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Abstract

Background
The first study to demonstrate that life expectancy in patients with a severe mental illness (SMI) was reduced was by Farr in 1841. More recently, comparative research has demonstrated a higher level of cardiovascular disease (CVD) than the rest of the population in this group. Despite this knowledge, little has changed in routine practice. One barrier could be that the educational needs of the primary care healthcare professionals in this area are not being met.

Aims
The aim of this programme of research is to address the physical health needs of people with SMI by improving the practice of healthcare professionals in primary care.

Methods
The methods employed are the development of a training package and a programme of research divided into eight studies:

1. A retrospective audit to find out whether patients will attend for a health check if they are invited.
2. A prospective audit to see if a tool used for people with physical illnesses to improve their lifestyle (a food diary) is as effective when used with the SMI population.
3. A systematic search to find out what evidence there is for the efficacy of healthcare professional educational outcomes in studies of physical health in SMI.
4. The development of a training package for practice nurses to teach them how to carry out physical health checks for people with SMI.

5. A retrospective audit to establish whether as many people with SMI are being screened for cardiovascular disease as people with physical conditions in Northampton.

6. An audit to find out whether as many people with SMI are being screened for cardiovascular disease as people with physical conditions in England.

7. A before and after study to measure the effect of a physical health and SMI training on the practice nurses’ motivation to carry out physical health checks for people with SMI.

8. A before and after study to establish whether training practice nurses to carry out physical health checks for people with SMI increases the level of screening for cardiovascular risk in this group.

9. A qualitative study using interviews with patients with SMI to find out what they think about the physical health checks.

Results

There were a total of 2,796 patients and eight healthcare professionals included in the programme in Northampton and 2,911,914 patients in the national study. People with SMI will attend for a health check if invited by letter giving them an appointment with a named practitioner (66%). The patients with schizophrenia were all successful in completing food diaries. There were no studies identified as suitable for a systematic review. In the five participating primary care practices in Northampton, the people with SMI received less CVD screening than those with diabetes (21% v 96%, CI=64.53 to 126.55: p<.01). In the
national study, patients with diabetes received higher levels of screening in the previous 15 months than those with SMI (97.3% vs 74.7%; p<0.0001). The attitudes of the practice nurses involved in the study towards their role in providing health checks appeared to be modified in a positive direction. Following the training of practice nurses, each individual patient received more CVD screening and lifestyle information (3.85 v 2.69: t=8.22, p<.05). The patients who were interviewed about their physical health check had a good understanding of the importance of a healthy diet and taking regular exercise but did not appear aware of the risk of cardiovascular disease.

**Conclusion**

Simple changes in the way patients with SMI are invited to attend a health check increases attendance rates. The quality of primary care health checks for this population is inferior to those provided to patients with diabetes. Training practice nurses improves the quality of the health checks but still not to the levels received by other patient groups.
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Chapter one: What is severe mental illness and how is it treated?

1.1 What is severe mental illness

In primary care mental health conditions are identified through disease registers alongside the physical conditions. Severe Mental Illness (SMI) includes Schizophrenia, Bipolar Disorder and other psychoses. In this chapter I have talked about the two main conditions (schizophrenia and bipolar disorder). Other psychoses includes schizotypal personality, persistent delusional disorder, acute/transient psychotic disorders, induced delusional disorders, schizoaffective disorders, manic episodes, severe depression with psychosis schizotypal personality and non organic psychosis. These conditions are not explained individually in this thesis as they all share symptoms with schizophrenia or bipolar disorder. Mental illnesses, such as depression and eating disorders, are not discussed because the care of patients with SMI is considered separately in United Kingdom (UK) guidance (NICE 2006, 2010, BMA and NHS Employers 2011).

1.1.1 Schizophrenia

Schizophrenia is a psychotic disorder characterized by positive, negative and cognitive symptoms (figure 1.1). Positive symptoms include hallucinations (hearing voices or seeing visions), delusions (beliefs held strongly by the patient but not shared by people around them) and thought disorder (for example conversation jumping from one thought to a completely unrelated thought). Social isolation and withdrawal are examples of negative symptoms. Cognitive
symptoms are very common and include problems in concentration and task planning. Schizophrenia is a long term condition and life expectancy is reduced by around 20 years compared to the general population (Wahlbeck et al. 2011). About two thirds of the excess mortality is due to natural causes, including heart disease, cancer, and cerebrovascular, respiratory, and lung diseases (Colton and Manderscheid 2006). The symptoms of schizophrenia often result in major social or occupational disturbance. For example few patients with schizophrenia are in employment (Rosenheck et al. 2006).

**Figure 1.1 Symptoms of schizophrenia**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive symptoms (that are not normal for the person)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Hallucinations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Delusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Thought disorder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative symptoms (that the person doesn't usually experience)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Poor motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Social isolation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Withdrawal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognitive symptoms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Impaired attention and memory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Difficulty forward-planning and problem solving</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affective or mood symptoms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Signs of depression and/or anxiety</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Andreasen (1995)
**Epidemiology**

Schizophrenia is not a common illness, affecting approximately one person in a hundred at some point in their lives (Saha *et al.* 2005). A meta-analysis of international studies of schizophrenia found using the pooled data, a prevalence estimate of 4.2 per 1000 (Saha *et al.* 2008). This means that in a primary care practice with 6,000 patients, there will possibly be 25 patients with schizophrenia on the SMI register.

Onset tends to be when patients are in their teens to early twenties, and although schizophrenia is equally common in men and women, men tend to develop the illness when they are younger than women. This may be explained by the female hormone oestrogen having a protective effect against schizophrenia (Palmer *et al.* 2001).

**Cause**

Fifty percent of the cause of schizophrenia can be attributed to genetics (Tsuang *et al.* 2001). It occurs in ten percent of people who have a first-degree relative with the disorder and is still more likely to develop in those who have second-degree relatives with the disease than the general population. The identical twin of a person with schizophrenia has a 40 to 65 percent chance of developing the disorder (Cardno and Gottesman 2000). Several genes are associated with an increased risk of schizophrenia (Harrison and Weinberger 2005). Recent research has found that people with schizophrenia have higher rates of rare genetic mutations involving hundreds of different genes (Walsh *et al.* 2008). Other recent studies suggest that schizophrenia may result when a gene malfunctions that is needed to make important brain chemicals. This
problem may affect the part of the brain involved in developing higher functioning skills (Huang et al. 2007).

Interactions between genes and the environment are necessary for schizophrenia to develop. Many environmental factors may be involved, such as exposure to viruses or malnutrition before birth, problems during birth, and other not yet known psychosocial factors (Tsuang et al. 2001).

An imbalance in the complex, interrelated chemical reactions of the brain involving the neurotransmitters dopamine and glutamate, and possibly others also play a role in schizophrenia. Studies of brain tissue after death have revealed changes in the distribution or characteristics of brain cells (leading to faulty connections) that could have occurred before birth (Mueser and McGurk 2004). The problem may not show up in a person until puberty when the brain undergoes major changes; these changes could then trigger psychotic symptoms.

In a study of 229 people with schizophrenia, the majority had prominent positive symptoms and a sudden onset of disease, with 69% of the cases having a record of heavy cannabis abuse at least one year before onset of psychotic symptoms. The authors argue that the high number of cases of schizophrenia in this cohort and the temporal relation between cannabis abuse and schizophrenia further supports the hypothesis that cannabis abuse may be a risk factor for schizophrenia. (Allebeck et al. 2007).

*Early detection of schizophrenia*

Making a diagnosis of schizophrenia requires psychotic symptoms to be present for at least a month (American Psychiatric Association 2000). GPs or practice
nurses are frequently the patient’s first point of contact with a health professional. Early detection and treatment by the primary care team is essential in order to ensure that patients are effectively treated as quickly as possible. Intervening early can improve the outcome of the illness and can reduce the risk of suicide (Melle et al. 2006). Early schizophrenia often starts with increasing social isolation and deterioration in intellectual functioning (Andreasen 1995).

*Diagnosis*

The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (4th Edition; DSM-IV) are the recommended criteria for health professionals in the United Kingdom to use in making a diagnosis of schizophrenia and bipolar disorder (American Psychiatric Association 2000 – see figure 1.2).
Figure 1.2 DSM-IV diagnostic criteria for schizophrenia

Two or more of the following symptoms during a one-month period (or one of these if the delusions are bizarre or hallucinations are commentary style):

- Delusions
- Hallucinations
- Disorganized speech (e.g. incoherence or derailed thinking)
- Grossly disorganised or catatonic behaviour
- Negative symptoms (e.g. avolition (loss of ability to motivate, choose or resolve), lack of planning, emotional blunting or poverty of speech)
- Social or occupational dysfunction. Disturbance in one or more major areas, such as work, self-care or interpersonal relationships
- Continuous signs of disturbance for at least six months
- Schizoaffective disorder and mood disorder with psychosis have been ruled out
- Substance misuse or a general medical condition have been excluded
- If autistic disorder or another pervasive developmental disorder is present, then schizophrenia can only be diagnosed if prominent delusions or hallucinations are present for at least one month

1.1.2 Bipolar disorder

Bi-polar disorder is a long term condition characterised by episodes of elated mood (mania or hypomania) and depression (figure 1.2). Making a diagnosis of bipolar disorder is challenging. Many patients experience long delays in the diagnosis of bipolar disorder, with an average of eight years from initial presentation to secondary care mental health services (Mantere et al. 2004). Substance use is extremely common with both epidemiological and clinical studies showing rates ranging from 35-60% (Grant et al. 2005, Fry et al. 2003, Chengappa 2000, Kessler et al. 1997, Feinman and Dunner 1996, Regier et al.
Life expectancy is reduced in people with bipolar disorder due to the increased prevalence of CVD, respiratory disease and high rates of suicide (Colton and Manderscheid 2006).

**Figure 1.3 Symptoms of bipolar disorder**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feeling sad and hopeless, empty or worthless, guilty or despairing, pessimistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacking in energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty in concentrating and remembering things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of interest and enjoyment in everyday activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-doubt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems with sleeping and waking up early</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicidal thoughts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mania</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feeling extremely happy, elated or euphoric, full of energy, self-important, full of great new ideas and having important plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking quickly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being easily distracted, irritated or agitated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing pleasurable things with distressing consequences, such as spending large amounts of money or having risky sexual encounters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sleeping or eating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychosis may be present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some people self-harm as a distraction from mental pain and distress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from American Psychiatric Association (2000)
Epidemiology

Bipolar disorder is divided into type I and type II (Type I: episodes of mania with or without episodes of depression, Type II: episodes of hypomania or elevated mood but patients are able to function, and depression - American Psychiatric Association 2000). Lifetime prevalence of bipolar I reported in European studies vary widely from 0.1 to 2.4 percent (Pini et al. 2005, ten Have et al. 2002, Szadoczky et al. 1998). An Australian study reported a lifetime prevalence of 2.5 percent (Goldney et al. 2005). Estimates of the lifetime prevalence of bipolar II disorder also vary widely. Authors of European studies estimate between 0.2–2.0 percent prevalence (Faravelli, et al. 1990, Szadoczky, et al. 1998).

Signs and symptoms of bipolar disorder

Mania

Manic symptoms include an elated mood accompanied by increased drive, over activity and decreased need for sleep. The patient thinks at speed and this is expressed in pressure of speech. To begin with they may work more efficiently until symptoms of poor concentration and distractibility occur. Some patients experience extreme irritability. Hardy and Gray (2012a) describe some common features:

- Hallucinations and mood-congruent delusions and occur in nine out of 10 patients.
- Loss of social inhibitions and extravagant plans may result in grave consequences for an individual's professional life, social functioning and financial stability.
o Mania often results in such a severe disruption of functioning, that hospital admission is necessary, sometimes requiring compulsory detention.

_Depression_

The symptoms and the diagnostic criteria of depression in bipolar disorder are the same as those for unipolar depression: low mood; loss of interest and pleasure; reduced energy; poor concentration; disturbed sleep; a change in appetite; and low self-esteem and confidence (American Psychiatric Association 2000). Some patients have ideas of guilt, hopelessness and suicide may occur. Psychotic symptoms may feature in severe episodes and are typically mood congruent (American Psychiatric Association 2000).

In comparison to unipolar depression, bipolar depression is more likely to present with psychomotor retardation, melancholic symptoms such as worthlessness, psychosis and atypical features such as hypersomnia (Hardy and Gray 2012a). Bipolar depressive episodes are typically shorter than in unipolar depression. However, patients presenting with depression directly following mania may be less likely to respond to treatment.

_Mixed states_

Some patients can experience a mixed emotional state, mania and depression (American Psychiatric Association 2000); for example, racing thoughts during a manic episode.
Diagnosis

Das et al. (2005) report that bipolar disorder is associated with a high attendance rate in primary care, which provides the opportunity for detection. However, their study showed that little attention has been given to primary care patients who have current depression and past episodes of hypomania or mania, history that may indicate bipolar disorder and a need for specialized treatment.

DSM-IV criteria for a depressive episode

To meet the criteria for a major depressive episode, the patients should have been experiencing at least five symptoms for at least two weeks. One of the symptoms has to be depressed mood or loss of interest or pleasure; there should also be distress or impairment in social or occupational functioning (American Psychiatric Association 2000).

DSM-IV criteria for a manic episode

The DSM-IV criteria for a manic episode are a distinct period of abnormally and persistently elevated, expansive or irritable mood, lasting one week (or any duration if hospitalisation is necessary). During the period of mood disturbance, three or more symptoms have persisted (four if the mood is only irritable) and have been present to a significant degree (American Psychiatric Association 2000).
*Early intervention*

Early intervention in patients with bipolar disorder can be effective in improving long term outcomes by ensuring the patient is prescribed and adheres with effective treatment. Primary care provides a necessary and valuable service for people with bipolar disorder because many of them never consult secondary care mental health services (ten Have *et al.* 2002).

1.2 Treatment of Severe Mental Illness

1.2.1 Schizophrenia

Schizophrenia requires treatment with antipsychotic medication to stabilize psychosis and prevent relapse of symptoms. Although many patients express a desire to come off medication, good adherence is essential to ensure effective management of the illness and psychosocial recovery (Hardy and Gray 2012a).

*Antipsychotic medication*

Antipsychotics improve psychosis by diminishing abnormal transmission of dopamine by blocking the dopamine D2/3 receptor (not D1 or D4), and although several brain regions may be involved, it is suggested that the ventral striatal regions may have a particularly critical role (Kapur *et al.* 2006).

Typical antipsychotics include chlorpromazine, haloperidol, pimozide, and zuclopenthixol. They were first introduced in the 1950s. Although still commonly used, most patients with schizophrenia are now treated with atypical antipsychotic drugs that started to be introduced in the early 1990s (Nasrallah 2003). Atypical antipsychotics include clozapine, olanzapine, quetiapine, risperidone and aripiprazole.
All antipsychotics (both typical and atypical) are, clinically, equally effective against the positive symptoms of schizophrenia. The older or typical drugs do not improve the negative symptoms which are associated with low levels of dopamine in the cortex (Van Rossum 1967). As might be predicted by their pharmacology atypical medicines seem to be more effective in treating some of the negative and cognitive symptoms and may be more helpful in treating mood symptoms of schizophrenia (Darba et al. 2011). This is because they are also serotonin (5-HT) antagonists at the 5-HT2A receptor subtype, they mitigate the negative signs and symptoms of schizophrenia by disinhibiting the dopamine system in the nigrostriatum and prefrontal cortex (Burns 2001).

Approximately a fifth of patients will fail to respond to treatment with antipsychotic medication (typical or atypical) and are deemed to have treatment resistant schizophrenia (Pantelis and Lambert 2003). These patients should be treated with a drug called clozapine. This is a complex to use drug but very effective (Pantelis and Lambert 2003). In about one per cent of patients it can cause agranulocytosis; consequently patients will require regular blood monitoring and should be registered with a clozapine patient monitoring service (Atkin et al. 1996).

Side effects
Antipsychotic medicines can cause a number of side effects.

Extrapyramidal Symptoms
Typical antipsychotics have diffuse effects blocking dopamine receptors throughout the brain. As a consequence they cause a range of dopamine
related side effects that include extrapyramidal symptoms (EPS). These include
dystonia, akathisia and tardive dyskinesia (Hardy and Gray 2012a). The newer
atypical medicines have lower affinity for dopamine receptors and this results in
less EPS (Worrel et al. 2000).

*Other side-effects*
One study has shown that long-term treatment with antipsychotic drugs is
associated with lower mortality compared with no antipsychotic use (Tiihonen et
al. 2009). However, some of the newer antipsychotic drugs have a greater
propensity to cause physical problems (Nasrallah 2003). They can induce
endocrine abnormalities (for example, diabetes and galactorrhoea), metabolic
abnormalities (for example, lipid abnormalities and weight gain) and
cardiovascular side effects (for example, lengthening of the QT interval on
However, the excess of other CVD risk factors, such as smoking, poor diet and
physical inactivity mean that the choice of treatment is not a factor for inclusion
in a lifestyle management programme. These problems are discussed in more
detail in chapter two.

*Other treatment*
Antipsychotic medication is the main treatment of schizophrenia. Additionally
the authors of a meta-analysis conclude that family intervention should be
offered to people with schizophrenia who are in contact with carers, and that
cognitive behavioural therapy (CBT) may be useful for those with treatment
resistant symptoms (Pilling et al. 2002). This is recognised by the authors of the
government guidelines for schizophrenia (NICE 2010a), who recommend offering:

- Cognitive behavioural therapy (CBT) to assist in promoting recovery in people with persisting positive and negative symptoms and for people in remission.
- Family intervention to families of people with schizophrenia who live with or are in close contact with the service user. This may be particularly useful for families of people recently relapsed or are at risk of relapse or have persisting symptoms.
- Arts therapies to assist in promoting recovery, particularly in people with negative symptoms.

1.2.2 Bipolar disorder

Medication is used in bipolar disorder to treat depression and mania, and to prevent depressive and manic symptoms from returning. Therefore, many patients require treatment with more than one medication. The medications used to treat bipolar disorder include:

- Antipsychotic medication as described in 1.2.1
- Valproate
- Lithium
- Lamotrigine
- Carbamazepine
- Selective serotonin Reuptake Inhibitors (SSRIs)
- Benzodiazepines
Valproate

Valproate (2-propylpentanoic acid) is an anticonvulsant drug used in the treatment of bipolar disorder (Fisher and Broderick 2003). It has a number of side effects including weight gain.

Lithium

Lithium is used for the prophylaxis of bipolar disorder (Cookson 2001). It is highly effective at preventing relapse (particularly manic episodes) and reducing the risk of suicide (Cipriani et al. 2005, Geddes et al. 2004). Due to the risk of toxicity lithium should only be started under specialist supervision and thyroid function, creatinine and plasma lithium levels need to be monitored regularly (Geddes et al. 2004). Lithium can also cause weight gain.

Lamotrigine

Lamotrigine is an anticonvulsant used to prevent depressive episodes associated with bipolar disorder (BNF: British Medical Association, 63, 2012a). Side effects include nausea, vomiting, diarrhoea, dry mouth, aggression, agitation, headache, drowsiness, dizziness, tremor, insomnia, ataxia, back pain, arthralgia, nystagmus, diplopia, blurred vision (BNF, 63, 2012a).

Carbamazepine

Carbamazepine is an anticonvulsant used for the prophylaxis of bipolar disorder (BNF, 63, 2012b). Side effects include dry mouth, nausea, vomiting, oedema, ataxia, dizziness, drowsiness, fatigue, headache, hyponatraemia, blood disorders, dermatitis and urticaria (BNF, 63, 2012b).
Selective serotonin Reuptake Inhibitors (SSRIs)
SSRIs are antidepressants which work by inhibiting pre-synaptic reuptake of the neurotransmitter serotonin (5-hydroxytryptamine, 5HT). This increases the availability of serotonin at synapses and enhances stimulation of postsynaptic neurones. The increased synaptic serotonin causes changes in receptor sensitivity which helps to reduce depression. Side effects include headache, changes in sleep pattern, gastrointestinal function and sexual functioning (BNF, 63, 2012c). The use of SSRIs in bipolar disorder is controversial as they can cause some patients to rebound into mania (Goodwin 2009).

Benzodiazepines
Benzodiazepines are used as anxiolytics, sedatives, hypnotics, anticonvulsants, and/or skeletal muscle relaxants (BNF, 63, 2012d). They are helpful in bipolar disorder for the treatment of behavioural disturbance or agitation; they should not be used for long periods because of the risk of dependence (BNF, 63, 2012d).

Acute or mixed episode
An acute manic or mixed episode of bipolar disorder may require treatment with a number of medications. Some patients will also be admitted to hospital or receive care from a crisis or home treatment team. Goodwin (2009) explains which drugs to use in each phase:

- Antipsychotics to bring mania under control and treat any psychosis (alternative treatments are valporate, lithium and carbemazepine)
• Sleep problems and behavioural disturbances can be treated with PRN benzodiazepines
• Antidepressant medication should be gradually stopped in patients experiencing a manic episode of illness to prevent further mania

Psychological treatments are not effective in this phase of the illness (Hardy and Gray 2012a).

**Acute depressive episode**

Goodwin (2009) describes how a patient should be treated in this phase

• SSRIs - but to prevent a switch to mania patients can be co-prescribed lithium, valporate or an antipsychotic. Then after 12 weeks taper treatment off and stop
• Lamotrigine may be a potentially helpful treatment

There is compelling evidence from a number of randomised controlled trials that quetiapine is effective in the treatment of bipolar depression (including any anxiety) and does not appear to switch patients into mania (Calabrese et al. 2005).

**Long term treatment**

Long term treatment (for at least two years following the first episode of illness) is required in bipolar disorder to prevent the reoccurrence of both the depressive and manic poles of the illness (Hardy and Gray 2012a).
**Psychological therapies**

As an addition to medication, psychosocial treatments are helpful in providing support, education, and guidance to people with bipolar disorder and their families (NICE 2006). Psychosocial interventions can lead to increased mood stability, fewer hospitalisations, and improved functioning in several areas (NICE 2006). Therapies that have been found to be helpful are described in figure 1.4.

Figure 1.4 Psychological therapy

**After an acute episode**
Consider individual structured psychological interventions, such as cognitive behavioural therapy, in addition to prophylactic medication for people who are relatively stable, but may have mild to moderate affective symptoms. The therapy should normally be at least 16 sessions over 6–9 months and:

- Include psychoeducation, the importance of a regular routine and concordance with medication
- Cover monitoring mood, detecting early warnings and strategies to prevent progression into full-blown episodes
- Enhance general coping strategies
- Be delivered by people who have experience of patients with bipolar disorder

Consider a focused family intervention if appropriate. This should last 6–9 months, and cover psychoeducation, ways to improve communication and problem solving.

**Psychosocial support**
Consider offering befriending to people who would benefit from additional social support, particularly those with chronic depressive symptoms.

This should be in addition to pharmacological and psychological treatments, and should be by trained volunteers providing, typically, at least weekly contact for between 2 and 6 months.

1.3 Summary of chapter

In this chapter I have described the two main conditions included on the primary care SMI disease register. I have explained the usual treatment offered to this group and some of the possible side effects of medication.
Chapter two: Why do people with severe mental illness die so young?

In this chapter I discuss the increased mortality of people with SMI when compared to the general population and the physical conditions which are more prevalent in this group. The healthcare professionals’ responsibilities to screen for CVD risk are explained.

2.1 The increased mortality of people with SMI

The earliest study of mortality in people with SMI was in 1841 by Farr (Singer 2001). Very early studies observed patients in hospitals and found increased mortality from diseases such as tuberculosis, pneumonia and gastrointestinal infections (Shepherd 1957). Excess mortality of people with SMI from these causes decreased with improved facilities (Norris 1959).

In epidemiological research, disease frequency is measured in a number of standardised ways. These include:

- **Relative risk (RR)** is the ratio that denotes how much more likely a person in one group are likely to die at a certain age than someone in the general population (Richards and Donaldson 2009). A score of greater than one means the risk is increased.

- **Standardised Mortality Ratio (SMR)** is the ratio of deaths observed to those expected on the basis of the mortality rates of some reference population (Liddell 1984). If the SMR is higher than one, then there are a higher number of deaths than expected. Standardised mortality ratios
can also be reported around 100. That means that values greater than 100 indicate increased mortality.

- Years of Potential Life Lost (YPLL) provides information about the risk of premature death by using the difference between the patient age at death and the current life expectancy, or mean survival age for living cohorts of the same age during the year of death (Colton and Manderscheid 2006).

- Hazard Ratios reflect the analysis of time survived. A hazard ratio of one corresponds to equal survival times; a hazard ratio of two implies that at any time twice as many patients with SMI died compared with the comparator group (Duerden 2009).

**Relative risk (RR)**

A study in America (Babigian and Oderoff 1969) showed that the mortality in people with SMI was increased; with the relative risk of death being three times more than the general population. Innes and Millar (1970) carried out a study in Scotland, their results showed a relative risk of two. Harris and Barraclough (1998) looked at 152 reports to identify whether people with mental illness still died prematurely. They examined 27 different categories of mental disorder and eight treated categories. They concluded that all mental disorders have an increased risk of premature death but people with schizophrenia have a higher risk from unnatural causes (suicide and accidents). Joukamaa et al. (2006) carried out baseline comprehensive health assessments to predict the mortality of 7,217 people with schizophrenia treated with antipsychotics. The relative mortality risk between those with schizophrenia and others was 2.84. These
results are similar to those studies carried out 36 and 37 years earlier by Babigian and Oderoff (1969) and Innes and Millar (1970) suggesting that life expectancy for people with SMI has increased in line with the general population.

**Standardised mortality ratio (SMR)**

Mortensen and Juel (1993) studied the psychiatric case register of a Danish hospital and the central person registry to find out the cause of death in people first admitted with schizophrenia. They studied the records of 9,156 people with schizophrenia and found increased mortality. Fifty percent of deaths were caused by suicide. Pooled data showed an SMR of 3.51 and of those, avoidable mortality (including CVD, suicide, accidents) was SMR 2.19. This was consistent with the findings of a meta-analysis by Brown et al. (1997). The authors found a large increased mortality from suicide and a moderate increased mortality from natural causes. In contrast, Brown et al. (2000) studied 370 patients with schizophrenia over 13 years in order to measure SMR and find out reasons for excess mortality. All cause SMR was 2.98. Two thirds of the deaths were due to physical diseases. Colton and Manderscheid (2006) had similar findings; they compared the mortality rates in people with mental illness and the general population using submitted records from eight different states in the United States of America. All cause SMR ranged between 1.2 and 4.9 in different states. The authors concluded that the majority of the excess premature deaths in people with SMI were due to CVD, not suicide. A later systematic review of 37 studies drawn from 25 different nations explored the distribution of standardized mortality ratios (SMRs) for people with
schizophrenia (Saha et al. 2007). Saha et al. found that most of the major causes-of-death categories were elevated with the median SMR being 2.58. In this analysis, suicide was associated with the highest SMR but the authors note that the SMRs for all-cause mortality have increased during recent decades. Hoang et al. (2011) studied the records of people with schizophrenia and bipolar disorder discharged from hospital. They wanted to investigate whether the mortality gap has reduced in recent years between people with schizophrenia or bipolar disorder and the general population. They reported that the SMR for people with schizophrenia was 2.2 and 1.9 for people with bipolar disorder. There was an increase in ratios for deaths caused by circulatory and respiratory disease. This group of studies illustrates that in the last two decades, the SMR of people with SMI has remained largely unchanged.

*Years of Potential Life Lost (YPLL)*

Colton and Manderscheid (2006) also measured YPLL in addition to SMR in their study; this ranged from a mean of 13.5 to 32.2. Similarly, using a large secondary mental healthcare database in southeast London linked to national mortality returns, Chang et al. (2011) found that life expectancy in people with SMI was reduced by 12-19 years. Laursen (2011) had the same results. He used the entire Danish population as a cohort to estimate the life-expectancy of people with schizophrenia and bipolar disorder and make a comparison to the general population. Life-expectancy was 18.7 years shorter for men with schizophrenia and 16.3 years for women. For men with bipolar disorder it was 13.6 years and for women, 12.1 years. Wahlbeck et al. (2011) carried out a five year consecutive cohort study of people admitted to hospital for mental
disorders in Denmark, Finland and Sweden. They wanted to evaluate trends in health outcomes of people with SMI. They found that men with mental disorders live 20 and women 15 years less, than the general population. These studies show that despite the general population living longer (Wang et al. 2012) people with SMI still have reduced life expectancy.

_Hazard ratios (HR)_

Osborn et al. (2007) carried out a retrospective cohort study with the objective of estimating the excess mortality of people with SMI and the contribution of antipsychotic medication, smoking, and social deprivation. A total of 46,136 people with SMI and 300,426 without SMI were selected for the study. Hazard ratios were 3.22 for coronary heart disease (CHD) mortality and 2.53 for stroke deaths in people with SMI under 50 years of age compared with controls. Osborn et al. (2007) also found that patients taking a higher prescribed dose of antipsychotics predicted a greater risk of mortality from CHD and stroke. The authors explain that the dose response observed in the relationship between antipsychotic medication and CHD mortality might be due to adverse effects of higher doses. Alternatively, the dose could be an indicator of the severity of the mental illness, which might in turn affect mortality through diet and exercise, intensity of tobacco use or the stresses of psychiatric symptoms. This contrasts with the findings of Tiihonen et al. (2009), who found that long-term treatment with antipsychotic drugs is associated with lower mortality compared with no antipsychotic use in people with SMI. However, Osborn et al. is describing dose of treatment in a cross sectional study while Tiihonen et al. is reporting the duration of treatment in a cohort study.
Healy et al. (2012) compared data from two epidemiologically complete cohorts of patients (1875-1924 and 1994-2010). The survival analysis shows the absolute mortality in the historical period was higher than today, but the actual years of life lost in the historical cohort are less than those lost now.

I have described a number of studies which measure the mortality of people with SMI in different ways (relative risk, standardized mortality ratio, years of potential life lost, hazard ratio). The presented studies show that YPLL, SMR, RR and HR for mortality remain as high as in the 1970s, and that the physical causation is reminiscent of the pre ninety-fifties.

2.2 Suicide

Suicide is one of the top ten causes of death world wide and one of the three leading causes of death in people aged between 15-35 years (World Health Organization 2000). However, most people with SMI (i.e those with schizophrenia or bipolar disorder) neither attempt nor die by suicide (Litts et al. 2008). It is estimated that the lifetime prevalence of suicide is 6-15% for people with mood disorders and 4-10% for those with schizophrenia (World Health Organization 2000).

A research study (Dutta et al. 2010) involving almost 2,723 patients in the UK who presented with their first psychotic symptoms between 1965 and 2004 found that the rate of suicide was highest in the first year following diagnosis (12 times greater than the general population). This risk reduced but was still four times greater than the general population ten years after diagnosis when there may be less intense monitoring. A key aim of this study was to dispute the widely held view that 10-15% of people with SMI could commit
suicide. They found that 1.9% took their own lives within an average period of 11.5 years after their first episode of psychosis.

Leitner et al. (2008) carried out a systematic review of 24 studies to provide a comprehensive overview of the known effectiveness of interventions aimed at preventing suicidal behaviour and ideation both in key risk groups and in the general population. In the studies evaluating treatment for people with schizophrenia or schizoaffective disorder the focus was almost exclusively on treatment with clozapine. The outcomes for treatment with clozapine were universally favourable but none of the available studies chose to evaluate clozapine against either a placebo or treatment as usual. Only three of five studies provided statistical evidence of reductions in suicidal behaviour. Only four studies in this review specifically evaluated interventions for people with bipolar disorder. All of these studies evaluated treatment with lithium, either as a main treatment or as an adjunct. The two studies evaluating lithium alone reported statistically significant reductions in suicide and attempted suicide (Goodwin et al. 2003) and in 'suicidal acts' (Tondo et al. 1998). One study evaluated lithium with a limited range of other pharmaceutical interventions in addition to interpersonal and social rhythm therapy (Rucci et al. 2002). They reported no significant impact of the combined therapy on any measure of suicidal behaviour or suicidal ideation. One study (Baker et al. 2004) compared treatment using olanzapine plus lithium with olanzapine plus valproate. This failed to find any significant differences between the two treatments though there was a statistically significant reduction in suicidal ideation.

Suicide prevention has narrowly focused on identifying proximate, individual-level risk factors, rather than thinking about population mental health
in terms of complex social and ecological relations (Knox 2004). To prevent suicide in SMI the focus should be on recognizing risk factors as well as adopting strategies to reduce the stigma associated with having a mental illness (United Nations 1996). Galon and Graor (2012) report from their study of 32 people with SMI that the process of engagement in primary care includes mattering, being perceived as credible and capable, and working together. Therefore managing people with SMI in primary care in the same way as those with other long term physical conditions has the potential to limit these risk factors because the focus of managing long term physical conditions is to engage the patient as a partner in care (Long term conditions Quality Innovation Productivity and Practice Workstream 2012)...

2.3 Higher prevalence of co-morbidities

Oud and Meyboom-de Jong (2009) carried out a systematic review of 15 original research articles on somatic co-morbidity in patients suffering from psychotic disorders. They found that the prevalence of chronic physical illnesses among patients with SMI was as high as 74%.

In their comprehensive review of the literature, Leucht et al. (2007) highlighted the conditions which had good and very good evidence for increased risk in people with SMI (see table 2.1). I have discussed each disease.
Table 2.1 Physical Health - prevalence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disease category</th>
<th>Physical diseases with increased frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bacterial infections and mycoses</td>
<td>Tuberculosis (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viral diseases</td>
<td>HIV (++), hepatitis B/C (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoplasms</td>
<td>Obesity-related cancer (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musculoskeletal diseases</td>
<td>Osteoporosis/decreased bone mineral density (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stomatognathic diseases</td>
<td>Poor dental status (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respiratory tract diseases</td>
<td>Impaired lung function (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urological and male genital diseases</td>
<td>Sexual dysfunction (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female genital diseases and pregnancy</td>
<td>Obstetric complications (++)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiovascular diseases</td>
<td>Stroke, myocardial infarction, hypertension, other cardiac and vascular diseases (++)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutritional and metabolic diseases</td>
<td>Obesity (++), diabetes mellitus (+), metabolic syndrome (++)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hyperlipidemia (++)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(++) very good evidence for increased risk, (+) good evidence for increased risk

Leuchter et al. (2007)

2.3.1 Tuberculosis

There are very few epidemiological studies on the association between schizophrenia and bacterial infections. Single studies from Japan (Ohta et al. 1988) and the United Kingdom (Baldwin 1979) found a higher incidence of tuberculosis (TB) among patients with schizophrenia compared with the general population. Ohta et al. studied outpatients living in a city and Baldwin looked at the statistical linkage between diseases using the Oxford Record Linkage Study from which in-patient data could be extracted. Reports from Israel (Zeenreich et al. 1998) and Russia (Fisher et al. 1996) were also indicative of an increased
prevalence of TB in psychiatric hospitals. As most of these studies were carried out in hospital settings, it could be argued that it is not the mental illness that is the risk factor for developing TB but the patients’ environment. This view is shared by Cavanaugh et al. (2012) who recently suggested that assisted living accommodation and residential homes (commonly housing people with SMI) may lack TB prevention infection control procedures. They report the example of one such facility for adults with mental illness in America. In 2008, 15 of the residents and three of the non residents contracted tuberculosis. Residents were not routinely screened for medical problems.

2.3.2 Lung function
One study in the United Kingdom (Filik et al. 2006) found higher rates of lung function impairment in people with schizophrenia compared to the general population. The prevalence of chronic respiratory problems such as chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) is also significantly higher in people with SMI (Himelhoch et al. 2004, Sokal et al. 2004, Chafetz et al. 2005, Carney et al. 2006, Copeland et al. 2007, Batki et al. 2009). A systematic review found that COPD was the most prevalent disease in this population (Oud and Meyboom-de Jong 2009).

2.3.3 Human immunodeficiency virus (HIV)
There are many studies on the association between schizophrenia and HIV (Leucht et al. 2007). These show that the prevalence of HIV positivity in people with schizophrenia is generally higher than in the general population but is very variable. This may be because some studies were performed in high risk areas
(such as the East coast of the United States) while studies in other parts of the world (e.g. Asia) showed lower HIV prevalence. Factors such as the high frequency of substance abuse, sexual risk behaviours and a reduced knowledge about HIV-related issues could account for the higher prevalence. A study of 430 psychiatric outpatients in the United States, (Carey et al. 2004) found significant rates of risky sexual behaviour in people with SMI particularly in those with mood disorders.

More recently, an American study examined 6,417,676 patients who were without HIV in 2001 (Prince et al. 2012). They compared the number of new diagnoses of HIV in 2002–2004 between people with SMI, a substance use disorder, and other psychiatric comorbidity. After controlling for substance abuse or dependence and other factors, their analyses indicated that the odds of new HIV/AIDS diagnoses among people with or without SMI did not differ significantly. Compared with people without a substance use disorder or SMI, individuals with a substance use disorder but without SMI were 3.1 times more likely, and those with both substance abuse or dependence and SMI were 2.1 times more likely, to receive a new HIV diagnosis. However, people with SMI without a substance use disorder were 23% less likely than people without SMI or a substance use disorder to receive a new HIV diagnosis. A number of earlier studies have identified possible reasons why it is the people with a substance use disorder who may be more vulnerable to HIV and STI (Cournos et al. 1994, Gray et al. 2002). These include: poor decision-making about safe sex and the increased likelihood of having sex with someone who is injecting drugs (due to intoxication); hypersexuality; neglecting to use a condom; vulnerability to coercion for sex; and selling or swapping sex for cash or drugs.
2.3.4 Hepatitis B/C

There has been little research carried out on hepatitis in psychiatric disorders, but studies from six different countries showed an increased prevalence of hepatitis in people with schizophrenia compared to the general population (Chaudhury et al. 1994, Cividini et al. 1997, Rosenberg et al. 2001, Said et al. 2001, Nakamura et al. 2004, Kalkan et al. 2005). A later study illustrated similar findings to those relating to HIV prevalence; 2.5% of participants with SMI and a substance abuse disorder were infected with hepatitis compared to 0.6% of patients without a substance abuse disorder (Rosenburg et al. 2005).

2.3.5 Sexual dysfunction

There are a number of relatively large studies that show sexual dysfunction to be more frequent in people with schizophrenia compared to the rest of the population (Aizenberg et al. 1995, Smith et al. 2002, McDonald et al. 2003). The antipsychotic drugs prescribed to treat SMI are associated with sexual dysfunction as they can cause hyperprolactinaemia (Kasperek-Zimowska et al. 2008). The propensity to cause hyperprolactinaemia differs between antipsychotics as a result of differential dopamine D2 receptor-binding affinity and ability to cross the blood–brain barrier (Holt and Peveler 2011). This side effect has a significant negative impact on the patients’ satisfaction with treatment and adherence (Hippisley-Cox et al. 2007).

2.3.6 Obstetric complications

There are many studies that demonstrate increased occurrence of obstetric complications among mothers with schizophrenia (De Hert et al. 2011a). Most
women with SMI cannot stop taking their medication as this would interfere with their activities of daily living, especially taking care of a baby (Einarson and Boskovic 2009). However, so far, there is no definitive association between the use of antipsychotics during pregnancy and an increased risk of birth defects or other adverse outcomes (Trixler et al. 2005, Einarson and Boskovic 2009). Therefore it may be the high rates of smoking, the use of illicit drugs and alcohol, and low socio-economic status that play a role in causing obstetric complications (Bennedsen 1998).

2.3.7 Osteoporosis

People suffering from osteoporosis have decreased bone mineral density and are more likely to suffer from fractures (Halbreich and Palter 1996). Leucht et al. (2007) found thirteen studies which consistently established that more people with schizophrenia had osteoporosis compared to normal controls (Baastrup et al. 1980, Ataya et al. 1988, Delva et al. 1989, Halbreich et al. 1995, Keely et al. 1997, Bergemann et al. 2002, Bilici et al. 2002, Zhang-Wong and Seeman 2002, Abraham et al. 2003, Liu-Seifert et al. 2004, Meaney et al. 2004, Hummer et al. 2005, Kishimoto et al. 2005, O'Keane and Meaney 2005). Most of the studies examined had very small samples, the smallest cohort being just 10 patients and the largest 402. Despite this knowledge, there is evidence that people with schizophrenia receive less care for their osteoporosis than age-matched controls (Bishop et al. 2004).

Reduced bone mineral density can be caused by a sedentary lifestyle, lack of exercise, smoking, alcohol and drug abuse, dietary and vitamin deficiencies, decreased exposure to sunshine and polydipsia inducing
electrolyte imbalance; these are behaviours frequently chosen by people with schizophrenia (Halbreich and Palter 1996). Additionally, many antipsychotic drugs increase prolactin levels which can cause osteoporosis (Holt and Peveler 2011).

A more recent meta-analysis (De Hert et al. 2011a) has found further studies which confirm the increased prevalence of osteoporosis in people with mental illness, particularly those taking antipsychotics. However, they report that data describing the epidemiology of osteoporotic fracture and antipsychotics in patients with SMI are limited and there are some conflicting results.

2.3.8 Cancer

Studies relating to cancer and people with schizophrenia have conflicting findings. Some have established that there is actually a decreased risk of cancer in this population (Barak et al. 2005, Dalton et al. 2005, Goldacre et al. 2005, Grinshpoon et al. 2005, Dalton et al. 2004, Lichtermann et al. 2004, Dalton et al. 2003, Cohen et al. 2001, Lawrence et al. 2000, Mortensen 1994, Gulbinat et al. 1992, Mortensen 1992, Mortensen 1989, Dupont et al. 1986, Nakane et al. 1986, Driscoli et al. 1978). The authors of these studies speculated that genetic factors that may lead to schizophrenia could protect the person from cancer. Other theories are that certain antipsychotic drugs may prevent tumours growing (Driscoli et al. 1978), or frequent admissions to hospital that provide good medical care and less exposure to urban air pollutants may be protective (Mortensen 1989, Grinshpoon et al. 2005, Goldacre et al. 2005, Dalton et al. 2003). In contrast, a large study carried out in
Finland found an increased cancer risk in patients with schizophrenia (Lichtermann et al. 2004). The results are also contradictory when examining studies looking at specific cancer sites. For example, some studies show decreased risks of lung cancer in people with schizophrenia (Mortensen 1989, 1994) while others show increased risks (Lichtermann et al. 2004, Grinshpoon et al. 2005). Prostate cancer is an exception, the studies consistently found this to be rarer in patients with schizophrenia compared to the general population (Barak et al. 2005, Dalton et al. 2005, Goldacre et al. 2005, Grinshpoon et al. 2005, Lichtermann et al. 2004, Lawrence et al. 2000, Mortensen 1992, Dupont et al. 1986).

More recently, in a cohort analysis within a large UK primary care database, the incidence of colo-rectal, breast and lung cancer and of all common cancers, did not differ significantly in people with SMI, including schizophrenia, compared with people without SMI (Osborn et al. 2013). It is worth noting that people with SMI are less likely to get screened for cancer. For example, a number of studies have shown that in comparison to the general population, women with schizophrenia were less likely to have received a mammogram in the last two years (Chochinov 2009, Carney and Jones 2006, Werenke 2006, Druss 2002).

Turning from incidence of cancer to mortality from cancer, one study has shown that having a SMI does not increase the risk of death from the seven most common cancers in the UK (Osborn et al. 2007).
2.3.9 Poor dental status

There are a number of studies which highlight the poor dental status of people with schizophrenia (Thomas et al. 1996, Velasco et al. 1997, Kenkre and Spadigam 2000, Lewis et al. 2001, McCreadie et al. 2004, Tang et al. 2004, Velasco-Ortega et al. 2005). Caries, gingivitis and periodontal disease may be caused by poor diet, neglecting oral hygiene and smoking; behaviours which are common in people with schizophrenia (Frielander and Marder 2002). In addition, antipsychotics, antidepressants and mood stabilisers can cause reduced saliva flow which causes additional risk (Frielander and Marder 2002).

2.4 Cardiovascular disease

The most common cause of premature death in people with SMI is CVD (Hennekens et al. 2005). Multiple risk factors for CVD are significantly increased in this patient group (Osborn et al. 2006). People with SMI have a higher risk of developing metabolic syndrome (prevalence of 36%) and there is a much higher prevalence of diabetes mellitus (9–14%) than the general population (Holt and Peveler 2010, Oud and Meyboo-de Jong 2009).

CVD is a term mainly used to describe disorders affecting the heart and/or the arteries and veins that are associated with atherosclerosis (the build up of fatty deposits and debris inside blood vessels). CVD, such as coronary heart disease and peripheral artery disease, are long term conditions but acute events such as myocardial infarction and stroke can occur suddenly when a vessel supplying blood to the heart or brain becomes blocked or bursts.

It is the combination of lifestyle factors (McCreadie 2003), poorer physical healthcare (Thornicroft 2011) and the side-effects of antipsychotic
medication (De Hert et al 2009a) which result in the high incidence of CVD in people with severe mental illness.

### 2.4.1 Risk factors for cardiovascular disease

Family history and ageing are the strongest risk factors for developing CVD. The most important behavioural risk factors for CVD are unhealthy diet, physical inactivity and tobacco use, which together cause about 80% of coronary heart disease (CHD) and stroke (World Health Organization (WHO) 2011). The effects of these unhealthy behaviours can contribute to metabolic risk factors such as raised blood pressure, raised blood glucose and cholesterol, and obesity. Therefore, public health initiatives focus on decreasing the development of CVD by encouraging people to follow a healthy diet, avoid smoking, exercise regularly, control blood pressure and blood glucose, and lower blood cholesterol. Underlying determinants of CVD may include poverty, stress and hereditary factors (WHO 2011). Risk factors for CVD can be divided into those that cannot be modified and modifiable types.

**Risk factors that cannot be modified**

Risk factors that cannot be modified are those that a patient cannot change, such as age, gender, ethnicity and genetics.

**Age and gender**

In the general population, the incidence of CVD increases with age (World Heart Federation 2012). CVD is more common in males than females up to the age of 65, when the incidence equalises across the genders (World Heart
Men aged 35 to 44 years are more than six times more likely to die from CVD than their female counterparts of the same age, although mortality due to CVD equalises in men and women over 75 years of age (Mercuro et al. 2010). In comparison, in a study of 46,163 people with SMI (Osborn et al 2007), risk of death from CHD was increased between the ages of 18-75 years but did not increase further over the age of 75. The study also revealed that risk of stroke was increased in people with SMI people aged 18-49 years, but this increased risk disappeared in people aged over 50 years (Osborn et al. 2007).

**Ethnicity**

Risk factors vary significantly by ethnic group; for example, atherosclerotic disease and CHD are relatively rare in black Africans and black Caribbeans (Lip et al. 2007). Despite this group having an increased risk of glucose intolerance, very low density lipoprotein (VLDL), small dense LDL, and lower triglyceride concentrations than in Europeans, the latter does not increase to the same extent in the presence of glucose intolerance (Chaturvedi 1994). In contrast, the prevalence rates of CVD in South Asians are at epidemic proportions (Lip et al. 2007). Risk factors such as smoking, blood pressure, obesity, and cholesterol vary between subgroups of South Asians, some levels are equivalent to, or lower than, a comparable European population; however, levels of glucose intolerance, central obesity, fasting triglyceride, and insulin are uniformly elevated in comparison (McKeigue 1991).
**Family history**

Individuals with a family history of CVD are at greater risk of an early CVD event (Williams *et al.* 2001). A positive family history is defined as having a father diagnosed with CVD younger than 55 years of age or a mother diagnosed younger than 65 years of age (Wood *et al.* 1998).

**Modifiable risk factors**

Modifiable risk factors are within the patient’s control, such as obesity, smoking, dyslipidaemia, physical activity, diet, blood pressure, alcohol intake and diabetes management.

Several antipsychotic drugs, particularly the atypicals such as clozapine and olanzapine, appear to contribute to cardiometabolic risk. In patients maintained on some of these antipsychotics, rates of metabolic syndrome and diabetes (or prediabetes) can exceed 50% (Manu *et al.* 2012). In contrast, a number of studies found that the rate of metabolic syndrome is 10% in patients with schizophrenia who are untreated (Manu *et al.* 2012, Chiu *et al.* 2010). This disparity could be due to the difference in severity of the SMI rather than the medication.

**Obesity**

There is strong evidence of an association between obesity and atherosclerosis, high blood pressure, high total blood cholesterol and type 2 diabetes (Wilson *et al.* 2002). This is due to an altered metabolic profile, a variety of adaptations/alterations in cardiac structure and function as adipose tissue accumulates in excess amounts (Poirier 2006). Some antipsychotic
medication can cause weight gain (Allison and Casey 2001). One study concluded that histamine receptor blockade is the primary cause of antipsychotics-induced weight gain and diabetes mellitus (Matsui-Sakata et al. 2005). However, Holt and Peveler (2009) argue that it is too simplistic to ascribe all obesity in people with SMI to their drug treatment. They suggest that the development of obesity in SMI results from the complex interaction of the genotype and environment of the person with mental illness, the mental illness itself and antipsychotic medication.

Two recent meta-analyses of patients with schizophrenia and bipolar disorder who were systematically monitored found about half were obese (Vancomforth et al. 2013, Mitchell et al. 2011).

**Smoking**

Smoking rates are high in people with SMI. Two meta-analyses of patients with SMI found about half smoked (Vancomforth et al. 2013, Mitchell et al. 2011). More recently, a study showed the same results, with approximately 50% of people with SMI smoking compared with 28% of the general population (Osborn et al. 2013). Patients with SMI have reported an improvement in their symptoms when using smoking to self medicate (Johnson et al. 2010). This may be due to an increased dopamine release in the pre-frontal cortex which alleviates positive and negative symptoms (Lavin et al. 1996). Additionally there may be a reduction in side effects of antipsychotic medication because of the enhanced metabolism of these drugs in smokers (Jeste et al. 1996).
Dyslipidaemia

The two major lipids (or fat chemicals) in the blood are cholesterol and triglyceride. As they are both insoluble they are transported in the blood by lipoprotein structures: low-density lipoproteins (LDL) known as ‘bad’ cholesterol and high-density lipoproteins (HDL) known as ‘good’ cholesterol. Dyslipidaemia is an abnormally high concentration of lipids or lipoproteins in the blood (it may also refer to abnormally low concentrations of HDL cholesterol) and is a risk factor for CVD; for example, a prospective cohort study of 7587 women and 6394 men showed that elevated triglyceride levels were associated with increased risk of heart disease and death (Nordestgaard et al. 2007).

A primary care study showed that patients with SMI had significantly lower HDL-cholesterol levels and higher total cholesterol to HDL-cholesterol ratio (Osborn et al. 2006). Two recent meta-analyses of patients with SMI found that two in five had hypertriglyceridemia (Vancomort et al. 2013, Mitchell et al. 2011).

Physical activity

Regular physical activity decreases the risk of death from CVD in general and death from CHD in particular (Kesaniemi et al. 2001). Regular physical activity prevents or delays the development of high blood pressure and reduces blood pressure in people with hypertension (Fagard 1999). Exercise can also lower blood cholesterol levels and help with weight loss (Cullinane 1982, Kantor et al. 1987). Low levels of exercise are common among people with SMI (Brown et al 1999). This may be due to the symptoms of their condition (such as poor
motivation) and/or sedative effects of the antipsychotic medication they are taking.

Diet

Diet affects blood cholesterol levels, body weight, blood pressure and blood glucose levels (Parikh et al. 2005). Studies have shown that the diets of people with SMI tend to be poor, for example lacking in fruit and vegetables (McCreadie et al. 2005), high in fat, salt and carbohydrates (Henderson et al. 2006) and low in nutritional content (Peet 2004).

Blood pressure

Persistently high blood pressure increases the risk of myocardial infarction and stroke (NICE 2011). The two most recent meta-analyses showed that two in five people with SMI had hypertension (Vancomfort et al. 2013, Mitchell et al. 2011). A study of 800 patients with SMI in the UK found that 34% were hypertensive (Eldridge et al. 2011). But in comparison, a UK survey of the general population showed that 32% of men and 27% of women aged over 35 were hypertensive (The Information Centre for Health and Social Care 2009). Other studies have found little overall difference in the blood pressure of people with SMI compared with the general population (Osborn et al 2006, Leucht et al. 2007). This may be due to the hypotensive effect of antipsychotic medication (Guggar 2011).

Alcohol intake

Consumption of one to two units of alcohol a day is associated with a reduced risk of cardiovascular disease (Rimm et al. 1991, Marmota 1983). Government
guidelines in the United Kingdom presently recommend a daily limit, two to three units (e.g. 175ml of ABV 13% wine is a standard glass of wine and is 2.3 units) for women and three to four units for men (e.g. one pint of ABV 5.2% beer is 3.1 units) (Drinkaware 2011). Excessive alcohol intake is associated with increased all-cause mortality (Vogel R 2002). There is little recent evidence regarding alcohol and people with SMI. The National Psychiatric Morbidity Survey in England found that 16 per cent of people with schizophrenia were drinking over the recommended limits for that time of 21 units of alcohol for men and 14 units or alcohol for women a week (Meltzer et al. 1996). A population survey found high alcohol use in people with bipolar disorder (Kessler et al. 1997).

**Psychosocial stress**

There is increasing evidence to support the hypothesis that psychosocial stress is an important risk factor for CVD (Bairey Merz et al. 2002). Patients with schizophrenia have an impaired ability to adapt to stress (Kudoh et al. 1999).

**Diabetes**

CVD is the main cause of death in patients with diabetes, accounting for 50% of all diabetes-related mortality and a high proportion of diabetes-related disability (Morrish et al 2001). Diabetes occurs in 15% of people with schizophrenia (Holt and Peveler 2005) compared with 5% of the general population (Bushe and Holt 2004). More recent meta-analyses of patients with SMI found one in three having metabolic syndrome, diabetes or prediabetes (Vancomfort et al. 2013, Mitchell et al. 2011). Risk factors include family history of diabetes, physical
inactivity, poor diet, smoking and the metabolic effects of antipsychotic medication (Gough and Peveler 2004). Patients with diabetes are three times more likely to suffer from depression (Goldney et al. 2004) and/or anxiety symptoms (Grigsby et al. 2002). This in turn further increases their risk of CVD due to poor self management of their condition (Williams and Pickup 2004).

### 2.4.2 Prevention of cardiovascular disease

There are two general strategies for the primary prevention of CVD: the population approach, in which population-wide changes in risk factors are made, and the high-risk approach in which individuals at high risk of the disease are identified and targeted for preventive treatment (Rose 1992). The former approach works on the assumption that making relatively small reductions in the most important risk factors for CVD (for example, blood cholesterol levels and blood pressure) throughout the whole population may lead to large reductions in CVD burden (Strachan and Rose 1991). In the UK, the government has made some effort to use this approach by producing policies and guidance for the general population regarding both physical activity (Department of Health (DH) 2011a) and diet (DH 2011b). However, the emphasis of current policy for the primary prevention of CVD is mainly placed on strategies to target those at high risk, for example health checks for people aged over 40 (DH 2009), diabetes annual reviews (British Medical Association and NHS Employers 2011) and smoking cessation services (DH 2011c). People with SMI are a high risk group; reducing any one of their independent risk factors can lead to a significant decrease in CVD risk (Table 2.2).
Table 2.2 Reductions in independent risk factors can lead to reduction in cardiovascular disease risk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk factor</th>
<th>Reduction</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blood cholesterol</td>
<td>10% decrease</td>
<td>30% decreased risk of cardiovascular disease (CVD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High blood pressure (&gt;140mm/Hg systolic or 90mm/Hg diastolic)</td>
<td>6mm/Hg reduction in diastolic blood pressure</td>
<td>16% reduction in risk of CVD; 42% reduction in risk of stroke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cigarette smoking</td>
<td>Cessation</td>
<td>50% reduction in risk of CVD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obesity</td>
<td>4-10kg weight reduction</td>
<td>27% reduction in risk of CVD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decrease in body mass index of one unit</td>
<td>8% reduction in risk of CVD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2.5 The physical health check

A Cochrane Effective Practice and Organisation Care (EPOC) Group Review (Tosh et al. 2010) did not identify any randomised trials which assessed the effectiveness of physical health monitoring in people with SMI. They concluded that guidance is based on expert consensus, clinical experience and good intentions. These experts have advocated the need to improve CVD monitoring and the provision of risk-factor guidance in people with SMI (Osborn et al. 2011, De Hert et al. 2009b, Kilbourne et al. 2007, Barnett et al. 2007). Authors of national guidance in the UK suggest that patients with SMI should receive a physical health check at least once a year, but recognize that research is needed (NICE 2010a, 2006). An annual review offers the opportunity to:

- Screen for diabetes, hypertension, raised cholesterol levels and other risk factors, and then offer prompt treatment to reduce the associated risk (Hardy and Gray 2010).
- Provide ongoing education to reduce the risks associated with poor diet, inactivity and smoking (Gray et al. 2009).
- Carry out a medication review (White and Hardy 2010).
2.6 The role of healthcare professional in the prevention of CVD in SMI

The authors of a qualitative study (including patients with SMI and staff from primary care and community mental health teams) suggest that neither primary nor secondary care services on their own can provide a comprehensive service to prevent CHD in patients with SMI (Wright et al. 2006). This view is shared by the charity Rethink; they have developed a tool to help primary and secondary care services to work together to monitor and address the physical health needs of people affected by mental illness (Rethink 2012).

Having written guidance on the prevention of CVD in people with SMI should aid healthcare professionals to deliver the appropriate intervention at the appropriate time. Eighteen specific sets of guidelines for the medical care of patients with severe mental illness or schizophrenia have been published since the year 2000 (De Hert et al. 2011). However, it is not clear whether these have influenced clinical practice (Mitchell et al. 2012a). What the guidelines have generally not stated is who should take responsibility for monitoring, the minimal frequency of monitoring, or how monitoring should be audited. In the United States of America, the key guideline was the American Diabetes Association (ADA) / American Psychiatric Association (APA) consensus document (2004). In the United Kingdom, three key guidelines are in place, namely National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE) guidelines for bi-polar disorder (2006), the revised NICE schizophrenia guidelines (2010a) and the GP contract for primary care (BMA and NHS Employers 2011). The European Psychiatric Association (De Hert et al. 2009b) have developed recommended actions to prevent CVD in people with SMI by clearly defining what needs to be
done when the patient is newly diagnosed, at initiation of treatment and at an annual health check.

2.6.1 Primary care

Primary Care in England is made up of practices which provide comprehensive acute and continuing medical care. They are considered to be the usual place for people with long term conditions that have an increased risk of CVD (such as diabetes) to attend for preventative care (NICE 2006, 2009, 2010a, Osborn et al. 2007). Authors of national guidance in England recommend that patients with SMI should receive a physical health check at least once a year (NICE 2006, 2010a). General Practitioners (GPs) in primary care are paid to provide CVD screening for this group every fifteen months through the Quality and Outcomes Framework (BMA and NHS Employers 2012). (In April 2013 the timeframe changed to the last 12 months). Between April 2004 and March 2011, payment was received if primary care practitioners documented that they had completed a review in people with SMI. There should have been evidence that the patient was offered screening, routine health promotion and prevention advice appropriate to their age, gender and health status, but these were not mandatory. This changed in April 2011, payment is now given for recording patients' alcohol consumption, body mass index (BMI), blood pressure, glucose and HDL cholesterol level (if over 40 years), and cervical screening within the last five years (if within national screening age). Waiting until patients are 40 years old to check their glucose and cholesterol may mitigate against good care as many risk factors can be identified earlier than this age in this patient group (De Hert et al. 2011).
Providing health checks for people with SMI in primary care affords the opportunity to enhance care integration, coordination, clinician accountability, and a sustained partnership in care (Galon and Graor 2012). This may be key to assisting individuals to meet their health needs and limit risk factors, thus preventing the development and progression of comorbid conditions (Galon and Graor 2012).

### 2.6.2 Secondary care

Current evidence suggests that mental health nurses do not consider the physical health care of their patients as being central to their role, or perceive themselves as inadequately trained to provide this aspect of care (Bradshaw and Pedley 2012). One study examining the attitudes of mental health nurses towards the physical health care of people with SMI (Robson et al. 2012) found that they were more positive if they had attended post-registration physical health training. However, an integrative literature review found that they are not routinely supported by physical health-care education and training (Blythe and White 2012). As many patients with SMI have no contact with secondary care services (Lester et al. 2004), they would be missed if mental health nurses had the responsibility of carrying out all health checks. However, mental health nurses are in a strong position to liaise between primary and secondary care services (DH 2006a); they should be encouraged to attain the skills required to assess and respond to the whole range of health needs in order to improve the physical wellbeing of their patients (Royal College of General Practitioners and the Royal College of Psychiatrists 2009, Royal College of Psychiatrists 2012, DH 2006a). This should include encouraging patients to attend their GP practice
for a physical health check or carrying out the health check themselves opportunistically. (NICE 2010a) Additionally mental health nurses should where indicated, support patients to attend established lifestyle groups (for example, a dieting group meeting or a smoking cessation support group), as well as providing ongoing lifestyle advice. For patients unwilling or unable to attend primary care, the mental health nurse should carry out the CVD risk screening (Royal College of Psychiatrists 2012). It could be worthwhile for secondary care services to set up their own lifestyle intervention groups for patients unable to participate in those open to the general population. There is some evidence to show this would be of benefit for smoking cessation (Evins et al. 2001), weight loss (Umbricht et al. 2001) and improved physical fitness (Marzialoni et al. 2009).

2.7 Barriers to the recognition and management of physical health in patients with severe mental illness

There are a number of barriers to the management of physical health in patients with SMI. These can be divided in to patient-related barriers and physician-related barriers (Figure 2.3) but often they are combination.
Figure 2.1 Barriers to management of cardiovascular disease in patients with severe mental illness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient related barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Difficulty understanding healthcare advice and/or carrying out the required lifestyle changes because of psychiatric symptoms and the adverse consequences of mental illness (SMI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Low health literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Severity of mental illness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Less compliant with treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Unawareness of physical problems as a result of cognitive deficits or reduced pain sensitivity associated with antipsychotic drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Migrant status and/or cultural and ethnic diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of social skills and difficulties communicating physical needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Missed appointment letters due to disrupted residential status (then seen as non-attenders)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Frequent changes of address may prevent the formation of relationships with clinicians</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary care physician-related barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Stigmatisation of people with mental disorders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Physical complaints regarded as psychosomatic symptoms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Suboptimal quality of care offered by clinicians to patients with SMI: lack of assessment, monitoring and continuity of care of the physical health status of people with SMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teams unequipped or underfunded to handle the behavioural and emotional problems of patients with SMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• See patients with SMI as non-attenders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from De Hert et al. (2011a)

Buhagiar et al. (2011) found that despite increased physical disease compared with people with non-psychotic mental illness and the general
population, people with SMI are likely to devote little attention to their lifestyle and physical health needs. The authors concluded this may be because of an impaired awareness of the implications of their high risk behaviour rather than a lack of motivation. If people with SMI do not consider themselves at risk of physical health problems then they may not attend for screening (Campion et al. 2005). However, if patients attend who are experiencing an acute phase of illness or their symptoms are not well controlled, taking this advice on board may not be on their agenda (De Hert et al. 2011a). This does make the consultation complex, but other research has shown that a lack of support and negative staff attitudes are possible barriers to their participation in lifestyle interventions (Roberts and Bailey 2011, Brunero and Lamont 2010).

Physician related barriers are not exclusive to primary care professionals; an Australian study of mental health workers revealed a sense of pessimism about improving physical health in people with chronic mental illness (Hyland et al. 2003). In addition, a survey carried out in the UK (Wright et al. 2006) found that some mental health staff felt that physical health was the remit of primary care and that management of disease risk/modifiable risk factors would be an inappropriate use of their skills and time. They also felt that responsibility for screening for CVD would blur their professional roles and that they lacked the expertise and resources to provide an adequate primary prevention service for CHD.

Healthcare professionals need to consider possible patient barriers for each individual (Roberts and Bailey 2011) and should actively promote health and offer suitable therapeutic interventions that reduce modifiable risk factors
for CVD. They should also consider the barriers that they themselves or their organisation may have created in this respect.

2.8 Summary of chapter

In this chapter I have provided a brief overview of why people with SMI die earlier than the rest of the population and the increased prevalence of physical illness in this group. I have then focused on the issues pertinent to the aims and objectives of the research: CVD in people with SMI; the roles and responsibilities of healthcare professionals; and the barriers in relation to this.

Part of this chapter has been published as:

Chapter three: Considerations of research in primary care

In this chapter I discuss how taking part in research is relatively new to many practice nurses and how this could affect the level of recruitment.

3.1 Background

Ninety per cent of people’s contact with the NHS is through primary care (DH 2012). Since the new GP contract was established in 2004 (DH 2003) the management of many long-term conditions, such as diabetes, depression and hypertension has shifted from secondary to primary care and become part of the practice nurse role (Macdonald et al. 2008). This shift has led to a corresponding increase in primary healthcare research (DH 2006b) and the establishment of Primary Care Research Networks. Practice teams are vital in this research for both recruitment and intervention purposes (Cooke et al. 2007). Current policy supports increasing involvement of nurses in this work (DH 2006b, UKCRC 2007).

The number of patients participating in research supported by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Primary Care Research Network has almost doubled over the last four years; reaching nearly 150,000 in 2010/11 (NIHR 2012a). There was considerable reinvestment in research in Northampton in 2010 which has led to the increase in research activity. In 2012, there were 20 research studies being carried out in primary care in Northamptonshire compared to 16 in 2011 (NIHR 2012b). At the start of this study in 2009 only three practices in Northamptonshire were engaged in any sort of research (NHS Northamptonshire 2010). This meant that being
approached to carry out research at this time was not usual practice for most healthcare professionals in primary care in Northampton.

### 3.2 Primary care view of research

Currently, knowledge of the perceptions and attitudes of practice nurses towards undertaking research as part of their clinical work is poor (Davies et al. 2002, Boase et al. 2012). McCabe and Timmins (2006) suggest that the focus of nursing is on getting the work done and is often task orientated; as a result, research might not be given high priority in a clinical role such as practice nursing. Additionally, the value of primary care nurses’ commitment to the success of externally funded research studies is seldom acknowledged (Bateman et al. 2006).

Boase et al. (2012) found that practice nurses considered it unfair that they received no remuneration for absorbing the research work into their normal clinical time, despite their employers receiving funding. They reported a feeling of isolation in regard to their research role within the practice. What's more, in the same study, nurses experienced resentment or concern from other nurses in their team where it was perceived that clinical time was being taken up by research resulting in increased work pressure overall. On a more encouraging note, most of the nurses felt that the experience of taking part in the research had positively changed their practice.

A low level of enthusiasm by nurses to take part in research can be caused if they are not consulted when the decision was made for them to be involved (Lock et al. 2006).
3.3 Practical issues for research in primary care

As practice nurses are employed directly by GPs and isolated from their peers, this may limit their independence in respect of carrying out any research activity (Kajermo et al. 2000). Their autonomy to run clinics varies, as does the time that they can allocate to each patient (Noakes and Johnson 2000). In a recent study, practice nurses reported that time influenced their engagement with the various aspects of the research including the trial process and the delivery of the complex intervention (Boase et al. 2012). Lack of work time was also the barrier most frequently mentioned for research in a study by Griffiths et al. (2001). This may be exacerbated if GPs employ practice nurses to undertake specific tasks and do not support them as researchers (Davies et al. 2002).

3.4 Being an insider researcher

As I am working in primary care delivering physical health checks to people with SMI, I share the characteristics, role, and experience under study. This is described as being an insider (Corbin Dwyer and Buckle 2009). For other areas of my research I am an outsider to the commonality shared by participants. Being an insider researcher could enhance my understanding of the population that may not be accessible to someone outside the field (Kanuha 2000) and allow me rapid and more complete acceptance by the practice nurses (Corbin Dwyer and Buckle 2009). However, the objectivity, reflexivity and authenticity of my research could be questioned because it may be viewed that I am too close to the project and too similar to those being studied (Kanuha 2000). Role confusion can occur in any research study but there is a higher risk when the researcher is familiar with the research setting or participants through a role
other than that of researcher (Asselin 2003). Good supervision from Professor Richard Gray and Dr Katherine Deane will be required to keep my research objective.

3.5 Summary of chapter

In this chapter I have briefly explained how taking part in research is a relatively new role for many practice nurses. I have also given details of some of the barriers that researchers may find when engaging practice nurses in their research and how my being an insider may affect my research. These factors have been given consideration when developing the programme of research explained in the next chapter.
Chapter four: Developing the programme of research

The aim of this programme of research is to address the physical health needs of people with SMI by improving the practice of healthcare professionals in primary care. This will be achieved by providing appropriate training. The programme of research is called the Northampton Physical Health and Wellbeing Project and is also known by the anacronym PhyHWell.

4.1 Research methods

Before developing the PhyHWell project I studied a number of methods which can be used in research.

4.1.1 Design strategies

Hennekens and Buring (1987) explain that analytical studies can be divided into those which are observational or experimental.

Observational studies

There are three types of observational investigation, the case control study, the cohort study and the cross sectional study. In a case control study, a group of patients who have a disease and another group of patients are selected. They are usually retrospective. A retrospective study looks backwards and examines exposures to suspected risk or protection factors in relation to an outcome that is established at the start of the study. Retrospective investigations are often criticised because error due to confounding and bias are more common than in prospective studies. However, there are benefits which include: being relatively inexpensive, smaller numbers are required, and they are quick to complete.
Cohort studies are usually prospective. Patients are selected on the basis of the presence or absence of exposure to a particular factor and then followed for a given period of time to observe for outcomes. The outcome of interest must be common or the number of outcomes observed will be too small to be statistically significant. Cross-sectional studies can be used to describe characteristics that exist in a population, but not to determine cause-and-effect relationships between different variables. This method is often used to make inferences about possible relationships or to gather preliminary data to support further research and experimentation.

*Experimental studies*

Experimental studies are also referred to as intervention studies or clinical trials. The intention is to improve the condition of a patient or a group of patients; for example, by evaluating the impact of a programme. They include RCTs, controlled non-randomised trials, controlled before-and-after and interrupted time series.

4.1.2 Hierarchies of evidence

There are a number of hierarchies of evidence which have been developed to rank research methodologies according to their validity (Evans 2002). The Scottish Intercollegiate Guidelines Network (SIGN) have developed a hierarchy which ranks the evidence for the efficacy of an intervention (figure 4.1). This hierarchy is used by NICE when reviewing the evidence for their guidelines (NICE 2004). After high quality meta-analyses and systematic reviews (of randomised control trials RCTs), RCTs with a very low risk of bias are
considered to be the highest standard of research evidence to determine the efficacy or effectiveness of a healthcare intervention or service (SIGN 2001). However, basing care in mental health solely on evidence from trials has been criticized as being unrealistic (Cooper 2003).

**Figure 4.1 Evidence of the efficacy of an intervention – did it work?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High quality meta-analyses, systematic reviews of RCTs (including cluster RCTs), or RCTs with a very low risk of bias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well conducted meta-analyses, systematic reviews of RCTs, or RCTs with a low risk of bias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meta-analyses, systematic reviews of RCTs, or RCTs with a high risk of bias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High quality systematic reviews of, or individual high quality non-randomised intervention studies (controlled non-randomised trial, controlled before-and-after, interrupted time series), comparative cohort and correlation studies with a very low risk of confounding, bias or chance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well conducted, non-randomised intervention studies (controlled non-randomised trial, controlled before-and-after, interrupted time series), comparative cohort and correlation studies with a low risk of confounding, bias or chance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-randomised intervention studies (controlled non-randomised trial, controlled before-and-after, interrupted time series), comparative cohort and correlation studies with a high risk of confounding, bias or chance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-analytical studies (eg case reports, case series)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert opinion, formal consensus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from SIGN (2001)
4.2 Designing the programme

When designing this programme of studies I considered the different design strategies and came to the decision that a programme of research which included a service evaluation would be the most informative. Using service evaluation as an approach can have a major impact on future health delivery and education and involves an intervention already in use (National Research Ethics Service 2009). There has been a plethora of service developments in primary care (e.g. DH 2008a) in response to policy drivers in the United Kingdom (e.g. DH 2008b, 2006c, Disability Rights Commission 2006).

To look at the effect of the training on nurses and patients, I have used the Interdisciplinary Chronic Disease Collaboration (ICDC) framework (Interdisciplinary Chronic Disease Collaboration 2012) and followed guidance from the Medical Research Council’s (MRC) framework for complex interventions (Craig et al. 2008). Within these frameworks I have designed the programme of research.

4.2.1 Research questions

From the literature it appeared that people with SMI are not being offered health checks in primary care (Roberts et al. 2007). Therefore the design needed to answer a number of questions:

1) Will patients attend for a health check if they are invited?

2) Are lifestyle interventions used for people with physical illnesses as effective when used with the SMI population?

3) What evidence is there for the efficacy of healthcare professional educational outcomes in studies of physical health in SMI?
4) Are as many people with SMI being screened for cardiovascular disease as people with physical conditions?

5) What effect will training have on the practice nurses’ motivation to carry out physical health checks for people with SMI?

6) Does training practice nurses to carry out physical health checks for people with severe mental illness increase the level of screening for cardiovascular risk?

7) What do patients think about physical health checks?

4.3 Using the Interdisciplinary Chronic Disease Collaboration framework to provide earlier detection and management of CVD in people with SMI

The Interdisciplinary Chronic Disease Collaboration (ICDC) is a motivated team of researchers whose overall objective is to improve the health of patients living with or at risk of a long term condition. The ICDC team is a novel collaboration between health care decision-makers, scientists and educators from 14 key disciplines that was formed to examine the issues related to treating patients with or at high risk of developing CVD. They have created a framework for researchers working with these patients (figure 4.2). SMI is a long term condition which carries a high risk of CVD; therefore the framework is appropriate with some adaptation for my research (figure 4.3). However, as there is little evidence and literature to support this framework I have also taken guidance from the Medical Research Council’s (MRC) framework for complex interventions (Craig et al. 2008).
Figure 4.2 Optimizing health outcomes for people with known chronic disease and earlier detection and management of undiagnosed chronic disease or its risk factors in patients at high risk of chronic disease.

Interdisciplinary Chronic Disease Collaboration (2012)
Figure 4.3 Optimizing health outcomes for people with SMI

Theme: to prevent or provide earlier detection of CVD in people with SMI by increasing the screening and lifestyle advice given to this group.

Phase One: Establish whether this group will attend and use standard interventions; review current evidence; focus on research which may affect change in clinical practice; develop training.

Phase Two: Collect data from audits, questionnaires and interviews to assess both medical and non-medical barriers to optimizing the health outcomes for people with SMI.

Phase Three: Evaluate the data and make recommendations for future training, research and policy.

Adapted from the Interdisciplinary Chronic Disease Collaboration (2012)

4.4 The Medical Research Council – complex interventions framework

Complex interventions are usually described as interventions that contain several interacting components. The MRC has updated and extended the 2000 Framework for complex interventions. The intention of the revised guidance is not to be prescriptive but to help researchers, funders, and other decision makers to make appropriate methodological and practical choices (Craig et al. 2008). It has re-emphasised some of the key messages, but also tried to address the limitations by providing a more flexible and less linear model of the process. Craig et al. suggest that identifying a single primary outcome may not make best use of the data; therefore a range of measures will be needed.

Figure 4.4 summarises the main stages and the key functions and activities at each stage and figure 4.5 shows the adaptations for this research. The arrows indicate the main interactions between the phases. The stages need not follow
a linear or even a cyclical sequence. Reporting is not shown as a separate activity, because the authors suggest it should be seen as an important element of each stage in the process.

**Figure 4.4 MRC key elements of the development and evaluation process**

![Diagram showing the MRC key elements of the development and evaluation process.]

Craig *et al.* (2008)

**Figure 4.5 PhyHWell key elements of the development and evaluation process**

![Diagram showing the PhyHWell key elements of the development and evaluation process.]

Adapted from Craig *et al.* (2008)
4.5 A programme of studies

A programme of studies involves projects that are complete on their own and may be both qualitative and quantitative (Morse 2003). They are then used together to form essential components of one research programme (Morse 2003). This brings together understanding of meaning and context to provide fuller discernment and greater transportability of the phenomenon under study (Strange and Miller 2006). Each of my studies has been designed and conducted to answer a specific question; this provides a more detailed and balanced picture of the situation than using one method alone (Altrichter et al. 2008). A further advantage is that each study maintains its own world view (Morse 2003). The separate studies are reported in concurrent chapters to show a logical sequence.

Each individual study has been published in a different journal. I intend to write a critique that reports the findings of all the studies so that the results of the whole programme are published together (Strange and Miller 2006).

The programme is divided into three phases using the ICDC framework.

4.5.1 Phase one

1. Identify whether patients with SMI will attend for a health check if they are invited.

2. Find out if lifestyle interventions used for people with physical illnesses are as effective when used with the SMI population.

3. Search for the evidence for the efficacy of healthcare professional educational outcomes in studies of physical health in SMI.
4. Develop training for practice nurses to deliver health checks for people with SMI (PhyHWell).

4.5.2 Phase two

1. Find out whether as many people with SMI are being screened for CVD as people with diabetes in Northampton.
2. Find out whether as many people with SMI are being screened for CVD as people with diabetes in England.
3. Determine the effect of the PhyHWell training on the practice nurses’ motivation to carry out physical health checks for people with SMI.
4. Establish whether training practice nurses increases CVD screening and lifestyle intervention in people with SMI.
5. Ascertain the patients’ views about physical health checks.

4.5.3 Phase three

1. Evaluate the data.
2. Publish and disseminate.
3. Make recommendations for future training, research and policy.

4.6 Ethical and research governance issues

Nurses have a duty to ensure that they provide their patients with safe and competent care (Nursing and Midwifery Council, 2008). As all research has the potential to be harmful to participants and researchers (Long & Johnson 2007), nurses should also make certain that their studies are safe, robust and ethical (Royal College of Nursing 2009). Audit studies do not have to be formally
reviewed by a research ethics committee; but as the distinction between audit and research is often a grey area, external ethical consideration will ensure that the potential moral issues are addressed fully (Wade, 2005). Therefore I took the programme of research to the Regional Ethical Committee. They suggested that most parts of the project were a service evaluation and did not need their approval, but the qualitative interviews with patients did, so I should resubmit this part separately (appendix 1). The whole programme of research was approved by the Research and Development department, NHS Northampton (appendix 2). Additionally as Community Mental Health Nurses were to be involved in the training I sought and was granted approval from Northamptonshire NHS Healthcare Trust Clinical Governance Support team (appendix 3).

4.6.1 Declaration of Helsinki
I ensured that this study was conducted in full conformity with the current revision of the Declaration of Helsinki (last amended October 2000, with additional footnotes added 2002 and 2004).

4.6.2 ICH Guidelines for Good Clinical Practice
I ensured that this study was conducted in full conformity with relevant regulations and with the ICH Guidelines for Good Clinical Practice (CPMP/ICH/135/95) July 1996.
4.6.3 Data Handling and Record Keeping

I complied with the requirements of the Data Protection Act 1998 with regard to the collection, storage and processing of information and upheld the Act’s core principles. The participants were identified by a study specific participant number. The name and any other identifying detail were not included in any study data electronic file. All study data were entered onto a secure computer system with user names and passwords. Written notes were transferred to this computer then shredded.

4.7 Preparing practices

Prior to training the practice nurses, I met with the Practice Manager of each participating surgery. I suggested that it would be helpful to give the practice nurses more time to carry out the health checks for patients with SMI than they would have for other patients (e.g. diabetes). This is recommended in the GP’s contract guidance (BMA and NHS Employers 2012). However, I was unable to offer any remuneration for this.

Many of the nurses participating in the PhyHWell project had not been consulted by their employers when they made the decision to take part. Therefore I needed to show an understanding of the nurses’ position in order to motivate them to engage in the research.

4.8 Summary of chapter

In this chapter I have explained how I have developed my programme of research. I have also described the ICDC and MRC frameworks which were used to structure the programme and explained ethical and governance issues.
Chapter five: Will patients with severe mental illness attend primary care for a health check?

This chapter explains how an invitation appointment letter is effective in prompting patients with SMI to attend a physical health check in primary care by comparing it to those with diabetes.

5.1 Background

Many clinicians believe that patients with SMI will not attend primary care for a health check (Lester et al. 2005), yet there is little evidence to demonstrate that they are actually poor at attending in response to an invitation. Consequently there is limited guidance on how best to promote attendance. Most primary care practices invite their patients to long term condition clinics by way of an invitation letter which asks the patient to make an appointment at their convenience (Brown et al. 1992, NICE 2010a). A study carried out in a primary care centre in England showed that letters offering patients (without a particular diagnosis) an appointment (with a specific date and time) for a health check produced a much higher attendance rate (70%) than letters containing an open invitation (37%) (Norman and Connor 1993). To date only one study by Harvey et al. (2005) has tested whether an invitation letter (requesting the patient makes an appointment to attend the practice) is an effective method of increasing the level of attendance of patients with schizophrenia for a primary care physical health check. Carried out in an inner city setting, fewer than one in five patients, half the number who responded in the general population, made an appointment and actually saw a Practice Nurse.
5.2 Method

My aim was to explore whether a letter offering an appointment with a predetermined date and time would be effective in prompting patients with SMI to attend for a primary care health check. If patients will not attend for a health check then it would not be a good use of resources to set up a clinic for this purpose.

This is a retrospective comparison of the response rate of patients with SMI and diabetes to an invitational appointment letter to attend for a primary care health check in my own practice.

Patients with SMI were sent an appointment at a pre-determined time and date to have their physical health reviewed. A letter was sent out 10 days prior to the appointment (figure 5.1); a copy of the letter was placed in the patients' notes. For patients with diabetes, letters were sent out two to three weeks ahead of the fixed appointment. The gap between the letter being sent out and the appointment was shorter for the SMI group because of the cognitive problems (e.g. poor memory and planning) associated with their condition. The letter gave the patient an option to contact the surgery if they had any questions or concerns, or wanted to change the date or time of the appointment.
I carried out an audit of all patients with SMI or diabetes who were offered an appointment by letter between the first of January 2010 and the 31st of December 2010. I examined:

- The lists of patients who had been invited over the last year (I keep monthly lists in order to monitor cancellations).
- The computer records of each patient on the on the invitation lists to see if an invite letter was recorded.
- The SMI clinic and diabetes clinic lists recorded on the GP practice computer system to identify the invited attendees of over the last year.
- The individual records of patients who had been offered a health check by written invitation and had not attended in an attempt to discover why they had not come, e.g. were they in hospital, incorrect address, regularly did not attend appointments.
Demographic information was extracted by electronic audit from the SMI and diabetes disease registers. Individual patient records were examined to determine whether or not they attended for a health check at the date and time stated in the invitational letter.

Data Analysis
I sought advice from Allan Clarke, statistician at the University of East Anglia. He suggested that I calculate crude odds ratio to explore whether the patient’s diagnosis (SMI or diabetes) made a difference to the numbers responding to an invitation for a health check. This is the standard test used when you want to compare the odds of something occurring in two different groups (Plitcha and Garzon 2009). The odds of an event occurring is the probability of the event divided by the probability of an event not occurring. It is the ratio of the odds for the first group and the odds for the second group.

Ethical approval
I submitted the protocol to the GP practice Caldicott guardian and it was given written approval.

5.2.1 Other possible methods
I considered carrying this audit out prospectively in my own practice but this would have taken more time. Additionally, the method of inviting patients would not have changed. I could have carried out the audit prospectively in another practice to reduce the possibility of bias, but I was unaware of any Northampton practice carrying out regular clinics for people with SMI at that time.
Other methods of invitation other than letter such as phone calls, opportunistic invitation with an appointment at the time, contact via carers or invites by other healthcare professionals such as the Community Mental Health Worker are all helpful methods for inviting patients with SMI to an appointment. They were not included in this study as I wanted to find out whether the use of an invitational letter alone was successful in getting patients to attend.

5.3 Results

There were approximately 10,000 patients registered at the practice. One hundred and twelve patients were listed on the SMI register (1.11% prevalence); 64 (57%) were male. Of the 534 patients on the diabetes register (5.3% prevalence), 289 (54%) were males (there was no significant difference in the gender ratio of patients). A small number (n=11) of patients were on both registers. Patients with SMI were significantly younger than those with diabetes (p<.01; see table 5.1).

Table 5.1 Age groups of participants in the audit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age range</th>
<th>Patients with SMI (n=112)</th>
<th>Patients with diabetes (n=534)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17-44</td>
<td>42 (37%)</td>
<td>57 (10.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45+</td>
<td>70 (63%)</td>
<td>477 (89.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Letters were not sent to the 138 patients (from both groups) who were currently inpatient, in residential care or prison. In total, invitation letters offering an appointment were sent to 508 patients, 92 with SMI and 416 with diabetes. The majority of patients from both groups attended at the date and time specified in
Patients with diabetes were more likely to attend for a health check compared with those with SMI (OR=2.20 95% CI=1.13-3.62). Patients with SMI that did not attend were followed up where possible by a telephone call either to themselves and/or their carer or community mental health worker. A letter was also sent offering another appointment. An additional four (4%) SMI patients attended a health check in response to the follow up increasing the total number that attended to 65 (70%). Fifty-three percent of patients with SMI had no contact with secondary care.

Table 5.2 Attendance for health checks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendance for health checks</th>
<th>Diabetes (n=416)</th>
<th>SMI (n=92)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attended for a health check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the offered time and date</td>
<td>321 (77%)</td>
<td>59 (64%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After changing time and date</td>
<td>17 (4%)</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not attend for health check</td>
<td>78 (19%)</td>
<td>31 (34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancelled the appointment</td>
<td>22 (5%)</td>
<td>7 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not attend (no reason)</td>
<td>56 (13%)</td>
<td>24 (26%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 Discussion

The prevalence rate for SMI in this practice was slightly higher than the United Kingdom national average of 0.5-1% (National Audit Office 2007); the diabetes incidence equates to that of England (Diabetes UK 2011). Fifty-seven percent of
patients with SMI were male, but this small majority may not reflect a statistical significant increase in the prevalence of SMI in men.

The aim of this audit was to examine whether an invitation letter with a predetermined appointment is effective in ensuring patients with SMI attend a physical health check in primary care. Although I have demonstrated patients with SMI are less likely to attend than patients with diabetes, it is striking that the proportion of the SMI patients who attended in my audit was much higher than those in a similar study by Harvey et al. (2005). It could be that patients in a suburban area (as in this study) are more likely to attend than those in an urban one (as in Harvey et al.’s study). Alternatively, Harvey et al. required patients to make an appointment, I sent them one. Given that people with schizophrenia can have cognitive problems (Andreasen 1995) and people with bipolar disorder may have impairment regarding daily functioning, even during remission (Martínez-Arán et al. 2004), the complexity of the task might have been a barrier. Offering a set time and date removes steps in the process and may explain my enhanced response rate. It is also possible that my response rate was higher because our letter gave details about who would be doing the health check rather than asking them to make an appointment with an unnamed person.

The results revealed that patients with SMI also responded to an additional invitation after non-attendance. As this group experience fluctuating symptoms there is a need to develop an alternative strategy when they are in an acute phase of illness (Iyer et al. 2005). This could be inviting them again in a few months rather than a few weeks.
The difference in attendance rates between the two groups may have been affected by age rather than diagnosis; patients with diabetes were older and it is possible they may be more likely to adhere to a letter from their doctor asking them to attend a clinic. To make this clearer I should have made an adjustment for the difference in age between the two groups in the statistical analysis using logistic regression methods. (The information for this study was extracted straight from the computer records using the current population and not stored on an excel or SPSS spreadsheet. It is therefore not possible to make this analysis now as the population may have changed). An Australian health survey (Deeks et al. 2009) ascertained that younger participants are less likely to have annual health checks, seek advice or attend education sessions. However, another study has shown that age is not a factor affecting response to an invitation to attend for a health check (Thorogood et al. 1993). It is perhaps also worth noting that patients with diabetes generally seem to be much better at attending for health checks compared to those with other long term conditions. This may be because as a population, patients with diabetes have been educated to recognise the importance of health checks from diagnosis through courses such as DESMOND (Davies et al. 2008). (DESMOND is a programme of patient education modules and related educator training, which have been developed by a collaborative of NHS organisations). My sample of SMI patients in fact compares very favourably with the attendance rates observed in other long term conditions.

It is difficult to assess whether my audit reflects the wider population. As health checks for people with SMI have been offered for the past six years (since this was part of the GPs’ payment contract in 2004) in this practice by the
same practitioner (at the time of the audit), the response rate to invitation letters is likely to be higher than that of a practice offering a new service (as in the study by Harvey et al.). It does, however, highlight what can be achieved over time.

5.5 Limitations

As this is a retrospective audit there is more risk of error due to confounding and bias. This risk is increased as I have carried out an audit of my own practice.

5.6 Summary of chapter

I have described in this chapter how sending patients with SMI in primary care an invitation appointment letter with a predetermined time and date for a health check may be effective in getting them to attend. This study has been published as: Hardy S and Gray R. (2012) Is the use of an invitation letter effective in prompting patients with severe mental illness to attend a primary care physical health check? Primary Health Care Research & Development. 13 347-352.
Chapter six: Are food diaries a useful clinical tool for people with Severe Mental Illness?

In the last chapter I explained how patients with SMI will attend for a health check if they are invited. However, there is some concern from healthcare professionals that if these patients do attend, the tools employed to improve lifestyle for the general population in primary care will not be effective (Lester et al. 2005). As there are many approaches and different tools to help patients improve their lifestyle I decided to choose one as an example. In this chapter I explain how food diaries which are used for patients with physical conditions can be just as helpful in the SMI population.

6.1 Background

Lifestyle factors such as low levels of physical activity and unhealthy food choices are prevalent in people with SMI (Henderson et al. 2006, McCreadie 2003, Allison & Casey 2001). Poor diet can cause a range of other physical and emotional effects due to inadequate nutrition (Peet 2004). For example a lack of essential fatty acids can lead to a number of problems such as infertility, poor wound healing and liver degeneration and a reduced intake of calcium can cause depression and tooth decay (Stewart 2010).

Studies have demonstrated that people with schizophrenia are able to benefit from education about nutrition and a healthy lifestyle (Bushe et al. 2005, Wirshing et al. 2006) and this should be a routine part of the patient’s annual physical review (Hardy and Gray 2010). However, there is a perception amongst health care workers that making lifestyle changes amongst people with
SMI, even if risk CHD factors are identified, would be difficult (Wright et al. 2006). I wanted to illustrate that a tool used in the general population can be just as effective in people with SMI.

Food diaries are often used in primary care as a tool to provide tailored feedback to patients on the quality of their diet; there is evidence to show that food diaries help people to lose weight by making overt the calories they are actually consuming (Hollis et al. 2008). Food diaries have been suggested as a helpful tool for people with schizophrenia (Rethink 2010); yet, I found little research using food diaries as a method to give us an in-depth insight into the quality of the diets of people with schizophrenia, or that illustrate their benefit to these patients. For example, a study by McDougall (1992) employed food diaries, but their use was only a small part of a larger package of education to eleven patients with schizophrenia and their contents were not explored; Henderson et al. (2006) used food diaries in their study of 88 patients with schizophrenia, but they used them as a data collection tool to measure the quantity of nutrients. The lack of employment of food diaries in this group maybe because clinicians and researchers perhaps have the belief that patients with schizophrenia do not have the cognitive ability to complete the task.

There is not a good understanding of the quality of the diet chosen by people with schizophrenia. I offer physical health checks to people with SMI and have observed the heterogeneity of dietary preferences and diet literacy. I wanted to explore whether using a food diary as a process would allow both a quantitative and qualitative assessment of the diet.
6.2 Method

This was a prospective audit of eight patients attending for a physical health check with myself. I asked the first eight patients with schizophrenia who attended from a predetermined date: (1) to complete food diaries; and (2) for permission to record their opinion about their own diet during the health check. The food diary I used was one side of A4 paper with a column for each day of the week divided into hourly time slots (appendix 4).

When introducing the use of food diaries in the primary care setting to any patient, they are given specific instructions to record everything that they eat and drink over the period of one week in the relevant day and time slot. No changes were made to these instructions for the purpose of this audit.

I chose a sample size of eight patients as this is an ample quantity to achieve enough information and small enough to permit examination of each food diary. This was a convenience sample and as such did not allow me to have any control over the representativeness (gender, age, race, education, etc.) of the sample to the whole population of people with schizophrenia (Lunneborg 2007).

Open questions were used as part of the patient’s usual consultation to ask their opinion about completing the diary. These were recorded in the the patients records following the consultation. This is usual practice when using diaries with any patient in primary care. The information was then transferred in an anonymised form to my secure computer.
Data analysis

A full thematic analysis could not be carried out from simple food intake recordings as I did not question beyond what the patients had written. This was in order for the consultation to remain usual practice. I was able to identify seven themes from the food diaries. I followed guidance from Howitt and Cramer (2010). I applied brief verbal descriptions to small chunks of data. I then adjusted these descriptions to become codings in the light of the full picture of the data. On the basis of these codings I was able to identify themes which I clarified with my supervisor (Richard Gray). An example of one theme was mealtime routines which emerged through the food diaries being divided into hourly slots for each day.

Ethical approval

I submitted the protocol to the GP practice’s Caldicott guardian and it was given written approval. Patients were informed that the information would be used in a professional journal publication and would remain anonymous. Before asking them I made an assessment of their mental capacity. All patients who attended were capable of giving consent and they all agreed to carry out the task and gave permission to record the diary contents and their responses. This verbal informed consent was recorded in their computer records. Written consent was not sought as this study was viewed as an evaluation of usual practice. However, if I was to carry out a study like this again I would seek approval from the regional ethics committee and would obtain written consent from each patient.
6.2.1 Other possible methods

I considered carrying out the audit retrospectively but the food diaries are usually kept by the patients so this would not have been possible. Additionally I would not have had a record of their opinions about their diet. I could have carried out the audit in one of the participating practices. This would have reduced bias because I would have been evaluating an intervention delivered by a third party and not myself. However, as using food diaries to help people with SMI improve their diet may not have been usual practice in other surgeries, this would have involved them providing additional care. Getting practices to recruit to the study for training had already been an issue.

6.3 Demographic information

Demographic information (age, gender, housing status and occupational status), body mass index (BMI), smoking status, exercise level, contact with secondary care, information about who shops and cooks, and prescribed antipsychotic medication were obtained from the patients’ computer records. This group were aged between 33 years and 83 years, with a mean age of 53 years (s.d. 15.60). There were five women and three men. Five patients lived alone, one in a nursing home and two with relatives. Five patients were unemployed, one was retired and two were working (part-time low paid employment). The mean body mass index was 27 kg/m² (s.d. 4.64 - two obese, four overweight and two within normal range). Three patients reported that they were currently smoking cigarettes. The patients' preferred form of exercise was walking. They all claimed that they did this regularly, though the level of walking and frequency varied enormously from a short walk to the shops twice a week.
to an hour of walking daily. All the patients were managed in primary care apart from one who received a monthly visit from a community mental health nurse.

Six of the patients bought and prepared their own food, one had food prepared by a relative and one by nursing home staff. All patients were currently prescribed antipsychotic medication: five were taking an atypical only [quetiapine, risperidone, olanzapine, aripiprazole (two patients)] one was taking an atypical and a typical (olanzapine, chlorpromazine), one was taking two atypicals (amisulpride, olanzapine) and one was taking a typical only (trifluoperazine).

6.4 Results

Seven themes were identified: fruit and vegetables, lack of variety, meal time routines, a ready meal diet, fluid intake, treat eating and diet literacy. Responses tended to be brief which may be characteristic of the cognitive problems of schizophrenia.

Fruit and vegetables

Eating fruit and vegetables was largely absent, even the patient with the highest intake of fruit and vegetables was eating well below the recommended daily intake (five portions a day recommended in the United Kingdom by the Food Standards Agency). By viewing the type and counting the numbers of portions of fruit and vegetables consumed each day, I observed a considerable degree of variation. For example, over the week, the patient with the highest intake reported eating bananas, grapes, oranges, an apple, cherry tomatoes, carrots, roasted parsnips, broccoli, salad and drinking daily fruit juice compared to the
patient with the lowest intake who reported eating some salad in a sandwich once that week. Overall patients repeatedly turned their noses up and reported that they did not like or could not afford vegetables.

‘No…I don’t like them.’

Patient 2 (33 year old female)

‘I only like apples but I can’t bite them now…’ (Rotten teeth)

Patient 3 (60 year old female)

‘I don’t really like vegetables, fruit’s ok, I suppose…I know it’s good for you but I don’t really have enough money to buy them anyway.’

Patient 4 (51 year old male)

‘The only fruit I like costs too much.’ (grapes, berries)

Patient 6 (39 year old female)

Lack of variety

There was very little variety in most of the patients’ diets with little apparent insight that this may not be healthy. Patient 1 had two eggs for breakfast everyday, Patient 2 had a ready meal of ‘chicken dinner’ on five out of seven days, Patient 3 had a scone for tea and egg sandwiches for breakfast everyday and Patient 5 had a cheese and tomato sandwich four out of seven days.
‘I eat them (eggs) every day because they are good for you.’
Patient 1 (44 year old female)

‘I like chicken dinner…’
Patient 2 (33 year old female)

I like them (scones)…?
Patient 3 (60 year old female)

‘They (café) make nice cheese sandwiches.’
Patient 5 (61 year old male)

Mealtime routine
As the food diaries are divided into hourly slots for each day, I was able to get a sense of when meals were being eaten. Breakfast was rarely missed and usually eaten between 7 am and 9 am. Most of the diaries illustrated a regular meal time pattern. The meal most likely to be missed seemed to be the evening meal.

‘I usually don’t bother to eat in the evening. Sometimes I just go to bed.’
Patient 2 (33 year old female)

‘I always have my dinner at 12.’
Patient 3 (60 year old female)
‘Breakfast is the best meal of the day!’

Patient 8 (83 year old female)

Ready meal diet

Some meals were home cooked but most patients relied on ready meals (examples: cottage pie, roast dinner, Chinese rice dinner) and convenience food and café bought snacks such as pizza, pies, sausage rolls, burgers, fish and chips or sandwiches.

‘I just go out to the caff when I get up…’

Patient 4 (51 year old male)

‘I really don’t feel like going shopping, then having to spend time cooking and washing up…it’s easier just to get a sandwich or a pork pie.’

Patient 5 (61 year old male)

‘I get what I fancy from Morrison’s…’

Patient 8 (83 year old female)

Fluid intake

Generally patients were drinking very little fluid, some recording as little as one or two cups of tea a day. There was a perception that they only needed to drink if they felt thirsty. There was one exception (Patient 7) whose food diary showed he was drinking about five litres a day.
‘I usually have a drink with my meals and before I go to bed.’
Patient 1 (44 year old female)

‘I don’t get thirsty, so I don’t need to drink much.’
Patient 2 (33 year old female)

‘Should I drink more…? I’m never thirsty.’
Patient 3 (60 year old female)

‘If I drank anymore I would always be running to the toilet!’
Patient 8 (83 year old female)

Treat Eating
Looking through the food diaries, I noted the foods eaten outside the routine meal times, typically were chocolate bars, biscuits, crisps or cake. A few patients had pudding after some meals. Patient 5 ate four Kit Kats during this week. However, most of the patients were only eating treats once or twice a week.

‘I like pudding…but you don’t really need it, do you?’
Patient 1 (44 year old female)

‘I always have my biscuits in the morning…they keep me going.’
Patient 3 (60 year old female)
‘I really like Kit Kats!’
Patient 5 (61 year old male)

Diet Literacy
It was notable that the general perception was that the food they ate was healthy, yet on the whole, the diaries portrayed a picture of unhealthy diets (high fat and salt, low nutritional content). Patient 4 only ate once a day at a café. Only Patient 6 recorded drinking any alcohol (5 units during this week). The participants gave very little detail on what they were eating but they all managed to complete this task.

‘I enjoy my food and think I eat all the right things’
Patient 1 (44 year old female)

‘I don’t need to worry about it (his diet) because I go to the caff.’
Patient 4 (51 year old male)

‘I don’t drink…it doesn’t mix with my medication.’
Patient 5 (61 year old male)

‘Yes, my diet’s good.’
Patient 8 (83 year old female):
6.5 Discussion

My sample size of patients with schizophrenia is too small to accurately compare with that of other larger studies; yet I have made some interesting observations. The mean BMI of my group was similar to larger studies (Thakore et al. 2002, Allison et al. 1999). Most of the group did not smoke which is not consistent with the patients observed in other studies (Goff et al. 2005). As four of the patients I observed had never smoked, I cannot argue that this divergence is due to them receiving an annual physical health check which included smoking cessation advice over the last six years. It is recognized that people with SMI are more physically inactive than the general population (McCreadie 2003), yet, all patients in this audit reported walking regularly. As I have no accurate measure of the quantity or frequency of their walking, it maybe that their level of activity is actually quite low. Because physical activity can have a positive effect on psychological well-being in people with schizophrenia (Bradshaw et al. 2005) as well as a physical benefit; we need to consider what may be effective strategies for promoting physical activity in this population, as standard interventions are not always effective.

The patients in this audit are eating well below the recommended (in the United Kingdom) five portions (400g) of fruit and vegetables a day (Food Standards Agency 2010b). Surveys have shown that a large proportion of the general population of the United Kingdom are also eating less (in England in 2006, the daily fruit and vegetables purchased was 350g, and in Scotland it was 295g - Office for National Statistics 2008), but it is still notably more than the people with SMI in this audit. This reduced intake of fruit and vegetables is perturbing, as apart from the well known benefits of fruit and vegetables, a
study (Joshipura et al. 2001) has shown that people who eat many fruits and vegetables, independent of any other health factors, have fewer heart attacks. With the population of people with SMI being at a higher risk of heart disease, increasing their fruit and vegetable intake could be a preventative strategy to reduce cardiovascular risk.

One reason for the low consumption of fruit and vegetables given by the participants in my audit was that they are too expensive and they could not afford to buy them (all of our participants are in receipt of benefits or in low paid work). This is consistent with the findings of a study in carried out in Scotland (McCreadie et al. 2005), which showed that the diet of people with schizophrenia can improve when they are given free fruit and vegetables. However, six months after the free supply had stopped; consumption fell back to pre-intervention levels. McCreadie et al. believe that this was because after the intervention stopped, patients had to buy their own fruit and vegetables. Providing diet advice will not make fruit and vegetables affordable either and one could argue that the provision of advice without the means to achieve the outcomes may only serve to cause frustration and resentment.

Variety in diet is important, not only to relieve boredom of eating the same foods but to ensure the adequate intake of vitamins, minerals, proteins, fibre carbohydrates and fats. Some of the food the diaries recorded in this audit did show a level of variety, but most were very routinised and repetitive. The lack of adequate nourishing ingredients is consistent with the findings of Henderson’s study (Henderson et al. 2006) which did not look at the variety in the diet, but measured the intake of the above nutrients by people with schizophrenia and found them to be lower than the general population. The
patients in this audit did not appear to be bored with what they are eating and showed little awareness of the importance of variety in their diet. Working with each patient using their diary as a starting point, would provide a guide for the healthcare professional to explain individual improvements. Only guidance appropriate to that particular patient would need to be offered, taking into account their obvious preferences, rather than giving them general diet advice. This negates the need for the patients, who may by the nature of their condition have some cognitive impairment, to filter out less important messages.

The patients in this group relied on ready meals and convenience foods for most of their dinners. These foods tend to be high in saturated fats and salt which can contribute to high blood pressure and cholesterol and low in nutrients such as vitamins and minerals needed to promote good health. Most of the patients in my audit bought and prepared their own food, but that does not inform us of the reasons that they maybe reliant on these foods. In order to provide useful education and helpful advice about eating a healthier diet, the healthcare professional needs to find out what these reasons are in each individual case. Some patients may lack the skills of food preparation, in which case, practical help will be needed in order to assist them to gain these skills if they so wish. Given the nature of the condition and the fact they are preparing food for themselves and eating alone, some patients may lack the motivation to prepare a proper meal. In this instance, it maybe beneficial to review whether it is the patient's medication is causing increased tiredness and considering a possible alternative. As eating is a social activity, exploring with the patient how their social network could be widened may improve the quality of their diet.
The food diaries showed that, even though the majority of patients are not working, they are still getting up to eat breakfast and appear to follow an ordered routine. This contrasts with the chaotic lifestyle or spending the day in bed, which is often described in this population. Perhaps their rigid routine is due to a lack of flexibility and is another indication of poor cognitive function (MacGabe 2008). Considering this more positively, people with schizophrenia seem to do best in well-organized home environments with regular routines that include meals, sleep, work and recreation (Minato & Zemke 2006). It could be the case that the patients in this group have been taught that maintaining a routine can be helpful, or perhaps they have found this out for themselves. Often when we offer general diet advice we advocate developing a routine; this is an example of where promoting this message may be unnecessary and only result in clouding the important ones.

The diaries revealed that not all the patients were eating the same things in the same amounts and at the same times. This confirms my view that interventions offered by healthcare professionals need to be considered on an individual basis in order to be effective (Hardy 2009).

My audit revealed a lower fluid intake than recommended for healthy hydration (1200mls for people in the United Kingdom, Food Standards Agency 2010c). Drinking too little is in common with the rest of the population, yet my group drank substantially less and reported that they did not feel thirsty. As this is a very small study, a much larger population is needed to explore whether my results are representative of the population of SMI. An American study (Farley et al. 1986) concluded that psychosis can severely impair the thirst mechanism directly. This is an old study and included only one patient; however it may go
some way to explain why the patients in this audit did not feel thirsty. Most people do not wait until they are thirsty to drink as social and cultural factors, e.g. work breaks, meeting up with friends prompt them; thirst offers a backup to these behavioural factors. We need to advise patients with schizophrenia who may not have these prompts to increase their fluid intake, explaining that they should not wait until they are thirsty to drink. Conversely, we should be mindful of polydipsia. A person suffering from polydipsia drinks too much fluid; this can cause hyponatraemia which can lead to coma and even death. It has been estimated that between six and 17% of psychiatric inpatients suffer from polydipsia (Brooks & Ahmed 2007). The food diaries also highlighted that the patient living in the nursing home was suffering from this condition. The patient in this study has spent his life in institutional care and no one had recognised this overconsumption of fluid. I have discussed this finding with his care staff.

A study showed that a higher national dietary intake of refined sugar and dairy products predicted a worse two year outcome of schizophrenia (Peet 2004). A high sugar intake in a person with schizophrenia can be seen as a critical indicator of poor general health and well-being (Houghton 1982). Fortunately, the patients in this audit are not eating too many sugary or fatty snacks, which as well as giving them a better outcome of schizophrenia, it has benefits for their dental health and reduces their risk of developing cardiovascular disease and diabetes. I don’t know whether these patients recognise this benefit or whether they are unable to afford to buy themselves treats.

It is perceived that people with schizophrenia drink more alcohol than the general population. In the United Kingdom, at the time of study, this factor was
viewed as important enough to consider payment to GPs to monitor patients with schizophrenia for alcohol use (NICE 2010a). This has since been implemented through the GPs’ payment contract (BMA and NHS Employers 2012). However, the patients in this audit did not drink alcohol. This may be because they are all taking antipsychotic medication, they have taken on board the advice that their medication can cause sedation and impair coordination (as described by Patient 5), and that using alcohol can further increase any impairment (Rethink 2008). Other reasons may be lack of money to buy alcohol, the fact they are not socialising or maybe they merely chose not to record their alcohol intake. Whatever the reasons, my results are consistent with the findings of Henderson et al. (2006), who also found that patients with schizophrenia had a lower alcohol intake than the general population.

McCreadie (2005) argues that many patients with schizophrenia come into the category of population subgroups that are not fully able to make wise, informed choices about dietary health. My findings certainly substantiate this view, as most of this group considered themselves to have a good diet despite recording the opposite. It could be argued that this would change if the people with schizophrenia were offered pertinent education about nutrition and a healthy lifestyle (Bushe et al. 2006, Wirshing et al. 2006).

It is a concern that these patients may think their diet is adequate, and when in a consultation with a busy healthcare professional may report that their diet is good. Because most of the literature regarding the physical health of people with schizophrenia focuses on obesity, if their body mass index (BMI) is within normal range, some healthcare professionals may assume diet advice is unnecessary. What I found alarming was that the patient with the lowest BMI
had the unhealthiest diet and without the use of the food diary I may not have discovered this.

Patients with schizophrenia who have poor dietary literacy need ongoing education about a healthy diet and how to prepare simple healthy meals in order to facilitate making a positive change. There is no one size fits all way to help patients with schizophrenia to improve their diet. The results show that a personalised approach is necessary. Education and interventions for the schizophrenia population should focus on overall lifestyle factors such as physical activity, their social situation as well as advising healthy food choices. Consideration should be given to how patients in financial difficulty can afford to buy the necessary quantity of fruit and vegetables to maintain their physical health.

6.6 Limitations

There is a risk of potential bias as I carried out the audit in my own practice. Patients may not have recorded everything that they ate or drank. I did not ask patients whether they had difficulty in completing the diaries.

6.7 Summary of chapter

I have observed from this audit that the food diary is a useful clinical tool. It has helped determine on an individual level the importance of diet to the patient’s physical and emotional wellbeing. I also learnt that contrary to public belief, some patients with schizophrenia are capable of completing homework tasks. This study was published as:
Chapter seven: What is the best evidence for training nurses about physical health in severe mental illness?

In the previous chapters I have discussed how to invite patients to a health check and the utility of food diaries in primary care. In this chapter I discuss how I carried out a systematic search for evidence regarding the efficacy of healthcare professional educational outcomes in studies of physical health in SMI. The intention was to review this evidence to inform the development of my own training package, but no relevant studies were found. Carrying out a systematic review is recommended by Craig et al. (2008) for researchers evaluating a complex intervention.

7.1 Background

A recent study has found that the strongest predictors of quality of clinical care given by practice nurses for long term conditions in England are organisational factors which include education and training (Griffiths et al. 2011). SMI is categorized as a long term condition (BMA and NHS Employers 2012). Yet in the most recent analysis of practice nursing, training about SMI was not identified as a need (Crossman 2008). In this study, 1,161 nurses were asked to identify both their responsibilities and training needs. Mental health was not given as a responsibility of any of the respondents. Six hundred and ninety-nine nurses (65%) said they required more training but only 668 identified what this was. From this group only six nurses cited mental health as a training need. This mirrored my own observations in 2009. Discussions with practice nurses in Northampton at that time, showed they were keen to be involved with improving
the health of people with SMI but did not see it as their role, a number even
quoting ‘I don’t do mental illness’. In a qualitative study of six primary care trusts
in the West Midlands, GPs and practice nurses largely believed that the care of
people with SMI was too specialised for their service (Lester et al. 2005). More
recently I have observed a positive shift in the attitudes of some practice nurses
in Northampton and the East Midlands regarding mental health. This appears to
have coincided with screening for depression in patients with diabetes and heart
disease becoming part of the payment contract (BMA and NHS Employers
2012). A study of GPs and practice nurses regarding the impact of this payment
contract reported that there was substantial improvements in teamwork and in
the organization, consistency and recording of care for conditions incentivized in
the scheme, but not for non-incentivized conditions (Maisey 2008). In 2012, as
part of a local study in Northampton, I carried out a survey with practice nurses
to examine their previous education and attitudes about screening for
depression and anxiety in long term conditions. The majority of nurses agreed
that everyone with a long term condition should be screened for depression and
anxiety symptoms and that they as the healthcare professional providing the
annual review should be the person to do it. They reported that a lack of
relevant training and time during the consultation may prevent them from doing
this effectively. Access to relevant training is one of the regulations in the Care
Quality Commission workforce outcomes document (Care Quality Commission
2012). These observations suggest that practice nurses need suitable support
and training to increase knowledge and skill.

I needed to educate practice nurses to equip them with the skills to carry
out these health checks and in doing this provide evidence that offering a
physical health check will be beneficial to the patients. I wanted the education to be evidence based so I set out to perform a systematic review with my fellow student Jacquie White (Jacquie is also studying for a PhD at the University of East Anglia. She is co-ordinating a RCT examining the effect of mental health nurses providing health checks for people with SMI). The aim was to identify the evidence of efficacy of the education of qualified health care professionals to deliver interventions aimed at improving the physical health of adults with SMI.

### 7.2 Method


**MEDLINE search terms**

(exp "schizophrenia and disorders with psychotic features"/ OR chronic mental illness.mp. OR chronically mentally ill.mp. OR chronic mentally ill.mp. OR severe mental illness.mp. OR severely mentally ill.mp. OR exp Bipolar Disorder/ OR (bipolar$ adj3 disorder$).ti,ab. OR (bipolar$ adj3 depress$).ti,ab. OR (bipolar$ adj3 illness$).ti,ab. OR (bipolar$ adj3 disease$).ti,ab. OR (bipolar$ adj3 episod$).ti,ab. OR mania.ti,ab. OR manic.ti,ab. OR (hypomanic or hypo-manic or hypomania or hypo-mania).ti,ab. OR cyclothym$.ti,ab. OR
(schizophren* or hebephreni* or oligophreni* or psychotic or psychosis).ab,ti.) AND (Health Status/ OR physical health.mp. OR Physical Fitness/ or Health/) AND (exp *education, continuing/ OR (education$ adj2 (program$ or intervention? or meeting? or session? or strateg$ or workshop? or visit?)).tw. OR (behavio?r$ adj2 intervention?).tw. OR (education$ adj1 (method? or material?)).tw. OR ((opinion or education$ or influential) adj1 leader?).tw. OR facilitator?.tw. OR *guideline adherence/ OR (guideline? adj2 (introduc$ or issu$ or impact or effect? or disseminat$ or distribut$)).tw. OR ((effect? or impact or evaluat$ or introduc$ or compar$) adj2 training program$).tw. OR (prompter? or prompting).tw. OR compliance.tw.)

No limitations on year of publication or language were applied. We inspected the references of all identified studies and relevant reviews for other appropriate studies to determine if any material may have been overlooked.

**Inclusion criteria**

- Education to deliver interventions to improve the physical health of people with SMI
- Assessment of the impact of the education package on the healthcare professionals
- Patient specific outcomes

**Justification for inclusion criteria**

At first, we planned to only include RCTs as they are considered to be the highest standard of research evidence to determine the efficacy or
effectiveness of a healthcare intervention or service. We searched for RCTs that evaluated the efficacy of the education of qualified health care professionals to deliver interventions aimed at improving the physical health of adults with SMI. As this criteria did not uncover any relevant papers, and the ‘most appropriate’ (or highest level of) evidence is not necessarily the RCT (Sanson-Fisher et al. 2007), we expanded our criteria to include service evaluations. However, searching for service evaluations did not prove fruitful either, so we removed the study design from the search criteria completely. The outcomes had to include some assessment of the impact of the education package on the healthcare professionals as well as patient specific outcomes.

We anticipated that the education packages would involve some face-to-face education (of any duration) backed up by the provision of written materials and potentially prompting processes when the trainees returned to practice. We intended to note the character of education delivery (group, one-to-one, experiential, didactic, duration, location etc), the character of the trainer (profession, level of education etc), the character of the group (multi or uniprofessional, level of qualifications and area expertise etc) and the provision of support subsequent to the education event (written resources, access to trainers, web groups etc).

7.3 Results of systematic search
We identified 414 references from the databases: MEDLINE (55), CINAHL (24), AMED (0), Psychinfo (21), Cochrane (0), WHO (4), OpenSIGLE (216), EMBASE (94), HTA (0) and none from other sources. We screened the results of this electronic search. Through screening and discussion 147 papers were
excluded as they did not meet the criteria for this review. There were no difficulties or disputes during this process.

A number of studies (Smith et al. 2007a,b) were excluded from this review as although there was an implicit education package provided to healthcare professionals, no information was reported on the outcomes of this education with regard to healthcare professionals’ knowledge, attitudes and behaviours. The only information that these studies provided was patient specific outcomes. Therefore no studies were identified as suitable for a systematic review. See flow diagram (figure 7.1).
Figure 7.1 Results of systematic search

References from databases (414): MEDLINE (55), CINAHL (24), AMED (0), Psychinfo (21), Cochrane (0), WHO (4), OpenSIGLE (216), EMBASE (94), HTA (0)

References from other sources 0

References (without duplicates) 147

147 references screened

145 references excluded

2 full text articles assessed for eligibility

2 full text references excluded

0 studies included in review
7.4 Discussion

It is significant that we were unable to identify any studies. There appears to be a lack of understanding regarding the importance of disseminating evidence based interventions in order to make them effective in practice. Specifically, it is important to understand the impact of an education package aimed at healthcare professionals on their knowledge, attitudes and behaviours. If this is not understood, then the reasons for any change in patient outcomes are impossible to determine. The lack of this information may be one of the reasons for the insufficiency of long term impact for such programmes as the Well-being Support Programme (Smith et al. 2007a,b), as critical information needed to apply such an intervention in practice is missing from the reports.

Providing health checks for people with SMI in the United Kingdom has become a requirement of the Quality and Outcomes Framework; along with providing health checks for people with other conditions such as diabetes that carry a high risk of developing CVD (BMA and NHS Employers 2012). The difference is however, there is an acceptance by the nurses that providing health checks for people with diabetes should be part of their role (Hall 2008). Additionally there are many courses about diabetes available to nurses from universities, local provisers and pharmaceutical companies. The lack of evidence based education available for qualified nurses to monitor the physical health of people with SMI (Blythe and White 2012, Robson et al. 2012) adds to the view that this is not their responsibility. The lack of specific evidence to demonstrate that education of the nurses will improve patients’ health makes advocating any education (should it be available) a difficult task.
Practitioners worry, quite rightly, about patients with SMI committing suicide (Gray et al. 2009) and maybe this is why there is an abundance of research regarding interventions to prevent suicide in this group of patients. Leitner et al. (2008) carried out a systematic review and uncovered no less than 24 studies in this area. This contrasts with a systematic search for the effectiveness of physical health monitoring in SMI which did not identify any studies (Tosh et al. 2010). Given the plethora of papers advocating the importance of monitoring the physical health check of people with SMI, it is striking that both my attempt and that of Tosh et al. (2010) to evaluate the evidence in this area by carrying out a systematic review, unearthed absolutely no studies. As more patients with SMI die from CVD than suicide (Gray et al. 2009); it is vital that researchers start to publish details of healthcare professional education and their outcomes in physical health and SMI research.

7.5 Limitations
Although our search criteria should have been robust enough to detect relevant studies or service evaluations, it is possible, however, that we have failed to identify small studies and evaluations or studies and evaluations in progress.

7.6 Summary of chapter
There is a need not only to develop education for qualified nurses and other relevant healthcare professionals to provide physical health checks and appropriate interventions for people with SMI, it is also necessary to demonstrate that offering this education will improve patient outcomes.

This study was published as:
Chapter eight: Developing a physical health in severe mental illness training package for practice nurses

In this chapter I have written an account of the development of the intervention, the physical health in SMI training package for practice nurses. This is recommended by Craig et al. (2008) as part of the evaluation.

8.1 Background

I have been carrying out physical health checks for people with severe mental illness in primary care since 2005. At that time there were no guidelines from the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE) in this area. The only documents available for primary care clinicians other than the Quality and Outcomes Framework guidance were a briefing guide about the new GP contract (Sainsbury Centre for Mental Health 2003) and some brief tables in medication books such as the BNF and the London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust, and Oxleas NHS Foundation Trust prescribing guidelines. An extensive search of literature by Roberts et al. (2000) to review whether offering routine or opportunistic health assessment in primary care to people with schizophrenia was effective in improving the mental and physical health found only three studies met their inclusion criteria. They concluded that there were insufficient data to suggest that health assessments of people with schizophrenia are effective in improving their mental and physical health. However, one study showed that use of a tool designed for mental health nurses to monitor the physical health of people with SMI was effective in achieving improved recording of physical illness and lifestyle needs (Phelan et
al. 2004). In addition, another study employing a nurse advisor to carry out health checks for this group accomplished improvements in the weight and diets of participants (Ohlsen 2005). This encouraged me to create my own best practice guide. Through providing these health checks I have observed improved health in these patients (figure 8.1). When creating the training, I wanted to equip practice nurses to provide patients with the same level of care. To assist in this process I developed two tools, a best practice manual and website.
The patient is a 57 years old gentleman who had not had any contact with his GP for three years, and only sporadic contact with staff in secondary care. I do not know the reasons why he had not chosen to come in; but before the introduction of the payment contract in 2004, patients with long term conditions were not routinely invited to attend for a health check. This patient was diagnosed with schizophrenia 35 years ago for which he was taking olanzapine. He also had epilepsy which was controlled with phenytoin; he was unable to tell us whether he was experiencing any fits. The patient lived with his elderly parents and did not go out. He was invited by letter for a health check and attended. Blood test results revealed that his phenytoin levels were low and his cholesterol and glucose levels were raised. His blood pressure was raised and the electrocardiogram showed his QT interval was lengthened. The patient had neglected his hygiene, leading to fungal infections on his feet, axillae and groin. Lifestyle advice and tactful hygiene advice was offered to the patient and he seemed to take this on board. Clotrimazole cream was prescribed, which along with his improved hygiene alleviated his fungal infections. He was subsequently diagnosed with diabetes, hypertension and AV heart block. The patient’s phenytoin dose was increased to ensure a therapeutic dose. Simvastatin, metformin, ramipril and aspirin were initiated to reduce cholesterol, blood sugar, blood pressure and lessen his risk of a heart attack or stroke. His olanzapine was stopped and replaced with quetiapine as olanzapine can increase the QT interval and increase blood glucose.
8.2 Developing a best practice manual

When developing a complex intervention, Craig et al. (2008) suggest making the recommendations as specific as possible. I therefore developed the Health Improvement Profile for Primary Care or HIP-PC (in collaboration with Professor Gray) from the original tool, the HIP (developed for secondary care), by adapting it for use in primary care (Hardy and Gray 2010). The HIP was chosen as a suitable tool as there is positive qualitative evidence that using it results in improved health (Schuel et al. 2009).

When designing this intervention, the main focus was to enable the practice nurse to provide a health check as part of their usual role, rather than as an adjunct service. This is a practical approach to the problem, yet it remains complex in terms of its evaluation and dissemination. Complex interventions contain several interacting components (Medical Research Council 2009); the HIP-PC targets the practitioner, the patient and the organisation and requires them all to interact.

8.2.1 The Health Improvement Profile (HIP)

The Health Improvement Profile (HIP) is an evidence based physical health risk assessment for mental health nurses. The developers of the HIP (White et al. 2009) identified the need to address these inequalities of physical health care experienced by people with SMI. They predicted that developing a specific tool could help mental health nurses in secondary care outline the physical health of the patients with severe mental illness that they work with and direct them towards the evidence base interventions available to address identified health problems. They agreed that this tool needed to address the major health
priorities, behaviours and problems where there is evidence of increased morbidity/mortality in people with SMI.

The HIP has 27 items and the male and female versions are slightly different. The HIP is undertaken annually and takes approximately 30 minutes to complete; drawing information from multiple sources. Basic demographic information, age, gender, ethnicity, weight and height are recorded at the top of the form. Each item is marked either ‘green’, if the observation or behaviour is within a healthy range or ‘red’ if it is unhealthy. A list of recommended actions based on best current evidence is provided to guide practice and the nurse should check the box indicating the intervention they have taken. The form is carbonated in triplicate; copies can be placed in the multi-disciplinary notes, sent to primary care and given to the patient (Schuel et. al 2009). The HIP is also available in an electronic format (eHIP).

8.2.2 The Health Improvement Profile for Primary Care

The HIP-PC is a manual which provides healthcare professionals with clear guidance and a rationale to help them make decisions about individual patients (appendix 5). I wanted to make sure there was local agreement regarding this manual so I discussed its proposed contents with the director of mental health services. He was very supportive and made some helpful comments.

In the United Kingdom, each GP practice uses a computerised system to record patient consultations, not all practices have the same system. The advantages of using one of these systems are that elements of the consultation can be coded and therefore data collection is very straightforward. Unfortunately, at present not all these individual systems are compatible with
other computer programmes. Using the HIP as it stands would mean that the nurse would have to record the information twice. Apart from this being an unpopular proposition, duplicate data entry opens the door to additional error and data conflicts. Therefore adapting the HIP to fit into each individual system as a template with the manual as accompanying guidance seemed a logical solution.

The HIP addresses all the physical elements that need to be considered when carrying out a health check. However, guidelines produced by NICE (2010a) recommend that patients managed in primary care should also have an assessment of their social needs. It is recognized that deprivation can impact on people’s physical health through cholesterol levels, blood pressure and heart disease (Mental Health Foundation 2009). The assessment should include monitoring of mental state, medication use, medication adherence, side-effects, social isolation, access to services, and occupational status (NICE 2010a). This was also acknowledged at the time by the General Medical Services Contract (British Medical Association 2008). The contract required that a care plan is documented in the records and that the patient is followed up by the practice team within 14 days of non-attendance. It also suggests that the accuracy of medication prescribed by the General Practitioner can also be checked at the time of the health check (British Medical Association 2008). Therefore added to the HIP-PC with a rationale and recommendations for each, are a medication review, care plan and follow up plan for non-attenders.

Despite the fact that each practice receives no payment in protecting patients with SMI from flu with a vaccination, this has been added to the HIP-PC. This group has not been recognized as being at risk by the creators of the
GMS contract. However, the Sainsbury Centre for Mental Health (2003) advocates protection against influenza by offering annual immunisation in view of increased occurrence of cardiac, respiratory disorders and diabetes in patients with SMI. Each practice receives payments as an incentive for vaccinating patients with conditions such as diabetes, stroke and heart disease. Although no other organisations have made the recommendation for people with SMI to have the flu vaccination; I argue that in view of their increased mortality, this group are just as susceptible to the serious effects of seasonal flu as the other groups of patients with the conditions that receive payment. This is concurred by Cohen (2001) who argues that this is an under-researched area and that people with SMI need extra protection during the winter months by receiving an influenza vaccination.

The HIP recommends blood tests for liver function, lipids, glucose and prolactin when there are symptoms. In some circumstances further blood tests are recommended (Hardy and Gray 2009). These have been added to the HIP-PC with a rationale and recommendations for each.

The HIP recommends checking prolactin levels if symptoms occur (breast swelling and milk production, disturbance of menstrual cycle); this is in line with the South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust, and Oxleas NHS Foundation Trust prescribing guidelines (Taylor et al. 2009), NICE (2006) guidelines for bipolar disorder and Northampton’s local guidance (Northampton Healthcare 2007). However, consensus guidelines for managing prolactinaemia (Peveler et al. 2008) recommend that health care professionals should monitor proactively for hyperprolactinaemia as it maybe asymptomatic. A study has shown that 5% of people taking antipsychotic medication such as aripiprazole
and clozapine (which are not associated with elevated prolactin) had raised levels (Bushe et al. 2008). For this reason, the HIP-PC recommends checking prolactin levels on all patients taking any antipsychotic medication. This also makes choosing relevant blood tests, less complicated for the clinician carrying out the health check.

The HIP suggests performing an ECG if the pulse rate is increased. There is evidence that many typical antipsychotics increase the risk of ventricular arrhythmias and cardiac arrest (Ray et al. 2001, Liperoti et al. 2005) and an association between many atypical antipsychotic drugs and the occurrence of unexplained sudden death (Abdelmawla and Mitchell 2006). Abdelmawla and Mitchell (2006) advocate that cardiac safety should be a routine part of clinical care in patients taking antipsychotic medication; therefore a preventive strategy is valuable even if the absolute risk of serious cardiac events is low. As it is quite simple to carry out an ECG in primary care (the equipment is available and most nurses in primary care will be proficient in carrying out this procedure) the HIP-PC suggests it is performed on all patients unless they are taking no medication. Carrying out an ECG also allows the opportunity to look for other possible problems such as gynaecomastia, hygiene neglect and rashes.

Because the HIP was designed for use by nurses in secondary care, some of the actions suggested by the HIP are referral to the GP or Practice Nurse. In these cases, the actions specified in the HIP-PC are those that the GP or Practice Nurse should carry out.

Originally a large number of manuals were printed. This proved invaluable at the beginning when trying to promote the project as people were
keen to take something away with them. The manual has since been updated
twice to keep abreast of the latest evidence. The latest version has been printed
for two new projects described in chapter 14.

The HIP-PC manual is being used by Nottingham Mental Health Trust,
Northamptonshire Healthcare Foundation Trust, Leicestershire Partnership
Trust and NHS London. It has been adapted for use in Norwich, Lincolnshire
and Australia. It has been translated into German for use in Switzerland. At the
time of writing, a request had just been received from London South Bank
University to use it for a new training programme.

8.3 The website
A website (http://physicalsmi.webeden.co.uk/ - appendix 6) for practice nurses
has been constructed as a repository for useful tools (e.g. letters, care-plans,
scales, HIP-PC), relevant information about SMI (e.g. medication, mental
capacity act, schizophrenia, bipolar disorder) and helpful links (e.g. leaflets,
further information for healthcare professional, charities). It is easy to use as
there are no requirements to log in or register. Housing information on a website
means I can update and add to it as appropriate. The website can be used both
as a training tool and a resource for practitioners. There are links to further
information and e-learning programmes. The best practice manual and useful
tools such as letters, scales, leaflets, forms (which can be adapted to suit each
organisation) are available to download. Practice nurses can save the address
to their favourites and use it during consultations with patients.
8.4 Summary

The HIP is a comprehensive evidence based tool which identifies and addresses the physical needs of patients with severe mental illness. Adapting it for use in primary care and providing training for its use, will ensure that primary care healthcare professionals have access to best practice guidance.

This chapter has been published as:

Chapter nine: Are people with Severe Mental Illness in Northampton receiving health checks in primary care?

I wanted to find out if as many people with SMI were being given the same level of care as people with physical conditions. In this chapter I discuss my study carried out in five primary care practices in Northampton. I aimed to determine the proportion of patients with SMI being screened for CVD risk factors in their GP practice compared to those with diabetes, and find out whether people with SMI receive lifestyle advice.

9.1 Background

Healthcare professionals in primary care in England have evidence-based recommendations to follow for patients with diabetes regarding physical health interventions (Diabetes UK 2005) but not for people with SMI (De Hert et al. 2011a). Guidelines from the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE) were not available for bipolar disorder until 2006 and do not specify who is responsible for carrying out physical health checks. The NICE guidelines for schizophrenia (2010a) provide more clarity in that some responsibility falls to primary care. There is some evidence that people with SMI are not receiving CVD risk screening from primary care clinicians in the way they would if they had diabetes. For example, Roberts et al. (2007) found patients with schizophrenia were significantly less likely than the general population to have either blood pressure or cholesterol recorded. A possible explanation could be the method of remuneration to GPs. Since 2004, each primary care centre in England has received payment through a contract (the Quality and Outcomes
Framework or QOF - BMA and NHS Employers 2011) to provide care for people with long term conditions. Before April 2011, to receive this payment practices were required to offer a review to people who had a diagnosis of SMI every 15 months. The particular contents of this review were not specified in the contract. The indicators simply stated that age-appropriate health promotion and prevention advice should be given (this changed in April 2011 with the introduction of specific indicators). Consequently, although best practice should include cardiovascular risk assessment, this was not part of the national contract at that time. In patients with diabetes there were specific payment indicators for recording blood pressure, body mass index (BMI), cholesterol and HbA1c.

9.2 Method
Craig et al. (2008) suggest using audit as one method of evaluating a complex intervention. I used a retrospective audit. Clinical audit is a quality improvement process that seeks to improve patient care and outcomes through systematic review of care against explicit criteria and the implementation of change (Copeland 2005). A recent Cochrane review found that the effect of audit on professional behaviour is enhanced if the health professionals are not performing well to start out with (Ivers et al. 2012).

Audit Standards
The standards for CVD screening and lifestyle advice were derived from published guidelines (NICE 2006, 2009, 2010a, De Hert et al. 2009b). These were that all patients with SMI and diabetes should, as a minimum, have their
blood pressure, BMI (or waist circumference), blood glucose (or HbA1c) and cholesterol measured at least once a year. They should also be given advice about diet, exercise and smoking cessation annually.

Data Collection
This was a retrospective audit that took place between September 2009 and August 2010. Patients were identified from the SMI register of each of the participating practices. The SMI register is a list of people who have a diagnosis of schizophrenia, bipolar disorder or other psychosis. Each GP practice is required to hold a register for a range of long term conditions of which SMI is one (DH 2002). I instructed the member of administrative staff from each practice who was identified to help in this study, to check the SMI registers. This was to make sure that if people without an appropriate diagnosis were included they could remove them. To ensure that everybody with SMI was included, the staff carried out a search on antipsychotic medications from the computer records. The diagnosis and history of identified patients were then checked by clinicians from each practice to determine whether they met the criteria for inclusion. However, as I was unable to access the registers myself, I do not know how accurate they were. I needed to extract demographic information (age, gender) and evidence of whether screening and lifestyle advice had been given in the last year from the electronic patient records. This information was not collected routinely for the purposes of QOF at the time of the audit, so I helped each practice to set up individual audits for each measurement. All data were anonymised and I had no access to patient specific information.
As CVD screening for patients with diabetes is a requirement under the GP contract, the information collected at source is also stored in a national database system called the Quality Management Analysis System (QMAS). This system determines practices’ contract payments (NHS Information Centre 2012a). All information from QMAS from the previous contract year (1st of April to the 31st March) is displayed on the NHS Information centre public website (NHS Information Service 2012b). I compared the percentage of patients with diabetes from the same five practices who had BP, BMI and blood glucose and cholesterol recorded from April 2010 to March 2011 on this website with those in the SMI patients from my audit. I could not make a comparison of diet, exercise or smoking advice. Offering diet and exercise information are not a contract requirement for diabetes, and are therefore were not recorded on this database (BMA and NHS Employers 2011). Though smoking advice is a contract requirement, the data is measured as a practice population of combined disease groups and not for each individual long term condition. Additionally, from this website, I was able to obtain the percentage of people with SMI in each practice that had a record of a review within the last 15 months.

Data Analysis

I took advice from Allan Clarke, statistician from the University of East Anglia. I calculated crude odds ratio to explore whether the patient’s diagnosis (SMI or diabetes) made a difference to the level of screening given (odds ratio has been described in chapter five). For patients with SMI, descriptive statistics have been used to determine whether certain elements of screening and lifestyle
advice were given more often than others. To find out the number of interventions received by each patient I calculated the mean. The advantage of using the mean (rather than the median and mode) is that all the data is used to find the answer. The disadvantage using the mean can be that very large or very small numbers can distort the answer so I used standard deviation to show how much variation exists from the mean. To test whether age was associated with the rate of screening in SMI patients, I used standard tests for association (chi-square). Chi-square is a test commonly used to compare observed data with data we would expect to obtain according to a specific hypothesis. This fitted my data as it was random, raw, mutually exclusive, drawn from independent variables and from a large enough sample (Plitcha and Garzon 2009). Analyses were done with SPSS, version18.

_Ethical Approval_

The local regional ethical committee confirmed that this project was a service evaluation and it did not require their approval. The manager from the participating practices gave written consent to take part in the audit.

### 9.2.1 Other possible methods

The method used in this study is recommended by Hennekens and Buring (1987) to compare two groups of patients. I could have asked the participants to set up separate audits for the diabetes patients as they did for patients with SMI. This would have ensured that the data was collected at the same time as that for the patients with SMI. However, this would have been a very burdensome task for the participants who were not receiving any remuneration.
9.3 Results

In the participating practices, fewer than one percent of patients had SMI and around four percent had diabetes. Fifty-three percent of the patients with SMI were men. I was unable to extract demographic data for patients with diabetes as this was not recorded on the NHS information database.

Virtually all the patients with SMI (96%) in the five practices had a record of a review on the NHS database within the last fifteen months.

Table 9.1 shows that patients with SMI had lower odds of receiving CVD screening (blood glucose and cholesterol, BP, BMI) than those with diabetes.

Table 9.2 shows which elements of CVD screening and lifestyle advice were given to patients with SMI in the last year. Smoking cessation advice was given more often than diet and exercise information. Comprehensive lifestyle advice (smoking, diet, exercise) was given to around one in ten patients. Only one in twelve were given both complete CVD screening and comprehensive lifestyle advice. Each patient with SMI was given fewer than two of the four screening measures and less than one of the three components of lifestyle advice.

I sought statistical advice about whether age should be used as a continuous or categorical variable. It was considered most conservative to use three age group 16-35, 36-55, and 56 and above, Table 9.3 shows that patients with SMI over the age of 36 years were more likely to be given complete CVD screening but there was no significant difference in the level of lifestyle advice given.
Table 9.1 The proportion of patients with SMI and diabetes given CVD screening

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Patients with diabetes (n=1875)</th>
<th>Patients with SMI (n=386)</th>
<th>Unadjusted odds ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>n=1800 (96%)</td>
<td>n=185 (48%)</td>
<td>OR=26.08; 95% CI=19.21 to 35.39: p&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blood pressure</td>
<td>n=1866 (99.5%)</td>
<td>n=243 (63%)</td>
<td>OR=99.83; 95% CI=53.29 to 187.00: p&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serum cholesterol</td>
<td>n=1818 (97%)</td>
<td>n=143 (37%)</td>
<td>OR=54.20; 95% CI=38.77 to 75.76: p&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blood glucose (or HbA1c)</td>
<td>n=1856 (99%)</td>
<td>n=135 (35%)</td>
<td>OR=181.62; 95% CI=110.38 to 298.85: p&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full CVD screen</td>
<td>n=1800 (96%)</td>
<td>n=81 (21%)</td>
<td>OR=90.37; 95% CI=64.53 to 126.55: p&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 9.2 Elements of screening and lifestyle advice given to patients with SMI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportion of patients receiving elements of screening and lifestyle advice</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smoking advice</td>
<td>n=220</td>
<td>(57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise advice</td>
<td>n=54</td>
<td>(14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diet advice</td>
<td>n=50</td>
<td>(13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full lifestyle advice (smoking, diet, exercise)</td>
<td>n=42</td>
<td>(11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full CVD screening and lifestyle advice (blood pressure, blood glucose and cholesterol, BMI, smoking, diet, exercise)</td>
<td>n=31</td>
<td>(8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Elements of screening and lifestyle advice given to individual patients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9.3 CVD screening and lifestyle advice given to patients with SMI by age category (n=386)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age categories</th>
<th>16-35</th>
<th>36-55</th>
<th>56+</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of patients in each age category</td>
<td>n=94 (24%)</td>
<td>n=169 (44%)</td>
<td>n=123 (32%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All four CVD screen (blood pressure, blood glucose and cholesterol, BMI)</td>
<td>n=10 (11%)</td>
<td>n=38 (22%)</td>
<td>n=39 (31%)</td>
<td>( \chi^2 = 13.55, p&lt;.01 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All three lifestyle advice (smoking, diet, exercise)</td>
<td>n=5 (5%)</td>
<td>n=22 (13%)</td>
<td>n=16 (13%)</td>
<td>( \chi^2 = 4.25, p=.12 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All CVD screen &amp; lifestyle advice (blood pressure, blood glucose and cholesterol, BMI, smoking, diet, exercise)</td>
<td>n=2 (2%)</td>
<td>n=18 (11%)</td>
<td>n=13 (11%)</td>
<td>( \chi^2 = 6.56, p=.04 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.4 Discussion
The aim of this study was to determine the proportion of patients with SMI being screened for CVD risk factors in their GP practice compared to those with diabetes. A secondary aim was to ascertain whether people with SMI receive lifestyle advice in primary care.

An important observation is that the NHS Information database had a high percentage of patients with SMI from the participating practices recorded as having a review compared to the actual level of screening and advice given. This suggests a lack of awareness of the screening, health promotion and prevention advice that is appropriate for this group of patients.

My findings show a considerable variation in CVD screening rates in SMI patients compared to those with diabetes in the same centres. The higher level of screening in the diabetes population is likely to have been achieved because clinics for these patients to receive their annual review have become part of routine clinical practice in primary care centres (Hall 2008). They are usually run by a nurse who has undertaken advanced education in diabetes and who will be offered free regular educational updates by a variety of sources (e.g. Primary Care Diabetes Society). The provision of these diabetes clinics may have been encouraged by the contract’s financial incentive. Conversely, meeting the physical needs of people with SMI does not appear to be common place (Shuel et al. 2009) and there is at present no evidence based education to address this discrepancy (Hardy et al. 2011). Teaching healthcare professionals in primary care about the increased risk of somatic co-morbidity in patients with SMI could develop the provision of health care for this group (Oud and Meyboom-de Jong 2009, Leucht et al. 2007). The introduction of specific contract indicators for
CVD screening in people with SMI in April 2011 may further promote this improvement.

My results were comparable with Roberts et al. (2007). In both studies blood pressure was the most frequently recorded CVD risk factor and the pattern of CVD risk screening was the same. However, the levels of screening for CVD risk in my audit were higher overall. Perhaps one of the reasons for this is that the audit by Roberts et al. was carried out before the contract was introduced (i.e. no payment was offered to primary care for providing this service) and therefore this screening was not considered by primary care clinicians to be their responsibility at that time.

It is possible that CVD screening of patients with SMI is not being done in primary care because it is happening in secondary care. However, an audit of patients (n=1966) under the care of community outreach teams across the UK carried out in 2005 showed this not to be the case, with recordings of blood pressure in just over a quarter of the records, obesity in less than a fifth, blood glucose in less than a third and cholesterol in less than a quarter (Barnes et al. 2007). A later study carried out at the psychiatric in-patient and out-patient units in Southampton and Winchester found that this had not improved with time (Holt et al. 2010). The following cardiovascular risk factors had been measured in the previous year: blood pressure (32%), glucose (16%), lipids (9%) and weight (2%).

It may be argued that the different rates of screening for each measure suggest that these are being carried out opportunistically rather than at a designated appointment. One explanation for this may be that, as Lester et al. (2005) found, primary care clinicians believe that patients with SMI will not
attend for a health check. In contrast, my audit in one primary care practice confirmed if patients with SMI are invited by letter giving them a specific appointment time with a named person, the attendance compares very favourably with rates observed in other long term conditions (Hardy and Gray 2012b).

My audit showed that just over half the patients with SMI were offered smoking advice in comparison to the other lifestyle factors. This could be because it was a requirement under the contract (BMA and NHS Employers 2011). However, Roberts et al. (2007) found a similar number of participants in their study had smoking status recorded and this was before the contract. I cannot tell from this audit about the quality of the smoking cessation intervention, or whether the advice had been tailored to suit the specific needs of this population.

It could be argued that practitioners (despite annual screening being part of government guidelines) are only targeting patients with SMI who they perceive to be at risk and not those for example who have a normal BMI, are asymptomatic and their blood glucose was normal two to three years previously. However, based upon the increased risk in metabolic syndrome in these patients, baseline and periodic medical evaluations should become a standard component in ongoing clinical assessment (Toalson et al. 2004).

The low level of diet and exercise information received by this group in my audit suggests that the importance of these interventions have not been considered by the healthcare professionals. This finding is disappointing as people with SMI appear to give low priority to their physical requirements (Buhagiar et al. 2011) and would benefit from education that is focused on
changing health behaviours (Brar et al. 2005, Graves and Miller 2003). In fact, brief lifestyle guidance delivered by a non-specialist worker has been shown to deliver useful health gains in this population (Brown and Chan 2006).

The older the patients with SMI in my audit, the more likely they were to receive screening. This is inconsistent with a study by Osborn et al. (2011), which established that people with SMI over 60 years of age were less likely to be screened. Osborn et al. explain this may be because in the United Kingdom, there are no specific schemes to remunerate general practitioners for assessing or managing elderly people. The system of payment is targeted at a number of long term conditions rather than specific age groups. It may be that the practitioners in my study were taking heed of guidelines to assess people over 40 years of age in primary care for CVD risk (Joint British Societies 2005).

The low rate of screening in the 16-55 year groups of people with SMI is concerning. Even the presence of a single major risk factor at age 50 substantially raises the lifetime risk for CVD and markedly shortens survival. Prevention efforts need to begin decades before the age 50 years (Lloyd-Jones et al. 2006).

The provision of diet and exercise advice was extremely low in all SMI age groups. This is another unwelcome observation as the excess morbidity and mortality in this population is largely due to modifiable lifestyle risk factors (de Hert et al. 2011b). Providing this education at an early age (particularly before the presence of metabolic syndrome) will have a greater effect (Brown et al. 2009).

Training nurses in primary care may increase screening for CVD risk factors and the level of lifestyle advice given. My before and after study to
establish the effectiveness of a training package for practice nurses about the physical health of people with SMI has recently been published (Hardy 2012) and is described in chapter 11. This showed that those who completed the training might be more likely to accept carrying out these health checks as part of their role.

9.5 Limitations
The study was retrospective, not prospective. It was reliant on secondary data. The observations were made at different time points as the secondary data could only be collected from April to March. I was not able to adjust for any potential confounders.

9.6 Summary of chapter
In this chapter I have examined the results of my study that aimed to find out if people with SMI were receiving screening for CVD risk factors and lifestyle advice. In the five Northampton practices, the proportion of patients with SMI being screened for CVD risk factors was much lower compared to those with diabetes. The number of people with SMI receiving lifestyle advice was also very low. I have discussed the possible reasons for this disparity.

This study has been published as:
Chapter ten: Are people with Severe Mental Illness in England receiving health checks in primary care?

In the last chapter I explained how people with SMI were receiving less screening for CVD risk then people with diabetes in five practices in Northampton. Since then the GP’s payment contract has changed, meaning that some of this data can now be collected nationally. This chapter describes the levels of screening received by people with SMI compared to those with diabetes in England.

10.1 Background

As described in the last chapter, since 2004, each primary care centre in England has received payment through this contract to provide care for people with long term conditions including the provision of medical screening of patients with SMI and diabetes (BMA and NHS Employers 2011). In order to receive payment practices are required to offer a review every 15 months. Even when treatment or diagnosis takes place in secondary care, responsibility for monitoring is often delegated to primary care (Bobes et al. 2010). Since April 2011, screening for CVD risk in patients with SMI and diabetes has become equal in the respect of payment received (figure 10.1 and 10.2 - BMA and NHS Employers 2011). The standards for cardiometabolic screening for diabetes and SMI share several similarities but are not identical. Nevertheless all patients with SMI and diabetes should, as a minimum, have their BP, body mass index (BMI), blood glucose (or HbA1c) and cholesterol (or cholesterol:HDL ratio).
Ideally information should be exchanged about the benefits of diet, exercise and smoking cessation.

In the last chapter I explained my study which compared the level of screening for CVD in five practices in Northamptonshire, England (Hardy et al. 2013a). I used two samples, patients with diabetes and patients with SMI. There was significantly less screening in patients with SMI. This study is an attempt to replicate this finding using a national sample.

**Figure 10.1 Mental Health Indicators 2011/12**

| MH8. | The practice can produce a register of people with schizophrenia, bipolar disorder and other psychoses |
| MH11. | The percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses who have a record of alcohol consumption in the preceding 15 months |
| MH12. | The percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses who have a record of BMI in the preceding 15 months |
| MH13. | The percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses who have a record of blood pressure in the preceding 15 months |
| MH19. | The percentage of patients aged 40 years and over with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses who have a record of total cholesterol:hdl ratio in the preceding 15 months |
| MH20. | The percentage of patients aged 40 years and over with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses who have a record of blood glucose or HbA1c in the preceding 15 months |
| MH16. | The percentage of patients (aged from 25 to 64 in England and Northern Ireland, from 20 to 60 in Scotland and from 20 to 64 in Wales) with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses whose notes record that a cervical screening test has been performed in the preceding five years |
| MH17. | The percentage of patients on lithium therapy with a record of serum creatinine and TSH in the preceding nine months |
| MH18. | The percentage of patients on lithium therapy with a record of lithium levels in the therapeutic range in the preceding four months |
| MH10. | The percentage of patients on the register who have a comprehensive care plan documented in the records agreed between individuals, their family and/or carers as appropriate |
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**Figure 10.2 Diabetes Indicators 2010/11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DM 19.</th>
<th>The practice can produce a register of all patients aged 17 years and over with diabetes mellitus, which specifies whether the patient has Type 1 or Type 2 diabetes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM 20.</td>
<td>The percentage of patients with diabetes whose 3 notes record BMI in the previous 15 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM 21.</td>
<td>The percentage of patients with diabetes who have a record of HbA1c or equivalent in the previous 15 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM 22.</td>
<td>The percentage of patients with diabetes in whom the last HbA1c is 7 or less (or equivalent test/reference range depending on local laboratory) in the previous 15 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM 23.</td>
<td>The percentage of patients with diabetes in whom the last HbA1c is 8 or less (or equivalent test/reference range depending on local laboratory) in the previous 15 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM 24.</td>
<td>The percentage of patients with diabetes in whom the last HbA1c is 9 or less (or equivalent test/reference range depending on local laboratory) in the previous 15 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM 25.</td>
<td>The percentage of patients with diabetes who have a record of retinal screening in the previous 15 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM 26.</td>
<td>The percentage of patients with diabetes with a record of the presence or absence of peripheral pulses in the previous 15 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM 27.</td>
<td>The percentage of patients with diabetes with a record of neuropathy testing in the previous 15 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM 28.</td>
<td>The percentage of patients with diabetes who have a record of the blood pressure in the previous 15 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM 29.</td>
<td>The percentage of patients with diabetes in whom the last blood pressure is 145/85 or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM 30.</td>
<td>The percentage of patients with diabetes who have a record of microalbuminuria testing in the previous 15 months (exception reporting for patients with proteinuria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM 31.</td>
<td>The percentage of patients with diabetes who have a record of estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR) or serum creatinine testing in the previous 15 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM 32.</td>
<td>The percentage of patients with diabetes with a diagnosis of proteinuria or micro-albuminuria who are treated with ACE inhibitors (or A2 antagonists)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM 33.</td>
<td>The percentage of patients with diabetes who have a record of total cholesterol in the previous 15 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM 34.</td>
<td>The percentage of patients with diabetes whose last measured total cholesterol within the previous 15 months is 5mmol/l or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM 35.</td>
<td>The percentage of patients with diabetes who have had influenza immunisation in the preceding 1 September to 31 March</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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10.2 Methods

Guideline Standards

Since April 2011 in order to receive payment under the terms of the Quality and Outcomes Framework, primary care practitioners are required to offer a review to people with a diagnosis of SMI every 15 months. This review should include measuring BP and BMI; and testing for blood glucose levels (or HBA1c) and cholesterol: HDL ratio in patients over 40 years of age. Prior to 2012, to receive payment for diabetes, primary care practices were required to offer a review to people who had a diagnosis of diabetes every 15 months for BP, glucose, BMI and cholesterol. Thus the standards for mental health and diabetes are almost identical (apart from the age requirement for blood tests in SMI patients) and run in consecutive years (2011 and 2012).

Data Collection

National data regarding Quality and Outcomes Framework standards for 2010/2011 and 2011/2012 was collected from the NHS database Health and Social Care Information Centre (HSCIC). This data is in the public domain.

As CVD screening for patients with diabetes and SMI is a requirement under the GP contract, the information collected at source is also stored in a national database system called the Quality Management Analysis System (QMAS). This system determines practices’ contract payments. All information from QMAS from the previous contract year (1st of April to the 31st March) is displayed on the NHS Information centre public website (http://www.ic.nhs.uk/searchcatalogue). The percentage of patients with diabetes who had BP, BMI, HBA1c and cholesterol recorded from April 2010 to
March 2011 was compared with the percentage of people with SMI with a recording of BP, BMI, cholesterol:HDL ratio and blood glucose (fasting or random or HBA1c) in 2011/2012. A comparison of patient demographics, diet, exercise, smoking advice and waist circumference could not be made. Measuring waist circumference and offering diet and exercise information are not a contract requirement for diabetes or SMI, and are therefore not recorded on this database. As described in the previous chapter, although smoking advice is a contract requirement, the data is measured as a practice population of combined disease groups and not for each individual long term condition.

**Data Analysis**

Chi squared statistic was calculated to explore whether the patient’s diagnosis (SMI or diabetes) made a difference to the level of screening given. Analyses were done with Statsdirect 2.77.

10.2.1 Other possible methods

It would not have been possible to gain this information from any other source.

10.3 Results

The total sample included 2,488,948 patients with diabetes seen in 2010/2011 and 422,966 patients with SMI in 2011/2012. In 2011/2012 there were 8123 reporting primary care practices

For those with diabetes in the previous 15 months, nearly all patients received BMI measure, total cholesterol test, blood pressure assessment and HBA1c test. For those with SMI, in the previous 15 months four-fifths received
a BMI measure and almost nine out of 10 patients received blood pressure assessment. In the patients with SMI over 40 years of age, just over seven out of 10 received cholesterol test (cholesterol:HDL ratio) and just over two thirds received a glucose test. Comparing each category of test revealed that all differences were very highly significant between the two groups of patients (see table 10.1). However, it has been highlighted that attendance and compliance is a significant issue with those who have a diagnosis of SMI; possibly more than in diabetes (Shrivastava et al. 2012). Practices are allowed to make exclusions of patients who are too unwell or unwilling to attend over the period concerned. These exclusions can be removed from the analysis and re-analysis is shown in table 10.2. After exclusions, nearly nine out of ten patients with SMI received a BMI measure and just over nine out of 10 patients received a blood pressure assessment. Over four-fifths of patients over 40 years of age received a cholesterol test (cholesterol:HDL ratio) and a glucose test. Comparing each category of test between the patients with SMI and diabetes revealed that all differences remained very highly significant (see table 10.2).
### Table 10.1

**Adherence of QoF measures of metabolic testing in diabetes vs SMI before SMI exclusions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Diabetes Tested</th>
<th>Diabetes % tested</th>
<th>Severe mental illness Tested</th>
<th>Severe mental illness %Tested</th>
<th>Chi 2 Statistic</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blood Pressure</td>
<td>2,298,767</td>
<td>96.1%</td>
<td>355,834</td>
<td>84.1%</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 205712$</td>
<td>$p &lt; .001$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>2,329,552</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
<td>335,652</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 691072$</td>
<td>$p &lt; .001$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholesterol</td>
<td>2,378,115</td>
<td>98.4%</td>
<td>218,539</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 262020$</td>
<td>$p &lt; .001$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBA1c or glucose</td>
<td>2,363,485</td>
<td>94.9%</td>
<td>197,494</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 495257$</td>
<td>$p &lt; .001$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 10.2

Adherence of QoF measures of metabolic testing in diabetes vs SMI after SMI exclusions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Diabetes tested</th>
<th>Diabetes % tested</th>
<th>Severe mental illness tested</th>
<th>Severe mental illness% tested</th>
<th>Chi² Statistic</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Blood Pressure</strong></td>
<td>2,298,767</td>
<td>96.1%</td>
<td>218,539</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>Chi² = 97549</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BMI</strong></td>
<td>2,329,552</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
<td>335,652</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
<td>Chi² = 96465</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cholesterol</strong></td>
<td>2,378,115</td>
<td>98.4%</td>
<td>355,834</td>
<td>81.9%</td>
<td>Chi² = 61743</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HBA1c or glucose</strong></td>
<td>2,363,485</td>
<td>94.9%</td>
<td>335,652</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
<td>Chi² = 313117</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10.4 Discussion

This research demonstrates that in a very large UK sample, testing for CVD risk factors is much less common in patients with SMI than in those with diabetes.

Both conditions are similarly remunerated by a points system through the payment contract. The non-invasive clinical monitoring, for example of blood pressure and BMI was more thorough than those requiring a blood test (cholesterol, cholesterol:HDL ratio, glucose and HBA1c) in both SMI and diabetes patients, though fewer patients with SMI than diabetes had these checked. In patients with SMI only 64.8% of those over 40 years old received a glucose test for diabetes in the preceding 15 months, but about 95% of all those with diabetes received HBA1c over a similar period. It can be argued that these tests are not directly comparable as one test is for case-finding (glucose) and one is for monitoring treatment adherence (HBA1c). However the purpose of monitoring cholesterol, BMI and BP is the same in both groups, that is to monitor background metabolic risk. In patients with SMI only 71.7% of those over 40 years of age received a cholesterol check as compared to 96.1% of all patients with diabetes. If we were able to measure the record of glucose and cholesterol:HDL in all patients with SMI regardless of age, the level of monitoring is likely to be even lower.

These findings are consistent with other research examining routine monitoring prior to explicit guidelines (Mitchell et al. 2012), in that more patients with SMI had their BP and weight checked than their cholesterol and glucose. However, they differ in that the level of screening of patients with SMI is higher across all the four screening elements. Several explanations are possible. Financial incentives given to primary care practices might have improved
monitoring in line with the observation that most targets are achieved. My study described in the previous chapter (Hardy et al. 2013a) was carried out before specific payment indicators were imposed. The results showed lower rates of screening for all CVD risk in patients with SMI (21%) than found in this national study (74.7%). However, as patients under 40 years of age were not required to have two of the elements tested (cholesterol and glucose) in the second study; this higher level of achievement is not comparable. Another explanation is that monitoring has improved in the last one to two years. A study examining the monitoring of patients with SMI in UK primary care settings over 2000–2007 found rates were very low (Osbourn et al. 2011); but there was a trend for improvement in both patients with and without SMI. This concurs with the results in the study described in the last chapter and this one. Though the change is small, screening for patients with diabetes has increased from 96% to 97.3%.

The findings of this study show that patients with diabetes receive considerably more thorough CVD screening than patients with SMI. However in terms of years lost through mortality, SMI is probably more serious than diabetes with an age gap of 15-22.5 years in several studies (Wahlbeck et al. 2011, Chang et al. 2011, Saha et al. 2007). Patients with SMI should be considered a vulnerable group at least equivalent to diabetes. Barriers to medical care include lack of resources or time, low organizational support, clinicians' reluctance to change, concerns over the quality of the guidelines and lack of ownership (Osbourn et al. 2007).

The relatively low achievement of SMI targets are in fact an outlier in the targets. Given these findings of disproportionately low surveillance of patients...
with SMI, even in an incentivised system, what can be done to improve physical healthcare? At present there is no systematic education on physical comorbidity and no culture of routine physical testing in many mental health or primary care organizations. In psychiatric settings physical health/metabolic clinics have been suggested. To date there are no RCTs of physical health monitoring clinics but one RCT of note has examined a package of medical care in the PCARE study (Druss et al. 2010). Four hundred and seven subjects with SMI were randomly assigned to either the medical care management intervention or usual care. At a 12-month follow-up evaluation, the intervention group received more than twice the level of preventive services compared to the usual care group (they also received a significantly higher proportion of evidence-based services for cardiometabolic conditions). However, many patients with SMI have no contact with secondary care services (Lester et al. 2004) and payment is received by GPs through their contract for screening this group for CVD risk. Therefore in order to reach all patients there needs to be systems for monitoring people with SMI in primary care too.

It is important to note that effective monitoring of CVD risk factors is not sufficient on its own, as appropriate treatment is also mandatory. Data from National Ambulatory Medical Care Survey from 1992 and 1996 found that in 1,600 office visits of patients with mental illness who were documented smokers, psychiatrists offered smoking-cessation counselling at 12% of the visits, and diet and exercise counselling at 6% and 4% of visits, respectively (Himelhoch and Daumit 2003). In my audit of five primary care practices in Northampton described in chapter nine (Hardy et al. 2013a), 57% of people with SMI received advice about smoking, 14% were given information about...
exercise and only 13% were offered diet guidance. In short, there is a question over the ability of health professionals to respond if a problem is found. Physical comorbidity is often unrecognized and inadequately treated in those with mental ill health (Bernardo et al. 2009).

10.5 Limitations
The study was retrospective, not prospective. It was reliant on secondary data. The observations were made at different time points as there was a change in the data collection requirements for each condition. It was not possible to adjust for any potential confounders.

10.6 Summary of chapter
In this chapter I have described how the introduction of specific contract incentives for people with SMI since April 2011 may be partly successful in increasing the level of screening in this group, but how inequalities remain compared with diabetes.

This study has been published as:
Chapter eleven: Does training practice nurses about the physical health of patients with severe mental illness motivate them to provide screening for this group?

In the last two chapters I have described how people with SMI receive less screening for CVD than those with diabetes. The overall aim of this thesis is to increase this level of screening by training practice nurses how to provide health checks for this group of patients. This chapter describes the effectiveness of the PhyHWell training package in modifying practice nurses’ attitudes and misconceptions about the physical health of people with SMI.

11.1 Background

I have described in chapter two that Government guidelines recommend that patients with SMI have an annual physical health check in order to identify risk factors for CVD (NICE 2010a, 2006) and that people generally attend primary care for routine health monitoring (Osborn et al. 2007). Despite this, my studies (explained in chapters nine and ten) show that there is little evidence these health checks are routinely taking place (Hardy et al. 2013a, Mitchell and Hardy 2013).

Practice nurses are already competent in carrying out physical health checks (Osborn et al. 2010). However, as explained in chapter seven, they lack training in mental illness and the most recent analysis of their perceived responsibilities did not include SMI (Crossman 2008). Even if practice nurses are not inviting patients with SMI to attend for a physical health check, this group may still present themselves for other reasons (Harvey et al. 2005). Up to
50% of patients with SMI in England receive help from a mental health professional in secondary care (BMA & NHS Employers 2011) who could have a role in ensuring a health check has taken place in primary care (Osborn et al. 2010). As practice nurses are not used to working specifically with people with SMI, they may not have a system for informing community mental health workers (CMHWs) about patients that they have invited for a health check. A survey of practice nurses revealed that only 7% have regular contact with a Community Psychiatric Nurse (Gray et al. 1999). It is possible that if CMHWs attend practice nurse training, collaborative working maybe promoted between primary and secondary care. Kelley et al. (2009) argue that the benefit of interprofessional learning is that students will have a better working knowledge of other professionals, enabling them to make appropriate referrals to other professions and work more closely with them. In my view, a focussed training delivered in the practice setting may be effective in breaking down practice nurses’ misconceptions.

11.2 The training package

When describing the intervention to participants, Craig et al. (2008) suggest using a multifaceted approach involving a mixture of interactive rather than didactic educational meetings, including feedback, reminders and local consensus processes.

11.2.1 Developing the Package

I developed the Health Improvement Profile for Primary Care or HIP-PC in collaboration with Professor Gray from the original tool developed for secondary
care (Hardy & Gray 2010) and constructed a website for practice nurses. This has been described in more detail in chapter eight.

11.2.2 Intended Learning Outcomes

Intended learning outcomes for practice nurses were:

- Understand the definition of SMI.
- Know the signs and symptoms of SMI.
- Be familiar with the epidemiology of SMI.
- Be aware of the impact of SMI on physical health particularly the increased risk of CVD.
- Be confident in navigating and using the website.
- Be confident in carrying out a health check using the HIP-PC manual.
- Be competent in entering data onto the computer template.
- Feel confident in providing this role within their practice.
- Liaise with relevant healthcare professionals and agencies.

11.2.3 Training

A two hour foundation block of training was delivered at the practice nurses’ usual place of work. In order to ensure the learning outcomes were achieved the training consisted of group discussion and demonstration (carrying out a simulated health check using the template added to their computer system). This fits with the recommendations given by the authors of a qualitative systematic review on educational interventions in primary mental health care Howe et al. 2006). These are that the impact of educational interventions which support constructive learning from personal data are likely to be more effective
than courses working with theory alone or ‘imaginary’ patients, even when these are well designed and carried out.

The link CMHW was invited to attend the training to increase the practice nurse’s motivation to work with them. It was my belief that learning together would help them to communicate with each other.

11.3 Method

This is a before and after study. Practice nurses participating in the study were asked to complete two questionnaires immediately before and directly after training (misconceptions and attitudes – appendices 7 and 8). Their motivation to work with CMHWs was assessed immediately after training (appendix 9). Post examination was carried out instantaneously due to the difficulty in gaining access to practice nurses.

Preparing primary care practices for training

Prior to inviting GPs to participate in training, I attended one of their regular meetings where a representative from all 31 practices in Northampton is usually present. I carried out a presentation describing the project and what they would need to do in order to participate. A letter was sent (with accompanying detailed information – appendices 10 and 11) to each GP practice representative. A practice nurse was identified from each practice to be the project lead for their organisation. Before the training a meeting was held with the Practice Manager to discuss giving the practice nurse(s) adequate time and support to carry out the physical health checks once they had received the training.
To support the delivery of the health checks by the practice nurse, the following additional preparatory work was undertaken with a member of the administrative team:

- Checking that the SMI register was accurate to ensure every patient is invited.
- Adjusting the physical health check computer template to ensure it contained all the necessary parameters.
- Discussing possible systems of inviting appropriate patients.

Developing the questionnaires

I searched the literature to see if there were any validated measures of attitudes to the physical health of people with SMI. It is recommended to employ previously used validated questionnaires that have been administered in similar settings and capture variables that are of interest according to the study hypothesis as they do not need to be tested for reliability. Additionally, if the mode of administration is similar to the original questionnaire, results can be compared for different studies and also combined for meta-analysis (Edwards 2010). As I did not discover any (there has since been a tool developed – Robson and Haddad 2012) I decided to develop my own evaluation. If a new questionnaire is to be developed, it should be pilot tested and validated in order to evaluate if it is measuring what it supposed to measure and is it doing it reliably (Streiner and Norman 2004). Consultations were carried out with practice nurses to develop the content of the questionnaires using an item pool created by me. This item pool was created from genuine statements by practice nurses in discussions with me over the previous year. In order to check the face
validity of the questionnaires, they were reviewed by six practice nurses, four mental health nurses and two academics who gave feedback e.g. one academic suggested including a question about the side effects of antipsychotic medication. Questions pertaining to basic demographic data (sex, ethnicity and years of experience as a registered nurse) were included. This feedback was carried out via email. Much of the feedback was positive without comment. In retrospect, this may have reflected that the participants had not fully analysed the questionnaires. A formal meeting would have assured that the professionals were studying the questionnaires and would have encouraged further ideas through discussion.

- Misconception questionnaire. This measures the nurses’ misconceptions of the physical health risks factors associated with people with SMI. Ten misconceptions were presented for which participants indicated whether they agreed or disagreed.

- Attitudes Questionnaire. This measures the nurses’ attitudes towards providing physical health checks for people with SMI. Participants had the option to either agree or disagree with these beliefs.

- Motivation to work with CMHW Questionnaire. This aims to determine the practice nurses’ motivation to engage with their secondary care colleagues regarding patients with SMI and any service developments.

**Data Analysis**

I have used descriptive statistics to measure the nurses’ misconceptions, attitudes and motivation. Each question carried a score of which I calculated the mean and standard deviation reached by all the nurses. Following advice from
Allan Clarke, I used the unpaired t-test to measure the difference in the scores before and after training. The t-test assesses whether the means of two groups are statistically different from each other (Plitcha and Garzon 2009).

Ethical approval
As this project is a service evaluation it did not require ethical approval. Each participating practice gave written consent (appendix 12). The nurses were not required to sign a consent form. They were given an information sheet (appendix 13) making clear that consent is implied by filling out the questionnaire which is the usual practice for surveys undertaken in the UK.

11.3.1 Other possible methods
The method I used is recommended by Hennekens and Burning (1987) to measure the effect of an intervention. The risk of bias would have been reduced if I had been in the position to ask someone else to deliver the training or to carry out the evaluation.

11.4 Results
Six GP practices agreed to take part. There was considerable variation in the number of people with SMI registered with each one. The mean number of patients was 80 (range 13 to 123 – sd 45). The average percentage of SMI patients as a proportion of each practice population was just under one percent (range: 0.3% to 1.89% - sd 0.56).

Practices identified a mean of 1.3 nurses (range: 1 to 2); a total of eight nurses agreed to take part. They were all white British females who on average
had been working as a registered nurse for 23 years (range: 3 to 42). None of the nurses had any prior training in providing physical health checks for people with SMI but one had previously taken on the role.

The mean number of nurses answering correctly on the misconception questions was 2 (sd=3.17) pre-training and 6 (sd=0.92) post training \([p=\text{<}.01, \text{CI 0.41 (0.63 to 0.19), } t=3.93]\) (see Table 11.1). This suggests that training had been effective in modifying nurses’ misconceptions of SMI and physical health; for example, they virtually all agreed that people with SMI tended to die earlier and knew how to deal with sedation caused by antipsychotics.

The mean number of nurses answering correctly on the attitude questions was 5 (sd=1.55) pre-training and 6 (sd=1.49) post training \([p=0.50, \text{CI 5.50 (-0.85 to 11.85), } t=11.00]\) (see Table 11.2). Following training, the practice nurses’ attitudes towards a number of parameters were only slightly shifted in a positive direction; for example, they nearly all believed that when they are delivering a health check they can help patients with SMI identify triggers that cause worsening symptoms and that they can assist them to maintain meaningful activities.

The results from the motivation to work with CMHW questionnaire revealed that practice nurses would be much more likely to be motivated to work with CMHWs regarding patients and service developments (see table 11.3)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Before n (%)</th>
<th>After n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People with mental illness die five years earlier than the general population (F)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>7 (87.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antipsychotic medication should be increased if the patient stops smoking (F)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>6 (75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychotic symptoms can be improved in schizophrenic patients by using caffeine (F)</td>
<td>7 (87.5)</td>
<td>6 (75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the patient is not under the care of the Community Mental Health team, then they do not need a care plan (F)</td>
<td>7 (87.5)</td>
<td>8 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patients who take lithium need their lithium levels monitored every six months and their creatinine and thyroid levels measured every year (F)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>5 (62.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the elevation of a patient’s prolactin levels is &lt;2000 mIU/L, then it is reasonable to continue to monitor the level without any further action (F)</td>
<td>1 (12.5)</td>
<td>6 (75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to encourage all patients with severe mental illness to drink lots of fluid (F)</td>
<td>0 (50)</td>
<td>6 (75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a much smaller proportion of people with SMI are sexually active compared to the general population, they are at less risk of acquiring a sexually transmitted infection (F)</td>
<td>6 (75)</td>
<td>6 (75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannabis use is a contributing factor in 50% of schizophrenia cases (F)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>5 (62.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The side effect of sedation from taking an antipsychotic, cannot be dealt with by the patient taking their medication just before they go to bed (F)</td>
<td>1 (12.5)</td>
<td>7 (87.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean total score  
(n=2, 25%, sd 3.17)  
(n=6, 75%, sd 0.92)
Table 11.2 Trainee attitudes to the physical health of SMI patients (n=8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Before n (%)</th>
<th>After n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The diagnosis of a patient with severe mental illness affects whether recovery is possible</td>
<td>7 (87.5)</td>
<td>7 (87.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You do not need to know the views of your patients with severe mental illness regarding their psychiatric medications (F)</td>
<td>6 (75)</td>
<td>8 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are not in a position to help your patients with severe mental illness identify people who can assist them during a crisis (F)</td>
<td>6 (75)</td>
<td>7 (87.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are not in a position to identify triggers that cause symptoms of your patients with severe mental illness to get worse and identify warning signs that come before they get symptoms (F)</td>
<td>6 (75)</td>
<td>8 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is sometimes necessary to disregard the patients’ preferences regarding their physical health in order to provide the best treatment (F)</td>
<td>2 (25)</td>
<td>5 (62.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many patients with severe mental illness cannot learn how to make well-informed choices about their physical care (F)</td>
<td>4 (50)</td>
<td>5 (62.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When providing patients with SMI a health check, you should keep focused on their physical health (F)</td>
<td>4 (50)</td>
<td>5 (62.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You should invalidate the patient’s goal when it is unrealistic (F)</td>
<td>3 (37.5)</td>
<td>6 (75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A physical health check appointment does not need to include assisting patients with severe mental illness in maintaining activities that are meaningful to them (F)</td>
<td>5 (62.5)</td>
<td>8 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The physical health goals of “normal” people are often too stressful for patients with severe mental illness to reach (F)</td>
<td>5 (62.5)</td>
<td>4 (50)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean total score  

(n=5, 62.5%, sd 1.55)  
(n=6, 75%, sd 1.49)
### Table 11.3 Practice nurse response to motivation to work with CMHW questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice nurse motivation to work with CMHW questionnaire</th>
<th>Number of nurses responding to each answer:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question: Would you:</td>
<td>Much more likely (score 5)</td>
<td>More likely (score 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact your own CMHW to inform them about changes in health or circumstances of a particular patient?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact your own CMHW to ask them about a particular patient?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact your own CMHW to inform them about new or changes in service developments?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact your own CMHW to ask them about new or changes in service developments?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop an individual system of communication between your own CMHW</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall mean response (sd)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11.5 Discussion

It was disappointing that only six practices agreed to take part. I tried to find out the reasons by asking 120 GPs (from the 31 practices invited) at a local training event to complete a questionnaire. Only one person completed it, stating they had not heard of the project. Therefore I can only hypothesize as to reasons why they chose not to participate: e.g. too busy; no extra funding provided; no interest in SMI; feel proficient in providing care for this group already; think their practice nurses should not be dealing with this group; unaware of the project; lack of faith in the trainer.

The proportion of patients with SMI registered in each practice is slightly higher than the national average of 0.8% (NHS Information Centre 2011). The variation in the proportion of people with SMI registered with the participating practices may be explained by their location. As would be expected the practices with a high population of people with SMI are located in the town centre and those with the lower population are located in either a village or quiet suburb (McManus et al. 2009).

The aim of this study was to establish whether a training package to address common misconceptions about the physical health of people with SMI was effective in modifying practice nurses’ attitudes and increasing motivation to work with CMHWs. This is the first time that anyone has considered whether the misconceptions of practice nurses could be a barrier to providing physical health checks to people with SMI. Because training was effective in correcting misconceptions, these practice nurses might be more motivated to carry out health checks for this group of people in their place of work. This study has not
illustrated whether training had altered the nurses’ more general perceptions of the value of health checks

Practice nurses were not aware of the reduced life expectancy of people with SMI. This is a possible explanation of why they have not seen screening these patients for CVD as part of their role. There are a number of studies that have been carried out in primary care in the United Kingdom that are consistent with my observation that health checks are not being carried out routinely (Roberts et al. 2007, Reilly et al. 2012). In addition, a systematic review of primary care studies relating to somatic diseases in patients with schizophrenia revealed that healthcare professionals are not proactive in screening these patients (Oud & Meyboom-de Jong 2009).

A study in the United Kingdom determined that serious and enduring disorders such as schizophrenia made up 1.5% of the patients seen by practice nurses and an estimated 2% were taking antipsychotic medication (Gray et al. 1999). This is without proactively inviting patients for a health check. Before any change in their motivation to work with patients with SMI can take place, practice nurses need to have an understanding of the problem. This is highlighted in two models of behaviour change (Prochaska & Di Clemente 1992, Rogers 1983). As a result, following training, practice nurses may be more likely to offer screening and appropriate interventions; either during a planned health check or if the patient presents themselves for another reason, e.g. helping them manage the side effects of their medication, such as sedation.

I do not know if the attitudes of the participants reflect those of other practice nurses. The fact they were asked by their employers to be involved in the study may have had some influence. A study to determine the abilities of 24
practice nurses to detect psychiatric morbidity concluded that one reason for the variation in their skills may be their interest in the subject (Plummer et al. 2000). The attitudes of the nurses in this study were fairly positive before training; though there appeared to be a small improvement after participation, I cannot claim this was due to my intervention.

The results show that practice nurses in my study already had an awareness of the high chance of contracting a sexually transmitted infection in a proportion of this group. This contrasts with mental health nurses who appear to underestimate this risk (Hughes & Gray 2008). My results highlight that the subject of sexual health may be less of a priority than some of the other issues when providing this programme to other practice nurses.

I established that following training more practice nurses agreed that finding out the views of their patients with SMI regarding their psychiatric medications was important. This means they could be more likely to actively promote adherence (Gray et al. 2006). The results also indicated, that despite the score relating to the recovery of people with SMI remaining unchanged, they showed a possibility that they may seek to develop a therapeutic relationship with this group of patients. The scores were higher post training for the questions relating to discovering the patients’ views and preferences and recognizing their own role in providing assistance with emotional or social issues. This demonstrates an acceptance to be supportive of the wellbeing of the client (Diorio 2001) and not exclusively follow a checklist of physical screening. This holistic approach embraces the process of recovery (Smith 2000).
After completing training, practice nurses displayed that they would be much more likely to communicate with their CMHW. This corresponds with a study to validate the readiness for interprofessional learning scale in the postgraduate context (Reid et al. 2006) which revealed that most participants agreed that learning with other healthcare workers would help them to communicate better with other professionals. In addition, because the whole concept of caring holistically for a patient with SMI is new to practice nurses, they may feel that they are supported by having contact with CMHWs. As very few Community Mental Health Teams have a clear strategy for communication with primary care (England and Lester 2005, Bindman et al. 1997) keeping up this contact maybe a challenge.

The design of the questionnaires was poor (see limitations). This reflects my lack of knowledge and experience when they were designed at the beginning of this PhD. I have since been successful in obtaining a bid to develop further training (see chapter 14). I wanted to measure how the practice nurses perceived their ability and role in carrying out physical health checks for people with SMI. I therefore used a likert rating scale which is a technique for measuring attitudes (Likert 1932). The questions are written with a positive statement.

11.6 Limitations

There are limitations to this study. It was designed for a much larger group of participants and therefore the results cannot be generalisable. Given the small numbers participating, a qualitative approach to data collection could have provided more meaningful results.
The correct answers for both the “misconception” and “attitudes” questionnaires are all false. This could have had an influence on the results if participants realized this after the training and answered the questions as false accordingly.

Some of the statements in the misconception questionnaire could have been confusing. In particular, question one, I have stated that people with SMI die five years earlier as a false statement when in fact they do die earlier but by 12-20 years.

The questionnaires were repeated directly after training therefore it is possible that participants would remember the questions that were asked pre-training and through strategic learning remembered the answers by rote. In order to discover the durability of any improvements a longer follow-up is needed. In retrospect, this could have been carried out electronically without the need to meet with the nurses physically.

There is potential bias as I delivered and evaluated the intervention. I do not know whether the participants were typical or atypical practice nurses.

11.7 Summary of chapter

In this chapter I have described how practice nurses who complete the physical health check for severe mental illness training package have fewer misconceptions about SMI and may be more likely to accept carrying out these health checks as part of their role; their motivation to work with the CMHW is enhanced.

This paper was published as:
Chapter twelve: Does training practice nurses increase CVD screening and lifestyle intervention?

In this chapter I describe how training practice nurses increased the level of CVD screening and lifestyle intervention given to people with SMI in the five participating practices. As the practices varied in the number of patients that they serve (the smallest serving approximately 5,000 and the largest 13,000) and in their location (urban, suburban and rural) they provided a reasonable national representation.

12.1 Background

As described previously in my thesis, experts have advocated the need to improve CVD monitoring and the provision of lifestyle advice in people with SMI (Osborn et al. 2011, De Hert et al. 2009a, Kilbourne et al. 2007, Barnett et al. 2007). An EPOC (Cochrane Effective Practice and Organisation Care) review did not identify any randomised trials which assessed the effectiveness of physical health monitoring in this group (Tosh et al. 2010). In the general population, authors of a systematic review have concluded that general health checks did not reduce morbidity or mortality (Krogsbøll et al. 2012). All the fourteen studies included were carried out before 1999; therefore it is possible that recent advances in the prevention of CVD may have improved the benefits of these checks (Thompson and Tonelli 2012). In contrast to Krogsbøll et al.’s observations, a meta-analysis of nurse-provided or nurse-coordinated care management programmes for secondary prevention, shows that they are highly effective in reducing CVD morbidity and mortality in patients with coronary artery disease (Clark et al. 2005). Running nurse led secondary prevention
clinics in primary care incurs the cost of nurses' time (Campbell et al. 1998). Consequently GPs may view them as expensive and be reluctant to resource them (Raftery et al. 2005). In a randomised controlled trial of 1343 patients with coronary heart disease, the results showed that these costs were relatively low and were linked to health gains that were considerable in terms of deaths, life years, and QALYs (Raftery et al. 2005).

There is some literature from the 1990s which supports designated practice nurse clinics for people with SMI. Kendrick et al. (1994, 1995) tested the teaching to GPs of structured assessments of their long-term mentally ill patients. They concluded that this can increase their involvement in psychiatric care, but as regular structured assessments were not feasible in routine surgeries, special appointments with input from practice nurses might be more reliable. Burns et al. (1998) carried out a randomised controlled trial in which they provided training to practice nurses to carry out structured assessment of people with schizophrenia. They concluded that structured assessments by practice nurses are feasible with this patient group, but training, targeted at both nurses and GPs, is needed if this intervention is to translate into health gain.

Since the introduction of a new payment contract in 2004 in England, the emphasis of practice nurse clinics has been focussed on long term conditions rather than general health checks. Annual clinics to review patients with diabetes for example, have become routine (Hall 2008). A recent randomised control trial of these clinics run by practice nurses showed equivalent results to GPs in respect of lipids, glucose and blood pressure levels and increased patient satisfaction (Houweling et al. 2011).
I have explained in previous chapters that the authors of national guidance in England recommend that patients with SMI should receive a physical health check at least once a year (NICE 2006, 2010a) and how GPs in primary care are paid to provide CVD screening for this group every fifteen months (BMA and NHS Employers 2012). It is important to repeat these details as the change in the way this reimbursement is given took place during the period of this study. Between April 2004 and March 2011, payment was received if primary care practitioners documented that they had completed a review in people with SMI. There should have been evidence that the patient was offered screening, routine health promotion and prevention advice appropriate to their age, gender and health status, but these were not measured. Since April 2011, payment is given for recording patients’ alcohol consumption, body mass index (BMI), blood pressure, glucose and HDL cholesterol level (if over 40 years), and cervical screening within the last five years (if within national screening age).

Many GPs in primary care choose to screen people with SMI opportunistically for CVD risk when these patients attend the clinic for another reason, rather than inviting them for an annual health check by a practice nurse (Reilly et al. 2012, Hardy 2011). As the GPs’ usual consultation times are short, it is difficult for them to provide adequate lifestyle advice (Phelan et al. 2001). For example, a recent study revealed that health education was not a common feature of consultations with the SMI group of patients in primary care (Reilly et al. 2012). When in a busy clinic, professionals may make assumptions, such as a patient with a normal BMI is eating well. These do not necessarily hold true, my study examining the food diaries completed by people with schizophrenia found that the patient with the lowest BMI had the unhealthiest diet (Hardy and
Gray 2011). It is important to have discussions with patients about their lifestyle to either encourage a change in unhealthy routines or to motivate them to maintain a healthy way of life (Miller 2005, NICE 2012). I argue that creating a nurse led clinic for people with SMI would provide sufficient time to achieve this effectively, but there is presently no evidence to support this view (Hardy and Gray 2010).

The aim of this study is to establish whether training practice nurses increases the proportion of patients with SMI screened for CVD risk factors and given lifestyle advice in primary care.

12.2 Method

Sample and procedures

Audits are suggested as one method of evaluating a complex intervention (Craig et al. 2008). This is a repeat audit monitoring how well primary care practitioners are meeting their duty to screen people with SMI for CVD risk factors and give them lifestyle advice. This audit will provide information to decide how this might be improved. Practice nurses will take part in training to deliver health checks for people with SMI. The audit will be carried out pre and post training as described below.

Audit Standards

The standards for CVD screening and lifestyle advice were derived from published guidelines (NICE 2006, 2010a, De Hert et al. 2009a). These were that all patients with SMI should, as a minimum, have their blood pressure, BMI (or waist circumference), blood glucose (or HbA1c) and cholesterol measured at
least once a year. They should also be given advice about diet, exercise and smoking cessation annually.

*Data Collection*

This was an audit that took place between September 2009 and August 2010 and was then repeated following the training of practice nurses between September 2010 and August 2011. Patients were identified from the SMI register of each of the five participating practices. Demographic information (age, gender) and evidence of whether screening and lifestyle advice had been given in the last year was extracted manually from the electronic patient records.

*Data Analysis*

Following advice from Allan Clarke, I used relative risk to calculate whether training made a difference to the level of screening and lifestyle advice given to people with SMI as a group. The t-test was employed to determine the difference between the mean number of interventions received by each individual patient with SMI before and after training. This analysis was done with SPSS, version 18.

12.2.1 Other possible methods

An RCT would have provided a comparison and reduced confounders. Due to the difficulty in recruiting practices and the fact I was conducting the project alone, this was not possible.
12.3 Results

I invited 31 primary care centres in Northampton to take part in this project, five agreed. From the computer records I identified 400 patients from the SMI register. The number of patients (n=400) in the first and second audit remained unchanged. However, I cannot assume that they were all the same patients as I did not record how many of them left or joined the practice during this time. That said, the turnover of patients in primary care in GP practices is generally very modest and therefore it is only likely to be a few patients who were different (Stokes et al. 2004). Table 12.1 shows that the demographic profile (age and gender) of the sample remained broadly similar between the two audits. Most of the participants were male and the majority of them were middle-aged.

Table 12.2 shows the proportion of patients that had each element of a health check completed in the year before and after Practice Nurse training. In terms of CVD screening factors, in the first audit the most commonly assessed element was blood pressure, more than half the patients that participated had this checked. BMI was recorded in the records of a little under half of patients. Around a third of patients had had a blood test for cholesterol and glucose levels. One in five patients had all four risk factors checked. Table 12.3 shows the elements of the health check delivered to each patient before and after training. The mean number of interventions received by each patient for screening was fewer than two from a possible four in the first audit. In the second audit following training, there was a significant increase in the proportion of patients receiving each health check element. Three quarters of the patients had their blood pressure checked and over half had their BMI recorded. Just under half were given blood tests for glucose and cholesterol levels. There was
no significant increase in the number of patients receiving all elements of CVD screening. The mean number of interventions received by each patient for screening was nearly two and a half from a possible four which was a significant increase.

Turning to lifestyle counselling, in the first audit just over one in ten patients with SMI received diet and exercise advice and over half received smoking advice. Around one in ten patients received all three elements of lifestyle guidance. From a possible three lifestyle interventions, patients received less than one. Following training there was a significant increase in the three elements of lifestyle advice giving. Just over a third of patients received diet and exercise advice and around two thirds were given information about smoking. From a possible three lifestyle interventions, patients received nearly one and a half.

In the first audit around one in twelve patients received a complete health check (all seven elements), this increased significantly following the training to more than one in seven. This is in fact, almost a doubling of patients receiving a comprehensive health check. The mean number of both screening and lifestyle advice elements from a possible seven received by each patient increased from just over two and a half to nearly four.
TABLE 12.1, age distribution of participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age category</th>
<th>16-35</th>
<th>36-55</th>
<th>56+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First audit (n=400)</td>
<td>96, 24</td>
<td>176, 44</td>
<td>128, 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second audit (n=400)</td>
<td>94, 23</td>
<td>179, 45</td>
<td>127, 32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 12.2, proportion of patients that had each element of a health check completed in the year before and after Practice Nurse training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component of health check</th>
<th>Completed at health check</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-training year (n=400)</td>
<td>Post-training year (n=400)</td>
<td>Relative risk (95% CI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n, % (95% CI)</td>
<td>n, % (95% CI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CVD risk factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glucose</td>
<td>125, 31 (27,36)</td>
<td>179, 45 (40-50)</td>
<td>1.43 (1.19, 1.72, p&lt;.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blood pressure</td>
<td>245, 61 (56, 66)</td>
<td>300, 75 (70-79)</td>
<td>1.22 (1.11, 1.35, p&lt;.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholesterol</td>
<td>144, 36 (31, 41)</td>
<td>177, 44 (39, 49)</td>
<td>1.23 (1.04, 1.46, p=.02)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body mass index (BMI)</td>
<td>186, 47 (42, 51)</td>
<td>219, 55 (50, 60)</td>
<td>1.18 (1.03, 1.36, p=.02)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All risk factors</strong></td>
<td>79, 20 (16-24)</td>
<td>91, 23 (19-27)</td>
<td>1.15 (0.88, 1.51, ns)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lifestyle advice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diet</td>
<td>50, 13 (10, 16)</td>
<td>136, 34 (30, 39)</td>
<td>3.06 (2.03, 3.65, p&lt;.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise</td>
<td>56, 14 (11, 18)</td>
<td>138, 35 (30, 39)</td>
<td>2.46 (1.87, 3.25, p&lt;.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoking</td>
<td>219, 55 (50, 60)</td>
<td>279, 70 (65, 74)</td>
<td>1.27 (1.14, 1.42, p&lt;.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All three elements</strong></td>
<td>43, 11 (8, 14)</td>
<td>112, 28 (24, 33)</td>
<td>2.60 (1.89, 3.60, p&lt;.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All elements of health check</strong></td>
<td>33, 8 (6, 11)</td>
<td>60, 15 (12-19)</td>
<td>1.82 (1.22, 2.72, p=.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 12.3, elements of the health check delivered to each patient with SMI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (sd 95% CI)</td>
<td>Mean (sd 95% CI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVD screening (out of 4)</td>
<td>1.83 (1.53, 1.68 to 1.98)</td>
<td>2.41 (0.47, 2.36 to 2.46)</td>
<td>t=-6.99, p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle (out of 3)</td>
<td>0.85 (0.95, 0.76 to 0.94)</td>
<td>1.41 (1.41, 1.27 to 1.55)</td>
<td>t=-6.98, p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screening and lifestyle (out of 7)</td>
<td>2.69 (2.22, 2.47 to 2.91)</td>
<td>3.85 (1.37, 3.72 to 3.98)</td>
<td>t=-8.22, p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12.4 Discussion

The aim of this study was to establish whether training practice nurses increases the proportion of the patients in their practice with SMI being screened for CVD risk factors and given lifestyle advice. Following training, all elements of CVD screening and lifestyle advice increased. Importantly, there was no decrease in any of the interventions.

The proportion of patients receiving cholesterol and glucose measurements increased from a third in the first audit to just under half in the second. Though this is a large increase, the actual numbers are low in comparison to the blood pressure and BMI measures. This is consistent with other studies (Eldridge et al. 2011, Smith et al. 2007a, b). Only a quarter of patients had glucose and cholesterol tested in the study by Eldridge et al. despite a hundred percent having BMI and blood pressure recorded. Smith et al. measured glucose in approximately 75% of participants but only recorded HDL cholesterol in 22%. They report obtaining fasting samples was not possible easily in an outpatient SMI cohort with the various limitations including timing of appointments and laboratory schedules. The nurses in my study may have experienced similar difficulties, as although unnecessary to fast for total cholesterol and HDL (Lab Tests Online 2012, Birtcher and Ballantyne 2004), the laboratory in Northampton requires it for HDL. My training suggested recording blood pressure and BMI, and testing random glucose or HbA1c and total cholesterol in everyone. However six months later there were changes to the targets for people with SMI in the GPs’ payment contract; these included measuring blood pressure and BMI to all but only offering blood tests to patients over forty years old and measuring HDL, rather than total cholesterol (BMA and
This may explain the fact that fewer patients had blood tests done than the other screening measures.

More patients were given diet and exercise advice following training and these interventions were not targets of the payment contract. The level of smoking advice increased significantly despite this being a payment target when the first audit took place. These findings are consistent with those of Bernard et al. (2009) who reported that the training and education of nurses in primary care centres promotes the use of prevention practices. This is important as the high prevalence of obesity and dyslipidemia in patients with SMI suggests that these patients may benefit from interventions that are focused more specifically on changing health behaviours (Graves and Miller 2003, Brar et al. 2005). As only half of the patients taking long-term primary prevention medications following screening adhere to their treatment (Morisky et al. 2008, Vrijens 2008), promoting a healthy lifestyle is essential.

It is encouraging to observe that in the second audit there was a significant increase in the mean number of elements of the health check received by each individual patient, both for screening and lifestyle advice. However, more research is required to examine whether this has an effect on patient outcomes. Unfortunately it was not possible to ascertain whether the effect was sustainable with time by examining records after 2011. This was due to the project only having two years of funding. It had been hoped at the start of the study that a further year may be funded and a third audit could have been carried out. However organisational change at the primary care trust level prevented this.
Although the training in my study incorporated the suggestion of developing a specific nurse led clinic, I had no control of whether the five practices participating developed this as a service. As described in the previous chapter, practice nurses who have completed training have fewer misconceptions about SMI and might be more likely to accept carrying out these health checks as part of their role (Hardy 2012), but the organization of their overall workload is usually controlled by the GPs (McGregor et al. 2008).

12.5 Limitations

The research activity around the training may have increased the awareness of the increased CVD risk in people with SMI and encouraged healthcare professionals in the practices to offer patients screening, rather than it being the effect of the training itself (the Hawthorne effect – Mayo 1933).

Due to the change in the GP contract, I cannot claim the increases in blood pressure and BMI in the second audit were fully due to my intervention.

12.6 Summary of chapter

Training practice nurses to deliver health checks for people with SMI increases the level of screening and lifestyle advice given to this group of patients. More research is needed to assess whether the organization of the practice nurse workload to include annual health checks for patients with SMI in addition to training, will enhance this progress.

This study has been published as:
Hardy S, Hinks P and Gray R. (2013) Does training practice nurses to carry out physical health checks for people with severe mental illness increase the level

(in press)
Chapter thirteen: What are the views of patients regarding their physical health check?

Craig et al. (2008) recommend that appropriate ‘users’ should be involved at all stages of the development, process and outcome analysis of a complex intervention, as this is likely to result in better, more relevant science and a higher chance of producing implementable data. The purpose of this chapter is to portray the views of patients with SMI regarding the physical health check that was delivered to them by a practice nurse who had received the PhyHWell training. These observations will be employed to refine and enhance the intervention.

13.1 Background

As described in previous chapters, there is little evidence to show that health checks are for people with SMI are routinely taking place (Roberts et al. 2007) or that health education is a common feature of consultations with this group of patients in primary care (Reilly et al. 2012). This may be because people with SMI do not consider themselves at risk of physical health problems and therefore do not attend for screening (Campion et al. 2005). However, my audit described in chapter 5 demonstrated that they will attend for a physical health check when invited to an appointment at a specific time and date with a named person (Hardy and Gray 2012). Additionally, a qualitative study from the perspectives of individuals with a mental illness, established that this group of patients thought it would be advantageous if primary health care providers
focused on preventative health and early detection of physical health problems (McCabe and Leas 2008).

Two studies concluded that people with SMI give less attention to their lifestyle and physical health needs due lack of knowledge rather than poor motivation (Buhagiar et al. 2011, Campion et al. 2005). In fact, other research has shown that people with SMI possessed a high positive attitude towards their physical health care but it is the lack of support and negative staff attitudes that are possible barriers to their participation in lifestyle interventions (Roberts and Bailey 2011, Brunero and Lamont 2010). People with schizophrenia consider it important that the healthcare professionals have the ability to inspire their confidence and that they are kind and patient (Lester et al. 2003). They also want to know what services are available to assist them to make informed decisions and adopt proactive health choices (McCabe and Leas 2008). Additionally, peer and staff support, knowledge, personal attributes and participation of staff have been identified as possible incentives for improving the health of this group (Roberts and Bailey 2011). For example, Campion et al. (2005) reported that one third of patients with SMI in their study said they would increase their physical activity following advice from a doctor.

A qualitative study examining personal (or holistic) care of all patients in general practice reported that patients regardless of diagnosis wanted to be treated as a “whole person” rather than just treating the presenting illness (Tarrant et al. 2003). The patients referred to the importance of professionals knowing about them and their family history. The nurses in this study described themselves as specialists in this respect. A mental health service user with a diagnosis of schizophrenia responded to this study (Antoniou 2003). She
emphasized that personal care is very important to mental health service users who are trying to survive in the community. Understanding the relationship from the perspective of persons with SMI may provide insight into how this relationship can be formed into a long-term working partnership with positive health outcomes (Galon and Graor 2012).

In this study my primary objective was to examine the patients’ view of the physical health check that was delivered to them by a practice nurse who had received PhyHWell training. I hoped to employ these observations to refine and enhance the intervention.

13.2 Method

I have used a qualitative method of research for this study. I chose to interview patients as this allowed for some flexibility in administration, clarification of questions and the use of follow up questions (Adler and Clark 2011). The advantage of interviewing is the use of open-ended questions and probing. This gives participants the opportunity to respond in their own words, rather than forcing them to choose from fixed responses. Open-ended questions can evoke responses that are meaningful to the participant, explanatory in nature and unanticipated by the researcher. Probing allows the researcher to ask why or how after the initial participant responses (encouraging them to elaborate on their answers) and engage with them according to their individual personalities and styles,
Recruitment

I intended to interview twelve patients from three of the participating practices who had had a health check by a nurse trained in the PhyHWell project. I aimed to build a sample representative of the population who have had a health check. It was planned that this would be achieved by using purposive non-random sampling by selecting a distribution of gender and diagnosis (three men and three women with bipolar disorder and three men and three women with schizophrenia), age (three patients from each age group 18-28 years, 29-39 years, 39-49 years and over 50 years) and ethnicity (one patient who belongs to the black minority ethnic sector diagnosed with bipolar and one with the diagnosis of schizophrenia). These characteristics would reflect the diversity and breadth of the sample population.

Each practice was asked to identify one male and one female patient with schizophrenia and the same for bipolar disorder. They were asked to include one patient from each age group. The practice that had the highest percentage of patients belonging to the black minority ethnic sector was requested to include a patient of either sex from this group. A member of the administrative team from each participating practice generated a list of eligible patients using these criteria. The first patient listed in each category was then selected. The names of the identified patients were checked by one of the healthcare professionals to ensure they had mental capacity to consent. As I recognized that it was unlikely that everyone invited would attend, I aimed to invite eight people from each of the three identified practices.
Conduct of Interviews

I followed this topic guide:

- How do you think you look after your physical health?
- How would you describe your physical health (e.g. good, poor)?
- Have you got any concerns about your physical health?
- Where would you go if you had a physical illness?
- How often do you visit your GP?
- What did you think about the health check you had (interventions, nurse delivering health check)?
- Has the health check encouraged you to make any lifestyle changes? If so, what are they?

Open ended questions were asked in order not to lead the patient. A tape recorder was not used. After consultation with people with schizophrenia, I determined that this could be unacceptable to some participants because of paranoid symptoms and therefore may restrict involvement. An assistant was used to take notes. This afforded a lack of distraction for me by having to write. I was able to keep eye contact with the patient and maintain the flow of conversation. However, the patient may have felt uncomfortable talking in front of another person or have been distracted by their presence.

Data Analysis

Thematic analysis was conducted on the notes from the interviews. I followed guidance from Howitt and Cramer (2010) as described in chapter six. I have driven some of the themes by using a topic guide. An example of one theme was the patients’ concerns about their physical health which emerged from
asking them about this directly. I discussed these with my supervisor Dr Katherine Deane.

*Ethical approval*

The Regional Ethics Committee (through proportionate review) gave approval on the condition there was an assistant to take notes (appendix 14 and 15). Additionally, I made my own notes immediately following the interviews in order to record some of my observations about the patients.

**13.2.1 Other possible methods**

The use of questionnaires rather than interviews may have provided me with the views of more patients.

**13.3 Results**

From a total of 29 invited patients, five attended. The first practice identified eight patients using the criteria and one turned up. As they had many eligible patients they were able to invite a further eight and again one attended. The second practice was very small and only had five eligible patients. They were all invited and one came to the interview. The third practice invited eight patients and two of them attended.

Table 13.1 illustrates the demographic information of the participants. None of them were working and the majority had no regular support from secondary care services.
13.3.1 Observations

Though all the patients were willing to take part in the interviews, their answers were in the main, very brief. It was difficult to get them to elaborate on the points they had made.

All the patients arrived on time for their interview without exception. Most appeared clean and well kempt. The majority of patients were initially a little guarded until they listened to the verbal explanation of the study. Finding out that the interviewer (me) was a nurse seemed to be a reassuring factor.

One patient lived with her husband who was present during the interview. She responded to all her questions but looked to her husband for confirmation of her answers. This patient stated that she was very happy with all the care received now and in the past. Only one patient declared the opposite.

The other four patients who all lived alone indicated that life could often be rather difficult.
Table 13. 1 Demographic information of participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient number</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Diagnosis</th>
<th>Year of diagnosis</th>
<th>Living arrangements</th>
<th>Occupational status</th>
<th>Social support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>White British</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Bipolar disorder</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Lives alone</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>White British</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Schizophrenia</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Lives alone</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>CPN for injection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>White British</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Psychotic episode</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Lives alone</td>
<td>Unemployed (carer for son)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>White British</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Bipolar disorder</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Lives with husband</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>CPN annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>White British</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Paranoid schizophrenia</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Lives alone</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>Weekly visit from support agency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13.3.2 Patients’ understanding of physical health

All of the patients appeared to have a good understanding of the importance of a healthy diet and taking regular exercise. Some were managing to do regular activity and eat well but others reported that it was not so easy. Two patients reported that their lifestyle had improved now that their mental state was better. Only one patient smoked but he was trying to give up. None of the patients were currently drinking alcohol or taking illicit drugs, though one reported a past habit.

Patients gave very little detail regarding whether they thought they were healthy or not. Two patients described joint problems or stiffness caused by the medication they were taking. One said the medication had made her gain weight. Another was unaware that his medication may increase weight or cause problems.

‘Sometimes I comfort eat though it doesn’t help me feel better.’
Patient 1 (52 year old female)

‘I try to exercise (cycle), sometimes I’m a bit lazy’
Patient 2 (48 year old male)

‘Look after health better now – didn’t give a t**s before when ill as didn’t care whether I lived or died’
Patient 3 (47 year old female)
‘My health is better since I started to look after myself’

Patient 4 (76 year old female)

‘My health is bad. I’m not a healthy eater, I smoke…’

Patient 5 (25 year old male)

13.3.3 Patients’ concerns about their physical health

The patients voiced some concern regarding their physical health though they did not display an awareness of the risk of CVD. One patient felt that everything that could be done in regard to keeping her healthy was in place. Another said they were not worried at the moment but probably would need to consider their health in the future. Two patients mentioned side effects of medication.

‘My health could be better. I haven’t looked after myself so well since my mental illness. I would rather have side effects (from the medication) than symptoms of bipolar disorder.’

Patient 1 (52 year old female)

‘I worry about the stiffness.’

Patient 2 (48 year old male)

Seeking help with a physical illness

The majority of patients said they would attempt to sort out minor ailments themselves and only attend the surgery because they have to, e.g. reviews for medication and diabetes or more severe illness. One said this was because she
was brought up not go but when her mental health was poor it was because she
didn’t trust anyone. She thought seeing the same person each time she came to
surgery would help. Two other patients said they had no confidence in doctors.
One said he found it easier to talk to the community mental health nurse but she
didn’t know about physical health and another said she might be happier seeing
a nurse. A different patient said seeing a nurse would be ok if they were not too
young and had some understanding of the patient’s situation.

‘System at this doctor means you see different doctor or
nurse each time. Not good when you have mental illness
and cannot trust people.’
Patient 3 (47 year old female)

‘I stopped coming (to GP surgery) because doctors would just read notes
and say will write to CPN. My physical illness is overlooked because I
have a mental health problem. They treat me like a child. I would be
more willing to come if this changed.’
Patient 5 (25 year old male)

13.3.4 Patients’ thoughts about the health check
Most of the patients expressed that they were pleased to be invited and thought
the health check was worthwhile. They were glad to be offered advice about
diet and exercise. Only one said he thought it didn’t matter but he was unaware
that he had had a health check. The majority of patients said that they had not
been told what the blood tests were for and would have liked an explanation.
Four patients wished that they could have discussed medication and its effects on their health. Generally patients wanted more information, both verbal and written.

‘I don’t know what to ask for, so would like to be offered more information about services available to me.’

Patient 3 (47 year old female)

13.3.5 Patients’ thoughts on the effect of the health check

All of the patients reported since the health check they had started to make changes to their lifestyle, three reporting an increase in regular exercise and making changes to their diet. The fourth patient was improving her eating and the fifth (who thought he had not had a health check) was working with the nurse to decrease his smoking.

‘It made me focus on my weight problem. I would like to see nurse weekly but they can only do once a month so my parents are paying for a diet class.’

Patient 1 (52 year old female)

‘I’m seeing the nurse every six weeks for my diet. I’ve lost 2 stone!’

Patient 4 (76 year old female)
13.4 Discussion

The purpose of this study was to examine the patients’ views regarding the physical health check delivered by a nurse trained in the PhyHWell project.

It was disappointing that I only managed to recruit five patients to the study. It is recognized that recruitment can be the most challenging part of a clinical research study and our potential participants shared most of the characteristics often associated with poor response (Patel et al. 2003, Armstrong et al. 1992). Given this, and the fact that patients with SMI are often not forthcoming in presenting themselves with physical ailments, the response rate is not surprising (Saha et al. 2007, Andreasen 1995). However, despite the small number of participants, I still managed to get a cross section of gender, age and diagnosis. I may have recruited more patients had I been in a position to invite more. I was limited by the need for room space in the practices and the goodwill of the staff to carry out the administration needed.

All the patients arrived on time for their interview without exception. It could be argued that this exhibits a picture of good organization which is a characteristic often described as lacking in people with SMI (Martinez-Arán et al. 2004, Andreasen 1995). However we should take into account that of the people who did not attend, only a small number telephoned to say they were not coming. We do not know if those who did not inform us of their non-attendance made a conscious choice not to participate, or if they were too disorganised to come.

Most of the participants appeared clean and well kempt. This could demonstrate that they want to look after themselves and were therefore
responsive to advice given by the nurse during the health check. These participants may not be typical of the SMI group as a whole.

The majority of patients were initially a little guarded until they listened to the verbal explanation of the study. This may have been due to concerns about confidentiality which any person being interviewed may be worried about (Lavin and Maynard 2001). These anxieties are usually allayed following assurance that their privacy will be respected (Sekaran 2003). Additionally, some people with SMI have an element of suspicion related to their diagnosis which could increase their apprehension in this situation (Freeman and Garety 2000). They could have been reassured by the knowledge of the interviewer (SH) being a nurse because they expected to be approached from a perspective of understanding (Freeman and Garety 2006).

The majority of patients who attended had no regular support from secondary care. This may be because they are well and so were able to make the decision to participate. Perhaps the people who were receiving support were less well and this is one reason why they did not attend.

Most participants answered the questions during the interviews very succinctly. This may be characteristic of the cognitive problems of SMI rather than indifference (Martinez-Arán et al. 2004, Andreasen 1995).

The patients did not display an awareness of CVD risk. I cannot be sure whether they were told about this during the health check and did not remember or were not given this education. Providing relevant written information could be helpful and was suggested by some of the participants.

A number of the patients said they would delay seeking help with a physical illness due to their lack of confidence in their doctors and having to see
a different person each visit. One of them illustrated his reluctance to attend due to the negative attitude of his GP. This concurs with the findings of Roberts and Bailey (2011) regarding possible barriers. However, the patients were willing to see a nurse. The reason may be because generally nurses have more time than doctors and therefore appear more patient; a trait considered important by people with schizophrenia (Lester et al. 2003). Having one nurse in the practice responsible for providing these health checks offers the opportunity to build ongoing relationships. However, as expressed by one of the participants, this nurse would need to have a positive manner and relevant skills. Training nurses will assist in this outcome (Hardy 2012).

Most of the patients expressed that they were pleased to be invited for a health check and thought it was worthwhile. Their views coincide with the participants of the study by McCabe and Leas (2008) who thought that it would be beneficial if primary health care providers focused on preventative health. The patients in our sample wanted to know more about what blood tests they were having and the effects of their medication. This demonstrates a high positive attitude towards their physical health care which concurs with the results of the study by Brunero and Lamont (2010). People with SMI may give more attention to their lifestyle and physical health needs if they have this knowledge (Buhagiar et al. 2011, Campion et al. 2005).

Despite the apparent lack of knowledge of CVD risk factors, the patients were making lifestyle changes. In fact, one patient was unaware that he had a health check. It could be argued that this is not important if the consequences are achieved i.e. he was tackling the toughest lifestyle change (smoking). It appears from the interviews that lifestyle changes were implemented following
the health check. This is synonymous with the findings of Campion et al. (2005). However, as I do not have an awareness of the participants’ previous behaviour, I cannot claim this to be the case.

The Kings Fund report for long term conditions and mental health (Kings Fund and Centre for Mental Health 2012) suggests that developing more integrated support for people with mental and physical health problems could improve outcomes. Providing education based on the views of the patients with SMI is only one but very important step to meeting this challenge and improving the service received by this group with regard to their physical health needs.

Training for practices nurses to provide physical health checks for people with SMI should emphasize the patients’ views of what will make them effective.

13.6 Limitations
There is a risk of potential bias as I carried out the interviews and analysis. There were only five patients in the study.

13.6 Summary of chapter
In this chapter I have described the views of five patients with SMI regarding their physical health check. These include: the importance of explaining why the health check has been offered; describing what each blood test is for; relating the potential side effects of antipsychotic medication; providing relevant verbal and written information; and the opportunity to see the same healthcare professional where possible. This study was published as:
Chapter fourteen: Impact case study

Craig et al. (2008) explain that publication in the research literature is essential but it is only part of an effective implementation strategy. In this chapter I have described how I have disseminated my research in order to make an impact.

14.1 Background

Nurses are taught to practice evidence based nursing (EBN) which is the conscientious, explicit, and judicious use of current best evidence in making decisions about the care of individual patients or groups (DiCenso et al. 2005). It requires integration of individual clinical expertise and patient preferences with the best available external clinical evidence from systematic research, and consideration of available resources (DiCenso et al. 2005). The purpose of this research was to create an evidence based pathway as there have been no previous studies regarding practice nurses and the physical health of people with SMI in primary care. However, evidence suggests that research findings may take one to two decades to be translated into standard health care practice (Sussman et al. 2006). The Promoting Action on Research Implementation in Health Services or PARIHS framework (Rycroft-Malone 2004) suggests that successful use of implementation of evidence into clinical practice is a function of three elements: the evidence to be put into practice, the environment where the research is going to be implemented and the type and extent of facilitation used to help the implementation process. Scott (2008) explains that there are many different strategies to get research into clinical practice, such as financial incentives, written information, educational materials, conferences and workshops. However, as there are differences in the way the doctors and
nurses work this may affect the way that research is introduced into their practice (Scott 2008) (in the case of this research, practice nurses work as salaried employees and GPs are usually the employers). Additionally, there is often a cultural divide between researchers, practitioners, and administrators which can prevent research becoming standard clinical practice (Eccles et al. 2005). Communicating the findings and practice implications of research occurs most effectively between people who share important attributes such as educational level, beliefs, social status, and networks (Haines and Jones 1994). My being a practicing clinician in primary care may therefore aid in this process.

14.2 Financial incentives

Funders and policy makers worldwide have experimented with initiatives to change physicians’ behaviour and improve the quality and efficiency of medical care (Tsai et al. 2005). Financial incentive schemes in healthcare can lead to improvements in the quality of care for rewarded activities but they could also lead to neglect of the non-incentivised aspects of patient care (Doran et al. 2011).

14.2.1 Commissioning for Quality and Innovation (CQUIN) payment framework

The Commissioning for Quality and Innovation (CQUIN) payment framework was developed in 2009 to enable commissioners to reward excellence by linking a proportion of English healthcare providers' income to the achievement of local quality improvement goals (NHS Institute for Innovation and Improvement 2012). This is a developmental process and participants are
encouraged to share their schemes to meet the requirement for transparency and support improvement in schemes over time.

**The Northamptonshire CQUIN**

Following the completion of the PhyHWell project I was asked to participate in the development of a CQUIN for physical health in SMI and work as a consultant on this project for Northamptonshire Healthcare Foundation Trust (NHFT) (see appendix 16). The commissioner for mental health reported that the GPs in primary care wish to improve their confidence, skills and practice when working with people with SMI. Her opinion was that the most effective source of this support would be from the specialist mental health clinicians.

The goal of the Northamptonshire CQUIN is to improve implementation of NICE Guidance regarding health checks for people with SMI in Primary Care (NICE 2006, 2010). The key outcome of undertaking this work will be:

1. NHFT supporting the development of Primary Care Clinicians to enable their undertaking of appropriate annual physical health checks of patients with SMI in line with Mental Health QOF indicators.

2. Clinicians in NHFT will provide CVD screening and lifestyle advice at baseline, six weeks and 12 weeks when prescribing a new or increased dose of antipsychotic medication.

To help meet the first outcome I have developed training for practice nurses through a Health Innovation Education Cluster (described in 14.4.1). Present at each training session are mental health nurses whose time is backfilled with payment from the CQUIN. The participating practice nurses are given the name and contact details of the community mental health worker
linked with their particular practice. They are advised to contact them for help and advice.

In order to meet the second outcome the clinical managers of NHfT have set up clinics to carry out the baseline, six and twelve week screening and lifestyle advice. Workers have been trained to perform electrocardiograms. I have written the protocol and guidelines for these checks (see appendices 17 and 18). I have also advised managers during this process and talked to various clinical teams to answer their queries.

14.2.2 Quality and Outcomes Framework

The Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) was introduced in 2004 in the UK. This is a mechanism intended to improve quality by linking up to 25% of general practitioners’ income to achievement of publicly reported quality targets for a number of long term conditions (Roland 2004). It contains groups of indicators, against which practices score points according to their level of achievement (British Medical Association and NHS Employers, 2011). This payment system has been criticised as the primary care doctors can decide to exclude patients they consider as unsuitable for a particular target, and the quality of the consultation is not measured (Ashworth and Jones, 2008). Since 2009, NICE has been responsible for managing the development of the QOF clinical and health improvement indicators. Evidence for changes to the QOF is provided by an expert committee, which includes representatives from the Universities of Birmingham and Manchester, NHS Employers and the General Practitioners Committee. The last indicator changes for severe mental illness (at the time of writing) were made by this panel in June 2010 for the QOF 2011/12
(NICE 2010b). The authors of the new guidance make the point that the indicators in the QOF are not intended to cover all the process outcomes or disease issues for each category and in some areas the indicators cover only a small part of the care for those conditions. This makes the assumption that primary care staff will be carrying out the care not included in the QOF.

The changes to the mental health QOF 2011/12 could mean that people with SMI will not be offered an annual review, which allows time for them to be given diet and exercise advice and adequate smoking counselling. When training the practice nurses, I advocate providing care using the best practice manual but also include the QOF requirements and how they have been developed. Additionally I encourage discussion about overcoming some of the difficulties they may have in practice when carrying out these health checks, such as time constraints and employers’ expectations.

When presenting this research to GPs and commissioners I have used the QOF requirements as one incentive to persuade them that training practice nurses to carry out health checks for people with SMI is a good idea.

14.3 Written information

Written information regarding research and good practice can take the form of journal publications written by the researchers, guidelines, website content (newly created or hosted by another party) and reports by journalists following interviews.
14.3.1 Publications

A study of 768 nursing journal papers documented that they disseminated not only information about clinical practice, but also informed readers about research of potential value to the nurse's practice (Oermann et al. 2008). Therefore I have submitted my research to two different types of publication: the reports of each study and the development of the intervention to relevant academic journals that report health outcomes-related research and/or with an impact factor or h-index (the impact factor reflects the frequency with which the journal's articles are cited in the scientific literature - Saha et al. 2003; the h-index attempts to measure both the productivity and impact of the published work – Hirsch 2005); and best practice articles to clinical journals.

Deciding on which academic journal to submit each study paper was dependant on the readership and relevance of the topic. For example, the paper: ‘Is the use of an invitation letter effective in prompting patients with severe mental illness to attend a primary care physical health check?’ is of interest to nurses, GPs, primary care researchers and commissioners, so a journal solely focused on nursing was not selected; instead this article was published in the Primary Health Care Research and Development journal which has a relevant multidisciplinary audience.

Research only published in academic journals is not seen by the nurses who could use it (Shuttleworth 2011) because they confine their reading to a narrower set of journals within their clinical field (McKibbon et al. 2007). With this in mind, to ensure that the information reaches the clinicians whose practice needs to change, I have published educational and best practice articles in clinical journals which are regularly accessed by practice nurses (Practice
Nursing, Nursing Standard and Independent Nurse) and mental health workers (Mental Health Nursing, British Journal of Wellbeing and Nursing Standard). This action meets with the recommendations of Goldsack et al. (2011). Following their study examining the distribution of health outcomes research of 12 clinical specialties in 535 journals, they suggest communicating the results to healthcare professionals as well as publishing in health outcomes-related research journals.

*Reports of studies and development of the intervention:*


Impact factor – 2.388

Impact factor – 1.071 (appendix 24)
Cited by 2

Impact factor – 1.147

H Index: 6

**Clinical articles:**


Cited by 1


Cited by 1
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14.3.2 The Health Improvement Profile for Primary Care (HIP-PC) Manual

Clinical guidelines are recommendations based on the best available evidence regarding the appropriate treatment and care of people with specific diseases and conditions (NICE 2012). They help health professionals in their work, but do not replace their knowledge and skills. Citrome and Yeomans (2005) recommend clear and consistent recommendations for people with SMI, on how and when to monitor weight, cardiovascular function, and metabolic parameters and, importantly, what to do with the results. This, they say, would support clinicians wishing to integrate physical and mental healthcare. A systematic search and meta-analysis identified seven studies which examined any change in the screening of people with SMI before and after guideline implementation (Mitchell et al. 2012a). From these studies, only glucose data were sufficient for analysis and showed a small but significant increase in monitoring post guidance. Despite the presence of eighteen sets of guidelines for physical healthcare in people with SMI, implementation is incomplete (Mitchell et al. 2012b). This may be because guidelines are not matched with resources (Mitchell et al. 2012b) and there is no evidence to suggest that the healthcare providers are given any training to use them. The Health Improvement Profile for Primary Care (HIP-PC) is an evidence based physical health manual specifically written for practice nurses. It is easily accessible by downloading from the website http://physicalsmi.webeden.co.uk/. Additionally, the practice nurses are offered training with regard to its use and it is updated according to any changes in recommended practice. As stated in chapter eight, the manual is being used in many areas and therefore may have improved the care of thousands of patients.
14.3.3 Website

I decided to create a website (http://physicalsmi.webeden.co.uk/) in order to make information regarding carrying out a health check for people with SMI in primary care accessible to any interested party. This is described in chapter eight. The website is listed on the Royal College of Psychiatrists’ National Audit of Schizophrenia (NAS) website as a useful resource for primary care (http://www.rcpsych.ac.uk/quality/nationalclinicalaudits/schizophrenia/nationalschizophreniaaudit/nasresources.aspx - see appendix 31). The author (Professor Mike Crawford) of the NAS is including it in his presentations about the audit.

14.3.4 Rethink

After presenting my research at the Improving Physical Health for people with Mental Health Conditions held in London on 4th July 2012 I was approached by Paula Reid from the charity, Rethink Mental Illness. She and her colleagues were due to hold a workshop to discuss some of the key challenges to better physical health outcomes for people affected by mental illness later that month. They were hoping to design a resource that might support professionals in addressing these challenges and invited me to attend to share my research as a best practice example. During this meeting I took an active role in the roundtable discussions and offered expertise from a primary care perspective.

Following the workshop, Rethink Mental Illness worked with a range of stakeholders to develop a document that outlined where physical health monitoring should be taking place along the care pathway. This document also clarifies whether this monitoring should be overseen by primary or secondary care. I offered constructive feedback on a number of iterations of this document,
particularly regarding the SMI register and the annual physical health check (see appendix 32).

Rethink have shared my resources as an example of best practice on the web pages they have designed for health professionals:

http://www.rethink.org/how_we_can_help/physical_health/physical_health_resources/annual_health_checks.html

14.3.5 Reports by journalists following interviews

Health and medical research is one of the most widely reported sources of news (PHCRIS 2012). I was invited to take part in a telephone interview on three occasions which was then reported in each journal. I saw this as an opportunity to publicize my research and encourage best practice in this area.

1. Stephen Robinson a journalist from General Practice magazine contacted me following the publication of my paper regarding inviting patients for a health check. He asked me a few very short quick questions. Though his article was not inaccurate, he focused mainly on the increase in payment GPs could receive if they followed my recommendations (Robinson 2012 – appendix 33).

2. Following an interview lasting nearly an hour and a half in which we discussed my research at length, the journalist Alison Moore from the Health Service Journal wrote a very short paragraph about the practice nurse training I have developed for people with SMI. Her report was not accurate and she did not provide links to my website or training even though she discussed them (Moore 2012 – appendix 34).
3. Ian Hullatt, the mental health advisor for the Royal College of Nursing (RCN) arranged for me to have an interview with one of the writers of their Bulletin. As this is sent out free to all RCN members I considered this to be a good opportunity. The article was accurate and sensitive (Palfrey 2012 – appendix 35). Following its publication I received a number of emails and have provided one example (permission given from author to publish his name and details):

   date: 2012-12-09 time: 22:19:48 UTC
   Your email address: andrew.lane@leicspart.nhs.uk
   Subject: SMI
   Message:
   Our team of Mental Health Facilitators commence working in primary care tomorrow working to enhance people with SMI holistic needs. How fortunate that I read the recent RCN article that led to your website which will aid our service delivery.
   Many thanks Andrew Lane Mental Health Facilitator.

14.4 Educational materials and workshops
I have adapted the educational materials originally developed for the Northampton Physical Health and Wellbeing project for two new projects, the East Midlands Health Innovation Education Cluster (EM HIEC) and the NHS London project.
14.4.1 East Midlands Health Innovation Education Cluster (EM HIEC)

The aim of the East Midlands Health Innovation and Education Cluster is to enable high quality patient care and services. They strengthen the co-ordination of education and training so that the benefits of research and innovation directly reach patients. Presently the EM HIEC is a formal cross sector partnership between NHS/Social Care organizations, higher education, and private and third sector organizations. It is anticipated that these collaborations will assure the creation of high quality education, a well equipped workforce, measurable service improvements and enhanced patient outcomes. The EM HIEC focuses on an ‘engine room’ approach to bring together partners for the rapid adoption and diffusion of ideas from education to service.

I completed an ‘expression of interests’ application to deliver a Physical Health in Severe Mental Illness for practice nurses, and was one of the five successful applicants from the original thirty-five. I was given a grant of £24,101.75. The project is explained in detail on the EM HIEC website http://emhiec.co.uk/projects-2012-2013/em22-physical-health-in-severe-mental-illness/. There is also a short video presentation.

The course has been accredited by the Royal College of Nursing (see appendix 36). Nine four hour sessions have been arranged for up to sixteen practice nurses each, over a period of six months. In an attempt to improve links between both disciplines, four mental health nurses can also attend each session. I teach the course myself. The practice nurses complete a pre and post self evaluation and all nurses give feedback about the course. The practice nurses will also be asked to complete a survey six months after their attendance
to see if there is any change in practice. The evaluation will be carried out by Professor Huber, the University of Northampton.

### 14.4.2 NHS London project

Under the Mental Health Payment by Results tariff patients assessed as having a history of psychotic symptoms (SMI) that are currently controlled and causing minor problems are eligible for discharge to primary care. However, one study has indicated that GPs and practice nurses feel that the care of such people is beyond their remit (Lester et al. 2005). The medical directors of NHS London were aware that the Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) in London recognise that the safe discharge of some patients with SMI from secondary to primary care is a clinical and financial priority. They were also aware of the need for training primary care staff to promote this safe discharge and increase the opportunities to address the physical health needs of this group. At their request, I developed a one-off training package in mental health (including physical health in SMI) for practice nurses in London to be delivered by mental health nurses. The project was facilitated by Dr Fiona Nolan of Camden and Islington NHS foundation trust.

Twenty mental health nurses attended one of two train the trainer sessions delivered by myself. One hundred and ninety-four practice nurses attended one of 22 three hour training sessions throughout London. Using a questionnaire developed specifically for the study, the attendees rated their levels of confidence and knowledge significantly more positively in all of the ten areas identified (CI -1.10 to -0.96, t = 27.98 p<.0001).
This project provided good initial evidence that brief training in mental health can effectively be delivered by mental health professionals to practice nurses with a positive impact on their confidence and knowledge. A more extensive programme of training using this method is planned, alongside evaluation of the impact on practice and patient outcomes. At the time of writing 294 practice nurses have booked for the second round. A third round is planned. We intend to publish our findings when these have been completed.

### 14.4.3 Royal College of General Practitioners’ (RCGP) workshop

I was asked to talk about my research at a RCGP workshop to describe the role of practice nurses in the care of people with severe and enduring mental illness. At this seminal workshop, I presented to an audience of 40 GPs. The feedback was that the GPs found my presentation to be excellent and my ideas on the role of the practice nurse very useful for their own practices and care offering (see appendix 37).

### 14.4.4 NHS London Primary Care Mental Health Leadership Development Programme

I am a member of the expert reference group for the NHS London Primary Care Mental Health Leadership Development Programme. The programme has been designed specifically for those working in primary care (in particular GPs) who would like to develop their leadership potential in the delivery of mental health services, or planning and commissioning of mental health services, through CCGs. As part of this programme I presented some of my research to 21 of the GP participants and explained how practice nurses can deliver health checks.
for people with SMI. The session was evaluated as good/excellent. The GPs recorded how they would apply their learning and future needs:

- Practice nurses are the way forward in General Practice.
- Get practice nurse to start doing physical health checks.
- Get templates up to date and care plans to focus on recovery.
- Engage with practice nurses and do health checks differently.
- Awareness of HIP-PC.
- Consider using the GASS in our SMI LES check, changing the template.
- Ensure Bexley will have trained practice nurses for this.
- Speak to my practice about having a template for physical health checks. Better education of colleagues about why we are doing this.
- Speak to our own practice nurse and get onto local course at end of February. Look at website physical SMI – [http://physicalsmi.webeden.co.uk/](http://physicalsmi.webeden.co.uk/)
- Talk to practice nurse in my practice. Eventually audit SMI cares in my practice.
- Use resources for physical health reviews (HIP-PC and website) in our practice and include within plans for primary care MH LES.
- Health checks in supported housing in Islington. Train our practice nurses re: SMI check.
- Encourage local GP nurses to do the training to still them and inspire them. Think about how we extend local LES to use nurses more in this.
14.5 Conferences

Presenting at conferences has provided me with an opportunity to engage in academic dialogue and share, discuss and disseminate my research (Williams 2009). I have attained some recognition in my field which has led to future collaborations. Facing challenging questions and remarks has helped me to identify the strengths and weaknesses of my research.

Conference presentations

- Physical and Mental Health Conference. 7.11.12. Northampton.
- Improving Physical Health for people with Long Term Conditions Conference. 4.7.12. London.
- Bipolar Disorder Conference. 28.6.12. Manchester
- Bipolar Disorder Conference. 20.2.12. Norwich.
- Physical Health/Mental Health Interface for SMI Conference. 16.1.12. Northampton.
- Physical health and SMI: Medic away day. 8.9.11. Northampton.
- Physical health and SMI. 29.8.11. Universitäre Psychiatrische Dienste. Bern, Switzerland.
• University of East Anglia PGR Conference. 22.6.11. Norwich.
• RCN 16th International Network for Psychiatric Nursing Research Conference. 22.9.10. Oxford.
• RCN Mental Health Conference. 5.3.10. Liverpool.

Planned conference presentations
• Commissioning Mental Health Services 18.6.13 London.
• International Network for Psychiatric Nursing Research Conference 5-6.09.13 Warwick (awaiting notification of acceptance of abstract).
• Breaking Barriers 11-13.09.13 Reykjavik (awaiting notification of acceptance of abstract).
• RCN Safer Mental Health Services 5.10.13 London.

14.6 Awards
Winning an award highlights the quality and innovation of a person's work. I have won two awards for the PhyHWell project. The first was for best practice in primary care, the Nursing in Practice Award for Mental Health 2010 (appendix 38). More recently I was runner up in the RCN Marjorie Simpson New Researcher Award 2013 where my research was highly commend (appendix 39).

14.7 Summary of Chapter
In this chapter I have described how I have attempted to increase the impact of my research by using various methods. These include: financial incentives (CQUIN and Quality and Outcomes Framework); written information
(publications, HIP-PC Manual, website, Rethink, reports by journalists following interviews); educational materials and workshops (Health Innovation Education Cluster, NHS London project, Royal College of General Practitioners’ workshops, London Primary Care Mental Health Leadership Development Programme); conferences and awards. Using these methods I have become recognised as an expert in the field of physical health in patients with SMI, particularly in regard to nursing and primary care.
Chapter fifteen: Conclusions

In this chapter I provide a summary of the thesis including a table (15.1) and offer my views on implications for policy and the service context, workforce competencies and training and further research.

15.1 Summary of thesis

A number of recent studies show that life expectancy in patients with SMI is reduced (Chang et al. 2011, Laursen 2011, Wahlbeck et al. 2011). Research has established that people in this group have a higher risk than the rest of the population of developing physical conditions including CVD (Leucht et al. 2007). People with long term physical conditions such as diabetes are screened for CVD by practice nurses in primary care (Hall 2008). However, despite GPs also receiving payment to screen patients with SMI (BMA and NHS Employers 2012), practice nurse contact with this group is low (Reilly et al. 2012). This may be explained by a number of factors. Healthcare professionals believe that patients with SMI will not attend for a health check if they are invited (Lester et al. 2005), despite there being only one study to demonstrate that they are poor at attending in response to an invitation (Harvey et al. 2005). They are also concerned that if they do attend, the tools used to help people improve lifestyle will be less effective than in the general population (Wright et al. 2006). Additionally, there is no appropriate training regarding the physical health of people with SMI universally available for primary care healthcare professionals (Hardy et al. 2011).
To address the physical health needs of people with SMI, healthcare professionals in primary care need access to training to improve their knowledge. In this thesis I have described how I have developed a training package and a programme of research. This was designed in an attempt to provide evidence that training practice nurses to deliver health checks for people with SMI will increase the quality of care in this group.

I carried out a retrospective audit to find out whether patients will attend for a health check if they are invited (Hardy and Gray 2012). I found that sending patients with SMI in primary care an invitation appointment letter with a predetermined time and date for a health check was effective in getting the to attend.

In order to find out whether a tool used for people with physical illnesses to improve their lifestyle is effective when used with the SMI population, I completed a prospective audit. This demonstrated that food diaries are one example of a tool being employed successfully in patients with SMI (Hardy and Gray 2011).

A systematic search to find out what evidence there is for the efficacy of healthcare professional educational outcomes in studies of physical health in SMI identified no studies (Hardy et al. 2011).

I developed a training package for practice nurses to teach them how to carry out physical health checks for people with SMI. This included a best practice
manual and a website (Hardy and Gray 2010). The learning outcomes were for the participants to:

- Understand the definition of SMI.
- Know the signs and symptoms of SMI.
- Be familiar with the epidemiology of SMI.
- Be aware of the impact of SMI on physical health particularly the increased risk of CVD.
- Be confident in navigating and using the website.
- Be confident in carrying out a health check using the HIP-PC manual as a guide.
- Be competent in entering data onto the computer template.
- Feel confident in providing this role within their practice.
- Liaise with relevant healthcare professionals and agencies.

To establish whether as many people with SMI are being screened for cardiovascular disease as people with physical conditions in Northampton, I carried out a retrospective audit (Hardy et al. 2013a). In the five Northampton practices, the proportion of patients with SMI being screened for CVD risk factors was much lower compared to those with diabetes. The number of people with SMI receiving lifestyle advice was also very low.

The GP’s payment contract changed in 2011, meaning that data regarding screening in SMI could be collected nationally. I completed a retrospective audit to establish whether as many people with SMI are being screened for CVD as people with physical conditions in England (Mitchell and Hardy 2013). Patients
with diabetes received higher levels of screening across all four parameters (body mass index, blood pressure, blood glucose and cholesterol) in the previous 15 months than those with SMI.

A before and after study to measure the effect of the physical health and SMI training on the practice nurses’ motivation to carry out physical health checks for people with SMI showed a positive effect (Hardy 2012).

I carried out a before and after study to establish whether training practice nurses to carry out physical health checks for people with SMI increases the level of screening for cardiovascular risk in this group (Hardy et al. 2013b). This confirmed that training practice nurses improves the quality of the health checks but still not to the levels received by other patient groups.

I interviewed patients with SMI to find out what they think about the physical health checks (Hardy et al. 2013c). They wanted: an explanation of why the health check had been offered; a description of what each blood test was for and the potential side effects of antipsychotic medication; relevant verbal and written information; and the opportunity to see the same healthcare professional where possible

15.2 Discussion

Following an invitation letter for a health check, attendance rates were lower than in patients with diabetes (Hardy and Gray 2012). However, they were higher than expected from the SMI group and comparable with the general
population (Norman and Connor 1993). My audit may not reflect the wider population as health checks for people with SMI had been offered for the past six years in this practice by the same practitioner. Therefore the response rate to invitation letters is likely to be higher than that of a practice offering a new service. This study highlights what can be achieved over time at a practice level. Clinicians should consider other ways in addition to an invitation letter for those patients who have not attended. This may include reminders by telephone or text directly to the patient or carer. For patients who are under the care of the mental health team, it would be pertinent to contact their Community Mental Health Worker (CMHW). The CMHW can provide the patient with information about the importance of the health check and may even accompany the patient to the appointment.

My study did not address how to engage with patients who are homeless or not registered with a GP practice. At least one in five homeless people suffer from a severe mental health problem (Crisis 1999). In a survey by Crisis in 2002, the homeless people that were interviewed were almost 40 times more likely not to be registered with a GP than members of the general public. CCGs and local authorities should work closely together to ensure they tackle the health needs of homeless people with SMI in an integrated way. There is a need to develop competent outreach workers who work differently and build up trusting relationships. This could be provided through a Local or Direct Enhanced Service. Homeless people with SMI can then be gently encouraged to attend GP surgeries but those who won’t attend should be offered tests and advice in the street. Staff in primary care practices should be trained how to provide a welcoming environment for this group. Communicating across sectors
and creating clear points of access for the agencies working with the homeless is also a priority.

The patients with schizophrenia who were asked to complete food diaries all managed to complete the task (Hardy and Gray 2011). This may be evidence of motivation to improve their health and demonstrates the utility of food diaries in educating this population. There is a need to educate practice nurses in how to help patients with all long term conditions (including SMI) to become effective managers of their disease. This education should include using a motivational approach, empowerment and problem solving.

A systematic search for evidence based education available for qualified nurses to monitor the physical health of people with SMI yielded no studies (Hardy et al. 2011). This lack of evidence adds to the view that carrying out physical health checks for people with SMI is not the responsibility of nurses (Blythe and White 2012, Robson et al. 2012). The lack of specific evidence to demonstrate that education of the nurses will improve patients’ health makes advocating any education (should it be available) a difficult task. I hope that this thesis and the outcomes of the training that I have delivered through the NHS London project and the HIEC project will have some influence in shaping the provision of education for practice nurses by providing specific evidence.

In the audit of the five practices in Northampton before training, the NHS information database had a much higher percentage of patients with SMI recorded as having a review compared with the actual level of screening and advice given Hardy et al. 2013a). This suggests that there was a lack of awareness of the screening, health promotion and prevention advice that is appropriate for this group of patients, but it was carried out before specific
payment indicators were imposed. The findings of the audit of England practices (Mitchell and Hardy 2013) show that the financial incentives given to primary care practices might have improved monitoring in line with the observation that most targets are achieved. In the repeat audit of the five Northampton practices following training all screening measures and lifestyle advice increased (Hardy et al. 2013b). These findings are consistent with those of Bernard et al. (2009) who reported that the training and education of nurses in primary care centres promotes the use of prevention practices. However the increases in screening following training were not as remarkable as those following the introduction of financial incentives. This suggests a need for payment to motivate the organisation to provide the service. As an example, payments through QOF could be made to provide lifestyle advice to people with SMI until it becomes usual practice. There is a need for good quality research and evidence based education to ensure that these interventions are effective. I am involved in developing and delivering the training for one such study (PRIMROSE - University College London).

I do not know whether the nurses in the study delivered their screening in designated clinics for people with SMI. The concern about patients not attending and leaving the practice nurse without patients to see could be addressed by having one such appointment at the end of the morning clinic. Offering a later appointment could increase attendance by patients with SMI who may have difficulty in getting up due to their illness. Additionally, the nurse would then be able to use the time if patients did not attend to follow them up and then carry on with non clinical duties. Practice nurses work for GPs who provide general care, yet most practices now offer specialised clinics for
different specific conditions such as COPD, asthma and diabetes. These clinics are cost effective at a practice level as there is a payment provided through QOF. At a population level they are also likely to be cost effective as much of the work is around self management and prevention of complications and/or exacerbation. It can therefore be argued that providing a specialised clinic for people with SMI would have the same benefits, However as many people have more than one long term condition, perhaps providing generic clinics encompassing all conditions may be be more cost effective and holistic. The RCGP (2012) promote medical generalism which they define as an approach to the delivery of health care that routinely applies a broad and holistic perspective to the patient’s problems. They advocate that these principles will be needed wherever and whenever people receive care and advice about their health and wellbeing, and all healthcare professionals need to value and be able to draw on this approach when appropriate. This suggests that the medical generalist approach can, and should be used by a practice nurse during any type of clinic. However, the RCGP do acknowledge that the ability to practise as a generalist depends on one’s training, and on the routine use of skills that helps people to understand and live with their illnesses and disabilities, as well as helping them to get the best out of the healthcare options that are available and appropriate for their needs. Many practice nurses do not have the skills and competencies to help patients manage a range of long term conditions. This may result in the patient attending the practice on a number of occasions to see different practitioners. There are pros and cons for this approach. On the positive side, messages can be reinforced by the practitioners at each visit and the emphasis of the consultation can focus on one specific area allowing the patient to
concentrate on one issue at a time. This is particularly useful for someone with schizophrenia where concentration and planning may be a problem. Additionally if the nurse is providing a clinic in just one field, she is more likely to be an expert in that area. Patients who are isolated and lonely may welcome additional visits. Conversely, busy patients may resent numerous visits and tests and advice may be duplicated. Most education is expensive and offered as disease specific. Therefore practice nurses (and/or their GP employers) may choose to access only those that they see as relevant to their role. Presently, for practice nurses to provide generic clinics that allow them to work according to their professional code of conduct, they would need to access a range of courses. A generic course encompassing all long term conditions could include the disease specific information as well as the psychological issues relevant to them all. This approach would meet with the recommendations of the Royal College of Psychiatrists’ mission statement (2010), ‘no health without public mental health’.

It appeared from the interviews with patients that they were making lifestyle changes following their health check, despite the apparent lack of knowledge of CVD risk factors (Hardy et al. 2013c). This is consistent with the findings of Campion et al. (2005). However, as we do not have knowledge of the participants’ previous behaviour, we cannot claim conclusively that this was the case. The patients’ views of what will make physical health checks for people with SMI effective were considered when modifying the HIEC training for practice nurses (explained in chapter 14).
In order to encourage a change in clinical practice, I have used a number of methods to promote my research. These include: financial incentives; written information; educational materials and workshops; and conferences and awards. All of these methods (described in chapter 14) could be employed on a wider scale by other organisations.

In summary, I have shown that patients with SMI will attend for a health check in primary care when invited by letter providing the date and time of appointment and the name of the practitioner. Training practice nurses to deliver these checks increases the level of screening and lifestyle advice given to this group of patients.
Table 15.1 Objectives, samples, design, analysis and outcomes of the studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase one</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To explore whether an invitation appointment letter is effective in</td>
<td>Study 1</td>
<td>92 patients with SMI and 416 with diabetes</td>
<td>Retrospective</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics: Odds ratio to explore whether the patient's diagnosis made a difference to the numbers responding to an invitation for a health check.</td>
<td>An invitation appointment letter is an effective way of ensuring that patients with SMI have a physical health check.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To consider the feasibility of food diaries as a method of understanding</td>
<td>Study 2</td>
<td>8 patients with schizophrenia</td>
<td>Prospective</td>
<td>Identification of themes</td>
<td>The food diary is a useful clinical tool for patients with schizophrenia. Contrary to public belief, patients with schizophrenia are capable of completing homework tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The dietary behaviour of people with schizophrenia.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>audit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To identify the evidence of efficacy of the education of qualified</td>
<td>Study 3</td>
<td>147 papers</td>
<td>Systematic</td>
<td>Summary of characteristics of studies, their methodological quality, a summary of the results, synthesis of results in light of risk of bias.</td>
<td>No studies were identified as suitable for a systematic review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>health care professionals to deliver interventions aimed at improving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>search</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the physical health of adults with SMI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase two</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To establish the proportion of patients with SMI being screened for CVD</td>
<td>Study 4</td>
<td>386 people with SMI and 1875 people with diabetes</td>
<td>Retrospective</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics: Odds ratio to see whether diagnosis made a difference to level of screening. Mean number of interventions. And standard deviation Chi-square test to see if age was associated with the number of interventions received.</td>
<td>Just over a fifth of patients with SMI received a full CVD screen compared to the 96% of those with diabetes (OR=80.37; 95% CI=64.53 to 128.55; p&lt;0.01). Fifty-seven percent of the SMI patients were given smoking advice but only thirteen and fourteen percent received guidance regarding diet and exercise respectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>risk factors in their GP practice compared to those with diabetes and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>audit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>determine whether people with SMI receive lifestyle advice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To establish the proportion of patients with SMI being screened for CVD</td>
<td>Study 5</td>
<td>2,488,948 people with diabetes and 422,966 with SMI</td>
<td>Retrospective</td>
<td>Chi-square test to see whether diagnosis made a difference to level of screening</td>
<td>Patients with diabetes received higher levels of screening across all four parameters in the previous 15 months than those with SMI (97.3% vs 74.7%; p&lt;0.0001).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>risk factors in England compared to those with diabetes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>audit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To address common misconceptions about the physical health of people with</td>
<td>Study 6</td>
<td>8 practice nurses</td>
<td>Before and after</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics: Mean of nurses' scores. Unpaired t-test to measure the difference in the scores before and after training.</td>
<td>The training was effective in modifying practice nurses’ misconceptions about physical health in people with SMI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To establish whether training practice nurses increases the proportion of</td>
<td>Study 7</td>
<td>400 patients with SMI</td>
<td>A before and</td>
<td>Relative risk to calculate whether training made a difference to the level of screening and lifestyle advice given to people with SMI as a group. T-test to determine the difference between the mean number of interventions received by each individual patient with SMI before and after training.</td>
<td>Training practice nurses about CVD prevention in people with SMI may be effective in increasing the proportion of patients in this group who receive a comprehensive health check.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patients with SMI being screened for CVD risk factors and given lifestyle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>after audit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advice in their GP practice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To examine the patients’ views regarding the physical health check</td>
<td>Study 8</td>
<td>5 patients with SMI</td>
<td>Interviews using</td>
<td>Thematic analysis.</td>
<td>Patients’ views include: explaining why the health check has been offered; describing blood tests and side effects of antipsychotic medication; providing verbal and written information; seeing the same healthcare professional where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delivered by a nurse trained to deliver the intervention.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a topic guide.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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25 May 2010

Mrs Sheila Hardy
22 Bridle Path
Brafield
Northampton
NN7 1BP

Dear Mrs Hardy

Study Title: An evaluation of the Northampton Physical Health and Wellbeing (PhyHWell) program on the impact of cardiovascular risk in patients with Severe Mental Illness

REC reference number: 10/H0403/38

The Research Ethics Committee reviewed the above application at the meeting held on 11 May 2010. Thank you for attending to discuss the study.

Ethical opinion
Discussion

- The Committee asked you how the methodology will answer the primary outcome measure for the study as outlined in section A57. of the Application Form. You outlined that the outcome measure was Patients (with Mental Health problems) rate of cardiovascular disease, and whether the health improvement profile helps to influence this by incorporating lifestyle changes etc.

- The Committee asked you to outline the Health Improvement Programme. You stated that you, the Chief Investigator (who has designed a Health Programme) has been commissioned to undertake this by the PCT. This programme requires Practice Nurses and Mental Health Nurses attending training in relation to the Health Improvement Profile (HIP). It then requires these Nurses to discuss the findings of the HIP with the patients, who are accessing the service throughout the year. The Health Improvement Profile is over and above what is current practice. This is a new service development but there is no randomisation.
• The Committee asked for clarification of the training. You stated that it is being imparted to Community Mental Health staff and Practice Nurses, and will consist of one day's training. There is no requirement for these Nurses to then cascade this training to others. The Committee asked whether the Nurses are competent to deliver the profile and would there be any overlap with HONOS – Mental Health? You stated that there will be no overlap with HONOS, as you will be measuring an intervention on the health check.

• You were asked if relevant data is being collected, and referred to in the QRISK®2. The Committee questioned whether this is patient data and whether it is correlated to patient medication. You acknowledged that this was a limitation of the study as it was not being envisaged that influencing factors (such as medication interactions) would not be correlated with the outcomes. You felt that the HIP should take these interactions into account.

• You were asked if there is a Community Mental Health Nurse attached to each GP practice, and you confirmed that there is in the Northamptonshire area.

• The Committee mentioned that some patients will be needle phobic. You stated that you are aware that some may not have blood tests etc. and you hope that this will be identified in the interviews.

• The Committee relayed their concerns over the Focus Groups and the sample size of 10. They questioned whether 10 will be enough for the Focus Groups; whether there is potential for bias in the interviews being a purposive sample. You stated that you will make it clear to the Nurses that you are not evaluating the Nurses themselves, but the intervention.

The members of the Committee present decided that it was unable to give a favourable ethical opinion of the research, for the following reasons. The following should be considered if a further application for ethical review is made:

• The Application needs splitting to give greater clarity of the research component as currently it is lacking this. The audit/service evaluation that is not part of the research, should be removed from the application and the research element specifically outlined. It should however, state how the research fits in with the audit/evaluation. Attention should be made to the methodology as it is difficult to understand (as it is currently described).

• The Application should be clear what the Researchers role is within the study e.g. delivering the training, what the training is intended to do etc. At present details within the application are obscure.

• The methodology is somewhat limited and it is very unclear what the primary outcome measure is as detailed in section A57. of the Application Form. This requires attention.
An application should state what relevant data is being collected, and referred to in the QRISK*2. It should be made clear whether this is patient data and whether it is correlated to patient medication.

Section A31. of the Application Form states that Healthcare Professionals will have up to a year to decide to take part. Clarification is required, and as to how this fits in with the 5 – 13 month schedule.

Greater clarity should be given as to how the 10 (out of the 31 practices) will be selected? It mentions ‘appropriate’ patients will be asked by the GP or Nurse whether they wish to take part in an interview. It is unclear what this means and there may be potential for bias.

It should be clear throughout the application what kind of ‘Nurse’ the application refer to e.g. Community Mental Health Nurse etc.

It should be made clear in the Participant Information Sheets what the mechanism is should any bad practice be identified whilst undertaking the research e.g. it should detail the boundaries of confidentiality etc.

The baseline assessment does not address that Mental Health patients may be needle phobic and whether this is likely to affect the study?

I regret to inform you therefore that the application is not approved.

Options for further ethical review

You may submit a new application for ethical review, taking into account the Committee’s concerns. You should enter details of this application on the application form and include a copy of this letter, together with a covering letter explaining what changes have been made from the previous application. We recommend that the application is submitted again to this Committee, but you may opt to submit to any another Research Ethics Committee within this domain.

Alternatively, you may appeal against the decision of the Committee by seeking a second opinion on this application from another Research Ethics Committee. The appeal would be based on the application form and supporting documentation reviewed by this Committee, without amendment. If you wish to appeal, you should notify the relevant Research Ethics Service manager (see below) in writing within 90 days of the date of this letter. If the appeal is allowed, another REC will be appointed to give a second opinion within 60 days and the second REC will be provided with a copy of the application, together with this letter and other relevant correspondence on the application. You will be notified of the arrangements for the meeting of the second REC and will be able to attend and/or make written representations if you wish to do so.

The contact point for appeals is:
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<td>01 April 2010</td>
</tr>
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<td>GP/Consultant Information Sheets</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>01 April 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP Consent Form</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>01 January 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter to GP/Consultant</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>01 April 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Care Nurse Information Sheet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>01 April 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Care Nurse Information Sheet</td>
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<td>01 April 2010</td>
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<td>Referees or other scientific critique report</td>
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</tr>
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<td>Interview Schedules/Topic Guides</td>
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<td>01 April 2010</td>
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<td>2</td>
<td>01 April 2010</td>
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<td>01 April 2010</td>
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<td>02 March 2010</td>
</tr>
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<td>Letter from CI of Amended Application</td>
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<td>01 April 2010</td>
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Statement of compliance
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After ethical review
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Dear Mrs Hardy


Thank you for requesting permission to conduct the above referenced service evaluation within NHS Northamptonshire.

We acknowledge that we have received and reviewed the documents listed below:

- Protocol – Version 1, June 2010
- Invitation letter (practice) – Version 3, April 2010
- Invitation letter – Version 4, June 2010
- Information Sheet (Practice) – Version 4, June 2010
- Information Sheet (Nurses) – Version 2, June 2010
- Consent Form (GP) – Version 1, January 2010
- Attitudes Quiz (pre-training) – Version 3, July 2010
- Attitudes Quiz (post-training) – Version 3, July 2010
- Knowledge Quiz (pre-training) – Version 3, July 2010
- Knowledge Quiz (post-training) – Version 3, July 2010
- Communication Questionnaire – Version 3, July 2010
- Quiz Scoring – Version 1, March 2010

In addition, we have received confirmation of the following:

- Research Sponsor – University of East Anglia
- Research Funder – NHS Northamptonshire

I am pleased to confirm that the trust had no outstanding issues and you have permission to undertake this service evaluation.
6th August 2010

Dear Sheila,

Re: An Evaluation of the Northampton Physical Health and Well-being Project (PhyHWell).

I am pleased to confirm that you now have full management approval for the above research project.

Please note that should you make any changes to the research in any respect, you will need to discuss this with our department and supply us with any copies of changed documentation.

We wish you every success with your research and look forward to discussing the final outcome with you.

In the meantime, please feel free to contact me should you require any information or assistance.

Yours sincerely

Emily Collins.
Clinical Effectiveness Support Assistant.
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Introduction
Severe mental illness such as schizophrenia and bipolar disorder is associated with high medical co-morbidity; mortality rates are approximately 50% higher than in the general population (Hennekens et al. 2005). The primary cause of death due to a physical cause is circulatory disease, diabetes and obesity. Evidence suggests excess weight gain can be 2-3 times more prevalent in people with schizophrenia than in the general population (Allison and Casey 2001). This may be due to high levels of smoking, unhealthy diets and lack of exercise which are common lifestyle choices of people with schizophrenia (McCreadie 2003), and that antipsychotic medication can also exacerbate weight gain (Allison and Casey 2001).

The National Institute for Clinical Excellence (Nice 2009, 2006a) recommends that physical health checks should normally be provided within primary care. However if the patient is not in contact with primary care then secondary services (the Mental Health Team) should monitor their physical health.

The Sainsbury Centre for Mental Health (2003) advocates that a physical health review should include advice about diet, exercise, smoking and substance and alcohol abuse; protection against influenza, plus regular preventative care. Consequently, the General Medical Services contract requires that each primary care centre has a register of people with schizophrenia, bipolar disorder and other psychoses and that healthcare professionals achieve a number of clinical indicators in order to receive payment (NHS Employers 2011).

The HIP-PC has been adapted for primary care from the Health Improvement Profile (HIP) (White et al. 2009). This is a specific tool designed to help mental health nurses outline the physical health of the SMI patients they work with and direct them towards the evidence base interventions available to address identified health problems. A rationale and recommended action has been specified for each intervention. Unlike other tools such as the Physical Health Check (PHC) (Rethink 2008a), it is recommended that clinicians carrying out health checks using the HIP-PC have relevant training. The guidance also takes into account that healthcare professionals in primary care are experienced in giving lifestyle advice.
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Measurements

**Body Mass Index (BMI)**

**Rationale**
Evidence suggests excess weight gain can be 2-3 times more prevalent in people with schizophrenia than in the general population (Allison and Casey 2001). The BMI is a simple index used to determine whether an individual is underweight, overweight or obese (WHO 2006). The BMI is defined as the weight divided by the square of the height. For example, a person who weighs 70 kg and has a height of 1.75 will have a BMI of 22.9.

A BMI calculator can be found at: [www.eatwell.gov.uk/healthydiet/healthyweight/bmicalculator/](http://www.eatwell.gov.uk/healthydiet/healthyweight/bmicalculator/)

Although BMI values are the same for both sexes, they may not be accurate in people who are athletes or who weight-train, in pregnant or breastfeeding women, or those over the age of 60 years.

Ethnicity should be considered; particularly in patients of South Asian origin (overweight varies from BMI > 23, obesity from BMI > 25).

**Recommended action**
Diet advice should be offered to all patients to prevent weight gain. Guidance about weight loss should be offered to patients with:
- A BMI ≥ 28
- Any degree of overweight coinciding with diabetes or other serious diseases

**Waist circumference**

**Rationale**
People who carry their excess fat centrally (within the abdominal cavity) are more likely to suffer the consequences of being overweight. Waist circumference correlates with visceral adipose tissue, plasma lipids, lipoproteins and insulin levels in adults (Taylor *et al.* 1998).

**Recommended action**
Measure waist circumference: ensure that a tape of adequate length is available. The correct position for measuring waist circumference is midway between the upper hip bone and the uppermost border of the right iliac crest. The tape should be placed around the abdomen at the level of this midway point and a reading taken when the tape is snug but does not compress the skin. In practice it may be difficult for very overweight patients to accurately palpate those bony landmarks in which case placing the tape at the level of the belly button is recommended (National Obesity Forum 2011).

For patients with waist circumference ≥ 80 cm (female) / ≥ 94 cm (male) (Barnett *et al.* 2007):
- Support and exchange information on diet (ie meal planning) and exercise
- Consider referral to a local weight/exercise management programme
- Consider medication review
Pulse rate
Rationale
Most antipsychotic medications have the potential for lengthening of the QT interval (prolonged: in males >450ms, in females >470ms - Committee for Proprietary Medicinal Products 1997). Therefore, cardiac safety should be a routine part of clinical care in patients taking antipsychotic medication; a preventive strategy is valuable even if the absolute risk of serious cardiac events is low (Abdelmawla and Mitchell 2006). There is evidence that many typical antipsychotics increase the risk of ventricular arrhythmias and cardiac arrest (Ray et al. 2001, Liperoti et al. 2005) and an association between many atypical antipsychotic drugs and the occurrence of unexplained sudden death (Abdelmawla & Mitchell, 2006).

Carrying out an ECG also allows the opportunity to look for other possible problems such as gynaecomastia, hygiene neglect and rashes.

Recommended action
Check pulse annually. If raised perform an ECG.
Consider an ECG for all patients taking antipsychotics.
The BNF recommends that an ECG should be performed on patients:
- Taking pimozide, sertindol and clozapine or prescribed antipsychotics over the BNF limits
- Who have specific cardiovascular risk
- With a personal history of cardiovascular disease
- Being admitted as an inpatient

Patients with an abnormal ECG may be referred to a cardiologist or to the original prescriber for review of their treatment as appropriate.

Blood pressure
Rationale
People with severe mental illness are at a higher risk of developing high blood pressure than the general population. The British Hypertension Society Guideline cites evidence that suboptimal blood pressure control leaves patients at an unacceptably high risk of cardiovascular complications and death, particularly from coronary heart disease (CHD) but also from stroke (Williams et al. 2004). Interventions actively combining exercise and diet have demonstrated a reduction of both systolic and diastolic blood pressure by only 4–5 mmHg (NICE 2006b), therefore medication is often required.

Recommended action
Check CVD risk using QRISK®2 (Hippisley-Cox et al. 2008) for all eligible patients and exchange information on weight loss/exercise (if overweight), improved diet and reduction in alcohol and salt intake, assistance with stopping smoking.
For patients with blood pressure > 140/90 mmHg without a diagnosis of hypertension (NICE 2011):
- offer ambulatory blood pressure monitoring (ABPM) to confirm the diagnosis of hypertension
- if the patient is unable to tolerate ABPM, then offer home blood pressure monitoring (HBPM)
- test urine for the presence of protein by sending a sample for estimation of the albumin:creatinine ratio and test for haematuria using a reagent strip
- take blood sample to test for plasma glucose, electrolytes, creatinine, estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR), serum total cholesterol and HDL cholesterol
- perform an ECG
- prescribe medication following the stepped NICE guidance

**Temperature**

**Rationale**

A raised temperature may be caused by infection, heat stroke, alcohol withdrawal, anticholinergic drugs, allergic drug reaction, and agonist drugs (Dougherty and Lister 2004).

Neuroleptic malignant syndrome is a rare but potentially life-threatening individual reaction to neuroleptic drugs. It causes fever, muscular rigidity, altered mental status and autonomic dysfunction. It is usually associated with potent neuroleptics such as haloperidol and fluphenazine. The underlying pathological abnormality is thought to be central D2 receptor blockade or dopamine depletion in the hypothalamus and nigrostriatal/spinal pathways. This leads to an elevated temperature set point, impairment of normal thermal homeostasis and extrapyramidally-induced muscle rigidity (Patient UK 2006a).

**Recommended action**

- Look for signs of infection and treat as appropriate
- Ask about alcohol withdrawal
- Check drug use
- For abnormally high temperatures with a fluctuating blood pressure and/or dystonia consider neuroleptic malignant syndrome and refer urgently to medics.
Blood tests

Liver Function Tests (LFTs)

Rationale
Antipsychotic medication can result in abnormal LFTs (Garcia-Unzueta et al. 2003). Hepatic disease should be detected early to prevent further serious complications.

Recommended action
Check LFTs every 12 months.

If tests are slightly abnormal:
- Repeat tests in 6 months
- Check alcohol intake and reduce if necessary
- Exchange information on diabetes control and weight loss if appropriate
- If remains abnormal for longer than six months then consider referral to a specialist
- If the patient is unwell despite slightly abnormal LFTs then they may need to be referred more urgently

Very abnormal liver function tests (i.e. more than twice upper limit of abnormal):
- Organise further blood tests and imaging.
- Refer to out-patients - if you suspect the cause may be malignancy then an urgent cancer referral should be made.

Consider urgent referral for hospital admission if patient unwell, for example:
- Severe jaundice
- Severe ascites
- Encephalopathy
- Septic

(Patient UK 2006b)

Lipid Levels

Rationale
Dyslipidaemia is a key component of the metabolic syndrome and a precursor for cardiovascular disease.

Recommended action
Check cholesterol levels annually – lipid profile if cholesterol is raised. Support and exchange information on diet (i.e. meal planning) and exercise.

Primary prevention
Consider for patients between 40-74 yrs with a high CVD risk (NICE 2008); offer simvastatin 40mg (or drug of similar efficacy and cost) for adults >40 years with 10-year CVD risk ≥20% (NICE 2008).

Abnormal levels (secondary prevention)
- Offer simvastatin 40mg (or drug of similar efficacy and cost) to all adults with clinical evidence of CVD
- Consider increasing simvastatin dose to 80mg or drug of similar efficacy and cost if TC and LDL-C targets not reached
- Offer higher intensity statin (eg simvastatin 80mg) to people with acute coronary syndrome. Do not delay until lipid levels available; measure fasting lipid levels after approximately 3 months
- If potential drug interactions or simvastatin 40mg contraindicated, offer lower dose of simvastatin or pravastatin

(NICE 2008)

**Glucose Rationale**

Diabetes occurs in 15% of people with schizophrenia (Holt and Peveler 2005), and only 5% of the general population (Bushe and Holt 2004). Risk factors include: family history of diabetes, physical inactivity, poor diet, smoking and the metabolic effects of antipsychotic medication (Gough and Peveler 2004). Typical antipsychotics, in particular the low potency ones such as chlorpromazine may induce or make existing diabetes worse (Newcomer et al. 2002). The atypical antipsychotics clozapine and olanzapine are associated with new onset or exacerbating type 2 diabetes, not just through their propensity to cause greater weight gain than other newer agents, but because of their effects on glucose regulation (Newcomer et al. 2002). There are also case reports linking risperidone and quetiapine to impaired glucose intolerance, diabetes and ketoacidosis (Taylor et al. 2007).

**Recommended action**

Blood glucose should be checked at least annually. It may be more practical to do a random test though a fasting test will be more accurate. The World Health Organization (2011) recommends that HbA1c can also be used as a diagnostic test for diabetes providing that stringent quality assurance tests are in place and assays are standardised to criteria aligned to the international reference values, and there are no conditions present which preclude its accurate measurement.

- More frequent assessments are required for patients with significant risk factors for diabetes (overweight, Asian/African ethnicity etc) (Barnett et al. 2007). Consider checking every 6 months
- Support and exchange information on diet (ie meal planning) and exercise
- If diabetes is diagnosed, refer to practice diabetes nurse for further investigations, education and treatment

**Prolactin Rationale**

Hyperprolactinaemia is a common side-effect of many antipsychotic drugs. Symptoms include gynaecomastia, galactorrhoea, amenorrhoea and sexual dysfunction. Switching to a prolactin sparing antipsychotic has been shown to lead to normalization of serum prolactin and resolution of the symptoms (Haddad et al. 2001).
**Recommended action**  
Consensus guidelines for managing prolactinaemia (Peveler et al. 2008) recommend that healthcare professionals should monitor proactively for hyperprolactinaemia as it maybe asymptomatic.

- Patients prescribed prolactin elevating antipsychotics should, where possible, have this issue explained to them prior to commencing treatment and be screened for symptoms suggestive of hyperprolactinaemia before starting treatment (Haddad et al. 2001) and annually thereafter.
- If the elevation of prolactin levels is mild (<1000 mIU/L (~50 ng/mL)) then it may be reasonable to continue to monitor the level. However, if even a mildly elevated level persists for more than 3 months, particularly if accompanied by amenorrhoea, bone mineral density may be compromised, and the possibility of reducing dose or switching to an antipsychotic with lower potential for prolactin elevation should be discussed with the patient.
- When elevation is persistent and >1000 mIU/L (~50 ng/mL) then the clinician should consider switching to a drug with a lower potential to elevate prolactin if this can be achieved safely and is consistent with the clinical status of the patient as a whole.
- For female patients switching to a drug with a lower potential to elevate prolactin may result in the return of fertility, and contraceptive advice should be given.
- If switching to a drug with a lower potential to elevate prolactin is not possible, it would be reasonable for clinicians to consider offering an oral contraceptive to female patients with amenorrhoea, if this is not contraindicated, to reduce the risk of subsequent osteoporosis.
- In any patient with a prolactin elevation greater than 3000 mIU/L (~150 ng/mL) then a prolactinoma should be considered.
- If the levels do not return to normal upon switching to a less prolactin-elevating antipsychotic, or if such switch is not possible for clinical reasons, then referral to a specialist in endocrinology is warranted to exclude a prolactinoma.


**Urea and Electrolytes (U & Es) and calcium**

**Rationale**  
There is a risk of electrolyte imbalance when taking antipsychotic medication particularly at high doses. For patients taking lithium, there is a higher than normal incidence of hypercalcaemia and abnormal renal function (BMA 2009).

**Recommended action**

- Check U & Es and calcium annually or when presented with symptoms.
- For patients taking lithium six monthly checks are recommended (BNF 2011).
**Thyroid Function Test**

**Rationale**
Studies have indicated that the elevated serum levels of T4 may be specific for acutely ill schizophrenic patients and that neuroleptic medication may affect thyroid hormone metabolism (Baumgartnera *et al.* 2000) and that there is a spectrum of thyroid function test abnormalities in chronic schizophrenia (Othman *et al.* 1994).

For patients taking lithium, there is a higher than normal incidence of hypothyroidism (BMA 2009).

**Recommended action**
- Check thyroid function annually or in the presence of symptoms
- For patients taking lithium six monthly checks are recommended (BNF 2011).

**Full Blood Count (FBC)**

**Rationale**
A case-control study (Teixeira *et al.* 2009) in patients with schizophrenia showed a significantly higher number of patients with changes on leukocytes. Many patients presented low values of haemoglobin, erythrocytes and platelets. Leukopenia and neutropenia are recognised as side effects of antipsychotic medication (Taylor *et al.* 2007).

**Recommended action**
Check FBC annually or in the presence of symptoms.

**B12 and Folate**

**Rationale**
A case-control study (Teixeira *et al.* 2009) in patients with schizophrenia presented low values of vitamin B12.

Having a deficiency of vitamin B12 just because of eating a poor diet is rare in Western countries, but unhealthy diets are common lifestyle choices of people with schizophrenia (McCreadie 2003).

**Recommended action**
Check B12 and folate annually or in the presence of symptoms.

**Plasma Levels**

**Lithium**

**Rationale**
There is potential toxicity caused by lithium therapy when the serum levels are outside of the narrow therapeutic range (BMA 2009).

**Recommended action**
It is recommended that lithium levels are monitored every three months (BNF 2011).
**Carbamazepine**

**Rationale**
Most authorities agree that plasma drug level monitoring is mandatory when using carbamazepine for seizure disorders and helpful for bipolar disorder (Taylor *et al.* 2000).

**Recommended action**
Consider monitoring carbamazepine levels annually.

**Valproate**

**Rationale**
Most authorities agree that plasma drug level monitoring is helpful for valproate in seizure disorders and bipolar disorder (Taylor *et al.* 2000).

**Recommended action**
Consider monitoring valproate levels annually.
Screening

Cervical Cytology (Women only)
Rationale
Women with schizophrenia have a lower cervical cancer screening rate (63%) than those without severe mental health problems (73%-Disability Rights Commission 2006). However, the evidence shows that if a woman has never been sexually active, then her risk of developing cervical cancer is very low indeed (NHS Cervical Screening Programme 2009a).
Cervical screening saves approximately 4,500 lives per year in England (Peto et al. 2004) and prevents up to 3,900 cases of cervical cancer per year in the UK (Sasieni et al. 1996). Cervical cancer incidence fell by 42% between 1988 and 1997 (England and Wales). This fall is directly related to the cervical screening programme (National Statistics 2000).

Recommended action
Determine patient history of cervical cytology. (Recommendation: under 25 years - no screening; 25-49 years - three yearly; 50-64 years - five yearly; 65+ years - those who have not been screened since age 50 or have had recent abnormal tests)
If no recent cervical cytology and has been sexually active, then offer appointment with the practice nurse.

Testicular examination (Men only)
Rationale
Cancer of the testicles accounts for only about 1% of all cancers in men. It is however, the most common type of cancer in males ages 16 to 35, and can occur anytime after age 15. Often, only one testicle is affected (Cancer Research 2002).

Recommended action
- Advise if any abnormalities are found to make an appointment with their GP.

Teeth
Rationale
Antipsychotics, antidepressants and mood stabilisers can cause reduced saliva flow leading to caries, gingivitis and periodontal disease (Robson and Gray 2007). Dental health may also be affected by poor diet and oral hygiene, and smoking (Robson and Gray 2007). The extent of dental disease can be directly related to schizophrenia intensity, impact of negative symptoms and the length of hospitalisation (Thomas et al. 1996).

Recommended action
Enquire about oral hygiene and give the appropriate advice.
Dental check-ups should be every three months to two years depending on need (DOH 2009). Patients should be encouraged to take regular visits to the community dentist (NICE 2004a).

**Eyes**

**Rationale**
Antipsychotic medication may cause lens and cornea damage, and has been associated with cataract development (Robson and Gray 2007).

**Recommended action**
 Patients with severe mental illness should be encouraged to routinely visit a local optician/optometrist every two years.

**Feet**

**Rationale**
Some patients with severe mental illness struggle to maintain their personal care. Lack of proper care, ill-fitting shoes and general foot neglect are responsible for the majority of foot problems. Feet are the foundation of the body, so if the foot is not functioning correctly, ankles, knees, hips and lower back are not aligned correctly and problems can develop throughout the entire body.

**Recommended action**
- Exchange information on keeping feet healthy, eg washing daily, trimming nails, treatment for burns, cuts and breaks in the skin (The Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists 2005)
- Elderly patients or those with diabetes, osteoarthritis and/or rheumatoid arthritis should be a priority in NHS foot care, and should receive regular check-up from a registered chiropodist (The Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists 2007)
- If the patient is presenting any signs/symptoms of foot problems refer to the chiropodist.

**Breast Examination (Women)**

**Rationale**
Breast cancer is the most common cancer in the UK (Breast Cancer Care 2000). Hyperprolactinaemia can be an adverse effect of antipsychotic therapy that leads to breast-related problems (Halbreich et al. 2003).

**Recommended action**
All patients should be advised on self examination (Breast Cancer Care 2010).

- Teach the breast awareness 5-point code:
  1. Know what is normal for you
  2. Know what changes to look and feel for
  3. Look and feel
  4. Report any changes to your GP without delay
5. Attend routine breast screening if you are aged 50 or over
   - Check risk factors for breast cancer (eg previous history, family history, age) (Patient UK 2007)
   - If there are any breast abnormalities, refer for further investigations (Patient UK 2007)
   - Check for increased levels of serum prolactin (Halbreich et al. 2003)

Breast Examination (Men)
Rationale
The causes of breast cancer in men are not fully known. However, the most important risk factor is increasing age. Most men who get breast cancer are over 60 although younger men can be affected (Breast Cancer Care 2008). Hyperprolactinaemia can be an adverse effect of antipsychotic therapy that leads to breast-related problems (Halbreich et al. 2003).

Recommended action
   - Check risk factors for breast cancer (age > 60 years, previous radiotherapy to the chest, obesity, family history of breast cancer, high oestrogen levels, chromosomal syndromes) (Breast Cancer Care 2008)
   - Check for any symptoms (painless lump, nipple discharge, ulceration or swelling) (Breast Cancer Care 2008)
   - Refer to breast clinic for further investigations (Breast Cancer Care 2008)
   - Check for increased levels of serum prolactin (Halbreich et al. 2003)

Menstrual Cycle
Rationale
Hyperprolactinaemia can cause amenorrhoea which is associated with anovulation (absence of ovulation), and infertility.

Recommended action
   - Check for amenorrhoea - consider offering an oral contraceptive, if this is not contraindicated, to reduce the risk of subsequent osteoporosis
   - Check for increased levels of serum prolactin, disturbed menstrual cycle and irregular menstrual cycle (Halbreich et al. 2003). See under Blood Tests – prolactin

Urine
Rationale
Many conditions and chronic urinary tract infection can be detected by using medical urine test strips, and the amount of urine produced can indicate certain conditions. Polyuria = the passing of excessive volumes of urine may be a sign of diabetes, renal failure, alcohol and drug misuse, metabolic abnormalities (Patient UK 2005) and polydipsia.
Oliguria = reduced urine volume. Cause maybe due to dehydration, vascular collapse or low cardiac output (Patient. UK 2008).

**Recommended action**
- Assess for signs of dehydration (NHS Direct 2007), encourage fluids and implement fluid balance chart to evaluate
- Assess for symptoms of polyuria (Patient. UK 2005), implement fluid balance chart to evaluate
- Check for any urine frequency/incontinence issues
- Dip test urine using eight parameter (as a minimum) diagnostic strips. Follow usual protocols for abnormalities

**Bowels**

**Rationale**
People with schizophrenia are almost twice as likely to have bowel cancer as the general population (DRC 2006).
Patients with schizophrenia seldom complain of gastrointestinal symptoms unless specifically asked (Gupta et al. 1997).
Eating a diet low in red or processed meat and high in fibre, fruit and vegetables can reduce the risk of bowel cancer. Being physically active helps to cut the risk, but being overweight or regularly drinking too much alcohol increases it (Cancer Research UK 2009).

**Recommended action**
- Exchange information on increasing physical activity, lowering alcohol and a healthy diet
- The NHS Bowel Cancer Screening Programme offers screening every two years to all men and women aged 60 to 69 (NHS Cancer Screening Programmes 2009b)
- Check for signs of irritable bowel symptoms, diarrhoea or constipation, excessive urgency, gastrointestinal symptoms, straining, bleeding, need for laxatives
- Check for any bowel frequency/incontinence issues
- Rapid referral for endoscopy if symptoms are suspicious (NICE 2004b)
Lifestyle

Sleep
Rationale
Most adults need around 7–8 hours of sleep each night (Benson 2006).
- In untreated schizophrenia, profound insomnia can result from psychotic symptoms (Benson 2006)
- Although antipsychotic treatment can reduce insomnia, the side effects of sedation and residual insomnia can occur (Benson 2006)
- Complaints of poor sleep quality are directly related to negative assessments of quality of life (Benson 2006)
- Improved sleep may lead to improved ability to cope with stress, and increased energy (Hofstetter et al. 2005)

Recommended action
- Clarify any patient sleep problems (Hofstetter et al. 2005)
- Provide education on good sleep hygiene and benefits of a sleep diary
- Consider medication review

Smoking
Rationale
Approximately 85% of people with schizophrenia smoke, compared with 23% of the general population (Goff et al. 2005). Smoking rates are higher in schizophrenia than in other severe mental illnesses (Goff et al. 2005).

Neurobiological, psychological, behavioural and social factors make it difficult for patients with mental illness to stop smoking (Robson and Gray 2007).

Smoking cessation medication and other non-pharmacological support can increase abstinence rates in those with mental health problems to as high as those in the general population (Foulds et al. 2006, Campion et al. 2008). However those with mental illness have previously been less likely to receive smoking cessation in primary care (Phelan et al. 2001).

Stopping smoking reduces the risk of (NHS Choices 2009a):
- Developing illness, disability or death caused by cancer, heart or lung disease
- Gangrene or amputation caused by circulatory problems
- Exposing others to secondhand smoke
- Children in the same household suffering from asthma or glue ear
- Infertility levels, and an unhealthy pregnancy and baby
- Breathing difficulties and decreased general fitness
- Less enjoyment of the taste of food
Recommended action
- Give advice about the possible health risks associated with smoking
- Ask about respiratory symptoms; chest examination if appropriate
- Refer any patients wishing to quit smoking to NHS Stop Smoking Services if appropriate (DH 2007a) or the primary care clinic’s stop smoking service. They may need to be seen individually. Review medication regularly.
- Cigarette smoking lowers the levels of many antipsychotic medications (Vazquez et al. 2007). Therefore, if a patient stops or reduces their smoking, a medication review should be undertaken.
  - Blood levels of olanzapine and clozapine should be measured before smoking cessation followed by 25% dose reduction during first week of cessation and then further blood levels (Taylor et al. 2007).
  - Doses of fluphenazine and benzodiazepine should be reduced by up to 25% in first week of cessation.
  - Tricyclic antidepressants may need to be reduced by 10-25% in first week (Taylor et al. 2007).

Nicotine replacement is available in a variety of forms and strengths to encourage patient preference and acceptability. Combining patch and faster-acting oral NRT improves efficacy. Side effects include mild local irritation of mouth, throat or nose. Bupropion is associated with seizures and is contraindicated in bipolar affective disorder and epilepsy. It should not be prescribed with drugs which increase risk of seizures such as tricyclic antidepressants and some anti-psychotics. Bupropion can also alter blood levels of medication such as antipsychotics and antidepressants. Varenicline has been reported to be more effective and have fewer side effects than bupropion (Cahill et al. 2007). However, reports of exacerbation of depression and suicidal ideation are currently being reviewed. (Royal College of Psychiatrists and Royal College of General Practitioners 2010).

Exercise
Rationale
People with severe mental illness are more physically inactive than the general population (Brown et al, 1999, McCreadie 2003). Physical activity can have a positive effect on psychological well-being in people with schizophrenia (DH 2004).

Recommended action
Identify the patient’s level of activity. The recommendation for exercise to be of benefit is 30 minutes five days a week (DH 2004). Help the patients make an exercise plan which fits in with their lifestyle and builds up activity gradually. For some individuals it may be appropriate to refer to an exercise scheme if there is one in your area.
**Alcohol Intake**

**Rationale**
Alcohol misuse is one of the most common and clinically significant co-morbidities among patients with severe mental illness (Brunette et al. 2004). There is considerable evidence to support the positive impact of reducing unsafe alcohol consumption on cardiovascular health (NHS Information Centre 2008). Many antipsychotics can cause sedation and impair alertness, concentration and coordination. The use of alcohol can further increase any impairment (rethink 2008b).

**Recommended action**
Offer recommendations on sensible daily alcohol intake:
- Adult women should not regularly drink > 2–3 units of alcohol a day
- Adult men should not regularly drink > 3–4 units of alcohol a day
- Women who regularly drink > 6 units a day (or > 35 units a week) and men who regularly drink > 8 units a day (or 50 units a week) are at highest risk of alcohol-related harm (Department of Health 2007b)

Refer to the local Alcohol Support Agency.

**Diet**

**Rationale**
In a survey of the dietary habits of 102 people with SMI by McCreadie (2003) the average fruit and vegetable intake for these people was 16 portions a week, compared with recommended intake of 35 per week (DH 2004). The physical health consequences of a poor diet include CVD, diabetes, obesity and some cancers. Studies of people with SMI repeatedly show that saturated fats from dietary intake of meat and dairy products are associated with worse outcomes in schizophrenia (Peet 2004). There is a particularly strong association between sugar consumption and poorer outcome in schizophrenia whereas consumption of fish and sea food, particularly omega 3 fatty acids, has been associated with better outcomes (Peet 2004).

**Recommended action**
Agree and implement a diet plan with the patient (and any carers) – may include referral to other members of the multidisciplinary team.
- Explain that five portions of fruit/vegetables each day and reducing fat intake, reduces the risk of cancer, coronary heart disease, and other chronic illnesses (DH 2007c).
- Aim to address potential barriers (access and availability of fresh fruit/vegetables, awareness of health benefits and attitudes towards buying, preparing and eating fruit/vegetables) (DH 2007c).

**Fluid Intake**

**Rationale**
Many people with severe mental illness do not drink enough fluid leading to dehydration. The body works less efficiently, even with a relatively low level of fluid
loss (NHS Choices 2009b). Some of the early warning signs are feeling thirsty and lightheaded, and having concentrated, strong-smelling urine. Overconsumption of fluid can also arise from a condition called polydipsia which is a serious complication of some psychotic illnesses, including schizophrenia. The exact reason for any one person developing polydipsia is unclear, but if untreated, the high intake of fluids can lead to hyponatraemia, which in turn can lead to coma or even death. It has been estimated that between six and 17% of psychiatric inpatients suffer from polydipsia (Brooks and Ahmed 2007).

**Recommended action**
Determine patient’s daily fluid intake:

If < one litre/day:
- Check for signs of dehydration
- Encourage the patient to drink 1-2 litres (6–8 glasses) of fluid every day (more during hot weather and physical exertion)
- Exchange information on increasing fluid intake (drinking semi-skimmed milk, diluted fruit juices, diluted fruit squash)
(NHS Choices 2010)

If > three litres/day check for signs of polydypsia, (Brooks and Ahmed 2007) such as increased urine output.
Implement a fluid balance chart if possible; enlist help of carers and family.
Electrolyte assessment if initial intervention is unsuccessful.

**Caffeine intake**

**Rationale**
Caffeine is a central stimulant, ie it stimulates the brain. Caffeine is present in drinks such as coffee, tea and cola (NWMHP 2008). Too much caffeine can cause feelings of anxiety and nervousness, sleep disruption (especially difficulty getting off to sleep), restlessness, irritability, diuresis (passing lots of water/urine), stomach complaints, tremulousness, palpitations and arrhythmias (changed heart rate, especially faster beating) (NWMHP 2008). A moderate daily caffeine intake of 250–500 mg is not associated with adverse events (NWMHP 2008).
Psychosis can be induced in normal individuals ingesting caffeine at toxic doses, and psychotic symptoms can also be worsened in schizophrenic patients using caffeine (Broderick and Benjamin 2004).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food or drink item</th>
<th>Average caffeine content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 cup of coffee</td>
<td>75–100 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 cup of tea</td>
<td>50 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 can of cola</td>
<td>40 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 energy drink</td>
<td>90 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar of plain chocolate</td>
<td>50 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar of milk chocolate</td>
<td>25 mg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FSA (2004)
**Recommended action**
- Exchange information on reducing caffeine intake (stopping gradually to avoid withdrawal effects) (NWMHP 2008)
- Check for symptoms of caffeinism or caffeine toxicity (> 1000 mg/day), which can make illnesses such as anxiety more resistant to drug treatment (NWMHP 2008)

**Safe Sex**

**Rationale**
Although a smaller proportion of people with SMI are sexually active compared to the general population, those that are sexually active are more likely to engage in high risk behaviours that may lead to HIV, such as sex without a condom and injecting drug use (Cournos et al. 2005). Reasons for this include lack of knowledge about how sexually transmitted diseases (STIs) and HIV are transmitted and prevented (Arrufo et al. 1990, Kalichman et al. 1994), a susceptibility to coercion into unwanted sexual activity, difficulties in establishing stable social and sexual relationships, and comorbid alcohol and substance use (Coverdale and Tubott 2000).

**Recommended action**
- Identify if the patient is engaging in behaviours that increase the risk of STIs
- Provide sexual health advice
- If STI is suspected, refer to the Genito-Urinary Medicine Clinic

**Sexual Satisfaction**

**Rationale**
Antipsychotic medication can have an adverse effect on sexual function, which impacts greatly on quality of life (Hanssens et al. 2006). A study (Smith et al. 2002) showed that sexual dysfunction occurred in 45% of patients taking antipsychotic medication. The main cause of sexual dysfunction in both men and women was hyperprolactinaemia.

**Recommended action**
- Determine the patient’s level of sexual activity – refer for gynaecological examination and laboratory assessments if required (EAU 2005)
- Use side effects scale for antipsychotic medication such as SESCAM (Bennett et al. 1994)
- Check for increased levels of serum prolactin = decreased libido and arousal, orgasmic dysfunction (Halbreich et al. 2003)
Cannabis
Rationale
Cannabis use is associated with poor outcomes in existing schizophrenia (Henquet et al. 2005).
Cannabis use is a contributing factor in 10% of schizophrenia cases and there are 1,500 expected new cases of cannabis-related schizophrenia each year (BBC 2007).

Recommended action
-Patients’ cannabis use should be recorded during a physical health check
-Ask about other non-prescribed drug use (BMA 2009)
-Work with support of dual diagnosis worker/service - systemically evaluate using a drug use scale
-Implement health behaviour interventions
Medication review

People with an established diagnosis of schizophrenia or bipolar disorder who are managed in primary care require monitoring of medication use, medication adherence and side-effects (NICE 2006a, 2009). The accuracy of other medication can also be checked at the same time as reviewing the antipsychotics and/or mood stabilisers (BMA 2009).

Antipsychotics

Rationale

Antipsychotics have a wide range of side effects. The most widely researched include (Rethink 2006):

Sedation: The antipsychotics that cause the most sedation include chlorpromazine, promazine, thioridazine, clozapine and zotepine. Often this can be dealt with by the patient taking their medication at night just before they go to bed. The dose may need to be reduced or changed if this is a big problem.

Movement disorders: There are different types of movement disorder. These include:

- **Dystonia** - prolonged muscle spasms often involving the face, neck, shoulders and upper limbs. Drugs such as procyclidine and orphenadrine are given to treat dystonia
- **Akathisia** - fidgety movements of the legs which may be accompanied by a strong sense of inner restlessness and unease. This often means that a person cannot sit comfortably, and may be driven to walk up and down to try and gain relief. It is best treated with clonazepam or propranolol
- **Parkinsonian movement disorders** - involve stiffness and shakiness, and resembles the unrelated condition of Parkinson’s disease. The limbs move slowly and muscles of the face may be quite immobile, producing an expressionless, staring face. Rhythmic shaking may occur but is not usually very severe, and is most obvious in the hands. Procyclidine and orphenadrine, amongst other drugs, are given to treat Parkinsonian movement disorders
- **Tardive dyskinesia** - major signs of the condition are excessive movement of the lips, tongue and jaw, (known as oro-facial dyskinesia). The term "tardive" means delayed or late-appearing and this reflects the fact that treatment may have gone on for some months or years before the movement disorder becomes apparent. Oro-facial dyskinesia is the most common form of tardive dyskinesia. Other abnormal movements are seen including jerky, abrupt movements of the limbs and body, but these are less common.

Recommended action

Side effects should be monitored in a systematic manner using a recognized tool such as SESCAM (Bennett et al. 1995). This is a two part scale, one for the observing health care professional and the other is self rated by the patient. Blood tests should be taken as described previously.

Refer back to original prescriber (NICE 2009) in the case of:

- Observed side effects
- Return of symptoms
• Any physical problems which may be related to the drug
• Any issues flagged up by the patient

**Mood stabilisers**

**Lithium**

**Rationale**
In long-term use lithium has been associated with thyroid disorders and mild cognitive and memory impairment. Lithium salts have a narrow therapeutic/toxic ratio, therefore it is important to determine the optimum range for each individual patient. Lithium toxicity is made worse by sodium depletion (BNF 2011).

**Recommended action**
• Check thyroid function, U & Es, and calcium six monthly
• Check lithium levels three monthly. Refer back to prescriber if not in therapeutic range
• Patients should be maintained on lithium after three to five years only if benefit persists.

(BNF 2011)

**Carbamazepine**

**Rationale**
In order to be effective, carbamazepine has to reach a given level in the blood (NWMHFT 2005a). Side effects include dizziness, drowsiness, shaky movements and feeling sick. Carbamazepine can cause a chronic low white blood cell count which increases susceptibility to infection (NWMHFT 2005a). This can be monitored with regular blood tests.

**Recommended action**
• Consider monitoring carbamazepine levels annually
• Check full blood count annually
• If abnormal FBC (without any other cause) and/or carbemazepine not in therapeutic range, refer back to prescriber

**Valproate**

**Rationale**
Valproate causes an increase in appetite and therefore weight gain (NWMHFT 2005b). Side effects include dizziness, drowsiness, shaky movements, feeling sick, impaired liver function, thrombocytopenia and impaired platelet function (NWMHFT 2005b).

**Recommended action**
• Give advice regarding a diet high in vegetables and fibre, refer to dietician if appropriate (NWMHFT 2005b)
• Advise if bruises without reason or bleeds easily, to stop taking valproate and refer back to prescriber (NWMHFT 2005b)
• Consider monitoring valproate levels
• Check full blood count and LFT annually
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• If abnormal FBC and/or LFT (without any other cause) and/or valproate not in therapeutic range, refer back to prescriber
Additional factors

Care plan
Rationale
The GMS contract (BMA 2009) requires the patient to have their care plan documented in the records; this is agreed between individuals, their family and/or carers as appropriate. The Care Programme Approach (CPA) is the process which mental health service providers use to co-ordinate the care for people who have mental health problems (Care programme approach association 2011).

Recommended action
- If the patient is under the care of secondary care, Care Programme Approach (CPA), the care plan is scanned into the patient record
- If the patient is on the register but not under the care of secondary care, the healthcare professional should document an accurate and easily understood plan of care as part of the annual review by discussing this with the patient, family and/or carers. The discussion should include the patient’s preferred course of action in the event of a clinical relapse; it should also contain a discussion around the following issues (NICE 2009):
  - Social support
  - Input from secondary and /or voluntary mental health
  - Early warning signs that may indicate possible relapse
  - Occupational status

Flu vaccination
Rationale
Patients with severe mental illness are at an increased risk of cardiac, respiratory disorders and diabetes (Sainsbury Centre for Mental Health 2003).

Recommended action
Offer annual immunisation (Sainsbury Centre for Mental Health 2003).

Follow up
Rationale
The patient may not attend for the health check due to his/her mental state. It is important to set up a robust system to allow further opportunities to attend.

Recommended action
- Try contacting the patient (or carer if known) by telephone
- Send a letter requesting that they contact the surgery to make a new appointment
- If unknown to secondary care, inform the GP of their non-attendance
- If known to secondary care, inform the secondary care link worker
- If patient does not make a further appointment they can be exception reported
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Physical health checks for people with Severe Mental Illness: a primary care guide

What is severe mental illness (SMI)?
Patients with SMI will most likely have a diagnosis of schizophrenia or bipolar disorder.
Click for more information:
Bipolar disorder
Schizophrenia

Why are these health checks important?
Due to a combination of lifestyle factors and the side-effects of antipsychotic medication, there is a high incidence of cardiovascular disease (CVD) causing premature death in people with SMI (15 years for bipolar disorder and 25 years for schizophrenia). It is therefore necessary that these patients have an annual physical health check in order to identify risk factors for CVD. A comprehensive physical health check carried out by a competent practitioner will also provide the opportunity to offer education regarding lifestyle and ask about other physical conditions. Link to Positive Cardiometabolic Health chart

Preparing to carry out health checks for people with severe mental illness
1. Identify a practice nurse to be responsible for carrying out the health checks
2. Ensure the practice nurse receives appropriate training to feel confident in carrying out the health checks. Find out what is available in your area. Link to free training.
Reading the links on this website will be informative – Recovery Medication – click on module for antipsychotic online learning module: Module, Click on site for SSMI learning module Neuroleptic injection protocol.
Knowledge Quiz (Pre-training)

Please supply the following information

Gender:  
Ethnicity:  
Year of first registered nursing qualification:

Please circle your answer

1. People with mental illness die five years earlier than the general population.  
   Agree  Disagree

2. Antipsychotic medication should be increased if the patient stops smoking  
   Agree  Disagree

3. Psychotic symptoms can be improved in schizophrenic patients by using caffeine  
   Agree  Disagree

4. If the patient is not under the care of the Community Mental Health team, then they do not need a care plan  
   Agree  Disagree

5. Patients who take lithium need their lithium levels monitored every six months  
   Agree  Disagree

6. If the elevation of a patient’s prolactin levels is <2000 mIU/L, then it is reasonable to continue to monitor the level without any further action  
   Agree  Disagree

7. It is important to encourage all patients with severe mental illness to drink lots of fluid  
   Agree  Disagree

8. People with SMI are at less risk of acquiring a sexually transmitted infection compared to the general population  
   Agree  Disagree

9. Cannabis use is a contributing factor in 50% of schizophrenia cases  
   Agree  Disagree

10. The side effect of sedation from taking an antipsychotic, cannot be dealt with by the patient taking their medication just before they go to bed  
    Agree  Disagree
Attitudes Quiz (Pre-training)

Please supply the following information

Gender:
Ethnicity:
Year of first registered nursing qualification:

Please circle your answer

1. Having a diagnosis of severe mental illness, means that recovery is not possible
   Agree Disagree

2. I do not need to know the views of my patients with severe mental illness regarding their psychiatric medications
   Agree Disagree

3. I am not in a position to help your patients with severe mental illness identify people who can assist them during a crisis
   Agree Disagree

4. I am not in a position to identify triggers that cause symptoms of your patients with severe mental illness to get worse and identify warning signs that come before they get symptoms
   Agree Disagree

5. It is sometimes necessary to disregard the patients’ preferences regarding their physical health in order to provide the best treatment
   Agree Disagree

6. Many patients with severe mental illness cannot make sensible choices about their physical care
   Agree Disagree

7. When providing patients with severe mental illness a health check, I should keep focused on their physical health
   Agree Disagree

8. I should invalidate the patient’s goal when it is unrealistic
   Agree Disagree

9. A physical health check appointment does not need to include assisting patients with severe mental illness in maintaining activities that are meaningful to them
   Agree Disagree

10. The physical health goals of “normal” people are often too stressful for patients with severe mental illness to reach
    Agree Disagree
Communication Questionnaire

Please supply the following information

Gender:  
Ethnicity:  
Year of first registered nursing qualification:  
Working in primary care or secondary care:

After receiving training to improve the physical health for people with severe mental illness (PhyHWell) will you (Please circle your response):

Contact your own primary/secondary care colleague to inform them about changes in health or circumstances of a particular patient?

a) Much more likely  b) More likely  c) less likely  d) will not  e) don’t know

Contact your own primary/secondary care colleague to ask them about a particular patient?

a) Much more likely  b) More likely  c) less likely  d) will not  e) don’t know

Contact your own primary/secondary care colleague to inform them about new or changes in service developments?

a) Much more likely  b) More likely  c) less likely  d) will not  e) don’t know

Contact your own primary/secondary care colleague to ask them about new or changes in service developments?

a) Much more likely  b) More likely  c) less likely  d) will not  e) don’t know

Develop an individual system of communication between your own primary/secondary care colleagues?

a) Much more likely  b) More likely  c) less likely  d) will not  e) don’t know
Evaluation of the Northampton Physical Health and Well-being Project (PhyHWell)

As you have accepted to take part in the Northampton Physical Health and Well-being project, we would like to invite you to take part in our research study. It is up to you whether you decide to join the study. The study is described in the enclosed information sheet. If you agree to take part, we will then ask you to sign a consent form. You are free to withdraw at any time, without giving a reason and will still be eligible for the training and support.

The overall aim of this study is to evaluate the Northampton Physical Health and Wellbeing Project (PhyHWell). Specifically we wish to determine:
- The impact of the PhyHWell project on cardiovascular risk in patients with severe mental illness.
- The impact of the PhyHWell project on patients’ adherence with medicine
- The acceptability of the PhyHWell project to the patients
- The acceptability of the PhyHWell project to the nurses

The data will be evaluated and you will be provided with the results. The project has been reviewed by the local Research Ethics Committee and the part you will be involved in has been classified as a service evaluation which has been approved by the local R & D centre.

Should you wish to take part, I will come and explain the study to you and answer any questions you may have. Please contact me on telephone number 07825934800 or email Sheila.Hardy@uea.ac.uk to arrange a convenient time.

Yours faithfully

Sheila Hardy
Principal Investigator
Information about the research (GP Practice)

An evaluation of the Northampton Physical Health and Well-being Project (PhyHWell)

We would like to invite you to take part in our research study. Before you decide we would like you to understand why the research is being done and what it would involve for you. We will answer any questions you have. You may wish to discuss this with the GP partners and practice nurses before making a decision.

(Part 1 tells you the purpose of this study and what will happen to you if you take part. Part 2 gives you more detailed information about the conduct of the study). Ask us if there is anything that is not clear.

Part 1

What is the Purpose of the Study?
The overall aim of this study is to evaluate the Northampton Physical Health and Wellbeing Project (PhyHWell). Specifically we wish to determine:
The impact of the PhyHWell project on cardiovascular risk in patients with severe mental illness
The impact of the PhyHWell project on patients’ adherence with medicine
The acceptability of the PhyHWell project to the patients
The acceptability of the PhyHWell project to the nurses

Why have I been invited?
You have been invited because you have accepted to undertake the PhyHWell project training.

Do I have to take part?
It is up to you to decide to join the study. The study is described in this information sheet. If you agree to take part, we will then ask you to sign a consent form. You are
free to withdraw at any time, without giving a reason and will still be eligible for the training and support.

What are the benefits of taking part?
There is no direct benefit to you in taking part. You will be providing evidence to illustrate how training contributes to service delivery.

What are the possible disadvantages and risks of taking part?
It is anticipated that there are no disadvantages from participating in this research. All information will remain anonymous and you are free to withdraw at anytime.

What will we have to do?
- Sign a consent form to permit use of anonymised data for the research
- The clinical team member identified to undertake training and responsibility for SMI health checks to complete two questionnaires before and after training
- Release an admin team member for one hour to set up the audit with the principle investigator
- Release an admin team member for one hour per year to run the audit under the guidance of the principle investigator

What is the alternative?
There is no other training at present for providing physical health checks for people with severe mental illness in primary care. Therefore there is no alternative way to collect the evidence needed to distinguish its effect.

What happens if the research study stops?
This will not affect any training or support you have been offered.

What if there is a problem?
Any complaint about the way you have been dealt with during the study will be addressed. The detailed information on this is given in Part 2.

Will taking part in the study be confidential?
We will follow ethical and legal practice and all information about you will be handled in confidence. The details are included in Part 2.

If the information in Part 1 has interested you and you are considering participation, please read the additional information in Part 2 before making any decision.

Part 2

What if relevant new information becomes available?
Sometimes we get new information about the treatment being studied. If this happens, the researcher will tell you.

What will happen if we don’t want to carry on with the study?
If you choose to take part and then decide you do not want your information used, providing it has not already been published or shared then your information will be withdrawn. If it has already been published, then it will be impossible to withdraw it.

What if there is a problem?
If you have a concern about any aspect of this study, you should ask to speak to the researchers who will do their best to answer your questions [Sheila Hardy 07825934800, Professor Richard Gray 01603 597132]. If you remain unhappy and wish to complain formally, you can do this, contact Sue Palmer-Hill, R&D Centre NHS Northamptonshire, email sue.palmer-Hill@northants.nhs or telephone 01604 651632 or write to the address above.

**NHS based research**
In the event that something does go wrong during the research and this is due to someone’s negligence then you may have grounds for a legal action for compensation against the University of East Anglia, but you may have to pay your legal costs. The normal National Health Service complaints mechanisms will still be available to you.

**Will taking part in this study be kept confidential?**
All information which is collected from the practice during the course of the research will be kept strictly confidential, and any information about patients which leaves the surgery will have their name and address removed so that they cannot be recognised. Data will be collected by audit which will be carried out by your own member of staff with guidance from the researcher. No-one outside the practice will have access to patient identifiable data. Data will be stored securely and coded to ensure anonymity. No-one other than the researchers, sponsors, regulatory authorities and Research and Development department will have access to view data that identifies the practice. Data will be stored in a locked room at the University of East Anglia for 5 years. It will then be disposed of securely.

**What will happen to the results of the research study?**
The information you give will remain anonymous. You will not be identified in any report/publication. It is intended to publish the results in reports and relevant medical journals. Individual GP surgeries will be informed and a poster will be displayed in the surgery. The results will also be made available on the Northamptonshire teaching Primary Care Trust website and by conference presentation.

**Who is organising and funding the research?**
The Principle Investigator is Sheila Hardy who is undertaking this research as a PhD at the University of East Anglia. This is being funded by Northamptonshire teaching Primary Care Trust.

**Who has reviewed this study?**
All research in the NHS is looked at by independent group of people, called a Research Ethics Committee, to protect your interests. This study was reviewed by a Research Ethics Committee through the Integrated Research Application System (IRAS) and the part you will be involved in has been classified as a service evaluation which has been approved by the local R & D Centre.

**Further information and contact details**
2. Specific information about this research project. Contact Sheila Hardy Sheila.Hardy@uea.ac.uk
3. Advice about participating in the study. Contact Professor Richard Gray Richard.Gray@uea.ac.uk
4. Who you should approach if you are unhappy with the study. Contact Sue Palmer-Hill, R&D Centre NHS Northamptonshire, email sue.palmer-Hill@northants.nhs or telephone 01604 651632.
You will be given a copy of this information sheet and a signed consent form to keep.

Sheila Hardy
Chief Investigator
Email – Sheila.Hardy@uea.ac.uk
Telephone - 07825934800
CONSENT FORM (General Practice)

Title of Project: Northampton Physical Health and Wellbeing Project

Name of Researcher: Sheila Hardy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please initial box</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I confirm that I have read and understand the information sheet dated.................... for the above study. I have had the opportunity to consider the information, ask questions and have had these answered satisfactorily.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I understand that our participation is voluntary and that we are free to withdraw at any time without giving any reason, without our access to the training being affected.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I understand that the data collected during the study will be looked at by the principal researcher, project leaders (Northamptonshire teaching Primary Care Trust) and research supervisors (University of East Anglia). I give permission for this information to be used anonymously.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I agree to take part in the above study.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name of Participant
(On behalf of Practice)

Date

Signature

Name of Person taking consent

Date

Signature
Information about the research (Primary Care Nurse)

An evaluation of the Northampton Physical Health and Well-being Project (PhyHWell)

We would like to invite you to take part in our research study. Before you decide we would like you to understand why the research is being done and what it would involve for you. We will answer any questions you have. (Part 1 tells you the purpose of this study and what will happen to you if you take part. Part 2 gives you more detailed information about the conduct of the study). Ask us if there is anything that is not clear.

Part 1

What is the Purpose of the Study?
The overall aim of this study is to evaluate the Northampton Physical Health and Wellbeing Project (PhyHWell). Specifically we wish to determine:
The impact of the PhyHWell project on cardiovascular risk in patients with severe mental illness
The impact of the PhyHWell project on patients’ adherence with medicine
The acceptability of the PhyHWell project to the patients
The acceptability of the PhyHWell project to the nurses

Why have I been invited?
You have been invited because you have accepted to undertake the PhyHWell project training.

Do I have to take part?
It is up to you to decide to join the study. The study is described in this information sheet. You are free to withdraw at any time, without giving a reason and will still be eligible for the training and support.

What are the benefits of taking part?
There is no direct benefit to you in taking part. You will be providing evidence to illustrate how training contributes to service delivery.

**What are the possible disadvantages and risks of taking part?**
It is anticipated that there are no disadvantages from participating in this research. All information will remain anonymous and you are free to withdraw at anytime.

**What will we have to do?**
Complete two questionnaires before training and three questionnaires after training. Each questionnaire will take about five minutes to complete. As this is a survey design you will not be required to sign a consent form. However, consent is implied to participate in the survey by filling out the questionnaires.

**What is the alternative?**
There is no other training at present for providing physical health checks for people with severe mental illness in primary care. Therefore there is no alternative way to collect the evidence needed to distinguish its effect.

**What happens if the research study stops?**
This will not affect any training or support you have been offered.

**What if there is a problem?**
Any complaint about the way you have been dealt with during the study will be addressed. The detailed information on this is given in Part 2.

**Will taking part in the study be confidential?**
We will follow ethical and legal practice and all information about you will be handled in confidence. The details are included in Part 2.

If the information in Part 1 has interested you and you are considering participation, please read the additional information in Part 2 before making any decision.

**Part 2**

**What if relevant new information becomes available?**
Sometimes we get new information about the treatment being studied. If this happens, the researcher will tell you.

**What will happen if we don’t want to carry on with the study?**
If you choose to take part and then decide you do not want your information used, providing it has not already been published or shared then your information will be withdrawn. If it has already been published, then it will be impossible to withdraw it.

**What if there is a problem?**
If you have a concern about any aspect of this study, you should ask to speak to the researchers who will do their best to answer your questions [Sheila Hardy 07825934800, Professor Richard Gray 01603 597132]. If you remain unhappy and wish to complain formally, you can do this, contact Sue Palmer-Hill, R&D Centre NHS Northamptonshire, email sue.palmer-Hill@northants.nhs or telephone 01604 651632 or write to the address above.
NHS based research
In the event that something does go wrong during the research and this is due to someone’s negligence then you may have grounds for a legal action for compensation against the University of East Anglia, but you may have to pay your legal costs. The normal National Health Service complaints mechanisms will still be available to you.

Will taking part in this study be kept confidential?
All information which is collected from the questionnaires you completed will be kept strictly confidential. Data will be stored securely and coded to ensure anonymity. No-one other than the researchers, sponsors, regulatory authorities and Research and Development department will have access to view data that identifies the practice. Data will be stored in a locked room at the University of East Anglia for 5 years. It will then be disposed of securely.

What will happen to the results of the research study?
The information you give will remain anonymous. You will not be identified in any report/publication. It is intended to publish the results in reports and relevant medical journals. Individual GP surgeries will be informed and a poster will be displayed in the surgery. The results will also be made available on the Northamptonshire teaching Primary Care Trust website and by conference presentation.

Who is organising and funding the research?
The Principle Investigator is Sheila Hardy who is undertaking this research as a PhD at the University of East Anglia. This is being funded by Northamptonshire teaching Primary Care Trust.

Who has reviewed this study?
All research in the NHS is looked at by independent group of people, called a Research Ethics Committee, to protect your interests. This study has been reviewed by a Research Ethics Committee through the Integrated Research Application System (IRAS) and the part you will be involved in has been classified as a service evaluation which has been approved by the local R & D Centre.

Further information and contact details
2. Specific information about this research project. Contact Sheila Hardy Sheila.Hardy@uea.ac.uk
3. Advice about participating in the study. Contact Professor Richard Gray Richard.Gray@uea.ac.uk
4. Who you should approach if you are unhappy with the study. Contact Sue Palmer-Hill, R&D Centre NHS Northamptonshire, email sue.palmer-Hill@northants.nhs or telephone 01604 651632.

You will be given a copy of this information sheet to keep.

Sheila Hardy
Chief Investigator
Email – Sheila.Hardy@uea.ac.uk
Telephone – 07825934800
22 March 2011

Mrs Sheila Hardy
Project Lead
Northamptonshire teaching Primary Care Trust
Francis Crick House
Summerhouse Road
Northampton
NN3 6BF

Dear Mrs Hardy

Study title: The Northampton Physical Health and Wellbeing (PhyHWell) project - The patients’ perspective
REC reference: 11/EM/0006
Amendment date: 08 March 2011

The above amendment was reviewed at the meeting of the Sub-Committee held on 15 March 2011.

Ethical opinion

The members of the Committee taking part in the review gave a favourable ethical opinion of the amendment on the basis described in the notice of amendment form and supporting documentation.

Approved documents

The documents reviewed and approved at the meeting were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GP/Consultant Information Sheets</td>
<td>1 - Focus Group</td>
<td>28 February 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Consent Form: Focus Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28 February 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Information Sheet: Focus Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28 February 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice of Substantial Amendment (non-CTIMPs)</td>
<td></td>
<td>08 March 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Membership of the Committee

The members of the Committee who took part in the review are listed on the attached sheet.

R&D approval

All investigators and research collaborators in the NHS should notify the R&D office for the relevant NHS care organisation of this amendment and check whether it affects R&D approval of the research.

Statement of compliance

The Committee is constituted in accordance with the Governance Arrangements for Research Ethics Committees (July 2001) and complies fully with the Standard Operating Procedures for Research Ethics Committees in the UK.

11/EM/0006: Please quote this number on all correspondence

Yours sincerely

Miss Jennifer Lea

Assistant Committee Co-ordinator

E-mail: jennifer.lea@nottspct.nhs.uk

Enclosures: List of names and professions of members who took part in the review

Copy to: Tracey Moulton, University of East Anglia
Norwich NR4 7TJ

Trent Research Ethics Committee

Attendance at Sub-Committee of the REC meeting on 15 March 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr Peter Korczak</td>
<td>Consultant Maxillo-facial Surgeon</td>
<td>Expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Helen Sammons</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PUBLIC HEALTH DIRECTORATE

Date: 4th April 2011

Sheila Handy
Project Lead – Northampton Physical Health and Wellbeing Project
NHS Northamptonshire
Francis Crick House
Summerhouse Road
Northampton
NN3 6BF

Dear Sheila

RE: The Northampton Physical Health and Wellbeing (PhyHWell) Project – The patients perspective

Thank you for requesting permission to conduct the above referenced study within NHS Northamptonshire.

We acknowledge that we have received and reviewed the documents listed below:

NHS R&D From
NHS SSI Form
Interview Schedule/Topic Guides – Version 3, dated 31 December 2010
Letter of invitation to participants – Version 2, dated 30 November 2010
GP/Consultant Information Sheets – Version 1, dated 01 January 2011
REC Application – dated 14 January 2011
CV for Richard Gray – dated 27 September 2010
Participant Information Sheet: Patients – Version 5, dated 31 December 2010
Protocol – Version 9, dated 31 December 2010
Evidence of Insurance – dated 18 June 2010
Scientific Critique Report – dated 01 January 2010
Letter from Sponsor – dated 17 January 2011
Sheila Handy CV
Participant Consent Form: Patients – Version 1, dated 31 January 2011
GP/Consultant Information Sheets: Focus Groups – Version1, 28 February 2011
Participant Consent Form: Focus Group - Version1, 28 February 2011
Participant Information Sheet: Focus Group - Version1, 28 February 2011
20th December 2012

To whom it may concern

This letter is to confirm that Sheila Hardy is working as consultant for our Physical Health in Severe Mental Illness CQUIN. She was chosen for this role because of her research in this field and her work in clinical practice.

Yours faithfully,

Gary Wainwright
07827 929057
Gary.Wainwright@nhft.nhs.uk

Gary Wainwright
Project Manager
St Marys Hospital
Carey Block
London Road
Kettering
NN15 7PW
Protocol for the management of Physical Health in SMI

All patients at first point of presentation/at point of initiation of treatment/change in treatment in secondary care (use the physical health guidance for prescriber’s manual):

**Step 1** – Record family history and patient history of previous CVD, diabetes and other physical disease, smoking, exercise and dietary habits.

**Step 2** – Examine blood pressure and body mass index (and/or waist circumference), ECG.

**Step 3** – Blood tests – Fasting cholesterol and glucose (if possible – otherwise do random), Hba1c, FBC, TFT, full profile, prolactin, B12 and folate (once only unless abnormal), plasma levels (for lithium, carbemazepine, valproate if appropriate).

**Step 4** – Advice: smoking cessation; food choices; physical activity.

**Step 5** – When choosing medication, consider cardio metabolic risk profile of available SGA drugs.

**Step 6** – Week 6 and 12: repeat steps 2, 3 and 4. Check for weight gain – if > 7%, review choice of antipsychotic.

**Step 7** – If measurements are normal repeat annually in primary care as part of full health check (if patient has no contact with primary care or is an inpatient, then is the responsibility of secondary care – follow guidance from the Health Improvement Profile for Primary Care manual - HIP-PC*).

*The HIP-PC manual can be downloaded from: [http://physicalsmi.webeden.co.uk](http://physicalsmi.webeden.co.uk)

The guidance in this protocol has been adapted from:

Initiating antipsychotic medication in people with Severe Mental Illness: Physical health guidance for prescribers
Initiating antipsychotic medication in people with Severe Mental Illness: Physical health guidance for prescribers

Introduction
The purpose of this guidance is to assist clinicians prescribing antipsychotic medication to look for side effects and prevent cardiovascular disease (CVD) in their patients. CVD is a term mainly used to describe disorders that can affect the heart (cardio) and/or the body’s system of arteries and veins (vascular) that are associated with atherosclerosis (the build up of fatty deposits and debris in the inner walls of blood vessels). Most are long-term conditions such as coronary heart disease (CHD) or peripheral artery disease (PAD), but acute events such as myocardial infarction and stroke can occur suddenly when a vessel supplying blood to the heart or brain becomes blocked.

Severe mental illness such as schizophrenia and bipolar disorder is associated with high medical co-morbidity; mortality rates are approximately 50% higher than in the general population (Hennekens et al. 2005). The primary cause of death due to a physical cause is circulatory disease, diabetes and obesity. Evidence suggests excess weight gain can be 2-3 times more prevalent in people with schizophrenia than in the general population (Allison and Casey 2001). This may be due to high levels of smoking, unhealthy diets and lack of exercise which are common lifestyle choices of people with schizophrenia (McCreadie 2003).

Antipsychotic medication can exacerbate weight gain (Allison and Casey 2001). Additionally, several reports have raised concerns that some of the second-generation antipsychotics may further increase the risk of type II diabetes (Newcomer et al. 2002). Clozapine and olanzapine are the agents most commonly associated with diabetes.
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Family and personal History of Cardiovascular disease

**Family History**

**Rationale**
Individuals with a positive family history of CVD are at a greater risk of an early CVD event (Williams et al. 2001). A positive family history is seen as fathers who succumb earlier than 55 years of age, and mothers before 65 years (Wood et al. 1998).

**Recommended action**
Obtain family history as soon as practicably possible.

**Personal History**

**Rationale**
A patient’s risk increases with age. They will be at a higher risk if they are male or South Asian. Modifiable risk factors are obesity, smoking, dyslipidaemia, physical inactivity, poor diet, raised blood pressure, high alcohol intake and diabetes.

**Recommended action**
Obtain personal history as soon as practicably possible. Provide advice on diet, exercise, alcohol and smoking as appropriate.

**Measurements**

**Body Mass Index (BMI)**

**Rationale**
The BMI is a simple index used to determine whether an individual is underweight, overweight or obese (WHO 2006).
The BMI is defined as the weight divided by the square of the height. For example, a person who weighs 70 kg and has a height of 1.75 will have a BMI of 22.9.
A BMI calculator can be found at: [www.eatwell.gov.uk/healthydiet/healthyweight/bmicalculator/](http://www.eatwell.gov.uk/healthydiet/healthyweight/bmicalculator/)
Although BMI values are the same for both sexes, they may not be accurate in people who are athletes or who weight-train, in pregnant or breastfeeding women, or those over the age of 60 years.
Ethnicity should be considered; particularly in patients of South Asian origin (overweight varies from BMI > 23, obesity from BMI > 25).

**Recommended action**
Calculate BMI before initiation of antipsychotic medication and at six and twelve weeks. Check for weight gain – if >7%, review choice of antipsychotic
Diet and exercise advice should be offered to all patients to prevent weight gain.
Waist circumference
Rationale
People who carry their excess fat centrally (within the abdominal cavity) are more likely to suffer the consequences of being overweight. Waist circumference correlates with visceral adipose tissue, plasma lipids, lipoproteins and insulin levels in adults (Taylor et al. 1998).

Recommended action
Measure the patient’s waist circumference before initiation of antipsychotic medication and at six and twelve weeks. Patients at risk are those with a waist circumference ≥ 80 cm (female) / ≥ 94 cm (male) (Barnett et al. 2007). If measurements are increasing, consider switching medication. Offer diet and exercise advice.

Electrocardiogram (ECG)
Rationale
Most antipsychotic medications have the potential for lengthening of the QT interval (prolonged: in males >450ms, in females >470ms - Committee for Proprietary Medicinal Products 1997). Therefore, cardiac safety should be a routine part of clinical care in patients taking antipsychotic medication; a preventive strategy is valuable even if the absolute risk of serious cardiac events is low (Abdelmawla and Mitchell 2006). There is evidence that many typical antipsychotics increase the risk of ventricular arrhythmias and cardiac arrest (Ray et al. 2001, Liperoti et al. 2005) and an association between many atypical antipsychotic drugs and the occurrence of unexplained sudden death (Abdelmawla & Mitchell, 2006).

Recommended action
Perform an ECG on all patients before prescribing antipsychotics if possible, or as soon as practicably achievable. Recheck at six and twelve weeks. If abnormal following initiation of medication then consider switching. You may refer to the GP or a cardiologist as appropriate.

Blood pressure
Rationale
People with severe mental illness are at a higher risk of developing high blood pressure than the general population. The British Hypertension Society Guideline cites evidence that suboptimal blood pressure control leaves patients at an unacceptably high risk of cardiovascular complications and death, particularly from coronary heart disease (CHD) but also from stroke (Williams et al. 2004). Interventions actively combining exercise and diet have demonstrated a reduction of both systolic and diastolic blood pressure by only 4–5 mmHg (NICE 2006), therefore medication is often required.

Recommended action
Check blood pressure before initiation of antipsychotic medication. Recheck at six and twelve weeks. Most antipsychotic medications have a hypotensive effect. For patients with blood pressure > 140/90 mmHg, refer to their GP
Blood tests

Liver Function Tests (LFTs)

Rationale
Antipsychotic medication can result in abnormal LFTs (Garcia-Unzueta et al. 2003). Hepatic disease should be detected early to prevent further serious complications.

Recommended action
Check LFTs before initiation of medication and at six and twelve weeks. If tests are abnormal, then review medication. If not associated with medication, refer to GP.

Lipid Levels

Rationale
Dyslipidaemia is a key component of the metabolic syndrome and a precursor for cardiovascular disease.

Recommended action
Check fasting cholesterol level before initiation of medication and at six and twelve weeks. If there is difficulty in obtaining a fasting sample then do a random one. If tests are abnormal, then review medication. If not associated with medication, refer to GP.

Glucose

Rationale
Diabetes occurs in 15% of people with schizophrenia (Holt and Peveler 2005), and only 5% of the general population (Bushe and Holt 2004). Risk factors include: family history of diabetes, physical inactivity, poor diet, smoking and the metabolic effects of antipsychotic medication (Gough and Peveler 2004). Typical antipsychotics, in particular the low potency ones such as chlorpromazine may induce or make existing diabetes worse (Newcomer et al. 2002). The atypical antipsychotics clozapine and olanzapine are associated with new onset or exacerbating type 2 diabetes, not just through their propensity to cause greater weight gain than other newer agents, but because of their effects on glucose regulation (Newcomer et al. 2002). There are also case reports linking risperidone and quetiapine to impaired glucose intolerance, diabetes and ketoacidosis (Taylor et al. 2007).

Recommended action
Check random or fasting glucose and HbA1c before initiation of medication and at six and twelve weeks. If tests are abnormal, then review medication. If not associated with medication, refer to GP.

Prolactin

Rationale
Hyperprolactinaemia is a common side-effect of many antipsychotic drugs. Symptoms include gynaecomastia, galactorrhoea, amenorrhoea and sexual dysfunction. Switching
to a prolactin sparing antipsychotic has been shown to lead to normalization of serum prolactin and resolution of the symptoms (Haddad et al. 2001).

**Recommended action**
Consensus guidelines for managing prolactinaemia (Peveler et al. 2008) recommend that healthcare professionals should monitor proactively for hyperprolactinaemia as it may be asymptomatic.

- Patients prescribed prolactin elevating antipsychotics should, where possible, have this issue explained to them prior to commencing treatment and be screened for symptoms suggestive of hyperprolactinaemia before starting treatment (Haddad et al. 2001) and at six and twelve weeks.
- If the elevation of prolactin levels is mild (<1000 mIU/L (~50 ng/mL)) then it may be reasonable to continue to monitor the level. However, if even a mildly elevated level persists for more than 3 months, particularly if accompanied by amenorrhoea, bone mineral density may be compromised, and the possibility of reducing dose or switching to an antipsychotic with lower potential for prolactin elevation should be discussed with the patient.
- When elevation is persistent and >1000 mIU/L (~50 ng/mL) then the clinician should consider switching to a drug with a lower potential to elevate prolactin if this can be achieved safely and is consistent with the clinical status of the patient as a whole.
- For female patients switching to a drug with a lower potential to elevate prolactin may result in the return of fertility, and contraceptive advice should be given.
- If switching to a drug with a lower potential to elevate prolactin is not possible, it would be reasonable for clinicians to consider offering an oral contraceptive to female patients with amenorrhoea, if this is not contraindicated, to reduce the risk of subsequent osteoporosis.
- In any patient with a prolactin elevation greater than 3000 mIU/L (~150 ng/mL) then a prolactinoma should be considered. Refer to GP.
- If the levels do not return to normal upon switching to a less prolactin-elevating antipsychotic, or if such switch is not possible for clinical reasons, then referral to a specialist in endocrinology via GP is warranted to exclude a prolactinoma.

**Urea and Electrolytes (U & Es) and calcium**
**Rationale**
There is a risk of electrolyte imbalance when taking antipsychotic medication particularly at high doses. For patients taking lithium, there is a higher than normal incidence of hypercalcaemia and abnormal renal function (BMA 2009).

**Recommended action**
Check U & E's and calcium before initiation of medication and at six and twelve weeks. If tests are abnormal, then review medication. If not associated with medication, refer to GP.
Thyroid Function Test
Rationale
Studies have indicated that the elevated serum levels of T4 may be specific for acutely ill schizophrenic patients and that neuroleptic medication may affect thyroid hormone metabolism (Baumgartnera et al. 2000) and that there is a spectrum of thyroid function test abnormalities in chronic schizophrenia (Othman et al. 1994). For patients taking lithium, there is a higher than normal incidence of hypothyroidism (BMA 2009).

Recommended action
Check thyroid function before initiation of medication and at six and twelve weeks. If tests are abnormal, then review medication. If not associated with medication, refer to GP.

Full Blood Count (FBC)
Rationale
A case-control study (Teixeira et al. 2009) in patients with schizophrenia showed a significantly higher number of patients with changes on leukocytes. Many patients presented low values of haemoglobin, erythrocytes and platelets. Leukopenia and neutropenia are recognised as side effects of antipsychotic medication (Taylor et al. 2007).

Recommended action
Check FBC before initiation of medication and at six and twelve weeks. If tests are abnormal, then review medication. If not associated with medication, refer to GP.

B12 and Folate
Rationale
A case-control study (Teixeira et al. 2009) in patients with schizophrenia presented low values of vitamin B12. Having a deficiency of vitamin B12 just because of eating a poor diet is rare in Western countries, but unhealthy diets are common lifestyle choices of people with schizophrenia (McCreadie 2003).

Recommended action
Check B12 and folate before initiation of medication. If tests are abnormal refer to GP.

Plasma Levels
Lithium
Rationale
There is potential toxicity caused by lithium therapy when the serum levels are outside of the narrow therapeutic range (BMA 2009).

Recommended action
It is recommended that lithium levels are monitored every three months (BNF 2011).
Carbamazepine

Rationale
Most authorities agree that plasma drug level monitoring is mandatory when using carbamazepine for seizure disorders and helpful for bipolar disorder (Taylor et al. 2000).

Recommended action
Consider monitoring at six and twelve weeks and/or until levels are stable.

Valproate

Rationale
Most authorities agree that plasma drug level monitoring is helpful for valproate in seizure disorders and bipolar disorder (Taylor et al. 2000).

Recommended action
Consider monitoring at six and twelve weeks and/or until levels are stable.
Normal blood test values

Liver function test
Albumin (ALB) = 35-50 g/L
Alkaline Phosphatase (ALK PHOS) = 38-126 IU/L
Alanine Aminotransferase (ALT) = M 21 - 72: F 9 - 52 IU/L
Aspartate Aminotransferase (AST) = M 17 - 59: F 14 - 36 U/L
Bilirubin (BIL) = 3 - 22 umol/L

Lipids
HDL = >0.9 mmol/L
If HDL is less than 1.0 mmol/L for men and less than 1.3 mmol/L for women, there is an increased risk of heart disease that is independent of other risk factors, including the LDL level.

Total Cholesterol = 3.0 - 5.5 mmol/L
If no CVD risk:
  - Total cholesterol - less than 5.0mmol/l
  - LDL cholesterol - less than 3.0mmol/l
If CVD risk:
  - Total cholesterol - less than 4.0mmol/l
  - LDL cholesterol - less than 2.0mmol/l

Glucose
Glucose = (fasting) 3.5 - 6.0 mmol/L (above 7mmols = diabetes)
Random glucose = > 11.1 mmols = diabetes, if > 6 mmols repeat fasting
Hba1c = less than 48mmols if do not have diabetes (cannot use alone if an antipsychotic has been initiated within eight weeks), 48-58mmols is the desired range for people with diabetes

Prolactin
Prolactin = M 45 - 375: F 59 – 619 mu/L

Urea
Urea = 3.3 - 6.7 mmol/L

Electrolytes
Sodium = 135 - 145 mmol/L
Potassium = 3.5 - 5.0 mmol/L
Creatinine = M 68 - 127: F 59 - 101 umol/L

Calcium
Calcium = 2.25 - 2.65 mmol/L

Thyroid function test
Thyroid Stimulating Hormone (TSH) = 0.35 - 5.5 mU/L
**Full blood count**

Haemoglobin (Hb) - M 13-18 g dL, F 11.5-15.5 g dL

White cell count (WCC or WBC) = 4-11x10³/L

Red blood cells (RBC) = M 4.5-6.5x10⁹/L, F 3.80-5.80x10⁹/L

Neutrophils/Granulocytes = 2-7.5 x10⁹/L

Eosinophils = ≤ 0.4

Platelets = 150-400 x10⁹/L

Mean cell volume (MCV) = 83-101 Fl

Mean Corporuscular Haemaglobin (MCH) = 27-32 pg

**Haematinic levels**

B12 = 210-910 ng/L

Folate = 5.4-24 ug/L

**Plasma levels**

Lithium = 0.6 - 1.0 mmol/L

Carbemazepine = 8 - 12 mg/L (single dose regimen)

Valproate = 50 - 100 mg/L
Lifestyle advice

Smoking

Rationale
Approximately 85% of people with schizophrenia smoke, compared with 23% of the general population (Goff et al. 2005). Smoking rates are higher in schizophrenia than in other severe mental illnesses (Goff et al. 2005). Neurobiological, psychological, behavioural and social factors make it difficult for patients with mental illness to stop smoking (Robson and Gray 2007). Smoking cessation medication and other non-pharmacological support can increase abstinence rates in those with mental health problems to as high as those in the general population (Foulds et al. 2006, Campion et al. 2008).

Recommended action
- Give advice about the possible health risks associated with smoking
- Ask about respiratory symptoms; chest examination if appropriate
- Refer any patients wishing to quit smoking to NHS Stop Smoking Services if appropriate (DH 2007a) or the primary care clinic’s stop smoking service. They may need to be seen individually.
- Cigarette smoking lowers the levels of many antipsychotic medications (Vazquez et al. 2007). Therefore, if a patient stops or reduces their smoking, a medication review should be undertaken.
  - Blood levels of olanzapine and clozapine should be measured before smoking cessation followed by 25% dose reduction during first week of cessation and then further blood levels (Taylor et al. 2007).
  - Doses of fluphenazine and benzodiazepine should be reduced by up to 25% in first week of cessation.
  - Tricyclic antidepressants may need to be reduced by 10-25% in first week (Taylor et al. 2007).

Exercise

Rationale
People with severe mental illness are more physically inactive than the general population (Brown et al, 1999, McCreadie 2003). Physical activity can have a positive effect on psychological well-being in people with schizophrenia (DH 2004).

Recommended action
Identify the patient’s level of activity. The recommendation for exercise to be of benefit is 30 minutes five days a week (DH 2004). Help the patients make an exercise plan which fits in with their lifestyle and builds up activity gradually. For some individuals it may be appropriate to refer to an exercise scheme if there is one in your area.
Alcohol Intake

Rationale
Alcohol misuse is one of the most common and clinically significant co-morbidities among patients with severe mental illness (Brunette et al. 2004). There is considerable evidence to support the positive impact of reducing unsafe alcohol consumption on cardiovascular health (NHS Information Centre 2008). Many antipsychotics can cause sedation and impair alertness, concentration and coordination. The use of alcohol can further increase any impairment (rethink 2008).

Recommended action
Offer recommendations on sensible daily alcohol intake:
- Adult women should not regularly drink > 2–3 units of alcohol a day
- Adult men should not regularly drink > 3–4 units of alcohol a day
- Women who regularly drink > 6 units a day (or > 35 units a week) and men who regularly drink > 8 units a day (or 50 units a week) are at highest risk of alcohol-related harm (Department of Health 2007b)
Refer to the local Alcohol Support Agency if appropriate.

Diet

Rationale
In a survey of the dietary habits of 102 people with SMI by McCreadie (2003) the average fruit and vegetable intake for these people was 16 portions a week, compared with recommended intake of 35 per week (DH 2004). The physical health consequences of a poor diet include CVD, diabetes, obesity and some cancers. Studies of people with SMI repeatedly show that saturated fats from dietary intake of meat and dairy products are associated with worse outcomes in schizophrenia (Peet 2004). There is a particularly strong association between sugar consumption and poorer outcome in schizophrenia whereas consumption of fish and sea food, particularly omega 3 fatty acids, has been associated with better outcomes (Peet 2004).

Recommended action
Agree and implement a diet plan with the patient (and any carers) – may include referral to other members of the multidisciplinary team.
Medication review
Observe for side effects. See appendix 1

Antipsychotics
Antipsychotics have a wide range of side effects. The most widely researched include (Rethink 2006):

Sedation: The antipsychotics that cause the most sedation include chlorpromazine, promazine, thioridazine, clozapine and zotepine. Often this can be dealt with by the patient taking their medication at night just before they go to bed. The dose may need to be reduced or changed if this is a big problem.

Movement disorders: There are different types of movement disorder. These include:
- **Dystonia** - prolonged muscle spasms often involving the face, neck, shoulders and upper limbs. Drugs such as procyclidine and orphenadrine are given to treat dystonia
- **Akathisia** - fidgety movements of the legs which may be accompanied by a strong sense of inner restlessness and unease. This often means that a person cannot sit comfortably, and may be driven to walk up and down to try and gain relief. It is best treated with clonazepam or propranolol
- **Parkinsonian movement disorders** - involve stiffness and shakiness, and resembles the unrelated condition of Parkinson's disease. The limbs move slowly and muscles of the face may be quite immobile, producing an expressionless, staring face. Rhythmic shaking may occur but is not usually very severe, and is most obvious in the hands. Procyclidine and orphenadrine, amongst other drugs, are given to treat Parkinsonian movement disorders
- **Tardive dyskinesia** - major signs of the condition are excessive movement of the lips, tongue and jaw, (known as oro-facial dyskinesia). The term "tardive" means delayed or late-appearing and this reflects the fact that treatment may have gone on for some months or years before the movement disorder becomes apparent. Oro-facial dyskinesia is the most common form of tardive dyskinesia. Other abnormal movements are seen including jerky, abrupt movements of the limbs and body, but these are less common.

Mood stabilisers

**Lithium**
In long-term use lithium has been associated with thyroid disorders and mild cognitive and memory impairment. Lithium salts have a narrow therapeutictoxic ratio, therefore it is important to determine the optimum range for each individual patient. Lithium toxicity is made worse by sodium depletion (BNF 2011). Patients should be maintained on lithium after three to five years only if benefit persists.

( BN F 2011)

**Carbamazepine**
In order to be effective, carbamazepine has to reach a given level in the blood (NWMHFT 2005). Side effects include dizziness, drowsiness, shaky movements and feeling sick. Carbamazepine can cause a chronic low white blood cell count which
increases susceptibility to infection (NWMHFT 2005). This can be monitored with regular blood tests.

**Valproate**
Valproate causes an increase in appetite and therefore weight gain (NWMHFT 2005). Side effects include dizziness, drowsiness, shaky movements, feeling sick, impaired liver function, thrombocytopenia and impaired platelet function (NWMHFT 2005).

**Follow up**
The patients may not attend for follow up appointments due to their mental state. It is important, therefore to set up a robust system to allow further opportunities to attend.

**Recommended action**
- Try contacting the patient (or carer if known) by telephone
- Send a letter requesting that they contact the department to make a new appointment
- Inform the patient’s link worker
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Glasgow Antipsychotic Side-effect Scale (GASS)

Please list current medication and total daily doses below:

| Name: | Age: | Sex: M / F |

This questionnaire is about how you have been recently. It is being used to determine if you are suffering from excessive side effects from your antipsychotic medication. Please place a tick in the column which best indicates the degree to which you have experienced the following side effects. Tick the end box if you found that the side effect distressed you.

© 2007 Waddell & Taylor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Over the past week:</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once</th>
<th>A few times</th>
<th>Everyday</th>
<th>Tick this box if distressing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I felt sleepy during the day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I felt drugged or like a zombie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I felt dizzy when I stood up and/or have fainted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I have felt my heart beating irregularly or unusually fast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My muscles have been tense or jerky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My hands or arms have been shaky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My legs have felt restless and/or I couldn’t sit still</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I have been drooling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My movements or walking have been slower than usual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I have had, or people have noticed uncontrollable movements of my face or body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. My vision has been blurry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. My mouth has been dry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I have had difficulty passing urine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I have felt like I am going to be sick or have vomited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I have wet the bed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I have been very thirsty and/or passing urine frequently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The areas around my nipples have been sore and swollen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I have noticed fluid coming from my nipples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I have had problems enjoying sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. <strong>Men only:</strong> I have had problems getting an erection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tick yes or no for the following questions about the last three months</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Tick this box if distressing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Women only:</td>
<td>I have noticed a change in my periods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Men and women:</td>
<td>I have been gaining weight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Staff Information**

1. Allow the patient to fill in the questionnaire themselves. Questions 1-20 relate to the previous week and questions 21-22 to the last three months.

2. Scoring

   For questions 1-20 award 1 point for the answer “once”, 2 points for the answer “a few times” and 3 points for the answer “everyday”. Please note zero points are awarded for an answer of “never”.

   For questions 21 and 22 award 3 points for a “yes” answer and 0 points for a “no”.

3. For male and female patients a **total score** of:
   - 0-12 = absent/mild side effects
   - 13-26 = moderate side effects
   - over 26 = severe side effects

4. Side effects covered by questions 1-2 sedation and CNS side effects
   - 3-4 cardiovascular side effects
   - 5-10 extra-pyramidal side effects
   - 11-13 anticholinergic side effects
   - 14 gastro-intestinal side effects
   - 15 genitourinary side effects
   - 16 screening for diabetes mellitus
   - 17-21 prolactinaemic side effects
   - 22 weight gain

   The column relating to the distress experienced with a particular side effect is not scored, but is intended to inform the clinician of the service user’s views and condition.
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RESEARCH

Background: Annual physical health checks are recommended for patients with severe mental illness (SMI) as this group has a higher risk of developing cardiovascular disease than the rest of the general population. There is little guidance for healthcare professionals to assist them in encouraging patients to attend a health check. Aim: To explore whether an invitation appointment letter is effective in prompting patients with SMI to attend a physical health check in primary care compared with those with diabetes.

Method: A retrospective audit comparing the response rate of patients with SMI and diabetes to an appointment letter inviting them to attend a primary care health check. Results: Two-thirds (n = 61, 66%) of the patients with SMI (n = 92) and three-quarters (n = 338, 81%) of those with diabetes (n = 416) attended the practice on the date and time stipulated in the letter. Patients with diabetes were 2.2 times more likely to attend a health check compared with those with SMI (OR = 2.20, 95% CI: 1.13-3.82). Conclusion: Although attendance rates were lower than in patients with diabetes, they were higher than expected from the SMI group. An invitation appointment letter is an effective way of ensuring that patients with SMI have a physical health check.
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Background

Severe mental illness (SMI) includes diagnoses that typically involve psychosis (losing touch with reality or experiencing delusions) such as schizophrenia or bipolar disorder. This group of patients should receive an annual physical health check because they have a higher rate of cardiovascular, metabolic and other long-term physical co-morbidities (e.g. respiratory disease, HIV; Hennekens, 2005; NICE, 2006; 2009). Rates of cardiovascular disease may be increased because of a combination of the side effects of antipsychotic medication and lifestyle factors (Mander et al., 2004). People with SMI often eat unhealthy diets, have lower levels of physical activity and are twice as likely to smoke compared with the general population (McCrindle, 2003). They also tend not to volunteer symptoms readily and as a consequence many physical co-morbidities go unrecognised and untreated (Saha et al., 2007).
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Accessible summary

• We wanted to find out whether looking at the food diaries filled in by people with schizophrenia would help us find out when they eat, what they eat, and why they eat those foods. We looked at the food diaries filled in by eight people with schizophrenia during one week.

• All the people managed to fill in their diaries. The food diaries showed that most of the people:
  ○ did not eat a lot of fruit and vegetables,
  ○ ate a lot of the same foods,
  ○ ate a lot of convenience food and ready meals,
  ○ had an organized mealtime routine,
  ○ did not drink enough liquid,
  ○ did not eat many cakes or sweets,
  ○ drank no or very little alcohol,
  ○ thought the food they ate was healthy when often it was not.

• The people with schizophrenia in our study do not have a very healthy diet. This could be because they:
  ○ cannot afford fruit and vegetables,
  ○ are not good at cooking,
  ○ do not feel like cooking,
  ○ are not sure what food is healthy.

• The people with schizophrenia all managed to fill in their diaries. This shows that:
  ○ they may want to get healthier,
  ○ filling in food diaries with the help of a nurse may assist people with schizophrenia eat healthier food.

Abstract

The objective was to consider the feasibility of food diaries as a method of understanding the dietary behaviour of people with schizophrenia. Examination of the food diaries completed in one week by eight patients with schizophrenia. All the patients were successful in completing the task. Examination of the food diaries revealed that eating fruit and vegetables was largely absent; there was very little variety in most of the patients’ diets; patients relied heavily on convenience food and ready meals for their main meal; as a rule patients followed an ordered mealtime routine; generally patients did not drink enough fluid; they were not big treat eaters; only one patient recorded drinking any alcohol; overall there appeared to be poor diet literacy in our small sample. The results show that on the whole, people with schizophrenia have a poor diet. This could be due to a combination of financial difficulty, lack of skills in food
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Abstract

All healthcare professionals caring for people with serious mental illness should be aware of the signs of physical problems and take action to help patients improve their health.

Our objective is to develop education for healthcare professionals caring for people with serious mental illness to enable them all to offer better physical care.

We performed a systematic search of the literature and found no papers reporting the outcomes of education with regard to healthcare professionals’ knowledge, attitudes and behaviours. The only information reported was the effect of the action taken on patients.

It is vital that researchers start to publish details of healthcare professional education and their outcomes in physical health research in serious mental illness.

Introduction

In this paper, the authors of the serious mental illness (SMI) Health Improvement Profile (HIP) and the Health Improvement Profile for Primary Care (HIP-PC) report the lack of evidence for the efficacy of healthcare professional educational outcomes in studies of physical health in SMI. The importance of researchers paying attention to education in
Adapting the severe mental illness physical Health Improvement Profile for use in primary care

Sheila Hardy and Richard Gray
The Northampton Physical Health and Well-Being Project, Park Avenue Medical Centre Northampton, Faculty of Health, University of East Anglia, Norwich, UK.

ABSTRACT: People with severe mental illness (SMI) have a higher incidence of long-term physical conditions, including diabetes and cardiovascular disease. This can dramatically reduce their life expectancy. In the UK, it is the duty of health-care professionals in primary care to monitor the physical health of this group of people. However, these professionals have been given no specific training in order to do this effectively. The Northampton Physical Health and Well-Being Project has been developed in order to reduce the morbidity of people with SMI, improve their physical and emotional health, and increase their support network. We have adapted the Health Improvement Profile (a tool to help mental health nurses profile the physical health of people with SMI) for use in primary care by creating a manual and website and will provide bespoke training in its use to the health-care professionals.
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BACKGROUND
People with severe mental illness (SMI) have a dramatically reduced life expectancy compared to the general population (Gray et al. 2006), dying on average 10–15 years earlier (DRC 2006). The primary causes of death due to a physical cause are circulatory disease, diabetes, and obesity (Brown 1997). Unhealthy diets and a lack of exercise are common lifestyle choices of people with a diagnosis of schizophrenia (McCrae 2003), leading to excessive weight gain (Alison & Casey 2001). The treatment of SMI is usually antipsychotic medication which can exacerbate weight gain (Alison & Casey 2001), increasing both the risk for hyperglycaemia and type 2 diabetes, and the risk of hypotension and cardiovascular disease (Fontaine et al. 2001).

The physical health of people with SMI has reached greater prominence in the UK, this is due in part to the publication of a number of key documents designed to address this matter (DoH 2006, 2008; DHC 2009). In addition, for primary care, the General Practitioner (GP) Contract has given some way towards ensuring the physical health monitoring of mental health service users (BMA 2008). However, life expectancy for people with SMI is actually decreasing (Fontaine et al. 2001), and inequalities still exist in the provision of physical health checks in those with mental illness when compared to the general population. For example, studies have shown that people with schizophrenia and heart disease have fewer blood pressure or cholesterol tests (Hippisley-Cox & Pringle 2005). Unlike people experiencing other long-term conditions, such as diabetes, stroke, and heart disease, the current contract does not require the health-care professionals to measure or reach targets for risk areas, such as blood pressure, cholesterol, or glucose level. The creators of the National Institute for Clinical Excellence (NICE) guidelines for schizophrenia (2009) state that it is GPs and other primary health-care workers that should
Screening for cardiovascular risk in patients with severe mental illness in primary care: A comparison with patients with diabetes
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Abstract
Background: People with severe mental illness (SMI) have a higher risk of developing cardiovascular disease (CVD) compared with the general population. Clinical guidelines recommend annual screening for CVD risk factors with appropriate lifestyle counselling.

Aims: To establish the proportion of patients with SMI being screened for CVD risk factors in their primary care practice compared with those with diabetes and determine whether people with SMI receive lifestyle advice.


Participants: Three hundred and eighty-six patients with SMI and 1,875 with diabetes.

Results: Just over a fifth of patients with SMI received a full CVD screen compared with the 96% of those with diabetes (OR = 0.80; 95% CI = 64.53-126.55, p < 0.01). Fifty-seven per cent of the SMI patients were given smoking advice but only 13% and 14% received guidance regarding diet and exercise, respectively. On average, 65% of each patient with SMI received fewer than two (from four) screening interventions and less than one (from three) components of lifestyle advice.

Conclusions: In primary care, the number of people with SMI receiving screening for CVD risk is much lower than those with diabetes.

Keywords: schizophrenia; bipolar affective disorder; cardiovascular disease; screening; primary care; risk factors

Introduction

Studies in primary care in England have shown that people with severe mental illness (SMI) have an increased risk of death from coronary heart disease and stroke (Osborn et al., 2006, 2007, 2008). This research demonstrated high levels of cardiovascular disease (CVD) risk factors and metabolic syndrome, including raised blood pressure (BP), serum cholesterol and plasma glucose, smoking, poor diet and lack of physical activity. There is some disparity in the evidence regarding hypertension in this population. A meta-analysis established it to be less prevalent in schizophrenia, possibly due to the BP lowering effects of some antipsychotic
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Training practice nurses to improve the physical health of patients with severe mental illness: Effects on beliefs and attitudes

Sheila Hardy
Park Avenue Medical Centre, University of East Anglia, Northampton, UK

ABSTRACT: Annual health checks are recommended for patients with severe mental illness (SMI) as they are at high risk of cardiovascular disease. Ideally, these health checks should be carried out in primary care. Practice nurses are already competent in carrying out physical health checks, but might have misconceptions about mental illness, which is a barrier to offering the service. We used a mixed-methods study to establish the effectiveness of a training package for practice nurses that aimed to address common misconceptions about the physical health of people with SMI. The 3-hour training package (Northampton Physical Health and Wellbeing Project) was delivered to eight practice nurses. Their misconceptions and beliefs were assessed before and after training. Motivation to work with community mental health workers was assessed after training. The practice nurses involved in the study rejected commonly held misconceptions about the physical health of people with SMI after training. Their attitudes towards their role in providing health checks appeared to be modified in a positive direction. Their motivation to work with community mental health workers also seemed to be enhanced. The Northampton Physical Health and Wellbeing Project training was effective in modifying practice nurses’ misconceptions about physical health in people with SMI.

KEYWORDS: education, physical health check, practice nurse, primary care, severe mental illness.

BACKGROUND
Due to a combination of lifestyle factors and the side effects of antipsychotic medication, there is a high incidence of cardiovascular disease (CVD) causing premature death in people with SMI (Pilk et al. 2005; Hamadens et al. 2005). Therefore, it is necessary that these patients have an annual physical health check to identify risk factors for CVD. There is little evidence to show that these health checks are routinely taking place (Hardy et al. 2011; Roberts et al. 2007).

People generally attend primary care for routine health monitoring and, therefore, it is the best place for people with SMI to receive screening (Osborn et al. 2007). Practice nurses are already competent in carrying out physical health checks (Osborn et al. 2010), but misconceptions about people with mental illness might be a barrier to accepting this as part of their routine work. Lester et al. (2008) discovered that primary care doctors and practice nurses largely believed that the care of people with SMI was too specialized for their service. Even if practice nurses are not inviting patients with SMI to attend for a physical health check, this group might still present themselves for other reasons (Harvey et al. 2000) e.g. coughs, cuts, and rashes.

Up to 50% of patients with SMI in the UK receive help from a mental health professional in secondary care (BMA & NHS Employers 2011) who could have a role in ensuring a health check has taken place in primary care (Osborn et al. 2010). We believe that as practice nurses are not used to working specifically with people with SMI,
Physical health

Why are people with serious mental illness still not getting their physical health checked?

Sheila Hardy and Jacqueline White examine the factors that cause patients’ physical health needs to be overlooked when they receive treatment for serious mental illness.

Introduction
In the UK all nurses are expected to be able to make a holistic and systematic assessment of physical, emotional, psychological, cultural, spiritual and social needs; this includes assessing risk and creating a comprehensive plan of care in partnership with the patient and others (Nursing & Midwifery Council, 2009).

They are encouraged to use reflection to learn from experience and plan for practice change (Gunter, 2003). In spite of these standards, due to the organisational systems of care delivery, patients are not always offered holistic care.

Using a reflective framework developed by Booth et al. in 2003, ‘Mind, Soul and New Mind, we examine how a person with serious mental illness can take a journey through the healthcare system meeting healthcare professionals, including nurses, and have their physical health assessed and treated.

It is our belief that the healthcare providers from each nation need to examine in detail each aspect of care delivery in order to start making improvements. We anticipate that by making an analysis of the situation in the UK, we are providing valuable information that can be used to influence change internationally.

What
People with serious mental illness have an increased risk of cardiovascular disease and are less likely to receive screening or treatment for physical problems.

We have been aware of this for decades through various studies (such as McIntyre and Rimerman, 1977; Bisgoa et al., 2000) yet little has changed in practice anywhere in the world.

Researchers are still measuring the prevalence of the problem (Gibson et al., 2007; Strang et al., 2010; Chong et al., 2011). While this is important and has influenced health policy, so far it has not influenced the nurses’ role and therefore patient outcomes.

A recent Cochrane Effective Practice and Organisation Care (EPOC) Group Review (Yosh et al., 2010) failed to identify any randomised trials that assessed the effectiveness of physical health monitoring in people with serious mental illness.

They concluded that guidance is based on expert consensus, clinical experience and good intentions. Nevertheless, experts agree that a comprehensive physical health check carried out by a competent practitioner will provide the opportunity to screen for cardiovascular risk, offer education regarding lifestyle and ask about other physical conditions (Hardy, 2009).

This has the potential to reduce the mortality of this patient group and identify and treat any existing physical ailments.

An important barrier to providing physical screening and intervention to patients with serious mental illness is that in places of the single NICE we now have an increasingly decentralised health system with a growing network of service providers.

The ethos of holistic care is ignored through this fragmented service driven by a
Assessing cardiovascular risk in patients with severe mental illness


Abstract
Cardiovascular disease (CVD) is a term mainly used to describe disorders affecting the heart and/or the arteries and veins that are associated with atherosclerosis (the build up of fatty deposits and debris inside blood vessels). CVDs, such as coronary heart disease and peripheral artery disease, are long-term conditions, but acute events such as myocardial infarction can occur suddenly when a vessel supplying blood to the heart or brain becomes blocked or ruptures. Lifestyle factors and the side effects of antipsychotic medication result in a high incidence of CVD in people with severe mental illness. This article explores how nurses in primary and secondary care can identify CVD risk factors and help patients reduce these risks.
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Alms and intended learning outcomes
The aim of this article is to assist nurses working in primary and secondary care who have contact with people with severe mental illness (SMI) to feel confident in assessing their patients for cardiovascular disease (CVD). After reading this article and completing the time out activities you should be able to:

- Understand the risk factors for CVD.
- Be aware of the increased risk of CVD in people with SMI.
- Recognise the barriers to effective management of the physical health of patients with SMI.
- Decide how you can promote prevention of CVD in patients with SMI.
- Understand the role of primary and secondary care nurses in reducing CVD risk.
- Develop an action plan for your workplace that promotes the prevention of CVD in patients with SMI.

Introduction
Patients with SMI will most likely have a diagnosis of schizophrenia or bipolar disorder. Other mental health disorders, such as depression, are not discussed in this article because the care of patients with SMI is considered separately in UK guidance (National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE) 2006, 2010, British Medical Association and NHS Employers 2011). The worldwide point prevalence (the proportion of people in a population who have a disease or condition at a particular time) is 0.4% for schizophrenia (Saha et al 2005) and 1% for bipolar disorder.
The increased risk of diabetes in people with severe mental illness

People with severe mental illness have worse physical health compared to the general population, and a greater risk of developing diabetes. Sheila Hardy highlights the need for better screening and support.

The term 'severe mental illness' includes diagnoses which typically involve psychosis or high levels of care, e.g. schizophrenia and bipolar disorder (British Medical Association and NHS Employers, 2012).

Schizophrenia is a long-term condition and generally presents in late adolescence or early adulthood. Symptoms of schizophrenia can include hallucinations, lack of motivation, and impaired attention and memory (Saha, 2003).

Bipolar disorder is also a lifelong condition with the peak age of onset between 15–19 years of age. Bipolar disorder affects the patient’s mood, which can swing from one extreme to another, i.e. periods or ‘episodes’ of depression and mania (NHS Choices, 2009).

Owing to the nature of severe mental illnesses, there are barriers which need to be overcome when attempting to engage the patient in preventive care (Table 1).

Aetiology of diabetes in severe mental illness

People with severe mental illness often have an increased risk of abnormal glucose metabolism and metabolic disorders (Ryan et al, 2003; McIntyre et al, 2005). The incidence of diabetes occurs in 1.5% of this group (Haft and Poverel, 2005), compared to 5% of the general population (Rush and Holt, 2004).

The risk of developing diabetes is increased by:
- Family history of diabetes
- Physical inactivity
- Poor diet.

Additionally, for people with severe mental illness, there is the dispute that there may be a direct physiological association between severe mental illness and glucose regulation (Ryan et al, 2003) and the metabolic effects of antipsychotic medication (Cromp and Poverel, 2004). However, the relative impact of pathophysiology and medication is raising the risk of diabetes in severe mental illness is disputed.

Physiology

In a study by Ryan et al (2003), it was discovered that patients with schizophrenia had higher fasting plasma levels of glucose, insulin and cortisol, and were more insulin resistant than healthy subjects. Cortisol is a steroid hormone produced in the cortex of the adrenal glands. It maintains normal physiological processes during times of stress by releasing amino acids (from muscle), glucose (from the liver), and fatty acids (from adipose tissue) into the bloodstream for use as energy. This results in stimulation of gluconeogenesis (conversion of amino acids into glucose), inhibition of glucose uptake in muscle and adipose tissue (which further increases blood-sugar levels), and stimulation of lipolysis (fat breakdown) in adipose tissue. The fatty acids released by lipolysis reduce sensitivity to insulin and the pancreas therefore needs to produce more.

Medication

Typical antipsychotics (Table 2), in particular the low potency ones such as chlorpromazine, may induce or make existing diabetes worse.

### Table 1. Barriers to preventive care in patients with severe mental illness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers to Preventive Care</th>
<th>Possible Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S.D. history of diabetes</td>
<td>Increase awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical inactivity</td>
<td>Promote physical activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor diet</td>
<td>Improve diet education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2. Types of antipsychotic medications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antipsychotic Medication</th>
<th>Common Side Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Typical antipsychotics</td>
<td>Sedation, weight gain, anticholinergic side effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atypical antipsychotics</td>
<td>Less sedation, less weight gain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Will the changes to the QOF mental health indicators improve care for people with severe mental illness?

Abstract
This article describes the changes made to the mental health clinical indicators in the General Medical Services Contract for 2011/12. The likely effect from these changes directly on patient care is discussed.

Key points
- People with severe mental illness (SMI) have a high incidence of cardiovascular disease causing premature death due to a combination of lifestyle factors and the side-effects of antipsychotic medication.
- The QOF is an incentive scheme for GP practices in the UK rewarding them for how well they care for patients.
- The changes to the mental health QOF 2011/12 mean that people with SMI are still unlikely to be offered appropriate interventions.

Key words
Severe mental illness, primary care, Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF), physical health

People with severe mental illness (SMI) have a high incidence of cardiovascular disease causing premature death due to a combination of lifestyle factors and the side-effects of antipsychotic medication (Heesakkers et al., 2005; Flik et al., 2006). Because these are modifiable risks, experts agree that this group of people should have their physical health monitored every year by a health-care professional in primary care (National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE), 2006; 2009). Each GP practice receives payment through the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) to provide care for patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses.

Quality and Outcomes Framework
Introduced in 2004 as part of the General Medical Services Contract, the QOF is an incentive scheme for GP practices in the UK, rewarding them for how well they care for patients. The QOF contains groups of indicators, against which practices score points according to their level of achievement (British Medical Association and NHS Employers, 2012). This payment system has been criticised as the primary care doctors can decide to exclude patients they consider as unsuitable for a particular target, and the quality of the consultation is not measured (Ashworth and Jones, 2004).

Since 2009, NICE has been responsible for managing the development of the QOF clinical and health improvement indicators. Evidence for changes to the QOF is provided by an expert committee, which includes representatives from the Universities of Birmingham and Manchester, NHS Employers and the General Practitioners’ Committee. This panel met in June 2010 to make its recommendations for the QOF 2011/12 and a number of changes were proposed for mental health. The previous mental health indicators are described in Table 1, and the new ones are outlined in Table 2.

The authors of the new guidance make the point that the indicators in the QOF are not intended to cover all the process outcomes or disease issues for each category and in some areas the indicators cover only a small part of the care for those conditions. This makes the assumption that primary care staff will be carrying out the care not included, in busy practices where there is no one with a particular interest or specialty in mental health the likelihood of this being the case is very low.

Changes to the mental health QOF
The changes to the mental health QOF indicators are illustrated in Table 3.

Indicators that have been removed:
1. Had a review in the last 12 months including health promotion advice. There should have been evidence that the patient has
Long-Term Conditions

Improving the physical health of people with severe mental illness

Abstract
This article describes a project in Northampton hospitals to train clinicians in primary care and their link community mental health nurses how to deliver physical health checks to people with severe mental illness (SMI). It endeavors to reduce the mortality of people with severe mental illness (SMI), improve their physical and emotional health, improve their medication adherence, increase their support networks, and provide a more skilled workforce through data sharing and collaborative working.
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People with severe mental illness (SMI) should receive an annual physical health check (National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence, 2009). However, there appears to be disparity in the way this is provided in primary care. At present it is not clear who should take on this role within each practice. Practice nurses provide care for people with long-term physical complaints, such as asthma, hypertension or diabetes, but there is an abundance of education for these conditions along with clear targets to be met within the General Medical Service contract.

A systematic literature search using the terms ‘severe mental illness’, ‘physical health’ and ‘education discovered’ identified a lack of information that would help nurses improve the physical health of people with SMI. In addition, some GPs in Northampton have expressed to the author that they believe the practice nurses they employ are not equipped to carry out this role and therefore they have taken on the role of providing the health checks themselves opportunistically. This suggests many GP practices do not have a system for inviting people with SMI to their surgery, resulting in a large proportion of people not gaining the benefit of having a physical health check.

Importance of health checks
People with SMI will die up to 15 years earlier than the general population (Steenekens et al., 2005) and 30% of them will also have a co-morbid medical illness (Disability Rights Commission, 2006). The principal causes of death are coronary disease, diabetes, and obesity. It has been reported that the antipsychotic medication that most of these people need to take to keep well can exacerbate weight gain (Allison and Casey, 2001). Screening for diabetes, hypertension, raised cholesterol and other conditions regularly will ensure prompt treatment to reduce the consequences of these conditions (Hardy and Gray, 2001).

There are high levels of smoking in people with SMI and they often choose to eat unhealthy diets and not to exercise (McCreadie, 2005). These are modifiable risks, which nurses can reduce by providing ongoing education (Gray et al., 2000). This group of people tend not to volunteer symptoms readily, therefore many illnesses go undiagnosed. Careful questioning by the nurse will identify these illnesses and present the opportunity to offer treatment.

People with SMI who are no longer in contact with secondary care may not have a named person they can contact should they have concerns about their medication or be experiencing symptoms of their mental illness, emotional or social problems. These health checks offer the opportunity to help the person plan his/her care to prevent relapses, identify key people to be involved in his/her care (Hardy, 2009) and carry out a medication review (White and Hardy, 2000).

Whose provides the physical health check?
Around 40% of people with mental health problems are treated in primary care (Social Exclusion Unit, 2004) and 35% of patients with severe mental illness have no contact with secondary care (Samuel et al, 2006). This figure is likely to rise with many NHS trusts in England presently examining methods to promote earlier discharge. The guidelines for bipolar disorder and schizophrenia produced by NICE (2006, 2009) state that the physical health checks
Managing medications in schizophrenia

The General Medical Services contract stipulates that each general practice has a register of people with schizophrenia, manic depressive disorder and other psychoses, and that each patient should have a regular review of their medication as part of their annual physical health check (British Medical Association and Nuffield Health, 2009). In addition, many patients have consented to discharge from secondary care and now attend their primary care practice regularly for their long-acting antipsychotic injection.

Medication management
Medication has been identified as a key concept of the recovery process in mental illness (Allott et al, 2002). Working collaboratively to meet the needs of patients who are prescribed medication is important to improve the health of patients and promote their future potential through engagement and empowerment. Medication management is a process (Gray et al, 2002):
- Promoting and involving patients in treatment decisions
- Exchanging information and monitoring
- Evaluating
- Providing feedback.

Evidence suggests that using medication management to support patients with schizophrenia in using their medication effectively improves shared decision making and medication taking, reduces the incidence of relapse and can lead to an improvement in mental health (Gray et al, 2010).

Schizophrenia
Schizophrenia affects approximately 1% of the population, with onset most common in late adolescence or early adulthood. It is characterized by a range of clinical experiences (Table 1). People with schizophrenia die 20–30 years earlier than people in the general population (Saha et al, 2007); most of these premature deaths are not related to suicide but to cardiovascular disease (CVD), with rates two to three times higher than expected (Newman and Bland, 1991). Many of the modifiable risk factors associated with CVD, such as smoking, obesity, poor diet, diabetes, hyperlipidaemia and lack of exercise, are highly prevalent among patients with schizophrenia (Benn et al, 2009). People with schizophrenia appear to have a natural vulnerability towards CVD, with even treatment-naive people demonstrating increased amounts of visceral fat, elevated cortisol and excess impaired glucose tolerance (Ryan et al, 2004).

Respiratory disease is more common in people with schizophrenia, and antipsychotic medication can impact on a range of physical parameters, including sexual, bowel, eye and dental health (Rashon and Gray, 2007).

Pharmacology
Although biological, social and psychological factors are all important in the maintenance of mental health in schizophrenia, medication treatment focuses on treating chemical imbalances in the brain to minimize distressing symptoms and provide future protection from relapse (Healy, 2005). Positive symptoms of psychotic are thought to be caused by an excess of the neurotransmitter dopamine in the synapses between brain cells in the limbic area of the brain. Cognitive symptoms and negative symptoms are hypothesized to be caused by too little dopamine in the synapses of the cerebral cortex. Affective or mood symptoms are thought to be caused by the effect of dopamine dysregulation on levels of noradrenaline and serotonin.

Table 1. Clinical experiences of patients with schizophrenia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of symptoms</th>
<th>Signs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive symptoms (those that are additional to normal for the person)</td>
<td>Hallucinations • Delusions • Thought disorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative symptoms (those that appear to take away from what the person once experienced)</td>
<td>Poor motivation • Social isolation • Withdrawal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive symptoms</td>
<td>Impaired attention and memory • Difficulty planning and problem-solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective or mood symptoms</td>
<td>Signs of depression and/or anxiety are common</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gray et al, 2010
Appendix 31

Improving the lives of people with mental illness

THE NATIONAL AUDIT OF SCHIZOPHRENIA (NAS) LAUNCHES A NEW CLINICAL RESOURCE:

"THE HEUSBERGER HAPITATION — Positive Cardiometabolic Health Resource: an intervention framework for patients with psychosis on antipsychotic medication."

This clinical resource provides a simple framework for identifying and treating cardiometabolic and type 2 diabetes risk in patients with psychosis receiving antipsychotic medication, which supports collaborative practice across professional disciplines and service settings. Its development was facilitated by the National Audit of Schizophrenia (NAS) and an initiative led by the Royal College of Psychiatrists' Centre for Quality Improvement, funded by the Healthcare Quality Improvement Partnership (HQIP) and involving a close collaboration with the Royal College of General Practitioners (RCGP) and the Royal College of Nursing (RCN).

The RCGP Clinical Innovation and Research Centre has been working with the NAS project team to produce a clinical resource for the United Kingdom (UK), adapted from work by Australian colleagues (Currie et al., 2015). This resource provides a simple collaborative framework for identifying and treating cardiometabolic and type 2 diabetes risk in any service setting.

The resource was adapted for UK use initially through a consensus group led on behalf of the RCGP by Professor Helen Lester and has now been further endorsed by the RCP Royal College of Psychiatrists, Royal College of Nursing, Royal College of Physicians, HQIP, National Mental Health and Diabetes UK.

Lead Authors on site (UK adaptation)

Helen Lester, David Shiers, Imran Raff, Steven Cooper, Richard Hopt.
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28th November 2012

To whom it may concern

This is an outline of the significant contribution Sheila Hardy has made to Rethink Mental Illness’ current work around the physical health of people affected by mental illness.

I first met Sheila at the Improving Physical Health for people with Mental Health Conditions held in London on 4th July 2012. Sheila was presenting her research to the conference, offering a primary care perspective on this issue. Sheila outlined the practical changes she had been involved in piloting and evaluating, and the impact this was having on the management and support of people affected by mental illness in primary care.

Later that month Rethink Mental Illness was due to hold a workshop to discuss some of the key challenges to better physical health outcomes for people affected by mental illness. We were hoping to design a resource that might support professionals in addressing these challenges. We invited Sheila to attend the workshop to share her research as a best practice example. Sheila took an active role in the roundtable discussions and offered invaluable expertise from a primary care perspective.

Following the workshop, Rethink Mental Illness worked with a range of stakeholders to develop a document that outlined where physical health monitoring should be taking place along the care pathway. This document also clarifies whether this monitoring should be overseen by primary or secondary care. Sheila has offered constructive feedback on a number of iterations of this document, particularly regarding the severe mental illness register and the annual physical health check. Sheila has also kindly agreed to allow us to share her resources as examples of best practice on the web pages we are designing for health professionals.

Sheila’s research has helped us shape our resources to be more effective and relevant for a primary care audience. I am happy to share any more information on Sheila’s contribution to the project, should it be useful.

Best wishes

Paula

Paula Reid
Policy Officer
Rethink Mental Illness
Practice health check invites boost mental illness visits and QOF income

By Stephen Robinson, 01 March 2012

Writing to invite patients with mental illness for health checks could improve attendance and help practices earn thousands of pounds in QOF pots, research suggests.

More on this topic
- Newpoint - CCGs can make a difference on mental health
- Consultation Skills - Effective mental health consultations
- NICE guidelines - Common mental health disorders
- The basics - Depression in primary care

Quick links
- GP curriculum, statement 13 - Care of people with mental illness

The scheme could earn QOF points worth £3.51p for an average-sized practice, University of East Anglia researchers said.

They found that inviting patients to an appointment more than doubled attendance rates compared with invitations asking patients to arrange a visit.

Lead author Sheila Hardy, a nurse practitioner in Northamptonshire, told GP ‘I do think this method should be adopted nationally; it could help practices meet QOF targets.’

Patients with severe mental illness are at higher risk of cardiovascular, metabolic and other long-term comorbidities, so it is important they receive an annual health check, researchers said.

But a 2005 study found a third of the patients with severe mental illness responded to a letter asking them to arrange an appointment — only half the number of responders from the general population.

Under the 2011/12 QOF GPs can earn 22 points for ensuring patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychosis are checked for BMI, BP, alcohol consumption, cholesterol levels and blood glucose at least once a year.

The researchers wrote to 62 patients with severe mental illness inviting them to an appointment for a health check in 10 days. In addition, 416 patients with diabetes were invited.

Two-thirds (66%) of patients with severe mental illness attended as specified in the letter and three-quarters (81%) of diabetes patients attended. Patients with diabetes were 2.2 times more likely to attend, but the proportion of mentally ill patients who attended was far higher than predicted by the 2005 study.

The authors recommended that an invitation later for patients with mental illness should become standard practice in primary care.

More on this topic
- Newpoint - CCGs can make a difference on mental health
- Consultation Skills - Effective mental health consultations
- NICE guidelines - Common mental health disorders
- The basics - Depression in primary care

Quick links
- GP curriculum, statement 13 - Care of people with mental illness

Checks visit for mentally ill (Photograph: GP)
Dr McCalloch says there is a balance of pros and cons with medication. Although it remains very important for many sufferers, the side effects can be severe and require sensible management and balance. "It is about being transparent and giving information," he says.

Mental health is not the only issue for those with serious mental illnesses. Their physical health can also be impacted: for example, patients with schizophrenia can be at higher risk of cardiovascular disease.

Sheila Hardy, a nurse consultant in mental health, says that people with serious mental illness will die 10-25 years earlier than the general population. Physical health checks carried out in primary care are one way to identify patients at risk and move them towards a healthier lifestyle.

Yet provision for patients whose care moves from secondary to primary care is very patchy. Ms Hardy felt that one barrier might be that practices were reluctant to set up health check clinics because they were inexperienced in dealing with this. She set up a practice nurse training course which she would deliver in practices, free of charge – but found practices were reluctant to release nurses for it. She has now set up a website to help nurses which has a range of tools and downloadable resources.

"Patients with schizophrenia can be at higher risk of cardiovascular disease" release nurses for it. She has now set up a website to help nurses which has a range of tools and downloadable resources.

One of the issues can be that psychiatrists are not experts in physical health and GPs are not experts in mental health so who is best placed to monitor the service user? Dr Nina Aziza, consultant psychiatrist at Northumberland Tyne and Wear Foundation Trust works closely with GPs to ensure that people don't fall between the gaps and their physical as well as their mental health is monitored. "It is about building relationships," she says. "I am shared care guidelines not as rigid but more flexible – sometimes you pick up the phone and have a chat."

So what of the future? Mr Cooney says that there is growing evidence of the importance of early intervention. To identify those developing schizophrenia will mean working with adolescents and creating an atmosphere in which they or those around them can raise troubling symptoms. "You have to get really close to young people," he says. "If you set up an early intervention in psychosis service in the middle of a psychiatric hospital they are not going to come."

And Dr McCalloch adds: "This is a very important group of people. The credibility of the system requires them to be well managed. It is a win-win for everyone to do it right and it is not necessarily more expensive than the wrong thing."
Body and soul

An RCN member has devised an innovative programme to improve the physical health of people with a severe mental illness. Sharon Palfrey reports

A combination of lifestyle factors and the side-effects of antipsychotic medication means there is a high incidence of cardiovascular disease causing premature death in people with severe mental illness. The statistics are staggering. Compared to other population groups, ages at death can be 15 years lower for people with bipolar disorder and 25 years for those with schizophrenia.

RCN member Sheila Hardy, a nurse consultant at mental health nurse with 19 years experience in the field, is determined not to do something about it. She believes clients should have an annual check to identify risk factors. "A comprehensive physical health check will also provide the opportunity for further education regarding lifestyle and ask about other physical conditions," she says.

Time for action

Sheila is concerned that people with severe mental illnesses don't know they are at risk. "They are not being told and they are not being screened," she says. "Clinics are held for those with asthma or diabetes but not for those people with severe mental illnesses. Twenty years ago it was the same for patients with diabetes, but it's now time to address the issue for patients with severe mental illnesses." Sheila has developed training and a website, which she sees as a practical tool to be used to help nurses in primary care address these issues. "I've purposely made the information freely available - I wanted to make it easy for nursing staff to access the information. As patient advocates, it's important we have access to best practice information," she says.

Make it easy

Addressing barriers and perceptions among nursing staff is important for Sheila. "There's a worry that patients won't attend clinics but you have to look at how you approach that," she says. "We've found it's better to give patients an appointment with a named person at a set time of day. Don't ask them to make an appointment as this requires organisation, and making a telephone call can be a barrier. Make it easy for them so they just have to turn up."

While acknowledging the severe pressures many practice nurses are under, Sheila stresses the need to offer this kind of support. "Most people with severe mental illnesses have no contact with secondary health care. If we're not looking after them, no one else is."

Hope for the future

With funding secured and her free training programme already being delivered, Sheila is hopeful for the future. "I hope my work will prove to be a benefit for patients and provide evidence of best practice," she says.

Jan Hudetz, RCN Mental Health Adviser, believes Sheila's work demonstrates the huge role to be played by nursing staff in this area. "Poor physical health outcomes on this scale are really no longer acceptable."

Free information

Sheila's website includes guidelines, a care plan outline, leaflets, links to professional websites and a guide for setting up a clinic. Read Sheila's guide, Physical Health Checks for People with Severe Mental Illness: A Primary Care Guide, at http://physyclinic walkthrough.co.uk and find out more information about how to book one of Sheila's free training courses at www.rcn.org.uk/bulletin
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To whom it may concern

Re: Sheila Hardy

This reference is to describe the work that Sheila Hardy has undertaken for NHS London strategic health authority, and the impact that she has had on practice improvements in London. Sheila has made a major positive impact on care in London through her participation in the following 2011-2012 programmes:

RCGP workshop on the role of practice nurses in the care of people with severe and enduring mental illness. At this seminal workshop, Sheila presented to an audience of 40 GPs. The feedback was that the GPs found her presentation to be excellent and her ideas on the role of the practice nurse very useful for their own practices and care offering.

Input to the London mental health CQUIN workshop: Sheila’s input to the pan London mental health CQUIN workshop was very well received and she raised the profile of practice nurses, and the major contribution they can play in the care of people with SMI. This was to an influential audience of over 100 senior clinicians and managers.

Practice nurse pan London master class training programme: Sheila has been an exceptional force for good in London, through her generous and very expert contribution to this very critical pan London programme. She wrote the training materials in the care of people with mental ill health in primary care and provided train the trainer sessions to senior nurse trainers in the ten mental health trusts. The 200 participants of the subsequent master classes report very significant improvement in their knowledge, and ability to provide care for people with schizophrenia and depression. Without her expertise, this programme would not have been possible, and London is in her debt.

Mental health Commissioning conference: Sheila presented, with her GP lead, David Smart at the national mental health commissioning conference. The commissioning audience was very enthused by her work and London services have subsequently requested that she run training events locally. Practice nurse profiles in London are rising as a result of her contribution to our city.

London care pathway profiling needs assessment programme and Expert reference group for the London Primary care mental health leadership development programme.

In addition to the formal contributions above, Sheila has been generous with her time and expertise, and is a very valued adviser to my own role as Associate medical director, mental health, at the strategic health authority and SHA London mental health lead.

Her contribution to her profession and the care of people with mental illness has been exceptional.

[Signature]

Dr Geraldine Strathdee, OBE, MRCPsych, Visiting Professor at UCLP
Associate Medical Director, Mental Health NHSL
NHS London, Southside, 105 Victoria Street, London, SW1E 6QT

London Strategic Health Authority

Interim Chair: Professor Mike Spyer  Chief Executive: Ruth Carnall CBE
Monitoring the physical health of people with severe mental illness

Shadie Hardy, Northamptonshire Teaching PCT

The Northamptonshire Physical Health and Wellbeing (PsyHealth) project won the 2010 Nursing in Practice Award for Mental Health and aims to improve the health and wellbeing of people with severe mental illness.

Many nurses in primary care are responsible for offering physical health checks to people with severe mental illness (SMI). The link between poor health and severe mental illness means that many people with SMI are not having their physical health monitored effectively.
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RCN Research Society Marjorie Simpson New Researchers’ award

The award is available to new or inexperienced researchers studying for a higher degree at masters or doctoral level. The award is a free place at the RCN annual international nursing research conference, and will cover the cost of the conference itself, conference accommodation and up to £100 travel costs. See the foot of the page for details of sponsors of the award.

2013 award

Winner

Suzanne Watts, Oxford Brookes University
Title: A qualitative multiple case study exploring child protection referrals from primary health care to child social care

Highly Commended

Nigel P. J. Vassell, University of Stirling
Title: Symptom experience and predictive factors in patients with liver cirrhosis: A cross sectional survey in Egypt

Highly Commended

Sheila Hardy, University of East Anglia
Title: People with severe mental illness have a reduced life expectancy
Abstract: Hardy, S. (2013). PDF

2012 award winner

Seonaid Mackay, University of Stirling
Title: The use of tail-hearts to manage inflammatory bowel disease
Abstract: Mackay, S. (2012). PDF

2011 award winners

Orla Watt, University of Ulster
Title: The impact on children’s development of having a child with Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) in the family.

Rebecca Verity, Lecturer, King’s College London
Title: Preparing and meeting the needs of family and friends who support people having chemotherapy

2010 award winners

Gussema Benah, Lecturer, King’s College London
Title: Adult critical care discharge information: development and evaluation of a strategy which encompasses user participation and investigates the potential for self management.

Wladyslaw Czuchaj-Dochan, Researcher in stroke, King’s College London
Title: Living more effectively with fatigue in inflammatory bowel disease.

Julie Green, Lecturer, Keele University
Title: Does a patient-focused in consultation in venous leg ulcer care improve patient satisfaction and health related quality of life?
Abstract: Green, J. (2010). PDF

2009 award winners

Natalie Petterson, Clinical nursing research fellow, Royal Marsden NHS Foundation Trust
Title: End-stage care in critically ill cancer patients: realities and hopes.

Anne Steele, Research nurse, Royal Devon & Exeter NHS Foundation Trust
Title: The health consequences of taking mild fasting hypoglycaemics.
Letters of attrition

I have described the contributions from each of the authors of the publications. Letters from each author confirming this are included.

40a Professor Richard Gray
Richard provided me with supervision in the design, execution and writing up of each study.


40b Dr Katherine Deane
Katherine provided me with instruction and supervision in carrying out the systematic search. She supervised the writing up of the qualitative paper.


### 40cJacquie White
Jacquie carried out the systematic search with me. We wrote all three papers together.


### 40d Dr Alex Mitchell
For the study below, we followed the design of my previous study carried out locally. Alex carried out the statistical analysis. We wrote the paper together.


### 40e Philippa Hinks
Philippa assisted me to clean the data for these two studies.

This letter is to confirm that I provided Sheila Hardy with supervision in the design, execution and writing up of each of the studies listed below.


Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Professor Richard Gray
25th February 2013

This letter is to confirm that I provided Sheila Hardy with instruction and supervision in carrying out the systematic search. I supervised the writing up of the qualitative paper.


Yours sincerely,

Dr Katherine Deane
21 March 2012

Ref: Mrs S Hardy

This letter is to confirm that I carried out the systematic review with Sheila Hardy. We wrote all three papers together.


Yours sincerely,

Jacquie White
Senior Lecturer/University Teaching Fellow, Trial Coordinator, HIP Cluster RCT
To whom it may concern


This letter is to confirm that for this study (cited above) we utilised the design of Sheila Hardy’s previous study carried out in Northampton. I designed the study, obtained the data and conducted the statistical analysis. We (AJM, SH) wrote the paper together. SH submitted the paper and corresponded with the journal.

Yours sincerely

Alex Mitchell

Dr Alex Mitchell
Consultant and Senior Lecturer in Liaison Psychiatry/Psycho-oncology
University of Leicester & Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust

Email alex.mitchell@leicspart.nhs.uk
This letter is to confirm that I provided Sheila Hardy with assistance to clean the data for these two studies:


Yours sincerely

Philippa Hinks