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 Wei ¹ , Carpentier Sydney ¹ , Blackwood Jena ¹ , 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

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	

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

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 current142 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 <i>Table 1</i> .
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 <i>Figure 1</i> , 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 <i>Table 2</i> . There was no floor or
187	ceiling effect, but the person mean location \pm standard deviation was 2.17 \pm 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

too easy (person mean location 1.88±1.71). We therefore do not recommend using the 7-items scale for clinical use. We recommend that the targeting first be solved before it can be used in 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 rescoring 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

Legend: The item threshold map shows the hierarchy of the item difficulty levels, with the
easiest item on top (item 7 "*I've been thinking clearly*") and the hardest item at the bottom (item
5 "*I've had energy to spare*"). The horizontal logit ruler demonstrates the person's ability level of
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 rescoring 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-

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

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

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

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

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

to spare" and 3 *"I've been feeling relaxed"* were consistently rated as the hardest items.[7, 9]

295

296 Conclusions

The WEMWBS demonstrated good item fit and person fit in a US population of communitydwelling adults and adults with stroke. However, the items are too easy, which is a consistent finding across the majority of WEMWBS Rasch studies performed in different countries. Thus, including more difficult items in a next iteration of the scale could help solve the targeting. Finally, further studies with larger sample sizes should be performed in adults with stroke, and 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
- 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,
- 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:
- Conception or design of the work: AVDW
- Acquisition and analysis of evidence: AVDW, WD
- Interpretation of the evidence: AVDW, WD, SC, JB
- 345

346 Acknowledgements

We appreciate all the participants who have participated in the study, and the research volunteers
who have helped with data collection. Our profound gratitude goes to Marc Noël for the critical
review of the manuscript.

Table 1. Demographic and clinical characteristic of participants by group

	Community-dwelling adults	Adults with	
	(n=533)	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 $\overline{Legend: N/A} = not assessed$

Item	Item descriptions	Item	SE	Fit	<i>p</i> -value
number		location		Residuals	
		(logits)			
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

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

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

355 *Legend:* SE = Standard Error

Item	Item descriptions	Item	SE	Fit	<i>p</i> -value
number		location		Residuals	
		(logits)			
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

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

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

357 *Legend:* SE = Standard Error

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

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

Item 9	I've been feeling close to other	0	1	9	17	10
	people					
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

361 **REFERENCES**

- Waters L, Algoe SB, Dutton J, et al (2021) Positive psychology in a pandemic: buffering,
 bolstering, and building mental health. J Posit Psychol 1–21
- McGinty EE, Presskreischer R, Han H, Barry CL (2020) Psychological Distress and
 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
- Hervas G, Vazquez CL (2013) Construction and Validation of a Measure of Integrative
 Well-Being in Seven Languages: The Pemberton Happiness Index.(PHI); Copyright:
 Creative Commons License.
- Tennant R, Hiller L, Fishwick R, Platt S, Joseph S, Weich S, Parkinson J, Secker J, Stewart Brown S (2007) The Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-being Scale (WEMWBS):
 development and UK validation. Health Qual Life Outcomes 5:63
- Stewart-Brown S, Tennant A, Tennant R, Platt S, Parkinson J, Weich S (2009) Internal construct validity of the Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-being Scale (WEMWBS): a Rasch analysis using data from the Scottish Health Education Population Survey. Health Qual Life Outcomes 7:15
- Houghton S, Wood L, Marais I, Rosenberg M, Ferguson R, Pettigrew S (2017) Positive
 Mental Well-Being: A Validation of a Rasch-Derived Version of the Warwick-Edinburgh
 Mental Well-Being Scale. Assessment 24:371–386
- 381 8. [No title]. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Bambang-
- 382 Sumintono/publication/352493582_Internal_Validation_of_the_Warwick-
- 383 Edinburgh_Mental_Wellbeing_Scale_Rasch_Analysis_in_the_Indonesian_Context/links/60
- 384 cbf3afa6fdcc01d47dd288/Internal-Validation-of-the-Warwick-Edinburgh-Mental-
- 385 Wellbeing-Scale-Rasch-Analysis-in-the-Indonesian-Context.pdf. Accessed 19 Feb 2022
- Bartram DJ, Sinclair JM, Baldwin DS (2013) Further validation of the Warwick-Edinburgh
 Mental Well-being Scale (WEMWBS) in the UK veterinary profession: Rasch analysis.
 Qual Life Res 22:379–391
- Tennant A, Conaghan PG (2007) The Rasch measurement model in rheumatology: what is
 it and why use it? When should it be applied, and what should one look for in a Rasch
 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

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.18.22274001; this version posted April 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint STROBEVStatementified Wheek liview internet wher/shoald the internet dimed by the liview internet internet where the base of the second seco

	Item No	Recommendation	Page No
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the	1
		title or the abstract	
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary	2-3
		of what was done and what was found	
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the	4-6
C		investigation being reported	
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	6
5		periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of	6-7
1		selection of participants	
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential	7
		confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if	
		applicable	
Data sources/	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of	7
measurement		methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of	,
		assessment methods if there is more than one group	
Rias	9	Describe any efforts to address notential sources of bias	7
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	, N/A
Ouantitative variables	11	Explain how duantitative variables were handled in the analyses	N/A
Quantitative variables	11	If annlicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	1 1/2 1
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to	7-8
Statistical methods	12	control for confounding	/ 0
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and	N/A
		interactions	1071
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	N/A
		(d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of	N/A
		sampling strategy	1.1/14
		(a) Describe any sensitivity analyses	N/A
D		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	1N/ A
Results Participants	12*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each store of study _ or	N/A
1 articipants	15	a) Report numbers of marviduals at each stage of study—eg	11/7
		aligible included in the study, completing follow up, and	
		analysed	
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	N/A
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	N/A
Descriptivo data	1/*	(a) Give observatoristics of study participants (as demosrate):	0
Descriptive data	14"	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic,	9
		confounders	
		(b) Indiasta number of participants with wissing late for 1	NT/A
		variable of interest	1N/ PA
		variable of interest	

			Table 3.
			Table 4.
			Additional
			file.
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-	N/A
		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	N/A
		categorized	
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into	N/A
		absolute risk for a meaningful time period	
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and	N/A
		interactions, and sensitivity analyses	
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	12
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of	14
		potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and	
		magnitude of any potential bias	
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering	12-14
		objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from	
		similar studies, and other relevant evidence	
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	14
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the	16
		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.

- 1. Make my own mind
- 2. Interested in new things
- 3. Think clearly
- 4. Deal with problem well
- 5. I feel loved
- 6. Feel good about myself
- 7. Interested in other people
- 8. Feeling useful
- 9. Feel close to others
- 10. Feel cheerful
- 11. Feeling confident
- 12. Feeling relaxed





- 1. Think clearly
- 2. I feel loved
- 3. Make my own mind
- 4. Feel cheerful
- 5. Interested in new things
- 6. Feel optimistic about the future
- 7. Deal with problems well
- 8. Feel good about myself
- 9. Feeling confident
- 10. Interested in other people
- 11. Feel close to others
- 12. Feeling relaxed
- 13. Feeling useful
- 14. Energy to spare



