Root cause analysis

We all look forward to Homicide Inquiries, mandated by the Department of Health Circular HSG(94)27 (Department of Health, 1994) being replaced or modernised as soon as possible, since there seems to be very little evidence that the enormous costs of these inquiries are justified by the benefits. Root cause analysis, as described by Neal et al (Psychiatric Bulletin, March 2004, 28, 75–77), may offer useful alternatives. However, reading their article left me with two doubts, both of which relate to the notion of ‘logical relationships’ between different ideas or issues. It is important that logical decisions are taken in medical practice, since this is one of the legal tests of good-enough medical practice. However, I would raise two concerns; first not everybody would agree on what constitutes a ‘logical relationship’. For example Neal et al suggest in their first figure that there is a ‘logical relationship’ between failure to diagnose and treat an emergency, good team working and support, and an emerging psychotic illness and suicide. However, to make such a statement is already to have completed the point of the inquiry without establishing that there is a logical relationship. Furthermore, it could be argued that the whole point of an inquiry is to establish whether there is a relationship or not between two events, and to bear in mind the possibility that there are lots of different types of relationships between events, including the possibility of no relationship.

The other aspect that is sometimes left out of ‘logic’ is the application and understanding of strong feelings. We sometimes make decisions (which in retrospect seem illogical) because we are moved by powerful feelings, usually negative ones of fear, anxiety and hostility. Post-incident inquiries frequently meet and are moved by similar feelings, and those feelings affect the way that they perceive logical relationships and analyse them. Although it seems that root cause analysis might provide a more systematic way of looking at the evidence that comes before inquiries, I am not convinced from Neal’s article that they will deal with these other aspects.

Consultant psychiatrists’ working patterns

Mears et al (Psychiatric Bulletin, July 2004, 28, 251–253) advocate that consultants should work in ‘progressive roles’ in order to combat occupational stress. This role includes a low accumulation of patients from other members of the multidisciplinary team, scope for delegation, time to respond to emergencies, taking a low level of direct referrals, and feeling support from and reliance upon other team members. Consultants working in such a role are more positive and less stressed.

However, there is nothing in the methodology to indicate that the numbers of supporting team members were considered in the analysis. Surely, all of the above factors may relate pretty directly to the number and quality of other members of one’s team, and without sufficient multidisciplinary colleagues it is rather difficult to envisage consultants surviving in the suggested ‘progressive’ role. In the absence of such data, and of any consideration of team sizes, the paper’s recommendations appear fairly vacuous.

Author’s reply: In his letter Dr John Eagles points out that the assertion in our paper that consultant psychiatrists working in more progressive roles (low accumulation of patients, effective delegation, good team working and support, effective gate keeping and low level of direct referrals, time to deal with emergencies) are likely to suffer less from occupational burdens is flawed, since no consideration is given to the number and/or quality of team members. Dr

Author’s reply: I agree with Dr Adshead that root cause analysis (RCA) does not necessarily add anything to the investigation process after an adverse event, in terms of determining causation, other than making it systematic and comprehensive. What is not made clear in our article is that RCA is not a means to an end in itself. The aim of RCA is the development of improved safety systems in patient care, which compensate for human error. The philosophy behind RCA is that human beings make unintentional errors and they will continue to make errors in future. The aim of the investigation phase in RCA is to determine where errors have occurred and their root cause. This information is used to design improved safety systems (e.g. barriers) to prevent any harm caused by similar errors in future. The intention of locating the errors is not in order to blame or discipline individuals.

With this in mind, the strength of the causal relationships, alluded to by Dr Adshead, is probably not of such importance to the individual as it was with the inquiries held under the auspices of HSG(94)27. The worst that can happen, after a flawed RCA, is the design of a redundant patient safety system. Staff who are found to have made an unintentional error may be upset if they feel wrongly criticised, but they can be reassured that they are never going to be the focus of the investigation or the outcome. It is extremely important that healthcare staff are made aware of the blameless nature of these RCA investigations or the cultural shift that is required to bring about the open reporting of errors (as occurs in the aviation industry) will never occur.
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Eagles continues, stating that conclusions and recommendations do not stand up in the absence of these data, since any consultant not in a sufficiently populated, effective team would not survive in a progressive role.

My initial response is to state that we did indeed collect data about the size of the respondent’s team. These data weren’t included in this paper as submitted to keep the length down to publishable level. In common with many national studies, the original dataset for this project is vast and contains several hundred variables. We are forced to choose not only which to analyse in depth, but must create a subset of those to submit for publication in peer-reviewed journals. I can report, however, that team size was included as a predictor in some of our univariate (the larger the respondent’s team, the higher their reported satisfaction level \( P < 0.05 \)) and multivariate (the larger the team, the lower the respondent’s General Health Questionnaire – version 12 score \( P < 0.05 \)), and the less they suffer from depersonalisation \( P < 0.01 \) analyses. My second point concerns Dr Eagles’ interpretation of the findings more generally. I feel that Dr Eagles has rather missed the point of this paper: the progressive model can only ever work where the consultant has a motivated, effective multidisciplinary team. A progressive role, by reference to its defining characteristics, cannot be achieved without it. Further, the more important point here is that a consultant cannot change in isolation: as we point out in the paper, any change of role is potentially dangerous unless carried out as part of a whole-systems approach to change, a restructure, where due consideration is given to ensure that any reduction in workload is not merely passed onto other team members, rendering them liable to stress and burnout.

Alex Mears
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**Partners in care. Who cares for the carers?**

Mike Shooter, President of the Royal College of Psychiatrists has highlighted an important aspect of psychiatric care in his recent editorial ‘Partners in care. Who cares for the carers?’ (Psychiatrists’ Bulletin, September 2004, 28, 313 – 314).

This is very relevant to the developing countries as many clinicians depend heavily on relatives or carers with regard to various aspects of a patient’s management, as social services and other supportive systems are poorly developed. For instance in many in-patient units in Sri Lanka, relatives or carers are encouraged to stay with the patients. Sometimes relatives take turns to stay with the patients to minimise the burden and disturbance. This helps ‘overworked staff members’ to alleviate the burden at least to some extent. When the patient is discharged from the in-patient unit, administration of medication and rehabilitation programmes are done with the help of the carers. Carers are further distressed prior to the admission of a patient for assessment or treatment. For instance as the existing mental health act does not address the admission policy comprehensively in Sri Lanka, relatives or carers have to play a major role in accommodating the disturbed patient until taken to a hospital for assessment/treatment/admission.

The other important area is the rapidly increasing elderly population in developing countries. At the moment many elderly people are looked after by their family members. For example, in Sri Lanka about 80% of the elderly population are living with their children and the main caregivers are female (National Council for Mental Health, Sahanaaya, 2002). We are bound to see more and more people with dementia and other disorders encountered in old age. Services for the elderly are not well developed compared with the West and the families, particularly females, are expected to look after their elderly relatives.

The other important area that needs to be highlighted is the introduction of community care without many resources. Management of mentally ill people in the community without resources will add to the burden on the carers. It is noteworthy that the crisis assessment teams are either poorly developed or non-existent in many developing countries.

We totally agree that the concept of ‘caring for the carers’ should be further emphasised and the undergraduate and postgraduate medical and nursing curriculum must be strengthened with regard to this aspect of care.


**K. A. L. A. Kuruppuarachchi**
Professor of Psychiatry, Department of Psychiatry, Faculty of Medicine, University of Kelaniya, Ragama, Sri Lanka.
E-mail: laithkuruppu@lycos.com

**Irish Psychiatric Association survey of psychiatric services in Ireland**

The article by O’Keane et al (Psychiatric Bulletin, October 2004, 28, 364 – 367) provides a valuable insight into the deficiencies present in mental health in the Eastern Regional Health Authority (EHRA) in Ireland. Unfortunately the data presented do not represent ‘a national survey’. The consultant sample is only 8.2% of the 281 consultant psychiatrists employed in Ireland (Walsh, 2004) and hence the results of this survey are limited to only the EHRA respondents.

The variation in the socio-economic and demographic profiles in different regions in Ireland noted by the authors and elsewhere (Central Statistics Office, 2003) alongside the variation in the management style, and political function of the various health boards, and differences in regional infrastructure also make the EHRA results non-generalisable to Ireland as a whole without further data.

The paper is a good start at examining the inequities of Irish mental healthcare but data including regions very different from Dublin and the East coast are essential in such a survey.


**Gifford Haley**
Consultant Psychiatrist, Letterkenny General Hospital, Co. Donegal

**The objective structured clinical examination**


I have recently been advising a number of my colleagues, who will be undertaking the clinical examination for Part II MRCPsych. A significant number undertook the Part I MRCPsych OSCE exam, so have not had experience of the unobserved long case.

With the introduction last year of the OSCE exam and its widespread use in undergraduate teaching, a large proportion of trainees have no experience of long case examination. As was mentioned in the letter by Haeney, candidates struggle with the uncontrollable variables of patient and examiners. My own feeling about this is that, with experience, candidates can often handle these situations better. During my undergraduate training, I was examined using the traditional long case format, and I believe this exposure to the format gave me greater confidence when dealing with long cases in both Part I, and more recently, in Part II examination.

It would be of interest to get an idea of how candidates who are now undertaking Part II are dealing with the lack of exposure to the long case. This would particularly apply to any proposed change in the Part II examination. Having reviewed previous articles it would appear that...
while most have highlighted the need for changes in the Part I clinical examination, there is little mention of what changes, if any, can be made to improve the Part II clinical examination.

It is my opinion that, having initiated the change to the OSCE format for the Part I clinical exam, the College would, inevitably have to review the current long case format in the Part II exam. The debate, I hope, will start sooner rather than later.
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Psychiatric secrets of success: who wants to be a specialist registrar?

Naeem’s excellent and informative article (Psychiatric Bulletin, November 2004, 28, 421–424) provided useful tips and advice for trainees aiming for higher specialist training as specialist registrars. However, we would like to point out certain factual inaccuracies which require further clarification.

First, the College’s Higher Specialist Training Handbook (Royal College of Psychiatrists, 1998) clearly states that higher specialist trainees in lecturer posts who do five or six clinical sessions become eligible for a single certificate of completion of training (CCT) (formerly CCST) after 3 years. It is only when they do 4 clinical sessions that the single CCST is after 4 years.

Second, overseas doctors who are non-European Economic Area nationals and do not have indefinite leave to remain in the UK, are also eligible to apply in open competition for type I specialist registrar training programmes leading to CCT (Department of Health, 1998). If appointed, they are provided with a visiting national training number (VNTN). They can then also apply to the Immigration and Nationality Directorate (IND) of the Home Office for permit-free training leave to remain in the UK. This can be further extended up to 3 years at a time depending on the training needs of the individual and satisfactory progress (UK Visas, 2004). The VNTN automatically becomes a NTN once the doctor gains indefinite right to remain in the UK. Overseas doctors without UK indefinite residence leave therefore are not limited to taking up fixed-term training appointment (FTTA) or type 2 posts, which do not lead to award of CCT, and conversely FFTAs are not limited to overseas doctors without residency rights.
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The psychiatrist, courts and sentencing: the impact of extended sentencing on the ethical framework of forensic psychiatry

Council Report CR129, June 2004

Professor Nigel Eastman, Professor John Gunn and Dr Mike Shooter, on behalf of the Royal College of Psychiatrists, provided a College response to the consultation paper on extended sentences, issued by the Sentencing Advisory Panel in June 2001. This followed a ruling by the Court of Appeal that sentencing guidelines should be issued to judges on the use of extended sentences. Sections 80 and 85 of the Power of Criminal Courts (Sentencing) Act 2000 replaced certain sections, dealing with extended sentences, of two previous acts namely the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and the Criminal Justice Act 1991. The Power of Criminal Courts (Sentencing) Act 2000 gave powers to courts to impose additional supervision or a longer than commensurate sentence on sexual and violent offenders ‘to protect the public from serious harm from the offender’. The College response was met with a wide spectrum of opinion within the Forensic Executive. The Executive therefore determined to have a seminar on the role of psychiatrists in court, concentrating particularly on the use of psychiatric evidence where longer than normal sentences are being considered. That seminar was held on 6 December 2002 at the Commonwealth Institute and involved: the Executive of the Forensic Faculty, the Ethics Committee, Royal College of Psychiatrists and the Confidentiality Committee, Royal College of Psychiatrists.

The seminar was structured around four presentations: In what circumstances should psychiatrists attempt to predict violence by the mentally disordered? Science and ethics, Nigel Eastman; Risk psychiatry and the courts, Tony Maden; Psychiatric evidence in the court room, John O’Grady; Psychiatrists in the court: black robes and white coats, Gwen Adshead.

There followed a wide range of discussion by participants at the seminar. This paper seeks to gather together these presentations and discussions and presents a summary based around various themes. Particular points or views are not credited to any particular person and the four presentations are amalgamated into the body of this report rather than being individually reported.

The issues raised were profoundly complex and, not surprisingly, where issues of personal morality and ethics were concerned, there was a wide variation in individual executive members’ response. There was a common feeling of intense unease in relation to our work with courts and public protection agencies. What clearly emerged was that there is no current adequate ethical framework to address the profound issues we face in our interface with public protection/criminal justice system. This is of very particular concern to forensic psychiatrists but we believe that the issues we face, because of our day-to-day interaction with the criminal justice system, will not be confined to forensic psychiatrists only but will be of concern to all psychiatrists. There was representation from the Child and Adolescent Faculty at our meeting and they confirmed that child psychiatrists equally face profound ethical dilemmas in their everyday work, particularly when issues of child protection reach the courts. These concerns are likely to be amplified greatly for all sections of the College if the proposals of the new Mental Health Bill reach Parliament and eventually form the basis of a new Mental Health Act.

Why are there ethical dilemmas?

The basic dilemma that faces forensic psychiatrists is their dual role. Most forensic psychiatrists act as catchment area forensic psychiatrists responsible for comprehensive services to a specified geographical area, and with gatekeeping functions in regard to secure services (both National Health Service and private). However, in the interaction with the criminal justice system, the forensic psychiatrist is also responsible to courts and other criminal justice agencies when they provide reports on their behalf.