The Course of Relapse Following Antipsychotic Discontinuation in Schizophrenia: A Test of the Antipsychotic Withdrawal Syndrome Hypothesis of Relapse

Krisya Louie[1]

Sameer Jauhar[2]

Jose Rubio[3]

Toby Pillinger[1,4,5]

Oliver D. Howes[4,6,7]

Robert A. McCutcheon[1,4,8*]

1. Department of Psychiatry, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK
2. Division of Psychiatry, Imperial College London, London, UK
3. Institute of Behavioral Science, Feinstein Institutes for Medical Research, Northwell Health, Glen Oaks, NY
4. Department of Psychosis Studies, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, King's College, London, SE5 8AF
5. TUNE-UP Service, South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK
6. South London & Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK
7. MRC Laboratory of Medical Sciences (LMS), London, UK
8. TUNE-UP Service, Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust, Oxford, OX3 7JX

* robert.mccutcheon@psych.ox.ac.uk

Abstract

Background

Antipsychotics are central to relapse prevention in schizophrenia, but longer-term use is associated with adverse effects that often prompt dose reduction or discontinuation. Although relapse risk increases after discontinuation, the nature of relapse remains unclear. Specifically, it is uncertain whether relapse reflects re-emergence of underlying illness or pharmacological withdrawal.

Methods

We analysed longitudinal symptom data (Positive and Negative Syndrome Scale; PANSS) from 417 individuals with schizophrenia who experienced relapse post-stabilization in five randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled discontinuation trials of oral and long-acting injectable (LAI) paliperidone. Latent class mixed modelling was used to identify distinct trajectories of symptom change preceding relapse.

Findings

Two latent classes of relapse were identified: ‘rapid’ and ‘delayed’ onset. Rapid relapse was associated with more severe positive, negative, and cognitive symptoms at relapse. The proportion of individuals experiencing rapid relapse did not differ between those randomized to placebo (treatment discontinuation) versus treatment continuation in either LAI (p=0.119) or oral trials (p=0.949). No consistent increase in withdrawal-like symptoms (e.g. anxiety, agitation, depression) was found in discontinuation compared to continuation groups. Across formulations, individuals with rapid relapse had significantly higher baseline PANSS scores than those with delayed relapse (p<0.001).

Interpretation

Relapse following antipsychotic discontinuation follows at least two distinct trajectories that are not specific to treatment withdrawal. The comparable proportions of rapid and delayed relapse trajectories between discontinuation and continuation groups, together with the absence of a distinct symptom profile at relapse, does not support pharmacological withdrawal as a common mechanism of relapse. Instead, higher baseline symptom severity in those who experience rapid relapse may reflect pre-existing vulnerability and/or trial-related measurement artefacts related to baseline symptom rating and trial inclusion criteria. This emphasizes the clinical importance of risk stratification and individual monitoring, and challenge the assumption that relapse risk can be meaningfully reduced through dose tapering strategies alone.

Introduction

Schizophrenia is a severe psychiatric disorder which often shows a relapsing-remitting illness course.[1] Relapse is common and associated with marked functional disruption[2], making relapse prevention a primary objective of long-term illness management.[3] Antipsychotic medications are the foundation of maintenance treatment, which primarily exert their therapeutic effects through dopamine D_2 receptor antagonism.[4] Meta-analyses of randomized controlled trials (RCTs) have demonstrated the efficacy of antipsychotics in reducing relapse risk compared to placebo,[5,6] supporting clinical guidelines that recommend maintenance therapy in individuals at risk of recurrence, particularly during the early phase of illness.[7,8]

Despite their efficacy, long-term antipsychotic treatment is associated with substantial side effects, which can impair quality of life and functional recovery, leading some people to request dose reduction or discontinuation.[9,10] Side-effects and lack of insight contribute to non-adherence, which is one of the main factors associated with relapse.[11] With increasing emphasis on shared decision-making and patient autonomy, there has been growing interest in whether antipsychotic medication can be safely reduced or discontinued in individuals who have achieved sustained symptom stability.[12,13] Current guidance endorses individualized treatment management strategies that balance relapse risk against tolerability.[14,15] However, at a group level, the risk of relapse after antipsychotic discontinuation is approximately twice those observed with continued maintenance treatment.[5] There remains a paucity of methodologically robust evidence to guide clinicians on how best to discontinue antipsychotics, how relapse should be monitored during discontinuation, and whether particular symptom patterns are early warning signs of relapse.[16]

Competing hypotheses have been proposed to explain the nature of relapse following antipsychotic discontinuation (eTable 1). The conventional view holds that relapse reflects re-emergence of underlying illness once dopamine D_2 receptor blockade drops below the effective threshold.[17] This interpretation is supported by meta-analyses finding no significant difference in risk of relapse between abrupt and gradual antipsychotic discontinuation,[5,18] suggesting that relapse is primarily driven by insufficient dopamine receptor blockade rather than the speed of dose reduction.[19] An alternative hypothesis proposes that some cases of relapse represent withdrawal phenomena such as dopamine supersensitivity psychosis, particularly in rapid-onset cases accompanied by new antipsychotic withdrawal symptoms.[20] Here, chronic D_2 blockade induces compensatory upregulation of D_2 receptors, increasing post-synaptic sensitivity to endogenous dopamine and triggering rebound symptoms upon drug discontinuation.[21] While this hypothesis is supported by rat models and some clinical observations, its prevalence and generalizability remain uncertain.[22–24]

Some antipsychotic discontinuation trials report a disproportionately large number of people with early relapse, which has been interpreted by some as evidence for withdrawal effects.[16,24] However, an alternative explanation for this observed rapid relapse patterns involves methodological artefacts in clinical trials.[19] Recruitment pressures can create incentives for symptom ratings to be artificially lowered during the pre-randomization phase to meet eligibility thresholds.[25] Once randomized, these pressures are relaxed and subsequent symptom ratings may more accurately reflect clinical status, creating the appearance of abrupt deterioration, leading to interpretation of an apparent abrupt relapse. These competing hypotheses raise the possibility that relapse may not be a single phenomenon, but might represent multiple trajectories, with different underlying neurobiology and symptom dynamics.

Resolving this debate is complicated by limitations of conventional analytical methods. Most RCTs employ time-to-relapse analyses, using Kaplan-Meier survival models to estimate the hazard of relapse.[18] While appropriate for quantifying *when* relapse occurs, survival analyses treat relapse as a single binary outcome, which may obscure *how* symptoms evolve over time, leading up to relapse. In clinical practice, patients may follow different illness courses prior to relapse: some may have illnesses that deteriorate rapidly, others more slowly or intermittently. A key question is whether relapse after antipsychotic discontinuation differs in trajectory and symptomatology from relapse occurring during continued treatment ("breakthrough" relapse).

To address this limitation, we applied latent class mixed modelling (LCMM) to longitudinal symptom data from randomized antipsychotic discontinuation trials. LCMM is a data-driven method that identifies latent subgroups of individuals with similar trajectories of symptom change.[26,27] This analytic approach enables the identification of distinct relapse trajectories, such as rapid-onset or delayed patterns.

Our main aim was to test whether the ratio of trajectory classes (e.g. rapid compared to delayed) was greater in the discontinuation arm compared to the continuation arm of randomized discontinuation trials, as this would support a pharmacological withdrawal form of relapse. Alternatively, hypotheses involving baseline score deflation and underlying illness-related processes, would predict similar distributions of relapse trajectories across treatment groups. In addition, we aimed to investigate symptom profiles at the time of relapse using item-level Positive and Negative Syndrome Scale (PANSS) scores[28] to evaluate whether symptoms plausibly related to withdrawal (e.g., agitation, anxiety, depression) were more prominent in certain trajectory classes or treatment groups. Finally, we planned to evaluate baseline symptom profiles to examine whether rapid relapses are associated with greater severity of symptoms at time of randomization – supporting the baseline inflation hypothesis.

Methods

Identification of study cohort and data extraction

The Yale Open Data Access (YODA)[29] was searched for randomized discontinuation trials of antipsychotics in individuals aged 18-65 with schizophrenia or schizoaffective disorder. Double-blind placebo-controlled relapse prevention RCTs of antipsychotic medications were included. In these trials, participants were first treated with antipsychotic drugs for more than three months and clinically stabilized before they were randomized to placebo (discontinuation) or continued active treatment. Five eligible trials were identified with available individual participant data examining both oral and long-acting injectable (LAI) formulations of paliperidone palmitate versus placebo.

The cohort of interest was defined as participants that experienced relapse regardless of treatment group at any time post-randomization during the double-blind phase according to the original study criteria (Supplementary Material 3). The individual participant data analyzed in this study included: treatment group, age, sex, baseline Clinical Global Impression (CGI) scores[30] and individual item scores on the Positive and Negative Syndrome Scale (PANSS)[28] at baseline and at all available measurement timepoints from the date of randomization up until date of relapse. The time to relapse was calculated as the number of days elapsed from the date of randomization.

Statistical analysis

LCMM was employed to identify subgroups with distinct trajectories of psychotic (PANSS) symptoms among individuals who experienced illness relapse during ongoing antipsychotic treatment or after treatment discontinuation. LCMM is a statistical modelling technique that can analyze the change in longitudinal outcomes over time, and identify latent classes with distinct outcome trajectories.[31] LCMMs are an extension of linear mixed models developed to handle population heterogeneity through uncovering unobserved (latent) classes of trajectories, based on longitudinal repeated measures.[27] Unlike conventional mixed-effects models that assume a single population symptom trajectory, LCMM can identify distinct trajectory classes by simultaneously modelling the pattern of within-person change, and between-person variability. By taking a data-driven approach to derive latent classes of symptom patterns, LCMM avoids incorporating a priori assumptions of group structure. This analytical method is well-suited to studying complex fluctuating latent processes, such as the experience of psychotic symptoms over time, as it can detect subtle individual differences in symptom progression and capture patterns of clinical variability leading up to illness relapse.[26]

The study cohort was split into two groups: an oral formulation cohort and an LAI cohort, for model fitting and subsequent analyses. A secondary analysis further splitting the LAI cohort into 1-monthly and 3-monthly formulations was also conducted. This approach allowed more optimal model fit and comparison between different formulations of paliperidone, with varying half-lives and pharmacokinetic profiles. A series of latent class models were fitted on the total PANSS scores from all available measurement timepoints, starting from initial randomization visit up to the date of relapse, irrespective of treatment status. An iterative process to model specification within the maximum likelihood framework was implemented (Supplementary Material 1). Goodness-of-fit of the selected model was confirmed by plotting weighted subject-specific predicted trajectories against observed values for each latent class.

After selecting the final optimal latent class model, each individual was assigned to the latent trajectory class with the highest posterior probability of membership. Chi-square tests of independence were performed to evaluate whether the proportion of individuals in specific relapse trajectory classes differed between treatment groups. Symptom profiles in terms of individual PANSS item scores at time of relapse and at baseline were compared between latent trajectory classes and between treatment groups, including symptoms previously proposed to reflect withdrawal rather than true psychotic withdrawal, such as anxiety, depression and agitation (see eTable 1). Differences between latent classes and between treatment groups in covariates of interest (original study trial, sex, age, baseline PANSS and CGI scores) were assessed with the appropriate statistical test, with correction for multiple testing (Supplementary Material 1). LCMM was conducted with the R package *lcmm*.[31] All statistical analyses were conducted in R version 4.3.0[32] on the secure YODA platform.[33]

Results

The final study cohort consisted of 417 participants who relapsed during the double-blind post-randomization phase of the five antipsychotic discontinuation trials, with 271 in the three long-acting injectable (LAI) trials and 146 in the two oral formulation trials (eTable 2). More individuals in the discontinuation group experienced relapse (LAI:72.7%; oral:74.0%) compared to continued active treatment (LAI:27.3%; oral:26.0%).

For both LAI and oral formulation groups, the two-class linear transformation latent class mixed model with random effects had the best fit, according to the predefined statistical criteria (eTable 3). There was general agreement between the predicted values and actual observations in the weighted mean subject-specific prediction plots by latent class (Figure 1).



Figure 1. Predicted relapse trajectories in the two latent trajectory classes

a) Long-acting injectable (LAI) paliperidone palmitate trials.
b) Oral paliperidone palmitate trials.
Dots represent the weighted subject-specific predicted values of each latent trajectory class. The confidence interval range of observed values are shown in the shaded region.

Latent class mixed modelling

In LAI trials, 224 of 271 participants (82.7%) had a relapse trajectory characterized by generally stable symptoms, with lower severity (Table 1). This latent class had a median time to relapse of 99 days, hence defined as 'delayed relapse'. 47 participants (17.3%) had a relapse trajectory characterized by relatively severe psychotic symptoms from trial onset, with greater fluctuation of symptom severity. This latent class had a median time to relapse of 56 days, defined as 'rapid relapse'.

In oral formulation trials, 107 of 146 participants (73.3%) had a relapse trajectory characterized by generally stable symptoms, with lower severity and median time to relapse of 43 days ('delayed relapse') (Table 1). 39 participants (26.7%) had a trajectory characterized by relatively severe symptoms from trial onset, with greater fluctuation of symptom severity and median time to relapse of 10 days ('rapid relapse').

Table 1. Baseline characteristics by relapse trajectory classes

Long-Acting Injectable (LAI) Formulation				
Characteristics	Total cohort (*n* = 271)	Delayed relapse (*n* = 224)	Rapid relapse (*n* = 47)	*p*-value
Treatment group:				0.119
Discontinuation	197 (72.7%)	158	39	
Active treatment	74 (27.3%)	66	8	
Time to relapse[a]	84 (88)	99 (100)	56 (50)	< 0.001
Trial study:				0.206
Berwaerts (3-monthly)	56 (20.7%)	42	14	
Fu (1-monthly)	82 (30.3%)	68	14	
Hough (1-monthly)	133 (49.1%)	114	19	
Male sex	155 (57.2%)	127 (56.7%)	28 (59.6%)	0.841
Age at screening[b]	38.4 (11.2)	38.2 (11.2)	39.2 (11.4)	0.596
Baseline PANSS total[b]	54.8 (13.7)	52.7 (11.0)	64.9 (19.6)	< 0.001
Baseline CGI[b]	2.70 (0.77)	2.63 (0.76)	3.02 (0.71)	0.001
Oral Formulation				
Characteristics	Total cohort (*n* = 146)	Delayed relapse (*n* = 107)	Rapid relapse (*n* = 39)	*p*-value
Treatment group:				0.949
Discontinuation	108 (74.0%)	79	29	
Active treatment	38 (26.0%)	28	10	
Time to relapse[a]	25.5 (48.8)	43 (55.5)	10 (9)	< 0.001
Trial study:				0.195
Kramer	75 (51.4%)	51	24	
Rui	71 (48.6%)	56	15	
Male sex	72 (49.3%)	50 (46.7%)	22 (56.4%)	0.396
Age at screening[b]	34.8 (11.5)	34.4 (11.6)	36.1 (11.2)	0.434
Baseline PANSS total[b]	52.9 (10.2)	50.8 (9.68)	58.6 (9.46)	< 0.001
Baseline CGI[b]	2.83 (0.75)	2.68 (0.71)	3.23 (0.71)	< 0.001

[a] Median (IQR); [b] Mean (SD)

Relapse trajectories in discontinuation compared to active treatment groups

In the LAI relapse cohort, the proportion of individuals with a rapid relapse trajectory did not differ significantly between the discontinuation (19.8%) and the active treatment group (10.8%; X^2=2.44, p=0.119, Table 1). The trajectory class distribution did not differ significantly between treatment groups in the 1-monthly and 3-monthly formulation cohorts (eTable 6-7). In the oral cohort, rapid relapse was seen in 26.9% of discontinuation relapses, and 26.3% of the active treatment relapses (X^2=0.004, p=0.949, Table 1).

Symptom profiles at the time of relapse

For the LAI cohort, individuals with a rapid relapse trajectory had significantly higher scores on all PANSS items at time of relapse, except for 3 general psychopathology subscale items (Figure 2a). For the oral formulation cohort, the rapid relapse trajectory class had significantly more severe symptoms in all except 10 PANSS items at relapse (Figure 2c).

In both formulations, the discontinuation and active treatment groups did not differ significantly in symptom profiles at the time of relapse, and this includes symptoms previously suggested as indicative of withdrawal (i.e. agitation, anxiety, and depression) (Figure 2b, 2d).

Baseline symptom profiles at the time of randomization

For the LAI cohort, the rapid relapse trajectory class had significantly higher baseline scores in terms of total PANSS ($p<0.001$), and 15 individual PANSS items compared to the delayed relapse class, across positive, negative and general symptom domains (Figure 3a). Baseline CGI severity was also significantly increased ($p=0.001$).

In the oral formulation cohort, the rapid relapse trajectory class had significantly higher baseline total PANSS scores ($p<0.001$) and 4 individual PANSS items compared to the delayed relapse class (Figure 3c). Baseline CGI severity was also significantly increased ($p<0.001$).

In both formulations, the relapse trajectory classes did not differ significantly in study cohort, sex or age (Table 1).

Figure 2. Forest plot of symptoms at the time of relapse.

(a) Long-acting injectable (LAI) paliperidone palmitate trials by relapse trajectory class
(b) Long-acting injectable (LAI) paliperidone palmitate trials by treatment group
(c) Oral paliperidone palmitate trials by relapse trajectory class
(d) Oral paliperidone palmitate trials by treatment group

Mean (SD) scores are shown per class/group. Symptoms are ordered by effect size. *P*-values of *t*-tests are false discovery rate (FDR) corrected. SMD *standardized mean difference.* P *PANSS positive subscale.* N *negative subscale.* G *general psychopathology subscale*.

(a)

LAI: Symptoms at relapse	Delayed relapse	Rapid relapse	SMD (95% CI)	p–value (FDR)
P03 Hallucinatory behaviour	2.22 (1.36)	3.91 (1.00)	1.30 [0.96; 1.63]	<0.001
P01 Delusions	2.67 (1.29)	4.15 (0.81)	1.21 [0.88; 1.54]	<0.001
G09 Unusual thought content	2.31 (1.10)	3.53 (0.95)	1.14 [0.81; 1.46]	<0.001
G04 Tension	2.08 (1.01)	3.21 (1.02)	1.12 [0.79; 1.44]	<0.001
P05 Grandiosity	1.59 (0.96)	2.66 (1.29)	1.04 [0.72; 1.37]	0.001
N03 Poor rapport	1.93 (0.89)	2.85 (0.96)	1.02 [0.69; 1.35]	<0.001
G05 Mannerisms and posturing	1.55 (0.81)	2.38 (0.99)	0.99 [0.67; 1.32]	<0.001
G13 Disturbance of volition	2.06 (0.95)	2.98 (0.97)	0.96 [0.64; 1.29]	<0.001
N06 Lack spontaneity / flow conversation	2.01 (0.97)	2.91 (0.95)	0.93 [0.61; 1.25]	<0.001
G11 Poor attention	2.13 (0.97)	3.02 (0.90)	0.93 [0.60; 1.25]	<0.001
N04 Passive / apathetic social withdrawal	2.51 (1.08)	3.47 (0.83)	0.92 [0.60; 1.25]	<0.001
G08 Uncooperativeness	1.77 (0.99)	2.70 (1.12)	0.92 [0.60; 1.25]	<0.001
P02 Conceptual disorganization	2.37 (1.11)	3.38 (1.05)	0.92 [0.60; 1.25]	<0.001
N07 Stereotyped thinking	2.17 (1.01)	3.02 (1.01)	0.85 [0.53; 1.17]	<0.001
G10 Disorientation	1.47 (0.74)	2.15 (1.10)	0.84 [0.51; 1.16]	<0.001
G15 Preoccupation	2.20 (0.99)	3.02 (1.01)	0.83 [0.51; 1.15]	<0.001
P06 Suspiciousness / persecution	2.63 (1.29)	3.66 (0.96)	0.83 [0.51; 1.15]	<0.001
G16 Active social avoidance	2.34 (1.07)	3.21 (1.10)	0.81 [0.49; 1.13]	<0.001
N02 Emotional withdrawal	2.53 (0.98)	3.28 (0.95)	0.77 [0.45; 1.09]	<0.001
G02 Anxiety	2.56 (1.13)	3.45 (1.23)	0.77 [0.45; 1.09]	<0.001
P04 Excitement	2.12 (1.10)	2.96 (1.02)	0.77 [0.44; 1.09]	<0.001
G14 Poor impulse control	2.00 (1.10)	2.72 (1.08)	0.66 [0.34; 0.98]	0.004
P07 Hostility	1.89 (1.14)	2.64 (1.11)	0.66 [0.34; 0.98]	<0.001
N01 Blunted affect	2.35 (1.02)	2.96 (1.00)	0.59 [0.28; 0.91]	0.009
N05 Difficulty in abstract thinking	2.83 (1.05)	3.40 (1.19)	0.53 [0.22; 0.85]	0.026
G12 Lack of judgment and insight	2.57 (1.17)	3.19 (1.19)	0.53 [0.21; 0.85]	0.060
G01 Somatic concerns	1.86 (1.02)	2.38 (1.47)	0.47 [0.15; 0.79]	0.024
G07 Motor retardation	1.66 (0.90)	2.02 (0.85)	0.41 [0.09; 0.72]	0.017
G03 Guilt feelings	1.49 (0.87)	1.79 (1.00)	0.33 [0.02; 0.65]	0.153
G06 Depression	2.16 (1.27)	2.53 (1.18)	0.30 [–0.02; 0.61]	0.180



(b)

LAI: Symptoms at relapse	Active	Discontinuation	SMD (95% CI)	p–value (FDR)
N05 Difficulty in abstract thinking	2.62 (1.14)	3.05 (1.06)	0.39 [0.12; 0.66]	0.157
G16 Active social avoidance	2.22 (1.09)	2.59 (1.12)	0.34 [0.07; 0.61]	0.157
G12 Lack of judgment and insight	2.39 (1.16)	2.78 (1.20)	0.33 [0.06; 0.60]	0.157
N07 Stereotyped thinking	2.11 (1.08)	2.39 (1.04)	0.27 [0.00; 0.54]	0.394
G11 Poor attention	2.11 (1.00)	2.36 (1.01)	0.24 [–0.02; 0.51]	0.394
G01 Somatic concerns	1.76 (1.11)	2.03 (1.12)	0.24 [–0.03; 0.51]	0.394
G13 Disturbance of volition	2.05 (0.99)	2.28 (1.02)	0.23 [–0.04; 0.50]	0.399
P04 Excitement	2.09 (1.20)	2.34 (1.10)	0.21 [–0.05; 0.48]	0.449
P07 Hostility	1.85 (1.08)	2.09 (1.19)	0.20 [–0.07; 0.47]	0.449
P01 Delusions	2.74 (1.41)	2.99 (1.32)	0.19 [–0.08; 0.46]	0.460
G10 Disorientation	1.47 (0.85)	1.63 (0.85)	0.18 [–0.08; 0.45]	0.460
N04 Passive / apathetic social withdrawal	2.55 (1.12)	2.72 (1.09)	0.15 [–0.12; 0.42]	0.602
P02 Conceptual disorganization	2.42 (1.15)	2.59 (1.17)	0.15 [–0.12; 0.41]	0.602
N02 Emotional withdrawal	2.55 (1.07)	2.70 (0.99)	0.14 [–0.13; 0.41]	0.602
G08 Uncooperativeness	1.82 (1.14)	1.97 (1.04)	0.14 [–0.13; 0.40]	0.602
P05 Grandiosity	1.69 (1.07)	1.81 (1.11)	0.11 [–0.16; 0.38]	0.676
P06 Suspiciousness / persecution	2.72 (1.34)	2.84 (1.28)	0.10 [–0.17; 0.36]	0.749
G09 Unusual thought content	2.45 (1.16)	2.55 (1.17)	0.09 [–0.18; 0.36]	0.749
P03 Hallucinatory behaviour	2.43 (1.47)	2.54 (1.45)	0.08 [–0.19; 0.34]	0.757
N03 Poor rapport	2.04 (0.93)	2.11 (0.98)	0.07 [–0.19; 0.34]	0.757
G02 Anxiety	2.66 (1.26)	2.74 (1.17)	0.06 [–0.21; 0.33]	0.780
G15 Preoccupation	2.30 (1.00)	2.36 (1.05)	0.06 [–0.21; 0.32]	0.780
N06 Lack spontaneity / flow conversation	2.15 (1.02)	2.18 (1.03)	0.03 [–0.24; 0.30]	0.897
G05 Mannerisms and posturing	1.68 (0.88)	1.70 (0.91)	0.03 [–0.24; 0.29]	0.897
G14 Poor impulse control	2.11 (1.33)	2.13 (1.05)	0.02 [–0.25; 0.28]	0.928
G04 Tension	2.27 (1.16)	2.28 (1.07)	0.01 [–0.25; 0.28]	0.928
G03 Guilt feelings	1.58 (0.95)	1.53 (0.88)	–0.06 [–0.33; 0.21]	0.780
N01 Blunted affect	2.53 (1.14)	2.43 (1.01)	–0.09 [–0.36; 0.18]	0.752
G07 Motor retardation	1.81 (0.92)	1.69 (0.90)	–0.14 [–0.41; 0.13]	0.602
G06 Depression	2.41 (1.36)	2.15 (1.22)	–0.20 [–0.47; 0.07]	0.460



(c)

Oral: Symptoms at relapse	Delayed relapse	Rapid relapse	SMD (95% CI)	p–value (FDR)
N05 Difficulty in abstract thinking	2.73 (1.07)	3.64 (1.11)	0.84 [0.46; 1.22]	0.001
N02 Emotional withdrawal	2.71 (0.99)	3.54 (1.12)	0.81 [0.43; 1.18]	0.001
N03 Poor rapport	2.45 (1.00)	3.23 (1.04)	0.77 [0.40; 1.15]	0.001
P05 Grandiosity	1.30 (0.66)	2.00 (1.54)	0.72 [0.34; 1.10]	0.020
G09 Unusual thought content	2.55 (1.10)	3.38 (1.31)	0.72 [0.34; 1.09]	0.006
N04 Passive / apathetic social withdrawal	2.83 (0.99)	3.54 (1.31)	0.65 [0.28; 1.03]	0.011
G08 Uncooperativeness	2.14 (1.21)	2.92 (1.42)	0.62 [0.24; 0.99]	0.011
N01 Blunted affect	2.53 (0.94)	3.13 (1.08)	0.61 [0.23; 0.98]	0.011
G06 Depression	2.13 (1.18)	2.87 (1.36)	0.60 [0.23; 0.97]	0.011
G13 Disturbance of volition	2.25 (1.17)	2.95 (1.12)	0.60 [0.23; 0.97]	0.010
G15 Preoccupation	2.46 (1.08)	3.10 (1.10)	0.60 [0.22; 0.97]	0.011
G05 Mannerisms and posturing	1.74 (0.91)	2.33 (1.28)	0.58 [0.21; 0.95]	0.021
N06 Lack spontaneity / flow conversation	2.49 (1.15)	3.15 (1.27)	0.56 [0.19; 0.94]	0.013
P03 Hallucinatory behaviour	2.78 (1.63)	3.56 (1.37)	0.50 [0.13; 0.88]	0.013
G14 Poor impulse control	2.22 (1.08)	2.79 (1.26)	0.50 [0.13; 0.87]	0.026
N07 Stereotyped thinking	2.35 (1.05)	2.87 (1.15)	0.49 [0.12; 0.86]	0.026
G10 Disorientation	1.42 (0.73)	1.82 (1.10)	0.48 [0.10; 0.85]	0.054
G04 Tension	2.39 (1.20)	2.97 (1.31)	0.47 [0.10; 0.84]	0.028
P01 Delusions	3.40 (1.21)	3.95 (1.07)	0.46 [0.09; 0.83]	0.021
P04 Excitement	2.55 (1.20)	3.08 (1.11)	0.45 [0.08; 0.82]	0.026
G11 Poor attention	2.49 (1.09)	2.97 (1.14)	0.44 [0.07; 0.81]	0.035
P02 Conceptual disorganization	2.79 (1.28)	3.33 (1.49)	0.41 [0.04; 0.78]	0.058
G16 Active social avoidance	2.78 (1.22)	3.23 (1.18)	0.38 [0.01; 0.75]	0.058
P06 Suspiciousness / persecution	3.17 (1.32)	3.64 (1.14)	0.37 [0.00; 0.74]	0.052
G03 Guilt feelings	1.58 (1.05)	2.00 (1.38)	0.37 [−0.00; 0.74]	0.098
G07 Motor retardation	1.82 (1.05)	2.23 (1.33)	0.36 [−0.01; 0.73]	0.098
G12 Lack of judgment and insight	3.36 (1.30)	3.79 (1.20)	0.35 [−0.02; 0.71]	0.070
P07 Hostility	2.42 (1.26)	2.69 (1.45)	0.21 [−0.16; 0.57]	0.319
G02 Anxiety	2.82 (1.26)	3.05 (1.17)	0.19 [−0.18; 0.55]	0.319
G01 Somatic concerns	2.07 (1.15)	2.21 (0.92)	0.12 [−0.25; 0.49]	0.483



(d)

Oral: Symptoms at relapse	Active	Discontinuation	SMD (95% CI)	p–value (FDR)
G12 Lack of judgment and insight	2.95 (1.11)	3.66 (1.29)	0.57 [0.19; 0.94]	0.054
G13 Disturbance of volition	2.03 (1.10)	2.58 (1.20)	0.47 [0.10; 0.85]	0.100
G05 Mannerisms and posturing	1.55 (0.86)	2.02 (1.09)	0.45 [0.08; 0.82]	0.100
G08 Uncooperativeness	1.97 (1.10)	2.48 (1.36)	0.39 [0.02; 0.76]	0.147
G10 Disorientation	1.29 (0.57)	1.61 (0.93)	0.38 [0.01; 0.75]	0.100
G14 Poor impulse control	2.08 (1.02)	2.48 (1.19)	0.35 [−0.02; 0.72]	0.212
G11 Poor attention	2.39 (1.15)	2.69 (1.11)	0.27 [−0.10; 0.64]	0.513
P07 Hostility	2.26 (1.20)	2.57 (1.35)	0.24 [−0.13; 0.61]	0.513
P05 Grandiosity	1.32 (0.77)	1.55 (1.09)	0.23 [−0.14; 0.60]	0.513
G15 Preoccupation	2.47 (1.08)	2.69 (1.12)	0.19 [−0.18; 0.56]	0.617
N05 Difficulty in abstract thinking	2.82 (1.16)	3.03 (1.15)	0.18 [−0.19; 0.55]	0.617
P01 Delusions	3.39 (1.31)	3.60 (1.16)	0.17 [−0.20; 0.54]	0.617
N03 Poor rapport	2.53 (1.06)	2.70 (1.07)	0.17 [−0.20; 0.54]	0.617
G03 Guilt feelings	1.55 (0.92)	1.74 (1.23)	0.16 [−0.21; 0.53]	0.617
G09 Unusual thought content	2.63 (1.08)	2.82 (1.26)	0.16 [−0.21; 0.53]	0.617
P04 Excitement	2.55 (1.13)	2.74 (1.22)	0.16 [−0.21; 0.53]	0.617
N01 Blunted affect	2.58 (1.00)	2.73 (1.02)	0.15 [−0.22; 0.52]	0.638
P02 Conceptual disorganization	2.82 (1.37)	2.97 (1.36)	0.11 [−0.25; 0.48]	0.781
P03 Hallucinatory behaviour	2.87 (1.73)	3.03 (1.56)	0.10 [−0.27; 0.47]	0.842
N06 Lack spontaneity / flow conversation	2.61 (1.28)	2.69 (1.20)	0.07 [−0.30; 0.44]	0.891
P06 Suspiciousness / persecution	3.24 (1.36)	3.31 (1.27)	0.06 [−0.31; 0.43]	0.891
G04 Tension	2.50 (1.25)	2.56 (1.26)	0.05 [−0.32; 0.42]	0.891
N02 Emotional withdrawal	2.89 (0.98)	2.94 (1.13)	0.05 [−0.32; 0.42]	0.891
G07 Motor retardation	1.95 (1.18)	1.93 (1.13)	−0.02 [−0.39; 0.35]	0.923
G16 Active social avoidance	2.92 (1.15)	2.89 (1.25)	−0.03 [−0.40; 0.34]	0.916
N04 Passive / apathetic social withdrawal	3.05 (1.11)	3.01 (1.13)	−0.04 [−0.41; 0.33]	0.898
N07 Stereotyped thinking	2.53 (1.16)	2.47 (1.08)	−0.05 [−0.42; 0.32]	0.891
G06 Depression	2.53 (1.22)	2.26 (1.29)	−0.21 [−0.58; 0.16]	0.617
G02 Anxiety	3.11 (1.16)	2.81 (1.26)	−0.24 [−0.61; 0.13]	0.513
G01 Somatic concerns	2.45 (1.18)	1.99 (1.05)	−0.42 [−0.80; −0.05]	0.194



Figure 3. Forest plot of baseline symptoms at the time of randomization.

(a) Long-acting injectable (LAI) paliperidone palmitate trials by relapse trajectory class
(b) Long-acting injectable (LAI) paliperidone palmitate trials by treatment group
(c) Oral paliperidone palmitate trials by relapse trajectory class
(d) Oral paliperidone palmitate trials by treatment group

Mean (SD) scores are shown per class/group. Symptoms are ordered by effect size. *p*-values of *t*-tests are false discovery rate (FDR) corrected. SMD *standardized mean difference.* P *PANSS positive subscale.* N *negative subscale.* G *general psychopathology subscale*.

(a)

LAI: Symptoms at baseline	Delayed relapse	Rapid relapse	SMD (95% CI)	p–value (FDR)
P01 Delusions	1.82 (0.84)	2.43 (0.90)	0.71 [0.39; 1.03]	0.002
N02 Emotional withdrawal	2.22 (0.86)	2.77 (0.81)	0.64 [0.32; 0.96]	0.002
N07 Stereotyped thinking	1.75 (0.80)	2.21 (0.91)	0.56 [0.24; 0.88]	0.010
P03 Hallucinatory behaviour	1.47 (0.82)	1.94 (0.89)	0.56 [0.24; 0.87]	0.010
N04 Passive / apathetic social withdrawal	2.23 (0.90)	2.72 (0.88)	0.55 [0.23; 0.87]	0.008
G09 Unusual thought content	1.79 (0.87)	2.26 (0.87)	0.54 [0.22; 0.86]	0.010
P06 Suspiciousness / persecution	1.87 (0.87)	2.34 (1.05)	0.52 [0.21; 0.84]	0.017
P04 Excitement	1.47 (0.74)	1.83 (0.73)	0.49 [0.17; 0.81]	0.013
G08 Uncooperativeness	1.33 (0.59)	1.64 (0.76)	0.49 [0.17; 0.80]	0.030
G10 Disorientation	1.37 (0.66)	1.70 (0.83)	0.48 [0.16; 0.80]	0.030
G13 Disturbance of volition	1.84 (0.86)	2.26 (0.87)	0.48 [0.16; 0.80]	0.016
G16 Active social avoidance	1.95 (0.85)	2.34 (1.03)	0.44 [0.12; 0.76]	0.036
N03 Poor rapport	1.65 (0.78)	1.98 (0.82)	0.41 [0.10; 0.73]	0.032
N05 Difficulty in abstract thinking	2.56 (0.98)	2.96 (0.91)	0.41 [0.09; 0.72]	0.026
N01 Blunted affect	2.20 (0.92)	2.55 (0.80)	0.40 [0.08; 0.71]	0.026
P05 Grandiosity	1.36 (0.68)	1.64 (0.79)	0.40 [0.08; 0.71]	0.055
G15 Preoccupation	1.79 (0.82)	2.06 (0.87)	0.33 [0.01; 0.64]	0.086
G05 Mannerisms and posturing	1.45 (0.69)	1.66 (0.67)	0.31 [−0.00; 0.63]	0.086
G12 Lack of judgment and insight	2.20 (0.97)	2.49 (0.91)	0.30 [−0.02; 0.61]	0.086
P02 Conceptual disorganization	1.94 (0.80)	2.17 (0.82)	0.28 [−0.03; 0.60]	0.122
G03 Guilt feelings	1.30 (0.58)	1.47 (0.75)	0.27 [−0.05; 0.58]	0.219
N06 Lack spontaneity / flow conversation	1.81 (0.90)	2.04 (0.78)	0.27 [−0.05; 0.58]	0.108
G01 Somatic concerns	1.69 (0.81)	1.89 (0.94)	0.24 [−0.07; 0.56]	0.219
G14 Poor impulse control	1.48 (0.69)	1.64 (0.79)	0.23 [−0.09; 0.54]	0.242
P07 Hostility	1.29 (0.53)	1.40 (0.54)	0.22 [−0.09; 0.54]	0.219
G04 Tension	1.60 (0.67)	1.72 (0.77)	0.18 [−0.13; 0.50]	0.352
G02 Anxiety	1.86 (0.82)	1.98 (0.82)	0.15 [−0.17; 0.46]	0.399
G07 Motor retardation	1.57 (0.69)	1.66 (0.70)	0.13 [−0.18; 0.45]	0.440
G06 Depression	1.72 (0.88)	1.77 (0.84)	0.05 [−0.27; 0.36]	0.780
G11 Poor attention	1.86 (0.80)	1.85 (0.78)	−0.01 [−0.32; 0.31]	0.962



(b)

LAI: Symptoms at baseline	Active	Discontinuation	SMD (95% CI)	p–value (FDR)
N04 Passive / apathetic social withdrawal	2.14 (0.85)	2.38 (0.93)	0.27 [0.00; 0.54]	0.962
N02 Emotional withdrawal	2.19 (0.90)	2.37 (0.86)	0.20 [−0.07; 0.47]	0.962
G16 Active social avoidance	1.91 (0.86)	2.06 (0.91)	0.17 [−0.09; 0.44]	0.962
G12 Lack of judgment and insight	2.16 (1.01)	2.28 (0.95)	0.13 [−0.14; 0.39]	0.998
N01 Blunted affect	2.18 (0.93)	2.29 (0.90)	0.13 [−0.14; 0.39]	0.998
N05 Difficulty in abstract thinking	2.55 (0.94)	2.66 (1.00)	0.11 [−0.16; 0.38]	0.998
N07 Stereotyped thinking	1.78 (0.85)	1.85 (0.83)	0.08 [−0.18; 0.35]	0.998
G10 Disorientation	1.39 (0.68)	1.44 (0.71)	0.07 [−0.20; 0.34]	0.998
G01 Somatic concerns	1.69 (0.84)	1.74 (0.83)	0.06 [−0.21; 0.33]	0.998
P02 Conceptual disorganization	1.96 (0.85)	1.99 (0.80)	0.04 [−0.23; 0.30]	0.998
G14 Poor impulse control	1.49 (0.71)	1.51 (0.71)	0.04 [−0.23; 0.30]	0.998
N03 Poor rapport	1.69 (0.81)	1.72 (0.80)	0.03 [−0.23; 0.30]	0.998
P01 Delusions	1.92 (0.90)	1.92 (0.87)	0.01 [−0.26; 0.27]	0.998
P06 Suspiciousness / persecution	1.95 (0.93)	1.95 (0.92)	0.00 [−0.26; 0.27]	0.998
G15 Preoccupation	1.84 (0.86)	1.84 (0.83)	−0.00 [−0.27; 0.27]	0.998
G13 Disturbance of volition	1.92 (0.84)	1.91 (0.89)	−0.01 [−0.27; 0.26]	0.998
G05 Mannerisms and posturing	1.49 (0.74)	1.48 (0.67)	−0.01 [−0.27; 0.26]	0.998
N06 Lack spontaneity / flow conversation	1.86 (0.88)	1.84 (0.88)	−0.03 [−0.29; 0.24]	0.998
G09 Unusual thought content	1.89 (0.87)	1.86 (0.90)	−0.04 [−0.31; 0.23]	0.998
G11 Poor attention	1.88 (0.81)	1.85 (0.79)	−0.04 [−0.31; 0.23]	0.998
G08 Uncooperativeness	1.41 (0.66)	1.38 (0.62)	−0.04 [−0.31; 0.23]	0.998
G02 Anxiety	1.91 (0.88)	1.87 (0.80)	−0.05 [−0.31; 0.22]	0.998
G06 Depression	1.77 (0.88)	1.72 (0.87)	−0.06 [−0.33; 0.20]	0.998
G03 Guilt feelings	1.38 (0.66)	1.31 (0.60)	−0.10 [−0.37; 0.16]	0.998
G07 Motor retardation	1.65 (0.71)	1.56 (0.68)	−0.13 [−0.40; 0.14]	0.998
G04 Tension	1.70 (0.68)	1.59 (0.69)	−0.17 [−0.43; 0.10]	0.962
P04 Excitement	1.62 (0.84)	1.50 (0.71)	−0.17 [−0.43; 0.10]	0.979
P03 Hallucinatory behaviour	1.66 (0.93)	1.51 (0.82)	−0.18 [−0.44; 0.09]	0.962
P05 Grandiosity	1.51 (0.78)	1.37 (0.67)	−0.20 [−0.47; 0.06]	0.962
P07 Hostility	1.41 (0.66)	1.27 (0.48)	−0.26 [−0.52; 0.01]	0.962



(c)

Oral: Symptoms at baseline	Delayed relapse	Rapid relapse	SMD (95% CI)	p–value (FDR)
G06 Depression	1.44 (0.79)	2.15 (1.18)	0.78 [0.41; 1.16]	0.029
G09 Unusual thought content	1.64 (0.82)	2.18 (0.91)	0.63 [0.26; 1.01]	0.031
P03 Hallucinatory behaviour	1.45 (0.80)	2.03 (1.16)	0.63 [0.26; 1.01]	0.044
P05 Grandiosity	1.11 (0.35)	1.41 (0.75)	0.61 [0.24; 0.99]	0.106
N02 Emotional withdrawal	2.26 (0.78)	2.64 (0.63)	0.51 [0.14; 0.88]	0.034
P01 Delusions	1.83 (0.91)	2.28 (1.05)	0.48 [0.11; 0.85]	0.106
G13 Disturbance of volition	1.67 (0.79)	2.03 (0.87)	0.44 [0.07; 0.81]	0.123
P02 Conceptual disorganization	1.69 (0.76)	2.03 (0.87)	0.42 [0.05; 0.79]	0.123
G05 Mannerisms and posturing	1.49 (0.69)	1.79 (0.83)	0.42 [0.05; 0.79]	0.123
P06 Suspiciousness / persecution	1.75 (0.88)	2.10 (0.91)	0.40 [0.03; 0.77]	0.123
N04 Passive / apathetic social withdrawal	2.34 (0.79)	2.64 (0.81)	0.38 [0.01; 0.75]	0.123
G02 Anxiety	1.79 (0.98)	2.13 (0.89)	0.36 [−0.01; 0.73]	0.123
G15 Preoccupation	1.71 (0.74)	1.97 (0.78)	0.35 [−0.02; 0.72]	0.163
P04 Excitement	1.35 (0.65)	1.59 (0.85)	0.35 [−0.02; 0.71]	0.218
G11 Poor attention	1.58 (0.73)	1.82 (0.76)	0.33 [−0.04; 0.70]	0.193
G14 Poor impulse control	1.36 (0.64)	1.59 (0.82)	0.33 [−0.04; 0.70]	0.221
G16 Active social avoidance	1.85 (0.79)	2.08 (0.77)	0.29 [−0.08; 0.66]	0.221
N03 Poor rapport	1.84 (0.79)	2.05 (0.86)	0.26 [−0.11; 0.63]	0.309
G07 Motor retardation	1.57 (0.77)	1.77 (0.87)	0.25 [−0.12; 0.62]	0.336
N07 Stereotyped thinking	1.67 (0.70)	1.85 (0.84)	0.23 [−0.13; 0.60]	0.349
G03 Guilt feelings	1.21 (0.58)	1.33 (0.58)	0.22 [−0.15; 0.59]	0.349
G04 Tension	1.64 (0.86)	1.82 (0.79)	0.21 [−0.16; 0.58]	0.349
N06 Lack spontaneity / flow conversation	1.92 (0.84)	2.08 (0.84)	0.19 [−0.18; 0.56]	0.402
N05 Difficulty in abstract thinking	2.36 (0.93)	2.51 (0.82)	0.17 [−0.19; 0.54]	0.409
N01 Blunted affect	2.25 (0.77)	2.38 (0.81)	0.17 [−0.20; 0.54]	0.457
G08 Uncooperativeness	1.32 (0.58)	1.41 (0.68)	0.15 [−0.21; 0.52]	0.501
G10 Disorientation	1.23 (0.51)	1.31 (0.52)	0.15 [−0.22; 0.51]	0.501
G12 Lack of judgment and insight	2.54 (1.14)	2.64 (0.96)	0.09 [−0.28; 0.46]	0.645
G01 Somatic concerns	1.60 (0.87)	1.67 (0.74)	0.08 [−0.28; 0.45]	0.659
P07 Hostility	1.36 (0.63)	1.33 (0.62)	−0.03 [−0.40; 0.33]	0.852



(d)

Oral: Symptoms at baseline	Active	Discontinuation	SMD (95% CI)	p–value (FDR)
G12 Lack of judgment and insight	2.13 (0.93)	2.72 (1.10)	0.56 [0.18; 0.93]	0.062
G07 Motor retardation	1.39 (0.64)	1.70 (0.83)	0.39 [0.02; 0.76]	0.311
G10 Disorientation	1.13 (0.41)	1.30 (0.53)	0.33 [−0.05; 0.70]	0.411
G11 Poor attention	1.47 (0.69)	1.70 (0.75)	0.31 [−0.06; 0.68]	0.527
P05 Grandiosity	1.08 (0.36)	1.23 (0.54)	0.31 [−0.07; 0.68]	0.411
G13 Disturbance of volition	1.63 (0.85)	1.81 (0.81)	0.22 [−0.15; 0.59]	0.646
P03 Hallucinatory behaviour	1.47 (0.92)	1.65 (0.95)	0.18 [−0.19; 0.56]	0.646
N03 Poor rapport	1.79 (0.81)	1.94 (0.81)	0.18 [−0.19; 0.55]	0.646
N06 Lack spontaneity / flow conversation	1.87 (0.81)	1.99 (0.85)	0.15 [−0.22; 0.52]	0.763
P07 Hostility	1.29 (0.61)	1.37 (0.64)	0.13 [−0.24; 0.50]	0.816
N07 Stereotyped thinking	1.66 (0.75)	1.74 (0.74)	0.11 [−0.26; 0.48]	0.836
G14 Poor impulse control	1.37 (0.63)	1.44 (0.71)	0.11 [−0.26; 0.48]	0.836
N01 Blunted affect	2.24 (0.75)	2.31 (0.79)	0.09 [−0.28; 0.46]	0.854
N02 Emotional withdrawal	2.32 (0.81)	2.38 (0.75)	0.08 [−0.29; 0.45]	0.854
N05 Difficulty in abstract thinking	2.34 (0.99)	2.42 (0.88)	0.08 [−0.29; 0.45]	0.854
G05 Mannerisms and posturing	1.53 (0.69)	1.58 (0.76)	0.08 [−0.29; 0.45]	0.854
P01 Delusions	1.92 (1.00)	1.96 (0.96)	0.04 [−0.33; 0.41]	0.881
G08 Uncooperativeness	1.34 (0.58)	1.34 (0.61)	0.00 [−0.37; 0.37]	0.997
P02 Conceptual disorganization	1.79 (0.87)	1.78 (0.78)	−0.01 [−0.38; 0.36]	0.975
N04 Passive / apathetic social withdrawal	2.45 (0.80)	2.41 (0.81)	−0.05 [−0.42; 0.32]	0.880
G15 Preoccupation	1.82 (0.80)	1.77 (0.74)	−0.06 [−0.43; 0.31]	0.867
P04 Excitement	1.45 (0.72)	1.40 (0.71)	−0.07 [−0.44; 0.30]	0.862
G01 Somatic concerns	1.74 (0.89)	1.57 (0.81)	−0.20 [−0.57; 0.17]	0.646
G09 Unusual thought content	1.92 (0.85)	1.74 (0.88)	−0.21 [−0.58; 0.16]	0.646
G06 Depression	1.79 (0.96)	1.57 (0.96)	−0.22 [−0.59; 0.15]	0.646
G03 Guilt feelings	1.34 (0.81)	1.20 (0.47)	−0.24 [−0.61; 0.13]	0.646
G04 Tension	1.84 (0.82)	1.64 (0.85)	−0.24 [−0.61; 0.13]	0.646
P06 Suspiciousness / persecution	2.03 (1.03)	1.78 (0.85)	−0.28 [−0.65; 0.09]	0.646
G02 Anxiety	2.08 (0.94)	1.81 (0.97)	−0.28 [−0.65; 0.09]	0.563
G16 Active social avoidance	2.08 (0.78)	1.85 (0.78)	−0.29 [−0.66; 0.08]	0.563



Discussion

Using LCMM we identified two distinct trajectory classes across 417 participants who experienced relapse in randomized double-blind discontinuation trials of paliperidone. A small group of participants experienced relapse with rapid onset, while the majority relapsed at a relatively delayed time point. The rapid relapse class was not over-represented in the treatment discontinuation group. This suggests that cases of rapid relapse observed in antipsychotic discontinuation trials are unlikely to be driven by withdrawal, and does not support the hypothesis that withdrawal-related mechanisms mediate a significant proportion of relapses observed in clinical trials. If acute withdrawal were the primary mechanism underlying rapid relapse, one would expect significantly greater proportions experiencing rapid relapse over delayed relapse in those who discontinued treatment. However, rapid relapse occurred independent of treatment status, supporting the hypothesis that pharmacological effects of acute withdrawal alone cannot explain the rapid relapses observed in antipsychotic discontinuation trials. This finding is contrary to the prediction that withdrawal-driven relapses should be more commonly observed after abrupt discontinuation. It is, however, consistent with meta-analyses showing no difference in relapse risk between abrupt and gradual antipsychotic discontinuation,[5,18] and with recent clinical trials that have tested a gradual tapering approach.[34,35]

A plausible explanation, for the fact that the proportion of rapid relapses was similar in both continuation and discontinuation arms, is baseline symptom score deflation during trial enrolment. The pressure to meet eligibility thresholds, i.e. to be relatively symptom free at trial entry, may result in a marginal number of participants for study entry being downrated in symptom severity during baseline screening. There is evidence in the LAI and oral trials to support this interpretation, as those who eventually experienced rapid relapse had significantly higher severity scores at baseline (time of randomization), suggesting severity scores may have been slightly deflated to get just below a threshold, and allow inclusion into the trial. Following randomization, with rating constraints relieved, symptom assessments likely reflected true clinical status, giving the appearance of abrupt deterioration. Importantly, this pattern occurred in both discontinuation and active treatment groups, which is inconsistent with withdrawal-based hypotheses that predict rapid relapse specifically following discontinuation. This suggests that trial design and rating practices may influence observed relapse patterns, highlighting the importance of distinguishing genuine symptom recurrence from artefacts introduced during recruitment and assessment procedures in clinical trials.

Our analysis did not find evidence supporting a distinct withdrawal symptom profile in individuals that discontinued antipsychotic treatment. Withdrawal-driven relapse has been cited as potential confounds in classifying relapse in clinical trials, particularly after abrupt

discontinuation.[36,37] Yet, in the present analysis, symptom profiles at the time of relapse did not reveal a consistent pattern of elevated withdrawal-like symptoms among individuals that abruptly discontinued medication. There were no differences in symptoms at time of relapse between active treatment and discontinuation across both LAI and oral formulations, contradicting the hypothesis that relapse following antipsychotic discontinuation is commonly driven by pharmacologically mediated withdrawal syndromes. This finding also aligns with prior investigations of the same set of discontinuation RCTs, which demonstrated the risk of relapse is associated with overall levels of D_2 receptor occupancy rather than rate of receptor occupancy decline,[19] and with recent clinical trial evidence that tapering speed does not affect risk of relapse,[35] strengthening the hypothesis that rapid relapses observed in discontinuation trials are a distinct phenomenon from an acute withdrawal reaction.

The finding that rapid relapsers had higher severity across a wide range of psychotic symptoms could suggest that individuals that experience rapid relapse had a more unstable disease course and greater susceptibility to abrupt clinical deterioration. This interpretation is supported by the fact that in both LAI and oral trials, rapid relapsers had a higher baseline CGI severity and higher baseline total PANSS scores than delayed relapsers.

Given the variability across studies in trial populations, inclusion and stabilization criteria, and definition of relapse, caution should be taken to avoid overinterpreting symptom profile differences. While relapse overall is markedly more common following antipsychotic discontinuation, our findings indicate rapid relapse can occur regardless of treatment status and appears to reflect an underlying vulnerability shaped by baseline severity and symptom stability.

These findings highlight the importance of interpreting rapid relapse cautiously in the clinic and not automatically attributing it to withdrawal syndrome or the patient having stopped treatment. Yet, this does not preclude the possibility that withdrawal-associated relapse occurs in specific clinical contexts, such as for patients with prolonged exposure to high-dose antipsychotics with abrupt cessation.[21,24] or people abruptly stopping clozapine.

These findings also reinforce the need for careful patient monitoring of early warning signs and relapse risk assessment, rather than specific antipsychotic dose tapering schedules. Although gradual dose reduction may not directly lower risk of rapid relapse, it may facilitate earlier detection of clinical deterioration. Antipsychotic discontinuation should be informed by factors such as past treatment response and history of relapse. Considerations of the discontinuation method, baseline severity, duration of remittance and patient expectations should be embedded into guidelines and clinical care pathways for evidence-based de-prescribing.

Strengths of this study include the use of double-blind RCT data; this being the first analysis to systematically compare relapse trajectories between antipsychotic continuation and discontinuation groups; and the consistency of findings across both long-acting injectable and oral formulations. We note several limitations in our analysis. First, RCT participants are typically more stable and treatment adherent, with fewer comorbidities than real-world clinical populations. The present analysis was constrained by availability of key covariates (e.g. history of relapse and antipsychotic use) which may be important predictors of trajectory class membership.[38] Future studies could apply predictive modelling approaches to identify factors associated with rapid relapse. Second, while LCMM is a powerful data-driven method that can identify latent trajectory classes without *a priori* assumptions, model selection can be subjective and there is a risk of overfitting, especially with smaller sample sizes. To mitigate this, we applied the best practice model selection procedure and validated class stability by iteratively fitting multiple models.[26,31] Third, the original study trials were not designed to assess withdrawal phenomena. As there are currently no available validated measures of antipsychotic withdrawal symptoms, inferences about withdrawal-related symptoms are indirect. We mitigated this by analyzing PANSS items for known withdrawal-like features (e.g., anxiety, agitation, depression). Finally, as the included trials were of risperidone/paliperidone, it would be useful to determine if our relapse trajectories are seen following withdrawal from other antipsychotic agents. Future research incorporating multimodal data on receptor occupancy and plasma level measurements could help further clarify the role of pharmacological withdrawal in psychosis relapse.

In conclusion, this study identified two distinct trajectories to relapse (a rapid and delayed relapse trajectory) in randomized discontinuation trials of oral and LAI antipsychotics. Crucially, the rapid relapse trajectory class was not overrepresented in those that discontinued treatment, suggesting relapse mediated by pharmacological withdrawal is not a common feature after discontinuation. There was no symptom profile uniquely associated with withdrawal syndrome in those who discontinued medication. Symptom profiles at relapse were more severe in rapid relapsers, with a wide range of psychotic symptoms. Higher baseline severity predicted trajectory class (rapid relapse) in both cohorts, implicating biological mechanisms. These findings challenge the assumption that rapid relapse observed in clinical trials reflects a distinct withdrawal syndrome. Instead, rapid relapse is more likely to be linked to both trial factors and pre-existing biological vulnerability. Clinically, our data supports discontinuation strategies grounded in careful monitoring and risk assessment, rather than standardized pharmacological tapering schedules.

Acknowledgements

This study, carried out under YODA Project #2025-0740, used data obtained from the Yale University Open Data Access Project, which has an agreement with JANSSEN RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT, L.L.C.. The interpretation and reporting of research using this data are solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the Yale University Open Data Access Project or JANSSEN RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT, L.L.C.. The original proposal can be found: https://yoda.yale.edu/data-request/2025-0740/.

RAMs work is funded by a Wellcome Trust Clinical Research Career Development Fellowship (224625/Z/21/Z) and is supported by the NIHR Oxford Health Biomedical Research Centre. TP is supported by a Wellcome Trust Early Career Fellowship, Maudsley Charity, the Brain and Behaviour Research Foundation, the UK Academy of Medical Sciences, and the UK Research and Innovation Hub for Metabolic Psychiatry (grant reference MR/Z503563/1, platform grant code MR/Z000548/1). The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care.

Declaration of Interests

RAM has received speaker/consultancy fees from Angelini Pharma, Boehringer Ingelheim, Bristol Myers Squibb, Janssen, Karuna, Lundbeck, Newron, Otsuka, and Viatris, and co-directs a company that designs digital resources to support treatment of mental ill health. JR has been a consultant for Teva, Janssen, Karuna, and Bristol-Myers Squibb, has received research funding from Alkermes, Neurocrine, Bristol-Myers Squibb and Saladax, and receives royalties from UpToDate. TP has been a consultant to Boehringer Ingelheim; has received payment and honoraria from Recordati, Lundbeck, Otsuka, Janssen, CNX Therapeutics, Sunovion, ROVI Biotech, Schwabe Pharma, and Lecturing Minds Stockholm AB; and has co-directed a company called Pharmatik. ODH has received research funding from Angelini, Autifony, Biogen, BMS (Karuna), Boehringer-Ingelheim, Delix, Eli Lilly, Elysium, Heptares, Global Medical Education, Invicro, Janssen, Karuna, Lundbeck, Merck, Neumora, Neurocrine, Ontrack/Pangea, Otsuka, Sunovion, Teva, Recordati, Roche, Rovi, and Viatris/Mylan; has participated in advisory meetings for AbbVie, Alkermes, Boehringer-Ingelheim and Merck; and has previously been a part-time employee of Lundbeck A/V.

References

1. McCutcheon RA, Reis Marques T, Howes OD. Schizophrenia—An Overview. *JAMA Psychiatry*. 2020;77(2):201-210. doi:10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2019.3360

2. Jauhar S, Johnstone M, McKenna PJ. Schizophrenia. *The Lancet*. 2022;399(10323):473-486. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(21)01730-X

3. Taylor DM. *The Maudsley Prescribing Guidelines in Psychiatry*. 14th ed. John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated; 2021.

4. Kaar SJ, Natesan S, McCutcheon R, Howes OD. Antipsychotics: Mechanisms underlying clinical response and side-effects and novel treatment approaches based on pathophysiology. *Neuropharmacology*. 2020;172:107704. doi:10.1016/j.neuropharm.2019.107704

5. Leucht S, Tardy M, Komossa K, et al. Antipsychotic drugs versus placebo for relapse prevention in schizophrenia: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Lancet*. 2012;379(9831):2063-2071. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(12)60239-6

6. Karson C, Duffy RA, Eramo A, Nylander AG, Offord SJ. Long-term outcomes of antipsychotic treatment in patients with first-episode schizophrenia: a systematic review. *Neuropsychiatr Dis Treat*. 2016;12:57-67. doi:10.2147/NDT.S96392

7. Kuipers E, Yesufu-Udechuku A, Taylor C, Kendall T. Management of psychosis and schizophrenia in adults: summary of updated NICE guidance. *BMJ*. 2014;348:g1173. doi:10.1136/bmj.g1173

8. Keepers GA, Fochtmann LJ, Anzia JM, et al. The American Psychiatric Association Practice Guideline for the Treatment of Patients With Schizophrenia. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2020;177(9):868-872. doi:10.1176/appi.ajp.2020.177901

9. Murray RM, Quattrone D, Natesan S, et al. Should psychiatrists be more cautious about the long-term prophylactic use of antipsychotics? *Br J Psychiatry*. 2016;209(5):361-365. doi:10.1192/bjp.bp.116.182683

10. Taylor M, Jauhar S. Are we getting any better at staying better? The long view on relapse and recovery in first episode nonaffective psychosis and schizophrenia. *Ther Adv Psychopharmacol*. 2019;9:2045125319870033. doi:10.1177/2045125319870033

11. Kane JM, Kishimoto T, Correll CU. Non-adherence to medication in patients with psychotic disorders: epidemiology, contributing factors and management strategies. *World Psychiatry*. 2013;12(3):216-226. doi:10.1002/wps.20060

12. Tani H, Takasu S, Uchida H, Suzuki T, Mimura M, Takeuchi H. Factors associated with successful antipsychotic dose reduction in schizophrenia: a systematic review of prospective clinical trials and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2020;45(5):887-901. doi:10.1038/s41386-019-0573-7

13. Schoretsanitis G, Kane JM, Correll CU, Rubio JM. Predictors of Lack of Relapse After Random Discontinuation of Oral and Long-acting Injectable Antipsychotics in Clinically Stabilized Patients with Schizophrenia: A Re-analysis of Individual Participant Data. *Schizophr Bull*. 2022;48(2):296-306. doi:10.1093/schbul/sbab091

14. McCutcheon RA, Pillinger T, Varvari I, et al. INTEGRATE: international guidelines for the algorithmic treatment of schizophrenia. *Lancet Psychiatry*. 2025;12(5):384-394. doi:10.1016/S2215-0366(25)00031-8

15. Vinkers CH, Kupka RW, Penninx BW, et al. Discontinuation of psychotropic medication: a synthesis of evidence across medication classes. *Mol Psychiatry*. 2024;29(8):2575-2586. doi:10.1038/s41380-024-02445-4

16. Horowitz MA, Jauhar S, Natesan S, Murray RM, Taylor D. A Method for Tapering Antipsychotic Treatment That May Minimize the Risk of Relapse. *Schizophr Bull*. 2021;47(4):1116-1129. doi:10.1093/schbul/sbab017

17. Howes OD, Kapur S. The Dopamine Hypothesis of Schizophrenia: Version III—The Final Common Pathway. *Schizophr Bull*. 2009;35(3):549-562. doi:10.1093/SCHBUL/SBP006

18. Takeuchi H, Kantor N, Uchida H, Suzuki T, Remington G. Immediate vs Gradual Discontinuation in Antipsychotic Switching: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Schizophr Bull*. 2017;43(4):862-871. doi:10.1093/schbul/sbw171

19. McCutcheon RA, Taylor D, Rubio J, et al. Does Slow and Steady Win the Race? Rates of Antipsychotic Discontinuation, Antipsychotic Dose, and Risk of Psychotic Relapse. *Schizophr Bull*. 2024;50(3):513-520. doi:10.1093/schbul/sbad139

20. Chouinard G, Samaha AN, Chouinard VA, et al. Antipsychotic-Induced Dopamine Supersensitivity Psychosis: Pharmacology, Criteria, and Therapy. *Psychother Psychosom*. 2017;86(4):189-219. doi:10.1159/000477313

21. Cosci F, Chouinard G. Acute and Persistent Withdrawal Syndromes Following Discontinuation of Psychotropic Medications. *Psychother Psychosom*. 2020;89(5):283-306. doi:10.1159/000506868

22. O'Dell SJ, La Hoste GJ, Widmark CB, Shapiro RM, Potkin SG, Marshall JF. Chronic treatment with clozapine or haloperidol differentially regulates dopamine and serotonin receptors in rat brain. *Synap N Y N*. 1990;6(2):146-153. doi:10.1002/syn.890060205

23. Samaha AN, Seeman P, Stewart J, Rajabi H, Kapur S. "Breakthrough" Dopamine Supersensitivity during Ongoing Antipsychotic Treatment Leads to Treatment Failure over Time. *J Neurosci*. 2007;27(11):2979-2986. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.5416-06.2007

24. Horowitz MA, Moncrieff J. Gradually tapering off antipsychotics: lessons for practice from case studies and neurobiological principles. *Curr Opin Psychiatry*. 2024;37(4):320. doi:10.1097/YCO.0000000000000940

25. Leucht S, Chaimani A, Mavridis D, et al. Disconnection of drug-response and placebo-response in acute-phase antipsychotic drug trials on schizophrenia? Meta-regression analysis. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2019;44(11):1955-1966. doi:10.1038/s41386-019-0440-6

26. Lennon H, Kelly S, Sperrin M, et al. Framework to construct and interpret latent class trajectory modelling. *BMJ Open*. 2018;8(7):e020683. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2017-020683

27. Proust-Lima C, Saulnier T, Philipps V, et al. Describing complex disease progression using joint latent class models for multivariate longitudinal markers and clinical endpoints. *Stat Med*. 2023;42(22):3996-4014. doi:10.1002/sim.9844

28. Kay SR, Fiszbein A, Opler LA. The positive and negative syndrome scale (PANSS) for schizophrenia. *Schizophr Bull*. 1987;13(2):261-276. doi:10.1093/schbul/13.2.261

29. Krumholz HM, Waldstreicher J. The Yale Open Data Access (YODA) Project — A Mechanism for Data Sharing. *N Engl J Med*. 2016;375(5):403-405. doi:10.1056/NEJMp1607342

30. Busner J, Targum SD. The Clinical Global Impressions Scale. *Psychiatry Edgmont*. 2007;4(7):28-37.

31. Proust-Lima C, Philipps V, Liquet B. Estimation of Extended Mixed Models Using Latent Classes and Latent Processes: The *R* Package **lcmm**. *J Stat Softw*. 2017;78(2). doi:10.18637/jss.v078.i02

32. R Core Team. R: A Language and environment for statistical computing. Published online 2022. https://cran.r-project.org

33. Krumholz HM, Ross JS. A model for dissemination and independent analysis of industry data. *JAMA*. 2011;306(14):1593-1594. doi:10.1001/jama.2011.1459

34. Moncrieff J, Crellin N, Stansfeld J, et al. Antipsychotic dose reduction and discontinuation versus maintenance treatment in people with schizophrenia and other recurrent psychotic disorders in England (the RADAR trial): an open, parallel-group, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Psychiatry*. 2023;10(11):848-859. doi:10.1016/S2215-0366(23)00258-4

35. Gangadin SS, de Beer F, Wijnen B, et al. Risk of relapse during tapering of antipsychotic medication after a first psychotic episode: association with D2 receptor affinity but not with tapering speed. *World Psychiatry*. 2025;24(2):240-249. doi:10.1002/wps.21315

36. Brandt L, Bschor T, Henssler J, et al. Antipsychotic Withdrawal Symptoms: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Front Psychiatry*. 2020;11. doi:10.3389/fpsyt.2020.569912

37. Horowitz MA, Murray RM, Taylor D. Confounding of Antipsychotic Discontinuation Studies by Withdrawal-Related Relapse. *Schizophr Bull*. 2022;48(2):294-295. doi:10.1093/schbul/sbab146

38. Brandt L, Ritter K, Schneider-Thoma J, et al. Predicting psychotic relapse following randomised discontinuation of paliperidone in individuals with schizophrenia or schizoaffective disorder: an individual participant data analysis. *Lancet Psychiatry*. 2023;10(3):184-196. doi:10.1016/S2215-0366(23)00008-1

39. Schwarz G. Estimating the Dimension of a Model. *Ann Stat*. 1978;6(2):461-464.

40. Raftery AE. Bayesian Model Selection in Social Research. *Sociol Methodol*. 1995;25:111-163. doi:10.2307/271063

41. Benjamini Y, Hochberg Y. Controlling the False Discovery Rate: A Practical and Powerful Approach to Multiple Testing. *J R Stat Soc Ser B Methodol*. 1995;57(1):289-300.

42. Subirana I, Sanz H, Vila J. Building Bivariate tables: The compareGroups package for R. *J Stat Softw*. 2014;57(12):1-16. doi:10.18637/jss.v057.i12

43. Dayimu A. forestploter: Create a Flexible Forest Plot. Published online 2025. https://github.com/adayim/forestploter

44. Fu DJ, Turkoz I, Simonson RB, et al. Paliperidone Palmitate Once-Monthly Reduces Risk of Relapse of Psychotic, Depressive, and Manic Symptoms and Maintains Functioning in a Double-Blind, Randomized Study of Schizoaffective Disorder. *J Clin Psychiatry*. 2015;76(03):253-262. doi:10.4088/JCP.14m09416

45. Hough D, Gopal S, Vijapurkar U, Lim P, Morozova M, Eerdekens M. Paliperidone palmitate maintenance treatment in delaying the time-to-relapse in patients with schizophrenia: A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study. *Schizophr Res*. 2010;116(2-3):107-117. doi:10.1016/j.schres.2009.10.026

46. Berwaerts J, Liu Y, Gopal S, et al. Efficacy and Safety of the 3-Month Formulation of Paliperidone Palmitate vs Placebo for Relapse Prevention of Schizophrenia: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Psychiatry*. 2015;72(8):830-839. doi:10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2015.0241

47. Kramer M, Simpson G, Maciulis V, et al. Paliperidone Extended-Release Tablets for Prevention of Symptom Recurrence in Patients With Schizophrenia: A Randomized, Double-Blind, Placebo-Controlled Study. *J Clin Psychopharmacol*. 2007;27(1):6-14. doi:10.1097/JCP.0b013e31802dda4a

48. Rui Q, Wang Y, Liang S, et al. Relapse prevention study of paliperidone extended-release tablets in Chinese patients with schizophrenia. *Prog Neuropsychopharmacol Biol Psychiatry*. 2014;53:45-53. doi:10.1016/j.pnpbp.2014.02.007

Supplementary Material

Supplementary Material 1: Details of LCMM model fit and statistical analysis

The LCMM model fit was conducted iteratively in the following manner. First, the simplest linear transformation model of total PANSS score varying with days since randomization up to relapse was fit. Then, a model with the rescaled cumulative distribution function (CDF) of a Beta distribution was fit to assess potential non-linear trajectories.[31] Next, random effects were added to account for heterogeneity in symptom trajectories within latent classes. Finally, models with 1, 2, 3 and 4 latent classes were estimated and compared. To maximize clinical meaningfulness of the latent trajectory classes, models in which the smallest class had less than 5% of the total participants were excluded.

The optimal model with the most appropriate number of latent classes was determined according to the following criteria:

1. Size-adjusted Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC): lower values indicate better model fit[39]
2. Entropy: describes class discriminability, with values closer to 1 indicating less classification uncertainty and better distinction between classes[40] – values greater than 0.5 is regarded acceptable[26]
3. Posterior probability of classification: average latent class probabilities for most likely latent class membership – higher probabilities indicate better classification, with 70%+ regarded as acceptable[26]

The non-linear Beta distribution models did not converge, and the models without random effects had higher BIC and lower entropy than the models with random effects.

For all between group symptom comparisons, the appropriate statistical test was applied: Shapiro-Wilk tests were conducted before applying Welch's *t*-test for continuous normal variables and Mann-Whitney *U* test for continuous non-normal variables. The Cohen's *d* standardized mean difference (SMD) and the standard error (SE) of the SMD was computed. Given that 30 tests were made for each group comparison, the false discovery rate (FDR) approach was implemented to account for multiple comparison testing.[41] For completeness, both the 95% confidence interval of SMD and the FDR-corrected *p*-value were computed. The SMD was selected as the effect size measure for better comparability between symptoms and study trials. Subgroup comparisons between 1-monthly and 3-monthly LAI trials were not conducted due to the small sample sizes.

Threshold of statistical significance was set at 0.05 (two-tailed, and FDR corrected where appropriate). Error bars represent the 95% confidence interval unless otherwise stated. All

statistical analyses were conducted in R version 4.3.0[32] on the secure YODA platform[33] using R packages lcmm v.2.1.0[31], compareGroups v.4.7.2[42] and forestploter v.1.1.3[43].

Supplementary Material 2: Extended results

In the LCMM model fit analyses, the 2-class model had the lowest size-adjusted BIC and highest entropy. The 4-class models had latent classes with less than 5% participants. The average latent class probabilities for most likely class membership were acceptable for all classes in the 2-class model (LAI: delayed 89.5%, rapid 76.7%; oral: delayed 96.7%, rapid 86.3%).

Model fit for the LAI trials split by 1-monthly and 3-monthly formulation showed a similar trend to the combined LAI cohort analysis. The 2-class linear models with random effects showed the best model fit. The average latent class probabilities for most likely class membership were acceptable in all classes for the 2-class models (range: 76.6%-90.2%). The goodness-of-fit of the final 2-class models were acceptable.

In the secondary analysis of LAI formulations, 177 of 215 participants (82.3%) with 1-monthly LAI had the 'delayed relapse' trajectory, with a median time to relapse of 96 days. The remaining 38 participants (17.7%) had the 'rapid relapse' trajectory with median 56 days to relapse. 41 of 56 participants (73.2%) in the 3-monthly LAI trial had a 'delayed relapse' trajectory with median 116 days to relapse, while 15 participants (26.8%) had a 'rapid relapse' trajectory with median 63 days to relapse.

For baseline differences in the two LAI formulations, the baseline total PANSS score ($p = 0.006$) in the 1-monthly LAI cohort was significantly higher in the rapid relapse trajectory class, but only marginally higher in the 3-monthly LAI cohort ($p = 0.050$). The baseline total CGI score was significantly higher in the rapid relapse class for the 3-monthly LAI cohort ($p = 0.009$), but not for the 1-monthly LAI cohort ($p = 0.235$). In both LAI formulations, there were no significant differences between treatment groups in any of the covariates.

As expected, given the randomized nature of the studies, there were no significant differences in baseline symptom profiles between discontinuation and active treatment groups (Figure 3b, 3d, eTable4).

Supplementary Material 3: Relapse criteria in the original studies

<u>Fu:</u> any of the following —

1. Psychiatric hospitalization
2. Any intervention employed to avert imminent hospitalization due to worsening of symptoms (e.g. increase in the level of psychiatric care) or the need for additional antipsychotics, antidepressant or mood stabilizers
3. Clinically significant self-injury, suicidal or homicidal ideation, violent behaviours
4. Total PANSS score increase for 2 consecutive visits by:
    a. If baseline score > 45: increase by 25% from baseline
    b. If baseline score ≤ 45: 10-point increase
5. Increase in CGI-Severity score for 2 consecutive visits to:
    a. If baseline score ≤ 3: increase in 2 or more points
    b. If baseline score ≥ 4: increase in 1 or more points
6. Worsening in specific PANSS items (to ≥6 if baseline ≤ 4 or to ≥5 if baseline ≤3):
    a. P01 Delusions
    b. P02 Conceptual disorganization
    c. P03 Hallucinatory behaviour
    d. P04 Excitement
    e. P06 Suspiciousness / persecution
    f. P07 Hostility
    g. G08 Uncooperativeness
    h. G14 Poor impulse control

<u>Hough, Berwaerts, Kramer, Rui:</u> any of the following —

1. Psychiatric hospitalization (involuntary or voluntary admission)
2. Increase in the level of psychiatric care (e.g. from clinic visits to day treatment)
3. Total PANSS score increase for 2 consecutive visits by:
    a. If baseline score > 40: increase by 25% from baseline
    b. If baseline score ≤ 40: 10-point increase
4. Increase in CGI-Severity score for 2 consecutive visits to:
    a. If baseline score ≤ 3: increase to 4
    b. If baseline score = 4: increase to 5
5. Deliberate self-injury
6. Suicidal or homicidal ideation
7. Clinically significant aggressive behaviour
8. Increase in specific PANSS item scores for 2 consecutive assessments:
    a. P01 Delusions
    b. P02 Conceptual disorganization
    c. P03 Hallucinatory behaviour
    d. P06 Suspiciousness / persecution
    e. P07 Hostility
    f. G08 Uncooperativeness

Supplementary Material 4: Baseline inclusion criteria in the original studies

Fu: Patients with a diagnosis of either a schizophrenia or schizoaffective disorder for at least one year and with prominent mood symptoms at screening. Specifically, patients who were experiencing exacerbation of psychotic symptoms, defined as a score of ≥ 4 on 3 or more of specific PANSS items:

a. P01 Delusions
b. P02 Conceptual disorganization
c. P03 Hallucinatory behaviour
d. P04 Excitement
e. P06 Suspiciousness/persecution
f. P07 Hostility
g. G04 Tension
h. G08 Uncooperativeness
i. G14 Poor impulse control

Hough and Berwaerts: Patients with a diagnosis of schizophrenia for at least one year. Total PANSS score under 120 (no minimum score required). Not treatment resistant.

Kramer and Rui: Patients with a diagnosis of schizophrenia for at least one year. Total PANSS score between 70 and 120. Not treatment resistant.

Supplementary Tables

eTable 1. Proposed antipsychotic withdrawal symptoms compared to relapse

Class	Onset	Duration	Symptoms
Withdrawal	Within days after drug discontinuation (peak onset of 36 to 96 hours)	6 weeks or more depending on drug half-life	New symptoms common to CNS drugs: nausea, headache, insomnia, tremor, anxiety, irritability, agitation, aggression, inattention, dysphoria, depression Serotonergic withdrawal syndrome: flu-like symptoms, dizziness, diarrhoea, confusion, disorientation, restlessness/clonus Adrenergic withdrawal syndrome: headache, anxiety, palpitation, increased blood pressure or heart rate, sweating, presyncope Histaminic withdrawal syndrome: irritability, depressed affect, loss of appetite, increased inducible seizure, lethargy or amnesia Muscarinic withdrawal syndrome: agitation, nausea, vomiting, abdominal cramp, hypothermia, tremor, parkinsonism, restlessness, insomnia
Relapse or recurrence	Any time post discontinuation	Days, weeks	Return of ongoing episodes or a new psychotic episode with symptoms known to the patient

Adapted from Chouinard et al. (2017)[20]

eTable 2. Study design and participant characteristics

Study	Follow-up	Relapse cases by intervention	Participant characteristics
Fu[44]	Up to 16 months	Discontinuation (*n*=57, 69.5%) 1-monthly LAI (*n*=25, 30.5%)	Schizophrenia or schizoaffective disorder experiencing exacerbation (48% male, mean age 36.3)
Hough[45]	Up to 16 months	Discontinuation (*n*=97, 72.9%) 1-monthly LAI (*n*=36, 27.1%)	Schizophrenia disorder (54% male, mean age 40.7)
Berwaerts[46]	Up to 16 months	Discontinuation (*n*=43, 76.8%) 3-monthly LAI (*n*=13, 23.2%)	Schizophrenia disorder (79% male, mean age 35.8)
Kramer[47]	Up to 12 months	Discontinuation (*n*=52, 69.3%) Oral (*n*=23, 30.7%)	Schizophrenia disorder (56% male, mean age 37.9)
Rui[48]	Up to 14 months	Discontinuation (*n*=56, 78.9%) Oral (*n*=15, 21.1%)	Schizophrenia disorder (42% male, mean age 31.8)

eTable 3. Model fit statistics for long-acting injectable (LAI) and oral trials

Model	BIC	Entropy	Proportion of individuals in each class			
LAI trials (1-monthly and 3-monthly combined, *n* = 271)						
1-class	10396.27	-	100%			
2-class	10377.55	0.60	82.7%	17.3%		
3-class	10384.02	0.50	63.1%	22.5%	14.4%	
4-class	10395.60	0.60	40.2%	39.1%	15.5%	5.2%
Oral trials (*n* = 146)						
1-class	6581.00	-	100%			
2-class	6516.34	0.80	73.3%	26.7%		
3-class	6528.63	0.56	53.4%	27.4%	19.2%	
4-class	6543.58	0.47	50.7%	27.4%	21.9%	0%

eTable 4. Baseline characteristics of long-acting injectable cohort by treatment group

Long Acting Injectable Formulation				
Characteristics	Total cohort (*n* = 271)	Discontinuation (*n* = 197)	Active treatment (*n* = 74)	*p*-value
Trajectory class:				0.119
Delayed relapse	224 (82.7%)	158 (80.2%)	66 (89.2%)	
Rapid relapse	47 (17.3%)	39 (19.8%)	8 (10.8%)	
Time to relapse[a]	84 (88)	85 (90)	81.5 (78.5)	0.451
Trial study:				0.639
Berwaerts (3-monthly)	56 (20.7%)	43 (21.8%)	13 (17.6%)	
Fu (1-monthly)	82 (30.3%)	57 (28.9%)	25 (33.8%)	
Hough (1-monthly)	133 (49.1%)	97 (49.2%)	36 (48.6%)	
Male sex	155 (57.2%)	109 (55.3%)	46 (62.2%)	0.382
Age at screening[b]	38.4 (11.2)	38.9 (11.4)	36.9 (10.8)	0.188
Baseline PANSS total[b]	54.8 (13.7)	54.7 (13.0)	55.0 (15.4)	0.897
Baseline CGI[b]	2.70 (0.77)	2.71 (0.74)	2.66 (0.83)	0.661
Oral Formulation				
Characteristics	Total cohort (*n* = 146)	Discontinuation (*n* = 108)	Active treatment (*n* = 38)	*p*-value
Trajectory class:				1.000
Delayed relapse	107 (73.3%)	79 (73.1%)	28 (73.7%)	
Rapid relapse	39 (26.7%)	29 (26.9%)	10 (26.3%)	
Time to relapse[a]	25.5 (48.8)	25.5 (48.8)	25.5 (45.5)	0.976
Trial study:				0.261
Kramer	75 (51.4%)	52 (48.1%)	23 (60.5%)	
Rui	71 (48.6%)	56 (51.9%)	15 (39.5%)	
Male sex	72 (49.3%)	54 (50.0%)	18 (47.4%)	0.928
Age at screening[b]	34.8 (11.5)	34.6 (11.5)	35.4 (11.5)	0.716
Baseline PANSS total[b]	52.9 (10.2)	53.1 (10.1)	52.3 (10.6)	0.678
Baseline CGI[b]	2.83 (0.75)	2.84 (0.71)	2.79 (0.84)	0.730

[a] Median (IQR); [b] Mean (SD)

eTable 5. Model fit statistics for LAI cohort split by formulation type

Model	BIC	Entropy	Proportion of individuals in each class			
3-monthly LAI formulation (*n* = 105)						
1-class	2554.65	-	100%			
2-class	2561.52	0.59	73.2%	26.8%		
3-class	2573.59	0.29	66.1%	33.9%	0%	
4-class	2585.67	0.23	60.7%	39.3%	0%	0%
1-monthly LAI formulation (*n* = 215)						
1-class	12374.21	-	100%			
2-class	7818.75	0.57	82.3%	17.7%		
3-class	7834.87	0.30	77.7%	22.3%	0%	
4-class	7837.95	0.46	76.7%	11.6%	11.6%	0%

eTable 6. Characteristics of 3-monthly LAI cohort by trajectory class

Characteristics	Total cohort (*n* = 56)	Delayed relapse (*n* = 41)	Rapid relapse (*n* = 15)	*p*-value
Treatment group:				0.730
Discontinuation	43 (76.8%)	32 (78.0%)	11 (73.3%)	
Active treatment	13 (23.2%)	9 (22.0%)	4 (26.7%)	
Time to relapse[a]	90.5 (78.8)	116 (72)	63 (42)	< 0.001
Male sex	44 (78.6%)	30 (73.2%)	14 (93.3%)	0.149
Age at screening[b]	36.2 (11.3)	37.1 (10.9)	32.1 (12.1)	0.072
Baseline PANSS total[b]	59.0 (16.1)	55.5 (11.3)	68.5 (22.9)	0.050
Baseline CGI[b]	2.82 (0.61)	2.73 (0.67)	3.07 (0.26)	0.009

[a] Median (IQR); [b] Mean (SD)

eTable 7. Characteristics of 1-monthly LAI cohort by trajectory class

Characteristics	Total cohort (*n* = 215)	Delayed relapse (*n* = 177)	Rapid relapse (*n* = 38)	*p*-value
Treatment group:				0.366
Discontinuation	154 (71.6%)	125 (70.1%)	30 (78.9%)	
Active treatment	61 (28.4%)	53 (29.9%)	8 (21.1%)	
Time to relapse[a]	84 (88.5)	96 (108)	56 (51.5)	< 0.001
Male sex	111 (51.6%)	94 (53.1%)	17 (44.7%)	0.448
Age at screening[b]	39.0 (11.2)	38.5 (11.4)	41.7 (9.82)	0.074
Baseline PANSS total[b]	53.7 (12.8)	52.2 (10.8)	60.9 (17.9)	0.006
Baseline CGI[b]	2.67 (0.80)	2.63 (0.79)	2.82 (0.87)	0.235

[a] Median (IQR); [b] Mean (SD)

Supplementary Figures



eFigure 1. Predicted relapse trajectories with 2 latent trajectory classes in 3-monthly long-acting injectable paliperidone palmitate (LAI) trials. Dots represent the weighted subject-specific predicted values. The confidence interval range of observed values are shown in the shaded region.



eFigure 2. Predicted relapse trajectories with 2 latent trajectory classes in 1-monthly long-acting injectable paliperidone palmitate (LAI) trials. Dots represent the weighted subject-specific predicted values. The confidence interval range of observed values are shown in the shaded region.