

Co-Occurrence of 12-Month Alcohol and Drug Use Disorders and Personality Disorders in the United States

Results From the National Epidemiologic Survey on Alcohol and Related Conditions

BRIDGET F. GRANT, PH.D., PH.D., FREDERICK S. STINSON, PH.D., DEBORAH A. DAWSON, PH.D., S. PATRICIA CHOU, PH.D., W. JUNE RUAN, M.A., AND ROGER P. PICKERING, M.S.

Background: *Very little information is available on the co-occurrence of different personality disorders (PDs) and alcohol and drug use disorders in the U.S. population.* **Objective:** *To present national data on sex differences in the co-occurrence of Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fourth Edition (DSM-IV) alcohol and drug use disorders and 7 of the 10 DSM-IV PDs.* **Design:** *Face-to-face interviews conducted in the 2001–2002 National Epidemiologic Survey on Alcohol and Related Conditions (N = 43,093).* **Setting:** *The United States and the District of Columbia, including Alaska and Hawaii.* **Participants:** *Household and group-quarters residents, age 18 and older.* **Results:** *Among individuals with a current alcohol use disorder, 28.6 percent (95 percent confidence interval [CI], 26.7–30.6) had at least one PD, whereas 47.7 percent (95 percent CI, 43.9–51.6) of those with a current drug use disorder had at least one PD. Further, 16.4 percent (95 percent CI, 15.1–17.6) of individuals with at least one PD had a current alcohol use disorder, and 6.5 percent (95 percent CI, 5.7–7.3) had a current drug use disorder. Associations between PDs and alcohol and drug use disorders were overwhelmingly positive and significant ($P < .05$). Overall, alcohol use disorders were most strongly related to antisocial (odds ratio [OR], 4.8; 95 percent CI, 4.1–5.6), histrionic (OR, 4.7; 95 percent CI 3.8–5.8), and dependent (OR, 3.0; 95 percent CI, 1.9–4.8) PDs. Drug use disorders also were more highly associated with antisocial (OR, 11.8; 95 percent CI, 9.7–14.3), histrionic (OR, 8.0; 95 percent CI, 6.0–10.7), and dependent (OR, 11.6; 95 percent CI, 7.1–19.1) PDs. Associations between obsessive-compulsive, histrionic, schizoid, and antisocial PDs and specific alcohol and drug use disorders were significantly stronger ($P < .04$) among women than men, whereas the association between dependent PD and drug dependence was significantly greater ($P < .04$) among men than women.* **Conclusions:** *The co-occurrence of PDs with alcohol and drug use disorders is pervasive in the U.S. population. Results highlight the need for further research on the underlying structure of these disorders and the treatment implications of these disorders when comorbid.*

Numerous studies have addressed the prevalence of personality disorders (PDs), especially antisocial PD, among alcohol and drug abusers.¹ They show a high but variable rate of a broad range of PDs in alcohol and drug abusers, and several among them have demonstrated the adverse effect of these disorders on duration of stay in treatment and outcome.^{2–9}

Studies of alcohol and drug use disorders among patients seeking treatment for personality psychopathology are rare. A recent study,¹⁰ however, has found high prevalences of alcohol and drug use disorders in patients seeking treatment for PDs. With few exceptions, psychiatric comorbidity in these clinical studies did not differentiate between alcohol and drug use disorders, and these studies

were conducted in predominantly male samples. That this literature has paid little attention to sex differences is surprising, considering that the importance

Reprinted with permission from Archives of General Psychiatry, April 2004, vol. 61, pp. 361–368. Copyright © 2004, American Medical Association. All rights reserved.

of distinguishing men and women is firmly established in the field of substance use disorder research.

From an epidemiological perspective, however, a more serious problem with research on comorbidity in clinical studies is that the samples of subjects do not represent the underlying populations. Because of this problem, it is necessary to turn to general population samples for more accurate and precise information on the comorbidity of PDs and alcohol and drug use disorders. However, large epidemiologic surveys conducted in the United States during the past two decades have focused exclusively on the prevalence and comorbidity of antisocial PD and alcohol and drug use disorders.^{11,12} With the exception of antisocial PD, we have very limited knowledge of the comorbidity between the range of PDs and alcohol and drug use disorders and whether these associations differ between men and women. The fact that accurate data on the sex-specific prevalences of a broad range of PDs have not been available in general population surveys of the United States reflects a major gap in our understanding of the processes underlying the comorbidity of PDs and alcohol and drug use disorders. The present study was designed, in part, to address this gap and provide the information.

Accordingly, this article presents nationally representative data on the prevalence and co-occurrence of alcohol and drug use disorders and 7 of the 10 PDs defined in the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fourth Edition (DSM-IV)*¹³ assessed in the 2001–2002 National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA) National Epidemiologic Survey on Alcohol and Related Conditions (NESARC).¹⁴ NESARC is the largest comorbidity survey ever conducted ($N = 43,093$). The sample size allows for accurate estimation of current or past-year co-occurrence of both alcohol and drug use disorders and avoidant, dependent, obsessive-compulsive,

histrionic, paranoid, schizoid, and antisocial PDs among men and women.

METHODS

NESARC Sample

Wave 1 of NESARC is a nationally representative face-to-face survey of 43,093 respondents, age 18 and older, conducted by NIAAA in 2001 through 2002. (A second wave will be conducted in 2004–2005.)¹⁴ The target population of NESARC's Wave 1 is the civilian, noninstitutionalized population residing in the United States and the District of Columbia, including Alaska and Hawaii. The housing-unit sampling frame of NESARC was the U.S. Census Bureau Census 2000 Supplementary Survey,¹⁴ a national survey of more than 78,000 households per month conducted in 2000 through 2001. NESARC also included a group-quarters sampling frame derived from the Census 2000 Group Quarters Inventory.¹⁴ The group-quarters sampling frame captures important subgroups of the population with heavy substance use patterns (e.g., college housing) not often included in general population surveys. The sampling frame response rate was 99 percent, the household response rate was 89 percent, and the person response rate was 93 percent, yielding an overall survey response rate of 81 percent, substantially higher than other surveys of this kind.

Information on race and ethnicity collected in the Census 2000 Supplementary Survey in 2000 through 2001 was used to oversample African American and Hispanic households. The oversampling procedure increased the percentage of non-Hispanic, African American households in the sample from 12.3 percent to 19.1 percent ($N = 8,245$) and the percentage of Hispanic households from 12.5 percent to 19.3 percent ($N = 8,308$). One sample person from each household or group-quarters unit was randomly selected for interview, and young adults, ages 18–24, were oversampled at a rate of 2.25 times that of other members in the household.

NESARC data were weighted to reflect the probabilities of the selection of primary sampling units (PSUs) within strata and for the selection of housing units within the sample PSUs. The PSUs are mutually exclusive categories of persons or units of interest identified in the first stage of the multi-stage NESARC sample. The PSUs consisted of geographic units representing the entire United States defined in terms of sociodemographic criteria. The data also were weighted: (1) to account for the selection of one sample person from each household; (2) to account for oversampling of young adults; (3) to adjust for nonresponse at the household level and person level; and (4) to reduce the variance arising from selecting two PSUs to represent an entire stratum. The weighted data were then adjusted to be representative of the U.S. civilian, noninstitutionalized population for a variety of socioeconomic variables including region, age, sex, race, and ethnicity using the 2000 Decennial Census of Population and Housing¹⁴ and statistics on births, deaths, immigration and emigration, and the size of the armed forces.

Interviewer Training and Field Quality Control

Approximately 1,800 experienced lay interviewers from the U.S. Census Bureau administered NESARC using laptop computer-assisted software that included built-in skip, logic, and consistency checks. On average, the interviewers had 5 years' experience working on Census and other health-related national surveys. All NESARC interviewers completed a 5-day self-study at home and participated in a standardized 5-day in-class training session at one of the bureau's 12 regional offices. NESARC training supervisors from each regional office also were required to complete the home study and to attend a centralized training session prior to fielding of the survey, where they completed the in-class training under the direction of NIAAA sponsors and Census Field and Demographics Survey Division headquarters staff.

Laboratory of Epidemiology and Biometry, Division of Intramural Clinical and Biological Research, National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD.

Regional supervisors recontacted a random 10 percent of all respondents for quality-control purposes. In these quality-control interviews, a series of questions were reasked to verify that respondents had received the entire interview and that the questionnaire had been administered properly. There was no case in which it was determined that the interview had been conducted in any manner that was inconsistent with the interviewer's extensive training. In addition, 2,657 respondents were randomly selected to participate in a reinterview study after completion of their NESARC interview. Each respondent was readministered one to three sections of the survey assessment instrument. These interviews not only served as an additional check on survey data quality but also formed the basis of a test-retest reliability study of new modules of the survey instrument.¹⁵

Alcohol and Drug Use Disorder Assessment

Diagnoses presented in this article were made by the NIAAA Alcohol Use Disorder and Associated Disabilities Interview Schedule–DSM–IV Version (AUDADIS–IV),¹⁶ a state-of-the-art structured diagnostic interview designed to be used by lay interviewers. The AUDADIS–IV included an extensive list of symptom questions that separately operationalized DSM–IV criteria for alcohol and drug abuse and dependence including 10 classes of drugs: sedatives, tranquilizers, opiates (other than heroin or methadone), stimulants, hallucinogens, cannabis, cocaine (including crack cocaine), inhalants/solvents, heroin, and other drugs. Consistent with the DSM–IV, current (in the last 12 months) dependence diagnoses required the respondent to satisfy at least three of the seven DSM–IV criteria for dependence during the last year. The withdrawal criterion of the alcohol dependence diagnosis was measured as a syndrome, requiring at least two positive symptoms of withdrawal as defined in the DSM–IV alcohol withdrawal category. The AUDADIS–IV diagnoses of alcohol abuse required a respondent to meet at least one of the four criteria

defined for abuse in the 12-month period preceding the interview and not meet criteria for dependence. The drug-specific diagnoses of abuse and dependence were derived using the same algorithm and were aggregated to produce measures of any drug use disorder, any drug abuse, and any drug dependence.

The reliability of AUDADIS–IV alcohol and drug use disorder measures was assessed in several large test-retest studies conducted in clinical and general population samples.^{17–21} The reliability of alcohol and drug abuse and dependence in these studies was excellent, exceeding $kappa = 0.74$ for alcohol diagnoses and $kappa = 0.79$ for drug diagnoses. The discriminant, concurrent, convergent, construct, and population validities of the AUDADIS–IV alcohol and drug use disorder diagnoses also have been well documented,^{22–35} including in the World Health Organization/National Institutes of Health Reliability and Validity Study.^{36–40} In these studies,³³ alcohol and drug use disorder diagnoses were found to be significantly and highly correlated with important validators, including substance use, social/occupational dysfunction and disability, and family history (convergent validity),^{24–26,32–34} and these results were shown to generalize to other populations (population validity).²⁷ These studies also demonstrated that abuse and dependence diagnoses also were related to different sets of validators (discriminant validity). Alcohol and drug use disorder diagnoses defined by *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Third Edition* (DSM–III), *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Third Edition, Revised* (DSM–III–R), DSM–IV, and *International Classification of Diseases, 10th Revision* (ICD–10)⁴¹ criteria also were shown to be highly concordant (convergent validity).^{22,23,28–30,37} Concordance between AUDADIS–IV alcohol and drug use disorders and those assessed with the *Schedule for Clinical Assessment in Neuropsychiatry*⁴² was high (concurrent validity),^{36,39} and the construct validity of these diagnoses has been supported by both exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses.^{32,35,38}

Personality Disorder Assessment

The diagnosis of PDs requires an evaluation of the individual's long-term patterns of functioning.^{13(p630)} Diagnoses of PDs made using the AUDADIS–IV were made accordingly. Respondents were asked a series of personality symptom questions about how they felt or acted most of the time throughout their lives regardless of the situation or whom they were with. They were reminded on 20 occasions throughout the PD section not to include times when they were depressed, manic, anxious, drinking heavily, using medicines or drugs, experiencing withdrawal symptoms (defined earlier in the AUDADIS–IV), or times when they were physically ill.

To receive a DSM–IV diagnosis, respondents needed to endorse the requisite number of DSM–IV symptom items for the particular PD, and at least one positive symptom item must have caused social or occupational dysfunction. Multiple symptom items were used to operationalize the more complex criteria associated with certain PDs. The following numbers of symptom items were used to assess each PD: avoidant ($N = 7$); dependent ($N = 8$); obsessive-compulsive ($N = 10$); paranoid ($N = 9$); schizoid ($N = 10$); histrionic ($N = 11$); and antisocial ($N = 30$). Because of time and space constraints, not all DSM–IV PDs were assessed in Wave 1 NESARC. The decision to exclude borderline, schizotypal, and narcissistic PDs was based on the larger number of symptom items required to operationalize the disorders relative to those PDs assessed in Wave 1 (i.e., borderline, 18 items; schizotypal, 16 items; and narcissistic, 19 items). However, in the follow-up Wave 2 of NESARC, borderline, schizotypal, and narcissistic PDs will be included.

The reliability of AUDADIS–IV PDs was assessed in a test-retest study conducted as part of the NESARC survey proper.¹⁵ A random subsample of 282 respondents was reinterviewed with the antisocial PD module, and another subsample of 315 respondents was reinterviewed with the AUDADIS–IV modules containing the remaining PD measures. These reinterviews were

conducted approximately 10 weeks after the NESARC interviews. The reliability of the PD diagnoses in these community samples ranged from fair to good, from $kappa = 0.40$ for histrionic PD to $kappa = 0.67$ for antisocial PD. Reliabilities of the AUDADIS-IV PD diagnoses are as good as or better than those found for semistructured personality interviews in short-term test-retest studies conducted in treated samples of patients.⁴³

The validity of AUDADIS-IV PDs was assessed in a series of linear regression analyses, using NESARC data, that examined the associations between each PD and three Short Form 12v2⁴⁴ disability scores, controlling for age, all other PDs, and 12-month comorbid DSM-IV substance use disorders and anxiety and mood disorders. The Short Form 12v2, a reliable and valid measure of generic quality of life used in large population surveys, yields 10 component summary and profile scores assessing various dimensions of disability and impairment. In the present analyses, the focus was on three Short Form 12v2 scores: the mental component summary score; the social functioning score, reflecting limitations in social functioning; and the role emotional function score, measuring role impairment due to emotional problems. All PDs, except histrionic, were shown to be highly significant ($P < .01$ to $P < .001$) predictors of the mental component summary, social functioning, and role emotional scores. Respondents with those PDs had significantly greater disability and social/occupational dysfunction than respondents who did not have the PD.

Statistical Analysis

Cross-tabulations were used to calculate prevalences and comorbidity rates of PDs and alcohol and drug use disorders. A series of univariate logistic regression analyses were used to study associations between PDs and alcohol and drug use disorders. The *beta* coefficients from these analyses were transformed into odds ratios (ORs) for ease of interpretation. Differences in the associations of PDs and alcohol and drug use disorders between men and women were examined by comparing sex-specific *beta* coefficients

derived from the logistic regression analyses. Because of the complex survey design of NESARC, variance estimation procedures that assume simple random sampling cannot be used. The stratification of the NESARC sample will result in standard errors much larger than those that would be obtained with a simple random sample of equal size. To take into account this NESARC sample design component, all standard errors and 95 percent confidence limits (CIs) presented here were generated using SUDAAN (Software for Survey Data Analysis),⁴⁵ a software program that uses appropriate statistical techniques to adjust for sample design characteristics.

RESULTS

Prevalence of Alcohol and Drug Use Disorders and PDs

The 12-month prevalences of any alcohol use disorder and any drug use disorder were 8.5 percent and 2.0 percent, respectively (Table 1). Rates of abuse

exceeded those for dependence for both alcohol and drug use disorders. The most prevalent PD in the general population was obsessive-compulsive PD (7.9 percent), followed by paranoid PD (4.4 percent), antisocial PD (3.6 percent), schizoid PD (3.1 percent), avoidant PD (2.4 percent), histrionic PD (1.8 percent), and dependent PD (0.5 percent).

Prevalence of PDs Among Respondents With 12-Month Alcohol and Drug Use Disorders

As indicated in the top row of Table 2, 28.6 percent and 47.7 percent of respondents with a 12-month alcohol use disorder and drug use disorder, respectively, had at least one PD. Rates of any PD were greater among respondents with any drug abuse (37.8 percent) and any drug dependence (69.5 percent) than among respondents with alcohol abuse (19.8 percent) and alcohol dependence (39.5 percent). The prevalence of antisocial PD (12.3 percent), obsessive-compulsive PD (12.1 percent), and paranoid PD (10.2 percent) were the

Table 1 Twelve-Month Prevalence of Alcohol and Drug Use Disorders and Prevalence of Personality Disorders (PDs)

Disorder	Prevalence %	(S.E.)*	No. of Subjects†
Any alcohol use disorder	8.5	(0.24)	3327
Alcohol abuse	4.7	(0.18)	1843
Alcohol dependence	3.8	(0.14)	1484
Any drug use disorder	2.0	(0.10)	777
Any drug abuse	1.4	(0.08)	528
Any drug dependence	0.6	(0.05)	249
Any PD	14.8	(0.36)	6295
Avoidant PD	2.4	(0.11)	995
Dependent PD	0.5	(0.05)	208
Obsessive-compulsive PD	7.9	(0.23)	3261
Paranoid PD	4.4	(0.15)	2105
Schizoid PD	3.1	(0.12)	1425
Histrionic PD	1.8	(0.09)	808
Antisocial PD	3.6	(0.15)	1422

* Prevalence figures are based on weighted data.
 † Number of subjects is based on unweighted data.

highest among respondents with an alcohol use disorder. These also were the most prevalent PDs among respondents with any drug use disorder, but the rates were much higher. The prevalence of specific PDs was much greater among respondents with dependence on alcohol (2.5 percent–18.3 percent) or drugs (10.1 percent–39.5 percent) compared with respondents with alcohol abuse (0.3 percent–9.5 percent) or any drug abuse (2.0 percent–22.3 percent).

Prevalence of 12-Month Alcohol and Drug Use Disorders Among Respondents With PDs

As indicated in Table 3, 16.4 percent of the respondents with at least one PD

met criteria for a current alcohol use disorder, and 6.5 percent met criteria for a current drug use disorder. The prevalence of any alcohol use disorder was greatest among respondents with histrionic (29.1 percent), antisocial (28.7 percent), dependent (21.6 percent), and paranoid (19.5 percent) PDs. Similarly, the rate of any drug use disorder was greatest among respondents with dependent (18.5 percent), antisocial (15.2 percent), and histrionic (12.8 percent) PDs. Prevalences of alcohol abuse (2.5 percent–9.5 percent) and drug abuse (2.0 percent–8.4 percent) were consistently lower among respondents with specific PDs than the corresponding rates for alcohol dependence (7.4 percent–21.3 percent) and any

drug dependence (2.3 percent–12.9 percent). The only exception to this pattern was among respondents with antisocial PD, where the prevalence of any drug abuse (8.4 percent) exceeded the rate for any drug dependence (6.8 percent).

Associations Between Alcohol and Drug Use Disorders and PDs

Associations between alcohol and drug use disorders and PDs are shown in Table 4 in the form of ORs. The overall pattern of ORs is overwhelmingly positive, with 88 percent of the disorder-specific ORs being positive and statistically significant. The association between any PD and any alcohol use disorder

Table 2 Prevalence of Personality Disorders (PDs) Among Respondents With a 12-Month Alcohol or Drug Use Disorder*

Comorbid Disorder	Alcohol			Any Drug		
	Disorder	Abuse	Dependence	Disorder	Abuse	Dependence
Any PD	28.6 (1.00)	19.8 (1.16)	39.5 (1.63)	47.7 (1.96)	37.8 (2.35)	69.5 (3.30)
Avoidant PD	4.5 (0.43)	2.0 (0.37)	7.7 (0.86)	10.1 (1.35)	6.5 (1.38)	18.2 (3.56)
Dependent PD	1.3 (0.25)	0.3 (0.13)	2.5 (0.54)	4.6 (1.06)	2.0 (0.63)	10.1 (3.01)
Obsessive–compulsive PD	12.1 (0.69)	9.5 (0.90)	15.2 (1.10)	16.9 (1.66)	11.5 (1.60)	28.7 (3.80)
Paranoid PD	10.2 (0.61)	5.6 (0.74)	15.8 (1.13)	18.6 (1.73)	11.9 (1.57)	33.2 (4.03)
Schizoid PD	5.1 (0.51)	2.5 (0.40)	8.2 (0.98)	12.3 (1.48)	8.4 (1.41)	21.0 (3.39)
Histrionic PD	6.3 (0.51)	3.1 (0.47)	10.3 (0.95)	11.8 (1.47)	7.8 (1.24)	20.6 (3.63)
Antisocial PD	12.3 (0.72)	7.4 (0.74)	18.3 (1.22)	27.7 (1.76)	22.3 (2.25)	39.5 (3.55)

* Values are expressed as percentage (SE).

Table 3 Prevalence of 12-Month Alcohol and Drug Use Disorders Among Respondents With a Personality Disorder (PD)*

Comorbid Disorder	Any PD	Obsessive–compulsive						
		Avoidant	Dependent	Paranoid	Schizoid	Histrionic	Antisocial	
Any alcohol use disorder	16.4 (0.62)	16.3 (1.43)	21.6 (3.97)	12.9 (0.77)	19.5 (1.17)	13.7 (1.32)	29.1 (2.19)	28.7 (1.53)
Alcohol abuse	6.2 (0.38)	3.9 (0.71)	2.5 (1.20)	5.6 (0.54)	5.9 (0.77)	3.7 (0.59)	7.8 (1.19)	9.5 (0.94)
Alcohol dependence	10.2 (0.51)	12.4 (1.33)	19.1 (3.93)	7.4 (0.60)	13.6 (1.04)	9.9 (1.17)	21.3 (1.88)	19.2 (1.29)
Any drug use disorder	6.5 (0.41)	8.6 (1.17)	18.5 (3.73)	4.3 (0.48)	8.4 (0.87)	7.9 (1.06)	12.8 (1.59)	15.2 (1.16)
Any drug abuse	3.5 (0.29)	3.8 (0.82)	5.7 (1.71)	2.0 (0.29)	3.7 (0.52)	3.7 (0.66)	5.8 (0.96)	8.4 (0.97)
Any drug dependence	2.9 (0.28)	4.8 (1.03)	12.9 (3.69)	2.3 (0.38)	4.7 (0.71)	4.2 (0.77)	7.0 (1.35)	6.8 (0.87)

* Values are expressed as percentage (SE).

(OR, 2.6) was weaker than the association found for any drug use disorder (OR, 5.5), a pattern also found when specific PDs were examined. Specific PDs were more strongly related to alcohol dependence (ORs, 2.2–7.5) and drug dependence (ORs, 4.8–26.0) than to alcohol abuse (ORs, 0.5–2.2) or drug abuse (ORs, 1.5–8.2). Although histrionic PD (OR, 1.7) and antisocial PD (OR, 2.2) were significantly associated with alcohol abuse, the associations between alcohol abuse and avoidant, dependent, obsessive-compulsive, paranoid, and schizoid PDs were not significant. All specific PDs, however, were strongly and consistently related to any alcohol use disorder (ORs, 1.7–4.8) and any drug use disorder (ORs, 2.4–11.8). Dependent, histrionic, and antisocial PDs were more strongly related to both alcohol and drug use disorders than any of the other PDs.

Associations Between Alcohol and Drug Use Disorders and PDs, by Sex

Similar to the pattern observed in the total sample, the associations between current alcohol and drug use disorders and PDs among men and women were overwhelmingly significant and positive, with the exception of the associations between avoidant, dependent, obsessive-compulsive, paranoid, and schizoid PDs and alcohol abuse (Table 5). With respect to any drug use disorder, drug abuse, and drug dependence, associations remained the strongest for antisocial, histrionic, and dependent PDs among men and women. The same pattern was observed for any alcohol use disorder and alcohol dependence among men and women.

Significant sex differences in the associations between alcohol and drug use disorders and PDs also were observed. The relationship between obsessive-compulsive ($P < .02$), histrionic ($P < .04$), and antisocial ($P < .006$) PDs and alcohol dependence was significantly greater for women than men. With regard to any drug abuse, the associations with obsessive-compulsive ($P < .03$), schizoid ($P < .009$), histrionic ($P < .02$), and antisocial ($P < .002$) PDs were greater for women than for men. In contrast,

the association between drug dependence and dependent PD was significantly greater ($P < .04$) among men than women.

COMMENT

The co-occurrence of DSM–IV current alcohol and drug use disorders and DSM–IV PDs is pervasive in the U.S. population. Among individuals with a current alcohol or drug use disorder, 28.6 percent and 47.7 percent, respectively, had at least one PD. While the proportion of individuals with a PD who also had an alcohol or drug use disorder was lower, a considerable proportion of those with PDs did meet criteria for alcohol or drug abuse or dependence. Overall, 16.4 percent of individuals in the general population with at least one PD had a current alcohol use disorder, and 6.5 percent had a current drug use disorder. The strong associations between most PDs and alcohol and drug use disorders were generally consistent when examined separately among men and women. Consistent with clinical research on comorbidity of Axis II disorders and alcohol and drug use disorders,¹ this study found greater associations between PDs and drug use disorders compared with alcohol use disorders.

Comorbidity in the general population is often lower than comorbidity in treated samples since individuals with more than one disorder have a greater probability of seeking treatment (i.e., Berkson bias). However, a striking finding in this study was that the prevalence of any PD and antisocial PD (one of the most extensively studied PDs in treated samples) among individuals with current alcohol and drug use disorders was similar to the median rates observed in samples of patients receiving treatment for alcohol and/or drug use disorders, as assessed with other standardized assessment instruments (i.e., the Structured Clinical Interview for DSM–III–R Personality Disorders [SCID–II]⁴⁶ and the Diagnostic Interview Schedule⁴⁷). For example, the median rate of any PD among patients receiving treatment for an alcohol use disorder assessed with the SCID–II^{48,49} was 39.0 percent

compared with 39.5 percent found among individuals in this study with current alcohol dependence. The median rate of any PD among patients receiving treatment for drug use using the SCID–II^{4,7,10,49–57} was 59.0 percent compared with the 69.5 percent rate found among individuals with current drug dependence. The prevalence of antisocial PD among respondents with current drug dependence was 39.5 percent, a figure midway between the median rates found in studies of drug treatment samples using the semistructured SCID–II^{50,52,53,55,58–60} (21.0 percent) and the fully structured Diagnostic Interview Schedule^{61–64} (49.0 percent) assessment instruments. The rate of antisocial PD among individuals with current alcohol dependence was 18.3 percent, somewhat lower than the median rate of 37.5 percent found among patients in alcohol treatment settings using the Diagnostic Interview Schedule.^{65–72} It is likely that the prevalences of PDs among individuals with alcohol and drug use disorders in this study would have been greater if all DSM–IV PDs had been assessed. If all PDs had been assessed, we might expect the reported rates of PDs using the fully structured AUDADIS–IV to have slightly exceeded the rates presented earlier for semistructured interviews, as would be predicted by the literature.

The PDs most strongly associated with alcohol and drug use disorders were antisocial, dependent, and histrionic PDs. The degree of diagnostic overlap between DSM–III PDs has long been recognized,^{73,74} and it may be responsible for the strong relationship observed between histrionic, antisocial, and dependent PDs and alcohol and drug use disorders. For example, individuals with antisocial PD share certain tendencies with individuals with histrionic PD to be impulsive, seductive, superficial, excitement seeking, reckless, and manipulative, but individuals with histrionic PD do not characteristically exhibit antisocial behaviors.¹³ Individuals with dependent PD and histrionic PD are excessively dependent on others for praise, guidance, and nurturance, but individuals with dependent PD do not characteristically demonstrate the

Table 4 Odds Ratio (ORs) of Personality Disorders (PDs) and Alcohol and Drug Use Disorders*

Comorbid Disorder	Disorder	Alcohol [†]		Any Drug [†]		
		Abuse	Dependence	Disorder	Abuse	Dependence
Any PD		2.6 (2.3–2.8)	4.0 (3.6–4.6)	5.5 (4.7–6.5)	3.5 (2.9–4.4)	13.5 (9.9–18.2)
Avoidant PD		2.2 (1.7–2.7)	3.8 (3.0–4.9)	5.0 (3.7–6.8)	2.9 (1.9–4.7)	9.6 (5.0–15.6)
Dependent PD		3.0 (1.9–4.8)	6.1 (3.6–10.1)	11.6 (7.1–19.1)	4.4 (2.3–8.5)	26.0 (13.3–50.6)
Obsessive– compulsive PD		1.7 (1.5–1.9)	2.2 (1.8–2.6)	2.4 (1.9–3.1)	1.5 (1.1–2.1)	4.8 (3.3–6.9)
Paranoid PD		2.8 (2.4–3.3)	4.6 (3.8–5.5)	5.3 (4.2–6.7)	3.0 (2.2–4.1)	11.3 (7.8–16.2)
Schizoid PD		1.7 (1.4–2.2)	2.9 (2.3–3.9)	4.6 (3.5–6.2)	2.9 (2.0–4.2)	8.6 (5.7–13.0)
Histrionic PD		4.7 (3.8–5.8)	7.5 (6.0–9.4)	8.0 (6.0–10.7)	4.7 (3.3–6.8)	14.8 (9.5–23.0)
Antisocial PD		4.8 (4.1–5.6)	7.1 (6.0–8.4)	11.8 (9.7–14.3)	8.2 (6.2–10.9)	18.5 (13.6–25.1)

* ORs represent the odds of having a PD among individuals with a specific alcohol or drug use disorder relative to the odds of having a PD among individuals who do not have the specific alcohol or drug use disorder.

[†] Values are expressed as OR (95% confidence interval).

Table 5 Twelve-Month Odds Ratios (ORs) of Personality Disorders (PDs) and Alcohol and Drug Use Disorders by Sex*

Comorbid Disorder	Disorder	Alcohol [†]		Any Drug [†]		
		Abuse	Dependence	Disorder	Abuse	Dependence
Men						
Avoidant PD		2.4 (1.7–3.3)	4.3 (3.0–6.1)	5.7 (3.6–8.8)	2.9 (1.4–5.7)	11.8 (6.3–22.0)
Dependent PD		4.4 (2.0–9.7)	9.3 (4.1–21.4)	17.1 (8.2–35.9)	2.7 (0.8–9.0)	48.4 (20.8–113.5) [‡]
Obsessive– compulsive PD		1.6 (1.3–1.9)	1.9 (1.5–2.3)	2.3 (1.6–3.1)	1.2 (0.8–1.8)	5.2 (3.3–8.5)
Paranoid PD		3.1 (2.6–3.9)	5.3 (4.1–6.8)	5.4 (3.9–7.5)	2.7 (1.7–4.4)	12.4 (7.5–20.6)
Schizoid PD		1.6 (1.2–2.1)	2.9 (2.1–4.0)	3.9 (2.7–5.7)	1.9 (1.0–3.3)	9.0 (5.3–15.3)
Histrionic PD		4.3 (3.2–5.8)	6.4 (4.7–8.7)	7.2 (4.9–10.6)	3.2 (1.8–5.5)	16.4 (9.5–28.6)
Antisocial PD		3.5 (2.9–4.2)	5.3 (4.4–6.5)	8.5 (6.6–10.9)	5.6 (4.1–7.8)	14.8 (9.7–22.4)
Women						
Avoidant PD		2.5 (1.8–3.5)	4.1 (2.9–5.9)	5.3 (3.5–8.1)	3.7 (2.1–6.6)	8.6 (4.8–15.6)
Dependent PD		2.8 (1.6–4.9)	5.1 (2.7–9.4)	10.1 (5.4–19.0)	7.9 (3.5–17.8)	13.4 (5.7–31.5)
Obsessive– compulsive PD		2.0 (1.5–2.5)	2.9 (2.2–4.0) [§]	2.9 (2.0–4.1)	2.3 (1.4–3.8) [§]	4.0 (2.3–6.9)
Paranoid PD		3.0 (2.4–3.8)	4.5 (3.4–6.0)	6.2 (4.5–8.4)	4.0 (2.6–6.3)	11.4 (7.1–18.3)
Schizoid PD		2.1 (1.5–2.9)	3.1 (2.1–4.6)	6.3 (4.3–9.1)	5.4 (3.2–9.0) [§]	7.8 (4.4–13.9)
Histrionic PD		5.8 (4.3–7.7)	10.2 (7.4–14.0) [§]	9.7 (6.3–15.0)	8.1 (4.8–13.8) [§]	11.9 (6.4–21.9)
Antisocial PD		6.2 (4.7–8.2)	9.4 (8.7–13.2) [§]	17.9 (12.5–25.5)	14.0 (8.8–22.3) [§]	22.6 (13.4–38.2)

* ORs represent the odds of having a PD among individuals with a specific alcohol or drug use disorder relative to the odds of having a PD among individuals who do not have the specific alcohol or drug use disorder.

[†] Values are expressed as OR (95% confidence interval).

[‡] Indicates association significantly greater ($P < .04$) among men than women.

[§] Indicates association significantly greater ($P < .04$) among women than men.

flamboyant emotional features of histrionic PD. Although multivariate studies⁷⁵⁻⁷⁷ have been conducted on item-level criteria of DSM PDs in search of the factor structure underlying PD diagnoses, the findings of this study suggest that this search be expanded to include criteria of Axis I substance use disorders along with the components of PDs that are most closely associated with them. The results of these future studies might elucidate subtypes of alcohol and drug use disorders, refine the classification of both types of disorder, and increase our understanding of the pathological processes underlying their comorbidity.

A number of the PDs examined in this study were more strongly associated with alcohol and drug use disorders among women, including antisocial PD. However, a stronger association between dependent PD and drug dependence was observed among men. Although reasons for these observed sex differences are unknown, these findings highlight the need to examine a broader set of factors that affect the prevalence and co-occurrence of PDs and alcohol and drug use disorders, including age, socioeconomic status, and, importantly, primary substance of abuse. In the current study, the stronger associations observed between antisocial PD and alcohol and drug use disorders among women may be the result of differential mortality or incarceration. That is, men who are highly comorbid for antisocial PD and alcohol and drug use disorders are more likely to die young or be incarcerated than women and thus less likely to be represented in general population surveys. This explanation is consistent with the findings that men are overrepresented in jail and prison populations and that substance use disorders occur in about 90 percent of individuals with antisocial PD who are incarcerated.⁷⁸

In light of the extensive comorbidity between PDs and alcohol and drug use disorders found in this study, there would appear to be great value in assessing a broad range of PDs among substance abuse patients. This more comprehensive assessment can guide treatment planning. For example, patients with comorbid alcohol and drug use disorders and PDs can be expected to require treatment

that is more extensive and of longer duration. In this regard, modified psychoanalytic psychotherapy focused or targeted on particular features of PDs might hold great promise for successful recovery among comorbid individuals.⁷⁹⁻⁸¹ The trend toward integrating 12-step programs into rehabilitation programs also appears promising in that 12-step programs require individuals to examine their relationship to others, overcome feelings of helplessness, gain an internal locus of control, encourage self-examination, address defects in character, and promote honest relationships.^{82,83} More clinical research is needed to examine the role of these and other approaches targeted at treating substance use disorders (e.g., contingency management, motivational enhancement therapy, cognitive behavior therapy) in improving the chances of recovery and the lives of individuals with comorbid alcohol and drug use disorders and PDs. This work will be formidable, because some of these components of treatment are on uncertain grounds in terms of efficacy and mechanisms of action (e.g., 12-step programs and psychoanalytic treatments). Attention in this clinical work on the effects of sex, substance of choice, and other factors that affect treatment outcome and eventual recovery might further refine treatment planning.

This national study of comorbidity represents a landmark study in the area of PDs. Previous psychiatric epidemiology studies were too small to address these important relationships in detail. Personality disorders are not only pervasive and associated with substantial disability,⁴⁴ they are very common among those with alcohol and drug use disorders. Further work in many directions is indicated by the results of this study, including a dissection of the components of the two types of disorders that are most closely associated, the factors giving rise to the associations, and the treatment and prevention implications of these disorders when comorbid. ■

REFERENCES

1. VERHEUL R, VAN DEN BRINK W, HARTGERS C. Prevalence of personality disorders among alco-

holics and drug addicts: an overview. *Eur Addict Res.* 1995;1:166-177.

2. CACCIOLA JS, RUTHERFORD MJ, ALTERMAN AL, MCKAY JR, SNIDER EC. Personality disorders and treatment outcome in methadone maintenance patients. *J Nerv Ment Dis.* 1996;184:234-239. PMID: 8604033
3. KOSTEN TA, KOSTEN TR, ROUNSAVILLE BJ. Personality disorders in opiate addicts show prognostic specificity. *J Subst Abuse Treat.* 1989;6:163-168. PMID: 2795705
4. KRANZLER HR, SATEL S, APTER A. Personality disorders and associated features in cocaine-dependent inpatients. *Compr Psychiatry.* 1994;35:335-340. PMID: 7995024
5. MARLOWE DB, KIRBY KC, FESTINGER DS, HUSBAND SD, PLATT JJ. Impact of comorbid personality disorders and personality disorder symptoms on outcomes of behavioral treatment for cocaine dependence. *J Nerv Ment Dis.* 1997;185:483-490. PMID: 9284861
6. MOVALLI MG, MADEDDU F, MAFFEI FC. Personality disorders (DSM-III-R, DSM-IV): prevalence in alcoholics and influence on dropout from treatment [In Italian]. *Alcolologia.* 1996;8:47-52.
7. NURNBERG HG, RIFKIN A, DODDI S. A systematic assessment of the comorbidity of DSM-III-R personality disorders in alcoholic outpatients. *Compr Psychiatry.* 1993;34:447-454. PMID: 8131392
8. PETTINATI HM, JENSEN JM, TRACY JI, SAMUELS D, MEYERS K. Cocaine vs alcohol dependence: Axis II and outcome. Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the Research Society on Alcoholism; June 19, 1991; Marco Island, FL.
9. THOMAS VH, MELCHERT TP, BANKEN JA. Substance dependence and personality disorders: comorbidity and treatment outcome in an inpatient treatment population. *J Stud Alcohol.* 1999;60:271-277. PMID: 10091966
10. SKODAL AE, OLDHAM JM, GALLAHER PE. Axis II comorbidity of substance use disorders among patients referred for treatment of personality disorders. *Am J Psychiatry.* 1999;156:733-738. PMID: 10327906
11. KESSLER RC, WALTERS EE. The National Comorbidity Survey. In: Tsuang MT, Tohen M, eds. *Textbook in Psychiatric Epidemiology.* 2nd ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons; 2002:343-362.
12. ROBINS LN, REGIER DS, eds. *Psychiatric Disorders in America: The Epidemiologic Catchment Area Study.* New York: Free Press; 1991.
13. American Psychiatric Association. *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fourth Edition.* Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association; 1994.
14. GRANT BF, MOORE TC, SHEPARD J, KAPLAN K. *Source and Accuracy Statement: Wave 1 National Epidemiologic Survey on Alcohol and*

- Related Conditions (NESARC)*. Bethesda, MD: National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism; 2003.
15. GRANT BF, DAWSON DA, STINSON FS, CHOU PS, KAY W, PICKERING R. The Alcohol Use Disorder and Associated Disabilities Interview Schedule–IV (AUDADIS–IV): reliability of alcohol consumption, tobacco use, family history of depression and psychiatric diagnostic modules in a general population sample. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 2003;71:7–16. PMID: 12821201
 16. GRANT BF, DAWSON DA, HASIN DS. *The Alcohol Use Disorder and Associated Disabilities Interview Schedule–DSM–IV Version*. Bethesda, MD: National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism; 2001.
 17. CANINO GJ, BRAVO M, RAMFREZ R, FEBO V, FERNANDEZ R, HASIN D. The Spanish Alcohol Use Disorder and Associated Disabilities Interview Schedule (AUDADIS): reliability and concordance with clinical diagnoses in a Hispanic population. *J Stud Alcohol* 1999;60:790–799. PMID: 10606491
 18. GRANT BF, HARFORD TC, DAWSON DA, CHOU PS, PICKERING R. The Alcohol Use Disorder and Associated Disabilities Interview Schedule (AUDADIS): reliability of alcohol and drug modules in a general population sample. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 1995;39:37–44. PMID: 7587973
 19. HASIN D, CARPENTER KM, MCCLOUD S, SMITH M, GRANT BF. The Alcohol Use Disorder and Associated Disabilities Interview Schedule (AUDADIS): reliability of alcohol and drug modules in a clinical sample. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 1997;44:133–141. PMID: 9088785
 20. VRASTI R, GRANT BF, CHATTERJI S, USTUN BT, MAGER D, OLTEANU I, BADOI M. Reliability of the Romanian version of the alcohol module of the WHO Alcohol Use Disorder and Associated Disabilities Interview Schedule–Alcohol/Drug–Revised (AUDADIS–ADR). *Eur Addict Res.* 1998;4:144–149. PMID: 9852366
 21. CHATTERJI S, SAUNDERS JB, VRASTI R, GRANT BF, HASIN DS, MAGER D. The reliability of the Alcohol Use Disorder and Associated Disabilities Interview Schedule–Alcohol/Drug–Revised (AUDADIS–ADR) in India, Romania and Austria. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 1997;47:171–185. PMID: 9306043
 22. GRANT BF. DSM–III–R and proposed DSM–IV alcohol abuse and dependence, United States, 1988: a nosological comparison. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res.* 1992;16:1068–1075. PMID: 1471761
 23. GRANT BF. DSM–IV, DSM–III–R and ICD–10 alcohol and drug abuse/harmful use and dependence, United States. 1992: a nosological comparison. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res.* 1996;20:1481–1488. PMID: 8947328
 24. GRANT BF. The relationship between ethanol intake and DSM–III–R alcohol dependence: results of national survey. *J Subst Abuse.* 1993;5:257–267. PMID: 8312731
 25. GRANT BF, HARFORD TC. The relationship between ethanol intake and DSM–III–R alcohol dependence. *J Stud Alcohol.* 1990;51:448–456. PMID:2232799
 26. GRANT BF, HARFORD TC. The relationship between ethanol intake and DSM–III–R alcohol use disorders: a cross-perspective analysis. *J Subst Abuse.* 1988–1989 1:231–252. PMID: 2980873
 27. HARFORD TC, GRANT BF. Prevalence and population validity of DSM–III–R alcohol abuse and dependence: the 1998 National Longitudinal Survey on Youth. *J Subst Abuse.* 1994;6:37–44. PMID: 8081108
 28. HASIN DS, GRANT BF. Draft criteria for alcohol use disorders: comparison to DSM–III–R and implications. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res.* 1994;18:1348–1353. PMID: 7695029
 29. HASIN DS, GRANT BF. Nosological comparisons of DSM–III–R and DSM–IV alcohol abuse and dependence in a clinical facility: comparison to National HIS88 results. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res.* 1994;18:272–279. PMID: 8048727
 30. HASIN D, LI Q, MCCLOUD S, ENDICOTT J. Agreement between DSM–III, DSM–III–R and DSM–IV and ICD–10 alcohol diagnoses in a US community sample of heavy drinkers. *Addiction.* 1996;91:1517–1527. PMID: 8917919
 31. HASIN DS, MUTHEN B, GRANT BF. The dimensionality of DSM–IV alcohol abuse and dependence: factor analysis in a clinical sample. In: Vraști R, ed. *Alcoholism: New Research Perspectives*. Göttingen, Germany: Hogrefe & Hubner 1997;27–39.
 32. HASIN DS, PAYKIN A. Alcohol dependence and abuse diagnoses: concurrent validity in a nationally representative sample. *Alcohol Clin Exp. Res.* 1999; 23:144–150. PMID: 10029216
 33. HASIN D, SCHUCKIT M, MARTIN CS, GRANT BF, BUCHOLZ KK, HELZER JE. The validity of DSM–IV alcohol dependence: what do we know and what do we need to know. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res.* 2003;27:244–252. PMID: 12605073
 34. HASIN DS, VAN ROSSEM R, MCCLOUD S, ENDICOTT J. Alcohol dependence and abuse diagnoses: validity in a community sample of heavy drinkers. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res.* 1997;21:213–219. PMID: 9113255
 35. MUTHEN B, GRANT BF, HASIN DS. The dimensionality of alcohol abuse and dependence: factor analysis of DSM–III–R and proposed DSM–IV criteria in the 1988 National Health Interview Survey. *Addiction.* 1993; 88:1079–1090. PMID: 8401162
 36. COTTLER LB, GRANT BF, BLAINE J, MAVREAS V, PULL CB, HASIN D, COMPTON WM, RUBIO-STIPEE M, MAGER D. Concordance of DSM–IV alcohol and drug use disorder criteria and diagnoses as measured by AUDADIS–ADR, CIDI and SCAN. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 1997;47:195–205. PMID: 9306045
 37. HASIN D, GRANT BF, COTTLER L, BLAINE J, TOWLE L, USTUN B, SARTORIUS N. Nosological comparisons of alcohol and drug diagnoses: a multisite, multi-instrument international study. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 1997;47:217–226. PMID: 9306047
 38. NELSON CB, REHM J, USTUN B, GRANT BF, CHATTERJI S. Factor structure of DSM–IV substance disorder criteria endorsed by alcohol, cannabis, cocaine and opiate users: results from the World Health Organization Reliability and Validity Study. *Addiction.* 1999;94:843–855. PMID: 10665074
 39. PULL CB, SAUNDERS JB, MAVREAS V, COTTLER LB, GRANT BF, HASIN DS, BLAINE J, MAGER D, USTUN B. Concordance between ICD–10 alcohol and drug use disorder criteria and diagnoses as measured by the AUDADIS–ADR, CIDI and SCAN: results of a cross-national study. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 1997;47:207–216. PMID: 9306046
 40. USTUN B, COMPTON W, MAGER D, BABOR T, BALLYEWU O, CHATTERJI S, COTTLER L, GOGUS A, MAVREAS V, PETERS L, PULL C, SAUNDERS J, SMEETS R, STIPEE MR, VRASTI R, HASIN DS, ROOM R, VAN DEN BRINK W, REGIER D, BLAINE J, GRANT B, SARTORIUS N. WHO study on the reliability and validity of the alcohol and drug use disorder instruments: overview of methods and results. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 1997;47:161–170. PMID: 9306042
 41. World Health Organization. *International Classification of Diseases, 10th Revision*. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization; 1992.
 42. World Health Organization. *Schedule for Clinical Assessment in Neuropsychiatry*. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization; 1997.
 43. ZIMMERMAN M. Diagnosing personality disorders: a review of issues and research methods. *Arch Gen Psychiatry.* 1994;51:225–245. PMID: 8122959
 44. WARE JE, KOSINSKI M, TURNER-BOWKER DM, GANDEK B. *How to Score Version 2 of the SF–12 Health Survey*. Lincoln, RI: Quality Metric; 2002.
 45. Software for Survey Data Analysis (SUDAAN) [computer program]. Version 8.2. Research Triangle Park, NC: Research Triangle Institute; 2002.
 46. SPITZER R, WILLIAMS J. *Structured Clinical Interview for DSM–III–R Personality Disorders (SCID–II)*. New York: New York State Psychiatric Institute, Biometrics Research Department; 1985.
 47. ROBINS LN, HELZER JE, CROUGHAN JL, RATCLIFF K. National Institute of Mental Health Diagnostic Interview Schedule: its history, characteristics and validity. *Arch Gen Psychiatry.* 1981;38:381–339. PMID: 6260053
 48. PETTINATI H. *Diagnosing Personality Disorders in Substance Abusers*. Bethesda, MD: National Institute on Drug Abuse; 1991;238–242.

49. THEVOS AK, BRADY KT, GRICE D, DUSTAN L, MALCOLM R. A comparison of psychopathology in cocaine and alcohol dependence. *Am J Addict.* 1993;2:279–286.
50. BROONER RK, HERBST JH, SCHMIDT CW, BIGELOW GE, COSTA PT JR. Antisocial personality disorder among drug abusers: relations to other personality diagnoses and the five factor model of personality. *J Nerv Ment Dis.* 1993; 181:313–319. PMID: 8501448
51. DEJONG CAJ, VAN DEN BRINK W, HARTEVELD FM, VAN DER WIELEN EGM. Personality disorders in alcoholics and drug addicts. *Compr Psychiatry.* 1993;34:87–94. PMID: 8387417
52. KLEINMAN PH, MILLER AB, MILLMAN RB, WOODY GE, TODD T, KEMP, LIPTON DS. Psychopathology among cocaine abusers entering treatment. *J Nerv Ment Dis.* 1990;178: 442–447. PMID: 2366058
53. MALOW RM, WEST JA, WILLIAMS JL, SUTKER PB. Personality disorders classification and symptoms in cocaine and opioid addicts. *J Consult Clin Psychol.* 1989;57:765–767.
54. MARLOWE DB, HUSBAND SD, LAMB RJ, KIRBY KG, IQUCHI MY, PLATT JJ. Psychiatric comorbidity in cocaine dependence: diverging trends, Axis II spectrum, and gender differentials. *Am J Addict.* 1995;4:70–61.
55. NACE EP, DAVIS CW, GASPARI JP. Axis II comorbidity in substance abusers. *Am J Psychiatry.* 1991;148:118–120.
56. RUTHERFORD MJ, CACCIOLA JS, ALTERMAN AI. Relationships of personality disorders with problem severity in methadone patients. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 1994;35:69–76. PMID: 8082558
57. WEISS RD, MIRIN SM, GRIFFIN ML, GUNDERSON JG, HUFFORD C. Personality disorders in cocaine dependence. *Compr Psychiatry.* 1993;34:145–149. PMID: 8339531
58. BRADY KT, GRICE DE, DUSTAN L, RANDALL L. Gender differences in substance use disorders. *Am J Psychiatry.* 1993;150:1707–1711. PMID: 8214180
59. LEHMAN AF, MEYERS CP, THOMPSON JW, CORTY E. Implications of mental and substance use disorders: a comparison of single and dual diagnosis patients. *J Nerv Ment Dis.* 1993; 181:365–370. PMID: 8388914
60. ROUNSAVILLE BJ, FOLEY AS, CARROL K, BUDDE D, PRUSOFF BA, GAVIN F. Psychiatric diagnoses of treatment-seeking cocaine abusers. *Arch Gen Psychiatry.* 1991;48:43–51. PMID: 1984761
61. HASIN DS, GRANT BF. Psychiatric diagnosis of patients with substance abuse problems: a comparison of two procedures, the DIS and SADS-L. *J Psychiatr Res.* 1987;21:7–22. PMID: 3560008
62. MUNTANER C, NAGOSHI C, JAFFE JH, WALTER D, HAERTZEN C, FISHBEIN D. Correlates of self-reported early childhood aggression in subjects volunteering for drug studies. *Am J Drug Alcohol Abuse.* 1989;15:383–402. PMID: 2596443
63. ROSS HE, GLASER FB, STIASNY S. Sex differences in the prevalences of psychiatric disorders in patients with alcohol and drug problems. *Br J Addict.* 1988;83:1179–1192. PMID: 3263889
64. VAN LIMBEK J, WOUTERS L, KAPLAN CD, GEERLINGS PJ, VAN ALEM V. Prevalence of psychopathology in drug-addicted Dutch. *J Subst Abuse Treat.* 1992;9:43–52. PMID: 1317465
65. CADORET R, TROUGHTON E, WIDMER R. Clinical differences between antisocial and primary alcoholics. *Compr Psychiatry.* 1984;25:1–8. PMID: 6697711
66. HELZER JE, PRYZBECK TR. The co-occurrence of alcoholism with other psychiatric disorders in the general population and its impact on treatment. *J Stud Alcohol.* 1988;49:219–224. PMID: 3374135
67. HERZ LR, VOLICER L, D'ANGELO N, GADISH D. Additional psychiatric illness by Diagnostic Interview Schedule in male alcoholics. *Compr Psychiatry.* 1990;31:72–79. PMID: 2297986
68. HESSELBROCK VM, HESSELBROCK MN, STABENAU JR. Alcoholism in men patients subtyped by family history and antisocial personality. *J Stud Alcohol.* 1985;46:59–64. PMID: 3974237
69. HESSELBROCK MN, MEYER RE, KEENER JJ. Psychopathology in hospitalized alcoholics. *Arch Gen Psychiatry.* 1985;42:1050–1055. PMID: 4051682
70. MALLOY P, NOEL N, LONGBAUGH R, BEATTIE M. Determinants of neuropsychological impairment in antisocial substance abusers. *Addict Behav.* 1990;15:431–438. PMID: 2248116
71. ROSS HE, GLASER FB, GERMANSON T. The prevalence of psychiatric disorders in patients with alcohol and other drug problems. *Arch Gen Psychiatry.* 1988;45:1023–1031. PMID: 3263100
72. YAMAMOTO J, SILVA JA, SASAO T, WANG C, NGUYEN L. Alcoholism in Peru. *Am J Psychiatry.* 1993;50:1059–1062. PMID: 8317576
73. FRANCIS AJ. Categorical and dimensional systems of personality disorder diagnoses. *Compr Psychiatry.* 1982;23:516–527. PMID: 7160170
74. LIVESLEY JW. Diagnostic dilemmas in classifying personality disorder. In: Phillips KA, First MB, Pincus HA, eds. *Advancing DSM: Dilemmas in Psychiatric Diagnosis.* Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association; 2003:153–189.
75. AUSTIN EJ, DEARY IJ. The “Four As”: a common framework for normal and abnormal personality? *Pers Individ Dif.* 2000;28:977–998.
76. LIVESLEY WJ, JANG KL, VERNON PA. The phenotypic and genetic architecture of traits delineating personality disorder. *Arch Gen Psychiatry.* 1998;55:941–948. PMID: 9783566
77. MULDER RT, JOYCE PR. Temperament and the structure of personality disorder symptoms. *Psychol Med.* 1997;27:99–106. PMID: 9122314
78. REGIER D, FARMER ME, RAE DS, LOCKE BZ, KEITH S, JUDD LL, GOODWIN FK. Comorbidity of mental disorders with alcohol and other drug abuse: results from the Epidemiologic Catchment Area (ECA) study. *JAMA.* 1990;264:2511–2518. PMID: 2232018
79. COCCARO EF. Psychopharmacologic studies in patients with personality disorders: review and perspective. *J Personal Disord.* 1993;7(suppl): 181S–192S.
80. GORDON C, BERESIN E. Conflicting treatment models for inpatient management of borderline patients. *Am J Psychiatry.* 1983;140:979–983. PMID: 6869617
81. LINEHAN MM. *Cognitive-Behavioral Treatment of Borderline Personality Disorder.* New York: Guilford; 1993.
82. CHAPPEL JN, GOTTHEIL E, NACE EP. *Alcoholism Update for Psychiatrists.* Port Washington, NY: American College of Psychiatrists, 1988.
83. NACE EP. Personality disorders in the alcoholic patient. *Psychiatr Ann.* 1989;19:256–260.