

Scoping review of Structured Diagnostic Interviews in the Forensic Psychiatric

Setting

Jade C Bouwer^a, Taryn Williams^b, Karen Marè^c, Nyameka Dyakalashé^d, Dan J Stein^e

- a. Department of Psychiatry, Division of Forensic Psychiatry Valkenberg Hospital, School of Clinical Medicine, University of Cape Town, South Africa
- b. Department of Psychiatry & Neuroscience Institute, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Cape Town, South Africa (email: tarynamos@gmail.com)
- c. South African Medical Research Council (SAMRC) Unit on Risk & Resilience in Mental Disorders, Dept of Psychiatry & Neuroscience Institute, University of Cape Town, South Africa (email: karentmare@gmail.com)
- d. Department of Psychiatry, Division of Forensic Psychiatry (Head of Clinical Unit: Forensics, Valkenberg Hospital), School of Clinical Medicine, University of Cape Town, South Africa (email: nyameka.dyakalashé@uct.ac.za)
- e. Department of Psychiatry & Neuroscience Institute, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Cape Town, South Africa; South African Medical Research Council (SAMRC) Unit on Risk & Resilience in Mental Disorders, Dept of Psychiatry & Neuroscience Institute, University of Cape Town, South Africa (email: dan.stein@uct.ac.za)

Correspondence: Jade Bouwer, Department of Psychiatry and Mental Health, University of Cape Town, Valkenberg Hospital, Observatory Road, Observatory, 7395, Cape Town, South Africa. E-mail: jade.bouwer@uct.ac.za

Funding: This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Declaration Statements: Prof Stein has received consultancy honoraria from Discovery Vitality, Johnson & Johnson, Kanna, L'Oreal, Lundbeck, Orion, Sanofi, Servier, Takeda and Vistagen. The remaining authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

Abstract

Background: Structured clinical diagnostic interviews are widely used in clinical practice and psychiatry research. Nevertheless, the extent to which such interviews have been used in forensic psychiatry is unclear, perhaps because of concerns about feasibility and utility.

Aim: We undertook a scoping review to investigate publications on structured clinical interviews in the forensic psychiatry context, paying particular attention to issues of feasibility and utility.

Methods: A PubMed and PsychInfo database search was undertaken using the terms “structured diagnostic interviews” AND “forensic psychiatry” AND “clinical attitudes” OR “utility” OR “feasibility” OR “acceptability”. PRISMA extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) was used as a guideline in reviewing and including studies.

Results: We found three articles on the use of structured diagnostic interviews in the forensic psychiatry context. In most publications, these interviews were used to assess the accuracy of symptom measures using existing validation tools. There were no publications that reported on issues of feasibility and utility.

Conclusions: Literature on the use of structured diagnostic interviews in forensic psychiatry is sparse. While this may reflect concerns about feasibility and utility, no publications provide data on the feasibility and utility of such interviews in the forensic setting. This highlights an important area of research to explore.

Keywords: “structured diagnostic interview”, “forensic psychiatry”, “clinician attitudes”, “feasibility”, “utility”, “acceptability”

1. Introduction

Modern psychiatric nosology is governed by two major classification systems (Clark et al., 2017). Currently, mental disorders are diagnosed using diagnostic criteria outlined in the American Psychiatric Association (APA)'s Diagnostic and Statistical Manual (DSM) or diagnostic guidelines outlined by the World Health Organisation's (WHO) International Classification of Diseases (ICD) 11th edition (ICD-11) (American Psychiatric Association, 2022; First et al., 2015; World Health Organisation (WHO), 2019). Recent revisions of these systems were advised by the nosological evidence-base and aim to inform psychiatric practice and research.

Structured diagnostic interviews (SDIs) for mental disorders are widely used in clinical practice and in psychiatric research. These interviews may improve diagnostic reliability (Basco et al., 2000; Endicott, 2001; Miller et al., 2001; Rocha Neto et al., 2023; Shear et al., 2000). Additionally, their use may promote detection of under-recognised comorbidity (Basco et al., 2000; Pinninti et al., 2003; Zimmerman & Mattia, 1999).

Forensic psychiatric interviews pose unique challenges to the clinician (Logan, 2018). Information obtained in such contexts is not solely for the purpose of diagnosis and treatment implementation but may very well influence court recommendations. These interviews are no longer for the benefit of the patient, but instead serve a third-party client (the court or lawyer) thus opening itself for scrutiny and query. The findings of these interviews thus bear legal weight, and clinicians may be called to account for their assessment procedure and veracity of information obtained. The availability of biological testing would certainly appease the courts in the reliability and sensitivity of information collated (Endicott, 2001), eliminating errors not only on the part of the clinician but also the interviewee. Such a luxury is not afforded to the field of psychiatry. By systematically probing symptoms and behaviours, variability between interviewers may be reduced (Basco et al., 2000) and dynamic factors such as rapport and clinician expertise accounted for.

Nevertheless, the extent to which such interviews have been used in forensic psychiatry is unclear. Our anecdotal impression is that they are not widely employed. Barriers to their use might include concerns about feasibility and utility. For example, interviews are often lengthy and require training (Basco et al., 2000), and existing interviews may not always address diagnoses that are key in the forensic setting (e.g., antisocial personality disorder, intermittent explosive disorder).

We undertook a scoping review to investigate publications on structured clinical interviews in the forensic psychiatry context, paying particular attention to issues of feasibility and utility.

We aimed to (1) search for all published English-language studies on structured diagnostic interviews undertaken in the forensic psychiatric setting, (2) determine which SDIs have been used in these studies, and (3) collate any data on clinician attitudes, utility, feasibility, and acceptability of SDIs in the forensic setting.

2. Methods

The undertaking of this review was guided by The PRISMA extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) (Tricco et al., 2018). A proposal of this scoping review was submitted to a panel of experts in the field and approved.

2.1 Search methods

PubMed and PsycINFO were searched for studies on SDIs in the forensic psychiatric setting. Only studies published in English and dated post 1980-Feb 2024 were included. Broad terms such as “structured diagnostic interviews” AND “forensic psychiatry” AND “clinical attitudes” OR “utility” OR “feasibility” OR “acceptability” were used when searching for included studies. Search terms were limited to title and abstract to yield the most relevant results.

2.2 Criteria for considering and including studies

Only studies utilising structured diagnostic interview tools on adult (older than 18) psychiatric patients admitted to forensic psychiatric units were included. These patients could be undergoing court-appointed evaluation or have already been declared forensic psychiatric patients by the courts post-assessment. The included studies could be observational or comparative studies, but had to comment on the clinical utility, feasibility, or acceptability of the use of these tools in this population.

2.3 Data collection, extraction, and management

All papers sourced were exported to Endnote™ (The EndNote Team, 2013), an online referencing manager software package. Once duplicates were removed the studies were further exported to Rayyan (Ouzzani, Hammady & Fedorowicz, 2016) and screened by two independent reviewers. First, the two reviewers reviewed the abstracts and titles of the studies for inclusion. Second, reviewing the selected studies full texts for inclusion. Any disagreements in selecting and making final decisions for including studies in the review were resolved by means of reviewer discussion (Figure A.1). Since this was a scoping review, articles were not excluded based on quality.

Once the final selection of included studies was made, select data was extracted: 1) authorship, year, 2) the name of tool, 3) setting, 4) sample studied and size, 5) rationale for use of the tool, and 6) any information gathered about the tool (e.g., feasibility and utility). These data were then synthesised into a table (Table A.1).

2.4 Data analysis

A narrative analysis was done which included the description of the studies and findings found specific to the objectives of the review. Since this was a scoping review, a quality analysis was not conducted on these studies.

3. Results

Our primary search yielded 121 unique articles. 99 articles were excluded based on title and abstract review. 22 full-text articles were reviewed. Out of the 22 full-text articles only three studies were found that met the inclusion criteria of the review and were analysed (Figure 1). Findings of these articles are represented in Table 1 and a narrative study provided below. Studies that were excluded were mostly because of wrong outcomes (82), wrong population (67), wrong study design or duration (47 + 1) or for being in a foreign language and therefore not analysed (3).

Two of these studies were published in the last decade (Green et al., 2013; Tylicki et al., 2018), and one in 2004 (Kristiansson et al., 2004). All studies were conducted at forensic psychiatric sites in high-income countries (HICs) (America and Sweden) although one included a migrant population living in an HIC (Kristiansson et al., 2004). All three studies were conducted on defendants undergoing a forensic psychiatric evaluation (FPE). Additionally, one study included a simulation group (Green et al., 2013) and one included civil litigation referees and post-trial participants (Tylicki et al., 2018). Most participants in all three studies were male between the ages of 30 – 40 years. Psychiatrists and psychologists conducted the studies in all three articles; however, two studies (Kristiansson et al., 2004; Tylicki et al., 2018) also included a self-report component. Studies ranged from 50 to 478 participants. Psychotic disorders tended to be the most common diagnosis among participants (Green et al., 2013; Kristiansson et al., 2004) and the most common offences triggering the FPE involved violent offences such as sexual or physical assault (Kristiansson et al., 2004; Tylicki et al., 2018).

Two studies evaluated the accuracy of the Structured Interview of Reported Symptoms, Second Edition (SIRS-2) in comparison to the original SIRS (Green et al., 2013; Tylicki et al., 2018). The SIRS is a structured diagnostic interview tool which is considered the gold-standard for the assessment of feigning of symptoms of mental illness (Green et al., 2013). The first of these, a study by Green, Rosenfield and Belfi (2003) (Green et al., 2013) aimed to determine the sensitivity and specificity rates for both, and then determine the additive value

of the RS-Total scale and the MT index of the SIRS-2. To do this, the sample studied included defendants undergoing criminal forensic evaluation and a community simulation sample. The second study to look at utility of the SIRS was undertaken by Tylicki et al. (2018) (Tylicki et al., 2018). It sought to examine the associations of the SIRS and SIRS-2 by comparing the classification scales to those of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2-Restructured Form (MMPI-2-RF) validity scales.

Both these studies reached a similar conclusion regarding the clinical utility of the updated SIRS-2. Green, Rosenfield and Belfi (2003) (Green et al., 2013) found the specificity of both in the forensic sample to be slightly improved (94.3% vs 92%) but sensitivity reduced (36.8% vs 47.4%) (Table 1). Similarly, Tylicki et al. (2018) (Tylicki et al., 2018) found the specificity of the SIRS-2 to be 100% in both the civil and forensic samples (in comparison to the SIRS which had a specificity of 100% and respectively), but a reduced sensitivity (9.3% in the civil litigants and 41.2% in the forensic sample). Therefore, the ability of the SIRS-2 in identifying false positives may be increased, the sensitivity was greatly reduced.

Furthermore, the addition of the RS-Total scale did not have any beneficial outcome on improving sensitivity (Green et al., 2013). Both studies also then explored the utility of the classification measures of the SIRS-2 and established that it held limited value in correctly identifying feigners from indeterminate groups as assigned by the original SIRS (Green et al., 2013; Tylicki et al., 2018) with a recommendation to review cutoff limits.

Further, Kristianson, Sumelius and Sondergaard (2004) (Kristiansson et al., 2004) looked at the feasibility of using the Clinician-Administered PTSD Scale (CAPS) versus the Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-IV (SCID) – PTSD, both structured questionnaires, to identify post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) in FPEs. A cohort of Swedes were compared to an immigrant group with similar criminal profiles. The SCID-PTSD was found to be less sensitive in immigrants, raising a question regarding its utility in interpreting symptoms in non-Swede speakers. The CAPS was therefore found to be more clinically adept at diagnosing PTSD across heterogenous groups, and clinicians found it to be more accurate and structured.

4. Discussion

We found 3 articles on the use of SDIs in the forensic psychiatry context. In most of the publications, these interviews were used to assess the accuracy of symptom measures themselves rather than the use/purpose of these tools in this population. While this is beneficial in aiding a clinicians' decision in which tool to consider and how reliable these may be, they still do not answer the question of attitudes or acceptability. The studies also did not comment on the time taken to conduct each interview, leaving open-ended questions regarding their feasibility in the context of human resources and time.

These findings conflict with the use of SDIs in other settings. Randomized controlled trials frequently use these instruments to ensure inclusion/exclusion criteria are met. Studies of the neurobiology of mental disorders similarly often use these instruments to characterize their samples, although there has been a move to use other assessment approaches e.g., Research Domain Criteria (RDoC) (Morris et al., 2022). The infrequent use of these tools in a forensic setting not only lends itself to the fallibility of the clinical interview (subject to a range of variables such as clinician experience and opinion, therapeutic rapport, and patient recall) and diagnostic inaccuracy which may bear weight on treatment outcomes but allows for legal scrutiny of the clinician compiling such reports as to their scientific, evidence-based justification for clinical opinions expressed (Logan, 2018).

Several limitations of this scoping review deserve emphasis. First, we did not assess papers published in languages other than English. However, during our search, we came across three such papers. Second, we did not assess the grey literature. However, given how sparse the literature in formal databases is, we do not expect that there is a large grey literature. Third, only two databases were searched, and the search terms used highly specific to enhance accuracy of the database search; articles not listing any of the keywords used but of relevance may have been missed. Fourth, the studies were not assessed for quality. Lastly, studies evaluated were all conducted in HICs and may not be generalisable to settings with high

patient to clinician ratios, overburdened forensic services with long waiting times for assessment, and time constraints.

5. Conclusion

In summary, the literature on the use of SDIs in forensic psychiatry is sparse. This seems an important gap to address. The legal weight of such assessments demands careful assessment of psychiatric symptomatology. The absence of evidenced-based assessment measures in this setting makes assessing the quality of its findings difficult to assess or defend. Future work in the formulation, implementation and appropriateness of such tools may not only enhance diagnostic accuracy, but also promote uniformity of assessments across sites in this complex population. Not only could this improve clinician satisfaction in their utility and encourage their use, but also build a clinical argument that can stand legal contestation.

6. Appendices

Figure A.1: Systematic literature search flow diagram




Table A.1: Data Extraction Table of Included Studies

Authorship, year	Name of tool	Setting	Sample studied and size	Rationale for use of the tool	Any information gathered about the tool (e.g. feasibility and utility)
Green, Rosenfeld, Belfi (2013)	Structured Interview of Reported Symptoms (SIRS) & Structured Interview of Reported Symptoms, Second Edition (SIRS-2)	HIC: Kirby Forensic Psychiatric Center in New York City	<p>Total size: 150 participants.</p> <p>Pretrial criminal defendants = 114; 79.2% of those admitted to the maximum-security forensic hospital</p> <p>Additional characteristics for forensic psychiatric patients: male ($n = 101$; 88.6%); 37.0 years of age ($SD = 11.1$; age range = 18-65 years); 68.4% black/African America ($n = 78$); years of education = 10.8years ($SD = 2.5$, range 6-16years); psychotic disorder ($n = 85$; 74.6%) or a mood disorder ($n = 24$; 21.1%); substance abuse or dependence disorder without a comorbid Axis I diagnosis ($n = 3$; 2.6%); malingering ($n = 2$; 1.8%); previous hospitalizations ($M = 6.7$, $SD = 11.1$; range = 0-75); numerous arrests ($M = 13.6$, $SD = 17.5$; range = 1-145).</p> <p>36 simulated participants from a community sample.</p> <p>Additional characteristics of community participants: male ($n = 32$; 88.9%); 35.9 years of age ($SD = 15.8$, age range 18-74 years; ($M = 35.9$, $SD = 15.8$). 47.2% black/African American ($n = 17$); years of education = 14.2 ($SD = 1.8$); 27.8% ($n = 10$) with a previous psychiatric diagnosis; 30.6% ($n = 11$) with a prior arrest.</p> <p>Community participants had more years of education, $t(146) = 9.08$, $p < 0.001$, and had significantly fewer arrests, $t(148) = 7.20$, $p < 0.001$, and were less likely to have a mental disorder diagnosis than the</p>	<p>Accuracy of the SIRS-2 To determine the accuracy of the SIRS-2 compared to the original SIRS.</p> <p>To determine the sensitivity and specificity rates for both scoring.</p> <p>To determine the additive value of the RS-Total scale and the MT Index of the SIRS-2.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SIRS-2 showed greater specificity (94.3%) than SIRS (92%) in forensic population. 2. Both scoring methods poor at identifying feigning in the forensic population (sensitivity: (SIRS = 47.4% vs SIRS-2 = 36.8%) but higher sensitivity rates in the community sample (SIRS = 75.0%; SIRS-2 = 66.7%). This suggests that where examinees are less adept at recognizing severe psychopathology detection of feigning may increase. 3. The introduction of the RS-Total scale successfully improved specificity but reduced sensitivity. 4. The introduction of the MT Index failed to enhance detection of feigning in either sample. <p>Recommendation: Replacing the original SIRS with the SIRS-2 may be premature, more validation studies are needed.</p>

			patient sample, $\chi^2(1, N = 150) = 99.60, p < 0.001$.		
Kristianson, Sumelius, Sondergaard (2004)	<p>Diagnosis during routine FPE: Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-IV (SCID).</p> <p>To assess a current diagnosis of PTSD: Clinician-Administered PTSD Scale (CAPS) for the DSM-IV, and the SCID-PTSD.</p>	HIC: Department of Forensic Psychiatry in Stockholm, Sweden.	<p>N = 50 men aged 18 to 64 years: 25 First-Generation Immigrants and 25 Native-Born Swedes undergoing forensic psychiatric evaluation (FPE).</p> <p>Offenses that triggered the FPE: violent crimes = 30; sexual crimes = 12; arson = 2; robbery = 4; property crimes = 2; psychotic disorder = 9; personality disorder = 23; mood disorder = 6; neuropsychiatric disorder = 5; substance use disorder (primary diagnoses) = 3; PTSD = 4; assaultive violence = 40; other injury or shocking experience = 6; learning about trauma affecting others = 3; sudden unexpected death of a relative or close friend = 1; any trauma = 0.</p> <p>Index offenses and psychiatric diagnoses for PTSD: violent crimes = 12; sexual crimes = 6; arson = 0; robbery = 0; property crimes = 0; psychotic disorder = 5; personality disorder = 8; mood disorder = 1; neuropsychiatric disorder = 0; PTSD = 4; substance use disorder = 0.</p> <p>Type and number of self-reported main trauma in the PTSD group: assaultive violence = 16; other injury or shocking experience = 2; learning about trauma affecting others = 0; sudden unexpected death of a relative or close friend = 0; any trauma = 0.</p>	<p>To assess the feasibility of using an extensive structured questionnaire in detainees undergoing FPE.</p> <p>To compare results from an extensive questionnaire to screening instruments used to detect PTSD and PTSD symptoms.</p>	<p>Good to excellent inter-rater agreement for CAPS scoring: 0.86 (Cohens K).</p> <p>Prevalence of PTSD according to CAPS = 36% (n = 18) (Immigrants 60% [n = 15], Swedes 12% [n = 3], $p < 0.001$)</p> <p>SCID diagnosed PTSD in 11 immigrant recruits at FPE, and 0 in Swedes raising a query that PTSD may be unconsidered in patients without combat/torture.</p> <p>Validity of SCID-PTSD compared to CAPS was similar for the Swedish group (n = 2), but less sensitive than in the immigrant groups (sensitivity 75%, n = 15 recruits (specificity was 94%) suggesting the need for a more structured approach in interpreting symptoms.</p> <p>In this study, a diagnosis of PTSD made according to CAPS was considered more accurate, particularly in immigrants.</p>

<p>Tylicki, Wygant, Tarescavage, Frederick, Tyner, Granacher, Selbom (2018)</p>	<p>Structured Interview of Reported Symptoms (SIRS) and Structured Interview of Reported Symptoms—Second Edition (SIRS-2).</p> <p>Associations between the SIRS and SIRS-2 were assessed using the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2-Restructured Form validity scales, a well-validated objective measure, to establish feigning and genuine criterion groups in samples in which both versions of the SIRS are most administered.</p>	<p>HIC: Midwestern federal medical centre.</p>	<p>Civil litigants: n = 385; mean age: 41.5 years (SD = 10.8).</p> <p>Criminal defendants: n = 93 (pre-trial and post-conviction); 45.3% of defendants were charged with violent offenses, 23.3% with drug-related offenses, 15% for weapon-related offenses, and 8.4% with other types of offenses; All participants were male with a mean age of 35 years (SD = 9.0).</p>	<p>To evaluate the clinical utility of the SIRS-2 by examining associations of the SIRS and SIRS-2 with the MMPI-2-RF validity scales in separate samples of disability claimants and criminal defendants.</p>	<p>1. Sensitivity and specificity:</p> <p>Civil litigants: Specificity of SIRS-2 vs SIRS = 100% (174 out of 174) Sensitivity: 9.3% (17 out of 43) vs 39.5% (4 out of 43)</p> <p>Criminal forensic sample: Specificity of SIRS-2 vs SIRS = 100% (7 out of 7) vs 85.7% (6 out of 7) Sensitivity: 41.2% (28 out of 68) vs 86.8% (59 out of 68)</p> <p>Conclusion: better specificity at a cost to sensitivity.</p> <p>2. Classification utility:</p> <p>Limited potential of the SIRS-2 disengagement classification in detecting feigning, suggesting the need for revision of the SS Index.</p> <p>Little effectiveness in the MT Index distinguishing between feigners & indeterminate cases, recommending the need to review cut off limits.</p> <p>Conclusion: SIRS-2 more likely to misclassify examinees.</p> <p>Recommendation: Further investigations should be undertaken prior to adopting the SIRS-2 in clinical practice.</p>
---	---	--	---	--	---

*SIRS = Structured Interview of Reported Symptoms, HIC = high income country, CAPS = Clinician Administered PTSD scale, PTSD = post-traumatic stress disorder, FPE = forensic psychiatric evaluation, USA = United States of America, CFS = criminal forensic sample. MMPI = Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2-Restructured Form

7. References:

American Psychiatric Association. (2022). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (5th ed.).

<https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.books.9780890425787>

Basco, M. R., Bostic, J. Q., Davies, D., Rush, A. J., Witte, B., Hendrickse, W., & Barnett, V. (2000). Methods to improve diagnostic accuracy in a community mental health setting. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *157*(10), 1599–1605. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.157.10.1599>

Clark, L. A., Cuthbert, B., Lewis-Fernández, R., Narrow, W. E., & Reed, G. M. (2017). Three Approaches to Understanding and Classifying Mental Disorder: ICD-11, DSM-5, and the National Institute of Mental Health’s Research Domain Criteria (RDoC). *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, *18*(2), 72–145. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100617727266>

Endicott, J. (2001). Good Diagnoses Require Good Diagnosticians: Collecting and Integrating the Data. *American Journal of Medical Genetics (Neuropsychiatric Genetics)*, *105*, 48–49.

First, M. B., Reed, G. M., Hyman, S. E., & Saxena, S. (2015). The development of the ICD-11 Clinical Descriptions and Diagnostic Guidelines for Mental and Behavioural Disorders. *World Psychiatry*, *14*(1), 82–90. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20189>

Green, D., Rosenfeld, B., & Belfi, B. (2013). New and Improved? A Comparison of the Original and Revised Versions of the Structured Interview of Reported Symptoms. *Assessment*, *20*(2), 210–218. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191112464389>

- Kristiansson, M., Sumelius, K., & Søndergaard, H. P. (2004). Post-traumatic stress disorder in the forensic psychiatric setting. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, 32(4), 399–407.
- Logan, C. (2018). Forensic Clinical Interviewing: Toward Best Practice. *International Journal of Forensic Mental Health*, 17(4), 297–309.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14999013.2018.1519615>
- Miller, P. R., Dasher, R., Collins, R., Griffiths, P., & Brown, F. (2001). Inpatient diagnostic assessments: 1. Accuracy of structured vs. Unstructured interviews. *Psychiatry Research*, 105(3), 255–264. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-1781\(01\)00317-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-1781(01)00317-1)
- Morris, S. E., Sanislow, C. A., Pacheco, J., Vaidyanathan, U., Gordon, J. A., & Cuthbert, B. N. (2022). Revisiting the seven pillars of RDoC. *BMC Medicine*, 20(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-022-02414-0>
- Ouzzani, M; Hammady, H; Fedorowicz, Z. et al. (2016). *Rayyan*. <https://www.rayyan.ai>
- Pinninti, N. R., Madison, H., Musser, E., & Rissmiller, D. (2003). MINI International Neuropsychiatric Schedule: Clinical utility and patient acceptance. *European Psychiatry*, 18(7), 361–364. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eurpsy.2003.03.004>
- Rocha Neto, H., Moreira, A. L. R., Hosken, L., Langfus, J. A., Cavalcanti, M. T., Youngstrom, E. A., & Telles-Correia, D. (2023). Inter-Rater Reliability between Structured and Non-Structured Interviews Is Fair in Schizophrenia and Bipolar Disorders—A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Diagnostics*, 13(3).
<https://doi.org/10.3390/diagnostics13030526>

Shear, M. K., Greeno, C., Kang, J., Ludewig, D., Frank, E., Swartz, H. A., & Hanekamp, M. (2000). Diagnosis of nonpsychotic patients in community clinics.

American Journal of Psychiatry, 157(4), 581–587. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.157.4.581>

The EndNote Team. (2013). *EndNote* (EndNote X9). Clarivate. <https://endnote.com/>

Tricco, A. C., Lillie, E., Zarin, W., O'Brien, K. K., Colquhoun, H., Levac, D., Moher, D., Peters, M. D. J., Horsley, T., Weeks, L., Hempel, S., Akl, E. A., Chang, C., McGowan, J., Stewart, L., Hartling, L., Aldcroft, A., Wilson, M. G., Garritty, C., ... Straus, S. E. (2018). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) Checklist SECTION. *Ann Intern Med*, 169(7), 11–12. <https://doi.org/10.7326/M18-0850.2>

Tylicki, J. L., Wygant, D. B., Tarescavage, A. M., Frederick, R. I., Tyner, E. A., Granacher, R. P., & Sellbom, M. (2018). Comparability of Structured Interview of Reported Symptoms (SIRS) and Structured Interview of Reported Symptoms-Second Edition (SIRS-2) classifications with external response bias criteria. *Psychological Assessment*, 30(9), 1144–1159. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pas0000573>

World Health Organisation (WHO). (2019). ICD-11 Implementation or Transition Guide. *ICD-11 Implementation or Transition Guide*, 1, 1–29.

Zimmerman, M., & Mattia, J. I. (1999). Psychiatric diagnosis in clinical practice: Is comorbidity being missed? *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, 40(3), 182–191.

[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-440X\(99\)90001-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-440X(99)90001-9)