

TREATMENT

There are many myths around serious mental illness (SMI) that are not always accurate. Let’s take a look at common myths around treatment for SMI.

MYTH	FACTS
Safety Plans Are Not Effective For Individuals Who Have SMI	<p>A safety plan is different from a safety contract. Only safety plans are effective in mitigating risk of suicide.</p> <p>Safety contracts, or Contracts for Safety (CFS), are when an individual agrees verbally or in writing not to engage in any self-harm.¹ It is like signing a contract not to attempt suicide. Safety contracts have been used for years but the research shows that they do not mitigate risk for suicide.²⁻³</p> <p>Safety plans are exactly that – plans. They focus on what individuals plan to do to keep themselves safe.^{4,5} In advance of a mental health crisis, individuals write down coping strategies and supports that are helpful to them when they feel a sense of self-harm arise. Research shows that safety plans work.³⁻⁵ Safety plans typically include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">✓ Early warning signs✓ Coping strategies✓ Safe places for the person to go to✓ Individuals or groups who can provide distractions or support✓ Professionals who can be contacted✓ How to make the environment safe✓ One or more things worth living for

MYTH	FACTS
Only Psychiatrists Can Effectively Treat and Manage Individuals Who Have SMI	<p>Given the waxing and waning course of diagnoses within the category of SMI and the difference in experience of these diagnosis, a care plan for an individual varies over time and also varies between individuals with the same diagnosis. Care may include psychotherapy, psychopharmacology, and utilization of other support services.⁶ Some undoubtedly need specialized care from psychiatrists. Yet emerging evidence suggests that some individuals who are seen in mental health settings and have stable medication regimens can be managed by primary care using a stepped approach. In a study of individuals who received psychiatric care and were stable before being transferred to primary care, only 2.1% were transferred back to specialized mental health settings.⁷ Transition to primary care was an indication to the individual that their illness had improved and was consistent with recovery-oriented practices.⁸</p> <p>Other studies are now under way that look at transitions in mental health care to primary care settings.⁹</p>

MYTH	FACTS
The State of Clinical High Risk is Not Valid As A Clinical Construct	<p>The early identification of individuals who have an increased risk for psychosis may allow clinicians to intervene more promptly. This can potentially alter the trajectory of the illness. The term clinical high risk for psychosis (CHR-P) is sometimes referred to as the prodrome, at risk mental state, or ultra-high-risk state. It describes the period of time when an individual has subthreshold signs or symptoms of psychosis prior to the onset of frank psychotic symptoms.¹⁰ Some of the more common instruments used in CHR-P research are semi-structured interviews like the Structured Interview for Prodromal Symptoms¹¹ and the Comprehensive Assessment of the At-Risk Mental State.¹² In an umbrella review summarizing 42 meta-analyses, among individuals who met CHR-P criteria, the risk of conversion to psychosis was 22% at three years among individuals who met CHR-P criteria.¹³</p>

MYTH	FACTS
Individuals Who Have SMI Do Not Benefit From Therapy	<p>Evidence-based practices (EBPs) include therapies that are studied scientifically in individuals who have SMI and are proven to be effective.¹⁴ In fact, a large body of research shows that many EBPs are very effective in reducing debilitating symptoms. Two of the primary EBP approaches are Cognitive Behavior Therapy (CBT) and Cognitive Behavior Therapy for psychosis (CBTp). In order for these treatments to be effective, individuals need to actively engage in their care and clinicians need to provide that care according to the principles and standards of the EBP.¹⁵</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">✓ EBPs lead to higher quality care, reduced costs, greater clinician satisfaction, and improved outcomes compared to traditional approaches to care¹⁶✓ EBPs are based on the best scientific evidence available about treatments that work✓ EBPs lead to improved outcomes because specialized training is required in order to provide this kind of care

Sources:

1. The Suicidal Client: Contracting for Safety, <https://psychcentral.com/pro/the-suicidal-client-contracting-for-safety#1>
2. Kelly, K.T., & Knudson, M.P. (2000). Are no-suicide contracts effective in preventing suicide in suicidal patients seen by primary care physicians? Archives of Family Medicine, 9, 1119–1121
3. Bryan CJ, Mintz J, Clemans TA, Leeson B, Burch TS, Williams SR, Maney E, Rudd MD. Effect of crisis response planning vs. contracts for safety on suicide risk in U.S. Army Soldiers: A randomized clinical trial. J Affect Disord. 2017 Apr 1;212:64-72. doi: 10.1016/j.jad.2017.01.028. Epub 2017 Jan 23. PMID: 28142085.
4. Stanley, B., & Brown, G. (2012). Safety Planning Intervention: A brief intervention to mitigate suicide risk. Cognitive and Behavioral Practice, 19(2), 256–264.
5. Centre for Suicide Prevention, <https://www.suicideinfo.ca/resource/safety-plans/>
6. Dixon LB, Goldman HH, Bennett ME, et al: Implementing Coordinated Specialty Care for Early Psychosis: The RAISE Connection Program. Psychiatric services (Washington, D.C.) 66:691-698, 2015
7. Smith TL, Kim B, Benzer JK, et al: FLOW: Early results from a clinical demonstration project to improve the transition of patients with mental health disorders back to primary care. Psychol Serv 18:23-32, 2021
8. Fletcher TL, Johnson AL, Kim B, et al: Provider perspectives on a clinical demonstration project to transition patients with stable mental health conditions to primary care. Translational Behavioral Medicine 11:161-171, 2021
9. Hundt NE, Yusuf ZI, Amspoker AB, et al: Improving the transition of patients with mental health disorders back to primary care: A protocol for a partnered, mixed-methods, stepped-wedge implementation trial. Contemporary Clinical Trials 105:106398, 2021
10. Fusar-Poli P, Borgwardt S, Bechdolf A, et al: The psychosis high-risk state: a comprehensive state-of-the-art review. JAMA Psychiatry 70:107-120, 2013
11. Miller TJ, McGlashan TH, Rosen JL, et al: Prodromal assessment with the structured interview for prodromal syndromes and the scale of prodromal symptoms: predictive validity, interrater reliability, and training to reliability. Schizophr Bull 29:703-715, 2003
12. Yung AR, Yuen HP, McGorry PD, et al: Mapping the onset of psychosis: the Comprehensive Assessment of At-Risk Mental States. Aust N Z J Psychiatry 39:964-971, 2005
13. Fusar-Poli P, Salazar de Pablo G, Correll CU, et al: Prevention of Psychosis: Advances in Detection, Prognosis, and Intervention. JAMA Psychiatry 77:755-765, 2020
14. What is evidence based practice and why does it matter?, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qFhxrT4MDt8>
15. Barwick MA, Peters J, Boydell K. Getting to uptake: do communities of practice support the implementation of evidence-based practice?. J Can Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry. 2009;18(1):16-29.
16. Drake RE, Goldman HH, Stephen Leff H, Lehman AF, Dixon L, Mueser KT, et al. Implementing evidence-based practices in routine mental health service settings. Psychiatr Serv. 2001;52(2):179–82. doi:10.1176/appi.ps.52.2.179.

