1 2	Can computer simulation support strategic service planning? Modelling a large integrated mental health system on recovery from COVID-19
3	
4	
5 6	Livia Pierotti <sup>1,2</sup> , Jennifer Cooper <sup>1</sup> , Charlotte James <sup>1,3</sup> , Kenah Cassels <sup>3</sup> , Emma Gara <sup>3</sup> , Rachel Denholm <sup>1,4</sup> , Richard Wood <sup>3,4</sup>
7	
8	<sup>1</sup> NIHR Bristol Biomedical Research Centre, University of Bristol, University of Bristol. <sup>2</sup> NIHR Health
9 10	Protection Research Unit in Behavioural Science and Evaluation, University of Bristol. <sup>3</sup> Bristol, North Somerset and South Gloucestershire Integrated Care Board, UK National Health Service. <sup>4</sup> HDR UK
11	Southwest.
12	
13	Correspondence to: Livia Pierotti
14	Livia.pierotti@bristol.ac.uk
15	
16	
17	Abstract
18	Background
19	COVID-19 has had a significant impact on people's mental health and mental health services. During
20	the first year of the pandemic, existing demand was not fully met while new demand was generated,
21	resulting in large numbers of people requiring support. To support mental health services to recover
22	without being overwhelmed, it was important to know where services will experience increased
23	pressure, and what strategies could be implemented to mitigate this.
24	Methods
25	We implemented a computer simulation model of patient flow through an integrated mental health
26	service in Southwest England covering General Practice (GP), community-based 'talking therapies'
27	(IAPT), acute hospital care, and specialist care settings. The model was calibrated on data from 1
28	April 2019 to 1 April 2021. Model parameters included patient demand, service-level length of stay,
29	and probabilities of transitioning to other care settings. We used the model to compare 'do nothing'
30	(baseline) scenarios to 'what if' (mitigation) scenarios, including increasing capacity and reducing
31	length of stay, for two future demand trajectories from 1 April 2021 onwards.
32	Results

33	The results from the simulation model suggest that, without mitigation, the impact of COVID-19 will
34	be an increase in pressure on GP and specialist community based services by 50% and 50-100%
35	respectively. Simulating the impact of possible mitigation strategies, results show that increasing
36	capacity in lower-acuity services, such as GP, results in demand being shifted to other parts of the
37	mental health system while decreasing length of stay in higher acuity services is insufficient to
38	mitigate the impact of increased demand.
39	Conclusion
40	In capturing the interrelation of patient flow related dynamics between various mental health care
41	settings, we demonstrate the value of computer simulation for assessing the impact of interventions
42	on system flow.
43	
44	<i>Keywords:</i> Computer modelling; Computer simulation; COVID-19; Coronavirus; Service design.
45	Mental health services.
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	

#### 57 Background

58

59 The COVID-19 pandemic has had a significant impact on people's mental health and mental health 60 services. During the pandemic, difficulties in accessing services have suppressed existing demand 61 while new demand has been generated by the social and financial consequences of lockdown, 62 bereavement, virus anxiety, and trauma in healthcare workers (Jia et al., 2020; Mazza et al., 2020; 63 Shevlin et al. 2020). Consequently, as mental health services re-open, a surge in demand is expected 64 (Xiang et al., 2020). For mental health services to recover from the pandemic and meet demand, 65 knowing which components of a service will experience increased pressure is essential, alongside 66 whether changes in service design could mitigate such effects. 67 68 Computer simulation, a digital model that replicates real-life processes, has a proven track record in 69 informing and improving the management of health services (Salleh et al, 2017; Mohiuddin et 70 al, 2020; Vázquez-Serrano et al, 2021). Simulations can be used to understand relationships, feedback 71 pathways and processes across multi-organisation systems, and assess how these would behave if a 72 change occurred. As they are both safer and cheaper than conducting experiments in a real-world

73 setting, they are useful for testing the potential impact of changes in service design.

74

Simulation modelling has been under-used in mental health service planning and development, compared to other clinical disease pathways (Long, 2017). While existing studies have implemented system dynamic modelling for improving mental health services during the pandemic (Katikireddi, 2022; Currie et al, 2020), simulation has only previously been applied to decision-making in treatment evaluation, cost-effectiveness analysis and epidemiological studies (Long, 2017).

80

In this study, we use a Discrete Time Simulation (DTS) model to evaluate the impact of the COVID-19
 pandemic on mental health services. Using the model, we assess where the pandemic-related surge

in demand will lead to increased pressure, and the effect of possible mitigation strategies to reduce
 this pressure. Our study demonstrates how simulation modelling can be used to inform decisions
 regarding changes to capacity and structure of mental health pathways, to best meet the needs of
 patients on recovery from the pandemic and beyond.

87

88 To address these questions, we first described the flow of patients across multiple mental health 89 services in the system by developing a schematic representation of the mental health pathways using 90 linked electronic patient-level data up to 1 April 2021. The pathway maps resulting from this exercise 91 in 'process mining' were used to configure the structure of the DTS, in terms of the mental health 92 services covered – GP, Improving Access to Psychological Therapy (IAPT) care, acute hospital, and 93 specialist care settings – and the various parameters relating to patient flow between these services 94 - arrival rates, lengths of stay, and transition probabilities. The model also captures the effect of 95 escalating need should demand not be met in a timely manner. With the model calibrated on data to 96 1 April 2021, this study then explores the potential effects of two different scenarios relating to 97 future mental health demand on recovery from the Covid-19 pandemic; first on a 'do nothing' 98 (baseline) basis, and then through considering service-level mitigatory measures through a 'what if' 99 (intervention) analysis. In addition, baseline and intervention scenarios can be compared in terms of 100 whether needs are adequately met for each patient, which can be evaluated by looking at patients 101 exiting the pathway without having received treatment.

102

#### 103 Methods

104 Study Setting

Bristol, North Somerset, and South Gloucestershire (BNSSG) Integrated Care System (ICS) is a healthcare system in southwest England, with a population of approximately one million residents. As with other NHS systems, BNSSG ICS is a network of healthcare providers covering primary, secondary, mental health, community, and social care. The healthcare system serves a mixture of

- 109 metropolitan areas and rural and coastal locations. The large metropolitan area of Bristol contains a
- 110 higher proportion of younger individuals and is culturally and ethnically diverse. Rural and coastal
- 111 areas contain a greater proportion of older individuals and pockets of severe deprivation (Ministry of
- 112 Housing Communities & Local Government, 2019).
- 113
- 114 **Population**
- 115 The study population included all patients aged 18 years and over referred to mental health services
- in BNSSG between 1 April 2019 to 1 April 2021. Patients were excluded if they were in community
- 117 mental health services for children.
- 118
- 119 Figure 1: Description of six 'levels of need' for mental health services in the healthcare system
- studied, detailing the setting, means of access, and type of resource. The colours represent the level
- 121 of intensity of care services, where the lighter colours represent the least intensity.
- 122

	Setting	Means of Access	Resource
	Level 6	Refer from any level	Miscellaneous
	Specialist / Inpatient		Acute secondary care MH bed. (self-harms, eating disorder (including bedded and outpatients)
	Secondary care		
0.000	Level 5	Refer from any level	Avon and Wilshire Mental Health Partnership NHS trust (AWP) bed
	Inpatient		Acute inpatients
			PICU / rehab / Level 3 older patients
12	Level 4	Refer from any level	Sequence of consultation with Mental Health Provider (MHP)
DS I	Outpatient		* MHP Community triage
te	Secondary care		* MHP Community crisis
<u> </u>			* MHP Community general(general/recovery/early intervention EIP/liaison/memory)
8			* MHP Community children services
2			* MHP Community specialist (eating disorders, perinatal, drug and alcohol, forensic, physical)
Se	Level 3	Refer from any level or	Consultation with psychologist or therapy course, Improving Access to Physiological therapy.
1	Primary care	Self-referral	* IAPT Assessment
at	(advanced)		* IAPT Therapy
e.			* IAPT Social Prescribing
0	Level 2	Refer from any level or	Sequence of consultation with general practice (GP) or other clinician
	Primary care	Self-referral	* GP initial (not possible to retrieve that in the given dataset)
	(routine)		* GP long term low intensity
	Start of the Mental health system		* GP long term high intensity
	Level 1	Self-directed or referred	Interactions with Volunteers and or community groups.
	Community Support	by level 2 services.	
	(Not NHS)		

- \* More information of the classification of the levels (1 to 6) and services are given in Table S1. GP: general practice. IAPT: Improving Access to Physiological Therapy. MHP: Mental Health Provide. AWP: Avon and Wilshire Mental Health Partnership NHS Trust
   126
- 127 Data
- 128

129 Analysis was conducted using the BNSSG System Wide Dataset (SWD) from 1 April 2019 to 1 April 130 2021. The SWD provides patient-level linkable primary, secondary and community health data for the 131 BNSSG population (BNSSG Healthier Together, 2021). Primary Care data is obtained via a bespoke 132 extract from general practitioners, collated by OneCare, which is a General Practice (GP) federation 133 operating in BNSSG. Sourced from Egton Medical Information Systems (EMIS) GP administration 134 systems, the extract contains data on GP attendances and prescriptions. Secondary Uses Service 135 (SUS) contains information on all NHS acute trust outpatient consultations, inpatient admissions, and 136 emergency department attendances, with detailed data on date of attendance, ward specialty and 137 clinical indications. The Community Services Data Set (CSDS), maintained by NHS Digital, includes 138 intermediate care admissions and patient visits to and from community service teams. Mental health 139 data, covering consultations and admitted stays, is available from the Mental Health Services Data 140 Set (MHSDS) also maintained by NHS Digital. A full specification of the System Wide Dataset is 141 publicly available (BNSSG Healthier Together, 2021) including the data dictionary. To mitigate any 142 risks associated with the holding of patient identifiable data, all records are pseudonymised by the 143 regional Commissioning Support Unit before being added to the SWD. The dataset also contains no 144 patient names or full addresses.

145

The SWD contains two data tables: attributes and activities, linkable using the pseudonymised patient identifier. The attribute table is a monthly data flow of social demographic factors (i.e., sex, age, LSOA, ethnicity) and clinical factors from patients registered to participating GPs within BNSSG. The activity table contains information on date of medical appointment, prescription and the specific healthcare service that the patient had appointment for.

151

The SWD was linked to IAPT care data. The IAPT programme is a large-scale initiative that aims to greatly increase the availability of National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) (NICE, 2011) recommended psychological treatment for depression and anxiety disorders within the NHS. It

155	offers a range of talking therapies in addition to those that the NHS can offer. This includes
156	interpersonal therapy, couples therapy, and counselling for depression. Through IAPT services,
157	approximately one million individuals per year start treatment (NHS Digital, 2020). A full description
158	of measures and conditions treated under IAPT services can be found via the IAPT manual (National
159	Collaborating Centre for Mental Health, 2019).
160	

#### 161 **Derived variables**

162 Clinical severity

Using the attribute table within the SWD, we define mental health severity using 3 categories: severe, moderate and mild. A patient's mental health severity is categorised as severe if they are suffering from a chronic mental health condition, such as depression, post-traumatic stress disorder or an eating disorder. A patient without a diagnosis of a mental health condition, but living with an associated condition, such as drug or alcohol dependency, autism, or ADHD, is categorised as moderate. Patients without any specific mental health or associated diagnoses are categorised as mild.

170

171Figure 2: Figure and online schematic representation (NHS BNSSG Analytics, 2022) of a sample of17210,000 entries of the mental health services to be modelled. Service nodes were aligned to the six173considered levels of need as detailed in Figure 1. GP: General Practice; IAPT: Improving Access to174PsychologicalTherapies;MHP:MentalHealthProvider.



176

177 178 GP: general practice. IAPT: Improving Access to Physiological Therapy. MHP: Mental Health Provide. AWP: Avon and Wilshire Mental

Health Partnership NHS trust. The darker arrows and nodes represent busier paths.

180 To enable mental health clinical pathways to be mapped across the system, services were grouped 181 into six levels according to clinical need (Figure 1), defined by clinical, managerial, and analytical 182 stakeholders from across the BNSSG mental health system. Level 1 represents the lowest level of 183 care required and 6 the highest. Of the six levels of care identified, only services in levels 2-5 were 184 included in the study. Level 1 services (community support) were excluded as they cover a very broad 185 array of services. It was not possible to recover reliable data for level 6 services.

186

187 **Process mining** 

<sup>179</sup> Level of care

Patients experience mental health care pathways as causally linked sequences of activities. However, in the data, these activities are recorded separately as discrete events. To reconstruct patient pathways from the SWD and IAPT data, we implemented process mining, a technique commonly used for extracting clinical pathways from administrative data (Rojas et al, 2016).

192

The mental health pathway in BNSSG, obtained through process mining, is displayed as a network map in Figure 2. Here, nodes represent services within the pathway and directed edges represent possible routes a patient can take between services. Using the reconstructed pathways, we calculated arrival rates, lengths of stay, and transition probabilities between levels of care and services to be used as parameters of the DTS. We also calculated the waiting time for each service and the 'reneging' rate – i.e., the rate at which patients leave the waiting list for a specific service without treatment and are transferred elsewhere – as additional DTS parameters.

200

#### 201 Computer simulation

202

A DTS model, developed by Murch et al (2021), was used to simulate patient flow across the reconstructed mental health pathway. The DTS models a patient's pathway through the mental health service as a series of events. Both the time between two events, and the next event in a patient's pathway, are determined by sampling from probability distributions. The probability distributions are parameterised by the arrival rates and lengths of stay for each service, and transition probabilities between services, obtained from the reconstructed pathway. For a technical description of the DTS methodology see Murch et al (2021).

210

Events simulated in the DTS include: a patient previously not known to mental health services presenting with a mental health condition; a patient moving from one service to another; a patient queuing for capacity in a service. Patients enter the model when there is available capacity in a

214 service. The time a patient remains in a service is sampled from the length of stay distribution for 215 that service. After a patient's length of stay has elapsed, they move to a different service. The service 216 a patient moves to is determined using the transition probabilities between the service they are in 217 and all other services. Patients leave the model if they are either successfully treated or are referred 218 to another service for ongoing care. To capture patient deconditioning associated with long waits 219 incurred during the pandemic, after a specified amount of time waiting for a service, patients can 220 'renege' from the queue they are in and join the pathway of a higher-level service or discharge 221 themselves from the pathway without treatment.

222

Using the DTS, patient events were simulated for each day within the post-lockdown study period (Figure 3). For each simulated day, the number of patients in each service, the number of patients waiting for each service, and the number of patients that reneged were recorded. This resulted in a time series for each of these measures over the study period.

227

As daily arrivals at each service, lengths of stay, and service transitions are randomly sampled from distributions, one simulation of the study period represents only one way in which events could pan out. To capture the range of possible outcomes over the study period, 35 replications of the simulation were performed, each using a different random seed. Results from each simulation were averaged over all replications.

233

234 Scenarios

235

The DTS was used to evaluate scenarios to mitigate waiting time and capacity at different mental health services after lockdown. Four scenarios were modelled: two baseline and two interventions. Baseline scenarios represent hypothesised changes to patient flow post-lockdown (from April 2021), as described in the literature (Tojesen, 2020; Hood et al, 2020). The demand profiles (i.e., external arrival rates) in the DTS were adjusted according to each baseline scenario to model the different

241 problem(s) that mental health services might encounter, such as where large queues may form, as 242 they recover from the pandemic. For each baseline scenario, a plausible intervention scenario was 243 simulated to estimate the impact possible measures to mitigate pressure could have (Table 1). The 244 DTS was used to simulate demand trajectories from the 1 April 2021 to April 2024 (Figure 3) for each 245 scenario. 246 247 Figure 3: Scenario Timeline. The study used data for the pre and during lockdown periods (from 1 248 April 2019 to 1 April 2021, representing week 1 to week 207 of the study period) to obtain model 249 parameters, and simulated baseline and intervention scenarios for the post lockdown period (from 1

April 2021 to 1 April 2024, from week 208 to week 364 of the study period assumed for this study).

251



Table 1: The four simulation scenarios considered in this study (two baseline scenarios and two intervention scenarios). Baseline scenarios were obtained from literature. The two intervention scenarios were related to the results of the two simulated baseline scenarios.

Scenario	Demand	Intervention
Baseline A:	This scenario predicted a doubling in demand from	Intervention A involved increasing capacity in
Dased on	April 2021 for GPs, cricis and inpatient levels 2, 3	GP primary care (Level 2) by 30% as well as
(2020)		Gi primary care (Level 2) by 50%, as were as
()	and 5, followed by drop to pre pandemic levels in	reducing length of stay in IAPT therapy (level 3)
	Oct 2021. In addition, IAPT Assessment will	by 20%.
	experience a decrease in demand of 20% in April	
	2021 and a subsequent increase of 25% from April	
	2022, before returning to pre pandemic levels in	
	Oct 2022.	

Baseline B: based on	The NHS-based Strategy Unit predicted that	Intervention B extended Intervention A by:
Hood et al (2020)	demand for primary mental health (IAPT, GP,	increasing capacity at community general and
(/	primary mental health team) will increase by 22%	specialist (level 4) by 20% and 30% respectively;
	in 2020/2021, by 20% in 2021/2022 and by 12% in	reducing of length of stay in community
	2022/2023 compared to before the pandemic.	specialist by 70 weeks instead of 78 weeks;
	Secondary care service will experience a 25%	increasing flow rates from community specialist
	increase in demand in 2020/2021, 24% in	care (Level 4) to general mental health services
	2021/2022 and 14% in 2022/2023. Whereas the	and crisis (Level 4) by 30%.
	secondary care crisis service will have a 13%	
	increase in demand estimated in 2020/2021, 12%	
	in 2021/2022 and a 7% in 2022/2023. Finally,	
	specialist inpatient will experience a small increase	
	of 1% in 2021/2022 and none by 2022/2023.	

257

The DTS was used to simulate baseline scenarios and assess the impact of increased demand on patient waiting times, service occupancy, and reneging rate. Estimates of demand in each service (mean and 95% confidence intervals (CI)) were obtained from 35 replications of the DTS. Estimated demand profiles were scaled by true demand in each service on 1 April 2021, allowing future demand to be assessed relative to this timepoint.

263 Intervention scenarios (Intervention A and B, Table 1) were used to investigate the impact of 264 increasing capacity, reducing length of stay or re-routing patients to different services, on service 265 occupancy, waiting times and reneging rate.

266

267 Results

268 269 **Data** 

271	There were 289,666 attendances by 188,682 patients recorded in the mental health pathway
272	between 1 April 2019 and 1 April 2021 (Table 2). Of the attendances, 254,208, (88%) were in primary
273	care level 2 and level 3, 33,830, (12%) were in secondary care outpatient level 4 and 1% were in AWP
274	inpatients level 5. 100,915 (35%) of the patients within the pathway were referred during April 2020
275	to April 2021. The cohort was predominately female (61%) and white (85%) and aged 40–59-year-old
276	(30%). Those who needed the highest level of service (level 4 and 5), were from the most deprived
277	groups. Almost 90% of the patients waiting at level 5 inpatients have experienced at least one
278	moderate mental health condition and 26% of those had experience at least one severe mental
279	health condition.

	L2 GP	L2 GP	L3  APT	L3  APT	L3  APT	L4 MHP	L4 MHP	L4 MHP	L4 MHP	L5 AWP
	Hight	Low	Assessment	Social	Therapy	General	Specialist	Crisis	Triage	Inpatients
	Intensity	Intensity		prescribing						
N=	96169	123146	410	2928	31555	9720	3219	10049	10842	1628
Activity Volume in pre-										
pandemic	61729	87385	404	2016	16180	5303	2025	6119	6557	1033
Activity volume during	34440	35761	6	912	15375	4417	1194	3930	4285	595
lockdown										
Sex								<i>,</i> ,		
Female	59488 (61.9)	73256 (59.5)	287 (70.0)	1980 (67.6)	21172 (67.1)	5481 (56.4)	1937 (60.2)	5489 (54.6)	6262 (57.8)	770 (47.4)
Male	36671 (38.1)	49880 (40.5)	123 (30.0)	948 (32.4)	10379 (32.9)	4237 (43.6)	1280 (39.8)	4558 (45.4)	4579 (42.2)	856 (52.6)
Age										
18-29	22617 (23.5)	31715 (25.8)	107 (26.1)	915 (31.2)	11748 (37.2)	2052 (21.1)	1485 (46.1)	2688 (26.7)	3528 (32.5)	311 (19.1)
30-39	19168 (19.9)	25432 (20.7)	96 (23.4)	777 (26.5)	8728 (27.7)	843 (8.7)	1054 (32.7)	2009 (20.0)	2356 (21.7)	342 (21.0)
40-59	29457 (30.6)	38419 (31.2)	147 (35.9)	937 (32.0)	8344 (26.4)	1239 (12.7)	605 (18.8)	2624 (26.1)	2970 (27.4)	552 (33.9)
60-79	17925 (18.6)	20876 (17.0)	56 (13.7)	280 (9.6)	2479 (7.9)	2062 (21.2)	74 (2.3)	1501 (14.9)	1224 (11.3)	320 (19.7)
80-90+	7002 (7.3)	6704 (5.4)	4 (1.0)	19 (0.6)	256 (0.8)	3524 (36.3)	1 (0.0)	1227 (12.2)	764 (7.0)	103 (6.3)
Ethnicity										
Asian / Asian British	2330 (2.8)	2910 (2.7)	1 (0.3)	71 (2.8)	731 (2.7)	144 (1.8)	56 (2.1)	213 (2.5)	197 (2.1)	42 (3.0)
Black/African/Caribbean/		· · /	. ,	· · ·	. ,		· · /	· ,	· · ·	· · ·
Black British	2031 (2.5)	2727 (2.6)	2 (0.6)	53 (2.1)	644 (2.4)	200 (2.4)	45 (1.7)	285 (3.3)	204 (2.2)	96 (6.9)
Mixed / Multiple ethnic										
groups	5066 (6.1)	7169 (6.8)	18 (5.1)	144 (5.7)	2084 (7.6)	423 (5.2)	224 (8.4)	612 (7.2)	607 (6.6)	92 (6.6)
Other / Unknow	2404 (2.9)	3019 (2.9)	3 (0.8)	61(2.4)	804 (2.9)	261 (3.2)	62 (2.3)	303 (3.5)	308 (3.3)	41 (2.9)
White	70715 (85.7)	90025 (85.0)	329 (93.2)	2204 (87.0)	22997 (84.4)	7151 (87.4)	2276 (85.5)	7131 (83.5)	7894 (85.7)	1124 (80.6)
SES <sup>1</sup>										
1 (most deprived)	19928 (20.7)	26645 (21.7)	89 (21.7)	610 (20.8)	6605 (21.0)	2185 (22.5)	943 (29.3)	2765 (27.6)	2617 (24.2)	532 (32.7)
2	17457 (18.2)	23606 (19.2)	64 (15.6)	591 (20.2)	6450 (20.5)	1884 (19.4)	653 (20.3)	2096 (20.9)	2201 (20.3)	385 (23.7)
3	16379 (17.0)	20716 (16.8)	64 (15.6)	487 (16.6)	5524 (17.5)	1600 (16.5)	536 (16.7)	1741 (17.4)	1963 (18.1)	228 (14.0)
4	20856 (21.7)	25779 (21.0)	111 (27.1)	637 (21.8)	6709 (21.3)	1996 (20.6)	596 (18.5)	1871 (18.7)	2050 (18.9)	263 (16.2)
5 (least deprived)	21478 (22.4)	26279 (21.4)	82 (20.0)	603 (20.6)	6235 (19.8)	2044 (21.1)	486 (15.1)	1558 (15.5)	1995 (18.4)	218 (13.4)
mental health condition		, ,			. ,	. ,	, ,			, ,
Severe <sup>2</sup>	14139 (14.7)	17609 (14.3)	121 (29.5)	409 (14.0)	4328 (13.7)	1922 (19.8)	1017 (31.6)	2364 (23.5)	2669 (24.6)	426 (26.2)
Moderate <sup>3</sup>	65384 (68.0)	88657 (72.0)	357 (87.1)	2272 (77.6)	24378 (77.3)	5753 (59.2)	2516 (78.2)	8730 (86.9)	9607 (88.6)	1459 (89.6)
Mild <sup>4</sup>	89 (0.1)	122 (0.1)	1 (0.2)	4 (0.1)	35 (0.1)	33 (0.3)	23 (0.7)	50 (0.5)	50 (0.5)	9 (0.6)

#### 280 Table 2: Demographic of study patients by level of need.

<sup>1</sup>SES: socioeconomic status. <sup>2</sup>Severe condition (Associated condition, i.e., Autism, ADHD, addiction) <sup>3</sup>Moderate condition (i.e., depression, anxiety, eating disorder). <sup>4</sup>Mild condition (Social Factors, i.e., homeless). GP: general practice. IAPT: Improving Access to Physiological Therapy. MHP: Mental Health Provide. AWP: Avon and Wilshire Mental Health Partnership NHS trust.

 $\begin{array}{c} 281\\ 282 \end{array}$ 

# 283 Baseline Simulation Modelling

284

285 Results from using the DTS to model waiting list size, service occupancy and reneging rates under 286 Baseline Scenarios A and B are displayed in Figure 4. Simulation results suggest the waiting list size 287 (Figure 4, top row), when compared to pre-pandemic size, will increase in level 2 services (GP) by up 288 to 50% for both baseline scenarios. Under Scenario B, results suggest there will also be moderate 289 increases in waiting list size for level 3 services (IAPT) and increases of 50-150% in community based 290 (level 4) mental health services. As a result, the occupancy of these specific services tends to increase 291 (Figure 4, second row), creating blockages because the services do not have the capacity to handle the sharp increase in demand post-lockdown. Due to increased waiting times and high service 292 293 occupancy in community services, results suggest an increased tendency to renege from these 294 services under both scenarios (Figure 4, third row). Both baseline scenarios showed an increase in 295 reneging to GP services, whereas only Scenario B showed an increase in reneging to MHP crisis 296 (Figure 4, bottom row).

297

Figure. 4: Summary of the simulation results of the queue size, occupancy, and renege output measures at each service (per week) for Baseline Scenarios A (red) and B (green), modelled pre-, during, and post-lockdown. Solid lines represent mean demand profiles obtained from 35 replications of the DTS, relative to demand at the end of the lockdown period, and the shaded area represents a 95% confidence interval in scaled demand. Results were omitted for services which display negligible change over the course of these three periods.



\*In each of the graphs, time at pre-lockdown, during-lockdown and post lockdown is indicated on the x-axis split into the dashed vertical lines. GP: general practice. IAPT: Improving Access to Physiological Therapy. MHP: Mental Health Provide. AWP: Avon and Wilshire Mental Health Partnership NHS trust

308

## 309 Intervention Simulation Modelling

310

311 Table 3 shows the results from using the DTS to simulate two intervention scenarios for mitigating 312 increased pressure following lockdown. To estimate the effectiveness of each intervention, we report 313 the percentage change in the mean and maximum values of waiting list size, service occupancy and 314 reneging rates compared to the baseline scenarios.

- 316 Given the large increase in waiting times for GP (level 2) services post-lockdown under Baseline
- 317 Scenario A, Intervention A focusses on increasing capacity in GP services to reduce waiting times and
- decreasing length of stay in IAPT therapy and level 4 services. The purpose of decreasing length of
- 319 stay in these services is to prevent demand being shifted from level 2 services because of increased
- 320 capacity. To simulate Intervention A using the DTS, capacity in level 2 services was increased by 30%

321 for the period April 2021 to October 2022 and length of stay in IAPT therapy and level 4 services was

decreased by 20% for the period April 2022 to October 2022.

323

324 Results from the DTS show that increasing GP capacity would lead to waiting list size for high 325 intensity GP services decreasing by an average of 7% compared to Baseline Scenario A and service 326 occupancy would increase by only 1% (Table 3). However, despite decreasing length of stay in IAPT 327 therapy and level 4 services, simulations show demand would still be shifted: waiting list size would 328 increase by over 10% in all of these higher level services (Table 3, Figure S1). This suggests that 329 reducing length of stay by 20% is insufficient to absorb the extra demand on these services 330 generated by increased capacity in level 2. Results from the DTS show increased capacity in level 2 331 does, however, have a positive impact on reneging: decreasing waiting times for GP services leads to 332 fewer patients reneging compared to Baseline Scenario A (Table 3).

333

334 Intervention B was an extension of Intervention A, to mitigate the impact of both the increased 335 demand due to lockdowns, and the shifts in demand from level 2 to level 4 services following 336 Intervention A. To decrease the waiting times for services that were blocked as a consequence of the 337 mitigations in Intervention A, Intervention B additionally involved: increasing capacity at MHP 338 community general and specialist services by 20 and 30 % respectively; decreasing length of stay by 339 10% in the MHP community specialist; increasing patient flow by 30 % from MHP community 340 specialist to MHP general mental health and crisis services. These additional interventions were 341 simulated for the period April 2021 to October 2022.

342

Using the DTS to simulate Intervention B, results show a decrease in waiting list size, occupancy, and
reneging rate for the MHP specialist service compared to Baseline Scenario B (Table 3, Figure S2).
Compared to Intervention A, the additional measures are successful in mitigating some of the

- 346 pressure on the IAPT therapy service, however both waiting times and service occupancy are greater
- 347 than Baseline Scenario B (Table 3).
- 348
- 349 Table 3: Summary of the impact of Interventions A and B on mental health system performance from
- 350 1<sup>st</sup> April 2021. Results represent the maximum and mean percentage change between baseline and
- 351 intervention scenarios.
- 352

		Intervention A				Intervention B			
		Waiting	Service	renege	renege	Waiting	Service	r en ege	renege
	Measure	List	Occupancy	from	to	List	Occupancy	from	to
Service node	Changein	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
L2 GP High intensity	max	-5	6	-	-	-4	0	-	-
	mean	-7	1	-	-	-5	0	-	-
L2 GP Low intensity	max	0	8	-	20	0	1	-	0
	mean	0	1	-	3	0	0	-	-10
L3 APT Assessment	max	0	0	-2	-	0	0	0	-
	mean	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	-
L3 IAPT Social prescribing	max	0	0	-4	-	0	0	14	-
	mean	0	0	-2	-	-1	0	5	-
L3 APT Therapy	max	69	2	9	-	19	2	20	-
	mean	44	3	17	-	17	2	-5	-
L4 MHP general	max	205	16	-	-	194	4	100	-
	mean	109	16	-	-	43	3	2	-
L4 MHP specialist	max	29	2	-43	-	-20	-1	-50	-
	mean	37	2	0	-	-34	-4	-14	-
L4 MHP Crisis	max	136	18	-	0	81	18	-	0
	mean	11	7	-	0	20	9	-	0
L4 MHP Triage	max	215	63	-	-	160	40	-	-
	mean	17	8	-	-	11	4	-	-
L5 AWP Inpatients	max	-2	-2	-	-	0	-4	-	-
	mean	0	-3	-	-	-4	3	-	-

<sup>353</sup> 

GP: general practice. IAPT: Improving Access to Physiological Therapy. MHP: Mental Health Provide. AWP: Avon and Wilshire Mental
 Health Partnership NHS trust

- 356
- 357 Discussion
- 358

Our work demonstrates how simulation modelling may be used to assess the impact of interventions on mental health service pathways. We used process mining to develop a schematic representation of mental health pathways using linked electronic patient-level data up to April 2021. The resulting pathway maps were used to obtain parameters of a DTS model, in terms of mental health services covered (GP, IAPT) care, acute hospital, and specialist care settings) and patient flow between these services (arrival rates, lengths of stay, and transition probabilities). The model also captures the

effect of escalating need should demand not be met in a timely manner (reneging). We calibrated the model with data to April 2021, and used it to assess the impact future demand may have on mental health services under different scenarios; first on a 'do nothing' basis (Baseline Scenarios A and B), and through considering service-level mitigatory measures through a 'what if' analysis (Intervention scenarios A and B).

370

371 To model mental health service demand following the pandemic, we used two different baseline 372 scenarios influenced by existing literature (Tojesen, 2020; Hood et al, 2020). This allowed us to 373 forecast demand at each service during a time when the true impact of COVID on mental health 374 services was unknown and derive realistic intervention scenarios to mitigate the impact of this 375 demand. On comparing the intervention scenarios with baseline projections, we found that the 376 intervention scenarios considered in our study are not sufficient for mitigating pressure due to 377 increased demand on mental health services following lockdown. Instead, we found that while 378 pressure may be reduced in one service, the consequence is an increase in pressure in other services. 379 These results suggest that isolated capacity increases in particular parts of a mental health pathway 380 do not necessarily benefit the system: changes in capacity can unblock part of a pathway, allowing 381 unserved demand to flow into other services, increasing utilization and queueing. Our results 382 highlight the need for strategic decision making around changes to service capacity, to ensure that 383 improvements in one service do not have a negative impact on other services and wider system flow.

384

For both intervention scenarios, we found that increasing capacity in level 2 would reduce waiting list size and service occupancy for these services. As this change to the pathway had a negative impact on higher level services (IAPT Therapy and level 4 services, Table 3), one extension to the interventions considered would be to increase capacity in these services in addition to level 2. However, in the local system the plausibility of this increase is unrealistic: simulations of baseline scenarios suggest a 50-150% increase in demand for level 4 services without any changes to level 2

391 capacity (Figure 4). Increasing existing capacity in higher level services to meet this increased 392 demand is therefore not a plausible intervention, and as with increases to GP capacity, changes may 393 result in blockages further along the pathway requiring further capacity increases.

394

395 A key assumption of the DTS used in this study is that a patient can only be in one service at any 396 given time. While this assumption allows us to model mental health services using DTS, it is also a 397 limitation of the approach: in mental health systems patients can simultaneously be in receipt of care 398 from multiple services at any one time. A further assumption of the model is that patients queuing 399 for a service are seen on a first-come first-served basis. However, when patients are referred to a 400 mental health service, they are assigned a priority which determines the order in which they are 401 seen: patients are not seen in the order in which they are referred (Dehghan et al, 2017). In the 402 future, the DTS framework implemented in this study could be extended to relax these assumptions. 403 Extending the framework in this way would improve the accuracy of simulations and ensure results 404 are representative of the way in which mental health services operate.

405

406 In the UK, the use of simulation modelling for mental health service design and delivery is limited by 407 the availability of high-quality data (Jacobs et al, 2019). Data capture and linkage across services 408 means there are often large gaps and inconsistencies in patients' pathways. As this data was required 409 for validating the model, for our study the help of system stakeholders with expert knowledge of 410 service delivery was necessary for parameterisation of the model. This highlights the need for 411 improvements in data capture and linkage with healthcare systems: incentives to improve data 412 quality in local systems will ensure computational techniques, such as simulation modelling, can be 413 utilised for service improvement.

414

415 Our work demonstrates the potential value of computer modelling and simulation for supporting 416 strategic service planning within mental health care. Highlighting the benefits of simulation, the

417	approach contained in	this paper may	serve as a blueprint f	or conducting simila	<sup>r</sup> modelling exercises
		/		0	0

- 418 in any healthcare systems. With regards to system recovery following the pandemic, we have
- 419 demonstrated the potential of simulation as an aid to strategic decision making and service planning:
- 420 modelling realistic scenarios for local healthcare systems can provide useful and actionable insight to
- 421 clinicians and managers on the ground at a time crucially important for effective future planning.

#### 422

## 423 Conclusion

- 424
- 425 In this study, we have demonstrated the value of simulation modelling for assessing the impact of
- 426 changes in service delivery on mental health pathways. Our results have informed decisions
- 427 regarding the resourcing and restructuring of capacity and pathways in the local mental health
- 428 service, to best meet the needs of patients during the pandemic and beyond.
- 429

## 430 List of abbreviations

NHS: National Health Scotland; BNSSG ICS: Bristol, North Somerset and South Gloucestershire
healthcare Integrated Care System; SWD: System Wide Dataset; MH: mental health; AWP: Avon and
Wilshire Mental Health Partnership NHS trust; MHP: Mental Health Provide; IAPT: Improving Access
to Physiological Therapy; GP: general practice; CI: Confidence Intervals; DTS :Discrete time
simulation.

- 436
- 437 Ethics approval and consent to participate.
- 438

NA

- 439
- 440 **Consent for publication**
- 441 NA
- 442

## 443 Availability of data and materials

- 444 This study used a discrete event simulation tool purpose built for modelling patient pathways. Model 445 code used for this study is freely available at https://github.com/nhs-bnssg-analytics.
- 446

452

## 447 **Competing interests**

- 448 No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).
- 449

# 450 **Funding**

451 This work was partially supported by Elizabeth Blackwell Institute.

## 453 Authors' contributions

- 454 Concept, methodology and design: Wood, Pierotti, Cooper,
- 455 Data curation: Cooper, Pierotti
- 456 Analysis and interpretation of data: Pierotti, Wood, Cassels, Gara

- 457 Writing-original draft preparation: Pierotti
- 458 Software, Validation: Wood, Pierotti
- 459 Writing reviewing and editing: Wood, Denholm, James
- 460 Funding acquisition: Denholm, Wood, Cooper
- 461 Project administration: Cooper, Pierotti
- 462 Supervision: Wood
- 463

# 464 Acknowledgements

- This work was supported by the Elizabeth Blackwell Institute, University of Bristol, the Welcome
   Trust Institutional Strategic Support Fund and the Rosetrees Trust.
- 467

# 468 **References**

- 469
- 470 1.Xiang, Y.T., Yang, Y., Li, W., Zhang, L., Zhang, Q., Cheung, T., Ng, C.H. (2020). Timely mental health care
- 471 for the 2019 novel coronavirus outbreak is urgently needed. Lancet Psychiatry 7 (3), 228–229.
- 472 2.Jia, R., Ayling, K., Chalder, T. (2020). Mental health in the UK during the COVID-19 pandemic: cross
- 473 sectional analyses from a community cohort study. BMJ open 10 (9).
- 474 3.Mazza, C., Ricci, E., Biondi, S., Colasanti, M., Ferracuti, S., Napoli, C., Roma, P. (2020). A nationwide
- 475 survey of psychological distress among italian people during the COVID-19 pandemic: Immediate476 psychological responses and
- 477 associated factor. International Journal Environmental Research Public Health 17 (9)
- 478 4.Shevlin, M., McBride, O., Murphy, J., Miller, J.G., Hartman, T.K., Levita, L., Mason, L., Martinez, A.P.,
- 479 McKay, R., Stocks, T.V.A., Bennett, K.M., Hyland, P, Karatzias, T., Bentall, R.P. (2020). Anxiety,
- depression, traumatic stress, and COVID-19 related anxiety in the UK general population during the
   COVID-19 pandemic. PsyArXiv.
- 482 5. Salleh, S., Thokala, P., Brennan, A. Hughes, R., Booth, A. (2017). Simulation Modelling in Healthcare:
- An Umbrella Review of Systematic Literature Reviews. *PharmacoEconomics* 35, 937–949.
  https://doi.org/10.1007/s40273-017-0523-3
- 485 6.Vázquez-Serrano, J.I., Peimbert-García, R.E., Cárdenas-Barrón, L.E. (2021) Discrete-Event Simulation 486 Modeling in Healthcare: A Comprehensive Review. Int J Environ Res Public Health.; 18(22)
- 487 7.Naylor,C., Bell,A., Baird,B.,Heller,A., Gilburt,H.(2020). Mental health and primary care networks
- 488 Understanding the opportunities. [PDF]. theking'sfund.
- 489 <u>https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/sites/default/files/2020</u>/Mental%20Health%20and%20PCNs%20onne
   490 %20version\_1.pdf
- 491 8.Davies,J. (2020). Mental health, We are monitoring trends in the quality of mental health care.
- 492 Nuffieldtrust.<u>https://www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk/news-item/mental-health-2</u>
- 493 9. City Council. (2019). Deprivation in Bristol 2019. Ministry of Housing Communities & Local
- 494 Government. https://www.bristol.gov.uk/files/documents/1905-deprivation-in-bristol-2019/file
- 495 10. BNSSG Healthier Together (2021) A system-wide dataset for Bristol, North Somerset, and South
- 496 Gloucestershire. Available at: https://bnssghealthiertogether.org.uk/population-health-497 management/
- 498 11. Cole, C.L., Waterman, S., Stott, J., Saunders, R., Buckman, J.E.J., Pilling, S., Wheatley, J. (2020).
- 499 Adapting IAPT services to support frontline NHS staff during the Covid-19 pandemic: the Homerton 500 Covid Psychological Support(HCPS) pathway. Cogn. Behav. Ther. 13
- 501 12. Clark, D. (2011). Implementing NICE guidelines for the psychological treatment of depression and
- anxiety disorders: the IAPT experience. International Review of Psychiatry, 23, 318–327. 13.
- 503 NICE (2011). Common mental health disorders: identification and pathways to care. Clinical Guideline
- 504 13. Retrieved from: www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg123Google Scholar
- 505 14. National Collaborating Centre for Mental Health (2019). The Improving Access to Psychological
- 506 Therapies Manual. Retrieved from: https://www.england.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/iapt-
- 507 manual-v3.pdfGoogle Scholar

508 15. NHS BNSSG analytics GitHub, mental health modelling, animated pathway. (2022), GitHub - nhs-509 bnssg-analytics/mental-health-modelling: Modelling of BNSSG mental health services on recovery 510 from the COVID-19 pandemic 511 512 16. NHS Digital (2020). Psychological Therapies: Reports on the Use of IAPT Services, England – 513 January 2020. Retrieved from: https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and 514 information/publications/statistical/psychological-therapies-report-on-the-use-of-iapt-515 services/january-2020-final-including-reports-on-the-iapt-pilots 10. Long, K,M., Meadows,G,N., 516 (2017) Simulation modelling in mental health: A systematic review. Journal of simulation. 12 (1) 76-517 85. 518 17.Katikireddi,V. (2022). Understanding the impacts of income and welfare policy responses to 519 COVID-19 on inequalities in mental health: a microsimulation model. The Health Foundation. 520 Retrieved from: https://www.health.org.uk/funding-and-partnerships/programmes/understanding-521 the-impacts-of-income-and-welfare-policy-response-covid 522 18.Currie, C,S., Fowler, J,W., Kotiadis, K., Monks, T., Onggo, B.S., Duncan A. Robertson, D,A., 523 Tako, A.A. (2020) How simulation modelling can help reduce the impact of COVID-19, Journal of 524 simulation. 14 (2) 83-97. 525 19. Mohiuddin, S., Gardiner, R., Crofts, M., Muir, P., Steer, J., Turner, J., Wheeler, H., Hollingworth, W., 526 Horner, P.J. (2020). Modelling patient flows and resource use within a sexual health clinic through 527 discrete event simulation to inform service redesign. BMJ open. 10 (7). 528 20. Murch, B., Cooper, J.A., Hodgett, T.J., Gara, E.L., Walker, J.S., Wood, R.M. (2021). Modelling the effect 529 on the first wave covid on mental health services. Elsevier. 30 -100311. 530 21. Jacobs, R., Chalkley, M., Böhnke, J.R., Clark, .M., Moran, V., Aragón, M.J. (2019). Measuring the activity 531 of mental health services in England: variation in categorising activity for payment purposes. 532 Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research. Springer Link. 46 533 847-857. 534 22. Murch, B. (2020). NHS BNSSG Analytics GitHub repository for discrete time simulation model. 535 https://github.com/nhs-bnssg-analytics/simulation-dts-renege. 536 23. Cooper, J. (2021). NHS BNSSG Analytics Github. Automated discovery of clinical pathways from 537 routinely collected electronic health record data. https://github.com/nhs-bnssg-analytics/process-538 mining-clinical-pathways 539 24. Rojas, E., Munoz-Gama, J., Sepúlveda, M., Capurro, D. (2016). Process mining in healthcare: A 540 literature review. Journal of Biomedical Informatics.61:224-36. 541 25.Green, L. (2006). Queueing analysis in healthcare. In Patient flow: reducing delay in healthcare 542 delivery (pp. 281-307). Springer, Boston, MA. 543 26.Pidd, M. (1989). Computer modelling for discrete simulation. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 605 Third 544 Ave 545 27. Torjesen, J. (2020). Covid-19: Mental health services must be boosted to deal with "tsunami" of 546 cases after lockdown. BMJ. 369:m1994. 547 28.Hood, A., Jemmett, T., Yu, V., Lawles, A. (2020). Estimating the impacts of COVID-19 on mental 548 health services in England. 549 [PDF].Strategyunitwm, https://www.strategyunitwm.nhs.uk/sites/default/files/2020-550 11/Modelling%20covid-20%20%20MH%20services%20in%20England 20201109 v2.pdf. 551 29.Wood, R.M., McWilliams, C.J., Thomas, M.J. (2020).COVID-19 scenario modelling for the mitigation 552 of capacity-dependent deaths in intensive care. Springer 23. 553 30.Wood, R.M. (2022). Modelling the impact of COVID-19 on elective waiting times. Journal of 554 simulation. 16 (1), 101-105.

- 555 31. Dehghan, A., Nowar, M.A., Molodynski, A. (2017). Improving the referral process from primary care 556 to an AMHT. Prog. Neurol. Psychiatry 21 (3), 22–25.
- 557 32.Ellis, L.A., Churruca, K., Braithwaite, J. (2017). Mental health services conceptualised as complex
- adaptive systems: what can be learned? International Journal of Mental Health System. 11(43)

559 33.Moss,S.J.,Vasilakis,C., Wood,R.M.(2022).Exploring financially sustainable initiatives to address out-

560 of-area placements in psychiatric ICUs: a computer simulation study. Journal of Mental

561 Health..DOI: <u>10.1080/09638237.2022.2091769</u>

562 34. Murch,B.J., Hollier,S.E., Kenward,C., Wood,R.M.(2020). Use of linked patient data to assess the 563 effect of Long-COVID on system-wide healthcare utilisation. Health Information Management 564 Journal. 0(0).

565

# 566 Supplementary tables and figures

567

## 568 Table S1: Services type for primary and secondary care mental health outpatients services.

Service Type Referred To	mental health group	Service Type Referred To	mental health group
Prescriptions for anxiety	L2 High intensity	Psychiatric Liaison Service	L4 MHP General
and/or depression			
General practice	L2 Low intensity	Psychotherapy Service	L4 MHP General
nurse	L2 Low intensity	Psychological Therapy Service (non IAPT)	L4 MHP General
unknown	L2 Low intensity	Early Intervention Team for Psychosis	L4 MHP General
Health care assistant	L2 Low intensity	Young Onset Dementia Team	L4 MHP General
other	L2 Low intensity	Asylum Service	L4 MHP General
Mental Health pharmacist /	L2 Low intensity	Individual Placement and Support	L4 MHP General
paramedic / social prescriber		Service	
Advanced nursing practice	L2 Low intensity	Problem Gambling Service	L4 MHP General
Assessment	L3 APT Assessment	Rough Sleeping Service	L4 MHP General
Review	L3  APT Assessment	Community Eating Disorder Service	L4 MHP Specialist
Follow-up appointment	L3 APT Assessment	Substance Misuse Team	L4 MHP Specialist
Improving Access to Psychological Therapies low intensity therapy (regime/therapy).	L3 Social prescribing	Acquired Brain Injury Service	L4 MHP Specialist
Applied relaxation	L3 Social prescribing	Criminal Justice Liaison and	L4 MHP Specialist
(regime/therapy)		Diversion Service	
Guided self-help using book (regime/therapy)	L3 Social prescribing	Prison Psychiatric In reach Service	L4 MHP Specialist
Other Mindfulness-based therapy (regime/therapy)	L3 Social prescribing	Personality Disorder Service	L4 MHP Specialist
Non-guided self-help using book (regime/therapy)	L3 Social prescribing	Community Team for Learning Disabilities	L4 MHP Specialist
Guided self-help using computer (regime/therapy)	L3 Social prescribing	Epilepsy/Neurological Service	L4 MHP Specialist
Treatment Applied relaxation (regime/therapy)	L3 Social prescribing	Specialist Parenting Service	L4 MHP Specialist
IAPT Treatment	L3 APT Therapy	Forensic Mental Health Service	L4 MHP Specialist
Treatment Psychoeducation	L3 APT Therapy	Forensic Learning Disability Service	L4 MHP Specialist
Counselling for depression (procedure)	L3 IAPT Therapy	Autistic Spectrum Disorder Service	L4 MHP Specialist
Cognitive behaviour therapy (regime/therapy)	L3 IAPT Therapy	Specialist Perinatal Mental Health Community Service	L4 MHP Specialist
Improving Access to Psychological Therapies high intensity therapy (regime/therapy)	L3 IAPT Therapy	Eating Disorders/Dietetics Service (Retired 1 April 2020)	L4 MHP Specialist
Eye movement desensitization and reprocessing therapy (regime/therapy)	L3 IAPT Therapy	Neurodevelopment Team	L4 MHP Specialist
Interpersonal psychotherapy (regime/therapy)	L3 APT Therapy	Crisis Resolution Team/Home Treatment Service	L4 MHP Crisis
Couple therapy for depression	L3 IAPT Therapy	Crisis Resolution Team	L4 MHP Crisis

(regime/therapy)			
Psychodynamic	L3 IAPT Therapy	Home Treatment Service	L4 MHP Crisis
psychotherapy			
(regime/therapy)			
Mindfulness-based therapy	L3 IAPT Therapy	Walk-in Crisis Assessment Unit	L4 MHP Crisis
(regime/therapy)		Service	
Group psychotherapy	L3 IAPT Therapy	Psychiatric Decision Unit Service	L4 MHP Crisis
(regime/therapy)			
Guided self-help	L3 IAPT Therapy	Acute Day Service	L4 MHP Crisis
(regime/therapy)			
Employment support	L3 IAPT Therapy	Crisis House Service	L4 MHP Crisis
(regime/therapy)			
Memory Services/Clinic	L4 MHP General	Enhanced/Intensive Support	L4 MHP Crisis
		Service	
Day Care Service	L4 MHP General	24/7 Crisis Response Line	L4 MHP Crisis
Community Mental Health	L4 MHP General	Health Based Place of Safety	L4 MHP Crisis
Team - Functional		Service	
Community Mental Health	L4 MHP General	Primary Care Mental Health	L4 MHP Triage
Team - Organic		Service	
Community Rehabilitation	L4 MHP General	Single Point of Access Service	L4 MHP Triage
Service			
General Psychiatry Service	L4 MHP General	Mental Health inpatient	L5 AWP Inpatient

569 570 571 \*Note that inpatients within the secondary mental health care were all considered within Level 6 and AWP inpatient were consider in level 5. GP: general practice. IAPT: Improving Access to Physiological Therapy. MHP: Mental Health Provide. AWP: Avon and Wilshire Mental Health Partnership NHS trust

572

573

574	Figure S1: Summar	y of Weekly Qu	ieue size fo	r services	modelled post	'lockdown' (m	nean and	95%
575	confidence	bands)	for	the	simulation	scenari	ios	Α.

576

Intervention based on increasing capacity at GP and reducing Length of Stay in therapy



577 578 579 Health Partnership NHS trust

580

Figure S2: Summary of Weekly Queue size for services modelled post 'lockdown' (mean and 95% 581

582 confidence bands) for the simulation scenarios B.



Intervention based on increasing capacity, reducing length of stay and re-routing patients

 583
 Apr-21
 Apr-22
 Apr-24
 Apr-24

 584
 GP: general practice. IAPT: Improving Access to Physiological Therapy. MHP: Mental Health Provide. AWP: Avon and Wilshire Mental

 585
 Health Partnership NHS trust