Abstract

This study examined the relationship between borderline personality disorder (BPD) assessed as self-reported borderline features (Morey, 1991), opioid use, and Hepatitis C virus (HCV) in pregnant women. There were 55 women in the opioid use group and 38 in the comparison group who were at high-risk due to medical issues that did not include drug use. Women were in their 2nd or 3rd trimester. All women received Medicaid and were racially representative of the geographic area (84% White). We assessed opioid use severity from medical records based on urine assays and prescriptions for opioids. The results revealed that women who scored in the clinical range of total borderline features, which is associated with a diagnosis of BPD (Trull, 1995), had 2.83 greater odds of being opioid users (prescribed and non-prescribed) than had individuals below the cut-off. The borderline features of affective instability, identity disturbance, negative relationships, and self-harm/impulsivity were significantly correlated with opioid use severity. Negative relationships and self-harm/impulsivity contributed significant variance in opioid use severity over and above affective instability and identity disturbance. Women in the clinical range of borderline features were more likely to have HCV than were women below the cut-off, and the borderline feature of negative relationships specifically was associated with HCV. We discuss implications for interventions to address negative relationships and self-harm/impulsivity, and interventions to help prevent opioid misuse in women before they become pregnant.
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Introduction

Borderline Personality Disorder (BPD) is a severe, chronic disorder characterized by emotional instability, suicidal behavior, unstable and intense relationships, and impulsive behavior that may be self-damaging, e.g., substance misuse (American Psychiatric Association, 2013). In addition to a categorical diagnosis, BPD can be assessed with a self-report measure of borderline features along a continuum (affective instability, identity disturbance, negative relationships, self-harm/impulsivity; Morey, 1991). Borderline features are highly correlated with a BPD diagnosis (Kurtz & Morey, 2001) and a clinical cut-off score for the sum of all four features is associated with a diagnosis of BPD (Trull, 1995).

Between 1999 and 2014, the number of pregnant women who misuse opioids more than quadrupled (Haight, Ko, Tong, Bohm, & Callaghan, 2018). Moreover, BPD is frequently co-morbid with opioid use disorder (OUD; Sansone, Watts, & Wiederman, 2013; Trull, Sher, Minks-Brown, Durbin, & Burr, 2000). Our review of the literatures identified no studies on the association between BPD and opioid misuse in pregnancy. This is an important omission because BPD is largely a disorder of a woman’s childbearing years, being first diagnosed in late adolescence or early adulthood and diminishing in severity by middle age (Paris, 2003). Co-morbid opioid misuse during this time may increase negative consequences not only for the mother but also for her infant. Moreover, pregnancy marks a critical time to intervene, as a mother-to-be is likely to seek medical care during prenatal appointments and may be motivated to address her drug misuse to safeguard her infant’s well-being, including the prevention of Neonatal Opioid Withdrawal Syndrome (NOWS; Patrick et al., 2015).

BPD and Substance Use in Pregnancy

A diagnosis of BPD is a risk factor in pregnancy, which a co-morbid diagnosis of
substance use disorder (SUD) compounds. Women who have BPD approach pregnancy and delivery as traumatic (Blankley, Galbally, Snellen, Power, & Lewis, 2015) and are more likely to give birth prematurely and have newborns with low APGAR scores (Bandelow et al., 2005; Blankley et al., 2015; Pare-Miron, Czuzoj-Shulman, Oddy, Spence, & Abenhaim, 2016). Furthermore, women with BPD also have higher rates of unplanned and teenage pregnancies, and are at increased risk for developing an SUD while pregnant compared to pregnant women without the disorder (De Genna, Feske, Larkby, Angiolieri, & Gold, 2012).

BPD and co-morbid SUD are most common in patients who are younger and female (Wapp et al., 2015). Overall, 24.2% BPD patients have some SUD. Specifically, 18.5% of individuals with BPD also have an opioid use/dependence, compared to 14.3% for alcohol and 16.8% for cocaine (Trull et al., 2000). Importantly, however, the co-morbidity between BPD and OUD is not due to overlap in symptoms for each diagnosis (Trull et al., 2000). In the current study, we examined the relationship between BPD and opioid misuse in pregnancy. We expected that women above the clinical cut-off for borderline features associated with a diagnosis of BPD would be more likely to misuse opioids in pregnancy than would women below the cut-off.

**Self-harm/impulsivity, Negative Relationships and Opioid Misuse**

Among borderline features, self-harm/impulsivity and negative relationships may be specifically associated with opioid misuse. Self-harm/impulsivity is characteristic of several psychiatric disorders including BPD and SUD (Moeller, Barratt, Dougherty, Schmitz, & Swann, 2001). Indeed, some researchers consider substance use to be a manifestation of impulsivity (Links, Heslegrave, & van Reekum, 1999; Martino et al., 2017). Risky drug use behavior (e.g. syringe sharing) may result from an impulsive decision based on current feeling and thinking,
together with an inability to foresee the consequences of a behavior in that present moment. Indeed, in college students, self-harm/impulsivity was significantly associated with higher levels of opioid misuse, more frequent opioid use, more serious consequences, and greater risk for dependence (Tragesser, Jones, Robinson, Stutler, & Stewart, 2013). In the current study, we therefore hypothesized that self-harm/impulsivity would be associated with severity of opioid misuse in pregnancy.

Negative interpersonal relationships are also associated with opioid misuse in women. In a community sample of non-treatment seeking individuals, women were more likely than were men to be motivated to misuse prescription opioids due psychological distress (Back, Payne, Simpson, & Brady, 2010), specifically interpersonal stress (Back, Lawson, Singleton, & Brady, 2011). Furthermore, in an epidemiological sample, victims of intimate partner violence were more likely to be women than men, and OUD was associated with victimization not perpetration (Smith, Homish, Leonard, & Cornelius, 2012). We hypothesized that in addition to self-harm/impulsivity, the borderline feature of negative relationships would also be associated with opioid misuse in pregnancy beyond the borderline features of affective instability and identity disturbance.

**Opioid Misuse, BPD, and Hepatitis C**

Hepatitis C virus (HCV) is the most common chronic bloodborne infection in the United States (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2018). Symptoms are initially mild and unlikely to lead an individual to seek medical treatment. However, HCV is the leading cause of liver-related deaths (Westbrook & Dusheiko, 2014). Syringe sharing in the context of injection drug use is the most common means of HCV transmission in the United States (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2018), leading to 53% of injection drug users contracting HCV.
(Degenhardt et al., 2017). Moreover, 60% of pregnant women on opioid maintenance therapy were positive for HCV (Krans et al., 2016), 4-7% of whom will transmit the infection to their infants (Roberts & Yeung, 2002). Furthermore, there is no known intervention to reduce the risk of transmission (Cottrell, Chou, Wasson, Rahman, & Guise, 2013). Additionally, BPD is associated with syringe sharing (Mackesy-Amiti, Donenberg, & Ouellet, 2014). We expected that a clinical cut-off of borderline features associated with a diagnosis of BPD in pregnant women would be associated with HCV. Additionally, given the relationship between sharing syringes and HCV, and the relationship between self-harm/impulsivity and drug use reviewed above, we expected that the borderline features of negative relationships and self-harm/impulsivity specifically would be associated with HCV in pregnant women.

**The Current Study**

Previous research outlined above led us to evaluate four hypotheses. Specifically, we hypothesized that: 1) women above a clinical cut-off score for total borderline features associated with a diagnosis of BPD (Trull, 1995) would be more likely to use opioids compared to mothers scoring below the cut-off; 2) women’s borderline features (affective instability, negative relationships, identity disturbance, self-harm/impulsivity) would be positively correlated with opioid use severity; 3) the borderline features of self-harm/impulsivity and negative relationships would contribute significant amounts of variance in opioid use severity over and above the borderline features of affective instability and identity disturbance; 4) women above the clinical cut-off for total borderline features would be more likely to have HCV; and 5) the borderline features of negative relationships and self-harm/impulsivity would be associated with HCV.
Method

Participants

We sampled women in a high-risk pregnancy clinic, some of whom were at high-risk due to use of opioids and others who were at “high-risk” due to non-substance use related medical issues such as obesity, high blood pressure, and cardio-pulmonary disease. We consented women in a high-risk pregnancy clinic who were over 18 years old and in their second trimester of pregnancy or beyond, and English literate. Women were referred to the clinic for substance use or other non-drug related factors (e.g., multiple pregnancy, high blood pressure, heart disease, morbid obesity). During patient intake, the receptionist asked the potential participant if she was interested in a 30-minute study on high-risk pregnancy. If the woman was interested and agreed to participate, the research assistant reviewed the Institutional Review Board approved consent form and procedures with her, and answered any questions the participant had. Once the questionnaire packet was complete, the participant received a nominal gift card. Fifty-five women were opioid users, and 38 were at high-risk due to medical factors.

Measures

Demographics. We collected demographic information from women’s medical records (See Table 1). We used receipt of Medicaid as a proxy for socioeconomic status. All women received Medicaid, which is a joint federal and state program to help with medical costs for those with limited income. Pregnant women qualify in the state in which the study took place if their income is below 160% of the federal poverty level ($38,880 for a family of four).

Opioid use severity. We assigned women to a score between 0 and 3 on an opioid use severity scale from medical records of urine toxicology assays and prescribed opioids within 30 days prior to participation in the study. There was a range of severity from no use (the high-risk
medical comparison group), to past but no current use, to prescribed use only, to current use of illicit drugs. We assigned “0” for “non-users” for women who did not produce a positive sample for opioids or another illicit drug who were at high-risk due to medical complications only \((n = 38)\). We assigned a “1” for “opioid detoxification” if they produced negative urine samples for opioids and other drugs within 30 days and had previously been prescribed buprenorphine, buprenorphine plus naloxone, or methadone \((n = 4)\); we assigned a “2” for “prescribed opioid use” if women who produced a positive urine sample within 30 days who were being prescribed buprenorphine, buprenorphine plus naloxone, or methadone, and who were not positive for other illicit drugs \((n = 21)\); and we assigned a “3” for “non-prescribed opioid misuse” \((n = 30)\) if women produced a positive urine sample for opioids which had not been prescribed for them within 30 days (buprenorphine, buprenorphine plus naloxone, or methadone), or if women produced a urine sample with traces of opioids other than those that they were prescribed, and who may have tested positive for other illicit drugs. The opioid use severity variable fell between acceptable limits for normality: skewness = -0.3, \(SE = .25\); and kurtosis = -1.77, \(SE = .50\) (George & Mallery, 2016).

**Opioid use (yes/no).** In addition to the opioid severity variable, we created a dichotomous variable for opioid use (yes/no): 55 women were in the user group and 38 women were in the non-user group.

**Hepatitis C virus.** HCV was assessed from medical records, specifically from blood tests, which indicated the presence/absence of the virus. In the current sample, 51% of our participants had HCV: 82% of opioid users and 18% of high-risk comparisons. Among the general population Center for Disease Control data indicate an HCV incidence rate of about 1% (Center for Disease Control, 2018).
**Borderline features.** The Personality Assessment Inventory- Borderline Features Scale (PAI-BOR) is a self-report measure (Morey, 1991) that includes four features of BPD: *affective instability* (mood swings and difficulty controlling anger); *identity problems* (identity instability and lack of sense of self); *negative relationships* (intense and unstable relationships); and *self-harm/impulsivity* (impulsivity in potentially harmful areas including risky sexual behavior, self-injury, substance misuse, or suicidal behaviors). The four subscales are summed to make a total borderline features score. The PAI-BOR shows high convergent validity with a BPD diagnosis from structured interviews (Kurtz & Morey, 2001) and has been used to assess borderline features in young adults diagnosed with the disorder with good test-retest reliability (Trull, 1995). Furthermore, the PAI-BOR and the DSM-IV criteria for BPD are significantly related (Stein, Pinsker-Aspen, & Hilsenroth, 2007). In the current sample, we calculated internal consistency with Cronbach’s alpha: affective instability, $\alpha = .81$; identity disturbance, $\alpha = .76$; negative relationships, $\alpha = .79$; self-harm/impulsivity, $\alpha = .79$; and total borderline features, $\alpha = .78$. We also used a clinical cut-off score to approximate a diagnosis of BPD. Trull (1995) found that a score $\geq 38$ for total borderline was equivalent to a clinical diagnosis of BPD, measured by meeting diagnostic criteria for BPD in the Diagnostic Statistical Manual III-R (DSM-III-R). In the current sample, 34% of women scored at or above the cut-off for BPD.

**Results**

There was a significant group difference in women’s age with mothers in the opioid misuse group being older than women in the comparison group. Maternal age was significantly correlated with HCV such that being older was more likely to be associated with HCV. We therefore controlled for age in all analyses.

**Tests of Hypotheses**
To test whether women above the clinical cut-off score for total borderline features would be more likely to be opioid users (Hypothesis 1), we conducted a binomial logistic regression. On Step 1, we entered maternal age as a covariate and opioid use as the dependent variable. The model was significant and explained 12% of the variance (Nagelkerke $R^2$) in opioid use and correctly classified 80% of cases. On Step 2, we added the borderline features clinical cut-off variable. The model was again statistically significant, explained an additional 6% of the variance in opioid use, and correctly classified 76% of cases. As hypothesized, women above the clinical cut-off were more likely to be opioid users (prescribed and non-prescribed) than were individuals below the cut-off, with 2.83 times higher odds. See Table 2 for tests of significance and regression coefficients.

We then tested whether women’s borderline features would be associated with their opioid use severity (Hypothesis 2) with partial correlations controlling for maternal age. Analyses supported our hypothesis. Affective instability, identity disturbance, negative relationships, and self-harm/impulsivity were all significantly correlated with opioid use severity. See Table 3 for correlation coefficients and significance.

To test the hypothesis that women’s borderline features of self-harm/impulsivity and negative relationships would account for significant variance in opioid use severity over and above affective instability and identity disturbance (Hypothesis 3), we conducted a hierarchical linear regression. On Step 1, we entered age as a covariate. The overall model was significant. On Step 2, we added borderline features of affective instability and identity disturbance. The overall model was significant and accounted for a significant additional 8% of variance in opioid use severity. Neither affective instability nor identity disturbance accounted for significant variance. On Step 3, we added negative relationships and self-harm/impulsivity, which
accounted for an additional 8% of variance. In support of our hypothesis, both self-harm/impulsivity and negative relationships contributed significant variance in opioid use severity over and above affective instability and identity disturbance. See Table 4 for regression coefficients and tests of model significance.

We next tested the hypothesis that women above the clinical cut-off for total borderline features would be more likely to have HCV (Hypothesis 4) with a second binomial logistic regression. On Step 1, we entered maternal age as a covariate and HCV as the dependent variable. The model was significant and explained 15% of the variance (Nagelkerke $R^2$) in HCV and correctly classified 61% of cases. On Step 2, we added the clinical cut-off variable for borderline features. The model was again statistically significant, explained an additional 8% of the variance in opioid use, and correctly classified 67% of cases. As hypothesized, women above the clinical cut-off were more likely have HCV than were individuals below the cut-off, with 3.4 times higher odds. See Table 5 for tests of significance and regression coefficients.

To test the hypothesis that the borderline features of negative relationships and self-harm/impulsivity would contribute significant variance to HCV (Hypothesis 5), we conducted a third binomial logistic regression. On Step 1, we entered maternal age as a covariate and opioid use as the dependent variable. The model was significant and explained 15% of the variance (Nagelkerke $R^2$) in opioid use and correctly classified 61% of cases. On Step 2, we added the borderline features of negative relationships and self-harm/impulsivity. The model was again statistically significant, explained an additional 13% of the variance in HCV, and correctly classified 69% of cases. As hypothesized, negative relationships were associated with HCV with 1.14 higher odds, but contrary to hypothesis, self-harm/impulsivity was not. See Table 6 for tests of significance and regression coefficients.
Discussion

We examined relationships between borderline features and HCV in women who misused opioids in pregnancy and in women in high-risk pregnancies due to medical factors other than drug misuse. We found that women who scored above the cut-off for total borderline features associated with a diagnosis of BPD (Trull, 1995) were more likely to use opioids in pregnancy than women below the cut-off and were more likely to have HCV. The borderline features of affective instability, identity disturbance, negative relationships, and self-harm/impulsivity were all related to opioid use severity. However, in multivariate analyses, self-harm/impulsivity and negative relationships contributed to opioid use severity over and above affective instability and identity disturbance; and negative relationships specifically (but not self-harm/impulsivity as we had also hypothesized) were associated with HCV.

Implications for Primary Interventions

How might interventions target self-harm/impulsivity? One way would be to help pregnant women abstain from opioid misuse. Indeed, pregnant women who misuse opioids may be motivated to abstain for their own and their infants’ health, and to avoid the guilt and shame associated with NOWS (Cleveland & Bonugli, 2014). For some women, change may include tapering off opioids entirely during pregnancy thus avoiding NOWS (Bell et al., 2016). For others, change may include replacing illicit opioids with maintenance doses of prescribed opioids to reduce cravings. Either abstinence or medically assisted treatment would reduce self-harm/impulsivity in pregnant women.

How might interventions target negative relationships? In a randomized clinical trial, Dialectical Behavior Therapy (DBT; Linehan, 1993), which includes a module on interpersonal effectiveness, was more effective in individuals with BPD and co-morbid SUD than was
treatment by non-behavioral therapists who were nominated as experts in working with difficult patients (Harned et al., 2008). Furthermore, treatment focused on improving the ability to make sense of others and oneself in terms of mental states, termed reflective functioning (Bateman, Fonagy, & Allen, 2009) may also reduce negative relationships. In a randomized clinical trial, 18 months of reflective functioning-based treatment improved social and interpersonal functioning in women with BPD (Bateman & Fonagy, 2009). Furthermore, in a randomized clinical trial, mothers in treatment for SUD in the reflective functioning-based therapy condition improved their reflective functioning capacity, which improved relationships with their children age 11—60 months (Suchman et al., 2017). A combination of DBT and reflective functioning-based therapy might be ideal to target negative relationships (Edel, Raaff, Dimaggio, Buchheim, & Brüne, 2017).

**Implications for Preventive Interventions**

Interventions with pregnant women who misuse opioids may be too late to prevent HCV transmission to infants, or NOWS. Ideally, prevention of initiation of opioid misuse needs to take place prior to pregnancy. In pregnant women who misuse opioids 62% reported that their drug use originated following childhood maltreatment: 40% reported sexual abuse (half occurring before age 13), 18% reported physical abuse without sexual abuse, and 4% who reported verbal abuse (Towers et al., 2018). Addressing childhood maltreatment may be a fruitful target of preventive intervention.

In a statewide intervention for children who had experienced trauma, the Attachment, Self-Regulation, and Competency Intervention (Blaustein & Kinniburgh, 2010; Kinniburgh, Blaustein, Spinazzola, & Van der Kolk, 2005), Trauma Focused Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (Cohen, Mannarino, Kliethermes, & Murray, 2012), and, to a lesser degree, Child-Parent
Psychotherapy (Lieberman, Van Horn, & Ippen, 2005), all improved children’s behavior problems and post-traumatic stress disorder symptoms (Bartlett et al., 2018). Future research might assess initiation of drug misuse as an outcome measure for these interventions. Statewide interventions to address childhood trauma may reduce the rate of HCV, opioid misuse in pregnancy, and NOWS.

**Strengths and Limitations**

This was the first study to examine BPD and opioid use in a sample of pregnant women. Thirty-four percent of the women scored above the clinical cut-off score that is consistent with a diagnosis of BPD (Trull, 1995), which indicates significant pathology. We assessed opioid use using urine assays and records of prescribed opioids rather than depending on self-report, which likely would be inaccurate, for example, if women feared having their newborn removed from their care. However, the study design, sampling, and opioid misuse assessment, each had limitations. First, the study design was cross-sectional, so the direction of effects and bi-directionality remain unclear, for example, between borderline features and opioid misuse. Additionally, there were important covariates omitted that ideally would have been included. We did not control for the presence of a mood disorder (e.g., depression, bipolar disorder), other psychiatric conditions (e.g., anxiety), history of substance misuse, or risk-taking more generally. This greatly limited our ability to conclude that it was solely borderline features that were associated with opioid use and HCV. Second, our sample’s racial background was majority White and from low socio-economic backgrounds, limiting generalizability of findings to other populations. Third, even with urine assays and records of prescribed opioids it was not possible to definitively assess drug misuse, in part due to the short half-lives of opioid drugs (from 6-46
hours) and to the fact that other drugs (e.g., alcohol) that cannot be detected in urine after passing through the digestive system.

**Conclusion**

Misuse of opioids in pregnancy may have serious implications for women and for their infants. For example, even though NOWS is considered a short-term and treatable condition (ACOG, 2017) there may be long-term effects. For example, a large prospective study found that infants born with NOWS (87% of whose mothers were undergoing opioid medication-assisted treatment), had a significantly smaller head circumference than did infants whose mothers were not taking opioids, which was not accounted for by use of other drugs: 30.1% of infants had a head circumference less than or equal to the 10th percentile, and 8.2% less than or equal to the 3rd percentile (Towers et al., 2019). Because head circumference may serve as a proxy for brain size, more research is needed on long-term outcomes for these infants. Helping women to detoxify from opioids during pregnancy (Bell et al., 2016), or intervening to prevent opioid misuse in the first place following the experience of childhood trauma may better protect not only young women but also their infants.
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### Table 1

**Demographic and Gestation Differences between the Opioid User and High-risk Comparison Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maternal variable</th>
<th>Whole sample $(N = 93)$</th>
<th>Opioid $(n = 55)$</th>
<th>Comparison $(n = 38)$</th>
<th>Opioid vs. Comparison $t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>27.19 (4.26)</td>
<td>28.22 (4.37)</td>
<td>25.68 (3.64)</td>
<td>2.94*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gestation</td>
<td>26.81 (7.9)</td>
<td>27.56 (7.89)</td>
<td>25.68 (7.89)</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>10.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biracial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has partner</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving Medicaid</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.
Table 2

*Bivariate logistic regression predicting opioid use based on the borderline features cut-off, controlling for maternal age*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Nagelkerke $R^2$</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Odds Ratio</th>
<th>95% CI for Odds Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>8.49**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal age</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>7.53**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.05-1.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>4.60*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal age</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>8.43**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.06-1.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borderline features</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>4.30*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.06-7.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$
Table 3.

*Bivariate partial correlations between borderline features and opioid use severity in pregnant women, controlling for maternal age.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borderline features</th>
<th>Affective instability</th>
<th>Identity disturbance</th>
<th>Negative relationships</th>
<th>Self-harm/impulsivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opioid use severity</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05; ** p < .01
Table 4
Hierarchical linear regression testing the association between pregnant women’s borderline features and opioid use severity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>( \Delta R^2 )</th>
<th>( B )</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>( t )</th>
<th>( R^2 ) (adj.)</th>
<th>( F )</th>
<th>( df )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Maternal age</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>2.96**</td>
<td>.09(.08)</td>
<td>8.74**</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Maternal age</td>
<td>.08*</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>3.45*</td>
<td>.17(.14)</td>
<td>5.95**</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affective instability</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identity disturbance</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Maternal age</td>
<td>.08*</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>2.56*</td>
<td>.24(.20)</td>
<td>5.58***</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affective instability</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identity disturbance</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative relationships</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>2.01*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-harm/impulsivity</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>2.09*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \( p < .05 \); ** \( p < .001 \); *** \( p < .001 \).
Table 5

*Bivariate logistic regression predicting HCV based on the borderline features cut-off, controlling for maternal age*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nagelkerke $R^2$</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Odds Ratio</th>
<th>95% CI for Odds Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>11.44**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>9.74**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.07-1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>6.43*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>11.03**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.09-1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borderline features clinical cut-off</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>5.99*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.28-9.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$
Table 6

*Bivariate logistic regression predicting HCV from the borderline features of negative relationships and self-harm/impulsivity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Nagelkerke $R^2$</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Odds Ratio</th>
<th>95% CI for Odds Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>11.44**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal age</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>9.74**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.07-1.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>6.43*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal age</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>9.17**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.07-1.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative relationships</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>4.07*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00-1.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-harm/impulsivity</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.95-1.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$