

P-630 - AN INCREASE OF COMPULSORY ADMISSION IN BELGIUM AND THE NETHERLANDS? AN EPIDEMIOLOGICAL EXPLORATION

K.Schoevaerts, R.Bruffaerts, K.Van Landeghem, J.Vandenberghe, Steering Group Compulsory Admission, Flemish Community

Psychiatry, KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium

Introduction: Compulsory admission is controversial and highly relevant to society. Nevertheless, epidemiological European data are scarce and of limited reliability and comparability. In several countries including Belgium and the Netherlands, the incidence of compulsory admissions seems to increase despite legislative amendments aiming to reduce coercion.

Objectives and aims: By pooling and analysing available epidemiological data, we estimated the incidence and evolution of compulsory admission in Belgium and the Netherlands within the 7-year timeframe of most recent available data.

Methods: We ran a systematic literature review including relevant epidemiological data, either published or from grey literature (e.g. unpublished governmental, regional or health care reports and databases). All data were (re)calculated into incidence rates per 100,000 inhabitants per year. Statistical testing (e.g. trend analyses) was performed when applicable.

Results: Incidence of compulsory admission increased with 38% (Belgium, 1999-2006) and 39% (2002-2009, Netherlands), respectively (all $p < .01$), culminating in incidence rates of 45/100,000/y (Belgium, 2006) and 113/100,000/y (Netherlands, 2009). In between country differences can be partially explained by legal differences (type and duration of compulsory admissions). More fine-grained results, regional differences (e.g. urban versus rural areas), and incidence comparisons within a European context will be presented.

Conclusions: Our data suggest a significant increase of the incidence of compulsory admissions in both Belgium and the Netherlands. Uniformity and standardization in registration of compulsory admission throughout Europe is needed to enhance the comparability and quality of the data. Substantial differences in legal frameworks and the structure and organisation of healthcare further limit international comparability.