

## Neurogenic Bowel Dysfunction Score (NBD)

### Assessment Overview

#### Assessment Area

**ICF Domain:**

Body Functions

**Subcategory:**

Digestive, Metabolic and Endocrine

#### You Will Need

**Length:**

10 items

**Scoring:**

Total score: out of 47 (each item has a weighted response base)

Severity of bowel dysfunction:

Score 0-6: Very minor

Score 7-9: Minor

Score 10-13: Moderate

Score 14+: Severe

#### Summary

The Neurogenic Bowel Dysfunction Score (NBD) is a self-report questionnaire designed to help healthcare professionals evaluate the effectiveness of their patient's current bowel management routine by assessing the impact it has on the patient's quality of life.

Questions ask about background parameters (n=8), faecal incontinence (n=10), constipation (n=10), obstructed defecation (n=8), and impact on quality of life (QOL).

#### Availability

**Worksheet:** Can be found [here](#).

**Languages:** English, Dutch, Turkish, and Spanish.

**Commented [CC1]:** Asked permission for the languages papers on 13-08-2024:  
- Spanish: Pending.  
- Dutch: Pending.  
- Turkish: Pending.

### Assessment Interpretability

#### Minimal Clinically Important Difference

Not established in SCI

#### Statistical Error

Not established in SCI

#### Typical Values

Not established in SCI

## Measurement Properties

### Validity – **Low to High**

#### **Low to High** Correlations between total NBD score & SF-36 subscales:

**Bodily pain subscale:**  $r = -0.382$  (low)

**General health subscale:**  $r = -0.560$  (moderate)

**Vitality subscale:**  $r = -0.626$  (moderate)

**Social role functioning subscale:**  $r = -0.741$  (high)

**Emotional role functioning subscale:**  $r = -0.604$  (high)

**Mental health subscale:**  $r = -0.687$  (high)

#### **High** Correlation between change in total NBD score and change in Global Rating of Change scale at end of 2 months:

$r = 0.821$  ( $P=0.007$ )

(Erdem et al. 2017;  $n=42$ , mean age (SD): 39 (16) years; level: 12 cervical, 24 thoracic, 6 lumbar; acute and chronic, Turkish version)

#### **High** Correlation between total NBD score & FIQL

$r = -0.648$

#### **Moderate** Correlation between total NBD score & FISI

$r = -0.367$

#### **High** Correlation between total NBD score & EQ-5D-3L index score:

$r = -0.589$

#### **Moderate** Correlation between total NBD score and EQ-5D-3L VAS Score

$r = -0.428$

(Van Doorn et al. 2022,  $n=55$ ; 6 males, 19 females; mean (SD) age: 54 (15.8) years; 14 cervical, 20 thoracic, 9 lumbar, and 3 unknown; 15 ASIA A, 7 ASIA B, 10 ASIA C, and 9 ASIA D; mean (SD) time since injury: 13.6 (8.4) years; Dutch version)

**Number of studies reporting validity data:** 3

### Reliability – **Low and High**

#### **Moderate** Internal Consistency:

$\alpha = 0.547$

#### **High** Test-retest answers of each question:

$r = 1.000$ ,  $P < 0.001$

#### **High** Consistency of frequency distribution:

$r = 1.000$ ,  $P < 0.001$

(Erdem et al. 2017;  $n=42$ , mean age (SD): 39 (16) years; level: 12 cervical, 24 thoracic, 6 lumbar; acute and chronic, Turkish version)

#### **Low to Moderate** Internal consistency:

Test:  $\alpha = 0.56$

Retest:  $\alpha = 0.30$

(Van Doorn et al. 2022,  $n=55$ ; 6 males, 19 females; mean (SD) age: 54 (15.8) years; 14 cervical, 20 thoracic, 9 lumbar, and 3 unknown; 15 ASIA A, 7 ASIA B, 10 ASIA C, and 9 ASIA D; mean (SD) time since injury: 13.6 (8.4) years; Dutch version)

#### **High** Construct Reliability

$\alpha = 0.897$

#### **High** Test-retest Reliability

ICC = 0.886 (0.764 – 0.946)

(González-Viejo et al. 2021;  $n=59$ ; 30 with SCI, 29 with cerebral vascular accident; 24 males, 6 females; mean (SD) age: 43.6 (11.7), chronic; Spanish version)

**Number of studies reporting reliability data:** 4

## Responsiveness

### Floor/Ceiling Effect:

Not established in SCI

### Effect Size:

Not established in SCI

### Number of studies reporting responsiveness data:

0