A norm-anchored framework for characterizing cognitive heterogeneity in schizophrenia

Chen Chen*
Department of Anatomy, Faculty of Medical Science, Naresuan University, Phitsanulok, 65000, Thailand

*Corresponding author email address: chench61@alumni.nu.ac.th

Abstract

Cognitive heterogeneity is a core feature of schizophrenia (SCZ), but it remains unclear whether this heterogeneity reflects graded deviation within a shared cognitive structure or alterations in that structure. In this study, latent cognitive structure was delineated in healthy controls (HC) and evaluated in SCZ using a norm-anchored cognitive structural deviation (NCSD) framework. A stable single-factor structure was identified in HC, indicating that diverse cognitive measures were captured within a common latent structure. Compared with HC, patients with SCZ showed greater overall deviation from the normative structure together with altered loading patterns in WCST-derived executive indicators, suggesting both magnitude differences and structural alteration. The global deviation index demonstrated stable performance in differentiating SCZ from HC under cross-validation. Structural deviation indices were associated with anxiety ratings and showed trend-level associations with positive symptoms. Exploratory clustering further suggested that cognitive heterogeneity in SCZ may reflect distinct profiles characterized by different combinations of deviation magnitude and loading alteration. NCSD provides a refined framework for characterizing cognitive heterogeneity beyond approaches that consider deviation severity or structural variation separately. Further studies will be needed to establish the robustness and broader applicability of this framework.

Introduction

Cognitive dysfunction is a core feature of schizophrenia (SCZ) and a determinant of functional outcome. Its clinical presentation is heterogeneous, with patients differing in both the severity and profile of deficits [1]. This raises a central question: does this heterogeneity reflect quantitative variation within a shared latent cognitive structure, or systematic reorganization of that structure?

Two approaches are often discussed. The normative modelling approach assumes that all individuals share the same latent structure, with SCZ representing deviation along normative

dimensions [2]. In contrast, clustering-based approach seeks to identify subgroups within the patient population that may differ in cognitive profiles [3]. However, these subgroups often reflect differences in overall impairment severity rather than qualitatively distinct cognitive patterns [4, 5].

Empirical evidence to date appears to favor a quantitative deviation model. At the same time, neuroimaging studies have reported that SCZ is associated with alterations in brain network topology and hub organization [6, 7]. These findings suggest that cognitive heterogeneity in SCZ may involve not only differences in deviation magnitude but also shifts in latent structural organization relative to a normative reference. However, existing approaches tend to address these aspects separately. To bridge this gap, an integrative method is needed to evaluate both within a unified framework.

In the present study, we delineated the latent cognitive structure in healthy controls (HC) and evaluated its equivalence in SCZ. We developed a norm-anchored cognitive structural deviation (NCSD) framework to jointly characterize deviation severity and structural alteration. The present study provides an initial evaluation of the NCSD framework, highlighting its potential as a refined approach for examining cognitive heterogeneity in SCZ.

2. Methods

2.1 Data

The analysis used a publicly available psychiatric dataset including patients with SCZ (n=32), their unaffected siblings (UC, n=32), and HC (n=33) [8]. The dataset contains neurocognitive assessments across multiple domains, demographic variables, and clinical measures. All data were fully anonymized and utilized under the terms of the original data-sharing agreements, and the present analyses did not require further ethical approval.

2.2 Neurocognitive measures

Neurocognitive measures were selected to represent executive function, attention, working memory, processing speed, and verbal fluency. These included three subscores from the Wisconsin Card Sorting Test (WCST): correct responses, perseverative errors (PE), and trials to complete first category (1st category), as well as Digit Span Forward (DSF), Digit Span Backward (DSB),

Verbal Fluency Test (VFT), Stroop Word, Stroop Color, Stroop Interference, Trail Making Test A (TMTA), and Trail Making Test B (TMTB).

To reduce dimensionality and address multicollinearity, Stroop performance was summarized as a composite score (Stroop-comp) from the Word, Color, and Interference subtests, which were highly correlated. For the Trail Making Test, the difference between TMTB and TMTA (TMT-diff) was calculated to reduce shared variance attributable to basic processing speed in the model. Scores indicating poorer performance were reverse-coded so that higher values consistently reflected better cognitive ability.

2.3 Data preprocessing

Data were screened for missing values and outliers prior to analysis. Cognitive variables were examined for skewness within the HC group and transformed when necessary, using order-normalization estimated in HC data and applied to all participants. Cognitive variables were then standardized using HC-based z-scores, so that scores in the UC and SCZ groups were expressed relative to the HC normative reference.

2.4 Normative cognitive modeling and deviation indices

Parallel analysis in the HC group suggested a single-factor solution [9]. Confirmatory factor analysis showed that this solution was not rejected ($p = 0.137$), although overall fit was modest (RMSEA = 0.10, 90% CI [0.00, 0.19]) [10]. To establish the normative cognitive loading pattern, a single-factor exploratory factor analysis was conducted. HC-derived loadings were used to compute factor scores for all participants, situating them on the normative cognitive dimension.

Deviation from the HC normative model was quantified using Mahalanobis distance, with the HC covariance matrix as the reference [11]. This index is referred to as the cognitive normative deviation index (CNDI).

Similarity of the loading pattern between HC and SCZ was evaluated using Tucker's congruence coefficient [12]. Loading pattern divergence (LPD) was defined as between-group shifts in factor loadings. Robustness of these loading differences was further assessed using alternative correlation metrics, bootstrap resampling, and re-estimation following multivariate outlier control.

Correlation structure discrepancy (CSD) was computed by comparing Pearson correlation matrices between HC and SCZ, identifying variable pairs with the largest absolute differences.

2.5 Clinical discrimination, association, and exploratory subgroup analysis of deviation indices

Logistic regression was used to test whether the CNDI could distinguish between SCZ and HC. Model performance was evaluated with 10-fold cross-validation.

Within the SCZ group, linear regression models were fitted to examine associations between CNDI, LPD, CSD, and clinical measures. Gaussian mixture modeling (GMM) was applied to the deviation indices to explore whether subgroup patterns could be detected. The number of mixture components (G) was constrained to 1–3 to account for sample size limitations [13]. Bootstrap resampling was used to assess the stability of the solution.

2.6 Statistical analysis

Group comparisons were conducted using t-tests or one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), as appropriate. Post hoc pairwise comparisons were performed using Tukey's honestly significant difference (HSD) test. Statistical significance was set at $p < 0.05$ (two-tailed). All analyses were conducted in R (version 4.5.0).

3. Results

3.1 Demographic

The three groups (HC, UC, SCZ) did not differ significantly in age, sex distribution, or years of education (all $p > 0.05$), consistent with the original report [8]. Detailed demographic, cognitive, and clinical characteristics are available in the original study.

3.2 Group differences in cognitive normative deviation index

CNDI showed significant group differences across HC, UC, and SCZ ($p = 2.93 \times 10^{-6}$; see Figure 1 and Table 1). Tukey's HSD test confirmed significant pairwise differences (all $p < 0.05$), with SCZ exhibiting the greatest deviation. A linear trend was also evident ($p=1.39\times10^{-6}$), indicating progressively greater deviation from HC to UC to SCZ.

Table 1. Cognitive normative deviation across three groups

Group	CNDI	p-value
HC	6.85 ± 2.43	
UC	25.3 ± 20.7	2.93×10^{-6}**
SCZ	44.2 ± 46.6	

HC = Healthy controls; UC = Unaffected siblings; SCZ = Schizophrenia patients.
Data are presented as mean ± SD and compared using one-way ANOVA.
** $p < 0.01$



Figure 1. Differences in cognitive normative deviation between groups

3.3 Divergence in factor loading and correlation structure

A Tucker's congruence coefficient of 0.73 indicated that the SCZ loading pattern was structurally not equivalent to that of HC [12].

All three WCST subscores showed loading direction reversals, being negative in HC but positive in SCZ, reflecting a shift in their contribution to the latent structure (see Figure 2). This shift was robust across alternative correlation metrics, bootstrap resampling, and re-estimation after multivariate outlier control. In contrast, the remaining cognitive measures retained consistent loading directions across groups. Apart from TMT_diff, which showed a modest reduction in loading magnitude, loadings for all other measures were generally higher in SCZ than in HC.

CSD analysis revealed that the largest differences involved 1st category in relation to VFT and STROOP-comp, both exceeding an absolute correlation difference of 0.50 and demonstrating stronger associations in SCZ relative to HC.

Figure 2. Factor loadings of WCST subscores in HC and SCZ

3.4 Clinical discrimination, association, and exploratory subgroup analysis of deviation indices

3.4.1 Clinical discrimination

CNDI showed strong ability to distinguish SCZ from HC. Logistic regression yielded a high classification accuracy of 93.9%, with sensitivity of 0.88 and specificity of 1.00. The area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUC) was 0.92, indicating good model performance. Ten-fold cross-validation produced a mean AUC of 0.90, confirming the robustness of the deviation metric (see Figure 3).



Figure 3. Receiver operating characteristic curve based on ten-fold cross-validation

3.4.2 Symptom associations within schizophrenia

Within the SCZ group, regression models were fitted with CNDI, LPD, and CSD to examine symptom associations. The model including LPD and CSD was significant for anxiety symptoms (HAMA; $R^2 = 0.31$, $p = 0.005$). LPD ($\beta = 1.90$, $p = 0.0045$) and CSD ($\beta = -0.167$, $p = 0.0033$) were independently associated with anxiety. For positive symptoms, LPD showed a trend-level association ($\beta = 2.10$, $p = 0.059$), while other indices were not significant.

3.4.3 Exploratory subgroup structure within schizophrenia

GMM selected a three-cluster solution based on the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC), comprising 18, 8, and 6 individuals. The mean posterior membership probability was 0.95, indicating high separation certainty (see Figure 4). Bootstrap resampling yielded a mean adjusted Rand index (ARI) was 0.60, reflecting moderate stability of the solution [14].

Cluster 2 was characterized by high CNDI with low LPD, whereas clusters 1 and 3 both showed moderate LPD but differed in CNDI level, with lower values in cluster 1 and higher values in cluster 3, see Figure 4.



Figure 4. Exploratory three-cluster structure within the schizophrenia group identified using Gaussian mixture modeling

Discussion

Using the NCSD framework, the present study characterized cognitive heterogeneity in SCZ at both the deviation and structural levels. Overall, the results suggest a pattern of graded deviations from a normative cognitive structure together with localized in loading patterns.

A stable single-factor solution in HC captured task performance within one latent structure. This aligns with prior evidence that diverse cognitive measures in healthy adults often load onto a common cognitive structure [15-17]. Network neuroscience provides a conceptual foundation for this interpretation, indicating that such a structure reflects the coordinated integration across distributed brain systems, enabling efficient information exchange and system-wide flexibility [18]. Individual differences in this structure may lead to differential vulnerability under environmental or neurodevelopmental stressors [19]. In patients with SCZ, greater deviation from the normative model accompanied altered loading patterns in WCST-derived executive indicators, suggesting both magnitude differences and structural reorganization. These loading shifts are consistent with neuroimaging evidence showing that, although HC and SCZ recruit broadly similar executive control networks, core executive regions are altered in patients [20]. Taken together, these findings offer a conceptual rationale for applying the NCSD to the study of cognitive heterogeneity in SCZ. Yet it remains unclear whether deviation severity precedes structural alteration or arises from it.

The deviation indices derived from NCSD demonstrated practical utility. The CNDI showed good performance in differentiating SCZ from HC, with results remaining stable under cross-validation. This likely reflects the fact that spatial patterns of cognitive structure capture group differences more effectively than single-domain scores [20]. Cognitive testing typically relies on domain-specific measures, such scores in practice reflect a summary expression of multi-domain abilities [21], and structural alterations across domains provide a more sensitive index of differences between HC and SCZ. Furthermore, LPD and CSD were associated with anxiety scores, and LPD also showed a trend-level relation to positive symptoms, consistent with previous studies linking anxiety to executive deficits [22] and WCST-related measures to positive symptoms [23].

Moreover, exploratory clustering suggested that cognitive deviation in SCZ may not be homogeneous but instead reflects distinct profiles, supported by a well-separated three-cluster solution. One cluster was characterized by high global deviation with minimal loading reversal, whereas the other two showed comparable levels of reversal but differed in deviation magnitude.

This pattern indicates that cognitive heterogeneity in SCZ is better characterized by the joint contribution of deviation severity and structural alteration, rather than by either a purely quantitative continuum or a fully distinct structural reorganization. This interpretation is consistent with findings from a large-scale cognitive profiling study [24]. Moderate bootstrap stability suggests that the identified clusters capture meaningful structure, while remaining open to refinement in future studies.

Several limitations should be acknowledged. First, the sample size was modest, which may limit the precision and stability of the NCSD estimates. Second, although the cognitive battery encompassed a range of measures, further studies are needed to evaluate NCSD using more comprehensive test sets. In addition, the stability of the identified structural patterns should be examined across different instruments assessing similar cognitive domains, and the applicability of NCSD should be tested in other clinical populations. Third, the cross-sectional design limits our understanding of the temporal dynamics of NCSD and its potential prognostic value. Fourth, the absence of biological measures limits the ability to explore the neurobiological correlates and mechanistic basis of NCSD.

In conclusion, the NCSD framework demonstrated both practical and conceptual value in characterizing cognitive heterogeneity in SCZ. By moving beyond conventional domain-based approaches, it offers a refined perspective on heterogeneity. Further research with larger samples, longitudinal designs, and multimodal data will be necessary to confirm its robustness and generalizability.

References

1. McCutcheon RA, Keefe RSE, McGuire PK. Cognitive impairment in schizophrenia: aetiology, pathophysiology, and treatment. Mol Psychiatry. 2023;28(5):1902-18.
2. Marquand AF, Kia SM, Zabihi M, Wolfers T, Buitelaar JK, Beckmann CF. Conceptualizing mental disorders as deviations from normative functioning. Molecular Psychiatry. 2019;24(10):1415-24.
3. Lim K, Smucny J, Barch DM, Lam M, Keefe RSE, Lee J. Cognitive Subtyping in Schizophrenia: A Latent Profile Analysis. Schizophrenia Bulletin. 2020;47(3):712-21.
4. Haining K, Gajwani R, Gross J, Gumley AI, Ince RAA, Lawrie SM, et al. Characterising cognitive heterogeneity in individuals at clinical high-risk for psychosis: a cluster analysis with clinical and functional outcome prediction. European Archives of Psychiatry and Clinical Neuroscience. 2022;272(3):437-48.
5. Vaskinn A, Haatveit B, Melle I, Andreassen OA, Ueland T, Sundet K. Cognitive Heterogeneity across Schizophrenia and Bipolar Disorder: A Cluster Analysis of Intellectual Trajectories. Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society. 2020;26(9):860-72.
6. Bassett DS, Bullmore E, Verchinski BA, Mattay VS, Weinberger DR, Meyer-Lindenberg A. Hierarchical organization of human cortical networks in health and schizophrenia. J Neurosci. 2008;28(37):9239-48.
7. van den Heuvel MP, Sporns O, Collin G, Scheewe T, Mandl RC, Cahn W, et al. Abnormal rich club organization and functional brain dynamics in schizophrenia. JAMA Psychiatry. 2013;70(8):783-92.
8. Xu F, Xian Z. Study investigating executive function in schizophrenia patients and their unaffected siblings. PLoS One. 2023;18(4):e0285034.
9. Lim S, Jahng S. Determining the number of factors using parallel analysis and its recent variants. Psychol Methods. 2019;24(4):452-67.
10. MacCallum RC, Browne MW, Sugawara HM. Power analysis and determination of sample size for covariance structure modeling [doi:10.1037/1082-989X.1.2.130]. US: American Psychological Association; 1996.
11. Reprint of: Mahalanobis, P.C. (1936) "On the Generalised Distance in Statistics.". Sankhya A. 2018;80(1):1-7.
12. Lorenzo-Seva U, ten Berge JMF. Tucker's Congruence Coefficient as a Meaningful Index of Factor Similarity. Methodology. 2006;2(2):57-64.
13. Fraley C, Raftery AE. Model-Based Clustering, Discriminant Analysis, and Density Estimation. Journal of the American Statistical Association. 2002;97(458):611-31.
14. Warrens MJ, van der Hoef H. Understanding the Adjusted Rand Index and Other Partition Comparison Indices Based on Counting Object Pairs. Journal of Classification. 2022;39(3):487-509.
15. Spearman C. 'General intelligence,' objectively determined and measured. The American Journal of Psychology. 1904;15(2):201-93.
16. Jensen AR. The g factor: The science of mental ability. Westport, CT, US: Praeger Publishers/Greenwood Publishing Group; 1998. xiv, 648-xiv, p.

17. Zhang L, Feng J, Liu C, Hu H, Zhou Y, Yang G, et al. Improved estimation of general cognitive ability and its neural correlates with a large battery of cognitive tasks. Cerebral Cortex. 2024;34(2).
18. Barbey AK. Network Neuroscience Theory of Human Intelligence. Trends in Cognitive Sciences. 2018;22(1):8-20.
19. McEwen BS, Gianaros PJ. Stress- and allostasis-induced brain plasticity. Annu Rev Med. 2011;62:431-45.
20. Minzenberg MJ, Laird AR, Thelen S, Carter CS, Glahn DC. Meta-analysis of 41 Functional Neuroimaging Studies of Executive Function in Schizophrenia. Archives of General Psychiatry. 2009;66(8):811-22.
21. Kovacs K, Conway ARA. Process overlap theory: A unified account of the general factor of intelligence. Psychological Inquiry. 2016;27(3):151-77.
22. Korczak A, Styła R. Anxiety and executive functions relationships in schizophrenia: A meta-analysis. Personality and Individual Differences. 2021;177:110643.
23. Stratta P, Daneluzzo E, Bustini M, Prosperini P, Rossi A. Processing of context information in schizophrenia: relation to clinical symptoms and WCST performance. Schizophrenia Research. 2000;44(1):57-67.
24. Huang Y, Wang W, Hei G, Shao T, Li L, Yang Y, et al. Subgroups of cognitive impairments in schizophrenia characterized by executive function and their morphological features: a latent profile analysis study. BMC Medicine. 2025;23(1):13.


CNDI
200
100
0
HC
UC
SCZ
Group
HC
UC
SCZ


Perseverative Errors
Correct Responses
1st Category
-0.50
-0.25
0.00
0.25
Group
HC_Loading
SCZ_Loading


Sensitivity
0.0
0.2
0.4
0.6
0.8
1.0
1.0
0.5
0.0
Specificity


LPD
2
1
0
200
400
CNDI
Cluster
1
2
3