Prevalence of Clinically Actionable Cerebrospinal Fluid Abnormalities in First Episode Psychosis: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis

Anjali Chandra, MD[1]; Laura Duque, MD[2] (0000-0002-6354-0720); Andrew Pines, MD, MA[1] (ORCID: 0000-0001-6968-2829); Anne Fladger, MLIS[3], Giovanna S. Manzano, MD, MSc[4†] (ORCID: 0000-0002-9991-9222 Michael E. Benros, MD, PhD[5, 6] (ORCID: 0000-0003-4939-9465); Graham Blackman, MRCPsych, PhD (ORCID: 0000-0001-7025-8670)[7,8*]; Matthew L. Baum, MD, PhD, DPhil (ORCID: 0000-0001-6840-8932) [1*]

1: Department of Psychiatry, Brigham and Women's Hospital; Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA
2: Division of Neuropsychiatry and Neuromodulation, Massachusetts General Hospital; Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA USA; Department of Psychiatry, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA (Current Address)
3: Harvard Countway Library, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA
4: Department of Neurology, Mass General Brigham; Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA
5: Copenhagen Research Centre for Biological and Precision Psychiatry, Mental Health Centre Copenhagen, Copenhagen University Hospital, Copenhagen, Denmark
6: Department of Clinical Medicine, Faculty of Health and Medical Sciences, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark
7: Department of Psychiatry, Warneford Hospital, University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom
8: Department of Psychosis Studies, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, King's College London, London, United Kingdom
†: Current address, Department of Neurology, University of California Irvine, Orange, CA, USA

*Joint senior authors

Contact Information:
Matthew L Baum, MD, PhD, DPhil, mbaum@bwh.harvard.edu, Department of Psychiatry, 60 Fenwood Road, Boston MA 02115

Word Count: 3615

Declaration of Interest

MLB receives royalties from Oxford University Press for his book, "The Neuroethics of Biomarkers: What the Development of Biopreditction Means for Moral Responsibility, Justice, and the Nature of Mental Disorder". LD, GB, GM, MEB have no disclosures

Key Points

Question: What is the prevalence of clinically actionable cerebrospinal fluid abnormalities in first-episode psychosis (FEP)?

Findings: In this systematic review and meta-analysis including 3330 patients with FEP who systematically received a lumbar puncture, at least 7.1% had a clinically-relevant abnormality detected in the cerebrospinal fluid; prevalence of oligoclonal bands was 7.1%, pleocytosis was 3.2%, anti-NMDAR antibodies were 2.3%, and other anti-neuronal antibodies were 0.4%. Subgroup-analysis identified association between prior suspicion of secondary causes and prevalence-estimates.

Meaning: Lumbar puncture detects clinically-relevant abnormalities in FEP at a similar rate to brain MRI and may be especially informative when there is heightened suspicion for secondary psychosis.

Abstract

Importance

First-episode psychosis (FEP) may result from a variety of secondary etiologies, making lumbar puncture (LP) for cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) investigations an important diagnostic consideration in this context. However, the lack of high-quality evidence on the prevalence of clinically-relevant CSF abnormalities hampers clinical consensus on when to pursue LP in FEP.

Objective

Determine a meta-analytic estimate of the prevalence of clinically-relevant CSF abnormalities in FEP.

Data Sources

Electronic databases Ovid, Medline, Embase, PsychoINFO, and Web of Science were searched from inception to October, 2024. References of included articles were also screened.

Study Selection

We included studies that performed LP on a cohort of FEP and reported results of clinically available CSF analysis, enabling prevalence-estimates of abnormalities.

Data Extraction and Synthesis

Data was extracted following PRISMA and MOOSE guidelines. Pooled prevalences were calculated by random-effects models. Moderators were tested using meta-regression analysis, and heterogeneity assessed by I^2 index.

Main Outcomes and Measures

Prevalence of CSF abnormalities, focusing on clinically-relevant markers and number needed to assess (NNA).

Results

Thirty-seven papers comprising 3,330 FEP patients who underwent LP were included, allowing calculation of prevalence-estimates for 12 CSF abnormalities. Of clinically-relevant abnormalities, the prevalence of CSF-restricted oligoclonal bands (OCB2) was 7.1% (95% CI 3.3-12.0, NNA 14), pleocytosis was 3.2% (95% CI 2.1-4.4, NNA 31) and anti-NMDAR antibodies was 2.3% (95% CI 0.1-6.4, NNA 43). Subgroup analysis showed that anti-neuronal antibodies were mainly detected in studies that selected patients with high suspicion of secondary causes and were low in studies which excluded patients with a high index of suspicion of a secondary cause, based on clinical and ancillary testing. OCBs and pleocytosis also had higher prevalence in the high-suspicion subgroup but were still detected at prevalence even in the low-suspicion subgroup.

Conclusions and Relevance

The meta-analytic estimate of the prevalence of the most common clinically relevant CSF abnormality was 7.1%, which is similar to the prevalence of finding any clinically-relevant radiologic abnormality with an MRI brain. Subgroup-analysis supports the usefulness of methods

97 to estimate the pre-LP probability of clinically-relevant CSF abnormalities, albeit these methods
98 are better applied for some abnormalities (CNS-reactive antibodies) than others (OCB2).

Introduction

Approximately 3 to 4 out of 100 people will experience a first episode of psychosis (FEP) in their lifetime[1]. Careful clinical assessment and use of ancillary diagnostic procedures is used to identify the subgroup of these cases that have secondary causes, including toxic, neurologic, metabolic, or autoimmune dysfunction, which carry distinct treatment and prognostic implications.[2] Because some causes of secondary psychosis may yield detectable abnormalities in the cerebrospinal fluid, lumbar puncture (LP) is sometimes considered in the evaluation of FEP. Lumbar puncture (LP) is a well-established general medical procedure with a high sensitivity and specificity for detection of neuroinflammation [3–6] , but its clinical utility remains uncertain for the evaluation of FEP. While many posit that LP should be restricted to cases where there exists a high suspicion of neuroinflammation (i.e., autoimmune encephalitis), supported by clinical red flags or abnormalities on MRI brain, EEG, or serum auto-antibody testing[3,4,6–9], others support incorporating LP into routine testing of FEP[10].

The lack of international consensus regarding the role of LP in the evaluation of FEP is likely driven, in part, by the absence of high-quality estimates of the prevalence of clinically relevant cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) abnormalities in this population. Existing reports of such abnormalities are derived from individual studies with limited statistical power. [3,8]

Although there have been systematic reviews and meta-analyses[11,12] that have examined the proportion of patients with psychosis who have CSF alterations, usefulness in general clinical practice is limited by the fact that they focused on cohorts in which secondary causes had already been exhaustively excluded (e.g., Pavel et al., Campana et al., Warren et al.). Evaluating the clinical utility of CSF analysis for FEP requires inclusion not only of these types of patients, but also of patients with undifferentiated FEP early in presentation, as well as those that might have some symptoms or signs concerning for secondary causes — these groups represent the types of cases seen at primary care offices, emergency rooms, general medical hospitals, not just the types of cases seen at specialized primary psychosis treatment programs after they have had a comprehensive workup to rule out secondary causes.

In this study, we sought to generate the first comprehensive meta-analytic estimate of the prevalence of clinically relevant CSF abnormalities in FEP. We also sought to explore how the prevalence of CSF abnormalities varied based on the *a priori* suspicion of an underlying secondary cause by grouping studies according to whether they were based on: (1) unselected FEP samples recruited solely on the basis of first-episode psychosis, regardless of whether there was a clinical suspicion for a secondary cause, (2) FEP samples with a high-clinical suspicion for a secondary cause and (3) FEP samples with low-clinical suspicion for a secondary cause.

Methods

We performed a systematic review and meta-analysis according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses (PRISMA) and Meta-Analysis of Observational

Studies in Epidemiology (MOOSE) guidelines[13–15]. The study was prospectively registered on PROSPERO (CRD42024577715). A comprehensive search of Ovid MEDLINE, Embase, Web of Science, and PsychInfo was conducted up to October 2024. References of included articles and reviews were also searched. After the automated removal of duplicate papers, a title and abstract screen was performed by two independent raters, followed by a full-text review. For further details on the search strategy, eligibility criteria, and method for data extraction, quality assessment, heterogeneity assessment, and sensitivity analyses, see eMethods.

Outcomes

Only CSF tests that were clinically available (as defined by inclusion in either of the catalogs of 2 major clinical laboratories, the Mayo Clinic Laboratories and Associated Regional and University Pathologists (ARUP) Laboratories). For consistency across studies, a common threshold was used to define an abnormal test result based on established, aligned cutoff values used by these two laboratories. For example, studies varied in the cutoff used for pleocytosis; we used >5 WBCs, which is the cut-off established by Mayo Clinic laboratories. Studies that only reported research-grade assays and continuous variables (that did not enable prevalence-estimates) were excluded. We performed meta-analytic estimates for any CSF tests that were reported by ≥3 studies. A subset CSF abnormalities were highlighted as clinically-relevant based on expert clinical opinion[4]: pleocytosis, OCB2, and antibodies associated with autoimmune encephalitis (anti-NMDAR antibodies, GAD65 antibodies, LGI1 antibodies, AMPAR antibodies, CASPR antibodies, GABAR antibodies, and Yo antibodies).

Statistical Analysis

The overall prevalence of CSF abnormalities amongst FEP patients was calculated within each study along with a 95% confidence interval. Meta-analytic estimates were calculated for abnormalities that were reported in 3 or more studies. A random-effects model using the DerSimonian and Laird method was performed[16]. We opted to use a random-effects model as we anticipated methodological heterogeneity between studies. All analyses were performed using R 4.4.1 with meta-analyses performed using meta, metafor and metainf. Number needed to assess (NNA) for each of the abnormalities as defined by 1/proportion. We aimed to calculate relative risk of any CSF abnormalities that were reported in 3 or more studies that also had healthy controls. Additional details regarding statistical methods are included in eMethods.

Subgroup Analyses

Where there were sufficient data (i.e. 6 or more studies)[17], we performed subgroup analysis of 3 cohort types: (1) Unselected FEP cohorts that included all individuals with first-episode psychosis, irrespective of clinical suspicion for a secondary cause, (2) cohorts that selected for patients with a high-clinical suspicion for a secondary cause and (3) studies that specifically excluded patients with high-clinical suspicion for secondary causes. In addition, for covariates that had data from at least 6 studies, meta-regression was used to examine their effects; only age and publication year met these criteria[17].

Results

Search Results and Study Selection

The search strategy resulted in 2,476 publications. After the removal of duplicates, screening of title and abstracts, 257 papers were reviewed in full. eFigure 1 shows the PRISMA flow chart and additional details are in eMethods.

Study Characteristics

There were 38 eligible papers[4,6,11–50]; reporting findings from 32 cohorts identified. See eTable 1 in Supplement 1 for detailed study characteristics. Papers were published between 1978 and 2024, reporting a total sample of 3,680 FEP patients. One paper was excluded due to high risk of bias[42] resulting in 37 papers being included with 3,330 unique patients. Only 3 papers reported healthy control comparison groups[19,34,52]. Studies were conducted in the following regions: Europe (n=28), North America (n=6), and Asia (n=4). While all patients within these studies received an LP, studies selected their patient population in different ways.19 papers had cohorts that excluded patients with suspicion for secondary causes for FEP (e.g. suspected autoimmune encephalitis), 5 papers selected for patients with a high suspicion for secondary causes, 2 papers had cohorts that were separable into a discrete high-suspicion group and discrete low-suspicion group, and the remaining 12 papers were based on an undifferentiated sample. Studies were not uniform in how they determined high or low suspicion for secondary psychoses with different clinical or ancillary testing used (see eTable 3 for details of individual methods).

Participant Characteristics

FEP sample sizes ranged from 13 to 332. Mean age ranged from 20-49 years. The median proportion of female was 42% (IQR 20.1 to 57.5). Duration of untreated psychosis ranged from 4 to 103.8 weeks. Practice settings included: inpatient psychiatric unit at an academic medical center (18), inpatient psychiatry and neurology unit within a general hospital, research ward or unspecified setting (8), mixed setting spanning inpatient units, a neurological center, and outpatient settings (3), acute (emergency) psychiatry (2), and finally, academic medical center (1).

Characteristics of CSF analysis

Assays reported in 3 or more studies were CSF IgG index, protein, OCBs Type 2, Type 3, Type 4, and Type 5, Cell Count (both studies using the more stringent WBC >5, and studies using WBC≥5), anti-NMDAR antibodies, GAD65 antibodies, LGI1 antibodies, AMPAR antibodies, CASPR antibodies, GABAR antibodies, and Yo antibodies.

Quality Assessment and Risk of Bias

Twenty-four cohorts were low risk of bias, 7 were medium risk of bias, and 1 was high risk of bias[42] (and was therefore excluded).

Prevalence of clinically relevant CSF abnormalities

Pleocytosis (defined as > 5WBCs) (Figure 1a) had a prevalence of 3.2% (95% CI 2.1-4.4, n=1087), a number needed to assess (NNA) of 31, and an I^2 of 0.0%. OCBs restricted to the CSF

226 (Type 2)[58] (Figure 1b) had a prevalence of 7.1% (95% CI 3.6-11.7, n=1400), a NNA of 14, and an
227 I^2 of 84.8%. Anti-NMDAR antibodies (Figure 1c) had a prevalence of 2.3% (95% CI 0.1-6.4,
228 n=1279), a NNA of 43, and an I^2 of 87.1%. Yo antibodies (eFigure 2a) had a prevalence of 0.4%
229 (95% CI 0 to 1.7, I^2 14.3%, n=367). GAD65, LGI1 antibodies, AMPAR, CASPR, and GABAR
230 antibodies (eFigure 2) all had a prevalence of 0% (95% CI 0 to 0.3, I^2 0.0%, n=507 [GAD65],
231 n=359 [LGI1], n=395 [AMPAR and GABABR], n = 365 [CASPR]) in the CSF.
232
233 Prevalences of other CSF abnormalities (eFigure 2)
234 Elevated CSF IgG index had a prevalence of 5.4% (95% CI of 1.1 – 11.6, I^2 78.6%, n=526). Type
235 3 OCBs had a prevalence of 6.1% (95% CI 3.3 – 9.5, I^2 53.0%, n=546), Type 4 OCBs had a
236 prevalence of 9.6% (95% CI 3.1 – 19.0, I^2 92.4%, n=717), and Type 5 OCBs had a prevalence of
237 0% (95% CI 0 - 0.5, I^2 0.0%, n=338). Prevalence of elevated albumin was 19.5% (95% CI 14.7 -
238 24.7, I^2 58.5%, n=782) and elevated total protein was 18.7% (95% CI 9.7 to 29.5, I^2 93.5%, n =
239 1,194).
240
241 Relative Risk of CSF Abnormalities
242 Relative risk was not calculated as there were ≤ 3 study cohorts with healthy control groups
243 reporting values for any given test[19,34,52].

244

245 Subgroup Analyses
246 Subgroup analyses are shown in Figure 2. The prevalence of pleocytosis (WBC>5) was 3.1%
247 (95% CI 1.9-4.6, k=5, I^2 0%, n=742) amongst studies that excluded cases with clinical suspicion
248 of secondary causes. Subgroup estimates could not be made for the undifferentiated or high
249 clinical suspicion subgroups because each had less than 3 studies.
250
251 The prevalence of OCB2 was 14.9% (95% CI 2.3-34.2, k=4, I^2 92.9%, n=390) amongst studies
252 that excluded cases with clinical suspicion of secondary causes. Prevalence was 3.6% (95% CI
253 2.2- 5.3, k=5, I^2 14.6%, n=713) amongst studies that did not include or exclude cases based on
254 clinical suspicion of secondary causes. Prevalence was 13.8% (95% CI 0.6-36.4, k=4, I^2 88.3%,
255 n=178) for the high clinical suspicion subgroup.
256
257 The prevalence of anti-NMDAR antibodies was 0% amongst studies that excluded cases with
258 clinical suspicion of secondary causes (95% CI 0.0-0.0%, I^2 0%, n=668), was 1.3% (95% CI 0.3
259 to 2.8, k=3, I^2=0%, n=452) amongst studies that did not include or exclude cases based on clinical
260 suspicion of secondary causes, and was 23.1% (95% CI 3.7-50.2, k=7, I^2=92.7%, n=230) in the
261 subgroup with high clinical suspicion of secondary causes.
262

263 Influence of Potential Effect-Modifiers and Publication Effects

264 Meta-regression found year of publication did not have a significant effect on pleocytosis (p =
265 0.46) but was associated with reduced OCB2 (p < 0.0001) and anti-NMDAR antibodies (p <
266 0.005). No statistically significant associations were identified for age for pleocytosis (p = 0.82),

OCB2 ($p = 0.27$), or anti-NMDAR antibodies ($p = 0.93$). Leave-one-out analyses showed general stability of pooled prevalence and heterogeneity estimates, suggesting that the overall results are not driven by any individual dataset (Fig. 3A). Funnel plots (Fig. 3B) showed no significant asymmetry by Egger's test for pleocytosis ($p = 0.71$) but did show significant asymmetry for OCB2 and anti-NMDAR antibodies ($p < 0.0001$), suggesting the latter may have small-study effects or publication bias (e.g., small studies tended to have higher prevalence of anti-NMDAR antibodies), or that studies included populations with different a priori risks of OCB2 or anti-NMDAR antibodies

Discussion

We report the first comprehensive meta-analytic prevalence-estimates of clinically relevant cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) abnormalities in patients with first-episode psychosis (FEP).

The most common finding was OCB2 (7.1%), followed by pleocytosis (3.2%), anti-NMDAR antibodies (2.3%) and other anti-neuronal antibodies (0.4%). The presence of pleocytosis, CSF auto-antibodies[4,59], or OBC2 may alter prognosis or management in the appropriate clinical context, including consideration of further ancillary testing or immunomodulatory treatments that would not form part of the normal treatment pathway of a primary psychotic disorder[60,61]. At 7.1%, the prevalence of OCB2 in FEP is comparable to the prevalence of a clinically relevant abnormality on MRI brain based on recent meta-analytic estimates[62]. As another benchmark for reference, CT head has an estimated diagnostic yield close to 0% in the workup of FEP[63]. The prevalence of OCBs in cryptogenic epilepsies (8%) and acute-Covid related neurological symptoms (2%), for which LP are sometimes pursued, suggest that lumbar puncture should be considered as part of the clinical workup in FEP.

The current initial workup for FEP varies between hospital systems but often includes serum laboratory testing, with the addition of neuroimaging and EEG[64] in some centers. Though lumbar puncture is not often included as a part of this initial workup, outside of a few hospital systems in Germany (as per the Freiburg diagnostic protocol for FEP[65]), it is often recommended in cases whether there is a heightened suspicion of autoimmune encephalitis based upon clinical history, exam, and/or other testing results[3]. Subgroup analyses in our analyses suggested that including, or excluding patients with high clinical suspicion for secondary psychosis makes a substantial difference to the detection of anti-neuronal antibodies. Prevalence of anti-NMDAR antibodies was an order of magnitude higher in the high-clinical suspicion group (23.1%) compared to samples with undifferentiated FEP (1.3%). In contrast they were undetectable in samples which excluded high-suspicion individuals. These observations suggest that thorough clinical assessment is important, and LP might be viewed as a critical diagnostic tool in people with FEP and high suspicion for secondary causes; an important technical caveat being, however, that the methods studies used to define high suspicion differed (see supplementary materials).

The prevalence of OCBs was marginally higher in the high-clinical suspicion group (13.8%) than in an undifferentiated FEP group (3.6%), studies that excluded patients considered high risk of a secondary psychosis did not have lower prevalence (14.9%);This suggests that the clinical

305 protocols for determining low suspicion groups did not effectively exclude some clinically relevant
306 CSF abnormalities.

307 Our results also raise the question of what should be the clinical role of LP in FEP. Although the
308 prevalence of CSF abnormalities in FEP provides critical information, there are other important
309 factors to consider prior to determining the clinical place of LP in FEP such as safety, acceptability,
310 cost, and accessibility. LPs are generally safe procedures, even amongst other vulnerable
311 populations such as patients with Alzheimer's dementia[67]. The most common iatrogenic risk is
312 post–LP headache[68,69] and the risk of more serious complications is low at 0.20%[70]. A recent
313 meta-analysis found that post-LP headache prevalence can be reduced to 4% with the
314 incorporation of novel methods (i.e., atraumatic needle) as compared to 11% with the
315 conventional method (i.e., traumatic needle)[71]. Acceptance rates of LP amongst patients with
316 psychosis have been estimated at 66%, with acceptance influenced by factors such as informative
317 patient education, perceived risk of invasiveness, and perceived necessity[72,73] Formal cost-benefit
318 analyses of LP in FEP are lacking, though there has been one USA-based study on cost-
319 effectiveness of serum testing for anti-NMDAR antibodies in all cases of FEP to select high-risk
320 individuals needing LP and CSF analyses for anti-NMDAR antibodies[74]. Accessibility to LP is
321 geographically variable, and patient factors such as having MRI-incompatible implanted device(s)
322 may preclude the accessibility of alternative imaging-guided approaches.

323 Strengths and Limitations

324 A meta-analytic estimate transcends the limits of small individual sample size and study-design
325 variation, thus rising to the highest category of quality by the Oxford Centre for Evidence-Based
326 Medicine criteria (cebm.net). A meta-analysis of prevalence of blood brain barrier disruption in
327 N=531 patients with recent onset psychosis was recently reported[75], outside the dates of our
328 literature search; our meta-analysis has a combined sample nearly seven times larger than this,
329 focuses on the most clinically relevant CSF abnormalities, and has a more comprehensive
330 inclusion of clinical abnormalities. Our study's general strengths include its comprehensive search
331 strategy, adherence to PRISMA and MOOSE guidelines, and rigorous assessment of
332 heterogeneity and publication bias. Subgroup analyses allowed us to explore potential
333 moderators and sources of heterogeneity.

334 However, several limitations also warrant consideration. First, most studies did not include healthy
335 controls, preventing us from being able to explore the relative risk of CSF abnormalities in
336 psychosis. Second, heterogeneity across studies was substantial, with I^2 values exceeding 80%
337 for OCBs and anti-NMDAR antibodies, likely reflecting variability in the included patient
338 populations, diagnostic criteria, and laboratory methods. Moreover, though our study assembled
339 a comparatively large sample size, the low prevalence of some abnormalities still resulted in wide
340 confidence intervals, consistent with previous meta-analyses on prevalence of anti-NMDAR
341 antibodies in serum[76]. Our Egger plot analysis also suggested possible small-study effects, cohort
342 differences, or publication bias of some abnormalities.

343 The majority of studies were from a population representative of patients with FEP, but certain
344 studies had selected patient populations that may be influencing prevalence-estimates. For

example, one study[23] examined only COVID-19 positive patients and another study[39], included patients with high clinical suspicion for "organic" psychosis between 1998 and 2016, but thereafter included all patients with psychosis. Notably, year of publication was associated with declining prevalence of OCBs, pleocytosis and anti-NMDAR antibodies, potentially reflecting advances in diagnostic specificity or changes in patient selection over time. Sometimes we were able to detect differences in reporting; for example, studies differed on the WBC cutoff to define pleocytosis, and we were able to harmonize the cutoff (in this case to greater than 5 WBCs). Other methodological differences in how studies conducted CSF testing were also not able to be accounted for in this study, for example, there increasing attention is being paid to the effect of different methods of anti-neuronal antibody ascertainment[77,78] and studies included here did not use identical methods.

Importantly, as studies did not consistently report individual patient-specific CSF abnormalities, we are not able to generate a pooled prevalence-estimate of likelihood of having *any (i.e at least one)* clinically relevant abnormality. Such information would be informative in practice, for example, as an individual may have a pathogenic process that is evident by detecting abnormality in one of several possible tested components, i.e., a pathogenic neuroimmunological process may show itself in a particular individual with the presence of an autoantibody, inflammatory routine studies, or elevated oligoclonal bands, but not necessarily all of the abnormalities or multiple of the abnormalities concurrently. The conservative estimate of the prevalence of *at least one* clinically relevant CSF abnormality is 7.1%, the rate of OCB2, but the true prevalence of having *any* abnormality is likely higher (e.g. as some people might have pleocytosis but not OCB2s).

Finally, our study was limited to a binary definition of most variables as abnormal or not, and any additional information from magnitude of the abnormality was not captured. For example, for anti-CNS antibodies, many studies reported only presence or absence, though the antibody titer is often important for interpretation.

Conclusion and perspectives

This meta-analysis found the prevalence of clinically-relevant CSF abnormalities in FEP to be at least 7.1%, and therefore comparable to the prevalence of clinically relevant imaging abnormalities via brain MRI. The prevalence of clinically-relevant CSF abnormalities was higher amongst patients with a high clinical suspicion for secondary causes. The findings underscore the need for continued consideration of LP as a diagnostic approach for the evaluation of FEP, and this meta-analytic estimate of CSF abnormality prevalence provides current state-of-the-art evidence to guide the decision whether to pursue LP. Having established the prevalence of clinically relevant CSF abnormalities in FEP, further evidence is needed to determine the clinical utility of lumbar puncture in this patient group, however. This includes research on its diagnostic impact, treatment implications, effects on clinical outcomes, acceptability to patients and clinicians, and cost-effectiveness. Moreover, further studies are needed to compare effectiveness of different diagnostic algorithms for secondary psychoses and to report the clinical outcomes of

patients with CSF abnormalities (especially those without an identified, clinically well-defined auto-antibody), including response to targeted treatments.

Acknowledgements:

Thank you to Tim W. Rattay, MD and Dirk Wildgruber, MD for generously providing further detail of the FEP patients with CSF results from Rattay et. al, 2021, to enable those patients to be included in this meta-analysis. MLB receives royalties from Oxford University Press for the sale of his book, “The Neuroethics of Biomarkers: What the Development of Bioprediction Means for Moral Responsibility, Justice, and the Nature of Mental Disorder.” The authors have no conflicts of interest.

References

1. Perälä J, Suvisaari J, Saarni SI, et al. Lifetime prevalence of psychotic and bipolar I disorders in a general population. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 2007;64(1):19-28. doi:10.1001/archpsyc.64.1.19

2. Blackman G, Byrne R, Gill N, et al. How common is secondary psychosis? Estimates from a systematic review and meta-analysis. *World Psychiatry Off J World Psychiatr Assoc WPA*. 2025;24(1):145-146. doi:10.1002/wps.21292

3. Guasp M, Gine-Serven E, Maudes E, et al. Clinical, Neuroimmunologic, and CSF Investigations in First Episode Psychosis. *Neurology*. 2021;97(1):e61-e75.

4. Graus F, Titulaer MJ, Balu R, et al. A clinical approach to diagnosis of autoimmune encephalitis. *Lancet Neurol*. 2016;15(4):391-404. doi:10.1016/S1474-4422(15)00401-9

5. Husari KS, Dubey D. Autoimmune Epilepsy. *Neurother J Am Soc Exp Neurother*. 2019;16(3):685-702. doi:10.1007/s13311-019-00750-3

6. Basu B, Abboud H. The Use of APE2 Score to Diagnose Autoimmune Encephalitis. *Neurology*. 2024;103(7_Supplement_1).

7. Pollak TA, Lennox BR, Müller S, et al. Autoimmune psychosis: an international consensus on an approach to the diagnosis and management of psychosis of suspected autoimmune origin. *Lancet Psychiatry*. 2020;7(1):93-108. doi:10.1016/S2215-0366(19)30290-1

8. Herken J, Prüss H. Red Flags: Clinical Signs for Identifying Autoimmune Encephalitis in Psychiatric Patients. *Front Psychiatry*. 2017;8:25. doi:10.3389/fpsyt.2017.00025

9. Dubey D, Pittock SJ, McKeon A. Antibody Prevalence in Epilepsy and Encephalopathy score: Increased specificity and applicability. *Epilepsia*. 2019;60(2):367-369. doi:10.1111/epi.14649

10. Endres D, Meixensberger S, Dersch R, et al. Cerebrospinal fluid, antineuronal autoantibody, EEG, and MRI findings from 992 patients with schizophreniform and affective psychosis. *Transl Psychiatry*. 2020;10(1):279. doi:10.1038/s41398-020-00967-3

11. Campana M, Yakimov V, Moussiopoulou J, et al. Association of symptom severity and cerebrospinal fluid alterations in recent onset psychosis in schizophrenia-spectrum disorders - An individual patient data meta-analysis. *Brain Behav Immun*. 2024;119:353-362. doi:10.1016/j.bbi.2024.04.011

12. Warren N, O'Gorman C, Horgan I, et al. Inflammatory cerebrospinal fluid markers in schizophrenia spectrum disorders: A systematic review and meta-analysis of 69 studies with 5710 participants. *Schizophr Res*. 2024;266:24-31. doi:10.1016/j.schres.2024.02.001

13. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*. 2021;372:n71. doi:10.1136/bmj.n71

14. Stroup DF, Berlin JA, Morton SC, et al. Meta-analysis of Observational Studies in EpidemiologyA Proposal for Reporting. *JAMA*. 2000;283(15):2008-2012. doi:10.1001/jama.283.15.2008

15. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *BMJ*. 2009;339:b2535. doi:10.1136/bmj.b2535

16. DerSimonian R, Laird N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials. *Control Clin Trials*. 1986;7(3):177-188. doi:10.1016/0197-2456(86)90046-2

17. Schmid CH, Lau J, McIntosh MW, Cappelleri JC. An empirical study of the effect of the control rate as a predictor of treatment efficacy in meta-analysis of clinical trials. *Stat Med*. 1998;17(17):1923-1942. doi:10.1002/(sici)1097-0258(19980915)17:17%3C1923::aid-sim874%3E3.0.co;2-6

18. Bauer K, Kornhuber J. Blood-cerebrospinal fluid barrier in schizophrenic patients. *Eur Arch Psychiatry Neurol Sci*. 1987;236(5):257-259.

19. Bien CG, Rohleder C, Mueller JK, Bien CI, Koethe D, Leweke FM. Neural Autoantibodies in Cerebrospinal Fluid and Serum in Clinical High Risk for Psychosis, First-Episode Psychosis, and Healthy Volunteers. *Front Psychiatry Front Res Found*. 2021;12:654602.

20. Campana M, Lohrs L, Straus J, et al. Blood-brain barrier dysfunction and folate and vitamin B12 levels in first-episode schizophrenia-spectrum psychosis: a retrospective chart review. *Eur Arch Psychiatry Clin Neurosci*. 2023;273(8):1693-1701.

21. Campana M, Straus J, Munz S, et al. Cerebrospinal Fluid Pathologies in Schizophrenia-Spectrum Disorder-A Retrospective Chart Review. *Schizophr Bull*. 2022;48(1):47-55.

22. Coughlin JM, Wang Y, Ambinder EB, et al. In vivo markers of inflammatory response in recent-onset schizophrenia: a combined study using [(11)C]DPA-713 PET and analysis of CSF and plasma. *Transl Psychiatry Psychiatry*. 2016;6:e777.

23. Du J, Zhou X, Guo Y, Jiang F, Yan M, Zhu Q. Clinical Features and Prognosis of Coronavirus Disease 2019-Related Psychosis: A Retrospective Case Series. *Alpha Psychiatry*. 2023;24(6):276-282.

24. Endres D, Dersch R, Hochstuhl B, et al. Intrathecal Thyroid Autoantibody Synthesis in a Subgroup of Patients With Schizophreniform Syndromes. *J Neuropsychiatry Clin Neurosci*. 2017;29(4):365-374.

25. Endres D, Perlov E, Baumgartner A, et al. Immunological findings in psychotic syndromes: a tertiary care hospital's CSF sample of 180 patients. *Front Hum Neurosci*. 2015;9. doi:10.3389/fnhum.2015200476

26. Endres D, Runge K, Meixensberger S, et al. An observational study on the association of anti-thyroid autoantibodies with clinical, EEG, MRI, FDG-PET, cerebrospinal fluid and anti-neuronal antibody findings in 530 patients with schizophreniform and affective disorders. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*. 2021;131:105320.

27. Endres D, von Zedtwitz K, Matteit I, et al. Spectrum of Novel Anti-Central Nervous System Autoantibodies in the Cerebrospinal Fluid of 119 Patients With Schizophreniform and Affective Disorders. *Biol Psychiatry*. 2022;92(4):261-274. doi:10.1016/j.biopsych.2022.02.010

28. Endres D, von Zedtwitz K, Nickel K, et al. Association of rheumatological markers with neuronal antibodies, cerebrospinal fluid, electroencephalography, and magnetic resonance imaging findings in 224 patients with psychotic syndromes. *Brain Behav Immun*. 2024;119:482-493. doi:10.1016/j.bbi.2024.04.001

29. Gine-Serven E, Martinez-Ramirez M, Boix-Quintana E, et al. Routine cerebrospinal fluid parameters as biomarkers in first-episode psychosis: A prospective observational study. *Prog Neuropsychopharmacol Biol Psychiatry*. 2022;112:110424.

30. Guasp M, Martin-Aguilar L, Sabater L, et al. Neurofilament Light Chain Levels in Anti-NMDAR Encephalitis and Primary Psychiatric Psychosis. *Neurology*. 2022;98(14):e1489-e1498.

31. Hinotsu K, Miyaji C, Yada Y, et al. The validity of atypical psychosis diagnostic criteria to detect anti-NMDA receptor encephalitis with psychiatric symptoms. *Schizophr Res*. 2022;248:292-299.

32. Jeppesen R, Borbye-Lorenzen N, Christensen RHB, et al. Levels of cytokines in the cerebrospinal fluid of patients with psychotic disorders compared to individually matched healthy controls. *Brain Behav Immun*. 2024;117:167-174.

33. Jeppesen R, Nilsson AC, Sorensen NV, Orlovska-Waast S, Christensen RHB, Benros ME. Antineuronal antibodies in cerebrospinal fluid and serum of 104 patients with psychotic disorders compared to 104 individually matched healthy controls. *Schizophr Res*. 2023;252:39-45.

34. Jeppesen R, Orlovska-Waast S, Sørensen NV, Christensen RHB, Benros ME. Cerebrospinal Fluid and Blood Biomarkers of Neuroinflammation and Blood-Brain Barrier in Psychotic Disorders and Individually Matched Healthy Controls. *Schizophr Bull*. 2022;48(6):1206-1216. doi:10.1093/schbul/sbac098

35. Kelleher E, McNamara P, Dunne J, et al. Prevalence of N-Methyl-d-Aspartate Receptor antibody (NMDAR-Ab) encephalitis in patients with first episode psychosis and treatment

497 resistant schizophrenia on clozapine, a population based study. *Schizophr Res*.
498 2020;222:455-461.

499 36. Kranaster L, Koethe D, Hoyer C, Meyer-Lindenberg A, Leweke FM. Cerebrospinal fluid
500 diagnostics in first-episode schizophrenia. *Eur Arch Psychiatry Clin Neurosci*.
501 2011;261(7):529-530.

502 37. Kruse JL, Lapid MI, Lennon VA, et al. Psychiatric autoimmunity: N-methyl-d-aspartate
503 receptor IgG and beyond. *Psychosom J Consult Liaison Psychiatry*. 2015;56(3):227-241.
504 doi:10.1016/j.psym.2015.01.003

505 38. Lopes J, Malaquias MJ, Freitas J, et al. Blood and CSF anti-neuronal antibodies testing
506 in psychotic syndromes: a retrospective analysis from a tertiary psychiatric hospital. *Immunol*
507 *Res*. 2024;31:31.

508 39. Maier HB, Stadler J, Deest-Gaubatz S, et al. The significance of cerebrospinal fluid
509 analysis in the differential diagnosis of 564 psychiatric patients: Multiple sclerosis is more
510 common than autoimmune-encephalitis. *Psychiatry Res*. 2024;333:115725.

511 40. Maurus I, Wagner S, Campana M, et al. The relationship between blood-brain barrier
512 dysfunction and neurocognitive impairments in first-episode psychosis: findings from a
513 retrospective chart analysis. *BJPsych Open*. 2023;9(3):e60.

514 41. Miller C, Kirchmair R, Troger J, et al. CSF of neuroleptic-naive first-episode
515 schizophrenic patients: levels of biogenic amines, substance P, and peptides derived from
516 chromogranin A (GE-25) and secretogranin II (secretoneurin). *Biol Psychiatry*.
517 1996;39(11):911-918. doi:10.1016/0006-3223(95)00098-4

518 42. Oviedo-Salcedo T, Wagner E, Campana M, et al. Cerebrospinal fluid abnormalities in
519 first- and multi-episode schizophrenia-spectrum disorders: impact of clinical and
520 demographical variables. *Transl Psychiatry Psychiatry*. 2021;11(1):621.

521 43. Oviedo-Salcedo T, de Witte L, Kumpfel T, et al. Absence of cerebrospinal fluid
522 antineuronal antibodies in schizophrenia spectrum disorders. *Br J Psychiatry*.
523 2018;212(5):318-320.

524 44. Müller N, Ackenheil M. Immunoglobulin and albumin content of cerebrospinal fluid in
525 schizophrenic patients: relationship to negative symptomatology. *Schizophr Res*.
526 1995;14(3):223-228. doi:10.1016/0920-9964(94)00045-a

527 45. Rattay TW, Martin P, Vittore D, et al. Cerebrospinal fluid findings in patients with
528 psychotic symptoms-a retrospective analysis. *Sci Rep*. 2021;11(1):7169.

529 46. Rauber S, Heming M, Repple J, et al. Cerebrospinal fluid flow cytometry distinguishes
530 psychosis spectrum disorders from differential diagnoses. *Mol Psychiatry*. 2021;26(12):7661-
531 7670.

532 47. Restrepo-Martinez M, Ramirez-Bermudez J, Bayliss L, Espinola-Nadurille M.
533 Characterisation and outcome of neuropsychiatric symptoms in patients with anti-NMDAR
534 encephalitis. *Acta Neuropsychiatr*. 2020;32(2):92-98.

535 48. Runge K, Balla A, Fiebich BL, et al. Antibody indices of infectious pathogens from serum
536 and cerebrospinal fluid in patients with schizophrenia spectrum disorders. *Fluids Barriers*
537 *CNS*. 2022;19(1):61.

538 49. Runge K, Fiebich BL, Kuzior H, et al. An observational study investigating cytokine
539 levels in the cerebrospinal fluid of patients with schizophrenia spectrum disorders. *Schizophr*
540 *Res*. 2021;231:205-213. doi:10.1016/j.schres.2021.03.022

541 50. Seppälä TT, Louhija UM, Appelberg B, Herukka SK, Juva K. Comparison between
542 clinical diagnosis and CSF biomarkers of Alzheimer disease in elderly patients with late onset
543 psychosis: Helsinki old age psychosis study (HOPS). *Am J Geriatr Psychiatry*.
544 2014;22(9):908-916. doi:10.1016/j.jagp.2012.08.020

545 51. Severance EG, Gressitt KL, Alaedini A, et al. IgG dynamics of dietary antigens point to
546 cerebrospinal fluid barrier or flow dysfunction in first-episode schizophrenia. *Brain Behav*
547 *Immun*. 2015;44:148-158. doi:10.1016/j.bbi.2014.09.009

548 52. Söderlund J, Schröder J, Nordin C, et al. Activation of brain interleukin-1beta in
549 schizophrenia. *Mol Psychiatry*. 2009;14(12):1069-1071. doi:10.1038/mp.2009.52

550 53. Srikanth S, Ravi V, Poornima KS, Shetty KT, Gangadhar BN, Janakiramaiah N. Viral
551 antibodies in recent onset, nonorganic psychoses: correspondence with symptomatic
552 severity. *Biol Psychiatry*. 1994;36(8):517-521.

553 54. Steiner J, Walter M, Glanz W, et al. Increased prevalence of diverse N-methyl-D-
554 aspartate glutamate receptor antibodies in patients with an initial diagnosis of schizophrenia:
555 Specific relevance of IgG NR1a antibodies for distinction from N-methyl-D-aspartate
556 glutamate receptor encephalitis. *JAMA Psychiatry*. 2013;70(3):271-278.
557 doi:10.1001/2013.jamapsychiatry.86

558 55. Tang C, Tan K, Lim G, et al. N-Methyl-D-Aspartate(NMDA) Receptor and Voltage-Gated
559 Potassium Channel (VGKC) Antibody-Associated Encephalitides Presenting as First Episode
560 Acute Psychosis. *Front Psychiatry Front Res Found*. 2019;10:913.

561 56. Theorell J, Ramberger M, Harrison R, et al. Screening for pathogenic neuronal
562 autoantibodies in serum and CSF of patients with first-episode psychosis. *Transl Psychiatry*.
563 2021;11(1):566.

564 57. Toorey EF, Peterson MR, Brannon WL, Carpenter WT, Post RM, Van Kammen DP.
565 Immunoglobulins and viral antibodies in psychiatric patients. *Br J Psychiatry*. 1978;132:342-
566 348. doi:10.1192/bjp.132.4.342

567 58. Jarius S, Pache F, Körtvelyessy P, et al. Cerebrospinal fluid findings in COVID-19: a
568 multicenter study of 150 lumbar punctures in 127 patients. *J Neuroinflammation*.
569 2022;19(1):19. doi:10.1186/s12974-021-02339-0

570 59. Gresa-Arribas N, Titulaer MJ, Torrents A, et al. Antibody titres at diagnosis and during
571 follow-up of anti-NMDA receptor encephalitis: a retrospective study. *Lancet Neurol*.
572 2014;13(2):167-177. doi:10.1016/S1474-4422(13)70282-5

60. Abboud H, Probasco JC, Irani S, et al. Autoimmune encephalitis: proposed best practice recommendations for diagnosis and acute management. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 2021;92(7):757-768. doi:10.1136/jnnp-2020-325300

61. Rozenberg A, Shelly S, Vaknin-Dembinsky A, et al. Cognitive impairments in autoimmune encephalitis: the role of autoimmune antibodies and oligoclonal bands. *Front Immunol*. 2024;15:1405337. doi:10.3389/fimmu.2024.1405337

62. Blackman G, Neri G, Al-Doori O, et al. Prevalence of Neuroradiological Abnormalities in First-Episode Psychosis: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Psychiatry*. 2023;80(10):1047-1054. doi:10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2023.2225

63. Tu LH, Malhotra A, Sheth KN, Yaesoubi R, Forman HP, Venkatesh AK. Yield of Head Computed Tomography Examinations for Common Psychiatric Presentations and Implications for Medical Clearance From a 6-Year Analysis of Acute Hospital Visits. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2022;182(8):879-881. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2022.2198

64. Skikic M, Arriola JA. First Episode Psychosis Medical Workup: Evidence-Informed Recommendations and Introduction to a Clinically Guided Approach. *Child Adolesc Psychiatr Clin N Am*. 2020;29(1):15-28. doi:10.1016/j.chc.2019.08.010

65. Endres D, Matysik M, Feige B, et al. Diagnosing Organic Causes of Schizophrenia Spectrum Disorders: Findings from a One-Year Cohort of the Freiburg Diagnostic Protocol in Psychosis (FDPP). *Diagnostics*. 2020;10(9). doi:10.3390/diagnostics10090691

66. Kular S, Griffin K, Batty R, Hoggard N, Connolly D. The role of MRI and CT of the brain in first episodes of psychosis and behavioural abnormality. *Clin Radiol*. 2021;76(9):712.e9-712.e13. doi:10.1016/j.crad.2021.05.009

67. Peskind E, Nordberg A, Darreh-Shori T, Soininen H. Safety of lumbar puncture procedures in patients with Alzheimer's disease. *Curr Alzheimer Res*. 2009;6(3):290-292. doi:10.2174/156720509788486509

68. de Almeida SM, Shumaker SD, LeBlanc SK, et al. Incidence of post-dural puncture headache in research volunteers. *Headache*. 2011;51(10):1503-1510. doi:10.1111/j.1526-4610.2011.01959.x

69. Al-Hashel J, Rady A, Massoud F, Ismail II. Post-dural puncture headache: a prospective study on incidence, risk factors, and clinical characterization of 285 consecutive procedures. *BMC Neurol*. 2022;22(1):261. doi:10.1186/s12883-022-02785-0

70. Bodilsen J, Mariager T, Vestergaard HH, et al. Association of Lumbar Puncture With Spinal Hematoma in Patients With and Without Coagulopathy. *JAMA*. 2020;324(14):1419-1428. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.14895

71. Nath S, Koziarz A, Badhiwala JH, et al. Atraumatic versus conventional lumbar puncture needles: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Lancet*. 2018;391(10126):1197-1204. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(17)32451-0

610 72. Endres D, Matysik M, Feige B, et al. Diagnosing Organic Causes of Schizophrenia
611 Spectrum Disorders: Findings from a One-Year Cohort of the Freiburg Diagnostic Protocol in
612 Psychosis (FDPP). *Diagnostics*. 2020;10(9):691. doi:10.3390/diagnostics10090691

613 73. Aldayel AY, Alharbi MM, Almasri MS, Alkhonezan SM. Public knowledge and attitude
614 toward lumbar puncture among adults in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia: A cross-sectional study.
615 *SAGE Open Med*. 2019;7:2050312119871066. doi:10.1177/2050312119871066

616 74. Ross EL, Becker JE, Linnoila JJ, Soeteman DI. Cost-Effectiveness of Routine Screening
617 for Autoimmune Encephalitis in Patients With First-Episode Psychosis in the United States. *J*
618 *Clin Psychiatry*. 2020;82(1):19m13168. doi:10.4088/JCP.19m13168

619 75. Campana M, Yakimov V, Moussiopoulou J, et al. Association of symptom severity and
620 cerebrospinal fluid alterations in recent onset psychosis in schizophrenia-spectrum disorders
621 – An individual patient data meta-analysis. *Brain Behav Immun*. 2024;119:353-362.
622 doi:10.1016/j.bbi.2024.04.011

623 76. Cullen AE, Palmer-Cooper EC, Hardwick M, et al. Influence of methodological and
624 patient factors on serum NMDAR IgG antibody detection in psychotic disorders: a meta-
625 analysis of cross-sectional and case-control studies. *Lancet Psychiatry*. 2021;8(2):109-120.
626 doi:10.1016/S2215-0366(20)30432-6

627 77. Milano C, Businaro P, Papi C, et al. Assessing Commercial Tissue-Based Assays for
628 Autoimmune Neurologic Disorders (I). *Neurol Neuroimmunol Neuroinflammation*.
629 12(4):e200410. doi:10.1212/NXI.0000000000200410

630 78. Papi C, Milano C, Arlettaz L, et al. Assessing Commercial Tissue-Based Assays for
631 Autoimmune Neurologic Disorders (II). *Neurol Neuroimmunol Neuroinflammation*.
632 12(4):e200406. doi:10.1212/NXI.0000000000200406

633 79. Hoy D, Brooks P, Woolf A, et al. Assessing risk of bias in prevalence studies:
634 modification of an existing tool and evidence of interrater agreement. *J Clin Epidemiol*.
635 2012;65(9):934-939. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2011.11.014

636 80. Egger M, Smith GD, Schneider M, Minder C. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple,
637 graphical test. *BMJ*. 1997;315(7109):629. doi:10.1136/bmj.315.7109.629

638 81. Blackman G, Neri G, Al-Doori O, et al. Prevalence of Neuroradiological Abnormalities in
639 First-Episode Psychosis: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Psychiatry*.
640 2023;80(10):1047-1054. doi:10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2023.2225

641
642
643
644
645

Figure 1. Forest plots of clinically relevant CSF abnormalities in first-episode psychosis

A. Prevalence of Pleocytosis (WBC>5)

Study	Cases	Total	Prev(%)	95% C.I.
Lopes 2024	1	68	1.5	[0.7; 8.3]
Guasp 2021	2	105	1.9	[0.7; 6.8]
Jeppesen 2022	2	104	1.9	[0.5; 6.7]
Endres 2015	6	179	3.4	[1.4; 7.0]
Gine-Serven 2022	3	95	3.2	[1.2; 9.0]
Campana 2022	11	314	3.5	[1.7; 5.9]
Oviedo-Salcedo 2018	6	124	4.8	[2.1; 10.1]
Rattay 2021	5	98	5.1	[2.0; 11.2]
Total		.	3.2	[2.1; 4.4]



Heterogeneity: $\chi^2_7 = 3.33$ ($P = .85$), $I^2 = 0.0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$

B. Prevalence of Oligoclonal Bands Type 2 (%)

Study	Cases	Total	Prev(%)	95% C.I.
Kruse 2015 Group B	0	8	0.0	[2.6; 34.2]
Runge 2022	1	100	1.0	[0.3; 5.6]
Maurus 2023	3	121	2.5	[0.9; 7.1]
Runge 2021	1	40	2.5	[1.1; 13.5]
Campana 2022	7	217	3.2	[0.0; 3.9]
Endres 2024	6	161	3.7	[0.0; 3.9]
Hinotsu 2022	7	151	4.6	[2.2; 9.2]
Endres 2015	10	180	5.6	[2.9; 9.8]
Rattay 2021	5	89	5.6	[2.5; 12.5]
Lopes 2024	5	68	7.4	[2.8; 15.8]
Oviedo-Salcedo 2018	18	123	14.6	[6.3; 19.6]
Kruse 2015 Group A	9	13	69.2	[42.8; 85.2]
Srikanth 1994	8	10	80.0	[49.1; 91.4]
Total			7.1	[3.3; 12.0]



Heterogeneity: $\chi^2_{12} = 83.05$ ($P < .001$), $I^2 = 85.6\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.0155$

C. Prevalence of anti-NMDAR Antibodies (%)

Study	Cases	Total	Prev(%)	95% C.I.
Guasp 2021	0	105	0.0	[0.0; 3.5]
Jeppesen 2022	0	104	0.0	[0.0; 3.6]
Bien 2021	0	103	0.0	[0.0; 2.4]
Rattay 2021	0	98	0.0	[0.0; 3.8]
Gine-Serven 2022	0	95	0.0	[0.0; 3.9]
Endres 2022	0	89	0.0	[0.0; 0.0]
Theorell 2021	0	71	0.0	[0.0; 2.9]
Rauber 2021	0	59	0.0	[0.0; 2.6]
Runge 2021	0	40	0.0	[0.2; 9.4]
Endres 2015	1	125	0.8	[0.0; 3.7]
Maier 2024	4	254	1.6	[0.0; 0.1]
Lopes 2024	4	68	5.9	[2.5; 14.3]
Tang 2019	3	15	20.0	[8.8; 45.4]
Kruse 2015 Group B	2	8	25.0	[8.9; 58.6]
Steiner 2013	2	6	33.3	[14.4; 67.5]
Kelleher 2020	1	2	50.0	[20.2; 79.8]
Restrepo-Martinez 2020	14	24	58.3	[39.1; 74.9]
Kruse 2015 Group A	8	13	61.5	[36.3; 80.5]
Total			2.3	[0.1; 6.4]



Heterogeneity: $\chi^2_{17} = 132.11$ ($P < .001$), $I^2 = 87.1\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.0247$

Figure 1 Legend: The size of each box is proportional to the weight of the study in relation to the pooled prevalence estimate (as calculated by a random effects model in the final row of the figure).

Columns: Cases – number of FEP patients with that particular CSF abnormality, Total – total number of FEP patients tested, Prev (%) – raw prevalence of abnormality in that study, C.I. – Confidence Interval.

Kruse 2015 Group A – patients who had serum positivity for anti-NMDAR antibodies. Kruse 2015 Group B- all patients who had serum studies regardless of NMDAR positivity

Figure 2 Forest plots of subgroup analysis of clinically relevant lumbar puncture abnormalities in First-Episode Psychosis, based on clinical suspicion of secondary causes

A. Prevalence of Pleocytosis (WBC>5) in subgroups based on clinical suspicion of secondary causes



B. Prevalence of Oligoclonal Bands in subgroups based on clinical suspicion of secondary causes



C. Prevalence of anti-NMDAR antibodies based on clinical suspicion of secondary causes



The size of each box is proportional to the weight of the study in relation to the pooled prevalence estimate (as calculated by a random effects model in the final row of the figure).

Columns: Cases – number of FEP patients with that particular CSF abnormality, Total – total number of FEP patients tested, Prev (%) – raw prevalence of abnormality in that study, C.I. – Confidence Interval.

Kruse 2015 Group A – patients who had serum positivity for anti-NMDAR antibodies. Kruse 2015 Group B- all patients who had serum studies regardless of NMDAR positivity

.



Figure 3. Publication Effects. A) Leave one out analyses show influences of individual studies B) Funnel plots show potential for small study effects, publication bias, or differences in baseline characteristics in studies.

Supplement

eMethods
eFigure 1. PRISMA diagram
eFigure 2. Prevalence-estimates of other CSF abnormalities
eFigure 3. Pleocytosis Graphs with different WBC cutoffs
eFigure 4. MOOSE checklist
eFigure 5. PRISMA checklist
eTable 1. Summary of Included Studies
eTable 2. Study Characteristics
eTable 3. Subgroup Characteristics
eReferences

eMethods

Search Strategy

The search was conducted in a stepwise fashion: (1) electronic databases were searched from inception until October 2024, and (2) the references of eligible articles and reviews were manually reviewed. A title and abstract screen was performed prior to full article review to confirm eligibility. Databases included were Ovid, MEDLINE, Embase, PsychINFO Web of Science using the search terms that were developed in consultation with a research librarian (AF). Two researchers (A.C., L.D., A.P., M.B) independently performed the title and abstract screen and full text review in parallel. Articles with consensus approval between both raters were included. Discrepancies were resolved by an independent rater (GB).

Search Terms

OVID Medline

Schizophrenia/di OR Psychotic Disorders/di OR (psychotic* OR psychosis or schizophren*).ti,ab,kw,kf
AND
exp cerebrospinal fluid/ OR exp spinal puncture/ OR (cerebrospinal fluid OR CSF OR spinal puncture* OR lumbar puncture*).ti,ab,kw,kf
AND
Diagnosis/ OR (diagnos*).ti,ab,kw,kf

Embase

'schizophrenia'/mj OR 'psychosis'/mj OR (psychotic* OR psychosis or schizophren*):ti,ab,kw
AND
'cerebrospinal fluid'/exp OR 'lumbar puncture'/exp OR ('cerebrospinal fluid' OR CSF OR 'spinal puncture*' OR 'lumbar puncture*'):ti,ab,kw
AND
'diagnosis'/mj OR (diagnos*):ti,ab,kw

Web of Science

TI=(psychotic* OR psychosis or schizophren*) OR AB=(psychotic* OR psychosis or schizophren*) OR AK=(psychotic* OR psychosis or schizophren*)
AND

TI=("cerebrospinal fluid" OR CSF OR "spinal puncture*" OR "lumbar puncture*") OR AB=("cerebrospinal fluid" OR CSF OR "spinal puncture*" OR "lumbar puncture*") OR AK=("cerebrospinal fluid" OR CSF OR "spinal puncture*" OR "lumbar puncture*")
AND
TI=(diagnos*) OR AB=(diagnos*) OR AK=(diagnos*)

PsychInfo

(DE "Schizophrenia" OR DE "Acute Schizophrenia" OR DE "Catatonic Schizophrenia" OR DE "Paranoid Schizophrenia" OR DE "Process Schizophrenia" OR DE "Schizoaffective Disorder" OR DE "Schizophrenia (Disorganized Type)" OR DE "Schizophreniform Disorder" OR DE "Undifferentiated Schizophrenia") OR TI (psychotic* OR psychosis OR schizophren*) OR AB (psychotic* OR psychosis or schizophren*)
AND
DE "Cerebrospinal Fluid" OR TI ("cerebrospinal fluid" OR CSF OR "spinal puncture*" OR "lumbar puncture*") OR AB ("cerebrospinal fluid" OR CSF OR "spinal puncture*" OR "lumbar puncture*")
AND
MM "Diagnosis" OR TI (diagnos*) OR AB (diagnos*)

Eligibility Criteria

Eligibility criteria were FEP patients (including patients with psychosis possibly due to a general medical condition, primary psychiatric disorder, and unspecified psychosis) for whom clinically available CSF testing had been reported to allow for the calculation of prevalence-estimates. Studies were included if they performed one or more clinically available CSF analyses, defined as being in the laboratory manual of Mayo Clinic or ARUP. Where there were overlapping samples, the study with the larger sample was utilized. There were no age or language restrictions. Excluded from the analysis were studies with insufficient data to permit calculation of prevalence-estimates, post-mortem studies, case reports or case series.

Data Extraction and Encoding

Data extraction was independently performed in Covidence systematic review software (Veritas Health Innovation, Melbourne, Australia. Available at www.covidence.org) by four researchers (AC, MB, LD, AP) using a piloted standardized form with a fourth researcher (GB) resolving any discrepancies. For each study, information on the study characteristics, sample, and CSF handling processes was also extracted. Where reported, healthy control data was also extracted to calculate risk ratios. For categorizing of subgroups and modeling purposes, certain assumptions were made and the following *ad hoc* criteria were applied for borderline cases: 1) if a study only excluded patients with known dementia (but not other causes of psychosis), they were coded as an undifferentiated sample, 2) if a cohort study changed inclusion criteria mid-study from including only cases with clinical high-suspicion for secondary cause to including all FEP (i.e. undifferentiated FEP), they were coded as undifferentiated FEP provided >80% of the cohort was collected during the period where LP was performed for all FEP. If not, they were coded as high-suspicion subgroups. This grouping was done *post hoc*.

In our review of studies, we found that there were several from one research group that had nested, partially overlapping samples: Endres

2015, 2017, 2020, 2021, 2022, and 2024. All of these studies had patient samples that partially overlapped with Endres 2020, and each study had some overlap with the closest chronological study, but Endres 2015 appeared to have no sample overlap with 2022 and 2024. As such we chose to include Endres 2015 and Enders 2022+2024 (as a merged cohort extracting the largest sample for each CSF test), as this resulted in the largest non-overlapping patient cohort from the overlapping group.. Similarly, Campana 2022 and 2023 were found to have 100% overlap and as such, the larger n amongst the two publications was chosen for any given prevalence estimate.

There were some studies where a substantial portion of patients were FEP but the report did not enable the disaggregation of those with FEP and those with persistent psychosis, Rattay 2021, Runge 2021 and Runge 2022. Rattay was able to be contacted to disaggregate the results. In the case of Runge 2021 and 2022, the studys' risk of bias rating was downgraded as it only partially met the sample selection criteria; since the final risk of bias was not "high risk", these studies were ultimately included.

Quality Assessment

A 10-item risk of bias assessment tool was utilized (Hoy et al. 2012). Individual papers were categorized based on a summative score and categorized as high (0-3), moderate (4-6), or low (7-10) risk of bias[79]. If multiple papers shared a cohort but diverged in quality assessment, the average quality assessment score was used for categorization. Those deemed as having high risk of bias were excluded.

Heterogeneity Assessment

The I^2 index was used to assess heterogeneity. Low degree of heterogeneity was defined as an I^2 of <25%, moderate heterogeneity was 25 to 75%, a high degree heterogeneity was defined as 75 to 100%. A Baujat plot was also generated to assess heterogeneity and influence.

Sensitivity Analyses

Sensitivity analyses were performed to explore the robustness of findings, including the effects of studies with a moderate risk of bias. Influencer diagnostics were performed based on leave one out analyses to identify studies with excessive influence on the pooled prevalence-estimates or heterogeneity. Risk of publication bias was assessed via visual inspection (for asymmetry) of Egger plots[80] for main outcomes.

Use of AI or LLM

Leave-one-out sensitivity analysis were conducted with the code from Blackman et al. 2023[81] that is publicly available on github. However, due to changes in the meta package in R from the version in use in Blackman et al. 2023 to the version used for the analyses in this manuscript, the code required debugging in order to be compatible with the new version of the meta package. Chat GPT 5.0 (openAI) was used to help troubleshoot these errors. AI was not used for the generation of any of the images, plots or original analyses, or elsewhere in the manuscript.

eFigures

eFigure1 PRISMA flow diagram



eFigure2. Prevalence-estimates of other CSF abnormalities

eFigure 2a: Prevalence of Anti-Yo antibodies



eFigure 2b: Prevalence of abnormal IgG antibody index



eFigure 2c: Prevalence of Glycine antibodies



eFigure 2d. Prevalence of GABAB receptor antibodies



eFigure 2e. Prevalence of AMPA receptor antibodies



eFigure 2f. Prevalence of Prevalence of CASPR antibodies



eFigure 2g. Prevalence of LGI1 antibodies



Heterogeneity: χ^2_4 = 0.12 (P > .99), I^2 = 0.0%, τ^2 = 0

eFigure 2h. Prevalence of GAD65 antibodies



839 eFigure 2i. Prevalence of Abnormally Elevated Albumin



840 Heterogeneity: χ^2_5 = 12.04 (P = .03), I^2 = 58.5%, τ^2 = 0.0030

841 eFigure 2j. Prevalence of Type 5 Oligoclonal Bands



842 Heterogeneity: χ^2_1 = 0.04 (P = .84), I^2 = 0.0%, τ^2 = 0

843 eFigure 2k. Prevalence of Type 3 Oligoclonal Bands



844 Heterogeneity: χ^2_3 = 6.39 (P = .09), I^2 = 53.0%, τ^2 = 0.0021

845 eFigure 2j. Prevalence of Elevated Protein



eFigure 3 Prevalence of Pleocytosis amongst studies with other WBC cutoff values

A. Prevalence of Pleocytosis (WBC≥5)



B. Prevalence of Pleocytosis combining studies with a WBC cutoff of WBC≥5 and WBC >5 (i.e. abnormal as defined by the study, regardless of which WBC cutoff they used)


Study
Cases
Total
Prev(%)
95% C.I.
Lopes 2024 1 68 1.5 [0.7; 8.3]
Guasp 2021 2 105 1.9 [0.2; 6.3]
Jeppesen 2022 2 104 1.9 [0.7; 6.9]
Maurus 2023 3 121 2.5 [0.9; 7.1]
Endres 2024 5 154 3.2 [0.0; 5.0]
Endres 2015 6 179 3.4 [1.3; 6.9]
Gine-Serven 2022 3 95 3.2 [1.1; 8.9]
Campana 2022 11 314 3.5 [0.0; 0.0]
Oviedo-Salcedo 2018 6 124 4.8 [0.3; 7.7]
Runge 2022 5 100 5.0 [0.0; 7.4]
Runge 2021 3 40 7.5 [3.3; 20.3]
Rattay 2021 8 98 8.2 [4.3; 15.4]
Du 2023 4 50 8.0 [3.6; 19.1]
Kruse 2015 Group B 2 8 25.0 [10.9; 58.2]
Restrepo-Martinez 2020 5 14 35.7 [17.7; 60.8]
Kelleher 2020 1 2 50.0 [20.0; 80.0]
Kruse 2015 Group A 7 13 53.8 [30.3; 75.3]
Random effects model 3.7 [1.7; 6.2]
Heterogeneity: I^2 = 68.4%, τ^2 = 0.0060, χ^2_{16} = 50.59 (p < 0.0001)
0
10
20
30
40
Abnormal Cell Count(%)

863

eFigure 4. MOOSE Checklist

Criteria	Brief Description of How Criteria were handled in the Meta-Analysis
Reporting of background should include	
Problem Definition	Patients presenting with first-episode psychosis may have an organic etiology identifiable using lumbar puncture. Detection of CSF abnormalities may help guide diagnosis and clinical management, thereby impacting prognosis. The proportion of patients with abnormalities in CSF remains unclear.
Hypothesis Statement	Since we didn't do a healthy control comparison what would the appropriate hypothesis statement be? CSF findings amongst patients with FEP will have a high enough prevalence to warrant inclusion in diagnostic workup.
Description of Study Outcomes	CSF abnormality
Type of Exposure or Intervention Used	n/a
Type of Study Designs Used	Prevalence
Study Population	Patients with first-episode psychosis
Reporting of Search Strategy should include	
Quality of Searchers	Academic qualifications listed on title page, all psychiatrists at major academic medical centers in the US and UK
Search Strategy, including time period included in the synthesis and key words	Full selection procedures with databases and search terms included in eMethods
Databases and registries searched	Ovid, MEDLINE, Embase, PsychINFO
Search Software used, name and version	Websites for each major database
Use of Hand Searching	Manually searched references of included articles

List of Citations located and those excluded, including justifications	Defined in Results
Method of Addressing Articles published in Languages other than English	Only studies in English were included although good-faith effort was made to screen and include non-English studies that fell within our eligibility criteria.
Method of Handling Abstracts and Unpublished Studies	Defined in Methods and eMethods
Reporting of Methods should Include	
Description of Relevance or Appropriateness of Studies Assembled for Assessing the Hypothesis to be tested	Described in Results, Study Selection. The minimum dataset to be included in the meta-analysis was the number of FEP patients with a CSF abnormality
Rationale for the selection and coding of data	Based on literature review and discussion with neurology and psychiatry experts
Assessment of confounding	Sensitivity analyses were performed to assess the impact of individual studies in pooled estimates
Assessment of study quality	Hoy et al. 2012's bias assessment
Assessment of heterogeneity	Calculated I^2
Description of statistical methods in sufficient detail to be replicated	Details provided in the methods section and supplement.
Provision of appropriate tables and graphics	Studies identified using PRISMA diagram. Forest plots provided. Raw data also included in supplement.
Reporting of results should include	
Graph summarizing individual study estimates and overall estimate	The results section includes forest plots for all analyses, as well as subgroup analyses and sensitivity analyses.

Table giving descriptive information for each study included	eTable 1
Results of sensitivity testing	
Quantitative assessment of bias	Bias assessment performed using Hoy et al 2012's checklist
Justification for Exclusion	The methods section references any studies excluded due to high risk of bias.
Assessment of Quality of Included Studies	Study quality reported in results.
Reporting of conclusions should involve	
Considerations of alternative explanations for observed results	Alternative explanations for observed results are detailed in the Discussion section.
Generalization of conclusions	Generalizability of our findings and clinical relevance are included in the Discussion.
Guidelines for future research	Directions for future research are discussed in the Discussion section
Disclosure of funding source	Defined on title page

873 eFigure 5 Prisma Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	1
ABSTRACT			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	2
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	2-3
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	2
METHODS			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	Supplement
Information sources	6	Specify all databases, registers, websites, organisations, reference lists and other sources searched or consulted to identify studies. Specify the date when each source was last searched or consulted.	3
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	Supplement
Selection process	8	Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, including how many reviewers screened each record and each report retrieved, whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	3, supplement
Data collection process	9	Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers collected data from each report, whether they worked independently, any processes for obtaining or confirming data from study investigators, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	4
Data items	10a	List and define all outcomes for which data were sought. Specify whether all results that were compatible with each outcome domain in each study were sought (e.g. for all measures, time points, analyses), and if not, the methods used to decide which results to collect.	5
	10b	List and define all other variables for which data were sought (e.g. participant and intervention characteristics, funding sources). Describe any assumptions made about any missing or unclear information.	5
Study risk of bias assessment	11	Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies, including details of the tool(s) used, how many reviewers assessed each study and whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	5
Effect measures	12	Specify for each outcome the effect measure(s) (e.g. risk ratio, mean difference) used in the synthesis or presentation of results.	5
Synthesis methods	13a	Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis (e.g. tabulating the study intervention characteristics and comparing against the planned groups for each synthesis (item #5)).	5
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	Supplement
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	5
	13d	Describe any methods used to synthesize results and provide a rationale for the choice(s). If meta-analysis was performed, describe the model(s), method(s) to identify the presence and extent of statistical heterogeneity, and software package(s) used.	5
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	5, Supplement

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	5
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	6, supplement
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	5
RESULTS			
Study selection	16a	Describe the results of the search and selection process, from the number of records identified in the search to the number of studies included in the review, ideally using a flow diagram.	6
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	6
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	6
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	6
Results of individual studies	19	For all outcomes, present, for each study: (a) summary statistics for each group (where appropriate) and (b) an effect estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval), ideally using structured tables or plots.	7-9, supplement
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	6
	20b	Present results of all statistical syntheses conducted. If meta-analysis was done, present for each the summary estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval) and measures of statistical heterogeneity. If comparing groups, describe the direction of the effect.	7-12
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	12
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	Supplement
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	Supplement
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	8-12
DISCUSSION			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	13
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	14
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	14
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	15
OTHER INFORMATION			

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	5
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	PROSPERO website
	24c	Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol.	None
Support	25	Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review.	None
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	1
Availability of data, code and other materials	27	Report which of the following are publicly available and where they can be found: template data collection forms; data extracted from included studies; data used for all analyses; analytic code; any other materials used in the review.	Supplement

874

875

eTable 1. Study inclusion/exclusion criteria*direct quotes are denoted by quotation marks

Study	Recruitment setting	Patient Inclusion Criteria
Campana 2023	patients at tertiary care hospital in Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy LMU University Hospital	"Medical records of patients suggesting clinical signs of a possible underlying autoimmune encephalitis (based on careful screening of all available data on clinical and physical examinations) were excluded from our analysis."
Campana 2022	retrospective analysis from inpatients admitted to tertiary care hospital at Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy at LMU Munich selected for FEP patients	"Patients with clinical signs that could indicate the presence of an underlying autoimmune encephalitis (eg seizures, movement disorders, autonomic instability) were excluded based on thorough screening of all available data on clinical and physical examination."
Du 2023	patients hospitalized in Departments of Neurology and Psychiatry of Sichuan Provincial People's Hospital	"Patients with mild or non-severe COVID-19 who tested positive for severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) (antigen or nucleic acid test) before or after admission; patients who presented abnormal mental behavior on admission, with delusions, hallucinations, and confusion in speech, behavior, and thinking as the main clinical manifestations."
Endres 2017	patients at tertiary care hospital (Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy at University Medical Center Freiburg)	"Patients diagnosed with schizophreniform syndrome included those with schizophrenia (N=56), schizoaffective disorder (N=29), acute polymorphic psychotic disorder (N=14), and substance-induced psychosis (N=1). Only CSF/serum samples from patients with complete thyroid hormone status (thyroid-stimulating hormone [TSH], triiodothyronine [t3], and thyroxine [t4]) were included. For pragmatic reasons, we selected the first 100 patients since 2006. The study included 13 patients who underwent lumbar puncture between 2006 and 2009 (i.e., CSF analysis was performed if there were signs of possible neuroinflammatory features). The other 87 patients underwent lumbar puncture since June 2009, when CSF analysis was offered as a routine procedure."
Endres 2020	patients at tertiary care hospital (Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy at University Medical Center Freiburg)	"All inpatients with schizophreniform syndromes (according to the International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems criteria, unipolar depression following ICD-10: F32.X, F33.X, F06.3 and bipolar disorder following ICD- 10: F30.X, F31X, F06.3) who underwent an LP at the Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy were included.Other preexisting (e.g., earlier stroke) or newly described (e.g., migraine) neurological comorbidities were recorded but not considered as an exclusion criteria if the LP was performed within the diagnostic process of the psychiatric disorder."

Endres 2015	university clinic of psychiatry and psychotherapy Freiburg	“From 2006 to 2013, we acquired 180 CSF samples from psychotic patients. Between 2006 and 2009, CSF examinations were only performed in cases in which organic brain disease was suspected.”
Endres 2024	all adult patients treated at specialized ward for psychosis and secondary mental disorders at University of Freiburg	“All adult patients treated in our specialized ward for psychosis and secondary mental disorders for over 2.5 years were screened, and those with primary or secondary psychotic syndromes were included in the current analysis(schizophreniform syndromes: F20.X, F29.X, F06.02, F10.5, F19.5; depression with psychotic symptoms: F32.3, F33.3; mania with psychotic symptoms: F30.2; bipolar affective disorder, currently manic or major depressive episode with psychotic symptoms: F31.2, F31.5). Thus, patients with secondary psychoses or rheumatological diseases were not excluded.”
Gine-Serven 2022	acute inpatient units (adult or child and adolescent units) from the Department of Mental Health at the Hospital of Matar´ o between 1 June 2018 and 31 March 2020 were offered to participate in the study	Patients with FEP who were admitted to acute inpatient units at the Hospital of Mataro between 1 June 2018 and 31 March 2020.
Guasp 2021	Hospital Cl´ ınic Institut d’Investigacions Biom` ediques August Pi i Sunyer (IDIBAPS), University of Barcelona	“All patients with FEP admitted to 2 hospitals at University of Barcelona, between June 1, 2018, and March 31, 2020, were invited to participate in the study. FEP was defined as new-onset disorganized behavior accompanied by delusions or hallucinations.”
Hinotsu 2022	newly hospitalized patients at Okayama Psychiatric Hospital initially diagnosed with schizophrenia, mood disorder, epilepsy, psychiatric symptoms	“Patients diagnosed with schizophrenia, a mood disorder or epilepsy with psychiatric symptoms”
Kelleher 2020	pts recruited from general psychiatric services from encatchment areas strictly defined as attached to St. Jame's hospital and Tallaght University Hospital in Dublin and Newcastle hospital Wicklow. FEP cases were recruited via community mental health teams who were educated about study and asked to recruit patients who met inclusion criteria. liased with neurology centres to identify any additional cases diagnosed with NMDA-R Ab encephalitis within encatchment area.Treatment resistant patients were invited by nursing staff from Clozapine clinics within encatchment area	“Inclusion criteria for the FEP cohort comprised of being resident in the study catchment area for longer than six months based on their address within the catchment area, being aged between 18 and 65 years old and to be experiencing their first episode of psychosis. Only 4 seropositive cases had an LP.” Excluded: Presence of known pre- existing neurological disorder.

Kruse 2015 ANTI-NMDAR IgG seropositive	NMDA receptor IgG seropositive patients seen at Mayo Clinic rochester from 2009-2013	Group 2: NMDA receptor IgG. Retrospective assessment for each seropositive patient. "High likelihood assigned when new psychiatric symptoms of subacute onset were accompanied by at least one of the following: ew-onset movement disorder, encephalitic-appearing magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), encephalopathic or epileptiform electroencephalogram (EEG), inflammatory cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) (with protein exceeding 70 mg/dL, pleocytosis, or at least 4 CSF-exclusive oligoclonal bands), neural autoantibody at least 50% predictive for cancer (eMethods), or past episode of immunotherapy-responsive encephalitis."
Kruse 2015	adult psychiatric inpatients at Mayo clinic who had comprehensive serological evaluation for neural autoantibodies	Group 1: adult psychiatric inpatients whose initial neuropsychiatric evaluation included comprehensive serologic evaluation for neural autoantibodies (January 1, 2002 - December 31, 2011)
Maurus 2023	FEP patients admitted to tertiary care hospital to Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy at University Hosital, Ludwig Maximilian University of Munich Germany	FEP admitted between 1 Jan 2008 and 1 Aug 2018 -Inclusion criteria were that patients have a main diagnosis of F2x (schizophrenia spectrum according to the ICD-10) in the discharge summary of the first in-patient stay, and that patients had undergone both a lumbar puncture and neurocognitive testing within the clinical routine assessments before receiving this diagnosis. In our hospital, CSF analyses are usually offered to every FEP patient by the treating physicians so as to rule out organic psychoses, according to best clinical practice. "We also included patients who initially presented themselves with psychotic symptoms and a non-F2x-diagnosis (e.g. drug-induced psychosis), and were later diagnosed within the schizophrenia spectrum. any psychiatric or physical pre- diagnoses possibly resulting in cognitive impairments or BBB dysfunction (such as intellectual disability, perinatal asphyxia or stroke); abnormal brain magnetic resonance imaging findings suggestive of a relevant co-occurring CNS disorder (e.g. neoplasms); and a time interval of more than 21 days between CSF and blood sampling, or of more than 90 days between CSF sampling and neurocognitive testing, to ensure a clinically meaningful temporal association. Based on thorough screening of all available data, 45 patients were excluded before data analysis."
Oviedo-Salcedo 2018	patients with schizophrenia who underwent a lumbar puncture through Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy at the Klinikum der Universitat Munchen	"We included patients with documented ICD-10 diagnoses of schizophrenia spectrum disorders and excluded patients with a diagnosis of organic psychotic disorders (F06.0/F06.1/F06.2), drug-induced psychotic disorder (F1X.5) or clinical signs that could indicate the presence of an underlying autoimmune encephalitis(e.g. seizures, movement disorders, autonomic instability), based on thorough screen-

		ing of all available data on clinical and physical examination. excluded patients with a diagnosis of organic psychotic disorders (F06.0/F06.1/F06.2), drug-induced psychotic disorder (F1X.5) or clinical signs that could indicate the presence of an underlying autoimmune encephalitis7 (e.g. seizures, movement disorders, autonomic instability), based on thorough screening of all available data on clinical and physical examination."
Restrepo-Martinez 2020	Patients were recruited via in- and outpatient clinics in the Capital Region of Denmark, whereas healthy controls were recruited via a Danish website (ForsÃƒÂ¸gsperson.dk). Patients and controls came from the same community. All participants had to be aged 18-50 years, and patients were to have been diagnosed with a nonorganic, nonaf-fective psychotic disorder (International Classification of Diseases, Tenth Revision (ICD10) F20/F22-29) within a year prior to inclusion.	"Patients who had not received a CSF analysis in the past as part of the diagnostic work-up. Patients with organic psychotic disorders (ICD-10: F06.0/F06.1/F06.2) and substance-induced disorders (ICD-10: F1X.5) were excluded from our analyses in order to isolate cases of primary psychosis as defined by clinical judgment. We also screened for major neurological symptoms in the clinical documentation such as epileptic seizures and disturbed consciousness that could indicate a major neurological disease at the time of admission. The decision to perform the lumbar puncture was made by the treating physicians according to best clinical practice. In our psychiatric hospital, CSF analyses are usually offered to every FEP patient and to MEP patients who had not received a CSF analysis in the past as part of the diagnostic work-up."
Runge 2022	patients with schizophrenia spectrum disorders who were treated as inpatients in the Department of psychiatry and psychotherapy of the medical center of the University of Freiburg	Exclusion criteria: known substance use disorders and immunological disorders known for brain involvement.
Jeppesen 2022	Patients were recruited via in- and outpatient clinics in the Capital Region of Denmark, whereas healthy controls were recruited via a Danish website (ForsÃƒÂ¸gsperson.dk).	Patients and controls came from the same community. All participants had to be aged 18-50 years, and patients were to have been diagnosed with a non organic, non-affective psychotic disorder (International Classification of Diseases, Tenth Revision (ICD10) F20/F22-29) within a year prior to inclusion.
Runge 2021	patients with schizophrenia spectrum disorders who underwent LP during acute inpatient stay at University of Freiburg	Patients with Schizophrenia Spectrum Disorders who underwent lumbar puncture during their acute inpatient stay to exclude secondary organic causes of the disorder. They had to have received prior MRI imaging and be able to give consent. Patients with schizophrenia (ICD-10: F20), delusional disorders (ICD-10: F22), brief psychotic disorder (ICD-10: F23) and schizoaffective disorders (ICD-10: F25) were included. Patients with neurodegenerative diseases, acute clinical infections, or current substance dependence disorders, as well as neurological or immunological diseases with known brain involvement were excluded from the study.
Kranaster 2011	first episode schizophrenia or schizophreniform patients at University of Cologne according to DSM-IV criteria	no known previous or current treatment with antipsychotic medication

Steiner 2013	acutely ill patients from scientific blood bank at Magdeburg University Department of Psychiatry	“Patients with psychosis resulting from other medical conditions and substance-induced psychosis were excluded by a thorough physical examination, routine blood analysis (including differential blood cell count, kidney function tests, and levels of C-reactive protein, glucose, lipids, liver, enzymes, and thyroid hormones), screening for illegal drugs, And magnetic resonance imaging the brain. In Addition,electroencephalography (EEG)was performed.The same tests were carried out in the control, MD, and BLPD participants.”
Srikanth 1994	patients admitted to NiMHANS Bangalore	“They met the exclusion criteria: absence of poor nutrition (based on general physical examination), anemia, generalized bacterial or fungal infections, recent trauma, alcohol and drug abuse, neurological disorders, therapeutic drugs (including psychotropic drugs) during the last 6 months. They never had organ transplantation, elec-electroconvulsive therapy (ECT), or recent vaccination or blood transfusion.”
Seppala 2014	geriatric psychiatry department of Helsinki University Central Hospital consisting of 4 wards	“Psychotic symptoms had not lasted more than 2 years before their admission.No patients with a known diagnosis of dementia (AD, DLB, etc.) at admission were included. Patients with other diseases of the central nervous system (e.g., Parkinson disease [PD] or major stroke) were also excluded.”
Bien 2021	pts recruited from two clinical sites with community service obligations for inpatient and outpatient services, including early recognition for psychosis units in Germany, Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy at University of Cologne, Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy at Central Institute of Mental Health Mannheim	“Individuals met the following criteria: attenuated positive symptoms, brief, limited intermittent psychotic symptoms that spontaneously resolved within a week, a recent decline in function.”
Bauer 1987	patients were investigated at Department of Neurology and Psychiatry at Bundeswehrkrankenhaus Ulm	Only included patients newly diagnosed as schizophrenic
Rauber 2021	retrospective screening of local clinical patient database at University Clinic Munster, Germany to identify patients with available CSF data and primary psychotic disorders encompassing schizophrenia	Identified patients with available CSF mFC data and primary psychotic disorders encompassing schizophrenia, delusional disorders, acute and transient psychotic disorders or schizoaffective disorders.

Tang 2019	first episode psychosis patients recruited from institute of mental health, national neuroscience institute, a neurollogical center, and Tan Tock Seng Hospital, a general hospital in Singapore between September 2011 and October 2013	Inclusion criteria were age 16–50 years, the presence of less than 1 month of psychotic symptoms, and any of the following neurological symptoms: cognitive dysfunction,seizures, abnormal movements, or autonomic dysfunction. Patients were excluded if there was alcohol or drug-induced psychosis as determined by clinical history and/or a positive drug screen.
Rattay 2021	inpatients with psychosis with CSF analysis between 01/2016 and 06/2020 at Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy at University Hospital Tubingen Germany	Patients on any four of the acute admission wards or two wards specialized in the psychotherapy of psychotic disorders
Maier 2024	inpatients treated at the Department of Psychiatry, Social Psychiatry and Psychotherapy at Hannover Medical School	Patients with a previously diagnosed neurological or organic mental disorder (ICD-10: F00-F09), the second LP of the same patient, and CSF analysis that was not indicated for the differential diagnostic work-up of psychiatric symptoms were excluded.
Muller 1995	schizophrenic patients from 18 to 57 at the Psychiatric Hospital at University of Munich	Patients presenting a clinical indication for an lp, e.g. the first detailed investigation in order to exclude an organic disease, the first hospitaliza- tion, the first onset;first detailed investigation in order to exclude an organic disease, the first hospitalization
Theorell 2021	first episode patients were recruited from psychiatric wards and outpatient departments as a part of the Karolinska Schizophrenia Project	First-episode psychosis patients (n = 74), defined as first physician contact due to psychotic symptoms. Exclusion: overt abnormal signs on neurological examination, seizures, autonomic instability or a movement disorder.
Soderland		first-episode
Torrey 1978	first admission schizophrenia patients, multi-episode schizophrenia, schizo-affective psychosis, and manic depressive psychosis amongst inpatients at National Institute of Mental Health Bethesda. Controls were patients at National Naval medical center	“The patient group was those with first admission schizophrenia, multiple admission schizophrenia, schizo-affective psychosis and manic depressive psychosis. One control group were surgical patients with no known neurological or psychiatric disease. Finally there was another comparison group of 80 patients with neurological disease.”

eTable2. Study Characteristics

Study	Year	Country	FEP (n)	Control (n)	Age (years)	Female (percent)	Psychosis Duration (weeks)	Quality Assessment
Campana et al.	2023	Germany	222	NA	34.89	46.4		8
Campana et al.	2022	Germany	314	NA	35.1	45.2	52.4	6
Du et al.	2023	China	57	NA				6

Endres et al.	2017	Germany	100	NA	33.32	59		6
Endres et al.	2020	Germany	279	NA	32.72	54		8
Endres et al.	2015	Germany	33	NA				7
Endres et al.	2024	Germany	161	NA	34.71	56		6
Gine-Serven et al.	2022	Spain	95	NA	35	39		9
Guasp et al.	2021	Spain	105	NA	30	42		8
Hinotsu et al.	2022	Japan	151	NA				9
Kelleher et al.	2020	Ireland	112	NA	33	38		7
Kruse et al.	2015	USA	13	173	27	92		6
Maurus et al.	2023	Germany	121		35.1	50	48.8	7
Oviedo-Salcedo et al.	2018	Germany	332		36.85	46.3	246.32	3
Oviedo-Salcedo et al.	2021	Germany	128		34.43	48.4	44.68	8
Restrepo-Martinez et al.	2020	Mexico	24		24.5	38.3	46.4	8
Runge et al.	2022	Germany	100	Pts with IIH	33.7	60		8
Jeppesen et al.	2024	Germany	104		26.1	38.5	86.8	7
Runge et al.	2021	Germany	40		34.6	60		7
Kranaster et al.	2011	Denmark	155		NA	0		8
Steiner et al.	2013	Germany	229	30 healthy controls	NA	0		6
Srikanth et al.	1994	India	35	35 controls (women undergoing epidural)	NA	0		6
Seppala et al.	2014	Finland	51		NA	78		6

Bien et al.	2021	Germany	103	Yes, 40 healthy controls	NA	19.1		9
Bauer et al.	1987	Germany	15		NA	0		6
Rauber et al.	2021	Germany	59	Control group with IIH 52 pts	NA	37		8
Tang et al.	2019	Singapore	15		NA	80		7
Rattay et al.	2021	Germany	144		NA			9
Maier et al.	2024	Germany	254		33.8	56.9	103.84	8
Muller et al.	1995	Germany						7
Theorell et al.	2021	Sweden and UK						8
Soderland et al.	2009	Sweden						8
Torrey et al.	1978	USA						6
Lopes et al.	2024	Portugal	68		49	60.3		7
Coughlin et al.	2016	USA	14		24	21	803	8

880

881 eTable 3. Protocol for how studies identified subgroups based off clinical suspicion for secondary causes
882 of psychosis

883 eTable 3a. Studies with low clinical suspicion for secondary causes

Study	Method of Rule Out	Additional Medical Tests performed	Serum studies (not used for inclusion/exclusion)	RBCs for Pleocytosis Correction	CSF Studies performed
Jeppesen 2022	Prior or current severe neurological disorder: head injury within past 3 months, epilepsy w/ seizures within past 10 years, multiple sclerosis, stroke, brain tumor.	In select cases additional neuroimaging, EEG were performed.	Serum and CSF performed.	Pleocytosis adjusted for RBC.	WBC, Albumin, Total Protein, IgG

	Per protocol, excluded known organic cause, or encephalitis but did not explicitly mention evaluation e.g. MRI, EEG, clinical exam for rule out. Did not a priori screen for or exclude infection.				
Jeppesen 2023	Prior or current severe neurological disorder: head injury within past 3 months, epilepsy w/ seizures within past 10 years, multiple sclerosis, stroke, brain tumor. Per protocol, excluded known organic cause, or encephalitis but did not explicitly mention evaluation e.g. MRI, EEG, clinical exam for rule out. Did not a priori screen for or exclude infection.	In select cases additional neuroimaging, EEG were performed.	Serum and CSF performed.	Pleocytosis adjusted for RBC.	WBC, Albumin, Total Protein, IgG
Jeppesen 2024	Prior or current severe neurological disorder: head injury within past 3 months, epilepsy w/ seizures within past 10 years, multiple sclerosis, stroke, brain tumor. Per protocol, excluded known organic cause, or encephalitis but did not explicitly mention evaluation e.g. MRI, EEG, clinical exam for rule out. Did not a priori screen for or exclude infection.	In select cases additional neuroimaging, EEG were performed.	Serum and CSF performed.	Pleocytosis adjusted for RBC.	WBC, Albumin, Total Protein, IgG
Guasp 2021	Exclusion: (1) positive symptoms of psychosis for >6 months, (2) previous diagnosis of intellectual disability (IQ), (3) any active medical or neurological conditions.	All patients had an MRI. EEG was routinely performed at one institution and if clinically indicated at another institution. Additionally had tox screen.	Serum samples for Nfl were obtained in addition to CSF studies performed	Unclear if RBC corrected. Did not explicitly mention.	NMDAR, Abnormal Celll Count
Endres 2020	Did not detail which specific tests were invoked. Did state that patients transferred from	MRI and EEG performed on all patients	Anti-thyroid, antineuronal IgG, anti-NMDAR IgG, anti-VGKC, anti-neuronal	Did correct for RBC contamination	WBC count, Elevated Protein, Oligoclonal Bands Type 2, Elevated Albumin, NMDAR, LGI1, CASPR,

	Dept of Neurology or those with dementia were excluded.		IgG to Yo, Hu, CV2/CRMP5, Ri, Ma1/2, Sox1, GAD65, amphiphysin, Tr, Zic4, anti-MOG, anti-AQP4, WBC, Total Protein, Albumin Quotient, IgG index, OCBs in serum/CSF		AMPAR, GABABR, IgG Index
Endres 2021	Did not detail which specific tests were invoked. Did state that patients transferred from Dept of Neurology or those with dementia were excluded.	MRI and EEG performed on all patients	Anti-thyroid, antineuronal IgG, anti-NMDAR IgG, anti-VGKC, anti-neuronal IgG to Yo, Hu, CV2/CRMP5, Ri, Ma1/2, Sox1, GAD65, amphiphysin, Tr, Zic4, anti-MOG, anti-AQP4, WBC, Total Protein, Albumin Quotient, IgG index, OCBs in serum/CSF	Did correct for RBC contamination	WBC count, Elevated Protein, Oligoclonal Bands Type 2, Elevated Albumin, NMDAR, LGI1, CASPR, AMPAR, GABABR, IgG Index
Bien 2021	Neurological Exam, MRI brain, EEG, blood pathology all performed as a part of screening; Included only if EEG, MRI, serum studies and neurological exam were within normal limits.	All patients had already had MRI/EEG as a part of the screening process.	Serum and CSF	Did not mention RBC correction but also did not report out pleocytosis	NMDAR, GAD65, LGI1, CASPR, AMPAR, GABAR, Glycine
Gine-Serven 2022	Active medical or neurological diseases, did not detail method of assessment	Did not perform MRI/EEG	Serum and csf studies for neuronal antibodies	Did not include pleocytosis parameter	WBC, Protein, NMDAR, GAD65
Theorell 2021	Screened patients using neurological exam, screened out for seizures, autonomic instability or movement disorder but did not detail/explicitly invoke EEG/MRI	MRI performed in some patients. EEG not performed.	Serum and CSF performed	Did not mention RBC correction, but also did not report pleocytosis	NMDAR
Rauber 2021	Patients were exlcuded if: Signs of systemic infection. 2. Suspected viral encephalitis and bacterial meningitis assessed by an elevated CSF	There was a separate NMDARE cohort who was diagnosed using the following criteria: : a rapid onset (<3 month) of four out of six typical clinical symptoms,	Serum and CSF studies	Did not explicitly report out pleocytosis	NMDAR, GAD65, LGI1, CASPR, AMPAR, GABAR, Glycine, Yo, Hu

	cell count (>5/µl), detection of viruses (Herpes simplex virus-1/2 [HSV-1/HSV-2], Cytomegalovirus [CMV], Epstein-Barr virus [EBV], Varicella zoster virus [VZV], Human herpesvirus-6 [HHV-6], and Enterovirus) in the CSF by polymerase-chain-reaction or bacteria by gram staining.	either abnormal EEG or pleocytosis/ oligoclonal bands in CSF studies, exclusion of differential diagnoses and detection of CSF-IgG antibodies targeting the GluN1 subunit of the NMDA receptor.			
Runge 2021	Neurodegenerative diseases, clinical infections, and neurological diseases with brain involvement were all excluded. Any patients with abnormality on MRI were excluded.	All patients had MRI and EEG.	Serum and CSF	Did not report pleocytosis and therefore did not comment on RBC correction	WBC, Protein, Oligoclonal Bands Type 2, NMDAR, GAD65, LGI1, CASPR, AMPAR, GABABR, IgG,
Kelleher 2020	Neurology review, MRI brain, EEG were used for exclusion. Presence of a pre-existing neurological disorder resultedi n exclusion.	All patients were offered EEG, MRI, malignancy screen (pelvic or testicular US & X-ray), and lumbar puncture for CSF	Serum and CSFstudies performed	Did not mention RBC correction for pleocytosis	WBC, Protein, NMDAR
Campana 2023	Clinical and physical Examinations for seizures, movement disorders, autonomic instability were utilized for exclusion.	MRI offered to all patients. EEG was not offered.	Serum and CSF studies performed	Did not mention RBC correction for pleocytosis.	Oligoclonal bands Type 2, Oligoclonal Bands Type 3
Campana 2022	Clinical and Physical Examinations for signs that could indicate presence of an autoimmune encephalitis e.g. seizures, movement disorders, autonomic instability were utilized for exclusion. Did not screen for infection.	All patients underwent an MRI.	Serum and CSF studies performed	Did not mention RBC correction for pleocytosis.	WBC, OCB2, OCB3, OCB4, OCB5, Albumin, MZRZ,
Muller 1997	Patients presenting with clinical indication for LP, first onset, and first hospitalization for psychosis were included. MRI and EEG not used for rule out.	MRI and EEG not performed.	Serum and CSF studies performed	Did not test for pleocytosis	Elevated Protein, elevated albumin, elevated IgG index

Coughlin 2016	Patients were excluded if: (1) history of neurological disorder, structural brain abnormality or history of traumatic brain injury with loss of consciousness; (2) history of special education or known learning disability; (3) history of an inflammatory medical condition including but not limited to diabetes, human immunodeficiency virus and/or hepatitis; (4) benzodiazepine use in the past 6 months; (5) substance abuse (for example, cannabis, alcohol) in the previous 6 months or any history of substance dependence except for nicotine; (6) contraindication to participation in magnetic resonance imaging (MRI); or (7) contraindication to participation in PET including pregnancy.	All patients underwent MRI.	Did not perform CSF studies	Did not assess pleocytosis	IL6
Srikanth 1994	Did not mention MRI or EEG	exclusion criteria: absence of poor nutrition (based on general physical examination), anemia, generalized bacterial or fungal infections, recent trauma, alcohol and drug abuse, neurological disorders, therapeutic drugs (including psychotropic drugs) during the last 6 months. They never had organ transplantation, electroconvulsive therapy (ECT), or recent vaccination or blood transfusion.	Serum and CSF	Did not mention RBC correction/did not calculate pleocytosis	Examined for infection e.g. CMV, HSV1, measles, mumps, varicella, JEV

Endres 2022	Patients who were transferred to the Depart-ment of Neurology for further investigations were notincluded. Patients with schizophreniform or affective syndromeswho were also diagnosed with dementia were excluded(ICD-10: F00.X-F04.X)	All patients were offered MRI and EEG but not used for exclusion	Serum and CSF studies performed	Did not assess for pleocytosis	Abnormal cell count, abnormal protein, oligoclonal bands Type 2, elevated albumin, NMDAR, elevated IgG, MOG
Oviedo-Salcedo 2018	Excluded patients with a " diagnosis of organic psychotic disorders (F06.0/F06.1/F06.2), drug-induced psychotic disorder (F1X.5) or clinical signs that could indicate the presence of an underlying autoimmune encephalitis7 (e.g. seizures, movement disorders, autonomic instability)	Did not specifically ennumerate whether patients received MRI/EEG; study appears to focus on chart review of existing history and physical exam	Serum and CSF.	Did not perform RBC correction for pleocytosis	Intrathecal OCBs, pleocytosis, anti-Yo, anti-NMDAR, GABA receptor B1/B2, AMPAR-2
Bauer 1987	Syphilis was ruled out; also excluded people with drug and alchol abuse; additional criteria not described;	All patients had CT scan, skull X-ray, EEG, spinal tap and routine laboratory tests.	CSF testing for common "neurotropic viruses (rubella, measles, mumps, enterovirus pool, lymphocytic choriomeningitis, herpes hominis I/II, varicella zoster, Russian spring summer encephalitis, central European encephalitis)"	Did not mention RBC correction for pleocytosis.	Rubella, measles, mumps, enterovirus, lymphocytic choriomeningitis, albumin, IgG

eTable 3b. Studies with a population enriched for high clinical suspicion for secondary causes of psychosis

Lopes 2024	Patients were all from a neurology unit: first psychotic episode with atypical features as late-onset psycho sis and psychosis refractory to treatment. MRI and EEG data were included where possible from review of medical records but not used for exclusion. All patients met possible, probable, or definite AIP by two neurologists utilizing the diagnostic criteria set by the 2019 Consensus	All had EEG and MRI	Serum and CSF where possible	Did not mention RBC correction	WBC, protein, OCB2, NMDAR, GAD65, LGI1, CASPR
Tang 2019	Included if there were the following neurological symptoms: cognitive function, seizures, abnormal movements, or autonomic dysfunction. CT or MRI was performed on all patients, but not both, not used for rule in/out.	Cases that were positive for anti-NMDAR or anti-VGKC encephalitis were offered MRIs. One was explicitly noted to have EEG.	Serum and CSF	Did not mention RBC correction for pleocytosis	NMDAR antibodies
Steiner 2013	Psychosis resulting from other medical conditions, and substance induced psychosis were excluded by a thorough physical examination, routine blood analysis, drug screen, MRI and EEG.	All patients had blood tests, MRI, and EEG.	Serum and CSF studies were performed	Did not mention RBC correction for pleocytosis	NMDAR antibodies
Restrepo-Martinez 2020	Patients were selected as high probability for ANDMARE according to the Graus et al. criteria.	MRI and EEG were obtained in all patients.	Serum studies not reported.	Did not report pleocytosis and therefore did not comment on RBC correction	Patients were screened for infection, namely HIV, M. TB, cryptococcus neoformans, viral PCR for Herpes Type 1 and Type 2, CMV, EBV, Varicella-Zoster, HHV 6, 7, 8, Enterovirus, Parvovirus B19, lymphocytic choriomeningitis virus
Restrepo-Martinez 2020 NM DAR Positive Group	Patients were selected as high probability for ANDMARE according to the Graus et al. criteria. One group was found to be NMDAR antibody positive (by serum)	MRI and EEG were obtained in all patients. One group only included those positive for	Serum studies not reported.	Did not report pleocytosis and therefore did not comment on RBC correction	Patients were screened for infection, namely HIV, M. TB, cryptococcus neoformans, viral PCR for Herpes Type 1 and Type 2, CMV, EBV, Varicella-Zoster, HHV 6, 7, 8, Enterovirus, Parvovirus B19,

		NMDAR antibodies			lymphocytic choriomeningitis virus
Kruse 2015 Group A	One of the following: new-onset movement disorder, encephalitic MRI, EEG, CSF findings, past episode of immuno-therapy responsive encephalitis were used for rule out. One subgroup of patients defined as Group 2/Group A was comprised of patients who had serum positivity for anti-NMDAR antibodies.	All patients had MRI, EEG and serum tests.	Serum and CSF	Did not mention RBC correction	WBC, Elevated Protein, Oligoclonal Bands Type 2,NMDAR antibodies
Du 2023	High risk given acute psychosis in the context of Covid-19. The exclusion criteria were as follows: (1) patients without COVID-19; (2) patients with psy chotic symptoms related to other systemic diseases (such as hepatic encephalopathy, renal encephalopathy, pulmonary encephalopathy, and hyponatremia), encephalitis, dementia, poisoning, drug abuse, or steroid use; (3) patients with severe or critical pneumonia; and (4) patients who were missing much critical data.	All patients had an EEG and MRI.	Serum and CSF	Did not mention RBC correction	Screened for Covid-19, WBC, Elevated Protein
Rattay 2021	Exclusion diagnostics of alcohol-/drug-associated, systemic, or other brain organic causes are based on a physical examination, neuropsychological testing, routine blood testing, urine drug screening, breath/blood alcohol test, electroencephalography (EEG), and brain structural imaging (MRI) at initial manifestation.	serum, MRI, EEG	Serum and CSF	Did not mention RBC correction	WBC, Protein, Oligoclonal Bands Type 2,Oligoclonal Bands Type 3, Oligoclonal Bands Type 4, NMDAR antibodies, anti-Yo, anti-Hu
Kruse 2015 Group B	Inclusion was One of the following: new-onset movement disorder,encephalitic MRI, EEG, CSF findings, past episode of immuno-therapy responsive encephalitis	All patients had MRI, EEG and serum tests.	Serum and CSF	Did not mention RBC correction	Did not mention screening for infection

891

eTable 3c. Studies with an undifferentiated sample in terms of suspicion for secondary causes of psychosis

Endres 2015	MRI and EEG performed for all patients	MRI, EEG, serum	Serum and CSF	Did not mention RBC correction	Cell count, protein, oligoclonal bands type 2, Oligoclonal bands Type 3, Oligoclonal Bands Type 4, Oligoclonal Bands Type 5, Elevated Albumin
Maier 2024	EEG, MRI and or CT	EEG, MRI or CT, serum studies	Serum and CSF studies	Did not mention RBC correction	Screened for infectious encephalitis e.g. HSV, enterovirus, neuroborreliosis, meningoencephalitis, CMV
Soderland 2009	Did not mention EEG or MRI For screening	No mention of other tests e.g. MRI, EEG.	Did not mention serum studies	Did not mention RBC correction	Did not explicitly screen for infections/CNS infections
Seppala 2014	All patients had MRI or CT. Excluded stroke, Parkinson's disease but no further exclusion criteria. Did not mention EEG	All patients had either MRI or CT.	Did not mention serum studies	Did not mention RBC correction	Tau, AB42
Kranaster 2011	Did not mention MRI or EEG	None	Did not mention serum studies	Did not mention RBC correction or pleocytosis	total cell count, total protein, ratios of albumin, IgG, IgM, IgA, and glucose, oligoclonal bands, lactate, and antibody indices of neurotrophic viruses as well as Toxoplasma gondii and Borrelia burgdorferi
Runge 2022	The information about diagnosis and comorbidity came from chart review. Patients with neurodegenerative diseases, acute clinical infections, or current substance dependence disorders, as well as neurological or immunological diseases with known brain	Patients had previously undergone MRI and EEG.	Serum and CSF	Did not mention RBC correction or pleocytosis	WBC, protein, oligoclonal bands type 2, NMDAR, GAD65, LGI1, CASPR, AMPAR, IgG, Herpes virus, EBV, CMV, Toxoplasma gondii

	involvement were excluded from the study.				
Hinotsu 2022	disorders including neuroleptic malignant syndrome were excluded.	MRI and EEG	Serum and CSF	Did not mention RBC correction	Screened for prior infection. CSF studies:
Endres 2017	Only CSF/serum samples from patients with complete thyroid hormone status (thyroid stimulating hormone [TSH], triiodothyronine [t3], and thy roxine [t4]) were included.	MRI and EEG	Serum and CSF	No RBC correction/pleocytosis reporting	WBC, protein
Torrey 1978	Did not explicitly screen out	MRI and EEG not performed.	Serum and CSF studies performed	Did not assess for pleocytosis	Measles, HSV-1, CMV, rubella, IgG, IgA
Endres 2024	Patients with secondary or rheumatological causes were not excluded.	All patients were offered MRI and EEG but not used for exclusion	Serum and CSF studies performed	Did not assess for pleocytosis	Abnormal cell count, abnormal protein, oligoclonal bands Type 2, elevated albumin, NMDAR, elevated IgG, MOG
Maurus 2023	Exclusion criteria comprised any psychiatric or physical prediagnoses possibly resulting in cognitive impairments or BBB dysfunction (such as intellectual disability, perinatal asphyxia or stroke); abnormal brain magnetic resonance imaging findings suggestive of a relevant co-occurring CNS disorder (e.g.	All patients were offered neurocognitive testing; MRI and EEG were not mentioned	Serum and CSF studies performed	Did not address RBC correction	Albumin, IgG, Protein, Elevated Number of Cells e.g. Pleocytosis, OCB Type 1, 2, 3, 4, 5

	neoplasms); and a time interval of more than 21 days between CSF and blood sampling, or of more than 90 days between CSF sampling and neurocognitive testing, to ensure a clinically meaningful temporal association. Based on thorough screening of all available data, 45 patients were excluded before data analysis (see Supplementary Appendix 1). Thus, 121 patients were included in the final sample..				