

1 **Rasch Validation of the Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-being Scale (WEMWBS) in**
2 **Community-Dwelling Adults and in Adults with Stroke in the US**

3

4 Deng Wei¹, Carpentier Sydney¹, Blackwood Jena¹, Van de Winckel Ann*²

5

6 ¹ Division of Rehabilitation Science, Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, Medical School,
7 University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota, United States of America

8

9 ² Division of Physical Therapy, Division of Rehabilitation Science, Department of Rehabilitation
10 Medicine, Medical School, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota, United States of
11 America

12

13 * Corresponding Author

14 Ann Van de Winckel, PhD, MSPT, PT

15 Division of Physical Therapy, Division of Rehabilitation Science, Department of Rehabilitation
16 Medicine, Medical School, University of Minnesota, 420 Delaware St SE (MMC 388), Rm 311,
17 Minneapolis, MN 55455. Phone: 612-625-1191; Fax: 612-625-4274

18 E-mail: avandewi@umn.edu

19

20

21

22

23

24 **Abstract**

25 **Background:** With the recent ongoing global COVID-19 pandemic and political divide in the
26 United States (US), there is an urgent need to address the soaring mental well-being problems
27 and to promote positive well-being. The Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-being Scale
28 (WEMWBS) measures the positive aspects of mental health. Previous studies confirmed its
29 construct validity, reliability, and unidimensionality with confirmatory factor analysis. Four
30 studies have performed a Rasch analysis on the WEMWBS, but none of them tested adults in the
31 US. The goals of our study are to use Rasch analysis to validate the WEMWBS in the general
32 US population and in adults with stroke.

33 **Methods:** We recruited community-dwelling adults and adults with chronic stroke with upper
34 limb hemiplegia or hemiparesis. We used the Rasch Unidimensional Measurement Model
35 (RUMM) 2030 software to evaluate item and person fit, targeting, person separation reliability
36 (PSR), and differential item functioning (DIF) for sample sizes of at least 200 persons in each
37 subgroup.

38 **Results:** After deleting two items, the WEMBS analyzed in our 553 community-dwelling adults
39 (average age 51.22 ± 17.18 years; 358 women) showed an excellent $PSR=0.91$ as well as person
40 and item fit, but the items are too easy for this population (person mean location= 2.17 ± 2.00).
41 There was no DIF for sex, mental health, or practicing breathing exercises. In the 37 adults with
42 chronic stroke (average age 58 ± 13 ; 11 women) the WEMWBS had a good item and person fit,
43 and $PSR=0.92$, but the items were too easy for this group as well (person mean
44 location= 3.13 ± 2.00).

45 **Conclusions:** The WEMWBS had good item and person fit but the targeting is off when used in
46 community-dwelling adults and adults with stroke in the US. Adding more difficult items might

47 improve the targeting and capture a broader range of positive mental wellbeing in both
48 populations. Our pilot data in adults with stroke needs to be confirmed in a larger sample size.

49

50 **Keywords**

51 Mental Well-being, Stroke, Healthy Volunteers, Community, Rasch, Validation Studies

52

53

54 **Background**

55 In recent years, the global COVID-19 pandemic has resulted in overworked health care workers,
56 and many adults facing serious health problems, death of loved ones, and fear of losing their
57 job.[1] Coupled with a rise in violence caused by a political divide, the United States (US) has
58 seen a 10% increase in prevalence of adults with serious psychological distress in 2020
59 compared to 2018.[2] Developing positive mental well-being and resilience has therefore
60 become critically important.

61
62 Positive mental well-being relates to feelings of happiness and life satisfaction (i.e., hedonic
63 aspects) as well as purpose of life, full functioning of the person with a focus on realizing one's
64 own abilities and goals, being productive, coping with daily life stresses, and contributing to the
65 community (i.e., eudaimonic aspects of life).[3, 4] Purpose in life or meaning plays an important
66 role in addressing stress, trauma, and adversity.[1]

67
68 The Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-being Scale (WEMWBS), developed by Tennant *et al.*
69 (2007), assesses positive mental health, covering both hedonic and eudaimonic aspects of
70 positive well-being.[3] The internal consistency reflected by Cronbach's α was 0.89 and 0.91, in
71 students and adults, respectively. Confirmatory factor analysis supported the unidimensionality
72 of the scale.[5] WEMWBS has good high test-retest reliability ($r=0.83$), good content validity,
73 moderately high correlations with other mental health scales, and lower correlations with scales
74 measuring overall health.[6]

75

76 Aside from these psychometric properties obtained with classical test theory (CTT), four studies
77 have investigated the structural validity of the WEMWBS in various countries with Rasch
78 analysis. Rasch Measurement Theory is based on a predictive model stating that a person with a
79 higher ability on a certain trait should have a higher probability of obtaining a higher score on
80 the scale.[6–9] The Rasch analysis ranks the item difficulty hierarchically from easy to difficult
81 on the same logit scale as the person’s ability.[10–12] It also transforms an ordinal scale to an
82 interval scale providing more measurement precision.[10–12]

83
84 The four studies that analyzed the WEMWBS with Rasch Measurement Theory obtained varied
85 results in terms of targeting and number of items that remained after the Rasch analysis was
86 completed.[6–9] Of note, the data on the scale was acquired in different countries with possibly
87 inherent differences in culture, which could at least partially explain this variation in results.
88 Stewart-Brown *et al.* (2009) [6] analyzed data in adults in Scotland. They obtained item fit and
89 good targeting (person mean location -0.48 ± 1.22). Bartram *et al.* (2013) [9] analyzed data of
90 veterinarians in the UK and presented a short 7-item unidimensional scale that fit the model,
91 called the Short Warwick Edinburgh Mental Well-Being Scale (SWEMWBS). However, the
92 items were too easy for this group (i.e., person mean location 1.15 ± 1.56). Houghton *et al.* (2015)
93 [7] reported on a 10-item scale in adults in Western Australia with 3 misfitting items. Targeting
94 was not reported. Finally, Wicaksono *et al.* (2021) [8] reported on the original 14-item scale with
95 no misfitting items but the items were too easy for adults in Indonesia (i.e., person mean location
96 2.67 ± 1.56). To our knowledge, there are no studies on WEMWBS data in the US population.

97

98 Aside from mental health problems in the general adult population, adults who experience a
99 stroke are particularly vulnerable to depression, with approximately 30% of stroke survivors
100 experiencing post-stroke depression at any given time.[13] Post-stroke depression is related to
101 poor rehabilitation outcomes. In contrast, an increase in positive emotions over a 3-month period
102 post-stroke is associated with an increased likelihood of functional recovery, which may lead to
103 improved quality of life.[14, 15] Therefore, it is important to measure positive mental well-being
104 in people with stroke and to assess whether WEMWBS would be a good measure for this
105 population, but this has not yet been investigated.

106

107 Therefore, our first aim of this study is to assess the structural validity of the WEMWBS with
108 Rasch in community-dwelling adults in the US. We will compare our findings with prior Rasch
109 results in other countries. Our second aim is to perform a pilot Rasch validation on the
110 WEMWBS in adults with chronic stroke.

111

112 **Methods**

113

114 **Participants**

115 For this cross-sectional study, we recruited participants at the Minnesota State Fair and Highland
116 Fest and through volunteer sampling using research fliers and study postings on relevant
117 websites. We also emailed the flier to volunteers who expressed interest in research from the
118 Brain Body Mind Lab at the University of Minnesota. Recruitment occurred from September 27,
119 2017 till August 12, 2020. For both community-dwelling adults and adults with stroke, we
120 included adults between 18-99 years of age, English speaking, and able to consent. Additionally,
121 adults with stroke were included if they had an ischemic or hemorrhagic stroke and were

122 medically stable. We excluded participants with stroke who had severe cognitive impairments
123 (Mini-Mental State Exam-brief version, <13/16)[16], severe aphasia[17] or apraxia[18], or other
124 medical conditions that would preclude participation in the study.

125
126 All community-dwelling adults gave verbal consent and were quizzed on the comprehension of
127 the content of the consent form through the University of California, San Diego Brief
128 Assessment of Capacity to Consent (UBACC).[19] The WEMWBS questionnaire was completed
129 either on a tablet (at Minnesota State Fair and Highland Fest) or on their personal computer at
130 home. All completed questionnaires were stored on the secure UMN REDCap platform. Adults
131 with chronic stroke signed consent and completed the WEMWBS questionnaire on paper as part
132 of a new scale development research study in the Brain Body Mind Lab. The studies were
133 approved by the University of Minnesota's Institutional Review Board (IRB# STUDY00005849
134 and STUDY00000821) and they were in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki.

135
136 **Main outcome measures**
137 The Warwick questionnaire covers positive aspects of mental health. All 14 items have a scoring
138 range from “0-None of the time” to “4-All of the time”. A higher score on each item indicates a
139 more positive attitude towards life. We collected demographic information, and whether
140 participants currently practiced mindfulness, breathing exercises, or body awareness exercises
141 (e.g., Yoga, Qigong, Pilates). We inquired whether they had current pain conditions or current
142 mental health conditions.

143
144 **Statistical analysis**

145 Following the recently accepted guidelines for reporting Rasch analyses, we report on structural
146 validity and unidimensionality with overall fit, item and person fit, examining the presence of
147 reversed thresholds, person separation reliability (PSR), differential item functioning (DIF),
148 principal components analysis of residuals (PCAR), targeting, floor, and ceiling effect.[11, 12]
149 Unidimensionality refers to the fact that all items should measure one construct. Item-trait
150 interaction measures the overall fit of the scale to the Rasch model using Chi-square statistics. A
151 non-significant *p*-value indicates the scale fits the model. However a large sample size can
152 influence this *p*-value even when all items fit the model. Individual person and item fit are
153 reported through Chi-square statistics. Residuals greater than 2.5 or smaller than 2.5 indicate
154 item redundancy and item misfit, respectively.[10] Item fit analysis takes into account
155 Bonferroni corrections for multiple comparisons.[20] Disordered thresholds of scoring categories
156 can be corrected by merging adjacent categories in order to improve fit to the model.[10, 20]
157 PSR evaluates how well individuals or groups of different ability levels can be distinguished
158 from each other.[21] DIF occurs when the hierarchies of items are significantly different between
159 two sample subgroups (e.g., men versus women) for sample sizes of at least 200 persons in each
160 subgroup. DIF is calculated with an analysis of variance (ANOVA) with Bonferroni
161 correction.[20] Further evidence of unidimensionality can be evaluated with the Principal
162 Component Analysis of Residuals (PCAR), which refers to the extent to which covariance in the
163 residuals is random and not explained underlying constructs than the one that is being
164 measured.[10, 22] In that case, the expected eigenvalue is less than 2, and the percent variance
165 explained by the first component is less than 10%. If those criteria are not met, then dependent *t*-
166 tests between the 2 subsets of items with positive and negative loadings on the first residual
167 component are performed. We would confirm unidimensionality if less than 5% of these tests are

168 significant. A scale is well-targeted when the person mean location is between -0.5 and 0.5
169 logits, and thus matching the average difficulty of the items.[23] Floor and ceiling effects need to
170 be reported when at least 15% of the sample obtains a minimum or maximum score of the
171 scale.[24] We used Rasch Unidimensional Measurement Model (RUMM) 2030 software
172 (RUMM Laboratory, Perth, WA, Australia) for all Rasch Measurement Theory analyses.

173

174 **Results**

175 We recruited 553 community-dwelling adults and 37 adults with stroke. The characteristics of
176 the demographic and clinical information of all participants is presented in *Table 1*.

177

178 **Rasch Measurement Theory**

179 The iteration analysis displays the step-by-step approach taken for the Rasch analysis
180 (*Additional file 1*). The main results are described below.

181 For our first analysis in community-dwelling Americans, none of the 14 items displayed
182 disordered thresholds. Two items were misfitting: item 1 “*I have been feeling optimistic about*
183 *the future*” and item 5 “*I have had energy to spare.*” After deleting items 1 and 5, all items fit the
184 model and only 2.71% of persons were misfitting. The hierarchy of the item difficulty is
185 presented in *Figure 1*, with the easiest items starting at the top and the hardest items at the
186 bottom. The item logit location and fit statistics are presented in *Table 2*. There was no floor or
187 ceiling effect, but the person mean location \pm standard deviation was 2.17 ± 2.00 logits, meaning
188 that the items were too easy for this population (*Figure 2*). The PSR was 0.91, indicating that we
189 can distinguish individuals with different positive mental health levels. PCAR’s eigenvalue was
190 2.04 with 16.97% variance explained by the first component. The paired t-test revealed that

191 7.59% of the persons had significantly different logit locations on the two subtests. These results
192 presume the existence of two dimensions in the scale. We calculated DIF for sex (men; women),
193 mental health conditions (yes; no), and current practice of breathing exercises (yes; no) because
194 they all had subgroup samples sizes of at least 200 persons each. No DIF was found.

195

196 **Fig.1. Item threshold map in community-dwelling adults in the US**

197 **Legend:** The item threshold map shows the hierarchy of the item difficulty levels, with the
198 easiest item on top (item 11 “*I’ve been able to make up my own mind about things*”) and the
199 hardest item at the bottom (item 3 “*I’ve been feeling relaxed*”). The horizontal logit ruler
200 demonstrates the person's ability level of their positive mental health.

201 **Fig.2. Person-item threshold distribution in community-dwelling adults in the US**

202 **Legend:** The horizontal logit ruler represents both item difficulty and person ability. The pink
203 histograms show the frequencies of the person's ability level in terms of positive mental well-
204 being. A higher logit value indicates the person has a higher level of positive mental well-being.
205 The blue histograms represent the frequencies of item difficulty level, and the items are
206 organized from the easiest on the left to the hardest on the right.

207

208 We also tested if the fit and unidimensionality would improve if we deleted items to match the 7-
209 item SWEMWBS mentioned in previous studies. There were no misfitting items. The PCAR’s
210 eigenvalue was 1.86 with 26.53% variance explained by the first component. The paired t-test
211 revealed that 8.50% of the person logit pairs had significantly different locations. Additionally,
212 the PSR dropped from 0.92 to 0.82, which would only allow researchers and clinicians to make
213 group decisions, rather than individual decision-making.[25, 26] Moreover, the items were still

214 too easy (person mean location 1.88 ± 1.71). We therefore do not recommend using the 7-items
215 scale for clinical use. We recommend that the targeting first be solved before it can be used in
216 the clinic or for research and therefore, we do not provide a revised scoring sheet or score-to-
217 measure table for the 12-item revised scale.

218
219 Our pilot Rasch Measurement Theory analysis in adults with chronic stroke ($n=37$) revealed that
220 item 7 had reversed thresholds. After rescored item 7 to scoring categories [00123], all items fit
221 (**Table 3**) and there were no more reversed thresholds (**Figure 3**). Only 2.70% of the people were
222 misfitting. There was no floor or ceiling effect, and the WEMWBS had an excellent PSR of 0.92.
223 However, the person mean location was 3.13 ± 2.00 (**Figure 4**). Even though these results need to
224 be validated in a larger study, they seem to indicate that those items are also too easy for adults
225 with chronic stroke and very few participants choose the lowest category of “None of the time”
226 or “Rarely” (**Table 4**). The PCAR analysis revealed an eigenvalue of 2.61 with 18.65% percent
227 variance explained by the first component. The paired t-test resulted in 16.22% of pairs that had
228 significantly different person logit locations on the 2 subtests.

229

230 **Fig.3. Item threshold map in adults with chronic stroke**

231 **Legend:** The item threshold map shows the hierarchy of the item difficulty levels, with the
232 easiest item on top (item 7 “*I’ve been thinking clearly*”) and the hardest item at the bottom (item
233 5 “*I’ve had energy to spare*”). The horizontal logit ruler demonstrates the person’s ability level of
234 their positive mental health.

235 **Fig.4. Person-item threshold distribution in adults with chronic stroke**

236 **Legend:** The horizontal logit ruler represents both item difficulty and person ability. The pink
237 histograms show the frequencies of the person's ability level in terms of positive mental well-
238 being. A higher logit value indicates the person has a higher level of positive mental well-being.
239 The blue histograms represent the frequencies of item difficulty level, and the items are
240 organized from the easiest on the left to the hardest on the right.

241
242 Similar to above, we deleted items to match the 7-item SWEMWBS reported in prior studies.
243 After rescaling item 7 to scoring categories [00123], the eigenvalue of the PCAR was 1.79 with
244 25.51% variance explained by the first component, with paired t-tests showing that 5.41% of
245 pairs had significantly different person locations. This is very close to demonstrating the
246 unidimensionality of the scale. However, the PSR dropped to 0.81, which is not reliable enough
247 for individual decision-making. The person mean location remained high at 3.13 ± 1.84 indicating
248 that the items were too easy. Similar to above, we do not recommend using the 7-item scale. We
249 recommend solving the targeting, as well as validating our results in a larger sample, prior to
250 using the WEMWBS for clinical or research purposes in adults with stroke.

251
252 **Discussion**
253 The aims of this study were to investigate the structural validity of the WEMWBS in
254 community-dwelling adults as well as adults with stroke in the US. The WEMWBS shows good
255 item and person fit in both these groups. The main problem was the targeting, demonstrating that
256 the items were too easy for either group. These findings were consistent with the findings in all
257 other studies that reported on person mean locations with Rasch analysis, except for Stewart-
258 Brown et al. (2009), who reported good targeting.

259
260 Of note, item fit in the community-dwelling adult group was obtained after deleting misfitting
261 items 1 and 5. Deleting item 5 “*I’ve had energy to spare*” was consistent with earlier studies.[6,
262 7, 9] In Houghton et al. (2015) item 5 was deleted because DIF was identified for age, while item
263 5 demonstrated misfit in both Stewart-Brown *et al.* (2009) and Bartram *et al.* (2013). Item 1 “*I*
264 *have been feeling optimistic about the future*” was maintained in prior studies. During a
265 qualitative study on item comprehension of the WEMWBS, a focus group in Pakistan noticed
266 difficulties in answering “Feeling optimistic about the future”, because there is no translation for
267 “optimistic” in Pashtun.[27] Teenagers in Northern Ireland also expressed difficulty in answering
268 item 1.[28] We did not perform a qualitative analysis after this study and thus were unable to
269 identify the reason for misfit in our US groups. The PCAR analysis pointed to underlying
270 dimensions underneath positive mental health. The items that loaded positively on the first
271 principal component – items 4 “*I have been feeling interested in other people*”, 9 “*I have been*
272 *feeling close to other people*”, and 12 “*I have been feeling loved*”– all seemed to point to
273 positive feelings regarding interpersonal relationships. The items that loaded negatively on the
274 first principal component seem more related to eudaimonic aspects of life in terms of a person
275 feeling productive regarding their goals and feeling in control of their lives. These were items 6
276 “*I have been dealing with problems well*”, 7 “*I have been thinking clearly*”, and 8 “*I have been*
277 *feeling good about myself*”.

278
279 In our pilot Rasch analysis in adults with chronic stroke, item fit was obtained after rescoring
280 item 7. The items were too easy for this group as well. Our results in adults with chronic stroke
281 are consistent with Ostir *et al.* (2008), who found that a third of adults reported high levels of

282 positive emotions after 3 months of stroke.[15] The positively loaded items on the first principal
283 component were the same as in the community-dwelling adults. The negatively loaded items
284 were items 1 “*I’ve been feeling optimistic about the future*”, 5 “*I’ve had energy to spare*”, 8
285 “*I’ve been feeling good about myself*”, and 10 “*I’ve been feeling confident*”. Those items seem
286 to relate to being in control of one’s life after a stroke. It makes sense that the positive feelings
287 about interpersonal relationships might point to something different than having control over
288 one’s life.

289
290 Even though studies evaluating the WEMWBS were conducted in different countries with
291 inherent differences in culture, it is noteworthy that across several studies, including our own
292 studies, items 11 “*I’ve been able to make up my own mind about things*” and 7 “*I have been*
293 *thinking clearly*” were consistently rated as the easiest items, whereas items 5 “*I’ve had energy*
294 *to spare*” and 3 “*I’ve been feeling relaxed*” were consistently rated as the hardest items.[7, 9]

295

296 **Conclusions**

297 The WEMWBS demonstrated good item fit and person fit in a US population of community-
298 dwelling adults and adults with stroke. However, the items are too easy, which is a consistent
299 finding across the majority of WEMWBS Rasch studies performed in different countries. Thus,
300 including more difficult items in a next iteration of the scale could help solve the targeting.

301 Finally, further studies with larger sample sizes should be performed in adults with stroke, and
302 perhaps include adults with acute and subacute stroke, to validate our preliminary findings.

303

304 **List of abbreviations**

305 WEMWBS: Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-being Scale

306 SWEMWBS: Short Warwick Edinburgh Mental Well-Being Scale

307 RUMM: Rasch Unidimensional Measurement Model

308 UBACC: University of California, San Diego Brief Assessment of Capacity to Consent

309 PSR: Person separation reliability

310 DIF: Differential item functioning

311 PCAR: Principal components analysis of residuals

312

313 **Declaration**

314 **Ethics and approval and consent to participate**

315 The study was approved by the University of Minnesota's Institutional Review Board (IRB#

316 STUDY00005849 and STUDY00000821) and the study was in accordance with the Declaration

317 of Helsinki. All of the healthy adults agreed with study consent and they were quizzed on the

318 comprehension of the content of the consent form through the University of California, San

319 Diego Brief Assessment of Capacity to Consent (UBACC).

320

321 **Consent for publication**

322 N/A

323

324 **Availability of data and materials**

325 The dataset(s) supporting the conclusions of this article is(are) available in the Data Repository

326 for U of M (DRUM), <https://doi.org/10.13020/jdfb-pn26>

327

328 **Competing interests**

329 There is no financial competing interest in this study.

330

331 **Funding**

332 The research was supported by the National Institutes of Health's National Center for Advancing

333 Translational Sciences grant UL1TR002494. The content is solely the responsibility of the

334 authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health's

335 National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences. The funders had no role in study design,

336 data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

337

338 **Authors' contributions**

339 All authors contributed substantially to parts of the manuscript, and critically revised it for

340 content, approved the final version, and agreed to be accountable for the accuracy and integrity

341 of this work. Specific contributions include:

342 ● Conception or design of the work: AVDW

343 ● Acquisition and analysis of evidence: AVDW, WD

344 ● Interpretation of the evidence: AVDW, WD, SC, JB

345

346 **Acknowledgements**

347 We appreciate all the participants who have participated in the study, and the research volunteers

348 who have helped with data collection. Our profound gratitude goes to Marc Noël for the critical

349 review of the manuscript.

350

351 **Table 1. Demographic and clinical characteristic of participants by group**

	Community-dwelling adults (n=533)	Adults with chronic stroke (n=37)
Age (years, Mean±SD)	51.22±17.18	57.97±12.97
Years post-stroke (Mean±SD)	N/A	3.76±2.82
Ischemic/hemorrhagic stroke (n)	N/A	29/8
Sex (n)		
Male	194	26
Female	358	11
Other	1	0
Ethnicity (n)		
Hispanic or Latino	8	0
Not Hispanic or Latino	545	37
Racial background (n)		

American Indian or Alaska Native	2	0
Asian	30	2
Black/ African American	11	1
Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0
White	491	31
Multi-racial	10	2
Other	9	1
Pain (n)	113	19
Mental health conditions (n)	230	3
Current breathing exercise (n)	225	15
Current mindfulness exercise (n)	181	N/A
Current body awareness training (n)	180	N/A

352 *Legend: N/A = not assessed*

353

354 **Table 2. Item fit statistics of the WEMWBS in community-dwelling adults in the US**

Item number	Item descriptions	Item location (logits)	SE	Fit Residuals	<i>p</i>-value
Item 2	I've been feeling useful	0.02	0.07	1.90	0.17
Item 3	I've been feeling relaxed	0.93	0.07	2.72	0.01
Item 4	I've been feeling interested in other people	-0.03	0.07	1.24	0.21
Item 6	I've been dealing with problems well	-0.18	0.08	-0.13	0.84
Item 7	I've been thinking clearly	-0.18	0.08	-0.37	0.84
Item 8	I've been feeling good about myself	-0.11	0.07	-4.92	0.003
Item 9	I've been feeling close to other people	0.03	0.07	-0.83	0.71
Item 10	I've been feeling confident	0.35	0.07	-5.47	0.002
Item 11	I've been able to make up my own mind about things	-0.56	0.07	2.13	0.05

Item 12	I've been feeling loved	-0.12	0.07	1.18	0.04
Item 13	I've been interested in new things	-0.25	0.07	-0.84	0.21
Item 14	I've been feeling cheerful	0.08	0.07	-4.65	0.04

355 **Legend:** SE = Standard Error

356 **Table 3. Item fit statistics of the WEMWBS in adults with chronic stroke**

Item number	Item descriptions	Item location (logits)	SE	Fit Residuals	<i>p</i>-value
Item 1	I've been feeling optimistic about the future	-0.35	0.27	-0.12	0.96
Item 2	I've been feeling useful	0.53	0.27	0.62	0.66
Item 3	I've been feeling relaxed	0.09	0.28	0.57	0.97
Item 4	I've been feeling interested in other people	-0.11	0.26	0.69	0.54
Item 5	I've had energy to spare	3.24	0.27	1.02	0.20
Item 6	I've been dealing with problems well	-0.27	0.30	0.30	0.81
Item 7	I've been thinking clearly	-0.71	0.30	2.02	0.001
Item 8	I've been feeling good about myself	-0.21	0.29	-0.09	0.82

Item 9	I've been feeling close to other people	0.005	0.29	0.34	0.79
Item 10	I've been feeling confident	-0.11	0.28	-0.78	0.51
Item 11	I've been able to make up my own mind about things	-0.52	0.25	-0.01	0.54
Item 12	I've been feeling loved	-0.60	0.26	0.14	0.70
Item 13	I've been interested in new things	-0.49	0.24	0.18	0.41
Item 14	I've been feeling cheerful	-0.49	0.27	-0.73	0.68

357 **Legend:** SE = Standard Error

358 **Table 4. Frequency of scoring category responses per item in adults with chronic stroke**

Item number	Item description	0 None of the time	1 Rarely	2 Some of the time	3 Often	4 All of the time
Item 1	I've been feeling optimistic about the future	0	2	9	16	10
Item 2	I've been feeling useful	0	5	13	15	4
Item 3	I've been feeling relaxed	0	3	15	13	6
Item 4	I've been feeling interested in other people	0	2	7	17	11
Item 5	I've had energy to spare	1	7	16	12	1
Item 6	I've been dealing with problems well	0	1	14	14	8
Item 7	I've been thinking clearly	0	0	10	16	11
Item 8	I've been feeling good about myself	0	1	10	16	10

Item 9	I've been feeling close to other people	0	1	9	17	10
Item 10	I've been feeling confident	0	2	11	15	9
Item 11	I've been able to make up my own mind about things	0	1	6	12	18
Item 12	I've been feeling loved	0	1	5	12	19
Item 13	I've been interested in new things	0	3	6	13	15
Item 14	I've been feeling cheerful	0	2	7	16	12

359

360

361 **REFERENCES**

- 362 1. Waters L, Algoe SB, Dutton J, et al (2021) Positive psychology in a pandemic: buffering,
363 bolstering, and building mental health. *J Posit Psychol* 1–21
- 364 2. McGinty EE, Presskreischer R, Han H, Barry CL (2020) Psychological Distress and
365 Loneliness Reported by US Adults in 2018 and April 2020. *JAMA* 324:93–94
- 366 3. Ryan RM, Deci EL (2001) On happiness and human potentials: a review of research on
367 hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annu Rev Psychol* 52:141–166
- 368 4. Hervas G, Vazquez CL (2013) Construction and Validation of a Measure of Integrative
369 Well-Being in Seven Languages: The Pemberton Happiness Index.(PHI); Copyright:
370 Creative Commons License.
- 371 5. Tennant R, Hiller L, Fishwick R, Platt S, Joseph S, Weich S, Parkinson J, Secker J, Stewart-
372 Brown S (2007) The Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-being Scale (WEMWBS):
373 development and UK validation. *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 5:63
- 374 6. Stewart-Brown S, Tennant A, Tennant R, Platt S, Parkinson J, Weich S (2009) Internal
375 construct validity of the Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-being Scale (WEMWBS): a
376 Rasch analysis using data from the Scottish Health Education Population Survey. *Health*
377 *Qual Life Outcomes* 7:15
- 378 7. Houghton S, Wood L, Marais I, Rosenberg M, Ferguson R, Pettigrew S (2017) Positive
379 Mental Well-Being: A Validation of a Rasch-Derived Version of the Warwick-Edinburgh
380 Mental Well-Being Scale. *Assessment* 24:371–386
- 381 8. [No title]. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Bambang-Sumintono/publication/352493582_Internal_Validation_of_the_Warwick-Edinburgh_Mental_Wellbeing_Scale_Rasch_Analysis_in_the_Indonesian_Context/links/60cbf3afa6fdcc01d47dd288/Internal-Validation-of-the-Warwick-Edinburgh-Mental-Wellbeing-Scale-Rasch-Analysis-in-the-Indonesian-Context.pdf. Accessed 19 Feb 2022
- 386 9. Bartram DJ, Sinclair JM, Baldwin DS (2013) Further validation of the Warwick-Edinburgh
387 Mental Well-being Scale (WEMWBS) in the UK veterinary profession: Rasch analysis.
388 *Qual Life Res* 22:379–391
- 389 10. Tennant A, Conaghan PG (2007) The Rasch measurement model in rheumatology: what is
390 it and why use it? When should it be applied, and what should one look for in a Rasch
391 paper? *Arthritis Care Res* 57:1358–1362
- 392 11. Van de Winckel A, Kozlowski AJ, Johnston MV, Weaver J, Grampurohit N, Terhorst L, et
393 al. Reporting Guideline for RULER: Rasch Reporting Guideline for Rehabilitation
394 Research – Explanation & Elaboration manuscript. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2022.
395 doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2022.03.019

- 396 12. Mallinson T, Kozlowski AJ, Johnston MV, Weaver J, Terhorst L, Grampurohit N, et al. A.
397 Rasch Reporting Guideline for Rehabilitation Research (RULER): The RULER Statement.
398 Arch Phys Med Rehabil. 2022. doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2022.03.013.
- 399 13. Hackett ML, Pickles K (2014) Part I: frequency of depression after stroke: an updated
400 systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies. Int J Stroke 9:1017–1025
- 401 14. Seale GS, Berges I-M, Ottenbacher KJ, Ostir GV (2010) Change in positive emotion and
402 recovery of functional status following stroke. Rehabilitation Psychology 55:33–39
- 403 15. Ostir GV, Berges I-M, Ottenbacher ME, Clow A, Ottenbacher KJ (2008) Associations
404 between positive emotion and recovery of functional status following stroke. Psychosom
405 Med 70:404–409
- 406 16. Folstein MF, Folstein SE, McHugh PR (1975) “Mini-mental state”: a practical method for
407 grading the cognitive state of patients for the clinician. J Psychiatr Res 12:189–198
- 408 17. Azuar C, Leger A, Arbizu C, Henry-Amar F, Chomel-Guillaume S, Samson Y (2013) The
409 Aphasia Rapid Test: an NIHSS-like aphasia test. J Neurol 260:2110–2117
- 410 18. Vanbellingen T, Kersten B, Van Hemelrijk B, Van de Winckel A, Bertschi M, Müri R, De
411 Weerd W, Bohlhalter S (2010) Comprehensive assessment of gesture production: a new
412 test of upper limb apraxia (TULIA). Eur J Neurol 17:59–66
- 413 19. Jeste DV, Palmer BW, Appelbaum PS, Golshan S, Glorioso D, Dunn LB, Kim K, Meeks T,
414 Kraemer HC (2007) A new brief instrument for assessing decisional capacity for clinical
415 research. Arch Gen Psychiatry 64:966–974
- 416 20. Uddin MN, Islam FMA (2019) Psychometric evaluation of an interview-administered
417 version of the WHOQOL-BREF questionnaire for use in a cross-sectional study of a rural
418 district in Bangladesh: an application of Rasch analysis. BMC Health Serv Res 19:216
- 419 21. Reliability and separation of measures. <https://www.winsteps.com/winman/reliability.htm>.
420 Accessed 19 Feb 2022
- 421 22. Dimensionality: contrasts & variances.
422 <https://www.winsteps.com/winman/principalcomponents.htm>. Accessed 19 Feb 2022
- 423 23. Displacement measures. <https://www.winsteps.com/winman/displacement.htm>. Accessed
424 19 Feb 2022
- 425 24. McHorney CA, Tarlov AR (1995) Individual-patient monitoring in clinical practice: are
426 available health status surveys adequate? Qual Life Res 4:293–307
- 427 25. Mallinson T, Schepens Niemiec SL, Carlson M, Leland N, Vigen C, Blanchard J, Clark F
428 (2014) Development and validation of the activity significance personal evaluation
429 (ASPEn) scale. Aust Occup Ther J 61:384–393


- 430 26. Kerlinger FN, Lee HB (2000) Foundations of behavioral research (4: e uppl.). Belmont,
431 CA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning
- 432 27. Taggart F, Friede T, Weich S, Clarke A, Johnson M, Stewart-Brown S (2013) Cross cultural
433 evaluation of the Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-being Scale (WEMWBS) --a mixed
434 methods study. Health Qual Life Outcomes 11:27
- 435 28. Lloyd K, Devine P (2012) Psychometric properties of the Warwick–Edinburgh Mental
436 Well-being Scale (WEMWBS) in Northern Ireland. Journal of Mental Health 21:257–263

	Item No	Recommendation	Page No
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	1
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	2-3
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	4-6
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	6
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	6
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	6
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	6-7
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	7
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	7
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	7
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	N/A
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	N/A
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	7-8
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	N/A
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	N/A
		(d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	N/A
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	N/A
Results			
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	N/A
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	N/A
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	N/A
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	9
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	N/A

Outcome data	Report number of outcome events or summary measures	Table 2.
		Table 3. Table 4. Additional file.
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included (b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized (c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses
Discussion		
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results
Other information		
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based

*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.




Person-Item Threshold Distribution


(Grouping Set to Interval Length of 0.50 making 26 Groups)


PERSONS

	No.	Mean	SD
Total	1553	2.167	2.004



ITEMS






**Disordered threshold

Person-Item Threshold Distribution

(Grouping Set to Interval Length of 0.50 making 36 Groups)

PERSONS



ITEMS

Frequency

