# The Diagnostic Divide

*Why the DSM missed C-PTSD, and how the ICD finally caught up.*

Austan Sloan • Recover-You

**A note before you begin.** This guide explains why the diagnosis that best describes complex trauma may not appear in your file, and what to do about it. It is not an argument against your clinician, and it is not a reason to reject a diagnosis you've been given. It is an argument for better shared language between you and the people trying to help.

**Feeling overwhelmed by what you're reading? Support is here.** Call or text 988, Canada's 24/7 Suicide Crisis Helpline • In Alberta, call or text 211 for community, social, health, and government services • In Edmonton and area, call the 24/7 Distress Line at 780-482-HELP (4357) • Call 911 in an emergency.

## Why C-PTSD Changed Everything

There's a particular irony in the fact that I'm the one writing this. I've spent most of my life on the receiving end of these manuals, collecting diagnoses the way some people collect parking tickets. ADHD here. Generalized anxiety there. Alcohol and substance use somewhere in the middle. Each one handed to me by someone who had presumably read the relevant pages with far more clinical composure than I ever could. I wasn't reading the DSM. The opposite had been true. For all my life, it had been effectively reading and interpreting me.

So the fact that I've now spent genuine time pulling apart two international diagnostic frameworks, comparing their structures, tracing their disagreements, reading the footnotes, is not something I would have predicted. But here we are. And being clinically overwhelmed by something for most of your life doesn't strip you of the right to eventually look at it clearly. If anything, it earns you one.

Reading my diagnoses used to feel like reading a horoscope about myself: half of it eerily accurate, the other half a confident swing and a miss. I'd catch myself trying to make the descriptions fit, convincing myself "yep, that must be me," even when it didn't register at all. Nothing explained the identity collapse, the chronic guilt, the emotional whiplash, or why recovery felt like something you performed.

Then I found Judith Herman's work. The experience was something like reading a lottery ticket number by number, growing more excited as each one matched. Except this lottery ticket offered no money. In a lot of ways it offered something better: a framework for finally understanding yourself.

But validation and frustration arrived together. To read Herman, and van der Kolk, who was pushing the same case, is to realize how long this understanding existed before it reached you. And then to learn that the DSM rejected their proposals. Twice. That the people who named your experience most accurately spent decades being told by the official record that the evidence wasn't sufficient.

> *The problem was never you, your symptoms, or your story. It's that the system took decades to catch up to what survivors already knew.*

# A Tale of Two Manuals

Both manuals exist to standardize diagnosis. When it comes to complex trauma, they arrived at very different conclusions.

**The DSM (American Psychiatric Association): widely used by clinicians and researchers in the United States and Canada. It shapes diagnostic language, treatment studies, documentation, and some insurance decisions. It does not single-handedly govern diagnosis or billing across North America.**

**The ICD (World Health Organization): covers all medical and mental health conditions and is the international standard for health classification. Canada currently uses ICD-10-CA for national coding and reporting while evaluating a future ICD-11 transition. Canadian clinicians may still use DSM language in assessment and practice. The systems overlap, but they are not interchangeable.**

### How They Diverged Around Trauma

**Early editions:** both treated PTSD as a response to a single, discrete traumatic event: combat, disaster, assault. There was no framework for trauma that was chronic, relational, or developmental. If your damage accumulated slowly over years, the manuals didn't have a box for you.

**DSM-5 (2013), followed by DSM-5-TR (2022): expanded PTSD criteria and added a dissociative subtype. It did not add DESNOS, C-PTSD, or Developmental Trauma Disorder as separate diagnoses. That decision remains debated. It does not mean every complex-trauma survivor was misdiagnosed; it means the DSM offers no single C-PTSD label for organizing the full pattern.**

**ICD-11 (adopted 2019; effective 2022): formally recognized Complex PTSD as its own diagnosis. It is related to, but distinct from, ICD-11 PTSD and adds disturbances in emotion regulation, self-concept, and relationships.**

The global system caught up to what trauma clinicians and survivors had understood for decades. The North American system is still working on it.

# A Fair Look at the DSM

The DSM isn't the villain here. It does exactly what it was designed to do: describe symptoms clearly enough that clinicians, researchers, and systems are all working from the same page. In that respect it earns its name. It is a diagnostic manual, and a very good one for what it was built to handle.

The problem isn't that it's broken. The problem is that people aren't machines. If you bring your car to a mechanic after blowing the same tire on the same curb for the second time this year, they'll replace the tire, maybe a tie rod, and send you on your way. Your mechanic isn't handing you a pamphlet for driving classes, nor asking why you keep clipping that curb. Nobody looks at the pattern. The part got fixed. The reason it keeps failing didn't come up.

> *The DSM correctly identifies the part that failed. It was never designed to ask why it keeps failing.*

That's the limitation for trauma survivors. Symptoms can be catalogued, but the story that produced them often goes unspoken. Anxiety, depression, substance use, emotional volatility, attention problems: all can be correctly diagnosed using DSM criteria while the actual driver,

chronic relational trauma, goes completely unaddressed. You leave with an accurate label for the symptom and no map to what's underneath it.

This isn't an indictment. It's a description of a design constraint. For most mental health challenges, DSM-style symptom mapping works well. But for developmental trauma, the kind that shapes identity, attachment, and how the nervous system calibrates to the world, a symptom checklist will never tell the full story. It can't. That's not what it was built for.

## The DSM Said No. Twice.

C-PTSD didn't fail to appear in the DSM by accident or oversight. It was proposed. It was reviewed. It was rejected. Twice. By the same body. With decades of mounting evidence behind it each time. That's worth sitting with.

**DSM-IV (1994):** the proposal for DESNOS (Disorders of Extreme Stress, Not Otherwise Specified), an early framework for what we now call C-PTSD, was rejected. The research supporting it was acknowledged. The diagnosis was not.

**DSM-5 development: Developmental Trauma Disorder was proposed as a diagnosis focused on chronic interpersonal trauma in children. It was not included. The decision reflected questions about evidence, boundaries, overlap, and diagnostic reliability, and it remains contested by many clinicians and researchers.**

These were not minor procedural debates. Without a single developmental- or complex-trauma diagnosis, some people continue to receive several valid but partial labels. The ICD-11's recognition of C-PTSD did not prove that every competing framework was wrong. It gave clinicians and patients another coherent way to name a pattern they had been describing for decades.

### Alberta Was Paying Attention

In 2014, the same year the DSM-5 rejection of Developmental Trauma Disorder was still fresh, two separate bodies of work came out of this province that pointed in exactly the same direction.

A commentary from the University of Alberta's Trauma and Attachment Program called the DSM's exclusion of Developmental Trauma Disorder a significant oversight, and went further. They argued that if only one trauma diagnosis were to exist, it would more accurately be developmental in nature, given how chronic early trauma reshapes a person's biology, psychology, and social functioning across an entire lifetime.

That same year, the Alberta Adverse Childhood Experiences Survey, the first provincial ACE study ever conducted here, published its findings from 1,200 Albertan adults. The results were stark: Albertans who had experienced three or more ACEs were six times more likely to be diagnosed with a mental health condition or substance dependence in adulthood. Nearly 60% of all mental health and addiction diagnoses in the sample were attributable to early adverse childhood experiences.

Two different research teams. Two different methodologies. One province. The same conclusion: early trauma is the through-line, and the system wasn't built to name it. I think they were right. Both of them.

## 2013: A Big Year for the DSM

In 2013, the DSM-5 rejected Developmental Trauma Disorder for the second time, killing the closest thing to C-PTSD the manual had ever considered. But something else happened in that same revision cycle that I haven't been able to stop thinking about.

That same year, DSM-5 added a fourth symptom cluster to the classical definition of PTSD: negative alterations in cognition and mood. For decades, PTSD had been built on three clusters: re-experiencing, avoidance, and hyperarousal. The fourth covered territory that should sound familiar by now: persistent negative beliefs about oneself, distorted blame, diminished interest, feelings of detachment, an inability to experience positive emotions.

> *In the same year they rejected the diagnosis that would have named complex trauma directly, they quietly absorbed a portion of its symptom domain into the existing PTSD framework.*

**This part is my opinion, and I want to be clear about that.** It's hard not to read that fourth cluster as a half-measure: a way of acknowledging that the classical PTSD definition wasn't capturing the full picture without actually recognizing C-PTSD as its own condition. Whether that was a deliberate compromise, a limit of the evidence threshold, or just how large institutional frameworks evolve, I can't say. What I can say is that the timing is worth noting.

There's a second issue with the DSM-5 change. Moving from three PTSD symptom clusters in DSM-IV to four in DSM-5 changed who qualifies. Some people who met the older criteria no longer meet the newer ones, while others qualify under symptoms the older manual did not capture. It is not simply a higher bar. It is a different gate, with different people falling on either side.

The ICD-11 went in the opposite direction. It kept the original three clusters intact and built C-PTSD on top of them as a separate diagnosis: requiring those three, plus three more. The classical definition of PTSD wasn't restructured to accommodate the revision. It was preserved, and the revision was added above it. The DSM expanded its criteria and captured less. The ICD held its criteria steady and captured more.

### To Be Clear About My Position

I'm not arguing that the ICD gets everything right and the DSM gets everything wrong. That's not the point. My question is narrower: why hasn't the DSM picked up C-PTSD?

The overlap is real because ICD-11 C-PTSD requires the core features of ICD-11 PTSD plus disturbances in self-organization: affect dysregulation, negative self-concept, and relational disturbance, along with impairment. That makes C-PTSD broader in presentation, but not simply 'PTSD plus three boxes' in every clinical sense. Differential diagnosis and comorbidity still matter.

And here's where I land: if the DSM wants to keep them separate, fine. That's a defensible position. But if that's the approach, then the multiple discrete diagnoses it produces have to be treated as connected, coordinated, and focused on root cause. Otherwise the symptoms will ruthlessly persist, because you're managing the outputs of an injury that nobody is naming or treating directly.

**A note on the DSM's lettering.** If you've read the DSM criteria closely, you'll notice they run from A through H, which makes it look like far more than four categories. Only B, C, D, and E

are actual symptom clusters. The others cover exposure criteria, duration, functional impairment, and exclusions. So: four clusters, eight letters.

## The Pattern Beneath the Diagnoses

A diagnosis can be genuinely useful. It gives language to what you're experiencing and helps clinicians coordinate care. But it's still a tool. Not a verdict. Not an identity. And for a lot of people with complex trauma histories, it's a tool that's been consistently reaching for the wrong shelf.

Many survivors with chronic trauma collect several diagnoses: depression, anxiety, substance use, personality, attention, or dissociative disorders. Sometimes those diagnoses are partial views of one connected pattern. Sometimes they are genuine co-occurring conditions requiring their own treatment. The failure is not having several labels. It is never asking whether a larger story connects them.

What the DSM's fragmented approach does, beyond the clinical inconvenience, is leave the door wide open for a particular and crushing conclusion: that you are broken in multiple, compounding ways. That you have a defective brain. That the sum of all these labels is simply what you are.

The C-PTSD lens moves the frame entirely. It doesn't look at the same picture and see malfunction. It sees adaptation. A nervous system that learned to survive the conditions it was given. The symptoms aren't evidence that something went wrong with you. They're evidence that something was done to you, and that you found a way to keep going anyway. Those are two completely different animals, and which one you're handed matters more than most people realize.

> *You don't need a perfectly worded diagnosis to begin healing. The work doesn't wait for the paperwork.*

## How to Use This Knowledge

Before the practical part, one thing worth saying clearly: many clinicians are just as frustrated by these gaps as you are. They're working inside systems that constrain their time, their training, and what they're able to formally diagnose, even when they can see complex trauma plainly in front of them. This isn't an indictment of individual therapists. It's about giving you, and the people trying to help you, better language to work with the reality you're both already navigating.

**In therapy:** if you've been diagnosed with ADHD, generalized anxiety, depression, or a personality disorder, you don't have to accept that as the whole story. Try: "I've been reading about C-PTSD in the ICD-11, and it fits my experience of long-term relational trauma better than the current diagnosis does. Can we explore treatment through that lens?" Most trauma-informed clinicians will know exactly what you're pointing at.

**Self-advocacy:** you don't need the diagnosis in your file to use the language. Phrases like "difficulties with emotional regulation," "negative self-concept connected to early trauma," or "chronic relational trauma" signal to the right clinicians that you understand what you're dealing with. That specificity changes the conversation.

**Choosing care:** when evaluating a therapist or program, don't just ask "do you treat PTSD?" Almost everyone will say yes. Ask: "what is your approach to complex or developmental

trauma?" The answer will tell you quickly whether they're working at the symptom level or the root level.

**Navigating Alberta's system:** Canada still uses ICD-10-CA for national health coding, while clinicians may document DSM-5-TR diagnoses or broader trauma- and stressor-related categories. C-PTSD may therefore be discussed clinically without appearing as an ICD-11 code in the chart. That is not necessarily a failure of the clinician. The label does not have to be perfect for the care to be useful.

**A note on PTSD versus C-PTSD. If your current diagnosis is PTSD rather than C-PTSD, you do not need to stall until someone changes the label. CPT, Prolonged Exposure, and EMDR have the strongest evidence for core PTSD symptoms. DBT skills, attachment-focused work, and other approaches may help with regulation, relationships, or stabilization; IFS and many somatic approaches have promising but smaller evidence bases. The C-PTSD framework here is meant to give you clarity and language. Recovery doesn't require a perfect code. It requires care that fits the problems you are actually living with.**

## Before You Go

Understanding where your experience sits in relation to the DSM-5 and ICD-11 isn't an academic exercise. It changes what you ask for, what you expect from care, and how you talk about what's actually happened to you. Having the right language doesn't fix anything on its own. But it gets you into the right conversation, and the right conversation is where things start to shift.

If you were hoping for ammunition to roast your doctor with a "checkmate, DSM" speech, this isn't that. This is about building a bridge, not burning one to the ground. The system is imperfect. The people inside it, mostly, are trying. The better your language, the better your odds of finding the ones who can actually help.

And if the diagnosis in your file doesn't match what you know about your own history, that gap is real, it's documented, and it is not a sign that you've misunderstood yourself.

**Feeling overwhelmed by what you're reading? Support is here.** Call or text 988, Canada's 24/7 Suicide Crisis Helpline • In Alberta, call or text 211 for community, social, health, and government services • In Edmonton and area, call the 24/7 Distress Line at 780-482-HELP (4357) • Call 911 in an emergency.

# Sources & Further Reading

These references trace how the DSM-5 and ICD-11 diverged in defining trauma-related disorders, why C-PTSD was validated through the ICD-11, and how clinicians and advocates are bridging the diagnostic gap for survivors of chronic trauma.


American Psychiatric Association. (2013). Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (5th ed.). American Psychiatric Publishing. *The current US diagnostic standard, which does not include Complex PTSD as a distinct diagnosis, instead subsuming its features across PTSD specifiers and personality disorder categories.*

World Health Organization. (2019). ICD-11: Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (6B40) and Complex PTSD (6B41). *The ICD-11 formally recognized C-PTSD as a diagnosis distinct from PTSD, requiring the core PTSD criteria plus three additional clusters arising from prolonged, repeated trauma. Its inclusion validated decades of clinical observation.*

Cloitre, M., Garvert, D. W., Brewin, C. R., Bryant, R. A., & Maercker, A. (2013). Evidence for proposed ICD-11 PTSD and complex PTSD: a latent profile analysis. European Journal of Psychotraumatology, 4(1),

20706. *Landmark analysis providing empirical evidence that PTSD and C-PTSD are statistically distinct presentations, not points on a single continuum. Directly substantiates the ICD-11's decision to recognize them separately.*

Herman, J. L. (1992). Trauma and Recovery. Basic Books. *The text that first proposed Complex PTSD as a distinct diagnostic category, making the clinical and human argument that the DSM's single-incident framework was structurally inadequate for survivors of prolonged interpersonal trauma.*

Van der Kolk, B. A., Roth, S., Pelcovitz, D., Sunday, S., & Spinazzola, J. (2005). Disorders of extreme stress: the empirical foundation of a complex adaptation to trauma. Journal of Traumatic Stress, 18(5), 389–399. *The empirical foundation paper for DESNOS, documenting the symptom clusters arising from prolonged developmental trauma that the DSM's single-incident framework cannot adequately capture. The proposal the DSM-5 declined and the ICD-11 accepted.*

Spinazzola, J., Van der Kolk, B. A., & Ford, J. D. (2018). Complex trauma exposure and symptoms in children and adolescents. Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 206(11), 873–880. *Examines the case for Developmental Trauma Disorder, extending the C-PTSD argument into the paediatric context where the gap between diagnosis and clinical reality is most consequential.*

Ford, J. D. (2017). Complex PTSD: research directions for nosology, clinical assessment, and treatment. European Journal of Psychotraumatology, 8(sup7), 1323022. *Reviews the state of complex PTSD research, providing the clinical and scientific rationale for its recognition as a distinct condition and the implications for treatment design.*

Cloitre, M., Courtois, C. A., Charuvastra, A., Carapezza, R., Stolbach, B. C., & Green, B. L. (2011). Treatment of complex PTSD: results of the ISTSS expert clinician survey on best practices. Journal of Traumatic Stress, 24(6), 615–627. *Expert consensus establishing phase-based, sequenced treatment as the clinical standard for C-PTSD, addressing directly what the diagnostic gap costs in practice: when the diagnosis is absent or misapplied, the treatment model that follows it is also misapplied.*

Ford, J. D., & Courtois, C. A. (2021). Posttraumatic Stress Disorder: Scientific and Professional Dimensions (2nd ed.). Academic Press. *Comprehensive academic and clinical reference covering PTSD and C-PTSD across nosology, neurobiology, assessment, and treatment: the scholarly scaffolding for understanding the DSM/ICD divergence and its downstream effects.*

SAMHSA. (2014). SAMHSA's Concept of Trauma and Guidance for a Trauma-Informed Approach. HHS Publication No. (SMA) 14-4884. *Foundational policy document establishing the trauma-informed care framework, implicitly acknowledging the diagnostic gap: systemic recognition of trauma's role does not automatically produce diagnostic tools adequate to name it.*