

Correspondence

Cite this article: Hogerzeil SJ, van Hemert AM (2019). Design choices when estimating the treated incidence of schizophrenia. *Psychological Medicine* 49, 2635–2636. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291719001338>

First published online: 26 July 2019

Author for correspondence:

Simon J. Hogerzeil, E-mail: s.j.hogerzeil@gmail.com

Design choices when estimating the treated incidence of schizophrenia

Simon J. Hogerzeil and Albert M. van Hemert

Parnassia Psychiatric Institute, The Hague, The Netherlands; Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, The Netherlands

Anderson *et al.* (2018) estimate the gap between the number of incident cases of schizophrenia aged 16–50 in Ontario, Canada in 1997–2015, and the number who were enrolled into Early Psychosis Intervention (EPI) services. Their analysis is a direct comparison between administrative records and the standard method for estimating the treated incidence.

The standard method (known as the ‘first-contact design’) involves screening subjects for signs of psychosis when they present for psychiatric treatment. Subjects screened positive then undergo standardized diagnostic procedures to establish the criteria for schizophrenia. But studies based on administrative records have suggested that two out of three cases may be missed this way (Hogerzeil *et al.*, 2014; Pedersen *et al.*, 2014; Jongsma *et al.*, 2019).

Anderson *et al.* (2018) also found that two out of three cases of schizophrenia had remained unknown to EPI services. Not all cases met EPI-services’ inclusion criteria, but still a substantial number of true cases of schizophrenia had been missed. In their discussion, Anderson *et al.* (2018) focused on the issue of incomplete coverage of services, but this is only one of several design aspects that matter.

We propose to distinguish three design aspects where complete case finding can go wrong: coverage of services, time frame of the diagnosis, and accuracy of the diagnosis. We believe that these distinctions can help to understand the five- to ten-fold variation in incidence between populations, which is commonly reported but only partially explained (Mcgrath *et al.*, 2004; Jongsma *et al.*, 2018, 2019).

(x) *Coverage of services where cases can be detected.* These may range from (1) very specialized services such as EPI services, emergency or inpatient services, extending to (2) general psychiatric or addiction services, and further to (3) primary care or somatic medical care or ultimately to (4) the general population.

(y) *Time frame of the diagnosis,* the interval allowed between the first contact with a service and the moment a diagnosis can be made. It may range from (1) case ascertainment at first-contact only, extending to (2) later stages of treatment, e.g. subjects presenting initially with another diagnosis, ultimately extending to a (3) life-time follow-up.

(z) *Accuracy of the diagnosis,* ranging from diagnosis based on (1) research diagnostic procedures, extending to (2) clinical criteria diagnoses (e.g. DSM-5 or ICD-10) and (3) non-standardized diagnostic procedures.

This can be illustrated in 3D, where design choices along the {x y z} axes determine a box, the volume of which represents the incidence estimate. Figure 1 illustrates how the first contact design (solid box; i.e. typically measured as first contacts at specialized services, using research diagnoses) results in a lower incidence compared to cumulative records (dotted box; i.e. typically measured at all psychiatric services, using clinical diagnoses over much longer timespans).

Case-register studies from the 1950s to the 1970s typically focused on inpatient hospital services, with long time frames and non-standardized diagnoses. The first-contact studies of the 1990s and later focused on a wider coverage of services and better diagnostic accuracy, while restricting the timeframe (Jablensky *et al.*, 1992). That approach has high specificity but low sensitivity: many subjects with an ultimate diagnosis of schizophrenia will be missed because they do not meet criteria for the disorder when they first seek treatment (Rietdijk *et al.*, 2011; Hogerzeil *et al.*, 2014).

Longer time frames became possible with (a) the wide adoption DSM or ICD based clinical diagnoses and (b) well maintained administrative records in (c) institutions serving all psychiatric needs of well-defined populations. Such databases can now be used to reconstruct diagnostic histories or treatment pathways through services, up to the first diagnosis of schizophrenia, capturing new onsets along pathways that cannot be covered with the standard approach. This new approach is more sensitive, although it might come at the expense of some diagnostic specificity.

The study by Anderson *et al.* (2018) is the second to compare first-contact and cumulative methods directly. Their study can be understood as a replication of our finding (Hogerzeil *et al.*, 2014) that in administrative data the incidence of treated schizophrenia is two- to three-fold higher than detected using the first-contact design. Now replicated, this finding has obvious





Fig. 1. Graphical illustration of three design aspects for studies measuring the incidence of schizophrenia. The volume of the solid box represents the incidence as estimated in a typical first-contact design and that of the dotted box the incidence as estimated in electronic administrative records.

implications for estimates of the number of cases affected and for the organization of services. Furthermore, considering subjects with psychosis at first contact as ‘prototype cases’ may have distorted our understanding of schizophrenia by spuriously highlighting a younger age of onset and a more acute clinical presentation than seen in actual administrative records (Hogerzeil *et al.*, 2016).

Study design matters a lot when estimating the incidence of schizophrenia. To interpret incidence studies or to make meaningful comparisons between them, we need a more elaborate classification of study designs, as suggested here.

Author ORCIDs.  Simon J. Hogerzeil, 0000-0001-6269-179X
Albert M. van Hemert, 0000-0003-3421-355X

References

- Anderson K, Norman R, MacDougall AG, Edwards J, Palaniyappan L, Lau C and Kurdyak P (2018) Estimating the incidence of first-episode psychosis using population-based health administrative data to inform early psychosis intervention services. *Psychological Medicine*, 1–9 doi:10.1017/S0033291718002933 (Epub ahead of print).
- Hogerzeil SJ, van Hemert AM, Rosendaal FR, Susser E and Hoek HW (2014) Direct comparison of first-contact versus longitudinal register based case finding in the same population: early evidence that the incidence of schizophrenia may be three times higher than commonly reported. *Psychological Medicine* 44, 3481–3490.
- Hogerzeil SJ, van Hemert AM, Veling W and Hoek HW (2016) Incidence of schizophrenia among migrants in the Netherlands: a direct comparison of first contact longitudinal register approaches. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology* 52, 147–154.
- Jablensky AV, Sartorius N, Ernberg G, Anker M, Korten A, Cooper JE, Day R and Bertelsen A (1992) Schizophrenia: manifestations, incidence and course in different cultures. A World Health Organization ten-country study. *Psychological Medicine. Monograph Supplement* 20, 1–97.
- Jongsma HE, Gayer-Anderson C, Lasalvia A, Quattrone D, Mule A, Szoke A, Seltén J-P, Turner C, Arango C, Tarricone I, Berardi D, Tortelli A, Llorca P-M, de Haan L, Bobes J, Bernardo M, Sanjuán J, Santos JL, Arrojo M, Del-Ben CM, Menezes PR, Velthorst E, Murray RM, Rutten BP, Jones PB, van Os J, Morgan C, Kirkbride JB and European Network of National Schizophrenia Networks Studying Gene-Environment Interactions Work Package 2 (EU-GEI WP2) Group (2018) Treated incidence of psychotic disorders in the multinational EU-GEI Study. *JAMA Psychiatry* 75, 36–46
- Jongsma HE, Turner C, Kirkbride JB and Jones PB (2019) International incidence of psychotic disorders, 2002–17: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Lancet Public Health* 4, e229–e244.
- Mcgrath J, Saha S, Welham J, El Saadi O, MacCauley C and Chant D (2004) A systematic review of the incidence of schizophrenia: the distribution of rates and the influence of sex, urbanicity, migrant status and methodology. *BMC Medicine* 2, 291.
- Pedersen CB, Mors O, Bertelsen A, Waltoft BL, Agerbo E, McGrath JJ, Mortensen PB and Eaton WW (2014) A comprehensive nationwide study of the incidence rate and lifetime risk for treated mental disorders. *JAMA Psychiatry* 71, 573–581.
- Rietdijk J, Hogerzeil SJ, van Hemert AM, Cuijpers P, Linszen DH and van der Gaag M (2011) Pathways to psychosis: help-seeking behavior in the prodromal phase. *Schizophrenia Research* 132, 213–219.