Embracing patient choice

The principle of informed consent is basic to medical practice. It requires that the patient be informed of the reasons for the proposed intervention, including medication, the expected outcome and any and all potential adverse reactions. As has been pointed out many times, informed consent – and informed refusal – does not consist merely of the signing of a form but the discussion between patient and physician. In the UK, USA and Canada, the right of informed refusal is well established but there persists a misunderstanding of the role of competence. The Supreme Court of Canada, in *Starson v. Swayze* [2003], allows informed refusal of medications even by a patient with a diagnosed psychiatric disorder. The presiding judge stated that:

‘The [Health Care Consent Act] confronts the difficult problem of when a mentally ill person may refuse treatment. The problem is difficult because it sets in opposition fundamental values which we hold dear. The first is the value of autonomy – the ability of each person to control his or her body and consequently, to decide what medical treatment he or she will receive. The second value is effective medical treatment – that people who are ill should receive treatment and that illness itself should not deprive an individual of the ability to live a full and complete life. A third value – societal protection – comes into play in some cases of mental illness. Where the mentally ill person poses a threat of injury to other people or to him- or herself, it may be justified to impose hospitalization. [...] The right to refuse unwanted medical treatment is fundamental to a person’s dignity and autonomy. This right is equally important in the context of treatment for mental illness. [...] Few medical procedures can be more intrusive than the forcible injection of powerful mind-altering drugs which are often accompanied by severe and sometimes irreversible adverse side effects [...] a competent patient has the absolute entitlement to make decisions that any reasonable person would deem foolish [...] The right knowingly to be foolish is not unimportant, the right to voluntarily assume risks is to be respected. The State has no business meddling with either. The dignity of the individual is at stake. [...] In this case, the only issue before the Board was whether Professor Starson was capable of making a decision on the suggested medical treatment. The wisdom of his decision no bearing on this determination. [...] The Board must avoid the error of equating the presence of a mental disorder with incapacity. Here, the respondent did not forfeit his right to self-determination upon admission to the psychiatric facility [...] The reviewing judge properly held that the Board’s finding of incapacity was unreasonable, and that the Board misapplied the statutory test for capacity. There is no basis to find that either of the courts below considered fundamental values which we hold dear.

The patient was granted the right to refuse medications and seek psychotherapy.


As a researcher, doctoral student and service user (with a diagnosis of schizophrenia), I commend Morrison and colleagues [2012] for their brave and timely editorial. In addition to the adverse effects they mention, a small but robust literature attests to the often overlooked impact of subjective or psychological side-effects on service users’ quality of life and ability to pursue meaningful, socially valued roles (e.g. Awad & Voruganti,2 Deegan,3 Jones,4 Roe & Swarbrick5).

In a focus group project on medications and treatment engagement that I recently completed, many service users reported that, in their experience, treating psychiatrists almost always refuse to even see patients who decline pharmacotherapy. Likewise, help with coming off medications is rarely available from medical professionals, leading to the deeply ironic fact that virtually the only comprehensive guide to psychotropic medication discontinuation widely available in the USA is the non-academic, activist-published *Harm Reduction Guide to Coming Off Psychiatric Drugs*.6 Similarly, I have yet to meet an American service user with a diagnosis of psychosis who has ever been actively offered targeted intermittent (v. continuous) treatment. Clearly, research documenting the representative ‘real-world’ availability of treatment choices and alternatives, as well as the actual extent of autonomy support in psychiatric settings (or the lack thereof), is urgently needed.

As things stand, ‘choice’ and ‘self-determination’, at least in the USA, often appear to involve little more than the choice between a variety of antipsychotics and other psychotropic medications. As Morrison *et al* suggest, it is high time we began to take the profound heterogeneity of treatment response, outcome and symptom trajectories, as well as individual needs, preferences and risk assessments, seriously.

Morrison and colleagues highlight the important issue of patient choice in relation to the prescription of antipsychotic medication. They argue that patient choice should be considered because of the uncertainty regarding potential benefits and increasing awareness of potential risks of both older and newer types of antipsychotic medication. I agree that patient choice, along with consideration of the evidence, should be an essential part of the decision-making process and believe that shared decision-making is an ideal way in which to do this.

Shared decision-making involves a collaborative approach to treatment decision-making whereby the clinician presents information about suitable treatment options along with details about the potential risks and benefits of each option.7 In return, the patient provides information about their personal values and preferences, so that a decision can be made on both evidence and patient preferences and values.

In areas where evidence is limited or ambiguous, shared decision-making offers an opportunity to be explicit about what is known about likely treatment outcomes and therefore encourages realistic expectations. Having frank and collaborative discussions as part of the decision-making process may also encourage patients to be more open about sources of decisional
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In any other branch of medicine today, the question ‘Is it time to introduce patient choice?’ would sound absurd: the only appropriate answer would be an incredulous, ‘Has this not happened already?’ For a significant number of readers of the *British Journal of Psychiatry*, this question in relation to the matter of antipsychotics is likely, in contrast, to be provocative and controversial. That this is the case shows just how far there is to travel before discrimination on the grounds of mental ill health can be said to have been extinguished.

It is therefore timely in suggesting we should re-evaluate the way in which antipsychotic medication is used in the treatment of psychosis, particularly for those very early in the course of illness. Since the beginning of the early psychosis reform period, we have consistently advocated for low-dose antipsychotic treatment of first-episode psychosis complemented with comprehensive psychosocial care. More recently we have argued that the success of early detection efforts means that young people are being seen much earlier in the development of their symptoms, and this alters the risk–benefit ratio associated with treatments. As proposed by the clinical staging model, there is a strong rationale for beginning treatment with more benign, but evidence-based psychological approaches and reserving pharmacological agents, which despite their efficacy, can have significant adverse effects for (psychological) treatment-resistant cases. Treatment should be proportional to severity and need. Factors that support the call for change in the use of antipsychotic medications include the well-documented metabolic side-effects of most antipsychotic medications, the possibility that some of the structural brain changes seen in psychosis may actually be produced by antipsychotic medications (although the significance of these changes in relation to course and outcome is still unclear), and the widespread non-adherence to prescribed antipsychotic
medications suggesting a lack of consumer engagement and dissatisfaction with the treatments offered. The influence of all of these factors is magnified in the case of young people early in their experience of psychotic illness. Finally, the arbitrary threshold of sustained positive symptoms may be an imperfect guide to the timing of antipsychotic medication use in every patient. Some people with subthreshold psychosis (or attenuated psychotic symptoms) may fail to respond to psychosocial treatments as first line and prove to benefit from antipsychotic medications, while a subset of patients with first-episode psychosis with short durations of illness may not require antipsychotic medication. Our research and that of other groups has indicated that antipsychotic medications are not needed as first-line therapy in subthreshold psychosis. We are also attempting to clarify the timing and need for antipsychotic medication in first-episode psychosis by conducting a randomised controlled trial investigating whether intensive psychosocial treatment is sufficient for recovery in a selected low-risk subgroup. It is possible that the results of this study will support a staged approach to the treatment of first-episode psychosis such that medications with significant side-effects are reserved for cases where safer treatments have not led to full remission and recovery. The study will also provide important information about structural brain changes in psychosis and the contribution of antipsychotic medication to these changes. The results of this randomised controlled trial will enhance available information about the risk and benefits of treatments for psychosis and thus improve the capacity of clinicians to support informed decision-making by consumers about their treatment.


The excellent editorial by Morrison et al strongly makes the case to shift current practice away from one in which service users are told that medication works and that they really must take it, towards one in which service users are presented with an accurate representation of the costs and benefits of antipsychotic medication and supported to make informed decisions about whether or not, for them, this is a option that appeals. This raises a very important challenge. How do we translate the information from this review of meta-analyses and double randomised controlled trials into something that will change the practice of front-line healthcare staff and be of direct use to service users? I am aware that despite similar conclusions being drawn with respect to antidepressant use for mild depression over 10 years ago and even changes to National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence guidelines about prescribing, this has not led to a reduction in prescriptions of these drugs and I doubt very much they are now prescribed along with an accurate summary of exactly how much clinical benefit one can expect to see as a result of taking them. This is a plea that this excellent analysis is followed up by a strategy to ensure it has a direct impact on clinical practice as soon as possible.


Authors’ reply: We have been pleasantly surprised by the positive tone of the responses to our editorial, as we had envisaged that it would attract criticism as well as support. However, this support has been very welcome, and we have been particularly impressed by the number of eloquent and authoritative responses from service users.

As Callard points out, the ability of service users to have a voice in academic and clinical journals is often missing, and the publication of several letters from service users in the British Journal of Psychiatry represents an important step in the right direction. We share her regret that the voice of service users, who have for years been making similar arguments to those in our editorial, but from a position of lived experience rather than scientific research, is often unheard or viewed as less legitimate. Jones, as one such service user voice, draws our attention to the often negative subjective effects that accompany antipsychotic medication, which is another important factor to consider in the cost–benefit profile. She shares experiences of service users being discharged from services if they choose not to take medication, which is a situation we have encountered many times, especially in recruiting for our recent clinical trial; this is clearly not to the benefit of anyone, and is only likely to result in crises that could have been avoided by a more collaborative approach to service provision. She also notes the lack of opportunities for guided discontinuation of antipsychotics; hopefully this is a situation that will change, given encouraging evidence from clinical trials that demonstrate that at least a proportion of people can be successful in their choices to discontinue medication.

Campbell-Taylor provides a compelling argument in support of autonomy and the importance of the ability to make decisions about our life, regardless of whether others agree with those decisions or not; we would agree that service users should have the right to make such choices as long as there is no immediate risk of significant harm to self or others. However, even in such difficult circumstances, there may be other ways to manage risk, including alternative pharmacological approaches such as the use of benzodiazepines in order to reduce arousal, which can still accommodate peoples’ wishes and respect their autonomy.

Simmons suggests shared decision-making as a way forward in the promotion of choice, and we would agree that this approach has great potential to enhance the involvement of service users in decisions about their care. However, we would also suggest a note of caution, as there may be risks if this is delivered in isolation from the system that service users have to negotiate, given that the wider cultural context within services may discourage autonomy and involve coercion; indeed, as Hamann and colleagues reported, service users who received the shared
decision-making intervention ‘were perceived as more “difficult” by their psychiatrists’. Thus, interventions should also aim to change the wider service context.

Francey et al discuss the relevance of a staging approach to the issues of choice regarding antipsychotics, which may certainly influence the relative cost–benefit profiles for service users at a particular phase of their mental health problems. However, we consider the issue of informed choice to be important regardless of whether it is an early phase or a more long-term condition. They also discuss their innovative clinical trial, which is a welcome development that will undoubtedly inform the evidence base regarding the possible costs and benefits of alternatives in comparison with antipsychotic medication, especially in first-episode psychosis, which is sorely needed.3

Finally, Lobban asks for a strategy for translating the emerging evidence into changes to routine practice, which we can only endorse. It can be hoped that the increasing influence of recommendations such as those contained in the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence guidelines,4 in combination with an associated programme of audit and incentives to perform in accordance with them, will promote such collaborative evidence-based practice. Similarly, we would hope that widespread provision of such information for service users and carers will help them in demanding change and ushering in genuinely collaborative care that embraces patient choice.


Embracing patient choice
Nev Jones
BJP 2012, 201:492.
Access the most recent version at DOI: 10.1192/bjp.201.6.492a