BIOLOGY AND MOLECULAR MEDICINE

Perspective

Postpartum Psychosis and the Evidentiary Limits of Timing

Eugenia Shvartsman[1*]

[1] Touro College of Osteopathic Medicine, New York, USA

[*] Correspondence: eshvarts@student.touro.edu

Abstract

Postpartum psychosis is a clinical emergency whose diagnostic status remains contested. The strongest proposal for separate recognition places it within the bipolar spectrum, rather than outside it. Genetic associations, immune findings, neuroendocrine mechanisms, and postpartum-restricted illness trajectories support biological vulnerability and possible subgroup distinctiveness, but do not establish a single exclusive mechanism. The central problem is how timing contributes to the diagnosis. Typical onset, operational diagnostic windows, and the duration of an established episode answer different questions. So do the first appearance of nonspecific distress, the onset of a qualifying affective syndrome, and the emergence of psychosis. When later psychosis is attributed to an earlier postpartum illness, continuity must be supported rather than supplied retrospectively by the diagnosis. Conversely, late recognition or late psychotic symptoms do not establish late syndrome onset. This Perspective examines the evidence and its limits, including the strongest competing interpretation that postpartum psychosis identifies a distinct subgroup within the bipolar spectrum. A public forensic dispute illustrates temporal attribution without resolving an individual diagnosis or criminal responsibility. Diagnostic usefulness, causal explanation, and legal exculpation require separate arguments. A defensible boundary must specify both what establishes membership and what evidence would count against it.

Keywords: Postpartum psychosis; Diagnostic classification; Bipolar spectrum; Postpartum onset; Temporal attribution

Abbreviations: Postpartum psychosis (PPP); Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition, Text Revision (DSM-5-TR); World Health Organization (WHO); International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems, 10th Revision (ICD-10) and 11th Revision (ICD-11); gamma-aminobutyric acid (GABA); 3-hydroxy-3-methylglutaryl-coenzyme A reductase (HMGCR); magnetic resonance imaging (MRI)

1. The Nosological Problem

Postpartum psychosis (PPP) describes a severe syndrome after childbirth, commonly involving mania, mixed affective symptoms, psychotic depression, delusions, hallucinations, confusion, and disorganized behavior. Incidence is commonly estimated at 1–2 episodes per 1,000 deliveries, with onset usually concentrated in the first days or weeks [1]. It requires urgent clinical attention. This Perspective asks a narrower question: when the relationship to childbirth helps define the diagnosis, what evidence should establish that relationship, and what should weaken it?

Three models organize the dispute. PPP may identify a distinct reproductive subgroup, potentially within the bipolar spectrum; childbirth may precipitate episodes adequately described by existing bipolar or other diagnoses; or the term may collect several disorders under a temporal umbrella. These possibilities overlap. The 2026 consensus specifically proposes a distinct category within the bipolar disorders chapter [2]. It therefore cannot fairly be characterized as choosing a reproductive disorder instead of a bipolar relationship. The disputed issue is the additional information supplied by a separate category.

A useful category need not possess a unique molecule. Evidence for distinctiveness would include reproducible clinical features and trajectories, or prediction of recurrence and treatment response beyond what existing diagnoses and reproductive timing already predict. Conversely, substantial heterogeneity, unstable boundaries, or failure to improve those predictions would weaken the case. These are proposed standards for evaluating the models, not findings already established. Neither shared genetic liability nor the absence of a specific biomarker settles the classification question. The diagnosis must earn its additional explanatory work.

The population being classified also matters. A first psychiatric episode after childbirth

Editor: Eric H. Rosenn

Received: 09/08/26
Accepted: 11/04/26
Published: 11/09/26

Citation: Shvartsman E. Postpartum Psychosis and the Evidentiary Limits of Timing. *Biology & Molecular Medicine* 2026, 1, 5.

Copyright: © 2026 by the author. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) license.

in a woman without a previous bipolar diagnosis is not interchangeable with a postpartum relapse in established bipolar disorder. Evidence from either population can inform the other, but cannot silently substitute for it. Whether a distinct first-onset category is useful and whether a postpartum specifier adds value to an existing diagnosis are related questions, not identical ones.

2. Diagnostic Windows Are Not Biological Verdicts

The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition, Text Revision (DSM-5-TR), does not provide an independent PPP diagnosis; it uses onset specifiers attached to existing mood or brief psychotic diagnoses, covering onset during pregnancy or within four weeks after delivery [3]. In the World Health Organization's (WHO) International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems, 10th Revision (ICD-10), category F53 concerns puerperal mental disorders beginning within six weeks that are not classified elsewhere [4]. In the 11th revision (ICD-11), category 6E21 describes pregnancy- or puerperium-associated syndromes with psychotic symptoms, ordinarily beginning within about six weeks after delivery, and directs assignment of another specific mental disorder diagnosis when its requirements are met [5]. These systems differ in purpose and organization, but none licenses temporally unlimited attribution.

The consensus proposal uses a broader, explicit onset window of 12 weeks and includes mania or a mixed state among its qualifying presentations; psychosis is not required in every qualifying presentation [2]. These are proposed criteria, not an adopted DSM diagnosis. Existing and proposed classifications thus already set operational limits. The remaining problem is how onset is dated, which syndrome must begin within the window, and what supports continuity when later symptoms are attributed to that episode. An episode that begins within a valid window need not end within it. Nor does an offense committed months later establish when an illness began.

An operational cutoff supports consistent classification; it does not prove that biology changes categorically on the following day. The opposite error is equally consequential: exceptions do not make boundaries optional. A late presentation requires its own evidential account. Broader clinical follow-up after childbirth and a narrower diagnostic onset criterion can coexist without contradiction.

3. Biology Without Diagnostic Exclusivity

The reproductive transition offers plausible mechanisms. Estradiol and progesterone fall after delivery, while progesterone-derived neurosteroids can influence inhibitory signaling [1]. Majewska and colleagues demonstrated that steroid metabolites modulate the gamma-aminobutyric acid (GABA) receptor-chloride channel complex in experimental preparations [6]. That is primary mechanistic evidence, not a demonstration of a PPP-specific endocrine lesion. The distinction matters: a normal transition may expose an unusual susceptibility, but this could support either a reproductive subgroup or an established vulnerability precipitated by childbirth. Mechanistic plausibility leaves that comparison open.

Immune findings deserve the same discipline. A first-onset PPP cohort showed increased thyroid autoimmunity relative to postpartum controls [7]. Bergink and colleagues reported altered T-cell responses, increased monocytes, and upregulated immune-related monocyte genes in 63 first-onset cases [8]. Kumar and colleagues subsequently found altered peripheral immune-cell subsets in a smaller first-onset sample [9]. These observations justify investigation; they do not establish that the abnormalities precede illness, cause the syndrome, or distinguish PPP from nonpostpartum affective psychosis. Associations across different biological systems also do not, by themselves, prove either unity or heterogeneity of disease.

The polygenic evidence contains both resemblance and difference. Di Florio and colleagues compared 203 women whose first psychiatric episode was a manic, mixed, or psychotic depressive episode within six weeks of delivery with 1,225 parous women with bipolar disorder and 2,809 controls [10]. Bipolar disorder and schizophrenia polygenic risk scores were elevated in both clinical groups. Major depression polygenic liability, however, was elevated in the bipolar group but not the first-onset PPP group: the latter comparison with controls yielded an adjusted relative risk ratio of 0.97 (95% confidence interval, 0.82–1.11). This difference supports the competing interpretation of a distinguishable subgroup within the bipolar spectrum. It is not a demonstration of complete genetic separation.

Jung and colleagues estimated family-based heritability at 55% (95% confidence interval, 42–68%) using Swedish sibling and cousin concordance in a liability-threshold model [11]. Phenotype-correlation genotype-correlation regression of common variants obtained from whole-genome sequencing yielded 45.6% (standard error, 22.2 percentage points) in 198 cases and 2,013 controls of European ancestry. The estimates address different components of genetic liability, depend on model assumptions, and are not precise, interchangeable measurements. Neither represents the genetic fraction of an individual patient's illness.

In a separate rare-variant analysis of 461 cases and 4,610 matched controls, HMGCR (3-hydroxy-3-methylglutaryl-coenzyme A reductase) reached a false discovery rate below 0.05 [11]. This is a reported gene-level association implicating a cholesterol-synthesis pathway, not proof of a causal brain-cholesterol defect. Associations with other psychiatric diagnoses further limit claims of exclusivity. Modest case numbers, diagnostic coding, and the need for independent PPP-specific replication constrain interpretation. The relevant question is how far the association discriminates diagnoses, not whether it supplies an impressive molecular name.

Sleep and imaging findings similarly require attention to the comparator. Lewis and colleagues studied women with established bipolar disorder: a history of sleep-loss-triggered mania was associated with PPP [12]. That supports susceptibility to a precipitant, rather than independently establishing a separate first-onset disease. McKenna

and colleagues found elevated midbrain neuromelanin-sensitive magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) signal in 30 women with a history of PPP compared with 24 healthy controls [13]. The cross-sectional sample included different prior psychiatric diagnoses and lacked a nonpostpartum bipolar or psychosis comparison group. It cannot establish diagnostic specificity or determine whether the signal reflects antecedent vulnerability, illness effects, or treatment exposure.

4. Course and the Limits of Follow-Up

Longitudinal evidence supplies a serious argument against reducing every first-onset PPP episode to an ordinary recurrent bipolar course. Gilden and colleagues combined six studies involving 645 women followed for 11–26 years [14]. The pooled proportion without a subsequent severe episode outside the postpartum period was 43.5% (95% confidence interval, 37.7–49.4%); the complementary proportion with nonpostpartum illness was 56.5%. Both results belong in the argument. Postpartum-restricted trajectories support possible subgroup distinctiveness, while later nonpostpartum illness demonstrates that this restriction is not universal. A single qualifying manic episode can nevertheless establish bipolar I disorder; subsequent nonrecurrence does not by itself invalidate that diagnosis [3].

In Rommel and colleagues' prospective cohort, 34 of 106 women (32.1%) experienced nonpostpartum mood or psychotic recurrence over four years, predominantly within the bipolar spectrum [15]. Two women experienced recurrences exclusively following later pregnancies; that cohort proportion is not a pregnancy-specific relapse probability. The lower nonpostpartum recurrence estimate cannot be directly equated with the estimate from the meta-analysis: four years offers less opportunity to observe recurrence than 11–26 years. Case definitions also differed: the meta-analysis allowed first onset within a year, whereas the prospective cohort excluded onset beyond 12 weeks [14, 15]. Treatment, ascertainment, and historical setting further limit comparison. Absence of recurrence during observation is evidence about that observation period, not a certificate of lifelong reproductive exclusivity.

Recurrence after another delivery asks a different question again. In the broader sample reported by Gilden and colleagues, 92 of 336 women with a subsequent pregnancy (27%) experienced another postpartum episode [14]. Wesseloo and colleagues estimated a 29% risk of severe postpartum episodes (95% confidence interval, 20–41%) among women with a history of PPP [16]. This conditional risk should not be confused with nonpostpartum recurrence or combined indiscriminately with estimates for established bipolar disorder. A single label should not conceal different denominators, outcomes, and periods of risk.

5. Timing as Evidence

The early concentration of risk is an empirical finding, not merely a naming convention. Kendell and colleagues linked obstetric and psychiatric registers and found a marked increase in admissions for psychotic illness during the first 30 days after childbirth [17]. Munk-Olsen and colleagues found that first psychiatric-admission risk in primiparous women peaked at days 10–19 and remained elevated through the first three months relative to months 11–12 [18]. The latter outcome encompassed mental disorders generally and should not be presented as a PPP-specific risk estimate. Admission timing is also not identical to symptom onset.

In a retrospective cohort of 248 participants recruited for psychosis within six months of delivery, Cohen and colleagues reported a median time to symptom onset of 10 days after delivery [19]. This supports early clustering within that selected population; the six-month inclusion window cannot validate itself as the biological boundary. Brockington's synthesis documents later presentations, including recurrent patterns, but historical case descriptions lack the population denominators needed to establish how much late-onset risk exceeds background risk [20]. Late cases deserve explanation. Their existence does not determine the appropriate size of the category.

Spinelli reports that a proposal submitted in 2020 to an American Psychiatric Association DSM committee did not establish distinctiveness to that committee's satisfaction, and describes a subsequent emphasis on the temporal relationship to childbirth [21]. This account is attributed to the proposal's author; an independently documented committee determination is not asserted here. If temporal concentration contributes to diagnostic validity, greater remoteness should ordinarily reduce the evidential contribution of timing alone. It need not exclude every case, but it increases the importance of corroborating syndrome onset and continuity.

6. Which Onset Is Being Dated

At least three dates require separation: the first nonspecific symptom, the onset of a qualifying affective or psychotic syndrome, and the first recognition of that syndrome. A fourth, the first psychotic symptom, may occur later than the onset of an already qualifying manic episode. Under criteria that allow mania without psychosis, delayed hallucinations do not necessarily imply delayed PPP onset. Equally, anxiety or insomnia alone does not establish that a qualifying syndrome had already begun. The inference depends on what the earlier symptoms were and how they developed, not simply on the fact that psychosis eventually appeared.

Heron and colleagues retrospectively interviewed 127 women with bipolar affective psychosis beginning within four weeks of childbirth; 73% recalled symptoms by day three, often involving elation, altered sleep, increased energy, or talkativeness [22]. This is relevant evidence that recognizable changes can precede full presentation. It does not validate attaching any early distress to psychosis emerging many months later. The concern proposed here is diagnostic circularity: a later diagnosis should not be the only reason an earlier, nonspecific symptom is judged to have been its onset. This is an evidential risk, not a demonstrated estimate of how often clinicians make that error.

The strongest competing explanation is genuine continuity that was incompletely recognized at the time. It should be assessed through contemporaneous records, collateral observations, the emergence of syndromal features, intervals of recovery, and alternative explanations. Failure to document psychosis is not proof that it was absent; later recollection is not proof that it was present. Defining cases by onset within a window and then treating that same clustering as independent validation risks circularity at the group level as well. A boundary becomes more credible when its apparent explanatory success can survive evidence collected independently of the boundary.

7. An Illustration of Temporal Attribution

Publicly recorded homicide proceedings illustrate the distinction. A defense psychiatrist testified that an alleged psychotic state approximately eight months after childbirth belonged to a postpartum illness because symptoms had begun within three months and continued thereafter [23]. A prosecution psychiatrist instead dated the relevant distress to approximately four months and disputed evidence of mania or psychosis. These are attributed, competing expert opinions reported in an unofficial transcript of the proceedings, not independently established clinical findings. The illustration concerns the reasoning used to connect events across time, rather than adjudicating the defendant's diagnosis or responsibility.

The competing formulations locate the disagreement precisely. What syndrome, if any, was present within the claimed onset window? What supports continuity into the later state? Which alternative account fits the intervening record? A clearly documented qualifying episode followed by sustained illness would support continuity more strongly than an isolated nonspecific symptom followed by a long evidential gap. The date of the alleged offense answers none of these questions by itself. The example therefore illustrates temporal attribution; it neither validates nor falsifies PPP as a diagnostic category.

8. When Nosology Acquires Forensic Utility

The legal implications of classification are explicit in the literature. Rhodes argues for the importance of a DSM diagnosis in the US legal system [24]. Feingold and Lewis advocate changes intended to influence judicial outcomes and prevent incarceration when culpability is linked to PPP [25]. Those are documented positions. They do not establish that legal objectives caused the terminology, widened diagnostic criteria, or motivated particular experts. Such causal claims would require additional evidence. The defensible criticism is that a classification's legal usefulness cannot independently validate its clinical boundaries.

Nor is a psychiatric diagnosis equivalent to a legal conclusion. Massachusetts, for example, asks whether mental disease or defect caused a lack of substantial capacity to appreciate criminality or wrongfulness, or to conform conduct to legal requirements [26]. Psychosis does not automatically establish that incapacity, and psychosis is not the only possible basis for it. When psychosis is alleged, its evidential support must be assessed; the reproductive attribution must be assessed separately; and the legal standard must then be applied to the relevant capacities at the time. Disagreement over postpartum classification neither resolves nor prevents a finding under that standard.

Filicide is an uncommon outcome of PPP, and forensic cases should not be treated as representative of the clinical population [1]. Within those cases, Resnick's term altruistic filicide classifies a perceived parental motive [27]. It does not describe an objective benefit to the child. A delusional belief that death would protect a child may be relevant to diagnosis and culpability; it cannot turn the child's death into protection. The ethical position advanced here is that explaining the parent's mental state and recognizing the child's independent personhood are compatible obligations. Reduced culpability, where established, changes the assessment of the actor without reducing the harm suffered by the victim.

9. Conclusion

PPP is a serious clinical phenomenon; the unresolved issue is how best to classify it. The strongest competing case for separate recognition invokes a distinct subgroup within the bipolar spectrum, supported by convergent clinical, genetic, and longitudinal observations. That case deserves assessment on its actual terms. Equally, biological associations should not be promoted into diagnostic exclusivity, and an absence of recurrence should not be promoted into a lifelong course before adequate follow-up.

The central proposal is evidential discipline. Distinguish a typical onset distribution from a diagnostic window, and distinguish both from a causal judgment about an individual. Date the qualifying syndrome rather than whichever earlier symptom makes the chronology convenient. Require independent support for continuity when a distant state is attributed to an earlier postpartum illness. A category may be useful without explaining every case, and a patient may be gravely ill without every proposed explanation being correct. Diagnostic boundaries are most defensible when they can exclude cases as well as accommodate them.

Literature Selection: Targeted searches for PubMed-indexed and publisher-hosted literature were supplemented by reference-list checking and consultation of diagnostic sources and public legal materials. Search topics included postpartum psychosis classification and onset, HMGCR and heritability, polygenic risk, recurrence, immune and neurosteroid findings, and forensic attribution. Sources were selected for direct relevance to these arguments, with priority given to primary studies and official diagnostic or legal documents. Reviews provided clinical context and additional references. Searches were completed on October 25, 2026. This is a selective perspective, not a systematic review; the selection does not establish completeness or eliminate selection bias.

Author Contributions: Eugenia Shvartsman is the sole author of this Perspective.

Funding: No funding was received.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable. This Perspective does not report original human-participant research.

Data Availability Statement: No new datasets were generated or analyzed. All evidence discussed is drawn from the cited literature and publicly available materials.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no competing interests.

References

1. Perry, A.; Gordon-Smith, K.; Jones, L.; Jones, I. Phenomenology, epidemiology and aetiology of postpartum psychosis: a review. *Brain Sci.* **2021**, *11*(1), 47. https://doi.org/10.3390/brainsci11010047.
2. Bergink, V.; Akbarian, S.; Byatt, N.; et al. Postpartum psychosis and bipolar disorder: review of neurobiology and expert consensus statement on classification. *Biol Psychiatry.* **2026**, *99*(9), 740–747. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2025.10.016.
3. American Psychiatric Association. Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders. 5th ed., text revision. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association Publishing; 2022. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.books.9780890425787.
4. World Health Organization. International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems. 10th revision, version 2019. Category F53. Accessed October 25, 2026. https://icd.who.int/browse10/2019/en#/F53.
5. World Health Organization. Clinical Descriptions and Diagnostic Requirements for ICD-11 Mental, Behavioural and Neurodevelopmental Disorders. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2024. Category 6E21. ISBN 978-92-4-007726-3. https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240077263.
6. Majewska, M.D.; Harrison, N.L.; Schwartz, R.D.; Barker, J.L.; Paul, S.M. Steroid hormone metabolites are barbiturate-like modulators of the GABA receptor. *Science.* **1986**, *232*(4753), 1004–1007. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.2422758.
7. Bergink, V.; Kushner, S.A.; Pop, V.; et al. Prevalence of autoimmune thyroid dysfunction in postpartum psychosis. *Br J Psychiatry.* **2011**, *198*(4), 264–268. https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.bp.110.082990.
8. Bergink, V.; Burgerhout, K.M.; Weigelt, K.; et al. Immune system dysregulation in first-onset postpartum psychosis. *Biol Psychiatry.* **2013**, *73*(10), 1000–1007. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2012.11.006.
9. Kumar, M.M.; Venkataswamy, M.M.; Sathyanarayanan, G.; Thippeswamy, H.; Chandra, P.S.; Mani, R.S. Immune system aberrations in postpartum psychosis: an immunophenotyping study from a tertiary care neuropsychiatric hospital in India. *J Neuroimmunol.* **2017**, *310*, 8–13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneuroim.2017.06.002.
10. Di Florio, A.; Yang, J.M.K.; Crawford, K.; et al. Post-partum psychosis and its association with bipolar disorder in the UK: a case-control study using polygenic risk scores. *Lancet Psychiatry.* **2021**, *8*(12), 1045–1052. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(21)00253-4.
11. Jung, S.; Caballero, M.; Kepińska, A.; et al. Genetic architecture of postpartum psychosis: from common to rare genetic variation. *Mol Psychiatry.* **2026**, *31*, 5528–5537. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41380-026-03637-w.
12. Lewis, K.J.S.; Di Florio, A.; Forty, L.; et al. Mania triggered by sleep loss and risk of postpartum psychosis in women with bipolar disorder. *J Affect Disord.* **2018**, *225*, 624–629. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2017.08.054.
13. McKenna, F.; Vinke, L.N.; Williams, M.; et al. Postpartum psychosis is associated with elevated neuromelanin-MRI signal in the midbrain. *Mol Psychiatry.* **2026**, *31*, 3524–3532. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41380-026-03476-9.
14. Gilden, J.; Kamperman, A.M.; Munk-Olsen, T.; Hoogendijk, W.J.G.; Kushner, S.A.; Bergink, V. Long-term outcomes of postpartum psychosis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Clin Psychiatry.* **2020**, *81*(2), 19r12906. https://doi.org/10.4088/JCP.19r12906.
15. Rommel, A.S.; Molenaar, N.M.; Gilden, J.; et al. Long-term outcome of postpartum psychosis: a prospective clinical cohort study in 106 women. *Int J Bipolar Disord.* **2021**, *9*, 31. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40345-021-00236-2.
16. Wesseloo, R.; Kamperman, A.M.; Munk-Olsen, T.; Pop, V.J.M.; Kushner, S.A.; Bergink, V. Risk of postpartum relapse in bipolar disorder and postpartum psychosis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Am J Psychiatry.* **2016**, *173*(2), 117–127. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.2015.15010124.
17. Kendell, R.E.; Chalmers, J.C.; Platz, C. Epidemiology of puerperal psychoses. *Br J Psychiatry.* **1987**, *150*, 662–673. Correction: 1987;151:135. https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.150.5.662.
18. Munk-Olsen, T.; Laursen, T.M.; Pedersen, C.B.; Mors, O.; Mortensen, P.B. New parents and mental disorders: a population-based register study. *JAMA.* **2006**, *296*(21), 2582–2589. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.296.21.2582.
19. Cohen, L.S.; Arakelian, M.; Church, T.R.; et al. The phenomenology of postpartum psychosis: preliminary findings from the Massachusetts General Hospital Postpartum Psychosis Project. *Mol Psychiatry.* **2025**, *30*, 2537–2544. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41380-024-02856-3.
20. Brockington, I. Late onset postpartum psychoses. *Arch Womens Ment Health.* **2017**, *20*, 87–92. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00737-016-0680-y.
21. Spinelli, M. Postpartum psychosis: a diagnosis for the DSMV. *Arch Womens Ment Health.* **2021**, *24*(5), 817–822. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00737-021-01175-8.
22. Heron, J.; McGuinness, M.; Robertson Blackmore, E.; Craddock, N.; Jones, I. Early postpartum symptoms in puerperal psychosis. *BJOG.* **2008**, *115*(3), 348–353. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-0528.2007.01563.x.
23. Commonwealth v. Clancy. Testimony of Phillip Resnick and Avram Mack, trial day 18. Unofficial transcript of recorded proceedings. Rev; published August 23, 2026. Relevant passages at 39:03–41:32, 2:09:46–2:10:07, and 2:19:33–2:20:02. Accessed October 25, 2026. https://www.rev.com/transcripts/ma-v-lindsay-clancy-day-18.
24. Rhodes, A.M. Why a DSM diagnosis of postpartum psychosis is important for women in the US legal system. *Arch Womens Ment Health.* **2021**, *24*, 799–800. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00737-021-01174-9.
25. Feingold, S.B.; Lewis, B.M. The criminalization of women with postpartum psychosis: a call for action for judicial change. *Arch Womens Ment Health.* **2025**, *28*, 455–461. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00737-024-01461-1.
26. Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court. Model Jury Instructions on Homicide. I. Criminal responsibility. Updated March 30, 2026. Accessed October 25, 2026. https://www.mass.gov/info-details/model-jury-instructions-on-homicide-i-criminal-responsibility.
27. Resnick, P.J. Child murder by parents: a psychiatric review of filicide. *Am J Psychiatry.* **1969**, *126*(3), 325–334. https://doi.org/10.1176/ajp.126.3.325.