# Correspondence

## Missing points

In response to an editorial by George Lodge[1] and a commentary by Helen Killaspy[2] I feel, with respect, that the authors have missed two terribly important points. First, that our enthusiasm for community services overcame us and second, that we forgot that admission to hospital can be a very powerful intervention.

The 11th report of the now defunct Mental Health Commission wrote cogently in 2003:[3]

> 'The systemic relation between hospital and community elements of mental health care make it dicult to determine whether inpatient overcrowding should be addressed by increasing bed numbers or further concentration on community support.'

It also gave information about in-patient care:

> 'the number of psychiatric beds has reduced dramatically from a highpoint in the early 1950s . . . The number of [National Health Service] mental illness beds available to services in England in the last twenty five years (up to 2002) . . . shows a 40% reduction since the [Mental Health Act] 1983 . . . however, as these figures do not include beds in the independent sector . . . the available but incomplete data on NHS and independent bed provision [appear] to show that, while the numbers of available beds in NHS facilities fell by around 20% between 1994 and 2001, the overall decrease in bed availability during that period was approximately 5%, once the growth in the independent sector is taken into account . . . In our view it is appropriate to note that independent sector services, whether profit-based or not, will rise and fall according to the dictates of the market. Given our estimate . . . that the actual reduction in beds was 5% up to 2000/1 . . . it could be that we have already attained the minimum number of psychiatric beds for a viable service.'

It seems that the road taken was to invest in community services over the following decade, quite commonly at the expense of in-patient care. Now some services are reducing the number of functional teams; few seem to be re-investing in acute in-patient care.

I remain to be convinced that developing community services across multiple functions (or specialisms, if you prefer) or putting these resources in catchment-based teams would solve the issue that most of us (clinicians and patients) have faced sometime painfully recently – where and when might we get a bed? Do not get me wrong, my threshold was high enough, but sometimes admission is the kindest thing.


1 Lodge G. How did we let it come to this? A plea for the principle of continuity of care. *Psychiatrist* 2012; **36**: 361–3.

2 Killaspy H. Importance of specialisation in psychiatric services. Commentary on . . . How did we let it come to this? *Psychiatrist* 2012; **36**: 364–5.

3 Mental Health Act Commission. *In Place of Fear? Eleventh Biennial Report 2003–2005*: pp. 102–35. TSO (The Stationery Office).


**J. Fiona MacMillan**, consultant psychiatrist, Staffordshire University, Walsall, West Midlands, UK, email: fmacmillan@nhs.net

doi: 10.1192/pb.36.12.475

**Author's response:** I agree with Dr MacMillan that unguarded enthusiasm for community services has led us into uncharted waters and that it is important to recognise the value of hospital admission. Every day psychiatric professionals conclude that admission is necessary for hundreds of patients.[1] In my editorial, I referred to the draconian reduction in psychiatric beds which has occurred in England over the past decade, a reduction driven, as Dr MacMillan says, by the need to fund the new multifarious community teams. In turn, the current focus on preventing hospital admissions is largely driven by bed shortages rather than by the needs of patients. These shortages frequently result in the transient placement of patients far from home, contributing further to the fragmentation of care pathways, distancing patients from family and friends and presenting challenges and delays in liaison. It is ironic that a service model intended to keep patients in their own environment has resulted in many being placed so far from home. A further irony is that it has led to the diversion of huge sums away from the National Health Service (NHS). In 2010/2011, out of the £925 million spent by primary care trusts in England on secure and psychiatric intensive care unit services, 34% was with non-statutory providers.[2]

Hospital admission may be the only practical way of keeping the patient or the community safe or the only environment in which the patient can be provided with the care they need. It can take the patient out of an adverse environment in which their mental state is deteriorating. However, it is always right to consider whether hospital care is necessary or whether treatment could be safely and effectively provided in the community. Hospital is an alien environment. Many will recognise the wish to be home and that long periods in hospital risk habituation, institutionalisation and disempowerment.

Though accused by Dr Killaspy of nostalgia and looking back through rose-tinted spectacles, I can assure her that, having worked in both acute and rehabilitation psychiatry, I do not need convincing of the benefits of community treatment and developments in treatment approaches for schizophrenia. However, all doctors should engage in reflective practice, carefully evaluating developments and modifying practice accordingly.

Dr Killaspy quotes the 2009 National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence guideline,[3] but she has been selective in her quotations. The guideline also says: 'Continuity of care from professionals capable of communicating warmth, concern and empathy is important, and frequent changes of key personnel threaten to undermine this process' (p. 24). On crisis and home treatment teams, it says: 'While such teams can offer a responsive service, they can at times struggle to maintain continuity of care' (p. 24). Also, 'Other service changes have seen the development in some areas of separate teams for inpatients and community-based individuals. These service changes present further potential seams and discontinuities' (p. 24). The NHS Institute for Innovation and Improvement observes: 'As patients pass through boundaries within and between organisations on their healthcare journey, there is often duplication, inefficiency and waste'.[4]

Dr Killaspy also cites Parker *et al*,[5] but does so extraordinarily selectively. The more complete quote is 'For