The interface between child and adult mental health services

The divide between services for children and adults with mental health problems continues, so I was pleased to read the article by Singh et al (Psychiatric Bulletin, August 2005, 29, 292–294) which draws our attention to this matter again. However, I think that more emphasis should have been placed on the important role of training, particularly for junior psychiatrists and general practitioners (GPs) who will be in the vanguard of developing or commissioning services in the future.

With this in mind, I have started to run an induction session in child psychiatry for our child and adolescent mental health service (CAMHS) in Plymouth. This began as an hour but is now half a day and may shortly be a day-long event. It is intended for new senior house officers in psychiatry, who may be career psychiatrists or vocational GP trainers, and occurs every 6 months as part of their routine induction programme. The evaluation of these sessions has been very positive, with all trainees so far finding the sessions ‘useful’ or ‘very useful’. This is the main reason that the length of the session will be extended: it seems to be filling a training need which is probably not met elsewhere. General practitioners not only have to deal with a considerable burden of psychiatric illness of both adults and children in primary care, but also receive very little training for this. Foreman (2001), for example, found that 47% of GPs sampled had no undergraduate training in CAMHS and 93% had negligible postgraduate experience.

The session includes an initial introduction to the CAMHS, followed by sections on self-harm and the local protocol for its assessment in young people, and the effects of parental mental illness on children. The second half of the session covers conditions commonly seen in a CAMHS which will continue into adult life, such as attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder and autistic-spectrum disorder. The teaching is interactive and videos provide a focus for discussion.

I would be interested to hear of other developments in CAMHS throughout the country on GP training in child and adolescent psychiatry. Perhaps the College should be developing an initiative to this end?
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Ward rounds – patients’ views

We have similar concerns regarding patients’ views of ward rounds to White & Karim (Psychiatric Bulletin, June 2005, 29, 207–209). Our service is a low secure forensic unit, which provides long-term rehabilitation in the West Midlands, and in contrast to general adult services in-patients have a 4-weekly ward round slot.

A recent review of records of 12 in-patients over a 6-month period highlighted that patient attendance at ward rounds has been poor – 2 patients attended frequently, 6 occasionally and 4 never. White & Karim fail to mention that standard nursing practice is to provide selective written and verbal feedback to patients after the ward round. Therefore the patients may feel that they do not need to attend as they receive comprehensive feedback without undergoing the ward round experience.

Hodgson et al (Psychiatric Bulletin, May 2005, 29, 171–173) stressed the compromise position of the ward round as it struggles to serve both professional and patient needs. The duties of a doctor according to the General Medical Council include the need to respect the rights of patients to be fully informed in decisions about their care, to give patients information in a way they can understand and to listen to patients. By maintaining the practice of ward rounds in which patients choose not to participate, are we failing to involve patients in decisions about their care? Patients want individual consultant time and ward rounds do not allow this. Perhaps the way forward is to have both a team meeting followed by individual patient time with a consultant.
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Guidelines for prescribing injectable heroin and methadone

I was surprised to read that heroin prescribing was considered controversial (Luty, 2005). In the 1970s my colleague and I had no serious problems prescribing heroin and cocaine. In the 1980s and ’90s Dr John Marks successfully prescribed heroin in Wrexham but there was great hostility to his programmes. I have not seen his success mentioned in official or clinical discussion, including the 2003 guidelines from the National Treatment Agency for Substance Misuse. He has been ‘air-brushed’ out of history.