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Abstract
We discuss the implications of our systematic review of the evidence regarding current postgraduate psychiatric training methods in the UK. The review found only 24 papers on the topic, 10 of which were research based. None of the papers addressed the reliability and validity of the teaching methods studied. These papers suggest that issues regarding psychiatric training and education in the UK have been addressed only to a limited extent. There is thus an urgent need for more rigorous and scientific evaluation of training methods, especially now that training and assessment are changing in the UK.

We decided to undertake a systematic review of the literature to examine the evidence base for current education and training initiatives in psychiatry in the UK. Our methods and more detailed results appear as a data supplement to the online version of this editorial. Here, we discuss the implications of our findings.

The current evidence

Most studies on postgraduate psychiatric training and outcomes have been conducted in the USA, Canada and Australia. We found only 24 papers from 1996 to the present that focused on the UK, 10 of which were research publications evaluating the quality of training (Table 1, online data supplement) and 14 were editorials or narrations about psychiatric training. We were unable to identify any randomised controlled or before–after studies. There were no papers on the reliability and validity of the various methods used for postgraduate training in psychiatry, nor were there any recent studies of the usefulness of training methods in improving the competence or skills of trainees. Of the papers with a research design (Table 1, data supplement), only two were on psychotherapy training, and one each on forensic

Modernising Medical Careers (http://www.mmc.nhs.uk/pages/home) and the Postgraduate Medical Education and Training Board (PMETB; http://www.pmetb.org.uk) have become part of everyday vocabulary with regard to the training of medical professionals in the UK. These initiatives are bringing about changes in training methods and the educational system, but where is the evidence showing which components of training work and which do not?

There is growing emphasis on defining an evidence base for medical education and practice (Harsden et al, 1999). More than 30 years ago, Brook (1974) reported a survey of training experiences of recently appointed psychiatric consultants in the UK. He found that a number of important aspects of training had been experienced by only a minority of trainees and that for the majority clinical experience had been poorly supervised and taught. His findings showed major deficiencies in certain areas of training, notably psychogeriatrics (old age psychiatry); medico-legal work; experience with ward consultations; dealing with psychiatric emergencies; and the specialties of mental handicap (intellectual disability), child psychiatry and forensic psychiatry. He recommended that academic units in universities and medical schools be strengthened.
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psychiatry training, logbooks, supervision, ethnicity, special skills (flexible training) and satisfaction with training. Overall, the quality of trainees was reported to be good and ‘flexible trainees’ were reported to be better than average. Eight studies were cross-sectional, one retrospective and one prospective. The themes of the studies were variable, and it was therefore difficult to summarise their findings.

**Discussion**

At a time when most clinical practice and guidelines are evidence based and the emphasis is on training, it is surprising to find a lack of evidence supporting methods of postgraduate psychiatric training. There are no systematic reviews, no controlled studies, no randomised studies and no studies on the reliability or validity of training methods.

It may be difficult to predict from research studies on methods and programmes of training how these reflect the competence and skills of the trainees, but the attempt must be made in psychiatry as it has been in other fields of medicine. Randomised comparative studies have been conducted in dermatology (Ochsendorf et al, 2004) and on the use and success of medical journal clubs (Linzer et al, 1988), and there are systematic reviews of postgraduate medical teaching (Coomarasamy et al, 2003) and critical appraisal skills (Taylor et al, 2000).

Training in psychiatry is based on paradigms that are largely historical. The reliability, validity and generalisability of the methods used have scarcely been addressed. Many aspects of psychiatric training are as relevant to UK trainees as they are to those in other Western countries. These include the quality of supervision, training in psychiatric sub-specialities, quality assurance in training, logbooks, research experience and part-time flexible training (Day et al, 2002). However, training methods in the UK are at variance with those in the USA, Canada and Australia. It is clear that we need well-designed systematic studies of current training programmes and teaching methods in the UK, to provide an evidence base justifying these differences. In view of the changes in psychiatric training already set in motion by Modernising Medical Careers and PMETB, further evaluative research is indicated as a matter of urgency.
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Material and methods for literature search

An electronic literature search was conducted systematically of appropriate databases, websites and the internet. The search for relevant articles consisted of on-line scanning of Medline (MEDL and MEZZ), EMBASE (EMZZ), PsycInfo, the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews (CDSR) and the Association for the Study of Medical Education (ASME), taking 1996 as the starting date. We used the following search terms, keywords and their word variants: ‘psychiatric postgraduate education’ and ‘psychiatric postgraduate training’. Only articles based on studies done in the UK were included. The quality of studies was assessed using standard methods on the basis of ten questions adapted from Guyatt et al (1993); studies were rated as good, satisfactory or unsatisfactory, depending on the scores. Quality ratings were conducted for the research papers identified in the search. Quality scores were based on a number of parameters defined by Guyatt et al and included criteria such as nature of assessments, response rates and control groups. Although the quality of the studies was variable, we decided to include all, as the number of studies was small. Additional hand searches were conducted of the Psychiatric Bulletin over an 8-year period and of all Bulletin issues identified from the Excerpta Medica database. The findings of the studies were tabulated (Table 1).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Study design</th>
<th>Sample (n)</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ho &amp; McConville, 2004</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>Trainees (140)</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Supervision viewed as useful for clinical management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyons et al, 2001</td>
<td>Structured psychiatric assessment</td>
<td>Prospective and retrospective audit</td>
<td>Trainees (100)</td>
<td>Comparison: structured and informal methods</td>
<td>Structured assessment benefits trainees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herzberg &amp; Goldberg, 1999</td>
<td>Flexible training</td>
<td>Retrospective</td>
<td>Trainees (67)</td>
<td>Open survey</td>
<td>Flexible trainees better than average; progress to consultant level slow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reiss &amp; Famoroti, 2004</td>
<td>Prison psychiatry</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>Successful candidates (208)</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Forensic psychiatry training is essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyrer et al, 2002</td>
<td>Medical school training</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>Trainees (1128)</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Factors affecting trainees need to be examined; ethnicity of candidates needs to be addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podlejska-Eyres &amp; Stern, 2003</td>
<td>Psychotherapy training</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>Trainees (22)</td>
<td>Open, postal survey</td>
<td>Wished for greater exposure to psychotherapy during training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCrindle et al, 2001</td>
<td>Psychotherapy training</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>Trainees (95)</td>
<td>Open, telephone survey</td>
<td>Majority of trainees not receiving adequate psychotherapy training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herzberg &amp; Paice, 2002</td>
<td>Satisfaction with training</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>SHOs (237)</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Training of high standard; most trainees satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>psychiatric training</td>
<td></td>
<td>SpRs (101)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall &amp; Doubtfire, 2001</td>
<td>Trainees’ log books</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>Trainees (79)</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Lack of mutual commitment to using the log book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCallum et al, 1998</td>
<td>Satisfaction with training</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>Trainees 3rd year SHOs (24)</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Satisfaction with training but concerns about Calman changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and impact of Calman reforms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SHO, senior house officer; SpR, specialist registrar.
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