Crisis teams

Sir: In 1997 we worked in two crisis assessment and treatment teams (CATTs) in the western suburbs of Melbourne, Australia. We found the work stimulating and are grateful for the opportunity to have worked in a highly developed community psychiatry service. It is therefore easy for us to agree with many of the points made by Carroll et al in their description of the Northern Crisis Assessment and Treatment Team (Psychiatric Bulletin, November 2001, 25, 439–441). While the article stimulated a degree of nostalgia for our time in Australia it has also encouraged us to make a few comments based on our collective experience.

It is true that the most skilled clinicians staff CATTs. Undoubtedly, this is because the work is seen as more challenging, is more prestigious and provides better pay. However, not only can this denude the other teams within the area (case management team and in-patient team) of the most motivated clinicians, it also beggars an elite team with a strong culture. The strong team culture does help ensure effective teamwork within the CATT, but we found that it can be exclusive and cause strained relations with members of other teams, damaging the effective working of the area mental health service as a whole (the wider team).

As gatekeepers the CATT clinicians see all patients prior to admission to assess suitability for home treatment. In practice this can be cumbersome. The situation can occur where an acutely unwell patient is assessed in turn by his/her case manager, a doctor in the case management team, a CATT clinician and possibly a CATT doctor. Then, if admission is required, he/she is assessed by the admitting doctor and nurse. Where the aim is to create a seamless service, we found that the inter team strife and procedural arrangements sometimes created seams.

*Feargal Leonard Specialist Registrar, Maudsley Hospital, Denmark Hill, London SE5 8AZ,
Norion O’Callaghan Specialist Registrar in Child and Adolescent Psychiatry,
Michael Ventress Specialist Registrar

Meeting mental health need in prisons

Sir: Birmingham’s article (Psychiatric Bulletin, December 2001, 25, 462–464) succinctly captures the current difficulties in providing adequate mental health care for prisoners. The description of poor facilities, inadequate resources and the difficulty of providing care and therapy in a non-therapeutic environment will be instantly recognisable to practitioners working within prisons.

Having had the opportunity to work as a locum medical officer and a visiting psychiatrist at a women’s prison, and viewing the same problems from different sides of the fence, it is evident that forensic psychiatrists have a prominent role in developing ‘coordinated, integrated services’ for mentally disordered offenders. Rigid, ineffective and inefficient procedures can be improved, resulting in an improvement in care and, more importantly, removal of the barriers preventing these individuals from accessing the services that they are entitled to.

In my experience this involves the training of non-medical staff in the recognition of mental disorders and reducing the stigma and discrimination attached to being ‘a psychiatric patient’. Additionally, evidence of ineffectiveness can be collected, using audits and surveys, and the results presented to those involved in the commissioning and purchasing of medical services. In our own case this involved completing an audit of the referral process, which revealed excessive waiting times, long waiting-lists and indiscriminate presentation and follow-up, as a result of which the system was altered after consultation with prison staff. As Birmingham correctly states, identifying and managing these individuals earlier has resulted in a noticeable improvement within the prison environment.

Finally, from our experience it is not the identification of these individuals that is the major difficulty, rather it is the management of complex, multiple health care needs in a setting that currently cannot meet those needs, with resources both inside and outside prisons already stretched. More optimistically, with the NHS now being involved in providing health care within prisons, there is now an opportunity to deliver effective, integrated services.

I Qureshi Specialist Registrar in Forensic Psychiatry, Mental Health Services of Salford, Manchester M25 3BL

The natural history of amphetamine misuse

Sir: Though Moselhy et al (Psychiatric Bulletin, February 2002, 26, 61–62) describe a reluctance by some services to make use of amphetamine substitution therapy, across the UK as a whole there is a large number of individuals who are receiving it. The fact that it is yet to be subjected to a randomised controlled trial is therefore of some concern.

With more substantial evidence lacking, there is a danger that amphetamine substitution will be regarded as entirely analogous to methadone substitution. This would be erroneous. Long-term prescribing of methadone can be justified, and has been shown to be effective, because heroin dependence has the quality of a long-term relapsing illness. Unfortunately, little is known about the natural history of amphetamine use, and users may be much better able to make changes without the help of a prescription.

An analysis of 156 amphetamine and heroin users who presented for treatment in Cornwall on more than one occasion over 7 years, showed that amphetamine users were more likely to switch both their main drug and their main route of use between presentations (details available from the author upon request). Taken together with the fact that cohorts of amphetamine users in the UK have been found to be younger than comparable heroin users, this would imply that amphetamine users are less likely to experience long-term patterns of problematic use over many years. If this is the case, long-term prescribing may do more harm than good.

Rupert White Specialist Registrar, Calshot Community Care Centre, 57 Calshot Street, Islington, London N1 9XH
General psychiatry: cuckoo

Sir: The articles from Colgan (Psychiatric Bulletin, January 2002, 26, 3–4) and Tyrer (Psychiatric Bulletin, January 2002, 26, 5) on the state of general psychiatry make sad reading. They look at this specialty from within and do not enjoy what they find. Everywhere else looks better: cardiothoracic surgeons luxuriate in a waiting-list and child and adolescent psychiatry in a well-stocked library; and general practice is vibrant with control of budgets. Perhaps someone should tell them that old and adolescent psychiatry has a massive recruitment problem and general practice cannot fill its empty training posts or its career posts. It is a tough old world out there for all of us – even old age psychiatry in its ‘quiet and homely sitting room’.

Where have they been? Old age psychiatry lives in the car and other people’s sitting rooms – and that is why it is alive and still expanding. It’s approach has not been to exclude people but to say progressively ‘yes’ as workforce and resources have begun to flow to allow this: thus most people with early onset dementia will find a welcome in an old age service. Increasingly, older people with chronic psychosis travel the same route and we are learning all the time.

There are all sorts of difficulties for general psychiatry but the discipline has a great deal to offer. That is why the customers keep on coming – services must remodel to the needs of these people rather than wish they would behave in a way that suits the established system. Perhaps the greatest difficulty is posed by the establishment itself, which confirms status on a subset of the specialty within the confines of the Institute of Psychiatry and the bigger university departments. They are massively overstuffed when compared with anywhere else in the country and their senior staff are heavily protected from the real world of Colgan. Yet it is they who have the accolades (count the A and A+ awards) and they who have the ear of the Government. Contrast this with the old age psychiatry of the 1970s and 1980s, when young psychiatrists were encouraged to join pioneers working in unattractive places with the heart-sink condition of dementia and the stigma of senility.

Perhaps if the cuckoo could be persuaded to leave, the true birds of the nest could grow strong and fly.

Professor David Jolley Consultant in Old Age Psychiatry, Medical Director of Wolverhampton Health Care NHS Trust, West Midlands WV4 5HA

Catatonia and neuroleptic malignant syndrome

Sir: Carey et al (Psychiatric Bulletin, February 2002, 26, 68–70) discussed the clinical issues surrounding a patient with features of catatonia and neuroleptic malignant syndrome (NMS). The relationship between the two conditions has been conceptualised in three ways.

Castillo et al (1989) argue that lethal catatonia and NMS can be distinguished by clinical features, especially lead-pipe rigidity. Mann et al (1986) state that lethal catatonia is a syndrome that may have many causes, one of which is NMS. Bristow and Kohen (1996) regard catatonia as a risk factor for the development of NMS and lethal catatonia being identical to NMS.

The literature is less informative about the longitudinal features of both conditions. NMS recurs in a minority of patients and catatonia can recur. Although there is a consensus on the avoidance of neuroleptics in the acute stages of both conditions, there is little research to guide clinicians on their long-term management. The patient that the authors discussed experienced a relapse while treated with risperidone and lithium and they do not state the follow-up period after the second episode. The re-introduction of neuroleptic treatment after a near fatal episode of NMS or lethal catatonia appears to be associated with a high risk. Prospective data are needed on patients re-challenged with neuroleptics versus those in whom neuroleptics are withheld in order to help establish whether the conditions may be differentiated and to clarify the long-term risks and benefits of neuroleptic treatment.


Robert Chaplin Consultant in General Adult Psychiatry, Springfield Hospital, London SW17 7DJ

Overseas psychiatrists

Sir: Among the many achievements cited in the President’s Report (Psychiatric Bulletin, December 2001, 25, 487–490), the initiatives of Professor Cox, President of the College, to engage with colleagues working in developing countries must be lauded as the dawn of a new era. Many overseas members perceive themselves as the proverbial lost sheep eating the crumbs that fall from the College’s table. Yet, far removed by distance from Belgrave Square, many members working overseas in an environment of non-British trained psychiatrists paradoxically hold total allegiance to the College and closely follow the proceedings.

It is hoped that this wind of change will result in more collaboration with overseas members. For example, there is a perception that the adjustment of membership fees linked to the gross domestic product of member countries is discriminatory in itself, enabling those from developed countries more ‘buying power’ into the College. The reasoning for a sliding scale is faulty since the sustainable income of psychiatrists in the poorest developing country is astronomical when compared to the per capita income of the general population. Arguably, a common membership rate may have been more equitable.

Nevertheless, the two working parties, one headed by Dr Kendell on international responsibilities of the College and the other chaired by the President himself on training and service delivery issues for Black and ethnic minorities are long overdue and must be welcomed. The chairperson of the new Ethnic Issues Committee, Dr Parmila Moodley, must be less Eurocentric and ought to devise a mechanism of incorporating overseas members from the developing countries into her committee.

Hari D. Maharaj Senior Lecturer, Department of Psychiatry, The University of the West Indies, Mount Hope, Trinidad, West Indies

The British Psychological Society review

Sir: The British Psychological Society (BPS) document, Report on Recent Advances in Understanding Mental Illness and Psychotic Experiences, is a most thorough commentary on current practice and research in psychological approaches to the treatment of psychosis. Though our view is that the BPS publication downplays neurobiological developments and is written in a style that might lead to counterproductive defensiveness in many psychiatrists, we feel that the tone of aspects of the brief Psychiatric Bulletin review (November 2001, 25, 454–545) are unfortunate. The BPS document needs to be read and discussed widely when it contains such cogent views that much
contemporary practice and attitudes need to be changed. There are many constructive recommendations that would assist in fulfilling National Service Framework objectives.

Although the views expressed are those of psychologists, there is much that many psychiatrists would agree with and indeed a lot of the research quoted is that of psychiatrists. We would have welcomed a review that encouraged our members to take much more seriously what well-respected colleagues in psychology are saying.

We will take just one area that the BPS report focuses on — family interventions. These were pioneered at places such as the Maudsley Hospital more than two decades ago and have consistently been found to have a power at least equivalent to medication in reducing the relapse rates that understandably burden Persaud (the reviewer) and so generate psychiatrists (not forgetting the patients and families themselves). Yet we understand that it is rare for a Maudsley trained psychiatrist to have been routinely trained in these methods, whereas we are sure that they are experts at the latest medications. We found it worrying that Persaud does not have the experience of working with a psychologist in an acute or early intervention service and seems unaware of parts of this country and other countries where psychologists are key members of teams running acute services along the lines recommended by the BPS, and getting improved results.

Our reading of the report is that psychologists are not suggesting that they run services without doctors and medication — as Persaud rather mischievously suggests — but in partnership. We would encourage College members to read the review and whenever possible form better relationships with well-trained psychologists, many of whom have a great deal to contribute to modern psychosocial services.

*Brian Martindale  Consultant Psychiatrist in Psychotherapy, Psychotherapy Department, John Conolly-Wrigg, Ealing Hammersmith & Fulham Mental Health NHS Trust, Uxbridge Road, Hanwell, UB1 3EU, Jan Birle  Director, Therapeutic Community Service, Teresa Black  Consultant Psychiatrist in Psychotherapy, Wolverhampton Healthcare Trust, Chris Burford  Consultant Psychiatrist, St Ann's Hospital, Marco Chiesa  Consultant Psychiatrist in Psychotherapy, Cassel Hospital, Joy Dalton  Consultant Psychiatrist, Camden and Islington Mental Health NHS Trust, Sheilagh Davies  Consultant Psychiatrist in Psychotherapy, Camden and Islington Mental Health NHS Trust, Steffan Davies  Honorary Consultant Forensic Psychiatrist, Rampton Hospital, Chris Evans  Consultant Psychiatrist in Psychotherapy, Rampton Hospital, Paola Franciosi  Consultant Psychiatrist in Psychotherapy, Bournemouth Community and Mental Health NHS Trust, Michael Gipfert  Consultant Psychiatrist in Psychotherapy, Wedi House Democratic Therapeutic Community, Lorenzo Grespi  Consultant Psychiatrist in Psychotherapy, West End Community Mental Health Team, Murray Jackson  Consultant Psychiatrist in Psychotherapy, Maudsley Hospital (emery), Claire Jenkins  Locum Consultant Psychotherapist, West Midlands University Hospitals, Chris Mace  Consultant Psychiatrist in Psychotherapy, South Warwickshire Combined Care NHS Trust, Dale Mathers  Psychologist, Jangin Analyst, Sally Mitchison  Consultant Psychiatrist, Cherry Knowle Hospital*

**Special interest sessions: some thoughts**

Sir: The correspondence from McIntosh (Psychiatric Bulletin, January 2002, 26, 37) on the use of her special interest sessions for a placement in public health was a welcome sight for specialist registrar organisational groups such as myself because even if a training scheme has special interest sessions already established, this is often left to our imagination and resourcefulness, so one is grateful for any inspiration.

A recent study (Stephenson & Puffett., Psychiatric Bulletin, May 2000, 124, 187–188) revealed that some trainees have real problems in knowing what to do about these sessions. Something along the lines of an internet database of pooled experiences might be valuable and I would be happy to be contacted by any interested parties.

Finally, we also need to be aware that placements outside of our employing trusts may not be covered either by trust indemnity or by our defence organisations, and it may be necessary to negotiate a contract with the trust our sessions are with.

Tom Pictson  Specialist Registrar in Psychiatry of Learning Disabilities, Health House, Grange Way, Colchester, Essex CO2 8GU

---

**Art at Belgrave Square**

Art at Belgrave Square — paintings by psychiatrists and people who have suffered mental health problems — is part of Mind Odyssey.

The College is very grateful to Henry Boxer, Director of the Henry Boxer Gallery, London, for the loan of a painting from his renowned collection of ‘Outer and Visionary’ art. The painting inside Banstead Hospital by Rosemary Carson, a service user, will be exhibited in the College from 10 May to 10 June 2002.

Rosemary Carson (b 1952)

Since the age of 6, Carson has occasionally experienced the sensation of maggots moving in her body. She describes her childhood as rather unhappy and attempted suicide at the age of 15. Since then she has spent periods in psychiatric care and her treatment has included drug and electric therapies. Her work featured in the exhibition Private Worlds – Outsider and Visionary Art at the Orleans House Gallery, Twickenham, last year. The Wellcome Trust has recently acquired one of her paintings for its permanent collection.

Painting has long been important to Carson but never more so after she became ill again in 1996 when she started hearing voices. She spontaneously began to paint faces that she subsequently recognised as fellow patients from her earlier stays in psychiatric hospitals. This brought back memories. The need to capture these memories was reinforced by the urgings of the ‘underlings’ (spirits of dead patients), so called because they speak to her under the voices of others. Mostly they encourage her in her work, but sometimes they become frightening and destructive. At these times, she enters a local psychiatric unit until she feels able to return to painting in safety.

---

**Changing Minds Campaign roadshow breakfast briefing**

**Stigma Alert**

**Tuesday 25 June 2002**

We would like to invite you to a breakfast briefing at St Fagan’s and Penarth Suite, Jury’s Hotel, Cardiff, 8.00–9.30 a.m. (including a complimentary full Welsh breakfast), to hear about the work of the Changing Minds Campaign, and in particular Stigma Alert.

Stigma Alert is an initiative, funded by Janssen—Cilag, that takes the messages of the Changing Minds Campaign to primary health care teams, in particular general practitioners (GPs), throughout the UK. Please come along to what should be a fascinating breakfast briefing. We need your help to promote the campaign locally. This will be the only opportunity that Members will have at this year’s