developing more effective, patient-centred approaches to managing antenatal depression. The findings highlight the need for integrated care pathways that address stigma, enhance partner involvement, and strengthen the role of obstetricians in perinatal mental health care. These insights can inform the development of more comprehensive and accessible mental health support services within perinatal care settings.

Abstracts were reviewed by the RCPsych Academic Faculty rather than by the standard *BJPsych Open* peer review process and should not be quoted as peer-reviewed by *BJPsych Open* in any subsequent publication.

Long-Acting Antipsychotic Injections: Prescribing Practices Across BCUHB

Dr Laura Robbins[1], Dr Vinila Zachariah[2], Dr Opeyemi Ikuewumi[3] and Dr Raj Sambhi[1]

[1]BCUHB, Wrexham, United Kingdom.; [2]BCUHB, Rhyl, United Kingdom. and [2]BCUHB, Llanfairfechan, United Kingdom

doi: 10.1192/bjo.2025.10533

Aims: Our aims for this project were to examine how long-acting antipsychotics are prescribed in the various teams (both inpatient, community and specialist services) across BCUHB, with a view to identify any emerging trends, and to compare this with data on efficacy and cost-effectiveness obtained via a systematic search of the available literature.

Methods: Data on depots prescribed across BCUHB was provided to us by the mental health pharmacy team for the year April 2023–March 2024. We extracted our points of interest from this data and demonstrated this graphically using Microsoft Excel.

We also completed a literature search of Ovid, Cochrane Library and Google Scholar on the topic, to identify relevant systematic reviews which included studies comparing depot antipsychotics head-to-head. This returned 1500 articles, of which 15 were shortlisted by title relevance, and 4 included following full-text analysis.

Results: According to the available research, there is no demonstrated clear superiority in efficacy of specific long-acting antipsychotics. The data on cost-effectiveness was somewhat conflicting; in that risperidone was found in a recent systematic review to be the most cost-effective in most studies apart from included UK studies; but that also paliperidone was more cost-effective than the typical antipsychotics. Our data showed that the three most commonly prescribed in BCUHB are typical antipsychotics, and interestingly, the unit price per depot for paliperidone in BCUHB was significantly higher than any other.

Conclusion: 'Cost-effectiveness' in the systematic review we looked at was defined by QALYS ('one year of life in perfect health'). To look at the BCUHB 'price per depot', you may, incorrectly, assume that prescribing paliperidone would be a waste of money (with it being 173 times more expensive than the highest dose of the cheapest depot available). This suggests that use of paliperidone may make cost-savings in the longer-term, for example, in preventing admissions to hospital which are costly. In BCUHB, paliperidone is commonly prescribed to patients with learning disabilities, but is not a commonly prescribed depot amongst general adult groups (either inpatient or community).

There is limited guidance on choice of antipsychotic depot and given the absence of significant differences in their efficacy, it is generally down to clinician choice, taking into account patient preferences and drug tolerability profiles. As mentioned, cost does not equal cost-effectiveness and having an awareness of this may influence local guidance and decision-making.

Abstracts were reviewed by the RCPsych Academic Faculty rather than by the standard *BJPsych Open* peer review process and should not be quoted as peer-reviewed by *BJPsych Open* in any subsequent publication.

Audit

How Robust Are Our Care Plans for Patients Detained Under Community Compulsory Treatment Orders?

Dr Louisa Adam, Dr Susannah Houston, Dr Suzanne Galloway, Dr Andrew Donaldson and Dr Martin Carlin

NHS Lanarkshire, Glasgow, United Kingdom

doi: 10.1192/bjo.2025.10534

Aims: The Mental Welfare Commission (MWC) released a report in February 2024 recommending the use of audit to ensure good clinical practice in the use of community Compulsory Treatment Orders (cCTO) as part of the Mental Health (Care and Treatment) (Scotland) Act 2003 (MHA). One particular area of concern was the use of care plans under section 76 of the Act.

An audit was performed across NHS Lanarkshire Mental Health services to determine if all patients on cCTOs had Section 76 care plans in place that were valid and compliant with the minimum standards set out by the MWC.

Methods: Medical records administration staff were contacted across all of the psychiatry specialities within the health board, to supply a list of patients on cCTOs. Their electronic medical records were reviewed and relevant data collated by the authors to determine if the appropriate paperwork was in place, was valid, and met the minimum standards, as set out by the MWC.

Results: Within NHS Lanarkshire, there were 89 patients on cCTOs. 87 of these had a Section 76 care plan in place, though one of these was considered invalid.

Only 24% of the care plans were found to meet all of the minimum standards. There was noted to be a high degree of variability in which of the minimum standards were met, how the care plans were documented and the quality of the information contained within them, across the specialties and between individual psychiatrists.

Conclusion: This was the first audit looking at cCTO Section 76 care plans carried out in NHS Lanarkshire. It demonstrated there is a need for standardisation of these care plans across mental health services, to ensure that as a minimum, all statutory information is documented.

Recommendations from the audit included the use of a proforma to capture the information required to meet the minimum standards, as well as provide prompts for additional information to improve the quality of the care plans. It has also been recommended that each psychiatry specialty sets up their own annual audit of care plans, and an audit tool for this has been provided.

Abstracts were reviewed by the RCPsych Academic Faculty rather than by the standard *BJPsych Open* peer review process and should not be quoted as peer-reviewed by *BJPsych Open* in any subsequent publication.