



Psychopathy

Stephane A. De Brito¹✉, Adelle E. Forth², Arielle R. Baskin-Sommers³, Inti A. Brazil⁴, Eva R. Kimonis⁵, Dustin Pardini⁶, Paul J. Frick⁷, Robert James R. Blair⁸ and Essi Viding⁹✉

Abstract | Psychopathy is a personality disorder characterized by a constellation of affective, interpersonal, lifestyle and antisocial features whose antecedents can be identified in a subgroup of young people showing severe antisocial behaviour. The prevalence of psychopathy in the general population is thought to be ~1%, but is up to 25% in prisoners. The aetiology of psychopathy is complex, with contributions of both genetic and environmental risk factors, and gene–environment interactions and correlations. Psychopathy is characterized by structural and functional brain abnormalities in cortical (such as the prefrontal and insular cortices) and subcortical (for example, the amygdala and striatum) regions leading to neurocognitive disruption in emotional responsiveness, reinforcement-based decision-making and attention. Although no effective treatment exists for adults with psychopathy, preliminary intervention studies targeting key neurocognitive disturbances have shown promising results. Given that psychopathy is often comorbid with other psychiatric disorders and increases the risk of physical health problems, educational and employment failure, accidents and criminality, the identification of children and young people at risk for this personality disorder and preventative work are important. Indeed, interventions that target the antecedents of psychopathic features in children and adolescents have been found to be effective.

This Primer is dedicated to the memory of our esteemed colleague S.O. Lilienfeld (PhD) for his significant contribution to the field of psychopathy as a scientist and as a mentor.

The long and controversial history of psychopathy within psychiatry and its portrayal in the media have contributed to misconceptualized views of the aetiology, assessment, treatment and definition of this disorder among parts of the scientific and clinical community and the general public^{1,2} (Supplementary Table 1). For example, among laypeople, psychopathy is often synonymous with violence and serial killing, but not all psychopaths commit violent acts³.

Psychopathy is a personality disorder that manifests as a syndrome characterized by a constellation of affective, interpersonal, lifestyle and antisocial features^{4,5} (FIG. 1). Affectively, individuals with psychopathy lack empathy, guilt or remorse, are callous, and have shallow and deficient affect, whereas interpersonally they are grandiose, arrogant, deceitful and manipulative. From an early age, individuals with psychopathy often engage in instrumental, planned acts of antisocial behaviour and aggression, but can also display impulsive and irresponsible behaviours⁶. The affective and interpersonal features of individuals with psychopathy distinguish them from those with the broader diagnosis of antisocial personality disorder⁶ (ASPD; BOX 1), defined by the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders,

Fifth Edition (DSM5)^{7,8}. Although the prevalence of psychopathy in the general population is thought to be ~1%^{9,10}, it is associated with enormous financial and personal costs to the individual, the individual's family and victims, and society such that it has been identified by some as the most expensive mental health disorder and a major public health issue¹¹, with annual costs estimated to be around US \$460 billion¹². Unsurprisingly, the prevalence of psychopathy in prisons is higher than in the general population, with estimates ranging between 16% and 25%¹³.

Diagnosing children with psychopathy would be inappropriate, and indeed inaccurate; however, most adults with psychopathy have exhibited callous and antisocial behaviour from childhood¹⁴, which is in line with the view that personality disorders manifest developmental antecedents in childhood or adolescence^{7,15}. Accordingly, a substantial body of evidence over the past 25 years shows that a subgroup of antisocial children and young people (CYP) might be at risk of developing psychopathy in adulthood¹⁶ (BOX 2), which is increasingly considered a neurodevelopmental disorder resulting from a complex interplay between genetic and environmental risk factors^{17–20}.

In this Primer, we adopt a developmental perspective to provide an overview of the epidemiology, aetiology, pathophysiology, diagnosis and treatment of psychopathy. We also consider the prevalence of the disorder and its effect on physical and mental health, as well as

✉e-mail: s.a.debrito@bham.ac.uk; e.viding@ucl.ac.uk
<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41572-021-00282-1>

Author addresses

¹School of Psychology and Centre for Human Brain Health, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK.

²Department of Psychology, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

³Department of Psychology, Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA.

⁴Radboud University, Donders Institute for Brain, Cognition and Behaviour, Nijmegen, The Netherlands.

⁵Parent-Child Research Clinic, School of Psychology, University of New South Wales, Sydney, NSW, Australia.

⁶Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice, Arizona State University, Phoenix, AZ, USA.

⁷Department of Psychology, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA, USA.

⁸Center for Neurobehavioral Research, Boys Town National Research Hospital, Boys Town, NE, USA.

⁹Division of Psychology and Language Sciences, University College London, London, UK.

on social, educational and occupational outcomes. We conclude by identifying gaps in knowledge, pressing challenges and future directions for the field, including how aetiological and neurocognitive data might inform management and treatment and how this should be systematically tested. It must be noted that most research on psychopathy has primarily focused on men, but more recent work has investigated women or compared the two sexes; the importance of this line of work is noted in the Outlook section.

Epidemiology

The prevalence of psychopathy among incarcerated offenders in North America is estimated as 16–25% in men and 7–17% in women^{13,21,22} (B. Verschuere, personal communication). The core affective and interpersonal features of psychopathy do not systematically differ between white, Black, and Latino offenders in

North America²³. Studies in the UK have tended to find lower mean psychopathy scores among offenders than studies in North America, with prevalence estimates of 5–8%^{22,24} in men and 2–4%^{24,25} in women. Studies from other European countries have found a prevalence of 11–18% in samples consisting primarily of violent male offenders from prisons and forensic psychiatric hospitals^{21,22} (B. Verschuere, personal communication). A similar prevalence has been reported for male offenders in South America (13–14%)²² and Southeast Asia (12%)²⁶ (J. S. Sohn, personal communication).

Studies of the prevalence of psychopathy in the community are rare. The prevalence of ‘possible’ psychopathy in community samples assessed using a screening interview has been estimated as 0.6% (1.3% of men, <1% of women) in the UK¹⁰ and 1.2% (1.0% of men, 1.2% of women) in the USA²⁷. Of note, these estimates are considerably lower than the prevalence of ASPD in the general adult population in Europe, North America, Australia and New Zealand, which is estimated as 5–6% in men and 1–2% in women²⁸.

Psychopathy co-occurs with the DSM cluster B personality disorders, particularly ASPD, narcissistic personality disorder and borderline personality disorder^{13,24,29,30} (BOX 1; FIG. 2b). Other conditions commonly comorbid with psychopathy include substance use disorders and attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD)²⁹; these conditions tend to be most strongly related to the lifestyle/antisocial features of psychopathy¹³ (FIG. 2).

The association between psychopathic features and symptoms of internalizing disorders tends to be relatively weak²⁹. An early conceptualization of psychopathy proposed an absence of anxiety problems as a central feature




Fig. 1 | Features of psychopathy operationalized by the Hare Psychopathy Checklist-Revised. The most widely accepted and used conceptualization of psychopathy in the scientific and clinical community is based on the construct operationalized by the Hare Psychopathy Checklist-Revised⁹ (PCL-R). Based on the PCL-R, psychopathy is underpinned by two correlated dimensions of interpersonal and affective features (Factor 1) and a chronic antisocial lifestyle (Factor 2). More recently, Hare (2003)⁹ proposed a four-facet model in which the original Factor 1 is parsed into interpersonal style (Facet 1) and affective experience (Facet 2), and Factor 2 is parsed into lifestyle (Facet 3) and antisocial (Facet 4) manifestations. Note that for diagnostic purposes, the presence of these traits cannot be scored without reference to the formal criteria contained in the published manuals⁹. Two behaviours that are common in people with psychopathy (promiscuous sexual behaviour and many short-term marital relationships) contribute to the total score but do not load on any factors. PCL-R 2nd Edition. Reproduced with permission from Multi-Health Systems Inc. Copyright © 2003, 2020 Multi-Health Systems Inc. All rights reserved.

Box 1 | Psychopathy, ASPD, dissocial personality disorder and sociopathy

Antisocial personality disorder (ASPD) and psychopathy are often considered synonymous, possibly as the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM)²⁶³ diagnostic criteria for ASPD consist of a subset of the symptoms of psychopathy; ~37.5% of the interpersonal/affective and ~60% of the lifestyle/antisocial features included in the Psychopathy Checklist–Revised (PCL-R) are included in the ASPD diagnostic criteria²⁶⁴. However, although psychopathy and ASPD are moderately correlated¹³ and both disorders include a lifelong pattern of antisocial behaviour, they are distinct^{265,266}. Indeed, the diagnostic criteria for ASPD mostly focus on a severe and chronic pattern of antisocial and criminal behaviour, whereas psychopathy is mostly operationalized based on personality features with an emphasis on emotional impairments and interpersonal features (FIG. 1). Consequently, about 80–90% of individuals with a diagnosis of psychopathy would meet the criteria for a diagnosis of ASPD, whereas only about 25–40% of those with a diagnosis of ASPD would meet the criteria for psychopathy^{13,258}. In the community, the prevalence of psychopathy is thought to be ~1%^{10,27}, whereas the prevalence of ASPD is estimated at ~4%⁷. Moreover, studies that have directly compared ASPD and psychopathy suggest that they are characterized by distinct emotional disturbances^{267,268}, as well as structural²⁶⁹ and functional⁷⁷ brain abnormalities.

Dissocial Personality Disorder (DPD) within the International Classification of Diseases (ICD-11)¹³⁵ is the 'equivalent' of the DSM diagnosis of ASPD, but its core features are closer to psychopathy. Indeed, disregard for the rights and feelings of others, including both self-centredness and lack of empathy, are part of the diagnostic criteria for DPD, but may not all be present in a given individual at a given time. However, there is almost no research focusing specifically on DPD.

The definition of sociopathy has varied over time^{270,271}. Although the descriptions have included behaviours and features that overlap with psychopathy (such as antisocial and aggressive behaviour, impulsivity, extreme self-centredness and lack of empathy), no comprehensively validated and widely used assessment tools for sociopathy exist. Although the term 'sociopath' is still occasionally used it is not currently a focus of active, systematic scientific research at multiple levels of analysis.

of psychopathy⁵, which is mirrored in the DSM-5 (REF. 29). However, when different psychopathy symptom dimensions are studied separately, the direction of the association with internalizing symptoms varies; internalizing problems are modestly, positively correlated with the lifestyle/antisocial facets of psychopathy, whereas the interpersonal/affective facets tend to be associated with lower levels of trait anxiety^{29,31} (FIG. 2b). Based on these data, some groups have suggested that internalizing problems should be conceptualized as a subtyping scheme that differentiates primary (low internalizing problems) and secondary (high internalizing problems) variants of psychopathy³¹ (Supplementary Box 1).

Mechanisms/pathophysiology**Genetic factors**

Twin and adoption studies in children and adults have found robust evidence of genetic risk for psychopathic personality traits^{18,32}. As the neurocognitive profile and some behaviours associated with psychopathy are at least partially distinct from those associated with antisocial behaviour in general, we might expect to find risk genes that are unique for psychopathy and those that are shared with the broader antisocial phenotype³³.

Only a handful of candidate gene studies have focused on psychopathic traits, with the majority of these investigations focusing on their putative precursor in CYP, callous–unemotional (CU) traits. These studies have identified genes involved in the serotonergic (such as *SLC6A4*) and oxytocinergic (for example, *OXTR*) systems, which are thought to contribute to reduced emotional

reactivity and capacity for attachment to others^{18,32}. There is also tentative evidence for shared genetic risk between a broader antisocial phenotype and CU traits. Indeed, one study found that a polygenic risk score for aggression, including variants in dopaminergic, glutamatergic and neuroendocrine signalling pathways that are thought to be important for neurocognitive function, information processing and temperament, accounted for just over 1% of the variance in CU traits³⁴. Genome-wide association studies of CU traits or antisocial behaviour in combination with CU traits^{35–37} have not produced any promising insights; however, the sample sizes in these studies have been small with <3,000 participants. Sample sizes of over one million participants are needed if we want to not only detect reliable associations but also account for a meaningful proportion of genetic variance³⁸.

Environmental factors

Genetic and environmental factors and their complex interplay shape how individual development canalizes over time (FIG. 3). Cross-sectional and longitudinal studies have identified a wide range of risk factors associated with antisocial behaviour and psychopathic features including prenatal maternal stress^{39–41}, child maltreatment⁴² during childhood and adolescence, harsh parental discipline during childhood and adolescence, negative parental emotions⁴³, disorganized parent–child attachment⁴⁴ and disrupted family functioning⁴⁵. By contrast, warm, responsive and consistent parenting has been associated with a reduced risk of antisocial behaviour and psychopathy^{43,46}.

Without genetically informative study designs, it is not possible to fully evaluate the causal role of postulated environmental risk factors in the development of psychopathy. Several risk factors that are thought to be 'environmental' may in part reflect genetic predispositions of people who are part of that environment, a phenomenon known as gene–environment correlation⁴⁷. For example, parents with genetic variants that predispose to psychopathic behaviour have an increased risk of engaging in negative and harmful parenting practices and may also pass on some of these genetic variants to their offspring¹⁸; in other words, the association between dysfunctional parenting and psychopathic traits in the child may, in part, represent a genetic confound. Children also evoke different reactions in people around them or actively seek particular environments^{18,48}. Data from longitudinal twin studies indicate that part of the association between harsh and negative parenting and higher levels of psychopathic traits in children may reflect genetic vulnerability within biological families⁴⁹. However, data from adoption and twin studies have also shown that warm parenting can buffer the effects of heritable risk for psychopathic traits^{50,51}. Taken together, these findings suggest that gene–environment correlation, gene–environment interaction and environmental main effects all have a role in the development of psychopathy.

Neurocognitive disruption

Three main forms of neurocognitive disruption are found in individuals with elevated psychopathic traits: emotional (particularly, though not limited to, empathic)

Box 2 | Children and young people (CYP) at risk of psychopathy

The impulsive and irresponsible lifestyle facets of psychopathy capture behaviours similar to symptoms of attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) and are highly correlated with conduct problems²⁷². By contrast, callous–unemotional traits (CU traits) constitute the core affective facets of adult psychopathy^{5,273}. They are less highly correlated with conduct problems in CYP than the impulsive and irresponsible lifestyle facet²⁷² and, most importantly, CU traits characterize a subgroup of CYP with conduct problems who seem to have a stronger genetic predisposition to their antisocial behaviour that is independent of the severity of conduct problems²⁷⁴ or ADHD²⁷⁵, and who show emotional and neurocognitive correlates comparable to those seen in adults with psychopathy. Based on these data, CU traits seem to designate a clinically and potentially aetiologically important subgroup of antisocial CYP that share features with psychopathy in adults^{16,137}.

In addition, there is substantial evidence that high levels of CU traits designate a subgroup of antisocial CYP characterized by severe and stable conduct problems, delinquency, and aggressive and violent behaviours, and which can critically be instrumental (goal-directed) in nature¹⁶. Further, antisocial CYP with high levels of CU traits remain more impaired after treatment than antisocial CYP with low levels of CU traits. Crucially, there are prospective longitudinal data showing that antisocial CYP with high levels of CU traits are at risk for psychopathy in early in adulthood^{138,276,277}.

Accordingly, CU traits are included in diagnostic criteria¹³⁵ under the form of the specifier 'With Limited Prosocial Emotions' are included in the diagnostic criteria of conduct disorder (CD) in the DSM-5 (REF.7) and International Classification of Diseases (ICD-11)¹³⁵, and oppositional defiant disorder (ODD) in ICD-11. Of note, CU traits are the only facet of psychopathy to be included in these diagnostic systems. Other facets of psychopathy continue to be represented by the impulsive–hyperactive symptoms of ADHD and in the deceitfulness or theft symptoms of CD.

There are two important things of note with the CU specifier. First, the DSM-5 allows the specifier only for the diagnosis of CD. However, there is evidence that CU traits may predict impairment (such as conduct, emotional and hyperactivity problems and crime) in the absence of conduct problems severe enough to warrant a diagnosis of CD^{278,279} which led the ICD-11 to allow their use in the diagnosis of ODD. Further, the ability of CU traits on their own to designate subgroups of CYP with ADHD who have different emotional correlates (emotion dysregulation for ADHD with low levels of CU traits versus low emotional arousal for ADHD with high levels of CU traits) has also been supported by some emerging research²⁸⁰. Further research is needed to determine if CU traits are an important specifier for other diagnoses. Second, the symptoms indexing CU traits in diagnostic systems were selected based on research showing the best indicators of the construct from items on rating scales across various samples²⁸¹. Testing how these criteria are being assessed in many clinical settings is still important, to determine if they still capture the construct in ways that define a clinically and aetiologically important subgroup of individuals with CYP who are at risk of future psychopathy. In addition, it is important to conduct longitudinal research investigating whether the addition of impulsive and interpersonal facet items that are not covered by ADHD and CD symptom criteria add to the prediction of not just antisocial behaviour and related outcomes (such as substance abuse²⁸²), but also adult psychopathy.

Callous–unemotional traits

Including a lack of guilt, lack of empathy, lack of concern over poor performance in important activities, and shallow/deficient affect.

Reactive aggression

Aggression, underpinned by negative affect, in response to threat, frustration or social provocation.

Social affiliation

The motivation to interact with others.

Aversive conditioning

Learning to associate negative valence with a previously neutral stimulus.

responsiveness, reinforcement-based decision-making (including moral judgements) and attention. Some types of neurocognitive disruption seem to be disorder-specific for psychopathy (for example, deficient empathic responding), whereas others (such as response to reward or attention) are shared with other disorders, some of which can co-occur with psychopathy, such as ADHD or addiction (BOX 3; Supplementary Box 2).

Emotional responsiveness. The suggestion that psychopathic traits reflect disturbances in emotional responsiveness has a long history⁵²; however, not all emotions are affected in those with psychopathy. Anger seems to be intact in individuals with psychopathic traits⁵³, as these individuals have an increased risk of anger-based reactive aggression⁵⁴. Conversely, empathic responding^{55,56}, fear^{52,57} and potentially social affiliation⁵⁸ all seem to be disrupted in those with psychopathic

traits, whether they are measured through psychophysiological, cognitive or functional MRI (fMRI) paradigms. Further research is needed to elucidate the specific aspects of fear and anxiety processing that may be affected in psychopathy. Studies have indicated problems in threat detection and responsivity, but evidence of an atypical subjective fear experience is less strong^{57,59}. A reduced ability to detect and respond to others' fear and distress has been suggested to increase the likelihood of an individual committing antisocial behaviour, particularly that which is instrumental (goal-directed¹⁷) in nature¹⁷, as the individual is less bothered by the distress of others and being punished for aggressive behaviour than individuals without psychopathy^{52,55}.

Considerable data in adults and young people support the involvement of emotional disturbance in psychopathy. Behaviourally, individuals with psychopathic traits display reduced aversive conditioning⁶⁰ and impaired emotion expression recognition, particularly for fear, compared with neurotypical individuals^{61,62}. These behavioural findings are complemented by data from fMRI studies that have found reduced responses in the amygdala and cortical regions implicated in responding to emotional stimuli, such as the anterior insula and ventromedial prefrontal cortices, during a variety of emotional and empathy tasks that have largely probed the processing of fear or pain^{59,63–66} (FIG. 4). Notably, reduced response in the amygdala to the distress of others mediates the relationship between CU traits and level of instrumental aggression⁶⁷.

Reinforcement-based decision-making. Adults with psychopathy and CYP at risk of psychopathy perform poorly on a variety of reinforcement-based decision-making tasks^{68–70}. This poor performance may relate to reduced reinforcement sensitivity or responsiveness, resulting in an individual who makes poorer decisions and is, therefore, more likely to be impulsive and display frustration-induced aggression⁷¹.

Studies in CYP at risk of psychopathy have found reduced neural responsiveness to reward in the striatum and ventromedial prefrontal cortex^{72,73} (FIG. 4a). This reduction may manifest as reduced responsiveness to drug cues in individuals with substance use disorders and psychopathic traits⁷⁴ (though see⁷⁵). In addition, some studies have found that high psychopathy scores are related to a reduced response in the ventral striatum to monetary loss⁷⁶ and a relative failure to reduce activity within the ventromedial prefrontal and/or posterior cingulate cortex following unanticipated punishment^{77,78}. However, other studies have found increased responses to reward in the nucleus accumbens⁷⁹.

Moral judgements involve emotional responses to the emotional content of an action and making decisions based on this content, both of which are impaired in individuals with psychopathy. Adults with psychopathy and CYP at risk of psychopathy are compromised in at least some forms of moral judgements (for example, they show a reduced endorsement of care-based transgressions (involving people being harmed, such as one person hitting another) and judge care-based transgressions more like social disorder-based, conventional transgressions

Reinforcement-based decision-making tasks

Tasks where the participant must learn which responses to make to a stimulus to gain reward/avoid punishment.

(such as talking in class) relative to comparison populations; for a review, see⁸⁰). Moral judgements also involve several brain regions, such as the ventromedial, rostromedial and dorsomedial frontal cortices, anterior insula cortex, striatum and amygdala⁸¹ (FIG. 4a). In line with the behavioural findings, fMRI studies have relatively consistently found reduced responding within these brain regions during moral judgement tasks in adults with psychopathy and CYP at risk of psychopathy, compared with individuals without psychopathy^{82,83}.

Attention. Attention-based accounts were some of the earliest models of psychopathic traits⁸⁴ and suggested that individuals with psychopathy over-focus on certain features of the stimulus array (such as those associated with reward or a particular goal) at the expense of other features (such as those associated with punishment, other's distress or contextual cues)⁸⁵. Numerous studies have found that individuals with psychopathic traits have compromised selective attention when performing basic attentional tasks⁸⁶. In addition, if individuals with psychopathic traits are explicitly asked to attend to the emotional content of an image or to empathize with actors in a video (rather than passively viewing the stimuli), group differences in emotional response between those with psychopathy and neurotypical individuals disappear, suggesting an attentional abnormality in those with psychopathy^{87–90}. The effect of psychopathy-related differences in selective attention on emotional responding has been documented using behavioural⁹¹ (such as response accuracy and reaction time), electrophysiological^{92,93} (for example startle potentiation, skin conductance and electroencephalography) and neuroimaging⁹⁴ (such as amygdala and lateral prefrontal cortex activation) metrics. A few studies have extended attention-based accounts of psychopathy to antisocial CYP with CU

traits, and found that manipulating attention influences emotional responding^{90,95}. The larger-scale neurocognitive systems underpinning differences in attention to emotions in individuals with or at risk of psychopathy have not been widely researched. However, a resting state fMRI study of a large sample of incarcerated individuals found that high levels of psychopathy are associated with a hyper-organized dorsal attention network⁹⁶.

Structural MRI studies

Grey matter. Structural abnormalities in a network of subcortical and cortical regions have been found in those with psychopathy, and probably account for the atypical neurocognitive functioning discussed above (FIG. 4b). Early studies exclusively focusing on specific lobes or regions of interest identified *a priori* showed that psychopathy is associated with a reduced volume of the prefrontal cortex and a reduced volume and abnormal shape of the hippocampus and amygdala, which probably underpins the impaired classic fear conditioning and stimulus-reinforcement learning in psychopathy^{97,98}. Increased and reduced volume of the dorsal and the ventral striatum^{97,98} have also been found and are consistent with data from neuropsychological and fMRI studies that have shown abnormal processing of reward and punishment information in individuals with psychopathy and CYP at risk of developing psychopathy¹⁷. In addition, a large cavum septum pellucidum, a marker of abnormal limbic brain development, is associated with psychopathy⁹⁸ (but see⁹⁹ for a failed replication) lending further support to the view that psychopathy might have a neurodevelopmental origin¹⁹. However, one study in young people found that a large cavum septum pellucidum may increase the risk of antisocial behaviour, but does not seem to be a neurodevelopmental marker for psychopathy *per se*¹⁰⁰.




Fig. 2 | The association between psychopathy and other psychiatric disorders and maladaptive outcomes. a | About 80–90% of individuals with a diagnosis of psychopathy would meet the criteria for a diagnosis of antisocial personality disorder (ASPD), whereas only about 25–40% of those with a diagnosis of ASPD would meet the criteria for psychopathy^{13,258}. In the community, the prevalence of psychopathy is thought to be ~1%^{10,27}, whereas the prevalence of ASPD is estimated at ~4%¹. **b** | Psychopathy can co-occur with ASPD and narcissistic personality disorder. Some symptoms of narcissistic personality disorder (such as grandiose sense of self-worth, exploiting others for personal gain, and lack of empathy) conceptually overlap with some interpersonal/affective features of psychopathy²⁹. Other conditions commonly comorbid with psychopathy involve problems with

behavioural disinhibition, such as attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder, borderline personality disorder and substance use disorders, which tend to be most strongly related to the chronic antisocial lifestyle symptoms of psychopathy. When different psychopathy symptom dimensions are studied separately, the direction of the association with internalizing symptoms varies; internalizing problems are modestly, positively correlated with the lifestyle/antisocial facets of psychopathy, whereas the interpersonal/affective facets tend to be associated with lower levels of trait anxiety. ASPD and criminal recidivism are weakly associated with interpersonal/affective traits, but are more strongly related to lifestyle/antisocial traits^{259–261}. The interpersonal facet is most strongly related to instrumental violence²⁰⁶, whereas the affective facet is most robustly associated with treatment drop-out²⁶².




Fig. 3 | **Dispositional and environmental risk factors for psychopathy.** Multiple dispositional and environmental risk factors for psychopathy operate across the lifespan; their hypothesized associations over time, many of which are yet to be empirically tested, are depicted in this figure. The nature and importance of these risk factors vary depending on the developmental stage. For example, genetic influences on fearless temperament may contribute to the risk of early behavioural problems, whereas genetic influences on low empathy could increase the risk of engaging in bullying during adolescence. The importance of environmental risk factors also varies by developmental stage, with low parental warmth contributing to risk behaviours during childhood and ineffective parental monitoring becoming more important during adolescence. Many of the dispositional factors also contribute to the generation of environmental risk (gene-environment correlation), as well as to susceptibility to environmental risk (gene-environment interactions). The challenge for the field is to use innovative study designs to improve the understanding of the gene-environment interplay in the development of psychopathy. Adapted with permission from REF.¹¹³, Springer Nature Limited.

Studies that have focused exclusively on *a priori* regions of interest may have missed abnormalities in other regions that are affected in psychopathy¹⁰¹. Therefore, more recent structural MRI studies have used automated and unbiased methods that are carried out using algorithms and do not depend on manual tracing or subjective assessments, such as voxel-based morphometry¹⁰² (VBM). Intriguingly, no overall differences between people with psychopathy and controls have been reported for total intracranial volume, or total grey matter volume, but psychopathy is characterized by reduced grey matter volume across several cortical and subcortical regions, including frontal, temporal, parietal and occipital regions, in addition to the anterior and posterior cingulate, anterior and posterior insula, amygdala, hippocampus and the caudate and putamen (although other studies have found increased grey matter volume in the caudate and amygdala)⁹⁷.

Based on evidence that psychopathy lies on a continuum of severity¹⁰³, five VBM studies have examined the association between the severity of psychopathy in prisoners and grey matter volume^{97,98}. The most consistent finding from these studies is that total psychopathy scores are negatively correlated with grey matter volume in temporal and limbic or paralimbic regions^{97,98}. A meta-analysis of studies in CYP found that the severity of CU traits is positively related to grey matter volume in the putamen¹⁰⁴, whereas more recent studies have found

negative associations between CU traits and grey matter volume in the amygdala^{105,106}. These findings provide support for an influential neurocognitive model of the development of psychopathy, which posits amygdala disruption as central to the development of disorder¹⁷. However, the large ABCD study¹⁰⁷ found that volume reductions of the amygdala and the hippocampus occur in antisocial young people, irrespective of the levels of CU traits, compared with typically developing young people, but that volume reduction in the insula might be unique to those with high levels of CU traits. The latter finding could partly explain difficulties in empathy and decision-making in this population.

Grey matter volume on VBM is thought to reflect several properties of the cerebral cortex, including its thickness, surface area and gyrification (folding)¹⁰⁸. Given evidence in neurotypical individuals that these properties are under distinct genetic influences as adults¹⁰⁸ and follow divergent developmental trajectories¹⁰⁹, some studies have used surface-based morphometry (SBM) to investigate these different metrics in individuals with psychopathy. The majority of studies have focused on cortical thickness, and in these studies the most consistent findings were reduced cortical thickness in the frontal and temporal lobes in individuals with psychopathy, with some evidence that these reductions are associated with the affective facet of the disorder¹¹⁰ and partially account for the commonly observed increased

response perseveration on neuropsychological tasks¹¹¹. In one study of 716 male prisoners, psychopathy was associated with reduced gyrification in the middle cingulate cortex extending into the dorsomedial frontal and parietal cortices¹¹², a network of regions that are central to a host of cognitive and emotional processes that are impaired in psychopathy, for example, error detection and emotional processing of negative images. Few SBM studies have examined CYP at risk of psychopathy¹¹³; in one study CU traits were found to be positively correlated with insula folding¹¹⁴, while in two other studies CU traits were negatively correlated with cortical thickness in the right superior temporal cortex^{115,116} and the lingual and fusiform gyri^{114,116}, which are involved in decision-making and face processing, respectively.

White matter volume and microstructure. Studies that have examined white matter in people with psychopathy have focused on its volume or the microstructure of white matter tracts^{97,98}. Increased volume of the corpus callosum, cerebellum, and frontal, parietal, and occipital

lobes have been found in individuals with psychopathy compared with neurotypical individuals⁹⁸. Studies in men and women using diffusion neuroimaging to examine white matter tracts have consistently demonstrated that psychopathy is associated with higher diffusivity (for example, reduced fractional anisotropy) in the uncinate fasciculus, a tract connecting the ventromedial prefrontal cortex and the anterior temporal lobe including the amygdala^{97,98,117} (FIG. 4c). However, some studies have also found higher diffusivity within other tracts implicated in interhemispheric (corpus callosum) and frontal lobe connectivity as well as within striatalthalamofrontal and dorsal default mode networks, with the latter specifically related to the affective dimension of the disorder^{97,98}. Intriguingly, an emerging body of research^{118–120} in antisocial young people has identified microstructural changes that are associated with high levels of CU traits in tracts similar to those identified in adults with psychopathy (such as the uncinate fasciculus, corpus callosum and dorsal cingulum), but these microstructural changes observed in young people are in opposite directions to those observed in adults: in young people lower diffusivity is observed (often interpreted as greater integrity), and in adults higher diffusivity is observed (commonly considered to reflect reduced integrity). The reasons for the discrepancy between young people and adults are not fully understood, but probably reflect differences in maturational stage, sample composition and analytical approaches (BOX 3).

In sum, there is increasing evidence from behavioural and fMRI studies suggesting that CYP at risk of psychopathy share some of the same neurocognitive disruptions as those observed in adults with psychopathy. However, although grey matter abnormalities have to some extent been observed in similar cortical and subcortical regions, evidence from structural connectivity studies indicates that these might present differently between childhood and adulthood. Crucially, the pattern of results in these studies also suggests that psychopathy, like most psychiatric disorders¹²¹, is likely to be a disorder that affects brain circuits rather than isolated regions¹⁷. Finally, despite the lack of prospective longitudinal studies, these data provide tentative support to the view that psychopathy has a neurodevelopmental origin.

Diagnosis, screening and prevention

Diagnosis

The construct of psychopathy was well-known to many mental health professionals prior to the advent of specific measures for its assessment, but no consensus existed on which specific traits or behaviours should be included in an assessment leading to a diagnosis. The DSM-5 does not include psychopathy as a personality disorder; however, the Cluster B personality disorders (ASPD, borderline, histrionic and narcissistic), particularly ASPD, are the disorders that are most strongly associated with psychopathy^{24,29,30}.

The most commonly used measure to assess psychopathy in clinical and forensic settings is the Hare Psychopathy Checklist–Revised (PCL-R)^{9,122} (FIG. 1). The PCL-R was designed to capture a constellation of traits and behaviours consistent with early conceptions of

Box 3 | Methodological considerations in neuroimaging studies

Several methodological considerations with neuroimaging studies probably affect the interpretation of their results and their generalizability (for more detailed discussions, see^{230,283–285}). Those methodological considerations include the nature and size of the sample and control groups, the Psychopathy Checklist–Revised (PCL-R) cut-off score to identify those with psychopathy, and the potential influence of demographic and clinical factors.

In terms of the nature of samples, study participants drawn from clinical and forensic settings are likely to show higher levels of psychopathic traits than those recruited in the community, which may translate into differences in neuroimaging results across studies. In addition, many neuroimaging studies have included small samples resulting in low statistical power²⁸⁶ and replications in this field have been rare. Crucially, it must also be noted that the nature and the size of the sample are not independent of each other (a problem referred to as confounding moderators in meta-analytic work²⁸⁷). Studies focusing on clinical and forensic samples are more likely to have a small sample sizes (but see¹¹²) than studies with samples from the community (such as the ABCD study), some of which have included hundreds of participants. Somewhat related, there is substantial variability among studies in the PCL-R score used to classify individuals with psychopathy (ranging from 15 to 31).

The nature of the comparison group has also been inconsistent across studies and has complicated interpretation of the findings. Some studies have used prisoners with low psychopathy scores as the control group, whereas others studies have used healthy controls. These approaches have led to two issues²⁸⁵. First, the lack of a healthy comparison group means that it is difficult to determine if a difference found between groups represents a difference from healthy functioning. Second, it is difficult to know whether any differences between groups are caused by psychopathy or are due to the effects of other variables associated with incarceration, such as length of incarceration and substance misuse.

Finally, demographic factors such as age, sex and IQ are all associated with brain development and anatomy^{288,289}. Psychiatric comorbidities typically associated with psychopathy, such as substance misuse²⁹, have also been associated with brain abnormalities in some of the same cortical and subcortical regions²⁹⁰ that are thought to be involved in the pathophysiology of psychopathy, and we know that adults with psychopathy typically have a long history of polysubstance use and CYP at risk of psychopathy begin using substances at a young age. The distribution of these demographic and clinical variables varies across studies and within the same study, and the influence of these variables as well as their potential interactions (for example, age and sex) have often not been systematically investigated across different studies. In addition, it is also worth noting that different patterns of alterations in brain structure and function could reflect the interaction between these demographic and clinical variables as well as main and interacting effects of genetic predispositions and environmental factors²⁹¹.




Fig. 4 | Brain abnormalities in psychopathy and children and young people at risk of psychopathy. **a** | Functional MRI (fMRI) studies examining brain response to emotional stimuli (mostly emotional faces expressing fear or stimuli depicting pain in others) have demonstrated that adults with psychopathy and children and young people (CYP) at risk of psychopathy are characterized by reduced responses within a set of cortical (such as the ventromedial prefrontal and insular cortices) and subcortical (such as the amygdala and striatum) regions. In terms of reinforcement-based decision-making, fMRI studies have shown reduced neural responsiveness to reward within the striatum and ventromedial prefrontal cortex (both in adults and CYP) as well as a relative failure to reduce activity within the ventromedial prefrontal and/or the posterior cingulate cortex (in adults only) following unanticipated punishment. Both adults with psychopathy and CYP at risk of psychopathy are compromised in at least some forms of moral judgements and, relative to individuals

without psychopathy, exhibit reduced response in associated regions, such as the ventromedial, rostromedial and dorsomedial frontal cortices, anterior insula cortex, striatum and amygdala. **b** | Structural MRI (sMRI) studies of grey matter have shown that adults with psychopathy are characterized by abnormalities across the four lobes, mostly in the form of reduced volume across all four lobes of the brain and cortical thickness in the frontal and temporal lobes. Evidence in CYP at risk of psychopathy suggests that CU traits are negatively related to grey matter volume and thickness in the amygdala, insular and temporal cortices, but positively associated with volume of the striatum. **c** | In terms of white matter tracts, both adults with psychopathy and CYP at risk of psychopathy have been found to exhibit microstructural changes within the uncinate fasciculus, corpus callosum, dorsal cingulum and anterior thalamic radiation. However, the microstructural changes in CYP are in opposite directions to those in adults.

psychopathy, particularly those described by psychiatrist Hervey Cleckley⁵ (Supplementary Table 1). The 20 items included in the PCL-R are weighted equally and are assessed on a three-point ordinal scale (0, 1, 2) based on information from a semistructured interview and review of collateral information, such as police reports, criminal and court records, institutional records, medical, social work and psychological assessments, and parole and probation records. The interview can last up to 3 hours. It should only be conducted by a suitably qualified and experienced clinician or researcher who is specifically trained to administer the PCL-R under standardized conditions. For clinical purposes, the PCL-R assessment should not be based solely on information learned through interview, as many individuals with psychopathic traits engage in impression management and lying. Although it is possible to conduct a PCL-R assessment for clinical purposes using only collateral information (information from different people, that spans temporal periods, and across diverse life domains, such as family, work/school and community), clinicians and researchers often rely on how the individual interacts with them to help assess the interpersonal features of psychopathy. A large number of studies have used the PCL-R and it has undergone rigorous psychometric evaluation.

The PCL-R and its derivatives were designed to measure the construct of psychopathy. However, data showing that psychopathy is a risk factor for violence¹²³ (but see¹²⁴) have contributed to the use of the PCL-R and its derivatives in the criminal justice system to inform decisions about future violence risk in sentencing and parole hearings¹²⁵, in the death penalty and sexually violent predator hearings in the USA¹²⁶, and dangerous offender hearings in Canada¹²⁷.

Psychopathy as assessed by the PCL-R and various other measures (TABLE 1) is a dimensional construct^{103,128}, but for research and clinical purposes, a categorical cut-off score of 30 or greater⁹ (out of a maximum possible score of 40) is commonly used on the PCL-R for a diagnosis of psychopathy in North American male offenders. Different cut-off scores of 25 or 26 or higher have been used for classifying forensic psychiatric patients or sexual offenders as high risk^{129,130} and in some European countries where the mean score on the PCL-R is lower¹³¹. Of note, an individual with no criminal record would normally score no more than 4 and most prisoners would score ~20–22 (REF.⁹). Having a high score on a couple of items would not be indicative of psychopathy, as having elevated scores across all facets of psychopathy is reflective of this disorder.

In addition to the rater-based approaches for the assessment of psychopathy, such as the PCL-R and similar rating scales, psychopathic traits can also be evaluated using self-report, which is used widely in research and measures have proliferated over the past 20 years (TABLE 1). One relatively recent self-report measure of psychopathy that has been the subject of a considerable amount of research is the Triarchic Psychopathy Measure (TriPM)¹³². This measure was developed to assess the triarchic model of psychopathy¹³³ which operationalizes psychopathy as three distinct domains:

boldness, meanness and disinhibition. Importantly, given the propensity of individuals with psychopathic traits to engage in impression management or dissimulation, self-report measures should not be used on their own when assessing psychopathic traits for clinical purposes¹³⁴.

Children and adolescents

Several measures can assess psychopathic traits in young people (TABLE 1); the decision regarding which measure to use should be guided by the main goals of the assessment (Supplementary Box 3). DSM-5 (REF.⁷) and the 11th revision of the International Classification of Diseases (ICD-11)¹³⁵ were focused on using dimensions of psychopathy to differentiate between persons with conduct problem diagnoses (CD in DSM-5, ODD and conduct-dissocial disorder in the ICD-11), and both diagnostic systems added a specifier of ‘with Limited Prosocial Emotions’ (Supplementary Box 4) that only includes CU traits. The rationale for this inclusion is because this CU-affective dimension of psychopathy seems most useful for the specific purpose of differentiating between persons with conduct problem diagnoses who show distinct aetiological, neurocognitive and social characteristics (Supplementary Box 3). Thus, for the purposes of designating an important subgroup of children with conduct problems, it would be important to include comprehensive measurement of CU traits, such as the widely used 24-item Inventory of Callous–Unemotional Traits (ICU), which exists in self-report, parent-report and teacher-report versions.

It is pertinent to note a few important cautions in using these criteria for making the diagnosis in children. First, given the pejorative connotations associated with the term ‘psychopathy’¹³⁶ and the evidence that these traits are highly changeable in children¹³⁷, clinicians should avoid using the term ‘psychopathy’ when referring to CYP. Instead, ‘limited prosocial emotions’ is descriptive of the limitations in the child’s emotions that can lead to his or her behaviour problems without necessarily having the same connotations as psychopathy. Second, this designation captures a subgroup of CYP that have distinct neurocognitive characteristics from other CYP with behavioural problems who are similar to adults with psychopathy, and that could be important for designing more effective treatments for these CYP. Further, there is evidence that children with high levels of CU traits are at risk of showing later psychopathic traits. However, it is important to note that more research is needed on the level of this risk and how this may be influenced by different ways of defining CU traits. Most importantly, the available evidence suggests that most antisocial children with elevated CU traits will not meet traditional definitions of psychopathy in adulthood¹³⁸.

Prevention

Prevention of psychopathy in adulthood is likely to necessitate timely and effective intervention in CYP at risk of psychopathy. Findings from meta-analyses support parent management training (PMT; also known as behavioural parent training) as the recommended

Parent management training

Training that teaches parents social learning techniques and behavioural strategies to increase children’s desirable behaviours and decrease their problematic and antisocial behaviours.

Table 1 | **Assessment measures of psychopathic traits in adults and youths**

Measure	Method	Items and scale	Dimensions, domains, facets and factors assessed	Refs
<i>Measures primarily for adults</i>				
Business Scan-360 (B-Scan-360)	Informant rater or self-report	20 items, 5-point scale	Manipulative or unethical, callous or insensitive, unreliable or unfocused and intimidating or aggressive	²⁴³
Comprehensive Assessment of Psychopathic Personality (CAPP)	Professional rater or self-report	33 items, 7-point scale	Attachment, behavioural, cognitive, dominance, emotional and self	²⁴⁴
Elemental Psychopathy Assessment (EPA) ^a	Self-report	178 items, 5-point scale	Antagonism, emotional stability, disinhibition and narcissism	²⁴⁵
Levenson Self-Report Psychopathy Scale (LSRP)	Self-report	26 items, 4-point scale	Primary and secondary variants	²⁴⁶
Psychopathy Checklist–Revised (PCL-R)	Professional rater	20 items, 3-point scale	Interpersonal, affective, lifestyle and antisocial	⁹
Psychopathy Checklist: Screening Version (PCL:SV)	Professional rater	12 items, 3-point scale	Interpersonal, affective, lifestyle and antisocial	²⁴⁷
Psychopathic Personality Inventory–Revised (PPI-R) ^a	Self-report	154 items, 4-point scale	Fearless dominance, self-centred impulsivity and coldheartedness	²⁴⁸
Self-report Psychopathy Scale (SRP-4) ^a	Self-report	64 items, 5-point scale	Interpersonal, affective, lifestyle and antisocial	²⁴⁹
Triarchic Psychopathy Measure (TriPM) ^a	Self-report	58 items, 4-point scale	Boldness, meanness and disinhibition	¹³³
<i>Measures primarily for children and/or adolescents</i>				
Antisocial Process Screening Device (APSD)	Parent-report, teacher-report or self-report	20 items, 3-point scale	Narcissism, callous–unemotional and impulsivity	²⁵⁰
Clinical Assessment of Prosocial Emotions, version 1.1 (CAPE 1.1)	Professional rater	4 items, 3-point scale	LPE specifier	²⁵¹
Child Psychopathy Scale (CPS)	Parent-report, teacher-report or self-report	52 items, 2-point scale	Interpersonal, affective and impulsive	²⁵²
Child Problematic Traits Inventory (CPTI)	Parent-report or teacher-report	28 items, 4-point scale	Grandiose–deceitful, callous–unemotional and impulsive–need for stimulation	²⁵³
Inventory of Callous–Unemotional Traits (ICU)	Parent-report, teacher-report or self-report	24 items, 4-point scale	Callous–unemotional	²⁵⁴
Psychopathy Checklist: Youth Version (PCL:YV)	Professional rater	20 items, 3-point	Interpersonal, affective, behavioural and antisocial	²⁵⁵
Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI) ^a	Self-report	50 items, 4-point scale	Grandiose–manipulative, callous–unemotional and impulsive–irresponsible	²⁵⁶
Youth Psychopathic Traits–Child Version (YPI-CV) ^a	Self-report	50 items, 4-point scale	Grandiose–manipulative, callous–unemotional and impulsive–irresponsible	²⁵⁷

LPE, limited prosocial emotions. ^aShort form available.

Contingency management
Rewarding youth for engagement in specified positive behaviour.

Cognitive–behavioural interventions
A family of psychological treatments that aim to alter maladaptive thinking patterns, feelings, and behaviours.

treatment for reducing childhood conduct problems, with treatment gains that are maintained over 3 or more years after the intervention¹³⁹. Other evidence-based psychosocial treatments for conduct problems include PMT with problem-solving skills training, anger control and social skills training, contingency management, cognitive–behavioural interventions, family therapy and multisystemic therapy^{140,141}. Across treatment modalities and versions of PMT, several studies have found that although antisocial CYP with high levels of CU traits do show improvements in CU traits^{43,142} and antisocial

behaviour, they often begin and end treatment with more severe parent-rated and teacher-rated conduct problems relative to CYP with lower levels of CU traits^{43,142–144}. This pattern of continued impairment after treatment is consistent with findings in adults with psychopathic traits¹⁴⁵ (see Management below).

The leading explanation for why first-line PMT treatments produce unequal outcomes depending on the severity of CU traits is that these treatments do not address the distinct familial and neurocognitive processes underlying the behavioural problems of

Multisystemic therapy
Synergistic interventions
that involve the youth, family,
school, and community
systems.

individuals with psychopathic traits. PMT is underpinned by established causal models of conduct problems that emphasize the importance of improving the effectiveness and consistency of parental discipline to produce child behavioural change. These strategies are undermined by the temperamentally fearless and punishment-insensitive learning styles of antisocial CYP with CU traits who experience core behavioural discipline strategies, such as time-out, as less aversive than antisocial CYP with low levels of CU traits^{41,146}. By contrast, using positive reinforcement within PMT was rated by parents of clinic-referred children with disruptive behavioural disorders as equally effective for reducing conduct problems in CYP across varying levels of CU traits¹⁴⁶. Indeed, using reward-oriented contingency management strategies that target the self-interests of incarcerated adolescents with high levels of psychopathic traits, within an intensive treatment that placed less emphasis on sanctions, reduced recidivism over a 2-year period following release, compared with treatment-as-usual^{147,148}. These findings suggest that modifying traditional behavioural therapies to emphasize individualized positive reinforcement over punishment may enhance some treatment outcomes for CYP at risk of psychopathy, with evidence for sustained effects over a 6-year follow-up¹⁴⁹. It should also be noted that a number of studies have found that CU and psychopathic traits do not affect children's responses to interventions for conduct problems when the treatment is multimodal (including medication management for comorbid ADHD), intensive (average of >20 weekly sessions), personalized to address the family's unique needs and risk factors, and/or is delivered as a preventative family-based intervention to toddlers and preschoolers at risk of early starting conduct problems^{150,151}. This suggests that CYP with CU traits can benefit from some generic conduct problem interventions, particularly when these are preventative or include some individualization.

Contemporary treatment research increasingly focuses on adapting established behavioural treatments to target the specific risk factors in CYP at risk of psychopathy. For example, augmenting PMT with parent-child emotion recognition training was superior to PMT alone in improving empathy and reducing conduct problems in antisocial children with elevated CU traits¹⁵². However, improvements in children's emotion recognition or affective empathy did not explain the positive effect of this enhancement on reducing conduct problems in children with high levels of CU traits. An alternative focus on enhancing warm, responsive and consistent parenting within family-based interventions has been spurred by findings that this style of parenting is associated with a reduced risk of antisocial behaviour and psychopathic traits^{43,46}, with encouraging findings of improved antisocial outcomes for CYP at risk of psychopathy^{151,153}. An intriguing but yet-unanswered question is whether PMT programmes that integrate a positive parent-child relationship-building component (44% of programmes examined in a meta-analysis¹⁵⁴) are superior to programmes that teach behavioural management alone in reducing conduct problems in children with high levels of CU traits. Another intriguing

question is whether such programmes can reduce the likelihood of those with an inherited risk of psychopathy (based on biological mother's fearlessness and low interpersonal affiliation) to evoke increasingly harsh parenting in the toddler to preschool years, which undermines empathy and conscience development and further increases levels of CU traits¹⁵⁵. This knowledge can be used to guide the selection of treatment programme from the many available options to adapt to children at risk of psychopathy.

The efficacy and efficiency of delivering these nuanced interventions will be greatest when provided to children with early starting conduct problems who are identified as being at risk based on validated tools for assessing CU and psychopathic traits (TABLE 1). Interventions for the prevention of psychopathy have use only insofar as individuals engage in, complete and benefit from treatment. Among CYP identified as at risk of developing psychopathy, there is likely to be variation in treatment responses, necessitating further research into moderating variables. Tailoring treatment programmes or their components to subpopulations that respond positively to these interventions, such as those sharing specific phenotypes, genotypes or other biomarkers, may further optimize intervention efficiency¹⁵⁶. However, the willingness to engage in intervention and/or develop the important therapeutic alliance may be detrimentally affected by traits such as low interpersonal affiliation that are shared in common between parents and their CYP with CU traits¹⁵⁷. Alternatively, some parents of a child with high levels of CU traits may be highly motivated for change because of the greater severity and burden of their child's conduct problems relative to the child's counterparts with low levels of CU traits. Findings on treatment engagement within family-based interventions are mixed, with some, but not all, studies finding greater dropout and less parent-reported treatment satisfaction for children with high levels of CU traits compared with those with low levels of CU traits^{143,158,159}. Among older CYP involved in treatment, psychopathic traits are modestly associated with treatment non-compliance, poor attendance, lower-quality participation and premature treatment dropout¹⁶⁰. Further areas of concern for therapists include poor motivation to change, manipulation or deceit, and high rates of aggression and violence among CYP with or at risk of developing psychopathic traits that raise safeguarding considerations. An important avenue for future research is to investigate factors that may motivate engagement in and reduce the likelihood of safeguarding concerns during interventions.

In sum, CYP with early starting conduct problems and high levels of CU traits, and at potential risk of psychopathy, may benefit most from psychosocial treatments for conduct problems that are either enhanced to target their specific vulnerabilities or that flexibly address their individual needs using multiple tailored modules determined from a comprehensive initial assessment. The durability over time of gains from these treatments in CYP with different levels of psychopathic traits, and whether treatment curtails the later development of psychopathy, require further investigation in

Milieu therapy

Therapeutic communities to treat individual group members through setting norms and boundaries.

randomized controlled trials with long-term follow-up periods. Where trials have followed children treated for conduct problems into early adulthood, findings are inconsistent and no studies examined moderation by CU or psychopathic traits^{161,162}. Continued translational psychological and neuroscience research that applies knowledge on the causes of psychopathy to strengthen established treatments or to develop novel interventions targeting these processes is critical to preventing the development of psychopathy in at-risk CYP.

Management

Finding appropriate ways to manage and treat the harmful behaviour displayed by adults with psychopathic traits has been particularly challenging. Indeed, such individuals often exhibit higher rates of institutional violence when in correctional and forensic psychiatric settings¹⁶³ and are placed in solitary confinement in correctional settings at a higher rate than individuals with lower psychopathy scores²⁴. Elevated psychopathic traits have been associated with reduced treatment cooperation, including bonding and the inclination to complete tasks as part of treatment¹⁶⁴. It also has been suggested that psychopathy may have a substantial effect on interpersonal relationships with staff¹⁶⁵, but empirical research into this topic is lacking. Given the severity and chronicity of their antisocial behaviour, both in the community and within correctional and forensic psychiatric settings, individuals with high levels of psychopathic traits are regularly referred for treatment in these supervised settings. Indeed, in the Netherlands a forensic psychiatric system has been developed for the treatment and management of severe antisocial behaviour and personality disorders, including psychopathy¹⁶⁶.

Several different pharmacotherapy and psychological approaches have been used to try to address the behaviour of adults with psychopathic traits. Some approaches that are useful for treating different types of antisocial individuals seem to be less effective in adults with high levels of psychopathic traits^{142,167,168}.

Medication

In general, administration of psychotropic medication has been an important tool for managing undesirable and maladaptive behaviour in individuals with psychiatric disorders. However, there has been very little work on psychopharmacological treatment for psychopathy, with only a handful of anecdotal reports and no reliable systematic investigation conducted. One report of pharmacotherapy in four individuals diagnosed with psychopathy and ASPD has been published, and showed a reduction in irritability, aggressiveness and impulsivity following treatment with the antipsychotic quetiapine¹⁶⁹. A few other studies in individuals with high levels of impulsive aggressive behaviour without a formal diagnosis of psychopathy have found that treatment with lithium¹⁷⁰, phenytoin (an anticonvulsant)¹⁷¹ and serotonin reuptake inhibitors¹⁷² may reduce aggression in these individuals compared with their behaviour before treatment. Notably, none of these studies was a large, rigorous randomized controlled trial and none targeted psychopathy specifically.

Psychological interventions

The vast majority of psychological interventions for adults with psychopathic traits focus on addressing their thoughts and behaviours. Many treatments encompass some variant of cognitive-behavioural therapy, behaviour therapy, and/or milieu therapy. Psychological interventions focusing on cognitive, behavioural and interpersonal functioning can take many forms and be administered over the course of a few months to years in order to address the needs of individuals.

There is general pessimism regarding the treatment of psychopathy in adults. One study compared the usefulness of cognitive-behavioural therapy in 20 offenders with psychopathy and 20 offenders without psychopathy and found that it had little effect in either group¹⁷³. Subsequent studies found that cognitive-behavioural therapy and milieu therapy had either minimal effects in individuals with psychopathy or, in some cases, that intervention worsened symptoms. For example, one study found a negative association between improvement in clinical symptoms and psychopathy¹⁷⁴. In addition, psychopathic traits are negatively associated with treatment-related outcome measures¹⁷⁵. Indeed, a handful of studies have found that adults with psychopathy are more likely to drop out of cognitive-behavioural therapy or milieu therapy compared with controls without psychopathy^{176–178}, which might suggest that individuals with psychopathy do not have the opportunity to benefit from treatment. In support of this conclusion, some studies have found improvements in clinical outcomes (such as antisocial behaviour) in adults with psychopathy when they complete psychological treatment^{176,178}. However, other studies have indicated that following treatment (regardless of drop-out or completion) adults with psychopathy have higher rates of re-offence than individuals without psychopathy¹⁶⁷. Of note, only a small number of studies have been conducted on this topic, no studies have included large samples, and they have rarely included appropriate methodological controls (such as a control group or randomization)¹⁷⁹. Therefore, strong conclusions about the treatability of adults with psychopathy are tenuous at best.

Common psychological interventions, such as cognitive-behavioural, behavioural and milieu therapies, may be less effective for treating adults with psychopathic traits than individuals without psychopathy. Although these therapies may yield some improvements in those with psychopathy, these treatments rarely result in desired clinical outcomes or return the individual to a 'normative' level of functioning. Moreover, it is hard to ignore the evidence suggesting that traditional interventions may have a negative effect on individuals with psychopathic traits. This conclusion underscores the pessimism about treating individuals with psychopathic traits; however, it is quite likely that individuals with psychopathic traits are treatable, but the right treatment has not yet been identified. In this regard, decades of research on the biological and cognitive mechanisms supporting psychopathic behaviour provide grounds to be optimistic, as it may provide insights into novel intervention approaches (see Outlook, below).




Fig. 5 | **Quality of life and psychopathy.** Psychopathy is devastating for individuals and society owing to its association with diverse negative outcomes across the lifespan, including mental and physical health problems, legal and institutional problems, social and family impairments, and educational and employment problems, as well as consequences of reckless and irresponsible behaviour. Adapted with permission from REF.¹¹³, Springer Nature Limited.

Quality of life

Quality of life (QOL) assessment measures an individual's subjective satisfaction with life across several domains¹⁸⁰. No studies have investigated QOL in adults with a psychopathy diagnosis compared with controls matched on key demographic variables, precluding a rigorous assessment of how individuals with psychopathy experience their life relative to others. Only two studies have examined the association between psychopathic traits and self-rated QOL in adults. In one study, a sample of Belgian forensic patients were divided into three groups according to level of psychopathy (total PCL-R scores <15, 15–24.9 and >25 for low, moderate and high levels of psychopathy, respectively), and the groups did not differ on self-ratings of physical health, psychological health or environment¹⁸¹. Furthermore, patients with moderate and high psychopathy scores rated their social relationships more positively than patients with low psychopathy scores. By contrast, in a Swedish community sample of adults with a varied history of youth crime¹⁸², individuals with a higher level of psychopathic traits reported less satisfaction with their work, psychological health and with family relationships. These contradictory findings indicate a need for more research on QOL in individuals with psychopathy. Reliance on an individual's subjective perception of his or her QOL might be

problematic in this population because individuals with psychopathy often have a profound lack of insight into the nature and extent of their problems¹³⁴ and therefore might not view their life through the same lenses as individuals without psychopathy. Given the paucity of research on QOL in individuals with psychopathy, this section mostly focuses on the effect of psychopathy on important domains of functioning. Psychopathy is devastating for individuals and society due to its association with diverse negative outcomes across the lifespan, including legal problems, social and family impairments, educational and employment problems, and mental and physical health problems (FIG. 5).

CYP at risk of psychopathy have difficulties in a number of domains that suggest reduced QOL. They have lower school and academic performance¹⁸³, and conflicted relationships with peers, parents and teachers¹⁸⁴. In addition, compared with their peers with no risk of psychopathy, these individuals are more likely to show conduct problems¹⁸⁵, bullying behaviour^{186,187}, instrumental and reactive aggression¹⁸⁸, frequent and diverse criminal behaviours¹⁸⁹, institutional aggression¹⁹⁰, programme non-compliance¹⁹¹, substance abuse¹⁹², risky sexual behaviours¹⁹³, unplanned pregnancy¹⁹³ and suicidality^{194,195}. They are also more likely than their peers to have experienced peer victimization¹⁹⁶, parenting that

is harsh, negative and low in warmth, physical or emotional abuse and neglect¹⁹⁷, increased exposure to violence at home and within the community¹⁹⁸, lack of parental supervision¹⁹⁹ and gang involvement²⁰⁰. A large ($N=1,215$) prospective longitudinal study in the USA found that the presence of CU traits at baseline in first-time adolescent arrestees were associated with both increased frequency of gun carrying and the likelihood of using a gun when committing a crime during a 4-year follow-up period²⁰¹.

Psychopathic and CU traits are moderately stable from childhood or adolescence into adulthood^{202–204}, and, without intervention, a number of negative outcomes occur in adulthood. Indeed, legal problems are very common, often starting at a young age and persisting across the lifespan²⁰⁵. Individuals with psychopathy commit both reactive and instrumental violence²⁰⁶ and researchers have found a link between sadistic motives and psychopathy in sexual offenders²⁰⁷. In the community, individuals with psychopathy have higher rates of substance abuse²⁰⁸, smoking quantity²⁰⁹, employment problems²¹⁰, homelessness¹⁰, problematic intimate relationships²¹¹ and divorce²¹², engagement in risky sexual behaviours²¹³, and negative parenting behaviours²¹⁴, than individuals without psychopathy. In addition, in a longitudinal community sample, psychopathic traits were associated with a reduction in general health and an increase in prevalence of diabetes mellitus, high blood pressure, high cholesterol and neurological disorders (epilepsy, migraines, stuttering, tinnitus, ADHD, anxiety, and depression) in early adulthood²¹⁵. Other studies have found a positive relationship between psychopathic traits and suicidality with stronger associations in women than in men^{216,217}. A large global study in adults found an association between psychopathic traits in women and maternal and infant mortality²¹⁸. Probably as a result of their impulsive and reckless behaviours, a Finnish study with a 30-year follow-up found that offenders with psychopathy die younger than the general population with a fivefold higher mortality rate, and the causes of their death are more violent than among other offenders without psychopathy²¹⁹.

Unsurprisingly, the societal and economic effects of psychopathy across the lifespan are substantial. In Missouri, USA, researchers concluded that juvenile offenders with psychopathic traits were responsible for a disproportionate amount of crime costs²²⁰. More broadly across the USA, the estimated annual costs of psychopathy to the criminal justice system has been estimated to be US \$460 billion¹². This does not include the considerable emotional costs to those who have a family member, who work with, or who are intimately involved with someone with psychopathy. In this context, we agree with Reidy and colleagues²²¹ that psychopathy should be considered ‘a serious public health problem’ and that more research needs to be conducted on primary prevention strategies in at-risk CYP.

Outlook

We have learned so much about psychopathy and its development over the past 40 years and, although small, this field of research is progressing rapidly. Yet, many outstanding questions and challenges remain.

Lack of funding and advocacy

As highlighted in this Primer, psychopathy is associated with enormous personal, societal and economic effects across the lifespan, which calls for substantial funding for its prevention, research and treatment. However, this is not the case. Indeed, borderline personality disorder is the only personality disorder mentioned in the US National Institute of Mental Health article ‘Anatomy of NIMH Funding’, and it receives the least amount of funding of all the psychiatric disorders, and psychopathy is not included at all. Similarly, ASPD is not mentioned in the UK Mental Health Research report ‘UK Mental Health Research Funding 2014–2017’ (<https://www.mqmentalhealth.org/our-work/research-reports/>), and personality disorder research more broadly received one of the smallest shares of support between 2014 and 2017. As noted in a recent Primer¹¹³, the same can be said for CD, meaning that there is a lack of funding at every developmental stage. This state of affairs is indefensible and probably results from several interlinked factors, including stigma, challenging family circumstances that reduce the ability of family members to lobby for funding, and the fact that adults with psychopathy and CYP at risk of psychopathy do not elicit sympathy due to the very nature of their disorder. Consequently, from a young age, these individuals do not have natural advocates, unlike individuals with other disorders that are arguably much less costly and concerning to society. Given that psychopathy is a serious public health problem, more research funding should be devoted to this disorder and on an equal basis to other psychiatric disorders.

Epidemiology and quality of life

Probably due to its absence from the DSM-5 as a disorder, limited epidemiological data exist on psychopathy and the data that do exist are confined to North American and UK samples. Given the potential impact of the disorder worldwide and evidence that psychological and neurobiological findings based on Western populations often do not replicate in other cultures²²², more large-scale global epidemiological research should be conducted. This line of work would clarify whether the effect of psychopathy as a public health issue varies across countries that differ, for example, in terms of income or rates of antisocial and violent behaviour or crimes. More research is also needed on the QOL of the population of individuals with psychopathy and its primary and secondary variants that includes both subjective and objective measures of distress and discomfort.

Mechanisms/pathophysiology

Defining the precise environmental and neurobiological risk factors and how they interact to contribute to the onset and course of psychopathy and its different facets is important. Despite the clear epidemiological phenomenon of sex differences in the prevalence of psychopathy and data in young people suggesting that the aetiology of high levels of CU traits might differ between the sexes²²³, the mechanisms that underpin these differences in prevalence and aetiology are poorly understood. Accordingly, more multilevel research (such

as investigating environmental, genetic, neuroimaging and behavioural factors) including both sexes should be conducted. Relatedly, there are no large international scientific consortia that specifically focus on the genetic underpinnings of psychopathy and its facets to conduct well-powered genome-wide association, epigenetic or gene–environment interplay studies. Furthermore, the extant large-scale studies with genetic data do not include psychometrically-sound measures of psychopathy. Crucially, no systematic investigations of psychopathy at different stages of development exist, although data from twin studies indicate that different genetic risk factors may be important for the initial risk versus the developmental course of psychopathic traits²²⁴. If molecular genetic research on psychopathy is to advance, larger samples and careful phenotyping are required. In addition to efforts focusing on common genetic variants, it is also important to study rare variants that may have more substantial effects but that only affect a very small subset of the population. Gene expression studies also hold promise in the field. One study²²⁵ focused on gene expression patterns in a small sample of psychopathic offenders ($N=6$), substance abusers ($N=3$) and healthy controls ($N=6$), and implicated expression of several genes and immune-related pathways in psychopathy. Replication of these findings in larger samples, as well as the degree to which these gene expression results reflect heritable genetic variation versus the individual's response to environmental inputs will be an important avenue for further research.

Four key challenges, shared with other fields, will have to be tackled to provide a more accurate understanding of the neurocognitive features of psychopathy and its facets. First, task parameters and demands often vary considerably between studies purporting to assess the same cognitive or affective constructs, which is problematic for meta-analytical studies. Thus, the field should agree on a core set of paradigms that more precisely and reliably measure a set of clearly defined candidate cognitive or affective functions. Second, psychometric validation of functional neuroimaging and experimental measures is needed if we want to advance the longitudinal study of psychopathy. Indeed, these paradigms have not been psychometrically validated to sensitively and reliably capture individual differences, so that their utility for inclusion in large-scale longitudinal studies is limited. Third, more work is needed to validate paradigms that could be used to assess the same neurocognitive domains in different age groups. Fourth, the substantial variability in analysis pipelines for fMRI data, combined with the degrees of freedom of researchers, are likely to have contributed to a lack of replicability across studies and therefore we call for data sharing (where ethically feasible) and codes between researchers along with pre-registration and registered reports²²⁶. A final challenge specific to this field will be to systematically research neurocognitive processes related to empathy and social affiliation in individuals with secondary psychopathy (Supplementary Box 1) and investigate how their social cognition develops. In other words, we must be open to investigating different developmental pathways (equifinality) to psychopathy.

Although personality disorders were not mentioned in the Grand Challenges in Global Mental Health Initiative²²⁷, its call for large-scale prospective longitudinal studies that start in the prenatal period and include multiple levels of analysis is also relevant to psychopathy. Such research is needed to identify and quantify how and when different risk factors operate to cause psychopathy. Some researchers have suggested that significant progress in understanding the pathophysiology of psychiatric disorder requires a good animal model²²⁸; in this respect recent genetic work on a non-human primate model of psychopathy might prove fruitful²²⁹. Finally, grey matter volume differences associated with psychopathy are present in the four lobes of the brain and in subcortical structures, possibly accounting for some of the neurocognitive disruptions seen in psychopathy. However, it is important to note that there are marked inconsistencies across studies in the loci and direction of the effects, probably due to methodological factors as well as differences in the demographic and clinical characteristics of the samples²³⁰ (BOX 3), which have been small, with a few notable exceptions^{231,232}. In this context, data sharing and harmonization in international and interdisciplinary collaborations (such as the Antisocial Behavior Working Group of Enhancing Neuro Imaging and Genetics through Meta Analysis²³³ (ENIGMA) (<http://enigma.ini.usc.edu/ongoing/enigma-antisocial-behavior/>) and the Psychiatric Genomics Consortium (<https://www.med.unc.edu/pgc/>)) will be important and should help overcome the small sample sizes in existing neuroimaging and genetic studies. Addressing the above gaps, pressing challenges, and future directions for the field will ultimately help refine existing models of psychopathy and its diagnosis, and promote the development of targeted treatment and prevention approaches.

Diagnosis

As the DSM-5 includes the limited prosocial emotions specifier for the diagnosis of CD (Supplementary Box 3) to recognize that there is a subgroup of CYP at risk of developing psychopathy (BOX 2), we, as do others¹⁹, believe that, from a developmental perspective, psychopathy should also be included within the DSM-5 as a specifier for the related but broader diagnosis of ASPD (BOX 1) for which a diagnosis of CD before age 15 is a prerequisite⁷. More work needs to be carried out to understand the variants of psychopathy, but it is unclear if diagnosis based solely on a clinician's ratings of observable symptoms will be able to differentiate them; in the future, the identification of biomarkers for psychopathy variants could improve their identification by providing more objective biological and neurocognitive measures to complement clinical judgement. This may in turn reduce stigma and contribute to advancing the field towards a 'precision psychiatry' approach tailored to specific individuals. The discovery of reliable structural neuroimaging biomarkers could also potentially contribute to reconceptualizing psychopathy as a neurodevelopmental disorder¹⁹. However, no reliable biomarkers for psychopathy have been identified, but advanced statistical methods such as machine learning

applied to structural neuroimaging and genetics data²³⁴ within prospective longitudinal research have potential for identifying reliable and predictive biomarkers. Ultimately, improved diagnostic and potential stratifications of patients based on reliable biomarkers and environmental risk factors could pave the way for better treatments and outcomes in psychopathy.

Treatment

The continued translation of research findings to improve the treatment of psychiatric disorders is a central goal of psychological and neuroscience research. Novel, cross-disciplinary, therapeutic frameworks propose that psychopathy could be treated using interventions designed to specifically target disturbances in biological and cognitive mechanisms relevant to this disorder¹⁶⁷. One study²³⁵ of prisoners used computerized training designed to target cognitive deficiencies related to psychopathy, and found training-related improvements after 6 weeks of training using computerized tasks, compared with individuals who received the alternative mechanistically unmatched training, and these training effects generalized to other tasks that were not practised. A key shift in the treatment focus was to identify and target putative cognitive–affective mechanisms related to psychopathy. This focus might allow for more direct change in the mechanisms supporting psychopathic behaviour. Alternatively, a mechanistic focus might allow individuals with psychopathic traits to build or harness compensatory strategies that would allow them to circumvent their cognitive–affective deficits and to engage in more prosocial behaviour supported through alternative strategies. This is consistent with our understanding of neural plasticity and behaviour change.

Box 4 | CU behaviours in young children

In the last decade, researchers have extended the study of callous–unemotional (CU) traits to children younger than 5 years by focusing on callous–unemotional-like behaviours (such as lack of guilt, and low fear and empathy)^{214,292}. The term CU behaviours was originally coined to reflect the possibility that these behaviours in very young children might not be stable enough to warrant the status of ‘traits’. Empathy and guilt-related behaviours emerge in the first few years of life and a subgroup of persistently aggressive children can already be identified at that stage. These are among the key motivations to extend the study of CU behaviours to young children²⁹³. These behaviours have been assessed either through standard CU traits measures previously used in children and young people (CYP) or via parent-rated items taken from questionnaires focusing on low empathy and guilt, uncaring behaviour and low emotional responsivity²⁹². An emerging body of evidence has accumulated regarding the aetiology, predictive validity, and temperamental precursors of CU behaviours. Although there is evidence that such behaviours at 2 years of age are moderately heritable²⁹⁴, adoption⁵⁰ and twin studies²⁹⁴ have indicated that heritable risk can be moderated, for example, by warm parenting. Several prospective longitudinal studies have now shown that CU behaviours measured in children as young as 3 years predict antisocial and proactive aggressive behaviour and CU traits at later ages (up to 10 years). As for temperamental precursors of CU behaviours, the data suggest that “impairments in attending to, recognizing, and responding to interpersonal emotions as early as infancy may increase risk for CU behaviors”²⁹². However, a limitation of the above literature is the lack of follow-up data to determine what proportion of young children will develop conduct problems with stable high levels of CU traits, and subsequently the syndrome of psychopathy in adulthood. This will be an important area of future research that has the potential to shed new light on the development of psychopathy and identify key targets for preventative work.

Another potential treatment approach for future investigation is biofeedback. Interventions using biofeedback involve measuring physiological responses (such as heart rate or skin conductance response) and relaying this information in real-time to the patient²³⁶. The assumption is that the patient will use this information to willingly regulate internal states and behaviour. This approach has shown promise for treating individuals with inattention and impaired behavioural regulation^{237,238}, which are also problems seen in psychopathy⁸⁶. One study²³⁹ developed a biofeedback training that required offenders with psychopathy to learn to regulate their brain activity to improve behavioural control. Preliminary findings in a small sample suggested that this type of training reduced aggressive and maladaptive behaviour, but results require replication in much larger samples to determine their robustness. Of note, a biofeedback approach requires some consideration of the different variants of psychopathy and their distinct underlying aetiology, as it is likely that different mechanisms will have to be targeted using techniques and measures tailored to the characteristics of each variant. It will also be important for future clinical research to examine how the effects of such interventions are reflected by changes in potential biomarkers for psychopathy.

Despite the promise of a shift towards a more mechanistic and neurocognitive focus for treatment in individuals with psychopathy, a key challenge will be to address the extent to which these individuals would be motivated to engage in more normative and prosocial thinking and behaviour. Additionally, given the effortful nature of engaging certain cognitive–affective processes, there is a question of how reliably individuals with psychopathy will be able to deliberately call upon these resources to promote more prosocial responding. However, even if automatic affective responses can be trained or evoked in individuals with psychopathy, finding the right interventions to achieve this (for each variant) will be difficult. It is likely that multimodal treatments will be needed to help psychopathic individuals build compensatory strategies for navigating their social world such that not only their own needs but also the needs of those they encounter are met.

As it is unlikely that psychopathy will ever be completely eradicated, one interesting avenue for future research to reduce its harmful effect on others might be to focus research and advocacy on the victims²⁴⁰. Given findings that individuals with psychopathy are particularly good at identifying potential victims²⁴¹, and that the likelihood of being victimized is not random²⁴², this avenue of research presents potential to alleviate much suffering. This line of work could increase the public’s awareness of who may be vulnerable and how those with psychopathy manipulate their victims, thereby decreasing a person’s risk of forming, or staying in, a toxic personal or professional relationship with an individual with psychopathy. This line of work needs to be conducted sensitively and has to be unequivocal in not placing any blame on victims. In this respect, the work of the Aftermath: Surviving Psychopathy Foundation (<https://aftermath-surviving-psychopathy.org/>) has been instrumental for the past 10 years.

Prevention

Given that psychopathy has such a deleterious impact on all aspects of life (FIG. 5), its associated personal and societal costs, and the difficulty in treating it, improving efforts at preventing the disorder should be a key public health priority. For such preventative work to be effective, it must be family-based, focusing on both parent or caregivers and the CYP. As the brain and personality are more adaptable early in life and work indicating that the precursors of CU traits can be identified in the first 3 years of life (BOX 4), prevention work must start early, focusing on putative causal mechanisms thought to be specific to the development of psychopathy and its variants, and must involve long-term follow-ups. Given the low prevalence of the disorder in the community, such work might have to be carried out on 'at-risk' individuals who are enrolled in well-designed randomized controlled trials within prospective longitudinal studies if the causal risk and, crucially, protective factors for the disorder are to be identified. However, such work based on deemed 'at-risk' populations will have to be carried out sensitively and with careful ethical consideration, protecting the rights of the individuals, both adults and CYP, and avoiding the potential negative impacts of labelling.

When Aristotle allegedly said "Give me a child until he is 7 and I will show you the man" he was partially correct. He was right because there is indeed some degree

of continuity between the temperament of the child and the personality of the adult. However, Aristotle was also wrong on several fronts that are particularly relevant to the discussion in this Primer about the development of psychopathy. First, although some features of psychopathy can be identified in a subgroup of CYP who show severe antisocial behaviour and may be genetically vulnerable, we now know that not all of those CYP will develop the syndrome as adults. In fact, only a minority of them will¹³⁸. Second, Aristotle neglected the influence of the environment, but the aetiology of psychopathy is complex, with contributions of both individual (such as genetic) and environmental (such as parenting) risk factors and different forms of interplay between the two. The exact timing and nature of those interplays remain poorly understood, partly due to a limited prospective longitudinal, multi-method body of research on the development of psychopathy. However, we are optimistic that methodological advances, combined with large-scale prospective international and interdisciplinary collaborations, can lead to radical changes in our understanding of the aetiology of psychopathy. Such progress could, in turn, contribute to improved diagnosis, treatment and prevention of the disorder, thereby decreasing its public health toll and conferring major benefits for the individual, the individual's family and society.

Published online 08 July 2021

- Skeem, J. L., Polaschek, D. L., Patrick, C. J. & Lilienfeld, S. O. Psychopathic personality: bridging the gap between scientific evidence and public policy. *Psychol. Sci. Public. Interest*. **12**, 95–162 (2011). **This article provides a thorough review of the scientific evidence related to the definition, assessment, and treatment of psychopathy and its variants as well their implications for public policy.**
- Berg, J. M. et al. Misconceptions regarding psychopathic personality: implications for clinical practice and research. *Neuropsychiatry* **3**, 63–74 (2013).
- Lilienfeld, S. O. Conceptual problems in the assessment of psychopathy. *Clin. Psychol. Rev.* **14**, 17–38 (1994).
- Hare, R. D. & Neumann, C. S. Psychopathy as a clinical and empirical construct. *Annu. Rev. Clin. Psychol.* **4**, 217–246 (2008).
- Cleckley, H. M. *The Mask of Sanity* 5th edn (Mosby, 1976).
- Blair, R. J. R., Mitchell, D. G. V. & Blair, K. S. *The Psychopath: Emotion and the Brain* (Blackwell, 2005).
- American Psychiatric Association. *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders: DSM-5* 5th edn (American Psychiatric Association, 2013).
- Hare, R. D. & Neumann, C. S. Psychopathy: assessment and forensic implications. *Can. J. Psychiatry* **54**, 791–802 (2009).
- Hare, R. D. *Manual for the Revised Psychopathy Checklist* 2nd edn (Multi-Health Systems, 2003).
- Coid, J., Yang, M., Ullrich, S., Roberts, A. & Hare, R. D. Prevalence and correlates of psychopathic traits in the household population of Great Britain. *Int. J. Law Psychiatry* **32**, 65–73 (2009).
- Kiehl, K. A. & Sinnott-Armstrong, W. P. in *Handbook on Psychopathy and Law* Ch. 1 (eds Kiehl, K. A. & Sinnott-Armstrong, W. P.) 1–2 (Oxford Univ. Press, 2013).
- Kiehl, K. A. & Hoffman, M. B. The criminal psychopath: history, neuroscience, treatment, and economics. *Jurimetrics* **51**, 355–397 (2011).
- Hare, R. D. *Hare Psychopathy Checklist-Revised (PCL-R)* 2nd edn (Multi-Health Systems, 2003).
- Marshall, L. A. & Cooke, D. J. The childhood experiences of psychopaths: a retrospective study of familial and societal factors. *J. Pers. Disord.* **13**, 211–225 (1999).
- World Health Organization. *The ICD-10 Classification of Mental and Behavioural Disorders: Clinical Descriptions and Diagnostic Guidelines* (WHO, 1992).
- Frick, P. J., Ray, J. V., Thornton, L. C. & Kahn, R. E. Can callous-unemotional traits enhance the understanding, diagnosis, and treatment of serious conduct problems in children and adolescents? A comprehensive review. *Psychol. Bull.* **140**, 1–57 (2014). **This article provides a comprehensive summary of research on how callous-unemotional traits are related to conduct problems in children and adolescents, with implications for causal theory, diagnosis, and treatment.**
- Blair, R. J. R. The neurobiology of psychopathic traits in youths. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* **14**, 786–799 (2013).
- Viding, E. & McCrory, E. J. Understanding the development of psychopathy: progress and challenges. *Psychol. Med.* **48**, 566–577 (2018).
- Raine, A. Antisocial personality as a neurodevelopmental disorder. *Annu. Rev. Clin. Psychol.* **14**, 259–289 (2018).
- Wakschlag, L. S. et al. The neurodevelopmental basis of early childhood disruptive behavior: irritable and callous phenotypes as exemplars. *Am. J. Psychiatry* **175**, 114–130 (2018).
- Verschuere, B. et al. What features of psychopathy might be central? A network analysis of the Psychopathy Checklist-Revised (PCL-R) in three large samples. *J. Abnorm. Psychol.* **127**, 51–65 (2018).
- Neumann, C. S., Hare, R. D. & Pardini, D. A. Antisociality and the construct of psychopathy: data from across the globe. *J. Pers.* **83**, 678–692 (2015). **This article provides evidence supporting the four-factor structure of psychopathy and prevalence estimates for the disorder using data collected on offender, psychiatric and community samples from several different countries.**
- Fanti, K. A., Lordos, A., Sullivan, E. A. & Kossou, D. S. in *Handbook of psychopathy* 2nd edn (ed. Patrick, C. J.) 529–569 (Guilford Press, 2018).
- Coid, J. et al. Psychopathy among prisoners in England and Wales. *Int. J. Law Psychiatry* **32**, 134–141 (2009).
- Coid, J. & Ullrich, S. Antisocial personality disorder is on a continuum with psychopathy. *Compr. Psychiatry* **51**, 426–433 (2010).
- Sohn, J. S. & Lee, S. J. Investigating two-, three-, and four-factor structures of the Korean PCL-R in serious offenders. *Int. J. Offender Ther. Comp. Criminol.* **60**, 725–738 (2016).
- Neumann, C. S. & Hare, R. D. Psychopathic traits in a large community sample: links to violence, alcohol use, and intelligence. *J. Consult. Clin. Psychol.* **76**, 893–899 (2008).
- Volkert, J., Gablonski, T.-C. & Rabung, S. Prevalence of personality disorders in the general adult population in Western countries: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br. J. Psychiatry* **213**, 709–715 (2018).
- Widiger, T. A. & Crego, C. in *Handbook of psychopathy* 2nd edn (ed. Patrick, C. J.) 281–298 (Guilford Press, 2018).
- Lopez-Villatoro, J., Palomares, N., Diaz-Marsá, M. & Carrasco, J. Borderline personality disorder with psychopathic traits: a critical review. *Clin. Med. Rev. Case Rep.* **5**, 1–8 (2018).
- Hicks, B. M. & Drislane, L. E. in *Handbook of psychopathy* 2nd edn (ed. Patrick, C. J.) 297–334 (Guilford Press, 2018).
- Moore, A. A., Blair, R. J., Hetttema, J. M. & Roberson-Nay, R. The genetic underpinnings of callous-unemotional traits: a systematic research review. *Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev.* **100**, 85–97 (2019).
- Viding, E., McCrory, E. & Seara-Cardoso, A. Psychopathy. *Curr. Biol.* **24**, R871–R874 (2014).
- Ruisch, I. H. et al. Aggression based genome-wide, glutamatergic, dopaminergic and neuroendocrine polygenic risk scores predict callous-unemotional traits. *Neuropsychopharmacology* **45**, 761–769 (2020).
- Viding, E. et al. In search of genes associated with risk for psychopathic tendencies in children: a two-stage genome-wide association study of pooled DNA. *J. Child. Psychol. Psychiatry* **51**, 780–788 (2010).
- Dadds, M. R., Moul, C., Cauchi, A., Hawes, D. J. & Brennan, J. Replication of a ROBO2 polymorphism associated with conduct problems but not psychopathic tendencies in children. *Psychiatr. Genet.* **23**, 251–254 (2013).
- Viding, E. et al. Genetics of callous-unemotional behavior in children. *PLoS One* **8**, e65789 (2013).
- Plomin, R. & von Stumm, S. The new genetics of intelligence. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* **19**, 148–159 (2018).
- Gao, Y., Huang, Y. & Li, X. Interaction between prenatal maternal stress and autonomic arousal in predicting conduct problems and psychopathic traits in children. *J. Psychopathol. Behav. Assess.* **39**, 1–14 (2017).

40. Wright, N., Pickles, A., Braithwaite, E. C., Sharp, H. & Hill, J. Sex-dependent associations between maternal prenatal cortisol and child callous-unemotional traits: findings from the Wirral Child Health and Development Study. *Psychoneuroendocrinology* **109**, 104409 (2019).
41. Barker, E. D., Oliver, B. R., Viding, E., Salekin, R. T. & Maughan, B. The impact of prenatal maternal risk, fearless temperament and early parenting on adolescent callous-unemotional traits: a 14-year longitudinal investigation. *J. Child. Psychol. Psychiatry* **52**, 878–888 (2011).
42. Viding, E. & Kimonis, E. R. in *Handbook of Psychopathy* Ch. 7 (ed. Patrick, C.J.) 144–164 (Guilford Press, 2018).
43. Waller, R., Gardner, F. & Hyde, L. W. What are the associations between parenting, callous-unemotional traits, and antisocial behavior in youth? A systematic review of evidence. *Clin. Psychol. Rev.* **33**, 593–608 (2013).
44. Pasalich, D. S., Dadds, M. R., Hawes, D. J. & Brennan, J. Attachment and callous-unemotional traits in children with early-onset conduct problems. *J. Child. Psychol. Psychiatry* **53**, 838–845 (2012).
45. Roberts, R., McCrory, E., Joffe, H., De Lima, N. & Viding, E. Living with conduct problem youth: family functioning and parental perceptions of their child. *Eur. Child. Adolesc. Psychiatry* **27**, 595–604 (2018).
46. Clark, J. E. & Frick, P. J. Positive parenting and callous-unemotional traits: their association with school behavior problems in young children. *J. Clin. Child. Adolesc. Psychol.* **47**, S242–S254 (2018).
47. Knopik, V. S., Neiderhiser, J. M., DeFries, J. C. & Plomin, R. *Behavioral Genetics* 7th edn (Macmillan Learning, 2017).
48. TenEyck, M. & Barnes, J. C. Examining the impact of peer group selection on self-reported delinquency: a consideration of active gene–environment correlation. *Crim. Justice Behav.* **42**, 741–762 (2015).
49. Viding, E., Fontaine, N. M. G., Oliver, B. R. & Plomin, R. Negative parental discipline, conduct problems and callous–unemotional traits: monozygotic twin differences study. *Br. J. Psychiatry* **195**, 414–419 (2009).
50. Hyde, L. W. et al. Heritable and nonheritable pathways to early callous-unemotional behaviors. *Am. J. Psychiatry* **173**, 903–910 (2016).
- This study provides strong evidence for genetic risk for callous–unemotional behaviours, but also shows that this risk can be moderated by positive reinforcement by parents.**
51. Henry, J. et al. Early warm-rewarding parenting moderates the genetic contributions to callous-unemotional traits in childhood. *J. Child. Psychol. Psychiatry* **59**, 1282–1288 (2018).
52. Hare, R. D. *Psychopathy: Theory and Research*. (Wiley, 1970).
53. Blair, R. J. R. Traits of empathy and anger: implications for psychopathy and other disorders associated with aggression. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci* **373**, 20170155 (2018).
54. Cornell, D. G. et al. Psychopathy in instrumental and reactive violent offenders. *J. Consult. Clin. Psychol.* **64**, 783–790 (1996).
55. Blair, R. J. R. A cognitive developmental approach to morality: investigating the psychopath. *Cognition* **57**, 1–29 (1995).
56. Bird, G. & Viding, E. The self to other model of empathy: providing a new framework for understanding empathy impairments in psychopathy, autism, and alexithymia. *Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev.* **47**, 520–532 (2014).
57. Hoppenbrouwers, S. S., Bulten, B. H. & Brazil, I. A. Parsing fear: a reassessment of the evidence for fear deficits in psychopathy. *Psychol. Bull.* **142**, 573–600 (2016).
58. Viding, E. & McCrory, E. Towards understanding atypical social affiliation in psychopathy. *Lancet Psychiatry* **6**, 437–444 (2019).
59. Viding, E. et al. Amygdala response to preattentive masked fear in children with conduct problems: the role of callous-unemotional traits. *Am. J. Psychiatry* **169**, 1109–1116 (2012).
60. Rothmund, Y. et al. Fear conditioning in psychopaths: event-related potentials and peripheral measures. *Biol. Psychol.* **90**, 50–59 (2012).
61. Marsh, A. A. & Blair, R. J. Deficits in facial affect recognition among antisocial populations: a meta-analysis. *Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev.* **32**, 454–465 (2008).
62. Dawel, A., O’Kearney, R., McKone, E. & Palermo, R. Not just fear and sadness: meta-analytic evidence of pervasive emotion recognition deficits for facial and vocal expressions in psychopathy. *Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev.* **36**, 2288–2304 (2012).
63. Marsh, A. A. et al. Reduced amygdala response to fearful expressions in children and adolescents with callous-unemotional traits and disruptive behavior disorders. *Am. J. Psychiatry* **165**, 712–720 (2008).
64. Decety, J., Chen, C., Harenski, C. & Kiehl, K. A. An fMRI study of affective perspective taking in individuals with psychopathy: imagining another in pain does not evoke empathy. *Front. Hum. Neurosci.* **7**, 489 (2013).
65. Birbaumer, N. et al. Deficient fear conditioning in psychopathy: a functional magnetic resonance imaging study. *Arch. Gen. Psychiatry* **62**, 799–805 (2005).
66. Poeppel, T. B. et al. A view behind the mask of sanity: meta-analysis of aberrant brain activity in psychopaths. *Mol Psychiatry* **24**, 463–470 (2019).
67. Lozier, L. M., Cardinale, E. M., VanMeter, J. W. & Marsh, A. A. Mediation of the relationship between callous-unemotional traits and proactive aggression by amygdala response to fear among children with conduct problems. *JAMA Psychiatry* **71**, 627–636 (2014).
- This fMRI study both demonstrates the neural basis of the emotional deficit related to the callous–unemotional features of psychopathic traits in young people and that the extent of atypical response mediates the association between the callous–unemotional features and instrumental aggression.**
68. Newman, J. P., Patterson, C. M. & Kosson, D. S. Response perseveration in psychopaths. *J. Abnorm. Psychol.* **96**, 145–148 (1987).
69. Budhani, S., Richell, R. A. & Blair, R. J. Impaired reversal but intact acquisition: probabilistic response reversal deficits in adult individuals with psychopathy. *J. Abnorm. Psychol.* **115**, 552–558 (2006).
70. De Brito, S. A., Viding, E., Kumari, V., Blackwood, N. & Hodgins, S. Cool and hot executive function impairments in violent offenders with antisocial personality disorder with and without psychopathy. *PLoS One* **8**, e65566 (2013).
71. Blair, R. J. R., Veroude, K. & Buitelaar, J. K. Neuro-cognitive system dysfunction and symptom sets: a review of fMRI studies in youth with conduct problems. *Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev.* **91**, 69–90 (2018).
72. White, S. F. et al. Disrupted expected value and prediction error signaling in youths with disruptive behavior disorders during a passive avoidance task. *Am. J. Psychiatry* **170**, 315–323 (2013).
73. Cohn, M. D. et al. Incentive processing in persistent disruptive behavior and psychopathic traits: a functional magnetic resonance imaging study in adolescents. *Biol. Psychiatry* **78**, 615–624 (2015).
74. Vincent, G. M., Cope, L. M., King, J., Nyalakanti, P. & Kiehl, K. A. Callous-unemotional traits modulate brain drug craving response in high-risk young offenders. *J. Abnorm. Child. Psychol.* **46**, 993–1009 (2018).
75. Denomme, W. J., Simard, I. & Shane, M. S. Neuroimaging metrics of drug and food processing in cocaine-dependence, as a function of psychopathic traits and substance use severity. *Front. Hum. Neurosci.* **12**, 350 (2018).
76. Pujara, M., Motzkin, J. C., Newman, J. P., Kiehl, K. A. & Koenigs, M. Neural correlates of reward and loss sensitivity in psychopathy. *Soc. Cogn. Affect. Neurosci.* **9**, 794–801 (2013).
77. Gregory, S. et al. Punishment and psychopathy: a case-control functional MRI investigation of reinforcement learning in violent antisocial personality disordered men. *Lancet Psychiatry* **2**, 153–160 (2015).
- This fMRI study shows that offenders with ASPD and psychopathy exhibit atypical brain response to punished errors compared with offenders with ASPD without psychopathy and healthy non-offenders, thereby providing important evidence that this group might be characterized by distinct neural abnormalities that have implications for psychiatric classification schemes and offender rehabilitation efforts.**
78. Finger, E. C. et al. Disrupted reinforcement signaling in the orbital frontal cortex and caudate in youths with conduct disorder or oppositional defiant disorder and a high level of psychopathic traits. *Am. J. Psychiatry* **168**, 834–841 (2011).
79. Hosking, J. G. et al. Disrupted prefrontal regulation of striatal subjective value signals in psychopathy. *Neuron* **95**, 221–231.e224 (2017).
80. Blair, R. J. R. Emotion-based learning systems and the development of morality. *Cognition* **167**, 38–45 (2017).
81. Boccia, M. et al. Neural foundation of human moral reasoning: an ALE meta-analysis about the role of personal perspective. *Brain Imaging Behav.* **11**, 278–292 (2017).
82. Fede, S. J. et al. Distinct neuronal patterns of positive and negative moral processing in psychopathy. *Cogn. Affect. Behav. Neurosci.* **16**, 1074–1085 (2016).
83. Harenski, C. L., Harenski, K. A. & Kiehl, K. A. Neural processing of moral violations among incarcerated adolescents with psychopathic traits. *Dev. Cogn. Neurosci.* **10**, 181–189 (2014).
84. Gorenstein, E. E. & Newman, J. P. Disinhibitory psychopathology: a new perspective and a model for research. *Psychol. Rev.* **37**, 301–315 (1980).
85. Hiatt, K. D. & Newman, J. P. in *Handbook of Psychopathy* (ed. Patrick, C. J.) 334–352 (Guilford Press, 2006).
86. Newman, J. P. & Baskin-Sommers, A. R. in *Cognitive Neuroscience of Attention* (ed. Posner, M. I.) 421–440 (Guilford Press, 2012).
87. Anderson, N. E. et al. Differentiating emotional processing and attention in psychopathy with functional neuroimaging. *Cogn. Affect. Behav. Neurosci.* **17**, 491–515 (2017).
88. Shane, M. S. & Groat, L. L. Capacity for upregulation of emotional processing in psychopathy: all you have to do is ask. *Soc. Cogn. Affect. Neurosci.* **13**, 1163–1176 (2018).
89. Meffert, H., Gazzola, V., den Boer, J. A., Bartels, A. A. & Keysers, C. Reduced spontaneous but relatively normal deliberate vicarious representations in psychopathy. *Brain* **136**, 2550–2562 (2013).
90. Dadds, M. R., El Masry, Y., Wimalaweera, S. & Guastella, A. J. Reduced eye gaze explains “fear blindness” in childhood psychopathic traits. *J. Am. Acad. Child. Adolesc. Psychiatry* **47**, 455–463 (2008).
91. Hoppenbrouwers, S. S., Van der Stigchel, S., Slotboom, J., Dalmaijer, E. S. & Theeuwes, J. Disentangling attentional deficits in psychopathy using visual search: failures in the use of contextual information. *Pers. Individ. Diff.* **86**, 132–138 (2015).
92. Tillem, S., Weinstein, H. & Baskin-Sommers, A. Psychopathy is associated with an exaggerated attention bottleneck: EEG and behavioral evidence from a dual-task paradigm. *Cogn. Affect. Behav. Neurosci.* <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13415-021-00891-z> (2021).
93. Newman, J. P., Curtin, J. J., Bertsch, J. D. & Baskin-Sommers, A. R. Attention moderates the fearlessness of psychopathic offenders. *Biol. Psychiatry* **67**, 66–70 (2010).
94. Larson, C. L. et al. The interplay of attention and emotion: top-down attention modulates amygdala activation in psychopathy. *Cogn. Affect. Behav. Neurosci.* **13**, 757–770 (2013).
95. Dadds, M. R. et al. Attention to the eyes and fear-recognition deficits in child psychopathy. *Br. J. Psychiatry* **189**, 280–281 (2006).
96. Tillem, S. et al. Psychopathy is associated with shifts in the organization of neural networks in a large incarcerated male sample. *NeuroImage Clin.* **24**, 102083 (2019).
97. Johanson, M., Vaurio, O., Tiihonen, J. & Lahteenpää, M. A systematic literature review of neuroimaging of psychopathic traits. *Front. Psychiatry* **10**, 1027 (2019).
98. Pujol, J., Harrison, B. J., Contreras-Rodriguez, O. & Cardoner, N. The contribution of brain imaging to the understanding of psychopathy. *Psychol. Med.* **49**, 20–31 (2019).
99. Toivonen, P. et al. Cavum septum pellucidum and psychopathy. *Br. J. Psychiatry* **203**, 152–153 (2013).
100. White, S. F. et al. The relationship between large cavum septum pellucidum and antisocial behavior, callous-unemotional traits and psychopathy in adolescents. *J. Child. Psychol. Psychiatry* **54**, 575–581 (2013).
101. Eckert, M. A. et al. Anatomical signatures of dyslexia in children: unique information from manual and voxel based morphometry brain measures. *Cortex* **41**, 304–315 (2005).
102. Scarpazza, C. & De Simone, M. S. Voxel-based morphometry: current perspectives. *Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev.* **19**, 19–35 (2016).
103. Guay, J.-P., Ruscio, J., Knight, R. A. & Hare, R. D. A taxometric analysis of the latent structure of psychopathy: evidence for dimensionality. *J. Abnorm. Psychol.* **116**, 701–716 (2007).

104. Rogers, J. C. & De Brito, S. A. Cortical and subcortical gray matter volume in youths with conduct problems: a meta-analysis. *JAMA Psychiatry* **73**, 64–72 (2016).
105. Gao, Y. et al. Gray matter changes in the orbitofrontal-paralimbic cortex in male youths with non-comorbid conduct disorder. *Front. Psychol.* **11**, 843 (2020).
106. Cardinale, E. M. et al. Callous and uncaring traits are associated with reductions in amygdala volume among youths with varying levels of conduct problems. *Psychol. Med.* **49**, 1449–1458 (2019).
107. Waller, R. et al. Disruptive behavior problems, callous-unemotional traits, and regional gray matter volume in the adolescent brain and cognitive development study. *Biol. Psychiatry Cogn. Neurosci. Neuroimaging* **5**, 481–489 (2020).
108. Panizzon, M. S. et al. Distinct genetic influences on cortical surface area and cortical thickness. *Cereb. cortex* **19**, 2728–2735 (2009).
109. Raznahan, A. et al. How does your cortex grow? *J. Neurosci.* **31**, 7174–7177 (2011).
110. Yang, Y., Raine, A., Colletti, P., Toga, A. W. & Narr, K. L. Abnormal temporal and prefrontal cortical gray matter thinning in psychopaths. *Mol. Psychiatry* **14**, 561–562 (2009).
111. Yang, Y., Raine, A., Colletti, P., Toga, A. W. & Narr, K. L. Abnormal structural correlates of response perseveration in individuals with psychopathy. *J. Neuropsychiatry Clin. Neurosci.* **23**, 107–110 (2011).
112. Miskovich, T. A. et al. Abnormal cortical gyrification in criminal psychopathy. *NeuroImage Clin.* **19**, 876–882 (2018).
113. Fairchild, G. et al. Conduct disorder. *Nat. Rev. Dis. Prim.* **5**, 43 (2019).
114. Fairchild, G. et al. Cortical thickness, surface area, and folding alterations in male youths with conduct disorder and varying levels of callous-unemotional traits. *NeuroImage Clin.* **8**, 253–260 (2015).
115. Wallace, G. L. et al. Cortical and subcortical abnormalities in youths with conduct disorder and elevated callous-unemotional traits. *J. Am. Acad. Child. Adolesc. Psychiatry* **53**, 456–465.e451 (2014).
116. Jiang, Y. et al. Abnormalities of cortical structures in adolescent-onset conduct disorder. *Psychol. Med.* **45**, 3467–3479 (2015).
117. Lindner, P. et al. White matter correlates of psychopathic traits in a female community sample. *Soc. Cogn. Affect. Neurosci.* **12**, 1500–1510 (2017).
118. Pozzo, I. et al. Altered white-matter microstructure in conduct disorder is specifically associated with elevated callous-unemotional traits. *J. Abnorm. Child. Psychol.* **46**, 1451–1466 (2018).
119. Sethi, A. et al. Anatomy of the dorsal default-mode network in conduct disorder: association with callous-unemotional traits. *Dev. Cogn. Neurosci.* **30**, 87–92 (2018).
120. Rogers, J. C. et al. White matter microstructure in youths with conduct disorder: effects of sex and variation in callous traits. *J. Am. Acad. Child. Adolesc. Psychiatry* **58**, 1184–1196 (2019).
121. Insel, T. et al. Research domain criteria (RDoC): toward a new classification framework for research on mental disorders. *Am. J. Psychiatry* **167**, 748–751 (2010).
122. Hare, R. D. *Psychopathy Checklist-Revised* (Multi-Health Systems, 1991).
123. Olver, M. E. et al. Reliability and validity of the Psychopathy Checklist-Revised in the assessment of risk for institutional violence: a cautionary note on DeMatteo et al. (2020). *Psychol. Public. Policy Law* **26**, 490–510 (2020).
124. DeMatteo, D. et al. Statement of concerned experts on the use of the Hare Psychopathy Checklist-Revised in capital sentencing to assess risk for institutional violence. *Psychol. Public. Policy Law* **26**, 133–144 (2020).
125. Neal, T. M. S. & Grisso, T. Assessment practices and expert judgment methods in forensic psychology and psychiatry: an international snapshot. *Crim. Justice Behav.* **41**, 1406–1421 (2014).
126. DeMatteo, D. et al. Investigating the role of the Psychopathy Checklist-Revised in United States case law. *Psychol. Public. Policy Law* **20**, 96–107 (2014).
127. Blais, J. & Forth, A. E. Prosecution-retained versus court-appointed experts: comparing and contrasting risk assessment reports in preventative detention hearings. *Law Hum. Behav.* **38**, 531–543 (2014).
128. Guay, J.-P., Knight, R. A., Ruscio, J. & Hare, R. D. A taxometric investigation of psychopathy in women. *Psychiatry Res.* **261**, 565–573 (2018).
129. Sewall, L. A. & Olver, M. E. Psychopathy and treatment outcome: results from a sexual violence reduction program. *Personal. Disord.* **10**, 59–69 (2019).
130. Tengström, A., Grann, M., Långström, N. & Kullgren, G. Psychopathy (PCL-R) as a predictor of violent recidivism among criminal offenders with schizophrenia. *Law Hum. Behav.* **24**, 45–58 (2000).
131. Cooke, D. J., Michie, C., Hart, S. D. & Clark, D. Searching for the pan-cultural core of psychopathic personality disorder. *Pers. Individ. Dif.* **39**, 283–295 (2005).
132. Patrick, C. J. *Operationalizing the Triarchic Conceptualization of Psychopathy: Preliminary Description of Brief Scales for Assessment of Boldness, Meanness, and Disinhibition* Unpublished Manual, Florida State University (2018).
133. Patrick, C. J., Fowles, D. C. & Krueger, R. F. Triarchic conceptualization of psychopathy: developmental origins of disinhibition, boldness, and meanness. *Dev. Psychopathol.* **21**, 913–938 (2009).
134. Sellbom, M., Lilienfeld, S. O., Fowler, K. A. & McCrary, K. L. in *Handbook of psychopathy* (ed. Patrick, C. J.) 211–258 (Guilford Press, 2018).
135. World Health Organization. ICD-11 for mortality and morbidity statistics. <https://icd.who.int/browse11/l-m/en> (2021).
136. Boccacini, M. T., Murrie, D. C., Clark, J. W. & Cornell, D. G. Describing, diagnosing, and naming psychopathy: how do youth psychopathy labels influence jurors? *Behav. Sci. Law* **26**, 487–510 (2008).
137. Frick, P. J., Ray, J. V., Thornton, L. C. & Kahn, R. E. Annual research review: a developmental psychopathology approach to understanding callous-unemotional traits in children and adolescents with serious conduct problems. *J. Child. Psychol. Psychiatry* **55**, 532–548 (2014).
138. Lynam, D. R., Caspi, A., Moffitt, T. E., Loeber, R. & Stouthamer-Loeber, M. Longitudinal evidence that psychopathy scores in early adolescence predict adult psychopathy. *J. Abnorm. Psychol.* **116**, 155–165 (2007).
139. van Aar, J., Leijten, P., Orobio de Castro, B. & Overbeek, G. Sustained, fade-out or sleeper effects? A systematic review and meta-analysis of parenting interventions for disruptive child behavior. *Clin. Psychol. Rev.* **51**, 153–163 (2017).
140. Chorrita, B. F. et al. Evidence-based treatments for children and adolescents: An updated review of indicators of efficacy and effectiveness. *Clin. Psychol.* **18**, 154–172 (2011).
141. Comer, J. S., Chow, C., Chan, P. T., Cooper-Vince, C. & Wilson, L. A. S. Psychosocial treatment efficacy for disruptive behavior problems in very young children: a meta-analytic examination. *J. Am. Acad. Child. Adolesc. Psychiatry* **52**, 26–36 (2013).
142. Hawes, D. J., Price, M. J. & Dadds, M. R. Callous-unemotional traits and the treatment of conduct problems in childhood and adolescence: a comprehensive review. *Clin. Child. Fam. Psychol. Rev.* **17**, 248–267 (2014).
143. Bjørnebekk, G. & Kjøbli, J. Observed callousness as a predictor of treatment outcomes in parent management training. *Clin. Child. Psychol. Psychiatry* **22**, 59–73 (2016).
144. Wilkinson, S., Waller, R. & Viding, E. Practitioner review: involving young people with callous unemotional traits in treatment – does it work? A systematic review. *J. Child. Psychol. Psychiatry* **57**, 552–565 (2015). **This systematic review provides the greatest coverage of the evidence pertaining to the treatment of CYP at risk of psychopathy.**
145. Polaschek, D. L. & Skeem, J. L. in *Handbook of psychopathy* Ch. 29 (ed. Patrick, C. J.) 710–731 (Guilford Press, 2018).
146. Hawes, D. J. & Dadds, M. R. The treatment of conduct problems in children with callous-unemotional traits. *J. Consult. Clin. Psychol.* **73**, 737–741 (2005).
147. Caldwell, M., Skeem, J., Salekin, R. & Van Rybroek, G. Treatment response of adolescent offenders with psychopathy features: a 2-year follow-up. *Crim. Justice Behav.* **33**, 571–596 (2006).
148. Caldwell, M. F., McCormick, D., Wolfe, J. & Umstead, D. Treatment-related changes in psychopathy features and behavior in adolescent offenders. *Crim. Justice Behav.* **39**, 144–155 (2012).
149. Muratori, P. et al. Six-year outcome for children with ODD or CD treated with the coping power program. *Psychiatry Res.* **271**, 454–458 (2019).
150. Hyde, L. W. et al. Dimensions of callousness in early childhood: links to problem behavior and family intervention effectiveness. *Dev. Psychopathol.* **25**, 347–363 (2013).
151. Kolko, D. J. & Pardini, D. A. ODD dimensions, ADHD, and callous-unemotional traits as predictors of treatment response in children with disruptive behavior disorders. *J. Abnorm. Psychol.* **119**, 713–725 (2010).
152. Dadds, M. R., Cauchi, A. J., Wimalaweera, S., Hawes, D. J. & Brennan, J. Outcomes, moderators, and mediators of empathic-emotion recognition training for complex conduct problems in childhood. *Psychiatry Res.* **199**, 201–207 (2012).
153. Kimonis, E. R. et al. Parent-child interaction therapy adapted for preschoolers with callous-unemotional traits: An open trial pilot study. *J. Clin. Child. Adolesc. Psychol.* **48**, S347–S361 (2019).
154. Leijten, P. et al. Are relationship enhancement and behavior management “the golden couple” for disruptive child behavior? Two meta-analyses. *Child. Dev.* **89**, 1970–1982 (2018).
155. Trentacosta, C. J. et al. Callous-unemotional behaviors and harsh parenting: reciprocal associations cross early childhood and moderation by inherited risk. *J. Abnorm. Child. Psychol.* **47**, 811–823 (2019).
156. Albert, D. et al. Can genetics predict response to complex behavioral interventions? Evidence from a genetic analysis of the fast track randomized control trial. *J. Policy Anal. Manag.* **34**, 497–518 (2015).
157. Waller, R. et al. Heritable temperament pathways to early callous-unemotional behaviour. *Br. J. Psychiatry* **209**, 475–482 (2016).
158. Fleming, G. E., Kimonis, E. R., Furr, J. M. & Comer, J. S. Internet-delivered parent training for preschoolers with conduct problems: do callous-unemotional traits moderate efficacy and engagement? *J. Abnorm. Child. Psychol.* **48**, 1169–1182 (2020).
159. Kimonis, E. R., Bagnier, D. M., Linares, D., Blake, C. A. & Rodriguez, G. Parent training outcomes among young children with callous-unemotional conduct problems with or at-risk for developmental delay. *J. Child. Fam. Stud.* **23**, 437–448 (2014).
160. Salekin, R. T. in *Handbook of Child and Adolescent Psychopathy* (eds Salekin, R. T. & Lynam, D. R.) 343–373 (Guilford Press, 2010).
161. Dodge, K. A. et al. Impact of early intervention on psychopathology, crime, and well-being at age 25. *Am. J. Psychiatry* **172**, 59–70 (2015).
162. Scott, S., Briskman, J. & O'Connor, T. G. Early prevention of antisocial personality: long-term follow-up of two randomized controlled trials comparing indicated and selective approaches. *Am. J. Psychiatry* **171**, 649–657 (2014).
163. Edens, J. F. & Campbell, J. S. Identifying youths at risk for institutional misconduct: a meta-analytic investigation of the psychopathy checklist measures. *Psychol. Serv.* **4**, 13–27 (2007).
164. DeSorcy, D. R., Olver, M. E. & Wormith, J. S. Working alliance and psychopathy: linkages to treatment outcome in a sample of treated sexual offenders. *J. Interpers. Violence* **35**, 1739–1760 (2020).
165. de Vries, M. G., Brazil, I. A., Verkes, R.-J. & Bulten, B. H. Staff's perception of patients' affiliation and control in a highly secure psychiatric setting. *Psychiatry Res.* **273**, 227–234 (2019).
166. de Boer, J. & Gerrits, J. Learning from Holland: the TBS system. *Psychiatry* **6**, 459–461 (2007).
167. Brazil, I. A., van Dongen, J. D. M., Maes, J. H. R., Mars, R. B. & Baskin-Sommers, A. R. Classification and treatment of antisocial individuals: from behavior to biocognition. *Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev.* **91**, 259–277 (2018).
168. Reidy, D. E., Kearns, M. C. & DeGue, S. Reducing psychopathic violence: a review of the treatment literature. *Aggr. Violent Behav.* **18**, 527–538 (2013).
169. Walker, C., Thomas, J. & Allen, T. S. Treating impulsivity, irritability, and aggression of antisocial personality disorder with quetiapine. *Int. J. Offender Ther. Comp. Criminol.* **47**, 556–567 (2003).
170. Sheard, M. H., Marini, J. L., Bridges, C. I. & Wagner, E. The effect of lithium on impulsive aggressive behavior in man. *Am. J. Psychiatry* **133**, 1409–1413 (1976).
171. Barratt, E. S., Stanford, M. S., Felthous, A. R. & Kent, T. A. The effects of phenytoin on impulsive and premeditated aggression. *J. Clin. Psychopharmacol.* **17**, 341–349 (1997).
172. Glenn, A. L. & Raine, A. Neurocriminology: implications for the punishment, prediction and prevention of criminal behaviour. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* **15**, 54–63 (2013).
173. Hitchcock, G. L. *The Efficacy of Cognitive Group Therapy with Incarcerated Psychopaths*, Doctoral Dissertation, California School of Professional Psychology (1994).

174. Hughes, G., Hogue, T., Hollin, C. & Champion, H. First-stage evaluation of a treatment programme for personality disordered offenders. *J. Forens. Psychiatry Psychol.* **8**, 515–527 (1997).
175. O'Brien, K. & Daffern, M. An exploration of responsivity among violent offenders: predicting access to treatment, treatment engagement and programme completion. *Psychiatr. Psychol. Law* **24**, 259–277 (2016).
176. Klein Haneveld, E., Neumann, C. S., Smid, W., Wever, E. & Kamphuis, J. H. Treatment responsiveness of replicated psychopathy profiles. *Law Hum. Behav.* **42**, 484–495 (2018).
This systematic review provides the greatest coverage of the evidence pertaining to the treatment of CYP at risk of psychopathy.
177. Ogloff, J. R. P., Wong, S. & Greenwood, A. Treating criminal psychopaths in a therapeutic community program. *Behav. Sci. Law* **8**, 181–190 (1990).
178. Olver, M. E. & Wong, S. C. P. Therapeutic responses of psychopathic sexual offenders: treatment attrition, therapeutic change, and long-term recidivism. *J. Consult. Clin. Psychol.* **77**, 328–336 (2009).
179. Salekin, R. T. Psychopathy and therapeutic pessimism. *Clin. Psychol. Rev.* **22**, 79–112 (2002).
180. The WHOQOL Group. Development of the World Health Organization WHOQOL-BREF quality of life assessment. *Psychol. Med.* **28**, 551–558 (1998).
181. Pham, T. & Saloppé, X. Influence of psychopathy on self-perceived quality of life in forensic patients: a cohort study in Belgium. *J. Forens. Psychiatry Psychol.* **24**, 31–47 (2013).
182. Fritz, M. V., Rajaleid, K., Hemström, Ö. & af Klinteberg, B. Quality of life towards an understanding of individuals with psychopathic tendencies. *Personal. Ment. Health* **3**, 183–192 (2009).
183. Horan, J. M., Brown, J. L., Jones, S. M. & Aber, J. L. The influence of conduct problems and callous-unemotional traits on academic development among youth. *J. Youth Adolesc.* **45**, 1245–1260 (2015).
184. Milledge, S. V. et al. Peer relationships and prosocial behaviour differences across disruptive behaviours. *Eur. Child. Adolesc. Psychiatry* **28**, 781–793 (2018).
185. Byrd, A. L., Loeber, R. & Pardini, D. A. Understanding desisting and persisting forms of delinquency: the unique contributions of disruptive behavior disorders and interpersonal callousness. *J. Child. Psychol. Psychiatry* **53**, 371–380 (2012).
186. Fanti, K. A., Kokkinos, C. M., Voulgaridou, I. & Hadjicharalambous, M. Z. Investigating the association between callous-unemotional traits with relational bullying and victimization: a cross-national study. *Soc. Dev.* **28**, 854–872 (2019).
187. Viding, E., Simmonds, E., Petrides, K. V. & Frederickson, N. The contribution of callous-unemotional traits and conduct problems to bullying in early adolescence. *J. Child. Psychol. Psychiatry* **50**, 471–481 (2009).
188. Fite, P. J., Raine, A., Stouthamer-Loeber, M., Loeber, R. & Pardini, D. A. Reactive and proactive aggression in adolescent males: examining differential outcomes 10 years later in early adulthood. *Crim. Justice Behav.* **37**, 141–157 (2009).
189. Campbell, M. A., Porter, S. & Santor, D. Psychopathic traits in adolescent offenders: an evaluation of criminal history, clinical, and psychosocial correlates. *Behav. Sci. Law* **22**, 23–47 (2004).
190. Dolan, M. C. & Rennie, C. E. Reliability and validity of the psychopathy checklist: youth version in a UK sample of conduct disordered boys. *Pers. Individ. Dif.* **40**, 65–75 (2006).
191. Falkenbach, D. M., Poythress, N. G. & Heide, K. M. Psychopathic features in a juvenile diversion population: reliability and predictive validity of two self-report measures. *Behav. Sci. Law* **21**, 787–805 (2003).
192. Hillege, S., Das, J. & de Ruiter, C. The youth psychopathic traits inventory: psychometric properties and its relation to substance use and interpersonal style in a Dutch sample of non-referred adolescents. *J. Adolesc.* **33**, 83–91 (2010).
193. Anderson, S. L., Zheng, Y. & McMahon, R. J. Predicting risky sexual behavior: the unique and interactive roles of childhood conduct disorder symptoms and callous-unemotional traits. *J. Abnorm. Child. Psychol.* **45**, 1147–1156 (2016).
194. Chabrol, H. & Saint-Martin, C. Psychopathic traits and suicidal ideation in high-school students. *Arch. Suicide Res.* **13**, 64–73 (2009).
195. Javdani, S., Sadeh, N. & Verona, E. Suicidality as a function of impulsivity, callous-unemotional traits, and depressive symptoms in youth. *J. Abnorm. Psychol.* **120**, 400–413 (2011).
196. Barker, E. D. & Salekin, R. T. Irritable oppositional defiance and callous unemotional traits: is the association partially explained by peer victimization? *J. Child. Psychol. Psychiatry* **53**, 1167–1175 (2012).
197. Tatar, J. R., Cauffman, E., Kimonis, E. R. & Skeem, J. L. Victimization history and posttraumatic stress: an analysis of psychopathy variants in male juvenile offenders. *J. Child. Adolesc. Trauma* **5**, 102–113 (2012).
198. Schraft, C. V., Kosson, D. S. & McBride, C. K. Exposure to violence within home and community environments and psychopathic tendencies in detained adolescents. *Crim. Justice Behav.* **40**, 1027–1043 (2013).
199. Muñoz, L. C., Pakalnskiene, V. & Frick, P. J. Parental monitoring and youth behavior problems: moderation by callous-unemotional traits over time. *Eur. Child. Adolesc. Psychiatry* **20**, 261–269 (2011).
200. Carson, D. C. & Ray, J. V. Do psychopathic traits distinguish trajectories of gang membership? *Crim. Justice Behav.* **46**, 1337–1355 (2019).
201. Robertson, E. L. et al. Callous-unemotional traits and risk of gun carrying and use during crime. *Am J Psychiatry* **177**, 827–833 (2020).
202. Frick, P. J., Kimonis, E. R., Dandreaux, D. M. & Farrell, J. M. The 4 year stability of psychopathic traits in non-referred youth. *Behav. Sci. Law* **21**, 713–736 (2003).
203. Hawes, S. W. et al. The developmental course of psychopathic features: investigating stability, change, and long-term outcomes. *J. Res. Pers.* **77**, 83–89 (2018).
204. Hemphälä, M., Kosson, D., Westerman, J. & Hodgins, S. Stability and predictors of psychopathic traits from mid-adolescence through early adulthood. *Scand. J. Psychol.* **56**, 649–658 (2015).
205. Porter, S., Birt, A. R. & Boer, D. P. Investigation of the criminal and conditional release profiles of Canadian federal offenders as a function of psychopathy and age. *Law Hum. Behav.* **25**, 647–661 (2001).
206. Blais, J., Solodukhin, E. & Forth, A. E. A meta-analysis exploring the relationship between psychopathy and instrumental versus reactive violence. *Crim. Justice Behav.* **41**, 797–821 (2014).
207. Robertson, C. A. & Knight, R. A. Relating sexual sadism and psychopathy to one another, non-sexual violence, and sexual crime behaviors. *Aggressive Behav.* **40**, 12–23 (2014).
208. Kennealy, P. J., Hicks, B. M. & Patrick, C. J. Validity of factors of the Psychopathy Checklist-Revised in female prisoners: discriminant relations with antisocial behavior, substance abuse, and personality. *Assessment* **14**, 323–340 (2007).
209. Vachon, D. D., Lynam, D. R., Loeber, R. & Stouthamer-Loeber, M. Generalizing the nomological network of psychopathy across populations differing on race and conviction status. *J. Abnorm. Psychol.* **121**, 263–269 (2012).
210. Leeper Piquero, N., Piquero, A. R., Narvey, C., Boutwell, B. & Farrington, D. P. Are there psychopaths in white-collar jobs? *Deviant Behav.* <https://doi.org/10.1080/01639625.2019.1708537> (2019).
211. Mager, K. L., Breslin, K. & Verona, E. Gender, psychopathy factors, and intimate partner violence. *Personal. Disord.* **5**, 257–267 (2014).
212. Weiss, B., Lavner, J. A. & Miller, J. D. Self- and partner-reported psychopathic traits' relations with couples' communication, marital satisfaction trajectories, and divorce in a longitudinal sample. *Personal. Disord.* **9**, 239–249 (2018).
213. Lemelin, C., Lussier, Y., Sabourin, S., Brassard, A. & Naud, C. Risky sexual behaviours: the role of substance use, psychopathic traits, and attachment insecurity among adolescents and young adults in Quebec. *Can. J. Hum. Sex.* **23**, 189–199 (2014).
214. Glenn, A. L. Early life predictors of callous-unemotional and psychopathic traits. *Infant. Ment. Health J.* **40**, 39–53 (2019).
215. Beaver, K. M. et al. The association between psychopathic personality traits and health-related outcomes. *J. Crim. Justice* **42**, 399–407 (2014).
216. Miller, J. D., Watts, A. & Jones, S. E. Does psychopathy manifest divergent relations with components of its nomological network depending on gender? *Pers. Individ. Dif.* **50**, 564–569 (2011).
217. Verona, E., Sprague, J. & Javdani, S. Gender and factor-level interactions in psychopathy: implications for self-directed violence risk and borderline personality disorder symptoms. *Personal. Disord.* **3**, 247–262 (2012).
218. Neumann, C. S., Schmitt, D. S., Carter, R., Embely, I. & Hare, R. D. Psychopathic traits in females and males across the globe. *Behav. Sci. Law* **30**, 557–574 (2012).
219. Vaurio, O., Repo-Tiihonen, E., Kautiainen, H. & Tiihonen, J. Psychopathy and mortality. *J. Forensic Sci.* **63**, 474–477 (2017).
This prospective longitudinal study of a large sample of offenders with psychopathy followed up for over 20–30 years shows that these individuals die younger than the general population, and that their causes of death are more violent than those of other offenders without psychopathy.
220. DeLisi, M., Reidy, D. E., Heirigs, M. H., Tostlebe, J. J. & Vaughn, M. G. Psychopathic costs: a monetization study of the fiscal toll of psychopathy features among institutionalized delinquents. *J. Crim. Psychol.* **8**, 112–124 (2018).
221. Reidy, D. E. et al. Why psychopathy matters: implications for public health and violence prevention. *Aggr. Violent Behav.* **24**, 214–225 (2015).
222. Henrich, J., Heine, S. J. & Norenzayan, A. The weirdest people in the world? *Behav. Brain Sci.* **33**, 61–83 (2010).
223. Fontaine, N. M., Rijdsdijk, F. V., McCrory, E. J. & Viding, E. Etiology of different developmental trajectories of callous-unemotional traits. *J. Am. Acad. Child. Adolesc. Psychiatry* **49**, 656–664 (2010).
224. Takahashi, Y., Pease, C. R., Pingault, J.-B. & Viding, E. Genetic and environmental influences on the developmental trajectory of callous-unemotional traits from childhood to adolescence. *J. Child Psychol. Psychiatry* **62**, 414–423 (2021).
225. Tiihonen, J. et al. Neurobiological roots of psychopathy. *Mol. Psychiatry* **25**, 3432–3441 (2020).
226. Botvink-Nezer, R. et al. Variability in the analysis of a single neuroimaging dataset by many teams. *Nature* **582**, 84–88 (2020).
227. Collins, P. Y. et al. Grand challenges in global mental health. *Nature* **475**, 27–30 (2011).
228. Nestler, E. J. & Hyman, S. E. Animal models of neuropsychiatric disorders. *Nat. Neurosci.* **13**, 1161–1169 (2010).
229. Litzman, R. D., Schapiro, S. J. & Hopkins, W. D. Triarchic psychopathy dimensions in chimpanzees (Pan troglodytes): investigating associations with genetic variation in the vasopressin receptor 1A gene. *Front. Neurosci.* **11**, 407 (2017).
230. Koenigs, M., Baskin-Sommers, A., Zeier, J. & Newman, J. P. Investigating the neural correlates of psychopathy: a critical review. *Mol. Psychiatry* **16**, 792–799 (2011).
231. Korponay, C. et al. Impulsive-antisocial dimension of psychopathy linked to enlargement and abnormal functional connectivity of the striatum. *Biol. Psychiatry Cogn. Neurosci. Neuroimaging* **2**, 149–157 (2017).
232. Ermer, E., Cope, L. M., Nyalakanti, P. K., Calhoun, V. D. & Kiehl, K. A. Aberrant paralimbic gray matter in criminal psychopathy. *J. Abnorm. Psychol.* **121**, 649–658 (2012).
233. Thompson, P. M. et al. ENIGMA and global neuroscience: a decade of large-scale studies of the brain in health and disease across more than 40 countries. *Transl. Psychiatry* **10**, 100 (2020).
234. Bzdok, D. & Meyer-Lindenberg, A. Machine learning for precision psychiatry: opportunities and challenges. *Biol. Psychiatry Cogn. Neurosci. Neuroimaging* **3**, 223–230 (2018).
235. Baskin-Sommers, A. R., Curtin, J. J. & Newman, J. P. Altering the cognitive-affective dysfunctions of psychopathic and externalizing offender subtypes with cognitive remediation. *Clin. Psychol. Sci.* **3**, 45–57 (2015).
236. Blanchard, E. B. & Young, L. D. Clinical applications of biofeedback training: a review of evidence. *Arch. Gen. Psychiatry* **30**, 573–589 (1974).
237. Arns, M., de Ridder, S., Strehl, U., Breteler, M. & Coenen, A. Efficacy of neurofeedback treatment in ADHD: the effects on inattention, impulsivity and hyperactivity: a meta-analysis. *Clin. EEG Neurosci.* **40**, 180–189 (2009).
238. Mayer, K., Wyckoff, S. N., Schulz, U. & Strehl, U. Neurofeedback for adult attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder: investigation of slow cortical potential neurofeedback—preliminary results. *J. Neurother.* **16**, 37–45 (2012).
239. Konicars, L. et al. Brain self-regulation in criminal psychopaths. *Sci. Rep.* **5**, 9426–9426 (2015).
240. Viding, E. We need to talk about development and victims. *J. Pers. Disord.* **33**, 640–644 (2019).

241. Ritchie, M. B., Blais, J. & Forth, A. E. "Evil" intentions: examining the relationship between the dark tetrad and victim selection based on nonverbal gait cues. *Pers. Individ. Dif.* **138**, 126–132 (2019).
242. Schoeler, T. et al. Multi-polygenic score approach to identifying individual vulnerabilities associated with the risk of exposure to bullying. *JAMA Psychiatry* **76**, 730–738 (2019).
243. Mathieu, C. & Babiak, P. Validating the B-Scan Self: a self-report measure of psychopathy in the workplace. *Int. J. Selection Assess.* **24**, 272–284 (2016).
244. Kreis, M. K., Cooke, D. J., Michie, C., Hoff, H. A. & Logan, C. The Comprehensive Assessment of Psychopathic Personality (CAPP): content validation using prototypical analysis. *J. Pers. Disord.* **26**, 402–413 (2012).
245. Lynam, D. R. et al. Assessing the basic traits associated with psychopathy: development and validation of the Elemental Psychopathy Assessment. *Psychol. Assess.* **23**, 108–124 (2011).
246. Levenson, M. R., Kiehl, K. A. & Fitzpatrick, C. M. Assessing psychopathic attributes in a noninstitutionalized population. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* **68**, 151–158 (1995).
247. Hart, S. D., Cox, D. N. & Hare, R. D. *Manual for the Hare psychopathy checklist: Screening version*. (Multi-Health Systems 1995).
248. Lilienfeld, S. O. & Widows, M. R. *Psychopathic Personality Inventory-Revised: Professional Manual* (Psychological Assessment Resources, 2005).
249. Paulhus, D. L., Neumann, C. S., Hare, R. D., Williams, K. M. & Hemphill, J. F. *The Self-Report Psychopathy Scale 4th edn* (Multi-Health Systems, 2016).
250. Frick, P. J. & Hare, R. D. *Antisocial process screening device* (Multi-Health Systems, 2001).
251. Frick, P. J. *Clinical Assessment of Prosocial Emotions* (University of New Orleans, 2013).
252. Lynam, D. R. Pursuing the psychopath: capturing the fledgling psychopath in a nomological net. *J. Abnorm. Psychol.* **106**, 425–438 (1997).
253. Colins, O. F. et al. A new measure to assess psychopathic personality in children: the Child Problematic Traits Inventory. *J. Psychopathol. Behav. Assess.* **36**, 4–21 (2014).
254. Frick, P. J. *The Inventory of Callous-Unemotional Traits* (University of New Orleans, 2004).
255. Forth, A. E., Kosson, D. & Hare, R. D. *The Hare Psychopathy Checklist: Youth Version* (Multi-Health Systems, 2003).
256. Andershed, H., Kerr, M., Stattin, H. & Levander, S. in *Psychopaths: Current International Perspectives* (eds Blaauw, E., Philippa, J. M., Ferenschild, K. C. M. P. & Van Lodesteijn B.) 131–158 (Elsevier, 2002).
257. van Baardewijk, Y. et al. Measuring psychopathic traits in children through self-report. The development of the Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory–Child Version. *Int. J. Law Psychiatry* **31**, 199–209 (2008).
258. Hildebrand, M. & de Ruiter, C. PCL-R psychopathy and its relation to DSM-IV axis I and II disorders in a sample of male forensic psychiatric patients in The Netherlands. *Int. J. Law Psychiatry* **27**, 233–248 (2004).
259. Leistico, A.-M. R., Salekin, R. T., DeCoster, J. & Rogers, R. A large-scale meta-analysis relating the Hare measures of psychopathy to antisocial conduct. *Law Hum. Behav.* **32**, 28–45 (2008).
260. Schulz, N., Murphy, B. & Verona, E. Gender differences in psychopathy links to drug use. *Law Hum. Behav.* **40**, 159–168 (2016).
261. Warren, J. I. & Burnette, M. The multifaceted construct of psychopathy: association with APD, clinical, and criminal characteristics among male and female inmates. *Int. J. Forensic Ment. Health* **12**, 265–273 (2013).
262. Olver, M. E., Stockdale, K. C. & Wormith, J. S. A meta-analysis of predictors of offender treatment attrition and its relationship to recidivism. *J. Consult. Clin. Psychol.* **79**, 6–21 (2011).
263. Widiger, T. A. in *Handbook of Psychopathy* (ed. Patrick, C. J.) 156–171 (Guilford Press, 2006).
264. Ogloff, J. R. Psychopathy/antisocial personality disorder conundrum. *Aust. N. Z. J. Psychiatry* **40**, 519–528 (2006).
265. Hare, R. D. Psychopathy: a clinical construct whose time has come. *Crim. Justice Behav.* **23**, 25–54 (1996).
266. Patrick, C. J. in *Personality Disorders: Toward the DSM-V* (eds O'Donohue, W., Fowler, K. A., & Lilienfeld S. O.) 109–166 (SAGE, 2007).
267. Kosson, D. S., Lorenz, A. R. & Newman, J. P. Effects of comorbid psychopathy on criminal offending and emotion processing in male offenders with antisocial personality disorder. *J. Abnorm. Psychol.* **115**, 798–806 (2006).
268. Verona, E., Sprague, J. & Sadeh, N. Inhibitory control and negative emotional processing in psychopathy and antisocial personality disorder. *J. Abnorm. Psychol.* **121**, 498–510 (2012).
269. Gregory, S. et al. The antisocial brain: psychopathy matters: a structural MRI investigation of antisocial male violent offenders. *Arch. Gen. Psychiatry* **69**, 962–972 (2012).
270. Yildirim, B. O. & Derksen, J. J. Systematic review, structural analysis, and new theoretical perspectives on the role of serotonin and associated genes in the etiology of psychopathy and sociopathy. *Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev.* **37**, 1254–1296 (2013).
271. Lykken, D. T. in *Handbook of Psychopathy* (ed. Patrick, C. J.) 22–38 (Guilford Press, 2018).
272. Frick, P. J. Editorial: Testing the validity of the limited prosocial emotions specifier. *J. Am. Acad. Child Adolesc. Psychiatry* <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaac.2020.12.020> (2020).
273. Hare, R. D. in *Psychopathy: Theory, Research and Implications for Society* (eds Cooke, D. J., Forth, A. E., & Hare, R. D.) 105–137 (Springer, 1998).
274. Viding, E., Blair, R. J. R., Moffitt, T. E. & Plomin, R. Evidence for substantial genetic risk for psychopathy in 7-year-olds. *J. Child Psychol. Psychiatry* **46**, 592–597 (2005).
275. Viding, E., Jones, A. P., Paul, J. F., Moffitt, T. E. & Plomin, R. Heritability of antisocial behaviour at 9: do callous-unemotional traits matter? *Dev. Sci.* **11**, 17–22 (2008).
276. Burke, J. D., Loeber, R. & Lahey, B. B. Adolescent conduct disorder and interpersonal callousness as predictors of psychopathy in young adults. *J. Clin. Child. Adolesc. Psychol.* **36**, 334–346 (2007).
277. Hawes, S. W., Byrd, A. L., Waller, R., Lynam, D. R. & Pardini, D. A. Late childhood interpersonal callousness and conduct problem trajectories interact to predict adult psychopathy. *J. Child. Psychol. Psychiatry* **58**, 55–63 (2017).
278. Moran, P., Ford, T., Butler, G. & Goodman, R. Callous and unemotional traits in children and adolescents living in Great Britain. *Br. J. Psychiatry* **192**, 65–66 (2008).
279. Hodgins, S., Larm, P., Ellenbogen, M., Vitaro, F. & Tremblay, R. E. Teachers' ratings of childhood behaviours predict adolescent and adult crime among 3016 males and females. *Can. J. Psychiatry* **58**, 143–150 (2013).
280. Musser, E. D., Galloway-Long, H. S., Frick, P. J. & Nigg, J. T. Emotion regulation and heterogeneity in attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *J. Am. Acad. Child. Adolesc. Psychiatry* **52**, 163–171.e162 (2013).
281. Kimonis, E. R. et al. Using self-reported callous-unemotional traits to cross-nationally assess the DSM-5 'With Limited Prosocial Emotions' specifier. *J. Child. Psychol. Psychiatry* **56**, 1249–1261 (2015).
282. Andershed, H. et al. Callous-unemotional traits only versus the multidimensional psychopathy construct as predictors of various antisocial outcomes during early adolescence. *J. Psychopathol. Behav. Assess.* **40**, 16–25 (2018).
283. Anderson, N. E. & Kiehl, K. A. The psychopath magnetized: insights from brain imaging. *Trends Cogn. Sci.* **16**, 52–60 (2012).
284. Hodgins, S., De Brito, S. A., Simonoff, E., Vloet, T. & Viding, E. Getting the phenotypes right: an essential ingredient for understanding aetiological mechanisms underlying persistent violence and developing effective treatments. *Front. Behav. Neurosci.* **3**, 44–44 (2009).
285. Seara-Cardoso, A. & Viding, E. Functional neuroscience of psychopathic personality in adults. *J. Pers.* **83**, 723–737 (2015).
286. Button, K. S. et al. Power failure: why small sample size undermines the reliability of neuroscience. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* **14**, 365–376 (2013).
287. Lipsey, M. W. Those confounded moderators in meta-analysis: good, bad, and ugly. *Ann. Am. Acad. Pol. Soc. Sci.* **587**, 69–81 (2003).
288. Giedd, J. N. & Rapoport, J. L. Structural MRI of pediatric brain development: what have we learned and where are we going? *Neuron* **67**, 728–734 (2010).
289. Hackman, D. A., Farah, M. J. & Meaney, M. J. Socioeconomic status and the brain: mechanistic insights from human and animal research. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* **11**, 651–659 (2010).
290. Mackey, S. et al. Mega-analysis of gray matter volume in substance dependence: general and substance-specific regional effects. *Am. J. Psychiatry* **176**, 119–128 (2019).
291. Taquet, M. et al. A structural brain network of genetic vulnerability to psychiatric illness. *Mol. Psychiatry* <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41380-020-0723-7> (2020).
292. Waller, R. & Hyde, L. W. Callous-unemotional behaviors in early childhood: the development of empathy and prosociality gone awry. *Curr. Opin. Psychol.* **20**, 11–16 (2018).
293. Wright, N., Pickles, A., Sharp, H. & Hill, J. A psychometric and validity study of callous-unemotional traits in 2.5 year old children. *Sci. Rep.* **11**, 8065 (2021).
294. Flom, M. & Saudino, K. J. Callous-unemotional behaviors in early childhood: genetic and environmental contributions to stability and change. *Dev. Psychopathol.* **29**, 1227–1234 (2017).

Acknowledgements

During the writing of the manuscript, S.A.D.B was hosted at the Kokoro Research Centre (Kyoto University) and supported by a short-term Invitational Fellowship from the Japanese Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS - S19103) and an International Academic Fellowship from the Leverhulme Trust (IAF-2019-032).

Author contributions

Introduction (S.A.D.B. and E.V.); Epidemiology (D.P. and E.R.K.); Mechanisms/pathophysiology (S.A.D.B., R.J.R.B., A.R.B.-S. and E.V.); Diagnosis, screening and prevention (A.E.F., P.J.F. and E.R.K.); Management (I.A.B. and A.R.B.-S.); Quality of life (A.E.F., E.V. and S.A.D.B.); Outlook (S.A.D.B., I.A.B., A.R.B.-S. and E.V.); Overview of Primer (S.A.D.B. and E.V.).

Competing interests

A.E.F. receives royalty payments from the sale of the Psychopathy Checklist: Youth Version, which is an instrument listed in Table 1. All other authors declare no competing interests.

Peer review information

Nature Reviews Disease Primers thanks J. Tiihonen, who co-reviewed with M. Lähteenhuo, S. Hodgins, C. Neumann, R. Salekin, and the other, anonymous, reviewer(s) for their contribution to the peer review of this work.

Publisher's note

Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Supplementary information

The online version contains supplementary material available at <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41572-021-00282-1>.

RELATED LINKS

Aftermath: Surviving Psychopathy Foundation:

<https://aftermath-surviving-psychopathy.org/>

Antisocial Behavior Working Group of Enhancing Neuro

Imaging and Genetics through Meta Analysis (ENIGMA):

<http://enigma.ini.usc.edu/ongoing/enigma-antisocial-behaviour/>

Mental Health Research Funding:

<https://www.mqmentalhealth.org/our-work/research-reports/>

Psychiatric Genomics Consortium: <https://www.med.unc.edu/pgc/>

Psychopathy Is: <https://psychopathyis.org/>

Society for the Scientific Study of Psychopathy: <https://psychopathysociety.org/>