Arch Psychiatry. 2025;3(1):61–63.

The Archives of Psychiatry Commentary

Borderline Personality Disorder: A Valid Psychiatric Diagnosis

Mark L. Ruffalo[1,2,*]

[1]Assistant Professor of Psychiatry, University of Central Florida College of Medicine, USA

[2]Adjunct Assistant Professor of Psychiatry, Tufts University School of Medicine, USA

[*]Correspondence should be addressed to Mark L. Ruffalo, mlruffalo@gmail.com

Received date: September 10, 2025, **Accepted date:** October 17, 2025

Citation: Ruffalo ML. Borderline Personality Disorder: A Valid Psychiatric Diagnosis. Arch Psychiatry. 2025;3(1):61–63.

Abstract

The validity of borderline personality disorder (BPD) has become an urgent issue in psychiatric nosology, with some proposing its absorption into complex posttraumatic stress disorder and others questioning its utility due to stigma. With planning for DSM-6 underway, reassessing the validity of BPD is both timely and necessary. This paper applies Robins and Guze's classic diagnostic validators—symptom specificity, genetics, course of illness, biological markers, and treatment response—to the case of BPD. Evidence demonstrates that BPD has a distinctive clinical presentation, strong familial and genetic underpinnings, a characteristic longitudinal course of symptom improvement with continued functional impairment, measurable neurobiological correlates, and robust response to specialized psychotherapies. Taken together, these findings affirm BPD as a scientifically valid psychiatric disorder. Efforts to eliminate or subsume the diagnosis risk undermining decades of research and treatment progress. BPD should be retained as a distinct entity in future classification systems.

Keywords: Borderline personality disorder, BPD, Classification, Nosology, DSM

Introduction

The validity of borderline personality disorder (BPD) has become increasingly urgent. Contemporary debates in psychiatric classification have led some to propose that BPD be absorbed into broader constructs such as complex posttraumatic stress disorder (cPTSD) [1]. Others have questioned whether the diagnosis is more harmful than helpful, given the stigma that often surrounds it [2]. With planning already underway for DSM-6, the stakes of this debate are high. A careful reassessment of the validity of BPD is therefore both timely and necessary, ensuring that the disorder is not prematurely discarded or diluted, but instead understood on the basis of scientific evidence and clinical utility.

In 1970, Eli Robins and Samuel Guze [3] published their landmark paper, "Establishment of Diagnostic Validity in Psychiatric Illness: Its Application to Schizophrenia," in the *American Journal of Psychiatry,* outlining a method for evaluating the validity (reality) of psychiatric disorders. These diagnostic validators have been widely accepted in the nosology research and psychiatry since. They are: *symptom specificity (discriminant validity), genetics, course of illness, biological markers, and treatment response.* In this paper, I will apply these validators to the diagnosis of BPD, demonstrating that it is a valid psychiatric diagnosis and should be retained in future classification systems.

Symptom Specificity (Discriminant Validity)

The first validator concerns the distinctiveness of the clinical picture. BPD has long been recognized as a syndrome with a specific constellation of symptoms: pervasive instability in affect, self-image, and relationships, along with marked impulsivity [4]. Despite surface overlaps with other conditions such as bipolar spectrum illness and posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD), the symptom profile of BPD is unique. For example, rapid shifts in mood in BPD are reactive to interpersonal events rather than driven by endogenous cycling as in bipolar disease [5]. Depressive symptoms in BPD are often explained by the patient's abandonment depression [6], not a mood illness. Similarly, the chronic emptiness and identity disturbance of BPD are not explained by PTSD, even when trauma is present [1]. Gunderson's work in the 1970s and 1980s demonstrated that BPD could be reliably

distinguished from schizophrenia and mood disorders by structured diagnostic interviews [4]. More recently, research has confirmed that BPD traits cluster together and load onto a cohesive construct [7]. BPD can also be distinguished from the construct of complex PTSD, [8] though complex PTSD may capture subsyndromal BPD patients described by Zanarini *et al.* [9]. Since trauma is neither necessary nor sufficient for the development of BPD [1,10]. cPTSD is not a more accurate term for the disorder. In short, BPD is not simply a collection of miscellaneous symptoms borrowed from other diagnoses; it is a syndrome with good discriminant validity.

Genetics

Second, Robins and Guze [3] emphasized the role of family and genetic studies. Twin and family research has consistently shown that BPD aggregates in families. Heritability estimates range from 40–50%, [11] comparable to other accepted psychiatric disorders. While genetic liability is not specific to BPD (overlaps exist with other conditions like mood and substance use disorders) studies suggest that a significant portion of variance in BPD traits can be traced to inherited factors. For example, pioneering research by Sven Torgersen [12] in Norway found that monozygotic twins had markedly higher concordance rates for BPD than dizygotic twins. Family studies also indicate that first-degree relatives of BPD patients have elevated risks of both BPD and related disorders [13]. This genetic evidence does not prove that BPD is reducible to biology alone, but it demonstrates that the disorder is not simply a cultural construct or artifact of social labeling. Like most psychiatric illnesses, BPD reflects a complex interaction of genetic vulnerability with environmental exposures, especially early adversity and trauma.

Course of Illness

It has been said that in psychiatry "diagnosis is prognosis," [14] and the third validator, course of illness, has proven especially informative in the case of BPD. Longitudinal research has shown that the disorder has a characteristic natural history. Studies such as the McLean Study of Adult Development (MSAD) and the Collaborative Longitudinal Personality Disorders Study (CLPS) have followed hundreds of patients for decades. The findings consistently show that BPD symptoms remit over time, often within 10 years, but functional impairments, especially in interpersonal and vocational domains, tend to persist [15]. This pattern differentiates BPD from mood disorders, which often recur episodically, and from schizophrenia, which tends toward progressive deterioration. The trajectory of BPD is one of symptomatic improvement but lingering disability, a paradox that reflects its status as a disorder of personality rather than of discrete symptom episodes. This distinctive longitudinal profile strongly supports the validity of BPD as a diagnostic entity.

Biological Markers

Robins and Guze [3] also considered laboratory or biological markers as validators. Here, psychiatry as a whole faces limitations, since few disorders have clear pathognomonic biomarkers. Nevertheless, evidence of biological abnormalities in BPD has accumulated [16]. Neuroimaging studies reveal structural and functional differences in brain regions implicated in emotion regulation, such as the amygdala, hippocampus, and prefrontal cortex. For instance, BPD patients often show hyperactivation of the amygdala in response to social threat cues, reflecting their heightened sensitivity to rejection [17]. Reduced connectivity between prefrontal regulatory regions and limbic structures has also been observed [18]. Neuroendocrine research points to dysregulation of the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal (HPA) axis, consistent with heightened stress reactivity [19]. While no single test can diagnose BPD, these convergent biological findings indicate that the disorder is rooted in measurable brain and stress-system dysfunctions, not merely "in the eye of the beholder."

Treatment Response

The final validator is treatment response. If a syndrome consistently responds to certain interventions, that fact supports its diagnostic validity. In BPD, treatment research has been especially fruitful. Unlike many personality disorders, BPD has several evidence-based psychotherapies with demonstrated efficacy, including dialectical behavior therapy (DBT), transference-focused psychotherapy (TFP), mentalization-based therapy (MBT), general psychiatric management (GPM), and schema-focused therapy (SFT) [11]. Randomized controlled trials show that these approaches reduce self-harm, suicidality, and hospitalization while improving interpersonal functioning. Pharmacologic treatments have more modest effects, but mood stabilizers and low-dose antipsychotics may target specific symptom dimensions [20]. Emerging research on novel agents may offer promising avenues for future treatment [20]. The robust and replicable treatment response in psychotherapy, especially compared to other personality disorders, suggests that BPD reflects a coherent clinical entity that can be targeted therapeutically.

Diagnostic Challenges

While the empirical evidence for the validity of BPD is strong, clinical diagnosis can be complicated by stigma and misinterpretation. Patients with BPD are sometimes labeled as "difficult" or "manipulative," which can bias clinicians against making or sustaining the diagnosis [2,11]. Misdiagnosis may also occur in contexts where trauma histories dominate clinical formulations, leading to reclassification of borderline

presentations as complex PTSD [10]. Such biases risk depriving patients of accurate diagnosis and access to effective treatments. Enhancing clinician education and reducing stigma in both professional and public discourse are therefore essential steps in ensuring BPD is diagnosed on the basis of its clinical reality rather than cultural or prejudicial distortions.

Conclusion

When evaluated through the lens of Robins and Guze's [3] five validators, BPD emerges as a valid psychiatric diagnosis. Its symptoms are specific and discriminable from other illnesses. It shows strong genetic underpinnings. Its course of illness follows a distinctive trajectory of improvement over time with some continued functional impairment. It is associated with identifiable biological abnormalities. And it responds to specific treatments.

Although the stigma surrounding BPD and controversies about its relationship to trauma have led some to question its legitimacy, the empirical evidence is clear: BPD is a real, valid, and clinically useful syndrome. This conclusion carries particular weight at the present moment, as psychiatry considers major revisions to its classification systems. Proposals to eliminate BPD or collapse it into cPTSD risk erasing decades of progress in research and treatment. Just as Robins and Guze provided psychiatry with tools to separate valid from invalid diagnoses, those same tools now compel us to retain BPD as a distinct entity. Far from being eliminated, BPD should remain and be studied further, both for its own sake and for what it teaches us about the relationship between personality, biology, and psychopathology.

References

1. Paris J. Complex posttraumatic stress disorder and a biopsychosocial model of borderline personality disorder. J Nerv Ment Dis. 2023; 211(11):805–10.
2. Watts J. The epistemic injustice of borderline personality disorder. BJPsych Int. 2024; 21(4):78–82.
3. Robins E, Guze SB. Establishment of diagnostic validity in psychiatric illness: Its application to schizophrenia. Am J Psychiatry. 1970; 126(7):983–7.
4. Gunderson J. Borderline Personality Disorder. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Press; 1984.
5. Gunderson J. Borderline Personality Disorder: A Clinical Guide. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Press; 2001.
6. Masterson JF. The Personality Disorders: A New Look at the Developmental Self and Object Relations Approach. Phoenix, AZ: Zeig, Tucker & Thiesen; 2000.
7. Letkiewicz AM, Spring JD, Carrillo VL, Shankman SA. Examining the construct validity of borderline personality traits using familial aggregation and other external validators. J Pers Disord. 2022;36(6):641–61.
8. Cloitre M, Garvert DW, Weiss B, Carlson EB, Bryant RA. Distinguishing PTSD, complex PTSD, and borderline personality disorder: A latent class analysis. Eur J Psychotraumatol. 2014;5:25097.
9. Zanarini MC, Frankenburg FR, Reich DB, Silk KR, Hudson JI, McSweeney LB. The subsyndromal phenomenology of borderline personality disorder: A 10-year follow-up study. Am J Psychiatry. 2007;164(6):929–35.
10. Newhill C, Ruffalo ML. Trauma, diagnosis, and borderline personality disorder: The need for conceptual clarity. Soc Work. In press.
11. Leichsenring F, Fonagy P, Heim N, Kernberg OF, Leweke F, Luyten P, et al. Borderline personality disorder: A comprehensive review of diagnosis and clinical presentation, etiology, treatment, and current controversies. World Psychiatry. 2024;23(1):4–25.
12. Torgersen S. Genetics of patients with borderline personality disorder. Psychiatr Clin North Am. 2000;23(1):1–9.
13. Skoglund C, Tiger A, Rück C, Petrovic P, Asherson P, Hellner C, et al. Familial risk and heritability of diagnosed borderline personality disorder: A register study of the Swedish population. Mol Psychiatry. 2021;26(3):999–1008.
14. Goodwin DW, Guze SB. Psychiatric Diagnosis. 4th ed. New York, NY: Oxford University Press; 1989.
15. Biskin RS. The lifetime course of borderline personality disorder. Can J Psychiatry. 2015;60(7):303–8.
16. Ruocco AC, Carcone D. A neurobiological model of borderline personality disorder: Systematic and integrative review. Harv Rev Psychiatry. 2016;24(5):311–29.
17. Donegan NH, Sanislow CA, Blumberg HP, Fulbright RK, Lacadie C, Skudlarski P, et al. Amygdala hyperreactivity in borderline personality disorder: Implications for emotional dysregulation. Biol Psychiatry. 2003;54(11):1284–93.
18. Giannoulis E, Nousis C, Sula IJ, Georgitsi ME, Malogiannis I. Understanding the borderline brain: A review of neurobiological findings in borderline personality disorder (BPD). Biomedicines. 2025;13(7):1783.
19. Thomas N, Gurvich C, Kulkarni J. Borderline personality disorder, trauma, and the hypothalamus-pituitary-adrenal axis. Neuropsychiatr Dis Treat. 2019;15:2601–12.
20. Pascual JC, Arias L, Soler J. Pharmacological management of borderline personality disorder and common comorbidities. CNS Drugs. 2023;37(6):489–97.