Validation of the Food Safe Zone Questionnaire for Families of Individuals with Prader-Willi syndrome

Elisabeth M Dykens*[1], Elizabeth Roof[1], Hailee Hunt-Hawkins[1]

[1] Vanderbilt University

Department of Psychology and Human Development

Nashville, TN, U.S.A.

*Corresponding Author: Elisabeth.m.dykens@vanderbilt.edu (EMD)

Abstract

Prader-Willi syndrome (PWS), a genetic neurodevelopmental disorder, is characterized by hyperphagia and significant behavioral problems. Hyperphagic individuals with PWS are chronically hungry yet rarely feel sated, and often engage in food-seeking behaviors. To avoid obesity in their children, families implement food security and supervision strategies (e.g., locking food sources, alerting others). Yet such accommodations may undermine parental appraisals of hyperphgia (e.g., it's not a problem as we lock food); a potential confound in clinical trials aimed at attenuating hyperphagia. We developed the Food Safe Zone (FSZ) questionnaire to remind parents of their food safety practices prior to them evaluating their child's hyperphagia.

Our team developed 20 FSZ items that were revised for clarity and completeness in an iterative feedback process with stakeholders; parents, PWS specialists, and individuals with PWS. The FSZ was pilot tested, descriptive findings were reviewed by additional stakeholders, and then administered to 624 parents in a large-scale study. Based on an open-ended question, "Is there anything else you do to ensure food safety?" two additional items were added and evaluated in a follow-up study.

Principal component analyses revealed that 21 FSZ items loaded onto 5 factors that were readily interpretable, accounting for 67% of test variance: Alerting Others and Food Supervision in the Community; Locking or Restricting Food Sources; Checking for Food; At Home Supervision and Meals; and Avoiding Food Settings. Internal consistency and test-rest reliability were robust. Convergent validity analyses revealed that regardless of age, parents implemented more FSZ strategies in response to the severity of their child's hyperphagia.

The psychometrically sound FSZ stands to enhance accurate parental assessments of hyperphagia in future studies or clinical trials. Analyses of the open-ended question also shine a light on the extraordinary measures that parents use to ensure the health of their individual with PWS.

Introduction

Prader-Willi syndrome (PWS) is a neurodevelopmental disorder caused by the lack of paternally imprinted genetic information on chromosome 15q11-q13 [1]. Most cases (~70%) are attributed to paternal deletions in this region that vary in size, or maternal uniparental disomy (mUPD), when the child inherits two copies of the maternal chromosome 15 [2]. Behaviorally, people with PWS typically exhibit salient compulsivity, anxiety, needs for sameness, rigid thinking, hoarding non-food items, temper outbursts, repetitive questioning, and skin-picking [3, 4]. They also have mild to moderate deficits in intellectual and adaptive functioning [5], as well as in social cognition [6,] and executive functioning [7, 8].

Hyperphagia, however, is the most striking and distinctive characteristic of PWS. Beginning in early childhood, hyperphagia is attributed to aberrant neural feedback mechanisms involved in appetite regulation and satiety [9]. As a result, hyperphagic individuals with PWS view the world through a lens of hunger; they are constantly hungry, yet rarely feel full or sated [10]. Their unrelenting hunger leads to food seeking behaviors, including sneaking food and manipulating others to obtain food. Hyperphagic severity and behaviors are often assessed with the informant-based Hyperphagia Questionnaire (HQ) [11], and an adapted version of the HQ, the HQ-Clinical Trials (HQ-CT) [12]. The HQ-CT has shown robust responsivity to treatment in previous clinical trials aimed at attenuating hyperphagia and related problems [13, 14,15].

Hyperphagia in PWS is life-threatening as it can lead to medical complications associated with morbid obesity, gastric distention, and necrosis, and choking while

binging or sneaking food [16, 17]. Risks of morbid obesity are lessened with growth hormone therapy (GHT), which is now a pediatric standard of care for treating growth hormone deficiencies in PWS. GHT is associated with increased linear height and lean muscle mass, and reduced body fat [18], as well as with advantages in cognition and adaptive behavior [19]. GHT does not, however, effectively treat or lessen the syndrome's characteristic hyperphagia. To avoid obesity, many families also keep track of the daily caloric content of food consumed by the person with PWS. Doing so is helpful as people with PWS have a lower absolute energy expenditure than others, and thus need fewer calories to lose or maintain a healthy weight [20].

Fortunately, PWS has now garnered the attention of several pharmaceutical companies that are sponsoring clinical trials of novel agents aimed at attenuating hyperphgia and related symptoms in PWS [21]. Although these are promising developments, hyperphagia is currently best managed with environmental food safety strategies [2]. Common food safety strategies include locking food sources (e.g., cabinets, refrigerators, pantries, trash); supervising individuals whenever food is present; coordinating food intake with school, work, or recreational settings; and educating family members, friends, neighbors, teachers, and others about PWS and the need for food restrictions.

Many parents report that over time, their food safety practices become the "new normal" and an integral part of their daily routines. As one parent in our research program observed, "Maintaining food safety has been automatic behavior 24/7 for 30 years." Automating food safety practices into daily life both facilitates family functioning and helps keep individuals with PWS from becoming dangerously obese.

At the same time, however, successfully implementing food safety practices may lead parents to minimize or underestimate the severity of their child's hyperphagia, i.e., it's not a problem because we lock up food, constantly supervise, adhere to a strict meal schedule, etc. Indeed, both the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and clinical trial sponsors have raised questions if parental accommodations to their children's hyperphagic symptoms could undermine their accurate responses on the HQ-CT. Precise measurements of hyperphagia are critical both as an endpoint assessing treatment efficacy in clinical trials and as a criterion for trial eligibility.

In the present study, we developed and validated a novel index of food safety tactics in PWS, the Food Safe Zone (FSZ). The FSZ aims to remind parents of the various strategies they use to manage their child's hyperphagia prior to them completing the HQ-CT or other measures of hyperphagia. Consistent with the FDA's guidelines for Observer-Reported and Patient-Reported Outcomes [22], we developed the FSZ by involving multiple stakeholders and adhering to psychometric principles involved in questionnaire development. The study also analyzed the FSZ in relation to demographic variables (e.g., age, gender, PWS genetic subtype, parental socio-economic status). Beyond these analyses, we conducted a content analysis of parental comments to an open-ended question; "What did we miss? Are there other things that you do to ensure food security?" In brief, we anticipate that the FSZ will be an important component of accurately assessing hyperphagia in future research and clinical trials in PWS.

Methods, Procedures and Participants

FSZ Item Development and Stakeholder Input. Our research team developed a pool of 20 items that tapped common, readily observable food safety practices. Items

were gleaned from interviews, data, and clinical notes from over 325 families enrolled in our previous and current PWS research programs.

Parents of 4 individuals with PWS provided initial feedback on the clarity of items, and the proposed response scale. We also asked them if additional items were needed to fully measure food safety, i.e., construct validity. Parents suggested a rewording of 8 items and nominated 5 additional items on the frequency that individuals with PWS attended events that did or did not involve food, with or without parental supervision.

The revised 25-item FSZ draft was then vetted by 12 parents of individuals with PWS, aged 5 to 33 years, in 4 different, 40-minute focus group sessions held on-line via Zoom. Parents concurred that the wording of the FSZ was clear and did not suggest additional items. Instead, parents specified how they implemented various FSZ strategies. They also mentioned that they are not typically asked about their food safety practices, and that it was helpful to learn how others managed their child's hyperphagia.

Finally, we solicited input on the FSZ via a Zoom focus group with 5 adults with PWS, aged 20 to 42 years. Group members were forthright about their struggles with hunger and food-seeking. They were asked which FSZ tactics they found helpful, and if we missed any strategies. The group did not suggest new FSZ items, and instead reinforced the importance of securing food, educating others about PWS, and maintaining a predictable meal and snack schedule.

Pilot Testing and Additional Stakeholder Input. The revised, 25-item FSZ was pilot tested in 133 parents of individuals with PWS aged 5-43 years (see Participants, Table 1). Respondents were asked to complete the questionnaire based on the last month, using the following rating scale: 1= Never/Rarely; 2 = Some of the time; 3= Most

of the time; 4 = All the time. The FSZ also included an open-ended question, “What did we miss? Are there other things you do to ensure food security?”

Descriptive pilot data (e.g., means, frequencies) were then reviewed by members of FPWR’s Clinical Trials Consortium, specifically 3 parents and 5 PWS professionals. Members concurred that items were clearly worded. They also noted a potential confound with intellectual disability for the parent-nominated questions on letting their individual with PWS attend gatherings with or without food or parental supervision. Nevertheless, the committee recommended retaining these items to determine how they performed in the large-scale study.

Large-scale Administration. The FSZ was administered to additional parents of individuals with PWS via The Global PWS Patient Registry, a secure, web-based Registry sponsored by the Foundation for Prader-Willi Research (FPWR) and hosted on the National Organization for Rare Disorders “IAMRARE” registry platform [23]. Registrants are asked to complete medical and behavioral questionnaires every six months, a time frame established by FPWR to reduce parental burden of more frequent assessments. The Registry garnered 491 respondents, and 304 (62%) completed the FSZ 6 months later.

Respondent Feedback and Follow-Up Study. A follow-up study was conducted to assess two additional items gleaned from parental responses to the open-ended question, answered by 78% of respondents. Our team reviewed these responses to determine if they represented novel strategies not included in the FSZ or were instead embellishments or descriptions of how families enacted the tactics already included in the FSZ (see Results). Based on this review, two additional questions were added:

"Making a food plan for child prior to attending events, outings, restaurants," mentioned by 32% of respondents; and "Avoid eating in front of child unless they are also eating," noted by 37% of respondents. We added these two items to the FSZ and administered the now 27-item FSZ to 119 parents of individuals with PWS in a follow-up study.

Informed Consent and IRB Approval

Approval for this study was obtained by the Vanderbilt University Institutional Review Board, Integrated Science Committee. Vanderbilt University participants provided written, informed consent using the e-consent function of RedCap, a secure, web-based data collection platform [24]. After consenting, parents were then invited to complete the FSZ, HQ-CT and Demographic questionnaires on RedCap. Additional study approval was obtained for participants recruited from the FPWR Patient Registry. Prior to collecting data from the Registry, the study was reviewed and approved by FPWR's research committee and internal IRB. All registrants in FPWR's Patient Registry give approval for their unidentified data to be used for research purposes.

Participants

Pilot study participants (n=133) were recruited by our team at Vanderbilt University via postings on PWS-related social media platforms, and announcements at regional and national PWS conferences. As previously described, participants for the large-scale study (n=491) were recruited via the FPWR Patient Registry.

Table 1 summarizes demographic variables for participants in the pilot and large-scale studies. No significant differences emerged between these two recruitment sources in participant demographics or FSZ scores. As such, they were combined to form a large group (n=624) to increase power and facilitate statistical analyses.

Participants in the follow-up study (n=119) were recruited from both Vanderbilt University and FPWR (see Table 1). After consenting, they completed the 27-item FSZ, which included the two additional items generated by parent feedback. Approximately 15% of those in the follow-up study had completed the 25-item FSZ one to two years prior either in Vanderbilt's Pilot study, or FPWR's Patient Registry.

Table 1. Demographics of participants with PWS and their families for the pilot, large-scale and follow-up studies.

	Pilot	**Large-Scale**	**Follow-up**
Demographic Variables	**M (SD) or %**	**M (SD) or %**	**M (SD) or %**
N	133	624*	119
Age, Years	18.86 (7.89) Range: 5-43	18.60 (10.65) Range: 5-59	14.25 (7.75) Range: 5-44
Gender	42.1% Male 57.9% Female	46% Male 54% Female	48% Male 52% Female
Genetic Subtypes			
Paternal Deletion	61.1%	50.7%	48.8%
mUPD	32.8%	34.4%	43.1%
Imprinting Deficit	3.8%	3.2%	3.1%
Other	2.3%	2.3%	1.3%
Unknown		9.4%	3.8%
Education Maternal/Paternal			
High School 2-year college 4-year college Post-graduate	21.4%, 27.0% 16.8%, 10.3% 31.3%, 32.5% 30.5%, 30.2%	17.2%, 24.4% 29.8%, 30.6% 34.2%, 26.9% 18.9%, 18.1%	18.8%, 23.3% 15.0%, 11.3% 28.1%, 31.4% 38.1%, 34.0%
Annual Income			
$10,000 - $30,000 $31,000 - $50,000 $51,000 - $70,000 $71,000 - 100,000 > $100,000 Unknown	6.1% 4.5% 13.8% 20.8% 54.6% --	5.8% 16.7% 16.0% 17.1% 35.3% 9.1%	8.8% 8.8% 13.8% 16.4% 52.2% ---

Race, Ethnicity			
White	92.3%	85.2%	88.7%
Hispanic	3.1%	7.4%	5.2%
Asian	2.3%	2.5%	3.5%
Black	2.3%	2.3%	2.6%
Multi-racial		2.6%	

Other Measures

Demographics: Parents completed a demographic form asking for the age, gender, race, and genetic subtype of their individual with PWS. Parental education and annual family income were also obtained. Demographic variables were used to both describe the sample, and to determine if they related to the FSZ and thus needed to serve as covariates in data analyses.

Hyperphagia Questionnaire-Clinical Trial: The HQ-CT was administered to all participants and was used to determine the convergent validity of the FSZ [12]. This 9-item, informant-based questionnaire assesses two components of hyperphagia in PWS; hyperphagic drive or severity, and self-directed food seeking behaviors, and has been used as an endpoint assessing treatment efficacy in clinical trials [13-15].

Statistical Analyses

Factor Analyses. Using the combined dataset (n=624), principal component analyses (PCAs) were conducted to identify the latent factor structure of the FSZ. Separate PCA's were performed using orthogonal (i.e., varimax) versus oblique rotations (i.e., equimax) to assess which rotation yielded the most readily interpretable, conceptually meaningful solutions [25]. Final analyses used the orthogonal solution.

PCAs adhered to well-established criteria [25]. These included Kaiser's criteria with an eigenvalue > 1; inspection of the Scree Plot to confirm the number of factors;

ensuring that items loading onto factors have a common conceptual meaning; nominal cross-loading across factors; factor loadings and communalities >.40; a significant Bartlett's Test of sphericity; and a Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy that was close to 1.

Although PCAs were conducted in the follow-up study, the sample size for these analyses was relatively small (n=119), falling below conventional rules of thumb in factor analyses [26]. As such, the goals of these analyses were limited in scope. Specifically, we assessed if the two new items loaded onto factors that made conceptual sense, and if their inclusion compromised the overall structure of the FSZ as established in the large-scale study.

Internal Consistency. Cronbach's alphas determined the internal consistency of items within each FSZ factor, and for the overall FSZ in the large-scale study. Alphas were also calculated in the follow-up study to assess the effects of the two additional items on internal consistency.

Test-Retest Reliability. Test-retest reliability was assessed in 304 participants from the large-scale study who completed the FSZ at time 1 and again 6 months later. To minimize test-retest measurement error, we ensured that raters were the same across assessments. We first compared FSZ scores between Time 1 and Time 2 in matched t-tests. Intraclass Correlation Coefficients (ICCs) were then calculated, which incorporate both the degrees of agreement and correlations between Time 1 and Time 2 [27]. ICCs were based on a single measurement and absolute agreement in a two-way, mixed-effects model in which participant effects were randomized and measure effects were fixed.

Demographics. Pearson correlations, t-tests or Chi-Squares assessed relations between the FSZ total or factor scores with PWS genetic subtypes, gender, parental education or income, and age. Age was also assessed by dividing participants into three, developmentally appropriate age groups; children (5-12 years), adolescents (13-19 years) and adults (20-59 years; see results).

Convergent Validity. As food safety tactics are implemented in response to hyperphagia, we predicted that scores on the HQ-CT would be positively associated with the FSZ. Pearson correlations were calculated between the HQ-CT and FSZ total and factor scores. Linear regressions were then conducted with FSZ factors as predictors of the HQ-CT. To further assess relations between the FSZ and hyperphagia, the sample was divided into tertiles based on their total HQ-CT score. ANOVAs then compared FSZ raw factor scores across participants who were in the lowest, middle, and highest tertile HQ-CT groups.

Open-Ended Question Analyses. A full 78% of parents provided responses to the open-ended question. These comments offer novel insights into how parents implement food-safety practices that complement and extend formal statistical analyses of the FSZ. As such, we conducted a content analysis of their comments, most of which overlapped with items on the FSZ.

Results

Factor Analyses

Large-Scale Study. Preliminary PCAs with the large, combined dataset revealed that 5 items failed to load onto any factor. These items all dealt with allowing individuals with PWS to attend events with or without food present, and with or without parental

supervision. Between 75% to 87% of respondents rated these items “Never,” most likely due to confounds with hyperphagia and intellectual disabilities.

PCAs were then conducted with the remaining 20 FSZ items. One item, “Weigh child at least weekly”, had a poor factor loading (.25) and communality (.35) and was thus eliminated from the final factor analysis. In retrospect, this item did not directly measure food security, and is instead a down-stream indicator of consumed food.

The final PCA with 19 items yielded five factors that collectively accounted for 67.02% of test variance. A common conceptual meaning could be readily applied to these factors, specifically: Alerting Others and Food Supervision in the Community (4 items, 15.32% of rotated variance); Locking and Restricting Food Sources (6 items, 15.21% of variance); Checking for Food (3 items, 14.62% of variance); At Home Supervision and Meals (4 items, 11.80% of variance); and Avoiding Food Settings (2 items, 10.07% of variance).

The Avoiding Food Settings factor contained two items instead of the conventional three or more items. As recommended Worthington and Whittaker [28], we thus ensured that these 2 FSZ items were strongly correlated (r = .72), shared a conceptual meaning, and were relatively unrelated to other FSZ items (r’s ranged from .12 to .31).

Table 2 presents the FSZ items that loaded onto these 5 factors, their factor loadings, and communalities. All factor loadings were strong (or above .40), yet more stringent guidelines suggest that 17 items had either excellent (> .71) or very good (>.63) factor loadings, and just 2 items were deemed fair to good (.40-.45) [29]. Similarly, communalities indicated that all items were valuable in contributing to the test

variance of their respective factors. Table 2 also includes the percentages of parents who endorsed each item as all or most of the time versus sometimes or never/rarely.

Table 2. FSZ items that loaded onto 5 factors, factor loadings, communalities, item means and relative frequencies from the large-scale-study.

FSZ Factor Labels and Items	Factor Loading	Communalities	Item Means (SD)	All or Most of the Time	Some or None of the Time
1. Alert Others, Supervision in the Community					
Make sure adults involved with my child are aware of his/her food issues.	.79	.66	3.68 (.74)	91.7%	8.3%
Alert others of child's food issues (to ensure they do not give child access to food).	.78	.67	3.47 (.91)	85.0%	15.0%
Make sure they are supervised while away from home.	.76	.66	3.64 (.75)	89.7%	10.3%
Ensure child has no access to other people's food at school, camp, or work.	.67	.53	3.06 (1.16)	72.1%	27.9%
Make a food plan for child prior to attending events, outings, restaurants*	.62	.56	3.24 (.89)	79.7%	20.3%
2. Lock, Restrict Food Sources					
Lock up pantry or cabinets where food is kept	.90	.87	2.64 (1.35)	55.3%	44.7%
Lock up refrigerator or freezer	.89	.80	2.46 (1.40)	49.9%	50.1%
Ensure there is no food left on counter tops, tables, or other areas of access	.65	.68	2.99 (1.35)	70.2%	29.8%
Lock up trash, compost, or recycling bins	.50	.51	1.62 (1.35)	20.5%	79.5%
Keep money or credit cards from child	.46	.50	2.32 (1.36)	46.0%	54.0%
Use security features (alarm, camera) in home to monitor food access	.40	.47	1.62 (1.23)	20.7%	79.3%

3. Check for Food					
Check their person (pockets, pat down, shoes, etc.) for food, wrappers, or money	.87	.82	1.70 (.94)	18.6%	81.4%
Check their belongings or bedroom for food, wrappers, or money	.87	.83	1.98 (1.03)	28.0%	72.0%
Check on child in bathroom to be sure he or she is not eating food	.84	.75	1.69 (.99)	19.6%	80.4%
4. At Home Supervision, Meals					
Make sure child is busy while at home	.72	.66	2.86 (.85)	67.6%	32.4%
Avoid eating in front of child unless they are also eating*	.69	.55	2.86 (1.02)	67.0%	33.0%
Aware of where child is at home all the time (but may not be in sight of caregiver)	.63	.63	3.39 (.86)	85.6%	14.4%
Supervise - always have eyes on at home	.61	.62	3.02 (.93)	73.9%	26.1%
Make sure that meals are planned and on time	.50	.41	3.05 (.81)	79.4%	20.6%
5. Avoid Food Settings					
Avoid taking child to the grocery store	.85	.79	2.08 (1.07)	34.3%	65.7%
Avoid taking child to restaurants	.84	.80	2.18 (1.02)	34.3%	60.2%

Notes: *Shaded items are from the follow-up study and included here for reader convenience. See S1 Table for the complete PCA results from the follow-up study.

Follow-Up Study. PCA's conducted in the follow-up study assessed the impact of the 2 additional items on the overall structure of the FSZ. The PCA with varimax rotation yielded 5 factors that collectively accounted for 62.75% of test variance. These 5 factors recapitulated the factors derived in the large-scale study, albeit with slightly different factor loadings, communalities, and frequencies (see S1 Table 1). Importantly, the two new items loaded onto factors that were readily interpretable. The item "Make a food

plan for child prior to attending events, outings, restaurants" loaded onto the Alerting Others and Supervision in the Community factor, and "Avoid eating in front of child unless they are also eating" was consistent with other tactics families implement in the At Home Supervision and Meals factor. The two added items were frequently endorsed, 79.7% and 67%, respectively. T-tests comparing all FSZ factor mean scores between the large-scale and follow-up studies were not significant (see S2 Table).

Internal Consistency

Cronbach's alphas were calculated for each of the five factors derived from the large-scale and follow-up studies. Conventional rules of thumb suggest that alphas >.70 and < .90 are considered good [30]. As summarized in Table 3, all alphas fell into this range and varied from .73 to .89.

Table 3. Cronbach alphas for FSZ factors in both the large-scale and follow-up studies.

FSZ Factors	Cronbach Alpha's
Alert Others, Supervise in Community Large-Scale Study	.79
Alert Others, Supervise in Community Follow-up Study	.76
Lock, Restrict Food Sources Large-Scale Study	.82
Lock, Restrict Food Sources Follow-up Study	.79
Check for Food Large Scale Study	.89
Check for Food Follow-Up Study	.89
At Home Supervision, Meals Large-Scale Study	.76
At Home Supervision, Meals Follow-Up Study	.73

Avoid Food Settings Large-Scale Study	.81
Avoid Food Settings Follow-Up Study	.74
Total FSZ Raw Scores Large Scale Study	.89
Total FSZ Raw Scores Follow-Up Study	.86

Test-Retest Reliability

Matched t-tests conducted with the total FSZ scores between Time 1 and Time 2 proved nonsignificant, Time 1 M = 51.93, SD = 13.07, Time 2 M = 51.62, SD = 12.65. Intraclass correlations and their corresponding 95% confidence intervals are presented in Table 4. Based on conventional criteria, ICCs were all in the good range [31].

Table 4. FSZ Time 1 to Time 2 Intraclass Correlations and 95% Confidence Intervals

FSZ Factors	Intraclass Correlations (95% CI)
Alert Others, Supervision in the Community	.74 (.67-.78)
Lock, Restrict Food Sources	.88 (.86-.91)
Check for Food	.78 (.74-.82)
At Home Supervision, Meals	.75 (.69-.79)
Avoid Food Settings	.65 (.58-.71)
Total FSZ	.88 (.85-.90)

Combined Large-Scale and Follow-Up Studies

Separate analyses of the large-scale and follow-up studies yielded the same factor structure, as well as similar mean FSZ scores and Cronbach's alphas. As such,

these datasets were combined (n = 743) for subsequent analyses of relations between the FSZ and demographic variables, as well as the convergent validity of the FSZ.

FSZ and Demographics

ANOVAS or t-tests revealed no significant differences in FSZ total or factor scores across gender, PWS genetic subtypes, race, and parental income or education. The correlation between age and total FSZ scores was relatively small, r (733) = .19, p< .001. Correlations also assessed relations between age and the HQ-CT's total score, and the severity/drive and food-seeking behavior domains. Only the self-directed food-seeking behavior domain proved significant, r (733) = .22, p<.001.

To further explore these findings, participants were divided into three developmentally appropriate age groups: children aged 5 through 12 years (n = 268; M = 8.31 years, SD = 2.44); adolescents aged 13-19 years (n=247, M = 16.16 years, SD = 2.40) and adults aged 20-59 years (n=228, M = 30.50 years, SD = 8.36). Between-age group ANOVAs were then conducted with both FSZ and HQ-CT.

As summarized in Table 5, significant age group differences were found in 4 FSZ factors. Bonferroni post-hocs revealed that locking food sources differed significantly between all age groups, and that the adolescent and adult groups scored higher than children in checking for food and avoiding food setting. Children, however, scored higher than the 2 older age groups in the alerting others factor. Effect sizes (η^2) were large for the locking factor, medium for checking for food, and small for the remaining two factors.

As shown in Table 5 the ANOVA assessing age group differences in the total HQ-CT was marginally significant. Consistent with correlational analyses, this finding is driven by the more robust age group differences in the HQ-CT's food seeking domain.

Table 5. FSZ and HQ-CT mean raw scores, and F, p and η^2 values across three age groups.

FSZ Factors	**5 to 12 M (SD)**	**13 to 19 M (SD)**	**20 to 59 M (SD)**	**F, p**	**η^2**
Alert Others, Community Supervision	15.12 (3.14)	14.21 (3.27)	13.95 (3.00)	9.63***	.025
Lock, Restrict Food Sources	11.62 (4.71)	13.58 (5.43)	16.22 (5.00)	58.74***	.138
Check for Food	4.42 (2.30)	5.53 (2.74)	5.91 (2.71)	22.24***	.057
At Home Supervision, Meals	12.67 (3.00)	12.73 (3.05)	12.80 (2.64)	.177	NS
Avoid Food Settings	3.77 (1.76)	4.37 (1.91)	4.43 (1.89)	9.88***	.026
Total FSZ	47.60 (10.40)	50.42 (12.03)	53.36 (10.94)	30.74***	.063
HQ-CT					
Hyperphagic Drive, Severity	13.49 (5.32)	14.73 (6.12)	14.00 (5.58)	2.59	NS
Food-Seeking Behaviors	5.06 (2.85)	5.66 (3.22)	6.06 (3.19)	6.47***	.017
Total HQ-CT	18.55 (7.40)	20.39 (8.55)	20.06 (7.96)	3.14*	.009

Notes: ***p<.001; *p< .05; NS = nonsignificant**.**

Convergent Validity

As expected, total FSZ and HQ-CT scores were positively correlated *r* (725) = .54, p< .001. Indeed, total HQ-CT scores were significantly correlated with all 5 FSZ factors, (r's range =.29 to .50, p's< .001).

The regression predicting the total HQ-CT was significant, F (5,717) = 66.13, p < .001, adjusted R^2 = .324. FSZ predictors, with p's < .001, included Checking for Food, *t*

=11.19, β = .401; Locking Food Sources, *t* = 6.30, β = .256; and At Home Supervision and Meals, *t* = 3.21, β = .153. Avoiding Food Settings was marginally significant, *t* = 2.33, p = .020, β = .082.

Probing deeper, participants were categorized into tertiles based on their total HQ-CT raw score; ANOVAs then compared FSZ scores across hyperphagia tertiles. The lowest tertile included 238 participants (32%), the middle tertile contained 245 individuals (33%) and the highest group had 260 participants (35%). As the tertile groups did not significantly differ in age, age was not controlled for in ANOVAs. As summarized in Table 6, significant differences were found between tertiles and all five of the FSZ raw factor scores. Bonferroni post-hocs revealed that all groups differed significantly from one another, with one exception. The medium and highest tertiles had comparable scores on the At Home Supervision and Meals factor. Effect sizes (η^2) were large for 3 factors, and medium to large for 2 factors.

Table 6. Comparisons of FSZ raw factor scores across tertiles of participants with low, medium, and high total HQ-CT scores.

FSZ Factors	**Low HQ-CT M (SD)**	**Medium HQ-CT M (SD)**	**High HQ-CT M (SD)**	**F, p**	**η^2**
HQ-CT Total	12.00 (2.05)	18.83 (2.02)	29.45 (5.33)		
Age	17.30 (11.47)	17.76 (10.93)	18.301 (9.16)	.561	NS
Alert Others, Community Supervision	13.24 (3.94)	14.82 (2.74)	15.20 (2.74)	26.72***	.069
Lock, Restrict Food Sources	10.23 (4.81)	13.72 (5.14)	16.24 (4.60)	91.87***	.204
Check for Food	3.88 (1.61)	5.00 (2.42)	6.65 (2.94)	79.79***	.182
At Home Supervision, Meals	11.05 (2.25)	13.09 (2.52)	13.88 (2.22)	70.05***	.163

Avoid Food Settings	3.37 (1.87)	4.20 (1.80)	4.82 (1.68)	39.11***	.098

Notes: *** p< .001. NS = nonsignificant. All groups differed significantly from one another with one exception; the medium and high groups did not differ in the Alert Others, Supervision in the Community FSZ factor.

Analyses of Open-Ended Question Responses

Beyond the two new items, four sets of findings also emerged from the open-ended question. First, 21 respondents indicated that their individual with PWS did not engage in food-seeking behaviors. The majority of these (n=16, 76.2%) were noted by their parents to have a medical or psychiatric exceptionality that impacted their hyperphagia or food intake. These exceptionalities were: severe developmental delays, including four, minimally verbal individuals with autism spectrum disorder, and two individuals with ongoing psychotic episodes. The remainder had such medical complications as Type I diabetes (n=3), multiple food allergies with anaphylaxis (n=3), severe hypothermia (n=1), overwhelming fatigue (n=1), being G-Tube dependent (n=1) and being paralyzed and in a wheelchair (n=1). We were curious if eliminating these individuals would substantially shift PCA or other analyses; it did not.

Second, parents overwhelmingly responded to the open-ended question by elaborating on the specific ways that they individualized or implemented FSZ tactics. Our team reviewed these descriptions and readily classified them into 6 categories that dovetailed with FSZ items, specifically: locking and securing food sources; scheduling meals and snacks; managing restaurants, parties, and family gatherings; eating and discarding food at home; and working with schools. Table 7 summarizes examples of parental responses within these categories, as well as the frequencies of them relative

to the number of respondents. As parents could elaborate on several strategies the frequencies noted in Table 9 exceeds 100%.

Third, 9.1% of respondents offered ways that they help their individual with PWS to eat. Although not necessarily food security tactics, parents noted that they used smaller plates so that food quantities seem larger, pre-plated meals, cut-up portions to avoid overstuffing, and encouraged their child to put down their fork after every few mouthfuls. Several participants also emphasized the importance of teaching their individual with PWS about proper nutrition and establishing healthy eating habits in all family members.

Finally, 5 respondents offered that their individual with PWS consumed non-edible items (e.g., pieces of a TV remote, hair). Some people with PWS may eat unpalatable items (e.g., stick of butter, frozen meat, garbage, pet food), or endorse a willingness to eat unusual food combinations [32]. However, pica, or eating non-food items, has not been widely reported in the PWS literature.

Table 7. Examples and frequencies of parental descriptions of food FSZ tactics derived from the open-ended question.

Locking and Securing Food Sources (37% of Respondents)
• We modified our kitchen/living area by creating two separate rooms and then installed locking doors. • We moved the entire kitchen to the basement with a locked, alarmed door and unique key. • Instead of locking cabinets or fridge, we lock off entire kitchen with a metal gate. • We turned an unused bedroom into a pantry with a self-closing door and pin code electronic lock. • We used to rely on physical locks but now rely on alarms. Both can work to restrict access and reduce anxiety. • We use motion sensors, open/close sensors, cameras, and locks. If he gets food, the cameras tell us "how." • Both doors to the kitchen are locked. She is only allowed in the kitchen when we are with her. • We just moved and do not have a pantry; it is being built. We miss the security of having a locked pantry. • Our keys to kitchen cabinets are locked in a safe. • We place baby gates at top of stairs and at kitchen door to ensure that he doesn't food seek at night. • We rest a spoon out of reach on top of the refrigerator that will fall if she opens the door. • I have a wind chime attached to my fridge door with a magnet, to alert me when it is opened. • We lock up purses or backpacks where we might have medicine, gum, or mints. • Must keep money and snacks from being left in cars, we lock the car in case any food is left in there. • Bathroom cupboard locked so no access to toothpaste, mouthwash, flavored antacids, cough drops, or vitamins. • We also need to lock up our liquor cabinet.
Scheduled Meals, Snacks (17.3%)
• Maintain regular times for breakfast, snack, lunch, snack, dinner, and dessert. • Post menus each day. Measure food at each meal so she doesn't manipulate different caregivers into giving her more food. • Schedule, schedule, and schedule. And always have a back-up plan! • Keeping a consistent schedule seems to work the best -- reducing uncertainty about next "snack" or "meal" relieves anxiety. • There is very little ambiguity about food times and items served. • She gets the same number of meals/snacks, the same number of calories, at the same time every day. • I always pack a snack in my purse if we are stuck in traffic or running behind schedule.

Restaurants, Parties, Family Gatherings (20.2%)
• Never let him go to bathroom alone at restaurants, he will grab food from other tables that was left behind. • Must hold hands in walking through a restaurant as she will take food off plates. • Must stay with me or an attendant in any store the entire time as she is very fast getting food. • Take waitstaff aside and educate them about PWS and why we will order for her. • Remove all condiments from table in a restaurant. • Preview restaurant menu and pick two options before going out to a restaurant. • She must take half of her restaurant meal in a to-go bag for the next day. • We sit next to him at family parties to ensure appropriate portions. • We don't attend family gatherings, it's too stressful for everyone, • Avoid buffet style parties or restaurants!! • At parties we give him a plate of food and tell others not to feed him. But this is awkward and hard to monitor.
Alerting Others and Supervision in the Community (14.3%)
• When he uses Lyft or Uber, I get a link to follow the route to ensure no food-related extra stops. • We live nearby restaurants, so we gave them a picture of our son and a caption: Please don't feed me. Call immediately if I am alone. And our phone numbers. • I have contacted the police department, so they are aware of her disorder. She ran away to a different neighborhood and asked for food after I posted an alert about her to our neighbors on Facebook. • All my neighbors know about my daughter's condition, and to call me is she asks for or steals food. • Must monitor church dinners/coffee hours, candy dishes at the bank, doctor's office, etc. • Alert everyone! Van drivers, Special Olympics coaches, neighbors, church groups. • I let people in charge at her day program know about her food issues - then I must trust their supervision. • She attends classes at a vocational school and must text us a picture of her lunch tray.
Eating and Discarding Food At Home (25.6%)

- Proportion food as soon as it is brought home instead of leaving it in bulk packaging.
- Ensure that only foods that she can eat comes into the house. No junk food allowed.
- I purchase less food, which means going to the market more often.
- EVERYONE eats at the table. No food allowed in bedrooms, while watching TV, etc.
- If I even glance away from the table during meals, he will take food from my plate.
- Scrape leftover food into the garage disposal, not the trash and run the garbage disposal frequently to ensure no food remains.
- The sight of empty food containers makes him upset, so we discard or recycle them right away in trash outside.
- Must discard bones from chicken, ribs, etc. where he cannot get to them.
- Table and floor are cleaned after every meal, otherwise he would eat dropped food or lick the floor.
- Siblings must keep treats or forbidden food a secret, store them in their locked bedrooms, and immediately discard wrappings outside in trash.
- Don’t allow siblings or family members to keep food in their rooms, desks, or private spaces. Only diet drinks.
- I sleep on the sofa to supervise and prevent night food seeking.
- We don't have an alarm system. But I am always within an arm's reach of her because she is an elopement risk, so I even sleep with her.

Working with Schools (13.2%)

- Written into his IEP that food cannot be used in lessons or offered as a reward.
- We lock her lunch box through the zippers. She hands it over to the school bus driver.
- Try to ensure a food free curriculum at school, including lessons with pictures of food.
- Needed to get a 1:1 aide at school to supervise food.
- I put several small items in his school lunchbox that take a bit of work to open to slow down his eating, e.g., plastic lids, oranges, pistachio nuts.
- My daughter buys lunch at school one day a week. It is important to her to be like others and to have this skill. We choose the healthiest option from the lunch calendar. The cafeteria supervisor ensures her tray is okay.
- Her lunch bag is handed to a helper on the school bus and then to a paraprofessional upon arriving at school.
- Her lunch/snacks are out of sight. We use colored containers, so staff recognize if she is eating other food.
- We keep her from attending school parties or celebrations that involve food or treats.
- We have the teacher bring her lunch to eat in her classroom. It has a specific calorie amount. This avoids her going to the cafeteria.

Discussion

The FSZ emerged as a psychometrically sound index of the tactics that parents use to manage their child's hyperphagia that stands to enhance their accurate assessments of hyperphagia in future research or clinical trials. Beyond the psychometrics of the FSZ, findings are discussed in relation to hyperphagia, and how food safety tactics compare to family accommodation in other disorders. As well, we discuss how parents tailor their food safety tactics to meet the individual needs of their child with PWS, and the impact of doing so on their well-being.

Consistent with best practices in creating novel questionnaires [22], the FSZ was developed with input from multiple stakeholders, including parents, PWS specialists and researchers, and individuals with PWS. In an iterative feedback process, items were added, or revised for clarity, and then pilot-tested, revised, and administered to parents in a large-scale study. Based on parental responses to an open-ended question, two additional items were added, and subsequently evaluated in a follow-up study. This multi-step process helped ensure both the construct and content validity of the FSZ.

Other psychometric properties of the FSZ were also robust. PCAs in the large-scale study yielded five, conceptually meaningful factors that collectively accounted for 67% of test variance. Communalities indicated that all items contributed meaningfully to their respective factors. Cronbach's alphas revealed strong internal consistency of items within each factor, and for FSZ total scores. As well, ICC's suggest strong test-retest reliability. Indeed, mean FSZ scores at Time 1 and 2 were almost identical, suggesting relatively stability in FSZ tactics over this 6-month time interval.

Importantly, analyses in the follow-up study, with two additional items, revealed the same overall factor structure as the large-scale study, albeit with slight differences in factor loadings, communalities, and frequencies. The new items were frequently endorsed by respondents and loaded onto two factors that made conceptual sense. Further, no differences were found between the large-scale and follow-up studies in mean scores of any FSZ factors. Taken together, findings justify the use of the final, 21-item version of the FSZ questionnaire in future research or clinical trials.

Age was the only demographic variable significantly associated with the FSZ. Relative to children, parents of adolescents and adults were more apt to lock food sources, check for food and avoid food settings. Parents of children, however, scored higher than their counterparts in the alerting others about food issues. These findings are best understood in relation to significant age-related increases in the HQ-CT's food-seeking behavior domain, even as hyperphagic severity or drive remained relatively stable in participants.

With advancing age and development, people with PWS may become more skilled or adept in finding or sneaking food. Indeed, they are known to exhibit such ingenious food-seeking strategies as unscrewing hinges to kitchen cabinets at night, dangling food on strings in the heating vents, and memorizing credit card numbers and ordering food deliveries to a friend's address. Such tactics require foresight and planning yet contradict well-documented deficits in executive functioning in people with PWS, especially task-switching and planning abilities [7, 8]. Perhaps these contradictory findings can be partially explained by hunger. Al-Shawaf [33] reports that people in states of chronic or acute hunger have difficulties sustaining attention on food-

irrelevant tasks, thereby compromising their general planning and problem-solving abilities. At the same time, however, hunger enhances memory of food stimuli [34] and the ability to solve food-acquisition problems [33].

Second, transitioning from childhood into adolescence or adulthood typically brings more opportunities for individuals to engage in community activities outside of the family home. And, compared to home, food is apt to be more readily available in community recreational, educational, or vocational venues. As one parent noted “My 23-year-old is more independent now, and he has found a church down the street that feeds him.”

Convergent validity analyses of the FSZ confirmed the hypothesized relationship between the FSZ and hyperphagia. Regression analyses revealed that all but one FSZ factor was predictive of the total HQ-CT. Follow-up comparisons of FSZ factors across those with low, medium, or high HQ-CT scores revealed robust differences in the expected direction in all five FSZ factors. These data offer a point of reference for using the FSZ in future studies or clinical trials. Importantly, age did not differ across HQ-CT tertiles, indicating that parents implement FSZ strategies in response to their child’s hyperphagic symptoms, not necessarily their age.

One FSZ factor was not a significant predictor of hyperphagia, Alerting Others and Community Supervision. Even so, all items in this factor were frequently endorsed, especially in the youngest age group. It is possible that, given their child’s PWS diagnosis, families preemptively alert others about their child’s food issues as a baseline strategy. This widespread strategy remains in place, even as parents implement additional FSZ tactics in response to the changing needs of their individual with PWS.

The FSZ is a means of reminding parents of the many ways that they accommodate to their child's hyperphagia. A related literature examines accommodation in parents of children with psychiatric conditions, especially anxiety disorders [35, 36]. In these families, accommodation refers to how parents modify their behaviors to alleviate or avoid the distress, anxiety or maladaptive behaviors caused by their child's disorder. In PWS, food safety tactics also alleviate anxiety, including food-related temper outbursts or repetitive questioning [4].

Although parental accommodation in both instances may temporarily reduce child anxiety, they lead to markedly different outcomes. Higher levels of parental accommodation to their children's psychiatric symptoms backfires, and in the long-term is associated with increased symptomatology, impairment, and poorer responses to treatment [35, 36]. In contrast, food safety tactics in PWS are lifesaving. In the long-term, however, food safety practices may become the "new normal," potentially compromising accurate parental evaluations of hyperphagia.

Parental responses to the open-ended question offered poignant insights into both the logistics and stress of ensuring food safety. Several overarching messages emerged from their comments. First, given the high response rate to this question, parents were clearly motivated to explain their food safety practices. Similarly, parents in the focus groups we conducted in developing the FSZ offered that they are rarely asked to discuss food safety and welcomed the opportunity to do so.

Second, parental remarks highlighted that food safety is a life-long, round the clock pursuit, one that is especially challenging given the necessity for humans to eat and the omnipresence of food in social and community settings. And food safety

requires constant vigilance. As one parent offered, “If the food is not secured and she gets it, then it is our fault. Not hers. This syndrome is terrible for them to live with.”

Third, parents were incredibly diligent and creative in establishing food security tactics at home, school, and in the community. At the same time, however, these parents also experience markedly high levels of caregiving burden. Indeed, levels of caregiving burden in PWS are high even as compared to parents of children with autism spectrum disorder or older caregivers of spouses with dementia [37]. Such burden relates to managing both their child’s hyperphagia and behavior problems, and has a profound, negative impact on their social and personal quality of life [37]. As one mother offered “My ENTIRE life is food security. 24/7, 24/7. We have NO life!”

Added to this burden is a counterintuitive psychological dilemma—the parental instinct to nurture and feed their hungry children juxtaposed with the reality that doing so could compromise their health and longevity. As one participant astutely observed, “It is so hard to balance the psychology of the parent, of wanting to feed a hungry child, with the dire medical repercussions of doing so.”

Finally, and as Table 7 depicted, there is no single “right” way of practicing food security. Some parents, for example, avoid attending restaurants or social gatherings, others find ways of navigating them. Some keep their children away from the school cafeteria, others do not. Some allow siblings to keep treats locked in their bedrooms, others forbid it. Some parents use locks and alarms, others do not. Parents are thus implementing FSZ tactics that meet the individual and changing needs of their child with PWS while also considering what is feasible within the larger context of their family.

Several study weaknesses should be noted. First, participants were generally White, well educated, and with relatively high annual incomes. Although SES was not significantly related to the FSZ, it would be helpful for future studies to include more economically or racially diverse participants. In this vein, one respondent offered that being homeless and in temporary housing made food safety nearly impossible. Second, test-retest reliability is typically assessed across shorter time frames than the 6-month interval used in the current study. Even so, mean FSZ scores at Time 1 and 2 were almost identical, and Intra-class correlations were strong. Finally, we did not examine associations between the FSZ and family composition or marital status. Future research is needed on how, for example, siblings, grandparents, current or ex-spouses practice or perceive food safety.

Despite these concerns, this study is the first to document and analyze food safety tactics in PWS. The 21-item FSZ emerged as a psychometrically robust measure of parental food safety tactics aimed at enhancing their accurate evaluations of hyperphagia in future research or clinical trials. In the meantime, the study also shines a light on the never-ending and extraordinary measures that parents use to ensure the health and wellbeing of their loved one with PWS.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank the many parents who participated in this study, as well as the generosity of stakeholders in providing their time and essential feedback in developing the FSZ. We are especially grateful for the enthusiastic support of our research from the Foundation for Prader-Willi Research (FPWR), including Teresa Strong PhD, Lauren Schwartz PhD, Jessica Bohonowych PhD, and members of the FPWR Clinical Trials Consortium. The authors also thank Robert M Hodapp, PhD, for his critical reading of an earlier draft of this manuscript.

References

1. Butler MG, Hartin SN, Hossain WA, Manzardo AM, Kimonis V, Dykens E. Molecular genetic classification in Prader-Willi syndrome: a multisite cohort study. J Med Genet. 2019; 56:149–53.

2. Cassidy, SB, Schwartz S, Miller JL, Driscoll DJ. Prader-Willi syndrome. Genet Med. 2012;14(1): 10-26.

3.Dykens EM, Roof E. Behavior in Prader-Willi syndrome: relationship to genetic subtypes and age. J Child Psychol Psychiatr. 2008; 49:1001–1008.

4. Schwartz L, Caixàs A, Dimitropoulos A, Dykens E, Duis J, Einfeld S, et al. Behavioral features in Prader-Willi syndrome: Consensus paper from the International PWS Clinical Trial Consortium. J Neurodev Disord. 2021; 13:25. https://doi.org/10.1186/s11689-021-09373-2

5. Milner KM, Craig EE, Thompson RJ, Veltman MWM, Thomas NS, Roberts S, et al. Prader-Willi syndrome: intellectual abilities and behavioural features by genetic subtype. J Child Psychol Psychiatr. 2005; 46:1089–1096.

6. Dykens EM, Roof E, Hunt-Hawkins H, Daniell C, Jurgensmeyer S. Profiles and trajectories of impaired social cognition in people with Prader-Willi syndrome. PLoS ONE. 2019;14: e0223162. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0223162

7. Chevalère, J., Postal, V., Jauregui, J., Copet, P., Laurier, V., & Thuilleaux, D. (2013). Assessment of Executive Functions in Prader–Willi Syndrome and Relationship with Intellectual Level. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*, *26*(4), 309-318. doi: 10.1111/jar.12044.

8. Woodcock, K. A., Oliver, C., & Humphreys, G. W. (2009b). Task-switching deficits and repetitive behaviour in genetic neurodevelopmental disorders: data from children with Prader–Willi syndrome chromosome 15 q11–q13 deletion and boys with Fragile X syndrome. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, *26*(2), 172-194. doi: 10.1080/0264329080268592.

9. Holland A, Whittington J, Hinton E. The paradox of Prader-Willi syndrome: A genetic model of starvation. Lancet. 2003; 362:989–91.

10. Dykens EM, Roof E, Hunt-Hawkins H. 'The cure for us is a lot of things': How young people with Prader-Willi syndrome view themselves and future clinical trials. J Appl Res Intellect Disabil. (2021);1–11. DOI: 10.1111/jar.12950JARID

11. Dykens EM, Maxwell MA, Pantino E, Kossler R, Roof E. Assessment of hyperphagia in Prader-Willi syndrome. Obes. 2007; 15:1816-1826.

12. Fehnel SE, Brown TM, Nelson L, Chen A, Kim DD, Roof E, Dykens EM. Development of the hyperphagia questionnaire for use In Prader-Willi syndrome clinical trials. Value Health. 2015; 18, A25.

13. Roof E, Deal CL, McCandles SE, Cowan RL, Miller JL, Hamilton JK, et al. Intranasal carbetocin reduces hyperphagia, anxiousness and distress in Prader-Willi syndrome: CARE-PWS Phase 3 Trial. J Clin Endocrinol Metab. 2023; 00:1–13. https://doi.org/10.1210/clinem/dgad015

14. Dykens EM, Miller J, Angulo, M, Roof E, Reidy M, Hatoum HT, et al. Reduction of hyperphagia in children and youth with Prader-Willi syndrome: Results of a multicenter, randomized, double blind, placebo-controlled study assessing safety and efficacy of intranasal carbetocin. J Clin Invest. 2018; 3(12): e98333.

15. Miller JL, Gevers E, Bridges N, Yanovski JA, Salehi P, Obrynba KS et al. Diazoxide choline extended-release tablet in people with Prader-Willi syndrome: A double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. J Clin Endocrinol Metab. 2023; 1-10. https://doi.org/10.1210/clinem/dgad014

16. Bellis SA, Juhn I, Adams S, Mullarkey L, Holland A. The consequences of hyperphagia in people with Prader-Willi Syndrome: A systematic review of studies of morbidity and mortality. Eur J Med Genet. 2022; 65(1). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejmg.2021.104379

17. Stevenson DA, Heinemann J, Angulo, M. Butler, MG, Loker J Rupe N, et al. Gastric rupture and necrosis in Prader-Willi syndrome. J Pediatr Gastroenterol Nutr. 2007; 45(2):272-4. doi: 10.1097/MPG.0b013e31805b82b5.

18. Deal CL, Tony M, Hoybye C, Allen DB, Tauber M, Christianses JS et al. Growth Hormone Research Society workshop summary: Consensus guidelines for recombinant human growth hormone therapy in Prader-Willi syndrome. J Clin Endocron Metab. 2013; 98(6), E1072-87. doi: 10.1210/jc.2012-3888.

19. Dykens EM, Roof E & Hunt-Hawkins H. Cognitive and adaptive advantages of growth hormone treatment in children with Prader-Willi syndrome. J Child Psychol Psychiatry. 2016; *doi:10.1111/jcpp.12601*

20. Alsaif M, Elliot SA, MacKenzie ML, Prado CM, Field CJ & Haqq AM. (2017). Energy metabolism profile in individuals with Prader-Willi syndrome and implications for clinical management: A systematic review. **Adv Nutr.** 2017; 8(6):905-915. *doi: https://doi.org/10.3945/an.117.016253*

21. Mahmoud R, Kimonis V & Nulter M. 2021. Clinical trials in Prader–Willi Syndrome: A review. In J Mol Sci. 2023; 24(3): 2150. Doi: 10.3390/ijms24032150

22. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services FDA Center for Drug Evaluation and Research., U.S. Department of Health and Human Services FDA Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research. & U.S. Department of Health and Human Services FDA Center for Devices and Radiological Health. Guidance for industry: patient-reported outcome measures: use in medical product development to support labeling claims: draft guidance. Health Qual Life Outcomes. 2006; 4 (79). https://doi.org/10.1186/1477-7525-4-79

23. Bohonowych J, Miller J, McCandless S, Strong T. The global Prader-Willi syndrome registry: development, launch, and early demographics. Genes (Basel). 2019;10(9):713.

24. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research electronic data capture (REDCap): A metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research informatics support, J Biomed Inform. 2009; 42(2):377-81.

25. Costello AB, Osborne JW. Exploratory factor analysis: four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. Pract. Assess. Res. Evaluation. 2005;10(7):1–9.

26. de Winter JCF, Dodou D & Wieringa PA. Exploratory factor analysis with small sample sizes. Multivar Behav Res. 2009; 44, 147-181.

27. Koo TK, Li MY. A guideline of selecting and reporting intraclass correlation coefficients for reliability research. J Chiropr Med. 2016; 15:155–163.

28. Worthington RL & Whittker TA. Scale development research A content analysis and recommendations for best practices. Counsel Psychol. 2006; 34(6): 806-838.

29. Comrey AL & Lee HB. (1992). A first course in factor analysis (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

30. Streiner D. Starting at the beginning: An introduction to coefficient alpha and internal consistency. J Pers Assess. 2003; 80: 99-103.

31. Koo TK, Li MY. A guideline of selecting and reporting intraclass correlation coefficients for reliability research. J Chiropr Med. 2016; 15:155–163.

32. Dykens EM. Contaminated and unusual food combinations: What do people with Prader-Willi syndrome choose? Ment Retard. 2000; 38(2), 163-171.

33. Al-Shawaf L. The evolutional psychology of hunger. Appetite, *2016;* 105, 591-594.

34. Montagrin, A., Martins-Klein, B., Sander, D., & Mather, M. Effects of hunger on emotional arousal responses and attention/memory biases. Emotion.2019; 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0000680

35. Lebowitz ER, Woolston J, Bar-Haim Y, Calvocoressi L, Dauser C, Warnick E, et al. Family accommodation in pediatric anxiety disorders. Depress Anxiety. 2013; 30(1), 47–54. https:// doi. org/ 10. 1002/ da. 21998

36. Lebowitz ER, Marin CE & Silverman WK. Measuring family accommodation of childhood anxiety: Confirmatory factor analysis, validity, and reliability of the parent and child family accommodation scale – anxiety. J Clin Child Adolesc Psychol. 2020; 49(6) 752-760. https:// doi. org/ 10. 1080/ 15374 416..16140 02

37. Kayadjanin N, Schwartz L, Farrar E, Comtois KA, Strong TV. High levels of caregiver burden in Prader-Willi syndrome. PloS One. 2018: 13(3): e0194655. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0194655