

FURTHER VALIDATION OF THE MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS RESILIENCY SCALE (MSRS)

Elizabeth S. Gromisch¹⁻⁴, Aaron P. Turner⁵⁻⁷, Lindsay O. Neto^{1,2}, Heather M. DelMastro^{1,2}, Jennifer A. Ruiz¹⁻³, Albert C. Lo¹,

Thomas Agresta^{8,9}, and Frederick W. Foley^{10,11}

¹Mandell Center for Multiple Sclerosis Care and Neuroscience Research, Mount Sinai Rehabilitation Hospital, Trinity Health Of New England, Hartford, CT, USA
²Departments of Rehabilitative Medicine and ³Medical Sciences, Frank H. Netter MD School of Medicine at Quinnipiac University, North Haven, CT, USA
⁴Departments of Neurology, University of Connecticut School of Medicine, Farmington, CT, USA
⁵Multiple Sclerosis Center of Excellence West, Veterans Affairs, Seattle, WA, USA
⁶Rehabilitation Care Service, VA Puget Sound Health Care System, Seattle, WA, USA
⁷Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA
⁸Department of Family Medicine and ⁹Center for Qualitative Medicine, University of Connecticut Health Center, Farmington, CT, USA
¹⁰Ferkauf Graduate School of Psychology, Yeshiva University, Bronx, NY, USA
¹¹Holy Name Medical Center Multiple Sclerosis Center, Teaneck, NJ, USA

Contact Information: Elizabeth S. Gromisch, elizabeth.gromisch@trinityhealthofne.org



Background

- Resilience among persons with multiple sclerosis (MS) has been described as “bouncing back”¹, “living well”¹, and “want[ing] to thrive”¹.
- The Multiple Sclerosis Resiliency Scale (MSRS) was designed to be a multidimensional measure of resilience based on the conceptual framework that MS-related resilience is an interaction between protective and risk factors².
 - In addition to a total score, five subscales can be calculated
 - Emotional and Cognitive Strategies
 - Physical Activity and Diet
 - MS Peer Support
 - Support from Family and Friends
 - Spirituality
- In the initial studies investigating its convergent validity^{2,3}, the MSRS was compared to measures assessing general resilience, depressive and anxiety symptom severity, and perceived stress.
 - However, there are other constructs that are part of the biopsychosocial model of resilience in MS⁴ that the MSRS has yet to be evaluated against.

Objective

- To further assess the MSRS’ validity using measures of physical functioning, psychosocial illness impact, and social engagement.

Methods

Participants: 64 persons with MS

Procedures:

- Cross-sectional data were collected electronically using REDCap.
- In addition to the MSRS, participants completed the following measures:
 - PROMIS Physical Function-Short Form 20a (PROMIS-PF)*⁵: a measure of self-reported capacity in terms of instrumental activities of daily living, upper extremities, lower extremities, and central regions
 - PROMIS Psychosocial Illness Impact-Positive-Short Form 8a (PROMIS-PII)*⁵: a measure of positive psychosocial outcomes of participants’ illness
 - Neuro-QOL Ability to Participate in Social Roles and Activities Short Form (Neuro-QOL)*⁶: a measure of social health

Statistical Analyses

- Pearson and Spearman correlations were run to examine the relationships between the measures.

Results

	PROMIS-PF
Total Score	r = .36 p = .004
Emotional and Cognitive Strategies	ρ = .55 p < .001
Physical Activity and Diet	ρ = .25 p = .050
MS Peer Support	ρ = -.13 p = .321
Support from Family and Friends	ρ = .28 p = .025
Spirituality	ρ = -.09 p = .465

Table 1: Correlations between the MSRS and PROMIS Physical Function-Short Form 20a

	PROMIS-PII
Total Score	r = .77 p < .001
Emotional and Cognitive Strategies	ρ = .72 p < .001
Physical Activity and Diet	ρ = .40 p = .001
MS Peer Support	ρ = .30 p = .018
Support from Family and Friends	ρ = .46 p < .001
Spirituality	ρ = .34 p = .006

Table 2: Correlations between the MSRS and PROMIS Psychosocial Illness Impact-Positive-Short Form 8a

	Neuro-QOL
Total Score	ρ = .73 p < .001
Emotional and Cognitive Strategies	ρ = .75 p < .001
Physical Activity and Diet	ρ = .36 p = .004
MS Peer Support	ρ = .13 p = .296
Support from Family and Friends	ρ = .47 p < .001
Spirituality	ρ = .14 p = .274

Table 3: Correlations between the MSRS and Neuro-QOL Ability to Participate in Social Roles and Activities Short Form

Results (Cont.)

- The MSRS Total Score was positively correlated with the PROMIS-PF, PROMIS-PII, and Neuro-QoL.
 - Strongest relationships with PROMIS-PII and Neuro-QoL.
- Emotional and Cognitive Strategies also had strong correlations with all three measures, while Support from Family and Friends’ correlations were moderate.
- Weakest correlations were noted with MS Peer Support, Spirituality, and Physical Activity and Diet.

Conclusions

- These findings are consistent with the biopsychosocial model of resilience⁴, providing further validation of the MSRS.
- The weaker associations with certain subscales are consistent with other validity studies with the MSRS^{3,7}, suggesting future versions of the MSRS may consider removing these subscales.

References

- Silverman AM, Verrall AM, Alschuler KN, Smith AE, Ehde DM. Bouncing back again, and again: a qualitative study of resilience in people with multiple sclerosis. *Disability and Rehabilitation*. 2017;39:14-22.
- Gromisch ES, Sloan J, Zemon V, et al. Development of the Multiple Sclerosis Resiliency Scale (MSRS). *Rehabilitation psychology*. 2018;63:357-364.
- Hughes AJ, Patel K, Brown A, Gromisch ES, Mowry EM. Reliability and validity of the Multiple Sclerosis Resiliency Scale (MSRS). *Journal of the neurological sciences*. 2020.
- Black R, Dorstyn D. A biopsychosocial model of resilience for multiple sclerosis. *Journal of health psychology*. 2015;20(11):1434-44.
- Ader DN. Developing the patient-reported outcomes measurement information system (PROMIS). *LWW*; 2007.
- Cella D, Lai JS, Nowinski CJ, Victorson D, Peterman A, Miller D, et al. Neuro-QOL: brief measures of health-related quality of life for clinical research in neurology. *Neurology*. 2012;78(23):1860-7.
- Gromisch ES, Neto LO, Sloan J, Tyry T, Foley FW. Using the multiple sclerosis resiliency scale to identify psychological distress in persons with multiple sclerosis. *Multiple Sclerosis and Related Disorders*. 2021 Aug 1;53:103079.

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to thank Dotty Wakefield, MS, for coding and management of the REDCap data collection.

The views and opinions expressed in this article reflect those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the United States Department of Veterans Affairs.

This study was funded by a *BestCare* grant from St. Francis Hospital and Medical Center. Dr. Gromisch is a Harry Weaver Scholar of the National MS Society.