the age of 18, represent severe and frequently disabling conditions with adverse long-term functional consequences. Effective pharmacological treatment is critical to mitigating symptom progression, reducing relapse, and improving long-term outcomes. This presentation provides an update on current evidence-based pharmacological strategies for EOS, with a focus on efficacy, safety, and emerging treatments.

Second-generation antipsychotics (SGAs), such as aripiprazole, quetiapine, paliperidone, and risperidone, remain the mainstay of treatment, with lurasidone and brexpiprazole showing positive results in more recent studies. While olanzapine is clearly an effective SGA, its more pronounced cardiometabolic side effects have relegated olanzapine more to a second-line antipsychotic when other SGAs are ineffective. Thus, comparative efficacy, side effect profiles, and long-term metabolic risks are relevant when choosing among individual agents. The role of clozapine for treatment-resistant EOS and considerations regarding polypharmacy are relevant, given that EOS is one of the most reliable risk factors for treatment-resistant schizophrenia .

Long-acting injectable antipsychotics (LAIs) have not been explored in randomized trials so far, but are an important treatment tool, given the widespread non-adherence risk, which is even higher earlier in the illness. Novel mechanisms, including cholinergic muscarinic agonist treatments, recently approved for the first time for adults with schizophrenia, which address presynaptic hyperdopaminergia and in a highly selective fashion, need to be explored in EOS in the future. Additionally, the importance of early intervention strategies and adjunctive nonpharmacological and pharmacological treatments, e.g., mood stabilizers, antidepressants for specific domains of schizophrenia and for comorbid conditions, as well as best practices for transition into the adult psychiatry sector require further study.

In summary, treatment selection for youth with EOS should balance short-term as well as long-term efficacy considerations and safety concerns. While pharmacological advancements in EOS generally lag behind advances in adults, innovations are hoped to also reach EOS. More individualized and measurement-based approaches needed to be explored in both research settings and clinical care aiming at optimizing the pharmacological management for individuals living with EOS.

Disclosure of Interest: C. Correll Grant / Research support from: Boehringer-Ingelheim, Janssen and Takeda, Consultant of: AbbVie, Alkermes, Allergan, Angelini, Aristo, Autobahn, Boehringer-Ingelheim, Bristol-Meyers Squibb, Cardio Diagnostics, Cerevel, CNX Therapeutics, Compass Pathways, Darnitsa, Delpor, Denovo, Draig, Eli Lilly, Eumentis Therapeutics, Gedeon Richter, GH, Hikma, Holmusk, IntraCellular Therapies, Jamjoom Pharma, Janssen/J&J, Karuna, LB Pharma, Lundbeck, MedInCell, MedLink, Merck, Mindpax, Mitsubishi Tanabe Pharma, Maplight, Mylan, Neumora Therapeutics, Neuraxpharm, Neurocrine, Neurelis, Newron, Noven, Novo Nordisk, Otsuka, PPD Biotech, Recordati, Relmada, Response Pharmaeutical, Reviva, Rovi, Saladax, Sanofi, Seqirus, Servier, Sumitomo Pharma America, Sunovion, Sun Pharma, Supernus, Tabuk, Takeda, Teva, Terran, Tolmar, Vertex, Viatris and Xenon.

WS003

French psychiatrists' concerns about assisted death

E. Olie

Department of Emergency Psychiatry and Acute Care, Lapeyronie Hospital, CHU Montpellier, Montpellier, France
doi: 10.1192/j.eurpsy.2025.192

Abstract: A bill on euthanasia and assisted suicide is currently under discussion in France. It proposes that only competent adults suffering from a serious and incurable condition that threatens their life in the medium term, or who are in an advanced or terminal phase, and experiencing unbearable physical or psychological suffering—either refractory to treatment or considered unbearable in the absence of treatment—may request medical assistance in dying (MAiD). However, French psychiatrists have expressed concerns about the bill, as it does not mandate a psychiatric evaluation, despite the high prevalence of mental disorders, including depression, in the general population. These disorders are even more frequent in end-of-life conditions and can significantly impact decision-making capacity and the wish to die. Depression, a common comorbidity in cancer—the leading cause of MAiD requests—affects approximately 15% of cancer patients but is often underdiagnosed and undertreated. The bill also raises concerns regarding its implications for suicide prevention. Some MAiD requests may stem from treatable psychiatric conditions rather than a well-considered end-of-life choice. Furthermore, a proposed obstruction offense could potentially criminalize suicide prevention efforts, complicating the role of mental health professionals. Uniquely, the French bill allows a third party chosen by the patient to administer the lethal substance, a provision not found in any other country. This raises significant ethical and psychological concerns regarding the emotional burden on the designated individual, who may experience distress, guilt, or long-term psychological repercussions from actively participating in assisted dying. Finally, the possibility of future expansion to include psychiatric-only indications, as seen in other countries, remains a critical issue requiring careful ethical and medical scrutiny.

Disclosure of Interest: None Declared

WS004

What forms of framing can be found in the Flemish media in a jury trial about euthanasia for psychological suffering?

K. Catthoor[1,2,3]

[1]CAPRI, University of Antwerp; [2]PZ Stuivenberg, Ziekenhuis aan de Stroom, Antwerp and [3]Flemish Association of Psychiatry, Kortenberg, Belgium
doi: 10.1192/j.eurpsy.2025.193

Abstract: The Flemish Association of Psychiatry developed due care guidelines for medical assisted dying in cases of severe and unbearable psychiatric suffering, which were adopted by the Order

of Physicians. In principle, there are therefore more than enough well-known recommendations on how to handle a request for termination of life from a patient with psychiatric issues.
Nevertheless, occasionally something goes wrong due to misinterpretation of the legal criteria or due to careless actions by the consulting or performing physician.
In 2010, a female patient died by euthanasia because of unbearable mental suffering, which was unacceptable for her family. The family decided to initiate a court case to have the inaccuracies in the decision-making process and the execution of the euthanasia evaluated by a judge. In 2020, three involved doctors, including a psychiatrist, were prosecuted for this euthanasia. An analysis of the court case and the media coverage of this case will be discussed.

Disclosure of Interest: None Declared

WS005

Euthanasia and assisted death from a Spanish perspective

M. Martin-Carrasco

Psychiatry, Clinica Psiquiatrica Padre Menni, Pamplona, Spain
doi: 10.1192/j.eurpsy.2025.194

Abstract: Medical assistance in dying is an increasingly available option for people suffering (solely) from psychiatric disorders. Initially promoted to alleviate the suffering of terminally ill people, a growing number of jurisdictions are adopting it for any cause of intractable and severe suffering, including mental disorders. Today, the BENELUX countries, along with Spain and Switzerland, explicitly authorise it or allow it de facto. Other countries, such as Canada, are considering implementing it. Although in jurisdictions where it is permitted it is argued that it is discriminatory not to consider mental suffering as sufficient cause, there are reasons for concern. The procedure is likely to be used as an alternative to care, that is, as a gentler form of suicide, more commonly used by women. The long-term impact of this practice must be considered, as it sends the message that mental illnesses may not be curable, and that it is not worth the effort to treat them, or to demand the necessary care. Furthermore, all of these factors must be considered in the context of highly stigmatized disorders to which clearly scarce resources are allocated.

Disclosure of Interest: None Declared

WS006

Lessons from Belgium: Physician-assisted dying for (neuro)psychiatric suffering after 23 years of Belgian euthanasia legislation

J. Vandenberghe[1,2]

[1]Dpt Neurosciences, Psychiatry Research Group, University KU Leuven and [2]Adult Psychiatry, University Psychiatric Center KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium
doi: 10.1192/j.eurpsy.2025.195

Abstract: In 2002, the euthanasia law was voted in Belgian parliament, depenalising physician-assisted dying under certain conditions for irremediable physical or mental suffering caused by an incurable condition for which all therapeutic options have been exhausted. The euthanasia request needs to be repeated, well-considered and voluntary and the patient should be competent. If the patient is not in a terminal condition, there should be at least one month between the written request and the euthanasia and three independent physicians have to be involved in the evaluation. Psychiatric suffering was not excluded in the law, but there is discussion whether the possibility of psychiatric euthanasia was intended by the legislator. In the first years after the euthanasia law, psychiatric euthanasia was limited to a few cases, but then rose to a mean of 25 cases per year. There was a peak in 2013 of 54 cases, but after 2013 there was no more increasing trend.
In 2017, the Flemish Association for Psychiatry issued an advice regarding due diligence in psychiatric euthanasia. Controversy regarding psychiatric euthanasia kept stirring the public debate, especially after one court case in which a psychiatrist and general physician were accused and acquitted after a psychiatric euthanasia. Another prominent topic in the public debate in Belgium is broadening the euthanasia law for advanced dementia based on an advance directive. Now euthanasia is only possible in the earlier stages of neurodegenerative disease, when competence is still sufficiently intact.

Disclosure of Interest: None Declared

WS007

Current situation in Europe – different perspectives from Poland

J. Samochowiec

Department of Psychiatry, Pomeranian Medical University, Szczecin, Poland
doi: 10.1192/j.eurpsy.2025.196

Abstract: The presence of large numbers of Ukrainians looking for refuge in Poland is a new experience for Poles. The ongoing war and the uncertainty of the situation of those displaced may cause anxiety and lead to stressful reactions, exacerbated by endlessly circulating information on hostilities. Therefore, the sense of security may be threatened not only among Ukrainians who have fled to Poland, but also among people who support Ukrainians, who offer them help and shelter. Prolonged support, if not accompanied by proper selfcare can increase the risk of burnout as well as lead to distressful emotional states, such as a feeling of helplessness, reluctance to provide further help, or even demonstrate hostility. The Polish government and polish NGO's have pledged to help refugees from Ukraine, including the provision of mental health care. Raising awareness of the whole society and training employees from sectors other than medical may help in the proper protection of mental health of refugees and the people supporting them. Dividing the organization of mental health care into the four levels (Intervention Pyramid (Inter Agency Standing Committee, 2007)and offering support depending on the needs, ranging from building a basic sense of security, acceptance, and support for meeting the needs of refugees, to the level of highly specialized psychological and psychiatric assistance, enables the use of the resources of the entire society and specialists in an appropriate manner. By activating refugees themselves and training employees and volunteers of