

1 **Title: Underdiagnosis of myalgic encephalomyelitis/chronic fatigue syndrome-like illness in a large**  
2 **integrated healthcare system — Kaiser Permanente Northern California, 2022-2023**

3

4 **Short Title: Underdiagnosis of ME/CFS-like illness**

5

6 **Authors:** Mariah S. Wood<sup>1\*</sup>, Nicole Halmer<sup>1</sup>, Jeanne Bertolli<sup>2</sup>, Laura B. Amsden<sup>1</sup>, Joshua R. Nugent<sup>1</sup>, Jin-  
7 Mann S. Lin<sup>2</sup>, Gretchen Rothrock<sup>3</sup>, Joelle Nadle<sup>3</sup>, Shua J. Chai<sup>2,3</sup>, Jamila H. Champisi<sup>4,5</sup>, James Yang<sup>4,6</sup>,  
8 Elizabeth R. Unger<sup>2</sup>, Jacek Skarbinski<sup>1,4,7,8</sup> for STOP-ME/CFS and COVID-SELECT

9

10 **Author Affiliations:**

- 11 1. Division of Research, Kaiser Permanente Northern California, Pleasanton, California, United States of  
12 America
- 13 2. Division of High-Consequence Pathogens and Pathology, National Center for Emerging and Zoonotic  
14 Infectious Diseases, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, Georgia, United States of  
15 America
- 16 3. California Emerging Infections Program, Oakland, California, United States of America
- 17 4. The Permanente Medical Group, Kaiser Permanente Northern California, Oakland, California, United  
18 States of America
- 19 5. Department of Infectious Diseases, South San Francisco Medical Center, Kaiser Permanente  
20 Northern California, South San Francisco, California, United States of America
- 21 6. Department of Adult and Family Medicine, Roseville Medical Center, Kaiser Permanente Northern  
22 California, Roseville, California, United States of America
- 23 7. Department of Infectious Diseases, Oakland Medical Center, Kaiser Permanente Northern California,  
24 Oakland, California, United States of America

25 8. Physician Researcher Program, Kaiser Permanente Northern California, Oakland, California, United  
26 States of America

27

28 \*Corresponding author

29 E-mail: [mariah.s.wood@kp.org](mailto:mariah.s.wood@kp.org)

30

31 **Keywords:** Myalgic encephalomyelitis/chronic fatigue syndrome (ME/CFS)

32

33 **Disclaimer:** The opinions expressed by authors contributing to this journal do not necessarily reflect the  
34 opinions of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention or the institutions with which the authors  
35 are affiliated

36 **Abstract**

37 Background: Surveillance of myalgic encephalomyelitis/chronic fatigue syndrome (ME/CFS), a chronic,  
38 debilitating multisystem illness, is challenging because ME/CFS can be under-recognized in healthcare  
39 settings.

40 Methods: Using a population-based panel study of 9,820 adult members of Kaiser Permanente Northern  
41 California (KPNC), a large, integrated healthcare system, we compared survey-defined ME/CFS-like  
42 illness with presence of an ME/CFS diagnosis in the electronic health record (EHR) to evaluate ME/CFS  
43 underdiagnosis.

44 Results: Of those with survey-defined ME/CFS-like illness, an estimated 97.8% (95% confidence interval  
45 [CI] 97.1%-98.4%) did not have an ME/CFS diagnosis in the EHR. The group without EHR diagnosis was  
46 younger, less likely to identify as white non-Hispanic, and more likely to have developed fatigue in the  
47 past three years than the EHR diagnosed group. Both diagnosed and undiagnosed ME/CFS-like illness  
48 groups had significantly impaired physical, cognitive, and social functioning, and significantly worse  
49 mental health and anxiety than those without ME/CFS-like illness.

50 Conclusion: ME/CFS is underdiagnosed in the Kaiser Permanente Northern California healthcare system.  
51 Enhanced syndromic surveillance that characterizes patients with ME/CFS who have not been diagnosed  
52 has the potential to increase timely recognition of ME/CFS.

## 53 **Introduction**

54 Myalgic encephalomyelitis/chronic fatigue syndrome (ME/CFS) is a chronic, debilitating  
55 multisystem illness that affects millions of people worldwide (1). The Institute of Medicine (IOM) 2015  
56 diagnostic criteria require a substantial reduction in the ability to engage in pre-illness activity for more  
57 than six months, accompanied by fatigue of new or definite onset not resulting from excessive exertion  
58 and that is unrelieved by rest, post-exertional malaise, unrefreshing sleep, and either cognitive  
59 impairment or orthostatic intolerance (2,3). Given the lack of a diagnostic biomarker, ME/CFS is  
60 diagnosed by clinicians based on patient self-report of symptoms that meet the IOM diagnostic criteria  
61 after full clinical evaluation to identify other conditions that could contribute to symptoms (4). Prior  
62 studies have suggested that most ME/CFS patients are undiagnosed (1), and the number of people with  
63 undiagnosed ME/CFS may have recently increased given ME/CFS is a possible outcome of SARS-CoV-2  
64 infection (5). Understanding the extent of ME/CFS underdiagnosis is crucial for mobilizing action to  
65 improve identification and subsequent care for those with ME/CFS. We estimate the prevalence of  
66 undiagnosed ME/CFS-like illness in a large, integrated healthcare system over a two-year study period,  
67 compare demographics, healthcare utilization, and health-related quality of life among undiagnosed and  
68 diagnosed persons, and suggest measures that could improve rates of diagnosis.

69

## 70 **Methods**

71 In collaboration with Kaiser Permanente Northern California (KPNC), the California Emerging  
72 Infections Program conducts enhanced syndromic surveillance for ME/CFS through the Surveillance to  
73 Optimize Protocols for Early Identification and Subgrouping of ME/CFS (STOP ME/CFS) project. STOP  
74 ME/CFS involves annual surveys to identify and follow patients with ME/CFS-like illness among KPNC's  
75 4.5 million members, who are demographically similar to the California population (6). The study was  
76 approved by the KPNC Institutional Review Board (IRB # 1692449). Informed written consent was

77 obtained for all participants in this study. This activity was reviewed by the CDC and was conducted  
78 consistent with applicable federal law and CDC policy.

79 A stratified random sample of adult English-speaking KPNC members who had been members  
80 for at least one year and who had a valid email address on file were recruited from seven mutually-  
81 exclusive strata, including: 1) ME/CFS diagnosis in the electronic health record (EHR); 2) post-COVID  
82 conditions diagnosis in the EHR; 3) persons at higher risk for ME/CFS based on an internally-created  
83 predictive model; 4) persons who had COVID-19 before July 5, 2021; 5) persons who had COVID-19  
84 between July 5, 2021 and December 14, 2021; 6) persons who had COVID-19 after December 15, 2021  
85 through beginning of recruitment (May 9, 2022); and 7) persons who did not fit into any above strata.  
86 (For full sampling strategy see methods section and flow diagram in the prior paper stemming from the  
87 STOP ME/CFS project (7)).

88 To select for people who were more likely to have the relatively rare outcome of ME/CFS,  
89 persons were oversampled from strata one to three. In stratum one, 8,061 (98.5%) of 8,182 persons  
90 were sampled. In stratum two, 6,057 (98.9%) of 6,126 were sampled. In stratum three, 29,720 (99.1%)  
91 of 30,000 were sampled. Within each of strata four through seven, a simple random sample was  
92 applied. In stratum four, 11,046 (8.3%) of 133,114 were sampled. In stratum five, 10,389 (18.2%) of  
93 57,127 were sampled. In stratum six, 10,982 (8.6%) of 128,206 were sampled and in stratum seven,  
94 22,250 (0.9%) of 2,382,619 persons were sampled. Sampled persons were invited to participate in an  
95 online survey from July 10 to October 17, 2022. Of 98,505 eligible sampled members, 9,825 (10.0%)  
96 completed the survey in year one. In year two, all respondents from year one were contacted again  
97 from May 1 to November 27, 2023; of those respondents, 6,393 (65.1%) completed the survey again in  
98 year two (since recruitment, five respondents requested data removal; the updated number of  
99 respondents is 9,820). Participants were offered a \$10 gift card each time they completed a survey.

100           The survey assessed sociodemographic characteristics, IOM ME/CFS diagnostic criteria based on  
101 standardized scores on symptom questionnaires, COVID-19 history, and health-related quality of life  
102 using established instruments (see footnote in Table 2)). Linked EHR data were used to assess ME/CFS  
103 and related diagnoses, COVID-19 history, body mass index (BMI), Charlson comorbidity index score, and  
104 outpatient primary care utilization (in-person, video, and telephone visits with a provider in family  
105 medicine, internal medicine, or obstetrics/gynecology). Of the respondents, 645 in year one and 316 in  
106 year two (not mutually exclusive) met criteria for survey-identified ME/CFS-like illness based on IOM  
107 ME/CFS diagnostic criteria (Supplemental Table 1). In total, 798 persons had ME/CFS-like illness in either  
108 year one, year two, or both. Persons with survey-identified ME/CFS-like illness were classified as either  
109 having undiagnosed ME/CFS if they had no recorded ME/CFS diagnosis in their EHR at any time  
110 (identified by either International Classification of Disease [ICD]-9 codes 780.71 or 323.9, or ICD-10  
111 codes G93.32, R53.82, or umbrella codes G93.3) or having diagnosed ME/CFS if a ME/CFS diagnosis was  
112 documented in their EHR. The primary outcome of interest was prevalence of an EHR ME/CFS diagnosis  
113 among those who qualified for survey-identified ME/CFS-like illness. Secondary outcomes of interest  
114 included characteristics and functional status of respondents stratified by presence of an EHR ME/CFS  
115 diagnosis.

116           Sampling weights were calculated equal to the inverse of the probability of sample selection.  
117 Non-response weights were estimated using Super Learner, an ensemble machine learning method that  
118 uses a weighted combination of candidate algorithms to optimize predictive performance via cross-  
119 validation (8). We modeled the probability of survey response within each stratum, adjusting for current  
120 age, race and ethnicity, sex, Charlson comorbidity index (CCI) score within the last year (9,10), and body  
121 mass index (BMI) within the last two years and generated non-response weights as the inverse of the  
122 predicted probability of response. Sampling strata four to seven had higher maximum non-response  
123 weights and were trimmed at the 99<sup>th</sup> percentile. Sampling and non-response weights were multiplied

124 together to determine final survey weights. The weighted sample was compared to the original eligible  
125 population using standardized mean differences to ensure the demographic distribution between  
126 sample and eligible population was not substantially different (Supplemental Table 3 in the prior paper  
127 stemming from the STOP ME/CFS project (7)). For those who had repeated observations (responded  
128 both years), final survey weights were divided by two, and half of each weight was applied to each year.  
129 All estimates are for the two-year period and include sampling weights and non-response weights as  
130 well as adjustment for repeated observations on participants who responded in both years one and two.  
131 SF-36 scores and PROMIS cognitive function scores were converted into T-scores (11–13). Associations  
132 between the groups were tested using the Wilcoxon rank-sum test for complex survey samples and chi-  
133 square test with Rao & Scott’s second-order correction; p-values were adjusted for multiple  
134 comparisons (14). Non-response weights were generated using the SuperLearner package (15),  
135 weighted, repeated-measures survey data were generated using the survey package (16), and tables of  
136 weighted data and p-values were generated using the gtsummary package (17).

137

## 138 **Results**

139 Using a weighted survey of 9,820 adult Kaiser Permanente members over two years, we  
140 estimated that 1.8% (95% confidence interval [CI] 1.3%-2.2%) of adult members had survey-identified  
141 ME/CFS-like illness during the two-year study period. Among those with survey-identified ME/CFS-like  
142 illness, an estimated 97.8% (CI 97.1%-98.4%) did not have any ME/CFS diagnosis in their EHR, with only  
143 2.2% (CI 1.6%-2.9%) having a ME/CFS diagnosis in their health record. Those without an EHR ME/CFS  
144 diagnosis were younger (mean age 44 vs. 51) and less likely to identify as White, non-Hispanic (46% vs.  
145 66%) compared to those with an EHR ME/CFS diagnosis (Table 1). Among all those with survey-identified  
146 ME/CFS-like illness, the average number of primary care visits over the past three years was 11 (median  
147 9, range 1 to 135); 100% of those without an EHR diagnosis and 98% of those with an EHR diagnosis had

148 at least one virtual or in-person primary care visit in the last three years. Among all those with ME/CFS-  
149 like illness, persons without an EHR ME/CFS diagnosis were significantly more likely to report fatigue  
150 onset less than three years prior to survey date (53% vs. 28%) than persons with an EHR ME/CFS  
151 diagnosis. Moreover, despite reporting these symptoms on the survey, persons with ME/CFS-like illness  
152 and without an EHR ME/CFS diagnosis were significantly less likely to have any diagnosis in their EHR of  
153 fatigue (47% vs. 92%), sleep issues (39% vs. 69%), or cognitive impairment (9% vs. 27%) compared to  
154 persons with ME/CFS-like illness and an EHR ME/CFS diagnosis.

155 Both groups with survey-identified ME/CFS-like illness, either diagnosed or undiagnosed,  
156 reported significantly lower quality of life than a group of KPNC members without ME/CFS-like illness  
157 (Table 2). The mean SF-36 T-score was 32 for those with ME/CFS-like illness without an EHR diagnosis,  
158 30 for those with ME/CFS-like illness and an EHR ME/CFS diagnosis, and 48 for those without ME/CFS-  
159 like illness; an SF-36 score of 50, with a standard deviation of 10, is the United States population norm  
160 (13). Scores on instruments assessing depression, anxiety, cognitive function, and orthostatic symptoms  
161 also indicated significant differences for both groups with ME/CFS-like illness compared to the general  
162 population. Generally, persons with ME/CFS-like illness and an EHR diagnosis had lower well-being  
163 scores than those with ME/CFS-like illness without an EHR diagnosis; however, persons without an EHR  
164 ME/CFS diagnosis had a significantly lower SF-36 mental health T-score (30 vs. 34) and significantly  
165 higher anxiety score on GAD-2 (worse anxiety) (4 vs. 3) than persons with an EHR ME/CFS diagnosis.

166

## 167 **Discussion**

168 In an integrated healthcare system with 2.7 million adult members, an estimated 1.8% had  
169 symptoms consistent with ME/CFS-like illness during a two-year period. Of those with ME/CFS-like  
170 illness, 97.8% had no documentation of an ME/CFS diagnosis, despite a high level of primary care  
171 utilization; 53% of those with ME/CFS-like illness and no EHR diagnosis reported fatigue began less than



172 three years prior. Surveying medical records alone would not have uncovered this younger, more racially  
173 diverse group with recent-onset ME/CFS-like illness. These findings suggest that many people with  
174 ME/CFS are not recognized, particularly those with recent onset. Earlier diagnosis of ME/CFS by  
175 clinicians might facilitate improvement in outcomes and prevention of disease progression for this group  
176 (18). Persons with ME/CFS-like illness without an EHR diagnosis had worse anxiety than persons with  
177 ME/CFS-like illness and an EHR diagnosis, suggesting a possible effect of unrecognized illness on mental  
178 health among people with ME/CFS symptoms.

179 This report documents potential underdiagnosis of ME/CFS by healthcare providers, even in an  
180 integrated healthcare system with accessible primary care services. Numerous factors may contribute to  
181 the high level of underdiagnosis of ME/CFS, including the lack of a diagnostic biomarker, a low level of  
182 dissemination of standardized screening and assessment tools, limited uptake of clinician training on  
183 ME/CFS, a low-level of patient awareness of ME/CFS, misconceptions among clinicians that the illness is  
184 psychogenic in nature or does not exist, and the fact that ME/CFS symptoms can overlap with other  
185 illnesses (1,19). The symptoms of the undiagnosed group may provide insight into screening for and  
186 monitoring ME/CFS earlier in the illness course.

187 These findings indicate the importance of enhanced symptom-based surveillance as an initial  
188 step in recognizing undiagnosed ME/CFS, as those with undiagnosed ME/CFS-like illness would not have  
189 been identified without this project's symptom-based surveillance efforts. Enhanced syndromic  
190 surveillance has the potential to increase timely recognition of ME/CFS. Public communication  
191 campaigns could also promote earlier recognition of ME/CFS symptoms, which could lead to earlier  
192 care-seeking and care provision. One avenue for public communication is via interactive web-based  
193 training for primary healthcare providers and patients. Web-based training could provide resources for  
194 managing this complex illness but has had limited implementation to date. Public health detailing, which

195 involves educational visits by public health officials to providers, might also provide support to clinicians,  
196 as it has for other chronic conditions (20).

197           The findings in this report are subject to limitations. First, we assessed ME/CFS-like illness using  
198 established IOM ME/CFS criteria based on self-reported symptom frequency, severity, and duration, but  
199 did not conduct in-person clinical examinations and interviews to establish a definitive clinical ME/CFS  
200 diagnosis; some persons classified as having survey-identified ME/CFS in this study might have an  
201 alternative diagnosis or condition that explains their symptoms, which might have inflated our estimate  
202 of persons with ME/CFS-like illness. Similarly, we used ICD-9/10 codes to identify persons who had an  
203 ME/CFS diagnosis documented in their EHR; ICD-9/10 coding has limitations as a surveillance tool due to  
204 the potential for misclassification. Second, our overall survey response rate was 10%; though results  
205 were weighted to be representative of the eligible KPNC adult population (see Supplemental Table 3 in  
206 prior paper (7)), lower response rates limit the generalizability of results. Third, we only included  
207 persons with English listed as their preferred language; 9% of KPNC members prefer a language other  
208 than English and were not included in this study.

209           The results suggest that underdiagnosis of ME/CFS is common despite high levels of care  
210 utilization in the Kaiser Permanente Northern California integrated healthcare system. Several strategies  
211 could be implemented to attempt to address underdiagnosis, including continued syndromic  
212 surveillance, web-based training for providers and patients, and public health detailing. Improved  
213 ascertainment of ME/CFS by the medical system is critical for patient care and well-being and has the  
214 potential to decrease patient morbidity from ME/CFS through earlier recognition and intervention.

215 **Acknowledgements**

216

217 All authors contributed to conceptual ideas and contributed to methodology. MSW, JSL, ERU, JS

218 contributed to operationalization of case-definition and survey instrument scoring; MSW, JRN, JS

219 contributed to formal analysis; MSW, JS contributed to writing and original draft preparation; all authors

220 contributed to writing, reviewing, and editing the manuscript; JS, JB, GR supervised the work. The

221 funders contributed to the study design, decision to publish, and preparation of the manuscript. They

222 did not contribute to the data collection or formal analysis.

223 The authors are grateful to all Kaiser Permanente members without whom this study would not

224 have been possible.

## 225 References

- 226 1. Bateman L, Bested AC, Bonilla HF, Chheda BV, Chu L, Curtin JM, et al. Myalgic  
227 Encephalomyelitis/Chronic Fatigue Syndrome: Essentials of Diagnosis and Management. *Mayo Clinic*  
228 *Proceedings*. 2021 Nov;96(11):2861–78.
- 229 2. IOM 2015 Diagnostic Criteria | Diagnosis | Healthcare Providers | Myalgic  
230 Encephalomyelitis/Chronic Fatigue Syndrome (ME/CFS) | CDC [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2023 Apr 17].  
231 Available from: [https://www.cdc.gov/me-cfs/healthcare-providers/diagnosis/iom-2015-diagnostic-](https://www.cdc.gov/me-cfs/healthcare-providers/diagnosis/iom-2015-diagnostic-criteria.html)  
232 [criteria.html](https://www.cdc.gov/me-cfs/healthcare-providers/diagnosis/iom-2015-diagnostic-criteria.html)
- 233 3. Institute of Medicine (U.S.), editor. *Beyond myalgic encephalomyelitis/chronic fatigue syndrome:*  
234 *redefining an illness*. Washington, D.C: The National Academies Press; 2015. 1 p.
- 235 4. Grach SL, Seltzer J, Chon TY, Ganesh R. Diagnosis and Management of Myalgic  
236 Encephalomyelitis/Chronic Fatigue Syndrome. *Mayo Clinic Proceedings*. 2023 Oct;98(10):1544–51.
- 237 5. Robertson MM, Qasmieh SA, Kulkarni SG, Teasdale CA, Jones HE, McNairy M, et al. The  
238 Epidemiology of Long COVID in US Adults. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2022 Dec 21;ciac961.
- 239 6. Davis AC, Voelkel JL, Remmers CL, Adams JL, McGlynn EA. Comparing Kaiser Permanente Members  
240 to the General Population: Implications for Generalizability of Research. *TPJ*. 2023 Jun 15;27(2):87–  
241 98.
- 242 7. Wood MS, Halmer N, Bertolli J, Amsden LB, Nugent JR, Lin JMS, et al. Impact of COVID-19 on myalgic  
243 encephalomyelitis/chronic fatigue syndrome-like illness prevalence: A cross-sectional survey. *Yon*  
244 *DK*, editor. *PLoS ONE*. 2024 Sep 18;19(9):e0309810.
- 245 8. van der Laan MJ, Polley EC, Hubbard AE. Super learner. *Stat Appl Genet Mol Biol*. 2007;6:Article25.
- 246 9. Charlson ME, Pompei P, Ales KL, MacKenzie CR. A new method of classifying prognostic comorbidity  
247 in longitudinal studies: development and validation. *J Chronic Dis*. 1987;40(5):373–83.
- 248 10. Deyo RA, Cherkin DC, Ciol MA. Adapting a clinical comorbidity index for use with ICD-9-CM  
249 administrative databases. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 1992 Jun;45(6):613–9.
- 250 11. Ware JE. SF-36 Health Survey Update: Spine. 2000 Dec;25(24):3130–9.
- 251 12. Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System Cognitive Function [Internet].  
252 HealthMeasures; 2019 [cited 2023 Aug 18]. Available from:  
253 [https://staging.healthmeasures.net/images/PROMIS/manuals/PROMIS\\_Cognitive\\_Function\\_Scoring](https://staging.healthmeasures.net/images/PROMIS/manuals/PROMIS_Cognitive_Function_Scoring_Manual.pdf)  
254 [\\_Manual.pdf](https://staging.healthmeasures.net/images/PROMIS/manuals/PROMIS_Cognitive_Function_Scoring_Manual.pdf)
- 255 13. Ware J, Kosinski M, Bjorner J, Turner-Bowker D, Gandek B, Maruish M. *User’s manual for the SF-*  
256 *36v2 Health Survey*. QualityMetric Incorporated; 2007.
- 257 14. Benjamini Y, Hochberg Y. Controlling the False Discovery Rate: A Practical and Powerful Approach to  
258 Multiple Testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*. 1995  
259 Jan;57(1):289–300.

- 260 15. Polley E, LeDell E, Kennedy C, van der Laan M. *\_SuperLearner: Super Learner Prediction\_*. [Internet].  
261 2023. Available from: <https://github.com/ecpolley/SuperLearner>
- 262 16. Lumley T. *Complex Surveys: A Guide to Analysis Using R*. John Wiley and Sons; 2010.
- 263 17. Sjoberg D D, Whiting K, Curry M, Lavery J A, Larmarange J. Reproducible Summary Tables with the  
264 *gtsummary* Package. *The R Journal*. 2021;13(1):570.
- 265 18. Bernhoff G, Rasmussen-Barr E, Bunketorp Käll L. A comparison of health-related factors between  
266 patients diagnosed with ME/CFS and patients with a related symptom picture but no ME/CFS  
267 diagnosis: a cross-sectional exploratory study. *J Transl Med*. 2022 Dec 9;20(1):577.
- 268 19. *Beyond Myalgic Encephalomyelitis/Chronic Fatigue Syndrome: Redefining an Illness* [Internet].  
269 Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press; 2015 [cited 2024 Feb 12]. Available from:  
270 <http://www.nap.edu/catalog/19012>
- 271 20. O'Brien MA, Rogers S, Jamtvedt G, Oxman A, Odgaard-Jensen J, Kristoffersen DT, et al. Educational  
272 outreach visits: effects on professional practice and health care outcomes. *CDSR* [Internet]. 2007  
273 Oct 17 [cited 2024 Nov 3]; Available from: <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/14651858.CD000409.pub2>

**Table 1. Demographics and characteristics of persons with myalgic encephalomyelitis/chronic fatigue syndrome (ME/CFS)-like illness<sup>a</sup> on survey, by presence of ME/CFS diagnosis in the electronic health record (EHR)**

	Overall		A. ME/CFS-like illness, no ME/CFS diagnosis in EHR		B. ME/CFS-like illness, ME/CFS diagnosis in EHR		C. No ME/CFS-like illness		p-values	
	n <sup>b</sup>	% (CI) <sup>b</sup>	n <sup>b</sup>	% (CI) <sup>b</sup>	n <sup>b</sup>	% (CI) <sup>b</sup>	n <sup>b</sup>	% (CI) <sup>b</sup>	A vs. B <sup>c</sup>	A vs. B vs. C <sup>d</sup>
<b>Unweighted number of respondents (weighted row percent (CI))</b>	9,820	100	473	1.7 (1.3, 2.2)	144	0.04 (0.03, 0.05)	9,202	98 (98, 99)		
<b>Age in years (weighted mean (CI))</b>		50 (49, 51)		44 (40, 48)		51 (49, 53)		50 (49, 51)	0.003	0.008
<b>Age in years</b>									0.037	0.02
18-34	1,595	25 (23, 27)	69	33 (22, 46)	20	13 (9, 20)	1,505	25 (23, 27)		
35-49	2,381	26 (24, 27)	152	27 (18, 39)	41	30 (23, 38)	2,187	26 (24, 27)		
50-64	3,302	24 (22, 26)	201	31 (20, 45)	57	40 (33, 48)	3,043	24 (22, 26)		
65+	2,542	25 (24, 27)	50	8 (4, 17)	26	17 (12, 23)	2,466	26 (24, 27)		
<b>Self-reported race/ethnicity</b>									0.041	0.382
Asian	1,310	22 (20, 24)	30	16 (8, 29)	4	4 (1, 9)	1,275	22 (20, 24)		
Black	480	6 (5, 7)	26	9 (3, 25)	5	5 (2, 11)	448	6 (5, 7)		
Latino/Hispanic	1,594	17 (16, 19)	101	24 (15, 36)	20	19 (12, 27)	1,473	17 (16, 19)		
White	5,860	50 (48, 52)	262	46 (34, 59)	105	66 (57, 74)	5,492	50 (48, 52)		
Other/unknown	576	5 (4, 6)	53	5 (3, 11)	10	7 (4, 12)	513	5 (4, 6)		
<b>Sex</b>									0.774	0.042
Female	6,676	58 (56, 60)	367	73 (59, 83)	115	75 (67, 82)	6,193	58 (56, 60)		
Male	3,144	42 (40, 44)	105	27 (17, 41)	29	25 (18, 33)	3,009	42 (40, 44)		
<b>Charlson comorbidity index score</b>									<0.001	0.141
0 or no visits	4,930	62 (60, 64)	195	60 (47, 72)	49	32 (25, 39)	4,685	62 (60, 64)		
1-2	3,307	25 (24, 27)	189	20 (13, 29)	64	46 (38, 54)	3,053	25 (24, 27)		
3+	1,582	13 (11, 14)	88	20 (11, 34)	31	22 (16, 30)	1,463	12 (11, 14)		
<b>Body mass index, kg/m<sup>2</sup></b>									0.774	0.02
< 30	5,899	63 (61, 65)	210	48 (35, 61)	83	57 (49, 65)	5,605	63 (61, 65)		
>= 30	3,820	34 (32, 36)	262	51 (38, 63)	61	43 (35, 51)	3,497	34 (32, 36)		

**Table 1. Demographics and characteristics of persons with myalgic encephalomyelitis/chronic fatigue syndrome (ME/CFS)-like illness<sup>a</sup> on survey, by presence of ME/CFS diagnosis in the electronic health record (EHR)**

	Overall		A. ME/CFS-like illness, no ME/CFS diagnosis in EHR		B. ME/CFS-like illness, ME/CFS diagnosis in EHR		C. No ME/CFS-like illness		p-values	
	n <sup>b</sup>	% (CI) <sup>b</sup>	n <sup>b</sup>	% (CI) <sup>b</sup>	n <sup>b</sup>	% (CI) <sup>b</sup>	n <sup>b</sup>	% (CI) <sup>b</sup>	A vs. B <sup>c</sup>	A vs. B vs. C <sup>d</sup>
<b>Number of visits with any primary care provider, last 3 years ( weighted mean (CI))</b>		7 (7, 8)		11 (10, 13)		17 (15, 19)		7 (7, 7)	0.007	<0.001
<b>Outpatient primary care visit in last 3 years, either virtual or in person</b>	9,616	93 (92, 94)	471	100 (100, 100)	142	98 (95, 99)	9,003	93 (92, 94)	<0.001	<0.001
<b>Self-reported diagnosis of ME/CFS</b>									<0.001	<0.001
Yes	555	0 (0, 1)	38	2 (1, 5)	87	59 (51, 67)	430	0 (0, 1)		
No	6,568	61 (59, 63)	370	87 (78, 93)	41	30 (24, 38)	6,156	60 (59, 62)		
Don't know/no response	2,696	39 (37, 41)	64	11 (5, 21)	15	11 (7, 16)	2,616	39 (37, 41)		
<b>Fatigue onset</b>									0.001	<0.001
Less than 3 years	3,341	29 (27, 30)	235	53 (41, 65)	39	28 (22, 36)	3,067	28 (27, 30)		
Greater than or equal to 3 years	6,478	71 (70, 73)	238	47 (35, 59)	105	72 (64, 78)	6,135	72 (70, 73)		
<b>Clinician diagnosis in EHR<sup>e</sup></b>										
Clinician diagnosis of fatigue	6,052	27 (25, 28)	415	47 (34, 59)	133	92 (87, 95)	5,504	26 (25, 28)	<0.001	<0.001
Clinician diagnosis of sleep issues	4,080	20 (19, 22)	300	39 (28, 52)	100	69 (60, 76)	3,679	20 (18, 21)	<0.001	<0.001
Clinician diagnosis of cognitive impairment	1,027	4 (3, 4)	89	9 (5, 16)	40	27 (21, 35)	898	3 (3, 4)	0.001	0.001
Clinician diagnosis of orthostatic intolerance	414	2 (1, 2)	38	9 (3, 23)	25	18 (12, 25)	351	2 (1, 2)	0.193	<0.001
<b>Work status</b>									0.002	<0.001
Employed	5,733	65 (63, 67)	225	59 (46, 71)	45	32 (25, 40)	5,463	65 (64, 67)		
Unable to work due to health disability	990	2 (2, 3)	161	22 (13, 34)	72	50 (43, 58)	756	2 (2, 3)		

**Table 1. Demographics and characteristics of persons with myalgic encephalomyelitis/chronic fatigue syndrome (ME/CFS)-like illness<sup>a</sup> on survey, by presence of ME/CFS diagnosis in the electronic health record (EHR)**

	Overall		A. ME/CFS-like illness, no ME/CFS diagnosis in EHR		B. ME/CFS-like illness, ME/CFS diagnosis in EHR		C. No ME/CFS-like illness		p-values	
	n <sup>b</sup>	% (CI) <sup>b</sup>	n <sup>b</sup>	% (CI) <sup>b</sup>	n <sup>b</sup>	% (CI) <sup>b</sup>	n <sup>b</sup>	% (CI) <sup>b</sup>	A vs. B <sup>c</sup>	A vs. B vs. C <sup>d</sup>
Unemployed	262	3 (2, 3)	21	9 (2, 26)	1	1 (0, 3)	239	3 (2, 3)		
Not in work force (retired, student, homemaker)	2,768	29 (28, 31)	62	10 (5, 19)	25	16 (12, 22)	2,680	30 (28, 31)		
Other	23	0 (0, 1)	1	0 (0, 1)	0	0 (0, 0)	22	0 (0, 1)		

275 Abbreviations: ME/CFS= myalgic encephalomyelitis/chronic fatigue syndrome; EHR=electronic health record;  
 276 CI=95% confidence interval  
 277 <sup>a</sup>ME/CFS-like illness is defined as self-reported symptoms that meet the Institute of Medicine 2015 ME/CFS  
 278 criteria: 1) fatigue, post-exertional malaise, and unrefreshing sleep or sleep problems frequently, at a moderate to  
 279 severe intensity, and for at least six months; 2) cognitive impairment or orthostatic intolerance frequently, at a  
 280 moderate to severe intensity, and for at least six months; 3) fatigue must substantially limit one’s ability to pursue  
 281 work, educational, social, or recreational activities, and rest must not make the fatigue substantially better  
 282 <sup>b</sup>“N” columns are unweighted counts unless otherwise specified in the row label and “% (CI)” columns are  
 283 weighted percentages with 95% confidence intervals unless otherwise specified in the row label  
 284 <sup>c</sup>Column contains the p-values comparing the group in column A (ME/CFS-like illness, no ME/CFS diagnosis in EHR)  
 285 to the group in column B (ME/CFS-like illness, ME/CFS diagnosis in EHR) using the chi-squared test with Rao &  
 286 Scott’s second-order correction for categorical variables and the Wilcoxon rank-sum test for continuous variables.  
 287 P-values are adjusted for multiple comparisons  
 288 <sup>d</sup>Column contains the p-values comparing the groups in column A (ME/CFS-like illness, no ME/CFS diagnosis in  
 289 EHR), column B (ME/CFS-like illness, ME/CFS diagnosis in EHR), and column C (No ME/CFS-like illness) using the chi-  
 290 squared test with Rao & Scott’s second-order correction for categorical variables and the Kruskal-Wallis rank-sum  
 291 test for continuous variables. P-values are adjusted for multiple comparisons  
 292 <sup>e</sup>Clinician diagnosis in the EHR based on the following International Classification of Disease [ICD]-9 or ICD-10 codes  
 293 documented in the EHR: F48.8 ,F51, F51.0, F51.01, F51.02, F51.03, F51.04, F51.05, F51.09, F51.1, F51.11, F51.12,  
 294 F51.13, F51.19, F51.8, F51.9, G31.84, G47, G47.0, G47.00, G47.01, G47.09, G47.1, G47.10, G47.11, G47.12, G47.13,  
 295 G47.14, G47.19, G47.20, G47.21, G47.22, G47.23, G47.24, G47.27, G47.29, G47.41, G47.411, G47.419, G47.42,  
 296 G47.421, G47.429, G47.9, G90.A, I95.1, R40.0, R41.8 ,R41.840, R41.841, R41.89, R41.9, R53.1, R53.81, R53.83,  
 297 300.5, 300.89, 307.40, 307.41, 307.42, 307.43, 307.44, 307.45, 307.47, 307.48, 307.49, 327.00, 327.01, 327.02,  
 298 327.09, 327.10, 327.11, 327.12, 327.13, 327.14, 327.15, 327.19, 327.30, 327.31, 327.32, 327.33, 327.34, 327.37,  
 299 327.39, 331.83, 347.00, 347.01, 347.10, 347.11, 458.0, 780.09, 780.50, 780.52, 780.54, 780.55, 780.58, 780.79,  
 300 780.99, 799.3, 799.51, 799.52, 799.59



**Table 2. Well-being scores of persons with myalgic encephalomyelitis/chronic fatigue syndrome (ME/CFS)-like illness<sup>a</sup> on survey, by presence of ME/CFS diagnosis in the electronic health record (EHR)**


Characteristic <sup>b</sup>	A. ME/CFS-like illness, no ME/CFS diagnosis in EHR		B. ME/CFS-like illness, ME/CFS diagnosis in EHR		C. No ME/CFS-like illness		p-values	
	mean <sup>c</sup>	CI <sup>c</sup>	mean <sup>c</sup>	CI <sup>c</sup>	mean <sup>c</sup>	CI <sup>c</sup>	A vs. B <sup>d</sup>	A vs. B vs. C <sup>e</sup>
<b>SF-36</b>								
Physical functioning (T-score)	38	(34, 42)	31	(29, 32)	50	(49, 50)	0.001	<0.001
Role-physical (T-score)	33	(30, 37)	26	(24, 27)	50	(50, 50)	<0.001	<0.001
Bodily pain (T-score)	35	(33, 38)	35	(33, 36)	51	(51, 51)	0.6	<0.001
Vitality (T-score)	30	(28, 32)	28	(27, 29)	49	(48, 49)	0.033	<0.001
General health (T-score)	34	(31, 37)	28	(27, 30)	47	(47, 47)	<0.001	<0.001
Social functioning (T-score)	29	(26, 32)	25	(24, 26)	47	(46, 47)	0.049	<0.001
Role-emotional (T-score)	30	(27, 33)	29	(27, 32)	46	(46, 47)	0.789	<0.001
Mental health (T-score)	30	(26, 33)	34	(32, 36)	47	(47, 48)	0.033	<0.001
<b>PHQ-8 depression score (0-24)</b>	16	(14, 17)	15	(14, 16)	6	(5, 6)	0.4	<0.001
<b>GAD-2 anxiety score (0-6)</b>	4	(3, 4)	3	(3, 3)	1	(1, 1)	0.028	<0.001
<b>PROMIS cognitive function (T-score)</b>	36	(34, 38)	32	(31, 33)	52	(51, 52)	0.003	<0.001
<b>OGS Orthostatic intolerance (0-25)</b>	5	(3, 6)	5	(4, 7)	0	(0, 0)	0.4	<0.001

301 Abbreviations: ME/CFS= myalgic encephalomyelitis/chronic fatigue syndrome; EHR=electronic health record;  
 302 CI=95% confidence interval  
 303 <sup>a</sup>ME/CFS-like illness is defined as self-reported symptoms that meet the Institute of Medicine 2015 ME/CFS  
 304 criteria: 1) fatigue, post-exertional malaise, and unrefreshing sleep or sleep problems frequently, at a moderate to  
 305 severe intensity, and for at least six months; 2) cognitive impairment or orthostatic intolerance frequently, at a  
 306 moderate to severe intensity, and for at least six months; 3) fatigue must substantially limit one’s ability to pursue  
 307 work, educational, social, or recreational activities, and rest must not make the fatigue substantially better  
 308 <sup>b</sup>36-Item Short Form Health Survey [SF-36], higher score indicates better functioning; Patient Health Questionnaire  
 309 Depression scale [PHQ-8], higher score indicates higher levels of depression; Generalized Anxiety Disorder scale  
 310 [GAD-2], higher score indicates higher levels of anxiety; Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information  
 311 System cognition instrument Adult v2.0 - Cognitive Function 4a [PROMIS cognition], higher score indicates better  
 312 cognition; Orthostatic Grading Scale [OGS], higher score indicates more orthostatic intolerance  
 313 <sup>c</sup>“Mean” columns are weighted means, “CI” columns are weighted 95% confidence intervals  
 314 <sup>d</sup>Column contains the p-values comparing the group in column A (ME/CFS-like illness, no ME/CFS diagnosis in EHR)  
 315 to the group in column B (ME/CFS-like illness, ME/CFS diagnosis in EHR) using the Wilcoxon rank-sum test. P-values  
 316 are adjusted for multiple comparisons  
 317 <sup>e</sup>Column contains the p-values comparing the groups in column A (ME/CFS-like illness, no ME/CFS diagnosis in  
 318 EHR), column B (ME/CFS-like illness, ME/CFS diagnosis in EHR), and column C (No ME/CFS-like illness) using the  
 319 Kruskal-Wallis rank-sum test. P-values are adjusted for multiple comparisons

<b>Supplemental Table 1. Logic for determining participant grouping into either myalgic encephalomyelitis/chronic fatigue syndrome (ME/CFS)-like illness or No ME/CFS-like illness.</b>			
<b>ME/CFS-like illness group inclusion criteria, based on Institute of Medicine (IOM) criteria<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Information from survey that would fulfill inclusion criteria</b>	<b>Information from medical record that would fulfill inclusion criteria</b>	<b>Responses that meet inclusion criteria</b>
Fatigue that substantially limits activities and is not substantially alleviated by rest	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “1. During the past 4 weeks, have you had fatigue, tiredness, or exhaustion?               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Yes</li> <li>○ No”</li> </ul> </li> <li>• “2. During the past 4 weeks, how often have you had fatigue, tiredness, or exhaustion?               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A little of the time</li> <li>○ Some of the time</li> <li>○ <b>A good bit of the time</b></li> <li>○ <b>Most of the time</b></li> <li>○ <b>All of the time”</b></li> </ul> </li> <li>• “3. During the past 4 weeks, how bad was your fatigue, tiredness, or exhaustion?               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Very mild</li> <li>○ Mild</li> <li>○ <b>Moderate</b></li> <li>○ <b>Severe</b></li> <li>○ <b>Very severe”</b></li> </ul> </li> <li>• “4. How long have you had fatigue, tiredness, or exhaustion?               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Less than 6 months</li> <li>○ <b>6 months up to 1 year</b></li> <li>○ <b>1 year up to 3 years</b></li> <li>○ <b>3 years up to 5 years</b></li> <li>○ <b>5 years up to 10 years</b></li> <li>○ <b>10 or more years”</b></li> </ul> </li> <li>• “5. Has your fatigue substantially limited your ability to pursue your work, educational, social, or recreational activities?               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Yes</li> <li>○ No</li> <li>○ Not applicable”</li> </ul> </li> <li>• “6. When you experience fatigue, does rest make your fatigue better?               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Yes, a lot</li> <li>○ <b>Yes, a little</b></li> <li>○ <b>No, not very much</b></li> <li>○ <b>No, not at all”</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	-	All of questions 1 through 6 must be answered with one of the responses in bold to meet inclusion criteria for fatigue
Post-exertional malaise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “7. During the past 4 weeks, have you been unusually fatigued or unwell for at least one day after exerting yourself in any way?               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Yes</li> <li>○ No”</li> </ul> </li> <li>• “8. During the past 4 weeks, how often have you had unusual fatigue after exertion?               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A little of the time</li> <li>○ Some of the time</li> <li>○ <b>A good bit of the time</b></li> <li>○ <b>Most of the time</b></li> <li>○ <b>All of the time”</b></li> </ul> </li> <li>• “9. During the past 4 weeks, how bad was your unusual fatigue after exertion?               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Very mild</li> <li>○ Mild</li> <li>○ <b>Moderate</b></li> <li>○ <b>Severe</b></li> <li>○ <b>Very severe”</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	-	All of questions 7 through 10 must be answered with one of the responses in bold to meet inclusion criteria for post-exertional malaise

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “10. How long have you had unusual fatigue after exertion? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Less than 6 months</li> <li>○ <b>6 months up to 1 year</b></li> <li>○ <b>1 year up to 3 years</b></li> <li>○ <b>3 years up to 5 years</b></li> <li>○ <b>5 years up to 10 years</b></li> <li>○ <b>10 or more years”</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
Unrefreshing sleep or problems sleeping	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “11. During the past 4 weeks, has unrefreshing sleep been a problem for you? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Yes</b></li> <li>○ No”</li> </ul> </li> <li>• “12. During the past 4 weeks, how often have you had unrefreshing sleep? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A little of the time</li> <li>○ Some of the time</li> <li>○ <b>A good bit of the time</b></li> <li>○ <b>Most of the time</b></li> <li>○ <b>All of the time”</b></li> </ul> </li> <li>• “13. During the past 4 weeks, how much of a problem was unrefreshing sleep? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Very mild</li> <li>○ Mild</li> <li>○ <b>Moderate</b></li> <li>○ <b>Severe</b></li> <li>○ <b>Very severe”</b></li> </ul> </li> <li>• “14. How long had you had unrefreshing sleep? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Less than 6 months</li> <li>○ <b>6 months up to 1 year</b></li> <li>○ <b>1 year up to 3 years</b></li> <li>○ <b>3 years up to 5 years</b></li> <li>○ <b>5 years up to 10 years</b></li> <li>○ <b>10 or more years”</b></li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> </li> <li>• “15. During the past 4 weeks, have you had problems getting to sleep, sleeping through the night, or waking up on time? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Yes</b></li> <li>○ No”</li> </ul> </li> <li>• “16. During the past 4 weeks, how often have you had sleeping problems? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A little of the time</li> <li>○ Some of the time</li> <li>○ <b>A good bit of the time</b></li> <li>○ <b>Most of the time</b></li> <li>○ <b>All of the time”</b></li> </ul> </li> <li>• “17. During the past 4 weeks, how bad were these sleeping problems? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Very mild</li> <li>○ Mild</li> <li>○ <b>Moderate</b></li> <li>○ <b>Severe</b></li> <li>○ <b>Very severe”</b></li> </ul> </li> <li>• “18. How long have you had sleeping problems? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Less than 6 months</li> <li>○ <b>6 months up to 1 year</b></li> <li>○ <b>1 year up to 3 years</b></li> <li>○ <b>3 years up to 5 years</b></li> <li>○ <b>5 years up to 10 years</b></li> <li>○ <b>10 or more years”</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	-	All of questions 11 through 14 OR all of questions 15 through 18 must be answered with one of the responses in bold to meet inclusion criteria for unrefreshing sleep or problems sleeping
Cognitive impairment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “19. During the past 4 weeks, have you had forgetfulness or memory problems that caused you to substantially cut back on your activities?</li> </ul>	-	All of questions 19 through 22 OR all of questions 23

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Yes</b></li> <li>○ No”</li> <li>• “20. During the past 4 weeks, how often have you had forgetfulness or memory problems?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A little of the time</li> <li>○ Some of the time</li> <li>○ <b>A good bit of the time</b></li> <li>○ <b>Most of the time</b></li> <li>○ <b>All of the time”</b></li> </ul> </li> <li>• “21. During the past 4 weeks, how bad were your forgetfulness or memory problems?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Very mild</li> <li>○ Mild</li> <li>○ <b>Moderate</b></li> <li>○ <b>Severe</b></li> <li>○ <b>Very severe”</b></li> </ul> </li> <li>• “22. How long have you had forgetfulness or memory problems?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Less than 6 months</li> <li>○ <b>6 months up to 1 year</b></li> <li>○ <b>1 year up to 3 years</b></li> <li>○ <b>3 years up to 5 years</b></li> <li>○ <b>5 years up to 10 years</b></li> <li>○ <b>10 or more years”</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “23. During the past 4 weeks, have you had difficulty with thinking or concentrating that caused you to substantially cut back on your activities?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Yes</b></li> <li>○ No”</li> </ul> </li> <li>• “24. During the past 4 weeks, how often have you had difficulty with thinking or concentrating?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A little of the time</li> <li>○ Some of the time</li> <li>○ <b>A good bit of the time</b></li> <li>○ <b>Most of the time</b></li> <li>○ <b>All of the time”</b></li> </ul> </li> <li>• “25. During the past 4 weeks, how severe was your difficulty with thinking or concentrating?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Very mild</li> <li>○ Mild</li> <li>○ <b>Moderate</b></li> <li>○ <b>Severe</b></li> <li>○ <b>Very severe”</b></li> </ul> </li> <li>• “26. How long have you had difficulty with thinking or concentrating?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Less than 6 months</li> <li>○ <b>6 months up to 1 year</b></li> <li>○ <b>1 year up to 3 years</b></li> <li>○ <b>3 years up to 5 years</b></li> <li>○ <b>5 years up to 10 years</b></li> <li>○ <b>10 or more years”</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul>		<p>through 26 must be answered with one of the responses in bold to meet inclusion criteria for cognitive impairment</p>
Orthostatic intolerance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “27. During the past 4 weeks, have you had dizziness or fainting problems?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Yes</b></li> <li>○ No”</li> </ul> </li> <li>• “28. During the past 4 weeks, how often have you had dizziness or fainting problems?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A little of the time</li> <li>○ Some of the time</li> <li>○ <b>A good bit of the time</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	-	<p>All of questions 27 through 30 must be answered with one of the responses in bold to meet inclusion criteria for orthostatic intolerance</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Most of the time</b></li> <li>○ <b>All of the time</b></li> <li>● “29. During the past 4 weeks, how bad was your dizziness or fainting problems?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Very mild</li> <li>○ Mild</li> <li>○ <b>Moderate</b></li> <li>○ <b>Severe</b></li> <li>○ <b>Very severe</b></li> </ul> </li> <li>● “30. How long have you had dizziness or fainting problems?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Less than 6 months</li> <li>○ <b>6 months up to 1 year</b></li> <li>○ <b>1 year up to 3 years</b></li> <li>○ <b>3 years up to 5 years</b></li> <li>○ <b>5 years up to 10 years</b></li> <li>○ <b>10 or more years</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
 <p>If participants met all three of the fatigue, post-exertional malaise, and unrefreshing sleep or problems sleeping criteria, plus either the cognitive impairment or the orthostatic intolerance criteria, they were sorted into the ME/CFS-like illness category. Otherwise, they were sorted into the No ME/CFS-like illness category. This logic was applied to both year one and year two participants based on the data in that year’s survey only; for participants who answered the survey both years, their year two category does not take into account their year one category.</p>			

<sup>a</sup>Institute of Medicine (U.S.), editor. Beyond myalgic encephalomyelitis/chronic fatigue syndrome: redefining an illness. Washington, D.C: The National Academies Press; 2015. 1 p.