Automatization and defamiliarization in Obsessive Compulsive Disorder

Published: 01-08-2012
Last updated: 01-05-2024

Primary objective 1: Does repeated relevant checking in general lead to automatization in OCD patients? Primary objective 2: If automatization as a result of repeated relevant checking occurs, do OCD patients differ from other anxiety disorder…

Ethical review	Approved WMO
Status	Recruitment stopped
Health condition type	Anxiety disorders and symptoms
Study type	Interventional

Summary

ID

NL-OMON39479

Source
ToetsingOnline

Brief title
Automatization and defamiliarization in OCD

Condition

- Anxiety disorders and symptoms

Synonym
Obsessive Compulsive Disorder, obsessive neurosis

Research involving
Human

Sponsors and support

Primary sponsor: Universiteit Utrecht
Source(s) of monetary or material Support: NWO

Intervention

Keyword: Automatization, Defamiliarization, OCD, Perseveration

Outcome measures

Primary outcome

The main study parameters are check duration at pre-test and post-test, and reaction times on the RIR task, as well as the measures at pre-test and post-test on the checking task, and the difference between pre- and post-test, in participants* ratings of memory vividness, memory detail and confidence in memory. The final three measures will be determined from VAS-scale indications.

Secondary outcome

In order to test whether between-group differences are specifically related to OCD and not to patients being more anxious/depressed in general, we will measure depression (BDI), anxiety (BAI) and OCD (OCI-R and Y-BOCS) severity scores.

Patients* medication will be recorded before the beginning of the experiment. While it is not expected that medication has an influence on the experimental results, recording the information leaves the option open to control for medication if need be.

Study description

Background summary

Patients with obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD) engage in perseverative behaviour in order to reduce obsessive uncertainty. Previous studies have demonstrated perseverative checking to be a counterproductive strategy to increase certainty. This helps to explain why OCD persists. The current study

wants to investigate which mechanisms play a role in this perseverative behaviour -> uncertainty cascade. Since perseverative checking, as a result of repetition and familiarity, is alleged to lead to automatic processing, and OCD patients typically have a tendency to distrust and control their automatic processes, it is suggested that familiarity induced automatization might be responsible for the detrimental effects of repeated checking on meta-memory. Theory suggests that defamiliarization will block automatization and could thereby reduce the negative meta-memory effects. The proposed study is the first to investigate 1) if repeated checking actually leads to automatization, 2) if defamiliarization leads to de-automatization and 3) if defamiliarization, by causing de-automatization, will lead to a reduction of the negative effects of repeated checking on meta-memory.

Study objective

Primary objective 1: Does repeated relevant checking in general lead to automatization in OCD patients? Primary objective 2: If automatization as a result of repeated relevant checking occurs, do OCD patients differ from other anxiety disorder patients and healthy controls in the speed with which they execute automatic processes? Primary objective 3: Does defamiliarization lead to de-automatization? Primary objective 4: Does defamiliarization reduce the negative effects of repeated relevant checking on memory certainty, vividness and detail in general? Primary objective 5: If defamiliarization reduces the negative effects of repeated relevant checking on memory certainty, vividness and detail, do OCD patients differ from other anxiety disorder patients and healthy controls in the amount of meta-memory confidence?

Study design

The study is a 3 x 3 randomized, single-blind, mixed intervention study.

Intervention

The intervention consists of either 15 relevant checking trials, 15 irrelevant checking trials or 15 relevant checking trials with perceptually modified stimuli at post-test

Study burden and risks

Participation in this study will not put the participant at risk for any harm or danger. The burden of this study is very minimal; the participant will only be asked to fill out some questionnaires and participate in a computerized checking task and a partially simultaneously administered Rapid Interval Repetition task, in which participants have to respond to randomly presented harmless tones. Benefits of the study are that it can provide new insight into the mechanism behind obsessive-compulsive perseveration, so that potentially,

treatment may be better tailored.

Contacts

Public
Universiteit Utrecht

Heidelberglaan 1
Utrecht 3584 CS
NL
Scientific
Universiteit Utrecht

Heidelberglaan 1
Utrecht 3584 CS
NL

Trial sites

Listed location countries

Netherlands

Eligibility criteria

Age
Adults (18-64 years)
Elderly (65 years and older)

Inclusion criteria

Patients will be included when they have a DSM-IV diagnosis of Obsessive Compulsive Disorder or another anxiety disorder diagnosis. Patients are allowed to use SSRI drugs, but not benzodiazepines because these have a negative effect on ones reaction speed. Healthy controls will be age/education matched with the patients included in the study.

Exclusion criteria

Subjects will be excluded from the study if they have color vision deficiency (color blindness); if they are insufficiently proficient in the Dutch language; if they are addicted to alcohol or drugs; if they are under 18 years of age; and/or if they present with symptoms from the psychotic spectrum. Patients who use benzodiazepine drugs will be excluded.
Healthy controls will also be excluded when they have any current psychiatric disorder.

Study design

Design

Study type:	Interventional
Intervention model:	Parallel
Allocation:	Randomized controlled trial
Masking:	Single blinded (masking used)
Control:	Active
Primary purpose:	Basic science

Recruitment

NL

Recruitment status:	Recruitment stopped
Start date (anticipated):	08-03-2013
Enrollment:	135
Type:	Actual

Ethics review

Approved WMO Date:	01-08-2012
Application type:	First submission
Review commission:	METC NedMec
Approved WMO Date:	15-03-2013
Application type:	Amendment
Review commission:	METC NedMec

Study registrations

Followed up by the following (possibly more current) registration

No registrations found.

Other (possibly less up-to-date) registrations in this register

No registrations found.

In other registers

Register	ID
CCMO	NL40081.041.12