Word count (including abstract, text, & references): 5,127
Number of tables/figures: 5

The induction of dissociative states: A meta-analysis

Benjamin Brake, BSc[a,*], Lillian Wieder, MSc[b,*], Natasha Hughes, MSc[c,*], Ivonne Saravia Lalinde, MSc[d,*], Danielle Marr, MSc[e], Dali Geagea, MSc[f], Susannah Pick, PhD[g], Antje A. T. S. Reinders, PhD[g], Sunjeev K. Kamboj, PhD[h], Trevor Thompson, PhD [i], & Devin B. Terhune, PhD [d]

[a] *Department of Neuroscience, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology & Neuroscience, King's College London*
[b] *Department of Psychology, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology & Neuroscience, King's College London*
[c] *Department of Clinical Psychology, Leiden University, the Netherlands*
[d] *Department of Psychosis Studies, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology & Neuroscience, King's College London*
[e] *Institute for Psychology, Friedrich Alexander Universität Erlangen-Nuremberg, Germany*
[f] *Centre for Children's Burns and Trauma Research, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia*
[g] *Department of Psychological Medicine, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology & Neuroscience, King's College London*
[h] *Clinical Psychopharmacology Unit, Department of Clinical, Educational and Health Psychology, University College London*
[i] *School of Human Sciences, University of Greenwich*

[*] These authors contributed equally to the manuscript.

Correspondence address:
Devin B. Terhune
Department of Psychology
Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology & Neuroscience (IOPPN)
King's College London
Henry Wellcome Building
Denmark Hill Campus
16 De Crespigny Park
London, UK SE5 8AB
devin.terhune@kcl.ac.uk

Disclosure: All authors report no financial relationships with commercial interests.

Acknowledgements: LW is supported by the Department of Psychology, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology & Neuroscience, King's College London. SP is supported by a Medical Research Council Fellowship. SKK is supported by the Medical Research Council (UK). DBT is supported by the Gyllenbergs Foundation.

Open access: For the purposes of open access, the author has applied a Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license to any Accepted Author manuscript version arising from this submission.

Abstract

Objective: Dissociative states, characterised by discontinuities in awareness and perception, occur in a diverse array of psychiatric disorders and contexts. Dissociative states have been modeled in the laboratory through various induction methods but relatively little is known about the efficacy and comparability of different experimental methods.

Methods: This meta-analysis quantified dissociative states, as indexed by a standardised instrument (*Clinician Administered Dissociative States Scale*), at baseline in varied diagnostic groups and in response to different experimental induction methods (psychological techniques and pharmacological agents) in both clinical and non-clinical samples. Primary outcomes were state dissociation effect sizes (Hedges's *g*) (PROSPERO registration CRD42022384886).

Results: 2,214 papers were screened, yielding 150 eligible articles and 251 effect sizes comprising 7,190 individuals. High levels of baseline state dissociation were observed in multiple diagnostic groups relative to controls, with the largest effects found in post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD). In controlled experiments, induced state dissociation was most pronounced in response to mirror-gazing, ayahuasca, ketamine, cannabis, MDMA, and nitrous oxide relative, with effects comparable to or exceeding baseline state dissociation in PTSD. The effect sizes were characterised by pronounced heterogeneity but were not reliably associated with methodological features of the original studies.

Conclusions: Elevated state dissociation is present in multiple diagnostic groups and comparable or higher levels can be reliably induced in controlled experiments using psychological techniques and pharmacological agents. These results demonstrate the efficacy of several methods for experimentally modelling dissociation and have implications for measuring adverse events and predicting outcomes in clinical interventions involving pharmacological agents.

Keywords: dissociative; ketamine; mirror-gazing; NMDAR; psychedelics; PTSD

Introduction

Dissociation comprises a constellation of symptoms characterised by discontinuities in awareness, volition, and perception (1, 2). These experiences range from episodes of depersonalisation and derealisation, encompassing feelings of detachment from emotional or bodily states, and/or environment, respectively, to distortions in control, identity and memory. Dissociation is increasingly recognised as a transdiagnostic symptom prevalent in a wide variety of psychiatric conditions (2). Higher levels of dissociation may also function as a salient marker of clinical outcomes including a higher burden of illness (3), poorer quality of life (4), more pronounced symptomatology (5-7), and poorer treatment outcomes (8).

The clinical significance of dissociation underscores the need for controlled research on these symptoms but there exists no consensus experimental model of dissociation. Psychological techniques range from those that induce dissociative states through modulation of awareness and perception (e.g., mirror-gazing) or exposure to stressors (9). Multiple pharmacological agents have been shown to trigger dissociation, particularly those that function as N-methyl-D-aspartate receptor (NMDAR) antagonists, such as ketamine and nitrous oxide (N_2O; (10). To our knowledge, there has not yet been any attempt to quantitatively synthesise and compare these different induction effects, nor to compare them against baseline dissociative states in diagnostic groups.

A robust experimental model of dissociative states will offer novel opportunities for identifying neurophysiological and neurochemical markers of dissociative states, elucidating the impact of dissociation on other symptoms (e.g., hallucinations), and could inform both the diagnosis and treatment of a range of psychiatric conditions (10, 11). Moreover, as NMDAR antagonists and serotonergic psychedelics are used or proposed as mainstream antidepressants (12), studying their dissociative effects might aid in advancing understanding of treatment-related adverse events (13) and treatment outcomes (14), which often covary with dissociative responses.

This meta-analysis sought to fill outstanding gaps in current knowledge regarding the experimental induction of dissociative states and their comparability to baseline dissociation in diagnostic groups. As in other meta-analyses (2), we sought to increase uniformity of comparisons within and across categories and

thus restricted our analyses to studies that measured dissociative states using the *Clinician-Administered Dissociative States Scale* (CADSS; (15)), the most widely used measure of state dissociation (16). Our primary aims were to quantitatively synthesise and compare baseline state dissociation effects in different diagnostic categories and in induced state dissociation effects in response to different psychological techniques and pharmacological agents. Our secondary aims were to explore the factors that moderate the magnitude of state dissociation effects within and across categories.

Method

This pre-registered study (t.ly/I-ppg) was conducted under the updated PRISMA 2020 guidelines (17).

Eligibility criteria

The inclusion criteria were: English language; full article in a peer-reviewed journal; participants aged 18 or older; inclusion of descriptive statistics and sample sizes for the CADSS in a diagnostic group and non-clinical control group or in an experimental and control condition. Exclusion criteria included: reviews, abstracts, dissertations, or case studies; data overlapping with included studies; use of a dissociation-attenuating agent; and CADSS completion after an extended period (>12h).

Search strategy

In October 2022, two researchers (BB and LW) independently searched MEDLINE, PubMed, PsycINFO, and Embase using terms relating to the CADSS (Supplementary Materials). The search was limited to studies published since 1998, the CADSS's initial publication year. All eligible studies were integrated into a database using Covidence ® (Veritas Health Innovation, Melbourne, Australia; available at www.covidence.org). The search was repeated in June 2023 and March 2024, yielding 6 and 4 additional studies, respectively.

Study selection

Two independent raters (BB, DG, NH, DM, ISL, LW) independently screened and assessed all studies for eligibility using a two-stage procedure. First, they screened titles and abstracts, rejecting articles not meeting

eligibility criteria. Then, they reviewed the remaining papers to finalize the study list. A third reviewer (DBT) resolved discrepancies at either stage. If eligible articles lacked sufficient CADSS data, corresponding authors were contacted via email (up to three attempts over three months).

Data extraction

Data extraction was performed by two raters (BB, DG, NH, DM, ISL, LW). The primary outcomes extracted were CADSS scores (15) in a target condition/group and a control condition/group. Secondary outcomes included CADSS subscale scores and correlations between trait dissociation scores and CADSS scores. Both raters independently extracted and coded data using a pre-piloted extraction form in Covidence, covering: study details (authors, title, journal, publication date, country); demographics (sample size, gender distributions, age, education, ethnicity); study design (repeated-measures, between-groups, mixed-model); category (diagnostic group, psychological technique, pharmacological agent); CADSS information (administrator [clinician/experimenter v. self-report], mode of administration [in person or remote], version [number of items], number of measurement timepoints, subscales, language); trait dissociation measure; clinical study methods (diagnosis, diagnostic criteria, diagnostic method, comorbidities, control type [healthy or clinical], clinical control diagnosis); pharmacological study methods (CADSS measurement times, drug class, dose, administration method and duration, concurrent drug-use information, active/inert placebo information); psychological technique (method, control condition/group information); other methodological details (counterbalancing, inclusion of suggestion for dissociation); descriptive statistics for CADSS scores (total and subscales in all conditions); and correlations between trait dissociation and CADSS scores. If descriptive statistics were not reported, they were extracted from figures using WebPlotDigitizer (v. 4.6; https://automeris.io/) when possible. Discrepancies were resolved with a third reviewer and sometimes a fourth. Overall, there was 91% agreement between raters (range: 85-98%).

Methodological quality

Two raters independently assessed the quality of each study using a 15-item scale (Supplementary Materials) concerning study objectives, participant recruitment, demographic data, inclusion/exclusion criteria, clarity of procedure, blinding, pre-registration, and relative matching of groups/conditions. The items, adapted from a previous meta-analysis (18), were based on Cochrane criteria and PRISMA

recommendations (19). Each item was categorically rated (0=criterion not met, 1=met), and a percentage met total was computed for each study; DBT resolved discrepancies. There was 90% agreement between raters (range: 63%-100%; mean kappa=.80; range: .25-1).

Meta-analysis and meta-regression

Descriptive statistics (*M*s, *SD*s, and *n*s, or other suitable statistics) were used to compute Hedges's *g*s (and *SE*s) for inclusion in random effects meta-analyses when there were three or more effect sizes per category (Supplementary Methods); if presented. Categories included different diagnostic groups, psychological techniques, and pharmacological agents. For each category, we computed standardised mean differences (*SMD*s) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) after outlier removal (studentized residuals > |3.3|; (20). *SMD*s were coded such that positive values reflect greater state dissociation (CADSS score) in the reference category than a control. Meta-analyses were supplemented with prediction intervals (PIs) when $k \geq 5$ (21, 22); PIs estimate the distribution of the effect in a future individual study with similar features. Heterogeneity of effect sizes was computed using I^2 and τ^2 where values exceeding 50% and 10%, respectively, reflect moderate or greater heterogeneity. Publication bias was evaluated using funnel plots of *SMD*s against *SE*s and Egger's bias test, where $p<.05$ reflects asymmetry (23); we computed revised *SMD*s correcting for asymmetry using the trim-and-fill method (24). Moderators of effect sizes were assessed using meta-regression analyses whenever there were 10 or more effect sizes within a category. Multiple pre-registered analyses were not performed due to insufficient number of effect sizes or insufficient information in original papers (Supplementary Materials). Analyses were performed in JASP (v. 0.18.3, 2014; JASP Team, the Netherlands), Jamovi (v. 2.3.26.0, the Jamovi project), and MATLAB (v. 2023a, MathWorks, Natick, Massachusetts, USA).

Results

Study inclusion and characteristics

A PRISMA diagram showing study selection is presented in Figure S1. 163 papers met inclusion criteria, yielding 386 effect sizes, of which 251 effect sizes (n=150) could be included in our analysis categories (see Supplementary Results for exclusions). After excluding 13 outliers, the effect sizes included controlled comparisons of diagnostic categories (k=30, n=1,886), psychological techniques (k=64, n=2,675), or

pharmacological agents (*k*=144, *n*=2,629) (Table 1). The largest categories (*k*s≥10) included PTSD, mirror-gazing, military training, trauma stimuli exposure, ketamine, N_2O, and esketamine. Methodological quality ratings at the study level can be found in Table S1 and full study details can be found in Supplementary Materials.

Meta-analyses of controlled comparisons of state dissociation in diagnostic groups

The magnitude of state dissociation at baseline was examined in five diagnostic groups in order to provide a reference point for effect sizes for induced dissociative states (Table 1, Figure 1a). Dissociative states were significantly greater than non-clinical controls in all groups except functional neurological disorder (FND). This effect was largest in patients meeting criteria for the dissociative and complex subtypes of PTSD (PTSD-DC), albeit with comparable effect sizes in PTSD, schizophrenia, and to a lesser extent major depressive disorder (analyses of CADSS subscales were not possible due to an insufficient number of studies) (for forest plots, see Figure 2 and Supplementary Materials). Moderate-to-large heterogeneity was present in all groups except PTSD-DC and schizophrenia.

Meta-analyses of psychological techniques for the induction of dissociative states

All induction methods significantly increased state dissociation except negative affect inductions (Table 1, Figure 1b). Mirror-gazing was characterised by a large effect size (*SMD*=0.80), military training, sleep deprivation, and complementary methods (hypnosis and yoga) elicited moderate effects, and the weakest significant effect was found for trauma stimuli inductions (*SMD*=0.35) (for forest plots, see Figure 3 and Supplementary Materials). Moderate-to-large heterogeneity in effect sizes was observed for mirror-gazing, military training, and sleep deprivation. Further analyses suggested that the effects of mirror-gazing were comparable across subdimensions of dissociation but most pronounced for depersonalisation (Table S2) and that the effects of different psychological techniques were comparable across different controls (Table S3).

Table 1. Results of meta-analyses of state dissociation effects (CADSS scores in reference vs. control) as a function of diagnostic group, psychological technique, and pharmacological agent.

Category	*k*	*N*	*SMD*	95% CI	*PIs*	*Z*	*p*	I^2 (%)	T^2	FPA*p*	Outliers
Diagnostic groups											
PTSD-DC	5	426	0.98	[0.70, 1.25]	[0.26, 1.70]	6.93	<.001	29.45	0.03	.36	1
PTSD	11	625	0.97	[0.66, 1.27]	[-0.00, 1.94]	6.22	<.001	64.95	0.16	.008	0
SZ	3	146	0.86	[0.51, 1.21]	-	4.83	<.001	0	0	.34	0
MDD	7	531	0.76	[0.29, 1.22]	[-0.82, 2.34]	3.17	.002	82.04	0.32	.80	0
FND	4	158	0.59	[-0.17, 1.35]	-	1.52	.13	80.59	0.48	.086	0
Psychological techniques											
Mirror-gazing	14	392	0.80	[0.36, 1.24]	[-0.51, 2.11]	3.54	<.001	89.06	0.31	<.001	0
Military training	13	819	0.64	[0.40, 0.88]	[-0.28, 1.56]	5.19	<.001	88.37	0.16	.98	1
Sleep deprivation	3	110	0.56	[0.26, 0.86]	-	3.69	<.001	52.2	0.04	.063	1
Complementary methods	3	232	0.41	[0.14, 0.67]	-	2.99	.003	22.29	0.01	.23	0
Trauma stimuli	26	997	0.35	[0.25, 0.46]	[-0.03, 0.73]	6.58	<.001	44.13	0.03	.70	2
Negative affect stimuli	5	125	0.15	[-0.04, 0.33]	[-0.16, 0.46]	1.59	.11	0	0	.19	1
Pharmacological agents											
Ayahuasca	4	17	2.75	[1.47, 4.02]	-	4.23	<.001	84.52	1.35	<.001	0
Ketamine	91	1,581	1.2	[1.02, 1.38]	[-0.39, 2.79]	13.01	<.001	87.71	0.63	<.001	6
Cannabis	6	139	1.11	[0.70, 1.52]	[-0.30, 2.52]	5.34	<.001	81.62	0.21	.074	0
MDMA	4	36	1.05	[0.49, 1.60]	-	3.71	<.001	72.46	0.23	.003	0
N_2O	10	131	1.00	[0.86, 1.14]	[0.83, 1.17]	13.71	<.001	0	0	.43	0
AZD6765	4	22	0.93	[-0.01, 1.86]	-	1.95	.052	92.75	0.83	<.001	0
Esketamine	14	648	0.74	[0.41, 1.07]	[-0.53, 2.01]	4.41	<.001	89.9	0.31	.036	1
LSD	3	24	0.61	[0.22, 1.01]	-	3.03	.002	59.99	0.07	.027	0
5-MeO-DMT	3	8	0.51	[-0.18, 1.20]	-	1.44	.15	15.72	0.06	.46	0
Lorazepam	5	23	0.34	[0.10, 0.59]	[-0.35, 1.03]	2.73	.006	38.44	0.03	.019	0

Notes. *k* = number of included effect sizes (after removal of outliers); *N* = sample size; *SMD* = standardized mean difference; *PI*s = prediction intervals; I^2 = heterogeneity statistic; T^2 = heterogeneity statistic; FPA*p* = funnel plot asymmetry *p*-value; outliers = number of outliers removed; 5-MeO-DMT = 5-methoxy-N,N-dimethyltryptamine; AZD6765 = lanicemine, NMDA receptor antagonist; FND =

functional neurological disorder; LSD = lysergic acid diethylamide; MDD = major depressive disorder; MDMA = 3,4-methylenedioxy methamphetamine; N_2O = nitrous oxide; PTSD = post-traumatic stress disorder; PTSD-DC = post-traumatic stress disorder - dissociative subtypes and complex subtypes; SZ = schizophrenia. - = analysis not possible due to small *k*.



Figure 1. Results of meta-analyses of state dissociation (CADSS scores) (a) at baseline in diagnostic groups, (b) in response to psychological interventions, and (c) in response to pharmacological agents.

Notes. AZD6765 = lanicemine; CADSS = clinician administered dissociative states scale; FND = functional neurological disorder; LSD = lysergic acid diethylamide; MDD = major depressive disorder; MDMA = 3,4-methylenediozymethamphetamine; PTSD = post-traumatic stress disorder; PTSD-DC = complex PTSD and PTSD dissociative subtype; SMD=Standardised Mean Difference; 5-MeO-DMT = 5-methoxy-N,N-dimethyltryptamine.



Figure 2. Forest plot of *Standardised Mean Differences* (*SMD*s; with 95% Confidence Intervals [CIs]) of baseline state dissociation (CADSS scores) in PTSD relative to controls. Marker sizes reflect study weights with smaller markers denoting smaller study weights.



Figure 3. Forest plot of *Standardised Mean Differences* (*SMD*s; with 95% Confidence Intervals [CIs]) of induced state dissociation (CADSS scores) in response to mirror-gazing relative to a control condition. Marker sizes reflect study weights with smaller markers denoting smaller study weights.

Meta-analyses of pharmacological induction of dissociative states

The analyses of pharmacological agents revealed that multiple agents reliably induced dissociative states, but effect sizes varied considerably (Table 1, Figure 1c). All but two agents (AZD6765 and 5-MeO-DMT) significantly increased state dissociation (for forest plots, see Figure 4 and Supplementary Materials). The largest effect sizes (*SMD*s>1) were observed for ayahuasca, ketamine, cannabis, MDMA, and N_2O; moderate effects (0.60<*SMD*s<0.75) were found for esketamine and LSD; and the weakest effect (*SMD*=0.34) was observed with lorazepam. There was moderate-to-large heterogeneity in all cases except for N_2O, 5-MeO-DMT, and lorazepam. Analyses of subdimensions of dissociation yielded comparable results although the effects were numerically larger for derealisation across all agents (see Table S2). The large number of ketamine effect sizes allowed sub-analyses of different time windows, groups and controls: its dissociative effects were most pronounced around 40-50 minutes post-infusion (*SMD*=1.53), in non-clinical samples (*SMD*=1.83), and in inert placebo-controlled studies (*SMD*=1.79) (Table S4).

Publication bias

Among diagnostic groups and psychological techniques, only the effect sizes for PTSD and mirror-gazing showed significant evidence for funnel plot asymmetry, suggestive of potential publication bias (see Table 1 and Supplementary Materials for funnel plots). By contrast, there was evidence of significant funnel plot asymmetry for all pharmacological agents except cannabis, N_2O, and 5-MeO-DMT. Trim-and-fill analyses involving the estimation and imputation of effect sizes to reduce asymmetry yielded modest changes in effect sizes (Δ*SMD*<|.05|) except for AZD6765 (Δ*SMD*=-0.40), esketamine (Δ*SMD*=-0.08), and schizophrenia (Δ*SMD*=0.14) (see Table S8). All revised *SMD*s remained significant except that for AZD6765 (analyses of CADSS subscales suggested that effect sizes for dissociative amnesia effects were plausibly inflated). These analyses suggest that effect size estimates are potentially inflated for AZD6765 and esketamine but may reflect an underestimate for schizophrenia.



Figure 4. Forest plot of *Standardised Mean Differences* (*SMDs*; with 95% Confidence Intervals [CIs]) of induced state dissociation (CADSS scores) in response to ketamine relative to a control condition. Marker sizes reflect study weights with smaller markers denoting smaller study weights.

Meta-regressions

Our first set of meta-regression analyses compared state dissociation effects across categories in cases where $k \geq 10$ in each category (see Supplementary Table 5). Both mirror-gazing and military training elicited larger increases in state dissociation than exposure to trauma stimuli (Δ*SMD*s>.25), although the former two did not significantly differ. By contrast, there were no significant differences between pharmacological agents, with only a weak trend for a larger dissociation effect for ketamine than esketamine. Induced dissociation effects did not differ from baseline state dissociation effects in PTSD, except in the case of exposure to trauma stimuli, which elicited a significantly weaker dissociative response (Δ*SMD*=-0.55). In comparisons of psychological techniques and pharmacological agents, ketamine and N_2O induced significantly greater state dissociation than military training and trauma stimuli exposure, and esketamine induced greater dissociation than the latter (Δ*SMD*s>.30).

Our final set of meta-regression analyses sought to clarify whether heterogeneity in effect sizes is associated with different methodological features (Supplementary Table 6). Methodological quality scores were not a significant moderator of *SMD*s except for esketamine, where higher methodological quality was associated with lower effect sizes. Whether the CADSS was administered by an experimenter/clinician or completed by self-report did not significantly moderate state dissociation effects. Clinical samples displayed a substantially weaker dissociative response to ketamine than non-clinical samples (Δ*SMD*=-0.98), but the two groups did not significantly differ in other categories. Experimental design did not uniformly moderate effect sizes with larger induction effects for between-groups designs and within-groups designs for ketamine and mirror-gazing, respectively. Induction effects did not differ across different control conditions for psychological techniques. Amongst ketamine studies, effect sizes were significantly lower after 80 minutes than at earlier timepoints and greater in studies employing inert placebo controls than baseline or active drug controls (Δ*SMD*s>0.95) but were not moderated by dose or route of administration (Supplementary Table 7).

Discussion

This meta-analysis sought to quantify, and compare, baseline state dissociation effects in clinical samples and induced state dissociation effects in response to psychological techniques and pharmacological agents. Baseline state dissociation was elevated in multiple diagnostic groups relative to controls but was most pronounced in individuals with PTSD and its dissociative and complex subtypes. Among induction studies,

multiple pharmacological agents elicited pronounced dissociative effects in clinical and non-clinical samples. Mirror-gazing was the most robust psychological technique, closely approximating the dissociative effects of pharmacological agents. These results reinforce state dissociation as a prominent transdiagnostic symptom (2) and demonstrate clinically-significant dissociative states can be reliably induced using a range of methods (10) (9).

Our analyses confirmed the presence of elevated baseline state dissociation across several diagnostic groups. Baseline dissociation was most pronounced in PTSD and its dissociative and complex subtypes, although most studies did not distinguish between PTSD subgroups, which may explain greater heterogeneity of effects in PTSD. Elevated state dissociation in PTSD broadly aligns with previous analyses of *trait* dissociation (2), although our results diverge from the latter analysis insofar as individuals with schizophrenia and depressive disorders displayed comparable, albeit weaker, dissociative effects to PTSD in our analysis. Moreover, whereas individuals with FND have been shown to display high levels of trait dissociation, comparable to PTSD (2, 5), FND was characterised by only moderate levels of state dissociation in our analyses and was the only non-significant diagnostic category. This discrepancy is plausibly attributable to a small number of studies in FND and the greatest heterogeneity among all groups. Although state and trait dissociation are strongly associated, they should be distinguished in research and clinical practice, as state dissociation may indicate more severe psychopathology (25). These results reinforce the importance of measuring dissociation in different diagnostic groups and clinical contexts, particularly given that dissociation may predict broader symptomatology (5-7), and treatment outcomes (26).

Analyses of pharmacological agents revealed that five agents elicited state dissociation effects that were comparable to, or exceeded, baseline dissociation in individuals with PTSD. The most pronounced effects were observed with the serotonergic psychedelic ayahuasca (27), although the effect sizes were heterogeneous and agents with overlapping (serotonergic) profiles (LSD and 5-MeO-DMT; (28)) produced much weaker dissociative effects. Ketamine, cannabis, MDMA, and N_2O elicited similarly large dissociative effects, with the most robust evidence in favour of ketamine and N_2O (NMDAR antagonism; (12), due to larger sample sizes and minimal heterogeneity, respectively. Further analyses suggested that ketamine's dissociative effects are greatest around 40-50 minutes post-infusion and larger in non-clinical samples. Taken together, these results indicate that different types of pharmacological action can produce large dissociative effects. Accordingly, dissociative states might not be associated with the perturbation of a

specific neurochemical system but rather with broader network-level increases in neural signal complexity and changes in intra- and inter-network connectivity that are shared across serotonergic psychedelics and glutamatergic dissociative anaesthetics (29, 30) and potentially with clinical samples (31).

Among psychological techniques for inducing dissociative states, mirror-gazing was the only method yielding comparable dissociative effects to PTSD and pharmacological agents (except ketamine), although the effect sizes were characterised by heterogeneity. The neurocognitive substrates of mirror-gazing remain poorly understood but it may effect dissociative states, particular depersonalisation, through a partial decoupling of visual and cognitive self-referential processing (32). By contrast, stress induction methods used in military/survival training elicited more moderate effects that were larger than those involving trauma and negative affect stimuli, the latter of which was not significant. The greater efficacy of the former methods is plausibly because they function as more uniform stressors than tasks involving different types of stimulus presentation with variable effects across individuals. Techniques targeting awareness and attention (sleep deprivation, complementary methods) also produced moderate dissociative effects. Although typically viewed as a consequence of stress (1, 3), these results cumulatively indicate that dissociative states can be reliably induced through a variety of methods including by modulating awareness, perception, and sleep and highlight the need for direct comparisons of these methods (1) (9).

The observed state dissociation effects have direct implications for the development of an experimental model of dissociation (33). The cumulative data point to the efficacy of mirror-gazing relative to stress induction methods, given that it produces greater dissociative effects and is less likely to trigger adverse events (34) (9). Our results highlight ketamine and N_2O as the most robust pharmacological agents for inducing dissociation; the latter is arguably better suited to experimental research given that its low blood solubility elicits rapid induction and termination effects (10, 35). Further neurophysiological research directly comparing different methods is necessary to understand the extent to which these methods have overlapping and distinct neurocognitive substrates. Preliminary trends suggest that pharmacological agents and mirror-gazing may differentially impact derealization and depersonalisation; targeting these seemingly divergent patterns could be beneficial in elucidating the neural correlates of subdimensions of dissociation (36). Development of experimental models of dissociation will also require greater attention to the temporal dynamics of, and dosing effects on, state dissociation, which are poorly understood apart from ketamine. Our analyses suggest that clinical samples display weaker dissociative responses to ketamine and previous

research points to trait dissociation as a predictor of such responses (26); further attention to the sources of individual differences in response to induction methods is necessary. Finally, although our meta-analysis demonstrates that mirror-gazing and multiple pharmacological agents can induce dissociative states that are comparable to those observed in PTSD, further research is required to assess their clinical relevance in comparison to dissociative effects in diagnostic groups.

Limitations

The principal limitations of this meta-analysis concern limited available data in specific categories and methodological weaknesses in the original studies. Many categories included a small number of effect sizes, thereby limiting the precision of our estimates and preventing us from examining sources of heterogeneity. Our choice to restrict our analyses to studies using the CADSS facilitated comparisons across categories but may have excluded important research with other validated instruments (16). Aside from ketamine, studies did not report state dissociation at multiple time points, thereby disenabling systematic analyses of peak dissociation effects. Similarly, only a small minority of studies included trait dissociation measures, which prevented us from assessing their value in predicting dissociation induction effects (26). We were unable to examine the potential confounding effects of concurrent psychotropic medication in clinical samples. Most studies reported drug doses as mg/kg, which does not account for individual differences in drug absorption, metabolism, distribution, and excretion (37), leading to variability in plasma concentrations and dissociative effects that could not be captured in our ketamine dose analyses. Many of the agents we analysed elicit broader psychotomimetic effects (e.g., hallucinations) that could overshadow more subtle dissociative responses (10, 12, 27), thereby potentially limiting the measurement reliability of state dissociation (38). State dissociation was alternately measured *peri*-induction (most pharmacological agents) or post-induction (most psychological techniques), which may introduce different response biases that were not captured in our analyses. Relatedly, most of the original studies are potentially confounded by demand characteristics and potential placebo effects as participants are likely to become unblinded to experimental conditions due to psychoactive effects (39). We planned to probe this in our pre-registered analyses by examining the presence of suggestions for dissociative responses during procedures, but this information was not reliably reported and could not be analysed. Insofar as dissociation was typically measured as a secondary outcome or adverse event (13), these types of biases may be less pronounced than for psychedelic effects but further

consideration of this issue is warranted, such as through the use of active drug controls, stringent reporting of suggestion effects, and statistical corrections for unblinding effects (40).

Summary and conclusions

This meta-analysis confirmed that state dissociation is a transdiagnostic symptom present in multiple psychiatric conditions that can be reliably induced using different pharmacological agents as well as mirror-gazing. These findings have direct implications for the experimental modelling of dissociation in controlled research, the search for neurophysiological markers of dissociation, and the assessment of adverse events and treatment outcomes in psychopharmacological interventions involving NMDAR antagonists and classic psychedelics.

References

1. Lynn SJ, Polizzi C, Merckelbach H, Chiu CD, Maxwell R, van Heugten D, Lilienfeld SO. Dissociation and Dissociative Disorders Reconsidered: Beyond Sociocognitive and Trauma Models Toward a Transtheoretical Framework. Annu Rev Clin Psychol. 2022;18:259-289.

2. Lyssenko L, Schmahl C, Bockhacker L, Vonderlin R, Bohus M, Kleindienst N. Dissociation in Psychiatric Disorders: A Meta-Analysis of Studies Using the Dissociative Experiences Scale. Am J Psychiatry. 2018;175:37-46.

3. Lebois LAM, Harnett NG, van Rooij SJH, Ely TD, Jovanovic T, Bruce SE, House SL, Ravichandran C, Dumornay NM, Finegold KE, Hill SB, Merker JB, Phillips KA, Beaudoin FL, An X, Neylan TC, Clifford GD, Linnstaedt SD, Germine LT, Rauch SL, Haran JP, Storrow AB, Lewandowski C, Musey PI, Jr., Hendry PL, Sheikh S, Jones CW, Punches BE, Swor RA, McGrath ME, Hudak LA, Pascual JL, Seamon MJ, Datner EM, Chang AM, Pearson C, Domeier RM, Rathlev NK, O'Neil BJ, Sergot P, Sanchez LD, Miller MW, Pietrzak RH, Joormann J, Barch DM, Pizzagalli DA, Sheridan JF, Smoller JW, Luna B, Harte SE, Elliott JM, Kessler RC, Koenen KC, McLean SA, Stevens JS, Ressler KJ. Persistent Dissociation and Its Neural Correlates in Predicting Outcomes After Trauma Exposure. Am J Psychiatry. 2022;179:661-672.

4. Polizzi CP, Aksen DE, Lynn SJ. Quality of life, emotion regulation, and dissociation: Evaluating unique relations in an undergraduate sample and probable PTSD subsample. Psychol Trauma. 2022;14:107-115.

5. Campbell MC, Smakowski A, Rojas-Aguiluz M, Goldstein LH, Cardena E, Nicholson TR, Reinders A, Pick S. Dissociation and its biological and clinical associations in functional neurological disorder: systematic review and meta-analysis. BJPsych Open. 2022;9:e2.

6. Bloomfield MAP, Chang T, Woodl MJ, Lyons LM, Cheng Z, Bauer-Staeb C, Hobbs C, Bracke S, Kennerley H, Isham L, Brewin C, Billings J, Greene T, Lewis G. Psychological processes mediating the association between developmental trauma and specific psychotic symptoms in adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis. World Psychiatry. 2021;20:107-123.

7. Longden E, Branitsky A, Moskowitz A, Berry K, Bucci S, Varese F. The Relationship Between Dissociation and Symptoms of Psychosis: A Meta-analysis. Schizophr Bull. 2020;46:1104-1113.

8. Bae H, Kim D, Park YC. Dissociation predicts treatment response in eye-movement desensitization and reprocessing for posttraumatic stress disorder. J Trauma Dissociation. 2016;17:112-130.

9. Sleight FG, McDOnald, C. W., Mattson, R., Lynn, S. J.: Inducing dissociative states: A (re)view from the laboratory. 2024.

10. Piazza GG, Iskandar G, Hennessy V, Zhao H, Walsh K, McDonnell J, Terhune DB, Das RK, Kamboj SK. Pharmacological modelling of dissociation and psychosis: an evaluation of the Clinician Administered Dissociative States Scale and Psychotomimetic States Inventory during nitrous oxide ('laughing gas')-induced anomalous states. Psychopharmacology (Berl). 2022;239:2317-2329.

11. Roydeva MI, Reinders A. Biomarkers of Pathological Dissociation: A Systematic Review. Neurosci Biobehav Rev. 2021;123:120-202.

12. Kalmoe MC, Janski AM, Zorumski CF, Nagele P, Palanca BJ, Conway CR. Ketamine and nitrous oxide: The evolution of NMDA receptor antagonists as antidepressant agents. J Neurol Sci. 2020;412:116778.

13. Short B, Fong J, Galvez V, Shelker W, Loo CK. Side-effects associated with ketamine use in depression: a systematic review. Lancet Psychiatry. 2018;5:65-78.

14. Johnston JN, Kadriu B, Allen J, Gilbert JR, Henter ID, Zarate CA, Jr. Ketamine and serotonergic psychedelics: An update on the mechanisms and biosignatures underlying rapid-acting antidepressant treatment. Neuropharmacology. 2023;226:109422.

15. Bremner JD, Krystal JH, Putnam FW, Southwick SM, Marmar C, Charney DS, Mazure CM. Measurement of dissociative states with the Clinician-Administered Dissociative States Scale (CADSS). J Trauma Stress. 1998;11:125-136.

16. Wainipitapong S, Millman, L. S. M., Wieder, L., Terhune, D., Pick, S.: Assessing dissociation: a systematic review and evaluation of existing measures. 2024.

17. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, Shamseer L, Tetzlaff JM, Akl EA, Brennan SE, Chou R, Glanville J, Grimshaw JM, Hrobjartsson A, Lalu MM, Li T, Loder EW, Mayo-Wilson E, McDonald S, McGuinness LA, Stewart LA, Thomas J, Tricco AC, Welch VA, Whiting P, Moher D. The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. J Clin Epidemiol. 2021;134:178-189.

18. Wieder L, Brown RJ, Thompson T, Terhune DB. Hypnotic suggestibility in dissociative and related disorders: A meta-analysis. Neurosci Biobehav Rev. 2022;139:104751.

19. Thompson T, Terhune DB, Oram C, Sharangparni J, Rouf R, Solmi M, Veronese N, Stubbs B. The effectiveness of hypnosis for pain relief: A systematic review and meta-analysis of 85 controlled experimental trials. Neurosci Biobehav Rev. 2019;99:298-310.

20. Viechtbauer W, Cheung MW. Outlier and influence diagnostics for meta-analysis. Res Synth Methods. 2010;1:112-125.

21. IntHout J, Ioannidis JP, Rovers MM, Goeman JJ. Plea for routinely presenting prediction intervals in meta-analysis. BMJ Open. 2016;6:e010247.

22. Riley RD, Higgins JP, Deeks JJ. Interpretation of random effects meta-analyses. BMJ. 2011;342:d549.

23. Egger M, Davey Smith G, Schneider M, Minder C. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. BMJ. 1997;315:629-634.

24. Duval S, Tweedie R. Trim and fill: A simple funnel-plot-based method of testing and adjusting for publication bias in meta-analysis. Biometrics. 2000;56:455-463.

25. Salmon AP, Nicol K, Kaess M, Jovev M, Betts JK, Chanen AM. Associations of state or trait dissociation with severity of psychopathology in young people with borderline personality disorder. Borderline Personal Disord Emot Dysregul. 2023;10:20.

26. Niciu MJ, Shovestul BJ, Jaso BA, Farmer C, Luckenbaugh DA, Brutsche NE, Park LT, Ballard ED, Zarate CA, Jr. Features of dissociation differentially predict antidepressant response to ketamine in treatment-resistant depression. J Affect Disord. 2018;232:310-315.

27. Ruffell SGD, Crosland-Wood M, Palmer R, Netzband N, Tsang W, Weiss B, Gandy S, Cowley-Court T, Halman A, McHerron D, Jong A, Kennedy T, White E, Perkins D, Terhune DB, Sarris J. Ayahuasca: A review of historical, pharmacological, and therapeutic aspects. PCN Rep. 2023;2:e146.

28. Warren AL, Lankri D, Cunningham MJ, Serrano IC, Parise LF, Kruegel AC, Duggan P, Zilberg G, Capper MJ, Havel V, Russo SJ, Sames D, Wacker D. Structural pharmacology and therapeutic potential of 5-methoxytryptamines. Nature. 2024;630:237-246.

29. Rajpal H, Mediano PAM, Rosas FE, Timmermann CB, Brugger S, Muthukumaraswamy S, Seth AK, Bor D, Carhart-Harris RL, Jensen HJ. Psychedelics and schizophrenia: Distinct alterations to Bayesian inference. Neuroimage. 2022;263:119624.

30. Dai R, Larkin TE, Huang Z, Tarnal V, Picton P, Vlisides PE, Janke E, McKinney A, Hudetz AG, Harris RE, Mashour GA. Classical and non-classical psychedelic drugs induce common network changes in human cortex. Neuroimage. 2023;273:120097.

31. Lebois LAM, Li M, Baker JT, Wolff JD, Wang D, Lambros AM, Grinspoon E, Winternitz S, Ren J, Gonenc A, Gruber SA, Ressler KJ, Liu H, Kaufman ML. Large-Scale Functional Brain Network Architecture Changes Associated With Trauma-Related Dissociation. Am J Psychiatry. 2021;178:165-173.

32. Mash J, Jenkinson PM, Dean CE, Laws KR. Strange face illusions: A systematic review and quality analysis. Conscious Cogn. 2023;109:103480.

33. Lynn SJ, Maxwell R, Merckelbach H, Lilienfeld SO, Kloet DVH, Miskovic V. Dissociation and its disorders: Competing models, future directions, and a way forward. Clin Psychol Rev. 2019;73:101755.

34. Noack H, Nolte L, Nieratschker V, Habel U, Derntl B. Imaging stress: an overview of stress induction methods in the MR scanner. J Neural Transm (Vienna). 2019;126:1187-1202.

35. Collado V, Nicolas E, Faulks D, Hennequin M. A review of the safety of 50% nitrous oxide/oxygen in conscious sedation. Expert Opin Drug Saf. 2007;6:559-571.

36. Hack LM, Zhang X, Heifets BD, Suppes T, van Roessel PJ, Yesavage JA, Gray NJ, Hilton R, Bertrand C, Rodriguez CI, Deisseroth K, Knutson B, Williams LM. Ketamine's acute effects on negative brain states are mediated through distinct altered states of consciousness in humans. Nat Commun. 2023;14:6631.

37. Hanks F, Phillips, B., Barton, G., Hakes, L., & McKenzie, C. How critical illness impacts drug pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics. . The Pharmaceutical Journal. 2022;308.

38. Schwenk ES, Viscusi ER, Buvanendran A, Hurley RW, Wasan AD, Narouze S, Bhatia A, Davis FN, Hooten WM, Cohen SP. Consensus Guidelines on the Use of Intravenous Ketamine Infusions for Acute Pain Management From the American Society of Regional Anesthesia and Pain

Medicine, the American Academy of Pain Medicine, and the American Society of Anesthesiologists. Reg Anesth Pain Med. 2018;43:456-466.

39. Burke MJ, Blumberger DM. Caution at psychiatry's psychedelic frontier. Nat Med. 2021;27:1687-1688.

40. Szigeti B, Nutt D, Carhart-Harris R, Erritzoe D. The difference between 'placebo group' and 'placebo control': a case study in psychedelic microdosing. Sci Rep. 2023;13:12107.