Clinical utility of the Alternative Model for Personality Disorders DSM-5: A Randomized Controlled Trial

Published: 19-02-2021
Last updated: 15-05-2024

We will compare the AMPD model to the traditional (Section II) PD model with regard to patients* and clinicians* experience of the clinical utility of both models. As the AMPD model was designed to improve clinical utility, we expect that both…

Ethical review	Approved WMO
Status	Recruitment stopped
Health condition type	Personality disorders and disturbances in behaviour
Study type	Interventional

Summary

ID

NL-OMON50957

Source
ToetsingOnline

Brief title
Clinical utility of the AMPD

Condition

- Personality disorders and disturbances in behaviour

Synonym
character pathology, Personality problems

Research involving
Human

Sponsors and support

Primary sponsor: Psychotherapeutisch Centrum De Viersprong (Halsteren)
Source(s) of monetary or material Support: De Viersprong

Intervention

Keyword: AMPD, assessment, Clinical utility, Personality disorders

Outcome measures

Primary outcome

The primary outcome is clinical utility as assessed by patients and clinicians (clinical utility questionnaire - patient and clinician version).

Secondary outcome

Secondary outcomes are outcome expectancy (expectancy for future treatment scale), satisfaction (Client satisfcation questionnaire), perceived benefits of the assessment (assessment questionnaire), motivation for treatment (motivation for treatment questionnaire) and an existing 6-item clinical utility scale for clinicians.

Study description

Background summary

The traditional section II on Personality Disorder (PD) model has been contested for its limited validity and lack of clinical utility. To counter these shortcomings, DSM-5 has introduced in its section III an Alternative Model for Personality Disorders (AMPD). Previous AMPD studies have focused on separate criteria of the new model, e.g. by designing new instruments to assess sections of the AMPD. No studies have investigated the full AMPD assessment procedure and compared it to the existing, traditional DSM-5 PD assessment. This project will compare both assessment procedures (traditional/categorical (Section II) versus alternative/dimensional (Section III)) with regard to different aspects of clinical utility, from both a patient and clinician perspective.

Study objective

We will compare the AMPD model to the traditional (Section II) PD model with regard to patients* and clinicians* experience of the clinical utility of both

models. As the AMPD model was designed to improve clinical utility, we expect that both patients and clinicians will report stronger clinical utility for the AMPD assessment procedure.

Study design

Randomized Controlled Trial. Patients referred to de Viersprong for assessment and treatment will be randomly assigned to a traditional versus AMPD assessment procedure. Both procedures are comparable in terms of their multi-method approach and length of assessment and both have been manualized and approved by international experts. After having finished the assessment procedure, patients will complete a clinical utility questionnaire as well as questionnaires concerning process variables like satisfaction, motivation, and treatment readiness. Likewise, clinicians who will treat these patients, will assess the assessment report for clinical utility regarding the treatment to come.

Intervention

In the traditional assessment procedure patients will have an intake consult with a clinician and the SCID-5-P will be administered (i.e., assessment as usual). In the AMPD admission procedure patients will be interviewed by a clinician and the STiP 5.1 and SCID-AMPD-II will be administered.

Study burden and risks

Burden will be minimal. Number of sessions will be the same in both conditions and also similar to the present standard assessment procedure (3 sessions). Patients will be asked to complete questionnaires at the end of the assessment procedure; an additional visit to the site is not necessary. Both groups will receive DSM-5 diagnoses (when applicable), according to the respective model. No impact is to be expected for treatment assignment.

Contacts

Public
Psychotherapeutisch Centrum De Viersprong (Halsteren)

De Beeklaan 2
Halsteren 4661EP
NL
Scientific
Psychotherapeutisch Centrum De Viersprong (Halsteren)

De Beeklaan 2

Halsteren 4661EP
NL

Trial sites

Listed location countries

Netherlands

Eligibility criteria

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

Inclusion criteria

In order to be eligible to participate in this study, a subject must meet all of the following criteria (inclusion criteria are similar to the general criteria used in screening referrals at de Viersprong, all patients that are screened and eligible for an admission procedure at de Viersprong will be included):
(Presumed) personality disordered

Exclusion criteria

- IQ below 80
- Acute Psychotic disorder

Study design

Design

Study type: Interventional

Masking:	Single blinded (masking used)
Control:	Uncontrolled

Primary purpose: Diagnostic

Recruitment

NL
Recruitment status: Recruitment stopped

Start date (anticipated): 12-01-2022

Enrollment: 128

Type: Actual

Ethics review

Approved WMO
Date: 19-02-2021

Application type: First submission

Review commission: METC Amsterdam UMC

Study registrations

Followed up by the following (possibly more current) registration

No registrations found.

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

ID: 25774
Source: NTR
Title:

In other registers

Register	ID
CCMO	NL75676.018.20
OMON	NL-OMON25774