Exploring Pathways to Compulsory Detention and Ways to Prevent Repeat Compulsory Detentions; Clinician Perspectives.

Authorship Line: Ariana Kular [a], Mary Birken [a], Lisa Wood [a,b], Jordan Parkinson [a,c], Theresa Bacarese-Hamilton [a], Louise Blakley[d], Chloe Hutchings-Hay[e], Patrick Nyikavaranda [a,f], Dilshard Alam[a], Raphael Ogbolu[c], Caroline Bendall[b], Lai Tang[b], Amy Nickson[c], Cathryn Revell[c], Henrietta Mbeah-Bankas[a], Lizzie Mitchell[a], Kathleen Lindsay Fraser [a], Valerie Christina White[a], Fiona Lobban[c, g], Brynmor Lloyd-Evans[a], Sonia Johnson[a, h]

[a] Division of Psychiatry, Faculty of Brain Sciences, University College London, UK

[b] North East London NHS Foundation Trust, UK

[c] Lancashire and South Cumbria NHS Foundation Trust, UK

[d] Southern Health NHS Foundation Trust

[e] National Eating Disorders Service, South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust, London, United Kingdom

[f] Department of Primary Care & Public Health, Brighton & Sussex Medical School, University of Sussex, Brighton, United Kingdom

[g] Spectrum Centre for Mental Health Research, Faculty of Health & Medicine, Lancaster University

[h] Camden and Islington NHS Foundation Trust

Correspondence to:

Dr Ariana Kular

E: a.kular@ucl.ac.uk

Division of Psychiatry, University College London, 6th Floor, 149 Tottenham Court Road, London, W1T 7NF

Abstract

Background: Rates of compulsory detention in psychiatric hospitals have risen over several decades in England and some other higher income countries. This study explores clinicians' perspectives on how service users come to be compulsorily detained in psychiatric hospitals and their suggestions for reducing these detentions in the future.

Methods: Semi-structured qualitative interviews were conducted with 23 clinicians working with individuals who have been compulsorily detained under the Mental Health Act in England. Interviews were carried out by telephone or videoconference. Data were analysed using template analysis.

Results: Three major themes were identified, with multiple sub-themes (a) service user factors that increase risk of compulsory detention, including high levels of risk, previous/underlying trauma, medication non-adherence , service user perceptions of their mental health state, disadvantage and discrimination, and lack of stability and involvement from family and social networks; (b) service-level reasons for being detained, including lack of communication and continuity of care, historical inability to obtain trust and confidence from parts of population, clinician biases and assumptions, lack of resources, lack of treatment and care variety, and systemic/institutional barriers to engagement; and (c) ways to improve services to reduce compulsory detainment, including increasing quality of care and patient/family level interventions, investing in services, offer choice regarding medication, offer alternatives to compulsory detention, and improve discharge planning.

Conclusions: Findings suggested clinicians see that at least some compulsory hospital admissions as avoidable, particularly through better resourced and more accessible services and changes in staff attitudes to address unconscious biases and promote collaborative care. Our findings provide a range of potential means to reduce detentions, which warrant development and testing in research and practice.

Key Words: compulsory detention, involuntary admission, qualitative, clinician

Background

Rates of compulsory detention in psychiatric hospital under mental health legislation have risen over several decades in England and some other European Countries, for reasons that are not fully understood [1-4] despite a major review of evidence and practice informing the Independent Review of the Mental Health Act [5]. In England, national data from 2022-2023 reported 51,312 detentions under the Mental Health Act (MHA) (1983), the legal framework in England for detaining people in hospital [6].

Preventing detentions wherever possible is a national and global priority as detention is an inherently coercive action which doesn't appear to confer great clinical benefit [2] and the experience is often distressing and sometimes traumatising for service users and carers, contravening otherwise valued principles of consent and collaborative decision making. It may undermine therapeutic relationships, engagement with services and overall mental health outcomes [7, 8]. Inpatient admissions are also very expensive, especially detentions, which are typically longer than voluntary admissions. In England, inpatient care is estimated to use over a third of the whole mental health care budget [9].

People from Black ethnic groups are at increased risk of being detained in hospital across high-income, majority White population countries [10]. In England, they are four times more likely to be detained than their White British counterparts [6]. This disparity has been attributed to a combination of socio-economic factors, cultural misunderstandings, and systemic biases [11], however these explanations lack robust empirical support [10]. Data from the UK and other European countries also indicates a greater risk of detention for males than females [12-14].

A review of recent studies worldwide found the highest risk factors for being detained were previous compulsory admissions and diagnosis of psychosis [13]. This review also found that medication non-adherence, police involvement during the process of detention, being unemployed, single, and receiving welfare benefits were also linked with increased risk of detention. Other research found socio-economic deprivation [13, 15], having a risk of aggression [16], lack of community services preceding admission [16-18], suicidal ideation and being admitted outside of normal service hours [17] to also be significantly associated with detention.

Qualitative findings on experiences and views about detention have potential to supplement the gradually growing quantitative body of evidence on risk factors for detention by illuminating individual pathways and contextual factors leading to detention, and by generating novel ideas for strategies for preventing detention. The views of clinicians are also of considerable interest, as they may provide a useful perspective on key factors contributing to detention and on any potential opportunities to avert this maximally coercive treatment at any stage [19, 20]. One qualitative study conducted in Norway investigated staff and service user perspectives on pathways towards a referral for compulsory detention [20]. These included patient-level issues such as treatment cessation, aggression, substance abuse, housing, and employment issues, limited social networks and service-level factors such as lack of collaboration between services, of crisis plans, and of individualisation of care. A mixed methods study carried out in Inner London explored the views of clinicians involved in assessments for compulsory detentions about potential approaches to reducing detentions [21]. These included: having higher detention thresholds; reducing delays in MHA assessments; facilitating informed decision-making, whereby service users' broader support network and their background are more thoroughly considered; having better resourced community services offering early detection and intervention and alternatives to detention.

Beyond these studies, little qualitative research has so far focused on clinician perspectives on pathways to detention and ways of intervening to prevent this. Findings from such research has potential to inform development of interventions to prevent detention. We therefore included an investigation of clinician views on this topic in the initial intervention development of the FINCH study, a National Institute for Health and Social Care Research (NIHR) (reference: NIHR201739). FINCH aims to adapt an intervention, previously validated in Switzerland, to reduce compulsory detentions in the UK. In this co-produced component of the FINCH study, we aimed to explore the views of a varied group of clinicians who work with people who are detained on factors that lead individuals to be compulsorily detained under civil sections of national mental health legislation and potential pathways to prevent these detentions. A study exploring this topic from a service user perspective was also conducted and is reported in a separate paper.

Methods

Governance

Ethical approval was obtained for this study from University College London (UCL) Research Ethics Committee (Ethics ID Number: 15249/002) for the first wave of recruitment and data collection through non-NHS routes. For the second wave of recruitment in the NHS, Health Research Authority (HRA) and NHS Research Ethics Committee (REC) approval was granted by the London - Bromley Research Ethics Committee (IRAS: 300671; Protocol number: 143180; REC reference: 21/LO/0734).

Research Team

The design, conduct, and analysis of the study was led by academic researchers at UCL in collaboration with the FINCH co-production team. The co-production team consists of lived experience researchers (LERs) who have experience of using mental health services and compulsory detention or of caring for someone who has been detained, in addition to clinicians and researchers who work in this area. This group was created at the beginning of the FINCH study. This team had input in the development of topic guides, participated in the development of the preliminary framework for analysis and discussed and refined findings.

Some of our academic researchers represent a range of professions including practicing clinicians involved in decisions to detain (SJ, LB, TBH) or involved in providing care for detained service users in hospital (LW, FL), The co-production group was diverse in terms of ethnic background, age and gender.

Participants

Clinicians who currently are employed in an NHS mental health service or local authority and work with service users who were currently or recently (in the last 6 months) detained under section 2 or 3 of the MHA were eligible to take part in the study. Section 2 or 3 of the MHA allow for people who are deemed to have a mental disorder to be detained in a psychiatric hospital because this is considered necessary for their own health or safety or protection of others to be detained in a psychiatric hospital. Section 2 allows a 28-day detention for assessment and Section 3 a renewable 6-month detention period for treatment [22].

Purposive sampling was used to ensure clinicians represented a variety of professional roles and settings across England that are directly and indirectly involved with the MHA assessment and with working with currently or recently detained patients (including community staff working with them pre-admission and post-discharge from compulsory admissions. We reviewed our sample for representativeness of main professional groups and clinician demographics during recruitment and carried out a second wave to include those with perspectives or roles not well represented.

Recruitment

Recruitment occurred in two phases with clinicians who worked in acute inpatient and community mental health services and local authorities across England. For the first phase of interviews (September 2021 to January 2022), study advertisements were circulated by a range of Twitter accounts linked to the study, its home institution (UCL) and the research team and within networks of professionals linked to university departments. To recruit participants from professional groups under-represented from our initial social media recruitment, a second wave of recruitment (January 2023 to February 2023) was completed at one London NHS Trust.

Data Collection Procedure

The study utilised a qualitative design, using semi-structured interviews. Questions were asked regarding clinicians' recent experiences of working with detained patients, and their views about what factors may have led to that detention and by what means detentions could have been prevented. The guide also included specific exploration of views about reasons for people from Black or Black British backgrounds being more likely to be detained, and potential ways to reduce the risk of future detentions. Please see Appendix A for the full topic guide. Previous study findings informed the guide, which was iteratively reviewed and refined with the co-production group.

Interviews were conducted by academic researchers (MB, AK, CHH) via Microsoft Teams or Zoom. Verbal Consent to take part in the interviews was recorded prior to beginning each interview. Socio-demographic information was collected via a secure online survey on Opinio (a secure university online survey platform). The interviews were video recorded, although participants could opt to have their camera off, and transcribed verbatim. Audio-files of

recordings were then saved and sent for transcription by a professional transcription company with which UCL has a data sharing and privacy agreement.

Data Analysis

Data were analysed using template analysis [23] a form of thematic analysis [24]. This involves identifying and organising themes using a coding template that are based on a subset of transcripts. These are then applied to additional transcripts, and adapted and refined as further data is analysed. This approach allows for analysis by a group of researchers focusing on collectively defining meanings and structure of themes during the analysis process. Drawing on a small sub-sample of transcripts, six researchers were initially given 1-2 transcripts each and were invited to familiarise and code transcripts and propose a basic set of themes to help organise data and develop a preliminary coding framework. The team, including some co-production group members and mental health clinicians reviewed and discussed the preliminary framework, providing suggestions for a revised draft of the framework for the analysis team to line-by-line code against. An iterative process of reading and coding further transcripts was conducted by the analysis team with suggestions for new themes and amendments to the framework which would be discussed with the wider project team. This collaborative collective approach to analysis allowed for higher validity with increased reflexivity, in addition to allowing the perspectives of service users, carers, and clinicians to inform the analysis.

Results

A total of 23 participants took part in the study. Nine (39.1%) were male, with the largest group being White British or Irish (47.5%), followed by Asian/Asian British/Indian (26.1%). Psychiatrists were the largest professional group (43.5%) and the most frequent work setting was inpatient and crisis services, 60.9%. Over half of the sample were based in London (65.2%). Full participant characteristics can be found in Table 1.

Thematic analysis

Three major themes were identified regarding clinician views, (a) service user factors that increase risk of compulsory detention, (b) aspects of services that contribute to compulsory detentions and (c) ways to improve services to reduce compulsory detention. Each theme contained several sub-themes. The themes outlined in table 1 are explained further below and

exemplified using participant quotes. Further quotes relating to each theme and subtheme can be found in the supplementary material.

Table 2 - Overview of Themes and Sub-Themes

Main Theme	Sub-Themes
Service user level factors influencing risk of being compulsorily detained	• High levels of risk • Previous/underlying trauma • Service user perceptions of their own mental wellbeing and/or diagnosis • Non-adherence to medication • Lack of support from the service user's family and networks • Disadvantage and discrimination • Cultural attitudes to mental illness and services
Service/clinician level factors contributing to people being compulsorily detained	• Lack of communication and continuity in care • Previous failure to build trust • Clinician biases and assumptions • Lack of resources and disruptions in care • Lack of variety and choice of treatments/care offered leading to compulsory detention • Systemic and institutional barriers to engagement
Ways of reducing compulsory detention	• Improving quality of care, continuity of care, and communication • Increasing access to patient & family level intervention • Investing in services

- Choice regarding medication
- Offering variety of treatments/care and alternatives to compulsory detention
- Improved discharge planning

Service User Level Factors Influencing Risk of Being Compulsorily Detained

The first theme encompasses factors related to service users that participants identified as contributing to compulsory detentions:

High Levels of Risk

Most participants discussed patients posing a risk of harm to themselves, from or to others as influencing detention. If high levels of risk were perceived as present and could not be effectively managed in the community, it was likely that compulsory detention would result:

"He had stopped working and he had been, at times, reacting in distress to ongoing voices, had left his [hostel] accommodation without clothes in the middle of the night to run into the street because voices suggested he should do that."

[P15]

Previous/Underlying Trauma

Traumas were also identified as contributing to people being compulsorily detained. This included previous experience of traumatic life events:

"It was this sense that it was a sensitive period of time for that reason that had escalated the extreme distress that she can feel, and escalated, you know, and that as a result escalated the risk to herself." [P4]

Personal experiences of racism or its intergenerational effects were also highlighted as contributing to vulnerability to poor mental health and thus risk of detention:

"you've got people in black communities who have experienced terrible trauma either in their own life or in their parent's generation through migration you get here and then you get treated really badly. So it's hardly surprising you breakdown." [P6]

Service Users' Perceptions of Their Own Mental Health

The concept of insight was mentioned by some participants, who reported that lack of capacity and decision-making, lack of awareness of the nature of illness experiences and unwillingness to engage in treatment can lead to service users being detained. In these cases, treatment against the person's will was seen as the only option as the service user would not engage in treatment or agree to an informal admission:

"She was quite manic, quite paranoid, difficult to interrupt, lacked insight. All these terminologies really, but basically, she was quite adamant that she wasn't unwell, that she shouldn't have been brought into hospital on the first occasion, that she was safe, in order to go home." [P5]

Non-adherence to Medication

Not taking prescribed medications was reported to be a common factor leading to detentions. Participants described service users stopping medication because they felt better and felt it was not needed, or due to its side effects:

"And a lot of the people that I see who get re-admitted, a factor is probably discontinuation of drug treatment, and which may lead to, like, a what's seen traditionally as a relapse in a person's condition, and that reinforces the notion that they need drugs." [P4]

One participant stated that those service users from Black backgrounds are more likely to be prescribed a depot antipsychotic, and that the visibility of non-adherence to this treatment made detention more likely, contributing to the over-representation of this group in detentions:

"If you think about treatment, you're [referring to Black service users] more likely to be on a depot antipsychotic rather than oral antipsychotics […] We often end up down the route of an MHA assessment when people have stopped taking medication. Now, if you stop a depot, we know about it instantly because we give it to you. If you're a black man receiving a depot, you're more like to be on a depot, and you stop it, we know." [P17]

Lack of Support from the Service User's Family and Networks

Service users lacking social support, particularly through family, was highlighted as a factor for repeat detentions. This was largely due to service users choosing to be in isolation, not

living close by to family or having no relationship with their family when they are in the community:
"Well, his friends and family lived elsewhere, so in a different city, so that was part of the difficulty. So, he didn't have much in the way of social structure around him." [P16]

Limited social support in the community leads to the service user's mental health to deteriorate to the point of crisis, because no one is around to provide support sooner:
"So, definitely, sometimes people who have less support around them can be a bit more tricky to be in touch with. You might find out, only, a lot later things have progressed a lot more." [P15]

One clinician stated that family members lacking understanding of the service user's mental illness can be stressor for detention:
"*One of the stressors is the person's relationship with their family or their family's understanding of their problems. They may feel that they're very pressured by their family to do things that they actually can't quite manage yet, because they're not well enough and their family are perhaps expecting too much of them. Sometimes, the family are highly critical, but yes, also, family can be the opposite."* [P16]

Disadvantage and Discrimination
Participants reported various social adversities that may contribute to deterioration of mental health and to a lack of help-seeking. These included socioeconomic status, racism, poor housing, unemployment, and lack of social support:
"Social factors like poverty, like unemployment, like racism and stigma, social exclusion of all forms, all play a part in a person perhaps being more likely then to have some mental health problems if they've experienced that, kind of, adversity, that, kind of, social trauma." [P4]

Some expressed helplessness that these social adversities are powerful influences that they could do relatively little about:
"Benefits and asylum status, for example…. It feels really difficult to support them because we don't have any power to do anything about those things and so we can't sort out the basics for our patients." [P17]

Cultural Attitudes to Mental Illness and Services

Participants spoke of the influence of cultural factors on how people understand their problems and whether they seek help was also reported:

"In some cultures, mental illness is seen as a taboo, it's seen as this is maybe the devil, black magic. If somebody in your family has got mental illness, then the stigma from the cultural aspect as well is a big thing, as well as wider society." [P9]

Service/Clinician Level Factors Contributing to People Being Compulsorily Detained

The second main theme encompassed the ways in which mental health clinicians and the ways in which mental health services are organised and delivered could contribute to compulsory detention.

Lack of Communication and Continuity of Care

A lack of clear communication and joined up working across the service user's care pathway was identified as a risk factor for being detained. Participants explained communication with service users about their care can be poor, and that services often do not communicate or collaborate well with each other, resulting in care plan not being followed through and service user needs not being met:

"…inpatient and community teams, it's very disjointed…because everyone has such a big caseload, the community team isn't even aware that a person was admitted… we've had cases where people have been on a depot, but the community team wasn't told that they were getting discharged, so they didn't know they had to follow up this depot." [P20]

Previous Failure to Build Trust

Numerous participants viewed service users not trusting mental health services as a key contributor to compulsory detentions. Various reasons were suggested for this, including previous experience of poor care and police involvement in treatment:

"Patients who still remember and are still traumatised by police officers crawling through windows to gain access to their properties to detain them". [P19]

"I think there wasn't enough understanding and communication between her and her community team. I think that, as she became increasingly suspicious of them, and they

became, in her mind, increasingly attempting to control and police her, and with not a lot of collaborative relationship building and trust formation." [P7]

Clinicians' Biases and Assumptions

Clinician biases and preconceptions were also seen as contributing to an increased likelihood of detaining certain service users. Many participants stated that if a service user has been detained previously, it is assumed that detention is likely to be needed again in future:
"I think, often, if that's happened before, we sometimes fall into the trap that it's a foregone conclusion, that's what's going to happen again rather than perhaps reappraising the situation and thinking about what an admission had achieved and thinking about whether there are alternatives." [P17]

Participants mentioned other biases such as age and gender "*we have a higher threshold of detaining elderly women than young men"*, as well as detaining more people with psychosis than depression.

Most participants felt that racial biases and stereotypes influenced likelihood of compulsorily detention, with some ethnic groups tending to be perceived as inherently a higher risk and thus more likely to require compulsory detention:
"The way that risk is perceived is different, in my view, sometimes, depending on what your ethnicity and your cultural background is." [P19]

This was reported as particularly true for service users from Black backgrounds:
"I mean, society, as such, is essentially racist […] It's not an intentional attitude, I guess, it's a fear response associated with it. So, I think males, Black males are seen as more dangerous, and more risky. And the reason for that has to do with the colour of their skin, largely. In a profession, in a setting that the people who make the decisions are largely of a different race, and different colour." [P23]

One participant stated that clinicians need to be better at reviewing whether detention is really necessary:
"It becomes the habit or routine response of the service to a crisis, rather than to rethink or review their part in the process that led to them being re-sectioned." [P1]

Lack of Resources and Disruptions

All participants spoke about compulsory detentions being linked to a lack of staffing, overstretched services, fragmented service provision and long waiting lists across inpatient and community services. Participants spoke about how overstretched community services meant that service users weren't receiving adequate care to maintain stability and facilitate recovery, leading to relapse, acute crisis and ultimately being detained. Participants also described hospital discharges as often rushed and driven by bed pressures, rather than timing being in the best interest of the service user:

"And, as we know, services have been stripped out by years of austerity, so community services have been, you know, a victim of that, as have lots of other services like the police and so forth, that we really are seeing the effects of austerity now in terms of the resources within community and preventative services, that the staffing levels, recruitment, and retention is really problematic." [P4]

"There are certain people that get sectioned again because the amounts of resources in the community are not there enough to provide a level of intensive support in the community." [P22]

Lack of Variety of Treatments/Care Offered Leading to Compulsory Detention

Participants spoke about how treatment mainly relied on pharmacological treatments due to the limited availability of psychosocial interventions for people in both inpatient and community settings:

"People, you know, are leaving hospital without the psychological skills that they need to be able to manage this if it were to happen in the community." [P12]

Inpatient care was described as particularly limited, with the focus being too narrowly on stabilising and discharging rather than providing a holistic care package to facilitate personal recovery:

"I would say that the hospital admission process and the stay itself is, kind of, geared to the discharge itself and it's a, kind of, machine that's made and its main objective is discharging people from it." [P10]

Systemic and Institutional Barriers to Engagement

Participants spoke about how the current mental health care systems excluded marginalised groups, leading to poor access to care, and worsening of mental health issues to a point of a crisis resulting in detention. Some participants said that mental health services are biased in relation to race. The people delivering services do not reflect the ethnic backgrounds of the services users or may not be culturally competent, so there is a lack of cultural understanding: *"A big discussion around the system being racist in terms of the approach, again, I think if you think about simple things like a delusion is by definition a fixed belief outside of the cultural norm. I mean, how on Earth can I be claiming, working in [inner London location] that I know everyone's cultural norm? My cultural norm may look like a delusion for you, so it's not so simple to kind of ignore these factors."* [P15]

Also, some participants believed that the potential barriers for service users from ethnic minority backgrounds, such as speaking a different language or having different beliefs about risk are not considered when developing and providing mental health services:
"The institutional response … I suspect that certain ethnic groups, possibly black men, … might have access issues to services, services might not be very visible to them. They might not know how to access them, or they might find barriers when they do try to access them." [P4]

Ways of Reducing Compulsory Detention

This theme relates to how participants thought improvements could be made to current practice to reduce the likelihood of a service user being compulsorily detained.

Improving Quality of Care, Continuity and Communication

The need for more collaborative care and joined up working between service users, inpatient and community teams was a prominent suggestion. This was especially important when a service user was in crisis. Collaborative crisis planning, involving key stakeholders, was highlighted as essential:
"*Well, I have seen care plans that have been used brilliantly and involve collaboration with the person to understand what their needs are, think what they would like to see happening in terms of plans, think about what they would like to see happening in terms of crisis, having this plan done together […] I've seen that less often, compared to the times I've seen the care plan being a bit of a tick box exercise."* [P15]

Having a meaningful therapeutic relationship with key workers who know service users well and can offer continuity of care was emphasised as key to preventing detentions as they can spot early warning signs, tailor treatment, and prevent the worsening of symptoms:
"If you've got a really good relationship with your care coordinator, it could reduce the chance of you being detained because that care coordinator is able to trust in the relationship to know when it's absolutely necessary." [P6]

Increasing Access to a wider range of Service User & Family Interventions

Improved access to preventative and inclusive psychosocial family interventions, such as Open Dialogue, which foster meaningful and collaborative relationships and bring everyone together, was reported to reduce the need for detention:
"*There've been approaches, like Open Dialogue, that advocate a lot more strongly, both, for the inclusion of the important people the person wants to bring in and also a more collaborative flat hierarchy. I appreciate sometimes our system is a little bit hierarchical in terms of power dynamic, so it's not just about bringing people on but trying to work together."* [P15]

Family and carer involvement at a time of crisis was seen as particularly important as they may be best placed to support the service user during a difficult period:
"*All of the community teams, crisis teams, inpatient units have to involve family and carers because they're the people that are also going to help support, keep this person well."* [P22]

Investing in Services

Multiple participants said if the community teams had more resources, they could review service users more regularly, build stronger relationships, and provide more intensive support. With time to build trust between services users and clinicians, relapse prevention work can happen and reduce future chance of being compulsorily admitted:
"If you had really well-staffed teams, you would have lots of time to spend with people who have been in hospital to do that important relapse prevention stuff. And that would be the best way to potentially avert future admissions under the MHA." [P19]

Choice Regarding Medication

It was highlighted that choice and collaboration regarding medication was important to ensure medication was acceptable to service users. As medication non-adherence was often a

key factor in relapse and ultimately detention, tackling the factors that may cause someone to stop taking their medication was seen as important.

One participant talked about formulating and intervening with the reasons for medication non-adherence:
"Medication is one thing, but if it is about somebody not wanting to take medication, then of course there needs to be a conversation about why that is and how can we change the medication, or use a different formulation that makes it easier for the person to have it? Is it that the side effects are unbearable or is it simply that the person just doesn't want to take medication because they don't accept that they're unwell, in which case". [P16]

Offering Variety of Treatments/Care and Alternatives to Compulsory Detention
Increased availability of a wide range of community services offering both crisis prevention and a range of approaches to crisis intervention were thought to be potentially helpful in preventing detentions, including day services, crisis houses and more responsive substance misuse services. Services users could be supported and treated when they are less unwell and have more insight, which could prevent someone from needing to be compulsorily admitted:
"If we can get to people at an earlier stage … restructure and repurpose and fund properly community services to have … localised earlier, more preventative impact." [P4]

Improved Discharge Planning
Participants thought that many service users are discharged from inpatient units before they are well due to operational issues such as bed shortages. Participants felt that clinically appropriate discharge with an agreed, well-conceived, communicated plan for the service user, community team and support network is needed to prevent readmission:
"…to discharge someone quickly and rescind the section quickly…person comes back and is re-detained […] making sure someone is well enough at the point of discharge, with a smooth- with proper support arranged from a community team." [P18]

Discussion

Statement of Principal Findings

Three overarching themes were identified which encompassed clinicians' perspectives on factors that may lead to compulsory detention and suggestions to reduce detention. The first theme **"Service user level factors influencing risk of being compulsory detained"** reports perceived patient-level factors including presenting with high levels of risk, non-adherence to medication, having a lack of insight to their own mental health and/or diagnosis, experiencing a previous trauma, having unstable family and wider social networks, and social and political factors such as race, culture, and employment status. The second theme **"Service/clinician level factors contributing to people being compulsorily detained"** describes a variety of factors at service-level which contribute to detention and where there is scope for improvement to reduce future detentions, this includes: a lack of communication and continuity of care, lack of resources and service disruptions, and lack of variety of treatments and care offered in the community. A historical lack of trust between services and patients, clinicians holding unconscious biases and assumptions towards service users, and systemic and institutional biases to engagement were also reported as reasons for detention. The final theme **"Ways of reducing compulsory detention"** delineates suggestions to reduce detentions. This includes improving discharge planning, offering choice in medications, investing in services, and increasing access to patient and family level interventions. Thus, while some of the factors seen as contributing to detentions were individual or societal factors which may not be directly influenced by clinicians or mental health service delivery, there was a strong consensus among interviewed clinicians that various aspects of mental health care are relevant. Interviewees from a range of backgrounds spoke directly of their views that lack of continuity of care, of choice and variety in interventions, racism among staff and in wider society, and lack of resources, contribute to compulsory detentions.

Findings in Context to other Literature

Clinicians interviewed in this study identified a range of patient-level, service-level and wider contextual factors that potentially contribute to detention, several of which were congruent with risk factors for compulsory detention identified through a range of approaches. Factors such as medication non-compliance, social adversities, lack of collaboration between services and a lack of individualisation of care have been previously identified in qualitative research on clinician perspectives on referral to detention [19]. In line with a recent meta-analysis and narrative synthesis, the perception of a service user having a reduced insight into their illness was also associated with detention [13].

A lack of community services preceding admission has been found to be associated with detention [16]. Other research has also delineated that better resourced and individualised community services might help minimise detentions [19, 21] and specialist early intervention in psychosis service teams may reduce detentions compared to generic community teams [25]. This is in congruent with our findings, whereby clinicians reported a need to have increased availability of community services which could divert service users from being detained.

Having a previous detention has also been proposed as one of the clearest risk factors for detention [13]: this may be explained in terms of our participant's view that clinicians tend to hold assumptions that if a service user has previously been detained it can become a routine response to assume they need to be detained again at the point of crisis, without considering alternatives. Thus, when conducting an MHA assessment, an in depth exploration on individuals' situations and their contexts rather than making assumptions based on their historical presentations may help reduce detentions but requires additional time and resources.

Previous studies have highlighted gender disparities in detention [12, 13]. Participants in our study also reported that clinicians may hold unconscious biases or assumptions based on age and gender, with detentions more likely for those who are young and male, a finding that should be further explored.

Clinicians in the current study explicitly highlighted a bias towards detaining Black men. This has been widely reported in other studies which have reported clinician biases and racial profiling being among the proposed explanations for the over-representation of Black men in detentions [10], and there are recent efforts to improve clinical practice and introduce unconscious bias training in mental health care [26]. Furthermore, this links with England and Wales government White Paper - Reforming the Mental Health Act [27]. The White Paper states that one of the major drives for the MHA reform is due to the disproportionately higher rates of detention and inequalities faced by ethnic minority groups. It has been recommended that health organisations should appoint a responsible person who monitors the use of the Act by ethnicity and have oversight of training and policies aimed at reducing discrimination.

Our findings also highlighted a need for collaborative crisis planning between clinician and service user, particularly prior to discharge. This is in keeping with policy in England and Wales, in which the focus is on delivering personalised care and treatment plans, and also with the limited available evidence on what can prevent detention, in which the best evidence so far is on forms of collaborative care planning [28].

Strengths of the Study

The current study had several strengths including addressing a gap in the literature with limited qualitative evidence in this area. The clinicians in the current study have worked with many service users who have been detained and a majority had been involved in the detention process: thus they have substantial direct experience relevant to understanding the process, although clearly views were subjective.

Limitations of the Study

Whilst we strived to have a variety of clinicians who work in different roles and settings directly and indirectly involved with the MHA assessment, the majority of our sample were psychiatrists, thus findings might not reflect the views of those who work in other relevant roles. . Additionally, a majority were based in London, thus findings may not be representative of clinicians who work in settings in other areas of England.

Clinical and Policy Implications

Clinicians focused to a large extent on deficiencies in current service organisation and delivery and potential ways of remedying these, suggesting a range of potential pathways to reducing compulsory admissions. Currently, staff see services in England as lacking in resources which leads to services being disrupted by factors such as high staff turnover and staff shortages. They also see as crucial continuity of care, provision of a choice of interventions and services, and collaboration with services. It has previously been reported that rising detention rates over the past decade may reflect a reduction in the number of contacts per patient in community teams [2].

Whilst development of community care and of admission alternatives was favoured overall, once service users had been admitted to hospital, over-hasty discharge without a clear care plan was seen as contributing to repeat crises and detentions, supporting a focus on high quality care planning in hospital [3, 29]. This is consistent with previous quantitative

research which found that, in England, shorter length of index inpatient admission is associated with greater risk of readmission [30].

Medication non-adherence was perceived as key contributor to detention, suggesting collaborative decision making to find best fit treatments as a potential avenue for reducing detentions.

An evidence synthesis of trials of interventions [1] which included detention as an outcome found evidence that some psychosocial interventions - joint crisis planning and Early Intervention on Psychosis teams – may help to reduce detentions: clinicians in our study were in agreement with a view that enriching community care and the psychosocial interventions offered has potential to avoid detentions.

Biases related especially to race but also to gender, age and clinical history were also widely seen as important drivers of detention decisions, suggesting a need to find effective ways of challenging clinicians' unconscious biases and assumptions, for example through cultural competence training.

Research Implications

Clinicians' views can generate rather than test hypotheses about how detention might be reduced: thus further research examining relationships between factors such as continuity of care and the range of community services offered and compulsory detention rates would be highly helpful, as well as in depth examination of the making of compulsory detention decisions, and the potential role of clinician biases and of availability of admission alternatives. An international perspective on service system characteristics and decision-making processes in countries with different levels of compulsory detentions is also potentially helpful.

Future research could also compare the perspectives of clinicians and service users on risk factors for compulsory detention as the factors highlighted by both groups may constitute high priorities for targets for initiatives to reduce detentions. Further research also may be needed to understand any discrepancies in views between stakeholder groups.

Availability of Data and Materials

The dataset used and analysed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Abbreviations

Health Research Authority (HRA)

Lived experience researchers (LERs)

Mental Health Act (MHA)

National Institute for Health and Social Care Research (NIHR)

NHS Research Ethics Committee (REC)

University College London (UCL)

References

1. Sheridan Rains L, Zenina T, Dias MC, Jones R, Jeffreys S, Branthonne-Foster S, et al (2019) Variations in patterns of involuntary hospitalisation and in legal frameworks: an international comparative study. The Lancet Psychiatry, 6(5), 403–17. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(19)30090-2

2. Sheridan Rains L, Weich S, Maddock C, Smith S, Keown P, Crepaz-Keay D, Singh SP, Jones R, Kirkbride J, Millett L, Lyons N & Lloyd-Evans, B (2020) Understanding increasing rates of psychiatric hospital detentions in England: development and preliminary testing of an explanatory model. BJPsych Open, 6(5), e88, https://doi:10.1192/bjo.2020.64

3. Care Quality Commission (2018) Ongoing rise in detentions under Mental Health Act may be symptomatic of a system 'under considerable strain'. https://www.cqc.org.uk/news/releases/rise-mha-detentions-act-may-be-symptomatic-system-under-pressure. Accessed 25 Mar 2024

4. Smith S, Gate R, Ariyo K, Saunders R, Taylor C, Bhui K, Mavranezouli I, Heslin M, Greenwood H, Matthews H, Barnett P, & Pilling S (2020) Reasons behind the rising rate of involuntary admissions under the Mental Health Act (1983): Service use and cost impact. International journal of law and psychiatry, 68, 101506. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijlp.2019.101506

5. Department of Health and Social Care (2018) Modernising the Mental Health Act – final report from the Independent Review. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5c6596a7ed915d045f37798c/Modernising_the_Mental_Health_Act_-_increasing_choice__reducing_compulsion.pdf Accessed 25 Mar 2024

6. NHS Digital (2022) Mental Health Act Statistics, Annual Figures, 2021-22. https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/mental-health-act-statistics-annual-figures/2021-22-annual-figures. Accessed 25 Mar 2024

7. Akther SF, Molyneaux E, Stuart R, Johnson S, Simpson A, Oram S (2019) Patients' Experiences of Assessment and Detention under Mental Health legislation: Systematic Review and Qualitative meta-synthesis. BJPsych Open, 5(3). https://doi:10.1192/bjo.2019.19

8. Stuart R, Akther SF, Machin K, Persaud K, Simpson A, Johnson S, et al (2020) Carers' experiences of involuntary admission under mental health legislation: systematic review and qualitative meta-synthesis. BJPsych Open, 6(2). https://doi.org.10.1192/bjo.2019.101

9. NHS England (2021) National Cost Collection 2019/20 Report. https://www.england.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/National-Cost-Collection-2019-20-Report-FINAL.pdf. Accessed 25 Mar 2024

10. Barnett P, Mackay E, Matthews H, Gate R, Greenwood H, Ariyo K, Bhui K, Halvorsrud K, Pilling S, & Smith S (2019) Ethnic variations in compulsory detention under the Mental Health Act: a systematic review and meta-analysis of international data. Lancet Psychiatry, 6(4), 305–317. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(19)30027-6

11. Singh SP, Burns T, Tyrer P, Islam Z, Parsons H & Crawford MJ (2014) Ethnicity as a predictor of detention under the Mental Health Act. Psychological medicine, 44(5), 997–1004. https://doi.org/10.1017/S003329171300086X

12. Curley A, Agada E, Emechebe A, Anamdi C, Ng XT, Duffy R & Kelly BD (2016) Exploring and explaining involuntary care: The relationship between psychiatric admission

status, gender and other demographic and clinical variables. International journal of law and psychiatry, 47, 53–59. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijlp.2016.02.034

13. Walker S, MacKay E, Barnett P et al (2019) Clinical and social factors associated with increased risk for involuntary psychiatric hospitalisation: a systematic review, meta-analysis, and narrative synthesis. Lancet Psychiatry, 6: 1039–53. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(19)30406-7

14. Salize HJ, Dressing H & Peitz, M (2002) Compulsory admission and involuntary treatment of mentally ill patients: legislation and practice in EU-Member States—final report. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_projects/2000/promotion/fp_promotion_2000_frep_08_en.pdf. Accessed 25 Mar 2024

15. Weich S, McBride O, Twigg L, Duncan C, Keown P, Crepaz-Keay D., Cyhlarova E, Parsons H, Scott J, & Bhui K (2017) Variation in compulsory psychiatric inpatient admission in England: a cross-classified, multilevel analysis. The Lancet. Psychiatry, 4(8), 619–626. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(17)30207-9

16. Canova Mosele, PH, Chervenski Figueira G, Antônio Bertuol Filho A, Ferreira de Lim, JAR, & Calegaro VC (2018) Involuntary psychiatric hospitalization and its relationship to psychopathology and aggression. Psychiatry research, 265, 13–18. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2018.04.031

17. Myklebust LH, Sørgaard K & Wynn R (2017) How mental health service systems are organized may affect the rate of acute admissions to specialized care: Report from a natural experiment involving 5338 admissions. SAGE open medicine, 5. https://doi.org/10.1177/2050312117724311

18. Karasch O, Schmitz-Buhl M, Mennicken R et al (2020) Identification of risk factors for involuntary psychiatric hospitalization: using environmental socioeconomic data and methods of machine learning to improve prediction. BMC Psychiatry 20, 401, https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-020-02803-w

19. Smyth S, Casey D, Cooney A, Higgins A, McGuinness D, Bainbridge E, Keys M, Georgieva I, Brosnan L, Beecher C, Hallahan B, McDonald C, & Murphy K (2017) Qualitative exploration of stakeholders' perspectives of involuntary admission under the Mental Health Act 2001 in Ireland. International journal of mental health nursing, 26(6), 554–569. https://doi.org/10.1111/inm.12270

20. Wormdahl I, Husum TL, Kjus SHH, Rugkåsa J, Hatling T, & Rise MB (2021) Between No Help and Coercion: Toward Referral to Involuntary Psychiatric Admission. A Qualitative Interview Study of Stakeholders' Perspectives. Frontiers in Psychiatry, 12, https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2021.708175

21. Wickersham A, Nairi S, Jones R, Lloyd-Evans B (2020) The Mental Health Act Assessment Process and Risk Factors for Compulsory Admission to Psychiatric Hospital: A Mixed Methods Study. The British Journal of Social Work, 50 (3), 642–663. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcz037

22. NHS (2022) Mental Health Act. https://www.nhs.uk/mental-health/social-care-and-your-rights/mental-health-and-the-law/mental-health-act/. Accessed 25 Mar 2024

23. King N & Brooks JM (2017) Template Analysis for Business and Management Students. Sage, London.

24. Braun V & Clark V (2019) Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health, 11:4, 589–597, https://doi.org.10.1080/2159676X.2019.1628806

25. Bone JK, McCloud T, Scott HR, Machin K, Markham S, Persaud K, Johnson S, & Lloyd-Evans B (2019) Psychosocial Interventions to Reduce Compulsory Psychiatric Admissions: A Rapid Evidence Synthesis. EClinicalMedicine, 10, 58–67. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2019.03.017

26. Smith SM, Kheri A, Ariyo K, Gilbert S, Salla A, Lingiah T, Taylor C, & Edge D (2023) The Patient and Carer Race Equality Framework: a model to reduce mental health inequity in England and Wales. Frontiers in psychiatry, 14, https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2023.1053502.

27. House of Commons Library (2023) Reforming the Mental Health Act. https://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/CBP-9132/CBP-9132.pdf. Accessed 25 Mar 2024

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

29. Keown P, Weich S, Bhui K S, Scott J (2011) Association between provision of mental illness beds and rate of involuntary admissions in the NHS in England 1988-2008: ecological study. BMJ, 343, https://doi:10.1136/bmj.d3736

30. Osborn DPJ, Favarato G, Lamb D, Harper T, Johnson S, Lloyd-Evans B, et al (2021) Readmission after discharge from acute mental healthcare among 231 988 people in England: cohort study exploring predictors of readmission including availability of acute day units in local areas. BJPsych Open, 7(4):e136. doi:10.1192/bjo.2021.961

Funding

This report describes independent research funded by the National Institute of Health and Care Research Policy Research Programme (Ref: NIHR20173). The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily of the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care Research. The funders have no role in the design of this study and will not have any role during its execution, data analyses, and interpretation, but are expected to provide assistance to any enquiry, audit, or investigation related to the funded work.
This work is supported by the NIHR UCLH BRC.

Author Information

Authors and Affiliations
Division of Psychiatry, Faculty of Brain Sciences, University College London, UK
Ariana Kular, Mary Birken, Lisa Wood, Jordan Parkinson, Theresa Bacarese-Hamilton, Patrick Nyikavaranda, Dilshard Alam, Henrietta Mbeah-Bankas, Lizzie Mitchell, Kathleen Lindsay Fraser, Valerie Christina White

North East London NHS Foundation Trust, UK
Lisa Wood, Caroline Bendall, Lai Tang

Lancashire and South Cumbria NHS Foundation Trust, UK
Jordan Parkinson, Amy Nickson, Cathryn Revell, Raphael Ogbolu

Southern Health NHS Foundation Trust
Louise Blakley

National Eating Disorders Service, South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust, London, United Kingdom
Chloe Hutchings-Hay

Department of Primary Care & Public Health, Brighton & Sussex Medical School, University of Sussex, Brighton, United Kingdom
Patrick Nyikavaranda

Spectrum Centre for Mental Health Research, Faculty of Health & Medicine, Lancaster University
Fiona Lobban

Camden and Islington NHS Foundation Trust
Sonia Johnson

Author Abbreviations
Amy Nickson (AN); Ariana Kular (AK); Brynmor Lloyd-Evans (BLE); Caroline Bendall (CB); Cathryn Revell (CR); Chloe Hutchings-Haye (CHH); Dilshard Alam (DA); Fiona Lobban (FL); Henrietta Mbeah-Bankas (HMB); Jordan Parkinson (JP); Kathleen Lindsay Fraser (KLF); Lai Tang (LT); Lisa Wood (LW); Lizzie Mitchell (LM); Louise Blakley (LB); Mary Birken (MB); Patrick Nyikavaranda (PN); Raphael Ogbolu (RO); Sonia Johnson (SJ); Theresa Bacarese-Hamilton (TBM); Valerie Christina White (VCW)

Corresponding Author
Correspondence to Ariana Kular (a.kular@ucl.ac.uk)

Ethics Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate
Full Health Research Authority (HRA) and NHS Research Ethics Committee (REC) approval has been granted by the London - Bromley Research Ethics Committee (IRAS: 300671; Protocol number: 143180; REC reference: 21/LO/0734). Participants will be required to provide informed consent before inclusion into the study.

Consent for publication
Not applicable.

Competing interests
The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Table 1: Sample Demographics

Gender	Male	9 (39.1%)
	Female	14 (60.9%)
Ethnicity	White British or Irish	11 (47.8%)
	Asian/Asian British/Indian	6 (26.1%)
	Black British/ Black African or Caribbean	2 (8.7%)
	Any Other White Background	4 (17.4%)
Job Title	Consultant Psychiatrist/Psychiatrist	10 (43.5%)
	Mental Health Nurse	3 (13%)
	Service manager/Team manager	2 (8.7%)
	Clinical Psychologist	2 (8.7%)
	Trainee Clinical Associate Psychologist	1 (4.35%)
	Approved Mental Health Professional (AMHP)	4 (17.4%)
	Occupational therapist	1 (4.35%)
Place of work	Acute mental health services (inpatient and crisis services)	14 (60.9%)
	Community mental health services	3 (13%)
	Both	5 (21.75%)
	Unknown	1 (4.35%)
Location	London	15 (65.2%)
	East of England	2 (8.7%)
	South West	2 (8.7%)
	North West	1 (4.35%)
	South East	2 (8.7%)
	Yorkshire and Humber	1 (4.35%)