

Conclusion. The recommendations from initial audit were compared with the second audit, and whilst some of them were completed such as incorporating growth chart in the electronic records system, some ongoing challenges were identified. Positive and negative findings were both noted although the final conclusions lies in favour of good changes been made to service including the caseload becoming more ID specific in this age group.

Abstracts were reviewed by the RCPsych Academic Faculty rather than by the standard *BJPsych Open* peer review process and should not be quoted as peer-reviewed by *BJPsych Open* in any subsequent publication.

If at First You Don't Succeed, Try, Try Again? Antipsychotic Trials and Clozapine Provision in Glasgow's Esteem (Early Intervention in Psychosis) Service

Dr Matthew Beattie*, Dr Josie Nott and Dr Rajeev Krishnadas
NHS Greater Glasgow & Clyde, Glasgow, United Kingdom
*Presenting author.

doi: 10.1192/bjo.2024.543

Aims. To support evidence gathering for Esteem's RCPsych Early Intervention in Psychosis (EIP) network accreditation efforts, an audit was conducted to investigate compliance with EIPN's quality standards (QS) no. 33 and no. 36.

EIPN QS 33 = patients with first episode psychosis (FEP) are offered antipsychotic medication.

EIPN QS 36 = If the patient's illness does not respond to an adequate trial of two different antipsychotic medicines given sequentially, they are offered clozapine.

EIPN QS 36 is also specifically included in RCPsych's National Clinical Audit of Psychosis (NCAP) (listed as standard 4), but a more pragmatic definition is used, to factor in the issue of antipsychotic intolerance.

NCAP Standard 4 = People with FEP who have not responded adequately to or tolerated treatment with at least two antipsychotic drugs should be offered clozapine (NICE QS80).

This broader standard definition was used for this audit, to allow for results comparison with national data.

Methods. For EIPN QS 33, all patients on North East Esteem caseload (any primary diagnoses) for at least 6 months on 01/04/2023 were included.

For EIPN QS 36/NCAP Standard 4, the same inclusion criteria were used but refined to FEP cases only.

The electronic clinical records (EMIS) of such cases were reviewed manually by an ST5 and CT3 psychiatrist. Data on prescription history was collected then analysed in Microsoft Excel.

Results. EIPN QS 33: 58 patients with any primary diagnosis were initially identified as being on NE Esteem caseload > 6 months as of 01/04/23. 58 (100%) patients were offered antipsychotic medication · 1 (2%) patient was prescribed an antipsychotic but never took it · 21 (36%) patients were only ever prescribed one antipsychotic · 17 (29%) patients were prescribed two antipsychotics sequentially trialled · 11 (19%) patients were prescribed three antipsychotics sequentially trialled · The remainder, 8 (14%) patients, had four or more antipsychotics sequentially prescribed (with the maximum number of trials being eight).

EIPN QS 36 / NCAP Standard 4: 55 patients with FEP diagnosis were initially identified as being on NE Esteem caseload > 6 months as of 01/04/23. 16 (29%) of these patients had at least three or more trials of antipsychotic medication, i.e. patients eligible for clozapine. However, only 5 (31%) of these 16 patients

had either been prescribed clozapine (3 patients, 19%) or offered/trialled clozapine (2 patients, 13%). This 31% figure compares with 85% in Wales, 52% in England, and 50% in Ireland (NCAP 2021–22).

Conclusion. EIPN QS 33: The standard that patients with first episode psychosis are offered antipsychotic medication was fully met. About a third of patients required only one antipsychotic trial. Less than a third required two antipsychotic trials. One in five required three antipsychotic trials, and approximately one in seven patients required more than three antipsychotic trials.

EIPN QS 36/NCAP Standard 4: The number of eligible patients being offered or prescribed clozapine for first episode psychosis under care of NE Esteem falls well below NCAP averages for Wales, England and Ireland.

Abstracts were reviewed by the RCPsych Academic Faculty rather than by the standard *BJPsych Open* peer review process and should not be quoted as peer-reviewed by *BJPsych Open* in any subsequent publication.

Audit of the Use of Outcome Measures Within Child and Adolescent Mental Health Outpatient Services in Rotherham, Doncaster and South Humber NHS Foundation Trust

Dr Lydia Bell* and Dr Mohan Thomas

Rotherham, Doncaster and South Humber NHS Foundation Trust, Rotherham, United Kingdom

*Presenting author.

doi: 10.1192/bjo.2024.544

Aims. Rotherham, Doncaster and South Humber NHS Foundation Trust (RDASH) has 28 Promises as part of its Strategy.

Promise 16 is to: *Focus on collating, assessing and comparing the outcomes that our services deliver, which matter to local people, and investing in improving those outcomes year on year.*

This audit in November 2023 looked at the practice of using outcome measures for CAMHS patients in order to highlight areas of development for the service to work toward achieving the promise.

Methods. We wanted to understand if young people were having outcome measures completed and if so, when, what and how often. We achieved this by using a dip sample of five patients each across the three different localities (Rotherham, Doncaster and Scunthorpe).

A report was generated to include all patients discharged from CAMHS in the preceding three months to September 2023. Young people who had been with the service less than six months were excluded from the audit. Five patients were chosen randomly from each locality and their electronic patient record on System One was studied.

Information in the patient records was compared against the audit standards and recorded in Excel so the data could be analysed.

Results. The results showed that 11 of 15 young people had an outcome measure completed at some point during their episode of care. All five young people in Scunthorpe had an outcome measure recorded in their clinical records however this tended to only happen at the very start, meaning there was no basis for comparison. Four out of five patients in Doncaster had outcome measures in the clinical record and these were undertaken throughout the episodes of care. In Rotherham, two of five young people had outcome measures recorded in the clinical records.