

Use of illicit substances and violent behaviour in psychotic disorders: Two nationwide case-control studies and meta-analyses

Jelle Lamsma ^{1,2}, Wiepke Cahn ², Seena Fazel ^{1*}, and GROUP and NEDEN investigators [†]

¹ Department of Psychiatry, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

² Department of Psychiatry, University Medical Centre Utrecht, Utrecht, The Netherlands

* Corresponding author; postal address: Department of Psychiatry, University of Oxford, Warneford Lane, OX3 7JX Oxford, UK; tel: +44 (0)1865 613165; e-mail:

seena.fazel@psych.ox.ac.uk

[†] See supplement

ABSTRACT

Background. Substance use disorder explains most of the excess risk of violent behaviour in psychotic disorders. However, it is unclear to what extent the psychopharmacological properties and subthreshold use of illicit substances are associated with violence.

Methods. Individuals with psychotic disorders were recruited for two nationwide projects: GROUP ($N = 871$) in the Netherlands and NEDEN ($N = 921$) in the United Kingdom. Substance use and violent behaviour were assessed with standardized instruments and multiple sources of information. First, we used logistic regression models to estimate the associations of daily and nondaily use with violence for cannabis, stimulants, depressants and hallucinogens in the GROUP and NEDEN samples separately. Adjustments were made for age, sex and educational level. We then combined the results in random-effects meta-analyses.

Results. Daily use, compared with nondaily or no use, and nondaily use increased the pooled odds of violence for all substance categories. The increases were significant for daily use of cannabis (pooled odds ratio [pOR] 1.6, 95% confidence interval [CI] 1.2-2.0), stimulants (pOR 2.8, 95% CI 1.7-4.5) and depressants (pOR 2.2, 95% CI 1.1-4.5) and nondaily use of stimulants (pOR 1.6, 95% CI 1.2-2.0) and hallucinogens (pOR 1.5, 95% CI 1.1-2.1). Daily use of hallucinogens, which could only be analysed in the NEDEN sample, significantly increased the adjusted odds of violence (adjusted odds ratio 3.3, 95% CI 1.2-9.3).

Conclusions. Strategies to prevent violent behaviour in psychotic disorders should target any substance use.

Keywords: Schizophrenia; Psychosis; Drugs; Aggression; Violence

Introduction

Most of the excess risk of violent behaviour in psychotic disorders can be explained by substance use disorder (SUD) (Fazel *et al.*, 2009). In a meta-analysis of 16 studies with a total of 5 365 cases, SUD more than doubled the odds of violence (odds ratio [OR] 2.2, 95% confidence interval [CI] 1.6-2.9) (Witt *et al.*, 2013).

However, it is unclear to what extent different categories of illicit substances, as defined by their psychopharmacological effects, are related to violent behaviour. Another uncertainty is whether subthreshold use (SU), as opposed to SUD, is a risk factor for violence. These questions may be clinically relevant, as the psychopharmacological properties of substances have been found to modify violence risk in the general population (Tomlinson *et al.*, 2016) and people with psychotic disorders are highly sensitive to the harmful effects of substances (Gregg *et al.*, 2007). The few studies of cannabis (Koen *et al.*, 2004; Moulin *et al.*, 2018; Oluwoye *et al.*, 2019) and stimulants (Bell *et al.*, 2002; Harris *et al.*, 2010; Miles *et al.*, 2003) have produced conflicting results. Moreover, these studies have been limited by small samples of inpatients and proxy measures of violent behaviour (e.g. hostility, aggression). A recent meta-analysis of 12 studies involving 3 873 subjects with severe mental illness – but not psychotic disorders specifically – reported a significant association between cannabis use and violence (pooled odds ratio [pOR] 3.0, 95% CI 2.0-4.5) (Dellazizzo *et al.*, 2019). To our knowledge, there have been no studies of depressants (besides alcohol) or hallucinogens.

To address the limitations of previous studies, we have investigated the associations of daily and nondaily use with violent behaviour for cannabis, stimulants, depressants and hallucinogens in two nationwide samples of individuals with psychotic disorders.

Methods

We used baseline data from two research projects: Genetic Risk and Outcome of Psychosis (GROUP) (Korver *et al.*, 2012) and National Evaluation of the Development and Impact of Early Intervention Services (NEDEN) (Birchwood *et al.*, 2014).

Setting and participants

GROUP

GROUP is conducted by four university medical centres (i.e. Amsterdam Medical Centre, Maastricht University Medical Centre+, University Medical Centre Groningen, University Medical Centre Utrecht) and affiliated mental health centres ($k = 36$) in the Netherlands. These centres are located in geographically representative areas of the country and provide access to treatment in a variety of settings (e.g. psychiatric hospitals, outpatient clinics) to approximately 75% of the population. Recruitment took place in 2004. To be eligible for participation, patients had to (i) be aged between 16 and 50, (ii) have a good command of the Dutch language and (iii) meet Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fourth Edition, Text Revision (DSM-IV-TR) (American Psychiatric Association, 2000) criteria for schizophrenia or another psychotic disorder. In accordance with standard local practice, DSM-IV-TR diagnoses were made with the Comprehensive Assessment of Symptoms and History (Andreasen *et al.*, 1992) or Schedules for Clinical Assessment for Neuropsychiatry (Wing *et al.*, 1990).

NEDEN

All individuals enrolled into Early Intervention Services (EIS) at five sites across England (i.e. Birmingham, Cornwall, Cambridge, Norwich, Lancashire) between 2005 and 2009 were invited to participate. Sites were chosen to reflect urban and rural differences. The Department of Health and Social Care requires that people receiving EIS are between 14 and 35 years old and present with a first episode of psychosis. No additional inclusion criteria were set. The Operationalized Criteria System (McGuffin *et al.*, 1991) was used to determine International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems, Tenth Edition (ICD-10) (World Health Organization [WHO], 1992) diagnoses of mental disorders.

Measures

Information about the instruments' psychometric properties can be found in the relevant publications for GROUP (Korver *et al.*, 2012) and NEDEN (Birchwood *et al.*, 2014). Unless otherwise specified, the reference period was the lifetime.

GROUP

Substance use

The Substance Abuse Module of the Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI-SAM) (WHO, 1990) was used to measure the frequency (i.e. daily use, nondaily use, no use) and severity (i.e. problematic use, nonproblematic use, no use) of substance use. The CIDI-SAM distinguishes between the following categories of substances: (i) alcohol; (ii) cannabis; (iii) cocaine; (iv) stimulants (e.g. amphetamine, khat); (v) sedatives (e.g. pentobarbital, diazepam); (vi) opiates (e.g. heroin, codeine); (vii) inhalants (e.g. toluene, butane); (viii) phencyclidine (PCP); (ix) psychedelics (e.g. lysergic acid diethylamide [LSD], mescaline); and (x) other substances (e.g. amyl nitrite, 3,4-methylenedioxymethamphetamine [MDMA]). Based on considerations of statistical power and similarities in psychopharmacological effects, we combined cocaine and stimulants as ‘stimulants’, sedatives, opiates and inhalants as ‘depressants’ and PCP and psychedelics as ‘hallucinogens’ (cf. Hill & Thomas, 2016). Cannabis, which has stimulant, depressive and hallucinogenic properties, was treated separately owing to the high prevalence of its use. We defined problematic alcohol use as an average intake of more than 18 standard drinks per week for men and more than 12 standard drinks per week for women during a minimum period of 2 weeks in the past year or 4 weeks at any other point in the past. These cutoffs reflect the median of several national guidelines and a consistent 1.5:1 male to female consumption ratio (Furtwaengler & de Visser, 2013). For other substances, problematic use corresponded to a DSM-IV-TR diagnosis of abuse or dependence.

Violent behaviour

Violent behaviour was established with the Life Chart Schedule (LCS) (Susser *et al.*, 2000). Designed to record the development of symptoms, health care consumption and social functioning in schizophrenia patients, the LCS contains the following question regarding violence: “Did the patient physically attack or abuse someone else?” The LCS was filled out based on review of clinical case notes and interviews with the patient and, if possible, one or both parents.

NEDEN

Substance use

A purposely designed questionnaire was used to assess substance use. For 15 substance categories, patients were asked whether they had used them: (i) almost every day; (ii) 1 to 3 times per week; (iii) less than once per week; (iv) 3 times or less; or (v) never. For the sake of consistency, we combined frequency categories ii, iii and iv as ‘nondaily use’ and refer to ‘almost every day’ as ‘daily’. The substance categories were rearranged as follows: (i) cannabis; (ii) stimulants (i.e. cocaine, amphetamine, khat); (iii) depressants (i.e. opiates, γ -hydroxybutyric acid, barbiturates, benzodiazepines, solvents, ‘poppers’); (iv) hallucinogens (i.e. LSD, psilocybin, ketamine); and (v) other substances (i.e. MDMA, ‘other’) (cf. Hill & Thomas, 2016).

Violent behaviour

Violent behaviour was ascertained from patient and clinician interviews using the Adverse Outcomes Questionnaire (AOQ). In the AOQ, a shortened version of the questionnaire used in the MacArthur Violence Risk Assessment Study (Steadman *et al.*, 1998), violence is operationalized to encompass: (i) battery that resulted in physical injury; (ii) sexual assault; (iii) assault involving the use of a weapon; (iv) threats made with a weapon in hand; and (v) battery that did not result in physical injury. The AOQ referred to the past 12 months.

Analyses

First, we used logistic regression models to estimate the associations of daily and nondaily use with violent behaviour for cannabis, stimulants, depressants and hallucinogens in the GROUP and NEDEN samples separately. Three comparisons were made: (i) daily use *vs* nondaily or no use; (ii) daily use *vs* no use; and (iii) nondaily use *vs* no use. For theoretical reasons, we included the confounders age, sex and educational level (Lamsma & Harte, 2015). Educational level, indicating whether a patient had completed secondary school, served as a proxy for socioeconomic status (Maksimović *et al.*, 2008). We only analysed complete cases. Depending on the scale of measurement, complete and incomplete cases were compared on each model variable with the χ^2 -test

(dichotomous) or *t*-test (continuous). To improve validity, we required models with at least 5 observations per cell in the 2x2 table of the exposure and outcome of interest.

We then combined the results for the GROUP and NEDEN samples in random-effects meta-analyses. The I^2 statistic was used as a measure of heterogeneity. Values of 25%, 50% and 75% denoted low, moderate and high levels of heterogeneity, respectively (Higgins *et al.*, 2003).

For sensitivity analyses, we examined severity of use. Alcohol, which has consistently been found to increase violence risk in people with psychotic disorders (Witt *et al.*, 2013), was used as a positive control.

The level of statistical significance was set at 5%. Analyses were carried out in STATA 12.1.

Results

Of the 1 013 patients in the GROUP sample, 871 (86%) had data on all model variables and were thus included in the analyses. The corresponding numbers in the NEDEN sample were 1 027 and 921 (90%), respectively. Complete cases differed significantly from incomplete cases on age ($t [1\ 011] = 3.31, p = .001$) in the GROUP sample (Table S1) and educational level ($\chi^2 [1] = 3.89, p = .049$) in the NEDEN sample (Table S2).

Demographic and clinical characteristics of patients

GROUP

Demographic and clinical characteristics of the patients ($N = 871$) are presented in Table 1. The mean age was 27.3 years (SD = 7.1). Most patients were male ($n = 673, 77%$) and had received a diagnosis of schizophrenia ($n = 602, 69%$). Use of illicit substances was reported by 602 (69%) patients. About one if five patients had been violent ($n = 179, 21%$).

NEDEN

The patients ($N = 921$) had a mean age of 22.8 years ($SD = 4.8$) and were predominantly male ($n = 639$, 69%). (Table 1). The most common diagnosis was schizophrenia ($n = 478$, 47%). Almost two thirds of the patients had used illicit substances ($n = 589$, 64%). The prevalence of violent behaviour was 22% ($n = 204$).

Primary analyses

GROUP

Daily use, compared with nondaily or no use, and nondaily use increased the adjusted odds of violent behaviour for all substance categories (Table 2). The increases were significant for daily use of stimulants (adjusted odds ratio [aOR] 2.2, 95% CI 1.3-3.8) and nondaily use of hallucinogens (aOR 1.8, 95% CI 1.2-2.7).

NEDEN

When comparing daily use with nondaily or no use, cannabis (aOR 1.8, 95% CI 1.3-2.5), stimulants (aOR 3.6, 95% CI 2.1-6.4), depressants (aOR 3.3, 95% CI 1.5-7.2) and hallucinogens (aOR 3.3, 95% CI 1.2-9.3) significantly increased the adjusted odds of violence (Table 2). Nondaily use increased the aORs for these substance categories as well, with that for stimulants reaching statistical significance (aOR 1.6, 95% CI 1.2-2.3).

Meta-analyses

Pooled across the GROUP and NEDEN samples, daily use of cannabis (pOR 1.6, 95% CI 1.2-2.0), stimulants (pOR 2.8, 95% CI 1.7-4.5) and depressants (pOR 2.2, 95% CI 1.1-4.5) significantly increased the odds of violence compared with nondaily or no use (Table 3). The same was found for nondaily use of stimulants (pOR 1.6, 95% CI 1.2-2.0) and hallucinogens (pOR 1.5, 95% CI 1.1-2.1). Moderate heterogeneity was present for daily use of depressants in both comparisons ($I^2 = 46\%$, 50%). Otherwise, heterogeneity was low ($I^2 \leq 36\%$).

Sensitivity analyses

We observed no material differences in results after repeating the analyses in the GROUP sample with severity of use. As expected, alcohol increased the adjusted odds of violence (Table S3).

Discussion

In two nationwide samples totalling 1 792 patients, we analysed associations between frequency of use and violence for different categories of illicit substances. Overall, daily and nondaily use of cannabis, stimulants, depressants and hallucinogens were found to increase violence risk.

There are at least four ways in which substance use may bring about violent behaviour in psychotic disorders. First, psychopharmacological effects of intoxication with or withdrawal from substances (e.g. disinhibition, intensification of negative emotions) may lower the threshold for violence (Kuhns & Clodfelter, 2009). Substance use may also induce or exacerbate positive symptoms (e.g. delusions, hallucinations) (Winklbaur *et al.*, 2006), which are risk factors for violent behaviour (Witt *et al.*, 2013). This may be particularly relevant for cannabis and hallucinogens. The former has been found to increase the risk of developing a psychotic disorder (Di Forti *et al.*, 2019), and the latter – with the possible exception of PCP – are thought not to increase violence risk in the general population (Tomlinson *et al.*, 2016). Second, substance use may interfere with treatment. Individuals with problematic substance use are less likely to seek and adhere to treatment than those without (Winklbaur *et al.*, 2006). At the same time, substances may be used in an attempt to alleviate psychotic symptoms or unpleasant side effects of antipsychotics (Gregg *et al.*, 2007). Self-medication increases the likelihood of avoidance or discontinuation of treatment and vice versa (Swartz *et al.*, 1998). Substances may also reduce the therapeutic activity of antipsychotics (Lindsey *et al.*, 2012). In the absence of effective treatment, positive symptoms may persist or worsen. Third, violence may occur during the commission of crimes to gain access to substances or the money to buy them (McGinty *et al.*, 2016). Finally, users may become involved in illegal drug markets where violent behaviour is commonplace (Hodgins, 2008). Other explanations for the findings are confounding or mediation by biological (e.g. genetics, neurobiological abnormalities), psychological (e.g. cognitive impairment, personality pathology) or environmental (e.g. childhood maltreatment, erosion of social support) risk factors (Lamsma & Harte, 2015).

As far as we know, this is the largest study yet to investigate the relationship between use of illicit substances and violent behaviour in psychotic disorders. It has several strengths. First, the samples were drawn from diverse geographic areas and care settings. Sampling was also independent of the exposures and outcome of interest. This enhanced the generalizability of the results. Second, the use of multiple data sources increased the sensitivity of the LCS and AOQ as measures of violence. Finally, the findings for alcohol (as a positive control) were in the expected direction, suggesting the design was appropriate. However, there are several limitations. First, causality cannot be inferred, as the temporal relationship between substance use and violent behaviour was unknown and we did not control for other confounders besides age, sex and educational level. Second, we included patients who had used substances belonging to different categories, which may have biased risk estimates. Exclusion would have made cell counts too low for meaningful analyses of most substance categories. Third, daily use was a proxy measure of SUD. However, similar results were obtained for DSM-IV-TR diagnoses of abuse and dependence in the GROUP sample. Fourth, the definition and reference period for violence varied between GROUP and NEDEN. The more stringent definition and shorter reference period may explain why aORs were slightly higher in the NEDEN sample. Fifth, missing data may have limited the validity of the results. Sixth, the results of the meta-analyses should be treated with some caution: the estimation of the between-study variance, which is used in the calculation of the pooled effect size and its confidence interval, may be inaccurate when the number of studies is small (Borenstein *et al.*, 2009). Seventh, we were unable to analyse PCP separately. Either too few patients had used PCP (GROUP) or no specific information was recorded for PCP (NEDEN). Finally, there has been a large increase in the use of novel psychoactive substances (NPS) in the years following data collection (Tracy *et al.*, 2017). NPS are synthetic compounds designed to mimic the psychopharmacological effects of traditional substances (Miliano *et al.*, 2016). Therefore, we hypothesize that NPS increase violence risk.

A clinical implication of the findings is that violence risk assessment in psychotic disorders should target any substance use. For structured instruments, it should be determined whether items for SUD and SU of different substance categories have incremental validity over a single item for SUD. The findings also suggest that interventions, which currently focus on SUD, may assist in the prevention of violent behaviour in patients with SU. To clarify causal mechanisms, we recommend that studies further isolate the psychopharmacological effects of substances, use prospective designs and test for additional confounders and mediators.

Financial support

GROUP was funded by the Geestkracht programme of The Netherlands Organisation for Health Research and Development (10-000-1001) and matching funds from the coordinating university medical centres (i.e. Academic Medical Centre, Maastricht University Medical Centre+, University Medical Centre Groningen, University Medical Centre Utrecht), their affiliated mental health centres (i.e. Altrecht, Arkin, Delta, Dimence, Dijk en Duin, Erasmus UMC, GGNet, GGZ Breburg, GGZ Centraal, GGZ Drenthe, GGZ Eindhoven en De Kempen, GGZ Friesland, GGZ inGeest, Mondriaan, GGZ Noord-Holland-Noord, GGZ Oost-Brabant, GGZ Overpelt, GGZ Rivierduinen, Lentis, Mediant GGZ, Met GGZ, Parnassia Psycho-Medical Centre, Psychiatric Centre Ziekeren, Psychiatric Hospital Sancta Maria, Public Centre for Mental Health Rekem, The Collaborative Antwerp Psychiatric Research Institute, Vincent van Gogh voor Geestelijke Gezondheid, Virenze riagg, University Psychiatric Centre Sint Jozef, Yulius, Zuyderland GGZ) and participating pharmaceutical companies (i.e. Lundbeck, AstraZeneca, Eli Lilly, Janssen Cilag). NEDEN was funded by the United Kingdom Department of Health and Social Care (PO261680). JL received funding from the Prins Bernhard Cultuurfonds and Dr Hendrik Muller Fonds. SF is funded by a Wellcome Trust Senior Research Fellowship in Clinical Science (202836/Z/16/Z).

Conflict of interest

None.

References

American Psychiatric Association (2000). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders: DSM-IV-TR*.

Author: Washington.

Andreasen NC, Flaum M, Arndt S (1992). The Comprehensive Assessment of Symptoms and History (CASH).

An instrument for assessing diagnosis and psychopathology. *Archives of General Psychiatry* **49**, 615-623.

- Bell M, Greig T, Gill P, Whelahan H, Bryson G** (2002). Work rehabilitation and patterns of substance use among persons with schizophrenia. *Psychiatric Services* **53**, 63-69.
- Birchwood M, Lester H, McCarthy L, Jones P, Fowler D, Amos T, Freemantle N, Sharma V, Lavis A, Singh S, Marshall M** (2014). The UK national evaluation of the development and impact of Early Intervention Services (the National EDEN studies): study rationale, design and baseline characteristics. *Early Intervention in Psychiatry* **8**, 59-67.
- Borenstein M, Hedges LV, Higgins JP, Rothstein HR** (2009). *Introduction to meta-analysis*. Wiley: Chichester.
- Dellazizzo L, Potvin S, Beaudoin M, Luigi M, Dou BY, Giguère CÉ, Dumais A** (2019). Cannabis use and violence in patients with severe mental illnesses: a meta-analytical investigation. *Psychiatry Research* **274**, 42-48.
- Di Forti M, Quattrone D, Freeman TP, Tripoli G, Gayer-Anderson C, Quigley H, Rodriguez V, Jongsma HE, Ferraro L, La Cascia C, La Barbera D, Tarricone I, Berardi D, Szöke A, Arango C, Tortelli A, Velthorst E, Bernardo M, Del-Ben CM, Menezes PR, Selten JP, Jones PB, Kirkbride JB, Rutten BP, de Haan L, Sham PC, van Os J, Lewis CM, Lynskey M, Morgan C, Murray RM, EU-GEI WP2 Group** (2019). The contribution of cannabis use to variation in the incidence of psychotic disorder across Europe (EU-GEI): a multicentre case-control study. *The Lancet Psychiatry* **6**, 427-436.
- Fazel S, Gulati G, Linsell L, Geddes JR, Grann M** (2009). Schizophrenia and violence: systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS Medicine* **6**, e1000120.
- Furtwaengler NA, de Visser RO** (2013). Lack of international consensus in low-risk drinking guidelines. *Drug and Alcohol Review* **32**, 11-18.
- Gregg L, Barrowclough C, Haddock G** (2007). Reasons for increased substance use in psychosis. *Clinical Psychology Review* **27**, 494-510.
- Harris AW, Large MM, Redoblado-Hodge A, Nielssen O, Anderson J, Brennan J** (2010). Clinical and cognitive associations with aggression in the first episode of psychosis. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry* **44**, 85-93.
- Higgins J, Thompson S, Deeks J, Altman D** (2003). Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *BMJ* **327**, 557-560.
- Hill SL, Thomas SH** (2016). Drugs of abuse. *Medicine* **44**, 160-169.

- Hodgins S** (2008). Violent behaviour among people with schizophrenia: a framework for investigations of causes, and effective treatment, and prevention. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **363**, 2505-2518.
- Koen L, Kinnear CJ, Corfield VA, Emsley RA, Jordaan E, Keyter N, Moolman-Smook JC, Stein DJ, Niehaus DJ** (2004). Violence in male patients with schizophrenia: risk markers in a South African population. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry* **38**, 254-259.
- Korver N, Quee PJ, Boos HB, Simons CJ, de Haan L, GROUP investigators** (2012). Genetic Risk and Outcome of Psychosis (GROUP), a multi-site longitudinal cohort study focused on gene-environment interaction: objectives, sample characteristics, recruitment and assessment methods. *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research* **21**, 205-221.
- Kuhns JB, Clodfelter TA** (2009). Illicit drug-related psychopharmacological violence: the current understanding within a causal context. *Aggression and Violent Behavior* **14**, 69-78.
- Lamsma J, Harte JM** (2015). Violence in psychosis: conceptualizing its causal relationship with risk factors. *Aggression and Violent Behavior* **24**, 75-82.
- Lindsey WT, Stewart D, Childress D** (2012). Drug interactions between common illicit drugs and prescription therapies. *The American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse* **38**, 334-343.
- Maksimović MŽ, Vlajinac HD, Radak DJ, Maksimović JM, Marinković JM, Jorga JB** (2008). Association of socioeconomic status measured by education and risk factors for carotid atherosclerosis: cross-sectional study. *Croatian Medical Journal* **49**, 824-831.
- McGinty EE, Choksy S, Wintemute GJ** (2016). The relationship between controlled substances and violence. *Epidemiological Reviews* **38**, 5-31.
- McGuffin P, Farmer A, Harvey I** (1991). A polydiagnostic application of operational criteria in studies of psychotic illness. *Archives of General Psychiatry* **48**, 764-770.
- Miles H, Johnson S, Amponsah-Afuwape S, Finch E, Leese M, Thornicroft G** (2003). Characteristics of subgroups of individuals with psychotic illness and a comorbid substance use disorder. *Psychiatric Services* **54**, 554-561.
- Miliano C, Serpelloni G, Rimondo C, Mereu M, Martí M, De Luca MA** (2016). Neuropharmacology of new psychoactive substances (NPS): focus on the rewarding and reinforcing properties of cannabimimetics and amphetamine-like stimulants. *Frontiers in Neuroscience* **10**, 153.

- Moulin V, Baumann P, Gholamrezaee M, Alameda L, Palix J, Gasser J, Conus P** (2018). Cannabis, a significant risk factor for violent behavior in the early phase psychosis. Two patterns of interaction of factors increase the risk of violent behavior: cannabis use disorder and impulsivity; cannabis use disorder, lack of insight and treatment adherence. *Frontiers in Psychiatry* **9**, 294.
- Oluwoye O, Monroe-DeVita M, Burduli E, Chwastiak L, McPherson S, McClellan JM, McDonell MG** (2019). Impact of tobacco, alcohol and cannabis use on treatment outcomes among patients experiencing first episode psychosis: data from the national RAISE-ETP study. *Early Intervention in Psychiatry* **13**, 142-146.
- Steadman HJ, Mulvey EP, Monahan J, Robbins PC, Appelbaum PS, Grisso T, Roth LH, Silver E** (1998). Violence by people discharged from acute psychiatric inpatient facilities and by others in the same neighborhoods. *Archives of General Psychiatry* **55**, 393-401.
- Susser E, Finnerty M, Mojtabai R, Yale S, Conover S, Goetz R, Amador X** (2000). Reliability of the life chart schedule for assessment of the long-term course of schizophrenia. *Schizophrenia Research* **42**, 67-77.
- Swartz MS, Swanson JE, Hiday VA, Borum R, Wagner HR, Burns BJ** (1998). Violence and severe mental illness: the effects of substance abuse and nonadherence to medication. *The American Journal of Psychiatry* **155**, 226-231.
- Tomlinson MF, Brown M, Hoaken PN** (2016). Recreational drug use and human aggressive behavior: a comprehensive review since 2003. *Aggression and Violent Behavior* **27**, 9-29.
- Tracy DK, Wood DM, Baumeister D** (2017). Novel psychoactive substances: types, mechanisms of action, and effects. *The BMJ* **356**, i6848.
- Wing JK, Babor T, Brugha T, Burke J, Cooper JE, Giel R, Jablenski A, Regier D, Sartorius N** (1990). SCAN: Schedules for Clinical Assessment in Neuropsychiatry. *Archives of General Psychiatry* **47**, 589-593.
- Winklbaur B, Ebner N, Sachs G, Thau K, Fischer G** (2006). Substance abuse in patients with schizophrenia. *Dialogues in Clinical Neuroscience* **8**, 37-43.
- Witt K, Van Dorn RA, Fazel S** (2013). Risk factors for violence in psychosis: systematic review and meta-regression analysis of 110 studies. *PLoS One* **8**, 1-15.
- World Health Organization** (1990). *Composite International Diagnostic Interview*. World Health Organization: Geneva.
- World Health Organization** (1992). *The ICD-10 classification of mental and behavioural disorders: clinical descriptions and diagnostic guidelines*. World Health Organization: Geneva.