



Available online at  
**ScienceDirect**  
[www.sciencedirect.com](http://www.sciencedirect.com)

Elsevier Masson France  
**EM|consulte**  
[www.em-consulte.com/en](http://www.em-consulte.com/en)



24th European Congress of Psychiatry

## Core symposia

### Symposium: choosing wisely – prioritization in mental health care?

CS01

#### Making mental health part of the solution for reducing the negative impact of austerity – a perspective from England

S. Bailey

*The Royal College of Psychiatrists, London, United Kingdom*

This paper will describe four initiatives in England to protect the mental health of the population.

1. Lobbying government – presenting the evidence about how mental health services can reduce the impact of austerity on families and communities.
2. Building psychosocial resilience in schools through well being programmes and through “enabling environments” in the workplace.
3. Delivering sustainability in mental and physical healthcare:
  - prevention – don’t get ill in the first place;
  - patient empowerment – if unwell patient to self manage where possible;
  - lean service design – if healthcare services necessary, these should be efficient and high value;
  - low carbon – reducing carbon footprint and waste.
4. Working across medicine – choosing wisely:
  - promoting conversations between doctors and patients to choose care that is:
    - supported by evidence,
    - not duplicative of other tests of procedures already received,
    - free from harm,
    - truly necessary.

*Disclosure of interest* The author has not supplied his declaration of competing interest.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.eurpsy.2016.01.782>

CS02

#### Choosing wisely in Germany – adapting an international initiative to a national healthcare agenda

D. Klemperer

*Ostbayerische Technische Hochschule Regensburg, Faculty of Social and Health Care Sciences, Regensburg, Germany*

Overuse and underuse in healthcare is a chronic problem in most healthcare systems. Inspired by the North American Choosing Wisely Initiative, the Association of Scientific Medical Societies in Germany (AWMF), which actually counts 173 member organisations, decided to address the problem. The aim of the German “Gemeinsam klug entscheiden” (deciding together wisely)-initiative is to reduce overuse, underuse and misuse of health interventions in areas where recommendations of clinical practice guidelines (CPG) are not adequately implemented or missing. Starting point are the positive and negative recommendations of the CPGs, which the AWMF-member societies have developed for more than 20 years, following the manual and rules set up by AWMF. To identify and select recommendations methodological criteria have been developed by a working group in a consensus-based process. The development of AWMF-CPGs follows a methodology that aims to ensure the full integration of evidence, an interdisciplinary and interprofessional perspective, the prevention of bias as a consequence of conflicts of interest and full transparency of the development process.

*Disclosure of interest* The author has not supplied his declaration of competing interest.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.eurpsy.2016.01.783>

CS03

#### Choosing wisely – the viewpoint and experiences of the American Psychiatric Association

J. McIntyre

*University of Rochester, Psychiatry, Rochester, NY, USA*

Choosing wisely, a program developed by the American Board of Internal Medicine in 2012, is advancing a national dialogue on avoiding wasteful or unnecessary medical tests, treatments or procedures. Recommendations are chosen that have a strong evidence base. There are now over seventy specialty society partners including the American Psychiatric Association. The program attempts to involve patients in the dialogue and an important partner in the program is consumer reports. In this presentation, information about the origins of the program, its development and the impact it has on the practice of medicine will be reviewed. Also the measures developed and submitted by the American Psychiatric Association will be discussed and potential additional psychiatric measures will be discussed. The strengths and weaknesses of the program will be identified.

*Disclosure of interest* The author has not supplied his declaration of competing interest.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.eurpsy.2016.01.784>