Title page

Title: Implementing an Advance Choice Documents resource for Black African and Caribbean people with experience of compulsory psychiatric admission

Adelabu Jonathan Simpson (corresponding author)
Correspondence: Jonathan.Simpson@kcl.ac.uk
Health Services and Population Research Department, David Goldberg Centre, King's College London Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, De Crespigny Park, London SE5 8AF

Abigail Babatunde
Health Services and Population Research Department, David Goldberg Centre, King's College London Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, De Crespigny Park, London SE5 8AF

Alan Simpson
Health Services and Population Research Department, David Goldberg Centre, King's College London Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, De Crespigny Park, London SE5 8AF

Steven Gilbert
Steve Gilbert Consulting, Suite 2A, Blackthorn House, St Pauls Square, Birmingham B3 1RL

Alex Ruck Keene
39 Essex Chambers; Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, King's College London

Lucy Stephenson

Department of Psychological Medicine, King's College London Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, De Crespigny Park, London, SE5 8AF

Kia-Chong Chua
Health Service and Population Research Department, David Goldberg Centre, King's College London, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, De Crespigny Park, London, SE5 8AF

Gareth Owen
Department of Psychological Medicine, King's College London Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, De Crespigny Park, London, SE5 8AF

Fiona Crowe
South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust

Pauline Edwards
South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust

Selena Galloway
Maudsley Learning, ORTUS, 82-96 Grove Lane, London, SE5 8SN, United Kingdom

Megan Fisher
Maudsley Learning, ORTUS, 82-96 Grove Lane, London, SE5 8SN, United Kingdom

Marcela Schilderman
Maudsley Learning, ORTUS, 82-96 Grove Lane, London, SE5 8SN, United Kingdom

Anita Bignell

Maudsley Learning, ORTUS, 82-96 Grove Lane, London, SE5 8SN, United Kingdom

Shubulade Smith

South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust; Royal College of Psychiatrists

Claire Henderson

Health Services and Population Research Department, David Goldberg Centre, King's College London Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, De Crespigny Park, London SE5 8AF; South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust

Abstract

Background – Advance Choice Documents (ACDs) have been recommended for use in England and Wales based on evidence from trials that show that they can reduce involuntary hospitalisation, which disproportionately affects Black African and Caribbean people. Our aim was therefore to develop and implement an ACD resource for Black people who have previously been involuntarily hospitalised and the people that support them.

Methods – Resource co-production workshops were held to inform the development of the ACD template and two types of training for all stakeholders, comprising a Recovery College course and simulation training. An ACD facilitator developed ACDs with service users and mental health staff over a series of meetings. Interviews with service user and staff participants were conducted after ACD completion and analysed to document their experience of the process and opinions on ACDs. Other implementation strategies were also employed alongside to support and optimise the development of ACDs.

Results – Nine ACDs were completed and were largely reported as appropriate, acceptable, and feasible to staff and service users. Both reported it being an empowering process that encouraged hope for better future treatment and therefore better wellbeing. Uncertainty was also expressed about the confidence people had that ACDs would be adhered to/honoured, primarily due to staff workload. The information provision training and the skills training were generally considered to be informative by attendees.

Conclusions – The project has developed an ACD development resource that was reported as agreeable to all stakeholders; however, the generalisability of the findings is limited due to the small sample size. The project also highlights the importance of staff and ACD facilitator capacity and good therapeutic relationships in ACD completion. Further research is needed to determine the adjustments needed for large scale use, including for those under age 18 and those under the care of forensic mental health services; and how to include carers/supporters more in the process.

Keywords: Advance Choice Documents, Advance directives, Advance Statements, Mental Health Act, Black mental health; Mental health inequity

Background

It is consistently found that Black people, defined as people of Black African and Caribbean heritage and people of mixed Black heritage, disproportionally have negative experiences of mental health services in the UK (1–3). This includes more coercive treatment, higher police involvement in detention in psychiatric hospitals under the Mental Health Act (MHA), and more frequent and sustained compulsory detentions (1,4) which all act to reduce autonomy. These disparities also exist alongside poorer mental health outcomes (2,5). Interventions designed to improve the experience of Black people in mental health services have been insufficient (6). However, written statements of treatment preferences created in advance of a mental health crisis or relapse have been associated with reduced compulsory psychiatric admissions (7–9) and reduced periods as an inpatient for Black people in particular (10). These are referred to as Advance Choice Documents (ACDs) in the 2018 Independent Review of the UK Mental Health Act (MHA Review) and depending on the legislative context and authors are variously termed Advance Statements, Psychiatric Advance Directives, Joint Crisis Plans, and Crisis Cards.

ACDs can support the autonomy of service users (11–13) and facilitate mental health care providers being held accountable in delivering preferred care. They can potentially address Black service users' dissatisfaction with services (14), impaired therapeutic alliance and trust, and reduced help seeking (15,16). ACDs are viewed positively by service users, carers/supporters of people with mental health difficulties, and mental health staff (MHS) (17,18). The UK government accepted the recommendation of the use of ACDs in the MHA Review and the parliamentary scrutiny committee recommended a statutory offer be made to anyone who has previously been detained under the MHA (19). However, in countries where there is legislation supporting the use of ACDs, such as Scotland and the USA, uptake is low (20).

Various reasons have been cited for the lack of development and use of ACDs, at the level of the service user, staff, and service (21). A study of Joint Crisis Plan use identified three barriers: 1) lack of recognition of the benefits of ACDs; 2) not recognising the need for a change in the clinician-service user relationship, including discussing treatment options and supporting patient choice; and 3) difficulties in implementation when working across the healthcare system (18).

To support effective implementation of ACDs at a National Health Service (NHS) mental health service provider and for wider adoption, this implementation research project (the Advance Statements for Black African and Caribbean people project; AdStAC) consisted of three phases: stakeholder workshops (to understand views about ACDs) (22); co-production (deciding what resources were needed to implement ACDs and in what format); and implementation (testing and revising the implementation resource) (23). This paper focuses on the co-production and implementation phases, which had the aims:

1. Co-produce an implementation resource (guidance and training on ACD implementation, and a modified ACD template)
2. Test, revise, and re-test the implementation of ACDs using the resource developed

Methods

Design

The resource co-production phase comprised three workshops: ACD template design; Recovery College training on understanding ACDs, and Simulation training on how to create and use ACDs.

The implementation phase comprised Plan-Do-Study-Act cycles (24) to develop ACDs, gain feedback, and modify the processes as necessary.

Ethics

Approval for the study was granted by the Bradford Leeds NHS Health Research Authority Research Ethics Committee (Research Ethics Committee reference number: 22/YH/0012) on 07/02/2022.

Context

The sites of implementation were in four South London local government areas served by an NHS mental health service provider (an NHS Trust) that have, relative to the UK, a high proportion of Black people (range 22.6%-26.8%) (25).

The NHS Trust has a Recovery College, which offers courses and workshops taught by people with lived experience of long-term mental health conditions/difficulties and people with expertise by profession. Recovery Colleges are widespread throughout the UK (88 in 2021; (26) and are open to service users, carers/supporters, and MHS to attend. The Trust also has a mental health simulation training centre that offers courses that can be booked by any NHS Trust.

Participants

The workshops were open to Black people aged 16+ who had previously been detained under the MHA; supporters/carers of a Black service user eligible for the project; MHS who may be involved in supporting the completion of ACDs/refer to ACDs in clinical records/involved in compulsory admission, and General Practitioners who work with people said to have serious mental illness.

The targeted groups for the intervention were Black service users and the people who support and work with them. Inclusion criteria for service users included: currently using the NHS Trust services; aged 16+; previously detained at least once under the MHA; and self-identifying as of Black African and Caribbean heritage, or of mixed Black heritage. For supporters/carers: aged 16+; informal

169 carers/supporters of eligible service users; and likely to be named in the ACD. Eligible staff included
170 those who may be involved in completing or referring to the ACD in clinical records, such as MHS
171 employed by the Trust in acute and community settings, section 12 (MHA) approved doctors,
172 Approved Mental Health Professionals, advocates, and peer workers.

173 Purposive sampling was used to recruit service users, carers/supporters, and staff for the co-
174 production workshops and the trainings. Recruitment occurred through presentations to clinical
175 teams and third-sector organisations (including community groups, voluntary organisations, and
176 faith and equalities groups). Physical and digital adverts were also distributed to these groups and
177 promoted via social media platforms. For the development of ACDs, the first 15 eligible service users
178 expressing interest were recruited, including via the Trust's consent for contact register.

179

180 Summary of the strategies

181 A steering committee, a lived experience advisory group, and a staff advisory group provided
182 guidance throughout the project. Co-production workshops based on stakeholder recommendations
183 shaped the implementation resource: an ACD template, training, and a manual and job description
184 for the ACD facilitator (22). Two training courses were developed: a simulation training course and a
185 Recovery College course, both for service users, staff, and carers/supporters. The ACD facilitator, a
186 social worker employed by the NHS Trust, was given the manual and developed the ACDs of
187 participating service users and their care staff whilst undergoing fortnightly supervision. Throughout
188 the ACD development period, monthly staff meetings were held for staff in participating teams to
189 discuss the project and presentations to clinical teams and third-sector organisations were also
190 delivered. Awareness videos about ACDs were also created and distributed. Throughout the project
191 the resource was improved based on data collected through participant interviews and staff
192 meetings. The strategies not detailed in the Methods section can be found in Additional File 1:
193 Additional project strategies.

194

195 ## Co-production workshops

196 Based on the recommendations from stakeholders, three co-production workshops were conducted
197 with mixed stakeholder groups to develop: an ACD template; the Trust's Recovery College course to
198 provide information on ACDs; and skills training delivered with the Trust's Simulation training team
199 on how stakeholders could create and use an ACD. The development of the ACD template involved
200 seeking views on existing documents (Crisis PaCK (27), Crisis Plus (28), Joint Crisis Plan (18), and
201 MAPS (29)). The trainings workshops sought to determine what people thought was needed to make
202 them effective for all stakeholders. The simulation training workshop allowed the Simulation team to
203 create a bespoke course to include service users and carers/supporters, as they had not previously
204 run a course for these stakeholders.

205

206 ## ACD facilitator manual and supervision

207 A co-Principal Investigator (co-PI) (CH) revised a manual drafted after the CRIMSON trial of Joint
208 Crisis Plans (18) for clinicians taking the role of the independent facilitator leading ACD creation. The
209 facilitator was independent in that they were not a part of a service user's care team. A facilitator
210 was recruited from within the NHS Trust and attended the simulation training and attended
211 fortnightly supervision via hour long virtual meetings with a project co-PI (CH) who is a psychiatrist.

212

213 ## ACD development

214 The facilitator used the AdStAC ACD template during meetings to develop ACDs. Service users were
215 invited to bring any informal carers/supporters. Meetings could be conducted via video call, phone
216 call, or in-person. The initial model was a minimum of two meetings, based on previous research
217 (18), the first including the participant's care-coordinator (a MHS member who co-ordinates a

218 service user's care across the health and care system) and the second meeting including their
219 treating psychiatrist; both to support the service user and provide their professional insights.
220 Meetings were scheduled by the facilitator and the research assistant.

221

222 ### Training – Recovery College course

223 The Recovery College course was developed to provide an opportunity for stakeholders to learn
224 about ACDs. Its development was informed by stakeholder workshops co-led by a peer trainer
225 employed by the Recovery College. The final course was produced through collaboration between
226 the peer trainer and the AdStAC team (facilitator, research associate, and research assistant) and
227 delivered by the peer trainer and facilitator with assistance from the research associate and the
228 research assistant. It was a four-day in-person course, running weekly from 10am-3pm. The course
229 included didactic and interactive components with regular space for discussion and individual and
230 group exercises.

231

232 ### Training – Simulation training

233 The simulation training was developed for stakeholders to develop skills in completing and using
234 them in their existing role. It was a full-day of in-person training comprising didactic content
235 delivered by a co-PI (CH) with a barrister (ARK) present to address legal questions; simulated
236 scenarios run by the training staff with a professional actor playing the service user that simulated
237 ACD completion and use in practice; and debriefing sessions facilitated by the training staff. Two
238 independent sessions were planned to allow modifications based on observation and participant
239 feedback.

240

241 ## Recommended strategies

242 Table 1 shows the AdStAC activities that map onto the strategies to "enhance the adoption,
243 implementation and sustainability of a clinical program or practice' and their clusters as defined by
244 the Expert Recommendations for Implementation Change (ERIC) study (30). See Additional file 2:
245 Known barriers and recommended strategies for how identified barriers to ACD implementation
246 characterised by the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research (CFIR) (31) are
247 addressed by the project strategies.

248 Table 1: AdStAC strategies and the ERIC clusters and strategies they correspond with

AdStAC strategies	**Cluster**	**Strategies**
ACD template	Provide interactive assistance	Provide local technical assistance
ACD development	Use evaluative and iterative strategies	Conduct cyclical small tests of change promote adaptability tailor strategies capture and share local knowledge identify early adopters Provide local technical assistance Purposely re-examine the implementation Use an implementation adviser facilitation
ACD facilitator manual and supervision	Develop stakeholder interrelationships Train and educate stakeholders	Identify and prepare champions Revise professional roles
Recovery College course	Train and educate stakeholders Use evaluative and iterative strategies	Conduct ongoing training Purposely re-examine the implementation Make training dynamic
Simulation training	Train and educate stakeholders Develop stakeholder inter-relationships Use evaluative and iterative strategies	Conduct ongoing training Provide ongoing consultation Model and simulate change Purposely re-examine the implementation Make training dynamic
Monthly staff meetings	Train and educate stakeholders Develop stakeholder inter-relationships Use evaluative and iterative strategies	Create a learning collaborative Identify early adopters Assess for readiness and identify barriers and facilitators Organize clinician implementation team meetings Conduct educational meetings
Presentations and films	Develop stakeholder inter-relationships Train and educate stakeholders	Identify early adopters Capture and share local knowledge Conduct educational outreach visits Develop educational materials

Advisory groups	Train and educate stakeholders Develop stakeholder inter-relationships	Conduct ongoing training Provide ongoing consultation Build a coalition Inform local opinion leaders Promote network weaving
Study protocol	Use evaluative and iterative strategies	Developing a formal implementation blueprint
Co-production workshops	Use evaluative and iterative strategies Develop stakeholder inter-relationships	Assess for readiness and identify barriers and facilitators Conduct local consensus discussions

Measures, data collection, and analysis

Recovery college course

Participants were invited to a group feedback session at the end of the course to share their opinions of the content and the experience. The researchers took notes of their responses.

Simulation learning training

Participants were asked to complete pre-course and post-course questionnaires rating their knowledge, confidence, and understanding of ACDs. Paired samples T-tests were conducted to compare pre- and post-course answers. Thematic analysis was conducted on the open-text survey given, which covered people's experience, what they learned, and, for staff, perceived influence on their practice.

ACD development

The Acceptability of Intervention Measure (AIM), Intervention Appropriateness Measure (IAM), and the Feasibility of Intervention Measure (FIM) were adapted for use by service users and staff following the authors' instructions (32).

268 Service users' trust in mental health services was assessed using an adapted single item question:
269 'Generally you can trust mental health staff and services', used previously in research with this
270 population (33) with responses on a five-point Likert scale.

271 Service users completed baseline and post ACD completion questionnaires including the item on
272 trust in services. Post ACD completion interviews of service users and staff covered acceptability,
273 appropriateness, and feasibility of the ACDs they were involved in developing using AIM, IAM and
274 FIM and open-ended questions about their experience and motivation to complete an ACD.
275 Interviews were recorded and transcribed verbatim for thematic analysis.

276 The ACD facilitator logged the profession and role of meeting attendees, the number and duration of
277 meetings, and meeting locations. Descriptive statistics were calculated for the lengths of ACD
278 development meetings, their quantity, who attended, and their location. ACD content was coded for
279 refusals and requests.

280

281 Results

282

283 Co-production workshops

284 The ACD template workshop led to the addition of a 'Who I am' section where people could include
285 content important to their sense of identity that they wanted others to know. It was felt that this
286 type of information could humanise service users and lead to less stigmatisation and more respectful
287 treatment during a relapse or crisis. Later feedback from various sources enabled the template to be
288 modified to include questions around advocacy, rephrasing of its wording to be more sensitive to
289 people's individual experiences, and flow of its presentation.

The Simulation team determined stakeholders wanted unified learning objectives across roles and then drafted learning objectives. For example, participants expressed the importance of learners understanding the document was patient-led and not like previous documents, like care plans, so one learning objective became “implement a model of decision making that is truly shared between service users, carers and healthcare professionals when making ACDs”. The team also identified beneficial and acceptable content for simulation scenarios. For example, cultural sensitivity and service user individuality were two desired themes, so the ACD creation scenarios included specific religious and dietary requests and the scenario actor was briefed to become less distressed if participants were attentive to related content in the ACD.

The Recovery College course was determined to require four sessions to cover learning objectives important for stakeholders.

Training - Simulation training

Two separate trainings occurred; the second was adapted to allow a later start time to facilitate access by some participants, for example those on sedative medication or those who had care/support commitments. Police input was sought for the development of training, but this was not obtained during the project.

Demographics

Twelve trainees attended, nine recorded as female, three as male, most were over 55 years old (n=5), and the majority identified as of a Black ethnic group (n=9). Backgrounds of trainees included service users; advocates; peer support workers; a clinical team leader; an equality, diversity, and inclusion lead; and a social worker.

Quantitative findings

Paired sample t-tests were conducted on the responses to pre- and post-course questionnaires, see table 2 for results. Higher scores denote increase in people's rated confidence, understanding, and ability. 6 trainees were excluded for providing incomplete responses.

Table 2: T-test results of pre-and post- simulation training questionnaire scores

		Paired sample characteristics			Paired samples test					
								95% Confidence Intervals		
		Mean	SD		*t*	*df*	*p*	Lower	Upper	Effect size
Overall knowledge, confidence and understanding of ACD ratings	Pre-training	3.17	0.81							
	Post-training	4.21	0.2	Pair	-5.26	5	<0.05*	-1.55	-0.53	-2.15
Confidence score in understanding what an ACD is	Pre-training	2.16	0.75					-	-	-
	Post-training	1.5	0.55	Pair	2.015	5	0.051	-	-	-
Ability score to explain to others what an ACD is	Pre-training	2	0.63					-	-	-
	Post-training	1.67	0.52	Pair	1.581	5	0.087	-	-	-
Confidence score in ability to complete an ACD	Pre-training	3.17	0.75					-	-	-
	Post-training	2	0.63	Pair	2.906	5	0.016*	-	-	-
Understanding score of who can and should be involved in ACD	Pre-training	2.5	0.55					-	-	-
	Post-training	1.67	0.52	Pair	2.711	5	0.021*	-	-	-
Understanding score of how to complete ACDs that are trauma informed	Pre-training	3.5	1.04					-	-	-
	Post-training	2	0.89	Pair	4.391	5	0.000*	-	-	-
Understanding score of how to complete ACDs that respect and value protected characteristics, cultural, and	Pre-training	3	1.09					-	-	-
	Post-training	1.67	0.52	Pair	4	5	0.005*	-	-	-

spiritual backgrounds										
Ability score to implement a model of decision making that is shared between service users, carers, and healthcare professionals	Pre-training	3	0.89					-	-	-
	Post-training	1.83	0.75	Pair	3.796	5	0.006	-	-	-
Ability score to identify and approach some of the complexities that may arise when making advanced choice documents	Pre-training	3.33	0.51					-	-	-
	Post-training	2	0.63	Pair	4	5	0.005*	-	-	-

Note: Based on responses of 6 trainees

Key: * - statistically significant results '-' – no test conducted

Qualitative findings

Four themes were identified through thematic analysis, including increased knowledge from facilitators and speakers; helpfulness of the activities; learning the importance of teamwork and collaboration; and desire for further exploration within the course (including medication refusal, simulation exercises, and how ACDs will work in practice).

Training - Recovery College course

Demographics

Twelve trainees attended, ten recorded as female, two recorded as male, with a mean age of 52 (range: 41-62yrs). Trainees included were people of lived experience, carers/supporters, third-sector organisation workers, and lived experience advisors & experts. No mental healthcare professionals

attended. Six people attended all sessions, four people attended three sessions, one attended two sessions, and one attended one session.

Feedback

Trainees described the course as informative and appreciated it being co-facilitated by a peer trainer who detailed their own views and experiences, as it made them relatable and created a safe space where trainees felt free to express themselves. Another favoured element was how interactive the sessions were. However, trainees stated the ACD and what it relates to makes it a 'heavy' document, which made the course feel somewhat challenging and that there was a need for a more digestible approach.

Generally, trainees felt more knowledgeable about how to approach making their own ACD with the appropriate people, such as MHS. Additionally, they felt they could support someone else with the making of their ACD. Trainees also felt the course would benefit friends and family of service users; peer support workers; voluntary organisation staff; carers; and mental and general health staff.

Trainees remarked that four days of training was a big commitment, as was the session length (10am-3pm). Views were mixed concerning clinical staff attendance: some thought there should be the option of a group including staff, due to the importance of having stakeholders learn from one another, while others did not want this as they did not feel that as supportive and safe a space would be possible with staff present.

ACD Development meetings

See Table 3 for demographics of service user participants. Nine ACDs were made through an average of two meetings, lasting for an average of 62 minutes. Of the 20 meetings held, 11 were

359 attended by care-coordinators, four by consultants, four by psychologists, one by a case
360 management officer, and one by a team leader. Six meetings took place in-person, and 12 by video
361 call. Six ACDs were not completed due to lack of responsiveness from clinical team to setting up
362 meetings or providing input to ACDs through offered alternate methods; clinical team members not
363 attending agreed meetings; numerous clinical team changes, facilitator responsiveness, and service
364 user disengagement. Typically, it was simpler to arrange meetings with psychologists, followed by
365 care-coordinators, then consultant psychiatrists, with the latter being more likely to attend once
366 given the option of attending for 15 minutes instead of the full hour. Approaches to scheduling were
367 adjusted with the aim of reducing delay before meetings were held and the ACD template adjusted
368 to maximise information gathering.

369

370

371 The most frequent request made in ACDs were Support (e.g., support groups, cultural support);
372 whom to notify as contact persons; strategies for de-escalation and reduction of coercive measures;
373 additional information and well-being factors (e.g., being outdoors, creative activities, support to
374 take medication); request for other treatment (e.g., psychotherapy); request for medication form;
375 refusal of specific medication; request for hospital alternative (e.g., home treatment, outpatient
376 treatment) (Table 4).

377

378 Table 3: Demographics of service user participants

Category	Total (n)
Age	
16-25	1
26-35	5
36-45	4
46-55	4
56-65	1
Recorded sex	

Female	9
Male	6
Ethnicity	
Black African	6
Black British	5
Mixed	2 (Afro-Caribbean & white English and Scottish; Black Caribbean and white Irish)
Black Other	1 (Black British Caribbean)
Black Caribbean	1
Highest level of formal education	
University undergraduate degree	6
Secondary school education	4
Post secondary education	4
University postgraduate degree	1
Housing situation	
Own house, flat or apartment (including council)	12
Live with others (in their house)	3
Living arrangement	
I live alone	8
My parent(s) or relatives	4
My children	3
Employment status	
I'm not able to work (disabled)	6
I'm looking for a job	3
I work part-time	3
I work full-time	2
I work as a volunteer (not paid)	1
Reported Diagnosis	
Schizophrenia	3
Paranoid schizophrenia	3
Psychosis	3
Bipolar disorder	2
Schizoaffective disorder	3
Anxiety and depression	1
EUPD	1
Agreement with diagnosis	
I agree fully	8
I disagree fully	3
I agree partially	3

Not sure	1
Age of first contact with services	
16-25	9
26-35	3
36-45	2
46-55	1
Number of admissions	
1	1
2-5	9
6-10	3
More than 10	2
Number of admissions under section	
One	3
Some	4
All	8

379 Note: Total count is out of 15 service user participants

380

381

382

383 Table 4. ACD Requests and refusals

Type of request			Total (n)
Main theme	Subtheme(s)		
Treatment setting preference	Treatment location	General request for and consent to hospitalisation	0
		Request for certain hospitals and wards	5
		Refusal of certain hospitals and wards	5
		Request for hospital alternative (e.g., home treatment, outpatient treatment)	8
		General refusal of hospitalisation	0
	Involvement of specific health care professionals (e.g., regular treating psychiatrist, general practitioner)		1
	Police involvement	Acceptance of police	0
		Avoid police	2
Treatment preferences	Medication preferences	Request for specific medication	3
		Refusal of specific medication	8
		Request for medication form	7
	Preferences regarding ECT	ECT request or consent	0
		ECT refusal	1
	Other treatment preferences	Request for other treatment (e.g., psychotherapy)	9
		Refusal of other treatment	0
	Refusal of all psychiatric	Yes	0

	treatment or medication	No	9
	Instructions regarding physical health conditions		3
	Additional information and well-being factors (e.g., being outdoors, creative activities, support to take medication)		9
Coercion	Strategies for de-escalation and reduction of coercive measures		7
	Preferences regarding coercive measures	Consent to and ranking of specific coercive measures	0
		Refusal of specific coercive measures	3
		Refusal of all coercive measures	0
Social instructions	Social preferences	Whom to notify as contact persons	8
		Whom not to notify	3
		Support (e.g., support groups, cultural support)	7
	Personal matters (e.g., finances, pets, dependents) + work, house		5

ACD development interviews

Demographics

Seven service users and five staff took part in the post ACD completion interviews.

Trust, acceptability, appropriateness, and feasibility

At baseline, service users responded most frequently with 'Agree' when asked whether they can trust services. At post-completion 'Agree' and 'Neither agree nor disagree' were the most frequent responses, with one respondent changing from 'disagree' to 'Neither agree nor disagree (see table 5). For service users, 'Agree' was the most common response across acceptability, appropriateness, and feasibility for their ACDs. 'Completely agree' was the second most frequent for acceptability and feasibility had the greatest number of 'Neither agree nor disagree' answers (see Additional file 3: Service user ratings of ACDs). For staff, across appropriateness and acceptability 'Completely agree' was the most common response. 'Agree' was most frequent for feasibility, which elicited the only neither 'Neither agree nor disagree' response (see Additional file 4: Staff ratings of ACDs).

Table 5. Service user ratings of their trust of services at three study points

	Baseline	Post-completion	Second Follow-up
SU1	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	NA
SU2	Agree	Agree	NA
SU3	Agree	Agree	NA
SU4	Agree	Agree	NA
SU5	Disagree	Neither agree/disagree	NA
SU6	Neither agree/disagree	Neither agree/disagree	NA
SU7	Neither agree/disagree	Neither agree/disagree	Neither agree/disagree

Service user interviews

See Table 6 for service user interview excerpts, and Additional file 6: Service user interview excerpts for those not listed here.

Process

Facilitator involvement

Generally, service users appreciated the presence of the facilitator. They cited their prompts as helpful, although service user SU6 stated that being reminded more explicitly that the ACD was a living document more often would be good. The presence and guidance of the facilitator was also seen as supportive and caring. The ease of someone else recording and summarising was also highlighted as a positive.

Staff involvement

Opinions on involvement of a service user's care team varied. Some saw it as helpful as they were able to provide important insight, and some cited their familiar presence as helping them participate in the development meetings. Others had a neutral opinion, or noted that attending staff had no

input in the meetings, without expressing any opinion on this. The brevity of staff attendance and their absence in some cases were mentioned but no explicit evaluation of this was given.

Demands

Some interviewees described the meetings as emotionally demanding and the cause of unease; SU3 stated it can be a daunting task. No participants reported feeling pressured in meetings when asked; however, SU7 didn't feel able to challenge the facilitator's summary when asked to review an initial draft of their ACD. The length of meetings was seen as appropriate for the content of the meetings and not demanding, but the time between meetings and between the last meeting and receiving ACDs to review was described as long.

Quality of ACD

Service users described their ACD as well made, comprehensive, and a good summary of who they were as a person and their experience. However, SU2 stressed that the ACD was only an indicator of who they were. Most asked for corrections to be made but most did not express an issue with what had to be adjusted. However, SU7 expressed that they felt their racialised experience of services, an experience important to them, was left out. After edits to their ACD were made in response to this, SU7 felt satisfied with the final ACD.

Benefits

Drive to complete

Participants cited multiple reasons for choosing to make an ACD, including being heard and increasing their autonomy. A desire to increase understanding was also mentioned multiple times, primarily in staff, but also family. Related to this, some people also wanted to avoid the repetition of coercive treatment and negative experiences with mental health services.

On taking part

Service users reported positive feelings for themselves and towards services. For services, participants detailed having a confidence in them, feeling listened to and respected, and being appreciative of having the opportunity to express themselves. SU3 however had an unchanged opinion of services, as they reported previously having confidence in them. Participants expressed finding the experience empowering and having a greater sense of control and feeling more involved in their care. Some found the experience itself enjoyable, for SU1 this was because they were being heard. Others were pleased with themselves for taking part and shared that it was a way to appreciate themselves due to the reflection involved, and others felt they had increased in self-confidence. The ACD development process was also appreciated for its personalised approach, which was described as humanising by some. SU7 also mentioned how the ACD provided reassurance for carers/supporters, which was of value to them.

Hope

Participants shared that they were hopeful creating the ACD would bring about better treatment for themselves when in contact with mental health services and be a part of a more holistic approach to their care. SU7 also described the potential of ACDs to reduce police aggression and violence against people from minoritised groups.

When asked what they would say to someone considering ACDs, participants cited the support or facilitation of support for their mental health needs as a reason to complete it. Additional reasons were its ability to increase understanding of who they are as an individual and to have their care personalised. Related to this, participants also mentioned having more say in their care and empowering themselves. The ACD was also spoken of in terms of safety and it being a safety net, with SU7 describing it as a practical solution to racial inequalities.

Honouring

Uncertainty

Uncertainty was widely expressed about whether ACDs would be used. Service users stated either they could not know until it was in practice or that they weren't familiar enough with ACDs to say. Some said their satisfaction with developing an ACD was dependent upon how it would be adhered to/honoured. Others were sceptical about whether it would be used, with some citing having low confidence in services or police using it, due to previous experiences. Participants also expressed uncertainty when asked what they would say to people considering ACDs, because they themselves were sceptical or inexperienced with ACDs. However, SU4 and SU1 had a general confidence it would be used.

Influencing factors

Participants felt the honouring of their ACDs depended upon staff training and awareness of ACDs. Furthermore, participants felt how staff and police regarded ACDs would have an impact on whether they were utilised. SU7 felt that for ACDs to be honoured an advocate would need to be involved. SU1 believed their own behaviour would have an influence on whether people would adhere to their ACD. Participants also generally felt that staff capacity and services in general being overwhelmed presented a risk of their ACD not being honoured.

Table 6: Service user interview excerpts

Theme	Subthemes and excerpts
Process	Staff involvement
	"Ohh, I think [the care team's input] was fine. I think my care coordinator is, I've been there for a couple of years now, so she kind of has an

	understanding of what I've been going through, so it was, it was fine. With the doctors it's different because that, in the service, like I don't get the same doctor every time. It changes continuously so that doctor doesn't, we don't really get to build a rapport with them”
	“It was also good to have [member of care team/psychologist] for the first session in so far as she was able to, umm, refine some things or remind of some things and sort of guide the session a little bit or provide context in ways that I actually needed at different times”
	Facilitator involvement
	“[The facilitator] was so patient. She was understanding she she made sure there was clarity with what I was trying to express and she really took her time. Which is, which is really, she tried to put herself in in my, she was empathetic, let me say that. There was empathy there, which I really, really appreciated.”
	“I think just sort of like support around the whole thing, it's just like, OK, I am taking all these down and you know and you're you're always free to amend or change and add to it as you see needed. Maybe just having that said a few more times during like the the sessions would be would be a good thing for people like me, that's all.”
	Demands
	“It was at times emotional remembering some of the things that I've experienced. But I did feel like I was supported and cared for in the process.”
	“The actual process was quick, but getting the feedback took a little while. I did it in April and I didn't receive the feedback until July, so I don't know whether that that means there's been improvement there or if it's just something that normally happens. But it's just, it felt like a long time to get the feedback back after doing the initial appointment.”
	Quality of ACD
	“[My ACD] seems like a very well done, well presented document that I'd be happy for mental health teams to see in the future. Um, this seems like a very just well put document something that I'd be happy for anyone to see really.”
	“The facilitator said she said she's gonna send me a final copy... they sent me a PDF copy of it with, just for me to check if there's any alterations required, I replied to her with...what needs to be changed and then, i think she said she'll get back to me. So that needs to be checked up a bit more, there's a few issues that I had to correct on it. They said they received the corrections. I think they said they'll let me know when it's been corrected. So that needs to be followed up as well.”
Benefits	Drive to complete
	“As a minority woman I felt it was really important to have my voice heard because two of the most, two of the most distressing factors of being in an institution was one, immediately I was deemed aggressive and I wasn't, particularly aggressive. My, obviously everything was very heightened, but I remember, they sort of took me and and didn't explain to me what the medication was. I've not been raised on western medication. So instead of that I experienced restraint...and I just felt, I felt it's, I mean there's been a lot of research into how Black people are categorised in mental health. How we're given certain diagnosis, that apparently are almost like trends at that time, like for example, schizophrenia, lots of Black males were told they had

	schizophrenia over a period of time in the 80s and 90s. And I think if you're a woman of colour and you are advocating for your rights, they, I just felt they just wanted me to be silent and doped up."
	"I wanted to complete an advance statement due to the treatment that I received the second time that I was sectioned. I wanted to be, for people to be clear, including like my family and the people who are, i'm in the care of, to understand the kind of person that I am and also my requirements if I would need to be hospitalised again."
	On taking part
	"It made me feel more, complete. It's had me reflect on who I am and what I know to be true about me. And I think, it's helped me to integrate my mental health experiences with me when I'm well. And so, I feel like I have a better picture of myself in totality. As a person versus my mental health is separate from me as a person and and that sad, disappointing, scary part of me...it just sort of helped me to integrate, I would say. Or it was an opportunity for me to integrate."
	"Made me feel about myself?...so take more control, I'm taking more control of my mental health, considering all these admissions I've had over the years, it makes me feel I have a say in my care for the first time, yeah. It made me to feel I've taken control of my care"
	Hope
	"Well, it's, it's for [the police's] education. You know, the police need to educate themselves. It's very tempting as a, as a brown skin, as a Black person to to hate the police. It's very tempting to do that, but I like to try and see hope in everything and I hope that they can come to learn ethnic minorities on a deeper level because then that removes their fear of us and then you can have some sort of progress because you're working with a person, you're not working with a person that you see as a threat to you, and hopefully will reduce some of some of the kind of, you know, psychological microaggressions or actual violence. I mean, there's been many cases of of police murdering Black people with mental health."
	"Just try and be part of the solution. Just try and be part of the solution. You know that that that's the only thing that we can do. Yes, we can rage and yes, and we can fight back and everything like that. That's all good as well. But try and find practical Solutions, long term change, I think that's Our responsibility."
Honouring	Uncertainty
	"I feel confident that something is in place in case I become unwell and I'm just happy that my my preferences have been put in place beforehand and I I believe I have confidence that the system will work, that the advance statement, you know if if if it needs to be implemented, it will work."
	"I don't think [the police] would be that interested in advanced statements. I really don't. Yeah. I'd say it's a good idea if they wanna just make sure that people know how they would like to be dealt with and a bit about them before they just get seen as just another patient. But at the same time, like I just mentioned, I'm not too sure how, whether you know once we do something like this, whether it will actually be implemented or not, or the staff will actually use it to make decisions and what happens with us."
	Influencing factors
	"I feel that if you know if a person is to ever do need psychiatric care, if it does get adhered to, then the potential to have a much more comfortable

	stay in hospital is there, but that's if it's really listened to and I feel like it might need an advocate for it, you know, if you become incoherent, um, and you're not able to refer back to it yourself, then maybe some advocacy would be complementary."
	"Maybe I'm like 30%, 30 to 40% confident, because I think in high pressure situations people might not feel like they have the time to, really do, do the review and try to put things in, but going through the process has me feel a bit more at ease that I at least had a say in how I wanted my care to go."

Staff interviews

See Table 7 for staff interview excerpts, and Additional file 7: Service user interview excerpts for those not listed here.

Process

Approach

Staff remarked how the process of creating the ACD felt collaborative in a way that felt personalised to the service user. Staff also approved of the ease of the process and the flexibility in respect to scheduling and meeting location. Whilst participants said no improvements were needed, it was mentioned how the delay in meetings and getting completed ACDs back was an issue that could impact on service user motivation.

Care team involvement

Some participants highlighted the need for a member of the care team to be present in meetings as their insight can be uniquely useful; particularly if a service user is being reserved, or alternatively an independent facilitator would need to be vigilant about this. Additionally, staff noted that a service user's wellness was a factor that needed to be monitored and that their care team was well suited to

advise on this. Some staff shared that they did not feel an independent facilitator was essential for the ACD to be developed; MHS6 felt it was unlikely they'll be available when ACDs are upscaled, so the process needs to be adjusted for care teams to facilitate ACD development.

Independent facilitator impact

Staff shared how the presence of the facilitator as an independent party allowed for a safe space to be created, which was supportive for both staff and service users. In this space it was said that there was an increased sense of openness that led to conversations that were not had in regular interactions. The involvement of a neutral party was also seen as beneficial in reducing the impact of staff conflict of interest, who may have their own priorities regarding a service user's care that differ to the service users. Staff frequently commented on the positive input of the facilitator and their sensitivity in dealing with challenging topics and their making the process a personalised experience.

Benefits

For staff

Generally, participants saw the ACD as informative and a useful tool, with MHS3 saying that it could provide targets where it was not previously known what works for service users or there was a lack of understanding about an aspect of their life. MHS4 also shared how the project being focused on Black people and then developing the ACD with that in mind made them think about how someone's colour or culture could impact their experience of mental health services, in a way they hadn't considered before in their work. The process itself was also said to be rewarding for staff, with MHS1 finding it enjoyable.

For service users

Staff saw the ACDs as an opportunity for service users to: be heard and have more input in their care; to prepare for their future care; preserve their rights during their contact with services; and to be given a sense of safety that they will be looked after in their preferred way. ACDs were seen as part of a holistic approach to care through more personalised action, and MHS3 noted they saw ACDs as a continuation of community care. Staff mentioned the importance of ACDs being completed by Black service users due to social inequities and hoped that having ACDs would provide them the confidence to access services when needed. MHS5 raised that due to the sensitive work involved in developing an ACD and the hope that it can offer, not honouring an ACD would have a significantly negative impact on service users.

Application

Barriers

Staff reported they would reserve stating how confident they were in ACDs until they were used in practice. They mentioned that whether ACDs would be honoured would be dependent on both requests and context, for example, which team was involved and in which clinical setting. Communication on wards was particularly highlighted as a barrier, as was collaboration between teams. MHS3 cited the latter as requiring proactiveness with ACDs. Staff thought that it would be easier to communicate the need to check an ACD with community mental health teams than with ward teams, and MHS5 felt confident the community teams would access it. Staff were unsure how police would interact with ACDs, due to not having much contact with them, but mentioned how police are busy and react to things quickly and that this would likely affect whether they would check whether someone has an ACD or adhere to it. MHS4 felt that if a service user had recurrent contact with police, they may be prompted to access their ACD.

Enablers

Staff awareness of a service user having an ACD or knowing what they were and how to use them was seen as key to them being honoured. ACD champions were one solution suggested to ensure clinical teams were made aware and accessed them. Participants also expressed concerns about how easily they could be accessed. They wondered what their visibility would be like on the used electronic clinical records system and highlighted the importance of them not being lost in patient notes. Staff also stressed the importance of the ACD being connected with legislation as an important part in garnering interest and faith in ACDs for service users. Generally, a wider rollout was sought to realise the potential benefits of ACDs. ACD completion when service users were well was underlined as crucial for achieving the benefits of ACDs for service users.

Table 7: Staff interview excerpts

Theme	Subthemes and excerpts
Process	Approach
	"I thought was a really nice collaborative process. I know that the service user we did it for, certainly enjoyed it. It was really beneficial having...an external facilitator kind of come in and do that as well, I think because it just guided our thinking. So yeah, it was, it was, I thought, was really helpful, as did, as did my client."
	"There was a bit of a delay, which is, you know, probably inevitable in the paperwork being completed, erm which might have perhaps meant things went off the boil a little bit. Umm, I've actually still got some sections to look at err to complete, yeah....so I think I think between us having the interviews and the actual advance statement being written up for my clients comments and mine and the doctors erm you know there was several months. So, I think maybe you perhaps lose a little bit of momentum...Umm yeah, but I'm, I'm not, that's not a criticism, you know, I understand people are, you know, overwhelmed."
	Care team involvement
	"There was one point when I erm where I kind of stepped in and wanted to kind of highlight and, you know, what, how somebody might misunderstand here. What might somebody see and how might that not be your normal self? Because it felt like compared to what I knew of the client and what they've shared with me in CBT, they were being a little bit more cautious in terms of what they were stating for the document."
	"The facilitator didn't know the client, but I was present and I did, so I was able to do that prompting and that might be the case for most people who complete it, that just the the fact of having somebody there who knows that means there's that bit of prompting if somebody isn't being that assertive…this was a client who was particularly self-critical, so [they] might say kind of well if I was coming across as kind of angry or aggressive or blah

	blah blah would describe things in quite judgmental language and I was kind of prompting [them] to be like, what exactly might you be saying? How else might somebody experience that erm rather than to kind of be critical of [themselves] in [their] describing of what [they] might be like when [they] was well, unwell, sorry. And so yeah, it might just be a facilitator is able to kind of keep an eye out for when people's self-esteem or self-criticism might impact on the completion process and and be ready to give a bit of a prompt if someone is using quite kind of, yeah, self, self-disparaging or self-critical language."
	Independent facilitator impact
	"One of the advantages I noticed that patient were able to talk about things they haven't been mentioning before in a consultation and with their meeting with with a care-coordinator, but they might be able to, there was, the patient was able to talk about it in, while we're being completing them, advance statement, and I think it give us a bit, little bit better understanding when patient might stop or refuse a treatment and a kind of, when we understand why it's happening, it's a field we can work on to just to improve kind of compliance and overall well-being."
	Yeah. So, in terms of the experience of getting them completed, it was a really positive experience erm with the client that I referred. I think she found it really useful and it was really helpful to kind of hear how kind of unbiased and open all of the questioning was with with her. So rather than trying to lead her to a particular response or erm entry in the document, it felt like there was lots and lots of effort to make sure it really reflected her preferences and her wishes. Erm, it seemed really, really helpful.
Benefits	For staff
	I haven't used [an ACD] yet, but I do know it's quite helpful. I mean my background is inpatient and community as well and I do know when people come in in a really terrible state, they don't, they can't tell you a lot, so I think knowing what their wish would be in terms of treatment helps a lot, professional, help professionals a lot to kind of make sure we're doing the right thing in supporting that person in that, in their recovery.
	"I do a lot of CBT for people with bipolar disorder, so advanced planning and relapse prevention planning is part and parcel of that work all the time erm but certainly this project has prompted me to think a bit about how the person's kind of colour and cultural background might have a particular impact on their experience of mental health services in those crisis points."
	For service users
	"I think it's very useful to have our, umm, Black service users making advance statement. As we all know, there is this unconscious bias about Black service users using the service and the treatment they've had in the past. So, it's it's helpful that we can get their voice in the treatment and and also, yeah, and it gives them the confidence of accessing the service too, because a lot of them do not access the service for the simple reason that they know a lot of people in the past has not had the, had had been treated, I would say perhaps differently, but I know that's all changing as well. So it's nice to give them that confidence that the service is changing and they they've been heard and them having an advanced statement will be helpful in their recovery as well"
	"So, I felt it was a very therapeutic interview. We did two, I I was involved in two actually erm I thought it was very positive about kind of, you know, uh,

	capturing my client's kind of personality that things that were important to [them] and the some of the distressing experiences [they'd] had. So, it did feel very positive."
Application	Barriers
	"I think erm you know, it would be important to have some kind of meetings with with relevant staff so that it is really given a high profile, because otherwise it may not got followed and then that would be detrimental actually if people have gone to the bother of doing it and then feel it's not being followed. That would be, you know, sort of worse actually than not doing it. You see what I mean? So that slightly concerns me because all these things are emergencies. I happen to be an [Approved Mental Health Professional]"
	"I think for other people that I've used advance statements with where their preferences might be quite strong in terms of 'I'm always offered this medication, I hate this medication, I really don't want that, I want something different.' I can imagine that there might be more challenges with implementing it, because somebody might read well it's your preference, but that's not what I think you should have, and there might be more of a tension between what a team thinks is the right thing and what the person has requested."
	Facilitators
	"I think some something maybe where there was kind of champions or whatever, so there was somebody who would, you know, in the ward who would be responsible for, you know, yeah erm disseminating the information. Erm so that it, you know, like you might have a lead on the ward for carers or something. Somebody who would take on that role on on wards erm, because otherwise communication is notoriously difficult erm, because it's essential on the wards that this information is there."
	"To my recollection, [they] didn't request anything that would be really, really outside of normal care practices. So rather than thinking do, you know, actually people have a tendency to really misunderstand me and they really need to kind of pay lots of attention to this document before I receive any treatment otherwise, things can go terribly wrong. It felt more like some of [their] things were about I'd slightly preferred this over this and if I am on a ward, these are the kind of things I would like these are people that need to be contacted. So I think it'd be quite feasible for it to be followed."

Discussion

The project set out to develop an implementation resource to get ACDs to work for Black people and those that support them. An ACD template, two sets of training, and a facilitation process were developed and used in the creation of ACDs, and the development of awareness and skills associated

583 with ACDs and their use. In addition to gaining insights into the meaning of ACDs for service users
584 and staff, the project identified key issues for the upscaling and routine use of ACDs.

585 Training of staff may not be achievable through the developed courses. The Recovery College
586 course, which was developed into a four-day course, had no clinical staff attendance, likely due to
587 the time commitment required and lack of an official requirement to attend. This absence does not
588 fulfil the joint-learning requested by stakeholders in workshops; however, the attendees largely
589 accepted the lack of staff attending and some preferred this. Simulation training trainees generally
590 reported finding the training useful for practical application in various stages of creating and using
591 ACDs. A noteworthy finding was that they felt less confident to complete ACDs than before they
592 started. This could be due to them believing they knew what ACDs were beforehand and then
593 finding that they were different to what they expected, and perhaps more complex. The reach of
594 this training's observed value may be limited as simulation training needs to be delivered in small
595 groups.

596 The completion of the ACD development meetings requires a degree of swiftness from staff which
597 can be hard to achieve. Service users expressed how demanding the process could be; and staff
598 believed it was important to time the meetings for when service users were well and to complete
599 ACDs promptly to avoid demotivation. However, staff cited high workload and higher priorities as
600 reasons for not attending or rearranging meetings, which increased time spent arranging meetings.

601 As there were substantial delays in setting up first or second meetings, due to lack of staff
602 availability or response, some meetings went ahead without staff present. It was found that the
603 presence of a care-coordinator was not always necessary for productive meetings; however, one
604 instance showed that having someone who knew the service user at the first meeting was crucial in
605 establishing the context of discussions. Additionally, although staff presence was sometimes not
606 considered vital by service users, some noted that it was reassuring.

607 Staff generally approved of the process of creating ACDs and described the creation and use of ACDs
608 as well aligned to community care practice. This contrasts previous findings of resistance to the role
609 of the facilitator, doubts about ability to follow preferences, and beliefs that the process duplicates
610 existing practice (21). However, it does support findings that some MHS believe having an
611 independent facilitator can lead to the successful completion of ACDs, particularly due to their
612 impartiality and having time to complete the document (34). Although some staff felt that a service
613 user's care team could facilitate ACD creation, this was partly due to scepticism regarding the use of
614 facilitators being scaled-up rather than resistance to their role.

615 Though service users generally reported positive views about the meetings, the act of creating an
616 ACD, and their ACD, echoing previous research findings (18,27,35), people from historically
617 marginalised groups and those who have individual negative experiences with services may still find
618 it difficult to speak freely when invited to by MHS. Discussion of racialised experience is not routine,
619 as exemplified by the staff member who required prompting to consider how a service user's lived
620 reality as a Black person may influence their experience of mental health care, and the service user
621 who had an additional meeting to discuss following encouragement from the researcher (AJS). This
622 project may have partly facilitated this, through the project title and its self-identified race/ethnicity-
623 based eligibility criterion, but project observations suggests that more explicit encouragement is
624 needed. This may cause discomfort in meetings already found to be challenging by service users; we
625 therefore suggest that this encouragement is made in initial offers to make an ACD, so that service
626 users can consider discussing these experiences beforehand, and that staff and facilitator training
627 covers the need to discuss these experiences as part of ACD creation.

628 The content of service user ACDs varied from including personally known people in their mental
629 health care, reducing staff coercion and how to do this, the way they received their medication,
630 what medication they did not want, specific requests for psychotherapy or art therapy, letting MHS
631 know what additional things help them, such as particular creative activities or being outside, and

requests for treatment at home when possible. Such requests if honoured have the potential to lead to the strengthening of therapeutic relationships, fewer hospital admissions, and an increased sense of safety and being supported in a personal manner. It is noteworthy that there were no refusals of all coercive measures, but none consented to or ranked any particular measures. Also, a minority mentioned the police in their ACD, despite either having past interactions with police or recognising the possibility of their involvement in the future.

Both service users and staff reserved judgement on the likelihood of ACD content being honoured, with staff describing awareness, content and service context as influencing this. Staff capacity was also cited as an issue in ACDs being honoured, due to staff overwhelm and the NHS being under pressure overall. Advocates and staff ACD champions were suggested to help with staff accessing and honouring ACDs in busy environments such as wards. Champions on wards are generally accepted as playing a significant role in implementation (36,37) and culturally appropriate advocates have been said to be useful in having service users' needs met and rights adhered to (38). These points highlight how ultimately for ACDs to work for Black service users, in addition to specific strategies, a culture prioritising the service user's voice is essential. This further highlights the need for ACDs to have legislative backing and having considered reasoning for not honouring them. Scepticism also existed around whether police would read or honour ACDs irrespective of training, due to them not seeing it as priority.

Strengths and limitations

Carrying out this study within one service provider allowed the creation of a resource that is feasible for use in its context and was largely acceptable to participating service users and staff. The focus on Black service users also enabled the development of a resource that aims to improve mental health equity, a resource well suited for further improvements and adaptions with this aim in mind. The project therefore established a useful foundation to apply and evaluate this resource on a larger

scale. The small sample size however limits the findings' generalisability, and the lack of staff attendance at the trainings limits what can be said about the usefulness for the everyday practice of staff and whether this varies between staff types. No forensic service users or staff were included in the study despite attempts to and given the disproportionate number of Black people in such services, the resource needs to be piloted and amended as needed for use within these services. Although carers/supporters were involved in the co-production phase and attended both sets of training, none were included in ACD development meetings. Further study is needed to find out why and how better to include them. The confidence in the findings from the AIM, IAM, and FIM implementation outcome measures is also limited, due to the repetitive nature of the questions. Importantly, the time frame of this project did not allow follow up to ascertain rates of access to and honouring of ACDs, nor to develop and test a process for their review.

Implications

Adaptations are likely to be needed to optimise implementability in other services and in other populations. In addition to the need to adapt and pilot ACDs in forensic services, this will also be needed for child and adolescent mental health services and those for older adults.

Further implementation studies will need to consider both additional strategies and research questions. Besides training that can easily be accessed by staff, other strategies are likely to be needed to increase the agility of community staff to respond to requests for ACDs. The digitisation of ACDs is likely to aid efficiencies in ACD creation and development, quality, safety monitoring, and routine clinical notes retrieval, and so should also be considered an important part of ACD implementation. Strategies are also needed to enable discussions about care influenced by other characteristics such as gender identity, sexuality, religion, etc. One possibility is that the role of the independent facilitator be expanded to promote this change in culture. Likewise, strategies will be needed to encourage relevant professionals to follow the content. While we did not encounter the

682 same attitudinal barriers that have affected previous research, we cannot assume they are now non-
683 existent. Furthermore, it still needs to be determined whether trial findings regarding the use of the
684 MHA and therapeutic alliance can be replicated through routine use, even with implementation
685 resources and strategies in place, for example due to trial samples not being representative of wider
686 populations. This includes the question of whether ACDs can improve mental health equity. These
687 questions need to be approached with observational and quasi experimental study designs. Finally,
688 there is no evidence about predictors of whether ACD content is accessed and followed, including
689 characteristics of services, mental health staff, service users, or ACD content. This question requires
690 large sample sizes, follow up lengths sufficient for periods when ACDs should be accessed, and
691 informatics work. Future work by our group will address these questions to fully realise the potential
692 of ACDs in addressing inequity in mental health care and enhancing the impact of mental health
693 services more widely.

694

695 # Abbreviations

696

697 AdStAC – Advance Statements for Black African and Caribbean people
698 ACD – Advance Choice Document
699 AIM - Acceptability of Intervention Measure (AIM), and the (FIM)
700 CFIR - Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research
701 co-PI – co-principal investigator
702 ERIC - Expert Recommendations for Implementation Change
703 FIM - Feasibility of Intervention Measure
704 IAM - Intervention Appropriateness Measure
705 MHA – Mental health act
706 MHA review - 2018 Independent Review of the UK Mental Health Act
707 MHS – Mental health staff
708 NHS – National Health Service
709

References

1. Barnett P, Mackay E, Matthews H, Gate R, Greenwood H, Ariyo K, et al. Ethnic variations in compulsory detention under the Mental Health Act: a systematic review and meta-analysis of international data. Lancet Psychiatry. 2019 Apr;6(4):305–17. doi: 10.1016/S2215-0366(19)30027-6.

2. National Collaborating Centre for Mental Health. Ethnic Inequalities in Improving Access to Psychological Therapies (IAPT) [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2023 Dec]. Available from: https://www.nhsrho.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/10/Ethnic-Inequalities-in-Improving-Access-to-Psychological-Therapies-IAPT.Full-report.pdf

3. Bansal N, Karlsen S, Sashidharan SP, Cohen R, Chew-Graham CA, Malpass A. Understanding ethnic inequalities in mental healthcare in the UK: A meta-ethnography. PLoS Med. 2022 Dec;19(12):e1004139. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1004139.

4. Halvorsrud K, Nazroo J, Otis M, Brown Hajdukova E, Bhui K. Ethnic inequalities and pathways to care in psychosis in England: a systematic review and meta-analysis. BMC Med. 2018 Dec 12;16(1):223. doi: 10.1186/s12916-018-1201-9.

5. Nazroo JY, Bhui KS, Rhodes J. Where next for understanding race/ethnic inequalities in severe mental illness? Structural, interpersonal and institutional racism. Sociol Health Illn. 2020 Feb 27;42(2):262–76. doi: 10.1111/1467-9566.13001.

6. Department of Health & Social Care. Modernising the Mental Health Act: Increasing Choice, Reducing Compulsion [Internet]. 2018 [cited 2023 Oct] Available from: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5c6596a7ed915d045f37798c/Modernising_the_Mental_Health_Act_-_increasing_choice__reducing_compulsion.pdf

7. Molyneaux E, Turner A, Candy B, Landau S, Johnson S, Lloyd-Evans B. Crisis-planning interventions for people with psychotic illness or bipolar disorder: Systematic review and meta-analyses. BJPsych Open. 2019 Jul 13;5(4):e53. doi: 10.1192/bjo.2019.28.

8. Tinland A, Loubière S, Mougeot F, Jouet E, Pontier M, Baumstarck K, et al. Effect of psychiatric advance directives facilitated by peer workers on compulsory admission among people with mental illness. JAMA Psychiatry. 2022 Aug 1;79(8):752. doi: 10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2022.1627.

9. de Jong MH, Kamperman AM, Oorschot M, Priebe S, Bramer W, van de Sande R, et al. Interventions to reduce compulsory psychiatric admissions: A systematic review and meta-analysis. JAMA Psychiatry. 2016 Jul 1;73(7):657-64. doi: 10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2016.0501.

10. Barrett B, Waheed W, Farrelly S, Birchwood M, Dunn G, Flach C, et al. Randomised controlled trial of joint crisis plans to reduce compulsory treatment for people with psychosis: Economic outcomes. PLoS One. 2013 Nov 25;8(11):e74210. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0074210.

11. Owen GS, Gergel T, Stephenson LA, Hussain O, Rifkin L, Keene AR. Advance decision-making in mental health – Suggestions for legal reform in England and Wales. Int J Law Psychiatry. 2019 May 1;64:162–77. doi: 10.1016/j.ijlp.2019.02.002

12. Department of Health and Social Care. Modernising the Mental Health Act – final report from the independent review [Internet]. 2018 [cited 2023 Oct]. Available from:

750 https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/modernising-the-mental-health-act-final-
751 report-from-the-independent-review

752 13. Department of Health and Social Care & Ministry of Justice. Draft Mental Health Bill
753 [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2024 Feb]. Available from:
754 https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/draft-mental-health-bill-2022

755 14. Parkman SE, Davies SN, Leese M, Phelan M, Thornicroft G. Ethnic differences in satisfaction
756 with mental health services among representative people with psychosis in South London:
757 PRiSM Study 4. British Journal of Psychiatry. 1997 Sep 3;171(3):260–4. doi:
758 10.1192/bjp.171.3.260.

759 15. Keating F, Robertson D, Francis E, McCulloch A. Breaking Circles of Fear: A Review of the
760 relationship between mental health services and African and Caribbean communities.
761 London: Sainsbury Centre for Mental Health, 2002.

762 16. Memon A, Taylor K, Mohebati LM, Sundin J, Cooper M, Scanlon T, et al. Perceived barriers to
763 accessing mental health services among black and minority ethnic (BME) communities: a
764 qualitative study in Southeast England. BMJ Open. 2016 Nov 16;6(11):e012337. doi:
765 10.1136/bmjopen-2016-012337.

766 17. Swanson J, Swartz M, Ferron J, Elbogen E, Van Dorn R. Psychiatric advance directives among
767 public mental health consumers in five U.S. cities: Prevalence, demand, and correlates. J Am
768 Acad Psychiatry Law. 2006 [cited 2023 Oct];34(1):43–57.
769 https://jaapl.org/content/34/1/43.long

770 18. Thornicroft G, Farrelly S, Szmukler G, Birchwood M, Waheed W, Flach C, et al. Clinical
771 outcomes of Joint Crisis Plans to reduce compulsory treatment for people with psychosis: A
772 randomised controlled trial. The Lancet. 2013 May 11;381(9878):1634–41. doi:
773 10.1016/S0140-6736(13)60105-1.

774 19. Joint Committee on the Draft Mental Health Bill. Draft Mental Health Bill 2022 - Report of
775 session 2022–23 [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2024 Feb]. Available from:
776 https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/jt5803/jtselect/jtmentalhealth/696/report.html

777 20. Sellars M, Fullam R, O'Leary C, Mountjoy R, Mawren D, Weller P, et al. Australian
778 Psychiatrists' Support for Psychiatric Advance Directives: Responses to a Hypothetical
779 Vignette. Psychiatry, Psychology and Law. 2017 Jan 2;24(1):61–73. doi:
780 10.1080/13218719.2016.1198224.

781 21. Farrelly S, Lester H, Rose D, Birchwood M, Marshall M, Waheed W, et al. Barriers to shared
782 decision making in mental health care: qualitative study of the Joint Crisis Plan for psychosis.
783 Health Expect. 2016 Apr;19(2):448–58. doi: 10.1111/hex.12368.

784 22. Babatunde A, Simpson AJ, Gilbert S, Simpson A, Stephenson L, Owen G, et al. People, process
785 and power: implementing advance choice documents for Black people in mental healthcare.
786 PsyArXiv. [Preprint] 2024 March 14 [cited 2024 March];
787 https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/c7tqf.

788 23. Babatunde A, Ruck Keene A, Simpson A, Gilbert S, Stephenson L, Chua KC, et al. Advance
789 Statements for Black African and Caribbean people (AdStAC): Protocol for an implementation
790 study. BMC Psychiatry. 2023 May 17;23(1):344. doi: 10.1186/s12888-023-04825-6.

791 24. Langley GJ, Moen RD, Nolan KM, Nolan TW, Norman CL, Provost LP. The improvement guide:
792 A practical approach to enhancing organizational performance. 2nd ed. John Wiley & Sons;
793 2009.

794 25. Office for National Statistics. Ethnic group - Census Maps, ONS [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2023
795 Dec]. Available from: https://www.ons.gov.uk/census/maps/choropleth/identity/ethnic-
796 group/ethnic-group-tb-6a/black-black-british-black-welsh-caribbean-or-african

797 26. Hayes D, Camacho EM, Ronaldson A, Stepanian K, McPhilbin M, Elliott RA, et al. Evidence-
798 based Recovery Colleges: developing a typology based on organisational characteristics,
799 fidelity and funding. Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol. 2023 Mar 11; 1-10. doi:
800 10.1007/s00127-023-02452-w.

801 27. Stephenson LA, Gergel T, Ruck Keene A, Rifkin L, Owen G. The PACT advance decision-making
802 template: preparing for Mental Health Act reforms with co-production, focus groups and
803 consultation. Int J Law Psychiatry. 2020 Jul;71:101563. doi: 10.1016/j.ijlp.2020.101563.

804 28. Sonigra KR, McIvor L, Payne-Gill J, Smith T, Beck A. A preliminary evaluation of Crisis Plus: A
805 model for working with frequent users of psychiatric crisis and inpatient services. Mental
806 Health Review Journal. 2023 Nov 9;28(4):350–61. doi:10.1108/mhrj-05-2022-0031.

807 29. Lenagh-Glue J, O'Brien A, Dawson J, Thom K, Potiki J, Casey H, et al. A MAP to mental health:
808 The process of creating a collaborative advance preferences instrument. N Z Med J. 2018 Nov
809 30 [cited 2023 Oct];131(1486):18–26. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30496163/.

810 30. Proctor EK, Powell BJ, McMillen JC. Implementation strategies: Recommendations for
811 specifying and reporting. Implementation Science. 2013 Dec 1;8(1):139. doi: 10.1186/1748-
812 5908-8-139.

813 31. Waltz TJ, Powell BJ, Fernández ME, Abadie B, Damschroder LJ. Choosing implementation
814 strategies to address contextual barriers: Diversity in recommendations and future directions.
815 Implementation Science. 2019 Dec 29;14(1):42. doi: 10.1186/s13012-019-0892-4.

816 32. Weiner BJ, Lewis CC, Stanick C, Powell BJ, Dorsey CN, Clary AS, et al. Psychometric
817 assessment of three newly developed implementation outcome measures. Implement Sci.
818 2017 Aug 29;12(1):108. doi: 10.1186/s13012-017-0635-3.

819 33. Henderson RC, Williams P, Gabbidon J, Farrelly S, Schauman O, Hatch S, et al. Mistrust of
820 mental health services: ethnicity, hospital admission and unfair treatment. Epidemiol
821 Psychiatr Sci. 2015 Jun 17;24(3):258–65. doi: 10.1017/S2045796014000158.

822 34. Farrelly S, Lester H, Rose D, Birchwood M, Marshall M, Waheed W, et al. Improving
823 Therapeutic Relationships: Joint crisis planning for individuals with psychotic disorders. Qual
824 Health Res. 2015 Dec;25(12):1637–47. doi: 10.1177/1049732314566320.

825 35. Rixe J, Neumann E, Möller J, Macdonald L, Wrona E, Bender S, et al. Joint crisis plans and
826 crisis cards in inpatient psychiatric treatment. Dtsch Arztebl Int. 2023 Feb 24; 120(8):125-132.
827 doi: 10.3238/arztebl.m2022.0384.

828 36. Powell BJ, Waltz TJ, Chinman MJ, Damschroder LJ, Smith JL, Matthieu MM, et al. A refined
829 compilation of implementation strategies: results from the Expert Recommendations for
830 Implementing Change (ERIC) project. Implement Sci. 2015 Feb 12;10:21. doi:
831 10.1186/s13012-015-0209-1.

37. Bunce AE, Gruß I, Davis J V., Cowburn S, Cohen D, Oakley J, et al. Lessons learned about the effective operationalization of champions as an implementation strategy: results from a qualitative process evaluation of a pragmatic trial. Implementation Science. 2020 Oct 1;15(1):87. doi: 10.1186/s13012-020-01048-1.

38. Salla A, Newbigging K, Joseph D, Eneje E. A conceptual framework for culturally appropriate advocacy with racialised groups. Front Psychiatry. 2023 Jul 11;14:1173591. doi: 10.3389/fpsyt.2023.1173591

Additional files

File name: Additional file 1

File format: Microsoft Word Document, DOC

Title of data: Additional project strategies

Description: Project strategies not directly a part of the implementation resource described in the paper

File name: Additional file 2

File format: Microsoft Excel Worksheet, XLS

Title of data: Summary of CFIR barrier constructs and the related ERIC and AdStAC strategies

Description: Summaries of the CFIR constructs (barriers) to ACD implementations matched with ERIC strategies to implement ACDs and the AdStAC strategies that correspond

File name: Additional file 3

File format: Microsoft Excel Worksheet, XLS

Title of data: Service user ratings of the acceptability, appropriateness, and feasibility of their ACD

Description: Service user participant responses to AIM, IAM, and FIM measures after ACD completion

File name: Additional file 4

File format: Microsoft Excel Worksheet, XLS

Title of data: Staff ratings of the acceptability, appropriateness, and feasibility of ACDs they worked on

Description: Staff participant responses to AIM, IAM, and FIM measures after ACD completion

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

Approval for the study was granted by the Bradford Leeds NHS Health Research Authority Research Ethics Committee (REC reference number: 22/YH/0012) on 07/02/2022. All study participants provided informed consent before they took part in the study.

Consent for publication

No identifiable information of individuals included in the manuscript.

Availability of data and materials

ACD resources are available on request from CH at claire.1.henderson@kcl.ac.uk

Quantitative data are available on reasonable request; however, qualitative data and ACD content are not due to risk of reidentification.

Competing interests

The authors have no competing interest to declare.

Funding

This study is funded by Maudsley Charity. ACD films funded by Health Education England.

Authors' contributions

Advisory groups – AS chaired the staff advisory group meetings. SG chaired the lived-experience advisory group meetings.

ACD template workshop – AB, CH, and SS facilitated the co-production workshops.

Simulation workshops and training – AB, CH, MF and MS facilitated the co-production workshops. AnB, AKS, CH, MF and MS facilitated the training, with support from AB and AJS. SG analysed data collected from participant surveys.

Recovery college course workshop and training – AB and PE facilitated the co-production workshops. FC, PE, AB, and AJS developed the course. FC and PE led the facilitation of the course, AB and AJS supported. AB and AJS held and recorded the feedback session.

ACD creation – AB, CH, and SS developed and revised the ACD template, AJS also revised. CH developed the facilitator manual and led facilitator supervision. FC facilitated the creation of service user ACDs. AJS collected baseline and follow-up data, transcribed interviews and analysed

transcripts. AB checked the created coding framework for reliability. FH led monthly staff meetings, supported by CH and AJS.

Films – SS, SG, and AJS were a part of filmed interviews on ACDs.

Manuscript – AJS led on drafting and editing the manuscript. All other authors reviewed, edited, and approved the final manuscript.

Acknowledgement

Within the NHS Trust - Recovery college; Maudsley Learning Simulation; Patient and Carer Race Equality Framework team; Staff BME forum; Lewisham Crisis Plus team; Simone Myers, Lewisham EDI lead; and Southwark: Trauma Informed Care Implementation Group. Staff and lived experience advisory groups; AdStAC project steering committee; Black Thrive: Culturally Appropriate Advocacy and Peer Support service; and Croydon BME forum.