

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

The Development and Validation of the Global Post Trauma Symptom Scale-Uganda among Trauma-Affected Adults

Lynn Murphy Michalopoulos ^{1,*,@}, Melissa Meinhart ^{2,@}, Erin Walton ^{1,@}, David Robertson ^{1,&}, Autumn
Thompson ^{5,&}, Thomas Northrup ^{1,&}, Jong Sung Kim ^{3,&}, Anne Conway ^{3,4,&}, Nikita Aggarwal^{1,&}

¹ Social Work, University of Maryland, Baltimore, MD USA

² Social Work, Columbia University, New York, NY USA

³ College of Social Work, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN USA

⁴ Department of Pediatrics, Division of General Pediatrics, College of Medicine, University of Tennessee
Health Science Center, Knoxville, TN USA

⁵ School of Social Work, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX USA

* Corresponding author email: lynn.michalopoulos@ssw.umaryland.edu

@These authors contributed equally to this work.

& These authors also contributed equally to this work.

Search terms:

Trauma; Measurement; Validation; Symptomatology; Item Response Theory

27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to adapt and validate the Global Post-Traumatic Stress Scale (GPTSS) among adult caregivers of youth living with HIV in Uganda. This is the first study to adapt and validate a non-western instrument measuring post-traumatic symptoms in Uganda, which is critical in the accurate assessment of caregiver trauma on psychosocial functioning. The study utilized qualitative (i.e., cognitive interviews) and quantitative (e.g., classical test and item response theory) methods to establish content, criterion, and construct validity. The results indicated that the GPTSS was a valid and reliable assessment tool for the population. Specifically, cognitive interview results (n=31) indicated that participants broadly understood items of the GPTSS, but revisions in wording were needed to capture the intended meaning of some items. A reduced version of the GPTSS, GPTSS-U, was created through item response theory analyses based on discrimination criteria and difficulty parameters. A positive relationship between higher GPTSS-U and the PHQ-9 scores indicated acceptable criterion validity with a moderate effect size ($r = 0.547$; $p < 0.000$). Results from the graded response model indicated high discrimination parameters (range $b = -.88, 3.14$). Test information function curve findings indicated that the GPTSS is most precise at moderate to severe levels of post-traumatic symptoms. Using nested linear regression models, we found incremental validity as the total scores on the GPTSS-U significantly predicted functional impairment ($p < 0.05$) beyond the impact of the Post Traumatic Stress Checklist-5. Overall findings indicate that post-traumatic symptom measures must be adapted and developed for cross-cultural use to maintain validity and contextual relevance.

50 Introduction

51 Exposure to potentially traumatic events can compound ongoing daily stressors,
52 such as poverty and living with HIV. Among populations in low and middle-income
53 countries, this is especially alarming as the risk of experiencing a traumatic event and
54 developing a mental health disorder is higher due to contextual risk factors, such as
55 poverty, conflict, and displacement (1–8). We are at a critical junction in global mental
56 health research, as projections indicate the population of LMIC will double by 2053 (9),
57 and awareness around trauma and global mental health continues to increase (8,10–
58 13).

59 Unfortunately, most global assessments of post-trauma symptoms rely on
60 Western assessment tools with a heavy emphasis on Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder
61 (PTSD) (8,10,14–16). For example, Fodor et al.(8) found that 87% of research studies
62 examining traumatic stress were in high-income countries (HIC), with over half of the
63 papers (51%) being from researchers in the United States. As a latent construct, PTSD
64 is similar among Western trauma-affected populations; however, there are inconsistent
65 findings related to the relevance and reliability of PTSD among trauma-affected
66 populations from LMIC (17,18). There is an ongoing debate in global mental health
67 around PTSD, whereby some researchers assess PTSD as a standardized global
68 disorder (7,19), and others emphasize local expressions of trauma (20–22).

69 In response to the lack of instruments that combine both perspectives, the Global
70 Post-Trauma Symptom-Item Bank (GPTS-IB) was developed (7,23). The GPTS-IB is a
71 51-item bank based on a systematic review of qualitative studies that indicated post-
72 trauma symptoms (24). The GPTS-IB acknowledges the potential utility of PTSD

73 constructs in standard measures and accounts for other post-traumatic symptoms. The
74 goal in creating the GPTS-IB was to establish an item bank that can be adapted and
75 locally validated in various non-western trauma-affected settings. The application of
76 GPTS-IB aims to make interpretations from norm-referenced scores about the
77 perceived existence of symptomology related to ongoing trauma at the level of the
78 individual.

79 Emerging research demonstrates that caregivers of children with high-need
80 illnesses (e.g., HIV) often report traumatization from the caregiving experience.
81 Caregivers reportedly have a higher prevalence of mental health needs (25,26), which
82 can result in stigma and discrimination that can affect children under their care (27).
83 Particularly relevant to the study context, caregivers in Uganda are often additionally
84 burdened with insecure provisions for food and difficulties accessing health care (28).

85 For this study, the GPTS-IB was used to assess the nuances of post-traumatic
86 symptoms among adult caregivers of children living with HIV in Uganda. The GPTS-IB
87 scores were utilized to make inferences about the severity of post-traumatic symptoms
88 experienced indirectly and directly among Ugandan caregivers of children living with
89 HIV. The primary aim was to assess the use of mixed methods to reduce the GPTS-IB
90 to a relevant scale among Ugandan adults (i.e., the Global Post Trauma Symptom
91 Scale-Uganda; GPTSS-U). The secondary aim was to contextually validate the GPTSS-
92 U using Classical Test Theory and Item-Response Theory (IRT). This is the first study
93 aimed at utilizing the GPTS-IB to adapt and develop a reliable and valid post-trauma
94 assessment tool in Uganda.

95 This study is especially significant for this region as most programs and services
96 that address mental health and psychosocial functioning are now applied through task-
97 shifting, a process where lay workers are trained to treat specific health disorders (29–
98 31). As task-shifting approaches become more widely utilized to address the “treatment
99 gap” in global mental health, research into its efficacy both for recipients of lay worker
100 interventions and for their caretakers is needed (32); this will build upon the growing
101 body of research to show the efficacy of treatment delivery by non-specialists (33–35).
102 To our knowledge, this is the first study to validate a post-traumatic symptom instrument
103 among trauma-affected caregivers of children with HIV in Uganda. Using the GPTSS-U
104 in the caregiver context may demonstrate how mental health symptomology varies
105 across cultural contexts, informing tailored responses to intervention development.

106 **Methods**

107 **Background and Setting of Study**

108 This study was conducted by the International Center for Child Health and
109 Development (ICHAD) as part of two more extensive projects, Suubi+Adherence and
110 Suubi Maka, both in Uganda's Rakai and Masaka regions. Suubi+Adherence is a
111 longitudinal randomized control trial [NIH: 1R01HD074949-01] focusing on economic
112 strengthening to increase adherence to HIV treatment for adolescents living with HIV in
113 Uganda. Suubi Maka is a cluster randomized control trial that focuses on the
114 educational outcomes of orphaned children through economic empowerment [NIH:
115 RMH081763A]. Participants were included in the study if they were primary caregivers
116 of a youth participant in the Suubi+Adherence or Suubi Maka study. The current study
117 aimed to implement valid and reliable scales to measure psychosocial outcomes among

118 caregivers within the interventions. Caregivers of youth living with HIV or orphaned
119 because of HIV-related deaths were chosen as a vulnerable population at risk for
120 multiple traumatic experiences and ongoing daily problems, indicating the likelihood that
121 we would include participants both with and without post-trauma symptoms.

122 **Training**

123 Ten local research staff members were trained to administer the psychosocial
124 measures with caregivers of participants involved in the Suubi+Adherence or Suubi
125 Maka study. All research staff received extensive training on cognitive interviewing
126 methods and administration of quantitative assessment of psychosocial problems for
127 the validation study. The research staff received ongoing feedback and training from the
128 validation study's principal investigator (PI) through role plays and group discussions
129 among the training team.

130 **Sample**

131 Participants were eligible to participate if they were indicated as caregivers of
132 one or more intervention participants and over the age of 18. Exclusion criteria
133 consisted of active psychosis or the presence of a significant developmental delay.

134 **Recruitment**

135 Participants were recruited from February 1, 2016 until December 18, 2016.

136 **Consent and Ethical Approval**

137 The cognitive interviews and validation study were approved by an IRB within a
138 US-based and Uganda-based university. All procedures performed in this study
139 involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the
140 institutional and/or national research committee and with the 1964 Helsinki Declaration

141 and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards. Written informed consent
142 was obtained from all participants. Participants received UGX 10,000 (local currency,
143 equivalent to USD 3.30) for the cognitive interviews and UGX 15,000 (USD 5) for the
144 validation study.

145 **Measures**

146 ***Demographics***

147 Basic demographics of age, gender, and HIV status were assessed by self-
148 report.

149 ***Global Post Trauma Symptom-Item Bank (GPTS-IB)***

150 The GPTS-IB (23,36) was used to assess post-trauma symptoms. The GPTS-IB
151 is a 51-item self-report item bank used to assess symptoms of post-trauma symptoms in
152 adults. The GPTS-IB and subsequent reduced Global Post Trauma Symptom Scale-
153 Uganda (GPTSS-U) use Likert scales to determine the frequency of symptoms
154 experienced in the past two weeks. Response categories are based on four ordered
155 response categories (*0 = none of the time, 1 = a little of the time, 2 = most of the time,*
156 *and 3 = almost all of the time*). For each item of the GPTS-IB and GPTSS-U,
157 participants were asked to indicate their experience of each symptom not in relation to a
158 particular traumatic event.

159 ***Functioning Scale***

160 A local measure of functional impairment, which was previously developed and
161 validated among Ugandan adults in the Rakai and Masaka regions, was used in the
162 current study (37). The measure includes tasks that men (9 items) and women (9 items)
163 do to care for themselves, their families, and their communities (e.g., participate in

164 community development activities, farm, care for children, etc.). Participants were asked
165 how much difficulty they had performing each item in the past four weeks. Response
166 options ranged from 0 ‘no difficulty’ to 4 ‘often cannot do.’ Functional impairment was
167 used as a validity criterion to assess the impact of post-trauma symptoms on
168 participants’ daily lives.

169 ***Patient Health Questionnaire-9 (PHQ-9)***

170 The PHQ-9 (38) is a nine-item self-report measure of symptoms of depression
171 experienced in the past two weeks, with response options ranging from 0 ‘not at all’ to 3
172 ‘nearly every day.’ The PHQ-9 is a commonly used measure of depression that has
173 been used in non-Western contexts (39–43), including sub-Saharan Africa (44–46). In
174 the current study, the PHQ-9 was used to determine the criterion validity of the GPTSS-
175 U among participants because previous research has demonstrated support for the co-
176 occurrence of depression and post-trauma symptoms among trauma-affected
177 populations in both Western (47–50) and non-Western settings (51–53).

178 ***Post-Traumatic Stress-Disorder Checklist for DSM-5 (PCL-5)***

179 The Post Traumatic Stress Disorder Checklist-5 (PCL-5; 54) is a 20-item
180 questionnaire that corresponds with the DSM-5 symptom criteria for PTSD. In the
181 current study, similar to the GPTS-IB, we asked participants to indicate how much each
182 symptom bothered them in the past two weeks and used response categories 0 = none
183 of the time, 1 = a little of the time, 2 = most of the time and 3 = almost all of the time,
184 rather than the five-category response options of the standard PCL-5. This was done to
185 maintain continuity across assessment tools, which the study team believed would
186 reduce confusion that could be caused by changing response categories. As such, the

187 range for the PCL-5 total symptom severity is 0-60, which lowered the preliminary
188 suggested cutoff score from 33 (54) to 20 in our study for a provisional PTSD diagnosis.
189 The PCL-5 has been used among trauma-affected populations from LMIC
190 (18,19,33,55). While the Post Traumatic Diagnostic Scale (56) has been validated
191 among adolescents and young adults in Northern Uganda, it is based on the DSM-IV
192 symptoms. The PCL-5 has not yet been validated in Uganda.

193 ***The Life Events Checklist for the DSM-5 (LEC-5)***

194 The LEC-5 (54) is a 16-item questionnaire that is used to screen for exposure to
195 potentially traumatic events (i.e., events associated with increased risk of PTSD or
196 psychosocial distress) in a person's lifetime. The LEC-5 has been widely used among
197 trauma-affected populations from non-Western LMICs (55,57). In the current study,
198 participants were asked to indicate if they had experienced or witnessed each
199 potentially traumatic event. A total sum score was calculated to indicate the total
200 number of events experienced (range 0-16) and witnessed (range 0-16), in addition to a
201 total score of witnessed and experienced events (range 0-32).

202 **Procedure**

203 ***Translation***

204 All measures were translated into Luganda (the local language in the region)
205 using translation-back translation, followed by group translation to ensure equivalence
206 in the meaning of terms, conceptual understanding, and the ability of an adult with
207 limited formal education to understand. Two translators certified in Luganda instruction—
208 a secondary school teacher and a research assistant—completed the initial translation-

209 back translation. The research team reviewed the translated assessment instruments
210 and back-translated assessment tools item by item.

211 ***Data Analysis***

212 To assess the face and content validity of the GPTS-IB, cognitive interviews were
213 administered to 30 adult caregivers. Cognitive interviewing is a research method that
214 establishes face and content validity by systematically asking participants how they
215 comprehend items on a questionnaire (58,59). We specifically utilized the *think-aloud*
216 cognitive interviewing method, which entails asking participants to describe each
217 questionnaire item in their own words with examples (58). For example, participants
218 were asked to describe the following in their own words and give examples for '*Feeling*
219 *afraid, including being afraid that a traumatic event would happen again.*' The
220 administration included reading the 51 items of the GPTS-IB to the participant. All
221 questions and responses were in Luganda, and answers were recorded verbatim using
222 paper and pencil.

223 Responses to the *think-aloud* methods were assessed in terms of consistency
224 with the intended meaning for each item. One author of the current study and a
225 graduate-level research assistant coded responses of each item based on consistency
226 with the intended meaning. Where the intended meaning was inconsistent, items were
227 revised or changed for the validation study after full review from the research team for
228 final validation before conducting the study.

229 ***Development of the GPTSS-U***

230 For the validation study, the administration included reading each item of the
231 measures to the participants. All responses were entered into Qualtrics (Qualtrics,

232 2016) by local research staff in Luganda. All research staff were fluent in both Luganda
233 and English.

234 All data analyses were conducted using STATA 14 (Stata Corp, 2013). The
235 GPTS-IB was reduced to a shortened and contextually specific version (GPTSS-
236 Uganda; GPTSS-U) based on results from the item response theory analysis. We first
237 conducted an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) to meet the assumption of
238 unidimensionality (60). The assumption of unidimensionality is met if the factor analysis
239 results in a 1-factor solution or a dominant first factor, with at least 20% of the variance
240 explained (60–62). The assumption of local independence was tested through
241 discrimination parameters for each item in the IRT model. Local independence was
242 determined by a slope < 4.00 (60).

243 Based on the EFA results, a unidimensional graded response IRT model (GRM)
244 was conducted to assess the degree to which the measure reflects the underlying latent
245 variable (63). This study used the GRM as this model allows for ordered response
246 categories. IRT was used to assess the ability of each item to differentiate among
247 individuals at different points along the latent continuum of post-traumatic stress
248 (64,65).

249 For each item, difficulty (or item location, b), discrimination (a), and measurement
250 information (θ) parameters were estimated. Item difficulty parameters (b) indicate the
251 amount of post-trauma symptoms where the probability of endorsing an item with a
252 particular response category is 0.50. Three difficulty parameters (b_1, b_2, b_3) were
253 estimated, corresponding with the four possible response categories of the GPTS-IB.
254 The first difficulty parameter (b_1) indicates the level of the underlying latent trait of post-

255 trauma symptoms, where the probability of endorsing an item with a “0” instead of “1” or
256 “2” is 0.50. The second difficulty parameter (b_2) is for the response of < 1. The third
257 difficulty parameter (b_3) is for the response of < 2. Discrimination parameters indicate
258 the ability of a particular item to distinguish between individuals with low and high
259 amounts of the latent construct of post-trauma symptoms. Values of 0.01-0.34 are
260 considered to be very low, 0.35-0.64 low, 0.65 -1.34 moderate, 1.35 -1.69 high, and
261 1.70 and above very high (66). Measurement information (or precision) was determined
262 by the Test Information Curve (TIC). Measurement information represents the certainty
263 with which the measure assesses the underlying latent trait (θ) and can vary as a
264 function of the level of θ .

265 We selected items for the GPTSS-U based on difficulty and discrimination
266 parameters, as well as measurement information. Using item location estimates, we
267 selected items that spanned a range of post-trauma symptom severity. We also
268 selected items based on high discrimination values or with estimates of 1.35 and above.
269 After selection of items for the GPTSS-U, we compared the TIC of the GPTS-IB to the
270 GPTSS-U. We examined whether the selected items of the GPTSS-U had a similar TIC
271 compared to the GPTS-IB across different levels of severity. Our final step included
272 conducting a GRM IRT model to estimate item difficulty parameters and discrimination
273 parameters of the reduced GPTSS-U scale.

274 **Data Analysis Plan for the Validation of the GPTSS-Uganda**

275 ***Internal Consistency Reliability***

276 Cronbach's alpha scores were utilized to determine the internal consistency
277 reliability of the GPTSS-U. A value between 0.70 and 0.79 is considered to be fair, 0.80
278 and 0.89 is considered good, and 0.90 and above is deemed excellent (67,68).

279 ***Construct Validity***

280 Construct validity is the degree to which a scale measures the theoretical
281 construct it was intended to measure and is associated with other related constructs. As
282 such, construct validity was determined through Spearman's correlation coefficients (ρ)
283 to examine the strength of the relationship between the GPTSS-U and PHQ-9, PCL-5,
284 trauma experienced from the LEC-5, and functioning scale. The effect size was based
285 on a coefficient between 0.10-0.29, representing a small association, a coefficient
286 between 0.30-0.49, representing a medium association, and a coefficient of 0.50 and
287 above, representing a large association (69). We hypothesized that the GPTSS-U would
288 be positively associated with each measure.

289 ***Criterion Validity***

290 Criterion validity is defined as the relationship of a scale to a criterion variable,
291 such as a clinical diagnosis (70). We used the Bolton method (37), a method used in
292 LMICs to establish criterion validity where there are no psychiatrists available to provide
293 psychiatric diagnostic assessments, to establish the criterion validity of the GPTSS-U. In
294 the current study, we developed cases based on a PCL-5 cutoff score of 20 or above.
295 Non-cases were participants who had a score below 20 on the PCL-5. We then
296 conducted a two-sample t-test with the hypothesis that cases would have a significantly
297 higher score on the GPTSS-U than non-cases.

298 ***Sensitivity and Specificity Analyses***

299 We conducted sensitivity and specificity analyses using receiver operating
300 characteristic (ROC) curves to test the performance of the GPTSS-U and suggest
301 appropriate cut-off scores for case identification. Similar to criterion validity, we used the
302 cutoff of the PCL-5 as cases and non-cases. ROC curves plot the true positive rate
303 (sensitivity) against the false positive rate (specificity). An area under the curve (AUC) of
304 0.50 indicates that the GPTSS-U would have no diagnostic utility, and an AUC of 1.0
305 would indicate perfect prediction. AUC values of 0.50–0.70 indicate low accuracy,
306 0.70–0.90 moderate accuracy, and above 0.90 high accuracy (71). An optimal cut-off
307 point was generated for the GPTSS-U based on maximizing sensitivity and specificity
308 (72).

309 ***Incremental Validity***

310 Finally, we assessed the incremental or predictive validity of the GPTSS-U on
311 functional impairment using nested linear regression models. In Model 1, we examined
312 the impact of gender, age, HIV status, total LEC-5 traumatic events experienced, total
313 PHQ-9 score, and total PCL-5 score. In Model 2, we added the GPTSS-U total score to
314 the model. Incremental validity would be supported if total scores on the GPTSS-U
315 significantly predicted functional impairment ($p < 0.05$) beyond the impact of the PCL-5.
316 This was measured by a statistically significant increase in the R^2 statistic when
317 comparing Model 1 to Model 2 (73). To measure collinearity between scores on the
318 PCL-5 and the GPTSS-U, we also examined the variance inflation factor (VIF). A VIF of
319 5 or above would indicate concern that the variables were highly collinear (74).

320 **Results**

321 **Cognitive Interviews**

322 Thirty participants (n=30) completed the cognitive interviews (83.33% female).
323 The average age was 49.07 years (SD=11.18, range 33-83 years). Verbal responses
324 from the cognitive interviews were back-translated into English, compiled in Excel, and
325 coded by main themes. Responses from the think-aloud methods were coded and
326 reviewed by two members of the research team in terms of consistency with the
327 intended meaning for each item. The majority of items required slight revision in wording
328 or additional description in meaning. For example, many participants described '*feeling*
329 *detached from others*' as '*feelings of sorrow*.' As such, we revised the item with the
330 addition of more details in the description, i.e., '*feeling detached or cut off from others*'
331 (*i.e., alienated, isolated, lonely, withdrawn or unable to socialize with others*).

332 **Demographics for Validation Study**

333 Two hundred caregivers (n=200) completed measures for the validation study
334 (80.50% female). The average age of participants was 47.70 years (SD= 12.52, range
335 19-83).

336 **Creating the GPTSS-U from the GPTS-IB**

337 ***Unidimensionality Assumption***

338 A simple factor solution was obtained using Varimax rotation. Kaiser Meyer Olkin
339 (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy was superb with .84 (75) and a significant
340 Bartlett's test of sphericity ($\chi^2_{(1275)} = 4264.56, p < .001$) suggesting a factor analysis was
341 appropriate to conduct with the data. Seven factors were suggested from initial
342 eigenvalues over 1. However, the first factor indicated over 44% of the variance, and, as
343 such, unidimensionality was determined.

344 ***Local Independence***

345 The graded response IRT model indicated local independence of the GPTS-IB as
346 all discrimination parameters were < 4.00 .

347 ***Selection of Items***

348 The graded response IRT model indicated items with discrimination parameters
349 ranging from low to high. For example, items such as '*headaches or migraines*' ($a =$
350 0.48), '*problems related to a long-term condition or a physical health problem*' ($a =$
351 0.66), and '*unable to eat or lack of appetite*' ($a = 0.69$) were indicated as poor in the
352 ability to distinguish between participants with low and high amounts of post-trauma
353 symptoms. Conversely, items such as '*sadness, sorrow or depressed mood*' ($a = 1.86$),
354 '*emotional pain, suffering, despair or distress*' ($a = 1.97$), and '*feeling confused or*
355 '*unable to figure out what was going on*' ($a = 2.10$) were indicated as high in their ability
356 to distinguish between participants with high and low amounts of post-trauma
357 symptoms. Discrimination parameters for the GPTS-IB are presented in Table 1. Based
358 on these estimates and item locations across low, moderate, and severe levels of post-
359 trauma symptoms, the GPTS-IB was reduced to 11 items for the GPTSS-U.

360 **Table 1**

361 *GPTS-IB Discrimination Parameters*

GPTS-IB Item	Discrimination Parameter (α) (Standard Error)
1. Felt afraid, including being afraid that a traumatic event or stressful event would happen again.	0.89 (0.16)

2. Felt detached or cut off from others (i.e., alienated, isolated, lonely, withdrawn, or unable to socialize with others).	0.93 (0.18)
3. Had disturbed sleep or trouble sleeping (difficulty falling or staying asleep).	0.85 (0.16)
4. Been unable to experience positive emotions (i.e., happiness, joy, excitement).	1.34 (0.20)
5. Felt apathetic or that life has become meaningless	1.19 (0.24)
6. Had persistent negative expectations or felt hopeless.	0.82 (0.18)
7. Experienced repeated and disturbing memories about a traumatic or stressful event.	1.64 (0.21)
8. Felt agitated, irritated, frustrated, or angry.	1.03 (0.18)
9. Cried frequently.	1.30 (0.24)
10. Felt sadness, sorrow, or a depressed mood.	1.9 (0.25)
11. Experienced disturbing dreams or nightmares related to a stressful or traumatic event.	1.08 (0.19)
12. Experienced excessive worry, anxiety, or an ongoing sense of panic.	1.35 (0.21)

13. Had frequent arguments or fights with an intimate partner, family, or community member.	0.90 (0.22)
14. Had headaches/migraines.	0.48 (0.15)
15. Had trouble concentrating.	1.13 (0.20)
16. Felt forgetful or experienced memory loss.	0.87 (0.17)
17. Felt you were thinking too much.	1.55 (0.21)
18. Felt that no one understands what you have been through or are currently experiencing.	0.89 (0.17)
19. Had a lack of or reduced interest in activities that you used to enjoy.	0.89 (0.16)
20. Felt tired, fatigued, weak, or exhausted.	1.04 (0.17)
21. Experienced irritable behavior or angry outbursts.	1.11 (0.19)
22. Engaged in reckless, self-destructive, risky, or harmful behavior (i.e., abusing alcohol/drugs, risky sex, cutting).	0.73 (0.33)
23. Become emotionally upset when reminded of a stressful or traumatic event.	1.48 (0.22)
24. Felt a sense of loss.	1.11 (0.19)

25. Felt an ongoing sense of uncertainty, helplessness, or a lack of control.	1.11 (0.18)
26. Had thoughts of wanting to kill yourself.	1.11 (0.18)
27. Been unable to eat or a lack of appetite.	0.76 (0.40)
28. Been unable to talk about the trauma or feeling a sense of silence.	0.69 (0.17)
29. Felt that a traumatic or stressful event is actually happening again; that you are reliving it in the present (flashbacks).	1.57 (0.23)
30. Felt guilty.	1.54 (0.23)
31. Felt ashamed or damaged.	1.28 (0.21)
32. Felt jumpy or easily startled such as jumping or flinching in response to an unexpected noise.	1.45 (0.24)
33. Actively avoided external reminders of a stressful or traumatic event.	1.06 (0.18)
34. Experienced physical heart problems: heart palpitations, cardiovascular problems, or symptoms related to a heart condition.	1.26 (0.21)

35. Felt as if your surroundings or environment are not real.	1.07 (0.18)
36. Felt emotional pain (suffering), despair, or distress.	1.14 (0.23)
37. Experienced dizziness, felt confused, or disoriented.	1.97 (0.26)
38. Had an upset stomach or digestive problems.	2.10 (0.28)
39. Actively avoided thoughts, feelings, or memories related to a stressful or traumatic event.	0.72 (0.16)
40. Experienced a loss of faith and trust in the world, others, or spiritual beliefs.	1.01 (0.18)
41. Felt watchful of your surroundings or on guard.	1.20 (0.22)
42. Experienced physical trembling or shaking.	1.08 (0.19)
43. Felt chest pain or pressure in the chest.	1.12 (0.21)
44. Felt as if you have gone mad/crazy (i.e., seeing things that are not there).	0.82 (0.17)
45. Experiencing problems related to the heart (i.e., heartache, a weak heart, spoiled heart, dead heart, sick heart, tired heart, wounded heart, broken heart, heart in	1.11 (0.32)

trouble, unclear heart, disturbed heart, falling heart, hot heart.)	
46. Experienced problems related to a long term condition or physical health problem (i.e., immune system disorders, diabetes, arthritis).	1.16 (0.20)
47. Had vision problems, eye problems, or weak/tired eyes.	0.66 (0.17)
48. Blamed yourself or others for a stressful or traumatic event.	0.84 (0.16)
49. Had an inability to remember an aspect or parts of a stressful or traumatic event.	1.15 (0.19)
50. Had a physical reaction when you were reminded of a stressful or traumatic event (i.e., sweating, racing heartbeat, nausea).	1.40 (0.21)
51. Having persistent and ongoing negative feelings such as anger, fear, guilt, horror, and sadness	1.32 (0.21)

362

363 **Descriptive Statistics for the GPTSS-U**

364 Table 2 presents results from the GRM IRT model for the 11 selected items of
 365 the GPTSS-U. Discrimination parameters remained in the acceptable range for all items

366 ($a = 1.34$ to $a = 2.24$), with item locations ranging from $b_1 = -0.88$ to $b_3 = 3.14$ across the
 367 latent construct. Test Information Curves for the GPTSS-U revealed little change from
 368 the GPTS-IB with both indicating the most amount of information at average to
 369 moderate levels of post-trauma symptoms ($\theta = 0$ to $\theta = 2$). Internal consistency
 370 reliability was good for the GPTSS-U with $\alpha = 0.87$ and no improvement upon removal
 371 of any item. The average total score of the GPTSS-U among participants was 8.09 (SD
 372 = 5.92), with scores ranging from 0-29 among participants (scores could range between
 373 0-33).

374 **Table 2**

375 *Graded Response Model Item Discrimination Parameters (a) and Standard Errors, and*
 376 *Item Difficulty Parameters (b_1, b_2, b_3) and standard errors, N=200*

GPTSS-U Item	Discrimination Parameter (α) (SE)	Difficulty Parameters (b) (SE)
Experienced repeated, disturbing or unwanted thoughts or memories about a traumatic or stressful event	1.82 (.25)	$b_1 = -.88 (.15)$ $b_2 = .66 (.13)$ $b_3 = 1.97 (.24)$
Felt sadness, sorrow or a depressed mood	2.19 (.31)	$b_1 = -.58 (.12)$ $b_2 = 1.14 (.15)$ $b_3 = 2.18 (.25)$

Experienced excessive worry, anxiety or an ongoing sense of panic	1.49 (.23)	$b_1 = -.07 (.13)$ $b_2 = 1.41 (.21)$ $b_3 = 2.56 (.37)$
Feeling you were thinking too much	1.62 (.24)	$b_1 = -.61 (.14)$ $b_2 = 1.18 (.18)$ $b_3 = 2.17 (.29)$
Becoming emotionally upset when reminded of a stressful or traumatic event	1.51 (.24)	$b_1 = .02 (.13)$ $b_2 = 2.01 (.29)$ $b_3 = 2.97 (.44)$
Been unable to talk about a traumatic or stressful event or feeling a sense of silence	1.49 (.24)	$b_1 = .06 (.13)$ $b_2 = 2.14 (.30)$ $b_3 = 2.52 (.36)$
Feeling that a stressful or traumatic event is happening again; that you are reliving it in the present (flashbacks)	1.60 (.26)	$b_1 = .26 (.13)$ $b_2 = 1.66 (.23)$ $b_3 = 2.44 (.34)$
Feeling ashamed or damaged	1.45 (.25)	$b_1 = .65 (.15)$ $b_2 = 2.05 (.31)$ $b_3 = 3.14 (.52)$

Feeling emotional pain (suffering), despair or distress	2.02 (.30)	$b_1 = -.29 (.12)$ $b_2 = 1.34 (.17)$ $b_3 = 2.12 (.26)$
Feeling confused or unable to figure out what was going on	2.24 (.33)	$b_1 = -.05 (.11)$ $b_2 = 1.35 (.16)$ $b_3 = 2.16 (.26)$
Had an inability to remember parts of a stressful or traumatic event	1.34 (.22)	$b_1 = .10 (.14)$ $b_2 = 2.13 (.32)$ $b_3 = 2.83 (.43)$

377

378 **Construct Validity of the GPTSS-U**

379 A positive relationship between higher GPTSS-U and the PHQ-9 scores
380 indicated construct validity with a moderate effect size ($r = 0.54$ $p < 0.001$) and a strong
381 effect size between the GPTSS-U and the PCL-5 ($r = 0.91$ $p < 0.001$). In addition,
382 although effect sizes were very small, GPTSS-U scores and trauma experienced ($r =$
383 0.17), trauma witnessed ($r = 0.04$), and trauma experienced or witnessed ($r = 0.14$)
384 were also significantly positively associated ($p < .05$). GPTSS-U scores and function
385 scale scores were also correlated with a moderate effect size ($r = .304$ $p < 0.001$). Table
386 3 displays the polychoric correlation matrix for (1) GPTSS-U, (2) PHQ-9, (3) trauma
387 experienced, (4) trauma witnessed, (5) trauma total, and (6) functional impairment
388 scale. A very strong correlation between the GPTSS-U and PCL-5 ($r=0.9$, $p<0.001$) and

389 a strong correlation between the GPTSS-U and PHQ-9 ($r=0.54$, $p<0.001$) support the
 390 construct validity of the GPTSS-U.

391 **Table 3**

392 *Polychoric Correlation Matrix*

Variable	GPTSS-U	PHQ-9	Trauma experienced	Trauma witnessed	Trauma Total	PCL-5	Functioning Scale
GPTSS-U	1.00						
PHQ-9	0.54***	1.00					
Trauma Experienced	0.19**	0.19**	1.00				
Trauma Witnessed	0.03*	-0.04	-0.04	1.00			
Trauma Total	0.15*	0.09	0.62***	0.75***	1.00		
PCL-5	0.90***	0.58***	0.15*	-0.04	0.06	1.00	
Functioning Scale	0.31***	0.20**	0.61***	0.70***	0.95***	0.26***	1.00

393 *Note:* GPTSS-U = Global Post Trauma Symptom Scale - Uganda; PHQ-P = Patient

394 Health Questionnaire-9 ; PCL-5 = Post-Traumatic Stress-Disorder Checklist for DSM-5.

395 * $p<0.05$; ** $p<0.01$; *** $p<0.001$

396

397

398 **Criterion Validity of the GPTSS-U**

399 Results from the two-sample t-test with unequal variances established criterion
400 validity of the GPTSS-U scale with cases (n=45) having a significantly higher mean
401 (15.96, SD = 4.74) than the mean (5.8, SD = 3.95) of non-cases (n=155) ($p < 0.001$).

402 **Predictive Validity**

403 The results of the incremental validity analysis are presented in Table 4. Nested
404 regression was used to compare the Models 1 and 2. Both models analyzed the effects
405 of (1) gender, (2) age, (3) HIV status, (4) traumatic experiences, (5) symptoms of
406 depression, and (6) symptoms of PTSD on functional impairment. Model 2 included
407 mean GPTSS-U scores in the analysis. Standardized beta coefficients were reported
408 for all models. Forty-three percent of the total variance in impaired functioning was
409 explained by Model 2,, which represented a 0.13% change in R^2 (explained variance)
410 with the addition of the average GPTSS-U scores to the final model. The results of
411 Model 2 indicated that *ceteris paribus*, a one-unit increase in average GPTSS-U was
412 associated with a 0.266 increase in impaired functioning. The VIF for GPTSS-U was
413 1.72, and the tolerance was 0.58 showing no multicollinearity. Notably, when GPTSS-U
414 scores were included in Model 2, the association between PCL-5 and impaired
415 functioning became non-significant. An F test of the change in R^2 when GPTSS-U was
416 added to Model 2 was statistically significant ($p < 0.05$), indicating further support for the
417 predictive validity of the GPTSS-U. Models 3 and 4 serve as sensitivity analyses by
418 reverse nesting the model to first include the GPTSS-U score in Model 3 and adding in
419 the PCL-5 score as a comparator in Model 4. This approach did not demonstrate a

420 change in explained variance, and the association between GPTSS-U and impaired
421 functioning maintained its statistically significant association.

422 **Table 4**

423 *Effects of Measured Variables on Impaired Functioning Presented as Beta Coefficients*

Model	β (S.E)	<i>t</i>
Model 1		
Gender	0.047 (0.89)	0.85
Age	0.114 (0.03)	1.95
HIV	0.04 (0.73)	0.7
Trauma	0.59 (0.18)	10.46**
PHQ-9	0.01 (0.11)	0.13
PCL-5	0.148 (0.05)	2.15*
Model 2		
Gender	0.034 (0.89)	0.85
Age	0.116 (0.03)	2.01*
HIV	0.042 (0.72)	0.73
Trauma	0.576 (0.18)	10.24**

PHQ-9	0.002 (0.11)	0.03
PCL-5	-0.086 (0.1)	-0.66
GPTSS-U	0.266 (0.14)	2.09*
Model 3		
Gender	0.039 (0.88)	0.7
Age	0.112 (0.03)	1.95
HIV	0.041 (0.72)	0.73
Trauma	0.578 (0.17)	10.33**
PHQ-9	-0.009 (0.11)	-0.14
GPTSS-U	0.195 (0.07)	2.94*
Model 4		
Gender	0.034 (0.89)	0.61*
Age	0.116 (0.03)	2.01
HIV	0.042 (0.72)	0.73
Trauma	0.576 (0.18)	10.24**
PHQ-9	0.002 (0.11)	0.03

GPTSS-U	0.266 (0.12)	2.09*
PCL-5	-0.086 (0.1)	-0.66

424 *Note:* GPTSS-U = Global Post Trauma Symptom Scale - Uganda; PHQ-P = Patient
425 Health Questionnaire-9 ; PCL-5 = Post-Traumatic Stress-Disorder Checklist for DSM-5
426 (PCL-5)
427 * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.001$

428 **Clinical Utility**

429 The GPTSS-U had an area under the curve (AUC) of 0.95 (95% CI 0.92-0.98)
430 when post-traumatic stress symptoms were compared to an absence of symptoms. The
431 cut-off score that was determined to be ideal for the GPTSS-U was 11, which aligned
432 with a sensitivity of 88.9% and specificity of 87.7% for post-traumatic stress symptoms
433 compared with an absence of symptoms.

434 **Discussion**

435 This study aimed to adapt and test the psychometric properties of the GPTSS
436 and GPTSS-U among caregivers of youth living with HIV in Uganda, utilizing both
437 qualitative and quantitative methods. The results demonstrate the effectiveness of
438 mixed methods in adapting and validating the scale, demonstrating the relevance of the
439 adapted GPTSS-U within the Ugandan context. Discrimination parameters were all in
440 the high range (see Table 2), indicating the scale's ability to distinguish between high
441 and low levels of post-traumatic stress. The graded response model also demonstrated
442 various difficulty parameters across questions. The difficulty parameters spanned the
443 latent construct, which means that the items in the scale represent expressions of the

444 latent construct with low, moderate, and high levels of difficulty to identify. The study
445 also found that the GPTSS-U is a reliable measure with demonstrable content, criterion,
446 and construct validity for caregivers of youth living with HIV in Uganda.

447 While not intended for diagnostic accuracy, the GPTSS-U provides additional
448 evidence for the nuances of mental health symptomatology across contexts.
449 Specifically, our results indicated that the GPTSS-U is a better predictor of functioning
450 among Ugandan caregivers compared to the standard PCL-5. Further, using IRT
451 allowed us to determine how precise the scale is at different levels. These findings
452 showed that the GPTSS-U was most accurate at identifying moderate and severe levels
453 of post-traumatic stress. Therefore, the GPTSS-U could help identify those with post-
454 trauma symptoms who are most in need of interventions. Further, the test information
455 function curve confirms that the GPTSS-U gives the most information or precise
456 measurement at moderate to severe levels of post-traumatic stress.

457 The average total score of the GPTSS-U across all participants was 8.09 (SD =
458 5.92), indicating that most participants reported mild to moderate severity of post-
459 trauma symptoms. A positive relationship between higher GPTSS-U and PHQ-9 scores
460 indicated acceptable criterion validity and provided additional evidence for the utility of
461 the GPTSS-U. Additionally, items from the item bank with the lowest discrimination were
462 related to physical health, which is contextually sound and may be related to the
463 difficulty in disentangling the cause of physical health problems from stress and mental
464 health.

465 Item response theory (IRT) was used in conjunction with Classical Test Theory
466 (CTT) to explore the relationship between the latent trait (trauma) and the nuances of its

467 symptomatology. Using cognitive interviews as a first step in the validation process
468 demonstrated high levels of utility in establishing semantic equivalence. Although post-
469 traumatic symptoms have been noted to be a relevant concept among caregivers
470 globally (25,27) and in Uganda (28), the use of cognitive interviews was critical in
471 understanding how post-traumatic symptoms are defined and understood in context.
472 These findings support the need to assess content validity before administering the
473 GPTSS in different contexts. Content validity should also be conducted before future
474 application of the GPTSS-U, especially among different populations within Uganda.

475 Findings supported using quantitative and qualitative methods to establish
476 validity and ensure culturally relevant contextual application. Examples of validating
477 mental health instruments exist among other sub-Saharan African populations.
478 Michalopoulos et al. (36) adapted and validated a measure of HIV-related shame, the
479 Shame Questionnaire (SQ), among Ugandan youth living with HIV using a similar
480 methodology. The SQ was also tested for validity and reliability among traumatized girls
481 in Lusaka, Zambia (18) using classical test and item response theory methods. Applying
482 the SQ across populations demonstrated its general utility and the need for additional,
483 similar studies in LMICs. The International Depression Symptom Scale-General (IDSS-
484 G) is used to screen for mental health disorders in LMICs while eliminating the Western
485 bias embedded in most self-report measures (32). It was found to be a valid and reliable
486 measure, with the ability to accurately predict functional impairment in this population.
487 Although we utilized methodology that is similar to previous cross-cultural validation
488 studies, our study is the first known measure that was developed and validated to
489 examine post-trauma symptoms among Ugandan caregivers.

490 Although the GPTSS was also deemed valid and reliable among other
491 populations globally (23), comparing the results indicates a difference in item difficulty
492 parameters across the latent post-traumatic symptoms construct. Such differences
493 could be due to varying cultural contexts or changes in the wording of some of the items
494 of the current study. Regardless, the differences in item location highlight the
495 importance of future validation studies in non-western contexts, which should include
496 examination of differences by gender, age, location, and type of trauma experienced.

497 An additional limitation of this study is that the sample represents the greater
498 Masaka region. Future studies should examine the utility of the GPTSS-U and
499 differential item functioning across varying regional contexts in Uganda and other
500 countries in Sub-Saharan Africa with a high prevalence of HIV. Through further study,
501 researchers can consult with local health and mental health professionals, caregivers,
502 and additional family members to gauge holistically whether adjustments to the
503 language GPTSS-U may be appropriate given cultural attitudes and understandings of
504 symptomatology.

505 According to research in this area, the sample size was adequate (32,60).
506 However, our sample size did not allow for the disaggregation between demographic
507 characteristics. Of primary interest would be investigating gender differences in post-
508 traumatic symptoms. Research has shown inconsistent results comparing trauma
509 symptoms (specifically PTSD) between males and females, while other research shows
510 invariance in the factor structure of PTSD (76–78). Even after controlling for PTSD
511 severity, other studies found differences between genders in item endorsement (79,80).
512 For example, women were more likely to report feeling more emotionally distant than

513 men (79). Future research needs to examine post-traumatic symptoms across genders,
514 which was not feasible for this study due to the smaller sample size.

515 Although difficulty parameters spanned the whole construct, some items
516 clustered in the middle overlapped. While the item information function indicated
517 potential overlap of some items, we retained all items to ensure acceptable reliability.
518 Future studies could explore reducing the overlapping categories where potential
519 redundancy exists to increase precision. However, this strategy was not applied to this
520 study because the findings point to the validity of the overall scale.

521 This study demonstrates several strengths, including providing nuanced
522 information on the mental health of an underrepresented population within global
523 research, supporting advocacy efforts around contextually appropriate and effective
524 mental health assessment tools, and increasing conversation on caregiver trauma
525 exposure in Sub-Saharan Africa. Additionally, the awareness and dialogue with locally
526 impacted communities alluded to themes of grief and loss related to caregiving and
527 chronic illness, which encourages further conversation and study of the GPTSS scale
528 efficacy.

529 **Conclusions**

530 The findings of this study suggest that caregiving for individuals living with HIV is
531 correlated with posttraumatic outcomes in Uganda and may be relevant to other
532 countries in Sub-Saharan Africa, especially in regions with high HIV prevalence. The
533 utility of the GPTSS-U indicates the high importance of further examination of contextual
534 factors that may affect the presentation and expression of post-traumatic symptoms,
535 such as gender, socioeconomic status, social support, region, caregiving

536 responsibilities, and additional types of trauma. Further, the mixed methods, in addition
537 to the utilization of both CTT and IRT to develop the GPTSS-U may be helpful in the
538 development of relevant scales in contexts where validated scales are unavailable.

539 The results of this study indicate a critical need both for the development and
540 implementation of evidence-based interventions to support caregivers of people with
541 high-needs health issues and to inform best practices regarding post-traumatic stress
542 interventions. Relevant interventions should be mindful of factors influencing the
543 presentation and perpetuation of post-traumatic symptoms for this population, with
544 particular emphasis on those tailored for individuals whose social determinants of health
545 (e.g., greater economic instability) are most closely linked to post-traumatic stress
546 disorder (81).

547

548

549

550

551

552

553

554

555

556

557

558

References

- 559
- 560 1. Demyttenaere K, Bruffaerts R, Posada-Villa J, Gasquet I, Kovess V, Lepine JP, et
- 561 al. Prevalence, severity, and unmet need for treatment of mental disorders in the
- 562 World Health Organization World Mental Health Surveys. *JAMA*. 2004 Jun
- 563 2;291(21):2581–90.
- 564 2. Patel V. Mental health in low- and middle-income countries. *Br Med Bull*. 2007 Jan
- 565 1;81–82(1):81–96.
- 566 3. Patel V, Kleinman A. Poverty and common mental disorders in developing countries.
- 567 *Bull World Health Organ*. 2003;81(8):609–15.
- 568 4. de Jong JT, Komproe IH, Van Ommeren M, El Masri M, Araya M, Khaled N, et al.
- 569 Lifetime events and posttraumatic stress disorder in 4 postconflict settings. *JAMA*.
- 570 2001 Aug 1;286(5):555–62.
- 571 5. Fazel M, Wheeler J, Danesh J. Prevalence of serious mental disorder in 7000
- 572 refugees resettled in western countries: a systematic review. *Lancet Lond Engl*.
- 573 2005 Apr 9;365(9467):1309–14.
- 574 6. Steel Z, Chey T, Silove D, Marnane C, Bryant RA, van Ommeren M. Association of
- 575 torture and other potentially traumatic events with mental health outcomes among
- 576 populations exposed to mass conflict and displacement: a systematic review and
- 577 meta-analysis. *JAMA*. 2009 Aug 5;302(5):537–49.
- 578 7. Seedat F, Hargreaves S, Nellums LB, Ouyang J, Brown M, Friedland JS. How
- 579 effective are approaches to migrant screening for infectious diseases in Europe? A
- 580 systematic review. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2018 Sep;18(9):e259–71.
- 581 8. Fodor KE, Unterhitzberger J, Chou CY, Kartal D, Leistner S, Milosavljevic M, et

- 582 al. Is traumatic stress research global? A bibliometric analysis. Eur J
583 Psychotraumatology. 2014;5.
- 584 9. United Nations. World Population Prospects 2017. United Nations Department of
585 Economic and Social Affairs Population Division; 2017.
- 586 10. Bedard M, Greif JL, Buckley TC. International Publication Trends in the Traumatic
587 Stress Literature. J Trauma Stress. 2004;17(2):97–101.
- 588 11. Betancourt TS, Chambers DA. Optimizing an Era of Global Mental Health
589 Implementation Science. JAMA Psychiatry. 2016 Feb;73(2):99–100.
- 590 12. Schnyder U, Ehlers A, Elbert T, Foa EB, Gersons BPR, Resick PA, et al.
591 Psychotherapies for PTSD: what do they have in common? Eur J
592 Psychotraumatology. 2015 Aug 14;6:10.3402/ejpt.v6.28186.
- 593 13. Murray LK, Jordans MJD. Rethinking the service delivery system of psychological
594 interventions in low and middle income countries. BMC Psychiatry. 2016 Jul
595 12;16(1):234.
- 596 14. Figueira I, Luz M da, Braga RJ, Cabizuca M, Coutinho E, Mendlowicz MV. The
597 increasing internationalization of mainstream posttraumatic stress disorder research:
598 A bibliometric study. J Trauma Stress. 2007;20(1):89–95.
- 599 15. Vermetten E, Olf M. Psychotraumatology in the Netherlands. Eur J
600 Psychotraumatology. 2013;4.
- 601 16. Patel V, Sumathipala A. International representation in psychiatric literature: survey
602 of six leading journals. Br J Psychiatry J Ment Sci. 2001 May;178:406–9.
- 603 17. Fodor KE, Pozen J, Ntaganira J, Sezibera V, Neugebauer R. The factor structure of
604 posttraumatic stress disorder symptoms among Rwandans exposed to the 1994

- 605 genocide: A confirmatory factor analytic study using the PCL-C. *J Anxiety Disord.*
606 2015 May 1;32:8–16.
- 607 18. Michalopoulos LM, Unick GJ, Haroz EE, Bass J, Murray LK, Bolton PA. Exploring
608 the fit of Western PTSD models across three non-Western low- and middle-income
609 countries. *Traumatology.* 2015;21(2):55–63.
- 610 19. Mughal AY, Devadas J, Ardman E, Levis B, Go VF, Gaynes BN. A systematic
611 review of validated screening tools for anxiety disorders and PTSD in low to middle
612 income countries. *BMC Psychiatry.* 2020 Jun 30;20(1):338.
- 613 20. Bracken PJ, Giller JE, Summerfield D. Psychological responses to war and atrocity:
614 the limitations of current concepts. *Soc Sci Med* 1982. 1995 Apr;40(8):1073–82.
- 615 21. Patel AR, Kovacevic M, Hinton D, Newman E. “I put a stone on my heart and kept
616 going”: An explanatory model of how distress is generated and regulated among
617 Indian women from slums reporting gender-based violence. *Transcult Psychiatry.*
618 2022 Aug 1;59(4):522–38.
- 619 22. Yeomans PD, Forman EM. Cultural factors in traumatic stress. In: *Culture and*
620 *mental health: Sociocultural influences, theory, and practice.* Hoboken, NJ, US:
621 Wiley Blackwell; 2009. p. 221–44.
- 622 23. Haroz EE, Michalopoulos LM, Bolton PA, Bass JK. Development of new global
623 instruments for assessing depression and posttraumatic stress related to torture and
624 trauma. Washington DC: United States Agency for International Development; 2015
625 p. 1–96.
- 626 24. Michalopoulos LM, Meinhart M, Yung J, Barton SM, Wang X, Chakrabarti U, et al.
627 *Global Posttrauma Symptoms: A Systematic Review of Qualitative Literature.*

- 628 Trauma Violence Abuse. 2020 Apr 1;21(2):406–20.
- 629 25. Penning MJ, Wu Z. Caregiver Stress and Mental Health: Impact of Caregiving
630 Relationship and Gender. *The Gerontologist*. 2016 Dec;56(6):1102–13.
- 631 26. Kaggwa MM, Najjuka SM, Mamun MA, Griffiths MD, Nyemara N, Ashaba S.
632 Involvement and burden of informal caregivers of patients with mental illness: the
633 mediating role of affiliated stigma. *BMC Psychiatry*. 2023 Jan 26;23(1):72.
- 634 27. McHenry MS, Nyandiko WM, Scanlon ML, Fischer LJ, McAteer CI, Aluoch J, et al.
635 HIV Stigma: Perspectives from Kenyan Child Caregivers and Adolescents Living
636 with HIV. *J Int Assoc Provid AIDS Care JIAPAC*. 2017 May 1;16(3):215–25.
- 637 28. Knizek BL, Mugisha J, Osafo J, Kinyanda E. Growing up HIV-positive in Uganda:
638 “psychological immunodeficiency”? A qualitative study. *BMC Psychol*. 2017 Aug
639 25;5(1):30.
- 640 29. Galvin M, Byansi W. A systematic review of task shifting for mental health in sub-
641 Saharan Africa. *Int J Ment Health*. 2020;49(4):336–60.
- 642 30. Bolton P, Bass J, Neugebauer R, Verdelli H, Clougherty KF, Wickramaratne P, et al.
643 Group interpersonal psychotherapy for depression in rural Uganda: a randomized
644 controlled trial. *JAMA*. 2003 Jun 18;289(23):3117–24.
- 645 31. Patel V, Weiss HA, Chowdhary N, Naik S, Pednekar S, Chatterjee S, et al.
646 Effectiveness of an intervention led by lay health counsellors for depressive and
647 anxiety disorders in primary care in Goa, India (MANAS): a cluster randomised
648 controlled trial. *The Lancet*. 2010 Dec 18;376(9758):2086–95.
- 649 32. Haroz EE, Bass JK, Lee C, Murray LK, Robinson C, Bolton P. Adaptation and
650 testing of psychosocial assessment instruments for cross-cultural use: an example

- 651 from the Thailand Burma border. *BMC Psychol.* 2014 Aug 31;2(1):31.
- 652 33. Bass JK, Annan J, Mclvor Murray S, Kaysen D, Griffiths S, Cetinoglu T, et al.
653 Controlled trial of psychotherapy for Congolese survivors of sexual violence. *N Engl*
654 *J Med.* 2013 Jun 6;368(23):2182–91.
- 655 34. van Ginneken N, Tharyan P, Lewin S, Rao GN, Meera SM, Pian J, et al. Non-
656 specialist health worker interventions for the care of mental, neurological and
657 substance-abuse disorders in low- and middle-income countries. *Cochrane*
658 *Database Syst Rev.* 2013 Nov 19;(11):CD009149.
- 659 35. Bolton P, Lee C, Haroz EE, Murray L, Dorsey S, Robinson C, et al. A
660 transdiagnostic community-based mental health treatment for comorbid disorders:
661 development and outcomes of a randomized controlled trial among Burmese
662 refugees in Thailand. *PLoS Med.* 2014 Nov;11(11):e1001757.
- 663 36. Michalopoulos LM, Meinhart M, Barton SM, Kuhn J, Mukasa MN, Namuwonge F, et
664 al. Adaptation and Validation of the Shame Questionnaire Among Ugandan Youth
665 Living with HIV. *Child Indic Res.* 2019 Jun;12(3):1023–42.
- 666 37. Bolton P, Tang AM. An alternative approach to cross-cultural function assessment.
667 *Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol Int J Res Soc Genet Epidemiol Ment Health*
668 *Serv.* 2002;37(11):537–43.
- 669 38. Kroenke K, Spitzer RL, Williams JB. The PHQ-9: validity of a brief depression
670 severity measure. *J Gen Intern Med.* 2001 Sep;16(9):606–13.
- 671 39. Lotrakul M, Sumrithe S, Saipanish R. Reliability and validity of the Thai version of
672 the PHQ-9. *BMC Psychiatry.* 2008 Jun 20;8:46.
- 673 40. Marc LG, Henderson WR, Desrosiers A, Testa MA, Jean SE, Akom EE. Reliability

- 674 and Validity of the Haitian Creole PHQ-9. *J Gen Intern Med.* 2014 Dec;29(12):1679–
675 86.
- 676 41. Zhou H, Liu L, Lan M, Zhu W, Song G, Jing F, et al. Using Google Street View
677 imagery to capture micro built environment characteristics in drug places, compared
678 with street robbery. *Comput Environ Urban Syst.* 2021 Jul 1;88:101631.
- 679 42. Carroll HA, Hook K, Perez OFR, Denckla C, Vince CC, Ghebrehiwet S, et al.
680 Establishing reliability and validity for mental health screening instruments in
681 resource-constrained settings: Systematic review of the PHQ-9 and key
682 recommendations. *Psychiatry Res.* 2020 Sep;291:113236.
- 683 43. Smith Fawzi MC, Ngakongwa F, Liu Y, Rutayuga T, Siril H, Somba M, et al.
684 Validating the Patient Health Questionnaire-9 (PHQ-9) for screening of depression
685 in Tanzania. *Neurol Psychiatry Brain Res.* 2019 Feb;31:9–14.
- 686 44. Monahan PO, Shacham E, Reece M, Kroenke K, Ong'or WO, Omollo O, et al.
687 Validity/Reliability of PHQ-9 and PHQ-2 Depression Scales Among Adults Living
688 with HIV/AIDS in Western Kenya. *J Gen Intern Med.* 2009 Feb;24(2):189–97.
- 689 45. Musisi S, Kinyanda E, Nakasujja N, Nakigudde J. A comparison of the behavioral
690 and emotional disorders of primary school-going orphans and non-orphans in
691 Uganda. *Afr Health Sci.* 2007 Dec;7(4):202–13.
- 692 46. Makhubela M, Khumalo I. Psychometric evaluation of the PHQ-9 in university
693 students: Factorial validity and measurement equivalence across three African
694 countries. *Curr Psychol.* 2022 Mar 23;42:1–9.
- 695 47. Caramanica K, Brackbill RM, Liao T, Stellman SD. Comorbidity of 9/11-related
696 PTSD and depression in the World Trade Center Health Registry 10-11 years

- 697 postdisaster. *J Trauma Stress*. 2014 Dec;27(6):680–8.
- 698 48. Greene T, Neria Y, Gross R. Prevalence, Detection and Correlates of PTSD in the
699 Primary Care Setting: A Systematic Review. *J Clin Psychol Med Settings*. 2016
700 Jun;23(2):160–80.
- 701 49. Hruska B, Irish LA, Pacella ML, Sledjeski EM, Delahanty DL. PTSD symptom
702 severity and psychiatric comorbidity in recent motor vehicle accident victims: a latent
703 class analysis. *J Anxiety Disord*. 2014 Oct;28(7):644–9.
- 704 50. Kessler RC, Chiu WT, Demler O, Merikangas KR, Walters EE. Prevalence, severity,
705 and comorbidity of 12-month DSM-IV disorders in the National Comorbidity Survey
706 Replication. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 2005 Jun;62(6):617–27.
- 707 51. Meyer SR, Robinson WC, Chhim S, Bass JK. Labor migration and mental health in
708 Cambodia: a qualitative study. *J Nerv Ment Dis*. 2014 Mar;202(3):200–8.
- 709 52. Murray-Swank AB, Lucksted A, Medoff DR, Yang Y, Wohlheiter K, Dixon LB.
710 Religiosity, Psychosocial Adjustment, and Subjective Burden of Persons Who Care
711 for Those With Mental Illness. *Psychiatr Serv*. 2006 Mar;57(3):361–5.
- 712 53. Peterson R, Darnell D, Berliner L, Dorsey S, Murray L, Monroe-DeVita M.
713 Implementing Transdiagnostic Cognitive Behavioral Psychotherapy in Adult Public
714 Behavioral Health: A Pilot Evaluation of the Feasibility of the Common Elements
715 Treatment Approach (CETA). *J Behav Health Serv Res*. 2019 Apr;46(2):249–66.
- 716 54. Weathers F, Litz B, Herman D, Huska JA, Keane T. The PTSD Checklist (PCL):
717 Reliability, Validity, and Diagnostic Utility. San Antonio, TX; 1993.
- 718 55. Bryant RA, Schafer A, Dawson KS, Anjuri D, Mulili C, Ndogoni L, et al. Effectiveness
719 of a brief behavioural intervention on psychological distress among women with a

- 720 history of gender-based violence in urban Kenya: A randomised clinical trial. *PLoS*
721 *Med.* 2017 Aug;14(8):e1002371.
- 722 56. Foa EB, Cashman L, Jaycox L, Perry K. The validation of a self-report measure of
723 posttraumatic stress disorder: The Posttraumatic Diagnostic Scale. *Psychol Assess.*
724 1997;9(4):445–51.
- 725 57. Gray CL, Pence BW, Ostermann J, Whetten RA, O'Donnell K, Thielman NM, et al.
726 Prevalence and Incidence of Traumatic Experiences Among Orphans in Institutional
727 and Family-Based Settings in 5 Low- and Middle-Income Countries: A Longitudinal
728 Study. *Glob Health Sci Pract.* 2015 Sep 10;3(3):395–404.
- 729 58. Collins D. Pretesting survey instruments: an overview of cognitive methods. *Qual*
730 *Life Res Int J Qual Life Asp Treat Care Rehabil.* 2003 May;12(3):229–38.
- 731 59. Vreeman RC, Nyandiko WM, Ayaya SO, Walumbe EG, Inui TS. Cognitive
732 interviewing for cross-cultural adaptation of pediatric antiretroviral therapy
733 adherence measurement items. *Int J Behav Med.* 2014 Feb;21(1):186–96.
- 734 60. Nguyen TH, Han HR, Kim MT, Chan KS. An Introduction to Item Response Theory
735 for Patient-Reported Outcome Measurement. *Patient - Patient-Centered Outcomes*
736 *Res.* 2014 Mar 1;7(1):23–35.
- 737 61. Hambleton RK, Swaminathan H, Rogers HJ. Fundamentals of item response theory.
738 Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc; 1991. x, 174 p. (Fundamentals of
739 item response theory).
- 740 62. Embretson SE, Reise SP. Item response theory for psychologists. Mahwah, NJ, US:
741 Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers; 2000. xi, 371 p. (Item response theory for
742 psychologists).

- 743 63. Samejima F. Graded Response Model. In: van der Linden WJ, Hambleton RK,
744 editors. Handbook of Modern Item Response Theory [Internet]. New York, NY:
745 Springer; 1997 [cited 2024 Jul 25]. p. 85–100. Available from:
746 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4757-2691-6_5
- 747 64. Wyse A, De Ayla RJ. The Theory and Practice of Item Response Theory.
748 Psychometrika. 2010;75(4):778–9.
- 749 65. Embretson SE, Reise SP. Item Response Theory. New York: Psychology Press;
750 2013.
- 751 66. Baker FB. The Basics of Item Response Theory. Second Edition [Internet]. For full
752 text: <http://ericae>; 2001 [cited 2024 Sep 8]. Available from:
753 <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED458219>
- 754 67. Cicchetti DV. Guidelines, criteria, and rules of thumb for evaluating normed and
755 standardized assessment instruments in psychology. Psychol Assess.
756 1994;6(4):284–90.
- 757 68. Nunnally JC, Bernstein IH. Psychometric Theory. 3rd edition. New York: McGraw-
758 Hill; 1994. 736 p.
- 759 69. Cohen J, Cohen P, West SG, Aiken LS. Applied multiple regression/correlation
760 analysis for the behavioral sciences, 3rd ed. Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum
761 Associates Publishers; 2003. xxviii, 703 p. (Applied multiple regression/correlation
762 analysis for the behavioral sciences, 3rd ed).
- 763 70. Allen MJ, Yen WM. Introduction to Measurement Theory. Waveland Press; 2001.
764 321 p.
- 765 71. Fischer JE, Bachmann LM, Jaeschke R. A readers' guide to the interpretation of

- 766 diagnostic test properties: clinical example of sepsis. *Intensive Care Med.* 2003
767 Jul;29(7):1043–51.
- 768 72. Liu X. Classification accuracy and cut point selection. *Stat Med.* 2012;31(23):2676–
769 86.
- 770 73. Sackett PR, Lievens F. Personnel selection. *Annu Rev Psychol.* 2008;59:419–50.
- 771 74. Craney TA, Surlles JG. Model-Dependent Variance Inflation Factor Cutoff Values.
772 *Qual Eng.* 2002 Mar 25;14(3):391–403.
- 773 75. Hutcheson G, Sofroniou N. *The Multivariate Social Scientist: Introductory statistics*
774 *using generalized linear models [Internet].* SAGE Publications, Ltd.; 1999 [cited
775 2024 Sep 8]. Available from: [https://methods.sagepub.com/book/the-multivariate-](https://methods.sagepub.com/book/the-multivariate-social-scientist)
776 *social-scientist*
- 777 76. Hall BJ, Elhai JD, Grubaugh A, Tuerk P, Magruder K. Examining the factor structure
778 of PTSD between male and female veterans in primary care. *J Anxiety Disord.*
779 2012;26(3):409–15.
- 780 77. King LA, Orcutt HK, King DW. Gender differences in stress, trauma, and PTSD
781 research: Application of two quantitative methods. In: *Gender and PTSD.* New York,
782 NY, US: The Guilford Press; 2002. p. 403–33.
- 783 78. Rivollier F, Peyre H, Hoertel N, Blanco C, Limosin F, Delorme R. Sex Differences in
784 DSM-IV Posttraumatic Stress Disorder Symptoms Expression Using Item Response
785 Theory: a Population-based Study. *J Affect Disord.* 2015 Nov 15;187:211–7.
- 786 79. He Q, Glas CAW, Veldkamp BP. Assessing impact of differential symptom
787 functioning on post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) diagnosis. *Int J Methods*
788 *Psychiatr Res.* 2014;23(2):131–41.

- 789 80. Palm KM, Strong DR, MacPherson L. Evaluating symptom expression as a function
790 of a posttraumatic stress disorder severity. *J Anxiety Disord.* 2009;23(1):27–37.
- 791 81. Holder N, Holliday R, Ranney RM, Bernhard PA, Vogt D, Hoffmire CA, et al.
792 Relationship of social determinants of health with symptom severity among Veterans
793 and non-Veterans with probable posttraumatic stress disorder or depression. *Soc*
794 *Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol.* 2023 Oct 1;58(10):1523–34.
- 795