Introduction

The 'default mode' system refers to a network of regions including the precuneus, posterior cingulate cortex, medial prefrontal cortex, and medial, lateral and inferior parietal cortices, that appear to be active in the resting brain, and consistently show attenuations of activity following onset of a task-related activity. Default mode network (DMN) attenuation is not task specific, however the magnitude of reduction is dependent on the cognitive load and task requirements. The more demanding the task being performed, the stronger the deactivation. DMN activity is characterised by coherent low frequency (less than 0.1 Hz) neural oscillations. The functional connectivity of DMN regions is determined through the temporal correlation of blood oxygen level dependent activity in discrete anatomical regions. A 'task-positive' network of regions including the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex, inferior parietal cortex and supplementary motor area has been identified that is strongly anti-correlated with DMN activity.

The DMN is thought to facilitate adaptive functioning, working memory, and processing emotionally salient stimuli. Schizophrenia has been associated with alterations in many brain regions. Changes in DMN functional activity as well as functional connectivity have been investigated in schizophrenia. Understanding of any brain alterations in people with schizophrenia may provide insight into changes in brain development associated with the illness onset or progression.

Method

We have included only systematic reviews (systematic literature search, detailed methodology with inclusion/exclusion criteria) published in full text, in English, from the year 2000 that report results separately for people with a diagnosis of schizophrenia, schizoaffective disorder, schizophreniform disorder or first episode schizophrenia. Reviews were identified by searching the databases MEDLINE, EMBASE, CINAHL, Current Contents, PsycINFO and the Cochrane library. Hand searching reference lists of identified reviews was also conducted. When multiple copies of reviews were found, only the most recent version was included. Reviews with pooled data are prioritised for inclusion.

Review reporting assessment was guided by the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) checklist, which describes a preferred way to present a meta-analysis[1]. Reviews rated as having less than 50% of items checked have been excluded from the library. The PRISMA flow diagram is a suggested way of providing information about studies included and excluded with reasons for exclusion. Where no flow diagram has been presented by individual reviews, but identified studies have been described in the text, reviews have been checked for this item. Note that early reviews may have been guided by less stringent reporting checklists than the PRISMA, and that some reviews may have been limited by journal guidelines.

Evidence was graded using the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) Working Group approach where high quality evidence such as that gained from randomised controlled trials (RCTs) may be downgraded to moderate or low if review and study quality is limited, if there is inconsistency in results, indirect comparisons, imprecise or sparse data and high probability of reporting bias. It may also be downgraded if risks associated with the intervention or other matter under review are high. Conversely, low quality evidence such as that gained from observational studies may be upgraded if effect sizes are large, there is a dose dependent response or if results are reasonably consistent, precise and direct with low

Default mode networks

associated risks (see end of table for an explanation of these terms)[2]. The resulting table represents an objective summary of the available evidence, although the conclusions are solely the opinion of staff of NeuRA (Neuroscience Research Australia).

Results

We found one systematic review that met our inclusion criteria[3].

- Moderate to low quality evidence is unclear of alterations in functional activity in schizophrenia in default mode networks when the brain is at rest, or during stimulus or task performance.

Broyd SJ, Demanuele C, Debener S, Helps SK, James CJ, Sonuga-Barke EJS

Default-mode brain dysfunction in mental disorders: A systematic review

Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews 2009; 33(3): 279-296

View review abstract online

Comparison	**Comparison of functional activity and connectivity (measured as the temporal correlation of changes in activity) in default-mode network regions including the precuneus/posterior cingulate cortex, medial prefrontal cortex and medial, lateral and inferior parietal cortex (active during conditions of rest) in people with schizophrenia vs. healthy controls.**
Summary of evidence	**Moderate to low quality evidence (unclear sample size, unable to assess precision, appears inconsistent, direct) is unclear of alterations in functional activity in schizophrenia in default mode networks when the brain is at rest, or during stimulus or task performance.**

Functional alterations in default mode networks
5 studies, N not reported
Two studies reported reduced DMN connectivity in schizophrenia; one study reported increased DMN connectivity in schizophrenia.
One study reported reduced deactivation of DMN regions following task initiation; one study reported increased deactivation.
Both outcomes were associated with positive symptomatology.

Consistency in results[‡]	No measure of consistency is reported, appears inconsistent.
Precision in results[§]	No confidence intervals are reported.
Directness of results[‖]	Direct

Explanation of acronyms

DMN = default mode network, N = number of participants, *p* = statistical probability of obtaining that result (*p* < 0.05 generally regarded as significant)

Explanation of technical terms

* Bias has the potential to affect reviews of both RCT and observational studies. Forms of bias include; reporting bias – selective reporting of results, publication bias - trials that are not formally published tend to show less effect than published trials, further if there are statistically significant differences between groups in a trial, these trial results tend to get published before those of trials without significant differences; language bias – only including English language reports; funding bias - source of funding for the primary research with selective reporting of results within primary studies; outcome variable selection bias; database bias - including reports from some databases and not others; citation bias - preferential citation of authors. Trials can also be subject to bias when evaluators are not blind to treatment condition and selection bias of participants if trial samples are small[4].

---

† Different effect measures are reported by different reviews.

ALE analysis (Anatomical Likelihood Estimate) refers to a voxel-based meta-analytic technique for structural imaging in which each point of statistically significant structural difference is spatially smoothed into Gaussian distribution space, and summed to create a statistical map estimating the likelihood of difference in each voxel, as determined by the entire set of included studies. Incorporated with the Genome Scan Meta-analysis (GSMA), the meta-analysis of coordinates from multiple studies can be weighted for sample size to create a random effect analysis. The ALE statistic (if reported) represents the probability of a group difference occurring at each voxel included in the analysis.

Fractional similarity network analysis refers to a network analysis technique in which secondary networks are identified within the larger framework of activity, creating a matrix for regional co-activity.

Weighted mean difference scores refer to mean differences between treatment and comparison groups after treatment (or occasionally pre to post treatment) and in a randomised trial there is an assumption that both groups are comparable on this measure prior to treatment. Standardised mean differences are divided by the pooled standard deviation (or the standard deviation of one group when groups are homogenous) which allows results from different scales to be combined and compared. Each study's mean difference is then given a weighting depending on the size of the sample and the variability in the data. 0.2 represents a small effect, 0.5 a medium effect, and 0.8 and over represents a large effect[4].

Odds ratio (OR) or relative risk (RR) refers to the probability of a reduction (< 1) or an increase (> 1) in a particular outcome in a treatment group, or a group exposed to a risk factor, relative to the comparison group. For example, a RR of 0.75 translates to a reduction in risk of an outcome of 25% relative to those not receiving the treatment or not exposed to the risk factor. Conversely, a RR of 1.25 translates to an increased risk of 25% relative to those not receiving treatment or not having been exposed to a risk factor. A RR or OR of 1.00 means there is no difference between groups. A medium effect is considered if RR > 2 or < 0.5 and a large effect if RR > 5 or < 0.2[5]. lnOR stands for logarithmic OR where a lnOR of 0 shows no difference between groups. Hazard ratios

measure the effect of an explanatory variable on the hazard or risk of an event.

Correlation coefficients (eg, *r*) indicate the strength of association or relationship between variables. They are an indication of prediction, but do not confirm causality due to possible and often unforseen confounding variables. An *r* of 0.10 represents a weak association, 0.25 a medium association and 0.40 and over represents a strong association. Unstandardised (*b*) regression coefficients indicate the average change in the dependent variable associated with a 1 unit change in the independent variable, statistically controlling for the other independent variables. Standardised regression coefficients represent the change being in units of standard deviations to allow comparison across different scales.Reliability and validity refers to how accurate the instrument is. Sensitivity is the proportion of actual positives that are correctly identified (100% sensitivity = correct identification of all actual positives) and specificity is the proportion of negatives that are correctly identified (100% specificity = not identifying anyone as positive if they are truly not).

‡ Inconsistency refers to differing estimates of treatment effect across studies (i.e. heterogeneity or variability in results) that is not explained by subgroup analyses and therefore reduces confidence in the effect estimate. I² is the percentage of the variability in effect estimates that is due to heterogeneity rather than sampling error (chance) - 0% to 40%: heterogeneity might not be important, 30% to 60%: may represent moderate heterogeneity, 50% to 90%: may represent substantial heterogeneity and 75% to 100%: considerable heterogeneity. I² can be

calculated from Q (chi-square) for the test of heterogeneity with the following formula;

$$I^2 = \left(\frac{Q - df}{Q} \right) \times 100\%$$

§ Imprecision refers to wide confidence intervals indicating a lack of confidence in the effect estimate. Based on GRADE recommendations, a result for continuous data (standardised mean differences, not weighted mean differences) is considered imprecise if the upper or lower confidence limit crosses an effect size of 0.5 in either direction, and for binary and correlation data, an effect size of 0.25. GRADE also recommends downgrading the evidence when sample size is smaller than 300 (for binary data) and 400 (for continuous data), although for some topics, this criteria should be relaxed[6].

‖ Indirectness of comparison occurs when a comparison of intervention A versus B is not available but A was compared with C and B was compared with C, which allows indirectcomparisons of the magnitude of effect of A versus B. Indirectness of population, comparator and or outcome can also occur when the available evidence regarding a particular population, intervention, comparator, or outcome is not available so is inferred from available evidence. These inferred treatment effect sizes are of lower quality than those gained from head-to-head comparisons of A and B.

References

1. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, PRISMAGroup (2009): Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *British Medical Journal* 151: 264-9.
2. GRADEWorkingGroup (2004): Grading quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. *British Medical Journal* 328: 1490.
3. Broyd SJ, Demanuele C, Debener S, Helps SK, James CJ, Sonuga-Barke EJS (2009): Default-mode brain dysfunction in mental disorders: A systematic review. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews* 33: 279-96.
4. CochraneCollaboration (2008): Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions. Accessed 24/06/2011.
5. Rosenthal JA (1996): Qualitative Descriptors of Strength of Association and Effect Size. *Journal of Social Service Research* 21: 37-59.
6. GRADEpro (2008): [Computer program]. Jan Brozek, Andrew Oxman, Holger Schünemann. *Version 32 for Windows*