

Methods. This was a retrospective review of patients' files referred to ASD Walsall CAHMS Clinic conducted in February 2021. A random sample size of 44 boys and girls equally distributed from the ASD database was selected randomly from the completed ASD assessment list, the equal distribution between genders was intentional. We looked at presenting symptoms reported on the referral letters, assessments in CAMHS, and interventions outlined from ASD outcome letters of all subjects with completed ASD assessment, in age groups 7–18 years.

Results. Across genders, most patients presented in the teenage years with common age of presentation seen at ages 15 and 17, both at 15.9% and mean age being 13 years. Ninety-five percent of patients were in school at the time of referral. Only 4.5% of patient were referred through crisis and the rest through local GP. A variety of presenting symptoms were seen, with the majority of the patients presenting with social and communication difficulties (77.3%), under /overreaction to sensory stimuli (63.6%) and anxiety (61.4%). 9.1% of patients had a family history of ASD. 100% of assessments included ADOS, SALT and neurodevelopmental assessment. 77.3% of patients were referred to support groups like living with ASD parent support groups. Along with CAMHS, education (97.7%) was the main agency involved in the care of these patients. In 44.2% of patients, EHCP was requested or already in place. The in between gender comparison also showed that although most symptoms were similar in both groups, some such as self-harm were higher among girls (27.3%) as compared to boys (13.6%) as well as obsessional symptoms which were more common in boys (63.3%) as compared to girls (27.3%).

Conclusion. Undiagnosed ASD presents with a wide variety of symptoms amongst boys and girls. Previous UK studies have shown an earlier presentation of ASD and which is contrary to our findings demonstrating a much later presentation. Therefore, we recommend referrers to be aware of the varied presentations and have a lower threshold for referral to secondary services to aid quicker ASD diagnosis and management.

An Audit to Assess the Quality of Ward Referrals Sent to City Hospital Liaison Psychiatry Team From Inpatients Wards D15, D17 and D27, Between July 2021 to September 2021

Dr Kesegofetse Setlhare^{1*}, Dr Hannah Woodman²,
Dr Amandeep Pahal² and Dr James Hickmott²

¹Black Country Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust, Wolverhampton, United Kingdom and ²Sandwell and West Birmingham Hospitals NHS Trust, Birmingham, United Kingdom

*Presenting author.

doi: 10.1192/bjo.2022.483

Aims. Liaison psychiatry provides psychiatric care to medical patients. Patients include those attending emergency departments, general hospital inpatients and outpatients. Liaison teams work hand in hand with several general hospital teams to offer advice, review and manage these patients. Over the last few months, the Liaison service in City Hospital have been receiving many inappropriate referrals. Inappropriate referrals are defined as patients who are referred to services, with one of the following reasons:

1. Insufficient presenting complaint
2. No documented Past psychiatric history
3. Insufficient Mental state Examination (MSE)
4. No risk assessment
5. No documented Drug/alcohol history

6. Patients having not consented to referral.

7. If one or more of the above criteria is not met

Our aim was to evaluate the appropriateness of the referrals received from D15, D17, D27 inpatients wards in City Hospital over a 3-month period from July to September 2021. These wards were chosen as they commonly refer patients to liaison services.

Methods. We collated data retrospectively on the nature of all referrals from D15, D17 and D27 ward over a 3-month period. The patient referral portal was used, and referral content of each patient was analysed. An audit tool was devised to assess whether the referrals followed the liaison referral pathway and guidelines set by NHS England for referral structure to liaison services.

Results. 18 patients were referred to the Liaison psychiatry from the three wards over the three-month period. We observed 77.8% (n = 14) of the referrals having insufficient information for the presenting complaints, whilst 22.2% (n = 4) of them did not state past psychiatric history. Approximately 94.4% (n = 17) did not state sufficient details of MSE. In 83.3% (n = 15) of referrals appropriate detailed risk assessment was not done, 27.8% (n = 5) of them did not have alcohol/ drug use stated and 22.2% (n = 4) of patients referred did not consent to the referral being made.

Conclusion. The results demonstrated that ward referrals lack quality and contain inadequate information to allow for safe screening of patients and for the implementation of appropriate actions by the liaison team. A possible reason for inappropriate referrals may be due an existing knowledge gap and lack of confidence taking detailed psychiatric histories, assessing risk, and performing MSE in non-psychiatric trainees making referrals to liaison services.

Audit Of Psychotropic Prescribing in the Crisis Team at Fieldhead Hospital According to NICE Guidelines

Dr Shumaila Shahbaz*, Dr Maya Garside and Dr Tim Rajanna
South West Yorkshire Partnership NHS Foundation Trust, Wakefield, United Kingdom

*Presenting author.

doi: 10.1192/bjo.2022.484

Aims. To ensure that psychotropic prescribing and monitoring in the Crisis Team is compliant with NICE guidelines and to provide excellent patient care and to practice medicine safely.

Methods. Medication prescribing should be a collaborative decision by the service user and the prescriber. This allows patients to have autonomy to decide their treatment plan. NICE provides guidelines for prescribing medication which includes baseline investigations, reviews of treatment including side effects, and physical health monitoring.

We selected 50 admitted patients for the audit from April 2021 until September 2021, who were prescribed psychotropic medications. We used medication cards and electronic patients' records (System One). Our exclusion criteria were the 72-hour post-discharge follow-up from the inpatient ward.

The audit standards included as follows: age, gender, the indication, the start of medications, dose, within BNF limits, discussion, consent from the patient, comorbidities, physical health monitoring, response to treatment, monitoring of side effects, and other important information.

Results. 100% results for indication, dosage, discussion with the patient, and side effects monitoring.

We had promising results for benefits from the treatment (46 out of 50 patients responded to treatment) and 4/50 did not respond to treatment. Unfortunately, one patient died from an