



Facial emotion recognition impairment is related to disorganisation in multi-episode schizophrenia



Anna Comparelli ^{a,*}, Antonella De Carolis ^b, Valentina Corigliano ^a, Giada Trovini ^a, Julia Dehning ^a, Simone Di Pietro ^a, Eleonora De Pisa ^a, Silvana Galderisi ^c, Paolo Girardi ^a

^a NESMOS Department (Neurosciences, Mental Health and Sense Organs) Unit of Psychiatry, Sant'Andrea Hospital, School of Medicine and Psychology, Sapienza University of Rome, Italy

^b NESMOS Department (Neurosciences, Mental Health and Sense Organs) Unit of Neurology, Sant'Andrea Hospital, School of Medicine and Psychology, Sapienza University of Rome, Italy

^c Department of Mental and Physical Health and Preventive Medicine, University of Naples SUN, Italy

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 22 May 2014

Received in revised form 17 July 2014

Accepted 21 July 2014

Available online 30 August 2014

Keywords:

Disorganisation

Social cognition

Schizophrenia outcome

Early psychosis

Cognition

ABSTRACT

The present investigation explores the relationship between facial emotion recognition (FER) and symptom domains in three groups of schizophrenia spectrum patients (43 ultra-high-risk, 50 first episode and 44 multi-episode patients) in which the existence of FER impairment has already been demonstrated. Regression analysis showed that symptoms and FER impairment are related in multi-episode patients, regardless of the illness duration. We suggest that the link between symptoms and FER impairment is involved in the progression of the disease.

© 2014 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Inc. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>).

1. Introduction

In schizophrenia facial emotion recognition (FER) impairment is stable at different stages of the disorder (Comparelli et al., 2013), regardless of the improvement of symptoms over time (Kohler et al., 2000). FER impairment is associated with lower community functioning (Kee et al., 2003), decreased levels of role (Eack et al., 2010), social functioning (Addington et al., 2006), and diminished interpersonal skills (Pinkham and Penn, 2006). As of the relationship with symptoms, we found an association with disorganisation (Comparelli et al., 2014), although associations with positive and negative symptoms (Schneider et al., 1995) were reported as well. One limitation of the literature to date is that it has tended to involve assessments at one point in time, leaving unclear the role that the deficit and its relationship with other aspects of the disease play over time for persons in different phases of illness. Thus, unresolved at present is whether association with core aspects of the disorder such as negative and disorganization symptoms are stable in different phases of illness. Better understanding of this relationship may highlight the predictive role of specific factors on the progression of the illness.

2. Methods

2.1. Subjects

We here reanalysed data from a previous study (Comparelli et al., 2013) in which we found that FER impairment was present before the onset of the full-blown psychosis and was stable across the illness. We enrolled 137 male and female patients over the age of 18 years who were referred either to our Acute Psychiatric Care Department or to our outpatient clinic. Forty-three patients met criteria for psychosis risk syndrome (McGlashan et al., 2010). Ninety-four patients met a diagnosis of DSM-IV schizophrenia or schizophreniform disorder based on the Structured Interview for DSM-IV Disorders-I (SCID-I) (First et al., 1997). Within this group, 50 patients were experiencing their first psychotic episode with very recent onset. Forty-four had an established diagnosis of schizophrenia with multiple-episode history. Exclusion criteria and further details of the patient population have been provided elsewhere (Comparelli et al., 2013). All participants provided informed consent for participation in the study and publication of results. The research was approved by the hospital's Ethics Committee.

2.2. Psychopathological assessment

Prodromal patients were assessed through the Italian version of the Scale of Prodromal Symptoms (Comparelli et al., 2011a). Psychopathology was rated through the Positive and Negative Syndrome Scale (PANSS)

* Corresponding author at: Azienda Ospedaliera Sant'Andrea, Unit of Psychiatry, Via di Grottarossa, 1035, Rome, Italy.

E-mail address: anna.comparelli@uniroma1.it (A. Comparelli).

(Kay et al., 1987). For statistical analysis we used the PANSS factor analysis according to Lykouras et al. (2000), who extracted the following five factors: a) Positive (P1 delusions, P3 hallucinatory behaviour, P5 grandiosity, P6 suspiciousness, and G9 unusual thought content); b) Negative (N1 blunted affect, N2 emotional withdrawal, N3 poor rapport, N4 passive withdrawal, N6 lack of spontaneity, G7 motor retardation, G16 active social avoidance); c) Excitement (P4 excitement, P7 hostility, G8 uncooperativeness, G14 poor impulse control); d) Anxiety and Depression (G2 anxiety, G3 guilt feelings, G4 tension, G6 depression); e) Disorganisation (N5 difficulty in abstract thinking, N7 stereotyped thinking, P2 conceptual disorganization, G11 poor attention).

The overall level of cognitive functionality was evaluated using the Raven Standard Progressive Matrices (RSPM) (Raven, 2008).

2.3. Facial emotion recognition assessment

To assess the facial emotion recognition ability, we used a specific FER test for face expression recognition (Comparelli et al., 2011b, 2012, 2013) based on Ekman and Friesen's (Ekman and Friesen, 1975) facial emotion theory of six basic emotions. The test is formed by two parts. In subtest A, each participant had to recognize a given emotion seven times; a face referring to a given emotion appeared seven times during the test in random order. Each correct guess was scored as 1, so that the participant may score 0 to 42 on the test and 0–7 on each emotion. In subtest B, four different facial expressions were shown on the monitor each time along with one emotion label; the participant was requested to indicate which face expresses the emotion displayed on the video. Eighteen four-face sets were provided, three sets for each emotion, and each correct guess was given a score of 1, for a possible range of 0–18. There was no time limit for completion. No feedback was provided about accuracy of performance. Both subtests measure emotional face recognition, but underlie different cognitive processing, as subtest A is an identification task (verbal modality), while subtest B is a recognition task (nonverbal modality). For more details regarding the test administration see Comparelli et al. (2013).

2.4. Statistical analysis

In our previous report (Comparelli et al., 2013), we analysed differences in socio-demographic, IQ, clinical features and FER performance among three clinical subgroups (UHR, FES, MES) and a healthy control group.

To determine associations between symptoms and FER identification and recognition scores, we performed partial correlations correcting for the possible confounding role of the variables that differed among groups. Then, we performed a stepwise regression analysis including all patients. We insert duration of illness and PANSS factors as independent variables and FER scores as dependent variable. Finally, a regression analysis with significant PANSS factor scores as independent variable and FER scores as dependent variable was carried out. A significance level of 0.05 was used for all statistical tests, and two-tailed tests were applied. Tests were carried out with the statistical package SPSS (version 17.0.2).

3. Results

Clinical groups differed for sex, age, duration of illness, IQ and the PANSS positive factor (Table 1). As mentioned in our previous report (Comparelli et al., 2013), the three clinical groups performed worse than healthy control subjects both on the identification and on the recognition tasks. ANCOVA analysis showed no differences between the number of correct answers on both the total scores of subtests A and B between FES and UHR. MES performed significantly worse than UHR on subtest A. Partial correlations (Table 2) adjusting for age, sex and IQ showed that in MES both the identification and the recognition scores correlated negatively with the PANSS positive, negative and disorganisation factor. Correlations retained statistical significance when the illness duration was taken into account. No other significant correlations between PANSS factors and the number of correct answers on the FER tasks were found in MES. In UHR and FES, no significant correlations were found. The stepwise analysis performed on the whole sample with PANSS factors and illness duration as independent variables and FER scores as dependent variables showed that the only unique factor that predicted FER impairment was disorganisation (Subtest A: $B = -.403$; $\text{Beta} = -.367$; $t = -4.225$; $p < 0.001$; Subtest B: $B = -.249$; $\text{Beta} = -.374$; $t = -4.326$; $p < 0.001$). When we carried out the regression excluding UHR and FES, PANSS disorganised factor severity explained 42.3% of the variance of the identification test score ($B = -.495$; $\text{Beta} = -.650$; $t = -5.544$; $p < 0.001$). No other variables entered into the model with statistical significance.

4. Discussion

The purpose of this re-analysis was to determine whether symptoms domains were related to emotion recognition in people affected by

Table 1
Socio-demographic and psychopathological characteristics of high-risk for psychosis, first-episode schizophrenia and multi-episode schizophrenia subjects.

	Ultra high-risk (43)			First episode schizophrenia (50)			Multi-episode schizophrenia(44)			Analyses		
	N	%		N	%		N	%		χ^2	df	P
Male	12	27.9%		38	76%		29	65.9%		21.3	3	<0.001*
	Mean	SD	95% CI	Mean	SD	95% CI	Mean	SD	95% CI	F	df	P
Age	23.2	3.6	21.9–24.5	25.0	7.1	23.2–26.8	34.3	7.9	31.9–36.7	32.6	2,134	<0.001 ^a
Duration of illness (yrs)	0.2	0.4	0.0–0.45	0.4	0.5	0.3–0.5	9.5	6.1	7.7–11.4	107.6	2,134	<0.001 ^a
Years of education	13.7	2.3	12.8–14.5	12.6	2.8	11.9–13.3	12.9	2.9	12.1–13.9	1.5	2,134	0.226
IQ	101.7	8.6	97.9–105.5	97.7	8.7	95.3–100.1	93.1	5.8	90.6–95.4	6.6	2,134	0.002 ^b
PANSS Pos	11.7	3.8	10.3–13.1	18.3	6.1	16.8–19.8	14.9	5.7	13.2–16.6	15.6	2,134	<0.001 ^c
PANSS Neg	21.6	6.6	19.1–24.0	23.0	8.6	20.9–25.1	25.6	6.8	23.6–27.7	2.9	2,134	0.062
PANSS Exc	8.4	2.9	7.3–9.5	11.4	5.3	10.1–12.7	11.2	5.1	9.6–12.7	4.4	2,134	0.014 ^a
PANSS Dep	14.4	3.9	12.9–15.8	13.5	4.3	12.5–14.6	12.7	4.5	11.3–14.1	1.5	2,134	0.224
PANSS Dis	9.2	3.4	7.9–10.4	12.1	4.6	10.9–13.3	11.1	4.7	9.6–12.5	4.7	2,134	0.010 ^d
PANSS Tot	81.0	14.8	75.6–86.4	95.1	18.5	90.5–99.7	93.3	18.0	87.8–98.8	7.1	2,134	0.001 ^a
Identification	27.5	4.9	25.7–29.3	24.4	4.7	23.3–25.6	23.9	6.5	21.9–25.9	4.6	2,134	0.012 ^a
Recognition	13.6	2.4	12.7–14.5	11.8	2.9	11.1–12.5	12.4	3.9	11.2–13.5	3.4	2,134	0.036 ^d

Bold type represents statistical significance <0.05.

* UHR vs FES and MES.

^a MES vs UHR and FES.

^b UHR vs MES.

^c UHR vs FES; FES vs MES.

^d UHR vs FES.

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/4191774>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/4191774>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)