

### Tizard Learning Disability F

# Stakeholder Experiences of Deprescribing Psychotropic Medicines for Challenging Behaviour in People with Intellectual Disabilities

Journal:	Tizard Learning Disability Review
Manuscript ID	TLDR-09-2023-0020.R1
Manuscript Type:	Research Feature
Keywords:	Challenging behaviour, Intellectual disability, Learning disabilities, Medication, Deprescribing, Psychotropic

SCHOLARONE™ Manuscripts 1 Stakeholder Experiences of Deprescribing Psychotropic Medicines for Challenging

**Behaviour in People with Intellectual Disabilities** 

### **Abstract**

### Purpose

- 7 Evidence of overprescribing of psychotropic medicines to manage challenging behaviour in
- 8 people with intellectual disabilities has led to national programmes within the U.K to promote
- 9 deprescribing, such as STOMP (Stopping the Overprescribing of Medication in People with
- 10 Learning Disabilities, Autism or both). To successfully implement deprescribing initiatives
- we need to understand how to engage stakeholders in the process.

### Approach

- In a published systematic review, we reported evidence about the process of deprescribing
- psychotropic medicines for people of all ages with intellectual disabilities and challenging
- behaviour. As a part of the original review, we searched for evidence about stakeholders'
- experiences of the psychotropic deprescribing process which was synthesised and reported
- within the current study.

### **Findings**

- 21 Six studies were identified. Involving carers and people with intellectual disabilities,
- providing ongoing support, and improving access to non-pharmacological interventions
- 23 including Positive Behaviour Support may contribute to successful outcomes, including
- reducing or stopping psychotropic medicines and improved quality of life. Implementing

- psychotropic deprescribing requires a multidisciplinary collaborative care approach andeducation for stakeholders.
- 27 Originality
- 28 There have been no previous reviews of stakeholder experiences of deprescribing
- 29 psychotropic medications for people with intellectual disabilities and challenging behaviour.
- The existing literature is scant and further research is needed.
- 32 Paper Type

- 33 Research Paper
- 34 .....
  - Background
- Overprescribing, the use of a medicine where there is a better non-medicine alternative, or the
- prescription is inappropriate for the circumstances and wishes of an individual, occurs
- throughout healthcare systems (Ridge, 2021). An estimated 10% of dispensed items are
- 40 overprescribed in primary care with 15% of people taking five or more medicines a day
- 41 (Ridge, 2021). Initially, a medicine may be appropriately prescribed, but in the absence of
- 42 timely review, it may no longer be the best choice. Furthermore, polypharmacy, the
- prescribing and administration of multiple medicines, and patient cognitive impairment can
- be problematic and may be associated with medication errors (Duerden et al., 2013,
- 45 Maidment et al., 2008).
- Overprescribing can lead to harm by exposing individuals to unnecessary adverse effects of
- 47 medicines and an increased risk of interactions with other medicines (Ridge, 2021). Equally,
- overprescribing increases the burden on the person and any family carers supporting them

(Duerden et al., 2013, Ridge, 2021, Bennett et al., 2021, Lawson et al., 2022). In 2021, the U.K. Government overprescribing review (Ridge, 2021) recommended expanding the use of structured medication reviews and embedding deprescribing within the prescribing process. Deprescribing, the planned and supervised process of dose reduction or stopping of medication in a safe and effective way (Doherty et al., 2020, Austrailian Deprescribing Network, US Deprescribing Research Network, 2020, Bruyère Research Institute), is a complex healthcare intervention that looks to address overprescribing. As with prescribing, deprescribing should be a collaborative process within a person-centred and shared decision making framework with the aim of minimising risk of harm from medication whilst achieving improved positive health outcomes (Department of Health and Social Care, 2021). In 2016, NHS England launched the STOMP programme in response to evidence that psychotropic medicines are overprescribed in people with intellectual disabilities for the management of challenging behaviour (Branford et al., 2019, NHS England, Sheehan et al., 2015, Bowring et al., 2017). For example, a report by Public Health England (Glover and Mehta, 2019) in 2015 found that a third of people known to have intellectual disabilities were prescribed at least one psychotropic medicine and more than half of these people did not have a documented mental health diagnosis. Our previously published systematic review reported findings addressing the primary review question in accordance with a published protocol (https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display record.php?RecordID=158079), looking at the effects of deprescribing psychotropic medicines as a part of a care pathway or treatment plan for people of all ages with intellectual disabilities and challenging behaviour (Adams et al.

2023). The review included 54 studies carried out in community and inpatient settings

primarily in the UK, the USA and the Netherlands focusing on 3292 people with intellectual disabilities. Our review found that psychotropic deprescribing interventions for people with intellectual disabilities may lead to dosage reductions and the discontinuation of these medicines. Although negative effects of deprescribing were reported we found there were positive effects on behaviour, mental and physical health which were associated with a multidisciplinary model (Adams et al., 2023). Examining the overall effectiveness of an intervention is essential, but alone is insufficient to fully support the widespread implementation of a complex intervention such as deprescribing. To successfully implement deprescribing initiatives we need to understand how to engage health and social care professionals, family carers and individuals with intellectual disabilities in the process and how they experience deprescribing. An understanding of how the attitudes, beliefs and values of these stakeholders affect decision making and influence behaviour as part of the deprescribing process is a key aspect of this (Darnton, 2008, Moore et al., 2015). Furthermore, a clear understanding of the barriers and enablers to successful deprescribing is important to maximise success and contribute towards the development of clear guidance and policy. Existing published literature reviews have not adequately explored these experiences of stakeholders, regarding deprescribing psychotropic medicines in people with intellectual disabilities. Previous reviews have considered people's experiences of deprescribing in older people (Lundby et al., 2019) and within primary care (Doherty et al., 2020) but have not specifically looked at deprescribing psychotropic medicine use with people with intellectual disabilities. To address this gap in the literature, we had originally included an additional review question in our protocol addressing stakeholder experiences and perspectives on deprescribing psychotropic medicines in individuals with intellectual disabilities and challenging behaviour.

We defined stakeholders as people with intellectual disabilities, paid carers, family carers, nurses, healthcare assistants, GPs, psychiatrists, pharmacists, other specialist healthcare professionals and social care professionals. In this paper we report and discuss the findings that emerged from our attempt to consider this review question.

### Methodology

Full details of the methodology are reported in our previously published systematic review (Adams et al., 2023). To answer the current question in this review, we only included papers that reported outcomes for stakeholders' experiences in terms of attitudes, views and beliefs about psychotropic deprescribing in people with intellectual disabilities.

Database searches were updated several times and a final search was completed in November 2022. Forwards and backwards reference searching of papers included in our published systematic review (Adams et al., 2023) was also conducted to track citations. Four key researchers, identified as having published several studies in this field over the last 10 years, were contacted to identify any further studies. Trial registries were not searched. Following data extraction using a bespoke data extraction form, studies were individually appraised for risk of bias using the qualitative tool from the Critical Appraisals Skills Programme Tools (CASP; CASP,2015) which consist of ten questions to assess internal and external validity.

### **Data Analysis**

We organised our findings into groups which were developed by discussions within the research team. This allowed us to synthesise our findings more easily and draw conclusions from our findings.

### **Findings**

We only found two papers through database searching (Kleijwegt et al., 2019, Deb et al.,
2020). We found one additional paper through citation searching (Wrein, 2019) and an
additional three more via direct author contact (de Kuijper et al., 2022b, de Kuijper et al.,
2022a, Deb et al., 2023). Two papers reported results from the same study; one reporting
quantitative data (Deb et al., 2020) and the other reporting qualitative data (Deb et al., 2023)
Two studies were carried out in the U.K. (Wrein, 2019, Deb et al., 2020) and three studies in
The Netherlands (de Kuijper et al., 2022b, de Kuijper et al., 2022a, Kleijwegt et al., 2019).
Two studies ( $n = 34$ , $n = 88$ ) reported experiences direct from psychiatrists (de Kuijper et al.
2022b, Deb et al., 2020, Deb et al., 2023), two studies ( $n = 29$ , $n = 8$ ) reported experiences
direct from carers (Kleijwegt et al., 2019, Wrein, 2019) and one study (n = 7) reported
experiences direct from people with intellectual disabilities (de Kuijper et al., 2022a). There
were a range of study types; two mixed methods studies using online questionnaires (de
Kuijper et al., 2022b, Deb et al., 2020, Deb et al., 2023), one qualitative study using
interviews (de Kuijper et al., 2022a), one qualitative study using semi structured interviews
(Wrein, 2019) and one qualitative study using focus groups (Kleijwegt et al., 2019).
We organised our findings by grouping data from the included studies into five categories:
(1) carer attitudes towards deprescribing, (2) healthcare professional attitudes towards
deprescribing, (3) the attitudes of people with intellectual disabilities towards deprescribing,
(4) the extent of multidisciplinary team and wider clinical team working, (5) the availability
of resources.

### Carer attitudes towards the deprescribing process

The involvement of paid carers was seen as vital to the success of deprescribing (Wrein, 2019). Overall, there is some evidence from two studies that carers are resistant, at times, to

deprescribing due to concerns about a deterioration, their lack of experience (Deb et al., 2020, Kleijwegt et al., 2019), and a feeling that "maybe at times it makes us more risk adverse if we're unsure how the individual is going you know to respond to something maybe we'll think, well let's not do that" (Wrein, 2019) p73 giving rise to therapeutic inertia. Three of these studies reported on findings regarding both paid and family carers whereas one study reported findings related to only paid carers (Kleijwegt et al., 2019).

Despite carer "resistance", findings from one study reported that there is evidence that paid carers are willing to collaborate on discontinuing antipsychotics where possible, although they feel more confident about achieving dosage reduction rather than total withdrawal. The concerns raised by paid caregivers about time constraints lead to the perception that caregivers may have limited capacity to effectively manage challenging behaviour exacerbations. (Kleijwegt et al., 2019). However, while this study involved people with mild intellectual disabilities; people with moderate to profound intellectual disabilities were not included. (Kleijwegt et al., 2019).

### Healthcare Professional attitudes towards the deprescribing process

In one online survey psychiatrists reported feeling positive towards deprescribing, reporting that they found the process of antipsychotic deprescribing a rewarding experience, increasing their confidence (Deb et al., 2023). However, the authors reported a low survey response rate meaning that their findings are unlikely to represent the views of psychiatrists working with people with intellectual disabilities broadly. In addition, an association was reported between well-resourced STOMP implementation with psychiatrists reporting satisfaction in the process with successful rationalisation of antipsychotic medication. However, where there was insufficient resource, psychiatrists seemed dissatisfied with the process with limited

success in deprescribing antipsychotic medication. In another study, healthcare professionals reported that the lack of stakeholder knowledge of the deprescribing process can be a barrier (de Kuijper et al., 2022b).

### The attitudes of people with intellectual disabilities towards deprescribing

There is some limited evidence from one study that people with intellectual disabilities are concerned about psychotropic medication deprescribing in case it leads to the re-emergence of behaviour problems (de Kuijper et al., 2022a). During the interviews in this study, participants expressed the importance of having a good rapport with their doctor. This relationship was important to them because it meant that they felt that their concerns were taken seriously. The participants also emphasised the importance of their own coping style in the success of discontinuing long-term medication, suggesting that the mindset and motivation of a person with intellectual disabilities may be a crucial facilitator in the deprescribing process (de Kuijper et al., 2022a).

Evidence from people with intellectual disabilities highlights the importance of accessing approachable physicians who can address issues that may arise during the deprescribing

185 ap186 pr187 Ir

process along with peer, family, and professional support (de Kuijper et al., 2022a). Interviews with people with intellectual disabilities revealed that their understanding of the deprescribing process and the quality of treatment by physicians are important facilitators of deprescribing (de Kuijper et al., 2022a).

### Extent of multidisciplinary team (MDT) and wider clinical team working

Evidence suggested that multiagency working and input from the MDT, nurse prescribers, allied healthcare professionals, social workers and pharmacists enables successful psychotropic deprescribing (Deb et al., 2023, Deb et al., 2020). Similarly, there is evidence from support staff that insufficient availability of multidisciplinary consultation was a barrier to successful deprescribing (Kleijwegt et al., 2019). Successful deprescribing should incorporate a multi-level approach involving the support of managers at the institutional level and the creation of favourable conditions at the political and professional level (de Kuijper et al., 2022b).

## Availability of resources

The belief that resources can play a significant role in achieving successful psychotropic deprescribing outcomes was reported in one study (Deb et al., 2023, Deb et al., 2020) where Positive Behaviour Support (PBS) plans were seen as a facilitator to deprescribing. The lack of time, absence of appropriate PBS plans, lack of non-pharmacological interventions for challenging behaviour, and inadequate social care provision were reported as barriers to achieving successful deprescribing (de Kuijper et al., 2022b, Deb et al., 2023).

### **Discussion**

The main finding from this review is the lack of studies reporting upon the stakeholder experience of psychotropic deprescribing in people with intellectual disabilities. It was difficult to find relevant studies, with most of the studies not identified in the initial data base searches. However, the findings extracted from the included studies do provide some valuable insights into stakeholder experiences and perspectives regarding the deprescribing of psychotropic medicines in individuals with intellectual disabilities and challenging behaviour, albeit limited by the lack of a substantial research literature.

Carer resistance is significant in the context of the review question as it highlights the balance between implementing deprescribing interventions with caution and the potential benefits of deprescribing. Carer willingness to collaborate (Wrein, 2019), notwithstanding certain limitations, emphasises the importance of involving them in decision-making processes related to medication management. There is a need for effective strategies to address carers' concerns to build confidence, making them feel an equal partner in the deprescribing process. Similarly, concerns expressed by individuals with intellectual disabilities about the reemergence of behaviour problems upon deprescribing reveal their unique perspective (de Kuijper et al., 2022a). Their emphasis on the doctor-patient relationship and personal coping strategies signifies the importance of shared decision making within a person-centred framework. Collaborative involvement of diverse healthcare and social care professionals is essential for effective deprescribing in individuals with intellectual disabilities and challenging behaviour. emphasizing the importance of collective psychotropic deprescribing decisions (Deb et al., 2020, Deb et al., 2023). In addition to secondary care healthcare professionals, primary care practitioners including GPs and non medical prescribers have a significant role in the prescribing and deprescribing of psychotropic medicines in people with intellectual disabilities who display challenging behaviour. However inadequate resources can hinder effective deprescribing review (Deb et al., 2023, Deb et al., 2020, de Kuijper et al., 2022b). Commentaries by Deb and colleagues (Deb, 2007, Deb et al., 2009) further emphasise the significance of the team approach in implementing psychotropic deprescribing. They highlight the barriers faced by general practitioners (GPs) in terms of lack of community support and negative attitudes of care staff.

We found in our review that healthcare professionals reported that the lack of stakeholder knowledge of the deprescribing process can be a barrier (de Kuijper et al., 2022b). The commentaries by Deb and colleagues (Deb, 2007, Deb et al., 2009) also stress the importance of education and support for GPs and carers to consider the withdrawal of psychotropic medications, even after long-term use.

NICE recommends that, during the annual physical health check for individuals with

intellectual disabilities conducted by GPs, it is crucial to consider the potential connection between challenging behaviour and physical health issues (NICE, 2015). This involves reviewing physical health medications and establishing a shared care management plan. GPs are well placed to review both psychotropic and physical health medications, providing a holistic, person centred approach to the management of challenging behaviour, including any subsequent plans for psychotropic deprescribing. Consequently, educational and training initiatives for GPs regarding psychotropic deprescribing should highlight the significance of reviewing both physical health and psychotropic medications.

Similar enablers of psychotropic deprescribing have been reported in people living with dementia where training appeared to increase the ability and confidence of care staff to manage challenging behaviour without the need for medication. In addition, a study exploring supporting deprescribing in older adults in long term care concluded that a key element of deprescribing success was attracting and sustaining engagement of a wide variety of relevant stakeholders from across the health system by leveraging best practices in stakeholder engagement (McCarthy et al., 2022). Furthermore, a systematic review looking at psychotropic deprescribing in older adults with limited life expectancy reported that patient and relative involvement and the importance of teamwork were associated with successful outcomes (Lundby et al., 2019). These findings are consistent with our findings regarding the

level of accessibility and engagement of the MDT can affect the outcome of psychotropic deprescribing interventions in people with intellectual disabilities. Studies looking at deprescribing interventions that are not specific to psychotropic medicines or people with intellectual disabilities reported some similar barriers and enablers to our study. A systematic review by Reeve and colleagues (Reeve et al., 2013) reported barriers of non-specific fears about stopping, such as stopping being problematic or being unable to cope, fear about the condition returning or worsening and fear of withdrawal effects. They also reported that a good relationship with the physician facilitated the deprescribing process. Interestingly, a systematic review exploring consumer attitudes towards deprescribing reported that the majority of carers reported that they would be willing for one or more of their care recipient's medications to be stopped if their care recipient's doctor said it was possible (Weir et al., 2022). Due to the low number of studies included in this review, the impact of our findings is limited and therefore it is important to exercise caution in interpreting these findings. The quality appraisal process identified potential bias associated with sampling and recruitment methods across studies, such as direct approaches (de Kuijper et al., 2022b, Deb et al., 2023, Deb et al., 2020), convenience sampling (Kleijwegt et al., 2019) and recruitment by physicians (de Kuijper et al., 2022a). In addition to the small number of included studies and despite there being no restriction on country, three out of the five studies were carried out in the Netherlands (de Kuijper et al., 2022a, de Kuijper et al., 2022b, Kleijwegt et al., 2019) and two studies were carried out in the U.K. (Wrein, 2019, Deb et al., 2020). This may limit the external validity and transferability of the overall systematic review when considering settings in other countries where there may

be differences in health policy, practices and access to healthcare.

When developing policies, we need to consider stakeholder experiences as this can impact on the uptake and the success of implementing the intervention. Earlier research suggests that carers of people with intellectual disabilities feel they are not sufficiently involved in healthcare decisions by services (Lalor and Poulson, 2013, Chadwick et al., 2013).

#### Conclusion

Our findings suggest that there is very limited data on stakeholder experiences of deprescribing psychotropic medicines as a part of a care plan for people with intellectual disabilities and challenging behaviour. To inform best practice in implementing the psychotropic deprescribing process in people with intellectual disabilities we need to further understand how these experiences impact on the implementation process of psychotropic deprescribing by carrying out further research. Despite these limitations, our review provides a valuable starting point for researchers and practitioners seeking to better understand the complex issues surrounding psychotropic deprescribing in people with intellectual disabilities.

#### References

- ADAMS, D., HASTINGS, R. P., MAIDMENT, I., SHAH, C. & LANGDON, P. E. 2023. Deprescribing psychotropic medicines for behaviours that challenge in people with intellectual disabilities: a systematic review. *BMC Psychiatry*, 23, 202.
- AUSTRAILIAN DEPRESCRIBING NETWORK. What is deprescribing? [Online]. Available: <a href="https://www.australiandeprescribingnetwork.com.au/">https://www.australiandeprescribingnetwork.com.au/</a> [Accessed].
- BENNETT, F., FERNER, R. & SOFAT, R. 2021. Overprescribing and rational therapeutics: Barriers to change and opportunities to improve. *British Journal of Clinical Pharmacology*, 87, 34-38.
- BOWRING, D. L., TOTSIKA, V., HASTINGS, R. P., TOOGOOD, S. & MCMAHON, M. 2017. Prevalence of psychotropic medication use and association with challenging behaviour in adults with an intellectual disability. A total population study. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 61, 604-617.
- BRANFORD, D., GERRARD, D., SALEEM, N., SHAW, C. & WEBSTER, A. 2019. Stopping over-medication of people with an intellectual disability, autism or both (STOMP) in England Part 2—the story so far. Advances in Mental Health and Intellectual Disabilities.
- BRUYÈRE RESEARCH INSTITUTE. *Canadian Deprescribing Network* [Online]. Available: <a href="https://deprescribing.org/">https://deprescribing.org/</a> [Accessed].

- CHADWICK, D. D., MANNAN, H., GARCIA IRIARTE, E., MCCONKEY, R., O'BRIEN, P., FINLAY, F., LAWLOR, A. & HARRINGTON, G. 2013. Family voices: life for family carers of people with intellectual disabilities in Ireland. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*, 26, 119-132.
- DARNTON, A. 2008. Practical Guide: An overview of behaviour change models and their uses. *In:* CENTRE FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT & WESTMINSTER, U. O. (eds.). London: Government Social Research Unit.
- DE KUIJPER, G., DE HAAN, J., DEB, S. & SHANKAR, R. 2022a. Withdrawing Antipsychotics for Challenging Behaviours in Adults with Intellectual Disabilities: Experiences and Views of Experts by Experience. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19, 15637.
- DE KUIJPER, G., DE HAAN, J., DEB, S. & SHANKAR, R. 2022b. Withdrawing Antipsychotics for Challenging Behaviours in Adults with Intellectual Disabilities: Experiences and Views of Prescribers. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19, 17095.
- DEB, S. 2007. The role of medication in the management of behaviour problems in people with learning disabilities. *Advances in Mental Health and Learning Disabilities*, 1, 26-31.
- DEB, S., KWOK, H., BERTELLI, M., SALVADOR-CARULLA, L., BRADLEY, E., TORR, J. & BARNHILL, J. 2009. International guide to prescribing psychotropic medication for the management of problem behaviours in adults with intellectual disabilities. *World Psychiatry*, 8, 181-186.
- DEB, S., LIMBU, B., NANCARROW, T., GERRARD, D. & SHANKAR, R. 2023. The UK psychiatrists' experience of rationalising antipsychotics in adults with intellectual disabilities: A qualitative data analysis of free-text questionnaire responses. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*.
- DEB, S., NANCARROW, T., LIMBU, B., SHEEHAN, R., WILCOCK, M., BRANFORD, D., COURTENAY, K., PERERA, B. & SHANKAR, R. 2020. UK psychiatrists' experience of withdrawal of antipsychotics prescribed for challenging behaviours in adults with intellectual disabilities and/or autism. *BJPsych open*, 6.
- DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE 2021. National overprescribing review report. London. DOHERTY, A. J., BOLAND, P., REED, J., CLEGG, A. J., STEPHANI, A.-M., WILLIAMS, N. H., SHAW, B., HEDGECOE, L., HILL, R. & WALKER, L. 2020. Barriers and facilitators to deprescribing in primary care: a systematic review. *BJGP Open*, 4, bjgpopen20X101096.
- DUERDEN, M., AVERY, T. & PAYNE, R. 2013. Polypharmacy and medicines optimisation. *Making it safe and sound. London: The King's Fund.*
- GLOVER, G. & MEHTA, H. 2019. Monitoring a national programme to reduce psychotropic overuse with a general practice research database. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 63 (7), 796.
- KLEIJWEGT, B., PRUIJSSERS, A., DE JONG-BAKKER, L., DE HAAN, K., VAN OS-MEDENDORP, H. & VAN MEIJEL, B. 2019. Support staff's perceptions of discontinuing antipsychotics in people with intellectual disabilities in residential care: A mixed-method study. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*, 32, 861-870.
- LALOR, J. & POULSON, L. 2013. Psychotropic medications and adults with intellectual disabilities: care staff perspectives. *Advances in Mental Health and Intellectual Disabilities*.
- LAWSON, S., MULLAN, J., WONG, G., ZAMAN, H., BOOTH, A., WATSON, A. & MAIDMENT, I. 2022. Family carers' experiences of managing older relative's medications: Insights from the MEMORABLE study. *Patient Education and Counseling*, 105, 2573-2580.
- LUNDBY, C., GRAABÆK, T., RYG, J., SØNDERGAARD, J., POTTEGÅRD, A. & NIELSEN, D. S. 2019. Health care professionals' attitudes towards deprescribing in older patients with limited life expectancy: A systematic review. *British Journal of Clinical Pharmacology*, 85, 868-892.
- MAIDMENT, I. D., HAW, C., STUBBS, J., FOX, C., KATONA, C. & FRANKLIN, B. D. 2008. Medication errors in older people with mental health problems: a review. *Int J Geriatr Psychiatry*, 23, 564-73.

- MCCARTHY, L. M., FARRELL, B., HOWELL, P. & QUAST, T. 2022. Supporting deprescribing in long-term care: An approach using stakeholder engagement, behavioural science and implementation planning. *Exploratory research in clinical and social pharmacy*, **7**, 100168.
- MOORE, G. F., AUDREY, S., BARKER, M., BOND, L., BONELL, C., HARDEMAN, W., MOORE, L., O'CATHAIN, A., TINATI, T. & WIGHT, D. 2015. Process evaluation of complex interventions: Medical Research Council guidance. *bmj*, 350.
- NHS ENGLAND. Stopping over medication of people with a learning disability, autism or both (STOMP) [Online]. Available: <a href="https://www.england.nhs.uk/learning-disabilities/improving-health/stomp/">https://www.england.nhs.uk/learning-disabilities/improving-health/stomp/</a> [Accessed].
- NICE 2015. Challenging behaviour and learning disabilities: prevention and interventions for people with learning disabilities whose behaviour challenges.
- REEVE, E., TO, J., HENDRIX, I., SHAKIB, S., ROBERTS, M. S. & WIESE, M. D. 2013. Patient barriers to and enablers of deprescribing: a systematic review. *Drugs & aging*, 30, 793-807.
- RIDGE, K. 2021. National Overprescribing Review Report. In: CARE, D. O. H. A. S. (ed.).
- SHEEHAN, R., HASSIOTIS, A., WALTERS, K., OSBORN, D., STRYDOM, A. & HORSFALL, L. 2015. Mental illness, challenging behaviour, and psychotropic drug prescribing in people with intellectual disability: UK population based cohort study. *Bmj*, 351.
- US DEPRESCRIBING RESEARCH NETWORK. 2020. What is deprescribing? [Online]. Available: <a href="https://deprescribingresearch.org/">https://deprescribingresearch.org/</a> [Accessed].
- WEIR, K. R., AILABOUNI, N. J., SCHNEIDER, C. R., HILMER, S. N. & REEVE, E. 2022. Consumer Attitudes Towards Deprescribing: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci*, 77, 1020-1034.
- WREIN, D. 2019. Understanding the role of care staff in supporting individuals with an intellectual disability who take psychotropic medication. University of East London.

- 1 Stakeholder Experiences of Deprescribing Psychotropic Medicines for Challenging
- 2 Behaviour in People with Intellectual Disabilities

### Abstract

### 6 Purpose

- 7 Evidence of overprescribing of psychotropic medicines to manage challenging behaviour in
- 8 people with intellectual disabilities has led to national programmes within the U.K to promote
- 9 deprescribing, such as STOMP (Stopping the Overprescribing of Medication in People with
- 10 Learning Disabilities, Autism or both). To successfully implement deprescribing initiatives
- we need to understand how to engage stakeholders in the process.

### Approach

- In a published systematic review, we reported evidence about the process of deprescribing
- psychotropic medicines for people of all ages with intellectual disabilities and challenging
- behaviour. As a part of the original review, we searched for evidence about stakeholders'
- experiences of the psychotropic deprescribing process which was synthesised and reported
- within the current study.

### **Findings**

- 21 Six studies were identified. Involving carers and people with intellectual disabilities,
- providing ongoing support, and improving access to non-pharmacological interventions
- 23 including Positive Behaviour Support may contribute to successful outcomes, including
- reducing or stopping psychotropic medicines and improved quality of life. Implementing

- psychotropic deprescribing requires a multidisciplinary collaborative care approach andeducation for stakeholders.
- 27 Originality
- 28 There have been no previous reviews of stakeholder experiences of deprescribing
- 29 psychotropic medications for people with intellectual disabilities and challenging behaviour.
- 30 The existing literature is scant and further research is needed.

32 Paper Type

33 Research Paper

34 .....

Background

- Overprescribing, the use of a medicine where there is a better non-medicine alternative, or the
- prescription is inappropriate for the circumstances and wishes of an individual, occurs
- throughout healthcare systems (Ridge, 2021). An estimated 10% of dispensed items are
- 40 overprescribed in primary care with 15% of people taking five or more medicines a day
- 41 (Ridge, 2021). Initially, a medicine may be appropriately prescribed, but in the absence of
- 42 timely review, it may no longer be the best choice. Furthermore, polypharmacy, the
- prescribing and administration of multiple medicines, and patient cognitive impairment can
- be problematic and may be associated with medication errors (Duerden et al., 2013,
- 45 Maidment et al., 2008).
- 46 Overprescribing can lead to harm by exposing individuals to unnecessary adverse effects of
- 47 medicines and an increased risk of interactions with other medicines (Ridge, 2021). Equally,
- overprescribing increases the burden on the person and any family carers supporting them

(Duerden et al., 2013, Ridge, 2021, Bennett et al., 2021, Lawson et al., 2022). In 2021, the U.K. Government overprescribing review (Ridge, 2021) recommended expanding the use of structured medication reviews and embedding deprescribing within the prescribing process. Deprescribing, the planned and supervised process of dose reduction or stopping of medication in a safe and effective way (Doherty et al., 2020, Austrailian Deprescribing Network, US Deprescribing Research Network, 2020, Bruyère Research Institute), is a complex healthcare intervention that looks to address overprescribing. As with prescribing, deprescribing should be a collaborative process within a person-centred and shared decision making framework with the aim of minimising risk of harm from medication whilst achieving improved positive health outcomes (Department of Health and Social Care, 2021). In 2016, NHS England launched the STOMP programme in response to evidence that psychotropic medicines are overprescribed in people with intellectual disabilities for the management of challenging behaviour (Branford et al., 2019, NHS England, Sheehan et al., 2015, Bowring et al., 2017). For example, a report by Public Health England (Glover and Mehta, 2019) in 2015 found that a third of people known to have intellectual disabilities were prescribed at least one psychotropic medicine and more than half of these people did not have a documented mental health diagnosis. Our previously published systematic review reported findings addressing the primary review question in accordance with a published protocol (https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display record.php?RecordID=158079), looking at the effects of deprescribing psychotropic medicines as a part of a care pathway or treatment plan for people of all ages with intellectual disabilities and challenging behaviour (Adams et al. 

2023). The review included 54 studies carried out in community and inpatient settings

primarily in the UK, the USA and the Netherlands focussing on 3292 people with intellectual disabilities. Our review found that psychotropic deprescribing interventions for people with intellectual disabilities may lead to dosage reductions and the discontinuation of these medicines. Although negative effects of deprescribing were reported we found there were positive effects on behaviour, mental and physical health which were associated with a multidisciplinary model (Adams et al., 2023). Examining the overall effectiveness of an intervention is essential, but alone is insufficient to fully support the widespread implementation of a complex intervention such as deprescribing. To successfully implement deprescribing initiatives we need to understand how to engage health and social care professionals, family carers and individuals with intellectual disabilities in the process and how they experience deprescribing. An understanding of how the attitudes, beliefs and values of these stakeholders affect decision making and influence behaviour as part of the deprescribing process is a key aspect of this (Darnton, 2008, Moore et al., 2015). Furthermore, a clear understanding of the barriers and enablers to successful deprescribing is important to maximise success and contribute towards the development of clear guidance and policy. Existing published literature reviews have not adequately explored these experiences of stakeholders, regarding deprescribing psychotropic medicines in people with intellectual disabilities. Previous reviews have considered people's experiences of deprescribing in older people (Lundby et al., 2019) and within primary care (Doherty et al., 2020) but have not specifically looked at deprescribing psychotropic medicine use with people with intellectual disabilities. To address this gap in the literature, we had originally included an additional review question in our protocol addressing stakeholder experiences and perspectives on deprescribing

psychotropic medicines in individuals with intellectual disabilities and challenging behaviour.

We defined stakeholders as people with intellectual disabilities, paid carers, family carers, nurses, healthcare assistants, GPs, psychiatrists, pharmacists, other specialist healthcare professionals and social care professionals. In this paper we report and discuss the findings that emerged from our attempt to consider this review question.

### Methodology

Full details of the methodology are reported in our previously published systematic review (Adams et al., 2023). To answer the current question in this review, we only included papers that reported outcomes for stakeholders' experiences in terms of attitudes, views and beliefs about psychotropic deprescribing in people with intellectual disabilities.

Database searches were updated several times and a final search was completed in November 2022. Forwards and backwards reference searching of papers included in our published systematic review (Adams et al., 2023) was also conducted to track citations. Four key researchers, identified as having published several studies in this field over the last 10 years, were contacted to identify any further studies. Trial registries were not searched. Following data extraction using a bespoke data extraction form, studies were individually appraised for risk of bias using the qualitative tool from the Critical Appraisals Skills Programme Tools (CASP; CASP,2015) which consist of ten questions to assess internal and external validity.

### **Data Analysis**

We organised our findings into groups which were developed by discussions within the research team. This allowed us to synthesise our findings more easily and draw conclusions from our findings.

### **Findings**

We only found two papers through database searching (Kleijwegt et al., 2019, Deb et al., 2020). We found one additional paper through citation searching (Wrein, 2019) and an additional three more via direct author contact (de Kuijper et al., 2022b, de Kuijper et al., 2022a, Deb et al., 2023). Two papers reported results from the same study; one reporting quantitative data (Deb et al., 2020) and the other reporting qualitative data (Deb et al., 2023). Two studies were carried out in the U.K. (Wrein, 2019, Deb et al., 2020) and three studies in The Netherlands (de Kuijper et al., 2022b, de Kuijper et al., 2022a, Kleijwegt et al., 2019). Two studies (n = 34, n = 88) reported experiences direct from psychiatrists (de Kuijper et al., 2022b, Deb et al., 2020, Deb et al., 2023), two studies (n = 29, n = 8) reported experiences direct from carers (Kleijwegt et al., 2019, Wrein, 2019) and one study (n = 7) reported experiences direct from people with intellectual disabilities (de Kuijper et al., 2022a). There were a range of study types; two mixed methods studies using online questionnaires (de Kuijper et al., 2022b, Deb et al., 2020, Deb et al., 2023), one qualitative study using interviews (de Kuijper et al., 2022a), one qualitative study using semi structured interviews (Wrein, 2019) and one qualitative study using focus groups (Kleijwegt et al., 2019). We organised our findings by grouping data from the included studies into five categories: (1) carer attitudes towards deprescribing, (2) healthcare professional attitudes towards deprescribing, (3) the attitudes of people with intellectual disabilities towards deprescribing, (4) the extent of multidisciplinary team and wider clinical team working, (5) the availability 70/2 of resources.

### Carer attitudes towards the deprescribing process

The involvement of paid carers was seen as vital to the success of deprescribing (Wrein, 2019). Overall, there is some evidence from two studies that carers are resistant, at times, to

deprescribing due to concerns about a deterioration, their lack of experience (Deb et al., 2020, Kleijwegt et al., 2019), and a feeling that "maybe at times it makes us more risk adverse if we're unsure how the individual is going you know to respond to something maybe we'll think, well let's not do that" (Wrein, 2019) p73 giving rise to therapeutic inertia. Three of these studies reported on findings regarding both paid and family carers whereas one study reported findings related to only paid carers (Kleijwegt et al., 2019).

Despite carer "resistance", findings from one study reported that there is evidence that paid

carers are willing to collaborate on discontinuing antipsychotics where possible, although they feel more confident about achieving dosage reduction rather than total withdrawal. The concerns raised by paid caregivers about time constraints lead to the perception that caregivers may have limited capacity to effectively manage challenging behaviour exacerbations. (Kleijwegt et al., 2019). However, while this study involved people with mild intellectual disabilities; people with moderate to profound intellectual disabilities were not included. (Kleijwegt et al., 2019).

### Healthcare Professional attitudes towards the deprescribing process

In one online survey psychiatrists reported feeling positive towards deprescribing, reporting that they found the process of antipsychotic deprescribing a rewarding experience, increasing their confidence (Deb et al., 2023). However, the authors reported a low survey response rate meaning that their findings are unlikely to represent the views of psychiatrists working with people with intellectual disabilities broadly. In addition, an association was reported between well-resourced STOMP implementation with psychiatrists reporting satisfaction in the process with successful rationalisation of antipsychotic medication. However, where there was insufficient resource, psychiatrists seemed dissatisfied with the process with limited

success in deprescribing antipsychotic medication. In another study, healthcare professionals reported that the lack of stakeholder knowledge of the deprescribing process can be a barrier (de Kuijper et al., 2022b).

### The attitudes of people with intellectual disabilities towards deprescribing

There is some limited evidence from one study that people with intellectual disabilities are concerned about psychotropic medication deprescribing in case it leads to the re-emergence of behaviour problems (de Kuijper et al., 2022a). During the interviews in this study, participants expressed the importance of having a good rapport with their doctor. This relationship was important to them because it meant that they felt that their concerns were taken seriously. The participants also emphasised the importance of their own coping style in the success of discontinuing long-term medication, suggesting that the mindset and motivation of a person with intellectual disabilities may be a crucial facilitator in the deprescribing process (de Kuijper et al., 2022a).

Evidence from people with intellectual disabilities highlights the importance of accessing approachable physicians who can address issues that may arise during the deprescribing process along with peer, family, and professional support (de Kuijper et al., 2022a). Interviews with people with intellectual disabilities revealed that their understanding of the deprescribing process and the quality of treatment by physicians are important facilitators of deprescribing (de Kuijper et al., 2022a).

### Extent of multidisciplinary team (MDT) and wider clinical team working

Evidence suggested that multiagency working and input from the MDT, nurse prescribers, allied healthcare professionals, social workers and pharmacists enables successful psychotropic deprescribing (Deb et al., 2023, Deb et al., 2020). Similarly, there is evidence from support staff that insufficient availability of multidisciplinary consultation was a barrier to successful deprescribing (Kleijwegt et al., 2019). Successful deprescribing should incorporate a multi-level approach involving the support of managers at the institutional level and the creation of favourable conditions at the political and professional level (de Kuijper et al., 2022b).

# Availability of resources

The belief that resources can play a significant role in achieving successful psychotropic deprescribing outcomes was reported in one study (Deb et al., 2023, Deb et al., 2020) where Positive Behaviour Support (PBS) plans were seen as a facilitator to deprescribing. The lack of time, absence of appropriate PBS plans, lack of non-pharmacological interventions for challenging behaviour, and inadequate social care provision were reported as barriers to achieving successful deprescribing (de Kuijper et al., 2022b, Deb et al., 2023).

### **Discussion**

The main finding from this review is the lack of studies reporting upon the stakeholder experience of psychotropic deprescribing in people with intellectual disabilities. It was difficult to find relevant studies, with most of the studies not identified in the initial data base searches. However, the findings extracted from the included studies do provide some valuable insights into stakeholder experiences and perspectives regarding the deprescribing of psychotropic medicines in individuals with intellectual disabilities and challenging behaviour, albeit limited by the lack of a substantial research literature.

Carer resistance is significant in the context of the review question as it highlights the balance between implementing deprescribing interventions with caution and the potential benefits of deprescribing. Carer willingness to collaborate (Wrein, 2019), notwithstanding certain limitations, emphasises the importance of involving them in decision-making processes related to medication management. There is a need for effective strategies to address carers' concerns to build confidence, making them feel an equal partner in the deprescribing process. Similarly, concerns expressed by individuals with intellectual disabilities about the reemergence of behaviour problems upon deprescribing reveal their unique perspective(de Kuijper et al., 2022a). Their emphasis on the doctor-patient relationship and personal coping strategies signifies the importance of shared decision making within a person-centred framework. Collaborative involvement of diverse healthcare and social care professionals is essential for effective deprescribing in individuals with intellectual disabilities and challenging behaviour. emphasizing the importance of collective psychotropic deprescribing decisions (Deb et al., 2020, Deb et al., 2023). In addition to secondary care healthcare professionals, primary care practitioners including GPs and non medical prescribers have a significant role in the prescribing and deprescribing of psychotropic medicines in people with intellectual disabilities who display challenging behaviour. However inadequate resources can hinder effective deprescribing review (Deb et al., 2023, Deb et al., 2020, de Kuijper et al., 2022b). Commentaries by Deb and colleagues (Deb, 2007, Deb et al., 2009) further emphasise the significance of the team approach in implementing psychotropic deprescribing. They highlight the barriers faced by general practitioners (GPs) in terms of lack of community support and negative attitudes of care staff.

We found in our review that healthcare professionals reported that the lack of stakeholder knowledge of the deprescribing process can be a barrier (de Kuijper et al., 2022b). The commentaries by Deb and colleagues (Deb, 2007, Deb et al., 2009) also stress the importance of education and support for GPs and carers to consider the withdrawal of psychotropic medications, even after long-term use.

NICE recommends that, during the annual physical health check for individuals with intellectual disabilities conducted by GPs, it is crucial to consider the potential connection between challenging behaviour and physical health issues (NICE, 2015). This involves reviewing physical health medications and establishing a shared care management plan. GPs are well placed to review both psychotropic and physical health medications, providing a holistic, person centred approach to the management of challenging behaviour, including any subsequent plans for psychotropic deprescribing. Consequently, educational and training initiatives for GPs regarding psychotropic deprescribing should highlight the significance of reviewing both physical health and psychotropic medications.

Similar enablers of psychotropic deprescribing have been reported in people living with dementia where training appeared to increase the ability and confidence of care staff to manage challenging behaviour without the need for medication. In addition, a study exploring supporting deprescribing in older adults in long term care concluded that a key element of deprescribing success was attracting and sustaining engagement of a wide variety of relevant stakeholders from across the health system by leveraging best practices in stakeholder engagement (McCarthy et al., 2022). Furthermore, a systematic review looking at psychotropic deprescribing in older adults with limited life expectancy reported that patient and relative involvement and the importance of teamwork were associated with successful outcomes (Lundby et al., 2019). These findings are consistent with our findings regarding the

level of accessibility and engagement of the MDT can affect the outcome of psychotropic deprescribing interventions in people with intellectual disabilities.

Studies looking at deprescribing interventions that are not specific to psychotropic medicines

or people with intellectual disabilities reported some similar barriers and enablers to our study. A systematic review by Reeve and colleagues (Reeve et al., 2013) reported barriers of non-specific fears about stopping, such as stopping being problematic or being unable to cope, fear about the condition returning or worsening and fear of withdrawal effects. They also reported that a good relationship with the physician facilitated the deprescribing process. Interestingly, a systematic review exploring consumer attitudes towards deprescribing reported that the majority of carers reported that they would be willing for one or more of their care recipient's medications to be stopped if their care recipient's doctor said it was possible (Weir et al., 2022).

Due to the low number of studies included in this review, the impact of our findings is limited and therefore it is important to exercise caution in interpreting these findings. The quality appraisal process identified potential bias associated with sampling and recruitment methods across studies, such as direct approaches (de Kuijper et al., 2022b, Deb et al., 2023, Deb et al., 2020), convenience sampling (Kleijwegt et al., 2019) and recruitment by physicians (de Kuijper et al., 2022a).

In addition to the small number of included studies and despite there being no restriction on country, three out of the five studies were carried out in the Netherlands (de Kuijper et al., 2022a, de Kuijper et al., 2022b, Kleijwegt et al., 2019) and two studies were carried out in the U.K.(Wrein, 2019, Deb et al., 2020). This may limit the external validity and transferability of the overall systematic review when considering settings in other countries where there may be differences in health policy, practices and access to healthcare.

When developing policies, we need to consider stakeholder experiences as this can impact on the uptake and the success of implementing the intervention. Earlier research suggests that carers of people with intellectual disabilities feel they are not sufficiently involved in healthcare decisions by services (Lalor and Poulson, 2013, Chadwick et al., 2013).

### Conclusion

Our findings suggest that there is very limited data on stakeholder experiences of deprescribing psychotropic medicines as a part of a care plan for people with intellectual disabilities and challenging behaviour. To inform best practice in implementing the psychotropic deprescribing process in people with intellectual disabilities we need to further understand how these experiences impact on the implementation process of psychotropic deprescribing by carrying out further research. Despite these limitations, our review provides a valuable starting point for researchers and practitioners seeking to better understand the complex issues surrounding psychotropic deprescribing in people with intellectual disabilities.

#### References

- ADAMS, D., HASTINGS, R. P., MAIDMENT, I., SHAH, C. & LANGDON, P. E. 2023. Deprescribing psychotropic medicines for behaviours that challenge in people with intellectual disabilities: a systematic review. *BMC Psychiatry*, 23, 202.
- AUSTRAILIAN DEPRESCRIBING NETWORK. What is deprescribing? [Online]. Available: <a href="https://www.australiandeprescribingnetwork.com.au/">https://www.australiandeprescribingnetwork.com.au/</a> [Accessed].
- BENNETT, F., FERNER, R. & SOFAT, R. 2021. Overprescribing and rational therapeutics: Barriers to change and opportunities to improve. *British Journal of Clinical Pharmacology*, 87, 34-38.
- BOWRING, D. L., TOTSIKA, V., HASTINGS, R. P., TOOGOOD, S. & MCMAHON, M. 2017. Prevalence of psychotropic medication use and association with challenging behaviour in adults with an intellectual disability. A total population study. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 61, 604-617.
- BRANFORD, D., GERRARD, D., SALEEM, N., SHAW, C. & WEBSTER, A. 2019. Stopping over-medication of people with an intellectual disability, autism or both (STOMP) in England Part 2—the story so far. *Advances in Mental Health and Intellectual Disabilities*.
- BRUYÈRE RESEARCH INSTITUTE. *Canadian Deprescribing Network* [Online]. Available: <a href="https://deprescribing.org/">https://deprescribing.org/</a> [Accessed].

- CHADWICK, D. D., MANNAN, H., GARCIA IRIARTE, E., MCCONKEY, R., O'BRIEN, P., FINLAY, F.,
  LAWLOR, A. & HARRINGTON, G. 2013. Family voices: life for family carers of people with
  intellectual disabilities in Ireland. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*, 26,
  119-132.
  - DARNTON, A. 2008. Practical Guide: An overview of behaviour change models and their uses. *In:* CENTRE FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT & WESTMINSTER, U. O. (eds.). London: Government Social Research Unit.
  - DE KUIJPER, G., DE HAAN, J., DEB, S. & SHANKAR, R. 2022a. Withdrawing Antipsychotics for Challenging Behaviours in Adults with Intellectual Disabilities: Experiences and Views of Experts by Experience. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19, 15637.
  - DE KUIJPER, G., DE HAAN, J., DEB, S. & SHANKAR, R. 2022b. Withdrawing Antipsychotics for Challenging Behaviours in Adults with Intellectual Disabilities: Experiences and Views of Prescribers. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19, 17095.
  - DEB, S. 2007. The role of medication in the management of behaviour problems in people with learning disabilities. *Advances in Mental Health and Learning Disabilities*, 1, 26-31.
  - DEB, S., KWOK, H., BERTELLI, M., SALVADOR-CARULLA, L., BRADLEY, E., TORR, J. & BARNHILL, J. 2009. International guide to prescribing psychotropic medication for the management of problem behaviours in adults with intellectual disabilities. *World Psychiatry*, 8, 181-186.
  - DEB, S., LIMBU, B., NANCARROW, T., GERRARD, D. & SHANKAR, R. 2023. The UK psychiatrists' experience of rationalising antipsychotics in adults with intellectual disabilities: A qualitative data analysis of free-text questionnaire responses. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*.
  - DEB, S., NANCARROW, T., LIMBU, B., SHEEHAN, R., WILCOCK, M., BRANFORD, D., COURTENAY, K., PERERA, B. & SHANKAR, R. 2020. UK psychiatrists' experience of withdrawal of antipsychotics prescribed for challenging behaviours in adults with intellectual disabilities and/or autism. *BJPsych open*, 6.
  - DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE 2021. National overprescribing review report. London. DOHERTY, A. J., BOLAND, P., REED, J., CLEGG, A. J., STEPHANI, A.-M., WILLIAMS, N. H., SHAW, B., HEDGECOE, L., HILL, R. & WALKER, L. 2020. Barriers and facilitators to deprescribing in primary care: a systematic review. *BJGP Open*, 4, bjgpopen20X101096.
  - DUERDEN, M., AVERY, T. & PAYNE, R. 2013. Polypharmacy and medicines optimisation. *Making it safe and sound. London: The King's Fund.*
  - GLOVER, G. & MEHTA, H. 2019. Monitoring a national programme to reduce psychotropic overuse with a general practice research database. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 63 (7), 796
  - KLEIJWEGT, B., PRUIJSSERS, A., DE JONG-BAKKER, L., DE HAAN, K., VAN OS-MEDENDORP, H. & VAN MEIJEL, B. 2019. Support staff's perceptions of discontinuing antipsychotics in people with intellectual disabilities in residential care: A mixed-method study. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*, 32, 861-870.
  - LALOR, J. & POULSON, L. 2013. Psychotropic medications and adults with intellectual disabilities: care staff perspectives. *Advances in Mental Health and Intellectual Disabilities*.
  - LAWSON, S., MULLAN, J., WONG, G., ZAMAN, H., BOOTH, A., WATSON, A. & MAIDMENT, I. 2022. Family carers' experiences of managing older relative's medications: Insights from the MEMORABLE study. *Patient Education and Counseling*, 105, 2573-2580.
  - LUNDBY, C., GRAABÆK, T., RYG, J., SØNDERGAARD, J., POTTEGÅRD, A. & NIELSEN, D. S. 2019. Health care professionals' attitudes towards deprescribing in older patients with limited life expectancy: A systematic review. *British Journal of Clinical Pharmacology*, 85, 868-892.
  - MAIDMENT, I. D., HAW, C., STUBBS, J., FOX, C., KATONA, C. & FRANKLIN, B. D. 2008. Medication errors in older people with mental health problems: a review. *Int J Geriatr Psychiatry*, 23, 564-73.

- MCCARTHY, L. M., FARRELL, B., HOWELL, P. & QUAST, T. 2022. Supporting deprescribing in long-term care: An approach using stakeholder engagement, behavioural science and implementation planning. *Exploratory research in clinical and social pharmacy*, **7**, 100168.
- MOORE, G. F., AUDREY, S., BARKER, M., BOND, L., BONELL, C., HARDEMAN, W., MOORE, L., O'CATHAIN, A., TINATI, T. & WIGHT, D. 2015. Process evaluation of complex interventions: Medical Research Council guidance. *bmj*, 350.
- NHS ENGLAND. Stopping over medication of people with a learning disability, autism or both (STOMP) [Online]. Available: <a href="https://www.england.nhs.uk/learning-disabilities/improving-health/stomp/">https://www.england.nhs.uk/learning-disabilities/improving-health/stomp/</a> [Accessed].
- NICE 2015. Challenging behaviour and learning disabilities: prevention and interventions for people with learning disabilities whose behaviour challenges.
- REEVE, E., TO, J., HENDRIX, I., SHAKIB, S., ROBERTS, M. S. & WIESE, M. D. 2013. Patient barriers to and enablers of deprescribing: a systematic review. *Drugs & aging*, 30, 793-807.
- RIDGE, K. 2021. National Overprescribing Review Report. In: CARE, D. O. H. A. S. (ed.).
- SHEEHAN, R., HASSIOTIS, A., WALTERS, K., OSBORN, D., STRYDOM, A. & HORSFALL, L. 2015. Mental illness, challenging behaviour, and psychotropic drug prescribing in people with intellectual disability: UK population based cohort study. *Bmj*, 351.
- US DEPRESCRIBING RESEARCH NETWORK. 2020. What is deprescribing? [Online]. Available: <a href="https://deprescribingresearch.org/">https://deprescribingresearch.org/</a> [Accessed].
- WEIR, K. R., AILABOUNI, N. J., SCHNEIDER, C. R., HILMER, S. N. & REEVE, E. 2022. Consumer Attitudes Towards Deprescribing: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci*, 77, 1020-1034.
- WREIN, D. 2019. Understanding the role of care staff in supporting individuals with an intellectual disability who take psychotropic medication. University of East London.