# Development of a novel patient-reported mental wellbeing scale for patients with chronic gastroduodenal symptoms: The Alimetry® Gut-Brain Wellbeing Survey

Mikaela Law[1,2], Isabella Pickering[2,3], Gayl Humphrey[1], Gabrielle Sebaratnam[2], Gabriel Schamberg[2], Katie Simpson[4], Chris Varghese[1], Peng Du[2,5], Charlotte Daker[2,6], I-Hsuan Huang[7], Armen Gharibans[1,2,5], Greg O'Grady[1,2,5], Christopher N. Andrews[2,8], Stefan Calder[1,2*]

[1] The Department of Surgery, The University of Auckland, New Zealand
[2] Alimetry Ltd., Auckland, New Zealand
[3] The Department of Psychological Medicine, The University of Auckland, New Zealand
[4] The Department of General Surgery, Auckland City Hospital, New Zealand
[5] Auckland Bioengineering Institute, The University of Auckland, New Zealand
[6] The Department of Gastroenterology, Te Whatu Ora - Waitematā, New Zealand
[7] Translational Research Center for Gastrointestinal Disorders (TARGID), University of Leuven, Belgium
[8] The Division of Gastroenterology, Cumming School of Medicine, University of Calgary, Canada

***Corresponding Author:**
Dr Stefan Calder,
Department of Surgery,
The University of Auckland,
Auckland, New Zealand
stefan.calder@auckland.ac.nz

**Data availability statement:** The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author, upon reasonable request.

**Funding statement:** This study is funded by a New Zealand Health Research Council Programme Grant 3715588.

**Conflicts of interest disclosure:** GOG, AG and PD hold intellectual property and grants in gastric electrophysiology and are Directors of University of Auckland spin-out companies (GOG: Alimetry Ltd., Insides Company; AG: Alimetry Ltd.; PD: FlexiMap). ML, IP, GS, GS, CD, CNA, and SC are members of Alimetry Ltd. The remaining authors have no relevant conflicts to declare.

## Abstract

**Background:** Patients with chronic gastroduodenal symptoms often experience psychological comorbidity, highlighting the bidirectional relationship between psychological factors and gastrointestinal symptoms. Consequently, it is recommended that clinicians routinely evaluate the mental wellbeing of these patients. However, a general mental wellbeing scale has yet to be developed for this patient population. This research describes the mixed-method process used to develop a novel mental wellbeing scale for patients with chronic gastroduodenal symptoms, the Alimetry® Gut-Brain Wellbeing (AGBW) Survey.

**Methods:** A patient-centred co-development process was implemented in three phases. In Phase 1, the most relevant concepts for this patient population were selected from existing mental health scales, using data collected from 79 patients and 50 healthy controls. In Phase 2, an interdisciplinary panel of experts generated scale items based on the identified concepts. Lastly, in Phase 3, the scale underwent pre-testing with external gastroenterologists (n=9), health psychologists (n=3), and patients (n=12). Feedback was incorporated through multiple rounds to refine the scale.

**Results:** The AGBW Survey comprises a patient preface, 10 close-ended questions, and a final optional open-ended question. This multidimensional scale can be used to assess general mental wellbeing, alongside specific subscales relating to depression, stress, and anxiety.

**Conclusions:** The AGBW Survey is a brief, novel scale developed to assess mental wellbeing in patients with chronic gastroduodenal symptoms. It serves as a valuable tool to complement physiological tests and has the potential to guide psychological referrals, inform multidisciplinary management, and evaluate treatment outcomes. Psychometric validation of the scale is currently underway.


**Keywords:** functional gastroduodenal disorders; disorders of gut-brain interaction; psychometrics; mental health; anxiety; depression; stress.

## Introduction

Disorders of gut-brain interaction (DGBIs), formerly known as functional gastrointestinal disorders (FGIDs), are a significant global health concern due to their rising prevalence and high degree of healthcare costs and utilisation [1–3]. In particular, chronic gastroduodenal symptoms, including those experienced in functional dyspepsia, gastroparesis, and chronic nausea and vomiting syndrome, afflict more than 10% of the adult global population and impart significant quality of life, economic and healthcare burden [1,4,5].

Growing evidence shows a bidirectional relationship between gastrointestinal symptoms and psychological factors. Psychological comorbidities are common in patients with chronic gastroduodenal symptoms, and stress, anxiety, and depression have been found to trigger and exacerbate gastroduodenal symptoms [6–12]. The gut-brain axis, a complex neurohormonal pathway that facilitates communication between the brain and the gastrointestinal tract, plays a crucial role in this association [6,13–15]. Psychosocial factors are also significant determinants of treatment adherence, efficacy, healthcare utilisation, and costs [11,16]. Psychological interventions and neuromodulators have the potential to improve mental wellbeing and gastrointestinal symptoms in these patients [12,17−20]. Therefore, early identification and treatment of psychological comorbidities are crucial for significant improvements in symptoms and quality of life.

The growing recognition of the gut-brain axis and the adoption of a biopsychosocial framework have led to the recommendation of psychological assessments as a critical part of the standard care for managing chronic gastroduodenal symptoms [3,6,11,21]. Clinicians routinely ask mental wellbeing questions when evaluating patients with various gastric disorders; however, these questions are often asked informally, relying on the clinician's own clinical experience, with standardised psychometrics not routinely used [22–24]. Although validated and widely used mental health questionnaires exist, these have limitations when used with patients with chronic gastroduodenal symptoms. For example, many questionnaires assessing depression and anxiety include questions on physical symptomatology as indicators for depression, such as reduced appetite and disrupted sleep. However, in patients with chronic gastroduodenal symptoms, these physical manifestations may be primarily related to their gastrointestinal symptom experience. Therefore, these questions may not be a valid reflection of their mental health, potentially resulting in an overestimation of psychological concerns among these patients and inaccurate formulations of their symptomatology, which can lead to ineffective management [11].

To date, no general mental wellbeing scale has been developed and validated among patients with chronic gastroduodenal symptoms. The ongoing improvement and validation of psychometrics within novel contexts and samples is recommended to increase the dependability and validity of the results while reducing patient burden and costs [25]. It is also recommended that a scale's validity be relative to the population and use context [26]. Therefore, there is a need to develop a brief self-report scale specifically designed for use in patients with chronic gastroduodenal symptoms, to ensure valid and reliable assessments of mental wellbeing in these patients.

Here we describe the steps used to develop a novel mental wellbeing scale, the Alimetry® Gut-Brain Wellbeing (AGBW) Survey for patients with chronic gastroduodenal symptoms.

This scale was developed in consultation with gastroenterologists, psychogastroenterologists, and patients with chronic gastroduodenal symptoms to ensure content validity, comprehensibility, and acceptability.

## Materials and Methods

As shown in Figure 1, the AGBW Survey was developed in three mixed-methods phases, with guidance from the results from a precursory user needs interview study with patients with gastroduodenal DGBIs and gastroenterology clinicians. The precursory interview study was conducted prior to the scale development phases, with results reported elsewhere [24]. Phase 1 used data from the precursory interview study and existing mental health scales to select relevant concepts. In Phase 2, an interdisciplinary panel of experts used these selected concepts to generate draft scale items. Phase 3 consisted of pre-testing, expert feedback, and scale refinement. Each phase involved co-design with clinicians and patients and is presented in the following sections. A final phase, consisting of psychometric validation, is currently underway and will be reported in a future publication.




***Figure 1.*** Flowchart of the phases used to develop the Alimetry Gut Brain Wellbeing Survey

### Phase 1. Concept Selection

The first phase of the scale development aimed to identify the most important mental wellbeing concepts to include in the new scale, contextualised specifically for patients with chronic gastroduodenal symptoms. Valid general mental wellbeing constructs have already been conceptualised within psychometric development for general populations. Therefore, concepts were selected from existing mental health scales, with the aim of reducing the number of constructs to those most relevant and contextualised to the target patient population.

The precursory interview study [24] identified depression, stress, and anxiety as the most important mental wellbeing domains to assess clinically in the target patient group. Both patients and clinicians desired a brief scale that combined these three domains. Based on this feedback, validated concepts from existing and widely used depression, stress, and anxiety questionnaires were used to identify the most important concepts for patients with chronic gastroduodenal symptoms. Using existing questionnaires as the basis for concept identification ensured content validity in the new questionnaire.

**Design.** Concept selection involved a combination of expert feedback and the analysis of psychometric data gathered from a sample of patients with chronic gastroduodenal symptoms, which was collected as part of another multi-national consortium database study,

on behalf of the BSGM working group (https://www.bsmconsortium.com/). Data collection was conducted in Auckland (New Zealand), Calgary (Canada), and Western Sydney (Australia). Ethics were obtained for each data collection site via: The Auckland Health Research Ethics Committee (AHREC; AH1130), The University of Calgary Conjoint Health Research Ethics Board (REB19-1925), and the Human Research Ethics Committee at Western Sydney (H13541). All participants provided written informed consent.

**Sample.** The sample consisted of 79 patients (73% female; mean age= 38.1 years, age range= 15-81 years) and 50 healthy controls (62% female; mean age= 39.2 years, age range= 19-84 years). Patients were defined as meeting the Rome IV criteria [27] for functional dyspepsia and/or chronic nausea and vomiting syndrome, whilst healthy controls were defined as having no chronic gastroduodenal symptoms.

**Procedure.** Participants completed a battery of psychometric questionnaires while participating in another study, using methods described elsewhere [28]. The Patient Health Questionnaire 9 (PHQ-9) [29] was used to measure levels of depression, the Perceived Stress Scale 4 (PSS-4) [30] was used to measure levels of stress, and the Generalised Anxiety Disorder 7 (GAD-7) [31] was used to measure levels of anxiety. These questionnaires were included as they are some of the most widely used and well-validated existing mental health assessment tools and are frequently used in patients with chronic gastroduodenal symptoms [32,33].

**Statistical analysis.** The key concepts from each questionnaire were selected by statistically evaluating the weighting of the concept as a total predictive value to the original scales' total score, using the following methodology in Python v3.7.

Firstly, the sample of 79 patients was separated into two subsamples: a 75% training sample and a 25% validation sample. Using bootstrapping 1000 random samples with replacement were generated from the original 75% cohort. The 1000 samples were then passed through a univariate feature selection to rank the importance of each item. Iteratively working from one feature to all features, the combination of features was used to train a regression model and then the predicted scores were compared to the actual scores. Results were compiled such that 1000 predictive scores were amassed for each feature value, along with the mean and 95% confidence interval. The subscale of each scale was then determined by allowing in the number of features required to have a mean accuracy of 90%. In the event of edge cases being close to the threshold, feature weighting was compared statistically (using a two-tailed t-test) to ensure each scale weighting was statistically different (no correction for multiple comparisons was performed). The defined subset of items was then trained on the original 75% sample and validated against the testing 25% sample. A valid score was reported if the $R^2$ value was greater than 0.9.

An additional confirmatory analysis was conducted to confirm the specificity of the extracted questions to patients compared to healthy controls. This analysis involved repeating the procedure described above in the healthy control group (n= 50). The rankings of the questions were compared between the two groups using two-tailed t-tests.

**Phase 2. Item Generation**

An interdisciplinary panel of experts (including two health psychology researchers specialising in psychogastroenterology, a gastroenterologist, a gastrointestinal surgeon, a digital health translational researcher, and two bioengineers with a specialist interest in gastric electrophysiology) generated draft individual items based on the concepts identified from Phase 1. The wording of the scale items was derived from the existing concepts; however, the new items were rewritten to enhance clarity and reduce the emphasis on physical symptomatology. The writing of the items was executed to ensure the seamless incorporation of the three domains into one unified scale. The panel also determined the test format of the scale based on relevant literature and recommendations from the precursory interview study [24].

**Phase 3. Pre-Testing and Expert Feedback**

The draft scale generated in Phase 2 was then pre-tested with a sample of patients with chronic gastroduodenal symptoms and reviewed by independent external experts to ensure the acceptability, clarity, comprehensibility, and content and face validity of the scale. This process occurred over multiple iterative rounds and the scale was refined accordingly.

**Sample.** The pretesting sample consisted of 12 patients with chronic gastroduodenal symptoms (11 females; mean age= 33.3 years, age range= 20-55 years). All patients had a diagnosis of functional dyspepsia, with 10 also having a coexisting diagnosis of chronic nausea and vomiting syndrome and nine also having a diagnosis of gastroparesis. The external experts comprised key opinion leaders in their respective areas, including nine gastroenterologists, one health psychologist specialising in psychogastroenterology, and two health psychology researchers.

**Procedure.** Both experts and patients were invited to provide independent feedback on the draft scale via Google Forms. Participants were provided with a copy of the draft scale, alongside images that showed the potential implementation design of the survey on a tablet interface. After viewing the scale, the participants were asked to answer a series of open-ended questions. These questions asked about the acceptability of the scale items, the utility of the scale in clinical practice, the ease of understanding and comprehension of the question wording, and whether the scale could be improved in any way. The feedback from the experts and patients was incorporated into the scale and the updated questions were sent back to respondents to ensure their feedback had been incorporated appropriately. This process occurred until all patients and experts were satisfied with the wording of the scale.

## Results

**Phase 1. Concept Selection**

The concept selection process resulted in the selection of 10 key concepts, which were identified as the most important indicators of mental wellbeing in this sample of patients with chronic gastroduodenal symptoms. These concepts were derived from specific items across three scales: items 1, 2, 4, and 7 of the PHQ-9; items 1, 2, and 3 of the PSS-4; and items 1, 2, and 7 of the GAD-7. These selections are illustrated in Figure 2.




***Figure 2.*** Flowchart showing the concepts selected from the original psychometrics

During the evaluation of the PHQ-9, results showed five potential factors (items 1, 2, 4, 7, 8) were required to meet the desired threshold of 0.9. However, there was only a marginal difference in accuracy between including either four or five of these items, with accuracy values shifting from 0.89 to 0.9. Upon applying statistical criteria, a t-test was conducted comparing the weighting scores of these items, with a significant difference revealed. Coupled with expert recommendations suggesting the exclusion of questions related to physical symptomatology for this patient population, item 5 (poor appetite/overeating) was ultimately excluded from the scale.

The results from the confirmatory analysis with healthy controls indicated that all scale values were significantly different, providing evidence to support the assertion that this scale is unique and contextualised to patients with chronic gastroduodenal symptoms. This selection of these items increased the specificity and contextualisation of the questions for use in patients with chronic gastroduodenal symptoms, while also allowing for a reduction in clinician and patient burden by including a smaller subset of questions than would typically be completed in separate anxiety, stress, and depression questionnaires.

**Phase 2. Item Generation**

The expert panel drafted 10 closed-ended questions to cover the 10 concepts identified in Phase 1. The first four questions covered the four concepts identified from the depression scale, the middle three from the stress scale, and the last three questions from the anxiety scale. Each question asks patients to rate how often they have felt or behaved in a certain way over the last two weeks on a scale of 0 (none of the time) to 4 (all of the time). Items 5 and 7, which are both a part of the stress subscale, were written in a positive frame to match the original concepts, which were positively worded. Therefore, these two questions are designed to be reverse-coded. A 5-point response format was chosen for these questions, based on recommendations that reliability increases with more scale points for unipolar items, with diminishing returns after 5 points [34,35]. Similar to the PHQ-9 and GAD-7, a

recall period of two weeks was chosen as this matches the criteria in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Health Disorders (5th Ed.; DSM-5) [36] for clinical depression and anxiety and is recommended by the FDA due to increased recall bias with increased recall periods beyond two weeks [26].

Both patients and clinicians in the precursory interview study [24] iterated the importance of prefacing patients before mental wellbeing assessments to explain to them why this information is being gathered and to reassure them that this data will not be used to dismiss medical care. This helps to minimise the concern around patient stigma and fear their physical symptoms will be dismissed as psychological [24]. Based on these recommendations, the expert panel drafted a short preface to be presented before the scale items. This preface explains the gut-brain axis alongside how this scale can help clinicians develop a more holistic understanding of the patient's condition and its impact on their lives, enabling them to deliver a more tailored management plan. The preface also communicates how the scale is not diagnostic and cannot be used to attribute their gastrointestinal symptoms to their mental health.

Lastly, an opt-out option was included at the end of the preface to allow patients to decline the survey. The responses from the precursory interviews [24] determined this to be an essential addition for patients concerned about how their clinician might misuse or misinterpret their psychological data. A follow-up optional, open-ended question is provided for patients to leave a comment about why they have chosen not to answer this survey. This question can help clinicians understand why the patient declined to answer, which may be relevant to their future care.

**Phase 3. Pre-Testing and Expert Feedback**

Two rounds of patient and clinician feedback were gathered and used to refine the final scale. Overall, the scale had high content and face validity and was seen as acceptable, easy to understand and complete, and useful to help clinicians further understand a patient's condition and aid in developing a tailored management plan. Both patients and clinicians were supportive of the use of the scale within clinical care for patients with chronic gastroduodenal symptoms, despite potential concerns around patient stigma and fear of being labelled.

Based on the feedback, the wording of the preface and some of the scale items were edited to ensure clarity and ease of answering. The preface was also expanded to include more information about the gut-brain axis to help patients further understand why they are being asked about their mental wellbeing in relation to their gastrointestinal symptoms. An optional open-ended question was also added to the end of the scale. This question allows patients to include additional comments regarding their mental wellbeing, enabling their clinician to develop a more comprehensive understanding of the survey results.

**The Final Scale: The Alimetry® Gut-Brain Wellbeing (AGBW) Survey**

The final scale (attached as a supplementary file) consists of a patient preface, 10 closed-ended questions, and an 11th open-ended question. The patient preface explains to patients why these questions are being asked and how the data is being used. The 10 closed questions ask patients to rate how often they have felt or behaved in a certain way over the last two weeks on a scale of 0 (none of the time) to 4 (all of the time). The scores

from each question can be totalled to create a total gut-brain wellbeing score (out of 40). Three subscales can also be calculated; a depression subscale score made up of the total from the first four questions (out of 16), a stress subscale score made up of the total from the middle three questions, after reverse coding questions 5 and 7 (out of 12), and an anxiety subscale score made up of the total from the last three questions (out of 12). Higher scores indicate worse mental wellbeing. The scale concludes with an optional open-ended question asking patients to add any further comments about their mental wellbeing. This scale is designed to be used clinically and for research purposes.

## Discussion

This research used a multi-phase, mixed-methods process, incorporating co-design with patients and clinicians to develop a brief, novel mental wellbeing scale for patients with chronic gastroduodenal symptoms, the AGBW Survey. This scale is multi-dimensional and can be used to assess a patient's overall mental wellbeing, as well as specific subscales for depression, stress, and anxiety. The scale includes an optional open-ended question for patients to provide further context and these patient comments should always be considered when interpreting their results. This scale cannot be used for diagnostic purposes but can be used as an assessment tool to guide clinical management. In addition, it can be used within research contexts to assess a patient's mental wellbeing at baseline or to assess changes over time in relation to symptoms or interventions.

The AGBW Survey was developed to be a novel addition to the existing pool of psychometrics for patients with chronic gastroduodenal symptoms, complementing other mental wellbeing tools that measure gastrointestinal symptom-specific anxiety [37] and quality of life [38]. Due to the high presence of psychological comorbidities [11,18] and clinical recommendations for routine psychological assessments in these patients [6,11,39], clinicians have typically relied on various general mental health scales. However, these are not contextualised for use within patients with chronic gastroduodenal symptoms and may exaggerate mental health issues due to their focus on physical symptomatology [11]. In contrast, the AGBW Survey is designed to focus more specifically on mental wellbeing concepts relevant to patients with chronic gastroduodenal symptoms.

Furthermore, the AGBW Survey combines assessments of depression, anxiety, and stress into a single, brief scale. This allows a quick assessment of a patient's general wellbeing, as well as the more specific dimensions of common mental health issues, which can be incorporated as part of routine clinical testing. This scale's brief nature reduces clinician and patient burden with psychological assessments. This feature is particularly important as gastroenterology clinicians often report time constraints as the key reason for not regularly assessing a patient's mental wellbeing, despite being aware of its importance [24]. The AGBW Survey is designed to complement routine medical tests, such as body surface gastric mapping, to provide more integrated evaluations and management plans for patients with chronic gastroduodenal symptoms. Research has demonstrated that incorporating psychological support for patients with chronic gastroduodenal symptoms as part of multidisciplinary care leads to better care and more effective symptom management [40–43]. Therefore, the results from the AGBW Survey could prompt clinicians to consider incorporating psychological referrals or interventions into the patient's care plan alongside traditional medical care.

A novel aspect of this scale is the addition of the patient preface, opt-out option, and the final open-ended question. These were important additions suggested by the external clinicians and patients during the precursory interview study and feedback phase to increase the acceptability and usability of the scale and to decrease stigma around mental wellbeing, which was noted as a potential and common concern. In particular, the open-ended question allows patients to provide valuable context to their survey responses. This context provides clinicians with important additional information that can be used for targeted management plans and reduces the chance of the patient's symptoms being dismissed as exclusively psychological.

Strengths of this scale development process include the co-development with patients, clinicians, and interdisciplinary experts. By involving patients and clinicians throughout every phase, we have ensured the development of an acceptable, understandable, useful, and clinically relevant scale. Both patients and clinicians were supportive of this scale within clinical care for the routine assessment of patients with chronic gastroduodenal symptoms, despite potential concerns about patient stigma and fear of labelling. However, the use of the AGBW Survey is limited as it is currently only available in English. The scale still needs to be translated and validated in other languages before it can be used in diverse population groups and globally. Furthermore, it should be noted that the scale's development involved patients and clinicians from diverse countries such as New Zealand, Australia, Canada, the United States, and Belgium. However, this focus on Western countries may restrict its generalisability to other cultural contexts.

The next step in the development of the AGBW Survey is to perform psychometric validation, including reliability and validity tests of the scale's total and subscale scores. This process is currently underway using an anonymous online survey in a global sample of more than 300 patients with chronic gastroduodenal symptoms; the results of which will be the focus of a future publication. Research is also underway to assess the scale's predictive validity to determine if the combination of the results from the AGBW Survey and physiological tests, such as body surface gastric mapping, can help predict which patients might benefit from multidisciplinary management plans. This research will inform the scale's clinical utility as an aid to help guide management decisions.

**Summary**

The AGBW Survey was developed using a multi-phase, co-design process that included precursory interviews, data from existing psychometrics, consensus from an interdisciplinary panel of experts, and feedback from clinicians, patients, and key opinion leaders in gastroenterology. This scale is designed to assess mental wellbeing in patients with chronic gastroduodenal symptoms and consists of a patient preface, 10 closed-ended questions, and a final optional open-ended question. The AGBW Survey is a valuable wellbeing assessment tool to complement existing routine physiological testing. It has the potential to guide psychological referrals, inform multidisciplinary care, and evaluate long-term outcomes in both clinical and research settings. Psychometric validation of the scale is currently underway.

## References


[1] Sperber AD, Bangdiwala SI, Drossman DA, Ghoshal UC, Simren M, Tack J, et al. Worldwide prevalence and burden of functional gastrointestinal disorders, results of Rome foundation global study. Gastroenterology 2021;160:99–114. https://doi.org/10.1053/j.gastro.2020.04.014.

[2] Drossman DA. Functional gastrointestinal disorders: History, pathophysiology, clinical features and Rome IV. Gastroenterology 2016;150:1262–79. https://doi.org/10.1053/j.gastro.2016.02.032.

[3] Schmulson MJ, Drossman DA. What is new in Rome IV. J Neurogastroenterol Motil 2017;23:151–63. https://doi.org/10.5056/jnm16214.

[4] Sandler RS, Everhart JE, Donowitz M, Adams E, Cronin K, Goodman C, et al. The burden of selected digestive diseases in the United States. Gastroenterology 2002;122:1500–11. https://doi.org/10.1053/gast.2002.32978.

[5] Aziz I, Palsson OS, Whitehead WE, Sperber AD, Simrén M, Törnblom H. Epidemiology, clinical characteristics, and associations for Rome IV functional nausea and vomiting disorders in adults. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol 2019;17:878–86. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cgh.2018.05.020.

[6] Van Oudenhove L, Crowell MD, Drossman DA, Halpert AD, Keefer L, Lackner JM, et al. Biopsychosocial aspects of functional gastrointestinal disorders. Gastroenterology 2016;150:1355–67. https://doi.org/10.1053/j.gastro.2016.02.027.

[7] Wouters MM, Boeckxstaens GE. Is there a causal link between psychological disorders and functional gastrointestinal disorders? Expert Rev Gastroenterol Hepatol 2016;10:5–8. https://doi.org/10.1586/17474124.2016.1109446.

[8] Woodhouse S, Hebbard G, Knowles SR. Psychological controversies in gastroparesis: A systematic review. World J Gastroenterol 2017;23:1298–309. https://doi.org/10.3748/wjg.v23.i7.1298.

[9] Knowles SR, Skvarc D, Ford AC, Palsson OS, Bangdiwala SI, Sperber AD, et al. Negative impact of disorders of gut-brain interaction on health-related quality of life: Results from the Rome Foundation Global Epidemiology Survey. Gastroenterology 2023;164:655–68.e10. https://doi.org/10.1053/j.gastro.2022.12.009.

[10] Raubinger S, Allworth S, Carey S. When you are living and dying at the same time: A qualitative exploration of living with gastrointestinal motility disorders. J Hum Nutr Diet 2022. https://doi.org/10.1111/jhn.13114.

[11] Luo Y, Keefer L. Role of psychological questionnaires in clinical practice and research within functional gastrointestinal disorders. Neurogastroenterol Motil 2021;33:e14297. https://doi.org/10.1111/nmo.14297.

[12] Palsson OS, Whitehead WE. Psychological treatments in functional gastrointestinal disorders: A primer for the gastroenterologist. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol 2013;11:208–16. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cgh.2012.10.031.

[13] Carabotti M, Scirocco A, Maselli MA, Severi C. The gut-brain axis: Interactions between enteric microbiota, central and enteric nervous systems. Ann Gastroenterol Hepatol 2015;28:203–9. https://doi.org/http://www.annalsgastro.gr/index.php/annalsgastro/article/view/1959.

[14] Weltens N, Iven J, Van Oudenhove L, Kano M. The gut-brain axis in health neuroscience: Implications for functional gastrointestinal disorders and appetite regulation. Ann N Y Acad Sci 2018;1428:129–50. https://doi.org/10.1111/nyas.13969.

[15] Keightley PC, Koloski NA, Talley NJ. Pathways in gut-brain communication: Evidence for distinct gut-to-brain and brain-to-gut syndromes. Aust N Z J Psychiatry 2015;49:207–14. https://doi.org/10.1177/0004867415569801.

[16] Levy RL, Olden KW, Naliboff BD, Bradley LA, Francisconi C, Drossman DA, et al. Psychosocial aspects of the functional gastrointestinal disorders. Gastroenterology 2006;130:1447–58. https://doi.org/10.1053/j.gastro.2005.11.057.

[17] Singh P, Ballou S, Rangan V, Katon J, Hassan R, Iturrino J, et al. Clinical and psychological factors predict outcome in patients with functional dyspepsia: A

prospective study. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol 2022;20:1251–8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cgh.2021.07.043.
[18] Shoji T, Endo Y, Fukudo S. Psycho-gastroenterology. In: Tominaga K, Kusunoki H, editors. Functional Dyspepsia: Evidences in Pathophysiology and Treatment, Singapore: Springer Singapore; 2018, p. 105–15. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-1074-4_9.
[19] Rodrigues DM, Motomura DI, Tripp DA, Beyak MJ. Are psychological interventions effective in treating functional dyspepsia? A systematic review and meta-analysis. J Gastroenterol Hepatol 2021;36:2047–57. https://doi.org/10.1111/jgh.15566.
[20] Keefer L, Ballou SK, Drossman DA, Ringstrom G, Elsenbruch S, Ljótsson B. A Rome working team report on brain-gut behavior therapies for disorders of gut-brain interaction. Gastroenterology 2022;162:300–15. https://doi.org/10.1053/j.gastro.2021.09.015.
[21] van Tilburg MAL, Drossman DA, Knowles SR. Psychogastroenterology: The brain-gut axis and its psychological applications. J Psychosom Res 2021;152:110684. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychores.2021.110684.
[22] Drossman DA, Chang L, Deutsch JK, Ford AC, Halpert A, Kroenke K, et al. A review of the evidence and recommendations on communication skills and the patient-provider relationship: A Rome Foundation working team report. Gastroenterology 2021;161:1670–88. https://doi.org/10.1053/j.gastro.2021.07.037.
[23] Wu JC. Psychological co-morbidity in functional gastrointestinal disorders: Epidemiology, mechanisms and management. J Neurogastroenterol Motil 2012;18:13–8. https://doi.org/10.5056/jnm.2012.18.1.13.
[24] Law M, Bartlett E, Sebaratnam G, Pickering I, Simpson K, Keane C, et al. “One more tool in the tool belt”: A qualitative interview study investigating patient and clinician opinions on the integration of psychometrics into routine testing for disorders of gut-brain interaction. medRxiv 2023. https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.06.06.23291063.
[25] Dima AL. Scale validation in applied health research: Tutorial for a 6-step R-based psychometrics protocol. Health Psychol Behav Med 2018;6:136–61. https://doi.org/10.1080/21642850.2018.1472602.
[26] U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Food and Drug Administration. Guidance for industry patient-reported outcome measures: Use in medical product development to support labeling claims. 2009.
[27] The Rome Foundation. Appendix A: Rome IV Diagnostic Criteria for FGIDs 2016, January 16. https://theromefoundation.org/rome-iv/rome-iv-criteria/.
[28] Gharibans AA, Calder S, Varghese C, Waite S, Schamberg G, Daker C, et al. Gastric dysfunction in patients with chronic nausea and vomiting syndromes defined by a noninvasive gastric mapping device. Science Translational Medicine 2022;14:eabq3544. https://doi.org/10.1126/scitranslmed.abq3544.
[29] Kroenke K, Spitzer RL, Williams JB. The PHQ-9: Validity of a brief depression severity measure. J Gen Intern Med 2001;16:606–13. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1525-1497.2001.016009606.x.
[30] Cohen S, Kamarck T, Mermelstein R. A global measure of perceived stress. J Health Soc Behav 1983;24:385–96. https://doi.org/10.2307/2136404.
[31] Spitzer RL, Kroenke K, Williams JBW, Lowe B. A brief measure for assessing generalized anxiety disorder: The GAD-7. Arch Intern Med 2006;166:1092–7. https://doi.org/10.1001/archinte.166.10.1092.
[32] Breedvelt JJF, Zamperoni V, South E, Uphoff EP, Gilbody S, Bockting CLH, et al. A systematic review of mental health measurement scales for evaluating the effects of mental health prevention interventions. Eur J Public Health 2020;30:539–45. https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/ckz233.
[33] Boeckxstaens GE, Drug V, Dumitrascu D, Farmer AD, Hammer J, Hausken T, et al. Phenotyping of subjects for large scale studies on patients with IBS. Neurogastroenterol Motil 2016;28:1134–47. https://doi.org/10.1111/nmo.12886.
[34] Boateng GO, Neilands TB, Frongillo EA, Melgar-Quiñonez HR, Young SL. Best

practices for developing and validating scales for health, social, and behavioral research: A primer. Front Public Health 2018;6:149. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2018.00149.
[35] Fabrigar LR, Ebel-Lam A. Questionnaires. In: Salkind NJ, editor. Encyclopedia of Measurement and Statistics, vol. 3, 2007, p. 808–12.
[36] American Psychiatric Association. Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders. vol. 5. 2013.
[37] Labus JS, Bolus R, Chang L, Wiklund I, Naesdal J, Mayer EA, et al. The Visceral Sensitivity Index: Development and validation of a gastrointestinal symptom-specific anxiety scale. Aliment Pharmacol Ther 2004;20:89–97. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2036.2004.02007.x.
[38] de la Loge C, Trudeau E, Marquis P, Kahrilas P, Stanghellini V, Talley NJ, et al. Cross-cultural development and validation of a patient self-administered questionnaire to assess quality of life in upper gastrointestinal disorders: The PAGI-QOL. Qual Life Res 2005;13:1751–62. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11136-004-8751-3.
[39] Keefer L, Palsson OS, Pandolfino JE. Best practice update: Incorporating psychogastroenterology into management of digestive disorders. Gastroenterology 2018;154:1249–57. https://doi.org/10.1053/j.gastro.2018.01.045.
[40] Bray NA, Koloski NA, Jones MP, Do A, Pang S, Coombes JS, et al. Evaluation of a multidisciplinary integrated treatment approach versus standard model of care for functional gastrointestinal disorders (FGIDS): A matched cohort study. Dig Dis Sci 2022;67:5593–601. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10620-022-07464-1.
[41] Kruimel J, Leue C, Winkens B, Marcus D, Schoon S, Dellink R, et al. Integrated medical–psychiatric outpatient care in functional gastrointestinal disorders improves outcome: A pilot study. Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol 2015;27:721–7. https://doi.org/10.1097/MEG.0000000000000335.
[42] Riehl ME, Kinnucan JA, Chey WD, Stidham RW. Nuances of the psychogastroenterology patient: A predictive model for gastrointestinal quality of life improvement. Neurogastroenterol Motil 2019;31:e13663. https://doi.org/10.1111/nmo.13663.
[43] Basnayake C, Kamm MA, Salzberg MR, Wilson-O'Brien A, Stanley A, Thompson AJ. Delivery of care for functional gastrointestinal disorders: A systematic review. J Gastroenterol Hepatol 2020;35:204–10. https://doi.org/10.1111/jgh.14830.

# Alimetry® Gut-Brain Wellbeing (AGBW) Survey

The following 10 questions will ask you about your mental wellbeing over the past 2 weeks.

Research has shown that stomach symptoms and mental wellbeing can affect each other through the gut-brain axis, a physical connection between the stomach and brain.

These questions will help your clinician better understand your mental wellbeing in connection with your symptoms and stomach's activity. This allows for a more holistic understanding of your condition, enabling a more personalised management plan.

Please note these questions cannot be used to diagnose you with a mental health condition and are not intended to attribute your symptoms to your mental health. Your answers are confidential and will be seen by your referring clinician in your test report.

☐ Decline wellbeing survey

Feel free to comment on why you have chosen not to answer these questions (optional) _____

☐ Continue

1. **Over the last 2 weeks, how often have you felt a reduced interest in things that usually bring you enjoyment?**

| None of the time | A little of the time | Some of the time | Most of the time | All of the time |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

2. **Over the last 2 weeks, how often have you felt sad, depressed, or unhappy?**

| None of the time | A little of the time | Some of the time | Most of the time | All of the time |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

3. **Over the last 2 weeks, how often have you felt tired, fatigued, or lacking in energy, for no good reason?**

| None of the time | A little of the time | Some of the time | Most of the time | All of the time |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

4. **Over the last 2 weeks, how often have you found thinking, staying focused, or making decisions difficult?**

| None of the time | A little of the time | Some of the time | Most of the time | All of the time |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

© Alimetry Ltd., 2023

5. **Over the last 2 weeks, how often have you felt like you could cope with the challenges in your life?**

| None of the time | A little of the time | Some of the time | Most of the time | All of the time |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

6. **Over the last 2 weeks, how often have you felt like the important things in your life were out of your control?**

| None of the time | A little of the time | Some of the time | Most of the time | All of the time |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

7. **Over the last 2 weeks, how often have you felt like things were going well for you?**

| None of the time | A little of the time | Some of the time | Most of the time | All of the time |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

8. **Over the last 2 weeks, how often have you felt anxious, nervous, or unable to relax?**

| None of the time | A little of the time | Some of the time | Most of the time | All of the time |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

9. **Over the last 2 weeks, how often have you found it hard to stop worrying about things?**

| None of the time | A little of the time | Some of the time | Most of the time | All of the time |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

10. **Over the last 2 weeks, how often have you felt scared or afraid as if something bad might happen, for no good reason?**

| None of the time | A little of the time | Some of the time | Most of the time | All of the time |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

**Please provide any further comments about your answers in the box below that you would like your clinician to be aware of (optional)**

© Alimetry Ltd., 2023