International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research (IJFMR)
E-ISSN: 2582-2160 ● Website: www.ijfmr.com ● Email: editor@ijfmr.com

Schizophrenia, Neuroscience, and the Law: Reconsidering Criminal Accountability

Myrra Jauhari

Abstract:
This research explores how advancements in neuroscience, particularly in understanding schizophrenia and frontotemporal dementia (FTD), are reshaping legal interpretations of criminal accountability. Traditional legal frameworks rely heavily on behavioral assessments to establish intent (mens rea), often overlooking underlying neurological impairments that affect cognition, impulse control, and moral judgment. By integrating neuroimaging evidence such as fMRI and PET scans, courts are beginning to consider how mental disorders biologically influence behavior at the time of a crime. The paper reviews key cases, legal standards like the M'Naghten Rules, and the emerging role of predictive psychiatry. It also addresses the stigma associated with mental illness in legal settings and its impact on verdicts and rehabilitation. Ultimately, the study argues for interdisciplinary reforms that incorporate neuroscientific findings into legal doctrines, promoting a justice system that is both scientifically informed and ethically sound. Future directions include refining diagnostic tools and developing more nuanced standards of legal responsibility.

Chapter 1: Introduction

Knowing the physiological workings of our brains should impact the way we understand and normatively establish the law. Given that neurology is the field that studies the cognitive processes that indicate human conduct, legal systems which are ultimately focused on regulating human behavior—should be significantly impacted.(Rosenthal, H. 2018.) Human Behaviour is increasingly being incorporated under the legal system and plays an important role in understanding the conduct of an individual in criminal cases. Neuroscience in law aids in the application of methods in diagnosis and therapy and offers insights through brain imaging, cognitive tests, and behavioral analysis. These analyses help to consider if an individual suffers from mental disorders that impair judgement and accountability.

Schizophrenia is a chronic mental disorder that distorts thinking, emotions, sense of self, and behaviour. Symptoms include hallucinations, delusions, and disorganized thinking. It can impair the ability to understand the nature of their actions and increases the risk of violence and criminal behavior in individuals. Individuals who suffer from the disease are placed in forensic psychiatric services which provide long-term care and secure environments.

A person's ability to comprehend the unlawfulness of their doings can be impacted by Schizophrenia, which are crucial elements in determining legal accountability. It may be difficult to determine if a person with schizophrenia has the intent to commit a crime if they show signs of the presence of delusions. Some legal systems consider the volitional aspect which can potentially lead to diminished or abolished criminal responsibility.

Individuals with schizophrenia have structural and functional changes in their brain which differ from individuals who don't suffer from the disease. These changes can hinder their decision-making process and affect their cognitive ability according to neuroimaging and genetic studies.

The disease can impact criminal accountability based on the severity of the illness and effects on the individual at the time of the crime. Oftentimes, legal systems use tests like M'Naghten Rules which focus on the individual's impaired judgement due to their illness.

Schizophrenia can be a basis for the insanity defense, which argues that the defendant was not mentally capable of understanding their actions. If not qualified for insanity defense, schizophrenia can be argued as diminished capacity.

Chapter 2. Understanding Schizophrenia through Neuroscience

Clinical features and diagnostic criteria (DSM-5 / ICD-11), ICD–11 is the international standard for systematic recording, reporting, analysis, interpretation and comparison of mortality and morbidity data. DSM-5 requires continuous signs of the disturbance to persist for a minimum of 6 months, while ICD-11 calls for a month or more. Prodromal or residual symptoms may be included in the DSM-5 criterion for an extra five months of symptoms. (First, M et al)

The required pattern of symptoms differs as well. While both the DSM-5 and ICD-11 require at least two types of symptoms lasting at least 1 month, the ICD-11 includes "experiences of influence, passivity or control" as a separate core symptom. These disturbances in the "ego-world boundary"39 involve patients having experiences such as their thoughts, actions or emotions. With an estimated lifetime frequency of 0.30 -- 0.60%, schizophrenia is the most common psychotic illness. The signs of this degenerative condition might be somewhat subtle at first and are frequently missed by others. The severity of symptoms varies widely across individuals, which is why schizophrenia is seen as a spectrum disorder.

Positive symptoms are psychotic symptoms that are not seen in healthy individuals like Hallucinations, Delusions, Disorganized thinking, and Immobility.These symptoms can severely impair a person's ability to function in daily life, maintain relationships, or engage in meaningful communication.

Schizophrenia patients may display both main and secondary unpleasant symptoms. Secondary negative symptoms, by definition, arise as a result of elements like drug-induced extra-pyramidal side effects, social withdrawal brought on by suspicious delusions, depression, environmental deprivation, and expected stigma, whereas primary negative symptoms are a part of the disease process itself. (Kaneko, K. 2018).

The majority of the patients with schizophrenia have been found to have cognitive deficits. Cognitive impairment predicts a range of poor functional outcomes. The experts who worked on the Measurement and Treatment Research to Improve Cognition in Schizophrenia (MATRICS) proposed seven cognitive deficits that are thought to be most severely affected. These included verbal and visual learning, working memory, attention/vigilance, reasoning and problem solving, processing speed, and social cognition. (Kaneko, K. 2018)

Behavioral manifestations refer to observable behaviors or symptoms that may indicate underlying psychological or neurological conditions. An example of this is Andres Behring Breivik, a Norwegian man who killed 77 people in a bomb and shooting massacre. He set off a vehicle bomb in the government sector downtown, leaving eight people dead and nine seriously injured. Two hours later, there were numerous reports of gunshots at the youth organization of the Norwegian Labor Party's summer camp. By posing as a police officer, Breivik was able to get on the island boat and travel straight from the bomb location to the little island of Utoya. He began shooting at the 600 people who were stranded on the island almost immediately, killing 69 of them and inflicting numerous serious and permanent injuries. According to survivors, he returned to shoot past victims repeatedly and convinced those who were hiding to come forward by posing as a police officer on multiple occasions.

The psychiatrist confirmed that Breivik was psychotic both throughout the evaluation and when he was organizing and carrying out his crimes. He compared his situation with those of Queen Isabella of Spain and Tsar Nicolas of Russia. He believed that he should decide who should live and die in Norway and thought the possibility of him becoming the next regent of Norway after a coup d'etat was plausible. He was diagnosed with paranoid schizophrenia, and his most beliefs were regarded to be bizarre delusions. (Melle, I. 2013). Breivik's trial ended with the prosecution recommending that Breivik should be confined to psychiatric care, and the defense arguing that Breivik should be considered sane but acquitted as his actions were in self-defense

2.1 Causes: Genetics, Epigenetics, and Neurodevelopmental Factors

Role of genetic predisposition and epigenetic triggers; It is well acknowledged that schizophrenia is an illness having both environmental and genetic causes. If a person has a genetic predisposition, it indicates that certain genes make them more likely to have the disease.A genetic predisposition means that certain inherited genes or gene combinations can increase an individual's likelihood of developing the condition. Having a close family member with schizophrenia greatly raises one's risk of getting the condition themselves. For instance, the risk increases to around 10% if one parent has schizophrenia, and it can reach 40–50% if both parents have the disorder (Gottesman, 1991).

Schizophrenia is a long-term neurodevelopmental illness that profoundly changes behavior and brain function. It is linked to anatomical anomalies such as larger brain ventricles and decreased grey matter volume in the prefrontal cortex, hippocampus, and temporal lobes (van Os & Kapur, 2009). The regions in charge of memory, judgment, and emotional control are impacted by these alterations. According to Tandon, Nasrallah, and Keshavan (2009), schizophrenia is functionally characterized by abnormalities in brain neurotransmitters, including dopamine and glutamate, which lead to hallucinations, delusions, and cognitive failure.

Chapter 3. Neuroscience and Criminal Accountability

3.1 Neuroethical Foundations of Criminal Behavior

Neuroscience is steadily chipping away at the idea that human behavior is entirely a matter of free will. The age-old legal assumption that people act with rational intent is now being challenged by brain scans, cognitive science, and neuroethics. At the heart of this is the philosophical debate between free will and determinism: if behavior is biologically determined by neural activity, to what extent can someone be held morally or legally accountable?

Traditionally, the law assesses mens rea—the guilty mind—through behavior, verbal testimony, and circumstantial evidence. But this framework is being reexamined as tools like functional MRI (fMRI) and positron emission tomography (PET) scans uncover neurological markers of diminished capacity. For instance, damage or dysfunction in areas like the prefrontal cortex or amygdala may impair impulse control, empathy, or foresight. These aren't excuses, but they are explanations—and they raise real questions about intent and culpability.

This shift doesn't mean absolving responsibility, but it does demand a more nuanced legal lens. Courts have begun to admit neuroscientific evidence to support claims of diminished capacity or insanity, though the standards of admissibility and interpretation vary widely. What's emerging is a hybrid model—one that integrates neuroscientific insights without undermining the foundational principles of justice.

In short, neuroscience is reshaping how we think about criminal behavior. It complicates simplistic binaries of guilt and innocence by introducing biological evidence that forces legal systems to reconsider

what it truly means to intend, to choose, and to be responsible.

3.2 Predictive Psychiatry and Responsibility

The emerging role of predictive psychiatry in assessing future violence rises; A crucial part of clinical practice is the assessment and management of violence risk. Clinical judgment is the basis for determining an individual's level of violence. The Dangerous Behavior Rating Scale, the Violence Risk Appraisal Guide, and the HCR-20 are just a few of the risk prediction instruments that have been developed and made available to clinics in North America. Their predictive validity has been demonstrated. Risk of violence is just one of many factors that influence a variety of choices. The principles guiding its assessment are the same as those guiding psychiatric practice more broadly, even when the doctor's interaction with the patient centers on the patient's risk of harm to others. The outcome of a patient's history and mental health examination will serve as the basis for an evaluation. Sometimes, psychiatric assessments of violence risk are conducted to address an explicit question, such as whether the risk to others can be managed in a community setting. The most beneficial evaluations in these situations are typically carried out in response to questions that are precise, clinically focused, and easy to understand. As situations change, so do people's mental states. (A. Buchanan et al.)

Ethical concerns about labeling and preemptive legal action; studies found that, after adjusting for age, gender, symptoms, and functioning, self-labeling as mentally ill was associated with greater stigma stress and reduced well-being , more suicidal ideation (mediated by social isolation) , and higher rates of developing schizophrenia. Additionally, self-labeling was linked to more favorable treatment attitudes. It is possible that the symptoms that put people at risk for psychosis—rather than an external label of psychosis risk provided by a researcher or clinician—are the source of self-labeling and the stigma stress that goes along with it (Corcoran, C. 2017).

3.3 Mental Illness, Violence, and Legal Misconceptions

Addiction is marked by continued compulsive want for, or use of, mood- and mind-altering substances despite negative consequences or desires to change habits. Post-childhood stress or stressful events have also been related to (earlier) initiation of various classes of substances. Stressful events can include death or serious illness of a family member or close friend, relocation, being fired or laid off, a financial crisis, trouble with a boss or coworker, separation, divorce or break-up, serious interpersonal strain with a friend, neighbor or relative, contact with law-enforcement, or being a victim of violence. Some studies also addressed uncontrollable daily hassles, or problems at home, school, or work .A study of initiation of “illicit” drugs reported elevated risk among 10–16 year old participants when participants were growing up in a disadvantageous neighborhood, which has been designated as a chronic stressor, and recent (6-month) stressful events reported by 12–14 year old adolescents, but not lifetime stressful events reported by their parents or self-reported negative affect, predicted earlier onset of use of marijuana, crack, cocaine, heroin, or amphetamines (measured as one global category), whereas more relocations before age 16 related to early initiation of using marijuana, crack, cocaine, hallucinogens, or prescription drugs (generally sedatives) among 18–35 year old adults.(Lijffijt et al)

Chapter 4. The Role of Mental Health Professionals in Legal Settings

Contribution to forensic assessments (competency, insanity, risk evaluation) Some assessment tools are designed for use in CR evaluations, and unlike third-party information, there is less agreement on whether tests should be used and, if so, which ones should be used. Most assessment tools were created for use in therapeutic or research settings. Clinical evaluation, which includes the use of tests or assessment tools,

primarily gathers data to support or contradict current mental health diagnoses and psychological problems. If the findings are contrasted with data on the defendant's actions, feelings, and thoughts during the period surrounding the accused offense, this could be significant for CR evaluations. More needs to be discovered about the tools specialists employ in their job and the additional data they consult when formulating their opinions on the questions posed by the courts in order to attain a higher caliber of forensic assessment of responsibility at the time of an alleged act. (Løvgren et al) . Additionally, videoconferencing can increase the experts' general safety when conducting the competency exam. Defendants may endanger the safety of individuals in attendance during in-person evaluations, particularly if they are egregiously underpaid and/or visibly hostile. Some institutions choose to restrain defendants for the duration of the interview in order to reduce this risk, which may cause them to feel uncomfortable, humiliated, or unpleasant.(Luxton et al).

Ethical obligations: balancing public safety and patients' rights; According to federal and state privacy regulations, individual medical data, including mental health records, are legally protected and cannot be disclosed to third parties without the consent of the patient, with the exception of certain restricted situations. Even patients who have passed away are protected by these privacy laws. The health and welfare of individual patients are the main ethical responsibilities of physicians. Although doctors and other healthcare professionals have a duty to the public's health, in part because they are uniquely positioned to recognize possible threats (such as people with communicable diseases or plans to commit violent crimes), strict confidentiality is still a traditional professional ethical norm in medicine. It is arguable that if a breach of patient confidentiality may be fairly expected to protect others from harm, then it may be morally acceptable or even required. (Anderson et al) Influence on shaping gun control and public safety policies With over 255 000 gun-related deaths reported in the US between 2012 and 2018, gun violence is a public health emergency.The American public is generally in favor of laws intended to reduce gun violence. According to polls, the vast majority of American adults, both gun owners and non-owners, are in favor of longer waiting periods, more thorough background checks, and regulations requiring that firearms be stored safely. Notwithstanding this support, a large number of gun owners voice concerns about new gun control legislation and frequently back political candidates who oppose it. Additionally, proponents of gun rights are more inclined than proponents of gun safety measures to voice their opinions, sign petitions, and get in touch with elected authorities.(Garett et al)

Chapter 5. The Law's Current Approach to Schizophrenia

5.1 Legal Insanity and Diminished Responsibility

The main argument against M'Naghten's obsolescence is that the rule ignores the widely acknowledged idea that the human mind and personality are intertwined. The cognitive, volitive, and affective capacities may not be separated. According to the argument, M'Naghten is a product of the rationalist era, which only recognizes the cognitive or intellectual faculties and excludes the power of the will and the effect of emotions. Even if a person may be conscious of the nature of his actions and their wrongfulness, mental illness may cause him to be unwilling to refrain from them (volition) or emotionally unstable enough to act irresponsibly.

Case studies illustrating varying standards across jurisdictions; The legal defense of insanity in Indian courts, specifically under Section 84 of the Indian Penal Code (IPC), is based on the M'Naghten Rules, which were taken from an English case in 1843 and are currently directly incorporated into Section 22 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS). This defense can be used if the perpetrator had a mental illness at the

time of the crime that prevented them from understanding the nature of the act or that it was illegal or unlawful.

5.2 Neuroscientific Evidence in Courtrooms

The single-photon emission computed tomography (SPECT) is utilized to describe neurodegenerative conditions such as inflammation, strokes, dementia, and trauma.16 The radioisotope technetium-99m (99mTc), which has a far longer half-life than 18FFDG, is used in SPECT. One photon is released as a result of 99mTc breaking down. A gamma camera that rotates around the subject records the imaging data. Compared to PET radioisotopes, which need to be created in a specialized cyclotron and consumed within hours of synthesis, SPECT radioisotopes are more widely available and less costly. Courts have only had to consider admissibility issues pertaining to the use of nuclear medical research, such as PET and SPECT technologies, in criminal prosecutions since the early 1990s.Judges primarily take into account if the facts from the scan will help the jury decide whether the criminal defendant has the necessary cognitive capacity. The importance of this information varies depending on the stage of the court proceedings. In every death penalty case, the jury must take the defendant's cognitive and neuropsychological deficiencies into account while determining the appropriate sentence. However, brain imaging tests are often provided to support a diagnosis or provide evidence of a causal relationship between a brain-based disorder and violent conduct during the guilt phase of a criminal prosecution. Nuclear research cannot be utilized to establish whether the defendant did the alleged offense at any stage of a criminal prosecution.The jury cannot be helped by brain imagery to comprehend the defendant's emotional state at the time of the offense. Nuclear medicine research, however, can reveal brain-based anomalies that could indicate a defendant's inadequate potential for self-control. (Rushing,S.2014)

Chapter 6. Stigma, Public Perception, and Legal Outcomes

Nine out of ten people with mental health conditions report that stigma and discrimination have a negative impact on their lives, according to a UK mental health charity. (2021) Mental Health Foundation. The idea that persons with mental health conditions are dangerous and unpredictable is one instance of these damaging stigmatic ideas (Corrigan & Bink, 2016; Levey et al., 1995; Marie & Miles, 2008; Silton et al., 2011). This results in discriminatory actions by the general public and society, such as the public choosing to maintain social distance and segregation from persons with mental health disorders and the avoidance of discriminatory actions by employers, landlords, and healthcare professionals.Unfortunately, adverse effects can help sustain the distress linked to a mental health illness. Self-esteem, access to healthcare, help-seeking behaviors, and the prevalence of suicide may all be negatively impacted if stigma results in social exclusion (Angermeyer & Dietrich; Clement et al., 2015; Corbière et al., 2011; Corrigan et al., 2006; Corrigan & Bink; Lasalvia et al., 2021; Overton & Medina, 2008; Schomerus et al., 2022). Less is known about mental health stigma inside the criminal justice system. Likewise, not much research has been done on the combined stigma associated with mental health issues and criminal activity. One possible effect of this stigma may be seen in the jury's decision-making process. . The empirical study found that the provision of mental health information (both symptoms and a diagnostic label) reduced the probability of a juror giving a guilty decision by almost 6 times. It also found those with higher stigma were in some cases 50% more likely to give a guilty verdict. (Tremlin, R. 2021).

Media portrayal vs. scientific reality; Fictional depictions of mental illness that are demeaning are common and powerful. In the United States, two to three percent of adult characters are shown to have mental health issues, and one-fifth of prime-time shows feature some form of mental illness. The mentally ill are the

group most prone to engage in violence, with one in four of them killing someone and half of them being shown as harming others. Compared to other television characters, mentally ill characters with speaking parts have a tenfold higher offense rate.Characters with mental illnesses also experience victimization more frequently than other characters, but this may have decreased over time in favor of more violent depictions.In general, characters with mental illnesses are shown as being far more aggressive than both actual persons with mental illnesses and ordinary characters. Since the early days of television, the idea that mental illness leads to violence has persisted .Mentally ill characters are frequently portrayed as disenfranchised with no family connections, no occupation and no social identity. (Stuart, H. 2006).

Impact of stigma on defendants' rights and rehabilitation prospects; according to the Criminal Procedure Rules, jurors are expected to render an unbiased judgment based on the evidence that has been presented to them. A mock jury study revealed that decisions were substantially correlated with opinions on criminal culpability and mental illness (Roberts et al., 1987).

Chapter 7. Reconsidering Criminal Accountability

7.1 Emerging Theories and Legal Reforms

There is a growing push to embed neuroscientific research more directly into legal frameworks, especially around questions of criminal responsibility. As brain science deepens our understanding of how mental disorders affect behavior, legal doctrines—particularly those governing the insanity defense, are under scrutiny. Scholars argue that defendants who suffer from impaired impulse control due to demonstrable neurological dysfunction should be eligible for a revised insanity plea. Redding (2006) emphasizes that if a person lacks the physiological ability to regulate their actions, the legal system must consider this biological limitation when assessing accountability and determining just outcomes.

7.2 Ethical Challenges in Redefining Accountability

Balancing justice, autonomy, and societal protection; Many individuals with mental retardation still reside in sizable institutional settings. The most glaring and serious issues with coerciveness are caused by such congregate care facilities. However, a growing number of individuals with mental retardation reside in a more intricate variety of structured community living arrangements. The level of restriction experienced by the residents of those arrangements varies widely. Significant differences in atmosphere and style exist even within a specific category, like group homes, which affect the legitimacy of a person's consent or refusal. Other people with mental retardation may work or engage in other activities in environments where they encounter varied degrees of coercion and restriction, but they do not live in any structured environment. The legal concept of consent originated in general medical cases, and its variations pertaining to mental disability have frequently involved children or individuals suffering from mental illness. The unique characteristics of mental retardation and the consent concerns that individuals with that disability face necessitate reevaluating the suitability of regulations created in various settings. (Ellis, J. 1992)

Implications for sentencing, incarceration, and treatment options; the United States has three times more individuals with severe mental illnesses in prison than in psychiatric hospitals. It was expected that although treatments geared toward psychosocial rehabilitation would be beneficial in reducing the symptoms of mental illness, correctional rehabilitation-oriented programs would be effective at reducing criminality. Additionally, it was predicted that the treatments would be unidirectional, meaning that programs focused on psychosocial rehabilitation would not lead to a drop in criminality and programs centered on penal rehabilitation would not lead to a decrease in psychopathology. It is anticipated that the

findings of this review will give psychologists and other mental health professionals in the forensic (patients are committed to the custody of the department of mental health and are housed in secure forensic hospitals or other forensic mental health settings) and correctional (offenders are sanctioned and under the supervision of the criminal justice system) systems an empirical basis upon which to frame interventions for treating dual issues of mental illness and criminality (Morgan et al).

Chapter 8. Conclusion

Neuroscience has redefined the way we think about criminal behavior, especially in individuals diagnosed with schizophrenia. Traditionally, criminal accountability hinges on the assumption that people possess the cognitive ability and moral understanding to distinguish right from wrong and act accordingly. But schizophrenia, a severe mental illness affecting perception, cognition, and behavior, disrupts this assumption in profound ways. Hallucinations, delusions, disorganized thinking, and cognitive deficits all impair a person's ability to make rational decisions, directly impacting their legal culpability.

Advances in neuroimaging have played a critical role in bringing these insights into the courtroom. Technologies like fMRI and PET scans provide tangible evidence of brain dysfunction, showing abnormalities in the prefrontal cortex, amygdala, and other areas involved in decision-making, emotional regulation, and impulse control. These biological insights allow courts to look beyond surface-level behavior and ask deeper questions: Was this individual capable of forming intent? Could they understand the nature and consequences of their actions? Were they able to choose otherwise?

This shift has exposed the inadequacy of outdated legal standards like the M'Naghten Rules, which rely heavily on cognitive awareness alone and ignore the broader picture of volitional and emotional impairment. A defendant with schizophrenia may know an act is wrong but still be powerless to resist it due to impaired impulse control or psychotic delusions. Neuroscience helps illuminate that gap; and calls for reforms that reflect this complexity.

That said, neuroscience is not a silver bullet. It doesn't excuse behavior but offers crucial context. The goal isn't to absolve individuals of responsibility, but to ensure that the justice system responds proportionately and fairly, recognizing when mental illness has compromised a person's agency. For this, interdisciplinary collaboration is vital. Lawyers, judges, psychiatrists, neuroscientists, and ethicists must work together to refine legal definitions of insanity, criminal intent, and diminished responsibility.

These insights also have implications beyond the courtroom. If criminal behavior is in part driven by untreated or poorly understood mental illness, then incarceration alone is not a sustainable solution. We need better psychiatric support, early intervention strategies, and rehabilitative justice models. Neuroscience reinforces that punishment without treatment often leads to recurrence - not resolution.

Looking ahead, future research must focus on more precise ways to assess mental incapacity at the time of a crime. We also need to address how stigma and public misconceptions influence juror bias, judicial outcomes, and policy decisions. Legal systems should be updated to allow for individualized assessments that take into account the dynamic and evolving understanding of the human brain.

In sum, neuroscience doesn't rewrite the law, it deepens it. In cases involving schizophrenia, it provides clarity where assumptions once prevailed. It demands that we stop treating complex mental disorders with one-size-fits-all legal responses and instead build a system that respects science, justice, and human dignity in equal measure.

This research set out to examine how schizophrenia; through the lens of neuroscience, challenges and reshapes legal notions of criminal accountability. What emerges is clear: the intersection of law and brain

science is no longer a theoretical debate but a practical necessity. Courts must now confront the reality that not all minds operate on equal footing, and justice cannot be blind to biological truth.

As our understanding of mental illness deepens, so must our systems of responsibility, punishment, and care. The legal system has a choice, to cling to outdated doctrines or evolve with science. The path forward is not simple, but it is necessary. A just society does not ignore neuroscience; it integrates it- thoughtfully, critically, and compassionately.

Chapter 9: References

1. Acklin, M. W. (2016). Madness, mayhem, and murder: A Rorschach case study in methamphetamine psychosis and paranoid schizophrenia.
2. Cognitive Research: Principles and Implications. (2019). Neuroscientific evidence in the courtroom: A review. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41235-019-0179-y
3. Diehl-Schmid, J., Perneczky, R., Koch, J., Nedopil, N., & Kurz, A. (2013). Guilty by suspicion? Criminal behavior in frontotemporal lobar degeneration. Cognitive and Behavioral Neurology, 26(2), 73–77. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23812170/
4. Frontiers in Psychology. (2021). Improving criminal responsibility determinations using structured neuropsychological assessment tools. https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.700991/full
5. Karcher, A., Hamza, R., & Jantzi, C. (2024). Case report: Assessing criminal responsibility and recidivism risk in the behavioral variant of frontotemporal dementia. Frontiers in Psychiatry, 15, Article 1437363. https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyt.2024.1437363/full
6. Metzl, J. M., & MacLeish, K. T. (2015). Mental illness, mass shootings, and the politics of American firearms. American Journal of Public Health, 105(2), 240–249. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2014.302242
7. Tsimploulis, G., Niveau, G., Eytan, A., Giannakopoulos, P., & Sentissi, O. (2018). Schizophrenia and criminal responsibility: A systematic review. Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 206(5), 370–377. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29652769/
8. Zabih, S. A., et al. (2023). Examining the propensity and nature of criminal risk behaviours in dementia: Focus on FTD. Alzheimer's & Dementia: Diagnosis, Assessment & Disease Monitoring, 15(1), e12577. https://doi.org/10.1002/dad2.12577
9. Zhong, R., et al. (2019). Criminal behavior in frontotemporal dementia and Alzheimer disease. JAMA Network Open, 2(6), e195389.