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Summary
How to respond optimally following traumatic events remains a Holy Grail. A number of early interventions lack evidence of effect. Practical, pragmatic support provided in an empathic manner is likely to be an appropriate initial response and complement the high levels of resilience shown by individuals exposed to traumatic events.

The 22 July 2011 Norway terrorist attacks horrified the world. The nature of the traumatic experiences endured by those involved was extreme; even the most hardened critics of the post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) diagnosis would be likely to acknowledge that the experiences were severe enough to precipitate significant distress, if not disorder, in many of those present. Dyb and colleagues' interview study unique. The study confirmed the repeated finding that not all individuals exposed to extremely traumatic events develop PTSD. Indeed, the 11% prevalence of ‘full PTSD’ and 36% rate of extreme; even the most hardened critics of the post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) diagnosis would be likely to acknowledge that the experiences were severe enough to precipitate significant distress, if not disorder, in many of those present. Dyb and colleagues' interview study unique. The study confirmed the repeated finding that not all individuals exposed to extremely traumatic events develop PTSD. Indeed, the 11% prevalence of ‘full PTSD’ and 36% rate of 'partial PTSD' are lower than might be anticipated after such an extreme event and point to resilience among those involved. Various factors may contribute to this, including many that were not measured. Younger age has not been consistently found to be associated with lower rates of PTSD after traumatic events but high level of perceived social support, a key finding in this study, has been.

Early psychosocial response

Dyb and colleagues' study raises the important yet still not fully resolved question of how to optimally respond from a psychosocial perspective following major traumatic events. The evidence has slowly moved forward over recent years but very early interventions remain evidence-informed rather than evidence-based. The notion of providing single-session preventive interventions for everyone involved has been dismissed as a result of evidence showing that single-session psychological debriefing, despite often being liked by recipients, is at best neutral and may even cause harm in some people. Subsequent attempts to develop multiple-session psychosocial interventions for everyone have also largely failed to show benefit over no formal intervention. The routine use of pharmacotherapy to temper the initial adrenergic response associated with the development of PTSD does not appear to be the answer.

The prospect of offering absolutely nothing, although arguably as evidence-based as anything, is not an attractive option to many people and does not address the repeated finding of perceived high levels of social support being protective. Many guidelines caution against doing nothing shortly after traumatic events, recommending the delivery of supportive, practical and pragmatic input in a supportive and empathic manner but avoidance of formal clinical interventions. Such approaches do not resemble psychological treatments, in contrast to most of the early interventions that have been subjected to randomised controlled trials. They are psychosocial with key social elements that address people's basic needs, such as housing, finances and nutrition.

Innovative work has moved the field away from the medicalisation of something that should not be medicalised, not in the majority, anyway. By extrapolating findings from related fields of research, five early intervention principles have been proposed: promoting a sense of safety, calming, a sense of self and community efficacy, connectedness and hope. These principles, along with human and community resiliency, now underpin best practice guidance to early intervention following traumatic events and have contributed to the re-emergence of psychological first aid.

Psychological first aid

First described in the 1950s, the principles of psychological first aid are increasingly advocated and used in the provision of early psychosocial intervention following traumatic events. Designed to be provided by trained lay people, the Inter-Agency Standing Committee described psychological first aid as ‘a description of a humane, supportive response to a fellow human being who is suffering and who may need support’. It is an approach that aims to address the psychosocial needs of those involved in major traumatic events. Key components include: active listening with the provision of an opportunity to talk while respecting the desire not to talk about their experience; assessing basic and physical needs and ensuring these are met; promoting positive coping mechanisms; supportive advice and linking people with sources of support, including family and friends; encouraging participation in normal daily routines; identification of those who need further help and facilitating referral to more specialist services when indicated.

Despite its burgeoning popularity, psychological first aid remains a non-evidence-based intervention and we continue to await definitive evidence that it is appropriate. (The same can be said of emerging approaches using peer support.) Given the current evidence, considered use of the principles of psychological interventions for everyone involved has been dismissed as a result of evidence showing that single-session psychological debriefing, despite often being liked by recipients, is at best neutral and may even cause harm in some people. Subsequent attempts to develop multiple-session psychosocial interventions for everyone have also largely failed to show benefit over no formal intervention. The routine use of pharmacotherapy to temper the initial adrenergic response associated with the development of PTSD does not appear to be the answer.
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first aid, as part of a well-coordinated response, appears to be an appropriate way to provide early psychosocial support.

Provision of psychosocial care following major traumatic events needs to be integrated with other services and part of the overall traumatic event response plan. Pre-planning, good coordination and adequate training (something that is often neglected until disaster strikes) are key. Ongoing planning will also be required as major traumatic events unfold; each will have unique characteristics and require a modified response.

Evidence-based treatments

The better news is that we do have evidence that specific treatments can be effective for established disorders following traumatic events. Trauma-focused cognitive–behavioural therapy has a good evidence base for DSM-IV acute stress disorder from 2 weeks after a trauma and for PTSD from 1 month. For PTSD of 3 months duration or longer, the evidence base is much stronger for trauma-focused cognitive–behavioural therapy and also strong for eye movement desensitisation and reprocessing. Recent reviews have consistently shown small positive benefits for selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors in the treatment of PTSD, although when considered individually some (e.g. paroxetine) have a better evidence base than others. Venlafaxine has a similar evidence base for the treatment of PTSD.

Conclusions

There remain many challenges to be addressed in preventing PTSD and other mental disorders following traumatic events. Key messages from the current evidence are that very early formal psychological and pharmacological interventions have not been shown to work and that practical, pragmatic support provided in an empathic manner is an appropriate initial response. Early detection and appropriate referral of those with more significant difficulties is important as there are a number of effective treatments available for PTSD and other disorders that occur following traumatic events. Thankfully, a large percentage of individuals are resilient after trauma and, although we do not know how to prevent disorder, we know what we can do to facilitate recovery and resilience by increasing access to protective factors and seeking to remove or mitigate further hazards.

Jonathan I. Bisson, BM, FRCPsych, DscClinPsychotherapy, DM, Institute of Psychological Medicine and Clinical Neuroscience, Cardiff University, Hadyn Ellis Building, Maindy Road, Cathays, Cardiff CF24 4HQ, UK. Email: bissonj@cf.ac.uk

First received 6 Oct 2013, final revision 23 Feb 2014, accepted 6 Mar 2014

References

Early responding to traumatic events
Jonathan I. Bisson
Access the most recent version at DOI: 10.1192/bjp.bp.113.136077

References
This article cites 8 articles, 2 of which you can access for free at:
http://bjp.rcpsych.org/content/204/5/329#BIBL

Reprints/permissions
To obtain reprints or permission to reproduce material from this paper, please write to permissions@rcpsych.ac.uk

You can respond to this article at
/letters/submit/bjprcpsych;204/5/329

Downloaded from
http://bjp.rcpsych.org/ on September 30, 2017
Published by The Royal College of Psychiatrists