

stroke in the clinically relevant area on interval MRI, but the remaining third had normal follow-up imaging. These patients were considered likely to have a variety of stroke mimics, as described by Dawson *et al*, or episodes of transient ischaemia lasting >24 hours and sometimes days.

In 2011, an Edinburgh group published a prospective study in which the diagnosis of stroke was made from case records by a panel of experts (neuroradiologist, vascular neurologist and stroke physician) who then reviewed the clinical and brain imaging data 21–52 months later.<sup>5</sup> 246 out of 253 patients were diagnosed with ‘definite stroke’ on presentation. While 81/246 (33%) had negative DWI at presentation, a quarter also had no MRI abnormality on follow-up. The authors concluded that ‘there is a high rate of negative MRI and DWI among patients with minor stroke (a third)’ and that ‘a negative MRI or DWI does not exclude the diagnosis of stroke’.

Therefore, there is now a narrative that stroke can be diagnosed on the basis of symptoms alone. We question this. Dawson *et al* rightly draw attention to the significant consequences of a stroke diagnosis on medical management and social and work activities. While it is recognised that DWI may not detect acute stroke, in our view persistent neurological symptoms and dysfunction are unlikely to be due to ischaemic stroke in the absence of neurological signs or relevant MRI abnormality on follow-up.

### Conflicts of interest

The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

RUSSELL LANE

*Medico-legal neurologist, Imperial College London, UK*

ANGUS NISBET

*Consultant neurologist, Queen Victoria Hospital and Western Sussex Hospitals NHS Trusts, East Grinstead, UK*

### References

- 1 Dawson A, Cloud GC, Pereira AC, Moynihan BJ. Stroke mimic diagnoses presenting to a hyperacute stroke unit. *Clin Med* 2016;16:423–6.
- 2 Aho K, Harmsen P, Hatano S *et al*. Cerebrovascular disease in the community: results of a WHO collaborative study. *Bull World Health Organ* 1980;58:113–30.
- 3 Sacco RL, Kasner SE, Broderick JP *et al*. An updated definition of stroke for the 21st century: a statement for healthcare professionals from the American Heart Association/American Stroke Association. *Stroke* 2013;44:2064–89.
- 4 Ay H, Buonanno FS, Rordorf *et al*. Normal diffusion-weighted MRI during stroke like deficits. *Neurology* 1999;52:1784–92.
- 5 Doubal FN, Dennis MS, Wardlaw JM. Characteristics of patients with minor ischaemic strokes and negative MRI: a cross sectional study. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatr* 2011;82:540–42.

### UK Medical Education Database: an issue of assumed consent

Editor – There are some significant misconceptions in the letter on UKMED by Best *et al*.<sup>1</sup> UKMED is a partnership between data providers from across the health and education sectors to evaluate medical career progression. This will help to raise

education standards by enabling us to assess the predictive validity of assessments.

Data protection and privacy considerations have been at the heart of UKMED’s development and the bodies involved take their safeguarding of information extremely seriously. The legislation states that the General Medical Council, which is the data controller for UKMED, must carry out its activities proportionately and use personal data fairly. For this reason, when a doctor or student provides their information to one of the organisations that contribute to UKMED, they are told what that data will be used for, including research of this kind. Each contributing organisation has a privacy notice that indicates data sharing may take place.

UKMED does not provide any identifiable data to potential employers and data are not used to monitor or make decisions about individual doctors. Only anonymised data are shared with approved academic researchers under the terms of a strict contract in a safe haven<sup>2</sup> to prevent attempts at re-identification.

Data are held in UKMED for research purposes only. Doctors’ information can’t be used to make decisions that could impact on their career, either positively or negatively.

We are committed to transparency in the operation of UKMED. Doctors can find out more about the way UKMED is run on the website, including details of the process for accessing research datasets.<sup>3</sup> The British Medical Association represents the interests of medical students and doctors on the UKMED development group.

We hope that medical students and trainees recognise the need for an evidence-based approach to medical education. UKMED facilitates this without infringing on privacy.

STEVE THORNTON

*Chair, UKMED Advisory Board*

*Vice principal (health) and executive dean, professor of obstetrics, Barts and the London School of Medicine and Dentistry, Queen Mary University of London, London, UK*

### References

- 1 Best R, Walsh JL, Harris BHL, Wilson D. UK Medical Education Database: an issue of assumed consent. *Clin Med* 2016;16:605.
- 2 Health Informatics Centre. *Safe haven user guide*. Dundee: Health Informatics Centre, 2015. <https://medicine.dundee.ac.uk/sites/medicine.dundee.ac.uk/files/Safe%20haven%20User%20Guide.pdf> [Accessed 25 January 2017].
- 3 UK Medical Education Database. *Process for completing UKMED research*. London: UKMED, 2016. [www.ukmed.ac.uk/documents/UKMED\\_research\\_process.pdf](http://www.ukmed.ac.uk/documents/UKMED_research_process.pdf) [Accessed 25 January 2017].

### Response

Editor – We thank Steve Thornton for his letter.

We appreciate the aim of the UKMED project, and the need for an evidence-based approach to medical education. However, this should not be at the expense of informed consent.

If the UKMED Advisory Board are committed to transparency, we suggest the organisations that contribute to the UKMED database ask explicit permission from students and doctors before sharing their data with UKMED. This should include checking candidates agree with the linking of