

Beyond Standardization: Integrating Individual Needs into Evidence-Based Psychotherapy

Yiyang Su

King's College London, London, UK

Abstract: This article examines the limitations of evidence-based practice (EBP) in psychotherapy and proposes an integrated model that balances scientific methodology with personalized care. While EBP has advanced psychotherapy standardization through randomized controlled trials and systematic reviews, implementation barriers persist, including external validity limitations, inadequate protocol individualization, therapeutic alliance undervaluation, and policy constraints. The article proposes future directions incorporating technological innovation, interdisciplinary collaboration, and policy refinement to enhance individualization while maintaining scientific rigor.

Keywords: evidence-based practice, psychotherapy individualization, therapeutic alliance, cultural adaptation, external validity, practice-based evidence

1. Introduction

Psychotherapy development has been limited by practitioners' subjectivity and theoretical orientations, impeding standardized efficacy evaluation [1]. Evidence-based practice emerged as psychology's dominant paradigm, integrating research evidence, clinical expertise, and client values [2]. EBP targets outcome enhancement and resource optimization. Based on randomized controlled trials and systematic reviews, EBP strengthens validity through variable control [3]. Its contribution lies in advancing psychotherapy standardization, enabling scientific clinical decisions and systematic approach comparison.

Gaps persist between EBP's theoretical framework and clinical application. Implementation barriers include research external validity limitations, inadequate protocol individualization, therapeutic alliance undervaluation and policy constraints. This article examines these limitations and proposes an integrated model balancing scientific methodology with personalized care.

2. External Validity Limitations

External validity limits restrict EBP applicability. RCTs ensure internal validity through variable control, but strict selection criteria exclude comorbid cases, limiting generalizability [3]. Zimmerman et al. [4] showed antidepressant trials excluded patients with substance use, suicidality, or complex comorbidities—conditions often accompanying depression—questioning findings' relevance. Westen et al. [19] further criticized the assumptions and reporting methods in controlled clinical trials, highlighting how methodological constraints can compromise the applicability of empirically supported psychotherapies in everyday practice.

Practice-based evidence offers an alternative through real-world data collection [5], despite variable control limitations. Researchers advocate integrating RCT rigor with PBE implementation to bridge research-practice gaps [6]. RCTs across diverse populations enhance external validity [7, 8]. Incorporating real-world data strengthens EBP's clinical relevance [9], improving treatment planning based on actual patient needs.

3. Individualization and Cultural Adaptation

EBP's standardized, statistically-derived approach neglects individual and cultural factors. Mental health interventions require personalization as identical protocols yield variable outcomes. Hwang [10] found Chinese Americans' resistance to direct self-expression hindered CBT adaptation, reducing adherence.

Researchers advocate individualized approaches including shared decision making (SDM) and culturally adapted interventions. SDM enhances treatment flexibility through therapist-client collaboration, though potentially creating cognitive overload in severely depressed patients [11]. Culturally sensitive interventions—employing adapted communication, cultural metaphors, and value-congruent elements—provide another effective strategy.

Paris et al. [12] demonstrated culturally adapted internet-based CBT improved adherence among Spanish-speakers with sustained substance use reduction at six-month follow-up, highlighting cultural integration's importance. Standard

approaches lack specificity for diverse populations. Incorporating SDM and culturally sensitive interventions enhances EBP's adaptability, rendering it individualized and culturally inclusive.

4. Therapeutic Alliance Considerations

Despite EBP's emphasis on empirically validated techniques, it sometimes undervalues therapeutic relationships. Outcomes depend on both specific interventions and therapist-client relationship quality [13]. EBP's standardization focus may prioritize technical proficiency over alliance development. While CBT theoretically emphasizes collaboration [14], practitioners often overemphasize cognitive restructuring, neglecting trust and empathy, compromising outcomes.

Training protocols enhancing cross-cultural sensitivity and relationship skills are essential alongside technical interventions [15]. Future guidelines should establish therapeutic alliance as a primary treatment component. In psychodynamic therapy, alliance constitutes a core intervention empirically proven to facilitate positive long-term outcomes [16]. While advancing standardization, recognizing alliance's critical function ensures psychotherapy maintains scientific foundation while addressing client needs.

5. Policy Constraints

Insurance policies may divert EBP from client-specific needs. Government and insurer policies typically restrict reimbursement to RCT-validated treatments [8]. This bias potentially excludes effective therapies like psychodynamic approaches, which demonstrate longitudinal efficacy but lack sufficient short-term RCT evidence [16]. Clients may receive suboptimal EBP-endorsed treatments rather than therapies most appropriate to their needs.

Research indicates certain patients benefit more from integrative psychotherapy, yet insurers often limit reimbursement to structured interventions like CBT or pharmacotherapy, hindering personalized treatment access [2]. An integrative model incorporating Practice-Based Evidence and Real-World Evidence could expand coverage parameters, including additional empirically validated interventions within reimbursement frameworks, balancing scientific rigor with clinical reality while enhancing treatment accessibility and effectiveness [2].

6. Future Directions

Future EBP must integrate technological innovation, interdisciplinary collaboration, and policy refinement to enhance individualization. Machine learning and AI can analyze treatment datasets to develop personalized interventions, improving guideline formulation [17]. Telemedicine extends mental health services to diverse populations, enhancing cross-cultural applicability.

Psychology's integration with neuroscience, sociology, and public health strengthens therapeutic precision through interdisciplinary cooperation. Biomarker research enables more accurate prediction of individual treatment responses, advancing EBP toward personalized medicine [18].

7. Conclusion

EBP has advanced psychotherapy's standardization and scientific foundation, though practical application remains challenging. Balancing scientific rigor with individualized care represents a central issue in EBP's evolution. Recent research has developed more flexible frameworks through methodological refinements.

Future EBP must transcend traditional paradigms, integrating diverse evidence systems and technological innovations. EBP will fulfill its objectives only by respecting individual differences while maintaining scientific principles, advancing mental health interventions toward precision and humanization.

References

- [1] Smith ML, Glass GV. Meta-analysis of psychotherapy outcome studies. *American Psychologist*. 1977;32(9):752-760.
- [2] Kazdin AE. Evidence-based treatment and practice: New opportunities to bridge clinical research and practice, enhance the knowledge base, and improve patient care. *American Psychologist*. 2008;63(3):146-159.
- [3] Deacon BJ. The biomedical model of mental disorder: A critical analysis of its validity, utility, and effects on psychotherapy research. *Clinical Psychology Review*. 2013;33(7):846-861.
- [4] Zimmerman M, Chelminski I, Posternak MA. Exclusion criteria used in antidepressant efficacy trials: Consistency across studies and representativeness of samples included. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*. 2004;192(6):395-404.

- [5] Horn SD, Gassaway J. Practice-based evidence study design for comparative effectiveness research. *Medical Care*. 2007;45(10):S50-S57.
- [6] Colnet B, Mayer I, Chen G, Dieng A, Li R, Varoquaux G, Vert JP, Josse J, Yang S. Causal inference methods for combining randomized trials and observational studies: A review. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.08047*. 2020.
- [7] Rothwell PM. External validity of randomised controlled trials: "To whom do the results of this trial apply?". *The Lancet*. 2005;365(9453):82-93.
- [8] Gartlehner G, Hansen RA, Nissman D, Lohr KN, Carey TS. Criteria for distinguishing effectiveness from efficacy trials in systematic reviews. Technical Reviews, No.12. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (US). 2006.
- [9] Kim HS, Lee S. Real-world evidence and its key issues: Bridging the gap between research and clinical practice. *Korean Journal of Internal Medicine*. 2019;34(4):767-775.
- [10] Hwang WC. The psychotherapy adaptation and modification framework: Application to Asian Americans. *American Psychologist*. 2006;61(7):702-715.
- [11] Duncan E, Best C, Hagen S. Shared decision-making interventions for people with mental health conditions. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2010;(1):CD007297.
- [12] Paris M, Silva M, Añez-Nava L, Jaramillo Y, Kiluk BD, Gordon MA, Nich C, Frankforter T, Devore K, Ball SA, Carroll KM. Culturally adapted, web-based cognitive behavioral therapy for Spanish-speaking individuals with substance use disorders: A randomized clinical trial. *American Journal of Public Health*. 2018;108(11):1535-1542.
- [13] Norcross JC, Lambert MJ. Psychotherapy relationships that work II. *Psychotherapy*. 2011;48(1):4-8.
- [14] Beck JS. *Cognitive behavior therapy: Basics and beyond* (2nd ed.). Guilford Press. 2011.
- [15] Norcross JC, Wampold BE. A new therapy for each patient: Evidence-based relationships and responsiveness. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*. 2018;74(11):1889-1906.
- [16] Shedler J. The efficacy of psychodynamic psychotherapy. *American Psychologist*. 2010;65(2):98-109.
- [17] Ivanovic M, Autexier S, Kokkonidis M. AI approaches in processing and using data in personalized medicine. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.04698*. 2022.
- [18] Sugawara S, Noma H. Efficient screening of predictive biomarkers for individual treatment selection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.01582*. 2019.
- [19] Westen D, Novotny CM, Thompson-Brenner H. The empirical status of empirically supported psychotherapies: Assumptions, findings, and reporting in controlled clinical trials. *Psychological Bulletin*. 2004;130(4):631-663.

Author Bio

Yiyang Su (born September 2001), female; Han Chinese; educational level: bachelor's degree; title: no title; research direction: psychological therapies.