

Data supplement to Berk et al. Quetiapine v. lithium in the maintenance phase following a first episode of mania: randomised controlled trial. Br J Psychiatry doi: 10.1192/bjp.bp.116.186833

Table DS1 Descriptive statistics depicting the differences between lithium and quetiapine groups on demographic characteristics, psychopathology, functioning and quality of life measures

Characteristics	Descriptive statistic	Total sample <i>N</i> =41	Quetiapine <i>n</i> =20	Lithium <i>n</i> =21	Test statistic	Value	df	<i>p</i>
Age	<i>M(S.D.)</i>	21.3 (2.3)	21.3 (2.3)	21.4 (2.3)	t-test	-0.18	39	.859
Gender %Female	% (n)	22.0 (9)	25.0 (5)	19.0 (4)	χ^2	0.21	1	.645
Relationship status %Not married/not in a relationship	% (n)	80.5 (33)	80.0 (16)	81.0 (17)	χ^2	0.01	1	.939
Accommodation status								
Rented flat/house	% (n)	17.1 (7)	15.0 (3)	19.0 (4)	χ^2	0.12	1	.731
House/flat with family of origin	% (n)	82.9 (34)	85.0 (17)	81.0 (17)				
Lives with ^a								
Alone	% (n)	4.9 (2)	5.0 (1)	4.8 (1)	χ^2	0.00	1	.972
Parents	% (n)	80.5 (33)	85.0 (17)	76.2 (16)	χ^2	0.51	1	.480
Siblings	% (n)	70.7 (29)	60.0 (12)	81.0 (17)	χ^2	2.17	1	.141
Highest level of education	<i>M (S.D.)</i>	11.8 (1.6)	11.9 (1.6)	11.6 (1.6)	t-test	0.55	39	.583
Vocation status								
Unemployed	% (n)	43.9 (18)	45.0 (9)	42.9 (9)	χ^2	0.40	2	.819
Employed (casual, part-time, full-time)	% (n)	26.8 (11)	30.0 (6)	23.8 (5)				
Student	% (n)	29.3 (12)	25.0 (5)	33.3 (7)				
Current financial support								
Parents	% (n)	22.0 (9)	20.0 (4)	23.8 (5)	χ^2	0.75	2	.686
Work	% (n)	19.5 (8)	15.0 (3)	23.8 (5)				
Government benefits	% (n)	58.5 (24)	65.0 (13)	52.4 (11)				
Country of birth % Australian born	% (n)	76.9 (30)	84.2 (16)	70.0 (14)	χ^2	1.11	1	.292

Diagnoses

Bipolar disorder ^b	% (n)	87.8 (36)	95.0 (19)	81.0 (17)	χ^2	1.89	1	.169
Anxiety disorder	% (n)	22.5 (9)	21.1 (4)	23.8 (5)	χ^2	0.04	1	.835
Cannabis use disorder	% (n)	45.0 (18)	47.4 (9)	42.9 (9)	χ^2	0.08	1	.775
Alcohol use disorder	% (n)	32.5 (15)	26.3 (5)	38.1 (8)	χ^2	0.63	1	.427

*Symptoms**Manic symptoms*

YMRS ^c	M(S.D.)	2.5 (3.6)	2.3 (2.7)	2.8 (4.3)	t-test	-0.01	39	.989
CGI-BP mania ^c	M(S.D.)	1.2 (0.6)	1.1 (0.4)	1.2 (0.7)	t-test	-0.50	39	.633

Depressive symptoms

BDRS ^c	M(S.D.)	8.4 (9.0)	9.8 (9.2)	7.0 (8.8)	t-test	1.56	39	.126
MADRS ^c	M(S.D.)	7.4 (8.9)	7.9 (9.2)	6.9 (8.9)	t-test	0.74	39	.467
CGI-BP depression ^c	M(S.D.)	2.1 (1.6)	2.1 (1.5)	2.1 (1.7)	t-test	0.15	39	.883

Psychotic symptoms

BPRS positive symptoms ^c	M(S.D.)	4.6 (1.6)	4.4 (1.0)	4.9 (2.1)	t-test	-0.87	39	.389
-------------------------------------	---------	-----------	-----------	-----------	--------	-------	----	------

Overall psychopathology

BPRS	M(S.D.)	33.2 (9.3)	33.1 (8.7)	33.4 (10.1)	t-test	-0.01	39	.994
CGI-BP severity ^c	M(S.D.)	2.0 (1.5)	2.0 (1.6)	2.1 (1.5)	t-test	-0.20	39	.842

Functioning

GAF	M(S.D.)	68.6 (13.7)	68.1 (14.0)	69.1 (13.7)	t-test	-0.24	39	.810
SOFAS	M(S.D.)	69.2 (14.2)	67.6 (14.6)	70.8 (14.0)	t-test	-0.72	39	.476

Quality of Life

QLS	M(S.D.)	4.2 (1.0)	4.1 (1.1)	4.3 (0.9)	t- test	-0.57	36	.575
-----	---------	-----------	-----------	-----------	------------	-------	----	------

Note: YMRS, Young Mania Rating Scale; CGI-BP, Clinical Global Impressions Scale - Bipolar; BDRS, Bipolar Depression Rating Scale; MADRS, Montgomery-Asberg Depression Rating Scale; BPRS, Brief Psychiatric Rating Scale; GAF, Global Assessment of Functioning; SOFAS, Social and Occupational Functioning Assessment Scale; QLS, Quality of Life Scale

^a Multiple responses were possible.

^b For one individual, a SCID interview was not conducted and diagnosis of bipolar was ascertained based on clinician report.

^c Because of skewness, logarithmic transformation (plus constant) was performed. Untransformed data are presented. Inferential statistics were based on the transformed data.