cambridge.org/psm

# **Review Article**

**Cite this article:** Edwards CJ, Garety P, Hardy A (2019). The relationship between depressive symptoms and negative symptoms in people with non-affective psychosis: a meta-analysis. *Psychological Medicine* **49**, 2486–2498. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291719002381

Received: 11 January 2019 Revised: 12 August 2019 Accepted: 17 August 2019 First published online: 18 September 2019

Key words:

Depression; meta-analysis; negative symptoms; psychosis

Author for correspondence:

Clementine Jane Edwards, E-mail: clementine. edwards@kcl.ac.uk

© Cambridge University Press 2019



# The relationship between depressive symptoms and negative symptoms in people with nonaffective psychosis: a meta-analysis

## Clementine Jane Edwards<sup>1,2</sup> <sup>(i)</sup>, Philippa Garety<sup>1,2</sup> and Amy Hardy<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Psychology, King's College London, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, De Crespigny Park, SE5 8AF, UK and <sup>2</sup>South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust, Bethlem Royal Hospital, Monks Orchard Road, Beckenham, Kent, BR3 3BX, UK

# Abstract

The negative symptoms of psychosis and depressive symptomatology share several features, e.g. low motivation, apathy and reduced activity. Understanding the associations between these two sets of symptoms will support improved assessment and the development of interventions targeting these difficulties in people with psychosis. This is the first large systematic review and meta-analysis to quantify the relationship between these two categories of symptoms, as measured in studies to date. PsycInfo, Embase and Medline were systematically searched to identify eligible studies. Inclusion criteria ensured the studies measured both depression and negative symptoms using validated measures in a sample of over 8000 participants with non-affective psychosis diagnoses. The search led to 2020 records being screened and 56 included in the meta-analysis and review. Both meta-analyses and meta-regressions were conducted to explore the main effect and potential moderating variables. A clear pattern emerges showing that higher ratings of negative symptoms are associated with higher levels of depressive symptoms, with a small effect [standardised effect size = 0.19, p < 0.05). This did not vary greatly with the measures used (SES = 0.19-0.26) and was not moderated by demographic variables or quality ratings. Interestingly, higher depressive symptoms predict a significant relationship with co-occurring negative symptoms. However, higher negative symptoms predict that it is less likely there will be a relationship with co-occurring depressive symptoms. Heterogeneity was high across these analyses. The findings support the adoption of a symptom-specific approach to understanding the interplay between negative and depressive symptoms in psychosis, to improve assessment and intervention.

## Introduction

The negative symptoms of psychosis include low motivation, anhedonia, alogia, social withdrawal and blunted affect (Kirkpatrick et al., 2006). Research has shown that these symptoms have a significant impact on functioning (Rocca et al., 2014; Robertson et al., 2014; Menendez-Miranda et al., 2015), with some studies suggesting these difficulties are a bigger barrier to recovery than other symptom domains (Berenbaum et al., 2008; Marchesi et al., 2015). Negative symptoms were initially conceptualised as primary, a core feature of schizophrenia-spectrum diagnoses, or secondary - present due to other factors such as substance misuse, medication side-effects, depression or as a response to the positive symptoms (Peralta et al., 2000). This conceptualisation allows for the co-occurrence of depressive and negative symptoms in non-affective psychosis. Recent research has focused on a further distinction within negative symptoms - experiential v. expressive (Messinger et al., 2011) which enables more reliable measurement. Experiential symptoms include low motivation, anhedonia and withdrawal, whereas expressive symptoms are identified as blunted affect and alogia. Depression also includes a range of symptoms with similarities to experiential negative symptoms, with loss of pleasure (anhedonia), low motivation and low mood highlighted as key in the diagnostic criteria (American Psychiatric Association, 2013). A narrative review concluded that depressive symptoms are very common in people with a schizophrenia diagnosis and worsen their prognosis; it has been reported that up to 50% would also meet criteria for depression (Siris, 2003; Buckley et al., 2009).

The diagnostic conceptualisation of negative and depressive symptoms is that they relate to distinct disorders which are driven by different organic processes and commonly occur (Malaspina *et al.*, 2014). It is important to consider that depression is defined by self-report criteria (experiential), whereas psychosis is defined by clinician-rated (expressive) criteria. Some attempt has also been made to identify people for whom low mood is a significant problem alongside psychosis and this has resulted in diagnoses such as 'schizoaffective disorder', 'depression with psychotic features' and applies of course to bipolar disorder. The usefulness of these diagnostic labels in clinical practice, particularly schizoaffective disorder, is still

debated in the field (Siris, 2003). The DSM-V (American Psychiatric Association, 2013) recommends the assessment of eight domains in schizophrenia-spectrum disorders, including depression, which represents a move towards dimensional as well as categorical assessment. Kirschner *et al.* (2016) concluded in their narrative review that the presence of depressive symptoms in someone with psychosis may be missed because of the lack of clarity regarding how to assess them reliably and this may negatively impact on their treatment options. A more recent review of the field highlights the continuing lack of clarity regarding how to validly distinguish whether reported phenomenology are reflective of psychotic or depressive disorder (Krynicki *et al.*, 2018).

The symptom-specific conceptualisation views depressive symptoms as part of the maintenance cycle of negative symptoms, driven by psychological processes such as low self-efficacy beliefs and reduced anticipatory pleasure (Sarkar et al., 2015). Indeed, psychological models of psychosis, e.g. Garety et al. (2001), have proposed a direct route from emotional changes to psychotic symptoms. The phenomenological overlap between negative and depressive symptomatology is more apparent with experiential negative symptoms which include low motivation and anhedonia, commonly seen in depression (American Psychiatric Association, 2013). Older measures of negative symptoms are in an interview format and conceptualise negative symptoms as a single construct including multiple symptoms, they do not make the distinction between experiential and expressive negative symptoms. Newer measures of negative symptoms include specific subscales of experiential symptoms and there is some evidence that they show good divergent validity from depressive measures (Forbes et al., 2010; Llerena et al., 2013). This has been achieved by focusing on low motivation across several areas of functioning (social, employment, hobbies) rather than using terms such as 'low energy' or 'low mood' which can measure affective and somatic depressive symptoms. Experiential subscales do not assess cognitive symptoms, specifically beliefs about self, world and the future, and there is some indication in the literature that this may be where distinctions can also be drawn from depressive symptoms although findings are mixed (Kirkpatrick, 2014). Cognitions which seem to be more specific to depression are those related to guilt, hopelessness and suicidality. Some cognitions such as defeatist beliefs appear to play a role in negative symptoms and have been incorporated into the cognitive model of negative symptoms (Grant and Beck, 2009). There is a clear need to investigate relationships between cognitive, somatic-affective and behavioural phenomena associated with depressive and negative symptoms to improve targeted treatments.

The evidence regarding the overlap between these symptoms has been mixed with some studies finding an association between depressive symptoms and negative symptoms and others reporting none (Blanchard *et al.*, 2001; Pelizza and Ferrari, 2009; Amr and Volpe, 2013; Edwards *et al.*, 2015). Studies focusing on the primary and secondary conceptualisation of negative symptoms consistently report low levels of co-occurring depressive symptoms in people with psychosis identified as having primary negative symptoms (Kirkpatrick, 2014). The variation in findings may also be due to the range of measures used to assess both depression and negative symptoms in people with psychosis. It has been shown that in depression, measures have very little overlap with one another, reflecting the heterogeneity of these symptoms (Fried, 2017). Measures aim to have high divergent validity between depressive and negative symptoms, adopting the

diagnostic rather than symptom-specific approach. However, a recent review (Krynicki et al., 2018) showed that the domains of anhedonia, avolition and anergia may be common to both and used this to suggest an overlapping, dimensional model of negative, positive and depressive symptoms. The findings of this narrative review concluded that the symptom domains of pessimism, low mood and suicidal ideation may be specific to depression, while alogia and blunted affect are specific to negative symptoms. Hopelessness is an important factor in terms of the relationship with suicidal intent and attempts; this has been shown to be present in both depression and psychosis, although hopelessness is more commonly seen in depression (Radomsky et al., 1999; Warman et al., 2004). The time is therefore ripe for a systematic meta-analysis of this field which aims to establish whether there is a quantitative relationship between negative and depressive symptoms in psychosis.

This method improves on previous systematic reviews by applying rigorous meta-analytic techniques and will include studies which have assessed both negative and depressive symptoms. Finally, this meta-analysis will be the first to look at the relationships between depression measures and specific sub-domains of negative symptoms as assessed by newer measures, which may help to improve our understanding of how they interact.

The following research questions will be addressed in this review and meta-analysis:

- (1) Is there a significant relationship between negative symptoms and depression in people with a diagnosis of non-affective psychosis?
- (2) Does the relationship between negative and depressive symptoms varies according to the measures or subscales used?
- (3) Is this relationship moderated by depressive or negative symptom severity?
- (4) Is this relationship moderated by the diagnosis of the sample, quality of the study or demographic factors?

#### Method

#### Literature search

PROSPERO was examined for reviews with an overlapping research question, none were identified. This review was then registered on the PROSPERO database (ID: CRD42017083440). Relevant studies were identified through the systematic search of the databases Medline, Embase and PsycINFO in February 2017 with no time period specified. These databases were selected to fully capture the range of journals in this field. The following search terms were used as heading or keyword searches: (SCHIZOPHREN\* OR SCHIZOAFFECT OR PSYCHOSIS OR PSYCHOTIC) AND (NEGATIVE SYMPTOMS) AND (DEPRESS\*). The use of search terms targeting specific depressive or negative symptoms (e.g. anergia, alogia, motivation) were considered but not included as the focus of this review is on the whole range of depressive and negative symptomatology and including individual symptoms may have biased the sample of papers identified. A recent narrative review (Krynicki et al., 2018) which did include individual symptoms returned a similar number of papers as the current review suggesting this strategy captured all relevant papers.

The current review followed the flow of information as suggested by the PRISMA statement (Moher *et al.*, 2009). Following the initial search, duplicate records were removed, and the inclusion and exclusion criteria were applied. The search was conducted by CE and any studies where inclusion was unclear were discussed with AH and PAG.

## Inclusion criteria

Studies were included if they (i) include a sample with at least one of the non-affective psychosis diagnoses, (ii) include a validated measure of negative symptoms in psychosis, (iii) include a validated measure of depression in psychosis, (iv) have been published in a peer-reviewed publication and (v) have been written in English. Studies were included if the results reported a test of a direct association between the negative symptom measure and depression measure regardless of whether this was the primary outcome of the study. Validated measures of depressive and negative symptoms were identified organically through the literature search - if a validation paper was cited for the measure, then it was considered eligible for inclusion.

#### **Exclusion** criteria

Studies were excluded if they were (i) conference abstracts, (ii) book chapters, (iii) theoretical or review articles, (iv) qualitative data only were presented or (v) they were single case studies or dissertations. Studies were also excluded if: the sample included people with a diagnosis of bipolar affective disorder or depression with psychotic features as low mood is primary in these diagnoses; they removed people who met criteria for depression from their sample as we wished to analyse the relationship at all levels of depressive symptoms; they only used a single item to assess depressive symptoms as this was not considered sufficiently robust. Studies were also excluded if insufficient statistical information was provided for the paper to be included in the analyses, e.g. only associations for change scores presented or authors did not respond to request for additional data within the time frame of the study (k = 3) (Dollfus and Petit, 1995; Forbes *et al.*, 2010; Schennach et al., 2015).

#### Quality assessment

Studies were assessed using an adapted version of the Quality Assessment Tool for Quantitative Studies (Thomas et al., 2004); see online Supplementary Material for rating scale and instructions. This was included for the purpose of characterising the studies included, and to analyse quality as a potential moderator of our findings. The measure was adapted by removing sections C, D and G which were relevant for randomised controlled trials only. One additional item was added which assessed whether the analyses of negative and depressive symptoms were outlined in the design of the study or whether it was the result of secondary analyses. This was identified as an important quality criterion in this group of studies. All studies were rated by CE and a sample of 10% (k = 6) was rated by an independent assessor. One of these six papers had a discrepancy >2 between raters which are specific to the selection bias item. This was discussed, and a consensus reached. The ratings were shown to have excellent reliability [intraclass correlation = 0.94, 95% confidence interval (CI) 0.76-0.99].

### Data extraction and analytic procedure

Based on the inclusion criteria, 56 studies were considered eligible for inclusion in the final meta-analyses. The following data were extracted from each study by CE: sample size, age, gender, Clementine Jane Edwards et al.

depression and negative symptoms measures, r statistic and pvalue for the correlation. To ensure each study was weighted appropriately where multiple Pearson's r values were presented for different subscales, these were averaged to combine them for the main analysis, allowing all data points to be included without introducing bias (Borenstein et al., 2009). Individual subscales were reported in sub-group analyses. All scores were converted to Fisher's z scores to represent the continuous nature of the data and to minimise the risk of bias associated with Pearson's r (Borenstein et al., 2009). All analyses were conducted in Stata (StataCorp, 2017) using the metan package for meta-analyses and metareg for meta-regressions. We hypothesised that the true effect sizes would vary with sample characteristics acting as moderating variables. Therefore, random-effect models were chosen for the meta-analyses of main effects as well as meta-regressions and subgroup analyses (Borenstein et al., 2010). The main analysis was conducted to assess the relationship between depressive and negative symptoms and included all the studies. Sub-group analyses were conducted to examine this relationship when different measures were used. Meta-regression analyses were carried out to examine whether the severity of depressive or negative symptoms, age, gender, ethnicity, diagnosis or quality score moderated the findings.

For all analyses, heterogeneity statistics ( $I^2$  and  $\tau^2$ ) are reported to examine the amount of variance across studies. The  $I^2$  statistic was included as it has greater power to detect true heterogeneity when analyses only include a small number of studies. The convention is to consider an  $I^2$  statistic higher than 25%, 50% or 75% as representing low, moderate or high heterogeneity, respectively. The  $\tau^2$  statistic measures the between-study variance in the meta-analyses and a value >1 is suggestive of very high heterogeneity (Deeks et al., 2008). For the reporting of the main effect, rather than the 95% CI, the more rigorous 95% prediction interval was used, which takes into account the heterogeneity and describes the range of values in which 95% of effect sizes in future studies can be expected to fall (Borenstein et al., 2009).

Publication bias was assessed with the metabias package in Stata which includes Egger's test for asymmetry (Egger et al., 1997) and Begg's test (Begg and Mazumdar, 1994). A funnel plot will also be produced to aid our assessment of bias. Egger's test is limited in its ability to detect bias in random-effects models as it was designed for fixed-effects analyses. The analysis of quality ratings as a potential moderator is also a method of bias analysis.

#### Results

#### Characteristics of studies

Fifty-six papers were included in the analyses, see PRISMA flow diagram in Fig. 1. The included studies are summarised in Table 1 below. Based on the data available, there were 8177 unique participants in these studies and 66.79% were male. The mean age reported for the samples ranged from 22.3 to 59.35 with a composite mean age of 37.16 (SD = 9.58). Two studies selected people aged over 40 years for inclusion in their sample (Zisook et al., 1999; Mausbach et al., 2007). A further two studies did not report mean age or gender for their samples (Addington et al., 1994; Chemerinski et al., 2008) and one did not report mean age (Norman et al., 2015). Only 10 studies reported the ethnicity of the sample, with an average of 49.25% of participants identifying as belonging to a Black and Minority Ethnic (BAME) group. This



Fig. 1. PRISMA flow diagram.

composite ethnicity categorisation was compared to a composite category of 'white' for the purposes of the meta-analysis to maximise power. Thirty-four of the studies included in the analyses only included people with a diagnosis of schizophrenia. Of the 23 studies that did include people with schizoaffective disorder, only 10 reported the percentage of their sample that had this diagnosis, with a mean of 16.12%. The majority of studies included mixed inpatient and outpatient participants and three studies included people solely from an inpatient setting. Three studies reported findings from participants experiencing their first or second episode of psychosis.

#### Quality ratings of studies

The quality scores are listed in Table 1. Studies generally scored moderate-high for selection of the sample with the majority recruiting from a wide pool of participants. Studies scored lower in this area when they sampled from clinic, service or ward only or their recruitment procedure was not described clearly. Studies did not consistently report subscales for the negative symptom measures used and this prevented them from achieving the full score in this section. The lower scores in the analysis section were given to studies which did not account for multiple correlational analyses in their analysis or significance levels.

Table 1. Table of Included Studies

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291719002381 Published online by Cambridge University Press

1     Control et al. [2011)     62     62     44.7 (M, M)     Y (M)     BDD     13 (11.0)     CMM     Degree 56 (6.0) (MAP = 20.41 (12.9)     Percent (12.0)	Study	Authors and publication year	Ν	% Male	Mean age (SD)	SZA disorder included (Y/N, %)	Depression scale(s)	Depression severity mean (SD)	Negative symptom scale (s)	Negative symptom severity mean (SD)	Correlation (r value)	p Value	Quality score (0–15)
2     6mt and Beck (2009)     55     65     36.9     Y (9)     8D     13 [11.5)     SAMS     23.7 (2.21)     0.20     r.006     10       3     Uurward ed. (2009)     1.1     3     5.8     38.9 (2.1)     Y     CDSS     7.76 (2.7)     PAMSS Neg     2.0.07 (7.1)     0.01     -0.05     10       4     Genta and Beck (2000)     1.4     8.07     5.3.3 (0.5)     Y (10)     NAM     NAMSS Neg     1.0.7 (2.0)     2.0     2.0     7.0     7     Feenan et al. (2000)     1.0.7     2.0     7.0     Y     MAMS     1.0.1 (7.2)     PAMSS Neg     1.0.4.75 (4.1)     0.00     1.1       4     Toddesch (2000)     1.67     1.7     7.5 (0.20)     Y (10)     MADS     1.4.6 (9.07)     PAMSS Neg     1.0.4.75 (4.1)     0.00     1.0.1       4     Toddesch (2000)     1.00     7.7     6.3     4.2.0 (1.0.1)     Y     MADS     1.4.6 (9.0.7)     PAMSS Neg     1.0.4.7.1     0.0.0     1.0.0     1.0.1     1.0.1     Y     MADS     2.0.1.1 <td>1</td> <td>Couture et al. (2011)</td> <td>62</td> <td>62.9</td> <td>46.7 (8.4)</td> <td>Y (39.5)</td> <td>CDSS</td> <td>2.85 (3.3)</td> <td>CAINS</td> <td>Expr = 5.6 (5.0) MAP = 23.8 (12.9)</td> <td>Expr = -0.08 MAP = 0.11</td> <td>&gt;0.05 &gt;0.05</td> <td>11</td>	1	Couture et al. (2011)	62	62.9	46.7 (8.4)	Y (39.5)	CDSS	2.85 (3.3)	CAINS	Expr = 5.6 (5.0) MAP = 23.8 (12.9)	Expr = -0.08 MAP = 0.11	>0.05 >0.05	11
1     Useredif et al (2019)     41     6.85     2.23 ()     V     CDSS     2.74 (4.2)     PAMSS-Meg     2.60 (7.10)     0.01     0.01     0.01       4     Genet and Peck (2019)     1.21     6.8     8.61 (1.1)     V (179)     IDI     7.11 (1.2.5)     SAMSS     PARSS-Meg     PARS     Mag     0.11     0.00     0.00       5     Reseman et al (2000)     1.07     2.0     2.03 (0.5.1)     V (1.0)     IMAD     0.01 (1.2.0)     PAMSS-Meg     IA.75 (7.4)     0.0.0     4.0.0       7     Freeman et al (2000)     1.07     2.00 (1.1)     VI     MADIS     2.1.0 (2.1)     PAMSS-Meg     1.0.1 (2.2)     C.24     1.0.0     4.0.0     1.0.0     1.0.0     1.0.0     1.0.0     1.0.0     1.0.0     VI     MADIS     2.1.0 (2.1)     PAMSS Meg     1.0.0 (2.4)     4.0.0     4.0.0     1.0.0     1.0.0     1.0.0     1.0.0     1.0.0     1.0.0     1.0.0     1.0.0     1.0.0     1.0.0     1.0.0     1.0.0     1.0.0     1.0.0     1.0.0     1.0.0	2	Grant and Beck (2009)	55	65	36.9 (9.9)	Y (9)	BDI	13 (11.5)	SANS	23.7 (12.1)	0.20	>0.05	10
4     Grant and Back (2010)     123     65.8     38.6 [12.1]     Y (17.9)     6D1     17.1 (12.5)     SANS     27.2 (11.9)     0.18     <0.05     10       5     Roseman et al. (2006)     144     80.87     52.33 (0.52)     Y (16.42)     CDSS     N.R     PANSS-Neg     N.R     0.11     >0.05     10       6     Musicach et al. (2007)     210     22     51.30 (7.54)     Y (11)     BD1     21.6 (1.6)     PANSS-Neg     12.0 (6.2)     .28     <0.001	3	Uzenoff et al. (2010)	41	58.5	22.3 (3.5)	Y	CDSS	3.78 (4.26)	PANSS-Neg	28.07 (7.10)	0.07	>0.05	10
5   Roseman et al. (2009)   144   80.87   52.33 (0.52)   Y (19)   HAMD   10.31 (7.26)   PANSS-Neg   14.75 (4.74)   0.34   ~0.05   9     6   Musubach et al. (2007)   210   23   51.30 (7.54)   Y (19)   HAMD   10.31 (7.26)   PANSS-Neg   12.0 (6.2)   2.8   ~0.001   11     7   Preeman et al. (2006)   187   72   37.5 (10.3)   Y (11)   BDI   21.6 (1.3.0)   PANSS-Neg   22.4 (10.5)   0.25   ~0.05   10     9   Fitzgerald et al. (2002)   309   64.1   34.05 (10.5)   Y   MADRS   14.6 (0.07)   PANSS-Neg   12.4 (10.4)   0.54   ~0.001   8     11   Muller et al. (2002)   57   63   42.9 (1.13)   Y (7)   CDS   9 (6.3)   PANSS-Neg   12.4 (7.4)   0.54   ~0.001   8     12   Brebion et al. (2001)   40   70   34.1 (11.1)   Y   HAMAD   8 (5.2)   SANS   6.6 (5.3)   0.01   4.05   9     13   Prevalue et al. (2000)   137   70   25.6 (3.1)   N	4	Grant and Beck (2010)	123	65.8	38.6 (12.1)	Y (17.9)	BDI	17.1 (12.5)	SANS	27.2 (11.9)	0.18	<0.05	10
6   Mausbach et al. (2007)   2.0   2.3   51.30 (7.54)   Y (19)   MAM-0   10.31 (7.26)   PANS5-Neg   14.75 (4.74)   0.34   -0.05   9     7   Foreman et al. (2006)   187   7.7   37.5 (10.9)   Y (11)   BDI   21.6 (13.0)   PANS5-Neg   21.0 (6.2)   2.8   4.00   0.00   10     8   Todarello et al. (2007)   3.9   4.1   Aboto 10.0   Y   MADS   21.9 (8.3)   PANS5-Neg   13.5   0.40   -0.00   12     9   Filtgreind et al. (2002)   7.6   4.24 (1.10)   Y   MADS   9.05.3   PANS5-Neg   13.4 (7.4)   0.4   -0.00   12     10   Maller et al. (2002)   10   7.2   2.49 (7.8)   Y (7.3)   CDS   2.41 (3.1)   SANS   3.44 (4.3)   0.44   -0.001   10.0     12   Brobin et al. (2002)   13   7.5   2.23 (2.29)   Y (1.0)   MADS   SANS   3.44 (4.3)   0.04   -0.001   10.0   10.0   10.0   10.0   10.0   10.0   10.0   10.0   10.0   10.0   10	5	Roseman et al. (2008)	144	80.87	52.33 (0.52)	Y (36.42)	CDSS	NR	PANSS-Neg	NR	0.11	>0.05	10
r     reama et al. (2009)     187     72     375. (10.9)     Y (11)     BD     21.6 (13.0)     PMNSS-Neg     21.0 (8.2)     22     -0.001     11       8     Todarello et al. (2007)     39     75.0     33.1 (10.9)     Y     MADRS     21.9 (8.3)     PMNSS-Neg     23.6 (10.5)     22.6 -0.00     12.0       9     Filtgarial et al. (2002)     30     64.1     34.05 (10.9)     Y     MADRS     14.6 (9.7)     PMNSS-Neg     18.8 (14.0)     0.40     -0.00     12.0       10     Maller et al. (2002)     10     72     24.9 (7.8)     Y (7.3)     CDSS     3.3 (3.7)     SMNS     8.4 (4.3)     0.34     -0.05     1.0       12     Brebin et al. (2001)     40     70     SA.11     Y     MADR     8.52     SAMS     8.4 (4.3)     0.34     -0.01     0.02     1.0     4.0     0.55     2.4 (1.1)     SMNS     8.4 (4.3)     3.4     -0.03     1.0     SAMS     8.4 (3.1)     8.4 (3.3)     0.34     -0.01     0.05     1.0     SAMS	6	Mausbach et al. (2007)	210	23	51.30 (7.54)	Y (19)	HAM-D	10.31 (7.26)	PANSS-Neg	14.75 (4.74)	0.34	<0.05	9
Image: Participant of all (2005)     Image: Participant of all (2002)     Image: Paritipant of all (2002)     Image: Participant of al	7	Freeman et al. (2006)	187	72	37.5 (10.9)	Y (11)	BDI	21.6 (13.0)	PANSS-Neg	21.0 (6.2)	.28	<0.001	11
9     Fitzgenid et al. (2002)     309     641     34.05 (1).05     Y     MARRS     1.4.6 (207)     PANSS-Neg     1.8.4 (7.4)     0.40     4.00.01     8       10     Muller et al. (2002)     57     63     4.2.9 (1).8     Y (7)     CDSS     9 (6.3)     PANSS-Neg     1.8.4 (7.4)     0.40     40.01     8       11     Maller et al. (2002)     10     72     2.4.9 (7.8)     Y (7.3)     CDSS     2.4 (3.1)     SANS     8.4 (4.3)     0.44     4.0.5     4.001     4.0.5     4.001     4.0.5     1.0     A.0.5     4.0.01     4.0.5     1.0     A.0.5     4.0.01     4.0.5     1.0     A.0.5     4.0.01     4.0.5     4.0.5     4.0.1     4.0.5     4.0.5     4.0.1     4.0.5     4.0.5     4.0.1     4.0.5     4.0.5     4.0.1     5.2.7 (2.7.7)     0.13     6.1.5     3.1.6     N     CDSS     7.5 (3.1)     PANSS-Neg     3.2.9 (4.21)     0.0.1     4.0.5     4.0.01     4.0.5     4.0.01     4.0.5     4.0.01     4.0.5     4.0.1	8	Todarello <i>et al</i> . (2005)	29	75.9	39.1 (10.9)	Y	MADRS	21.9 (8.3)	PANSS-Neg	28.4 (10.5)	0.25	>0.05	10
10     Muller et al. (2002)     57     63     42.9 (11.8)     Y (7)     CDSS     9 (6.3)     PANSS-Neg     18.4 (7.4)     0.54     -0.00     8       11     Malle et al. (2002)     110     72     24.9 (7.8)     Y (7.3)     CDSS     3.3 (37)     SANS     102 (2.5)     Maller - 0.4     0.00     Maller - 0.4       12     Brebion et al. (2001)     40     70     3.41 (11.1)     Y     HAMD     8 (5.2)     SANS     8.4 (4.3)     0.44     -0.05     9       13     Persita et al. (2000)     138     76.8     2.32 (5.26)     Y (10.1)     MADRS     NR     PANSS-Neg     NR     0.51     -0.01     2.05     9     1.01     1.02     PANSS Neg     3.3 (9.1)     0.33     0.01     -0.05     9     5.37 (6.1)     PANSS Neg     3.23 (9.1)     0.03     PANSS Neg     1.25 (5.8)     0.21     -0.05     1.0       14     Ancon et al. (2000)     45     5.2     3.3 (1.1)     N     CDSS     7.5 (5.1)     PANSS Neg     3.4 (4.2)     0.02	9	Fitzgerald et al. (2002)	309	64.1	34.05 (10.6)	Y	MADRS	14.6 (9.07)	PANSS-Neg	19.55	0.40	= 0.000	12
11   Malla et ol. (2002)   110   72   24.9 (7.8)   Y (7.3)   CDSS   3.3 (3.7)   SANS   102 (2.5)   Expr = 0.20 MAP = 0.42   >0.05   13     12   Brebion et al. (2001)   40   70   34.1 (11.1)   Y   HAMD   8 (5.2)   SANS   8.4 (4.3)   0.3   4.00   9     13   Peratta et al. (2000)   47   70   25.9 (9.1)   Y (4)   CDSS   2.4 (3.1)   SANS   6.6 (5.3)   0.01   -0.05   9     14   Wolthaus et al. (2000)   138   76.8   23.2 (5.2)   Y (0.1)   MADRS   NR   PANSS-Neg   NR   0.13   0.01   -0.05   9     15   Zisook et al. (1999)   60   50   59.35 (10)   N   CDSS   7.5 (5.1)   PANSS-Neg   12.5 (5.8)   0.21   >0.05   9     16   Peratta and Cuesta (1999)   45   63.6   31.6 (12.8)   N   CDSS   7.5 (5.1)   PANSS-Neg   12.5 (5.8)   0.01   >0.05   9     17   Lancon et al. (2000)   45   52   33.9 (11.7)   N   CDSS	10	Muller <i>et al</i> . (2002)	57	63	42.9 (11.8)	Y (7)	CDSS	9 (6.3)	PANSS-Neg	18.4 (7.4)	0.54	<0.001	8
12     Brebion et al. (2001)     40     70     34.1 (11.1)     Y     HAM-D     8 (5.2)     SANS     8.4 (4.3)     0.34     <0.05     10       13     Peralta et al. (2000)     13     76     26.9 (3.1)     Y (4)     CDSS     2.4 (3.1)     SANS     6.6 (5.3)     0.01     <0.05	11	Malla et al. (2002)	110	72	24.9 (7.8)	Y (7.3)	CDSS	3.3 (3.7)	SANS	10.2 (2.5)	Expr = 0.20 MAP = 0.42	>0.05 <0.001	13
13     Peralta et al. (2000)     47     70     26.9 (9.1)     Y (4)     CDSS     2.4 (3.1)     SANS     6.6 (5.3)     0.01     -0.05     9       14     Wolthaus et al. (2000)     138     76.8     23.2 (5.26)     Y (10.1)     MADRS     NR     PANSS-Neg     NR     0.51     -0.001     12       15     Zisook et al. (1999)     60     50     59.35 (10)     N     HAM-D     10.35 (5.73)     SANS     8.39 (4.91)     0.33     0.01     -0.05     9       16     Peralta and Cuesta (1999)     45     63.6     31.6 (12.8)     N     CDSS     3.6 (4.8)     PANSS-Neg     12.5 (5.8)     0.21     -0.05     9       17     Lancon et al. (2000)     95     62     33.9 (11.7)     N     CDSS     7.5 (5.1)     PANSS-Neg     24.7 (5.6)     -0.01     -0.05     10     0.12     >0.05     0.02     >0.05     0.02     >0.05     0.02     >0.05     0.02     >0.05     0.02     >0.05     0.02     >0.05     0.02     >0.05	12	Brebion et al. (2001)	40	70	34.1 (11.1)	Y	HAM-D	8 (5.2)	SANS	8.4 (4.3)	0.34	<0.05	10
14     Wolthaus et al. (2000)     138     7.6.8     2.3.2 (5.26)     Y (10.1)     MADRS     NR     PANSS-Neg     NR     0.51     -0.01     12       15     Zisook et al. (1999)     60     50     59.35 (10)     N     HAM-D     10.35 (5.73)     SANS BPRS-Neg     8.39 (4.91) 5.27 (2.77)     0.13     0.01     0.15     0.15       16     Peralta and Cuesta (1999)     45     63.6     31.6 (12.8)     N     CDSS     3.6 (4.8)     PANSS-Neg     12.5 (5.8)     0.21     >0.05     9       17     Lancon et al. (2000)     95     62     33.9 (11.7)     N     CDSS     7.5 (5.1)     PANSS-Neg     24.7 (5.6)     0.01     >0.05     10       18     Brebion et al. (2000)     40     70     3.41 (11.1)     N     HDRS     18.1 (5.6)     PANSS     8.63 (6.7)     0.19     >0.05     0.09     >0.05     0.09     >0.05     0.09     >0.05     0.09     >0.05     0.09     >0.05     0.09     >0.05     0.09     >0.05     0.09     >0.05 <td>13</td> <td>Peralta et al. (2000)</td> <td>47</td> <td>70</td> <td>26.9 (9.1)</td> <td>Y (4)</td> <td>CDSS</td> <td>2.4 (3.1)</td> <td>SANS</td> <td>6.6 (5.3)</td> <td>0.01</td> <td>&lt;0.05</td> <td>9</td>	13	Peralta et al. (2000)	47	70	26.9 (9.1)	Y (4)	CDSS	2.4 (3.1)	SANS	6.6 (5.3)	0.01	<0.05	9
15   Zisook et al. (1999)   60   50   59.3 5 (10)   N   HAM-D   10.35 (5.73)   SANS BPRS-Neg   8.39 (4.91) 5.27 (2.77)   0.33   0.01 0.15   10     16   Perata and Cuesta (1999)   45   63.6   31.6 (12.8)   N   CDSS   3.6 (4.8)   PANSS-Neg   12.5 (5.8)   0.21   >0.05   9     17   Lancon et al. (2000)   95   62   33.9 (11.7)   N   CDSS   7.5 (5.1) MADRS   PANSS-Neg   24.7 (5.6)   -0.01   >0.05   10     18   Brebion et al. (2000)   40   70   34.1 (11.1)   N   HDRS   7.98 (5.17)   PANSS-Neg   16.3 (6.7) 8.39 (4.21)   0.19   >0.05   10     19   Kontaxakis et al. (2000)   40   70   34.1 (11.1)   N   HDRS   18.11 (5.4)   PANSS-Neg   NR   0.19   >0.05   10     20   Baynes et al. (2000)   120   76   39 (9.95)   N   HDRS   18.11 (5.4)   PANS   51.1(18.4)   0.11   >0.05   13     21   Kilzeih et al. (2003)   43   97.7   43.05 (7.05)	14	Wolthaus et al. (2000)	138	76.8	23.2 (5.26)	Y (10.1)	MADRS	NR	PANSS-Neg	NR	0.51	<0.001	12
16     Peralta and Cuesta (1999)     45     63.6     31.6 (12.8)     N     CDSS     3.6 (4.8)     PANSS-Neg     12.5 (5.8)     0.21     >-0.05     9       17     Lancon et al. (2000)     95     62     3.3.9 (1.17)     N     CDSS     7.5 (5.1)     PANSS-Neg     24.7 (5.6)     -0.01     >-0.05     0.02     >-0.05     0.02     >-0.05     0.02     >-0.05     0.02     >-0.05     0.02     >-0.05     0.02     >-0.05     0.02     >-0.05     0.02     >-0.05     0.02     >-0.05     0.02     >-0.05     0.02     >-0.05     0.02     >-0.05     0.02     >-0.05     0.02     >-0.05     0.02     >-0.05     0.02     >-0.05     0.02     >-0.05     0.02     >-0.05     0.03     -0.05     0.03     -0.05<	15	Zisook <i>et al</i> . (1999)	60	50	59.35 (10)	Ν	HAM-D	10.35 (5.73)	SANS BPRS-Neg	8.39 (4.91) 5.27 (2.77)	0.33 0.19	0.01 0.15	10
17   Lancon et al. (2000)   95   62   3.3.9 (11.7)   N   CDSS MADRS HDRS   7.5 (5.1) 17.9 (9.1)   PANSS-Neg   2.4.7 (5.6)   -0.01 0.12   >0.05 >0.05   >0.05     18   Brebion et al. (2000)   40   70   34.1 (11.1)   N   HDRS   18.1 (6.5)   PANSS   16.3 (6.7) 8.39 (4.32)   0.19   >0.05   0.00   >0.05   0.00   >0.05   0.05<	16	Peralta and Cuesta (1999)	45	63.6	31.6 (12.8)	Ν	CDSS	3.6 (4.8)	PANSS-Neg	12.5 (5.8)	0.21	>0.05	9
18   Brebion et al. (2000)   40   70   34.1 (11.1)   N   HDRS   7.98 (5.17)   PANSS SANS   16.3 (6.7) 8.39 (4.32)   0.19 0.35   >0.05   10     19   Kontaxakis et al. (2000a, 2000b)   64   60.9   30.3 (8.9)   N   HDRS CDSS   18.11 (5.46) 5.67 (5.13)   PANSS-Neg   NR   0.19 0.09   >0.05   9     20   Baynes et al. (2000)   120   76   39 (9.95)   N   BDI HDRS   16.1(5.8) 12.65(6.7)   SANS   51.1(18.4)   0.11   >0.05   13     21   Kilzeih et al. (2003)   43   97.7   43.05 (7.05)   N   HDRS   18.3 (8.8)   SANS   51.2(17.41)   0.19   >0.05   10     22   Bottlender et al. (2003)   33   66.67   32.15 (9.12)   N   MADRS   18.3 (8.8)   SANS   55.5 (24.4)   0.15   0.41   10     23   Rocca et al. (2005)   78   59   36.13 (8.93)   N   CDSS   3.77(3.0)   PANSS-Neg   NR   0.14   0.03   9     24   Chemerinski et al. (2008)   230   NR   NR <t< td=""><td>17</td><td>Lancon <i>et al</i>. (2000)</td><td>95</td><td>62</td><td>33.9 (11.7)</td><td>Ν</td><td>CDSS MADRS HDRS</td><td>7.5 (5.1) 17.9 (9.1) 18.1 (6.5)</td><td>PANSS-Neg</td><td>24.7 (5.6)</td><td>-0.01 0.12 0.02</td><td>&gt;0.05 &gt;0.05 &gt;0.05</td><td>10</td></t<>	17	Lancon <i>et al</i> . (2000)	95	62	33.9 (11.7)	Ν	CDSS MADRS HDRS	7.5 (5.1) 17.9 (9.1) 18.1 (6.5)	PANSS-Neg	24.7 (5.6)	-0.01 0.12 0.02	>0.05 >0.05 >0.05	10
19   Kontaxakis et al. (2000a, 2000b)   64   60.9   30.3 (8.9)   N   HDRS CDSS   18.11 (5.46) 5.67 (5.13)   PANSS-Neg   NR   0.19 0.99   >0.05   9     20   Baynes et al. (2000)   120   76   39 (9.95)   N   BDI HDRS   16.1(5.8) 12.65(6.7)   SANS   51.1(18.4)   0.11 0.35   <0.05	18	Brebion et al. (2000)	40	70	34.1 (11.1)	Ν	HDRS	7.98 (5.17)	PANSS SANS	16.3 (6.7) 8.39 (4.32)	0.19 0.35	>0.05 <0.05	10
20   Baynes et al. (2000)   120   76   39 (9.95)   N   BDI HDRS   16.1(5.8) 12.65(6.7)   SANS   51.1(18.4)   0.11 0.35   >0.05 <0.001   13     21   Kilzeih et al. (2003)   43   97.7   43.05 (7.05)   N   HDRS   6.84 (4.25)   SANS   62.23 (17.41)   0.19   >0.05   10     22   Bottlender et al. (2003)   33   66.67   32.15 (9.12)   N   MADRS   18.3 (8.8)   SANS   55.5 (24.4)   0.15   0.41   10     23   Rocca et al. (2005)   78   59   36.13 (8.93)   N   CDSS   3.77(3.0)   PANSS-Neg   17.1 (9.52)   0.42   <0.001	19	Kontaxakis <i>et al</i> . (2000a, 2000b)	64	60.9	30.3 (8.9)	Ν	HDRS CDSS	18.11 (5.46) 5.67 (5.13)	PANSS-Neg	NR	0.19 0.09	>0.05 >0.05	9
21   Kilzeih et al. (2003)   43   97.7   43.05 (7.05)   N   HDRS   6.84 (4.25)   SANS   62.23 (17.41)   0.19   >0.05   10     22   Bottlender et al. (2003)   33   66.67   32.15 (9.12)   N   MADRS   18.3 (8.8)   SANS   55.5 (24.4)   0.15   0.41   10     23   Rocca et al. (2005)   78   59   36.13 (8.93)   N   CDSS   3.77(3.0)   PANSS-Neg   17.1 (9.52)   0.42   <0.001	20	Baynes et al. (2000)	120	76	39 (9.95)	Ν	BDI HDRS	16.1(5.8) 12.65(6.7)	SANS	51.1(18.4)	0.11 0.35	>0.05 <0.001	13
22   Bottlender et al. (2003)   33   66.67   32.15 (9.12)   N   MADRS   18.3 (8.8)   SANS   55.5 (24.4)   0.15   0.41   10     23   Rocca et al. (2005)   78   59   36.13 (8.93)   N   CDSS   3.77(3.0)   PANSS-Neg   17.1 (9.52)   0.42   <0.001	21	Kilzeih et al. (2003)	43	97.7	43.05 (7.05)	Ν	HDRS	6.84 (4.25)	SANS	62.23 (17.41)	0.19	>0.05	10
23     Rocca et al. (2005)     78     59     36.13 (8.93)     N     CDSS     3.77(3.0)     PANSS-Neg     17.1 (9.52)     0.42     <0.01     10       24     Chemerinski et al. (2008)     230     NR     NR     N     BDI     11.5 (9.6)     PANSS-Neg     NR     0.14     0.03     9       25     Schennach-Wolff et al. (2011)     249     61     34.1 (11.09)     N     CDSS     6.97(2.49)     PANSS-Neg     19.07(7.13)     0.29     NR     9       26     Rabany et al. (2011)     240     73.3     36.99 (12.21)     N     CDSS     3.16 (3.61)     PANSS-Neg     27.38 (4.69)     -0.184     0.012     11	22	Bottlender et al. (2003)	33	66.67	32.15 (9.12)	Ν	MADRS	18.3 (8.8)	SANS	55.5 (24.4)	0.15	0.41	10
24     Chemerinski et al. (2008)     230     NR     NR     N     BDI     11.5 (9.6)     PANSS-Neg     NR     0.14     0.03     9       25     Schennach-Wolff et al. (2011)     249     61     34.1 (11.09)     N     CDSS     6.97(2.49)     PANSS-Neg     19.07(7.13)     0.29     NR     9       26     Rabany et al. (2011)     240     73.3     36.99 (12.21)     N     CDSS     3.16 (3.61)     PANSS-Neg     27.38 (4.69)     -0.184     0.012     11	23	Rocca et al. (2005)	78	59	36.13 (8.93)	Ν	CDSS	3.77(3.0)	PANSS-Neg	17.1 (9.52)	0.42	<0.001	10
25   Schennach-Wolff <i>et al.</i> (2011)   249   61   34.1 (11.09)   N   CDSS   6.97(2.49)   PANSS-Neg   19.07(7.13)   0.29   NR   9     26   Rabany <i>et al.</i> (2011)   240   73.3   36.99 (12.21)   N   CDSS   3.16 (3.61)   PANSS-Neg   27.38 (4.69)   -0.184   0.012   11	24	Chemerinski <i>et al</i> . (2008)	230	NR	NR	Ν	BDI	11.5 (9.6)	PANSS-Neg	NR	0.14	0.03	9
26     Rabany et al. (2011)     240     73.3     36.99 (12.21)     N     CDSS     3.16 (3.61)     PANSS-Neg     27.38 (4.69)     -0.184     0.012     11	25	Schennach-Wolff et al. (2011)	249	61	34.1 (11.09)	Ν	CDSS	6.97(2.49)	PANSS-Neg	19.07(7.13)	0.29	NR	9
	26	Rabany et al. (2011)	240	73.3	36.99 (12.21)	Ν	CDSS	3.16 (3.61)	PANSS-Neg	27.38 (4.69)	-0.184	0.012	11

(Continued)

Table 1. (Continued.)

Study	Authors and publication year	Ν	% Male	Mean age (SD)	SZA disorder included (Y/N, %)	Depression scale(s)	Depression severity mean (SD)	Negative symptom scale (s)	Negative symptom severity mean (SD)	Correlation (r value)	p Value	Quality score (0–15)
27	Addington et al. (1994)	150	NR	NR	Ν	CDSS	4.1(4.28)	PANSS-Neg	20.15(4.84)	0.27	<0.01	10
28	McAdams et al. (1996)	101	77	58.5 (9.7)	Ν	HDRS	9.6 (6.1)	SANS	8.2 (4.8)	0.50	<0.05	10
29	Addington et al. (1996)	89	60	35.3 (10.3)	Ν	CDSS HDRS	6.49 (3.31) NR	PANSS-Neg	20.2 (9.6)	-0.03 0.08	>0.05 >0.05	8
30	Collins <i>et al</i> . (1996)	37	75.6	32.33 (8.81)	Ν	HDRS CDSS	NR	PANSS-Neg	NR	0.453 0.228	<0.005 >0.05	9
31	Nakaya <i>et al.</i> (1997)	89	45	31.19 (9.6)	Ν	HDRS	16.5 (7.3)	PANSS	23.9 (4.7)	0.20	>0.05	13
32	Collins et al. (1996)	58	77.6	34.10 (8.01)	Ν	CDSS	5.40 (4.32)	PANSS-Neg	18.74 (7.37)	0.178	>0.05	8
33	Norman et al. (1998)	60	68.3	38.8	Ν	BDI HRSD	12.37 6.00	SANS	34.87	0.15 0.15	>0.05 p > 0.05	10
34	Haug et al. (2016)	55	51	25.2 (7.3)	Y	CDSS	9.1 (6.0)	PANSS-Neg	14.1 (6.7)	-0.289	0.032	10
35	Norman et al. (2015)	127	78.7	NR	Y	CDSS	NR	SANS	NR	Expr: 0.30 MAP: 0.37	<0.01 <0.01	10
36	Fervaha <i>et al</i> . (2015)	62	67.7	26.3 (3.9)	Ν	CDSS	1.8 (2.7)	SANS	11.5 (6.7)	0.21	>0.05	10
37	Bozikas <i>et al</i> . (2016)	48	62.5	32.81 (7.74)	Y	CDSS	5.21 (4.26)	PANSS-Neg	15.38 (6.76)	0.404	<0.01	12
38	Kjelby et al. (2014)	124	68.5	37.2 (13.1)	Y	CDSS	5.44 (4.8)	PANSS-Neg	20.6 (7.95)	0.15	<0.05	10
39	Alessandrini et al. (2016)	271	70.8	36.1 (11.9)	Ν	CDSS	4.2 (4.4)	PANSS-Neg	20 (8.0)	0.17	>0.05	11
40	Best et al. (2014)	136	73.5	56.08 (9.23)	Y	BDI	NR	PANSS-Neg	NR	0.21	0.019	10
41	DeRosse et al. (2014)	184	69.02	40.98 (11.07)	Y	HRSD	11.59 (7.65)	SANS	29.01 (12.54)	0.32	<0.001	8
42	Fervaha <i>et al</i> . (2014)	1427	74.2	40.6 (11.1)	Ν	CDSS	4.6 (4.4)	PANSS-Neg	19.3 (6.7)	0.18	<0.001	11
43	Ricarte et al. (2014)	31	80.6	38.5 (10.6)	Ν	BDI	13.03 (8.39)	PANSS-Neg	13.41 (3.83)	0.15	>0.05	9
44	Rabany et al. (2013)	184	74.5	36.37 (12.58)	Ν	CDSS	3.17 (3.61)	PANSS-Neg	27.30 (4.52)	-0.189	0.01	9
45	Lin <i>et al</i> . (2013)	302	61.3	38.17 (9.48)	Ν	HDRS	5.89 (4.20)	SANS	50.42 (15.97)	0.265	<0.001	11
46	Tapp <i>et al</i> . (2001)	104	65	30 (9)	Ν	HDRS	13.5 (4.14)	SANS	NR	0.47	<0.0001	10
47	Roche <i>et al</i> . (2010)	67	70.1	25 (9.78)	Ν	CDSS	2.16 (3.07)	PANSS-Neg	NR	0.005	>0.05	9
48	Kring <i>et al.</i> (2013)	162	57	46.8 (9.5)	Y	CDSS	2.7 (3.0)	CAINS SANS BPRS-Neg	NR	Expr:0.15 MAP: 0.13 0.25 0.05	>0.05 >0.05 <0.01 >0.05	11
49	Llerena et al. (2013)	37	64.9	50.16 (5.12)	Y	CDSS	1.11 (1.88)	MAP-SR	NR	0.13	>0.05	10
50	Kontaxakis et al. (2000b)	64	61	30.3 (8.9)	Ν	CDSS	5.67 (5.13)	PANSS-Neg	20.22 (8.84)	0.123	>0.05	10
51	Sarro et al. (2004)	93	60.2	37.2 (10.4)	Ν	CDSS	4.1 (4.4)	PANSS-Neg	19.8 (8.9)	0.239	<0.01	10
52	Polat Nazli <i>et al</i> . (2016)	65	76	34.6 (8.3)	Ν	CDSS	2.5 (3.8)	BNSS	29.4 (17.6)	-0.013	0.91	11

(Continued)

Study	Authors and publication year	z	% Male	Mean age (SD)	SZA disorder included (Y/N, %)	Depression scale(s)	Depression severity mean (SD)	Negative symptom scale (s)	Negative symptom severity mean (SD)	Correlation (r value)	<i>p</i> Value	Quality score (0-15)
53	Engel and Lincoln (2016)	50	56	35.7 (10.36)	٨	BDI	16.37 (7.30)	MAP-SR	25.93 (10.39)	0.39	<0.001	11
54	Valiente-Gomez <i>et al.</i> (2015)	100	74	40.98 (12.5)	z	CDSS	3.12 (3.91)	CAINS-MAP CAINS-Expr CAINS Total	17.88 (8.69) 6.70 (3.60) 24.58 (11.1)	0.34 0.27 0.35	<0.01 <0.01 <0.01	11
55	Mucci et al. (2015)	912	69.8	40.1 (10.7)	z	CDSS	4.0 (4.0)	BNSS	NR	0.28	<0.00001	11
56	Kim <i>et al.</i> (2016)	139	54.7	38.9 (11.1)	z	CDSS	4.9 (4.9)	MAP-SR	NR	60.0	>0.05	11

#### Measures of negative symptoms

Four measures of negative symptoms were used in the studies included in the analysis; these are detailed in Table 1. The most commonly used assessment was the negative symptom subscale of the Positive and Negative Syndrome Scale (PANSS) (Kay et al., 1987) with 34 studies using this measure. The second most common was also an older measure of negative symptoms the Scale for the Assessment of Negative Symptoms (SANS) (Andreasen, 1989) with 17 studies using this measure. These measures are the most widely used which reflect the historical conceptualisation of primary and secondary negative symptoms. The newer measures - the Clinical Assessment Interview for Negative Symptoms (CAINS) (Forbes et al., 2010) (k=5) and the Brief Negative Symptom Scale (BNSS) (Kirkpatrick *et al.*, 2011) (k = 2) were used far less often in these studies. The most important differences in the newer measures are that they draw a distinction between expressive and experiential symptoms. Where these data were reported, expressive and experiential subscales from the CAINS, BNSS and SANS were analysed separately in the sub-group meta-analyses. Three is the minimum number of studies needed to conduct a robust sub-group analysis (Borenstein et al., 2010) and therefore the studies which solely used the BNSS were not analysed separately.

#### Measures of depression

Four measures of depression were used in the sample of studies included in the analyses; these are also detailed in Table 1. The most commonly used measure was the Calgary Depression Scale for Schizophrenia (CDSS, k = 34) (Addington *et al.*, 1990). This measure was designed specifically for use in this population and the scale was developed not to include items which overlap with negative symptoms and has been shown to reliably distinguish these two symptom clusters (Lako et al., 2012). The second most common measure was the Hamilton Depression Rating Scale (HDRS, k = 16) (Hamilton, 1960) which is a more general measure used in many different populations and includes many of the physical symptoms of depression. The other two measures used, the Beck Depression Inventory (BDI, k = 9) (Beck et al., 1988) and the Montgomery-Asberg Depression Rating Scale (MADRS, k = 5) (Williams and Kobak, 2008), were developed initially for the assessment of people with mood disorders and include the full range of depressive symptoms, including cognitive features such as hopelessness and low self-esteem.

#### Meta-analysis findings

(1) Is there a relationship between negative symptoms and depression in people with psychosis?

The meta-analysis testing the relationship between negative symptoms and depression showed a small but significant association between increased levels of reported negative symptoms and depressive symptoms in people with nonaffective psychosis [k = 56, pooled standardised effect size (SES) = 0.194, 95% CI 0.141–0.247, z = 7.20, p < 0.001] (see Fig. 2).

(2) Does this relationship vary according to depression or negative symptom measures or subscales used?

The relationship was consistently present across the subgroup analyses looking at each depression and negative symptoms measure. When the most common combination – PANSS Neg and CDSS – was examined, the effect size was also small but significant (k = 23, pooled ES = 0.135, 95% CI

Table 1. (Continued.)

Number		7 (05% 0)	%
Number		2_1(32%C)	weight
Couture et al, 2011		-0.03 (-0.28, 0.23)	1:60
Srant et al, 2009		0 20 (-0 07, 0 47)	1:53
Jzenoff et al, 2010		0.07 (-0.25, 0.39)	1153
Grant et al, 2010	i	0.18 (0.00, 0.36)	1:68
Roseman et al, 2008		0.11 (-0.05, 0.28)	2:05
Freeman et al. 2006		0.35 (0.22, 0.43)	2:15
Todarallo at al. 2005		- 0.25 (0.13, 0.43)	1:00
Fitzerald et al. 2002		0.42 (0.31 0.54)	2120
Muller et al. 2002		0.60 (0.34, 0.37)	1:55
Malla et al. 2002		0.32 (0.13.0.51)	1:93
Brebion et al. 2001		0.35 (0.03, 0.68)	1:51
Peralta et al. 2000		0.01 (-0.29 0.31)	1:42
Wolthaus et al, 2000	[ i  <del>   </del>	0.56 (0.39, 0.73)	2:03
Zisook et al, 1999		0.19 (-0.07, 0.45)	1:58
Peralta et al, 1999		0.21 (-0.09. 0.52)	1:59
Lancon et al, 2000		0.01 (-0.19 0.21)	1:85
Brebion et al, 2000		0.19 (-0.13, 0.51)	1251
Kontaxakis et al, 2000		0.09 (-0.16, 0.34)	1:62
Baynes et al, 2000		0.11 (-0.07, 0.29)	1:97
Kilzeih et al, 2003		0.19 (-0.12 0.50)	1:55
Bottlender et al, 2003	<b> +</b> ii	0.15 (-0.21, 0.51)	1:18
Rocca et al, 2005	1	- 0.45 (0.22, 0.67)	1174
Chemerinski et al, 2008		0.14 (0.01, 0.27)	2:22
Schennach-Wolff et al, 2011		0.30 (0.17, 0.42)	2:24
Rabany et al, 2011	<b>-</b>	-0.19 (-0.31, -0.05)	2:23
Addington et al, 1994		0.28 (0.12, 0.44)	2:07
McAdams et al, 1996		0.55 (0.35, 0.75)	1:88
Addington et al, 1996		-0.03 (-0.24, 0.18)	1:82
Collins et al, 1996		0.23 (-0.10, 0.57)	126
Nakaya et al, 1997	1	0.20 (-0.01, 0.41)	1:82
Collins et al, 1997		0.18 (-0.08, 0.44)	1:50
Norman et al, 1998		0.15 (-0.11 0.41)	1:08
Norman et al. 2016		-0.50 (-0.57, -0.05)	1:55
Feoraba et al. 2015		0.33 (0.13, 0.33)	1/60
Rozikas et al. 2016		0.43 (0.14.0.72)	1:44
Kielby et al. 2015		0.15 (-0.03 0.33)	1:68
Alessandrini et al. 2016		0.17 (0.05 0.29)	2225
Best et al. 2014		0.21 (0.04, 0.38)	2:02
DeRosse et al. 2014		0.33 (0.19, 0.48)	2114
Fervaha et al. 2014		0.18 (0.13, 0.23)	2:50
Ricarte et al. 2014		0.15 (-0.22 0.52)	1:13
Rabany et al, 2013		-0.19 (-0.34, -0.05)	2:14
un et al, 2013	- <b>*</b> i i	-0.27 (-0.38, -0.16)	2:29
Tapp et al, 2001	<del>  •</del>	0.51 (0.32, 0.71)	1:50
Roche et al, 2010		0.00 (-0.24, 0.25)	1(65
Kring et al, 2013		0.14 (-0.01, 0.30)	2:10
llerena et al, 2013		0.13 (-0.21, 0.47)	1226
Contaxakis et al, 2000b		0.12 (-0.13, 0.37)	1:62
Sarro et al, 2004	<b> ¦≑</b>	0.24 (0.04, 0.45)	1:84
Polat Nazli et al, 2016	<del>  • • • •</del>	-0.01 (-0.26, 0.24)	1:63
Engel et al, 2016		0.41 (0.13, 0.70)	1:45
aliente-Gomez et al, 2015		0.37 (0.17, 0.56)	1:88
Mucci et al, 2015		0.29 (0.22, 0.35)	2:47
(im et al, 2016		0.09 (-0.08, 0.26)	2:03
overall		0.19 (0.14, 0.25)	100.00
		. (415,634)	
	i i l'i i		
	525 0 .25 .5		

Fig. 2. Forest Plot of the relationship between negative and depressive symptoms. Main effect (95% Cls). Lines around main effect represents 95% prediction interval (-0.15 to 0.54) based on effect sizes included in the meta-analysis.

0.055-0.216, z = 3.29, p = 0.001). The expressive (k = 6, pooled ES = 0.189, 95% CI 0.090-0.288, z = 3.75, p < 0.001) and experiential (k = 12, pooled ES = 0.263, 95% CI 0.185-0.341, z = 6.58, p < 0.001) subscales also had small but significant relationships with measures of depression which was numerically larger for experiential subscales. However, the CIs for the pooled ESs slightly overlap, and so it is not possible to conclude whether there is a stronger relationship between depressive and experiential symptoms than alogia and blunted affect.

#### Heterogeneity analyses

The full sample included in the main effect analyses showed high levels of heterogeneity (p < 0.001,  $I^2 = 79.5\%$ ,  $\tau^2 = 0.0283$ ) as expected given the wide range of different measures used. The 95% prediction interval (-0.15 to 0.54) is displayed around the main effect size in the Forest Plot (see Fig. 2).

In line with this, the heterogeneity was lower in the sub-group analyses (see online Supplementary Material for full results), and for expressive (p = 0.216,  $I^2 = 29.3\%$ ,  $\tau^2 = 0.0308$ ) and experiential (p = 0.263,  $I^2 = 25.3\%$ ,  $\tau^2 = 0.007$ ) subscales, the heterogeneity was even lower and non-significant.

### Publication bias

Visual inspection of the funnel plots showed publication bias to be unlikely. This was confirmed by the Egger's and Begg's tests conducted which found no evidence of publication bias in the main effect analyses (Egger's p = 0.962, Begg's p = 0.772). This was consistent across the negative symptom (Egger's p = 0.138– 0.932, Begg's p = 0.621–1.0) and depression measures used (Egger's p = 0.224–0.687, Begg's p = 0.419–0.917).

(3) Is this relationship moderated by depressive or negative symptom severity?

Meta-regression analyses using the subset of the full sample that reported severity scores showed that the severity of depressive symptoms positively predicted a relationship with negative symptoms (k = 51, t = 2.08, p = 0.044). Negative symptom severity also predicted the association with depressive symptoms but in the opposite direction (k = 43, t = -2.45, p = 0.019). As these analyses included the whole sample, the heterogeneity was high ( $I^2$ res = 78.13%, 73.84%,  $\tau^2 = 0.02579$ , 0.02569) and thus the results should be considered with caution. This analysis was not repeated by specific measure sub-groups as the overall relationship was consistent across all measures when analysed separately. (4) Is this relationship moderated by the diagnosis of the sample,

quality of the study or demographic factors?

To investigate whether variables which differed between samples accounted for heterogeneity in findings, metaregression analyses were conducted for demographic data and study characteristics including those studies which reported these data (see Table 1). No significant results were found for age, gender or ethnicity (ts = 0.10-0.85, ps = 0.418-0.924). The proportion of the sample with schizoaffective disorder also did not significantly moderate the findings (t = 0.22, p = 0.829). The quality ratings for each study were also examined to assess whether they moderated the presence of an association between the measures, this analysis was non-significant (t = 0.51, p = 0.61).

#### Discussion

The findings confirm that there is a relationship between negative symptoms and depressive symptoms in people with non-affective psychosis. In the first large meta-analysis to examine this, with data from 56 studies and over 8000 unique participants, and across a range of measures, a clear pattern emerges showing that overall there is a small, significant relationship between depressive and negative symptoms. The relationship was consistent across measures, so it does not appear to be the result of measurement artefacts. The effect size did vary with the measure used, but not greatly. There were no significant moderating effects of demographic or quality variables suggesting it is robust and generalisable. A non-reciprocal relationship was highlighted in the findings - higher depression severity was linked to higher negative symptom severity but there was an inverse relationship in the other direction whereby higher negative symptom severity was linked to lower depression severity. All these findings support the hypothesis that this relationship is consistent with a symptom-specific approach and highlights the phenomenological overlap in the dimensions of depression and negative symptoms.

These findings support the model proposed in the recent review by Krynicki et al. (2018) which suggests that an overlapping, symptom-specific approach to these symptom categories may best represent their relationships. This approach allows the co-occurrence of specific symptoms in the dimensions, as suggested by the evidence. Depression may act as a driver of negative symptoms as proposed in cognitive models, which highlight the role of emotion in psychosis, e.g. Garety et al. (2001). This is also consistent with the secondary negative symptom conceptualisation, where depression drives the presentation of negative symptoms (Kirkpatrick, 2014). Indeed, the inverse reciprocal relationship found in this study supports the existence of primary negative symptoms which do not predict co-occurring depressive symptoms as highlighted in the work of Kirkpatrick and Carpenter (Kirkpatrick et al., 2006; Kirkpatrick and Galderisi, 2008). A recent factor analysis concluded that a five-factor not two-factor solution is more appropriate within the category of negative symptoms, providing further evidence supporting a symptom-specific approach (Strauss et al., 2018).

The sub-group analyses of negative symptom sub-domains and depression suggested that, as expected, the experiential negative symptoms have phenomenological overlap with depression, with expressive symptoms appearing more distinct from depression. These symptoms of low motivation, apathy and anhedonia are present in the majority of *both* the negative and depressive symptom measures used in the studies in this meta-analysis. However, an important difference in anhedonia in depression and psychosis is not commonly assessed in these measures. A recent review highlights that people with psychosis do not experience a reduction in their capacity to experience pleasure (Strauss and Cohen, 2018), whereas this is commonly seen in people with depression and described as anhedonia. Unfortunately, the subscales reported in the depression measures included are not detailed enough to analyse this difference in our findings, but it should be considered in future research. Measures such as the CDSS have attempted to reduce phenomenological overlap by excluding experiential symptoms in their assessment of depression, but this may result in false negatives and could therefore lack validity. It seems from recent reviews of the area that suicidal ideation, pessimism and guilt are a more common characteristic of depression (Krynicki et al., 2018). Expressive symptoms, with poorer verbal and emotional expression, are more uniquely found in people experiencing negative symptoms (Kirkpatrick, 2014; Krynicki *et al.*, 2018).

Importantly, the findings were not moderated by demographic variables such as age, ethnicity and diagnosis suggesting the depression and negative symptom relationship is present across the population of people with schizophrenia-spectrum diagnoses. The quality ratings did not moderate the findings, although there was a limited range of scores because of the measure used and inclusion criteria applied to the studies. The lack of moderation by schizoaffective disorder is perhaps surprising as people with this diagnosis might be expected to report more symptoms related to mood. It therefore tentatively suggests that the overlap between depressive and negative symptoms is consistent across the diagnoses included.

The findings of the meta-regressions showed a non-reciprocal relationship between negative and depressive symptoms. As the severity of depressive symptoms increases, the more likely they are to demonstrate a positive association with negative symptoms. However, if a person reports more severe negative symptoms, the less likely they are to be related to depressive symptoms. This is a cross-sectional finding and hypotheses regarding a directional relationship are therefore speculative at this stage. As negative symptom severity increases, the person is more likely to experience expressive deficits and greater apathy or numbing of emotion. This may either limit their ability to report depressive symptoms or be protective against them. It is important to consider that depressive symptoms are more often self-reported, whereas negative symptoms are always interviewer-rated. This may explain this non-reciprocal relationship in terms of how symptoms are expressed in an interview - which may be more challenging for someone with severe negative symptoms. Negative symptoms may also be a less potent bridge to co-occurring depressive symptoms (Borsboom, 2017). The role of depressive symptoms in driving psychosis has been discussed previously (Garety et al., 2001; Sarkar et al., 2015) and it may be that this is a more potent route to co-occurring negative symptoms. A true symptom-specific approach would explore the phenomena associated with the concepts of 'depressive' and 'negative' symptoms across a broad population. Such an approach will assist with determining the factors contributing to the presenting symptoms, and specifically whether apparent negative symptoms are primary or secondary to depressive symptoms.

The main analysis and some of the sub-group analyses had high heterogeneity in the included studies which is a limitation of including different measures in the analysis, although this did increase power. Only two studies were excluded due to missing data; however, many studies did not report the sample demographics, with ethnicity data particularly lacking. Meta-analyses that consider symptoms are only as good as the measures of those symptoms used. Several studies did not report the measure total scores and so they could not be included in the meta-regressions, which limits these findings. More robust conclusions would have been possible with a greater number of studies in the sub-group analyses considering subscales of both negative (i.e. expressive and experiential) and depressive symptoms (e.g. behavioural, cognitive and somatic-affective symptoms). The role of positive and cognitive symptoms cannot be elucidated from the data available; future analyses may wish to include these data if possible to examine whether these difficulties play a moderating role in the relationship between depressive and negative symptoms. The narrow range of quality ratings provided

by the scale used may have limited the power of the moderation analysis. Future meta-analyses addressing these questions may wish to include a wider range of bibliographical sources, although this may increase heterogeneity.

These important findings tell us that depressive and negative symptoms can both be present in people with non-affective psychosis. This means both should be assessed using the most current and robust measures, and care should be taken to ensure the measure selected captures the full range of symptoms the person is experiencing. It follows that treatment for both depressive and negative symptoms might be indicated, although further research is required to explore whether this requires targeting the same or different causal mechanisms.

The findings highlight the importance of mood across the psychosis spectrum as proposed in several cognitive models of psychosis (Chadwick et al., 1996; Garety et al., 2001; Freeman et al., 2002; Birchwood, 2003). A symptom-specific approach to considering these difficulties in the context of fuzzy boundaries between diagnostic categories may have the greatest clinical utility (van Os and Reininghaus, 2016). Indeed, the findings of a recent factor-analysis suggest that negative symptoms are best conceptualised as five factors: blunted affect, alogia, anhedonia, avolition and asociality rather than the two expressive and experiential factors discussed previously (Strauss et al., 2018). Thus, it seems there is increasing evidence that each of these symptoms is best considered as a unique entity and subsequently each can be expected to have a different relationship with depressive symptoms. Although the findings of the review suggest that depressive and negative symptoms mirror each other, we are aware that there is a phenomenological complexity behind this and research focused on gaining a deeper understanding of these symptoms is required. This further work is needed to develop our theoretical understanding of the causes and maintenance factors underlying specific symptoms in order to improve therapeutic outcomes. Assessment of these individual symptoms is important, as the diagnostic and conceptual lines we have drawn so far appear to be more complex than we anticipated. The impact of these symptoms is at least as, if not more significant than any other group of symptoms and they are a priority for service users (Rose, 2014).

**Supplementary material.** The supplementary material for this article can be found at https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291719002381.

Acknowledgements. PAG acknowledges the support from the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Biomedical Research Centre of the South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust and King's College London. The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR, the Department of Health.

Conflict of interest. None.

#### References

- Addington D, Addington J and Schissel B (1990) A depression rating scale for schizophrenics. *Schizophrenia Research* **3**, 247–251.
- Addington D, Addington J and Maticka-Tyndale E (1994) Specificity of the Calgary Depression Scale for schizophrenics. *Schizophrenia Research* **11**, 239–244.
- Addington D, Addington J and Atkinson M (1996) A psychometric comparison of the Calgary depression scale for schizophrenia and the Hamilton depression rating scale. *Schizophrenia Research* **19**, 205–212.
- Alessandrini M, Lançon C, Fond G, Faget-Agius C, Richieri R, Faugere M, Metairie E, Boucekine M, Llorca PM, Auquier P and Boyer L (2016) A structural equation modelling approach to explore the determinants of quality of life in schizophrenia. *Schizophrenia Research* 171, 27–34.

- American Psychiatric Association (2013) Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, 5th Edn. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association.
- Amr M and Volpe FM (2013) Relationship between anhedonia and impulsivity in schizophrenia, major depression and schizoaffective disorder. Asian Journal of Psychiatry 6, 577–580.
- Andreasen NC (1989) The Scale for the Assessment of Negative Symptoms (SANS): conceptual and theoretical foundations. *British Journal of Psychiatry Supplement* 7, 49–58.
- Baynes D, Mulholland C, Cooper SJ, Montgomery RC, MacFlynn G, Lynch G, Kelly C and King DJ (2000) Depressive symptoms in stable chronic schizophrenia: prevalence and relationship to psychopathology and treatment. Schizophrenia Research 45, 47–56.
- Beck AT, Steer RA and Carbin MG (1988) Psychometric properties of the Beck Depression Inventory: twenty-five years of evaluation. *Clinical Psychology Review* 8, 77–100.
- Begg CB and Mazumdar M (1994) Operating characteristics of a rank correlation test for publication bias. *Biometrics* 50, 1088–1101.
- Berenbaum H, Kerns JG, Vernon LL and Gomez JJ (2008) Cognitive correlates of schizophrenia signs and symptoms: III. Hallucinations and delusions. Psychiatry Research 159, 163–166.
- Best MW, Gupta M, Bowie CR and Harvey PD (2014) A longitudinal examination of the moderating effects of symptoms on the relationship between functional competence and real world functional performance in schizophrenia. *Schizophrenia Research: Cognition* 1, 90–95.
- Birchwood M (2003) Pathways to emotional dysfunction in first-episode psychosis. The British Journal of Psychiatry 182, 373–375.
- Blanchard JJ, Horan WP and Brown SA (2001) Diagnostic differences in social anhedonia: a longitudinal study of schizophrenia and major depressive disorder. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology* 110, 363–371.
- Borenstein M, Hedges LV, Higgins JP and Rothstein HR (2009) Introduction to Meta-Analysis. Chichester, UK: Wiley.
- Borenstein M, Hedges LV, Higgins JP and Rothstein HR (2010) A basic introduction to fixed-effect and random-effects models for meta-analysis. *Research Synthesis Methods* 1, 97–111.
- Borsboom D (2017) A network theory of mental disorders. *World Psychiatry* 16, 5–13.
- Bottlender R, Sato T, Groll C, Jäger M, Kunze I and Möller HJ (2003) Negative symptoms in depressed and schizophrenic patients: how do they differ? *The Journal of Clinical Psychiatry* **64**, 954–958.
- Bozikas VP, Parlapani E, Holeva V, Skemperi E, Bargiota SI, Kirla D, Rera E and Garyfallos G (2016) Resilience in patients with recent diagnosis of a schizophrenia spectrum disorder. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease* 204, 578–584.
- Brébion G, Amador X, Smith M, Malaspina D, Sharif Z and Gorman JM (2000) Depression, psychomotor retardation, negative symptoms, and memory in schizophrenia. *Neuropsychiatry, Neuropsychology and Behavioural Neurology* 13, 177–183.
- Brébion G, Gorman J, Malaspina D, Sharif Z and Amador X (2001) Clinical and cognitive factors associated with verbal memory task performance in patients with schizophrenia. *The American Journal of Psychiatry* 158, 758–764.
- Buckley PF, Miller BJ, Lehrer DS and Castle DJ (2009) Psychiatric comorbidities and schizophrenia. *Schizophrenia Bulletin* **35**, 383–402.
- Chadwick PDJ, Birchwood MJ and Trower P (1996) Cognitive Therapy for Delusions, Voices and Paranoia. Chichester, UK: Wiley.
- Chemerinski E, Bowie C, Anderson H and Harvey PD (2008) Depression in schizophrenia: methodological artifact or distinct feature of the illness? *The Journal of Neuropsychiatry and Clinical Neurosciences* 20, 431–440.
- Collins AA, Remington G, Coulter K and Birkett K (1996) Depression in schizophrenia: a comparison of three measures. *Schizophrenia Research* **20**, 205–209.
- Couture SM, Blanchard JJ and Bennett ME (2011) Negative expectancy appraisals and defeatist performance beliefs and negative symptoms of schizophrenia. *Psychiatry Research* 189, 43–48.
- Deeks JJ, Altman DG and Bradburn MJ (2008) Statistical methods for examining heterogeneity and combining results from several studies in meta-

analysis. In Systematic Reviews in Health Care: Meta-Analysis in Context, 2nd Edn. pp. 285–312.

- **DeRosse P, Nitzburg GC, Kompancaril B and Malhotra AK** (2014) The relation between childhood maltreatment and psychosis in patients with schizophrenia and non-psychiatric controls. In Egger M, Smith DG and Altman DG, (eds), *Schizophrenia Research*. London, UK: BMJ Publishing Group, pp. 66–71.
- Dollfus S and Petit M (1995) Negative symptoms in schizophrenia: their evolution during an acute phase. *Schizophrenia Research* 17, 187–194.
- Edwards CJ, Cella M, Tarrier N and Wykes T (2015) Investigating the empirical support for therapeutic targets proposed by the temporal experience of pleasure model in schizophrenia: a systematic review. *Schizophrenia Research* **168**, 120–144.
- Egger M, Smith GD, Schneider M and Minder C (1997) Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. *British Medical Journal* **315**, 629–634.
- Engel M and Lincoln TM (2016) Motivation and Pleasure Scale-Self-Report (MAP-SR): validation of the German version of a self-report measure for screening negative symptoms in schizophrenia. *Comprehensive Psychiatry* 65, 110–115.
- Fervaha G, Foussias G, Agid O and Remington G (2014) Impact of primary negative symptoms on functional outcomes in schizophrenia. *European Psychiatry* 29, 449–455.
- Fervaha G, Foussias G, Takeuchi H, Agid O and Remington G (2015) Measuring motivation in people with schizophrenia. *Schizophrenia Research* 169, 423–426.
- Fitzgerald PB, Rolfe TJ, Brewer K, Filia K, Collins J, Filia S, Adams A, de Castella AR, Davey P and Kulkarni J (2002) Depressive, positive, negative and parkinsonian symptoms in schizophrenia. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry* **36**, 340–346.
- Forbes C, Blanchard JJ, Bennett M, Horan WP, Kring A and Gur R (2010) Initial development and preliminary validation of a new negative symptom measure: the Clinical Assessment Interview for Negative Symptoms (CAINS). *Schizophrenia Research* **124**, 36–42.
- Freeman D, Garety PA, Kuipers E, Fowler D and Bebbington PE (2002) A cognitive model of persecutory delusions. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology* 41, 331–347.
- Freeman D, Garety PA, Kuipers E, Colbert S, Jolley S, Fowler D, Dunn G and Bebbington PE (2006) Delusions and decision-making style: use of the Need for Closure Scale. *Behaviour Research and Therapy* 44, 1147–1158.
- Fried EI (2017) The 52 symptoms of major depression: lack of content overlap among seven common depression scales. *Journal of Affective Disorders* 208, 191–197.
- Garety PA, Kuipers E, Fowler D, Freeman D and Bebbington PE (2001) A cognitive model of the positive symptoms of psychosis. *Psychological Medicine* 31, 189–195.
- Grant PM and Beck AT (2009) Defeatist beliefs as a mediator of cognitive impairment, negative symptoms, and functioning in schizophrenia. *Schizophrenia Bulletin* 35, 798–806.
- Grant PM and Beck AT (2010) Asocial beliefs as predictors of asocial behavior in schizophrenia. *Psychiatry Research* 177, 65–70.
- Hamilton M (1960) A rating scale for depression. Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery, and Psychiatry 23, 56.
- Haug E, Øie MG, Andreassen OA, Bratlien U, Romm KL, Møller P and Melle I (2016) The association between anomalous self-experiences, selfesteem and depressive symptoms in first episode schizophrenia. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience* 10, 557.
- Kay SR, Feszbein A and Opler LA (1987) The positive and negative syndrome scale (PANSS) for schizophrenia. *Schizophrenia Bulletin* 13, 261–276.
- Kilzieh N, Ernst Wood A, Erdmann J, Raskind M and Tapp A (2003) Depression in Kraepelinian schizophrenia. Comprehensive Psychiatry 44, 1–6.
- Kim JS, Jang SK, Park SC, Yi JS, Park JK, Lee JS, Choi KH and Lee SH (2016) Measuring negative symptoms in patients with schizophrenia: reliability and validity of the Korean version of the Motivation and Pleasure scale-self-report. *Neuropsychiatric Disease and Treatment* 12, 1167.
- Kirkpatrick B (2014) Progress in the study of negative symptoms. Schizophrenia Bulletin 40, S101–S106.

- Kirkpatrick B and Galderisi S (2008) Deficit schizophrenia: an update. World Psychiatry 7, 143–147.
- Kirkpatrick B, Fenton WS, Carpenter Jr. WT and Marder SR (2006) The NIMH-MATRICS consensus statement on negative symptoms. *Schizophrenia Bulletin* **32**, 214–219.
- Kirkpatrick B, Strauss GP, Nguyen L, Fischer BA, Daniel DG, Cienfuegos A and Marder SR (2011) The Brief Negative Symptom Scale: psychometric properties. *Schizophrenia Bulletin* 37, 300–305.
- Kirschner M, Aleman A and Kaiser S (2016) Secondary negative symptoms a review of mechanisms, assessment and treatment. *Schizophrenia Research* **186**, 29–38.
- Kjelby E, Sinkeviciute I, Gjestad R, Kroken RA, Løberg E, Jørgensen H and Johnsen E (2014) Suicidality in schizophrenia spectrum disorders: the relationship to hallucinations and persecutory delusions. *Schizophrenia Research* 153, S169–S170.
- Kontaxakis VP, Havaki-Kontaxaki BJ, Stamouli SS, Margariti MM, Collias CT and Christodoulou GN (2000a) Comparison of four scales measuring depression in schizophrenic inpatients. *European Psychiatry* 15, 274–277.
- Kontaxakis VP, Havaki-Kontaxaki BJ, Margariti MM, Stamouli SS, Kollias CT, Angelopoulos EK and Christodoulou GN (2000b) The Greek version of the Calgary depression scale for schizophrenia. *Psychiatry Research* 94, 163–171.
- Kring AM, Gur RE, Blanchard JJ, Horan WP and Reise SP (2013) The clinical assessment interview for negative symptoms (CAINS): final development and validation. *American Journal of Psychiatry* **170**, 165–172.
- Krynicki CR, Upthegrove R, Deakin JFW and Barnes TRE (2018) The relationship between negative symptoms and depression in schizophrenia: a systematic review. Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica 137, 380–390.
- Lako IM, Bruggeman R, Knegtering H, Wiersma D, Schoevers RA, Slooff CJ and Taxis K (2012) A systematic review of instruments to measure depressive symptoms in patients with schizophrenia. *Journal of Affective Disorders* 140, 38–47.
- Lançon C, Auquier P, Reine G, Bernard D and Toumi M (2000) Study of the concurrent validity of the Calgary Depression Scale for Schizophrenics (CDSS). *Journal of Affective Disorders* 58, 107–115.
- Lin CH, Huang CL, Chang YC, Chen PW, Lin CY, Tsai GE and Lane HY (2013) Clinical symptoms, mainly negative symptoms, mediate the influence of neurocognition and social cognition on functional outcome of schizophrenia. *Schizophrenia Research* 146, 231–237.
- Llerena K, Park SG, Mccarthy JM, Couture SM, Bennett ME and Blanchard JJ (2013) The Motivation and Pleasure Scale-Self-Report (MAP-SR): reliability and validity of a self-report measure of negative symptoms. *Comprehensive Psychiatry* 54, 568–574.
- Malaspina D, Walsh-Messinger J, Gaebel W, Smith LM, Gorun A, Prudent V, Antonius D and Tremeau F (2014) Negative symptoms, past and present: a historical perspective and moving to DSM-5. *European Neuropsychopharmacology* 24, 710–724.
- Malla AK, Takhar JJ, Norman RM, Manchanda R, Cortese L, Haricharan R, Verdi M and Ahmed R (2002) Negative symptoms in first episode nonaffective psychosis. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica* 105, 431–439.
- Marchesi C, Affaticati A, Monici A, De Panfilis C, Ossola P, Ottoni R and TONNA M (2015) Decrease of functioning in remitted and non-remitted patients 16 years after a first-episode schizophrenia. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease* 203, 406–411.
- Mausbach BT, Cardenas V, Goldman SR and Patterson TL (2007) Symptoms of psychosis and depression in middle-aged and older adults with psychotic disorders: the role of activity satisfaction. Aging and Mental Health 11, 339–345.
- McAdams LA, Harris MJ, Bailey A, Fell R and Jeste DV (1996) Validating specific psychopathology scales in older outpatients with schizophrenia. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease* **184**, 246–251.
- Menendez-Miranda I, Garcia-Portilla MP, Garcia-Alvarez L, Arrojo M, Sanchez P, Sarramea F, Gomar J, Bobes-Bascaran MT, Sierra P, Saiz PA and Bobes J (2015) Predictive factors of functional capacity and real-world functioning in patients with schizophrenia. European Psychiatry 30, 622–627.

- Messinger JW, Tremeau F, Antonius D, Mendelsohn E, Prudent V, Stanford AD and Malaspina D (2011) Avolition and expressive deficits capture negative symptom phenomenology: implications for DSM-5 and schizophrenia research. *Clinical Psychology Review* **31**, 161–168.
- Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J and Altman DG (2009) Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *British Medical Journal* 339, b2535.
- Mucci A, Galderisi S, Merlotti E, Rossi A, Rocca P, Bucci P, Piegari G, Chieffi M, Vignapiano A and Maj M (2015) The Brief Negative Symptom Scale (BNSS): independent validation in a large sample of Italian patients with schizophrenia. *European Psychiatry* **30**, 641–647.
- Müller M, Kienzle B and Dahmen N (2002) Depression, emotional blunting, and akinesia in schizophrenia: overlap and differentiation. *The European Journal of Health Economics* **3**, S99–S103.
- Norman RM, Malla AK, Cortese L and Diaz F (1998) Aspects of dysphoria and symptoms of schizophrenia. *Psychological Medicine* 28, 1433–1441.
- Norman RMG, Manchanda R, Harricharan R and Northcott S (2015) The course of negative symptoms over the first five years of treatment: data from an early intervention program for psychosis. *Schizophrenia Research* **169**, 412–417.
- Pelizza L and Ferrari A (2009) Anhedonia in schizophrenia and major depression: state or trait? *Annals of General Psychiatry* 8, 22.
- Peralta V and Cuesta MJ (1999) Negative parkinsonian, depressive and catatonic symptoms in schizophrenia: a conflict of paradigms revisited. *Schizophrenia Research* 40, 245–253.
- Peralta V, Cuesta MJ, Martinez-Larrea A and Serrano JF (2000) Differentiating primary from secondary negative symptoms in schizophrenia: a study of neuroleptic-naive patients before and after treatment. *American Journal of Psychiatry* 157, 1461–1466.
- Polat Nazlı I, Ergül C, Aydemir Ö, Chandhoke S, Üçok A and Gönül AS (2016) Validation of Turkish version of brief negative symptom scale. International Journal of Psychiatry in Clinical Practice 20, 265–271.
- Rabany L, Weiser M, Werbeloff N and Levkovitz Y (2011) Assessment of negative symptoms and depression in schizophrenia: revision of the SANS and how it relates to the PANSS and CDSS. *Schizophrenia Research* 126, 226–230.
- Rabany L, Weiser M and Levkovitz Y (2013) Guilt and depression: two different factors in individuals with negative symptoms of schizophrenia. *European Psychiatry* 28, 327–331.
- Radomsky ED, Haas GL, Mann JJ and Sweeney JA (1999) Suicidal behavior in patients with schizophrenia and other psychotic disorders. *American Journal of Psychiatry* 156, 1590–1595.
- Ricarte JJ, Hernández JV, Latorre JM, Danion JM and Berna F (2014) Rumination and autobiographical memory impairment in patients with schizophrenia. *Schizophrenia Research* **160**, 163–168.
- Robertson BR, Prestia D, Twamley EW, Patterson TL, Bowie CR and Harvey PD (2014) Social competence versus negative symptoms as predictors of real world social functioning in schizophrenia. *Schizophrenia Research* 160, 136–141.
- Rocca P, Bellino S, Calvarese P, Marchiaro L, Patria L, Rasetti R and Bogetto F (2005) Depressive and negative symptoms in schizophrenia: different effects on clinical features. *Comprehensive Psychiatry* 46, 304–310.
- Rocca P, Montemagni C, Zappia S, Pitera R, Sigaudo M and Bogetto F (2014) Negative symptoms and everyday functioning in schizophrenia: a cross-sectional study in a real world-setting. *Psychiatry Research* 218, 284–289.
- Roche E, Clarke M, Browne S, Turner N, McTuige O, Kamali M, Kinsellla A, Larkin C, Waddington JL and O'Callaghan E (2010) Prevalence and clinical correlates of depression in the acute phase of first episode schizophrenia. *Irish Journal of Psychological Medicine* 27, 15–18.
- Rose D (2014) The mainstreaming of recovery. *Journal of Mental Health* 23, 217–218.
- Roseman AS, Kasckow J, Fellows I, Osatuke K, Patterson TL, Mohamed S and Zisook S (2008) Insight, quality of life, and functional capacity in middle-aged and older adults with schizophrenia. *International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry* 23, 760–765.

- Sarkar S, Hillner K and Velligan DI (2015) Conceptualization and treatment of negative symptoms in schizophrenia. World Journal of Psychiatry 5, 352–361.
- Sarró S, Dueñas RM, Ramírez N, Arranz B, Martínez R, Sánchez JM, González JM, Saló L, Miralles L and San L (2004) Cross-cultural adaptation and validation of the Spanish version of the Calgary Depression Scale for schizophrenia. *Schizophrenia Research* 68, 349–356.
- Schennach-Wolff R, Obermeier M, Seemüller F, Jäger M, Messer T, Laux G, Pfeiffer H, Naber D, Schmidt LG, Gaebel W, Klosterkötter J, Heuser I, Maier W, Lemke MR, Rüther E, Klingberg S, Gastpar M, Möller HJ and Riedel M (2011) Evaluating depressive symptoms and their impact on outcome in schizophrenia. Applying the Calgary Depression Scale. Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica 123, 228–238.
- Schennach R, Riedel M, Obermeier M, Seemuller F, Jager M, Schmauss M, Laux G, Pfeiffer H, Naber D, Schmidt LG, Gaebel W, Klosterkotter J, Heuser I, Maier W, Lemke MR, Ruther E, Klingberg S, Gastpar M and Moller HJ (2015) What are depressive symptoms in acutely ill patients with schizophrenia spectrum disorder? *European Psychiatry* 30, 43–50.
- Siris SBC (2003) Depression and schizophrenia. In Hirsch S and Weinberger D (eds), *Schizophrenia*, 2nd Edn. Oxford, UK: Blackwell, 142–167.
- Statacorp (2017) Stata Statistical Software: Release 15. College Station, TX: StataCorp LLC.
- Strauss GP and Cohen AS (2018) The schizophrenia spectrum anhedonia paradox. World Psychiatry 17, 221–222.
- Strauss GP, Nunez A, Ahmed AO, Barchard KA, Granholm E, Kirkpatrick B, Gold JM and Allen DN (2018) The latent structure of negative symptoms in schizophrenia. JAMA Psychiatry 75, 1271–1279.
- Tapp A, Kilzieh N, Wood AE, Raskind M and Tandon R (2001) Depression in patients with schizophrenia during an acute psychotic episode. *Comprehensive Psychiatry* 42, 314–318.

- Thomas BH, Dobbins M, Fau M and Micucci S (2004) A process for systematically reviewing the literature: providing the research evidence for public health nursing interventions. *Worldviews on Evidence-Based Nursing* 1, 176–184.
- Todarello O, Porcelli P, Grilletti F and Bellomo A (2005) Is alexithymia related to negative symptoms of schizophrenia? *Psychopathology* **38**, 310–314.
- Uzenoff SR, Brewer KC, Perkins DO, Johnson DP, Mueser KT and Penn DL (2010) Psychological well-being among individuals with firstepisode psychosis. *Early Intervention in Psychiatry* **4**, 174–181.
- Valiente-Gómez A, Mezquida G, Romaguera A, Vilardebò I, Andrés H, Granados B, Larrubia J, Pomarol-Clotet E, McKenna PJ, Sarró S and Bernardo M (2015) Validation of the Spanish version of the Clinical Assessment for Negative Symptoms (CAINS). Schizophrenia Research 166, 104–109.
- Van Os J and Reininghaus U (2016) Psychosis as a transdiagnostic and extended phenotype in the general population. World Psychiatry 15, 118–124.
- Warman DM, Forman EM, Henriques GR, Brown GK and Beck AT (2004) Suicidality and psychosis: beyond depression and hopelessness. Suicide and Life-Threatening Behaviour 34, 77–86.
- Williams J and Kobak KA (2008) Development and reliability of a structured interview guide for the Montgomery Asberg Depression Rating Scale (SIGMA). British Journal of Psychiatry 192, 52–58.
- Wolthaus JED, Dingemans PMAJ, Schene AH, Linszen DH, Knegtering H, Holthausen EAE, Cahn W and Hijman R (2000) Component structure of the Positive And Negative Syndrome Scale (PANSS) in patients with recent-onset schizophrenia and spectrum disorders. *Psychopharmacology* 150, 399–403.
- Zisook S, McAdams LA, Kuck J, Harris MJ, Bailey A, Patterson TL, Judd LL and Jeste DV (1999) Depressive symptoms in schizophrenia. *American Journal of Psychiatry* **156**, 1736–1743.