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Abstract. Introduction. Skin diseases account for a high proportion of presenting complaints in primary health care. In Spain, the growing demand for consultations and the resulting longer waiting lists make it necessary to establish criteria for appropriate referrals to a specialist. This study aimed to investigate the characteristics of referrals from primary care centers to dermatology specialists as well as the correlation between the presenting complaint and the final dermatologic diagnosis.

Patients and methods. We collected data from 3164 patients seen for the first time by dermatologists in our specialist service during 1998. Patients were stratified according to the referring primary health care center and the reason for referral. The agreement between the presenting complaint and the final dermatologic diagnosis was studied. For each dermatologic condition, the positive predictive value, diagnostic sensitivity, and \( \kappa \) statistic were calculated.

Results. The overall diagnostic agreement was 65.52%. Primary care physicians were found to overdiagnose diseases caused by papillomavirus and the diagnostic sensitivity was very low for diseases such as basal cell carcinoma and seborrheic keratosis.

Conclusions. It is necessary to insist on training primary care physicians, ensuring appropriate referral from primary health care clinics, and promoting an effective dialogue with the specialist.
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however, have analyzed the ability of primary care physicians in Spain to diagnose and treat these disorders correctly, and data from similar studies conducted in the United States of America (USA) are not very encouraging.4-10

The growing demand for consultations and the subsequent emergence of waiting lists call for the development of appropriate referral criteria.

The aim of this study was to describe dermatology referrals made in a primary health care setting and to analyze the level of diagnostic agreement between primary care physicians and dermatologists.

Materials and Methods

We prospectively gathered data corresponding to patients who were seen for the first time in 1998 by primary care physicians and referred to the San José Specialist Center, which belongs to the health care district served by Hospital Miguel Servet in Saragossa, Spain.

The data were entered into purpose-designed patient files in a Microsoft Access database. Each file contained the following data: a patient identification number, the patient’s date of birth and sex, the name of the referring (primary care) center, the location of the center (urban or rural), the date of the first consultation, the presenting complaint, and the diagnosis.

To facilitate statistical analysis, we created a database containing all possible diagnoses together with their corresponding codes according to the International Classification of Diseases (ICD), Ninth Revision, Clinical Modification and ICD-10.11,12

The patients’ data were also coded and stored for subsequent statistical analysis using the SPSS software package and Microsoft Excel spreadsheet software. The χ² test was used to analyze associations between qualitative variables and the t test to compare means of quantitative variables. Statistical significance was set at a value of P<.05 in all cases.13-15

We analyzed agreement between the tentative diagnosis made by the primary care physician and the final diagnosis by the dermatologist, and calculated diagnostic sensitivity (percentage of patients with a given disease who were correctly suspected to have this disease), positive predictive value (percentage of patients with a given tentative diagnosis that was later confirmed), and the κ statistic (agreement between the 2 diagnoses).16

Results

We classified 3164 medical histories into 3 categories according to the information provided on the primary care referral form regarding the patient’s presenting complaint. These categories were (1) no mention of presenting complaint, (2) description of presenting complaint but no mention of possible diagnosis, and (3) description of presenting complaint and clear mention of possible diagnosis.

We also classified the patients’ medical histories according to the center from which they were referred: (1) a health care center in an urban setting, (2) a health care center in a rural setting, and (3) an old-style clinic that had not yet been converted into a primary health care center. Table 1 shows a summary of the types of referral made by the different types of centers.

No details of presenting complaints were given for 7.6% of patients. This lack of information was most common in old-style clinics (15.5%) and the differences between these and other types of centers were statistically significant (P<.001).

Almost a third (32.7%) of the referral forms analyzed contained a description of the patients’ skin lesions but did not offer a tentative diagnosis. This second type of referral was more common in health care centers than in old-style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referral Center</th>
<th>Presenting Complaint</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Mention</td>
<td>Description of Lesions</td>
<td>Tentative Diagnosis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban primary health care center</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>1259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural primary health care center</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old-style clinic</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>1376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>1034</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>3164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
clinics, with highly significant differences \((P<0.001)\). The differences between centers in urban and rural settings, in contrast, were not significant.

The majority of referral forms provided a tentative diagnosis \((n=1888, 59.67\%)\), although these types of forms were least common in old-style clinics, for which the differences with urban health centers were statistically significant. The corresponding data are shown in the Figure.

Table 2 shows the different diagnoses offered by primary care physicians in order of frequency. The most common diagnoses were, again in order of frequency, warts, nevus, acne, eczema, alopecia, mycosis, psoriasis, seborrheic dermatitis, urticaria, plantar warts, and fibromas. It is noteworthy that 828 \((43.9\%)\) of the 1888 patients for whom a diagnosis was offered by the referring primary care physician were tentatively diagnosed with warts.

As mentioned, we analyzed the level of agreement between the diagnoses offered by primary care physicians and dermatologists, and calculated, in each case, the positive predictive value, the diagnostic sensitivity, and the \(\kappa\) statistic. In the case of diagnoses of warts suggested by primary care physicians, we observed a positive predictive value of 40.8\%, a diagnostic sensitivity of 99.7\%, and a \(\kappa\) statistic of 0.425. Not all of the lesions initially classified as warts, however, were actually caused by the human papillomavirus. Other causes included soft fibromas, seborrheic keratosis, melanocytic nevus, and even basal cell carcinoma (Table 3).

For certain diagnoses, such as acne, striae distensae, hyperhidrosis, impetigo, burns, hirsutism, and leukoplakia, we obtained a \(\kappa\) statistic of 1 and a diagnostic sensitivity and positive predictive value of 100\%. The \(\kappa\) statistic, however, was extremely low for other diagnoses such as
basal cell carcinoma (0.198), seborrheic keratosis (0.19), and molluscum contagiosum (0.221).

The overall level of agreement between the tentative diagnoses offered by primary care physicians and the final diagnoses offered by dermatologists was 65.52%.

Table 4 shows a summary of the results for each of the diagnoses.

**Discussion**

As mentioned in the Methods section, we classified the 3164 referral forms analyzed in our study according to the type of referral center and the details provided on the presenting complaint. Forms containing no mention of the presenting complaint were more common in clinics that had not yet been converted into primary health care centers than in primary health care centers per se, with highly significant differences ($P<.001$). This confirmed our suspicion that old-style clinics referred more patients to the dermatologist than did conventional health care centers and that in many cases the forms were not properly completed.

Until very recently, the general physicians employed in old-style clinics worked part time and were not specialists in family and community medicine. This, added to the fact that they had to attend to a large number of patients in a short period of time, might explain why they referred—often inappropriately—more patients to the dermatologist than physicians working in conventional primary health care centers. Our findings highlight the importance of ensuring that all outpatient centers are fully equipped to operate as full-scale primary health care centers and allocated the resources to assign more time to each patient, as well as the need to provide better dermatology training for primary care physicians.

Referral forms containing a description of the patient’s skin lesions were significantly more common in primary health care centers than in old-style clinics ($P<.001$), confirming that the physicians in the former were better equipped to provide guidance regarding their patients than those in the latter, as even those who did not offer a tentative diagnosis were able to provide a description of the lesions that justified referral to a specialist.

On analyzing the 1888 referral forms containing a tentative diagnosis, we found an overall level of agreement of 65.52% between the diagnoses made by the primary care physicians and those made by the dermatologist. This level of agreement is higher than the figure reported by Romaní et al$^{17}$ (42.3%) for a study performed in a regional hospital in Spain and also higher than the figures reported by several authors in the USA, including Fleisher et al$^{18}$ (52.7%), Kirsner et al$^{19}$ (40%-60%), Federman et al$^{20}$ (40%-60%), Solomon et al$^{21}$ (48%), and Gerber et al$^{22}$ (50%), all of whom highlighted the poor knowledge of dermatology on
the part of primary care physicians.
A recent study by Graells et al\textsuperscript{23} reported higher values than ours, specifically, a diagnostic agreement of 72\% and a $\kappa$ statistic of 0.69. The 2 studies, however, are not strictly comparable as Graells et al focused on skin lesions requiring possible surgery or cryotherapy while we focused on general skin diseases.

It is interesting to note that warts were the most common diagnosis offered by primary care physicians. Just over 43\% of all patients for whom a tentative diagnosis was offered were diagnosed with warts, although some of the lesions actually corresponded to soft fibromas, seborrheic keratosis, nevi, and basal cell carcinoma, among others. This clearly indicates overdiagnosis of human papillomavirus infection, as has been reported elsewhere.\textsuperscript{17} Other diagnoses such as fibromas, seborrheic keratosis, and basal cell carcinoma had a very low diagnostic sensitivity (11\%–15\%).

If we compare our results to those of a study on the validity of the clinical diagnosis of basal cell carcinoma in a primary care setting in Spain, the diagnostic sensitivity observed in our study was lower (11.1\% vs 27.5\%) but the positive predictive value was higher (100\% vs 78\%).\textsuperscript{24} Another Spanish study that also analyzed the validity of the clinical diagnosis of basal cell carcinoma but in a hospital setting (the Dermatology Department of Hospital Clínico de Madrid) reported a diagnostic sensitivity of 85.6\% and a positive predictive value of 83.2\%.\textsuperscript{25} Both of these figures are higher than those reported for primary care centers.

The corresponding rates for the validity of the clinical diagnosis of melanocytic nevus obtained in a study by Herrera et al,\textsuperscript{26} also at the Dermatology Department of Hospital Clínico de Madrid, were 93\% and 83.2\%, respectively. In the present study the positive predictive value and diagnostic sensitivity for nevus (diagnosed in 216 patients) were 84.3\% and 62.8\%, respectively. Both of these figures are lower than those reported by Herrera et al.

\section*{Conclusions}

To conclude, we would like to stress the importance of training primary care physicians in the field of dermatology, to provide them with the knowledge needed to recognize common skin lesions such as warts and to avoid confusion with benign skin tumors such as soft fibromas and seborrheic keratosis, lesions often incorrectly identified as warts. Most skin conditions are morphologically distinctive, meaning that with adequate knowledge and clinical expertise, a correct diagnosis can be made in the majority of cases.

We therefore, once again, stress the importance of providing primary care physicians with the knowledge needed to recognize basic skin lesions and to become familiar with the most common skin disorders seen in primary care settings. We also believe that fostering good relationships between primary care physicians and dermatologists will contribute to improving the quality of health care.
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