TECHNICAL COMMENTARY

Polydipsia

Introduction

Polydipsia is the intake of more than three litres of fluid per day that cannot be better explained by a physical medical condition, but may be due to stress or a compulsive disorder. Polydipsia occurs more frequently in people with mental illness than the general population, and has been estimated to occur at rates of between 9-17% in psychiatric inpatients. Polydipsia may be measured through fluid intake, urine or plasma analysis. Severe polydipsia may lead to insufficient sodium in the body, which may cause coma or even death. As such, it is important to understand prevalence rates and potential treatments for polydipsia in people with schizophrenia.

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 with 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 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 two systematic reviews that met our inclusion criteria[3, 4].

- Moderate to low quality evidence suggests people with schizophrenia have increased rates of polydipsia.

- Low quality evidence is unable to determine the pharmacological benefits or demeclocycline or naloxone for psychosis-related polydipsia.

Brookes G, Ahmed AG

Pharmacological treatments for psychosis-related polydipsia

Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2006; (4): CD003544

View review abstract online

Comparison	**Pharmacological treatments of polydipsia in people with schizophrenia or schizoaffective disorder.**
Summary of evidence	**Low quality evidence (small sample, unable to assess consistency or precision, direct) is unable to determine the benefits of demeclocycline or naloxone for psychosis-related polydipsia.**
**Psychosis related polydipsia**

2 studies (N = 17) compared the effects of either demeclocycline (1.2 grams/day) or naloxone to placebo.

Authors state that as few data were reported and, as both studies applied inappropriate use of crossover methodology, no data is reported.

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

Leucht S, Burkard T, Henderson J, Maj M, Sartorius N

Physical illness and schizophrenia: a review of the literature

Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica 2007; 116: 317-333

View review abstract online

Comparison	**Rates of polydipsia in people with schizophrenia vs. the general population.**
Summary of evidence	**Moderate to low quality evidence (unclear sample size, unable to determine consistency or precision, direct) suggests people**

NeuRA | Polydipsia   June 2020

Margarete Ainsworth Building, Barker Street, Randwick NSW 2031. Phone: 02 9399 1000. Email: info@neura.edu.au   Page 2
To donate, phone 1800 888 019 or visit www.neura.edu.au/donate/schizophrenia

Polydipsia

	with schizophrenia have increased rates of polydipsia.
Polydipsia	
14 studies reported increased rates of polydipsia in people with schizophrenia compared to the general population.	
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

NeuRA | Polydipsia | June 2020

Margarete Ainsworth Building, Barker Street, Randwick NSW 2031. Phone: 02 9399 1000. Email: info@neura.edu.au
To donate, phone 1800 888 019 or visit www.neura.edu.au/donate/schizophrenia

Page 3

TECHNICAL COMMENTARY

Polydipsia

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[5].

---

† 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[5].

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[6]. 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 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. 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 considerable heterogeneity and over this is considerable heterogeneity. I² can be calculated from Q (chi-square) for the test of heterogeneity with the following formula[5];

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

§ 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[7].

‖ 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.

NeuRA | Polydipsia June 2020

Margarete Ainsworth Building, Barker Street, Randwick NSW 2031. Phone: 02 9399 1000. Email: info@neura.edu.au Page 5
To donate, phone 1800 888 019 or visit www.neura.edu.au/donate/schizophrenia

Polydipsia

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. Leucht S, Burkard T, Henderson J, Maj M, Sartorius N (2007): Physical illness and schizophrenia: a review of the literature. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica* 116: 317-33.
4. Brookes G, Ahmed AG (2006): Pharmacological treatments for psychosis-related polydipsia.[update of Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2002;(3):CD003544; PMID: 12137700]. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*: CD003544.
5. CochraneCollaboration (2008): Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions. Accessed 24/06/2011.
6. Rosenthal JA (1996): Qualitative Descriptors of Strength of Association and Effect Size. *Journal of Social Service Research* 21: 37-59.
7. GRADEpro (2008): [Computer program]. Jan Brozek, Andrew Oxman, Holger Schünemann. *Version 32 for Windows.*