Published in final edited form as:

Early Interv Psychiatry. 2019 November 22; 14(3): 379–382. doi:10.1111/eip.12901.

Violent outcomes in first-episode psychosis: A clinical cohort study

Daniel Whiting^{1,2,iD}, Belinda R. Lennox^{1,2}, Seena Fazel^{1,2}

¹Department of Psychiatry, Warneford Hospital, University of Oxford, Oxford, England ²Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust, Warneford Hospital, Oxford, England

Abstract

Aim—Violence risk is an important part of a comprehensive clinical assessment in first-episode psychosis. This study addresses limitations of previous violent outcome research in first-episode psychosis, which has typically investigated selected cohorts or been restricted to violence occurring prior to service contact, with limited use of police data.

Methods—For individuals consecutively assessed by Early Intervention in Psychosis (EIP) services in two UK regions (n = 177), violent outcomes in the subsequent 12-months were collected using electronic patient records, supplemented by police data.

Results—Of individuals accepted by EIP services (n = 109), electronic medical records indicated around 1 in 4 (n = 28, 25.7%) perpetrated any physical violence, and 1 in 10 (n = 10, 9.2%) were arrested or charged for violent offences in the 12-months after first contact. Police data on all individuals assessed (n = 177) reported 1 in 7 (n = 26, 14.7%) were arrested or charged for violent offences in the 12-months after first contact.

Conclusions—EIP services should consider integrating multi-agency sources of data to evaluate violent outcomes. The potential role of violence risk management should be further examined.

Keywords

aggression; crime; psychosis; schizophrenia; violence

1 Introduction

Interpersonal violence is an outcome with significant implications for patients, their families, health services and society. A range of mental disorders are associated with small

iDORCID

Daniel Whiting: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5323-364X>

Correspondence: Daniel Whiting, Department of Psychiatry, Warneford Hospital, University of Oxford, Oxford OX3 7JX, England. daniel.whiting@psych.ox.ac.uk.

Data Availability Statement

N/a

Author Contributions

D.W., B.L. and S.F. designed the study; D.W. collected and analysed the data; D.W., B.L. and S.F. wrote the article.

but increased risks of violence, including schizophrenia-spectrum disorders, where risks are elevated two to fivefold compared with general population comparisons and further increased with comorbid substance use (Fazel, Gulati, Linsell, Geddes, & Grann, 2009; Sariaslan, Larsson, & Fazel, 2016; Short, Thomas, Mullen, & Ogloff, 2013; Stevens, Laursen, Mortensen, Agerbo, & Dean, 2015). First-episode psychosis (FEP) has been highlighted as a high risk period, with around 16% of patients perpetrating physical assault or violent crime before initial treatment has been instituted (Winsper, Ganapathy, et al., 2013).

Violence risk is therefore relevant to clinical practice in Early Intervention in Psychosis (EIP) services. However, studies reporting violence in FEP have mostly studied violence risk at or before first contact with psychiatric services rather than investigating outcomes following service contact (Coid et al., 2013; Rolin et al., 2018). In a 2013 systematic review, of the 6 studies that reported violence after first contact, there was inconsistency in the length of the outcome period examined, the outcome measure used for violence, and study population (which included some inpatient samples) (Winsper, Ganapathy, et al., 2013). Subsequent longitudinal studies have partly addressed this. A study in Norway and Denmark found 20% of individuals recruited during their first episode of psychosis self-reported being arrested or incarcerated for violence in the year before baseline assessment or during the subsequent 10 years (Langeveld et al., 2014), and, in a large UK cohort, 14% displayed violent behaviour (self-report of physically harming others) in the 12-months after EIP service entry (Winsper, Singh, et al., 2013). However, these previous studies have been limited by evaluating violent outcomes based on patient interview and file review, often employing an aggression scale, which may not be informative for services that require a clear outcome that is of a nature and severity that they would identify and respond to clinically. Further, preventing criminal justice involvement will be important to ensure continuity of care, maintain social support networks where present, and reduce additional psychosocial stressors. In addition, individuals recruited into research cohorts and assessed with periodic outcome interviews may not represent the clinical population. A violent incident may in itself disrupt service engagement, and so reliance on such methods without complementary data will likely miss outcome information for potentially vulnerable individuals.

The current study therefore sought to examine rates of violence in all patients assessed by EIP services. Outcomes were collected with scalable use of routine documentation in electronic patient records (EPRs). Additionally, police-recorded violent arrest information was obtained for all those assessed by EIP services on a group level, whether or not they were subsequently engaged by these services, in order to understand the risk profile of all those being routinely assessed in this setting. We then tested the concordance of these two methods—EPR-based reporting and police-recorded arrest—to examine this particular outcome.

2 Methods

All individuals consecutively referred to two EIP services in Oxfordshire and Buckinghamshire, United Kingdom, between June 2015 and June 2016 who received a face-

to-face assessment were included. Prior to such assessments referrals were first triaged by clinical services to ascertain appropriateness. For each individual, a period of 1 year from initial contact was reviewed for violent outcomes, regardless of whether they remained under the care of EIP services at the end of this.

The “Carenotes” EPR was examined for violent outcomes by reviewing risk assessment forms, unstructured clinical progress notes and correspondence (documents for example, letters, reports and emails). Free-text search functionality was used to review risk assessments and clinical notes, filtered for the review period, for violent synonyms likely to capture incidents in routine clinician language (all matches for stems “aggre,” “assault,” “punch,” “kick,” “violen,” “fight,” “beat” and “batter” and whole word matches for “hit” or “hitting”). Similarly, titles of documents within correspondence were searched for references to street-triage, police (including “Thames Valley Police” or “TVP”), criminal justice liaison and diversion services (“CJLD” or “LD”) and court. Incidents identified were reviewed for relevance and coded as less serious interpersonal physical violence (not documented to have caused injury) or more serious interpersonal physical violence (any documented injury, any use of a weapon or any sexual assault). Documentation referring to arrest, charge or conviction for a violent offence was additionally recorded. Finally, centrally logged incident reports for included patients, coded as involving violence and aggression, were similarly reviewed for relevance. For individuals with multiple incidents, the most severe was counted as the primary outcome. The total number of individuals in the cohort with at least one arrest/charge for violence was cross-checked by Thames Valley Police (ie, without individual-level data). Data was anonymised at the point of collection and the project was approved by Oxford Health National Health Service (NHS) Foundation Trust's Quality and Audit team as part of a local service evaluation.

3 Results

Characteristics of 177 consecutive patients assessed by EIP services are presented in Table 1. 109 of 177 patients assessed (62%) were accepted onto EIP service caseloads, having satisfied standard criteria for entry into the EIP service model based on symptoms, functional impairment, and being within 3 years of the onset of a previously untreated psychotic illness. Of these, EPRs documented that 28 (26%) perpetrated any physical violence, and 10 (9%) were arrested/charged for violent offences in the 12-months after referral. Free-text searching of running clinical progress notes was found to be a feasible method of extracting outcomes, and was the EPR location that most reliably recorded the most serious incident (capturing this in 93% of cases where some violence was documented).

Of the 68 individuals (38%) who were assessed by EIP services but not subsequently taken on, many were followed up by non-EIP mental health services, with 40% remaining under the care of secondary mental health services within the same healthcare organization 12-months after initial EIP referral. According to police records, 26 of all 177 patients assessed (15%) were arrested or charged for alleged violence in the 12-months following this referral.

4 Discussion

In a cohort of 109 consecutive individuals assessed as having first-episode psychosis by EIP services in two English regions, electronic medical records documented that 1 in 4 individuals perpetrated interpersonal violence in the subsequent 12-months after first service contact, and that 1 in 10 were arrested or charged with violent offences by the police.

Among all 177 individuals consecutively assessed by EIP services (the majority of whom remained under the care of either EIP or other local secondary mental health services after 12-months), EPRs recorded that 7% were arrested for or charged with a violent offence during follow-up. Based on police records, however, the 1-year rate was around double at 15%, demonstrating the value of triangulating data sources for outcome measurement. Police data has the advantage of capturing events for individuals no longer in active or regular contact with mental health services, and so potentially identifies unmet need among those who have disengaged or been discharged.

First contact with EIP services is therefore an important point in the clinical pathway to identify modifiable risk factors for violence. A violent or forensic history in individuals with FEP is associated with poor prognosis including increased frequency and length of hospital admission, poorer functional status and victimization (Cotton et al., 2017; Hachtel, Harries, Luebbers, & Ogloff, 2018), and, in those with schizophrenia-spectrum disorders, is associated with suicide and premature mortality (Fazel, Wolf, Palm, & Lichtenstein, 2014). Identifying individuals likely to benefit from interventions to reduce violence risk could therefore also improve overall prognosis. Whether and how EIP services explicitly assess violence risk and initiate preventative interventions warrants further exploration. Rates of violence following EIP service entry in the current study are broadly comparable to pretreatment rates previously reported (Winsper, Ganapathy, et al., 2013), which supports the suggestion that for some individuals interventions to reduce violence risk may need to specifically target antisocial behaviour rather than psychotic symptom-control alone (Winsper, Singh, et al., 2013). To develop and test such interventions, practical and accurate methods of capturing violent outcomes are necessary. Use of routine documentation in EPRs was found here to be one feasible approach.

A limitation of the current study is the lack of individual-level police data, and lack of healthcare data for individuals who may have been transferred to a different geographical area. It is therefore not possible to state what proportion of police-recorded events related to individuals who were still in active contact with mental health services. Future research would benefit from developing national linkages between health and police records that allow extraction of individual-level data in a de-identified manner. The use of arrest/charge data captures an alleged rather than proven incident. There are, however, many reasons that a subsequent conviction may not occur or be significantly delayed. Thus, the use of arrest/charge information is an objective indicator of an incident that consumes police resources, is stressful for individuals and their carers and families, potentially disrupts community care, and for these reasons is one important marker of psychosocial morbidity. We also did not have access to data on individual risk factors for violence in this cohort, and such work should be a priority for future research (Lamsma, Cahn, & Fazel, 2019).

Violence is an important adverse outcome to assess, manage and prevent in psychiatry, and presentation to EIP services is an important opportunity to identify risk and consider preventative interventions. These measures need further investigation, and may involve other mental health services or agencies, or be developed as integral to EIP services themselves. The positive benefits of identifying high-risk subgroups within EIP settings, and adopting a stratified approach to assessment and allocation of focussed resources (Fazel et al., 2017), potentially include reductions in hospitalization and crisis contact, and improved symptoms and global functioning (Brewer et al., 2015). This is therefore an area of research that has scope to inform the further development of these essential clinical services.

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to Thames Valley Police for their assistance with the project.

This report is independent research supported by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR Doctoral Research Fellowship, Dr Daniel Whiting, DRF-2018-11-ST2-069). The views expressed in this publication are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NHS, the National Institute for Health Research or the Department of Health and Social Care. Professor Seena Fazel is funded by the Wellcome Trust (202836/Z/16/Z).

Funding information

National Institute for Health Research, Grant/Award Number: DRF-2018-11-ST2-069; Wellcome Trust, Grant/Award Number: 202836/Z/16/Z

References

- Brewer WJ, Lambert TJ, Witt K, Dileo J, Duff C, Crlenjak C, et al. Murphy BP. Intensive case management for high-risk patients with first-episode psychosis: Service model and outcomes. *Lancet Psychiatry*. 2015; 2(1):29–37. DOI: 10.1016/s2215-0366(14)00127-8 [PubMed: 26359610]
- Coid JW, Ullrich S, Kallis C, Keers R, Barker D, Cowden F, Stamps R. The relationship between delusions and violence: Findings from the East London first episode psychosis study. *JAMA Psychiatry*. 2013; 70(5):465–471. DOI: 10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2013.12 [PubMed: 23467760]
- Cotton SM, Lambert M, Schimmelmann BG, Filia K, Rayner V, Hides L, et al. Conus P. Predictors of functional status at service entry and discharge among young people with first episode psychosis. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*. 2017; 52(5):575–585. DOI: 10.1007/s00127-017-1358-0 [PubMed: 28233045]
- Fazel S, Gulati G, Linsell L, Geddes JR, Grann M. Schizophrenia and violence: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS Medicine*. 2009; 6(8):e1000120.doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1000120 [PubMed: 19668362]
- Fazel S, Wolf A, Larsson H, Lichtenstein P, Mallett S, Fanshawe TR. Identification of low risk of violent crime in severe mental illness with a clinical prediction tool (Oxford Mental Illness and Violence tool [OxMIV]): A derivation and validation study. *Lancet Psychiatry*. 2017; 4(6):461–468. DOI: 10.1016/s2215-0366(17)30109-8 [PubMed: 28479143]
- Fazel S, Wolf A, Palm C, Lichtenstein P. Violent crime, suicide, and premature mortality in patients with schizophrenia and related disorders: A 38-year total population study in Sweden. *Lancet Psychiatry*. 2014; 1(1):44–54. DOI: 10.1016/s2215-0366(14)70223-8 [PubMed: 25110636]
- Hachtel H, Harries C, Luebbers S, Ogloff JR. Violent offending in schizophrenia spectrum disorders preceding and following diagnosis. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*. 2018; 52(8):782–792. DOI: 10.1177/0004867418763103 [PubMed: 29543067]
- Lamsma J, Cahn W, Fazel S. Use of illicit substances and violent behaviour in psychotic disorders: Two nationwide case-control studies and meta-analyses. *Psychological Medicine*. 2019; :1–6. DOI: 10.1017/s0033291719002125
- Langeveld J, Bjorkly S, Auestad B, Barder H, Evensen J, Ten Velden Hegelstad W, et al. Friis S. Treatment and violent behavior in persons with first episode psychosis during a 10-year prospective

- follow-up study. *Schizophrenia Research*. 2014; 156(2–3):272–276. DOI: 10.1016/j.schres.2014.04.010 [PubMed: 24837683]
- Rolin SA, Marino LA, Pope LG, Compton MT, Lee RJ, Rosenfeld B, et al. Dixon L. Recent violence and legal involvement among young adults with early psychosis enrolled in Coordinated Specialty Care. *Early Intervention in Psychiatry*. 2018; 13(4):832–840. DOI: 10.1111/eip.12675 [PubMed: 29740953]
- Sariaslan A, Larsson H, Fazel S. Genetic and environmental determinants of violence risk in psychotic disorders: A multivariate quantitative genetic study of 1.8 million Swedish twins and siblings. *Molecular Psychiatry*. 2016; 21(9):1251–1256. DOI: 10.1038/mp.2015.184 [PubMed: 26666206]
- Short T, Thomas S, Mullen P, Ogloff JR. Comparing violence in schizophrenia patients with and without comorbid substance-use disorders to community controls. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*. 2013; 128(4):306–313. DOI: 10.1111/acps.12066 [PubMed: 23379839]
- Stevens H, Laursen TM, Mortensen PB, Agerbo E, Dean K. Post-illness-onset risk of offending across the full spectrum of psychiatric disorders. *Psychological Medicine*. 2015; 45(11):2447–2457. DOI: 10.1017/s0033291715000458 [PubMed: 25851504]
- Winsper C, Ganapathy R, Marwaha S, Large M, Birchwood M, Singh SP. A systematic review and meta-regression analysis of aggression during the first episode of psychosis. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*. 2013; 128(6):413–421. DOI: 10.1111/acps.12113 [PubMed: 23521361]
- Winsper C, Singh SP, Marwaha S, Amos T, Lester H, Everard L, et al. Birchwood M. Pathways to violent behavior during first-episode psychosis: A report from the UK National EDEN Study. *JAMA Psychiatry*. 2013; 70(12):1287–1293. DOI: 10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2013.2445 [PubMed: 24089149]

Table 1
Characteristics of individuals assessed by EIP services and violent outcomes

	Individuals taken on to EIP service caseload (n = 109)	Individuals not taken on to EIP service caseload (n = 68)
Male gender, n (%)	57 (52.3)	50 (73.5)
Age in yrs. at referral, mean (SD)	24.1 (7.2)	23.5 (6.9)
Under care of secondary MH services		
6-months post-referral to EIP, n (%)	92 (84.4)	35 (51.5)
12-months post-referral to EIP, n (%)	75 (68.8)	27 (39.7)
EPR documentation		
Any interpersonal violence in the 12 months post-referral to EIP, n (%)	28 (25.7)	11 (16.2)
Less serious (no injury or weapon), n (%)	19 (17.4)	8 (11.8)
More serious (injury or weapon), n (%)	9 (8.3)	3 (4.4)
Violent arrest/charge/conviction, n (%)	10 (9.2)	4 (5.9)
Police recorded violent arrest/charge for all individuals assessed (n = 177) in the 12 months post-referral to EIP, n (%)	26 (14.7) ^a	

Abbreviations: EIP, Early Intervention in Psychosis; EPR, electronic patient record; MH, mental health.

^aPolice data collected was at level of cohort of all assessed patients, not individual-level.