

## Biopsychosocial Assessment Tools in Practice: Comparing Standardized Instruments Against

Sylviastella Favour Peteranaba<sup>1\*</sup>, Helen Ekwi Osinem<sup>2</sup>, Florence Eribenne<sup>3</sup>, Olakunle Saheed Soyegbe<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Independent Researcher,

[Favourpeteranaba@gmail.com](mailto:Favourpeteranaba@gmail.com)

<sup>2</sup>Jos University Teaching Hospital (JUTH),

Nursing Services Department, Jos, Nigeria [helenosinem@gmail.com](mailto:helenosinem@gmail.com)

<sup>3</sup>Bay Cove Human Services, Boston,

MA, USA, [feribenne1980@gmail.com](mailto:feribenne1980@gmail.com)

<sup>4</sup>Independent Researcher, Pretoria,

south Africa, [ossoyegbe@gmail.com](mailto:ossoyegbe@gmail.com)

\*Corresponding Author: Sylviastella Favour

Peteranaba, [Favourpeteranaba@gmail.com](mailto:Favourpeteranaba@gmail.com)

DOI: 10.56201/ijmepr.v7.no4.2023.pg173.195

---

### Abstract

*This review critically examines how standardized instruments and individualized clinical evaluation contribute to biopsychosocial assessment across diverse practice settings. Its purpose was to determine how each approach addresses multidimensional clinical needs, including biological, psychological, social, functional, cultural, and contextual factors, while considering reliability, validity, clinical utility, person-centeredness, and decision-making value. A structured narrative review approach was adopted, drawing on theoretical, psychometric, clinical, cross-cultural, and implementation literature published through 2023. The evidence indicates that standardized tools strengthen consistency, transparency, screening accuracy, severity estimation, functional measurement, and longitudinal monitoring, particularly when instruments are locally validated and linked to explicit clinical decisions. However, standardized scores may underrepresent culturally specific meanings, contextual influences, complex life histories, and atypical presentations. Individualized interviews and professional judgment address these limitations by eliciting narrative, relational, cultural, and situational information, although unaided judgment remains susceptible to bias and inter-clinician variability. The review therefore finds that neither approach is sufficient when used in isolation. The most defensible model combines validated standardized measures with structured, culturally responsive interviewing and multidisciplinary interpretation. Such integration enables reproducible measurement while preserving individualized meaning, contextual precision, and therapeutic relevance. The review recommends greater investment in cross-cultural validation, locally grounded instrument development, implementation research, shared clinical formulations, and comparative studies of integrated versus single-method assessment models. Future research should prioritize diagnostic accuracy, patient experience, treatment modification, equity, feasibility, cost, and longitudinal outcomes. Future scholarship should also evaluate digital tools*

*without displacing clinical interpretation. Overall, integrated biopsychosocial assessment offers the strongest basis for scientifically rigorous, culturally sensitive, and clinically meaningful decision-making across complex and diverse care environments.*

**Keywords:** *Biopsychosocial assessment; standardized instruments; clinical judgment; person-centered assessment; cultural responsiveness; clinical decision-making.*

---

## **1. Introduction**

### **1.1 Evolution of Biopsychosocial Assessment Practice**

Biopsychosocial assessment practice emerged from dissatisfaction with a narrowly biomedical conception of illness that privileged pathology, laboratory findings, and organ-level dysfunction while underemphasizing psychological experience and social environment. Engel's seminal formulation challenged this reductionism by proposing that health and illness arise through interacting biological, psychological, and social systems. In assessment terms, this reframed the clinical encounter from a search for discrete disease entities toward a structured inquiry into multiple levels of causation, meaning, functioning, relationships, and context. The model supplied a foundation for comprehensive assessment, treating subjective experience and social circumstances as clinically relevant data (Engel, 1977).

The practical implications of this shift became visible beyond specialist psychiatry. In Eastern Nigeria, biopsychosocial practice was incorporated into primary healthcare and medical education, linking individual clinical evaluation with community conditions, health communication, social adjustment, and locally available resources. This application demonstrated an early movement from an abstract systems model toward assessment embedded within cultural and community realities, where healthcare delivery required attention to environmental constraints and collective support (Day, 1985). As the model entered routine clinical reasoning, however, scholars recognized that comprehensiveness alone did not guarantee coherent decision-making. A biopsychosocial inventory of facts could become clinically diffuse unless practitioners determined how biological findings, psychological processes, ethical considerations, and practical circumstances should influence formulation and care (Sadler & Hulgus, 1992). By the early twenty-first century, biopsychosocial assessment increasingly converged with patient-centred medicine. Rather than treating the model as a checklist of three independent domains, clinical scholarship emphasized relationships across organizational levels and the patient's illness account. This strengthened interviewing, collaborative meaning-making, and attention to the clinician-patient relationship. It also clarified that subjective experience could contribute to diagnostic accuracy without displacing biomedical evidence, thereby positioning assessment as both scientifically informed and interpretive (Borrell-Carrió et al., 2004). The subsequent development of multidimensional instruments represented another important transition. The Biopsychosociospiritual Inventory, for example, operationalized physical, psychological, social, spiritual, and functional dimensions into measurable scales, illustrating how holistic concepts could be translated into standardized assessment structures while retaining multidomain breadth (Katerndahl & Oyiriaru, 2007).

This movement toward structured measurement did not eliminate longstanding conceptual tensions. Biopsychosocial practice continued to face the problem of determining which domains deserved greatest weight for a particular patient, condition, or decision. Such concerns encouraged greater scrutiny of assessment methods and of the assumption that simply collecting

information across domains automatically produces an integrated formulation. Empirical examination of community mental-health intake records found that therapists frequently documented biological, psychological, and sociocultural information but often did so without sufficient depth or integration, highlighting a gap between nominal adherence to biopsychosocial principles and their disciplined application in case conceptualization (Meyer & Melchert, 2011). This finding helped shift attention from whether multiple domains were assessed to how information was synthesized, prioritized, and converted into clinically useful judgments.

The model's later evolution has therefore involved renewed emphasis on integration rather than comprehensiveness alone. In rehabilitation, the biopsychosocial approach has been linked with functioning, disability, chronic illness, and complex interventions, reinforcing assessment practices that examine how symptoms interact with activity, participation, personal factors, and environmental conditions. This broader orientation reflects the growing clinical relevance of outcomes that cannot be understood solely through pathology, particularly when long-term conditions alter identity, autonomy, relationships, and social participation (Wade & Halligan, 2017). Contemporary psychiatric discussion in India likewise shows how the model became embedded in holistic clinical practice while remaining subject to debate about biological advances, explanatory precision, and implementation. Its persistence reflects the continuing need for assessment frameworks capable of connecting neurobiological knowledge with psychological processes and social determinants without reducing one domain to another (Tripathi et al., 2019). More recent developments have also exposed the cultural assumptions embedded in conventional biopsychosocial assessment. African clinical scholarship has argued that relational worldviews, community identity, and culturally grounded concepts of personhood may shape how distress is understood, communicated, and assessed. The incorporation of ubuntu into clinical social work illustrates an effort to extend biopsychosocial and ecological assessment beyond individualized Western formulations by recognizing interdependence, social belonging, and collective meaning as clinically consequential dimensions (Chigangaidze, 2021). Across its evolution, biopsychosocial assessment has thus moved from a theoretical challenge to biomedical reductionism toward a range of clinical practices encompassing multidomain interviewing, standardized measurement, contextual formulation, functional assessment, and culturally responsive interpretation. The historical trajectory is consequential for comparing assessment tools because contemporary standardized instruments and clinician-led approaches both inherit the unresolved task: transforming complex biological, psychological, and social information into valid, coherent, person-sensitive clinical understanding.

## **1.2 Importance of Multidimensional Clinical Assessment**

Multidimensional clinical assessment is fundamental to biopsychosocial practice because clinically significant difficulties rarely arise from a single determinant. Biological vulnerability, emotional regulation, cognition, relationships, socioeconomic circumstances, developmental stage, culture, and environmental stressors can interact in ways that alter both symptom presentation and functional impairment. An assessment confined to one domain may therefore identify an immediate complaint while overlooking mechanisms that sustain it, protective resources that mitigate it, or contextual pressures that influence treatment engagement. Evidence from Nigerian adolescents illustrates this interdependence: parenting styles and effortful control were both associated with mental-health outcomes, demonstrating how family environment and individual self-regulation may jointly shape psychological functioning (Oyarekua&Sabbobh,

2021). The value of multidimensional assessment also lies in its capacity to distinguish superficially similar presentations. Observable behavior may reflect different combinations of personal vulnerability, peer relationships, institutional climate, family conditions, or wider social exposure. In Ibadan, school climate, self-efficacy, social-media influence, and peer pressure showed differential relationships with aggressive behaviour, indicating that meaningful assessment requires attention to several explanatory levels rather than reliance on behavior alone (Sabbah & Alausa, 2021). For clinicians, such breadth supports more precise formulation by separating presenting manifestations from contributing and maintaining factors and by identifying domains that may require intervention, monitoring, or referral.

Multidimensional assessment is equally important for cultural validity. Standardized measures developed in one population can misrepresent distress when locally meaningful expressions, idioms, and social circumstances are absent from the instrument. Research in Kenya demonstrated that combining culturally adapted survey items, locally developed content, and semi-structured clinical interviews produced a more context-sensitive approach to identifying mental distress, underscoring the importance of integrating measurement with local interpretation (Watson et al., 2020). This is particularly relevant to biopsychosocial practice, where assessment validity depends not only on psychometric consistency but also on whether the domains measured adequately represent the patient's lived environment.

Clinical usefulness further depends on capturing functioning beyond diagnostic symptoms. In adolescent psychiatric care, a multidimensional instrument incorporating social, behavioural, psychological, familial, and risk-related information generated clinically meaningful profiles that would have been obscured by symptom-focused classification alone (Laget et al., 2006). Contemporary measurement approaches extend this principle by incorporating dimensions such as daily functioning, emotional support, quality of life, and sense of purpose. The Brief Multidimensional Assessment Scale demonstrates how concise standardized instruments can broaden routine assessment without imposing excessive administrative burden (Keitner et al., 2023). Accordingly, multidimensional assessment provides the evidentiary bridge between standardized measurement and clinician-led formulation: structured tools can enhance consistency and comparability, while contextual inquiry interprets how biological, psychological, and social dimensions combine within the individual case, thereby supporting more proportionate, person-centred clinical decision-making across diverse clinical and community care settings.

### **1.3 Standardization Versus Individualized Clinical Evaluation**

Standardization and individualized clinical evaluation represent complementary but potentially competing logics within biopsychosocial assessment. Standardized instruments translate symptoms, functioning, and psychosocial characteristics into predefined items and scoring rules, improving consistency across assessors, settings, and time points. Their principal value lies in reducing idiosyncratic variation and making thresholds, change scores, and population comparisons more transparent. In Nigerian general practice, brief screening instruments for common mental disorders demonstrated the practical importance of validating standardized measures across major language groups before routine use, illustrating that standardization is meaningful only when psychometric performance is established within the population being assessed (Makanjuola et al., 2014).

Individualized evaluation, by contrast, allows clinicians to interpret symptoms in relation to biography, relationships, culture, developmental history, stressors, strengths, and presenting circumstances. This flexibility is essential when identical scores conceal different causal pathways or functional implications. Yet clinical judgment is vulnerable to inconsistency, selective attention, and cognitive bias when information is combined informally. A major meta-analysis of decades of comparative research found that statistical approaches generally achieved greater predictive accuracy than unaided clinical prediction, supporting structured methods where reliable algorithms are available (Ægisdóttir et al., 2006). Nevertheless, the distinction between statistical and clinical assessment should not be reduced to a contest between machines and professionals. Clinical observations themselves can be systematically quantified, allowing expert description to become reproducible data while preserving information that fixed questionnaires may not capture (Westen & Weinberger, 2004).

The limitations of rigid standardization become especially apparent across cultural contexts. A measure may possess strong internal consistency yet still misrepresent the meaning of an item when translated into another linguistic or social environment. South African research on adapting an anxiety measure showed that context-specific interpretations can emerge despite conventional translation and expert-review procedures, indicating that qualitative community input can strengthen cultural validity alongside psychometric testing (Myburgh et al., 2021). Such evidence is particularly important for biopsychosocial assessment, because social meanings are not peripheral variables; they influence how distress is experienced, expressed, and interpreted.

Individualized information can also reveal relationships among psychological constructs that standardized scores alone cannot fully contextualize. Nigerian research examining perceived stress, hopelessness, self-esteem, and attitude-related outcomes demonstrates how multiple measured constructs may be analytically linked while still requiring interpretation within lived social circumstances (Sabbah, 2023). In practice, the strongest assessment architecture is therefore neither uncritical standardization nor unrestricted clinical intuition. Standardized instruments can establish reproducible anchors for screening, severity estimation, and monitoring, whereas individualized evaluation explains why a score matters for a particular person. Their disciplined integration enables biopsychosocial assessment to combine psychometric accountability with contextual precision, thereby supporting decisions that are both comparable across patients and responsive to clinically meaningful individual variation overall.

#### **1.4 Review Purpose, Scope, and Review Approach**

This review aims to critically examine how biopsychosocial assessment is operationalized in practice by comparing standardized assessment instruments with individualized, clinician-led evaluation. Its central concern is the extent to which each approach captures the biological, psychological, social, functional, and contextual dimensions required for comprehensive clinical understanding. Rather than treating standardized tools and professional judgment as mutually exclusive, the review considers their respective strengths, limitations, and potential for integration within person-centred assessment.

The scope encompasses mental health, behavioural health, primary care, rehabilitation, and related clinical environments where multidimensional assessment informs screening, formulation, treatment planning, risk evaluation, referral, and outcome monitoring. Particular attention is given to psychometric quality, clinical utility, cultural responsiveness, contextual

sensitivity, consistency, interpretive depth, and the practical demands of implementation across diverse populations and service settings.

The review has four principal objectives. First, it examines the conceptual foundations that justify multidimensional biopsychosocial assessment. Second, it evaluates the reliability, validity, usability, and decision-making value of standardized instruments. Third, it analyses the contribution of clinical interviews, professional judgment, contextual narratives, and person-specific formulation to individualized evaluation. Fourth, it compares both approaches to identify circumstances in which one may be insufficient without the other and to clarify opportunities for integrated assessment models.

Methodologically, the paper adopts a structured narrative review approach, synthesizing relevant theoretical, psychometric, clinical, and cross-cultural literature. Evidence is organized thematically to support comparison across assessment domains and practice contexts. Emphasis is placed on conceptual coherence, methodological quality, practical applicability, and cultural relevance, enabling the review to identify current evidence gaps and priorities for more balanced, defensible, and clinically meaningful biopsychosocial assessment. This approach also supports examination of how assessment choices influence equity, therapeutic engagement, continuity, and interdisciplinary clinical communication.

## **2. Foundations of Biopsychosocial Assessment**

### **2.1 Biopsychosocial Model in Clinical Practice**

The biopsychosocial model translates clinical assessment from a disease-centred exercise into an integrated examination of how biological processes, psychological characteristics and social conditions interact to shape illness, functioning and recovery. Its value lies not in merely recording information under three headings, but in establishing relationships among domains. Primary-care scholarship has shown that this perspective is relevant to chronic and functional conditions, where symptoms, adherence, family circumstances and environmental demands cannot be adequately interpreted through pathology alone. Yet implementation remains uneven because biomedical routines, workload pressures and limited training can constrain multidimensional inquiry, making systematic operationalization essential for clinical use (Kusnanto et al., 2018).

Clinical application begins with information gathering while preserving diagnostic discipline. Biological assessment remains indispensable: medical history, examination, medication effects, developmental factors and disease processes establish the physiological context. Psychological assessment then considers affect, cognition, coping, beliefs, behaviour, trauma, motivation and self-regulation, while social inquiry addresses relationships, education, employment, economic resources, culture and living conditions. Chronic pain provides an example because nociceptive processes, emotional responses, learning histories, expectations and interpersonal environments mutually influence symptom persistence and disability. Consequently, assessment and treatment become more precise when clinicians examine interacting determinants rather than treating pain intensity as a sufficient explanation of the patient's experience (Gatchel et al., 2007).

The model is equally valuable in mental and behavioural health because psychosocial variables may influence both vulnerability and observed behaviour. Nigerian evidence concerning in-school adolescents demonstrates that moral disengagement is associated with psychosocial influences, reinforcing the clinical importance of examining behaviour within relational and environmental contexts rather than interpreting it solely as an individual disposition (Sabboh,

2021). Similarly, research on child abuse among junior secondary students in Kaduna identified socioeconomic and parenting-related factors as predictors, illustrating why assessment of risk requires attention to family organization, material conditions and interpersonal processes alongside individual characteristics (Sabbah& Yusuf, 2021).

Operationalization is especially important when presentations cross conventional disciplinary boundaries. In paediatric practice, somatic symptom disorders may involve physical complaints without a simple correspondence between symptoms and identifiable pathology. A structured biopsychosocial method can integrate medical evaluation with psychological, developmental, family and school-related information while maintaining the child and caregivers as participants. Such practice reduces false dichotomies between “physical” and “psychological” illness and supports interdisciplinary formulation based on converging evidence rather than diagnostic exclusion alone (Førde et al., 2022).

Biopsychosocial practice also requires cultural responsiveness because social meaning influences symptom interpretation, coping and help-seeking. Evidence from Ghanaian adults with sickle cell disease showed that an African-enhanced biopsychosocial-spiritual framework incorporating social support, cultural coping and spiritual dimensions offered a broader account of psychological health than narrowly focused approaches. This indicates that clinicians should not assume that standardized Western categories exhaust the domains relevant to patients’ explanatory models or sources of resilience; culturally situated beliefs may affect assessment and care planning (Anim, Adongo&Yirdong, 2022).

The importance of longitudinal assessment is evident after physical illness. Among South African intensive-care survivors, recovery encompassed changing physical, psychological and social outcomes over time, demonstrating that discharge status alone cannot represent rehabilitation needs. Reassessment across recovery stages can reveal evolving limitations in physical function, emotional wellbeing and social reintegration, enabling clinicians to adjust intervention priorities as the patient’s circumstances change (van Aartsen & van Aswegen, 2018). A challenge, however, is integrating rather than merely accumulating multidomain data. Effective biopsychosocial reasoning requires clinicians to identify plausible pathways linking factors across levels and to distinguish predisposing, precipitating, perpetuating and protective influences. Cross-disciplinary scholarship emphasizes that the model reaches its greatest explanatory value when biological, psychological, social and cultural variables are connected through hypotheses rather than presented as parallel lists. This demands communication across professional boundaries and assessment methods capable of generating information that can be synthesized into coherent clinical formulations (Suls et al., 2013).

## **2.2 Core Domains of Comprehensive Assessment**

Comprehensive biopsychosocial assessment requires systematic attention to interdependent domains rather than accumulation of isolated symptoms. Clinicians should examine biological status, psychological functioning, behavioural patterns, social relationships, environmental conditions, functional capacity and cultural influences. This architecture enables presenting problems to be interpreted in relation to symptoms and the circumstances shaping vulnerability, resilience and care needs. A six-domain medical-history framework encompassing biomedical and psychiatric conditions, behavioural health, living environment and resources, social support, and functional status demonstrated that structured domain-based inquiry can reveal actionable information that conventional histories may overlook (Williams et al., 2019).

The psychological domain encompasses mood, cognition, coping, perceived stress, self-concept, motivation and other internal processes that influence functioning and treatment engagement. Nigerian evidence linking psychological factors with mental-health outcomes among university students illustrates why comprehensive assessment should evaluate multiple psychological constructs rather than rely on a single symptom indicator (Yusuf & Sabboh, 2021). Such inquiry is useful when psychological findings are interpreted alongside physical health, medication effects, developmental history and functional consequences, avoiding artificial separation between mental and somatic experience. Social and relational assessment is indispensable. Family attachment, educational experiences, peer relationships, socioeconomic resources, housing, employment and social support may operate as protective or aggravating influences. Among Nigerian undergraduates, teaching styles and parental bonding were associated with academic boredom, demonstrating that individual functioning can be shaped by relational and institutional environments beyond the person alone (Sabbah&Olugbade, 2021). Comprehensive assessment should therefore establish not merely whether social factors are present, but how they interact with psychological and behavioural patterns. Cultural, spiritual and service-context domains determine how difficulties are understood, expressed and managed. South African psychiatric practice has emphasized biological, psychological and social assessment alongside culture, spirituality, community context, recovery and multidisciplinary care, underscoring the need to situate clinical findings within local systems of meaning and available services (Janse van Rensburg, 2007). This is especially important when standardized instruments are used across populations whose explanatory models differ from those assumed during instrument development. Finally, comprehensive assessment must integrate domains into a coherent formulation. Holistic primary-care scholarship argues that clinical assessment should establish safety, understand the person and relationships, recognize meaning, and connect presenting distress with history and context rather than reducing evaluation to criteria-based diagnosis alone (Lynch et al., 2012). The quality of biopsychosocial assessment therefore depends on breadth, depth and synthesis: standardized tools can structure domain coverage, while individualized interviewing determines relevance, chronology and interaction among findings.

### **3. Standardized Biopsychosocial Assessment Instruments**

#### **3.1 Types and Applications of Standardized Tools**

Standardized assessment tools occupy a role in biopsychosocial practice because they convert clinical and psychosocial phenomena into reproducible scores that can support screening, case identification, severity estimation, functional assessment, treatment planning, and outcome monitoring. Their defining characteristics include predetermined items, uniform administration procedures, explicit scoring rules, and empirically derived interpretive thresholds. These features reduce assessor variation and permit comparison across patients and time. Among symptom-focused instruments, the Patient Health Questionnaire-9 (PHQ-9) is widely used to assess depressive symptom severity and identify probable depressive disorders in primary-care settings; its brevity facilitates repeated treatment measurement (Kroenke et al., 2001).

Anxiety-specific instruments serve a related but distinct function. The seven-item Generalized Anxiety Disorder scale (GAD-7) was developed as a brief self-report measure for identifying probable generalized anxiety disorder and grading symptom severity. Its standardized format supports rapid case finding in settings where lengthy psychiatric interviews are impractical, while numerical scoring enables clinicians to monitor change over successive encounters. Such

instruments are most useful when interpreted as structured indicators rather than substitutes for diagnostic evaluation, because symptom scores require consideration of duration, impairment, comorbidity, medical explanations, and the patient's wider circumstances (Spitzer et al., 2006). Comprehensive biopsychosocial assessment also requires standardized measurement beyond symptoms. The World Health Organization Disability Assessment Schedule 2.0 (WHODAS 2.0) operationalizes functioning across cognition, mobility, self-care, interpersonal relations, life activities, and societal participation. Its development across multiple countries illustrates an important class of generic instruments designed to compare disability across diagnostic categories and cultural settings. In practice, such tools can identify functional consequences that symptom inventories may miss, establish baselines, and evaluate whether interventions produce meaningful improvements in everyday participation rather than merely reductions in clinical symptoms (Üstün et al., 2010). Culturally grounded standardized tools constitute another important category. The Shona Symptom Questionnaire was developed in Zimbabwe by combining locally elicited idioms of distress with established psychiatric items, producing a brief instrument for common mental disorders that reflected both indigenous experience and cross-cultural clinical constructs. Its development demonstrates that standardization need not require cultural homogenization; locally meaningful content can be incorporated into a structured measure, strengthening relevance where imported terminology may inadequately represent how distress is experienced or communicated (Patel et al., 1997). Standardized psychosocial instruments are also used to quantify relational, motivational, educational, and behavioural variables that may inform broader biopsychosocial understanding. In Nigeria, parental involvement was examined through structured questionnaire methods in relation to career decision-making among secondary-school students, showing how social and family influences can be converted into measurable variables for systematic analysis. Although such measures are not diagnostic instruments, they illustrate the application of standardized assessment to contextual domains that may become clinically relevant when evaluating developmental functioning, family influence, or psychosocial resources (Ezeani et al., 2023). Similarly, structured measurement can distinguish multiple psychosocial contributors within the same assessment framework. Research among Nigerian undergraduates assessed peer approval seeking, socioeconomic status, locus of control, and academic self-handicapping through questionnaire-based procedures, illustrating how interpersonal, contextual, and psychological constructs can be operationalized separately and examined together. This approach is pertinent to biopsychosocial assessment because standardized tools can create comparable indicators across domains while allowing clinicians to identify patterns that warrant deeper individualized inquiry (Sabbah & Ojo, 2023). The breadth of potential application is further demonstrated by Nigerian research on academic buoyancy, where standardized measures captured academic self-efficacy, school engagement, parental involvement, emotional intelligence, school connectedness, and related characteristics within a single analytic framework. Such multidomain measurement demonstrates the capacity of structured tools to organize otherwise diffuse psychosocial information and identify relationships among individual and environmental factors (Yusuf et al., 2023). In clinical practice, standardized instruments therefore range from symptom screeners and disorder-specific severity scales to functioning schedules, culturally adapted measures, risk instruments, and psychosocial questionnaires. Their principal strength lies in consistency and explicit measurement; their responsible application requires selection according to purpose,

population, setting, cultural fit, psychometric evidence, and the specific clinical decision the assessment is intended to inform.

### **3.2 Reliability, Validity, and Clinical Utility**

Reliability, validity, and clinical utility constitute interdependent criteria for judging whether standardized biopsychosocial instruments are fit for practice. Reliability concerns the consistency of scores across items, occasions, or raters, whereas validity addresses whether an instrument measures the construct it claims to assess. Clinical utility extends beyond psychometric quality to consider interpretability, feasibility, responsiveness, burden, and usefulness for decision-making. Explicit standards are essential because high internal consistency alone cannot establish content validity, criterion validity, responsiveness, or meaningful interpretation of scores (Terwee et al., 2007).

Contemporary psychometric evaluation increasingly requires structured examination of several measurement properties rather than dependence on a single coefficient. The COSMIN framework formalized this approach by distinguishing reliability, measurement error, validity, responsiveness, and interpretability and by emphasizing methodological quality in studies evaluating health-status instruments. For biopsychosocial assessment, this framework is relevant because instruments may measure heterogeneous domains such as symptoms, functioning, coping, relationships, or quality of life; each domain requires evidence that the measure performs consistently and represents its intended construct appropriately (Mokkink et al., 2010).

Population-specific validation is equally important. An instrument developed in one linguistic or cultural setting may retain apparent reliability while performing differently when transferred elsewhere. In Ethiopia, evaluation of the PHQ-9 against a psychiatrist-administered diagnostic interview demonstrated good internal and test-retest reliability while also examining factor structure, sensitivity, specificity, and an optimal diagnostic threshold. The study illustrates why interpretation should depend on local performance characteristics rather than assuming that cut-off scores derived elsewhere operate identically across populations (Gelaye et al., 2013).

Nigerian scale-development research further demonstrates the importance of cultural and construct adaptation. The revised self-esteem scale for Nigerian adolescents and youths was designed to address contextual relevance while examining internal consistency, factor structure, convergent relationships, and discriminatory properties. Such work is important to biopsychosocial practice because culturally responsive standardization requires more than translation; item wording, construct representation, and response patterns must remain meaningful for the population in which scores will inform assessment or research decisions (Sabbah, 2022). Clinical utility determines whether psychometrically acceptable instruments improve real-world assessment. Brief measures may be valuable where time, workforce, and administrative resources are constrained, provided brevity does not compromise accuracy or responsiveness. Australian research comparing abbreviated measures of depression, anxiety, and general distress found that short forms could retain useful discriminant properties and sensitivity to treatment change, illustrating how efficiency can support routine screening and progress monitoring (Staples et al., 2019). Within biopsychosocial assessment, standardized tools should therefore be selected through a layered appraisal: reliability establishes score dependability, validity establishes defensible interpretation, and clinical utility establishes whether the instrument contributes to screening, formulation, monitoring, referral, or treatment planning.

These criteria determine whether standardization strengthens clinical judgment or merely produces numbers without sufficient contextual or decisional value.

#### **4. Individualized and Clinician-Led Assessment Approaches**

##### **4.1 Clinical Interviews and Professional Judgment**

Clinical interviews remain a central component of biopsychosocial assessment because they allow clinicians to move beyond symptom counts and examine chronology, context, meaning, functioning, relationships, strengths and environmental pressures. Unlike fixed questionnaires, interviews permit clarification, follow-up questions and adjustment of emphasis as relevant information emerges. Their value, however, depends on disciplined interviewing rather than intuition alone. Unstructured interviews can support rapport and individualized exploration, but they may also vary across practitioners. Guidance on unstructured interviewing therefore emphasizes systematic coverage of presenting problems, psychiatric history, medical factors, psychosocial circumstances and mental status while preserving flexibility in how information is elicited (Jones, 2010). The interview also initiates a professional relationship that can affect the quality of information obtained. Patients may disclose sensitive, ambiguous or culturally shaped experiences more fully when clinicians communicate respect, collaboration and curiosity. Research on initial psychological assessment indicates that therapist behaviors such as empathic listening, appropriate structure and collaborative engagement can strengthen the working alliance during assessment. These relational processes are not merely interpersonal refinements; they influence whether clinically important material is expressed, understood and incorporated into formulation (Hilsenroth & Cromer, 2007).

Professional judgment becomes necessary when clinicians interpret interview material, weigh competing explanations and determine the significance of findings that do not map neatly onto standardized thresholds. Yet judgment can introduce inconsistency. Research comparing standardized psychiatric interviewing with ratings requiring greater clinical discretion found that judgment-based ratings did not necessarily add diagnostic information and could be less reliable. This illustrates the need to distinguish useful contextual interpretation from unsupported inference, particularly when symptoms are overlapping or shaped by expectations about what the clinician anticipates finding (Lewis & Williams, 1989).

Structured and semi-structured interviews provide one mechanism for constraining such variability without removing clinical expertise. Evaluation of the SCID-5 Clinician Version in Brazil showed strong reliability and specificity across diagnostic categories and confirmed clinical validity when interview results were compared with longitudinal expert diagnoses. Importantly, performance still depended partly on interviewer experience, demonstrating that standardization can strengthen consistency but cannot fully substitute for training, questioning skill and interpretive competence (Osório et al., 2019).

Clinical judgment must also remain culturally informed. The Cultural Formulation Interview offers a structured means of exploring cultural definitions of problems, explanatory models, stressors, supports and help-seeking preferences. Among South African psychiatrists and registrars, awareness and actual use of the instrument were limited despite favorable attitudes, with assessment time identified as a practical concern. The findings illustrate how culturally responsive interviewing requires both suitable frameworks and implementation conditions that permit clinicians to use them meaningfully (Mabaso & Kotze, 2020).

Evidence from Nigeria further demonstrates the value of combining diagnostic guidance with professional appraisal. Field testing of ICD-11 diagnostic guidelines across two Nigerian mental-health facilities produced substantial to near-perfect inter-rater reliability and favorable clinician ratings of clinical utility, including goodness of fit, comprehensibility and usefulness for distinguishing disorders. These findings show that professional judgment becomes more defensible when clinicians work within explicit diagnostic frameworks while retaining responsibility for interpreting the patient's presentation (Onofa et al., 2019). In biopsychosocial practice, clinical interviews therefore contribute contextual depth and individualized meaning, whereas structured guidance promotes completeness, comparability and accountability. The strongest approach treats professional judgment as an evidence-informed interpretive process that integrates interview narratives, observed functioning, collateral information and standardized findings into a coherent formulation responsive to the patient.

#### **4.2 Contextual Narratives and Person-Centered Assessment**

Contextual narratives are indispensable to person-centered biopsychosocial assessment because standardized scores cannot fully represent how individuals understand illness, assign meaning to symptoms, negotiate social roles, or experience constraints within everyday life. Person-centered assessment therefore requires clinicians to interpret measurable indicators alongside the patient's account of priorities, relationships, values, expectations, and lived circumstances. Patient-centeredness has been conceptualized through dimensions including the biopsychosocial perspective, recognition of the patient as a person, shared power and responsibility, therapeutic alliance, and awareness of the clinician as a person. These dimensions position assessment as a relational process rather than a one-directional extraction of clinical data (Mead & Bower, 2000). Narrative information deepens this process by revealing chronology, causation as understood by the patient, and the personal significance of illness. Narrative medicine emphasizes the clinician's capacity to recognize, absorb, interpret, and act upon patients' stories, thereby strengthening empathy and interpretive accuracy. Within biopsychosocial assessment, this approach is particularly valuable when symptom severity alone does not explain distress, treatment preferences, functional disruption, or reluctance to engage with recommended care (Charon, 2001). Context also determines how illness categories are experienced and communicated. Cross-cultural clinical scholarship distinguishes disease, as professional biomedical interpretation, from illness, as the patient's culturally and socially mediated experience. Exploring explanatory models can therefore uncover beliefs about cause, expected course, acceptable treatment, family responsibilities, and help-seeking that standardized instruments may not adequately elicit. Incorporating such information reduces the risk that culturally meaningful expressions are misclassified or stripped of their social significance (Kleinman et al., 1978). The importance of contextual interpretation is evident in Nigerian psychosocial research. Economic adversity, marital disagreement, parenting patterns, and changing expectations surrounding husbands' breadwinner roles were examined as interconnected influences within family life. Such findings demonstrate why person-centered assessment should situate psychological experiences within household responsibilities, economic pressures, relationship dynamics, and prevailing social expectations rather than treating them as isolated individual characteristics (Ezeani & Sabboh, 2021).

Person-centered assessment also depends on whether health systems permit patients to be heard and treated responsively. National evidence from Ghana found that experiential quality and

health-system responsiveness were closely associated with patients' assessments of care, highlighting communication, dignity, autonomy, confidentiality, and prompt attention as important dimensions of care experience (Ratcliffe et al., 2020). Accordingly, contextual narratives complement standardized biopsychosocial instruments by explaining what quantified findings mean for a particular person. They allow clinicians to connect symptoms and functional measures with biography, culture, relationships, structural conditions, strengths, and patient-defined goals. Used alongside standardized tools, narrative inquiry supports assessments that remain systematic without becoming reductive, enabling clinical formulations to preserve both comparability and the individuality essential to person-centered decision-making. This balance is crucial when assessment findings guide collaborative care planning across culturally diverse and clinically complex service environments overall.

## **5. Comparing Assessment Approaches in Practice**

### **5.1 Accuracy, Consistency, and Decision-Making Value**

Accuracy in biopsychosocial assessment should be understood as the extent to which an assessment identifies clinically meaningful problems and supports decisions that improve care. Consistency concerns whether comparable information produces similar interpretations across clinicians and settings, while decision-making value refers to whether findings alter screening, diagnosis, referral, treatment selection, or monitoring defensibly. Standardized measurement strengthens these functions by replacing impressionistic estimates with repeatable scores and explicit thresholds. Measurement-based care consequently links routine symptom measurement with clinical decisions, reducing unexplained practice variation and creating longitudinal evidence about whether an intervention is working (Fortney et al., 2017).

Accuracy, however, cannot be assumed because an instrument is standardized. Measures require validation against credible reference standards within the populations in which they will be used. Among Nigerian university students, the PHQ-9 demonstrated strong reliability, sensitivity, and specificity at empirically derived cut-off scores for depressive disorders. The study illustrates the decision-making importance of locally tested thresholds: a score becomes clinically useful when its classification performance is known, rather than when a foreign cut-off is adopted without contextual evidence (Adewuya et al., 2006). Comparable concerns arise when screening is introduced into resource-constrained primary care. In South Africa, a brief mental-health screening tool was evaluated against diagnostic assessment for common mental disorders and showed that structured instruments can support case identification while remaining feasible for non-specialist services. Such tools can improve consistency by prompting systematic enquiry and reducing dependence on whether clinicians spontaneously recognize psychological symptoms. Their value is greatest when positive results trigger fuller assessment rather than being treated as self-sufficient diagnoses (Bhana et al., 2019). Decision-making value also depends on how assessment information is converted into treatment choices. In a study comparing therapists' recommendations with statistical prediction for major depression, algorithmic treatment selection produced better outcome differentiation than clinical judgment alone. The findings do not eliminate professional interpretation, but they demonstrate that systematically weighted patient characteristics can reveal decision-relevant patterns that clinicians may not integrate consistently during unaided judgment (van Bronswijk et al., 2021). This distinction is central to biopsychosocial assessment, where interacting variables can exceed the reliability of intuitive synthesis.

Routine use nevertheless requires practical feasibility. In schizophrenia care, structured measurement can clarify heterogeneous symptom domains and provide objective markers of change, yet time demands and workflow burden may discourage implementation. The proposed use of brief standardized scales illustrates how decision support must balance psychometric comprehensiveness with clinical usability; an instrument that is accurate but rarely administered has limited real-world value (Dinakaran et al., 2020).

Technology-assisted detection further illustrates the relationship between accuracy and professional oversight. Nigerian research using template matching to identify architectural distortions in mammograms reported high sensitivity while also recording false-positive detections. The broader assessment lesson is that structured algorithms can direct attention consistently to potentially important signals, but error patterns remain consequential and require interpretation before action is taken (Ejofodomi et al., 2014). This reinforces the need to judge tools through detection performance and downstream decisional consequences.

Similarly, artificial intelligence combined with biosensor technologies has been proposed to improve rapid detection and pattern recognition in antimicrobial-resistant foodborne pathogens by integrating sensitive measurement with automated signal interpretation. Such systems illustrate the capacity of computational approaches to accelerate classification and reduce dependence on manual processes, while raising requirements for validation, calibration, and responsible interpretation of false-positive and false-negative results (Olorunkosebi et al., 2023). For biopsychosocial practice, the most defensible model treats accuracy, consistency, and decision value as linked but non-equivalent properties. Standardized instruments contribute reproducibility, explicit thresholds, and trackable change; clinician judgment contributes context, exceptions, cultural interpretation, and information not captured by fixed measures. High-quality assessment emerges when standardized findings are locally valid, clinically interpretable, feasible to obtain, and deliberately incorporated into decisions rather than collected as administrative data. The comparative value of an assessment approach should ultimately be judged by whether it improves recognition, reduces unwarranted variation, supports proportionate action, and preserves individualized interpretation across complex biological, psychological, and social presentations.

## 5.2 Cultural Responsiveness and Contextual Sensitivity

Cultural responsiveness and contextual sensitivity are essential to defensible biopsychosocial assessment because symptoms, coping practices, risk expressions, family expectations, and help-seeking behaviours are interpreted through social and cultural frameworks. Standardized instruments may provide consistency, yet their apparent objectivity can become misleading when constructs, language, thresholds, or response formats do not correspond with the patient's lived context. Cultural competence should therefore be understood not as mastery of group traits, but as a capacity to recognize uncertainty, examine assumptions, negotiate meanings, and adapt clinical reasoning to the individual encounter (Kirmayer, 2012).

Contextual sensitivity is particularly important when psychosocial variables are embedded within locally specific social structures. Among Nigerian adolescents, parental socioeconomic status, peer influence, and self-esteem were examined in relation to juvenile delinquency, illustrating how behavioural outcomes can reflect interacting personal and social conditions rather than isolated individual pathology. For biopsychosocial assessment, such evidence supports inquiry

into family resources, peer environments, social expectations, and locally salient pressures before standardized scores are interpreted as self-explanatory indicators (Balogun & Sabboh, 2021).

Culturally responsive assessment also requires evidence that measurement tools function appropriately within the population of use. In rural western Kenya, investigators developed and validated a perinatal depression screening instrument that blended established psychiatric criteria with locally identified idioms of distress. The locally developed measure demonstrated strong diagnostic performance, showing that cultural adaptation can preserve measurement discipline while improving sensitivity to how distress is expressed in a specific community (Green et al., 2018). The same principle applies when established instruments are transferred across languages and belief systems. Work with Ethiopian populations modified the Self-Reporting Questionnaire through culturally meaningful translations and additional locally specific items, producing a revised instrument with improved validity. This demonstrates that literal translation is insufficient when concepts of distress, somatic expression, and everyday terminology differ across settings; adaptation must address conceptual and experiential equivalence as well as linguistic accuracy (Youngmann et al., 2008).

Clinical interviewing can complement these psychometric safeguards by eliciting explanatory models, social identities, perceived causes, supports, treatment expectations, and experiences of discrimination or migration. Scholarship on the DSM-5 Cultural Formulation Interview emphasizes its value for systematically incorporating cultural information into diagnostic assessment, training, research, and clinical practice, while also recognizing implementation demands such as clinician skill and service constraints (Aggarwal et al., 2020). It also requires clinicians to distinguish culturally normative beliefs and behaviours from clinically significant dysfunction, particularly when interpreting unusual experiences across diverse populations. Within biopsychosocial evaluation, cultural responsiveness therefore depends on combining validated measures with contextual interpretation. Standardization should establish comparability, while person-centered inquiry determines whether constructs, scores, and thresholds accurately represent the individual's circumstances. This balance reduces culturally driven misclassification, strengthens therapeutic engagement, and supports assessment decisions that are methodologically defensible and socially meaningful.

## **6. Integration and Future Assessment Practice**

### **6.1 Evidence Gaps and Research Priorities**

Evidence gaps in biopsychosocial assessment arise less from the absence of available instruments than from uncertainty about how different assessment approaches perform across populations, settings, and clinical decisions. Standardized tools offer reproducibility, explicit scoring, and longitudinal comparability, whereas individualized evaluation contributes contextual interpretation, flexibility, and attention to atypical presentations. Yet comparatively few studies examine these approaches head-to-head using patient-centred outcomes, diagnostic accuracy, treatment modification, engagement, and resource use as simultaneous endpoints. Evidence-based assessment scholarship has therefore emphasized that future research should evaluate not only psychometric adequacy but also the conditions under which particular measures and methods improve clinical decisions for diverse patients (Hunsley & Mash, 2007).

A major priority is stronger cross-cultural validation. Many instruments continue to be transported across languages and populations with limited evidence concerning construct equivalence, locally meaningful symptom expression, or appropriate thresholds. Work in

Rwanda demonstrated that psychiatric measures can be evaluated through culturally grounded methods even where conventional diagnostic gold standards are unavailable, highlighting both methodological possibilities and persistent limitations in under-resourced settings (Bolton, 2001). Future studies should combine qualitative inquiry, cognitive interviewing, local expert input, psychometric testing, and differential item functioning analyses before assuming that standardized scores have comparable meanings across cultural groups.

Measurement quality itself also requires greater transparency. Researchers frequently report scale scores without sufficiently documenting why a measure was selected, whether its dimensional structure fits the population, or how scoring decisions were justified. Such practices can undermine construct validity even when reliability coefficients appear acceptable. Research priorities should therefore include preregistered measurement plans, replication across independent samples, explicit reporting of adaptation procedures, and examination of measurement invariance across demographic and clinical groups (Flake & Fried, 2020).

Another gap concerns implementation in routine services. Systematic evidence indicates that patient-reported and routine outcome measures are adopted unevenly, with barriers including administrative burden, limited infrastructure, clinician skepticism, confidentiality concerns, inadequate feedback systems, and uncertainty about how scores should alter treatment. Research should move beyond demonstrating that instruments can be administered and determine which implementation strategies make assessment data timely, interpretable, and actionable for both clinicians and service users (Gelkopf et al., 2021). Hybrid effectiveness-implementation designs could establish whether standardized assessment improves outcomes under ordinary service conditions rather than only within controlled research environments.

Age and developmental appropriateness also require sustained attention. Reviews of mental-health outcome measures for young people have identified substantial variation in domains assessed, psychometric evidence, and suitability for routine feedback. Future research should determine whether instruments capture developmental transitions, family influences, educational functioning, autonomy, and changing social contexts without imposing adult-derived assumptions on younger populations (Kwan & Rickwood, 2015). Comparable research is needed for older adults, people with cognitive impairment, individuals with multiple chronic conditions, and populations experiencing displacement or socioeconomic adversity.

Internationally harmonized instruments may facilitate comparison, but comprehensiveness can create respondent burden and implementation complexity. The World Mental Health Composite International Diagnostic Interview illustrates how standardized assessment can integrate diagnoses, functioning, treatment, risk factors, and sociodemographic information within a common framework. Future work should test whether modular, digitally supported versions preserve validity while reducing burden and enabling clinicians to combine structured outputs with individualized narratives and collateral information (Kessler & Üstün, 2004).

Research must also address how assessment information is shared across disciplines. Nigerian evidence from emergency departments emphasizes the contribution of multidisciplinary collaboration to patient outcomes, reinforcing the importance of communication across professional roles when complex information informs care (Ohunyon et al., 2023). For biopsychosocial assessment, future studies should examine shared formulations, interoperable documentation, multidisciplinary interpretation of standardized scores, and mechanisms for resolving discordance between instruments, clinician judgment, patient narratives, and collateral reports. Priority should be given to prospective, multicentre, culturally diverse studies that

compare integrated assessment models with standardized-only and clinician-led approaches, while measuring diagnostic agreement, treatment changes, patient experience, equity, feasibility, cost, and longitudinal outcomes. Such evidence would clarify not simply which assessment method performs best in isolation, but how combinations of methods can produce clinically useful, culturally defensible, and person-centred decisions across real-world practice. This agenda would also strengthen accountability for assessment-informed clinical decision-making globally.

## **Conclusion**

This review examined the practical value of biopsychosocial assessment by comparing standardized instruments with individualized, clinician-led evaluation across conceptual, psychometric, cultural, and implementation dimensions. The study achieved its aims by clarifying the foundations of multidimensional assessment, identifying the principal domains of comprehensive evaluation, examining the applications and measurement properties of standardized tools, and assessing the contribution of contextual narratives and professional judgment to person-centred care.

The evidence indicates that standardized instruments offer important advantages in reliability, consistency, transparency, comparability, and longitudinal monitoring. Their structured formats can improve screening, severity estimation, functional assessment, and documentation while reducing unwarranted variation between assessors. However, their usefulness depends on population-specific validation, cultural adaptation, appropriate thresholds, and clear linkage between scores and clinical decisions. Individualized assessment contributes complementary strengths by capturing chronology, explanatory models, family dynamics, socioeconomic pressures, cultural meanings, strengths, and patient priorities that fixed instruments may overlook. At the same time, unaided professional judgment remains vulnerable to inconsistency and bias when not supported by explicit frameworks.

The review therefore finds that neither approach is sufficient in isolation. The most defensible assessment model is an integrated one in which validated standardized tools provide reproducible anchors and clinician-led inquiry supplies contextual interpretation, synthesis, and individualized meaning. Such integration is particularly important in culturally diverse and resource-variable settings, where imported measures may not fully represent local experiences.

Future practice should prioritize culturally validated instruments, structured yet flexible interviewing, multidisciplinary formulation, routine outcome monitoring, and transparent documentation of how assessment findings inform care. Research should further compare integrated, standardized-only, and clinician-led approaches using diagnostic accuracy, patient experience, treatment modification, equity, cost, and longitudinal outcomes. Greater investment in locally grounded validation and implementation research is also recommended to ensure that assessment remains scientifically rigorous, culturally responsive, clinically useful, and genuinely person-centred. These priorities can strengthen assessment quality while preserving professional accountability and collaboration.

## References

- Adewuya, A.O., Ola, B.A. and Afolabi, O.O. (2006) 'Validity of the Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9) as a screening tool for depression amongst Nigerian university students', *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 96(1–2), pp. 89–93. DOI: [10.1016/j.jad.2006.05.021](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2006.05.021).
- Ægisdóttir, S., White, M.J., Spengler, P.M., Maugherman, A.S., Anderson, L.A., Cook, R.S., Nichols, C.N., Lampropoulos, G.K., Walker, B.S., Cohen, G. and Rush, J.D. (2006) 'The meta-analysis of clinical judgment project: Fifty-six years of accumulated research on clinical versus statistical prediction', *The Counseling Psychologist*, 34(3), pp. 341–382. DOI: [10.1177/0011000005285875](https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000005285875).
- Aggarwal, N.K., Jarvis, G.E., Gómez-Carrillo, A., Kirmayer, L.J. and Lewis-Fernández, R. (2020) 'The Cultural Formulation Interview since DSM-5: Prospects for training, research, and clinical practice', *Transcultural Psychiatry*, 57(4), pp. 496–514. DOI: [10.1177/1363461520940481](https://doi.org/10.1177/1363461520940481).
- Anim, M.T., Adongo, C.A. and Yirdong, F. (2022) 'African cultural values in the biopsychosocial-spiritual care model to manage psychological symptoms in adults with sickle cell disease in Ghana, West Africa', *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 25(2), pp. 177–196. DOI: [10.1080/13674676.2021.2025351](https://doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2021.2025351).
- Balogun, C.T. and Sabboh, G.M. (2021) 'Psycho-sociological factors as determinants of juvenile delinquency among adolescents in junior secondary schools in Patani Local Government Area of Delta State, Nigeria', *International Journal of Academic Management Science Research*, 5(10), pp. 34–40.
- Bhana, A., Mntambo, N., Gigaba, S.G., Luvuno, Z.P.B., Grant, M., Ackerman, D., Ntswe, E., Nomathemba, M. and Petersen, I. (2019) 'Validation of a brief mental health screening tool for common mental disorders in primary healthcare', *South African Medical Journal*, 109(4), pp. 278–283. DOI: [10.7196/SAMJ.2019.v109i4.13664](https://doi.org/10.7196/SAMJ.2019.v109i4.13664).
- Bolton, P. (2001) 'Cross-cultural validity and reliability testing of a standard psychiatric assessment instrument without a gold standard', *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 189(4), pp. 238–242. DOI: [10.1097/00005053-200104000-00005](https://doi.org/10.1097/00005053-200104000-00005).
- Borrell-Carrió, F., Suchman, A.L. and Epstein, R.M. (2004) 'The biopsychosocial model 25 years later: Principles, practice, and scientific inquiry', *Annals of Family Medicine*, 2(6), pp. 576–582. DOI: [10.1370/afm.245](https://doi.org/10.1370/afm.245).
- Charon, R. (2001) 'Narrative medicine: A model for empathy, reflection, profession, and trust', *JAMA*, 286(15), pp. 1897–1902. DOI: [10.1001/jama.286.15.1897](https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.286.15.1897).
- Chigangaidze, R.K. (2021) 'Defending the African philosophy of ubuntu and its place in clinical social work practice in mental health: The biopsychosocial and ecological systems perspectives', *Social Work in Mental Health*, 19(4), pp. 276–288. DOI: [10.1080/15332985.2021.1910894](https://doi.org/10.1080/15332985.2021.1910894).
- Day, S.B. (1985) 'Clinical biopsychosocial practice and primary health care in Eastern Nigeria', *Social Science & Medicine*, 21(12), pp. 1383–1389. DOI: [10.1016/0277-9536\(85\)90448-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-9536(85)90448-4).
- Dinakaran, D., Sreeraj, V.S. and Venkatasubramanian, G. (2020) 'Measurement based care in schizophrenia—Feasibility in routine clinical practice', *Asian Journal of Psychiatry*, 49, article 101954. DOI: [10.1016/j.ajp.2020.101954](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajp.2020.101954).

- Ejofodomi, O.A., Gideon, E.N., Oladipo, G.O. and Oshomah, E.R. (2014) 'Automated detection of architectural distortions in mammograms using template matching', *International Journal of Biomedical Science and Engineering*, 2(1), pp. 1–6. DOI: [10.11648/j.ijbse.20140201.11](https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijbse.20140201.11).
- Engel, G.L. (1977) 'The need for a new medical model: A challenge for biomedicine', *Science*, 196(4286), pp. 129–136. DOI: [10.1126/science.847460](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.847460).
- Ezeani, P.T. and Sabboh, G.M. (2021) 'Psychosocial predictors of the changing role of husbands as breadwinners in a depressed economy in Ibadan Metropolis, Oyo State, Nigeria', *British Journal of Education, Learning and Development Psychology*, 4(2), pp. 31–42. DOI: [10.52589/BJELDP-ZU3KSUJU](https://doi.org/10.52589/BJELDP-ZU3KSUJU).
- Ezeani, P.T., Ogu, C. and Sabboh, G.M. (2023) 'Parental involvement as correlate of career decision-making among secondary school students in Oyo State, Nigeria', *British Journal of Multidisciplinary and Advanced Studies*, 4(4), pp. 106–115. DOI: [10.37745/bjmas.2022.0260](https://doi.org/10.37745/bjmas.2022.0260).
- Flake, J.K. and Fried, E.I. (2020) 'Measurement schmeasurement: Questionable measurement practices and how to avoid them', *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*, 3(4), pp. 456–465. DOI: [10.1177/2515245920952393](https://doi.org/10.1177/2515245920952393).
- Førde, S., Herner, L.B., Helland, I.B. and Diseth, T.H. (2022) 'The biopsychosocial model in paediatric clinical practice—An interdisciplinary approach to somatic symptom disorders', *Acta Paediatrica*, 111(11), pp. 2115–2124. DOI: [10.1111/apa.16517](https://doi.org/10.1111/apa.16517).
- Fortney, J.C., Unützer, J., Wrenn, G., Pyne, J.M., Smith, G.R., Schoenbaum, M. and Harbin, H.T. (2017) 'A tipping point for measurement-based care', *Psychiatric Services*, 68(2), pp. 179–188. DOI: [10.1176/appi.ps.201500439](https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ps.201500439).
- Gatchel, R.J., Peng, Y.B., Peters, M.L., Fuchs, P.N. and Turk, D.C. (2007) 'The biopsychosocial approach to chronic pain: Scientific advances and future directions', *Psychological Bulletin*, 133(4), pp. 581–624. DOI: [10.1037/0033-2909.133.4.581](https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.133.4.581).
- Gelaye, B., Williams, M.A., Lemma, S., Deyessa, N., Bahretibeb, Y., Shibire, T., Wondimagegn, D., Lemenhe, A., Fann, J.R., Vander Stoep, A. and Zhou, X.-H.A. (2013) 'Validity of the Patient Health Questionnaire-9 for depression screening and diagnosis in East Africa', *Psychiatry Research*, 210(2), pp. 653–661. DOI: [10.1016/j.psychres.2013.07.015](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2013.07.015).
- Gelkopf, M., Mazor, Y. and Roe, D. (2021) 'A systematic review of patient-reported outcome measurement (PROM) and provider assessment in mental health: Goals, implementation, setting, measurement characteristics and barriers', *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*, 34(Suppl. 1), pp. ii13–ii27. DOI: [10.1093/intqhc/mzz133](https://doi.org/10.1093/intqhc/mzz133).
- Green, E.P., Tuli, H., Kwobah, E., Menya, D., Chesire, I. and Schmidt, C. (2018) 'Developing and validating a perinatal depression screening tool in Kenya blending Western criteria with local idioms: A mixed methods study', *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 228, pp. 49–59. DOI: [10.1016/j.jad.2017.11.027](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2017.11.027).
- Hilsenroth, M.J. and Cromer, T.D. (2007) 'Clinician interventions related to alliance during the initial interview and psychological assessment', *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training*, 44(2), pp. 205–218. DOI: [10.1037/0033-3204.44.2.205](https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-3204.44.2.205).
- Hunsley, J. and Mash, E.J. (2007) 'Evidence-based assessment', *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, 3, pp. 29–51. DOI: [10.1146/annurev.clinpsy.3.022806.091419](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.clinpsy.3.022806.091419).

- Janse van Rensburg, A.B. (2007) 'A framework for current public mental health care practice in South Africa', *African Journal of Psychiatry*, 10(4), pp. 205–209. DOI: [10.4314/ajpsy.v10i4.30256](https://doi.org/10.4314/ajpsy.v10i4.30256).
- Jones, K.D. (2010) 'The unstructured clinical interview', *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 88(2), pp. 220–226. DOI: [10.1002/j.1556-6678.2010.tb00013.x](https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6678.2010.tb00013.x).
- Katerndahl, D. and Oyiriaru, D. (2007) 'Assessing the biopsychosociospiritual model in primary care: Development of the Biopsychosociospiritual Inventory (BioPSSI)', *The International Journal of Psychiatry in Medicine*, 37(4), pp. 393–414. DOI: [10.2190/PM.37.4.d](https://doi.org/10.2190/PM.37.4.d).
- Keitner, G.I., Mansfield, A.K. and Kelley, J.E. (2023) 'The Brief Multidimensional Assessment Scale (BMAS): A broad measure of patient well-being', *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, 76(2), pp. 75–81. DOI: [10.1176/appi.psychotherapy.20220032](https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.psychotherapy.20220032).
- Kessler, R.C. and Üstün, T.B. (2004) 'The World Mental Health (WMH) Survey Initiative version of the World Health Organization (WHO) Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI)', *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research*, 13(2), pp. 93–121. DOI: [10.1002/mpr.168](https://doi.org/10.1002/mpr.168).
- Kirmayer, L.J. (2012) 'Rethinking cultural competence', *Transcultural Psychiatry*, 49(2), pp. 149–164. DOI: [10.1177/1363461512444673](https://doi.org/10.1177/1363461512444673).
- Kleinman, A., Eisenberg, L. and Good, B. (1978) 'Culture, illness, and care: Clinical lessons from anthropologic and cross-cultural research', *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 88(2), pp. 251–258. DOI: [10.7326/0003-4819-88-2-251](https://doi.org/10.7326/0003-4819-88-2-251).
- Kroenke, K., Spitzer, R.L. and Williams, J.B.W. (2001) 'The PHQ-9: Validity of a brief depression severity measure', *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 16(9), pp. 606–613. DOI: [10.1046/j.1525-1497.2001.016009606.x](https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1525-1497.2001.016009606.x).
- Kusnanto, H., Agustian, D. and Hilmanto, D. (2018) 'Biopsychosocial model of illnesses in primary care: A hermeneutic literature review', *Journal of Family Medicine and Primary Care*, 7(3), pp. 497–500. DOI: [10.4103/jfmpe.jfmpe.145.17](https://doi.org/10.4103/jfmpe.jfmpe.145.17).
- Kwan, B. and Rickwood, D.J. (2015) 'A systematic review of mental health outcome measures for young people aged 12 to 25 years', *BMC Psychiatry*, 15, article 279. DOI: [10.1186/s12888-015-0664-x](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-015-0664-x).
- Laget, J., Sofia, C., Bolognini, M., Plancherel, B., Halfon, O. and Stéphan, P. (2006) 'Use of a multidimensional assessment tool in a psychiatric adolescent care unit', *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice*, 12(5), pp. 549–558. DOI: [10.1111/j.1365-2753.2006.00669.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2753.2006.00669.x).
- Lewis, G. and Williams, P. (1989) 'Clinical judgement and the standardized interview in psychiatry', *Psychological Medicine*, 19(4), pp. 971–979. DOI: [10.1017/S0033291700005699](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291700005699).
- Lynch, J.M., Askew, D.A., Mitchell, G.K. and Hegarty, K.L. (2012) 'Beyond symptoms: Defining primary care mental health clinical assessment priorities, content and process', *Social Science & Medicine*, 74(2), pp. 143–149. DOI: [10.1016/j.socscimed.2011.08.043](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2011.08.043).
- Mabaso, D.J. and Kotze, C. (2020) 'Cultural formulation interview: Awareness and attitudes of South African psychiatrists and psychiatry registrars', *South African Journal of Psychiatry*, 26, article 1467. DOI: [10.4102/sajpsy.v26i0.1467](https://doi.org/10.4102/sajpsy.v26i0.1467).
- Makanjuola, V.A., Onyema, M., Nuhu, F.T., Kola, L. and Gureje, O. (2014) 'Validation of short screening tools for common mental disorders in Nigerian general practices',

- General Hospital Psychiatry, 36(3), pp. 325–329. DOI: [10.1016/j.genhosppsych.2013.12.010](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.genhosppsych.2013.12.010).
- Mead, N. and Bower, P. (2000) ‘Patient-centredness: A conceptual framework and review of the empirical literature’, *Social Science & Medicine*, 51(7), pp. 1087–1110. DOI: [10.1016/S0277-9536\(00\)00098-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536(00)00098-8).
- Meyer, L. and Melchert, T.P. (2011) ‘Examining the content of mental health intake assessments from a biopsychosocial perspective’, *Journal of Psychotherapy Integration*, 21(1), pp. 70–89. DOI: [10.1037/a0022907](https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022907).
- Mokkink, L.B., Terwee, C.B., Patrick, D.L., Alonso, J., Stratford, P.W., Knol, D.L., Bouter, L.M. and de Vet, H.C.W. (2010) ‘The COSMIN checklist for assessing the methodological quality of studies on measurement properties of health status measurement instruments: An international Delphi study’, *Quality of Life Research*, 19(4), pp. 539–549. DOI: [10.1007/s11136-010-9606-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11136-010-9606-8).
- Myburgh, N., Loxton, H. and Engels, R.C.M.E. (2021) ‘Cross-cultural adaptation of an anxiety measure in a disadvantaged South African community context: Methodological processes and findings’, *Transcultural Psychiatry*, 58(6), pp. 759–771. DOI: [10.1177/13634615211011850](https://doi.org/10.1177/13634615211011850).
- Ohunyon, G., Ayinde, M. and Ojukwu, P.U. (2023) ‘The impact of multidisciplinary collaboration on patient outcomes in emergency departments’, *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies*, 3(6), pp. 2727–2741. DOI: [10.62225/2583049X.2023.3.6.6029](https://doi.org/10.62225/2583049X.2023.3.6.6029).
- Olorunkosebi, M.T., Ayinde, M.K., Mensah, G.K. and Penddah, A.L. (2023) ‘Integrating artificial intelligence and advanced biosensors for rapid and sensitive detection of antimicrobial-resistant foodborne pathogens’, *Journal of Advances in Microbiology Research*, 4(2), pp. 175–182. DOI: [10.22271/micro.2023.v4.i2b.293](https://doi.org/10.22271/micro.2023.v4.i2b.293).
- Onofa, L., Odunleye, M., Kola, L. and Gureje, O. (2019) ‘Reliability and clinical utility of ICD-11 diagnostic guidelines for severe mental disorders in Nigeria’, *Archives of Medical Research*, 50(8), pp. 535–542. DOI: [10.1016/j.arcmed.2020.01.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arcmed.2020.01.004).
- Osório, F.L., Loureiro, S.R., Hallak, J.E.C., Machado-de-Sousa, J.P., Ushirohira, J.M., Baes, C.V.W., Apolinario, T.D., Donadon, M.F., Bolsoni, L.M., Guimarães, T., Fracon, V.S., Silva-Rodrigues, A.P.C., Pizeta, F.A., Souza, R.M., Sanches, R.F., dos Santos, R.G., Martin-Santos, R. and Crippa, J.A.S. (2019) ‘Clinical validity and intrarater and test–retest reliability of the Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-5 – Clinician Version (SCID-5-CV)’, *Psychiatry and Clinical Neurosciences*, 73(12), pp. 754–760. DOI: [10.1111/pcn.12931](https://doi.org/10.1111/pcn.12931).
- Oyarekua, T.A. and Sabboh, G.M. (2021) ‘Parenting styles and effortful control as predictors of mental health among secondary school adolescents in Akinyele Local Government Area, Oyo State, Nigeria’, *International Journal of Academic Multidisciplinary Research*, 5(10), pp. 108–114.
- Patel, V., Simunyu, E., Gwanzura, F., Lewis, G. and Mann, A. (1997) ‘The Shona Symptom Questionnaire: The development of an indigenous measure of common mental disorders in Harare’, *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, 95(6), pp. 469–475. DOI: [10.1111/j.1600-0447.1997.tb10134.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0447.1997.tb10134.x).
- Ratcliffe, H.L., Bell, G., Awoonor-Williams, K., Bitton, A., Kim, J.-H., Lipsitz, S., Macarayan, E., Ofosu, A., Otupiri, E., Schwarz, D. and Hirschhorn, L.R. (2020) ‘Towards patient-

- centred care in Ghana: Health system responsiveness, self-rated health and experiential quality in a nationally representative survey', *BMJ Open Quality*, 9(2), e000886. DOI: [10.1136/bmjopen-2019-000886](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2019-000886).
- Sabboh, G.M. (2021) 'Psychosocial factors as predictors of moral disengagement among in-school adolescents in Ibadan Metropolis', *International Journal of Academic Information Systems Research*, 5(10), pp. 1–7.
- Sabboh, G.M. (2022) Development and validation of the revised self-esteem scale for Nigerian adolescents and youths. Master's thesis. Moscow, Russia: National Research University Higher School of Economics. DOI: [10.13140/RG.2.2.32753.45926](https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.32753.45926).
- Sabboh, G.M. (2023) Relationship of perceived stress, hopelessness and self-esteem with attitude towards suicide among people in Nigeria. Master's thesis. Moscow, Russia: National Research University Higher School of Economics. DOI: [10.13140/RG.2.2.21009.40802](https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.21009.40802).
- Sabboh, G.M. and Alausa, S.S. (2021) 'School climate, self-efficacy, social media and peer pressure as correlates of aggressive behaviour among secondary school adolescents in Ibadan Metropolis, Oyo State, Nigeria', *International Journal of Academic Management Science Research*, 5(11), pp. 43–51.
- Sabboh, G.M. and Ojo, Y. (2023) 'Influence of peer approval seeking, socio-economic status and locus of control on academic self-handicapping behaviour of undergraduates in Oyo State, Nigeria', *British Journal of Multidisciplinary and Advanced Studies*, 4(4), pp. 98–112. DOI: [10.37745/bjmas.2022.0264](https://doi.org/10.37745/bjmas.2022.0264).
- Sabboh, G.M. and Olugbade, D. (2021) 'Influence of teaching styles and parental bonding on academic boredom among undergraduates in Oyo State, Nigeria', *African Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Research*, 4(1), pp. 122–133.
- Sabboh, G.M. and Yusuf, A.O. (2021) 'Influence of psycho-social factors as predictors of child abuse among junior secondary school students in Kaduna Metropolis of Kaduna State', *International Journal of Academic and Applied Research*, 5(8), pp. 18–24.
- Sadler, J.Z. and Hulgus, Y.F. (1992) 'Clinical problem solving and the biopsychosocial model', *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 149(10), pp. 1315–1323. DOI: [10.1176/ajp.149.10.1315](https://doi.org/10.1176/ajp.149.10.1315).
- Spitzer, R.L., Kroenke, K., Williams, J.B.W. and Löwe, B. (2006) 'A brief measure for assessing generalized anxiety disorder: The GAD-7', *Archives of Internal Medicine*, 166(10), pp. 1092–1097. DOI: [10.1001/archinte.166.10.1092](https://doi.org/10.1001/archinte.166.10.1092).
- Staples, L.G., Dear, B.F., Gandy, M., Fogliati, V., Fogliati, R., Karin, E., Nielssen, O. and Titov, N. (2019) 'Psychometric properties and clinical utility of brief measures of depression, anxiety, and general distress: The PHQ-2, GAD-2, and K-6', *General Hospital Psychiatry*, 56, pp. 13–18. DOI: [10.1016/j.genhosppsych.2018.11.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.genhosppsych.2018.11.003).
- Suls, J., Krantz, D.S. and Williams, G.C. (2013) 'Three strategies for bridging different levels of analysis and embracing the biopsychosocial model', *Health Psychology*, 32(5), pp. 597–601. DOI: [10.1037/a0031197](https://doi.org/10.1037/a0031197).
- Terwee, C.B., Bot, S.D.M., de Boer, M.R., van der Windt, D.A.W.M., Knol, D.L., Dekker, J., Bouter, L.M. and de Vet, H.C.W. (2007) 'Quality criteria were proposed for measurement properties of health status questionnaires', *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 60(1), pp. 34–42. DOI: [10.1016/j.jclinepi.2006.03.012](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2006.03.012).
- Tripathi, A., Das, A. and Kar, S.K. (2019) 'Biopsychosocial model in contemporary psychiatry: Current validity and future prospects', *Indian Journal of Psychological Medicine*, 41(6), pp. 582–585. DOI: [10.4103/IJPSYM.IJPSYM\\_314\\_19](https://doi.org/10.4103/IJPSYM.IJPSYM_314_19).

- Üstün, T.B., Chatterji, S., Kostanjsek, N., Rehm, J., Kennedy, C., Epping-Jordan, J., Saxena, S., von Korf, M. and Pull, C. (2010) 'Developing the World Health Organization Disability Assessment Schedule 2.0', *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*, 88(11), pp. 815–823. DOI: [10.2471/BLT.09.067231](https://doi.org/10.2471/BLT.09.067231).
- van Aartsen, J. and van Aswegen, H. (2018) 'Changes in biopsychosocial outcomes for a mixed cohort of ICU survivors', *South African Journal of Physiotherapy*, 74(1), article 427. DOI: [10.4102/sajp.v74i1.427](https://doi.org/10.4102/sajp.v74i1.427).
- van Bronswijk, S.C., Lemmens, L.H.J.M., Huibers, M.J.H. and Peeters, F.P.M.L. (2021) 'Selecting the optimal treatment for a depressed individual: Clinical judgment or statistical prediction?', *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 279, pp. 149–157. DOI: [10.1016/j.jad.2020.09.135](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2020.09.135).
- Wade, D.T. and Halligan, P.W. (2017) 'The biopsychosocial model of illness: A model whose time has come', *Clinical Rehabilitation*, 31(8), pp. 995–1004. DOI: [10.1177/0269215517709890](https://doi.org/10.1177/0269215517709890).
- Watson, L.K., Kaiser, B.N., Giusto, A.M., Ayuku, D. and Puffer, E.S. (2020) 'Validating mental health assessment in Kenya using an innovative gold standard', *International Journal of Psychology*, 55(3), pp. 425–434. DOI: [10.1002/ijop.12604](https://doi.org/10.1002/ijop.12604).
- Westen, D. and Weinberger, J. (2004) 'When clinical description becomes statistical prediction', *American Psychologist*, 59(7), pp. 595–613. DOI: [10.1037/0003-066X.59.7.595](https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.59.7.595).
- Williams, B.C., Ward, D.A., Chick, D.A., Johnson, E.L. and Ross, P.T. (2019) 'Using a six-domain framework to include biopsychosocial information in the standard medical history', *Teaching and Learning in Medicine*, 31(1), pp. 87–98. DOI: [10.1080/10401334.2018.1480958](https://doi.org/10.1080/10401334.2018.1480958).
- Youngmann, R., Zilber, N., Workneh, F. and Giel, R. (2008) 'Adapting the SRQ for Ethiopian populations: A culturally-sensitive psychiatric screening instrument', *Transcultural Psychiatry*, 45(4), pp. 566–589. DOI: [10.1177/1363461508100783](https://doi.org/10.1177/1363461508100783).
- Yusuf, A.O. and Sabbah, G.M. (2021) 'Psychological factors as correlates of suicidal ideation among university students in Lagos State', *International Journal of Academic and Applied Research*, 5(9), pp. 1–7.
- Yusuf, A.O., Sabbah, G.M. and Asiyanbi, M. (2023) 'Correlates of academic buoyancy among undergraduates in the Ibadan Metropolis', *International Journal of Academic Information Systems Research*, 7(1), pp. 1–10.