



Insight in cognitive impairment assessed with the Cognitive Assessment Interview in a large sample of patients with schizophrenia

Paola Bucci¹ · Armida Mucci¹ · Giulia M. Giordano¹ · Edoardo Caporusso¹ · Luigi Giuliani¹ · Dino Gibertoni² · Alessandro Rossi³ · Paola Rocca⁴ · Alessandro Bertolino⁵ · Silvana Galderisi¹ · on the behalf of the Italian Network for Research on Psychoses

Received: 6 February 2023 / Accepted: 13 June 2023 / Published online: 28 June 2023
© The Author(s) 2023

Abstract

The Cognitive Assessment Interview (CAI) is an interview-based scale measuring cognitive impairment and its impact on functioning in subjects with schizophrenia (SCZ). The present study aimed at assessing, in a large sample of SCZ ($n = 601$), the agreement between patients and their informants on CAI ratings, to explore patients' insight in their cognitive deficits and its relationships with clinical and functional indices. Agreement between patient- and informant-based ratings was assessed by the Gwet's agreement coefficient. Predictors of insight in cognitive deficits were explored by stepwise multiple regression analyses. Patients reported lower severity of cognitive impairment vs. informants. A substantial to almost perfect agreement was observed between patients' and informants' ratings. Lower insight in cognitive deficits was associated to greater severity of neurocognitive impairment and positive symptoms, lower severity of depressive symptoms, and older age. Worse real-life functioning was associated to lower insight in cognitive deficit, worse neurocognitive performance, and worse functional capacity. Our findings indicate that the CAI is a valid co-primary measure with the interview to patients providing a reliable assessment of their cognitive deficits. In the absence of informants with good knowledge of the subject, the interview to the patient may represent a valid alternative.

Keywords Schizophrenia · Cognitive impairment · Co-primary measure · Insight · Functioning

Introduction

An impairment of several neurocognitive domains has been widely reported in patients with schizophrenia and is regarded as a core feature of the disorder [1–6]. It can be observed before the onset of the disorder [7, 8], often persist

after symptom remission, and during periods of clinical stability [9, 10] and has been found, though less severe, in unaffected first-degree relatives of patients with schizophrenia [10–12], thus representing a possible vulnerability factor for the disorder. According to the findings of a large body of literature, cognitive deficits are among the strongest predictors of functional outcome in subjects with schizophrenia, showing an even greater impact on social functioning than positive and negative symptoms [13–20].

For these reasons, cognition is increasingly considered an important target for schizophrenia treatment [21–23], and a reliable and feasible assessment of cognitive deficits represent a crucial point for the implementation of specific treatments and the assessment of their efficacy. To assess the cognitive domains more frequently impaired in schizophrenia, a comprehensive consensus cognitive battery, the NIMH-Measurement and Treatment Research to Improve Cognition in Schizophrenia (MATRICS) Consensus Cognitive Battery (MCCB) was developed [24, 25]. This is a performance-based instrument now regarded as

✉ Giulia M. Giordano
giuliamgiordano@gmail.com

¹ Department of Psychiatry, University of Campania “Luigi Vanvitelli”, Naples, Italy

² Research and Innovation Unit, IRCCS Azienda Ospedaliero-Universitaria di Bologna, Bologna, Italy

³ Section of Psychiatry, Department of Biotechnological and Applied Clinical Sciences, University of L'Aquila, L'Aquila, Italy

⁴ Department of Neuroscience, Section of Psychiatry, University of Turin, Turin, Italy

⁵ Department of Basic Medical Science, Neuroscience and Sense Organs, University of Bari ‘Aldo Moro’, Bari, Italy

the ‘state-of-the-art’ neuropsychological battery for research purposes in schizophrenia and other severe psychiatric disorders [26].

However, within the MATRICS initiative, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) indicated the need to integrate primary measures of cognitive functioning, obtained using a standardized neuropsychological battery, with coprimary measures, such as interview-based evaluations [27, 28]. Within this initiative, the Cognitive Assessment Interview (CAI) [29] was developed; it is an interview-based measure of cognition aimed at measuring the subjective perception of the impact on functioning of the cognitive impairment.

Interview-based cognitive assessments may have several advantages: (a) they are easier to use in clinical contexts than neuropsychological test batteries; (b) can provide a self-evaluation of cognition by patients, as well as an evaluation by caregivers, which may increase motivation to adhere to cognitive rehabilitation programs and awareness of the impact of cognitive deficits on real-life functioning; (c) may enable the identification of subtle cognitive deficits in spite of a performance within normal range on neuropsychological tests; (d) may allow the identification of cognitive improvements induced by treatments which may be only subjectively perceived [30–34].

Although the subjective assessment of cognition may provide valuable information, it may be influenced by some limitations. First of all, reliability of patients’ reports may be affected by the level of insight of the impact of their cognitive deficits on real-life functioning. Other potential limitations include reliability of informants’ reports which varies according to their characteristics, such as their level of knowledge of the patient functioning, as well as the difficulty in some contexts to find a caregiver available to be interviewed [28].

Clinical insight in schizophrenia is a complex construct which underwent changes in its definition in the last decades [35–37] and it is now regarded as a degree of awareness of the illness, rather than a binary concept [38]. A poor level of clinical insight into their condition and into the need of treatment is a common feature among patients with schizophrenia with respect to other mental disorders [38, 39]. However, clinical insight definition focuses on the degree of awareness of abnormal experiences, especially psychotic symptoms, such as delusions and hallucinations, or disorganization [35–38].

Whether the poor insight of patients suffering from schizophrenia extends to cognitive deficits is still a controversial issue. Studies investigating the convergence between patients’ subjective ratings and objective measures of cognitive performances provided non-conclusive findings. A review on this topic [40] highlighted that, among 26 included studies, approximately half found a

good correspondence between subjective and objective measures of cognition, while the remaining half did not. Findings of further studies did not clarify the picture, as poor association between subjective and objective assessments was found in the majority of studies [28, 41–43] but not in all [34, 44]. Moreover, the lack of convergence between subjective and objective assessments in some studies was limited to some cognitive domains [41, 45, 46]. Discrepancies in these findings may be related to the heterogeneity of tools adopted for both interview-based and performance-based assessments of cognitive functioning and to the different cognitive domains considered in different studies, as well as to the fact that the majority of studies were not based on representative samples, often including a small sample of subjects or subjects with schizoaffective disorder. A few studies investigated the correspondence between objective measures of cognitive performance and interview-based ratings provided by informants (i.e., patients’ caregivers) and reported a good correlation between the two measures, although in some studies, this convergence was limited to some cognitive domains [41, 44, 47]. Thus, even if coprimary interview-based measures were developed and shown to be reliable and strongly associated with objective neuropsychological assessments of cognition and real-life functioning [48, 49], it is uncertain whether the patient can be the source of information when no caregiver or high contact clinician is available [50]. The systematic investigation of agreement among different sources is crucial to translate interview-based assessment into clinical practice. As a matter of fact, in several health care settings, caregivers having regular contact with patients in real-life situations are not available and clinicians or staff members very often have limited knowledge of patients’ competence in everyday life [50].

The present study was carried out in a large sample of community dwelling persons with schizophrenia within the activities of the Italian Network for Research on Psychoses (NIRP). Using the Italian version of the CAI [51], we investigated the agreement of clinician ratings based only on patients’ report of their cognitive impairment with those based on informants’ reports to explore whether patients can be a reliable source of information in the absence of available and/or informed caregivers; we also examined factors associated with patients’ insight in their cognitive deficits, to explore if it can be influenced by specific demographic and/or clinical characteristics; finally, we investigated the associations of cognitive indices with real-life functioning to explore whether patients’ awareness of cognitive impairment has an impact on functional outcome. We hypothesized that the CAI interviews carried out with patients—at least with chronic and clinically stable ones—may provide a reliable assessment of their cognitive deficits; we also expected that a reduced awareness of cognitive impairment may have an

impact on functional outcome and may, therefore, represent a target of intervention in personalized treatment programs.

Materials and methods

Subjects

The present study was carried out in a large sample of community dwelling persons with schizophrenia within the activities of the Italian Network for Research on Psychoses (NIRP). We used the database relevant to the 4-year follow-up study [20, 52] since the CAI interview was not included in the baseline assessments.

Study participants were patients recruited among those consecutively seen at the outpatient units of 24 Italian university psychiatric clinics and/or mental health departments. All patients included in the baseline study [15] who agreed to participate in the follow-up were enrolled. Inclusion criteria were a diagnosis of schizophrenia confirmed with the Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-IV-Patient version (SCID-I-P) -and an age between 18 and 66 years. Exclusion criteria were: (a) history of head trauma with loss of consciousness in the last 4 years; (b) progressive cognitive deterioration possibly due to dementia or other neurological illness diagnosed in the last 4 years; (c) history of alcohol and/or substance abuse in the last 6 months; (d) current pregnancy or lactation; (e) inability to provide an informed consent; (f) treatment modifications (any change in the antipsychotic treatment, either dosage or compound) and/or hospitalization due to symptom exacerbation in the last 3 months to ensure clinical stability of the sample. All subjects signed a written informed consent to participate after receiving a comprehensive explanation of the study procedures and aims.

The study protocol was approved by the Ethics Committee and has been conducted in accordance with the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki (59th World Medical Association General Assembly; October 2008).

Assessments

Psychopathology

The Positive and Negative Syndrome Scale (PANSS) was used to rate the severity of two psychopathological dimensions: ‘Disorganization’—assessed using the PANSS item P2, to avoid overlap with cognitive impairment [52] and ‘Positive symptoms’—calculated according to Wallwork et al. [53] by summing the scores for delusions, hallucinatory behavior, grandiosity, and unusual thought content.

Negative symptoms were assessed using the Brief Negative Symptom Scale (BNSS) [54, 55], an instrument

designed to overcome the problem of heterogeneity of these symptoms. In fact, it allows the identification of two separate factors: the “Experiential domain”, consisting of anhedonia, asociality, and avolition, and the “Expressive deficit domain” including blunted affect and alogia.

Depressive symptoms were assessed by means of the Calgary Depression Scale for Schizophrenia (CDSS) [56]. It includes nine items (depression, hopelessness, self-depreciation, guilty ideas of reference, pathological guilt, morning depression, early wakening, suicide, observed depression), each rated from 0 (absent) to 3 (severe).

Neurocognition—Performance-based assessment

The Measurement and Treatment Research to Improve Cognition in Schizophrenia (MATRICS) Consensus Cognitive Battery (MCCB) [25, 57] was used for the performance-based neurocognitive assessment. It includes tests for the assessment of seven distinct cognitive domains: processing speed, attention/vigilance, working memory, verbal learning, visual learning, reasoning/problem solving, and social cognition. The latter domain was not used, since a thorough assessment of social cognition was included in this study, as described below. Standardized T-scores corrected for age and gender using Italian normative data [10] were calculated to the same measurement scale with a mean of 50 and SD of 10. The MCCB provides two composite score options: the overall and the neurocognitive composite scores, which respectively include and exclude the social cognition domain. We used the latter as index of neurocognition.

Neurocognition—interview-based assessment

The CAI [29] is a semi-structured interview developed by shortening and modifying the CGI-Cogs [30] and the SCoRS [33] scales. It includes ten items investigating six cognitive domains derived from the MCCB (speed of processing, attention/vigilance, working memory, verbal learning and memory, reasoning and problem solving, and social cognition). Each item is scored from 1 to 7, with higher scores indicating greater impairment. A “not applicable” score is assigned if the subject interrupts the interview or if not enough information is available. The clinician assigns a score rating the extent to which the cognitive dysfunction influences expected functioning in the workplace, school or in the social environment, avoiding to rate the influence on functioning of other symptoms of the disorder. The interview should be administered to the patient (patient interview) and to an informant, for instance a caregiver or someone who knows patient’s daily functioning (informant interview). Separate scores are obtained from the patient and informant interviews. Patient’s interview scores reflect the judgment of the clinician exclusively based on patient’s interview, while

informant's interview scores reflect the clinical judgment based on the informant's interview. In addition, the clinician assigns for all the items a composite score, reflecting his/her expert judgement based on all available sources of information, combining that obtained by both interviews (patient and informant) and, when available, other sources (e.g., chart, or other sources of information). At the end of the interview, a score from 1 to 7 is rated on the global severity of cognitive impairment reflecting the patient's overall cognitive impairment. Also for the global score, there are three separate ratings (one based on the patient interview, one on the informant interview, and one on the composite scores). In the present paper, we used the Italian version of the CAI [51] and we focused on the difference between patient and informant scores.

Social cognition

Social cognition was assessed by the Facial Emotion Identification Test (FEIT) [58] and The Awareness of Social Inference Test (TASIT) [59].

FEIT explores emotion perception. It consists in identifying the correct emotion (joy, anger, fear, disgust, surprise, sadness or neutral) represented in a specific photo.

TASIT is a theory of mind test consisting of seven scales (positive emotions, negative emotions, sincere, simple sarcasm, paradoxical sarcasm, sarcasm enriched, and lie), organized into three sections: emotion recognition, social inference-minimal, and social inference-enriched. The mean of standardized scores of FEIT and TASIT was used as a composite score in the present study.

Functional capacity

Functional capacity was evaluated by the brief version of the University of California San Diego (UCSD) Performance-based Skills Assessment (UPSA-B) [60], a performance-based instrument that assesses “financial skills” and “communication skills”. A total score, ranging from 0 (worst performance) to 100 (best performance), was obtained summing the two domains.

Real-life functioning

Real-life functioning was assessed using the Specific Level of Functioning Scale (SLOF) [61, 62], an instrument endorsed by the panel of experts involved in the Validation of Everyday Real-World Outcomes (VALERO) initiative. It explores different domains of functioning. This is based on key caregiver's judgment on behavior and functioning of patients. The SLOF includes 43 items exploring 6 domains: physical efficiency, skills in self-care, interpersonal relationships, social acceptability, everyday life skills (e.g., shopping, using public

transportation), and work skills. In the present study, we only analyzed the three SLOF domains showing moderate functional impairment (interpersonal relationships, everyday life skills, and work skills), as for the other domains, ceiling effects were observed and there was a reduced variability in patients' scores. For all SLOF scales, higher scores correspond to better real-life functioning.

Statistical analysis

Patient-informant agreement was calculated on all ten items of the CAI scale, and on the CAI global score. The mean scores of patient- and informant-based interviews and their difference were compared to assess the agreement, and tested using the following tests: the Wilcoxon matched-pair test of the null hypothesis of equality of means, Lin's concordance correlation, the percentage agreement, the Gwet's agreement coefficient (AC) and its related probabilistic benchmark interval. It is preferred to Cohen's kappa family of coefficients because it has been found to be more robust and to be able to avoid the paradox of negative agreement [63–66]. Gwet's AC are categorized into the classes of agreement provided by Landis and Koch (Landis and Koch, 1977) as slight (0.00 to 0.20), fair (0.21–0.40), moderate (0.41–0.60), substantial (0.61–0.80), and almost perfect (0.81–1.00) using a probabilistic assignment, that takes into account the variance of the estimate (Gwet, 2014). The ordinal weighting to Gwet's AC calculation was applied to assign an increasing penalty as disagreement between scores increased along the item range.

To investigate factors associated with cognitive insight, stepwise multiple regression analyses were run in which patient-informant difference on the CAI global score was entered as dependent variables (higher scores for this index indicate better patients' insight in cognitive deficits); independent variables included demographic characteristics (age, gender, education), psychopathological dimensions (positive, disorganization, Expressive deficit domain, Experiential domain and depression) as well as cognitive indices (MCCB neurocognitive composite score, social cognition composite score, functional capacity).

To investigate cognitive predictors of real-life functioning, separate stepwise multiple regressions were run, in which the three areas of real-life functioning were entered as dependent variables, while independent variables included the following cognitive indices: patient-informant difference on the CAI global score, MCCB neurocognitive composite score, and UPSA-B total score.

Table 1 Demographic, clinical, and functional characteristics of the experimental sample

	Total <i>N</i> = 601
Males (<i>N</i> , %)	415 (69.05%)
Age (years, mean ± SD)	45.24 ± 10.40
Education (years, mean ± SD)	11.70 ± 3.39
Duration of illness (years, mean ± SD)	21.27 ± 10.48
PANSS positive factor	8.463 ± 4.30
PANSS disorganization item (P2)	2.46 ± 1.44
BNSS experiential domain	12.10 ± 7.71
BNSS expressive deficit domain	18.60 ± 9.79
CDSS total score	3.27 ± 3.63
MCCB composite score	31.11 ± 12.80
UPSA-B total score	68.75 ± 23.97
Social cognition composite score	−0.03 ± 0.87
SLOF interpersonal relationships	22.13 ± 6.08
SLOF everyday life skills	45.04 ± 9.61
SLOF working skills	20.02 ± 6.13

PANSS Positive and Negative Syndrome Scale, BNSS Brief Negative Symptom Scale, CDSS Calgary Depression Scale for Schizophrenia, MCCB Measurement and Treatment Research to Improve Cognition in Schizophrenia (MATRICS) Consensus Cognitive Battery, UPSA-B University of California San Diego (UCSD) Performance-based Skills Assessment, SLOF Specific Levels of Functioning

Results

Subjects

Six hundred and one patients with a diagnosis of schizophrenia according to the DSM-5 criteria were included in the study. They were 415 men and 186 women, had a mean age of 45.24 ± 10.40 years, and a mean education of 11.70 ± 3.4 years. Demographic and clinical characteristics of the experimental sample are reported in Table 1.

Agreement among patient-based and informant-based CAI ratings

Patient-based ratings on all CAI items and on global ratings were lower than informant-based ratings, indicating that patients reported a lower severity of cognitive impairment with respect to informants. These differences were statistically significant for the global ratings and for all CAI items, except for the first one (“Difficulty maintaining newly learned verbal information in mind for brief periods”) (Table 2).

Gwet’s AC ranged from 0.73 to 0.82, indicating substantial to almost perfect agreement among patients and informants for all the CAI items and an almost perfect agreement for CAI global ratings (Table 2).

Table 2 Patient and informant’s CAI scores, concordance, and interrater agreement

	Patient		Informer		Wilcoxon matched-pairs test		Lin’s concordance correlation coefficient		Interrater agreement		Probabilistic benchmark interval
	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev	test	<i>p</i> value	Percent agreement	Gwet’s AC	
CAI 1	601	2.73	1.44	586	2.77	1.52	−1.0	0.300	0.717	0.784	0.600–0.800
CAI 2	599	2.61	1.52	585	2.83	1.60	−5.4	<0.001	0.779	0.808	0.600–0.800
CAI 3	601	2.92	1.42	584	3.19	1.49	−6.3	<0.001	0.741	0.786	0.600–0.800
CAI 4	600	2.48	1.44	586	2.79	1.56	−7.1	<0.001	0.755	0.809	0.600–0.800
CAI 5	601	2.53	1.36	586	2.72	1.48	−4.2	<0.001	0.747	0.820	0.600–0.800
CAI 6	601	2.22	1.35	584	2.33	1.40	−2.8	0.005	0.757	0.841	0.800–1.000
CAI 7	600	2.64	1.52	585	3.08	1.64	−10.1	<0.001	0.724	0.767	0.600–0.800
CAI 8	601	2.73	1.54	586	3.15	1.67	−9.5	<0.001	0.747	0.785	0.600–0.800
CAI 9	601	2.60	1.43	585	2.96	1.49	−7.5	<0.001	0.705	0.770	0.600–0.800
CAI 10	599	2.58	1.47	585	3.01	1.56	−8.8	<0.001	0.658	0.730	0.600–0.800
CAI Global	598	3.00	1.26	579	3.31	1.38	−8.1	<0.001	0.766	0.810	0.600–0.800

CAI Cognitive Assessment Interview

Lack of difference between patient and informant global ratings was observed in 51.38% of cases. A negative value as result of the difference between the two types of ratings – indicating a lower severity of cognitive impairment reported by patients with respect to informants – was observed in 35.81% of cases, while the opposite pattern (i.e., positive value indicating a greater severity of cognitive impairment reported by patients compared to informants) was observed in 12.81% of cases.

Stepwise multiple regression analyses

Results of multiple regression analyses run to investigate factors associated with reduced insight in cognitive

impairment are reported in Table 3. Greater neurocognitive impairment, greater severity of the positive psychopathological dimension, and older age were associated to lower insight in cognitive deficits; greater severity of depressive symptoms was associated to a better insight in cognitive impairment (Table 3).

Results of multiple regression analyses carried out to investigate cognitive predictors of real-life functioning are reported in Table 4. Greater impairment of neurocognition and functional capacity and lower insight in cognitive impairment were associated with worse functioning in all the three areas of real-life functioning. For the area, interpersonal relationships, the association with the neurocognitive composite score showed the highest level of statistical

Table 3 Stepwise multiple regression analysis on cognitive insight

Patient-informant difference on CAI global ratings	F(4485)	b	p
Age	8.27	−0.009	.004
Gender			
PANSS positive factor	6.40	−0.023	.01
PANSS disorganization item (P2)			
BNSS_experiential domain			
BNSS expressive deficit domain			
CDSS total score	6.10	0.031	.01
MCCB composite score	21.48	0.012	.000005
Social cognition composite score			
UPSA-B total score			

CAI Cognitive assessment interview, PANSS Positive and Negative Syndrome Scale, BNSS Brief Negative Symptom Scale, CDSS Calgary Depression Scale for Schizophrenia, MCCB Measurement and Treatment Research to Improve Cognition in Schizophrenia (MATRICS) Consensus Cognitive Battery, UPSA-B University of California San Diego (UCSD) Performance-based Skills Assessment

Table 4 Stepwise multiple regression analysis on real-life functioning

SLOF	F(3486)	b	p
Interpersonal relationships			
Patient-informant difference on CAI global ratings	7.69	0.825	.006
UPSA-B total score	6.35	0.035	.01
MCCB-neurocognitive composite score	28.97	0.061	<.000001
SLOF	F(3486)	b	p
Everyday life skills			
Patient-informant difference on CAI global ratings	20.81	1.640	.000006
UPSA-B total score	288.58	0.199	<.000001
MCCB-neurocognitive composite score	11.16	0.111	.0009
SLOF	F(3486)	b	p
Work skills			
Patient-informant difference on CAI global ratings	12.32	0.099	.0005
UPSA-B total score	139.25	0.082	<.000001
MCCB – neurocognitive composite score	21.83	0.099	.000004

SLOF Specific Levels of Functioning, CAI Cognitive Assessment Interview, UPSA-B University of California San Diego (UCSD) Performance-based Skills Assessment, MCCB Measurement and Treatment Research to Improve Cognition in Schizophrenia (MATRICS) Consensus Cognitive Battery

significance, followed by the patient-informant difference on CAI global score and by the UPSA-B total score; for everyday life skills, the association with the UPSA-B total score showed the highest level of statistical significance, followed by the patient-informant difference on CAI global score and by the neurocognitive composite score; for work skills, the association with the UPSA-B total score showed the highest level of statistical significance, followed by the neurocognitive composite score and by the patient-informant difference on CAI global score.

Discussion

According to our findings, for all the CAI items, patients reported a lower impact of cognitive impairment on real-life functioning with respect to informants. This is in line with several previous studies reporting a tendency of patients with schizophrenia to overestimate their cognitive abilities with respect to those obtained by informants, by clinicians, and with neuropsychological batteries [4, 28, 46, 67–69]. However, we also found that patient ratings showed a substantial to almost perfect agreement with those of informants. In 51.38% of cases, patients did not underestimate the impact of their cognitive deficits on functioning. In the study by Gould et al. [68], that is the only other work in which the discrepancy of self-assessed vs. informant-rated CAI scores was investigated, in 40% of the cases, no underestimation of such an impact was found. The difference in the percentage of cases is probably related to the different methods of scoring and to the different informants used in the two studies. In fact, while, in our study, the ratings were assigned by the expert clinician interviewing the patient and the informant, who was a relative or a high contact staff member, in the study by Gould et al., the clinician assigned the ratings interviewing the patients and then rated the impairment of the patients based on his/her own appraisal of it. Notwithstanding the different methodology used in the two study, both Gould et al. and our own findings demonstrate that there is a substantial proportion of patients who present awareness of the impact that their cognitive deficits have on daily activities. Our findings of almost a perfect agreement between patient-based and informant-based ratings is of relevance to the field as not always it is possible to find informants who have a good knowledge of the patient functioning in real-life situations [47]. In our study, 64% of informants included a family member, either a relative or a partner, with a regular contact with the patient. This represents an advantage increasing reliability of informants with respect to what is described in other countries such as U.S., in which there is a lower percentage of family members among informants, with reduced contact with the patient

[28, 47]. Thus, the agreement between patient-based and informant-based CAI ratings in our study lends support to the possibility of using the patients as the source of information for interview-based assessment of cognitive impairment in subjects living with schizophrenia.

The regression analyses carried out to investigate factors associated with the awareness of the impact of cognitive deficits on real-life functioning showed that lower awareness was associated to a greater severity of neurocognitive impairment and positive symptoms, lower severity of depressive symptoms and older age. The relationship between greater severity of positive symptoms and reduced insight has been reported in other studies [70, 71] and is an expected finding. However, this association was not found in some studies [67, 69] probably due to methodological factors such as the use of different types of cognitive interviews or differences in the characteristics of the experimental samples, such as lack of clinical stability, which may have an impact on the severity of positive symptoms. The positive association between depressive symptoms and subjective cognitive insight has been consistently reported in previous studies [28, 67, 69, 72] and may be related to the clinical characteristics of patients with depression [73]. It has been explained as a tendency of patients with depression to perceive a higher degree of cognitive impairment; this hypothesis is supported by the observation that depressive symptoms are correlated to subjective but not objective cognitive impairment [74]. In addition, depression has been related to a tendency to attribute negative experiences to internal causes; thus, it has been hypothesized that patients with depression may be excessively sensitive to normally occurring cognitive failure [42]. On the other hand, it cannot be excluded that a greater insight in subjective cognitive impairment contributes to the worsening of depressive symptoms.

On the whole, our findings on the level of agreement among patient-based and informant-based ratings, together with the above reported patterns of associations, suggest that the observed tendency to overestimate their cognitive abilities is limited to a proportion of patients characterized by the presence of more severe cognitive impairment and/or positive symptoms.

The regression analyses carried out to investigate cognitive predictors of real-life functioning showed that worse functioning on the three SLOF areas was associated to lower insight of the impact that cognitive deficits have on functioning, worse objective neurocognitive performance, and worse functional capacity. Our findings are in line with those of other studies on the relationships between insight and functioning [68]. In fact we confirmed that, in addition to the impairment in cognition and in functional capacity, that are well known predictors of functional outcome [14, 15, 17, 75], also the lack of awareness of cognitive impairment

has an impact on real-life functioning and for some areas, the impact is even greater than the formers.

Strengths and limitations

The main strengths of the present study are: (a) the large sample size including community dwelling subjects with schizophrenia; (b) the use of state-of-the-art instruments to conduct both performance-based and interview-based neurocognition assessments, as well as psychopathological and real-life functioning assessments.

The following study limitations have to be acknowledged: (a) lack of inclusion of the CAI in the baseline study, which did not allow to investigate its sensitivity to change over time; (b) lack of generalizability of findings to patients at their first episode of schizophrenia, or in acute phases of the illness, given the inclusion of chronic and clinically stable patients.

Conclusion

In conclusion, our findings indicate that the CAI is a valid co-primary measure with the interview to the patients providing a reliable assessment of their awareness of the impact of cognitive deficits on functioning. In the absence of informants with high contact and good knowledge of the subject, the interview with the patient may represent a valid alternative.

The use of this interview in clinical practice to patients and caregivers may contribute to the implementation of comprehensive and personalized treatments, whose importance to improve outcome in schizophrenia has been highlighted in the recent literature [76–83] and may increase adherence to treatment by increasing awareness of cognitive dysfunction in patients and caregivers.

Acknowledgements Members of the Italian Network for Research on Psychoses who participated in this study include: Giuseppe Piegari, Eleonora Merlotti, Francesco Brando (University of Campania “Luigi Vanvitelli”, Naples); Marco Papalino, Vitalba Calia, Raffaella Romano (University of Bari); Stefano Barlati, Giacomo Deste, Paolo Valsecchi (University of Brescia); Federica Pinna, Alice Lai, Silvia Lostia Di Santa Sofia (University of Cagliari); Maria Salvina Signorelli, Laura Fusar Poli, Teresa Surace (University of Catania); Giovanni Martinotti, Chiara Montemitto, Silvia Patricelli (University of Chieti); Mario Altamura, Eleonora Angelini, Antonella Elia (University of Foggia); Pietro Calcagno, Martino Belvederi Murri, Simone Cattegra (University of Genoa); Francesca Pacitti, Rodolfo Rossi, Valentina Succi, Laura Giusti, Anna Salza, Silvia Mammarella (University of L’Aquila); Andrea de Bartolomeis (University of Naples Federico II); Angela Favaro, Enrico Collantoni, Paolo Meneguzzo (University of Padua); Matteo Tonna, Paolo Ossola, Maria Lidia Gerra (University of Parma); Carla Gramaglia, Valeria Binda, Eleonora Gambaro (University of Eastern Piedmont, Novara); Claudia Carmassi, Barbara Carpita, Ivan Mirko Cremone (University of Pisa); Giulio Corrivetti,

Giammarco Cascino, Gianfranco Del Buono (Department of Mental Health, Salerno); Roberto Brugnoli, Anna Comparelli, Valentina Corigliano, Antonio Buzzanca, Nicoletta Gerardi, Marianna Frascarelli (Sapienza University of Rome); Andrea Fagiolini, Arianna Goracci, Simone Bolognesi (University of Siena); Alberto Siracusano, Giorgio Di Lorenzo, Michele Ribolsi (Tor Vergata University of Rome); Cristiana Montemagni, Cecilia Riccardi, Elisa Del Favero (University of Turin).

Author contributions SG and AM contributed to the conceptualization and methodology of the study. AM and PB drafted the manuscript. DG analyzed the data. All authors participated in the investigation, resources and data curation as well as in the critical revision of the manuscript, providing the final approval of the version to be published.

Funding Open access funding provided by Università degli Studi della Campania Luigi Vanvitelli within the CRUI-CARE Agreement. The study was funded by the Italian Society of Psychopathology (SOPSI) and the Italian Society of Biological Psychiatry (SIPB). These entities had no role in the study design; in the collection, analysis and interpretation of data; in the writing of the report and in the decision to submit the paper for publication.

Data availability The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author, GMG, upon reasonable request.

Declarations

Conflict of interest None.

Informed consent statement After receiving a comprehensive explanation of the study procedures and goals, a written informed consent to participate in the study was asked to all subjects.

Institutional review board statement The authors assert that all procedures contributing to this work comply with the ethical standards of the relevant national and institutional committees on human experimentation and with the Helsinki Declaration of 1975, as revised in 2008. All procedures involving human patients were approved by the Ethics Committee “Comitato Etico Università degli Studi della Campania ‘Luigi Vanvitelli’—Azienda Ospedaliera Universitaria ‘Luigi Vanvitelli’—AORN ‘Ospedali dei Colli’” on October 9, 2015 (Protocol number 1382).

Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

References

- Green MF, Harvey PD (2014) Cognition in schizophrenia: past, present, and future. *Schizophr Res Cogn* 1(1):e1–e9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scog.2014.02.001>

2. Green MF, Horan WP, Lee J (2019) Nonsocial and social cognition in schizophrenia: current evidence and future directions. *World Psychiatry* 18(2):146–161. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20624>
3. Moritz S, Balzan RP, Bohn F, Veckenstedt R, Kolbeck K, Bierbrodt J, Dietrichkeit M (2016) Subjective versus objective cognition: evidence for poor metacognitive monitoring in schizophrenia. *Schizophr Res* 178(1–3):74–79. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2016.08.021>
4. First MB, Gaebel W, Maj M, Stein DJ, Kogan CS, Saunders JB, Poznyak VB, Gureje O, Lewis-Fernandez R, Maercker A, Brewin CR, Cloitre M, Claudino A, Pike KM, Baird G, Skuse D, Krueger RB, Briken P, Burke JD, Lochman JE, Evans SC, Woods DW, Reed GM (2021) An organization- and category-level comparison of diagnostic requirements for mental disorders in ICD-11 and DSM-5. *World Psychiatry* 20(1):34–51. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20825>
5. Fusar-Poli P, Estradé A, Stanghellini G, Venables J, Onumere J, Messas G, Gilardi L, Nelson B, Patel V, Bonoldi I et al (2022) The lived experience of psychosis: a bottom-up review co-written by experts by experience and academics. *World Psychiatry* 21(2):168–188. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20959>
6. Sass L (2022) Subjectivity, psychosis and the science of psychiatry. *World Psychiatry* 21(2):165–166. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20986>
7. Kravariti E, Morris RG, Rabe-Hesketh S, Murray RM, Frangou S (2007) Comparative profile analysis of cognitive function in recent-onset and chronic patients with adolescent-onset schizophrenia. *Schizophr Res* 94(1–3):240–244. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2007.05.014>
8. Mesholam-Gately RI, Giuliano AJ, Goff KP, Faraone SV, Seidman LJ (2009) Neurocognition in first-episode schizophrenia: a meta-analytic review. *Neuropsychology* 23(3):315–336. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014708>
9. Heinrichs RW, Zakzanis KK (1998) Neurocognitive deficit in schizophrenia: a quantitative review of the evidence. *Neuropsychology* 12(3):426–445. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0894-4105.12.3.426>
10. Mucci A, Galderisi S, Green MF, Nuechterlein K, Rucci P, Gibertoni D, Rossi A, Rocca P, Bertolino A, Bucci P, Hellemann G, Spisto M, Palumbo D, Aguglia E, Amodeo G, Amore M, Bellomo A, Brugnoli R, Carpiniello B, Dell’Osso L, Di Fabio F, di Giannantonio M, Di Lorenzo G, Marchesi C, Monteleone P, Montemagni C, Oldani L, Romano R, Roncone R, Stratta P, Tenconi E, Vita A, Zeppegno P, Maj M (2018) Italian network for research on psychoses. Familial aggregation of MATRICS consensus cognitive battery scores in a large sample of outpatients with schizophrenia and their unaffected relatives. *Psychol Med* 48(8):1359–1366. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291717002902>
11. Staal WG, Hijman R, Hulshoff Pol HE, Kahn RS (2000) Neuropsychological dysfunctions in siblings discordant for schizophrenia. *Psychiatr Res* 95(3):227–235. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0165-1781\(00\)00172-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0165-1781(00)00172-4)
12. Sponheim SR, Steele VR, McGuire KA (2004) Verbal memory processes in schizophrenia patients and biological relatives of schizophrenia patients: intact implicit memory, impaired explicit recollection. *Schizophr Res* 71(2–3):339–348. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2004.04.008>
13. Leifker FR, Bowie CR, Harvey PD (2009) Determinants of everyday outcomes in schizophrenia: the influences of cognitive impairment, functional capacity, and symptoms. *Schizophr Res* 115(1):82–87. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2009.09.004>
14. Harvey PD, Strassnig M (2012) Predicting the severity of everyday functional disability in people with schizophrenia: cognitive deficits, functional capacity, symptoms, and health status. *World Psychiatry* 11(2):73–79. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wpsyc.2012.05.004>
15. Galderisi S, Rossi A, Rocca P, Bertolino A, Mucci A, Bucci P, Rucci P, Gibertoni D, Aguglia E, Amore M, Bellomo A, Biondi M, Brugnoli R, Dell’Osso L, De Ronchi D, Di Emidio G, Di Giannantonio M, Fagiolini A, Marchesi C, Monteleone P, Oldani L, Pinna F, Roncone R, Sacchetti E, Santonastaso P, Siracusano A, Vita A, Zeppegno P, Maj M (2014) Italian Network For Research on Psychoses. The influence of illness-related variables, personal resources and context-related factors on real-life functioning of people with schizophrenia. *World Psychiatry* 13(3):275–87. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20167>
16. Galderisi S, Rossi A, Rocca P, Bertolino A, Mucci A, Bucci P, Rucci P, Gibertoni D, Aguglia E, Amore M, Blasi G, Comparelli A, Di Giannantonio M, Goracci A, Marchesi C, Monteleone P, Montemagni C, Pinna F, Roncone R, Siracusano A, Stratta P, Torti MC, Vita A, Zeppegno P, Chieffi M, Maj M (2016) Italian Network for Research on Psychoses. Pathways to functional outcome in subjects with schizophrenia living in the community and their unaffected first-degree relatives. *Schizophr Res* 175(1–3):154–160. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2016.04.043>
17. Galderisi S, Rucci P, Kirkpatrick B, Mucci A, Gibertoni D, Rocca P, Rossi A, Bertolino A, Strauss GP, Aguglia E, Bellomo A, Murri MB, Bucci P, Carpiniello B, Comparelli A, Cuomo A, De Berardis D, Dell’Osso L, Di Fabio F, Gelao B, Marchesi C, Monteleone P, Montemagni C, Orsenigo G, Pacitti F, Roncone R, Santonastaso P, Siracusano A, Vignapiano A, Vita A, Zeppegno P, Maj M (2018) Italian network for research on psychoses. interplay among psychopathologic variables, personal resources, context-related factors, and real-life functioning in individuals with Schizophrenia: a network analysis. *JAMA Psychiatry* 75(4):396–404. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2017.4607>
18. Kotov R., Jonas KG, Carpenter WT, Dretsch MN, Eaton NR, Forbes MK, Forbush KT, Hobbs K, Reininghaus U, Slade T, South SC, Sunderland M, Waszczuk MA, Widiger TA, Wright AGC, Zald DH, Krueger RF, Watson D, HiTOP Utility Workgroup (2020) Validity and utility of Hierarchical Taxonomy of Psychopathology (HiTOP): I. Psychosis superspectrum. *World Psychiatry*, 19(2): 151–172. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20730>
19. Mucci A, Galderisi S, Gibertoni D, Rossi A, Rocca P, Bertolino A, Aguglia E, Amore M, Bellomo A, Biondi M, Blasi G, Brasso C, Bucci P, Carpiniello B, Cuomo A, Dell’Osso L, Giordano GM, Marchesi C, Monteleone P, Niuoli C, Oldani L, Pettorruso M, Pompili M, Roncone R, Rossi R, Tenconi E, Vita A, Zeppegno P, Maj M (2021) Italian network for research on psychoses. Factors associated with real-life functioning in persons with Schizophrenia in a 4-year follow-up study of the Italian network for research on psychoses. *JAMA Psychiatry* 78(5):550–559. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2020.4614>
20. Siskind D, Yung A (2022) After the acute crisis – engaging people with psychosis in rehabilitation-oriented care. *World Psychiatry* 21(2):246–247. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20970>
21. Lysaker PH, Hasson-Ohayon I (2021) Metacognition in psychosis: a renewed path to understanding of core disturbances and recovery-oriented treatment. *World Psychiatry* 20(3):359–361. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20914>
22. Ostuzzi G, Bertolini F, Tedeschi F, Vita G, Brambilla P, del Fabro L, Gastaldon C, Papola D, Purgato M, Nosari G et al (2022) Oral and long-acting antipsychotics for relapse prevention in schizophrenia-spectrum disorders: a network meta-analysis of 92 randomized trials including 22,645 participants. *World Psychiatry* 21(2):295–307. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20972>
23. Ventura J (2022) Computer-based virtual reality assessment of functional capacity in primary psychosis. *World Psychiatry* 21(3):464–465. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.21024>

24. Green MF, Nuechterlein KH, Gold JM, Barch DM, Cohen J, Essock S, Fenton WS, Frese F, Goldberg TE, Heaton RK, Keefe RS, Kern RS, Kraemer H, Stover E, Weinberger DR, Zalcman S, Marder SR (2004) Approaching a consensus cognitive battery for clinical trials in schizophrenia: the NIMH-MATRICES conference to select cognitive domains and test criteria. *Biol Psychiatry* 56(5):301–307. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2004.06.023>
25. Nuechterlein KH, Green MF, Kern RS, Baade LE, Barch DM, Cohen JD, Essock S, Fenton WS, Frese FJ 3rd, Gold JM, Goldberg T, Heaton RK, Keefe RS, Kraemer H, Mesholam-Gately R, Seidman LJ, Stover E, Weinberger DR, Young AS, Zalcman S, Marder SR (2008) The MATRICS consensus cognitive battery, part 1: test selection, reliability, and validity. *Am J Psychiatry* 165(2):203–13. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.2007.07010042>
26. Maj M, van Os J, De Hert M, Gaebel W, Galderisi S, Green MF, Guloksuz S, Harvey PD, Jones PB, Malaspina D, McGorry P, Miettunen J, Murray RM, Nuechterlein KH, Peralta V, Thornicroft G, van Winkel R, Ventura J (2021) The clinical characterization of the patient with primary psychosis aimed at personalization of management. *World Psychiatry* 20(1):4–33. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20809>
27. Buchanan RW, Davis M, Goff D, Green MF, Keefe RS, Leon AC, Nuechterlein KH, Laughren T, Levin R, Stover E, Fenton W, Marder SR (2005) A summary of the FDA-NIMH-MATRICES workshop on clinical trial design for neurocognitive drugs for schizophrenia. *Schizophr Bull* 31(1):5–19. <https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sbi020>
28. Durand D, Strassnig M, Sabbag S, Gould F, Twamley EW, Patterson TL, Harvey PD (2015) Factors influencing self-assessment of cognition and functioning in schizophrenia: implications for treatment studies. *Eur Neuropsychopharmacol* 25(2):185–191. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euroneuro.2014.07.008>
29. Ventura J, Reise SP, Keefe RS, Baade LE, Gold JM, Green MF, Kern RS, Mesholam-Gately R, Nuechterlein KH, Seidman LJ, Bilder RM (2010) The cognitive assessment interview (CAI): development and validation of an empirically derived, brief interview-based measure of cognition. *Schizophr Res* 121(1–3):24–31. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2010.04.016>
30. Keefe RS, Poe M, Walker TM, Kang JW, Harvey PD (2006) The schizophrenia cognition rating scale: an interview-based assessment and its relationship to cognition, real-world functioning, and functional capacity. *Am J Psychiatry* 163(3):426–432. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.163.3.426>
31. Bilder RM (2008) Phenomics: building scaffolds for biological hypotheses in the post-genomic era. *Biol Psychiatry* 63(5):439–440. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2007.11.013>
32. Green MF, Nuechterlein KH, Kern RS, Baade LE, Fenton WS, Gold JM, Keefe RS, Mesholam-Gately R, Seidman LJ, Stover E, Marder SR (2008) Functional co-primary measures for clinical trials in schizophrenia: results from the MATRICS psychometric and standardization study. *Am J Psychiatry* 165(2):221–228. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.2007.07010089>
33. Ventura J, Cienfuegos A, Boxer O, Bilder R (2008) Clinical global impression of cognition in schizophrenia (CGI-CogS): reliability and validity of a co-primary measure of cognition. *Schizophr Res* 106(1):59–69. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2007.07.025>
34. Reise SP, Ventura J, Keefe RS, Baade LE, Gold JM, Green MF, Kern RS, Mesholam-Gately R, Nuechterlein KH, Seidman LJ, Bilder R (2011) Bifactor and item response theory analyses of interviewer report scales of cognitive impairment in schizophrenia. *Psychol Assess* 23(1):245–261. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021501>
35. Slade M, Blackie L, Longden E (2019) Personal growth in psychosis. *World Psychiatry* 18(1):29–30. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20585>
36. David AS (2020) Insight and psychosis: the next 30 years. *Br J Psychiatry* 217(3):521–523. <https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.2019.217>
37. Slade M, Sweeney A (2020) Rethinking the concept of insight. *World Psychiatry* 19(3):389–390. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20783>
38. Phelan S, Sigala N (2022) The effect of treatment on insight in psychotic disorders - a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Schizophr Res* 244:126–133. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2022.05.023>
39. Buckley PF, Wirshing DA, Bhushan P, Pierre JM, Resnick SA, Wirshing WC (2007) Lack of insight in schizophrenia: impact on treatment adherence. *CNS Drugs* 21(2):129–141. <https://doi.org/10.2165/00023210-200721020-00004>
40. Homayoun S, Nadeau-Marcotte F, Luck D, Stip E (2011) Subjective and objective cognitive dysfunction in schizophrenia - is there a link? *Front Psychol* 2:148. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2011.00148>
41. Poletti S, Anselmetti S, Riccaboni R, Bosia M, Buonocore M, Smeraldi E, Cavallaro R (2012) Self-awareness of cognitive functioning in schizophrenia: patients and their relatives. *Psychiatry Res* 198(2):207–211. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2011.12.040>
42. Sellwood W, Morrison AP, Beck R, Heffernan S, Law H, Bentall RP (2013) Subjective cognitive complaints in schizophrenia: relation to antipsychotic medication dose, actual cognitive performance, insight and symptoms. *PLoS One* 8(12):e83774. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0083774>
43. Balzan RP, Neaves A, Denson LA, Liu D, Galletly C (2014) Cognitive deficit awareness in schizophrenia: absent, intact, or somewhere in-between? *Cogn Neuropsychiatry* 19(6):471–484. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13546805.2014.909311>
44. Sanchez-Torres AM, Elosua MR, Lorente-Omenaca R, Moreno-Izco L, Peralta V, Ventura J, Cuesta MJ (2016) Using the cognitive assessment interview to screen cognitive impairment in psychosis. *Eur Arch Psychiatry Clin Neurosci* 266(7):629–637. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00406-016-0700-y>
45. Medalia A, Lim RW (2004) Self-awareness of cognitive functioning in schizophrenia. *Schizophr Res* 71(2–3):331–338. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2004.03.003>
46. Chan RC, Wang Y, Ma Z, Hong XH, Yuan Y, Yu X, Li Z, Shum D, Gong QY (2008) Objective measures of prospective memory do not correlate with subjective complaints in schizophrenia. *Schizophr Res* 103(1–3):229–239. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2008.02.019>
47. Keefe RS, Davis VG, Spagnola NB, Hilt D, Dgetluck N, Ruse S, Patterson TD, Narasimhan M, Harvey PD (2015) Reliability, validity and treatment sensitivity of the schizophrenia cognition rating scale. *Eur Neuropsychopharmacol* 25(2):176–184. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euroneuro.2014.06.009>
48. Ventura J, Subotnik KL, Ered A, Hellemann GS, Nuechterlein KH (2016) Cognitive Assessment Interview (CAI): validity as a co-primary measure of cognition across phases of schizophrenia. *Schizophr Res* 172(1–3):137–142. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2016.01.028>
49. Giordano GM, Palumbo D, Mucci A, Ventura J, Giuliani L, Perrottelli A, Bucci P, Rocca P, Rossi A, Bertolino A, Rucci P, Galderisi S, Maj M (2022) Italian Network for research on, P. the cognitive assessment interview (CAI): association with neuropsychological scores and real-life functioning in a large sample of Italian subjects with schizophrenia. *Schizophr Res* 241:161–170. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2022.01.029>
50. Keefe RS, Haig GM, Marder SR, Harvey PD, Dunayevich E, Medalia A, Davidson M, Lombardo I, Bowie CR, Buchanan RW, Bugarski-Kirolo D, Carpenter WT, Csernansky JT, Dago PL, Durand DM, Frese FJ, Goff DC, Gold JM, Hooker CI, Kopelowicz A, Loebel A, McGurk SR, Opler LA, Pinkham AE, Stern RG

- (2016) Report on ISCTM consensus meeting on clinical assessment of response to treatment of cognitive impairment in schizophrenia. *Schizophr Bull* 42(1):19–33. <https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sbv111>
51. Palumbo D, Bucci P, Mucci A, Pietrafesa D, Giordano GM, Vignapiano AR, Galderisi S (2019) Inter-rater reliability and psychometric characteristics of the Italian version of the cognitive assessment interview (CAI). *J Psychopathol* 25:85–114
 52. Galderisi S, Rucci P, Mucci A, Rossi A, Rocca P, Bertolino A, Aguglia E, Amore M, Bellomo A, Bozzatello P, Bucci P, Carpiniello B, Collantoni E, Cuomo A, Dell’Osso L, Di Fabio F, di Giannantonio M, Gibertoni D, Giordano GM, Marchesi C, Monteleone P, Oldani L, Pompili M, Roncone R, Rossi R, Siracusano A, Vita A, Zeppegno P, Maj M (2020) Italian Network for Research on Psychoses. The interplay among psychopathology, personal resources, context-related factors and real-life functioning in schizophrenia: stability in relationships after 4 years and differences in network structure between recovered and non-recovered patients. *World Psychiatry* 19(1):81–91. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20700>
 53. Wallwork RS, Fortgang R, Hashimoto R, Weinberger DR, Dickinson D (2012) Searching for a consensus five-factor model of the positive and negative syndrome scale for schizophrenia. *Schizophr Res* 137(1–3):246–250. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2012.01.031>
 54. Kirkpatrick B, Strauss GP, Nguyen L, Fischer BA, Daniel DG, Cienfuegos A, Marder SR (2011) The brief negative symptom scale: psychometric properties. *Schizophr Bull* 37(2):300–305. <https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sbq059>
 55. Mucci A, Galderisi S, Merlotti E, Rossi A, Rocca P, Bucci P, Piegari G, Chieffi M, Vignapiano A, Maj M (2015) Italian network for research on psychoses. The brief negative symptom scale (BNSS): independent validation in a large sample of Italian patients with schizophrenia. *Eur Psychiatry* 30(5):641–7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eurpsy.2015.01.014>
 56. Addington D, Addington J, Maticka-Tyndale E (1993) Assessing depression in schizophrenia: the calgary depression scale. *Br J Psychiatry* 163(S22):39–44
 57. Kern RS, Nuechterlein KH, Green MF, Baade LE, Fenton WS, Gold JM, Keefe RS, Mesholam-Gately R, Mintz J, Seidman LJ, Stover E, Marder SR (2008) The MATRICS consensus cognitive battery, part 2: co-norming and standardization. *Am J Psychiatry* 165(2):214–220. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.2007.07010043>
 58. Kerr SL, Neale JM (1993) Emotion perception in schizophrenia: specific deficit or further evidence of generalized poor performance? *J Abnorm Psychol* 102(2):312–318. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-843x.102.2.312>
 59. McDonald S, Bornhofen C, Shum D, Long E, Saunders C, Neulinger K (2006) Reliability and validity of the awareness of social inference test (TASIT): a clinical test of social perception. *Disabil Rehabil* 28(24):1529–1542. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09638280600646185>
 60. Mausbach BT, Harvey PD, Goldman SR, Jeste DV, Patterson TL (2007) Development of a brief scale of everyday functioning in persons with serious mental illness. *Schizophr Bull* 33(6):1364–1372. <https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sbm014>
 61. Sabbag S, Twamley EW, Vella L, Heaton RK, Patterson TL, Harvey PD (2012) Predictors of the accuracy of self assessment of everyday functioning in people with schizophrenia. *Schizophr Res* 137(1–3):190–195. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2012.02.002>
 62. Mucci A, Rucci P, Rocca P, Bucci P, Gibertoni D, Merlotti E, Galderisi S, Maj M (2014) Italian network for research on psychoses. The specific level of functioning scale: construct validity, internal consistency and factor structure in a large Italian sample of people with schizophrenia living in the community. *Schizophr Res* 159(1):144–50. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2014.07.044>
 63. Wongpakaran N, Wongpakaran T, Wedding D, Gwet KL (2013) A comparison of Cohen’s Kappa and Gwet’s AC1 when calculating inter-rater reliability coefficients: a study conducted with personality disorder samples. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 13:61. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-13-61>
 64. Gwet, KL (2014) Handbook of inter-rater reliability fourth edition. Gaithersburg, MD: Advanced Analytics, LLC
 65. Quarfoot D, Levine RA (2016) How robust are multirater inter-rater reliability indices to changes in frequency distribution? *Am Stat* 70:373–384
 66. Klein D (2018) Implementing a general framework for assessing interrater agreement in Stata. *Stata J* 18:871–901
 67. Medalia A, Thysen J (2008) Insight into neurocognitive dysfunction in schizophrenia. *Schizophr Bull* 34(6):1221–1230. <https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sbm144>
 68. Gould F, McGuire LS, Durand D, Sabbag S, Larrauri C, Patterson TL, Twamley EW, Harvey PD (2015) Self-assessment in schizophrenia: accuracy of evaluation of cognition and everyday functioning. *Neuropsychology* 29(5):675–682. <https://doi.org/10.1037/neu0000175>
 69. Burton CZ, Harvey PD, Patterson TL, Twamley EW (2016) Neurocognitive insight and objective cognitive functioning in schizophrenia. *Schizophr Res* 171(1–3):131–136. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2016.01.021>
 70. Bora E, Erkan A, Kayahan B, Veznedaroglu B (2007) Cognitive insight and acute psychosis in schizophrenia. *Psychiatry Clin Neurosci* 61(6):634–639. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1440-1819.2007.01731.x>
 71. Greenberger C, Serper MR (2010) Examination of clinical and cognitive insight in acute schizophrenia patients. *J Nerv Ment Dis* 198(7):465–469. <https://doi.org/10.1097/NMD.0b013e3181e4f35d>
 72. Saperstein AM, Thysen J, Medalia A (2012) The measure of insight into cognition: reliability and validity of clinician-rated and self-report scales of neurocognitive insight for schizophrenia. *Schizophr Res* 134(1):54–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2011.10.002>
 73. Maj M, Stein DJ, Parker G, Zimmerman M, Fava GA, De Hert M, Demyttenaere K, McIntyre RS, Wittchen HU (2020) The clinical characterization of the adult patient with depression aimed at personalization of management. *World Psychiatry* 19(3):269–293. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20771>
 74. Moritz S, Ferahli S, Naber D (2004) Memory and attention performance in psychiatric patients: lack of correspondence between clinician-rated and patient-rated functioning with neuropsychological test results. *J Int Neuropsychol Soc* 10(4):623–633. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1355617704104153>
 75. Lahey BB, Moore TM, Kaczurkin AN, Zald DH (2021) Hierarchical models of psychopathology: empirical support, implications, and remaining issues. *World Psychiatry* 20(1):57–63. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20824>
 76. McGorry PD, Mei C, Chanen A, Hodges C, Alvarez-Jimenez M, Killackey E (2022) Designing and scaling up integrated youth mental health care. *World Psychiatry* 21(1):61–76. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20938>
 77. Patel V, Saxena S, Lund C, Thornicroft G, Baingana F, Bolton P, Chisholm D, Collins PY, Cooper JL, Eaton J (2018) The lancet commission on global mental health and sustainable development. *Lancet* 392(10157):1553–1598. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(18\)31612-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(18)31612-X)
 78. Malla A, Boksa P, Joober R (2022) Meeting the challenges of the new frontier of youth mental health care. *World Psychiatry* 21(1):78–79. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20927>

79. Kazdin AE (2017) Addressing the treatment gap: a key challenge for extending evidence-based psychosocial interventions. *Behav Res Ther* 88(1):7–18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2016.06.004>
80. Carpenter WT (2021) Primary psychosis: more to know, much more to do. *World Psychiatry* 20:1–2. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20807>
81. Peralta V, Gil-Berrozpe GJ, Sánchez-Torres A, Cuesta MJ (2021) Clinical relevance of general and specific dimensions in bifactor models of psychotic disorders. *World Psychiatry* 20(2):306–307. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20879>
82. Stein DJ, Shoptaw SJ, Vigo DV, Lund C, Cuijpers P, Bantjes J, Sartorius N, Maj M (2022) Psychiatric diagnosis and treatment in the 21st century: paradigm shifts versus incremental integration. *World Psychiatry* 21(3):393–414. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20998>
83. Atwoli L, Muhia J, Gitau CW (2022) From diversity to individualized care: Africa's contribution to psychiatry. *World Psychiatry* 21(3):424–426. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.21007>