

<sup>2</sup> Institute of Psychological Medicine IPM, Department of Psychiatry, Psychotherapy, Ludwig-Maximilians-University, Haag o.B., Germany  
\* Corresponding author.

**Introduction** In most European countries postgraduate training for specialization in psychiatry and psychotherapy is acquired over the course of 4–6-year programs. In the European Union, qualification in one country is recognized within other countries of the Union.

**Objectives and aims** To analyze the present situation of psychopharmacology-pharmacopsychiatry postgraduate teaching in Europe and to present the needs and preliminary instruments for improving the situation by harmonization of the programs.

**Methods** Analysis of the data available from national psychiatric societies and from the literature; development of a consensus among experts in this field.

**Results** Despite efforts to standardize post-graduate training, the curricula in different European countries vary greatly. This variability limits comparability between countries and international exchange while carrying consequences in the breadth and quality of education that trainees receive. Literature and curricula mainly published in USA as well as a recently published curriculum and learning catalogue in Germany [1] offer useful tools for the development of a curriculum at a European level.

**Conclusions** There is clearly a need for standardization of psychopharmacology-pharmacopsychiatry teaching at the European level. This can be achieved by the introduction of a curriculum and learning catalogue developed by European experts and based on tools already available.

**Disclosure of interest** The authors have not supplied their declaration of competing interest.

#### Reference

[1] Laux G. Proposal for a model psychopharmacology curriculum for psychiatric residents in Germany. *Psychopharmakotherapie* 2014;21:64–8.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.eurpsy.2016.01.952>

## W19

### Proposal for a model psychopharmacology curriculum for psychiatric residents in Germany

G. Laux

*Institute of Evidence-based Medicine in Psychopharmacotherapy, Institute of Psychological Medicine, Haag i.OB, Germany*

All German societies of medicine have been ordered by the Federal Association of Physicians (Bundesärztekammer) to propose new revised regulations for the education of residents. The German Association for Psychiatry, Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics (DGPPN) is offering a broad extension of education in psychotherapy while education in pharmacotherapy is still rather small and limited. The working group Biological Psychiatry of the German Association of Psychiatric Hospitals (Bundesdirektorenkonferenz, BDK) suggests a detailed proposal of a psychopharmacology curriculum based on a Delphi method consent of medical directors involved in the education of the majority of German psychiatric residents. Issues include general pharmacology, neurobiological principles, clinical pharmacology of different classes of psychotropics (antidepressants, antipsychotics, mood stabilizers, anxiolytics, hypnotics, stimulants etc.), special aspects (e.g. pregnancy, geriatric patients) as well as ethical, legal and economic aspects. About 160 hours of theoretical education are proposed, clinical teaching should be interactive, with vignettes and supervision covering about 300 hours.

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

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.eurpsy.2016.01.953>

## W20

### Psychopharmacology during residents' training: The role of scientific societies

P.M. Llorca

*Hôpital Gabriel Montpied, Psychiatry department, Clermont-Ferrand, France*

In France, psychopharmacology is supposed to be one of the bases of the training during the first year of residency. But there is no standardization in the content of the psychopharmacology courses for residents from one region to another. There is also a debate around the way psychopharmacology has to be learned by young professionals, with the development a narrative approach that seems to have a pedagogic relevance, opposed to a more academic approach. In this context, the French Society for Biological Psychiatry and neuropsychopharmacology developed a program of specific psychopharmacology workshops for residents. These workshops combine a fundamental pharmacologic approach, with a more clinical evidence-based one, trying to take into account the discrepancy that residents may experienced between knowledge and every day practice, around specific topics (e.g. polypharmacotherapy). This program highlights different issues in the domain of the psychopharmacology courses for residents around the format (e.g. on-line courses versus face-to-face courses), the topics and the content of the courses (e.g. categorical approach of prescription versus dimensional approach). It underlines the need for a clear definition of what has to be known by residents in this field but also how this initiative can be implemented for a large number of residents using numeric tools and what is the role of scientific societies and their interactions with academic teaching. The funding of such programs has also to be defined and clarified.

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

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.eurpsy.2016.01.954>

## W21

### The new neuroscience based nomenclature of neuropsychotropic drugs: A chance for a better understanding and teaching of clinical psychopharmacology

H.J. Möller

*Psychiatric University Hospital Munich, Munich, Germany*

Traditional psychopharmacological terminology is based on historical grounds and under different aspects not systematic and rational. It even tends to confuse patients by prescribing a drug that does not reflect their identified diagnosis, prescribing “antipsychotics” to depression. Four major colleges of neuropsychopharmacology (ECNP, ACNP, Asian CNP, an CINP) proposed a new multi-axial pharmacologically-driven nomenclature. The template has five axes: 1- class (primary pharmacological target and relevant mechanism); 2- family (reflecting the relevant neurotransmitter and mechanism); 3- neurobiological activities; 4- efficacy and major side effects; and 5- approved indications. The results of the surveys suggest that the clinicians found the available indication-based nomenclature system dissatisfactory, non-intuitive, confusing, and doubt-inducing for them and the patients. The proposed five-axis template seeks to upend current usage by placing pharmacology rather than indication as the primary axes. With the proposed nomenclature relating primarily to Axis 1 – the class, and usage of the other axes would largely depend the extent to which the clinician seeks to deepen the scientific and clinical base of his involvement.