Int. j. adv. multidisc. res. stud. 2026; 6(3):1616-1623

Received: 29-04-2026
Accepted: 09-06-2026

International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies

ISSN: 2583-049X

Are Personality Disorders Diagnosed Too Late? A Review of Genetic and Developmental Evidence Using Artificial Intelligence-Assisted Synthesis

Sharleen A Harty
Swedenborg Library, Chicago, United States

Corresponding Author: **Sharleen A Harty**

Abstract
Personality disorders (PDs) are traditionally diagnosed in adulthood, often following the consolidation of maladaptive behavioral patterns and interpersonal dysfunction. However, advances in behavioral genetics, developmental psychopathology, and neuroscience increasingly challenge the assumption that personality pathology emerges primarily from adult experiences or environmental adversity alone. This review synthesizes emerging evidence indicating that genetically influenced traits, early temperament, and neurobiological differences can be identified well before formal diagnosis is possible. Findings from twin studies and longitudinal cohorts suggest substantial heritability of personality traits associated with PDs, alongside developmental continuity from childhood behavioral patterns to adult pathology.[1523] Early indicators—including emotional dysregulation, impulsivity, and callous–unemotional traits—demonstrate predictive validity for later dysfunction.[78] At the same time, environmental factors such as trauma, attachment disruption, and social context remain critical in shaping the expression, severity, and trajectory of these traits, highlighting the importance of gene–environment interplay.[414] The evidence suggests that current diagnostic frameworks may be temporally misaligned with the developmental onset of personality pathology, potentially limiting opportunities for early intervention. A shift toward earlier identification—integrating genetic risk, developmental markers, and environmental context—may improve prevention and treatment outcomes. Future research should focus on refining predictive models and addressing ethical considerations surrounding early labeling and intervention. This review incorporates AI-assisted synthesis to integrate complex interdisciplinary findings.

Keywords: Personality Disorders (PDs), Gene–Environment Interaction, Developmental Psychopathology, Early Identification, Temperament, Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Research

1. Introduction

Personality disorders are typically diagnosed in adulthood after persistent patterns of maladaptive behavior and interpersonal dysfunction have become entrenched. This raises an important question: Are PDs identified too late to meaningfully influence developmental trajectories? Converging evidence from behavioral genetics, developmental psychopathology, and longitudinal research increasingly challenges models that emphasize adult symptom emergence and environmental causation alone.[15] Research on heritability, gene–environment interaction, and neurodevelopment suggests that core traits associated with personality pathology—including emotional dysregulation, impulsivity, and callous–unemotional traits—can be observed in early temperament and childhood behavior.[78] Complicating this picture is the high degree of comorbidity and phenotypic overlap both within and across PD clusters, as well as between personality pathology and other psychiatric conditions along the broader psychopathology spectrum.[2] These overlaps challenge categorical diagnostic frameworks and support dimensional models in which shared underlying traits cut across traditional boundaries.[15] Such complexity further obscures early identification, as emerging traits may not align neatly with adult diagnostic criteria. At the same time, synthesizing this expanding body of interdisciplinary research presents significant challenges due to its scale and rapid evolution. By aligning genetic risk, early identification, and developmental markers, this review examines whether current diagnostic frameworks are temporally misaligned and explores implications for earlier intervention and improved outcomes in personality pathology.

1.2 Personality disorder clusters

PDs are commonly grouped into three clusters based on descriptive similarities introduced in DSM classification systems.[12]

Cluster A (odd or eccentric): Paranoid, schizoid, and schizotypal PDs.
Cluster B (dramatic, emotional, or erratic): Antisocial, borderline, histrionic, and narcissistic PDs.
Cluster C (anxious or fearful): Avoidant, dependent, and obsessive–compulsive PDs.
Summary: While this categorical framework remains widely used in clinical practice, it has been increasingly critiqued for limitations in capturing overlap, comorbidity, and developmental continuity across personality pathology.[13]

1.3 Historical development
1801–1835: Early clinical descriptions of disordered personality (e.g., "moral insanity," "madness without delirium") establish the concept of enduring maladaptive behavior independent of psychosis.
1923: Systematic typologies of "psychopathic personalities" introduce early classification of persistent personality traits.
1952 (DSM-I): First formal diagnostic recognition of personality pathology under "sociopathic personality disturbance."[12]
1968 (DSM-II): Expansion of PD categories; definitions remain largely descriptive and theory-driven.[12]
1980 (DSM-III): Major shift toward operationalized diagnostic criteria, with modern PD categories formally defined.[12]
1987 (DSM-III-R): Introduction of Cluster A, B, and C framework.[12]
1990s–2000s: Expansion of behavioral genetics and twin studies demonstrating moderate heritability of personality traits and disorders.[6,15,23]
2000s–present: Integration of molecular genetics, neurobiology, and developmental psychopathology, with increasing recognition of early-life indicators and gene–environment interaction.[4,14]
2013 (DSM-5): Retention of categorical model alongside emerging dimensional approaches.[12]
Summary: This timeline illustrates a progression from descriptive classification toward biologically informed models, highlighting a temporal lag between early developmental vulnerability and formal diagnostic recognition.

2. Methodology
2.1 Study design and literature synthesis
This study employs a narrative review to synthesize interdisciplinary research on personality disorders, focusing on genetic, developmental, and neurobiological evidence relevant to early identification. Literature was identified through targeted review of peer-reviewed sources in behavioral genetics, developmental psychopathology, psychiatry, and neuroscience, with emphasis on longitudinal cohort studies, twin studies, genome-wide association studies, and key theoretical contributions.[14,15] Findings were organized thematically into genetic influences, developmental indicators, neurobiological correlates, and environmental or epigenetic factors. AI-assisted synthesis was used to support integration of complex literature; all outputs were critically reviewed by the author. As a narrative review, this study is subject to selection bias and interpretive limitations.

2.2 DSM-5 framework used in this review
This review uses the DSM-5 classification system as a reference framework for organizing PDs. They are defined as enduring patterns of cognition, affectivity, interpersonal functioning, and impulse control that deviate from cultural expectations and may lead to functional impairment.[12]
Cluster A (odd or eccentric): Paranoid, schizoid, schizotypal PDs.
Cluster B (emotional, impulsive, or dramatic): Antisocial, borderline, histrionic, narcissistic PDs.
Cluster C (anxious or fearful): Avoidant, dependent, obsessive-compulsive PDs.
Summary: While widely used clinically, this categorical system does not fully capture dimensional traits, comorbidity, or developmental continuity across personality pathology.[13]

2.3 Brief descriptions of ten personality disorder types
Cluster A
1. **Paranoid PD:** Distrust and suspicion of others.
2. **Schizoid PD:** Emotional detachment and limited interest in relationships.
3. **Schizotypal PD:** Unusual beliefs, thinking patterns, and social discomfort.

Cluster B
1. **Antisocial PD:** Disregard for rules and others' rights.
2. **Borderline PD:** Emotional instability and fear of abandonment.
3. **Histrionic PD:** Attention-seeking and emotional expression.
4. **Narcissistic PD:** Grandiosity and lack of empathy.

Cluster C
1. **Avoidant PD:** Social inhibition and fear of rejection.
2. **Dependent PD:** Excessive reliance on others.
3. **Obsessive–Compulsive PD:** Perfectionism and rigidity.

2.4 Clinical diagnostic considerations
For diagnostic validity and clinical reference, standardised and evidence-based sources include internationally recognised classification systems and clinical guidelines, including the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition, Text Revision (DSM-5-TR) and the International Classification of Diseases, 11th Revision (ICD-11) diagnostic criteria, as well as guidance from established public health authorities such as the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) in the United Kingdom and the World Health Organization (WHO). Peer-reviewed psychiatric literature (e.g., The Lancet Psychiatry and JAMA Psychiatry) and clinician-developed psychoeducational materials further contribute to evidence-based understanding of personality pathology within both research and clinical contexts.

3. Genetic evidence in personality disorders
A substantial body of research supports the role of genetic factors in the development of personality disorders, challenging models that attribute these conditions primarily to environmental influences or adult-onset pathology. Twin and family studies consistently demonstrate moderate to

high heritability estimates for personality traits and related psychopathology, suggesting that vulnerability to personality pathology is, in part, biologically mediated.[515] Research in behavioral genetics has been particularly influential in establishing the heritability of personality traits, with findings indicating that genetic factors account for approximately 40–60% of variance in many core traits relevant to PDs.[6] These traits are observable early in life and remain relatively stable across development, supporting the view that personality pathology may reflect maladaptive developmental trajectories of underlying temperamental dispositions rather than discrete adult-onset conditions.

Longitudinal research further reinforces this developmental perspective, demonstrating that early temperament and behavioral patterns—such as impulsivity, emotional dysregulation, and antisocial tendencies—can predict later psychopathology, including features associated with personality disorders.[414] Gene–environment interaction models highlight that genetic vulnerability is not deterministic but is shaped by environmental exposures, including trauma, attachment disruption, and social context.[4] These mechanisms help explain divergent outcomes among individuals with similar genetic liability. Kenneth Kendler's work in psychiatric genetics emphasizes that genetic influences on psychiatric disorders, including PDs, operate probabilistically through multiple interacting pathways across development.[5] This aligns with twin study findings showing that genetically identical individuals can exhibit different outcomes depending on environmental conditions. While individual variants exert small effects, polygenic models suggest that cumulative genetic burden contributes to vulnerability across a spectrum of psychiatric conditions, including those overlapping with PDs.[2] Together, this body of genetic evidence supports a dimensional rather than purely categorical understanding of personality pathology.

3.1 A growing body of research

In behavioral genetics and psychiatric genomics provides increasingly precise evidence for the heritable basis of personality pathology. Genome-wide association studies (GWAS)—which identify associations between genetic variants and traits or disorders—have moved beyond twin designs to identify specific loci linked to personality traits and psychopathology. Large-scale analyses demonstrate that personality traits exhibit a highly polygenic architecture, with thousands of genetic variants each contributing small but cumulative effects.[1] GWAS research focused on personality pathology has begun to identify disorder-level genetic signals. A large-scale genome-wide association study of borderline personality disorder identified multiple independent loci and highlighted genetic overlap with major depression, bipolar disorder, and schizophrenia, reinforcing the view that PDs exist within a broader genetically interconnected psychopathology spectrum.[2] These findings extend cross-disorder models by demonstrating that personality pathology is not genetically isolated but shares biological pathways with other psychiatric conditions. These findings are increasingly interpreted within neurodevelopmental frameworks in which processes such as synaptic pruning shape the maturation of neural systems underlying personality. Population-based and multigenerational family studies provide converging evidence for heritable liability.[3] Such designs strengthen causal inference by distinguishing inherited risk from shared environmental exposure. At the trait level, genomic meta-analyses of traits such as neuroticism, impulsivity, and emotional dysregulation confirm substantial genetic correlations with psychiatric disorders, suggesting that personality traits may represent early phenotypic expressions of broader genetic vulnerability.[1] This supports dimensional models in which subclinical traits precede categorical diagnoses. Importantly, these findings align with emerging models of personality genomics in which * DNA-based prediction of behavioral tendencies is increasingly feasible, though not yet clinically deterministic. Genetic liability appears to be present early in development, with expression shaped through gene–environment interaction and epigenetic modulation.[4] Rather than emerging abruptly in adulthood, PDs may reflect the later consolidation of long-standing, genetically influenced traits. * *DNA (deoxyribonucleic acid) is the fundamental molecule that carries the genetic instructions used in the growth, development, functioning, and reproduction of all known living organisms. It acts as a biological instruction manual or recipe book for your cells.*

3.2 Hare's phenotypic validation of personality pathology traits

The work of Robert Hare provides important phenotypic validation of traits relevant to personality pathology. Through the Psychopathy Checklist–Revised (PCL-R), Hare identified stable characteristics such as callousness, lack of empathy, and interpersonal manipulation, which are central to psychopathy and overlap with features of Cluster B PDs.[12] Although primarily clinical rather than genetic, the consistency and early emergence of these traits support findings from behavioral genetics suggesting that such characteristics may reflect underlying heritable dispositions. His work complements genetic research by demonstrating that these traits are measurable, stable, and observable across the lifespan.

4. Developmental trajectories and early indicators

4.1 Developmental psychopathology

Supports the view that many features associated with personality disorders can be identified well before adulthood, emerging in childhood as stable temperamental and behavioral patterns. These findings challenge traditional diagnostic frameworks that delay formal identification until adulthood. Longitudinal research led by Avshalom Caspi has been central in demonstrating that early behavioral tendencies—such as impulsivity, emotional reactivity, and antisocial behavior—can persist across the lifespan and predict later psychopathology.[4] Moffitt's distinction between life-course persistent and adolescence-limited trajectories is particularly relevant, as it identifies a subgroup with early-emerging and enduring behavioral patterns associated with severe adult outcomes. Research on callous–unemotional traits provides further evidence of early markers linked to psychopathy and related personality pathology.[7] These traits—reduced empathy, diminished guilt, and shallow affect—have been identified in children and show moderate heritability and developmental stability.

4.2 Personality pathology

Findings suggest that components of may be observable prior to adult personality consolidation, supporting earlier identification. Temperamental research strengthens this

perspective. Early differences in emotional regulation, behavioral inhibition, and reward sensitivity are associated with later risk for psychopathology, including traits relevant to Cluster B and Cluster C PDs.[14] These profiles interact dynamically with environmental influences across development. Identification must remain cautious, as developmental pathways are probabilistic rather than deterministic. Many children exhibiting risk-related traits do not develop PDs. Environmental factors—including caregiving quality, social context, and trauma exposure—moderate these trajectories.[4] This aligns with gene–environment interaction models.

4.3 Phenomena

In addition to biological, temperamental factors and developmental trajectories are shaped by how individuals interpret internal experiences. Phenomena such as hallucinations or voice-hearing are most commonly associated with psychotic disorders but can be understood within broader frameworks of subjective experience. Phenomenological accounts suggest that such experiences are not interpreted uniformly. Van Dusen's books and clinical writings, influenced by Emanuel Swedenborg, described voice-hearing in terms of perceived external "presences."[1920] While not aligned with contemporary neurobiological models, these perspectives illustrate how cultural and conceptual frameworks shape the interpretation of internal experiences. This variability may influence symptom reporting and longitudinal integration of unusual perceptual phenomena within broader developmental pathways of psychopathology.

5. Neurobiological correlates of personality pathology

5.1 Neurobiological findings

Neurobiological findings provide additional support for the early emergence and relative stability of traits associated with personality disorders. Studies in affective neuroscience and neuroimaging have identified structural and functional differences in brain regions involved in emotion regulation, impulse control, and social cognition—particularly the prefrontal cortex, amygdala, and interconnected limbic systems. These neural circuits are central to threat processing, reward sensitivity, and behavioral inhibition, which are frequently implicated in personality pathology. Research on individuals with psychopathic traits has demonstrated atypical amygdala responsiveness and reduced functional connectivity with prefrontal regulatory regions, consistent with impairments in emotional learning, empathy, and decision-making. Importantly, similar patterns have been observed in youth exhibiting callous–unemotional traits, suggesting that these neurobiological differences may be present prior to adulthood and may interact with genetic and environmental influences over development.[7] Neurodevelopmental models further emphasize that brain maturation—particularly in prefrontal systems—continues into early adulthood. This prolonged developmental period is characterized by processes such as synaptic pruning, in which excess neural connections are selectively eliminated to optimize network efficiency. While pruning is a normative feature of brain maturation, emerging evidence suggests that atypical or dysregulated pruning may contribute to altered connectivity within prefrontal–limbic circuits implicated in emotion regulation and impulse control. Such disruptions have been linked to a range of psychiatric conditions, particularly those with adolescent onset. Although direct evidence in PDs remains limited, aberrant pruning provides a plausible neurodevelopmental mechanism through which genetic vulnerability and environmental stressors may shape the maturation of neural systems underlying personality pathology.[1718] This extended developmental window may help explain both the persistence of maladaptive traits and the potential for intervention during adolescence and young adulthood. At the same time, variability in neural development underscores the importance of avoiding deterministic interpretations. Neurobiological differences should be understood as risk markers rather than fixed outcomes. Overall, neurobiological evidence complements genetic and developmental findings by illustrating potential mechanisms through which early vulnerabilities are expressed and maintained across time.

6. Discussion

6.1 Findings synthesized

These findings support a shift away from conceptualizing personality disorders as conditions that emerge fully formed in adulthood, toward a developmental model in which genetic predispositions, early temperament, and neurobiological systems interact over time. Evidence from behavioral genetics, longitudinal cohort studies, and psychiatric epidemiology converges on the conclusion that traits associated with personality pathology—such as emotional dysregulation, impulsivity, and callous–unemotional characteristics—are observable in childhood and demonstrate moderate developmental stability.[781415] This raises important questions regarding the timing of diagnosis and whether current frameworks, which largely restrict formal PD diagnosis to adulthood, are misaligned with underlying developmental processes.[121317] At the same time, the evidence does not support deterministic interpretations of genetic or neurobiological influence. Gene–environment interaction models consistently demonstrate that genetic vulnerability is probabilistic and shaped by environmental context, including caregiving quality, stress exposure, and broader social conditions.[45] This has important clinical implications: Early identification should be framed as risk recognition rather than inevitability. A further complication arises from the heterogeneity and comorbidity of personality pathology. Traits associated with different diagnostic clusters frequently overlap, and longitudinal trajectories often do not conform neatly to categorical classifications.[2135] This supports dimensional and developmental models of personality pathology, consistent with emerging frameworks in contemporary psychiatric classification.[1314]

6.2 Current treatment limitations

Despite increasing recognition of PDs as clinically significant conditions, available treatments remain limited, particularly when diagnosis occurs in adulthood. Psychotherapeutic approaches such as cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT) and dialectical behavior therapy (DBT) have demonstrated some efficacy, but outcomes are variable and often modest.[22] Treatment requires long-term engagement, and dropout rates are high, especially among individuals with severe personality pathology.[22] Pharmacological interventions are not specifically designed for PDs and are typically used to target comorbid symptoms such as mood instability, anxiety, or impulsivity. As a result, medication

use is often adjunctive rather than curative, and evidence for sustained benefit remains limited.[21] In younger populations, access to specialized treatment is even more constrained. PDs are frequently underdiagnosed in childhood and adolescence due to concerns about diagnostic stability and stigma.[1217] Consequently, early intervention opportunities are often missed, and structured treatment programs tailored to this age group are scarce.[14] Additionally, many clinicians report limited training in the assessment and management of PDs, contributing to variability in care quality. High patient dropout rates may be caused by * ego-syntonic behaviors and thoughts or anosognosia. The outcomes contribute to recurring patterns of personality pathology across multiple generations.[23] * *Ego-syntonic thoughts or behaviors are acceptable to the self. They align perfectly with values, beliefs, and self-image, meaning patients see nothing wrong with them. Anosognosia is a neurological condition in which a person is unaware of their own illness or cognitive deficits. It is a literal lack of self-awareness resulting from actual brain damage or chemical dysfunction, not a psychological defense mechanism like stubbornness or denial, these factors result in suboptimal treatment outcomes.*

6.3 Clinical outcomes

These findings indicate that the burden of PDs extends beyond diagnostic boundaries into both patient-level and systemic consequences. At the individual level, PDs are associated with chronic emotional dysregulation, impaired impulse control, unstable identity formation, and elevated risk of self-harm and suicidality.[1213]

In severe presentations—particularly where comorbid conditions or pronounced Cluster B traits are present—there is evidence of increased risk for extreme maladaptive outcomes, including rare, but documented cases of violence toward self or others.[8910] While such outcomes are statistically uncommon, their clinical relevance lies in their association with severity, chronicity, and lack of sustained treatment engagement. Across relational and social systems, PDs are consistently associated with substantial interpersonal burden. Families and caregivers frequently report high levels of psychological distress, including anxiety, depression, and burnout, alongside disruption to family functioning, economic strain, and social isolation.[23] Romantic relationships are often characterized by instability and conflict, while workplace functioning may be impaired by interpersonal dysfunction and reduced cohesion.[1314] Collectively, these findings suggest that untreated personality pathology can generate cascading effects across multiple domains, often accumulating prior to formal diagnosis and intervention. In parallel with empirical research, clinical and psychoeducational literature and videos provide additional contextual insight into how these patterns are experienced in real-world settings.[16] While such sources are not used as causal evidence, they highlight the lived expression of stable personality traits across relational contexts. Taken together, the integration of genetic, developmental, neurobiological, and outcome-based evidence suggests that current diagnostic frameworks may benefit from reconsideration.[1417] Earlier identification of at-risk individuals—grounded in validated developmental markers rather than rigid categorical thresholds—may allow for more timely and preventive intervention strategies. However, such a shift requires careful ethical safeguards and continued empirical refinement to distinguish transient developmental variation from persistent risk trajectories.

6.4 Health system implications

The findings reviewed in this paper have important implications for both clinical practice and public health. If PDs are understood as conditions with significant genetic and developmental contributions, delayed diagnosis may have consequences that extend beyond the individual and may influence risk transmission across generations.[2334] Genetic vulnerability to personality pathology can be transmitted across generations, particularly when combined with stable environmental factors such as maladaptive family dynamics, trauma exposure, or impaired attachment patterns.[45] In such contexts, the absence of early identification and effective intervention may contribute to the persistence of maladaptive traits within families over time. Emerging genetic research suggests that multiple interacting variants may substantially increase susceptibility to psychiatric conditions.[12] When both parents carry risk-related traits or genetic vulnerabilities, offspring risk may be elevated; however, phenotypic expression remains strongly moderated by environmental and developmental factors, underscoring the importance of early intervention.[414] Late diagnosis and limited treatment effectiveness in adulthood may therefore contribute to a cycle in which personality pathology is both maintained within individuals and reinforced across generations. Future research should focus on integrating genetic, developmental, and environmental models to improve early identification of high-risk individuals.[1417] Expanding access to early intervention and improving clinician training may help disrupt intergenerational patterns and improve outcomes at both individual and familial levels. At a systems level, stepped and stratified care models represent a major development in the treatment of PDs, reflecting a shift toward frameworks in which intervention intensity is matched to severity, risk profile, and functional impairment. This approach integrates low-intensity early interventions (including psychoeducation, digital tools, and structured skills-based programmes) with escalation pathways toward more intensive psychotherapy or specialist services for complex or treatment-resistant presentations.[1422] Such frameworks reflect increasing recognition that personality pathology is heterogeneous in severity and course, requiring flexible and developmentally informed service design rather than uniform treatment allocation.

6.5 Societal and economic impact

Personality disorders (PDs) are associated with substantial burden at multiple levels, including individuals, families, and wider society. Affected individuals often experience chronic interpersonal difficulties, impaired occupational functioning, and reduced quality of life. These challenges frequently extend to family systems, contributing to caregiver stress, relational instability, and intergenerational transmission of maladaptive patterns.

At a societal level, PDs are linked to increased healthcare utilisation, including emergency services, inpatient admissions, and long-term psychiatric care. Indirect costs such as loss of productivity, unemployment, and social support dependence further contribute to the overall economic burden. Collectively, these findings underscore

the importance of early identification and developmentally informed intervention strategies.[24]

6.6 Emerging and cutting-edge directions in personality disorder research

6.6.1 Music-and sound-based interventions

One emerging direction involves music-and sound-based interventions as adjunctive tools for emotion regulation and autonomic modulation. Systematic reviews and meta-analyses indicate that music listening, music creation, and structured music therapy can reduce anxiety, depressive symptoms, and physiological stress responses across psychiatric populations.[2122] Neurobiologically, music engages cortico-limbic systems involved in emotional salience and regulation, making it relevant to personality disorders characterised by affective instability.[21] It is increasingly conceptualised as an active regulatory input rather than passive distraction, with potential to modulate short-term affective states and physiological arousal.

6.6.2 Digital phenotyping and computational psychiatry

Digital phenotyping uses passive smartphone and wearable data (sleep, movement, communication patterns) to model real-world behavioural states.[1617] These markers correlate with impulsivity, affective instability, and interpersonal dysregulation. Artificial intelligence and machine learning approaches further extend this framework by analysing speech, language, and behavioural cues relevant to personality pathology.[247] While promising, these approaches remain limited by bias, interpretability constraints, and lack of robust clinical validation.[18]

6.6.3 Neurobiological plus stepped and stratified intervention systems

Personality disorders are increasingly conceptualised in terms of dysregulated large-scale neural networks involved in emotion regulation, impulse control, and self-referential processing.[20] Within this framework, emerging interventions include real-time functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging (fMRI) neurofeedback. Functional MRI (fMRI) is a neuroimaging technique that measures changes in blood oxygenation (* BOLD signals) as an indirect marker of neural activity. In neurofeedback paradigms, individuals receive real-time feedback on activity in specific brain regions (e.g., the amygdala) and attempt to modulate this activity using cognitive strategies.[25] Although evidence remains preliminary and largely derived from affective and trauma-related disorders, fMRI neurofeedback represents a translational approach aimed at directly modifying neural circuits implicated in emotional dysregulation.[2025] Its application in PDs remains experimental. Stepped and stratified care models complement these developments by matching intervention intensity to severity, risk profile, and functional impairment, enabling escalation from low-intensity to specialist treatment when required.[1422] * *BOLD stands for Blood-Oxygen-Level-Dependent. It is the primary signal used to measure brain activity in functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI).*

6.6.4 Precision psychiatry and state–trait interaction models

Emerging precision psychiatry approaches integrate genetic, environmental, and digital behavioural data into unified predictive frameworks.[1223] A key conceptual development is the state–trait interaction model, which distinguishes stable personality traits (e.g., impulsivity, affective instability) from transient state-dependent fluctuations driven by environmental stressors. This framework conceptualises symptom expression as the dynamic interaction between underlying vulnerability and contextual triggers, offering a more flexible alternative to purely categorical diagnostic models.

6.6.5 Traditional Chinese Medicine (TCM) and acupuncture in research

Within integrative psychiatry, Traditional Chinese Medicine (TCM)-informed frameworks and acupuncture have been explored as adjunctive approaches targeting autonomic regulation and stress-related physiological systems.

Acupuncture is not recognised within DSM-5-TR or ICD-11 as a diagnostic or core treatment modality for personality disorders, and there is no empirical evidence supporting its use in PD classification. Its relevance is therefore considered indirect, through shared mechanisms of stress and affect regulation. Systematic reviews and meta-analyses in psychiatric populations suggest that acupuncture may reduce anxiety symptoms and physiological arousal.[2526] Randomized controlled trials indicate small-to-moderate effects for anxiety reduction, particularly in generalized anxiety disorder.[25] Proposed mechanisms include modulation of autonomic nervous system activity, hypothalamic–pituitary–adrenal (HPA) axis regulation, and limbic system reactivity.[27] These systems are relevant to PDs insofar as affective instability, heightened threat sensitivity, and impaired emotional regulation are core features. Within TCM theory, emotional dysregulation is conceptualised through systemic imbalance frameworks involving constructs such as "Shen" regulation and patterns described as Liver Qi stagnation or Heart–Kidney disharmony.[28] These constructs are internally coherent within TCM but are not empirically validated within modern psychiatric classification systems. Neuroimaging studies suggest acupuncture may influence limbic and paralimbic regions involved in emotional processing and autonomic regulation.[27] However, evidence remains preliminary, and no controlled trials exist in diagnosed PD populations. Accordingly, acupuncture should be considered an exploratory adjunct rather than an evidence-based intervention for personality pathology.

7. Methodological and ethical constraints

7.1 Limitations

This review has several limitations. First, as a narrative synthesis spanning behavioral genetics, developmental psychopathology, and neuroscience, it is subject to selection bias and does not follow a formal systematic review protocol. Although efforts were made to integrate findings across disciplines, the rapidly evolving nature of genetic and developmental research means conclusions should be interpreted as provisional. Second, portions of this manuscript were developed using AI-assisted synthesis to support organisation and integration of interdisciplinary literature. While this improves efficiency, it introduces limitations including potential bias, lack of independent verification of primary sources, and absence of inferential validation. All content was critically reviewed by the author. Third, interpreting PDs as developmentally continuous and partially genetically influenced raises ethical considerations, including risks of stigma, misclassification, and deterministic interpretation of genetic vulnerability. Appropriate safeguards are necessary in any clinical translation. Finally, while clinical observation and lived

experience may provide contextual understanding, they are not treated as empirical evidence within this review.

8. Conclusion

This review has examined converging evidence from behavioral genetics, developmental psychopathology, and neurobiology suggesting that personality disorders may be more accurately conceptualized as the outcome of long-term developmental processes rather than conditions that emerge in adulthood. Genetic influences, early temperament, and neurodevelopmental factors collectively indicate that vulnerability to personality pathology is often detectable well before current diagnostic thresholds are applied. At the same time, the evidence does not support deterministic interpretations. Instead, it highlights the dynamic interplay between genetic predispositions and environmental contexts, emphasizing that early risk represents probabilistic vulnerability rather than inevitable disorder. These findings underscore both the potential and the challenge of earlier identification. While earlier recognition may enable more timely and preventive interventions, it also raises important ethical concerns regarding labeling, stigma, and clinical responsibility. Overall, the integration of interdisciplinary evidence suggests that current diagnostic frameworks may benefit from closer alignment with developmental trajectories, moving toward earlier and more nuanced recognition of risk. Future research should focus on refining predictive developmental markers, improving longitudinal validation, and strengthening ethical frameworks for early identification and developing ethically grounded strategies for early intervention that balance scientific insight with clinical caution. The review also highlights the potential role of AI-assisted synthesis in managing and integrating complex interdisciplinary evidence across behavioral genetics, developmental psychopathology, and neuroscience.

9. References

1. Gupta P, *et al*. A genome-wide investigation into the underlying genetic architecture of personality traits and their overlap with psychopathology. Nat Hum Behav., 2024.
2. Streit F, Awasthi S, Hall AS, *et al*. Genome-wide association study of borderline personality disorder identifies loci and highlights shared risk with mental and somatic disorders. medRxiv. 2024/2025.
3. Multigenerational family study of borderline personality disorder and co-aggregation with psychiatric conditions. Mol Psychiatry, 2025.
4. Caspi A, McClay J, Moffitt TE, *et al*. Role of genotype in the cycle of violence in maltreated children. Science. 2002; 297(5582):851-854.
5. Kendler KS, *et al*. The structure of genetic and environmental risk factors for DSM-IV personality disorders. Arch Gen Psychiatry. 2008; 65(12):1438-1446.
6. Plomin R, Deary IJ. Genetics and intelligence differences: Five special findings. Mol Psychiatry. 2015; 20(1):98-108.
7. Viding E, Blair RJR, Moffitt TE, Plomin R. Evidence for substantial genetic risk for psychopathy in 7-year-olds. J Child Psychol Psychiatry. 2005; 46(6):592-597.
8. Frick PJ, White SF. The importance of callous–unemotional traits for developmental models of aggressive and antisocial behavior. J Child Psychol Psychiatry. 2008; 49(4):359-375.
9. Blair RJR. The neurobiology of psychopathic traits in youths. Nat Rev Neurosci. 2013; 14(11):786-799.
10. Hare RD. Without Conscience: The Disturbing World of the Psychopaths Among Us. Guilford Press, 1999.
11. Salerno P. Traumatic Cognitive Dissonance: Healing From an Abusive Relationship With a Disordered Personality, 2025.
12. American Psychiatric Association. Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders. 5th ed. APA Publishing, 2013.
13. Livesley WJ. The DSM-IV Personality Disorders. Guilford Press, 2001.
14. Cicchetti D, Rogosch FA. A developmental psychopathology perspective on adolescence. J Consult Clin Psychol. 2002; 70(1):6-20.
15. Torgersen S, Lygren S, Øien PA, *et al*. A twin study of personality disorders. Compr Psychiatry. 2000; 41(6):416-425.
16. Grande T. Clinical psychoeducation on personality disorders (YouTube channel). Video example: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JBG57zhaWaw1622
17. Paus T, Keshavan M, Giedd JN. Why do many psychiatric disorders emerge during adolescence? Nat Rev Neurosci. 2008; 9:947-957.
18. Sekar A, Bialas AR, de Rivera H, *et al*. Schizophrenia risk from complex variation of complement component 4. Nature. 2016; 530:177-183.
19. Van Dusen W. The Natural Depth in Man. New York: Harper & Row, 1972. *(Chapter 10: Hallucinations).*
20. Van Dusen W. The Presence of Other Worlds: The Psychological/Spiritual Findings of Emanuel Swedenborg. New York: Harper & Row, 1974. *(Chapter 6: The Presence of Spirits in Madness).*
21. Stoffers-Winterling JM, Storebø OJ, Lieb K. Pharmacotherapy for borderline personality disorder: An update of published meta-analyses. Curr Psychiatry Rep. 2020; 22(6):1-10.
22. Cristea IA, Gentili C, Cotet CD, *et al*. Efficacy of psychotherapies for borderline personality disorder: A systematic review and meta-analysis. JAMA Psychiatry. 2017; 74(4):319-328.
23. Bornovalova MA, Hicks BM, Iacono WG, McGue M. Familial transmission and heritability of personality disorders. Am J Psychiatry. 2009; 166(5):587-593.
24. Soeteman DI, Hakkaart-van Roijen L, Verheul R, Busschbach JJ. The economic burden of personality disorders in mental health care. J Clin Psychiatry. 2008; 69(2):259-264.
25. Jang A, *et al*. Acupuncture for anxiety: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. J Clin Psychol, 2026.
26. Li M, *et al*. Efficacy of acupuncture for generalized anxiety disorder: PRISMA systematic review and meta-analysis. Medicine (Baltimore). 2022; 101(49):e30076.
27. Hong W, *et al*. Effectiveness of electroacupuncture on anxiety: Systematic review and meta-analysis. Front Psychol. 2023; 14:1196177.
28. Kaptchuk TJ. The Web That Has No Weaver: Understanding Chinese Medicine.
29. World Health Organization. Traditional Medicine Strategy / Acupuncture Safety Overview. WHO

technical documentation.
30. Keown D. The Spark in the Machine: How the Science of Acupuncture Explains the Mysteries of Western Medicine. Singing Dragon, 2014.