

Schizophrenia – a parameters’ game?

Anca Rădulescu, Applied Mathematics, University of Colorado at Boulder
UCB 526, Boulder, CO 80309-0526, *radulesc@colorado.edu*

November 5, 2018

Motto: “Ivan concentrated his attention on the cat and saw how the strange animal walked up to the platform of an A tram waiting at a stop, cheekily pushed off a screaming woman, grasped the handrail and offered the conductress a ten-kopec piece.”

M. Bulgakov – “The Master and Margarita”

Schizophrenia is a severe, currently incurable, relatively common mental condition. Its symptoms are complex and widespread. It structurally and functionally affects cortical and subcortical regions involved in cognitive, emotional and motivational aspects of behavior. Its cause is unknown, its diagnosis is based on statistical behavior and its treatment is elusive.

Our paradigm addresses the complexity of schizophrenic symptoms. Building upon recent neural vulnerability and limbic dysregulation hypotheses, it offers a mathematical model for the evolution of the limbic system under perturbation. Dependence on parameters and the concept of “bifurcation” could be the key to understanding the threshold between “normality” and “disease”.

1 Stress and mental illness

In the wild, living beings survive by responding to perceived threats with adaptive and appropriate changes in their behaviors and physiological states. Besides the species-specific factors, the nature of these responses depends on the external environment, but also on the internal physiological and emotional conditions. Unfortunately, the neuroendocrine mechanisms that control stress responses based on these environments are poorly understood for most animals [72], in particular for humans.

Altogether, we are aware of a few physiological mechanisms that allow stressful events to affect behavior. The stress response impacts on autonomic functions, such as respiration and heart rate variability [73]. It also alters, through the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal axis, the secretion of corticotropin-releasing factor, the hormone that coordinates behavior, autonomic and hormonal function in response to stress [1]. It subsequently affects the production of multiple other hormones, such as adrenocorticotropin hormone and cortisol.

It has been generally understood for years that, via its autonomic effects, sustained stress can severely affect health [39], contributing to a variety of conditions, among which heart disease, diabetes, growth retardation [105], decreased immunity [74] and various eating and digestive disorders [62]. Through similarly complex mechanisms, stress is also believed to lead to a number of psychiatric disorders, including depression, posttraumatic stress disorder, Alzheimer’s disease, and other anxiety disorders [68]. Interestingly, whether one is male or female is one of the most important health determinants. This has been partly explained exactly by the underlying sex differences in the physiological response to stress, specifically by the fact that estrogen exposure attenuates

sympathoadrenal responsiveness. It has been hypothesised that these differences have been driven in females by strong evolutionary pressure, in the need to protect the fetus from the adverse effects of maternal stress responses, in particular excess glucocorticoid exposure [64]. As psychiatric stress-associated pathologies will be the object of our present study, we will come back to the idea of neural exposure to cortisol in a later section.

In relation to behavior and mental illness, stress has been noticed to impair healthy individuals and psychiatric patients in sometimes surprisingly similar ways. Consider schizophrenia, for example, which will be the focus of this paper: a severe mental disorder with a heterogeneous set of symptoms including paranoia, hallucinations, delusional beliefs, thought disorder, emotional flattening and social withdrawal. The illness is relatively common, affecting 1.1% of the population, or over 2.2 million people every year in the United States alone, and has a devastating impact on social functioning. Studies over the past two decades have established that it is a chronic [9] [52] and neurodegenerative [8] [35] [34] disease, structurally and functionally affecting various cortical and subcortical regions involved in cognitive, emotional and motivational aspects of behavior [69] [6] [112] [7].

Many cognitive abnormalities [86] [38] [15] associated with this illness, such as delusions and hallucinations [54], impaired memory [60], lowered sensory gating and selective attention [17] [76] are also induced in healthy adults under acute emotional stress [45] [108] [18]. So the question raises itself: Can stress single-handedly cause a mental illness just through its perseverance? And if not, then what is the intrinsic detail that makes the dramatic difference between normality and pathology?

Historically, theories have ranged over a large scale, and psychiatry hasn't lacked controversies. Some attributed schizophrenic symptoms solely to prenatal stress, or to social and other environmental factors during the patient's childhood and teenage years [59]. Others made them entirely the responsibility of genetic programming [12] [122].

Unfortunately, despite intensive research, our knowledge of the underpinnings of schizophrenia is now about as relevant as ever. At present, there is no generically sustainable treatment for most serious psychiatric illnesses. Progress has been made in understanding some effects and side-effects of medication, but the drugs that are being used may only treat the effects of the disease rather than its cause. In fact, the main unanswered questions in current psychiatry concern diagnosis of mental illness as much as its treatment. Consensus diagnoses are revised periodically [3] based upon observed behavior rather than actual causes (etiology), which are usually still unknown. Most psychiatric conditions come with complex, widespread symptoms, accompanied by seemingly unrelated cognitive abnormalities and psychosocial consequences. The severity of symptoms cannot be stated in reproducible terms, and is therefore left to clinical interpretation, which varies among psychiatrists. This increases the potential of misdiagnosis, together with the fact that psychotic or very young patients are often neither cooperative nor articulate enough to describe their symptoms.

This is true in particular for schizophrenia. Recently, an idea which gained ground, under diverse forms, has been that the etiology of schizophrenia is based on neural vulnerability and degeneration. The theory (first conceptualized in the mid 19th century) attributes mental disorders to a hereditary predisposition that reduces the individual psychological threshold towards stimuli [113], to the point where even minor daily stresses will directly trigger psychotic experiences [89]. It has been observed that this "vulnerability" (or lack of inhibition in the threat detection mechanism [87]) manifests itself as an overt illness only under the impact of stress factors [116], so that schizophrenic disturbances eventually result as an overlap of environmental stress onto the individual's premorbid personality component.

In support to this hypothesis come the well-known relationship between stress and first-break psychosis [53] or relapse [116], and the sympathetic upturn that occurs prior to symptom exacerbation. Prospective data suggest that signs and symptoms (such as elevated autonomic activation [33] and electrodermal activity levels [53] [32]) prodromal to psychotic first episodes and relapses may be present in about 60 percent of patients. Also, it has been observed that stressful life events and highly critical attitudes toward the patient in the social environment predict relapse [90]. On the other hand, research with schizophrenic out-patients has shown that antipsychotic (neuroleptic) medication reduces relapse rates. This protective factor may operate partially by raising the threshold in the face of environmental stressors [117].

Such first outbreak and relapse predictors are currently being used as clinical indicators for schizophrenia, together with more traditional ones, such as paranoia, agitation and sleeplessness [54].

The subsequent possibility of pre-symptomatic treatment [79] [80], among other things, motivated a more careful investigation of the factors implicated in producing this “vulnerability”, and the attempt to determine the conditions that precipitate the plethora of outward clinical manifestations diagnosed as “schizophrenia”. In this perspective, several vulnerability models have been proposed [13], which we will discuss in some detail in the next section.

2 The limbic dysregulation hypothesis

Recent studies have increasingly correlated vulnerability to schizophrenia to volume reductions in several limbic areas (amygdala, hippocampus and prefrontal cortex [124]). In light of the previous section, this should not appear surprising, since the limbic system is primarily associated with the regulation of emotion and arousal, and is also responsible for integrating the internal and external environments via its wide connections with the neocortex [5], as well as with the autonomic [2] and endocrine [75] systems.

Dopamine and serotonin abnormalities [63] [123] in schizophrenia constitute today the most established and popular etiological hypothesis (which forms the bases for development of newer antipsychotics [43] [65]). However, schizophrenia has many neurobiological features suggesting an underlying dysregulation of emotional arousal, including limbic [24] [121], endocrine [100] [104] [120] [115], and autonomic [33] [125] [85] abnormalities. It is possible that the neurotransmitter dysfunction may be induced by hyperarousal [58] [83] [41], making it a consequence of dysregulation, rather than its cause.

Over the years, this variety of abnormalities of schizophrenia (and the relationship among themselves and with hyper/hypo-arousal) have spurred research interest. Historically, Gruzelier et al. [49] [48] were among the first to hypothesize that limbic abnormalities in the regulation of arousal may be an important feature of the disease. Grossberg’s model [47] linked schizophrenia to pathologies of the amygdala and Hanlon and Sutherland [51] – to prenatal damage to the limbic system. Williams et. al. [121] have reported differences between the amplitude of patient and control limbic and autonomic responses to different facial expressions. Other studies pointed out the abnormally high cortisol levels in schizophrenic patients, [120] [115], and McEwen [78] has sustainably related mental illness to chronic stress and to the corresponding deleterious effects of cortisol on the hippocampus and prefrontal cortex to mental illness.

In (1989), Nuechterlein and others [90] [31] [32] elaborated a “vulnerability/stress” hypothesis of schizophrenia, in which a vulnerability to stress (assumed to be due to cognitive deficits), combined with stressful “life-events,” leads to first-break or relapse of schizophrenia. Advances in understanding the neurobiology of the stress cascade led to a plausible model by which this vulnerability may occur through neurotoxic effects on the hippocampus that may involve synaptic remodeling [27] [68] [119].

In this context, schizophrenic symptoms may constitute an end-stage of a cyclic and neurodegenerative process. Recent studies [81] [96] [114] support the theory that the vulnerability to stress in schizophrenia is based on a pre-existing hippocampal/prefrontal deficit. Impaired hippocampal/prefrontal function leads to decreased inhibition of the amygdala, contributing to higher arousal levels, even under minor stress. Via the connections of the amygdala with the hypothalamus, the fear reaction triggers autonomic and endocrine effects [70] (such as changes in heart rate variability [85] and electrodermal activity [53] [32], or increased cortisol levels [104]). Excessive cortisol leads to brain neurotoxicity [119] and further hippocampus damage [91] [104], thus closing the dysregulation vicious cycle. The delay in schizophrenia’s onset (late teens in males and early 30’s in females) is consistent with a vicious cycling process, in which the neurodegenerative loop would need sufficient time to progress to the point where symptoms become apparent; the already mentioned neuroprotective effect of estrogen in ameliorating the effects of cortisol on the hippocampus and prefrontal cortex [10] [46] would slow but not stop the cycle in females [67], accounting for their delayed onset.

The dynamical analysis in this paper is based on a control system model described by Sotres-Bayon et al. [109], in which limbic regions define a negative feedback loop that regulates arousal. The central amygdala forms the main excitatory component of the arousal response [30]. The primary inhibitory pathways are the medial prefrontal cortex [11][16] [56] [57] [94] [103] and the hippocampus [27] [109]. Outputs from the limbic system, via the hypothalamus, provide inputs for the endocrine and autonomic nervous systems. In this sense, the model presents a review of the

known possible mechanisms for regulation of arousal. In our context, the model explains how limbic dysregulation in schizophrenia could lead to its characteristic behavioral features and could also cause the endocrine and autonomic abnormalities that so often accompany the illness.

Section 3 will give a brief review of the known neural pathways that underlie the limbic connection assumed in our model. Section 4 will construct and analyze the mathematical model. Section 5 will interpret the results of the analysis and will discuss the conclusions in a clinical context.

3 Connections and pathways

Over the past decade, significant research has been conducted on the role of the prefrontal cortex, the hippocampus and the amygdala in the fear conditioning and extinction. The predominant view is that the amygdala is excitatory and the hippocampus and prefrontal cortex are inhibitory [109]. More precisely, we believe that the activity of the prefrontal cortex modulates the amygdala fear reaction to a stressor. In this section, we will describe in some detail the internal anatomical organization and the pathways between the regions involved in the stress-reaction. This will provide us with some background and motivation for our mathematical model, although the model itself will be much more schematic and will try to avoid detail.

1. **Amygdala.** It has been observed, in both human and animal studies, that damage to the amygdala prevents the acquisition and expression of fear. It was thereby concluded that the amygdala may be the underlying site for fear conditioning and extinction. Amygdala is divided into a few physiologically and functionally distinct parts: the lateral amygdala (LA), the central amygdala (CE), the basal nucleus (B) and the intercalated cell mass (ITC). The current hypothesized mechanism of the fear reaction, in a very simplified form, is the following: In the absence of stimuli, the intra-amygdala connections are suppressing its activation, maintaining it at fairly low levels. When an emotionally potent conditioned stimulus is received, it is transmitted via thalamic pathways to the LA, then to the CE (either directly or via more complex intra-amygdala connections). Finally, the CE has output connections to a set of regions that control specific autonomic, endocrine and behavioral responses (autonomic and endocrine systems, PFC). The role of B is still controversial. Although there is anatomical [95] and physiological [55] evidence that there are strong reciprocal projections of B with the hippocampus and with the mPFC, B lesions seem to have no effect on fear extinction. It has been suggested that the role of B may be to integrate information from the LA, hippocampus and mPFC, thus being a site of contextual contributions to conditioning. As both the hippocampus and the PFC are believed to be crucial in the dynamics of schizophrenia, and as contextual interpretation of threat has been proved to be impaired in schizophrenic patients, these interconnections may prove to be of interest to our present study.

2. **Prefrontal cortex.**

Damage to the prefrontal cortex (PFC) is known to generally induce emotional and cognitive changes. In fact, these changes seem to be very finely-tuned and region-specific. The PFC consists of several functionally distinct subregions, which include the lateral prefrontal cortex, the orbital frontal cortex and the medial prefrontal cortex (mPFC) [88] [106] [101]. The lateral prefrontal cortex is involved in working memory and executive control functions (such as motor control) [82]. The orbitofrontal cortex is involved in motivation, reward and emotional decision-making [28] [14]. The mPFC is itself divided into a few subregions: anterior cingulate cortex (ACC) and several more ventral areas (infralimbic, prelimbic). The dorsal part of the ACC is involved in attention and cognitive control, and the ventral part in emotional regulation [19]. The functionality of the other subregions hasn't yet been clearly established, but the predominant view is that neural activity in the mPFC regulates the amygdala-mediated fear responses via direct projections to the LA or the ITC, as well as the activity in the hippocampus, via projections to CA1 (see below). Conversely, experimental studies suggest that initiating and sustaining behavior require several types of mPFC modulation, including mPFC self-stimulation [84] [40].

3. **Hippocampus.** The hippocampus is critical in episodic memory consolidation [111] and for aspects of working memory [71]. Unlike the role of the amygdala and PFC in stress processing,

which have been confirmed by a wide variety of studies, the potential contribution of the hippocampus remains relatively unexplored.

Structurally, MRI studies [20] found decreased hippocampal volumes in depressed patients and correlated the volume loss with the length of the illness. The same volume reduction has been observed in schizotypal disorders [37]. This is consistent with the hypothesis that hypercortisolism could result in hippocampal neurotoxicity in conditions such as bipolar disorder and schizophrenia.

However, although chronic stress has been shown to structurally damage the hippocampus, this damage is believed to be restricted to particular subfields [110] [77], which is possibly not sufficient to explain psychotic symptoms. Cerqueira et al. [21] showed that chronic stress may also impair working memory and behavioral flexibility indirectly, by affecting not the volume or the number of neurons in the hippocampus itself, but rather the synaptic plasticity within CA1 [66] or of the hippocampus-PFC interactions (see the paragraph below on hippocampus-PFC pathways).

4. **Amygdala – prefrontal cortex**

Different amygdala nuclei are robustly connected with different regions in the mPFC, suggesting that the two are functionally coupled. Several studies have shown that the functional mPFC activity is inversely related to amygdala activity [5], and this regulatory interaction is believed to be critical for the organism's ability to adapt to change. Although it has been proposed that mPFC inhibits activity in the amygdala, the mechanisms of this suppression are not yet known. As most mPFC projections to the amygdala are excitatory, it has been proposed that the inhibition occurs by activation of inhibitory neurons within the amygdala [103]. However, based on experimental evidence, a new study [118] suggests a more complex, bidirectional modulation of fear, in which PL excites amygdala output (via its projections to B) and IL inhibits amygdala output (through its projections to LA and ITC).

It has been argued that dysfunction of the mPFC-amygdala interaction may trigger the emotional preservation (usually a hyperactive amygdala and a hypoactive PFC) found in depression [107], anxiety [29] and other fear disorders [97].

5. **Hippocampus – prefrontal cortex**

Clinical and experimental studies implicate both hippocampus and PFC in several aspects of learning and memory. Not surprisingly, the two units are strongly interconnected and modulate each other's activity in a complex manner. Hippocampal innervation of the PFC is mainly excitatory and originates from the temporal CA1/subiculum region and projects to the pre-limbic, medial orbital and infralimbic areas [61]. Conversely, hippocampal memory suppression is (at least for non-psychiatric populations) under the control of prefrontal regions [36].

Cerqueira et al. [21] explain how stress can influence the integrity of the hippocampus-PFC pathway, and thereby explain some of the neurobiological deficits triggered by stress that can't be attributed to hippocampal lesions. The study correlated stress exposure with an observed volumetric reduction in the upper layers of the mPFC which could not be accounted for by neural loss, but rather by dendritic atrophy and retraction of the pyramidal neurons in layers II and III of the mPFC (also see [22]). Although the hippocampus-mPFC pathway was shown to be impaired even by a single episode of acute stress [102], this stress-induced atrophy seems to be reversible [98].

6. **Amygdala – hippocampus** The amygdala impact on the hippocampus is best represented not by neural pathways, but by the indirect autonomic and endocrine effects initiated in the amygdala in response to stress, which lead to hippocampus impairment and functional reduction (as described above). Conversely however, studies such as [26] have opened the possibility that hippocampal projections to the B might be important for contextual contributions in fear extinction.




Figure 1: *Two schematic models of the amygdala-hippocampus-mPFC interactions, as illustrated by Sotres-Bayon et al. [109].*

4 The mathematical model

Our theoretical, simplified model quantifies the amygdala-mPFC mutual regulation in a way which can be studied and understood analytically. The pathways between the two regions, as well as the self-modulation within each region are represented by linear terms, while the indirect hippocampus-modulated influences are expressed as nonlinearities. As we don't consider bilaterality, our model is constructed as a 2-dimensional dynamical system in which the variables $a = a(t)$ and $p = p(t)$ are levels of activation of amygdala and prefrontal cortex, respectively. (In a data-driven model, one may think of these variables as BOLD percent signal change.)

The strengths of the interactions are tuned differently for different individuals. In our model, this tuning is quantified by a set of parameters, so that the time-evolution of the system, and ultimately its asymptotic behavior, depend on the choice of these parameter values. While making no claim to illustrate exactly the complex fear reaction, the model should rather be seen as a metaphor of the brain undergoing stress, supporting the limbic dysregulation hypothesis. This has no immediate practical value. However, if explored further, the idea may turn out to be clinically priceless, as it suggests ways in which a more quantitative approach would be helpful to the field of psychiatry. New clinical paradigms, could be developed to test and use this hypothesis, as we will later explain.

In the next sections, we will show how for different values of the parameters, the system can exhibit dramatically different time evolutions: some corresponding to normal physiology and behavior, some corresponding to typical symptoms of schizophrenia.

4.1 A linear model. Pros and cons.

Let's start with the strong (and, as we will see, unreasonable) assumption that the amygdala-mPFC dynamic is linear, and criticize the flows inherent to this oversimplification. One would not expect, in general, for complex phenomena in the brain to behave in a linear fashion. It is a well-known mathematical fact that linear systems don't exhibit any "interesting" behavior. As a rule of thumb an isolated fixed point is either a global attractor or repeller, a center or a saddle point (depending

on the nature of the Jacobian’s eigenvalues at that point). Moreover, linear systems have no limit cycles, due to the Poincare-Bendixon theorem. The only circumstance in which cycles exist is if the system has a “center”, i.e. a fixed point surrounded by accumulating cycles, neither attracting nor repelling them. (Mathematically, centers happen when the Jacobian has two conjugate imaginary roots.)

In this context, if the parameters of the system change, the behavior of a fixed point may change from being a global attractor to being a repeller, going through a transitional stage (*bifurcation*). The bifurcation corresponds to a *critical* set of the parameters for which the fixed point is a center, and thus represents a point of sudden transition in the dynamics (see Figure 1). As one would want to believe that brain processes have somewhat more fail-safe mechanisms, this is a feature of the linear model that we will try to correct later.

As an illustration, we construct a very simple and plausible linear model for the basic interaction between the amygdala and mPFC. This toy version of the model will leave out the autonomic and endocrine feedback loops, and will therefore neglect their influence on the hippocampus function. All other region interactions will be assumed linear.

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{a} &= -\mu_1 a - k_1 p + I - \gamma_1 H \\ \dot{p} &= k_2 a + \mu_2 p + \gamma_2 H\end{aligned}$$

where $I, H, \mu, k_1, k_2, \gamma_1, \gamma_2 > 0$.

The amygdala activation a is driven by four terms: the input $I > 0$ (corresponding to the background environmental stimuli), the self-inhibition $-\mu_1 a$ (the amygdala “resilience to stress”) and the prefrontal and hippocampal modulations $-k_1 p$ and $\gamma_1 H$ (the hippocampus is assumed to have constant activation H , since it receives no feedback). In the absence of the PFC term, the asymptotic equilibrium for a would be $a = \frac{I - \gamma_1 H}{\mu_1}$. The PFC activation p is driven by: the amygdala excitatory input $k_2 a$, a hippocampal excitatory modulation $\gamma_2 H$ and a self-excitation $\mu_2 p$.




Figure 2: *Phase portraits of the linear model for $\mu_2 = 1, k_1 = 2, k_2 = 4$ and different values of the parameter μ_1 . The fixed point (a^*, p^*) is a global attractor for $\mu_1 = 1.1$ (left), a center for $\mu_1 = 1$ (middle) and a repeller for $\mu_1 = 0.9$.*

In a “brain” with a well-balanced feedback, this should euristically work as follows: If the amygdala activation level is high, its excitatory effect on the mPFC will drive p up, which in turn will inhibit a and make the system converge towards an equilibrium. In a “brain” with an overactive amygdala (low μ_1 value), convergence fails to happen.

The Jacobian matrix:

$$D = \begin{pmatrix} -\mu_1 & -k_1 \\ k_2 & \mu_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

has determinant $\Delta = k_1 k_2 - \mu_1 \mu_2$. We will assume that $\Delta = k_1 k_2 - \mu_1 \mu_2 > 0$, i.e. we work in a regime where the interconnections prevail over self-modulations in the two regions.

Then the system has always a fixed point (equilibrium) at

$$(a^*, p^*) = \left(\frac{k_2 I + H(\mu_1 \gamma_2 - \gamma_1 k_2)}{\Delta}, \frac{-\mu_1 I + H(\gamma_1 \mu_2 - k_1 \gamma_2)}{\Delta} \right)$$

The equilibrium depends on the outside stress level and on the hippocampus activation, as well as on the mutual and self excitation and inhibition parameters. The fixed point is globally attracting if $\mu_1 > \mu_2$, i.e. if the amygdala self-inhibition is strong enough to exceed the PFC self-excitation. However, as μ_1 decreases, the stability of the fixed point changes, and for $\mu_1 < \mu_2$ it becomes a global repeller. A system operating under such values of the parameters ($\mu_1 < \mu_2$) will have all trajectories pushed away from the repeller and never stabilize. It is hard to believe that the brain operates with switch between stable and unstable behavior so suddenly.

So where could the nonlinearity come from and what does it do?

4.2 The nonlinear model

Nonlinearity in a two-dimensional system introduces an interesting characteristic feature: possible existence of limit-cycles. Consider the general form of a 2-dimensional nonlinear system with a fixed point at the origin:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \dot{x} \\ \dot{y} \end{pmatrix} = D \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} + N(x, y) = \begin{pmatrix} d_{11}x + d_{12}y + N_1(x, y) \\ d_{21}x + d_{22}y + N_2(x, y) \end{pmatrix}$$

where D is the Jacobian matrix and N is the nonlinear part, both parameters-dependent.

The eigenvalues λ_1 and λ_2 of D may take real or complex values that satisfy $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 = \text{trace}(D) = \tau$ and $\lambda_1 \lambda_2 = \Delta = \det(D)$. In general, if $\Delta > 0$, then the origin is either an attracting node or spiral (in case $\tau < 0$) or a repelling node or spiral (in case $\tau > 0$). At the parameter values where $\tau = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 = 0$, the system exhibits a bifurcation. In particular, if λ_1 and $\lambda_2 = \overline{\lambda_1}$ are imaginary, then we may have a *Hopf bifurcation*. The way the local dynamics of the system changes at a Hopf bifurcation is described by the Lyapunov number, which depends on both the linear part D and the nonlinear part N , as described below [93]. If $N_1, N_2: \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are analytical, with expansions:

$$N_1(x, y) = \sum_{i+j \geq 2} a_{ij} x^i y^j = (a_{20}x^2 + a_{11}xy + a_{02}y^2) + (a_{30}x^3 + a_{21}x^2y + b_{12}xy^2 + b_{03}y^3) + \dots$$

$$N_2(x, y) = \sum_{i+j \geq 2} b_{ij} x^i y^j = (b_{20}x^2 + b_{11}xy + b_{02}y^2) + (b_{30}x^3 + b_{21}x^2y + b_{12}xy^2 + b_{03}y^3) + \dots$$

then the Lyapunov number:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma &= \frac{-3\pi}{2d_{12}\Delta^{3/2}} \{d_{11}d_{21}(a_{11}^2 + a_{11}b_{02} + a_{02}b_{11}) + D_{11}d_{12}(b_{11}^2 + a_{20}b_{11} + a_{11}b_{02}) \\ &+ d_{21}^2(a_{11}a_{02} + 2a_{02}b_{02}) - 2d_{11}d_{21}(b_{02}^2 - a_{20}a_{02}) - 2d_{11}d_{12}(a_{20}^2 - b_{20}b_{02}) \\ &- d_{12}^2(2a_{20}b_{20} + b_{11}b_{20}) + (d_{12}d_{21} - 2d_{11}^2)(b_{11}b_{02} - a_{11}a_{20}) \\ &- (d_{11}^2 + d_{12}d_{21})[3(d_{21}b_{03} - d_{12}a_{30}) + 2d_{11}(a_{21} + b_{12}) + (d_{21}a_{12} - d_{12}b_{21})]\} \end{aligned}$$

If $\sigma \neq 0$, a Hopf bifurcation occurs at the critical value of the parameters where $\tau = 0$. More precisely:

(1) If $\sigma < 0$, the origin is attracting for $\tau \leq 0$, and the system has no limit cycle. For $\tau > 0$, the origin becomes repelling, but a circular stable limit cycle forms around it, whose radius increases with τ .

(2) If $\sigma > 0$, the system has a unique unstable limit cycle that surrounds the stable origin for $\tau < 0$. The radius of the cycle decreases with τ . At $\tau = 0$, the unstable cycle collapses into the origin, making it unstable for $\tau > 0$.




Figure 3: *When $\sigma < 0$, the system exhibits a supercritical Hopf bifurcation.*




Figure 4: *When $\sigma > 0$, the system exhibits a subcritical Hopf bifurcation.*

The change in dynamics is still very sudden at a Hopf bifurcation (even though the parameters change smoothly), but has much more subtle implications. To interpret this phenomenon in our clinical context, let's first construct as before a more particular example of a nonlinear model, as an extension of our linear toy-model.

Staying faithful to our original assumption, we include the nonlinearities as the contribution of the autonomic and endocrine response to stress. As mentioned in the introduction, experimental studies showed that high levels of cortisol due to the amygdala stress-reaction have a detrimental effect on the PFC, in two known distinct ways: its neurotoxic effects on hippocampal cells and its suppression of synaptic function between hippocampus and the receptive PFC areas. The new system, including these nonlinear contributions, will take the form:

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{a} &= -\mu_1 a - k_1 p + I - \gamma_1 (H - f(a)) \\ \dot{p} &= k_2 a - \mu_2 p + \gamma_2 (H - f(a) + g(a, p))\end{aligned}$$

Here the term $-f(a)$ signifies the structurally detrimental effect that amygdala overactivity and the subsequent hypercortisolemia has directly on the hippocampus. The term $g(a, p)$ refers to the synaptic remodeling induced by high cortisol on the PFC afferents from the hippocampus, and hence it only affects p .

Under the change of variables $x = a - a^*$ and $y = p - p^*$, the system becomes:

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x} &= \mu_1 x - k_1 y + \gamma_1 h(x) \\ \dot{y} &= k_2 x - \mu_2 y - \gamma_2 (h(x) - j(x, y))\end{aligned}$$

where $h(x) = f(a) = f(x + a^*)$ and $j(x, y) = g(a, p) = g(x + a^*, y + p^*)$.

To fix our ideas, we will take both terms to be of the simplest possible nonlinear forms: $h(x) = \gamma x^2$ to reflect the decrease in H activation and $j(x, y) = \delta xy$, for the suppression of Hebbian-like synapses

in mPFC. Recall that, in our original system, this corresponds to $f(a) = \gamma(a - a^*)^2$ and $g(a, p) = \delta(a - a^*)(p - p^*)$.

The system has a fixed point at $(x^*, y^*) = (0, 0)$, and exhibits a Hopf bifurcation at $\mu_1 = \mu_2$, with Lyapunov number

$$\sigma = \frac{3\pi}{2\Delta^{3/2}}(\delta\gamma_2 + 2\gamma\gamma_1) [\mu_2(\delta\gamma_2 - \gamma\gamma_1) + k_1\gamma_2\gamma]$$

Applying the theoretical results we discussed above, we conclude that: if $\frac{\delta}{\gamma} + \frac{k_1}{\mu_1} < \frac{\gamma_1}{\gamma_2}$ (i.e., $\sigma < 0$), then the system has a supercritical Hopf bifurcation at $\mu_1 = \mu_2$, and if $\frac{\delta}{\gamma} + \frac{k_1}{\mu_1} > \frac{\gamma_1}{\gamma_2}$ (i.e., $\sigma > 0$) then the system has a subcritical Hopf bifurcation at $\mu_1 = \mu_2$.

5 Discussion

This theoretical model is more a “philosophical” than “physiological” illustration of the limbic dysregulation and neurotoxicity hypotheses. It presents the working brain in a light that permits interpretation of its “stress vulnerability” and “hippocampus deficit” as parameters that vary continuously, determining its regulation and function. The focus of this interpretation is on the idea that, although these parameters change smoothly over a whole continuum of possible values, there are critical/threshold values, which, when passed, could suddenly and completely change the system’s dynamics.

The two parameters on which we focus, whose tuning determines the behavior of the system, are the amygdala sensitivity to stress, represented by μ_1 and the more diffuse hippocampal/prefrontal vulnerability to cortisol neurotoxicity, represented by the Lyapunov number σ . Indeed, staying faithful to the stress/vulnerability hypothesis of schizophrenia, our interpretation will regard σ as the “disease-quantifying” parameter: negative values of σ correspond to normal limbic regulation, while positive values of σ quantify risk for developing schizophrenia, and, in more advanced stages, severity of the illness. On the other hand, larger values of μ_1 correspond to a more stress-resilient amygdala, while smaller values of μ_1 signify a more stress-reactive amygdala. We could think of this parameter as quantifying the amygdala responsiveness to stress, which in literature has been related to mental conditions such as depression, or anxiety disorders [109], but which is not the signature of schizophrenia. We can verify whether this paradigm is clinically plausible by testing what happens if we apply a brief stress increase to the system (which in real life may come in the form of a traumatic event). We quantify the burst of stress by boosting the amygdala to a high initial state. We observe whether the system returns to homeostasis by checking if the respective trajectory eventually stabilizes.

Suppose $\sigma < 0$. For high amygdala resilience $\mu_1 > \mu_2$, all trajectories converge to the global attractor, so the initial condition is irrelevant: the time evolutions stabilize after any stimulus, if sufficient time is allowed to pass. For $\mu_1 < \mu_2$, the situation is changed by the formation of an attracting limit cycle (Figure 4a). After a short stress burst, the duo amygdala-PFC slowly stabilizes towards the cycle. Note that, although dampened in time, the system continues to oscillate in both cases. We will return to this idea later. The memorable feature of the $\sigma < 0$ regime is that, although stability of the fixed point changes at the bifurcation $\mu_1 = \mu_2$, the role of the attractor is assumed by a limit cycle. The fact that the amygdala-PFC pair exhibits in some people wider oscillations that don’t seem to dampen in time could be a mark of low amygdala self-inhibition.

When $\sigma > 0$, the situation changes completely. In the regime $\mu_1 > \mu_2$, the system has a locally attracting fixed point, surrounded by a repelling cycle, whose radius gets smaller with smaller μ_1 and with larger σ . The basin of attraction of the stable point is the interior of the cycle: any initial state inside this basin will converge in time towards the fixed point, and any initial state outside will spiral out to infinity. When $\mu_1 = \mu_2$, the cycle disappears, so when $\mu_1 < \mu_2$ the fixed point is globally repelling (Figure 5b). The behavior of the model in the positive σ regime is representative for schizophrenic dysregulation. A stimulus may elevate amygdala to a value which places the corresponding state outside of the attraction basin, preventing convergence from ever happening. If allowed to follow its natural evolution, the trajectory would perform larger and larger oscillations, corresponding to the cyclic psychotic behavior observed in patients. At some




Figure 5: We illustrate the dynamics of the nonlinear model for a particular example of parameter values. Fixed parameters: $\mu_2 = 1, k_1 = 2, k_2 = 4, \gamma_1 = 2, \gamma_2 = 0.5, \gamma = 1$. A. The system exhibits a supercritical Hopf bifurcation for $\delta = 1$. The phase portraits show the local dynamics around the origin for $\mu_1 = 0.9$ (panel A.1) and $\mu_1 = 1.1$ (panel A.2). As μ_1 crosses the critical value $\mu_2 = 1$, the attracting origin becomes repelling and surrounded by an attracting limit-cycle. B. The system exhibits a subcritical Hopf bifurcation for $\delta = 3$. As μ_1 crosses the critical value $\mu_1 = 1$, the repelling cycle surrounding the attracting origin ($\mu_1 = 0.9$, shown in B.1) collapses into the origin and changes it to a global repeller ($\mu_1 = 1.1$, shown in B.2).

point during this evolution, the patient may enter clinical treatment; antipsychotic medication may succeed to temporarily alter this time-course. It is interesting to note that, as we increase the value of σ , the attraction basin shrinks around the attracting point, so that even weak stressful stimuli may push the state outside the attraction basin. This makes the Lyapunov number σ a good quantifier of the risk and severity of the disease: the larger σ , the more likely it is for the time-evolution to be thrown outside of the convergence range even by small perturbations. This relates to the fact that highly vulnerable individuals may develop psychotic behavior even after common daily stress that may appear benign to others.

We want to conclude the analysis of the phenomena described above with a few time-frame considerations. Our model works in parallel with behavioral research that relates stress with first outbreak [53] and relapse [116]. The time-frame that the model addresses is thereby of the order of days, even weeks, allowing possible psychotic behavior to develop after a stressful event. Cycles and oscillations in brain activity, as well as regulation and return to homeostasis have been already the

subject of a wide variety of studies, addressing very different time scales. Electrophysiology studies revealed high frequency oscillations in neuronal brain activity, and correlated synchronization of theta rhythms in the amygdalo-hippocampal pathways with retrieval of conditioned fear [25] [92]. It is also known that that the brain has a circadian rhythm, so that its activity oscillates according to a daily pattern [50]. Additionally, recent imaging studies focus on the dynamics of certain regions of interest in response to visual stimuli, such as facial expressions. (See Figure 6, which illustrates comparatively the behavior of the amygdala and a prefrontal area, in control subjects and schizophrenic patients.) Although our model does not address such short-scale phenomena, these findings better describe its place as just one level in a general complex picture.




Figure 6: *A. fMRI data on amygdala and BA45 activation under visual stimulation with Pictures of Facial Affect. The data has been averaged over all stimulation blocks, as well as over the control and population samples, respectively (samples sizes $N = 11$) [99].*

Further testing of the model should be willing to compromise precision for duration. Firstly, the design does not need to focus on identifying the exact brain areas involved in the process, but rather in estimating the average activation in generic areas such as amygdala, hippocampus and mPFC. Secondly, these activations need to be measured over an extended time-period, allowing the feed-back cycle to repeatedly loop around, so that the long-term dynamics could become apparent. In this context, EEG readings would be ideal, as they can be taken at length, without drastically restricting the subject’s normal routine. To create the required set-up and take the measures following a stress burst, the testing should be ideally planned for immediately after a scheduled stressful event such as an exam, or first time ski-diving (see <http://www.bme.sunysb.edu/people/lstrey/research.htm#2>). Another variable of interest that can be very conveniently measured during a long-term routine is salivary cortisol, which is believed to reflect stress-related hypocortisolemia. In our model this variable is one of the factors determining the system’s nonlinear behavior, so observing its evolution would help us understand these nonlinearities better. To the best of my knowledge, these testing paradigms are – if not already being used in other tests – then fairly easy to design and reproduce.

6 Conclusions

A natural question to address is the significance of this model. Theoretically, the model shows how two different clinical systems (with very similar underlying rules, and only slightly different parameter values) can exhibit drastically different long term behavior if started under the same initial conditions. The literature talks about the “continuum” of human behavior and the practical difficulties of establishing a normality/pathology threshold. Such a bifurcation could constitute the needed threshold for clinical evaluations. Practically, if the model proves to be valid, both diagnosis of illness and quantification of its severity can be achieved by calculating the Lyapunov number of a system constructed from clinical measures. As computer capabilities have sky-rocketed over the past few decades, fast and accurate algorithms [44] [23] have become available to compute such system invariants from time-series.

On a slightly different note, our model supports the idea that the dynamics of a diseased system is not driven randomly, but is rather only apparently random due to its complicated behavior over short

time periods. This idea is very important for clinical treatment, as it suggests that the deterministic behavior of a system can be changed by proper tuning of the parameters. In general, the drugs currently in use only temporarily alter the time-course of the illness, which typically relapses when interrupting medication. It is possible that medication options could be improved by exploring how drugs can change the parameter values to permanently alter the system and its long-term behavior.

A more sophisticated, higher-dimensional model, although preferable and possible, is a different and much harder task to undertake. As discussed before, the exact physiological underpinnings of the brain interactions are not yet fully known from experimental studies, making an educated choice of parameters very difficult. Furthermore, even the theoretical study of the evolution of a system's dynamics under perturbations is an ongoing mathematical problem. However, we expect that, as the theoretical and experimental knowledge progress, so will our ability to understand and model such complex phenomena.

Epilogue

While walking in a dark swampy place one night, I had the distinct feeling that something was following me, with insane reddish eyes, ready to leap. The darkness, the rotten smell, the chill in the air, all made my skin wrinkle in little goose-bumps. A stick cracked under my foot, and my heart skipped a beat. But I did not run off, neither did my heart stop. A split second later I skipped back to the reality of my short stroll in the vicinity of a very populated area, which never harbored red-eyed beasts. I giggled at the memory of all the horror Hollywood movies that lived involuntarily on that brief adrenaline peak. The moment was gone and the heart was beating all its strokes again. But I will never know what just happened in that brief moment of panic. How many more years of research are needed to shed light onto something as seemingly simple, and when will we be able to understand why such a casual moment sometimes conquers people and takes over their lives, keeping them in the constant terror of some red-eyed beast.

References

- [1] Aguilera, G., Kiss, A., Liu, Y., Kamitakahara, A., 2007. Negative regulation of corticotropin releasing factor expression and limitation of stress response. *Stress*. 10 (2) 153-161.
- [2] Amann, J.F., Constantinescu, G.M., 1990. The anatomy of the visceral and autonomic nervous systems. *Semin Vet Med Surg (Small Anim)*. 5 (1) 4-11.
- [3] American Psychiatric Association, 1994. *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-IV)*. 4-th edition, Washington DC.
- [4] Anand, A., Shekhar, A., 2003. Brain imaging studies in mood and anxiety disorders: Special emphasis on the amygdala. *Ann. NY Acad. Sci.* 985, 370388.
- [5] Anand, A., 2005. Activity and connectivity of brain mood regulating circuit in depression: a functional magnetic resonance study. *Biol Psychiatry*. 57 (10) 1079-1088.
- [6] Ananth, H., Popescu, I., Critchley, H.D., Good, C.D., Frackowiak, R., Dolan, R.J., 2002. Cortical and subcortical gray matter abnormalities in schizophrenia determined through structural magnetic resonance imaging with optimized volumetric voxel-based morphometry. *American Journal of Psychiatry*. 159 (9) 1497-1505.
- [7] Andreasen, N., Nasrallah, H.A., Dunn, V., Olson, S.C., Grove, W.M., Ehrhardt, J.C., Coffman J.A., Crossett, J.H., 1986. Structural abnormalities in the frontal system in schizophrenia. A magnetic resonance imaging study. *Archives of General Psychiatry* 43 (2) 136-144.
- [8] Ashe, P.C., Berry M.D., Boulton, A.A., 2001. Schizophrenia, a neurodegenerative disorder with neurodevelopmental antecedents. *Progress in Neuro-Psychopharmacology & Biological Psychiatry*. 25 (4) 691-707.

- [9] Bachrach L.L., 2000. Chronicity in schizophrenia. *Hospital & Community Psychiatry*. 38 (11) 1226-7.
- [10] Bao, A.M., Meynen, G., Swaab, D.F., 2007. The stress system in depression and neurodegeneration: Focus on the human hypothalamus. *Brain Res Rev*. Epub.
- [11] Baxter, M.G., Parker, A., Lindner, C.C., Izquierdo, A., Murray, E.A., 2000. Control of response selection by reinforcer value requires interaction of amygdala and orbital prefrontal cortex. *J Neurosci* 20 (11) 4311-4319.
- [12] Bearden, C.E., van Erp, T.G., Thompson, P.M., Toga, A.W., Cannon, T.D., 2007. Cortical mapping of genotype-phenotype relationships in schizophrenia. *Hum Brain Mapp*. 28 (6) 519-532.
- [13] Berner, P, 2002. Conceptualization of vulnerability models for schizophrenia: historical aspects. *Am J Med Genet*. 114 (8) 938-942.
- [14] Berns, G.S., McClure, S.M., Pagnoni, G., Montague, P.R., 2001. Predictability modulates human brain response to reward. *J. Neurosci*. 21, 27932798.
- [15] Blackwood, N.J., Howard, R.J., Murray, R.M., 2001. Cognitive neuropsychiatric models of persecutory delusions. *American Journal of Psychiatry*. 158 (4) 527-539.
- [16] Blair, H.T., Sotres-Bayon, F., Moita, M.A., LeDoux, J.E., 2005. The lateral amygdala processes the value of conditioned and unconditioned aversive stimuli. *Neuroscience*. 133 (2) 561-569
- [17] Braff, D.L., Light, G.A., 2004. Preattentional and attentional cognitive deficits as targets for treating schizophrenia. *Psychopharmacology*. 174 (1) 75-85.
- [18] Brugger, P., Regard, M., Landis, T., Oelz, O., 1999. Hallucinatory experiences in extreme-altitude climbers. *Neuropsychiatry Neuropsychol Behav Neurol*. 12 (1) 67-71.
- [19] Bush, G., Luu, P., Posner, M., 2000. Cognitive and emotional influences in anterior cingulate cortex. *Trends Cogn Sci*. 4, 215-222.
- [20] Caetano, S., Hatch, J., Brambilla, P., Sassi, R., Nicoletti, M., Mallinger, A., Frank, E., Kupfer, D., Keshavan, M., Soares, J., 2004. Anatomical MRI study of hippocampus and amygdala in patients with current and remitted major depression. *Psychiatry Research. Neuroimaging*. 132 (2) 141-147.
- [21] Cerqueira, J., Mailliet, F., Almeida, O., Jay, T., Sousa, N., 2007. The Prefrontal Cortex as a Key Target of the Maladaptive Response to Stress. *J Neurosci*. 27 (11) 2781-2787.
- [22] Cerqueira, J., Taipa, R., Uylings, H., Almeida, O., Sousa, N., 2007. Specific configuration of dendritic degeneration in pyramidal neurons of the medial prefrontal cortex induced by differing corticosteroid regimens. *cereb Cortex*, in press.
- [23] Chon, K.H., Kanters J.K., Cohen, R.J., Holstein-Rathlou, N.H., 1997. Detection of chaotic determinism in stochastic short time series. *Proceedings 19-th International Conference IEEE/EMBS*.
- [24] Chua, S.E., McKenna, P.J., 1995. Schizophrenia - a brain disease? A critical review of structural and functional cerebral abnormality in the disorder. *Br J Psychiatry*. 166 (5) 563-582.
- [25] Collins, D.R., Pelletier, J.G., Pare, D., 2001. Slow and fast (gamma) neuronal oscillations in the perirhinal cortex and lateral amygdala. *J Neurophysiol*. 85 (4) 1661-1672.
- [26] Corcoran, K., Maren, S., 2001. Hippocampal inactivation disrupts contextual retrieval of fear memory after extinction. *J Neurosci*. 21, 1720-1726.
- [27] Corcoran, C., Mujica-Parodi, L., Yale, S., Leitman, D., Malaspina, D., 2002. Could stress cause psychosis in individuals vulnerable to schizophrenia? *CNS Spectr*. 7 (1) 33-38, 41-42.

- [28] Damasio, A.R., 1990, Synchronous activation in multiple cortical regions: a mechanism for recall. *Semin. Neurosci.* 2, 287-296.
- [29] Davidson, R., 2002. Anxiety and affective style: role of prefrontal cortex and amygdala. *Biol Psychiatry.* 51, 68-80.
- [30] Davis, M., Whalen, P.J., 2001. The amygdala: vigilance and emotion. *Mol Psychiatry* 6 (1) 13-34.
- [31] Dawson, M.E., Nuechterlein, K.H., Schell, A.M., 1992. Electrodermal anomalies in recent-onset schizophrenia: relationships to symptoms and prognosis. *Schizophr Bull.* 18 (2) 295-311.
- [32] Dawson, M.E., et al., 1992. Concurrent and predictive electrodermal correlates of symptomatology in recent-onset schizophrenic patients. *J Abnorm Psychol.* 101 (1) 153-64.
- [33] Dawson M.E., Nuechterlein, K.H., Schell, A.M., Gitlin M., Ventura, J., 1994. Autonomic abnormalities in schizophrenia. State or trait indicators? *Arch. Gen. Psychiatry.* 51 (10) 813-824.
- [34] de Haan, L., Bakker, J.M., 2004. Overview of neuropathological theories of schizophrenia: from degeneration to progressive developmental disorder. *Psychopathology.* 37 (1) 1-7.
- [35] DeLisi, L.E., 1999. Defining the course of brain structural change and plasticity in schizophrenia. *Psychiatry Research.* 92 (1) 1-9.
- [36] Depue, B., Curran, T., Banich, M., 2007. Prefrontal regions orchestrate suppression of emotional memories via a two-phase process. *Science,* 317 , 215.
- [37] Dickey, C., McCarley, R., Xu, M., Seidman, L., Voglmaier, M., Niznikiewicz, M., Connor, E., Shenton, M., 2007. MRI abnormalities of the hippocampus and cavum septi pellucidi in females with schizotypal personality disorder. *Schizophrenia Research.* 89, 49-58.
- [38] Dirkin, G.R., 1983. Cognitive tunneling: use of visual information under stress. *Perceptual & Motor Skills.* 56 (1) 191-198.
- [39] Elliott, G.R., Eisdorfer, C. 1982. *Stress and Human Health.* New York, Springer Publishing Company.
- [40] Ferrer, J.M., Sabater, R., Saez, J.A., 1993. Neurotensin participates in self-stimulation of the medial prefrontal cortex in the rat. *Eur J Pharmacol.* 231 (1) 39-45.
- [41] Finlay, J.M., Zigmond, M.J., 1997. The effects of stress on central dopaminergic neurons: possible clinical implications. *Neurochem Res.* 22 (11) 1387-1394.
- [42] Floresco, S., Tse, M., 2007. Dopaminergic regulation of inhibitory and excitatory transmission in the basolateral amygdala – prefrontal cortical pathway. *The Journal of Neuroscience.* 27 (8) 2045-2057.
- [43] Friedman, J.I., Ocampo, R., Elbaz, Z., et al., 2005. The effect of citalopram adjunctive treatment added to atypical antipsychotic medications for cognitive performance in patients with schizophrenia. *J. Clin. Psychopharmacol.* 25 (3) 237-242.
- [44] Geist, K., Parlitz, U., Lauterborn, W., 1990. Comparison of different methods for computing Lyapunov exponents. *Prog Theor Phys* 83.
- [45] Ghisolfi, E.S., Schuch, A., Strimitzer, Jr., I.M., Luersen, G., Martins, F.F., Ramos, F., Becker, J., Lara, D.R., 2006. Caffeine modulates P50 auditory sensory gating in healthy subjects. *Eur Neuropsychopharmacol.* 16 (3) 204-210.
- [46] Grant, M.M., Friedman, E.S., Haskett, R.F., Riso, L.P., Thase, M.E., 2007. Urinary free cortisol levels among depressed men and women: differential relationships to age and symptoms severity? *Arch Womens Ment Health.* 10 (2) 73-78.
- [47] Grossberg, S., 2000. The imbalanced brain: from normal behavior to schizophrenia. *Biological Psychiatry.* 48 (2) 81-98.

- [48] Gruzelier, J.H., Lykken D.T., Venables, P.H., 1972. Schizophrenia and arousal revisited. Two-flash thresholds and electrodermal activity in activated and nonactivated conditions. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 26 (5) 427-432.
- [49] Gruzelier, J.H., 1976. Clinical attributes of schizophrenic skin conductance responders and non-responders. *Psychological Medicine*. 6 (2) 245-249.
- [50] Guilding, C, Piggins, H.D., 2007. Challenging the omnipotence of the suprachiasmatic timekeeper: are circadian oscillators present throughout the mammalian brain? *Eur J Neurosci*. 25 (11) 3195-3216.
- [51] Hanlon, F.M. and R.J. Sutherland, 2000. Changes in adult brain and behavior caused by neonatal limbic damage: implications for the etiology of schizophrenia. *Behavioural Brain Research*. 107 (1-2) 71-83.
- [52] Harding, C.M., Zubin, J., Strauss, J.S., 1992. Chronicity in schizophrenia: revisited. *British Journal of Psychiatry - Supplementum* (18) 27-37.
- [53] Hazlett, H., Dawson, M.E., Schell A.M., Nuechterlein, K.H., 1997. Electrodermal activity as a prodromal sign in schizophrenia. *Biological Psychiatry*. 41 (1) 111-113.
- [54] Hirsch, S., Weinberger, D., 1995. *Schizophrenia*. Blackwell Science, 1st edition.
- [55] Ishikawa, A., Namura, S., 2003. Convergence and interaction of hippocampal and amygdalar projections within the prefrontal cortex in the rat. *J Neurosci*. 23, 9987-9995.
- [56] Izquierdo, A., Murray, E.A., 2005. Opposing effects of amygdala and orbital prefrontal cortex lesions on the extinction of instrumental responding in macaque monkeys. *Eur J Neurosci* 22 (9) 2341-2346.
- [57] Izquierdo, A., Suda, R.K., Murray, E.A., 2005. Comparison of the effects of bilateral orbital prefrontal cortex lesions and amygdala lesions on emotional responses in rhesus monkeys. *J Neurosci* 25 (37) 8534-8542.
- [58] Jackson, M.E., Moghaddam, B., 2004. Stimulus-specific plasticity of prefrontal cortex dopamine neurotransmission. *J Neurochem*. 88 (6) 1327-1334.
- [59] Jarvis, G.E., 2007. The social causes of psychosis in North American psychiatry: a review of a disappearing literature. *Can J Psychiatry*. 52 (5) 287-294.
- [60] Javitt, D.C., Doneshka, P., Grochowski, S., Ritter, W., 1995. Impaired mismatch negativity generation reflects widespread dysfunction of working memory in schizophrenia. *Archives of General Psychiatry*. 52 (7) 550-558.
- [61] Jay, T.M., Witter, M.P., 1991. Distribution of hippocampus CA1 and subicular efferents in the prefrontal cortex of the rat studied by means of anterograde transport of Phaseolus vulgaris leucoagglutinine. *J Comp Neurol*. 313, 574-586.
- [62] Jones, C.J., Harris, G., Leung, N., Blissett, J., Meyer, C., 2007. The effect of induced stress on the relationship between perfectionism and unhealthy eating attitudes. *Eat Weight Disord*. 12 (2) 39-43.
- [63] Joyce J.N., Milan M.J., 2005. Dopamine D3 receptor agonists and therapeutic agents. *Drug Discov. Today*. 10 (13) 917-925.
- [64] Kajantie, E., Phillips, D.I., 2006. The effects of sex and hormonal status on the physiological response to acute psychosocial stress. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*. 31 (2) 151-178.
- [65] Kapur S., Mamo D., 2003. Half a century of antipsychotics and still a central role for dopamine D2 receptors, *Prog. Neuropsychopharmacol. Biol. Psychiatry*. 27 (7) 1081-1090.
- [66] Kemp, A., Manahan-Vaughan, D. The Hippocampal CA1 Region and Dentate Gyrus Differentiate between Environmental and Spatial Feature Encoding through Long-Term Depression. *Learning and Memory Research*, Medical Faculty.

- [67] Kessler, R.C., Amminger, G., Aguilar-Gaxiola, S., Alonso, J., Lee, S., Ustn, T., 2007. Age of onset of mental disorders: a review of recent literature. *Curr Opin Psychiatry*. 20 (4) 359-364.
- [68] Kim, H.G., Kim, K.L., 2007. Decreased hippocampal cholinergic neurostimulating peptide precursor protein associated with stress exposure in rat brain by proteomic analysis. *J Neurosci Res*. Epub.
- [69] Lawrie, S.M., Whalley, H.C., Job, D.E., Johnstone, E.C., 2003. Structural and functional abnormalities of the amygdala in schizophrenia. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*. 985, 445-460.
- [70] LeDoux, J., 2003. The emotional brain, fear, and the amygdala. *Cell Mol Neurobiol*. 23 (4-5) 727-738.
- [71] Lipska, B., Aultman, J., Verma, A., Weinberger, D., Moghaddam, B., 2002. Neonatal damage of the ventral hippocampus impairs working memory in the rat. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 27, 47-54.
- [72] Lowry, C.A., Moore, F.L., 2006. Regulation of behavioral responses by corticotropin-releasing factor. *Gen Comp Endocrinol*. 146 (1) 19-27.
- [73] Lucini, D., Di Fede, G., Parati, G., Pagani, M., 2005. Impact of chronic psychosocial stress on autonomic cardiovascular regulation in otherwise healthy subjects. *Hypertension*. 46, 1201-1206.
- [74] Manuck, S.B., Cohen, S., Rabin, B.S., Muldoon, M.F., Bachen, E.A. Individual differences in cellular immune response to stress. *Psychological Science*. 2, 111- 114.
- [75] Mason, J., Iqauta, W.J.H., Brody, J.V., Robinson, J.A., Sachar, E.J., 1961. The role of limbic system structures in the regulation of ACTH secretion. *Journal of Neural Transmission*. 23 (1-2) 4-14.
- [76] Mathalon, D.H., Heinks, T., Ford, J.M., 2004. Selective attention in schizophrenia: sparing and loss of executive control. *American Journal of Psychiatry*. 161 (5) 872-881.
- [77] McEwen, B.S., 2001. Plasticity of the hippocampus: adaptation to chronic stress and allostatic load. *Ann NY Acad Sci* 933. 265277.
- [78] McEwen, B.S., 2004. Protection and damage from acute and chronic stress: allostasis and allostatic overload and relevance to the pathophysiology of psychiatric disorders. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*. 1032, 1-7.
- [79] McGlashan, T.H., 1998. Early detection and intervention of schizophrenia: rationale and research. *British Journal of Psychiatry – Supplementum*. 172 (33) 3-6.
- [80] McGlashan, T.H., Zipursky, R.B., Perkins, D., et al., 2003. The PRIME North America randomized double-blind clinical trial of olanzapine versus placebo in patients at risk of being prodromally symptomatic for psychosis. I. Study rationale and design. *Schizophrenia Research*. 61 (1) 7-18.
- [81] Medoff, D.R., et. al., 2001. Probing the human hippocampus using rCBF: contrasts in schizophrenia. *Hippocampus*. 11 (5) 543-550.
- [82] Miller, E.K. and Cohen, J.D., 2001. An integrative theory of prefrontal cortex function. *Ann. Rev. Neurosci*. 24, 167202.
- [83] Moghaddam, B., Jackson, M., 2004. Effect of stress on prefrontal cortex function. *Neurotox Res*. 6 (1) 73-78.
- [84] Mora, F., Myres, R.D., 1977. Brain self-stimulation: direct evidence for the involvement of dopamine in the prefrontal cortex. *Science*. 197, 1387-1389.
- [85] Mujica-Parodi L.R., et. al., 2005. Nonlinear complexity and spectral analyses of heart rate variability in medicated and unmedicated patients with schizophrenia. *Neuropsychobiology*. 51 (1) 10-15.

- [86] Mujica-Parodi, L.R., 2002. Are cognitive symptoms of schizophrenia mediated by abnormalities in emotional arousal? *CNS Spectrums*. 7 (1) 58-60,65-69.
- [87] Mujica-Parodi, L.R., Korgaonkar, M., Greenberg, T., Dardo, T., Wagshul, M., Ardekani, B., Guilfoyle, D., Zong, Y., Chon, K., Malaspina, D. Lymbic dysregulation is associated with lowered heart rate variability and increased trait anxiety in healthy adults. *Hum Brain Mapp*. Under review.
- [88] Muller, N.G., Machado, L., and Knight, R.T., 2002. Contributions of subregions of the prefrontal cortex to working memory: evidence from brain lesions in humans. *J. Cogn. Neurosci*. 14, 673686.
- [89] Myin-Germeys, I., Delespaul, P., van Os, J, 2005. Behavioural sensitization to daily life stress in psychosis. *Psychol. Med*. 35 (5) 733-741.
- [90] Nuechterlein, K.H., Dawson, M.E., Gitlin, M., Ventura, J., Goldstein, M.J., Snyder, K.S., Yee, C.M., Mintz, J., 1992. Developmental Processes in Schizophrenic Disorders: longitudinal studies of vulnerability and stress. *Schizophr Bull*. 18 (3) 387-425.
- [91] Pavlides, C., et al., 2002. Effects of chronic stress on hippocampal long-term potentiation. *Hippocampus*. 12 (2) 245-257.
- [92] Pelletier, J.G., Pare, D., 2004. Role of amygdala oscillations in the consolidation of emotional memories. *Biol Psychiatry*. 55 (6) 559-562.
- [93] Perko, L. Differential equations and dynamical systems. Springer-Verlag New York, Inc., 1993.
- [94] Phelps, E.A., Delgado, M., Nearing, K., LeDoux, J., 2004. Extinction learning in humans: role of the amygdala and vmPFC. *Neuron* 43 (6) 897-905.
- [95] Pitkanen, A., Pikkarainen, M., Nurminen, N., Ylinen, A., 2000. Reciprocal connections between the amygdala and the hippocampal formation, perirhinal cortex, and postrhinal cortex in rat. A review. *Ann. NY Acad. Sci*. 911, 369391.
- [96] Preston, A.R., 2005. Hippocampal function, declarative memory, and schizophrenia: anatomic and functional neuroimaging considerations. *Curr Neurol Neurosci Rep*. 5 (4) 249-256.
- [97] Quirk, G., Gehlert, D., 2003. Inhibition of the amygdala: Key to pathological states? *Ann. NY Acad. Sci*. 985, 263272.
- [98] Radley, J., Rocher, A., Janssen, W., Hof, P., McEwen, B., Morrison, J., 2005. Reversibility of atypical dendritic retraction in the rat medial prefrontal cortex following repeated stress. *Exp Neurol*. 196, 199-203.
- [99] Radulescu, A., Mujica-Parodi, L.R., 2007. A systems approach to schizophrenia and limbic dysregulation. *Sch Res*. Under review.
- [100] Ritsner M., Maayan, R., Gibel, A., Strous, R.D., Modai, I., et. al., 2004. Elevation of the cortisol/dehydroepiandrosterone ratio in schizophrenia patients. *Eur. Neuropsychopharmacol*. 14 (4) 267-273.
- [101] Robbins, T.W., 1996. Dissociating executive functions of the prefrontal cortex. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci*. 351, 14631470.
- [102] Rocher, C., Spedding, M., Munoz, C., Jay, T., 2004. Acute stress-induced changes in hippocampal-prefrontal circuits in rats: effects of antidepressants. *Cereb Cortex*. 14, 224-229.
- [103] Rosenkranz, J.A., Moore, H., Grace, A.A. , 2003. The prefrontal cortex regulates lateral amygdala neuronal plasticity and responses to previously conditioned stimuli. *J Neurosci* 23 (35) 11054-11064.
- [104] Sapolsky, R.M., P.M. Plotsky, 1990. Hypercortisolism and its possible neural bases. *Biol Psychiatry*. 27 (9) 937-952.

- [105] Sapolski, R., *Why Zebras Don't Get Ulcers*. Third Edition. Henry Holt and Co. 2004.
- [106] Seamans, J.K., Floresco, S.B., Phillips, A.G., 1995. Functional differences between the prelimbic and anterior cingulate regions of the rat prefrontal cortex. *Behav. Neurosci.* 109, 1063-1073.
- [107] Siegle, G., Konecky, R., Thase, M., Carter, C., 2003. Relationships between amygdala volume and activity during emotional information processing tasks in depressed and never-depressed individuals: An fMRI investigation. *Ann. NY Acad. Sci.* 985, 481-484.
- [108] Silva, J.A., Leong, G.B., Harry, B.E., Ronan, J., Weinstock, R., 1998. Dangerous misidentification of people due to flashback phenomena in posttraumatic stress disorder. *J Forensic Sci.* 43 (6) 1107-1111.
- [109] Sotres-Bayon, F., Bush, D., LeDoux, J.E., 2004. Emotional perseveration: an update on prefrontal – amygdala interactions in fear extinction. *Learning Memory.* 11, 525-535.
- [110] Sousa, N., Lukoyanov, N.V., Madeira, M.D., Almeida, O.F., Paula-Barbosa, M.M., 2000. Reorganization of the morphology of hippocampal neurites and synapses after stress-induced damage correlates with behavioral improvement. *Neuroscience* 97. 253-266.
- [111] Squire, L.R., Zola-Morgan, S., 1991. The medial temporal lobe memory system. *Science.* 253, 1380-1386.
- [112] Staal, W.G., Hulshoff Pol, H.E., Schnack, H.G., van Haren, N.E.M., Seifert, N., Kahn, R.S., 2001. Structural brain abnormalities in chronic schizophrenia at the extremes of the outcome spectrum. *American Journal of Psychiatry.* 158 (7) 1140-1142.
- [113] Stamm, R., Buhler, K.E., 2001. Concepts of vulnerability of psychiatric diseases. *Fortschr Neurol Psychiatr.* 69 (7) 300-309.
- [114] Tamminga, C.A., 2006. The neurobiology of cognition in schizophrenia. *J Clin Psychiatry.* 67 Suppl 9, 9-13; discussion 36-42.
- [115] Tandon, R., Mazzara, C., DeQuardo, J., Craig, K.A., Meador-Woodruff, J.H., Goldman, R., et al., 1991. Dexamethasone suppression test in schizophrenia: relationship to symptomatology, ventricular enlargement, and outcome. *Biol Psychiatry.* 29 (10) 953-964.
- [116] Ventura, J., Nuechterlein, K.H., Lukoff, D., Hardesty, J.P., 1989. A prospective study of stressful life events and schizophrenic relapse. *J Abnorm Psychol.* 98 (4) 407-411.
- [117] Ventura, J., Nuechterlein, K.H., Hardesty, J.P., Gitlin, M., 1992. Life events and schizophrenic relapse after withdrawal of medication. *Br J Psychiatry.* 161, 615-620.
- [118] Vidal-Gonzales, I., Vidal-Gonzales, B., Rauch, S., Quirk, G., 2007. Microstimulation reveals opposing influences of prelimbic and infralimbic cortex on the expression of conditioned fear. *Learn Mem.* 13, 728-733.
- [119] Weinberger, D., McClure, R., 2002. Neurotoxicity, neuroplasticity and Magnetic Resonance Imaging morphometry. *Arch Gen Psychiatry.* 59, 553-558.
- [120] Wik, G., Wiesel, F.A., Eneroth, P., Sedvall, G., Astrom, G., 1986. Dexamethasone suppression test in schizophrenic patients before and during neuroleptic treatment. *Acta Psychiatr Scand.* 74 (2) 161-167.
- [121] Williams, L.M., Harris, A.W.F., Liddell, B.B., Olivieri, G., Phillips, M.L., Peduto, A., Gordon, E., 2004. Dysregulation of arousal and amygdala-prefrontal systems in paranoid schizophrenia. *American Journal of Psychiatry.* 161 (3) 480-489.
- [122] Williams, H.J., Owen, M.J., O'Donovan, M.C., 2007. Is COMT a susceptibility gene for schizophrenia? *Schizophr Bull.* 33 (3) 635-641.
- [123] Yamamoto, K., Hornykiewicz, O., 2004. Proposal for a noradrenaline hypothesis of schizophrenia. *Prog Neuropsychopharmacol Biol Psychiatry.* 28 (5) 913-922.
- [124] Yui, K., 2007. Stress Sensitization in Schizophrenia. *Ann N Y Acad Sci.* 2007 Jun 21, Epub.

- [125] Zahn T.P., 1997. Autonomic nervous system markers of psychopathology in childhood-onset schizophrenia. *Arch. Gen. Psychiatry.* 54 (10) 904-912.