

ISSN 2278 - 0211 (Online)

A Cross Sectional Study of Factors Influencing Duration of Untreated Psychosis in a Tertiary Mental Health Care Institute

Nageswar Rao Nallapaneni

Associate Professor, Department of Psychiatry, Institute of Mental Health, Osmania Medical College, Hyderabad, Telangana, India

Usha V. R. Lanka

Associate Professor, Department of Psychiatry, Institute of Mental Health, Osmania Medical College, Hyderabad, Telangana, India

Chandra Bhanu Gupta Paritala

Associate Professor, Department of Psychiatry, Institute of Mental Health, Osmania Medical College, Hyderabad, Telangana, India

Abstract:

Background-There are several factors affecting duration of untreated psychosis (DUP) which may affect the long term prognosis of the patient's illness? Understanding them will help us in early intervention and management at all levels of illness.

Aim: To study factors influencing duration of untreated psychosis (DUP) in a tertiary care centre.

Methods: Sample collected from inpatients of a tertiary care psychiatric hospital in a purposive way. Socio demographic and illness factors were analysed and correlated with DUP statistically.

Results: There was a predominance of males (52%); younger age (16-25 years)-40%; illiterates-40%; Hindus-86%; rural background-80%. Majority (92%) belonged to low economic status; 62% belonged to nuclear families and 60% were married. However there was no significant difference between the sociodemographic factors when compared with DUP except for background being rural or urban area. Family history of mental illness was present in 10%; Schizophrenia and other psychosis constituted 78%. Predominant symptom danger to others was seen in 40%, suicidal risk in 16% and lack of motivation in 6% 80% patients had no associated substance abuse. Majority of the patients were brought by parents (68%) and by police in 26% cases. There was no statistically significant difference when compared with DUP in all the factors above. Age of onset of illness was 52% in below 25 years age group; 26% in 26-35 years group; 12% in 36-45 years and 10% in 46 years and above group. There was statistically significant difference when compared with DUP.

Conclusion: Age of onset of psychosis was the only illness factor and background being rural or urban was associated with DUP in a statistically significant way; others not being significant.

Limitations: Study was done in a tertiary care setup with a small sample which is not representative of the whole population Future Directions: Need to increase awareness about mental illness in the public with improving general practitioner's ability to identify symptoms for early diagnosis.

Keywords: DUP (duration of untreated psychosis), sociodemographic factors, tertiary care hospital

1. Introduction

Duration of untreated psychosis (DUP) refers to the duration between the onset of first psychotic symptom and the initiation of adequate antipsychotic drug treatment. (1) Delay in seeking appropriate treatment is influenced by many factors which are studied earlier.

Identifying the factors that prolong the DUP will help in decreasing DUP and potentially improve the long-term outcome. ⁽²⁾ In a review done by Barker and colleagues it is found that individual factors, such as personal beliefs, internalised gender norms, coping skills, self-efficacy, and perceived stigma interact with structural factors like the national health system, accessibility and affordability of services, and social support.⁽³⁾ Longer duration of DUP predicts poorer prognosis for the patient. 'The decision to seek care' which is the first stage of help seeking is found to be prone to delays and may be because of avoidant coping styles and pessimistic beliefs about health services, as studied by Mcgerry. ⁽⁴⁾ Longer DUP is being associated with poorer outcome with steady fall in clinical and global outcomes. ⁽⁵⁾ DUP correlated with a weak earlier social network, instability of professional identity, long duration of prodromal

symptoms, psychological dependency on the family, and criticism by the parents of the patient. In this same study longer DUP is associated with insidious onset, poor global functioning, and labour incapability. (6)

It is suggested that increasing the ability of general practitioners to identify early/prodromal symptoms may lead to reduced DUP. In an Indian study it is found that shorter duration of untreated illness predicts favourable clinical outcome. Increasing public awareness of psychosis and the importance of early treatment may help avoidant youngsters to seek treatment without delay.

Male gender, unemployed status, co morbid substance abuse, family factors, lack of public awareness, lower education social stigma attached with visit to psychiatrist etc are found to influence DUP. With the need to understand different factors influencing DUP and their effect on patient's prognosis this study was undertaken. There are few Indian studies done in this regard.

2. Aims

To study the factors influencing DUP in a tertiary psychiatric care centre in a metropolitan city.

3. Methods

Appropriate permission was first obtained from the hospital authorities to conduct this study. This cross sectional study was conducted between 2013 and 2014. Inpatients from closed and open wards in a tertiary hospital were selected by purposive sampling. Information was collected by interviewing the patient and caregiver if available. Informed consent was obtained from the patients and caregivers before the interview. The inclusion criteria was patients with psychosis (one of the categories in the International Classification of Disorders (ICD-10) of psychotic episode arising from a functional or substance misuse cause which could be affective or non affective in nature); who consented for the study, patients who did not receive any formal treatment earlier and aged between 18 and 60 years. Exclusion factors were patients who received allopathic treatment earlier, patients who did not give consent, organic brain syndromes (OBS) and patients not having psychosis. A semi structured intake proforma was prepared to collect sociodemograpic data and illness details which included age of onset, first consultation, referral mode, symptom profile, co morbidity and diagnosis. The data collected was subjected to statistical evaluation and results were compiled. The level of significance was set at P<0.05.

4. Results

(Table no.1) Males represented 52% and females were 48 % of the sample. Ages between 16-25 years represented 40 %; 26-35 years 28 %; 36-45 years 20% and > 46 years were 12 % of the whole sample. Regarding education illiterate represented 40 %; SSC, 36 %; intermediate 4% and degree holders were 20% of the sample. Occupation being farmers represented 18%; manual labourer, 28%; skilled/semi skilled, 14%; unemployed, 12% and home makers were 28% of the sample. Majority (86%) belonged to Hindu religion while Muslims were 12 % and Christians were 2% of the sample. There was no difference in all the above factors when compared with DUP. 80% came from rural background whereas 20% from urban background. This difference was significant when compared with DUP. Majority (92%) belonged to low economic status and only 8% belonged to high economic status. This was not significant statistically. 62% belonged to nuclear and 38 % belonged to joint family. The difference was not significant. 60% were married, 30% were unmarried and 10% had marital conflict. There was no significant difference between sociodemographic factor when compared with DUP except for background being rural or urban. Family history of mental illness was present in 10% and was absent in 90%. This difference was not significant statistically. (Table no 1)

Parameter	DUP	DUP	DUP	Total	Chisquare	Significance
	<1month	1m-1 y	>1year		P value	_
	n(%)	n(%)	n(%)	n(%)	(df)	
Gender						
Male	13(26)	9(18)	4(8)	26(52)	0.143	Not significant
Female	6(12)	10(20)	8(16)	24(48)	(2)	
Total	19(38)	19(38)	12(24)	50(100)		
Age						
16-25 years	9(18)	9(18)	2(4)	20(40)		
26-35 years	5(10)	3(6)	6(12)	14(28)	0.19	Not significant
36-45years	2(4)	6(12)	2(4)	10(20)	(6)	
≥46 years	3(6)	1(2)	2(4)	6(12)		
Total	19(38)	19(38)	12(24)	50(100)		
Education						
Illiterate	6(12)	8(16)	6(12)	20(40)		Not significant
SSC	8(16)	7(14)	3(6)	18(36)	0.84	
Intermediate	1(2)	0(0)	1(2)	2(4)	(6)	
Degree	4(8)	4(8)	2(4)	10(20)		
Total	19(38)	19(38)	12(24)	50(100)		

Farmer 3(6) 3(6) 3(6) 9(18) 0.086 Not significant	Occupation						
Skilled /semiskilled 5(10) 1(2) 1(2) 7(14) A(8) A(14)	Farmer	3(6)	3(6)	3(6)	9(18)	0.086	Not significant
Unemployed Homemaker 4(8) 7(14) 3(6) 14(28) 14(28) 14(28) 19(38) 19(38) 12(24) 50(100)	Manual labourer	7(14)	6(12)	1(2)	14(28)	(8)	
Homemaker Total 19(38) 19(38) 12(24) 50(100)	Skilled /semiskilled	5(10)	1(2)	1(2)	7(14)		
Total	Unemployed	0(0)	2(4)	4(8)	6(12)		
Religion Hindu 16(32) 17(34) 10(20) 43(86) 0.585 Not significant Muslim 3(6) 1(2) 2(4) 6(12) (4) Christian 0(0) 1(2) 0(0) 1(2) (4) Christian 0(0) 1(2) 0(0) 1(2) 0(0) 1(2) 0(0) 1(2) 0(0) 1(2) 0(0) 1(2) 0(0) 1(2) 0(0) 1(2) 0(0) 1(2) 0(0) 1(2) 0(0) 1(2) 0(0) 1(2) 0(0) 1(2) 0(0)	Homemaker	4(8)	7(14)	3(6)	14(28)		
Hindu 16(32) 17(34) 10(20) 43(86) 0.585 Not significant	Total	19(38)	19(38)	12(24)	50(100)		
Muslim Christian 3(6) 0(0) 1(2) 0(0) 1(2) 4(4) 1(2) 1(2) 1(2) Total 19(38) 19(38) 12(24) 50(100) Background Rural 12(24%) 16(32%) 12(24%) 40(80%) 0.037 Significant Urban 7(14%) 3(6%) 19(38%) 19(38%) 12(24%) 50(100%) 40(80%) 0.037 Significant Economic status Ighigh 1(2%) 1(2%) 12(24%) 12(24%) 50(100%) 4(8%) 0.447 Not Significant Low 18(36%) 18(36%) 10(20%) 46(92%) (2) 4(8%) 0.447 Not Significant Family type Joint Nuclear 9(18) 13(26) 9(18) 31(62) (2) 13(26) 9(18) 31(62) (2) Not significant Married 19(38) 19(38) 19(38) 12(24) 50(100) Married 19(38) 19(38) 12(24) 50(100) Not significant Married 10(20) 10(20) 10(20) 30(60) 0.367 Not significant Married 10(36) 2(4) 0(0) 5(10) (4) Total 19(38) 19(38) 12(24) 50(100) Family H/O mental illness Present Absent 1(2) 3(6) 16(32) 11(22) 45(90) (2) Not significant Absent Total 18(36) 16(32) 11(22) 45(90) (2) Not significant	Religion						
Christian Total 0(0) 19(38) 19(38) 19(38) 12(24) 50(100) Background Rural Urban Total 12(24%) 16(32%) 12(24%) 40(80%) 0.037 (2) Significant Urban Total 19(38%) 19(38%) 19(38%) 12(24%) 50(100%) (2) Significant Economic status High Low 18(36%) 18(36%) 10(20%) 4(8%) 0.447 Not Significant Low 18(36%) 18(36%) 10(20%) 46(92%) (2) Total Total 19(38) 12(24) 50(100) Not Significant Family type Joint Nuclear 9(18) 13(26) 9(18) 13(26) 9(18) 31(62) (2) 19(38) 0.232 Not significant Not significant Nuclear Nuclear 9(18) 13(26) 9(18) 31(62) (2) 10(20) 10(20) 10(20) 10(20) 30(60) 0.367 Not significant Marital status Unmarried 10(20) 10(20) 10(20) 10(20) 30(60) 0.367 Not significant Marital conflict 3(6) 2(4) 0(0) 5(10) (4) Not significant Marital conflict Total 19(38) 19(38) 19(38) 12(24) 50(100) 50(100) Not significant Family H/O mental illness Present Absent 1(2) 3(6) 16(32) 11(22) 45(90) (2) 10(20) 10(20) 45(90) (2) 10(20) 5(10) 0.544 Not significant Total 18(36) 16(Hindu	16(32)	17(34)	10(20)	43(86)	0.585	Not significant
Total 19(38) 19(38) 12(24) 50(100) Background Rural 12(24%) 16(32%) 12(24%) 40(80%) 0.037 Significant Urban 7(14%) 3(6%) 0(0%) 10(20%) (2) Total 19(38%) 19(38%) 12(24%) 50(100%) (2) Total Not Significant Economic status High 1(2%) 1(2%) 2(4%) 4(8%) 0.447 Not Significant Low 18(36%) 18(36%) 10(20%) 46(92%) (2) Total 19(38) 19(38) 12(24) 50(100) Total Not significant 10(20) 6(12) 3(6) 19(38) 0.232 Not significant Nuclear 9(18) 13(26) 9(18) 31(62) (2) 2 Total 19(38) 19(38) 12(24) 50(100) Total 19(38) 19(38) 12(24) 50(100) Total Not significant Marital status Unmarried 6(12) 7(14) 2(4)	Muslim	3(6)	1(2)	2(4)	6(12)	(4)	
Background Rural 12(24%) 16(32%) 12(24%) 40(80%) 0.037 Significant Urban 7(14%) 3(6%) 0(0%) 10(20%) (2) Significant Total 19(38%) 19(38%) 12(24%) 50(100%) (2) Not Significant Economic status High 1(2%) 1(2%) 2(4%) 4(8%) 0.447 Not Significant Low 18(36%) 18(36%) 10(20%) 46(92%) (2) 70 10	Christian	0(0)	1(2)	0(0)	1(2)		
Rural Urban 12(24%) 7(14%) 16(32%) 3(6%) 12(24%) 0(0%) 40(80%) 10(20%) 0.037 (2) Significant Economic status High 1(2%) 1(2%) 2(4%) 4(8%) 0.447 Not Significant Low 18(36%) 18(36%) 10(20%) 46(92%) (2) Not Significant Family type Joint 10(20) 6(12) 3(6) 19(38) 0.232 Not significant Nuclear 9(18) 13(26) 9(18) 31(62) (2) Not significant Marital status Unmarried 6(12) 7(14) 2(4) 15(30) Not significant Marriad conflict 3(6) 2(4) 0(0) 5(10) 0.367 Not significant Total 19(38) 19(38) 12(24) 50(100) 0.367 Not significant Married 10(20) 10(20) 30(60) 0.367 Not significant Family H/O mental illness 1(2) 3(6) 1(2)	Total	19(38)	19(38)	12(24)	50(100)		
Urban Total 7(14%) 19(38%) 3(6%) 19(38%) 0(0%) 10(20%) 50(100%) (2) Economic status High 1(2%) 1(2%) 2(4%) 4(8%) 0.447 Not Significant Low 18(36%) 18(36%) 10(20%) 46(92%) (2) Total 19(38) 19(38) 12(24) 50(100) Family type Joint 10(20) 6(12) 3(6) 19(38) 0.232 Not significant Nuclear 9(18) 13(26) 9(18) 31(62) (2) Total 19(38) 19(38) 12(24) 50(100) Marital status Unmarried 6(12) 7(14) 2(4) 15(30) Not significant Marital conflict 3(6) 2(4) 0(0) 5(10) 0.367 Not significant Marial conflict 3(6) 2(4) 0(0) 5(10) (4) Total Total 19(38) 19(38) 12(24) 50(100) Annumerical Not significant Family H/O mental illnes	Background						
Total 19(38%) 19(38%) 12(24%) 50(100%) Economic status High 1(2%) 1(2%) 2(4%) 4(8%) 0.447 Not Significant Low 18(36%) 18(36%) 10(20%) 46(92%) (2) Total 19(38) 19(38) 12(24) 50(100) Family type Joint 10(20) 6(12) 3(6) 19(38) 0.232 Not significant Nuclear 9(18) 13(26) 9(18) 31(62) (2) Total 19(38) 19(38) 12(24) 50(100) Marital status Unmarried 6(12) 7(14) 2(4) 15(30) Married 10(20) 10(20) 30(60) 0.367 Not significant Marital conflict 3(6) 2(4) 0(0) 5(10) (4) Total 19(38) 19(38) 12(24) 50(100) Family H/O mental illness Present Absent 1(2)	Rural	12(24%)	16(32%)	12(24%)	40(80%)	0.037	Significant
Economic status High 1(2%) 1(2%) 2(4%) 4(8%) 0.447 Not Significant Low 18(36%) 18(36%) 10(20%) 46(92%) (2) Total 19(38) 19(38) 12(24) 50(100) Family type Joint 10(20) 6(12) 3(6) 19(38) 0.232 Not significant Nuclear 9(18) 13(26) 9(18) 31(62) (2) Total 19(38) 19(38) 12(24) 50(100) Total 19(38) 19(38) 12(24) 50(100) Total Not significant Married 10(20) 10(20) 10(20) 30(60) 0.367 Not significant Marital conflict 3(6) 2(4) 0(0) 5(10) (4) Not significant Total 19(38) 19(38) 12(24) 50(100) Not significant Family H/O mental illness Present Absent 1(2) 3(6) 1(2) 5(10) 0.544 Not significant </td <td>Urban</td> <td>7(14%)</td> <td>3(6%)</td> <td>0(0%)</td> <td>10(20%)</td> <td>(2)</td> <td></td>	Urban	7(14%)	3(6%)	0(0%)	10(20%)	(2)	
High Low 1(2%) 1(2%) 2(4%) 4(8%) 0.447 Not Significant Low 18(36%) 18(36%) 10(20%) 46(92%) (2) Total 19(38) 19(38) 12(24) 50(100) Family type Joint 10(20) 6(12) 3(6) 19(38) 0.232 Not significant Nuclear 9(18) 13(26) 9(18) 31(62) (2) 20 Total 19(38) 19(38) 12(24) 50(100) 20 20 Marital status Unmarried 6(12) 7(14) 2(4) 15(30) 26 Not significant Marital conflict 3(6) 2(4) 0(0) 5(10) (4) 30 30 30 60 0.367 Not significant Total 19(38) 19(38) 12(24) 50(100) 44 50(100) 44 40 40 50(100) 60 60 60 10 60 10 60 10 60 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	Total	19(38%)	19(38%)	12(24%)	50(100%)		
Low 18(36%) 18(36%) 10(20%) 46(92%) (2) Total 19(38) 19(38) 12(24) 50(100) Family type Joint 10(20) 6(12) 3(6) 19(38) 0.232 Not significant Nuclear 9(18) 13(26) 9(18) 31(62) (2) Total 19(38) 19(38) 12(24) 50(100) Marital status Unmarried 6(12) 7(14) 2(4) 15(30) Not significant Marital conflict 3(6) 2(4) 0(0) 5(10) (4) Total 19(38) 19(38) 12(24) 50(100) Family H/O mental illness Present Absent 1(2) 3(6) 1(2) 5(10) 0.544 Not significant Total 18(36) 16(32) 11(22) 45(90) (2)	Economic status						
Total 19(38) 19(38) 12(24) 50(100) Family type Joint 10(20) 6(12) 3(6) 19(38) 0.232 Not significant Nuclear 9(18) 13(26) 9(18) 31(62) (2) Total 19(38) 19(38) 12(24) 50(100) Marital status Unmarried 6(12) 7(14) 2(4) 15(30) Married 10(20) 10(20) 30(60) 0.367 Not significant Marital conflict 3(6) 2(4) 0(0) 5(10) (4) Total 19(38) 19(38) 12(24) 50(100) Family H/O mental illness Present Absent 1(2) 3(6) 1(2) 5(10) 0.544 Not significant Total 18(36) 16(32) 11(22) 45(90) (2)	High	1(2%)	1(2%)	2(4%)	4(8%)	0.447	Not Significant
Family type Joint 10(20) 6(12) 3(6) 19(38) 0.232 Not significant Nuclear 9(18) 13(26) 9(18) 31(62) (2) Total 19(38) 19(38) 12(24) 50(100) Marital status Unmarried 6(12) 7(14) 2(4) 15(30) Married 10(20) 10(20) 30(60) 0.367 Not significant Marital conflict 3(6) 2(4) 0(0) 5(10) (4) Total 19(38) 19(38) 12(24) 50(100) Family H/O mental illness Present Absent 1(2) 3(6) 1(2) 5(10) 0.544 Not significant Total 18(36) 16(32) 11(22) 45(90) (2)	Low	18(36%)	18(36%)	10(20%)	46(92%)	(2)	
Joint 10(20) 6(12) 3(6) 19(38) 0.232 Not significant	Total	19(38)	19(38)	12(24)	50(100)		
Nuclear Total 9(18) 13(26) 19(38) 9(18) 12(24) 31(62) 50(100) (2) Marital status Unmarried Married Marital conflict Marital conflict Total 10(20) 10(20) 10(20) 10(20) 30(60) 0.367 (4) Not significant Not significant Family H/O mental illness Present Absent Total 1(2) 3(6) 1(2) 10(20) 5(10) 0.544 Not significant Total 1(2) 3(6) 16(32) 11(22) 45(90) (2)	Family type						
Total 19(38) 19(38) 12(24) 50(100) Marital status Unmarried 6(12) 7(14) 2(4) 15(30) Married 10(20) 10(20) 10(20) 30(60) 0.367 Not significant Marital conflict 3(6) 2(4) 0(0) 5(10) (4) Total 19(38) 19(38) 12(24) 50(100) Family H/O mental illness Present Absent 1(2) 3(6) 1(2) 5(10) 0.544 Not significant Total 18(36) 16(32) 11(22) 45(90) (2)	Joint	10(20)	6(12)	3(6)	19(38)	0.232	Not significant
Total 19(38) 19(38) 12(24) 50(100) Marital status Unmarried 6(12) 7(14) 2(4) 15(30) Married 10(20) 10(20) 10(20) 30(60) 0.367 Not significant Marital conflict 3(6) 2(4) 0(0) 5(10) (4) Total 19(38) 19(38) 12(24) 50(100) Family H/O mental illness Present Absent 1(2) 3(6) 1(2) 5(10) 0.544 Not significant Total 18(36) 16(32) 11(22) 45(90) (2)	Nuclear	9(18)	13(26)	9(18)	31(62)	(2)	
Unmarried 6(12) 7(14) 2(4) 15(30) 0.367 Not significant Married 10(20) 10(20) 30(60) 0.367 Not significant Marital conflict 3(6) 2(4) 0(0) 5(10) (4) Total 19(38) 19(38) 12(24) 50(100) Family H/O mental illness Present Absent 1(2) 3(6) 1(2) 5(10) 0.544 Not significant Total 18(36) 16(32) 11(22) 45(90) (2)	Total	19(38)	19(38)	12(24)	50(100)		
Married Marital conflict Marital conflict Total 10(20) 2(4) 2(4) 10(20) 30(60) 5(10) (4) Not significant Family H/O mental illness Present Absent Total 1(2) 3(6) 16(32) 11(22) 45(90) (2) 1(2) 16(32) 11(22) 45(90) (2) Not significant	Marital status						
Marital conflict 3(6) 2(4) 0(0) 5(10) (4) Total 19(38) 19(38) 12(24) 50(100) Family H/O mental illness Present Absent 1(2) 3(6) 1(2) 5(10) 0.544 Not significant Total 18(36) 16(32) 11(22) 45(90) (2) Not significant	Unmarried	6(12)	7(14)	2(4)	15(30)		
Marital conflict 3(6) 2(4) 0(0) 5(10) (4) Total 19(38) 19(38) 12(24) 50(100) Family H/O mental illness Present Absent 1(2) 3(6) 1(2) 5(10) 0.544 Not significant Total 18(36) 16(32) 11(22) 45(90) (2)	Married	10(20)	10(20)	10(20)	30(60)	0.367	Not significant
Total 19(38) 19(38) 12(24) 50(100) Family H/O mental illness Present Absent 1(2) 3(6) 1(2) 5(10) 0.544 Not significant Total 18(36) 16(32) 11(22) 45(90) (2)	Marital conflict			0(0)	5(10)	(4)	
Present 1(2) 3(6) 1(2) 5(10) 0.544 Not significant Total 18(36) 16(32) 11(22) 45(90) (2)	Total	19(38)	19(38)	12(24)	50(100)		
Present 1(2) 3(6) 1(2) 5(10) 0.544 Not significant Total 18(36) 16(32) 11(22) 45(90) (2)	Family H/O mental illness						
Total 18(36) 16(32) 11(22) 45(90) (2)							
Total 18(36) 16(32) 11(22) 45(90) (2)	Absent	1(2)	3(6)	1(2)	5(10)	0.544	Not significant
	Total	` '	` '	` '	45(90)	(2)	
		` '	` /	` /	50(100)	, ,	

Table 1: Comparison of DUP with sociodemographic parameters DUP- duration of untreated psychosis

SSC- secondary school Certificate

		Diagnosis					
Duration of Untreated Psychosis		Schiz & Other Psychosis	Mood Disorder	Substance Abuse			
less than a month	Count	16	2	1	19		
	% of Total	32.0%	4.0%	2.0%	38.0%		
1m to 1year	Count	14	4	1	19		
	% of Total	28.0%	8.0%	2.0%	38.0%		
more than 1 year	Count	9	3	0	12		
	% of Total	18.0%	6.0%	.0%	24.0%		
Total	Count	39	9	2	50		
	% of Total	78.0%	18.0%	4.0%	100.0%		

Table 2: Comparison of DUP with Diagnosis of patient Chi-Square P value=0.773 df=4 Not Significant

Schizophrenia and other psychosis constituted 78 %; mood disorders 18 % and substance induced psychosis were 4 % of the sample. When compared with DUP there was no significant difference. (Table no 2)

Predominant symptom suicidal risk was seen in 16%; danger to others in 40%; lack of motivation in 6 %, Lack of awareness of illness in 6% and other symptoms in 32% of the sample. There was no difference when compared with DUP.(Table no 3)

				Symptom Profi	le		Total
Duration of Untreated Psychosis		Suicidal Risk	Danger to Others	Lack of Motivation	Lack of Awareness of Illness	Others	
Less than a month	Count	1	9	1	1	7	19
	% of Total	2.0%	18.0%	2.0%	2.0%	14.0%	38.0%
1m to 1year	Count	4	6	1	2	6	19
	% of Total	8.0%	12.0%	2.0%	4.0%	12.0%	38.0%
more than 1 year	Count	3	5	1	0	3	12
	% of Total	6.0%	10.0%	2.0%	.0%	6.0%	24.0%
Total	Count	8	20	3	3	16	50
	% of Total	16.0%	40.0%	6.0%	6.0%	32.0%	100.0%

Table 3: Comparing DUP with the predominant symptom profile at presentation Chi-Square P value =0.785; df=8. Not Significant

			Total			
Duration of Untreated Psychosis		Below 25	26-35	36-45	46 & Above	
less than a month	Count	10	6	0	3	19
	% of Total	20.0%	12.0%	.0%	6.0%	38.0%
1m to 1year	Count	12	1	5	1	19
	% of Total	24.0%	2.0%	10.0%	2.0%	38.0%
more than 1 year	Count	4	6	1	1	12
	% of Total	8.0%	12.0%	2.0%	2.0%	24.0%
Total	Count	26	13	6	5	50
	% of Total	52.0%	26.0%	12.0%	10.0%	100.0%

Table 4: Comparison of duration of untreated psychosis with age of onset Chi-Square P value =0.02; df=6.Significant

		1st (Consultation	Total
Duration of Untreated Psychosis		Faith Healer	Allopathic & Ayush	
less than a month	Count	10	9	19
	% of Total	20.0%	18.0%	38.0%
1m to 1year	Count	10	9	19
	% of Total	20.0%	18.0%	38.0%
more than 1 year	Count	3	9	12
	% of Total	6.0%	18.0%	24.0%
Total	Count	23	27	50
	% of Total	46.0%	54.0%	100.0%

Table 5: Comparison of DUP with patient's first consultation Chi-Square Test P value=0.246; df=2.Not Significant

Age of onset of illness was 52% in below 25 years age group; 26 % in 26-35 years group; 12 % in 36-45 years and 10 % in 46 years and above group. There was significant difference when compared with DUP.(Table no 4) Patients were first taken to faith healers in 46 % and to Allopathic /Ayush physicians in 54% of the sample. However there was no difference between the groups when compared with DUP. (Table no 5)

			Substance	e Abuse	Total
Duration of Untreated Psychosis			Present	Absent	
	less than a month	Count	3	16	19
		% of Total	6.0%	32.0%	38.0%
	1m to 1year	Count	6	13	19
		% of Total	12.0%	26.0%	38.0%
	more than 1 year	Count	1	11	12
		% of Total	2.0%	22.0%	24.0%
Total		Count	10	40	50
		% of Total	20.0%	80.0%	100.0%

Table 6: Comparison of different groups with associated substance abuse Chi-Square Test P value=0.244; df=2 .Not Significant

History of substance abuse was present in 20% and 80% patients had no associated substance abuse. There was no difference when compared with DUP. (Table no 6) Patients were brought for consultation by parents in 68% cases; by relatives in 6 % cases and by Police in 26% cases. There was no difference when compared with DUP. (Table no 7)

		I	Brought By				
DUP		Parents	Relatives	PC			
less than a month	Count	11	2	6	19		
	% of Total	22.0%	4.0%	12.0%	38.0%		
1m to 1year	Count	14	1	4	19		
	% of Total	28.0%	2.0%	8.0%	38.0%		
more than 1 year	Count	9	0	3	12		
	% of Total	18.0%	.0%	6.0%	24.0%		
Total	Count	34	3	13	50		
	% of Total	68.0%	6.0%	26.0%	100.0%		

Table 7: Comparison between groups on brought by whom for consultation DUP=Duration of untreated psychosis. Chi-Square P value=0.68

5. Discussion

In our study males represented 52 % and females were 48 %; 50% of the males received treatment before 1 month while female patients were 25% but with no statistical significance. Another study also did not find any difference as far as gender was concerned. But other studies found that a longer DUP was associated with male gender. Madianos MG, in their study found that females had shorter DUP. Mackenzie, in their study found that females exhibited more favourable intentions to seek help from mental health professionals than men, which was opined to be due to their positive attitudes concerning psychological openness. Negative attitudes related to psychological openness was opined to contribute to men's underutilization of mental health services.

In our study patients aged between 16 -25years and 26-35 years represented 68 %; which reflected the young population base of India. Early intervention before one month of illness onset was sought in younger age 47.4% below 25yrs compared to older 15.8% above 46yrs. There was no significant difference when compared with DUP. Other studies also did not find any difference as far as age was concerned. (9,11)

Age of onset of illness was mostly (52%) below 25 years of age; least (10 %) in the age group of 46 years and above. Onset of illness was seen more in young age. Majority of the patients aged above 46yrs (60%) were with DUP less than 1 month. There was a significant difference when compared with DUP. Larsen T K,⁽¹⁰⁾ and Jagdeo A,⁽¹⁴⁾found in their study that patients with a long DUP (> 1 year) were young males with poor social network, social withdrawal, and a more deteriorating course. They were also found to be single lesser educated, socioeconomically challenged with comorbid substance abuse. (14) But Madianos MG, (12) found that younger age of onset predicted a shorter duration without psychiatric treatment and more positive views about the necessity of help-seeking.

Illiterates constituted 40% of the patients while intermediate qualified constituted lowest 4%. Illiterates were majority reflecting the level of education of the rural population but it was not significant. Lower education was also found in another study which was significantly associated with prolonged DUP. $^{(15)}$ Higher education predicted shorter DUP in a study done by Madianos MG. $^{(12)}$

Majority of the sample were either farmer & manual labour (46%) or home maker (28%) while unemployed (12%) and skilled/semiskilled (14%) were lowest. Unemployed who received treatment before 1 month were nil though jobless constituted only 12% of the total sample. Unemployment was significantly associated with longer DUP in earlier studies. (6,11) Barnes, (16) also found that unemployment was associated with longer DUP which he reasoned to be due to social isolation and withdrawal caused by illness. In our study patients were first taken to faith healers in 46% suggesting delay in seeking formal treatment and to Allopathic or Ayush physicians in 54% of the sample. However there was no difference between the groups when compared with DUP. Earlier studies

found longer DUP was associated with family being less bothered about help seeking.⁽¹¹⁾ Shorter DUP of <12 months was associated with more positive views towards help-seeking than those with longer DUP.⁽¹²⁾ Another study found that for young people, embarrassment or concern about what others might think was the main barrier to seeking help and in parents it was resistance from the child.⁽¹⁷⁾

In our study Hindus were majority (86%) while Muslims and Christians were 14% in congruence with population statistics, though with no statistical significance with DUP. Patients with rural background were 80% and lower economic status were 92% constituting majority which represents the population base utilising the government services. Majority (70%) of the urban patients received treatment early before 1 month which was statistically significant. Nuclear families constituted 62% while joint families were 38% signifying change in family structure of the society. Majority (52.6%) of the patients from the joint families had DUP less than 1 month though statistically not significant. Regarding marital status majority (60%) were married and living together while minority (10%) had marital conflict but comparing DUP was not significant. Majority (68%) were brought by parents suggesting family support but it was not significant statistically. Poor family support was significantly associated with longer DUP. (11) But family's involvement was there in our study so there were other factors like stigma/lack of education/cultural beliefs which could have influenced help seeking. These factors need to be studied with a larger cohort of patients. Having a family history of mental illness was not significant statistically with DUP. Other studies did not compare this aspect.

Comorbid substance abuse was seen only in 20 % of patients. However it was not significant when compared with DUP. Shibu, ⁽¹¹⁾ in their study found significant association between longer DUP and comorbid substance abuse. Morgan, ⁽¹⁸⁾ in his study found that continuous use of illicit drugs could also contribute to difficulties in early recognition and help-seeking. He opined that patients or significant others may think that the psychosis will resolve as soon as drug-taking ceases. ⁽¹⁸⁾

In our study majority (78%) were diagnosed as schizophrenia; there was no statistically significant difference when compared with DUP. Similar findings were reported by Loebel, ⁽⁹⁾ in a prospective study. It was suggested in some western studies that there was better control of symptoms/outcome of schizophrenia with reduction in duration of untreated psychosis. The reduction of time between onset of psychosis and start of treatment leads to better outcome of schizophrenia and related disorders.^(4,19) It was also proposed that psychosis itself may have toxic effects on brain .^(20,21) The predominant symptom in our study was danger to others at time of presentation(40%) and suicidal risk (16%). In another study, longer DUP was associated with more severe positive symptoms at admission.⁽⁶⁾ Prolonged DUP association with insidious onset was seen in a study by Morgan , ⁽¹⁸⁾ who opined that negative symptoms early in the course of illness which precede the positive symptoms could be one of the reason for delay in seeking help.

In another study it was suggested that increasing the ability of general practitioners to identify early or prodromal symptoms may lead to reduced DUP. ⁽⁷⁾ It was also found that intrapersonal variables like denial and avoidance, were common responses to onset of psychosis. ⁽⁷⁾Increasing public awareness of psychosis and the importance of early treatment may help avoidant youngsters to seek treatment without delay. ⁽⁷⁾

5.1. Future Directions

Increasing GP's expertise to identify early /prodromal symptoms, incorporating psychiatry as a separate subject for examination in undergraduate courses of medicine, increasing public awareness of psychosis and importance of early treatment will help in reducing the stigma associated with mental illness and as such reducing DUP. This will decrease the morbidity and improve the prognosis of the patient. These social measures should be undertaken at the national level from prevention point of view

5.2. Limitations

Our study was done in a tertiary care set up. We could get only 50 patients who fulfilled the intake criteria. A larger population based sample would help us clearly understand factors influencing DUP so that appropriate measures are adopted for better prognosis for patients.

- Acknowledgements: We sincerely are thankful for the cooperation of the patients and relatives who participated in this study.
- Source of funding-nil
- Conflict of interest-nil

6. References

- 1. 1.Oosthuizen P., Emsley R.A., Keyter N., et al. Duration of untreated psychosis and outcome in first-episode psychosis. Perspective from a developing country. Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica. 2005,111, 214-19.
- 2. Norman RM, Lewis SW, Marshall M. Duration of untreated psychosis and its relationship to clinical outcome.Br J Psychiatry Suppl. 2005;48:s19–s23.
- 3. Barker G, Olukoya A, Aggleton P: Young people, social support and helpseeking. International. journal of adolescent medicine and health. 2005.17(4):315-35.
- 4. McGerry P.D,Edwards J,Mihalopoulos C et al (1996)An evolving system of early detection and optimal management. Schizophrenia bulletin, 1996, 22, 305-26.
- 5. Srinivasan NT.Rangaswamy T,Padmavathy R.Duration of untreated psychosis and treatment outcome in schizophrenia patients untreated for many years. Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry 2004, Vol38, 5, 339-43.
- 6. O. Kalla, J. Aaltonen, J. Wahl-ström, V. Lehtinen et al. Duration of untreated psychosis and its correlates in first-episode psychosis in Finland and Spain. Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica. 2002: 265–75.

- 7. Amanda S, Chris J, Max B. Duration of untreated psychosis and pathways to care in first-episode psychosis Investigation of help-seeking behaviour in primary care. British Journal of Psychiatry 2002, 181 (43): 73-7
- 8. Mehta S, Tyagi A, Swami MK, et al.Onset of acute and transient psychotic disorder in India: a study of socio-demographics and factors affecting its outcomes. East Asian Arch Psychiatry. 2014, 24(2):75-80
- 9. Loebel A D,Lieberman JA,Alvir JMJ et al .Duration of psychosis and outcome in first episode schizophrenia.American journal of psychiatr.1992,149:1183-88.
- 10. Larsen TK, Johannessen JO, Opjordsmoen S. First-episode schizophrenia with long duration of untreated psychosis: pathways to care. Br J Psychiatry Suppl. 1998;172(33): 45–52.
- 11. Shibu PT, Harpal S N. Early Intervention in Psychosis: A Retrospective Analysis of Clinical and Social Factors Influencing Duration of Untreated Psychosis. Prim Care Companion J Clin Psychiatry. 2009;11(5):212–14
- 12. Madianos MG, Zartaloudi A, Alevizopoulos G, Katostaras T. Attitudes toward help-seeking and duration of untreated mental disorders in a sectorized Athens area of Greece. Community Ment Health J. 2011;47(5):583-93
- 13. Mackenzie CS, Gekoski WL, Knox VJ. Age, gender, and the underutilization of mental health services: the influence of help-seeking attitudes. Aging Ment Health. 2006 Nov;10(6):574-82.
- 14. Jagdeo A, Cox BJ, Stein MB, Sareen JNegative attitudes toward help seeking for mental illness in 2 population-based surveys from the United States and Canada. Can J Psychiatry. 2009 Nov;54(11):757-66.
- 15. Sadeghiehahari S , Nikpou H , Molavi.P. An investigation of duration of untreated psychosis and the affecting factors. Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing.2014; 21: 87–92
- 16. Barnes TR, Hutton SB, Chapman MJ, et al. West London first-episode study of schizophrenia: clinical correlates of duration of untreated psychosis. Br J Psychiatry. 2000;177:207–11.
- 17. Jorm AF, Wright A, Morgan AJ. Where to seek help for a mental disorder? National survey of the beliefs of Australian youth and their parents. Med J Aust. 2007 Nov 19;187(10):556-60.
- 18. Morgan C, Abdul-Al R, Lappin JM, et al. Clinical and social determinants of duration of untreated psychosis (ÆSOP study). Br J Psychiatry. 2006;189:446–52.
- 19. Mcglashen, T.H & Johannesen J.OEarly detection and intervention with Schizophrenia: rationale, Schizophrenia Bulletin. 1996;22:201-22
- 20. Grace AA.Phasic versus tonic dopamine release and modulation of dopamine release and modulation of dopamine system responsivity:a hypothesis for etiology of schizophrenia. Neuroscience. 199; 41:1-24.
- 21. Wyatt R.J.Neuroleptics and natural course of schizophrenia. Schizophrenia bulletin. 1991;17:325-51.