

An Audit of Compliance With NICE Guideline: Obesity: Identification, Assessment and Intervention by the Forensic Community Mental Health Team Based at a Supported Accommodation

Dr Chung Mun Alice Lin¹ and Dr Neeti Sud^{2*}

¹National Institute of Health Research Newcastle Biomedical Research Centre and the Translational and Clinical Research Institute, Newcastle Upon Tyne, United Kingdom and ²Cumbria, Northumberland, Tyne and Wear NHS Foundation Trust, Newcastle Upon Tyne, United Kingdom

*Presenting author.

doi: 10.1192/bjo.2022.492

Aims. In England, 64.8% of adults are currently classified as overweight or obese, with rates even higher in the North East at 68.6%, especially in adults with severe mental health illnesses. This additional body weight has the potential to increase the risk of developing a number of serious health conditions including diabetes, heart disease and even cancer. Studies have shown that patients with schizophrenia have a 2.8–3.5 increased likelihood of significant weight gain and reduction in life expectancy of 15–20 years, mainly due to preventable physical illness. Monitoring of risk factors for this, particularly weight gain, is therefore crucial. The NICE Guideline (2014) recommends that patients are routinely categorised into BMI categories to assist with obesity identification, management, and monitoring. A waist measurement is also advised to help with risk stratification. Patients with psychosis or schizophrenia, especially those taking anti-psychotics are also recommended to be offered a combined healthy eating and physical activity programme by their mental healthcare provider. Finally, patients with rapid or excessive weight gain, abnormal lipid levels or problems with blood glucose management should be offered appropriate interventions. Our main objective was to identify whether the obesity assessment, monitoring and intervention care delivered by our community team is in line with current guidance. **Methods.** A total of 12 residents living in community forensic supported accommodation and currently taking antipsychotic medications were included. Data reviewed were from September 2020 to September 2021. Data audited were from electronic medical records. **Results.** This audit found that 10 out of 12 patients (83%) fell into either the overweight or obese BMI categories (seven obese and three overweight). Only four patients had agreed to have their waist circumference measured, which meant only four patients were able to be appropriately risk stratified. One patient was identified as pre-diabetic and another diabetic. All patients identified to be overweight or obese received appropriate lifestyle advice. Qrisk scores, to assess cardiovascular risk, were calculated for the majority of eligible patients, except for two.

Conclusion. This audit highlights that patients who are on regular antipsychotic treatment and living in the community are at high risk of obesity and its associated complications. It is important to perform regular health checks in this cohort due to this risk, both to improve their quality of life and prevent significant morbidity and mortality. Waist circumference measurements should be encouraged to enable risk stratification and accurate documentation will enable timely treatment intensification.

A DVLA Notification Audit in Forensic Supported Accommodation

Dr Chung Mun Alice Lin¹, Miss Nicole Lim² and Dr Neeti Sud^{3*}

¹National Institute of Health Research Newcastle Biomedical Research Centre and the Translational and Clinical Research Institute,

Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, United Kingdom;

²Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, United Kingdom and

³Cumbria, Northumberland, Tyne and Wear NHS Foundation Trust, Newcastle upon Tyne, United Kingdom

*Presenting author.

doi: 10.1192/bjo.2022.493

Aims. The Driver and Vehicle Licensing Agency (DVLA) in England, Scotland and Wales are legally responsible for deciding if a person is medically unfit to drive. This means they need to know if a person holding a driving licence has a condition or is undergoing treatment that may now, or in the future, affect their safety as a driver. The driver is legally responsible for telling the DVLA about any such condition or treatment. Doctors should therefore alert patients to conditions and treatments that might affect their ability to drive and remind them of their duty to tell the appropriate agency. Patients with acute schizophrenia or an acute psychotic disorder must not drive and must notify the DVLA. In alliance with the above, the GMC advises that clinicians have a responsibility to explain the above information to the patient and inform them that they have a legal duty to inform the DVLA. Doctors should also inform patients that relevant medical information may need disclosing about them to the DVLA if they continue to drive against advice, and any advice given should be documented. The main objective of this audit is to identify if notification of DVLA for forensic patients living in supported accommodation, is in accordance with the DVLA guidelines.

Methods. A total of 12 residents living in community forensic supported accommodation who have a notifiable diagnosis were included. Data collection took place in September 2021, looking through all previous records relating to the search words “DVLA”, “drive”, “driving” and “license”. Data audited were from the trust’s electronic patient records.

Results. Diagnoses included paranoid schizophrenia, delusional disorder and personality disorder. Antipsychotic medications included Olanzapine (oral and IM), Clozapine and Zuclopenthixol +/- antidepressants. Legal status included community treatment orders (civil section), voluntary community patients and those on a conditionally discharged restriction under secretary of State supervision. Two patients held full driving licences and a further two held provisional licences, with DVLA documented discussions and notification compliance at 100%. The remaining eight patients had no documentation regarding driving nor DVLA discussions or notification.

Conclusion. This audit found that DVLA discussions are not currently well documented, with only four patient records that have this recorded. Although it is the clinical team’s responsibility to advise the patient to notify the DVLA, it is ultimately the patient’s responsibility to notify the DVLA themselves. DVLA discussions need to be had regardless of driving status and documentation should reflect this.

Audit: Do Electronic Mental Health Records Match General Practice Shared Records of Medications and Allergies for Patients Residing at a Community Forensic Supported Accommodation?

Dr Kate Bernard¹ and Dr Neeti Sud^{2*}

¹Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, United Kingdom and

²Cumbria, Northumberland, Tyne and Wear NHS Foundation Trust, Newcastle upon Tyne, United Kingdom

*Presenting author.

doi: 10.1192/bjo.2022.494

Aims. Medicine reconciliation in community teams is guided by trust guidance, which emphasises that for all new patients accepted into a community team, staff should be aware of all current medication (both psychotropic medication and those prescribed for physical health needs). This information needs to be considered at each review to inform safe prescribing. Upon this background, concordance between electronic mental health records and general practice shared records of medications and allergy status for patients residing at a community forensic supported accommodation was audited in order to identify areas for improvement in practice.

Methods. Data were collected from mental health electronic records (Rio) and general practice records (Health Information Exchange). All patients residing full-time at a community forensic supported accommodation in Cumbria Northumberland Tyne and Wear NHS Foundation Trust during January 2022 were included. Concordance between the records in medication and allergy status was assessed. Initial assessment was performed by one reviewer and 100% of included records were then cross checked by a second reviewer. Data collection was intended to pick up any mismatch in the records. Standards were set at 100% concordance.

Results. Eight patients were included. For allergy status, in two patients' (25%) records showed allergies which were present in electronic mental health records were not present in general practice records. The reasons as to lack of documentation of allergy status in general practice records were unclear. Cross check of the discharge summaries to primary care from the wards where allergies were originally identified indicates that allergies were clearly documented.

For medication, discrepancies between records were found in two patients (25%). In these patients, medications present on general practice records were not present on mental health records. These were both physical health medications (vitamin D supplements) which were being prescribed regularly by primary care and had been omitted during transcription onto electronic mental health records.

Conclusion.

- 1) Currently, standard practice is for updates of medication on mental health records to take place every four months as part of quarterly care coordination reviews. Electronic mental health records should not be relied upon solely to check patients' medication: while they provide a snapshot, cross checking with primary care records and pharmacy remains a must. This is current practice and ensures patient safety.
- 2) Primary care to be made aware of the omissions and requested to update their records as per the discharge summaries.
- 3) Continue regular re-audits every four months

Buckinghamshire Early Intervention Service' (BEIS) Compliance With the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) Antipsychotic Monitoring Guidelines: Practical Challenges, Including Those Posed by the Pandemic, in an Outpatient Setting

Dr Shinn Tan^{1*}, Dr Harun Butt², Dr Grace Pike², Dr Busayo Williams², Dr Alexandre Breton² and Dr Alastair Reid¹

¹Oxford Health, Oxford, United Kingdom and ²Oxford Health, Aylesbury, United Kingdom

*Presenting author.

doi: 10.1192/bjo.2022.495

Aims. Antipsychotic use is associated with cardiovascular and metabolic side-effects, which may contribute to increase mortality and morbidity in this patient group. This highlights the importance of physical health monitoring. We aimed to assess our compliance with the more stringent NICE guidelines, updated in September 2021.

Methods. Half of BEIS team's caseload was audited (n = 67) during October 2021 for compliance with NICE's monitoring guidelines for patients initiated on antipsychotic medication. These included initial and, if indicated, repeat monitoring of body mass index (BMI), pulse, blood pressure (BP), blood results, electrocardiogram, and adverse effects. Patients who were not on antipsychotics were excluded. 61% of patients were initiated on antipsychotics as inpatients, and 39% were outpatients. These patients have been started on antipsychotics within the last three years. Data were collected via electronic record systems. 80% compliance was set as the standard, in line with National Clinical Audit of Psychosis standards.

Results. In the first three months of antipsychotic initiation (61% as inpatients, 39% in the community) six out of nine parameters met standards (ranging from 2% to 100%), with BMI measurement (weekly), pulse and BP measurements and one month repeat haemoglobin A1C (HbA1c) failing. When only accounting for patients who were started on antipsychotics in outpatient settings (BEIS or crisis team), compliance was only met on two parameters.

Three months post initiation, when patients were mainly monitored in the community, only three of the nine parameters met compliance (lipids, HBA1c, and side-effects).

Conclusion. Adherence to the NICE standards for physical health monitoring in the community poses significant challenges. Possible barriers include reduced patient contact during the pandemic, lack of awareness of monitoring requirements, poor documentation (particularly of declined screening) and a lack of time and resources. There is also a possibility of unnecessarily stringent and impractical guidelines which are difficult to achieve in outpatient settings – such as weekly BMI. We plan to implement interventions including providing a checklist for medical and nursing staff and encouraging patients to monitor their own blood pressure and weight at home. We will reaudit the same parameters in 6 months' time.

Availability and Functionality of Physical Health and Resuscitation Equipment in an Inpatient Setting: A Closed Loop Audit Cycle

Dr Song Ling Tang^{1*} and Dr Ikhlas Fadlalla²

¹Norfolk and Norwich University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Norwich, United Kingdom and ²Norfolk and Suffolk NHS Foundation Trust, Norwich, United Kingdom

*Presenting author.

doi: 10.1192/bjo.2022.496

Aims. To ensure physical health and resuscitation equipment on all wards in a mental health hospital fulfil relevant standards. A closed-loop audit of this was performed on four acute adult inpatient wards after implementing interventions.

Methods. Data were collected from treatment rooms on each ward, with standards based on Physical Health in Mental Health; Final Report of a Scoping Group (Royal College of Psychiatrists) and Mental Health Inpatient Care Equipment and Drug Lists (Resuscitation Council UK) – parallel to the trust approved standards.

Percentage of availability and functionality against audit standards were tabulated and interventions were carried out, including:

1. Awareness presentations at trust clinical governance meetings.
2. Each ward to have own complete sets of physical health and resuscitation equipment.
3. Policy for wards to register their physical health equipment and service details on the trust maintenance services database.