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Abstract

Lithium was discovered by the Swedish Arfvedson at the beginning of the 1800s and began to be used in psychiatry for the past 1950s. Lithium, as a mood stabilizer, is the gold standard and first choice treatment agent for the treatment of bipolar disorders in adults. However, it is mostly difficult in clinical practice to predict which patient would respond to the treatment with lithium well due to the huge variation in patients’ characteristics. Clinicians seem to focus primarily on identifying a clinical phenotype to foresee lithium treatment response. In this article, researches on predictors of the lithium treatment response were reviewed and evaluated in four titles as clinical, biochemical, neuroimaging and genetic predictors.
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Bipolar Disorder (BD) is a common chronic disease that is characterized by recurrent mood episodes. Approximately 80% of patients with BD have a new mood episode within the first two years after an initial mood episode (Goodwin and Jamison 2007, NICE 2014). BD also has higher rate of other medical comorbidities and higher risk of suicide. There is a 6-10 fold increase in premature death compared to the general population (Hayes et al. 2015). Not surprisingly, BD is among the most severe 10 diseases all around the world (Lopez and Murray 1998, Collins et al. 2011). Lithium which has been used in the treatment of the disease for long years was discovered by the
Swedish Arfvedson at the beginning of the 1800s and then was used in the treatment of some kidney diseases. It was first noticed in 1886 that it was effective in psychiatric diseases, especially in acute and preventive treatment of depression. Although its first use in psychiatry field began in the 1950s, its actual use extends back to the 1970s. In 1949, John Cade noticed that lithium urate caused lethargy at high doses in experimental animals, and then determined that lithium carbonate was an effective antimanic agent (Schou 2001). In the later years, its use has increasingly become common due to the regulatory effects of lithium on mood.

Lithium has been reported to reduce relapse, suicide, and premature mortality as well as to improve cognitive functions in the preventive treatment of BD when compared to lack of treatment or inadequate treatment (Sportiche et al. 2017). Considering the significant positive effects of lithium on morbidity and mortality in treatment for BD, lithium is considered as the gold standard therapy in clinical practices and significantly reduces recurrence rates when compared to placebo or other anticonvulsant mood stabilizers regardless of polarity (Geddes et al. 2004, BALANCE Investigators and Collaborators et al. 2010, Severus et al. 2014). Lithium is the primary treatment option for the prevention of recurrent mood episodes in bipolar disorder among adults (Grof and Muller-Oerlinghausen 2009, Yatham et al. 2013). Moreover, it is the only mood stabilizer known to have anti-suicide effects in patients with bipolar disorder (Muller-Oerlinghausen et al. 1992, Goodwin et al. 2003, Cipriani et al. 2005, Baldessarini and Tondo 2008). When lithium treatment is started particularly in the early period, the rate of response to lithium treatment may be higher (Kessing et al. 2014) and the neuroprotective effects of lithium may be greater (Hajek et al. 2013, Pfennig et al. 2014, Malhi and Outhred 2016). Although its effectiveness is well known in adults, the efficacy, tolerability, and acceptability of lithium treatment have been relatively less studied in children and adolescents. As a result, most of guidelines and studies seem to focus on adult patients (Yatham et al. 2013, Fountoulakis et al. 2016).

Lithium is the first drug to be released into the market as a mood stabilizer. Since it has been used for many years, many studies have been conducted on it. Because its efficacy and side effect profile has been well defined, it is recommended as a first-line drug for preventive treatment in treatment guidelines (Tondo et al. 2001). We still have limited information about its therapeutic mechanism although it has been commonly used in the treatment of BD for longer than a half century (Malhi and Outhred 2016). Although its mechanism of action is still unclear, it is thought that lithium regulates G proteins in the phosphatidylinositol system via the second messenger system, inhibits inositol monophosphatase, and has regulatory effects on gene expression for growth factors and neuronal plasticity by inhibiting protein kinase C and glycogen synthase kinase-3 (Ünal et al. 2013). In particular, recent studies have emphasized that lithium makes changes on the cell membrane and nucleus, second messenger molecules, and neurotransmitter systems. However, the mechanism of its positive effects on depressive and manic episodes has not yet been understood precisely (Jefferson and Greist 2000). For this reason, it has not been possible to determine which patient will respond better or worse during which episode. Therefore, the fact that the biologic predictors of lithium treatment response can be more clearly identified can help to predict which patient will respond better to lithium treatment or which patient will experience side effects related to lithium treatment. Thus, it may also increase confidence for lithium prescri-
The first information on lithium treatment response were obtained from personal clinical experiences and observational studies. Clinicians seem to focus primarily on identifying a clinical phenotype (Schulze et al. 2010). In this article, after studies on the predictors of lithium treatment response were reviewed, it was evaluated under four headings as clinical, biochemical, neuroimaging, and genetic predictors.

Table 1. The biochemical predictors which are investigated to assess the lithium response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mendels and Frazer 1973</td>
<td>BD (n=9) MDD (n=4), prospective study</td>
<td>Better responses in the ones with higher RBC/plasma lithium rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shapiro et al. 1976</td>
<td>BD (n=47)</td>
<td>A positive relation between HLA-A3, HLA-B7 and HLA-Bw16 and BD; A negative relation between HLA-B8 and BD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perris et al. 1979</td>
<td>Psychotic BD (n=33) Psychotic Unipolar Recurrent Depression (n=29) Cycloid Psychosis (n=20)</td>
<td>HLA-A3 antigen frequency more in the ones not responding to lithium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell et al. 1984</td>
<td>BD (n=37)</td>
<td>Unrelated mood disorder with HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kato et al. 1993</td>
<td>BD (n=8)</td>
<td>In predicting response, the brain lithium concentration; more correlated serum and RBC concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kato et al. 1994</td>
<td>BD in manic period (n=14)</td>
<td>More related responses to lithium with the brain lithium concentration in manic period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kusumi et al. 2000</td>
<td>BD (n=24) Melancholic MDD (n=51) Non-melancholic MDD (n=23), prospective study</td>
<td>Good responses to the lithium treatment but bad responses to antidepressants of depressed patients with higher calcium response induced by serotonin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GÜlökşüz et al. (2012)</td>
<td>Euthymia BD (n=60)</td>
<td>Significantly higher TNF-a levels in the ones responding to lithium badly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debnath et al. 2013</td>
<td>BD (n=516) Control Group (n=161)</td>
<td>Lower HLA-G 14 base pair insertion/insertion genotype in BD patients than healthy controls</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clinical Predictors

The efficacy of prophylactic treatment against recurrence of manic and depressive episodes during long-term lithium treatment can be assessed with retrospective and prospective studies. Treatment responses are divided into three categories: (1) full responders (no mood episodes during lithium treatment); (2) partial responders (50% reduction in the number of mood episodes when compared to prelithium period); (3) non-responders/poor responders (less than 50% reduction in the number of mood episodes, no change or worsening when compared to prelithium period) (Sportiche et al. 2017).

Today, one of the scales that measure the response to preventive treatment is the 'Preventative Treatment Assessment Scale' (the Alda scale) developed by Grof et al.
(2002) (Rybakowski et al. 2014). This scale is a measure that assesses the healing effect of preventive treatment on the course of disease by taking into account clinical factors. In this scale, criterion A rates the degree of response (activity of the illness while on adequate lithium treatment) on a 10-point scale. Criteria B1-B5 establish whether there is a causal relationship between the improvement and the treatment. Criterion B involves B1: the number of episodes before the treatment, B2: frequency of episode before the treatment, B3: the duration of treatment, B4: compliance during period(s) of stability, and B5: the use of additional medications during the periods of stability. Higher scores of the ‘Alda scale’ indicate a good response to lithium. The total score (TS) ranges from 0 to 10 and is obtained by subtracting score B from score A. Patients with TS ≥7 are defined as full responders, while patients with TS ≤6 are partial or nonresponders. This scale has been used in many studies evaluated in our article.

Although lithium is known to be a highly effective treatment for BB according to studies, the rate of response to lithium treatment among individuals varies considerably in clinical practice. Rybakowski et al. (2001) reported that approximately 30% of individuals treated with lithium responded perfectly; for instance, there was no any mood episode during a 10-year lithium preventative treatment. Grof et al. (2002) indicated that the response rate in first-degree relatives of these individuals may increase further. Furthermore, it was reported that approximately 30% of patients with BD responded partially to lithium treatment in clinical practice and that nearly 40% of them were nonresponsive to treatment (Baldessarini and Tondo 2000, Garnham et al. 2007). Considering these findings, the response to lithium treatment is predicted by determining the personal and clinical characteristics of individuals with and without recurrence during prophylactic treatment with lithium.

Studies conducted to identify clinically relevant indicators for good lithium response have revealed conflicting results. Two well-known clinical indicators of ideal response include the history of good response to lithium in the first degree relatives and the presence of remissions between mood episodes (Grof et al. 2002). Some clinical characteristics such as bipolar subtype, number of mood episodes before initiation of lithium, age at onset of illness, type of first episode, rapid cycling, psychiatric and other medical comorbidities, and atypical depression are other clinical predictors of treatment response (Sportiche et al. 2017).

In a systematic review evaluating 43 studies and 42 clinical variables, Kleindienst et al. (2005) have indicated that there are only five potential predictors of clinical response to lithium treatment. Among clinical factors, the strongest predictors of good response are fewer hospitalizations preceding treatment, an episodic course characterized by an illness pattern of mania followed by depression (MDI), and a later age at onset of bipolar disorder. The strongest predictors of poor response are more hospitalizations preceding treatment, rapid cycling, and an episodic course characterized by an illness pattern of depression followed by mania (DMI). However, different results were obtained in later studies. For instance, Garnham et al. (2007) reported that early age at onset of illness, presence of periodic mood episodes (regardless of MDI or DMI), and meeting the diagnostic criteria for bipolar I disorder were associated with better response. Pfennig et al. (2010) found that the likelihood of recurrence in patients treated with lithium was positively related to mood-incongruent psychotic symptoms, residual symptoms, and rapid cycling. Kessing et al. (2011) indicated that good lithium response was rela-
Predictors of Lithium Response

In a current independent study of Sportiche et al. (2017), they investigated three response groups (full response, partial response, unresponsiveness) characterized using the ‘lithium treatment response scale’ in 300 patients with bipolar disorder receiving lithium treatment for at least 6 months. In this study, only three clinical factors from the previously mentioned predictors for good lithium response showed significant differences between the three pre-defined response groups. From among these, the positive family history of bipolar I disorder was found to be associated with a good response whereas the presence of mixed episodes and the history of alcohol use disorders were found to be associated with a poor response. Another noteworthy condition is that the positive family history of bipolar I disorder is a facilitating factor for improvement, while the positive family history of bipolar II disorder has a tendency in the opposite direction. In this study, there was no statistically significant relationship with age at onset of illness, duration of illness before initiation of lithium, clinical features (bipolar subtype, onset polarity, seasonality, rapid cycle, psychotic findings, suicide attempts) or other psychiatric comorbidities (anxiety disorder or substance abuse).

Biochemical Predictors

Some chemical factors can be used in showing the efficiency of lithium and in predicting lithium response (as summarized at Table 1). Some of these have been reported and accepted in their articles by different authors (Rohayem et al. 2008). For instance, it was reported that higher levels of lithium in red blood cells (RBC) compared to serum were associated with better response to lithium treatment. Firstly, Mendels and Frazer (1973) revealed that depressed patients who responded to lithium treatment had higher RBC/plasma lithium ratios than nonresponders. However, they then reported that they could not achieve the same result in a larger sample (Frazer et al. 1978). With using lithium-7 magnetic resonance spectroscopy (7Li-MRS), which allows the measurement of lithium levels in the brain, in studies in parallel with technological improvements (Renshaw and Wicklund 1988, Komoroski et al. 1990, Kato et al. 1992, Sachs et al. 1995), it has been found that brain lithium concentrations are more correlated with serum lithium concentrations than erythrocyte lithium concentrations (Kato et al. 1993). As a result, given the possible relationship between the RBC lithium concentration and the positive lithium response, it is not wrong to say that the RBC lithium concentration is a good parameter for reflecting the brain lithium concentration. Similarly, a study using 7Li-MRS has also detected that, in manic patients, a brain lithium concentration of ≥0.2mEq/L, which approximately corresponds to a serum concentration of ≥0.4mEq/L, is a more useful predictor of lithium response than serum concentration (Kato et al. 1994). These studies support the hypothesis that brain lithium levels are a better predictor than plasma lithium levels (Ikeda and Kato 2003). In contrast, with regard to lithium prophylaxis, correlation between brain concentration and clinical effectiveness was not supported (Kato et al. 1994).

Another reported biochemical predictor is the human leukocyte antigen (HLA) present on the cell membrane surface. There is some evidence that there is an association between particular HLA types and some specific diseases (Ryder et al. 1974). In psychiatry, HLA frequencies in schizophrenic patients were first studied (Cazzullo et
al. 1974), and then an association between HLA typing and BD was also reported (Ventura et al. 1990, Debnath et al. 2013). It was found that BD had a positive association with HLA-A3, HLA-B7, HLA-B16 and a negative association with HLA-B8 (Shapiro et al. 1976, Shapiro et al. 1977). However, Beckman et al. (1978) claimed a decreased frequency of the B7 antigen in patients with affective disorders. Perris et al. (1979) found that the frequency of HLA - A3 antigen was significantly higher in lithium non - responders. This relationship between HLA - A3 antigen and non - response to prophylactic treatment by lithium was confirmed by other researchers (Del Vecchio et al. 1981, Maj et al. 1984, Maj et al. 1985). However, subsequent studies could not replicate an association between affective disorder and HLA antigens (Targum et al. 1979, Johnson et al. 1981, Goldin et al. 1982, Campbell et al. 1984).

A possible relationship between intracellular calcium signaling systems and BD has been reported since the early 1980s (Dubovski and Franks 1983, Yamawaki et al. 1998). Lithium has been reported to affect intracellular calcium signaling mainly by inhibiting inositol monophosphatase (IMPase) (Meltzer 1986, Berridge 1989). It is thought either spontaneous inhibition of IMPase or subsequent downregulation of IMPase gene expression may be related to clinical efficacy of lithium in the treatment of bipolar disorder (Atack et al. 1995, Shaldubina et al. 2001). For this reason, individual variation of these parameters may become a good predictor of lithium response. On the other hand, higher intracellular calcium concentrations (Emamghoreishi and Schlichter 1997) and and lower expression levels of IMPase mRNA (Nemanov et al. 1999) have been reported in transformed lymphoblastoid cell lines derived from patients with bipolar disorder. Yoon et al. (2001) examined the relationship between intracellular calcium concentration and IMPase mRNA expression in patients with bipolar I disorder and found a significant negative correlation between IMPase2 mRNA levels and calcium concentrations in the cell lines from male patients with bipolar I disorder.

Similarly, Kusumi et al. have investigated serotonin - induced platelet intracellular calcium mobilization (Kusumi et al. 1994, Kusumi et al. 2000, Suzuki et al. 2001). They have suggested that serotonin - induced platelet intracellular calcium mobilization is specific to bipolar disorder. Initially, they reported that the elevated serotonin - induced calcium response was significantly higher not only in unmedicated patients with bipolar depression, but also in patients with melancholic major depression (Kusumi et al. 1994). They also found that depressed patients with a higher serotonin - induced calcium response exhibited a good response to lithium treatment but had a poor response to antidepressants (Kusumi et al. 2000). However, it was reported that there were no significant differences in basal intracellular calcium concentration among patient groups and normal controls.

In recent times, the role of inflammation in BD has emerged as a promising mechanism. With the identification of effects of cytokines on neuromodulation, many studies have begun to focus on the role of cytokines in mood disorders. Tumor necrosis factor-alpha (TNF-a), a proinflammatory cytokine, is one of these cytokines. Gülöksüz et al. (2012) measured plasma TNF-a levels in 60 euthymic patients with BD receiving lithium treatment and assessed the patients’ responses to lithium treatment as good, partial, and poor by using the Alda scale. As a result, they reported that patients who responded poorly to lithium had significantly higher plasma TNF-a levels when compared to patients who responded well to lithium.
In summary, studies suggest that there may be a relationship between intracellular calcium signal and lithium response in BD. In particular, lower IMPase mRNA levels and higher serotonin-induced calcium mobilization become prominent as biological predictors of lithium response. However, whether or not basal intracellular calcium concentration may be a good predictor of lithium response is still controversial. Most of the possible biological predictors of better lithium response in bipolar disorder (such as lower IMPase mRNA levels, white matter hyperintensity, lower brain intracellular pH, enhanced calcium response, and PLCG1-5 repeat) have been shown to be risk factors for bipolar disorder (Swayze et al. 1990, Altshuler et al. 1995, Kato et al. 1998, Suzuki et al. 2001). As a result of these studies, several findings have been obtained that bipolar disorder responding well to lithium therapy has a certain neurobiological basis. However, further evidence is needed to confirm these findings. The neurobiological basis of resistance to lithium treatment is still controversial.

**Neuroimaging Predictors**

Bipolar Disorder (BD) appears to be associated with neuroanatomical, neurochemical, and functional abnormalities in neuroanatomical circuits modulating mood. The information obtained by brain imaging methods allows for the investigation of underlying brain mechanisms of BD as well as therapeutic effect of lithium. Brain imaging studies have reported that lithium makes different functional and neurochemical changes in the brain in patients with BD (Silverstone et al. 2003). Lithium treatment was found to be associated with increased gray matter volume in brain regions such as the hippocampus (Yücel et al. 2007, Foland et al. 2008) and the amygdala (Foland et al. 2008, Usher et al. 2010, Moore et al. 2000).

Magnetic resonance spectroscopy (MRS) studies have reported increased amygdala and hippocampal volumes in bipolar patients with lithium treatment. Some studies have suggested that the increase in brain volume occurs due to the osmotic effects of lithium and its effects on signal changes in imaging techniques. Cousins et al. (2013) have suggested that lithium can directly affect magnetic resonance imaging signal intensity with the contribution of its biological effects as well as its atomic-level effects. For this reason, they have reported that volumetric findings can be artifacts due to altered image contrast caused by lithium. Although the underlying factors of gray matter changes associated with lithium are still unclear, it is suggested that these changes may be due to the fact that lithium shortens the T1 relaxation time on MRI (Cousins et al. 2013). However, it is very difficult to explain lithium-related regional brain volume changes without global brain volume changes with shortening of T1 relaxation time by lithium (Vernon and Hajek 2013). Lyoo et al. (2010) have reported that gray matter volume changes occur due to the neurotrophic effects of lithium rather than the osmotic effects of lithium. On the other hand, the relationship between cortical thickness and increased levels of N-acetyl-aspartate with lithium treatment suggests that lithium increases synaptic density and is neuroprotective (Curran and Ravindran 2014).

Although the molecular mechanisms underlying the therapeutic effects of lithium are not known precisely, it is suggested that lithium treatment may suppress overactive neural networks in BD through the consumption of myoinositol which is a component of the secondary messenger system (Tighe et al. 2011). Friedman et al. (2004) showed that lithium treatment changed cerebral myoinositol (MI) levels in their MRS study.
Davanzo et al. (2001) compared MI levels of 11 bipolar children treated with lithium with 11 basic screenings from gender- and age-appropriate controls using proton MRS and 11 children with BD treated with lithium. They reported that the patients responding to lithium had significant reduction in anterior cingulate MI compared to pretreatment levels after 1 week of treatment. Despite these studies, the obtained findings do not support that lithium-induced changes in the phosphatidylinositol cycle occur through the mechanism of clinical response to lithium (Silverstone and McGrath 2013).

As another predictor, choline (Cho) is an important component of the plasma membrane and plays an important role in membrane functions. The choline peak on MRS contains a variety of choline molecules, including a small fraction of free choline. It was reported that there was increased choline peak in the basal ganglia of patients with BD (Soares et al. 1996). The Cho concentrations showed few differences between gray and white matter. However, since the creatine-phosphocreatine (Cr-PCr) ratio is higher in gray matter, a larger percentage of gray matter corresponds with a lower Cho/Cr-PCr ratio (Noworolski et al. 1999). Moore et al. (2000) found an increase in the Cho/PCr-Cr ratio in the right anterior cingulate gyrus of bipolar patients. The increase in choline-containing molecules in the basal ganglia reported in many studies seems to be irrespective of lithium treatment and may represent an important aspect of the pathophysiology of these disorders.

Kato et al. (2000) suggested that white matter hyperintensity can be a positive predictor of lithium response in a limited number of patients examined by MRI. It is generally reported that patients with neurological signs and lesions may be better able to respond to anticonvulsants than to lithium. This finding does not seem to be consistent with the literature in this respect. Kato et al. (2000b) found that decreased intracellular pH was significantly associated with positive lithium response and that increased phosphodiester (PDE) and decreased phosphocreatine tended to be associated with poor lithium response. They indicated that these findings were consistent with P-MRS findings (such as that lower intracellular pH values responded well to lithium and higher PDE values and lower PCr values responded poorly to lithium) previously reported in BD. Murashita et al. (2000) investigated brain energy metabolism in lithium-resistant bipolar disorder using the photic stimulation paradigm in ³¹P-MRS. The phosphocreatine peak area ratio was significantly decreased after photic stimulation in lithium-resistant bipolar patients. For this reason, decreased phosphocreatine may be worth studying as a negative predictor of lithium response. It is possible that mitochondrial function is impaired in lithium-resistant bipolar disorder (Ikeda and Kato 2003).

Fleck et al. (2017) investigated the predictability of lithium response using fMRI and Proton MRS as well as a machine learning system in a system called LITHIA in the first episode of mania. They have shown that this system can determine lithium response with an accuracy rate of 88% and a validity rate of 80%. Despite small sample size of this study, short follow-up duration of patients, heterogeneous nature of the brain, limited standardization available in imaging methods, and restrictions in machine learning techniques, further studies in the field of similar machine learning systems may be promising in predicting lithium response.

Lithium has significant effects on Electro Encephalogram (EEG). There is no doubt that EEG will give information about lithium-induced biochemical and biophysical
features in the brain (Atagün et al. 2015). Tan et al. (2016) found that beta oscillations in response to a visual target stimulus were significantly higher in euthymic bipolar patients receiving lithium compared to bipolar patients not receiving lithium and healthy controls. They argued that increased beta oscillations in bipolar patients receiving lithium may be a reflection of the negative effects of lithium on cognitive functions, rather than the therapeutic effects of lithium. Atagün et al. (2015) examined brain oscillatory responses using a auditory oddball paradigm. They found that lithium increased auditory-related beta amplitudes in response to a target stimulus. They suggested that their findings were consistent with previous studies reporting increased white matter connectivity, increased gray matter volume, increased brain lithium concentration or improved brain biochemistry. When considering the relevant studies, lithium-EEG studies may be considered to have more informative intermediate phenotypic characteristics than many other methods including magnetic resonance imaging techniques. None of these findings have yet been shown in subsequent studies. Therefore, further studies are needed to characterize lithium response in bipolar patients by neuroimaging.

Genetic Predictors

Clustering of both BD and lithium response in families suggests the importance of genetics in disease occurrence and treatment response (Groff et al. 2002). The disease itself appears to be the most heritable disease among all psychiatric disorders, and the predictors of lithium response seem to be a relatively homogeneous subtype of BD (Alda et al. 2006). Twin studies reported that monozygotic and dizygotic twin pairs gave similar responses to lithium (Mendlewicz et al. 1979). Mendlewicz et al. (1978) investigated lithium distribution in red blood cells with 42 twin pairs with BD. They determined that concordant bipolar twin pairs had a better response to lithium than discordant pairs. Only 30% of patients with good treatment adherence are fully responsive to lithium treatment, and there is considerable evidence that there are patients groups with partial or inadequate response to lithium treatment (Baldessarini 2000, Rybakowski 2001, Manchia 2013). The difficulty in predicting lithium response through clinical variables and the recent developments in molecular genetic technology encourage investigation of the genetic predictors of lithium response (as summarised at Table 2) (Kleindienst et al. 2005a).

The serotonin transporter gene (5-HTTLPR) produces a protein that plays a role in the reuptake of serotonin in the synaptic cleft. It has a 44 bp insertion/deletion polymorphism within the promoter region (5-HTTLPR) with two allelic forms, the long (L) and the short (S) variants. Serretti et al. (2001) prospectively examined lithium response over 4 years in 201 patients (167 bipolar patients and 34 major depression patients). They revealed that patients with the s/s variant had a worse response compared to patients with the l/s or l/l variants.

Rybakowski et al. (2005a) found that the frequency of 's' allele was significantly higher in lithium non-responders than in partial/good lithium responders among 67 patients with BD (p = 0.05). Contrary to these results, Del Zompo et al. (1999) informed that the frequency of l/l allele was significantly higher in poor lithium responders from among 67 Italian patients with BD.
Table 2. The genes which are investigated to assess the lithium response and the results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serretti et al. 1998</td>
<td>BD (n=43) MDD (n=12)</td>
<td>Unrelated D3 gene variants of dopamin receptor with the lithium response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steen et al. 1998</td>
<td>a) BD (n=23), control (n=20) b) BD (n=54), control (n=50)</td>
<td>Polymorphisms in the coding area of INPP1 gene; a) More C973A allel of INPP1 gene in the ones responding to lithium b) Unrelated with the lithium response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turecki et al. 1998</td>
<td>BD (n=136), control (n=163)</td>
<td>In the ones giving good responses to lithium, unrelated gene encoding PLCG1 -8 alleles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serretti et al. 1999a</td>
<td>BD (n=100), MDD (n=25)</td>
<td>Unrelated the DRD2, DRD4, GABRA1 gene variants with the lithium response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serretti et al. 1999b</td>
<td>BD (n=90), MDD (n=18)</td>
<td>Poorly related tryptophane hydroxylase (TPH) gene variants with the lithium response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del zompo et al. 1999</td>
<td>BD (n=67), retrospective study</td>
<td>Higher I/I allel frequency in the ones giving bad responses to lithium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewald et al. 1999</td>
<td>BD (n=18), haplotype based genetical study</td>
<td>Related 18q23 chromosomal area with the lithium response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serreti et al. 2001</td>
<td>BD (n=167), MDD (n=34)</td>
<td>5-HTTLPR gene variants; Worse response from s / s genotype s / l and l / l', but for bipolar diseases ineffective by oneself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavlie et al. 2001</td>
<td>BD (n=61), control (n=50)</td>
<td>In patients with B/B diagnosis, unrelated with PLCG1-5 and PLCG1-8 alleles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turecki et al. 2001</td>
<td>BD (n=31), genom screening</td>
<td>The patients responding to lithium well linked with locus on chromosome 15q14 and 7q11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washizuka et al. 2003</td>
<td>BD (n=54)</td>
<td>MtDNA 5178 and 10398 polymorphisms; MtDNA 5178 genotype ineffective, but a significant relation between the 10398A polymorphism and the lithium response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rybakowski et al. 2005a</td>
<td>BD (n=67)</td>
<td>5-HTTLPR s and l alleles; significantly more often s/s genotype and s allele in the ones giving less response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rybakowski 2005b</td>
<td>BD (n=88)</td>
<td>More often in the ones giving good responses on Val / Met genotype of BDNF from Val66Met and -270C/T polymorphisms of BDNF gene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masui et al. 2006</td>
<td>BD (n=66)</td>
<td>XBP1 -116C/G polymorphism; More effective lithium, -116G allele transporter, -116G homozygotes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rybakowski et al. 2007</td>
<td>BD (n=111)</td>
<td>Significantly more often in the individuals not responding to lithium from 5-HTTLPR s and l alleles and BDNF Val66Met genotypes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferreira et al. 2008</td>
<td>Olgu (n=4387), control (n=6209)</td>
<td>No strong relation between the ANK3 and the the lithium response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baum et al. 2008</td>
<td>GWAS</td>
<td>No strong relation between the BD and the DGK gene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mamdani et al. 2008</td>
<td>BD (n=249), control (n=127)</td>
<td>Unrelated CREB1 gene polymorphisms with the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Predictors of Lithium Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>SNP</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silberberg et al. 2008</td>
<td>BD (n=35)</td>
<td>Schizophrenia (n=35) Control (n=35), genotype</td>
<td>About the CACNG2 gene, three related SNPs with the lithium response (rs2284017, rs2284018, rs5750285)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perlis et al. 2009</td>
<td>BD (n=458)</td>
<td>GWAS</td>
<td>Related chromosome areas 8q22, 3p22, 11q14, 4q32 and 15q26 with the lithium response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squassina et al. 2011</td>
<td>BD (n=204)</td>
<td>GWAS</td>
<td>Related ACCN1 with the lithium response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shulze et al. 2012</td>
<td>ConLiGen</td>
<td>Unrelated SCL4A10 with the lithium response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen et al. 2014</td>
<td>BD (n=294)</td>
<td>GWAS</td>
<td>A significant relation in the GAD1 gene localization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobe et al. 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pluripotent stem cells; Increased phosphorylation of CRMP2 in the patients responding to lithium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitjans et al. 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>GSK-3β polymorphisms; A significant relation between the rs1732170, rs11921360 and rs334558 polymorphisms and responses to the lithium treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altınbaş et al. 2017</td>
<td>BD (n=100)</td>
<td></td>
<td>GSK-3β polymorphisms; higher points of responses to the lithium treatment in the patients with rs17183890 AG genotype</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BD, bipolar disorder; GWAS, genom-wide association study; MDD, major depressive disorder; SNP, Single nucleotide polymorphism

Brain-derived neurotrophic factor (BDNF) is another genetic predictor. It affects neuronal proliferation and synaptic plasticity. BDNF has also been found to be associated with the mechanisms of action of antidepressants and lithium (Green et al. 2006). The Val66Met (Val66Met or G196A) polymorphism of the BDNF gene has been related to the occurrence of BD (Sklar et al. 2002, Green et al. 2006). Although two retrospective studies did not prove the relationship between the BDNF val66Met genotype and the lithium response in bipolar patients (Masui et al. 2006, Michelon et al. 2006), several subsequent studies reported that the val/met genotype appeared to be more common in those who responded well to lithium than in those who did not respond to lithium (Rybakowski et al. 2005b, Dmitrzak-Weglarz et al. 2008). The same researchers retrospectively examined the possible association between the serotonin transporter genotype (5-HTTLPR) and the BDNF val66Met polymorphism according to lithium response. They evaluated 111 patients with BD and reported that the 5-HTTLPR s/s or s/l genotype and the BDNF val/val genotype were significantly more common in patients who did not respond to lithium (Rybakowski et al. 2007).

One of the possible mechanisms of action of lithium is that it makes changes on the second messenger system. The INPP1 gene encodes the enzyme inositol polyphosphate-1-phosphatase (IPPaz) which dephosphorylates inositol 1,3,4-trisphosphate and inositol 1,4-bisphosphate as a part of the phospholipase C signaling system. This gene is of interest as a potential modulator of lithium response. In a retrospective study of Steen et al. (1998) involving 23 patients with BD and 20 controls, they found that a single-nucleotide polymorphism (C973A) in the INPP1 coding region indicated good lithium response. However, when this study was repeated in a larger sample of 54 patients with BD, it was reported that this polymorphism did not differ significantly.
between those who responded well to lithium and those who responded poorly to lithium in terms of predicting lithium response (Steen et al. 1998). The data obtained so far suggest that this INPP1 variant is not associated with lithium response in bipolar patients. Turecki et al. (1998) investigated polymorphisms of the phospholipase C gamma 1 (PLCG1) gene in 163 healthy controls and 136 bipolar patients who responded well to lithium. They found that patients who responded well to lithium treatment had a higher frequency of the gene encoding the PLCG1 isoenzyme on chromosome 20. Similarly, Løvlie et al. (2001) retrospectively investigated polymorphisms of the PLCG1 gene in 61 patients with BD and 50 healthy controls. They found that patients with BD had a higher frequency of PLCG1-5 and PLCG1-8 alleles than healthy controls.

It is also thought that lithium inhibits inositol monophosphatase (IMPA) and reduces inositol levels (Manji H. et al. 1995). IMPA2 encodes an enzyme inhibited by lithium. Dimitrova et al. (2005) examined eight single-nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) associated with BD in the gene where this enzyme is found. No association was found between lithium response and any SNPs in the study involving 237 families. Diacylglycerol (DAG), another molecule involved in the inositol pathway, is degraded and reversed by diacylglycerol kinase (DGK). Two genome-wide association studies (GWAS) reported strong evidence that there is an association between the DGK gene and BD (Burton et al. 2007, Baum et al. 2008). Starting from these studies, the DGK gene was investigated in 199 Sardinian patients with BD who received lithium. There was no significant difference between those who responded well to lithium treatment and those who responded partially or poorly to lithium (Manchia et al. 2009).

One of the genes involved in the phosphatidylinositol signal pathway is prolyl endopeptidase or prolyl oligopeptidase (PREP). This gene is highly active in the brain, especially in the frontal cortex and in the limbic system. Williams et al. (1999) genetically investigated the possible mechanisms of action of lithium on amoebae and reported that lithium-resistant amoebae lacked the PREP gene. These results also include the findings showing the effects of the inositol second messenger system on BD and lithium. Mamdani et al. (2007) examined 9 SNPs on the PREP gene in 249 patients with BD and 126 healthy controls. They found that there were no genotypic differences between lithium responders, lithium non-responders, patients with BD, and healthy controls.

Another gene family that needs to be investigated is genes that encode CREB (cAMP responsive element binding protein). The cAMP signal transduction pathway is activated after the ligand binds to G protein–coupled receptors, resulting in CREB phosphorylation. Studies investigating the effects of lithium on CREB gene expression reported that lithium caused ineffective DNA binding and altered expression of cAMP-responsive genes by reducing CREB phosphorylation (Bezchlibnyk et al. 2002). Thus, genetic variation of the genes encoding CREB proteins is thought to help determine the response to lithium treatment. Mamdani et al. (2008) investigated three genomic SNPs in the CREB gene family in 249 patients with BD and 127 healthy controls. They found that CREB1 gene polymorphisms were associated with lithium response (Mamdani et al. 2008).

There are studies supporting that lithium interacts with protein kinase C (PKC), an important mediator of many intracellular responses against neurotransmitter signals.
PKC increases the activity of voltage-gated calcium channels. PKC binds to Ca\(^{2+}\) channels via PDLIM5 (an adaptor protein). It has been suggested that impaired intracellular calcium homeostasis plays an important role in mood control in BD. In a study investigating three SNPs in the PDLIM5 gene in 155 bipolar patients who received lithium, when PDLIM5 expression was assessed, no significant difference was found between those who responded well to lithium treatment and those who responded partially or poorly to lithium (Squassina et al. 2008). FYN, another member of the protein kinase family, plays a role in ion transport, regulation of the BDNF/TrkB signaling pathway, and phosphorylation of the NMDA receptor subunit 2B (GRIN2B). Therapeutic mechanisms and neuroprotective effects of lithium occur through glutamatergic neurotransmission via NMDA receptors. It has been reported that there may be a relationship between lithium response and BDNF (Rybakowski et al. 2005). Since FYN plays an important role in the effect of BDNF on the NMDA receptor, the three polymorphisms of the FYN gene have been investigated for differences in response to lithium treatment in patients diagnosed with BD. In a study conducted in 101 patients with BD, no relationship was found between FYN gene polymorphisms and lithium response (Szczepankiewicz et al. 2009).

Another molecule that is considered to be predictive of lithium treatment response is glycogen synthase kinase-3 beta (GSK-3\(\beta\)). GSK-3\(\beta\) inactivates glycogen synthase and plays a role in many metabolic pathways such as protein synthesis and plasticity in the brain. Phosphorylated GSK-3\(\beta\) has been reported to play an important role in the regulation of oxidative stress, neuroinflammation, and neurogenesis pathways and in the pathogenesis of BD (Gould et al. 2004, Can et al. 2014, Luca et al. 2016). Studies investigating the relationship between GSK-3\(\beta\) polymorphisms and lithium treatment response have found that there is an association between rs2199503 and rs6438552 polymorphisms and lithium treatment response (Can et al. 2014). Another study reported that there was a significant association between GSK-3\(\beta\) rs1732170, rs11921360 and rs334558 polymorphisms and lithium treatment response (Mitjans et al. 2015). In our country, a current study was conducted in 100 patients with bipolar I disorder to investigate the relationship between GSK-3\(\beta\) and lithium treatment response. Altınbaş et al. (2017) investigated the relation between the GSK-3\(\beta\) rs17183904, rs17183897, rs34009575, rs34002644, rs17183890 polymorphisms and the lithium treatment response using the lithium treatment response scale. They reported that the patients harbouring GSK-3\(\beta\) rs17183890 AG genotype had higher lithium treatment response scores.

Another genetic predictor is matrix metalloproteinases (MMPs) that are a family of zinc- and calcium-dependent collectively capable of degrading essentially all extracellular matrix components. MMPs play a role in chronic diseases such as cancer and heart disease and in neuropsychiatric disorders such as schizophrenia and BD. The MMP-9 gene polymorphism was investigated in 190 bipolar patients who received lithium treatment for at least 5 years. It was found that there was no association between the lithium treatment response and the MMP-9 gene polymorphism (Rybakowski et al. 2011).

A study of mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA) reported a possible association between the 5178C/10398A haplotype and the risk of BD (Kato et al. 2001). In a retrospective study involving 54 patients with BD, the patients with the 10398A mtDNA poly-
morphism were found to respond well to lithium treatment (Washizuka et al. 2003). On the other hand, no significant difference was found between 167 bipolar patients with serotonin 5-HT2A and 5-HT2C variants in terms of lithium response (Serretti et al. 2000). The X-box binding protein 1 (XBP1) is an important predictor of endoplasmic reticulum stress response. Masui et al. (2006) retrospectively investigated -116C/G polymorphism of this gene in patients with BD. They found that lithium responders were more likely to be carriers rather than homozygous for -116C allele (2006). Because this study was conducted only in a small group of Japanese patients, further studies are needed to determine whether there is a real association between the -116C/G polymorphism of the XBP1 gene and the lithium treatment response.

Ankyrin 3 (ANK3) has a role in the assembly of voltage-gated sodium channels (Nanavati et al. 2011). It is regulated down by lithium (McQuillin et al. 2007, Leussis et al. 2013). Despite the small effect size, it is promising that several genome-wide association studies that have highlighted ANK3 as a susceptibility gene (Ferreira et al. 2008, Muhleisen et al. 2014). Tryptophane hydroxilase (TPH) is an enzyme which limits the rate of serotonin biosynthesis. Serretti et al. (1999b) found that tryptophan hydroxylase (TPH) gene variants were less related to lithium treatment response in 90 bipolar patients and 18 depressive patients.

Unlike the above-mentioned findings, in a study involving 134 patients with BD (61 good lithium responders, 24 partial lithium responders, and 49 poor lithium responders), no significant differences were observed in the genotype or allele frequencies of good, partial and poor responders for BDNF G196A, INPP1 C973A, AP-2β (CAAA), 5HTTLPR, and GSK-3βA-1727T gene variants (Michelon et al. 2006). In a prospective study involving 43 patients with BD and 12 patients with major depressive disorder (MDD), the DRD3 genotypes were not found to be associated with the lithium response (Serretti et al. 1998). Similarly, no association was found between good lithium response and DRD1, DRD2, DRD3, DAT1, 5HTTLPR and HTR2A genes in 155 Sardinian patients with BD (Manchia et al. 2009). Serretti et al. (1999a) did not find any relationship between the lithium response and the DRD2, DRD4 and GABA receptor α-1 subunit (GABRA1) gene variants in 100 patients with BD and 25 patients with MDD in their prospective study. In another study, 92 patients with BD who received lithium treatment for at least five years were genotyped for the -48A/G polymorphism of the DRD1 gene. It was found that patients who responded partially or poorly to lithium were more likely to have the G/G genotype than patients who responded well to lithium treatment (Rybakowski et al. 2009). In a study of Turecki et al. (1999) investigating the association of MAO genetic polymorphisms with susceptibility to BD in 108 healthy controls and 138 patients with good response to lithium, they did not find a significant association between the MAO-A gene and the lithium response.

Candidate gene studies have not yielded reproducible results although they have focused on the genes that are considered to be involved in lithium therapy (McCarthy et al. 2010, Can et al. 2014). A few genome-wide association studies (GWAS) have been published on lithium response. Perlis et al. (2009) found that five chromosomal regions (8q22, 3p22, 11q14, 4q32, and 15q26) were associated with the lithium response in 458 patients with BD. Another GWAS was conducted in 204 patients with BD. SNP sequences were genotyped in 52 persons. ACCN1 (amiloride-sensitive cation channel
permeable for lithium) was found to be associated with the lithium response (Squassina et al. 2011). In another GWAS, Chen et al. (2004) selected 294 Asian patients with good response to lithium from among 1761 patients diagnosed with BD. They reported a significant association between the genome size and the SNP clusters in the GADL1 gene (Chen et al. 2014).

An international group examining patients treated with lithium together with a unit interested in the genetic basis of mood and anxiety disorders in the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) has established ConLiGen in order to create the largest study of genetic variation to date for investigating the genetics of lithium response. This sample has contained more than 1200 patients and has been described retrospectively with the Alda scale. This study showed that SLC4A10 (solute carrier family 4, sodium bicarbonate transporter, member 10) was associated with lithium response (Schulze et al. 2012). This gene is located on chromosome 2q24 and is present in higher level in the hippocampus and the cerebral cortex. This relationship is important because the bicarbonate sensitive pathway is one of the most important mechanisms for active lithium entry into cells.

When we examine genetic mapping studies in BD, pharmacogenetic strategy is becoming increasingly more prominent although it seems difficult due to the complexity and heterogeneity of genetic mechanisms. Turecki et al. (2001) performed genome-wide screening using 378 markers in the families of 31 bipolar patients with good response to lithium. They found that good lithium response may be associated with loci on chromosomes 15q14 and 7q11.2. In a haplotype-based genetic study of 18 bipolar patients and their families responding well to lithium in the Faroe Islands, the 18q23 chromosomal region was found to be associated with the lithium response (Ewald et al. 1999). Recently, it has been reported that the calcium channel γ2 subunit gene family (CACNG2, Stargazin) located in the 22q13.1 chromosomal region is associated with schizophrenia (Liu et al. 2005). This region is also associated with BD (Liang et al. 2002). Together with substantial evidence supporting that chromosome 22q13 is associated with BD, some evidence suggesting that CACNG2 is involved in shaping the synaptic response and that BD is associated with impaired neuropsychological and cellular flexibility make CACNG2 an attractive candidate gene (Manji et al. 2000, Du et al. 2004). In order to determine the expression levels of CACNG2 in post-mortem brain specimens of schizophrenia patients, bipolar patients, and healthy controls, to analyze the genetic relationship between CACNG2 and these diseases, and to investigate the genetic relationship between CACNG2 and the lithium response, 12 SNPs involving CACNG2 were genotyped in 35 schizophrenia patients, 35 bipolar patients, and 35 healthy controls. It was determined that the expression level of CACNG2 was 1.6-fold higher in patients with BD. No relationship was found between 12 genotyped SNPs and BD. However, three of them were found to be significantly associated with the lithium response (Silberberg et al. 2008).

In a study using induced pluripotent stem cells from patients responsive and non-responsive to lithium treatment, it was focused on changes in protein and genes after lithium treatment. In this study, increased phosphorylation of collapsin response mediator protein 2 (CRMP2) in lithium-responsive patients was selected as an attractive candidate for future studies. CRMP2 regulates the cellular response to semaphorin-3A that is an extracellular signaling molecule that binds to neuropilin/plexin receptors.
This pathway, which has effects on synapse formation and function, shapes dendritic spine and axonal growth morphologies during development and adulthood. They showed that morphologies changed in in vitro conditions and postmortem brain specimens and also reported that it is an actual BD pathology and can be improved with lithium (Tobe et al. 2017). As a result, poor efficacy of genetic predictors in the prediction of lithium response and relatively low frequency of reported alleles indicate that genetic testing is far from contributing to clinical practice in most patients. With determination of new genetic predictors with greater potency in future studies, tests can be provided to predict the lithium response in clinical practice. However, it would be necessary to utilize pre-determined clinical predictors such as family history (Do et al. 2012). Genome-wide screening studies with larger sample sizes are needed to predict the lithium response.

**Conclusion**

In order to investigate future clinical, genetic or biological predictors, it is necessary to develop consensus on the identification of the clinical response phenotype. Based on current data, it is thought that the 'lithium response' may create a clinical profile. The family history of mood disorder and good lithium response, presence of remissions between mood episodes, fewer hospitalizations in psychiatric clinics, mania-dominant polarity, and fewer somatic comorbidities have been found to be associated with good lithium response. With pharmacogenomic progress, genetic predictors make it easier to provide a genetic test panel for clinicians to optimally predict which bipolar patients can best respond to lithium treatment. It is noteworthy that patients with the 5-HTTLPR s/l or l/l genotype, BDNF val/met genotype, INPP1 gene polymorphism (C973A), gene encoding PLCG1 isoenzyme, CREB1 gene polymorphisms, GSK-3β rs17183904, rs17183897, rs34009575, rs34002644, rs17183890 polymorphisms, 10398A mtDNA polymorphism, 8q22, 3p22, 11q14, 4q32, 15q26, 15q14 ve 7q11.2 chromosomal regions, some SNP clusters in the GAD1 gene, and SLC4A10 gene polymorphisms respond well to lithium treatment.

None of the findings obtained with neuroimaging methods have yet been shown in subsequent studies. Neuroimaging methods and studies may expand these results. The effects of lithium on the brain and the predictors of lithium response can be better understood with other molecular, intracellular, neurotransmitter and genetic data. Therefore, in order to characterize the lithium response in bipolar patients, there is a need for further larger scale multicenter studies where clinical response phenotypes are well defined.

**References**


Psikiyatride Güncel Yaklaşımlar – Current Approaches in Psychiatry


Predictors of Lithium Response


---

**Hazan Tomar Bozkurt**, Selçuk University, Konya; **Vefa Erbasan**, Selçuk University, Konya; **Ümran Eğilmez**, Selçuk University, Konya; **Barış Şen**, Selçuk University, Konya; **Memduha Aydın**, Selçuk University, Konya; **Kürşat Altınbaş**, Selçuk University, Konya;.

**Correspondence**: Hazan Tomar Bozkurt, Selçuk Üniversitesi Tıp Fakültesi Psikiyatri Anabilim Dalı, Konya, Turkey.

E-mail: hazan.tomar@hotmail.com

No conflict of interest is declared related to this article.

**Submission date**: 28 Ekim/October 28, 2017 - **Accepted**: 8 Aralık/December 8, 2017