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PART A – LITERATURE REVIEW

1. LITERATURE SEARCH STRATEGY

Pubmed and COCHRANE databases were searched, and a systematic-like process was used to identify any relevant literature. Publications dated from 2000 to December 2018 only, were included in the databases search. Google search engine was used to identify possible grey literature. The following Boolean operator terms were searched using the advanced search option in each database. [Paramedics OR Prehospital health care provider OR prehospital provider] AND [Behavioural emergencies] AND [Responsibilities OR roles]. [Law enforcement OR police] AND [Behavioural emergencies]. Titles and abstracts were screened for relevance to the topic. Links to suggested articles that databases identified as possible relevant articles to search terms were also screened.

Inclusion criteria: For articles that showed high relevance, full articles were sought and included for review.

Exclusion criteria: Abstracts that show low relevance or articles with high relevant abstract for which full article could not be obtained.

2. INTRODUCTION

The World Health Organization (WHO) defines health as “a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity.” Mental health forms thus an integral part of overall health, still, this entity of healthcare is neglected and receives low priority during budget allocation – worldwide. It is estimated that neuropsychiatric disorders ranks third in their contribution to the burden of diseases in South Africa(SA), after Human Immunodeficiency Virus and other infectious diseases. Within a 12 month period, approximately 16% of SA adults will present with a mental illness and almost 70% of those adults will not receive adequate mental healthcare. SA as a country, struggles with many of the identified risk factors such as inequality, poverty, unemployment, exposure to violence and urbanisation, which contributes to the development of mental illness. These risk factors together with budget constraints, limited resources, little
training opportunities amongst primary healthcare providers, and the lack in recognition for the need of mental health care amongst SA adults worsens the mental health status of the country.\textsuperscript{3, 7, 8} Without adequate mental healthcare, the restoration of a person’s mental health is not always possible and may easily develop into a clinical significant mental illness.\textsuperscript{9, 10}

Mental health is defined by the WHO as “A state of well-being in which every individual realises his or her own potential, can cope with the normal stresses of life, can work productively and fruitful, and is able to make a contribution to her or his community.”\textsuperscript{11} Mental illness is the collective term for all diagnosable mental disorders which relates to changes in thinking –, behaviour – or emotional disorders and can present through a cluster of symptoms which can cause an impairment in daily functionality.\textsuperscript{12-14} When a person’s coping mechanisms fail and that person’s thinking, emotion and behaviour impair daily functionality it is considered a clinical significant mental illness.\textsuperscript{3, 12, 13} Only when the impairment in thinking, emotion or behaviour places the person or bystanders in imminent physical harm is it considered as a behavioural emergency.\textsuperscript{15, 16}

3. HISTORY OF MENTAL HEALTHCARE IN SOUTH AFRICA

The history of mental healthcare has a dark and cruel start, but gaining knowledge on all the wrongs done, helps one understand the reasons for the changes implemented and the challenges the mental healthcare system faces today.\textsuperscript{17}

The development of mental healthcare in SA can be divided into three stages:\textsuperscript{17}

3.1. The expediency and restraint period

The period dates back as far as 1652, when the Dutch East India Company settled in the Cape Colony.\textsuperscript{17} During that time mental healthcare was mostly provided to soldiers and sailors who were considered mad – persons with illness without clear physical cause.\textsuperscript{17} They were locked up in small rooms – institutionalised – and completely isolated from society. They were deprived of their human rights to freedom, liberty and autonomy - their freedom of choice.\textsuperscript{3, 5} The institutions provided basic healthcare, but lacked in the provision of mental healthcare, adequate sanitation and protection against restraints, neglect and abuse.\textsuperscript{5, 17}
3.2. Psychiatric hospital period

Immanuel Kant brought about the idea of equality during the enlightenment area; 1724-1804.\textsuperscript{17,18} Kant argued that every human is equal and each person should have autonomy over one’s own body.\textsuperscript{17,18} It was not long before the humanism movement entered SA borders.\textsuperscript{17,19} The movement fought for equal healthcare and opportunities in society, which included persons with mental illness.\textsuperscript{5,17,19} Soon it was realised that restraint and isolation no longer conform to the world’s view and mental healthcare changed from institutionalisation to specialised facilities.\textsuperscript{17} These facilities had larger rooms, gardens and occupational activities to aid in recovery, but still provided limited to no mental healthcare.\textsuperscript{17} Many persons with mental illness were still exposed to abuse and neglect.\textsuperscript{5,17,19}

3.3. The Modern Period

In 1910 SA became a union, and on 1 November 1916 the state Department of Health, promulgated the Mental Disorders Act.\textsuperscript{17,19} The legislation was the first to regulate the treatment provided to persons with mental illness.\textsuperscript{17,19} Even though the Act improved the medical and mental healthcare provided, the focus remained on the well-being of society, rather than the well-being of a person with mental illness.\textsuperscript{17,19} In 1966 a need for further regulation on the management of persons with mental illness was found and the Mental Disorders Act was reviewed.\textsuperscript{17,19} The Mental Health Act was developed and promulgated in 1975.\textsuperscript{17,19} The Act brought about improvements in protecting the human rights of persons with mental illness and provided better guidelines on the reception, detention and treatment of these persons.\textsuperscript{17,19} The Act was also the first in the country which empowered South African Police Services (SAPS) to make an application for involuntary apprehension.\textsuperscript{17,19} This means a SAPS was empowered to apprehend a person with mental illness without their consent and transport them to a mental healthcare facility.\textsuperscript{19} After the 1994 democratic election, the government once again reviewed the mental healthcare system and the Mental Health Care Act no 17 of 2002 was promulgated in 2004.\textsuperscript{5,17,19} At that time, the Act was commended to be one of the most advanced legislation in protecting the human rights of persons with mental illness.\textsuperscript{5,19} The Act was based on the WHO ten mental health principles as well as their recommendation of deinstitutionalisation.\textsuperscript{3,5,17}
4 DEINSTITUTIONALISATION

Deinstitutionalisation is the integration of mental healthcare into the general healthcare system, which ensures the provision of mental healthcare starts at a primary healthcare level and advances through to secondary and tertiary healthcare levels.\(^{20, 21}\) A major motivator for deinstitutionalisation is the strong association between mental illness and non-communicable diseases.\(^{3, 22}\) The South African Stress and Health study 2009,\(^{23}\) found adults are more likely to visit the general healthcare system for mental related problems than seeking specific mental healthcare services.\(^{23}\) These findings are supported by a literature review by Jacob and Coetzee\(^{20}\) It is argued that deinstitutionalisation allows for simultaneous treatment, assessment and monitoring of both mental health and physical health.\(^{21, 22, 24}\) Additionally, it should decrease the treatment gap by increasing accessibility and availability of mental healthcare, decrease cost to care, aid in early recognition of mental illness, treat persons with stable mental illness on an outpatient bases, practice preventative measures, promote human rights and decrease the stigmatisation against persons with mental illness.\(^{21, 22, 24}\)

There are arguments against deinstitutionalisation. Persons with mental illness have different diagnostic and management needs from those with physical disorders.\(^{25}\) Jacob and Coetzee\(^{20}\) found deinstitutionalisation has led to an increase in the presentation of behavioural emergencies in SA primary healthcare settings.\(^{20}\) Two studies from Australian support these findings.\(^{26, 27}\) The primary healthcare setting is that first contact a person has with the healthcare system.\(^{3}\) These settings are often chaotic, unpredictable, loud and busy, which may further aggravate the person’s anxiety, aggression or violence.\(^{9, 26, 28}\) Furthermore, studies have found primary healthcare providers, including prehospital emergency care providers and police officers, are not adequately trained in recognising and managing mental illness appropriately.\(^{21, 29-32}\) The lack of training, the ambiguous presentations of mental illness and difficulty in performing a thorough assessment and management of a person with mental illness in the primary healthcare setting can lead to substandard treatment, stigmatisation towards a person with mental illness and violation of human rights.\(^{9, 21, 31}\) Other concerns are the large number of people with mental health illness that are misdiagnosed or overlooked in the primary healthcare setting.\(^{9}\)
5. THE CURRENT MENTAL HEALTHCARE STATUS IN SOUTH AFRICA

In 2007, the Department of Health did a national review of the mental healthcare system using the WHO Assessment instrument for Mental Health System (WHO-AIMS). They reported a significant shortage in mental healthcare providers and facilities and that only between 1-8% of health expenditure were devoted to mental health care. The reported available mental health facilities were 3460 mental health outpatient facilities which treated 1660 person with mental illness per 100 000 general population annually; 80 day facilities which treated 3.4 person with mental illness 100 000 general population; 41 community-based inpatient psychiatric facilities with 2.8 beds per 100 000 general population; 63 community residential facilities with 3.6 beds capacity per 100 000 general population and 23 mental hospitals capable of providing 18 beds per 100 000 general population. As for the number of available mental healthcare providers, the report estimate there are 9.3 per 100 000 general population. They reported that deinstitutionalisation occurred mostly at district level, neglecting the important role the primary healthcare setting has in the provision of mental healthcare. Possible reasons for the failure of integration were the lack of additional guidance and support primary healthcare facilities received from secondary and tertiary healthcare facilities. The lack in support resulted in the provision of substandard mental healthcare without further referral or follow-up treatment plans. Other reasons were budgets constraints, lack in primary healthcare providers, including prehospital emergency care providers, lack in mental healthcare training, lack of knowledge of legislation, inadequate infrastructure and problems with the SAPS. The low numbers of available healthcare facilities and providers able to manage mental illness has led to a progressive increase in the presentation of persons with mental illness in the emergency care setting. After the release of the 2007 WHO-AIMS report, the Department of Health realised they were far from providing mental healthcare as intended by the Mental Healthcare Act. During February to April 2012, numerous mental healthcare summits were held and through extensive consultative meetings a National Mental Health Policy Framework and Strategic Plan 2013-2020 was drafted. This strategic plan set goals to achieve deinstitutionalisation into the primary healthcare setting, and recommended
further, specialised mental health training for primary healthcare providers. There are two concerns relating to the Mental Health Policy Framework and Strategic Plan; one is the neglect and acknowledgment of prehospital emergency care provider’s role in the provision of mental healthcare on a primary level and the second is an investigative report, released after the Esidimeni tragedy, in which 143 persons with mental illness died in 2016, after being transported form a designated mental healthcare facility to numerous non-governmental organisations and healthcare facilities, found SA is still far from reaching those set goals.

6. CURRENT LEGISLATION THAT REGULATES MENTAL HEALTHCARE IN SOUTH AFRICA

Mental healthcare and specifically the protection of human rights, including those living with mental illness in SA are regulated by the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa no 108 of 1996, the Mental Healthcare Act no 17 of 2002 and the National Health Act no 61 of 2003, Patient Rights charter, Health Profession Council of South-Africa guidelines and other individual guidelines provided by private or provincial institutions, each described below.


The Constitution is considered as the supreme law of the court and all other legislation and laws must conform to the set values of the Constitution. According to Chapter 2, the Bill of Rights, everyone has the right to equality, dignity, freedom and autonomy. Chapter 2, Section 27(a) describes the right to access to healthcare services which include mental healthcare and subsection 3 states no one may be refused emergency medical treatment. It is the responsibility of the Department of Health to realise the right to access to health within the constraints of available resources. A frequently asked question is, what is meant by essential healthcare and emergency medical services and what treatment does it constitute of? Both the Constitution and the National Health Act no 61 of 2003 fail to provide concise definitions.
6.2. The National Health Act no 61 of 2003

The Act is the right-based framework for the SA healthcare system. It should provide guidelines, definitions and parameters of entitlement of each available healthcare profession in SA to improve and promote healthcare, including mental healthcare on a national level. Spamers raised a major concern that none of these supporting policies, regulations and guidelines were provided. According to him and Kramer, confusion exists amongst patients and healthcare providers as to what an emergency and emergency treatment entails. According to the Medical Schemes Act 1998, an emergency is defined as “a sudden and, at the time, unexpected onset of a health condition that requires immediate medical or surgical treatment, where failure to provide medical or surgical treatment would result in serious impairment to bodily functions or serious dysfunction of a bodily organ or part, or would place the person’s life in serious jeopardy.” After the Soobramoney vs Minister of Health (Kwazulu-Natal) case the concept of emergency was redefined by Justice Madala and Justice Chaskalson as “a dramatic sudden situation or event which is of a passing nature in terms of time. There is some suddenness and at times even an element of unexpectedness in the concept ‘emergency medical treatment’.” Mr Soobramoney suffered from chronic renal failure, but was refused dialysis due to resource constraints. Mr Soobramoney argued that he had the right to these services in terms of Section 27(3) and Section 11 of the Constitution. The constitutional Court dismissed the case as his suffering from a chronic illness and not an emergency. These definitions provided by the Constitutional court and the Medical Schemes Act may pose difficulties in the SA setting. Many life-threatening emergencies encountered involves acute exacerbation of already diagnosed chronic illnesses. These exacerbations may not be sudden or unexpected in nature but may be life-threatening should immediate treatment not be provided.
6.3. National Health Act, Emergency Medical Services Regulations

The regulations were released on 1 December 2017. The regulations provide definitions for each level of prehospital care. The regulation defines emergency care as “the evaluation, treatment and care of an ill or injured person in a situation in which such emergency evaluation, treatment and care is required and the continuation of treatment and care during the transportation of such person to or between healthcare establishment (facilities).”

The definition is vague as it provides no clarity on what that situation is or what the scope of practice is for the emergency evaluation, treatment and care.

6.4. Health Professions Act no 56 of 1974, Regulations defining the scope of profession of emergency care

The definition provided by the regulations for emergency differs from the National Health Act by also including emergency rescue. An emergency situation is defined as “circumstances during which a person is injured or is for some other reason in mortal danger and need emergency care.” As seen with the National Health Act, these regulations fail to provide a scope of practice for the emergency rescue, evaluations, treatment and care.

6.5. The Mental Healthcare Act no 17 of 2002 (MHCA)

The Act aims to provide equal and fair mental healthcare to all SA citizens. It aims to protect the human rights of persons with mental illness by regulating the care, treatment and rehabilitation services provided, by guiding the roles and responsibilities of mental healthcare practitioners, mental healthcare providers, Mental Healthcare Review Boards, South African Police Services and lay persons. The Act however is silent on the roles and responsibilities of prehospital emergency care providers.

Chapter 1 of the act, provides many definitions, of which the most important for this review are:
6.5.1. Mental healthcare provider

“Means a person providing mental healthcare services to mental healthcare users (MHCU) and includes mental healthcare practitioners.”

It is unclear as to whether prehospital health care providers can be considered under the definition of a mental healthcare provider. Because the profession focuses on acute emergency situations it is rather assumed, they are not. If this is the case, the management of a person with mental illness in the prehospital setting, except in the case of a behavioural emergency, is under the onus of the South African Police Services.

6.5.2. Mental healthcare user (MHCU)

“Means a person receiving care, treatment and rehabilitation services or using a health service at a health establishment aimed at enhancing the mental health status of a user, state patient and mentally ill prisoner and where the person concerned is below the age of 18 years or is incapable of taking decisions and in certain circumstances may include – Prospective user; the person’s next of kin; a person authorised by any other law or court order to act on that persons behalf; an administrator appointed in terms of this Act; and an executor of that deceased person’s estate.”

6.5.3. Mental illness

“Means a positive diagnosis of a mental health related illness in terms of accepted diagnostic criteria made by a mental healthcare practitioner authorised to make such diagnosis.”

From this definition it almost appears that mental illness have indistinguishable characteristics, but as described earlier, mental illness is a range of mental-, behaviour and emotional disorders each with its own cluster of signs, symptoms and experiences. It also suggests that mental illness is completely separated from physical illness, when in reality these two entities are interconnected. One concern with this definition is the requirement of a diagnoses made by a mental healthcare practitioner. If this is the case, no healthcare provider or police officer will be able to provide involuntary care and treatment to a MHCU without that positive diagnosis of a mental illness.
6.5.4. Involuntary care, treatment and rehabilitation

“Provision of health intervention to people incapable of making informed decisions due to their mental health status and who refuse health intervention but require such services for their own protection or for the protection of others.”

As a principle, all patients are considered mentally capable of making informed decisions and provide consent. Autonomy is a fundamental human right and therefore no care, treatment or rehabilitation may be provided without consent. According to the above definition involuntary care, treatment and rehabilitation may only be provided when the person is incapable of making informed decisions. Currently SA has no legislation or guidelines on the assessment of mental capacity.

According to the discussion paper 105, by the South African law reform Commission, a patient is considered mentally incapable of making informed decision when they are unable to communicate the decision after all communication options have been considered and/or the patient is unable to retain and understand the information provided.

Chapter 3 (section 9), Chapter 5 (Section 32) and Chapter 5 (Section 40) describe the circumstance in which involuntary care, treatment and rehabilitation services may be provided. According to Chapter 3 (Section 9) (Addendum A) involuntary care, treatment and rehabilitation services may be provided by a healthcare provider when due to a mental illness any delay in providing these services may lead to irreversible harm to health, or death of a MHCU or others or serious loss to property. This section is unclear on whether a MHCU illness should be considered mentally incapable before involuntary care and treatment may be provided. Considering the immediate reaction required to prevent serious harm or even death, it is assumed that a healthcare provider may provide involuntary care to a MHCU irrespective of their current mental capacity to make informed decisions. Under the National Health Act and Health Professions Act, prehospital emergency care providers are considered healthcare providers, which suggest prehospital emergency care providers may provide involuntary care and treatment to preserve life or prevent irreversible harm.

Chapter 5 (section 32) (Addendum B) describes the process of involuntary care in situations other than those describe in Chapter 3 (Section 9) and is clear that the MHCU
must be mentally incapable of making informed decisions before involuntary care, treatment of rehabilitations services may be provided.\textsuperscript{36}

Chapter 5 (Section 40) (Addendum C) describes the involvement SAPS.\textsuperscript{36} According to this section a SAPS officer must take a MHCU to an appropriate healthcare facility if the officer has reason to believe through observation or information obtained by a mental healthcare practitioner, that a MHCU is likely to inflict serious harm due to a mental illness or severe and profound intellectual disability.\textsuperscript{36} When examining Chapter 5 (Section 40) one notice the Act does not provide a definition for ‘serious harm’.\textsuperscript{36} The interpretation of serious harm, is left up to the SAPS officer’s understanding of the behaviour of the MHCU at the time of assessment.\textsuperscript{31, 51} The definition provided for severe profound intellectual disability is; “a range of intellectual functioning extending from partial self-maintenance under close supervision, together with limited self-protection skills in a controlled environment through limited self-care and requiring constant aid and supervision, to severely restricted sensory and motor functioning and requiring nursing care.”\textsuperscript{36} From this definition it appears there is already a diagnoses of a mental illness. One cannot help but wonder, does this exclude the person experiencing a behavioural emergency with an acute mental illness?

Concerns have been raised by Ndou\textsuperscript{19, 51} and Moosa\textsuperscript{52} on this authority provided to SAPS to apprehend a MHCU.\textsuperscript{19, 51, 52} According to Ndou\textsuperscript{19, 51} they lack medical training and understanding of mental illness.\textsuperscript{51} This is supported by a retrospective study done by Johnson\textsuperscript{53}. The study reports that SAPS are unable to correctly predict or recognise behaviour that might cause harm to self or others.\textsuperscript{52, 53} This again opens the SAPS to civil law suits in cases of unlawful involuntary apprehension or in cases where the officer made a decision not to apprehend a MHCU and harm is done to others or property.\textsuperscript{51} The second concern is the lack in guidance provided by the MHCA on the acceptable methods of apprehension and transportation by SAPS.\textsuperscript{51, 54, 55}

\subsection*{6.6. Health Professions Council of South Africa (HPCSA) Guidelines}

The HPCSA is the regulatory body of all healthcare professions as established in terms of the Health Professions Act no 56 of 1974.\textsuperscript{5} Their function is to guide and advance the healthcare professions through training and clinical practice guidelines.\textsuperscript{5} For
prehospital emergency care providers the council provide guidelines on patient consent, patient rights and scope of practice for each prehospital level of care. On 31 December 2018 the Council released new clinical practice guidelines for prehospital emergency care providers. To date, implementation is slow. The new clinical practice guidelines recommend no deviations from current practices in terms of managing behavioural disturbances, although no previous clinical guidelines exist.

6.7. Guidelines provided to Gauteng Emergency Services (EMS) employees

There are two guidelines; Management of Mental Health Cases in the EMS setting and Guidelines for the Management of Emergency Mental Health Patients by EMS and provided to the employees of the Gauteng Emergency Medical Services. Both documents are vague in the management of behavioural emergencies. According to the guidelines a MHCU may no longer be transported in SAPS vehicle and Gauteng EMS may use leather bands to mechanically restrain a MHCU. Restraints are emergency intervention used to quickly deescalate a behavioural emergency, but are highly discouraged as it often causes injuries to the MHCU. The MHCA does not provide any guidelines on the use of restraints, but a separate guideline, Policy Guidelines on Seclusion and Restraints of a Mental Health Care User, was released by the Department of Health which does provide guidance. According to this Policy, mechanical restraints may only be used by a mental health care practitioner inside a health care facility in the event of a MHCU inflicting serious harm to self or others. It is presumed then that mental healthcare providers and other healthcare providers, including prehospital health care providers, may not make use of mechanical restraints. According to the scope of practice provided by HPCSA, prehospital emergency care providers practicing at advanced level of care, may sedate patients. The guidelines are unclear on whether sedation may be used as a chemical restraint in behavioural emergencies as well or whether it may only be used in patients that require sedation because of their physical illness.

6.8. Guidelines used by the South African Police Services

The training guideline for the SAPS, dated 2003, provided basic training on the MHCA. The guideline differs from the EMS guidelines, stating that SAPS may transport a MHCU in the a SAPS vehicle. The use of an ambulance, is recommended
when the MHCU has been sedated and requires continuous monitoring, but when an 
ambulance is not available a sedated MHCU may be transported in a SAPS vehicle, 
provided a healthcare provider accompanies the MHCU.54 The guideline placed high 
value on the relationship required between the justice system and healthcare system 
during the management of behavioural emergencies.54 Concerns have been raised that 
such relationship are lacking, especially between the justice system and primary 
healthcare setting.41, 53, 61 Both parties would seem to feel unsure of their 
responsibilities and are hence reluctant to assist, trying to transfer responsibilities from 
one party to the other.41, 53, 61

7. INTERNATIONAL LEGISLATION

SA is a signatory state to international entities such as the United Nations (UN) and 
the WHO and agreed to conform to certain guidelines, amongst which are the United 
Nations Mental Illness Principles and the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.2, 5 By 
signing such a document the SA government committed to improve and empower the 
rights of person with disabilities.2, 62 A systematic review by Burns2 identified a 
significant gap between the provision and the demand of mental healthcare in SA.2, 7 
These findings implied that the Government was failing as a signatory to execute their 
responsibilities and obligation set out by these guidelines.2, 62 Despite efforts by the 
UN and WHO to improve mental healthcare and protect human rights, no universal 
regulation for the provision of mental healthcare exists.63 The lack of universal mental 
healthcare regulations means that there are still approximately 40% of the world’s 
countries without any form of mental healthcare legislation or programs.63 

Countries such as the United Kingdom and Australia do have mental healthcare 
legislation and are in many ways similar to the South African Mental Healthcare Act.

7.1. Australia, State of Victoria Mental Health Act no 26 of 2014

The Act was promulgated in July in 2014 and the main purpose is to provide a 
legislative framework on the assessment and treatment of MHCU and is an amendment 
to the Mental Health Act 1994.64, 65 The Act provides definitions for important terms, 
many of which has a different meaning as that provided by the SA MHCA. Mental 
ilness is defined as “a medical condition that is characterised by significant 
disturbance of thought, mood, perception or memory.” And does not require a
diagnosis from a mental healthcare practitioner. The Act also elaborate on what is not a mental illness. Compulsory has the same meaning as Involuntary. The State of Victoria’s justice system has the same responsibilities as the SAPS. The criterion for involuntary apprehension is like that of the SA MHCA. The Act does not require the police officer to make any clinical judgement. According to the Victorian Protocol for the transport of people with mentally illness, the MHCU may only be transported in a police vehicle if the person cannot be transported safely in an ambulance or a mental health service vehicle.

A significant difference observed between the Australian State of Victoria Mental Health Act and the SA MHCA is the power provided to prehospital emergency care providers. According to Section 353, State of Victoria prehospital emergency care providers may enter any premises, when there is reason to belief a MHCU can be found within that premises and is likely to commit or attempt suicide or inflict serious harm to self or others. The prehospital emergency care providers may then involuntary apprehend the MHCU and transport to a designated mental healthcare facility. Involuntary apprehension by a prehospital emergency care provider may be performed whether the MHCU is mentally incapable of making informed decisions or not. Prehospital emergency care providers must always take the MHCU’s decision making capacity into account but may still involuntary apprehend in situations where they are of the opinion the MHCU has the likelihood of causing serious harm to self or other. The authority provided to prehospital emergency care providers to involuntary apprehend a MHCU is not without concern. Such authority may encourage defensive practice, where prehospital emergency care providers transport the MHCU without just cause to prevent law suits of negligence. Such practices are against the principles of healthcare, a patient’s autonomy has always been considered or implied in cases of an emergency, before any care and treatment is rendered. Involuntary apprehension is easy to perform in cases where the MHCU lack decision making capabilities, but the terms of involuntary apprehension when the MHCU have decision making capabilities are unclear. Healthcare providers have a legal obligation towards their patient’s in both respecting their autonomy and providing the care they required. Involuntary apprehension is in direct conflict with this legal obligation.
7.2. The United Kingdom, Mental Health Act 2007

The Act is an amendment to the Mental Health Act 1983. In this Act the term “mental illness” is substitute with the term “mental disorder” which is seen as any “disorder or disability of the mind.” This definition is very different from the term mental illness as described in the definition of the Australian Mental Health Act or the SA MHCA. Section 136 of this Act describe the responsibilities of the United Kingdom Police services.

According to this section, police officers may remove the MHCU, when found in a place to which the public has access to, and remove the MHCU to a place of safety, when the MHCU appears to be suffering from a mental disorder and immediate intervention is required for the safety of others and the MHCU. This differ from the Australian Mental Health Act which provide this apprehension power to police services and prehospital emergency care providers on any premises. The SA MHCA does not specify the place in which a SAPS may involuntary apprehend a MHCU.

8. PREHOSPITAL EMERGENCY CARE PROVIDERS

For the purpose of this review, the prehospital setting refers to the rescue, evaluation, care and treatment provided to a person that requires such emergency interventions due to injury or illness, and the continuations of care of treatment during transportation from the place of incident to an appropriate healthcare facility. In SA there are three levels of care, Basic Life Support, Intermediate Life Support and Advanced Life support. Historically, qualifications were obtained through short courses training.

At present a new National Emergency Care Education and training Policy is being implemented under the Department of Health with the help of the HPCSA. This is to ensure unity in training standards and qualifications conform to the South African National Qualifications Framework.

Prehospital emergency care providers are often the first to respond to an emergency, which may be a call for assistance with a MHCU. While mental health legislation have changed, from a paternalistic approach, to respecting the rights of MHCU and deinstitutionalisation, the prevalence of mental illness in the prehospital
setting has increased.\textsuperscript{27, 30, 71, 72} It is estimated that 4-5.4\% of patients visiting primary healthcare facilities seek mental healthcare and approximately 30\% of those patients are transported by prehospital emergency care providers.\textsuperscript{29, 70, 73-75} This number may be a gross underestimation as it only included MHCUs actively seeking mental healthcare and many mental illness are overlooked in the primary health setting.\textsuperscript{9, 29, 74} A literature review done by Ford-Jones\textsuperscript{70} in Toronto, America, identified three possible concerns relating to mental healthcare and prehospital healthcare setting.\textsuperscript{70} First is the misuse of prehospital healthcare services in the management of behavioural emergencies and MHCUs, secondly there is insufficient and inadequate training on mental healthcare and thirdly the substandard and scarce community based mental healthcare facilities.\textsuperscript{70} They go so far as to question the appropriateness of prehospital emergency care providers to manage behavioural emergencies.\textsuperscript{70}

Shaban,\textsuperscript{27, 30} an Australian based researcher has completed multiple studies on behavioural emergencies and the prehospital settings. Systemic reviews from 2004 and 2006 found the changes in Australian mental healthcare legislation now requires prehospital emergency care providers to perform a thorough assessment of a MHCUs mental capacity.\textsuperscript{27, 30} Australian healthcare facilities use a mental capacity tool, but the tool is too complex and time consuming for the prehospital healthcare setting, so there is a concern on how prehospital emergency care providers can make accurate clinical judgements and decisions in unpredictable situations.\textsuperscript{27, 30} Both Shaban\textsuperscript{71} and Wyatt\textsuperscript{76} from Australia, and Prener\textsuperscript{29} from Northeastern city, United States, investigated clinical judgement amongst prehospital emergency care providers during a behavioural emergency.\textsuperscript{27, 30, 76}

Shaban\textsuperscript{71} and Prener’s\textsuperscript{29} studies found participants perceived MHCU users as violent and feared for their own safety.\textsuperscript{29, 71} They experienced professional and personal stresses and were uncertain on the roles that they as prehospital emergency care providers fulfil during the management of a behavioural emergency.\textsuperscript{29, 71} Prener’s\textsuperscript{29} participants felt they are expected to make clinical decisions on the necessity for transportation of MHCUs based on limited training and knowledge. Participants felt they are trained in medical and traumatic emergencies, not in the management of mental illness. Some higher qualified participants even believed that behavioural emergencies are not true emergencies and waste time and resources that could have been used for true medical or traumatic emergencies.\textsuperscript{29} Watt\textsuperscript{76} found inexperienced
prehospital emergency care providers uses guidelines and protocols to guide their
decision making, while more experienced prehospital emergency care providers based
their judgements and decisions on knowledge gained through experience.\textsuperscript{76}
Rees et al\textsuperscript{69} from Wales, United Kingdom and McCann et al from Australia\textsuperscript{77}
investigated how prehospital emergency care providers perceived the care they provide
towards a MHCU. Rees’s\textsuperscript{69} study emphasized that traditional training for prehospital
emergency care providers focused on medical and traumatic emergencies but provided
little training on the management of mental illness.\textsuperscript{69} They found participants were
torn between their moral obligations towards the MHCU and law. Some participants
felt more loyal towards their moral obligations and reported manipulating the system
and MHCU as to whether they transport them voluntarily or involuntarily.\textsuperscript{69} McCann\textsuperscript{77}
reported the care provided to a MHCU were most likely influenced by the prehospital
emergency care provider’s understanding of their roles and responsibilities during the
management of a behavioural emergency.\textsuperscript{77} No consensus could be reached amongst
participants on whether their scope of practice should be extended to manage
behavioural emergencies in this study.\textsuperscript{77}
Roberts and Henderson\textsuperscript{75} looked at the perception South Australian prehospital
emergency care providers have on their roles, education and working relationship
when responding and managing a behavioural emergency. They found that
participants perceived their main responsibilities during the management of a
behavioural emergency, being to prevent further harm, treat life-threatening injuries
and transport the MHCU to an appropriate healthcare facility.\textsuperscript{75}
Only one study on behavioural emergencies and prehospital emergency care providers
in South Africa was found, performed in Cape Town by Evans\textsuperscript{45}. Evans\textsuperscript{45} explored
prehospital emergency care providers’ decision around transport of a MHCU who self-
harms and refuses care. She found that less than 66% of participants were willing to
take steps to convince a MHCU to be transported.\textsuperscript{45} It appears that SA prehospital
emergency care providers follow the same management approach as the participants
from Rees’s et al\textsuperscript{69} study. More than 50% of participants transported MHCU
involuntary and 80% of participants received no training on the SA MHCA.\textsuperscript{45}
Emond et al,\textsuperscript{72} performed a quantitative study to determine whether training in mental
healthcare could improve understanding amongst Australian prehospital
undergraduate students. After mental healthcare training only 25% of the participant
felt comfortable managing a behavioural emergency, but training in mental healthcare
could remove confusion and misunderstanding on the legal aspects of behavioural
emergencies.\textsuperscript{72}

It is interesting to notice that Rees’s\textsuperscript{69} study commented on the perception of MHCU
when treated by prehospital emergency care providers. They perceived the care
provided as hostile and unsympathetic, and felt they are judged and threatened by
prehospital emergency care providers.\textsuperscript{69, 78} This negative interaction has led to an
underlying fear amongst MHCU and may have a negative impact on MHCU’s
safety.\textsuperscript{45, 69, 78} MHCU are less likely to seek mental healthcare which may lead to
progressive worsening mental health status or increase the likelihood of refusing
prehospital transportation.\textsuperscript{10, 29, 45} Refusal to transportation may lead to prehospital
emergency care providers transporting MHCU involuntarily for fear of law suits of
neglect, as in Australia.\textsuperscript{75}

9. THE INVOLVEMENT OF LAW ENFORCEMENT

Historically, police services were most often involved in the apprehension and
detainment of MHCU for the greater well-being of the society.\textsuperscript{17, 79} Today, even with
the movement towards the protection of MHCU’s human rights, society is still of the
opinion that police services have a legal obligation to protect the society whatever the
cost and police services are often the service contacted to deal with a behavioural
emergency.\textsuperscript{26, 80} Approximately 15% of police related calls in England and Wales,
involved a person with a mental illness.\textsuperscript{25} As for prehospital emergency care
providers, police officers are unfamiliar with the correct procedures and services
available to assist with the management of a MHCU.\textsuperscript{80} Most police officers perceive
a MHCU as violent, hence it was found that this negative viewpoint together with a
lack of training and understanding in mental illness, lead to the use of unnecessary
force to manage a behavioural emergency.\textsuperscript{81}

Many sources were found to criticize the involvement of police services, especially as
prescribed in the SA MHCA (section 40).\textsuperscript{5, 25, 31, 51} Only one study was found that
focused on the perspectives of SAPS.\textsuperscript{53} Jonsson\textsuperscript{53}, through a retrospective study,
determined the compliance of SAPS with the SA MHCA.\textsuperscript{53} The study recognised a
weak relationship between the healthcare system and justice system in SA, and found
mental health training for SAPS to be lacking.\textsuperscript{53} With the lack in training and unclear boundaries as to when a MHCU should be held responsible for a criminal act, SAPS must make difficult decision when dealing with a MHCU.\textsuperscript{53} The study found SAPS officers felt a lack of support from the healthcare system which led to either unnecessary arrests of a MHCU, or a MHCU requiring medical assistance being left in the community.\textsuperscript{53} Both environments may have a negative impact on the MHCU’s mental health status.\textsuperscript{53} The study also found that approximately 25\% of all MHCU assessed in the healthcare facility are brought in by SAPS.\textsuperscript{53} SAPS experienced prehospital emergency care providers as unwilling to assist in the transportation of a violent MHCU, and the healthcare system perceived SAPS as unwilling to help.\textsuperscript{53} To adequately manage a MHCU, the healthcare system and justice system need to support one another.\textsuperscript{53}

10. CONCLUSION

SA has still a long road ahead in providing mental healthcare as indented by the MHCA. As seen in the literature, the incidence of mental illness is increasing in the primary healthcare setting.\textsuperscript{27, 71, 75, 78} While the WHO recognises prehospital emergency care providers as important role players for the provision and access to primary healthcare, legislation and regulation in SA remains unclear on the roles and responsibilities of prehospital emergency care providers in the provision of mental healthcare. Regulatory bodies call on prehospital emergency care providers to account for their clinical judgements, decisions and actions, but without the proper training programs, legislation and support in place. It is therefore necessary to research the following identified gaps.

1) Numerous definitions for an emergency were identified in SA legislation. Without a universal definition of an emergency, what would SA prehospital emergency care providers perceive as a behavioural emergency?

2) According to the Mental Health Care Act no 17 of 2002, Chapter 3 (Section 9) a healthcare provider may provide involuntary care and treatment to preserve life. Currently there are no regulations to guide SA prehospital emergency care providers in the provision of such care and treatment towards a MHCU. How do SA prehospital emergency care providers currently perform these duties?
3) The MHCA provides powers to SAPS to apprehend persons presenting with a clinically significant mental illness. How do SA prehospital emergency care providers currently manage such a MHCU and are current practices in line with current legislation?

4) Internationally, prehospital emergency care providers are of the opinion that behavioural emergencies and mental illness should not be managed by prehospital emergency care providers. Do SA prehospital emergency care providers share this viewpoint?
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ADDENDUMS TO LITERATURE REVIEW

ADDENDUM A: MENTAL HEALTH CARE ACT NO 17 OF 2002 CHAPTER 3 (SECTION 9)

(1) A health care provider or a health establishment may provide care, treatment and rehabilitation services to or admit a mental health care user only if –

   (a) the user has consented to the care, treatment and rehabilitation services or to admission;

   (b) authorised by a court order or a Review board; or –

   (c) due to mental illness, any delay in providing care, treatment and rehabilitation services or admission may result in the –

      (i) death or irreversible harm to the health of the user

      (ii) user inflicting serious harm to himself or herself or other; or

      (iii) user causing serious damage to or loss of property belonging to him or her or other

(2) Any person or health establishment that providers care, treatment and rehabilitation services to a mental health user or admits the user in circumstance referred to in subsection (1)(c)

   (a) must report this fact in writing in the prescribed manner to the relevant Review Board; and

   (b) may not continue to provide care, treatment and rehabilitation services to the user concerned for longer than 24 hours unless an application in terms of Chapter V is made within the 24-hour period.
ADDENDUM B: MENTAL HEALTH CARE ACT NO 17 OF 2002 CHAPTER 5 (SECTION 32)

Involuntary care, treatment and rehabilitation may only be provided to a mental healthcare user in a healthcare establishment when;

(a) an application in writing is made to the head of the health establishment concerned to obtain the necessary care, treatment and rehabilitation services and the application is granted;

(b) at the time of making the application, there is reasonable belief that the mental healthcare user has mental illness of such a nature that

(i) the user is likely to inflict serious harm to himself and herself or others; or

(ii) care, treatment and rehabilitation of the user is necessary for the protection of the financial interest or reputation of the user; and

(c) at the time of the application the mental healthcare user is incapable of making an informed decision on the need for the care, treatment and rehabilitation services and is unwilling to receive the care, treatment and rehabilitation required.
ADDENDUM C: MENTAL HEALTH CARE ACT NO 17 OF 2002 CHAPTER 5 (SECTION 40)

The involvement of South African Police Services in the management and transfer of mental healthcare user.

(1) If a member of the south African Police Service has reason to believe, from personal observation or from information obtained from a mental healthcare practitioner, that a person due to his or her mental illness or severe profound intellectual disability is likely to inflict serious harm to himself or herself or others, the member must apprehend the person and cause that person to be-

a) taken to an appropriate health establishment administered under the auspices of the State for assessment of the mental health status of the person; and;

b) handed over into custody of the head of the health establishment or any other person designated by the head of the health establishment to receive such persons.

(4) If an assisted or involuntary mental healthcare user has absconded or is deemed to have absconded or if the user has to be transferred under sections 27(10, 33(9, 34(4(b, 34(6 and 39, the head of the health establishment may request assistance from the South African Police Services to –

a) locate, apprehend and return the user to the health establishment concerned; or

b) transfer the user in the prescribed manner.

(8) A member of the South African Police Services may use such constraining measure as may be necessary and proportionate in the circumstances when apprehending a person or performing any function in terms of this section.
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SOUTH AFRICAN PREHOSPITAL EMERGENCY CARE PROVIDERS’ UNDERSTANDING OF RESPONSIBILITIES DURING A BEHAVIOURAL EMERGENCY

ABSTRACT

Background: Prehospital emergency care providers in South Africa are regularly called to assist with the management of mental healthcare users. The Mental Health Care Act no 17 of 2002 regulates mental healthcare in South Africa but makes no reference to the roles and responsibilities of prehospital emergency care providers in the provision of mental healthcare, rather giving the South African Police Services authority over the wellbeing of a mental healthcare user outside the hospital setting.

Aims: To investigate what prehospital emergency care providers understand their responsibilities are towards a mental healthcare user and the community during the management of a behavioural emergency.

Setting: Prehospital emergency care providers from the three main levels of care, currently operational within the boundaries of Pretoria.

Methods: A grounded theory qualitative study design was chosen using semi-structured focus groups for each level of prehospital emergency care; Basic Life Support, Intermediate Life Support and Advanced Life Support. Data from each focus group was collected through audio recordings, transcribed and analysed using a framework approach.

Results: A total of 19 prehospital emergency care providers from all three main levels of care participated in the focus group discussions (4 BLS, 6 ILS and 9 ALS). Four main themes were identified: Perceptions of behavioural emergencies, responsibilities, understanding of legislation and barriers experienced.

Conclusion: Participants placed high value on their moral and medical responsibilities towards a mental healthcare user and would like to have the backing of legislation to
fulfil their role. There is a desire for better education, skill development and awareness of mental healthcare in the prehospital emergency care setting.
INTRODUCTION
Prehospital emergency care in South Africa (SA) is regulated by the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa no 108 of 1996, the National Health Act no 61 of 2003, the Health Professions Act 56 of 1974 and regulations and guidelines provided by the Health Professions Council of South Africa (HPCSA). Prehospital emergency care is a primary service and according to the Health Professions Act refers to “the rescue, evaluation, care and treatment provided to a person that requires such emergency interventions due to injury or illness, and the continuations of care of treatment during transportation from the place of incident to an appropriate healthcare facility.” According to the Constitution no one may be refused emergency treatment, but as Spamers highlights: “what constitute such emergency interventions?”. Numerous definitions for an emergency is found in SA regulations, creating confusion amongst lay persons and emergency care providers on what constitutes an emergency. Another concern relating to these legislation are the lack in guidance provided to prehospital emergency care providers on the management of mental health care users (MHCU). The Mental Health Care Act no 17 of 2002, regulates mental healthcare in SA, and focuses on deinstitutionalisation – the integration of mental healthcare into the primary healthcare setting, however the Act fails to recognise prehospital emergency care providers’ role in the provision of mental healthcare.

An SA based study has reported an increase in the presentation of MHCU in the primary to general healthcare settings, this is most likely due to deinstitutionalisation. A MHCU can present with changes in emotion, thinking and behaviour, which may cause impairment in their daily functionality, or in the case of a behavioural emergency “a situation in which impairment in a person’s thinking, emotions and behaviour places the person or bystanders in imminent physical harm”

According to all the above mentioned legislation no treatment may be provided without consent, the exception being a behavioural emergency. According to Chapter 3(Section 9) of the MHCA, a healthcare provider, which include prehospital emergency care providers, may provide involuntary care, treatment and rehabilitation to a MHCU, however, it is unclear how this involuntary care and treatment should be provided in the prehospital setting.

Even in countries, such as Australia and the United Kingdom, where legislative support is provided to prehospital emergency care providers, they may still lack the
skills and knowledge to appropriately manage a MHCU and remain uncertain of their roles during the management of a MHCU. Studies have found that some prehospital emergency care providers considered behavioural emergencies as a waste of emergency service’s resources.

Prehospital emergency care providers in SA are frequently called to assist a MHCU. The management of such a person is complex as their human rights should be respected and their medical needs met, while protecting the community and other providers from harm. SA legislation is vague and provides little guidance to prehospital emergency care providers in how to management a MHCU. This study will to investigate what a cohort of SA prehospital emergency care providers understand their responsibilities are towards a MHCU and the community during the management of a behavioural emergency.

METHODS

Study design

A grounded theory qualitative research approach was chosen, using semi-structured focus group interviews as the tool for data collection. Because the study is exploratory, focus group discussions were chosen to add focus group dynamics during the discovery process.

Focus group design

An interview guide was developed, which encouraged participants to introduce their own concepts and ideas. Focus group interviews were conducted by the principal investigator, an Advanced Life Support prehospital emergency care provider, with the assistance of an experienced qualitative researcher. Separate focus groups were conducted for each of the three main levels of prehospital emergency care in SA, for level specific attributes to surface and to allow comparison between practitioners with varying levels of training and clinical experience. Focus group sizes were kept small, with no more than eight participants in each, to allow in depth discussion and equal opportunity for contributions.
Participants and sampling strategy

SA prehospital emergency care setting has three main levels of care: Basic Life Support (BLS), Intermediate Life Support (ILS) and Advanced Life Support (ALS). The scope of practice for each level of care is described in the HPCSA clinical guidelines.\textsuperscript{3, 4, 27-29} A convenience sampling approach was used, and participants were recruited using an invitation distributed around organisations and social media to ensure participants from both the public and private sector were included. The invitation provided a short description of the study, details to attend a focus group at a predetermined time, date and venue and contact details of the principle investigator. A secured list of all emergency care providers that showed interest to participate was compiled and those registered with the HPCSA, operational within the municipal boundaries of Pretoria SA and with at least two years’ clinical experience were included and invited to partake in the focus group interviews. Invited persons were reminded of the focus group interviews two weeks prior and were send participants information sheets to peruse prior to the interview date.

Data Collection

Focus group interviews were conducted in English, in a private room at a convenient and neutral location. Two rounds of focus group interviews were held with all three levels to ensure data saturation and to explore or clarify issues raised in the first round. Data were collected using audio recording and observational field notes, with sessions lasting from 40 min to two hours (including interval breaks).

Data Analysis

Focus group interview were manually transcribed by the principal investigator. The principal investigator became familiarised with the data and made analytical notes on possible meanings and the introduction of bias before analysis.\textsuperscript{30} Framework analysis, as illustrated by figure 1, was used. Codes identified from the data were arranged under predefined structural codes. Structural coding is “a questions-based code that acts as a labelling and indexing device, allowing researcher to quickly access data likely to be relevant to a particular analysis from a larger data set”.\textsuperscript{31} Data were analysed to identify codes that conformed with the structural codes and then placed into categories, illustrated in table 2. Uncategorised codes were re-examined and assigned as best fit to either an existing structural code or a new category. From these structural codes four
main themes were identified. The analytic notes and recognition of bias before data analysis acted as verification strategies which, together with peer-review, ensured a level of reliability and validity.

Figure 1: Data Analysis using Framework analysis
Ethical Consideration

Ethical approval was obtained from the Human Research Ethics Committee of the University of Cape Town (HREC REF: 201/2018). All participants completed an informed consent form prior the commencement of the focus group interview and provided verbal consent for audio recordings throughout and were reassured that their responses and opinions would remain anonymous.

RESULTS

Participant Demographics

In total, 4 BLS, 6 ILS and 9 ALS prehospital emergency care providers participated in the focus group interviews over the period of November 2018 and January 2019. An overview of the participant’s demographics is presented in table 1. (One participant had only a year’s experience which was discovered retrospectively but included in the results due to low response rate)

Table 1: Participant demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BLS Focus Group</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years experience</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ILS Focus Group</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years experience</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALS Focus group</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years experience</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Four main themes

Eight structural codes were identified from the focus group semi-structure interview guide. The ninth structural code represented all codes that initially did not conform to the first eight. From these the four main themes were identified.

Table 2: Four main themes identified from the structural codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural Code</th>
<th>Feelings and thoughts</th>
<th>Behavioural emergency meaning</th>
<th>Phrases without structural code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stigma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prevalence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Theme 2: Responsibilities
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural Code</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Theme 3: Barriers experienced
| Structural Code | Education and training | Systems | Phrases without structural code |
|                 |                      |          |                                 |
|                 | Layperson            | Family members |                             |
| Theme 4: Legislation
| Structural Code | Police involvement | Legislations and guidelines | Mental capacity |
|                 |                      |                      |                                 |

Theme 1: Perception of behavioural emergencies

An ALS participant was of the opinion the prevalence of behavioural emergencies in the prehospital setting has increased. All participants reported negative feelings such as fear, frustration, apprehension, anger, aggression and uncertainty when being dispatched to a behavioural emergency. Participants felt behavioural emergencies are time consuming and emotionally and physically taxing. An ILS participant described prehospital emergency care providers as unsympathetic towards a MHCU.

“...apprehension. Because you do not know...and for me it's like, I know to us it will be, ah, emotionally and mentally taxing...” (I01)

BLS and ILS participants reported positive feelings such as curiosity and empathy towards a MHCU, but only one ALS participant reported feeling confident in the management of a MHCU.
Participants described a MHCU behaviour as being “a deviation from norm”. A MHCU was described as unpredictable, presenting with behaviour that often fluctuates between a state of calmness to aggression and usually refuses treatment or transportation. Participants associated the following mental health disorders with a MHCU: post-traumatic stress disorder, acute psychosis, bipolar, depression, paranoia and Schizophrenia, and are often called to manage situations of panic attacks, self-harm, harm to others, self-neglect, domestic disputes, hallucination, suicide, overdose or a MHCU that needs someone to talk to.

“…we are talking like all of the patients are like…cutting his business off just saying; “I want to die.”. Those are the obvious ones…The, the patient I usually have a problem with… locked himself in his ho, house for three weeks. Literally lying on the floor wasting away, with severe sepsis. But he is still technically GCS fifteen…He is still looking at his telephone, looking at the laws going; “But you cannot touch me”…and you know for a fact, you can’t leave this oke here. He will die…” (A02)

Theme 2: Responsibilities

Participants felt that once they have established their own safety in a behavioural emergency the next responsibility is to act as a neutral body, assess the situation and determine whether emergency medical services or other resources are required. According to ALS participants they are a supportive role to SAPS during the management of a MHCU.

“Because my responsibility, first and foremost, is my safety as well as my partner.” (Ib01)

Participants viewed their responsibilities towards a MHCU as being; to act in the best interests of the patient, provide appropriate medical treatment, prevent further harm and promote health. This is best done through a calm approach, removing the MHCU from the situation, listening attentively and where appropriate convincing the MHCU to be transported. Participants reported often lying to the MHCU to convince them to agree to transport and treatment. One ALS participant felt strongly against this method.

“Well in the prehospital field it would be to prevent them from harming themselves or others.” (Bb02)

“We can ah, convince them to go to hospital with their own consent.” (I02)
Some participants stated that treatment for mental illness is outside their scope of practice and that it is not their responsibility to act as enforces or mental healthcare providers. ILS participants especially, placed high value on their responsibility as being more to report their findings on scene to the receiving facility to ensure the MHCU receives adequate mental healthcare.

“*It is your responsibility to report it at the facility where you take the patient, but I don’t think it is our responsibility to sort out the mental illness.*” (Ib04)

The BLS and ILS groups saw their responsibilities as minor, during the management of a behavioural emergency, especially when managing an aggressive MHCU.

“As a BLS our involvement is quite minimal. You are just an extra set of hands on scene. We don’t typically make decisions...That is up to the ALS or if the patient is not violent it is your ILS.” (Bb02)

“...it is not for us as Intermediate Life Support practitioners to sedate, handle. We can try and defuse the situation. But, with regards to sedation of the aggressive...we can’t do much without ALS.” (I01)

ALS participants realise the main expectation of their role in the management of an aggressive MHCU is sedation. However, they do feel BLS and ILS often ask for their assistance prematurely.

“Crews called me for backup...”*Bring your drugs, your are going to sedate.*”

“I’ll come up and assess this”...there was absolutely no indication for me to sedate him there and then.” (A04)

Theme 3: Knowledge and understanding of current Legislation

Participants appear to have a good understanding on patient consent to treatment, as well as the requirement of mental capacity to provide consent. It seems that the Glasgow Coma Scale and participants own judgement on whether a MHCU is grounded in reality is used to assess a MHCU mental capacity. Participants however do feel, determining mental capacity is a grey area in the prehospital setting and outside their training.

“...we can’t force them to stop hurting themselves. We are actually not allowed to, because if that guy says; “I don’t want to” we are not allowed to touch him.” (Bb01)
“GCS 15 out of 15. Knows where they are. Know when. What time it is. Can answer all my questions...” (I02)

Some participants knew of the MHCA having learnt about it through training or word of mouth but showed little familiarity with the practical application of the MHCA. Most participants reported having learnt through experience that when a MHCU does not consent and has the potential to cause harm, South Africa Police Services (SAPS) must be involved for involuntary transport of the MHCU to a facility that is equipped to observe the MHCU for seventy-two hours.

“...those facilities most of the times would be (Naming a few public government facilities) they need to be kept for that involuntary observation...for seventy-two hours.” (Ib01)

One ALS participant, familiar with the MHCA, suggested the current legislation and guidelines must be reviewed to clarify prehospital emergency care providers’ responsibilities during the management of a MHCU.

“...that’s why a lot of the times they would tell us to refer to SAPS.” (I01)

“...This is what's happening. What are our rights? What are we obliged to do? How do we intervene here?”...It’s possibly time to review the Mental Health Care Act and mandate such things.” (Ab01)

Theme 4: Barriers experienced during the management of a behavioural emergencies

Barriers that prevent participants from performing their responsibilities as described above were also identified and encompassed issues with the current prehospital system, family members and SAPS.

Family members often expect prehospital emergency care providers to enter a scene and enforce treatment upon the MHCU, which leaves the MHCU apprehensive towards them.

“Families threatening them; 'The ambulance is coming to take you away.' They immediately apprehensive to talk to you or even allow you to treat them.” (Ib02)
Difficulties experienced with the prehospital system included the; dispatching system, education and scope of practice, and lack in prehospital, SAPS and mental healthcare resources. Education was a major concern amongst participants, who reported training in mental healthcare as inadequate, insufficient and varying across levels of care. Participants’ training focused more on medical emergencies, while knowledge gained in this area were largely self-taught or through experience. Many participants showed interested in receiving additional training in mental healthcare as well as on the legislation relating to mental healthcare.

“I think experience has prepared us, to kind of understand which situation has got the potential to go certain places and how to deal with it...most newly qualified people...I don’t think there’s enough things preparing them to deal with all of these situations.” (Ab02)

The dispatching system often provides inaccurate information around the type of emergency participants are being dispatched to, which make it difficult to adequately prepare.

“...where you get dispatched to a patient that fell... Yes, he fell. But that’s due to reasoning that he wants to jump from a building or a roof or...” (I02)

SAPS involvement overall was described as reluctant and uncaring, and participants found SAPS members lack understanding of the MHCA and mental illness. Two ALS participant are of the opinion SAPS members fear litigations which may explain their reluctance. Participants thought that SAPS involvement should be limited to the safety of prehospital emergency care providers and the community.

“...our police is not equipped. And they don't care about the well-being of the patient.” (Bb01)

“And from what I’ve picked up it’s also a fear of litigation...And that is also why the p, police just don’t want to get involved. But, that also leaves us hanging.” (Ab01)

Participants acknowledged the shortage of prehospital emergency care providers, SAPS officers and healthcare facilities and provided suggestions to overcome these barriers, such as; provide prehospital emergency care providers with the authority to transport an involuntary MHCU or to have a mental healthcare expert with whom they
can consult and make decisions regarding the MHCU’s treatment. One ALS however did raise the concern on the appropriateness of prehospital emergency care providers in the management of a MHCU.

“When we mandate certain things, this is the limitation of what paramedics can do and what police can do. This is what they are authorised to do, and then we mandate an expert being available for a telephonic consult...”(Ab01)

“You require somebody that is specialised in that to deal with these patients, rather than someone like us...”(Ab03)

DISCUSSION

Prehospital emergency care providers in this study showed an overwhelmingly negative feeling towards MHCU, which is not unique to the SA setting. Participants experienced behaviour emergencies as emotionally and physically taxing, but did not share the viewpoint, as described in literature, that behaviour emergencies are a waste of prehospital resources. Interesting, the feeling of prehospital emergency care providers being unsympathetic towards MHCU, has been experienced by MHCU and described by Rees et al. The results confirms that a MHCU can be perceived as violent, overdosed or suicidal individual, who often refuses treatment and transportation. The study further show that prehospital emergency care providers are not only exposed to behavioural emergencies but to MHCU presenting with a wide range of behavioural disturbance.

Safety was a major concern amongst participants, whom described the SA prehospital setting as unsafe; however, participants are willing to take responsibility for the wellbeing of a MHCU. This finding is contradictory to local and international reports which suggest prehospital emergency care providers are unwilling to take steps to convince a MHCU to be transported or view a MHCU as an issue for social services. The responsibilities described by participants during the management of a MHCU included: treat injuries, prevent further harm and transport the MHCU to an appropriate facility, which correlates with other studies. BLS participants saw their involvement as minimal in the management of MHCU, whereas ILS felt when
managing an aggressive MHCU, responsibility for the management of such person falls upon ALS. One responsibility mentioned by participants, and not reported elsewhere is reporting scene findings to the receiving facility to ensure MHCU receives appropriate care.

Healthcare providers must obtain informed consent from a *compos mentis* patient, before any treatment may be provided.\(^9,36\) Available mental capacity assessment tools are intended for in-hospital use.\(^21\) According to the Medical Protection Society\(^36\) mental capacity is defined as “the capacity to make decisions in light of information about the relevant risks, benefits and consequences of the proposed intervention, specifically being able to understand relevant information, appreciate the consequences of the situation and reason about the treatment.”\(^36\) Using GCS to determine mental capacity is inappropriate as it a scale intended to determine level of consciousness and following acute cerebral damage.\(^37\) An Australian study also found that the method of determining mental capacity is inadequately taught.\(^11\) The HPCSA and MHCA provides no guidelines on the appropriate provision of involuntary care and treatment during the management of a behavioural emergency.\(^9,20\) Participants were unsure of what their responsibilities are and how to provide this involuntary care and treatment.

Reluctance from police in dealing with MHCU with the potential to cause harm has been described in local and international studies.\(^20,22\) Prehospital emergency care providers feel they are thus obliged to take responsibility for the well-being of a MHCU and often have to convince MHCU to allow voluntary transport.\(^22,33\) Participants were of the opinion that current legislation should change to empower them to act in the best interest of the MHCU and SAPS should only be responsible for scene safety. Another solution may be to have a mental healthcare expert available to both parties to assist in the decision-making process as to whether a MHCU requires involuntary assistance.

The study suggests that SA prehospital emergency care providers do not receive adequate training on the MHCA, and learn largely through experience.\(^20\) Experience is what mostly guides decision making processes in prehospital emergency care providers, but those that are inexperienced rely on protocols and guidelines.\(^12,22,38\) Due to the lack of guidelines, an inexperienced SA prehospital emergency care provider could make clinical decisions which violates a MHCU human rights. It is essential for
prehospital emergency care providers to be ethically and legally competent. This study identified a need for additional training and education in mental healthcare. Participants felt well prepared in the management of medical emergencies, but poorly prepared when managing a MHCU, which also has been reported by Australian and UK.

Family members often struggle to cope with a MHCU and phone for assistance. Negative feelings experienced by prehospital emergency care providers towards MHCU, the description of a MHCU and behavioural emergencies and the difficulties experienced with police have been described in international and local literature. Results unique to this study were viewpoint that behavioural emergencies were not a waste of prehospital resources, but rather there is no one else to take up the responsibility for the wellbeing of a MHCU in the prehospital setting.

**Strengths and Limitations**

This study is the first to explore how prehospital emergency care providers view their responsibilities during the management of a behavioural emergency and set a baseline for further research on mental healthcare in the prehospital setting.

The study had a small and focussed sample size from limited geographical area, thus findings are not generalisable to the rest of SA, which will require further studies. The distribution between public and private participants were disproportionate. During the sampling process attempt was made to include participants from both sectors, but more interest was shown from the private sector. There is no reason to believe that the public sector would have a different understanding or experience from the private sector. Focus group discussions are excellent to explore a topic but does have limitations; participants may not express their own views to the group, and group interaction and dominances are unpredictable. An experienced qualitative facilitator assisted with the initial focus group and care was taken to facilitate a safe and conductive context for all. The working definition of what a behavioural emergency evolved during the study was used to design the semi-structured interview guide, and as more understanding and knowledge was gained on the topic, only then was the term, behavioural emergency, limited to the provided definition. During the transcription of the first focus group discussion, it was noticed that on occasions participants’ comments were occasionally interrupted or completed, especially when participants
had difficulty expressing themselves. This might have led to the introduction of researcher bias - leading questions and wording bias. During the second focus group interviews the principal investigator focused on limiting this type of researcher bias. Afrikaans speaking participants may have had difficulty expressing their ideas and it should have been considered to conduct focus group discussions in participant’s home language. The principal investigator had a working relationship with most of the participants, but participants were encouraged to speak and present their ideas freely.

**Recommendations**

Further research on mental healthcare in the prehospital setting is required. Future studies should determine whether this study’s results can be generalised to SA, focus on changes in prehospital mental health education and legislation and how these will impact a MHCU and their interactions with prehospital emergency care providers.

**CONCLUSION**

Prehospital emergency care providers in this study place high value on their moral and medical responsibilities towards a MHCU. They would like to have legislative support to fulfil their responsibilities towards a MHCU and desire better education, skill and understanding in mental healthcare. BLS and ILS participants are of the opinion that most decisions made around the management of an aggressive MHCU are made by ALS practitioners. SA legislation, prehospital clinical guidelines and training programs need revision to clarify the responsibilities prehospital emergency care providers have during the management of a MHCU in the prehospital setting.
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The behaviour of a person is described as the manner in which he or she normally acts. (1) A deviation from this normal behaviour, such as violence, aggression, loss of emotional control, self-destruction, agitation or the increase use in creational drugs or alcohol in the presence of one or more recent stressors, is defined as a behavioural emergency. (1–3) Over the decades mental healthcare has contributed significantly to healthcare cost and disability within the community. (4) Today, it is estimated that mental healthcare contributes almost a third to the burden of disease in South Africa. (4–6)

Ancient societies placed high value on the well-being of a community as a whole. (7–9) This often led to the neglect of an individual’s rights and autonomy within that society. (7,8,10,11) During the era of enlightenment (1724–1804), Immanuel Kant brought about the concept that all men are equal. (7–9) This movement has lead to the improvement in quality of life and health care for mental healthcare users. (7,8,12)

The Mental Health Care Act of South Africa no 17 of 2002 (MHCA) has ensured for some of these improvements. (4,13) Under the Act both regional and district hospitals were designated to provide mental healthcare, which significantly improved the accessibility and availability of mental healthcare to a mental healthcare user. (4) Even with these improvements, mental healthcare is unfortunately still considered as a low priority in medical care, worldwide. (4,6) The MHCA provides valuable definitions, of which includes mental illness and a mental healthcare user, as well as the responsibilities of respective stakeholders involved in the care of a mental healthcare user. (13) These definitions and responsibilities are not without flaws. (13–15) Defining mental illness suggests there is a single mental illness and all mental disorders have indistinguishable characteristics, when in reality there is a range of mental disorders each with its own signs, symptoms and experiences. (15) The definition of a mental healthcare user may also create confusion; “A person receiving care, treatment and rehabilitation services using a healthcare facility aimed at enhancing the mental health status of that user” (13) It is unclear from this definition whether this ‘person’ includes only those with a positive diagnosis of a mental illness or also include a person with an acute mental health disorder. The MHCA explains the responsibilities of mental healthcare practitioners, healthcare facilities, South African Police Services (SAPS), and even that of a lay person, but is silent on the specific responsibilities of prehospital healthcare providers. (13,14,16)
Currently the responsibility to detain and apprehend a violent mental healthcare user lies with the SAPS.\(^\text{13,16}\) This has been heavily criticised by South African mental healthcare authors.\(^\text{17,18}\) According to them, this responsibility places SAPS’s members under enormous pressure.\(^\text{17,18}\) Firstly; the decision to apprehend a mental healthcare user is based on the SAPS members’ subjective ‘reason to believe’ that a person is likely to inflict serious harm to self or others.\(^\text{17}\) This subjective opinion is thus made by an individual without any medical training.\(^\text{17}\) Secondly; should the SAPS member have any doubt that the mental healthcare user is likely to cause serious harm and does not apprehend the person, the SAPS’s member may face civil claims for damages.\(^\text{17}\) Lastly; should the SAPS member apprehend a mental healthcare user based on his/her ‘reason to believe’ that the mental healthcare user is likely to cause harm to self or others, without objective justification, the mental healthcare user may claim for unlawful apprehension.\(^\text{17}\) No definition of serious harm is provided by the MHCA which means involuntary apprehension is determined by the SAPS member’s understanding of the behaviour of the mental healthcare user and their interpretation of the MHCA.\(^\text{17}\)

The lack of guidance from legislation, protocols and insufficient training on how to manage a behavioural emergency, often creates feelings of incompetence, frustration and stigmatisation amongst the prehospital healthcare providers and police members.\(^\text{10,14,19–22}\)

In this study, the prehospital setting refers to the care and treatment provided to a person that requires emergency care and/or transportation from outside an appropriate healthcare facility. Within South African setting, mental healthcare forms part of the healthcare system, which includes primary healthcare.\(^\text{2,22–24}\) This means prehospital healthcare providers are often the first point of access to mental healthcare for many mental healthcare users.\(^\text{14,21,22,25}\) During the management of a behavioural emergency it is required, by law, that the mental healthcare user should be treated with respect, dignity and equality.\(^\text{9–11}\) However, behavioural emergencies often require rapid action from prehospital healthcare providers for the safety of the mental healthcare user and the community, which may lead to the violation of these basic human rights.\(^\text{2,3,25}\) The international literature shows prehospital healthcare providers across different settings, admit to substandard care and negative feelings towards mental healthcare users.\(^\text{3,19,21,22}\) According to them the attributing factors are a lack in knowledge and understanding on responsibility towards the mental healthcare user during the management of a behavioural emergency, the lack of guidance from legislation as well as the lack in availability and cooperation from police services.\(^\text{3,19,21,22}\) Some studies have found
prehospital healthcare providers feel, behavioural emergencies are outside of their scope of practice and should rather be managed by trained Mental Healthcare Practitioners and Police Services.(2,3,25)

By gaining insight into EMS practitioners’ current understanding relating to their responsibilities during a behavioural emergency, it will help to determine the need (if any) for adapting processes to meet mental healthcare legislation, for example by the development and implementation of suitable guidelines for prehospital healthcare providers.

1.2 Motivation for Study

Management of a mental healthcare user during a behavioural emergency is a complex task. It involves harmonising the person’s medical needs and legal entitlements against their personal wellbeing and the safety of the greater community. The implementation of legislation and ethical guidelines to protect and respect the rights of a mental healthcare user, must consider and appropriately stipulate the responsibilities of all stakeholders involved in the mental wellbeing of a mental healthcare user.(19,22,26) There has been little guidance offered for prehospital healthcare providers to aid them in dealing with an increased volume of behavioural emergencies.(1–3,21,22,25) Legislative and ethical policies are vague and do not provide concise guidance for appropriate day-to-day management of behavioural emergencies in the prehospital setting.(3,21,22,27)

This study will explore the understanding of prehospital healthcare providers on their responsibilities towards a mental healthcare user during the management of behavioural emergencies. It flows from a previous (unpublished) research conducted by the research student: “Understanding of patient consent to treatment in behavioural emergencies amongst South African advanced life support paramedics” which determined there is a poor level of understanding amongst prehospital providers on patient consent to treatment and involuntary care during behavioural emergencies.(28) Patient consent will not be the focus of this study.

1.3 Research Question

What is the understanding amongst a sample of prehospital healthcare providers in Pretoria, South Africa, on their responsibilities towards a mental healthcare user during the management of a behavioural emergency?
1.4 Aim
This study aims to investigate what South African prehospital healthcare providers understand their responsibilities are towards a mental healthcare user and the community during the management of a behavioural emergency.

1.5 Objectives
1) Perform a literature review of currently applicable laws and professional guidelines pertaining to the management of behavioural emergencies in the South African prehospital healthcare setting
2) Describe and contextualise the understanding of a representative sample of prehospital healthcare providers of their responsibilities towards a mental healthcare user during the management of behavioural emergencies by means of focus group interviews.
3) Determine whether the understanding among prehospital healthcare providers of their responsibilities towards a mental healthcare user during the management of behavioural emergencies corresponds with current legislative and ethical guidelines, as derived from the literature review.

2. METHODOLOGY
2.1 Study Design
This study will have a qualitative descriptive design, using focus group interviews as the method of data collection. Focus group interviews, are in-depth interviews on a specific topic, and provides a deeper insight into the thoughts and understanding of the study participants.(29,30)

Within the South African prehospital setting there are three levels of prehospital healthcare; Basic Life Support (BLS), Intermediate Life Support (ILS) and Advanced Life Support (ALS). The following HPCSA registers are all considered as ALS prehospital healthcare providers; Paramedic (ANT), Emergency Care Technician (ECT), and Emergency Care Practitioner (ECP).

One focus group interview per level of care will be conducted. Thematic analysis, the process of identifying the most emergent themes or patterns within a qualitative dataset, will be used as the primary method of qualitative data analysis.(31)
2.2 Study Population and Sampling

This study will take place within the municipal boundary of Pretoria, South Africa. Pretoria is one of the country’s capital cities and falls within the City of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality with a resident population of approximately 2.1 Million. (32) To ensure maximum disclosure during the interview, the focus groups should be kept as homogeneous as possible. (33) Each level of care (BLS, ILS, ALS), will therefore be investigated separately. Separating the levels of care will also provide an opportunity to determine any differences in the understanding of responsibilities during the management of a mental healthcare user during a behavioural emergency.

The focus group interview will be conducted by the research student. Each focus group will consist of 6-8 participants. The chosen focus group size is to ensure that no participant is left out of the discussion but large enough to generate valuable information. (33)

The HPCSA iRegister site was searched on 2 August 2017 to estimate the number of prehospital healthcare providers actively registered in Pretoria. Provisional numbers reflect 397 BLS, 161 ILS and 107 ALS healthcare providers that were registered in Pretoria. Although not all practitioners residing in Pretoria may be practising therein, it gives a good estimation of the sample population. These results, however, do not indicate public or private sector employment status of the prehospital healthcare provider.

The inclusion criteria for this study are consenting prehospital healthcare providers from all three levels of care that are actively registered with the HPCSA. The prehospital healthcare provider must be currently operational and responding to emergencies within the municipal boundary of Pretoria, with at least 2 years’ post-registration experience. The study will include prehospital healthcare providers from both the public and private sectors. Exclusion criteria for this study are prehospital healthcare providers not actively registered with the HPCSA or currently holding a dispatch or managerial position. The reason for the exclusion criteria is to ensure that participants are current with ‘in the field’ behavioural emergency practices.

A non-probability sampling approach will be applied, using convenience and snowball techniques to recruit participants. An invitation (Addendum A) will be distributed by the research student. Social media platforms such as Facebook, WhatsApp Emergency Services groups as well as email lists used to send out weekly news relating to the prehospital setting will be used. The research student has good knowledge of both the private and public emergency services operating in the Pretoria region and will also personally distribute the
research invitation. A well-known recruitment technique to mitigate selection bias in qualitative research is the snowball technique.(29,34) Potential participants who respond to the research invitation, will be encouraged - on a voluntary basis - to nominate two to three other potential participants. The nominees may be from either the private or public sector and invited using any of the invitational platforms mentioned.

The invitation provides basic information about the study, dates, times and venue of each focus group, including the research student’s contact details. The date, time, and venue of each focus group will be predetermined by the research student. At no time will a potential participant be coerced to neglect personal or working obligations to participate in the study. The venue that will be used to conduct the focus group interviews will be situated in the centre of Pretoria, easily accessible from most areas in Pretoria and close to public transport station. It is not foreseen that any disturbance will interrupt the focus group discussions.

All potential participants who respond to the research invitation will be added to a password protected participant database. This database will be used to store basic personal contact details such as phone numbers and email addresses. The contact details will only be used to provide the potential participants with additional information regarding the study. Participant Information Sheets (Addendum B) will be emailed and hardcopies will be available. The information sheet will explain what participation means, the process of withdrawal, and what the study expects from the participants. It is expected of all participants to be professional, provide opportunity to other participants to voice their views and beliefs relating to the topic, respect those views and beliefs but also have the freedom to voice their own views and beliefs during the focus group interviews. Only when potential participants have reviewed the information leaflet and indicated willingness to participate and attend the relevant focus group, will they become study participants.

Participation is within each participant’s own personal capacity, thus no explicit permissions from employers are required. Participation will not affect the participant’s employment or professional standing as a prehospital healthcare provider. Participants will be telephonically contacted 2 days prior the pre-determined focus group interview date as a reminder and confirmation of participation. Participants will be required to complete an Informed Consent Form (Addendum C) on arrival at the venue and before commencement of the focus group interviews.
For Qualitative research using thematic analysis, the desire is to reach thematic saturation. This is the point in qualitative research which uses thematic analysis where no more new themes arises during new focus group interviews.(29–31,33) The sample size anticipated for this study may not reach thematic saturation. Thematic saturation however is not the only determinant for the use of small sample size in qualitative research. Because of the narrow study aim and the specific characteristics chosen for the sample population the sample size is considered sufficient to reach the study aim.(35)

2.3 Focus Group Design

The focus group interviews will take place in the form of a semi-structured interview, with predetermined topics. Cases of behavioural emergencies (Addendum D) will be presented to participants, after which the participants will be encouraged to elicit an open discussion on their understanding of their responsibilities towards the mental healthcare user and the community during the management of these situations:

1) A mental healthcare user that has caused harm to self but not others,
2) A mental healthcare user that has caused harm to others but self,
3) family members raising concerns regarding a mental healthcare user who has the potential to cause self-harm, but no obvious evidence is present at the time of treatment,
4) A mental healthcare user actively causing harm to self or others which may lead to irreversible injuries.

These scenarios will explore the mental healthcare user who has no cognitive impairment and is able to make informed decisions, as well as the mental healthcare user with impaired cognitive abilities.

The research student will facilitate the focus group interviews in English and will attempt to stay neutral to all comments. Bias introduced to the study by the research student will be recognised and described during data analysis. Thematic analysis through coding of the data will be done to determine basic, organisational and global themes. Findings of the focus group interviews will be concluded in a narrative report which will provide the basis of finding discussions.
2.4 Data Collection and Management

Time prior to the focus group interviews will be provided for participants to review, ask questions, and sign the informed consent form (Annexure C) and get familiarised with one another. A unique research identifier will be allocated to each participant and will be used during data transcription and analysis to ensure anonymity.

The discussion group will break after every 40 minutes of discussion for approximately 15-20 minutes. It is aimed not to have a focus group interview for longer than 2 hours. It has been found the productivity of a focus group decrease beyond 90 minutes. Refreshments in the form of snacks and water will be provided to participants during the breaks.

During the focus group interviews, the research student will use field notes and voice recordings to collect data. All data obtained, whether by means of voice recording or field notes will be stored onto a password protected computer and hard drive not later than one day after the focus group discussion. Only the research student and supervisors will have access to participant codes and data.

Participants may withdraw from the study at any time during the research. Withdrawal by participants prior to the focus group discussion will have no negative effect on the outcome of the study. Non-attendance may have a negative influence on the study outcomes, for this reason the research student will attempt to book the maximum of 8 participants for that focus group instead of the minimum of 6 participants. If a participant does not attend the relevant focus group, without notice, an attempt to contact the participant and confirm absence from the focus group discussion will be explored.

Withdrawal after or even during the focus group discussion will also influence the outcome of the study. Data already obtained cannot be retracted. Statements made by a withdrawing participant might have opened the discussion to another theme or led to valuable information that would otherwise not have been obtained. Should it be necessary the research student will only mention that a previous statement made by a participant who has withdrawn from the study has led to the following data.
2.5 Data Analysis Plan

Immediately after each focus group interview, recordings and field notes will be reviewed and clarified to ensure no important information is lost from memory. Once all focus group interviews have been conducted, the research student will transcribe the data into a format which is easy to analyse. These transcriptions together with the original field notes and recordings will be passed on to research supervisor, Dr Enrico Dippenaar, to assist with data analysis. The results from the data analysis will be discussed with Victor Voorendyk for further assistance on the legal aspects of the study. Victor is a lawyer, specialising in medical malpractice claims. He has previous prehospital experience with a special interest as well as knowledge on the research topic. Dr. Dippenaar has experience in conducting and analysing focus groups dataset. Data analysis will be done separately to ensure no influence from either party is introduced. The analysis method chosen for this study is that of analytic induction, using thematic analysis. The data obtained from each focus group interview will be compared with one another to identify commonalities and divide these findings into common themes. Possible explanation for differences found during the analysis will be explored and discussed amongst the research supervisors and research student. Once data analysis is completed, the themes will be compared with findings from literature to develop a theory regarding the understanding of the sample population on their responsibilities towards a mental healthcare user during the management of a behavioural emergency.

2.6 Ethical Considerations

Ethical approval will be obtained from the University of Cape Town Human Research Ethics Committee. All ethical and data management guidelines set by the University of Cape Town will be followed. Participants’ rights common with qualitative research and the declaration of Helsinki will be respected during the study recruitment, data collections and analysis. Informed consent will be obtained from every participant following review of the participant information leaflet, and prior to interview commencement. Confidentiality; due to the nature of this study, anonymity is not possible during the focus group interview. For this reason, a section on confidentiality has been included on the informed consent forms to which participants will agree to. Participants will be encouraged not to disclose any response or information from the focus group interview.
A research identifier will be allocated to the participant to ensure that data are stored and analysed in a confidential manner. All data will be kept confidential by saving the data on a password protected computer and hard drive. Access will only be provided to the research student and supervisors.

2.7 Limitations

Qualitative research aims to describe an in-depth understanding of a specific phenomenon and contextualise that understanding. This can easily be achieved with a small sample size. Because there are few literature pieces available regarding this topic, an indirect outcome of this study would be to determine whether further research on this topic is required. The findings will only represent the sample and will not be representative of the population of prehospital healthcare providers in Pretoria.

The research student will be guided by the study supervisors, who have experience in both qualitative research and focus group interviews to mitigate bias that may be introduced into the study. The research student has already completed a Massive Open Online Course (MOOC), by the University of Amsterdam on Qualitative research to further broaden her understanding of qualitative research.

Selection bias may be introduced to the study. The snowball technique that will be used during the recruitment stage is a well-known strategy used in qualitative research to minimise selection bias. This technique also allow for potential participants that are unrelated or unfamiliar to the research student to participate in the study.

The inexperience of the research student in conducting focus group interviews may lead to information bias. To mitigate this, the research student will complete another MOOC on how to conduct effective focus group interviews. Information bias may further be introduced into the study during data analysis. It is for this reason the research student and supervisor, Dr. Enrico Dippenaar will analyse the data separately. The individual analysed data will then be compared and interpret.
2.8 Expected Outcomes

The findings generated by this study will provide information regarding the understanding of prehospital healthcare providers on their responsibility towards a mental healthcare user during the management of behavioural emergencies. The aim is to publish these findings in a peer reviewed publication and stimulate future research to investigate the gaps within the prehospital healthcare training programs relating to behavioural emergencies. It is anticipated that this research study will assist in improving training outcomes amongst prehospital health care providers as well as improve the management of mental healthcare users during behavioural emergencies.

2.9 Project Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>’17</td>
<td>’17</td>
<td>’17</td>
<td>’18</td>
<td>’18</td>
<td>’18</td>
<td>’18</td>
<td>’18</td>
<td>’18</td>
<td>’18</td>
<td>’18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM-DRC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews (Data Collection)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcribing of Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compilation of Final Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.10 Resources and Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Unit cost</th>
<th>No of Units</th>
<th>Total cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consumables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>R 343.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pens</td>
<td>R 3.50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R 7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note book for field notes</td>
<td>R 25.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R 25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invitational flyers</td>
<td>R 1.00 p/p</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>R 100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informed consent forms</td>
<td>R 1.00 p/p</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>R 180.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plane white stickers</td>
<td>R 30.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R 30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refreshment platters</td>
<td>R 65.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>R 390.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minor research equipment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>R 1400.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice recorder</td>
<td>R 1000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R 1000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32G Memory card</td>
<td>R 400</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R 400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>R 2132.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study will be funded by the research student.
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MANAGEMENT OF A BEHAVIOURAL EMERGENCY

Do you fully understand your responsibilities as a prehospital healthcare provider, towards a mental healthcare user or are you still tolling a dice between ethics, legislation and moral code?

I am a student in the Division of Emergency Medicine, University of Cape Town, and I am looking for volunteers to take part in a research study exploring what South African prehospital healthcare providers in Pretoria understand their responsibilities are towards a mental healthcare user and the community during the management of a behavioural emergency.

To explore your understanding on this topic, you are invited to participate in a focus group interview. During the interview you will be provided with the opportunity to air your views and beliefs in a relaxed and informal discussion.

Each level of care, BLS, ILS and ALS will be interviewed separately.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Group</th>
<th>BLS</th>
<th>ILS</th>
<th>ALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>Xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venue</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The focus group interviews will take approximately 2 hours of your time.

In appreciation for your time, snacks and beverages will be supplied.

For more information please contact:

Charnelle Stander
The study has been reviewed and approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee, University of Cape Town.
WE WOULD LIKE TO INVITE YOU TO PARTICIPATE in a research study that will be investigating what prehospital healthcare providers understand their responsibilities are towards a mental healthcare user and the community during the management of behavioural emergencies. Before deciding to participate, we would like you to understand why and how the research is being done and what it would involve for you. The research student will be available to answer any questions you may have. We suggest that you take the necessary time to read and thoroughly understand the information on this sheet. The study is part of an educational project in partial fulfilment of the requirements of a MPhil degree through the University of Cape Town, South Africa.

THE PURPOSE OF THIS PROJECT is to describe the understanding of responsibilities during the management of behavioural emergencies amongst prehospital healthcare providers; and to determine whether this understanding reflects current legislation.

DO I HAVE TO TAKE PART? It is your decision to voluntarily participate in this study and should you agree to partake we will then ask you to sign a consent form. You are free to withdraw at any time, without giving a reason.

THE STUDY INVOLVES focus group interviews. The focus group interview will consist of 6-8 participants of the same level of registration, Basic Life Support (BLS), Intermediate Life Support (ILS) and Advanced Life Support (ALS). During the focus group interview participants will be encouraged to speak openly about their views and beliefs on their responsibilities during the management of behavioural emergencies in the prehospital setting. The focus group interview will be conducted by the research student and audio recorded for data collection purposes. It is expected that each focus group interview should not last longer than 2 hours.
PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET
Understanding of responsibilities during the management of behavioural emergencies amongst prehospital healthcare providers in Pretoria, South Africa

EMDRC Study Number: EMxxxx/xx, HREC Ref: xxx/2017
Principal Investigator: Dr Peter Hodkinson (peter.hodkinson@uct.ac.za)
Research Student: Mrs Charnellé Stander (dvrcha001@myuct.ac.za)

THE FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEWS WILL BE HELD ON:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Group</th>
<th>BLS</th>
<th>ILS</th>
<th>ALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>Xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venue</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXPENSES AND PAYMENT: You will receive no payment for your participation, however snacks and drinks will be provided during a short break of the focus group interview.

RISKS INVOLVED IN PARTICIPATION: There are no anticipated risk to your participation.

BENEFITS INVOLVED IN PARTICIPATION: You will not receive any direct personal benefit from participation. Your participation will help in identifying the gap between the responsibilities as set out by current legislation and prehospital healthcare providers’ understanding on their responsibilities towards a mental healthcare user during the management of behavioural emergencies. This information can be used for future guidelines, which may improve and benefit your future work circumstances.

WHAT IF THERE IS A PROBLEM? should you have any questions, concerns or complaints about this research study, its procedures, risks and benefits, you may contact the principal investigator or the University of Cape Town Ethics Committee.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF I WANT TO WITHDRAW FROM THE STUDY? Withdrawal may be done at any time during the study and without a reason. In the event of withdrawal, you should contact the principal researcher to convey your withdrawal. There will be no prejudice or effect on your professional standing. Due to the nature of the study, documentation and information obtained during the focus group interview cannot be destroyed. This is because a statement or comment made by you, may have led to another participants ideas or question. For this reason, no direct reference will be made to any information obtained from you prior to your withdrawal.
PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET

Understanding of responsibilities during the management of behavioural emergencies amongst prehospital healthcare providers in Pretoria, South Africa

EMDRC Study Number: EMxxxx/xx, HREC Ref: xxx/2017
Principal Investigator: Dr Peter Hodkinson (peter.hodkinson@uct.ac.za)
Research Student: Mrs Charnellé Stander (dvrcha001@myuct.ac.za)

WILL MY TAKING PART IN THIS STUDY BE KEPT CONFIDENTIAL? Yes. Names on any data sheets, both electronic and hard copy will be removed once analysis starts. All data and back-ups thereof will be kept in password protected computer. Only the principle investigator, research student, and a co-supervisor will have access to the raw data. Due to the interactive participation nature of the study, participants will be asked to keep all responses confidential.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN TO THE RESULTS OF THE STUDY? The aim is to publish the findings in scientific journal through the University of Cape Town, South Africa. For your convenience, a summary of the findings will be made available upon your request and emailed to you. You will not be identifiable in any publication made.

WHO HAS REVIEWED AND AUTHORISED THE STUDY? This study has been authorised by the Human Research and Ethics Committee (HREC) of the University of Cape Town South Africa (Ref.xxx/2017). HREC can be contacted on Tel: (+27) 021 406 6338, Email: xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx. The study is funded by the research student.

FURTHER INFORMATION AND CONTACT DETAILS: Should you wish to have more specific information about this research project, need advice as to whether to participate, have any questions or concerns you may speak to the research student, Charnellé Stander, who can be contacted telephonically on (+27) 082 382 4282.
PARTICIPANT INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Understanding of responsibilities during the management of behavioural emergencies amongst prehospital healthcare providers in Pretoria, South Africa

Principal Investigator: Dr Peter Hodkinson (peter.hodkinson@uct.ac.za)
Research Student: Mrs Charnellé Stander (dvrcha001@myuct.ac.za)

Please initial within the box:

1. ☐ confirm that I have read and understand the information sheet dated xx/xx/2017 for the above study. I have had the opportunity to consider the information, ask questions and have had these answered to my satisfaction.

2. ☐ understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time without giving any reason, without my employment, academic progression or legal rights being affected.

3. ☐ understand that each focus group interview will be audio recorded and the data collected during the study, may be looked at by individuals from regulatory authorities. I give permission for these individuals to have access to my data. I agree to keep all responses during the focus groups confidential.

4. ☐ agree to take part in the above study.

____________________  ______________________  ______________________
Name of Participant      Date                   Signature consenting

____________________  ______________________  ______________________
Name of Researcher       Date                   Signature taking conse
All three focus group discussions will be conducted by the research student. To address the study aim through its objectives open ended questions will be used to guide the focus group discussions.

**Example guiding themes:**

1) What are your general feelings when you are dispatched to a behavioural disturbance?

2) In general, what do you feel your responsibility are towards a mental healthcare user? (For this focus group interview, the definition of a mental healthcare user is: A person receiving care, treatment or rehabilitation services using a healthcare facility aimed at enhancing the mental health status of that user. This includes prehospital healthcare services)

3) According to the Mental Health Care Act, mental health forms part of the healthcare system, which include primary healthcare, i.e. prehospital healthcare. What do you think this mean in terms of your responsibilities towards a mental healthcare user?

4) Let’s for argument sake say, a mental healthcare user has caused physical harm to another person but self has not sustained any injuries. Do you think you still have a responsibility, in terms of treatment, towards this mental healthcare user? Why? In your opinion who should take responsibility? The justice system or the healthcare system? Why the justice system? Why the healthcare system?

5) What if this scenario changes slightly? The mental healthcare user has also sustained injuries. Do you now think you have a treatment responsibility towards him or her? Will you feel comfortable as a healthcare provider, if the mental healthcare user has sustained only minor injuries to rather hand him or
her over to the Police instead of letting the mental healthcare user enter the healthcare System? Those that answered no, why not? Those that answered yes, why? In your opinion then, when should this mental healthcare user receive mental health care?

6) How would you describe your responsibilities as a prehospital healthcare provider towards a mental healthcare user that causes self-harm only? Do you think this mental healthcare user requires the justice system or healthcare system? Those participants that believes a mental healthcare user that sustained minor injuries while causing harm to others, should enter the justice system but a mental healthcare user that causes self-harm only, should enter the healthcare system, how would you say your responsibility towards the two mental healthcare users differ?

7) Would you say, as a prehospital healthcare provider, you have the responsibility in deciding which mental healthcare user is mentally stable to rather enter the justice system, provided a crime has allegedly been committed by the mental healthcare user and does not require any medical treatment on scene? Do you think such responsibility should be placed upon prehospital healthcare providers? Why?

8) How would you describe your responsibilities towards a mental healthcare user that is not harmful to self or others at the time of assessment, but has a history of causing harm?

9) Taking everything that was discussed and mentioned into considerations, how would you summarise your responsibilities as a prehospital healthcare provider during the management of a behavioural emergency?
ADDENDUM 4: SOUTH AFRICAN JOURNAL OF PSYCHIATRY INSTRUCTION FOR AUTHORS

Overview
The author guidelines include information about the types of articles received for publication and preparing a manuscript for submission. Other relevant information about the journal's policies and the reviewing process can be found under the about section. The compulsory cover letter forms part of a submission and must be submitted together with all the required forms. All forms need to be completed in English.

Original Research Article
An original article provides an overview of innovative research in a particular field within or related to the focus and scope of the journal, presented according to a clear and well-structured format. Systematic reviews should follow the same basic structure as other original research articles. The aim and objectives should focus on a clinical question that will be addressed in the review. The methods section should describe in detail the search strategy, criteria used to select or reject articles, attempts made to obtain all important and relevant studies and deal with publication bias (including grey and unpublished literature), how the quality of included studies was appraised, the methodology used to extract and/or analyse data. Results should describe the homogeneity of the different findings, clearly present the overall results and any meta-analysis.

Word limit
3000-4000 words (excluding the structured abstract and references)

Structured abstract
250 words to include a Background, Aim, Setting, Methods, Results and Conclusion

References
60 or less

Tables/Figures
No more than 7 Tables/Figure
**Ethical statement**

Should be included in the manuscript

**Compulsory supplementary file**

Ethical clearance letter/certificate

**Original Research Article full structure**

*Title:* The article’s full title should contain a maximum of 95 characters (including spaces).

*Abstract:*  
The abstract, written in English, should be no longer than 250 words and must be written in the past tense. The abstract should give a succinct account of the objectives, methods, results and significance of the matter. The structured abstract for an Original Research article should consist of six paragraphs labelled Background, Aim, Setting, Methods, Results and Conclusion.

*Background:*  
Summarise the social value (importance, relevance) and scientific value (knowledge gap) that your study addresses.

*Aim:*  
State the overall aim of the study.

*Setting:*  
State the setting for the study.

*Methods:*  
Clearly express the basic design of the study, and name or briefly describe the methods used without going into excessive detail.

*Results:*  
State the main findings.
Conclusion:

State your conclusion and any key implications or recommendations.

Do not cite references and do not use abbreviations excessively in the abstract.

Article

Introduction:

The introduction must contain your argument for the social and scientific value of the study, as well as the aim and objectives:

Social value: The first part of the introduction should make a clear and logical argument for the importance or relevance of the study. Your argument should be supported by use of evidence from the literature.

Scientific value: The second part of the introduction should make a clear and logical argument for the originality of the study. This should include a summary of what is already known about the research question or specific topic, and should clarify the knowledge gap that this study will address. Your argument should be supported by use of evidence from the literature.

Conceptual framework: In some research articles it will also be important to describe the underlying theoretical basis for the research and how these theories are linked together in a conceptual framework. The theoretical evidence used to construct the conceptual framework should be referenced from the literature.

Aim and objectives: The introduction should conclude with a clear summary of the aim and objectives of this study.

Research methods and design:

This must address the following:

Study design:

An outline of the type of study design.

Setting: A description of the setting for the study; for example, the type of community from which the participants came or the nature of the health system and services in which the study is conducted.
Study population and sampling strategy: Describe the study population and any inclusion or exclusion criteria. Describe the intended sample size and your sample size calculation or justification. Describe the sampling strategy used. Describe in practical terms how this was implemented.

Intervention (if appropriate): If there were intervention and comparison groups, describe the intervention in detail and what happened to the comparison groups.

Data collection: Define the data collection tools that were used and their validity. Describe in practical terms how data were collected and any key issues involved, e.g. language barriers.

Data analysis:

Describe how data were captured, checked and cleaned. Describe the analysis process, for example, the statistical tests used or steps followed in qualitative data analysis.

Ethical considerations: Approval must have been obtained for all studies from the author's institution or other relevant ethics committee and the institution’s name and permit numbers should be stated here.

Results:

Present the results of your study in a logical sequence that addresses the aim and objectives of your study. Use tables and figures as required to present your findings. Use quotations as required to establish your interpretation of qualitative data. All units should conform to the SI convention and be abbreviated accordingly. Metric units and their international symbols are used throughout, as is the decimal point (not the decimal comma).

Discussion:

The discussion section should address the following four elements:

Key findings: Summarise the key findings without reiterating details of the results.

Discussion of key findings: Explain how the key findings relate to previous research or to existing knowledge, practice or policy.

Strengths and limitations: Describe the strengths and limitations of your methods and what the reader should take into account when interpreting your results.
Implications or recommendations: State the implications of your study or recommendations for future research (questions that remain unanswered), policy or practice. Make sure that the recommendations flow directly from your findings.

Conclusion:

Provide a brief conclusion that summarises the results and their meaning or significance in relation to each objective of the study.
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Notes

- Your reference list should appear at the end of your assignment/report with the entries listed numerically and in the same order that they were cited in the text.
- It is very important that you use the right punctuation and that the order of details in the reference is also correct.
- No use of & between author names
- Book and journal titles are not italicised or placed in quotation marks.
- Abbreviate page numbers to p., for example p. 12–25.
- Only first words of the article title and words that normally begin with a capital letter are capitalised.
- Journal titles are abbreviated. A list of abbreviations for the titles is available online at either List of Journals in MEDLINE with abbreviations (NB: Use the binoculars in the toolbar to search for a title) or Medical Journal Abbreviations (Internationally recognised abbreviations for journal titles). Other sources: Caltech Library Services and Bioscience
- In reference list: more than 6 authors, first 3 authors are listed; thereafter add et al. after the third author. In text: only the first authors name then et al.
- If the journal has continuous page numbering, you may omit month/issue number.
- Place superscript reference number after commas and full stops and before colons and semi-colons – unless the superscript is attached to authors name or title of book/database – then always before punctuation.
- If the reference number is connected to a year or number, place a space between the number and the reference number for clarity. [example: back as 1915 35 …]
- Italicise the title of artwork (painting, photograph, sculpture etc.) in the text. The title should be written in title case. For example, The Alchemist. Place single inverted commas around the title of an art exhibition, which should be written in sentence case. For example, Fossil icons of South Africa’.
## Books

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single author</th>
<th>The theory was first propounded in 1993 by Comfort(^1) that … OR Comfort(^1) claimed that ‘…’</th>
<th>1. Comfort A. A good age. London: Mitchell Beazley; 1997.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 – 6 authors</td>
<td>‘… new definition of disability’(^2) OR Madden et al. have stated that ‘…’(^2)</td>
<td>2. Madden R, Hogan T. The definition of disability in Australia: Moving towards national consistency. Canberra: Australian Institute of Health and Welfare; 1997.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple works by same author</th>
<th>University research (^5,6) has indicated that… [if not previously cited]</th>
<th>4. Advertising in the Western Cape. Cape Town: ABC Publishers; 1990.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>The most comprehensive work on the Subject(^7) …</td>
<td>5. Brown P. Corals in the Capricorn group. Rockhampton: Central Queensland University; 1982.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encyclopedia or Dictionary</td>
<td>‘is defined as …’(^9)</td>
<td>8. Renton N. Compendium of good writing. 3rd ed. Milton: John Wiley &amp; Sons; 2004. An edition number is placed after the title of the work - this is not necessary for a first edition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Comfort A. A good age. London: Mitchell Beazley; 1997.


\(^4\) Advertising in the Western Cape. Cape Town: ABC Publishers; 1990.

\(^5\) Brown P. Corals in the Capricorn group. Rockhampton: Central Queensland University; 1982.


\(^8\) Renton N. Compendium of good writing. 3rd ed. Milton: John Wiley & Sons; 2004. An edition number is placed after the title of the work - this is not necessary for a first edition.

\(^9\) Oxford dictionary for scientific writers and editors. Oxford: Clarendon; 1991. Parabola; p. 89. [include the definition looked up – in this case ‘Parabola’].

| Conference proceeding (the whole conference) | This was discussed at the conference\textsuperscript{15}… | 15. Harnden P, Joffe JK, Jones WG, editors. Germ cell tumours V. Proceedings of the 5th Germ Cell Tumour Conference; 2001 Sep 13–15; Leeds, UK. New York: Springer; 2002. |
| Conference poster/workshop | This was discussed at the conference\textsuperscript{15}… | 15. Chasman J, Kaplan RF. The effects of occupation on preserved cognitive functioning in dementia. Poster session presented at: Excellence in clinical practice, 4th Annual Conference of the American Academy of Clinical Neuropsychology; 2006 Jun 15–17; Philadelphia, PA. |

Print Journals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Print Journals</th>
<th>In-Text Example</th>
<th>Reference List Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Press release

As stated by the company


Electronic Journals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electronic Journals</th>
<th>In-Text Example</th>
<th>Reference List Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Text Example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

World Wide Web

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>In-Text Example</th>
<th>Reference List Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document on WWW – No date</td>
<td>A link between these conditions has been noted by McCook.32</td>
<td>32. McCook A. Pre-diabetic condition linked to memory loss [homepage on the Internet]. No date [cited 2003 Feb 7]. Available from: <a href="http://www.nlm.nih.gov/medlineplus/news_11531.html">http://www.nlm.nih.gov/medlineplus/news_11531.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Government Publications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government Publications</th>
<th>In-Text Example</th>
<th>Reference List Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cases</td>
<td>State-federal relations in this issue were tested in court as far back as 1915&lt;sup&gt;35&lt;/sup&gt;...</td>
<td>35. The State of New South Wales v. The Commonwealth (1915) 20 CLR 5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Also:


|----------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Secondary Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Sources</th>
<th>In-Text Example</th>
<th>Reference List Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Record the book that you actually used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Record the journal that you actually used.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Sources</th>
<th>In-Text Example</th>
<th>Reference List Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal communication, email, discussion lists (no web archive)</td>
<td>This was later confirmed (Savieri S 1999, personal communication, April 24) that an outbreak occurred in London at this time.</td>
<td>Not included in reference list as they cannot be traced by the reader.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Citing unpublished work using numbered references:

Give ‘(Unpublished)’ at the end of a reference if the information is not readily available or obvious.

Matthews C, Van Rensburg A, Schierhout G, Coetzee N. The potential of syndromic management to improve the care of patients at an STD clinic in Cape Town. Medical Research Council and Department of Community Health, University of Cape Town; 1997 (Unpublished report).

Thapisa A. Co-operation with the University of Botswana. [Personal interview, 10 March] Cape Town; 1998 (Unpublished).

Films and video recordings

…as seen in the Lonergan film, You Can Count on Me\(^44\).


Television and radio programmes

…then AMA chief, in a television interview.\(^45\)


Podcast

….in The Wings of a Butterfly – Children, Teenagers and Anxiety \(^46\)


CD-ROM

….in Anderson’s Electronic Atlas of Haematology\(^47\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>web archive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association/organisation</td>
<td>Examples</td>
<td>Name of organisation. Title of book. Place of publication: Publisher; year. Page(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referencing software packages in Vancouver</td>
<td>Format: Title (1 space) medium in square brackets [e.g. computer program, computer file](full-stop, 1 space) Version (full-stop, 1 space) Place of production (colon, 1 space) Producer (semicolon, 1 space) Year (full-stop)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>