Professor Iliffe wonderfully caricatures the four flattering tailors who would weave the magic suit of clothes to bedeck the Emperor. 'But look' says he, and professor Manthorpe, and doctors Vahabzadeh, Abbas, and Boyle say 'aye'. This is an important but well-recognised variant of the human condition, don't make it more than that. Enfold it as such among people at home and in their care homes and help these individuals live their lives as fully as possible — specialist skills welded within primary care can play a useful, humble part in this.

The Gnosall model has recently been visited by Professor Burns in full Tsar regalia. Shrewd Scot that he is, he knows true value when he sees it. This may be a further step toward wide adoption, the approach that offers better care for people with dementia, their families, and people who devote their working lives to their support. Its economics may just save the NHS from administration.

David Jolley,
PSSRU, Manchester University, Dover Street, Manchester, M13 9PL.
E-mail: David.jolley@manchester.ac.uk

Ian Greaves,
Gnosall Medical Centre, Gnosall, ST20 0GP.

REFERENCES

1. Iliffe S. National Dementia Strategy. *Br J Gen Pract* 2010; **60(574):** 372.
2. Vahabzadeh A, Abbas M, Boyle A. National Dementia Strategy. *Br J Gen Pract* 2010; **60(574):** 372–373.
3. Manthorpe J. National Dementia Strategy. *Br J Gen Pract* 2010; **60(574):** 373.
4. Greaves I, Jolley D. National Dementia Strategy: well intentioned — but how well founded and how well directed? *Br J Gen Pract* 2010; **60(572):** 193–198.

DOI: 10.3399/bjgp10X514882

Do general practice patients who are prescribed Tamiflu® actually take it?

Caley and colleagues found that West Midlands GPs thought oseltamivir (Tamiflu®) was easy for patients to obtain.[1] But it is unclear how many patients actually complete the course. Between December 2009 and March 2010 we conducted an audit of patients with suspected swine flu at an inner London practice to see how many actually took a course of oseltamivir and reasons behind their decisions to take or not to take the drugs.

Using Population Manager in EMIS and key words 'swine flu' or 'suspected swine flu', we identified 72 registered patients who may have been prescribed oseltamivir between August and October 2009. Attempts were then made to contact these patients by telephone.

The response rate was 50% (36/72). Thirty-three of the 36 patients (92%) said they had been prescribed oseltamivir: 20 by the practice, 12 via the pandemic flu line, and one through the local out-of-hours service. The mean age of these 33 patients was 27 years (range 1 to 79 years), 45% were female, and 25% were from ethnic minority groups. The majority — 27 patients (82%) said they had completed the full 5-day course. Four patients took oseltamivir for less than 5 days, and two patients did not take any medication, one because of clinical improvement and one because of fear of side effects. In total, eight patients (24%) experienced symptoms that they attributed to oseltamivir, mainly gastrointestinal symptoms and listlessness or drowsiness.

Caley *et al* identified ease of obtaining antiviral medication as one of the strengths in the 'professional to professional' H1N1 response. Our small audit found this was matched by a high (82%) compliance rate in patients at one general practice, suggesting that many patients seem to have trusted the information they received.

Tahira Chishti,
Academic ST4 GP, St George's, University of London. E-mail: tchishti@sgul.ac.uk

Pippa Oakeshott,
Reader in General Practice, St George's, University of London.

REFERENCE

1. Caley M, Sidhu K, Shukla R. GPs' opinions on the NHS and HPA response to the first wave of the influenza A/H1N1v pandemic. *Br J Gen Pract* 2010; **60(573):** 283-285.

DOI: 10.3399/bjgp10X514891

PHQ-9: sensitivity to change over time

Malpass *et al*, in a mixed methods study assessing PHQ-9 scores and patients' experiences, report that patients found the PHQ-9 to be helpful,[1] concurring with other recent qualitative work that suggested that patients viewed such measures as an 'objective adjunct to medical judgement'.[2] Unfortunately, the value of these observations rests entirely on the assumption that the PHQ-9 is a valid measure of depression severity. Considerable doubt attends this premature notion.[3,4] Indeed, the most recent of these findings is reported by Reddy and colleagues on the pages following Malpass *et al*'s piece.[5] We should not be comforted by the observation that patients' believe their depression is being better assessed by this process until it is shown that this belief matches the evidence.

A further finding of Malpass *et al* was of discord between symptom frequency and intensity in relation to the PHQ-9 and patients' accounts.[1] This raises an important consideration for the use of the PHQ-9 in assessing depression severity and treatment responsiveness. If depression severity measures are intended to facilitate the alignment of clinical decision making to evidence-based interventions, consideration should be given to how severity of depression was measured in that evidence base. Guidelines indicate[6] that largely this has been in studies where depression severity has been measured with the Hamilton Depression Rating Scale.[7] With regard to how to administer this measure, Hamilton states that 'no distinction is made between intensity and frequency of symptom, the rater having to give due

weight to both of them in making his judgment'. It is not surprising that the PHQ-9, with its sole emphasis on symptom frequency, fails to probe important aspects of the patient experience of the severity of depressive symptoms.

The authors also state that they 'are aware of only one study that considers sensitivity to change over time of the PHQ-9' however, they may like to expand their reading to include a study of ours. We assessed the sensitivity to change over time of the PHQ-9, relative to the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale, Depressive subscale (HADS-D), in a sample of patients referred to primary care mental health workers.[3] At end of treatment, in a sample of 491, the PHQ-9 and HADS-D demonstrated similar effect sizes (0.99 and 1 respectively). However, while the HADS-D provided a useful reference standard, in that there is evidence of the scale measuring treatment responsiveness,[8] further work is required to assess the sensitivity of change over time of the PHQ-9 relative to a more stringent reference standard.

Isobel M Cameron,
Lecturer, Applied Health Sciences (Mental Health), University of Aberdeen, Royal Cornhill Hospital, Aberdeen, AB25 2ZH. E-mail: i.m.cameron@abdn.ac.uk

Ian C Reid,
Professor of Mental Health, Applied Health Sciences, (Mental Health), University of Aberdeen.

Kenneth Lawton,
Senior Clinical Lecturer, Centre of Academic Primary Care, University of Aberdeen.

REFERENCES

1. Malpass A, Shaw A, Kessler D, Sharp D. Concordance between PHQ-9 scores and patients' experiences of depression: a mixed methods study. *Br J Gen Pract* 2010; **60(575):** 231–238.
2. Dowrick C, Leydon GM, McBride A, *et al*. Patients' and doctors' views on depression severity questionnaires incentivised in UK quality and outcomes framework: qualitative study. *BMJ* 2009; **338:** b663.
3. Cameron IM, Crawford JR, Lawton K, Reid IC. Psychometric comparison of the PHQ-9 and HADS for measuring depression severity in primary care. *Br J Gen Pract* 2008; **58(546):** 32–36.
4. Hansson M, Chotai J, Nordstom A, Bodlund O. A comparison of two self-rating scales to detect depression: HADS and PHQ-9. *Br J Gen Pract* 2009; **59(566):** 650–654.
5. Reddy P, Dunbar J, Ford D, Philpot B. Identification of depression in diabetes: the efficacy of PHQ-9 and HADS-D. *Br J Gen Pract* 2010; **60(575):** 239–245.
6. NICE project team. *Depression: the treatment and management in adults (update), 2009*. London: National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence: 1–585.
7. Hamilton M. A rating scale for depression. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 1960; **23:** 56–62.
8. Herrmann C. International experiences with the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale — a review of validation data and clinical results. *J Psychosom Res* 1997; **42(1):** 17–41.

DOI: 10.3399/bjgp10X514909

Correction

In the letter: Saleem F, Dua JS, Hassali AA, Shafie AA. Hypertension in Pakistan: time to take some serious action. *Br J Gen Pract* 2010; **60(575):** 449–450. The inclusion of the second author shown was an error. This has been corrected in the online version.

DOI: 10.3399/bjgp10X514918