

Schizophrenia spectrum disorders

Aetiology, staging, treatment and physical co-morbidities



- What is the estimated percentage explaining schizophrenia using the information of 108 genetic loci related to the disorder?
- a. 10%
- b. 20%
- c. 30%
- These loci are related to
- a. Serotonin
- b. GABA
- c. Immune system

Questions - etiologie

- The risk of schizophrenia is increased by childhoodtrauma with:
- a. 2-4%
- b. 4-6%
- c. 6-10%
- A first degree family member has increased risk of schizophrenia:
- a. 5-20%
- b. 20-35%
- c. 35-50%

Aetiology - Genes

Biological insights from 108

Schlzophrenla Bulletin vol. 41 no. 1 pp. 15-19, 2015 doi:10.1093/schbul/sbu162 Advance Access publication November 13, 2014

SIUJUSICAI IUSISIUS IVOITI IUS Schizophirenia USISIUS IVOITI IUS Summan and and associated senetic loci Schizophrenia Genetics: Building the Foundations of the

Katherine E. Tansey*, Michael J. Owen, and Michael C. O'Donovan

MRC Centre for Neuropsychiatric Genetics and Genomics, Institute of Psycholog Medicine, Cardiff University, Cardiff, UK

*To whom correspondence should be addressed; MRC Centre for Neuropsych' Medicine and Clinical Neurosciences, School of Medicine, Cardiff University fax: +44-029-20-687-068, e-mail: tanseyk@cardiff.ac.uk

Schizophrenia ja highly heritalise intenna senance wide aktivitatise disorder. International disorder dis Schizophenika ja bishuk katisha disona shahu katish Support Bucket of shared and shar New of the second se Definition of the second se Personal statistical descention descention descentes Net to the state of the stat ^b and some and s The latest example comes from the Schizophrenia Working Group of the Psychiatric Genomics Consortium (PGC-SCZ) which, at the time of publication, included contributions from around 37 000 individuals with schizophrenia, 302 investigators, 35 countries, and 4 continents.1 In their recent paper, published in Nature in July 2014, the PGC-SCZ group report 128 statistically independent genetic associations, implicating a minimum of 108 conservatively defined schizophrenia-associated genetic loci.1



Characterization of associated loci

Of the 108 loci, 75% include protein-coding genes (40%, a single gene) and a further 8% are within 20 kb of a gene (Supplementary Table 3). Notable associations relevant to major hypotheses of the aetiology and treatment of schizophrenia include DRD2 (the target of all effective antipsychotic drugs) and many genes (for example, GRM3, GRIN2A, SRR, GRIA 1) involved in glutamatergic neurotransmission and synaptic plasticity. In addition, associations at CACNA1C, CACNB2 and CACNA1I, which encode voltage-gated calcium channel subunits, extend previous findings implicating members of this family of proteins in schizophrenia and other psychiatric disorders^{11,13,31,32}. Genes encoding calcium channels, and proteins involved in glutamatergic neurotransmission and synaptic plasticity have been independently implicated in schizophrenia by studies of rare genetic variation^{33–35}, suggesting convergence at a broad functional level between studies of common and rare genetic variation.

The genetic overlap between schizophrenia and other non-psychiatric discussion

Improved Detection of Common Variants Associated with Schizophrenia by Leveraging Pleiotropy with Cardiovascular-Disease Risk Factors

Ole A. Andreassen,^{1,2,3,*} Srdjan Djurovic,^{1,2} Wesley K. Thompson,³ Andrew J. Schork,^{4,5,6} Kenneth S. Kendler,⁷ Michael C. O'Donovan,⁸ Dan Rujescu,⁹ Thomas Werge,¹⁰ Martijn van de Bunt,¹¹ Andrew P. Morris,¹¹ Mark I. McCarthy,¹¹ International Consortium for Blood Pressure GWAS, Diabetes Genetics Replication and Meta-analysis Consortium, Psychiatric Genomics Consortium Schizophrenia Working Group, J. Cooper Roddey,^{4,13} Linda K. McEvoy,^{4,12} Rahul S. Desikan,^{4,12} and Anders M. Dale^{3,4,12,13,*}

Several lines of evidence suggest that genome-wide association studies (GWASs) have the potential to explain more of the "missing heritability" of common complex phenotypes. However, reliable methods for identifying a larger proportion of SNPs are currently lacking. Here, we present a genetic-pleiotropy-informed method for improving gene discovery with the use of GWAS summary-statistics data. We applied this methodology to identify additional loci associated with schizophrenia (SCZ), a highly heritable disorder with significant missing heritability. Epidemiological and clinical studies suggest comorbidity between SCZ and cardiovascular-disease (CVD) risk factors, including systolic blood pressure, triglycerides, low- and high-density lipoprotein, body mass index, waist-to-hip ratio, and type 2 diabetes. Using stratified quantile-quantile plots, we show enrichment of SNPs associated with SCZ as a function of the association with several CVD risk factors and a corresponding reduction in false discovery rate (FDR). We validate this "pleiotropic enrichment" by demonstrating increased replication rate across independent SCZ substudies. Applying the stratified FDR method, we identified 25 loci associated with SCZ at a conditional FDR level of 0.01. Of these, ten loci are associated with both SCZ and CVD risk factors, mainly triglycerides and low- and high-density lipoproteins but also waist-to-hip ratio, systolic blood pressure, and body mass index. Together, these findings suggest the feasibility of using genetic-pleiotropy-informed methods for improving gene discovery in SCZ and identifying

Int. J. Epidemiol. Advance Access published August 18, 2015



International Journal of Epidemiology, 2015, 1–16 doi: 10.1093/ije/dyv136 Original article



Original article

New data and an old puzzle: the negative association between schizophrenia and rheumatoid arthritis

S Hong Lee,^{1,2} Enda M Byrne,¹ Christina M Hultman,³ Anna Kähler,³

Family risk



Environmental factors and schizophrenia





ONLINE FIRST Family-Based Analysis of Genetic Variation Underlying Psychosis-Inducing Effects of Cannabis

Sibling Analysis and Proband Follow-up

Ruud van Winkel, MD, MSc, PhD; Genetic Risk and Outcome of Psychosis (GROUP) Investigators





Figure. *AKT1* rs2494732 × cannabis interaction in the at-risk and case-only paradigm. A, Mean positive schizotypy scores according to *AKT1* rs2494732 genotype in 728 unaffected siblings with (n=55) and without (n=673) recent cannabis use. Genotyping was unsuccessful in 12 unaffected siblings. THC indicates tetrahydrocannabinol. B, Relative risks for weekly and daily lifetime cannabis use in the patients according to *AKT1* rs2494732 genotype.

Table 4. Lifetime Frequency of Cannabis Use and Relative Risks, Determined by Multinomial Logistic Regression Analysis,
According to AKT1 rs2494732 Genotype in 679 Patients ^a With a Psychotic Disorder

		CIDI Lifetime Use, %)		RR	
	T/T (n=237)	C/T (n=313)	C/C (n=129)	T/T (n=237)	C/T (n=313)	C/C (n=129)
No use	48.1	44.7	35.7	b	b	b
Less than weekly use	9.7	6.4	6.2	1 [Reference]	0.71	0.86
Weekly use	9.3	11.8	12.4	1 [Reference]	1.31	1.72
Daily use	32.5	37.1	45.7	1 [Reference]	1.23	1.90°

REVIEW ARTICLE

Childhood adversity in schizophrenia: a systematic meta-analysis



(<i>e</i>)	Schizop	hrenia	Dissociative	e / PTSD		Odds ratio	_	Odd	s ratio	
Study or subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% C	1	M-H, Rand	lom, 95% Cl	
Fink 1990	1	11	15	16	18.8%	0.01 (0.00-0.12)	4			
Honig 1998	3	18	8	15	33.4%	0.17 (0.04-0.87)	-	-	-	
Nurcombe 1996	0	10	22	25	17.5%	0.01 (0.00-0.16)	←			
Ross 1989	2	20	16	20	30.3%	0.03 (0.00–0.17)	← ■			
Total (95% CI)		59		76	100.0%	0.03 (0.01–0.15)				
Total events	6		61					· · ·	Г	
Heterogeneity: τ^2 = 1.28	8; $\chi^2 = 6.06$,	df=3(p	= 0.11); / ² = 51 ⁹	%			0.01	0.1	1 10	100
Test for overall effect:	Z = 4.31 (p <	0.0001)						adversity	More adversi	

(f)	Schizop	hrenia	Other psyc	hoses		Odds ratio	_	Odds	ratio	
Study or subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% C		M-H, Rando	om, 95% Cl	
Craine 1989	21	43	3	7	30.4%	1.27 (0.25–6.38)				
Goff 1991	11	33	3	9	32.3%	1.00 (0.21-4.78)			—	
Hlastala 2005	17	27	17	20	37.2%	0.30 (0.07–1.29)		-	-	
Total (95% CI)		103		36	100.0%	0.69 (0.28–1.68)		-	•	
Total events	49		23					2.55		
Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 0.0$	1; $\chi^2 = 2.03$,	df=2(p	= 0.36); / ² = 2%				0.01	0.1 1	I 10	100
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.82 (p =	0.41)						adversity	More adversi	

(<i>g</i>)	Schizop	hrenia	Personality	disorders		Odds ratio		Od	ds ratio		
Study or subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% (CI	M-H, Rar	ndom, 95% C	1	
Byrne 1990	4	14	13	15	30.3%	0.06 (0.01-0.41)	+	-			
Craine 1988	21	43	8	23	37.4%	1.79 (0.63-5.09)			+		
Kingdon 2010	56	59	30	33	32.3%	1.87 (0.35–9.82)		-	-		
Total (95% CI)		116		71	100.0%	0.65 (0.09-4.71)					
Total events	81		51								
Heterogeneity: τ^2 = 2.4	13; $\chi^2 = 10.26$, df = 2 (p	<i>p</i> = 0.006); / ² =	= 80%			0.01	0.1	1 1	0	100
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.42 (p =	= 0.67)					Les	s adversity	More ad	versit	y

Childhood adversity and psychosis

Trauelsen AM et al. Childhood adversity specificity and doseresponse effect in non-affective first-episode psychosis. Schizophr Res. 2015 Jun;165(1):52-9. Table 2



Wald

7.41

2.29

7.49

5.62

10.96

39.97

Number of adversities

Fig. 1. Number of reported adversities including sexual, physical, emotional abuse, physical and emotional neglect, separation and institutionalization in persons with FEP (n =101) and matched control persons (n = 101).

Childhood Residential Mobility, Schizophrenia, and Bipolar Disorder: A Populationbased Study in Denmark



Diana Paksarian*,1.5, William W. Eaton¹, Preben B. Mortensen²⁻⁴, and Carsten B. Pedersen²⁻⁴





Relative risks and 95% confidence intervals. Blue lines represent RRs for 1 move. Green lines represent RRs for 2 moves. Red lines represent 3 or more moves. Estimates are adjusted for age, sex, calendar year, birth period, parental age, urbanicity level at birth, and history of mental disorder in a parent or sibling. For a color version, see this figure online. Schizophrenia Bulletin vol. 39 no. 4 pp. 740–747, 2013 doi:10.1093/schbul/sbt065 Advance Access publication May 13, 2013

ENVIRONMENT AND SCHIZOPHRENIA

Life Events and Psychosis: A Review and Meta-analysis

Stephanie Beards^{*,1}, Charlotte Gayer-Anderson¹, Susana Borges¹, Michael E. Dewey², Helen L. Fisher^{3,4}, and Craig Morgan^{1,4}





Questions - etiology

- What is the estimated percentage using the information from 108 genetic loci explaining schizophrenia?
- a. 10%
- b. 20%
- c. 30%
- These loci are related to
- a. Serotonin
- b. GABA
- c. Immune system

Questions - etiologie

The risk of schizophrenia is increased by childhood trauma with:

- a. 2-4%
- b. 4-6%
- c. 6-10%

A first degree family member has increased risk of schizophrenia:

- a. 5-20%
- b. 20-35%
- c. 35-50%

Staging schizophrenia





Brain volume changes with a second







Koutsouleris N et al. Schizophr Bull 2014;40:1140-1153

© The Author 2013. Published by Oxford University Press on behalf of the Maryland Psychiatric Research Center. All rights reserved. For permissions, please email: journals.permissions@oup.com



Questions staging



- To reduce the prevalence of psychotic disorders we should:
- 1. Set up pecialized clinics for subjects who have prodromal symptoms
- 2. Follow-up subjects seen in the child and adolescent psychiatry department
- 3. Screen the pre-adolescent population
- 4. Other
- Are we able to detect all subjects who will develop a psychotic disorder if we do all of the above?
- 1. Yes
- 2. No

Questions treatment

- What is the percentage of patients with a first episode psychosis receiving a diagnosis of schizophrenia spectrum disorder?
- a. 60 %
- b. 70%
- c. 80%
- Which treatment is not proven effective yet for patients with schizophrenia?
- a. Cognitive behavioral treatment
- b. EMDR
- c. Psychoeducation





Ultra High Risk Criteria

<u> PACE</u>:

Ultra-high risk was defined by the presence of subthreshold and/or self-limiting psychotic symptoms and/or having a family history of psychotic disorder combined with functional Decline.

PRIME:

One or more of 3 criteria

1. new onset or recent worsening of subsyndromal

"attenuated" positive psychotic symptoms

- 2. very brief periods of fully psychotic positive symptoms
- 3. deterioration in functioning within the last year and schizotypal personality disorder or a having first-degree relative with psychosis.

Transition rate of prodromal to psychol

M.C.KLAASSEN/D.H. NIEMAN/H.E. BECKER E.A.

TABEL 2	Onderzoeken bij jonge	ren met een ultrahoog ri	isico voor schizofrenie (patiënten in de tweede
	lijn met een sterk verho	ogd risico op een psycho	se binnen één jaar)
UHR-centrum	Intakecriteria	Aantal patiënten	Aantal (%) psychotisch binnen 12 maanden
PACE (Australië)	PACE	104	36 (34,6)
(Yung & McGorry 1996)			
PRIME (VS)	PRIME	14	7 (50)
(McGlashan & Miller 2004)			
rap (vs)	Chr+	34	9 (26,5)
(Cornblatt e.a. 2002)			
TO PP (Noorwegen)	PRIME	14	6(43)
(Larsen 2002)			
EDIE (Manchester)	PACE	23	5 (22)
(Morrison e.a. 2002)			
PAS (Newcastle, Australië)	PACE	74	37 (50)
(Carr e.a. 2000)			
pier (vs)	PRIME OF BLIPS	47	11 (23,4) : BLIPS
(McFarlane e.a.2002)			
FETZ (CER) (Duitsland)	BSABS	51	5 (9,8)*
(Klosterkötter e.a. 2001)			
CARE (VS, San Diego)	PRIME	25	4 (16)
(Cadenhead e.a.)			
EPOS (Duitsland, Engeland, Finland, Nederland)	PRIME CN BSABS	250	loopt
	Deze tabel is mede tots	tandgekomen met behul	p van gegevens uit Yung e.a. 2004 en Cornblatt
	e.a. 2003		
	* binnen 15 maanden	CE - Personal Assessment	and Crisis Evaluation; P RIME = Prevention through
	• •		P = Recognition en Prevention Program; TOP P =
		. ,	arly Identification and Intervention Evaluation;
	PAS = Psychological Assis	tence Service; PIER = Portle	and Identification and Early Referral; BLIPS =
			z = F nıhErkennungs- und Therapie Zentrum
			ition; CAR E = Cognitive Assessment and Risk
		pean Prediction Of Psychos	is Study; BSABS = Bonn Scale for the Assessment of
	Basic Symptoms		

Evidence That Transition from Health to Psychotic Disorder Can Be Traced to Semi-Ubiquitous Environmental Effects Operating against Background Genetic Risk



Martine van Nierop^{1®}, Mayke Janssens^{1®}, Genetic Risk OUtcome of Psychosis (GROUP) Investigators[¶], Richard Bruggeman², Wiepke Cahn³, Lieuwe de Haan⁴, René S. Kahn³, Carin J. Meijer⁴, Inez Myin-Germeys¹, Jim van Os^{1,5}*, Durk Wiersma²

Table 4. Transition as a function of proxy environmental and genetic exposures.

		Non-tra	insition	Tran	sition	Odds ratio _{adj} *	95% CI	PAF #
		n	%	n	%			
Minority position	Majority	1,117	88.5	7	63.6	3.8	1.2-12.8	28%
	Minority	145	11.5	4	36.4			
Urban birth	Non-urban	807	68.0	3	32.0	3.7	0.9-15.4	45%
	Urban	379	37.5	5	62.5			
Cannabis use	No use	798	63.2	3	27.3	4.1	1.1-15.4	57%
	Use	464	36.8	8	72.7			
Early trauma	No	921	78.9	1	11.1	34.4	4.4-267.4	86%
	Yes	247	21.2	8	88.9			
Any exposure	No	447	35.4	0	0.0	∞		
	Yes	815	64.6	11	100.0			
High risk group	Comparison subject	460	99.6	2	0.4	2.2	0.5-10.3	50%
	Sibling	802	98.9	9	1.1			

*Odd ratio's adjusted for age sex and high-risk sibling status.

PAF = population attributable fraction, or the reduction in incidence that would be observed if the population were entirely.

unexposed, compared with its current exposure pattern.

 $\infty = OR$ is infinity due to zero denominator.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0076690.t004

Review

Randomized-controlled trials in people at ultra high risk of psychosis: A review of treatment effectiveness

Antonio Preti a,*, Matteo Cellab,1

* Centro Medico Genneruxi, Via Costantinopoli 42, 09129 Cagliari, Italy

^b King's College London, Institute of Psychiatry, Department of Psychological Medicine, Weston Education Centre, Cutcombe Rd, London SE5 9RJ, United Kingdom

Table 1

RCT of focused treatment aimed at reducing the risk of transition to psychosis in people at high risk of psychosis.

Study	Criteria for diagnosis	Criteria for outcome	Focused treatment (FT)	Contrast group (C)	Transition to psychosis at 1 year*	Transition to psychosis at more than 1 year*
McGorry et al., 2002; Phillips et al., 2007	UHR criteria according to PACE criteria based on the CAARMS	Suprathreshold levels of psychosis	Risperidone 1-2 mg + CBT Duration =6 months N=31 Dropout = none	Needs-based intervention (?) Duration = 6 months N = 28 Dropout = none	FT = 6/31 (19.33) C = 10/28 (35.7%)	Within 3/4 years FT=10/31 (32.2%) C=12/28 (42.8%) Dropout=18 (7/11)
Morrison et al., 2004; Morrison et al., 2007		Transition to psychosis using cut-off points on PANSS	CT Duration =6 months N=35 Dropout =9	Monitoring Duration = 6 months N=23 Dropout = 7	FT=2/35 (5.7%) C=5/23 (21.7%)	Within 3 years FT=7/35 (20.0%) C=7/23 (30.4%) Dropout=31 (18/13)
McGlashan et al. (2006)	UHR criteria based on the SIPS	Conversion to psychosis according to the Presence of Psychosis Scale	Olanzapine $5-15 \text{ mg}$ Duration $= 12 \text{ months}$ N=31 Dropout $= 14$	Placebo Duration = 12 months N = 29 Dropout = 19	FT=5/31 (16.13) C=11/29 (37.9%)	Within 2 years FT=8/31 (25.8%) C=13/29 (44.8%) Dropout=none
Nordentoft et al. (2006)	KD-10 criteria for Schizotypal disorder	ICD-10 diagnosis of a psychotic disorder within the F2 spectrum Raters were not blind	Intensive treatment with family intervention Duration =24 months N=42 Dropout =5	Standard care Duration = 24 months N= 37 Dropout = 7	FT=3/37 (8.1%) C=10/30 (33.3%)	Within 2 years FT=9/36 (25.0%) C=14/29 (48.2%) Dropout=14 (6/8)
Amminger et al. (2010)	UHR criteria equivalent to PACE criteria based on PANSS	Transition to psychosis using cut-off points on PANSS	Omega-3 PUFAs 1.2 g Duration =3 months N=41 Dropout =3	Placebo Duration = 3 months N= 40 Dropout = 2	FT=2/41 (4.8%) C=11/40 (27.5%)	

Ultra High Risk

Abbreviations and explanations:

PACE = Personal Assessment and Crisis Evaluation (PACE) Clinic in Melbourne,

CAARMS = Comprehensive Assessment of At-Risk Mental States.

PANSS = Positive and Negative Syndrome Scale.

SIPS = Structured Interview for Prodromal Syndromes, which operationally defines the PACE UHR criteria.

ICD-10 = International Classification of Diseases, tenth edition, World Health Organization.

CBT = Cognitive Behavioral Therapy.

CT = Cognitive Therapy.

PUFAs = Polyunsaturated Fatty Acids.

Suprathreshold levels of psychosis: a score of 3 or more on the hallucinations subscale, a score of 4 or more on the unusual thought content subscale (plus a score 3 for delusional conviction on the Comprehensive Assessment of Symptoms and History), or a score of 4 or more on the conceptual disorganization subscale of the Brief Psychiatric Rating Scale; all for a duration greater than 1 week.

Transition to psychosis using cut-off points on PANSS: 4 or more on hallucinations, 4 or more on delusions and 5 or more on conceptual disorganization; all for a duration greater than 1 week.

Conversion to psychosis according to the Presence of Psychosis Scale: any psychotic disorder in the DSM-IV schizophrenia spectrum on the basis of scores on the Presence of Psychosis Scale (unspecified threshold).

*Data on transition to psychosis are on a intention-to-treat basis.



Staging schizophrenia

Psychological Medicine (2014), 44, 17–24. © Cambridge University Press 2013 doi:10.1017/S0033291713000184

REVIEW ARTICLE

Lessons learned from the psychosis high-risk state: towards a general staging model of prodromal intervention

P. Fusar-Poli1*, A. R. Yung^{2,3}, P. McGorry³ and J. van Os^{1,4,5}

Conclusions. In the general population, mixed and non-specific expression of psychosis, depression, anxiety and subthreshold mania is common and mostly transitory. When combined with distress, it may be considered as the first, diagnostically neutral stage of potentially more severe psychopathology, which only later may acquire a degree of diagnostic specificity and possible relative resistance to treatment. Therefore, rather than creating silos of perdisorder ultra-HR syndromes, an early intervention focus on the broad syndrome of early mental distress, requiring phase-specific interventions, may be more profitable.



From: Association Between Duration of Untreated Psychosis and Outcome in Cohorts of First-Episode Patients: A Systematic Review

A ALATA

Arch Gen Psychiatry. 2005;62(9):975-983. doi:10.1001/archpsyc.62.9.975



Figure Legend:

Odds of no remission in the long vs short duration of untreated psychosis (DUP) groups. An odds ratio greater than 1 indicates that individuals in the long DUP group were more likely not to be in remission at the follow-up point. CI indicates confidence interval; PANSS, Positive and Negative Syndrome Scale; GAF, Global Assessment of Functioning; WHO, World Health Organization; and SAPS, Scale for the Assessment of Positive Symptoms. Squares indicate the size of the contribution to the study of the summary odds ratio (diamonds). Copyright © 2012 American Medical

Association. All rights reserved.

Shortening the DUP with national campaign about psychosis - Norway



Inge Joa, et al. Schizophr Bull. 2008





Cahn et al. Eur.Neuro. Psychoph 2009



Onze Ontdekkingen in Grote Lijnen

Long term outcome of schizophrenia spectrum disorder A six year follow up in 1000 patients

Korver et al.

Genetic Risk and Outcome of Psychosis (GROUP)



 Table 2
 Demographic and clinical characteristics of participants in the GROUP study, means (standard deviations in parentheses) and absolute numbers

Variable	Patients (N = 1120)	Siblings (N = 1057)	Parents (N = 919)	Controls (N = 5	90)
Age (years) at T0	27.7 (8.0)	27.8 (8.3)	54.7 (6.9)	30.4 (10.6)	
Gender, male (%)	76.2	45.6	42.7	45.8	
Education, Verhage ^a	4.0 (2.1)	5.1 (2.1)	5.1 (2.3)	5.4 (1.8)	
WAIS-III Estimated IQ	94.9 (16.1)	102.6 (15.6)	103.1 (17.0)	109.6 (15.2)	
Ethnicity, Caucasian (%)	79.1	83.2	88.9	92.0	
Marital status (%)					
Not married	87.9	57.4	4.7	55.0	
Married/living together	9.2	40.3	70.7	41.0	
Other	2.9	2.3	24.7	4.0	
Residential status (%)					
Single	33.7	20.5	8.3	22.1	
With parents(s)	39.5	27.7	5.5	26.8	
With partner/family	10.3	46.3	84.8	46.9	
Sheltered living	9.7	0.1	0.0	0.0	
Other	6.8	5.3	1.4	4.3	
Lifetime psychopathology					
Depressive disorder					
Male (%)	0	5.8	12.5	3.0	
Female (%)	0.4	13.6	20.9	12.5	
Bipolar disorder					
Male (%)	1.3	0.8	0.5	0	
Female (%)	1.5	1.2	1.0	0.3 Koi	rver et a
Substance abuse				JN	lethods
Male (%)	45.6	17.6	3.8	10.7	chiatr F
Female (%)	17.2	8.7	2.1	3.8 202	

Drop-out 6 years – patients only

	Drop-out	In study (6 years)	Statistics
AGE at T0 GENDER (m/f) IQ Ethnicity (Caucasian/other)	27.7 (8.4) 455/134 93.2 (16) 414/146	27.4 (7.4) 397/133 97.4 (16) 443/80	n.s. n.s. p<0.001 p<0.001
CAN-unmet needs PANSS TOTAL Pos. Neg. Gen. Remission Yes/no	3.54 (2.9) 5.7 (1.9) 1.9 2.1 1.8 217/314	2.91 (3.2) 1.6 (0.7) 1.7 1.9 1.7 250/255	p<0.01 p<0.001 P<0.01 P<0.001 P<0.001 P<0.01
	,		L <0'01

DROP OUT IS 35% AND 58% IN SYMPTOMATIC REMISSION

GROUP in preparation

Functional outcome after 6 years









GROUP in preparation

Neurocognition and remission status after three year follow up

Table 3. Results of Multinomial Logistic Regression Analysis with cognitive predictors for Remission

		95%	6 CI for Odds R	atio
	b (SE)	Lower	Odds ratio	Upper
Intercept	1,38 (2,56)			
Age	- 0,04 (0,03)	0,90	0,96	1,03
Education	0,14 (0,10)	0,94	1,16	1,41
Duration of illness	0,08 (0,06)	0,97	1,09	1,22
Number of psychotic episodes	- 0,64 (0,22) *	0,34	0,53	0,82
Benton score	0,03 (0,08)	0,88	1,03	1,21
Hinting score	- 0,04 (0,07)	0,84	0,96	1,10
Correct immediate RAVLT	0,40 (0,04)	0,97	1,04	1,12
WAIS-III Block design score	- 0,04 (0,07)	0,84	0,96	1,09
WAIS-III Arithmetic score	0,17 (0,07) *	1,03	1,19	1,37
WAIS-III Digit symbol score	0,01 (0,07)	0,88	1,01	1,17
WAIS-III Information score	0,22 (0,09) *	0,67	0,81	0,97
Drug during tests	0,53 (1,67)	0,06	1,71	45,26
Gender	- 0,04 (1,70)	0,04	0,97	26,91
Drugs x Gender	- 0,09 (1,75)	0,03	0,92	28,07

Note, R2 = ,14 (Cox &Snell); ,20 (Nagelkerke); Model X2 (14) = 215,16, *p < ,05

Premorbid Adjusment and remission status at follow up





P



FASSCOLES				
		Ν	Mean	Std. Deviation
PAS mean up to age 12	NRem	194	1.5387	.94598
	Rem	286	1.2547	.91299
	Total	480	1.3694	.93594
PAS mean age 12-16	NRem	195	2.0123	.94615
	Rem	283	1.7004	.91936
	Total	478	1.8276	.94199
PAS mean age 16-19	NRem	188	2.5481	1.04090
	Rem	273	2.0555	1.04092
	Total	461	2.2564	1.06765
PAS overall score	NRem	191	2.1889	.84970
	Rem	286	1.7802	.84693
	Total	477	1.9439	.87055

P<0.001
Schizophrenia Is a Cognitive Illness Time for a Change in Focus

René S. Kahn, MD, PhD; Richard S. E. Keefe, PhD

Schizophrenia is currently classified as a psychotic disorder. This article posits that this emphasis on psychosis is a conceptual fallacy that has greatly contributed to the lack of progress in our understanding of this illness and hence has hampered the development of adequate treatments. Not only have cognitive and intellectual underperformance consistently been shown to be risk factors for schizophrenia, several studies have found that a decline in cognitive functioning precedes the onset of psychosis by almost a decade. Although the question of whether cognitive function continues to decline after psychosis onset is still debated, it is clear that cognitive function in schizophrenia is related to outcome and little influenced by antipsychotic treatment. Thus, our focus on defining (and preventing) the disorder on the basis of psychotic symptoms may be too narrow. Not only should cognition be recognized as the core component of the disorder, our diagnostic efforts should emphasize the changes in cognitive function that occur earlier in development. Putting the focus back on cognition may facilitate finding treatments for the illness before psychosis ever emerges.

JAMA Psychiatry. 2013;70(10):1107-1112. doi:10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2013.155 Published online August 7, 2013. Editorial page 1009

Author Affiliations: Department of Psychiatry, Rudolf Magnus Institute of Neuroscience, UMC Utrecht, Utrecht, the Netherlands (Kahn); Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Duke University Medical Center, Durham, North Carolina (Keefe).

Corresponding Author: René S. Kahn, MD, PhD, Department of Psychiatry, Rudolf Magnus Institute of Neuroscience, UMC Utrecht, Utrecht, Heidelberglaan 100, 3508 GA Utrecht. PO Box 85500. the

Machine learning





https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ty-kTUzMnjk

Treatment- Psychoeducation

[Intervention Review]

Psychoeducation for schizophrenia

Jun Xia¹, Lars Bertil Merinder², Madhvi R Belgamwar³

¹Cochrane Schizophrenia Group, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK. ²Dept of Psychiatric Demography, Institute of Basic Psychiatric Research, University Hospital of Aarhus, Risskov, Denmark. ³Radbourne Unit, Royal Derby Hospital, Derby, UK

Contact address: Jun Xia, Cochrane Schizophrenia Group, University of Nottingham, Institute of Mental Health, Sir Colin Campbell Building, University of Nottingham Innovation Park, Triumph Road, Nottingham, NG7 2TU, UK. Jun.Xia@nottingham.ac.uk.

Editorial group: Cochrane Schizophrenia Group. Publication status and dater Edited (no change to conclusions), published in Issue 11, 2011. Review content assessed as up-to-dater 18 April 2010.

Citation: Xia J, Merinder LB, Belgarnwar MR. Psychoeducation for schizophrenia. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2011, Issue 6. Art. No.: CD002831. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD002831.pub2.

Copyright © 2011 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Main results

This review includes a total of 5142 participants (mostly inpatients) from 44 trials conducted between 1988 and 2009 (median study duration - 12 weeks, risk of bias - moderate). We found that incidences of non-compliance were lower in the psychoeducation group in the short term (n – 1400, RR 0.52 CI 0.40 to 0.67, NNT 11 CI 9 to 16). This finding holds for the medium and long term. Relapse appeared to be lower in psychoeducation group (n – 1214, RR 0.70 CI 0.61 to 0.81, NNT 9 CI 7 to 14) and this also applied to readmission (n – 206, RR 0.71 CI 0.56 to 0.89, NNT 5 CI 4 to 13). Scale-derived data also suggested that psychoeducation promotes better social and global functioning. In the medium term, treating four people with schizophrenia with psychoeducation

Treatment - Forest plot of studies in the meta-analysis of overall symplop cognitive-behavioural therapy.

Statistics for each study Sample size Hedges' g and 95% CI Study name Hedges' g Lower limit Upper limit CBT Control Control Kuipers et al (1997) ¹ -0.324 -0.0908 0.225 23 24 Hedges' g Lower limit Upper limit CBT CBT Control 100					1	A COMPANY OF THE OWNER.				Terre Te	
Study name Hedges' g Lower limit Upper limit Control Kuipers et al (1997) ¹ -0.342 -0.908 0.225 23 24 Levine et al (1999) ¹⁹ -0.547 -0.209 6 6 Haddock et al (1999) ¹⁹ -0.547 -0.067 19 18 Bradshaw (2000) ³³ -1.453 -2.540 -0.366 8 Lecler et al (2000) ⁸¹ -0.087 -0.386 8 7 Lecler et al (2000) ⁸¹ -0.135 -0.247 0 55 Granhoim et al (2000) ⁸¹ -0.136 7 72 7655 Durham et al (2003) ⁷² -0.038 0.709 2257 1655 Durham et al (2003) ⁷⁰ -0.038 0.709 22 8 Gumiley et al (2003) ⁷⁰ -0.058 0.797 22 88 Gumiley et al (2003) ⁷⁰ 0.058 0.797 22 88 Gumiley et al (2003) ⁷⁰ 0.058 0.797 24 88 </td <td></td> <td>Statis</td> <td>tics for each</td> <td>study</td> <td>Samp</td> <td>le size</td> <td></td> <td>Hedges' g</td> <td>g and 95% (</td> <td>CI</td> <td></td>		Statis	tics for each	study	Samp	le size		Hedges' g	g and 95% (CI	
Levine et al (1998) ⁷⁸ - 3.970 - 5.871 - 2.069 6 6 Haddock et al (1999) ⁷⁹ 0.567 - 0.338 1.472 8 10 Philo et al (1999) ⁷⁹ - 0.571 - 0.366 3 7 Leclerc et al (2000) ⁶³ - 0.087 - 0.481 0.306 55 44 Sensky et al (2000) ⁶³ - 0.087 - 0.481 0.306 55 44 Sensky et al (2000) ⁶¹ - 1.136 - 2.225 - 0.047 10 5 Granholm et al (2002) ⁸² - 0.744 - 1.735 0.247 8 7 Lewis et al (2002) ⁹² - 0.014 - 0.293 0.265 78 131 Turkington et al (2003) ⁷³ - 0.225 - 0.240 - 0.029 257 165 Durham et al (2003) ⁷³ - 0.252 - 0.0489 72 72 Jolley et al (2003) ⁷⁴ - 0.058 - 0.896 1.013 7 8 Rector et al (2003) ⁸⁴ - 0.698 - 1.316 - 0.081 24 18 Wang et al (2003) ⁸⁵ - 0.524 - 0.774 - 0.273 126 125 Bechdolf et al (2003) ⁸⁶ - 0.598 - 1.086 - 0.110 34 322 Granholm et al (2003) ⁸⁶ - 0.598 - 0.436 0.664 35 23 Bernowclough et al (2006) ⁹⁷ - 0.482 - 0.057 - 0.434 32 33 Valmaggia et al (2006) ⁹⁷ - 0.527 - 0.434 32 33 Valmaggia et al (2006) ⁹⁷ - 0.524 - 0.774 - 0.556 64 64 Gauciano & Herbert (2006) ⁹² - 0.544 - 1.173 - 0.056 42 19 Penadès et al (2008) ¹¹¹ (no carer) - 0.124 - 0.415 0.164 90 90 Garety et al (2008) ¹¹¹ (no carer) - 0.124 - 0.415 0.167 90 90 Garety et al (2008) ⁹⁷ - 0.150 - 0.573 0.274 36 51 Lecomte et al (2008) ⁹⁷ - 0.150 - 0.573 0.274 36 51 Lecomte et al (2008) ⁹⁷ - 0.345 - 0.749 0.279 28 29 Van der Gaage et al (2008) ⁹⁷ - 0.345 - 0.749 0.279 28 29 Van der Gaage et al (2008) ⁹⁷ - 0.150 - 0.573 0.274 36 51 Lecomte et al (2008) ⁹⁷ - 0.150 - 0.573 0.274 36 51 Lecomte et al (2008) ⁹⁷ - 0.150 - 0.573 0.274 36 51 Lecomte et al (2008) ⁹⁷ - 0.345 - 0.288 0.724 0.149 40 Rathod et al (2011) ¹⁴ - 0.995 - 0.386 0.178 109 97 Van der Gaage et al (2011) ¹⁴ - 0.995 - 0.386 0.749 0.279 28 29 Van der Gaage et al (2011) ¹⁴ - 0.995 - 0.386 0.749 0.479 97 Lincoln et al (2009) ⁹⁵ - 0.288 - 0.749 0.279 28 29 Van der Gaage et al (2011) ¹⁴ - 0.988 - 0.288 - 0.724 0.149 40 Rathod et al (2012) ⁸⁸ - 0.288 - 0.724 0.149 40 Rathod et al (2012) ⁸⁸ - 0.288 - 0.724 0.149 40 Rathod et al (2013) ⁹⁷ - 0.176 - 0.91	Study name			and the same state of the same	CBT	Control					
Levine et al (1998) ⁷⁸ - 3.970 - 5.871 - 2.069 6 6 Haddock et al (1999) ⁷⁹ 0.567 - 0.338 1.472 8 10 Philo et al (1999) ⁷⁹ - 0.571 - 0.366 3 7 Leclerc et al (2000) ⁶³ - 0.087 - 0.481 0.306 55 44 Sensky et al (2000) ⁶³ - 0.087 - 0.481 0.306 55 44 Sensky et al (2000) ⁶¹ - 1.136 - 2.225 - 0.047 10 5 Granholm et al (2002) ⁸² - 0.744 - 1.735 0.247 8 7 Lewis et al (2002) ⁹² - 0.014 - 0.293 0.265 78 131 Turkington et al (2003) ⁷³ - 0.225 - 0.240 - 0.029 257 165 Durham et al (2003) ⁷³ - 0.252 - 0.0489 72 72 Jolley et al (2003) ⁷⁴ - 0.058 - 0.896 1.013 7 8 Rector et al (2003) ⁸⁴ - 0.698 - 1.316 - 0.081 24 18 Wang et al (2003) ⁸⁵ - 0.524 - 0.774 - 0.273 126 125 Bechdolf et al (2003) ⁸⁶ - 0.598 - 1.086 - 0.110 34 322 Granholm et al (2003) ⁸⁶ - 0.598 - 0.436 0.664 35 23 Bernowclough et al (2006) ⁹⁷ - 0.482 - 0.057 - 0.434 32 33 Valmaggia et al (2006) ⁹⁷ - 0.527 - 0.434 32 33 Valmaggia et al (2006) ⁹⁷ - 0.524 - 0.774 - 0.556 64 64 Gauciano & Herbert (2006) ⁹² - 0.544 - 1.173 - 0.056 42 19 Penadès et al (2008) ¹¹¹ (no carer) - 0.124 - 0.415 0.164 90 90 Garety et al (2008) ¹¹¹ (no carer) - 0.124 - 0.415 0.167 90 90 Garety et al (2008) ⁹⁷ - 0.150 - 0.573 0.274 36 51 Lecomte et al (2008) ⁹⁷ - 0.150 - 0.573 0.274 36 51 Lecomte et al (2008) ⁹⁷ - 0.345 - 0.749 0.279 28 29 Van der Gaage et al (2008) ⁹⁷ - 0.345 - 0.749 0.279 28 29 Van der Gaage et al (2008) ⁹⁷ - 0.150 - 0.573 0.274 36 51 Lecomte et al (2008) ⁹⁷ - 0.150 - 0.573 0.274 36 51 Lecomte et al (2008) ⁹⁷ - 0.150 - 0.573 0.274 36 51 Lecomte et al (2008) ⁹⁷ - 0.345 - 0.288 0.724 0.149 40 Rathod et al (2011) ¹⁴ - 0.995 - 0.386 0.178 109 97 Van der Gaage et al (2011) ¹⁴ - 0.995 - 0.386 0.749 0.279 28 29 Van der Gaage et al (2011) ¹⁴ - 0.995 - 0.386 0.749 0.479 97 Lincoln et al (2009) ⁹⁵ - 0.288 - 0.749 0.279 28 29 Van der Gaage et al (2011) ¹⁴ - 0.988 - 0.288 - 0.724 0.149 40 Rathod et al (2012) ⁸⁸ - 0.288 - 0.724 0.149 40 Rathod et al (2012) ⁸⁸ - 0.288 - 0.724 0.149 40 Rathod et al (2013) ⁹⁷ - 0.176 - 0.91	Kuipers et al $(1997)^1$	-0.342	-0.908	0.225	23	24			H-	1	
Haddock <i>et al</i> (1999) ⁸⁰ 0.567 -0.338 1.472 8 10 Pinto <i>et al</i> (1999) ⁸⁰ -0.718 -1.370 -0.067 19 18 Bradshaw (2000) ⁵³ -1.453 -2.540 -0.366 8 7 Lecler <i>et al</i> (2000) ⁸ -0.082 -0.492 0.328 46 44 Turkington <i>et al</i> (2000) ⁸¹ -1.136 -2.225 -0.047 10 5 Granholm <i>et al</i> (2002) ¹² -0.744 -1.735 0.247 8 7 Lewis <i>et al</i> (2002) ¹³ -0.225 -0.420 -0.029 257 165 Durham <i>et al</i> (2002) ¹³ -0.225 -0.420 -0.029 257 165 Durham <i>et al</i> (2003) ³⁴ -0.678 -0.896 1.013 7 8 Rector <i>et al</i> (2003) ⁸⁴ -0.678 -0.896 1.013 7 8 Rector <i>et al</i> (2003) ⁸⁴ -0.678 -1.316 -0.081 24 18 Wang <i>et al</i> (2003) ⁸⁴ -0.578 -0.524 -0.774 -0.273 126 125 Bechdolf <i>et al</i> (2003) ⁸⁴ -0.578 -1.316 -0.081 24 18 Wang <i>et al</i> (2003) ⁸⁴ -0.578 -1.366 -0.110 34 32 Granholm <i>et al</i> (2005) ⁵⁴ -0.524 -0.774 4.32 23 Granholm <i>et al</i> (2005) ⁵⁴ -0.542 -1.099 0.136 21 19 Penadés <i>et al</i> (2005) ⁵⁴ -0.543 -1.173 0.066 20 20 Deng <i>et al</i> (2006) ⁶² -0.554 -1.173 0.066 20 20 Deng <i>et al</i> (2008) ¹⁴ (no caref) -0.124 -0.415 0.167 90 90 Garety <i>et al</i> (2008) ¹⁷ (no caref) -0.124 -0.415 0.167 90 90 Garety <i>et al</i> (2008) ⁹⁵ -0.534 -0.177 48 52 Farhall <i>et al</i> (2008) ⁹⁵ -0.534 -0.175 48 52 Farhall <i>et al</i> (2008) ⁹⁵ -0.534 -0.175 48 52 Farhall <i>et al</i> (2008) ⁹⁵ -0.235 -0.749 0.274 36 51 Wu <i>et al</i> (2008) ⁹⁵ -0.534 -0.175 48 52 Farhall <i>et al</i> (2009) ⁹⁵ -0.334 -0.079 28 29 Farhall <i>et al</i> (2008) ⁹⁵ -0.235 -0.749 0.279 28 29 Farhall <i>et al</i> (2008) ⁹⁵ -0.235 -0.749 0.279 28 29 Farhall <i>et al</i> (2008) ⁹⁵ -0.235 -0.749 0.279 28 29 Farhall <i>et al</i> (2008) ⁹⁵ -0.235 -0.749 0.279 28 29 Farhall <i>et al</i> (2009) ⁹⁵ -0.235 -0.749 0.279 28 29 Farhall <i>et al</i> (2009) ⁹⁵ -0.235 -0.749 0.279 28 29 Farhall <i>et al</i> (2009) ⁹⁵ -0.235 -0.749 0.279 28 29 Farhall <i>et al</i> (2009) ⁹⁵ -0.235 -0.749 0.279 28 29 Farhall <i>et al</i> (2009) ⁹⁵ -0.235 -0.749 0.279 28 29 Farhall <i>et al</i> (2009) ⁹⁵ -0.235 -0.749 0.279 28 29 Farhall <i>et al</i> (2009) ⁹⁵ -0.235 -0.749 0.279 28 29 Farhall <i>et al</i> (2009) ⁹⁵ -0.235 -0.749 0.279 28 29 Farhall <i>et al</i> (2009)											
Pinto et al (1999) ⁸⁰ - 0.718 - 1.370 - 0.067 19 18 B Bradshaw (2000) ⁵³ - 1.453 - 2.540 - 0.366 8 7 Leclerc et al (2000) ⁶³ - 0.087 - 0.481 0.306 55 44 Sensky et al (2000) ⁸¹ - 1.136 - 2.225 - 0.047 10 5 Granholm et al (2002) ⁸² - 0.744 - 1.735 0.247 8 7 Lewis et al (2002) ⁸² - 0.744 - 0.293 0.265 78 131 Turkington et al (2002) ³³ - 0.417 - 0.746 - 0.029 257 165 Durham et al (2003) ⁷³ - 0.588 - 0.029 257 165 Durham et al (2003) ⁷³ - 0.058 - 0.886 1.013 7 8 Rector et al (2003) ⁸⁴ - 0.658 - 0.774 - 0.773 126 125 Bechdolf et al (2003) ⁸⁵ - 0.524 - 0.774 - 0.273 126 125 Bechdolf et al (2003) ⁸⁶ - 0.588 - 1.086 - 0.110 34 32 Granholm et al (2005) ⁸⁴ - 0.678 - 1.086 - 0.110 34 32 Barrowclough et al (2005) ⁸⁴ - 0.587 - 1.086 - 0.142 54 45 Gaudiano & Herbert (2006) ⁹² - 0.522 - 0.646 0.142 54 45 Gaudiano & Herbert (2006) ⁹² - 0.553 - 0.734 - 0.577 0 90 Garety et al (2008) ¹⁴ - 0.314 - 0.899 0.271 21 23 Becrowclough et al (2008) ¹⁴ - 0.573 0.274 36 51 Wu et al (2008) ¹⁴ - 0.573 0.274 36 51 Wu et al (2008) ¹⁴ - 0.573 0.274 36 51 Wu et al (2008) ¹⁴ - 0.573 0.274 36 51 Wu et al (2008) ⁹² - 0.553 - 0.734 0.274 36 51 Wu et al (2008) ⁹² - 0.553 - 0.739 0.274 36 51 Wu et al (2008) ⁹² - 0.354 - 0.1705 48 52 Farhall et al (2008) ⁹³ - 0.235 - 0.749 0.279 28 29 Van der Gaag et al (2009) ³⁴ - 0.291 0.420 45 47 Foller et al (2008) ⁹⁵ - 0.533 0.274 36 51 Wu et al (2008) ⁹⁵ - 0.235 - 0.749 0.279 28 29 Van der Gaag et al (2011) ¹⁴ - 0.095 - 0.388 0.274 0.179 40 Rathod et al (2013) ⁹⁷ - 0.176 - 0.910 0.557 13 14 - 0.327 - 0.467 - 0.187 -4.00 -2.00 0.00 2.00 2.00 4.00	Haddock et al $(1999)^{79}$										
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$											
Leclerc et al $(2000)^{63}$ -0.087 -0.481 0.306 55 44 Sensky et al $(2000)^{87}$ -0.082 -0.492 0.328 46 44 Turkington et al $(2002)^{87}$ -1.136 -2.225 -0.047 10 5 Granholm et al $(2002)^{87}$ -0.014 -0.293 0.265 78 131 Turkington et al $(2002)^{87}$ -0.014 -0.293 0.265 78 131 Turkington et al $(2002)^{83}$ -0.477 -0.746 -0.089 72 72 Jolley et al $(2003)^{84}$ -0.698 -1.316 -0.081 24 18 Rector et al $(2003)^{84}$ -0.698 -1.316 -0.081 24 18 Wang et al $(2003)^{86}$ -0.524 -0.774 -0.273 126 125 Bechdolf et al $(2004)^{10}$ 0.290 -0.128 0.709 40 48 Startup et al $(2003)^{86}$ -0.588 -1.086 -0.110 34 32 Granholm et al $(2005)^{54}$ -0.047 -0.527 0.434 32 33 Valmaggia et al $(2005)^{54}$ -0.0482 -1.099 0.136 21 19 Penadés et al $(2006)^{97}$ -0.554 -1.173 0.066 20 20 Deng et al $(2006)^{97}$ -0.554 -1.173 0.056 64 64 Garety et al $(2006)^{97}$ -0.554 -1.173 0.056 64 64 Garety et al $(2008)^{11}$ (no carer) -0.124 -0.415 0.167 90 90 Garety et al $(2008)^{11}$ (no carer) -0.124 -0.415 0.167 90 90 Garety et al $(2008)^{11}$ (no carer) -0.124 -0.415 0.167 90 90 Garety et al $(2008)^{11}$ (no carer) -0.124 -0.415 0.167 90 90 Garety et al $(2008)^{11}$ (no carer) -0.157 0.573 0.274 36 51 Wu et al $(2008)^{11}$ (no carer) -0.150 -0.573 0.274 36 51 Wu et al $(2008)^{11}$ (no carer) -0.150 -0.573 0.274 36 51 Wu et al $(2009)^{36}$ -0.335 -0.749 0.279 28 29 Haddock et al $(2009)^{36}$ -0.335 -0.749 0.279 28 29 Haddock et al $(2009)^{36}$ -0.328 -0.724 0.149 40 40 Rathod et al $(2013)^{97}$ -0.176 -0.910 0.557 13 14 -0.327 -0.467 -0.187 -4.00 -2.00 0.00 2.00 4.00	Bradshaw (2000) ⁵³							_			
Sensky et al (2000) ⁸¹ -1.136 -2.225 -0.047 10 5 Granholm et al (2002) ⁸¹ -1.136 -2.225 -0.047 10 5 Granholm et al (2002) ⁸² -0.744 -1.735 0.247 8 7 Lewis et al (2002) ⁹² -0.014 -0.293 0.265 78 131 Turkington et al (2002) ¹³ -0.225 -0.420 -0.029 257 165 Durham et al (2003) ⁸³ -0.417 -0.746 -0.089 72 72 Jolley et al (2003) ⁸⁴ -0.678 -1.316 -0.081 24 18 Wang et al (2003) ⁸⁵ -0.524 -0.774 -0.273 126 125 Bechdolf et al (2003) ⁸⁵ -0.524 -0.774 -0.273 126 125 Bechdolf et al (2005) ⁵⁴ -0.578 -1.086 -0.110 34 32 Granholm et al (2005) ⁵⁴ -0.579 -0.434 32 33 Barrowclough et al (2005) ⁵⁴ -0.047 -0.527 0.434 32 33 Barrowclough et al (2006) ⁶¹ -0.252 -0.646 0.142 54 45 Gaudiano & Herbert (2006) ⁶² -0.482 -1.099 0.136 21 19 Penadés et al (2005) ⁵⁴ -0.0170 -0.156 64 64 Garety et al (2008) ⁶⁴ -0.150 -0.573 0.274 36 51 Wu et al (2008) ⁶⁶ -0.150 -0.573 0.274 36 51 Wu et al (2008) ⁶⁶ -0.150 -0.573 0.274 36 51 Wu et al (2008) ⁶⁶ -0.150 -0.573 0.274 36 51 Wu et al (2008) ⁶⁶ -0.150 -0.573 0.274 36 51 Wu et al (2008) ⁶⁶ -0.150 -0.573 0.274 36 51 Wu et al (2008) ⁶⁶ -0.150 -0.573 0.274 36 51 Wu et al (2008) ⁶⁶ -0.150 -0.573 0.274 36 51 Wu et al (2008) ⁶⁶ -0.150 -0.573 0.274 36 51 Wu et al (2008) ⁶⁶ -0.150 -0.573 0.274 36 51 Haddock et al (2009) ³⁴ -0.047 -0.979 28 29 Haddock et al (2009) ³⁵ -0.335 -0.749 0.279 28 29 Haddock et al (2009) ³⁶ -0.235 -0.749 0.279 28 29 Haddock et al (2009) ³⁶ -0.235 -0.749 0.279 28 29 Haddock et al (2009) ³⁶ -0.235 -0.749 0.279 28 29 Haddock et al (2009) ³⁶ -0.288 -0.724 0.149 40 40 Rathod et al (2013) ⁹⁷ -0.176 -0.910 0.557 13 14 -0.327 -0.467 -0.187 -4.00 -2.00 0.00 2.00 4.00	Leclerc et al $(2000)^{63}$							_	_		
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	Sensky et al $(2000)^8$							_			
$\begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$	Turkington <i>et al</i> (2000) ⁸¹										
Lewis <i>et al</i> (2002) ⁹ -0.014 -0.293 0.265 78 131 Turkington <i>et al</i> (2002) ¹³ -0.225 -0.420 -0.029 257 165 Durham <i>et al</i> (2003) ⁸³ -0.417 -0.746 -0.089 72 72 Jolley <i>et al</i> (2003) ⁸³ -0.417 -0.746 -0.089 72 72 Jolley <i>et al</i> (2003) ⁸⁴ -0.698 -1.316 -0.081 24 18 Wang <i>et al</i> (2003) ⁸⁵ -0.524 -0.774 -0.273 126 125 Bechodif <i>et al</i> (2004) ¹⁰ 0.290 -0.128 0.709 40 48 Startup <i>et al</i> (2004) ⁸⁶ -0.598 -1.086 -0.110 34 32 Granholm <i>et al</i> (2005) ⁵⁴ -0.047 -0.527 0.434 32 33 Valmaggia <i>et al</i> (2006) ⁹² -0.482 -1.099 0.136 21 19 Penadés <i>et al</i> (2006) ⁹² -0.454 -1.173 0.066 20 20 Deng <i>et al</i> (2008) ⁹⁴ -0.919 -1.281 -0.556 64 64 Garety <i>et al</i> (2008) ⁹⁴ -0.919 -0.156 -1.167 90 90 Garety <i>et al</i> (2008) ⁹⁴ -0.517 0.434 -0.899 0.271 21 23 Lecomte <i>et al</i> (2008) ⁹⁴ -0.517 0.434 -0.899 0.271 21 23 Lecomte <i>et al</i> (2008) ⁹⁴ -0.517 0.434 -0.899 0.271 21 23 Lecomte <i>et al</i> (2008) ⁹⁴ -0.517 0.974 8 52 Farhall <i>et al</i> (2009) ³⁵ -0.345 -0.938 0.248 20 23 Haddock <i>et al</i> (2009) ³⁵ -0.345 -0.938 0.248 20 23 Haddock <i>et al</i> (2009) ³⁵ -0.345 -0.938 0.248 20 23 Val <i>et al</i> (2008) ⁹⁷ -0.150 -0.577 0.348 -1.50 Farhall <i>et al</i> (2009) ³⁶ -0.235 -0.749 0.279 28 29 Van der Gaag <i>et al</i> (2011) ¹⁴ -0.095 -0.368 0.178 109 97 Lincoln <i>et al</i> (2013) ⁹⁷ -0.176 -0.910 0.557 13 14 -0.327 -0.467 -0.187 -4.00 -2.00 0.00 2.00 4.00	Granholm et al $(2002)^{82}$										
Turkington et al (2002) ¹³ -0.225 -0.420 -0.029 257 165 Durham et al (2003) ⁷³ 0.190 -0.330 0.709 22 38 Gumley et al (2003) ⁸³ -0.417 -0.774 -0.089 72 72 Jolley et al (2003) ⁸⁴ -0.6498 -1.316 -0.081 24 18 Wang et al (2003) ⁸⁵ -0.524 -0.774 -0.273 126 125 Bechdolf et al (2004) ¹⁰ 0.290 -0.128 0.709 40 48 Startup et al (2005) ⁵⁴ -0.047 -0.527 0.434 32 33 Valmaggia et al (2005) ⁵⁴ -0.047 -0.527 0.434 32 33 Barrowclough et al (2005) ⁵⁴ -0.047 -0.527 0.434 35 23 Barrowclough et al (2005) ⁵⁹ 0.083 -0.436 0.604 35 23 Barrowclough et al (2006) ⁹² -0.554 -1.173 0.066 20 20 Deng et al (2008) ⁹⁴ -0.919 -1.281 -0.556 64 64 Garety et al (2008) ⁹⁴ -0.919 -1.281 -0.556 64 64 Garety et al (2008) ⁹⁴ -0.919 -1.281 -0.556 64 64 Garety et al (2008) ⁹⁴ -0.919 -1.281 -0.556 64 64 Garety et al (2008) ⁹⁴ -0.919 -1.281 -0.556 64 64 Garety et al (2008) ⁹⁴ -0.919 -1.281 -0.556 64 64 Garety et al (2008) ⁹⁴ -0.919 -1.281 -0.556 64 64 Garety et al (2008) ⁹⁴ -0.919 -1.281 -0.556 64 64 Garety et al (2008) ⁹⁵ -0.314 -0.899 0.271 21 23 Lecomte et al (2008) ⁹⁵ -0.334 -0.938 0.274 36 51 Wu et al (2008) ⁹⁵ -0.345 -0.938 0.248 20 23 Haddock et al (2009) ³⁵ -0.345 -0.938 0.248 20 23 Haddock et al (2009) ³⁵ -0.345 -0.938 0.248 20 23 Haddock et al (2003) ⁹⁵ -0.368 0.178 109 97 Lincoln et al (2003) ³⁶ -0.235 -0.749 0.279 28 29 Van der Gaag et al (2011) ¹⁴ -0.095 -0.368 0.178 109 97 Lincoln et al (2013) ⁹⁷ -0.176 -0.910 0.557 13 14 -0.327 -0.467 -0.187 -4.00 -2.00 0.00 2.00 4.00									_		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $									- T		
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$											
Jolley <i>et al</i> $(2003)^{70}$ -0.058 -0.896 1.013 7 8 Rector <i>et al</i> $(2003)^{84}$ -0.698 -1.316 -0.081 24 18 Wang <i>et al</i> $(2003)^{85}$ -0.524 -0.774 -0.273 126 125 Bechdolf <i>et al</i> $(2004)^{10}$ 0.290 -0.128 0.709 40 48 Startup <i>et al</i> $(2004)^{86}$ -0.598 -1.086 -0.110 34 32 Granholm <i>et al</i> $(2005)^{54}$ -0.047 -0.527 0.434 32 33 Valmaggia <i>et al</i> $(2005)^{89}$ 0.083 -0.436 0.604 35 23 Barrowclough <i>et al</i> $(2006)^{91}$ -0.252 -0.646 0.142 54 45 Gaudiano & Herbert $(2006)^{92}$ -0.482 -1.099 0.136 21 19 Penadés <i>et al</i> $(2008)^{94}$ -0.919 -1.281 -0.556 64 64 Garety <i>et al</i> $(2008)^{94}$ -0.919 -1.281 -0.556 64 64 Garety <i>et al</i> $(2008)^{94}$ -0.150 -0.573 0.274 36 51 Wu <i>et al</i> $(2008)^{96}$ -1.517 -1.960 -1.075 48 52 Lecomte <i>et al</i> $(2008)^{96}$ -0.150 -0.573 0.274 36 51 Wu <i>et al</i> $(2009)^{35}$ -0.345 -0.938 0.248 20 23 Haddock <i>et al</i> $(2009)^{36}$ -0.235 -0.749 0.279 28 29 van der Gaag <i>et al</i> $(2011)^{14}$ -0.095 -0.368 0.178 109 97 Lincoln <i>et al</i> $(2012)^{38}$ -0.288 -0.724 0.149 40 40 Rathod <i>et al</i> $(2013)^{97}$ -0.176 -0.910 0.557 13 14 -0.327 -0.467 -0.187 -4.00 -2.00 0.00 2.00 4.00						20		54 -			
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	(2003)										
Wang et al $(2003)^{85}$ -0.524 -0.774 -0.273 126 125 Bechdolf et al $(2004)^{10}$ 0.290 -0.128 0.709 40 48 Startup et al $(2004)^{86}$ -0.598 -1.086 -0.110 34 32 Granholm et al $(2005)^{54}$ -0.047 -0.527 0.434 32 33 Valmaggia et al $(2005)^{89}$ 0.083 -0.436 0.604 35 23 Barrowclough et al $(2006)^{91}$ -0.252 -0.646 0.142 54 45 Gaudiano & Herbert $(2006)^{62}$ -0.482 -1.099 0.136 21 19 Penadés et al $(2008)^{94}$ -0.919 -1.281 -0.556 64 64 Garety et al $(2008)^{94}$ -0.919 -1.281 -0.556 64 64 Garety et al $(2008)^{96}$ -0.150 -0.573 0.274 36 51 Lecomte et al $(2008)^{96}$ -0.150 -0.573 0.274 36 51 Wu et al $(2008)^{96}$ -0.150 -0.573 0.274 36 51 Farhall et al $(2009)^{35}$ -0.345 -0.938 0.248 20 23 Haddock et al $(2009)^{36}$ -0.235 -0.749 0.279 28 29 Van der Gaag et al $(2011)^{14}$ -0.095 -0.368 0.178 109 97 Lincoln et al $(2013)^{97}$ -0.176 -0.910 0.557 13 14 -0.327 -0.467 -0.187 -4.00 -2.00 0.00 2.00 4.00	Julley et al (2003)										
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Rector $et al (2003)^{85}$										
Startup <i>et al</i> (2004) ⁸⁶ -0.598 -1.086 -0.110 34 32 Granholm <i>et al</i> (2005) ⁵⁴ -0.047 -0.527 0.434 32 33 Walmaggia <i>et al</i> (2005) ⁸⁹ 0.083 -0.436 0.604 35 23 Barrowclough <i>et al</i> (2006) ⁹¹ -0.252 -0.646 0.142 54 45 Gaudiano & Herbert (2006) ⁶² -0.482 -1.099 0.136 21 19 Penadés <i>et al</i> (2008) ⁹⁴ -0.919 -1.281 -0.556 64 64 Garety <i>et al</i> (2008) ⁹⁴ -0.919 -1.281 -0.556 64 64 Garety <i>et al</i> (2008) ⁹⁴ -0.150 -0.573 0.274 36 51 Lecomte <i>et al</i> (2008) ⁶⁹ -1.517 -1.960 -1.075 48 52 Farhall <i>et al</i> (2009) ³⁶ -0.345 -0.739 0.279 28 29 Van der Gaag <i>et al</i> (2001) ³⁵ -0.345 -0.738 0.278 29 Van der Gaag <i>et al</i> (2011) ¹⁴ -0.095 -0.336 0.178 109 97 Lincoln <i>et al</i> (2013) ³⁷ -0.176 -0.910 0.557 13 14 -0.327 -0.467 -0.187 -4.00 -2.00 0.00 2.00 4.00											
Granholm et al (2005) -0.047 -0.527 0.434 32 33 Valmaggia et al (2005) 0.083 -0.436 0.604 35 23 Barrowclough et al (2006) -0.252 -0.646 0.142 54 45 Gaudiano & Herbert (2006) -0.482 -1.099 0.136 21 19 Penadés et al (2006) -0.554 -1.173 0.066 20 20 Deng et al (2008) -0.554 -1.173 0.066 20 20 Deng et al (2008) -0.554 -1.173 0.066 20 20 Garety et al (2008) -0.124 -0.415 0.167 90 90 Garety et al (2008) -0.314 -0.899 0.271 21 23 Lecomte et al (2008) -0.573 0.274 36 51 Wu et al (2008) -0.555 -0.345 -0.393 0.248 20 23 Haddock et al (2009) -0.355 -0.345 -0.368 0.178 109 97 Lincoln et al (2011) -0.095 -0.368 0.178 109 97 Lincoln et al (2013) -0.288 -0.724 0.149 40 -4.00 -2.00 0.00 2.00 4.00 Rathod et al (2013) -0.467 -0.187 -4.00 -2.00 0.00 2.00 4.00					0.0273				-		
Valmaggia et al (2005) 0.083 -0.436 0.604 35 23 Barrowclough et al (2006) -0.252 -0.646 0.142 54 45 Gaudiano & Herbert (2006) -0.482 -1.099 0.136 21 19 Penadés et al (2008) -0.554 -1.173 0.066 20 Deng et al (2008) -0.919 -1.281 -0.556 64 64 Garety et al (2008) -1.075 0.167 90 90 Garety et al (2008) -1.075 -0.573 0.274 36 51 Wu et al (2008) -0.150 -0.573 0.274 36 51 Wu et al (2009) -0.150 -0.573 0.274 36 51 Wu et al (2009) -0.325 -0.749 0.279 28 29 van der Gaag et al (2011) -0.325 -0.724 0.149 40 Rathod et al (2013) -0.776 -0.187 -4.00 -2.00 0.00 2.00 4.00	Startup <i>et al</i> (2004) ⁵⁵							_	1		
Barrowclough <i>et al</i> (2006) ⁹¹ -0.252 -0.646 0.142 54 45 Gaudiano & Herbert (2006) ⁶² -0.482 -1.099 0.136 21 19 Penadés <i>et al</i> (2008) ⁹² -0.554 -1.173 0.066 20 20 Deng <i>et al</i> (2008) ⁹⁴ -0.919 -1.281 -0.556 64 64 Garety <i>et al</i> (2008) ¹¹ (no carer) -0.124 -0.415 0.167 90 90 Garety <i>et al</i> (2008) ¹¹ (no carer) -0.314 -0.899 0.271 21 23 Lecomte <i>et al</i> (2008) ⁶⁹ -1.517 -1.960 -1.075 48 52 Farhall <i>et al</i> (2009) ³⁴ 0.014 -0.391 0.420 45 47 Fowler <i>et al</i> (2009) ³⁵ -0.345 -0.938 0.248 20 23 Haddock <i>et al</i> (2009) ³⁶ -0.235 -0.749 0.279 28 29 van der Gaag <i>et al</i> (2011) ¹⁴ -0.095 -0.368 0.178 109 97 Lincoln <i>et al</i> (2012) ³⁸ -0.288 -0.724 0.149 40 40 Rathod <i>et al</i> (2013) ⁹⁷ -0.176 -0.910 0.557 13 14 -0.327 -0.467 $-0.187-4.00$ -2.00 0.00 2.00 4.00	Grannoim <i>et al</i> (2005) ⁶⁴										
Gaudiano & Herbert (2006) 62^2 -0.482 -1.099 0.136 21 19 Penadés et al (2006) -0.554 -1.173 0.066 20 20 Deng et al (2008) -0.919 -1.281 -0.556 64 64 Garety et al (2008) -0.919 -1.281 -0.556 64 64 Garety et al (2008) -0.124 -0.415 0.167 90 90 Garety et al (2008) -0.314 -0.899 0.271 21 23 Lecomte et al (2008) -0.150 -0.573 0.274 36 51 Wu et al (2008) -0.157 -1.075 48 52 Farhall et al (2009) -0.345 -0.938 0.248 20 23 Haddock et al (2009) -0.325 -0.749 0.279 28 29 van der Gaag et al (2011) -0.235 -0.749 0.279 28 29 van der Gaag et al (2013) -0.176 -0.910 0.557 13 14 -0.327 -0.467 -0.187 -4.00 -2.00 0.00 2.00 4.00	Valmaggia <i>et al</i> (2005) ⁵⁷										
Penadés et al $(2006)^{92}$ -0.554 -1.173 0.066 20 20 Deng et al $(2008)^{94}$ -0.919 -1.281 -0.556 64 64 Garety et al $(2008)^{11}$ (no carer) -0.124 -0.415 0.167 90 90 Garety et al $(2008)^{11}$ (carer) -0.314 -0.899 0.271 21 23 Lecomte et al $(2008)^{69}$ -0.150 -0.573 0.274 36 51 Wu et al $(2008)^{96}$ -1.517 -1.960 -1.075 48 52 Farhall et al $(2009)^{34}$ 0.014 -0.391 0.420 45 47 Fowler et al $(2009)^{35}$ -0.345 -0.938 0.248 20 23 Haddock et al $(2009)^{36}$ -0.235 -0.749 0.279 28 29 van der Gaag et al $(2011)^{14}$ -0.095 -0.368 0.178 109 97 Lincoln et al $(2013)^{97}$ -0.176 -0.910 0.557 13 14 -0.327 -0.467 -0.187 -4.00 -2.00 0.00 2.00 4.00	Barrowciougn et al (2006)							-	T.		
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$								_	-		
Garety et al (2008)^{11} (no carer) -0.124 -0.415 0.167 90 90 Garety et al (2008)^{11} (carer) -0.314 -0.899 0.271 21 23 Lecomte et al (2008)^{69} -0.150 -0.573 0.274 36 51 Wu et al (2008)^{96} -1.517 -1.960 -1.075 48 52 Farhall et al (2009)^{34} 0.014 -0.391 0.420 45 47 Fowler et al (2009)^{35} -0.345 -0.938 0.248 20 23 Haddock et al (2009)^{36} -0.235 -0.749 0.279 28 29 van der Gaag et al (2011)^{14} -0.095 -0.368 0.178 109 97 Lincoln et al (2012)^{38} -0.288 -0.724 0.149 40 Rathod et al (2013)^{97} -0.176 -0.187 -4.00 -2.00 0.00 2.00 4.00											
Garety et al (2008) ¹¹ (carer) -0.314 -0.899 0.271 21 23 Lecomte et al (2008) ⁶⁹ -0.150 -0.573 0.274 36 51 Wu et al (2008) ⁹⁶ -1.517 -1.960 -1.075 48 52 Farhall et al (2009) ³⁴ 0.014 -0.391 0.420 45 47 Fowler et al (2009) ³⁵ -0.345 -0.938 0.248 20 23 Haddock et al (2009) ³⁶ -0.235 -0.749 0.279 28 29 van der Gaag et al (2011) ¹⁴ -0.095 -0.368 0.178 09 97 Lincoln et al (2012) ³⁸ -0.288 -0.724 0.149 40 40 Rathod et al (2013) ⁹⁷ -0.176 -0.910 0.557 13 14 -0.327 -0.467 -0.187 -4.00 -2.00 0.00 2.00 4.00	Deng et al (2008) ²⁴										
Lecomte et al $(2008)^{69}$ -0.150 -0.573 0.274 36 51 Wu et al $(2008)^{96}$ -1.517 -1.960 -1.075 48 52 Farhall et al $(2009)^{34}$ 0.014 -0.391 0.420 45 47 Fowler et al $(2009)^{35}$ -0.345 -0.938 0.248 20 23 Haddock et al $(2009)^{36}$ -0.235 -0.749 0.279 28 29 van der Gaag et al $(2011)^{14}$ -0.095 -0.368 0.178 109 97 Lincoln et al $(2012)^{38}$ -0.288 -0.724 0.149 40 40 Rathod et al $(2013)^{97}$ -0.176 -0.910 0.557 13 14 -0.327 -0.467 $-0.187-4.00$ -2.00 0.00 2.00 4.00	Garety et al (2008) ¹¹ (no carer)							1.1.1	T.		
Wu et al $(2008)^{96}$ -1.517 -1.960 -1.075 48 52 Farhall et al $(2009)^{34}$ 0.014 -0.391 0.420 45 47 Fowler et al $(2009)^{35}$ -0.345 -0.938 0.248 20 23 Haddock et al $(2009)^{36}$ -0.235 -0.749 0.279 28 29 van der Gaag et al $(2011)^{14}$ -0.095 -0.368 0.178 109 97 Lincoln et al $(2012)^{38}$ -0.288 -0.724 0.149 40 40 Rathod et al $(2013)^{97}$ -0.176 -0.910 0.557 13 14 -0.327 -0.467 -0.187 -4.00 -2.00 0.00 2.00 4.00	Garety et al (2008) '' (carer)								H -		
Farhall et al (2009) Fowler et al (2009) Haddock et al (2009) Rathod et al (2011) Provide et al (2011) Provid	Lecomte et al (2008)07								-		
Fowler et al (2009) Haddock et al (2009) as -0.345 -0.938 0.248 20 23 Haddock et al (2009) van der Gaag et al (2011) Lincoln et al (2012) Rathod et al (2013) P7 -0.235 -0.749 0.279 28 29 -0.235 -0.749 0.279 28 29 -0.095 -0.368 0.178 109 97 Lincoln et al (2012) Rathod et al (2013) P7 -0.176 -0.910 0.557 13 -0.327 -0.467 -0.187 -4.00 -2.00 0.00 2.00											
Haddock et al (2009) ³⁶ -0.235 -0.749 0.279 28 29 van der Gaag et al (2011) ¹⁴ -0.095 -0.368 0.178 109 97 Lincoln et al (2012) ³⁸ -0.288 -0.724 0.149 40 40 Rathod et al (2013) ⁹⁷ -0.176 -0.910 0.557 13 14 -0.327 -0.467 -0.187 -4.00 -2.00 0.00 2.00 4.00									-		
van der Gaag et al (2011) ¹⁴ -0.095 -0.368 0.178 109 97 Lincoln et al (2012) ³⁸ -0.288 -0.724 0.149 40 40 Rathod et al (2013) ⁹⁷ -0.176 -0.910 0.557 13 14 -0.327 -0.467 -0.187 -4.00 -2.00 0.00 2.00 4.00	Fowler <i>et al</i> (2009) ³⁵							-	┡╋╾		
Lincoln <i>et al</i> (2012) ³⁸ Rathod <i>et al</i> (2013) ⁹⁷ $-0.327 -0.467 -0.187$ $-4.00 -2.00 0.00 2.00 4.00$											
Rathod et al (2013)97 -0.176 -0.910 0.557 13 14 -0.327 -0.467 -0.187 -4.00 -2.00 0.00 2.00 4.00	van der Gaag <i>et al</i> (2011) ¹⁴							-	-		
Rathod et al (2013) ⁹⁷ -0.176 -0.910 0.557 13 14 -4.00 -2.00 0.00 2.00 4.00	Lincoln <i>et al</i> (2012) ³⁸	-0.288	-0.724	0.149	40	40		_	-		
-4.00 - 2.00 0.00 2.00 4.00	Rathod <i>et al</i> (2013) ⁹⁷	-0.176	-0.910	0.557	13	14					
-4.00 - 2.00 0.00 2.00 4.00		-0.327	-0.467	-0.187							
Favours CBT Favours control							-4.00	-2.00 0	0.00 2.	.00	4.00
							F	avours CBT	Favours	s contro	ol

S. Jauhar et al. BJP 2014;204:20-29



Other treatments







Cognitive Remediation Therapy for Schizophrenia Theory & Practice

> Til Wykes Clare Reeder

Dartmouth PRC HAZELDEN

Severe Mental Disorders Program

Supported Employment

Updated and Expanded

Applying the Individual Placement and Support (IPS) Model to Help Clients Compete in the Workforce

> Sarah J. Swanson Deborah R. Becker

12

Questions

- To reduce the prevalence of psychotic disorders we should:
- 1. Set up pecialized clinics for subjects who have prodromal symptoms
- 2. Follow-up subjects seen in the child and adolescent psychiatry department
- 3. Screen the pre-adolescent population
- 4. Other
- Are we able to detect all subjects who will develop a psychotic disorder if we do all of the above?
- 1. Yes
- 2. No





- What is the percentage of patients with a first episode psychosis receiving a diagnosis of schizophrenia spectrum disorder?
- a. **60 %**
- b. 70%
- c. 80%
- Which treatment is not proven effective yet for patients with schizophrenia?
- a. Cognitive behavioral treatment
- b. EMDR
- c. Psychoeducation (family/patients)

Prevention of early death and improving quality of life in schizophrena



Life-style



- What percentage of patients with schizophrenia smoke?
- a. 30%-50%
- b. 50%-80%
- c. 80%-100%
- Percentage of metabolic syndrome in schizphrenia?
- a. 20%
- b. 40%
- c. 60%

Life expectancy and specific causes of death for substances disorders, schizophrenia-like psychoses, affective disorders personality disorders in patients 2000–2006 in Denmark, Fund Sweden.



Nordentoft M, Wahlbeck K, Hällgren J, Westman J, et al. (2013) Excess Mortality, Causes of Death and Life Expectancy in 270,770 Patients with Recent Onset of Mental Disorders in Denmark, Finland and Sweden. PLoS ONE 8(1): e55176. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0055176 http://www.plosone.org/article/info:doi/10.1371/journal.pone.0055176 Cardiovascular disease and diabetes in people with severe mental illness position statement from the European Psychiatric Association (EPA), supported by the European Association for the Study of Diabetes (EASD) and the European Society of Cardiology (ESC)



M. De Hert^{a,*}, J.M. Dekker^b, D. Wood^c, K.G. Kahl^d, R.I.G. Holt^e, H.-J. Möller^f

^a University Psychiatric, Centre Catholic University, Leuven campus Kortenberg, Leuvensesteenweg 517, 3070 Kortenberg, Belgium
^b Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics and the EMGO, Institute for Health and Care Research, VU University Medical Centre, van der Boechorststraat 7, 1081 BT Amsterdam, The Netherlands
^c National Heart and Lung Institute Cardiovascular Science, Imperial College, Charing Cross Campus, W6 8RP London, United Kingdom
^d Department of Psychiatry, Social Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, Hannover Medical School, Carl-Neubergstrasse. 1, 30625 Hannover, Germany
^e Endocrinology & Metabolism, Developmental Origins of Health and Disease, School of Medicine, University of Southampton, Southampton SO16 6YD, United Kingdom
^f Department of Psychiatry, Ludwig-Maximilians-University, Nussbaumstrasse 7, 80336 Munich, Germany

Received 22 January 2009; accepted 29 January 2009 Available online 13 August 2009

Table 1 Estimated prevalence and relative risk of modifiable cardiovascular disease risk factors in schizophrenia and bipolar disorder compared to the general population [39,47].

Modifiable risk factors	Schizophrenia	Bipolar disorder		
Obesity	45-55% RR: 1.5-2	21-49% RR: 1-2		
Smoking	50-80% RR: 2-3	54-68% RR: 2-3		
Diabetes	10-15% RR: 2	8-17% RR: 1.5-2		
Hypertension	19-58% RR: 2-3	35-61% RR: 2-3		
Dyslipidemia	25-69% RR: ≤ 5	23–38% RR: ≤ 3		
Metabolic Syndrome	37-63% RR: 2-3	30-49% RR: 1.5-2		

Estimated prevalence and relative risk

RR: relative risk.

Original Investigation

Cardiometabolic Risk in Patients With First-Episode Schizophrenia Spectrum Disorders Baseline Results From the RAISE-ETP Study

Christoph U. Correll, MD; Delbert G. Robinson, MD; Nina R. Schooler, PhD; Mary F. Brunette, MD; Kim T. Mueser, PhD; Robert A. Rosenheck, MD; Patricia Marcy, BSN; Jean Addington, PhD; Sue E. Estroff, PhD; James Robinson, MEd; David L. Penn, PhD; Susan Azrin, PhD; Amy Goldstein, PhD; Joanne Severe, MS; Robert Heinssen, PhD; John M. Kane, MD

Figure 2. Prevalence of Smoking, Lipid Abnormalities, Hypertension, Diabetes, and Metabolic Syndrome and Respective Medication Treatment for the Conditions



Dyslipidemia indicates an elevated low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (LDL-C) level (\geq 130 mg/dL; to convert to millimoles per liter, multiply by 0.0259), an elevated non-high-density lipoprotein cholesterol (HDL-C) level (≥130 mg/dL; to convert to millimoles per liter, multiply by 0.0259), an elevated triglycerides level (≥150 mg/dL; to convert to millimoles per liter, multiply by 0.0113), or a low HDL-C level (<40 mg/dL in males and <50 mg/dL in females; to convert to millimoles per liter, multiply by 0.0259). HbA_{1c} indicates hemoglobin A_{1c}.

JAMA Psychiatry December 2014 and overweight and obseity figures comparable to Volume 71, Number 12



Life expectancy is decreased because of:

- 1. Disease itself (suicide/self neglect)
- 2. Antipsychotics other medication and their side-effects
- 3. Unhealthy lifestyles (i.e. smoking and unhealthy diet)
- 4. Gene x enviromental overlap with somatic disease (i.e. Diabetes, CVD, CVA)

Weight Change in Antipsychotic name patients



Bak M, Fransen A, Janssen J, van Os J, et al. (2014) Almost All Antipsychotics Result in Weight Gain: A Meta-Analysis. PLoS ONE 9(4): e94112. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0094112 http://www.plosone.org/article/info:doi/10.1371/journal.pone.0094112



Side-effects of other medication used in the treatment of psychotic disorders

ELSEVIER www.elsevier.com/locate/euroneuro

Side effects of antidepressants during long-term use in a naturalistic setting

Pierre M. Bet^{a,b,*}, Jacqueline G. Hugtenburg^{a,c}, Brenda W.J.H. Penninx^{b,c,d,e,f}, Witte J.G. Hoogendijk^{b,d,g}

^{*}Department of Clinical Pharmacology and Pharmacy, VU University Medical Center, De Boelelaan 1117, 1081 HV Amsterdam, the Netherlands

^bNeuroscience Campus Amsterdam, VU University, Amsterdam, the Netherlands 'EMGO Institute, VU University Medical Center, Amsterdam, the Netherlands ^aDepartment of Psychiatry VII University Medical Center, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

^dDepartment of Psychiatry, VU University Medical Center, Amsterdam, the Netherlands ^DDepartment of Psychiatry, University Medical Center Groningen, University of Groningen, Groningen, the Netherlands ^DDepartment of Psychiatry, University Medical Center, Leiden, the Netherlands

⁸Department of Psychiatry, Erasmus Medical Center, Rotterdam, the Netherlands

Received 14 November 2012; received in revised form 11 March 2013; accepted 4 May 2013

Table 2 Prevalence of side effects (SEs in %) to different types of antidepressant (n=927).

CrossMark

Type of antidepressant	SSRI n=584	TCA n=97	VEN n=145	MIR n=58	Overall p-value	SJW n=24	Other ADs n=19
Number of SEs per case							
Zero SEs (%)	36"	28	27ª	36	0.09	100	47
One or two SEs (%)	33	33	37	40	0.55	0	26
Three or more SEs (%)	31	39	36	24	0.16	0	26
Type of SE							
Sleeplessness (%)	7	5	10	5	0.50	0	16
Sleepiness during the day (%)	21	14ª	20	30ª	0.16	0	16
Restlessness (%)	9	6	10	12	0.64	0	11
Muscle spasms, twitching (%)	9ª	12	15	7	0.09	0	5
Dry mouth (%)	22ª	49 ^{a,b,c}	23 ^b	22°	<0.001°	0	16
Profuse sweating (%)	20 ^a	20 ^b	32 ^{a,b,c}	14 ^c	0.01°	0	11
Sexual dysfunction (%)	23 ^{a,b}	20 ^c	31 ^{a,c,d}	10 ^{b,d}	0.01°	0	11
Nausea (%)	10	4	9	5	0.16	0	11
Constipation (%)	8"	20 ^{a,b,c}	10 ^{b,d}	2 ^{c,d}	0.001 ^e	0	0
Diarrhea (%)	7	4	5	5	0.58	0	0
Weight gain (%)	19	22	17	29	0.24	0	16
Dizziness (%)	12 ^a	11	19 ^a	12	0.15	0	5

AD=antidepressant, SE=side effect, SSRI=selective serotonine reuptake inhibitor, TCA=Tricyclic Antidepressant, VEN=Venlafaxine, MIR=Mirtazapine, SJW=St John's wort.

^{a,b,c,d}Difference in SE prevalence between two types of AD in univariate analysis, p<0.05.

Difference is CE and the balance between CCD1 TC1 and for the and with the state of the second state of CD1.

Treatment of weight gain and the second seco

Conclusion: When nonpharmacological strategies alone are insufficient, and switching antipsychotics to relatively weight-neutral agents is not feasible, the literature supports the use of concomitant metformin as first choice among

Mizuno et al. 2014 schiz. bull

CI: -4.44 to -1.90 kg) compared to placebo. Pooled effects for topiramate, sibutramine, aripiprazole, and reboxetine were also different from placebo. Furthermore, metformin and rosiglitazone improved insulin resistance, while aripiprazole, metformin, and sibutramine decreased blood lipids.

Metformin for Weight Gain and Metabolic Abnormalities Associated With Antipsychotic Treatment

Meta-Analysis of Randomized Placebo-Controlled Trials

Wei Zheng, MD,* Xian-Bin Li, MD,†‡ Yi-Lang Tang, MD, PhD,†§ Ying-Qiang Xiang, MD, PhD,† Chuan-Yue Wang, MD, PhD,†‡ and Jose de Leon, MD||¶#



Relative risk of fatal cardiovascular disease

Smoking

BMJ Open Meta-analysis: the effects of smoking on the disposition of two commonly used antipsychotic agents, olanzapine and clozapine

Yoshiyuki Tsuda,1 Junji Saruwatari,1 Norio Yasui-Furukori2

Conclusions: We suggest that the doses of olanzapine and clozapine should be reduced by 30% and 50%, respectively, in non-smokers compared with smokers in order to obtain an equivalent olanzapine or clozapine concentration.

NICE GUIDELINE UPDATE

Consider one of the following to help people stop smoking:

- Nicotine replacement therapy (usually a combination of transdermal

patches with a short acting product such as an inhalator, gum, lozenges, or

spray) for people with psychosis or schizophrenia

- 1. Bupropion for people with a diagnosis of schizophrenia
- 2. 2. Varenicline for people with psychosis or schizophrenia.

[Based on very low to moderate quality evidence from randomised controlled trials]

- Warn people taking bupropion or varenicline that there is an increased risk of adverse neuropsychiatric symptoms and monitor them regularly,

particularly in the first two to three weeks of treatment. (New

recommendation.) [Based on the experience and opinion of the GDG]

Diet????



Stubbs et al. 2016. How much physical activity do people with schizophrenia engage in? A systematic review, comparative meta-analysis and meta-regression They found:

- 1. less moderate and vigorous PA in schizophrenia
- 2. Only 56% met the recommended 150 min of moderate physical activity per week
- 3. Depressive symptoms and older age were associated with less vigorous PA





Physical Fitness

Incinulers in PSYCHIATRY

ORIGINAL RESEARCH ARTICLE published: 30 October 2014 doi: 10.3383/tpsyt.2014.00148

High aerobic intensity training and psychological states in patients with depression or schizophrenia

Jern Heggelund^{1,2}*, Kim Daniel Kleppe², Gunnar Morken^{2,4} and Einar Vedul-Kjelsås^{2,4}

¹ Division of Psychiatry Department of Eletmarka, St. Olava University Hospital, Tondheim, Norway.

² Department of Neuroscience, Faculty of Medicine, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Toncheim, Norwey

² Hern ar District Psychiatric Centre, Indendet Hospital Fust, Ottestad, Norvey

⁴ Division of Psychiatry Department of Research and Development (AFFU), St. Olava University Hospital, Tondheim, Norway

Edited by:

Jan Hoff, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Norwey

Reviewed by:

Evind Wang, Norwegian University of Science and Technology Norwey Byvind Stemm, Telemark University College, Norwey

*Compandence:

Jam Haggalund, Dapartment of Batmarka, Division of Psychiatry St. Olava University Hospital, Box 2009 Lada, Fondh eim N-2447, Norway em al: Jom Haggaland@intru no Aim: To explore changes in psychological states in response to a bout of high aerobic intensity training (HIT) in patients with depression or schizophrenia compared to healthy individuals.

Methods: After familiarization training of HIT, 20 patients with schizophrenia, 13 patients with depression, and 20 healthy individuals performed a no-training day followed by a training day. HIT was 4 × 4 min intervals at 85–95% of peak heart rate, intermitted by 3 min active rest periods at 70% of peak heart rate. Self-evaluation questionnaires of positive affect, negative affect, state anxiety, well-being, distress, and fatigue were completed before training, 15 min after, and 3 h after training. The two latter measures were also completed the no-training day.

Results: All three groups improved in positive affect and well-being 15 min after HIT (p < 0.01), but only patients with depression had maintained the effect after 3 h (p = 0.007, p = 0.012). The duration of the improved positive affect was longer in depression (p = 0.002) and schizophrenia (p = 0.025) than in healthy individuals ($F_{2.50} = 5.83$, p < 0.01). Patients with depression or schizophrenia had reduced distress and state anxiety 15 min after HIT and 3 h after HIT (p < 0.05). The improvement in distress 15 min after HIT was larger in patients with depression (p = 0.028) compared to healthy individuals ($F_{2.50} = 5.05$, p < 0.01). No changes were found during the no-training day (p > 0.05).

Conclusion: High aerobic intensity training used as an acute intervention improved positive affect and well-being and reduced distress and state anxiety in patients with depression and schizophrenia.

ClinicalTrials.gov identifier: NCT01310998.

Keywords: exercise, intensity, affect, anxiety, transitory emotions

Life-style



- What percentage of patients with schizophrenia smoke?
- a. 30%-50%
- b. 50%-80%
- c. 80%-100%
- Percentage of metabolic syndrome in schizphrenia?
- a. 20%
- b. **40%**
- c. 60%

Conclusions



- Polygenic risk score explains 20% in the development of schizophrenia. In particular genes involved in the immune system appear to play a role in schizophrenia.
- Prevention psychiatry should target a broad range of psychiatric complaints
- Studies with the aim to improve cognition in all stages of schizophrenia are needed
- Focus on life-styles and reduction of side-effects room for improvement

Neuroimaging findings approximation of the second s

Brain Imaging and Behavior (2014) 8:153-182



Fig. 2 ENIGMA founding sites. The first ENIGMA project (Stein et al. 2012) was initiated in 2009, by a consortium of research groups worldwide involved in neuroimaging and genetics. Several existing consortia and research networks are taking part, including IMAGEN, EPIGEN, SYS, FBIRN, and ADNI. Many of these efforts pre-dated

ENIGMA and continue today; each conducts its own projects in addition to their collaborative work within ENIGMA. ADNI collects data at 58 sites around the U.S.; for clarity, not all data collection sites are shown here. Each *symbol* represents a site contributing to ENIGMA, as of June 2013

			294919				
		Hippoca	mpal V	olume			
ADNI		+		-			
BFS		1					
BIG			_				
fBIRN			_	_	_	_	_
IMAGEN			_				
ImaGene			_	-			
LBC1936			_	-			
MooDs			_				
MPIP			-				
NCNG			_				
QTIM				-			
SHIP							
SHIP-TREND		-					
SuperStruct		-	•				
SYS			_				
TOP		+					
UMCU			_				
ENIGMA Discovery							
CHARGE		1 -	•				
BIG Replication		++					
EPIGEN		-	_	_	-		
NESDA	-			_			
TCD/NUIG			_				
GOBS			-				
NIMH-IRP		-	_	_			
COMBINED		1					
-20	0 -10	0 0	100	200	300	400	500

Fig. 3 Forest plots from the ENIGMA1 study (adapted from Stein et al. 2012). Forest plots are a graphical display designed to illustrate the relative strength of an effect in different cohorts. In the *left panel*, we show the effect of the genetic variant at rs7294919 on the hippocampal volume, in a range of cohorts in ENIGMA. In ADNI, for example, the confidence interval on the effect overlaps zero, which means that there is no evidence to reject the hypothesis of no effect, if only that cohort were considered. The "ENIGMA Discovery" line combines the effects of all cohorts above it. At the bottom of the figure, the meta-analysis of all



Effect in mm³ per allele (standard error) Effect Allele: C

effects above the line includes data from another large consortium, CHARGE, and several replication samples. The area of each square is proportional to the study's weight in the meta-analysis. The *right panel* shows a similar plot for the effect on intracranial volume of the common genetic variant at rs10784502. It is not necessary for the effect to be detected in all cohorts for the meta-analysis to support the effect. The abbreviations denote the names of the different cohorts in ENIGMA (please see Stein et al. 2012, for details). [Adapted, with permission, from Stein et al., *Nature Genetics*, April 15 2012] X

H H

Neuroimaging findings and enviromental factors

Reduced Cortical Thickness as an Outcome of Differential Sensitivity to Environmental Risks in Schizophrenia



Figure 2. Interaction between environmental risk factors and group on cortical thickness. (A) Interaction between childhood trauma and group (linear trauma x group interaction, p = .01). (B) Interaction between cannabis use and group (cannabis x group interact...

Habets et al Biological Psychiatry, Volume 69, Issue 5, 2011, 487–494

Brain volume changes in schizophrenia

S. V. Haijma et al



Comparison of Effect Sizes Between Medicated and Antipsychotic-Naive Patients With Schizophrenia

Fig. 1. The numbers of included studies are indicated for each brain region (N). *Abbreviations*: ICV, intracranial volume; TBV, total brain volume; GM, total gray matter volume; WM, total white matter volume; CSF, total cerebrospinal fluid volume.

Human connectome

http://www.myconnectome.nl







Impaired Connectivity

Schizophrenia Bulletin vol. 40 no. 2 pp. 438–448, 2014 doi:10.1093/schbul/sbt162 Advance Access publication December 2, 2013

Impaired Rich Club Connectivity in Unaffected Siblings of Schizophrenia Patients

Guusje Collin*.1.2, René S. Kahn^{1,2}, Marcel A. de Reus^{1,2}, Wiepke Cahn^{1,2}, and Martijn P. van den Heuvel^{1,2}



Fig. 2. Rich club, feeder, and local connectivity. Bar graphs indicate connectivity strength (ie, sum of reconstructed fibers), for rich club, feeder, and local connections. A significant ordered difference, such that controls > siblings > patients, was found for rich club connectivity (P = .014).



Fig. 3. Node-specific abnormalities. Cortical regions for which differential reductions (ie, controls > siblings > patients) in $S_{\rho} E_{\rho}$ and C_{ρ} were found. Regions are color-coded according to *P*-value, with dark blue regions surviving FDR-correction, marking the bilateral superior frontal and rostral anterior cingulate gyri, left medial orbitofrontal and inferior temporal gyri, and right precentral and insular gyri, (all q < .05).

FDR-corrected significant

p<0.01

p<0.05

Connectome organization is related to longitudinal changes in general functioning, symptoms and IQ in chronic schizophrenia

G. Collin *, J. de Nijs, H.E. Hulshoff Pol, W. Cahn¹, M.P. van den Heuvel¹

Department of Psychiatry, Brain Center Rudolf Magnus, University Medical Center Utrecht, Utrecht, The Netherlands





Fig. 1. Three intuitive measures of real-world functioning in schizophrenia (employment, independent living and symptom remission) were combined in one composite measure of general functioning (GF). GF was assessed at the time of MRI acquisition (T-MRI) and 3-year follow-up (T-FU). Four major trajectories of change in GF during follow-up were discerned (increase in GF, stable GF, minor decrease in GF) and patients were grouped accordingly.

3



6

Change in general functioning between time of T-MRI and T-FU

Fig. 3. Overall connectivity *S* (a) and connection classes (rich club, feeder and local connections) (b) were examined for a link with change in general functioning (GF) during follow-up. Total connectivity showed a trend-level effect with subsequent change in GF (c); rich club and local connectivity both showed significant associations (d), but only rich club connections remained significantly associated with GF change when examined as a proportion of *S* (e).

Machine learning and neuroimaging for diagnostic



Fig. 1. Classification scheme. The three groups (healthy subjects (HC), patients with bipolar disorder (BP) and schizophrenia patients (SZ)) are depicted by circles. The three models that are trained to perform pair-wise separations of the groups are indicated by arrows, labeled with the model's name (M) and a symbolic picture of its discriminative brain pattern (w-map). In the center a schematic picture of the support vector machine (SVM): an optimal separation plane (OSH; blue) separates the two classes of subjects based on their positions in a high-dimensional feature space (yellow and purple dots).