PostScript

LETTERS

Legibility of doctors' handwriting is as good (or bad) as everyone else's

Doctors have a reputation for illegible handwriting. Is such notoriety deserved?

Methods

With approval of the Kansas University Human Subjects Committee, we recruited 10 right-handed men and 10 right-handed women with seven different occupations (accountant, attorney, automobile technician, builder, engineer, doctor and scientist). Participants wrote in cursive "The quick brown fox jumps over the lazy dog" in <17 s.

The number of malformed individual letters was judged by an investigator, blinded to participant characteristics.¹ Four blinded investigators independently rated the global legibility of the writing samples using a four-point scale: poor, fair, good and excellent.² The power to detect a 25% difference was 0.8.

Results

No significant difference was seen in age, but there was difference in education (table 1). Intraobserver (κ 0.35) and interobserver (κ 0.23) agreements were good ($p < 0.001$), as was correlation between the scoring methods ($r = 0.75$; $p < 0.001$).

Across occupations, no differences in legibility were observed with either scoring methods, even after adjustment for age and education. In all, 40% of the men's handwriting was illegible (score < 2.0) compared with 20% of the women's ($p = 0.057$).

Comment

In a prospective study of 209 healthcare professionals, using a timed standard sentence and scoring for global legibility (1–4 scale), legibility of doctors' handwriting was not different from that of administrators.² In a comparison of 200 doctors and 500 community volunteers who wrote a standard sentence, doctors wrote more malformed individual letters.¹ A prospective study using computer scoring showed that doctors wrote poorly formed letters than other health professionals.³

Ours is the first study to compare the legibility of doctors' handwriting, with that of several other non-healthcare occupations and to adjust for age, education and, most importantly, sex. Our study agrees with Berwick and Winikoff² that doctors' handwriting is no less legible than that of other occupations.

This lack of difference in handwriting legibility does not excuse doctors from responsibility for clarity and accuracy in their written communication. As handwriting illegibility correlates with prescription error rates and misinterpretation of orders,⁴ doctors should strive to have "better" handwriting than everyone else or embrace the computerisation of medical records and orders.

K A Schneider, C W Murray, R D Shadduck, D G Meyers

Department of Internal Medicine, School of Medicine, University of Kansas, Kansas, USA

Correspondence to: D G Meyers, Division of Cardiovascular Diseases, Kansas University Medical Center, 3901 Rainbow Blvd, Kansas City, KS 66160, USA; dmeyers@kumc.edu

doi: 10.1136/qshc.2006.018911

Accepted for publication 19 June 2006

Competing interests: None.

References

- 1 Goldsmith H. The facts on the legibility of doctors' handwriting. *Med J Aust* 1976;2:462–3.
- 2 Berwick DM, Winikoff DE. The truth about doctors' handwriting: a prospective study. *BMJ* 1996;313:1657–8.
- 3 Lyons R, Christopher P, McCabe M, et al. Legibility of doctors' handwriting: a quantitative comparative study. *BMJ* 1998;317:863–4.
- 4 Briggs B. Fighting medical errors on a binary battlefield. *Health Data Manage* 2002;10:64–8, 70, 72.

Effect of European working time directive on a stroke unit

The European working time directive (EWTD) was introduced into National Health Service hospitals for doctors in training in August 2004.¹ Mounting evidence had shown that fatigue in doctors contributes to adverse events

in patients.² However, the implementation of potential quality improvements requires an understanding of whole healthcare systems.³ Before the introduction of the EWTD, our stroke ward had a resident senior house officer who provided weekday care, ensuring that all patients were medically reviewed on a daily basis. This is required, as patients with acute stroke are at high risk of many complications.^{4,5} We assessed junior doctors' weekday attendance on the stroke unit after the introduction of the EWTD.

The presence of junior doctors on the 12-bed unit during weekdays was prospectively monitored by the nursing staff over a 3-month period (between 1 November 2005 and 31 January 2006). Only weekday attendances were assessed, as weekends and statutory holidays were covered on an on-call basis, similar to the ward cover before the introduction of the EWTD.

During the study period, 82 patients (43 women and 39 men) of mean (SD) age 72.8 (15.6) years were admitted to the ward. Programme Foundation 1 doctors or senior house officers did not attend the ward on 33 weekdays (52%), over the study period of 64 days. No specialist registrar was present on the ward for 27 weekdays (42%). On 18 weekdays (28%), no junior doctor attended the ward.

This study shows an alarming change in junior doctor practice in one ward in a district general hospital after the introduction of the EWTD. The drop of 28% in weekday attendance raises important service and training issues. This is particularly true of stroke care, as stroke outcomes in the UK and Ireland already appear to be less favourable than those in North America and northwest Europe.⁶ Even before the introduction of the EWTD, it was recognised that there was insufficient evidence to estimate the effect of any intervention to limit the working hours of doctors.⁷

Surgeons and anaesthetists have documented a decrease in training capacity in terms of procedure counts after the introduction of the EWTD.^{8,9} Recent changes in the UK postgraduate system combined with the EWTD may have halved the total number of hours of postgraduate "training".¹⁰ Our study implies that follow-up of medical patients or continuity of care, which is recognised as an important service quality of junior doctors and as an integral part of training, may be

Table 1 Participant characteristics and handwriting scores

	Attorney	Builder	Scientist	Engineer	Doctor	Accountant	AutoTech	p Value
Sex (M/F)	10/10	10/10	10/10	10/10	10/10	10/10	10/10	
Age* (years)	41 (10)	34 (7)	42 (7)	29 (6)	36 (10)	35 (12)	29 (9)	0.313
Education* (years)	20 (2)	13 (1)	22 (2)	17 (1)	22 (2)	17 (1)	14 (2)	<0.001
Poorly formed letters*	11.3 (5.0)	9.4 (6.2)	8.8 (3.2)	8.6 (7.9)	8.5 (5.2)	7.0 (6.7)	5.8 (3.9)	0.705
Median score (1–4; range)	2.0 (1.2–2.8)	2.0 (1.6–3.0)	2.1 (1.2–3.0)	2.3 (1.0–3.2)	2.4 (1.6–3.0)	2.6 (1.0–3.0)	2.6 (1.2–3.2)	0.076
Illegible (<2.0)	40%	30%	40%	35%	25%	15%	30%	0.619
Median score (1–4)								
Male	2.0	2.0	2.1	1.8†	1.9†	2.3†	1.9†	
Female	2.2	2.3	2.1	2.9	2.6	2.8	2.6	
Pairwise p value	0.439	0.114	0.424	0.003	0.020	0.038	0.020	<0.001

AutoTech, automobile technician; M/F, male/female. *Data are presented as mean (standard deviation).

†Pairwise comparison, $p < 0.04$.

suboptimal in some hospitals under the EWTD.

M O McCarron, M Armstrong

Acute Stroke Unit, Department of Neurology,
Altnagelvin Hospital, Londonderry, UK

P McCarron

Department of Epidemiology and Public Health
Medicine, Queen's University of Belfast, Belfast, UK

Correspondence to: M McCarron, Department of
Neurology, Altnagelvin Hospital, Londonderry BT47
6SB, UK; markmccarron@doctors.org.uk

doi: 10.1136/qshc.2006.019489

Accepted for publication 16 June 2006

References

- 1 **Department of Health.** *European working time directive*, <http://www.dh.gov.uk/PolicyAndGuidance/HumanResourcesAndTraining/WorkingDifferently/EuropeanWorkingTimeDirective/fs/en> (accessed 26 Feb 2006).
- 2 **Jagsi R, Kitch BT, Weinstein DF, et al.** Residents report on adverse events and their causes. *Arch Intern Med* 2005;**165**:2607–13.
- 3 **Woolf SH.** Patient safety is not enough: targeting quality improvements to optimize the health of the population. *Ann Intern Med* 2004;**140**:33–6.
- 4 **Grau AJ, Weimar C, Buggle F, et al.** Risk factors, outcome, and treatment in subtypes of ischemic stroke: the German stroke databank. *Stroke* 2001;**32**:2559–66.
- 5 **Irwin P, Hoffman A, Lowe D, et al.** Improving clinical practice in stroke through audit: results of three rounds of National Stroke Audit. *J Eval Clin Pract* 2005;**11**:306–14.
- 6 **Gray LJ, Sprigg N, Bath PMW, et al.** Significant variation in mortality and functional outcome after acute ischaemic stroke between western countries: data from the tinzaparin in acute ischaemic stroke trial (TAIST). *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2006;**77**:327–33.
- 7 **Fletcher KE, Davis SQ, Underwood W, et al.** Systematic review: effects of resident work hours on patient safety. *Ann Intern Med* 2004;**141**:851–7.
- 8 **Anwar M, Irfan S, Daly N, et al.** EWTD has negative impact on training for surgeons. *BMJ* 2005;**331**:1476.
- 9 **Sim DJ, Wrigley SR, Harris S.** Effects of the European working time directive on anaesthetic training in the United Kingdom. *Anaesthesia* 2004;**59**:781–4.
- 10 **Craft A.** Modernizing medical careers: a response from the Academy of Medical Royal Colleges. *J R Soc Med* 2006;**99**:165–7.

Bedside tipples

Alcohol hand-gel is now provided at all patient–staff contact points throughout the National Health Service as part of the Department of Health's "clean your hands" campaign. This potentially could adversely influence patient care as we found out in our hospital. A 53-year-old patient admitted with alcoholic liver disease and acute renal failure consumed about 350 ml of spirigel from the container at his bedside. Gastric lavage was not considered safe and he was monitored closely over the next two days. He did not manifest any signs of ethanol intoxication and was discharged in due course. Spirigel contains 70% ethanol and small quantities of glycerol, bitrex and triethanolamine. The features of toxicity are entirely due to the ethanol. The estimated fatal dose for this gentleman was about 600 ml. The presence of bitrex and the consistency of this product discourage ingestion. However, the easy availability of this rather rich source of

alcohol could prove tempting to patients known to misuse alcohol. It is perhaps prudent to put in place measures to limit access to alcohol-containing products for this type of patients.

M Bairy, S Bhandari

Renal Unit, Hull Royal Infirmary, Kingston upon Hull
HU3 2JZ, UK

Correspondence to: M Bairy, 48, Lancelot Court
Victoria Dock Hull HU9 1QD, UK; manoharbairy@yahoo.com

doi: 10.1136/qshc.2006.019679

Accepted 30 June 2006

Competing interests: None declared.

Using a sentinel adverse incident audit on a Medicine for the Elderly ward

Adverse events in healthcare occur more often in older people,^{1,2} and older people are more vulnerable to the effects of adverse events. Despite this, there are few studies that focus specifically on reducing adverse events in older people.³ Several problems have been noted with systems such as the incident reporting (IR1) system used in the National Health Service—lack of anonymity,⁴ failure of medical staff to fill in reports,⁵ bias towards certain types of events (eg, falls) and lack of feedback to ward staff. We therefore introduced an anonymous adverse incident reporting system on our Medicine for the Elderly ward in Ninewells Hospital, Tayside, Scotland to ascertain (a) whether additional events would be detected by this system and (b) to provide a driver for ward-based quality improvement activities.

The audit ran between November 2004 and October 2005. The tool was based on a tool previously developed by one of the authors, the trial for which was conducted in general medical wards in an Australian hospital.⁶ Before its introduction, an orientation session took place at the weekly ward multidisciplinary meeting. Reports were collated at three-monthly intervals by the middle grade doctor on the ward (MDW) and presented to the

multidisciplinary team in aggregate form. These aggregate reports were then used to select a small number of areas on which to focus ward-level quality improvement activities.

In all, 268 patients, all female, mean age 85.2 years, were admitted to the ward during the study period. Table 1 compares the audit results with IR1 reports from the same timeframe and from the preceding year. A total of 32 of 72 (44%) of sentinel audit incidents were reported by nursing staff and 37 of 72 (51%) by medical staff, with three reports not attributable. No incidents were reported by allied health professionals. There was no overlap in reports between the sentinel audit and the IR1 system.

The adverse incident audit was acceptable to staff, quick to use and generated additional adverse event reports to the IR1. Event categories for both the audit and IR1 were similar to those previously reported.^{7,8} The frequency and type of events reported using the IR1 system did not change when the sentinel audit was introduced, confirming that the audit collected new information. The results were easily fed back to the ward team, who initiated new ward-level quality improvement activities as a result. A simple, anonymous adverse incident audit can therefore provide useful additional information to drive quality improvement activities in a Medicine for the Elderly hospital service.

M D Witham

University of Dundee, Dundee, UK

P M Jenkins

NHS Tayside, Dundee

M E T McMurdo

University of Dundee

Correspondence to: M D Witham, Section of Ageing and Health, Ninewells Hospital and Medical School, University of Dundee, Dundee DD1 9SY, UK; m.witham@dundee.ac.uk

doi: 10.1136/qshc.2006.020180

Accepted 3 August 2006

Competing interests: None declared.

Table 1 Adverse incidents captured by sentinel audit and IR1 reports

Category	Sentinel audit 2004–5	IR1 2004–5	IR1 2003–4
Delay in investigation or diagnosis or treatment	24	0	0
Prescribing error	14	0	0
No discharge summary or notes entry	5	0	0
Inappropriate treatment	4	0	0
Unplanned readmission	4	0	0
Cancelled or inadequate discharge	4	0	0
Adverse drug reaction	4	0	0
Unprescribed fluids or warfarin	3	0	0
Over-anticoagulation	2	0	0
Observations not recorded	2	0	0
Patients with slip, trips and falls	0	110	112
Drug administration error	0	5	3
Hospital-acquired infection	0	2	0
Patient missing	0	4	1
Theft or intruder	0	3	2
Violence and aggression	0	11	11
Other injury (staff or patient)	0	8	12
Unsafe staffing levels	0	0	3
Other	6	4	4
Total	72	147	148