INTRODUCTION

People with psychosis rarely inflict legal deaths, for example in declared war. ‘Intentional homicide’—unlawful death purposefully inflicted on a person by another person—is the one form of violent death other than suicide in which they may be overinvolved, but with a frequency that excludes them from anything but an indirect footnote in the 2013 UN Office on Drugs and Crime Global Study on Homicide [1]. Nevertheless, psychosis and homicide are inextricably linked in the public mind and in law, driving fear and prejudice, but also a form of compassion in the criminal courts taking mental state into account when convicting, sentencing or otherwise ordering placement. In the United Kingdom, though, hospital orders from court for people with mental illness who have killed have been falling since 2005 [2]. In 2017, the Sentencing Council for England and Wales launched a consultation on the manslaughter guideline [3]. Questions included whether evidence of planning or weapon use or substance use at the time of the killing should, in effect, mitigate against health service disposal. How far can empirical research evidence help here? A small, French qualitative study of psychiatric expert witnesses suggests that they too would welcome such help [4]. Although we have chosen to exclude single case reports in our review, worldwide, they often drive substantial legal and public policy changes. The McNaughton rules on legal insanity form an early example (1843) [5]. In the USA, in 1999, ‘Kendra’s law’ on involuntary outpatient commitment followed a man, lapsed from years of intermittent treatment for psychosis [6], killing Kendra Webdale [7]. In Japan, law allowing specialist forensic psychiatric service development followed a man’s running amok in a girls’ school [8]. In February 2017, however, Donald Trump repealed Obama’s regulation restricting gun purchase by people with mental disorder [9], then, in November 2017, said of a new mass shooting ‘isn’t a guns situation’ but ‘a mental health problem at the highest level’ [10]. This fits with a wider populist view. Examination of a random 25% sample of 1997–2012 United States news stories on mass shootings found they were more often attributed to people with ‘serious mental illness’ than to ‘dangerous weapons’ [11]. Metzl and MacLeish [12] systematically reviewed empirical evidence for the following: mental illness causes gun violence, psychiatric diagnosis can predict gun crime before it happens, US mass shootings teach us to fear mentally ill loners, because of the complex psychiatric histories of mass shooters, gun control ‘won’t prevent’ another Tucson, Aurora or Newtown.

They remark that ‘each of these statements is true in particular instances’, but only 5% of 120,000 gun killings in the USA between 2001 and 2010 were by people with mental illness [13], concluding that focus on individual psychopathologies may be obscuring the real issues. So far, we have referred only to people with psychosis as homicide perpetrators, but there is good evidence that psychosis makes people more vulnerable to being attacked [14]. Crump et al. [15], in a Swedish-population-based cohort, found that people with any mental disorder were nearly five times more likely to be victims of homicide than people without disorder; people with schizophrenia were nearly twice as likely to be victims as perpetrators of homicide. Here we cover only literature on psychosis and homicide perpetration because, Crump apart, that is all that there is.

METHOD OF LITERATURE SEARCH

Homicide by people with psychosis is a small-scale research field, not previously reviewed in this journal. We therefore scoped the topic by extending the literature database search to publications of 2000–2017, but selected for the years 2013–2017. The terms schiz_, psychos_, homicid_ and murder_, and mesh terms schizophrenia, psychotic disorders and homicide, were entered into MEDLINE, MEDLINE In-Process, PsycINFO, Embase, Web of Science. We hand searched journals which had published included articles for 2013–2017, inclusive, and reference lists of included articles. Independent reading of 100 titles and abstracts confirmed 100% agreement on inclusion. We excluded studies of violence without clearly separate homicide figures, single case studies and conference abstracts, but
used general web searches for includable publications by these authors. The online Supplementary figure (SDC1, http://links.lww.com/YCO/A40) details search results and article selection. We also consulted the UK-wide National Confidential Inquiry into Suicide and Homicide (NCISH) over the same period.

THE EPIDEMIOLOGY OF PSYCHOSIS AND HOMICIDE
A landmark article identified just five homicide studies internationally between 1990 and 2009 which, as case–control or cohort studies, allowed comparison between people with psychosis and the general population [16]. Risk of homicide among people with psychosis was significantly higher, regardless of comorbid substance misuse [0.3% schizophrenia, 0.02% general population; odds ratio 19.5, confidence interval (CI) 14.7–25.8]. It is also worth noting the consistency of the preceding plethora of studies of homicide rates among people with psychosis or psychosis rates among homicide offenders: in complete national or smaller area samples, the latter is almost invariably 5–10% [17]. New studies of this type continue, often from countries new to this area (e.g. Iran [18&]). A US records study, in one Pennsylvanian county, found that 4% of all criminal 18–40-year-old homicide cases and 7% of the over-40-year olds had nonaffective psychosis (total 10 cases) [19&].

The main reason for continuing to add to the range of countries studied is the considerable international variation in population base rates of homicide, which could affect proportionate contribution of psychosis [20–22]. In a systematic review, Large et al. [23] challenged this; Golenkov et al. [24&] then showed that in an area with a very high homicide rate – 10 per 100 000 in the Russian Federation’s Chuvash Republic, over half had a mental disorder, although, in line with the weight of evidence from other studies, nearly 5% had schizophrenia. In other studies, they examined homicide recidivism by people with schizophrenia – in the Chuvash Republic [25&&] and in a systematic review [26&], which identified two further studies and unpublished data. In the Chuvash, 16 (11%), all men, of 149 homicide offenders with schizophrenia had previously killed. Recidivism was more likely in rural areas with poorer psychiatric service access. The other countries, with lower homicide rates, showed lower psychotic homicide recidivism (Finland 4.4% [27]; Sweden 6% [28&&]). The UK NCISH acquires national data on all homicides and suicides, identifies those in any contact with health services for 12 months beforehand, then asks clinicians involved to complete a detailed questionnaire; about 95% of clinicians respond Annual statistical reports allow trends analyses.

The 2017 report on England and Wales was notified of 6004 homicides (6333 victims) during the years 2005–2015 (average 576 per year) [2&&]. Annual rates fluctuate, generally and among people with psychosis specifically, but with an overall reducing trend; 365 (6%) of convictions were of people with schizophrenia or other delusional states. There were similar general and specific trends in a Swedish national cohort of anyone convicted of homicide 1987–2006 [29&&]. In England and Wales, it was rare for those with psychosis not to have been misusing alcohol or other drugs, which may partly account for the decline in post-conviction hospitalization. Among those with schizophrenia, 140 (44%) had killed within 4 weeks of their last health service contact, most with psychotic symptoms at the time. Findings were similar among the smaller Scottish and Northern Irish cohorts.

WHAT CHARACTERIZES HOMICIDAL PEOPLE WITH PSYCHOSIS?
A description of homicidal patients with psychosis in one medium secure hospital (49 homicide, 24 attempted homicide) may reveal more about admission decisions in England than about the patients [30&]. It is puzzling to find that, after matching the homicidal group with 74 ‘controls’ on sex, age, admission, diagnosis and prior offending, homicidal patients were significantly more likely to be men, older, diagnosed with schizophrenia (not personality disorder) and less troubled in childhood. In Turkey, 30 homicidal men with schizophrenia were compared with 71 other violent and 109 nonviolent patients [31&]. The two violent groups differed from the nonviolent in older age of illness onset, longer illness at the index event, higher levels of paranoia, lower insight and higher aggression ratings; the homicidal group were distinguished only by rural residence and most likely targeting a spouse. In China, older age and various social features similarly characterized 107 homicidal people with schizophrenia (103 without) [32&]. Treatment availability was low; 40% of those with schizophrenia who had killed another person had never had treatment and only 4% of them were in treatment at the time of the homicide. In France, among 210 homicide cases before one court (Angers), 30 (17.6%) had major mental disorder histories; they were younger, more educated and more likely to have been alcohol intoxicated during the offence than those without disorder; depressive symptoms dominated among women and delusions among men [33&]. A Tunisian comparison of 36 homicidal men hospitalized with schizophrenia and 50 without criminality found that, however measured, the former had had much less treatment; they had low insight and poor medication compliance [34&].
The under-representation of women as convicted killers partly explains why they are so little studied in this context. One study focussed on them [35&]. Of all 14 women found not guilty of homicide by reason of insanity between 2006 and 2014 in Rio de Janeiro State in Brazil, eight were diagnosed with schizophrenia or similar by the researchers, but not necessarily the experts for the court. These women were generally disadvantaged and most attacked family members. Questions about comorbidities – between psychosis and substance misuse, or psychosis and personality disorder, or being ‘triply troubled’ – are important, not least following claims that the violence of people with psychosis may be better explained by comorbidities or behavioural antecedents than the psychosis itself. In their 2009 meta-analysis of studies comparing samples of people with psychosis with general population samples, Fazel et al. [16] estimated that the former were about nine times as likely to be violent if misusing substances, but only twice as likely if not. In a longitudinal study, Elbogen and Johnson [36] found that psychosis predicted violence only in the presence of substance misuse, prior violence, demographics and external stressors. Even this study, however, fails to map temporal relationships, so there is little to help arguments in court on whether substance misuse might reduce mitigating aspects of psychosis; most substance misuse may follow from symptoms. Van Dongen et al. [37&], in a study of 223 court reports for people with schizophrenia completed in one specialist centre in the Netherlands, found that the subgroup of 26 people who were over the age of 35 on first offending were disproportionately likely to have committed a homicide and at least likely to have comorbidities. Richard-Devantoy et al. [38&], in a systematic review of cohort, case–control studies and systematic reviews, January 2001 to December 2011, focused on psychosis, substance misuse and homicide specifically, found further support for the position that substance misuse and variables, such as sex, prior violence or external stressors, increase but do not fully explain the risk. They add that those who start violence long after psychosis onset are most likely to kill in response to psychotic symptoms, within the family, and with low recidivism risk if treated. Seeking more objective indicators of homicidal propensities, some researchers have explored cerebral structure and function. A systematic MEDLINE search up to August 2012 [39&] yielded three studies of executive function in schizophrenia, five structural and four neuroimaging studies (although three listed); two structural and two functional studies were reports from the same sample, not exclusively of homicidal patients. There were no features which consistently distinguished between homicidal and non homicidal people with schizophrenia. One cognitive study found impaired executive functions, the other two did not. One of the structural brain studies – of ‘murderers’ – found grey matter augmentation in the medio frontal cortex; if really murderers, these people would have had unequivocal intent to kill and probably planned the act. Otherwise, the cerebral story was of tissue loss, implicating the whole brain as examined in one study and, taking the other studies together, almost the whole brain. Subsequently, Te`nyi et al. [40&] compared 44 patients with schizophrenia and a homicide/attempted homicide history with 22 never violent patients and 21 ‘normal’ controls on a checklist of 57 minor physical anomalies. They took these to be indicative of brain damage, finding them significantly more common in the homicidal group. Thus, they concluded there could be a ‘stronger neurodevelopment component of cause in this subgroup of schizophrenia’, but did not control for or consider other explanations of the group differences – such as age. Stratton et al. [41&] described the neuropsychology of 24 men and one woman with schizophrenia referred to one of them for expert reports for the court; they used standardized assessments with population norms, including the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale, Wechsler Memory Scales, Trail Making Tests and the Stroop Test. Scores on more than one scale indicated attentional dysfunction, and that most had executive and/or memory dysfunction. High rates of such dysfunctions seem surprising in such a highly selected sample. It is striking that this evidence seemed of little relevance in court; 21 were convicted of first degree murder – thus deemed to be able form intent – and four found not guilty by reason of insanity. Perhaps had there been an option for finding diminished responsibility, this evidence would have had more impact.

**VICTIMS AND METHODS**

The years 2013–2017 saw little new knowledge about psychotic homicide offenders’ victims. A small, Italian, descriptive study of matricide by sons [42&] confirms continuing interest in this unusual crime, exhorting understanding of the parental dynamic as well as symptoms. This is not new; there is robust, earlier evidence that the parent–child relationship often becomes distorted as the parent has to continue, in effect, practical parenting long after the child has reached majority [43]. These vulnerable dyads – father has often left home – may need special support. For England and Wales, an NCISH team clustered homicide of a parent with that of a sibling or 16p years child as ‘adult homicide’ [44&]. The mental illness rate among ‘adult homicides’ was higher (27% of 251 with psychosis) than among those killing a partner (7% of 1180). Among 297 filicides, about half the
women and a fifth of the men had mental illness at the time of the offence; only 18 and 12%, respectively, were psychotic [45&].

Torrey et al. [46&] sought to quantify homicide rates within families in the USA, from two national databases – the Centers for Disease Control [13&], which captures all records of homicide, and the Supplementary Homicide Reports (SHRs) submitted by local law enforcement agencies to the Federal Bureau of Intelligence, which include details of relationships between perpetrator and victim. In 2013, there were 16 121 homicides in the USA but just 6664 SHR records noting relationships. Torrey’s assumption was that the SHR records were representative, so about 4000 people in the USA died by the hand of a family member that year – the largest group spousal killings (39%), the next largest parents killing children (23%) and the rest ‘adult homicides’ (refer to NCISH definition, above). From a literature review, they infer rates of mental disorder among types of family homicide perpetrators. The rank ordering of presumed contribution of mental disorder is similar to the NCISH findings, but with higher proportions attributed to it within each band. A major continuing contribution is their Treatment Advocacy Center’s ‘Preventable Tragedies Database’, drawing on daily press reports. Although acknowledging information gaps, Torrey et al. highlight a common thread of failures to access or get adequate treatment. Knable [47&] searched PubMed and ‘the internet at large’ for cases of psychotic patients killing mental health staff in the USA. He identified 33 between 1981 and 2014. Unaccompanied, young, women visiting residential facilities were most at risk. Among those in treatment, men with schizophrenia were the most risky. He describes over 40% of the staff as ‘gunned down’; this group might have survived in other countries. In a systematic literature review, Minero et al. [48&] found nine studies of relationships between psychosis and homicide method; almost everyone (96%) with psychosis in these studies had been symptomatic at the time of the offence. The one included US study found 48% used guns [49], in Italy 20% did so [50], but well under 10% in most other countries. Sharp instruments were preferred among people with schizophrenia and forms of asphyxiation by those with major mood disorders. The largest study (n¼1462 with mental disorder and weapon information) – from England and Wales – found that just 3% of homicides by people with mental disorder were by guns and 37% knives [51]. An update showed little change in such proportions over time [52]. For context, however, even in the USA, with guns widely available, only 2% of the nearly 1000 inpatients discharged to the community in the MacArthur sample used a gun in any violence in the following year [53&].

INTERVENTION

There is little literature on intervention, despite indications that many homicide perpetrators with psychosis had troubling symptoms at the time and may not have been in adequate treatment. An important perspective on the value of treatment comes from early intervention studies. Nielsussen and Large [54] completed a systematic review and meta-analysis of rates of homicide during the first episode of psychosis and after treatment, in well delineated populations within specific periods. The homicide rate during first episode psychosis was 1.59 per 1000 (95% CI 1.06–2.40) but 0.11 per 1000 (95% CI) after treatment. Park et al. [55&] modelled the economic impact of early intervention in England drawing on these figures and rather old data (2003) on costs of a homicide, standardized to 2009 prices and allowing for future costs. Over 10 years, early intervention saved £80 compared with standard care. This seems low, but partly reflects the low rate of psychotic homicide. An important but unusual perspective recognizes that the homicidal act is traumatic in itself, possibly interfering with recovery and safety. Crisford et al. [56] showed this for crime generally. So, imagine a real case: delusions cleared with medication – allowing realization that in the bloody business of releasing his mother from the clutches of an alien, there was no alien and his mother was dead. Forty-one such Men were described in ‘not explicitly a research study but a discussion of the clinical material generated’.

Most had been psychotic on admission to a high security hospital; they participated in groups over 10 years [57&]. The conclusion indicated that such work helped these men to stop avoiding what they had done, so that they could consider the crime fully – and how not to do the same again.

The World Federation of Societies of Biological Psychiatry Task Force on Men’s Mental Health consensus statement on prevention of homicide by men with psychiatric disorders suggested priority
is ‘to identify high risk groups, to provide adequate treatment, and to facilitate compliance with long-term treatment while considering male specific problems and needs’ [58&]. Identifying high-risk groups is feasible, but we need to identify risky individuals. Sophisticated risk assessment tools, while having other useful roles, may not help to predict any violence in psychosis [59]; they will be even less likely to do so for homicide specifically, given its lower base rate. Providing everyone with adequate treatment and facilitating long-term treatment adherence, however, could help. Early recognition and treatment of psychosis is important and, generally, detailed analyses of homicides find failures of treatment delivery and/or compliance. In Wales, for example, one post homicide inquiry noted: ‘two distinct periods during which Ms A had contact with mental health and social services. . . . 1992–8 was characterised by a diagnosis of psychotic mental illness and high levels of . . . care; 2003–2005, . . .by a diagnosis of borderline personality disorder . . . but an absence of robust engagement by [mental health] services’ [60]. In the latter period, she killed a stranger. In New York State, the man whose offence led to ‘Kendra’s law’ had over 3500 pages of clinical records, but he missed two appointments, so a case worker wrote to him saying that unless he called by a specified date his case would be closed; the next day he killed [6]. Coerced community treatment under well-defined conditions binds service providers as well as service users into appropriate care, associated with lower offending rates [61]. As homicide is a rare and complex event, however, it may be impossible to devise a study to confirm that a particular course of action has specific impact.

CONCLUSION

Homicides by people with psychosis are so rare that they are not even mentioned in the 2013 United Nations Global Survey of Homicide. This may account for the limitations to much research for this group. Failures in access to treatment or in treatment adherence before a homicide are common themes. Improving treatment for people with psychosis is the best way forward. As numbers with psychosis who kill are so small, the impact of doing so may be difficult to detect, but reflected in reduction in violent offending more generally.
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