

Metabolic parameter (mean±SD)	Treated with clozapine or olanzapine	Referent values
BMI	26.147±4.180	25.0-29.9 (healthy weight)
Glycemia mmol/L	5.783±0.849	3.9-5.6
Cholesterol mmol/L	4.413±0.953	<5.17
Triglycerides mmol/L	2.433±1.380	<1.7

Conclusions: We justify the off-label use of clozapine in prison settings due its benefits in reducing violence and aggression; however, further research would be necessary to clarify does the use of clozapine in incarcerated persons cause behavioral improvements that could reduce recidivism and improve post-imprisonment outcomes. The prevalence of adverse effects is rare; however, that is possibly due to low doses of the prescribed antipsychotics and specific prison settings in terms of dietary options and physical activity, as well as the average young age of the inmates.

Disclosure of Interest: None Declared

EPV0857

Involving forensic psychiatric patients in research - experiences, challenges and lessons learnt after one year of the PART Advisory Board

E. Drewelow^{1*}, M. Daum², K. Gerullis¹, I. Kilimann², O. Biernetzky³, S. Teipel³, P. Walde⁴ and B. Völlm¹
¹Clinic for Forensic Psychiatry; ²Clinic for Psychosomatic Medicine and Psychotherapy, Rostock University Medical Center; ³Deutsches Zentrum für Neurodegenerative Erkrankungen (DZNE), Rostock and ⁴LVR-Institut für Forschung und Bildung, Köln, Germany
*Corresponding author.
doi: 10.1192/j.eurpsy.2025.1513

Introduction: Participatory research can enhance the relevance, quality, and impact of studies, increase recruitment, and optimize research methods. It can also help to secure third-party funding. The participatory inclusion of forensic psychiatric patients in research has so far primarily been implemented in the UK. With the establishment of the PART advisory board, founded in December 2023, this gap is intended to be closed in Germany by creating sustainable, previously lacking structures for the involvement of forensic psychiatric patients. The acronym PART refers to participation/ participatory. In the PART advisory board, people with lived experience and researchers actively cooperate in projects in the field of forensic psychiatry. In preparation for their role, people with lived experience received training where they were provided with knowledge and skills for their work. The board has now advised several research projects and issued recommendations. **Objectives:** The purpose of this presentation is to critically reflect on the first experiences and consider how to incorporate these insights to improve the structure and working methods of the advisory board: What experiences have researchers, people with

lived experience and those presenting their research projects made? How were participants involved? What impact did the advisory board have on specific research projects? What challenges arose, and how were they addressed? What are the lessons learned so far? **Methods:** To answer these questions, various evaluation tools were used. These include feedback questionnaires from participants assessing each advisory board meeting and project presentation, interviews with participants at least two times throughout the project, statements from the advisory board to project presenters, and responses from the presenters on how the board’s recommendations were implemented. Additionally, the perspectives of involved project staff were considered. **Results:** By the time interim results are presented at the EPA Congress 2025, the PART Forensic Advisory Board will have met at least 12 times and at least five research projects will have been presented to the board and received its recommendations. It has already become clear that involving participants, especially in forensic psychiatric settings, requires specific framework conditions. These address overarching structural aspects, disease specific patient relevant needs, as well as knowledge- and method-based issues relevant to participants. **Conclusions:** Even at this stage, the advisory board can be considered successfully implemented. Participatory research with people with lived experience in forensic psychiatric settings is possible, feasible, and above all, meaningful.

Disclosure of Interest: None Declared

EPV0858

Gambling among forensic psychiatric patients: A prevalence study

J. W. Eriksen^{1*}, L. U. Sørensen^{2,3}, S. Kristiansen⁴, M. D. Terkildsen^{2,3,5}, R. M. Hansen⁵, T. Marcussen¹ and L. Frostholm³
¹The Reseach Clinic on Gambling Disorder, Aarhus University Hospital; ²Department of Forensic Psychiatry, Aarhus University Hospital Psychiatry; ³Department of Clinical Medicine, Faculty of Health, Aarhus University, Aarhus N; ⁴Department of Sociology and Social Work, Aalborg University, Aalborg and ⁵DEFACTUM, Central Denmark Region, Aarhus N, Denmark
*Corresponding author.
doi: 10.1192/j.eurpsy.2025.1514

Introduction: While gambling problems are increasingly recognized as a public health concern, knowledge of the prevalence and impact within psychosocially vulnerable populations is scarce. Never before has the prevalence of gambling problems been studied in a forensic psychiatric patient population. Given the risk for gambling problems to exacerbate existing mental health conditions, cause financial strain, and contribute to criminal behavior, understanding its prevalence and associated factors within this population is critical. **Objectives:** The study aims to estimate the prevalence of gambling behavior and gambling problems among forensic psychiatric patients in Denmark and compare the results to the general Danish population. Additionally, the study seeks to identify associations