

**Predictors and moderators of burden of care and emotional distress in first-episode psychosis caregivers.
Results from the GET UP pragmatic cluster randomized controlled trial**

Journal:	<i>Epidemiology and Psychiatric Sciences</i>
Manuscript ID	EPS-OA-2018-0213
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	10-Sep-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Onwumere, Juliana; kings college london, psychology Bonetto, Chiara; University of Verona, Section of Psychiatry, Department of Neurosciences, Biomedicine and Movement Sciences, Lasalvia, Antonio; Azienda Ospedaliera Universitaria Integrata (AOUI), Unit of Psychiatry Miglietta, Elisabetta; University of Verona, Section of Psychiatry, Department of Neurosciences, Biomedicine and Movement Sciences veronese, Angela; University of Padova and Azienda Ospedaliera, Department of Neurosciences Bellini, Francesca; Azienda USL Romagna, Department of Mental Health Imbesi, Massimiliano; Azienda USL Piacenza, , Department of Mental Health Bebbington, Paul; University College London, Division of Psychiatry Kuipers, Elizabeth; King's College London, Psychology Ruggeri, Mirella ; University of Verona, Section of Psychiatry, Department of Neurosciences, Biomedicine and Movement Sciences,
Keywords:	Schizophrenia, Psychosis, Families, Psychiatric Services

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

ABSTRACT

Aims: First episode psychosis (FEP) is a major life event and can have an adverse impact on the diagnosed individual and their families. The importance of intervening early and providing optimal treatments is widely acknowledged. In comparison to patient groups, literature is scarce on identifying treatment predictors and moderators of caregiver outcomes. This study aimed to identify pre-treatment characteristics predicting and/or moderating carer outcomes, based on data from a multi-element psychosocial intervention to FEP patients and carers (GET-UP PIANO trial).

Methods: Carer demography, type of family relationship, patient contact hours, pre-treatment carer burden, patient perceptions of parental caregiving, and expressed emotion (EE) were selected, *a priori*, as potential predictors/moderators of carer burden and emotional distress at 9 months post treatment. Outcomes were analyzed separately in mixed-effects random regression models.

Results: Analyses were performed on 260 carers. Only patient perceptions of early maternal criticism predicted reports of lower carer burden at follow-up. However, multiple imputation analysis failed to confirm this result. Higher levels of baseline, pre-treatment carer burden, a younger caregiver age (< 51 years), and higher levels of perceived EE were significant treatment moderators in the experimental group, compared to the treatment as usual.

Conclusion: The study failed to identify significant treatment predictors of FEP carer outcomes. However, our preliminary findings suggest that optimal treatment outcomes for carers at first episode might be moderated by younger carer age, and carers reporting higher baseline levels of burden, and where patients perceive higher levels of negative affect from caregivers.

Key words: first-episode psychosis, families, carers, psychosocial interventions, treatment moderators

INTRODUCTION

Psychotic disorders affect several million people worldwide (Fleischhacker et al 2014). The peak phase of first onset often falls during late adolescence and early adulthood (Kirkbride et al 2012). Many close relatives, predominately parents, will assume informal caregiving roles that can often be long-term (Onwumere et al 2008; Lavis et al 2015; Boydell et al 2014). The importance and value of carer support in psychosis has been extensively reviewed in the literature. The pattern of evidence highlights improved illness course (Norman et al 2005), mortality rates (Revier et al 2015), treatment outcomes (Stowkowy et al 2012), and facilitated access to relevant services for individuals with family support, when compared to peers without (Jansen et al 2015a).

Though many families will take on caregiving responsibilities and in many cases will live with their relative with psychosis (Cotton et al 2013; Garety & Rigg, 2001; Ran et al 2016), a large proportion will also report experiencing high levels of carer burden, social isolation and a poorer quality of life, as part of their role (Sadath et al 2017; Gupta et al 2015; Poon et al 2016). Psychosis can impact negatively on carer health and wellbeing, and lead to feelings of loss, burnout, worry, shame, self-stigma, and psychological distress, which are already firmly established soon after first onset (Boydell et al 2014; Patterson et al 2005; Onwumere et al 2017; McCann et al 2011; Addington et al 2003). Approximately 30-40% of carers report clinical depression and other indicators of psychological distress and morbidity (Jansen et al 2015b; Kuipers & Raune, 2000; Hayes et al 2015) and reports of distress and burden can persist (Poon et al 2016; Lee et al 2014; Brown & Birtwistle, 1998).

Caregiving relationships and outcomes

Caregiving relationships characterised by elevated criticism, hostility and intrusive behaviours, and commonly described as high expressed emotion (EE), are typically predictive of a poorer illness

course and outcomes in psychosis, including higher rates of patient relapse and rehospitalisation (Bebbington & Kuipers, 1994). This is particularly evident with reports of criticism that can have different underlying predictors and correlates (Cechnicki et al 2013; Alvarez-Jimenez et al 2010). Carers reporting higher levels of patient focused criticism are more inclined to blame their relative for their illness and perceive illness symptoms and related behaviours as something their relative could control, if they chose to (Barrowclough & Hooley, 2003; Bentsen et al, 1998; McNab et al 2007; Vasconelos et al 2013).

Patient perceptions of negative caregiving relationships (i.e. perceived EE) are themselves also linked to poorer patient functioning and outcomes (Hesse et al 2016; Onwumere et al 2009), which are observable at first episode (Von Polier et al 2014; Haidl et al 2018).

Carer burden is complex and multi-dimensional, and we know that higher levels are positively linked with greater levels of carer distress and negative caregiving relationships (Raune et al 2004). Carer burden is also influenced by several clinical and demographic factors that hitherto have included carer age, the type of caregiving relationship (e.g. being a parent carer versus other carers), and illness beliefs (Kuipers & Bebbington, 2005; Gonclaves-pereira et al 2013; Patel et al 2014). EE and burden are long-term risk factors for poorer illness outcomes (Bebbington & Kuipers, 1994). Hence, the inclusion of evidence based psychosocial interventions for individuals with psychosis and their families in several treatment guidelines across the globe (Norman et al 2017; Galletly et al 2016; National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) 2014; Kreyenbuhl et al 2010). Traditionally, the interventions integrate different components such as psychoeducation, problem-solving, emotional processing, each designed to facilitate a better understanding about psychosis, a more relaxed family atmosphere and greater use of adaptive coping strategies.

The current study

The predictors of outcome across treatment groups can provide valuable prognostic information by helping to clarify which participants will respond more favourably to treatment in general, whereas treatment moderators provide prescriptive information about optimal treatment selection. Although there are clinical benefits in establishing baseline predictors of overall treatment success, identifying treatment moderators (i.e. who will do better in which treatment) may have more important clinical and cost-effectiveness implications.

There is, however, a very limited evidence base on treatment predictors in carer populations in psychosis. Further, where there is available data, they are rarely based on epidemiological representative samples compared with controls, which invariably increases the risk of underestimating the complexities of treating families in real-world services. Likewise, the literature is also scarce on moderators of treatment outcomes in carers. Despite the value of identifying the subgroups of caregivers and the circumstances associated with the effectiveness of early multi-element psychosocial interventions for psychosis there is, as yet, little information about moderators of outcome. These findings would be extremely relevant in order to clarify generalizability issues of the experimental intervention effectiveness. The present study aims to address this gap in literature.

As part of the GETUP (Genetics, Endophenotypes, Treatment: Understanding early Psychosis), PIANO (Psychosis: early Intervention and Assessment of Needs and Outcome) multi-element psychosocial intervention cluster trial in FEP (Ruggeri et al 2012), the current study sought to identify, among pre-treatment characteristics, predictors and moderators of caregiver burden and emotional distress at 9 months post baseline. It aimed to understand: (a) which caregivers' characteristics, among pre-treatment variables at baseline, are associated with a better treatment response regardless of treatment type (*non-specific predictors*); and (b) which characteristics are

associated with a better response to the specific treatment provided in the GETUP PIANO trial (*moderators*). Based on the existing literature we hypothesized that, regardless of treatment, improvement in carer burden and emotional distress at 9 months would be associated with non-parental caregivers, fewer hours per week spent between carers and patients, and patients' greater perception of positive care from carers (Sadath et al 2017; Awad & Voruganti 2008; Poon et al 2016; Bebbington & Kuipers, 1994; Kuipers & Bebbington, 2005). Given the lack of available information, no specific *a priori* hypotheses were offered about moderators; thus, moderator analyses will be exploratory and utilise the same set of variables analysed as predictors.

METHODS

The GET UP PIANO trial

The GETUP PIANO trial (Ruggeri et al 2012) is a large multi-centre randomized controlled cluster trial comparing an add-on multi-element psychosocial early intervention with 'routine care' for patients with FEP and their caregivers provided within Italian public general mental health services. It was designed to assess early multi-element psychosocial interventions in epidemiologically representative samples of patients and families treated in routine generic mental health settings. Of the 126 community mental health centres (CMHCs) located in two northern Italian regions (Veneto and Emilia-Romagna) and the urban areas of Florence, Milan, and Bolzano, 117 (92.8%) participated, covering an area of 9,304,093 inhabitants. The assignment units (clusters) were the CMHCs, and the units of observation and analysis were patients and their families. The trial received approval by the ethics committees of the coordinating center (Azienda Ospedaliera Universitaria Integrata di Verona) and each participating unit and was registered with ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT01436331). Full details on the protocol of the GETUP PIANO study and on the main findings of the GETUP PIANO trial are given elsewhere (Ruggeri et al 2012; 2015).

Participants

During the index period all CMHCs participating in the GETUP PIANO trial were asked to refer potential cases of psychosis at first contact to the study team. Inclusion eligibility comprised patients aged 18-54 years; residence within specified CMHC catchment area; presence of at least 1 of the following: hallucinations, delusions, qualitative speech disorder, qualitative psychomotor disorder, bizarre or grossly inappropriate behavior, or 2 of the following: loss of interest, initiative and drive, social withdrawal, episodic severe excitement, purposeless destructiveness, overwhelming fear, or marked self-neglect (as rated by the World Health Organisation(WHO) Screening Schedule for Psychosis (WHO, 1992), and first contact with CMHC. Exclusion criteria comprised a three month or greater history of use of anti-psychotic medication for treatment of the same or similar mental health problem; presence of other mental health condition(s) due to general medical condition; other International Classification of Diseases-10 psychiatric diagnosis (apart from psychosis); moderate-severe learning disability confirmed by clinical functional assessment. Eligible patients who achieved clinical stabilization were invited to provide written informed consent for assessment. They were provided with information detailing the nature, scope, and possible consequences of participation in the trial and informed that they could withdraw consent at any time. Patient participants were also asked to give consent for family member contact; family members who agreed to participate provided written informed consent. The data is based on one identified carer per household.

Treatments

The experimental treatment consisted of a multi-element psychosocial intervention, adjunctive to routine care. It included the delivery of Cognitive Behavioural Therapy(CBT) for psychosis to patients (Kuipers et al 1998; Garety et al 2008), and of psychosis-focused Family Intervention (Kuipers et al 2002) to families, together with Case Management (Burns & Firm, 2002), involving

both patients and their families. It was provided by CMHC staff, trained in the previous 6 months and supervised by field experts. Control arm CMHCs provided only treatment as usual (TAU), which, in Italy, comprises personalized outpatient psychopharmacological treatment and non-specific supportive clinical management by the CMHC (Ferrannini et al 2014). Family interventions in TAU consisted of non-specific informal support sessions.

Measures

Carers

Carer outcomes (i.e. burden and emotional distress) were assessed by the Involvement Evaluation Questionnaire (IEQ-EU, van Wijngaarden et al (2000) and the General Health Questionnaire-12 (GHQ-12, Goldberg & Williams, 1988) at baseline (before treatment was initiated) and at 9-month follow-up, by independent researchers, blind to treatment allocation.

The IEQ-EU (van Wijngaarden et al 2000) is a 31-item four subscale questionnaire. The subscales relate to the encouragement and care that the caregiver has to give to the patient (urging); to personal problems between patient and caregiver (tension); to the caregiver's worries (worrying), and burden and monitoring patients about their medication, sleep and any dangerous behaviours (supervision). All items are scored on a 5-point Likert scale. Higher scores indicate greater burden of care as an overall scale and within each domain.

The GHQ-12 (Goldberg & Williams, 1988) is a widely used 12 item self-report measure to screen and identify minor psychiatric disorders. Each item assesses the severity of a mental problem over the past few weeks using a 4-point Likert scale. Higher scores indicate more psychological distress.

Patients

The 25-item Parental Bonding Instrument (Parker et al 1979) measures an adult's retrospective account of the parenting they received up to the age of 16 years. The measure is completed separately for care received from the mother and father. It yields two scales: 'care' and 'overprotection' (or 'control'). Higher scores reflect a greater recollection of that parenting style. Optimal parenting is typically expressed by participant reports of high care and low control.

The Level of Expressed Emotion Scale (LEE, Cole & Kazarian, 1988, Cole & Kazarian, 1993) is a 60 item self-report measure designed to assess patient perceptions of carer expressed emotion. It was originally conceived as a reliable and expedient alternative to the Camberwell Family Interview (Vaughn & Leff, 1976), the gold standard measurement of carer expressed emotion. It comprises four subscales: emotional response (e.g. high emotional response to illness (e.g. anger)); negative attitude (e.g. doubt patient is genuinely ill, blame patient for illness); intrusiveness (e.g. offering unsolicited often critical advice and frequent attempts to have contact), and low tolerance and high expectations (e.g. intolerance of illness behaviour and impairments). Respondents are required to read through a set of brief statements and indicate to what degree the statement accurately represents their carer's behaviour towards them during the preceding three months on a Likert scale of 1 (untrue) to 4 (true). An overall EE and subscale scores are generated.

As a global measure of patient symptomatology at baseline, the Positive and Negative Syndrome Scale (PANSS, Kay et al., 1987). The PANSS is a 30-item semi-structured interview used to rate psychotic symptomatology and comprises 3 subscales related to positive symptoms, negative symptoms, and general psychopathology. Interview items are rated on a 7-point Likert scale that reflect increasing levels of psychopathology with higher scores indicate higher levels of symptomatology.

The Childhood Experience of Care and Abuse Questionnaire (CECAQ, Bifulco et al 1994) is a self-report questionnaire that taps adverse childhood experiences including reports of physical and sexual abuse and neglect. A single item that assesses patient perceptions of caregiver criticism was used as an additional method to assess relationship quality.

Before starting the assessments, independent evaluators received formal training in the use and administration of instruments, with measurement of their knowledge, skills and assessment of inter-rater reliability to assess competency.

Statistical analyses

Analyses were conducted using an intention-to-treat (ITT) approach. IEQ-EU and GHQ-12 scores were analyzed separately in mixed-effects random regression models. In order to take into account the trial design in which caregivers (level 1) were nested within CMHCs (level 2) (CONSORT guidelines for cluster randomized trials (Campbell et al 2012), the individual CMHCs were included in the models as a random effect. In order to identify predictors and moderators of treatment outcome according to MacArthur's approach (Kraemer et al 2002), we selected, *a priori*, on clinical or empirical grounds and derived from the literature, pre-treatment caregivers' variables. Specifically, we investigated age and gender of caregiver, family relationship shared with patient (parents vs others), hours per week spent with patient (<32 vs ≥ 32), mother's criticism and father's criticism (assessed by CECA-Q item 6; yes vs no), PBI (care and protection (mother), care and protection (father), LEE (emotional response, negative attitude, intrusiveness, tolerance and expectations), and IEQ-EU tension at baseline (this last variable considered only for GHQ-12). Each model included treatment allocation (T coded as $+1/2$ for caregivers in the Experimental Treatment Group and $-1/2$ for those in the Treatment as Usual Group), one predictor/moderator (M standardized), their interaction (T x M), and the baseline score of the outcome investigated (B

standardized). When the main effect of a variable was significant, but the interaction was not, the variable was considered a non-specific predictor of outcome. When the interaction was significant (regardless of the significance of main effects), the variable was considered as a moderator.

In a secondary analysis, missing data on outcomes were estimated using a multiple imputation approach by chained equations (MICE), which generate several different plausible imputed data sets and combines results from each of them. Multiple imputations by chained equations were applied because it enables different variable types to be handled; specifically, we used predictive mean matching to deal with possible non-normality when imputing continuous variables.

The alpha level was set to 0.05 for all main effects and interactions. No correction for multiple testing was applied due to the exploratory nature of the study. All statistical analyses were carried out using the STATA software package, version 13 (Stata Corp, 2013)

RESULTS

Overall, 380 relatives (230 experimental; 150 TAU) out of 444 FEP patients were available for assessment at baseline (Table 1).

Insert Table 1 about here

In the experimental arm, 16 patients did not have an identified relative; 6 patients declined consent to contact their relative; 7 relatives declined consent to engage in the family intervention (FI); and 13 patients refused to engage with the individual CBT, so the matched relative was excluded. In the TAU arm, 10 patients did not have an identified relative and 12 patients declined consent to contact their relative.

At baseline, 185 experimental arm and 75 TAU arm relatives were assessed. Demographic and pre-treatment characteristics of the 260 caregivers examined as potential predictors or moderators of outcome are presented in Table 1 and have been previously published elsewhere (Lasalvi et al 2017; Ruggeri et al 2017).

No significant differences with respect to socio demographics of relatives and link with patient variables were found between the two trial arms. At follow-up, 60 (32.4%) caregivers in the experimental group and 15 (20.0%) in the TAU group dropped out from assessment. There were no significant differences in demographics and outcome variables at baseline between completers and non-completers, with exception only of the GHQ-12 total score in the experimental group (completers: 14.27 sd 6.00 vs non-completers: 16.39 sd 7.84; $p=0.044$).

By considering burden of care (IEQ-EU), both groups had similar baseline scores (t-test; $p>0.05$). Specifically, we observed the following scores: Total EXP 2.07 sd 0.69 vs TAU 1.98 sd 0.63; Tension EXP 1.70 sd 0.66 vs TAU 1.57 sd 0.50; Supervision EXP 1.75 sd 0.99 vs TAU 1.58 sd 0.79; Worrying EXP 2.81 sd 1.15 vs TAU 2.69 sd 0.98; Urging EXP 2.09 sd 0.85 vs TAU 2.10 sd 0.89. Both groups experienced an improvement at follow-up, however no dimension reached statistical significance (Total EXP 1.79 sd 0.93 vs TAU 1.80 sd 0.64; Tension EXP 1.60 sd 1.02 vs TAU 1.58 sd 0.64; Supervision EXP 1.54 sd 1.13 vs TAU 1.38 sd 0.71; Worrying EXP 2.14 sd 0.96 vs TAU 2.31 sd 1.12; Urging EXP 1.81 sd 1.02 vs TAU 1.88 sd 1.02). Emotional distress (GHQ-12) differed significantly between the two groups at baseline (EXP 15.06 sd 6.82 vs TAU 12.97 sd 5.69; $p=0.023$ t-test), while both groups experienced significant improvement at the 9 months follow up – this proved more so for the experimental group (EXP 10.88 sd 4.58 vs TAU 11.65 sd 6.03; (FU-BL) EXP vs TAU -1.71, $p=0.029$). Most families in the experimental group engaged in at

least one family session (91.1%, n=170); the majority receiving 5 or more family intervention sessions (90.6%, n=154) and from these, 72.7% (n=112) attended 10 or more sessions.

Predictors

Of the predictors examined, only patient reports of early maternal criticism (i.e. during the first 16 years) predicted lower caregiver worrying as measured by IEQ-EU at 9 months ($b = -0.36$, $p = 0.019$), regardless of treatment assignment (see Table 2 Main effect column). However, multiple imputation analysis did not confirm this result.

<Insert Table 2 about here>

Moderators

Differential effects of pre-treatment IEQ-EU Tension on GHQ-12 ($b = -0.37$, $p = 0.044$) were found (see Table 2 Interaction with treatment column). Moreover, the LEE tolerance and expectations dimension moderated IEQ-EU Tension domain ($b = +0.48$, $p = 0.021$), while age of caregiver was a moderator of IEQ-EU Worrying ($b = +0.35$, $p = 0.017$). When analyses were rerun using multiple imputation of missing data, all these findings were confirmed ($b = -0.38$, $p = 0.003$; $b = +0.42$, $p = 0.034$ and $b = +0.34$, $p = 0.022$, respectively).

In order to determine the pre-treatment IEQ-EU Tension level cut-off at which the experimental treatment started to be significantly superior to usual care, the domain was categorized using different cut-offs in a sensitivity analysis. This analysis showed that starting from 2.0 there was a significantly higher beneficial effect of experimental treatment at 9 months, in terms of reduction in GHQ-12 total scores (Figure 1). Carers with IEQ-EU Tension levels below 2 showed similar reduction of GHQ-12 in both experimental and usual treatment.

<Insert Figure 1 about here>

The same approach was applied in order to explore the moderation due to the LEE tolerance and expectations domain on IEQ-EU Tension. We found that where patients reported LEE tolerance and expectations levels below 8 (i.e. where patient perceptions of carer tolerance towards the patient was low), carers showed a significantly higher beneficial effect of experimental treatment at 9 months, in terms of reduction in IEQ-EU Tension scores (Figure 2, top panel).

<Insert Figure 2 about here>

Finally, carers aged less than 51 years (at the top of figure 3) experienced a higher beneficial effect of experimental treatment in terms of reduction in IEQ-EU Worrying, while carers aged 51 years and above experienced at 9 months, a similar reduction of IEQ-EU Worrying in both the experimental and usual treatment arms.

<Insert Figure 3 about here>

DISCUSSION

The FEP can be a traumatic and stress provoking period for individuals with psychosis and their families (McCann et al 2011; Bendall et al 2012). The illness course can fluctuate with elevated levels of relapse and poor social and vocational functioning (Robinson et al 1999; Velthorst et al 2017). The impact of care (i.e. carer burden) is often recorded at its highest levels during the first episode (Addington et al 2003). Access to evidence based psychosocial interventions, designed to improve understanding, uptake of adaptive coping and address the negative impact of illness on functioning and relationships, is increasingly proposed and implemented in several different

countries (Marwaha et al 2016; Mueser et al 2015). This is the first study to investigate in a FEP ‘real world’ setting which caregiver characteristics: (a) predict carer burden and emotional distress at 9 months regardless of treatment assignment (*non-specific predictors*) and (b) moderate differential response of treatment (*moderators*).

The results identified only one significant treatment predictor, which was patient perception of early maternal criticism. It predicted carer burden, specifically in terms of carer reports of worry. The significance of this finding, however, was not maintained after multiple imputation analysis for missing data. Thus, overall, the current findings did not identify pre-treatment predictors for carer outcomes and highlighted the need for further work to isolate these key variables. It would seem important to note that it was only until very recently that family based interventions recorded carer outcomes in their own right (Lobban et al 2013), and highlighted the importance of looking at carer outcomes.

In contrast, our exploratory analyses identified three significant moderators of carer burden and distress. Pre-treatment levels of carer burden, specifically in terms of tension (i.e. strained and difficult relations between carer and relative), moderated levels of emotional distress in carers; patient perceptions of carer intolerance of the patient and their illness symptoms moderated carer burden in terms of tension; and younger age of caregiver moderated carer burden, specifically in terms of worry. It could be suggested that carers expressing interpersonal difficulties with their relative which, in some circumstances, might have predated the psychosis onset, will also be the groups to derive the greatest benefits from the multi-component interventions. Whilst their elevated levels of burden could serve as a marker of those carers who are most in need and struggling with their understanding and adaptation to the illness. It could also simply be the case that given their elevated burden levels, there is more room to demonstrate improvements. However, the importance

of not assuming that carers who present in a less overtly distressed manner or report less relationship difficulties with their relative do not require input from services is acknowledged (Treanor et al 2013).

The difficulties observed in the wellbeing and functioning of carers of long-term psychosis populations can typically emerge soon after the first episode. We know that family environment at FEP offers important implications for the quality and direction of patient outcomes (Dominguez-Martinez et al 2014; Koutra et al 2015; Haidl et al 2018). Our results are encouraging and suggest multi-element psychosocial treatment approaches delivered during the first-episode psychosis phase in routine mental health services, does appear to exert a specific and additional beneficial effect on caregivers (Penn et al 2005), and we now have an awareness of potential factors that can moderate enhanced outcomes.

Strengths and limitations

To the best of our knowledge, this study represents the first exploration of predictors and moderators of carer outcomes in FEP following multi-element treatments or TAU treatment. It extends similar work exploring generic outcomes (Penn et al 2005) and compliments developments with patient outcomes (Lasavi et al 2017). The sample size, prospective design methodology and rationale underpinning the study in a large catchment area and in a highly representative cohort of participants, remain notable strengths. The study, however, does have limitations. First, the sample was drawn from specified Northern Central Italian regions, which means caution is required before generalising findings to groups from other socio-economic areas. Second, we previously acknowledged that our moderator analyses were exploratory, with the primary aim of providing useful information for designing future studies. This is likely to improve with time following a greater focus on carer outcomes. We are aware that we performed a high number of statistical tests

without correction. Multiple testing corrections are applied in order to reduce the number of false positives, but this correction may increase the number of false negatives, where there's an effect but we don't detect it as statistically significant. Due to the exploratory nature of this study, we did not apply multiple testing because the cost of a false negative could be that we have missed out on an important result to be confirmed in future larger studies.

Implications

Our findings are encouraging but require replication and employment of samples drawn from other geographical contexts. Future considerations of the underlying mechanisms or key therapeutic components that give rise to the positive changes are indicated. We already know that in an unselected group of FEP carers in routine services, multi-element psychosocial interventions can yield more positive outcomes on carer distress and burden of care than treatment as usual (Ruggeri et al 2015). In services where resources might be limited and access to support triaged and prioritised, it would appear that younger aged carers exhibiting higher levels of burden, interpersonal difficulties with the patient, and struggling to acknowledge that the identified patients does have a recognisable mental health problem that is likely to impact on their functioning and behaviour, are also those most likely to exhibit the greatest gains from the interventions.

Conclusion

Following the increasing and globalized focus on early intervention in psychosis (e.g. Marwaha et al 2016), the results offer some helpful guidance on resource allocation and prioritization. Though the evidence base for targeting recommended evidence based interventions in psychosis to those identified to derive greatest benefit, remains limited (Harvey, Lewis & Farhall, 2018), our preliminary findings support the approach. The important role played by carers in helping to

improve the scale and quality of patient outcomes in psychosis is well established, as is the need to provide comprehensive care packages to support them in their role (Mueser et al 2015). However, far more evidence is required to improve our understanding of the benefits of interventions and key determinants of optimal carer outcomes in FEP.

Funding

This work was supported by the Ministry of Health, Italy – Ricerca Sanitaria Finalizzata, Code H61J08000200001

Conflict of interest

On behalf of all authors, the corresponding author states that there is no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to the patients and their family members who participated in this study.

REFERENCES

1. Addington J, Coldham EL, Jones B, Ko T, Addington D. (2003). The first episode of psychosis: the experience of relatives. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica* 108(4), 285-289.
2. Awad AG, Voruganti LNP. (2008). The burden of schizophrenia on caregivers - A review. *Pharmacoeconomics* 26(2), 149-162.
3. Barrowclough C, Hooley JM. (2003). Attributions and expressed emotion: a review. *Clinical Psychology Review* 23(6), 849-880.
4. Bebbington P, Kuipers L. (1994). The predictive utility of EE in schizophrenia: an aggregate analysis. *Psychological Medicine* 24: 707-718.
5. Bendall S, Alvarez-Jimenez M, Hulbert CA, McGorry PD, Jackson HJ. (2012). Childhood trauma increases the risk of posttraumatic stress disorder in response to first-episode psychosis. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, 46:35-9
6. Bentsen H, Notland TH, Boye B, Munkvold OG, Bjorge H, Lersbryggen AB, Uren G, Oskarsson KH, Berg-Larsen R, Lingjaerde O, Malt UF. (1998). Criticism and hostility in relatives of patients with schizophrenia or related psychoses: demographic and clinical predictors. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica* 97(1): 76-85.
7. Bifulco A, Brown GW, Harris TO. (1994). The childhood experience of care and abuse. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 35(8), 1419-35.
8. Boydell J, Onwumere J, Dutta R, Bhavsar V, Hill N, Morgan C, Dazzan P, Morgan K, Pararajan M, Kuipers E, Jones P, Murray R, Fearon, P. (2014). Caregiving in first-episode psychosis: social characteristics associated with perceived 'burden' and associations with compulsory treatment. *Early Intervention in Psychiatry* 8(2), 122-129. doi: 10.1111/eip.12041

9. Brown S, Birtwistle J. (1998). People with schizophrenia and their families. Fifteen-year outcome. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 173, 139-44.
10. Burns T, Firth M. (2002). *Assertive Outreach in Mental Health. A Manual for Practitioners*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
11. Campbell MK, Piaggio G, Elbourne DR, Altman DG; CONSORT Group. (2012). Consort 2010 statement: extension to cluster randomised trials. *BMJ* 345: e5661
12. Cechnicki A, Bielańska A, Hanuszkiewicz I, Daren A. The predictive validity of Expressed Emotions (EE) in schizophrenia. (2013). A 20-year prospective study. *Journal of Psychiatric Research* 47, 208-214.
13. Cole JD, Kazarian SS. (1988). The Level of Expressed Emotion Scale. A new measure of expressed emotion. *Journal of Clinical Psychology* 44(3), 392-7
14. Cole, JD, Kazarian SS. (1993). Predictive validity of the Level of Expressed Emotion (LEE) Scale: Readmission follow-up data for 1, 2, and 5-year periods. *Journal of Clinical Psychology* 49, 216 –218.
15. Cotton SM, McCann TV, Gleeson JF, Crisp K, Murphy BP, Lubman DI. (2013). Coping strategies in carers of young people with first episode psychosis. *Schizophrenia Research*, 146(1-3); 118-24. doi: 10.1016/j.schres.2013.02.008.
16. Domínguez-Martínez T, Medina-Pradas C, Kwapil TR, Barrantes-Vidal N. (2014). Relatives' illness attributions mediate the association of expressed emotion with early psychosis symptoms and functioning. *Psychiatry Research* 218, 48-53.
17. Ferrannini L, Ghio L, Gibertoni D, Lora A, Tibaldi G, Neri G, Piazza A, and Italian Mental Health Data Group (2014). Thirty-five years of community psychiatry in Italy. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease* 202, 432-439.

18. Fleischhacker WW, Arango C, Arteel P, Barnes TRE, Carpenter W, Duckworth K, Galderisi S, Halper L, Knapp M, Marden SR, Moller M, Sartorius N, Woodruff P. Schizophrenia—time to commit to policy change (2014). *Schizophrenia Bulletin*; 40 suppl. no. 3 pp. S165–S194 doi:10.1093/schbul/sbu00
19. Galletly C, Castle D, Dark F, Humberstone V, Jablensky A, Killackey E,....& Tran N. (2016). Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists clinical practice guidelines for the management of schizophrenia and related disorders. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, 50(5), 410-472
20. Garety PA, Fowler DG, Freeman D, Bebbington P, Dunn G, Kuipers E. (2008). Cognitive behavioural therapy and family intervention for relapse prevention and symptom reduction in psychosis: randomised controlled trial. *British Journal of Psychiatry* 192, 412-423.
21. Garety P, Rigg A. (2001) Early psychosis in the inner city: a survey to inform service planning. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology* 36(11), 537-544. doi:10.1007/s001270170004
22. Goldberg D, Williams P (1988). A user's guide to the General Health questionnaire. Windsor, UK: NFER-Nelson
23. Gonclaves-pereira M, Xavier M, van Wijngaarden B, Papoila AL, Schene AH, Caldas-de-Almedia JM. (2013). Impact of psychosis on Portuguese caregivers: a cross cultural explanation of burden, distress, positive aspects and clinical-functional correlates. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology* 48(2), 325-335.
24. Gupta S, Isherwood G, Jones K, Van Impe K. (2015). Assessing health status in informal schizophrenia caregivers compared with health status in non-caregivers and caregivers of other conditions. *BMC Psychiatry* 15, 162. DOI: 10.1186/s12888-015-0547-1

25. Harvey, C. Lewis, J., Farhall, J. (2018). Receipt and targeting of evidence-based psychosocial interventions for people living with psychoses: findings from the second Australian national survey of psychosis. *Epidemiology and Psychiatric Sciences*, doi:10.1017/S2045796018000288
26. Hayes L, Hawthorne G, Farhall J, O'Hanlon B, Harvey C. (2015). Quality of life and social isolation among caregivers of adults with schizophrenia: policy and outcomes. *Community Mental Health Journal* 51(5), 591-597. doi: 10.1007/s10597-015-9848-6
27. Hesse K, Kriston L, Mehl S, Wittorf A, Wiedemann W, Wolwer W, Klingberg S. (2016). The vicious cycle of family atmosphere, interpersonal self-concepts and paranoia in schizophrenia- a longitudinal study. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, 41(6), 1403-1412; Doi: 10.1093/schbul/sbv055
28. Jansen JE, Gleeson J, Cotton S. (2015a). Towards a better understanding of caregiver distress in early psychosis: a systematic review of the psychological factors involved. *Clinical Psychology Review* 35, 56-66.
29. Jansen, J.E., Haahr, U.H., Harder, S., Trauelsen AM., Lyse HG., Pedersen MB., Simonsen E (2015b). Caregiver distress in first-episode psychosis: the role of subjective appraisal, over-involvement and symptomatology. *Social Psychiatry Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 50: 371-378. doi.org/10.1007/s00127-014-0935-8
30. Kay SR, Fiszbein A, Opler LA. (1987) The Positive and Negative Syndrome Scale for Schizophrenia. *Schizophrenia Bulletin* 13, 261-276
31. Kirkbride JB, Errazuriz A, Croudace TJ, Morgan C, Jackson D, McCrone P, Murray RM. (2012). Systematic review of the incidence and prevalence of schizophrenia and other psychoses in England. Department of Health Policy Research Programme.

32. Koutra K, Trilivac S, Roumeliotaki T, Basta M, Simos P, Lionis C, Vgontzas AN. (2015). Impaired family functioning in psychosis and its relevance to relapse: a two-year follow-up study. *Comprehensive Psychiatry* 62,1-12
33. Kraemer HC, Wilson GT, Fairburn CG, Agras WS. (2002). Mediators and moderators of treatment effects in randomized clinical trials. *Archives of General Psychiatry* 59, 877-883
34. Kreyenbuhl J, Buchanan RW, Dickerson FB, Dixon LB (2010). The Schizophrenia Patient Outcomes Research Team (PORT): updated treatment recommendations 2009. *Schizophrenia Bulletin* 36(1), 94–103.
35. Kuipers E, Bebbington P. (2005). Research on Burden and Coping Strategies in families of people with mental disorders: problems and perspectives. In N. Sartorius, J. Leff, J.J. L'opez-Ibor, M. Maj & A. Okasha, *Families and Mental Disorders: From Burden to Empowerment*, John Wiley & Sons: London.
36. Kuipers E, Fowler D, Garety P, Chisolm D, Freeman D, Dunn G, Bebbington P, Hadley, C. (1998). London-east Anglia randomised controlled trial of cognitive-behavioural therapy for psychosis. III: Follow-up and economic evaluation at 18 months. *British Journal of Psychiatry* 173, 61–68.
37. Kuipers E, Leff J, Lam D. (2002). *Family work for schizophrenia: a practical guide*. London: Gaskell.
38. Kuipers E, Onwumere J, Bebbington, P. (2010). A cognitive model of caregiving in psychosis. *The British Journal of Psychiatry* 196, 259-265. doi:10.1192/bjp.bp.109.070466.
39. Kuipers E, Raune D. (2000). The early development of expressed emotion and burden in the families of first onset psychosis. In M. Birchwood, D. Fowler & C. Jackson (eds) *Early intervention in psychosis*. Chichester: Wiley.
40. Lasalvi A, Bonetto C, Lenzi J, Rucci P, Lozzino L, Cellini M et al. (2017). Predictors and

- moderators of treatment outcome in patients receiving multi-element psychosocial intervention for early psychosis. Results from the Get UP pragmatic cluster randomized controlled trial. *The British Journal of Psychiatry* 210, 342-349. Doi:10.1192/bjp.bp.190058
41. Lavis A, Lester H, Everard L, Freemantle, N., Amos, T., Fowler, D, Hodgekins J, Jones P, Marshall M, Sharma V, Larsen J, McCrone P, Singh, S, Smith J, Birchwood, M. (2015). Layers of listening: qualitative analysis of the impact of early intervention services for first episode psychosis on carers' experiences. *The British Journal of Psychiatry* 207(2); 135-142 .doi: 10.1192/bjp.bp.114.146415
42. Lee G, Barrowclough C, Lobban F. (2014). Positive affect in the family environment protects against relapse in first-episode psychosis. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology* 49(3), 367-376. doi: 10.1007/s00127-013-0768-x
43. Lobban F, Postlethwaite A, Glentworth D, Pinfold V, Wainwright L, Dunn G, Clancy A, Haddock G. (2013). A systematic review of randomised controlled trials of interventions reporting outcomes for relatives of people with psychosis. *Clinical Psychology Review* 33(3),372-382
44. Malla AK, Norman RM, Manchanda R. (2002). Status of patients with first episode psychosis after one year of phase-specific community oriented treatment. *Psychiatry Services*, 253, 458 -463.
45. Marwaha S, Thompson A, Upthegrove R, Broome MR. (2016). Fifteen years on- early intervention for a new generation. *The British Journal of Psychiatry* 209(3), 186-188. DOI: 10.1192/bjp.bp.115.170035

46. McCann TV, Lubman DI, Clark E. (2011). First-time primary caregivers' experience of caring for young adults with first-episode psychosis. *Schizophrenia Bulletin* 37(2), 381-388. doi:10.1093/schbul/sbp085.
47. McNab C, Haslam N, Burnett P. (2007). Expressed emotion, attributions, utility beliefs and distress in parents of young people with first episode psychosis. *Psychiatry Research*, 15(1-2): 97-106
48. Mueser KT, Penn DL, Addington J, Brunette MF, Gingerich S, Glynn SM, Lynde DW, Gottlieb JD, Meyer-Kalos P, McGurk SR, Cather C, Saade S, Robinson DG, Schooler NR, Rosenheck RA, Kane JM. (2015). The NAVIGATE program for first episode psychosis: rationale, overview and description of psychosocial components. *Psychiatry Services* 66, 680-90.
49. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. (2014) *Psychosis and Schizophrenia in adults: treatment and management*. Clinical Guideline 178. London: NICE.
50. Norman RMG, Malla AK, Manchanda R, Harricharan R, Takhar J, Northcott S. S. (2005). Social support and three-year symptom and admission outcomes for first episode psychosis. *Schizophr Research* 80, 227-234.
51. Norman, R., Lecomte, T., Addington, D., Anderson, E (2017). CPA treatment guidelines on psychosocial treatment of schizophrenia in adults. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry/La Revue Canadienne de Psychiatrie*, 1-7. DOI: 10.1177/0706743717719894
52. Onwumere J, Kuipers E, Bebbington P, Dunn G, Fowler D, Freeman D, Watson P, Garety P. (2008). Care-giving and illness beliefs in the course of psychotic illness. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry* 53(7), 460-468.
53. Onwumere J, Kuipers E, Bebbington P, Dunn G, Freeman D, Fowler D, Garety P. (2009). Patient perceptions of caregiver criticism in psychosis: links with patient and caregiver

- functioning. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease* 197, 2, 85-91.
54. Onwumere J, Lotey G, Schulz J, James G, Afsharzadegan R, Harvey R, Chu Man L, Kuipers E, Raune D. (2017). Burnout in early course psychosis caregivers: the role of illness beliefs and coping styles. *Early Intervention in Psychiatry*, 11 (3), 237-243
DOI:10.1111/eip.12227
55. Parker G, Tupling H, Brown LB. (1979). A parental bonding instrument. *British Journal of Medical Psychology* 52, 1–10.
56. Patel M, Chawla R, Krynicki CR, Rankin P, Upthgrove R. (2014). Health beliefs and carer burden in first episode psychosis. *BMC Psychiatry* 171, DOI: 10.1186/1471-244X-14-171.
57. Patterson P, Birchwood M, & Cochrane R. (2005). Expressed emotion as an adaptation to loss - Prospective study in first-episode psychosis. *British Journal of Psychiatry* 187 (Suppl.48), S59-S64.
58. Penn DL, Waldheter EJ, Perkins DO, Mueser KT, Lieberman JA. (2005). Psychosocial treatment for first episode psychosis: a research update. *American Journal of Psychiatry* 162, 2220-2232
59. Poon AW, Harvey C, Mackinnon A, Joubert L.(2016). A longitudinal population-based study of carers of people with psychosis. *Epidemiology and Psychiatric Sciences*, 5: 1-11.
60. Ran MS, Chui CHK, Wong IY-L, Mao WJ, Lin FR, Liu B, Chan CLW. (2016). Family caregivers and outcome of people with schizophrenia in rural china: 14 year follow up study. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 51 (4), 513-520 doi 10.1007/s00127-015-1169-0
61. Raune D, Kuipers E, Bebbington P. (2004). Expressed emotion at first episode psychosis: investigating a carer appraisal model. *British Journal of Psychiatry* 184, 321-326.

62. Revier CJ, Reininghaus U, Dutta R, Fearon P, Murray R, Doody GA, Croudace T, Dazzan P, Heslin M, Onyejiaka A, Kravariti E, Lappin J, Lomas, B, Kirkbride, JB, Donoghue, K, Morgan C, Jones PB. (2015). Ten-Year Outcomes of First-Episode Psychoses in the MRC AESOP-10 Study. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease* 203(5), 379-386. doi: 10.1097/NMD.0000000000000295
63. Robinson D, Woerner MG, Alvir JM, Bilder R, Goldman R, Geisler S, Koreen A, Sheitman B, Chakos M, Mayerhoff D, Lieberman JA. (1999) Predictors of relapse following response from a first episode of schizophrenia or schizoaffective disorder. *Archives of General Psychiatry* 56(3), 241-247. doi: 10.1001/archpsyc.56.3.241
64. Ruggeri M, Bonetto C, Lasalvia A, De Girolamo G, Fioritti A, Rucci P, et al. (2012). A multi-element psychosocial intervention for early psychosis (GET UP PIANO TRIAL) conducted in a catchment area of 10 million inhabitants: study protocol for a pragmatic cluster randomized controlled trial. *Trials* 13, 73.
65. Ruggeri M, Bonetto C, Lasalvia A, Fioritti A, de Girolamo G, Santonastaso P, et al. (2015). Feasibility and effectiveness of a multi-element psychosocial intervention for first-episode psychosis: results from the cluster-randomized controlled GET UP PIANO trial in a Catchment Area of 10 Million Inhabitants. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, 4, 1192-1203.
66. Ruggeri, M., Lasalvia, A., Santonastaso, P., Pileggi, F., Leuci, E., Miceli, M et al. (2017). Family burden, emotional distress and service satisfaction in first episode psychosis: a nine month follow up study comparing TAU and a multi element integrated intervention. Data from the Get UP Trial. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 721. Doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00721
67. Sadath A, Muralidhar D, Varambally S, Gangadhar BN, Jose JP. (2017). Do stress and support matter for caring? The role of perceived stress and social support on expressed emotion of carers of persons with first episode psychosis. *Asian Journal of Psychiatry*, 25, 163-8

68. Stata Corp. (2013). *Stata Statistical Software: Release 13*. College Station: TX
69. Stowkowy J, Addington D, Liu L, Hollowell B, Addington J. (2012). Predictors of disengagement from treatment in an early psychosis program. *Schizophrenia Research* 136(1-3), 7-12. doi: 10.1016/j.schres.2012.01.027
70. Treanor L, Lobban F, Barrowclough C. (2013). Relatives responses to psychosis: an exploratory investigation of low expressed emotion relatives. *Psychology and Psychotherapy*, 86(2), 197-211
71. van Wijngaarden B, Schene AH, Koeter MA, Vazquez-Barquero JL, Knudsen HC, Lasalvia A, Mcrone P and the Epsilon Study Group (2000). Caregiving in schizophrenia: development, internal consistency and reliability of the involvement evaluation questionnaire- European version. *British Journal of Psychiatry* 177(39), s21-27. DOI: 10.1192/bjp.177.39.s21
72. Vasconcelos ESD, Wearden A, Barrowclough C. (2013) Expressed emotion, types of behavioural control and controllability attributions in relatives of people with recent-onset psychosis. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology* 48(9), 1377-1388. doi: 10.1007/s00127-013-0659-1
73. Vaughn CE, Leff JP. (1976). The measurement of expressed emotion in the families of psychiatric patients. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology* 15, 157–165
74. Velthorst E, Fett AKJ, Reichenberg A, Perlman G, van OS J, Bromet EJ, Kotov R. (2017). The 20 year longitudinal trajectories of social functioning in individuals with psychotic disorders. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 174. (11) 1075-1085
Dx.doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.2016.15111419
75. Von Polier GG, Meng H, Lambert M, Strauss M, Zarotti G, Karle M, Dubois R, Stark FM, Neidhart S, Zollinger R, Burgin D, Felder W, Resch F, Koch E, Schulte-Markwort M,

Schimmelmann BG. (2014). Patterns and correlates of expressed emotion, perceived criticism and rearing style in first admitted early onset schizophrenia spectrum disorders.

The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease 202(11), 783-7.

Doi:10.1097/NMD.0000000000000209

76. World Health Organisation (1992). Schedules for Clinical Assessment in Neuropsychiatry (SCAN), Version 1.0. World Health Organisation: Geneva

Proof

Table 1. Pre-treatment characteristics of caregivers examined as potential predictors/moderators of carer treatment outcome (EXP n=185; TAU n=75)

	BASELINE		p-value (Chi-square or t test, where appropriate)
	Treatment as usual group (n=75)	Experimental treatment group (n=185)	
Gender, n (%)			
Male	28 (37.3%)	69 (37.3%)	0.980
Female	47 (62.7%)	115 (62.7%)	
Age, mean (sd)	50.7 (10.5)	49.6 (11.2)	0.466
Relationship with patient, n (%)		(2 missing)	0.597
Mother/father	47 (62.7%)	121 (66.1%)	
Other	28 (37.3%)	62 (33.9%)	
Patient's gender, n (%)		(1 missing)	0.851
Male	47 (62.7%)	113 (61.4%)	
Female	28 (37.3%)	71 (38.6%)	
Hours per week in the last 4 weeks, n (%)		(5 missing)	0.752
<32	24 (32.0%)	54 (30.0%)	
≥32	51 (68.0%)	126 (70.0%)	
PBI Parental Bonding, mean (sd)	(5 missing)	(11 missing)	
Mother			
Care	17.2 (3.6)	17.0 (3.7)	0.585
Over protection	19.2 (4.4)	18.6 (4.6)	0.318
Father			
Care	16.4 (3.3)	16.6 (4.0)	0.737
Over protection	17.6 (4.6)	17.2 (5.0)	0.567
LEE Expressed Emotion Level, mean (sd)	(4 missing)	(9 missing)	
Emotional Response	6.6 (1.8)	7.0 (1.75)	0.120
Negative Attitude	7.7 (2.0)	8.2 (1.6)	0.056
Intrusiveness	7.1 (1.9)	7.5 (2.3)	0.131
Tolerance & Expectations	7.2 (1.7)	7.3 (2.1)	0.745
Criticism (CECA-Q item 6), n (%)			
Mother	(3 missing)	(14 missing)	0.677
Yes	26 (36.1%)	57 (33.3%)	
No	46 (63.9%)	114 (66.7%)	
Father	(8 missing)	(19 missing)	0.434
Yes	21 (31.3%)	61 (36.7%)	
No	46 (68.7%)	105 (63.3%)	

Table 2. Pre-treatment characteristics as potential predictors/moderators of treatment outcome in caregivers. Mixed-effects random regression models estimated on caregivers who were assessed at both baseline and follow-up (EXP n=125; TAU n=60). (Only variables significant at $p < 0.05$) are shown.)

Potential predictor/moderator (Pre-treatment)	Outcome at FU (adjusted for BL)	Main effect (Prediction) b [95% CI], p	Interaction with treatment (Moderation) b [95% CI], p
Age of caregiver	IEQ Worrying	+0.02 [-0.13;+0.16], p=0.806	+0.35 [+0.06;+0.64], p=0.017*
Mother's criticism	IEQ Worrying	-0.36 [-0.67;-0.06], p=0.019	+0.53 [-0.07;+1.14], p=0.085
IEQ Tension	GHQ	+0.21 [+0.01;+0.41], p=0.036	-0.37 [-0.72;-0.01], p=0.044*
LEE Tolerance & Expectations	IEQ Tension	+0.06 [-0.15;+0.26], p=0.590	+0.48 [+0.07;+0.88], p=0.021*

* Predictors/moderators which remained significant ($p < 0.05$) after applying multiple imputation procedure by chained equations (MICE)

Proof

Figure 1. Moderation played by pre-treatment IEQ tension domain (top panel <2 , bottom panel ≥ 2) on the effect of intervention (Experimental vs. TAU) on the GHQ-12 total score.




Figure 2. Moderation played by LEE tolerance and expectations domain (top panel <8 , bottom panel ≥ 8) on the effect of intervention (Experimental vs. TAU) on the IEQ tension domain.





Figure 3. Moderation played by age of caregiver (top panel <51, bottom panel ≥ 51) on the effect of intervention (Experimental vs. TAU) on the IEQ worrying domain.



Proof