Pegem Journal of Education and Instruction, Vol. 16, No. 2, 2026 (pp. 560-576)

RESEARCH ARTICLE WWW.PEGEGOG.NET

Structural and Functional Variables in Clinical Formulation: A Translational Framework for the Clinical Psychologist-Neuroscientist

Abbad Bachir
PhD in School Psychology
The National Higher School Of Mathematics, Algeria
Email: bachir.abbad@nhsm.edu.dz
Received:21/08/2025 ; Accepted: 26/04/2026 ; Published: 21/05/2026

Abstract

The gap between psychological research methodology and clinical practice represents a persistent challenge for evidence-based practitioners. This article introduces a translational framework that integrates foundational principles of model-building in psychological research with contemporary neuroscience and clinical practice. Drawing upon the critical distinction between structural variables (sine qua non conditions that define a construct) and functional variables (manifestations that express a construct), we argue that this methodological distinction provides a powerful heuristic for case conceptualization, treatment planning, and interprofessional collaboration. Through detailed clinical vignettes spanning trauma-related disorders, obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD), and anhedonic depression, we demonstrate how identifying the structural neural circuits underlying psychopathology—hyperactive amygdala, dysregulated cortico-striatal-thalamo-cortical (CSTC) loop, hypofunctional mesolimbic pathway—versus their functional behavioral manifestations directly informs therapeutic strategy. This framework elevates clinical formulation from descriptive symptom-checking to mechanism-based intervention, positioning the psychologist as a true scientist-practitioner who translates methodological rigor into therapeutic precision.

Keywords: Structural Variables; Functional Variables; Clinical Formulation; Model-Building; Neuropsychopharmacology; Psychotherapy Integration; Translational Neuroscience.

1. Introduction: The Methodology-Practice Gap

Contemporary clinical psychology faces a persistent challenge: the disconnect between sophisticated research methodologies developed in academic settings and the intuitive, often unstructured approaches that characterize everyday clinical practice. While researchers rigorously construct and validate models using established methodological principles, clinicians frequently rely on experience-based heuristics that lack explicit structural integrity.

This gap has been recognized for decades. Stricker and Trierweiler [1] introduced the concept of the "local clinical scientist" to describe practitioners who apply scientific thinking to individual cases, while Kazdin [2] has repeatedly called for greater integration of research methodology into clinical training and practice. More recently, Lilienfeld, Ritschel, Lynn, Cautin, and Latzman [3] argued that many clinical errors stem from failures in scientific reasoning, suggesting that methodological training could directly improve patient outcomes.

This article proposes that bridging this gap requires not merely translating research *findings* into practice, but translating research *methodology* itself. Specifically, we draw upon foundational work on model-building in psychological research—including but not limited to Mesly's [4] contributions—to offer clinicians a systematic framework for case conceptualization that mirrors the rigor of scientific model construction. This framework is then integrated with contemporary neuroscience to create a truly translational approach.

The central thesis is straightforward: effective clinical formulation is an act of model-building. Every time a clinician listens to a patient's narrative, identifies core problems, and develops a treatment plan, they are constructing a working model of that patient's psychological world. The question is whether this model is built with methodological awareness—with attention to structural integrity, functional manifestations, and the logical relationships between variables—or whether it emerges haphazardly, vulnerable to the very errors that rigorous methodology seeks to eliminate.

2. The Structural-Functional Distinction: A Methodological Foundation

2.1 Defining Structural Variables

The distinction between structural (formative) and functional (reflective) variables has deep roots in psychometric theory and research methodology. Structural variables (alternatively termed formative indicators) are the *sine qua non* conditions that define a construct. They are essential, constitutive components without which the construct cannot exist.

As Bollen and Lennox [5] explained in their seminal work on measurement models, formative indicators "cause" the latent construct rather than being caused by it. Diamantopoulos and Winklhofer [6] further elaborated that with formative measurement, "the direction of causality is from indicators to the latent variable," meaning that the indicators jointly determine the conceptual and empirical meaning of the construct.

Key properties of structural (formative) variables include:

- They must be present for the construct to exist
- Changes in the indicators cause changes in the construct, not vice versa
- They need not be highly correlated; in fact, low intercorrelation is typical because they measure fundamentally different aspects
- The indicators are not interchangeable; omitting an indicator potentially changes the nature of the construct

In legal contexts, for example, harassment is structurally defined by four necessary elements: repetitive behaviors, hostile conduct, unwanted actions, and psychological harm. Remove any one element, and the legal definition of harassment no longer applies. Similarly, in clinical contexts, a diagnosis requires meeting specific criteria—each criterion functions as a structural indicator of the disorder.

2.2 Defining Functional Variables

Functional variables (alternatively termed reflective indicators), in contrast, are the manifestations or expressions of a construct. They allow the researcher—or clinician—to *infer* the presence of the construct without being essential to its definition. As Nunnally and Bernstein [7] described in their classic psychometric text, reflective indicators are "effects" or "outcomes" of the underlying latent variable.

Key properties of functional (reflective) variables include:

- They are not essential to the construct's definition; the construct exists independently
- They represent observable manifestations that "reflect" the underlying construct
- They typically show high intercorrelation because they share a common cause
- Indicators are interchangeable; removing one does not alter the conceptual meaning of the construct

Using an example from clinical practice, depression can be inferred from functional manifestations such as sad mood, anhedonia, sleep disturbance, and appetite change. A clinician can infer that a patient is depressed even if one manifestation (e.g., sleep disturbance) is absent, as long as others are present. The depression construct causes these symptoms; the symptoms do not cause depression.

2.3 The Complete Model

A fully specified construct requires both structural and functional specification, though in practice most psychological constructs are measured reflectively (functionally) rather than formatively (structurally) [8]. Structural variables answer the question: "What *constitutes* this phenomenon?" Functional variables answer: "How do we *recognize* this phenomenon when it occurs?" This dual specification provides the methodological rigor essential for valid research and clinical formulation.

Table 1: Comparison of Structural (Formative) and Functional (Reflective) Variables

Feature	Structural/Formative Variables	Functional/Reflective Variables
Relationship to construct	Constitutive (cause the construct)	Manifestive (caused by the construct)
Essentiality	Sine qua non	Non-essential
Typical intercorrelation	Low (may be any value)	High (should be positively correlated)
Indicator interchangeability	Not interchangeable; omitting an indicator alters construct meaning	Interchangeable; omitting an indicator does not alter construct meaning
Measurement approach	Often binary or composite indices	Typically continuous scales with multiple items
Theoretical role	Define the construct's boundaries	Index the construct's presence/severity

3. Neuroscience as the Structural Foundation of Psychopathology

3.1 The RDoC Framework and Neural Circuits

The National Institute of Mental Health's Research Domain Criteria (RDoC) initiative represents a paradigm shift in conceptualizing psychopathology. As Insel and colleagues [9] articulated, RDoC aims to "develop, for research purposes, new ways of classifying mental disorders based on dimensions of observable behavior and neurobiological measures." Central to this framework is the emphasis on neural circuits as the fundamental units of analysis.

This aligns precisely with our structural-functional distinction: neural circuits function as the structural (formative) substrates of psychopathology, while symptoms and behaviors function as the functional (reflective) manifestations. As Insel and Wang [10] argued, "mental disorders are biological disorders involving brain circuits that implicate specific domains of cognition, emotion, or behavior." The structural integrity—or dysfunction—of these circuits constitutes the disorder; symptoms are how we recognize it.

3.2 Structural Circuits in Major Disorders

3.2.1 Trauma-Related Disorders: The Fear Extinction Network

Research over the past two decades has consistently identified the fear extinction network as the structural foundation of trauma-related disorders. This network includes three interconnected regions:

- Amygdala: Shin and Liberzon [11], in their comprehensive review of neuroimaging studies in PTSD, documented consistent amygdala hyperreactivity to threat-related stimuli. This hyperactivity generates exaggerated threat detection and fear responses.
- Ventromedial Prefrontal Cortex (vmPFC): Milad and Quirk [12] demonstrated that vmPFC dysfunction impairs extinction retention—the ability to learn that previously threatening cues are now safe. In PTSD, vmPFC hypoactivity fails to inhibit amygdala responsivity.
- Hippocampus: Hayes, Hayes, and Mikedis [13] meta-analytically confirmed hippocampal abnormalities in PTSD, contributing to deficits in contextual processing and discrimination between threat and safety.

These three structural components function as formative indicators of trauma-related pathology. Remove any one—for example, normalize amygdala reactivity through pharmacological intervention—and the nature of the disorder fundamentally changes.

3.2.2 Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder: The CSTC Loop

The cortico-striatal-thalamo-cortical (CSTC) loop constitutes the structural foundation of OCD. As Saxena and Rauch [14] detailed in their seminal review:

- Orbitofrontal Cortex (OFC) hyperactivity generates excessive error signals and inappropriate salience attribution to intrusive thoughts
- Caudate nucleus dysfunction impairs gating mechanisms that normally filter irrelevant information
- Thalamic abnormalities amplify threat-related feedback, creating a positive feedback loop
- Serotonergic modulation regulates the sensitivity of this circuit

More recent work by Milad and Rauch [15] has confirmed that abnormalities in this circuit distinguish OCD patients from healthy controls and predict treatment response. The CSTC loop's structural integrity—or its dysregulation—constitutes the disorder; obsessive thoughts and compulsive rituals are functional manifestations.

3.2.3 Anhedonic Depression: The Mesolimbic Reward Pathway

Anhedonia—the loss of pleasure or interest in previously rewarding activities—reflects dysfunction in the mesolimbic dopamine pathway. As Der-Avakian and Markou [16] reviewed, this pathway includes:

- Ventral Tegmental Area (VTA) dopamine neurons that project to
- Nucleus Accumbens, critical for reward anticipation and consummatory pleasure
- Prefrontal Cortex regions that represent reward value and guide reward-seeking behavior

Treadway and Zald [17] introduced the concept of "reward valuation" to capture how deficits in this circuit produce both anhedonia and amotivation. Pizzagalli [18] has demonstrated that these structural abnormalities can be measured behaviorally and neurobiologically, and that they predict differential treatment response.

3.3 Integrating Structural and Functional Levels

The relationship between structural circuits and functional symptoms is not one-to-one but rather reflects complex, dynamic interactions. As Insel and Cuthbert [19] emphasized in their update on RDoC, "the same clinical presentation can arise from different pathophysiological processes," and "the same pathophysiological process can result in different clinical presentations."

This complexity requires clinicians to think in terms of structural-functional relationships rather than simple symptom-diagnosis correspondences. A patient presenting with anxiety may have panic disorder (with structural abnormalities in periaqueductal gray and brainstem nuclei), GAD (with abnormalities in prefrontal-amygdala regulation), or PTSD (with abnormalities in the fear extinction network)—each with distinct structural substrates requiring different treatment approaches.

4. Clinical Application: From Structure to Function to Intervention

4.1 Clinical Vignette 1: Trauma-Related Disorders

Presentation: "Rachid," 19, presents with hypervigilance, emotional flashbacks, and avoidance of reminders following a sexual assault. Standardized assessment confirms PTSD (PCL-5 score = 52).

Structural Formulation: Drawing upon the fear extinction network model, the clinician identifies:

- Amygdala hyperactivity inferred from exaggerated startle response and hypervigilance
- vmPFC hypoactivity inferred from difficulty extinguishing fear responses and persistent avoidance despite safety
- Hippocampal dysfunction inferred from fragmented trauma memories and poor discrimination between past threat and present safety

These three structural components constitute the disorder. Treatment must address each component, either directly or through functional manifestations.

Functional Manifestations:

- Hypervigilance (functional manifestation of amygdala hyperactivity)
- Flashbacks (functional manifestation of hippocampal-contextual dysfunction)
- Avoidance (functional manifestation of failed extinction/vmPFC dysfunction)

Treatment Implications:

- Targeting structural components: Pharmacological interventions (SSRIs to modulate amygdala reactivity; prazosin for nightmares if present; alpha-2 agonists for hyperarousal) address the structural substrates directly
- Targeting functional manifestations: Prolonged Exposure therapy targets avoidance behaviors; Cognitive Processing Therapy targets trauma-related cognitions; both aim to modify functional manifestations while indirectly strengthening structural regulation
- Sequencing: As Foa and colleagues [20] have shown, stabilization (addressing structural hyperarousal) may be necessary before exposure-based work (targeting functional avoidance) can be tolerated

4.2 Clinical Vignette 2: Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder

Presentation: "Safia," 34, experiences intrusive contamination fears and engages in 4+ hours of daily handwashing. Y-BOCS score = 28 (severe).

Structural Formulation: The CSTC loop model provides structural specification:

- OFC hyperactivity: Excessive error signals regarding contamination
- Caudate dysfunction: Failure to filter irrelevant intrusions
- Thalamic amplification: Feedback loop amplifying threat perception

- Serotonergic dysregulation: Modulating circuit sensitivity

Functional Manifestations:

- Obsessive thoughts (functional manifestation of OFC hyperactivity)
- Compulsive rituals (functional manifestation of failed caudate gating)
- Avoidance of "contaminated" situations (functional manifestation of thalamic threat amplification)

Treatment Implications:

- Targeting structural components: SSRIs modulate serotonergic tone within the CSTC loop, reducing the intensity of error signals
- Targeting functional manifestations: Exposure and Response Prevention (ERP) systematically addresses compulsive rituals and avoidance, functioning as "circuit retraining" that strengthens prefrontal regulation of striatal-thalamic activity
- Synergy: As Simpson and colleagues [21] demonstrated, combined treatment (SSRI + ERP) is superior to monotherapy, with medication making ERP more tolerable and ERP enhancing medication's durability

4.3 Clinical Vignette 3: Anhedonic Depression

Presentation: "Amine," 20, reports profound loss of pleasure, diminished motivation, and social withdrawal despite adequate sleep and appetite on current SSRI. SHAPS score = 14 (severe anhedonia).

Structural Formulation: The mesolimbic dopamine pathway model guides formulation:

- VTA dopamine neuron hypofunction: Reduced reward anticipation
- Nucleus accumbens deficits: Blunted consummatory pleasure

- Prefrontal reward representation abnormalities: Impaired reward valuation and decision-making

Functional Manifestations:

- Anhedonia (functional manifestation of accumbens dysfunction)
- Amotivation (functional manifestation of VTA hypofunction)
- Social withdrawal (functional manifestation of reward system failure)

Treatment Implications:

- Targeting structural components: Consideration of agents with dopaminergic activity (e.g., bupropion); referral to psychiatry for medication optimization; emerging evidence for ketamine's rapid effects on anhedonia through glutamatergic mechanisms
- Targeting functional manifestations: Behavioral Activation (BA) functions as "prescribed dopamine circuit stimulation"—deliberate engagement in rewarding activities to "exercise" the hypofunctional reward circuit

- Neurobiological rationale: As explained to the patient, "Your brain's reward system isn't responding normally to pleasurable activities. We need to gradually re-engage it, like physical therapy for a weakened muscle, while considering medication that might directly strengthen the neural pathways involved."

5. A Nine-Step Framework for Clinical Model-Building

Drawing upon methodological principles from multiple sources, we propose a nine-step framework for clinical model-building that integrates structural-functional analysis with contemporary neuroscience:

5.1 Step 1: Cross-Check Clinical Data

Just as researchers cross-check multiple data sources [4], clinicians should integrate:

- Patient self-report (symptom inventories, clinical interviews)
- Behavioral observation (in-session behavior, reported functioning)
- Collateral information (with consent, from family or previous providers)
- Standardized assessment instruments (diagnostic interviews, symptom severity measures)
- Previous treatment records (response to prior interventions)

5.2 Step 2: Identify Contrasting Presentations

Kazdin [2] emphasizes the importance of ruling out alternative explanations. Clinically, this means actively seeking disconfirming evidence and considering differential diagnoses. A patient presenting with anxiety may have panic disorder, GAD, or PTSD—each with distinct structural substrates requiring different treatment approaches.

5.3 Step 3: Identify Emerging Concepts

As clinical data accumulate, new patterns may emerge. The patient who initially appeared to have uncomplicated depression may reveal trauma history that reconceptualizes the case as trauma-related. This iterative refinement is consistent with both scientific method and good clinical practice [4].

5.4 Step 4: Identify Patterns and Trends

Clinicians should look for consistent relationships between variables. Does anxiety predict avoidance? Does trust predict therapeutic engagement? These patterns, once identified, guide intervention selection and timing. Haynes and O'Brien [22] provide systematic approaches to behavioral assessment that identify such functional relationships.

5.5 Step 5: Seek Hidden Truths

As Shedler, Mayman, and Manis [23] demonstrated, patients may not have conscious access to—or may defend against—core psychological conflicts. Clinically, this means attending to what patients *cannot* or *will not* say: dissociated memories, shameful experiences, hidden vulnerabilities that maintain pathology.

5.6 Step 6: Establish Thresholds

Research in behavioral economics and decision science suggests that psychological variables often operate within specific thresholds [4]. Clinically, identifying patients' tolerance limits—for exposure, for emotional intensity, for therapeutic confrontation—prevents iatrogenic harm and maintains the therapeutic alliance.

5.7 Step 7: Take a Step Back

Clinical work is intense. Periodic reflection—through supervision, consultation, or personal therapy—allows clinicians to see their formulations with fresh perspective. Schön [24] termed this "reflection-on-action," distinguishing it from the "reflection-in-action" that occurs during sessions.

5.8 Step 8: Identify the Indifference Point

Patients have limits beyond which they disengage. Recognizing the "indifference point"—the moment when therapeutic demands exceed patient capacity—prevents dropout and maintains engagement. This concept aligns with motivational interviewing's emphasis on "rolling with resistance" rather than confronting it directly [25].

5.9 Step 9: Ask the Six Questions

Adapted from methodological principles [4], clinicians should regularly ask:

1. "Have I obtained similar results across assessment methods?" (Convergence)
2. "Does this formulation apply to similar patients?" (Generalizability)
3. "Is the formulation evolving appropriately with new information?" (Flexibility)
4. "Do assessment data inform treatment response?" (Utility)
5. "Is the formulation becoming more precise over time?" (Refinement)
6. "Am I working within the patient's capacity?" (Therapeutic alliance)

6. Challenges and Limitations

While the structural-functional framework offers significant clinical utility, several limitations warrant consideration. First, the reliance on reverse inference—inferring neural circuit dysfunction from behavioral symptoms—remains a methodological challenge [26]. Clinicians rarely have access to neuroimaging data, making structural formulations necessarily inferential.

Second, significant individual variability exists: the same clinical presentation can arise from different pathophysiological processes, and identical circuit dysfunctions can manifest as diverse symptoms [19]. This complexity requires clinicians to maintain humility and avoid reductionistic formulations that ignore personal meaning, cultural context, and relational factors.

Third, the risk of biological reductionism must be acknowledged. While neural circuits provide structural foundations, they do not capture the full complexity of human experience—the narratives patients construct, the meanings they attribute to their suffering, and the interpersonal contexts that shape their recovery. Effective formulation must integrate neurobiological understanding with phenomenological appreciation [27].

Finally, access to the specialized assessments that would validate structural hypotheses (functional neuroimaging, psychophysiological measures) remains limited in routine clinical practice. This gap between research capabilities and clinical reality underscores the need for continued development of behavioral and self-report measures that more precisely index specific circuit functions.

7. Implications for Clinical Training and Practice

7.1 Training the Neuroscientist-Practitioner

Adopting this framework requires fundamental changes in clinical training. As Lilienfeld and colleagues [3] argued, "evidence-based practice requires evidence-based practitioners"—clinicians trained not just in techniques but in scientific thinking. Beyond learning assessment techniques and therapeutic modalities, trainees must develop competence in:

- Neurocircuitry literacy: Understanding the structural substrates of psychopathology
- Methodological reasoning: Applying model-building principles to case formulation
- Structural-functional analysis: Distinguishing constitutive from manifestive variables in clinical presentations

7.2 Enhancing Interprofessional Collaboration

The structural-functional distinction provides a shared language for interprofessional communication. When a psychologist reports to a psychiatrist, "The patient's anhedonia persists despite improved sleep, suggesting a dopaminergic component that may require structural intervention," they are communicating in terms both professions understand. This aligns with the Institute of Medicine's [28] emphasis on interprofessional practice as essential to quality care.

7.3 Preserving Clinical Wisdom Within Scientific Rigor

This framework does not replace clinical intuition but *disciplines* it. The best clinicians have always built implicit models; this framework makes those models available for scrutiny, refinement, and scientific validation. As McHugh and Slavney [27] argued in their "perspectives" approach to psychiatry, multiple explanatory frameworks can coexist, each illuminating different aspects of the patient's presentation.

8. Conclusion: The Clinician as Methodologist

This article has integrated foundational principles of model-building in psychological research with contemporary neuroscience to offer a translational framework for clinical practice. By distinguishing structural variables—the neural circuits that constitute psychopathology—from functional variables—the observable manifestations that allow inference of underlying dysfunction—clinicians can develop formulations with greater precision, testability, and treatment utility.

The three clinical vignettes demonstrate how this distinction applies across disorders and how it directly informs treatment selection, sequencing, and interprofessional collaboration. In each case, identifying structural neural circuits provides a mechanistic foundation for understanding functional symptoms and selecting appropriate interventions.

As psychological science advances, the gap between research methodology and clinical practice must narrow. By embracing the role of methodologist—by building clinical models with the same rigor that researchers bring to their work—the clinician transcends the role of technician to become a true scientist-practitioner. This is not the medicalization of psychology but its maturation into a discipline that honors both the complexity of human experience and the precision of scientific method.

References

[1] Stricker G, Trierweiler SJ. The local clinical scientist: A bridge between science and practice. American Psychologist. 1995;50(12):995-1002.

[2] Kazdin AE. Evidence-based treatment and practice: New opportunities to bridge clinical research and practice, enhance the knowledge base, and improve patient care. American Psychologist. 2008;63(3):146-159.

[3] Lilienfeld SO, Ritschel LA, Lynn SJ, Cautin RL, Latzman RD. Why many clinical psychologists are resistant to evidence-based practice: Root causes and constructive remedies. Clinical Psychology Review. 2013;33(7):883-900.

[4] Mesly O. Creating models in psychological research. Springer; 2015.

[5] Bollen K, Lennox R. Conventional wisdom on measurement: A structural equation perspective. Psychological Bulletin. 1991;110(2):305-314.

[6] Diamantopoulos A, Winklhofer HM. Index construction with formative indicators: An alternative to scale development. Journal of Marketing Research. 2001;38(2):269-277.

[7] Nunnally JC, Bernstein IH. Psychometric theory. 3rd ed. McGraw-Hill; 1994.

[8] Jarvis CB, MacKenzie SB, Podsakoff PM. A critical review of construct indicators and measurement model misspecification in marketing and consumer research. Journal of Consumer Research. 2003;30(2):199-218.

[9] Insel TR, Cuthbert BN, Garvey MA, Heinssen RK, Pine DS, Quinn KJ, et al. Research domain criteria (RDoC): Toward a new classification framework for research on mental disorders. American Journal of Psychiatry. 2010;167(7):748-751.

[10] Insel TR, Wang PS. Rethinking mental illness. JAMA. 2010;303(19):1970-1971.

[11] Shin LM, Liberzon I. The neurocircuitry of fear, stress, and anxiety disorders. Neuropsychopharmacology. 2010;35(1):169-191.

[12] Milad MR, Quirk GJ. Fear extinction as a model for translational neuroscience: Ten years of progress. Annual Review of Psychology. 2012;63:129-151.

[13] Hayes JP, Hayes SM, Mikedis AM. Quantitative meta-analysis of neural activity in posttraumatic stress disorder. Biology of Mood & Anxiety Disorders. 2012;2(1):9.

[14] Saxena S, Rauch SL. Functional neuroimaging and the neuroanatomy of obsessive-compulsive disorder. Psychiatric Clinics of North America. 2000;23(3):563-586.

[15] Milad MR, Rauch SL. Obsessive-compulsive disorder: Beyond segregated cortico-striatal pathways. Trends in Cognitive Sciences. 2012;16(1):43-51.

[16] Der-Avakian A, Markou A. The neurobiology of anhedonia and other reward-related deficits. Trends in Neurosciences. 2012;35(1):68-77.

[17] Treadway MT, Zald DH. Reconsidering anhedonia in depression: Lessons from translational neuroscience. Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews. 2011;35(3):537-555.

[18] Pizzagalli DA. Depression, stress, and anhedonia: Toward a synthesis and integrated model. Annual Review of Clinical Psychology. 2014;10:393-423.

[19] Insel TR, Cuthbert BN. Medicine. Brain disorders? Precisely. Science. 2015;348(6234):499-500.

[20] Foa EB, Hembree EA, Rothbaum BO, Rauch S. Prolonged exposure therapy for PTSD: Emotional processing of traumatic experiences. 2nd ed. Oxford University Press; 2019.

[21] Simpson HB, Foa EB, Liebowitz MR, Huppert JD, Cahill S, Maher MJ, et al. Cognitive-behavioral therapy vs risperidone for augmenting serotonin reuptake inhibitors in obsessive-compulsive disorder: A randomized clinical trial. JAMA Psychiatry. 2013;70(11):1190-1199.

[22] Haynes SN, O'Brien WH. Principles and practice of behavioral assessment. Springer; 2000.

[23] Shedler J, Mayman M, Manis M. The illusion of mental health. American Psychologist. 1993;48(11):1117-1131.

[24] Schön DA. The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action. Basic Books; 1983.

[25] Miller WR, Rollnick S. Motivational interviewing: Helping people change. 3rd ed. Guilford Press; 2013.

[26] Poldrack RA. Can cognitive processes be inferred from neuroimaging data? Trends in Cognitive Sciences. 2006;10(2):59-63.

[27] McHugh PR, Slavney PR. The perspectives of psychiatry. 2nd ed. Johns Hopkins University Press; 1998.

[28] Institute of Medicine. Measuring the impact of interprofessional education on collaborative practice and patient outcomes. National Academies Press; 2015.

[29] Ressler KJ, Mayberg HS. Targeting abnormal neural circuits in mood and anxiety disorders: From the laboratory to the clinic. Nature Neuroscience. 2007;10(9):1116-1124.

[30] Stahl SM. Stahl's essential psychopharmacology: Neuroscientific basis and practical applications. 5th ed. Cambridge University Press; 2021.