1360

Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior 49 (5) October 2019 © 2018 The American Association of Suicidology DOI: 10.1111/sltb.12529

Mood, Dimensional Personality, and Suicidality in a Longitudinal Sample of Patients with Bipolar Disorder and Controls

MASOUD KAMALI, MD, ERIKA F. H. SAUNDERS, MD, SHERVIN ASSARI, MD, KELLY A. RYAN, PHD, DAVID F. MARSHALL, PHD, AND MELVIN G. McInnis, MD (D)

Objective: To evaluate the effects of mood and anxiety symptoms in relation to personality dimensions and clinical features such as trauma and substance use on suicidal behaviors in a longitudinal sample of individuals with bipolar illness (BP) and healthy controls (HC).

Methods: Mood, personality, and clinical features were assessed in 151 individuals with BP I and 119 HC. Clinical data were collected at baseline and at 2-year follow-up. Personality traits were measured using the NEO PI-R.

Results: In bivariate analyses, personality measures were significantly different between BP and HC, and between BP based on suicide attempt history. However, in regression analyses, baseline measures of depression, mania, anxiety, trauma, education, and age of BP onset correlated with personality domains, while a history of suicide attempts did not. Logistic regressions showed that prospective depression or mania, and a pattern of mixed mood features and chronicity of illness, along with two Neuroticism facet scores (N4—Self-Consciousness and N6—Vulnerability) were predictive of suicide ideation (SI) in the 2-year follow-up period.

Conclusions: While dimensions of personality, trauma, and substance use clearly correlated with suicidal behaviors in BP, in multivariate models emerging mood symptoms were the most robust predictors of suicidality. These results reinforce the importance and attributable role of mood and anxiety symptoms in evaluating suicidal risk.

Masoud Kamali, Department of Psychiatry, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA and Department of Psychiatry, Massachusetts General Hospital and Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA; Erika F. H. Saunders, Department of Psychiatry, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA and Department of Psychiatry, Penn State College of Medicine, Penn State Milton S. Hershey Medical Center, Hershey, PA, USA; Shervin Assari, Kelly A. Ryan, David F. Marshall, and Melvin G. McInnis, Department of Psychiatry, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA.

Drs. Kamali, Saunders, Assari, Ryan, and Marshall report no competing interest related to the content of this study. Dr. McInnis has consulted for Janssen and Otsuka Pharmaceuticals in the past 3 years.

This study was supported by the Heinz C Prechter Bipolar Research Fund, the Richard Tam Foundation at the University of Michigan., the University of Michigan Depression Center, and the Department of Psychiatry of the University of Michigan. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not reflect the views of the funding agency. The authors wish to thank all the research participants for volunteering for this study.

Address correspondence to Melvin G. McInnis, Heinz C Prechter Bipolar Research Program, University of Michigan, 734-936-6018, 4250 Plymouth Rd, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-2700; E-mail: mmcinnis@umich.edu

The bipolar disorders are a spectra of complex psychiatric illnesses where the observed clinical phenotype is a manifestation of several underlying phenotype classes (e.g., disease process, neurocognition, motivated behaviors, life events such as trauma) (Belmaker, 2004; McInnis et al., 2017); one of the associated classes is personality and temperament. Individuals with BP are at higher risk for personality disorder diagnoses (Barnett et al., 2011; Qiu, Akiskal, Kelsoe, & Greenwood, 2017) and similarly, among the personality disorders, BP is frequently comorbid (Gunderson et al., 2006). Their comorbid occurrence bodes a more severe course of illness (Ng et al., 2017) and a higher risk of suicidal behavior (Baldessarini et al., 2012; Garno, Goldberg, Ramirez, & Ritzler, 2005; Leverich et al., 2003; Ucok, Karaveli, Kundakci, & Yazici, 1998; Zimmerman et al., 2014). Reported rates of comorbid personality disorders in BP vary widely and range from 12% to 84% (Deltito et al., 2001; Fan & Hassell, 2008; O'Connell, Mayo, & Sciutto, 1991; Peselow, Sanfilipo, & Fieve, 1995; Pica et al., 1990). This high level of comorbidity has contributed to controversy over the diagnostic boundaries of BP and personality disorders and led to debates about the over- versus underdiagnosis of BP (Bowden, 2001; Ghaemi, Sachs, Chiou, Pandurangi, & Goodwin, 1999; Karam et al., 2014; Moreno et al., 2007; Paris, Gunderson, & Weinberg, 2007; Ruggero, Zimmerman, Chelminski, & Young, 2010; Zimmerman, Ruggero, Chelminski, & Young, 2008).

An alternative to diagnosing personality as distinct categories is the use of dimensional measures of personality. Dimensional measures have a substantial advantage over categorical diagnoses in that they are able to quantify variations in personality traits using standardized instruments such as the NEO PI-R (Costa & McCrae, 1992) to capture self-reported responses and score them based on a recognized 5-factor model of personality, which consists of dimensions of Neuroticism, Extroversion, Openness, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness. Several studies have documented differences in personality traits

among BP individuals compared to controls (Bagby et al., 1997; Barnett et al., 2011; Chioqueta & Stiles, 2005; Farmer et al., 2001; Nowakowska, Strong, Santosa, Wang, & Ketter, 2005; Strong et al., 2007; Tackett, Quilty, Sellbom, Rector, & Bagby, 2008; Velting, 1999). However, there are few longitudinal studies of suicide risk in BP utilizing dimensional measures of personality traits that also control for clinical features that may covary with personality. Understanding the relative contribution from personality, mood symptoms, trauma, substance use and other clinical features on suicide can guide treatment and intervention choices.

This study assesses the relative contributions of mood states and clinical features (such as past trauma, substance use, chronicity of illness, and particularly a history of suicide attempts) on measures of personality at baseline, and the contributions of personality domains, mood state, and clinical features for predicting suicide risk longitudinally.

METHODS

Participants and Baseline Assessments

This study utilizes a subset (N=650) of the Prechter Longitudinal Study of Bipolar Disorder at the University of Michigan (McInnis et al., 2017) who were enrolled between October of 2004 and December of 2010. The study was approved by the Institutional Review Board of the University of Michigan Medical School (IRBMED). We included only those with a diagnosis of bipolar type I disorder (BP; N=151) and unaffected controls (HC; N=119) who had completed measures of childhood trauma and had a mood measurement within 30 days of the personality assessment (mean difference = 0.59 days, SD 5.67 days).

All participants were evaluated utilizing the Diagnostic Interview for Genetic Studies (DIGS) (Nurnberger et al., 1994). Mood state was determined at baseline using the Hamilton Rating Scale for Depression, 17 item (HAMD-17) (Hamilton, 1960) and

the Young Mania Rating Scale (YMRS) (Young, Biggs, Ziegler, & Meyer, 1978). Euthymia was defined as both a HAMD-17 and YMRS <8. History of abuse and neglect was obtained through the Childhood Trauma Questionnaire (CTQ) (Bernstein & Fink, 1998), a self-report questionnaire designed to assess five types of negative childexperiences including emotional neglect, emotional abuse, physical neglect, physical abuse, and sexual abuse. Each item is rated on a 1-5 scale, ranging from never true when you were growing up to very often true when you were growing up. Scores ranged from 5 to 25 for each type of negative childhood experience. The CTQ has demonstrated test-retest reliabilities ranging from .79 to .86 over an average of four months as well as internal consistency reliability coefficients ranging from a median of .66 to a median of .92 across samples (Bernstein & Fink, 1998). If participants reported mood symptoms present for more than half the duration of their illness, they were categorized as having a chronic course. BP participants were categorized based on the presence of a lifetime history of any comorbid substance use disorder (excluding nicotine dependence) and any comorbid anxiety disorder.

Presence of a lifetime history of suicide attempts was captured during the DIGS interview. All BP participants who had at least one reported past suicide attempt were categorized as suicide attempters (BPSA+) vs. those with no history of suicide attempts (BPSA-).

Personality traits were measured using the NEO Personality Inventory-Revised (NEO PI-R) (Costa & McCrae, 1992), a 240 item self-report questionnaire that measures multiple dimensions of the individual's personality, including Neuroticism (N), Extraversion (E), Openness (O), Agreeableness (A), and Conscientiousness (C). Within each dimension, six individual facets are also calculated. Based on normative means and standard deviations provided by the test designer for adult populations (ages 21 and above) and college age populations (ages 17–20), the T scores for the 30 different facets were calculated separately for males and females and

then using the formula provided, factor scores were calculated for each of these five personality traits (Costa & McCrae, 1992).

Follow-Up Assessments

Of the 151 BP participants, 117 (77.5%) also underwent a Longitudinal Interval Follow-up Evaluation (LIFE) (Keller et al., 1987) interview approximately two years after the original interview date to identify changes in diagnosis and course of illness. The last LIFE interview providing data used in this study occurred in August 2013. We determined the number of depression or mania/hypomania episodes they experienced since the baseline evaluation, and the instances of suicide ideation, suicide attempts, or hospitalizations. Participants were dichotomized into groups, with or without at least one episode of depression, mania/hypomania, or suicide ideation over the entire course of follow-up. The longitudinal analysis in this study is only based on the presence of suicide ideation since the total number of suicide attempts during follow-up (n = 8) was too few for statistical analysis.

Statistical Analysis

We compared clinical and demographic variables between groups using the chi-square test or the independent t-test. We first compared NEO PI-R factor and facet scores with bivariate t-tests. Correlations were examined with Pearson's r for continuous data and Spearman's rho for ordinal data. We then identified clinical variables that were significantly different between groups and were also correlated with personality factors (at a p value of .1 or less). We performed separate linear regression analyses with the personality factors as the dependent variables to examine the associations between diagnostic status, comorbid anxiety, or suicide history and these identified clinical variables with personality factors. In these models, BP was the main independent variable and personality factors were the dependent variables. A

logistic regression analysis was used to assess the effects of different clinical variables on predicting the development of suicide ideation prospectively. We ran models with interactions between depressive symptoms and personality factors on suicide ideation, to test differential effects of depressive symptoms on suicide ideation based on personality factors. Statistical significance was set at 0.05. All Statistics were performed using SPSS version 20 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL).

RESULTS

Bivariate Group Comparisons

The demographic and clinical characteristics of the BP and HC participants, categorized by mood state and suicide history status, are presented in Table 1. Scores for each of the 5 factors and 30 facets of the NEO PI-R were compared among groups. There were significant differences in the personality dimensions between BP and HC (Table 2) for N, E, C, and facets of O and A. All but 3 of the differences remained significant even when only the euthymic BP group was compared to HC group. Within the BP group, differences in personality factors between groups based on suicide status were identified, both in the factor (N) and in facet (N, E, O, A, C) scores. We also found differences in baseline personality scores among those who developed mood episodes during the follow-up period (N, C factors and N, E, O, C facets). We found no statistically significant difference in the personality scores among those BP participants that completed the follow-up evaluation (n = 117) and those who did not (n = 34).

Relationship between Personality Factors and Clinical Variables

Table 3 summarizes the correlations of personality factors with clinical and demographic variables that differed between

the BP and HC groups and between the BPSA+ and BPSA- groups (selected from Table 1). As seen in the table, in bivariate analyses, personality factors had correlations with many clinical features (particularly N which was strongly correlated with almost all variables.)

Independent Factors Associated with 5 Personality Factors (N, E, O, A, and C) at Baseline

For each personality factor, a multivariate linear regression model was constructed, with the personality factor as the dependent variable, and variables that were significant or marginally significant in bivariate analysis (Table 3) as independent variables. These included diagnostic status, baseline mood state, demographic factors, and features of illness (Table 4). Three linear regressions were done for each personality factor: one with all participants (BP and HC), one with only euthymic BP and HC, and one with only BP participants. The BP participants had higher N scores than HC (B = 8.05, p < .001). Comorbid anxiety disorder (B = 8.39, p < .001), baseline depression severity (B = 0.47, p < .001), and childhood trauma (B = 0.12, p = .003) were also each independently associated with increased N scores. In the models for E, O, and A, BP diagnosis did not have a significant independent effect on the factor scores. E was associated with baseline depression scores (B = -0.42, p = .001), O with years of education (B = 1.17, p <.001), and A with mania scores (B = -0.55, p = .005). In the model for C, BP diagnosis was a significant predictor when the full sample was used (B = -5.06, p = .015), but was only marginally significant when the analysis was limited to euthymic BP participants (B = -4.50, p = .052). C was positively associated with more years of education (B = 0.77, p = .010) and comorbid anxiety (B = 5.56, p = .011).

In the models with only BP participants, a history of suicide attempts was not associated with personality scores. The

TABLE 1
Demographic Characteristics of Unaffected Healthy Controls and Bipolar Participants

0 1	ò	C.	,	1	7						
			Baseline					Follow-u	Follow-up (BP only)		
		Diagnosis		Suicic BP pa	Suicide status of BP participants	Suicide BP par	Suicide status of BP participants	Depressir during 1	Depressive episodes during follow-up	Ma hypoman during f	Manic/ hypomanic episodes during follow-up
	HC $(N = 119)$	$\begin{array}{l} {\rm AllBP^b} \\ (N=151^{\rm a}) \end{array}$	Euthymic BP $^{\rm b}$ ($N = 73^{\rm a}$)	BPSA- $(N = 100)$	$BPSA + ^{c}$ $(N = 51)$	BPSI- $(N = 71^{a})$	$BPSI+ {}^{d}$ $(N = 45)$	None $(N = 42^a)$	At least one $^{\rm e}$ $(N = 75)$	None $(N = 48^{a})$	At least one c $(N = 69)$
Age, mean (SD) Number female	31.6 (13.9) 63 (52%)	40.6 *** (12.2) 99* (65%)	42.3 *** (12.0) 46 (63%)	40.7 (12.6) 60 (60%)	40.4 (11.6) 39* (76%)	41.3 (11.9) 42 (59%)	41.0 (11.2) 34 † (75%)	41.3 (11.7) 22 (52%)	41.1 (11.5) 55 * (73%)	41.3 (11.6) 29 (60%)	41.1 (11.6) 48 (69%)
(percent) Years of education.	15.6 (2.4)	15.7 (2.5)	16.3 *(2.3)	16.4 (2.5)	14.2***(1.9)	16.1 (2.5)	15.6 (2.8)	16.1 (2.8)	15.8 (2.5)	16.1 (2.7)	15.8 (2.5)
mean (SD) Total HAMD-17,	0.7 (1.2)	8.0*** (6.8)	2.8 *** (2.4)	7.3 (6.5)	9.5 (7.1)	6.6 (6.2)	10.1 ** (7.2)	6.3 (6.4)	9.0 * (6.9)	7.5 (7.4)	8.4 (6.4)
mean (<i>SD</i>) Total YMRS,	0.1 (0.6)	2.9*** (4.7)	1.4 *** (1.8)	2.8 (4.9)	3.2 (4.3)	2.6 (5.1)	3.1 (3.9)	2.9 (6.2)	2.8 (3.6)	1.7 (3.3)	3.6 * (5.3)
mean (<i>SD</i>) Total CTQ,	32.2 (8.8)	47.4*** (19.4)	44.4 *** (17.9)	42.6 (15.4)	56.9 *** (22.8)	44.1 (17.2)	48.8 (19.1)	41.4 (15.1)	48.8* (19.1)	41.5 (13.1)	49.3* (20.3)
mean (5D) Number with	0 (0%)	55 (36%)	17 (23%)	30 (30%)	25*(49%)	19 (26%)	20 † (44%)	9 (21%)	31*(41%	10 (20%)	30 * (43%)
anxiety diagnosis (percent) Substance use disorder, Number	N/A	80 (53%)	35 (47%)	43 (43%)	37*** (72.5%)	30 (42%)	26 (57%)	17 (40%)	40 (53%)	19 (39%)	38 (55%)
(percent) Years III,	N/A	22.6 (12.9)	23.1 (13.3)	20.8 (13.5)	26.1*(11.0)	21.9 (12.4)	23.3 (12.8)	21.8 (13.3)	22.7 (12.1)	21.4 (12.4)	23.1 (12.5)
Age of illness onset,	N/A	17.8 (7.3)	19.1 (7.4)	19.6 (7.2)	14.2 *** (6.2)	19.4 (8.0)	17.6 (7.1)	19.4 (7.7)	18.3 (7.7)	19.8 (7.8)	18.0 (7.5)
mean (SD)											

(continued)

TABLE 1
(continued)

			Baseline					Follow-u	Follow-up (BP only)		
		Diagnosis		Suicide BP par	Suicide status of BP participants	Suicide BP part	Suicide status of BP participants	Depressiv during f	Depressive episodes during follow-up	Ma hypoman during f	Manic/ hypomanic episodes during follow-up
	HC $(N = 119)$	All BP $^{\rm b}$ $(N = 151^{\rm a})$	Euthymic BP b $(N = 73^{\rm a})$	BPSA- $(N = 100)$	$BPSA+^{c}$ $(N = 51)$	BPSI- $(N = 71^{a})$	$BPSI+^{d}$ $(N = 45)$	None $(N = 42^a)$	At least one $^{\rm e}$ $(N = 75)$	None $(N = 48^{a})$	At least one $^{\rm e}$ $(N = 69)$
Mood state at Euthymic baseline, Depressed number Manic, (percent) Hypomanic, Miyed	N/A N/A N/A	73 (48%) 61 (40%) 17 (11%)	73 (100%) 0 0	52 (52%) 37 (37%) 11 (11%)	21 (41%) 24 (41%) 6 (11%)	39 (54%) 27 (38%) 5 (7%)	18 (40%) 21 (46%) 6 (13%)	24 (57%) 14 (33%) 4 (9%)	33 (44%) 35 (46%) 7 (9%)	27 (56%) 20 (41%) 1 (2%)	30 [†] (48%) 29 [†] (42%) 10 [†] (14%)
Chronic Illness course, Number (norcent)	N/A	(%65) 88	29 (40%)	46 (46%)	42 *** (82%)	32 (46%)	33 * (73%)	17 (42%)	49*(65%)	22 (46%)	44 † (64%)
Psychotic symptoms present, Number	N/A	93 (61%)	48 (65%)	(%59) 59	28 (54%)	47 (66%)	26 (57%)	31 (73%)	42 (56%)	30 (62%)	43 (62%)
Rapid cycling present, Number	N/A	60 (40%)	19 (26%)	32 (32%)	28* (54%)	18 (25%)	23 ** (51%)	9 (21%)	33 * (44%)	8(16%)	34 *** (49%)
Mixed episodes present, Number	N/A	63 (42%)	22 (30%)	32 (32%)	31*** (60%)	24 (33%)	26 * (59%)	14 (33%)	37 (50%)	13 (27%)	38 ** (55%)
percent) Prior suicide attempt, Number	N/A	51 (33%)	21 (28%)	0	51 (100%)	15 (21%)	44*(44%)	5 (11%)	30 *** (40%)	12 (25%)	23 (33%)
(percent) At least one depressive episode during follow-up period. Number (percent)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	33 (46%)	41 *** (91%)	(%0)0	75 (100%)	23 (47%)	52 ** (75%)

(continued) TABLE 1

			Baseline					Follow-u	Follow-up (BP only)		
		Diagnosis		Suicide BP par	Suicide status of BP participants	Suicide BP part	Suicide status of BP participants	Depressiv during 1	Depressive episodes during follow-up	Ma hypoman during f	Manic/ hypomanic episodes during follow-up
	HC $(N = 119)$	All BP $^{\rm b}$ $(N=151^{\rm a})$	Euthymic BP b $(N = 73^{\rm a})$	BPSA- $(N = 100)$	$BPSA + ^{c}$ $(N = 51)$	BPSI- $(N = 71^{a})$	$BPSI+^{d}$ $(N = 45)$	None $(N = 42^a)$	At least one $^{\rm e}$ $(N = 75)$	None $(N = 48^a)$	At least one c $(N = 69)$
At least one manic/ hypomanic episode	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	34 (47%)	34(47%) 34**(75%) 17(40%) 52**(69%)	17 (40%)	52 ** (69%)	0 (0%)	(80(100%)
during follow- up period. Number (percent)											
Suicide ideation During follow- up period Number	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	4 (9%)	4 (9%) 41*** (55%)	11(22%) 34** (50%)	34** (50%)
(percent)											

Bold values refer to significance.

BPSA+, bipolar with a past suicide attempt; BPSA+, bipolar with a past suicide attempt; BPSI-, bipolar without suicide ideation;
BPSI+, bipolar with suicide ideation; CTQ, Childhood Trauma Questionnaire; HAMD-17, Hamilton Rating Scale for Depression-17 item; HC, healthy control; YMRS, Young Mania Rating Scale.

Except for years of education, where there is one fewer participant.

Compared to HC.

Compared to BPSA-.

Compared to BPSI-.

Compared to no episodes during follow-up.

*** $p \le .001$; ** $p \le .001$

TABLE 2 Comparison of Baseline Personality Factor Scores^a between Unaffected Healthy Controls and Patients with Bipolar Disorder

•											
		Βε	Baseline Mean SD				I	ollow-up (BF	Follow-up (BP only) Mean SD		
		Diagnosis		Suicide BP part	Suicide status of BP participants	Swicide BP par	Suicide status of BP participants	Depressiv during 1	Depressive episodes during follow-up	Manic/l episod foll	Manic/hypomanic episodes during follow-up
	HC $(N = 119)$	All BP ^b $(N = 151)$	Euthymic BP $^{\rm b}$ ($N = 73$)	BPSA- $(N = 100)$	$BPSA+^{c}$ $(N = 51)$	BPSI- $(N = 71)$	$BPSI+^{d}$ $(N = 45)$	None $(N = 42)$	At least one $^{\rm e}$ $(N = 75)$	None $(N = 48)$	At least one $^{\rm e}$ $(N=69)$
N factor	43.5 9.3	60.8*** 13.5	57.2*** 13.1	58.814.3	64.7 * 11.0	56.612.6	65.8 *** 10.9	56.3 12.8	62.9**12.8	55.410.6	64.1*** 13.6
(Ineuroncism) E factor	49.78.6	45.5 *** 11.0	46.9* 9.7	46.410.9	43.8 11.1	45.611.3	46.011.7	45.6 10.6	45.7 11.9	44.9 10.5	46.2 12.0
(Extraversion) O factor	57.110.7	58.0 11.8	59.4 11.0	58.812.0	56.5 11.3	58.2 12.7	57.111.7	57.1 12.0	58.2 12.4	55.5 13.4	59.4 11.2
(Openness) A factor	51.5 10.3	49.3 12.5	51.3 12.0	50.012.1	48.0 13.3	48.7 11.5	48.8 14.7	48.8 11.1	48.5 13.7	50.3 12.0	47.4 13.3
(Agreeableness) C factor	49.1 10.4	43.5*** 13.7	44.6 * 13.8	45.013.5	40.6 13.7	44.913.9	41.5 13.8	47.3 12.5	41.5* 14.2	44.412.5	43.0 14.7
N1 T score	44.89.0	56.8 *** 11.6	54.0 *** 11.8	55.5 12.1	59.4 * 10.0	53.911.6	59.4 * 10.4	53.5 10.5	57.8 11.9	52.2 10.0	59.1*** 11.8
(Anxiety) N2 T score	44.3 8.7	56.7*** 13.5	53.8 *** 12.6	55.913.9	58.2 12.7	55.013.0	59.610.4	54.7 12.8	58.3 13.5	54.111.0	59.0*14.4
(Angry Hostunty) N3 T score	43.3 7.3	63.5*** 12.8	58.6*** 12.7	61.5 13.0	67.4**11.3	59.113.0	68.2*** 9.1	57.8 11.8	65.6*** 12.1	59.111.7	65.4** 12.5
(Depression) N4 T score	45.69.0	57.4 *** 12.8	55.6 *** 13.6	55.012.6	62.2 *** 12.0	53.2 11.6	62.3*** 10.0	52.6 11.7	59.4** 11.6	53.3 11.2	59.4** 12.0
N5 T score	44.99.7	57.1*** 11.2	55.0 *** 11.0	55.811.4	59.4 10.3	55.7 10.6	60.4 * 10.8	55.2 9.6	59.1 11.7	54.5 10.2	60.0** 11.2
(Impuisiveness) N6 T score	45.08.2	60.6 *** 13.8	56.9 *** 14.0	58.3 13.4	64.9** 13.5	55.7 11.3	66.8 *** 12.9	55.010.4	63.1*** 13.7	56.3 12.2	62.9** 13.2
	53.3 9.0	46.9 *** 14.6	49.6 * 12.9	48.8 14.1	43.3 * 15.0	47.014.9	46.8 14.9	47.6 13.5	46.0 16.1	47.2 13.2	46.2 16.5
E2 T score (Gregariousness)	54.5 10.5	48.0 *** 13.8	50.1 ** 12.0	49.7 13.8	44.5 * 13.3	48.3 14.7	49.3 13.1	48.6 13.8	48.4 14.4	50.5 11.6	47.1 15.6

TABLE 2 (continued)

		E	Baseline Mean SD	0				Follow-up (B	Follow-up (BP only) Mean SD	0	
		Diagnosis		Suicide BP par	Suicide status of BP participants	Suicide BP par	Suicide status of BP participants	Depress during	Depressive episodes during follow-up	Manic/l episod foll	Manic/hypomanic episodes during follow-up
	HC $(N = 119)$	All BP $^{\rm b}$ $(N=151)$	Euthymic BP b $(N = 73)$	BPSA- $(N = 100)$	$BPSA+^{c}$ $(N = 51)$	BPSI- $(N = 71)$	BPSI+ d $(N = 45)$	None $(N = 42)$	At least one $^{\rm e}$ $(N = 75)$	None $(N = 48)$	At least one $^{\rm e}$ $(N = 69)$
E3 T score	53.19.1	50.6*11.5	51.412.0	51.5 12.0	48.910.4	51.911.6	49.2 11.9	51.2 12.6	50.7 11.2	50.5 12.2	51.111.4
(Assertiveness) E4 T score	50.48.8	48.4 11.8	48.811.2	49.611.8	45.811.5	49.5 10.5	47.6 12.5	51.1 11.2	47.5 11.1	45.7 10.2	51.0*11.5
(Activity) E5 T score	53.5 10.6	51.6 10.9	51.411.3	50.3 10.9	54.2 * 10.4	50.011.5	52.5 10.8	48.4 10.7	52.5 11.3	48.810.9	52.6 11.2
(Excitement Seeking) E6 T score (Positive	54.89.0	48.0*** 13.3	51.4 * 10.9	49.013.7	46.2 12.2	48.5 13.1	47.6 14.7	48.2 13.1	47.814.3	46.814.1	48.8 13.7
Emotions) $O1T$ score	52.610.3	56.6 ** 11.1	57.0 ** 10.4	56.511.3	56.8 10.8	56.811.0	56.3 11.5	55.5 12.2	57.5 10.9	54.112.0	58.7* 10.6
(Fantasy) O2 T score	55.410.6	55.7 11.7	56.611.3	55.811.7	55.5 11.7	55.3 11.7	56.0 11.9	54.3 12.2	56.411.5	53.812.9	57.0 10.8
(Aestneucs) O3 T score (Feelings) O4 T score (Actions)	52.2 10.6	57.3 *** 10.1 48.9 ** 13.6	57.0 ** 9.4 50.5 12.5	57.5 10.6	57.19.3 45.7 * 11.0	56.410.3	58.2 11.0 47.5 13.5	56.2 11.0 48.4 13.3	57.9 10.5 48.5 13.8	54.3 11.0 47.3 12.4	59.3*9.9 49.4 14.3
O5 T score (Ideas)	57.89.4	55.4 12.1	57.5 11.1	56.012.0	54.1 12.4	56.012.0	54.3 12.6	56.4 10.9	54.5 13.1	54.3 13.0	55.8 11.9
O6 T score (Values)	54.7 10.3	56.8 10.9	57.010.7	56.611.7	57.09.4	56.5 11.5	57.19.7	55.411.7	57.2 10.5	55.610.8	57.3 11.0
A2 T score	48.010.4	46.9 11.6	48.7 10.7	47.7 12.0	45.3 10.5	47.611.2	47.1 12.2	49.0 11.4	46.1 12.0	48.9 10.7	45.9 12.5
(Straightforwardness) A3 T Score (Altruism) A4 T score	52.2 10.7 51.4 9.3	49.5 12.0 46.6 *** 13.2	50.5 10.6 49.7 12.2	49.8 12.1 47.4 12.3	49.0 12.1 45.1 14.9	50.111.6	48.8 13.7 44.9 16.3	49.6 11.5 47.0 11.1	49.2 13.2 45.2 14.6	50.412.0 48.611.3	48.6 13.0 43.8 14.4
(Compliance) A5 T score (Modesty)	50.110.6	50.9 11.3	50.9 11.5	50.411.3	52.0 11.2	50.111.7	51.7 10.2	50.9 11.6	51.011.3	51.5 11.1	50.6 11.6

(continued) TABLE 2

		B	Baseline Mean SD					Follow-up (B	Follow-up (BP only) Mean SD		
		Diagnosis		Suicide BP par	Suicide status of BP participants	Suicide BP par	Suicide status of BP participants	Depressi during	Depressive episodes during follow-up	Manic/I episod foll	Manic/hypomanic episodes during follow-up
	HC $(N = 119)$	All BP $^{\rm b}$ $(N = 151)$	Euthymic BP $^{\rm b}$ ($N = 73$)	BPSA- $(N = 100)$	$BPSA+^{c}$ $(N = 51)$	BPSI- $(N = 71)$	$BPSI+^{d}$ $(N = 45)$	None $(N = 42)$	At least one $^{\rm e}$ $(N = 75)$	None $(N = 48)$	At least one $^{\rm e}$ $(N=69)$
A6 T score	53.3 10.8 55.3 11.	55.3 11.1	55.7 12.1	55.011.8	55.9 9.7	54.2 12.0	53.99.6	51.713.5	55.5 9.4	51.812.2	55.8 10.0
(1 ender mindedness) C1 T score	52.89.5	45.1 *** 13.8	46.2*** 13.4	46.613.9	42.2 13.3	47.3 12.3	41.0* 15.8	49.3 11.8	42.1** 14.7	47.2 12.1	43.0 15.2
(Competence) C2 T score (Order)	48.410.7	43.5** 13.7	44.9* 13.5	43.913.8	42.9 13.5	43.7 13.7	42.913.9	47.012.1	41.6* 14.3	45.012.9	42.6 14.3
C3 T score	50.29.9	42.6 *** 12.3	44.7 *** 12.0	44.7 11.3	38.4 ** 13.3	44.611.9	39.5 * 12.6	46.89.8	$40.1^{**}13.0$	45.111.5	40.7 12.6
(Dutifulness)	52 3 0 7	45 A*** 13 3	46 0** 13 6	47 4 1 2 0	41 4** 13 4	46 6 13 7	44 0 14 3	47.4.12.8	45 2 14 1	46.4.11.6	45 8 14 0
(Achievement Striving)			200	/:		7: 67 0:01	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0:71	1:17	0.11	7:1
C5 T score	50.3 10.2	38.4 *** 14.2	41.0*** 15.6	40.114.6	35.3*13.0	41.1 14.1	33.6** 14.4	42.912.7	35.4** 14.9	40.013.2	36.8 15.4
(Self-Discipline)		7 C1 *** C 7 7	0 11 ***	7,010		7 5 7 13 7	0110	0 (1 (3)	12 / 12 /	1	, ,
Co 1 score	52.79.0	44.3 12.0	46.2 11.8	40.012.4	41.0" 12.3	45.4 15.0	42.911.8	45.212.8	45.0 15.4	4/.011.0	47.7 14.7
(Deliberation)											

Bold values refer to significance.

BP, bipolar disorder; BPSA-, bipolar without a past suicide attempt; BPSA+, bipolar with a past suicide attempt; BPSI-, bipolar without suicide ideation; CTQ, Childhood Trauma Questionnaire; HAMD-17, Hamilton Rating Scale for Depression-17 item; HC, healthy control; YMRS, uoung mania rating scale.

"We used the test designers formula to calculate factor scores from raw data. These represent T scores with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10. Compared to HC. Compared to BPSA-.

Compared to BPSI-.

Compared to no episodes during follow-up. * $p \le .001$; * $p \le .01$; * $p \le .05$.

Bivariate Correlations between Clinical Variables and Personality Factor Scores in Patients with Bipolar Disorder and Healthy Controls TABLE 3

	N factor (Neuroticism)	E factor (Extraversion)	O factor (Openness)	A factor (Agreeableness)	C factor (Conscientiousness)
Total sample (all BP and HC) (N = 270) HAMD-17 (correlation coefficient) YMRS (correlation coefficient)	0.584 ***	-0.279 *** -0.176 **		0.112 †	-0.195 ***
CTQ (correlation coefficient) Vene of education (correlation coefficient)	0.515 ***	-0.241 ***	0.741 ***	-0.152 *	_0.251 *** 0.148 *
Age (correlation coefficient) Only BP sample (N = 151)	0.222 ***		1		
History of suicide attempts (Yes/No)	$ m Yes>No^*$				$ m Yes{<}No}^{\dagger}$
Comorbid anxiety (Yes/No)	Yes>No***	$ m Yes{<}No}^{\dagger}$		$ m Yes{<}No}^{\dagger}$	
HAMD-17 (correlation coefficient)	0.387 ***	-0.259 ***	-0.149^{\dagger}		
YMRS (correlation coefficient)	0.184*			-0.190 *	-0.145^{+}
CTQ (correlation coefficient)	0.331 ***			-0.221 **	
Years of education (correlation coefficient)	-0.185*	0.145^{+}	0.210 **		0.211 **
Substance abuse history (Yes/No)	$ m Yes>No^*$			m Yes < No *	Yes< $No*$
Chronicity of illness (Yes/No)	m Yes>No **				$ m Yes{<}No$ †
Mixed episodes (Yes/No)	m Yes>No***				
Rapid cycling (Yes/No)	m Yes>No***				
Age of onset (correlation coefficient)	-0.313 ***		-0.156^{+}		

BP, bipolar disorder; CTQ, Childhood Trauma Questionnaire; HC, healthy control, HAMD-17, Hamilton Rating Scale for Depression-17 item; YMRS, Young Mania Rating Scale. *** $p \le .001$; ** $p \le .05$; * $p \le .05$.

Summary of Linear Regressions on the Associations between Bipolar Disorder, Depressive Symptoms, and Anxiety with Personality Traits at Baseline^a TABLE 4

Bendymit Plant All BP and Plant Enthymic Plant plant Enthymic Plant pl	N fa	N factor (Neuroticism)	ism)	E facto	E factor (Extraversion)	(uo	O fac	O factor (Openness)	(ss)	A facto	A factor (Agreeableness)	ess)	(Con	C factor (Conscientiousness)	(ss)
0.29*** 0.08*** 0.06*** 0.05*** 0.06*** 0.05*** 0.00*** <t< th=""><th>All BP and BP and HC HC $N = 270$ $N = 192$</th><th></th><th>All BP $N = 124$</th><th>All BP and HC $N = 270$</th><th>Euthymic BP and HC $N = 192$</th><th>All BP $N = 150$</th><th>All BP and HC $N = 269$</th><th>Euthymic BP and HC $N = 191$</th><th>All BP $N = 149$</th><th>All BP and HC $N = 270$</th><th>Euthymic BP and HC N = 192</th><th>All BP $N = 151$</th><th>All BP and HC NN = 269</th><th>Euthymic BP and HC $N = 191$</th><th>All BP $N = 148$</th></t<>	All BP and BP and HC HC $N = 270$ $N = 192$		All BP $N = 124$	All BP and HC $N = 270$	Euthymic BP and HC $N = 192$	All BP $N = 150$	All BP and HC $N = 269$	Euthymic BP and HC $N = 191$	All BP $N = 149$	All BP and HC $N = 270$	Euthymic BP and HC N = 192	All BP $N = 151$	All BP and HC NN = 269	Euthymic BP and HC $N = 191$	All BP $N = 148$
0.52** -0.42*** N.S. -0.42*** N.S. N.S.<	0.33 *** 7.51 *** 7.49 *		0.29 ***	0.08 *** N.S. N.S.	0.05 ** N.S. N.S.	0.06 ** N.S.	0.05 *** N.S. N.S.	0.05 ** N.S. N.S.	0.08 **	0.05 ** N.S. N.S.	-0.01 N.S. N.S. N.S.	0.08 **	0.07 *** -5.06 * 5.56 *	0.03 [†] -4.50 [†] N.S.	0.03 †
N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S.			0.52 **	-0.42 ***	y.	-0.42 **			S.	S.	s Z		s. Z	S	
NS. N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S.	N.S. N.S.		N.S.	N.S.	Z.S.	!				-0.55 **	N.S.	-0.55 **	Z.S.	Z.S.	S.S.
N.S. 1.17 *** 1.02 ** 0.84 * 0.77 * N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S0.39 **			N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	,				N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	S.S.	
N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S0.39 ***			Z S			Z S	1.17 ***	1.02 **	* 48.0				0.77 *	Z. S.	N.S.
N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S.	N.S.														
N.S. N.S. — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —			Z.S.			N.S.			Z.S.			N.S.			N.S.
-0.39 ***			N.S.									N.S.			Z.S.
-0.39 **															
			N.S.												S.S.
			Z.S.												
			N.S.												
			y Z						** 65 0-						

Bold values refer to significance.

BP, bipolar disorder; CTQ, Childhood Trauma Questionnaire; HAMD-17, Hamilton Rating Scale for Depression-17 item; HC, healthy control; YMRS, Young Mania Rating Scale.

Reported numbers for variables are B values (amount of change in personality factors with one point change in each independent variable, controlling

for other variables in the equation). *** $p \le .001$; * $p \le .05$; * $p \le .1$.

variance within the personality scores was better explained by other variables. Higher N scores were related to the presence of comorbid anxiety disorders (B = 7.04, p = .006) and baseline depression severity (B = 0.52, p = .006). Baseline depression was also associated with lower E (B = -0.42, p = .002) and baseline mania with lower A (B = -0.55, p = .009) while O was significantly higher in the more educated (B = 0.84, p = .042) and was negatively associated with age at onset (B = -0.39, p = .004). The model for C did not reach statistical significance.

Independent Predictors of Suicide Ideation during a Prospective Follow-Up Period

Using binary logistic regression, we examined the predictors of suicide ideation (SI) in the BP participants that completed the follow-up LIFE interview. In the first step, we added a personality factor or facet that was significantly related with SI from our bivariate analyses to a model in which SI was the dependent variable (from Table 2: N, N1-6, C1, C3, and C5). We then added the significant and marginally significant clinical and demographic variables that were different between the BP with suicide ideation during follow-up (BPSI+) and those without SI (BPSI-) groups (from Table 1: suicide attempt history, baseline depression, gender, chronic course, history of mixed episodes, rapid cycling, comorbid anxiety disorders, and presence of at least one depression or mania/hypomania during follow-up period) and used a backward conditional method to remove nonsignificant variables. The strongest predictor of reporting SI during followup was having an episode of depression. Having a manic episode during follow-up, a chronic course of illness, or having mixed episodes prior to baseline evaluation were also associated with elevated odds ratios for SI in some models (results are summarized in Table 5). Although in the models including only personality scores (step 1 rows in Table 5), many personality factors and facets showed a relation with prospective SI, they

were no longer statistically significant when other clinical measures were added (step 2 rows in Table 5). Only N4 (Self-Consciousness) and N6 (Vulnerability) had statistically significant higher odds ratios.

To test interaction effects between follow-up depression and personality factor and facets scores, we performed logistic regression models to determine how depressive episodes during follow-up, baseline personality (N, N1-N6, C, C1, C3, and C5), and the interaction between them predicted followup SI (a moderator effect). The interaction effect was not significant in any of the N models (results not shown). The models showed significant interaction effects for C (OR for interaction = 0.87, C.I. 0.78–0.98, p = .022) C1 (OR = 0.86, C.I. 0.76-0.96, p = .009), suggesting that the effect of depressive symptoms over time on suicide ideation depends on C and C1 levels. In individuals with depression during follow-up, higher C or C1 scores reduced the odds of SI and inversely, in those individuals without depression, higher C and C1 scores increased the odds of suicide (main effect OR for both C and C1 = 1.1, C.I. 1.0-1.2, p = .04).

DISCUSSION

Bipolar illness in the context of a history of childhood trauma, depressive symptoms, and comorbid anxiety in an individual with early-onset disorder contributes to high levels of Neuroticism and low Extraversion and Conscientiousness, while manic symptoms contribute to lower Agreeableness. In this sample, mood and anxiety states impact the prospective risk for suicide ideation more than personality factors, although two N facets, N4 (Self-Consciousness), and N6 (Vulnerability) increased the odds of suicide ideation, independent of depression. Higher Conscientiousness was a risk factor for suicide ideation in those without depression.

The personality measures in the current BP sample were clearly different from healthy controls in our bivariate analysis and these differences remained significant

 TABLE 5

 Summary of Logistic Regressions to Investigate Predictors of Suicide Ideation at Follow-Up in Patients with Bipolar Disorder

		Nagelkerke R square	Personality Measure	Depression during follow-up	Mania during follow-up	Chronic course of illness	History of mixed episodes	-Suicide attempt history -Baseline depression -Sex -Rapid cycling -Comorbid anxiety disorders
N factor (Neuroticism)	Step 1 Step 2 OR	0.167	p = .001 $1.0 (0.99-1.08)$	5.5 (1.5-19.7) 3.0 (0.98-9.2)	3.0 (0.98–9.2)	2.9 (1.0–8.6)	N.S.	N.S.
N1 T score	(25.70 CL) Step 1	0.070	p = .031	ooo. = d	cco. – <i>q</i>	<i>p</i> = <i>d</i>		
(Alixiety)	Step 2 OR (95% CI)	0.387	1.0 (0.97 - 1.06) $h = 313$	5.7 (1.6-20.0)	5.7 (1.6-20.0) 3.4 (1.1-10.4) 3.4 (1.2-9.6) n = .005 $n = .027$	3.4 (1.2-9.6)	N.S.	N.S.
N2 T score (Angry	Step 1	0.47	p = 0.074					
riosunty)	Step 2 OR (95% CI)	0.385	1.0 (0.97-1.05) $p = .379$	5.6 (1.6–19.7) 3.5 (1.2–9.8) p = .007 p = .022	3.5 (1.2-9.8) p = .022	3.5 (1.2-9.81) p = .018	N.S.	N.S.
N3 T score (Depression)	Step 1	0.140	p = .003	1	1	1		
N4T score	Step 2 OR (95% CI) Step 1	0.393	1.02 (0.98–1.07) p = .213 p < .001	5.1 (1.4-18.2) $p = .01$	3.4 (1.1-10.5) p = .027	5.1 (1.4–18.2) 3.4 (1.1–10.5) 2.9 (1.01–8.6) N.S. $p = .01$ $p = .027$ $p = .047$	N.S.	N.S.
(Sen-Consciousness)	Step 2 OR (95% CI)	0.410	1.06 (1.01-1.1) $p = .008$	7.7 (2.1–27.6) N.S. $p = .001$	N.S.	N.S.	3.3 (1.2-9.1) p = .020	N.S.
N5 T score (Impulsiveness)	Step 1	0.104	p = .01					

2	(P
Į	time
Ξ	iti
⋖	con
_	-

		Nagelkerke R square	Personality Measure	Depression during follow-up	Mania during follow-up	Chronic course of illness	History of mixed episodes	-Suicide attempt history -Baseline depression -Sex -Rapid cycling -Comorbid anxiety disorders
N6 T score (Vulnerability)	Step 2 OR (95% CI) Step 1	0.395	1.03 (0.98–1.08) p = .19 p = .001	5.5 (1.5-19.3) $p = .01$	5.5 (1.5-19.3) $3.5 (1.1-10.6)$ $3.0 (1.0-8.7)p = .01$ $p = .022$ $p = .04$		N.S.	N.S.
C1 T score	Step 2 OR (95 % CI) Step 1	0.396	1.05 (1.01–1.09) <i>p</i> = .013 <i>p</i> = .048	7.3 (2.1–25.5) N.S. $p = .001$	N.S.	N.S.	3.9(1.4-10.7) $p = .008$	N.S.
C3 T score	Step 2 OR (95 % CI) Step 1	0.393	0.98 (0.94-1.02) p = .35 p = .168	5.6 (1.5–20.8) 2.9 (0.97–9.1) $p = .009$ $p = .056$		2.7 (0.95-8.1) p = .062	2.4 (0.85 - 7.1) $p = .094$	N.S.
C5 T Score	Step 2 OR 0.377 (95% CI) Step 1 0.059	0.059	1.0 (0.96–1.04) p = .93 p = .044	5.6 (1.6-19.6) p = .007	3.8 (1.2-11.4) $p = .015$	5.6 (1.6–19.6) 3.8 (1.2–11.4) 3.6 (1.2–10.2) N.S. $p = .007$ $p = .015$ $p = .014$	N.S.	N.S.
	Step 2 OR (95% CI)	0.384	0.98 (0.94–1.02) p = .40	5.4 (1.5-19.0) p = .007	5.4 (1.5-19.0) $3.7 (1.2-10.9)$ $3.2 (1.1-9.2)p = .007$ $p = .018$ $p = .031$		N.S.	N.S.

Bold values refer to significance.

throughout periods of euthymia, this is consistent with previous reports (Bagby et al., 1997; Barnett et al., 2011; Nowakowska et al., 2005; Strong et al., 2007; Tackett et al., 2008). Personality measures (higher N) were significantly different between groups based on suicide risk (both historical suicide attempts and future SI). However, in multivariate analyses history of suicide attempts did not correlate with personality, while severity of mood symptoms, anxiety, trauma, and education level were better predictors of personality at baseline. The literature is divided in this area, with supportive (Sparding, Palsson, Joas, Hansen, & Landen, 2017) and counter (Bezerra et al., 2017) findings using a multivariate approach.

Studies have shown that personality traits like N influence the development of depressive symptoms (Duggan, Lee, & Murray, 1990; Heerlein, Richter, Gonzalez, & Santander, 1998; Lozano & Johnson, 2001; Quilty, Sellbom, Tackett, & Bagby, 2009), indirectly influencing SI. Our study also shows that individuals with higher N and lower C (and some facets of O and E) were more likely to have mood episodes or SI during follow-up. However, our study examines this relationship further by using a multivariate model, longitudinal follow-up, and exploring the moderating effects of personality factors on SI. The interactions of N (factors and facets) and depression with SI as an outcome were not significant, indicating that N does not have a moderating effect on the relationship between depression and SI (it does not affect the direction or strength of that relationship). The lack of moderation, and the lack of direct effect for N factor and most facets (other than N4 and N6) in predicting SI indicate that the higher levels of SI seen in the BP individuals with baseline higher N is primarily related to their predisposition to develop depression, rather than direct effects of the personality trait itself. Another novel finding in our sample was the interaction effect for C and C1 with depression. Individuals with higher C and Competence (C1) were more likely to have SI if they did not experience depression

during follow-up. On the other hand, if depression occurred during follow-up, lower C and Competence (C1) increased the odds of SI; that is, the effect of depressive symptoms on suicide ideation of patients with BP depends on their personality. In this sample, C was positively correlated with anxiety diagnosis, while lower C has been associated with more impulsive behaviors like smoking and drug use. One possible explanation for the differential effect of C based on mood is that in individuals without depression, higher C may lead to SI through elevated anxiety, while in those with depression, impulsivity leads to SI.

Overall, the strongest associations in this study between personality dimensions and clinical features and suicide risk were with Neuroticism factor and facet scores. This correlation was both cross-sectional and prospective in nature. However, the effects of Neuroticism were nonspecific (e.g., in predicting both future mania and depression). This is consistent with the suggestion that N represents a general predisposition to psychopathology with limited specificity.

Our study has notable limitations. We did not have measures of personality at multiple (>2) time points and during various mood states. Due to this, the dynamic effects of mood on personality are not measured in this study. Our prospective measure of suicide risk was only the presence of suicide ideation, and we were not able to consider suicide attempts as the main outcome due to the small number of attempts. This limits the generalizability of our findings to other forms of suicide risk. Follow-up was incomplete; only 77% of the BP participants completed the follow-up interview. However, the difference in personality scores between the group who completed follow-up and the group who were lost to follow-up were small (numerical differences for each personality factor score were as follows: N = 1.2, E = 0.7, O = 1.0, A = 3.1and C = 0.3) and not statistically significant. The collection of data at the baseline and the follow-up visit were retrospective in nature and limited by issues of recall and memory. We utilized structured interviews and scales

and used a best estimate process to minimize any bias. Finally, although we examined multiple clinical variables, unknown confounders may have affected our results. The strengths of this study include the availability of detailed clinical outcomes data and dimensional measures of personality.

Similar to previous studies showing the high comorbidity of BP and personality disorders, and in line with what practitioners observe clinically, we found differences in personality dimensions between BP and HC, and between those with and without a history of suicide. However, this study further advances our understanding of this complex relationship by showing that the differences identified in personality scores in our sample were due to different levels of mood symptoms, comorbid anxiety, trauma, education level, and age of onset, while a diagnosis of BP or history of suicide attempts was not

correlated with personality traits in multivariate analyses. The most compelling driving influence on suicidality was the level of depressive symptoms, which clearly had a differential effect on SI, with influence from the level of Conscientiousness. These findings in BP align with evidence from depression that suicide risk can be reduced by the adequate treatment or prevention of depression (Isacsson, Bergman, & Rich, 1996; Rihmer, Barsi, Veg, & Katona, 1990; Rutz, von Knorring, & Walinder, 1992). Although Neuroticism factors and some of its facets (particularly Self-Consciousness and Vulnerability) are associated with future suicide ideation, mood episodes, particularly depression, are much stronger predictors of suicide ideation in our BP sample. Attention to treatment of mood episodes and residual mood symptoms, even in instances of comorbid personality abnormality is critical to reduce suicidal risk.

REFERENCES

BAGBY, R. M., BINDSEIL, K. D., SCHULLER, D. R., RECTOR, N. A., YOUNG, L. T., COOKE, R. G., ET AL. (1997). Relationship between the five-factor model of personality and unipolar, bipolar and schizophrenic patients. *Psychiatry Research*, 70, 83–94

Baldessarini, R. J., Undurraga, J., Vazquez, G. H., Tondo, L., Salvatore, P., Ha, K., et al. (2012). Predominant recurrence polarity among 928 adult international bipolar I disorder patients. *Acta Psychiatrica Scand.*, 125, 293–302. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0447.2011.01818.x.

Barnett, J. H., Huang, J., Perlis, R. H., Young, M. M., Rosenbaum, J. F., Nierenberg, A. A., et al. (2011). Personality and bipolar disorder: Dissecting state and trait associations between mood and personality. *Psychological Medicine*, 41, 1593–1604. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291710002333.

Belmaker, R. H. (2004). Bipolar disorder. *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 351, 476–486. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMra035354.

BERNSTEIN, D. P., & FINK, L. (1998). Childbood trauma questionnaire: A retrospective self-report: Manual. San Antonio, TX: Psychological Corporation.

BEZERRA, S. F., GALVAO-DE-ALMEIDA, A., STUDART, P., MARTINS, D. F., JR,, CARIBE, A. C., SCHWINGEL, P. A., ET AL. (2017). Suicide attempts

in bipolar I patients: Impact of comorbid personality disorders. *Revista Brasileira de Psiquiatria*, *39*, 133–139. https://doi.org/10.1590/1516-4446-2016-1982.

BOWDEN, C. L. (2001). Strategies to reduce misdiagnosis of bipolar depression. *Psychiatric Services*, 52, 51–55.

Chioqueta, A. P., & Stiles, T. C. (2005). Personality traits and the development of depression, hopelessness, and suicide ideation. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *38*, 1283–1291. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2004.08.010.

COSTA, P. T., & MCCRAE, R. R. (1992). Revised NEO-PI: Professional manual. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

DELTITO, J., MARTIN, L., RIEFKOHL, J., AUSTRIA, B., KISSILENKO, A., & CORLESS, C. M. P. (2001). Do patients with borderline personality disorder belong to the bipolar spectrum? *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 67, 221–228.

Duggan, C. F., Lee, A. S., & Murray, R. M. (1990). Does personality predict long-term outcome in depression? *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 157, 19–24. https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.157.1.19

FAN, A. H., & HASSELL, J. (2008). Bipolar disorder and comorbid personality psychopathology: A review of the literature. *The Journal of Clinical Psychiatry*, *69*, 1794–1803. https://doi.org/10.4088/JCP.v69n1115

Farmer, A., Redman, K., Harris, T., Webb, R., Mahmood, A., Sadler, S., et al. (2001). The Cardiff sib-pair study: Suicidal ideation in depressed and healthy subjects and their siblings. *Crisis*, 22, 71–73. https://doi.org/10.1027//0227-5910.22.2.71

Garno, J. L., Goldberg, J. F., Ramirez, P. M., & Ritzler, B. A. (2005). Bipolar disorder with comorbid cluster B personality disorder features: Impact on suicidality. *The Journal of Clinical Psychiatry*, 66, 339–345. https://doi.org/10.4088/JCP.v66n0310

Ghaemi, S. N., Sachs, G. S., Chiou, A. M., Pandurangi, A. K., & Goodwin, K. (1999). Is bipolar disorder still underdiagnosed? Are antidepressants overutilized? *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 52, 135–144.

Gunderson, J. G., Weinberg, I., Daversa, M. T., Kueppenbender, K. D., Zanarini, M. C., Shea, M. T., et al. (2006). Descriptive and longitudinal observations on the relationship of borderline personality disorder and bipolar disorder. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 163, 1173–1178. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.163.7.1173.

HAMILTON, M. (1960). A rating scale for depression. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery, and Psychiatry*, 23, 56–62.

HEERLEIN, A., RICHTER, P., GONZALEZ, M., & SANTANDER, J. (1998). Personality patterns and outcome in depressive and bipolar disorders. *Psychopathology*, *31*, 15–22.

ISACSSON, G., BERGMAN, U., & RICH, C. L. (1996). Epidemiological data suggest antidepressants reduce suicide risk among depressives. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 41, 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1016/0165-0327(96)00050-X.

KARAM, E. G., SAMPSON, N., ITANI, L., ANDRADE, L. H., BORGES, G., CHIU, W. T., ET AL. (2014). Under-reporting bipolar disorder in large-scale epidemiologic studies. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 159, 147–154.

Keller, M. B., Lavori, P. W., Friedman, B., Nielsen, E., Endicott, J., McDonald-Scott, P., et al. (1987). The longitudinal interval follow-up evaluation, A comprehensive method for assessing outcome in prospective longitudinal studies. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, *44*, 540–548. https://doi.org/10.1001/archpsyc.1987. 01800180050009

LEVERICH, G. S., ALTSHULER, L. L., FRYE, M. A., SUPPES, T., KECK, P. E., JR,, McElroy, S. L., Et al. (2003). Factors associated with suicide attempts in 648 patients with bipolar disorder in the Stanley Foundation Bipolar Network. *The Journal of Clinical Psychiatry*, 64, 506–515.

LOZANO, B. E., & JOHNSON, S. L. (2001). Can personality traits predict increases in manic and depressive symptoms? *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 63, 103–111.

McInnis, M. G., Assari, S., Kamali, M., Ryan, K., Langenecker, S. A., Saunders, E. F. H., et al. (2017). Cohort profile: The Heinz C Prechter longitudinal study of bipolar disorder. *International Journal of Epidemiology*, 47, 28.

Moreno, C., Laje, G., Blanco, C., Jiang, H., Schmidt, A. B., & Olfson, M. (2007). National trends in the outpatient diagnosis and treatment of bipolar disorder in youth. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 64, 1032–1039. https://doi.org/10.1001/archpsyc.64.9.1032.

NG, T. H., BURKE, T. A., STANGE, J. P., WALSHAW, P. D., WEISS, R. B., UROSEVIC, S., ET AL. (2017). Personality disorder symptom severity predicts onset of mood episodes and conversion to bipolar I disorder in individuals with bipolar spectrum disorder. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 126, 271–284. https://doi.org/10.1037/abn00000255.

Nowakowska, C., Strong, C. M., Santosa, C. M., Wang, P. W., & Ketter, T. A. (2005). Temperamental commonalities and differences in euthymic mood disorder patients, creative controls, and healthy controls. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 85, 207–215. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2003.11.012.

Nurnberger, J. I. Jr., Blehar, M. C., Kaufmann, C. A., York-Cooler, C., Simpson, S. G., Harkavy-Friedman, J., et al. (1994). Diagnostic interview for genetic studies. Rationale, unique features, and training. NIMH Genetics Initiative. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, *51*, 849–859. https://doi.org/10.1001/archpsyc.1994. 03950110009002

O'CONNELL, R. A., MAYO, J. A., & SCIUTTO, M. S. (1991). PDQ-R personality disorders in bipolar patients. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 23, 217–221.

Paris, J., Gunderson, J., & Weinberg, I. (2007). The interface between borderline personality disorder and bipolar spectrum disorders. *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, 48, 145–154. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comppsych.2006.10.001.

PESELOW, E. D., SANFILIPO, M. P., & FIEVE, R. R. (1995). Relationship between hypomania and personality disorders before and after successful treatment. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 152, 232–238. https://doi.org/10.1176/ajp.152.2.232.

PICA, S., EDWARDS, J., JACKSON, H. J., BELL, R. C., BATES, G. W., & RUDD, R. P. (1990). Personality disorders in recent-onset bipolar disorder. *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, 31, 499–510.

QIU, F., AKISKAL, H. S., KELSOE, J. R., & GREENWOOD, T. A. (2017). Factor analysis of temperament and personality traits in bipolar patients: Correlates with comorbidity and disorder severity. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 207,

282–290. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2016.08.

QUILTY, L. C., SELLBOM, M., TACKETT, J. L., & BAGBY, R. M. (2009). Personality trait predictors of bipolar disorder symptoms. *Psychiatry Research*, *169*, 159–163. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2008.07.004.

RIHMER, Z., BARSI, J., VEG, K., & KATONA, C. L. (1990). Suicide rates in Hungary correlate negatively with reported rates of depression. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 20, 87–91.

RUGGERO, C. J., ZIMMERMAN, M., CHELMINSKI, I., & YOUNG, D. (2010). Borderline personality disorder and the misdiagnosis of bipolar disorder. *Journal of Psychiatric Research*, 44, 405–408. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychires. 2009.09.011.

RUTZ, W., VON KNORRING, L., & WALINDER, J. (1992). Long-term effects of an educational program for general practitioners given by the Swedish Committee for the Prevention and Treatment of Depression. *Acta Psychiatrica Scand.*, 85, 83–88.

Sparding, T., Palsson, E., Joas, E., Hansen, S., & Landen, M. (2017). Personality traits in bipolar disorder and influence on outcome. *BMC Psychiatry*, 17, 159. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-017-1332-0.

STRONG, C. M., NOWAKOWSKA, C., SANTOSA, C. M., WANG, P. W., KRAEMER, H. C., & KETTER, T. A. (2007). Temperament-creativity relationships in mood disorder patients, healthy controls and highly creative individuals. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 100, 41–48. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2006.10.015.

Tackett, J. L., Quilty, L. C., Sellbom, M., Rector, N. A., & Bagby, R. M. (2008). Additional evidence for a quantitative hierarchical model of mood and anxiety disorders for DSM-V: The context of personality structure. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 117, 812–825. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013795.

UCOK, A., KARAVELI, D., KUNDAKCI, T., & YAZICI, O. (1998). Comorbidity of personality disorders with bipolar mood disorders. *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, *39*, 72–74.

Velting, D. M. (1999). Suicidal ideation and the five-factor model of personality. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 27, 943–952. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(99)00046-X.

YOUNG, R. C., BIGGS, J. T., ZIEGLER, V. E., & MEYER, D. A. (1978). A rating scale for mania: Reliability, validity and sensitivity. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 133, 429–435.

ZIMMERMAN, M., MARTINEZ, J., YOUNG, D., CHELMINSKI, I., MORGAN, T. A., & DALRYMPLE, K. (2014). Comorbid bipolar disorder and borderline personality disorder and history of suicide attempts. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, 28, 358–364. https://doi.org/10.1521/pedi_2013_27_122.

ZIMMERMAN, M., RUGGERO, C. J., CHELMINSKI, I., & YOUNG, D. (2008). Is bipolar disorder overdiagnosed? *The Journal of Clinical Psychiatry*, 69, 935–940.

Manuscript Received: March 6, 2018 Revision Accepted: August 9, 2018