TECHNICAL COMMENTARY

Hormonal changes

Introduction

Hormones are chemical messengers secreted by the endocrine glands. Hormones travel through the bloodstream to tissues and organs, and control most of the body's major systems including heart rate, metabolism, mood, sexual function, and growth and development.

The hormone oestrogen has been proposed to confer a protective effect for schizophrenia. Women generally have a later onset of schizophrenia than males with an increased risk after menopause (see the risk factor topic on sex differences). Oestrogen levels drop over time, particularly with the onset of menopause. This protection may also mean that pre-menopausal women who develop schizophrenia may experience a less severe illness than males.

Prolactin is another hormone implicated in schizophrenia. It is a polypeptide secreted by the pituitary gland, and is involved in many biological functions including reproduction, pregnancy and lactation, and growth and development. Some medications, such as antipsychotics are among the factors that can affect blood prolactin concentrations. Increased prolactin (hyperprolactinemia) is associated with a variety of adverse effects, including risk of breast cancer, lack of menstruation, and early osteoporosis in women, and a lack of libido and erectile function in men.

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 which describes a preferred way to present a meta-analysis[1]. Reviews rated as having less than 50% if items checked are 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 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 quality evidence suggests a large increase in prolactin levels in antipsychotic-naïve males with schizophrenia and a medium-sized increase in antipsychotic - naïve females with schizophrenia.

We found no reviews assessing oestrogen levels in schizophrenia.

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 2

Hormonal changes

Comparison	Prolactin levels in antipsychotic -naïve people with schizophrenia vs. controls.
Summary of evidence	Moderate quality evidence (inconsistent, precise, direct, medium-sized samples) suggests a large increase in prolactin levels in antipsychotic -naïve males and a medium-sized increase in antipsychotic -naïve females.

Prolactin	
A significant, large effect of increased prolactin levels in males with schizophrenia and a medium-sized effect in females with schizophrenia;	
Males 7 studies, N = 332, g = 1.02, 95%CI, 0.77 to 1.26, $p < 0.001$, I^2 = 81%, $p < 0.001$	
Females: 5 studies, N = 183, g = 0.43, 95%CI, 95%CI 0.11 to 0.76, $p < 0.01$, I^2 = 66%, $p < 0.02$	
Meta-regression analyses showed no associations with the effect size and age, smoking, body mass index, year of publication, or cortisol levels.	
Authors report no evidence of publication bias.	

Consistency	Inconsistent
Precision	Precise
Directness	Direct

Explanation of acronyms

CI = Confidence Interval, d = Cohen's d and g = Hedges' g = standardised mean differences, I^2 = the percentage of the variability in effect estimates that is due to heterogeneity rather than sampling error (chance), N = number of participants, p = statistical probability of obtaining that result ($p < 0.05$ generally regarded as significant), vs = versus

NeuRA | Hormonal changes   October 2017

Margarete Ainsworth Building, Barker Street, Randwick NSW 2031. Phone: 02 9399 1000. Email: info@neura.edu.au   Page 3
To donate, phone 1800 888 019 or visit www.neura.edu.au/donate/schizophrenia

Explanation of technical terms

* Bias has the potential to affect reviews of both RCT and observational studies. Forms of bias include; 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.

† Different effect measures are reported by different reviews.

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].

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 which are correctly identified (100% sensitivity = correct identification of all actual positives) and specificity is the proportion of negatives which are correctly identified (100% specificity = not identifying anyone as positive if they are truly not).

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]. ORs and RRs are similar when the outcome is rare. lnOR stands for logarithmic OR where a lnOR of 0 shows no difference between groups. Hazard

NeuRA | Hormonal changes

October 2017

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 4

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 dependent 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 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 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 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. Gonzalez-Blanco L, Greenhalgh AM, Garcia-Rizo C, Fernandez-Egea E, Miller BJ, Kirkpatrick B (2016): Prolactin concentrations in antipsychotic-naive patients with schizophrenia and related disorders: A meta-analysis. *Schizophrenia Research* 174: 156-60.
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*