes it. Clinicians must take into account factors that affect duration of the excitement phase, such as age, novelty of the sexual partner or situation, and recent frequency of sexual activity.

B. The disturbance causes marked distress or interpersonal difficulty.

C. The premature ejaculation is not due exclusively to the direct effects of a substance (e.g., withdrawal from opioids).

Defining Premature Ejaculation

These are examples of the types of questions you could ask the patient in order to determine whether they meet the Diagnostic Criteria for Premature Ejaculation according to the DSM-IV-TR definition. [see square brackets]

You do not need to report responses to these questions - this is just a guide to help you decide whether the patient satisfies these criteria.

 During sexual intercourse do you (if male patient) / does your partner (if female patient) often ejaculate before you wish?

Yes / No [required answer to meet criteria = 'yes']

 If 'Yes' how much of a problem is this for you? None / A little / Somewhat / Very much
 [required answer to meet criteria = 'somewhat' or 'very much']

• During the time that this problem has been happening, has (the male partner) started taking, or stopped taking, any therapeutic/recreational substance?

Yes / No [required answer to meet criteria = 'no']

94 Type 2 diabetes—investigations and related conditions

Organisation supporting this study: National Prescribing Service

Issues: The prevalence of type 2 diabetes among patients attending general practice, the most recent HbA1c level and time since last HbA1c test; current blood pressure level; the proportion of type 2 diabetes patients taking aspirin, clopidogrel, and/or an ACE inhibitor; the prevalence of specified co-morbidities among the type 2 diabetes patients.

Sample: 2,713 patient encounters with 92 GPs; data collection: 17/01/2006 - 20/02/2006.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Methods for this study: In this study: specified co-morbidities included ischaemic heart disease (IHD), cerebrovascular disease (CVD), peripheral vascular disease (PVD) or microalbuminuria/proteinuria. Blood pressure levels were defined according to the classification from the Heart Foundation, available from <www.heartfoundation/ downloads/hypertension_management_guide_2004>.

Summary of results

The age-sex distribution of the respondents was similar to the distribution for all BEACH encounters, with the majority of patients (58.0%) being female. Patients aged 45–64 years accounted for 26.5% of the sample.

Of the 2,713 respondents, 224 (8.3%, 95% CI: 6.7–9.8) had been diagnosed with type 2 diabetes. There was no significant difference in the prevalence between males and females.

The most recent HbA1c level was provided for 206 (92.0%) of these patients. More than half (53.9%) had an optimal HbA1c level of \leq 7.0%, while 18.5% of patients had an HbA1c level of more than 8.0%. The mean HbA1c level was 7.2% (95% CI: 7.0–7.3). Two-thirds of these patients had their last HbA1c test within the previous 3 months. Only 4.9% of patients had not had their HbA1c tested for over 12 months.

For 217 Type 2 diabetic patients blood pressure readings were taken and recorded at the consultation. According to Heart Foundation definitions, 49.3% of the patients had 'high-normal' blood pressure and 7.4% had mild, moderate or severe hypertension.

For 223 type 2 diabetic patients questions about selected current medications were answered. Nearly half these patients (49.3%) were taking aspirin and a further 5.4% were taking clopidogrel. Over two-thirds (64.7%) were using an ace inhibitor medication. A combination of aspirin/clopidogrel and an ace inhibitor was reported for 41.3% of these respondents while 12.6% were taking aspirin/clopidogrel only and 23.8% an ace inhibitor only.

There were 217 patients for whom both medication and blood pressure data were complete. Of those with 'normal' blood pressure 51.7% were taking an ace inhibitor. Of those with 'high-normal' blood pressure 66.4% were taking an ace inhibitor and of those with 'high' blood pressure 75.0% were taking an ace inhibitor.

Two in five (42.1%) of respondents (n=216) had at least one of the four listed co-morbidities or risk factors, the most common co-morbidity being IHD (24.5% of patients with diabetes), followed by microalbuminuria/proteinuria (13.4%), CVD (7.8%) and PVD (7.9%).

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, 45 Diabetes mellitus prevalence, management and risk factors, 86 Diabetes Types 1 and 2 and coronary heart disease, 87 Management of cardiovascular or diabetes related conditions.

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **TYPE 2 DIABETES.** You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

INSTRUCTIONS

Ask $\underline{\textbf{ALL}}$ of the $\underline{\textbf{next 30 PATIENTS}}$ the following questions

in the order in which the patients are seen.

Please **DO NOT** select patients to suit the topic being investigated.



95 Cultural background of patients attending general practice

Organisations supporting this study: Australian General Practice Statistics and Classification Centre (AGPSCC)

Issues: The proportion of people attending general practice who were born in and/or have parents born in countries outside Australia; distribution of type of cultural background; the proportion who self identify as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander people; the proportion who speak a language other than English in the home.

Sample: 6,035 respondents from 202 GPs; data collection period: 20/07/2004-23/08/2004.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Summary of results

Fifty-eight per cent of respondents were female which is comparable with the total BEACH sample. There were a greater proportion of patients aged 65 years and over in this SAND sample (31.7%) compared with the total BEACH sample (26.8%).

Nearly a quarter of respondents (25.4%) were themselves born overseas. Patients born overseas were most often born in England (n=333, 5.5%), Italy (n=131, 2.2%) and New Zealand (n=79, 1.3%). More than one-third (36.1%) of patients had their mother born overseas and 38.2% had their father born overseas. At least one parent was born overseas for two out of five respondents (41.5%).

Ninety-five (1.6%, 95% CI: 0.7–2.5) respondents identified as being of either Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander origin.

Seventeen per cent (17.1%, 95% CI: 14.1–20.0) of respondents reported speaking a language other than English at home. Southern European languages (for example, Italian, Greek, French, Spanish) were the most common, spoken by 5.7% of respondents, followed by Eastern Asian Languages (for example, Cantonese, Mandarin, Korean, Japanese) with 2.6%, Southwest Asian and North African Languages (for example Arabic, Farsi) (2.1%) and Eastern European Languages (e.g. Russian, Czech, Croatian, Armenian) (2.0%).

For other related abstracts see: 52 Language and cultural background of patients, 65 Language and cultural background of general practice patients.

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

INSTRUCTIONS



237

96 Inhaled corticosteroid use for asthma management

Organisation supporting this study: Australian General Practice Statistics and Classification Centre

Issues: Prevalence of asthma among patients attending general practice; severity of asthma; proportion taking asthma medication, proportion taking inhaled corticosteroids (ICS); current ICS and its daily dose; proportion adequately managed on ICS; proportion of patients with ICS dosage altered since resolution of last exacerbation and reason for alteration.

Sample: 5,911 respondents from 201 GPs; data collection period: 21/02/2006 – 27/03/2006 and 02/05/2006 – 05/06/2006.

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 and sex distributions of respondents were similar to the distribution for all BEACH (general practice) encounters, with the majority (58.1%) of patients being female.

GPs indicated that 686 (11.6%, 95% CI: 10.6–12.7) of the 5,911 respondents had diagnosed asthma. Prevalence did not differ between the sexes and was highest (19.0%) among 5–14 year olds.

Medication data were provided for 671 of the 686 respondents with asthma. Only 9.4% of these did not take any asthma medication. About half (49.3%) were taking one asthma medication, 32.0% were taking two and 9.3% three or more. Short acting beta agonists were being used by 66.5% of asthma patients, combination products (long acting beta agonist and ICS) by 35.6% and ICS by 24.1%. ICS (alone or as part of a combination product) were used by 57.4% (95% CI: 52.6–62.2). Most asthma patients (86.3%) were taking a reliever (beta agonist alone or in combination). The majority (53.4%) were using both a reliever and preventer and 32.9% were taking a reliever only.

Classification of severity of the asthma was provided by the GP for 82 children. Of these, 76.8% (n=63) had infrequent asthma, 22% (n=18) had frequent asthma and 1.2% (n=1) had persistent asthma. For 503 adults, severity was recorded. About one-third (34.8%) had very mild asthma, 34.4% had mild asthma, 27.8% had moderate asthma and 3.0% had severe asthma.

Of the 395 patients taking an ICS (alone or in combination) details of current dose were provided for 361. Half of these patients were taking fluticasone/salmeterol (55.7%), 15.5% were taking fluticasone propionate and 15.5% were taking budesonide/eformoterol.

Adequacy of current management with the current ICS dose was judged for 327 of the 361 patients for whom ICS medication data had been provided. GPs indicated that for 88.4% of these patients the current ICS dose had provided adequate management of their asthma, for 6.7% it did not provide adequate management, and for 4.9% GPs were unsure.

Information about changes (or not) in ICS dosage since the last exacerbation was provided for 356 of the 361 for whom ICS details had been given. A further 35 responded to this question because they had ceased ICS medication since the last exacerbation. In all 391 responses were received. The ICS dose had not been altered since last exacerbation for 62.4%

of these respondents. The ICS dosage had been decreased for 12.8% and had been stopped for 9.0% since the last exacerbation.

For other related abstracts see: 3 Asthma, 22 Asthma – prevalence, severity and management, 39 Severity of asthma, medications and management, 48 Asthma prevalence and management, 63 Asthma-prevalence, management and medication side-effects, 70 Inhaled corticosteroid use for asthma management, 104 Asthma management and medication use among patients attending general practice.

Further reading:

Henderson, J., Knox, S., Pan, Y., & Britt, H. 2004, 'Changes in asthma management in Australian general practice', *Prim.Care Respir.J*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 138–143.

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

Severity*	Common features			
Very mild	Episodic			
Mild	Occasional symptoms (up to 2/wk); exacerbations >6-8 weeks apart; normal FEV $_1$ when asymptomatic			
Moderate	Symptoms most days; exacerbations <6-8 weeks apart which affect day-time activity and sleep; exacerbations last several days; occasional emergency room visit.			
Severe	Persistent; limited activity level; nocturnal symptoms > 1/wk; frequent emergency room visits and hospital admission in past year; FEV ₁ may be significantly reduced between exacerbations.			
* The severity classes are adapted from the NAC Asthma Management Handbook 1998 edition, updated March 2002				

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **INHALED CORTICOSTEROID USE FORASTHMA.** You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.



97 Statin medication use among high CHD risk patients attending general practice

Organisations supporting this study: Merck Sharp & Dohme (Australia) Pty Ltd

Issues: The proportion of patients attending general practice who are in a high risk category for coronary heart disease (CHD); the proportion of these patients taking statin medication; National Heart Foundation (NHF) lipid targets reached by patients taking statin medication; proposed treatment of patients who had not reached targets.

Sample: 2,707 respondents from 94 GPs; data collection period: 28/03/2006 - 05/05/2006.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Methods for this study: High CHD risk conditions of interest for this sample of patients were hypertension, diagnosed coronary heart disease, familial hyperlipidaemia, diabetes mellitus, cerebrovascular disease and peripheral vascular disease.

Summary of results

The age and sex distributions of respondents were similar to those for all BEACH encounters, the majority (60.0%) of patients being female. Of the 2,707 patients, 1,042 (38.5%, 95% CI: 35.2–41.8) had at least one of the high CHD risk conditions, hypertension being most common (29.6% of patients), followed by familial hyperlipidaemia (9.2%).

Of the 1,015 CHD high risk patients responding to the question on statin use, 489 (48.2%) were currently taking or commencing a statin medication. Statin use was highest for the 65–74 years age group, where 57.8% were taking a statin medication, and it was significantly higher for male patients (54.7%, 95% CI: 48.7–60.8) than for female patients (43.0%, 95% CI: 38.0–47.9). Statin use was highest (78.3%) among patients with diagnosed CHD, followed by those with familial hypercholesterolaemia (76.5%).

Of the 489 patients taking or commencing a statin, specific details on those medications were provided for 437 patients (89.4%). The most common statins taken (or commenced at that encounter) were atorvastatin (54.2% of all statins recorded) and simvastatin (31.1%).

Of the 477 responses to the question on NHF target for lipid levels, 328 patients (68.8%) had achieved the target. Of patients with coronary heart disease, 74.6% had achieved target levels, while 66.9% of patients with familial hyperlipidaemian had achieved target levels. There were no significant differences found in the rate of target lipid levels achieved with different statin medications.

There were 473 respondents for whom details on NHF targets and up-titration suitability were recorded. Of these, 145 (30.7%) had not achieved target levels. For 33 (22.8%) of these patients, up-titration was not possible. The most common reason given for not up-titrating the statin was that the patient was on maximum dose (53.1%). Intolerance of a higher dose was the second most common reason, given for 21.9% of these patients. The ongoing lipid treatment proposed for most of these patients, 59.3%, was to maintain the current statin.

For other related abstracts see: 15 Lipid lowering medication, 20 Screening and management of blood cholesterol, 30 Lipid lowering medications and coronary heart disease, 46 Coronary heart disease, risk factors and lipid lowering medication, 58 Lipid lowering medications: patient eligibility under PBS, 64 Current use of statins by general practice patients, 67 Risk factors of patients on lipid lowering medications, 79 Hypertension and dyslipidaemia – comorbidity and management in general practice patients, 86 Diabetes Types 1 and 2 and coronary heart disease, 99 Lipid management in patients with high risk conditions.

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **PATIENTS TAKING STATIN THERAPY.** You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.


98 Management of hypertension and angina in general practice patients

Organisations supporting this study: Abbott Australasia Pty Ltd

Issues: The proportion of patients attending general practice with hypertension and/or angina; current and target blood pressure levels for those with hypertension; medication use for hypertension and/or angina; co-morbidities present in patients with hypertension and/or angina (diabetes type I or II, ischaemic heart disease (IHD), peripheral vascular disease (PVD), renal disease, stroke and isolated systolic hypertension).

Sample: 2,919 respondents from 98 GPs; data collection period: 02/05/2006-05/06/2006.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Methods for this study: Heart Foundation guidelines were used to classify blood pressure (available from <www.heartfoundation/downloads/hypertension_management_guide _2004>).

Summary of results

The age and sex distributions of respondents were similar to those for all BEACH encounters, the majority (60.6%) of patients being female. Of the 2,919 patients, 718 (24.6%, 95% CI: 21.4–27.8) had diagnosed hypertension. The prevalence of hypertension increased with age from <1% among those aged<25 years to 60.1% of patients aged 75 years or over. There was no significant difference in the sex–specific rate of hypertension.

Of 2,856 respondents, 133 (4.7%, 95% CI: 3.7–5.7) had diagnosed angina. Males were significantly more likely to have angina (6.5 per 100 encounters, 95% CI: 4.7–8.3) than females (3.5, 95% CI: 2.5–4.6). The rate of angina increased with age to 18.4% of patients aged 75 years or more. A quarter of all respondents (25.4%, n=740) had either hypertension or angina, and 3.8% (n=111) had both hypertension and angina.

Blood pressure (BP) was measured at the encounter for 696 of the 718 patients with hypertension. Almost half (46.7%) of these had high–normal, 6.2% normal BP, 28.2% isolated systolic hypertension and 18.9% had BP defined as hypertensive.

Target BP level was recorded for 667 patients with diagnosed hypertension, 75.1% of whom had a target BP classified as 'high-normal'. Of the patients whose BP was measured and target BP recorded (n=660), 50.6% met their targets. A further 15.3% had lower measured BP than target and 34.1% had higher BP than target.

Of the 718 patients with hypertension, 713 provided data on 933 medications. Most patients were on a single medication (n=423, 59.3%), 255 (35.8%) were taking 2 medications and 35 were not currently taking any medications. Of the 133 patients with angina, 130 provided data about 167 medications. Most patients were on a single medication (n=63, 38.5%), 52 (40.0%) were taking 2 medications and 15 were not currently taking any medications.

Information on co-morbidities was provided by 669 patients with hypertension and/or angina. Half of these (50.4%) had at least one of the listed co-morbidities (21.8% diabetes, 27.8%, 7.0% IHD, 8.1% PVD, 8.1% renal disease, 6.1% stroke).

For other related abstracts see: 26 Prevalence of diagnosed hypertension and difficulties in treatment, 59 Hypertension management and control in general practice patients, 79 Hypertension and dyslipidaemia – comorbidity and management in general practice patients, 98 Management of hypertension and angina in general practice patients. The following page contains the recording form and instructions with which the data in this abstract were collected.

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

INSTRUCTIONS

Ask ALL of the next 30 PATIENTS the following questions

in the order in which the patients are seen.

Please **DO NOT** select patients to suit the topic being investigated.

Blood pressure - Hypertensive patients

Please test the patient's blood pressure

today and write the levels in the space

Also, please advise what **BP levels** you would like this patient to achieve.

Hypertension and / or angina

Please indicate by ticking the appropriate box whether this patient currently has diagnosed hypertension and / or angina

If neither condition has been diagnosed, either today or previously, you should end the questions here.

provided.

Medications

Please write the name and regimen of the medication/s this patient is currently taking for the management of hypertension or angina.

If no medication is taken for either hypertension or angina, please tick the 'No hypertension medication' and /or the 'No angina medication' box/es.

Other co-morbidity

Please advise whether the patient also has any of the listed conditions. Tick as many as apply.

If the patient has none of these conditions, please tick the box labelled 'none of the above'.

↓	↓	↓		\checkmark
Does this patient have	If 'yes' to hypertension, what is the	What medication is currently being taken for HYPERTENSION?		Does the patient also have:
diagnosed	patient's blood pressure (BP) today?	<u>Name & Form Strength Dose Freq</u>	□ No	Diabetes - type I or II
- Hypertension? 🛛 Yes	Systolic mmHg	1	hypertension	Ischaemic Heart Disease
No No	Diastolic mmHg	2	medication	Peripheral vascular disease
and / or	What is your target BP for this patient?	What medication is currently being taken for ANGINA2		Renal disease
- Angina? 🛛 Yes	Svetolic pmHg	what medication is currently being taken to Anoma:	□ No angina	 Stroke (current or history)
	systolic mining	3	modication	Isolated systolic hypertension
If neither, end questions here	Diastolic mmHg	4	medication	□ None of the above BL82C

99 Lipid management in patients with high risk conditions

Organisation supporting this study: AstraZeneca Pty Ltd and Merck, Sharp & Dohme (Australia) Pty Ltd

Issues: Prevalence of selected risk factors among patients attending general practice; current lipid levels; whether target levels had been met; lipid lowering management; proportion who had cholesterol test in conjunction with current encounter; proportion managed by a specialist for dyslipidaemia, type of specialist; future management plan.

Sample: 5,372 encounters with 183 GPs; data collection period: 06/06/2006 - 14/08/2006.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Methods for this study: In this study risk factors include: coronary heart disease (CHD), diabetes, hypertension, familial hypercholesterolaemia, elevated cholesterol, family history of CHD and peripheral vascular disease.

Summary of results

The age and sex distributions of respondents were similar to the distributions for all BEACH (general practice) encounters, with the majority (58.7%) of patients being female.

From the 5,372 patient encounters, 2,270 (42.3%, 95% CI: 39.8–44.7) patients had at least one risk factor, and age-specific rates increased with age to 77.7% (95% CI: 74.2–81.2) among patients 75+ years. The most common risk factor was hypertension (24.5%), followed by elevated cholesterol (17.8%). One-fifth of patients (21.3%) indicated they had only one of the listed risk factors and 21.0% had two or more.

Total cholesterol (TC) level was provided for 1,786 patients, and the average TC level was 5.1 mmol/L. Female patients had a significantly higher average level (5.3, 95% CI: 5.2–5.4) than males (4.9, 95% CI: 4.8–5.0). GPs felt 56% of 1,584 respondents had reached target TC levels. The average high-density lipoprotein (HDL) level was 1.5 mmol/L (from 1,461 respondents). GPs indicated that 83.1% (of 1,277 respondents) had reached target HDL level. The average low density lipoprotein (LDL) level was 2.9 mmol/L (from 1,402 respondents). GPs indicated that 60.4% (of 1,224 respondents) had reached target level. The average triglyceride (TG) level was 1.7 mmol/L (from 1,692 respondents). GPs indicated that 73.6% (of 1,277 respondents) had reached target TG level.

Of 2,057 patients for whom information on current lipid medication was available, 882 (42.9%) were currently taking 903 lipid medications. Atorvastatin accounted for 46.2%, simvastatin 35.1% and pravastatin 11.1% of these. Of 1,562 respondents, 56.2% indicated diet and/or advice was a current lipid management strategy, for 44.6% (n=697) this was a previous strategy and for 17.5% (n=274) this strategy had not been used.

Of the 2,119 respondents to the question on cholesterol monitoring, 31% were tested in conjunction with the current consultation.

Specialists managed 11% of 2,061 patients with dyslipidaemia. The most common type of specialist was a cardiologist (63.5% of 181 patients for whom type of specialist was recorded). Of the 2,106 respondents changes to medication were planned for 16.6%: 2.9% to increase the dose of the same medication; 1.9% to add a new medication.

For other related abstracts see: 15 Lipid lowering medication, 20 Screening and management of blood cholesterol, 30 Lipid lowering medications and coronary heart disease, 46 Coronary heart disease, risk factors and lipid lowering medication, 58 Lipid lowering medications: patient eligibility under PBS, 64 Current use of statins by general practice patients, 67 Risk factors of patients on lipid lowering medications, 79 Hypertension and dyslipidaemia – comorbidity and management in general practice patients, 97 Statin medication use among high CHD risk patients attending general practice. The following page contains the recording form and instructions with which the data in this abstract were collected.

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **PATIENT LIPID LEVELS and MANAGEMENT.** You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

INSTRUCTIONS



100 Gastrointestinal symptoms in patients attending general practice

Organisation supporting this study: Janssen-Cilag Pty Ltd

Issues: The proportion of general practice patients with heartburn or reflux; the diurnal distribution of symptoms; predominant symptoms; duration and frequency of episodes; source and nature of management.

Sample: 2,801 encounters from 97 GPs; data collection period: 06/06/2006 - 10/07/2006.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Methods for this study: A card was supplied to participating GPs to assist in defining the primary symptom, and the frequency and severity of gastrointestinal symptoms.

Summary of results

The age-sex distribution of respondents was similar to the distribution for all BEACH encounters, with the majority (58.5%) of patients being female.

In the 2,801 encounters, 827 patients (29.5%, 95% CI: 26.4–32.6) indicated that they had symptoms of heartburn and/or reflux. The proportion of patients with heartburn or reflux was similar among males and females. The likelihood of experiencing symptoms increased with age, with 44.0% of patients aged between 65 and 74 years experiencing such symptoms.

Of the 827 patients reporting symptoms 381 (46.1%, 95% CI: 41.4–50.7) indicated that they currently had symptoms, 255 (30.1%, 95% CI: 26.4–35.3) had symptoms over the past 12 months, and 245 (29.6%, 95% CI: 25.3–33.9) had past symptoms that had now resolved.

The predominant symptom was heartburn among 404 patients (54.4%, 95% CI: 48.6–60.2), followed by acid regurgitation in 251 patients (33.8%, 95% CI: 28.7–38.8). Almost half the patients, 350 (45.8%, 95% CI: 40.8–50.8) experienced their symptoms both day and night.

Episodes of symptoms lasted a mean of 2.5 hours, with a median of 1.0 hour. Three in ten patients (30.1%, n=220) stated they had experienced symptoms for 1 to 5 years, and 20.1% (n=147) indicated their symptoms had been present for less than 1 year.

Half the patients (51.1%, n=396) had symptoms on less than 25% of days, and 23.5% (n=182) had symptoms on 25% to 50% of days. Two in five patients (40.3%, n=326) ranked their symptoms as mild, 41.6% (n=337) as moderate and 18.1% (n=147) as severe or very severe.

Of the 816 patients who indicated whether they had sought treatment 80.4% (n=656) had sought treatment. The most common sources of treatment was a GP (70.3%, n=457), or a specialist (25.5%, n=166), while 20.9% (n=136) self-medicated using supermarket products.

The most common diagnosis was oesophageal reflux in 66.3% (327 of 493 recorded diagnoses) of patients, followed by oesophagitis in 10.8% (n=53) of patients.

The most common investigation was endoscopy constituting 84.1% of 277 recorded investigations. Patients were referred to gastroenterologists in 125 of 159 total referrals.

Of the 544 medications used in the treatment of gastrointestinal symptoms, esomeprazole was the most common (22.1% of all medications listed), followed by omeprazole (19.9%) and pantoprazole (15.1%).

For other related abstracts see: 18 Drugs for the treatment of peptic ulcer and reflux, 24 Gastro-oesophageal reflux disease (GORD) in general practice patients, 34 Gastro-oesophageal reflux disease (GORD), 51 Use of proton pump inhibitors for gastrointestinal problems, 60 Prevalence of GORD and associated proton pump inhibitor use, 62 Use of proton pump inhibitors by general practice patients, 91 Prevalence and management of gastrointestinal symptoms.

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

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

INSTRUCTIONS

Ask ALL of the next 30 PATIENTS the following questions

in the order in which the patients are seen.

Please DO NOT select patients to suit the topic being investigated.

Treatment sought The patient may or may not have presented to you for help with these Heartburn or reflux symptoms. Please ask the patient if *Severity of symptoms they have sought treatment for their Please indicate by ticking the appropriate box/es GI symptoms from any source. If 'no' whether this patient has experienced heartburn or Please refer to the you may end the questions here. oesophageal reflux either currently, in the past definitions of severity on 12 months or at another time in the past but which the laminated cards in your If 'yes' please use the tick boxes to has since resolved. Tick as many as apply. research kit and advise the advise where the patient sought level of severity for this If the patient has not experienced these symptoms treatment. patient's symptoms. please end the questions here. Management of GI symptoms (definitions also Primary symptoms, duration and frequency Time since onset or on laminated duration of episodes card in research If the patient has sought treatment, either from Please circle an option or write a response to advise: pack) you or from another source, please advise the Please advise the . the time of day the patient typically experiences/ed symptoms diagnosis, investigation/s, referral/s and approximate time since current medication taken for management. You the primary (1°) or predominant symptom* experienced the episodes of GI may need to ask the patient for this information. (1 = heartburn/epigastric pain 2 = acid regurgitation 3 = bloating 4 = belching)symptoms commenced. If the management was advice only e.g. to the duration of each episode i.e.how long the symptoms last If GI symptoms are now change diet, please tick the box labelled 'advice • the **frequency**** of symptoms i.e how often they occur. resolved, please advise only'. If the patient cannot provide information (1 = on <25% of days 2 = ≥ 25% but <50% of days how long episodes about management, please tick the box labelled 4 = ≥ 75% of days) 3 = ≥ 50% but <75% of days were experienced. 'unknown'. Has the patient experienced If 'Yes' symptoms typically were Has the patient sought treatment? If treatment was sought, describe management: How severe* How long were $\square \text{ No} \rightarrow \text{End questions}$ heartburn or reflux? (tick all experienced: episodes are/were the Diagnosis (please specify) Yes - currently symptoms? Yes, please specify that apply) experienced/ Day / night / both (please circle) Investigation (please specify) Self-medication - supermarket (see definition on since episodes Yes - over the last 12 • 1° Symptom * = 1 2 3 4 card) Referral (please specify)_ began? Self-medication - pharmacy months (see definition on card) (please circle) 🗆 mild Medication (please specify) D Pharmacist/OTC medication Yes - in the past, now Duration _____ (hours) moderate GP GP Name & Form Strength Dose Freq resolved severe • Frequency** = 1 2 3 4 weeks / mths / yrs □ Specialist BL83C No \rightarrow End questions (please circle) (see definition on card) (please circle) very severe Unknown □ Advice only Emergency department

248

*Primary (1°) Symptom

Please categorise the patient's predominant symptom as one of the following:

1 = Heartburn or epigastric pain

2 = Acid regurgitation

3 = Bloating

4 = Belching

**Frequency of Symptoms

Please categorise the description that most closely resembles the patient's impression of symptom frequency over the total time they experienced their heartburn or reflux symptoms:

Rating	Criteria
1 = few	Occurring on <25% of days
2 = several	Occurring on ≥25% but <50%of days
3 = many	Occurring on ≥50% but <75%of days
4 = continual	Occurring on ≥75% of days

Adapted from Birbara C, Breiter J, Perdomo C, et al. *Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2000; Aug 12(8):889-897.

*Severity of Symptoms Please categorise the description that most closely resembles the patient's impression of symptom severity: Rating Daytime Night-time Symptoms are present, but Symptoms are disturbing, causing little or no but you immediately go 1 = mild symptoms discomfort back to sleep Symptoms are annoying, Symptoms are annoying, you remain awake for a but not interfering with your short time before going 2 = moderate symptoms daily activities back to sleep Symptoms are causing marked discomfort and Symptoms are disturbing, and you have difficulty some interference with your 3 = severe symptoms daily routine returning to sleep Symptoms are disabling, Symptoms are disabling, interferes considerably with you are unable to return to sleep because of discomfort 4 = very severe symptoms your daily routine

Adapted from Birbara C, Breiter J, Perdomo C, et al. *Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2000; Aug 12(8):889-897.

101 Types of medicine use and patient use of medicines list

Organisation supporting this study: National Prescribing Service

Issues: To determine: the proportion of general practice patients who regularly take medicine and the type(s) of medicines they take; the types of medicines recorded in the patient's medical record; the use of Medicines Lists in general practice patients who regularly take medicines; the types of medicines included in the Medicines List.

Sample: 5,528 encounters with 187 GPs; data collection period: 11/07/2006 - 18/09/2006

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Summary of results

The age distribution of respondents differed a little from the average for BEACH, with fewer patients aged 25–44 years and more aged 75+ at these encounters; sex distribution was similar to BEACH (general practice) encounters, the majority (55.7%) being female.

At the 5,528 patient encounters, GPs indicated that 3,829 (69.3%; 95% CI: 66.5–72.0) patients regularly took at least one of the medicine types listed. Of these, 3,767 specified whether they had as Medicines list, and 31.0% (95% CI: 27.3–34.6) stated they did.

Prescription medications

Overall, 3,493 (63.2%, 95% CI: 60.3–66.1) regularly took prescription medicines and these were said to be recorded in the medical records for 3,415 (98.4%) of 3,470 respondents. Of 3,453 respondents 1,128 (32.7%) had a medicines list. The prescribed medications were said to be on the medicines list by 1,080 (99.7%) of 1,084 patients responding to this question.

Non-prescription medications

Overall, 790 (14.3%, 95% CI: 12.1–16.5) regularly took non-prescription medicines and these medications were said to be in the medical records for 354 (45.3%) of 781 respondents.

A medicines list was held by 234 (30.4) of 771 respondents and the non-prescription medications on the medicines list was confirmed by 148 (65.2%, 95% CI: 56.7–73.7) of 227 respondents to this question

Herbal/natural medicines

Overall, 495 (9.0%, 95% CI: 7.5–10.4) regularly took herbal/natural medicines. For 88 (18.0%) of 488 respondents the herbal/natural medications were in the medical records.

Of 487 respondents 147 (30.2) had a medicines list and the herbal/natural medications was on the medicines list of 72 (51.8%) of 139 respondents

Vitamins/minerals

Overall, 874 (15.8%, 95% CI: 13.4–18.2) regularly took vitamins/minerals and the presence of these vitamins/minerals in the medical record was confirmed for 195 (22.7%) of 861 patients responding to this question.

Of 856 respondents using vitamins/minerals who responded to the medicines list question, 253 (29.6, 95% CI: 23.7–35.4) had a medicines list. The presence of the vitamins/minerals on this list was confirmed by 149 of 240 respondents to this question (62.1%, 95% CI: 52.2–72.0).

For other related abstracts see: 36 Patient use of complimentary therapies.

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

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **TYPES OF MEDICINES AND PATIENT USE OF MEDICINES LIST.** You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

INSTRUCTIONS		Definitions	i
Ask ALL of the next 30 PATIENTS in the order in which the patients Please DO NOT select patients to	the following questions s are seen. suit the topic being investigated.	Prescription medicines: require a prescri *Non-prescription medicines: any tablet that can be bought over the counter at a ch without a prescription. This category exclu- and vitamins and minerals. *Herbal and other natural medicines: in	iption is, syrups, ointments, inhalers or drops nemist, health food or grocery store des herbal and other natural medicines, cludes herbal products, homeopathic
		remedies and traditional medicines. *Vitamins and minerals: any type of vitar prescription. * These medicines can be self-prescribed or recom- realth practitioner or other person. They can be us	nin or mineral available without a mended by a health professional, alternative ed in place of or in addition to prescription
		nedicines Regular use of medicines: medicines tal short term treatment of a specific problem.	ken on an ongoing basis or taken for
Types of medicines Please indicate by ticking the appropriate		Medicines List: a document or card where dose taken, frequency of use, reason for m by the patient are recorded. Medicines List health professionals (e.g. GPs, pharmacist	e details of the medicines (e.g. name, nedicine, date of commencement) taken ts are carried by patients and provided to (s) involved in their management.
box/es whether this patient regularly takes any of the listed types of medicines . (See definitions)	Medicines recorded in the medical record - Please indicate by ticking the -	Medicines List	
Tick as many as apply. If the patient does not take any medicines please end the questions here.	appropriate box/es which types of medicines are recorded in the patient's medical record . (See definitions)	keeps a list of the medicines they take regularly. (See definitions)	Medicines included in the Medicines List f the patient has a Medicines List, either from
	Tick as many as apply.	the questions here.	you or from another source, please advise the types of medicines included in the list.
Does the patient regularly take any of the following? (fick all that apply)	What medicines are recorded in the patient's medical record?	Does the patient keep a list of any of the medicines they take regularly?	Which of the following are included in the patient's Medicines List? (tick all that apply)
 Prescription medicines Non-prescription medicines Herbal and/or other natural medicines Vitamins and/or minerals None → End questions 	 Prescription medicines Non-prescription medicines Herbal and/or other natural medicines Vitamins and/or minerals None 	 Yes No → End questions Unsure → End questions 	 Prescription medicines Non-prescription medicines Herbal and/or other natural medicines Vitamins and/or minerals

102 Alzheimer's disease or dementia in patients attending general practice

Organisation supporting this study: Pfizer Australia

Issues: The proportion of general practice patients with diagnosed or suspected Alzheimer's disease or dementia; the proportion of these patients who have had cognitive assessments; the provider who performed these assessments; severity of diagnosed Alzheimer's disease; medications prescribed for diagnosed Alzheimer's disease.

Sample: 2,863 respondents from 99 GPs; data collection period: 15/08/2006 - 18/09/2006.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Summary of results

The sex distribution of patients was similar to the distribution for all respondents, with 55.4% of the patients being female. There were a significantly larger proportion of patients aged 75 years or more at these encounters (19.2%, 95% CI: 15.9–22.5) than at overall BEACH encounters in 2004–05 (13.9%, 95% CI: 13.1–14.7), and significantly fewer aged 25–44 years.

At least one of the listed conditions was indicated for 119 patients, with an overall prevalence of 4.2%. Prevalence increased with age from 1.3% among 45–64 year olds to 17.1% in those aged 75 years and over. The prevalence of diagnosed Alzheimer's disease was 1.3%, while suspected Alzheimer's disease had a prevalence of 1.3%, diagnosed dementia 1.1% and suspected dementia 1.4%. One patient had been diagnosed with both Alzheimer's disease and dementia.

Of the 37 patients with diagnosed Alzheimer's disease, GPs answered the question on cognitive assessment using the Alzheimer's disease Assessment Scale Cognitive Test (ADAS-Cog) for 17 patients, of whom six had been assessed, all by specialists. None of the patients with suspected Alzheimer's disease has been assessed using the ADAS-Cog. Information about assessment using the ADAS-Cog for patients with either diagnosed or suspected dementia was provided for 39 of the 67 patients with these conditions. Seven patients had been assessed, four by a specialist, two by a GP and one by another health provider.

Severity of diagnosed Alzheimer's disease was provided for 34 patients. Of these, 38.2% were regarded as having severe Alzheimer's disease, while 41.1% had a moderate level of severity.

Of patients on current medication for Alzheimer's disease (n=14), details were provided for 13 patients. Donepezil hydrochloride was the most common medication, taken by 9 patients, 3 patients were taking galantamine hydrobromide and one patient was taking olanzapine. Of the six patients who had changed medication, reasons for this change were listed for 5 patients. Lack of efficacy was the reason for change for two patients and two patients changed due to side effects.

For other related abstracts see: 28 Prevalence of Alzheimer's disease and dementia.

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

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **PATIENTS WITH ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE OR DEMENTIA.** You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

INSTRUCTIONS

Answer the following questions for <u>ALL</u> of the <u>next 30 PATIENTS</u>

in the order in which the patients are seen.

Please DO NOT select patients to suit the topic being investigated.



103 Cardiovascular risk in patients attending general practice

Organisations supporting this study: The Australian General Practice Statistics & Classification Centre on behalf of The George Institute.

Issues: Smoking status of patients attending general practice aged 18 years or older; proportion who have an existing cardiovascular disease (CVD)/risk factors for CVD; medications taken for management of existing CVD/risk factors for CVD (statins, antiplatelet therapy, ACE inhibitors, angiotensin receptor blockers, beta blockers, other antihypertensives); blood pressure (BP), serum creatinine, and cholesterol levels, and the proportion of these that are unknown.

Sample: 2,618 adult respondents (18 years and over) from 99 GPs; data collection period: 19/09/2006-23/10/2006.

Method: Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Methods for this study: Heart Foundation guidelines were used to classify blood pressure (available from <www.heartfoundation/downloads/hypertension_management_guide _2004>).

Summary of results

The age and sex distributions were similar to all adult BEACH encounters for the 2005–06 data collection period, with 60.3% of patients being female.

Smoking status: Data on patient smoking status was available for 2,583 patients. About one in six (16.8%) patients were current smokers, 4.0% had quit within the last 12 months, and 22.6% had quit >12 months ago. Smoking was defined as a cardiovascular risk factor for current smokers and smokers who quit less than 12 months ago. Therefore, 20.8% of patients had a cardiovascular risk factor related to their smoking status.

Existing CVD/risk factors: Of 2,615 adult patients whom CVD/risk factor status could be determined, 1,614 (61.7%, 95% CI: 58.6–64.8) had at least one of eight risk factors. Prevalence of at least one CVD/risk factor was similar for males and females (65.9% c.f. 59.0%), but significantly different by age, increasing from 42.7% for ages 18–24 to 75.0% for 75+.

Prescribed medications for CVD/risk factors: Of 2,553 respondents, 1,006 (39.4%) were currently taking at least one of six listed medications (statins 20.4%, antiplatelet therapy 18.1%, ACE inhibitors 17.6%, angiotensin receptor blockers 11.6%, beta blockers 10.8%, other antihypertensives 14.4%). Males were significantly more likely to be taking a medication (45.0%) than females (35.8%). Likelihood increased significantly from 1.3% of those aged 18–24 to 80.5% of those aged 75+.

Measured BP & serum creatinine: BP was not known for 11.0% of adult patients. Of the 2,282 patients for whom BP was known, 514 (22.5%) had normal BP, 1,142 (50.0%) had high normal BP, and 10.0% had high BP.

Measured total and HDL cholesterol & triglycerides: Of 2,552 respondents to the total cholesterol question, 2,457 to HDL question and 2,534 to the triglycerides question, levels were not known/never tested for 38.6%, 53.2% and 41.8% respectively. For those with test results supplied, mean total cholesterol level (n=1,568) was 5.07 mmol/L (95% CI: 5.00–5.13), mean HDL cholesterol (n=1,151) was 1.53 mmol/L (95% CI: 1.49–1.57) and the mean triglycerides (n=2,534) was 1.56 mmol/L (95% CI: 1.50–1.63).

For other related abstracts see: 20 Screening and management of blood cholesterol, 33 Prevalence and management of cardiovascular risk factors, 46 Coronary heart disease, risk factors and lipid lowering medication, 97 Statin medication use among high CHD risk patients attending general practice, 103 Cardiovascular risk in patients attending general practice.

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

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **CARDIOVASCULAR RISK FOR PATIENTS**. You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.

INSTRUCTIONS

These questions investigate the whole cardiovascular risk for patients aged 18 years or more. For the next 30 PATIENTS, ask every adult (18+) the following questions. If the patient is less than 18 years of age leave the questions blank. Please DO NOT select patients according to their age or to suit the topic being investigated.

Existing cardiovascular disease and risk factors

Please use the tick boxes to indicate whether this

patient has any of the listed diseases or risk factors

(overweight = BMI>25; obesity = BMI>30; family

younger than 65 years when diagnosed with heart

disease; proteinuria includes microalbuminuria,

albuminuria and proteinuria).

history of premature heart disease = a mother or sister younger than 55 years, or a father or brother

ASK THE PATIENT

If this patient is 18 years of age or older please ask which category best describes their smoking status.

255

Current therapy

Please indicate whether, this patient is currently taking statins, antiplatelet therapy, ACE inhibitors, Angiotensin receptor blockers, Beta blockers or other antihypertensives.

Cholesterol levels

Please advise, at the time of most recent testing, the patient's levels of -

- Total Cholesterol (TC),
- High Density Lipoprotein Cholesterol (HDLC),
- Triglycerides (TG)

If you do not know the patient's cholesterol levels or this patient has never been tested tick 'don't know'.

Please indicate when the most recent tests were performed (i.e.<12 months ago or >12 months ago) for each of the TC, HDLC and TG levels.



Please also indicate this patient's most recent serum creatinine level. If never tested or unknown please tick 'don't know'. (Please use micromole/L - μ mol/L)

For patients aged 18+ years:	Does the patient have:	Yes/No	Don't	Is this patient currently taking: Y	es/No	What was this patient's	What were the most recent levels of:	Don't
Which best describes your	(tick all that apply)			Statins		most recent BP reading?	Total Cholesterol mmol/L	
smoking status?	Cerebrovascular disease			Antiplatelet therapy		/mmHg	HDI Cholesterol mmol/l	Π
Current smoker	Peripheral vascular disease.			ACE Inhibitors		Don't know		
Quit <12 months ago	Overweight/obesity	. 🗆 🗖		Angiotensin receptor		What was the most recent		Don't
	Family History of heart disease			blockers		serum creatinine level?	Most recent tests were:	know
	Proteinuria			Beta blockers C		μmol/L	<12 mths ago for • 🔲 TC 🔲 HDLC 🔲 TC	; 🗆
Never smoked	Diabetes			Other antihypertensives C		Don't know BL86B	>12 mths ago for - TC HDLC TC	• 🗖

104 Asthma management and medication use among patients attending general practice

Organisation supporting this study: AstraZeneca Pty Ltd

Issues: The proportion of general practice patients with asthma; frequency of asthma management by a GP; frequency of asthma medication alterations; inhaled corticosteroid (ICS) use by patients with asthma; short acting beta agonist use by patients with asthma.

Sample: 2,862 respondents from 97 GPs; data collection period: 19/09/2006 – 23/10/2006. **Method:** Detailed SAND methods are provided in Chapter 2.

Summary of results

The age and sex distributions of respondents were similar to the distribution for all BEACH (general practice) encounters, with the majority (60.3%) of patients being female.

Of the 2,862 respondents, 442 patients (15.4%; 95% CI: 13.6–17.3) had been diagnosed with asthma. Prevalence was highest among patients aged 15–24 years (22.0%; 95% CI: 16.8–27.1), followed by those aged 5–14 yrs (16.1%, 95% CI: 8.8–23.5), and lowest in patients aged 1–4 years (11.4%; 95% CI: 5.0–17.8). There was no difference in the prevalence of diagnosed asthma among male (15.3%) and female (15.5%) patients.

Of the 442 asthma patients, 421 responded about the number of GP visits in the previous 12 months. In that time, 34 patients (8.1%) had not visited a GP prior to the current visit, 111 (26.4%) had visited 2–4 times, and 71 patients (16.9%) had visited a GP more than 15 times. At these visits, 246 patients had had asthma managed – 102 (24.3%) had asthma managed once, and 95 (22.6%) had asthma managed at 2–3 visits. A further 174 (41.3% of the 421 respondents) had not had asthma managed in the previous 12 months. Of these respondents, 168 provided details of when their asthma was last managed. For 72.6% of these, it had been more than 2 years. Approximately half (48.6%) of the 246 patients with asthma managed in the previous 12 months had not had their asthma medication altered during that time, 33.5% had medication altered once, and 13.9% had medication altered two or three times.

Of the 414 asthma patients who provided responses about asthma medication, 225 (54.3%) used an ICS and 189 (45.7%) did not. More than one third (36.2%) of ICS users took an ICS daily. Details of generic medication were available for 213 patients. Fluticasone/salmeterol in combination was used by 43.7%, budesonide by 19.3%, fluticasone by 16.0% and the budesonide/eformoterol combination was used by 14.1% of patients. The median daily dose reported for the most frequently recorded ICS, fluticasone/salmeterol, was 1,100 mcg.

Of the 442 patients who had been diagnosed with asthma, 398 (90.1%) used a short-acting beta agonist (SABA). Of the 246 patients who had had their asthma managed in the previous 12 months, 232 (94.3%) used a SABA. The most common regimen (for 13.8% of these 232) was twice daily, and just over 10% responded that they used a SABA less than once per year. Of the 174 patients who had no asthma management in the previous year, 91.4% used a SABA.

For other related abstracts see: 3 Asthma, 22 Asthma – prevalence, severity and management, 39 Severity of asthma, medications and management, 48 Asthma prevalence and management, 63 Asthma-prevalence, management and medication side-effects, 70 Inhaled corticosteroid use for asthma management, 96 Inhaled corticosteroid use for asthma management.

Further reading:

Henderson, J., Knox, S., Pan, Y., & Britt, H. 2004, 'Changes in asthma management in Australian general practice', *Prim.Care Respir.J*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 138–143.

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

The shaded section of the following forms asks questions about **FREQUENCY OF ASTHMA MANAGEMENT & OF MEDICATION USE**. You may tear out this page as a guide to completing the following section of forms.



Reference list

- 1. Sayer GP, Britt H, Horn F, Bhasale A, McGeechan K, Charles J et al. 2000. Measures of health and health care delivery in general practice in Australia. AIHW Cat. No. GEP 3. Canberra: Australian Institute of Health and Welfare.
- 2. Medicare Australia 2007. Medicare Benefits Schedule (MBS) statistics reports. Viewed 7 May 2007, <www.medicareaustralia.gov.au/providers/health_statistics/ statistical_reporting/medicare.htm>.
- 3. Commonwealth Department of Health and Aged Care and Australian Institute of Health and Welfare 1999. National Health Priority Areas Report: diabetes mellitus 1998. AIHW Cat. No. PHE 10. Canberra: DHAC & AIHW.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics 2006. National Health Survey: Users' guide electronic publication 2004–05. Edition 4364.0.55.001. Canberra: ABS, Viewed 7 May 2007, <www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/DetailsPage/4363.0.55.0012004-05? OpenDocument>.
- 5. Britt H, Harris M, Driver B, Bridges-Webb C, O'Toole B, Neary S 1992. Reasons for encounter and diagnosed health problems: convergence between doctors and patients. Fam Pract 9:191–194.
- 6. Driver B, Britt H, O'Toole B, Harris M, Bridges-Webb C, Neary S 1991. How representative are patients in general practice morbidity surveys? Fam Pract 8:261–268.
- 7. Sayer GP 2004. The development of Australian general practice data collections for epidemiological surveillance. PhD, University of Sydney.
- 8. Britt H, Miller GC, Charles J, Pan Y, Valenti L, Bayram C et al. 2007. General practice activity in Australia 2005–06. AIHW Cat. No. GEP 19. Canberra: Australian Institute of Health and Welfare.
- 9. Britt H 1998. Reliability of central coding of patient reasons for encounter in general practice, using the International Classification of Primary Care. Informatics(May):3–7.
- 10. Bridges-Webb C, Britt H, Miles DA, Neary S, Charles J, Traynor V 1992. Morbidity and treatment in general practice in Australia 1990–1991. Med J Aust 157(19 Oct Spec Sup):S1–S56.
- 11. Britt H 1997. A measure of the validity of the ICPC in the classification of reasons for encounter. Informatics November:8–12.
- 12. Britt H, Meza RA, Del Mar C 1996. Methodology of morbidity and treatment data collection in general practice in Australia: a comparison of two methods. Fam Pract 13(5):462–467.

- 13. Britt H, Angelis M, Harris E 1998. The reliability and validity of doctor-recorded morbidity data in active data collection systems. Scand J Prim Health Care 16:50–55.
- 14. Britt H, Miller G, Bayram C 2007. The quality of data on general practice a discussion of BEACH reliability and validity. Aust Fam Physician 36(1–2):36–40.
- 15. SAS Proprietary Software Release 6.12. Cary: SAS Institute Inc, 1996.
- 16. SAS Proprietary Software Release 9.1. Cary: SAS Institute Inc, 2003.
- 17. Donner A, Klar N 2004. Pitfalls of and controversies in cluster randomization trials. Am J Public Health 94(3):416–422.
- 18. Kish L 1965. Survey Sampling. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Classification Committee of the World Organization of Family Doctors (WICC) 1998. ICPC-2: International Classification of Primary Care. 2 ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 20. World Health Organisation Collaborating Centre for Drug Statistics Methodology (WHO) 1997. Anatomical Therapeutic Chemical (ATC) classification index with Defined Daily Doses (DDDs). January;1998 ed. Oslo: WHO.
- 21. Bayram C, Britt H, Kelly Z, Valenti L 2003. Male consultations in general practice in Australia 1999–00. AIHW Cat. No. GEP 11. Canberra: Australian Institute of Health and Welfare.
- 22. Henderson J, Knox S, Pan Y, Britt H 2004. Changes in asthma management in Australian general practice. Primary Care Respiratory Journal 13(3):138–143.
- 23. Miller GC, Britth HC, Valenti L 2006. Adverse drug events in general practice patients in Australia. Med J Aust 184(7):321–324.
- 24. Britt H, Miller G, Knox S, Charles J, Pan Y, Henderson J et al. 2005. General Practice Activity in Australia 2004–05. AIHW Cat. No. GEP 18. Canberra: Australian Institute of Health and Welfare.
- 25. Britt H, Miller GC, Knox S, Charles J, Valenti L, Pan Y et al. 2004. General Practice Activity in Australia 2003–04. AIHW Cat. No. GEP 16. Canberra: Australian Institute of Health and Welfare.
- 26. Britt H, Miller GC, Knox S, Charles J, Valenti L, Henderson J et al. 2003. General practice activity in Australia 2002–03. AIHW Cat. No. GEP 14. Canberra: Australian Institute of Health and Welfare.
- 27. Britt H, Miller GC, Knox S, Charles J, Valenti L, Henderson J et al. 2002. General practice activity in Australia 2001–02. AIHW Cat. No. GEP 10. Canberra: Australian Institute of Health and Welfare.

- 28. Britt H, Miller GC, Knox S, Charles J, Valenti L, Henderson J et al. 2001. General practice activity in Australia 2000–01. AIHW Cat. No. GEP 8. Canberra: Australian Institute of Health and Welfare.
- 29. World Health Organization 2006. Global database on body mass index. Viewed 9 August 2006, <www.who.int/bmi/index.jsp?introPage=intro_3.html>.
- 30. Dunstan D, Zimmet P, Welborn T, Sicree R, Armstrong T, Atkins R et al. 2001. Diabesity and associated disorders in Australia 2000: The accelerating epidemic. Melbourne: International Diabetes Institute.
- 31. Australian Bureau of Statistics 2002. National Health Survey: Summary of Results, Australia, 2001. Canberra: Australian Bureau of Statistics.
- 32. Cole TJ, Bellizzi MC, Flegal KM, Dietz WH 2000. Establishing a standard definition for child overweight and obesity worldwide: international survey. BMJ 320(7244):1240–1243.
- 33. Saunders JB, Aasland OG, Babor TF, de la Fuente JR, Grant M 1993. Development of the Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT): WHO Collaborative Project on Early Detection of Persons with Harmful Alcohol Consumption—II. Addiction 88(6):791–804.
- 34. Centre for Drug and Alcohol Studies 1993. The alcohol use disorders identification test. Sydney, Royal Prince Alfred Hospital and the University of Sydney.
- 35. Commonwealth Department of Health and Aged Care (DHAC) 2001. Medicare Benefits Schedule Book. Canberra: DHAC.

Glossary

A1 Medicare items: Medicare item numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 13, 19, 20, 23, 24, 25, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 43, 44, 47, 48, 50, 51, 601, 602.

Aboriginal: The patient identifies himself or herself as an Aboriginal person.

Activity level: The number of general practice A1 Medicare items claimed during the previous 3 months by a participating GP.

Allied and other health professionals: Those who provide clinical and other specialised services in the management of patients, including physiotherapists, occupational therapists, dietitians, dentists and pharmacists.

Complaint: A symptom or disorder expressed by the patient when seeking care.

Consultation: See Encounter.

Diagnosis/problem: A statement of the provider's understanding of a health problem presented by a patient, family or community. GPs are instructed to record at the most specific level possible from the information available at the time. It may be limited to the level of symptoms.

- *New problem:* The first presentation of a problem, including the first presentation of a recurrence of a previously resolved problem but excluding the presentation of a problem first assessed by another provider.
- *Old problem:* A previously assessed problem that requires ongoing care. Includes followup for a problem or an initial presentation of a problem previously assessed by another provider.

Encounter (enc): Any professional interchange between a patient and a GP.

- *Indirect:* Encounter where there is no face-to-face meeting between the patient and the GP but a service is provided (e.g. prescription, referral).
- *Direct:* Encounter where there is a face-to-face meeting of the patient and the GP.

Direct encounters can be further divided into:

- *Medicare-claimable:* Including Surgery consultations, Home visits, Hospital encounters, Residential aged care facility, Health assessments, Chronic disease management items, Case conferences, Incentive payments, Other MBS encounters.
- *Workers compensation:* Encounters paid by workers compensation insurance.
- Other paid: Encounters paid from another source (e.g. state).

General practitioner (GP): A medical practitioner who provides primary comprehensive and continuing care to patients and their families within the community (Royal Australian College of General Practitioners).

Medication: Medication that is prescribed, provided by the GP at the encounter or advised for over-the-counter purchase.

Medication rates: The rate of use of all medications including medications that were prescribed, supplied by the GP and advised for over-the-counter purchase.

Medication status:

- *New:* The medication prescribed/provided at the encounter/advised is being used for the management of the problem for the first time.
- *Continuation:* The medication prescribed/provided at the encounter/advised is a continuation or repeat of previous therapy for this problem.
- Old: See Continuation.

Morbidity: Any departure, subjective or objective, from a state of physiological wellbeing. In this sense, sickness, illness and morbid conditions are synonymous.

Prescribed rates: The rate of use of prescribed medications (i.e. does not include medications that were GP-supplied or advised for over-the-counter purchase).

Problem managed: See Diagnosis/problem.

Provider: A person to whom a patient has access when contacting the health care system.

Reasons for encounter (RFEs): The subjective reasons given by the patient for seeing or contacting the general practitioner. These can be expressed in terms of symptoms, diagnoses or the need for a service.

Recognised GP: A medical practitioner who is:

- vocationally recognised under Section 3F of the Health Insurance Act, or
- a holder of the Fellowship of the Royal Australian College of General Practitioners who participates in, and meets the requirements for, quality assurance and continuing medical education as defined in the RACGP Quality Assurance and Continuing Medical Education Program, *or*
- undertaking an approved placement in general practice as part of a training program for general practice leading to the award of the Fellowship of the Royal Australian College of General Practitioners or undertaking an approved placement in general practice as part of some other training program recognised by the RACGP as being of equivalent standard.³⁵

Referral: The process by which the responsibility for part or all of the care of a patient is temporarily transferred to another health care provider. Only new referrals to specialists and allied health professionals and for hospital and residential aged care facility admissions arising at a recorded encounter are included. Continuation referrals are not included. Multiple referrals can be recorded at any one encounter.

Torres Strait Islander: The patient identifies himself or herself as a Torres Strait Islander person.

Abbreviations

AGPSCC	Australian General Practice Statistics and Classification Centre, University of Sydney, a collaborating unit of the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare
AIHW	Australian Institute of Health and Welfare
ATC	Anatomical Therapeutic Chemical (classification)
AUDIT	Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test
BEACH	Bettering the Evaluation And Care of Health
BMI	Body mass index
CAPS	Coding Atlas for Pharmaceutical Substances
CHD	Coronary heart disease
CI	Confidence interval (in this report 95% CI is used)
DoHA	Australian Government Department of Health and Ageing
Enc	Encounter
GI	Gastrointestinal
GORD	Gastro-oesophageal reflux disorder
GP	General practitioner
GPSCU	General Practice Statistics and Classification Unit (now the Australian General Practice Statistics and Classification Centre, AGPSCC)
HbA1c	Haemoglobin, type A1c
ICPC-2	International Classification of Primary Care (Version 2)
ICPC-2 PLUS	A terminology classified according to ICPC-2
IHD	Ischaemic heart disease
MBS	Medicare Benefits Schedule
NESB	Non-English-speaking background (i.e. a language other than English is spoken at home)
NOS	Not otherwise specified
NSAID	Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug
OTC	Over-the-counter (i.e. medications advised for over-the-counter purchase)
PBS	Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme
QA	Quality assurance (in this case the Quality Assurance Program of the Royal Australian College of General Practitioners)
RACGP	Royal Australian College of General Practitioners
SAND	Supplementary Analysis of Nominated Data
SAS	Statistical Analysis System
WHO	World Health Organization
Wonca	World Organization of Family Doctors

Subject bibliography

ABS	SENTEEISM	
9	Influenza and absenteeism	
ACI	D SUPPRESSANT	
29	Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDS) and acid suppressant use	
78	NSAID & acid suppressant use in general practice patients	198
AD	VERSE PHARMACOLOGICAL EVENTS	
56	Prevalence, cause and severity of adverse pharmacological events	150
AFT	TER-HOURS MEDICAL SERVICES	
10	Length of consultation; after-hours arrangements; co-morbidity	
32	Patient use of after-hours medical services	
ALC	COHOL	
Sect	ion 4.4 Alcohol consumption	
See i Aus	also: Alcohol use in: Measures of health and health care delivery in general practice in tralia (pg 20).	
ALI	ERGIC RHINITIS	
1	Allergic rhinitis	
ALZ	ZHEIMER'S	
28	Prevalence of Alzheimer's disease and dementia	
102	Alzheimer's disease or dementia in patients attending general practice	252
AN	GINA	
98	Management of hypertension and angina in general practice patients	243
AN	ΓΙ-ΡSYCHOTIC	
66	Anti-psychotic medication use by general practice patients	171
AN	XIETY	
2	Anxiety/stress, consultation time, level of education	
47	Management of depression and anxiety	130
AR	THRITIS	
88	Arthritis rates and NSAID use in general practice patients	221
AST	THMA	
3	Asthma	
22	Asthma – prevalence, severity and management	
39	Severity of asthma, medications and management	113
48	Asthma prevalence and management	132

63	Asthma – prevalence, management and medication side-effects	164
70	Inhaled corticosteroid use for asthma management	181
96	Inhaled corticosteroid use for asthma management	238
104	Asthma management and medication use among patients attending general practice	256
BILL	LING	
16	Effect of day and time of GP visit on billing method	61
41	Time of visit and billing status	118
BOD	DY MASS INDEX (BMI)	
55	Patient weight, perception of weight and weight loss	147
68	Patient weight, perception of weight and weight loss in adults	175
69	Patient weight, methods and medications tried for weight loss in adults	178
71	Patient BMI, morbidity and medication use in adults	184
Section	on 4.1 Body mass index of adults	
Section	on 4.2 Body mass index of children	
See al Austi	lso: Body mass in: Measures of health and health care delivery in general practice in ralia (pg 11).	

CARDIOVASCULAR

4	Cardiovascular disease	35
26	Prevalence of diagnosed hypertension and difficulties in treatment	84
30	Lipid lowering medications and coronary heart disease	94
31	Prevalence and severity of chronic heart failure	96
33	Prevalence and management of cardiovascular risk factors	100
38	Prevalence of chronic heart failure, management and control	111
46	Coronary heart disease, risk factors and lipid lowering medication	128
54	Secondary prevention of heart attack or stroke	145
57	Prevalence and management of chronic heart failure in general practice patients	152
59	Hypertension management and control in general practice patients	156
75	Prevalence, management and investigations for chronic heart failure	192
76	Patients with risk factors for metabolic syndrome	194
77	Heart failure – underlying causes and medication management	196
79	Hypertension and dyslipidaemia – comorbidity and management in general practice patients	200
86	Diabetes Types 1 and 2 and coronary heart disease	217
87	Management of cardiovascular or diabetes related conditions	219
90	Prevalence, management and investigations for chronic heart failure in general practice patients	225
92	Prevalence of metabolic syndrome	229

97	Statin medication use among high CHD risk patients attending general practice	241
98	Management of hypertension and angina in general practice patients	243
103	Cardiovascular risk in patients attending general practice	254

See also: Hypertension in: Measures of health and health care delivery in general practice in Australia (pg 55).

CHOLESTEROL

20	Screening and management of blood cholesterol	70
See	also: Cholesterol in: Measures of health and health care delivery in general practice in	
Aus	stralia (pg 31).	

CHRONIC HEART FAILURE

31	Prevalence and severity of chronic heart failure	96
38	Prevalence of chronic heart failure, management and control	111
57	Prevalence and management of chronic heart failure in general practice patients 1	152
75	Prevalence, management and investigations for chronic heart failure	192
77	Heart failure – underlying causes and medication management	196
90	Prevalence, management and investigations for chronic heart failure in general practice patients	225
CHR	RONIC ILLNESS	
61	Prevalence of chronic illnesses identified as National Health Priority Areas among general practice patients1	160
89	Estimates of the prevalence of chronic illnesses identified as Health Priority Areas among patients attending general practice	223
CHR	RONIC PAIN	
42	Prevalence and management of chronic pain1	120
82	Prevalence and management of chronic pain	207
CIRC	CULATORY	
4	Cardiovascular disease	35
26	Prevalence of diagnosed hypertension and difficulties in treatment	84
30	Lipid lowering medications and coronary heart disease	94
31	Prevalence and severity of chronic heart failure	96
33	Prevalence and management of cardiovascular risk factors	100
38	Prevalence of chronic heart failure, management and control	111
46	Coronary heart disease, risk factors and lipid lowering medication	128
54	Secondary prevention of heart attack or stroke1	145
57	Prevalence and management of chronic heart failure in general practice patients 1	152
59	Hypertension management and control in general practice patients	156
75	Prevalence, management and investigations for chronic heart failure	192
76	Patients with risk factors for metabolic syndrome	194
77	Heart failure – underlying causes and medication management 1	196

79	Hypertension and dyslipidaemia – comorbidity and management in general practice patients	200
86	Diabetes Types 1 and 2 and coronary heart disease	217
87	Management of cardiovascular or diabetes related conditions	219
90	Prevalence, management and investigations for chronic heart failure in general practice patients	225
92	Prevalence of metabolic syndrome	229
See a (pg 5	lso: Hypertension in: Measures of health and health care delivery in general practice in Au 5).	stralia
CO-I	MEDICATIONS	

14	Co-medications	5	7
----	----------------	---	---

CO-MORBIDITY

10	Length of consultation; after-hours arrangements; co-morbidity	
37	Prevalence of common morbidities in patients encountered in general practice	109
61	Prevalence of chronic illnesses identified as National Health Priority Areas among general practice patients	160
89	Estimates of the prevalence of chronic illnesses identified as Health Priority Areas among patients attending general practice	223
See 0	also: Co-morhidity in Measures of health and health care delivery in general practice in	

See also: Co-morbidity in: Measures of health and health care delivery in general practice in Australia (pg 61).

COMPLIMENTARY THERAPIES

36	Patient use of complimentary therapies	17
CON	JTRACEPTIVE	
72	Contraceptive use among female general practice patients aged 16-44 years	6
COR	CONARY HEART DISEASE	
30	Lipid lowering medications and coronary heart disease9	4
46	Coronary heart disease, risk factors and lipid lowering medication	8
86	Diabetes Types 1 and 2 and coronary heart disease	7
97	Statin medication use among high CHD risk patients attending general practice 24	1
98	Management of hypertension and angina in general practice patients	3
COR	TICOSTEROID	
70	Inhaled corticosteroid use for asthma management18	1
96	Inhaled corticosteroid use for asthma management	8
CUL	TURAL BACKGROUND	
52	Language and cultural background of patients14	0
65	Language and cultural background of general practice patients	9
95	Cultural background of patients attending general practice	6

DEMENTIA

28	Prevalence of Alzheimer's disease and dementia
102	Alzheimer's disease or dementia in patients attending general practice
DEP	RESSION
5	Depression
23	Depression
47	Management of depression and anxiety

See also: Depression in: Measures of health and health care delivery in general practice in Australia (pg 44).

DIABETES

21	Diabetes – prevalence, management and screening
25	Prevalence of diabetes, medications and control
40	Type 2 diabetes mellitus, prevalence and management
45	Diabetes mellitus prevalence, management and risk factors
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 234
DIG	ESTIVE
18	Drugs for the treatment of peptic ulcer and reflux
24	Gastro-oesophageal reflux disease (GORD) in general practice patients
29	Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDS) and acid suppressant use
34	Gastro-oesophageal reflux disease (GORD)
51	Use of proton pump inhibitors for gastrointestinal problems
60	Prevalence of GORD and associated proton pump inhibitor use158
62	Use of proton pump inhibitors by general practice patients
78	NSAID & acid suppressant use in general practice patients
91	Prevalence and management of gastrointestinal symptoms
Also : (pg 6	see, in: Measures of health and health care delivery in general practice in Australia: Hepatitis 8) and Prevalence of upper gastro-intestinal conditions and NSAID use (pg 26).
DRU	IG UTILIZATION
101	Types of medicine use and patient use of medicines list
EDU	CATION
2	Anxiety/stress, consultation time, level of education

EMPLOYMENT

6	Employment status and workers' compensation claims	39
11	Patient employment status and occupation	50
80	Employment status and workers compensation claims in general practice patients 2	.02

See also: Employment and occupation in: Measures of health and health care delivery in general practice in Australia (pg 73).

ENDOCRINE, METABOLIC AND NUTRITIONAL

15	Lipid lowering medication	59
20	Screening and management of blood cholesterol	70
21	Diabetes – prevalence, management and screening	72
25	Prevalence of diabetes, medications and control	82
30	Lipid lowering medications and coronary heart disease	94
40	Type 2 diabetes mellitus, prevalence and management	116
45	Diabetes mellitus prevalence, management and risk factors	126
46	Coronary heart disease, risk factors and lipid lowering medication	128
50	Risk factors of patients on lipid lowering medications [interim report] See Abstrac	t 67
55	Patient weight, perception of weight and weight loss	147
58	Lipid lowering medications: patient eligibility under PBS	154
64	Current use of statins by general practice patients	167
67	Risk factors of patients on lipid lowering medications	173
68	Patient weight, perception of weight and weight loss in adults	175
69	Patient weight, methods and medications tried for weight loss in adults	178
71	Patient BMI, morbidity and medication use in adults	184
76	Patients with risk factors for metabolic syndrome	194
86	Diabetes Types 1 and 2 and coronary heart disease	217
87	Management of cardiovascular or diabetes related conditions	219
92	Prevalence of metabolic syndrome	229
94	Type 2 diabetes – investigations and related conditions	234
99	Lipid management in patients with high risk conditions	245
Section	on 4.1 Body mass index of adults	20
Secti	on 4.2 Body mass index of children	21
Also mass	see, in: Measures of health and health care delivery in general practice in Australia: Body (pg 11) and Cholesterol (pg 31).	

ETHNIC

52	Language and cultural background of patients	. 140
65	Language and cultural background of general practice patients	. 169
92	Prevalence of metabolic syndrome	. 229
95	Cultural background of patients attending general practice	. 236
FEMALE GENITAL		
8	Hormone replacement therapy (HRT)	43
84	Menopausal status, symptoms and treatment of women aged 18 and over	. 212
See also: Vaccination and mammography in: Measures of health and health care delivery in general practice in Australia (pg 35).		

GABAPENTIN

81	Prevalence and indications for gabapentin use by patients attending general practice	205
GAS	TROESOPHAGEAL REFLUX	
18	Drugs for the treatment of peptic ulcer and reflux	65
24	Gastro-oesophageal reflux disease (GORD) in general practice patients	80
34	Gastro-oesophageal reflux disease (GORD)	102
60	Prevalence of GORD and associated proton pump inhibitor use	158
100	Gastrointestinal symptoms in patients attending general practice	247
GAS	TROINTESTINAL	
18	Drugs for the treatment of peptic ulcer and reflux	65
24	Gastro-oesophageal reflux disease (GORD) in general practice patients	80
29	Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDS) and acid suppressant use	92
34	Gastro-oesophageal reflux disease (GORD)	102
51	Use of proton pump inhibitors for gastrointestinal problems	138
60	Prevalence of GORD and associated proton pump inhibitor use	158
62	Use of proton pump inhibitors by general practice patients	162
78	NSAID & acid suppressant use in general practice patients	198
91	Prevalence and management of gastrointestinal symptoms	227
100	Gastrointestinal symptoms in patients attending general practice	247
Also : (pg 6	see, in: Measures of health and health care delivery in general practice in Australia: Hepatiti 8) and Prevalence of upper gastro-intestinal conditions and NSAID use (pg 26).	5

GENERAL AND UNSPECIFIED

6	Employment status and workers' compensation claims	39
7	Health services utilisation, lifestyle status and chronicity	41
10	Length of consultation; after-hours arrangements; co-morbidity	47
11	Patient employment status and occupation	50
12	Smoking and passive smoking in general practice patients	52
14	Co-medications	57
16	Effect of day and time of GP visit on billing method	61
17	Private prescription products	63
32	Patient use of after-hours medical services	98
35	Smoking status of adults and their attempts to quit	. 104
36	Patient use of complimentary therapies	. 107
37	Prevalence of common morbidities in patients encountered in general practice	. 109
41	Time of visit and billing status	. 118
42	Prevalence and management of chronic pain	. 120
43	Initiation and purpose of pathology orders	. 122

44	Severity of illness	. 124
52	Language and cultural background of patients	. 140
53	Smoking status of adults and their attempts to quit	. 142
56	Prevalence, cause and severity of adverse pharmacological events	. 150
61	Prevalence of chronic illnesses identified as National Health Priority Areas among general practice patients	. 160
65	Language and cultural background of general practice patients	. 169
73	Warfarin use in patients with qualifying morbidity	. 188
74	Smoking and passive smoking in the home	. 190
80	Employment status and workers compensation claims in general practice patients	. 202
82	Prevalence and management of chronic pain	. 207
89	Estimates of the prevalence of chronic illnesses identified as Health Priority Areas among patients attending general practice	. 223
95	Cultural background of patients attending general practice	. 236
101	Types of medicine use and patient use of medicines list	. 250
Secti	on 4.3 Smoking	21
Secti	on 4.4 Alcohol consumption	22
Secti	on 4.5 Length of consultation	23

Also see, in: Measures of health and health care delivery in general practice in Australia: Alcohol use (pg 20); Co-morbidity (pg 61); Consultation time and GP satisfaction (pg 51); Employment and occupation (pg 73); Health care utilisation (pg 40); Physical activity (pg 23); Severity of illness (pg 58); Smoking (pg 15); The effect of the introduction of therapeutic group premiums on patient care (pg 47); Vaccination and mammography (pg 35) and Wellbeing (pg 7).

GORD

18	Drugs for the treatment of peptic ulcer and reflux	65
24	Gastro-oesophageal reflux disease (GORD) in general practice patients	80
34	Gastro-oesophageal reflux disease (GORD)	102
60	Prevalence of GORD and associated proton pump inhibitor use	158
100	Gastrointestinal symptoms in patients attending general practice	247

GP SATISFACTION

See also: Consultation time and GP satisfaction in: Measures of health and health care delivery in general practice in Australia (pg 51).

HEALTH PRIORITY AREAS

Anxiety/stress, consultation time, level of education	. 30
Asthma	. 32
Cardiovascular disease	. 35
Depression	. 37
Smoking and passive smoking in general practice patients	. 52
Perceived stress	. 54
	Anxiety/stress, consultation time, level of education Asthma Cardiovascular disease Depression Smoking and passive smoking in general practice patients Perceived stress

15	Lipid lowering medication	59
19	Osteoporosis	67
20	Screening and management of blood cholesterol	70
21	Diabetes – prevalence, management and screening	72
22	Asthma – prevalence, severity and management	75
23	Depression	78
25	Prevalence of diabetes, medications and control	82
26	Prevalence of diagnosed hypertension and difficulties in treatment	84
29	Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDS) and acid suppressant use	92
30	Lipid lowering medications and coronary heart disease	94
31	Prevalence and severity of chronic heart failure	96
33	Prevalence and management of cardiovascular risk factors	100
35	Smoking status of adults and their attempts to quit	104
38	Prevalence of chronic heart failure, management and control	111
39	Severity of asthma, medications and management	113
40	Type 2 diabetes mellitus, prevalence and management	116
45	Diabetes mellitus prevalence, management and risk factors	126
46	Coronary heart disease, risk factors and lipid lowering medication	128
47	Management of depression and anxiety	130
48	Asthma prevalence and management	132
49	Health status and management of patients on non-steroidal anti-inflammatory	
	drugs	135
50	Risk factors of patients on lipid lowering medications [interim report] See Abstr	act 67
53	Smoking status of adults and their attempts to quit	142
54	Secondary prevention of heart attack or stroke	145
55	Patient weight, perception of weight and weight loss	147
57	Prevalence and management of chronic heart failure in general practice patients .	152
58	Lipid lowering medications: patient eligibility under PBS	154
59	Hypertension management and control in general practice patients	156
61	Prevalence of chronic illnesses identified as National Health Priority Areas among general practice patients	160
63	Asthma – prevalence, management and medication side-effects	164
66	Anti-psychotic medication use by general practice patients	171
67	Risk factors of patients on lipid lowering medications	173
68	Patient weight, perception of weight and weight loss in adults	175
69	Patient weight, methods and medications tried for weight loss in adults	178
70	Inhaled corticosteroid use for asthma management	181
71	Patient BMI, morbidity and medication use in adults	184
74	Smoking and passive smoking in the home	190

75	Prevalence, management and investigations for chronic heart failure	192
76	Patients with risk factors for metabolic syndrome	194
77	Heart failure – underlying causes and medication management	196
78	NSAID & acid suppressant use in general practice patients	198
79	Hypertension and dyslipidaemia – comorbidity and management in general	200
05	practice patients	200
85	Management of osteoporotic fractures in general practice patients	215
86	Diabetes Types 1 and 2 and coronary heart disease	217
87	Management of cardiovascular or diabetes related conditions	219
88	Arthritis rates and NSAID use in general practice patients	221
89	Estimates of the prevalence of chronic illnesses identified as Health Priority Areas among patients attending general practice	223
90	Prevalence, management and investigations for chronic heart failure in general practice patients	225
92	Prevalence of metabolic syndrome	229
94	Type 2 diabetes – investigations and related conditions	234
96	Inhaled corticosteroid use for asthma management	238
97	Statin medication use among high CHD risk patients attending general practice	241
98	Management of hypertension and angina in general practice patients	243
99	Lipid management in patients with high risk conditions	245
103	Cardiovascular risk in patients attending general practice	254
104	Asthma management and medication use among patients attending general practice	256
Section	on 4.1 Body mass index of adults	20
Section	on 4.2 Body mass index of children	21
Section	on 4.3 Smoking	21
Section	on 4.4 Alcohol consumption	22
Also s use (p Musc upper	see, in: Measures of health and health care delivery in general practice in Australia: Alcohol og 20); Body mass (pg 11); Cholesterol (pg 31); Depression (pg 44); Hypertension (pg 55); suloskeletal conditions and NSAID use (pg 64); Physical activity (pg 23); Prevalence of gastro-intestinal conditions and NSAID use (pg 26) and Smoking (pg 15).	
HEA	RT ATTACK	
54	Secondary prevention of heart attack or stroke	145

HEART FAILURE

Prevalence and severity of chronic heart failure	96
Prevalence of chronic heart failure, management and control	. 111
Prevalence and management of chronic heart failure in general practice patients	. 152
Prevalence, management and investigations for chronic heart failure	. 192
Heart failure – underlying causes and medication management	. 196
	Prevalence and severity of chronic heart failure Prevalence of chronic heart failure, management and control Prevalence and management of chronic heart failure in general practice patients Prevalence, management and investigations for chronic heart failure Heart failure – underlying causes and medication management

90	Prevalence, management and investigations for chronic heart failure in general practice patients	225
HEI	PATITIS	
See Aus	also: Hepatitis in: Measures of health and health care delivery in general practice in tralia (pg 68).	
но	RMONE REPLACEMENT THERAPY	
8	Hormone replacement therapy (HRT)	43
HY	PERTENSION	
26	Prevalence of diagnosed hypertension and difficulties in treatment	84
59	Hypertension management and control in general practice patients	156
79	Hypertension and dyslipidaemia – comorbidity and management in general practice patients	200
98	Management of hypertension and angina in general practice patients	243
See (pg	also: Hypertension in: Measures of health and health care delivery in general practice in Aus 55).	tralia
INF	FECTIONS	
9	Influenza and absenteeism	45
18	Drugs for the treatment of peptic ulcer and reflux	65
27	Prevalence and management of influenza	86
See Aus	also: Hepatitis in: Measures of health and health care delivery in general practice in tralia (pg 68).	
INF	IUENZA	
9	Influenza and absenteeism	45
27	Prevalence and management of influenza	86
LAI	NGUAGE	
52	Language and cultural background of patients	140
65	Language and cultural background of general practice patients	169
95	Cultural background of patients attending general practice	236
LEN	IGTH OF CONSULTATION	
2	Anxiety/stress, consultation time, level of education	30
10	Length of consultation; after-hours arrangements; co-morbidity	47
Sect	tion 4.5 Length of consultation	23
See in g	also: Consultation time and GP satisfaction in: Measures of health and health care delivery eneral practice in Australia (pg 51).	
LIF	ESTYLE	
7	Health services utilisation, lifestyle status and chronicity	41
LIP	ID	
15	Lipid lowering medication	59

30	Lipid lowering medications and coronary heart disease	94
46	Coronary heart disease, risk factors and lipid lowering medication	128
50	Risk factors of patients on lipid lowering medications [interim report] See Abstr	ract 67
58	Lipid lowering medications: patient eligibility under PBS	154
64	Current use of statins by general practice patients	167
67	Risk factors of patients on lipid lowering medications	173
79	Hypertension and dyslipidaemia – comorbidity and management in general	
	practice patients	200
99	Lipid management in patients with high risk conditions	245
MA	LE GENITAL	
93	Sexual dysfunction – premature ejaculation	231
MA	MMOGRAPHY	
See i gene	also: Vaccination and mammography in: Measures of health and health care delivery in eral practice in Australia (pg 35).	
MA	NAGEMENT	
20	Screening and management of blood cholesterol	70
21	Diabetes – prevalence, management and screening	72
22	Asthma – prevalence, severity and management	75
27	Prevalence and management of influenza	86
33	Prevalence and management of cardiovascular risk factors	100
38	Prevalence of chronic heart failure, management and control	111
39	Severity of asthma, medications and management	113
40	Type 2 diabetes mellitus, prevalence and management	116
42	Prevalence and management of chronic pain	120
45	Diabetes mellitus prevalence, management and risk factors	126
47	Management of depression and anxiety	130
48	Asthma prevalence and management	132
49	Health status and management of patients on non-steroidal anti-inflammatory	
	drugs	135
57	Prevalence and management of chronic heart failure in general practice patients .	152
59	Hypertension management and control in general practice patients	156
63	Asthma – prevalence, management and medication side-effects	164
70	Inhaled corticosteroid use for asthma management	181
75	Prevalence, management and investigations for chronic heart failure	192
77	Heart failure – underlying causes and medication management	196
79	Hypertension and dyslipidaemia – comorbidity and management in general	••••
02	practice patients	200
82	Prevalence and management of chronic pain	207
83	Prevalence and management of migraine	210

85	Management of osteoporotic fractures in general practice patients	215
87	Management of cardiovascular or diabetes related conditions	219
90	Prevalence, management and investigations for chronic heart failure in general practice patients	225
91	Prevalence and management of gastrointestinal symptoms	227
96	Inhaled corticosteroid use for asthma management	238
97	Statin medication use among high CHD risk patients attending general practice	241
98	Management of hypertension and angina in general practice patients	243
99	Lipid management in patients with high risk conditions	245
100	Gastrointestinal symptoms in patients attending general practice	247
104	Asthma management and medication use among patients attending general practice	256
MEI	DICINES	
8	Hormone replacement therapy (HRT)	43
14	Co-medications	57
15	Lipid lowering medication	59
17	Private prescription products	63
18	Drugs for the treatment of peptic ulcer and reflux	65
29	Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDS) and acid suppressant use	92
30	Lipid lowering medications and coronary heart disease	94
46	Coronary heart disease, risk factors and lipid lowering medication	128
49	Health status and management of patients on non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs	135
50	Risk factors of patients on lipid lowering medications [interim report] See Abs	tract 67
51	Use of proton pump inhibitors for gastrointestinal problems	138
56	Prevalence, cause and severity of adverse pharmacological events	150
58	Lipid lowering medications: patient eligibility under PBS	154
60	Prevalence of GORD and associated proton pump inhibitor use	158
62	Use of proton pump inhibitors by general practice patients	162
63	Asthma – prevalence, management and medication side-effects	164
64	Current use of statins by general practice patients	167
66	Anti-psychotic medication use by general practice patients	171
67	Risk factors of patients on lipid lowering medications	173
70	Inhaled corticosteroid use for asthma management	181
72	Contraceptive use among female general practice patients aged 16-44 years	186
73	Warfarin use in patients with qualifying morbidity	188
77	Heart failure – underlying causes and medication management	196
78	NSAID & acid suppressant use in general practice patients	198

81	Prevalence and indications for gabapentin use by patients attending general	205
00	A sthetic entry of NICAID and in a second and the setting to	205
00 0(Arthritis rates and NSAID use in general practice patients	221
96	Inhaled corticosteroid use for astima management.	238
97	Statin medication use among high CHD risk patients attending general practice	241
99	Lipid management in patients with high risk conditions	245
101	Types of medicine use and patient use of medicines list	250
104	Asthma management and medication use among patients attending general practice	256
Also Musc condi on pa	see, in: Measures of health and health care delivery in general practice in Australia: culoskeletal conditions and NSAID use (pg 64); Prevalence of upper gastro-intestinal itions and NSAID use (pg 26); The effect of the introduction of therapeutic group premiums ttient care (pg 47) and Vaccination and mammography (pg 35).	
MEN	JOPAUSAL	
8	Hormone replacement therapy (HRT)	43
84	Menopausal status, symptoms and treatment of women aged 18 and over	212
MET	TABOLIC SYNDROME	
76	Patients with risk factors for metabolic syndrome	194
92	Prevalence of metabolic syndrome	229
MIG	RAINE	
83	Prevalence and management of migraine	210
MOI	RBIDITY	
37	Prevalence of common morbidities in patients encountered in general practice	109
71	Patient BMI, morbidity and medication use in adults	184
73	Warfarin use in patients with qualifying morbidity	188
MUS	SCULOSKELETAL	
19	Osteoporosis	67
29	Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDS) and acid suppressant use	92
49	Health status and management of patients on non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs	135
78	NSAID & acid suppressant use in general practice patients	198
85	Management of osteoporotic fractures in general practice patients	215
88	Arthritis rates and NSAID use in general practice patients	221
Also Musc condi	see, in: Measures of health and health care delivery in general practice in Australia: culoskeletal conditions and NSAID use (pg 64) and Prevalence of upper gastro-intestinal itions and NSAID use (pg 26).	

NEUROLOGICAL

28	Prevalence of Alzheimer's disease and dementia	. 89
54	Secondary prevention of heart attack or stroke1	145

81	Prevalence and indications for gabapentin use by patients attending general practice	205
83	Prevalence and management of migraine	210
102	Alzheimer's disease or dementia in patients attending general practice	252
NON	N-STEROIDAL ANTI-INFLAMMATORY DRUGS (NSAIDs)	
29	Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) and acid suppressant use	92
49	Health status and management of patients on non-steroidal anti-inflammatory	
	drugs	135
78	NSAID & acid suppressant use in general practice patients	198
88	Arthritis rates and NSAID use in general practice patients	221
Also Muse condi	see, in: Measures of health and health care delivery in general practice in Australia: culoskeletal conditions and NSAID use (pg 64) and Prevalence of upper gastro-intestinal itions and NSAID use (pg 26).	
occ	CUPATION	
11	Patient employment status and occupation	50
See a pract	lso: Employment and occupation in: Measures of health and health care delivery in general ice in Australia (pg 73).	
OST	EOPOROSIS	
19	Osteoporosis	67
85	Management of osteoporotic fractures in general practice patients	215
PAT	HOLOGY	
43	Initiation and purpose of pathology orders	122
PEP	FIC ULCER	
18	Drugs for the treatment of peptic ulcer and reflux	65
PHY	SICAL ACTIVITY	
See a Aust	lso: Physical activity in: Measures of health and health care delivery in general practice in ralia (pg 23).	
PRE	GNANCY, CHILD-BEARING, FAMILY PLANNING	
72	Contraceptive use among female general practice patients aged 16-44 years	186
PRE	MATURE EJACULATION	
93	Sexual dysfunction – premature ejaculation	231
PRE	SCRIPTION	
17	Private prescription products	63
DDT		
PKE	VALENCE	
РКЕ 21	VALENCE Diabetes – prevalence, management and screening	72
21 22	VALENCE Diabetes – prevalence, management and screening Asthma – prevalence, severity and management	72 75
212225	VALENCE Diabetes – prevalence, management and screening Asthma – prevalence, severity and management Prevalence of diabetes, medications and control	72 75 82
PRE21222526	VALENCE Diabetes – prevalence, management and screening Asthma – prevalence, severity and management Prevalence of diabetes, medications and control Prevalence of diagnosed hypertension and difficulties in treatment	72 75 82 84
27	Prevalence and management of influenza	86
------------------	---	-----
28	Prevalence of Alzheimer's disease and dementia	89
31	Prevalence and severity of chronic heart failure	96
33	Prevalence and management of cardiovascular risk factors	100
37	Prevalence of common morbidities in patients encountered in general practice	109
38	Prevalence of chronic heart failure, management and control	111
40	Type 2 diabetes mellitus, prevalence and management	116
42	Prevalence and management of chronic pain	120
45	Diabetes mellitus prevalence, management and risk factors	126
48	Asthma prevalence and management	132
56	Prevalence, cause and severity of adverse pharmacological events	150
57	Prevalence and management of chronic heart failure in general practice patients	152
60	Prevalence of GORD and associated proton pump inhibitor use	158
61	Prevalence of chronic illnesses identified as National Health Priority Areas among general practice patients	160
63	Asthma – prevalence, management and medication side-effects	164
75	Prevalence, management and investigations for chronic heart failure	192
81	Prevalence and indications for gabapentin use by patients attending general	
	practice	205
82	Prevalence and management of chronic pain	207
83	Prevalence and management of migraine	210
89	Estimates of the prevalence of chronic illnesses identified as Health Priority Areas among patients attending general practice	223
90	Prevalence, management and investigations for chronic heart failure in general	
	practice patients	225
91	Prevalence and management of gastrointestinal symptoms	227
96	Inhaled corticosteroid use for asthma management	238
97	Statin medication use among high CHD risk patients attending general practice	241
98	Management of hypertension and angina in general practice patients	243
99	Lipid management in patients with high risk conditions	245
100	Gastrointestinal symptoms in patients attending general practice	247
102	Alzheimer's disease or dementia in patients attending general practice	252
104	Asthma management and medication use among patients attending general practice	256
See ai health	lso: Prevalence of upper gastro-intestinal conditions and NSAID use in: Measures of h and health care delivery in general practice in Australia (pg 26).	

PROTON PUMP INHIBITORS

51	Use of proton pump inhibitors for gastrointestinal problems	138
60	Prevalence of GORD and associated proton pump inhibitor use	158
62	Use of proton pump inhibitors by general practice patients	162

PSYCHOLOGICAL

2	Anxiety/stress, consultation time, level of education	
5	Depression	
13	Perceived stress	
23	Depression	
47	Management of depression and anxiety	130
66	Anti-psychotic medication use by general practice patients	171
See a Aust	lso: Depression in: Measures of health and health care delivery in general practice in ralia (pg 44).	
REF	LUX	

18	Drugs for the treatment of peptic ulcer and reflux	65
24	Gastro-oesophageal reflux disease (GORD) in general practice patients	80
34	Gastro-oesophageal reflux disease (GORD)	
60	Prevalence of GORD and associated proton pump inhibitor use	
RES	SPIRATORY	
1	Allergic rhinitis	
3	Asthma	
9	Influenza and absenteeism	45
22	Asthma – prevalence, severity and management	

22	Astnma – prevalence, severity and management	75
27	Prevalence and management of influenza	86
39	Severity of asthma, medications and management	113
48	Asthma prevalence and management	132
63	Asthma – prevalence, management and medication side-effects	164
70	Inhaled corticosteroid use for asthma management	181
96	Inhaled corticosteroid use for asthma management	238
104	Asthma management and medication use among patients attending general	
	practice	. 256

RISK FACTORS

12	Smoking and passive smoking in general practice patients	52
15	Lipid lowering medication	59
20	Screening and management of blood cholesterol	70
26	Prevalence of diagnosed hypertension and difficulties in treatment	
30	Lipid lowering medications and coronary heart disease	
33	Prevalence and management of cardiovascular risk factors	100
35	Smoking status of adults and their attempts to quit	104
45	Diabetes mellitus prevalence, management and risk factors	126
46	Coronary heart disease, risk factors and lipid lowering medication	128
50	Risk factors of patients on lipid lowering medications [interim report] See Abs	stract 67

53	Smoking status of adults and their attempts to quit	142
55	Patient weight, perception of weight and weight loss	147
58	Lipid lowering medications: patient eligibility under PBS	154
59	Hypertension management and control in general practice patients	156
67	Risk factors of patients on lipid lowering medications	173
68	Patient weight, perception of weight and weight loss in adults	175
69	Patient weight, methods and medications tried for weight loss in adults	178
71	Patient BMI, morbidity and medication use in adults	184
74	Smoking and passive smoking in the home	190
76	Patients with risk factors for metabolic syndrome	194
79	Hypertension and dyslipidaemia – comorbidity and management in general	200
	practice patients	200
97	Statin medication use among high CHD risk patients attending general practice	241
99	Lipid management in patients with high risk conditions	245
103	Cardiovascular risk in patients attending general practice	254
Section	on 4.1 Body mass index of adults	. 20
Section	on 4.2 Body mass index of children	. 21
Section	on 4.3 Smoking	. 21
Section	on 4.4 Alcohol consumption	. 22
Also s	see, in: Measures of health and health care delivery in general practice in Australia: Alcohol	

use (pg 20); Body mass (pg 11); Cholesterol (pg 31); Hypertension (pg 55); Physical activity (pg 23) and Smoking (pg 15).

SEVERITY

22	Asthma – prevalence, severity and management	75
31	Prevalence and severity of chronic heart failure	96
39	Severity of asthma, medications and management	113
44	Severity of illness	124
56	Prevalence, cause and severity of adverse pharmacological events	150
See also: Severity of illness in: Measures of health and health care delivery in general practice in Australia (pg 58).		

SEXUAL DYSFUNCTION

93	Sexual dysfunction – premature ejaculation	
SM	OKING	
12	Smoking and passive smoking in general practice patients	
35	Smoking status of adults and their attempts to quit	
53	Smoking status of adults and their attempts to quit	
74	Smoking and passive smoking in the home	
Sect	tion 4.3 Smoking	

See also: Smoking in: Measures of health and health care delivery in general practice in Australia (pg 15).

STATINS

·		
64	Current use of statins by general practice patients	
97	Statin medication use among high CHD risk patients attending general practi	ce 241
STF	RESS	
2	Anxiety/stress, consultation time, level of education	
13	Perceived stress	
STF	ROKE	
54	Secondary prevention of heart attack or stroke	
TH	ERAPEUTIC GROUP PREMIUMS	
See of he	also: The effect of the introduction of therapeutic group premiums on patient care in: M ealth and health care delivery in general practice in Australia (pg 47).	easures
TIN	1E	
16	Effect of day and time of GP visit on billing method	61
41	Time of visit and billing status	
See in g	also: Consultation time and GP satisfaction in: Measures of health and health care deliz eneral practice in Australia (pg 51).	pery
TYI	PE 2 DIABETES	
40	Type 2 diabetes mellitus, prevalence and management	
86	Diabetes Types 1 and 2 and coronary heart disease	
94	Type 2 diabetes – investigations and related conditions	
UTI	ILISATION	
7	Health services utilisation, lifestyle status and chronicity	
See in A	also: Health care utilisation in: Measures of health and health care delivery in general p .ustralia (pg 40).	ractice
VA	CCINATION	
See prac	also: Vaccination and mammography in: Measures of health and health care delivery in ctice in Australia (pg 35).	general
WA	RFARIN	
73	Warfarin use in patients with qualifying morbidity	
WE	IGHT	
55	Patient weight, perception of weight and weight loss	
68	Patient weight, perception of weight and weight loss in adults	
69	Patient weight, methods and medications tried for weight loss in adults	
71	Patient BMI, morbidity and medication use in adults	
Sect	tion 4.1 Body mass index of adults	
Sect	tion 4.2 Body mass index of children	

WELLBEING

See also: Wellbeing in: Measures of health and health care delivery in general practice in Australia (pg 7).

WORKERS COMPENSATION

- 80 Employment status and workers compensation claims in general practice patients.. 202

SAND abstracts from the first year of BEACH (1998–99) have been published in *Measures of health and health care delivery in general practice in Australia* available from www.fmrc.org.au/publications/Books3.htm. Topics investigated included:

- Wellbeing
- Body mass
- Smoking
- Alcohol use
- Physical activity
- Prevalence of upper gastro-intestinal conditions and NSAID use
- Cholesterol
- Vaccination and mammography
- Health care utilisation
- Depression
- The effect of the introduction of the therapeutic group premiums on patient care
- Consultation time and GP satisfaction
- Hypertension
- Severity of illness
- Co-morbidity
- Musculoskeletal conditions and NSAID use
- Hepatitis
- Employment and occupation.

Other SAND abstracts from BEACH 2006–07 will be published in *General practice activity in Australia* 2006–07 in December 2007. The topics under investigation include:

- Severity of illness using the DUSOI scale
- Weight loss
- Diabetes
- Adverse pharmacological events
- Type 2 diabetes
- Secondary prevention of heart attack and stroke
- Erectile dysfunction.