retrospective postal survey to investigate the extent of, and the reasons for, non-attendance at the PR programme, with the aim of making recommendations to improve future attendance. Our results are notably different to those obtained by Zakrisson *et al.*

We sent out questionnaires to 88 patients who had previously been invited to the PR programme. Out of the 48 responded, the response rate was 54.5%. Only 13% had completed the full PR programme, 34% dropped out before the end, and 53% did not participate at all.

21% of responders indicated that they had not received notification of the appointment. Amongst those who did receive the appointment, the top three reasons for not attending either in part or altogether were health-related reasons (37.5%), personal and social reasons (34.3%), and because patients did not think that PR would help them (31.2%). Other reasons were: inconvenient location (15.6%); lack of transport (9.3%); lack of enough information (3.1%); and not enough notice (3.1%). Only a minority of patients (21.8%) who failed to attend either part or the whole of the programme were sent a second appointment. The rest (88%) of this group indicated that they would not have attended even if they had been sent another appointment. Of those who indicated that they did not attend because the venue was inconvenient, 63.3% said they would not have attended even if they were offered a venue nearer to their home.

Although it might be difficult to influence patients' personal, health- and social-related issues in this context, telephone confirmation of the appointment beforehand, with explanation of the benefits of PR, the offer of transport, sufficient advance notice and a convenient venue, may help to improve attendance at the PR programme. Although these

results were obtained from a specific geographical area, these general reasons for non-attendance at a PR programme are likely to be similar elsewhere. Not attending a PR programme deprives patients of the benefits of this extremely effective modality in the management of their COPD.

***Rajendra Kumar Sinha^a, Charlotte Mitchell^b**

^a Consultant Respiratory Physician, Yeovil District Hospital, Yeovil, Somerset, UK.

^b Senior Clinical Governance Assistant, Yeovil District Hospital, Yeovil, Somerset, UK

*Correspondence: rajendra.sinha@ydh.nhs.uk

Received 24th April 2012; accepted 3rd May 2012; online 23rd May 2012

Acknowledgements We thank Somerset Community COPD Services for supplying the names of patients for this survey.

Conflicts of interest The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest in relation to this article.

Funding No funding was received for this survey

References

1. Zakrisson A-B, Engfeldt P, Hagglund D *et al.* Nurse-led multidisciplinary programme for patients with COPD in primary health care: a controlled trial" *Prim Care Respir J* 2011; **20**(4):427-33. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4104/pcrj.2011.00060>
2. Management of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease in adults in primary and secondary care. National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence – clinical guideline 101, June 2010.

© 2012 Primary Care Respiratory Society UK. All rights reserved.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.4104/pcrj.2012.00042>

The implementation of a COPD continuous management improvement programme: learning for the future

Dear Sirs,

Adherence to recommended standards of management (such as NICE guidelines in the UK) differs widely in clinical practice. Programmes of management appear to drive improved patient outcomes, and there have been several reports in this journal recently of the benefits that follow formalised COPD disease management programmes.¹⁻³ In the most recent paper by Zakrisson *et al.* in the December 2011 issue,³ there was a significant reduction in exacerbation frequency in those patients in the intervention group.

We therefore wish to report the findings of an audit and targeted education programme on the management of COPD patients in Dartford, Gravesham and Swanley (DG&S) in West Kent, UK, focussed on the 2004 UK COPD NICE guidelines.⁴ A proprietary general practice data audit tool (POINTS) (identical to the tool used by Roberts *et al.*² previously) was integrated into 30 practices, and data were collected from patients on the COPD registers. An education programme was incorporated to underpin the launch and implementation of the programme, and there were additional COPD clinic hours provided. The programme also incorporated qualitative interviews with practice members to determine attitudes and to learn from the process.

The programme was successful in improving the management of COPD patients in DG&S according to NICE guidelines over a 12-month period. Key improvements included statistically significant improvements to the categorisation of patients by COPD severity (42% up to 60%;

$p < 0.001$) and the recording of patient-centric measures (FVC, exacerbations, and MRC dyspnoea scores; $p < 0.001$. Inhaler technique measurement; $p < 0.01$).

The level of participation in the education programme and the number of additional clinic hours appeared to drive improved interest, knowledge and care of patients with COPD. Practices involved in less than 25 hours education and additional clinic hours had significantly more patients categorised to severity at baseline than those undertaking 25 – 49 and ≥ 50 hours education and additional clinic hours ($p < 0.001$). At 12 months, however, there were no significant differences between the level of categorisation between the three groups. These improvements were validated by the qualitative analysis which showed that highly engaged practices accepted, implemented and valued the programme and saw the advantage of the better patient care it created.

Even in its infancy, the impact of the programme of audit and targeted education is impressive; the rate of increase in unscheduled hospital admissions for the year following the programme in the DG&S locality was 2%, compared to 55% in the remainder of the Primary Care Trust, and 12% in England – a trend replicated in the cost of admissions data.

A central feature in the success of this programme was the use of the POINTS audit tool which served two important purposes. It provided a patient-linked reminder of the key elements of NICE guidance at each consultation, and it provided detailed data on the COPD patient population in primary care. POINTS provided reliable data on current management practices which facilitated the identification of gaps in service provision and unmet patient needs and allowed targeted training programmes to be undertaken. This would not be feasible without such

a database. To use the information in the audit tool reports, practitioners need to want to access it. Practitioners with high engagement and an understanding of the programme thrived on comparison of performance with their peers, and across practices.

The management programme was successful in improving the management of COPD patients in DG&S to NICE guidelines. Continued improvement in the adherence of practices to NICE standards through targeted educational initiatives directed by centrally analysed outcomes data could further improve patient outcomes, and reduce unscheduled admissions and the related cost of treating COPD. The lessons from this study could be used to create and implement guidelines for other chronic diseases to the benefit of patients and health care budgets.

David Woodhead^a, *Zoe Blumer^b

^a Dartford, Gravesham and Swanley, Clinical Commissioning Group, Istead Rise Surgery, Worcester Close, Istead Rise, Kent, UK

^b Premark Services Ltd, Shepherds, Brighton Road, Shermanbury, West Sussex, UK

*Correspondence: zblumer@premarkservices.com

Received 30th April 2012; accepted 3rd May 2012; online 23rd May 2012

Acknowledgements We thank the staff of all practices and the team from the DG&S Practice-based commissioning (PBC) Group that participated in this study,

along with the Insight Research Group who managed the qualitative fieldwork, and Dr Andrew Myers at Premark Services for the statistical analysis.

Conflicts of interest ZB's involvement was support by an unrestricted educational grant provided by GlaxoSmithKline (GSK). DW declares that he has no conflicts of interest in relation to this article.

Funding This research was supported by an unrestricted educational grant from GSK. The Patient Outcomes and Information Service (POINTS) is provided by GlaxoSmithKline (UK) Ltd, and is delivered on behalf of GSK by Quintiles.

References

1. Chavannes NH, Grijzen M, van den Akker M *et al*. Integrated disease management improves one-year quality of life in primary care COPD patients: a controlled clinical trial. *Prim Care Respir J* 2009;**18**(3):171-6. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3132/pcrj.2009.00003>
2. Roberts JA., Maslin TH, Bakerly ND. Development of an integrated chronic obstructive pulmonary disease service model in an inner-city region in the UK: initial findings and 12 months results. *Prim Care Respir J* 2010;**19**:390-7. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4104/pcrj.2010.00071>
3. Zakrisson A-B, Engfeldt P, Hagglund D *et al*. Nurse-led multidisciplinary programme for patients with COPD in primary health care: a controlled trial. *Prim Care Respir J* 2011; **20**(4):427-33.
4. National Collaborating Centre for Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease. National clinical guidance on the management of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease in adults in primary and secondary care. *Thorax* 2004;**59**(Suppl 1). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/thx.2004.022707>

© 2012 Primary Care Respiratory Society UK. All rights reserved.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.4104/pcrj.2012.00043>

Available online at <http://www.thepcrj.org>