Disclosure of Interest: X. Ling: None Declared, S. Wang: None Declared, N. Li: None Declared, Q. Zhang: None Declared, H. Li Grant / Research support from: This study was supported by National Key R & D Program of China [grant number 2022YFC3302001], National Natural Science Foundation of China [grant number 81801881], Science and Technology Committee of Shanghai Municipality [grant numbers 20DZ1200300, 21DZ2270800, 19DZ2292700].

EPP038

Self-harm and suicide risk amongst attendees at five lower courts in London, England

J. McCarthy[1]*, E. Chaplin[1], C. Allely[2] and A. Forrester[3]

[1]London South Bank University, London; [2]University of Salford, Manchester and [3]Cardiff University, Cardiff, United Kingdom
*Corresponding author.
doi: 10.1192/j.eurpsy.2025.398

Introduction: Individuals in contact with the criminal justice system are at higher risk of suicide than the general population (Carter et al. EClinicalMedicine 2022, 44, 101266). Research to date has concentrated on the prison population with little evidence on the risk of suicide and self-harm for those defendants within the Court system including those referred to the Court Mental Health Liaison and Diversion Services. Court Mental Health Liaison and Diversion services were developed in England to support vulnerable people when they first come into contact with the criminal justice system.
Objectives: The main aim of the study was to analyse the existing service data to examine rates of self-harm behavior and suicide ideation of those defendants presenting to the Court Mental Health Liaison and Diversion Services across five Magistrates Courts (lower courts) in London, England. In addition, a further aim was to establish if risk factors such as mental illness and substance misuse but also other vulnerabilities such as neurodevelopmental disorders are associated with the risk for self-harm behaviour or suicide along with demographic factors of age, gender and ethnicity.
Methods: The study analysed service level data of five London Magistrates' Courts covering a timeframe from September 2015 to April 2017. During this time 9088 attendees were referred to the Court Mental Health & Liaison Diversion service covering the five courts. Attendees were screened for current risk of suicide ideation and self-harm behaviour as part of the mental health assessment. Data examined was from the National Health Service (NHS) minimum mental health data set which reflects current clinical and custody records and is obtained from frontline court and health service staff.
Results: An overall rate of 14.2% for self-harm behaviour and/or suicide ideation was found for attendees presenting to five London Court Liaison and Diversion Services over a 20-month time frame. Aside from autism and bipolar affective disorder, the current large study showed a significant association between self-harm behaviour and suicide ideation with several mental disorders. The study found no significant differences for risk of self-harm behaviour and suicide ideation relating to gender or ethnicity.
Conclusions: This group of defendants presented with high levels of severe mental illness, substance and alcohol misuse and neurodevelopmental disorder which increased the individual vulnerability to express suicidal ideation as has been found in smaller studies. The wider criminal justice services need to examine the current approach to screening for risk of suicide ideation and self-harm behaviour given the high rates of completed suicide within the prison population compared to the general population.

Disclosure of Interest: J. McCarthy Grant / Research support from: £674,000 , E. Chaplin Grant / Research support from: £674,000 , C. Allely: None Declared, A. Forrester Grant / Research support from: £674,000.

EPP039

Mapping Forensic Psychiatry Education Across Europe: Insight from EFPT members

F. M. Monshizadeh Tehrani[1]*, B. Akan[1], B. Özel[1], S. Kukurt[1], E. Ilgin[1], V. H. Santos[1], M. Nouri[2], D. Zani[1], K. Krasteva[1], P. Viktorova[1], M. Godschalk[1], G. Autissier[1], A. Compaired[1], F. Mustač[1], L. Sanduleac[1], O. Nikolaieva[1], D. A. Zaharie[1], J. Halili[1], A. Avalishvili[1], G. Longo[1], N. De Ridder[1], A. Braicu[1] and S. Shokatpour[3]

[1]Forensic Psychiatry Working Group, European Federation of Psychiatric Trainees, Brussels, Belgium; [2]Zanjan University of Medical Science, Zanjan and [3]Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, Islamic Azad University, Islamshahr Branch, Tehran, Iran, Islamic Republic Of
*Corresponding author.
doi: 10.1192/j.eurpsy.2025.399

Introduction: Forensic psychiatry transcends legal and cultural boundaries across Europe, but specialization and training remain inconsistent. With freedom of movement in most European countries, psychiatrists accredited in one country can practice in others if they meet language requirements. Therefore, harmonizing psychiatric education and practice is crucial and aligns with the European Federation of Psychiatry Trainees (EFPT)'s goals.
Objectives: This study aims to map the current state of forensic psychiatry education across Europe, focusing on its recognition as a specialty on its own or subspecialty, training structure, and financial implications. It also assesses whether general adult psychiatry (GAP) and child and adolescent psychiatry (CAP) trainees receive adequate forensic psychiatry education, identifying gaps and variations across countries.
Methods: Data was collected via an online survey distributed to European National Trainee Association (NTA) representatives in the EFPT through Google Forms in August 2024. Responses from non-European countries and incomplete entries were excluded. The final dataset was analyzed using SPSS 24.
Results: A total of 29 participants, including 24 GAP trainees (82.8%), 2 CAP trainees (6.9%), and 3 specialists (10.3%), from 20 European countries responded to the survey. Forensic psychiatry was recognized either as a specialty or subspecialty in 13 counctries (65%) with 20 (69%) of participants confirming its recognition. 38% reported forensic training lasts less than 1 year or lacks a formal program. Financial support varied as well, with some countries offering full subsidies, while others required trainees to cover costs. Forensic psychiatry was included in the training of 66.7% of GAP trainee and 50% of CAP trainees, though the depth of

https://doi.org/10.1192/j.eurpsy.2025.398 Published online by Cambridge University Press