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Abstract
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Introduction: There is a recognised increase in vulnerability to psychosis in autistic people (AP). However, the construct of psychosis (particularly schizophrenia) contains several distinct factors, making understanding the relationship between autism and psychosis complex. Previous research has suggested that affective lability may be particularly related to psychotic experiences for AP who have experienced psychosis (AP-P). There is also a suggestion that psychosis might be a state of extreme (over)empathising, perhaps related to emotional processes.
Method: We recruited three groups: AP-P (N=23), a group of AP who had not experienced psychosis (AP-NP; N=59) and a neurotypical group (N=41). Participants completed measures of autistic traits, schizotypal traits (as a proxy for psychosis-proneness), emotional processes, and perspective taking (as a proxy for the type of empathising most theoretically likely to be linked to psychosis). As well as comparisons between groups, regression analyses were used to understand the influence of dependent variables on schizotypal traits.
Results: We found that AP-P had significantly higher rates of schizotypy (positive and disorganised), as well as higher rates of emotional difficulties. Across all groups, affective lability had a positive and significant association with positive and disorganised schizotypal traits. Differences in perspective taking between groups were small and generally non-significant, particularly in adjusted comparisons; additionally, its impact on schizotypy was small and non-significant.
Discussion: Our findings suggest that positive and disorganised schizotypy, in particular, have a relationship with affective lability. This, in turn, supports the idea of emotional processes as related to the development of schizotypal traits and psychosis across all individuals, regardless of autism diagnostic status. We found no evidence of empathy relating to any subscale of schizotypy, or the total schizotypy score. We contend that emotional processes should be considered in exploration of the relationship between autism and schizotypy in future. This may help to explain some of the findings of overlap between these constructs in previous research. Factors known to affect neurodevelopment of emotion systems such as history of early trauma, challenges during pregnancy and birth, and early childhood experiences of adversity during critical windows of development need further consideration in future research.

Contribution to the field
Attempts to understand the relationship between autistic and schizotypal traits have failed to yield a clear answer, suggesting that other factors may be involved and that to view the concepts dichotomously may be unhelpful. In this study, we have utilised a unique sample of autistic people who have experienced psychotic mental illness, as well as other participants, to investigate the role of affective processes, including emotional regulation, affective lability, and empathy, in the context of the autistic/schizotypal spectrum as it is currently conceptualised. Our results clearly show that affective processes, particularly affective lability, are involved in the relationship between autistic and schizotypal traits. This further supports the need to consider neurobiological constructs when understanding these behaviourally-defined traits, as executive functioning provides a clear explanation of our results. This research has implications for identification and treatment of at-risk individuals, and we would argue that further research utilising a uniquely vulnerable population (autistic people who have experienced psychotic mental illness) will be needed to understand the development of these differences, most likely in the context of historical trauma.
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Abstract

Introduction: There is a recognised increase in vulnerability to psychosis in autistic people (AP). However, the construct of psychosis (particularly schizophrenia) contains several distinct factors, making understanding the relationship between autism and psychosis complex. Previous research has suggested that affective lability may be particularly related to psychotic experiences for AP who have experienced psychosis (AP-P). There is also a suggestion that psychosis might be a state of extreme (over)empathising, perhaps related to emotional processes.

Method: We recruited three groups: AP-P (N=23), a group of AP who had not experienced psychosis (AP-NP; N=59) and a neurotypical group (N=41). Participants completed measures of autistic traits, schizotypal traits (as a proxy for psychosis-proneness), emotional processes, and perspective taking (as a proxy for the type of empathising most theoretically likely to be linked to psychosis). As well as comparisons between groups, regression analyses were used to understand the influence of dependent variables on schizotypal traits.

Results: We found that AP-P had significantly higher rates of schizotypy (positive and disorganised), as well as higher rates of emotional difficulties. Across all groups, affective lability had a positive and significant association with positive and disorganised schizotypal traits. Differences in perspective taking between groups were small and generally non-significant, particularly in adjusted comparisons; additionally, its impact on schizotypy was small and non-significant.
Discussion: Our findings suggest that positive and disorganised schizotypy, in particular, have a relationship with affective lability. This, in turn, supports the idea of emotional processes as related to the development of schizotypal traits and psychosis across all individuals, regardless of autism diagnostic status. We found no evidence of empathy relating to any subscale of schizotypy, or the total schizotypy score. We contend that emotional processes should be considered in exploration of the relationship between autism and schizotypy in future. This may help to explain some of the findings of overlap between these constructs in previous research. Factors known to affect neurodevelopment of emotion systems such as history of early trauma, challenges during pregnancy and birth, and early childhood experiences of adversity during critical windows of development need further consideration in future research.

1 Introduction

Autism spectrum disorders (ASDs) are life-long neurodevelopmental conditions affecting an individual’s perception of, and interaction with, the world (Ousley and Cermak, 2014). ASD refers to a number of heterogeneous ‘autisms’ (Geschwind and Levitt, 2007), conditions that share core features of unusual perceptual abilities (Dakin and Frith, 2005), social communication difficulties (Sigman et al., 1986), and difficulties interpreting social cues (Dawson et al., 2004) but differ subtly from individual to individual. Since the first definition of autism, and Bleuler’s description of what we would now label ‘negative symptoms’ of psychotic mental illness (Kuhn, 2004), there has been persistent debate about the relationship between experiences of autistic people (AP; individuals who meet diagnostic criteria for ASD) and experiences of mental illness, particularly psychosis. This study is an attempt to further explore and clarify the relationship between these concepts, with reference to other relevant psychological processes.

Chisholm and colleagues (2015) reviewed eight possible models of relationship between ASD and schizophrenia spectrums disorders (SSDs), and concluded that the evidence was strongest for four models: the increased vulnerability model (AP are more at risk of psychosis due to their ASD, but the conditions are separate); the diatematical model (ASD and psychosis are opposite ends of a continuum of overlapping constructs); associated liabilities model (factors that increase risk of one condition also increase risk of the other, but they remain separate); and the multiple overlapping aetiologies model (some factors that lead to developing ASD also lead to developing psychosis, but others do not, leading to distinct but often similar or overlapping presentations). From the available evidence, the authors were not able to demonstrate that one model was clearly superior. They highlight that these models may not be mutually exclusive, and that there are likely to be subgroups for whom one or other model may provide the greatest explanatory power. Thus, any research into an overlap between ASD and psychosis will be informed by, and influence, discussion of an explanatory model of that overlap.

In order to understand the relationship between ASD and psychosis, researchers have attempted to map ASD traits and psychotic traits into the same conceptual ‘space’. A personality construct called schizotypy has been used as a proxy for ‘psychosis-proneness’ (Rossi and Daneluzzo, 2002). Schizotypy is characterised by magical thinking, strange experiences, social withdrawal, and other features, and can broadly be categorised into factors called positive, negative, or disorganized (Johns and Van Os, 2001). Like ASD, it can be considered a spectrum that blends into ‘normality’ – all people have schizotypal traits, but these are usually not clinically significant. In higher quantities, schizotypal traits might lead to a diagnosis of schizotypal personality disorder, a

\[1\] Identity first language is used throughout this paper. For readers unfamiliar with this concept who wish to learn more about it, we would refer you to https://www.identityfirstautistic.org/ for an introduction.
condition strongly linked to psychosis (Kendler et al., 1981). This makes it perhaps easier to compare ASD (a collection of traits) to schizotypy (another set of traits), rather than psychosis (a state that changes over time and might at any time be considered present or absent). Research has found correlations between subscales of schizotypy and ASD. For example, there is a robust overlap between negative symptoms of schizotypy and autistic traits in adolescents with ASD (Barneveld et al., 2011). Social skill deficit seems specific to ASD, and positive schizotypy (for example, unusual experiences such as believing in magic or psychic phenomena), seems specific to schizotypy in high functioning adults (Spek and Wouters, 2010). Executive functioning processes have been implicated as a causal neurobiological mechanism that might explain both (Demetriou et al., 2018).

Using factor analysis, two of the largest studies in this area drew differing conclusions about the relationship between autistic and schizotypal traits. Dinsdale et al. (2013) favoured a two-factor solution, and argued that there was a clear division between autistic and schizotypal traits, adding further support for a theory that defined ASD and schizophrenia as diametrical opposites (Crespi and Badcock, 2008). Ford and Crewther (2014), however, defined a three-factor solution that presents a more complex relationship between the traits. While there were two factors that segregated between the measures, indicating separate autistic (‘social disorganisation’) and schizotypal (‘perceptual oddities’) constructs, these explained much less variance than the third factor which included both autistic and schizotypal traits. They term the construct that this factor measures ‘social rigidity’ and postulate that this factor underlies many of the difficulties experienced by both AP and people who experience high levels of schizotypy. Other evidence from research on those dually-diagnosed with ASD and psychosis indicates high rates of major mood disorders such as schizoaffective disorder or bi-polar disorder (Larson et al., 2017). This finding is also supported by genetic studies (DeLong and Dwyer, 1988) and prevalence data (Vannucchi et al., 2014) showing higher rates of bi-polar disorder in AP.

A factor that may be involved in the relationship between schizotypal and autistic traits is empathy. Empathy is a complex skill that involves predicting and reacting to how you believe another person will feel. It has been conceptualised as having broadly two factors: cognitive empathy (broadly, this is defined as understanding other people’s perspectives); and affective empathy (colloquially, feeling for another person). The diametric model of ASD and schizophrenia suggests that increased empathy may be linked to increased risk of psychosis, through a mechanism of overly empathising with the perceived contents of others’ minds (Brosnan et al., 2010; Crespi and Badcock, 2008). Empathy is found to be impaired in AP in general (Baron-Cohen, 2002), and has been linked to Theory of Mind deficits, which have a strong basis in both the mirror neuron and executive functioning systems of the brain (Mahy et al., 2014). Harmesen (2019) has highlighted that both AP, those with a diagnosis of BPD and those with a diagnosis of bipolar disorder all show impaired cognitive empathy. Conversely, individuals with schizophrenia show impaired affective empathy. However, one particular subtype of empathy, perspective taking, has been found to be impaired in both AP (Reed and Peterson, 1990) and, separately, in individuals with schizophrenia (Langdon et al., 2006). Previous research has shown that there are differences in empathising between AP-P and AP-NP (Larson et al., 2015), but cognitive and affective empathising have not been considered separately in this population. It might reasonably be predicted that perspective taking may be differentially experienced by AP-P and AP-NP, on the basis of the above research, and further that it could play a role in our understanding of autistic and schizotypal traits.

In order to contribute to better understanding of this area, and the potential interactions between emotion regulation difficulties, affective lability, schizotypy, and autistic traits, we have
attempted to investigate these concepts in the same theoretical space. The following hypotheses were tested:

H1. AP-P will use less effective emotion regulation strategies and report more affective lability than AP-NP
H2. AP-P will be better at perspective taking than AP-NP
H3. Schizotypal traits will be higher in AP with a history of psychosis (AP-P) compared with AP who have no history of psychosis (AP-NP)
H4. Emotion regulation difficulties and affective lability will be associated with higher schizotypal scores across participant groups

2 Materials and Methods

Ethical approval for the study was given by the North of Scotland NHS Research Ethics Committee in January 2016. The study was conducted between January 2016 and April 2017.

2.1 Design

An observational study comparing self-reported measures of autistic traits, schizotypal traits, and emotional processes between participant groups. Participants were recruited either via participation in previous research or via social media advertising, and were incentivised with the opportunity to participate in a prize draw.

2.2 Participants

Participants were all adults (aged 18 or older), and were required to have English as their first language. They were recruited to three groups.

2.2.1 Autistic People with No Psychosis (AP-NP)

Recruited via the Autism Research Centre’s (ARC’s) database (https://www.autismresearchcentre.net/), they were asked to confirm they had no significant mental health history. ASD diagnosis was not confirmed, but the database is maintained by a respected research group who check participant eligibility: thus, we considered this group representative of AP. A total of 59 participants were recruited.

2.2.2 Autistic People with Psychosis (AP-P)

Consisted of:
- i) participants invited from previous research (Larson et al. 2017);
- ii) new participants self-identified through the (ARC) database.

Participants from the ARC database were screened using the Diagnostic Interview for Psychosis (DIP-DM) (Castle et al., 2006), which generates diagnoses using the OPCRIT algorithm (McGuffin et al., 1991). Individuals meeting criteria for an SSD in DSM-IV-TR (American Psychiatric Association, 2000), ICD-10 (World Health Organisation, 2007), or Research Diagnostic Criteria (RDC) (Spitzer et al., 1979) systems were considered to have a confirmed history of psychosis. This replicates methods used in Larson et al. (2017), and full details are given in Supplemental Materials. A total of 23 participants were recruited from both sources.
2.2.3 Neurotypical Controls (NC)

Participants were recruited through social media advertising. Participants were not formally screened, but were asked to confirm they had no history of ASD diagnosis nor any significant mental health history. A total of 41 participants were recruited.

2.3 Measures

The following self-report measures were used:

- **Autism Spectrum Quotient (AQ)** (Baron-Cohen et al., 2001): A 50-item questionnaire that measures traits associated with ASD. It contains five subscales (Communication, Social, Imagination, Local Details, and Attention Switching). The minimum score is zero, indicating low ASD traits, and the maximum is 50. A cut-off of 32 is considered indicative of probable ASD. The AQ has been shown to have good reliability and construct validity by the original authors and in later studies (Hurst et al., 2007; Stewart and Austin, 2009), although subscale definitions have been questioned. Thus, we used the ‘total AQ’ summary score.

- **Schizotypal Personality Questionnaire – Brief Revised (SPQ-BR)** (Cohen et al., 2010): A 32-item questionnaire measuring schizotypal traits. Contains nine subscales that can be categorised into three or four superordinate subscales: cognitive perceptual differences, interpersonal difference, and disorganised traits. SPQ-BR scores range from 32 (low overall schizotypy) to 160. Cognitive Perceptual (Positive Schizotypy) scores range from 14 to 70. Interpersonal (Negative Schizotypy) ranges from 10 to 50, and Disorganised ranges from eight to 40. It has been suggested that the Interpersonal subscale could be divided into two, separating out social anxiety (Davidson et al., 2016); however, in line with previous studies we are seeking to replicate, we do not do so. The SPQ-BR as a whole has been shown to have reasonable reliability and validity in a large normative sample (Davidson et al., 2016).

- **Affective Lability Scale-18 (ALS-18)** (Oliver and Simons, 2004): This 18-item assesses the extent to which individuals switch between emotional states and comprises three subscales (anxiety/depression, depression/elation, and anger) assessing shifts between different emotional states. Higher scores indicate higher levels of affective lability, ranging from zero to 54. The anxiety/depression and anger subscales, each consisting of five items, have scores ranging from zero to 15. The depression/elation subscale consists of eight items and produces scores ranging from zero to 24. The measure has good psychometric properties (Aas et al., 2015).

- **Emotion Regulation Questionnaire-9 (ERQ-9)** (Spaapen et al., 2014): This is a nine item measure of the extent to which individuals utilise one of two distinct coping strategies to manage strong emotion: reappraisal and suppression. Results are given in relation to these two strategies. Individuals rate themselves from one to seven on each item, and some items are reverse-scored. Reappraisal is measured by five items, giving a score of five to 35. Suppression is measured by four items, giving a score of four to 20. Higher scores indicate higher levels of emotion regulation strategy use, and can be considered separately or as a total. The measure has good reliability and validity in community samples (Rice et al., 2018), and has improved psychometric properties compared to a previous, longer, version.

- **Questionnaire of Cognitive and Affective Empathy (QCAE)** (Reniers et al., 2011), perspective-taking subscale: A 10-item subscale of a larger measure, it captures the cognitive empathy element related to the ability to imagine alternative perspectives other than one’s own. Higher scores indicate higher levels of alternative perspective-taking ability, ranging
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from zero to 10. It has good reliability and construct validity in a student sample (Reniers et al., 2011).

All participants were asked their age and gender. No other demographics were collected.

2.4 Analysis

Data were analysed using R (R Core Team).

2.4.1 Descriptive statistics and univariate comparisons

Initially, the AP-NP, AP-P and NC groups were compared in terms of gender, age and the measures introduced in Section 2.3. Univariate comparisons between AP-NP and AP-P were made using Fisher’s Exact test and t-tests. Univariate comparisons across all three groups were made using Fisher’s Exact test and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). Non-parametric versions (Wilcoxon and Kruskal-Wallis rank-sum tests) of these comparisons, along with appropriate descriptive statistics, are reported in the Supplementary Materials. These sets of analyses are compared to determine robustness of conclusions.

2.4.2 Group comparisons of ALS-18, ERQ-9 and QCAE Perspective Taking

To begin examining our hypotheses, unadjusted comparisons of affective and empathy measures between groups were conducted as outlined in Section 2.4.1. Adjusted group comparisons were made using linear regression, with a separate regression for each scale. Independent variables (excluding the outcome scale in the corresponding regression) included: Participant Group; Gender; Age; ALS-18 Total; ERQ-9 Cognition Reappraisal; ERQ-9 Emotion Suppression; QCAE Perspective Taking.

2.4.3 Schizotypy regressions

Linear regression models were used to look for adjusted relationships with SPQ-BR scales (Total and all subscales). In these models, the following independent variables were included: Participant Group; Gender; Age; AQ Total; ALS-18 Total; ERQ-9 Cognition Reappraisal; ERQ-9 Emotion Suppression; QCAE Perspective Taking. In each regression, multicollinearity was examined using variation inflation factors (VIFs).

For each regression, a key area of interest was the potential interaction between Participant Group and each of the dependent variables. To explore these interactions, we fitted a series of models that extended each base regression with all possible combinations of (first order) interactions between Group and other dependent variables. Fitted models were compared using the second-order Akaike Information Criterion (AICc) (Hurvich and Tsai, 1991; Sugiura, 1978), where lower values indicate a better fitting model. The AICc, as opposed to the standard AIC, was used given the sample size. We considered models with AICcs within 2 of the lowest AICc (details given in the Supplementary materials), as models within this range are not considered distinguishable. This allowed us to check the robustness of the fit of the best model. Where this set of models included the model with no interactions, we choose this model for greater parsimony. Residual plots of the finally selected models were reviewed to check model fit.

Where interactions were fitted, the Effects (Fox and Weisberg, 2018) package in R was used to plot their effect.
2.4.4 Secondary analysis: Exploring ALS-18 Subscales

Having conducted the analysis outlined in the above sections, affective lability was highlighted as a key factor. Thus, we repeated the analyses described in Sections 2.4.1-2.4.3, replacing ALS-18 Total with its subscales.

2.4.5 Effect size measures

Pearson’s correlation coefficient (r) was used as the primary measure of effect size. Generally, Pearson’s r was calculated from t-statistics (Field et al., 2009), using a formula from Rosenthal (1994). For the one-way ANOVA, eta-squared effect measures were converted to r using formulas from Cohen (1988) and Rosenthal (1994) – the common effect size measure easing comparison. Effect sizes for r were considered small (<0.1), medium (<0.3) and large (<0.5) (Cohen, 1992). To further assist interpretation, regression models fit in the main paper were refitted in the Supplementary materials with their continuous variables standardised to zero mean and unit variance.

3 Results

3.1 Participant group size, descriptive statistics and univariate comparisons

Group sizes, descriptive statistics and tests of differences between groups (including confidence intervals, p-values and effect sizes) are reported in Table 1 and non-parametric forms of these comparisons are reported in Table S1.

Gender split was similar between AP-NP and NC groups; however, there were significantly (proportionately) fewer women in AP-P compared to AP-NP. The AP-NP group was significantly older than the AP-P and NC groups. A large and significant difference in AQ scores was found between AP-NP and AP-P. As would be expected, the NC group had the lowest AQ score. Between AP-NP and AP-P groups, across SPQ-BR scales, the only significant difference was found on the Positive scale. NC had the lowest means across all SPQ-BR scales. The same differences between groups were found in the equivalent non-parametric analysis reported in Table S1.

3.2 Group comparisons of ALS-18, ERQ-9 and QCAE Perspective Taking Scores

Detailed unadjusted comparisons of these measures are given in Table 1 (including test statistics, 95% confidence intervals (CIs), p-values and effect sizes). Between AP-NP and AP-P, there were only significant unadjusted differences on ALS-18 Total. The NC group only significantly differed to the AP-NP and AP-P groups on QCAE Perspective Taking.

Detailed adjusted comparisons of these measures are given in Table 2 (including 95% CIs, p-values and effect sizes; equivalent standardised versions are given in Table S2). The only significant adjusted differences included: the NC group scoring significantly higher than AP-NP group on ALS-18 Total; and NC had significantly higher QCAE Perspective Taking scores than both AP-NP and AP-P on.

3.3 Schizotypy regressions: Controlled relationships with Schizotypy scores

Regression models within 2 of the best AICc for each SPQ-BR scale (Total, Positive, Negative and Disorganised) are shown in Table S3. For three of the models (Total, Positive and Disorganised) the model including no interactions with Group gave the best fitting model (highlighted in yellow in Table S1); additionally, there were no consistently included interactions across the other models considered. For the Negative scale, the model with no interactions did not have the lowest AICc;
however, its fit is only negligibly worse than the best fitting model (765.52 versus 764.38) – given this fit, and the lack of consistent interactions included across the other models, we chose the model with no interactions for reasons of parsimony. Residual plots indicate no substantial problems with model fit. Except for one variable, all VIFs are below four; the remaining variable has a VIF of just over five.

The fit of the final models is given in Table 3 (including 95% CIs, p-values and effect sizes; the resulting fit with continuous variables standardised is given in Table S4). The amount of variation explained varied from its lowest in disorganised schizotypy to highest in negative schizotypy. In each of the four regression models, the test of overall regression is significant (p-values<0.001).

Between groups, schizotypy differences are minimal. For total schizotypy, there was a significant difference between NC and AP-P, with AP-P scoring approximately 11 units higher. On positive schizotypy, AP-P scored significantly higher than both AP-NP and NC. Other group differences were small and non-significant.

Across Positive, Negative and Disorganised scales, AQTotal was only significantly associated with negative schizotypy. This was the second largest effect on the Negative scale, and likely drives the significant relationship with AQTotal on the Total scale.

ALS-18 Total had significant and the largest impact within each of the Positive and Disorganised scales. Accordingly, ALS-total significantly impacts on SPQ-BR Total and has the largest impact thereon. ERQ-9 Emotion Suppression had a significant effect on the Positive and Negative scales, and had the third and largest impact on these respectively. These relationships likely drive the significant impact of ERQ-9 Emotion Suppression on SPQ-BR Total.

There were no significant relationships between the SPQ-BR subscales and gender, age, ERQ-9 Cognitive Reappraisal, or QCAE Perspective Taking respectively.

With no interactions with Participant Group, we had no evidence for effects noted above differing by Participant Group (however, this is not proof for the contrary).

### 3.4 Secondary Analysis: Exploration of ALS-18 Subscales

Unadjusted comparisons between groups on the three ALS-18 subscales are detailed in Table 1. AP-P scores higher on all three subscales, but only significantly so on the ALS-18 Depression/Elation scale. Differences between NC and AP-P are greatest, but non-significant; differences between NC and AP-NP are smaller.

Adjusted comparisons between groups on the three ALS-18 subscales are detailed in Table S4 (and standardised in Table S5). In the adjusted comparisons, all group differences were non-significant and small, including direct comparisons between NC and AP-P groups.

Regressions relating the ALS-18 subscales to SPQ-BR measures, alongside other variables, are reported in Table 4 (standardised version given in Table S8). A detailed report on these regressions is given in the Supplementary Results. Results were broadly similar to those reported in Section 3.3.

ALS-18 Anxiety/Depression significantly impacted on positive and negative schizotypy. ALS-18 Depression/Elation significantly impacted on disorganised schizotypy. These relationships likely drive the relationships between the total schizotypy and both of Anxiety/Depression and Depression/Elation. ALS-18 Anger generally does not impact on schizotypy scales except for
negative schizotypy, where there is an interaction with participant group, as depicted in Figure 1:

increases on ALS-18 Anger is associated with increases on negative schizotypy for NCs, but decreases for the AP-NP and AP-P groups. There was also interaction between participant group and ERQ-9 Cognitive reappraisal, as depicted in Figure S1: increases on cognitive reappraisal are associated with increases for NC, decreases for AP-P and very little change for AP-NP.

4 Discussion

Our study set out to examine whether there was a role for emotional factors to explain existing known relationships between ASD traits and schizotypal traits. In particular, we were interested in the role of emotion regulation, affective lability, and perspective taking/empathy in understanding the relationship between these constructs. Our results replicated those found in previous research in terms of the relationship between AP and NC groups on variables such as schizotypal traits, autistic traits, and empathy. We tested four novel hypotheses, finding that affective processes do appear to contribute to the model of interaction between schizotypal and autistic traits, but our results were not fully conclusive. Taking each hypothesis in turn:

H1. AP-P will use less helpful strategies and report more affective lability than AP-NP

While in the uncorrected analysis the AP-P group reported significantly greater affective lability, particularly shifts between elation and depression, this difference was not found in the adjusted model. There was no effect found of group on emotion regulation strategy usage, either helpful or unhelpful, and the results provide no corroboration for this hypothesis. However, there is significant gender imbalance between groups, with the AP-P group having proportionally fewer women than the AP-NP group, which may have impacted our ability to identify differences even having controlled for gender. Female AP are known to present differently to male AP in multiple ways (Lai et al., 2012; Van Wijngaarden-Cremers et al., 2014), and it is unknown how they might differ in their emotion processing.

H2. AP-P will be better at perspective taking than AP-NP

We found no evidence to support this hypothesis. While AP in general reported worse perspective taking in our study than NC, there was no significant difference between AP groups. This combined with the results of H3, suggest that the psychotic experiences of AP-P are not linked with high levels of empathising after the onset and resolution of their acute episodes of mental ill-health. We cannot say whether their self-reported empathising skills would have been at the time of their illness. It is also possible that our study was under-powered to detect differences, as previous research has shown differences between AP-P and AP-NP in empathising, using a different measure (Larson et al., 2015). Finally, it is possible that differences might have been found in different types of empathy, and that we simply selected a type of empathy which does not have significant links to psychosis.

H3. Schizotypal traits will be higher in AP-P compared with AP-NP.

While this was not true for overall schizotypal traits, it was supported for Positive Schizotypy. Both autistic groups had higher mean levels of schizotypy across the three subscales (Positive, Negative, and Disorganised) than NC, although not all of these comparisons were statistically significant.

H4. Emotion regulation difficulties and affective lability will be associated with higher schizotypal scores across participant groups

The premise of this hypothesis is that emotional processes are involved with or impacted by schizotypy, regardless of other factors. This hypothesis was supported. Affective lability has a significant and positive association with overall schizotypy (as one increases, so does the other);
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traits correlate with emotional processing differences. Future studies would benefit from comparing AP-P to other populations with psychosis to further understanding in this area.

It seems plausible to us that emotional processes, particularly affective lability, add to the model of relationship between autistic and schizotypal constructs. To our knowledge, these factors have not previously been considered in this research field. Lability involving anxious emotional states is associated with positive and negative schizotypy, while lability involving elated emotional states is associated with disorganised schizotypy, suggesting that different emotional experiences may give rise to or be caused by different patterns of thought or behaviour. AP as a whole in our study reported significantly higher negative schizotypal traits than NC, replicating previous findings. However, this difference was complicated by interactions with euthymia/anger lability and use of cognitive reappraisal as an emotion regulation strategy, which require further research to replicate and explore further.

Clinically, we would hypothesise that individuals with emotion regulation difficulties and affective lability are likely to be those with either underlying neurobiological differences and/or histories of traumatic experiences such as difficulties during pregnancy/birth (e.g. Faa et al., 2016), insecure early attachments (e.g. Rogosch et al., 1995; Waters et al., 2010), or traumatic events during childhood/adolescence (e.g Aminoff et al., 2012; Perry, 2009) which affect neurodevelopmental trajectories. We posit that this would therefore be a potential relevant factor in the development of schizotypal traits that should be further investigated. While differences in attachment have been found between autistic and non-autistic children, these differences seem to be mediated by cognitive ability and level of autistic traits (Rutgers et al., 2004), meaning this may not be a risk factor that is greater than in the general population. Little is known about the childhood experiences of AP, including pregnancy and birth issues, and this is an area that would benefit from future study.

We believe that our finding could be considered a development of the stress-vulnerability theory of psychosis (Nuechterlein and Dawson, 1984), and that AP might be particularly at risk due to a combination of neurobiology and life experiences influencing the development of emotion regulation difficulties. In particular, Ford and Crewther’s (2014) proposal of a social rigidity factor could be representing the same processes at work in emotional suppression – primarily avoidance and control, as contrasted with openness and flexibility. Understanding the impact of something like social rigidity or other stressors would be key to supporting a programme of prevention/strengthening of emotional regulation skills in the at-risk population of teenagers/young AP (see Devoe et al., 2019 for a possible model). We believe this is an exciting and transdiagnostic direction for understanding in this field to take, which will ultimately benefit patients through identification of treatment targets and risk markers.
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11 Figure captions

Figure 1: Fitted interactions between participant group and ALS-18 Anger in SPQ-BR Negative regression with ALS-18 subscales (see Section 3.4; averaged across other variables). Coloured regions indicate the 95% confidence intervals. AP-NP= Autistic people with no psychosis. AP-P= Autistic people with psychosis. NC= Neurotypical controls. SPQ-BR= Schizotypal Personality Questionnaire. ALS-18= Affective lability scale-18.
### Table 1: Descriptive statistics

Means, standard deviation (SD) by participant group and comparisons between (i) AP groups (Fisher’s exact test/two-sample t-test) and (ii) all three groups (Fisher’s exact test/ANOVA). Bold/italic p-values indicate significant differences at the 5% level. AP-NP= Autistic people with no psychosis. AP-P= Autistic people with psychosis. NC= Neurotypical controls. Stats. Comp= Statistical comparison. OR/diff= Odds ratio/difference. LCI/UCI= Lower/upper 95% confidence interval. W= Women. SPQ-BR= Schizotypal Personality Questionnaire. ALS-18= Affective lability scale-18. ERQ-9= Emotional regulation questionnaire-9. QCAE= Questionnaire of cognitive and affective lability. There are two separate sets of comparisons: the first compares the AP groups (middle set of columns) and the second compares all three groups (last set of columns).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AP-NP</th>
<th>AP-P</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>Stats comp</th>
<th>ASD comparison (AP-NP v AP-P)</th>
<th>All group comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>OR/diff</td>
<td>LCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N=</strong></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender (% W)</strong></td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>Fisher's</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (years)</strong></td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>t(47)=3.8</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AQ Total</strong></td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>t(35)=3.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPQ-BR Total</strong></td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>t(33)=1.2</td>
<td>-5.8</td>
<td>-16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPQ-BR Positive</strong></td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>t(30)=2.8</td>
<td>-8.5</td>
<td>-14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPQ-BR Negative</strong></td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>t(38)=0.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPQ-BR Disorganised</strong></td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>t(51)=0.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALS-18 Total</strong></td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>t(49)=2.4</td>
<td>-6.8</td>
<td>-12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALS-18 Anxiety/Depression</strong></td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>t(40)=1.9</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALS-18 Depression/Elation</strong></td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>t(54)=2.2</td>
<td>-3.0</td>
<td>-5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALS-18 Anger</strong></td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>t(40)=1.8</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ERQ-9 Cognitive Reappraisal</strong></td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>t(44)=1.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ERQ-9 Emotion Suppression</strong></td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>t(43)=0.7</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QCAE Perspective Taking</strong></td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>t(42)=1.2</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2: Fitted regressions on ALS-18 Total, ERQ-9 and QCAE scales.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cat. level</th>
<th>ALS-18 Total (adjusted R²=0.43)</th>
<th>Adjusted comparison regressions (n=123)</th>
<th>QCAE Perspective Taking (adjusted R²=0.67)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ERQ-9 Cognitive Reappraisal (adjusted R²=0.08)</td>
<td>ERQ-9 Emotion Suppression (adjusted R²=0.43)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b 95% CI  P-value  r</td>
<td>b 95% CI  P-value  r</td>
<td>b 95% CI  P-value  r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td></td>
<td>-6.0  -26.7  14.7  0.567  0.054  11.6  -1.8  25.0  0.090  0.160  4.7  -5.0  14.4  0.343  0.090  37.0  30.8  43.3  &lt;0.001  0.743</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Group*</td>
<td>AP-P</td>
<td>3.4  -2.6  9.3  0.266  0.105  -2.1  -6.0  1.8  0.289  0.101  0.7  -2.1  3.5  0.626  0.046  -2.3  -5.0  0.3  0.086  0.162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>7.1  1.1  13.1  0.020  0.218  -0.7  -4.7  3.3  0.723  0.034  2.4  -0.5  5.2  0.105  0.153  -1.4  -4.1  1.4  0.330  0.092</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender†</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>0.9  -3.0  4.9  0.636  0.045  0.1  -2.5  2.7  0.945  0.007  -2.4  -4.2  -0.6  0.008  0.247  0.8  -1.0  2.5  0.392  0.081</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.2  -0.3  0.0  0.023  0.213  0.0  -0.1  0.1  0.534  0.059  0.0  -0.1  0.1  0.659  0.042  0.0  -0.1  0.1  0.984  0.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.4  0.1  0.7  0.025  0.211  0.1  -0.1  0.3  0.484  0.067  0.0  -0.1  0.2  0.683  0.039  -0.5  -0.6  -0.3  &lt;0.001  0.569</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ-BR Positive</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5  0.3  0.7  &lt;0.001  0.406  0.1  0.0  0.3  0.122  0.146  0.0  -0.1  0.1  0.411  0.078  0.1  0.0  0.2  0.243  0.111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ-BR Negative</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0  -0.3  0.4  0.826  0.021  0.0  -0.2  0.2  0.953  0.006  0.5  0.3  0.6  &lt;0.001  0.503  -0.1  -0.3  0.0  0.122  0.146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ-BR Disorganised</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.4  0.1  0.7  0.012  0.236  0.1  -0.2  0.3  0.632  0.045  -0.2  -0.3  0.0  0.039  0.195  -0.1  -0.2  0.1  0.508  0.063</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALS-18 Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>95% CI  P-value  r</td>
<td>0.022  0.215  0.0  -0.1  0.1  0.894  0.013  0.0  0.0  0.1  0.354  0.088</td>
<td>0.022  0.215  0.0  -0.1  0.1  0.894  0.013  0.0  0.0  0.1  0.354  0.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERQ-9 Cognitive Reappraisal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.3  -0.6  0.0  0.022  0.215</td>
<td>0.0  -0.2  0.1  0.580  0.053  0.2  0.0  0.3  0.017  0.224</td>
<td>0.0  -0.2  0.1  0.580  0.053  0.2  0.0  0.3  0.017  0.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERQ-9 Emotion Suppression</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0  -0.4  0.4  0.894  0.013  -0.1  -0.3  0.2  0.580  0.053</td>
<td>0.1  -0.1  0.2  0.554  0.056</td>
<td>0.1  -0.1  0.2  0.554  0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QCAE Perspective Taking</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2  -0.2  0.6  0.354  0.088  0.3  0.1  0.6  0.017  0.224</td>
<td>0.1  -0.1  0.3  0.554  0.056</td>
<td>0.1  -0.1  0.3  0.554  0.056</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bold italic p-values indicate significant terms at the 5% level. Grey cells indicate that the corresponding term has not been included in the regression. Cat. = Categorical. SPQ-BR= Schizotypal Personality Questionnaire. CI= Confidence interval. AP-P= Autistic people with psychosis. NC= Neurotypical controls. W=Woman. AQ= Autism quotient. ALS-18= Affective lability scale-18. ERQ-9= Emotional regulation questionnaire-9. QCAE= Questionnaire of cognitive and affective lability. *‘AP-NP’ group taken as reference level. †‘Man’ taken as reference level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cat. level</th>
<th>Total (adjusted R²=0.61)</th>
<th>Positive (adjusted R²=0.41)</th>
<th>Negative (adjusted R²=0.68)</th>
<th>Disorganised (adjusted R²=0.28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>P-value</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>-8.0</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Group*</td>
<td>AP-P</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-5.7</td>
<td>-17.7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-4.7</td>
<td>-12.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender†</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>-6.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALS-18 Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERQ-9 Cognitive Reappraisal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERQ-9 Emotion Suppression</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QCAE Perspective Taking</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.691</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Fitted Schizotypal regressions with ALS-18 subscales. Bold/italic p-values indicate significant terms at the 5% level. Cat.= Categorical. SPQ-BR= Schizotypal Personality Questionnaire. CI= Confidence interval. AP-P= Autistic people with psychosis. NC= Neurotypical controls. AQ= Autism quotient.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cat. level</th>
<th>Total (adjusted R²=0.62)</th>
<th>Positive (adjusted R²=0.41)</th>
<th>Negative (adjusted R²=0.74)</th>
<th>Disorganised (adjusted R²=0.32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>P-value</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>-11.2</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>0.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Group*</td>
<td>AP-P</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>0.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender†</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>-4.9</td>
<td>-13.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td><strong>0.017</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALS-18 Anxiety/Depression</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td><strong>0.002</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALS-18 Depression/Elation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td><strong>0.018</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALS-18 Anger</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERQ-9 Cognitive Reappraisal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERQ-9 Emotion Suppression</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td><strong>0.002</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QCAE Perspective Taking</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Group × ALS-18 Anger</td>
<td>AP-P</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Group × ERQ-9 CR</td>
<td>AP-P</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.338</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In review