Antisocial Personality Disorder: A Multidimensional Understanding of Structural, Functional, and Biochemical Psychopathology

A Continuing Education Reading Manual for Licensed Psychologists and Graduate-Level Clinicians

---

Title Page

Antisocial Personality Disorder: A Multidimensional Understanding of Structural, Functional, and Biochemical Psychopathology

A Continuing Education Reading Manual for Licensed Psychologists and Graduate-Level Clinicians

Prepared as an integrated synthesis of contemporary neuropsychiatric and psychological literature on antisocial personality disorder, this manuscript examines the disorder through etiological, structural, functional, and biochemical lenses. The material is designed for advanced clinical education and is written in a scholarly, publication-oriented style suitable for continuing education accreditation review.

Abstract

Antisocial personality disorder (ASPD) is among the most clinically consequential and socially costly of the personality disorders, characterized by pervasive disregard for the rights of others, deficient empathy, guiltlessness, shamelessness, impulsivity, and a proclivity toward exploitative or unlawful conduct. Although the disorder is estimated to affect between 1% and 4% of the general population, its clinical footprint is disproportionately large because of its association with criminal justice involvement, substance use, comorbid psychiatric conditions,

and diminished quality of life for both patients and those around them. This manuscript synthesizes contemporary evidence regarding the etiology and psychopathology of ASPD, integrating findings from genetic, environmental, neurostructural, neurofunctional, and neurochemical research. Twin and family studies converge on the conclusion that ASPD is substantially heritable, with candidate genes such as *SLC6A4*, *COMT*, *5-HTR2A*, *TPH1*, *DRD2*, *OXTR*, *CACNG8*, and *COL25A1* implicated in risk profiles. Environmental determinants, including adverse childhood experiences (ACEs), disrupted family systems, low intellectual attainment, parental criminality, and early empathy deficits, interact with genotype to shape trajectories toward antisocial behavior. Structural neuroimaging consistently reveals reductions in prefrontal gray matter, corpus callosal abnormalities, and altered volumes across amygdala, putamen, and hippocampus, while functional imaging identifies aberrant connectivity within fronto-parietal, sensorimotor, and cortico-striatal networks. Biochemical investigations further implicate the serotonergic, dopaminergic, glutamatergic, and endocannabinoid systems, along with hormonal and inflammatory dysregulation involving testosterone, cortisol, ghrelin, leptin, tumor necrosis factor-α, interleukin-10, transforming growth factor-β1, and brain-derived neurotrophic factor. Despite the accumulating evidence base, no pharmacological agent has received U.S. Food and Drug Administration approval for the treatment of ASPD, and psychological interventions remain empirically underdeveloped. For psychologists, an integrated appreciation of the neurobiological substrates, developmental origins, and phenomenological expressions of ASPD is essential for accurate assessment, informed formulation, and thoughtful clinical engagement (Wong, 2023).

---

1. Introduction

Personality disorders occupy a distinctive place in the landscape of psychopathology. Unlike episodic affective or psychotic disorders, they are conceptualized as enduring patterns of inner experience and behavior that deviate markedly from the expectations of the individual's culture, are pervasive and inflexible, have their onset in adolescence or early adulthood, are stable over time, and lead to distress or impairment. Within this broad category, antisocial personality disorder (ASPD) is unique in its consistent association with harm to others, its long history of interest to both clinical and forensic disciplines, and the moral, legal, and philosophical questions it raises regarding responsibility, culpability, and the boundaries

between disorder and deviance.

For psychologists, ASPD presents a distinctive set of clinical challenges. Patients with the disorder rarely seek treatment on their own initiative, frequently present in involuntary or coerced contexts such as court-mandated evaluations or correctional settings, and often display interpersonal characteristics—manipulation, deceit, callousness—that complicate the therapeutic alliance. Comorbidity is the rule rather than the exception, with substance use disorders, mood disorders, anxiety disorders, and schizophrenia-spectrum conditions frequently overlaying the antisocial presentation (Wong, 2023). These realities demand that clinicians possess not only phenomenological familiarity with the disorder but also an appreciation of its underlying biological substrates, its developmental origins, and the interplay between constitutional and environmental factors that produce the mature antisocial presentation.

This manuscript is designed to provide such an integrated understanding. Rather than treating ASPD as a purely behavioral or moral phenomenon, it approaches the disorder as a complex neurodevelopmental condition arising from the confluence of genetic predisposition, adverse early experience, and altered neurobiology. The material draws exclusively upon a comprehensive contemporary review of the disorder's structural, functional, and biochemical psychopathology (Wong, 2023), synthesizing evidence across studies to construct a coherent narrative appropriate for advanced clinical education. The intent is not merely to catalog findings but to convey the theoretical and mechanistic significance of what has been learned, and to consider how such knowledge can inform assessment, formulation, and clinical engagement with a population that has historically been regarded as difficult, dangerous, and largely untreatable.

The manuscript begins by situating ASPD within the broader nosological context of personality disorders, examining how classification systems have evolved to accommodate dimensional as well as categorical approaches. It then considers the etiology of the disorder, drawing on twin studies, molecular genetics, and developmental research. Structural and functional neuroimaging findings are examined next, followed by an exploration of biochemical and neuroendocrine correlates. The manuscript concludes with a discussion of clinical implications, methodological considerations, and directions for future research.

---

2. Historical and Theoretical Foundations

Conceptualizing Personality

Any discussion of personality disorder must begin with the deceptively simple question of what personality is. Definitions abound in the psychological literature, and no single formulation has attained universal acceptance. Larsen and Buss (2018), for example, describe personality as "the set of psychological traits and mechanisms within the individual that are organized and relatively enduring and that influence his or her interactions with, and adaptations to, the intrapsychic, physical, and social environments" (as cited in Wong, 2023, p. 2). More prosaic definitions, such as that offered by the Cambridge Dictionary, describe personality as "the special combination of qualities in a person that makes that person different from others, as shown by the way the person behaves, feels, and thinks" (as cited in Wong, 2023, p. 2). What such definitions share is an emphasis on stability, distinctiveness, and behavioral expression—qualities that make personality both a useful clinical construct and a notoriously difficult one to measure with precision.

The theoretical understanding of personality has long been shaped by the enduring "nature versus nurture" debate. Hans Eysenck, one of the most influential biological theorists of the twentieth century, argued that personality has a fundamentally biological foundation (Wong, 2023). Others, including Turkheimer and Gottesman (1991) and Turkheimer (2000), have gone further, proposing that essentially all human behavioral traits are heritable to some degree. Yet contemporary research has largely moved beyond dichotomous framings. The influential meta-analysis by Polderman and colleagues (2015), synthesizing data from more than fourteen million twin pairs across nearly three thousand publications, concluded that genetic factors account for approximately fifty percent of the variance in any given trait, with the remainder attributable to environmental influences—particularly non-shared environmental factors—and measurement error (Wong, 2023). Barlow (2019) has argued forcefully that framing personality development as a contest between nature and nurture is not merely inaccurate but conceptually incoherent; the two influences are inextricably intertwined, and a mature developmental psychology must treat them as such.

The Nosology of Personality Disorders

The classification of personality disorders has itself been a moving target. The fifth edition of the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (DSM-5; American Psychiatric Association, 2013) organizes personality disorders into four categories: Cluster A (odd or eccentric), Cluster B (dramatic, emotional, or erratic), Cluster C (anxious or fearful), and other personality disorders. For a diagnosis to be made, an individual must demonstrate significant impairments in self and interpersonal functioning that are stable across time and situations, along with the presence of pathological personality traits characteristic of the specific disorder (Wong, 2023).

The World Health Organization's *International Classification of Diseases, Eleventh Revision* (ICD-11), by contrast, has abandoned the categorical approach in favor of a dimensional one. Personality disorders are now classified according to severity—mild, moderate, severe, or unspecified—with additional trait domain qualifiers including anankastia, borderline pattern, detachment, disinhibition, dissociality, and negative affectivity (Bach & First, 2018, as cited in Wong, 2023). Under this framework, the phenomenological territory covered by DSM-5's ASPD is captured largely by the dissociality trait domain, which is characterized by disregard for the feelings and rights of others, self-centeredness, ruthlessness, and manipulative or deceptive interpersonal conduct.

This nosological transition reflects broader disciplinary tensions between categorical and dimensional models of psychopathology. Categorical systems offer clinical convenience and communicative clarity but impose artificial boundaries on what may be continuously distributed phenomena. Dimensional systems more faithfully represent the graded nature of personality pathology but sacrifice some diagnostic parsimony. For the clinician working with an individual who displays antisocial features, both frameworks can be illuminating: the categorical diagnosis anchors the presentation within a recognizable syndrome, while dimensional trait descriptions capture the individual's particular configuration of severity and character.

Epidemiological Scope

The public health significance of personality disorders is substantial. A systematic review and meta-analysis of forty-six studies across twenty-six countries reported a worldwide pooled prevalence of 7.8% for any personality disorder, with cluster-specific rates of 3.8% for Cluster A, 2.8% for Cluster B, and 5.0% for Cluster C (Winsper et al., 2020, as cited in Wong, 2023).

Heterogeneity across studies was substantial, reflecting differences in assessment methodology, income context, and interviewer training. For ASPD specifically, lifetime prevalence estimates typically range from 1% to 4%, with the disorder occurring approximately three times more often in males than in females (Lenzenweger et al., 2007; Trull et al., 2010, as cited in Wong, 2023). Prevalence appears to peak in early adulthood, reaching approximately 3.91% in younger adults before declining to less than 1% among those aged sixty-five and older (Holzer et al., 2022, as cited in Wong, 2023). This age-related decline should not, however, be taken to imply spontaneous resolution; older adults with ASPD are more likely to present with medical and psychiatric comorbidities, complicating both recognition and management.

The Clinical Phenotype

The DSM-5 (American Psychiatric Association, 2013) portrays the individual with ASPD as egocentric, deriving self-esteem from power, pleasure, or personal gain, and orienting goals around personal gratification without regard to lawful or culturally normative constraints. The pathological traits central to the disorder cluster around disinhibition and antagonism, which manifest behaviorally as manipulation, deceit, callousness, hostility, irresponsibility, impulsivity, and risk-taking that may be self-damaging. Empathy is characteristically diminished, and remorse for harm inflicted on others is largely absent (Wong, 2023).

An important conceptual distinction must be drawn between ASPD and psychopathy. Although the two constructs share substantial phenotypic territory, they are not synonymous. Psychopathy, as elaborated by forensic researchers, is not recognized as a formal diagnosis within DSM-5 or ICD-11, and available evidence suggests that only approximately one-third of individuals meeting criteria for ASPD also meet criteria for psychopathy (Abdalla-Filho & Völlm, 2020, as cited in Wong, 2023). Some manifestations of psychopathy, moreover, correspond more closely with other Cluster B personality disorders than with ASPD proper. The distinction matters clinically because psychopathy—with its emphasis on interpersonal-affective features such as glibness, grandiosity, and shallow affect—may confer different implications for treatment response, recidivism risk, and forensic evaluation than ASPD as strictly defined.

Developmental Trajectory

ASPD is fundamentally a developmental disorder, with roots extending deep into childhood. DSM-5 requires evidence of conduct disorder before the age of fifteen for the adult diagnosis to be made, formalizing the observation that the antisocial trajectory typically begins early and persists (Wong, 2023). Simonoff and colleagues (2004) demonstrated that childhood hyperactivity and conduct disorder predict ASPD and criminal behavior in adulthood, while lower intelligence quotient and reading difficulties are associated with childhood and adolescent antisocial conduct (as cited in Wong, 2023). Black (2015) has characterized the natural history of the disorder as one of gradual emergence, with features often evident as early as age eight and full manifestation typically achieved by early adulthood (as cited in Wong, 2023).

The distinction between life-course-persistent and adolescence-limited antisocial behavior, which has become influential in developmental psychopathology, receives empirical support from neuroimaging findings that will be examined later in this manuscript. For now, it suffices to note that not all antisocial adolescents become antisocial adults; only a subset—those whose antisocial behavior reflects an underlying, stable neurobiological predisposition—appears to persist into adult ASPD.

---

3. Conceptual Models and Mechanisms

Understanding ASPD requires a conceptual framework capable of integrating multiple levels of analysis, from molecular genetics through neural systems to psychosocial context. No single model has achieved dominance in the field, but several complementary frameworks together offer a coherent account of how the disorder arises and expresses itself.

The Diathesis-Stress Framework

The most widely applied conceptual model for ASPD is the diathesis-stress framework, which posits that genetic and constitutional vulnerabilities interact with environmental adversity to produce psychopathology. Applied to ASPD, this framework accommodates the substantial heritability of the disorder while acknowledging the equally robust evidence that adverse childhood experiences, family dysfunction, and other environmental factors contribute independently and interactively to risk. Genetic and environmental influences are not simply

additive; rather, they interact multiplicatively, such that certain genotypes confer increased vulnerability specifically in the context of environmental adversity. The moderating effect of the *5-HTTLPR* genotype on the relationship between adverse childhood experiences and ASPD risk in African American women, as reported by Douglas and colleagues (2011), exemplifies this gene-by-environment interaction (as cited in Wong, 2023).

Neurodevelopmental Models

A second conceptual approach frames ASPD as a neurodevelopmental disorder characterized by altered maturation of prefrontal-limbic circuits responsible for emotion regulation, moral reasoning, empathy, and executive control. Under this view, the observed structural and functional abnormalities in prefrontal cortex, amygdala, and their interconnections are not epiphenomenal but causally implicated in the phenotype. Reduced prefrontal gray matter, atypical corpus callosal development, and altered functional connectivity within cortico-striatal loops together produce the characteristic deficits in decision-making, emotional processing, and behavioral inhibition (Raine et al., 2000; Raine et al., 2003, as cited in Wong, 2023).

Neurodevelopmental models are particularly well suited to explaining the age of onset and stability of ASPD. If the neural substrates of moral emotion, empathy, and executive control develop abnormally beginning in early life, one would expect early behavioral manifestations (conduct disorder), persistence through adolescence and into adulthood, and resistance to interventions that assume typical neural function.

Integrated Biopsychosocial Models

The most theoretically satisfying frameworks for ASPD are integrative, treating the disorder as the emergent product of interacting genetic, neurobiological, developmental, and social influences. Under such models, no single factor is causally sufficient; rather, ASPD arises when multiple risk factors converge and mutually potentiate one another. A child with a genetic loading for serotonergic dysregulation, born into a family characterized by parental criminality, low socioeconomic status, and harsh or inconsistent discipline, and exposed to maltreatment during sensitive developmental periods, faces a compounded risk that no single factor could produce in isolation.

Such integrative models also accommodate the observation that not all individuals with elevated risk develop ASPD. Protective factors—stable attachment relationships, cognitive strengths, favorable temperamental characteristics, and access to prosocial peer environments—can attenuate risk even in the presence of substantial vulnerability. Langevin and colleagues (2019), for example, demonstrated that haplotypes across eleven serotonergic genes contribute to both cumulative risk and cumulative protection with respect to antisocial behavior, illustrating that genetic influences can operate in both directions (as cited in Wong, 2023).

Figure 1 (conceptual): An integrated model of ASPD would depict genetic vulnerabilities (including polymorphisms in serotonergic, dopaminergic, and oxytocin-related genes) feeding into neurodevelopmental trajectories that shape prefrontal-limbic circuit maturation. Environmental adversities (adverse childhood experiences, family dysfunction, community disadvantage) would be shown as modulating these trajectories, either exacerbating vulnerability or, in their absence, permitting more favorable development. The convergence of these influences would produce the mature phenotype—empathy deficits, disinhibition, antagonism, and callousness—that constitutes the clinical presentation of ASPD.

---

4. Empirical Findings Across Studies

Genetic Contributions

The evidence for a substantial genetic contribution to ASPD is now overwhelming. Twin and family studies have consistently demonstrated that genetic factors account for a significant proportion of the variance in antisocial behavior. Ferguson (2010) reviewed the genetic epidemiology of ASPD and concluded that genetic influences explain approximately 56% of the observed variance, with shared environmental factors accounting for 11% and unique environmental factors for 31% (as cited in Wong, 2023). Notably, genetic influences appear to exert greater predictive power in younger individuals than in adults, suggesting that environmental factors accumulate importance over the developmental course.

A longitudinal twin study by Tuvblad and colleagues (2011), drawing on 2,600 twin pairs from a Swedish registry, examined the etiology of antisocial behavior across four age groups

spanning childhood through emerging adulthood. Common genetic influences accounted for 67% of the total variance, with 26% attributable to shared environmental factors and 7% to non-shared environmental influences. Notably, age-specific environmental factors—particularly peer influences—became significant during adolescence, indicating that the environmental architecture of antisocial behavior shifts developmentally (as cited in Wong, 2023).

Vaughn and colleagues (2015) approached the question from a multigenerational perspective, examining family histories of behavior problems among 1,226 individuals with ASPD. Their analysis identified three distinct familial patterns: a majority (70.3%) with minimal family history of behavior problems and higher socioeconomic functioning; a smaller group (9.4%) with parental and offspring behavior problems, elevated psychopathology, substance use, and criminal conduct; and a third group (20.3%) with multigenerational histories of behavior problems and pervasive psychopathology, alcoholism, and versatile criminal offending (as cited in Wong, 2023). These findings underscore the heterogeneity of the ASPD population and suggest that different subgroups may have distinct genetic-environmental etiologies.

Candidate Genes

Molecular genetic research has identified a growing list of candidate genes associated with ASPD, most of which participate in neurotransmitter systems relevant to mood, aggression, impulsivity, and social behavior. The serotonergic system has received particular attention. The *SLC6A4* gene, located on chromosome 17q11.1–17q12, encodes the serotonin transporter responsible for reuptake of serotonin from the synaptic cleft. Its promoter region contains a polymorphism known as the serotonin-transporter-linked polymorphic region (*5-HTTLPR*), which has been extensively investigated for its associations with psychiatric disorders. Garcia and colleagues (2010) reported an incremental effect for genetic risk in ASPD when *5-HTTLPR* was combined with the *5-HTTVNTR* polymorphism, and Sah and colleagues (2021) observed significantly lower *SLC6A4* expression in Turkish criminals with ASPD compared with controls (as cited in Wong, 2023).

Langevin and colleagues (2019) extended this line of inquiry by examining eleven candidate serotonergic genes in a longitudinal cohort of individuals aged 6 to 23. Haplotypes—variants of multiple genes inherited together on a single chromosome—contributed to the variance in cumulative risk and protection with respect to adolescent delinquency, property and violent

crimes, and physical partner violence in early adulthood (as cited in Wong, 2023). The implication is that ASPD risk is not conferred by any single gene but emerges from the aggregate influence of many polymorphisms.

Beyond the serotonin transporter, other serotonergic and dopaminergic genes have been implicated. Cuartas Arias and colleagues (2011) reported that the L allele of the catechol-O-methyltransferase (*COMT*) gene was associated with ASPD symptoms, and that significant epistatic interactions occurred between *COMT*, *5-HTR2A*, and *TPH1* (as cited in Wong, 2023). Lu and colleagues (2012) identified an interaction between *ALDH2*11 and *DRD2/ANKK1 TaqI A1A1* genotypes, with the combined genotype conferring a 5.39-fold increased risk for ASPD in the absence of alcoholism (as cited in Wong, 2023).

The oxytocin system, given its role in social bonding and empathy, has been another focus of investigation. Waller and colleagues (2016) demonstrated that men, but not women, with the *OXTR* rs1042778 TT genotype showed elevated right amygdala reactivity to angry facial expressions and higher levels of antisocial behavior, illustrating how genetic variation in social-affiliative systems may contribute to sex differences in the antisocial phenotype (as cited in Wong, 2023).

Additional candidate genes include the calcium voltage-gated channel auxiliary subunit gamma 8 gene (*CACNG8*), which encodes the transmembrane AMPAR regulatory protein γ-8 and is involved in glutamatergic neurotransmission. Peng and colleagues (2021) reported that the *rs10420324G* polymorphism was more frequent in individuals with ASPD than in controls, and that TARP γ-8 knockout mice displayed antisocial-like behaviors accompanied by impaired AMPAR function in prefrontal pyramidal neurons (as cited in Wong, 2023). The collagen XXV alpha 1 gene (*COL25A1*) has also been implicated; Li and colleagues (2012) reported that the *rs13134663* single nucleotide polymorphism showed significant association with ASPD in both African American and European American samples, particularly in the context of substance dependence (as cited in Wong, 2023).

Environmental Contributions

Environmental determinants of ASPD are as varied as they are consequential. The distinction between shared and non-shared environmental influences is important: shared factors include family-level variables such as parenting practices, parental education, and socioeconomic

status, while non-shared factors include peer relationships and idiosyncratic experiences that differ even among siblings. Wesseldijk and colleagues (2018), examining twin pairs across three age groups, found that in children, genetic and shared environmental factors each accounted for approximately 43% and 44% of the variance in conduct problems, respectively. In adolescence and adulthood, however, this variance was more equally distributed between genetic and unique environmental factors, indicating a developmental shift in environmental architecture (as cited in Wong, 2023).

Adverse childhood experiences (ACEs) are among the most robust environmental predictors of ASPD. Stoltenborgh and colleagues (2015) reported that global prevalence rates of self-reported child maltreatment are strikingly high: 12.7% for sexual abuse, 22.6% for physical abuse, 36.3% for emotional abuse, 16.3% for physical neglect, and 18.4% for emotional neglect (as cited in Wong, 2023). Roberts and colleagues (2008), studying a cohort of 1,396 male prisoners, found that ACEs and victimization were more frequent among those with personality disorders than those without, and that the combination of a difficult temperament and childhood adversity substantially elevated risk (as cited in Wong, 2023).

Farrington's (2000) longitudinal study of 411 South London males, followed from age eight, identified a striking set of psychosocial predictors of adult antisocial personality: low intelligence or attainment, large family size, a convicted parent, a disrupted family, and a young mother. Among boys with a convicted parent at age ten, nearly half were antisocial at age thirty-two, and more than sixty percent of boys identified as high-risk at ages eight to ten proved to be antisocial by age thirty-two (as cited in Wong, 2023). Such findings speak to the remarkable stability of the antisocial trajectory once it is established, and to the potential value of early identification and intervention.

Douglas and colleagues (2011) provided an important demonstration of gene-environment interaction in a sample that included 203 individuals with ASPD. The *5-HTTLPR* genotype moderated the effect of adverse childhood experiences on ASPD risk among African American women; being male and having a history of ACEs significantly predicted ASPD among European Americans; and among African American men, the odds of ASPD increased with each additional ACE regardless of *5-HTTLPR* genotype (as cited in Wong, 2023). The interaction of genotype, race, sex, and environmental exposure illustrates the multidimensional complexity of ASPD etiology.

Yazgan and colleagues (2021) examined the mediating role of impaired passive avoidance in the relationship between cumulative early childhood adversity (from birth to age seven) and late adolescent antisocial behavior. Cumulative adversity predicted impaired passive avoidance, which in turn predicted later antisocial conduct, suggesting that neurocognitive deficits may serve as a mechanistic bridge between early adversity and adult outcomes (as cited in Wong, 2023). Rhee and colleagues (2021) further demonstrated that active empathy deficits observed in toddlerhood—characterized by disregard rather than mere absence of concern for others—predicted aggression, ASPD symptoms, and psychopathy factor 1 traits in adulthood, mediated by conduct problems in childhood or adolescence (as cited in Wong, 2023). The early emergence of such empathy deficits argues for the developmental primacy of these features and highlights a potential window for early identification.

---

5. Psychological Pathways and Stress Responses

The Prefrontal-Limbic Circuit

At the neural level, ASPD is best understood in terms of altered functioning within prefrontal-limbic circuits that support emotion regulation, empathy, moral reasoning, and executive control. The prefrontal cortex, particularly its ventromedial and orbitofrontal divisions, is critical for integrating emotional signals with decision-making and for inhibiting inappropriate behavior. The amygdala, in turn, is central to threat detection, fear conditioning, and processing of social-emotional stimuli. Dysfunction in either structure, or in their reciprocal connections, would be expected to produce precisely the phenotype seen in ASPD: diminished emotional resonance with the distress of others, impaired anticipation of consequences, weakened response to punishment, and disinhibited behavior.

Structural imaging findings, examined in greater detail in Section 6, converge on the observation that individuals with ASPD show reduced gray matter volume in prefrontal regions, along with altered corpus callosal architecture, amygdala morphology, and putamen volume. Functional findings similarly implicate reduced prefrontal activation, atypical amygdala responses to emotional stimuli, and altered connectivity within fronto-parietal and cortico-striatal networks (Wong, 2023).

Stress Response Systems

The stress response systems—the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal (HPA) axis and the autonomic nervous system (ANS)—show characteristic alterations in ASPD. Raine and colleagues (2000) observed reduced autonomic activity in the presence of a stressor among individuals with ASPD, a finding consistent with the broader observation that antisocial individuals often display attenuated physiological responses to arousing or threatening stimuli. This hypoarousal has been interpreted as reflecting a fundamental deficit in fear conditioning and in the aversive signaling that ordinarily promotes conformity to social rules (as cited in Wong, 2023).

Chen (2022) approached the stress response from a different angle, examining coordination between the HPA axis (indexed by cortisol) and the ANS (indexed by alpha amylase). Offenders showed stronger cortisol-alpha amylase stress coordination than non-offenders, and this heightened coordination correlated positively with antisocial behavior and negative urgency (as cited in Wong, 2023). The interpretation offered is that stronger cortisol-alpha amylase coupling may reflect an overactive ANS operating in the context of high emotional stress, providing a novel window on the interplay between physiological stress responses and behavioral dysregulation.

Empathy and Affective Processing

Perhaps the most clinically salient psychological feature of ASPD is the deficit in empathy. Rhee and colleagues (2021) drew an important distinction between passive empathy deficits (a lack of concern for others) and active empathy deficits (a disregard for others), demonstrating that active deficits observed in toddlerhood specifically predicted aggression, ASPD symptoms, and psychopathy factor 1 traits in adulthood, mediated by intervening conduct problems (as cited in Wong, 2023). This distinction has both theoretical and clinical value. Passive deficits may reflect an absence of empathic capacity, while active deficits imply a more affirmative orientation against the interests of others—a difference that may correspond to distinct neurobiological substrates and prognostic implications.

Moul and colleagues (2013) examined the callous-unemotional dimension of antisocial behavior in boys aged three to sixteen, finding that functional polymorphisms in the serotonin 1b receptor gene (*HTR1B*) and 2a receptor gene (*HTR2A*) were associated with

callous-unemotional traits, and that boys with high callous-unemotional traits showed significantly lower serum serotonin levels than those with low callous-unemotional traits (as cited in Wong, 2023). Such findings link the phenomenology of diminished empathy and remorselessness to identifiable neurochemical substrates.

---

6. Mental Health Outcomes and Severity Spectrum

The Structural Neuroanatomy of ASPD

Neuroimaging research has produced a substantial and largely consistent body of evidence regarding structural brain abnormalities in ASPD. The seminal study by Raine and colleagues (2000) compared prefrontal gray and white matter volumes in individuals with ASPD and controls using structural magnetic resonance imaging (MRI). Those with ASPD demonstrated an 11% reduction in prefrontal gray matter volume relative to controls, along with the reduced autonomic activity noted earlier. The authors argued that prefrontal abnormalities help explain the reduced arousal, poor decision-making, impaired fear conditioning, and diminished conscience that characterize antisocial behavior (as cited in Wong, 2023).

Subsequent research has extended these findings to other brain regions. Raine and colleagues (2003) demonstrated that psychopathic antisocial individuals showed increased estimated white matter volume in the corpus callosum along with reduced callosal thickness. Larger callosal volumes were associated with interpersonal and affective deficits, low spatial ability, and low reactivity to autonomic stress, and were accompanied by increased functional interhemispheric connectivity. These findings were interpreted as evidence of atypical neurodevelopmental processes, potentially involving increased white matter myelination or premature axonal pruning (as cited in Wong, 2023).

Barkataki and colleagues (2006) compared brain structure in patients with schizophrenia, ASPD, and healthy controls. Both ASPD and schizophrenic patients showed reduced whole-brain and temporal lobe volumes and increased putamen volume relative to controls; schizophrenic patients with a violence history additionally showed elevated lateral ventricle volume, while those without such history showed reduced hippocampal volume (as cited in Wong, 2023). A meta-analysis by Yang and Raine (2009), synthesizing forty-three imaging

studies, documented significant reductions in prefrontal structure and function across antisocial, violent, and psychopathic individuals, with involvement of the anterior cingulate cortex and orbitofrontal and dorsolateral prefrontal cortices (as cited in Wong, 2023).

White matter microstructural abnormalities have also been described. Jiang and colleagues (2017a), using diffusion tensor imaging, examined fractional anisotropy, radial diffusivity, and axial diffusivity in individuals with ASPD. Numerous major white matter fiber bundles connecting fronto-parietal control and fronto-temporal networks showed reduced fractional anisotropy, and additional diffusivity deficits were identified in tracts including the left posterior corona radiata, the splenium of the corpus callosum, and the left inferior and right superior longitudinal fasciculi. Axial and radial diffusivity values correlated with impulsivity and risky behavior scores (as cited in Wong, 2023).

Carlisi and colleagues (2020) contributed one of the most methodologically rigorous investigations to date, using MRI in 672 individuals followed from age three to forty-five. Those with life-course-persistent antisocial behavior showed significantly smaller mean cortical surface area and reduced mean cortical thickness compared with those with low antisocial behavior, with involvement of temporal and frontal regions associated with affect regulation, motivation, and executive function. Importantly, the adolescence-limited antisocial group did not differ from either the life-course-persistent or non-antisocial groups in widespread brain morphometry, supporting the developmental distinction between transient and persistent antisocial trajectories (as cited in Wong, 2023).

Kleine Deters and colleagues (2022) examined the intersection of ASPD with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), reporting that polygenic risk scores for antisocial behavior were associated with alterations in the shape—rather than the volume—of the left basolateral amygdala among individuals with disruptive behavior disorders. This association was independent of ADHD symptom severity and ADHD polygenic risk, suggesting shared genetic influences on amygdala morphology across antisocial and disruptive behavior phenotypes (as cited in Wong, 2023).

Functional Neural Abnormalities

Functional imaging has produced complementary findings. Jiang and colleagues (2017b), using resting-state functional MRI, examined functional connectome properties in 32

individuals with ASPD compared with 35 controls. Small-world analysis revealed reduced global integration of whole-brain function, evidenced by increased path length and reduced network efficiency. Modularity analysis showed reduced frontal region modularity, reduced intra- and inter-module connectivity, and merged network modules. Network-based statistics identified a specific affected sub-network involving sixteen nodes and sixteen edges. Together, these findings indicated reduced brain integration and impaired topological segregation of functional networks, particularly involving the fronto-parietal control network (as cited in Wong, 2023).

Jiang and colleagues (2021) extended this work by examining dynamic functional connectivity, finding that antisocial behavior was associated with reduced dynamic connectivity in sensorimotor and higher-order cognitive networks. Simard and colleagues (2021) reported altered spectral power within resting-state networks among antisocial male offenders, with abnormal neural oscillations associated with cocaine use (as cited in Wong, 2023).

Kolla and colleagues (2018) demonstrated differences in cortico-striatal functional connectivity between individuals with ASPD and healthy controls, particularly involving the dorsal striatum, anterior cingulate gyrus, and frontal pole. These connectivity differences correlated with monoamine oxidase A (MAO-A) genotype, providing a striking demonstration of how genetic variation shapes functional neural organization in ASPD (as cited in Wong, 2023).

Severity and Comorbidity

The clinical severity of ASPD is heavily influenced by the presence of comorbid conditions. Substance use disorders are especially common; Fridell and colleagues (2008) reported that in a cohort of 1,052 drug abusers, those with ASPD were 2.16 times more likely to be charged with theft only and 2.44 times more likely to be charged with multiple types of crime compared with those without ASPD (as cited in Wong, 2023). Comorbidity with schizophrenia has been implicated in the elevated risk of violence in that condition (Maghsoodloo et al., 2012, as cited in Wong, 2023), and generalized anxiety disorder, major depression, mania, and substance abuse are more common in older ASPD patients (Holzer et al., 2022, as cited in Wong, 2023).

Esposito and colleagues (2022) reported an instructive comparison between incarcerated and non-incarcerated (outpatient) ASPD patients. The outpatient group was older, less likely to be

married, more likely to have psychiatric comorbidity predating the ASPD onset, more likely to have previous psychiatric hospitalizations, and less likely to have received lifetime psychotherapy. The authors interpreted these findings as suggesting that pre-existing psychiatric comorbidity—and the resulting early engagement with mental health services—may have protected against imprisonment (as cited in Wong, 2023). If accurate, this interpretation has important preventive implications: early recognition and treatment of comorbid psychopathology in at-risk youth may attenuate the trajectory toward incarceration.

Table 1 would synthesize the principal structural and functional imaging findings across studies, organized by brain region and imaging modality. Such a table would highlight the prefrontal cortex (reduced gray matter volume and function; reduced cortical thickness and surface area), corpus callosum (increased white matter volume, reduced thickness, altered interhemispheric connectivity), amygdala (altered shape and reactivity), putamen (increased volume), and white matter tracts (reduced fractional anisotropy, altered diffusivity) as the most consistently implicated structures. Functional findings across resting-state and task-based paradigms would similarly cluster around fronto-parietal, cortico-striatal, and sensorimotor networks.

---

7. System-Level and Contextual Psychological Effects

The Biochemical Landscape of ASPD

Beyond structural and functional neural abnormalities, ASPD is characterized by a range of biochemical and neuroendocrine alterations that further illuminate the disorder's pathophysiology and suggest potential targets for future intervention.

Monoamine Oxidase A and the Dopaminergic System. Monoamine oxidase A (MAO-A) breaks down serotonin, epinephrine, noradrenaline, and dopamine, and has long been implicated in aggression and antisocial behavior. Kolla and colleagues (2016), using [11C]harmine positron emission tomography, resting-state functional MRI, and self-reported impulsivity measures in 19 impulsive males with ASPD, demonstrated a link between ventral striatal MAO-A binding and the functional connectivity of striatal regions associated with impulsive behavior (as cited in Wong, 2023). The dopamine transporter (DAT) has similarly

been implicated. Rafiei and Kolla (2021) reported that individuals with ASPD who carried low-DAT-activity genotypes performed poorly on the Iowa Gambling Task, while healthy individuals with the same genotypes showed better performance—suggesting that dopaminergic influences on decision-making are moderated by broader neurobiological context (as cited in Wong, 2023).

Serotonergic System. The serotonergic system contributes to ASPD pathophysiology through multiple mechanisms. Godar and colleagues (2019) demonstrated in a mouse model that postnatal stress produced abnormal stress responses, aggressive behavior, and social deficits accompanied by significant upregulation of the *5-HT2A* receptor gene in prefrontal cortex; these effects were attenuated by a *5-HT2* receptor antagonist, providing mechanistic evidence for gene-environment interactions mediated by early-life serotonergic dysregulation (as cited in Wong, 2023).

Glutamatergic System. Glutamate, the principal excitatory neurotransmitter of the central nervous system, has also been implicated. Smaragdi and colleagues (2019), using proton magnetic resonance spectroscopy, found that individuals with ASPD showed elevated glutamate plus glutamine (Glx) levels in the left dorsolateral prefrontal cortex compared with individuals with bipolar disorder and healthy controls. Among those with ASPD, Glx levels correlated positively with aggression (as cited in Wong, 2023).

Endocannabinoid System. The endocannabinoid system, consisting of endogenous cannabinoids, their receptors, and metabolizing enzymes, has emerged as a promising area of investigation. Kolla and colleagues (2021) used [11C]CURB positron emission tomography to demonstrate reduced fatty acid amide hydrolase (FAAH) density in the amygdala of individuals with ASPD relative to controls. FAAH expression in the striatum and cerebellum correlated inversely with impulsivity, and cerebellar FAAH levels were inversely related to assaultive aggression (as cited in Wong, 2023). These findings position the endocannabinoid system as a potentially important therapeutic target.

Endocrine Alterations. Testosterone, given its long-established associations with aggression, has been extensively studied. Tajima-Pozo and colleagues (2015) reported positive correlations in both sexes between basal plasma testosterone levels and antisocial personality traits, criminal thinking traits, and Millon compulsive traits (as cited in Wong, 2023). Aromäki and colleagues (1999) similarly reported that plasma testosterone levels correlated with hostility among violent males and with ASPD symptom count among those

with the diagnosis (as cited in Wong, 2023).

Tasci and colleagues (2022) examined the metabolic hormones ghrelin and leptin, both of which are influenced by cortisol and have been linked to aggression and impulsivity. Patients with ASPD showed significantly higher anxiety, aggression, depression, and impulsivity scores than healthy controls, along with decreased serum leptin and increased serum ghrelin levels. Both hormones correlated positively with aggression and impulsivity (as cited in Wong, 2023).

Inflammatory and Neurotrophic Alterations. Wang and colleagues (2017) documented significantly elevated tumor necrosis factor-α and reduced transforming growth factor-β1 and brain-derived neurotrophic factor (BDNF) levels among patients with ASPD, substance use disorders, and combined ASPD-plus-substance-use presentations. Interleukin-10 was elevated in substance use disorder groups, particularly those with opioid use disorder (as cited in Wong, 2023). Such findings suggest that inflammation and neurotrophic factor dysregulation may participate in the pathophysiology of ASPD, with obvious implications for the disorder's frequent comorbidity with substance use.

Table 2 would summarize these biochemical findings across neurotransmitter, hormonal, and immune-neurotrophic systems, highlighting the direction of alterations (elevated versus reduced) and their behavioral correlates.

---

8. Clinical Implications for Psychologists

Assessment Considerations

The multidimensional nature of ASPD, encompassing genetic vulnerabilities, developmental adversities, neurobiological abnormalities, and biochemical dysregulation, imposes on the clinician a corresponding breadth of assessment. A thorough evaluation should include not only the standard diagnostic interview but also a careful developmental history attentive to conduct disorder features, adverse childhood experiences, family functioning, academic and cognitive attainment, and the temporal relationship between substance use and antisocial behavior. Comorbid conditions should be systematically evaluated, given the near-universal

presence of additional psychopathology and the important prognostic implications of comorbidity patterns.

Distinguishing ASPD from psychopathy is a matter of both diagnostic precision and clinical utility. Only approximately one-third of individuals with ASPD meet criteria for psychopathy (Abdalla-Filho & Völlm, 2020, as cited in Wong, 2023), and the interpersonal-affective features characteristic of psychopathy carry distinct implications for treatment engagement, therapeutic risk management, and forensic assessment. Similarly, the developmental subtyping of antisocial behavior—life-course-persistent versus adolescence-limited—receives empirical support from neuroimaging data (Carlisi et al., 2020, as cited in Wong, 2023) and should inform prognostic formulation. An adolescent with recent-onset antisocial behavior arising in the context of peer influence and family transition presents a substantially different prognostic picture than one whose behavior has been persistent from early childhood.

Therapeutic Considerations

The empirical foundation for psychological interventions in adult ASPD remains thin. Black (2017) and Gibbon and colleagues (2020), in their Cochrane review, concluded that evidence for psychological interventions in adult ASPD is insufficient to support strong treatment recommendations (as cited in Wong, 2023). Pharmacological treatment fares no better in terms of approved indications; no medication has been approved by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration for the treatment of ASPD proper, although medications are commonly prescribed off-label for associated features such as aggression and impulsivity, or for comorbid conditions such as depression, anxiety, or substance dependence (Gibbon et al., 2020, as cited in Wong, 2023).

This state of affairs has several implications for practicing psychologists. First, the paucity of established treatments should not be taken to mean that clinical engagement is futile; rather, it means that the clinician must operate with unusual attention to formulation, treatment targeting, and outcome monitoring, and with realistic expectations regarding the pace and scope of change. Second, comorbid conditions often represent the most immediately tractable clinical targets. Attending to depression, anxiety, substance use, or ADHD in an individual with ASPD may not resolve the core personality pathology but can meaningfully reduce distress and functional impairment. Third, the observation by Esposito and colleagues (2022) that outpatient ASPD patients tended to have pre-existing psychiatric comorbidity treated before

ASPD onset suggests that early engagement with mental health services may exert protective effects, underscoring the value of accessible, developmentally appropriate mental health care for at-risk youth (as cited in Wong, 2023).

Neurobiologically Informed Formulation

The neurobiological findings reviewed in this manuscript have implications not only for future treatment development but for how clinicians conceptualize their patients. An individual with ASPD is not simply willfully or morally deficient; that individual is operating with a neural architecture characterized by reduced prefrontal gray matter, altered corpus callosal development, atypical amygdala reactivity, and disrupted connectivity within networks that support empathy, moral emotion, and behavioral inhibition. This is not a claim of biological determinism or exculpation; it is an acknowledgment that the phenomenological features of ASPD have substrates that constrain, though do not eliminate, the individual's behavioral repertoire.

Such a formulation may support the clinician's capacity for what has been called clinical equanimity—the ability to engage patients with ASPD without retreating into moralistic condemnation or, conversely, into naive optimism about the malleability of core traits. A neurobiologically informed formulation also has ethical and legal implications, particularly in forensic settings, where questions about capacity, culpability, and treatability inevitably arise. As Wong (2023) has noted, the observation that individuals with ASPD have brain abnormalities raises difficult questions about whether such findings should mitigate or aggravate criminal responsibility—questions that psychologists working at the intersection of clinical and forensic domains cannot avoid.

Working with Comorbid Substance Use

Given the frequency of comorbid substance use disorders in ASPD and the elevated inflammatory and neurotrophic dysregulation observed in this subgroup (Wang et al., 2017, as cited in Wong, 2023), particular clinical attention is warranted. Substance use both exacerbates and complicates the antisocial presentation, contributing to criminal justice involvement, treatment nonadherence, and functional deterioration. Integrated approaches that address substance use and antisocial features simultaneously, rather than sequentially, are likely to be more effective than serial single-target interventions, although the empirical

evidence for such approaches remains limited.

Family and Systems Considerations

The strong developmental and familial roots of ASPD (Vaughn et al., 2015; Farrington, 2000, as cited in Wong, 2023) argue for attention to family systems, particularly when working with adolescents or young adults in the early phase of the disorder's manifestation. Multigenerational patterns of antisocial behavior, substance use, and psychopathology imply that identified patients often exist within family systems that themselves require intervention. Psychologists working with such families should be attentive to the ways in which family dynamics may either sustain or challenge antisocial behavioral patterns, and to the practical constraints imposed by ongoing environmental adversity, poverty, and social disadvantage.

---

9. Future Directions and Research Gaps

Methodological Considerations

The empirical literature on ASPD, though substantial, is characterized by significant methodological heterogeneity that complicates synthesis. Sample sizes are often modest, particularly in neuroimaging studies. Diagnostic criteria have evolved across editions of DSM and ICD, and dimensional versus categorical framings yield different case identification. Comorbidity is nearly universal, making it difficult to isolate ASPD-specific findings from those attributable to substance use, mood disorders, or ADHD. Sex differences have been inadequately examined in many studies, despite the substantially higher prevalence of the disorder in males and evidence that some genetic and neural correlates differ by sex (Waller et al., 2016, as cited in Wong, 2023). Ethnic and racial diversity is often limited, though findings from Douglas and colleagues (2011) demonstrate that gene-environment interactions may operate differently across groups (as cited in Wong, 2023).

Areas for Further Investigation

Several promising directions warrant further investigation. First, longitudinal designs beginning in early childhood are needed to trace the developmental trajectory of ASPD and to identify the earliest neurobiological and behavioral markers of risk. The distinction between life-course-persistent and adolescence-limited antisocial trajectories, supported by the work of Carlisi and colleagues (2020), argues for developmental approaches that can distinguish these subgroups prospectively (as cited in Wong, 2023).

Second, the biochemical correlates of ASPD—including inflammatory markers, neurotrophic factors, and endocrine hormones—warrant further exploration as potential biomarkers for early detection or therapeutic targets. The reduced amygdala FAAH density observed by Kolla and colleagues (2021) is particularly intriguing, given the growing interest in the endocannabinoid system as a therapeutic target for psychiatric disorders (as cited in Wong, 2023).

Third, the near-total absence of evidence-based treatments for ASPD represents perhaps the most pressing research gap. Well-designed trials of psychological interventions—particularly those grounded in the neurobiological and developmental understanding of the disorder—are urgently needed. Pharmacological development is similarly needed, though the heterogeneity of the disorder and the practical challenges of conducting trials in this population have historically limited such efforts.

Fourth, the interface between ASPD research and forensic practice remains underdeveloped. Better integration of neurobiological findings with forensic assessment, risk prediction, and correctional intervention could improve outcomes for individuals with ASPD and for the communities affected by their behavior.

Ethical and Conceptual Challenges

Finally, the field must continue to grapple with the ethical and conceptual challenges that ASPD uniquely poses. If antisocial behavior arises in part from neural abnormalities established through gene-environment interactions during early development, how should society respond to such behavior? Should neurobiological findings be considered mitigating or aggravating in criminal proceedings? How should clinicians balance therapeutic engagement with the ongoing risk that some patients with ASPD pose to others? These questions do not have simple answers, but they cannot be avoided by clinicians or researchers working in this

domain.

---

10. Conclusion

Antisocial personality disorder is a common, clinically consequential, and neurobiologically complex condition characterized by disregard for the rights of others, empathy deficits, guiltlessness, impulsivity, and antagonism. Its early onset, developmental persistence, and frequent comorbidity distinguish it from more episodic forms of psychopathology and impose particular challenges for clinical assessment, formulation, and intervention. The evidence reviewed in this manuscript indicates that ASPD arises from the confluence of genetic predisposition, adverse developmental experience, and altered neurobiological function. Twin studies and molecular genetic research have identified substantial heritability along with a growing catalog of candidate genes, particularly within serotonergic, dopaminergic, and oxytocinergic systems. Environmental factors—including adverse childhood experiences, family dysfunction, parental criminality, and early empathy deficits—interact with genetic vulnerability to shape the developmental trajectory. Structural and functional neuroimaging have documented consistent abnormalities in prefrontal cortex, amygdala, corpus callosum, striatum, and their interconnections. Biochemical investigations have implicated the serotonergic, dopaminergic, glutamatergic, and endocannabinoid systems, along with hormonal and inflammatory dysregulation (Wong, 2023).

For the practicing psychologist, this integrated understanding carries several implications. First, ASPD should be conceptualized not as a moral failing but as a complex neurodevelopmental disorder whose features have identifiable substrates. Second, comorbidity is essential to attend to, given its prognostic importance and its potential tractability. Third, assessment should be developmentally informed, distinguishing life-course-persistent from adolescence-limited trajectories and attending to the earliest signs of empathy deficit and conduct disturbance. Fourth, treatment expectations must be realistic; no established interventions exist for adult ASPD proper, though comorbid conditions and specific symptom dimensions may be addressable. Fifth, ethical and forensic considerations require ongoing engagement; the neurobiological findings that increasingly characterize the disorder have implications for questions of responsibility, risk, and treatability that psychologists cannot avoid.

The path forward requires continued integration across levels of analysis, from molecular genetics through neural systems to social context. It requires methodological rigor, developmental focus, and attention to individual differences within a heterogeneous diagnostic category. Above all, it requires that clinicians and researchers approach ASPD with both scientific seriousness and clinical humanity—recognizing that individuals with the disorder have often themselves been shaped by early adversity, and that behind the often unappealing clinical presentation lies a human being whose developmental history and neurobiological constitution have converged to produce the difficulties that bring them, or those affected by them, to our attention.

---

11. References

Abdalla-Filho, E., & Völlm, B. (2020). Does every psychopath have an antisocial personality disorder? *Brazilian Journal of Psychiatry, 42*(3), 241–242. https://doi.org/10.1590/1516-4446-2019-0762

American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (5th ed.). American Psychiatric Association.

Aromäki, A. S., Lindman, R. E., & Eriksson, C. J. P. (1999). Testosterone, aggressiveness, and antisocial personality. *Aggressive Behavior, 25*(2), 113–123.

Bach, B., & First, M. B. (2018). Application of the ICD-11 classification of personality disorders. *BMC Psychiatry, 18*(1), 351. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-018-1908-3

Barkataki, I., Kumari, V., Das, M., Taylor, P., & Sharma, T. (2006). Volumetric structural brain abnormalities in men with schizophrenia or antisocial personality disorder. *Behavioural Brain Research, 169*(2), 239–247. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbr.2006.01.009

Barlow, F. K. (2019). Nature vs. nurture is nonsense: On the necessity of an integrated genetic, social, developmental, and personality psychology. *Australian Journal of Psychology, 71*, 68–79.

Black, D. W. (2015). The natural history of antisocial personality disorder. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry, 60*(7), 309–314. https://doi.org/10.1177/070674371506000703

Black, D. W. (2017). The treatment of antisocial personality disorder. *Current Treatment Options in Psychiatry, 4*, 295–302. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40501-017-0123-z

Blom, R. M., Samuels, J. F., Riddle, M. A., Joseph Bienvenu, O., Grados, M. A., Reti, I. M., et al. (2011). Association between a serotonin transporter promoter polymorphism (5HTTLPR) and personality disorder traits in a community sample. *Journal of Psychiatric Research, 45*(9), 1153–1159. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychires.2011.03.003

Carlisi, C. O., Moffitt, T. E., Knodt, A. R., Harrington, H., Ireland, D., Melzer, T. R., et al. (2020). Associations between life-course-persistent antisocial behaviour and brain structure in a population-representative longitudinal birth cohort. *The Lancet Psychiatry, 7*(3), 245–253. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(20)30002-X

Chen, F. R. (2022). The association between cortisol-AA coordination in response to stress, negative urgency, and antisocial behavior in an urban adult sample. *Psychoneuroendocrinology, 142*, 105799. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psyneuen.2022.105799

Cuartas Arias, J. M., Palacio Acosta, C. A., Valencia, J. G., Montoya, G. J., Arango Viana, J. C., Nieto, O. C., et al. (2011). Exploring epistasis in candidate genes for antisocial personality disorder. *Psychiatric Genetics, 21*(3), 115–124. https://doi.org/10.1097/YPG.0b013e3283437175

de Farias, M. S. J. A., Gomes, A. R. F., Calheiros, M. B., Cavalcante, H. P. A., Lessa, M. M. M., & Neto, V. L. M. (2013). The antisocial personality disorder and its characteristics, changes and advances: A challenge. *International Journal of Collaborative Research on Internal Medicine and Public Health, 5*(1), 95–102.

Dinwiddie, S. H., & Daw, E. W. (1998). Temporal stability of antisocial personality disorder: Blind follow-up study at 8 years. *Comprehensive Psychiatry, 39*(1), 28–34. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0010-440x(98)90029-3

Douglas, K., Chan, G., Gelernter, J., Arias, A. J., Anton, R. F., Poling, J., et al. (2011). 5-HTTLPR as a potential moderator of the effects of adverse childhood experiences on risk of antisocial personality disorder. *Psychiatric Genetics, 21*(5), 240–248.

https://doi.org/10.1097/YPG.0b013e3283457c15

Esposito, C. M., Ceresa, A., Auxilia, A. M., Zanelli Quarantini, F., Caldiroli, A., Capuzzi, E., et al. (2022). Which clinical and demographic factors are related to incarceration in male patients with antisocial personality disorder? *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*. https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X221139073

Eysenck, H. J. (1967). *The biological basis of personality*. Charles C Thomas Publisher.

Farrington, D. P. (2000). Psychosocial predictors of adult antisocial personality and adult convictions. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 18*(5), 605–622.

Ferguson, C. J. (2010). Genetic contributions to antisocial personality and behavior: A meta-analytic review from an evolutionary perspective. *Journal of Social Psychology, 150*(2), 160–180. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224540903366503

Forsell, C., Björk, B. F., Lilius, L., Axelman, K., Fabre, S. F., Fratiglioni, L., et al. (2010). Genetic association to the amyloid plaque associated protein gene COL25A1 in Alzheimer's disease. *Neurobiology of Aging, 31*(3), 409–415. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2008.04.009

Fridell, M., Hesse, M., Jaeger, M. M., & Kühlhorn, E. (2008). Antisocial personality disorder as a predictor of criminal behaviour in a longitudinal study of a cohort of abusers of several classes of drugs: Relation to type of substance and type of crime. *Addictive Behaviors, 33*(6), 799–811. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2008.01.001

Garcia, L. F., Aluja, A., Fibla, J., Cuevas, L., & García, O. (2010). Incremental effect for antisocial personality disorder genetic risk combining 5-HTTLPR and 5-HTTVNTR polymorphisms. *Psychiatry Research, 177*(1–2), 161–166. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2008.12.018

Gibbon, S., Khalifa, N. R., Cheung, N. H., Völlm, B. A., & McCarthy, L. (2020). Psychological interventions for antisocial personality disorder. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, 9*(9), CD007668. https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD007668.pub3

Godar, S. C., Mosher, L. J., Scheggi, S., Devoto, P., Moench, K. M., Strathman, H. J., et al. (2019). Gene-environment interactions in antisocial behavior are mediated by early-life

5-HT2A receptor activation. *Neuropharmacology, 159*, 107513. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropharm.2019.01.028

Holzer, K. J., Vaughn, M. G., Loux, T. M., Mancini, M. A., Fearn, N. E., & Wallace, C. L. (2022). Prevalence and correlates of antisocial personality disorder in older adults. *Aging & Mental Health, 26*(1), 169–178. https://doi.org/10.1080/13607863.2020.1839867

Jiang, W., Shi, F., Liao, J., Liu, H., Wang, T., Shen, C., et al. (2017b). Disrupted functional connectome in antisocial personality disorder. *Brain Imaging and Behavior, 11*(4), 1071–1084. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11682-016-9572-z

Jiang, W., Shi, F., Liu, H., Li, G., Ding, Z., Shen, H., et al. (2017a). Reduced white matter integrity in antisocial personality disorder: A diffusion tensor imaging study. *Scientific Reports, 7*, 43002. https://doi.org/10.1038/srep43002

Jiang, W., Zhang, H., Zeng, L. L., Shen, H., Qin, J., Thung, K. H., et al. (2021). Dynamic neural circuit disruptions associated with antisocial behaviors. *Human Brain Mapping, 42*(2), 329–344. https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.25225

Kleine Deters, R., Ruisch, I. H., Faraone, S. V., Hartman, C. A., Luman, M., Franke, B., et al. (2022). Polygenic risk scores for antisocial behavior in relation to amygdala morphology across an attention deficit hyperactivity disorder case-control sample with and without disruptive behavior. *European Neuropsychopharmacology, 62*, 63–73. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euroneuro.2022.07.182

Kolla, N. J., Boileau, I., Karas, K., Watts, J. J., Rusjan, P., Houle, S., et al. (2021). Lower amygdala fatty acid amide hydrolase in violent offenders with antisocial personality disorder: An [11C]CURB positron emission tomography study. *Translational Psychiatry, 11*(1), 57. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41398-020-01144-2

Kolla, N. J., Dunlop, K., Downar, J., Links, P., Bagby, R. M., Wilson, A. A., et al. (2016). Association of ventral striatum monoamine oxidase-A binding and functional connectivity in antisocial personality disorder with high impulsivity: A positron emission tomography and functional magnetic resonance imaging study. *European Neuropsychopharmacology, 26*(4), 777–786. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euroneuro.2015.12.030

Kolla, N. J., Dunlop, K., Meyer, J. H., & Downar, J. (2018). Corticostriatal connectivity in antisocial personality disorder by MAO-A genotype and its relationship to aggressive behavior. *International Journal of Neuropsychopharmacology, 21*(8), 725–733. https://doi.org/10.1093/ijnp/pyy035

Langevin, S., Mascheretti, S., Côté, S. M., Vitaro, F., Boivin, M., Turecki, G., et al. (2019). Cumulative risk and protection effect of serotonergic genes on male antisocial behaviour: Results from a prospective cohort assessed in adolescence and early adulthood. *British Journal of Psychiatry, 214*(3), 137–145. https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.2018.251

Larsen, R. R., & Buss, D. M. (2018). *Personality psychology: Domains of knowledge about human nature* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Lenzenweger, M. F., Lane, M. C., Loranger, A. W., & Kessler, R. C. (2007). DSM-IV personality disorders in the National Comorbidity Survey Replication. *Biological Psychiatry, 62*(6), 553–564. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2006.09.019

Li, D., Zhao, H., Kranzler, H. R., Oslin, D., Anton, R. F., Farrer, L. A., et al. (2012). Association of COL25A1 with comorbid antisocial personality disorder and substance dependence. *Biological Psychiatry, 71*(8), 733–740. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2011.12.011

Lu, H. C., & Mackie, K. (2016). An introduction to the endogenous cannabinoid system. *Biological Psychiatry, 79*(7), 516–525. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2015.07.028

Lu, R. B., Lee, J. F., Huang, S. Y., Lee, S. Y., Chang, Y. H., Kuo, P. H., et al. (2012). Interaction between ALDH2*1*1 and DRD2/ANKK1 TaqI A1A1 genes may be associated with antisocial personality disorder not co-morbid with alcoholism. *Addiction Biology, 17*(5), 865–874. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1369-1600.2010.00268.x

Maghsoodloo, S., Ghodousi, A., & Karimzadeh, T. (2012). The relationship of antisocial personality disorder and history of conduct disorder with crime incidence in schizophrenia. *Journal of Research in Medical Sciences, 17*(6), 566–571.

Moul, C., Dobson-Stone, C., Brennan, J., Hawes, D., & Dadds, M. (2013). An exploration of the serotonin system in antisocial boys with high levels of callous-unemotional traits. *PLOS ONE, 8*(2), e56619. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0056619

Peng, S. X., Wang, Y. Y., Zhang, M., Zang, Y. Y., Wu, D., Pei, J., et al. (2021). SNP rs10420324 in the AMPA receptor auxiliary subunit TARP γ-8 regulates the susceptibility to antisocial personality disorder. *Scientific Reports, 11*(1), 11997. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-91415-9

Polderman, T. J., Benyamin, B., de Leeuw, C. A., Sullivan, P. F., van Bochoven, A., Visscher, P. M., et al. (2015). Meta-analysis of the heritability of human traits based on fifty years of twin studies. *Nature Genetics, 47*(7), 702–709. https://doi.org/10.1038/ng.3285

Rafiei, D., & Kolla, N. J. (2021). DAT1 polymorphism associated with poor decision-making in males with antisocial personality disorder and high psychopathic traits. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law, 39*(5), 583–596. https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.2537

Raine, A., Lencz, T., Bihrle, S., LaCasse, L., & Colletti, P. (2000). Reduced prefrontal gray matter volume and reduced autonomic activity in antisocial personality disorder. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 57*(2), 119–127. https://doi.org/10.1001/archpsyc.57.2.119

Raine, A., Lencz, T., Taylor, K., Hellige, J. B., Bihrle, S., Lacasse, L., et al. (2003). Corpus callosum abnormalities in psychopathic antisocial individuals. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 60*(11), 1134–1142. https://doi.org/10.1001/archpsyc.60.11.1134

Ramamoorthy, S., Bauman, A. L., Moore, K. R., Han, H., Yang-Feng, T., Chang, A. S., et al. (1993). Antidepressant- and cocaine-sensitive human serotonin transporter: Molecular cloning, expression, and chromosomal localization. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 90*(6), 2542–2546. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.90.6.2542

Rhee, S. H., Woodward, K., Corley, R. P., du Pont, A., Friedman, N. P., Hewitt, J. K., Hink, L. K., Robinson, J., & Zahn-Waxler, C. (2021). The association between toddlerhood empathy deficits and antisocial personality disorder symptoms and psychopathy in adulthood. *Development and Psychopathology, 33*(1), 173–183. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579419001676

Roberts, A., Yang, M., Zhang, T., & Coid, J. (2008). Personality disorder, temperament, and childhood adversity: Findings from a cohort of prisoners in England and Wales. *Journal of Forensic Psychiatry and Psychology, 19*, 460–483.

Sah, I., Yukseloglu, E. H., Kocabasoglu, N., Bayoglu, B., Cirakoglu, E., & Cengiz, M. (2021). The effects of 5-HTTLPR/rs25531 serotonin transporter gene polymorphisms on antisocial personality disorder among criminals in a sample of the Turkish population. *Molecular Biology Reports, 48*(1), 77–84. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11033-021-06137-y

Simard, I., Denomme, W. J., & Shane, M. S. (2021). Altered power spectra in antisocial males during rest as a function of cocaine dependence: A network analysis. *Psychiatry Research: Neuroimaging, 309*, 111235. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pscychresns.2020.111235

Simonoff, E., Elander, J., Holmshaw, J., Pickles, A., Murray, R., & Rutter, M. (2004). Predictors of antisocial personality: Continuities from childhood to adult life. *British Journal of Psychiatry, 184*, 118–127. https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.184.2.118

Smaragdi, A., Chavez, S., Lobaugh, N. J., Meyer, J. H., & Kolla, N. J. (2019). Differential levels of prefrontal cortex glutamate+glutamine in adults with antisocial personality disorder and bipolar disorder: A proton magnetic resonance spectroscopy study. *Progress in Neuro-Psychopharmacology and Biological Psychiatry, 93*, 250–255. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pnpbp.2019.04.002

Soeteman, D. I., Verheul, R., & Busschbach, J. J. (2008). The burden of disease in personality disorders: Diagnosis-specific quality of life. *Journal of Personality Disorders, 22*(3), 259–268. https://doi.org/10.1521/pedi.2008.22.3.259

Stoltenborgh, M., Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J., Alink, L. R., & van Ijzendoorn, M. H. (2015). The prevalence of child maltreatment across the globe: Review of a series of meta-analyses. *Child Abuse Review, 24*, 37–50.

Tajima-Pozo, K., Bayón, C., Díaz-Marsá, M., & Carrasco, J. L. (2015). Correlation between personality traits and testosterone concentrations in healthy population. *Indian Journal of Psychological Medicine, 37*(3), 317–321. https://doi.org/10.4103/0253-7176.162956

Tasci, G., Kaya, S., Kalayci, M., & Atmaca, M. (2022). Increased ghrelin and decreased leptin levels in patients with antisocial personality disorder. *Journal of Affective Disorders, 317*, 22–28. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2022.08.048

Trull, T. J., Jahng, S., Tomko, R. L., Wood, P. K., & Sher, K. J. (2010). Revised NESARC personality disorder diagnoses: Gender, prevalence, and comorbidity with substance

dependence disorders. *Journal of Personality Disorders, 24*(4), 412–426. https://doi.org/10.1521/pedi.2010.24.4.412

Turkheimer, E. (2000). Three laws of behaviour genetics and what they mean. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 9*(5), 160–164.

Turkheimer, E., & Gottesman, I. I. (1991). Is H2=0 a null hypothesis anymore? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 14*(3), 410–411.

Tuvblad, C., Narusyte, J., Grann, M., Sarnecki, J., & Lichtenstein, P. (2011). The genetic and environmental etiology of antisocial behavior from childhood to emerging adulthood. *Behavior Genetics, 41*(5), 629–640. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10519-011-9463-4

Tyrer, P., Reed, G. M., & Crawford, M. J. (2015). Classification, assessment, prevalence, and effect of personality disorder. *The Lancet, 385*, 717–726. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(14)61995-4

Vaughan, R. A., & Foster, J. D. (2013). Mechanisms of dopamine transporter regulation in normal and disease states. *Trends in Pharmacological Sciences, 34*(9), 489–496. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tips.2013.07.005

Vaughn, M. G., Salas-Wright, C. P., DeLisi, M., & Qian, Z. (2015). The antisocial family tree: Family histories of behavior problems in antisocial personality in the United States. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology, 50*(5), 821–831. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00127-014-0987-9

Waller, R., Corral-Frías, N. S., Vannucci, B., Bogdan, R., Knodt, A. R., Hariri, A. R., et al. (2016). An oxytocin receptor polymorphism predicts amygdala reactivity and antisocial behavior in men. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience, 11*(8), 1218–1226. https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsw042

Wang, T. Y., Lee, S. Y., Hu, M. C., Chen, S. L., Chang, Y. H., Chu, C. H., et al. (2017). More inflammation but less brain-derived neurotrophic factor in antisocial personality disorder. *Psychoneuroendocrinology, 85*, 42–48. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psyneuen.2017.08.006

Wesseldijk, L. W., Bartels, M., Vink, J. M., van Beijsterveldt, C. E. M., Ligthart, L., Boomsma, D. I., et al. (2018). Genetic and environmental influences on conduct and antisocial

personality problems in childhood, adolescence, and adulthood. *European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry, 27*(9), 1123–1132. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00787-017-1014-y

Winsper, C., Bilgin, A., Thompson, A., Marwaha, S., Chanen, A. M., Singh, S. P., et al. (2020). The prevalence of personality disorders in the community: A global systematic review and meta-analysis. *British Journal of Psychiatry, 216*(2), 69–78. https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.2019.166

Wong, R. S.-Y. (2023). Psychopathology of antisocial personality disorder: From the structural, functional and biochemical perspectives. *Egyptian Journal of Neurology, Psychiatry and Neurosurgery, 59*(1), 113. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41983-023-00717-4

World Health Organization. (2022). *International classification of diseases, eleventh revision (ICD-11)*. https://icd.who.int

Yang, Y., & Raine, A. (2009). Prefrontal structural and functional brain imaging findings in antisocial, violent, and psychopathic individuals: A meta-analysis. *Psychiatry Research, 174*(2), 81–88. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pscychresns.2009.03.012

Yazgan, I., Hanson, J. L., Bates, J. E., Lansford, J. E., Pettit, G. S., & Dodge, K. A. (2021). Cumulative early childhood adversity and later antisocial behavior: The mediating role of passive avoidance. *Development and Psychopathology, 33*(1), 340–350. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579419001809