



**Richard Woods** @Richard\_Autism

May 25 · 9 tweets · [Richard\\_Autism/status/1529474683015507971](#)

A rather thought provoking article. Of course PDA relevant.

<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/dmcn.15177>

"In general, everyone involved in evaluating the use of diagnostic labels should ask of each proposed policy and future direction: who would benefit?" Werkhoven et al 2021, p5.

I am still reflecting on the article, but generally seems balanced.

Article is open access, so anyone can access it.

"in cases where there is more room for transformation of traits and behavioural patterns, identification may indeed cause stagnation, undermining possibilities for improvement, again by representing change as a threat to the person's identity." p4. [@FidgetyF\\_cker](#) Ally Hat, much?

It is clear from the article, that much of my ethical concerns surrounding PDA are reasonable. That "PDA Profile of ASD" supporters do need to robustly justify their actions with it, like trying to tie good practice replicating strategies to a PDA dx.

Also some aspects of the "myth" around PDA, the "Lightbulb moment", seems to be a generic sense-making effect common to diagnosing Disorders. There needs to be more critical questioning of what is being said around PDA.

Also points out that no stakeholders have a monopoly on a Disorder. Showing the nonsensical position of claiming "PDA profile of ASD", as others can research test PDA's competing hypotheses. Why is so much of common PDA discourse built on sand?

[@threadreaderapp](#) please could you unroll?

Thank you in advance.

...