

The effects of community treatment orders (CTOs) on readmission to hospital using electronic health records

Justin C Yang*^{† 1,2}
Johan H Thygesen^{† 1,2,3}
Nomi Werbeloff⁴
David Kelsey^{2,5}
Dominique Merlande^{2,6}
Joseph Hayes^{1,2}
David PJ Osborn^{1,2}

*Corresponding Author: 6th Floor, Maple House, 149 Tottenham Court Road, London, W1T 7NF, justin.yang@ucl.ac.uk

[†] These authors contributed equally to this work

¹ Division of Psychiatry, University College London

² Camden and Islington NHS Foundation Trust

³ Institute of Health Informatics, University College London

⁴ The Louis and Gabi Weisfeld School of Social Work, Bar-Ilan University

⁵ Oxleas NHS Foundation Trust

⁶ East London NHS Foundation Trust

Authorship Statement

JCY: Conception or design of the work; data collection; data analysis and interpretation; drafting the article, final approval of the version to be published

JHT: Conception or design of the work; initial data analysis, drafting the article; critical revision of the article; final approval of the version to be published

NW: Critical revision of the article; final approval of the version to be published

DK: Critical revision of the article; final approval of the version to be published

DM: Critical revision of the article; final approval of the version to be published

JH: Data analysis and interpretation; critical revision of the article; final approval of the version to be published

DPJO: Critical revision of the article; final approval of the version to be published

Funding

This work was supported by the Medical Research Council (MR/W014386/1). David P.J. Osborn is also supported by the University College London Hospitals NIHR Biomedical Research Centre and the NIHR North Thames Applied Research Collaboration. Joseph F. Hayes is supported by UKRI grant MR/V023373/1, the University College London Hospitals NIHR Biomedical Research Centre and the NIHR North Thames Applied Research Collaboration. The funder had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, or writing of the report. The views expressed in this article are those of the

43 authors and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR, or the Department of Health and
44 Social Care.

45

46 Declaration of Conflicts

47 JCY, JHT, NWB, DK, DM, and DPJO have no conflicts to disclose. JFH has received
48 consultancy fees from Wellcome Trust and Juli Health.

49

50 Data Availability

51 The data that support the findings of this study are available to approved researchers
52 through Camden & Islington NHS Foundation Trust. The data are not publicly available due
53 to restrictions on data access by the Data Controller in the interest of patient confidentiality.

54 Abstract

55 **Background:** Community treatment orders (CTOs) are used to manage community-based
56 care for individuals with severe mental health conditions who have been discharged from
57 inpatient care. Evidence examining whether CTOs are successful at reducing
58 rehospitalisation has been mixed.

59 **Methods:** Using deidentified electronic health records from 2009-21, we compared patients
60 who had ever been placed on a CTO (n=836) and two other groups of patients who had
61 never been placed on CTO: patients admitted under Section 3 of the Mental Health Act
62 (n=1,182) and outpatients with severe mental health issues (n=7,651). We examined the
63 association between CTOs and rehospitalisation using within-individual stratified
64 multivariable Cox regression.

65 **Results:** Patients on CTO were more likely to be male, single, of Black or Mixed ethnicity,
66 and have a severe mental illness diagnosis than patients in the comparison groups. Time
67 spent on CTO was associated with a lower risk of hospitalisation compared to time spent off
68 CTO for the same individual (HR 0.60; 95% CI 0.56-0.64). This decreased risk of
69 hospitalisation remained when we restricted analysis to individuals with a single CTO
70 episode (HR 0.05; 95% CI 0.02-0.11) and when we restricted follow-up time to a patient's
71 first CTO episode (HR 0.20; 95% CI 0.17-0.25). However, there was no difference in re-
72 hospitalisations when we observed patients starting from the first CTO (HR 1.07; 95% CI
73 1.00-1.16).

74 **Conclusions:** We found that patients on CTO were at lower risk of hospitalisation, though
75 this pattern was not observed when we excluded time prior to the first CTO. Further research
76 should consider whether CTOs provide genuine clinical benefit.

77 **Keywords:** community treatment orders, compulsory community treatment, hospitalisation
78 rates, within individual analysis, electronic health records, clinical informatics

79 Introduction

80 Community Treatment Orders (CTOs) are a legal mechanism used in England and Wales to
81 manage individuals with severe mental health conditions who have been discharged from
82 inpatient care ¹. They are intended to provide support and treatment to individuals in the
83 community, with the goal of preventing relapse and hospital readmission. CTOs can be used
84 for individuals with conditions such as schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, and severe
85 depression who have a history of non-adherence to treatment and/or frequent hospitalisation
86 ¹.

87

88 Under a CTO, an individual is required to comply with a specified treatment plan, which may
89 include medication, therapy, and other support services ². They may also be required to
90 attend regular reviews with a mental health professional and/or comply with other conditions
91 such as living at a specific address, abstaining from illicit substances, or not leaving a certain
92 geographical area ². They are also subject to being recalled to hospital under a CTO ². CTOs
93 are typically issued on the recommendation of the Responsible Clinician and an Approved
94 Mental Health Professional and can be in place for up to six months, with the possibility of
95 renewal ². The individual has a right to appeal the decision and the patient may be
96 discharged from a CTO by a the tribunal if the individual's condition improves or they no
97 longer meet the legal criteria for the CTO ². CTOs are a type of compulsory community
98 treatment (CCT), often used to treat patients with serious mental illnesses, and have been
99 used in Australia, Canada, Israel, New Zealand, and the United States ³.

100

101 Critics of CTOs argue that they can be used as a form of involuntary treatment and may
102 restrict the individual's rights and freedom ⁴. Supporters argue that they can be an effective
103 way to provide continuity of care and support for individuals with severe mental health
104 conditions who may be at risk of hospitalization or harm to themselves or others ⁵. Moreover,
105 there is evidence to suggest that there may be disparities in the application of CTOs on

106 certain patient populations⁶. Some research has highlighted higher rates of CTO use among
107 patients from Black, Asian, and minority ethnic (BAME) backgrounds^{7,8}. These disparities
108 may be due to a combination of factors, including bias and discrimination within the mental
109 health system, cultural differences in understandings of mental health and treatment, and a
110 lack of culturally appropriate services and support⁹ris.

111

112 In part due to these concerns, there has been an interest in understanding whether or not
113 CCTs such as CTOs actually reduce hospital admissions. A systematic review and meta-
114 analysis of randomised controlled clinical trials (RCTs) and observational studies concluded
115 that there was little evidence for CCT in reducing hospital admission length or frequency¹⁰,
116 finding no significant reduction in readmission to hospital¹⁰ in experimental studies. Some
117 observational studies showed improvements in outcomes among patients on CCT but did
118 not compare these findings with a control group¹⁰. Relatively few studies have examined
119 CTOs in the UK. The only RCT in the UK to assess the effectiveness of CTOs, the OCTET
120 trial, found no effect on admission length and frequency for any subgroup at 12 and 36
121 months^{11,12}. However, criticism exists of the representativeness of patients within this RCT
122¹³.

123

124 The use of electronic health records (EHRs) provides an opportunity to understand
125 disparities in the application of CTOs by providing a comprehensive and detailed view of an
126 individual's health history, follow-up time, treatment, and outcomes. EHRs can be used to
127 analyse data on the demographic characteristics of individuals subject to CTOs, including
128 race, ethnicity, gender, and socioeconomic status. We aimed to use de-identified clinical
129 data to evaluate patterns and trends in the use and outcomes of CTOs in reducing hospital
130 admissions across different patient populations over extended periods of time. We also
131 aimed to characterise patients who are placed on CTO compared with patients with a
132 similarly severe symptomatology who are not placed on a CTO.

133 Methods

134 Setting and participants

135 We used the Camden & Islington NHS Foundation Trust (C&I) Clinical Record Interactive
136 Search (CRIS) database of deidentified electronic health records for this study. C&I is a
137 secondary mental health trust providing mental health, learning disability, and community
138 health services to approximately 470,000 residents in the London boroughs of Camden and
139 Islington. The geographical area is known for its diverse communities, with a high proportion
140 of immigrants and people from ethnic minority backgrounds. Both boroughs have a higher
141 proportion of people in the 20-29 age group as well as relatively high levels of deprivation
142 compared to the London average.

143

144 The C&I CRIS database allows for analysis of anonymised EHR data of over 160,000
145 patients under the care of C&I from 2008 onwards ^{14,15}.

146 Exposures

147 We defined our study cohort as any individual aged 16 and above receiving care at C&I who
148 was ever on a CTO at any point in the 13-year period between 1 January 2009 to 31
149 December 2021. Individuals were followed up from 1 January 2009 or the first recorded date
150 of contact with the Trust, whichever was later, until 31 December 2021 or date of death,
151 whichever was earlier.

152

153 We compared this cohort with two comparison groups who were never on CTO: (1)
154 individuals who had been admitted for inpatient care under Section 3 of the *Mental Health*
155 *Act (1983)* during the study period and; (2) individuals with serious mental illness (defined as
156 having at least one Health of the Nation Outcome Scales (HONOS) ¹⁶ score in the top 25%
157 of those recorded in C&I CRIS) who were never admitted as inpatients during the study
158 period.

159 Outcomes

160 We calculated the number of episodes and days each patient spent on CTO during the study
161 follow-up period among patients who had at least one recorded CTO episode and the
162 number of episodes and days spent in inpatient care during the study period among patients
163 who had at least one recorded CTO episode or at least one recorded episode under Section
164 3 of the Mental Health Act.

165 Covariates

166 Sociodemographic variables, specifically, gender, marital status, ethnicity, and area-level
167 index of multiple deprivation, were extracted from CRIS. The index of multiple deprivation
168 (IMD) is a composite measure of relative deprivation for a specific area. We used IMD ranks
169 for lower super output areas (LSOAs), a small geographic area with a population of about
170 1,500, to calculate tertiles representing high, medium, and low relative area-level
171 deprivation, indexed across LSOAs in England.

172 In addition, we identified whether or not patients had a history of severe mental illness by
173 identifying patients who had a recorded ICD-10 diagnosis of F20-29 (schizophrenia), F30-1
174 (manic episode and bipolar disorder), or F32.3/ F33.3 (major depressive disorder with
175 psychotic symptoms).

176 Ethics Approval


177 Ethical approval for use of the C&I CRIS database was obtained from the East of England -
178 Cambridge Central Research Ethics Committee (19/EE/0210) and the project was approved
179 by the C&I Research Oversight Committee.

180 Statistical analysis

181 Firstly, we compared the sociodemographic and clinical characteristics of the main CTO
182 study cohort with the two comparison groups not on CTOs.

183

184 For the main analysis of patients who had been placed on a CTO, we performed a stratified
185 Cox proportional hazards analysis comparing hospitalisations during periods on and off
186 CTO. All analyses were stratified by individual patients and adjusted for time-varying
187 confounders, namely: calendar year, age and count of inpatient admissions within the study
188 period. Time spent as an inpatient was omitted to avoid immortal time bias, because patients
189 could not experience a new admission whilst an inpatient. Figure 1 depicts an example of
190 how our stratified Cox proportional hazards regression examined periods on and off CTO for
191 an individual patient, where yellow indicates a period during which a patient was on a CTO
192 and red indicates a period spent as an inpatient (which was excluded from our analysis).
193



194 **Figure 1:** Diagram illustrating periods of hospitalisation coinciding with periods on or off community
195 treatment orders (CTO), of a hypothetical patient.
196

197
198 We conducted three further sensitivity analyses to test whether or not findings from our main
199 analysis held even when specific parameters or assumptions were changed:

- 200 1) We restricted the sample to only individuals with one recorded CTO to account for
201 potential bias if there were a systematic difference between individuals who are only
202 ever placed on one CTO from individuals who are repeatedly placed on CTO during
203 their follow up period;
- 204 2) We restricted the observation period up to and including the first CTO to investigate
205 the potential that being placed on one CTO and the outcome from that CTO may
206 affect a clinician's decision to place someone on subsequent CTO episodes, thereby
207 introducing a systematic difference between people who are only ever placed on one
208 CTO and those who are placed on multiple CTOs; and

209 3) We began observation starting at the first CTO to avoid potential bias introduced by
210 medical care prior to the first CTO in case potential confounders, especially time-
211 varying confounders, played a role in the time leading up to an individual being
212 placed on their first CTO.

213

214 Analyses were conducted using R 4.2.4.

215 Results

216 Characteristics of Patients Placed on CTO Compared with 217 Patients Who Were Not

218 Sample characteristics are shown in Table 1. We included deidentified data from 836
219 individuals who were treated under CTO during the study period with a median of 1 (IQR 1-
220 3) CTO episode and a median of 490 (183.0 to 994.0) days spent on CTO. In the
221 comparison groups who were not exposed to CTO, we included 1,182 individuals who were
222 treated under Section 3 of the MHA, and 7,651 severely unwell individuals who exclusively
223 received care in the community. Individuals receiving a CTO were more likely to be male,
224 single, from Black or Mixed ethnic groups, and have a diagnosis of severe mental illness
225 compared to individuals treated on Section 3 or severely unwell outpatients. Compared with
226 individuals who had been treated on Section 3, individuals on CTO had more previous
227 inpatient episodes and had previously spent more days under inpatient care.

228

229 **Table 1:** Sample demographics, stratified by intervention. Numbers in (parentheses) are percentages.
230 p-values are provided for Fisher's exact test.

		CTO (n = 836)	Section 3 (n = 1,182)	Community Treatment Only (n = 7,651)	p-value
Gender	Male	476 (56.9)	526 (44.5)	3475 (45.4)	<0.001
	Female	300 (35.9)	571 (48.3)	3530 (46.1)	
Marital Status	Single	645 (77.2)	759 (64.2)	3082 (40.3)	<0.001
	Married or Civil Partnership	38 (4.5)	127 (10.7)	1009 (13.2)	
	Separated, Divorced, or Surviving	78 (9.3)	170 (14.4)	1296 (16.9)	

		CTO (n = 836)	Section 3 (n = 1,182)	Community Treatment Only (n = 7,651)	p-value
	Partner				
Ethnicity	White	345 (41.3)	621 (52.5)	3945 (51.6)	<0.001
	Black, Black British, Caribbean, or African	293 (35.0)	277 (23.4)	788 (10.3)	
	Asian or Asian British	36 (4.3)	60 (5.1)	262 (3.4)	
	Mixed or Multiple Ethnic Groups	45 (5.4)	46 (3.9)	253 (3.3)	
	Other	53 (6.3)	73 (6.2)	809 (10.6)	
Area-Level Deprivation	High deprivation	409 (48.9)	616 (52.1)	3987 (52.1)	0.093
	Medium deprivation	299 (35.8)	392 (33.2)	2381 (31.1)	
	Low deprivation	68 (8.1)	89 (7.5)	639 (8.4)	
Severe Mental Illness	Yes	823 (98.4)	1058 (89.5)	1188 (15.5)	
Number of Inpatient Episodes	Median (IQR)	5.0 (3.0 to 9.0)	3.0 (2.0 to 5.0)	-	<0.001
	Number of Days on Inpatient	405.0 (220.5 to 772.5)	189.0 (111.0 to 337.5)	-	
Number of CTO Episodes	Median (IQR)	1.0 (1.0 to 3.0)	-	-	<0.001
	Number of Days on CTO	490.0 (183.0 to 994.0)	-	-	

231 Comparison of hospitalisation rates on and off CTO

232 In our main analysis of individuals with at least one CTO during the study period, we found
233 that time spent on CTO was associated with a lower risk of hospitalisation than time spent
234 off CTO (HR 0.60; 95% CI 0.56-0.64) (Table 2). This decreased risk of hospitalisation was
235 also observed when we restricted analysis to individuals with only one CTO episode (HR
236 0.05; 95% CI 0.02-0.11) and when we restricted analysis to time up to and including the first
237 CTO (HR 0.20; 95% CI 0.17-0.25). However, we did not observe a difference in risk of
238 hospitalisation when we restricted our analysis to observing patients starting from the first
239 CTO (HR 1.07; 95% CI 1.00-1.16). Results were largely similar between unadjusted
240 univariable regression and adjusted multivariable regression except when we examined
241 individuals starting from their first CTO, where we observed a higher risk of hospitalisation
242 during CTO in both the unadjusted and adjusted models (though, in either case, these were
243 not statistically significant differences).

244

245 **Table 2:** Cox proportional hazard results of analysis of risk for hospitalisation
 246

Sample	Number of CTOs	Observation Start	Observation End	n	Person-Days Observed	Hazard Ratio (Univariable)	Hazard Ratio (Multivariable*)
Individuals with at least one CTO	≥1	1 Jan 2009 or first contact with C&I	31 Dec 2021 or death	834	12,662	0.61 (0.57-0.64, p<0.001)	0.60 (0.56-0.64, p<0.001)
Individuals with only one CTO	1	1 Jan 2009 or first contact with C&I	31 Dec 2021 or death	262	2,612	0.04 (0.02-0.09, p<0.001)	0.05 (0.02-0.11, p<0.001)
Individuals up to and including first CTO	≥1	1 Jan 2009 or first contact with C&I	End of first CTO	834	7,256	0.30 (0.26-0.36, p<0.001)	0.20 (0.17-0.25, p<0.001)
Individuals starting from first CTO	≥1	Start of first CTO	31 Dec 2021 or death	834	7,336	1.02 (0.95-1.09, p=0.584)	1.07 (1.00-1.16, p=0.062)

247 *Adjusted for year, number of inpatient episodes, gender, marital status, ethnicity, IMD tertile, and
 248 diagnosis of severe mental illness

249 Discussion

250 To our knowledge, this is the first study to examine effectiveness of CTOs in reducing
 251 rehospitalisation with long follow-up periods, compared to existing literature, in a
 252 representative sample. Using anonymised EHR data, we were able to highlight differences in
 253 the types of patients most likely to be placed on CTO as well as effects of CTOs on
 254 readmission over thirteen years in the second largest sample examined in the UK to date. By
 255 comparison, Taylor et al. examined 1,558 individuals followed up over 12 months¹⁷ and
 256 Vergunst et al. looked at 114 patients over 48 months¹⁸.

257

258 We observed that patients treated under CTO were more likely to be male, single, of Black
 259 or mixed ethnicity, and have a diagnosis of severe mental illness compared with patients
 260 treated on Section 3 or severely unwell outpatients in secondary care. The patients who
 261 received CTOs were also more likely to have previous inpatient episodes and to have spent
 262 more time under inpatient care in the past. In the main analyses, we found that periods on
 263 CTO were associated with a lower risk of re-hospitalisation compared to periods off CTO
 264 among individuals with at least one CTO. This is consistent with prior findings. This finding
 265 remained when we examined only individuals with a single CTO episode or when limiting the

266 follow-up period so it only included time before and during the first CTO episode. However,
267 when we restricted observations to commence from the date of the first CTO, there was no
268 difference in rates of admission whether on or off CTO. Notwithstanding, there is some
269 evidence to suggest that CTOs may reduce the risk of rehospitalisation, especially among
270 those who only ever have a single CTO episode.

271 Comparison with other studies

272 An estimated 5,000 individuals are on CTOs in the UK annually, much more than envisaged
273 when they were introduced and; controversially, those of Black or Black British ethnicity are
274 up to eight times more likely than White people to be placed on CTO ⁶. Our findings showed
275 this national pattern at the local level. As well, our findings were consistent with other studies
276 showing that people placed on CTO were more likely to be unmarried, have a primary
277 diagnosis of psychotic illness, and have a history of longer inpatient admissions ⁶, possibly
278 reflective of increased disease severity among people who are considered for and put on
279 CTOs compared with patients who are treated by other means.

280

281 Comparisons with studies set outside the UK are challenging, given major differences in
282 legislation which provide the legal mechanism for CCTs, health care provision, and
283 demography. There are few previous UK-based observational studies which tend to be
284 limited by relatively short follow-up periods and small sample sizes, or are subject to
285 unmeasured confounding ¹⁰. These studies find that CTOs offer clinical benefits, yet the only
286 UK-based RCT on CTOs failed to find any improvement from CTOs ^{11,12}.

287 Strengths and limitations

288 Our study addresses many of the limitations which apply to RCTs of CTOs in terms of
289 generalisability due to strict inclusion criteria. Methodological limitations have been
290 described in non-randomised studies ¹⁰, such as unmeasured confounding or channelling
291 bias, however we addressed some of these through our within-individual design, by including

292 multiple hospital admissions and performing a number of sensitivity analyses; particularly in
293 excluding the period just prior to the initiation of the first CTO. Furthermore, relatively few
294 studies have assessed follow-up beyond one or two years, while we were able to follow up
295 for over 10 years in some cases, and most published studies have, to the best of our
296 knowledge, only included single CCT episodes.

297

298 Yet, limitations remain in our design. There may be important time-varying confounders,
299 such as the availability of social or community support as well as periods of illness stability
300 which cannot be captured from the EHR. In addition, this study only includes data from one
301 mental health service where decisions about CTOs may be relatively homogenous or
302 influenced by a small number of clinicians and may not reflect wider patterns in the use of
303 CTOs across the UK as a whole.

304 Conclusions

305 CTOs, introduced in England over fifteen years ago, continue to be used to treat patients
306 with severe mental illness. Despite a review of the Mental Health Act which recommended a
307 reduction in their use, the use of CTOs has not decreased²⁰, despite concerns about ethnic
308 disparities in the use of CTOs¹⁹. They provide a legal mechanism by which patients may be
309 discharged into the community but still be compelled to return to hospital if a clinician deems
310 it necessary. Nevertheless, their potentially coercive nature necessitates greater scrutiny of
311 whether they truly benefit patients or not, and whether there are significant disparities in the
312 use of CTOs based on demographic characteristics.

313

314 Our findings highlight the need to further examine whether CTOs truly provide clinical
315 benefits beyond proxy measures of re-hospitalisation and lengths of stay, given patients'
316 concerns about coercion and potential disparities in their use, and for whom these benefits
317 might apply.

318

319 References

- 320 1 Lawton-Smith S. Community Treatment Orders in England and Wales: How Many
321 People Will be Affected? *Ment Health Rev* 2005; **10**: 21.
- 322 2 Jethwa K, Galappathie N. *Community treatment orders*. British Medical Journal
323 Publishing Group, 2008.
- 324 3 Kisely S, Campbell L, O'Reilly R. Compulsory community and involuntary outpatient
325 treatment for people with severe mental disorders. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2017.
326 doi:10.1002/14651858.CD004408.pub5.
- 327 4 Pridham KMF, Berntson A, Simpson AI, Law SF, Stergiopoulos V, Nakhost A.
328 Perception of coercion among patients with a psychiatric community treatment order: a
329 literature review. *Psychiatr Serv* 2016; **67**: 16–28.
- 330 5 Harris A, Chen W, Jones S, Hulme M, Burgess P, Sara G. Community treatment orders
331 increase community care and delay readmission while in force: Results from a large
332 population-based study. *Aust N Z J Psychiatry* 2019; **53**: 228–35.
- 333 6 Trevithick L, Carlile J, Nodiyal S, Keown P. Community treatment orders: an analysis of
334 the first five years of use in England. *Br J Psychiatry* 2018; **212**: 175–9.
- 335 7 Bhui K, Stansfeld S, Hull S, Priebe S, Mole F, Feder G. Ethnic variations in pathways to
336 and use of specialist mental health services in the UK: systematic review. *Br J*
337 *Psychiatry* 2003; **182**: 105–16.
- 338 8 Patel MX, Matonhodze J, Baig MK, Gilleen J, Boydell J, Holloway F, *et al*. Increased use
339 of antipsychotic long-acting injections with community treatment orders. *Ther Adv*
340 *Psychopharmacol* 2011; **1**: 37–45.
- 341 9 Haynes P, Stroud J. Community treatment orders and social factors: complex journeys
342 in the mental health system. *J Soc Welf Fam Law* 2019; **41**: 463–78.
- 343 10 Barnett P, Matthews H, Lloyd-Evans B, Mackay E, Pilling S, Johnson S. Compulsory
344 community treatment to reduce readmission to hospital and increase engagement with
345 community care in people with mental illness: a systematic review and meta-analysis.

- 346 *Lancet Psychiatry* 2018; **5**: 1013–22.
- 347 11 Burns T, Rugkåsa J, Molodynski A, Dawson J, Yeeles K, Vazquez-Montes M, *et al.*
348 Community treatment orders for patients with psychosis (OCTET): a randomised
349 controlled trial. *The lancet* 2013; **381**: 1627–33.
- 350 12 Burns T, Yeeles K, Koshiaris C, Vazquez-Montes M, Molodynski A, Puntis S, *et al.* Effect
351 of increased compulsion on readmission to hospital or disengagement from community
352 services for patients with psychosis: follow-up of a cohort from the OCTET trial. *Lancet*
353 *Psychiatry* 2015; **2**: 881–90.
- 354 13 Mustafa FA. *On the OCTET and supervised community treatment orders*. SAGE
355 Publications Sage UK: London, England, 2014.
- 356 14 Fernandes AC, Cloete D, Broadbent M, Hayes RD, Chang C-K, Jackson RG, *et al.*
357 Development and evaluation of a de-identification procedure for a case register sourced
358 from mental health electronic records. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak* 2013; **13**: 1–14.
- 359 15 Werbeloff N, Osborn DP, Patel R, Taylor M, Stewart R, Broadbent M, *et al.* The Camden
360 & Islington Research Database: Using electronic mental health records for research.
361 *PloS One* 2018; **13**: e0190703.
- 362 16 Wing JK, Curtis RH, Beevor AS. Health of the nation outcome scales (HoNOS). *Br J*
363 *Psychiatry* 1999; **174**: 432–4.
- 364 17 Taylor M, Macpherson M, Macleod C, Lyons D. Community treatment orders and
365 reduced time in hospital: a nationwide study, 2007–2012. *BJPsych Bull* 2016; **40**: 124–6.
- 366 18 Vergunst F, Rugkåsa J, Koshiaris C, Simon J, Burns T. Community treatment orders and
367 social outcomes for patients with psychosis: a 48-month follow-up study. *Soc Psychiatry*
368 *Psychiatr Epidemiol* 2017; **52**: 1375–84.
- 369 19 Laing J. Reforming the Mental Health Act: Will More Rights Lead to Fewer Wrongs? *Med*
370 *Law Rev* 2022; **30**: 158–76.
- 371 20 Lei H, Barnicot K, Maynard E, Etherington A, Zalewska K, Quirk A, *et al.* Factors
372 influencing use of community treatment orders and quality of care that people receive:
373 results of a national survey in England and Wales. *BJPsych Bull* 2019; **43**: 227–35.