TITLE: Experiencing mental health diagnosis: a systematic review of service user, clinician, and carer perspectives across clinical settings.

Amorette Perkins, Joseph Ridler, Daniel Browes, Guy Peryer, Caitlin Notley, Corinna Hackmann.

Department of Research and Development, Norfolk and Suffolk NHS Foundation Trust, Hellesdon Hospital, Norwich, NR6 5BE, UK (A Perkins BA Hons, J Ridler BSc Hons, D Browes BSc Hons, C Hackmann DClinPsy); and Norwich Medical School, University of East Anglia, Norwich Research Park, Norwich, NR4 7TJ, UK (A Perkins BA Hons, G Peryer PhD, C Notley PhD).

Correspondence to: Dr Corinna Hackmann, Department of Research and Development, Norfolk and Suffolk NHS Foundation Trust, Norwich, NR6 5BE, UK, corinna.hackmann@nsft.nhs.uk, 01603 421268

ABSTRACT

Receiving a mental health diagnosis can be pivotal for service users. It has been described in both positive and negative terms. It is unclear what influences service user experience of the diagnostic process; consequently, clinicians report uncertainty regarding best practice. This review aimed to understand and inform diagnostic practice through a comprehensive synthesis of qualitative data on views and experiences from key stakeholders (service users/clinicians/carers/family). We searched five databases and identified 78 papers for inclusion, originating from 13 countries and including 2228 participants. Eligible papers were assessed for quality and data was coded then developed into themes, which generated a model representing factors to consider for clinicians conveying, and individuals receiving, mental health diagnoses. Themes included disclosure, information provision, collaboration, timing, stigma, and functional value of diagnosis for recovery. Variations between different stakeholders and clinical contexts are explored. Findings support an individualised, collaborative, and holistic approach to mental health diagnosis.

INTRODUCTION

Receiving a formal diagnosis can have significant impact.[1] It can help service users understand their experiences; provide a sense of relief, control, and containment; offer hope for recovery; improve relationships with services; and reduce uncertainty.[2–4] Nonetheless, diagnosis may have unintended consequences, increasing individual and societal burden. These include feelings of hopelessness, disempowerment, and frustration; stigma and discrimination; exacerbated symptoms; as well as disengagement from services.[5–7]

Qualitative research designs most appropriately capture peoples' views and experiences.[8] Evidence suggests that the impact of diagnosis depends on a variety of factors, including service delivery. For instance, diagnosis was experienced negatively when individuals felt they received insufficient information from clinicians.[4] Conversely, when people felt knowledgeable about their diagnosis, it could foster a sense of control, meaning, and hope.[6] The experience is also affected by the method of communication (e.g. letter), time taken to decide and disclose a diagnosis, and whether diagnosis is framed as enduring or malleable.[3–5, 9–11]

Previous studies that considered service user experience of mental health diagnosis have focused on a single diagnosis, setting, or stage of the process (e.g. disclosure). This limits generalisability. Studies typically explore isolated viewpoints of service users, clinicians, or carers/family. Understanding the process of diagnosis from the perspective of a single stakeholder has limited utility for guiding service provision, which must be implemented at individual, service, and organisational levels. We identified one previous review, but this was limited to whether service users received the information they desired.[12] To our knowledge, no published reviews have yet synthesised data on the entire diagnostic process or included carer/family views.

This review aimed to incorporate the views of all key stakeholders, throughout the diagnostic process, across mental health conditions. This offers opportunity to gain a comprehensive and widely applicable understanding of the factors influencing service user experience. Through this, we seek to reveal nuanced consideration of the experiential similarities and differences across contexts, such as diagnosis and service setting. This understanding will support the diagnostic process to improve service user experience and outcomes. Our review is timely, considering the upcoming release of the International Classification of Diseases of Mental and Behavioural Disorders (ICD) 11th revision.[13] Clinicians have reported uncertainty regarding best practice for the diagnostic process, resulting in discomfort and hesitance implementing diagnostic manuals.[14–18] We aimed to offer practical guidance for clinicians. This review also sought to inform service users and carers/family how to navigate the diagnostic process and support participation of all involved.[19]

AIMS

1. To identify factors impacting service user experience of mental health diagnosis
2. To collate and compare perspectives and experiences of service users, clinicians, and carers/family
3. To explore variation in service user experience across clinical settings

METHODS

Search strategy and selection criteria

We searched PsychINFO, Embase, MEDLINE, and CINAHL from inception to 20 July 2017 (initial search October 2016, updated July 2017).Our search strategy was as follows: ("experienc* ADJ5 diagno*" or "perspective* ADJ5 diagno*" or "view* ADJ5 diagno*" or "perce* ADJ5 diagno*" or "communicat* ADJ5 diagno*" or "receiv* ADJ5 diagno*" or "deliver* ADJ5 diagno*" or "giv* ADJ5 diagno*" or "process* ADJ5 diagno*" or "news ADJ5 diagno*" or "inform* ADJ5 diagno*" or "disclos* ADJ5 diagno*" or "tell* ADJ5 diagno*" or "breaking ADJ5 news" or "deliver* ADJ5 news") and ("mental health" or "mental illness*" or "psychiatric disorder" or MESH terms relating to psychiatric disorders, adapted for each database [see appendix 1]).

Inclusion criteria encompassed primary research with a formal qualitative component, gathering data on service user, clinician, and/or carer/family views and experiences regarding the process of adult mental health diagnosis. We placed no restrictions on language of publication. Papers not reported in English were translated. We included dissertations, doctoral theses, and non-peer reviewed reports to reduce potential for publication bias. We also searched the first 20 pages of Google Scholar, contacted key authors, and reviewed reference lists of included papers. We excluded developmental disorders, somatoform disorders, substance abuse and dual-diagnosis, dementia, traumatic brain injury, and diagnosis during childhood (under 18 years). We selected these exclusion criteria as they involve services outside the scope of our review and these diagnoses require additional or different processes (e.g. further physiological testing, compulsory parent/guardian involvement).

Two authors (AP, JR) independently screened titles and abstracts for eligibility. To establish inter-rater reliability, the first 50 studies were screened together. Full-text articles of potentially eligible studies were screened by AP and JR. Where full-text articles were unavailable, we contacted authors. Uncertainties were resolved by discussion, with involvement of a third reviewer where necessary (GP, CN).

Two reviewers (AP, JR) extracted data. A pre-piloted table was used to extract demographic and methodological information (table 1). We assessed study quality using the Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP) qualitative assessment checklist,[20] supplemented with narrative appraisal in which we considered alternative reporting checklists (e.g. COREQ).[21] Three reviewers (AP, JR, DB) assigned quantified quality scores (table 1). NVivo v.11 software[22] was used to code first-order (participant quotations) and second-order (researcher interpretations – i.e. concepts, themes, and descriptions of findings derived from data) data line by line (AP, JR).[23,24] To establish reliability, the first ten percent of papers were extracted and coded by two reviewers together (AP, JR). These reviewers independently verified a further ten percent subsample of the data extraction and coding.

Thematic synthesis involved the development of descriptive and analytical themes, going beyond initial coding by accounting for transferability (to different contexts), relevancy to the research objectives, and frequency of data. Themes were combined into a model representing groups of factors influencing service user experience of diagnosis. To examine variance across context, we compared themes of papers focused on different stakeholders, diagnoses, service settings, countries, time periods, and cultures. We conducted a sensitivity analysis to assess the impact of quality appraisal, examining whether including exclusively high-quality studies altered findings. A service user, clinician, and academics contributed to the analysis.[25,26] Consensus seeking ensured triangulation of different perspectives and minimisation of bias.

The protocol was registered with PROSPERO, number: CRD42016047013.

Role of the funding source

There was no funding source for this study. All authors had full access to all the data in the study and had final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication.

RESULTS

Our searches yielded 18,104 results, of which we screened 533 full-text articles for eligibility (figure 1). We included 67 studies (reported in 78 papers) in thematic synthesis (table 1). Total sample size was 2228 (mean = 33; range = 4 – 274). Studies were conducted in two middle-income and eleven high-income countries: UK (21), USA (17), Australia (13), Canada (5), Netherlands (2), Brazil (2), Sweden (1), New Zealand (1), Latvia

(1), Belarus (1), and Israel (1). Two studies collected data across multiple countries (Denmark and Norway; USA, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and UK). Thirty-seven studies involved service users, fifteen involved clinicians, seven involved carers/family, and eight were mixed samples. Diagnoses included psychotic disorders (16), depression (13), personality disorders (12), bipolar disorder (5), anxiety (1), eating disorders (1), mixed (12), and unspecified mental illness (7). Studies spanned from 1994-2017.

Participants were recruited from a range of settings, including primary care, community, specialist, and inpatient services. Research methods included interviews (47), focus groups (7), questionnaires (3), mixed (9), and online observations (1).

Inductive thematic synthesis, derived from data of included studies, is represented in a model of factors identified as influential on service user experience of diagnosis (figure 2). Themes developed from codes are depicted with their relative 'weight', demonstrated by the coding frequency of each theme (shown in the key and numeric labels of figure 2). Our model comprises three superordinate categories: service provision, external, and internal factors. Service provision factors were most frequently cited and are further divided into three subgroups representing different stages of the diagnostic process: deciding, communicating, and using the diagnosis. We found that the journey through these stages is typically sequential, though there is potential for repetition and/or circularity of stages. The external and internal factors predate, occur alongside, and postdate service-level influences. They impact service user experience both directly and in interaction with service provision factors and each other.

To illustrate themes, we have displayed quotations from included studies in table 2.

Service provision factors

Deciding the diagnosis

Drivers of diagnosis. Whether decisions were driven by service user need was a major theme contributing to a diagnosis being experienced as accurate and validating. Some service users felt diagnoses were instead driven by political motives like power and control; business, financial, and resource affairs (e.g. treatment costs); or clinician fears of causing harm (e.g. damaging therapeutic relationships). Clinicians reported feeling pressured by these issues during diagnostic decision-making.

Comprehensiveness and quality of the diagnostic assessment. Service users found it disconcerting when they perceived a lack of thoughtful and rigorous appraisal preceding diagnosis. Both service users and clinicians felt the process was more validating and effective when a breadth of factors were considered (i.e. biopsychosocial), alongside severity, burden, and chronicity of symptoms. They felt that diagnostic manuals (e.g. ICD) could guide assessment, but were sometimes unhelpful because of inaccurate or incomplete symptom descriptors. Service users also expressed that to fully capture their experience, it was beneficial to consider comorbidities and the potential diagnosis of multiple conditions.

Time to diagnose. Clinicians expressed that diagnosis is complex; a comprehensive assessment takes time. They reported challenges across several areas, including differentiating disorders with overlapping symptoms, deciding what was and was not 'normal', and complications from symptom fluctuation. Nevertheless, service users often felt diagnosis was delayed; causing uncertainty, sense of rejection or abandonment, and delay in treatment. Service users more often reported a positive experience when diagnosis was felt to be efficient and timely.

Diagnostic accuracy and 'fit'. Service users reported that diagnosis was most helpful when it 'fit' their experience of symptoms; providing relief, validation, and a framework to interpret experiences. In contrast, misdiagnosis (being given one diagnosis then later being told another is more appropriate without a perceived change in presentation) caused distress, loss of confidence in services, and inappropriate treatment. Service users and clinicians felt it was unhelpful to over-pathologise and diagnose mild experiences that did not cause distress or dysfunction, or to under-diagnose or overlook a problem. This could cause service users to reject their diagnosis or feel dismissed. When diagnosis was felt to be inaccurate, sometimes attributed to change in symptomatology over time, it was reported helpful to remove or change the diagnosis accordingly; permanency of diagnostic labels was viewed negatively.

Communicating the diagnosis

Disclosure. This theme encompassed the most codes. Disclosure was frequently described as a pivotal moment for service users (figure 2). Clinicians described an internal struggle or dilemma, whereby they were unsure whether disclosure was beneficial. Most clinicians felt service users had a right to know their diagnosis, whilst simultaneously fearing potential harm. Although sometimes experienced negatively, service users generally reported preference for disclosure; giving relief, validating their experiences, as well as providing greater self-understanding and empowerment. There were numerous negative accounts of having a diagnosis withheld that caused service users to feel isolated, confused, or insignificant. Service users felt particularly uninformed about changes to their diagnosis. Paradoxically, many clinicians reported reluctance to disclose due to fear of subjecting service users to stigma or damaging the therapeutic relationship, yet non-disclosure was more often associated with these outcomes.

Both service users and clinicians reported instances of disclosure using vague, 'less stigmatising', or euphemistic labels, compared to specific or 'true' diagnoses (e.g. emotional dysregulation vs. borderline personality disorder). Clinicians described using this practice to protect service user's best interests, yet service users reported uncertainty, reduced agency, and damaged therapeutic relationships as a result. Service users found it unhelpful when disclosure was unplanned, insensitive, or delayed. For example, discovering a diagnosis on health records, letters, or when it was 'let slip' in care meetings caused distress. Whilst some clinicians were cautious of causing potential harm through premature disclosure, this juxtaposed service user reports that delays to disclosure were common and can have adverse consequences. Finally, service users found the process less damaging for identity when diagnosis was disclosed as a name for their experiences, rather than framed as an inherent trait, which could feel blaming or like a personal attack.

Provision of information. This had a pronounced influence on the experience of diagnosis and yielded the second greatest number of codes (figure 2). Many clinicians expressed concerns regarding lack of time and resources; also reflected by service users who often reported being given little or no information when diagnosed. Nonetheless, receiving information about a diagnosis was empowering and normalising for service users. Understanding symptoms provided validation and often helped people come to terms with their diagnosis, despite sometimes causing fear initially. Service users and clinicians reported that diagnostic manuals could be a useful tool to learn about the diagnosis and its associated symptoms, though this approach was sometimes experienced as impersonal, and language could be interpreted as derogatory or confusing. Service users also found it helpful to receive information about likely causes of symptoms and the reasoning behind diagnostic decision-making. Yet many felt aetiology went unexplored, and diagnoses were 'plucked from the air'; causing confusion, shock, and sometimes rejection of the diagnosis. Further, service users expressed that diagnosis created fear and uncertainty about the future, with insufficient information and discussion regarding prognosis.

When and how information was accessed impacted service user experience. Delay could be experienced as neglectful, while having excessive information too soon was overwhelming. Resources like leaflets, books, and web pages were helpful, sometimes preferred. Nonetheless, sole reliance on self-research without face-to-face discussion with a clinician was damaging, leading people to feel dismissed or unclear about their diagnosis. Service users reported feeling hopeless when told their condition was permanent or untreatable. Rather, being offered realistic messages of hope yielded a more constructive experience. Service users discussed the use of biomedical approaches to explain the diagnosis or its cause. Some found this helpful as it reduced self-blame, though others criticised the approach for being inconsistent with their pre-existing psychosocial explanations. In addition, service users often felt there was too much jargon, preferring accessible information, as long as it was not experienced as too simplistic, uninformative, or patronising.

Using the diagnosis

Functional value of diagnosis. Service users experienced diagnosis more positively when offered as a tool for recovery leading to appropriate treatment. It was considered most helpful when used to guide care in consideration with service user preference and other factors (e.g. previous treatment experiences); relying solely on diagnosis was considered negligent. Similarly, service users believed that diagnosis should not be a pre-requisite to accessing services. Others felt their diagnosis was meaningless for recovery, or even removed support and evoked prejudice from providers. Diagnosis without functional value was experienced as disempowering and frustrating, leading to hopelessness and distrust of services. Service users expected treatment to follow diagnosis and were taken aback when this was not provided. Clinicians reported reluctance to record diagnoses due to potential harm (e.g. stigma), despite potentially impacting continuity of care.

Ongoing support. Both service users and clinicians emphasised concern about consequences of diagnosis, including impacts on relationships, finances, and identity. Service users reported follow-up appointments as helpful; to revisit the diagnosis and address its consequences, particularly stigma. Collaborative discussion was

favoured, as service users reported occasions when clinicians made erroneous predictions about the consequences of diagnosis.

Factors across superordinate themes

Collaborative and therapeutic relationships. Across all stages of the diagnostic process, service users felt respected when clinicians were empathetic, caring, and attuned to individual needs. Collaboration was preferred, though such practice was infrequently reported. Many service users described their diagnosing clinician as an 'authoritative expert', causing them to feel uninvolved, unheard, and potentially reject the diagnosis. Service users particularly found diagnostic decision-making more positive and credible when their expertise and opinions were valued alongside clinical knowledge. Nonetheless, sometimes this caused service users to feel overwhelmed and clinicians to feel strained with regards to time and resources. Consistent therapeutic relationships were favoured by service users and clinicians alike, as they eased personal discussion and rapport. Quality of relationships between clinicians within and across services was also important. Service users valued a multi-disciplinary approach that supported a holistic diagnosis, though some clinicians reported futile team dynamics as a limiting factor.

Involvement of carers, family, and peers. Where appropriate, carer/family involvement helped service users navigate services and come to terms with their diagnosis. Additionally, peer support groups reduced isolation, normalised the diagnosis, and facilitated acceptance and coping. Whilst carers/family sometimes found diagnosis a relief, it could also be distressing and confusing. Carers/family often reported a lack of involvement and support from clinicians, including poor provision of information and limited opportunity for discussion, which could have negative, indirect influences on service user experience.

External factors

Stigma, discrimination, and culture. This theme accumulated the largest number of codes amongst non-service-related factors. Service users found the diagnostic process damaging when it resulted in stigma. Many reported negative social 'side-effects' of diagnosis, including hostility, exclusion, and marginalisation by others. Some felt they were no longer seen as a person, but as a diagnosis, to be feared or avoided. Fear of stigma alone could create anxiety about being diagnosed and cause isolation. When a service user's culture considered a diagnosis as 'normal' or socially acceptable, the process was considered less frightening and easier to accept than when a diagnosis was associated with cultural discourses of abnormality, defectiveness, or 'craziness'.

Support from others. Some service users reported that it was easier to adjust to a diagnosis with support and encouragement from carers, family, and friends, as it reduced fear and isolation. At times, diagnosis led to the development of new social networks and a sense of peer connectedness, which normalised the experience. This differs to the *involvement of carers, family, and peers* theme as it applies to the broader context outside service provision that is associated with adjusting to a diagnosis.

Internal factors

Service users' prior experiences and help-seeking. Many had preconceptions of diagnoses, developed from prior experiences. If these were negative (e.g. associated with poor outcome through negative familial experiences of mental health conditions), the diagnostic process could be particularly anxiety-provoking. Many also developed theories about the cause of their symptoms. If these did not correspond with explanations offered by services (e.g. believing symptoms were physical rather than psychological), the experience was conflicted. More broadly, if service users felt nothing was wrong or did not want a diagnosis, the process could cause anger and frustration. Those who were seeking help or diagnosis were more likely to experience relief and validation.

Service user identity and recovery. Diagnosis was distressing when it was perceived as undermining individual identity; causing feelings of shame or loss when individuals felt like 'just a diagnosis', a 'freak', or 'worthless'. On the other hand, service users less frequently found diagnosis protected or positively defined their identity. Furthermore, when useful for recovery, service users experienced the process as meaningful and empowering; bringing attention to their difficulties and giving them 'something to grasp', providing direction for positive change. There was significant individual variation within this theme as the service user processed the diagnosis over time; a journey influenced by service provision and external factors.

Subgroup analysis

We reflected similarities and differences between stakeholders in the overall analysis. An overarching finding was that, despite uncertainty, clinicians aimed to provide best care, yet this was sometimes found unhelpful or

harmful by service users. There were limited carer/family papers for comparison, though a common theme among this group was feeling excluded from the process.

Analyses revealed substantial similarity between diagnoses, albeit with some variation. Issues of non-disclosure and poor provision of information were commonly reported for psychotic and personality disorder diagnoses. These diagnoses were most associated with negative impacts for identity and hope for recovery. Personality disorder diagnoses were also found to have least functional value, and most likely to cause removal of services; reportedly being perceived as 'not a mental illness' or 'difficult', with connotations of blame. Correspondingly, personality disorders were most associated with institutionalised stigma within mental health services, whereas the other diagnoses were mainly associated with social stigmatisation. Depression diagnoses were most commonly experienced as validating, difficult to diagnose due to manifestations of physical symptoms, and most often understood within a medical model. Inadequate involvement of family and carers was most frequently reported for psychotic diagnoses.

We found themes were highly consistent between service types, though some differences were noted between primary and secondary care. Limited confidence and hesitancy about diagnostic decision-making were commonly reported by clinicians in primary care settings. They discussed difficulty with diagnosing physical manifestations of mental health conditions, short consultations, and limited resources. The medical model was frequently associated with primary care settings, and team/family/carer involvement was mostly mentioned in secondary and specialist settings. We found issues with assessment, disclosure, information provision, value of diagnosis for treatment and recovery, stigma, and identity were similar across time. Service user self-research (e.g. on the internet), access to peer support, and developing a sense of connectedness with others who have mental health diagnoses were mostly reported in studies conducted within the past 10 years. Use of a medical model was discussed less over time, and the impact of cultural differences in presentation on diagnostic decision-making was increasingly reported. In cross-national comparisons, we found issues with diagnoses being driven by billing and insurance unique to studies in Australia and the USA. Themes regarding political and financial influences on diagnostic decision-making were most prevalent in USA research. Stigma was frequently discussed in studies focused on cultural minorities.

When including only the top quality rated studies (highest 20% of scores) in analysis, themes identified in the model were unchanged.

DISCUSSION

Understanding the factors influencing service user experience of diagnosis was limited by research focused on specific diagnoses, settings, or stages of the diagnostic process. Our synthesis identifies that how diagnoses are decided, communicated, and used by services is important. Disclosure, information provision, collaboration, timing, and functional value for recovery were among the most prominent themes. External and internal factors were found to further influence service user experience throughout the diagnostic process.

Findings are represented in a model to inform service provision and clinical decision-making (figure 2). To increase practical utility, we present themes as considerations for clinicians as they work with individuals through their diagnostic journey. These could be drawn upon in the implementation of diagnostic manuals, including the forthcoming release of ICD-11.[13] Whilst these manuals provide clinical descriptors that can guide diagnostic decisions, they do not inform clinicians how to communicate or use the diagnosis. Our model aims to compliment diagnostic manuals, providing guidance for communication and potentially alleviating uncertainty previously reported by clinicians. Our review also sought to inform service users and carers/family; access to our model could support them to navigate the diagnostic experience and be actively involved.

We suggest that the model forms the basis of initial and ongoing diagnostic discussions between clinicians and service users. It encourages a holistic approach, including consideration of internal and external factors directly and in interaction with service factors. Of note, all stakeholders reported that diagnosis could be experienced as 'labelling', which had consequences for stigma and discrimination. This aligns with Link and Phelan's theory (2001) that stigma exists when people distinguish and give labels to human differences which are associated with negative stereotypes.[27] Our subgroup analyses found that stigma was consistently reported over time, suggesting it is an ongoing issue. Discussing and providing support about stigma during the diagnostic encounter might be a development which service users reported to find helpful.

Our review advances previous research by collating and comparing experiences of service users, clinicians, and carers/family. Triangulation of perspectives in this area is novel and allows a more complex understanding of diagnostic practice. Findings suggest an element of unfounded paternalism. Many clinicians felt hesitant to

decide and disclose a diagnosis, due to uncertainty or concern about causing harm, yet service users reported negative consequences from having a diagnosis withheld. Results also reveal discordant understandings and expectations of diagnosis between stakeholders. For instance, clinicians emphasised difficulty and the need for time to make an accurate diagnosis, yet service users often felt diagnosis took too long. Highlighting variations in perspectives should encourage open and reciprocal discussions between service users and clinicians about preferences, expectations, and concerns regarding the diagnostic process. Such discussions might provide the foundation to make informed, transparent, and collaborative decisions regarding diagnostic practice, facilitating better outcomes for service users.

Comparison of diagnoses, service settings, time periods, countries, and cultures allowed us to identify considerations that may be more important in some contexts or groups than others. For example, stigma was frequently mentioned by research with cultural minorities, and negative impacts for identity and hope for personality disorder diagnoses. It is therefore important to be mindful of these differences and their potential associated influences. Our review draws attention to other areas for reflection about clinical practice. Most prominent in the data were non-disclosure of psychotic and personality disorder diagnoses, as well as less recovery-orientated practice in diagnosing personality disorders. Also evident were financial influences on diagnosis in the USA and Australia. Further, where access to information and service user communities have increased, self-research and peer support may be more important to explore during diagnostic conversations. Increasing diversity within society means that cultural differences in social constructions of mental illness and presentation should also be considered. Clinicians identified particular difficulty with diagnosing in primary care settings, and using a team approach in multi-disciplinary settings, highlighting potential areas for clinical training.

Our synthesis offers a way to integrate diagnosis with recovery approaches increasingly represented in international policy; emphasising hope, identity, and empowerment.[19] Recovery-focused models are traditionally thought to contrast with diagnosis, but many clinicians who value diagnoses are supportive of recovery approaches.[28] Our model could inform the diagnostic process to be conducted in a way that is concordant with recovery principles. It particularly supports collaboration, person-centred care, and service user agency and empowerment, reflecting recommendations about service user participation.[19]

Diagnosis has been criticised for being overly medicalised, offering limited information about causation of psychiatric disorders, and poor instruction for intervention.[29] A case formulation approach has been considered a viable alternative to diagnosis.[29,30] Whilst the two practices are often considered dissimilar, our review suggests the experience of diagnosis may be improved by integrating some of the principles of psychological formulation.[29,30] This includes collaboratively developing a holistic understanding of a person's difficulties that addresses aetiology, then using diagnosis as a tool to guide treatment and recovery. Further research could assess the benefit of the two processes becoming more affiliated within clinical services.

This systematic review offers a widely applicable understanding of the factors influencing service user experience of diagnosis, capturing variation across contexts. Our model is evidence based; developed through a coproduced process of rigorous synthesis. Whilst we presented overarching findings, it is important to recognise individual experiences of the diagnostic process; factors and practices may affect different people in different ways. For example, we identified the provision of information was especially beneficial for individuals with negative preconceptions or limited understanding of their diagnosis. Similarly, clear disclosure was empowering to some but destructive for others. We therefore emphasise that there is not one 'right' way to diagnose; rather the data promotes an approach that is sensitive to an individual's needs and preferences. A strength of our model is that it accounts for individuality by posing themes as questions for consideration, rather than providing a 'best practice' checklist. We propose that clinicians and service users have open discussions about the factors identified (e.g. timing) to decide best practice for an individual. This aligns with growing evidence and guidance supporting shared decision making.[31] We also emphasise that diagnosis is not always wanted, necessary, or beneficial, irrespective of how the process is conducted; some service users, clinicians, and carers/family opposed the practice of diagnosis entirely. We recommend establishing service user views on diagnosing early in consultation and proceeding according to individual preference, considering potential alternatives such as clinical formulation.

A limitation of this review was a lack of published research for some diagnoses, meaning they were insufficiently represented in our synthesis. There was only one study each for anxiety and eating disorders. It is possible that the influencing factors for these diagnoses differ, potentially making the model less appropriate for some groups. Rather, it may be most representative of the factors influencing psychotic, depressive, and personality disorders, which were the most common diagnoses explored in the literature. Similarly, most included studies were from the UK, USA, and Australia. Whilst themes appeared similar, there were limited

data from other countries, potentially not capturing cultural variations and limiting transferability of our model. Further, all countries included are upper-middle to high income and it is likely that service user experience will differ in lower income countries where access to care and resources are limited. Whilst we incorporated research on multiple stakeholders, there were limited studies including carers/family. These voices may therefore be underrepresented. Future research would benefit from comparing findings with other contexts, such as child mental health services, and populations such as dual diagnosis. We recommend future testing of the acceptability, validity, and utility of this model with service users, clinicians, and carers/family.

Receiving a mental health diagnosis can hugely impact service users' lives, yet there has been limited research into how to best approach the diagnostic process. Our coproduced, evidence-based model may directly inform clinical training and practice; functioning as a reflective guide for clinicians. The model promotes a holistic understanding of individuals, which can empower, provide hope, and guide treatment. We emphasise that the model should be drawn on in collaboration with service users, and sensitivity to individual needs and preferences is important. The aim of our model as a foundation for open, transparent, and collaborative decisions regarding diagnostic practice is to facilitate improved experiences and outcomes for service users.

CONTRIBUTIONS

AP contributed to the design, data searches and extraction, thematic synthesis, and the writing of the report. JR contributed to design, data searches and extraction, thematic synthesis, and thorough revision of the report. DB contributed to thematic synthesis and revision of the report. AP, JR, and DB contributed to the creation of the tables, and all authors contributed to figures. GP and CN contributed to design, data searches, thematic synthesis, and revision of the report. CH contributed to design, thematic synthesis, and revision of the report.

DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

We declare no competing interests.

ACKNOWLEGEMENTS

Table 1
Characteristics of included studies

Study	Participants	Diagnosis	Country	Setting	Sample size	Data collection	Analysis	Quality rating*	No. of codes	Summary of themes
Aref-Adib et al 2016[32]	Service user	Psychosis	UK	Secondary care	22	Interviews	Thematic analysis	30	19	Provision of information; comprehensiveness and quality of the diagnostic assessment; collaborative and therapeutic relationships
Baik et al 2005[33]	Clinician	Depression	USA	Primary care	8	Interviews	Grounded theory	30	236	Comprehensiveness and quality of the diagnostic assessment; time to diagnose; stigma, discrimination, and culture; diagnostic accuracy and 'fit'; collaborative and therapeutic relationships; service user's prior experiences and help-seeking
Barker 1994[34]	Service user & clinician	Psychosis	UK	Community	61	Interviews	Not stated	23	60	Provision of information; disclosure; stigma, discrimination, and culture; comprehensiveness and quality of the diagnostic assessment
Barnable et al 2006[35]	Carer/family	Schizophrenia	Canada	Not stated	6	Interviews	Thematic analysis	29	54	Service user's prior experiences and help-seeking; provision of information; disclosure; support from others; involvement of carers, family, and peers;
Bartsch et al 2016[36]	Service user	Borderline personality disorder	Australia	Community	12	Focus groups	Thematic analysis	32	13	Time to diagnose; diagnostic accuracy and 'fit'; service user's prior experiences and help-seeking
Bilderbeck et al 2014[37]	Service user	Mixed	UK	Secondary care	28	Interviews	Framework analysis	32	367	Provision of information; collaborative and therapeutic relationships; stigma, discrimination, and culture; functional value of diagnosis; involvement of family, carers, and peers; service user identity and recovery; diagnostic accuracy and 'fit'; disclosure; comprehensiveness and quality of the diagnostic assessment; involvement of carers, family, and peers;
Black et al 2013[38]	Service user	Personality disorder	UK	Forensic	10	Interviews	Interpretative phenomenological analysis	32	17	Stigma, discrimination, and culture; functional value of diagnosis
Bonnigton & Rose 2014[39]	Service user	Mixed	UK	Not stated	46	Mixed	Thematic analysis	30	112	Collaborative and therapeutic relationships; provision of information; disclosure; service user identity and recovery; stigma, discrimination, and culture; diagnostic accuracy and 'fit'; functional value of diagnosis; drivers of diagnosis; ongoing support
Bril-Barniv et al 2017[40]	Service user	Mixed	Israel	Mixed	29	Interviews	Phenomenological analysis	28	5	Stigma, discrimination, and culture; service user identity & recovery
Carney et al 1998[41]	Clinician	Depression	USA	Primary care	21	Focus groups	Content analysis	34	237	Comprehensiveness and quality of the diagnostic assessment; diagnostic accuracy and

										'fit'; service user's prior experiences and help-seeking; stigma, discrimination, and culture; collaborative and therapeutic relationships; drivers of diagnosis; functional value of diagnosis; disclosure; time to diagnose
Castillo 2000, 2001, 2003[42-45] /Ramon et al 2001[83]	Service user	Personality disorder	UK	Not stated	50	Mixed	Quantitative analysis with qualitative component	26	384	Functional value of diagnosis; service user identity and recovery; stigma, discrimination, and culture; comprehensiveness and quality of the diagnostic assessment; diagnostic accuracy and 'fit'; disclosure; collaborative and therapeutic relationships; support from others; ongoing support
Charles & O'Loughlin 2012[46]	Service user	Psychosis	USA	Private inpatient	44	Interviews	Unspecified qualitative analysis	19	57	Functional value of diagnosis; service user identity and recovery; stigma, discrimination, and culture; drivers of diagnosis; disclosure; diagnostic accuracy and 'fit'; collaborative and therapeutic relationships; comprehensiveness and quality of the diagnostic assessment
Clafferty et al 2001[9]	Clinician	Schizophrenia	UK	Not stated	211	Questionnaires	Not stated	19	42	Disclosure; drivers of diagnosis; collaborative and therapeutic relationships; involvement of family, carers, and peers; stigma, discrimination, and culture; comprehensiveness and quality of the diagnostic assessment; diagnostic accuracy and 'fit'
de Oliveira et al 2013[47]	Service user	Schizophrenia	Brazil	Inpatient	10	Interviews	Thematic analysis	29	28	Disclosure; service user identity and recovery; time to diagnose; stigma, discrimination, and culture; functional value of diagnosis; provision of information; service user's prior experiences and help-seeking
Delmas et al 2012[48]	Service user & carer/ family	Bipolar disorder	Australia	Mixed	26	Interviews	Phenomenological analysis	32	173	Time to diagnose; comprehensiveness and quality of the diagnostic assessment; involvement of family, carers, and peers; diagnostic accuracy and 'fit'; stigma, discrimination, and culture; support from others; involvement of carers, family, and peers; service user's prior experiences and help-seeking
Dinos et al 2004[49]	Service user	Depression	UK	Community	46	Interviews	Thematic analysis	31	29	Stigma, discrimination, and culture; functional value of diagnosis; diagnostic accuracy and 'fit'; provision of information; service user's prior experiences and help-seeking
Farzad Nawabi 2004[50]	Service user	Mixed	USA	Not stated	9	Interviews	Grounded theory	31	339	Stigma, discrimination, and culture; service user identity and recovery; time to diagnose support from others; involvement of carers, family, and peers; diagnostic accuracy and 'fit'; functional value of diagnosis; service user's prior experiences and help-seeking

Ferriter & Huband 2003[51]	Carer/family	Schizophrenia	UK	Forensic	26	Interviews	Not stated	23	8	Disclosure; involvement of family, carers, and peers; comprehensiveness and quality of the diagnostic assessment; diagnostic accuracy and 'fit'
Fletcher et al 2008[52]	Service user	Mixed	Australia	Specialist	110	Questionnaires	Not stated	20	55	Functional value of diagnosis; involvement of family, carers, and peers; collaborative and therapeutic relationships; provision of information; comprehensiveness and quality of the diagnostic assessment; ongoing support
Ford et al 2016[53]	Clinician	Anxiety disorders	UK	Primary care	17	Interviews	Thematic analysis	34	332	Drivers of diagnosis; comprehensiveness and quality of the diagnostic assessment; diagnostic accuracy and 'fit'; functional value of diagnosis; time to diagnose; collaborative and therapeutic relationships; stigma, discrimination, and culture
Frank & Davidson 2012[54]	Service user	Psychosis	USA	Secondary community	8	Interviews	Interpretative phenomenological analysis	28	55	Functional value of diagnosis; stigma, discrimination, and culture; time to diagnose; service user identity and recovery
Frese & Myrick 2010[55]	Service user	Unspecified mental health diagnosis	USA, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, & UK	Not stated	57	Mixed	Content analysis	20	367	Collaborative and therapeutic relationships; stigma, discrimination, and culture; drivers of diagnosis; diagnostic accuracy and 'fit'; comprehensiveness and quality of the diagnostic assessment; involvement of family, carers, and peers; functional value of diagnosis; service user identity and recovery
Gallagher et al 2010[56]	Service user	Unspecified mental health diagnosis	UK	Mixed	10	Interviews	Grounded theory	30	162	Diagnostic accuracy and 'fit'; comprehensiveness and quality of the diagnostic assessment; disclosure; provision of information; functional value of diagnosis; collaborative and therapeutic relationships; stigma, discrimination, and culture
Gammell & Stoppard 1999, 2003[57,88]	Service user	Depression	Canada	Not stated	9	Interviews	Thematic analysis	30	275	Collaborative and therapeutic relationships; service user identity and recovery; stigma, discrimination, and culture; time to diagnose; diagnostic accuracy and 'fit'; comprehensiveness and quality of the diagnostic assessment; functional value of diagnosis
Giacon & Galera 2013[58]	Carer/family	Schizophrenia	Brazil	Mixed	23	Interviews	Unspecified qualitative analysis	32	17	Time to diagnose; diagnostic accuracy and 'fit'; stigma, discrimination, and culture; involvement of family, carers, and peers
Goicoechea 2006[59]	Service user & clinician	Mixed	USA	Inpatient	8	Mixed	Conversational analysis & thematic analysis	28	82	Diagnostic accuracy and 'fit'; service user identity and recovery; collaborative and therapeutic relationships; comprehensiveness and quality of the diagnostic assessment; drivers of diagnosis; provision of information
Goldberg 2007[60]	Service user	Bipolar	USA	Not stated	6	Interviews	Thematic analysis	28	1423	Stigma, discrimination, and culture; service

		disorder								user identity and recovery; service user's prior experiences and help-seeking; diagnostic accuracy and 'fit'; collaborative and therapeutic relationships; drivers of diagnosis; comprehensiveness and quality of the diagnostic assessment; support from others; involvement of carers, family, and peers
Hagen & Nixon 2011[5]	Service user	Psychosis	Canada	Not stated	18	Interviews	Phenomenological analysis	28	207	Provision of information; collaborative and therapeutic relationships; service user identity and recovery; functional value of diagnosis; diagnostic accuracy and 'fit'; disclosure; comprehensiveness and quality of the diagnostic assessment
Harding et al 2015[61]	Clinician	Unspecified mental health diagnosis	Australia	Primary care	10	Interviews	Thematic analysis	27	49	Collaborative and therapeutic relationships; stigma, discrimination, and culture; service user's prior experiences and help-seeking; drivers of diagnosis; comprehensiveness and quality of the diagnostic assessment
Hayne 2003[2]	Service user	Unspecified serious mental health diagnosis	Canada	Not stated	14	Interviews	Thematic analysis	31	376	Drivers of diagnosis; functional value of diagnosis; service user identity and recovery; stigma, discrimination, and culture; diagnostic accuracy and 'fit'; collaborative and therapeutic relationships; comprehensiveness and quality of the diagnostic assessment; disclosure; provision of information; time to diagnose
Highet et al 2004[62]	Service user	Bipolar disorder	Australia	Not stated	53	Mixed	Thematic analysis	30	114	Diagnostic accuracy and 'fit'; provision of information; time to diagnose; collaborative and therapeutic relationships; disclosure; functional value of diagnosis; comprehensiveness and quality of the diagnostic assessment
Horn et al 2007[6]	Service user	Borderline personality disorder	UK	Not stated	10	Interviews	Interpretative phenomenological analysis	31	646	Stigma, discrimination, and culture; provision of information; functional value of diagnosis; service user identity and recovery; collaborative and therapeutic relationships; ongoing support; diagnostic accuracy and 'fit'; disclosure; support from others; drivers of diagnosis; time to diagnose
Hunt & Churchill 2013[63]	Clinician	Anorexia nervosa	UK	Primary care	12	Focus groups	Corpus linguistic & discourse analysis	29	129	Comprehensiveness and quality of the diagnostic assessment; drivers of diagnosis; functional value of diagnosis
Hwang 2008[14]	Clinician	Schizophrenia	USA	Secondary community	4	Interviews	Thematic analysis	27	777	Disclosure; stigma, discrimination, and culture; collaborative and therapeutic relationships; functional value of diagnosis; service user's prior experiences and help-seeking; provision of information; involvement of family, carers, and peers; diagnostic accuracy and 'fit'; ongoing support; service user identity and

										recovery; time to diagnose
Jönsson et al 2008[64]	Service user	Bipolar disorder	Sweden	Outpatient	18	Interviews	Content analysis	31	30	Provision of information; disclosure; service user's prior experiences and help-seeking
Karp 1996[65]	Service user	Depression	USA	Not stated	50	Interviews	Unspecified qualitative analysis	24	90	Stigma, discrimination, and culture; functional value of diagnosis; service user identity and recovery; involvement of family, carers, and peers; time to diagnose
Karp & Tanarugsachock 2000[66]	Carer/family	Mixed	USA	Not stated	50	Interviews	Grounded theory	27	88	Support from others; involvement of carers, family, and peers; comprehensiveness and quality of the diagnostic assessment
Keating & Robertson 2004[67]	Service user, carer/family & clinician	Unspecified mental health diagnosis	UK	Inpatient & community	93	Mixed	Unspecified qualitative analysis	31	49	Stigma, discrimination, and culture
Krupchanka et al 2016, 2017[68,69]	Carer/family	Schizophrenia	Belarus	Not stated	20	Interviews	Thematic analysis	30	9	Stigma, discrimination, and culture; involvement of family, carers, and peers
Lampe et al 2012[15]	Clinician	Mixed	Australia	Primary care	38	Focus groups	Thematic analysis	24	306	Comprehensiveness and quality of the diagnostic assessment; drivers of diagnosis; functional value of diagnosis; time to diagnose; stigma, discrimination, and culture
Leff et al 2017[70]	Clinician	Depression	Latvia	Primary care	16	Interviews	Thematic analysis	32	114	Service user's prior experiences and help-seeking; comprehensiveness and quality of the diagnostic assessment; time to diagnose; collaborative and therapeutic relationships; involvement of family, carers, and peers; service user identity and recovery; stigma, discrimination, and culture; drivers of diagnosis
Lewis 1995[71]	Service user	Depression	UK	Not stated	48	Interviews	Thematic analysis	28	151	Diagnostic accuracy and 'fit'; stigma, discrimination, and culture; service user identity and recovery; functional value of diagnosis; collaborative and therapeutic relationships
Loughland et al 2015[3]	Service user	Schizophrenia	Australia	Mixed	14	Interviews	Unspecified qualitative analysis	34	256	Provision of information; collaborative and therapeutic relationships; disclosure; service user's prior experiences and help-seeking; functional value of diagnosis; ongoing support
Lovell & Hardy 2014[72]	Service user	Borderline personality disorder	UK	Forensic	8	Interviews	Interpretative phenomenological analysis	31	115	Collaborative and therapeutic relationships; service user identity and recovery; functional value of diagnosis; stigma, discrimination, and culture; diagnostic accuracy and 'fit'; disclosure
McCormack & Thomson 2017[73]	Service user	Mixed	Australia	Not stated	5	Interviews	Interpretative phenomenological analysis	30	92	Stigma, discrimination, and culture; functional value of diagnosis; service user identity and recovery; diagnostic accuracy and 'fit'; collaborative and therapeutic relationships; comprehensiveness and quality of the assessment
McMahon &	Service user	Borderline	Australia	Not stated	274	Questionnaires	Not stated	26	219	Disclosure; functional value of diagnosis;

Lawn 2011[74,75]	& carer/ family	personality disorder								stigma, discrimination, and culture; provision of information; collaborative and therapeutic relationships; involvement of family, carers, and peers
Milton & Mullan 2015[76]	Service user	Unspecified serious mental health diagnosis	Australia	Secondary community	45	Interviews	Thematic analysis	32	514	Time to diagnose; collaborative and therapeutic relationships; disclosure; support from others; involvement of carers, family, and peers; stigma, discrimination, and culture; comprehensiveness and quality of the diagnostic assessment; provision of information; functional value of diagnosis; diagnostic accuracy and 'fit'; involvement of family, carers, and peers; service user identity and recovery
Milton et al 2016[10]	Clinician	Unspecified mental health diagnosis	Australia	Mixed	19	Interviews	Thematic analysis	31	619	Involvement of family, carers, and peers; provision of information; diagnostic accuracy and 'fit'; functional value of diagnosis; time to diagnose; disclosure; collaborative and therapeutic relationship; stigma, discrimination, and culture; ongoing support
Mitchell et al 2011[77]	Clinician	Depression	UK	Primary care	38	Focus groups	Thematic analysis	32	190	Drivers of diagnosis; comprehensiveness and quality of the diagnostic assessment; diagnostic accuracy and 'fit'; time to diagnose; collaborative and therapeutic relationships; stigma, discrimination, and culture; disclosure
Morris et al 2014[78]	Service user	Borderline personality disorder	UK	General mental health services	9	Interviews	Thematic analysis	30	167	Disclosure; provision of information; functional value of diagnosis; comprehensiveness and quality of the diagnostic assessment; collaborative and therapeutic relationships; service user identity and recovery
Nehls 1999[79]	Service user	Borderline personality disorder	USA	Inpatient & community	30	Interviews	Interpretative phenomenological analysis	25	106	Functional value of diagnosis; stigma, discrimination, and culture; collaborative and therapeutic relationships; disclosure; provision of information
Outram et al 2014, 2015[16,80]	Clinician	Schizophrenia	Australia	Mixed	16	Interviews	Thematic analysis	32	826	Disclosure; collaborative and therapeutic relationships; stigma, discrimination, and culture; diagnostic accuracy and 'fit'; time to diagnose; provision of information; involvement of family, carers, and peers; functional value of diagnosis
Petersen & Madsen 2017[81]	Service user	Depression	Denmark & Norway	Not stated	16	Interviews	Thematic analysis	19	70	Collaborative and therapeutic relationships; comprehensiveness and quality of the diagnostic assessment; time to diagnose; service user's prior experiences and help-seeking; functional value of diagnosis; service user identity and recovery
Pitt et al 2009[4]	Service user	Mixed	UK	Not stated	8	Interviews	Interpretative	33	247	Collaborative and therapeutic relationships;

						phenomenological analysis				support from others; involvement of carers, family, and peers; comprehensiveness and quality of the diagnostic assessment; functional value of diagnosis; drivers of diagnosis; stigma, discrimination, and culture; service user identity and recovery; disclosure
Proudfoot et al 2009[82]	Service user	Bipolar disorder	Australia	Specialist	26	Online observation	Phenomenological & lived experience framework analysis	25	119	Diagnostic accuracy and 'fit'; involvement of carers, family, and peers; stigma, discrimination, and culture; service user identity and recovery; collaborative and therapeutic relationships; functional value of diagnosis; time to diagnose
Rogers & Dunne 2011, 2013[84,85]	Service user	Borderline personality disorder	UK	Specialist	7	Focus groups	Thematic analysis	32	43	Disclosure; collaborative and therapeutic relationships; diagnostic accuracy and 'fit'; functional value of diagnosis; stigma, discrimination, and culture
Rumpza 2015[86]	Clinician	Borderline personality disorder	USA	Not stated	117	Mixed	Content analysis	29	334	Comprehensiveness and quality of the diagnostic assessment; disclosure; diagnostic accuracy and 'fit'; collaborative and therapeutic relationships
Saver et al 2007[87]	Service user	Depression	USA	Primary care	15	Interviews	Descriptive analysis	31	185	Provision of information; diagnostic accuracy and 'fit'; collaborative and therapeutic relationships; service user identity and recovery; service user's prior experiences and help-seeking; stigma, discrimination, and culture; comprehensiveness and quality of the diagnostic assessment; time to diagnose
Stalker et al 2005[7]	Service user & clinician	Personality disorder	UK	Not stated	22	Interviews	Grounded theory	28	112	Stigma, discrimination, and culture; functional value of diagnosis; provision of information; comprehensiveness and quality of the diagnostic assessment; disclosure; diagnostic accuracy and 'fit'
Sulzer et al 2012, 2016[11,89]	Service user & clinician	Borderline personality disorder	USA	Not stated	64	Mixed	Grounded theory	30	689	Disclosure; service user identity and recovery; stigma, discrimination, and culture; comprehensiveness and quality of the diagnostic assessment; functional value of diagnosis; diagnostic accuracy and 'fit'; ongoing support
Thomas-Maclean & Stoppard 2004[90]	Clinician	Depression	Canada	Primary care	20	Interviews	Foucauldian discourse analysis	27	94	Comprehensiveness and quality of the diagnostic assessment; service user's prior experiences and help-seeking; diagnostic accuracy and 'fit'; collaborative and therapeutic relationships
Tuck et al 1997[91]	Carer/family	Schizophrenia	USA	Not stated	9	Interviews	Phenomenological analysis	27	78	Diagnostic accuracy and 'fit'; collaborative and therapeutic relationships; provision of information; disclosure; time to diagnose; involvement of family, carers, and peers;

										comprehensiveness and quality of the diagnostic assessment
Venhaus 2009[92]	Service user	Mixed	USA	Inpatient	7	Interviews	Narrative analysis	32	101	Stigma, discrimination, and culture; drivers of diagnosis; time to diagnose; service user identity and recovery; comprehensiveness and quality of the diagnostic assessment; diagnostic accuracy and 'fit'; functional value of diagnosis
Van Rijswijk et al 2009[17]	Clinician	Mixed	Netherlands	Primary care	23	Focus groups	Thematic analysis	30	257	Comprehensiveness and quality of the diagnostic assessment; collaborative and therapeutic relationships; functional value of diagnosis; diagnostic accuracy and 'fit'; time to diagnose; drivers of diagnosis
Wheeler 1994[93]	Carer/family	Schizophrenia	New Zealand	Not stated	4	Interviews	Content analysis	31	138	Involvement of family, carers, and peers; stigma, discrimination, and culture
Wittink et al 2006, 2008[94,95]	Service user	Depression	USA	Primary care	48	Interviews	Thematic analysis	31	370	Collaborative and therapeutic relationships; diagnostic accuracy and 'fit'; service user's prior experiences and help-seeking; time to diagnose; functional value of diagnosis; comprehensiveness and quality of the diagnostic assessment; provision of information; stigma, discrimination, and culture; disclosure
Wittkampf et al 2008[96]	Service user & clinician	Depression	Netherlands	Primary care	17	Interviews	Thematic analysis	30	251	Diagnostic accuracy and 'fit'; service user's prior experiences and help-seeking; comprehensiveness and quality of the diagnostic assessment; functional value of diagnosis; collaborative and therapeutic relationships; stigma, discrimination, and culture; disclosure

*Ten CASP criteria were rated as low, medium, or high quality, scoring 1-3 points respectively. A further 5 points were available to reflect quality determined by narrative appraisal, which considered generalisability and relevancy.

Table 2
Quotations from participants and authors of primary studies

Theme	Quotations from participants	Interpretations offered by authors
Service provision factors		
Deciding the diagnosis		
Drivers of diagnosis	It seems as if consumers in the U.S. get stuck with and in their diagnosis due to insurance needs. (p.499)[55] … maybe I hesitate to diagnose a depression because of the long term treatment with antidepressant drugs... (p.56)[17] Makers of the DSM are in the pockets of 'Big Pharma'. (p.499)[55] I have a lot of difficulty throwing that diagnosis on somebody, because to be really honest with you, when somebody gets diagnosed with borderline personality disorder, it's a really negative diagnosis. (pp.69-70)[89]	… there is a tendency for [diagnosis] to be seen more as a label, and one associated with stigma in the community, which almost certainly contributes to reluctance to make a specific diagnosis. (p.376)[15] … Darlene wondered if her initial bipolar diagnosis of Bipolar II Disorder, later modified to Bipolar I, was given only to minimize her distress. (p.139)[60]
Comprehensiveness and quality of the diagnostic assessment	So I said, "How can they diagnose me as bipolar if they don't even know who the hell I am, because I don't even know who the hell I am"? (p.189)[60] Psychiatrists take history of things in Axis 3… but it seems as if there is little interest in exploring how Axis 3 conditions influence the diagnosis of mental illness. (p.499)[55]	… GPs emphasize the necessity for a holistic approach to understanding the patient, including work, relationships and family contexts, in the process of making a diagnosis. (p.376)[15] Rebecca partly links her positive experience with getting the diagnosis with the process in which she got it. The doctor took time to examine her in great detail, not just subjecting her to standard tests or questionnaires. (p.27)[81] Assessments that seemed hurried, overly formal or impersonal, and clinicians who it was felt did not acknowledge their client's suffering, left participants feeling frustrated and unheard. (p.237)[37]
Time to diagnose	For so many years I haven't, sort of like, had a label, I've sort of like floated. (p.260)[6] Sometimes I'm a bit hesitant to… say 'Yes, you've got schizophrenia,' because I'll be thinking, 'What if it's drugs? What if it isn't a schizophreniform [disorder], have we really had enough time?' and things like that. (p.552)[16] It took us about 4 years to finally get a diagnosis for our daughter. It was not until we found a great psychiatrist in the private system, that we were given a clear diagnosis and the information and understanding of what our daughter was suffering from. (p.25)[75]	…delayed or inaccurate diagnoses frequently resulted in no intervention, less appropriate treatments being implemented, and/or repeated hospital admissions. (p.S49)[62] One of the concerns of clinicians was a lack of diagnostic certainty, including the length of time needed to make a confident diagnosis, variables that confound a clear diagnosis, the symptom overlap between different diagnoses, and the fact that there are no confirmatory laboratory tests to buttress clinical opinion. (p.552)[16] GPs suggested that they used time as a tool… to increase certainty over the diagnosis... (p.6)[53]
Diagnostic accuracy and 'fit'	What a waste of life with being diagnosed the wrong things. (p.30)[74] … I don't like that there's a sheet that says what you must have if you have bipolar and I'm like 'well that's not true because I don't have that, and I don't have that'. (p.12)[39] It explained a lot of things and I felt an enormous sense of relief… (p.233)[72]	…participants expressed relief at receiving a "the right" diagnostic label as it offered an explanation for their distressing emotions and behaviours… (p.13)[73] The burden of illness was exacerbated by difficulties with obtaining an accurate diagnosis. (p.S47)[62]

Communicating the diagnosis		
Disclosure	I didn't understand why I was so sensitive… It was really a relief to find out that it wasn't something else or that it was just me… it was rather good to discover that I had an illness, even if it's not a very nice thing… it explained why I felt the way I did. (p.1227)[64] I knew what was wrong with me, and if I knew what was wrong with me I had a chance of possibly understanding it better and maybe work on it a bit more… (p.461)[76] Because some people just think borderline personality means difficult patient you know and I, that's not my opinion, but the thing is because of all that bad press of borderline um I don't bring that up right away. (p.87)[86]	Open diagnostic information sharing was often recommended by participants as it provided an understanding of the issues and symptoms, and facilitated access to treatment and support… (p.461)[76] It was a matter of concern that several people reported they had only discovered their diagnosis by accident, for example, on the back of a Disability Living Allowance form, on a hospital discharge certificate and, in one case unfortunately, on receiving a letter from their consultant asking if they would like to take part in this research… Apart from the shock of finding out such sensitive information in this way, the lack of any accompanying explanation left these individuals feeling anxious and upset. (pp.363-4)[7]
Provision of information	It was quite nice to like for him to say I don't think it's bipolar, because – this reason, this reason, this one. But, I do think you are a little bit borderline because of this, this and this… He was like explaining it in a like a quite a simple way sort of thing instead of like ''you're this and that's it''. (p.237)[37] Not surprisingly then, as participants began to recognize the fleeting and arbitrary nature of the labels that the mental health system gave them, and how they lacked any meaning within the context of their own lives, they soon began to reject the labels altogether. (p.53)[5] I can't emphasise this enough… I would have accepted it more if they explained what schizophrenia was… (p.731)[3]	Individuals indicated that diagnostic conversations that were devoid of hope were extremely immobilizing and potentially dangerous…hope-focused discussions centered on recognition that individuals could live meaningful lives and be productive members of society. (p.462)[76] Where diagnosis was disclosed, sometimes the lack of information that accompanied that disclosure was one of the main causes of disempowerment. Lack of information meant participants often experienced diagnosis as 'a prognosis of doom' about their future. (p.421)[4]
Using the diagnosis		
Functional value of diagnosis	I think it was more of a case, it was, you have to be categorised, you have to be put in a box in some ways… we can't do much for you but we need to label you. (p.262)[6] I guess it seems like the diagnosis hasn't been used; it's been abused and has become more of just a wastebasket versus something to help direct treatment. (p.288)[79]	In many situations, diagnoses serve to guide a plan of care and, thus, are viewed as useful. For these participants, however, the diagnosis… perpetuated a sense of being marginalized and potentially mistreated. (p.288)[79] Personality disorder was seen as having all the drawbacks of a mental illness diagnosis, especially in terms of stigma, but none of the benefits, particularly access to services. (p.365)[7]
Ongoing support	I was diagnosed with Bipolar II disorder. I had no idea that's what I had. I felt quite distressed afterwards and would have liked someone to talk to... (p.30)[52]	A number of patients expressed the need for post-assessment support, particularly when given a new and unexpected diagnosis… (p.30)[52] …it was seen as useful to offer more in-depth discussion and information at follow-up. (p.739)[10]
Factors across superordinate themes		
Collaborative and therapeutic relationships	It's horrible having a label, having a label done to you. (p.233)[72] … overall, I think it is better to know and they talk to you about it [diagnosis], although it might take time to adjust to the thought of things, it's the "old nothing about me without me" idea. (p.463)[76]	Clinicians spoke of the importance of being as approachable as possible, attending to the patient's needs during the interview being a priority, and rapport being the basis of therapeutic interaction… (p.176)[80] Most participants said they preferred a multidisciplinary approach... (p.176)[80] Danielle described how any questions about the diagnosis were met with ''No, this is

		definitely what you have. We are 100% sure". (pp.260-1)[6]
Involvement of family, carers, and peers	They [Clinicians] were telling me stuff, but I'm so sick I can't take it on board. Your family, your carer, have to work together. They don't do that enough, they just treat the patient. (p.463)[76]	… the majority of family members reported that learning more about the illness and understanding its effects helped them to accept the diagnosis. (p.138)[48] A proportion of participants described family involvement as crucial as they supported the persons to navigate the system. (p.463)[76]
External factors		
Stigma, discrimination, and culture	Schizophrenic is the worst diagnosis because I've heard it in the newspapers and on TV, that they are really mad schizophrenic people, they are very dangerous to society, they've got no control. So obviously I came under that category. (p.177)[49] I'd heard about people that had been diagnosed with personality disorder being the black sheep of the community. It made me feel I didn't belong anywhere. (p.55)[42]	Fears related to the stigma attached to mental illness and the diagnosis meant that individuals tried to hide their diagnosis or did not want to accept the fact that they have been identified as mentally ill. (p.444)[67] …clinicians commented that misconceptions and stigma relating to the diagnostic label still influenced a person's response to the diagnosis. (p.740)[10] …the effects of stigma resulting from a diagnosis can play a role in relapse and hinder the recovery process. (p.422)[4]
Support from others	He [father] wouldn't say the actual words… when I was diagnosed with being bipolar over the summer, my dad, there is no way that those words will ever come out of his mouth. And if I say something to him about it, he still doesn't believe it… Because of the way that I've seen them react to the diagnosis of bipolar, that totally gives me an idea of how people are going to react if I tell them about it. If it's my family that is reacting this way, how are people who I'm not even close to going to react? (p.147)[50]	… participants felt that they may have accepted the diagnosis sooner… if they had greater support from family and friends. (p.138)[48] Several participants reported receiving positive messages, motivation, and support from their families which helped them come to terms with their diagnoses. (p.144)[50]
Internal factors		
Service user's prior experiences and help-seeking	It is good to put a name on somethings, because I knew there was something wrong there must be a reason as to why I am like I am. (p.233)[72] I believe the time is ripe for it; it has been long enough now that I've been letting this prey on my mind. I just needed this prod. Now it's time to clear my mind. (p.441)[96]	Their predominant reaction was to associate bipolar disorder with "crazy" and out-of-control or unpredictable behaviour…They remembered all of the worst conditions of their relatives with psychiatric and other cognitive disabilities and assumed their lives would follow the same trajectory. (p.250)[60]
Service user identity and recovery	Having a name to put to that gave me something to attack. It gave me something to work with ... a tangible framework of something I could manage. (p.15)[73] You're not human, once you have got that disorder you're not a human anymore, that goes your name goes. (p.233)[72] … it's made me very insecure about my worth as a person, who I am, because I used to be so capable and now I'm a nothing, a nobody. It's taken everything away from me. (p.11)[39] It was the beginning of being able to sort out a lifetime of feelings, events… my entire life. It was the chance for a new beginning. (p.66)[65]	Our results show that the common nominator among our informants is process – people are always in process as their relationship to a categorization like a depression diagnosis is never static, but always in motion. (p.30)[81] While participants expressed relief at receiving a *'the right'* diagnostic label… there was fear associated with *"being"* the label and what this meant for their relationships and sense of self. (p.13)[73] The diagnosis impacted the sense of self and identity of all of the participants. They all said words to the effect of 'it IS me,' rather than, 'this is something I have and will have to deal with'. (p.176)[60]

REFERENCES

1. Rose D, Thornicroft G. Service user perspectives on the impact of a mental illness diagnosis. *Epidemiol Psichiatr Soc* 2010; **19**: 140–7 doi:10.1017/S1121189X00000841
2. Hayne YM. Experiencing psychiatric diagnosis: client perspectives on being named mentally ill. *J Psychiatr Ment Health Nurs* 2003; **10**: 722–9 doi:10.1046/j.1365-2850.2003.00666.x
3. Loughland C, Cheng K, Harris G, et al. Communication of a schizophrenia diagnosis: A qualitative study of patients' perspectives. *Int J Soc Psychiatry* 2015; **61**: 729–34 doi:10.1177/0020764015576814
4. Pitt L, Kilbride M, Welford M, Nothard S, Morrison AP. Impact of a diagnosis of psychosis: user-led qualitative study. *Psychiatric Bull* 2009; **33**: 419–23 doi:10.1192/pb.bp.108.022863
5. Hagen B, Nixon G. Spider in a Jar: Women Who Have Recovered From Psychosis and Their Experience of the Mental Health Care System. *Ethical Human Psychol Psychiatry* 2011; **13**: 47–63 doi:10.1891/1559-4343.13.1.47
6. Horn N, Johnstone L, Brooke S. Some service user perspectives on the diagnosis of Borderline Personality Disorder. *J Ment Health* 2007; **16**: 255–69 doi:10.1080/09638230601056371
7. Stalker K, Ferguson I, Barclay A. 'It is a horrible term for someone': service user and provider perspectives on 'personality disorder'. *Disabil Soc* 2005; **20**: 359–73 doi:10.1080/09687590500086443
8. Al-Busaidi ZQ. Qualitative Research and its Uses in Health Care. *Sultan Qaboos University Medical Journal* 2008; **8**: 11–9
9. Clafferty RA, McCabe E, Brown KW. Conspiracy of silence? Telling patients with schizophrenia their diagnosis. *Psychiatric Bull* 2001; **25**: 336–9 doi:10.1192/pb.25.9.336
10. Milton AC, Mullan B, Hunt C. Information giving challenges and support strategies at the time of a mental health diagnosis: qualitative views from Australian health professionals. *Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol* 2016; **51**: 735–46 doi:10.1007/s00127-016-1187-6
11. Sulzer SH, Muenchow E, Potvin A, Harris J, Gigot G. Improving patient-centered communication of the borderline personality disorder diagnosis. *J Ment Health* 2016; **25**: 5–9 doi:10.3109/09638237.2015.1022253
12. Milton AC, Mullan BA. Communication of a mental health diagnosis: a systematic synthesis and narrative review. *J Ment Health* 2014; **23**: 261–70 doi: 10.3109/09638237.2014.951474
13. WHO. International Classification of Diseases (ICD) Information Sheet. http://www.who.int/classifications/icd/factsheet/en (accessed Oct 20, 2017)
14. Hwang W-C. Diagnostic Nondisclosure of Schizophrenia to Chinese American Patients. *Asian J Counselling* 2008; **15**: 1–31
15. Lampe L, Shadbolt N, Starcevic V, et al. Diagnostic processes in mental health: GPs and psychiatrists reading from the same book but on a different page. *Australas Psychiatry* 2012; **20**: 374–8 doi: 10.1177/1039856212458007
16. Outram S, Harris G, Kelly B, et al. Communicating a Schizophrenia Diagnosis to Patients and Families: A Qualitative Study of Mental Health Clinicians. *Psychiatr Serv* 2014; **65**: 551–4 doi:10.1176/appi.ps.201300202
17. van Rijswijk E, van Hout H, van de Lisdonk E, Zitman F, van Weel C. Barriers in recognising, diagnosing and managing depressive and anxiety disorders as experienced by Family Physicians; a focus group study. *BMC Fam Pract* 2009; **10**: 52–8 doi:10.1186/1471-2296-10-52
18. Reed GM. Toward ICD-11: Improving the clinical utility of WHO's International Classification of mental disorders. *Prof Psychol* 2010; **41**: 457–64 doi:10.1037/a0021701
19. Shepherd G, Boardman J, Slade M. Making Recovery a Reality. *Sainsbury Centre for Mental Health*. 2008. http://www.mentalhealthrecoverystories.hscni.net/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/Making-recovery-a-reality-policy.pdf (accessed Oct 20, 2017)
20. Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP) Qualitative Checklist. 2013. http://www.casp-uk.net/casp-tools-checklists (accessed Oct 20, 2017)
21. Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *Int J Qual Health Care* 2007; **19**: 349–57 doi:10.1093/intqhc/mzm042
22. NVivo. NVivo product range. 2017. http://www.qsrinternational.com/nvivo/nvivo-products (accessed Oct 20, 2017)
23. Schütz A. Collected papers 1. The Hague, Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff; 1962
24. Thomas J, Harden A. Methods for the thematic synthesis of qualitative research in systematic reviews. *BMC Med Res Methodology* 2008; **8**: 45–54 doi:10.1186/1471-2288-8-45
25. Rose D. Collaborative research between users and professionals: peaks and pitfalls. *The Psychiatrist* 2003; **27**: 404–6 doi:10.1192/pb.27.11.404

26. Walshe K, Davies HTO. Health research, development and innovation in England from 1988 to 2013: from research production to knowledge mobilization. *J Health Serv Res Policy* 2013; **18**: 1–12 doi:10.1177/1355819613502011

27. Link BG, Phelan JC. Conceptualizing Stigma. *Ann Rev Soc* 2001; **27**: 363–85 doi:10.1146/annurev.soc.27.1.363

28. Collins R, Firth L, Shakespeare T. "Very much evolving": a qualitative study of the views of psychiatrists about peer support workers. *J Ment Health* 2016; 25: 278–83 doi:10.3109/09638237.2016.1167858

29. Macneil CA, Hasty MK, Conus P, Berk M. Is diagnosis enough to guide interventions in mental health? Using case formulation in clinical practice. *BMC Medicine* 2012; 10: 111–3 doi:10.1186/1741-7015-10-111

30. British Psychological Society. Good Practice Guidelines on the use of psychological formulation. 2011. http://www.bps.org.uk/system/files/Public%20files/DCP/cat-842.pdf (accessed Oct 20, 2017)

31. NICE. Shared decision making. https://www.nice.org.uk/about/what-we-do/our-programmes/nice-guidance/nice-guidelines/shared-decision-making (accessed Jan 10, 2018)

32. Aref-Adib G, O'Hanlon P, Fullarton K, et al. A qualitative study of online mental health information seeking behaviour by those with psychosis. *BMC Psychiatry* 2016; **16**: 232–41 doi:10.1186/s12888-016-0952-0

33. Baik S-Y, Bowers BJ, Oakley LD, Susman JL. The Recognition of Depression: The Primary Care Clinician's Perspective. *Ann Fam Med* 2005; **3**: 31–7 doi:10.1370/afm.239

34. Barker P. Points of view. *Nursing Times* 1994; **90**: 66–8

35. Barnable A, Gaudine A, Bennett L, Meadus R. Having a sibling with schizophrenia: A phenomenological study. *Res Theory Nurs Pract* 2006; **20**: 247–64

36. Bartsch DR, Roberts RM, Davies M, Proeve M. Understanding the Experience of Parents with a Diagnosis of Borderline Personality Disorder. *Aust Psychol* 2016; **51**: 472–80 doi:10.1111/ap.12174

37. Bilderbeck AC, Saunders KE, Price J, Goodwin GM. Psychiatric assessment of mood instability: qualitative study of patient experience. *Br J Psychiatry* 2014; **204**: 234–9 doi:10.1192/bjp.bp.113.128348

38. Black G, Thornicroft G, Murray J. What do people in forensic secure and community settings think of their personality disorder diagnosis? A qualitative study. *Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol* 2013; **48**: 1161–8 doi:10.1007/s00127-012-0616-4

39. Bonnington O, Rose D. Exploring stigmatisation among people diagnosed with either bipolar disorder or borderline personality disorder: a critical realist analysis. *Soc Sci Med* 2014; **123**: 7–17 doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2014.10.048

40. Bril-Barniv S, Moran GS, Naaman A, Roe D, Karnieli-Miller O. A Qualitative Study Examining Experiences and Dilemmas in Concealment and Disclosure of People Living With Serious Mental Illness. *Qual Health Res* 2017; **27**: 573–83 doi:10.1177/1049732316673581

41. Carney PA, Rhodes LA, Eliassen MS, et al. Variations in approaching the diagnosis of depression: a guided focus group study. *J Fam Pract* 1998; **46**: 73–82

42. Castillo H. Temperament or trauma? Users' views on the nature and treatment of personality disorder. *Ment Health Learn Disabil Care* 2000; **4**: 53–8

43. Castillo H. You don't know what it's like. *Ment Health Care* 2000; **4**: 42–3. http://heathercastilloconsultancy.co.uk/Files/PDYouDon'tKnowWhatIt'sLike.pdf (accessed Oct 20, 2017)

44. Castillo H. A dangerous diagnosis. *Ment Health Today* 2003; 27–30.

45. Castillo H, Allen L, Coxhead N. The hurtfulness of a diagnosis: user research about personality disorder. *Ment Health Pract* 2001; **4**: 16–9 doi:10.7748/mhp.4.9.16.s16

46. Charles M, O'Loughlin M. The complex subject of psychosis. *Psychoanal Cult Soc* 2012; **17**: 410–21 doi:10.1057/pcs.2012.30

47. de Oliveira RM, Rodrigues PCB, Furegato ARF, Júnior ACS. The meaning and implications of schizophrenia from the perspective of people who experience it. *Acta Scientiarum* 2013; **35**: 77–84 doi:10.4025/actascihealthsci.v35i1.11007

48. Delmas K, Proudfoot J, Parker G, Manicavasagar V. Recording past experiences: a qualitative study of how patients and family members adjust to the diagnosis of bipolar disorder. *J Nerv Ment Dis* 2012; **200**: 920–3 doi:10.1097/NMD.0b013e318271a75e

49. Dinos S, Stevens S, Serfaty M, Weich S, King M. Stigma: the feelings and experiences of 46 people with mental illness. *Br J Psychiatry* 2004; **184**: 176–81 doi:10.1192/bjp.184.2.176

50. Farzad Nawabi P. Lifting the Veil on Invisible Identities: A Grounded Theory of Self-Disclosure for College Students with Mood Disorders. *University of Maryland*. 2004. http://drum.lib.umd.edu/bitstream/handle/1903/1750/umi-umd-1726.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y (accessed Oct 20, 2017)

51. Ferriter M, Huband N. Experiences of parents with a son or daughter suffering from schizophrenia. *J Psychiatr Ment Health Nurs* 2003; **10**: 552–60 doi:10.1046/j.1365-2850.2003.00624.x

52. Fletcher K, Parker G, Tully L. Patient satisfaction with the Black Dog Institute Depression Clinic. *Australas Psychiatry* 2008; **16**: 27–32 doi:10.1080/10398560701784805

53. Ford E, Campion A, Chamles DA, Habash-Bailey H, Cooper M. "You don't immediately stick a label on them": a qualitative study of influences on general practitioners' recording of anxiety disorders. *BMJ Open* 2016; **6**: e010746 doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2015-010746

54. Frank DM, Davidson L. Experiences of Self-Esteem in Outpatients Diagnosed With Psychosis: A Phenomenological Study. *J Humanistic Psychol* 2012; **52**: 304–20 doi:10.1177/0022167811410603

55. Frese FJ III, Myrick KJ. On consumer advocacy and the diagnosis of mental disorders. *Professional Psychol Res Pract* 2010; **41**: 495–501 doi:10.1037/a0021527

56. Gallagher A, Arber A, Chaplin R, Quirk A. Service users' experience of receiving bad news about their mental health. *J Ment Health* 2010; **19**: 34–42 doi:10.3109/09638230903469137

57. Gammell DJ, Stoppard JM. Women's experiences of treatment of depression: Medicalization or empowerment? *Can Psychol* 1999; **40**: 112–28 doi:10.1037/h0086831

58. Giacon BCC, Galera SAF. Ajustamento familiar após o surgimento da esquizofrenia. *Rev Bras Enferm* 2013; **66**: 321–6 doi:10.1590/S0034-71672013000300003

59. Goicoechea J. Diagnostic disclosure in patient-staff interactions: A conversation analysis clarified by participant interviews. In: Fischer CT. (ed.) *Qualitative Research Methods for Psychologists: Introduction through Empirical Studies*. London, Academic Press; 2006: 111–40

60. Goldberg SG. The social construction of bipolar disorder: the interrelationship between societal and individual meanings. *Fielding Graduate University*. 2007. http://www.taosinstitute.net/websites/taos/images/resourcesnoteworthy/goldbergdissertation.pdf (accessed Oct 20, 2017)

61. Harding S, Schattner P, Brijnath B. How general practitioners manage mental illness in culturally and linguistically diverse patients: an exploratory study. *Aust Fam Physician* 2015; **44**: 147–52

62. Highet NJ, McNair BG, Thompson M, Davenport TA, Hickie IB. Experience with treatment services for people with bipolar disorder. *Med J Aust* 2004; **181** (suppl 7): S47–51

63. Hunt D, Churchill R. Diagnosing and managing anorexia nervosa in UK primary care: a focus group study. *Fam Pract* 2013; **30**: 459–65 doi:10.1093/fampra/cmt013

64. Jönsson PD, Wijk H, Skärsäter I, Danielson E. Persons living with bipolar disorder - their view of the illness and the future. *Issues Ment Health Nurs* 2008; **29**: 1217–36 doi:10.1080/01612840802370764

65. Karp DA. Speaking of Sadness: Depression, Disconnection, and the Meanings of Illness. Oxford, Oxford University Press; 1996

66. Karp DA, Tanarugsachock V. Mental illness, caregiving, and emotion management. *Qual Health Res* 2000; **10**: 6–25 doi:10.1177/104973200129118219

67. Keating F, Robertson D. Fear, black people and mental illness: a vicious circle? *Health Soc Care Community* 2004; **12**: 439–47 doi:10.1111/j.1365-2524.2004.00506.x

68. Krupchanka D, Kruk N, Murray J, et al. Experience of stigma in private life of relatives of people diagnosed with schizophrenia in the Republic of Belarus. *Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol* 2016; **51**: 757–65 doi:10.1007/s00127-016-1190-y

69. Krupchanka D, Kruk N, Sartorius N, Davey S, Winkler P, Murray J. Experience of stigma in the public life of relatives of people diagnosed with schizophrenia in the Republic of Belarus. *Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol* 2017; **52**: 493–501 doi:10.1007/s00127-017-1365-1

70. Leff MS, Vrubļevska J, Lūse A, Rancāns E. Latvian family physicians' experience diagnosing depression in somatically presenting depression patients: A qualitative study. *Eur J Gen Pract* 2017; **23**: 91–7 doi:10.1080/13814788.2017.1291626

71. Lewis SE. A search for meaning: making sense of depression. *J Ment Health* 1995; **4**: 369–82 doi:10.1080/09638239550037424

72. Lovell LJ, Hardy G. Having a diagnosis of borderline personality disorder in a forensic setting: a qualitative exploration. *J Forensic Pract* 2014; **16**: 228–40 doi:10.1108/JFP-01-2014-0003

73. McCormack L, Thomson S. Complex trauma in childhood, a psychiatric diagnosis in adulthood: Making meaning of a double-edged phenomenon. *Psychol Trauma* 2017; **9**: 156–65 doi:10.1037/tra0000193

74. McMahon J, Lawn S. *FOUNDATIONS FOR CHANGE: PART 1 – CONSUMERS: Experiences of CONSUMERS with the Diagnosis of Borderline Personality Disorder (BPD)*. Private Mental Health Consumer Carer Network: Marden, Australia; 2011

75. McMahon J, Lawn S. *FOUNDATIONS FOR CHANGE: PART 2 – CARERS: Experiences of CARERS supporting someone with the Diagnosis of Borderline Personality Disorder (BPD)*. Private Mental Health Consumer Carer Network: Marden, Australia; 2011

76. Milton AC, Mullan BA. A qualitative exploration of service users' information needs and preferences when receiving a serious mental health diagnosis. *Community Ment Health J* 2015; **51**: 459–66 doi:10.1007/s10597-014-9761-4

77. Mitchell C, Dwyer R, Hagan T, Mathers N. Impact of the QOF and the NICE guideline in the diagnosis and management of depression: a qualitative study. *Br J Gen Pract* 2011; **61**: e279–89 doi:10.3399/bjgp11X572472

78. Morris C, Smith I, Alwin N. Is contact with adult mental health services helpful for individuals with a diagnosable BPD? A study of service users views in the UK. *J Ment Health* 2014; **23**: 251–5 doi:10.3109/09638237.2014.951483

79. Nehls N. Borderline Personality Disorder: The Voice of Patients. *Res Nurs Health* 1999; **22**: 285–93 doi:10.1002/(SICI)1098-240X(199908)22:4<285::AID-NUR3>3.0.CO;2-R

80. Outram S, Harris G, Kelly B, et al. Contextual Barriers to Discussing a Schizophrenia Diagnosis with Patients and Families: Need for Leadership and Teamwork Training in Psychiatry. *Acad Psychiatry* 2015; **39**: 174–80 doi:10.1007/s40596-014-0226-4

81. Petersen A, Madsen OJ. Depression: Diagnosis and suffering as process. *Nordic Psychol* 2017; **69**: 19–32 doi:10.1080/19012276.2016.1267913

82. Proudfoot JG, Parker GB, Benoit M, Manicavasagar V, Smith M, Gayed A. What happens after diagnosis? Understanding the experiences of patients with newly-diagnosed bipolar disorder. *Health Expectations* 2009; **12**: 120–9 doi:10.1111/j.1369-7625.2009.00541.x

83. Ramon S, Castillo H, Morant N. Experiencing personality disorder: a participative research. *Int J Soc Psychiatry* 2001; **47**: 1–15 doi:10.1177/002076400104700401

84. Rogers B, Dunne E. A qualitative study on the use of the care programme approach with individuals with borderline personality disorder: a service user perspective. *J Psychosoc Nurs Ment Health Serv* 2013; **51**: 38–45 doi:10.3928/02793695-20130628-03

85. Rogers B, Dunne E. 'They told me I had this personality disorder … all of a sudden I was wasting their time': personality disorder and the inpatient experience. *J Ment Health* 2011; **20**: 226–33 doi:10.3109/09638237.2011.556165

86. Rumpza LM. Borderline Personality Disorder: The Frequency of Disclosure and the Choice to Disclose. *Walden University.* 2015. http://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1500&context=dissertations (accessed Oct 20, 2017)

87. Saver BG, Van-Nguyen V, Keppel G, Doescher MP. A qualitative study of depression in primary care: missed opportunities for diagnosis and education. *J Am Board Fam Med* 2007; **20**: 28–35 doi:10.3122/jabfm.2007.01.060026

88. Stoppard JM, Gammell DJ. Depressed women's treatment experiences: exploring themes of medicalisation and empowerment. In: Stoppard JM, McMullen LM. (eds.) *Situating Sadness: Women and Depression in Social Context*. New York, New York University Press; 2003: 39–61

89. Sulzer SH. Borderline Personality Disorder: Clinical Navigation of Stigma, Communication and the Reimbursable Patient. *University of Wisconsin-Madison*. 2012

90. Thomas-MacLean R, Stoppard JM. Physicians' constructions of depression: inside/outside the boundaries of medicalization. *Health* 2004; **8**: 275–94 doi:10.1177/1363459304043461

91. Tuck I, du Mont P, Evans G, Shupe J. The Experience of Caring for an Adult Child with Schizophrenia. *APN* 1997; **11**: 118–25 doi:10.1016/S0883-9417(97)80034-9

92. Venhaus CK. Social construction of mental illness among rural and frontier persons with severe and persistent mental illness. *Fielding Graduate University*. 2009

93. Wheeler C. The diagnosis of schizophrenia and its impact on the primary caregiver. *Nurs Prax N Z* 1994; **9**: 15–23

94. Wittink MN, Barg FK, Gallo JJ. Unwritten rules of talking to doctors about depression: integrating qualitative and quantitative methods. *Ann Fam Med* 2006; **4**: 302–9 doi:10.1370/afm.558

95. Wittink MN, Dahlberg B, Biruk C, Barg FK. How Older Adults Combine Medical and Experiential Notions of Depression. *Qual Health Res* 2008; **18**: 1174–83 doi:10.1177/1049732308321737

96. Wittkampf KA, van Zwieten M, Smits FTh, Schene AH, Huyser J, van Weert HC. Patients' view on screening for depression in general practice. *Fam Pract* 2008; **25**: 438–44 doi:10.1093/fampra/cmn057