**Supplementary Tables**

**(insert STables 1a, 1b** and **1c here)**

**Table S2.** Summary of evidence of mediators between adversity and psychosis for Dissociation in clinical samples (subjects at risk for psychosis and with psychotic disorder) and in the general population

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Clinical samples | | | General population | | | | | Total | |
| Category | *Number of analyses. (number of studies)* | |  | *Number of analyses. (number of studies)* | | |  | |  | |
| (*N total analyses/studies*\*) | Evidence of mediation | Null mediation | % analyses supporting mediation | | Evidenceof mediation | Null mediation | | % analyses supporting mediation | | % analyses supporting mediation | |
| Dissociation (43/12) | 6(4) | 20(6) | **23%** | | 12(6) | 5(1) | | **70%** | | **42%** | |
| Overall measure  (24/8) | 5(4) | 15(5) | **25%** | | 4(3) | **-** | | **100%** | | **37.5%** | |
| Dissociative amnesia  (4/2) | - | 2(1) | **0%** | | 1(1) | 1(1) | | **50%** | | **25%** | |
| Defensive dissociation (3/2) | - | - | **-** | | 3(2) | **-** | | **100%** | | **100%** | |
| Absorption  (5/3) | **-** | 2(1) | **0%** | | 3(2) | **-** | | **100%** | | **60%** | |
| Depersonalization (7/3) | 1(1) | 1(1) | **50%** | | 1(1) | 4(1) | | **20%** | | **29%** | |

\* We considered that one analysis showed evidence of mediation when authors reported significant p-values (<0.05) in the indirect (or mediating) effects, or when using a regression-based approach, an important reduction of the total effect occurred once the mediator was included in the model. Null mediation was defined as the non significant (p>0.05) indirect or mediating effect or as the lack of reduction of the total effect once the mediator was included in the model when using a regression-based approach.

**Quality assessment procedures**

The quality assessment was carried out using the Newcastle–Ottawa Scale (see Quality Assessment Tool(1)) for cohort studies by two independent reviewers (LA and PM). Those papers over which there was disagreement were discussed at a project group meeting. The Newcastle–Ottawa is a ten-point scale allocating points based on: the selection of cohorts (e.g. representativeness of the sample; 0–4 points), the comparability of cohorts (e.g. whether the study controls for confounding factors; 0–2 points), the identification of the exposure (e.g. objectivity of exposure measurement) and the outcomes of study participants (e.g. independence of outcome measurement, adequacy of follow-up; 0–3 points). Scores were considered as follows: “poor” quality for 3 or less; “fair” between 4 and 7 and “good” for scores of 8 or above. The agreed quality grades of each study are presented in Table S1 and the specific criteria used for our systematic review are specified in the Newcastle Ottawa Scale displayed below.

**Newcastle Ottawa Scale**

**Selection**

Note: A study can be awarded a maximum of one star for each numbered item within the Selection and Exposure categories. A maximum of two stars can be given for Comparability.

1) Representativeness of the exposed cohort

a) truly representative of the average individuals with psychosis or attenuated psychotic symptoms in the community \*

b) somewhat representative of the average individuals with psychosis or attenuated psychotic symptoms in the community \*

c) selected group of users eg nurses, volunteers

d) no description of the derivation of the cohort

2) Selection of the non exposed cohort

a) drawn from the same community as the exposed cohort \*

b) drawn from a different source

c) no description of the derivation of the non-exposed cohort

3) Ascertainment of exposure

a) secure record\*

b) structured interview\*

c) written self-report\* (star included here given the common use of self-reports in the field of adversity in psychosis)

d) no description

4) Demonstration that outcome of interest was not present at start of study

a) yes \* (here we considered a start when the mediator was not present at the time of the assessment to traumatic experiences)

b) no

**Comparability**

1) Comparability of cohorts on the basis of the design or analysis

a) study controls for confounders \*

b) study controls for any additional factor (we considered a start here if studies used a robust method of adjustment for multiple comparison such as bootstrapping)

**Outcome**

1) Assessment of outcome

a) independent blind assessment \*

b) record linkage \*

c) self-report

d) no description

(in this section we considered none star if studies did not report the indirect and direct effects nor the percentage of total effect mediated. One start if they reported that information partially and two stars if they provided that information fully)

2) Was follow-up long enough for outcomes to occur

a) yes (if follow-up longer than 6 months) \*

b) no

3) Adequacy of follow up of cohorts

a) complete follow up - all subjects accounted for \*

b) subjects lost to follow up unlikely to introduce bias - small number lost - > 20 % \*

c) follow up rate < 80%) and no description of those lost

d) no statement

**Data extraction procedures**

*Definition of the different types of mediating effects*

Null mediation was considered as the situation in which the indirect or mediating effect is not statistically significant (p>0.05). “Partial mediation” is the situation in which the path between adversity and psychosis (also called the direct effect) is reduced but still statistically significant when the mediator is introduced. “Total mediation” describes the case were the path between adversity and psychosis (direct effect) is no longer significant after the introduction of the mediating variable. “Suggested mediation” was considered when the indirect (or mediating) effect were reported but not the direct effects, not allowing us to determine whether the mediation was total or partial. “Suggested mediation” was also considered in a subset of studies using a regression-based approach, in which an important reduction of the total effect occurred once the mediator was included in the model. Studies including this type of scenario were also considered but where rated and methodologically less robust (section “Assessment of outcome” from the Newcastle Ottawa Scale as described above) than the ones testing mediation with mediation analyses, path analyses, structural equation models (SEM)) and providing the direct and indirect effects. Data extraction was performed in duplicate (50% of papers by LA and GT and 50% by LA and PM).

*Estimation of the percentage of total effect mediated*

This measure is the proportion of the total effect that is accounted for by the pathway through the mediating variable. Despite reported by authors in most of the papers; when this information was not given, we estimated the percentage by dividing the indirect (or mediating effect) by the total effect (shown in coefficients) and multiplying it by 100 according to previous published studies(2). When results were reported in odd rations, and not in coefficients, these were transformed into log odds before calculating the percentage. Authors were contacted when provided data was not enough to extract as exposed. We managed to obtain this information for 83.1% of the analyses that found a significant indirect effect, details are provided in **Figure 2** footnote and the percentage of total effect mediated can also be found in detailed **Stables 1a, 1b and 1c.**

**Search Strategy**

(EMBASE, Psyinfo and MEDLINE through Ovid provider)

**Childhood adversity terms**

108. sexual abuse.mp.

109. physical abuse.mp.

110. emotional abuse.mp.

114. psychological abuse.mp.

117. maltreat\*.mp.

118. bully\*.mp.

119. bullied.mp.

123. parental loss.mp.

124. (Separation adj5 parent).mp.

138. childhood trauma.mp.

139. early trauma.mp.

155. Neglect\*.mp.

156. (trauma\* adj5 experienc\*).mp.

160. adversit\*.mp.

161. (advers\* adj5 experienc\*).mp.

233. exp Child Abuse/

234. exp Physical Abuse/

235. exp Sexual Abuse/

236. exp Emotional Abuse/

237. exp Child Neglect/

238. exp Emotional Trauma/

239. exp BULLYING/

240. exp Parental Absence/

241. exp RAPE/

242. exp Domestic Violence/

243. exp Victimization/

**Mediation terms**

127. mediat\*.mp.

130. (psycholog\* adj3 mechanism\*).mp.

131. (biolog\* adj3 mechanism\*).mp.

143. path analysis.mp

157. network analysis.mp.

170. structural equation.mp.

171. path analysis.mp

246. exp MEDIATION/

247. exp Structural Equation Modeling/

248. exp Path Analysis/

**Psychosis terms**

87. psychosis.mp.

88. psychot\*.mp.

100. schizophr\*.mp.

101. schizotyp\*.mp.

102. hallucinat\*.mp.

103. parano\*.mp.

104. delusion\*.mp.

105. persecut\*.mp.

167. (disorganiz\* adj5 symptom\*).mp.

168. (disorganiz\* adj5 dimension\*).mp.

251. exp PSYCHOSIS/

252. exp SCHIZOPHRENIA/

253. exp CHILDHOOD SCHIZOPHRENIA/

254. exp SCHIZOTYPY/

255. exp HALLUCINATIONS/

256. exp PARANOIA/

257. exp DELUSIONS/

258. exp PERSECUTION/
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