Hypothesis / aims of study

To quantify differences in clinical information obtained from patients by health care professionals whilst assessing for lower urinary tract symptoms

Study design, materials and methods

A retrospective, observational study that formed part of a wider urodynamics audit.
The subjects were Gynaecology patients who had undergone urodynamic studies (performed by local urologists as per local service structure).
Patient identification numbers were obtained from the urodynamics nurse for all gynaecology patients who underwent cystometrogram between January and July 2009.
Casenotes were obtained and reviewed.
Data was extracted from histories documented by the following professionals-

General Practitioners (at time of referral),
Gynaecologists,
Physiotherapists and
Urologists,

Regarding the presence of the following symptoms-

Stress urinary incontinence
Urinary urgency
Urinary frequency
Nocturia
Urge urinary Incontinence
Potential voiding dysfunction

Data obtained was analysed for overall comparison of symptom reporting between groups and agreement between groups

Results

57 women were identified. All casenotes were obtained for review
40 "GP" histories were available
The remaining 17 referrals did not give a history of urinary symptoms
21 Physio histories were available
56 Gynaecology histories were available
57 Urology histories were available
14 had a history from everyone

Average No of symptoms per patient history by professional group

- GP 1.95
- Physio 2.48
- Gynae 2.86
- Urology 3.74

Percentages of histories reporting specific symptoms by professional group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symptom</th>
<th>GP</th>
<th>Physio</th>
<th>Gynae</th>
<th>Urology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stress UI</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>91.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urgency</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>84.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>freq</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nocturia</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urge UI</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiding</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agreement
- all professionals agreed on symptom “cocktail” for 1 patient (1.8%)
- No agreement whatsoever in 2 patients
- Disagreement over 1 symptom in 9 patients (15.7%)
- In most cases disagreement related to 2 or more symptoms

Agreement by symptom
- SUI 85.6%
- Urgency 62.5%
- Frequency 29.3%
- Nocturia 32.9%
- UUI 38.45%
- Voiding 39.33%

Interpretation of results
- Variations in history obtained
- Multiple symptoms common
- Urologists report most symptoms
- GPs report fewest
- Widespread disagreement, except SUI
- Commonest variations in histories relate to urge urinary incontinence and overactive bladder symptoms, with more reporting by urologists

Concluding message
It appears that different healthcare professionals involved in the care of individual patients frequently report different and widely variable histories. Potential reasons for this will be explored in more detail.
Steps to improve consistency of histories include greater use of patient questionnaires, bladder diaries and specific structured history proformas at all stages of the patient journey.
Education for primary care practitioners and generalist gynaecologists may also be beneficial.
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