

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Can antipsychotic dose reduction lead to better functional recovery in first-episode psychosis? A randomized controlled-trial of antipsychotic dose reduction. The reduce trial: Study protocol

Amber Weller^{1,2} | John Gleeson³ | Mario Alvarez-Jimenez^{1,2} | Patrick McGorry^{1,2} | Barnaby Nelson^{1,2} | Kelly Allott^{1,2} | Sarah Bendall^{1,2} | Cali Bartholomeusz^{1,2} | Peter Koval⁴ | Susy Harrigan⁵ | Brian O'Donoghue^{1,2,6}  | Alex Fornito⁷ | Christos Pantelis^{8,9} | G. Paul Amminger^{1,2} | Aswin Ratheesh^{1,2,6} | Andrea Polari^{2,6} | Stephen J. Wood^{1,2,10} | Kristi van der El^{1,2} | Carli Ellinghaus^{1,2} | Jesse Gates⁶ | Jessica O'Connell⁶ | Marianne Mueller^{1,2} | Lex Wunderink¹¹  | Eóin Killackey^{1,2} 

¹Orygen, the National Centre of Excellence in Youth Mental Health, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

²Centre for Youth Mental Health, The University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

³Australian Catholic University, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

⁴School of Psychological Sciences, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

⁵Centre for Mental Health, School of Population and Global Health, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

⁶Melbourne Health, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

⁷Monash Clinical and Imaging Neuroscience, School of Psychological Sciences, Monash University, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

⁸Melbourne Neuropsychiatry Centre, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

⁹Department of Psychiatry, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

¹⁰School of Psychology, University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, UK

¹¹Friesland Mental Health Services, Leeuwarden, Netherlands

Correspondence

Eóin Killackey, 35 Poplar Rd, Parkville, Centre for Youth Mental Health, The University of Melbourne, Melbourne Victoria Australia 3052.

Email: eoin.killackey@orygen.org.au

Funding information

Ronald Philip Griffiths Fellowship; Fellowship from the McCusker Charitable Foundation;

Antipsychotic medication has been the mainstay of treatment for psychotic illnesses for over 60 years. This has been associated with improvements in positive psychotic symptoms and a reduction in relapse rates. However, there has been little improvement in functional outcomes for people with psychosis. At the same time there is increasing evidence that medications contribute to life shortening metabolic and cardiovascular illnesses. There is also uncertainty as to the role played by antipsychotic medication in brain volume changes.

Aim: The primary aim of the study is, in a population of young people with first-episode psychosis, to compare functional outcomes between an antipsychotic dose reduction strategy with evidence-based intensive recovery treatment (EBIRT) group (DRS+) and an antipsychotic maintenance treatment with EBIRT group (AMTx+) at 24-months follow-up.

Methods: Our single-blind randomized controlled trial, within a specialist early psychosis treatment setting, will test the whether the DRS+ group leads to better vocational and social recovery than, the AMTx+ group over a 2-year period in 180 remitted first-episode psychosis patients. Additionally, we will examine the effect of DRS+ vs AMTx+ on physical health, brain volume and cognitive functioning. This study will also determine whether the group receiving DRS+ will be no worse off in terms of psychotic relapses over 2 years follow-up.

Results: This paper presents the protocol, rationale and hypotheses for this study which commenced recruitment in July 2017.

Conclusion: This study will provide evidence as to whether an antipsychotic dose-reduction recovery treatment leads to improved functioning and safer outcomes in first-episode psychosis patients. In addition, it will be the first-controlled experiment of the effect of exposure to antipsychotic maintenance treatment on brain volume changes in this population.

KEYWORDS

antipsychotic medication, dose reduction, first-episode psychosis, functional recovery, protocol

NHMRC Senior Research Fellowship, Grant/Award Number: ID Number 1137687; Career Development Fellowship, Grant/Award Number: APP1082934; BB & A Miller Foundation; NHMRC CDF II Fellowship, Grant/Award Number: APP1051891; National Health Medical Research Council (NHMRC) Project grant, Grant/Award Number: 1102394

1 | INTRODUCTION

It is over 65 years since antipsychotic medications were introduced and became the mainstay of treatment for psychotic illnesses. There has undoubtedly been many benefits of their use in the control of symptoms, particularly positive symptoms of psychotic illness and the reduction of relapse rates (Addington, Killackey, & Marulanda, 2018). Despite this, and even with the introduction of second-generation antipsychotic medication, there has been little indication that people with psychotic illness have returned to functional roles in any great number. For example, people diagnosed with psychotic illnesses (Killackey & Allott, 2013) are less likely to complete their secondary education (Waghorn et al., 2012) and unemployment remains a highly prevalent problem associated with the disorder. Loneliness is also a significant issue for young people with psychosis, so much so that the onset of psychosis has been characterized as a social network crisis which is not ameliorated by current interventions (Horan, Subotnik, Snyder, & Nuechterlein, 2006). In a range of other functional domains, housing security, (Harvey, Killackey, Groves, & Herrman, 2012) physical health (Morgan et al., 2013), social relationships and engagement in community (Morgan et al., 2010), people with psychotic illnesses have worse outcomes than the general population. Antipsychotic medications are effective at addressing the symptoms of illness but have little to no success at addressing many of the associated problems of the illness (Alvarez-Jimenez et al., 2016). Yet, it is these problems that people living with psychosis most want addressed (Ramsay et al., 2011).

Data from papers published over the last 11 years (Wunderink et al., 2007; Wunderink, Nieboer, Wiersma, Sytema, & Nienhuis, 2013) have raised the question of how the best balance or "sweet-spot" is struck between exposure to antipsychotic medication, symptomatic improvement, the minimization of iatrogenic harm and maximizing functional recovery (Correll, Rubio, & Kane, 2018). The study described in this paper seeks to answer this question.

2 | BACKGROUND

After remission from acute symptoms of psychosis is achieved, most treatments for psychosis have focussed upon the prevention of psychotic relapse (Andreasen et al., 2005; Program EPGWGaENS, 2016). Relapse prevention is a worthy clinical goal, because of the potential for distress and other risks associated with acute symptoms, the direct cost of multiple hospital visits associated with relapse (Knapp et al., 2013), as well as relapsing courses of psychosis being up to four times more expensive than non-relapsing courses (Almond, Knapp, Francois, Toumi, & Brugha, 2004; Ascher-Svanum

et al., 2010). Less focus has been placed on improving social and vocational functioning despite these being the primary goals of people who experience psychosis (Iyer, Mangala, Anitha, Thara, & Malla, 2011; Ramsay et al., 2011). For this reason, functional recovery of people with psychotic illness warrants further attention. In this context we define functional recovery to mean-age appropriate vocational functioning, having social outlets, such as friends beyond one's immediate family and participation in one's community through such activities as voting.

2.1 | The impact of antipsychotic maintenance treatment

Current evidence-based treatment guidelines recommend antipsychotic maintenance treatment for 2-5 years after a first episode of psychosis (FEP) (Program EPGWGaENS, 2016), followed by annual review (Program EPGWGaENS, 2016). In reality, maintenance treatment can continue for decades (Andreasen, Liu, Ziebell, Vora, & Ho, 2013), partly due to the lack of clarity and evidence around how long individuals should receive antipsychotic treatment (Program EPGWGaENS, 2016; Sohler et al., 2016). The goal of current guidelines is to prevent symptomatic relapse rates in FEP clients (Chen et al., 2010; Emsley, Chiliza, & Asmal, 2013). Arguments in favour of ongoing maintenance treatment are that: in the absence of medication, risk of relapse rises significantly, episodes of relapse tend to become longer after the initial episode (Emsley, Chiliza, & Asmal, 2013); response to medication takes longer and approximately 14% at each relapse will not respond to medication (Emsley, Chiliza, Asmal, & Harvey, 2013). While maintenance treatment is generally successful at treating positive psychotic symptoms (Sohler et al., 2016), the associated side-effects of antipsychotic medication can be a case of significant harm. These side-effects include weight gain (Grundy, Brewer Jr., Cleeman, Smith Jr., & Lenfant, 2004; Klemp et al., 2011), sexual dysfunction (Program EPGWGaENS, 2016) and possible contribution to poor functional recovery in (Wunderink et al., 2013) people with positive symptom remission. These associated side-effects can result in poor medication adherence (Coldham, Addington, & Addington, 2002). Adherence to antipsychotic medication is poor in FEP; around 60% of them have either non-adherence or poor adherence (Whale, Harris, Kavanagh, et al., 2016). Further implications of maintenance treatment include metabolic disturbances which lead to increased risks for cardiovascular disease and diabetes and the potential for a 20 to 30 year reduction in life expectancy in people with psychosis (De Hert et al., 2011; Olfson, Gerhard, Huang, Crystal, & Stroup, 2015; Subotnik, Nuechterlein, Ventura, & Marder, 2011). Metabolic and cardiovascular illness, in large part due to antipsychotic

medication (De Hert et al., 2011), accounts for the majority of this mortality (Hage et al., 2018).

In addition, maintenance treatment studies (Waghorn et al., 2012) and meta-analyses (Alvarez-Jimenez, Parker, Hetrick, McGorry, & Gleeson, 2011) over the last 10 years have found a relationship between exposure to antipsychotic medication and changes in brain volume. Recent cross-sectional evidence indicates that antipsychotic medications may produce reductions in grey and white matter volumes (Alvarez-Jimenez et al., 2011) (Bola & Moshier, 2002). One study in particular found medicated FEP patients to display significant cortical thinning in the dorsolateral prefrontal and temporal cortices when compared to unmedicated FEP patients, who had cortical thickness measures similar to controls (Lesh et al., 2015). Moreover, a 7-year longitudinal neuroimaging study in FEP showed that loss of brain tissue occurs at the rate of 0.56 cm (Waghorn et al., 2012) in patients receiving an average of 4 mg/day of haloperidol (dose equivalent) over a 1-year period (Andreasen et al., 2013). Intensity in dose years of antipsychotic treatment was associated with reductions in total cerebral volume as well as frontal lobe and white matter volumes. However, without a control group this study could not establish whether brain volume reductions are a direct consequence of maintenance treatment or are accounted for by other illness-related factors. Given that early psychosis is associated with significant loss of grey matter volume over time relative to healthy controls (Bowie, McLaughlin, Carrion, Auther, & Cornblatt, 2012), there is a possibility that medication discontinuation could reduce this loss, or preserve brain changes such that they are comparable to neurotypical same-age peers. Further, some evidence suggests that antipsychotic treatment may alter cerebral function in FEP and the impact of a dose reduction strategy on functional connectivity of resting-state neural networks is currently unknown (Lesh et al., 2015; Lui et al., 2010; Radua et al., 2012; Sarpal et al., 2015). Additionally, cognitive function may be adversely affected by maintenance treatment. Three naturalistic studies in prodromal and established schizophrenia groups show a relationship between level of exposure to antipsychotic medication and decline in cognitive function over time (Faber, Smid, Van Gool, Wiersma, & Van Den Bosch, 2012; Husa et al., 2014; Weickert et al., 2013). Furthermore, meta-analytic evidence suggests that the processing speed impairment observed in psychotic disorders is significantly associated with chlorpromazine equivalent daily dose (Knowles, David, & Reichberg, 2010). As symptom intensity or persistence may confound the relationship between cognitive performance and antipsychotic dose, randomized controlled trials are required.

Two small double-blind placebo-controlled crossover studies of inpatients with schizophrenia ($n = 27$ and $n = 19$, respectively) found that antipsychotic medication was associated improved cognitive performance compared with placebo (Potkin, Fleming, Jin, & Gulasekaram, 2001; Weickert et al., 2003). A recent guided antipsychotic discontinuation RCT in FEP ($n = 53$) found that cognitive function improved in remitted FEP clients who received guided discontinuation compared with those who received maintenance treatment over a 5-month follow-up period (Faber et al., 2012). Previous research has also shown that adherence to high/standard-dose maintenance treatment is associated with poorer psychosocial functioning early in the course of recovery, suggesting that a strong focus on high-dose

maintenance medication may interfere with long-term recovery (Wunderink et al., 2013). This is also consistent with the follow-up results from the Episode II trial (Gleeson, Cotton, Alvarez-Jimenez, et al., 2009).

A recent critical review also proposed that although antipsychotic maintenance may be efficacious in mid-term treatment of psychosis, there is a paucity of evidence supporting the efficacy of this treatment approach in the long-term, this supports further investigation of a dose reduction strategy (Correll et al., 2018).

2.1.1 | Is dose reduction the answer?

The negative impacts of long-term maintenance have raised the question of whether dose reduction might be associated with better outcomes for individuals affected by psychotic disorders. Recent evidence showing that functioning improves with a strategy to reduce the dose of antipsychotic medication suggests that functional recovery may be suppressed by long-term exposure to antipsychotic medication (McGorry, Alvarez-Jimenez, & Killackey, 2013; Wunderink et al., 2013). A meta-analysis of RCTs of antipsychotic treatments in FEP clients showed that approximately 40% of placebo-treated FEP clients had not relapsed at 1-year follow-up (Alvarez-Jimenez et al., 2011). Subsequently, one recent RCT revealed that, when compared with continuous maintenance treatment, the discontinuation of maintenance treatment in FEP led to improved recovery at 7 years follow-up (Wunderink et al., 2013). Importantly, this occurred in the absence of intensive psychosocial treatments that may hasten improvement of functioning and prevent relapse (Alvarez-Jimenez et al., 2011). Thus, recovery may be enhanced or hastened if a dose reduction strategy were combined with intensive evidence-based psychosocial interventions. These findings suggest that, despite current guidelines, FEP clients may not require maintenance treatment for the initial recommended two-year minimum period to attain recovery and prevent relapse. Indeed, previous research has shown that it is early functional recovery rather than symptomatic recovery that predicts functional recovery at 7.5 years (Alvarez-Jimenez et al., 2012).

Arguably, patient non-adherence (Gitlin et al., 2001), and planned discontinuation of maintenance treatment both pose risks for relapse after FEP (Alvarez-Jimenez et al., 2012). However, reduction in symptoms does not automatically translate into functional gains. Prioritizing relapse prevention without also giving full consideration to the implications for functional recovery may compromise the long-term outcomes most valued by those who experience the illness (McGorry, 2007; Ramsay et al., 2011).

Management of relapse risk therefore, should be balanced with a focus on functional recovery and the costs of long-term continuous maintenance treatment, including probable enhancement in functioning (Alvarez-Jimenez et al., 2011). A promising balanced approach to treatment includes a dose reduction strategy, combined with intensive and recovery-focussed psychosocial treatments with vigilant monitoring for early signs of relapse (Carpenter Jr., Appelbaum, & Levine, 2003).

Supplementary to a dose reduction strategy, the use of an evidence-based intensive recovery treatment (EBIRT) should be employed to improve likelihood of overall functional outcomes. In the

present study, EBIRT combines two previously trialled interventions. These interventions are Individual Placement and Support (IPS) for vocational recovery and CBT for Relapse Prevention. IPS in addition to specialist FEP treatment has produced significantly better outcomes in gaining employment, hours worked, jobs acquired and longevity of jobs compared to specialist FEP treatment alone (Gleeson et al., 2009; Killackey, Jackson, & McGorry, 2008). CBT for relapse prevention combined with specialist FEP treatment when compared with specialist FEP treatment alone (Gleeson et al., 2009), led to a significant reduction in relapse rates at 7-months follow-up in FEP clients who met remission on positive symptoms. This effect was sustained at 1 year, and relapse rates were kept to historically low levels beyond this time point (30% at 2.5 years) (Gleeson et al., 2009; Gleeson et al., 2013). However, these differences were no longer significant at 30-month follow-up.

Importantly, 83% of clinicians providing care to people experiencing FEP would support a carefully monitored dose reduction strategy after patient relapse, and believe this would improve the quality of life of their clients (Thompson, Singh, & Birchwood, 2016). This further supports the acceptability of a dose reduction strategy, particularly in a FEP setting (Gitlin et al., 2001; National Collaborating Centre for Mental Health, 2014; ORYGEN, 2010).

2.1.2 | Aims

The primary aim of the study is to compare functional outcomes between a dose reduction strategy with EBIRT group (DRS+) and an antipsychotic maintenance treatment with EBIRT group (AMTx+) at 24-months follow-up.

This study has a range of secondary aims:

1. To compare physical health and metabolic profiles between DRS+ and AMTx+ at 24-months follow-up.
2. To compare grey and white matter volume between DRS+ and AMTx+ at 24-months follow-up.
3. To compare brain activity during resting-state between DRS+ and AMTx+ at 24 months follow-up*.
4. To compare cognitive functioning between DRS+ and AMTx+ at 24-months follow-up.
5. To compare remission and relapse rates between DRS+ and AMTx+ at 24-months follow-up.

*This is a largely exploratory aim, however based on the limited literature in this area we hypothesize that the DRS+ group would display greater resting state functional connectivity than the AMTx+ and healthy control groups.

2.1.3 | Primary hypothesis

Hypothesis 1: *Remitted FEP patients randomized to DRS+ will achieve superior social and vocational functioning at 24-months follow-up, compared with remitted FEP patients randomized to AMTx+.*

2.1.4 | Secondary hypotheses

Hypothesis 2: *Participants randomized to DRS+ will have less reduction in grey and white matter volume than participants randomized to AMTx+ at 24-months follow-up.*

Hypothesis 3: *Degree of antipsychotic exposure will be negatively associated with grey and white matter volume at 24-months follow-up. Further, it is expected that change in neural activity during resting state will differ significantly between the DRS+ and AMTx+ groups at 24-months follow-up.*

Hypothesis 4: *Participants randomized to DRS+ will have better cognitive functioning compared to participants randomized to AMTx+ at 24-months follow-up.*

Hypothesis 5: *Participants in the AMTx group will have experienced fewer relapses at 24-months follow-up.*

Hypothesis 6: *Participants randomized to DRS+ will have significantly better metabolic indices (defined as being within normal parameters) and an improved physical health status at 24-months follow-up.*

2.1.5 | Ethical approval

This study was approved by the Melbourne Health Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC/16/MH/309) in February 2017 and began recruiting participants in July 2017. The trial is registered on the Australian and New Zealand Clinical Trials Registry (126170008 70358).

3 | METHODOLOGY

3.1 | Study design

This study is a single blinded non-placebo randomized controlled trial where research assistants are blinded to treatment allocation.

3.2 | Study setting

This study will be conducted at the Early Psychosis Prevention and Intervention Centre (EPPIC), a sub-program of Orygen Youth Health (OYH). OYH is a youth public mental health service in Melbourne for 15 to 25-year-olds (inclusive). EPPIC is a comprehensive specialist early psychosis program that provides outpatient case management, psychosocial intervention and psychiatric treatment. OYH is co-located with Orygen, the National Centre of Excellence in Youth Mental Health and the Centre for Youth Mental Health, The University of Melbourne. EPPIC provides up to 2 years of specialized care after which clients are transferred to another service depending upon the level of care required. A proportion of clients receive follow-up care within primary care settings, while others may continue to require

case-management and specialist care and are therefore transferred to the adult mental health service. The Reduce Trial will embed specific resources within EPPIC, including a proportion of one psychiatry registrar position, a Vocational Support Worker and a number of specialist Reduce trial case managers, who will provide the medical oversight, the vocational recovery support and the clinical case management for trial participants, respectively.

3.3 | Inclusion and exclusion criteria

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria have been designed to reflect “real-world” characteristics of young people presenting to clinical settings with a FEP.

Inclusion criteria: (a) Current client of EPPIC; (b) A confirmed diagnosis of first episode of a DSM 5 (Association AP, 2013) psychotic disorder or mood disorder with psychotic features (Association AP, 2013; First, Karg, & Spitzer, 2015); (c) Aged 15 to 25 years (inclusive); (d) ≥ 3 months of remission on positive symptoms of psychosis in the first year of antipsychotic treatment (participants must currently be taking their prescribed antipsychotic medication) at EPPIC (a score of ≤ 3 (mild) on the hallucinations, unusual thought disorder, conceptual disorganization and suspiciousness subscale items of the Brief Psychiatric Rating Scale (BPRS) (Ventura et al., 1993) for the past 2 weeks and a score ≤ 3 on the hallucinations, unusual thought content, conceptual disorganization and suspiciousness subscales of the BRPS (Ventura et al., 1993) for the past 3 months based on a systematic clinical file review and collateral information collected from the participant's treating team in EPPIC (as needed); (e) Low suicidality defined as a score of 4 or below on the BPRS (Ventura et al., 1993) sustained for the past 1-month period prior to baseline; (f) The young person is willing for a caregiver to be informed about the study and will have at least weekly contact with their caregiver; (g) Ability to provide written informed consent.

Exclusion criteria: (a) A documented history of an intellectual disability or IQ < 70 ; (b) Inability to converse in or read English; (c) Women who are currently pregnant or breastfeeding; (d) Neurological disorder (illness of the brain, nerves or spinal cord which could not better explain the presence of psychosis).

3.4 | Recruitment, consent and enrolment

Participants will be recruited into the trial through a number of strategies—including regular case review discussions between the reduce research assistant (RA) and EPPIC consultants, direct referral to reduce from EPPIC clinicians and through the RA attending regular EPPIC team meetings to discuss ongoing eligibility of clients nearing 3 months of psychotic remission. Potential participants are then approached to take part in the trial by either the RA, reduce registrar or case manager. They are given ample time to consider the option to take part in reduce and are encouraged to discuss this with their family, local doctor and other supports. Before being enrolled in the study all participants will provide written and informed consent. In the case of minors, their parent or legal guardian will also be required to provide written and informed consent. After the consent process is

complete, a Core Baseline assessment is administered by the research assistant. Eligibility is assessed, using the BPRS (Ventura et al., 1993) and the SCID-RV (First et al., 2015). Participant medical files and EPPIC clinical files will also be used for collateral information to confirm eligibility.

3.5 | Method of assigning participants to treatment groups and randomization

An independent statistician will organize the randomization. The randomization will be stratified by sex at birth (male vs female) and baseline diagnosis (affective vs non-affective) as these characteristics are associated with key outcomes in this study and any chance imbalances may bias the analysis. Participants will be allocated to either the EBIRT (AMTx+) or EBIRT (DRS) treatment groups using randomly permuted blocks of varying size within each stratum, to maintain approximately equal group sizes over time. The randomization sequences will be concealed within a secured password protected website. On obtaining informed consent of a new participant, the delegated research team member will access this website and enter the participant's details. The delegated research team member will then inform the treating team the randomization outcomes who will then inform and discuss this with the participant.

A client identification (ID) number will be allocated to clients approached to ascertain their eligibility to participate in the study. Each eligible participant will be allocated to a unique and sequential randomization number.

3.6 | Healthy control group

Because the age range of participants covers a time of significant neurodevelopment, 40 healthy controls aged 15-25 years (inclusive), living in the EPPIC catchment, with no history of mental illness, neurological condition or antipsychotic medication treatment will also be recruited. They will undergo MRI scanning, be cognitively assessed and have physical health indicators measured (except bloods) at the same four time points as the DRS+ and AMTx+ groups (baseline, 9-months, 15-months and 24-months). This will provide objective control data to determine whether there are physical health, brain volume and neural activation or cognition changes and if they are related to illness, medication or typical development.

4 | OUTCOME MEASURES

The primary outcome measure is the Social and Occupational Functioning Scale (Goldman, Skodol, & Lave, 1992) (SOFAS) at 24 months. In addition to the primary outcome measure, a number of measures will assess physical health and metabolic profiles, brain volumes/activity, cognitive functioning and remission and relapse rates at 24 months.

5 | SECONDARY ENDPOINT MEASURES

5.1 | Symptomatology

Remission and relapse of positive symptoms will be assessed using the expanded Brief Psychiatric Rating Scale (Overall & Gorham, 1962) (BPRS) in treatment groups only. Remission of negative symptoms will be assessed using the Scale for Assessment of Negative Symptoms (SANS) (Andreasen, 1984). The a priori clinically significant degree of difference on duration of relapse is 7 days, in accordance with published duration criteria (Gleeson et al., 2013).

5.2 | Neurocognitive assessments

A battery of neurocognitive tests including the Brief Assessment of Cognition in Schizophrenia (Keefe et al., 2008) (BACS App) will be used to assess cognitive functioning in all groups, including healthy controls. Further detail of the full neurocognitive battery can be found in the Schedule of Assessments (Table 1).

5.3 | Physical health assessments

Blood pressure, weight, height and waist circumference will also be recorded in all groups including healthy controls.

5.4 | Haematological investigations

Physical health will be measured by clinical blood analysis evaluating fasting glucose, haemoglobin A_{1c}, triglycerides and total HL cholesterol in the treatment groups only.

5.5 | Brain imaging

Brain volume will be quantified in both treatment groups and healthy controls by high-resolution magnetic resonance imaging (MRI). In addition to structural MRI, functional resting state data will also be collected.

6 | STUDY INTERVENTION

6.1 | Intervention

After randomization and allocation to one of the two conditions, all participants will commence the intensive EBIRT phase in which they will attend up to twice weekly individual therapy and vocational support sessions until month 9.

6.2 | Evidence-based intensive recovery treatment

EBIRT combines two well-validated and manualized psychosocial interventions: Individual Placement and Support (IPS) for vocational recovery and Cognitive Behaviour Therapy (CBT) for Relapse Prevention. EBIRT will be delivered in two phases; a 9-month intensive phase which entails up to two sessions of individual therapy (one CBT sessions and one IPS session) per week for 9 months. All participants will receive 9 months of the EBIRT intensive phase. This will followed by a

6 to 9 month (dependent on tenure remaining in service)—maintenance/monitoring phase in which individual therapy sessions will be delivered every 4 to 6 weeks.

The first component of EBIRT is CBT. This will be provided by a therapist trained in CBT and is comprised of six or more modules of therapy delivered over the 9-month intensive period. The six phases of EBIRT intervention include: (Addington et al., 2018) initiation of vocational intervention (Killackey & Allott, 2013) formulation and agenda setting; including vocational goal setting (Waghorn et al., 2012); engagement and assessment for recovery and risk for relapse (Horan et al., 2006); psychoeducation with a focus on relapse (Harvey et al., 2012); early warning signs and relapse planning—will also involve family members with participant's consent; and, treatment and progress review (Morgan et al., 2013). Additional optional modules may be drawn upon depending on case formulation and clinical determination in collaboration with the participant include: substance abuse, stress management and co-morbid anxiety and depression at the participant or clinician discretion. The second component of EBIRT is IPS. This will focus on (a) focussed upon competitive employment, education or training as an outcome; and (b) focussed upon immediate job/education searching and will be delivered by a Youth Specialist Vocational Consultant. In tandem with EBIRT, participants will be randomly assigned following baseline assessment to either the DRS+ or AMTx treatment conditions.

DRS will comprise a 9-month EBIRT phase (DRS+). The comparator group will receive AMTx and EBIRT (AMTx+). The EBIRT intervention will be the same in both groups. The AMTx group treatment, including medication prescription will be in accordance with published treatment guidelines. The Reduce trial clinicians will collect data on frequency, content and duration of therapy sessions in order to measure treatment compliance for the duration of the 15 to 18 month EBIRT treatment.

At month 9, all participants will transition into the lower intensity monitoring phase of EBIRT in which they will attend individual therapy sessions with their Reduce case manager every 4 to 6 weeks for a minimum of 6 months. All participants will receive at least 15 months of total reduce treatment and a maximum of 18 months, depending on how long their psychotic symptoms take to stabilize upon entry into EPPIC. This means that some participants will receive a total of 24 months of EPPIC treatment whereby, some participants will receive 27 months total EPPIC treatment. Participants are entitled to the full EPPIC treatment package throughout this time and can have the frequency of appointments with EPPIC team increased should there be a clinical indication to do so. Differences in EPPIC treatment will be recorded.

6.3 | Dose reduction strategy (DRS+) group

Participants who are randomized to this arm of the trial will be offered a gradual dose reduction of their antipsychotic medication at their next medical review after randomization. Medication will be tapered under close medical supervision over 3 months after allocation to the DRS group to minimize the risk of relapse due to abrupt discontinuation. The rate of tapering will be a 25% dose reduction (or as near to 25% as the medication allows) of the pre-reduction dose every month

TABLE 1 Outline of schedule of assessments

	Visit 1 Baseline		Visit 2	Visit 3 end of intervention		Visit 4 End of study
	Core baseline ^a Day -21 to 1	Non-core baseline ^b Day 1 to day 21	9-month + 3 months	15-18 month + 3 months	Phone follow-up ^c ± 7 days	24-month ± 28 days
Assessment						
Informed consent ^d	X					
Inclusion/exclusion criteria	X					
Demographics	X		X	X		X
Medical & psychiatric history		X				
Pregnancy (urine) ^e	X			X		X
Concomitant med. review ^f		X	X	X	X	X
Treatment allocation						
Randomization	X					
Diagnosis						
SCID5-RV (modules A & B)	X			X		X
Intervention						
Participants in DRS+ ^g						
EBIRT ^h					Post intervention follow-up	
Medication compliance						
Clinician's compliance rating ^e		X	X	X		
MARS ^e		X	X	X		X
Medication side effects						
LUNERS		X	X	X		X
Symptomatology						
BPRS ⁱ	X		X	X	X	X
SANS		X	X	X		X
DASS-21		X	X	X	X	X
CDSS		X	X	X		X
IPASE		X	X	X		X
Functioning & quality of life						
SOFAS ^h		X	X	X	X	X
Vocational functioning		X	X	X	X	X
WHOQoL-BREF		X	X	X		X
UCLALS		X	X	X		X
MHCS		X	X	X		X
The self-efficacy scale		X	X	X		X
BPNS		X	X	X		X
Daily functioning and affect						
SEMA ^j		X	X	X		X
Pre-morbidity and illness						
NOS		X				
Trauma						
CTQ		X				
Metabolic monitoring						
Clinical bloods ^k		X	X	X		X
Blood pressure, height, weight and waist circumference ^l		X	X	X		X
Substance use						
AUDIT		X	X	X		X
ASSIST		X	X	X		X
Neurocognitive						
WRAT-4		X				

TABLE 1 (Continued)

	Visit 1 Baseline	Visit 2	Visit 3 end of intervention	Visit 4 End of study
BACS	X	X	X	X
ER-40	X	X	X	X
The hinting task	X	X	X	X
PAL	X	X	X	X
Edinburgh handedness inventory	X			
NSSR	X	X	X	X
PDQ	X	X	X	X
AES	X	X	X	X
Structural and functional imaging				
Shoulder and hip width ^m	X			
MRI ⁿ	X	X	X	X

Abbreviations: AES, adverse events; BACS, Brief Assessment of Cognition in Schizophrenia; BPRS, Brief Psychiatric Rating Scale; CDSS, The Calgary Depression Scale for Schizophrenia; DASS, The Depression, Anxiety and Stress Scale; CTQ, Childhood Trauma Questionnaire; EBIRT, evidence-based intensive recovery treatment; IPASE, Inventory of Psychotic-like anomalous self-experiences; LUNERS, Liverpool University neuroleptic side effect rating scale; MHCS, mental health confidence scale; NOS, nottingham onset schedule; NSSR, neuropsychological symptoms self-report; PDQ, perceived deficits questionnaire; SANS, Scale for Assessment of Negative Symptoms; SEMA, smartphone ecological momentary assessment; SOFAS, Social and Occupational Functioning Scale; UCLALS, The University of California - Los Angeles loneliness scale.

^a Core baseline assessments may be conducted over a number of visits to allow for “real-world” scenarios however, must be completed prior to randomization.

^b Non-core component baseline assessments may be conducted over a number of visits to allow for “real-world” scenarios and can be completed up to 3 weeks after randomization.

^c Telephone contact every 6 weeks from month 9-24 to check discontinuation/withdrawal criteria.

^d Informed consent can be obtained up to 21 days prior to baseline.

^e In addition to conducting urine pregnancy tests at each baseline and 24-month assessments, participants will also be asked to indicate whether they are pregnant or not during 9-month, 15-month assessments and telephone follow-ups.

^f To maintain blinding of RAs, EBIRT clinicians will review medication adherence weekly (every second session) during the EBIRT intensive phase and every session during the EBIRT maintenance phase. EBIRT clinicians will also check concomitant medications every 6 weeks during the intervention phase (up to minimum of 15 months).

^g Reduce antipsychotic medication dose by 25% every month for 3 months as clinically indicated.

^h EBIRT intensive phase: Twice weekly individual therapy sessions to month 9, maintenance/monitoring phase 4-6 weeks individual therapy for a minimum of 6 months. A checklist recording details and items covered in of the EBIRT (CBT) session will be completed every session by the clinician and entered directly into the eCRF. The IPS worker will also complete a checklist recording items covered in every session and enter this in to the eCRF. This data will be used to assess fidelity of EBIRT.

ⁱ In addition to assessment time-points and telephone follow-up, the BPRS and SOFAS will be measured weekly during the intensive phase and at therapy sessions during the maintenance phase for purposes of discontinuation criteria.

^j SEMA will be used to deliver electronic surveys (to be administered directly after the baseline and follow-up assessments (visits 1-4) at 8 time points per day in the waking hours of each participant for a period of 7 days. Only participants who have smartphones will complete these surveys.

^k Clinical bloods will involve testing for fasting glucose, haemoglobin A_{1c}, fasting triglycerides and fasting total HL cholesterol. Clinical bloods assessment to be completed within 2 weeks of randomization and within 2 weeks of visits 2-4.

^l Blood pressure, height, weight and waist circumference will also be measured at approximately 12, 18 and 21 months in addition to study visits. These will be measured by study RAs.

^m Eligibility assessment for MRI scan.

ⁿ MRI assessment to be completed within 2 weeks of randomization and within 2 weeks of visits 2 to 4.

for 3 months, until the participant reduces a dose that is considered clinically safe, whereby some participants will completely cease taking the antipsychotic medication. This will see some variation in participants' reduction schedule. All data on the rate of dose reduction will be collected by the reduce clinicians to measure the variations in participant treatment.

6.4 | Antipsychotic maintenance treatment (AMTx) group

Participants will be prescribed medication as clinically indicated, concordant with the Australian Clinical Practice Guidelines for FEP (National Collaborating Centre for Mental Health, 2014; ORYGEN, 2010). These guidelines recommend the use of the lowest effective dose of atypical antipsychotics.

All trial participants will have access to all components of treatment at EPPIC, including psychiatric care, case management,

psychosocial program, acute inpatient care and outreach as clinically indicated (Andreasen, 1984; Keefe et al., 2008; Ventura et al., 1993).

6.5 | Safety measures

Participants will be managed within the EPPIC clinic at OYH. Participants will be monitored by the treating team. Clinical appointments can be held more frequently when clinically indicated. In addition, the BPRS (Ventura et al., 1993) and SOFAS (Goldman et al., 1992) scales will administered weekly by the participant's EBIRT Clinician to assess for participant symptomatic relapse, and to measure the acceptability and safety of the prescribed dose. The SOFAS will measure functioning during the 9-month intensive phase. These safety assessments will continue to occur every 4 to 6 weeks up until month 24 and administered by either the EBIRT Clinician or the Research Assistant.

TABLE 2 Temporary pause from DRS+

1.	Increases from 3 (mild) or below to ratings of 6 or 7 (severe or very severe) on any one of the following 3 BPRS (McGorry, 2007) items: (a) unusual thought content, (b) hallucinations and (c) conceptual disorganization, with a duration criterion of 1 week.
2.	Significant psychotic exacerbations defined by an increase from 3 or below (for at least 1 month) on all the BPRS (McGorry, 2007) 3 scales followed by a score of 5 (moderate) on any of the 3-items plus a 2-point increase on one of the other scales (again with the addition of a duration criterion of 1 week) or a rating of 5 on any one of the 3 scales for at least 1 month.
3.	An increase in suicidality as defined by a score of 5 or more on the BPRS (McGorry, 2007) suicidality subscale (ie, many fantasies about suicide, specific suicide plan, non-lethal attempt) for a duration of at least 1 week.
AND	
4.	A significant decrease in overall functioning as defined by a 20-point drop in SOFAS score from the baseline score, maintained for 1 month.
OR	
5.	If the above criteria are not met but the participant is considered by their treating clinical team to have significantly deteriorated in relation to psychotic symptoms compared to baseline, and clinical response is deemed necessary, they may also be temporarily paused from the DRS+.

7 | TEMPORARY PAUSE OR COMPLETE DISCONTINUATION FROM DRS+

In the event of symptomatic relapse or worsening of symptoms, and the participant meeting the criteria for relapse described in Table 2, the participant's dose reduction treatment may be temporarily paused.

Table 2 presents the criteria used to define psychotic relapse and will result in a temporary pause from the DRS+ treatment. These relapse criteria have been developed with the aim of reflecting 'real-world' relapse of FEP. Participants must satisfy either criteria 1, 2 or 3 in combination with 4 to meet relapse criteria (Ventura et al., 1993). There is also a "fail-safe" option should stopping the DRS be clinically indicated.


Participants will be monitored by their treating team and study personnel and regularly assessed for relapse, psychotic exacerbations and functioning.

In the event of a temporary pause in the dose reduction strategy the clinical team will decide whether the participant should restart their antipsychotic medication or increase their dose. Any changes made will be in consultation with the participant.

If antipsychotic medication is recommenced or if the dose is increased, it will be titrated up until an effective dose is reached. Titration will occur at a pace appropriate to the individual's clinical presentation and should allow adequate time for a response at each dosing interval. In this case, psychiatry registrars will discuss appropriate dose with treating consultants and ensure any changes are documented. If the participant fails to achieve satisfactory recovery defined by persistence of severe psychotic symptoms whilst consistently meeting criteria described in Table 2 for 3 months following the initial relapse, or if they become pregnant during the study they will be completely discontinued from DRS+, whilst still remaining in EPPIC and receiving EBIRT. These participants will also be invited to continue with the research assessments and included in intention-to-treat analyses.

Table 3 outlines the study schema

Participants discontinued from the AMTx+ group will continue to receive treatment in accordance with the Australian Clinical Practice

TABLE 3 Reduce intervention timeline

Guidelines. If they wish they may continue with EBIRT and the research assessments. These participants will also be included in intention-to-treat analyses.

8 | WITHDRAWAL CRITERIA

A participant will be withdrawn from the study if they choose to no longer participate in the study voluntarily, a participant will be considered "withdrawn" from the study in cases where all involvement in the trial is ceased and no further follow-up is enacted.

9 | BLINDING

The delegated study statistician will be blind to treatment allocation. Research assistants (RAs) will also be blind to treatment allocation. The study RAs will be kept blind using the following processes: (a) regular reminders will be sent to clinical staff at EPPIC, regarding the importance of the blind; (b) at the start of each research interview the RA will remind the participants of the importance of the blind; (c) the RA will have restricted access to participants' medical records. The unblinded Project Manager will have access to the participant's medical records and will retrieve and provide study RA's with any information that is required (ie, for screening). Because the extent and rate of dose tapering in each individual case requires clinical tailoring in response to preceding dose reductions, it is not feasible to utilize a placebo control, so medication treatment will be open-label, with medications chosen by EPPIC psychiatrists.

10 | STATISTICAL METHODS AND DETERMINATION OF SAMPLE SIZE

Data analysis will be conducted at the completion of the study (24 months from last patient first visit) and as such there will be no interim analyses conducted. The primary outcome is SOFAS score at two-year follow-up. Calculations of effect size are based on detecting a two-year follow-up effect size of $d = 0.505$, based on our previous relapse prevention studies which found a group difference of this magnitude on the SOFAS at two-year follow-up. Power is set at 0.85, $\alpha = 0.05$ (two-tailed). The estimated sample size is 144 ($n = 72$ per group). To accommodate an attrition rate of 20%, the target sample size will be 180, or 90 participants per treatment group. Differences on social and vocational functioning measures will be examined using mixed model repeated measures and intention-to-treat analysis. Between-group differences on vocational status will be examined using logistic regression. Patterns of missing data and missing data mechanisms will be investigated using two approaches; firstly, Little's missing completely at random (MCAR) test will be used to assess the degree to which the data are likely to meet the MCAR mechanism; secondly, prediction of missingness at each of the assessment points will be undertaken using binary logistic regression, with a range of baseline sociodemographic, clinical and psychopathology variables used to predict the presence or absence of a particular assessment.

Likelihood techniques will be used to address missing data. The same statistical models described above will be used to characterize the effects of treatment regimen on grey and white matter volumes. Flexible factorial models will be used to estimate significant within-and between-group activation effects at the whole brain level (using F tests) to determine the effects of treatment regimen on brain function. A cluster-based permutation approach will be used to identify significant differences satisfying a Family Wise Error rate of 0.05. Age and sex assigned at birth will be controlled for in all analyses.

11 | DATA SAFETY MONITORING BOARD

A Data Safety Monitoring Board will be established in accordance with ICH-GCP Guidelines and the NHMRC's 2018 guidelines on DSMBs.

12 | TRIAL STATUS

The study commenced enrolling participants in July 2017. Enrolment is continuing at the time of manuscript submission. The report of the study findings is expected in 2024.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The study is funded by an National Health Medical Research Council (NHMRC) Project grant (APP 1102394) from the Commonwealth of Australia. Killackey has been funded by an NHMRC CDF II Fellowship (APP1051891) and a Fellowship from the BB & A Miller Foundation. Alvarez-Jimenez was supported by a Career Development Fellowship (APP1082934) from the National Health and Medical Research Council. Nelson is funded by an NHMRC Senior Research Fellowship. Bendall is funded by a Fellowship from the McClusker Charitable Foundation. Allott is funded by a Ronald Philip Griffiths Fellowship, The University of Melbourne.

ORCID

Brian O'Donoghue  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6240-6952>

Lex Wunderink  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4150-4681>

Eóin Killackey  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9649-5551>

REFERENCES

- Addington, J., Killackey, E., & Marulanda, D. (2018). Early psychosis services. In A. R. Yung & P. D. McGorry (Eds.), *Youth mental health: A preventive approach to mental disorders in young people*. Melbourne, VIC: IP Communications In Press.
- Almond, S., Knapp, M., Francois, C., Toumi, M., & Brugha, T. (2004). Relapse in schizophrenia: Costs, clinical outcomes and quality of life. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, *184*, 346–351.
- Alvarez-Jimenez, M., Gleeson, J. F., Henry, L. P., Harrigan, S. M., Harris, M. G., Killackey, E., ... McGorry, P. D. (2012). Road to full recovery: Longitudinal relationship between symptomatic remission and psychosocial recovery in first-episode psychosis over 7.5 years. *Psychological Medicine*, *42*(3), 595–606.
- Alvarez-Jimenez, M., O'Donoghue, B., Thompson, A., Gleeson, J. F., Bendall, S. C., Gonzalez-Blanch, C., ... McGorry, P. D. (2016). Beyond clinical remission in first episode psychosis: Thoughts on antipsychotic

- maintenance vs. guided discontinuation in the functional recovery era. *CNS Drugs*, 30(5), 357–368.
- Alvarez-Jimenez, M., Parker, A. G., Hetrick, S. E., McGorry, P. D., & Gleeson, J. F. (2011). Preventing the second episode: A systematic review and meta-analysis of psychosocial and pharmacological trials in first-episode psychosis. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, 37(3), 619–630.
- Andreasen, N., Carpenter, W., Kane, J., Lasser, R., Marder, S., & Weinberger, D. (2005). Remission in schizophrenia: Proposed criteria and rationale for consensus. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, 162, 441–449.
- Andreasen, N. C. (1984). *Scale for Assessment of Negative Symptoms (SANS)*. Iowa, IA: University of Iowa.
- Andreasen, N. C., Liu, D., Ziebell, S., Vora, A., & Ho, B. C. (2013). Relapse duration, treatment intensity, and brain tissue loss in schizophrenia: A prospective longitudinal MRI study. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, 170(6), 609–615.
- Ascher-Svanum, H., Zhu, B. J., Faries, D. E., Salkever, D., Slade, E. P., Peng, X., & Conley, R. R. (2010). The cost of relapse and the predictors of relapse in the treatment of schizophrenia. *BMC Psychiatry*, 10, 1–7.
- Association AP. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders*. 5th ed. Arlington, VA: American Psychiatric Publishing.
- Bola, J. R., & Mosher, L. R. (2002). At issue: Predicting drug-free treatment response in acute psychosis from the Soteria project. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, 28(4), 559–575.
- Bowie, C. R., McLaughlin, D., Carrion, R. E., Auther, A. M., & Cornblatt, B. A. (2012). Cognitive changes following antidepressant or antipsychotic treatment in adolescents at clinical risk for psychosis. *Schizophrenia Research*, 137(1–3), 110–117.
- Carpenter, W. T., Jr., Appelbaum, P. S., & Levine, R. J. (2003). The declaration of Helsinki and clinical trials: A focus on placebo-controlled trials in schizophrenia. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, 160(2), 356–362.
- Chen, E. Y. H., Hui, C. L. M., Lam, M. M. L., Chiu, C. P. Y., Law, C. W., Chung, D. W. S., ... Honer, W. G. (2010). Maintenance treatment with quetiapine versus discontinuation after one year of treatment in patients with remitted first episode psychosis: Randomised controlled trial. *British Medical Journal*, 341, c4024.
- Coldham, E. L., Addington, J., & Addington, D. (2002). Medication adherence of individuals with a first episode of psychosis. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, 106(4), 286–290.
- Correll, C. U., Rubio, J. M., & Kane, J. K. (2018). What is the risk-benefit ratio of long-term antipsychotic treatment in people with schizophrenia? *World Psychiatry*, 17, 149–160.
- De Hert, M., Correll, C., Bobes, J., Cetkovich-Bakmas, M., Cohen, D., Asai, I., ... Leucht, S. (2011). Physical illness in patients with severe mental disorders. I. Prevalence, impact of medications and disparities in health care. *World Psychiatry: Official Journal of the World Psychiatric Association*, 10(1), 52–77.
- Emsley, R., Chilliza, B., & Asmal, L. (2013). The evidence for illness progression after relapse in schizophrenia. *Schizophrenia Research*, 148(1–3), 117–121.
- Emsley, R., Chilliza, B., Asmal, L., & Harvey, B. H. (2013). The nature of relapse in schizophrenia. *BMC Psychiatry*, 13, 1–8.
- Faber, G., Smid, H. G., Van Gool, A. R., Wiersma, D., & Van Den Bosch, R. J. (2012). The effects of guided discontinuation of antipsychotics on neurocognition in first onset psychosis. *European Psychiatry*, 27(4), 275–280.
- First, M. B., Karg, R. S., & Spitzer, R. L. (2015). *Structured clinical interview for DSM-5—research version (SCID-5 for DSM-5, research version; SCID-5-RV)*. Arlington, VA: American Psychiatric Association.
- Gitlin, M., Nuechterlein, K., Subotnik, K. L., Ventura, J., Mintz, J., Fogelson, D. L., ... Aravagiri, M. (2001). Clinical outcome following neuroleptic discontinuation in patients with remitted recent-onset schizophrenia. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, 158(11), 1835–1842.
- Gleeson, J. F., Cotton, S. M., Alvarez-Jimenez, M., et al. (2009). A randomized controlled trial of relapse prevention therapy for first-episode psychosis patients. *The Journal of Clinical Psychiatry*, 70(4), 477–486.
- Gleeson, J. F. M., Cotton, S. M., Alvarez-Jimenez, M., Wade, D., Gee, D., Crisp, K., ... McGorry, P. D. (2013). A randomized controlled trial of relapse prevention therapy for first-episode psychosis patients: Outcome at 30-month follow-up. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, 39(2), 436–448.
- Goldman, H. H., Skodol, A. E., & Lave, T. R. (1992). Revising Axis V for DSM-IV: A review of measures of social functioning. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, 149(9), 1148–1156.
- Grundy, S., Brewer, H., Jr., Cleeman, J., Smith, S., Jr., & Lenfant, C. (2004). Definition of metabolic syndrome: Report of the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute/American Heart Association conference on scientific issues related to definition. *Circulation*, 109, 433–438.
- Hage, A., Weymann, L., Bliznak, L., Marker, V., Mechler, K., & Dittmann, R. W. (2018). Non-adherence to psychotropic medication among adolescents - a systematic review of the literature. *Zeitschrift für Kinder- und Jugendpsychiatrie und Psychotherapie*, 46(1), 69–78.
- Harvey, C., Killackey, E., Groves, A., & Herrman, H. (2012). A place to live: Housing needs for people with psychotic disorders identified in the second Australian survey of psychosis. *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, 46, 840–850.
- Horan, W. P., Subotnik, K. L., Snyder, K. S., & Nuechterlein, K. H. (2006). Do recent-onset schizophrenia patients experience a "social network crisis"? *Psychiatry*, 69, 115–129.
- Husa, A. P., Rannikko, I., Moilanen, J., Haapea, M., Murray, G. K., Barnett, J., ... Jääskeläinen, E. (2014). Lifetime use of antipsychotic medication and its relation to change of verbal learning and memory in midlife schizophrenia - an observational 9-year follow-up study. *Schizophrenia Research*, 158(1–3), 134–141.
- Iyer, S. N., Mangala, R., Anitha, J., Thara, R., & Malla, A. K. (2011). An examination of patient-identified goals for treatment in a first-episode programme in Chennai, India. *Early Intervention in Psychiatry*, 5(4), 360–365.
- Keefe, R. S., Harvey, P. D., Goldberg, T. E., Gold, J. M., Walker, T. M., Kennel, C., & Hawkins, K. (2008). Norms and standardization of the brief assessment of cognition in schizophrenia (BACS). *Schizophrenia Research*, 102(1–3), 108–115.
- Killackey, E., & Allott, K. (2013). Utilising individual placement and support to address unemployment and low education rates among individuals with psychotic disorders. *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, 47(6), 521–523.
- Killackey, E., Jackson, H. J., & McGorry, P. D. (2008). Vocational intervention in first-episode psychosis: Individual placement and support v. treatment as usual. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 193(2), 114–120.
- Klemp, M., Tveté, I. F., Skomedal, T., Gaasemyr, J., Natvig, B., & Aursnes, I. (2011). A review and Bayesian meta-analysis of clinical efficacy and adverse effects of 4 atypical neuroleptic drugs compared with haloperidol and placebo. *Journal of Clinical Psychopharmacology*, 31(6), 698–704.
- Knapp, M., Patel, A., Curran, C., Latimer, E., Catty, J., Becker, T., ... Burns, T. (2013). Supported employment: Cost-effectiveness across six European sites. *World Psychiatry*, 12(1), 60–68.
- Knowles, E. E. M., David, A. S., & Reichenberg, A. (2010). Processing speed deficits in schizophrenia: Reexamining the evidence. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, 167(7), 828–835.
- Lesh, A. T., Tanase, C., Geib, B. R., Niendam, T. A., Yoon, J. H., Minzenberg, M. J., ... Carter, C. (2015). A multimodal analysis of antipsychotic effects on brain structure and function in first-episode schizophrenia. *JAMA Psychiatry*, 72(3), 226–234.
- Lui, S., Li, T., Deng, W., Jiang, L., Wu, Q., Tang, H., ... Gong, Q. (2010). Short-term effects of antipsychotic treatment on cerebral function in drug-naïve first-episode schizophrenia revealed by "resting state" functional magnetic resonance imaging. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 67(8), 783–792.
- McGorry, P. (2007). Issues for DSM-V: Clinical staging: A heuristic pathway to valid nosology and safer, more effective treatment in psychiatry. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, 164(6), 859–860.
- McGorry, P. D., Alvarez-Jimenez, M., & Killackey, E. (2013). Antipsychotic medication during the critical period following remission from first-episode psychosis. Less is more. *JAMA Psychiatry*, 70, 898–900.
- Morgan, V., McGrath, J., Jablensky, A., Badcock, J. C., Waterreus, A., Bush, R., ... Galletly, C. (2013). Psychosis prevalence and physical, metabolic and cognitive co-morbidity: Data from the second Australian national survey of psychosis. *Psychological Medicine*, 10, 1–14.
- Morgan, V. A., Waterreus, A., Jablensky, A., Mackinnon, A., McGrath J. J., Carr, V., ... Saw S. (2010). People living with psychotic illness. In

- Department of health and ageing (p. 2011). Canberra, ACT: Commonwealth of Australia.
- National Collaborating Centre for Mental Health. (2014). *Psychosis and schizophrenia in adults: The NICE guideline on treatment and management. Updated edition 2004*. London: National Institute for Health and Care Excellence.
- Olfson, M., Gerhard, T., Huang, C., Crystal, S., & Stroup, T. (2015). Premature mortality among adults with schizophrenia in the United States. *JAMA Psychiatry*, *12*, 1–10.
- ORYGEN. (2010). *Youth health. The Australian clinical guidelines for early psychosis*. ORYGEN Youth Health Research Centre: Melbourne, VIC.
- Overall, J. E., & Gorham, D. R. (1962). The brief psychiatric rating scale. *Psychiatric Reports*, *10*, 799–812.
- Potkin, S. G., Fleming, K., Jin, Y., & Gulasekaram, B. (2001). Clozapine enhances neurocognition and clinical symptomatology more than standard neuroleptics. *Journal of Clinical Psychopharmacology*, *21*(5), 479–483.
- Program EPGWGaENS. (2016). *Australian Clinical Guidelines for Early Psychosis, 2nd edition Update*. Melbourne, VIC: Orygen, The National Centre of Excellence in Youth Mental Health.
- Radua, J., Borgwardt, A., Crescini, A., Mataix-Cols, D., Meyer-Linderberg, A., McGuire, P. K., & Fusar-Poli, P. (2012). Multimodal meta-analysis of structural and functional brain changes in first episode psychosis and the effects of antipsychotic medication. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, *36*, 2325–2333.
- Ramsay, C. E., Broussard, B., Goulding, S. M., Cristofaro, S., Hall, D., Kaslow, N. J., ... Compton, M. T. (2011). Life and treatment goals of individuals hospitalized for first-episode nonaffective psychosis. *Psychiatry Research*, *189*(3), 344–348.
- Sarpal, D. K., Robinson, D. G., Lencz, T., Ikuta, T., Karlsgodt, K., Gallego, J. A., ... Malhotra, A. K. (2015). Antipsychotic treatment and functional connectivity of the striatum in first-episode schizophrenia. *JAMA Psychiatry*, *72*(1), 5–13.
- Sohler, N., Adams, B. G., Barnes, D. M., Cohen, G. H., Prins, S. J., & Schwartz, S. (2016). Weighing the evidence for harm from long-term treatment with antipsychotic medications: A systematic review. *The American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, *86*(5), 477–485.
- Subotnik, K. L., Nuechterlein, K. H., Ventura, J., & Marder, S. (2011). Response to Gordon and Green letter. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, *168*(9), 987–988.
- Thompson, A., Singh, S., & Birchwood, M. (2016). Views of early psychosis clinicians on discontinuation of antipsychotic medication following symptom remission in first episode psychosis. *Early Intervention in Psychiatry*, *10*(4), 355–361.
- Ventura, J., Lukoff, D., Nuechterlein, K. H., Liberman, R. P., Green, M. F., & Shaner, A. (1993). *Brief Psychiatric Rating Scale (BPRS) expanded version (4.0). Scales, anchor points, and administration manual*. UCLA Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences: West Los Angeles.
- Waghorn, G., Saha, S., Harvey, C., Morgan, V. A., Waterreus, A., Bush, R., ... McGrath, J. J. (2012). 'Earning and learning' in those with psychotic disorders: The second Australian national survey of psychosis. *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, *46*(8), 774–785.
- Weickert, T. W., Goldberg, T. E., Marengo, S., Bigelow, L. B., Egan, M. F., & Weinberger, D. R. (2003). Comparison of cognitive performances during a placebo period and an atypical antipsychotic treatment period in schizophrenia: Critical examination of confounds. *Neuropsychopharmacology: Official Publication of the American College of Neuropsychopharmacology*, *28*, 1497–1500.
- Weickert, T. W., Mattay, V. S., Das, S., Bigelow, L. B., Apud, J. A., Egan, M. F., ... Goldberg, T. E. (2013). Dopaminergic therapy removal differentially affects learning in schizophrenia and Parkinson's disease. *Schizophrenia Research*, *149*(1–3), 162–166.
- Whale, R., Harris, M., Kavanagh, C., et al. (2016). Effectiveness of antipsychotics used in first episode psychosis: A naturalistic cohort study. *Br. J. Psych Open.*, *2*, 323–329.
- Wunderink, L., Nieboer, R. M., Wiersma, D., Sytema, S., & Nienhuis, F. J. (2013). Recovery in remitted first-episode psychosis at 7 years of follow-up of an early dose reduction/discontinuation or maintenance treatment strategy: Long-term follow-up of a 2-year randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Psychiatry*, *70*(9), 913–920.
- Wunderink, L., Nienhuis, F. J., Sytema, S., Slooff, C. J., Knegtering, R., & Wiersma, D. (2007). Guided discontinuation versus maintenance treatment in remitted first-episode psychosis: Relapse rates and functional outcome. *The Journal of Clinical Psychiatry*, *68*(5), 654–661.

How to cite this article: Weller A, Gleeson J, Alvarez-Jimenez M, et al. Can antipsychotic dose reduction lead to better functional recovery in first-episode psychosis? A randomized controlled-trial of antipsychotic dose reduction. The reduce trial: Study protocol. *Early Intervention in Psychiatry*. 2018;1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1111/eip.12769>