ORIGINAL ARTICLE

The Frankfurt Complaint Questionnaire for self-assessment of basic symptoms in the early detection of psychosis—Factor structure, reliability, and predictive validity

Martina Uttinger^{1,2} | Erich Studerus¹ | Sarah Ittig¹ | Ulrike Heitz¹ |
Frauke Schultze-Lutter^{3,4} | Anita Riecher-Rössler¹

¹Center for Gender Research and Early Detection, University of Basel Psychiatric Hospital, University of Basel, Basel, Switzerland

²Psychiatric Services Solothurn, Olten, Switzerland

³University Hospital of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland

⁴Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, Medical Faculty, Heinrich-Heine-University, Düsseldorf, Germany

Correspondence

Anita Riecher-Rössler, Center for Gender Research and Early Detection, University of Basel Psychiatric Hospital, University of Basel, Basel, Switzerland.
Email: anita.riecher@upkbs.ch

Funding information

Swiss National Science Foundation (SNF)

Abstract

Objectives: Patients with schizophrenia often experience subtle disturbances in several domains of information processing—so-called basic symptoms (BS). BS are already present before onset of frank psychosis and can be assessed by interviews but also by the self-administered Frankfurt Complaint Questionnaire (FCQ). We investigated the factor structure, reliability, and predictive validity for transition to psychosis of the FCQ, comparing previously proposed factor solutions containing 1, 2, 4, and 10 factors.

Methods: Confirmatory factor analysis was used in a sample of 117 at-risk mental state and 92 first-episode psychosis participants of the Basel FePsy (early detection of psychosis) study.

Results: Although all factor models fitted to the data, the 2- or 4-factor solutions performed best among the models that used at least half of the FCQ items, suggesting the covariance between FCQ items is best explained by 2 to 4 underlying factors. No FCQ-scale predicted transition to psychosis.

Conclusion: We could confirm a 2- to 4-factor structure of the FCQ in a sample of at-risk mental state and first-episode psychosis patients using confirmatory factor analysis. Contrary to interview-assessed cognitive-perceptive BS, self-assessed BS do not seem to improve prediction of psychosis. This result reinforces reports of poor correspondence between interview- and questionnaire-assessed BS.

KEYWORDS

basic symptoms, confirmatory factor analysis, Frankfurt Complaint Questionnaire, prediction of psychosis, self-assessment

1 | INTRODUCTION

Patients with schizophrenia frequently experience not only overt positive and negative symptoms but also various subclinical disturbances in several domains of information processing. These often start already several years before the onset of frank psychosis (Riecher-Rössler

et al., 2006; Riecher-Rössler et al., 2009). Following early works of Wilhelm Mayer-Gross (1932), Gerd Huber (1966) first systematically described these subjective disturbances based on in-depth clinical interviews with patients. He coined the term *basic symptoms* (BS), because based on his pioneer works on dysplastic ventricles in schizophrenia, he assumed them to be the most immediate

Abbreviations: ARMS; at-risk mental state; ARMS-NT; at-risk mental state—non transitioned; ARMS-T; at risk mental state—transitioned; BPRS; Brief Psychiatric Rating Scale; BS; basic symptoms; BSABS; Bonn Scale for the Assessment of Basic Symptoms; CFA; confirmatory factor analysis; CFI; comparative fit index; CI; confidence interval; COGDIS; cognitive disturbances; COPER; cognitive-perceptive basic symptoms; FCQ; Frankfurt Complaint Questionnaire; FEP; first-episode psychosis; FePsy; Basel project of early detection of psychosis (German: Früherkennung von Psychosen); PCA; principal component analysis; RMSEA; root mean square error of approximation; SANS; scale for the assessment of negative symptoms; SPI-A, Schizophrenia Proneness Instrument, adult version; SPI-CY, Schizophrenia Proneness Instrument, children and youth version; TLI; Tucker-Lewis index; UHR; ultra-high risk; WLSMV; weighted least square mean and variance adjusted estimator; WRMR; weighted root mean residual

psychopathological expression of the neurobiological changes underlying the development of psychosis (Huber & Söllwold, 1986). BS are subjectively experienced by patients as deviations from their “normal” self and as a loss of control over different mental functions (Schultze-Lutter, 2009; Schultze-Lutter et al., 2012b; Schultze-Lutter et al., 2016). The 142 BS initially described in the interviewer rated Bonn Scale for the Assessment of Basic Symptoms (BSABS; Gross, 1987) can be present in various numbers and combinations and include self-experienced disturbances in thinking, attention, speech, (body) perception, motor actions, stress tolerance, drive, and affective responses, as well as central-vegetative processes.

Developed from the BSABS as economic, age-appropriate and severity-sensitive interview assessments of BS, the Schizophrenia Proneness Instrument, adult version (SPI-A; Schultze-Lutter, Addington, Ruhrmann, & Klosterkötter, 2007) and Schizophrenia Proneness Instrument, child and youth version (SPI-CY; Schultze-Lutter, Ruhrmann, Berning, Maier, & Klosterkötter, 2010) are the most used instrument today in the clinic and in research, especially in early detection of psychosis (Schultze-Lutter et al., 2012b). From interview assessments of BS, two partially overlapping psychosis-risk criteria were developed—the cognitive-perceptive BS (COPER; Klosterkötter, Hellmich, Steinmeyer, & Schultze-Lutter, 2001) and the cognitive disturbances (COGDIS; Schultze-Lutter et al., 2007; Schultze-Lutter, Ruhrmann, & Klosterkötter, 2006). Studies indicated that the combined presence of symptomatic ultra-high risk (UHR) criteria (Yung & McGorry, 1996) and BS criteria almost triples the risk of developing psychosis when compared to the exclusive presence of either UHR or BS criteria (Michel, Ruhrmann, Schimmelmann, Klosterkötter, & Schultze-Lutter, 2014; Schultze-Lutter et al., 2012a; Schultze-Lutter, Klosterkötter, & Ruhrmann, 2014). Supported by other findings on a psychosis-risk enhancement by self-experienced cognitive disturbances in UHR samples (Nelson, Thompson, & Yung, 2012; Parnas et al., 2011; Yung et al., 2005), it was argued that cognitive BS in particular might capture the cognitive core dimension of psychosis that is hardly addressed by UHR criteria (Michel et al., 2014; Schultze-Lutter et al., 2014). All studies so far have been using interviewer-rated scales such as the Examination of Anomalous Self-Experience instrument or the BSABS. However, as the interview assessment of BS requires intensive training and is rather time consuming, and as BS are self-experienced by nature, it is of interest if the same kind of risk enhancement could be detected in UHR samples by a self-report questionnaire.

In close collaboration with Huber and parallel to the development of the BSABS, Lilo Söllwold (1986) designed a questionnaire-based assessment of BS, the German Frankfurt Complaint Questionnaire (FCQ; Söllwold, 1986) from example statements of the BSABS. The 98 dichotomous FCQ items partially overlap with each other and refer to identical underlying BS, for example, a disturbance of receptive speech (BSABS-item C.1.6) is targeted by as much as seven different FCQ items (no. 37, 40, 69, 82, 90, 93, and 94; Michel, Kutschal, Schimmelmann, & Schultze-Lutter, 2016a). The FCQ has become the main BS questionnaire, as it was used in several different cultural contexts and was translated into seven languages (Michel, Kutschal, Schimmelmann, & Schultze-Lutter, 2016b; Moritz et al., 2000). Furthermore, it is still the most extensive self-report BS questionnaire used. Yet, despite its development based on the BSABS, the FCQ items

hardly capture the same phenomena as interview-assessed BS (Mass, Krausz, & Gross, 1995; Michel et al., 2016a).

Several studies of the factor structure of the FCQ yielded inconclusive results. Apart from the original 10 theory-based factors (Söllwold, 1991), various data-based factor solutions including one (Loas, Yon, & Brien, 2002; Yon, Loas, & Monestes, 2008), two (Mass et al., 1995; Mass, Haasen, & Krausz, 1997), and four factors (Söllwold, 1991) of different total numbers of FCQ items have been suggested based on different samples (Table 1). So far, the model fits of these factor solutions have not been formally tested and compared using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). Furthermore, in all previous factor analyses, binary FCQ items were treated as continuous variables, which can severely bias the resulting factor structure (Kubinger, 2003). Specifically, because the exploratory factor analysis of Söllwold (1991) was performed on Pearson instead of the more appropriate tetrachoric correlation matrices, items were clustered together not only according to their content but also according to their endorsement probabilities. This may have led to the relatively higher number of factors by the emergence of “pseudo-factors” that are artifacts of item difficulty or extremeness. Thus, this study aimed to close both gaps in knowledge regarding the questionnaire-assessed BS: the model fit and reliability of the different proposed FCQ-factor solutions and the potential property of predicting the risk of transition to psychosis.

First, we tested all previously proposed factorial structures of the FCQ using CFA and categorical item methodology in a sample of at-risk mental state (ARMS) and first-episode psychosis (FEP) patients. We hypothesized that the proposed factor models would provide a good fit to our data. Based on the so far strong evidence for two to four dimensionality of the FCQ, we assumed that a two- to four-factor model would fit best. In addition, we expected good reliability for all proposed factors.

Second, we tested for the first time whether any of the previously proposed FCQ factors was predictive for a later transition to psychosis in ARMS patients. We expected that the total scores and in particular factors mainly consisting of the 34 cognitive and perceptive items most similar to the basic symptoms included in COGDIS and COPER (Table 1) would be most predictive for psychosis.

2 | METHODS

2.1 | Sample and recruitment

Study participants were recruited as part of the prospective Früherkennung von Psychosen (FePsy; English: early detection of psychosis) project between March 2000 and July 2016. A detailed description of the study design is provided in Riecher-Rössler et al. (2007). In brief, patients suspected to have an ARMS for psychosis were referred to our specialized early detection clinic at the Psychiatric University Outpatient Department of the Psychiatric University Hospital Basel, Switzerland, by local psychiatrists, family doctors, or other hospital departments. Some also sought help with us at the advice of family members or through self-referral.

To be eligible for the FePsy study, patients had to be at least 18 years old. Exclusion criteria were (a) insufficient knowledge of German, (b)

TABLE 1 The Frankfurt Complaint Questionnaire: Factor solutions and corresponding items

Model	Original	Stillwold (1991)	Mass et al. (1997)	Mass et al. (1995)	Loas et al. (2002)	Yon et al. (2008)
Number of factors/items	10/98	4/98	2/50	2/18	1/24	1/98
N		229	692	242	310	399
Sample		Schizophrenia patients	Schizophrenia patients (N = 505), alcohol-dependent patients (N = 187)	Schizophrenia patients (N = 85), alcohol-dependent patients (N = 101), both diagnoses (N = 222)	Schizophrenia patients	Students
Age (mean)		32.8 years	40.7 years	37.3 years	39.23 years	24.3 years
Male		55.9%	79.1%	67.4%	37.9%	8.3%
Female		44.1%	20.9%	32.6%	26.1%	91.7%
Version	German	German	German	German	French	Spanish
Cronbach's α	n.a.	.96	n.a.	n.a.	.78	.95
Factors	1. Loss of control 2. Simple perception^a 3. Complex perception 4. Language^a 5. Thought^a 6. Memory 7. Motility 8. Lack of automatism 9. Anhedonia and anxiety 10. Sensory overstimulation	1. Disturbances of automated responses ^a 2. Perceptual disturbances ^a 3. Depression ^a 4. Overinclusion	1. Dysphoric concomitants of severe illness particularly impairing concentration ^a 2. Subjective experiences of perceptual uncertainties	1. Schizophrenia-specific factor 2. Alcohol-specific factor		
Corresponding items ^a	1. 7, 22, 33, 74, 83, 85, 86, 96 2. 19, 24, 25, 29, 45, 47, 50, 51, 63, 67, 84, 92 3. 14, 23, 26, 27, 97, 30, 76, 79, 97 4. 31, 40, 42, 66, 69, 71, 82, 90, 93, 94 5. 2, 4, 12, 35, 36, 39, 43, 54, 70 6. 8, 37, 52, 60, 62, 68, 73, 78, 88, 91 7. 5, 9, 11, 18, 20, 34, 44, 59, 64, 81 8. 6, 13, 17, 38, 46, 48, 56, 57, 75, 77 9. 1, 15, 16, 28, 41, 55, 72, 87, 95, 98 10. 3, 10, 21, 32, 49, 53, 58, 61, 65, 80, 89	1. 33, 35, 36, 42, 48, 52, 54, 60, 63, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 73, 85, 88, 89, 91, 94, 95, 96 2. 3, 5, 9, 11, 14, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 29, 30, 32, 34, 40, 45, 47, 50, 51, 59, 64, 67, 76, 79, 81, 84, 87, 92 3. 1, 6, 8, 15, 16, 17, 22, 26, 27, 28, 31, 37, 38, 39, 43, 49, 55, 57, 72, 75, 77, 78, 82, 90, 93, 97, 98 4. 2, 4, 7, 10, 12, 13, 44, 46, 53, 56, 58, 61, 62, 65, 74, 80, 83, 86	1. 1, 5–8, 17, 27, 31, 35–39, 42, 46, 52, 54, 56, 65, 66, 68–71, 73, 75, 77, 78, 80, 82, 90, 93, 94, 95, 96, 98 2. 14, 18, 19, 23–25, 29, 32, 45, 51, 63, 76, 79, 84	1. 11, 14, 15, 63, 81, 90, 93, 94 2. 2, 13, 16, 28, 41, 47, 52, 56, 87	26, 27, 35, 36, 38, 39, 42, 44, 45, 46, 55, 60, 66, 69, 73, 75, 80, 85, 86, 89, 93, 95, 96, 98	1–98
Method	Grouping according to phenomenological similarities	EFA, varimax rotation	PCA, varimax rotation	Item-by-item comparison	PCA, varimax rotation	PCA, varimax rotation
VE	n.a.	72%	59.6%	n.a.	65.30%	68.98%

Note. EFA = exploratory factor analysis; PCA = principal component analysis; n.a. = not available; VE = variance explanation.

^aFactors and items most likely corresponding to COGDIS or COPER in bold (Michel et al., 2016a).

indication of an IQ below 70, (c) psychotic symptoms within a clearly diagnosed affective psychosis or borderline personality disorder, (d) symptoms clearly due to organic reasons or substance use, and (e) antipsychotic treatment with a lifetime cumulative chlorpromazine equivalent dose of more than 2,500 mg. For this study, patients were also excluded if they had completed less than 50% of the FCQ items.

Written informed consent was obtained from all participating patients. The study was approved by the local ethics committee (Ethikkommission der Nordwest- und Zentralschweiz) and conformed to the Declaration of Helsinki.

2.2 | Screening procedure

Patients were screened with the Basel Screening Instrument for Psychosis (BSIP), which has good interrater reliability ($\kappa = .67$) and high psychosis-predictive validity (32%; Riecher-Rössler et al., 2008). Individuals were classified by the Basler screening instrument for early detection of psychosis as being in an ARMS for psychosis, having a FEP or not being at risk for psychosis, using criteria corresponding to the UHR criteria of Yung et al. (1998).

2.3 | Assessment of basic symptoms

BS were assessed with the original German paper-pencil version of the FCQ (Süllwold, 1991), presented as part of a larger package of questionnaires at the baseline of the FePsy study. The FCQ contains 98 statements describing particular complaints that are rated dichotomously (yes/no) indicating either presence or absence of the complaint. If patients had experienced a complaint in the past but not around the time of assessment, they are asked to score "yes" and add the word "formerly" next to it. For the lack of detailed time specifications however, these items were regarded as absent in the analyses.

2.4 | Follow-up and transition to psychosis

ARMS patients were followed up for transition to psychosis for up to 5 years. During the first year of follow-up, patients were assessed monthly. During the second and third years, assessments took place every 3 months; thereafter, patients were followed up annually.

The Brief Psychiatric Rating Scale (BPRS; Lukoff, Nuechterlein, & Ventura, 1986) items "suspiciousness," "unusual thought content," "hallucinations," and "conceptual disorganization," which are included in the Basler screening instrument for early detection of psychosis, were used to determine transition to psychosis in ARMS patients. Patients were considered to have transitioned according to criteria of Yung et al. (1998), that is, when any one frank psychotic symptom (BPRS score of at least 5 or 4 for "hallucinations") had persisted for more than 1 week.

2.5 | Statistical analyses

CFA were used to test the fit of the six different factor solutions described in Table 1. The four-, two-, and one-factor models were fitted using the weighted least square mean and variance adjusted estimator (WLSMV) as this is currently considered the best option for conducting a CFA with categorical data (Brown, 2015). We tested goodness of model fit using the model fit χ^2 , the comparative fit index

(CFI), the Tucker–Lewis index (TLI), the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), and the weighted root mean residual (WRMR). Cutoffs for good, adequate, and poor fit for all fit indices are described in the footnotes below Table 3.

Because the 10-factorial solution was too complex to be fitted using WLSMV, we additionally fitted all models using Bayesian estimation (Muthén & Asparouhov, 2012). A more detailed description of this estimation method, including applied fit indices, is provided in the Supporting Information.

We first performed Bayesian CFA on all six factor solutions (Table 1) with cross-loadings fixed to 0 comparable to the previously calculated WLSMV analysis. We used noninformative priors with parameters fixed to exactly 0 for freely estimated residual and factor variances, which are the default priors of Mplus (Muthén & Muthén, 1998–2010). Due to initially bad model fit, we additionally relaxed the restraint on cross-loadings for models with more than one factor. We did so by setting sequentially less strict informative priors for cross-loadings starting with variances equal to 0.001, 0.01, progressing to 0.05 and 0.1.

The reliability of all previously proposed FCQ scales in our sample of ARMS and FEP patients was estimated by the nonlinear structural equation modelling reliability coefficient of Green and Yang (2009), which has been termed *categorical omega* (ω_{cat}) by Kelley and Pornprasertmanit (2016). Unlike the most popular reliability measure Cronbach's α , categorical omega does not rest on the unrealistic assumption of a perfectly fitting unidimensional CFA model with equal factor loadings (i.e., essential tau equivalence) and therefore has been recommended as the best estimator for the reliability of composites that are the sum of categorical item scores (Kelley & Pornprasertmanit, 2016). We also estimated the confidence intervals (CIs) for categorical omega by using the bias-corrected-and-accelerated bootstrap as recommended by Kelley and Pornprasertmanit (2016). All reliability calculations were performed by using the *ci.reliability* function in the R package MBESS version 4.4.0 (Kelley, 2007).

The abilities of the various FCQ measures to predict later transition to psychosis in ARMS patients were tested outside the structural equation modelling framework with univariate Cox proportional hazard models, in which the FCQ totals or factors served as the independent variable and time to transition to psychosis as the outcome measure. For the exploratory nature of this first-time examination, we did not adjust for multiple testing at this step.

The handling of missing data is described in the Supporting Information. Structural equation models were fitted with Mplus, version 7 (Muthén & Muthén, 1998–2010). All other analyses were performed using the R environment for statistical computing (R Core Team, 2014; Revelle, 1979). Data and scripts of all analyses are available on request. Study method and results are reported according to the guidelines outlined by Brown (2015).

3 | RESULTS

3.1 | Sample characteristics

Of the 693 patients screened during the recruitment period, 291 were identified as FEP and 289 as ARMS. One hundred forty FEP and 186

ARMS patients consented to participate in the FePsy study; 92 FEP and 117 ARMS additionally completed at least half of the items of the FCQ and were therefore included in this study.

ARMS and FEP with and without sufficient FCQ data did not differ statistically regarding age, sex, and years of education. Missing FCQ data in the included patients were relatively small with the majority of items having $\geq 2\%$ missingness (see Supporting Information for the proportion of data present in each item and for each pairwise combination).

Twenty-four (20.5%) ARMS patients later made a transition to psychosis within the follow-up (Table 2). Mean follow-up time was 1.24 years (median 0.80, range 0.03–4.86) for patients with later transition (ARMS-T) and 2.83 years (median 2.53, range 0.05–5.00) for patients without transition (ARMS-NT). The attrition rate in ARMS-NT patients after 1, 2, and 3 years was 26%, 37%, and 55%, respectively. Incomplete follow-up in ARMS-NT patients was mostly due to drop-outs and in some patients also because they were recruited less than 5 years before the recruitment period ended.

As expected, there were significant differences between ARMS and FEP patients with higher mean age, more positive symptoms,

and a higher BPRS total score in FEP patients (Table 2). FEP patients showed significantly more positive symptoms and a higher overall BPRS score at baseline compared to ARMS-T patients. At baseline, there were no statistically significant differences in any of the presented measures between ARMS-T and ARMS-NT patients, although ARMS-T patients presented more positive symptoms, higher BRPS total scores, and higher Scale for the Assessment of Negative Symptoms scores.

3.2 | Model evaluation

Overall goodness of fit and multiple fit indices for the models estimated with WLSMV are shown in Table 3 and those estimated with Bayesian methods in Table 4. Mplus scripts and standardized parameter estimates for all estimated structural equation models are available in the Supporting Information.

All tested WLSMV models provided an acceptable fit to the data according to the CFI, TLI, and RMSEA (Table 3). Overall, the one-factor solution (24-item short version) suggested by Loas et al. (2002) had the best fitting model with both CFI and TLI being >0.98 , although the

TABLE 2 Sociodemographic and clinical sample characteristics

	All N = 209	ARMS		FEP N = 92	p value			
		ARMS-NT N = 93	ARMS-T N = 24		ARMS vs. FEP	ARMS-NT vs. ARMS-T	ARMS-NT vs. FEP	ARMS-T vs. FEP
Age mean (SD) ^a	27.3 (7.99)	25.4 (7.46)	25.6 (5.99)	29.7 (8.37)	<0.001	0.993	<0.001	0.051
Gender ^b	Women (%)	67 (32.1%)	31 (33.3%)	7 (29.2%)	29 (31.5%)	0.917	1.000	1.000
	Men (%)	142 (67.9%)	62 (66.7%)	17 (70.8%)	63 (68.5%)			
Years of education mean (SD) ^a	11.5 (2.87)	11.6 (3.05)	11.4 (2.06)	11.4 (2.89)	0.882	0.931	0.897	0.997
Occupation ^b	Unemployed (%)	66 (35.3%)	24 (29.3%)	4 (18.2%)	38 (45.8%)	0.099	0.425	0.256
	Employed (%)	57 (30.5%)	29 (35.4%)	6 (27.3%)	22 (26.5%)			
	In education (%)	49 (26.2%)	23 (28.0%)	9 (40.9%)	17 (20.5%)			
	Other (%)	15 (8.02%)	6 (7.32%)	3 (13.6%)	6 (7.23%)			
BPRS positive symptoms Mean (SD) ^a	9.57 (4.50)	6.53 (2.58)	8.13 (2.40)	13.3 (3.86)	<0.001	0.083	<0.001	<0.001
BPRS total score mean (SD) ^a	43.7 (12.1)	37.3 (8.33)	42.1 (8.86)	50.9 (12.4)	<0.001	0.125	<0.001	0.001
SANS total score mean (SD) ^a	22.9 (15.7)	22.0 (16.6)	25.8 (16.2)	23.0 (14.7)	0.597	0.568	0.919	0.732

Note. ARMS = at-risk mental state (T = transition, NT = non-transition); BPRS = Brief Psychiatric Rating Scale; FEP = first-episode psychosis; SANS = Scale for the Assessment of Negative Symptoms.

^aContinuous variables were tested using ANOVA.

^bCategorical variables were tested using χ^2 test statistics or Fisher exact test in case of cell counts <5 .

TABLE 3 Fit of the factor models estimated with WLSMV

Model	Number of factors	Parameters	Chi-square	DF	Chi-square model fit p value	CFI	TLI	RMSEA (90% CI)	WRMR
Süllwold (1991)	4	200	4,942.4	4,553	<0.001	0.961	0.960	0.020 (0.015–0.024)	0.976
Mass et al. (1997)	2	101	1387.1	1,174	<0.001	0.965	0.964	0.029 (0.022–0.036)	0.970
Mass et al. (1995)	2	35	160.4	118	0.0057	0.962	0.956	0.041 (0.023–0.057)	0.908
Loas et al. (2002)	1	48	316.3	252	0.0037	0.981	0.980	0.035 (0.021–0.046)	0.859
Yon et al. (2008)	1	196	5,168.8	4,655	<0.001	0.949	0.948	0.023 (0.019–0.027)	1.027

Note. CFI = comparative fit index (>0.95 = good fit, >0.9 = adequate fit, <0.9 = poor fit); CI = confidence interval; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation (<0.05 = good fit, <0.08 = adequate fit, >0.08 = poor fit); TLI = Tucker–Lewis index (>0.95 = good fit, >0.9 = adequate fit, <0.9 suggests poor fit); WLSMV = weighted least square mean and variance adjusted estimator ($\chi^2 < 0.05$ = good fit, <0.08 = adequate fit, >0.08 = poor fit); WRMR = weighted root mean residual (<1.0 = adequate model fit); DF = degree of freedom.

TABLE 4 Fit of the factor models estimated with Bayesian method

Model	Number of factors	Cross-loads	Number of parameters	ppp	95% CI for the difference between the observed and replicated chi-square value	
					Lower limit	Upper limit
Original	10	0	241	0.089	-132.090	556.490
		0.001	1,123	0.138	-152.596	528.073
		0.01	1,123	0.219	-197.821	458.485
		0.05	1,123	0.383	-294.922	383.571
		0.1	1,123	0.448	-317.942	356.685
Süllwold (1991)	4	0	200	0.081	-94.850	566.360
		0.001	491	0.082	-99.837	570.740
		0.01	491	0.208	-139.130	540.545
		0.05	491	0.200	-185.160	488.248
		0.1	491	0.261	-223.003	450.478
Mass et al. (1997)	2	0	101	0.143	-75.050	245.540
		0.01	151	0.167	-80.590	243.600
		0.05	151	0.191	-88.520	233.250
		0.1	151	0.193	-88.860	231.240
Mass et al. (1995)	2	0	35	0.394	-45.612	60.755
		0.001	52	0.389	-46.699	61.196
		0.01	52	0.396	-46.801	60.807
		0.05	52	0.405	-47.630	60.197
		0.1	52	0.416	-48.345	59.312
Loas et al. (2002) ^a	1/24 items	0	48	0.317	-60.490	76.970
Yon et al. (2008) ^a	1/98 items	0	196	0.042	-38.680	647.450

Note. CI = confidence interval; ppp = posterior predictive *p* value (ppp close to .5 = good model fit).

^aRelaxing constraints on cross-loads is not possible in models containing only one factor.

two- and four-factor models (Mass et al., 1997; Süllwold, 1991) also showed similarly high CFI and TLI indices of ≥ 0.95 . The RMSEA however was best for the four-factor model (0.020) and worst for the short-version one-factor model (0.035). Both models based on all 98 FCQ items (Süllwold, 1991; Yon et al., 2008) as well as the two-factor model on 50 items (Mass et al., 1997) provided an equally good fit with similar fit indices. Depending on the fit index, the four-factor model (RMSEA) or the Mass et al. (1997) two-factor model (CFI and TLI) fit best of all solutions with at least 50 items (Table 3).

For all Bayesian models, the posterior predictive *p* value (ppp) was >0.04 and fell within the range of the 95% CI for the difference between the observed and the replicated chi-square values, thus indicating adequate model fit (Table 4). In contrast to the WSLMV analyses, the Mass et al. (1995) two-factor model provided the best fit, as its ppp of .394 was closest to .5 (Table 4), followed by the 24-item short version with a ppp of 0.317. Of the four ≥ 50 -item models, the two-factor model showed the best fitting value with a ppp of 0.143 using cross-loadings fixed to 0.

For the two-factor 50-item model suggested by Mass et al. (1997), an improvement in model fit could be found sequentially with increasing informative priors on the variance of the cross-loadings between the factors (Table 4). The model with the most flexibility allowance for cross-loads, that is, 0.1, showed a ppp closest to 0.5 (ppp = .193). While the already best fitting second two-factor model improved only slightly in ppp (0.396 for the solution with the most relaxed cross-loads), a considerable improvement in model fit with setting informative priors for variances of cross-loadings at 0.1 was found in the four-factor model, whose ppp improved from 0.081 to 0.261, as well as for the original 10-factor model, with a ppp improvement from 0.089 to 0.448 (Table 4). Comparing the two 98-item model solutions using increasingly relaxed nonzero cross-loadings, the original theory-

based 10-factor model fitted better than the data-based four-, the first two-, and both one-factor models but still less well than the best fitting second two-factor solution (Table 4).

3.3 | Scale reliability

Point estimates and CIs of the reliability coefficient omega categorical for all previously proposed FCQ scales are shown in Table 5. Most scales demonstrated good ($0.9 > \omega_{\text{cat}} \geq 0.8$) or excellent ($1 \geq \omega_{\text{cat}} > 0.9$) reliability. Only the alcohol and schizophrenia specific subscales of Mass et al. (1995) showed a reliability below 0.8—although still in the acceptable range ($0.8 > \omega_{\text{cat}} \geq 0.7$)—and a lower bound of the 95% CI below 0.7.

3.4 | Survival analysis (prediction of psychosis)

Neither any one of the factors of the six tested models nor the FCQ total score was found to be significantly associated with a later transition to psychosis in ARMS patients (Table 6).

4 | DISCUSSION

This study investigated for the first time the goodness of fit of all previously proposed factor structures of the FCQ, as well as scale reliability and psychosis-predictive validity of all previously proposed FCQ scales in a sample of ARMS and FEP patients. In contrast to previous psychometric investigations of the FCQ, methods appropriate for categorical items were used. Although none of the tested factorial structures was clearly rejected, results indicated that the one-factorial solution based on 24 items suggested by Loas et al. (2002) and the two-factorial solution based on 17 items by Mass et al. (1995)

TABLE 5 Scale reliabilities

Model	Scale	Number of items	Omega categorical
Original	Loss of control	8	0.84 [0.78; 0.87]
	Simple perception	10	0.86 [0.74; 0.90]
	Complex perception	10	0.86 [0.61; 0.90]
	Language	10	0.91 [0.85; 0.92]
	Thought	10	0.87 [0.82; 0.89]
	Memory	10	0.88 [0.82; 0.91]
	Motility	10	0.84 [0.69; 0.87]
	Loss of automatization	10	0.87 [0.82; 0.89]
	Anxiety/anhedonia	10	0.80 [0.71; 0.83]
	Sensory overstimulation	10	0.83 [0.76; 0.86]
Süllwold (1991)	Disturbances of automated responses	22	0.95 [0.92; 0.95]
	Perceptual disturbances	30	0.97 [0.93; 0.97]
	Depression	27	0.96 [0.94; 0.96]
	Overinclusion	18	0.90 [0.85; 0.91]
Mass et al. (1995)	Dysphoric concomitants of severe illness particularly impairing concentration	36	0.99 [0.99; 0.99]
	Subjective experiences of perceptual uncertainties	14	0.90 [0.74; 0.92]
Mass et al. (1995)	Alcohol dependency specific subscale	9	0.75 [0.67; 0.80]
	FCQ schizophrenia specific subscale	8	0.77 [0.67; 0.82]
Loas et al. (2002)	24-item scale	24	0.95 [0.93; 0.95]
Yon et al. (2008)	FCQ total scale	98	0.99 [0.99; 1.00]

Note. ARMS = at-risk mental state; FCQ = Frankfurt Complaint Questionnaire; FEP = first-episode psychosis, omega categorical (>.9 = excellent, >.8 = good, >.7 = acceptable measures)

TABLE 6 Predictive validities of the Frankfurt Complaint Questionnaire (FCQ) factors

Model	Factor	No transition mean (SD) N = 93	Transition mean (SD) N = 24	p value ^a
Original	Loss of control	2.08 (1.94)	2.17 (2.12)	0.927
	Simple perception	0.89 (1.40)	0.84 (1.18)	0.843
	Complex perception	1.00 (1.19)	0.71 (0.96)	0.290
	Language	1.73 (2.15)	2.14 (2.27)	0.564
	Thought	4.20 (2.87)	4.36 (2.99)	0.784
	Memory	2.59 (2.63)	2.01 (1.85)	0.161
	Motility	1.26 (1.32)	1.43 (1.67)	0.846
	Loss of automatization	3.14 (2.67)	3.20 (2.87)	0.652
	Anxiety/anhedonia	3.16 (2.36)	3.57 (2.44)	0.590
	Sensory overstimulation	2.69 (2.15)	3.08 (2.57)	0.391
Süllwold (1991)	Disturbances of automated responses	5.25 (4.78)	5.57 (4.37)	0.970
	Perceptual disturbances	3.17 (3.08)	3.07 (2.94)	0.875
	Depression	7.73 (5.93)	7.97 (6.19)	0.849
	Overinclusion	6.06 (3.91)	6.20 (4.12)	0.987
Mass et al. (1997)	Dysphoric concomitants of severe illness particularly impairing concentration	10.1 (8.40)	10.3 (8.13)	0.841
	Subjective experiences of perceptual uncertainties	1.01 (1.38)	0.79 (1.22)	0.549
Mass et al. (1995)	Schizophrenia specific factor	1.04 (1.07)	1.08 (1.41)	0.970
	Alcohol dependency specific factor	3.45 (2.09)	3.52 (2.28)	0.904
Loas et al. (2002)	24 item scale	6.61 (5.57)	7.04 (5.30)	0.996
Yon et al. (2008)	FCQ total score	22.7 (15.5)	23.5 (15.7)	0.941

^aWald tests from univariate Cox proportional Hazard models.

provided the best fit to the data. However, if only factorial solutions based on at least 50 items are considered, the two-factorial solution of Mass et al. (1997) and the four-factorial solution of Süllwold (1991) performed best. While all tested FCQ scales had at least acceptable reliability, none of them could be demonstrated to have psychos-predictive validity.

The one-factorial solution based on 24 items by Loas et al. (2002), which provided the best fit to our data when using WLSMV

estimation, was originally derived by performing a PCA in a sample of schizophrenia patients. Although both parallel analysis and the scree test indicated that the optimal number of factors was two, the authors opted for a one-factorial solution based on the finding that all items had their strongest loading on the first factor in the unrotated solution. The one-factorial solution was further refined by retaining only those 24 items that had a factor loading >0.6 (Loas et al., 2002). The two-factor model of Mass et al. (1995) based on 17 items, which provided the

best fit to our data when using Bayesian estimation, was not based on factor analysis but on item-by-item comparisons of the sensitivity to either schizophrenia or alcohol dependency, revealing two factors construed as schizophrenia- and alcohol dependency-specific factors. However, the superior fit of the models suggested by Loas et al. (2002) and Mass et al. (1995) might be explained by the restricted number of items they are based on. To answer the question of how many dimensions are measured by the FCQ, fit indices of models based on a more complete set of items are likely more meaningful. Considering only these models, we found that the two- and four-factorial solutions of Mass et al. (1997) and Söllwold (1991), respectively, provided the best fit. Overall, both models were approximately equally well fitting. Specifically, while the two-factor model had a slightly better CFI, TLI, and WRMR with WLSMV estimation and a slightly better ppp with Bayesian estimation, the four-factorial model had a slightly better RMSEA with WLSMV estimation.

Thus, our structural results in a sample of ARMS and FEP patients suggest that BS as measured by the FCQ are indicators of two to four underlying dimensions, which is in line with some of the previous research on the factor structure of the FCQ (Mass et al., 1997; Söllwold, 1991), as well reported results from parallel analyses (Loas et al., 2002; Yon et al., 2008). Contrary to this, dimensional analyses of interview-assessed BS (which also excluded central-vegetative complaints) had revealed six clear and replicable dimensions in adult prodromal and manifest psychosis samples (Schultze-Lutter et al., 2012b; Schultze-Lutter & Eckjar, 2008a) of different specificity for psychosis. This difference between the dimensional structures of self- and interviewer-rated BS is most likely due to the lack of content validity of self-assessed BS when compared to interview-assessed BS (Michel et al., 2016a). Furthermore, while items of the interview assessments refer to clearly distinct phenomena, items of the FCQ are less markedly defined, and frequently several items relate to the same interview-assessed BS (Michel et al., 2016b). Consequently, the 98 items of the FCQ do not cover all BS described in the BSABS. Moreover, they do not cover four basic symptoms and some acoustic and visual perception disturbances of COPER/COGDIS. These differences in item pools might have additionally affected dimensional analyses.

In this study, the reliability of the FCQ scales was estimated for the first time with a new SEM-based reliability coefficient, the so-called categorical omega (Green & Yang, 2009; Kelley & Pornprasertmanit, 2016). Our results confirm that the FCQ total scales of both the original 98-item (Söllwold, 1991) and shortened 24-item versions (Loas et al., 2002) have excellent reliabilities (i.e., 0.99 and 0.95, respectively). Previously reported Cronbach's α values for these scales ranged between .95 and .97 (Loas et al., 2002; Söllwold, 1991; Yon et al., 2008) and between .87 and .94 (Loas et al., 2002; Yon et al., 2008), respectively. Hence, our reliability estimates tended to be slightly higher, which might be explained by the use of a method not biased downwards under violation of essential tau equivalence. The reliability of FCQ subscales, to our knowledge, has not been investigated in previous studies. We could therefore demonstrate for the first time that these scales have mostly good-to-excellent reliabilities. The only scales with a reliability <0.8 were the alcohol and schizophrenia specific subscales of Mass et al. (1995). This might be explained by these scales not being

based on factor analytic results or similarity of item content but on the diagnostic power of single items.

In line with early studies questioning the psychosis specificity of the FCQ (Mass et al., 1995), we found no predictive validity with respect to later transition to psychosis in ARMS patients—neither for the FCQ total score nor for any of its subscales. So far, no other self-assessment instruments for BS were tested for predictive validity. This is in contrast to previous studies, in which BS were assessed using semistructured interviews such as the SPI-A (Schultze-Lutter et al., 2007), that reported a psychosis-predictive value of a subgroup of BS included in COPER and COGDIS of at least comparable quality to UHR criteria (Schultze-Lutter et al., 2014; Schultze-Lutter et al., 2015). This indicates that BS are only predictive of later transition to psychosis if descriptions of patient's experiences are rated based on in-depth clinical interviews by experienced clinicians and are not simply rated by patients themselves based on a single exemplary statement. This interpretation is in line with previous studies that have generally found poor correlations and convergent validity, respectively, between BS measured with the FCQ and those assessed with the gold-standard of a semistructured interview (Mass et al., 1995; Michel et al., 2016a). However, due to difficulties in assigning a BSABS or SPI equivalence to each FCQ item and vice versa, these previous studies did not include all FCQ items and COPER/COGDIS items, respectively. This further questions the correspondence between FCQ and BSABS or its subsequent scales, SPI-A and SPI-CY. While FCQ-assessed BS seem to predict worse symptomatic outcomes in FEP patients (Prouteau et al., 2004)—likely as a measure of overall symptom severity—the same does not seem to be the case for transition to psychosis for lack of psychosis-specificity of the FCQ. In addition to differences in item content, differences in the item response format could also have contributed to heterogeneous results regarding the predictive validities of self- and interview-assessed BS. Specifically, the dichotomous item response format of the FCQ might have precluded the assessment of BS symptoms of low intensity and thus have led to items with low endorsement frequencies. Future studies should therefore investigate whether the use of Likert scales, as implemented in the SPI-A, improves the predictive validities of self-rated BS.

The predictive value of the FCQ might be further lowered by the lack of controlling for confounders, such as somatic illness or substance use effects, in the assessment of BS with the FCQ. For example, Moritz, Krausz, Gottwalz, and Andresen (2000) questioned the construct validity of the FCQ, as they found evidence that the FCQ score correlated significantly with the administered dose of antipsychotic medication. The authors found a significant positive correlation of BS measured with the FCQ with antipsychotic dosage instead of the expected opposite treatment effects, even when controlled for other psychopathology. While in interviews, the co-occurrence of BS with medication or drug use is controlled for, this is not done in the FCQ. However, a medication effect was controlled for in our sample, because patients with a summarized chlorpromazine equivalent dose of 2,500 mg or higher were excluded from study participation. Furthermore, ARMS patients were not treated with antipsychotics during the follow-up, while FEP patients were treated with antipsychotics only after completion of baseline assessments. Thus, further supported by the lack of differences in medication between patient groups at baseline, we do not assume that such a medication effect significantly biased our results.

A limitation of our study was the rather small sample size of just over 200 participants. Although Bayesian analysis has been shown to perform well even with smaller sample sizes, it was not possible to estimate the factor models for ARMS and FEP patients or ARMS-T and ARMS-NT patients separately. Hence, it was also not possible to estimate scale reliabilities for these groups separately. As most ARMS patients did not transition to psychosis, the two patient groups do not completely pertain to the same spectrum of disorders, and therefore, it would be interesting to investigate possible factor invariance across patient groups. A study on BSABS dimensions did not find differences between ARMS-T and FEP patient groups but with a subsample of patients suffering from depressive disorders (Schultze-Lutter & Eckjar, 2008b).

5 | CONCLUSION AND DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Depending on the method used, our results suggest a two- or four-factorial structure best fit the full 98-item version of the FCQ. Because this is the first study to use CFA, categorical item methodology, and a sample of early detection of psychosis patients (ARMS and FEP), more research of this nature is clearly needed. Studies on the factor invariance of the FCQ in separate samples of ARMS and FEP patients as well as ARMS-NT and ARMS-T patients would be interesting. Although we could not demonstrate predictive validities for any FCQ scales, it might still be useful to apply this questionnaire in clinical practice to assess subjectively experienced BS in ARMS patients and thereby to facilitate personalized treatment (e.g., initiating cognitive remediation). Because the FCQ as a self-report represents a more economical possibility to assess BS as compared to more time- and resource-intensive semistructured interviews, it seems important to develop scales of better convergent validity of items with interview-assessed BS to fully and broadly exploit the advantages of the BS approach in the early detection of psychosis.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank all patients who participated in the interviews as well as the referring specialists and colleagues. We also would like to thank the registry office of the Centre for Gender research and early detection—namely Johannes Hapig and Claudine Pfister—for their help with the preparation and submission of the manuscript.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

All authors declare not to have any conflicts of interest that might have influenced the content of the manuscript. The authors of this study were supported by research grants of the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNF) and by the EU FP7 Project “European Network of National Schizophrenia Networks Studying Gene–Environment Interactions” (EU-GEI).

ORCID

Martina Uttinger <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2510-6680>

Anita Riecher-Rössler <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6361-8789>

REFERENCES

- Brown, T. A. (2015). *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research* (Second ed.). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Green, S. B., & Yang, Y. Y. (2009). Reliability of summed item scores using structural equation modeling: An alternative to coefficient alpha. *Psychometrika*, 74(1), 155–167. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11336-008-9099-3>
- Gross, G. (1987). *BSABS Bonner skala für die beurteilung von basissymptomen manual, kommentar, dokumentationsbogen*. Berlin: Springer.
- Huber, G. (1966). Reine defektsyndrome und basisstadien endogener psychosen. *Fortschritte der Neurologie-Psychiatrie*, 34, 409–426.
- Huber, G., & Süllwold, L. (1986). *Schizophrene basisstörungen*. Berlin: Springer.
- Kelley, K. (2007). Methods for the behavioral, educational, and social sciences: An R package. *Behavior Research Methods*, 39(4), 979–984. <https://doi.org/10.3758/Bf03192993>
- Kelley, K., & Pornprasertmanit, S. (2016). Confidence intervals for population reliability coefficients: Evaluation of methods, recommendations, and software for composite measures. *Psychological Methods*, 21(1), 69–92. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0040086>
- Klosterkötter, J., Hellmich, M., Steinmeyer, E. M., & Schultze-Lutter, F. (2001). Diagnosing schizophrenia in the initial prodromal phase. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 58(2), 158–164. <https://doi.org/10.1001/archpsyc.58.2.158>
- Kubinger, K. D. (2003). On artificial results due to using factor analysis for dichotomous variables. *Psychology Science*, 45(1), 106–110.
- Loas, G., Yon, V., & Brien, D. (2002). Dimensional structure of the Frankfurt Complaint Questionnaire. *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, 43(5), 397–403. <https://doi.org/10.1053/comp.2002.33487>
- Lukoff, D., Nuechterlein, K. H., & Ventura, J. (1986). Manual for the expanded brief psychiatric rating scale. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, 12, 594–602.
- Mass, R., Haasen, C., & Krausz, M. (1997). Dimensional structure and diagnostic specificity of the Frankfurt Complaint Questionnaire. *European Psychiatry*, 12, 117–123. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0924-9338\(97\)80199-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0924-9338(97)80199-X)
- Mass, R., Krausz, M., & Gross, J. (1995). Basissymptome bei schizophrenie und alkoholismus. Eine methodenkritische vergleichsstudie. *Nervenarzt*, 66, 331–337.
- Mayer-Gross, W. (1932). Die schizophrenie. Die klinik. In O. Bumke (Ed.), *Handbuch der geisteskrankheiten* (pp. 293–578). Berlin: Springer.
- Michel, C., Kutschal, C., Schimmelmänn, B. G., & Schultze-Lutter, F. (2016a). Convergent and concurrent validity of the Frankfurt Complaint Questionnaire as a screener for psychosis risk. *Journal of Risk Research*, 20, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13669877.2016.1179209>
- Michel, C., Kutschal, C., Schimmelmänn, B. G., & Schultze-Lutter, F. (2016b). Convergent and concurrent validity of the Frankfurt Complaint Questionnaire as a screener for psychosis risk. *Journal of Risk Research*, 20, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13669877.2016.1179209>
- Michel, C., Ruhrmann, S., Schimmelmänn, B. G., Klosterkötter, J., & Schultze-Lutter, F. (2014). A stratified model for psychosis prediction in clinical practice. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, 40(6), 1533–1542. <https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sbu025>
- Moritz, S., Krausz, M., Gottwalz, E., & Andresen, B. (2000). The impact of neuroleptic dosage and extrapyramidal side effects on schizophrenic basic symptoms. *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, 41(4), 284–288. <https://doi.org/10.1053/comp.2000.7425>
- Moritz, S., Krausz, M., Gottwalz, E., Lambert, M., Perro, C., Ganzer, S., & Naber, D. (2000). Cognitive dysfunction at baseline predicts symptomatic 1-year outcome in first-episode schizophrenics. *Psychopathology*, 33, 48–51.
- Muthén, B., & Asparouhov, T. (2012). Bayesian structural equation modeling: A more flexible representation of substantive theory. *Psychological Methods*, 17(3), 313–335. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0026802>

- Muthén, L. K., & Muthén, B. O. (1998–2010). *Mplus user's guide*. CA: Los Angeles.
- Nelson, B., Thompson, A., & Yung, A. R. (2012). Basic self-disturbance predicts psychosis onset in the ultra high risk for psychosis "prodromal" population. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, 38(6), 1277–1287. <https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sbs007>
- Parnas, J., Raballo, A., Handest, P., Jansson, L., Vollmer-Larsen, A., & Saebye, D. (2011). Self-experience in the early phases of schizophrenia: 5-year follow-up of the Copenhagen prodromal study. *World Psychiatry*, 10(3), 200–204. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2051-5545.2011.tb00057.x>
- Prouteau, A., Verdoux, H., Briand, C., Lesage, A., Lalonde, P., Nicole, L., ... Stip, E. (2004). Self-assessed cognitive dysfunction and objective performance in outpatients with schizophrenia participating in a rehabilitation program. *Schizophrenia Research*, 69(1), 85–91. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2003.08.011>
- Revelle, W. (1979). Hierarchical cluster analysis and the internal structure of tests. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 14(1), 57–74. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327906mbr1401_4
- Riecher-Rössler, A., Aston, J., Ventura, J., Merlo, M., Borgwardt, S., Gschwandtner, U., & Stieglitz, R. D. (2008). The Basel Screening Instrument for Psychosis (BSIP): Development, structure, reliability and validity. *Fortschritte der Neurologie-Psychiatrie*, 76(4), 207–216. <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-2008-1038155>
- Riecher-Rössler, A., Gschwandtner, U., Aston, J., Borgwardt, S., Drewe, M., Fuhr, P., ... Stieglitz, R. D. (2007). The Basel early-detection-of-psychosis (FePsy)—study—design and preliminary results. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, 115(2), 114–125. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0447.2006.00854.x>
- Riecher-Rössler, A., Gschwandtner, U., Borgwardt, S., Aston, J., Pflüger, M., & Rössler, W. (2006). Early detection and treatment of schizophrenia: How early? *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica. Supplementum*, 113(429), 73–80. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0447.2005.00722.x>
- Riecher-Rössler, A., Pflueger, M. O., Aston, J., Borgwardt, S. J., Brewer, W. J., Gschwandtner, U., & Stieglitz, R. D. (2009). Efficacy of using cognitive status in predicting psychosis: A 7-year follow-up. *Biological Psychiatry*, 66(11), 1023–1030. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2009.07.020>
- Schultze-Lutter, F. (2009). Subjective symptoms of schizophrenia in research and the clinic: The basic symptom concept. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, 35(1), 5–8. <https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sbn139>
- Schultze-Lutter, F., Addington, J., Ruhrmann, S., & Klosterkötter, J. (2007). *Schizophrenia Proneness Instrument (SPI-A)*. Rome, Italy: Giovanni Fioriti.
- Schultze-Lutter, F., Debbané, M., Theodoridou, A., Wood, S. J., Raballo, A., Michel, C., ... Uhlhaas, P. J. (2016). Revisiting the basic symptom concept: Toward translating risk symptoms for psychosis into neurobiological targets. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 7, 9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2016.00009>
- Schultze-Lutter, F., & Eckjar (2008a). The dimensional structure of self-reported "prodromal" disturbances in schizophrenia. *Clinical Neuropsychiatry*, 5(3), 140–150.
- Schultze-Lutter, F., & Eckjar (2008b). The dimensional structure of self-reported "prodromal" disturbances in schizophrenia. *Clinical Neuropsychiatry*, 5(3), 140–150.
- Schultze-Lutter, F., Klosterkötter, J., & Ruhrmann, S. (2014). Improving the clinical prediction of psychosis by combining ultra-high risk criteria and cognitive basic symptoms. *Schizophrenia Research*, 154(1–3), 100–106. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2014.02.010>
- Schultze-Lutter, F., Michel, C., Schmidt, S. J., Schimmelman, B. G., Maric, N. P., Salokangas, R. K., ... Klosterkötter, J. (2015). EPA guidance on the early detection of clinical high risk states of psychoses. *European Psychiatry*, 30(3), 405–416. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eurpsy.2015.01.010>
- Schultze-Lutter, F., Ruhrmann, S., Berning, J., Maier, W., & Klosterkötter, J. (2010). Basic symptoms and ultrahigh risk criteria: Symptom development in the initial prodromal state. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, 36(1), 182–191. <https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sbn072>
- Schultze-Lutter, F., Ruhrmann, S., Fusar-Poli, P., Bechdolf, A., Schimmelman, B. G., & Klosterkötter, J. (2012a). Basic symptoms and the prediction of first-episode psychosis. *Current Pharmaceutical Design*, 18(4), 351–357. <https://doi.org/10.2174/138161212799316064>
- Schultze-Lutter, F., Ruhrmann, S., Fusar-Poli, P., Bechdolf, A., Schimmelman, B. G., & Klosterkötter, J. (2012b). Basic symptoms and the prediction of first-episode psychosis. *Current Pharmaceutical Design*, 18(4), 351–357. <https://doi.org/10.2174/138161212799316064>
- Schultze-Lutter, F., Ruhrmann, S., & Klosterkötter, J. (2006). Can schizophrenia be predicted phenomenologically? In J. Johannessen, B. Martindale, & J. Cullberg (Eds.), *Evolving psychosis different stages, different treatments* (pp. 104–123). London, New York: Routledge.
- Süllwold, L. (1986). Die Selbstwahrnehmung defizitärer Störungen. Psychologische Aspekte des Basisstörungenkonzepts. In L. Süllwold & G. Huber (Eds.), *Schizophrene Basisstörungen* (pp. 1–38). Berlin, Heidelberg, New York: Springer.
- Süllwold, L. (1991). *Manual zum Frankfurter Beschwerde-Fragebogen (FBF)*. Berlin: Springer.
- Team RC. (2014). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing* (Version 3.0.3).
- Yon, V., Loas, G., & Monestes, J. L. (2008). Dimensional structure of the Frankfurt Complaint Questionnaire in a sample of French students. *Psychopathology*, 41(2), 85–89. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000111552>
- Yung, A. R., & McGorry, P. D. (1996). The prodromal phase of first-episode psychosis: Past and current conceptualizations. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, 22(2), 353–370. <https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/22.2.353>
- Yung, A. R., Phillips, L. J., McGorry, P. D., McFarlane, C. A., Francey, S., Harrigan, S., ... Jackson, H. J. (1998). Prediction of psychosis—A step towards indicated prevention of schizophrenia. *The British Journal Psychiatry*, 172, 14–20.
- Yung, A. R., Yuen, H. P., McGorry, P. D., Phillips, L. J., Kelly, D., Dell'Olio, M., ... Buckley, J. (2005). Mapping the onset of psychosis: The comprehensive assessment of at-risk mental states. *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, 39(11–12), 964–971. <https://doi.org/10.1080/j.1440-1614.2005.01714.x>

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional Supporting Information may be found online in the supporting information tab for this article.

How to cite this article: Uttinger M, Studerus E, Ittig S, Heitz U, Schultze-Lutter F, Riecher-Rössler A. The Frankfurt Complaint Questionnaire for self-assessment of basic symptoms in the early detection of psychosis—Factor structure, reliability, and predictive validity. *Int J Methods Psychiatr Res*. 2018;27:e1600. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mpr.1600>