TECHNICAL COMMENTARY

Criminal victimisation

NeuRA Discover. Conquer. Cure.

SCHIZOPHRENIA LIBRARY

Introduction

Criminal victimisation refers to a person being the victim of a violent crime (e.g. rape or sexual assault, robbery, aggravated or simple assault) or a property crime (burglary and theft). People with a severe mental illness may be at higher risk of criminal victimisation. This may be a result of possible cognitive impairment (e.g. poor reality testing, judgment, social skills, planning, and problem solving), and sometimes compromised social situations (e.g. poverty, unemployment, homelessness, and social isolation).

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 given priority for inclusion.

Review reporting assessment was guided by the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) checklist that 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 (RCT) 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 or if there is a dose dependent response. We have also taken into account sample size and whether results are consistent, precise and direct with low 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 three reviews that met inclusion criteria[3-5].

- Moderate quality evidence found increased rates of criminal victimisation in people with schizophrenia compared to general population rates. Between 43% and 83% of women with schizophrenia reported partner domestic violence.
- In people with any psychotic disorder, rates of victimisation were around 20%. Criminal activity showed a medium to large

Margarete Ainsworth Building, Barker Street, Randwick NSW 2031. Phone: 02 9399 1000. Email: info@neura.edu.au

association with increased victimisation. Small associations were found with having delusions, hallucinations, or mania symptoms. Being unemployed, homeless, or using drugs or alcohol also increased the risk of victimisation.

Margarete Ainsworth Building, Barker Street, Randwick NSW 2031. Phone: 02 9399 1000. Email: info@neura.edu.au

de Vries B, van Busschbach JT, van der Stouwe ECD, Aleman A, van Dijk JJM, Lysaker PH, Arends, J, Nijman SA, Pijnenborg GHM

Prevalence Rate and Risk Factors of Victimization in Adult Patients With a Psychotic Disorder: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis

Schizophrenia Bulletin 2019; 45: 114-26

View review abstract online

Comparison	**Prevalence of victimisation and risk factors for victimisation in people with a psychotic disorder.**
Summary of evidence	**Moderate quality evidence (large samples, mostly inconsistent or imprecise, direct) suggests rates of victimisation are around 20% in people with a psychotic disorder. Criminal activity showed a medium to large association with increased victimisation. Small associations were found with having delusions, hallucinations, or mania symptoms. Being unemployed, homeless, or using drugs or alcohol also increased the risk of victimisation.**

Prevalence of victimisation

Violent victimisation: 13 studies, prevalence = 20%

Nonviolent victimisation: 7 studies, prevalence = 19%

Sexual victimisation: 2 studies, prevalence = 20%

Other victimisation: 10 studies, prevalence = 19%

Authors report these rates are approximately 4–6 times higher than population rates.

Risk factors associated with victimisation

Medium to large effect of increased victimisation increased criminal activity;

Criminal activity: 5 studies, N = 4,426, OR = 4.33, 95%CI 2.53 to 7.41, $p < 0.001$, $I^2 = 81\%$

Small effects of increased victimisation with;

Delusions: 3 studies, N = 1,678, OR = 1.69, 95%CI 1.16 to 2.46, $p < 0.01$, $I^2 = 60\%$

Hallucinations: 4 studies, N = 2,466, OR = 1.70, 95%CI 1.41 to 2.06, $p < 0.001$, $I^2 = 0\%$

Mania: 3 studies, N = 2,725, OR = 1.66, 95%CI 1.27 to 2.17, $p < 0.001$, $I^2 = 73\%$

Being unemployed: 7 studies, N = 3,845, OR = 1.31, 95%CI 1.04 to 1.64, $p = 0.02$, $I^2 = 23\%$

Being homeless: 6 studies, N = 5,417, OR = 2.49, 95%CI 2.00 to 3.08, $p < 0.01$, $I^2 = 6\%$

Drug misuse: 4 studies, N = 3,461, OR = 1.90, 95%CI 1.16 to 3.12, p = 0.01, I^2 = 71%
Alcohol misuse: 4 studies, N = 3,450, OR = 2.05, 95%CI 1.17 to 3.56, p = 0.01, I^2 = 71%
There were no associations with;
Overall symptoms: 3 studies, N = 1,474, OR = 1.03, 95%CI 0.98 to 1.08, p = 0.27, I^2 = 86%
Duration/worse outcome: 8 studies, N = 6,219, OR = 1.19, 95%CI 0.88 to 1.63, p = 0.26, I^2 = 64%
Functioning: 3 studies, N = 2,841, OR = 1.11, 95%CI 0.85 to 1.44, p = 0.46, I^2 = 42%
Positive symptoms: 4 studies, N = 1,916, OR = 1.23, 95%CI 0.97 to 1.55, p = 0.08, I^2 = 87%
Negative symptoms: 4 studies, N = 1,915, OR = 0.95, 95%CI 0.75 to 2.34, p = 0.55, I^2 = 49%
Depression: 4 studies, N = 3,071, OR = 1.29, 95%CI 0.89 to 1.86, p = 0.17, I^2 = 88%
Past hospitalisation: 3 studies, N = 1,233, OR = 1.06, 95%CI 0.70 to 1.59, p = 0.79, I^2 = 44%
Diagnosis: 3 studies, N = 2,803, OR = 1.01, 95%CI 0.62 to 1.66, p = 0.97, I^2 = 78%
Age of onset: 5 studies, N = 3,543, OR = 1.38, 95%CI 0.97 to 1.97, p = 0.07, I^2 = 83%
Age: 9 studies, N = 5,484, OR = 1.02, 95%CI 0.96 to 1.08, p = 0.51, I^2 = 83%
Education: 4 studies, N = 3,473, OR = 0.98, 95%CI 0.85 to 1.13, p = 0.76, I^2 = 0%
Ethnicity: 3 studies, N = 2,803, OR = 1.32, 95%CI 0.91 to 1.92, p = 0.14, I^2 = 35%
Income: 4 studies, N = 2,960, OR = 1.49, 95%CI 0.83 to 2.67, p = 0.19, I^2 = 76%
Living alone: 3 studies, N = 618, OR = 1.23, 95%CI 0.90 to 1.68, p = 0.19, I^2 = 0%
Marital status: 5 studies, N = 3,539, OR = 1.29, 95%CI 0.85 to 1.95, p = 0.22, I^2 = 56%
Gender: 9 studies, N = 5,029, OR = 1.02, 95%CI 0.80 to 1.30, p = 0.87, I^2 = 59%

Consistency in results‡	Mostly inconsistent
Precision in results§	Mostly imprecise
Directness of results‖	Direct

Maniglio R

Severe mental illness and criminal victimization: a systematic review

Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica 2009; 119: 180–191

View review abstract online

Comparison	**Assessment of criminal victimisation rates in schizophrenia spectrum disorders vs. the general population.**

	Note: some studies also included patients with a major affective disorder.
Summary of evidence	**Moderate quality evidence (large samples, unable to assess consistency or precision, direct) suggests increased rates of criminal victimisation in people with schizophrenia.**
9 studies, N = 5,195 Authors report that prevalence estimates of the frequency of violent criminal victimisation in people with schizophrenia ranged from 4.3% to 35.04%. Frequency of non-violent victimisation ranged from 7.7% to 27.99%. Rates of victimisation range from 2.3 to 140.4 times higher than those in the general populations of USA, Australia, UK or Finland. Criminal victimisation is most frequently associated with alcohol and/or illicit drug use, homelessness, more severe symptomatology, and engagement in criminal behaviour.	
Consistency in results	Unable to assess; no measure of consistency is reported.
Precision in results	Unable to assess; no measure of precision is reported.
Directness of results	Direct

Trevillion K, Oram S, Feder G, Howard LM

Experiences of Domestic Violence and Mental Disorders: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

PLoS ONE 2012; 7(12): e51740

View review abstract online

Comparison	**Domestic violence rates in people with a schizophrenia spectrum disorder.**
Summary of evidence	**Moderate quality evidence (large samples, unable to assess consistency, imprecise, direct) suggests rates of partner domestic violence are between 43% and 83% in women with schizophrenia.**
2 studies (N = 376) reported that the lifetime prevalence of any partner violence ranged from 43.8% to 83.3% among women with schizophrenia and non-affective psychosis. One birth cohort study (N = 922) reported the past-year prevalence of physical partner violence was 43.8 % among 16 women with non-affective psychosis; and these women were significantly more	

likely to experience partner violence in the past year, compared to women without a mental disorder (OR = 3.25, 95%CI 0.97 to 10.3).	
Consistency in results	Unable to assess; no measure of consistency is reported.
Precision in results	Imprecise
Directness of results	Direct

Explanation of acronyms

CI = confidence interval, I^2 = the percentage of the variability in effect estimates that is due to heterogeneity rather than sampling error (chance), N = sample size, OR = odds ratio *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[6].

† Different effect measures are reported by different reviews.

Prevalence refers to how many existing cases there are at a particular point in time. Incidence refers to how many new cases there are per population in a specified time period. Incidence is usually reported as the number of new cases per 100,000 people per year. Alternatively some studies present the number of new cases that have accumulated over several years against a person-years denominator. This denominator is the sum of individual units of time that the persons in the population are at risk of becoming a case. It takes into account the size of the underlying population sample and its age structure over the duration of observation.

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).

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) that 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. Less than 0.4 represents a small effect, around 0.5 a medium effect, and over 0.8 represents a large effect[6].

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[7]. lnOR stands for logarithmic OR where a lnOR of 0 shows no difference between groups. Hazard ratios

Margarete Ainsworth Building, Barker Street, Randwick NSW 2031. Phone: 02 9399 1000. Email: info@neura.edu.au

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 can provide an indirect 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.

‡ Inconsistency refers to differing estimates of 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. I^2 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 considerable heterogeneity and over this is considerable heterogeneity. I^2 can be calculated from Q (chi-square) for the test of heterogeneity with the following formula[6];

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

§ 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, these criteria should be relaxed[8].

‖ 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 that allows indirect comparisons 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 and is therefore 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. Maniglio R (2009): Severe mental illness and criminal victimization: a systematic review. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica* 119: 180-91.
4. Trevillion K, Oram S, Feder G, Howard LM (2012): Experiences of Domestic Violence and Mental Disorders: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *PLoS ONE* 7.
5. de Vries B, van Busschbach JT, van der Stouwe ECD, Aleman A, van Dijk JJM, Lysaker PH*, et al.* (2019): Prevalence Rate and Risk Factors of Victimization in Adult Patients With a Psychotic Disorder: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Schizophrenia Bulletin* 45: 114-26.
6. CochraneCollaboration (2008): Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions. Accessed 24/06/2011.
7. Rosenthal JA (1996): Qualitative Descriptors of Strength of Association and Effect Size. *Journal of Social Service Research* 21: 37-59.
8. GRADEpro (2008): [Computer program]. Jan Brozek, Andrew Oxman, Holger Schünemann. *Version 32 for Windows*