Prospective memory in non-psychotic first-degree relatives of patients with schizophrenia
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A B S T R A C T

Although a number of studies have found prospective memory (PM) impairment in patients with schizophrenia, very little is known about the PM performance in non-psychotic relatives of these patients. The current study aimed to explore the PM performance in non-psychotic first-degree relatives of these patients. Two groups of participants (26 non-psychotic first-degree relatives of schizophrenia patients and 26 healthy comparison participants) were administered three PM tasks (time-, event-, and activity-based) and a set of neurocognitive tests. Results showed that the relatives performed significantly worse than the comparisons on most indices of the PM tasks, with a similar pattern of impairment found in other neurocognitive measures. Together with findings from previous studies, results of the current study suggest that PM may be a potential endophenotype for schizophrenia.

© 2009 Elsevier Ireland Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Studies suggest that schizophrenia may be heritable (Kendler and Diehl, 1993). First-degree non-psychotic relatives of schizophrenia patients have been reported to have a higher rate in developing psychosis than the general population (Gottesman, 1991, 1993). Neurocognitive disorder, as one of the core deficits in schizophrenia, is also heritable. First-degree non-psychotic relatives of schizophrenia patients have also been found to show similar but milder degree neurocognitive impairments (Cannon et al., 2000; Gottesman and Shields, 1982; Kendler and Diehl, 1993; Tuulio-Henriksson et al., 2002).

Results of meta-analyses (Heinrichs and Zakzanis, 1998) indicate that schizophrenia patients have a wide range of neurocognitive disorders. Among them, memory impairment is one that has been studied extensively (Aleman et al., 1999; Lee and Park, 2005; Pelletier et al., 2005; Piskulic et al., 2007). This type of impairment is also evident in first-degree non-psychotic relatives of schizophrenia (Sitskoorn et al., 2004; Szokr et al., 2005; Trandafr et al., 2006; Whyte et al., 2005). However, all of these studies were limited to the study of retrospective memory (RM) rather than prospective memory (PM).

PM refers to the ability to remember to carry out an intended action in the future (Brandimonte et al., 1996). It is considered important for daily living. Everyday functionings such as remembering to turn up for an appointment and make a phone call at the right time, all require good working of PM. In addition, failures of PM such as forgetting to take medication or forgetting to turn off the oven after cooking could have dire consequences (Shum et al., 2001).

PM can be divided into three types according to the nature of the cues associated with the planned delayed intention (Einstein and McDaniel, 1990; Kavalashvili and Ellis, 1996). Time-based PM refers to remembering to execute an intention at a specific time or after a period of time (e.g., remember to attend a meeting at 10:00 am on Tuesday); event-based PM refers to remembering to execute an intention when an event/cue appears (e.g., remember to give a message to a friend upon his/her arrival).
appearance); and activity-based PM refers to remembering to execute an intention after completion of an activity (e.g., remember to answer an email after lunch).

Among the studies that examined PM in individuals with schizophrenia, their findings consistently showed that these patients are impaired on PM, irrespective of subtypes (Chan et al., 2008b; Elvevag et al., 2003; Henry et al., 2007; Kondel, 2002; Kumar et al., 2005, 2008; Shum et al., 2004; Twamley et al., 2008; Wang et al., 2008a,b; Woods et al., 2007). Furthermore, some of these studies have found that PM impairment in these patients persist even after controlling for other neuropsychological disorders, suggesting that PM impairment is a primary rather than secondary deficit of schizophrenia (Henry et al., 2007; Wang et al., 2008a). In terms of the nature of impairment, some of these studies suggest that the PM impairments in these patients mainly occur at the cue detection and intention retrieval stages (Wang et al., 2008a,b; Woods et al., 2007), and others suggest that subjective PM complaints may be dissociated from objective PM performances (Chan et al., 2008b).

We know about the cognitive profiles of first-degree relatives of schizophrenia patients on verbal and visual memory, working memory, attention, and executive functions. Basically, this group of individuals has been found to perform significantly more poorly than matched controls on these functions but their level of performance was not as severe as patients with schizophrenia. However, the performance of PM in this population has not been studied yet. This study will provide information on the PM performance in this group of individuals. By studying PM in relatives of schizophrenia patients, we can identify whether PM would be an endophenotypic marker of schizophrenia and can lead to further genetic studies. In addition, we can provide cognitive remediation therapy to improve the PM difficulties in this high risk group. The present study, therefore, aimed to explore the PM performance in these relatives. We hypothesized that the relatives would perform significantly more poorly than the comparison group.

2. Methods

2.1. Participants

Twenty-six first-degree non-psychotic relatives (14 parents and 12 siblings) of schizophrenia patients were recruited, one relative from each patient. All the patients fulfilled the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, fourth edition (DSM-IV; American Psychiatric Association, 1994) diagnostic criteria for schizophrenia based on diagnostic interviewing (using the Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-IV and medical record reviews). These relatives were recruited from two regional psychiatric hospitals in China (Mental Health Center of Shantou University & Beijing Anding Hospital of Capital Medical University). Relatives were interviewed by psychiatrists to ensure that they did not have psychiatric illness, history of neurological illness, or drug/alcohol dependence. None of the participants reported having human immunodeficiency syndrome (HIV) infection.

Twenty-six healthy participants were also recruited as comparison group from three universities and the general community. A semi-structured interview was conducted by a trained research assistant to ensure that none of the comparison group would perform significantly better than the relatives. We hypothesized that the relatives would perform significantly more poorly than the comparison group.

2.2. Measures

2.2.1. PM tasks

Detailed description of the three PM tasks used in this study has been included in our previous studies (Chan et al., 2008b; Wang et al., 2008a,b). Briefly, there were two versions of each task: (i.e., semantic (event-based) and perceptual) in order to control for semantic memory. In the semantic event-based PM (se_ev) session, a four-character phrase (in Chinese) was presented in the center of the screen and the participants were asked to judge whether the phrases were idioms or not. They were asked to press the “J” key to answer affirmatively and the “F” key to answer negatively (this was defined as the ongoing task). If there was an animal character in the phrase (e.g., horse), they were asked to press the spacebar (this was defined as the PM task). A total of five animal characters appeared during the session and the time interval between the appearances of these characters was kept approximately the same. The participants were told that the two tasks (ongoing task and PM) were of the same importance. There were 88 ongoing task trials and five PM task trials in this session.

The semantic time-based PM (se_ti) session is basically the same as the semantic event-based PM one except that a clock was placed at the upper right part of the keyboard. The participants were asked to monitor the time throughout the testing session. Each time the clock reached the full minute (e.g., 12:23:00, the last two digits were 00), they were asked to press the spacebar (PM task). This session lasted for about 5 1/2 min. Unlike the semantic event-based session, no animal characters were included in the four-character phrases of this task. There were 90 ongoing task trials and five PM task trials in this session.

The perceptual event-based PM (pe_ev) session is similar to the semantic event-based one except that the ongoing task involved judging whether a perceptually degraded digit appeared in the center of the screen was a 0. The participants were asked to press “J” if it was the case and “F” if it was not. On occasions that there was a down arrow under the perceptually degraded digit, the participants were asked to press the spacebar regardless whether the digit was a 0 or not, and this was defined as the PM task. There were 122 ongoing task trials and five PM task trials in this session. The perceptual time-based PM (pe_ti) session is the same as the perceptual event-based one except that a clock was placed at the upper right part of the keyboard and participants were asked to monitor the clock and press the spacebar at each 1 min interval. A down arrow was included in one of the trials. There were 135 ongoing task trials and five PM task trials in this session.

At the end of each of the above four sessions, participants would see the phrase “Thank you for your participation! Bye” on the screen and they were instructed to press the “Enter” key upon seeing this phrase. This was defined as the activity-based PM task. The activity-based PM performance was the proportion of time the participants pressing the “Enter” key in all four sessions. For all the time-, event-, and activity-based PM performances, accuracy of PM was recorded.

2.2.2. Other neuropsychological tests

A set of neuropsychological tests was also administered to all participants. Details of these tests have also been described elsewhere (Chan et al., submitted; Wang et al., 2008a,b). In brief, neurocognitive tests have also been described elsewhere (Chan et al., 2008b; Wang et al., 2008a,b). Brieﬁng, in our sample, all neurocognitive tests were administered in a random order for all participants: se_ti, pe_ev, se_ev and pe_ti. Then the neurocognitive tests were administered by the modified Wisconsin Card Sorting Test (WCST) (Nelson, 1976) and the animal name semantic verbal reproduction subtests of the Chinese version (Cong et al., 1989) of the Wechsler Memory Scale—Revised (Wechsler, 1987); working memory was assessed by the Chinese version of the Letter–Number Span Test (Chan et al., 2008a) and the 2-back part of the n-back task (Cullinott et al., 1998), for Letter–Number Span, the total correct number and longest passed item were recorded, for 2-back task, the accuracy and reaction time for correct responses were recorded; sustained attention was evaluated by the Sustained Attention Response Task (SART) (Roberton et al., 1997), the correct press rate and commission error rate were recorded; executive function was evaluated by the Wechsler Card Sorting Test (WCST) (Nelson, 1976) and the animal name semantic verbal fluency task (Spreen and Strauss, 1998), for WCST, categories achieved and perseverative errors were recorded, for verbal fluency task, correct items were recorded.

2.3. Procedure

All participants were given a general introduction to the study as well as an opportunity to ask questions about the study. They then signed an informed consent form before testing began. IQ subtests were administered between PM practice and formal testing as a delay activity. The four PM tasks were given in the following randomly generated order for all participants: se_ti, pe_ev, se_ev and pe_ti. Then the neurocognitive tests were administered in a random order.

2.4. Data analysis

Se_ev and pe_ev PM task performances were averaged to generate an event-based PM score. Se_ti and pe_ti PM task performances were averaged to generate a time-based PM score. Event-based, time-based, and activity-based PM scores were converted to standardized scores (using save standardized values as variables in SPSS 13.0). These scores were then added up to give a summary PM score Z_PM.

Table 1

| Relative | Control |
|----------|---------|
| Mean     | Mean    | F(1,50) | P    |
| S.D.     | S.D.    |

| Test   | Gender and handedness used χ² test. | N = 26 | N = 26 | χ²(1) | P   |
|--------|-----------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-----|
| Male: female | 18.8:8.9 | 18.8:8.9 | 0:1   | 1    |
| Right-handed percentage | 50:50 | 50:50 | 1.33 | 0.513 |
| Age (years) | 50.02:36.43 | 51.54:36.38 | 1.58 | 0.646 |
| Education (years) | 11.71:11.29 | 11.15:11.29 | 2.98 | 0.049 |
| IQ | 108.42:123.93 | 98.31:163.13 | 6.23 | 0.016 |

Gender and handedness used χ² test.
Multivariate analyses of covariance (MANCOVAs) were performed to examine the group difference in PM measures with IQ used as covariates. This is followed by individual univariate ANCOVAs. In addition, effect sizes (Cohen’s d) were calculated. Next, a series of ANCOVAs was performed to examine the group difference on the neurocognitive function measures administered (verbal and visual memory, working memory, attention, and executive function). Finally, correlation analysis between PM performance and other neurocognitive functions was conducted.

3. Results

3.1. Group difference of PM and other neurocognitive functions

For MANCOVA test of all PM performance, the group difference was significant, $F(3,47) = 4.81$, $P = 0.005$ (Pillai’s Trace). Time-based PM $F(1,49) = 9.15$, $P = 0.004$, event-based PM $F(1,49) = 10.32$, $P = 0.002$, and total PM index $Z_{PM} F(1,49) = 13.46$, $P = 0.001$ all had significant group differences. A general profile of the PM performances was the comparison group performed better than non-psychotic relatives of schizophrenia patients. Several comparisons between relatives and the comparison group reached or approached medium effect sizes (Cohen’s d ranged from $-0.25$ to $-0.59$) (Table 2).

All the PM errors in this study were omission errors, which meant that the participants forgot to make PM responses.

For the ongoing task performances, the mean accuracy of ongoing task in event-based PM was $0.88$ (S.D. = 0.07) for comparison group and $0.82$ (S.D. = 0.07) for relatives, and mean accuracy of ongoing task in time-based PM was $0.86$ (S.D. = 0.04) for comparison group and $0.81$ (S.D. = 0.08) for relatives. Relative performances significantly worse than comparisons in ongoing task of event-based PM, $F(1,49) = 13.34$, $P = 0.001$ and time-based PM, $F(1,49) = 12.93$, $P = 0.001$. Event-based and time-based PM performance were still significantly different between two groups after controlling for corresponding ongoing task performances, for event-based PM, $F(1,48) = 6.22$, $P = 0.016$; and for time-based PM, $F(1,48) = 5.09$, $P = 0.029$.

For other neurocognitive measures, significant group differences were found for 2-back accuracy, $F(1,30) = 8.47$, $P = 0.007$, and WCST perseverative error $F(1,40) = 4.32$, $P = 0.044$. The same pattern of performance level as in the PM tasks was demonstrated for these neurocognitive tests, that is, the comparison group performed better than relatives (see Table 3).

Considering the non-normal distribution of the performances, we also performed non-parametric statistical analysis; Mann–Whitney U test indicated that time-based PM, PM summary score and 2-back performance level as in the PM tasks was demonstrated for these neurocognitive differences, for event-based PM, $z = -1.973$, $P = 0.048$. These results were similar to the former parametric statistical results, so we just present parametric test results in detail.

3.2. Correlations between PM and other neurocognitive functions

Correlation analyses showed that significant associations were found between PM tasks and neurocognitive tests that measure visual memory, working memory, sustained attention, and executive function (Table 4).

Table 2

|                  | Relative (N = 26) | Control (N = 26) | F    | P    | Cohen’s d |
|------------------|-------------------|------------------|------|------|-----------|
| Time PM          | 0.53              | 0.33             | 0.72 | 0.33 | 9.15      |
| Event PM         | 0.54              | 0.33             | 0.67 | 0.25 | 10.32     |
| Activity PM      | 0.88              | 0.25             | 0.94 | 0.20 | 4.22      |
| Z_PM             | -0.20             | 0.68             | 0.20 | 0.71 | 13.46     |

For the time-, event-, and activity-based PM performances, the table presents the proportion correct of PM task: for the $Z_{PM}$ (PM summary score), it is the addition of standardized score of three types of PM performances. According to Cohen (1988), Cohen’s d more than 0.5 is medium; more than 0.8 is large.

Table 3

|                  | Relative | Control | F    | P    | Cohen’s d |
|------------------|----------|---------|------|------|-----------|
|                   | Mean     | S.D.    | Mean | S.D. |
|                   |          |         |      |      |           |
| Time PM          | 0.53     | 0.33    | 0.72 | 0.33 | 9.15      |
| Event PM         | 0.54     | 0.33    | 0.67 | 0.25 | 10.32     |
| Activity PM      | 0.88     | 0.25    | 0.94 | 0.20 | 4.22      |
| Z_PM             | -0.20    | 0.68    | 0.20 | 0.71 | 13.46     |

4. Discussion

In accordance with our hypothesis, results indicate that these relatives performed significantly worse than the comparison group on time- and event-based PM tasks, with a similar pattern of performances for other neurocognitive functions. In addition, unlike patients with schizophrenia who were found to be impaired on the activity-based PM task (Chan et al., 2008b; Kumar et al., 2008; Shum et al., 2004; Wang et al., 2008a), the relatives in this study did not show similar impairment. This suggests that first-degree non-psychotic relatives of schizophrenia patients show neurocognitive impairment (including PM) but not as severe as in patients with schizophrenia.

Functional neuroimaging studies have found frontal abnormalities in relatives of schizophrenia patients. For example, relatives of schizophrenia patients showed abnormal activations in prefrontal regions compared to the participants in the comparison group (Whalley et al., 2005); relatives of schizophrenia showed a different activation pattern compared to the participants in the comparison group (MacDonald et al., 2006); individuals at high genetic risk for schizophrenia showed significantly greater activation in right dorsal lateral prefrontal cortex, suggesting that altered dopamine catecholism in the dorsal lateral prefrontal cortex was a genetically transmitted abnormality associated with the functional deficit (Seidman et al., 2006). Given that neuromaging studies in healthy populations found frontal regions (especially dorsal lateral prefrontal cortex and BA10) were activated when subjects performed PM tasks (Burgess et al., 2001, 2003; den Ouden et al., 2005; Okuda et al., 1998, 2007; Simmons et al., 2006), it is understandable that relatives of schizophrenia patients would show impairments in PM. In addition, measures of PM were also found to correlate significantly with other neurocognitive functions (Henry et al., 2007; Wang et al., 2008a), suggesting that other neurocognitive functions may underlie PM.
process. Nevertheless, studies such as Henry et al. and Wang et al. have found that PM impairment in schizophrenia was not secondary to other neurocognitive impairment. Given the small number of relatives included in this study, it is not possible to clarify if this is also the case for the relatives and further studies with large samples are needed to answer this question.

Results of the present study are consistent with meta-analysis on non-psychotic first-degree relatives of schizophrenia (Sitskoorn et al., 2004; Trandafir et al., 2006) in verbal memory, visual memory, and executive tests (see Table 5, effect sizes are in absolute values, with relatives performed poorer than participants in the comparison group unless otherwise indicated). For working memory, Horan et al. (2008) found that for their large relative sample (N = 324) the effect size of Letter–Number Sequencing was 0.36. In the present study, the Chinese version also had an effect size of 0.36. In general, the results of the present study are consistent with previous studies and meta-analyses that showed relatives of schizophrenia patients have a wide range of neurocognitive impairments and they had less severe deficits compared to patients. For PM, the effect size of combined PM indices ranged from 0.25 to 0.59 and it is similar to other neurocognitive measures, suggesting that the relatives of patients with schizophrenia have a moderate PM impairment, and their level of impairment is comparable to that of other neurocognitive deficits.

Together with results from previous studies (Chan et al., 2008b; Henry et al., 2007; Shum et al., 2004; Wang et al., 2008a,b; Woods et al., 2007), the findings of this study suggest that PM may be a potential endophenotype of schizophrenia. This is of importance for researchers: endophenotypes lie nearer to the neurobiology of disease, thus it would be more straightforward to search for the genetic determinants of schizophrenia using the endophenotype approach (Chan and Gottesman, 2008; Gottesman and Gould, 2003).

For the correlations between PM and other neurocognitive functions, PM was significantly correlated with memory and executive functions, which was consistent with previous studies on schizophrenia patients (Henry et al., 2007; Shum et al., 2004). In the first-degree relatives, visual memory was found to correlate with event-based but not time-based PM. This may be because event-based PM of this study required visual search of the animal names in the semantic condition and visual retention of the down arrow in the perceptual condition. In contrast time-based PM of this study did not involve such functions. This veracity of this explanation, however, needs to be confirmed by further studies.

### Table 4

| Measure                              | Control | Relative |
|--------------------------------------|---------|----------|
| Time PM                              | Event PM | Activity PM | Z_PM          |
| LM_imme r                            | 0.26    | 0.31     | 0.33         | 0.38         | −0.13 | 0.21 | −0.42 b | −0.17 |
| N                                    | 25      | 25       | 25           | 25           | 25    | 25    | 25      | 25    |
| LM_delay r                           | 0.34    | 0.40 a   | 0.35         | 0.46 a       | −0.18 | 0.17 | −0.45 a | −0.25 |
| N                                    | 25      | 25       | 25           | 25           | 24    | 24    | 24      | 24    |
| VR_imme r                            | 0.49 b  | 0.73 b   | 0.84 b       | 0.75 b       | 0.24  | 0.52 b| 0.01    | 0.40  |
| N                                    | 24      | 24       | 24           | 24           | 25    | 25    | 25      | 25    |
| VR_delay r                           | 0.60 b  | 0.72 b   | 0.63 b       | 0.81 b       | 0.06  | 0.45 b| 0.05    | 0.30  |
| N                                    | 25      | 25       | 25           | 25           | 24    | 24    | 24      | 24    |
| CLN_corr r                           | −0.19   | 0.13 c   | 0.01         | −0.27        | 18    | 18    | 18      | 18    |
| 2back c r                            | 0.18    | 0.22 c   | 0.16         | 0.21         | 17    | 17    | 17      | 17    |
| N                                    | 18      | 18       | 18           | 18           | 20    | 20    | 20      | 20    |
| SART_hit r                           | 0.66 b  | 0.32     | 0.21         | 0.51 b       | −0.09 | 0.12  | 0.46 a  | 0.14  |
| N                                    | 25      | 25       | 25           | 25           | 20    | 20    | 20      | 20    |
| SART_ce r                            | −0.35   | −0.48 a  | 0.00         | −0.34        | 0.00  | −0.43 | −0.13   | −0.29 |
| N                                    | 25      | 25       | 25           | 25           | 20    | 20    | 20      | 20    |
| VF_c r                               | 0.23    | 0.48 a   | 0.10         | 0.33         | 0.07  | 0.19  | 0.23    | 0.26  |
| N                                    | 25      | 25       | 25           | 25           | 20    | 20    | 20      | 20    |
| WCST_pe r                            | −0.15   | −0.10    | −0.23        | −0.21        | −0.25 | −0.52 a| 0.09    | −0.37 |
| N                                    | 23      | 23       | 23           | 23           | 20    | 20    | 20      | 20    |
| WCST_ca r                            | 0.00    | −0.16    | −0.03        | −0.07        | 0.53 a| 0.47 a| −0.01   | 0.52 a|
| N                                    | 23      | 23       | 23           | 23           | 20    | 20    | 20      | 20    |

LM_imme = logical memory immediate; LM_delay = logical memory delay; VR_imme = visual reproduction immediate; VR_delay = visual reproduction delay; CLN_corr = CLN total correct; CLN_lg = CLN longest passed; 2back_c = 2back accuracy; 2back_rt = 2back RT; SART_hit = SART correct press percentage; SART_ce = SART commission error percentage; VF_c = verbal fluency correct; WCST_pe = WCST perseverative error; WCST_ca = WCST category.

a Indicates P < 0.05.
b Indicates P < 0.01.
c Cannot be computed because activity PM is constant in these participants.

Table 5

| Measure                              | Meta-analysis | Meta-analysis effect size | Present study effect size |
|--------------------------------------|---------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Logical memory immediate             | Trandafir et al. (2006) | 0.47 | 0.29 |
| Logical memory delay                 | Trandafir et al. (2006) | 0.38 | 0.23 |
| Visual reproduction immediate        | Trandafir et al. (2006) | 0.17 | 0.14 |
| Visual reproduction delay            | Trandafir et al. (2006) | 0.24 | 0.14 |
| Verbal fluency correct               | Sitskoorn et al. (2004) | 0.35 | 0.28 a |
| Wisconsin Card Sorting Test          | Sitskoorn et al. (2004) | 0.29 (pooled) | 0.29 (perseverative error) 0.20 (category) |

a Relatives generate more words than controls in the present study.
There are several limitations in the present study. First, the sample size of the relative group is small and more participants should be recruited in future studies. Second, parents and siblings of schizophrenia patients were not analyzed separately due to the small sample size. Instead, we tried to match the two samples according to age and gender. This is mainly due to the one-child policy introduced in China in the late 1950s, persons born after the 1980s do not usually have siblings. Therefore, it is difficult to recruit a large number of siblings of schizophrenia research for a study like this in China.

Notwithstanding these limitations, the current study presented promising data on PM performance of non-psychotic first-degree relatives of patients with schizophrenia and suggests that PM may be a potential endophenotype for schizophrenia. To corroborate these findings, future studies adopting a more rigorous design and recruiting a larger sample are needed.
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