

## What is already known on this topic

Trained professionals can deliver effective cognitive behaviour therapy to depressed patients presenting to general practitioners

Limited evidence shows that cognitive behaviour therapy is effective when delivered by general practitioners who have received extensive instruction

Most doctors do not have the time or inclination to carry out such comprehensive training

## What this study adds

Basic training in brief cognitive behaviour therapy has little effect on general practitioners' attitudes to the identification and treatment of depression or the outcome of their patients with emotional problems

General practitioners may require more extensive training and support if they are to acquire skills in brief cognitive behaviour therapy that will have a positive impact on their patients

Funding: MK received funding from the NHS research and development programme. The views expressed are those of the authors' and not necessarily those of the NHS Executive or the Department of Health.

Competing interests: None declared.

- 1 Bebbington PE, Brugha TS, Meltzer H, Jenkins R, Ceresa C, Farrell M, et al. Neurotic disorders and the receipt of psychiatric treatment. *Psychol Med* 2000;30:1369-76.
- 2 Bebbington PE, Meltzer H, Brugha TS, Farrell M, Jenkins R, Ceresa C, et al. Unequal access and unmet need: neurotic disorders and the use of primary care services. *Psychol Med* 2000;30:1359-67.
- 3 Goldberg D, Huxley P. *Common mental disorders: a bio-social model*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- 4 Sibbald B, Addington-Hall J, Brennenman D, Freeling P. Counsellors in English and Welsh general practices: their nature and distribution. *BMJ* 1993;306:29-33.
- 5 Cape J, Barker C, Buszewicz M, Pistrang N. General practitioner psychological management of common emotional problems (II): a research agenda for the development of evidence-based practice. *Br J Gen Pract* 2000;5:396-400.
- 6 Paykel ES, Scott J, Teasdale JD, Johnson AL, Garland A, Moore R, et al. Prevention of relapse in residual depression by cognitive therapy: a controlled trial. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 1999;56:829-35.

- 7 Ward E, King M, Lloyd M, Bower P, Sibbald B, Farrelly S, et al. Randomised controlled trial of non-directive counselling, cognitive-behaviour therapy and usual general practitioner care for patients with depression. I: Clinical effectiveness. *BMJ* 2000;321:1383-8.
- 8 Scott C, Tacchi MJ, Jones R, Scott J. Acute and one-year outcome of a randomised controlled trial of brief cognitive therapy for major depressive disorder in primary care. *Br J Psychiatry* 1997;171:131-4.
- 9 Mynors-Wallis LM, Gath DM, Llyof-Thomas AR, Tomlinson D. Randomised controlled trial comparing problem solving treatment with amitriptyline and placebo for major depression in primary care. *BMJ* 1995;310:441-5.
- 10 Davidson O, King M, Sharp D, Taylor F. A pilot randomized trial evaluating GP registrar management of major depression following brief training in cognitive behaviour therapy. *Educ Gen Pract* 1999;10:485-8.
- 11 Botega N, Mann A, Blizard R, Wilkinson G. General practitioners and depression—first use of the depression attitude questionnaire. *Int J Methods Psychiatr Res* 1992;4:169-80.
- 12 Kerr M, Blizard R, Mann A. General practitioners and psychiatrists: comparison of attitudes to depression using the depression attitude questionnaire. *Br J Gen Pract* 1995;45:89-92.
- 13 Zigmond AS, Snaith RP. The hospital anxiety and depression scale. *Acta Psychiatr Scand* 1983;67:361-70.
- 14 Wilkinson MJB, Barczak P. Psychiatric screening in general practice: comparison of the general health questionnaire and the hospital anxiety and depression scale. *J Roy Coll Gen Pract* 1988;38:311-3.
- 15 Beck AT, Ward CH, Mendelson M, Mock J, Erbaugh J. An inventory for measuring depression. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 1961;4:561-71.
- 16 Spielberger CD, Gorsuch RL, Lushene RE, Vagg PR, Jacobs GA. *Manual for the state-trait anxiety inventory*. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1983.
- 17 Smith RC, Lay CD. State and trait anxiety: an annotated bibliography. *Psychol Rep* 1974;34:519-94.
- 18 Jenkinson C, Coulter A, Wright L. Short form 36 (SF36) health survey questionnaire: normative data for adults of working age. *BMJ* 1993;306:1437-40.
- 19 Bashir K, Blizard B, Bosanquet A, Bosanquet N, Mann A, Jenkins R. The evaluation of a mental health facilitator in general practice: effects on recognition, management and outcome. *Br J Gen Pract* 2000;50:626-9.
- 20 Fleming M, Manwell L. Brief intervention in primary care settings: a primary treatment method for at-risk problem and dependent drinkers. *Alcohol Res Health* 1999;23:128-37.
- 21 Cordoba R, Delgado MT, Pico V, Aliscent R, Fores D, Monreal A, et al. Effectiveness of brief intervention on non-dependent alcohol drinkers (EBIAL): a Spanish multi-centre study. *Fam Pract* 1998;15:562-8.
- 22 Ridgeway NA, Harvill DR, Harvill LM, Falin TM, Forester GM, Gose OD. Improved control of type 2 diabetes mellitus: a practical education/behaviour modification program in a primary care clinic. *South Med J* 1999;92:667-72.
- 23 Robinson P, Katon W, Von-Korff M, Bush T, Simon G, Lin E, et al. The education of depressed primary care patients: what do patients think of interactive booklets and a video? *J Fam Pract* 1997;44:562-71.
- 24 Lidbeck J. Group therapy for somatization disorders in general practice: effectiveness of a short cognitive-behavioural treatment model. *Acta Psychiatr Scand* 1997;96:14-24.
- 25 Gedenk M, Nepps P. Obsessive-compulsive disorder: diagnosis and treatment in the primary care setting. *J Am Board Fam Pract* 1997;10:349-56.

(Accepted 2 January 2002)

# General practitioners' self ratings of skills in evidence based medicine: validation study

Jane M Young, Paul Glasziou, Jeanette E Ward

Editorial by  
Woodcock et al

continued over

BMJ 2002;324:950-1



See box and  
additional table on  
bmj.com

To practise evidence based medicine, clinicians need to understand and use terms such as "relative risk reduction," "absolute risk reduction," and "number needed to treat."<sup>1</sup> Self ratings represent one method of assessing competence in these skills. About a third of clinicians claim to understand such terms.<sup>2</sup> We evaluated the validity of self ratings and conducted a blinded validation in general practice.

## Methods and results

Fifty general practitioners in Sydney, Australia, completed self administered questionnaires,<sup>2</sup> in which they rated their understanding of each of seven terms used in evidence based medicine as "Would not be

helpful for me to understand," "I don't understand but would like to," "I already have some understanding," and "I understand this and could explain to others." We considered the last response to represent full understanding (self rating of competence). Participants sealed their responses in an envelope before participating in a structured interview with JY (who was unaware of their self rating), in which they were asked to explain each term as if to a medical student. Unprompted comments were recorded (see box on bmj.com). The study was approved by the Central Sydney Area Health Service Ethics Review Committee.

Three independent experts in evidence based medicine had been asked to identify criteria essential for showing that the participant knew the correct

Comparison of participants' self rating of understanding of terms used in evidence based medicine with objective criteria developed by experts

Self rating of competence	No of responses	No of criteria met			Could not or refused to answer or participate	Positive predictive value (%)	Negative predictive value (%)
		All	Some	None			
Levels of evidence:							
I understand and could explain to others	7	0	0	6	1	0	100
Other responses	43	0	2	3	38		
Relative risk:							
I understand and could explain to others	9	0	0	8	1	0	100
Other responses	41	0	0	5	36		
Absolute risk:							
I understand and could explain to others	15	0	0	8	7	0	100
Other responses	35	0	0	1	34		
Number needed to treat:							
I understand and could explain to others	8	0	2	2	4	0	100
Other responses	42	0	0	4	38		
Test sensitivity:							
I understand and could explain to others	13	0	1	7	5	0	100
Other responses	37	0	1	4	32		
Test specificity:							
I understand and could explain to others	13	0	0	6	7	0	100
Other responses	37	0	0	3	34		
Positive predictive value:							
I understand and could explain to others	13	1	0	1	11	8	100
Other responses	37	0	0	0	37		

meaning of the term (criterion based assessment; see table on bmj.com). During interviews with general practitioners, JY ticked any criterion met by participants' verbal explanations. To demonstrate competence in understanding number needed to treat, for example, participants had to include in their verbal responses the concept that this represents the number of patients needed to be treated to achieve one good outcome or prevent one bad outcome and that it is the reciprocal of absolute risk reduction.

Participants' verbal explanations almost never met the essential criteria (table). Although self ratings were modest, only one participant's explanation met all essential criteria, and this for only one term, positive predictive value.

We could not calculate sensitivity and specificity of self rated competence for any terms other than positive predictive value as only one respondent met objective criteria for competence. We calculated positive and negative predictive values for each term to assess the probability of competence given a positive or negative self rating. The predictive value of a positive self rating was 8% for positive predictive value but zero for the other six terms (table). As no participants demonstrated competence exceeding their self rating, the predictive value of a negative self rating was 100% for all terms.

## Comment

Participants' self ratings of their understanding of terms used in evidence based medicine differed from an objective, criterion based assessment. Moreover, participants' comments showed considerable misunderstanding about terms.

Medical education in Australia has largely not prepared general practitioners for evidence based medicine. Remediation is crucial if they are to understand research findings on which clinical practice ought to be based and avoid pitfalls such as

"framing effect."<sup>3</sup> Little rigorous research has been conducted to identify effective educational strategies for clinicians.<sup>4</sup>

It is unclear whether findings from our modest sample also apply to medical practitioners in other settings. Australia's general practitioners are at least as familiar with evidence based medicine as their counterparts in other countries, given recent focus in health policy.<sup>5</sup> Our method may have resulted in underperformance by participants, who might have been able to explain these terms to medical students when not under the scrutiny of an academic interviewer. Furthermore, general practitioners may understand these terms less in the abstract but more when they are used in context by a conference speaker or in a research article.

We thank the general practitioners who participated in this study and Jeremy Anderson, Chris Del Mar, and Chris Silagy, who responded to our request to rate criteria.

Contributors: JW and PG were responsible for the study concept. All authors developed the study protocol. JY conducted the study and analysed data. All authors jointly wrote the paper. JY is the guarantor.

Funding: At the time of the fieldwork, JY was employed by Central Sydney Area Health Service. JY is currently supported by National Health and Medical Research Council Public Health (Australia) fellowship No 007024.

Competing interests: None declared.

- 1 Sackett DL, Richardson WS, Rosenberg W, Haynes RB. *Evidence-based medicine: how to practise and teach EBM*. Edinburgh: Churchill Livingstone, 1998.
- 2 McColl A, Smith H, White P, Field J. General practitioners' perceptions of the route to evidence based medicine: a questionnaire survey. *BMJ* 1998;316:361-5.
- 3 Cranney M, Walley T. Same information, different decisions: the influence of evidence on the management of hypertension in the elderly. *Br J Gen Pract* 1996;46:661-3.
- 4 Hyde C, Parkes J, Deeks J, Milne R. Systematic review of effectiveness of teaching critical appraisal. Oxford: ICRF/NHS Centre for Statistics in Medicine, 2000. [www.bham.ac.uk/arif/SysRevs/TeachCritApp.PDF](http://www.bham.ac.uk/arif/SysRevs/TeachCritApp.PDF) (accessed 4 Jan 2002).
- 5 Ahmed T, Silagy C. The move towards evidence-based medicine. *Med J Aust* 1995;163:60-1.

(Accepted 15 October 2001)

Needs Assessment and Health Outcomes Unit, Central Sydney Area Health Service, Camperdown, NSW 2050, Australia

Jane M Young  
*research fellow*

School of Population Health, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Queensland 4006, Australia

Paul Glasziou  
*professor of evidence based practice*

Division of Population Health, South Western Sydney Area Health Service, Liverpool, NSW 2170, Australia

Jeanette E Ward  
*director*

Correspondence to:  
J Young  
[janey@netlink.com.au](mailto:janey@netlink.com.au)