VERSION 1

JUN 06, 2020

OPEN ACCESS

DOI:
[dx.doi.org/10.17504/protocols.io.bf3hj6](https://doi.org/10.17504/protocols.io.bf3hj6)

External link:
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0234047>

Protocol Citation: Ka-young Ban, D Osborn, Y Hameed, S Pandey, J Perez, PB Jones, JB Kirkbride 2020. Personality disorder in an Early Intervention Psychosis cohort: Findings from the Social Epidemiology of Psychoses in East Anglia (SEPEA) study. **protocols.io**
<https://dx.doi.org/10.17504/protocols.io.bf3hj6>

MANUSCRIPT CITATION:
 Ban K, Osborn DPJ, Hameed Y, Pandey S, Perez J, Jones PB, Kirkbride JB (2020) Personality disorder in an Early Intervention Psychosis cohort: Findings from the Social Epidemiology of Psychoses in East Anglia (SEPEA) study. PLoS ONE 15(6): e0234047. doi: [10.1371/journal.pone.0234047](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0234047)

Personality disorder in an Early Intervention Psychosis cohort: Findings from the Social Epidemiology of Psychoses in East Anglia (SEPEA) study V.1

PLOS One

Ka-young Ban¹, D Osborn^{1,2}, Y Hameed³, S Pandey³, Perez^{4,5}, PB Jones^{4,5}, JB Kirkbride¹

¹University College London, University of London;

²Camden and Islington NHS Foundation Trust, UK;

³Norfolk & Suffolk Foundation Trust, Norwich, Norfolk, UK;

⁴University of Cambridge;

⁵Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Foundation Trust, and NIHR Collaboration for Leadership in Applied Health Research and Care (CLAHRC) East of England, Cambridge, Cambridgeshire, UK

Ka-young Ban

License: This is an open access protocol distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited

Protocol status: Working

Created: May 06, 2020

Last Modified: Jun 06, 2020

PROTOCOL integer ID:
36681

Keywords: Personality disorder, Early Intervention in Psychosis, Prevalence, Cohort study

ABSTRACT

Aim: Personality Disorders (PD) often share clinical and phenomenological overlap with psychotic disorders, especially at onset. However, there is little research on comorbid PD among people experiencing first episode psychosis. We examined the prevalence of PD recording and its sociodemographic and clinical correlates in people accepted to Early Intervention in Psychosis (EIP) services.

Methods: Participants were aged 16-35, accepted into 6 EIP services for suspected psychosis, as part of the Social Epidemiology of Psychoses in East Anglia (SEPEA) study. PD was recorded by clinicians according to ICD-10. Multilevel logistic regression was performed.

Results: Of 798 participants, 76 people (9.5%) received a clinical diagnosis of PD, with emotionally unstable PD (75.0%, N=57) the most common subtype. In multivariable analysis, risk factors for PD included female sex (odds ratio [OR]: 3.4; 95% CI: 2.0-5.7), absence of psychotic disorder after acceptance to EIP (OR: 3.0; 95% CI: 1.6-5.5), more severe hallucinations (OR: 1.6; 95% CI: 1.2-2.1), and lower parental SES (OR: 1.4; 95% CI: 1.1-1.8). Compared with the white British, black and minority ethnic groups were less likely to receive a PD diagnosis (OR: 0.3; 95% CI: 0.1-0.7). There was no association between PD and neighbourhood-level deprivation or population-density.

Conclusions: Recording of a PD diagnosis was three times more common amongst participants later found not to meet threshold criteria for psychotic disorder, implying phenomenological overlap at referral which highlights difficulties encountered in accurate diagnostic assessment, treatment and onward referral. People with PD experienced more individual-level, but not neighbourhood-level social disadvantage in an already disadvantaged sample.