

Irritable Personality Trait and Type of Antidepressant Prescribed Moderates the Association between genotypes of HTR1A-rs6295 or HTR2A-rs6311 with Treatment Response.

Ibrahim Mohammed Badamasi

bimohammed.ana@buk.edu.ng

Bayero University Kano

Munn Sann Lye

Department of Community Health, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Universiti Putra Malaysia, Selangor, Malaysia.

Normala Ibrahim

Department of Community Health, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Universiti Putra Malaysia, Selangor, Malaysia.

Nurul Asyikin Abdul Razaq

Department of Psychiatry, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Universiti Putra Malaysia, Selangor, Malaysia.

King Hwa Ling

Department of Biomedical Science, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Universiti Putra Malaysia, Selangor, Malaysia.

Johnson Stanslas

jstanslas@yahoo.co.uk

Pharmacotherapeutics Unit, Department of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Universiti Putra Malaysia, Selangor, Malaysia.

Research Article

Keywords: Depression, Moderators, Phenotypes, Pharmacogenetic, Antidepressant

Posted Date: May 21st, 2024

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-4441400/v1>

License:  This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.
[Read Full License](#)

Additional Declarations: The authors declare no competing interests.

Abstract

Background

Currently, empiric treatment of major depressive disorder (MDD) relies on the characteristics of the presenting patients.

Aim

The aim of the current study was to identify moderators for the association of SSRI treatment efficacy response phenotype with genotypes of *HTR1A*-rs6295 or *HTR2A*-rs6311 polymorphism in a population of MDD patients.

Methodology

The study included 300 patients with MDD. The assessment of selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRI) treatment response was based on 50% reduction in the depressive score obtained within 6 weeks of treatment onset on the Montgomery asberg depression rating scale (MADRS-S) for each patient recruited in the psychiatric clinics of the four tertiary hospitals in the Klang valley region of Malaysia.

Result

The study population was made up of young adults (median age = 37.00years), mostly females (67.1%) with no family history of psychiatric illness (73.4%). MDD patients with the GA genotype for the *HTR2A*-rs6311 polymorphism and received escitalopram antidepressant were significantly (over-dominant model; $P = 0.019$, $OR = 0.114$ (0.019–0.701)) less likely to respond to treatment. The CG + GG genotype of *HTR1A*-rs6295 gene polymorphism was associated with significantly (recessive model: $P = 0.019$, $OR = 0.146$ (0.026–0.733)) reduced likelihood of responding to antidepressant treatment among the MDD patients with the irritability personality trait.

Conclusion

The association between the CG genotype of the *HTR1A*-rs6295 with poor SSRI treatment response is elaborated among patients that have an irritable personality. The role of medication type in determining the direction of association between genotype of the *HTR2A*-rs6311 with treatment response identified in the literature was also revalidated in the current study.

Background

The lifetime prevalence of MDD is 16.2% (Kessler et al., 2003; Whiteford et al., 2013). Its associated with high morbidity, attendant loss in productivity and poor quality of life as well as high suicidal tendency and these features are unrivalled by other non-communicable diseases (Vieta et al., 2018). The absence of universal biomarkers for directing diagnostics and/or treatment options for patient have contributed to the delay in development of more efficient treatment options (Krishnan & Nestler, 2008;). In some earlier report, it was reported that lower educational levels, lower family monthly income and a family history of psychiatric illness were socio-demographic characteristics that were more common among MDD patients (Akhtar-Danesh and Landeen, 2007; Lye et al., 2020). It is also well established that there are many biological measures that may play central roles in the development of depression and this may explain the difficulty in identifying biomarkers for determining appropriate treatment options. A vital tool for the clinician that addresses the query as to under what condition does a marker performs optimally is described as a moderator. Thus, it has a prescriptive value (Curry et al., 2006; Kazdin, 2007). The prescriptive value is in the fact that moderators can suggest the directions for differential treatment (or diagnostic test) selection and planning (Fairchild and MacKinnon, 2009). Moderators are those variables that have an interactive effect with treatment condition on treatment outcome of interest (Curry et al., 2006; Fairchild and MacKinnon, 2009). It specifically elaborate the sub-population of patients that behave differently for the same outcome under different additional layers of conditions (Fairchild and MacKinnon, 2009). Some potential moderators that have been reported in the literature fall into one of 6 groups; demographics, severity of illness markers, comorbid disorders, parental psychopathology, psychosocial variables, and treatment expectancies (Curry et al., 2006). High baseline depression score, low socioeconomic status and presence of other medical or psychiatric conditions have all been postulated to be predictors of treatment response with moderator effect (Trivedi et al., 2006; Rush et al., 2008). Personality pathology was common among MDD patients that fail to respond to antidepressant treatment or in some situations they show better response to pharmacotherapy compared to psychotherapy (Tyrer et al. 1983; Tyrer et al. 1993; Shawcross and Tyrer 1985). High HA scores were associated with non-response to AD treatments (Kampman and Poutanen, 2011). High Novelty Seeking (NS) scores were associated with a more poor treatment outcome in many studies (Takahashi et al., 2013a; Corruble et al., 2002). Response to antidepressant treatment had been associated with Self Directedness (SD) personality (Paavonen et al., 2016; Takahashi et al., 2013b; Kaneda et al., 2011; Corruble et al., 2002; Sato et al., 1999; Black and Sheline, 1997). There are no studies that evaluated the role played by key socio-demographic, personality and clinical features of MDD patients in the association between genotypes of serotonergic genes with efficacy treatment outcome. The aim of the current study was to determine the predictive role of HT2A-rs6313 and HTR1A-rs6295 gene polymorphism in antidepressant treatment outcome in line with some moderating factors of sociodemographic and personality features.

Methodology

This study is the pharmacogenetic wing of a larger case-control (300 cases: 300 controls) MDD study. The detailed methodology of both the diagnosis and pharmacogenetic wings of the MDD studies had been

described in earlier publication (Badamasi et al., 2021; Lye et al., 2020a; 2020b; Lye et al., 2019; Faris et al., 2019). In the earlier pharmacogenetic study, only 142 cases of MDD patients were assessed for association between the HTR2A-rs6311 and HTR1A-rs6295 polymorphisms with SSRI treatment outcome (Badamasi et al., 2021).

The current study included an additional 158 participants to make up the 300 patients with MDD undergoing SSRI treatment for 6 weeks assessed. As previously described, the MDD patients recruited were 18–65 years of age, diagnosed with first episode of MDD, placed on treatment with SSRI for at least 6 weeks with verifiable means (records or direct interview) of determining treatment response within this time. The assessment of SSRI treatment response was based on reduction in the depressive score obtained within 6 weeks of treatment onset on the Montgomery asberg depression rating scale (MADRS-S) for each patient recruited in the psychiatric clinics of the four tertiary hospitals in the Klang valley region of Malaysia. Any patient with a 50% decrease in MADRS score within the 6 weeks period was designated as a treatment responder, while those with less than 50% decrease in MADRS score were described as treatment non- responders.

Detailed information regarding personality types and traits were obtained from each patient using the Temperament and Personality questionnaire. Socio-demographic as well as clinical features were also measured for each of the study participants. Bivariate analysis between the socio-demographic/personality features and treatment outcome as well as between genotypes from HTR2A-rs6311 or HTR1A-rs6295 with treatment outcome, based on a paired classification of each of the socio-demographic/personality features, was done. The adjusted statistical evaluation of the later analysis was also done, using the gender, ethnicity and age.

Statistical assessment were calculated using chi-square and logistic regression. The alpha value (p value) were adjusted for multiple testing by dividing the alpha value by the number of bivariate assessment done for each output. Specifically, the alpha value adopted for the Association between treatment response after 6 weeks treatment with selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRI) and socio-demographic /clinical features was $p \leq 0.0055$ ($0.05/9$). The P value adopted for the assessment of the Association between treatment response and socio-demographic /clinical features was $p \leq 0.005$ ($0.05/10$). The p value adopted for the assessment for the crude and adjusted evaluations for the moderating effect of some socio-demographic and clinical features of MDD patients in the association between treatment outcome and genotypes of HTR1A-rs6295 or HTR2A-rs6311 was $p \leq 0.01$ ($0.05/5$).

Results

The socio-demographic as well as clinical features of the study participants were measured appropriately and reported in Table 1.

Table 1
Socio-demographic and clinical features in the study population

Character	Labelling	Frequency / Value	Percentage
Age	Median - age (minimum - maximum)	37.00 (18–65)	
Gender	Male (n) / females (n)	94/192	32.9% / 67.1%
Medication	Escitalopram/other SSRI	62/224	78.3% /21.7%
Family income	Low /high	202 /84	70.6% / 29.4%
Work status	Employed/ Students/ Others	155/40/91	52.8%/14.0%/31.8%
Marital status	Single/ Married and others	113/173	39.5% /60.5%
Education	Basic / Advanced	127/159	44.4/55.6
Religion	Islam/Buddhist/Hindu/ Christianity/Others	148/64/44/25/5	51.7/22.4/15.4/8.7/1.7(%)
Family history of psychiatric	Yes / No	76 / 210	26.6/ 73.4
Chronic disease	Yes / No	102 / 184	35.7% /64.3%
Anxious Worrying	Yes / No	210 / 69	73.4% / 24.1%
Reserve	Yes / No	221/ 50	81.5%/ 18.5%
Perfectionism	Yes / No	278/ 8	97.2%/ 2.8%
Irritability	Yes / No	235 / 42	84.8% / 15.2%
Social avoidance	Yes / No	249 / 28	89.9% /10.1%
Interpersonal sensitivity	Yes / No	188 / 84	69.1% / 30.9%
Self-criticism	Yes / No	80 / 196	29.0% / 71.0%
Self-focused	Yes / No	222/53	80.7% /19.3%
Cooperativeness	Yes / No	152 / 118	56.3% / 43.7%
Effectiveness	Yes / No	176 / 87	66.9% / 33.1%
Duration of depression	6 (1–96) months		
Baseline MADRS score	26 (1–60)		
HTR1A-rs6295	CC/CG/GG	135/103/48	47.2%/36.0%/16.8%

Character	Labelling	Frequency / Value	Percentage
genotypes			
HTR2A-rs6311 genotypes	GG/GA/AA	65/115/106	22.7%/40.2%/37.1%

The study population was made up of young adults (median age = 37.00), mostly females (67.1%) of low socio-economic status (70.6%) who profess to the Islamic faith. Most of the participants have been in some form of marriage or relationship (52.8%) and they had no family history of psychiatric illness (73.4%). The various categories of “Temperament and Personalities” identified among the study participants included anxious worrying (73.4%), reserve (81.5%), perfectionism (97.2%), irritability (84.8%), social avoidance (89.9%), interpersonal sensitivity (69.1%), self-focused (80.7%), cooperativeness (56.3%) and effectiveness (66.9%) (Table 1).

The association of the various socio-demographic features with the phenotype of treatment response was also evaluated in the current study and presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Association between treatment response after 6 weeks treatment with selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRI) and socio-demographic /clinical features

		Responder	Non-responder	
Chronic disease	Yes	75	27	$X^2 = 0.375$, df = 1, P = 0.540
	No	129	55	
Ethnicity	Malay	96	46	$X^2 = 1.920$, df = 2, P = 0.383
	Chinese	67	22	
	Indian	41	14	
Gender	Male	64	30	$X^2 = 0.720$, df = 1, P = 0.396
	Female	140	52	
Medication	Luvox & other	162	62	$X^2 = 0.498$, df = 1, P = 0.480
	Escitalopram	42	20	
Family income	Low income	141	63	$X^2 = 0.784$, df = 1, P = 0.376
	High income	61	21	
Jobs status	Employed	108	47	$X^2 = 0.755$, df = 2, P = 0.686
	Student	28	12	
	others	68	23	
Marital status	Single	76	37	$X^2 = 1.515$, df = 1, P = 0.218
	Married (including previously married)	128	45	
Family history of psychiatric illness	Yes	52	24	$X^2 = 0.428$, df = 1, P = 0.513
	No	152	58	
Educational level	Low	118	41	$X^2 = 1.457$, df = 1, P = 0.227
	High	86	41	

Statistics* with Bonferonni corrections involved the division of the common alpha of 0.05 divided by the number of test conducted (5) which is $0.05/5 = 0.01$.

The proportion of responders was more than the non-responders to SSRI treatment. The common socio-demographic features of the patients included; more females, no chronic disease, SSRI type- on luvox (and other SSRIs), and low family income, employed, once married (including previously married), low educational level and no family history of psychiatric illness. It was also observed that most of the study

participants were responders to SSRI treatment and their common socio-demographic features were in keeping with the commonest socio-demographic features of the combined study population earlier described. Nevertheless, none of the association between the socio-demographic features and treatment response phenotype was statistically significant in the current study (Table 2). The association of the different phenotypes of personality types and traits were also evaluated for association with treatment response phenotype in the current study (Table 3).

Table 3
Association between treatment response and socio-demographic /clinical features

		Non-responder	Responder	
Anxious- worrying	No	157	53	X2 = 5.93, df = 1, P = 0.015, OR = 2.023 (1.14–3.59)
	Yes	41	28	
Personal-reserve	No	158	63	X2 = 0.24, df = 1, P = 0.624
	Yes	34	16	
Perfectionism	No	198 (71%)	80 (29%)	Not computed
	Yes	0	0	
Irritability	No	170	65	X2 = 1.88, df = 1, P = 0.171
	Yes	26	16	
Social- avoidance	No	180	69	X2 = 1.64, df = 1, P = 0.200
	Yes	17	11	
Interpersonal sensitivity	No	143	45	X2 = 8.79, df = 1, P = 0.003, OR = 2.27 (1.31–3.93)
	Yes	49	35	
Self- criticism	No	67	13	X2 = 9.32, df = 1, P = 0.002; OR = 2.74 (1.41–5.31)
	Yes	128	68	
Cooperativeness	No	102	50	X2 = 2.72, df = 1, P = 0.099
	Yes	90	28	
Self-focused	No	161	61	X2 = 0.879, df = 1, P = 0.349
	Yes	35	18	
Effectiveness	No	120	56	X2 = 2.84, df = 1, P = 0.092
	Yes	68	19	

Statistics* with Bonferonni corrections involved the division of the common alpha of 0.05 divided by the number of test conducted (5) which is $0.05/10 = 0.005$.

The association between personality trait of anxious-worrying ($X^2 = 5.93$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.015$, $OR = 2.023$ (1.14–3.59)), self-criticism ($X^2 = 9.32$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.002$; $OR = 2.74$ (1.41–5.31)) and interpersonal sensitivity ($X^2 = 8.79$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.003$, $OR = 2.27$ (1.31–3.93)) with treatment response were statistically significant (Table 3). Self-criticism was associated with better response to treatment when compared to those patients without the self-criticism personality. Patients with the anxious-worrying personality are more likely to respond to treatment compared to those without the personality type. Relatively, when compared with those patients without the interpersonal-sensitivity for both response and non-response to treatment, the patients with the interpersonal-sensitivity were more likely to respond to treatment.

Marital status and the status of family income have an interactive effect with the phenotype of treatment efficacy response when evaluating its association with genotype of HTR1A-rs6295 polymorphism. Single (unmarried) participants with the GG genotype of the HTR1A-rs6295 polymorphism were significantly (homozygote model ($P = 0.046$, $OR = 0.194$ (0.039–0.969); Dominant model ($P = 0.057$, $OR = 0.220$ (0.046–1.045)) less likely to report a clinical treatment (Table 4).

Table 4

Crude and adjusted evaluations for the Moderating effect of some socio-demographic and clinical features of MDD patients in the association between treatment outcome and genotypes of HTR1A-rs6295 or HTR2A-rs6311

Medication (All except Esc) = 1					Medication esc only = 2		
		Clinical NR	Clinical R	Statistics*	Clinical NR	Clinical R	Statistics*
Heterozygous 2A	GG	37	12	P = 0.295, OR = 1.517 (0.695–3.311); Adjusted statistics P =	9	7	P = 0.026, OR = 0.135 (0.023 – 0.787); Adjusted statistics P =
	GA	63	31	0.261, OR = 1.621 (0.698– 3.764)	19	2	0.076, OR = 0.114 (0.010– 1.258)
Medication (All SSRIs except Esc)					Medication (only esc)		
		Clinical NR	Clinical R	Statistics*	Clinical NR	Clinical R	Statistics*
Over dominant 2A	GG + AA	99	31	P = 0.133, OR = 1.571(0.871– 2.834) Adjusted stat. P = 0.092, OR = 1.691,	23	18	P = 0.013 [#] , OR = 0.135(0.028– 0.654)
	GA	63	31	(0.918–3.115)	19	2	Adjusted stat = P = 0.019, OR = 0.114 (0.019–0.701)
Statistics* = reports statistically significant crude statistics for moderators and statistically significant results when the evaluation was adjusted with age, gender and ethnicity (adjusted statistics); Note: NR = non response; R = response; Esc = escitalopram, SSRI = selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors. Statistics* with Bonferonni corrections involved the division of the common alpha of 0.05 divided by the number of test conducted (5) which is 0.05/5 = 0.01							

Table 4 continued:

Marital status = Single = 1					Marital status = Married = 2		
		Clinical NR	Clinical R	Statistics*	Clinical NR	Clinical R	Statistics*
Homozygous model 1A	CC	37	23	P = 0.054 (OR = 0.214 (CI = 0.045– 1.025)); Adjusted statistics P = 0.046, OR = 0.194 (0.039– 0.969)	54	21	P = 0.915, OR = 1.052 (0.417– 2.653); Adjusted statistics P = 0.795, OR = 1.145 (0.413– 3.173)
	GG	15	2		22	9	
Marital status = 1							
		Clinical NR	Clinical R	Statistics*	Clinical NR	Clinical R	Statistics*
Dominant model 1A	CC + CG	61	35	P = 0.052 (OR = 0.232 (CI = 0.050– 1.076)); Adjusted statistics P = 0.057, OR = 0.220 (0.046– 1.045)	106	36	P = 0.672, OR = 1.205 (0.508– 2.854); Adjusted statistics P = 0.703, OR = 1.192 (0.484– 2.937)
	GG	15	2		22	9	
Low educational status = 1				High educational status = 2			
		Clinical NR	Clinical R	Statistics*	Clinical NR	Clinical R	Statistics
Recessive 2A	GG	31	5	P = 0.071 (OR = 2.566 (CI = 0.924–7.124; Adjusted statistics P = 0.130, OR = 2.279 (0.785– 6.613)	15	14	P = 0.039, OR = 0.407 (0.174– 0.956); Adjusted statistics P = 0.071, OR = 0.439 (0.179– 1.073)
	AA + GA	87	36		71	27	
	GG + AA	63	31		19	2	
Statistics* = reports statistically significant crude statistics for moderators and statistically significant results when the evaluation was adjusted with age, gender and ethnicity (adjusted statistics) ;Note: NR = non response; R = response; Esc = escitalopram, SSRI = selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors. Statistics* with Bonferonni corrections involved the division of the common alpha of 0.05 divided by the number of test conducted (5) which is 0.05/5 = 0.01							

Table 4 Continued:

		Irritability = No			Irritability = Yes		
		Clinical NR	Clinical R	Statistics*	Clinical NR	Clinical R	Statistics*
Recessive model 1A	CC	77	31	P = 0.741 (OR = 0.908 (CI = 0.512– 1.610));	11	12	P = 0.044, OR = 0.244 (0.062– 0.965);
	CG + GG	93	34	Adjusted statistics P = 0.810, OR = 0.930 (0.516– 1.677)	15	4	Adjusted statistics P = 0.019, OR = 0.146 (0.026– 0.733)
		Irritability = No			Irritability = Yes		
		Clinical NR	Clinical R	Statistics*	Clinical NR	Clinical R	Statistics*
Homozygous model 1A	CC	77	31	P = 0.542 (OR = 0.781 (CI = 0.352–1.730); Adjusted statistics P = 0.492, OR = 0.741 (0.315– 1.741)	11	12	P = 1.000 (OR = 0.00 (CI = 0.000 - -); Adjusted statistics P = 1.000, OR = 0.00 (0.00 - -)
	GG	35	11		1	0	
		Irritability = No			Irritability = Yes		
		Clinical NR	Clinical R	Statistics*	Clinical NR	Clinical R	Statistics*
Heterozygous model 1A	CC	77	31	P = 0.963 (OR = 0.985 (CI = 0.520–1.864	11	12	P = 0.057, OR = 0.262 (0.066–1.041) Adjusted statistics P = 0.026, OR = 0.157 (0.031– 0.798)
	CG	58	23	Adjusted statistics P = 0.987, OR = 1.006 (0.524– 1.928)	14	4	
		Irritability = No			Irritability = Yes		
		Clinical NR	Clinical R	Statistics*	Clinical NR	Clinical R	Statistics*
Over dominant Model 1A	CC + GG	112	42	P = 0.855, OR = 1.057 (0.581–1.925) ; Adjusted statistics P = 0.798, OR = 1.082 (0.592– 1.976)	12	12	P = 0.073, OR = 0.286 (0.073 – 1.124); Adjusted statistics P = 0.033, OR = 0.173 (0.035– 0.868)
	CG	58	23		14	4	

Statistics* = reports statistically significant crude statistics for moderators and statistically significant results when the evaluation was adjusted with age, gender and ethnicity (adjusted statistics); Note: NR = non response; R= response; Esc= escitalopram, SSRI = selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors. Statistics* with Bonferonni corrections involved the division of the common alpha of 0.05 divided by the number of test conducted (5) which is $0.05/5 = 0.01$.

Table 4; Continued

		Effectiveness = No			Effectiveness = Yes		
		Clinical NR	Clinical R	Statistics*	Clinical NR	Clinical R	Statistics*
Recessive 1A	CC	46	29	P = 0.094, OR = 0.579 (0.305–1.098); Adjusted statistics P = 0.056, OR = 0.512 (0.258–1.016)	36	12	P = 0.430, OR = 0.656 (0.230–1.869); Adjusted statistics P = 0.582, OR = 0.736 (0.248–2.190)
	CG + GG	74	27		32	7	
Interpersonal_Sensitivity =No				Interpersonal_Sensitivity = Yes			
		Clinical NR	Clinical R	Statistics*	Clinical NR	Clinical R	Statistics*
Dominant 1A	CC + CG	117	42	P = 0.074, OR = 0.321, (0.092–1.117); Adjusted statistics P = 0.097, OR = 0.343 (0.097–1.215)	40	28	P = 0.851, OR = 1.111 (0.370–3.336); Adjusted statistics P = 0.705, OR = 0.789 (0.232–2.683)
	GG	26	3		9	7	
Interpersonal_Sensitivity = No				Interpersonal_Sensitivity = Yes			
		Clinical NR	Clinical R	Statistics*	Clinical NR	Clinical R	Statistics*
Homozygous model 1A	CC	66	24	P = 0.080, OR = 0.317, (0.088–1.145); Adjusted statistics P = 0.102, OR = 0.325 (0.084–1.248)	21	19	P = 0.079, OR = 0.860, (0.268–2.760); Adjusted statistics P = 0.677, OR = 0.748 (0.191–2.929)
	GG	26	3		9	7	
Family income = mLow				Family income = High			
		Clinical NR	Clinical R	Statistics*	Clinical NR	Clinical R	Statistics*
Recessive 2A	GG	35	11	P = 0.293, OR = 0.150, (0.704–3.198); Adjusted statistics P = 0.462, OR =	11	8	P = 0.056, OR = 0.344 (0.115–1.027); Adjusted statistics P = 0.065, OR =
	AA + GA	106	50		52	13	

Effectiveness = No	Effectiveness = Yes
1.347 (0.608–2.986)	0.340 (0.108–1.071)
Statistics* = reports statistically significant crude statistics for moderators and statistically significant results when the evaluation was adjusted with age, gender and ethnicity (adjusted statistics); Note: NR = non response; R = response; Esc = escitalopram, SSRI = selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors. Statistics* with Bonferonni corrections involved the division of the common alpha of 0.05 divided by the number of test conducted (5) which is 0.05/5 = 0.01.	

MDD patients who had the GG + AA genotype for the HTR2A-rs6311 polymorphism and received escitalopram antidepressant were significantly (over-dominant model (crude statistics: P = 0.013, OR = 0.135(0.028–0.654); Adjusted statistics: P = 0.019, OR = 0.114 (0.019–0.701)) less likely to respond to treatment when compared to those with the AA genotype. The CG + GG genotype (recessive model) of HTR1A-rs6295 gene polymorphism was associated with significantly (recessive model (crude statistics: P = 0.044, OR = 0.244 (0.062–0.965)); Adjusted statistics: P = 0.019, OR = 0.146 (0.026–0.733)) reduced likelihood of responding to antidepressant treatment among the MDD patients with the irritability personality trait. A similar significant association was observed for CG genotype (Heterozygous model (Adjusted statistics: P = 0.026, OR = 0.157 (0.031–0.798))) and over-dominant model (Adjusted statistics: P = 0.033, OR = 0.173 (0.035–0.868)) of HTR1A-rs6295 gene polymorphism with reduced likelihood of treatment response in Irritable MDD patients.

Discussion

The patients in this study were largely young, employed, females, of low socioeconomic status, married (including previously married (widowed, separated and divorced)), well-educated with no family history of psychiatric illness. Although, the proportion of responders is higher than the proportion of non-responder, distribution of the socio-demographic features based on treatment outcome was similar to that of the combined study population described earlier. None of the socio-demographic features evaluated in the current study was statistically significantly associated with SSRI treatment outcome. However, the anxious-worrying, self-criticism and interpersonal sensitivity personality traits were associated with SSRI treatment response among the MDD patients. In the pharmacogenetic arm of the current study, patients who were single and had an irritable personality type were more likely to have a poor response to SSRI treatment when they have the GG genotype (or carry the G-allele) of HTR1A-rs6295 polymorphism. When all MDD patients who have homozygous genotype (the GG + AA genotype) for the HTR2A-rs6311 polymorphism were combined together and compared to those with the heterozygote genotype (GA of HTR2A-rs6311), the patients with the later genotype were significantly less likely to respond to treatment with escitalopram. The association between the genotypes of the HTR2A-rs6311 polymorphism with treatment outcome was not observed among patients treated with other SSRI medication. Although adjustment of the alpha value for multiple testing did not support the association result, nevertheless, the potential for association remains plausible in such scenario when more samples are recruited into the study .

The socio-demographic features of age and gender for the study participants in this study was similar to those in earlier studies that evaluated the role of socio-demographic and clinical features in relations to MDD treatment outcome (Papakostas and Larsen, 2011; De Carlo et al., 2016). The literature were awash with reports for association between high harm avoidance (HA), high novelty seeking (NS) and low self-directedness scores with non-response to AD treatments (Paavonen et al., 2016; Takahashi et al., 2013b; Takahashi et al., 2013a; Kaneda et al., 2011; Kampman and Poutanen, 2011; Corruble et al., 2002; Sato et al., 1999; Black and Sheline, 1997). Personality features appear to consistently play a role in treatment outcome. The personality features identified to be associated with the SSRI treatment response in this study (anxious worrying, self-criticism and interpersonal sensitivity) were very different from the personality features highlighted in the literature. The reason for the disparity in the specific personality feature highlighted in the earlier study and the current one, may stem from the differences in the study design in terms of study participants evaluated (treatment resistant MDD vs unipolar MDD only), medication (Paroxetine or other SSRI) used for treatment, definition of the treatment response phenotype as well as the study sample size and recruitment criteria.

In the literature, the role of maladaptive responses to negative feelings in the aetiology and persistence of depressive episodes have been reported (Ehret et al., 2015). The earliest symptom of depression that was commonly attenuated during SSRI treatment was 'biased emotional information processing towards negative emotions', and other appreciable clinical improvement takes place weeks after commencement of treatment (Booij & Van der Does, 2011; Bouhuys, et al., 1999; Browning, et al.2007; Harmer et al., 2009; Harmer, et al., 2003; Rantamäki & Yalcin, 2016). Self-criticism has been defined as a response pattern to perceived failure and it is characterized by self-judgment and self-evaluation that are entirely negative (Gilbert, Clarke, Hempel, Miles, & Irons, 2004). The higher the level of negative emotions directed at oneself (very self-critical) with associated irritability and poor capacity to cope with these emotions the higher the risk for individuals to develop a depressive episode that can become persistent (Gilbert et al., 2004; Mauas et al., 2014). High grade of self-criticism appears to be remedied through some key therapeutic focus including inter-personal relationship, perfectionism as well as issues of self-esteem (Zimmermann et al., 2012; Zeeck et al., 2020). The irritability feature is well known to affect the capacity for self-regulation with associated higher level of depression and thus remains a predictor of depression in later life (Burton, 1857; Freud, 1915; Vidal-Ribs et al., 2016, Burke et al., 2005). The association between irritability and depression appears to have a shared genetic risk as demonstrated in earlier studies among different population (Sweden, United Kingdom and United States of America) of adolescent twins followed prospectively (Stringaria et al., 2012; Savage et al., 2015). The relationship between depression and irritability extends to the similarity in the types of medication, serotonin reuptake inhibitor (SRI), atomoxetine and norepinephrine, which are effective in treating both conditions (Fava and Rosenbaum, 1999; Garland and Weiss, 1996; Armenteros and Lewis, 2002). Ameliorating the irritability features can also play a key role in attenuating the risk of developing depression and also the risk for its persistence.

There are numerous studies that evaluated the role of anxious-depression (depression with high level of anxiety symptoms) in predicting antidepressant treatment outcome (Trivedi et al., 2006; Fava et al., 1997;

Fava et al., 2007; Fava et al., 2008; Rush et al., 2008; Howland et al., 2008; Papakostas et al., 2008; Souery et al., 2007; Nelson et al., 2009; Nelson et al., 2010; Mujittapha et al., 2020). Presence of the anxious-depression trait was associated with poor antidepressant treatment efficacy response (Papakostas et al., 2011).

A role of personality features of irritability was observed to moderate the association of the genotype of HTR1A-rs6295 gene polymorphism with treatment efficacy outcome. The consistency in the allele/genotype implicated in poor treatment response for the different hereditary models (recessive, homozygous and over-dominant) of the HTR1A-rs6295 gene polymorphism among patients with the irritability features was also a pointer at the veracity of the association. This finding elaborates the earlier underlying relationship shared between depression and irritability as well as increase the usefulness of that information for the goal for personalized medicine. Thus, narrowing the poor response phenotypes to irritable MDD patients with the GG genotype (or carry the G-allele) of HTR1A-rs6295 polymorphism. It also lends credence to the fact that depression is a complex of syndromes that may need to be unbundled into its components for optimum identification of endophenotypic markers (Badamasi et al., 2019).

In the literature, there are numerous studies that reported higher incidence of mental disorder such as depression among previously married (divorced/widowed) individuals and it was usually attributed to social isolation and stigma that precedes marital distress (Patel et al., 2006; Baig et al., 2015; Nmabi et al., 2009). Similarly, some earlier studies reported that the incidence of depression among married women was also higher when compared to the married men. And this had been attributed to issues such as migration to husbands place after marriage, marital separation due to transfer of husband and pregnancy. Other factors reported included; miscarriage/abortion, disturbance of sexual cycle attributable to dysmenorrhea/ menopause and weight gain/loss (Shaily, 2019; Prakash, 2011). Thus, single (un-married) status or married status (including previously married) can both be implicated in the development of depression. In the current study, the finding that single un-married patients carrying the GG genotype of HTR1A-rs6295 were more likely to report failure to respond to treatment was very novel. Although, there are association studies between treatment outcome and marital status, there were no literature report on the role of marital status in moderating the association between genotype of HTR1A-rs6295 with treatment efficacy response. Thus, there is need for replication of this findings in future studies.

There are pharmacogenetic studies that had revealed an association between antidepressant treatment response for MDD patients with HTR2A-rs6311 and other HTR2A gene polymorphisms such as; rs7997012, rs6313, rs1928040, rs6308, rs6304, and rs677702 (Choi et al., 2004; McMahon et al., 2006; Kato et al., 2006; Wilkie et al., 2009). Specifically, in a cohort of Caucasian patients, the heterozygous (C/T) genotype for HTR2A- rs6314 polymorphism was associated with improved health following treatment with antidepressant. In another study in a mixed population of Caucasians and a few African-Americans, the A-allele of HTR2A-rs7997012 was associated with an 18% increase in absolute risk for antidepressant treatment response (McMahon et al., 2006). In a study populated with Japanese MDD

patients receiving fluvoxamine treatment for 6 weeks, the assessment for association between the genotypes of HTR2A-rs6311 with treatment response was not statistically significant (Sato et al., 2002). And this was not similar to the result of another study among Japanese patients treated with fluvoxamine for 6 weeks in which, the -1438G/G genotype of HTR2A was associated with a good response to fluvoxamine (SSRIs) (Kato et al., 2006). The probable reason for the difference in association finding was probably because the latter study recruited patients with recurrent MDD while the former study involved a population of unipolar MDD patients. This literature reports suggest that the underlying association between genotypes of HTR2A-rs6311 with fluvoxamine treatment response depends on the phenotype of MDD evaluated. The current study observed an association between GA genotypes of HTR2A-rs6311 **with poor** treatment response among patients treated with escitalopram only (the association was not significant among patients treated with other SSRIs). This was in keeping with the earlier reports that suggested that fluvoxamine was only effective in phenotypes of MDD other than the unipolar variant, which was the population of study participants in the current study. It is important to note that the comparator study from the literature involved only the completed data from 54 unipolar MDD patients receiving treatment with fluvoxamine for 6 weeks while the fluvoxamine (with few on sertraline) study wing in the current study involved 143 or 224 study participants on SSRI (mainly fluvoxamine) for 6 weeks. Thus, suggesting that a similar association result may be obtained even with higher sample size of well-defined phenotypes of MDD treatment outcome with genotypes of HTR2A-rs6311 polymorphism. The basis for the current association finding may involve a number of features especially related to the activity of the alleles. Specifically, the mutant allele for HTR2A-rs6311 was characterized with increased expression of the encoded receptors and the wild variant was associated with low expression (Newman-Tancredi and Albert, 2012; Falkenberg et al., 2011; Parsey et al., 2006; Albert et al 2004; Lemonde et al., 2003; Stevenson and Bishop, 2013). Low expression of the HTR2A-rs6311 gene predispose patients to high levels of SSRI activities. Thus, from the current results, it appears that the heterozygote genotype may be the worst genotype for the optimal activity of the escitalopram antidepressant medication in treating unipolar MDD (Colonna et al., 2005; Llorca et al., 2005; Wade et al., 2002; Ventura et al., 2007; Montgomery et al., 2004). Another feature that may underlie the current association finding may be related to the strong presence of the irritability personality feature in the unipolar MDD patients. The presence of the irritability feature adds an additional layer of burden to the clinical set up of the patients, thus, phenotypically tilting the clinical scenario to a moderate-severe status for the unipolar depression, which is poorly managed with escitalopram among patients with the GA genotype of HTR2A-rs6311 polymorphism (Colonna et al., 2005; Llorca et al., 2005; Wade et al., 2002; Kasper et al., 2009; Ventura et al., 2007; Montgomery et al., 2004).

Conclusion

The association between the CG genotype of the HTR1A-rs6295 gene polymorphism with poor SSRI treatment response is assuredly elaborated among patients that have an irritable personality type. A role of marital status in moderating the association between genotype of HTR1A-rs6295 with treatment efficacy response was identified. There was a role of treatment type (escitalopram) in the association

between GA-HTR2A-rs6311 genotype with treatment response. Although the different associations identified did not survive the Bonferonni corrections, nevertheless, the current study identified the potential for replicating an association in a larger study.

Declarations

Ethical Statement

This study was approved by the Medical Research Ethics Committee of the Ministry of Health Malaysia (NMRR 14-688-19696). Written consent was obtained from all participants.

Acknowledgement

Universiti Putra Malaysia is thanked for funding this project via the Group Initiative Putra Grant (GP/IPB/2013/9415702). We thank the Director-General of Health Malaysia for his permission to publish this study (NMRR-14-688-19696). We thank Bayero University Kano (Nigeria) for sponsoring the Ph.D fellowship of IBM. We also thank the patients and staff of the hospitals involved, as well as Dr. Azizul Awaluddin, Dr. Sharifah Suziah Syed Mokhtar, Dr. Mazni Mat Junus, Dr. Elinda Tunan, Dr. Su Peng Loh, Prof Rozita Rosli, Dr. Yin Yee Tey, Dr. Vaidehi Ulanganathan, Ms. Aldoghachi Asraa Faris Abdulridha, Mr. Khairul Aiman Bin Lokman, Ms. Siti Zubaidah Redzuan, and all those who have assisted in one way or another.

Funding

The research was funded by Putra grant GP-IPB/2013/9415702. IBM's Ph.D was sponsored by Bayero University Kano through the TETFund scholarship and University fellowship award.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no competing interests.

References

1. Akhtar-Danesh, N and Landeen, J. (2007). Relation between depression and sociodemographic factors International Journal of Mental Health Systems. 1:4 doi:10.1186/1752-4458-1-4
2. Aldoghachi AF, Tor YS, Redzun SZ, Lokman KAB, Razaq NAA, Shahbudin AF, et al. (2019) Screening of *brain-derived neurotrophic factor (BDNF)* single nucleotide polymorphisms and plasma BDNF levels among Malaysian major depressive disorder patients. PLoS ONE 14(1): e0211241. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0211241>
3. American Psychiatric Association (2000). Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders. 4th ed., text revision. Washington, D.C., American Psychiatric Association,.

4. Armenteros JL, Lewis JE (2002). Citalopram treatment for impulsive aggression in children and adolescents: an open pilot study. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*;41(5):522–9.
5. Badamasi IM, Ibrahim N; Lye M-S; Ling K-H; Abdul Razak NA; Stanslas J (2021). Serotonergic receptor gene polymorphism and response to selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors in ethnic Malay patients with first episode of major depressive disorder. *The Pharmacogenomics Journal* <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41397-021-00228-6>.
6. Badamasi IM, Lye MS, Ibrahim N, Stanslas J. (2019). Genetic endophenotypes for insomnia of major depressive disorder and treatment-induced insomnia. *J Neural Transm (Vienna)*. 126(6):711-722. doi: 10.1007/s00702-019-02014-y. Epub 2019 May 18. PMID: 31111219.
7. Baig MG, Baderuzzaman, Athar F, (2015). Psychiatric morbidity in married females living away from their spouses attending the psychiatry clinic in a tertiary care, teaching hospital. *Int J Res Med Sci* 3 2086-2092.
8. Black, K.J., Sheline, Y.I., (1997). Personality disorder scores improve with effective pharmacotherapy of depression. *J. Affect. Disord.* 43, 11-18.
9. Booij, L., & Van der Does, A. J. W. (2011). Emotional processing as a predictor of symptom change: An acute tryptophan depletion study in depressed patients. *European Neuropsychopharmacology*, 21(5), 379–383.
10. Bouhuys, A. L., Geerts, E., & Gordijn, M. C. (1999). Depressed patients' perceptions of facial emotions in depressed and remitted states are associated with relapse: a longitudinal study. *J Nerv Ment Dis*, 187(10), 595–602.
11. Browning, M., Reid, C., Cowen, P. J., Goodwin, G. M., & Harmer, C. J. (2007). A single dose of citalopram increases fear recognition in healthy subjects. *Journal of Psychopharmacology*, 21(7), 684–690.
12. Burke JD, Loeber R, Lahey BB, (2005). Developmental transitions among affective and behavioral disorders in adolescent boys. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry*; 46(11):1200–10.
13. Burton R (1857). The anatomy of melancholy. London: JW Moore;
14. Choi, M. J., Lee, H. J., Ham, B. J., Cha, J. H., Ryu, S. H., & Lee, M. S. (2004). Association between major depressive disorder and the -1438A/G polymorphism of the serotonin 2A receptor gene. *Neuropsychobiology*, 49(1), 38–41.
15. Colonna, L., Andersen, H.F., Reines, EH., (2005). A randomised, double-blind, 24-week study of escitalopram (10 mg/day) versus citalopram (20 mg/day) in primary care patients with major depressive disorder. *Current Medical Research and Opinion* 21, 1659–1668. Condorelli, D. F., Dell’Albani, P., Mudò, G., Timmusk, T., & Belluardo, N. (1994). Expression of neurotrophins and their receptors in primary astroglial cultures: induction by cyclic AMP-elevating agents. *Journal of Neurochemistry*, 63, 509– 516.
16. Corruble, E., Duret, C., Pelissolo, A., Falissard, B., Guelfi, J.D., (2002). Early and delayed personality changes associated with depression recovery? A one-year follow-up study. *Psychiatry Res.* 109, 17–25.

17. Curry J, Rohde P, Simons A, Silva S, Vitiello B, Kratochvil C, Reinecke M, Feeny N, Wells K, Pathak S, Weller E, Rosenberg D, Kennard B, Robins M, Ginsburg G, March J; (2006)TADS Team. Predictors and moderators of acute outcome in the Treatment for Adolescents with Depression Study (TADS). *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*;45(12):1427-39. doi: 10.1097/01.chi.0000240838.78984.e2. PMID: 17135988.
18. De Carlo, V., Calati, R., & Serretti, A. (2016). *Socio-demographic and clinical predictors of non-response/non-remission in treatment resistant depressed patients: A systematic review. Psychiatry Research, 240, 421–430.* doi:10.1016/j.psychres.2016.04.03
19. Ehret A.M., Joormann, J. and Berking, M (2015) Examining risk and resilience factors for depression: The role of self-criticism and self-compassion, *Cognition and Emotion*, 29:8, 1496-1504, DOI: 10.1080/02699931.2014.992394
20. Fairchild, A. J., & MacKinnon, D. P. (2009). A general model for testing mediation and moderation effects. *Prevention science: the official journal of the Society for Prevention Research, 10*(2), 87–99. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11121-008-0109-6>
21. Falkenberg, V.R., Gurbaxani, B.M., Unger, E.R. Rajeevan M.S. (2011). Functional Genomics of Serotonin Receptor 2A (HTR2A): Interaction of Polymorphism, Methylation, Expression and Disease Association. *Neuromol Med.* 13(1), 66-76
22. Fava M, Martinez JM, Greist J, Marangell LB, Brown E, Chen L, Wohlreich MM (2007) The efficacy and tolerability of duloxetine in the treatment of anxious versus non-anxious depression: a posthoc analysis of an open label outpatient study. *Ann Clin Psychiatry* 19(3):187–195
23. Fava M, Rosenbaum JF (1999). Anger attacks in patients with depression. *J Clin Psychiatry*;60(15):21–4.
24. Fava M, Rush AJ, Alpert JE, Balasubramani GK, Wisniewski SR, Carmin CN, Biggs MM, Zisook S, Leuchter A, Howland R, Warden D, Trivedi MH (2008) Difference in treatment outcome in outpatients with anxious versus nonanxious depression: a STAR*D report. *Am J Psychiatry* 165(3):342–351
25. Fava M, Uebelacker LA, Alpert JE, Nierenberg AA, Pava JA, Rosenbaum JF (1997) Major depressive subtypes and treatment response. *Biol Psychiatry* 42(7):568–576
26. Freud S (1915). *Trauer und Melancholie*. Frankfurt (Germany): Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag;
27. Garland EJ, Weiss M. (1996). Case study: obsessive difficult temperament and its response to serotonergic medication. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*;35(7):916–20.
28. Gilbert, P., Clarke, M., Hempel, S., Miles, J. N. V., & Irons, C. (2004). Criticizing and reassuring oneself: An exploration of forms, styles and reasons in female students. *The British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 41, 31–50. doi:10.1348/014466504772812959
29. Harmer, C. J., Hill, S. A., Taylor, M. J., Cowen, P. J., & Goodwin, G. M. (2003). Toward a neuropsychological theory of antidepressant drug action: Increase in positive emotional bias after potentiation of norepinephrine activity. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 160(5), 990–992.
30. Harmer, C. J., O’Sullivan, U., Favaron, E., Massey-Chase, R., Ayres, R., Reinecke, A., Goodwin G. M., Cowen, P. J. (2009). Effect of acute antidepressant administration on negative affective bias in

- depressed patients. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 166(10), 1178–1184.
31. Howland RH, Wilson MG, Kornstein SG, Clayton AH, Trivedi MH, Wohlreich MM, Fava M (2008) Factors predicting reduced antidepressant response: experience with the SNRI duloxetine in patients with major depression. *Ann Clin Psychiatry* 20(4): 209–218
<https://doi.org/10.31117/neuroscirn.v2i3.34>
 32. Kampman, O., Poutanen, O., 2011. Can onset and recovery in depression be predicted by temperament? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J. Affect. Disord.* 135, 20–27
 33. Kaneda, A., Yasui-Furukori, N., Nakagami, T., Sato, Y., Kaneko, S., (2011). The influence of personality factors on paroxetine response time in patients with major depression. *J. Affect. Disord.* 135, 321–325
 34. Kato, M., Fukuda, T., Wakeno, M., Fukuda, K., Okugawa, G., Ikenaga, Y., Yamashita, M., Takekita, Y., Nobuhara K., Azuma J., Kinoshita, T. (2006). Effects of the serotonin type 2A, 3A and 3B receptor and the serotonin transporter genes on paroxetine and fluvoxamine efficacy and adverse drug reactions in depressed Japanese patients. *Neuropsychobiology*, 53(4), 186–195.
 35. Kazdin AE (2007). Mediators and mechanisms of change in psychotherapy research. *Annu Rev Clin Psychol.*;3:01-27.
 36. Kessler RC, Berglund P, Demler O, Jin R, Koretz D, Merikangas KR, Rush AJ, Walters EE, Wang PS, (2003). The Epidemiology of Major Depressive Disorder: Results From the National Comorbidity Survey Replication (NCS-R). *JAMA.* ;289(23):3095–3105. doi:10.1001/jama.289.23.3095
 37. Krishnan V, Nestler EJ. (2008). The molecular neurobiology of depression. *Nature*; 455:894–902. [PubMed: 18923511].
 38. L., Nierenberg, A. A., Lebowitz, B. D., Biggs, M. M., Luther, J. F., ShoresWilson, K., Rush, A. J. (2006). Medication Augmentation after the Failure of SSRIs for Depression. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 354(12), 1243–1252.
 39. Lemonde, S., Turecki, G., Bakish, D., Du, L., Hrdina, P. D., Bown, C. D., Sequeira, A., Kushwaha, N., Morris, S.J., Basak, A., Ou, X-M., Albert, P. R. (2003). Impaired repression at a 5-hydroxytryptamine 1A receptor gene polymorphism associated with major depression and suicide. *The Journal of Neuroscience: The Official Journal of the Society for Neuroscience*, 23(25), 8788–8799.
 40. Llorca, P-M., Despiégl, N., Verpillat P, Azorin, J-M. (2005). Efficacy of escitalopram in patients with severe depression: A pooled analysis. *International Journal of Clinical Practice* 59(3), 268-75.
 41. Lye MS, Tey YY, Tor YS, Shahabudin AF, Ibrahim N, Ling KH, Stanslas J, Loh SP, Rosli R, Lokman KA, Badamasi IM, Faris-Aldoghachi A, Abdul Razak NA (2020b). Predictors of recurrence of major depressive disorder. *PLoS One*. 15(3):e0230363. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0230363. PMID: 32191745; PMCID: PMC7082055.
 42. Lye, M.-S., Tor, Y.-S., Tey, Y.-Y., Shahabudin, A., Loh, S.-P., Ibrahim, N., ... Ling, K.-H. (2020a). *Bsm1-Apal-Taql TAC (BAT) Haplotype of Vitamin D Receptor Gene Is Associated with Increased Risk of Major Depressive Disorder*. *Journal of Molecular Neuroscience*. doi:10.1007/s12031-020-01719-0.

43. Lye, M.-S., Tor, Y.-S., Tey, Y.-Y., Shahbudin, A., Loh, S.-P., Ibrahim, N., ... Ling, K.-H. Stanslas J., Rosli, R (2019). Zinc transporter-3 [SLC30A3 (rs11126936)] polymorphism is associated with major depressive disorder in Asian subjects . *Neuroscience Research Notes* 2(3):20-28
44. Mauas V, Kopala-Sibley DC, Zuroff DC. (2014) Depressive symptoms in the transition to menopause: the roles of irritability, personality vulnerability, and self-regulation. *Arch Womens Ment Health*. Aug;17(4):279-89. doi: 10.1007/s00737-014-0434-7. Epub 2014 Jun 24. PMID: 24957780.
45. McMahon, F. J., Buervenich, S., Charney, D., Lipsky, R., Rush, A. J., Wilson, A. F., Manji, H. (2006). Variation in the gene encoding the serotonin 2A receptor is associated with outcome of antidepressant treatment. *American Journal of Human Genetics*, 78(5), 804–814.
46. Montgomery SA, Huusom AKT, Bothmer J (2004). A randomised study comparing escitalopram with venlafaxine XR in patients in primary care with major depressive disorder. *Neuropsychobiology* 50:57–64.
47. **Mujittapha U. Sirajo**, Lukman F. Owolabi, Abubakar M, Sagir M. Saleh, Kabir Shehu, Esther O. Oyeleke (2020). Proposed Neuromorphological Mechanism of Dopamine-2 Receptor Blocker model of Parkinsonism. *Nig. J. Neurosci.* 11(1):21-27. DOI: 10.47081/njn2020.11.1/003 ISSN 1116-4182
48. Nambi S. (2009) Marriage, mental health and the Indian legislation. *Indian J Psychiatry* 47: 3-14.
49. Nelson JC (2010) Anxiety does not predict response to duloxetine in major depression: results of a pooled analysis of individual patient data from 11 placebo-controlled trials. *Depress Anxiety* 27(1):12–18
50. Nelson JC, Delucchi K, Schneider LS (2009) Anxiety does not predict response to antidepressant treatment in late life depression: results of a meta-analysis. *Int J Geriatr Psychiatry* 24(5): 539–544
51. Newman-Tancredi, Adrian & Albert, Paul. (2012). Gene polymorphism at serotonin 5-HT1A receptors: Moving toward personalized medicine for psychosis and mood deficits?. Chapter 15, Nova Publishers
52. Paavonen, V., Luoto, K., Koivukangas, A., Lassila, A., Leinonen, E., Kampman, O., (2016). Temperament and character profiles associated with depression and treatment response in patients with or without comorbid substance abuse. *Psychiatry Res.* 245, 250–258.
53. Papakostas G.I., Larsen K (2011). Testing anxious depression as a predictor and moderator of symptom improvement in major depressive disorder during treatment with escitalopram. *Eur Arch Psychiatry Clin Neurosci.* 261:147–156. DOI 10.1007/s00406-010-0149-3.
54. Papakostas GI, McGrath P, Stewart J, Charles D, Chen Y, Mischoulon D, Dording C, Fava M (2008) Psychic and somatic anxiety symptoms as predictors of response to fluoxetine in major depressive disorder. *Psychiatry Res* 161(1):116–120
55. Parsey, R. V, Olvet, D. M., Oquendo, M. a, Huang, Y., Ogden, R. T., & Mann, J. J. (2006). Higher 5-HT1A receptor binding potential during a major depressive episode predicts poor treatment response: preliminary data from a naturalistic study. *Neuropsychopharmacology*, 31, 1745-1749.
56. Patel V, Kirkwood BR, Pednekar S, (2006). Risk factors for common mental disorders in women Population-based longitudinal study. *Br J Psychiatry* 189 547-555.

57. Prakash P. ((2011) Gender issues in life event research in India: A critical appraisal of the presumptive stressful life events scale. *Asian J Psychiatr* 4 19-21.
58. Rantamäki, T., & Yalcin, I. (2016). Antidepressant drug action - From rapid changes on network function to network rewiring. *Progress in Neuro-Psychopharmacology and Biological Psychiatry*, 64, 285–292.
59. Rush AJ, Wisniewski SR, Warden D, Luther JF, Davis LL, Fava M, Nierenberg AA, Trivedi MH (2008) Selecting among secondstep antidepressant medication monotherapies: predictive value of clinical, demographic, or first-step treatment features. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 65(8):870–880
60. Rush AJ, Wisniewski SR, Warden D, Luther JF, Davis LL, Fava M, Nierenberg AA, Trivedi MH (2008) Selecting among secondstep antidepressant medication monotherapies: predictive value of clinical, demographic, or first-step treatment features. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 65(8):870–880
61. Sato, T., Hirano, S., Narita, T., Kusunoki, K., Kato, J., Goto, M., (1999). Temperament and character inventory dimensions as a predictor of response to antidepressant treatment in major depression. *J. Affect. Disord.* 56, 153–161.
62. Savage J, Verhulst B, Copeland W, (2015). A genetically informed study of the longitudinal relation between irritability and anxious/depressed symptoms. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*;54(5):377–84.
63. Shaily Mina. Predictors of Marriage in Psychiatric Illness: A Review of Literature. *Journal of Psychiatry and Psychiatric Disorders* 3 (2019): 014-022.
64. Shawcross CR, Tyrer P (1985) Influence of personality on response to monoamine oxidase inhibitors and tricyclic antidepressants. *J Psychiatr Res*; 19:557-562.
65. Souery D, Oswald P, Massat I, Bailer U, Bollen J, Demyttenaere K, Kasper S, Lecrubier Y, Montgomery S, Serretti A, Zohar J, Mendlewicz J, Group for the Study of Resistant Depression (2007) Clinical factors associated with treatment resistance in major depressive disorder: results from a European multicenter study. *J Clin Psychiatry* 68(7):1062–1070
66. Stevenson, J.M., Bishop, J.R. (2013). Antidepressant Tolerability and Potential Clinical Implications of Serotonin-2A Receptor Genotypes. *Clinic Pharmacol Biopharmaceut*, 2, 2
67. Stringaris A, Zavos H, Leibenluft E, (2012). Adolescent irritability: phenotypic associations and genetic links with depressed mood. *Am J Psychiatry*;169(1): 47–54.
68. Takahashi, M., Shirayama, Y., Muneoka, K., Suzuki, M., Sato, K., Hashimoto, K., 2013Aa. Low openness on the revised NEO personality inventory as a risk factor for treatment resistant depression. *PLoS One* 8, e71964.
69. Takahashi, M., Shirayama, Y., Muneoka, K., Suzuki, M., Sato, K., Hashimoto, K., (2013a). Low openness on the revised NEO personality inventory as a risk factor for treatment-resistant depression. *PLoS One* 8, e71964.
70. Trivedi MH, Rush AJ, Wisniewski SR, Nierenberg AA, Warden D, Ritz L, Norquist G, Howland RH, Lebowitz B, McGrath PJ, Shores-Wilson K, Biggs MM, Balasubramani GK, Fava M (2006) STAR*D

- study team. Evaluation of outcomes with citalopram for depression using measurement-based care in STAR*D: implications for clinical practice. *Am J Psychiatry* 163(1):28–40.
71. Trivedi MH, Rush AJ, Wisniewski SR, Nierenberg AA, Warden D, Ritz L, Norquist G, Howland RH, Lebowitz B, McGrath PJ, Shores-Wilson K, Biggs MM, Balasubramani GK, Fava M. (2006) Evaluation of outcomes with citalopram for depression using measurement-based care in STAR*D: implications for clinical practice. *Am J Psychiatry*, 163:28–40
 72. Trivedi, M. H., Fava, M., Wisniewski, S. R., Thase, M. E., Quitkin, F., Warden, D., Ritz,
 73. Tyrer P, Casey P, Gall J: (1983). Relationship between neurosis and personality disorder. ***Br J Psychiatry***; 142:404-408Crossref, Medline, Google Scholar
 74. Tyrer P, Seivewright N, Ferguson B, Murphy S, Johnson AL (1993) The Nottingham Study of Neurotic Disorder: effect of personality status on response to drug treatment, cognitive therapy and self-help over two years. ***Br J Psychiatry***; 162:219-22
 75. Ventura, D., Armstrong, E.P., Skrepnek, G.H, Haim E.M. (2007). Escitalopram versus sertraline in the treatment of major depressive disorder: a randomized clinical trial. *Curr Med Res Opin* 23:245–250.
 76. Vidal-Ribas P, Brotman MA, Valdivieso I, (2016). The status of irritability in psychiatry: a conceptual and quantitative review. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*; 55(7):556–70.
 77. Vieta, E., bERK, M., Schulze, T.G., Carvalho, A.F., Suppes, T., Calabrese, J.R, (2018) Bipolar disorder. *Nat Rev. Dis, Primers* 4, 18008
 78. Wade, A, Lemming, O.M, Hedegaard, K.B. (2002). Escitalopram 10 mg/day is effective and well tolerated in a placebo-controlled study in depression in primary care. *Int Clin Psychopharmacol*, 17:95–102,
 79. Whiteford, H.A., Degenhardt, L., Rehm, J., Baxter, A.J., Ferrari, A.J., Erskine, H.E. (2013) Global burden of disease attributable to mental and substance use disorders.
 80. Wilkie, M. J. V, Smith, G., Day, R. K., Matthews, K., Smith, D., Blackwood, D., Reid, I. C., Wolf, C. R. (2009). Polymorphisms in the SLC6A4 and HTR2A genes influence treatment outcome following antidepressant therapy. *The Pharmacogenomics Journal*, 9(1), 61–70.
 81. Zeeck A, von Wietersheim J, Weiss H, Hermann S, Endorf K, Lau I and Hartmann A (2020) Self-Criticism and Personality Functioning Predict Patterns of Symptom Change in Major Depressive Disorder. *Front. Psychiatry* 11:147. doi: 10.3389/fpsyt.2020.00147
 82. Zimmermann J, Ehrental JC, Cierpka M, Schauenburg H, Doering S, Benecke C. (2012). Assessing the level of structural integration using operationalized psychodynamic diagnosis (OPD): implications for DSM-5. *J Pers Assess*. 94:522–32. doi: 10.1080/00223891.2012.700664