



King's Research Portal

DOI:

[10.1038/s41398-020-01165-x](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41398-020-01165-x)

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Salazar de Pablo, G., Estrade Vaz, A., Cutroni, M., Andlauer, O., & Fusar-Poli, P. (2021). Establishing a clinical service to prevent psychosis: what, how and when? Systematic review. *Translational psychiatry*, 11(1), 43. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41398-020-01165-x>

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

ESTABLISHING A CLINICAL SERVICE TO PREVENT PSYCHOSIS: WHAT, HOW AND WHEN? SYSTEMATIC REVIEW

Gonzalo Salazar de Pablo^{1,2,#}, Andrés Estradé^{3,#}, Marcello Cutroni⁴, Olivier Andlauer^{5,6}, Paolo Fusar-Poli^{1,4,7,8}

¹Early Psychosis: Interventions and Clinical-detection (EPIC) lab, Department of Psychosis Studies, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology & Neuroscience, King's College London, London, UK;

²Institute of Psychiatry and Mental Health. Department of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, Hospital General Universitario Gregorio Marañón School of Medicine, Universidad Complutense, Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria Gregorio Marañón (IISGM), CIBERSAM, Madrid, Spain;

³Department of Clinical and Health Psychology, Catholic University, Montevideo, Uruguay;

⁴Department of Brain and Behavioral Sciences, University of Pavia, Pavia, Italy;

⁵Heads UP service, East London NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK;

⁶Centre for Psychiatry, Wolfson Institute of Preventive Medicine, Barts and the London School of Medicine and Dentistry, Queen Mary University of London, London, United Kingdom.

⁷National Institute for Health Research, Maudsley Biomedical Research Centre, South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK;

⁸OASIS service, South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK.

Abstract: 250

Text: 4849

References 124

Tables: 4

Figures: 2

Supplementary Tables: 3

Supplementary Texts: 4

These authors have contributed equally and share the first position authorship

Endnote reference file: CHR-P clinical services.enl

Correspondence to: Dr Paolo Fusar-Poli MD PhD, Department of Psychosis Studies, 5th Floor, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology & Neuroscience, PO63, 16 De Crespigny Park, SE5 8AF London, UK. E-mail: paolo.fusar-poli@kcl.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

Introduction: The first rate-limiting step to successfully translate prevention of psychosis in clinical practice is to establish specialised Clinical High Risk for Psychosis services (CHR-P). This study systematises the knowledge regarding CHR-P services and provides guidelines for translational implementation.

Methods: PRISMA/MOOSE-compliant (PROSPERO-CRD42020163640) systematic review of Web of Science to identify studies until 4/05/2020 reporting on CHR-P service configuration, outreach strategy and referrals, service user characteristics, interventions and outcomes.

Results: 56 studies (1998-2020) were included, encompassing 51 distinct CHR-P services across 15 countries and a catchment area of 17,252,666 people. Most services (80.4%) consisted of integrated multidisciplinary teams taking care of CHR-P and other patients. Outreach encompassed active (up to 97.6%) or passive (up to 63.4%) approaches: referrals came mostly (90%) from healthcare agencies. CHR-P individuals were more frequently males (57.2%). Most (70.6%) services accepted individuals aged 12-35 years, typically assessed with the CAARMS/SIPS (83.7%). Baseline comorbid mental conditions were reported in two-third (69.5%) of cases, past history of suicide attempts in one in ten (10.5%) and unemployment in one third (36.6%). Most services provided up to 2-years (72.4%), of clinical monitoring (100%), psychoeducation (81.1%), psychosocial support (73%), family interventions (73%), individual (67.6%) and group psychotherapy (18.9%), physical health interventions (37.8%), antipsychotics (87.1%), antidepressants (74.2%), anxiolytics (51.6%) and mood stabilisers (38.7%). Outcomes were more frequently ascertained clinically (93.0%) and included: persistence of symptoms/comorbidities (67.4%), transition to psychosis (53.5%) and functional status (48.8%).

Conclusions: Health service knowledge summarised by the current study will facilitate translational efforts for implementation of CHR-P services worldwide.

Keywords: Prevention, clinical service, at-risk mental state, intervention, young people.

INTRODUCTION

The clinical high risk for psychosis (CHR-P) paradigm¹, which represents one of the most established preventive approaches in clinical psychiatry², originated in Australia around twenty-five years ago³; since then it has gained substantive traction from clinical research⁴. CHR-P individuals are young and accumulate risk factors for the disorders⁵⁻⁷ that lead to functional impairments⁸ and attenuated psychotic symptoms⁹. Because of these features, these individuals seek help¹⁰ at specialised CHR-P mental health services. The detection¹¹, prognostic assessment¹² and preventive treatment¹³⁻¹⁶ in CHR-P individuals¹⁵ have the potential to maximize the benefits of early interventions in psychosis^{17, 18}. A recent evidence-based summary by the European College of Neuropsychopharmacology Network for the Prevention of Mental Disorders and Mental Health Promotion¹⁹ indicated that the first rate-limiting step to prevent psychosis is to establish specialised CHR-P services²⁰. Accordingly, several CHR-P services have been implemented worldwide, as recently mapped by the International Early Psychosis Association (IEPA²¹: <https://iepa.org.au/list-a-service>).

Despite these progresses, health service research in this field has been fragmented to the point that the characteristics (“what”) of a CHR-P service per se are poorly defined. As CHR-P services expand globally²¹, it becomes essential to synthesize the core CHR-P health service features that have been implemented in real-world scenarios. While a CHR-P clinic can be broadly defined as a “multidisciplinary community mental health service that provides treatment and support to people at high risk of developing psychosis” (page 16 from NHS England²²), this definition remains elusive. Similarly, there is no clear guidance on “how” to integrate different service components. The three main models for delivering CHR-P services include the ‘stand-alone’, ‘hub and spoke’ and ‘integrated’ models²². While the stand-alone model works independently from other more generic community mental health teams, in the ‘hub and spoke’ model, dedicated team workers (‘spokes’) are based within more generic community teams to route patients needing more intensive services to the central ‘hub’²³. In an integrated model, the CHR-P service is completely integrated into the community mental health care. In addition, these models can be combined within broad mental health services enhancing transitional primary care platforms across adolescents and young adults²⁴. The additional limitation of knowledge is that the timing (“when”) for preventive approaches, which is reflected by CHR-P entry age criteria is uncertain. While this has been typically set for young people aged 8-40⁴ years, more recent lifespan-inclusive approaches for those under the age of 25 (0-25 years)²⁵ models have been piloted.

While previous systematic reviews have addressed these issues for services taking care of patients with a first episode of psychosis^{26, 27}, CHR-P research has remained mostly “academic” and did not systematically address real-world service characteristics such as: service configuration, outreach strategy and referrals, service user characteristics, interventions and outcomes. The current systematic review summarizes for the first time evidence on these domains to inform the real-world implementation (i.e. what, how and when) of CHR-P clinical services worldwide.

METHODS

This study (study protocol: PROSPERO CRD42020163640) was conducted in accordance with PRISMA²⁸ (eTable1) and MOOSE²⁹ (eTable 2) checklists.

Search strategy and selection criteria

A multi-step systematic literature search strategy was used to identify relevant articles by two independent researchers (GSP, AE). First, the Web of Science database (Clarivate Analytics) was searched, incorporating the Web of Science Core Collection, BIOSIS Citation Index, KCI-Korean Journal Database, MEDLINE, Russian Science Citation Index, and SciELO Citation Index as well as Cochrane Central Register of Reviews, and Ovid/PsychINFO databases, as well as the OpenGrey database (for grey literature) from inception until 4th May 2020, with no restrictions on language. The following search terms were applied: (“risk” OR “prodrom*” OR “ultra-high risk” OR “clinical high risk” OR “attenuat*” OR “high risk” OR “genetic high risk” OR “risk syndrome” OR “at risk mental state” OR “at-risk mental state” OR “ARMS” OR “risk of progression” OR “schizophrenia” OR “schizoaffective disorder” OR “schizophreniform disorder”) AND (“psychosis”) AND (“prevention” OR “intervention” OR “early intervention” OR “referral” OR “assessment” OR “service” OR “clinical service” OR “psychiatric service” OR “implementation” OR “care pathways”). The references of the articles identified in previous reviews and relevant commentaries and the references from the included studies were manually searched to identify additional relevant records. Abstracts were screened, and potential full texts were assessed against inclusion and exclusion criteria.

The inclusion criteria were a) being an original study published in international databases or in the grey literature, b) describing clinical services for individuals in a CHR-P state as defined according to established instruments: Comprehensive Assessment of At-Risk Mental States (CAARMS³), Structured Interview for Psychosis-risk Syndromes (SIPS³⁰, ³¹), Bonn Scale for the Assessment of Basic Symptoms (BSABS³²), Basel Screening

Instrument for Psychosis (BSIP³³), Schizophrenia Proneness Instrument³⁴ - Adult (SPI-A) and Child and Youth (SPI-CY) version -, Positive and Negative Syndrome Scale (PANSS³⁵), Scale for the Assessment of Negative Symptoms (SANS³⁶), Brief Psychiatric Rating Scale (BPRS³⁷) and Early Recognition Inventory (ERIraos³⁸), c) providing information on any of the following: service configuration, outreach strategy and referrals, service user characteristics, interventions and outcomes, d) providing relevant information without any restrictions on language, sex, age or ethnicity. The exclusion criteria were a) non-original studies such as abstracts, conference proceedings, study protocols, reviews, guidelines, b) studies with a primary research focus (e.g. research networks) and lacking description of CHR-P clinical services, c) studies describing clinical services for conditions other than the CHR-P or services without a CHR-P component; d) national or regional survey studies with aggregate data and lacking a service-specific description.

Descriptive measures and data extraction

Independent researchers (GSP, AE, MC) extracted data from the included studies; discrepancies were resolved through consensus, consulting a senior researcher (PFP). The variables included were those necessary to describe “what, how and when” to implement CHR-P services. These variables were grouped according to health service domains previously established (beyond general data such as first author, year of publication, name of the CHR-P service, country)³⁹: (i) service configuration: continent, service set-up date, population in the catchment area, type of service, professionals involved (ii) outreach strategy and referrals: outreach activities -measured using an adapted version of the LYRIKS study⁴⁰ classification-, referral sources (iii) service user characteristics: sociodemographic characteristics, CHR-P assessment, CHR-P subgroups (defined as in previous studies)⁴¹, minimum and maximum age inclusion criteria and service use age range, comorbidities and employment (iv) interventions: type of intervention (non-pharmacological vs psychopharmacological) and duration of service provision and (v) outcomes: type of outcomes monitored and outcome instruments. Furthermore, we reported quality assessment (see below).

Data analysis

Systematic review

All the studies were systematically summarized in tables reporting on various health service domains: service configuration, outreach strategy and referrals (Table 1), service user characteristics (Table 2), interventions and outcomes (Table 3). We complement this with descriptive analysis of common operational and clinical challenges. An online

tool (<https://www.maptive.com>) was used to create a graphical representation of the geographical distribution of the CHR-P services included in the review (Figure 2).

Quality assessment

We adapted the mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT)^{42, 43} questions for non-randomized clinical studies due to the heterogeneity expected in the included studies to assess the quality of the included studies (eMethods 2), considering the content and characteristics of the studies according to our inclusion criteria.

RESULTS

Database

The literature search yielded 12,130 citations, which were screened for eligibility. 221 full-text articles were evaluated for eligibility, and 165 were excluded. In total, 49 studies reporting information on individual CHR-P services (eTable 3), and seven multisite studies (eTable 4) were selected (PRISMA, Figure 1). The final pool of 56 included studies were published between the years 1998 and 2020. The total sample encompassed 51 distinct CHR-P clinical services, from 41 different regions, across 15 countries (Figure 2).

Most multisite studies reported on collaborative networks of clinical CHR-P services, including the Pan-London Network for Psychosis-Prevention (PNP³⁹), the Early Detection and Intervention for the Prevention of Psychosis Program (EDIPPP⁴⁴⁻⁴⁶), and the Swiss Early Psychosis Project (SWEPP⁴⁷). Two additional multisite studies report on five centres operating under the Italian Departments⁴⁸ and six CHR-P services in Canada⁴⁹.

Service configuration

The CHR-P services were located mostly in Europe (58.8%), followed by North America (25.5%), Australia (7.8%), Asia (5.9%) and South America (2.0%; Figure 2 and Table 1). The first program to be implemented was the Personal Assessment and Crisis Evaluation (PACE) clinic in 1994, in Melbourne⁵⁰, and the most recent one the City & Hackney At-Risk Mental State Service (HEADS UP) in 2015, in London³⁹. 62.0% CHR-P services were set up from 2000 to 2009 (Table 1). Population in the catchment area covered a total of 17,252,666 people, with an average of 492,933 people (SD: 396,997, Table 1). Most services (80.4%) consisted of teams integrated into the community mental health care. Standalone CHR-P services were less frequent (19.6%) and there were no hub and spoke services. CHR-P clinical services involve a wide range of professionals,

the most frequent ones being psychiatrists (100%), psychologists or clinical counsellors (76.7%), case managers/care coordinators (50%) and nurses (50%).

Outreach strategy and referrals

Outreach activities and audiences were highly variable (Table 1). Within active strategies, workshops for referral sources were the most frequent (97.6%), often targeting healthcare professionals (85.4%), educational professionals (48.8%), or community organisations (34.1%). Services also approached NGOs and community services (34.1%), and less frequently social and governmental services (19.5%) and family members of mental health patients (4.9%). About one-third of CHR-P services (36.6%) implemented general public awareness campaigns including TV or radio appearances^{51, 52}, theatre adverts, high school art contests, and sponsors for minor league sports teams⁴⁶. More than half of services (63.4%) implemented either a dedicated online site for service promotion, or have elaborated printed and other media materials (53.7%), such as information brochures and leaflets⁵¹⁻⁵³, posters⁵⁴, articles in professional journals and local newspapers^{52, 55}, presentations in scientific conferences⁴⁷, newsletters⁵², and promotional videos^{44, 56}. Most CHR-P services received referrals from health-related organizations, including both outpatient or community mental health services (90.0%) and general healthcare services (75.0%). Education organisations are also frequent referral sources (65.0%), followed by self (60.0%), family or relatives (60.0%), inpatient mental health services (42.5%) and accident and emergency departments (22.5%). Other referral sources were reported in less than 20% of CHR-P services.

Service user characteristics

The total sample size of service users was of 5,637 CHR-P individuals, ranging from 4⁵⁷ to 467⁵⁸ individuals: most of them were males (% of CHR-P females=42.8, Table 2). CHR-P status was most frequently assessed using the Comprehensive Assessment of At-Risk Mental States (CAARMS) (48.6%), followed by the Structured Interview for Psychosis-risk Syndromes (SIPS) (35.1%) and the Early Recognition Inventory retrospective assessment of symptoms checklist (ERlraos-CL) (16.2%; Table 2). The Basel screening instrument for psychosis (BSIP) and basic symptoms instruments were infrequently used (<6% of services). Most services provided treatment starting in adolescence, from the ages 12 to 17 (83.4%). The most frequent minimum inclusion age range was 13 to 15 years (31.3%); only 2 services reported the inclusion of children from the age of 8 and 6^{47, 49, 59}. Most services accepted users until 30-35 years (49.0%) or 24-

29 years (28.6%). A few services (6.1%) accepted service-users of 65 years or older⁵⁷.
The most frequent age range (70.6% of services) was 12 and 35 years.
Baseline comorbid mental disorders were reported in 69.5% CHR-P individuals. Mood disorders were the most common: depressive disorders (42.3%), bipolar disorders (15.5%) and persistent depressive disorder (6.7%). Anxiety disorders were also frequent (24.1%), including social phobia (5.9%) and obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD) (5.1%). Adjustment disorder appeared in 11.6% of CHR-P individuals. Comorbid personality disorders were present in 15.5% of CHR-P individuals, particularly schizotypal personality disorder (11.0%). Substance use disorders were present in 12.4% of CHR-P individuals. Past history of suicide attempts was present in 10.5% of CHR-P subjects. Unemployment rate (i.e. neither work nor study) was observed in 36.6% in CHR-P individuals in clinical services.

Interventions

Across non-pharmacological interventions, clinical monitoring (100%), psychoeducation (81.1%), case management and psychosocial support (73.0%) and family interventions (73.0%) were the most common (Table 3). Cognitive behavioural therapy-based interventions and any other type of individual psychotherapeutic intervention (encompassing individual motivational interviewing⁶¹ or sessions⁴⁸, supportive counselling^{39, 45, 48, 50, 53, 62-72}, relaxation training⁶², cognitive remediation⁵⁶, solution focused brief therapy⁵⁶, social skills training^{66, 71}, substance misuse work⁷¹ and psychotherapy NOS^{73, 74}) were provided by over half of the services (67.6% and 64.9%, respectively). Physical health interventions and group psychotherapy sessions were more infrequent (37.8% and 18.9% respectively).

Most (87.1%) services employed low-dose antipsychotic (AP) medication, although not as the first-line intervention but only following worsening of symptoms or functioning^{53, 75, 76}. Other interventions employed by CHR-P services included antidepressants (74.2%), anxiolytics (51.6%), mood stabilisers (38.7%). Three services (9.7%) reported the use of omega-3 fatty acids^{39, 67, 72, 77, 78}. Most services provided care up for 24 months (44.8%) or 12 months (24.1%). Three services (10.3%) provided 36 months of clinical follow-up. Extended service provision of 60 months or more were reported in 17.2% of services.

Outcomes

The outcomes most frequently evaluated in the CHR-P services were persistence of symptoms/comorbidities (67.4%), transition to psychosis (53.5%), functional status (48.8%) and remission (41.9%). Physical health outcomes (30.2%), service users'

satisfaction (25.6%), hospitalisation (18.6%) and mortality (13.9%) were less frequently evaluated.

Outcomes were most commonly evaluated with standard clinical interviews with the service users (93.0%) and more infrequently with psychometric instruments (37.2%). In the latter case, the CAARMS (23.2%) and SIPS (11.6%) were more frequently employed. About 16.3% of CHR-P services evaluated outcomes via electronic health records.

Quality of the included studies

Study quality scores ranged from 1 to 5. The overall mean quality score for included studies reporting on individual services was 3.8 (moderately high quality) on the MMAT scale, with a SD of 1.3 (eTable 3).

DISCUSSION

To our knowledge, this is the first systematic review to comprehensively summarize the evidence from real-world implementation of CHR-P clinical services. This reviews encompasses 56 studies describing a total of 51 services for CHR-P individuals.

Consistent with recent surveys of CHR-P services^{21, 48, 79}, there is great diversity in how clinical services have been implemented in real-world scenarios, across all aspects of service delivery: 1. service configuration, 2. outreach strategy and referrals, 3. service user characteristics, 4. interventions and 5. outcomes. We discuss these points, while also mentioning common challenges. The evidence summarised will then be used to operationalise ten empirical recommendations for overcoming these challenges and facilitating the real-world implementation of CHR-P services (Table 4).

In terms of service configuration, several CHR-P clinical services have been implemented across - at least - 15 countries (Figure 2), covering a catchment area of over 17M people. Following a period of rapid expansion (2000-2009), new CHR-P services continue to emerge^{39, 77}. At present, CHR-P services spread across most continents²¹, although they are mostly established in developed countries. While most CHR-P services are configured as integrated services (80.4%), standalone models of care (19.6%) seem to be associated with high levels of service efficiency²⁷. For example, CHR-P standalone services had dropout rates in the range of 12-19.2%^{51, 78, 80-83} compared to 25.4% in integrated service⁵³. One possible explanation is that in integrated models of care, healthcare resources are typically diverted towards more severe service users (e.g. first-episode vs CHR-P patients)³⁹. In line with this notion, the actual caseload of CHR-P individuals was minimal (n=4 out of 239 clients) in some integrated services⁵⁷, and more severe patients had more frequent contacts with these services⁷⁴. Another

issue is that standalone services may be physically located outside general psychiatric services, which is preferable to reduce stigmatisation risks^{78, 82}. Service users and their relatives were generally more satisfied with standalone CHR-P services, particularly with clinical contact being outside traditional mental health settings⁶⁸. Conversely, family disengagement was the most significant barrier (71.4%) in integrated services⁶¹. Likewise, primary care clinicians favoured standalone models of care because of the superior accessibility of the services⁶⁸. Standalone services are more costly to set up in the first year but deliver highest economic savings in the longer term⁷⁰, mainly associated with the improved outcome of the disorder⁶⁹. These considerations are of relevance given that poor financial support and lack of adequate infrastructures are frequently cited barriers for the establishment of standalone CHR-P services outside mental healthcare²¹. Future health service research is expected to consolidate these speculations, as well as to test the efficiency of innovative models of care. For example, although there were no hub and spoke services, this organization design which arranges service delivery assets into a network may be particularly promising in this field and fit well with the youth friendly mental health reform which is undergoing in several countries⁸⁴. Based on this evidence we recommend to preferably implement standalone services (Table 4).

This review also indicates that the CHR-P clinical services are essentially multidisciplinary, reflecting the complexity of the psychopathological assessment and case formulation⁸⁵. Based on the most frequent professionals involved in CHR-P services, we recommend a minimum team encompassing psychiatrists, psychologists or clinical counsellors, case managers and nurses (Table 4). Because multidisciplinary work requires adequate articulation and training of staff, a core associated recommendation is to ensure adequate training⁸⁶. National surveys have found lack of specialised training in evidence-based interventions to cause dismal across staff^{79, 87}. Ensuring proper training is particularly challenging for non-academic services, with less resources and limited organizational support⁴⁹.

In terms of outreach strategy, we have confirmed high heterogeneity across two main strategies: active (up to 97.6%) and passive (up to 63.4%) outreach. The first strategy involved active efforts to organise workshops more frequently targeting healthcare professionals (85.4%), or service promotion activities in the community (up to 34.1% of CHR-P services) and implementing general public awareness campaigns (36.6%). The second strategy involved passive approaches such as a dedicated online site (63.4%), or printed and other media materials (53.7%). This heterogeneity is likely to reflect

diverse culturally sensitive approaches across CHR-P services that led to variable pathways to care. In terms of referrals, most CHR-P services received young people with a putative risk of psychosis from health-related organisations such as mental health services (90.0%) and general healthcare services (75.0%). Implementing an outreach to promote referrals is challenging for CHR-P. In the lack of clear guidance, there is high risk of inefficient use of resources (e.g. staff) and inappropriate referrals that eventually do not meet CHR-P criteria. For example, some CHR-P services reported a high number of inappropriate referrals following intense media campaigns, switching to more focused outreach strategies^{50, 52, 62, 80, 88-91}. At times of financial constraints, the core outreach activities and referral targets summarised in the current study can be used as benchmark to maximise the efficiency of resources when implementing a new CHR-P service. There are also empirical constraints. For example, difficulties in recruiting participants is the most difficult challenge in countries where the CHR-P paradigm is starting to be implemented⁷⁷ and in culturally diverse catchment areas⁴⁴. Even in countries with an established CHR-P network like the UK, increasing numbers of referrals following the implementation of new national policies resulted in more dedicated CHR-P services that were needed to manage the referrals⁶⁰. Finally, the type of outreach and referrals determine the accumulation of established risk factors for psychosis^{5, 7, 92}, thus influencing the level of psychosis risk among individuals recruited for undergoing a CHR-P assessment (also termed as pretest risk enrichment)^{93, 94}. For example, individuals sampled from inpatient units may have accumulated more risk factors for psychosis and therefore present with a higher level of psychosis compared to those sampled from the community. This level of risk enrichment^{94, 95}, substantially impacts the clinical utility of CHR-P instruments¹². Accordingly, intense outreach strategies mainly targeting the general population end up diluting the level of pretest psychosis risk⁹⁴ and therefore impeding a clinically meaningful identification of CHR-P individuals^{11, 96}. In line with recent psychometric guidances^{12, 20}, we recommend CHR-P outreach to primarily target healthcare agencies to promote referrals from these sources (Table 4). Community outreach and recruitment from the general public should be considered only if adequate risk enrichment strategies can be implemented (for a detailed review see¹¹). For example, pre-screening approaches can increase pretest risk enrichment among referrals²¹ and was employed by some services⁴⁸.

In terms of service users characteristics, we confirmed that males were relatively more represented than females, in line with the epidemiological gender distribution of psychosis risk⁶. Currently, the vast majority (83.7%) of CHR-P services employ the CAARMS or the SIPS, while basic symptoms instruments failed to enter clinical practice

at large scale. This suggests that the harmonisation of these two instruments could deliver a widely used gold standard assessment measure for clinical practice. A rapid response to referrals⁶³ and flexibility with time and setting of assessments⁶⁸ have been found to improve engagement with CHR-P services.

Age intake is a core implicit criterion (along with the help-seeking behaviour) defining the CHR-P state^{4, 10, 20}. The most frequently applied age range (70.6% of services) was of 12-35 years, in line with epidemiological research indicating that the peak of risk is between 15 and 35 years⁶. Empirical research confirms that CHR-P psychometric assessment (e.g. the CAARMS) is valid in young people aged 12 years⁶⁵. This finding also confirms the transitional nature of the CHR-P paradigm that cuts across adults and children and adolescent mental health services²⁵. Accordingly, most services provided treatment starting in adolescence (between 13 and 15 years). Conversely, only a few services accepted users beyond 40 years^{57, 60, 97}. The requirement of extending the assessment and care of emerging psychosis in the older people, introduced by national guidelines such as the Access and Waiting Time Standards in the UK²² is against the evidence that CHR-P instruments are valid up to 40 years⁴. Furthermore, it conflicts with recent mental health reforms that are lowering- as opposed to increasing- the age threshold for preventive approaches to those aged from 0 to 25 years²⁵. Based on these findings we recommend that CHR-P services ascertain the at-risk status through the CAARMS or SIPS in both adolescents and young adults (Table 4). This review also indicated that presentation to CHR-P services was associated with frequent comorbid mental health conditions (in particular mood and anxiety disorders^{98, 99}) in two-thirds (69.5%) of the individuals, coupled with past history of suicide attempts in about one in ten (10.5%) and unemployment in about one third (36.6%) of cases. We further observed regional heterogeneity in clinical presentation: substance misuse was more prevalent in Western services^{39, 52, 55, 61, 66}, while non-existent in Japan⁵³. These findings recommend that CHR-P services should adopt a broader “transdiagnostic” approach¹⁰⁰⁻¹⁰² which is cutting across several psychopathological dimensions (Table 4), given that psychosis onset can occur from preceding mood dysregulation¹⁰³ or substance abuse. This recommendation is also relevant for current operationalisations of at-risk syndromes which require formulating a differential diagnosis between psychosis risk and other psychopathological dimensions such as the SIPS or the DSM-5-APS².

In terms of interventions, most services (72.4%) provided care for 2 years or less (see outcomes below), with some exceptions^{39, 49, 53, 55, 56, 63, 64, 73, 75, 82, 88, 104}, encompassing clinical monitoring (100%), psychoeducation (81.1%), psychosocial support (73%), family interventions (73%), CBT-based individual interventions (67.6%), group

psychotherapy (18.9%), physical health interventions (37.8%), antipsychotics (87.1%), antidepressants (74.2%), anxiolytics (51.6%) and mood stabilisers (38.7%). It appears that CHR-P clinical services currently provide a wide range of psychosocial and biological interventions to meet the clinical needs of CHR-P service users. Clinical monitoring, case management and targeted case management are essential elements of preventive treatment²², based on the principles of social psychiatry and the importance of engaging CHR-P individuals with healthcare services¹⁰⁵. These often included psychoeducation and informing patients about their risk, as done in other preventive approaches in medicine⁸⁵. Despite current guidelines recommending psychological interventions (such as cognitive behavioural therapy) as first-line treatment, about one-third of CHR-P services did not provide them. Evidence to favour psychotherapy over other types of interventions in this population is currently uncertain^{13, 15, 16, 20}. Conversely, antipsychotic treatment, which is discouraged by current treatment guidelines, was frequently considered, although typically at low dosages and only when the symptoms were deteriorating. This is consistent with data from global and national surveys of CHR-P services^{21, 79} that report frequent use of antipsychotic drugs. The relatively frequent use of anxiolytics, antidepressants and mood stabilizers- which is not considered by current guidelines- can index the transdiagnostic nature of the CHR-P state with frequent affective and anxiety comorbidities. The variety in provision of treatments likely reflects the high clinical heterogeneity of this population and the lack of clear treatment guidelines stratified on their individual needs. For example, current guidelines are not stratified across CHR-P subgroups. Individuals with a brief and limited intermittent psychotic symptoms (BLIPS) designation have the highest risk of developing psychosis²⁰- especially when recurrent or presenting with seriously disorganizing or dangerous features^{106, 107} - and also display poor clinical outcomes and do not engage with the recommended cognitive behavioural therapy^{41, 107}, leaving them with unmet need for care¹⁰⁶. Stratification across these clinical subgroups has been proposed in recent revisions of the CHR-P paradigm^{1, 20} and should be considered in future clinical guidelines²¹. Because the uncertainty of current evidence is high, we align with the recent recommendations of the European College of Neuropsychopharmacology Prevention of Mental Disorders and Mental Health Promotion Network¹⁹ to still offer needs-based interventions and psychological interventions, titrating the intervention according to the characteristics and risk profile (i.e. transition risk, symptom severity, functional impairment)²⁰ as well as the values and preferences of the CHR-P individuals (table 4)²⁰. For example, it seems important to individualise physical health and lifestyle interventions on the needs presented by each service user^{61, 77}.

In terms of outcomes, surprisingly, persistence of symptoms/comorbidities (67.4%) was measured more frequently than transition to psychosis (53.5%), functional status (48.8%) and remission (41.9%). This likely reflects the efforts of CHR-P services to treat comorbid conditions, aiming for improving recovery, functioning and quality of life²⁰. At the same time, other outcomes such as physical health were collected in only about a third 30.2% of CHR-P services¹⁰⁸. CHR-P individuals accumulate genetic and environmental risk factors²⁰, including cardiometabolic risk factors as decreased physical activity¹⁰⁹ and high rates of substance use¹⁰⁹, including tobacco¹⁰⁹, alcohol¹⁰⁹ and cannabis¹¹⁰. Thus, more attention should be paid to recording the physical health of CHR-P individuals in clinical services¹¹¹. Another domain of improvement includes a more frequent monitoring of service users' satisfaction, which is pivotal to higher engagement and decreased drop-out rates. Furthermore CHR-P services should also more extensively monitor healthcare utilisation (e.g. hospital admissions)¹¹² and broad outcomes such as mortality rates to better characterise the overall burden of this condition¹¹³. Future research is needed to standardise a core outcome set for CHR-P research and therefore facilitate collaborative efforts. These initiative should also indicate the assessment measures to be employed to monitor outcomes. Currently, clinical outcomes in CHR-P services are most commonly evaluated with standard clinical interviews (93.0%), and psychometric instruments are more infrequently used (37.2% of cases, most frequently CAARMS or SIPS to evaluate transition to psychosis)²⁰. In the future, monitoring broad health outcomes in CHR-P services could leverage electronic health records that can provide real-world, real-time valuable clinical information^{11, 114-117} and that are being increasingly implemented in healthcare providers. As noted above, duration of care including clinical monitoring is currently limited to, most frequently (44.8%), two years. However, accumulating evidence has clearly indicated that although the risk of psychosis onset peaks within 2 years¹¹⁸, it can increase in the longer term at least until 3-4 years^{41, 119, 120}. In addition, non-transitioning CHR-P individuals can continue to experience functional impairment and symptomatology at 6-years⁹⁸. This confirms that a 2-year service provision is insufficient²¹. As such, we recommend clinical monitoring for outcomes to be implemented for at least 3 years (table 4). Flexible follow-up after this timepoint can help make more efficient use of clinical resources, while tailoring interventions to users' needs¹²¹. For example, the clinical follow-up can be extended if service users are still symptomatic or present socio-occupational difficulties^{56, 63}. Finally, CHR-P services should be prepared to collect information and target outcomes other than psychosis such as recovery, physical health outcomes, service users' satisfaction, functioning and quality of life^{20, 121}. Harmonisation of core outcome set for CHR-P services is a clinical research priority for the future. Several national and

regional networks of CHR-P services started to emerge during the decade of 2010-2019 and may facilitate this enterprise, allowing services to leverage best practices and expertise, increasing lobby capacity and enhancing collaborative efforts^{39, 45, 47}.

Limitations

The main limitation is that health service information was scattered across services, and that there are no established standards to measure the core domains. This limited the capacity to quantitatively compare the different services with meta-analyses. Future harmonisation efforts in terms of CHR-P healthcare research would be extremely valuable. The database was nonetheless large and sufficiently powered to analyse different factors including service configuration, outreach strategy and referrals, CHR-P service user characteristics, interventions and outcomes. A further limitation is the limited knowledge provided about the long-term outcomes. Finally, a considerable amount of studies were carried out in relatively small samples, with only 45.5% services^{40, 51-53, 60, 63, 69, 70, 74, 76, 81, 83, 88-91, 104, 122-124} including more than 100 CHR-P individuals.

CONCLUSIONS

Health service knowledge summarised by the current study will facilitate translational efforts for implementation of CHR-P services worldwide.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST DISCLOSURE:

Dr Fusar-Poli has received grants from Lundbeck and personal fees from Menarini, Lundbeck and Angelini. No other disclosures reported.

FUNDING:

This study was supported by the King's College London Confidence in Concept award from the Medical Research Council (MRC) (MC_PC_16048) to Dr Fusar-Poli. Dr Fusar-Poli is supported by the PSYSCAN project through the European commission. Dr Salazar de Pablo is supported by the Alicia Koplowitz Foundation. The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care.

REFERENCES

1. Fusar-Poli P. The Clinical High-Risk State for Psychosis (CHR-P), Version II. *Schizophrenia Bulletin* 2017; **43**(1): 44-47.
2. Salazar de Pablo G, Catalan A, Fusar-Poli P. Clinical Validity of DSM-5 Attenuated Psychosis Syndrome: Advances in Diagnosis, Prognosis, and Treatment. *JAMA Psychiatry* 2019.
3. Yung AR, Yuen HP, McGorry PD, Phillips LJ, Kelly D, Dell'Olio M *et al.* Mapping the onset of psychosis: the Comprehensive Assessment of At-Risk Mental States. *Aust N Z J Psychiatry* 2005; **39**(11-12): 964-971.
4. Fusar-Poli P, Borgwardt S, Bechdolf A, Addington J, Riecher-Rossler A, Schultze-Lutter F *et al.* The Psychosis High-Risk State A Comprehensive State-of-the-Art Review. *Jama Psychiatry* 2013; **70**(1): 107-120.
5. Fusar-Poli P, Tantardini M, De Simone S, Ramella-Cravaro V, Oliver D, Kingdon J *et al.* Deconstructing vulnerability for psychosis: Meta-analysis of environmental risk factors for psychosis in subjects at ultra high-risk. *European Psychiatry* 2017; **40**: 65-75.
6. Radua J, Ramella-Cravaro V, Ioannidis JPA, Reichenberg A, Phipphothatsanee N, Amir T *et al.* What causes psychosis? An umbrella review of risk and protective factors. *World Psychiatry* 2018; **17**(1): 49-66.
7. Oliver D, Reilly TJ, Baccaredda Boy O, Petros N, Davies C, Borgwardt S *et al.* What Causes the Onset of Psychosis in Individuals at Clinical High Risk? A Meta-analysis of Risk and Protective Factors. *Schizophr Bull* 2019.
8. Fusar-Poli P, Rocchetti M, Sardella A, Avila A, Brandizzi M, Caverzasi E *et al.* Disorder, not just state of risk: meta-analysis of functioning and quality of life in people at high risk of psychosis. *British Journal of Psychiatry* 2015; **207**(3): 198-206.
9. Fusar-Poli P, Raballo A, Parnas J. What Is an Attenuated Psychotic Symptom? On the Importance of the Context. *Schizophrenia Bulletin* 2017; **43**(4): 687-692.
10. Falkenberg I, Valmaggia L, Byrnes M, Frascarelli M, Jones C, Rocchetti M *et al.* Why are help-seeking subjects at ultra-high risk for psychosis help-seeking? *Psychiatry Research* 2015; **228**(3): 808-815.
11. Fusar-Poli P, Sullivan SA, Shah JL, Uhlhaas PJ. Improving the Detection of Individuals at Clinical Risk for Psychosis in the Community, Primary and Secondary Care: An Integrated Evidence-Based Approach. *Front Psychiatry* 2019; **10**: 774.

- 593 12. Fusar-Poli P, Cappucciati M, Rutigliano G, Schultze-Lutter F, Bonoldi I,
594 Borgwardt S *et al.* At risk or not at risk? A meta-analysis of the prognostic
595 accuracy of psychometric interviews for psychosis prediction. *World Psychiatry*
596 2015; **14**(3): 322-332.
- 597
- 598 13. Davies C, Cipriani A, Ioannidis JPA, Radua J, Stahl D, Provenzani U *et al.* Lack of
599 evidence to favor specific preventive interventions in psychosis: a network
600 meta-analysis. *World Psychiatry* 2018; **17**(2): 196-209.
- 601
- 602 14. Devoe DJ, Farris MS, Townes P, Addington J. Attenuated psychotic symptom
603 interventions in youth at risk of psychosis: A systematic review and meta-
604 analysis. *Early Intervention in Psychiatry* 2019; **13**(1): 3-17.
- 605
- 606 15. Fusar-Poli P, Davies C, Solmi M, Brondino N, De Micheli A, Kotlicka-Antczak M
607 *et al.* Preventive Treatments for Psychosis: Umbrella Review (Just the
608 Evidence). *Front Psychiatry* 2019; **10**: 764.
- 609
- 610 16. Davies C, Radua J, Cipriani A, Stahl D, Provenzani U, McGuire P *et al.* Efficacy
611 and Acceptability of Interventions for Attenuated Positive Psychotic Symptoms
612 in Individuals at Clinical High Risk of Psychosis: A Network Meta-Analysis.
613 *Frontiers in Psychiatry* 2018; **9**.
- 614
- 615 17. Correll CU, Galling B, Pawar A, Krivko A, Bonetto C, Ruggeri M *et al.* Comparison
616 of Early Intervention Services vs Treatment as Usual for Early-Phase Psychosis:
617 A Systematic Review, Meta-analysis, and Meta-regression. *JAMA Psychiatry*
618 2018; **75**(6): 555-565.
- 619
- 620 18. Fusar-Poli P, McGorry PD, Kane JM. Improving outcomes of first-episode
621 psychosis: an overview. *World Psychiatry* 2017; **16**(3): 251-265.
- 622
- 623 19. Fusar-Poli P, Bauer M, Borgwardt S, Bechdolf A, Correll CU, Do KQ *et al.*
624 European college of neuropsychopharmacology network on the prevention of
625 mental disorders and mental health promotion (ECNP PMD-MHP). *Eur*
626 *Neuropsychopharmacol* 2019; **29**(12): 1301-1311.
- 627
- 628 20. Fusar-Poli P, Salazar de Pablo G, Correll CU, Meyer-Lindenberg A, Millan MJ,
629 Borgwardt S *et al.* Prevention of Psychosis: Advances in Detection, Prognosis,
630 and Intervention. *JAMA Psychiatry* 2020.
- 631
- 632 21. Kotlicka-Antczak M, Podgórski M, Oliver D, Maric NP, Valmaggia L, Fusar-Poli P.
633 Worldwide implementation of clinical services for the prevention of psychosis:
634 The IEPA early intervention in mental health survey. *Early Interv Psychiatry*
635 2020.
- 636
- 637 22. NHS-England The National Collaborating Centre for Mental Health and the
638 National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Implementing the Early
639 Intervention in Psychosis Access and Waiting Time Standard: Guidance. 2016.

23. Elrod JK, Fortenberry JL. The hub-and-spoke organization design: an avenue for serving patients well. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2017; **17**(Suppl 1): 457.
24. Rickwood D, Paraskakis M, Quin D, Hobbs N, Ryall V, Trethowan J *et al.* Australia's innovation in youth mental health care: The headspace centre model. *Early Interv Psychiatry* 2019; **13**(1): 159-166.
25. Fusar-Poli P. Integrated Mental Health Services for the Developmental Period (0 to 25 Years): A Critical Review of the Evidence. *Front Psychiatry* 2019; **10**: 355.
26. Bird V, Premkumar P, Kendall T, Whittington C, Mitchell J, Kuipers E. Early intervention services, cognitive-behavioural therapy and family intervention in early psychosis: systematic review. *British Journal of Psychiatry* 2010; **197**(5): 350-356.
27. Behan C, Masterson S, Clarke M. Systematic review of the evidence for service models delivering early intervention in psychosis outside the stand-alone centre. *Early Intervention in Psychiatry* 2017; **11**(1): 3-13.
28. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, Group P. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *BMJ* 2009; **339**: b2535.
29. Stroup DF, Berlin JA, Morton SC, Olkin I, Williamson GD, Rennie D *et al.* Meta-analysis of observational studies in epidemiology: a proposal for reporting. Meta-analysis Of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (MOOSE) group. *JAMA* 2000; **283**(15): 2008-2012.
30. Fusar-Poli P, Cappucciati M, Rutigliano G, Lee TY, Beverly Q, Bonoldi I *et al.* Towards a Standard Psychometric Diagnostic Interview for Subjects at Ultra High Risk of Psychosis: CAARMS versus SIPS. *Psychiatry J* 2016; **2016**: 7146341.
31. McGlashan T WB, Woods S. *The psychosis-risk syndrome: handbook for diagnosis and follow-up*. Oxford: Oxford University 2010.
32. Vollmer-Larsen A, Handest P, Parnas J. Reliability of measuring anomalous experience: The Bonn Scale for the assessment of basic symptoms. *Psychopathology* 2007; **40**(5): 345-348.
33. Riecher-Rössler A, Aston J, Ventura J, Merlo M, Borgwardt S, Gschwandtner U *et al.* [The Basel Screening Instrument for Psychosis (BSIP): development, structure, reliability and validity]. *Fortschr Neurol Psychiatr* 2008; **76**(4): 207-216.

- 686 34. Fux L, Walger P, Schimmelmann BG, Schultze-Lutter F. The Schizophrenia
687 Proneness Instrument, Child and Youth version (SPI-CY): practicability and
688 discriminative validity. *Schizophr Res* 2013; **146**(1-3): 69-78.
689
- 690 35. Kay SR, Fiszbein A, Opler LA. The positive and negative syndrome scale (PANSS)
691 for schizophrenia. *Schizophr Bull* 1987; **13**(2): 261-276.
692
- 693 36. Andreasen NC. The Scale for the Assessment of Negative Symptoms (SANS):
694 conceptual and theoretical foundations. *Br J Psychiatry Suppl* 1989; (7): 49-58.
695
- 696 37. Overall J, Gorham D. The Brief Psychiatric Rating Scale (BPRS): recent
697 developments in ascertainment and scaling. *Psychopharmacol Bull* 1988; **24**:
698 97-99.
699
- 700 38. Haefner H, Bechdorf A, Klosterkotter J, Maurer K. Early detection and
701 intervention in psychosis. A practice handbook. Stuttgart: Schattauer 2011.
702
- 703 39. Fusar-Poli P, Estradé A, Spencer TJ, Gupta S, Murguia-Asensio S, Eranti S *et al*.
704 Pan-London Network for Psychosis-Prevention (PNP). *Front Psychiatry* 2019;
705 **10**: 707.
706
- 707 40. Mitter N, Nah GQR, Bong YL, Lee J, Chong SA. Longitudinal Youth-At-Risk Study
708 (LYRIKS): outreach strategies based on a community-engaged framework. *Early*
709 *Intervention in Psychiatry* 2014; **8**(3): 298-303.
710
- 711 41. Fusar-Poli P, Cappucciati M, Borgwardt S, Woods SW, Addington J, Nelson B *et*
712 *al*. Heterogeneity of Psychosis Risk Within Individuals at Clinical High Risk A
713 Meta-analytical Stratification. *Jama Psychiatry* 2016; **73**(2): 113-120.
714
- 715 42. Hong QN, Gonzalez-Reyes A, Pluye P. Improving the usefulness of a tool for
716 appraising the quality of qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods studies,
717 the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT). *J Eval Clin Pract* 2018; **24**(3): 459-
718 467.
719
- 720 43. Hong QN, Pluye P, Fàbregues S, Bartlett G, Boardman F, Cargo M *et al*.
721 Improving the content validity of the mixed methods appraisal tool: a modified
722 e-Delphi study. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2019; **111**: 49-59.e41.
723
- 724 44. Lynch S, McFarlane WR, Joly B, Adelsheim S, Auther A, Cornblatt BA *et al*. Early
725 Detection, Intervention and Prevention of Psychosis Program: Community
726 Outreach and Early Identification at Six US Sites. *Psychiatric Services* 2016;
727 **67**(5): 510-516.
728
- 729 45. McFarlane W, Cook W, Downing D, Ruff A, Lynch S, Adelsheim S *et al*. Early
730 Detection, Intervention, and Prevention of Psychosis Program: Rationale,
731 Design, and Sample Description. *Adolescent Psychiatry* 2012; **2**(2): 112 - 124.
732

- 733 46. Ruff A, McFarlane W, Downing D, Cook W, Woodberry K. A Community
734 Outreach and Education Model for Early Identification of Mental Illness in
735 Young People. *Adolescent Psychiatry* 2012; **2**: 140-145.
736
- 737 47. Simon AE, Theodoridou A, Schimmelmann B, Schneider R, Conus P. The Swiss
738 Early Psychosis Project SWEPP: a national network. *Early Intervention in*
739 *Psychiatry* 2012; **6**(1): 106-111.
740
- 741 48. Cocchi A, Balbi A, Corlito G, Ditta G, Di Munzio W, Nicotera M *et al.* Early
742 intervention in psychosis: a feasibility study financed by the Italian Center on
743 Control of Maladies. *Early Intervention in Psychiatry* 2015; **9**(2): 163-171.
744
- 745 49. Bertulies-Esposito B, Nolin M, Iyer SN, Malla A, Tibbo P, Otter N *et al.* OÙ en
746 sommes-nous? An Overview of Successes and Challenges after 30 Years of Early
747 Intervention Services for Psychosis in Quebec. *Can J Psychiatry* 2020:
748 706743719895193.
749
- 750 50. Phillips L, Leicester S, O'Dwyer L, Francey S, Koutsogiannis J, Abdel-Baki A *et al.*
751 The PACE Clinic: Identification and Management of Young People at "Ultra"
752 High Risk of Psychosis. *J Psychiatr Pract* 2002; **8**(5): 255-269.
753
- 754 51. McFarlane WR, Cook WL, Downing D, Verdi MB, Woodberry KA, Ruff A.
755 Portland Identification and Early Referral: A Community-Based System for
756 Identifying and Treating Youths at High Risk of Psychosis. *Psychiatric Services*
757 2010; **61**(5): 512-515.
758
- 759 52. Schultze-Lutter F, Ruhrmann S, Klosterkotter J. Early detection of psychosis -
760 Establishing a service for persons at risk. *European Psychiatry* 2009; **24**(1): 1-10.
761
- 762 53. Katsura M, Ohmuro N, Obara C, Kikuchi T, Ito F, Miyakoshi T *et al.* A naturalistic
763 longitudinal study of at-risk mental state with a 2.4 year follow-up at a
764 specialized clinic setting in Japan. *Schizophrenia Research* 2014; **158**(1-3): 32-
765 38.
766
- 767 54. Carr V, Halpin S, Lau N, O'Brien S, Beckmann J, Lewin T. A risk factor screening
768 and assessment protocol for schizophrenia and related psychosis. *Australian*
769 *and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry* 2000; **34**: S170-S180.
770
- 771 55. Riecher-Rossler A, Gschwandtner U, Aston J, Borgwardt S, Drewe M, Fuhr P *et*
772 *al.* The Basel early-detection-of-psychosis (FEPSY)-study - design and
773 preliminary results. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica* 2007; **115**(2): 114-125.
774
- 775 56. Rao S, Pariyasami S, Tay SA, Lim LK, Yuen S, Poon LY *et al.* Support for Wellness
776 Achievement Programme (SWAP): A Service for Individuals with At-Risk Mental
777 State in Singapore. *Annals Academy of Medicine Singapore* 2013; **42**(10): 552-
778 555.
779

- 780 57. Penno SJ, Hamilton B, Petrakis M. Early Intervention in Psychosis: Health of the
781 Nation Outcome Scales (HoNOS) Outcomes From a Five-Year Prospective Study.
782 *Archives of Psychiatric Nursing* 2017; **31**(6): 553-560.
783
- 784 58. Geros H, Sizer H, Mifsud N, Reynolds S, Kim DJ, Eaton S *et al.* Migrant status and
785 identification as ultra-high risk for psychosis and transitioning to a psychotic
786 disorder. *Acta Psychiatr Scand* 2020; **141**(1): 52-59.
787
- 788 59. Schultze-Lutter F, Hubl D, Schimmelmann BG, Michel C. Age effect on
789 prevalence of ultra-high risk for psychosis symptoms: replication in a clinical
790 sample of an early detection of psychosis service. *European Child & Adolescent*
791 *Psychiatry* 2017; **26**(11): 1401-1405.
792
- 793 60. Adamson V, Barrass E, McConville S, Irikok C, Taylor K, Pitt S *et al.*
794 Implementing the access and waiting time standard for early intervention in
795 psychosis in the United Kingdom: An evaluation of referrals and post-
796 assessment outcomes over the first year of operation. *Early Intervention in*
797 *Psychiatry* 2018; **12**(5): 979-986.
798
- 799 61. Coates D, Wright L, Moore T, Pinnell S, Merillo C, Howe D. The psychiatric,
800 psychosocial and physical health profile of young people with early psychosis:
801 Data from an early psychosis intervention service. *Child & Youth Services* 2019;
802 **40**(1): 93-115.
803
- 804 62. Yung AR, Phillips LJ, McGorry PD, McFarlane CA, Francey S, Harrigan S *et al.*
805 Prediction of psychosis - A step towards indicated prevention of schizophrenia.
806 *British Journal of Psychiatry* 1998; **172**: 14-20.
807
- 808 63. Pruessner M, Faridi K, Shah J, Rabinovitch M, Iyer S, Abadi S *et al.* The Clinic for
809 Assessment of Youth at Risk (CAYR): 10 years of service delivery and research
810 targeting the prevention of psychosis in Montreal, Canada. *Early Intervention in*
811 *Psychiatry* 2017; **11**(2): 177-184.
812
- 813 64. Kollias C, Xenaki LA, Dimitrakopoulos S, Kosteletos I, Kontaxakis V, Stefanis N *et*
814 *al.* Early psychosis intervention outpatient service of the 1st Psychiatric
815 University Clinic in Athens: 3 Years of experience. *Early Intervention in*
816 *Psychiatry* 2018; **12**(3): 491-496.
817
- 818 65. Spada G, Molteni S, Pistone C, Chiappedi M, McGuire P, Fusar-Poli P *et al.*
819 Identifying children and adolescents at ultra high risk of psychosis in Italian
820 neuropsychiatry services: a feasibility study. *European Child & Adolescent*
821 *Psychiatry* 2016; **25**(1): 91-106.
822
- 823 66. Meneghelli A, Cocchi A, Preti A. 'Programma2000': a multi-modal pilot
824 programme on early intervention in psychosis underway in Italy since 1999.
825 *Early Intervention in Psychiatry* 2010; **4**(1): 97-103.
826

- 827 67. Leanza L, Studerus E, Mackintosh AJ, Beck K, Seiler L, Andreou C *et al.*
828 Predictors of study drop-out and service disengagement in patients at clinical
829 high risk for psychosis. *Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol* 2020; **55**(5): 539-548.
830
- 831 68. Broome MR, Woolley JB, Johns LC, Valmaggia LR, Tabraham P, Gafoor R *et al.*
832 Outreach and support in south London (OASIS): implementation of a clinical
833 service for prodromal psychosis and the at risk mental state. *European*
834 *Psychiatry* 2005; **20**(5-6): 372-378.
835
- 836 69. Fusar-Poli P, Byrne M, Badger S, Valmaggia LR, McGuire PK. Outreach and
837 support in South London (OASIS), 2001-2011: Ten years of early diagnosis and
838 treatment for young individuals at high clinical risk for psychosis. *European*
839 *Psychiatry* 2013; **28**(5): 315-326.
840
- 841 70. Valmaggia LR, McCrone P, Knapp M, Woolley JB, Broome MR, Tabraham P *et al.*
842 Economic impact of early intervention in people at high risk of psychosis.
843 *Psychological Medicine* 2009; **39**(10): 1617-1626.
844
- 845 71. Tiffin PA, Hudson S. An Early Intervention in Psychosis Service for adolescents.
846 *Early Intervention in Psychiatry* 2007; **1**(2): 212-218.
847
- 848 72. Kwon JS, Byun MS, Lee TY, An SK. Early intervention in psychosis: Insights from
849 Korea. *Asian J Psychiatr* 2012; **5**(1): 98-105.
850
- 851 73. Theodoridou A, Heekeren K, Dvorsky D, Metzler S, Franscini M, Haker H *et al.*
852 Early Recognition of High Risk of Bipolar Disorder and Psychosis: An Overview
853 of the ZInEP "Early Recognition" Study. *Front Public Health* 2014; **2**: 166.
854
- 855 74. Conrad AM, Lewin TJ, Sly KA, Schall U, Halpin SA, Hunter M *et al.* Ten-year audit
856 of clients presenting to a specialised service for young people experiencing or
857 at increased risk for psychosis. *Bmc Psychiatry* 2014; **14**.
858
- 859 75. Pelizza L, Azzali S, Paterlini F, Garlassi S, Scazza I, Chiri LR *et al.* The "Reggio
860 Emilia At-Risk Mental States" program: A diffused, "liquid" model of early
861 intervention in psychosis implemented in an Italian Department of Mental
862 Health. *Early Interv Psychiatry* 2019; **13**(6): 1513-1524.
863
- 864 76. Leuci E, Quattrone E, Pellegrini P, Pelizza L. The "Parma-Early Psychosis"
865 program: General description and process analysis after 5 years of clinical
866 activity. *Early Interv Psychiatry* 2019.
867
- 868 77. Gaspar PA, Castillo RI, Maturana A, Villar MJ, Ulloa K, Gonzalez G *et al.* Early
869 psychosis detection program in Chile: A first step for the South American
870 challenge in psychosis research. *Early Intervention in Psychiatry* 2019; **13**(2):
871 328-334.
872

- 873 78. Kotlicka-Antczak M, Pawelczyk T, Rabe-Jablonska J, Pawelczyk A. PORT
874 (Programme of Recognition and Therapy): the first Polish recognition and
875 treatment programme for patients with an at-risk mental state. *Early*
876 *Intervention in Psychiatry* 2015; **9**(4): 339-342.
877
- 878 79. Stain H, Mawn L, Common S, Pilton M, Andrew T. Research and practice for
879 ultra-high risk for psychosis: A national survey of early intervention in psychosis
880 services in England. *European Psychiatry* 2017; **41**: S191-S192.
881
- 882 80. Yung AR, Phillips LJ, McGorry PD, Hallgren MA, McFarlane CA, Jackson HJ *et al.*
883 Can we predict the onset of first-episode psychosis in a high-risk group?
884 *International Clinical Psychopharmacology* 1998; **13**: S23-S30.
885
- 886 81. Green CEL, McGuire PK, Ashworth M, Valmaggia LR. Outreach and Support in
887 South London (OASIS). Outcomes of non-attenders to a service for people at
888 high risk of psychosis: the case for a more assertive approach to assessment.
889 *Psychological Medicine* 2011; **41**(2): 243-250.
890
- 891 82. Kotlicka-Antczak M, Pawelczyk T, Podgorski M, Zurner N, Karbownik MS,
892 Pawelczyk A. Polish individuals with an at-risk mental state: demographic and
893 clinical characteristics. *Early Intervention in Psychiatry* 2018; **12**(3): 391-399.
894
- 895 83. Power P, McGuire P, Iacoponi E, Garety P, Morris E, Valmaggia L *et al.* Lambeth
896 Early Onset (LEO) and Outreach & Support in South London (OASIS) service.
897 *Early Intervention in Psychiatry* 2007; **1**(1): 97-103.
898
- 899 84. Mei C, Fitzsimons J, Allen N, Alvarez-Jimenez M, Amminger GP, Browne V *et al.*
900 Global research priorities for youth mental health. *Early Interv Psychiatry* 2020;
901 **14**(1): 3-13.
902
- 903 85. Fusar-Poli P, Davies C, Bonoldi I. A Case of a College Student Presenting With
904 Mild Mental Health Problems. *JAMA Psychiatry* 2018; **75**(12): 1298-1299.
905
- 906 86. Schultze-Lutter F, Michel C, Schmidt SJ, Schimmelmann BG, Maric NP,
907 Salokangas RKR *et al.* EPA guidance on the early detection of clinical high risk
908 states of psychoses. *European Psychiatry* 2015; **30**(3): 405-416.
909
- 910 87. Cocchi A, Cavicchini A, Collavo M, Ghio L, Macchi S, Meneghelli A *et al.*
911 Implementation and development of early intervention in psychosis services in
912 Italy: a national survey promoted by the Associazione Italiana Interventi Precoci
913 nelle Psicosi. *Early Intervention in Psychiatry* 2018; **12**(1): 37-44.
914
- 915 88. Nelson B, Yuen HP, Wood SJ, Lin A, Spiliotacopoulos D, Bruxner A *et al.* Long-
916 term Follow-up of a Group at Ultra High Risk ("Prodromal") for Psychosis The
917 PACE 400 Study. *Jama Psychiatry* 2013; **70**(8): 793-802.
918

- 919 89. Yung AR, McGorry PD, Francey SM, Nelson B, Baker K, Phillips LJ *et al.* PACE: a
920 specialised service for young people at risk of psychotic disorders. *Medical*
921 *Journal of Australia* 2007; **187**(7): S43-S46.
922
- 923 90. Yung AR, Stanford C, Cosgrave E, Killackey E, Phillips L, Nelson B *et al.* Testing
924 the Ultra High Risk (prodromal) criteria for the prediction of psychosis in a
925 clinical sample of young people. *Schizophrenia Research* 2006; **84**(1): 57-66.
926
- 927 91. Yung AR, Nelson B, Stanford C, Simmons MB, Cosgrave EM, Killackey E *et al.*
928 Validation of "prodromal" criteria to detect individuals at ultra high risk of
929 psychosis: 2 year follow-up. *Schizophrenia Research* 2008; **105**(1-3): 10-17.
930
- 931 92. Davies C, Segre G, Estradé A, Radua J, De Micheli A, Provenzani U *et al.* Prenatal
932 and perinatal risk and protective factors for psychosis: a systematic review and
933 meta-analysis. *Lancet Psychiatry* 2020; **7**(5): 399-410.
934
- 935 93. Fusar-Poli P, Palombini E, Davies C, Oliver D, Bonoldi I, Ramella-Cravaro V *et al.*
936 Why transition risk to psychosis is not declining at the OASIS ultra high risk
937 service: The hidden role of stable pretest risk enrichment. *Schizophrenia*
938 *Research* 2018; **192**: 385-390.
939
- 940 94. Fusar-Poli P, Schultze-Lutter F, Cappucciati M, Rutigliano G, Bonoldi I, Stahl D *et al.*
941 The Dark Side of the Moon: Meta-analytical Impact of Recruitment
942 Strategies on Risk Enrichment in the Clinical High Risk State for Psychosis.
943 *Schizophr Bull* 2016; **42**(3): 732-743.
944
- 945 95. Fusar-Poli P, Rutigliano G, Stahl D, Schmidt A, Ramella-Cravaro V, Hitesh S *et al.*
946 Deconstructing Pretest Risk Enrichment to Optimize Prediction of Psychosis in
947 Individuals at Clinical High Risk. *JAMA Psychiatry* 2016; **73**(12): 1260-1267.
948
- 949 96. Oliver D, Radua J, Reichenberg A, Uher R, Fusar-Poli P. Psychosis Polyrisk Score
950 (PPS) for the Detection of Individuals At-Risk and the Prediction of Their
951 Outcomes. *Frontiers in Psychiatry* 2019; **10**.
952
- 953 97. Quijada Y, Tizon JL, Artigue J, Parra B. At-risk mental state (ARMS) detection in
954 a community service center for early attention to psychosis in Barcelona. *Early*
955 *Intervention in Psychiatry* 2010; **4**(3): 257-262.
956
- 957 98. Rutigliano G, Valmaggia L, Landi P, Frascarelli M, Cappucciati M, Sear V *et al.*
958 Persistence or recurrence of non-psychotic comorbid mental disorders
959 associated with 6-year poor functional outcomes in patients at ultra high risk
960 for psychosis. *Journal of Affective Disorders* 2016; **203**: 101-110.
961
- 962 99. Fusar-Poli P, Nelson B, Valmaggia L, Yung AR, McGuire PK. Comorbid Depressive
963 and Anxiety Disorders in 509 Individuals With an At-Risk Mental State: Impact
964 on Psychopathology and Transition to Psychosis. *Schizophrenia Bulletin* 2014;
965 **40**(1): 120-131.

100. Fusar-Poli P, Solmi M, Brondino N, Davies C, Chae C, Politi P *et al.* Transdiagnostic psychiatry: a systematic review. *World Psychiatry* 2019; **18**(2): 192-207.
101. Fusar-Poli P, Rutigliano G, Stahl D, Davies C, Bonoldi I, Reilly T *et al.* Development and Validation of a Clinically Based Risk Calculator for the Transdiagnostic Prediction of Psychosis. *JAMA Psychiatry* 2017; **74**(5): 493-500.
102. Fusar-Poli P. TRANSD recommendations: improving transdiagnostic research in psychiatry. *World Psychiatry* 2019; **18**(3): 361-362.
103. Mishara AL, Fusar-Poli P. The phenomenology and neurobiology of delusion formation during psychosis onset: Jaspers, Truman symptoms, and aberrant salience. *Schizophr Bull* 2013; **39**(2): 278-286.
104. Conrad AM, Lewin TJ, Sly KA, Schall U, Halpin SA, Hunter M *et al.* Utility of risk-status for predicting psychosis and related outcomes: evaluation of a 10-year cohort of presenters to a specialised early psychosis community mental health service. *Psychiatry Research* 2017; **247**: 336-344.
105. Dimitrakopoulos S, Kollias C, Stefanis NC, Kontaxakis V. Early psychotic experiences: Interventions, problems and perspectives. *Psychiatrike = Psychiatriki* 2015; **26**(1): 45-54.
106. Fusar-Poli P, De Micheli A, Chalambrides M, Singh A, Augusto C, McGuire P. Unmet needs for treatment in 102 individuals with brief and limited intermittent psychotic symptoms (BLIPS): implications for current clinical recommendations. *Epidemiol Psychiatr Sci* 2019; **29**: e67.
107. Fusar-Poli P, Cappucciati M, De Micheli A, Rutigliano G, Bonoldi I, Tognin S *et al.* Diagnostic and Prognostic Significance of Brief Limited Intermittent Psychotic Symptoms (BLIPS) in Individuals at Ultra High Risk. *Schizophr Bull* 2017; **43**(1): 48-56.
108. Carney R, Cotter J, Bradshaw T, Yung AR. Examining the physical health and lifestyle of young people at ultra-high risk for psychosis: A qualitative study involving service users, parents and clinicians. *Psychiatry Res* 2017; **255**: 87-93.
109. Carney R, Cotter J, Bradshaw T, Firth J, Yung AR. Cardiometabolic risk factors in young people at ultra-high risk for psychosis: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Schizophr Res* 2016; **170**(2-3): 290-300.
110. Carney R, Cotter J, Firth J, Bradshaw T, Yung AR. Cannabis use and symptom severity in individuals at ultra high risk for psychosis: a meta-analysis. *Acta Psychiatr Scand* 2017; **136**(1): 5-15.

- 1013 111. Yung AR, Wood SJ, Malla A, Nelson B, McGorry P, Shah J. The reality of at risk
1014 mental state services: a response to recent criticisms. *Psychol Med* 2019: 1-7.
1015
- 1016 112. Yoviene Sykes LA, Ferrara M, Addington J, Bearden CE, Cadenhead KS, Cannon
1017 TD *et al.* Predictive validity of conversion from the clinical high risk syndrome to
1018 frank psychosis. *Schizophr Res* 2020; **216**: 184-191.
1019
- 1020 113. Chang CK, Hayes RD, Broadbent M, Fernandes AC, Lee W, Hotopf M *et al.* All-
1021 cause mortality among people with serious mental illness (SMI), substance use
1022 disorders, and depressive disorders in southeast London: a cohort study. *BMC*
1023 *Psychiatry* 2010; **10**: 77.
1024
- 1025 114. Oliver D, Spada G, Colling C, Broadbent M, Baldwin H, Patel R *et al.* Real-world
1026 implementation of precision psychiatry: Transdiagnostic risk calculator for the
1027 automatic detection of individuals at-risk of psychosis. *Schizophr Res* 2020.
1028
- 1029 115. Wang T, Oliver D, Msosa Y, Colling C, Spada G, Roguski Ł *et al.* Implementation
1030 of a Real-Time Psychosis Risk Detection and Alerting System Based on
1031 Electronic Health Records using CogStack. *J Vis Exp* 2020; (159).
1032
- 1033 116. Fusar-Poli P, Werbeloff N, Rutigliano G, Oliver D, Davies C, Stahl D *et al.*
1034 Transdiagnostic Risk Calculator for the Automatic Detection of Individuals at
1035 Risk and the Prediction of Psychosis: Second Replication in an Independent
1036 National Health Service Trust. *Schizophr Bull* 2019; **45**(3): 562-570.
1037
- 1038 117. Rutigliano G, Merlino S, Minichino A, Patel R, Davies C, Oliver D *et al.* Long term
1039 outcomes of acute and transient psychotic disorders: The missed opportunity
1040 of preventive interventions. *European Psychiatry* 2018; **52**: 126-133.
1041
- 1042 118. Kempton MJ, Bonoldi I, Valmaggia L, McGuire P, Fusar-Poli P. Speed of
1043 Psychosis Progression in People at Ultra-High Clinical Risk: A Complementary
1044 Meta-analysis. *JAMA Psychiatry* 2015; **72**(6): 622-623.
1045
- 1046 119. Fusar-Poli P, Bonoldi I, Yung AR, Borgwardt S, Kempton MJ, Valmaggia L *et al.*
1047 Predicting psychosis: meta-analysis of transition outcomes in individuals at high
1048 clinical risk. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 2012; **69**(3): 220-229.
1049
- 1050 120. Fusar-Poli P, Rutigliano G, Stahl D, Davies C, De Micheli A, Ramella-Cravaro V *et*
1051 *al.* Long-term validity of the At Risk Mental State (ARMS) for predicting
1052 psychotic and non-psychotic mental disorders. *European Psychiatry* 2017; **42**:
1053 49-54.
1054
- 1055 121. Schmidt SJ, Schultze-Lutter F, Schimmelmann BG, Maric NP, Salokangas RKR,
1056 Riecher-Rossler A *et al.* EPA guidance on the early intervention in clinical high
1057 risk states of psychoses. *European Psychiatry* 2015; **30**(3): 388-404.
1058

- 1059 122. Lee J, Rekhi G, Mitter N, Bong YL, Kraus MS, Lam M *et al.* The Longitudinal
1060 Youth at Risk Study (LYRIKS) - An Asian UHR perspective. *Schizophrenia*
1061 *Research* 2013; **151**(1-3): 279-283.
1062
- 1063 123. Tay SA, Yuen S, Lim LK, Pariyasami S, Rao S, Poon LY *et al.* Support for Wellness
1064 Achievement Programme (SWAP): clinical and demographic characteristics of
1065 young people with at-risk mental state in Singapore. *Early Intervention in*
1066 *Psychiatry* 2015; **9**(6): 516-522.
1067
- 1068 124. Fusar-Poli P, Frascarelli M, Valmaggia L, Byrne M, Stahl D, Rocchetti M *et al.*
1069 Antidepressant, antipsychotic and psychological interventions in subjects at
1070 high clinical risk for psychosis: OASIS 6-year naturalistic study. *Psychological*
1071 *Medicine* 2015; **45**(6): 1327-1339.
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1080
1081

Table 1. Service configuration (above); outreach strategy and referrals (below)

	Number of services (%)
SERVICE CONFIGURATION	
Continent	51
Europe	30 (58.8)
North America	13 (25.5)
Australia	4 (7.8)
Asia	3 (5.9)
South America	1 (2.0)
Service set-up date	50
1991-1999	6 (12.0)
2000-2009	31 (62.0)
2010-2019	13 (26.0)
Population in the catchment area	35
Combined total population	17,252,666
Average total pop. per service	492,933
Type of service	51
Integrated CHR-P service	41 (80.4)
Standalone CHR-P service	10 (19.6)
Hub and spoke CHR-P service	0
Professionals involved (not mutually exclusive)	30
Psychiatrist ^a	30 (100)
Psychologist or counsellor ^b	23 (76.7)
Case manager/care coordinator ^c	15 (50.0)
Nurse ^d	15 (50.0)
Occupational therapist/social worker/educator	12 (40.0)
Research personnel ^e	3 (10.0)
Neuropsychologist	2 (6.7)
General practitioner	1 (3.3)
Exercise physiologist	1 (3.3)
OUTREACH STRATEGY AND REFERRALS	
Outreach activities (not mutually exclusive)	41
Active approaches	
Workshops	
General workshops	40 (97.6)
Targeting healthcare professionals	35 (85.4)
Targeting education professionals ^f	20 (48.8)
Targeting community organisations	14 (34.1)
Service promotion to NGOs and community services ^g	14 (34.1)
Service promotion to social and governmental services ^h	8 (19.5)
Service promotion to family members	2 (4.9)
General public awareness campaigns	15 (36.6)
Passive approaches	
Dedicated online site	23 (63.4)
Print and other media ⁱ	22 (53.7)
Referral sources (not mutually exclusive)	40
Outpatient or community mental health services ^j	36 (90.0)
General healthcare ^k	30 (75.0)
Education organisations or services ^l	26 (65.0)
Self	24 (60.0)
Family, relatives or friends	24 (60.0)
Inpatient mental health services ^m	17 (42.5)
A&E departments	9 (22.5)
Social services & welfare	7 (17.5)
Government organisations ⁿ	6 (15.0)
Community organisations ^o	5 (12.5)
Early Intervention for Psychosis services	5 (12.5)

For footnotes see the supplementary section (eResults 1).

A&E: Accident and Emergency Departments; NGO: Non-governmental organization.

Table 2. Service user characteristics

	Number of services (%)
Sociodemographic characteristics	
Sample size	33
<50	12 (39.4)
50-100	6 (18.2)
>100	15 (45.5)
Sex	43 (CHR-P individuals)
Male (frequency %)	57.2
CHR-P Assessment (not mutually exclusive)	37
CAARMS	18 (48.6)
SIPS	13 (35.1)
ERlraos-CL	6 (16.2)
BSIP	2 (5.4)
BSABS/SPI-A/SPI-CY	1 (2.7)
Min. age inclusion criteria	48
Between 8 and 6 years	2 (4.2)
12 years	12 (25)
Between 13 and 15 years	15 (31.3)
Between 16 and 17 years	13 (27.1)
18 years or older	6 (12.5)
Max. age inclusion criteria	49
18 years	4 (8.2)
Between 24 and 29 years	14 (28.6)
Between 30 and 35 years	24 (49.0)
Between 40 and 56 years	4 (8.2)
65 years or older	3 (6.1)
Service users age range	51
Children and adolescents only (<18)	2 (3.9)
Adolescents only (12 to 18)	2 (3.9)
Adolescents and young adults (12 to 35)	36 (70.6)
Children, adolescents and adults (8-40)	1 (2.0)
Adolescents and adults (≥12) ^a	5 (9.8)
Young adults (18 to 35)	4 (7.8)
Adults only (≥18)	1 (2.0)
CHR-P individuals (%)	
Comorbidity (not mutually exclusive)	31
Any DSM/ICD comorbid disorder	69.5
Depressive disorders	42.3
Bipolar disorder	15.5
Persistent depressive disorder	6.7
History of suicide attempts	10.5
Anxiety disorders	24.1
Social phobia	5.9
Obsessive compulsive disorder	5.1
Adjustment disorder	11.6
Any personality disorder	15.5
Schizotypal personality disorder	11.0
Substance use disorders	12.4
Employment	13
Unemployment rates	36.6

^a Includes two services that enrolled "adolescents and adults" without further specification.

APS: Attenuated Psychosis Symptoms; BLIPS: Brief Limited Intermittent Psychotic Symptoms; BSABS, Bonn scale for the assessment of basic symptoms; BSIP, Basel screening instrument for psychosis; CAARMS: comprehensive assessment of at-risk mental states; ERlraos-CL, early recognition inventory retrospective assessment of symptoms checklist; GRD: Genetic Risk and Deterioration. SIPS: structured interview for psychosis-risk syndromes; SPI-A: schizophrenia proneness instrument (adults version); SPI-CY: schizophrenia proneness instrument (child and youth version).

Table 3. Interventions (above) and outcomes (below)

INTERVENTIONS	
	Number of services (%)
Non-pharmacological interventions (not mutually exclusive)	37
Clinical monitoring	37 (100.0)
Psychoeducation	30 (81.1%)
Case management and psychosocial support ^a	27 (73.0)
Family intervention ^b	27 (73.0)
CBT-based individual intervention ^c	25 (67.6)
Other individual psychotherapeutic intervention ^d	24 (64.9)
Physical health interventions ^e	14 (37.8)
Group social or therapeutic interventions ^f	7 (18.9)
Pharmacological interventions (not mutually exclusive)	31
Antipsychotic medication	27 (87.1)
Antidepressants	23 (74.2)
Anxiolytics	16 (51.6)
Mood stabilizers	12 (38.7)
Omega-3 fatty acids	3 (9.7)
Duration of service provision	29
6 months	1 (3.4)
12 months	7 (24.1)
24 months	13 (44.8)
36 months	3 (10.3)
60 months or more	5 (17.2)
OUTCOMES	
Type of outcomes (not mutually exclusive)	43
Persistence of symptoms/comorbidities	29 (67.4)
Transition to psychosis	23 (53.5)
Functional status	21 (48.8)
Remission	18 (41.9)
Physical health outcomes	13 (30.2)
Service users' satisfaction	11 (25.6)
Hospitalisation	8 (18.6)
Mortality	6 (13.9)
Outcome instruments (not mutually exclusive)	43
Clinical interviews	40 (93.0)
Psychometric instruments	16 (37.2)
CAARMS	10 (23.2)
SIPS	5 (11.6)
Electronic health records	7 (16.3)

For footnotes see the supplementary section (eResults 2).

Table 4. Ten simple recommendations for real-world implementation of CHR-P service

Service configuration	
1	Implement a standalone community service (“what”)
2	Train a multidisciplinary team (psychiatrists, psychologists or clinical counsellors, case managers and nurses) (“what”)
Outreach strategy and referrals	
3	Adopt active and passive outreach, primarily targeting healthcare agencies (“how”)
4	Ensure adequate risk enrichment during the recruitment (“how”)
CHR-P service user characteristics	
5	Define CHR-P through established psychometric instruments (not in general population) (“how”)
6	Implement a transitional and transdiagnostic service across adolescents and young adults (“when”)
Interventions	
7	Offer needs-based interventions and psychological interventions (“how”)
8	Titrate the intervention according to the characteristics and risk profile* as well as the values and preferences of the individuals (“how”)
Outcomes	
9	Collect information and target recovery, physical health outcomes, service users’ satisfaction, functioning and quality of life (“how”)
10	Extend clinical monitoring for outcomes for at least three years (“how”)

* i.e. CHR-P subgroups BLIPS>APS>GRD, severity of attenuated positive and negative symptoms, and level of functioning.