include dream interpretation – is more likely to regain a key role in the surely-here-to-stay multidisciplinary team than one whose expertise is narrowly confined to 'excellence' in prescribing, desirable though that no doubt is.

1 Craddock N, Antebi D, Attenburrow M-J, Bailey A, Carson A, Cowen P, Craddock B, Eagles J, Ebmeier K, Farmer A, Fazel S, Ferrier N, Geddes J, Goodwin G, Harrison P, Hawton K, Hunter S, Jacoby R, Jones I, Keedwell P, Kerr M, Mackin P, McGuffin P, MacIntyre DJ, McConville P, Mountain D, O'Donovan MC, Owen MJ, Oyebode F, Phillips M, Price J, Shah P, Smith DJ, Walters J, Woodruff P, Young A, Zammit S. Wake-up call for British psychiatry. *Br J Psychiatry* 2008; **193**: 6–9.

2 Reil J, Hoffbauer J. *Beytrage zur Beforderung einer Kurmethode auf psychischem Wege* [Contributions to the Advancement of a Treatment Method by Psychic Ways]. Curt'sche Buchhandlung, 1808.

3 Mayes L, Fonagy P, Target M (eds). *Developmental Science and Psychoanalysis*. Karnac, 2007.

4 Royal College of Psychiatrists & Royal College of General Practitioners. *Psychological Therapies in Psychiatry and Primary Care* (College Report CR151). Royal College of Psychiatrists, 2008.

Jeremy Holmes, Department of Psychology, University of Exeter, EX 4 4QG, UK. Email: j.a.holmes@btinternet.com

doi: 10.1192/bjp.193.6.511a

Craddock *et al*[1] make some interesting points about the role of the psychiatrist. It is unashamedly made from a psychiatrist's perspective.

We would like to comment from a primary care perspective, since many of the issues raised have a significant bearing on the way primary care works currently and how it may work in the future.

The authors make the point that 'psychiatry is a medical specialty' and that general practitioners should have the opportunity to refer patients for an opinion when they are unclear about the diagnosis or treatment. Sadly, in our experience, this rarely happens, as patients who have a mood disorder such as depression or anxiety are often told that they do not fulfil the criteria for referral (understood by the patient to mean that they are not 'ill enough') to see a psychiatrist. It is a rare occurrence where a psychiatrist will intervene in the administrative chore of 'bouncing the patient' back to the GP, so that the patient does benefit from their opinion. Such referrals are often pejoratively labelled as inappropriate, implying a lack of competence by the referrer.

This behaviour, of screening out people with certain conditions, is justified on the grounds that psychiatrists should concentrate on the most ill, that is the psychoses, and they quote the National Service Framework for Mental Health as supporting this stance. No other medical specialty diverts patients away from a medical opinion in the same way. It is a sad testament to both primary and secondary care clinicians that the person who was able to negotiate an improved level of care for people with a significant mental illness such as depression or anxiety was an economist, making an economic argument at the highest level of government.

The authors also make the case that they should be responsible for managing the physical healthcare needs of the people for whom they care. They are, according to the authors, first and foremost highly trained doctors. What has stopped psychiatrists providing this care in the past? Are the authors really making the case that they should manage not only the psychiatric needs of a person with schizophrenia, but also that person's diabetes, hypertension, obesity and osteoarthritis? Surely not. Readers were offered a thought experiment; we offer another thought experiment to the authors: if you had diabetes, hypertension, obesity and osteoarthritis, would you want these conditions managed by a psychiatrist, or a GP?

If there is a real concern that psychiatrists no longer have the opportunity to practise the specialty in which they trained, then they should do something about it. The National Service Framework for Mental Health is coming to an end – so the restrictions on who psychiatrists will see should also come to an end. If psychiatrists wish to behave as other medical consultants, then they should see the referrals made to their teams – as team leaders it is in their gift to do so. It may well be that some form of screening may be necessary, but do so based on patient need, not on the basis of a diagnosis.

1 Craddock N, Antebi D, Attenburrow M-J, Bailey A, Carson A, Cowen P, Craddock B, Eagles J, Ebmeier K, Farmer A, Fazel S, Ferrier N, Geddes J, Goodwin G, Harrison P, Hawton K, Hunter S, Jacoby R, Jones I, Keedwell P, Kerr M, Mackin P, McGuffin P, MacIntyre DJ, McConville P, Mountain D, O'Donovan MC, Owen MJ, Oyebode F, Phillips M, Price J, Shah P, Smith DJ, Walters J, Woodruff P, Young A, Zammit S. Wake-up call for British psychiatry. *Br J Psychiatry* 2008; **193**: 6–9.

Alan Cohen, **Andre Tylee**, **Chris Manning**, Sainsbury Centre for Mental Health, 134–138 Borough High Street, London SE1 1LB, UK. Email: alan.cohen@scmh.org.uk

doi: 10.1192/bjp.193.6.512

There are a number of key issues which those who have criticised the 'Wake-up call for British psychiatry'[1] have failed to address.

(a) In order that any illness be treated, proper assessment and diagnosis is necessary. Is there definitive evidence that complex problems such as very early psychotic illness (at-risk mental states) or type II bipolar disorder can be properly identified by non-medical staff without specific training? Is there a possibility that cases may be missed – and how big is this risk?

(b) How certain can any doctor – or indeed any person – be that they can assess 'service users' appropriately based only on the reported assessment of others? This is different from asking other respected professionals for their considered opinion in a multidisciplinary meeting.

(c) Why is psychiatry the only medical specialty where many seem to feel that we can accept 'patient choice' to take or not take medication with entire equanimity, even though we know that antipsychotic medication and antidepressants do actually help treat symptoms . . . and then why do we suddenly become concerned when tragedy happens because of non-concordance with medication?

(d) Why do we in the UK expect other professions to deliver all psychological interventions, while we simply seem to provide biological treatment? Why do we not provide psychotherapy as well as medication as many of our colleagues in Europe do? Should there not be one standard for how psychiatric help is delivered across the continent of Europe . . . and should this not obviously be holistic?

(e) Having been a GP for many years before going into psychiatry, I would ask, why are psychiatrists and their teams happy to dispense with the common courtesy of expecting the person addressed to answer a GP referral; in what other profession is 'sending the referral back because it is inappropriate' after a brief discussion in a multidisciplinary meeting considered an appropriate response? When this happens, is it not the service user who suffers because their problem is not dealt with?

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.193.6.512a Published online by Cambridge University Press

(f) On the other hand, as a GP, I would certainly consider carefully who to refer to secondary care and would use all my skills, as acquired in my GP training, before referral. I would also consult my liaison community psychiatric nurse or other attached mental health professional if I had one, and if necessary consult the consultant psychiatrist over the phone. However, a good GP will expect to be able to refer problems which they cannot solve to secondary care, and then expect the referral to be treated with respect by the consultant psychiatrist colleague with an adequate response, for GPs are specialists in their own right.

(g) Finally, in all of this debate, we have entirely forgotten that the reason service users consult doctors is the doctor–patient relationship, which is a relationship based on trust in another person, who may or may not have a greater or lesser knowledge of psychology and neuroscience, but who most of all is a person to be confided in during difficult times. This is what we must be as doctors, and all our discussions about 'the role of the consultant' pales into insignificance before this.

We must remember how Sir James Spence defined the consultation: 'The occasion when, in the intimacy of the consulting room, a person who is ill, or believes himself to be ill, seeks the advice of a doctor whom he trusts. This is a consultation'.[2] If we forget this, then what indeed is the point of our being doctors?

1 Craddock N, Antebi D, Attenburrow M-J, Bailey A, Carson A, Cowen P, Craddock B, Eagles J, Ebmeier K, Farmer A, Fazel S, Ferrier N, Geddes J, Goodwin G, Harrison P, Hawton K, Hunter S, Jacoby R, Jones I, Keedwell P, Kerr M, Mackin P, McGuffin P, MacIntyre DJ, McConville P, Mountain D, O'Donovan MC, Owen MJ, Oyebode F, Phillips M, Price J, Shah P, Smith DJ, Walters J, Woodruff P, Young A, Zammit S. Wake-up call for British psychiatry. *Br J Psychiatry* 2008; **193**: 6–9.

2 Spence J. The need for understanding the individual as a part of the training and functions of doctors and nurses (speech delivered at a conference on mental health held in March 1949). In *The Purpose and Practice of Medicine: Selections from the Writings of Sir James Spence*: pp. 273–4. Oxford University Press, 1960.

Mark Agius, Academic Department of Psychiatry, University of Cambridge, UK. Email: ma393@cam.ac.uk

doi: 10.1192/bjp.193.6.512a

We welcome the debate initiated by Craddock *et al*[1] and agree that the role of the psychiatrist is key to the delivery of high-quality services, and may be currently threatened. However, we believe that their proposals would be restrictive and counterproductive. If the psychiatrist has to assess all those referred to secondary services, access to such care would be restricted increasing the burden of unmet need. To deploy services effectively the psychiatrist should assess only those who require their direct input, freeing-up the psychiatrist to have an overview of the clinical work of all the team members: from allocation, initial assessment and management through to discharge as well as a training and development role. This was the ambition of New Ways of Working,[2] although not realised in its implementation, partly due to the lack of training of the other team members for their extended role and the development of teams without adequate medical input for them to work effectively. These issues should be addressed directly. To return to a position of the consultant taking full clinical responsibility for all the team's case-load is not only retrogressive, but unworkable. Allowing staff to take the personal responsibility that they already have improves the quality of care delivered and works best when the consultant is readily available for consultation and review rather than running over-booked out-patient clinics as occurred hitherto.

The authors, in focusing on the importance of biomedical methods, appear to underestimate the important contribution of other approaches, psychological and social, to psychiatry, which have been shown to lead to effective interventions. The profession of medicine is changing, with our physician colleagues taking up many of the challenges of a psychosocial approach. We appreciate that psychiatry is a medical specialty and that psychiatrists are physicians who have an expertise in psycho- and socio-dynamics in their broadest forms. In reconsidering our roles and values on the 200th anniversary of our specialty we should consider what we should be doing in the 21st century and how we can adapt to this. The mental health services have far to go to improve standards, quality and the delivery of evidence-based practice. The users of these services should expect to encounter experts in the field of mental disorders, but these experts need a wide range of skills and knowledge to guide assessment (including diagnosis) and management (including treatment). But, in addition, they need to utilise the ideas of recovery[3,4] (a term regrettably omitted from Craddock *et al*'s paper) to negotiate and facilitate the types of goals and outcomes valued by service users and to allow people with mental disorders to participate more fully in their communities and society.

It is important not to polarise this crucial debate, nor to retreat into restrictive medical modes of thinking. To meet the challenges of the 21st century will mean an important shift in our ways of working, which can be of enormous value to our professional roles and to the service users that we work with.

1 Craddock N, Antebi D, Attenburrow M-J, Bailey A, Carson A, Cowen P, Craddock B, Eagles J, Ebmeier K, Farmer A, Fazel S, Ferrier N, Geddes J, Goodwin G, Harrison P, Hawton K, Hunter S, Jacoby R, Jones I, Keedwell P, Kerr M, Mackin P, McGuffin P, MacIntyre DJ, McConville P, Mountain D, O'Donovan MC, Owen MJ, Oyebode F, Phillips M, Price J, Shah P, Smith DJ, Walters J, Woodruff P, Young A, Zammit S. Wake-up call for British psychiatry. *Br J Psychiatry* 2008; **193**: 6–9.

2 Department of Health. *New Ways of Working for Psychiatrists. Enhancing Effective, Person Centered Services Through New Ways of Working in Multi-disciplinary and Multi-agency Contexts. Executive Summary of the Final Report 'but not the end of the story'*. Department of Health, 2005.

3 Care Services Improvement Partnership, Royal College of Psychiatrists and Social Care Institute for Excellence (SCIE) (2007) *A Common Purpose: Recovery in Future Mental Health Services*. Social Care Institute for Excellence, 2007.

4 Shepherd G, Boardman J, Slade M. *Making Recovery a Reality*. Sainsbury Centre for Mental Health, 2008.

Jed Boardman, South London and Maudsley Foundation NHS Trust, UK. Email: jedboard@atlas.co.uk; **Michele Hampson**, Queen's Medical Centre Nottingham, UK

doi: 10.1192/bjp.193.6.513

The interpretation in *The Times*[1] of Craddock *et al*[2] risks alienating multidisciplinary colleagues and patients alike, turning a call for quality services into an appeal for primacy for the psychiatric profession.

New Ways of Working is similarly open to misinterpretation, including by Craddock *et al*. A fundamental principle of New Ways of Working is freeing up the appropriate staff to work with the patient. That means consultant practitioners working with those with the most complex needs – exactly what these doctors ordered.

Yet Craddock *et al* appear defensive, undermining their own call for self-confident progress. Why get exercised about