columns

more important to service users than their psychiatrists, this does not tell us what happens in practice.

The real question which we should be asking is to service users themselves and how *they* feel religion has been accounted for in treatment. I worry that the answers might be even more demoralising.

Taking a spiritual history is both an easy and important task to be undertaken by any professional. It can substantially help a service user feel understood and hence engaged in treatment. The Spirituality Special Interest Group provides several tools which should surely become routine practice for all mental health professionals, at the very least in screening (www.rcpsych.ac.uk/PDF/DrSEaggeGuide.pdf).

The suggestion of prayer with service users is a troubling one with the potential to lead to transgression of boundaries through sharing such an intimate act. It leads to duplicity of the psychiatrist's role, erosion of the purpose of treatment and in my mind is best avoided.

Declaration of interest

P.C. is an atheist.

KOENIG, H.G. (2008) Religion and mental health: what should psychiatrists do? *Psychiatric Bulletin*, **32**, 201–203.

Peter Carter Consultant Psychiatrist, North East London Foundation Trust, South Forest Centre, 21 Thorne Close, Leytonstone, London E11 4HU, email: Peter.carter@nelmht.nhs.uk

doi: 10.1192/pb.32.9.357b

Medication for side-effects under the Mental Health Act

The need to authorise the use of hyoscine to counter hypersalivation caused by antipsychotics has been recently debated by Woochit & Husain (2008). They question the logic of the Mental Health Act Commission in suggesting that authorisation needs to be sought on Forms 38 or 39 for detained individuals to receive such medication. They propose a corollary of the Commission's position that all medication used for possible side-effects should similarly be specified, such as senna for constipation and metformin for diabetes.

The Mental Health Act 1983 nowhere defines 'medication for mental disorder' in relation to its consent to treatment powers and the courts have never ruled on the question, although the case of *B v. Croydon Health Authority* [1995] is often cited as a precedent for the contention that a treatment ancillary to the administration of medication for mental disorder can fall within section 58 of the Act (Jones, 2006) and therefore requires certification. It is a long accepted practice, for example, that antimuscarinic drugs should be named on the legal forms. Of course this approach could be taken to absurd lengths, meaning that a statutory second opinion might be required to administer a laxative or an indigestion tablet to an incapacitated detained individual.

The Mental Health Act Commission seeks to ensure that forms should provide a clear indication of the limits of any authorisation, both for clinical teams and for the service user, while remaining practical. We therefore seek to distinguish between ancillary treatments that are an essential adjunct to the core treatment, without which the latter could not be reasonably given, and treatments of more widespread physical complaints that may or may not be related to the core treatment.

Hyoscine is a good example of how this distinction should work in practice. Idiopathic sialorrhoea is exceptionally rare. Where it occurs with antipsychotics, in particular but not exclusively with clozapine, it can be said to be almost certainly one of the side-effects of that drug and nothing else. Contrast this with, for example, constipation or indigestion: both are known to be side-effects of psychotropic medication, but are also common intermittent or chronic problems in the general population, often with no exact known cause. From such pragmatic distinctions we have drawn up a list of ancillary treatments requiring certification including, for example, antimuscarinics used in parkinsonism and other motor effects of antipsychotics and hyoscine used for hypersalivation but excluding laxatives, indigestion remedies, or antidiabetics (Mental Health Act Commission, 2002). Our guidance is under review and we would welcome comments and responses to the correspondence address below.

JONES, R. (2006) *Mental Health Act Manual* (10th edn). Sweet & Maxwell.

MENTAL HEALTH ACT COMMISSSION (2002) *Guidance for Commissioners on Consent to Treatment and Section 58 of the Mental Health Act 1983*. MHAC.

WOOCHIT, V. & HUSAIN, S. (2008) Does hyoscine need to be 'legally' prescribed? *Psychiatric Bulletin*, **32**, 196–197.

B v. Croydon Health Authority [1995] 1 All E.R. 683, CA.

***Mat Kinton** Senior Policy Analyst, Mental Health Act Commission, 56 Hounds Gate, Nottingham NG5 4AU, email: mat.kinton@mhac.org.uk, **Keith Dudleston, Peter Jefferys, Satnam Singh Palia, Claire Royston, Simon Wood** Lead Second Opinion Appointed Doctors, Mental Health Act Commission, Nottingham

doi: 10.1192/pb.32.9.358

Discharge delays

Many elderly psychiatric wards are currently experiencing problems with delayed discharges (Hanif & Rathod, 2008). It is interesting to note that mental health patients were initially included in the Community Care Act 2003. They were only excluded in a late House of Lords amendment after lobbying by mental health groups, particularly MIND.

As with New Ways of Working, we reap what we sow.

HANIF, I. & RATHOD, B. (2008) Delays in discharging elderly psychiatric in-patients. *Psychiatric Bulletin*, **32**, 211–213.

David Tullett Consultant Old Age Psychiatrist, Rochford Hospital, Union Lane, Rochford, Essex SS4 1RB, email: david.tullett@southessex-trust.nhs.uk

doi: 10.1192/pb.32.9.358a

Depot risperidone, hyperprolactinaemia and prolactin-associated side-effects

Hyperprolactinaemia is a significant adverse effect of antipsychotic treatment and is particularly associated with dopamine-blocking agents like risperidone. Hyperprolactinaemia may cause menstrual disturbance, galactorrhoea, impotence and reduced libido. These problems impair the quality of life and contribute to non-adherence to medication (Maguire, 2002). Chronic hyperprolactinaemia has been associated with osteoporosis (Naidoo *et al*, 2003).

Depot risperidone is an injectable, slow-release formulation whose prolactin-inducing properties may differ from oral risperidone. Only one previous trial assessed hyperprolactinaemia associated with the use of depot risperidone in routine clinical care (Bushe & Shaw, 2007).

In a pilot study in Renfrewshire, Scotland, we identified 37 individuals who were taking depot risperidone. Twelve individuals had medical conditions or took other drugs that may have influenced the level of prolactin and thus were excluded from our study. The remaining 25 individuals had the level of prolactin measured and they completed a questionnaire about prolactin-related side-effects. Ten individuals refused to take part in the study and it was completed by 15 participants (9 men and 6 women, mean age 48 years, mean duration of treatment with depot risperidone 15.4 months).

In 12 participants the level of prolactin has risen, with 3 individuals having levels more than four times the upper limit of