

**TITLE: Prospective analysis of a TRD cohort over a 1-year follow-up with standard of care in Mexico: results for depression severity, treatment response, disability and QoL from the multicenter, observational TRAL Study**

**Titulo: Análisis prospectivo de una cohorte de TRD durante un seguimiento de 1 año con atención estándar en México: resultados para la gravedad de la depresión, la respuesta al tratamiento, la discapacidad y la CdV del Estudio TRAL multicéntrico y observacional.**

**Short Title: Prospective follow-up of TRD patients in Mexico**

**Título corto: Seguimiento prospectivo de pacientes con TRD en México**

#### **AUTHORS**

Javier ZAMBRANO ([jazamra@hotmail.com](mailto:jazamra@hotmail.com), 0009-0005-3576-4435)<sup>1</sup>,

Juan Luis Vázquez Hernández ([juluvazq@hotmail.com](mailto:juluvazq@hotmail.com), 0000-0003-4522-6946)<sup>2</sup>, Francisco Fernando Brandi Rigal

([docbrandi@hotmail.com](mailto:docbrandi@hotmail.com), 0009-0007-0727-5604)<sup>3</sup>, Luis Daniel

Alviso de la Serna ([dralviso@gmail.com](mailto:dralviso@gmail.com), 0000-0001-8266-5409)<sup>4</sup>,

Gabriela Kanevsky MD ([GKanevsk@ITS.JNJ.com](mailto:GKanevsk@ITS.JNJ.com), 0000-0001-7360-

6941)<sup>5</sup>, Sergio Perocco ([SPerocco@ITS.JNJ.com](mailto:SPerocco@ITS.JNJ.com), 0000-0001-9255-

7305)<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Consultorio privado - Ciudad de México, Mexico

<sup>2</sup> Médico psiquiatra - Hospital Aranda de la Parra - León,  
Guanajuato, Mexico

<sup>3</sup> Centro de Salud Brandi Rigal S.C. - Monterrey, Mexico

<sup>4</sup> Avalon Salud, Vinculacion Medica en Salud Mental - Ciudad de  
México, Mexico

<sup>5</sup> Janssen-Cilag Farmacéutica (Argentina). Mendoza, Buenos  
Aires, Argentina

<sup>6</sup> At the time of this research, SP was an employee at Janssen  
Pharmaceutical

#### **CORRESPONDING AUTHOR**

Author: Gabriela Kanevsky

Address: Mendoza 1259 Bs As Argentina

Telephone: + 5491155826875

Email: [gkanevsk@its.jnj.com](mailto:gkanevsk@its.jnj.com)

#### **Acknowledgments**

The authors would like to thank all TRAL investigators and  
site coordinators, as well as the patients and their families.

Clinical Trial & Consulting Services (CTI) provided  
statistical analysis support to the TRAL funded by Janssen  
LatAm.

© Instituto Nacional de Neurología y Neurocirugía Manuel Velasco Suárez. Open access articles  
under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International ([CC BY-  
NC 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)) license, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the  
original work is properly cited. No commercial re-use is allowed.

Diogo Morais from Clinical Trial & Consulting Services (CTI) provided medical writing assistance and editorial support with this manuscript, funded by Janssen LatAm. Janssen LatAm participated in the interpretation of data, review, and approval of the content. All the authors had access to all relevant data and participated in writing, review, and approval of this manuscript.

### **Conflict of Interest**

1. JZ: declares no conflict of interests
2. JLVH: declares no conflict of interests
3. FFBR: declares no conflict of interests
4. LDAS: researcher for "Avalon-Vinculación Médica en Salud Mental", in which he is the principal investigator and sub-investigator of several protocols of original epidemiological research of the institution. Has received professional fees for the time spent on subject interviews in the present study by Janssen Research & Development, as approved by the Independent Research Ethics Committee. Dr. Alviso has work as speaker, collaborated in advisory boards, or received scientific fees from: Janssen, Pfizer, Sanofi Aventis, Schwabe-Pharma, Novartis, Lundbeck, Roche, Lilly, Asofarma, Psicofarma, Ferrer, Servier, and Shire
5. GK: Is currently an employee at Janssen Pharmaceutical

6. SP: At the time of this research, SP was an employee at  
Janssen Pharmaceutical

#### **Financial support statement**

TRAL (Treatment-Resistant Depression in America Latina) study was funded by Janssen Latin America. CTI provided medical writing and editorial support funded by Janssen Latin America.

#### **Author Contribution**

All authors contributed significantly to the design of the study and interpretation of the data. All the authors reviewed the final manuscript and approved the content.

1 **TITLE: Prospective analysis of a TRD cohort over a 1-year**  
2 **follow-up with standard of care in Mexico: results for**  
3 **depression severity, treatment response, disability and QoL from**  
4 **the multicenter, observational TRAL Study**

5 **Titulo: Análisis prospectivo de una cohorte de TRD durante un**  
6 **seguimiento de 1 año con atención estándar en México: resultados**  
7 **para la severidad de la depresión, la respuesta al tratamiento,**  
8 **la discapacidad y la Calidad de Vida del Estudio TRAL**  
9 **multicéntrico y observacional.**

10

11 **Short Title: Prospective follow-up of TRD patients in Mexico**

12 **Título corto: Seguimiento prospectivo de pacientes con TRD en**  
13 **México**

14

15

ARTICLE IN PRESS

16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

## Abstract

Introduction: Based on TRAL Mexico subsample, clinical outcomes and Patient-Reported Outcomes (PROs) are reported here. Methods: From 697 patients with MDD recruited from 14 Mexican sites, 140 patients with diagnosis of TRD under standard of care (SOC) were included in the 1-year follow-up. Patients with relevant psychiatric comorbidities or active participation in a clinical trial were excluded. Outcomes were obtained from PROs and clinical assessment scales. Results: Patients were mostly female (82.6%), with a mean age of 47.6 years. Only 44.3% of the patients achieved a clinical response, and remission was around 37% (measured through MADRS). Results from PHQ-9, EQ-5D and SDS show significant symptoms and disability for TRD patients in their everyday life after 1-year of follow-up with SOC. Discussion: TRD patients showed a significant burden of the disease, as current SOC fails to deliver clinically meaningful results for the majority of the patients. Response, remission and relapse are far from the desired outcomes Conclusion: Mexico has undertaken relevant and meaningful strategies to improve mental health resources availability, but some unmet needs are yet to be addressed. All involved stakeholders should consider public policies to enhance clinical outcomes and availability of resources.

39

40 Key-words: Mexico, Clinical Outcomes, Treatment-Resistant

41 Depressive Disorder, response, Patient-reported outcomes.

42

43

44

ARTICLE IN PRESS

3

45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67

## Resumen

Objetivo: De acuerdo con la submuestra de TRAL de México, estos son los resultados clínicos y los resultados reportados por el paciente (PRO). Material y métodos: De 697 pacientes con TDM reclutados en 14 centros de México, se incluyeron 140 con diagnóstico de DRT con el estándar de atención (SOC) en el seguimiento a 1 año. Se excluyó a pacientes con otros trastornos psiquiátricos relevantes o participación activa en un ensayo clínico. Los resultados se obtuvieron de los PRO y escalas de evaluación clínica. Resultados: En su mayoría, los pacientes fueron mujeres (82.6 %), con edad media de 47.6 años. Solo en 44.3 % de los pacientes se logró respuesta clínica y la remisión cercana a 37 % (medida con la MADRS). Los resultados de PHQ-9, EQ-5D y SDS muestran síntomas significativos y discapacidad en pacientes con DRT en su vida diaria después de 1 año de seguimiento con el SOC. Discusión: Los pacientes con DRT tuvieron carga significativa de enfermedad, ya que el SOC actual no brinda resultados clínicamente significativos en la mayoría de los pacientes. La respuesta, remisión y recidiva están lejos de los resultados deseados. Conclusión: Aunque México ha emprendido estrategias relevantes y significativas para mejorar los recursos de salud mental, todavía hay que abordar necesidades insatisfechas. Todas las partes interesadas deben

68 considerar políticas públicas para mejorar los resultados  
69 clínicos y disponibilidad de recursos.

70

71 Palabras clave: México, resultados clínicos, trastorno depresivo  
72 resistente al tratamiento, respuesta, resultados reportados por  
73 el paciente.

74

75

ARTICLE IN PRESS

## 76 **Background**

77 Major depressive disorder (MDD) is a mental disorder from the  
78 depressive spectrum and arguably the most disabling disease  
79 worldwide<sup>1</sup>. Beyond the significant global prevalence, this  
80 condition poses a challenge to modern societies as it impacts  
81 most dimensions of everyday living <sup>2,3</sup>. Although prevalence  
82 varies significantly, Latin America (LatAm) seems to be  
83 particularly affected by the condition. Previous research showed  
84 that Mexico presents lower prevalence values (around 8%)  
85 compared to other countries in the region<sup>4</sup>.

86 A major concern with MDD is the development of Treatment  
87 Resistant depression (TRD). TRD can be defined as a failure to  
88 respond to two or more antidepressants at therapeutic doses,  
89 over an appropriate period of time, within the current  
90 depressive episode<sup>5</sup> -although definition remains as a current  
91 discussion topic- which also impacts comparability between  
92 countries and regions, as well as an increase in the time to  
93 diagnosis. It is estimated that TRD develops in 20-30% of MDD  
94 patients and response is rarely over 70% with current Standard  
95 of Care (SOC) <sup>6-8</sup>. Treatment is the most pressing issue in TRD.  
96 Strategies such as combination, potentiation and augmentation  
97 with available therapeutic solutions - ranging from  
98 pharmacotherapy to psychotherapy - fail to deliver an adequate

99 clinical outcome in both response, remission and as prevention  
100 for relapse<sup>9-11</sup>. The need for more effective treatment is  
101 critical as suicidality is a common outcome of TRD, with  
102 increased mortality compared to MDD<sup>12</sup>. The proportion of TRD  
103 patients with partial or no response to treatment has been  
104 highlighted, although values vary significantly depending on the  
105 assessment criteria<sup>13,14</sup>.

106 The burden of both MDD and TRD is significant. The impact of the  
107 disease goes far beyond the economic and healthcare resource  
108 utilization<sup>6,15-17</sup>. Although MDD is a source of obvious burden,  
109 this tends to increase significantly in patients developing TRD  
110<sup>6,16,17</sup>. The detrimental effect on daily living has been associated  
111 also with humanistic, quality of life (QoL), work-productivity  
112 and overall psychosocial dimensions. In this regard, QoL is  
113 significantly affected, which is associated with the significant  
114 impairment posed by high levels of disability derived by the  
115 severe clinical presentation of the disease<sup>18,19</sup>.

116 The TRAL (Treatment Resistant Depression in America Latina) was  
117 intended to add to the existing literature in the region in  
118 which TRD epidemiological data was lacking. This was a  
119 multinational, real-world study aiming to estimate the  
120 prevalence of TRD among MDD on follow-up at reference centers in

121 the region. The study provided updates on prevalence of TRD,  
122 which was around 30% in MDD patients.  
123 This paper presents the results obtained from the subset of  
124 Mexico in the phase 2 of the TRAL study, a 1-year follow-up of  
125 TRD patients under SOC.

126

## 127 **Objectives**

128 This study has two main objectives:

- 129 - To depict a 1-year follow-up of TRD patients in Mexico  
130 under Standard-of-care, focused on the characterization of  
131 clinical outcomes (depression severity, clinical response,  
132 remission and relapse;
- 133 - To present the PROs (QoL, disability) for 1-year follow-up  
134 of TRD patients in Mexico under Standard-of-care providing  
135 key indicators of the burden of the disease.

ARTICLE IN PRESS

136 **METHODS**

137 *Study design and population*

138 TRAL was a multicenter, multinational, observational study  
139 conducted in a real-world setting (October 2017 - December 2018)  
140 based on reference psychiatric sites from 4 countries (Argentina,  
141 Brazil, Colombia and Mexico). The main purpose of the TRAL's phase  
142 1 was a cross-sectional analysis to portray the epidemiology and  
143 disease characterization of TRD in a sample of MDD patients, which  
144 constituted the study baseline. Following this, a phase 2 is an 1-  
145 year follow-up of TRD patients under SOC for the determination of  
146 clinical -depression and suicidality- and safety outcomes, as well  
147 as PROs (e.g. work impairment, quality of life, disability). The  
148 present analysis depicts the phase 2 data from Mexico, based on a  
149 subsample obtained in the country from 13 reference centers (7  
150 public and 6 private sites) providing a broad characterization of  
151 the whole country. A full list of sites can be found in previous  
152 publications<sup>20</sup>.

153 Patients that were clinically diagnosed with TRD based on both  
154 DSM-5 criteria and MINI, and fulfilling the study's TRD definition,  
155 were included in the phase 2 (longitudinal) of the study.

156

157 *Data and assessments*

158 TRD diagnosis was established based on the criteria defined by  
159 protocol. Patients had to be followed up adequately and treated  
160 with  $\geq 2$  antidepressants -at adequate dose and for adequate  
161 duration- in the current episode, with an absence of clinical  
162 response to treatment based on MADRS <sup>5</sup>. Validated instruments were  
163 used for clinical response and Patient Reported Outcomes.  
164 Depression severity was assessed with the Montgomery - Åsberg  
165 Depression Rating Scale (MADRS) <sup>21</sup>, which shows a good  
166 discrimination between responders and non-responders to  
167 antidepressants, particularly to assess response to SOC over a 1-  
168 year time span (more information can be found here)<sup>20</sup>.

169 The Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9), a 10-item questionnaire  
170 that characterizes the severity of symptoms on a 4 point scale  
171 relative to a pre-defined time frame, usually the last 2 weeks,  
172 was also included to assess depression severity <sup>22,23</sup>.

173 Sheehan Disability Scale (SDS) was used to assess functional  
174 disability from TRD <sup>24</sup>. A patient that scores 5 or more in any of  
175 the SDS scales should be closely monitored since it implies  
176 significant functional impairment.

177 Quality of life was assessed with the EQ-5D-5L questionnaire <sup>25</sup>, a  
178 5-dimension questionnaire (Mobility, Self-Care, Usual Activities,  
179 Pain/Discomfort, Anxiety/Depression) which also comprises a global  
180 assessment visual analogue 100-point scale. Score were also

181 converted to the EQ-5D-3L score using responses in the EQ-5D-5L  
182 index values based on US values set<sup>26</sup>.  
183 Sociodemographic (age, sex, marital status and years of education)  
184 and clinical features at baseline were collected (age, depression  
185 duration and comorbidities) and assessed by a physician, while  
186 clinical features were again collected at the end of the study.  
187 Written informed consent was obtained from all participants. The  
188 study was approved by local Independent Ethics Committee /  
189 Institutional Review Board.

190

### 191 *Statistical Analysis*

192 From the initial Mexican sample of 699 MDD included in phase 1,  
193 140 were included in the phase 2 as per the study criteria -  
194 diagnosis of TRD and follow-up. Although the sample size is  
195 relevant for Mexico, the study was not designed to be  
196 representative for each country, but only for the whole region  
197 (LatAm). Therefore, inferences should be performed with care.  
198 Quantitative variables were summarized as mean, median, standard  
199 deviation minimum and maximum, and qualitative variables were  
200 summarized as absolute frequency and percentages. Longitudinal  
201 comparisons on clinical outcomes were performed with a Generalized  
202 estimating equation (GEE) for a 95% Confidence interval. There  
203 were no multiple testing corrections performed.

204 There was no imputation of missing data. Statistical significance  
205 was set at 5%. Statistical analysis was performed using SAS®  
206 (version 9.4, SAS Institute Inc, Cary).

207

## 208 **RESULTS**

### 209 **Patient disposition and sociodemographic characteristics over a 1-** 210 **year follow-up with SOC for the Mexican subset**

211

212 From an overall sample of 699 patients with MDD in Mexico,  
213 roughly 20% (n=140) were included in phase 2 with a clinical  
214 diagnosis of TRD (table 1). Most of these patients (87.1%)  
215 completed the study as planned in the protocol and, for those  
216 that did not complete (n=18, 12.9%) the main reason was lost to  
217 follow up (n=12, 66.7%).

218 Most of the sample identified in phase 1 as having TRD were  
219 female patients (82.6%), averaging 47.6 years, with more than  
220 half (50.7%) married or on consensual union and 33.1% single.  
221 Around 40% had at least 13 years of formal education (table 1).

222

### 223 **Clinical outcomes of depression and depression severity in TRD** 224 **patients over a 1-year follow-up with SOC for the Mexican subset**

225 *Montgomery-Asberg Depression Scale (MADRS) in TRD patients over a*  
226 *1-year follow-up with SOC for the Mexican subset*

12

227

228 The average MADRS score at visit 1 was 30.17 (range: 9 to 50) -  
229 Table 2. MADRS total score varied significantly over time  
230 ( $p < 0.0001$ ), with a mean monthly variation of 1.1 points ( $B =$   
231  $1.054$ )).

232 Almost 27% of the TRD sample had severe depression at visit 1,  
233 while at the end of study 10.7% of the patients still presented  
234 values consisted with severe depression, with moderate depression  
235 representing around 22.1% of the patients. At the end of study  
236 visit, 84.3% of the patients still displayed some degree of  
237 depressive symptoms.

238 Less than half (44.3%) of the patients showed a clinically  
239 significant response (reduction  $\geq 50\%$  in the MADRS total score) at  
240 the end of the study visit. As for clinically diagnosed relapse,  
241 less than 0.8% of the TRD sample showed values in MADRS consistent  
242 with these outcome at the end of study visit after 1-year of SOC,  
243 while remission was achieved by less than 37% of the patients  
244 (table 2).

245

246 *Questionnaire On Patient's Health (PHQ-9) in TRD patients over a*  
247 *1-year follow-up with SOC for the Mexican subset*

248

249 The mean total score of PHQ-9 at visit 1 was 17.01 in TRD patients  
250 and more than two-thirds (66.7%) of TRD patients had a moderately  
251 severe or severe depression). At the end of study the mean score  
252 of phase 2 patients (TRD patients) was 10.3 points and 34.5% of  
253 patients had their depression classified as moderately severe or  
254 severe (table 3). Moreover, at the end of study, 77.9% of the  
255 patients reported having some difficulties conducting their  
256 instrumental daily activities.

257

258 **Quality of life (EQ-5D-5L questionnaire) and Disability (Sheehan**  
259 **Disability Scale - SDS) in TRD patients over a 1-year follow-up**  
260 **with SOC for the Mexican subset**

261 *Quality of Life - EQ-5D-5L Questionnaire in TRD patients over a 1-*  
262 *year follow-up with SOC for the Mexican subset*

263 Results from quality of Life can be seen in table 4 as assessed  
264 with EQ-5D. At baseline, 54.9% of the patients reported having  
265 no problems walking, 48.6% reported having no problems washing  
266 or dressing themselves, 18.8% of the patients revealed no  
267 problems doing their usual activities, 27.8% of the patients  
268 reported having no pain or discomfort and 3.5% of the TRD  
269 patients did not feel anxious or depressed. TRD patients seem to  
270 have a positive evolution in most dimension at the end of the

271 study. However, 33.6% of the patients still reported mobility  
272 issues, 31.1% had issues with self-care, 50.8% have problems  
273 with their usual activities, 54.9% still presented some  
274 pain/discomfort and, most importantly, 73.8% still had some  
275 anxiety/depression issues.

276 The mean classification of the overall health for TRD patients  
277 was 52.9 points at visit 1 and 73.3 points at the end of study,  
278 a statistically significant result ( $p < 0.0001$ ).

279  
280 *Sheehan Disability Scale (SDS) in TRD patients over a 1-year*  
281 *follow-up with SOC for the Mexican subset*

282 Table 5 depicts the evolution of values of disability assessed  
283 by SDS over 1 year. At visit 1, 6.4% of TRD patients reported  
284 that symptoms extremely disrupted their work/school, 6.3% that  
285 symptoms extremely disrupted their social life/leisure  
286 activities and for 6.9% the symptoms extremely disrupted their  
287 family life/home responsibilities. Interestingly, the proportion  
288 of patients at the end of study visit varied slightly in most  
289 dimensions. Very relevant is the proportion of patients that  
290 still reported disruption of work/school activities (87.3%), as  
291 well as the 85.2% that still disruption in their social  
292 life/leisure activities, and the 87.7 that feel it has disrupted  
293 their family/home responsibilities.

294 The mean total SDS score varied significantly from baseline to  
295 the end of study ( $p < 0.0001$ ). On average, TRD patients identify  
296 that in at least one day in the past 7 days, the condition has  
297 impaired in a significant way from performing at school/work or  
298 even missing on their responsibilities.

299

### 300 **DISCUSSION**

301 This paper follows epidemiological data regarding TRD in  
302 Mexico<sup>27</sup>. Within the scope of the TRAL study, Mexico had a  
303 significant prevalence of TRD including all patients (20.7%) and  
304 only treated patients (23.5%), in line with a high proportion of  
305 female patients -over 82%. The present results show that despite  
306 the baseline of patients in Mexico -the clinical presentation of  
307 the patients seems to be less severe than expected- a  
308 significant proportion of the patients do not achieve a clinical  
309 response. From a total of around 44% that showed response,  
310 almost 37% can be characterized as remitters -contrasting also  
311 with the less than 1% of patients with relapse- as assessed with  
312 MADRS. Regardless of the outcome, which should be interpreted  
313 with caution since sample size was not calculated to allow  
314 inferences at a country level, this is still far from desired  
315 outcomes. The analysis of other measures of depression severity,

316 such as PHQ-9, support the evidence that current results  
317 achieved with SOC are insufficient. Only about 22% of the  
318 patients reported having no difficulties in their everyday life,  
319 underscoring the unmet needs in the country and region<sup>20</sup>. The  
320 limited access to mental healthcare services in Mexico may offer  
321 some explanation to the results, as the reference centers may be  
322 confronted with the need to follow patients that are treatment  
323 compliant and willing to participate in a study with 5  
324 longitudinal assessments. Many TRD patients have economic  
325 problems, maybe derived from depression among other causes,  
326 leading to problems with long follow-ups in Mexico. Also, Mexico  
327 has mixed -public and private sector- mental healthcare offer  
328 which were evenly included in this study, contrasting somewhat  
329 to what is the reality in other countries.

330 The burden of TRD affects patients in multiple dimensions. The  
331 current results show that the assessments based on QoL and  
332 disability highlight the need for better outcomes in these  
333 dimensions based on the available SOC. The proportion of  
334 patients that report on the severe impact of the condition on a  
335 daily basis, hindering their independence and adding to the  
336 burden of the disease, is high. However, these results are  
337 aligned with the vast body of literature available on the  
338 subject <sup>6,16-18,28,29</sup>. Considering suicidality, this leads to higher

339 number of hospitalizations, with increased cost and healthcare  
340 resources utilization. On the other hand, school/work  
341 productivity is limited which impacts also on families and  
342 formal and informal caregivers. This impairment is highlighted  
343 in the prevalence of depression and anxiety symptoms after 1-  
344 year, which underlines the simultaneous nature of depression and  
345 anxiety in these patients <sup>30,31</sup>.

346 A significant effort in Mexico has been put in place in the last  
347 decade to increase offer in both treatment options and mental  
348 health specialists, but there is still some way to go as far as  
349 treatment gap <sup>32,33</sup>. This changing trend in the healthcare  
350 ecosystem saw improvements in three key areas - prevention,  
351 hospitalization and social reintegration- but more effort should  
352 be implemented to ensure that objectives are fulfilled <sup>34</sup>, namely  
353 increased access to primary care<sup>35</sup>. Working on social stigma and  
354 ensuring proper patient education is also paramount to the  
355 success of the current strategy <sup>36</sup>.

356 The study has some limitations assumed on the study design.  
357 Real-world provides a more accurate depiction of the reality in  
358 Mexico. However, due to the observational nature of the study  
359 some variables were not controlled, and study inclusion criteria  
360 may have been impacted by the characteristics of each center in  
361 the study. Moreover, only patients already followed at the study

362 centers were included, which may have left some more severe  
363 cases out of the study sample. The high proportion of female  
364 patients, although expected based on the literature, may impact  
365 the overall results, as women tend to have a higher treatment  
366 adherence than men<sup>37,38</sup>. Concomitantly, sample size was not  
367 designed for inferential analysis and generalization at country  
368 level, so data interpretation should be performed with caution.  
369 Therefore, this is not a population-based study, as only adults  
370 under regular follow-up at medical centers and with a clinical  
371 diagnosis of MDD were included in the study.

372 On the other hand, the depiction of the reality in Mexico is  
373 enhanced using real-world evidence, and all procedures were put  
374 in place to ensure the maximum level of rigor in the study.

375 Regarding this, it is important to mention the inclusion of a  
376 diversity of reference centers with different size, expertise and  
377 location -including both private and public sites-, as well as  
378 the diversity of patient profile and treatment protocols used.

379 Therefore, the present data constitutes a very important  
380 reference data source for future decisions in the healthcare  
381 context in Mexico, namely in addressing the current medical and  
382 societal unmet needs for TRD patients. This is the first study  
383 in Mexico on TRD. On a broader perspective, this study adds to  
384 the evidence in support of the development of new treatment

385 protocols for TRD. Also, it is essential to ensure a timely  
386 diagnosis and swift medication switch when needed, to avoid the  
387 development of more complex and chronic clinical presentations.  
388 More psychiatrists are needed in Mexico, as well as a more  
389 balanced distribution of healthcare resources -namely the  
390 availability of therapeutics in all regions-, suggesting that  
391 more investment in mental health is needed.

392

### 393 *Further research*

394 Future research on the subject should provide a comparative  
395 approach to different therapeutics available in Mexico, not only  
396 focused on clinical outcomes but also on treatment adherence,  
397 patient reported outcomes and other unmet needs in the context  
398 of mental healthcare for TRD patients in Mexico. Also of  
399 interest is the possibility of performing sub-group analysis  
400 that allow the identification of factors associated with good  
401 prognosis, as well as to understand the subtleties of the  
402 variation in values for the PRO based on patients achieving  
403 response/non-response to treatment.

404

### 405 **CONCLUSIONS**

406 The burden of TRD in LatAm is significant. Available clinical  
407 protocols based on standard of care do not provide the necessary

408 clinical outcomes for those in need. Due to the life-  
409 threatening nature of TRD, associated with high levels of  
410 suicidality, a urgent call to action is necessary which includes  
411 all relevant stakeholders and decision makers in Mexico to  
412 ensure proper measures are enforced. The action plan should also  
413 consider that the burden of disease strains the already limited  
414 healthcare resources on mental health existent in the country,  
415 as well as caregivers and patients alike. Effort should also be  
416 placed on achieving a scientific consensus on the definition of  
417 TRD that leads to an easier operationalization of screening,  
418 diagnosis and treatment. Results from the TRAL study have the  
419 potential to become a relevant decision-making supporting tool  
420 to ensure adequate decisions and aid for those in need in  
421 Mexico.

422

## 423 **REFERENCES**

- 424 1. Malhi GS, Mann JJ. Depression. The Lancet. 2018 Nov;392(10161):2299–312.
- 425 2. Storeng SH, Sund ER, Krokstad S. Factors associated with basic and instrumental activities of daily  
426 living in elderly participants of a population-based survey: The Nord-Trøndelag Health Study,  
427 Norway. BMJ Open. 2018;8(3):1–10.
- 428 3. Xie H, Chen PW, Zhao L, Sun X, Jia XJ. Relationship between activities of daily living and  
429 depression among older adults and the quality of life of family caregivers. Frontiers of Nursing.  
430 2018;5(2):97–104.
- 431 4. Kessler RC, Bromet EJ. The Epidemiology of Depression Across Cultures. Annu Rev Public Health.  
432 2013 Mar 18;34(1):119–38.

- 433 5. Conway CR, George MS, Sackeim HA. Toward an evidence-based, operational definition of  
434 treatment-resistant depression: When Enough is enough. *JAMA Psychiatry*. 2017;74(1):9–10.
- 435 6. Mrazek DA, Hornberger JC, Altar CA, Degtjar I. A Review of the Clinical, Economic, and Societal  
436 Burden of Treatment-Resistant Depression: 1996–2013. *Psychiatric Services*. 2014;65(8):977–87.
- 437 7. Hasin DS, Sarvet AL, Meyers JL, Saha TD, Ruan WJ, Stohl M, et al. Epidemiology of adult DSM-5  
438 major depressive disorder and its specifiers in the United States. *JAMA Psychiatry*.  
439 2018;75(4):336–46.
- 440 8. Gaynes BN, Warden D, Trivedi MH, Wisniewski SR, Fava M, Rush AJ. What Did STAR\*D Teach Us?  
441 Results From a Large-Scale, Practical, Clinical Trial for Patients With Depression. *Psychiatric*  
442 *Services*. 2009 Nov;60(11):1439–45.
- 443 9. Thase M, Connolly R. Unipolar depression in adults: Choosing treatment for resistant depression -  
444 UpToDate [Internet]. UpToDate. 2019 [cited 2019 Aug 14]. Available from:  
445 [https://www.uptodate.com/contents/unipolar-depression-in-adults-choosing-treatment-for-](https://www.uptodate.com/contents/unipolar-depression-in-adults-choosing-treatment-for-resistant-depression#H925759895)  
446 [resistant-depression#H925759895](https://www.uptodate.com/contents/unipolar-depression-in-adults-choosing-treatment-for-resistant-depression#H925759895)
- 447 10. Kraus C, Kadriu B, Lanzenberger R, Zarate CA, Kasper S. Prognosis and improved outcomes in  
448 major depression: a review. *Transl Psychiatry*. 2019;9(1).
- 449 11. O’Reardon JP, Cristancho P, Peshek AD. Vagus Nerve Stimulation (VNS) and Treatment of  
450 Depression: To the Brainstem and Beyond. *Psychiatry (Edmont)*. 2006 May;3(5):54–63.
- 451 12. Döme P, Kunovszki P, Takács P, Fehér L, Balázs T, Dede K, et al. Clinical characteristics of  
452 treatment-resistant depression in adults in Hungary: Real-world evidence from a 7-year-long  
453 retrospective data analysis. *PLoS One*. 2021;16(1 January):1–20.
- 454 13. Ionescu DF, Rosenbaum J, Alpert J. Pharmacological approaches to the challenge of treatment-  
455 resistant depression. *Dialogues Clin Neurosci*. 2015;17(2):111–26.
- 456 14. Fedgchin M, Trivedi M, Daly EJ, Melkote R, Lane R, Lim P, et al. Efficacy and Safety of Fixed-Dose  
457 Esketamine Nasal Spray Combined With a New Oral Antidepressant in Treatment-Resistant  
458 Depression: Results of a Randomized, Double-Blind, Active-Controlled Study (TRANSFORM-1).  
459 *International Journal of Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2019;
- 460 15. Johnston KM, Powell LC, Anderson IM, Szabo S, Cline S. The burden of treatment-resistant  
461 depression: A systematic review of the economic and quality of life literature. *J Affect Disord*.  
462 2019;242(June):195–210.
- 463 16. Lepine BA, Moreno RA, Campos RN, Couttolenc BF. Treatment-resistant depression increases  
464 health costs and resource utilization. *Revista Brasileira de Psiquiatria*. 2012 Dec;34(4):379–88.
- 465 17. Chow W, Doane MJ, Sheehan ; Jack, Alphs L, Le H. Economic Burden Among Patients With Major  
466 Depressive Disorder: An Analysis of Healthcare Resource Use, Work Productivity, and Direct and  
467 Indirect Costs by Depression Severity. *Am J Manag Care*. 2019;

- 468 18. Jaffe DH, Rive B, Deneer TR. The humanistic and economic burden of treatment-resistant  
469 depression in Europe: a cross-sectional study. *BMC Psychiatry*. 2019;19(1):1–11.
- 470 19. Dibernardo A, Lin X, Zhang Q, Xiang J, Lu L, Jamieson C, et al. Humanistic outcomes in treatment  
471 resistant depression: A secondary analysis of the STAR\*D study. *BMC Psychiatry*. 2018;18(1):1–8.
- 472 20. Caldieraro MA, Tung TC, Agudelo Baena LM, Vilapriño Duprat M, Corral RM, Alviso de la Serna  
473 LD, et al. Depression and suicidality severity among TRD patients after 1-year under standard of  
474 care: Findings from the TRAL study, a multicenter, multinational, observational study in Latin  
475 America. *Rev Psiquiatr Salud Ment*. 2022;
- 476 21. Montgomery SA, Asberg M. A new depression scale designed to be sensitive to change. *British  
477 Journal of Psychiatry*. 1979;134(4):382–9.
- 478 22. Kroenke K, Spitzer RL, Williams JBW. The PHQ-9: Validity of a brief depression severity measure. *J  
479 Gen Intern Med*. 2001;16(9):606–13.
- 480 23. Spitzer RL, Kroenke K, Williams JBW. Validation and utility of a self-report version of PRIME-MD:  
481 The PHQ Primary Care Study. *J Am Med Assoc*. 1999 Nov;282(18):1737–44.
- 482 24. Sheehan KH, Sheehan D V. Assessing treatment effects in clinical trials with the Discan metric of  
483 the Sheehan Disability Scale. *Int Clin Psychopharmacol*. 2008;23(2):70–83.
- 484 25. Herdman M, Gudex C, Lloyd A, Janssen M, Kind P, Parkin D, et al. Development and preliminary  
485 testing of the new five-level version of EQ-5D (EQ-5D-5L). *Quality of Life Research*.  
486 2011;20(10):1727–36.
- 487 26. van Hout B, Janssen MF, Feng YS, Kohlmann T, Busschbach J, Golicki D, et al. Interim Scoring for  
488 the EQ-5D-5L: Mapping the EQ-5D-5L to EQ-5D-3L Value Sets. *Value in Health*. 2012  
489 Jul;15(5):708–15.
- 490 27. Vázquez Hernández JL, Alviso de la Serna LD, Cruz C, Becerra Palars C, Ibarreche Beltran J,  
491 Kanevsky G, et al. Prevalence of Treatment Resistant Depression: TRAL study sub analysis in a  
492 Mexican sample | [Internet]. *Archivos de Neurociencias*. 2023 [cited 2023 Jun 19]. Available  
493 from: <https://archivosdeneurociencias.org/index.php/ADN/article/view/448>
- 494 28. Amos TB, Tandon N, Lefebvre P, Pilon D, Kamstra RL, Pivneva I, et al. Direct and indirect cost  
495 burden and change of employment status in treatment-resistant depression: A matched-cohort  
496 study using a us commercial claims database. *Journal of Clinical Psychiatry*. 2018;79(2).
- 497 29. Fujii RK, Goren A, Annunziata K, Mould-Quevedo J. Prevalence, Awareness, Treatment, and  
498 Burden of Major Depressive Disorder: Estimates from the National Health and Wellness Survey in  
499 Brazil. *Value Health Reg Issues*. 2012;1(2):235–43.
- 500 30. Moffitt TE, Harrington H, Caspi A, Kim-Cohen J, Goldberg D, Gregory AM, et al. Depression and  
501 Generalized Anxiety Disorder. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 2007;64(6):651.

- 502 31. Groen RN, Ryan O, Wigman JTW, Riese H, Penninx BWJH, Giltay EJ, et al. Comorbidity between  
503 depression and anxiety: Assessing the role of bridge mental states in dynamic psychological  
504 networks. *BMC Med.* 2020;18(1):1–17.
- 505 32. Guerra M, Ferri CP, Sosa AL, Salas A, Gaona C, Gonzales V, et al. Late-life depression in Peru,  
506 Mexico and Venezuela: The 10/66 population-based study. *British Journal of Psychiatry.*  
507 2009;195(6):510–5.
- 508 33. Borges G, Benjet C, Medina-Mora ME, Orozco R, Wang PS. Treatment of mental disorders for  
509 adolescents in Mexico City. *Bull World Health Organ.* 2008;86(10):757–64.
- 510 34. Pimentel L. The Importance of Mental Health in the Mexican Public Health System. *Mexican*  
511 *Journal of Medical Research ICSA.* 2019;7(13):1–6.
- 512 35. Martinez W, Galván J, Saavedra N, Berenzon S. Barriers to integrating mental health services in  
513 community-based primary care settings in Mexico city: A qualitative analysis. *Psychiatric Services.*  
514 2017;68(5):497–502.
- 515 36. Alvarez-Monjaras M, Gonzalez D. Depression : Stigma and its. 2016;(November).
- 516 37. Picco L, Subramaniam M, Abdin E, Ajit Vaingankar J, Chong SA. Gender differences in major  
517 depressive disorder: findings from the Singapore Mental Health Study. *Singapore Med J.*  
518 2017;58(11):649–55.
- 519 38. Albert PR. Why is depression more prevalent in women? *Journal of Psychiatry and Neuroscience.*  
520 2015;40(4):219–21.

521

522

ARTICLE IN PRESS

523 **Table 1. Patient disposition and Sociodemographic data at visit**  
524 **1 (baseline) in the Mexican subset**

ARTICLE IN PRESS

TRD	
(n=144)	
<b>Age (years)</b>	
N	144
Mean	47.60
Median	47.50
Standard deviation	12.98
Minimum	18.00
Maximum	80.00
<b>Gender, n (%)</b>	
Female	119 (82.6%)
Male	25 (17.4%)
Total	144
<b>Marital status, n (%)</b>	
Single	47 (33.1%)
Married/Consensual Union	72 (50.7%)

ARTICLE IN PRESS

	TRD
	(n=144)
Divorced/Separated	16
	(11.3%)
Widower	7 (4.9%)
Total	142

**Years of formal education, n**

(%)

0	0
1-4 years	0
5-9 years	42
	(29.6%)
10-12 years	43
	(30.3%)
≥ 13 years	57
	(40.1%)
Total	142

**Analysis dataset for phase 2**

**by visit, n (%)**

Visit 1	140
	(100.0%)

	TRD
	(n=144)
Visit 2	132 (94.3%)
Visit 3	124 (88.6%)
Visit 4	122 (87.1%)
Visit 5 (end of study)	122 (87.1%)

**For patients enrolled in the phase 2**

Patient completed the study as planned into the protocol, n (%)

No	18 (12.9%)
Yes	122 (87.1%)
Total	140

ARTICLE IN PRESS

---

TRD

(n=144)

---

**If no, reason for premature**

**withdrawal, n (%)**

The subject withdraws his consent	2 (11.1%)
The subject is lost to follow up	12 (66.7%)
The subject died	2 (11.1%)
Other reason	2 (11.1%)
Total	18

---

525 MDD - Major Depressive Disorder. TRD - Treatment Resistant  
526 Depression.

ARTICLE IN PRESS

527  
 528 **Table 2. Montgomery-Asberg Depression Scale (MADRS) in TRD**  
 529 **patients over a 1-year follow-up with SOC for the Mexican subset**

	Visit 1 (n=144)	Visit 2 (n=132)	Visit 3 (n=124)	Visit 4 (n=122)	End of study* (n=122)
<b>Total score<sup>a)</sup></b>					
N	144	132	124	122	122
Mean	30.17	22.16	20.19	19.51	17.64
Standard	8.63	11.16	11.20	11.21	11.87
Minimum	9.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Maximum	50.00	45.00	48.00	45.00	48.00
GEE model	50.00	48.00	46.00	49.00	47.00
B (linear			-1.054		
95% CI			[-1.222; -0.885]		
p-value			<0.0001		
Symptom absent	0	14	14	16	19
Mild depression	21	38	48	50	63
Moderate (20-34)	77	54	44	40	27
Symptom	98	106	106	106	109
Severe depression	46	26	18	16	13
<b>Change in total score from visit 1 (%)</b>					
N		132	124	122	122
Mean		-25.58	-31.04	-32.53	-39.92
Standard		31.66	34.73	35.92	36.87
Minimum		-100.00	-100.00	-100.00	-100.00
Maximum		75.00	100.00	87.50	100.00
<b>Response (Reduction ≥50% in the total</b>					
Yes		24	32	38	54
Total		132	124	122	122
<b>Remission (MADRS total score ≤12), n</b>					
Yes		28	27	31	45
Total		132	124	122	122
<b>Relapse, n (%)</b>					
Yes			6 (4.8%)	5 (4.1%)	1 (0.8%)

Visit 1	Visit 2	Visit 3	Visit 4	End of study*
(n=144)	(n=132)	(n=124)	(n=122)	(n=122)

---

Total		124	122	122
-------	--	-----	-----	-----

---

TRD - Treatment Resistant Depression. GEE: Generalized

estimating equation. 95%CI: 95% Confidence interval.

a) Range: 0 to 60. Higher values indicate a higher level of depression. \*End of study - final visit, after 1 year follow-up

530

531

ARTICLE IN PRESS

532 **Table 3. Reported analysis of Questionnaire on Patient's Health**  
 533 **(PHQ-9) of TRD patients over a 1-year follow-up with SOC for the**  
 534 **Mexican subset**

535

	<b>Visit 1</b>	<b>Visit 3</b>	<b>End of</b>	<b>Longitudinal</b>
	<b>(n=144)</b>	<b>(n=124)</b>	<b>study</b>	<b>analysis</b>
			<b>(n=122)</b>	GEE model
<b>Total score<sup>a)</sup></b>				
N	144	124	122	
Mean	17.01	12.06	10.28	
Median	17.00	11.50	8.00	B (linear regression parameter) -0.556
Standard deviation	5.49	7.02	7.80	95% CI [-0.664; -0.447]
Minimum	2.00	0.00	0.00	p-value <0.0001
Maximum	27.00	27.00	27.00	
<b>Depression severity, n (%)</b>				
None (0-4)	2 (1.4%)	20 (16.1%)	39 (32.0%)	

	<b>Visit 1</b> <b>(n=144)</b>	<b>Visit 3</b> <b>(n=124)</b>	<b>End of</b> <b>study</b> <b>(n=122)</b>	<b>Longitudinal</b> <b>analysis</b> GEE model
Mild (5-9)	10 (6.9%)	28 (22.6%)	28 (23.0%)	
Moderate (10-14)	36 (25.0%)	25 (20.2%)	13 (10.7%)	
Moderately severe (15-19)	42 (29.2%)	25 (20.2%)	24 (19.7%)	
Severe (20-27)	54 (37.5%)	26 (21.0%)	18 (14.8%)	
Total	144	124	122	

**If you checked off any problems, how difficult have these problems made it for you to do your work, take care of things at home, or get along with other people?, n (%)**

Not difficult at all	4 (2.8%)	18 (14.5%)	27 (22.1%)
----------------------	----------	---------------	---------------

	<b>Visit 1 (n=144)</b>	<b>Visit 3 (n=124)</b>	<b>End of study (n=122)</b>	<b>Longitudinal analysis GEE model</b>
Somewhat difficult	56 (38.9%)	74 (59.7%)	77 (63.1%)	
Very difficult	65 (45.1%)	31 (25.0%)	16 (13.1%)	
Extremely difficult	19 (13.2%)	1 (0.8%)	2 (1.6%)	
Total	144	124	122	

536 a) Total score range between 0 and 27 and higher values indicate  
537 higher depression severity.

538 MDD - Major Depressive Disorder. TRD - Treatment Resistant  
539 Depression. GEE: Generalized estimating equation. 95%CI: 95%  
540 Confidence interval.

541

ARTICLE IN PRESS

542 **Table 4. Quality of life - EQ-5D-5L questionnaire over a 1-year**  
 543 **follow-up of TRD patients with SOC for the Mexican subset**

	<b>Visit 1 (n=144)</b>	<b>End of study (n=122)</b>	<b>Longitudinal analysis GEE model</b>
<b>Mobility, n (%)</b>			
I have no problems walking	79 (54.9%)	81 (66.4%)	
I have slight problems walking	26 (18.1%)	22 (18.0%)	
I have moderate problems walking	35 (24.3%)	18 (14.8%)	
I have severe problems walking	3 (2.1%)	1 (0.8%)	
I am unable to walk	1 (0.7%)	0	
Total	144	122	
<b>Self-care, n (%)</b>			
I have no problems washing or dressing myself	70 (48.6%)	84 (68.9%)	

	<b>Visit 1 (n=144)</b>	<b>End of study (n=122)</b>	<b>Longitudinal analysis GEE model</b>
I have slight problems washing or dressing myself	27 (18.8%)	20 (16.4%)	
I have moderate problems washing or dressing myself	35 (24.3%)	17 (13.9%)	
I have severe problems washing or dressing myself	12 (8.3%)	1 (0.8%)	
I am unable to wash or dress myself	0	0	
<b>Total</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>122</b>	
<b>Usual activities, n (%)</b>			
I have no problems doing my usual activities	27 (18.8%)	60 (49.2%)	

	<b>Visit 1 (n=144)</b>	<b>End of study (n=122)</b>	<b>Longitudinal analysis GEE model</b>
I have slight problems doing my usual activities	38 (26.4%)	31 (25.4%)	
I have moderate problems doing my usual activities	57 (39.6%)	28 (23.0%)	
I have severe problems doing my usual activities	18 (12.5%)	3 (2.5%)	
I am unable to do my usual activities	4 (2.8%)	0	
Total	144	122	
<b>Pain/discomfort, n (%)</b>			
I have no pain or discomfort	40 (27.8%)	55 (45.1%)	
I have slight pain or discomfort	36 (25.0%)	38 (31.1%)	

	<b>Visit 1 (n=144)</b>	<b>End of study (n=122)</b>	<b>Longitudinal analysis GEE model</b>
I have moderate pain or discomfort	44 (30.6%)	24 (19.7%)	
I have severe pain or discomfort	19 (13.2%)	3 (2.5%)	
I have extreme pain or discomfort	5 (3.5%)	2 (1.6%)	
Total	144	122	

**Anxiety/depression, n**

(%)

I am not anxious or depressed	5 (3.5%)	32 (26.2%)	
I am slightly anxious or depressed	25 (17.4%)	55 (45.1%)	
I am moderately anxious or depressed	59 (41.0%)	25 (20.5%)	
I am severely anxious or depressed	42 (29.2%)	7 (5.7%)	

	<b>Visit 1 (n=144)</b>	<b>End of study (n=122)</b>	<b>Longitudinal analysis</b> GEE model	
I am extremely anxious or depressed	13 (9.0%)	3 (2.5%)		
Total	144	122		
<b>Health in the current day<sup>a)</sup></b>				
N	144	122		
Mean	52.90	73.32		
Median	51.50	80.00	B (linear regression parameter)	0.801
Standard deviation	19.56	19.21	95% CI	[0.395; 1.207]
Minimum	0.00	20.00	p-value	0.0001
Maximum	90.00	100.00		
<b>EQ-5D-3L score<sup>b)</sup></b>				
N	144	122		
Mean	0.64	0.79		

	Visit 1 (n=144)	End of study (n=122)	Longitudinal analysis GEE model	
Median	0.67	0.82	B (linear regression parameter)	0.012
Standard deviation	0.17	0.16	95% CI	[0.009; 0.014]
Minimum	-0.06	0.24	p-value	<0.0001
Maximum	1.00	1.00		

**Score recoded as  
categorical variable, n  
(%)**

Worst health status (score <0.403)	14 (9.7%)	5 (4.1%)
Higher health status (score ≥0.403)	130 (90.3%)	117 (95.9%)
Total	144	122

- 544 a) The health in current day was assessed through a visual  
545 analogic scale (range 0=worst health to 100=best health).  
546 b) Score was calculated based on response combinations and using  
547 US population/scores as a reference.

548 MDD - Major Depressive Disorder. TRD - Treatment Resistant  
549 Depression. GEE: Generalized estimating equation. 95%CI: 95%  
550 Confidence interval.  
551

ARTICLE IN PRESS

552 **Table 5. Sheehan Disability Scale (SDS) over a 1-year follow-up**  
 553 **of TRD patients with SOC for the Mexican subset**

	<b>Visit 1 (n=144)</b>	<b>Visit 3 (n=124)</b>	<b>End of study (n=122)</b>	<b>Longitudinal analysis GEE model</b>
<b>The symptoms have</b>				
<b>disrupted your work</b>				
<b>/school, n (%)</b>				
Not at all	7 (6.4%)	9 (11.5%)	10 (12.7%)	
Mildly	15 (13.6%)	16 (20.5%)	23 (29.1%)	
Moderately	31 (28.2%)	37 (47.4%)	34 (43.0%)	
Markedly	50 (45.5%)	13 (16.7%)	11 (13.9%)	
Extremely	7 (6.4%)	3 (3.8%)	1 (1.3%)	
Total	110	78	79	
N	110	78	79	
Mean	5.91	4.59	4.04	
Median	7.00	5.00	4.00	

	<b>Visit 1 (n=144)</b>	<b>Visit 3 (n=124)</b>	<b>End of study (n=122)</b>	<b>Longitudinal analysis GEE model</b>
Standard deviation	2.75	2.64	2.48	
Minimum	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Maximum	10.00	10.00	10.00	
<b>The symptoms have disrupted your social life/leisure activities, n (%)</b>				
Not at all	4 (2.8%)	14 (11.3%)	18 (14.8%)	
Mildly	13 (9.0%)	26 (21.0%)	46 (37.7%)	
Moderately	43 (29.9%)	61 (49.2%)	40 (32.8%)	
Markedly	75 (52.1%)	19 (15.3%)	18 (14.8%)	
Extremely	9 (6.3%)	4 (3.2%)	0	
Total	144	124	122	

	<b>Visit 1 (n=144)</b>	<b>Visit 3 (n=124)</b>	<b>End of study (n=122)</b>	<b>Longitudinal analysis GEE model</b>
N	144	124	122	
Mean	6.45	4.36	3.74	
Median	7.00	4.00	3.00	
Standard deviation	2.29	2.45	2.50	
Minimum	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Maximum	10.00	10.00	9.00	
<b>The symptoms have disrupted your family life/home responsibilities, n (%)</b>				
Not at all	4 (2.8%)	15 (12.1%)	15 (12.3%)	
Mildly	11 (7.6%)	33 (26.6%)	49 (40.2%)	

	<b>Visit 1 (n=144)</b>	<b>Visit 3 (n=124)</b>	<b>End of study (n=122)</b>	<b>Longitudinal analysis GEE model</b>
Moderately	61 (42.4%)	53 (42.7%)	41 (33.6%)	
Markedly	58 (40.3%)	21 (16.9%)	17 (13.9%)	
Extremely	10 (6.9%)	2 (1.6%)	0	
Total	144	124	122	
N	144	124	122	
Mean	6.24	4.23	3.70	
Median	6.00	4.00	3.00	
Standard deviation	2.23	2.37	2.43	
Minimum	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Maximum	10.00	10.00	9.00	
<b>Total score</b>				
N	110	78	79	
Mean	18.68	13.31	12.28	

	<b>Visit 1 (n=144)</b>	<b>Visit 3 (n=124)</b>	<b>End of study (n=122)</b>	<b>Longitudinal analysis</b>	
				GEE model	
				B (linear	
Median	20.00	15.00	14.00	regression	-0.518
				parameter)	
Standard deviation	6.56	6.97	7.01	95% CI	[-0.645; -0.390]
Minimum	2.00	0.00	0.00	p-value	<0.0001
Maximum	30.00	30.00	27.00		
<b>On how many days in the past 7 days did your symptoms cause you to miss school or work or leave you unable to carry out your normal daily responsibilities</b>					
N	144	124	122		
Mean	1.72	1.12	1.04		

	<b>Visit 1 (n=144)</b>	<b>Visit 3 (n=124)</b>	<b>End of study (n=122)</b>	<b>Longitudinal analysis GEE model</b>
Median	1.00	0.00	0.00	
Standard deviation	2.14	1.68	1.65	
Minimum	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Maximum	7.00	7.00	7.00	
<b>On how many days in the past 7 days did you feel so impaired by your symptoms, that even though you went to school or work or had other daily responsibilities, your productivity was reduced</b>				
N	144	124	122	
Mean	2.16	1.52	1.09	

	<b>Visit 1 (n=144)</b>	<b>Visit 3 (n=124)</b>	<b>End of study (n=122)</b>	<b>Longitudinal analysis GEE model</b>
Median	2.00	1.00	0.00	
Standard deviation	2.04	1.69	1.37	
Minimum	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Maximum	7.00	7.00	5.00	

554 TRD - Treatment Resistant Depression. GEE: Generalized

555 estimating equation. 95%CI: 95% Confidence interval.

556

ARTICLE IN PRESS

557

558

559

ARTICLE IN PRESS