

1 **Clinician perspectives on what constitutes good**
2 **practice in community services for people with**
3 **Complex Emotional Needs: A qualitative thematic**
4 **meta-synthesis**

5

6 Authors:

7 Jordan Troup¹, Billie Lever Taylor², Luke Sheridan Rains³, Eva Broeckelmann⁴, Jessica Russell⁴, Tamar

8 Jeynes⁴, Chris Cooper⁵, Thomas Steare³, Zainab Dedat³, Shirley McNicholas⁶, Sian Oram⁷, Oliver

9 Dale⁸, Sonia Johnson^{3,6}

10

11 1 - Health Service and Population Research Department, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology &

12 Neuroscience, King's College London

13 2 - Division of Psychiatry, University College London

14 3 - NIHR Mental Health Policy Research Unit, Division of Psychiatry, University College London

15 4 - NIHR Mental Health Policy Research Unit Complex Emotional Needs Lived Experience Working

16 Group, Health Service and Population Research Department, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology &

17 Neuroscience, King's College London

18 5 - Department of Clinical, Educational and Health Psychology, University College London

19 6 – Camden and Islington NHS Foundation Trust, London

20 7 – NIHR Mental Health Policy Research Unit, Health Service and Population Research Department,

21 Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology & Neuroscience, King's College London

22 8 – West London Mental Health Trust, London

23

24 **Abstract**

25 **Introduction**

26 The need to improve the quality of community mental health services for people with
27 Complex Emotional Needs (CEN) is recognised internationally and has become a renewed policy
28 priority in England. Such improvement requires positive engagement from clinicians across the
29 service system, and their perspectives on achieving good practice need to be understood.

30 **Aim**

31 To synthesise qualitative evidence on clinician perspectives on what constitutes good
32 practice, and what helps or prevents it being achieved, in community mental health services for
33 people with CEN.

34 **Methods**

35 Six bibliographic databases were searched for studies published since 2003 and
36 supplementary citation tracking was conducted. Studies that used any recognised qualitative
37 method and reported clinician experiences and perspectives on community-based mental health
38 services for adults with CEN were eligible for this review, including generic and specialist settings.
39 Meta-synthesis was used to generate and synthesise over-arching themes across included studies.

40 **Results**

41 Twenty-nine papers were eligible for inclusion. Six over-arching themes were identified: 1.
42 The use and misuse of diagnosis; 2. The patient journey into services: nowhere to go; 3. Therapeutic
43 relationships: connection and distance; 4. The nature of treatment: not doing too much or too little;
44 5. Managing safety issues and crises: being measured and proactive; 6. Clinician and wider service
45 needs: whose needs are they anyway? The overall quality of the evidence was moderate.

46 **Discussion**

47 Through summarising the literature on clinician perspectives on good practice for people
48 with CEN, over-arching priorities were identified on which there appears to be substantial
49 consensus. In their focus on needs such as for a long-term perspective on treatment journeys, high
50 quality and consistent therapeutic relationships, and a balanced approach to safety, clinician
51 priorities are mainly congruent with those found in studies on service user views. They also identify
52 clinician needs that should be met for good care to be provided, including for supervision, joint
53 working and organisational support.

54 Introduction

55 The global prevalence of “personality disorder” in the community is estimated to be around
56 7.8%⁽¹⁾. This increases to between 40 and 92% among people who use community secondary mental
57 health care services in Europe⁽²⁾. High rates of comorbidity with other mental health conditions have
58 been identified^(3, 4) and people with comorbid conditions appear to have particularly high inpatient
59 and involuntary service use and poor outcomes^(5, 6). High rates of comorbid physical conditions have
60 also been found⁽⁷⁻⁹⁾ and evidence suggests shorter life expectancies⁽¹⁰⁾. Impacts on quality of life are
61 comparable to serious somatic illness⁽¹¹⁾ and a substantial economic cost has been found for health
62 and social care services and society more generally^(12, 13).

63 The value of “personality disorder” as a diagnostic category is still contested⁽¹⁴⁻¹⁶⁾. It arguably
64 provides a basis for clear explanations for service users and reliable categorisation for research.
65 However, it is also criticised as potentially misogynist, and as associated with a heavy burden of
66 stigma that is likely to be difficult to dispel, and with a lack of progress in improving care⁽¹⁷⁾. The
67 papers included in this review largely use the term “personality disorder”, but given the gravity of
68 critiques, we choose instead to use the alternative term that has recently come into use to identify
69 the cluster of needs that may lead to a “personality disorder” diagnosis - complex emotional needs
70 (CEN).

71 In the UK, care provided for people with CEN has recurrently been described as of very
72 variable and often poor quality⁽¹⁸⁾. In 2003, new policy guidance was published aimed at greatly
73 increasing provision of specialist services and improving training and support in generic services^{(19,}
74 ²⁰⁾. The number of mental health Trusts providing dedicated services increased fivefold over the
75 following decade, but a national survey in 2015 found persisting deficits in access to specialist
76 therapies and to a full spectrum of biopsychosocial interventions, and it remained unclear as to
77 whether overall quality of care had improved⁽¹⁸⁾. Improving care for people with CEN has since
78 become a renewed priority in England⁽²¹⁻²³⁾. The need to improve quality of care, reduce stigma and

79 deliver effective treatments for CEN is recognised internationally⁽²⁴⁾, with formulation of policies and
80 guidelines in various countries aimed at improving care^(25, 26).

81 Policy focus on improving CEN care has been accompanied by growing evidence that there
82 are effective psychological treatment options for CEN⁽²⁷⁻³²⁾, but that the translation of policy and
83 evidence into service provision has been slow⁽³³⁾. Service users and clinicians have been found to
84 agree that access to specialist services and psychological interventions, interventions to reduce
85 stigma in services, access to specialist consultation services for generic mental health staff, and
86 positive risk management are priorities, but these do not appear to be widely reflected in service
87 provision⁽³⁴⁾.

88 As well as lack of resources, clinician-related barriers to service improvement have
89 repeatedly been found. Stigma related to “personality disorder” diagnosis has recurrently been
90 identified among clinicians: feeling powerless to be helpful, perceived un-treatability,
91 preconceptions about patients and poor CEN understanding have been identified as contributors to
92 this stigma^(33, 35). Unmet training needs and lack of a clear framework are reported to contribute to
93 negative experiences of working with people with CEN⁽³⁶⁾. These do not, however, appear inevitable
94 consequences of working with CEN: in a relatively well-resourced specialist “personality disorder”
95 service setting, Crawford et al.⁽³⁷⁾ reported relatively low levels of clinician burnout and good
96 satisfaction among staff working with people with CEN. Thus, understanding the perspectives,
97 experiences and attitudes of clinicians and the conditions that allow them to work effectively and
98 without excessive burnout with people with CEN is a crucial element in informing next steps for
99 improving service provision.

100 The aim of this review was to synthesise existing qualitative evidence on clinician
101 perspectives on what constitutes good practice in community mental health settings for people with
102 CEN, and how this could be achieved. Objectives included conducting a systematic search of the
103 literature, conducting a meta-synthesis of qualitative data, and assessing the quality of the evidence.

104 This review is part of a broader programme of work conducted by the NIHR Mental Health Policy
105 Research Unit to inform the development of NHS England specialist pathways and to strengthen the
106 evidence base for service development in this field nationally and internationally. Other reviews
107 include a synthesis of qualitative literature on service user perspectives on good practice⁽³⁸⁾, systematic
108 reviews on treatment effectiveness and cost-effectiveness⁽³⁹⁾ and a study of service typologies.

109 **Methods**

110 **Information sources and search strategy**

111 The review team developed the protocol in line with PRISMA guidelines⁽⁴⁰⁾ and guidance on
112 qualitative meta-syntheses⁽⁴¹⁾ in collaboration with a project-specific working group of lived-
113 experience researchers and subject experts. The protocol was registered prospectively on PROSPERO
114 (CRD42019145615), as was the protocol for the wider programme of work (CRD42019131834).

115 One search strategy was developed for all the reviews in the programme (see Appendix A).
116 Search terms were built around key words and subject headings relevant to CEN and related needs,
117 community mental health services, and eligible study designs including qualitative, quantitative and
118 guidelines. Comprehensive searches were conducted of MEDLINE (January 2003 - December 2019),
119 Embase (January 2003 - December 2019), HMIC (January 2003 - December 2019), Social Policy and
120 Practice (January 2003 - December 2019), CINAHL (January 2003 - December 2019) and ASSIA
121 (January 2003 - January 2019). No limits were placed on the language or country, and a limit of 2003
122 or later was placed on the date to capture perspectives of greater contemporary relevance.

123 Citations retrieved during searches were collated in Endnote, a reference management
124 software, and duplicates were removed. Titles and abstracts were double screened by two NIHR
125 Mental Health Policy Research Unit researchers for all the reviews together and full text screening
126 was performed on potentially eligible papers for this review. Supplementary searching included a
127 call for evidence publicised via the study team's networks, relevant professional associations and
128 social media, forward and backward citation tracing of included articles, and reference lists of other
129 relevant systematic reviews found in an additional systematic review search of EMBASE and
130 MEDLINE (January 2003 - November 2019). Grey literature was identified through web searches and
131 the above bibliographic database search. All included studies and 20% of those excluded were
132 double screened, and discussion with senior reviewers achieved consensus.

133 **Eligibility criteria**

134 Studies using recognised qualitative data collection and analysis methods to explore clinician
135 perspectives on good practice in community mental health services for people with CEN were
136 included. Studies were eligible if they reported the relevant perspectives of any mental health
137 professional with experience of working with people with CEN or related needs (e.g., recurrent self-
138 harm). Eligible settings were community-based mental health services, including mental health care
139 in primary care settings, generic community mental health teams, and specialist services for people
140 with CEN. Residential, forensic, or crisis services, or specialist services for different conditions were
141 excluded. Papers were excluded if the service target population were primarily below the age of 16,
142 unless focussing on transition into adult services. Published and grey literature were eligible, except
143 for case studies, dissertations and theses. (See Appendix B for full eligibility criteria). Most of the
144 papers used “personality disorder” to describe the sample, but here we use the term CEN in view of
145 the contentious nature of the “personality disorder” diagnosis.

146 **Quality assessment and analysis**

147 Study characteristics were extracted into a Microsoft Excel form. The Critical Appraisal Skills
148 Programme (CASP) Qualitative Checklist⁽⁴²⁾ was used to perform quality assessments. Study quality
149 was not used to determine eligibility but is reported below. Text from results sections of included
150 articles was entered verbatim into the coding software NVivo for thematic meta-synthesis⁽⁴¹⁾ and
151 linked to individual study characteristics such as types of clinicians, services, and interventions. For
152 stage one, articles were coded line-by-line by one of two researchers and 20% of papers were
153 double coded to produce an initial framework. A descriptive thematic framework emerged from
154 further discussion between the two researchers for stage two, iteratively developed as codes were
155 merged and grouped hierarchically. Finally, analytic themes were generated to address the research
156 question for stage three. Analysis was finalised collaboratively by a small team of reviewers and

157 experts by experience and occupation. The analysis process included considering whether there

158 were sub-group differences related to major study characteristics such as country of publication.

159

160 **Results**

161 A total of 29 papers (drawing on 27 unique datasets) were eligible for inclusion^(37, 43-70) (Fig
162 1), representing perspectives from at least 550 clinicians. Clinicians represented a variety of
163 professions and included psychologists, social workers, psychiatric nurses, occupational therapists,
164 psychiatrists, family doctors (known as General Practitioners or ‘GPs’ in the UK) and counsellors
165 (Table 1). They worked in a range of settings from primary through tertiary (non-residential) care
166 and offered anything from specific interventions (e.g., Dialectical Behavioural Therapy,
167 Mentalisation-Based Interventions, Cognitive Analytic Therapy, etc.) to more general and varied
168 support. While we use the term “CEN”, service users in most included studies were identified as
169 having “personality disorder” or “borderline personality disorder”.

170 **Fig. 1. PRISMA Diagram**

171 [insert figure 1 – PRISMA diagram]

172 **Table 1. Study Characteristics**

<i>First Author, Year. Title.</i>	<i>Data collection</i>	<i>Service / setting, Location</i>	<i>Target population</i>	<i>Intervention if applicable</i>
<i>Clinician type</i> <i>Sample size</i>				
<i>Bosanac, 2015.⁽⁴³⁾ Mentalization-based intervention to recurrent acute presentations and self-harm in a community mental health service setting.</i>				
Case managers: psychiatric nurses and occupational therapists N = 8	Five 3-monthly focus groups of 3-5 clinicians	Community mental health service, Australia	8 female service users diagnosed with 'BPD' (DSM-IV) and <7 on DIB-R.	MBI
<i>Carmel, 2014.⁽⁴⁴⁾ Barriers and solutions to implementing dialectical behavior therapy in a public behavioral health system.</i>				
Clinicians NS N = 19/34	Structured phone interviews	Community mental health and substance abuse agencies within a public behavioral health system, Northern California	People with 'BPD'	DBT
<i>Crawford, 2007.⁽⁴⁶⁾ Learning the lessons: a multi-method evaluation of dedicated community-based services for people with personality disorder.</i>				
Service managers, front-line clinicians (range), referrers, commissioners. N = 89 service providers, 26 referrers, 13 commissioners from across all 11 dedicated services.	Comprehensive evaluation including in-depth qualitative interviews	11 'Pilot' dedicated services, England	People with 'PD' – range of criteria across services	Range – psychotherapeutic, social, occupational
<i>Crawford, 2007.⁽⁴⁵⁾ Lessons learned from an evaluation of dedicated community-based services for people with personality disorder. See Crawford 2007a, above</i>				
<i>Crawford, 2010.⁽⁴⁷⁾ Job satisfaction and burnout among staff working in community-based personality disorder services.</i>				
Service managers and 'front-line' clinicians: therapists, psychotherapists, nurses, psychologists, social workers, psychiatrists, occupational therapists, art therapists, support workers, and employed service users. N = 89 from across all 11 dedicated services	Comprehensive evaluation including in-depth qualitative interviews	11 'Pilot' dedicated services, England	People with 'PD'	Range: psychotherapeutic, social, occupational
<i>Donald, 2017.⁽⁴⁷⁾ Clinician perspectives on recovery and borderline personality disorder.</i>				
Social workers, nurses, psychologists, one psychiatry registrar and one consultant psychiatrist N = 16	Interviews	Clinicians mostly from one specialist service, and two from a generalist service, Australia	People with 'PD' / 'BPD'	Range
<i>Fanaian, 2013.⁽⁴⁸⁾ Improving services for people with personality disorders: Views of experienced clinicians.</i>				
Recognised specialists and experts in 'PD' N = 60	Written group responses to one question during clinical and scientific meeting	Range of public and private services across Australia	NA	NA
<i>French, 2019.⁽⁴⁹⁾ GPs' views and experiences of managing patients with personality disorder: a qualitative interview study.</i>				

General practitioners N = 15	Phone interviews with topic schedule	GP Practices, West of England	People suspected by GP to have 'PD'	NA
<i>Herschell, 2009.⁽⁵⁰⁾ Understanding community mental health administrators' perspectives on dialectical behavior therapy implementation.</i>				
Mental health service administrators N = 13 from 9/10 participating organisations	Semi-structured phone interviews	Ten provider organisations partnered with a large non-profit managed behavioral health organization, Pennsylvania	Primarily people with 'BPD', some other disorders	DBT
<i>Hogard, 2010.⁽⁵¹⁾ An evaluation of a managed clinical network for personality disorder: breaking new ground or top dressing?</i>				
Network staff from across multiple agencies with diverse backgrounds, including psychotherapy, occupational therapy, and advocacy N = All staff from network	Semi-structured interviews	A managed clinical network for 'PD', England	People with a diagnosis of 'PD'	NA
<i>Hutton, 2017.⁽⁵²⁾ Switching roles: a qualitative study of staff experiences of being dialectical behaviour therapists within the National Health Service in England.</i>				
Clinicians from 3 DBT teams: social workers, community psychiatric nurses and clinical psychologists N = 6/24 from all 3 teams	Semi-structured interviews	3 DBT teams within 1 Trust (alongside secondary care service roles), England	People with difficulties associated with 'BPD'	DBT
<i>Koekkoek, 2009.⁽⁵³⁾ Clinical problems in community mental health care for patients with severe borderline personality disorder.</i>				
Expert mental health professionals from different disciplines, different treatment locations, and different educational backgrounds, with expertise on treatment for people with 'BPD' and at least 3 years experience N = 8	Focus group	Experts had at least some experience with the specialised treatment of such patients, but worked in a general setting	Severe 'BPD' (DSM-IV)	NA
<i>Lamph, 2019.⁽⁵⁴⁾ Personality disorder co-morbidity in primary care 'Improving Access to Psychological Therapy' services: A qualitative study exploring professionals' perspectives of working with this patient group.</i>				
Trained and trainee psychological wellbeing practitioners, high intensity cognitive behavioural therapist, clinical psychologists, clinical leaders and IAPT clinical service managers N = 28	Interviews	IAPT in 2 localities (primary care), England	People with CMD and co-morbid 'PD'	IAPT interventions e.g., CBT
<i>Langley, 2005.⁽⁵⁵⁾ Trust as a foundation for the therapeutic intervention for patients with borderline personality disorder.</i>				
Multidisciplinary clinicians with extensive experience in the management of 'BPD' in both private and public systems: psychiatrists, psychiatric nurses, a psychiatric social worker, a clinical psychologist and a counselling psychologist N = 10	Individual interviews or focus group	Psychiatric Community Services, South Africa	People with 'PD' (DSM-IV)	NA
<i>Lee, 2008.⁽⁵⁶⁾ A pilot personality disorder outreach service: development, findings and lessons learnt.</i>				
Consultant psychiatrists	Semi-structured	Pilot 'PD' outreach service	People with 'BPD' (SAP)	MBI / psychodynamic

	interviews	(secondary care), England		
N = Unclear. 13 SUs in case series element, unknown number of psychiatrists from across 8 teams, from which 2 were selected for outreach service.				
<i>Morant, 2003.⁽⁵⁷⁾ A multi-perspective evaluation of a specialist outpatient service for people with personality disorders.</i>				
Referrers to service: consultant psychiatrists, social workers, one clinical psychologist, one substance misuse worker, and one clinical nurse specialist	Multi-perspective / multi-method evaluation including semi-structured interviews	Specialist 'PD' outreach service (clinicians primarily from CMHTs), England	People with moderate to severe 'PD'	Individual treatment (cognitive therapy), Group psychotherapy (psychodynamic), Art psychotherapy (group)
N = 12				
<i>O'Connell, 2013.⁽⁵⁸⁾ Community psychiatric nurses' experiences of caring for clients with borderline personality disorder.</i>				
Psychiatric nurses	Interviews	CMHT (secondary care), Ireland	People with 'BPD'	
N = 10				
<i>Perseius, 2003.⁽⁶⁰⁾ Treatment of suicidal and deliberate self-harming patients with borderline personality disorder using dialectical behavioral therapy: the patients' and the therapists' perceptions.</i>				
DBT therapists: a psychiatrist, a registered nurse, and cognitive psychotherapists	Individual free-format questionnaire and group interview	DBT Team, Sweden	People with 'BPD' or related symptoms	DBT
N = 4/4				
<i>Perseius, 2007.⁽⁵⁹⁾ Stress and burnout in psychiatric professionals when starting to use dialectical behavioural therapy in the work with young self-harming women showing borderline personality symptoms.</i>				
Physicians, psychologists, registered nurses, mental health care assistants and one occupational therapist	An individual open question, free text answer questionnaire and a group interview (and burnout inventory)	DBT Team, Sweden	Women with 'BPD'	DBT
N = 22				
<i>Pigot, 2019.⁽⁶¹⁾ Barriers and facilitators to the implementation of a stepped care intervention for personality disorder in mental health services.</i>				
Mental health clinicians and managers actively involved in the intervention	Semi-structured interview	Publicly funded open access provider of health and medical services, Australia	People with 'PD', particularly 'BPD'	Stepped-care approach
N = 21/46				
<i>Priest, 2011.⁽⁶²⁾ How can mental health professionals best be supported in working with people who experience significant distress?</i>				
Social workers, nurses, occupational therapists, psychiatrists, psychologists and support workers	Focus groups	CMHTs and CSMT (secondary care), England	CMHT case load / People with 'PD' / NA people who experience 'significant distress'	
N = 26				
<i>Rizq, 2012.⁽⁶³⁾ 'There's always this sense of failure': an interpretative phenomenological analysis of primary care counsellors' experiences of working with the borderline client.</i>				
Experienced counsellors (senior practitioners)	Semi-structured	Primary care, England	People with 'BPD' (clinician	NA

	interviews		judgement)	
N = 5				
<i>Stalker, 2005.⁽⁶⁴⁾ It is a horrible term for someone': service user and provider perspectives on 'personality disorder'.</i>				
Psychiatrists, three community psychiatric nurses, one clinical psychologist, one senior social worker and one senior occupational therapist, managers and an administrator	Interviews	CMHTs through Mental Health Resource Centres, Scotland	People with 'PD'	NA
N = 12				
<i>Stroud, 2013.⁽⁶⁵⁾ Working with borderline personality disorder: A small-scale qualitative investigation into community psychiatric nurses' constructs of borderline personality disorder.</i>				
Community psychiatric nurses	Semi-structured interviews	CMHT, Wales	People with 'BPD'	NA
N = 4				
<i>Sulzer, 2016.⁽⁶⁶⁾ Improving patient-centered communication of the borderline personality disorder diagnosis.</i>				
Psychiatrists, Psychologists, Clinical Social Workers and BPD activists	Semi-structured interviews	Clinicians from 11 states, America	People with 'BPD'	NA
N = 32				
<i>Thompson, 2008.⁽⁶⁷⁾ Multidisciplinary community mental health team staff's experience of a 'skills level' training course in cognitive analytic therapy.</i>				
All eligible clinicians: social workers and community psychiatric nurses	Structured, open-ended interviews	CMHT (secondary care), UK	People with complex needs e.g., people presenting with features of 'PD'	CAT
N = 12				
<i>Vyas, 2017.⁽⁶⁸⁾ Working in a therapeutic community: exploring the impact on staff. Therapeutic Communities: The International Journal of Therapeutic Communities.</i>				
Clinicians working in a TC	Semi-structured interviews	A long-standing TC, UK	People with 'EUPD' / 'emotional instability'	CAT / MBT
N = 8				
<i>Wilson, 2018.⁽⁶⁹⁾ Experiences of parenting and clinical intervention for mothers affected by personality disorder: a pilot qualitative study combining parent and clinician perspectives.</i>				
Referring CAMHS clinicians	Semi-structured interviews	Four CAMHS teams referred into the Helping Families Programme	Mothers with 'PD' who had a child (living with them) aged 3–11 years with a behavioural and/or emotional disorder	Helping Families Programme – parenting and clinical intervention
N = 5				
<i>Włodarczyk, 2018.⁽⁷⁰⁾ Exploring General Practitioners' Views and Experiences of Providing Care to People with Borderline Personality Disorder in Primary Care: A Qualitative Study in Australia.</i>				
Any currently practicing GPs	Focus groups	Primary care, Australia	People with 'BPD'	NA
N = 12				

173 Abbreviations: NS = Not Specified. BPD = Borderline Personality Disorder. DSM-IV = Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Health Disorders Version 4. DIB-R =
174 Diagnostic Interview for Borderline Patients – Revised. MBI/MBT – Mentalisation Based Intervention / Therapy. DBT = Dialectical Behavioural Therapy. PD = Personality
175 Disorder. GP = General Practitioner. IAPT = Improving Access to Psychological Therapies. CMD = Common Mental Disorders. CBT = Cognitive Behavioural Therapy. SU =
176 Service User. SAP = Standardised Assessment of Personality. CMHT = Community Mental Health Team. CSMT = Community Substance Misuse Team. CAT = Cognitive Analytic
177 Therapy. TC = Therapeutic Community. EUPD = Emotionally Unstable Personality Disorder. CAMHS = Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service.

178 Quality appraisal indicated that the majority of studies appropriately used qualitative
179 methodology (n=28), employed an appropriate research design (n=28), and described clear findings
180 (n=28). Most studies also presented clear aims (n=27) and used appropriate data collection methods
181 (n=26). However, a number of papers did not provide enough information to determine whether the
182 data analysis was sufficiently rigorous (n=6), whether the recruitment strategy was appropriate
183 (n=11), nor whether ethical issues had been sufficiently considered (n=12). Only 5 papers in total
184 adequately considered the relationship between researcher and participants (Table 2).

185

Table 2. Quality assessment according to the Critical Appraisal Skills Programme

First Author, Year.	1. Was there a clear statement of the aims of the research?	2. Is a qualitative methodology appropriate?	3. Was the research design appropriate to address the aims of the research?	4. Was the recruitment strategy appropriate to the aims of the research?	5. Was the data collected in a way that addressed the research issue?	6. Has the relationship between researcher and participants been adequately considered?	7. Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?	8. Was the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	9. Is there a clear statement of findings?	10. How valuable is the research?
Bosanac, 2015 ⁽⁴³⁾	Yes	Yes	Yes	Can't Tell	Yes	No	No	Can't Tell	Yes	Unclear
Carmel, 2014 ⁽⁴⁴⁾	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Can't Tell	Yes	Valuable
Crawford, 2007a ⁽⁴⁶⁾	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Valuable
Crawford, 2007b ⁽⁴⁵⁾	*									
Crawford, 2010 ⁽³⁷⁾	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Valuable
Donald, 2017 ⁽⁴⁷⁾	Yes	Yes	Yes	Can't Tell	Yes	No	Can't tell	Yes	Yes	Valuable
Fanaian, 2013 ⁽⁴⁸⁾	Yes	Yes	Yes	Can't Tell	Can't Tell	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Valuable
French, 2019 ⁽⁴⁹⁾	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Can't Tell	Yes	Yes	Valuable
Herschell, 2009 ⁽⁵⁰⁾	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Valuable
Hogard, 2010 ⁽⁵¹⁾	Yes	Yes	Yes	Can't Tell	Can't Tell	No	No	Can't Tell	Yes	Unclear
Hutton, 2017 ⁽⁵²⁾	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Valuable
Koekkoek, 2009 ⁽⁵³⁾	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Valuable
Lamph, 2019 ⁽⁵⁴⁾	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Can't Tell	Yes	Yes	Valuable
Langley, 2005 ⁽⁵⁵⁾	Yes	Yes	Yes	Can't Tell	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Valuable
Lee, 2008 ⁽⁵⁶⁾	No	Can't Tell	Can't Tell	Can't Tell	Can't Tell	No	No	Can't Tell	No	Unclear
Morant, 2003 ⁽⁵⁷⁾	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Can't Tell	Can't Tell	Yes	Valuable
O'Connell, 2013 ⁽⁵⁸⁾	Yes	Yes	Yes	Can't Tell	Can't Tell	No	Yes	Can't Tell	Yes	Valuable
Perseius, 2003 ⁽⁶⁰⁾	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Valuable
Perseius, 2007 ⁽⁵⁹⁾	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Valuable
Pigot, 2019 ⁽⁶¹⁾	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Valuable
Priest, 2011 ⁽⁶²⁾	Yes	Yes	Yes	Can't Tell	Yes	No	Can't Tell	Yes	Yes	Valuable
Rizq, 2012 ⁽⁶³⁾	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Valuable
Stalker, 2005 ⁽⁶⁴⁾	Yes	Yes	Yes	Can't Tell	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Valuable
Stroud, 2013 ⁽⁶⁵⁾	Yes	Yes	Yes	Can't Tell	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Valuable
Sulzer, 2016 ⁽⁶⁶⁾	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Valuable
Thompson, 2008 ⁽⁶⁷⁾	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Valuable
Vyas, 2017 ⁽⁶⁸⁾	Yes	Yes	Yes	Can't Tell	Yes	Yes	Can't Tell	Yes	Yes	Valuable
Wilson, 2018 ⁽⁶⁹⁾	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Can't Tell	Yes	Yes	Valuable
Wlodarczyk, 2018 ⁽⁷⁰⁾	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Valuable

186 *Crawford2007b is a short published paper based on Crawford 2007a which is a long-form report and provides details in full. Only the quality ratings of
 187 Crawford 2007a have therefore been provided.

188 Six overarching themes were identified through meta-synthesis: 1. The use and misuse of
189 diagnosis; 2. The patient journey through services: nowhere to go; 3. Therapeutic relationships:
190 connection and distance; 4. The nature of treatment (including intervention models): not doing too
191 much or too little; 5. Managing safety issues and crises: being measured and proactive; and 6.
192 Clinician and wider service needs (including clinician support, interagency working and the wider
193 system, and establishing new services, interventions and skills): whose needs are they anyway?
194 These themes are further described below. Table 3 gives further supporting quotes from the studies
195 relevant to each theme. While conducting the analysis, variations by setting or by participant
196 characteristics were considered. Substantial variations by country or by year of data collection were
197 not identified but variations between types of clinician and service setting were found: these are
198 described where relevant.

Table 3. Table of quotes

Theme	Quotes
Subtheme	
The Use and Misuse of Diagnosis	
	<p><i>“The global, all-encompassing nature of the diagnosis, coupled with the view that it was untreatable, could have a devastating impact on the individual, while also leading to a lack of therapeutic optimism on the part of clinicians. Personality disorder was seen as having all the drawbacks of a mental illness diagnosis, especially in terms of stigma, but none of the benefits, particularly access to services. Likewise, the contested and uncertain nature of personality disorder limited the potential for users to gain some control over their condition through knowledge and information. The diagnosis could lead to people facing discrimination and stereotyping within mental health services, within generic health and social care services and within society at large, with individuals being labelled as attention-seeking and demanding.”</i></p> <p><i>“A different view expressed by some service providers was that personality disorder is best understood as a form of social deviance or cultural rule-breaking. One respondent described people with a personality disorder diagnosis as those whose ‘behavior, attitudes, lifestyles seem to consistently transgress cultural norms, which brings them into conflict with other people, in the absence of any symptom of an underlying mental illness...’ These respondents believed that a diagnosis of personality disorder could simply serve to medicalize or pathologize an individual’s feelings of distress.” (Stalker et al., 2005)⁶⁴</i></p>
The Patient Journey into Services: Nowhere to Go	
	<p><i>“Several GPs described adopting a strategy of ‘writing-up’, or embellishing descriptions of a patient’s risk status in order to ensure that the patient was seen by secondary care services. On the other hand, faced with an overly cautious response from IAPT, several GPs described emphasising the patient’s more ‘agreeable’ mental health conditions, such as depression or anxiety, to maximise the chances of the patient being accepted into treatment.”</i></p> <p><i>“GPs also described patients with PD as having to endure particularly long waits, before being seen—waiting times that often far exceeded those experienced by patients with other mental health problems. Indeed, several GPs described patients with PD having to wait over 12 months for treatment. They felt shortening waiting times would reduce the likelihood of mental health problems escalating or patients disengaging from the health service altogether.” (French et al., 2019)⁴⁹</i></p>
	<p><i>“Unfortunately, because of the model of stepped care in the Trust, there were barriers to primary care staff wishing to refer patients directly into a tertiary service, such as a specialist psychology service for people with PD. ‘...Have a real problem in getting through the cycle of exclusion: GPs who identify suitable patients cannot refer to [tertiary psychology service], they have to refer to the CMHT and get them to take person on... so we cannot keep clients out of mental health services, and CMHTs can say they won’t take them, as don’t meet their criteria.”</i></p> <p><i>“The majority of referrers made reference to the assessment as an important part of the process, and some stated that having an assessment was one of the reasons for referring someone to the service. Referrers linked to two services made specific comment of how much they valued the provision of a comprehensive assessment, even if the service user was not taken on. Benefits included helping the referrer to develop their own management plan or to better understand the service user’s problems and building confidence and trust for the service user.” (Crawford et al., 2007)⁴⁶</i></p>
Therapeutic Relationships: Connection and Distance	
	<p><i>“A few service provider respondents however were careful not to locate ‘the problem’ within individual service users. They believed that unhelpful responses from mental health services were often responsible for compounding people’s problems shown, for example, in judgemental attitudes expressed by some staff who reportedly used words like ‘manipulative’, ‘attention-seeking’ and ‘demanding’ to stereotype people with personality disorder diagnoses.” (Stalker et al., 2005)⁶⁴</i></p>
	<p><i>“Patients have a hard time trusting a therapist and may only do so after quite some time, which professionals tend to underestimate. These people really need a secure attachment, they fight it for a year, claim help and then reject it again. But if one succeeds in breaking that pattern, one can really mean something. On the other hand, a dependency relationship may be perceived as dangerous in community mental health care as many patients become long-term users that lay a large claim on scarce resources, according to the experts.” (Koekkoek et al., 2009)⁵³</i></p>
	<p><i>“Clare uses the powerful metaphor of a nursing mother to describe the nature of the relationship. She seems to feel ambivalent about being at the mercy of a newborn baby, whose need to feed on demand cannot be denied. It is as if her capacity to psychologically nourish these clients is being ruthlessly exploited: ‘they latch onto you and it’s like suck suck suck suck.’”</i></p>

“... For [clinician], the encounter with the depth of his clients' needs and their sense of emptiness or lack of self ushers in an uncomfortable awareness of his own vulnerability and inner emptiness: ‘What you're met with is a neediness which is bottomless really ... and it's almost collateral to the emptiness is the neediness and lack of self ... what a lot of borderline patients talk about is being in nothingness, their experiences of nothingness, they have the most acute sense of nothingness that I think you'll ever come across ... it's within that that the draining and the exhaustingness of it all, because we all experience emptiness to some degree, but I think these clients ... they almost get a heightened sense of all these things ... so I almost get a heightened sense of what humanity is and vulnerability.’” (Rizq, 2012)⁶³

The Nature of Treatment: Not doing too much or too little

- “Some of the experts are particularly critical of the apparent denial that can be seen to occur in several settings of the long-term nature of the problems of the patient with a severe BPD. That is, a rather naïve and overly “optimistic” attitude characterizes professionals who rapidly discharge such patients. According to the experts, in fact, such optimism is simply “therapeutic nihilism” disguised as optimism... The combination of powerlessness and the blaming of the patient for any lack of progress may result in non-therapeutic behaviors on the part of the professional such as irritation, anger, and even aggression. Less overt but equally destructive is the reduction of the therapeutic encounter to doing as little as possible and simply hoping that a crisis does not arise. Further referral of the patient without substantial justification of the reasons for doing this is another example of really doing nothing. ‘Professionals have many strategies to do completely nothing in therapeutic encounters with the patient.’” (Koekkoek et al., 2009)⁵³
- “One respondent used the term ‘hard to engage services’ to describe what she saw as a model of provision too inflexible to find ways of taking on the often chaotic reality of people’s lives.” (Stalker et al., 2005)⁶⁴
- “A continuum of severity and complexity was referred to, with acknowledgement that those who were deemed less complex could respond well to routine IAPT treatment but people with what was deemed to be more severe presentations would struggle with routine treatment as they could oscillate from one problem to the next on a weekly basis making adherence to the IAPT model and protocol delivered therapies very challenging to deliver. Participant frustration at the lack of treatment options and the constraints of time-limited therapy was commonly reported.” (Lamph et al., 2019)⁵⁴
- “In recognition of the heterogeneous needs and capacities of people with PD, most of the pilots set out to provide a range of services. Provision of more than one service or treatment option also enabled most pilots to present a choice to potential service users, a capacity that many believed important in promoting engagement.”
- “Discharge or disengagement from the service is likely to be difficult and threatening for some service users: it may be viewed as abandonment and may precipitate an increase in behaviour designed to demonstrate need or risk. Some services address this by working toward discharge or self-sufficiency as a specific goal at a specific time from the point of engagement, while others have provisos for re-entry into the service. Some services are developing models for less intensive, ongoing support so that discharge need not be absolute... Some staff of open-ended services felt that there should be a cut-off point, and that allowing ongoing use of a service encourages dependence and reduces motivation and the development of coping strategies for existing clients, while denying others the opportunity of using the service.” (Crawford et al., 2007)⁴⁶
- “Look, although I'm not doing my job properly here — I'm seeing people for longer, I'm, you know, they're dropping in, topping them up every so often when they need it — so on the one hand I see that as a failing in me, but I think it's also a response to the needs of this type of client. So it's not just coincidence, or inexperience in this field, in this type of work with personality disorder.”
- “Michael's account exemplifies counsellors' struggle with what appears to be an insoluble paradox — that the establishment of a much-needed therapeutic relationship is precisely what is most likely to evoke yet further trauma for the borderline client when it ends: ‘... they could experience it as a good experience of another person — that not everyone's going to destroy them, if you want, which is their fantasy... But at the same time, you then are faced with the whole thing of ending that. And are you going to do them any good? And are we really just re-traumatising these people again?’” (Rizq, 2012)⁶³
- Intervention models “I think an ability to manage their emotions better, because they usually come into our service because, on a day to day basis, their emotions are causing them all sorts of difficulties in their personal life, with regard to employment, education, leisure activities, and they are perhaps just going from one crisis or problem, to another, and no wonder they are anxious and depressed, which obviously brings them into our world.” (Lamph et al., 2019)⁵⁴
- “Many relatives have high expectations of the mental health system but are disappointed over time, which also results in a poor relationship between the family of the patient and professionals.” (Koekkoek et al., 2009)⁵³

“Pilots included several day therapeutic communities: none was residential but they achieved a high degree of consistency through the guidance of shared consultants, staff and service users, and the Association of Therapeutic Communities. A TC is: A safe and secure environment, a place of safety, where people can come and learn how to make relationships... It creates an environment where people engage in normal interactions that trigger behaviours and feelings they have difficulty with: it’s got to be an emotionally safe environment, where they can reflect on and interpret those feelings, so they don’t have adverse consequences.” (Crawford et al. 2007)⁽⁴⁶⁾

Managing Safety Concerns and Crises: Being Measured and Proactive

“As a CPN if something goes wrong then the buck stops with you and then I think that does not help staff to take positive risks. Staff are very defensive in their practice and very risk adverse and in DBT it is about accepting that this is a risky client group and if we wrap them up in cotton wool all the time that is not treating them and I think it is about having a service that is prepared to take well thought out positive risks and I don’t think we are there yet. Because I think staff are so scared of things going wrong and them getting the blame and being sued it is very hard to allow clients to have some responsibility.” (Stroud and Parsons, 2013)⁽⁶⁵⁾

“There is general recognition that no external agent can stop a person self-harming: responsibility lies with the only person who can change the course of events, the service user themselves. Putting self-harmers into hospital on suicide watch backfires: it takes responsibility away from them. It is better to talk to them about how it comes about and find something to divert them from it.”

“Several of the pilot services also have guidelines governing staff–client interaction, such as limits on the amount of time clients can spend in one-to-ones during crises... Staff suggest that the act of recording messages has advantages over phone calls because it introduces a slight delay which inhibits impulsiveness and allows a natural pause for consideration. Other services have suggested that e-mail messages to the service have a similar function, even though they will not be read until the next working day... Methods for supporting people in crisis developed by pilot services seek to actively involve service users and tend not to provide an instant response. Service providers report that if people have been helped to prepare for crises, a delayed response can help ensure the service user plays an active role in crisis management.” (Crawford et al., 2007)⁽⁴⁶⁾

Clinician and Wider Service Needs: Whose Needs Are They Anyway?

Clinician needs “Some participants were clear that it was not simply more support that was needed, but a particular type and quality of clinical supervision. Clare was critical of the supervision she was offered in primary care, feeling that it was based on providing expert advice and technical information, rather than examining complex unconscious process issues within the therapeutic relationship. She seems to feel that this is part of a more general tendency where increasingly managed or professionalised forms of practice now take precedence over the emotional aspects of therapeutic work: ‘... it’s all about have you filled in the right form, rather than ‘what do you need for your work in terms of emotional support?’”

“I think that people with personality disorder need some kind of secure base if you’re going to work with them... I also work in secondary care you see and when you work in secondary care, it’s easier to manage people with personality disorder because there’s somebody if they do feel suicidal or make a suicide attempt, there’s some structure in place. Whereas in primary care you’re kind of left on your own with somebody, and you don’t have a team to consult, you don’t have the support.” (Rizq, 2012)⁽⁶³⁾

“It actually helps workers to survive in their work, if they have a place to think ... One of the main theories about, you know, personality disordered people is that they don’t have the capacity to reflect on themselves and so if [they are involved with] an organization that equally can’t reflect, you’re going to have this sort of mirroring that goes all the way up from the client themselves all the way up through the organization that’s trying to help the client.” (Crawford et al., 2010)⁽³⁷⁾

“Participants noted the flattened hierarchy principle encouraged them to feel that they had a voice in TC and encouraged relational working by bridging the gap between therapists and members: ‘I felt more confident, I felt like I did have a voice in the group.’” (Vyas et al., 2017)⁽⁶⁸⁾

“In effect, there are all sorts of expectations on the part of all the players in the system, which may mean that those with the least power are the least likely to have their expectations met.”

“Differences in models of understanding might at times be helpful: The opportunity to have a number of disciplines, and talk through a particularly difficult case ... that’s the strength of the team ... it is that exchange of ideas and it does alleviate things an awful lot’... When asked, ‘what helps you keep working with someone when you feel you’ve tried everything and nothing seems to have helped?’, workers reported that joint working, attention to the needs of workers, including good clinical supervision, trying alternative interventions and working with people who have different models of understanding and alternative perspectives were all potentially helpful... It can also depend on mutual understanding and respect: ‘If you can look at the immediate thing, it might be that you’ve got different ideas but somewhere above that, the motivation

	<p>might be common, where the aims overarch.” (Priest et al., 2011)⁽⁶²⁾</p>
Interagency working and the wider system	<p>“The high but inefficient use of the services of several agencies by patients... contributes further to this lack of continuity, the diffused nature of the treatment being offered by professionals, and responsibility for treatment.” (Koekkoek et al., 2009)⁽⁵³⁾</p> <p>“We get very little feedback from the talk therapies team as to how they felt things went. We obviously get the feedback oh they attended six out of the seven sessions or you know, initially they seem very depressed, but you never get a feedback as to how treatment is going. It’s important I feel because if the service works closely with you it helps you to support the patient better. Added to which many of these patients have other health complaints and better communication can only lead to better treatment.” (French et al., 2019)⁽⁴⁹⁾</p>
	<p>“Almost all groups of clinicians reported the need for more training in working with persons who have a personality disorder, particularly for generalist mental health workers and frontline and ancillary staff. Similarly, several groups of clinicians also emphasized the need for a coordinated and cross-agency approach to training, including staff from other government agencies that have more frequent contact with clients with personality disorders, such as social service organizations. This is in order to encourage an intensive and integrated case management approach (e.g. ‘coordinated whole of team training’, and ‘cross-agency training within local areas: health, police, community mental health, custodial services, community services’).”</p> <p>“Another theme that emerged was the need for better acknowledgement of the existence of personality disorder as a diagnostic group, and a recognition of the costs and time required to help these clients (e.g. ‘acknowledge the disorder: it exists, is treatable, worthwhile, and economically good to treat’, ‘seeing treatment of personality disorder as core business, alongside mood and psychotic disorders’, and ‘recognition of the enormous cost of the disorder in terms of health service resources, clinician time, [and] administration’).” (Fanaian et al., 2013)⁽⁴⁸⁾</p> <p>“Promoting the new service with the right balance of expertise and uncertainty or humility has been challenging. It was difficult to promote the setting up of a specialist service without implying that existing services had somehow failed this client group. It is important to not locate ‘blame’ in either the patient or the worker [who may naturally feel her / himself to be the brunt of criticism]. And it’s a double-edged sword: they want to refer to you, but success is resented: you have to work with that.” (Crawford et al., 2007)⁽⁴⁶⁾</p>
Establishing new services, interventions and skills	<p>“Clinicians felt their confidence to recall theory and detail post training could fade, as they rolled on with daily case management activity.” (Bosanac et al., 2015)⁽⁴³⁾</p> <p>“Several administrators described the importance of ongoing training to accommodate staff turnover, exemplified by the administrator who said ‘There also is no provision for training new people once the training is over. We don’t like that [the trainers are] out after that instead of providing training on an ongoing basis.’” (Herschell et al., 2009)⁽⁵⁰⁾</p>
	<p>“The respondents were asked to provide general feedback on how trainings can address the challenges of implementing DBT mentioned above. Several respondents discussed the difficulties in establishing collaboration between teams at different agencies and viewed this collaboration as key to sustainability of their DBT program, due in part, to the changing of staffing and the loss of many team members due to financial cutbacks.” (Carmel et al., 2014)⁽⁴⁴⁾</p>
	<p>“Because of the fact the network was initially a pilot there was limited access to funding and resources and their capacity to coordinate care for a large number of clients was restricted. It appeared to the referring bodies that the network was unable to cope with the scale of need.” (Hogard and Ellis, 2010)⁽⁵¹⁾</p>
	<p>“Training alone was perceived as insufficient for practice, but a combination of training and hands-on experience was useful to build confidence. One participant stated ‘that could perhaps be a good thing if it was—if everyone saw at least one person through it ... they felt comfortable in it, they felt that they could relax ... they could actually engage better with the person.’” (Pigot et al., 2019)⁽⁶¹⁾</p>
	<p>“However, there were some clear areas in which the participants were less satisfied, for example, with the viability of post-training implementation of methods, most notably associated with a perception of an increased time pressure created by some of the practices suggested.” (Thompson et al., 2008)⁽⁶⁷⁾</p>

200 **1. The use and misuse of diagnosis**

201 Our main aim was to synthesise evidence on clinician views of good practice, but it was clear
202 that underlying beliefs about the nature of such difficulties and the appropriate use of diagnosis
203 influenced clinicians' perspectives on care. A few studies reported that some clinicians found
204 conceptualising and diagnosing difficulties as "personality disorder" helpful. They saw it as offering a
205 'common language', and a useful way to understand service users' difficulties, while also helping to
206 ensure that service users were seen as having genuine needs.

207 However, across a number of studies, clinicians questioned the use, meaning and validity of
208 this diagnosis. They saw it as being associated with stigma, discrimination and exclusion from
209 services, felt it could be difficult to 'shake off', and risked becoming "the person's entirety"⁽⁴⁷⁾.

210 *Patients with a psychosis were seen as not accountable and in need of support. Borderline*
211 *patients, however, were considered theatrical, posing, and in need of punishment.*

212 Psychologist describing a crisis intervention team (Koekkoek et al., 2009)⁽⁵³⁾

213 Accounts of the use of "personality disorder" diagnoses in non-specialist primary and
214 secondary care services suggested it was made at times on a basis of "gut instinct"⁽⁵⁴⁾ or "gut
215 feeling"⁽⁷⁰⁾ or because other diagnoses did not 'fit'. An investigation of clinician views in generic
216 community and voluntary sector services found that some perceived "personality disorder" as
217 essentially "a form of social deviance or cultural rule-breaking"⁽⁶⁴⁾, while others felt that the label
218 was an unhelpful medicalisation of legitimate feelings of distress, especially among women. In this
219 study, as in several studies examining perspectives of specialist clinicians, a majority of clinicians saw
220 trauma and adversity as major causes of "personality disorder". As a result of concerns about
221 diagnosis, clinicians were reported in several studies to be reluctant to use this label and to avoid
222 discussing it with service users. Some opted for alternative diagnoses (e.g., complex post-traumatic
223 stress disorder) or employed what they considered to be 'euphemisms' like "difficulty managing

224 emotions”⁽⁶⁶⁾. Other specialist clinicians reported that they preferred a focus on narrative
225 descriptions of presenting difficulties rather than relying on a “personality disorder” diagnosis.

226 **2. The patient journey into services: nowhere to go**

227 Access to services for people with CEN was reported in several studies to be a persistent
228 difficulty, with GPs in one study⁽⁴⁹⁾ reporting longer waiting times than for any other group of mental
229 health service users. Referrals for specialist support were impeded by factors such as a lack of local
230 services, lack of awareness of services, frequent changes to services, and poorly established referral
231 pathways. This was felt to risk disengagement, escalation of distress, or missing windows of
232 opportunity to provide effective support.

233 Thresholds for acceptance by specialist services were reported in some studies to be
234 inconsistent and influenced by subjective judgements regarding for example ‘severity’, ‘stuck’ness or
235 ‘motivation to engage’. Many service users were excluded from specialist support due to being
236 perceived as a risk to others (e.g., through having a forensic history), having substance misuse
237 problems, exhibiting behaviour considered too ‘problematic’ or ‘chaotic’, or being seen as ‘non-
238 psychologically minded’.

239 Referrers such as GPs in several studies also reported difficulties getting service users
240 accepted by generic, mainstream community mental health teams or psychological treatment
241 services. However, in other studies, clinicians working in these generic teams saw their eligibility
242 criteria as over-inclusive, with one study describing them as a “dumping ground” for anyone who did
243 not ‘fit’ elsewhere⁽⁶²⁾. Stepped care pathways could also contribute to difficulties accessing
244 appropriate treatment. For example, clinicians in the UK reported being encouraged to refer initially
245 to primary care Improving Access to Psychological Therapy (IAPT) or mainstream secondary care
246 services, rather than to specialist teams. However, knowledge and capacity for treating CEN were
247 often seen as lacking in these generic services, with people with CEN not prioritised and clinicians
248 feeling they did not have the skills to deliver expected care. Some referrers described ‘embellishing’

249 referral information to meet thresholds for specialist support. However, in other cases, GPs as well
250 as assessors in secondary care services, ‘downplayed’ service users’ difficulties or risk levels and
251 emphasised ‘more agreeable’ traits to meet thresholds for primary care support, such as IAPT
252 services. Service users could end up being passed back and forth in “a tennis ball effect”⁽⁵⁴⁾ with a
253 high but inefficient use of services.

254 *You know if you mention ‘PD’ there will be nowhere at all for them to go so I’m usually very*
255 *careful not to put it down in their notes. I usually say depressed or a bit anxious. Something*
256 *that won’t make them think the patient is risky. It’s about knowing the hoops that you’ve got*
257 *to jump through.*

258 GP (French et al., 2019)⁽⁴⁹⁾

259 The referral process was reported to be facilitated by good working relationships and
260 communication between receiving clinicians and referrers, outreach by specialist services to raise
261 visibility and explain service models, and acceptance of self-referrals, which some felt could be
262 empowering and inclusive. Some referrers valued holistic, in-depth assessments and formulations
263 from specialist clinicians, particularly non-medical, non-psychiatric or psychodynamic formulations,
264 even if service users ultimately weren’t taken on, as these could inform treatment plans and
265 facilitate therapeutic relationships.

266 **3. Therapeutic relationships: connection and distance**

267 Strong, trusting relationships between clinicians and service users were seen as key to
268 treatment success across many studies, but clinicians’ experiences of such relationships varied
269 greatly both between and within studies. In several studies, clinicians were keen to emphasise the
270 positives of working with people with CEN, describing them as ‘relatable’, ‘honest’ and ‘creative’,
271 and seeing the role of the clinician as being to “harness that”⁽³⁷⁾. However, negative feelings and a
272 sense of burnout were also frequently described, with clinicians viewing (or reporting that other
273 clinicians viewed) service users as ‘demanding’, ‘challenging’, ‘risky’, ‘dependant’, ‘self-destructive’,

274 ‘manipulative’, ‘non-compliant’, ‘untreatable’, and likely to ‘push boundaries’. Service users’
275 difficulties were seen as enduring but urgent, and clinicians could feel overwhelmed by “a
276 bottomless pool of need”⁽⁷⁰⁾ especially as comorbid diagnoses and wider social issues with housing,
277 employment, finances and social networks were often also present. Clinicians described feeling both
278 idealised by service users and as though nothing they did was good enough. While establishing an
279 authentic connection with service users was seen as vital, clinicians admitted to fears of being
280 “sucked dry” and “emotionally swamped”⁽⁶³⁾, experiencing feelings of vulnerability and of being
281 dangerously on the edge of losing their sense of self.

282 *Participants spoke repeatedly about the need to maintain a psychological distance from*
283 *clients in order to prevent themselves from becoming overwhelmed or burned out.*

284 (Langley & Klopner, 2005)⁽⁵⁵⁾

285 In a few studies, however, clinicians reported they felt able to make use of their unsettling
286 feelings to connect with service users’ own feelings. Although there were exceptions, negative
287 attitudes and experiences appeared particularly prevalent in mainstream primary and secondary
288 care services. This was attributed to poor understanding of CEN in these settings, to staff being
289 overburdened but inadequately supported, and to observing poor outcomes, leading to frustration,
290 hopelessness, and sometimes feelings of aggression and blame towards service users. Suggestions to
291 combat negative attitudes included better supervision and training by specialists to improve
292 understanding, compassion, and perceptions of treatment effectiveness, along with more support
293 from services for clinicians to engage with supervision and training.

294 Overall, the impression across studies was that clinicians described the need to be authentic,
295 non-judgemental, empathic, collaborative, hopeful, motivating, consistent and dependable to build
296 trust with service users, whom they understood often to have had histories of abuse or
297 abandonment by key attachment figures. The importance of ‘knowing’ service users, holding them in
298 mind, and acknowledging the reality of their experiences was emphasised. When relationships went

299 well, clinicians described successfully negotiating connection and distance in the therapeutic
300 relationship: being open, warm and available, but also retaining boundaries, structure and a degree
301 of emotional detachment. Clinicians spoke of a need to create a sense of shared responsibility for
302 progress with service users, and of the value of adopting a curious, non-expert stance to help
303 develop a safe space where strong emotions could be processed, tolerated and “radically
304 accepted”⁽⁴⁷⁾.

305 Clinicians who reported more positive relationships tended to be those who felt better
306 supported, for example describing better team working, supervision, and informal support from
307 their colleagues, as well as longer-term treatment frameworks, which allowed time for relationships
308 to develop. Such support appeared to be much more available in more specialised services.

309 **4. The nature of treatment: not doing too much or too** 310 **little**

311 Clinicians’ beliefs regarding appropriate duration of treatment, and how best to negotiate
312 not doing ‘too much’ or ‘too little’, were complex. There was consensus across studies that people
313 with CEN had long-term needs, but in a few studies clinicians voiced concerns that open-ended,
314 long-term support could be too demanding for service users to engage with, too resource-intensive,
315 or could result in ‘dependency’ and a lack of delivery of interventions with clear therapeutic content,
316 particularly in generic secondary care services. Clinicians felt that it was important to be realistic
317 about what they could achieve and to avoid setting expectations that they could ‘fix’ everything. At
318 the same time, in several studies clinicians emphasised that not offering sufficient long-term support
319 could result in unrealistic expectations for recovery, disappointment and undertreatment. Several
320 studies reported a perceived lack of well-developed, longer-term support programmes at a medium
321 level of intensity.

322 *The requirements of the system do not always fit with the needs of the people who are using*
323 *the service: The expectation is that you will recover... you will get out of the service... we can*
324 *only work with you for a certain amount of time... It just doesn't work as simply as that.*

325 Mainstream secondary care clinician (Priest et al., 2011)⁽⁶²⁾

326 Across studies, clinicians described a need for balance between recognising the limits of
327 what could be achieved, managing the expectations of both clinicians and service users, and
328 maintaining hope. In one study, clinicians saw a tendency in mainstream settings for clinicians to “do
329 completely nothing”⁽⁵³⁾ in therapeutic encounters with people with CEN, or alternatively to display
330 ‘false optimism’ or ‘therapeutic nihilism’, rapidly discharging service users due to underlying feelings
331 of powerless and demoralisation. Paradoxically, however, such undertreatment then had the effect
332 of increasing the very ‘dependency’ clinicians feared, as service users had to keep ‘coming back for
333 more’.

334 Premature discharge was identified as common and was put down to clinicians seeking to
335 ‘escape’ from work they found challenging, to service recovery models conflicting with service users’
336 needs, and to pressures to move people on. Yet, there was consensus across several studies that
337 discharge could be particularly challenging for people with CEN and needed to be managed
338 sensitively, especially because of associated safety issues (e.g., due to service users feeling
339 abandoned by clinicians). Views diverged, however, about the best way to approach discharge. For
340 example, in one study evaluating specialist services for CEN⁽⁴⁶⁾, some clinicians feared that open-
341 ended service use without a clear plan for discharge could reduce service users’ motivation to
342 develop coping skills, affect the service’s capacity to take on new referrals, and encourage
343 ‘dependency’. These clinicians felt having discharge or self-sufficiency as a time-specific goal from
344 the beginning of care was helpful. However, other clinicians in the same study favoured offering
345 continuing support at a lower level of intensity (for example through peer support), rather than

346 absolute discharge following a period of intensive treatment, with clear provisions for re-engaging
347 with services if required.

348 Short-term therapy, such as that offered by IAPT in the UK, tended to be seen as
349 insufficiently flexible and intensive for people with CEN. In one study, primary care clinicians
350 described a sense that they were “short-changing” service users⁽⁶³⁾. In a few studies, clinicians also
351 expressed fears that short-term support could potentially be harmful or experienced by service users
352 as ‘abandoning’ and ‘retraumatising’. However, in a small number of studies clinicians did argue that
353 short-term support had value, either at specific points in service users’ treatment journeys, or for
354 those with less severe difficulties.

355 Clinicians in multiple studies also underlined the need to deliver both psychotherapeutic
356 interventions and pragmatic social support to meet the varied and fluctuating needs of this
357 population. Pragmatic support, which was reportedly offered more often in specialist services, could
358 include vocational, educational, social, substance misuse, or parenting support, as well as skills to
359 promote independence.

360 **Intervention models**

361 Specific treatment models that clinicians reported as having therapeutic benefits included
362 Dialectic Behaviour Therapy (DBT), Mentalisation Based Therapy (MBT), Cognitive Analytic Therapy
363 (CAT) and psychodynamic formulations. However, in several studies clinicians also emphasised that
364 ‘one size does not fit all’, that diverse, flexible treatment options were needed within mental health
365 services and in primary care, and that more formulation-driven treatments could be more beneficial
366 than those based on diagnosis or driven by manuals.

367 There was a consensus across studies that a variety of approaches could be taken to some
368 core therapeutic tasks, making a range of interventions similarly effective in achieving good
369 outcomes. Clinicians tended to see difficulties with managing emotions as central in CEN, and

370 prioritised interventions that promoted development of skills relating to emotion regulation, distress
371 tolerance, or developing a capacity for *thinking* and *feeling* rather than *doing*. Similarly, models that
372 helped service users to practice their interpersonal skills (e.g., via groups, peer support, or
373 therapeutic communities) were seen as valuable in several studies. DBT was the specific therapeutic
374 intervention most often discussed in studies and clinicians identified several benefits from this. As
375 well as helping service users develop better relationships and emotion regulation, clinicians felt it
376 was based on a clear model and manual, and that it promoted hope, decreased medication use,
377 encouraged service users to take responsibility for treatment, and helped encourage compassion,
378 understanding and team working on the part of clinicians. Clinicians in some studies did, however,
379 also report that delivering DBT placed considerable demands on them and their services, including
380 the need for intensive training, implementation of a complex model allowing relatively little
381 flexibility, and being contactable outside of working hours.

382 Formats like groups, peer support, and therapeutic communities were also valued for
383 broadening the range of available options and promoting collaborative, user-led models of care and
384 empowering service users to have ownership over their treatment in a more democratic way.
385 Finally, support for family and friends was identified in several studies as important but as an area
386 where even well-resourced specialist services often fall short despite the perception that people
387 with CEN often experience difficulties with relationships.

388 **5. Managing safety issues and crises: being measured** 389 **and proactive**

390 Managing safety issues was considered vital across all treatment settings. The nature of
391 deliberate self-harm and other safety issues in the context of CEN was seen as differing from acute
392 presentations in other mental health conditions because of its chronic, recurrent and to some extent
393 predictable nature. As such, clinicians felt it could be prepared for proactively, through open
394 dialogue with service users to agree parameters within which clinicians would respond.

395 In a small number of studies, clinicians suggested that ‘rescuing’ or stepping in too quickly at
396 times of crisis could be detrimental or disempowering for service users. However, there was a
397 competing need not to become neglectful, with a lack of consensus regarding how available
398 clinicians should make themselves. Views about out of hours service provision varied. In one study of
399 community-based mental health services implementing DBT, some clinicians described 24/7
400 availability or an ‘on call’ system as a ‘step backwards’ and ineffective. But in other studies clinicians
401 argued that this was important, and that greater availability of support in fact usually reduced the
402 need for it. Some clinicians felt that people with CEN were seen as ‘bad’ for posing a safety risk, in
403 contrast to those with other diagnoses, such as psychosis, who were seen as ‘mad’.

404 Practice in mainstream services was described in some studies as risk-averse and reactive,
405 sometimes creating a vicious cycle wherein service users felt they had to present in crisis to get
406 more input. Clinicians used to dealing with crises in the context of conditions such as depression or
407 psychosis were reported to struggle to manage the specific dynamics of safety concerns for people
408 with CEN. Specialist services were seen as adopting more proactive approaches, negotiating plans
409 for managing safety issues in collaboration with service users, moving away from action-reaction or
410 fearful responses from clinicians, and fostering ownership of the management of safety issues
411 among service users.

412 **6. Clinician and wider service needs: whose needs are** 413 **they anyway?**

414 **Clinician needs**

415 A recurring challenge across studies was for clinicians to reconcile their own needs with
416 those of service users. This dilemma was particularly acute where clinicians lacked organisational
417 support or adequate supervision. Clinicians found themselves negotiating between meeting the
418 needs of service users, their own needs, and wider service needs. When synthesising studies, it was
419 complex at times to disentangle whose needs were in reality met by particular practices. For

420 example, when clinicians described a need to reduce service users' alleged 'dependency' and
421 promote 'self-sufficiency', this seemed in part connected to clinicians' own feelings of being
422 overwhelmed, as well as to wider service pressures to conserve resources. One study of clinicians
423 working in "personality disorder" services⁽³⁷⁾ suggested that service users' perceived difficulties (e.g.,
424 with reflection) could be 'mirrored' further up the organisation. This study also reported that service
425 leads across several teams appeared to be 'charismatic' but also 'autocratic', seeking to 'quell
426 dissent' among clinicians by adopting firm, unequivocal stances. In other studies, it was clear that
427 services, rather than service users, were at times experienced by clinicians as 'difficult to engage
428 with'.

429 *It's not the patients that make you frustrated nowadays, it's the organization around that is*
430 *troublesome.*

431 DBT Therapist (Perseus et al., 2003)⁽⁶⁰⁾

432 The importance of clinicians feeling supported in their work was a common theme across
433 studies. Working effectively with people with CEN without becoming burnt out was seen as
434 achievable, but the organisational support needed to do so was often missing, with the low priority
435 and investment accorded to treatment of people with CEN affecting both service users and
436 clinicians. Clinicians valued both supportive relationships with colleagues and formal supervision in a
437 variety of formats, including individual and whole team supervision and input from external experts.
438 The importance of addressing clinicians' own emotional needs, engaging in reflective practice and
439 enabling clinicians to process their own vulnerabilities and 'destructive' emotions was emphasised,
440 but provision was frequently described as inadequate.

441 Good team-working and sharing responsibilities for treatment and decisions regarding safety
442 also helped clinicians to feel supported. This appeared to be reported most often regarding
443 specialist teams, especially in those using DBT and CAT models, and in therapeutic communities, and
444 least frequently in primary care settings – where "you're kind of left on your own with

445 somebody”⁽⁶³⁾. There could also be challenges in teams where only one or two clinicians in a team
446 were trained in a particular therapeutic intervention or skill set. While clinicians saw value in
447 including a range of clinicians with diverse backgrounds and approaches they also felt this could
448 encourage “splitting”, making it more difficult to develop a shared language or model of
449 understanding across team members.

450 Having divided caseloads (i.e., not fully CEN) was considered by some to be beneficial for
451 integration of CEN work into generic teams and for staff wellbeing. However, having competing
452 clinical priorities could impede therapeutic work, and the ‘psychological shift’ between various roles
453 was experienced by some as challenging. One study noted that specialist services tended to promote
454 broad, combined roles where all clinicians contributed to delivering the therapeutic model, but this
455 required significant training. Specialist services sometimes had ‘flat hierarchies’ which could be
456 empowering but also frustrating for clinicians when responsibility was equal but authority or pay, for
457 example, was not.

458 **Interagency working and the wider system**

459 Effective inter-team and inter-agency working was considered important for management of
460 the resource-intensive, multi-agency, and often out-of-hours service use by people with CEN.
461 However, reports of inadequate communication between services were common at all levels of
462 care. Challenges included high staff turnover, staff cutbacks due to reduced budgets, time
463 constraints, and disagreements between clinicians or competing priorities, with poor interagency
464 working leaving clinicians feeling more anxious and less contained. Pre-existing, personal, or good
465 professional relationships and clearly assigned responsibilities (taking into account service user
466 preferences regarding clinicians and services where possible) facilitated interagency working.

467 Clinicians in mainstream services reported in several studies that they valued support from
468 specialist services, such as in hub and spoke models, where specialist staff provide expert
469 assessments, case consultation, supervision, and staff training to mainstream services. This model

470 was perceived as making efficient use of specialist staff, allowing them to support not only those on
471 their small caseload for intensive therapy but also a much wider group beyond the dedicated
472 services. However, reservations about such models were described in a few studies, including that
473 specialist input from specialists could undermine professional roles in mainstream service, may be
474 ineffective on an ad hoc rather than sustained basis, and risks specialist clinicians having
475 unsustainable workloads. There were also some tensions identified between mainstream and
476 specialist services, where mainstream services were seen as having to 'firefight' whereas specialist
477 services were perceived to have greater freedom to 'select' service users, refuse certain
478 responsibilities, and prioritise time for reflection.

479 **Establishing new services, interventions and skills**

480 Finally, a number of studies were conducted in the context of establishing a new service or
481 intervention programme, and thus themes emerged relating to good practice in initial
482 implementation. Factors that were considered helpful for developing new services or interventions
483 included: managerial support, recruitment of appropriate staff, leadership that embraced
484 uncertainty and allowed clinicians freedom to innovate, team building, cross-agency and whole team
485 training, and having realistic plans, timescales and budgets. Ongoing sustainability of new services
486 was facilitated by integrating them into existing service systems, effective interagency working, and
487 measuring and demonstrating good outcomes. Clinicians trained in new models described feeling
488 like 'beginners' despite their clinical expertise, and being required to make significant time
489 commitments for implementation and ongoing practice and learning. There was widespread
490 recognition of the need for ongoing support and training beyond the initial phase to support
491 knowledge retention and ensure programme sustainability. Some questioned the suitability of
492 mental health service settings for delivering services given previous unsatisfactory or traumatic
493 experiences for service users. However, acquiring alternative premises was often challenging.

494 Discussion

495 Several overall proposals can be drawn from this synthesis of clinicians' perspectives for
496 good practice in treating this population effectively and respectfully and at the same time supporting
497 the clinicians working with them. Areas of consensus between the findings of eligible studies
498 included the need for high quality, holistic assessments and care plans encompassing physical,
499 psychological and social needs; easily navigable referral systems enabling good continuity of care;
500 and the need for a proactive, collaborative approach to safety management. Therapeutic
501 relationships were seen as key and as a major common factor in the success of different approaches,
502 and clinicians in participating studies believed that they could be improved through greater
503 therapeutic optimism, overcoming pejorative attitudes, developing partnerships between service
504 users and clinicians through shared responsibility and decision making, radical acceptance and a
505 non-expert stance, and sustainable models for service user involvement in care.

506 Some dilemmas and variations in opinion were also identified, especially regarding the
507 balance between doing 'too much' or 'too little.' Potential positive and negative consequences were
508 identified both for open-ended long-term input and for time-limited input, as for 24 hour availability
509 of clinicians in specialist services. Those who advocate for long-term support may be more in tune
510 with service users, reported often to see periods of treatment as too short and continuing support
511 between periods of intensive therapy as lacking⁽³⁸⁾. Whether or not services were time-limited, there
512 was agreement that careful collaborative discharge planning was required to mitigate some of the
513 frequently experienced challenges and help service users work towards self-sufficiency.

514 Many of these findings align with those identified in our accompanying meta-synthesis of
515 the of the perspectives and experiences of service users with CEN⁽³⁸⁾. For example, service users also
516 appear to prioritise individualised care, preferring clinicians to focus on individual needs and
517 aspirations rather than diagnosis or intervention fidelity. Clinicians were called upon in papers on
518 service user perspectives to sustain hope and provide encouragement while at the same time

519 maintaining realistic expectations and not invalidating service user distress. The centrality of the
520 therapeutic relationship is a further point of consensus. While both clinicians and service users
521 emphasised the need to offer a variety of treatment options to meet service users' heterogeneous
522 needs, service users also prioritised structure, stability and a long-term perspective in their care.
523 These are not inconsistent demands as options can be flexible and varied, yet the delivery of such
524 can remain structured and consistent on an individual level.

525 Concerns around the usefulness and impact of using "personality disorder" labels were also
526 similar to those reported from studies of service user perspectives. However, the included papers on
527 clinician perspectives tended less to reflect recent calls by service user advocates and some
528 clinicians, supported by patient testimonials and growing evidence, to give trauma a central role in
529 the assessment and treatment of CEN^(71, 72), a call also reinforced by feminist critiques of "personality
530 disorder" as a mechanism for pathologising understandable responses to oppression, abuse and
531 structural inequalities⁽¹⁷⁾. This omission may in part reflect the fact that most studies were
532 conducted before the rise of the 'Trauma not PD' movement^(71, 72). We suggest that alongside the
533 priorities identified above, incorporating trauma-informed approaches to care and preventing re-
534 traumatising within mental health settings should probably be seen as key elements in good
535 practice if a shared agenda for service improvement is to be agreed on by service users and
536 clinicians⁽⁷³⁾.

537 The value of exploring clinician perspectives is particularly in identifying ways of promoting
538 positive change and of removing clinician-related barriers to this. This review echoes much other
539 literature in identifying pejorative clinician attitudes and behaviours as an important obstacle to
540 delivering care that is even adequate, especially in non-specialist settings. Developing and evaluating
541 ways to challenge and change such behaviours is thus a pressing need. This review also identifies the
542 need to extend more support to clinicians working with people with CEN; across several studies
543 clinicians reported on the significant emotional toll of their work, which could potentially fuel

544 negative behaviours and a lack of therapeutic optimism. Several of our themes related to the need
545 for clinicians to strike a balance, including balancing connection against distance, doing too much or
546 too little in terms of treatment provision and balancing service user empowerment and
547 independence with service pressures of risk-aversion. Needs of different stakeholders also require
548 balancing: for example, do some clinicians warn against long-term input for the benefit of service
549 users (to promote independence), for the benefit of themselves (to avoid challenging work), or for
550 the benefit of services (to meet capacity constraints)? This balancing act, together with caseload and
551 referral pressures, may well contribute to the emotional toll of working with people with CEN.
552 However, clinicians, especially in specialist services, also described many ways of alleviating this
553 burden, including through supervision, reflective practice and informal support between colleagues.
554 The burdens associated with difficult therapeutic decisions, especially regarding safety, were clearly
555 alleviated by being shared, both with colleagues and service users. As such, multidisciplinary co-
556 produced formulations, maintaining the centrality of the therapeutic relationship, and ‘holding in
557 mind’ the SU could provide some guiding principles for clinicians when navigating these complex
558 balances and would be a useful focus for further research.

559 Constraints on good practice relating to the wider service system were recurrently
560 described, including exclusive thresholds and referral pathways, inflexibility of services to meet
561 diverse and long-term needs and manage co-occurring conditions, and lack of time for reflection and
562 training. Lack of recognition of the needs of people with CEN and lack of resourcing to meet these
563 needs were widely reported and likely to contribute. These deficits may also reflect a lack of
564 evidence and strategic thinking on how to optimise service design to result in coherent pathways
565 allowing smooth transitions between accessible services corresponding to service users’ needs and
566 delivery of a full range of evidence-based psychosocial interventions in all relevant settings. The
567 major focus of research on CEN has been on the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of relatively
568 short-term psychological therapies: co-produced research taking a whole-system perspective on

569 how to design systems of care that meet the varying needs of diverse service users at different
570 stages in their pathways through services now appears to be an important need.

571 **Limitations**

572 We aimed to include papers regarding management in the community of people with a
573 range of “personality disorder” diagnoses or who might have related difficulties, such as recurrent
574 self-harm, but not have received such a diagnosis. However, in practice most studies focused on
575 people who had received a diagnosis of “borderline personality disorder”. As such, our findings
576 relate mainly to this group, with some heterogeneity in the ways in which study samples were
577 identified. There was a good variety of professional backgrounds and levels of care across included
578 papers, but little literature about voluntary organisations and other community services outside the
579 secondary mental health care system. This may reflect limitations of the search strategy, but
580 probably also indicates a scarcity of research in these areas. This may mean that the voices of staff
581 who support individuals who have disengaged or been excluded from the mainstream mental health
582 system are not included.

583 As this is a meta-synthesis identifying and cross-validating over-arching themes across many
584 studies, a level of nuance and specificity will have inevitably been lost, with findings pooled from a
585 variety of contexts, dates and countries. The two researchers who worked the most closely on
586 synthesis (JT and BLT) both have clinical experience of providing mental health care, while three
587 other authors (JR, TJ, EB) bring relevant lived experience of service use – the results presented here
588 and their interpretation may well be shaped by their perceptions born from these experiences.
589 Efforts were made to counter this through adopting an inductive approach to analysis, double coding
590 a portion of papers, discussing themes together and iteratively, and through the collaboration of the
591 review team and experts by experience and occupation.

592 **Conclusion**

593 Clinicians' experiences of and perspectives on good practice for providing community care
594 for people with CEN offer valuable insight into how to better meet the needs of this population and
595 the needs of the clinicians supporting them and are largely in harmony with the perspectives of
596 service users⁽³⁸⁾. In further research, a focus is now needed on how to implement these principles of
597 good practice across the service system to improve service user outcomes and the experiences of
598 service users and clinicians. Previous research has tended to focus on individual psychological
599 interventions: a focus on designing a whole system of care that can meet the longer-term needs of
600 people with CEN in a sustainable way is now desirable. Development and evaluation of fidelity
601 measures that reflect agreed good practice^(74, 75), and of approaches to support services in achieving
602 and maintaining high fidelity, is a potential approach to meeting this need. The apparent congruence
603 on many values and principles between service users and clinicians suggests that a co-produced
604 approach to future research, service development and policy formulation is likely to be fruitful.
605 Finally, an overarching emerging issue deserving further research and policy development is of
606 equity: clinicians echo service users in arguing that people with CEN tend to be a marginal group,
607 often not prioritised for resources and attracting negative attitudes and behaviour. Change is not
608 likely to be achieved unless the needs of people with CEN are placed on an equal footing with the
609 needs of people with other long-term physical and mental health conditions.

610 **Lived Experience Commentaries**

611 In line with service user critiques and our own lived experience, this meta-synthesis provides
612 further evidence that for many people with CEN, current mental health services are simply not fit for
613 purpose. From clinician burnout and pejorative attitudes, to a clinical victim-blaming culture when a
614 service cannot meet service users' needs, the signs of a system at breaking point are undeniable.

615 Since clinicians themselves seem to recognise the wider social context, i.e., that trauma and
616 adversity are major contributors to the distress experienced by people with CEN, it begs the

617 question: why do most services still regard the medical model as the panacea? It appears that we
618 need major systemic change and services should truly embrace inclusive, co-designed approaches
619 that value lived experience and also support user-led models of care.

620 Clinicians' concerns around diagnostic utility are noted and shared. However, 'dancing
621 around the diagnosis' due to fears of stigma and exclusion - no matter how well intentioned - may
622 actually be counterproductive and inadvertently further perpetuate the stigma. It only underscores
623 the urgent need to address this controversial terminology.

624 Despite the awareness of a gender bias that results in women with CEN being
625 disproportionately more likely to receive a "borderline personality disorder" label than men, there is
626 no mention of the overlap with Autism Spectrum Conditions (ASC)⁽⁷⁶⁾ and the fact that women are
627 conversely under-diagnosed with ASC. This may have serious implications for potentially mis-
628 diagnosed service users who may end up trapped on unsuitable treatment pathways and therefore
629 constitutes a significant gap in the evidence base warranting investment in further research.

630 While we support inter- and multi-agency working in principle, stakeholders need to be
631 mindful of its potential pitfalls. For example, as if pathologising legitimate feelings of distress wasn't
632 problematic enough, collaborating with law enforcement (e.g., through the "Serenity Integrated
633 Mentoring" programme)⁽⁷⁷⁾ can exacerbate the risk of going as far as criminalising CEN. Such
634 misconceived interventions can not only permanently destroy service users' trust in mental health
635 services, but can also have absolutely devastating effects on their life chances, negating any attempt
636 at meaningful recovery.

637 Overall, it is encouraging that there *are* clinicians who share our views after all, and the
638 answer to "Whose needs are they anyway?" should be a resounding "Everyone's!"

639 After all, service users don't benefit from working with stressed and burnt-out clinicians,
640 either; therefore, the desire to improve staff training and support is mutual. Unfortunately, the

641 prevailing systemic flaws are not conducive to either individual practitioner or service improvement.
642 Likewise, influencing those clinicians who are steadfast in holding onto stigmatising views of people
643 with CEN is going to be a major challenge that should ideally be addressed with co-production
644 throughout service development and delivery.

645 Eva Broeckelmann and Jessica Russell

646 **Broken Mirrors**

647 Whilst reading this review, I was struck by the allegory of a mirror. The focus is on clinicians,
648 but its sister paper with a service user focus⁽³⁸⁾ reflects the same issues. The mirror allegory goes
649 beyond similar themes being reflected. The opinions of each side are fragmented – like a broken
650 mirror. The broken fragments of each side appear as perfect replicas of the other, yet can only see
651 each other in reverse, appearing as polar opposites.

652 The data here is constricted to what is within the literature, with both papers dutifully
653 reporting this. This data is limited in providing an understanding of why, despite appearing to want
654 the same thing, there is such a relational divide between service user and service provider.

655 The roles of people working within the Lived Experience Professions (i.e., peer support
656 workers, service user consultants, lived experience researchers) could be described as roles that
657 bridge between the two polarised worlds, communicating sameness and difference between the
658 two. Literature exploring how this could relate to developing relational bridges within the field of
659 trauma/complex emotional needs/“personality disorder” is not included – potentially because it
660 does not exist or exists in a format that does not fit within the search criteria. This highlights the
661 importance of being able to value experiential data as a valid consideration within research, in order
662 to lessen the phenomenon of studies giving a perfect view of one small fragment of the broken
663 mirror, whilst disregarding the rest. Services benefit more from a full view of the broken mirror,
664 even if the individual shards are more blurred than one perfect piece.

665 This gave me pause for thought when researchers described their experiences of working in
666 services as a potential limitation in the review. Once they have acknowledged their own perspective,
667 understanding the line between this and the data, their 'limitation' is in fact a strength – and this
668 knowledge needs to be recognised, valued and encouraged more. The literature we use to inform
669 and shape policy is not being practiced under lab conditions, but in the messy world where broken
670 mirrors exist.

671

Tamar Jeynes

672 **Acknowledgments**

673 This report is based on independent research commissioned and funded by the National
674 Institute for Health Research Policy Research Programme. The views expressed are those of the
675 author(s) and not necessarily those of the NHS, the National Institute for Health Research, the
676 Department of Health and Social Care or its arm's length bodies, and other Government
677 Departments.

678 **Contributions**

679 Conceptualisation: Sonia Johnson, Sian Oram, Chris Cooper
680 Data curation: Chris Cooper, Luke Sheridan Rains, Jordan Troup, Zainab Dedat, Thomas Steare.
681 Formal analysis: Billie Lever-Taylor and Jordan Troup.
682 Methodology: Sonia Johnson, Sian Oram, Chris Cooper, Luke Sheridan Rains, Billie Lever-Taylor, and
683 Jordan Troup.
684 Supervision: Chris Cooper, Billie Lever-Taylor, Luke Sheridan Rains, Sian Oram, and Sonia Johnson.
685 Writing – original draft: Billie Lever-Taylor, Jordan Troup, Jessica Russell, Tamar Jeynes, and
686 Eva Broeckelmann.
687 Writing – review & editing: Luke Sheridan Rains, Eva Broeckelmann, Tamar Jeynes, Jessica Russell,
688 Billie Lever-Taylor, Chris Cooper, Sian Oram, Oliver Dale, Shirley McNicholas, and Sonia Johnson

689 **Funding**

690 This paper presents independent research commissioned and funded by the National
691 Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Policy Research Programme, conducted by the NIHR Policy
692 Research Unit (PRU) in Mental Health. The views expressed are those of the authors and not
693 necessarily those of the NIHR, the Department of Health and Social Care or its arm's length bodies,
694 or other government departments.

695

References

- 696 1. Winsper C, Bilgin A, Thompson A, Marwaha S, Chanen AM, Singh SP, et al. The prevalence of
697 personality disorders in the community: a global systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J*
698 *Psychiatry*. 2020;216(2):69-78.
- 699 2. Beckwith H, Moran P, Reilly J. Personality disorder prevalence in psychiatric outpatients: a
700 systematic literature review. *Personal Ment Health*. 2014;8(2):91-101.
- 701 3. Coid J, Yang M, Bebbington P, Moran P, Brugha T, Jenkins R, et al. Borderline personality
702 disorder: health service use and social functioning among a national household population. *Psychol*
703 *Med*. 2009;39(10):1721-31.
- 704 4. Lenzenweger MF, Lane MC, Loranger AW, Kessler RC. DSM-IV Personality Disorders in the
705 National Comorbidity Survey Replication. *Biological Psychiatry*. 2007;62(6):553-64.
- 706 5. Fok ML-Y, Stewart R, Hayes RD, Moran P. The impact of co-morbid personality disorder on
707 use of psychiatric services and involuntary hospitalization in people with severe mental illness.
708 2014;49(10):1631-40.
- 709 6. Newton-Howes G, Tyrer P, Johnson T. Personality disorder and the outcome of depression:
710 Meta-analysis of published studies. *British Journal of Psychiatry*. 2006;188(1):13-20.
- 711 7. Lee HB, Bienvenu O, Cho S, Ramsey C, Bandeen-Roche K, Eaton W, et al. Personality
712 disorders and traits as predictors of incident cardiovascular disease: findings from the 23-year
713 follow-up of the Baltimore ECA study. 2010;58(4):289-96.
- 714 8. Moran P, Stewart R, Brugha T, Bebbington P, Bhugra D, Jenkins R, et al. Personality disorder
715 and cardiovascular disease: Results from a national household survey. *The Journal of Clinical*
716 *Psychiatry*. 2007;68(1):69-74.
- 717 9. Quirk SE, El-Gabalawy R, Brennan S, Bolton J, Sareen J, Berk M, et al. Personality disorders
718 and physical comorbidities in adults from the United States: data from the National Epidemiologic
719 Survey on Alcohol and Related Conditions. *Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol*. 2014;50(5):807-20.
- 720 10. Fok ML-Y, Hayes RD, Chang C-K, Stewart R, Callard FJ, Moran P. Life expectancy at birth and
721 all-cause mortality among people with personality disorder. *J Psychosom Res*. 2012;73(2):104-7.
- 722 11. Soeteman DI, Verheul R, Busschbach JJ. The burden of disease in personality disorders:
723 diagnosis-specific quality of life. *J Pers Disord*. 2008;22(3):259-68.
- 724 12. McCrone PR, Dhanasiri S, Patel A, Knapp M, Lawton-Smith S. *Paying the price: the cost of*
725 *mental health care in England to 2026*. London: King's Fund; 2008.
- 726 13. Soeteman DI, Hakkaart-van Roijen L, Verheul R, Busschbach JJ. The economic burden of
727 personality disorders in mental health care. *J Clin Psychiatry*. 2008;69(2):259-65.
- 728 14. Campbell K, Clarke K-A, Massey D, Lakeman R. Borderline Personality Disorder: To diagnose
729 or not to diagnose? That is the question. *International journal of mental health nursing* [Internet].
730 2020. DOI: 10.1080/01612840.2020.1833119
- 731 15. Lester R, Prescott L, McCormack M, Sampson M, North West Boroughs Healthcare NHS
732 Foundation Trust. Service users' experiences of receiving a diagnosis of borderline personality
733 disorder: A systematic review. *Personality and Mental Health*. 2020;14(3):263-83.
- 734 16. Recovery in the Bin. *RITB Position Statement On Borderline Personality Disorder*. 2019.
735 Available from: [https://recoveryinthebin.org/2019/04/03/ritb-position-statement-on-borderline-](https://recoveryinthebin.org/2019/04/03/ritb-position-statement-on-borderline-personality-disorder/)
736 [personality-disorder/](https://recoveryinthebin.org/2019/04/03/ritb-position-statement-on-borderline-personality-disorder/).
- 737 17. The Lancet Psychiatry. Beyond the borderline. *The Lancet Psychiatry*. 2019;6(3):187.
- 738 18. Dale O, Sethi F, Stanton C, Evans S, Barnicot K, Sedgwick R, et al. Personality disorder
739 services in England: findings from a national survey. *BJPsych Bull*. 2017;41(5):247-53.
- 740 19. National Institute for Mental Health for England. *Personality Disorder: No Longer a Diagnosis*
741 *of Exclusion. Policy Implementation Guidance for the Development of Services for People with*
742 *Personality Disorder*. London: NIMH(E); 2003.
- 743 20. Snowden P, Kane E. Personality disorder: no longer a diagnosis of exclusion. *Psychiatric*
744 *Bulletin*. 2003;27(11):401-3.

- 745 21. NHS England. *NHS Mental Health Implementation Plan 2019/20 – 2023/24*. England: NHS
746 England; 2019.
- 747 22. Royal College of Psychiatrists PS01/20. *Services for people diagnosable with personality*
748 *disorder* 2020. Available from: [https://www.rcpsych.ac.uk/docs/default-source/improving-](https://www.rcpsych.ac.uk/docs/default-source/improving-care/better-mh-policy/position-statements/ps01_20.pdf?sfvrsn=85af7fbc_2)
749 [care/better-mh-policy/position-statements/ps01_20.pdf?sfvrsn=85af7fbc_2](https://www.rcpsych.ac.uk/docs/default-source/improving-care/better-mh-policy/position-statements/ps01_20.pdf?sfvrsn=85af7fbc_2).
- 750 23. Jarrett C. Understanding personality disorder. *The Psychologist*. 2006;19(7):402.
- 751 24. Chanen A, Sharp C, Hoffman P, Global Alliance for Prevention and Early Intervention for
752 Borderline Personality Disorder. Prevention and early intervention for borderline personality
753 disorder: a novel public health priority. *World Psychiatry*. 2017;16(2):215-6.
- 754 25. Simonsen S, Bateman A, Bohus M, Dalewijk HJ, Doering S, Kaera A, et al. European guidelines
755 for personality disorders: past, present and future. *Borderline Personality Disorder and Emotion*
756 *Dysregulation*. 2019;6(1):9.
- 757 26. National Health and Medical Research Council. *Clinical Practice Guideline for the*
758 *Management of Borderline Personality Disorder*. Melbourne: National Health and Medical Research
759 Council; 2012.
- 760 27. Blum N, St. John D, Pfohl B, Stuart S, McCormick B, Allen J, et al. Systems Training for
761 Emotional Predictability and Problem Solving (STEPPS) for Outpatients With Borderline Personality
762 Disorder: A Randomized Controlled Trial and 1-Year Follow-Up. *American Journal of Psychiatry*.
763 2008;165(4):468-78.
- 764 28. Clarkin JF, Levy KN, Lenzenweger MF, Kernberg OF. Evaluating Three Treatments for
765 Borderline Personality Disorder: A Multiwave Study. *American Journal of Psychiatry*.
766 2007;164(6):922-8.
- 767 29. Giesen-Bloo J, van Dyck R, Spinhoven P, van Tilburg W, Dirksen C, van Asselt T, et al.
768 Outpatient Psychotherapy for Borderline Personality Disorder: Randomized Trial of Schema-Focused
769 Therapy vs Transference-Focused Psychotherapy. *Archives of General Psychiatry*. 2006;63(6):649-58.
- 770 30. Linehan MM, Comtois KA, Murray AM, Brown MZ, Gallop RJ, Heard HL, et al. Two-Year
771 Randomized Controlled Trial and Follow-up of Dialectical Behavior Therapy vs Therapy by Experts for
772 Suicidal Behaviors and Borderline Personality Disorder. *Archives of General Psychiatry*.
773 2006;63(7):757-66.
- 774 31. McMaim SF, Guimond T, Streiner DL, Cardish RJ, Links PS. Dialectical Behavior Therapy
775 Compared With General Psychiatric Management for Borderline Personality Disorder: Clinical
776 Outcomes and Functioning Over a 2-Year Follow-Up. *American Journal of Psychiatry*.
777 2012;169(6):650-61.
- 778 32. Storebø OJ, Stoffers-Winterling JM, Völlm BA, Kongerslev MT, Mattivi JT, Jørgensen MS, et
779 al. Psychological therapies for people with borderline personality disorder. *Cochrane Database of*
780 *Systematic Reviews* [Internet]. 2020; (5):CD012955. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD012955.pub2
- 781 33. Evans S, Sethi F, Dale O, Stanton C, Sedgwick R, Doran M, et al. Personality disorder service
782 provision: a review of the recent literature. *Mental Health Review Journal*. 2017;22(2):65-82.
- 783 34. Crawford M, Price K, Rutter D, Moran P, Tyrer P, Bateman A, et al. Dedicated community-
784 based services for adults with personality disorder: Delphi study. *Br J Psychiatry*. 2008;193(4):342-3.
- 785 35. Ring D, Lawn SA-O. Stigma perpetuation at the interface of mental health care: a review to
786 compare patient and clinician perspectives of stigma and borderline personality disorder[Internet].
787 2019. DOI: 10.1080/09638237.2019.1581337.
- 788 36. Dickens GL, Lamont E, Gray S. Mental health nurses' attitudes, behaviour, experience and
789 knowledge regarding adults with a diagnosis of borderline personality disorder: systematic,
790 integrative literature review. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*. 2016;25:1848-75.
- 791 37. Crawford MJ, Adedeji T, Price K, Rutter D. Job Satisfaction and Burnout Among Staff Working
792 in Community-Based Personality Disorder Services. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry*.
793 2010;56(2):196-206.

- 794 38. Sheridan Rains L, Echave A, Rees J, Scott HR, Lever-Taylor B, Broeckelmann E, et al. Service
795 user experiences of community services for Complex Emotional Needs: A qualitative thematic
796 synthesis (pre-print). *medRxiv* [Internet]. 2020. DOI: 10.1101/2020.10.30.20222729
- 797 39. Botham J, Clark A, Steare T, Stuart R, Oram S, Lloyd-Evans B, et al. Community interventions
798 for people with complex emotional needs that meet the criteria for 'personality disorder' diagnoses:
799 a systematic review of economic evaluations (pre-print). *medRxiv* [Internet]. 2020. DOI:
800 10.1101/2020.11.03.20225078
- 801 40. Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, et al. Preferred reporting
802 items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Systematic*
803 *Reviews*. 2015;4(1):1.
- 804 41. Thomas J, Harden A. Methods for the thematic synthesis of qualitative research in
805 systematic reviews. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*. 2008;8(1):45.
- 806 42. Critical Appraisal Skills Programme. *CASP Qualitative Checklist 2018*. Available from:
807 <https://casp-uk.net/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/CASP-Qualitative-Checklist-2018.pdf>
- 808 43. Bosanac P, Hamilton B, Beatson J, Trett R, Rao S, Mancuso S, et al. Mentalization-based
809 intervention to recurrent acute presentations and self-harm in a community mental health service
810 setting. *Australasian Psychiatry*. 2015;23(3):277-81.
- 811 44. Carmel A, Rose ML, Fruzzetti AE. Barriers and solutions to implementing dialectical behavior
812 therapy in a public behavioral health system. *Adm Policy Ment Health*. 2014;41(5):608-14.
- 813 45. Crawford M, Rutter D. Lessons Learned from an Evaluation of Dedicated Community-based
814 Services for People with Personality Disorder. *The Mental Health Review*. 2007;12(4):55-61.
- 815 46. Crawford M, Rutter D, Price K, Weaver T, Josson M, Tyrer P, et al. Learning the lessons: a
816 multi-method evaluation of dedicated community-based services for people with personality
817 disorder. London: National Co-ordinating Centre for NHS Service Delivery & Organisation. 2007.
- 818 47. Donald F, Duff C, Lawrence K, Broadbear J, Rao S. Clinician perspectives on recovery and
819 borderline personality disorder. *The Journal of Mental Health Training, Education and Practice*.
820 2017;12(3):199-209.
- 821 48. Fanaian M, Lewis KL, Grenyer BFS. Improving services for people with personality disorders:
822 Views of experienced clinicians. *International Journal of Mental Health Nursing*. 2013;22(5):465-71.
- 823 49. French L, Moran P, Wiles N, Kessler D, Turner KM. GPs' views and experiences of managing
824 patients with personality disorder: a qualitative interview study. *BMJ Open* [Internet]. 2019;
825 9(2):e026616. DOI: 10.1136/bmjopen-2018-026616
- 826 50. Herschell AD, Kogan JN, Celedonia KL, Gavin JG, Stein BD. Understanding Community Mental
827 Health Administrators' Perspectives on Dialectical Behavior Therapy Implementation. *Psychiatric*
828 *Services*. 2009;60(7):989-92.
- 829 51. Hogard E, Ellis R. An evaluation of a managed clinical network for personality disorder:
830 breaking new ground or top dressing? *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice*. 2010;16(6):1147-56.
- 831 52. Hutton R, Hodge S, Tighe M. Switching roles: a qualitative study of staff experiences of being
832 dialectical behaviour therapists within the National Health Service in England. *The Cognitive*
833 *Behaviour Therapist* [Internet]. 2017; 10:e6. DOI: 10.1017/S1754470X17000083
- 834 53. Koekkoek B, van Meijel B, Schene A, Hutschemaekers G. Clinical Problems in Community
835 Mental Health Care for Patients with Severe Borderline Personality Disorder. *Community Mental*
836 *Health Journal*. 2009;45(6):508.
- 837 54. Lamph G, Baker J, Dickinson T, Lovell K. Personality disorder co-morbidity in primary care
838 'Improving Access to Psychological Therapy' services: A qualitative study exploring professionals'
839 perspectives of working with this patient group. *Personality and Mental Health*. 2019;13(3):168-79.
- 840 55. Langley GC, Klopper H. Trust as a foundation for the therapeutic intervention for patients
841 with borderline personality disorder. *Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing*.
842 2005;12(1):23-32.
- 843 56. Lee T, McLean D, Moran P, Jones H, Kumar A. A pilot personality disorder outreach service:
844 development, findings and lessons learnt. *Psychiatric Bulletin*. 2008;32(4):127-30.

- 845 57. Morant N, King J. A multi-perspective evaluation of a specialist outpatient service for people
846 with personality disorders. *The Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology*. 2003;14(1):44-66.
- 847 58. O'Connell B, Dowling M. Community psychiatric nurses' experiences of caring for clients with
848 borderline personality disorder. *Mental Health Practice*. 2013;17(4):27-33.
- 849 59. Perseus KI, Kåver A, Ekdahl S, Åsberg M, Samuelsson M. Stress and burnout in psychiatric
850 professionals when starting to use dialectical behavioural therapy in the work with young self-
851 harming women showing borderline personality symptoms. *Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health
852 Nursing*. 2007;14(7):635-43.
- 853 60. Perseus K-I, Öjehagen A, Ekdahl S, Åsberg M, Samuelsson M. Treatment of suicidal and
854 deliberate self-harming patients with borderline personality disorder using dialectical behavioral
855 therapy: the patients' and the therapists' perceptions. *Archives of Psychiatric Nursing*.
856 2003;17(5):218-27.
- 857 61. Pigot M, Miller CE, Brockman R, Grenyer BFS. Barriers and facilitators to the implementation
858 of a stepped care intervention for personality disorder in mental health services. *Personality and
859 Mental Health*. 2019;13(4):230-8.
- 860 62. Priest P, Dunn C, Hackett J, Wills K. How can mental health professionals best be supported
861 in working with people who experience significant distress? *Journal of Mental Health* [Internet].
862 2011; 20(6):543-54 pp.]. DOI: 10.3109/09638237.2011.577115
- 863 63. Rizq R. 'There's always this sense of failure': an interpretative phenomenological analysis of
864 primary care counsellors' experiences of working with the borderline client. *Journal of Social Work
865 Practice*. 2012;26(1):31-54.
- 866 64. Stalker K, Ferguson I, Barclay A. 'It is a horrible term for someone': service user and provider
867 perspectives on 'personality disorder'. *Disability & Society*. 2005;20(4):359-73.
- 868 65. Stroud J, Parsons R. Working with borderline personality disorder: A small-scale qualitative
869 investigation into community psychiatric nurses' constructs of borderline personality disorder.
870 *Personality and Mental Health*. 2013;7(3):242-53.
- 871 66. Sulzer SH, Muenchow E, Potvin A, Harris J, Gigot G. Improving patient-centered
872 communication of the borderline personality disorder diagnosis. *Journal of Mental Health*.
873 2016;25(1):5-9.
- 874 67. Thompson AR, Donnison J, Warnock-Parkes E, Turpin G, Turner J, Kerr IB. Multidisciplinary
875 community mental health team staff's experience of a 'skills level' training course in cognitive
876 analytic therapy. *International Journal of Mental Health Nursing*. 2008;17(2):131-7.
- 877 68. Vyas A, Spain C, Rawlinson D. Working in a therapeutic community: exploring the impact on
878 staff. *Therapeutic Communities: The International Journal of Therapeutic Communities*.
879 2017;38(1):32-40.
- 880 69. Wilson R, Weaver T, Michelson D, Day C. Experiences of parenting and clinical intervention
881 for mothers affected by personality disorder: a pilot qualitative study combining parent and clinician
882 perspectives. *BMC Psychiatry*. 2018;18(1):152.
- 883 70. Włodarczyk J, Lawn S, Powell K, Crawford GB, McMahon J, Burke J, et al. Exploring General
884 Practitioners' Views and Experiences of Providing Care to People with Borderline Personality
885 Disorder in Primary Care: A Qualitative Study in Australia. *International Journal of Environmental
886 Research and Public Health*. 2018;15(12):2763.
- 887 71. Giourou E, Skokou M, Andrew SP, Alexopoulou K, Gourzis P, Jelastopulu E. Complex
888 posttraumatic stress disorder: The need to consolidate a distinct clinical syndrome or to reevaluate
889 features of psychiatric disorders following interpersonal trauma? *World J Psychiatry*. 2018;8(1):12-9.
- 890 72. Watts J. Problems with the ICD-11 classification of personality disorder. *The Lancet
891 Psychiatry*. 2019;6(6):461-3.
- 892 73. Sweeney A, Clement S, Filson B, Kennedy A. Trauma-informed mental healthcare in the UK:
893 what is it and how can we further its development? *Mental Health Review Journal*. 2016;21(3):174-
894 92.

- 895 74. Lloyd-Evans B, Bond GR, Ruud T, Ivanicka A, Gray R, Osborn D, et al. Development of a
896 measure of model fidelity for mental health Crisis Resolution Teams. *BMC Psychiatry*.
897 2016;16(1):427.
- 898 75. Lloyd-Evans B, Osborn D, Marston L, Lamb D, Ambler G, Hunter R, et al. The CORE service
899 improvement programme for mental health crisis resolution teams: results from a cluster-
900 randomised trial. *Br J Psychiatry*. 2020;216(6):314-22.
- 901 76. Dudas RB, Lovejoy C, Cassidy S, Allison C, Smith P, Baron-Cohen S. The overlap between
902 autistic spectrum conditions and borderline personality disorder. *PLOS ONE* [Internet]. 2017;
903 12(9):e0184447. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0184447
- 904 77. Jennings P, Matheson-Monnet CB. Multi-agency mentoring pilot intervention for high
905 intensity service users of emergency public services: the Isle of Wight Integrated Recovery
906 Programme. *Journal of Criminological Research, Policy and Practice*. 2017;3(2):105-18.

