

EPV0525

Development and establishment of a patient advisory board for forensic psychiatric patients - Insights and experiences from the PART project

E. Drewelow^{1*}, M. Daum², F. Ferra¹, K. Gerullis¹, I. Kilimann², O. Klein³, P. Walde¹, S. Teipel² and B. Völm¹

¹Clinic for Forensic Psychiatry; ²Clinic for Psychosomatic Medicine and Psychotherapy, Rostock University Medical Center and ³(DZNE), Deutsches Zentrum für Neurodegenerative Erkrankungen, Rostock, Germany

*Corresponding author.

doi: 10.1192/j.eurpsy.2024.1206

Introduction: Participatory research (PF) actively involves people with lived experience (pwle), e.g. for a disease, in research. This improves the relevance, quality and impact of research and can help to raise third-party funds, increase recruitment numbers, select research methods. Pwle can support all stages of the research process, including dissemination. While PF is already standard in other countries, Germany is still lagging behind. Our participatory advisory board aims to create a sustainable structure to involve underrepresented patients.

Objectives: In the PART advisory board, pwle and researchers should actively cooperate in projects in the field of forensic psychiatry. In preparation to establish the advisory board procedures, key documents and training material were developed. In addition experiences, opinions, ideas and concerns of stakeholders and pwle in relation to PF were collected.

Methods: Guided interviews were conducted with stakeholders (clinical, research) and focus groups with in-patient pwle from forensic psychiatry. They were asked how they imagine the structure, tasks and goals of a participatory advisory board, what opportunities and obstacles they see. Anticipated framework conditions and support needs for the successful implementation were also asked. The interviews and focus groups were audio-recorded and transcribed. Data was analysed with MAXQDA using thematic analysis.

Results: In total, 8 expert interviews and 2 focus groups with 15 pwle were conducted in the first half of the year 2023. The analysis so far shows great interest in PF, although the term is mostly unknown and experience seems to be limited. The respondents identified opportunities for participatory research, but also challenges that need to be overcome in terms of its implementation. Both groups emphasise the importance of PF, especially in the field of mental illness, and express ideas for its implementation.

Conclusions: The results will be incorporated into the structure of the advisory board, so that PF in the field of forensic psychiatry will be more successful and the exchange between researchers and pwle will be facilitated. Detailed results as well as impressions from the first meeting(s) of the advisory board will be presented at the EPA conference.

Disclosure of Interest: None Declared

EPV0524

The preferences of Hungarian judges with regard to forensic psychiatry and forensic psychology experts

B. Baran¹, F. Á. Szabó^{1*}, A. Lisincki¹, L. Vida¹, P. Czobor¹, É. Jekkel¹ and B. Szuromi²

¹Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, Semmelweis University and ²National Institute of Mental Health, Neurology, Neurosurgery -Nyíró Gyula Center, Budapest, Hungary

*Corresponding author.

doi: 10.1192/j.eurpsy.2024.1207

Introduction: Although Hungarian forensic psychiatry has a historical legacy dating back to the 1890s, for the past few years there has been a dramatically increasing shortage of forensic psychiatry experts in Hungary, which affects both health care practices and the judiciary.

Objectives: In order to join the international academic unity of forensic psychiatry including research, education and treatment besides expert witnessing, our workgroup aims to facilitate the development of high-level quality standards in modern forensic psychiatry in Hungary. Based on our pilot study on this topic, in the current nationwide study we attempted to delineate the preferences of Hungarian judges regarding the role of forensic psychiatry and forensic psychology experts in both criminal and civil legal proceedings.

Methods: With the help of the National Office of the Courts, Hungarian judges were asked to complete a questionnaire that - besides personal characteristics - comprised specific questions in several areas including; hearing the experts; their preferences when assigning experts; the value of the expert's oral statement in court; the extent of their reliance on the psychiatric or legal knowledge of the experts; and the ways judges assess their own psychiatric and psychological knowledge. They were also asked to disclose their opinion about the attributes of optimally applicable expert opinions. Respondents provided their answers as rating on a 10-point Likert scale; or as percentage estimates. Besides descriptive statistics, we investigated the difference between the two groups of judges using Chi-square statistics and ANOVA with respect to the association between the answers and the main personal characteristics of judges.

Results: The dataset contains >400 completed questionnaires, returned from all over the country, and the analyses are ongoing. Preliminary results are available for a sample of 125 respondents: 53 criminal court and 72 civil court judges, with 64 of them having a maximum of 14 years and 61 having more than 14 years of work experience. Rating the characteristics of assigned experts, we found a significant association between being a criminal court judge and assigning an expert who is considered as an "acknowledged authority" by peers ($p=0.002$). Finding it crucial what the assessed people report on the legal case itself was significantly associated with civil court judges ($p=0.026$).

Conclusions: In the absence of any available nationwide information in Hungary, our study is expected to provide much-needed and fundamental information to the current practice of forensic psychiatry in the country.

Disclosure of Interest: None Declared