ETHICAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE DSM-5
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Agenda
- Describe the background and several important changes in DSM-5
- Explore the philosophical question: why is reclassification of mental disorder an ethical activity?
- Examine the decision-making process in regard to these changes
- Address several key questions
Criticism of DSM-5

- Too soon for new classification
- Not sufficient advances to warrant revision
- Still far from the goal of having diagnoses based mostly on objective & biologically measurable criteria
- Broadening of categories (idiosyncrasies are pathologized)

Overview of revision process

- Process began in 2000
- Preliminary research agenda published in 2002
- 2006: Kupfer & Regier appointed to head DSM task force
- Three commenting periods
- Available to public May 22, 2013

Study groups:
- Diagnostic Spectra
- Lifespan Developmental Approaches
- Gender & Cross-Cultural Issues
- Psychiatric/General Medical Interface
- Impairment Assessment
- Diagnostic Assessment Instruments

Work groups for each diagnostic category

Revision Principles

- Useful to clinicians
- Recommendations guided by research evidence
- Continuity with previous editions
- No a priori constraints on the degree of change between DSM-IV and DSM-5

Revision Principles

- Development - across the life span
- Dimensional concepts - measurement of distress, disability, and severity
- Incorporation of new knowledge - risk factors, prevention, new syndromes
- “Living document” – Note the use of “5”

DSM-5 Chapter Headings

A. Neurodevelopmental Disorders
B. Schizophrenia Spectrum & Other Psychotic Disorders
C. Bipolar and Related Disorders
D. Depressive Disorders
E. Anxiety Disorders
F. Obsessive/Compulsive & Related Disorders
G. Trauma and Stressor Related Disorders
H. Dissociative Disorders
I. Somatic Symptom Disorders
J. Feeding and Eating Disorders
DSM-5 Chapter Headings

K. Elimination Disorders
L. Sleep-Wake Disorders
M. Sexual Dysfunctions
N. Gender Dysphoria
O. Disruptive, Impulse Control, & Conduct Disorders
P. Substance Use and Addictive Disorders
Q. Neurocognitive Disorders
R. Personality Disorders
S. Paraphiliias
T. Other Disorders

Psychiatric Disorder

Ethical Issues

• Are we medicalizing normal variability?
• What are the implications of dimensional vs. categorical approaches?
• Are treatments disease-focused or patient-focused?
• Is there disease mongering by adding new disorders?
• Are these changes truly beneficent?
In the context of biomedical ethics

A Brief Introduction to the Philosophy & Ethics of Behavioral Healthcare

methods in biomedical ethics

deontology utilitarianism
natural law virtue ethics casuistry principlism feminism pragmatism

Biobehavioral Healthcare Ethics

- Subdiscipline of bioethics
- Focus on unique ethical issues in psychiatry, psychology, neurology, and clinical social work
- Unique issues include
  - Involuntary treatment
  - Capacity assessments
  - Forensics
  - Nosology
  - Free will and autonomy
  - Diagnosis, stigma, personal identity

- Involuntary treatment
- Capacity assessments
- Forensics
- Nosology
- Free will and autonomy
- Diagnosis, stigma, personal identity
Philosophy of Medicine 101: Kinds of Things

- Natural kind realism/platonism
  - There exist entities in the world independent of our knowledge or recognition
  - Carving nature at its joints
  - Elements as bona fide natural kinds
  - Species (?)

- Social constructionism/artificial kinds
  - Entities exist insofar as we recognize and use them or interact with them
  - Nominalism

- Pragmatic kinds, moral kinds, interactive kinds, pluralistic realism

Philosophy of Medicine 101: The Concepts of Health and Disease

- Naturalism
  - Disease as deviation of species typical function (Boorse)
    - Heart – form and function to pump blood
    - Pathogens (ens morbi)
  - "Illness" = disease + social value

- Normativism
  - Diseases are value-laden constructs

- Hybrid
  - Harmful dysfunction (Wakefield)

Philosophy of Medicine 101: The Concept of Mental Disorder

- Mental illness as mythology
  - Szasz: Strong normativist OR strong naturalist

- Mental illness as social constructs (Foucault, et al.)
  - Social control, medicalization of deviance

- Mental illness as natural kinds (Boorse)
  - Brain-based dysfunction

- Mental illness contain both biological basis and social value (Wakefield)
Why Nosology Matters Ethically

IDENTITY, STIGMA, NORMALITY, BLAME & EXCULPATION

The Ethics Of Categories & Labels

Why do labels matter?

- Categorizing illness is an ethical activity
  - Concepts of health, disease, illness are value-laden
  - Many mental disorders are not natural kinds
- By marking out the sick, persons are relegated to sick role
- The width matters
  - Too narrow: sick are left out
  - Too wide: individual idiosyncrasies, eccentricities pathologized, liberty undermined
- Key to the ethical enterprise: Beneficent Intent
  - Proximate goal: diagnose, treat, and conduct research
  - Ultimate goal: relieve human suffering
Labeling Gone Horribly Wrong

- Analysis of intent reveals:
  - Political pressure
  - Racism, sexism
  - Appeals to religious/moral tradition
  - Medical domain expansion
  - Disease mongering
- Was maleficent intent not apparent at the time?
  - Problem of temporal and cultural relativism
- Critical analysis needed at all stages of nosology development

Labeling: a question of identity

- Illness as identity
  - Diagnosis shapes the way we think of self and others
  - Identity altering impact of physical illness
  - "Identity work" - the process and adjusting to new identity
- Mental disorder as identity
  - "Schizophreno" versus "canceric"
  - She is "borderline" versus she suffers with borderline personality disorder
- Mental condition as gift
  - Melancholic artist
  - Aspergian genius
Identity & stigma dynamics

- Foucault, *Madness & Civilization*
  - Mentally ill were cordoned off from society
- According to Goffman, stigma can be:
  - Mental illness
  - Physical disability
  - Race, gender, religion, belief system
- The "Other"

Embracing mental disorder

Identity disruptions
- Asperger’s syndrome → ASD
- Borderline personality disorder → Public recognition, acceptance

Core versus boundary
Natural versus artificial
Mad versus bad

Malingering
Asperger’s
ADHD
Bipolar Disorder
Classical Autism
Schizophrenia
OCD
Depression
GAD
Chemical Addictions
Non-chemical Addictions

Narcissistic PD
Antisocial PD
Borderline PD
OCPD
Blame & exculpation

- Controversies surrounding expanded categories
- ’Rationalizing’ or medicalizing bad, vicious, evil behavior
  - Gambling
  - Promiscuity (hypersexuality/ out of control sexual behavior)
  - Pedophilia (minor attracted persons; B4U-ACT)

Why Nosology Matters Ethically

REVISIONS, ADDITIONS & DELETIONS IN THE DSM-5

A Word About The Field Trials

**Sites & Patients**
- Academic outpatient settings (7 adult, 4 pediatric)
- Target enrollment of 50/disease category
- 279 clinicians/2246 patients

**Design**
- Assess clinical utility and feasibility, est. reliability
- Two clinical interviews (60 min.) with 2 providers
- Third interview for symptom resolution (few)
- Acceptable kappa of .4 - .6 (.6 > typical)

See also Kupfer, D. & Kraemer, H., Huffington Post, 11/7/2012; Frances, A., Huffington Post, 10/31/2012
A Word About the Field Trials

Anecdotal reports
- Varying diagnostic abilities of clinicians
- Too little time for adequate assessment
- Lack of familiarity with all patient groups

Test-retest reliability
- Only 2/3 of disorders had significant sample size to calculate kappa
- Kappa’s ranged from 0-0.8, most < 0.6
- Why low kappa’s? Can it be improved?

Field Trials: Disorders
- Alcohol use disorder (adults), substance use disorder (kids)
- Binge eating disorder
- MDD, mixed anxiety depression, bipolar disorder (both adults & kids)
- Complex somatic symptom disorder
- GAD, hoarding disorder, PTSD (adults & kids)
- Mild & major neurocognitive disorder, TBI
- Schizoaffective, schizophrenia, attenuated psychosis
- Personality disorders (antisocial, borderline, narcissistic, OC, schizotypal)
- ADHD
- Autism spectrum disorder
- Avoidant/restrictive food intake
- Disruptive mood dysregulation disorder
- Conduct disorder, oppositional defiant disorder
- Non-suicidal self-injury

Mood Disorders

Revisions
- Eliminate the grief exclusion criterion from MDD

New Disorders
- Mixed Anxiety/Depression
- PMDD
- Disruptive mood dysregulation disorder (child BP)

Field Trial Data
- Mixed anxiety/depression — “needs further study” though included in ICD-10, kappa < 0
- Clinicians worse at MDD dx now than 1990 (kappa = 0.25)
- Bipolar disorder kappa = 0.56
- PMDD kappa = 0.25
Anxiety Disorders

Revisions
- New Categories:
  - OCD & Related Disorders
  - Trauma & Stressor Related Disorders
- Trichotillomania now “Hair Pulling Disorder”

New Disorders
- Agoraphobia a separate, coded diagnosis
- Hoarding a separate, coded diagnosis

Field Trial Data
- GAD kappa = 0.2
- Hoarding (n = 17) but kappa = 0.6

OCD and Related Disorders

Disorders
- OCD
- Hair-Pulling Disorder
- Hoarding Disorder
- Skin Picking Disorder
- Body Dysmorphic Disorder

Rationale
- Obsessions and compulsive rituals differentiate OCD from other anxiety disorders.
- Data challenge hoarding ↔ OCD/OCPD relationship
- OCRD similar to OCD ➔ prominent obsessions & compulsive rituals (BDD), repetitive motoric behaviors like compulsions (hair pulling, skin picking)

Field Trial Data
- OCD kappa = 0.3

Trauma & Stressor Related Disorders

Disorders
- PTSD (adults & kids)
- Acute stress D/O
- Adjustment D/O
- Reactive attachment D/O
- Disinhibited social engagement D/O

PTSD Revisions
- Clearer definition of trauma (sexual assault, recurring exposure)
- Symptom clusters: re-experiencing, avoidance, negative cognitions/mood, arousal
- Eliminate acute, chronic features
- Subtypes: PTSD preschool, PTSD dissociative
- PTSD kappa = 0.7
Schizophrenia Spectrum & Other Psychotic Disorders

**Revisions**
- Schizophrenia threshold raised → 2 symptoms
- Must have delusions, hallucinations, or disorganized speech
- Subtypes removed.

**Field Trial Data**
- Schizophrenia $\kappa = .46$
- Schizoaffective disorder $\kappa = .5$
- Attenuated Psychosis Syndrome
  (individuals at increased risk for developing psychotic disorder) "needs more research" $\kappa = .46$

Somatic Symptom & Related Disorders

**Rationale**
- Significant diagnostic overlap & lack of defining boundaries between diagnoses

**Revisions**
- Somatic Symptom Disorder: somatic symptoms (no set #) + abnormal thoughts, feelings, & behaviors
- Hypochondriasis & Illness Anxiety Disorder
- Psychological factors affecting other medical conditions & factitious disorder

**Field Trial Data**
- Somatic Symptom Disorder $\kappa = .46$

Feeding & Eating Disorders

**Revisions**
- Pica, Rumination, Avoidant/Restrictive Food Eating (ED in child)
- Eliminate fear of gaining weight, amenorrhea from AN
- Binging only need occur 1x/week for BN

**New Disorders**
- Binge Eating Disorder $\kappa = .56$
- Avoidant/Restrictive Food Eating $\kappa = .48$
Sexual Dysfunction Disorders

Revisions
- Hypoactive Sexual Desire

New Disorders
- Sex addiction → Hypersexual Disorder (Appendix)
- Gender Dysphoria* in childhood & adult

*no “disorder” in the label

Neurodevelopmental Disorders

Revisions
- Autism Spectrum Disorder:
  Autistic Disorder, Asperger's, PDD, Childhood Disintegrative Disorder
  - Must show symptoms from childhood
  - Continuum
- ADHD: age of onset from 7 yrs to 12 yrs
- Motor Disorders: Tourette’s Tic disorders

Field Trial Data
- Autism kappa = .7
- ADHD kappa = .6

Substance Abuse & Addictive Disorders

Revisions
- Behavioral addictions: Gambling Disorder
- Substance abuse/dependence → Substance use dimension
  (mild → severe) subcategories: use, intoxication, withdrawal

Additions
- Substance-Induced Disorders
- Further research: Internet Gaming Disorder
- Caffeine use disorder
- Alcohol use disorder kappa = .4
Personality Disorders

Reasons for change
- Increase clinical utility & improve patient care
- Final decision not to make any changes

Field Trial Data
Borderline kappa = .5
Schizotypal & Narcissistic < 7 pts
Antisocial kappa = .2
OCPD kappa = .3

Personality Disorders

Revisions Proposed
- Evaluate a limited set of personality disorder types
  - antisocial
  - borderline
  - schizotypal
  - avoidant
  - narcissistic
  - OCD
- Assess core impairments in functioning
  Sense of self: identity, self-direction
  Interpersonal relationships: empathy, intimacy
- Overall measure of dysfunction severity

Categories and proposals
Controversies & Concerns
British Psychological Association (2011)
- Grief
- Psychosis risk syndrome
- Schizophrenia
- Social causes of mental illness
- Reductionism

APA Division 32:
Society for Humanistic Psychology
- Letter/petition of concern
  http://www.ipetitions.com/petition/dsm5/
- 14K signatures - professional societies & APA divisions
- Concerns:
  - Lowering thresholds
  - Vulnerable populations
  - Sociocultural variation
  - Reductionism
  - PD revisions

Research Domain Criteria
NIMH director, Thomas Insel
- More biologically based nosology of mental disorders incorporating genetics, imaging, etc.
- Said RDoC project will replace DSM -- "a first step towards precision medicine."

apa president, Jeffrey Lieberman
- got Insel to agree that DSM and ICD "remain the contemporary consensus standard to how mental disorders are diagnosed and treated," but "what may be realistically feasible today for practitioners is no longer sufficient for researchers."
Research Domain Criteria


RDoC classification rests on three assumptions:
1. Mental illnesses are brain disorders
2. Dysfunction in neural circuits can be identified with the tools of clinical neuroscience (electrophysiology, fMRI, PET, etc)
3. Data from genetics and clinical neuroscience will yield biosignatures that will augment clinical symptoms and signs for clinical management

Primary focus is on neural circuitry:

Cognition/ Emotion/ Behavior

---

Research Domain Criteria

NIMH & APA agree —

- "Laying the groundwork for a future diagnostic system that more directly reflects modern brain science, will require openness to rethinking traditional categories. It is increasingly evident that mental illness will be best understood as disorders of brain structure and function that implicate specific domains of cognition, emotion, and behavior."

- "DSM-5 and RDoC represent complementary, not competing, frameworks for this goal."

---

Question 1:
Will dimensional traits of disordered personalities increase stigma and labeling of patients?

---

ON HOLD UNTIL DSM-5.x
PDs in DSM-5
- Not much has changed.
- Still three clusters
- Goal was to apply a dimensional model to the categories.
- Dimensional model discussed in Section III and anticipated in future edition

Personality Disorders, Dimensions, & Traits
- Excessive heterogeneity in DSM-IV
  > 256 ways to meet criteria for BPD!
- Arbitrary boundaries between “disordered” & “normal” personality
- No consideration of personality itself—only Disorders
- Gender-laden values still permeate criteria
  - Relationship instability
  - Career flux
  - Coping strategies within oppressive society

Personality Disorders, Dimensions, & Traits
- DSM-IV does not systematically capture variations in personality that do not meet criteria for a disorder
  *But do variations that are not “disordered” require assessment?*
- DSM-5’s trait system assesses strengths and impairments along cognitive, self, emotional, behavioral, physical, interpersonal, occupational, and recreational dimensions
  *But does this aid diagnosis? Is it beneficent?*
Ethical Implications of Dimensions

- Traits ascribed to individuals who are otherwise healthy:
  - Risk of stigma
  - Medical misuse
  - Blurring the lines of normalcy
- Traits may be seen as prodromal or predisposing patient of full blown personality disorder
  - Analogous to biomarkers?
- Diagnostic creep/expansion of medical categories
- Important to note: Categories & traits not mutually exclusive

Question 2:

Will new categories of non-chemical addiction influence our understanding of free will and personal autonomy?

Ethical Implications

- Dimensional view of “use” versus categorical
- New criteria increases inclusion of people “at risk” for abuse
- Confusion between “addiction” and “use”
- There is choice in behavior
Pathological Gambling → Gambling D/O

- Connection with other addictions—neurological evidence, genetic evidence, etc.
- Lowering diagnostic threshold
  - Removal of criminal behavior criterion
  - "Is preoccupied with gambling" will be "Is often preoccupied with gambling," to clarify that one need not be obsessed with gambling all the time to meet this diagnostic criteria.
  - "Gambles as a way to escape from problems" will be "Gambles when feeling distressed."
- See National Center for Responsible Gaming (NCRG) white paper titled "The Evolving Definition of Pathological Gambling in the DSM-5."
  - http://www.ncrg.org/resources/white-papers

Question 3:

What has been the impact of advocacy or interest groups in shaping the new nosology?

Ethical Implications

"Major family support groups such as NAMI have expressed concern that this research [attenuated psychosis] continue so that early identification of children at risk for psychoses and non-pharmacologic interventions including cognitive behavioral therapy and Omega-3 Fatty Acids be made available to prevent the toxic effects of psychoses on the brains of developing children and adolescents." – APA

- Is a diagnosis determined by science or social opinion?
- What place is there for prevention in setting diagnostic criteria?
Ethical Implications

“We are trying to make diagnostic criteria more accurate to better describe the symptoms and behaviors of people who are currently seeking clinical help.” APA

- Are diagnoses determined by the symptoms with which patients present?
- Are these changes truly beneficent? For individuals? For society?

DSM-5 is...

...an opportunity to put into practice some of the ethical and philosophical lessons reviewed today

...a challenge to clinicians and researchers to understand and translate the point of categories to answer critics and educate public

Solutions

- Classification and reclassification should continue to be a transparent and semi-democratic process
- Be up front about values, evidence, and uncertainty
- Emphasis on goal of classification: the relief of human suffering
Determining Disorders Democratically

Underlying principle: to engage the broader public on issues related to DSM revisions.

Three Open commentary periods via DSM5.org

Thousands of comments were received from patients, advocacy groups, professional societies, and the general public.

Feedback & Commenting

Ethical Issues

“Major family support groups such as NAMI have expressed concern that this research (attenuated psychosis) continue so that early identification of children at risk for psychoses and non-pharmacologic interventions including cognitive behavioral therapy and Omega-3 Fatty Acids be made available to prevent the toxic effects of psychoses on the brains of developing children and adolescents.” – APA

- Should a mental health diagnosis be determined by science, a vote, or both?
- What if any other field of medicine—say oncology—held their nosology up for social commentary?
Autism Speaks & ASD’s
- Asperger’s inclusion under Autism Spectrum Disorders
- Autism Speaks, in an open letter to the Work Group, accepted the scientific bases for the proposed changes
- Concerns about “real-world” impact of the new nosology on patients & families (insurance reimbursement, special education eligibility, other support services)

Should these pragmatic concerns influence the classification of Asperger’s?

NAMI & Psychosis risk syndrome
- NAMI is committed philosophically to the medical model of mental illness
- Initially supportive of controversial diagnostic expansion of psychosis
- The DSM-5 Work Group ultimately withdrew inclusion of psychosis risk syndrome

Illustrates the profound effect of a group’s philosophical position on psychiatric nosology—that all mental illnesses are forms of biological function analogous to diabetes or asthma

B4U-ACT & Pedophilia
- To publicly promote services and resources for self-identified individuals (adults and adolescents) who are sexually attracted to children and seek such assistance; to educate mental health providers regarding the approaches helpful for such individuals; to develop a pool of providers in Maryland who agree to serve these individuals and abide by B4U-ACT’s Principles and Perspectives of Practice; and to educate the citizens of Maryland regarding issues faced by these individuals

Further refine pedophilia → Hebephilia (attraction to pubescent minors aged 11-14)

Concerned that “hebephilic” desires:
- Inappropriately labeled as pathological
- Individuals expressing such desires will be improperly stigmatized or detained under involuntary civil commitment laws
Observations

- Advocacy groups vary in their influence
- Unclear how the DSM-5 task force has incorporated public feedback and commentary.
- Questions remain about the degree to which democratic processes should influence a process that aims to be evidence-based.

The Optics

How Will The DSM Revision Process Affect Public Perceptions Of Behavioral Healthcare? How Will This Affect Access To Care?

Issues of public outcry

Medicalization of "normal life processes" (grief)
"Excuse making" for bad behavior (e.g., nonchemical addictions)
- Issue in Health Reform
- Public funds for "treating" sex, internet, gambling addiction

Conflict of interest & influence of pharma on DSM
- Policies in place to minimize potential effect
DSM-5 is...

...an opportunity to put into practice some of the ethical and philosophical lessons of history, when medical labeling went horribly wrong.

...an important exercise in developing a system by which both science and social values can transparently coexist.

...a challenge to clinicians to understand and translate the point of categories to answer critics and educate public

Ethical Solutions

- Classification and reclassification should continue to be a transparent and semi-democratic process
- Be clear about values, evidence, & uncertainty

Focus on the goal of all medical classification systems: The relief of human suffering