



University  
of Glasgow

Norbury, M., Mercer, S.W., Gillies, J., Furler, J. and Watt, G.C.M. (2011)  
*Time to care: tackling health inequalities through primary care*. Family  
Practice, 28 (1). pp. 1-3. ISSN 0263-2136

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/49615>

Deposited on: 7 March 2011

# **Time to Care: Tackling Health Inequalities through Primary Care**

## **Authors**

Michael Norbury, GP Academic Fellow<sup>1</sup>

Stewart W Mercer, Professor of Primary Care Research<sup>2</sup>

John Gillies, Chair of Scottish Council, RCGP Scotland<sup>3</sup>

John Furler, Senior Research Fellow<sup>4</sup>

Graham CM Watt, Professor of General Practice<sup>2</sup>

1. Quality, Safety and Informatics Research Group, Clinical and Population Sciences and Education Division, University of Dundee, Mackenzie Building, Dundee, DD2 4BF
2. Academic Unit of General Practice & Primary Care, University of Glasgow, 1 Horselethill Road, Glasgow, G12 9LX
3. RCGP Scotland, 25 Queen Street, Edinburgh, EH2 1JX
4. Primary Care Research Unit, Department of General Practice, University of Melbourne, 200 Berkeley Street, Carlton, VIC 3053

## **Corresponding author**

Stewart Mercer [Stewart.Mercer@glasgow.ac.uk](mailto:Stewart.Mercer@glasgow.ac.uk)

Tel: 0141 330 8330

Fax: 0141 330 8331

Word count: 1,632

## **Time to Care: Tackling Health Inequalities through Primary Care**

Health inequalities are systematic, socially produced and unfair: Systematic because the differences in health outcomes are not randomly distributed, but rather show a consistent pattern across the socioeconomic spectrum; socially produced because no Law of Nature decrees that the poor should endure greater ill health and premature mortality than the rich, and unfair because they are maintained by unjust social arrangements – arrangements which mean for instance that the chances of survival for many children are determined by the socioeconomic position into which they are born.[1]

### ***A global issue***

Life expectancy, health and health related behaviours have greatly improved over the last 50 years in many countries, but progress among disadvantaged groups has been slower so the overall gap in health between rich and poor continues to widen.[2-6] The World Health Organisation (WHO) established the Commission on Social Determinants of Health (CSDH) in 2005 to marshal evidence on what could be done to promote health equity, describing social justice as a ‘matter of life and death.’[7] Critically, the Commission identified health inequities as an urgent problem for all countries, (high, middle and low income). The Commission provided three overarching recommendations; (1) improve daily living conditions; (2) tackle the inequitable distribution of power, money, and resources, and, (3) measure and understand the problem and assess the impact of action.[7]

The recent independent review of health inequalities in England concluded that premature illness and death affects everyone below the wealthiest tier of English society, causing productivity losses for England of £31-33 billion annually, lost taxes and higher welfare costs of £20-32 billion each year and additional costs for the NHS in excess of £5.5 billion per year.[8] The review suggested that reducing health inequalities would require action on six fronts which included giving every child the best start in life; enabling all children to maximise their capabilities; creating fair employment and good work for all; ensuring a healthy standard of living; creating sustainable communities and strengthening the role of ill health prevention.[8]

Such high-level reports emphasise the importance of the social determinants of health, but they can also be criticised for offering little in the way of policy change that could affect health inequalities in the short term.[9]

### ***The Inverse Care Law; policy failure and the potential of primary care***

The 2008 WHO World Health Report, marking the 30<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Declaration of Alma-Ata, 'Primary Health Care, Now More than Ever' emphasises the importance of primary healthcare in addressing health inequalities.[10] The report argues that strengthening primary healthcare is a key practical strategy for responding effectively to the needs of entire populations.[10] Evidence shows that strong primary healthcare is associated with both better health and a more equitable distribution of healthcare both cross-nationally and within nations.[11] In the UK, with over 300 million consultations annually, representing over 90% of all contact with healthcare professionals, the importance of General Practice is clear.[12]

Whilst primary healthcare has the potential to help narrow health inequalities, the 'inverse care law, first described in 1971 by Tudor-Hart, still persists.[13, 14] In Scotland, the flat distribution of General Practitioners across the population, despite levels of ill-health in deprived areas that are 2-3 fold that seen in more affluent areas, results in high demand and unmet need. Patients in these deprived communities face poorer access to their GP, have less time with the GP and are less enabled by the consultation compared with patients in more affluent areas, as well as GPs in these deprived areas experiencing higher levels of stress in the encounters.[15, 16] Combined, these factors confound attempts to narrow health inequalities. The rhetoric on more resources for deprived areas continues, but with little action.[17, 18] The report from the UK House of Commons Committee of Public Accounts further serves to underscore this point. The report was highly critical of the Department of Health (DOH) in England who took 'nine years after it announced the importance of tackling health inequalities to establish this as an NHS priority'.[19] The report was also critical of a missed opportunity by the DOH to use the revised GP contract in 2004 to ensure that more doctors worked in deprived areas or to focus attention on key interventions in deprived areas that would make a difference to inequalities.[19-21] The potential for primary health care to play a key role in addressing health inequalities is made all the harder in the face of such policy failures. The opportunity to mitigate the health effects of social inequity becomes instead a health system that "perpetuates injustice and social stratification." [22]

### ***Ways forward***

Nevertheless it is possible to make progress. An analysis of 34 Quality and Outcome Framework (QOF) clinical indicator scores following the implementation of the new UK GP contract in 2004 revealed a significant narrowing of the scores between deprived and affluent areas in the first three years of QOF, although it is not yet clear if these will actually result in more equitable health

outcomes.[12, 23] The impact of financial incentives on inequalities is likely to vary by the care targeted and some kinds of care may require more focussed activity.[24] Primary care resources could be targeted more directly to the disadvantaged at various levels, for example to the lowest income patients within each GP practice, or the most deprived GP practices within primary care organisations.[25]

In terms of tackling health inequalities more broadly, a recent evidence review supports the importance of generalism, patient advocacy, and community and population level healthcare by General Practice.[12] GPs and primary care teams can play a crucial role in improving the health of those in the most deprived areas, although they have been criticised for failing to focus sufficient attention on their more deprived patients and ignoring the political call to tackle inequalities [19, 21]. However, the capacity of a strong primary care/GP sector to act as a positive social determinant of health in a community by practicing in a way that sustains levels of trust, security, and sense of caring and well-being is hampered if it is so overwhelmed by the burden of disease care it must perform.[22] Until action is taken by governments to directly reverse the inverse care law, the latter will persist. Indeed, in identifying characteristics of policies which are likely to be effective in reducing health inequalities, Macintyre highlights that both prioritising disadvantaged groups and offering intensive support are of key importance.[26]

Decisive leadership and evidence of effectiveness are key priorities for the future if health inequalities are to be reduced despite the current economic climate. High level policy recommendations such as those recently made by the Royal College of Physicians in the UK which call for a change in doctors' attitudes, a change in healthcare systems, and a change in the education of doctors, whilst important, are in themselves insufficient.[27] The Royal College of General Practitioners (RCGP) in the UK has also published a guide for GPs on addressing health inequalities. The Health Inequalities Standing Group of the RCGP and the Health Inequalities Unit at the Department of Health in England identified six key areas in which GPs can exert their influence to help reduce health inequalities: GPs as individuals, GPs and the primary care team, practice-based commissioning, engagement with Primary Care Trusts, working in partnership with other organisations, and influencing the national agenda.[28]

Subsequent to the publication of the English report, RCGP Scotland recently completed their own assessment of the situation in Scotland.[29] This differed substantially from the approach taken in England, by bringing together GPs working in the 100 most deprived areas of Scotland (coined 'GPs at the Deep End') for a unique meeting to gather views and make recommendations – the first time in the history of the NHS (and perhaps in the world) that such a meeting has taken place.[30] GPs in

remote and rural areas were also included and a review of deprivation in remote and rural areas was also commissioned. The report concluded that the only route by which practices in severely deprived areas can improve patient's health and narrow health inequalities is by increasing the volume and quality of the care they provide, but that practitioners lack time in consultations to address the multiple morbidity, social complexity and reduced expectations that are typical of patients living in severe socio-economic deprivation. As such, opportunities for anticipatory care are often fleeting and may be lost if there is not the opportunity to connect quickly with other disciplines and services that are closely linked to the practice. Specific proposals included; (1) additional time for consultations with patients in very deprived circumstances, addressing directly the fundamental cause and operation of the inverse care law, (2) enhancement of multi-professional practice teams via the attachment of staff with specific skills/expertise, (3) improved joint working between general practices and other local services e.g. child health, care of the elderly, mental health and addiction, health improvement, and (4) recognition of the principle that additional activity should not be expected of practices without commensurate resources.[29, 30]

In conclusion, general practices provide contact, coverage, continuity, flexibility and coordination, of care and need to be recognised and supported as the hubs around which other services operate.[31] Support and development of practices in areas of high deprivation as multidisciplinary, learning organisations, committed and supported to sharing experience, information, evidence, activity and education is essential if progress is to be made on reducing health inequalities through primary care. This includes the need for recognition, training, support and reward for the leadership required to co-ordinate integrated local services. Policy makers need the moral imagination to understand that the lives of the poor have as much value as those of the rich [32] but also need to demonstrate the courage to distribute limited resources where they are most needed. The time to care is now.

## References

1. Whitehead M and Dahlgren G, *Concepts and principles for tackling social inequalities in health: Levelling up Part 1*. 2007, WHO: Copenhagen.
2. Macintyre S, *Briefing Paper on Health Inequalities*. 2007, MRC Social & Public Health Sciences Unit: Glasgow.
3. The Scottish Government, *Equally Well. Report of the ministerial task force on health inequalities*. 2008, The Scottish Government: Edinburgh.
4. The Scottish Government, *Long-term monitoring of health inequalities. Headline indicators - October 2010*. 2010, The Scottish Government: Edinburgh.
5. Murray CJ, et al., *Eight Americas: Investigating Mortality Disparities across Races, Counties, and Race-Counties in the United States*. PLoS Medicine, 2006. **3**(9): p. e260.
6. Draper G, Turrell G, and Oldenburg BF, *Health inequalities in Australia: Mortality. Health Inequalities Monitoring Series No. 1*. 2004, Queensland University of Technology and the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare: Canberra.
7. Commission on Social Determinants of Health, *Closing the gap in a generation. Health equity through action on the social determinants of health*. 2008, World Health Organisation: Geneva.
8. Marmot M, et al., *Fair Society, Healthy Lives. The Marmot Review. Strategic Review of Health Inequalities in England post-2010*. 2010.
9. The Economist (editorial), *The Price of Being Well* (<http://www.economist.com/node/12009974>) (accessed 05/12/2010). 2008.
10. World Health Organisation, *The World Health Report 2008: Primary Healthcare, Now More Than Ever*. 2008, WHO: Geneva.
11. Starfield B, Shi L, and Mackinko J, *Contribution of Primary Care to Health Systems and Health*. The Milbank Quarterly, 2005. **83**(3): p. 457-502.
12. Hutt P and Gilmour S, *Tackling Inequalities in General Practice*. 2010, The King's Fund: London.
13. Hart JT, *The Inverse Care Law*. The Lancet, 1971. **297**(7696): p. 405-412.
14. Watt G, *The Inverse Care Law Today*. The Lancet, 2002. **360**: p. 252-54.
15. Mercer S and Watt G, *The Inverse Care Law: Clinical Primary Care Encounters in Deprived and Affluent Areas of Scotland*. Annals of Family Medicine, 2007. **5**: p. 503-510.
16. Watt G, *The NHS at 60: time to end the fairy tale*. BJGP, 2008. **58**(552): p. 459-460.
17. The Scottish Parliament Health & Sports Committee (press release). *More GPs Required in Deprived Areas* (<http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/nmCentre/news/news-08/pa08-037.htm>) (accessed 05/12/2010). 2008.
18. BMA Scotland, *General Practice in Scotland: The Way Ahead - Final Report*. 2010, British Medical Association: Edinburgh.
19. House of Commons Committee of Public Accounts, *Tackling inequalities in life expectancy in areas with the worst health and deprivation*. 2010: London.
20. National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (public health guidance 15), *Reducing the rate of premature deaths from cardiovascular disease and other smoking-related diseases: finding and supporting those most at risk and improving access to services*. 2008, NICE: London.
21. The Lancet (editorial), *"Claptrap" from the UK's Department of Health*. The Lancet, 2010. **376**: p. 1617.
22. Gilson L, et al., *Challenging inequity through health systems: Final report of the knowledge network on health systems*. 2007, WHO: Geneva. p. 8.
23. Doran, T., et al., *Effect of Financial Incentives on Inequalities in the Delivery of Primary Clinical Care in England: Analysis of Clinical Activity Indicators for the Quality and Outcomes Framework*. The Lancet, 2008. **372**: p. 728-36.

24. Norbury M, Fawkes N, and Guthrie B, *The GP contract, influenza immunisation and inequalities: a retrospective population database analysis*. BJGP (in press), 2010.
25. Epstein D, et al., *An Economic Framework for Analysing the Social Determinants of Health and Health Inequalities*. Research paper 52. 2009, Centre for Health Economics, The University of York York.
26. Macintyre S, *Inequalities in health in Scotland: what are they and what can we do about them? Occasional paper No 17*. 2007, MRC Social & Public Health Sciences Unit: Glasgow.
27. Royal College of Physicians, *How Doctors can Close the Gap*. 2010, Royal College of Physicians: London.
28. Ali A, Wright N, and Rae M, *Addressing Health Inequalities: A guide for general practitioners*. 2008, RCGP: London.
29. RCGP Scotland Health Inequalities Short-Life Working Group, *Time to Care: Health inequalities, deprivation and General Practice in Scotland (in press)*. 2010, RCGP Scotland: Edinburgh.
30. Watt G, *General Practitioners at the Deep End (in press)*. BJGP, 2011.
31. Gillies J, et al., *Distilling the essence of General Practice: a learning journey in progress*. BJGP, 2009. **59**: p. 167-76.
32. Benatar SR, *Moral Imagination: The Missing Component in Global Health*. PLoS Medicine, 2005. **2**(12).