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This is the last in a six-part series on general practice ethics. Cases from practice are used to trigger reflection on common ethical issues where the best course of action may not be immediately apparent. The case presented in the article is an illustrative compilation and not based on specific individuals.

**Case**

Dr Warburton works in a large and busy metropolitan general practice. One evening, after he turns his computer off, the receptionist hands him a written request for an urgent medication renewal for one of his patients, Mr Thomson, who is 60 years of age with hypertension and diabetes. Dr Warburton is in a hurry to leave, so he quickly writes a prescription by hand, leaving it with the receptionist for Mr Thomson’s wife to collect the next morning.

Two months later, while Dr Warburton is on holiday, Mr Thomson is seen by his colleague, Dr Schmidt. As usual, Mr Thomson brings his tablets with him. Dr Schmidt notices that his current blood-pressure-lowering medication is twice the dosage previously recorded in his notes. This is considerably more than she would usually prescribe for a patient with Mr Thomson’s condition. Dr Schmidt writes Mr Thomson a new prescription with the right dosage and advises him to use this new dosage.

When Dr Warburton returns from holidays, Dr Schmidt tells him about her consultation with Mr Thomson. Dr Warburton realises that he had mistakenly prescribed the wrong dose. He is unsure how the error occurred but thanks Dr Schmidt for her intervention.

Should Dr Warburton tell Mr Thomson about the mistake? And if so, what should Dr Warburton tell him?

This case concerns the disclosure of errors in the general practice setting. There are convincing reasons for disclosing errors to patients, including the virtues of being good physicians, preventing patient harm and improving healthcare. However, fears of litigation, loss of reputation and harm to the physician–patient relationship can make this ethical obligation very difficult for physicians to discharge. When a patient has been harmed by a medical error, early disclosure can have legal and financial advantages.¹ However, in our case, Mr Thomson has not been harmed and will probably never know about the error, unless Dr Warburton or someone at the practice tells him.

As with other papers in this series, we will look first at the patient’s perspective, then at the duties of the physician, and, finally, at possible actions and their consequences.

**The patient’s perspective**

Regardless of how Dr Schmidt explained the change in medication to Mr Thomson, he is likely to have realised that something was not quite right about his current blood pressure medication, prompting Dr Schmidt to write a new prescription. Although he may be unaware of any error, he may also have questions or concerns about his treatment.

We cannot foretell Mr Thomson’s reaction to disclosure of the error. Patients’ expectations vary in regard to disclosure of errors that do not harm them.² Some patients expect complete honesty from their physician, understanding that this can help to prevent similar errors in the future. Other patients may want harmful mistakes to be disclosed, but are less concerned about small mistakes if no harm arises. Patients may have differing views about the extent to which they are responsible for their healthcare, including an obligation to check their prescriptions. Nevertheless, most patients, and society in general, place the greater part of this responsibility on the physician.

Actions taken by patients after disclosure of errors can also be diverse.³ Some patients appreciate their doctor’s honesty, and regard it as a mark of the trust that holds between them and their doctor. Other patients may think that an error is an indication of failure and lack of competence on the part of their doctor, and may be inclined to trust their doctor less as a result. Relationships between this latter group of patients and their doctor may not necessarily recover, and disclosure in this situation might lead to transfer to another doctor, litigation or criticism of the doctor to other patients. How patients react depends on many factors, including their personal tolerance of mistakes, the quality of their prior relationship with the doctor and attitudes towards the medical profession.
in society generally. It may be difficult to
know in advance how an individual patient
will react, but general practitioners (GPs)
with good relationships with their patients
are well placed to predict the types of
reactions they will encounter.

The GP's duties and
responsibilities

The most important duty of the GP is to
prevent harm to the patient. Thus, even
if there is only a slight chance that the
medication has caused or will cause harm,
the doctor must minimise or prevent this
harm. In our case of a blood-pressure-
lowering drug, with the dosage corrected,
we would not expect any harm to have
occurred. However, Dr Warburton must
take measures to prevent the error
occurring again. Disclosing the error to
Mr Thomson may reduce the chance of
recurrence (eg through self-check of his
prescriptions).

Respect for patient autonomy requires
that patients be informed about events
that concern them so they can make their
own decisions about how to respond.
In this case, for example, disclosure will
allow Mr Thomson to change his GP if he
thinks the error is unacceptable.

Doctors have a duty to maintain their
knowledge and skills, and improve if
possible.4 This improvement must include
the safety of the care they provide.
Reporting and reviewing the incident
through the practice's management
may lead to changes to Dr Warburton's
personal practice, and the policies and
procedures of the clinic. However, these
changes do not necessarily require
Mr Thomson to know about the error.

Trust between doctor and patient is
extremely important, both as a value in
itself and to provide good care.5 Society
and patients must rely on the information
they receive from physicians. To achieve
and maintain this trust, people need
to know that doctors are honest. Trust
in the physician's honesty is therefore
highly important, and links to trust in
the physician's clinical competence.
Dr Warburton's error may never come to
light, but if Mr Thomson somehow finds
that an error was not disclosed, trust in
the doctor's honesty may be lost and
trust in physicians more generally may be
undermined.

Finally, doctors have an obligation
to the profession to act in ways that
maintain or enhance the quality of care
in the healthcare system. Early and
regular disclosure of errors by health
professionals contributes to a culture
of openness and transparency, which is
helpful for all doctors and patients.

Possible actions and their
consequences

Dr Warburton may decide not to
disclose the error in the interests of
protecting his reputation and maintaining
his relationship with Mr Thomson.
However, this action does not respect
Mr Thomson's autonomy. In addition,
if Mr Thomson does find out about
the mistake, both trust and Dr Warburton's
reputation will be undermined. Not
disclosing the error also places
Dr Schmidt in a difficult position, knowing
that her colleague has not explained the
error.

We think Dr Warburton should disclose
his mistake to Mr Thomson. He should
consult his insurer, who will agree that
early and full disclosure is appropriate,
and that an apology is the best course
of action. Dr Warburton should arrange
to see Mr Thomson, allowing enough
time to describe the situation, apologise
and address any concerns he may
have. He should respond empathically
to Mr Thomson's views, accepting any
anger he may express and supporting any
decision he may make about changing
doctors. It would also be appropriate for
Dr Warburton to review the practice's
prescribing policy with colleagues to
prevent similar cases from occurring in the
future. Mr Thomson may find it reassuring
to know that Dr Warburton and the
practice have learned from this incident.
Such a response might be difficult for
Dr Warburton and Mr Thomson, but
will demonstrate to Mr Thomson and
Dr Warburton's colleagues the virtues of
honesty, courage and beneficence.

Conclusion

There is little doubt that disclosing errors is
almost always the best course of action. It
is underpinned by duties of beneficence,
non-maleficence, honesty and respect
for patient autonomy. However, doctors
also have legitimate fears about disclosing
errors. Programs that encourage disclosure
exist in some countries, including
Australia.6 Disclosing errors, even those
that did not cause harm, can create an
atmosphere that supports and values
disclosure and minimises both formal and
informal punishment for errors. In this
atmosphere, physicians will be able to
admit, correct and minimise their errors.

Authors

Annette Braunack-Mayer BMedSci (Hons), PhD,
Professor of Health Ethics, School of Public Health,
University of Adelaide, Adelaide, SA. annette.
braunackmayer@adelaide.edu.au
Yishai Mintzer MD, Clinical Instructor, Sackler Faculty
of Medicine, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel
Competing interests: None.
Provenance and peer review: Commissioned,
externally peer reviewed.

References

Liability claims and costs before and after
implementation of a medical error disclosure
2.  Gallagher TH. Patients' and physicians' attitudes
regarding the disclosure of medical errors. JAMA
3.  Helmchen LA, Richards MR, McDonald TB. How
does routine disclosure of medical error affect
patients' propensity to sue and their assessment
of provider quality? Evidence from survey data.
Med Care 2010;48:955–61.
4.  Lynn J. The ethics of using quality improvement
5.  Hall MA, Dugan E, Zheng B, Mishra AK. Trust in
physicians and medical institutions: What is it,
can it be measured, and does it matter? Milbank
6.  Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in
safetyandquality.gov.au/our-work/open-disclosure
correspondence afp@racgp.org.au