Confectionery consumption and violence

Moore et al. found a ‘novel and robust’ relationship between confectionery consumption during childhood and conviction for violence in adulthood. However, there are serious methodological concerns, which make the overall findings questionable. As the authors recognise, the number of violent people in their cohort is very low. The lack of descriptive information in the paper, contrary to recommendations on the reporting of observational studies, forces the reader to an exercise of reconstruction. What emerges is that only about 33 participants were violent (0.47% of 6942) and of these, only 23 (69% of the 33 violent individuals) had eaten confectionery excessively. With such numbers, it is highly discouraged in the biostatistical literature to model the probability of being violent using as many parameters (8) as the authors did, since the fit is essentially driven by the number of cases and not by the entire sample size. The deficiencies of this approach are well known and numerous, affecting all aspects of the modelling process, from variable selection to effect size estimation, and are not, generally, accommodated by the adoption of rare-events logistical models, which only provide a fix for bias in estimating regression parameters. With such few cases, no interactions have been considered, even though some may be very intuitive (e.g. confectionery consumption and child-oriented parenting). With no serious attempt at considering interactions in the model, the risk of finding spurious associations is well documented (Simpson’s paradox). Unfortunately, no details are provided in the paper concerning distribution of the other seven factors included in the multivariable model (gender, birth, etc.) between violent and non-violent people, so that it is almost impossible to understand how low the cell frequency is in some such combinations. With these considerations in mind, the conclusions suggesting a relationship between confectionery and violence seem an over-interpretation of the fitted model.


Author’s reply: We take issue with Gregori’s statement that methodological concerns render the overall findings of our report questionable. Gregori correctly observes that ‘the number of violent people in their cohort is very low’ and goes on to suggest that reporting results on such small samples should be discouraged. We are interested in life-course factors that predict adult violence in the hope that such research might inform early life-course interventions. We therefore have two options. Either recruit violent offenders and enquire of their childhoods, or follow a cohort of individuals recording information on their circumstances to assess associations with later problem behaviour. Unfortunately, compounding the vagaries of human memory are the particular difficulties many offenders have with recalling what they did the previous day, let alone several decades ago. It is thus unfeasible to conduct retrospective studies; this leaves cohort studies as the only realistic and robust methodology. We are fortunate in the UK to have one of the most highly regarded cohort studies in the world, but despite its large initial sample size the rarity of violence means that only a small number of respondents demonstrate the behaviour of interest. Should we, as Gregori counsels, simply not consider using the British Cohort Study to look into childhood factors predicting adult violence because violence is rare? We suggest that this would be a valuable and informative resource squandered if that advice were followed. Gregori also suggests that models on rare data should not involve too many covariates. In our short paper we reported that we considered various configurations including the unadjusted association between confectionery and violence and that the strength of association was consistent across models – analytically we did as much as we could to test this association. We chose not to report simpler models and hardly mentioned the extensive analyses assessing the impact of attrition simply because we felt this paper suited a short-report format and including this additional information would only detract from what was a perfectly well-articulated finding. We therefore maintain that we analysed some of the best cohort data available to assess childhood predictors of an important outcome and found a robust association. We were honest with regard to the sample size, concluding in the paper that this is one area that should be addressed before firm conclusions can be drawn.

Structural brain abnormalities in bipolar disorder: what meta-analyses tell us

Findings from Armone et al’s systematic review and meta-analysis of magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) studies suggest that patients with bipolar disorder are characterised, in comparison with healthy controls, by significant reductions of whole-brain and prefrontal lobe volumes and by enlargement of lateral ventricles and globus pallidus, although most of the brain changes detected in bipolar disorder do not seem to be diagnostically specific and some clinical variables, such as patients’ age, duration of illness and pharmacological treatment, appear to be relevant in determining the magnitude of observed effect sizes.

These findings are not completely consistent our own recent meta-analysis of MRI studies in first-episode bipolar disorder.
Our study did not evidence whole-brain volume deficits in first-episode bipolar disorder compared with healthy controls. This may indicate that a progressive decrease of whole-brain volume occurs over the course of the disease, and might be detectable only when multi-episode or chronic cases are considered. This is confirmed by the correlation found between gray matter loss and duration of illness in the meta-regression performed by Arnone et al and by the results of longitudinal studies demonstrating gray matter volume loss over time in the prefrontal cortex in young adults with bipolar disorder or of cross-sectional comparisons between first- and multiple-episode bipolar disorder showing more severe brain abnormalities in patients with multiple episodes of illness.

On the other hand, we did find a significant decrease of total white matter volume in first-episode bipolar disorder, while Arnone et al failed to obtain the same finding in their analysis of a larger number of studies mainly conducted in patients with chronic illness. This may indicate that alterations in white matter normal growth may constitute early and primary abnormalities in bipolar disorder, consistent with some preliminary evidence of the association between patterns of disturbed structural white matter integrity in bipolar disorder and genetic liability for the illness. In order to explain the lack of white matter volume reduction in chronic illness, it could be hypothesised either that other, more generalised brain changes may override white matter abnormalities over the course of the disease, or that white matter changes may be attenuated by treatment or, again, may be less sensitive to the later effects of ageing. Indirect support for this idea derives from the finding of smaller volumetric differences in the temporal lobes in bipolar disorder with increasing age, duration of illness and use of mood stabilisers, the only discrete brain volume including white matter analysed in the meta-regressions performed by Arnone et al.

In conclusion, the finding of different brain abnormalities in chronic v. first-episode bipolar disorder supports the notion of different pathophysiological trajectories of specific brain morphological characteristics over the course of the disease and emphasises the need for further longitudinal studies aimed at addressing specifically the issue of the time of appearance and course of individual brain abnormalities in bipolar disorder, from which may derive a better understanding of the pathogenesis of the disease itself.
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Evolution and psychiatry

If evolution is the missing half of a ‘truly biological psychiatry’, the other half being biological reductionism, then value is out of the picture. But this cannot be. We do not deny the gains from biology or those that are to come (millions of people manage to live because of this field). Nor are we pessimistic about the potential gains that evolution claims for mental healthcare. However, these two ‘halves’ do not make a whole. We understand the aspiration for a truly biological psychiatry: life would be easier. Biology (although a big part, or the major part of the picture) cannot (alas!) be the whole, and evolutionary theoretical considerations of disorder, natural function, design and the like cannot fill what is missing. The reason is that even if we accept a value-free account of naturally selected mechanisms, physical as well as mental, these must be considered within the spectrum of individual and social values. Fulford explains why values are so feared. Other therapists who have considered...
evolution in terms of disorder also accept the indisputable place of values in psychiatry. Psychiatry is conceptually and empirically more complex than the rest of medicine. Every now and then a claim is made for a concept that will push psychiatry to an exclusively biological future. But psychiatry must be the avant-garde of science, rather than the run-up of medicine, for perspectives which truly add to those complexities (empirical as well as philosophical) to do justice to themselves.3

Psychiatry’s interest in evolutionary theory is not new. The authors will be familiar with the views of Scadding, Kendell and Boorse, who all attempted to define disease in evolutionary terms. Accounts of disorder based on evolutionary theory allegedly offered the epistemological background for a value-free conceptualisation of disease. This is one way out of psychiatry’s embarrassment when comparing itself against the scientific status of the rest of medicine and the medical model. However, this seems to be a misuse of natural selection, dressed in the colours of realism in order to enhance a ‘scientific’ psychiatry.

We do not argue that evolutionary theory has no role to play. Evolutionary psychology may offer new significant ways of approaching mental disease. But let us hope that this interest in Darwin will not be a pretext for blind reductionism and a return to a fact/value dichotomy. Britain is in the front line of value-based and evolution-based considerations with the work of Fulford, Thornton,4 Bolton5 and others. Great heritage, greater present.

Nesse1 argues that psychiatry requires both proximate and evolutionary explanations to become a fully fledged biological science. He thinks that mental disorders such as schizophrenia and depression would benefit from posing the question of whether low mood and variable social ability were adaptive traits in times of depression would benefit from posing the question of whether low mood and variable social ability were adaptive traits in times


Author’s reply: Douzenis is concerned that adding evolution will make psychiatry narrowly biological in a way that excludes values. However, my article makes no claim that proximate and evolutionary approaches make up the whole of psychiatry, it says only that ‘biological psychiatry is making full use of only one half of biology.’1 Applying this additional biological knowledge to psychiatry should not exclude values. In fact, it offers a scientific foundation for addressing the very difficulties Douzenis mentions. It is fundamentally different from 19th-century evolutionary applications to medicine.2 It is an antidote to mindless reductionism. It helps to solve the problem of defining disease,3 and to explain why psychiatric nosology is inherently problematic.4 Furthermore, profound advances in understanding human moral capacities, with important implications for psychiatry, are coming from evolutionary analyses of their origins and functions. I encourage those who share Douzenis’ concerns to consider how evolutionary approaches can help us better understand our patients as individuals and provide personalised treatments that go far beyond analysing genes and prescribing drugs.

I am delighted that Treffurth finds my approach laudable, but dismayed that she seems to think my article is about evolutionary psychology. Evolutionary biology has vastly more to offer psychiatry than just evolutionary psychology, a field not mentioned in the article. I share Treffurth’s concerns about the
difficulties of reaching firm conclusions about the adaptive significance of traits; this is challenging science. However, most working biologists find little value in philosophical arguments about whole fields and generalisations about the study of adaptations. Using historical, comparative, and other evidence to assess hypotheses about past events poses challenges in geology and cosmology, as well as in evolutionary biology. Generalisations about the difficulties are not very helpful. Examples like the one provided do not undermine the enterprise, they illustrate how such hypotheses can be tested. We will come to better methods, not by disparaging whole areas of work, but by pursuing specific questions in depth with evidence.

The fields of animal behaviour, behavioural ecology, and evolutionary genetics offer well-developed frameworks for understanding phenomena of core importance to psychiatry, such as the origins and functions of the capacities for emotions, attachment, and social behaviour. Darwinian medicine offers explanations for why natural selection has left us vulnerable to diseases. My argument is simple: basic knowledge from these fields is useful in psychiatry. Unfortunately, they are connected to psychiatry by only a few bridges. I hope readers will explore and build more.


Correction

Long-term mental health of Vietnamese refugees in the aftermath of trauma. BJP, 196, 122–125. The second sentence of the Method (p.122, col. 1) should read: An interview administered in the respondents’ home (by A.B.V. and T.V.T.) included a self-report questionnaire available in Vietnamese and Norwegian, and a structured face-to-face interview in Vietnamese.
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Bringing new life into psychiatry

Rebecca McKnight

I recently spent my elective doing psychiatry in a world-renowned hospital in the USA. I went hoping to confirm my interest in psychiatry as a career, but also as a way of avoiding the practical nature of most placements in low- and middle-income countries. I am not a ‘hands-on’ person, much preferring talking therapies to actually doing anything practical.

During my time on the in-patient unit, a patient with bulimia nervosa was admitted with hypokalaemia secondary to thrice-daily purging. This was not an unusual scenario, but this lady happened to be 34 weeks pregnant. One morning, having arrived on the ward at 6.40 am to prepare for the daily rounds, I was asked to review the patient as she was having abdominal pain. From the end of the bed I could see she was sweaty, pale, and looked to be in severe discomfort. I was concerned, and asked the nurse to contact an obstetrician urgently. Moving closer I saw there was bloody fluid on the bedclothes, and the patient starting yelling she could ‘feel something coming out’. I took the plunge and asked for permission to examine her. After the usual psychiatric ward struggle to find some equipment, I performed a vaginal examination. I was alarmed to feel a head pushing down on my hand, and immediately went into the push … stop … push mode I had learnt during obstetrics. A few moments later and I had delivered the baby, which thankfully started to breathe by itself. I put the baby onto the mother’s chest, and then started to panic as to what to do next. I was saved by the arrival of a paediatrician, swiftly followed by someone with a pair of umbilical cord scissors. Now all I had to do was to sort out the fourth year resident – obstetrics was optional in her training, and witnessing her first delivery left her collapsed in a heap on the floor.

While I hated obstetrics as a student, and complained about most practical specialties, I am extremely glad the UK training system remains for the most part general and all-inclusive. I’m still heading for psychiatry, but perhaps will put a little more effort into honing my practical skills, and encouraging other psychiatrists to do the same.
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