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**ABSTRACT**

Recognizing the diagnostic challenges that clinicians face when attempting to arrive at an accurate psychiatric diagnosis for individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities (IDD) co-occurring with mental illness (MI), in 2007 the National Association for the Dually Diagnosed (NADD), in association with the American Psychiatric Association (APA), published Diagnostic Manual—Intellectual Disability (*DM-ID*): A Textbook of Diagnosis of Mental Disorders in Persons with Intellectual Disability (Fletcher, Loschen, Stavrakaki, & First, 2007). The *DM-ID* was designed as a companion to the *DSM-IV-TR* and aimed to assist clinicians to arrive at a more accurate *DSM-IV-TR* diagnosis for individuals with IDD. In 2013, the American Psychiatric Association published the *DSM-5*, thus necessitating revision of the *DM-ID* to incorporate the changes from the *DSM-IV-TR* to the *DSM-5*. The authors discuss the need for and development of the original *DM-ID* and changes in the *DSM-5*. The authors then offer insight into several chapters in the *DM-ID-2* across the lifespan of individuals with IDD, looking at the changes in the *DSM-5* and how these impact the ascertainment of mental disorders in individuals with IDD.
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Individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities (IDD) can experience the same psychiatric disorders as people in the general population. While estimates of the prevalence of mental disorders among people with IDD varies, research indicates that the prevalence is higher with people who have IDD than in the general population. Prevalence estimates range from 30% to 70% of individuals with IDD having mental illness or behavioral problems (Szymanski & King, 1999). The range of findings can be attributed to a variety of factors including differences in population sampling and methodologies used in identifying psychiatric disorders in persons with IDD. Two of the larger studies are: Cooper, Smiley, Morrison, Williamson, and Allan (2007), who revealed a rate of 40.9% with a population-based study (*N* = 1023) employing a comprehensive individualized clinical assessment; and National Core Indicators (NCI), which has identified a rate of 55%
(N = 13,466) (National Core Indicates, 2016) based on patient charts from thirty states in the U.S.

Recognizing the diagnostic challenges that clinicians are faced with when attempting to arrive at an accurate diagnosis for individuals with IDD coexisting with mental illness (MI), the National Association for the Dually Diagnosed (NADD), in association with the American Psychiatric Association (APA), published Diagnostic Manual—Intellectual Disability (DM-ID): A Textbook of Diagnosis of Mental Disorders in Persons with Intellectual Disability in 2007 (Fletcher, Loschen, Stavrakaki, & First, 2007). The challenges stem, to a great extent, from the difficulty or inability of individuals with IDD to describe their own symptoms. Diagnosis for an individual within the population without IDD generally relies upon the person’s description of his or her experiences and feelings. Individuals with IDD have limited receptive and expressive language, thus limiting their ability to describe their symptoms. They may also lack the self-reflection to describe internal states. Furthermore, individuals with IDD who are experiencing mental illness may present in very different ways than their peers without IDD. Accurate diagnosis can be further stymied by diagnostic overshadowing, in which the diagnosis of IDD can overshadow coexisting mental disorders and predispose practitioners to overlook the presence of psychopathology or attribute the symptoms of psychopathology to the IDD (Reiss, Levitan, & Szysko, 1982). Also, some people with IDD tend to try to hide their disability under a “cloak of competence,” while others may try to please the evaluator by providing the answer the individual thinks the evaluator wants (“acquiescence bias”). The DM-ID provides guidance for assessing and diagnosing specific disorders in individuals with IDD and provides information on recognizing challenging behaviors of individuals with IDD and how to differentiate between behavioral problems and psychiatric disorders. The DM-ID was designed as a companion to the DSM-IV-TR and aimed to assist clinicians to arrive at a more accurate DSM-IV-TR diagnosis for individuals with IDD.

Work on the DM-ID began almost 10 years before its publication, when Dr. Robert Fletcher, Founder and CEO of NADD, submitted a proposal to the NADD Board of Directors to develop a companion to the DSM-IV to facilitate a more accurate DSM-IV diagnosis for people with IDD. Experts were recruited for work groups for each diagnostic category. Approximately 60 experts participated in this project. The editors for the DM-ID were Robert Fletcher, Earl Loschen, Chrissoula Stavrakaki, and Michael First. The DM-ID covers all major diagnostic categories of mental disorders as defined in the DSM-IV-TR. Each work group reviewed the existing research concerning the disorder(s) on which they were working, with emphasis on how the disorder manifests in individuals who have IDD. The Cochrane system was used to evaluate the research reviewed (Cochrane Library, 2001).
Based upon the research and the work group’s expert consensus, modifications and adaptations of the DSM-IV-TR diagnostic criteria were proposed which included addition of symptom equivalents, omission of symptoms, changes in symptom count, modification of symptom duration, modification of age requirements, addition of explanatory notes, and criteria sets that do not apply. In addition, advice about working with the individual and with respondents in order to achieve an accurate diagnosis was provided.

During the summer of 2006, prior to publication, field trials were held to assess the clinical usefulness of the DM-ID. The results were reported briefly in the introduction to the DM-ID and more thoroughly in an article published in the Journal of Clinical Psychiatry in 2009 (Fletcher et al., 2009). Sixty three clinicians, from eleven different countries, were recruited to participate in the research. These clinicians were asked to use the DM-ID with a minimum of 20 clients and to provide feedback about the clinical usefulness of the DM-ID. A clinical survey was developed. Part I, completed once by each clinician, provided information about the training and experience of each clinician who participated in the field trials and sought the clinician’s assessment of the usefulness of the DSM-IV-TR when used with individuals who have IDD, as well as the clinician’s reasons for this assessment. Part II was completed for each patient after the clinician had used the DM-ID to arrive at a diagnosis. Demographic information about the client was collected, followed by information about the DSM-IV-TR diagnosis and the DM-ID diagnosis arrived at. Finally, three yes/no questions about use of the DM-ID were answered: (1) “Did the DM-ID allow you to come up with a more specific diagnosis than you would have with DSM-IV-TR?” (2) “Did the DM-ID allow you to arrive at a psychiatric diagnosis that you think is appropriate for this patient?” and (3) “Did you find the DM-ID allowed you to avoid using the NOS (not otherwise specified) category.” Three questions on a five-point scale were also asked: (1) “Was the DM-ID easy to use (user-friendly) to arrive at a psychiatric diagnosis for this patient?” (2) “Did you find the DM-ID clinically useful in the diagnosis of this patient?” and (3) “For the diagnosis used for this patient, do you feel that the number of adapted criteria were too few/excessive?”

Eight hundred and forty-five surveys on use of the DM-ID with specific patients were completed. Overall, response to the use of the DM-ID was positive, with 67.9% of respondents rating the DM-ID as “easy” or “very easy” to use and 83.1% of respondents indicating that the DM-ID allowed them to arrive at an appropriate psychiatric diagnosis for the patient. Over one-third of clinicians (36.5%) indicated that the DM-ID allowed them to arrive at a more specific diagnosis than the DSM-IV-TR.

The publication of the DSM-5 (American Psychiatric Association, 2013) necessitated that the DM-ID be updated. NADD began putting together work groups to revise the DM-ID during the summer of 2012. The editors of the
One hundred and four experts were recruited to work in 26 work groups. A chairperson was identified for each work group. Work has been proceeding on the various chapters, and publication is anticipated for the summer of 2016. Changes from DSM-IV to DSM-5 reflect developments in genetic research and neuroimaging as well as efforts to promote ease of use. The disorders included in DSM-5 have been reordered into a revised organizational structure, reflecting the fact that mental disorders do not always fit completely within the boundaries of a single disorder and that some symptom domains involve multiple diagnostic categories. DSM-5 recognizes developmental issues utilizing a lifespan approach and including descriptions of how the disorder presentation changes across the lifespan. The multi-axial approach has been dropped. A number of disorders that had been distinct in DSM-IV, such as autistic disorder, Asperger’s disorder, and pervasive developmental disorder, have been consolidated in DSM-5 and the DM-ID-2 into autism spectrum disorder (ASD). Trauma- and stressor-related disorders in the DSM-5 and DM-ID-2 is an umbrella diagnostic area that now includes reactive attachment disorder, disinhibited social engagement disorder, post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), acute stress disorder, and adjustment disorder. Disorders previously referred to as “dementias” are now designated as major or mild neurocognitive disorders.

It would be impossible, in the space of this article, to review all the challenges faced in developing the DM-ID-2. In the next sections, we look at a sample of disorders discussed in the DSM-5 and the DM-ID-2, beginning with those often seen early in life (designated as neurodevelopmental disorders in the DSM-5) and ending with challenges encountered late in life (neurocognitive disorders). In between these early-lifetime and late-lifetime challenges, we consider a group of disorders that have a serious impact on the lives of individuals with IDD: trauma- and stressor-related disorders. The specific disorders found in this article are intended to illustrate issues of diagnostic limitations, lack of research in the population with IDD, and important changes in the conceptualization of these disorders.

**Neurodevelopmental Disorders**

The DSM-5 reconfigures “Disorders with Onset during Childhood and Adolescence” (found in DSM-IV-TR and DM-ID) and stereotypic movement disorders and tic disorders to create neurodevelopmental disorders. Neurodevelopmental disorders share three basic features: an age of onset during the developmental period, diverse etiologies, and a large number of overlapping symptoms that co-occur in what appear to be discrete syndromes. But intellectual disability (intellectual developmental disorder) or IDD is included as a discrete “syndrome” within neurodevelopmental disorders.
Herein lies a problem: IDD is a subset of neurodevelopmental disorders, yet it is frequently listed among the exclusion criteria in the *DSM-5* (American Psychiatric Association, 2013). The central focus of the *DM-ID-2* is on co-occurring IDD and mental disorders. The presence of IDD shapes the presentation and course of many neurodevelopmental disorders and by doing so creates several cognitive dissonances. In many circumstances, the clinicians will have to judge how to modify inclusion, specifiers, and exclusion criteria to match up with heterogeneous populations of individuals with IDD. Resolving these dissonances is one of the major challenges for the authors of this section.

There are several additional changes in diagnostic criteria contained in both the *DSM-5* and the upcoming *DM-ID-2* beyond those mentioned earlier, such as the removal of the exclusion of ADHD in the context of ASD; the realigning of impulse control and disruptive behavior disorders, the creation of disruptive mood dysregulation disorder (DMD) for individuals with affect dysregulation and ADHD (previously diagnosed as bipolar disorder), and the creation of trauma- and stress-related disorders (American Psychiatric Association, 2013).

The *DSM-5* modifies the diagnostic criteria for IDD in a manner that shifts the emphasis from IQ scores to social-support needs. Severity of ID now depends upon the level of social-supports needs as measured by functional domain criteria (conceptual, social, and practical domains). Yet even this shift toward an emphasis on adaptive criteria does not resolve the problems we face in capturing the multidirectional relationships between ID, other neurodevelopmental disorders, and late-onset psychiatric disorders. The presence of ASD further complicates this process.

**Remaining Foundational Issues for People with IDD**

1. **Age of Onset**—This is a more complex issue than it first seems. For many people with IDD, the presence of specific neurodevelopmental disorders can be “overshadowed” by baseline global cognitive and adaptive deficits. In addition, the majority of referrals for individuals with IDD involve behavioral/psychiatric complaints rather than neurodevelopmental disorders. As a consequence, the various combinations of IDD, challenging behavior, and late-onset psychiatric disorders can overshadow the “age” of onset for many neurodevelopmental disorders. It may be more useful to describe the age of recognition along with patterns of comorbidity in order to avoid the ambiguity associated with the determination of an age of onset (Barnhill, 2014).

2. **Parameters of the Developmental Period**—Most mental health consultations and diagnoses are “point in time” events. As a result, the clinician has little opportunity to follow the ongoing development,
especially the interactions between the person’s special vulnerabilities (including neurodevelopmental disorders), levels of resilience, and experiences across the life cycle. For example, the expression of many neurodevelopmental disorders changes in response to many interrelationships with IDD and ASD. These intertwining developmental trajectories influence and are influenced by the social ecology, changing academic or occupational demands, availability of learning experiences, impact of accessibility/utilization of services, and the vicissitudes of interventions for co-occurring mental disorders (Gardner, Griffiths, & Hamlin, 2012). Each of these impact brain neuroplasticity secondary to new learning that blurs the endpoint of the neurodevelopmental period. From this perspective, most diagnoses are hypotheses that may change over time (Barnhill, 2011; Piek, Dawson, Smith, Gasson, 2008).

(3) Diagnosis and Discrepancy Criteria—The concept of diagnosis relies upon measuring that the gap between expected and actual performance is larger than that “normally associated with ID.” In many neurodevelopmental disorders, the diagnosis is either based on standardized assessment scores or a judgement call by the clinician. Clinical judgement can be both a blessing and a curse. For example, the presence of IDD changes its developmental trajectory as well as the risk for co-occurring mental disorders. As a result, many standardized measures are not sufficiently normed. Test scores and clinical judgements can be undermined by the severity of ID; comorbidity with ASD or genetic/metabolic disorders; and heterogeneity found in many cognitive, social communication, attentional, executive functional, and motor skills (Barnhill, 2003; Fletcher, Loeschen, Stavrakaki & First, 2007).

(4) Behavioral Phenotypes and Neurodegenerative Disorders—Diagnosis is only as good as the quality of observation data and current scientific evidence. This evidence changes in response to new technologies, genetic discoveries (behavioral phenotypes or metabolic disorder), and the development of new treatments for evolving brain disorders. Recent evidence suggests that many late-onset psychiatric disorders are preceded by unrecognized neurodevelopmental disorders (Barnhill, 2012). Genome-wide array studies (GWAS) suggest that ID, ASD, specific learning and attention deficit–hyperactivity disorders, and some forms of epilepsy share genetic profiles (Guilmarte et al., 2009). Early recognition and diagnosis of at-risk infants and children permit early intervention of many neurodevelopmental and neurodegenerative disorders (Gresham & Vellutino, 2010). Longitudinal assessment is useful in tracking the changing developmental trajectory as well as monitoring the efficacy of treatment intervention.
Neurodevelopmental disorders appear as distinct syndromes that are largely based on phenomenology and not neurobiological criteria. Each syndrome represents a variety of complex signs and symptoms that frequently co-occur with other neurodevelopmental, behavioral, and primary psychiatric disorders. For example, motor disorders are divided into three heterogeneous disorders: developmental co-ordination, stereotypic movement (with and without self-injury), and tic disorders. Each can be comorbid with attention deficit hyperactivity, specific learning, communication, or autism spectrum, intellectual disability, and obsessive-compulsive and related disorders (Barnhill, 2011). When severe profound ID (SPID) or ASD/SPID are present, these boundaries are likely more diffuse. We are left to choose between making inappropriate diagnoses, excluding this population (nihilistic), or providing our best clinical judgement. Barnhill (2003, 2011) proposed an alternative, a pattern of DSM-IV-TR diagnosis that focused on defining neurobiological endo-phenotypes based on observable clusters of behaviors, patterns of comorbidity, trauma history (Aupperle, Melrose, Stein, & Paulus, 2012), issues related to attachment temperament, and ethological features. In these articles, the author algorithm resembles the Research Domain Criteria now considered to be an alternative to diagnostic classification systems for researchers (Adam, 2013).

Unfortunately, many of our best practices and evidence-based medicine are based on lumping (large studies, statistical analyses, and meta-analyses) at the expense of defining specific endo-phenotypes or using data from single-case designed studies. Bridging the gaps between these conceptual models may provide useful insights that allow for more individualized treatment planning.

**Implications and Speculations**

Since the *DM-ID-2* is designed for people with IDD, several new applications warrant consideration.

The use of the functional domains to assign a level of severity for IDD makes it reasonable device for classifying neurodevelopmental disorders in a similar manner. Currently, discrepancy criteria include a domain for clinical judgement as well as the gap between actual and expected performance based on standardized instruments. Many of these instruments use age-based normative data that may have lessening degrees of validity and reliability for people with severe-profound IDD. Perhaps the best examples are communication and specific learning disabilities (SLD). For nonverbal individuals with profound IDD, the domains of comprehension, expression, and pragmatics need to be expanded. The global deficits associated with (SPID)
limit the individual’s verbal and conceptual skills to the extent a more basic level of analysis that assesses functional neurobiological substrates such as the ability to use basic shape recognition, cued responses for previously learned skills or capacity to respond to picture communication systems. Even individuals with mild-moderate IDD may require modifications. Under these conditions, it may be more useful to augment test score with the pattern of scatter on the functional domains criteria (conceptual, social and practical) rather than discrepancy/performance criteria based on chronological or developmental age. This might add some structure to clinical judgment.

The structure of the DSM-5 (symptoms, specifiers, exclusion criteria) can provide a methodology to differentiate primary and secondary neurodevelopmental disorders. Perhaps more useful is their application for creating diagnostic algorithms that can reduce the heterogeneity of neurodevelopmental disorders. For an example, the diagnosis for a person with chronic schizophrenia might read: chronic schizophrenia in the context of mild ID, behavioral phenotype associated with Velocardiofacial syndrome, history of childhood developmental co-ordination and communication disorder (social pragmatics) and physical abuse during early childhood. Such a diagnostic scheme can provide more useful information for monitoring symptoms change and implementing changes in treatment to match evolving clinical needs.

Like the DSM-5, the DM-ID-2 is based on phenomenological rather than neurobiological subtypes. Although not included in the neurodevelopmental disorders, oppositional defiant and conduct disorders represent the convergence of biologically based (e.g., relatedness to attention or impulse dyscontrol), socially “deviant” behaviors (callous unemotionality, irritability/overt defiance, violations of property or individual “rights”). For example, the relationship between ADHD, oppositional defiant, and conduct disorders represents a subset of externalizing behavioral disorders that requires a level of awareness for rule-governed social behaviors. They may also lie on a continuum of impulse dys-control, affective dysregulation, neuroticism, and deficits in conceptual, social, and practical skills. In this sense, conduct and oppositional defiant disorders have limited utility for individuals with severe and profound ID. It may be more helpful to describe and address underlying temperamental, psychophysiological, and behavioral response to threat or physical trauma, as well as genetic risk for ADHD or DMD. The goal is to include more than a descriptive diagnosis and focus instead on associated functional impairments.

**Trauma- and Stressor-Related Disorders**

Trauma- and stressor-related disorders include disorders in which exposure to a traumatic or stressful event is listed explicitly as a diagnostic criterion.
This is a new chapter within *DSM-5* and includes reactive attachment disorder (RAD), disinhibited social engagement disorder (DSED), (PTSD), acute stress disorder, and adjustment disorder. Within *DM-ID* these disorders were described in separate chapters, but in keeping with *DSM-5* they are brought together to reflect the increased understanding in the variation of expressing psychological distress when an individual is exposed to a traumatic or stressful event. The inclusion of reactive attachment disorders and disinhibited social engagement disorder, which develop early in life due to lack or absence of adequate caregiving, show a recognition in the importance of early experiences on the later development of an individual, including those with IDD.

Despite the frequency of pathogenic care and risk for neglect or abuse in people with IDD, it can be difficult to diagnose attachment disorders such as RAD and DSED in people with IDD. This is due to a variety of reasons including biological and genetic factors that influence an individual’s ability to make attachments such as an ASD. In addition, there is a significant lack of research pertaining to both RAD and DSED in children and adults with IDD. There are instruments to assess the attachment behaviors of individuals with intellectual disabilities such as the Secure Base Safe Haven Observation List (De Schipper & Schuengel, 2010). The need to screen individuals for difficulties in attachment behaviors within adult care settings is becomingly increasingly recognized (Schuengel, De Schipper, Sterkenburg, & Kaf, 2013). Adults and children with ID can show signs and symptoms of disordered attachment even with a secure attachment pattern (Minnis, Fleming, & Cooper, 2010). Behaviors alone should not be used to diagnose RAD or DSED, but evidence of early life experiences of abuse, deprivation, and neglect should be sought. In individuals with borderline intellectual functioning or mild IDD referred for psychiatric consultation, the following prevalence figures have been reported with 42% exhibiting symptoms of overall disordered attachment, 16% showing symptoms of RAD, and 11% showing symptoms of both RAD and DSED. Individuals in this study were aged 5 to 11 and had borderline or mild IDD, with IQs ranging between 50 and 85 and a mean IQ of 71.7 (Giltaji, Sterkenburg, & Schuengel, 2013).

PTSD is a chronic disorder in response to trauma. With respect to ascertainment of PTSD in people with IDD, the research supports three important points: (1) people with IDD seem to be more vulnerable to the development of PTSD than members of the general population; (2) people with IDD are more often exposed to conditions known to contribute to the development of PTSD, such as interpersonal abuse and violence; and (3) for people with only mild IDD, the presentation of PTSD is similar to that seen in members of the general population (Wieland, Wardenaar, Dautovic, & Zitman, 2013). For people with more severe IDD, the presentation may be complicated by differing presentation of symptoms, with a lower
developmental functioning increasing the risk for developing PTSD (Mevissen & de Jongh, 2010).

Acute stress disorder is characterized by symptoms similar to those of PTSD that occurs immediately following exposure to one or more traumatic events. There is very little research on acute stress disorder presenting in those with IDD. Most of the evidence is from studies of PTSD, with no reference to the first month of presentation in these studies when an acute stress disorder would be present.

Adjustment disorders involve the development of clinically significant emotional or behavioral symptoms in response to an identifiable psychosocial stressor or stressors. The stressor may be a single event or events or circumstances that are recurrent or continuous. This definition incorporates an extremely valuable diagnostic concept, suggesting that environmental stressors, so common in the lives of persons with IDD, might be a critical source of psychopathology, which could otherwise be mistaken for other behavioral or mental health disorders. As simply stated in the DSM-5, “When bad things happen, most people get upset...the diagnosis should only be made when the magnitude of the distress...exceeds what would normally be expected...” Also noted in DSM-5 is the fact that what is normally expected may vary in different cultures, so clinicians serving people with IDD must take into consideration that the world of a person with IDD is a culture (e.g., residential setting) within a broader culture (geographic region, ethnic community, etc.). In one study, Tsakanikos, Bouras, Costello, and Holt (2007) looked at a clinic sample of people with IDD and demonstrated that IDD is associated with a general increase in psychological vulnerability to life events, with adjustment disorder being more likely for people with ID exposed to multiple events but not as closely associated with single life events.

**Neurocognitive Disorders**

DSM-5 replaced the term “dementias” with a characterization of these neurodegenerative disorders as neurocognitive disorders. Previously known as Dementia, Delirium, Amnestic, and Other Cognitive Disorders in DSM-IV-TR, these disorders comprise delirium, and major and mild neurocognitive disorder (NCD) in the DSM-5. The term “dementia” may still be used where physicians and patients are accustomed to this, but “neurocognitive disorder” is preferred, especially for conditions affecting younger adults. NCD is also seen as broader and encompasses disorders previously included under Amnestic Disorders in DSM-IV-TR. The conceptualization of delirium as a disturbance in consciousness (specifically in attention and awareness), which develops over a short period of time and is due to a direct physiological consequence of another medical condition, has not changed significantly.
Major Neurocognitive Disorder (Major NCD)

The DSM-5 has adopted a hierarchical approach to the diagnosis of NCDs, so that the criteria for major or mild NCD must be met before criteria for etiological subtypes such as Alzheimer’s disease (AD), Lewy body disease, or vascular disease can be applied. The essential feature of a major neurocognitive disorder is the development of multiple cognitive deficits that are severe enough to cause impairment in daily functioning and represents a decline from a previous level of functioning. To meet the diagnostic criteria for a major NCD, individuals must present with significant cognitive decline in one or more domains (including complex attention, executive function, learning and memory, language, perceptual-motor, or social cognition). The DSM-5 definition therefore differs from the DSM-IV and ICD-10 definitions which require an impairment in memory as well as at least one other cognitive disturbance; the rationale being to ensure that the diagnosis of an NCD would apply to most dementia etiological subtypes, whereas previous definitions were based on the typical presentation of AD and therefore less valid in other subtypes (Ganguli et al., 2011). Most of what we know about the course of neurocognitive disorders in individuals with IDD comes from the study of individuals with Down syndrome (DS) and probable Alzheimer-type dementia. Although individuals with DS often present with memory decline and behavioral and other cognitive changes, such as deficits in executive functioning, are also prominent and may be the presenting symptoms in many cases (Strydom et al., 2010; Wiseman et al., 2015). As life expectancy of people with IDD extends into older age, dementia is an increasing cause of morbidity and mortality. To update and summarize current knowledge on dementia in older adults with IDD, the authors conducted a comprehensive review of the published literature from 1997–2008 with a specific focus on: (1) epidemiology of dementia in IDD in general as well as in specific genetic syndromes; (2) presentation; and (3) diagnostic criteria for dementia. The authors report that varied methodologies and inherent challenges in diagnosis yield a wide range of reported prevalence rates of dementia. Rates of dementia in the population with IDD without DS are comparable with or higher than the general population. Alzheimer’s disease onset in DS appears earlier, and the prevalence increases from under 10% in the 40s to more than 30% in the 50s, with varying prevalence reported for those 60 and older. Incidence rates increase with age. Few studies of dementia in other genetic syndromes were identified. Presentation differs in the IDD population compared with the general population; symptoms of depression, sleep disturbances, delusions, and auditory hallucinations may also be apparent when individuals with IDD develop dementia (Strydom et al., 2010), particularly in adults with DS (Dekker et al., 2015).
Since the requirement for both memory and at least one other cognitive decline has been shown to affect the performance of dementia diagnoses in individuals with DS or IDD (Sheehan et al., 2014; Strydom et al., 2013), the new streamlined criteria for NCDs, therefore, have considerable face validity in this population. Nevertheless, several limitations in applying the criteria for NCD in individuals with IDD are apparent, the most important of which is the difficulty in objectively defining cognitive impairment and decline in a population with pre-morbid deficits. Individuals may have a wide range of baseline abilities across different domains, and there is considerable between-individual variation. Criteria therefore need to clearly state that a change from an individual’s own baseline is required for a diagnosis of dementia; the new DSM-5 NCD criteria do indeed require significant decline from a previous level of performance. This must be based on concern from an individual, knowledgeable informant, or clinician, as well as documented by standardized neuropsychological testing, or in its absence, another qualified clinical assessment.

Formal neuropsychological testing is difficult due to the limited range of tests suitable for the population with ID, especially for those with more severe intellectual disability. It is also difficult to “optimize” cognitive tests due to factors such as emotional states, sensory problems, and medical status. Questionnaire-based assessment of cognitive functioning reported by caregivers are often used instead, though these may not map well onto specific cognitive domains and the “context” may not be considered, e.g., whether a task is regularly ignored because the person is unwilling to do it rather than unable to do it. Reliability of informant reports of impairment or decline may also be an issue, particularly when information is obtained from different caregivers at different times. However, retrospective report has been found to be as good as prospective ratings (Jamieson-Craig, Scior, Chan, Fenton, & Strydom, 2010) and an adjustment to the DSM-5 major NCD criterion for neuropsychological testing may therefore be to use informant-based questionnaires to demonstrate decline, such as the Dementia Questionnaire for Persons with Mental Retardation—DMR; (Evenhuis, 1996) or the CAMDEX-DS (Ball, Holland, Huppert, Treppner, & Dodd, 2016).

**Mild Neurocognitive Disorder**

DSM-5 introduced the term “mild neurocognitive disorder” to refer to a preclinical state of having symptoms akin to dementia which precedes significant functional impairment. Mild NCD can be distinguished from major NCD by the severity of the cognitive decline (modest vs. significant) and the impact the symptoms have on everyday function; for a diagnosis of mild NCD the cognitive deficits do not interfere with capacity for independence in everyday activities. However, in individuals with IDD this may be difficult to
apply, given their variable pre-morbid abilities and lifelong dependence on support. Indeed, a similar definition of mild cognitive impairment has been found to have poor predictive validity in individuals with IDD (Strydom et al., 2013) and could result in over-diagnosis. However, this diagnosis may be useful in individuals at high risk for dementia such as those with DS, particularly in research settings, and could help to diagnose dementia at an earlier stage as long as the individual’s own baseline is used to define decline or level of independence in everyday activities.

Summary
The authors in this article have first explored the evolution of the DSM to the DM-ID nosology systems. Then a discussion about neurodevelopmental disorders follows. These disorders share three basic features—an age of onset during the developmental period, diverse etiologies, and a large number of overlapping symptoms that co-occur in what appear to be discrete syndromes. Clinicians will have to judge how best to modify inclusion, specifiers, and exclusion criteria to apply these diagnostic criteria to individuals with IDD. The authors address trauma- and stressor-related disorders, which include disorders in which exposure to a traumatic or stressful event is listed explicitly as a diagnostic criterion. Most of the recent research around trauma- and stressor-related disorders has focused on PTSD and there remains a need for further research to look at the impact of the early experiences of trauma on the attachment behaviors of people with IDD. The benefits of DM-ID-2 will be to support how we recognize these disorders from a clinical perspective but also be a basis to support further research of these disorders in persons with IDD. Finally, the authors point out clinical issues as they pertain to neurocognitive disorders and their relationship to IDD. The DSM-5 and the DM-ID-2 include criteria for major neurocognitive disorder and mild neurocognitive disorder. While the criteria for major neurocognitive disorder have several characteristics which will help to diagnose dementia in individuals with ID, the validity of mild neurocognitive disorder should be established before it is widely applied.
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