

From: Peter Lange
To: [medboardconsultation](#)
Subject: Public consultation on Good medical practice
Date: Monday, 2 July 2018 7:54:44 PM

Many thanks for the opportunity to review this document. In general I found the changes appropriate, however regarding specific sections I have the following comments:

4.5	Explicit reference to knowledge of the alternatives to the proposed treatment/investigation that consent is sought for is consistent with current best practise and would be an appropriate addition here, as it is not possible to consent in a wholly informed way without knowledge of the alternatives.
4.7.1 and 4.8.1	The combined impact of 4.7.1 and 4.8.1 is to create a potential violation of good conduct that is solely in the perception of the patient and/or their family. No reference to any external standard is made, thus a practitioner might be in poor conduct as a consequence of an unknown and unknowable individual standard. This is contrary to natural justice and in my opinion is not a suitable change
4.8.2	Again the combined impact of 4.8.1 and 4.8.2 is to create misconduct that is solely in the perception of the patient and/or family. Given that currently the topic of many gender identities such as intersex, genderqueer or non-binary gendered is NOT at a consensus in society or science, to imply that misconduct occurs when a practitioner, for example, fails to address a patient by pronouns indicating their new gender identity and that misconduct can only be judged by that person is fraught with risk.
4.9	This section is so vague I am uncertain what it means (and I'm a geriatrician) from title to the last word. The terms used are undefined. The risk is undefined. This entire section should not be included or substantially revised in a manner that actually lends itself to interpretation, I presume this is meant to mean patients who

	have disabilities, but the current wording could mean anything, or indeed merely the potential to have any kind of additional need. Revise (by someone willing to say what is actually meant) or remove.
5.4.6	Mandates a particular response to behaviour without respect to the circumstances, yet 5.4.7 could contradict this, when “zero tolerance” is not “timely and respectful” Contradictory and dictatorial.

Dr Peter Lange

Consultant Geriatrician