

From the Editor's desk

By Kamaldeep Bhui

A fine balance in the science of risk and resilience

The origins of the term resilience lie in the fields of mechanics and engineering, but its usage has moved into the fields of ecology, psychology, psychiatry, public health, social sciences, and even to the environmental and sustainability discourse. 1-3 Ayyub3 considers how to construct resilience metrics and proposes a framework based on the mechanical sciences; thus, there are 'brittle, ductile, and graceful' events, followed by 'better than new', 'good as old', 'better than old', 'as good as old', 'worse than old' outcomes. Applying these notions of resilience to human populations raises contradictions between restitution as a goal and inexorable movement and events requiring adaptation. The intergovernmental panel on climate change's report in March 2014 warns of major impacts of climate change on human health and security. The report defines resilience as: 'The capacity of social, economic, and environmental systems to cope with a hazardous event or trend or disturbance, responding or reorganizing in ways that maintain their essential function, identity, and structure, while also maintaining the capacity for adaptation, learning, and transformation'. The IPCC's definition encompasses changing in function, identity and structure, as well as adaptation and transformation. After all, who is not changed by disasters and

Environmental, natural and man-made disasters seem to be increasing in number and impact; for example, flooding and coastal disasters are linked to global warming. As a consequence there is a growing urgency to find ways of bolstering individual and population psychological resilience and to maintain societal functions (social or population resilience) in the face of adversity. The same applies to the prevention of new-onset mental illness and disability due to harmful events that can have life-long consequences, for example, early childhood traumatic events as well as contemporary disasters and even war and terrorism.^{5,6} However, the way we perceive disasters, the historical narrative we sustain, and the story we tell ourselves about new and similar events, shape our ability to survive them.⁷ The evidence suggests that social support and practical aid are the most powerful interventions (see editorial by Bisson, pp. 329-330), however, there are some intriguing new findings about the place of epigenetics^{4,8,9} and neurobiology¹⁰ and the impact on resilience.

This issue of BJPsych brings two broad approaches to understanding individual resilience, although not all studies foreground these aspects of their data. A number of studies examine man-made disasters like war, interpersonal violence and terrorism. Dyb et al (pp. 361-367) show post-traumatic stress levels were higher in survivors of the '2011 massacre' in Norway; women, ethnic minorities, those with high levels of trauma, pain or loss fared worse. A meta-analysis of trauma-exposed young people found interpersonal violence was predictive of PTSD reactions, especially among girls. However, in both studies not everyone received a diagnosis of PTSD, which raises questions about which characteristics confer resistance or resilience to psychological distress. Elbogen et al's study of veterans (pp. 368-375) showed that aggression was sustained in non-conflict zones if they reported PTSD and alcohol misuse. Again, early-life influences were important; younger age, financial instability and a history of violence before service were predictive of later violence. Cullen et al's (pp. 354-360) study of children at risk of schizophrenia

(either by family history or by presence of antecedents) found they experienced more stressors and adverse life events, and they were more stressed by them, suggesting that reactions to stress are useful treatment targets. Morgan et al's elegant study (pp. 346-353) shows a complex multiplicative relationship between the effects of child abuse and the number of life events on the risk of future psychotic experiences. In combination, abuse and adverse experiences rapidly escalate future risks of psychosis, more so than their individual contributions. As hinted in these studies, psychological processes and the meaning given to events seem instrumental in determining outcomes. A fascinating study by Ando and colleagues (pp. 341-345) of comedians and actors shows comedians to suffer from 'cyclothymic' traits, hypothesising that the opposite emotional poles buffer each other to provide a different sort of personality performance and mode of resilience than that, for example, found in actors. Mindfulness for psychosis (Chadwick, pp. 333-334), tackling self-stigma as a source for negative cognitions and poor self-esteem (Rüsch et al, pp. 391-397), and group problem-solving (McAuliffe et al, pp. 383-390) seem to carry much evidence of their effectiveness and are slowly entering practice, in contrast to the speed with which pharmacological agents are adopted and then dropped (see editorial by Shorter, pp. 331-332).

Studies of resilience and its history seem to suggest that individually resilient minds are not a product of only the individual but of multiple interpersonal, societal, historical, as well as genetic and epigenetic expressions and interplays. We are vulnerable to external environmental threats, man-made disasters including war and conflict, interpersonal violence as well as our genetically influenced destinies (see Balan et al, pp. 398-399). Yet we adapt and survive. Studies of resilience are needed alongside studies of illness. Some studies suggest vulnerability may be found in genetic risks and resilience in environmental and social influences,11 others suggest resilience may also be in part or mostly influenced by genetic polymorphisms. 12-14 There is a dynamic impact of stressors on brain anatomy with greater reductions of hippocampal volume in boys compared with girls exposed to emotional abuse, making gender responses to disasters another fruitful research focus.¹⁵ Notwithstanding the ethical debates that must take place, research into inflammatory processes¹⁶ and resilience-conferring proteins involved in cell signaling and synaptic transmission all offer hope for future understanding and possible interventions to promote resilience and reduce vulnerability. ¹⁰ In the short term, shaping our contexts, securing social support, and changing patterns of cognitive coping can improve resilience.¹⁷ Social relationships, support and practical assistance, adaptation and the ability to transform our environments and our selves are our most powerful and effective interventions.

- 1 Alexander DE. Resilience and disaster risk reduction: an etymological journey. Nat Hazards Earth Syst Sci 2013; 13: 9.
- 2 Johnson J, Gooding PA, Wood AM, Taylor PJ, Pratt D, Tarrier N. Resilience to suicidal ideation in psychosis: positive self-appraisals buffer the impact of hopelessness. *Behav Res Ther* 2010; 48: 883–9.
- 3 Ayyub BM. Systems resilience for multihazard environments: definition, metrics, and valuation for decision making. Risk Anal 2014; 34: 340–55.
- 4 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Working Group II. Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Summary for Policymakers (available at http://ipcc-wg2.gov/AR5/report/). IPCC, 2014.
- 5 Rodriguez-Llanes JM, Vos F, Guha-Sapir D. Measuring psychological resilience to disasters: are evidence-based indicators an achievable goal? *Environ Health* 2013; 12: 115.
- 6 Rousseau C, Jamil U, Bhui K, Boudjarane M. Consequences of 9/11 and the war on terror on children's and young adult's mental health: a systematic review of the past 10 years. Clin Child Psychol Psychiatry 2013; epub 25 September.

- 7 Mohatt NV, Thompson AB, Thai ND, Tebes JK. Historical trauma as public narrative: A conceptual review of how history impacts present-day health. Soc Sci Med 2014; 106C: 128–36.
- 8 Kim-Cohen J, Moffitt TE, Caspi A, Taylor A. Genetic and environmental processes in young children's resilience and vulnerability to socioeconomic deprivation. *Child Dev* 2004; **75**: 651–68.
- 9 Carli V, Mandelli L, Zaninotto L, Roy A, Recchia L, Stoppia L, et al. A protective genetic variant for adverse environments? The role of childhood traumas and serotonin transporter gene on resilience and depressive severity in a high-risk population. Eur Psychiatry 2011; 26: 471–8.
- **10** Fatemi SH. Reelin, a marker of stress resilience in depression and psychosis. *Neuropsychopharmacology* **2011**; **36**: 2371–2.
- 11 Newsome J, Sullivan CJ. Resilience and vulnerability in adolescents: genetic influences on differential response to risk for delinquency. *J Youth Adolesc* 2014: epul March
- 12 Kang JI, Kim SJ, Song YY, Namkoong K, An SK. Genetic influence of COMT and BDNF gene polymorphisms on resilience in healthy college students. Neuropsychobiology 2013; 68: 174–80.

- 13 Waaktaar T, Torgersen S. Genetic and environmental causes of variation in trait resilience in young people. Behav Genet 2012; 42: 366–77.
- 14 McGrath LM, Cornelis MC, Lee PH, Robinson EB, Duncan LE, Barnett JH, et al. Genetic predictors of risk and resilience in psychiatric disorders: a cross-disorder genome-wide association study of functional impairment in major depressive disorder, bipolar disorder, and schizophrenia. Am J Med Genet B Neuropsychiatr Genet 2013; 162: 779–88.
- 15 Samplin E, Ikuta T, Malhotra AK, Szeszko PR, Derosse P. Sex differences in resilience to childhood maltreatment: effects of trauma history on hippocampal volume, general cognition and subclinical psychosis in healthy adults. J Psychiatr Res 2013; 47: 1174–9.
- 16 Cole SW, Arevalo JM, Manu K, Telzer EH, Kiang L, Bower JE, et al. Antagonistic pleiotropy at the human IL6 promoter confers genetic resilience to the pro-inflammatory effects of adverse social conditions in adolescence. Dev Psychol 2011; 47: 1173–80.
- 17 Tait L, Birchwood M, Trower P. Adapting to the challenge of psychosis: personal resilience and the use of sealing-over (avoidant) coping strategies. Br J Psychiatry 2004; 185: 410–5.