

Validation of the Portuguese Version of Amsterdam Preoperative Anxiety and Information Scale (APAIS)

Sandra Maurício (✉ s.duquemauro@gmail.com)

Instituto Portugues de Oncologia de Lisboa Francisco Gentil EPE <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4134-848X>

Isabel Rebêlo

Instituto Portugues de Oncologia de Lisboa Francisco Gentil EPE

Catarina Madeira

Instituto Portugues de Oncologia de Lisboa Francisco Gentil EPE

Filipa Resende

Instituto Portugues de Oncologia de Lisboa Francisco Gentil EPE

Susana Esteves

Instituto Portugues de Oncologia de Lisboa Francisco Gentil EPE

Research

Keywords: anxiety, cancer, surgery, anesthesia, questionnaire, validation study, perioperative care

Posted Date: November 13th, 2020

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-104499/v1>

License:   This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Version of Record: A version of this preprint was published on March 19th, 2021. See the published version at <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12955-021-01736-6>.

Abstract

Background

Preoperative anxiety is common among the oncological surgical population. Due to its psychological and physiological detrimental effects, identifying and addressing it is of uttermost importance to improve anesthetic management and patient's experience. The aim of this study is to establish the Portuguese version of Amsterdam Preoperative Anxiety and Information Scale (APAIS) in the oncological population

Methods

Following forward and backward translation of the original APAIS scale, further adaptation was obtained through cognitive interviewing. The resulting instrument was tested on the day before surgery on a sample of adult cancer surgical patients from a Portuguese oncology centre. Psychometric evaluation was derived from inter-item correlation, confirmatory factor analysis, Cronbach's alpha, correlation with comparative scales, receiver operating characteristic curve and Youden index.

Results

109 patients (58 males, 51 females) were included. A three-dimensional model - anxiety about anesthesia, anxiety about surgery and desire for information, showed the best fit to the data. The questionnaire revealed high internal consistency (Cronbach alpha 0.81) and good inter-item correlation. Also, Portuguese APAIS correlated well with the gold standard anxiety scale. Therefore, the psychometric properties of this scale version make it a valid and reliable instrument. The optimal cutoff to maximize both sensitivity and specificity was 12.

Conclusions

Portuguese APAIS version is an accurate tool to identify preoperative anxiety among cancer patients and might impact its management, from premedication choice to provision of information and reassurance about either anesthesia or surgery.

Background

Preoperative anxiety has been recognized as a significant issue among surgical patients (1–2). Excessive anxiety leads to psychological and physical adverse stress reactions. It causes a greater consumption of anesthetic (3–4) and analgesic drugs (5), intra- and post-operatively. Moreover, it is a negative predictor of surgical outcomes (6) and has a deleterious impact on the patient's health care experience (7).

Preoperative anxiety is a multifactorial disorder. Causes may include fear of anesthesia, concern about surgical outcomes, anticipation of post-operative pain and hospital environment hostility (8). It is also influenced by socio-demographic and psychosocial factors, which may be of great significance and challenging to evaluate (9–10).

Regarding the oncological population, 18% of the patients report depression symptoms and 24% anxiety symptoms (11). In the preoperative setting, these patients have additional anxiety causes, including the life-threatening nature of their disease, the surgical impact on their body image and the effects of other non-surgical treatments (12). Psychological pre-rehabilitation has been suggested to have a favorable outcome in improving postoperative functional capacity and resuming normal daily activities (13). However, albeit the relevance of psychological factors in postsurgical outcomes, these variables are not systematically evaluated. As a result, despite being well known among clinicians, anxiety is not being sufficiently treated.

Several instruments can be used to evaluate patients' anxiety. The *State-Trait Anxiety Inventory* (STAI) and the *Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale* (HADS) (14) have been widely used in the hospital setting. They both have already been translated and validated to the Portuguese language. However, they are long and time-consuming, have not been designed for the pre-operative setting and do not assess the need for information.

The *Amsterdam Preoperative Anxiety and Information Scale* (APAIS) was created in order to obtain a rapid and easy evaluation of the patient's anxiety and need for information about the surgery and anesthesia (15). It is a simple questionnaire consisting of six items, four regarding the anxiety about the surgical procedure and the fear of anesthesia, and two regarding the need for information (Table 1). The answers are recorded in a 5-point *Likert* scale, thus the anxiety scale ranges from 4 to 20 points and the need for information scale ranges from 2 to 10 points. The original cutoffs from the Dutch version and its English translation are 11 for the clinical context, and 13 for investigation purposes due to its higher specificity (15).

The APAIS questionnaire has been showing remarkable results in the preoperative evaluation of subjects undergoing a variety of procedures, from minor to major surgery, as it allows the identification of patients who would benefit from therapeutic intervention and/or further information (16). The APAIS has been translated into several languages (17–22), but it is still not validated to Portuguese population neither specifically for cancer patients.

The aim of this study is to translate the APAIS into Portuguese and validate this version for the oncologic population.

Methods

Design, setting and ethics

Following the institution's Ethics Committee approval, this cross-sectional psychometric study was carried out at Instituto Português de Oncologia de Lisboa Francisco Gentil, one of the main oncology centers in Portugal. Participant selection was done using a quota sampling procedure to obtain equal proportion of males and females. Patients were recruited between July and December 2018, and written consent was obtained from all of them.

Translation and adaptation

First, authorization to translate the APAIS was required from the authors of the original scale. According to the WHO guidelines for translation and adaptation of instruments (23), the process included a forward translation by two anesthesia trainees, an expert review by two bilingual senior anesthetists, a backward translation by an independent translator and cognitive interviewing with ten surgical adult inpatients by a senior clinical psychologist, in order to obtain an equivalent scale in Portuguese.

Sampling process, study subjects and data collection

The size of the validation sample was based on a ratio of 20 cases per item, which holds a number that is similar to those seen in other APAIS validation studies (17–22). The sample included patients aged above 18 years old, able to read and understand the Portuguese language, undergoing elective cancer surgery, either general, gynaecological or urological procedures. Exclusion criteria were: psychiatric disorder requiring antipsychotic drugs, cognitive impairment, difficulty understanding the study, non-cancer or emergent surgery. The day before surgery, and after the pre-anesthetic visit, patients filled in the questionnaires.

Patients' characteristics and scales

Patients' sociodemographic and clinical variables potentially associated with anxiety and desire for information were collected. These included age, gender, ASA physical status, education, work situation and marital status, previous anesthesia and/or surgery, regular use of anxiolytics, type of surgery and waiting time. The instruments used were the APAIS (anxiety scale – 4 items, score 4–20; need for information scale – 2 items, score 2–10), STAI-Y1 (subscale for anxiety-state – 20 items, score 20–80, ref 24) and HADS-D (subscale for depressive mood disorder – 7 items, score 0–21, ref 25) for *post hoc* comparisons.

Statistical analysis and psychometric evaluation

We performed a descriptive analysis of the sociodemographic and clinical variables and of the APAIS, STAI-Y1 and HADS-D scores using mean, standard deviation (SD), and absolute and relative frequencies.

Evaluation of APAIS validity was conducted as follows. A confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) has been performed to evaluate whether the APAIS Portuguese version, once applied to oncology patients, would maintain the same factor structure reported in previous validation studies. We evaluated the one-factor model as described in the Spanish APAIS validation (22), the two-factor model as in the original APAIS (15) and the three-factor model as in the French APAIS validation (19). Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy (0.77) and Bartlett's test of sphericity ($p < 0.001$) confirmed data suitability for factor analysis but Mardia's test rejected multivariate normality. Therefore, we used a maximum likelihood estimation with robust standard errors and a Satorra-Bentler scaled test statistic suitable for non-normal data. We report the fit indices derived from this robust approach chi-square test of exact fit ($p > 0.05$ indicates good fit), Tucker Lewis Index (good fit if $TLI \geq 0.95$), comparative fit index (good fit if $CFI \geq 0.95$)

and the root mean square error of approximation (good fit if RMSEA < 0.08) and its 90% confidence interval (90% CI). The Scaled Chi Square Difference Test was used for model comparison (likelihood ratio test with robust estimation).

Internal consistency of the APAIS scale was assessed by Cronbach's alpha coefficient (reliability acceptable if ≥ 0.70). Nonparametric Spearman correlations were used for determining the associations and correlations between the scales, with the correlation between STAI-Y1 and APAIS being used to evaluate concurrent validity. Finally, we attempted to identify the utility of the APAIS in Portuguese cancer patients. The sensitivity, specificity, and positive and negative predictive values of the APAIS were assessed for different cutoff points by using a STAI-Y1 score ≥ 40 as the reference point to detect clinically significant anxiety (26). Accuracy was estimated by receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve and the corresponding area under the curve (AUC). The best cutoff of APAIS was determined by analysis of accuracy at every APAIS score and by Youden index.

We considered the significance level of 5% unless otherwise specified. The statistical analysis was performed using R (27) and the packages "lavaan" (28), "psych" (29), "pROC" (30) and "epiR" (31).

Results

Process of translation and adaptation

Following translation into Portuguese by a Portuguese anesthesiologist knowledgeable of the English language, the scale was reviewed by a different bilingual health professional. Then it was independently translated back into English with no mismatches. Further feedback was obtained from pretesting using cognitive assessment. Ten surgical patients were interviewed by a clinical psychologist with experience in instrument development. During this process, complex phrasing was identified and resolved as follows: "continuamente" was replaced by "permanentemente" in items 2 and 5, "o mais possível" was replaced by "mais" in items 3 and 6. The six items of the original English version and their Portuguese equivalents are shown in Table 1.

Table 1
Items of the *Amsterdam Preoperative Anxiety and Information Scale*

English (Moerman et al, 1996)	Portuguese before cognitive interviews	Portuguese final version
1. I am worried about the anesthetic.	Estou preocupado com a anestesia.	Estou preocupado com a anestesia.
2. The anesthetic is on my mind continually.	Estou continuamente a pensar na anestesia.	Estou permanentemente a pensar na anestesia.
3. I would like to know as much as possible about the anesthetic.	Gostaria de saber o mais possível sobre a anestesia.	Gostaria de saber mais sobre a anestesia.
4. I am worried about the procedure.	Estou preocupado com a cirurgia.	Estou preocupado com a cirurgia.
5. The procedure is on my mind continually.	Estou continuamente a pensar na cirurgia.	Estou permanentemente a pensar na cirurgia.
6. I would like to know as much as possible about the procedure.	Gostaria de saber o mais possível sobre a cirurgia.	Gostaria de saber mais sobre a cirurgia.

Characteristics of study subjects

123 subjects were recruited the day before surgery. Fourteen (11%) were excluded due to difficulties in understanding and filling the written forms. Hence the response rate was 100% and there was no missing data. Characterisation of the respondent group is presented in Table 2. Men represented 53% of the sample, median age was 62 years and 95% had an ASA status score of II or higher. 43% of the patients had only attained primary school education, less than half were currently employed and the majority were married. Additionally, 83% of the study participants had been anesthetized before and 71% had undergone surgery before. Regarding waiting times, 74% of the patients had waited over a month for cancer surgery. Anxiolytics were used regularly by 11% of respondents, roughly in accordance with general population data (32).

Table 2
Characteristics of the respondents

Characteristics		Male	Female	Total
Respondents, <i>no. (%)</i>		58 (53)	51 (47)	109 (100)
Age in years, <i>median (Q1-Q3)</i>		64 (53–72)	57 (50–66)	62 (50–68)
Physical status	ASA I, <i>no. (%)</i>	2 (3)	3 (6)	5 (5)
	ASA II, <i>no. (%)</i>	32 (55)	35 (69)	67 (61)
	ASA III, <i>no. (%)</i>	24 (41)	13 (25)	37 (34)
Education	None, <i>no. (%)</i>	1 (2)	0 (0)	1 (1)
	Basic, <i>no. (%)</i>	26 (45)	21 (41)	47 (43)
	Secondary, <i>no. (%)</i>	21 (36)	14 (27)	35 (32)
	Tertiary, <i>no. (%)</i>	10 (17)	16 (31)	26 (24)
Work situation	Employed, <i>no. (%)</i>	24 (41)	25 (49)	49 (45)
	Unemployed, <i>no. (%)</i>	4 (7)	9 (18)	13 (12)
	Retired, <i>no. (%)</i>	30 (52)	17 (33)	47 (43)
Marital status	Single, <i>no. (%)</i>	10 (17)	6 (12)	16 (15)
	Married, <i>no. (%)</i>	41 (71)	34 (67)	75 (69)
	Divorced, <i>no. (%)</i>	4 (7)	5 (10)	9 (8)
	Widowed, <i>no. (%)</i>	3 (5)	6 (12)	9 (8)
Previous anesthesia, <i>no. (%)</i>		47 (81)	44 (86)	91 (83)
Previous surgery, <i>no. (%)</i>		38 (66)	39 (76)	77 (71)
Regular use of anxiolytics, <i>no. (%)</i>		4 (7)	8 (16)	12 (11)
Type of surgery	General, <i>no. (%)</i>	40 (69)	29 (57)	69 (63)
	Gynecologic, <i>no. (%)</i>	-	19 (37)	19 (17)
	Urologic, <i>no. (%)</i>	18 (31)	3 (6)	21 (19)
Waiting time for surgery	< 1 month, <i>no. (%)</i>	10 (17)	18 (35)	28 (26)
	1–3 months, <i>no. (%)</i>	26 (45)	29 (57)	55 (50)
	3–6 months, <i>no. (%)</i>	12 (21)	3 (6)	15 (14)
	> 6 months, <i>no. (%)</i>	10 (17)	1 (2)	11 (10)

Scales scoring and internal consistency of the APAIS

As shown in Table 3, the mean scores were as follows: APAIS anxiety 12.82 ± 4.68 , APAIS desire for information 7.33 ± 2.29 , STAI-Y1 42.10 ± 10.59 . Of the 109 patients, 61% would be classified as anxious using STAI-Y1 (score ≥ 40), and 34% using HADS-A. 18% were found to be at least mildly depressed using HADS-D (33). Overall APAIS items showed good inter-item correlations, the weakest correlation was between item 6 and items 1 and 2 (Table 4).

Table 3
Scales scoring (n = 109)

Scales and items		Scores, mean (SD)		
APAIS	item 1	3.15 (1.55)	anxiety about anesthesia	anxiety
	item 2	2.34 (1.52)	5.49 (2.82)	12.82 (4.68)
	item 4	3.99 (1.37)	anxiety about surgery	
	item 5	3.34 (1.45)	7.33 (2.53)	
	item 3	3.48 (1.42)	desire for information	
	item 6	3.85 (1.36)	7.33 (2.29)	
STAI	anxiety-state (Y1)	42.10 (10.59)		
HADS	depression (D)	4.07 (3.67)		

Table 4
Inter-item correlation matrix

Items	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.
1. I am worried about the anesthetic.	1.00					
2. The anesthetic is on my mind continually.	0.70	1.00				
3. I would like to know as much as possible about the anesthetic.	0.45	0.43	1.00			
4. I am worried about the procedure.	0.48	0.42	0.31	1.00		
5. The procedure is on my mind continually.	0.44	0.51	0.38	0.62	1.00	
6. I would like to know as much as possible about the procedure.	0.19	0.12	0.31	0.34	0.40	1.00

Tests of dimensionality

Confirmatory factor analysis was run, evaluating three *a priori* hypotheses: one factor model (as in the Spanish APAIS validation), two-factor model (as in the original APAIS) and three-factor model (as is the French APAIS validation). Overall, the model with the best fit to the data was a three-dimensional model: anxiety about anesthesia, anxiety about surgery, desire for information. Table 5 reports fit statistics for each model.

Table 5
Confirmatory factor analysis adjustment parameters

Models and items	1-factor model	2-factor model	3-factor model
	1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + 5 + 6	anxiety 1 + 2 + 4 + 5 desire for information 3 + 6	anxiety about anesthesia 1 + 2 anxiety about surgery 4 + 5 desire for information 3 + 6
Chi-square p	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.066
TLI	0.796	0.776	0.926
CFI	0.878	0.880	0.970
RMSEA (90% CI)	0.156 (0.110–0.206)	0.164 (0.115–0.217)	0.095 (0.017–0.161)
Model comparison	1-factor vs 2-factor model: p = 0.1817 1-factor vs 3-factor model: p < 0.001 2-factor vs 3-factor model: p < 0.001		
CFI Comparative Fit Index, RMSEA Root Mean Square Error of Approximation, TLI Tucker Lewis Index			

Tests of reliability

Regarding the internal consistency of scale items, all items showed item-to-total correlations > 0.5, and Cronbach's alpha was 0.81, 95% CI 0.71 to 0.91 (Table 6).

Table 6
Item-to-total correlations

Items	Item-to-total correlation corrected for item overlap	Guttman's Lambda 6 reliability squared multiple correlation	Cronbach's alpha if item removed
1. I am worried about the anesthetic.	0.713	0.754	0.769
2. The anesthetic is on my mind continually.	0.704	0.752	0.771
3. I would like to know as much as possible about the anesthetic.	0.582	0.794	0.790
4. I am worried about the procedure.	0.661	0.771	0.779
5. The procedure is on my mind continually.	0.737	0.755	0.762
6. I would like to know as much as possible about the procedure.	0.481	0.805	0.813

Tests of convergent validity

In order to assess the extent to which the Portuguese APAIS version measures anxiety, the APAIS global anxiety score resulting from the sum of scores from items 1, 2, 4 and 5 was compared with STAI-Y1 and HADS-D scores (Fig. 1). APAIS score correlates slightly better with the gold standard STAI-Y1 (Spearman's rho 0.580, $p < 0.001$), which intends to assess the state of anxiety at a given moment, than with HADS-D results (Spearman's rho 0.455, $p < 0.001$), which screens for probable depression in the hospital setting.

Figure 1. Correlation between APAIS and (A) STAI-Y1, (B) HADS-D

Tests of criterion validity

Criteria validity was tested by means of a ROC curve from APAIS and STAI-Y1 scores, yielding an area under the curve for anxiety as assessed by APAIS of 79.7% (95% CI 70.5–88.9%, Fig. 2). The optimal cutoff to maximise sensitivity and specificity was 11.5 (Fig. 2) and several integer cutoff points were tested (Table 7). Overall, a value of 12 is the best cutoff value for the Portuguese version of APAIS until new representative data are available.

Figure 2. ROC curve for AUC and cutoff point determination

Table 7
Sensitivity, specificity, predictive values and likelihood ratios for different cutoff values

Metric (95% CI)	Cutoff 10	Cutoff 11	Cutoff 12	Cutoff 13
Sensitivity	0.91 (0.81, 0.97)	0.86 (0.76, 0.94)	0.76 (0.64, 0.85)	0.68 (0.56, 0.79)
Specificity	0.49 (0.33, 0.65)	0.60 (0.44, 0.75)	0.79 (0.64, 0.90)	0.84 (0.69, 0.93)
Positive predictive value	0.73 (0.62, 0.82)	0.77 (0.66, 0.86)	0.85 (0.73, 0.93)	0.87 (0.74, 0.94)
Negative predictive value	0.78 (0.58, 0.91)	0.74 (0.57, 0.88)	0.68 (0.53, 0.80)	0.63 (0.49, 0.76)
Positive likelihood ratio	1.78 (1.31, 2.40)	2.18 (1.49, 3.20)	3.62 (1.99, 6.57)	4.19 (2.08, 8.41)
Negative likelihood ratio	0.19 (0.08, 0.42)	0.23 (0.12, 0.43)	0.31 (0.19, 0.48)	0.38 (0.26, 0.55)

Discussion

The aim of this study is to translate and validate the APAIS for the Portuguese oncologic population. The use of a quick and easy-to-administer instrument to evaluate anxiety is of foremost importance in the perioperative setting as anxiety leads to a more challenging anesthetic management and a worse patient experience. Our study revealed an anxiety prevalence of 61%, higher than other published oncological reports.

Education level of our sample was in line with the average elder Portuguese population (52% of the people aged 65 and over only attained primary school education, PORDATA 2018). Thus, in order to obtain a better comprehension, warranting an appropriate phrasing was crucial. Following WHO guidelines, after cross-validation of the direct translation, the final questionnaire resulted from additional cognitive interviewing.

Contrary to previous validations, all questionnaires were applied after the patient's admission on the day before surgery, instead of immediately before the surgery. We believe this provided a less stressful environment for the patients.

Results showed high-quality psychometric properties. Scale reliability revealed a Cronbach's alpha of 0.81, consistent with the one obtained on the original scale and further validations. In contrast, confirmatory factor analysis revealed a best fit with a three-dimensional model (anxiety about anesthesia, anxiety about surgery, desire for information), differently from the original scale. This model has already been described for the French scale validation (19). Differences might be explained by cultural and educational reasons, as well as the life-changing nature of the oncological disease and its surgical treatment. Thus inter-item correlation was moderate to high on both anxiety dimensions. A weaker

correlation, however, was observed in the desire for information dimension. A paternalistic doctor-patient relationship, based on trustworthiness, may be a reason for the mismatch between reported anxiety and need for information.

Spearman's correlation established the capacity for the Portuguese version of the APAIS to explore anxiety states. The STAI-Y1 convergent validity evaluation correlated slightly better to the APAIS than HADS-D did (Spearman's rho 0.580 vs 0.455). Albeit the presence of convergent correlation in both scales, these results were not as disparate as anticipated. As shown in the HADS-D final scores, 18% of the studied population also suffered from depression. Although clinically different, anxiety and depression are both frequent comorbidities in oncological patients, and sometimes coexist, which may justify our observations. Indeed, results from correlation testing between APAIS and HADS-D suggested that preoperative anxiety is usually present in cancer patients suffering from depression (Fig. 1.b), an association that should be tested in future works.

For this specific population, two cutoffs determined by the ROC curves could be used. For a higher sensitivity (0.86) a cutoff of 11 would be recommended, similar to the original version. However, taking all the results into account, a cutoff of 12 is suggested in order to gain specificity (specificity 0.79),

That said, this study presents some limitations. First, the studied population is restricted to a single hospital and it only includes cancer surgery patients. As previously mentioned, cancer patients are known to have higher baseline anxiety and depression. Furthermore, many of these patients undergo multiple diagnostic and therapeutic procedures during the course of the disease, somehow modulating their perioperative-related anxiety. Secondly, several patients were not included due to low literacy, meaning that further works should be developed in order to evaluate the applicability of a verbal assessment in this group. One factor contributing to the difficulty of answering the questionnaires was their length, particularly the ones used for comparative measures, not APAIS itself. Also, convenience sampling was applied in this study. Last, and unintentionally, no ASA IV or V were sampled from the population.

Conclusion

This study established the Portuguese version of the APAIS as a valid and reliable instrument for the evaluation of preoperative anxiety in cancer patients.

Routine preoperative anesthetic evaluation should encompass not only the identification of anxious patients but also the need for further information. This allows to tailor premedication and non-pharmacological strategies when needed.

In this setting, and considering the complexity of oncological surgical wards, the implementation of enhanced recovery programs, and the increasing awareness of the perioperative anxiety impact on overall patient experience, a prompt and easy evaluation tool has become of utmost importance. Recognizing anxiety and need for information is the first step toward clinical intervention, either anxiolytic premedication or further information and reassurance.

Additionally, as data on interventions to decrease preoperative anxiety are scarce and benzodiazepines continue to be widely used despite its side effects, the application of the APAIS might also be appropriate for evaluating the role of current pharmacological and psychological interventions. Its ability to objectively identify states of anxiety makes it suitable not only for the clinical setting, but also as a tool for further works in this field.

Finally, if meant to be used more widely, the Portuguese version of the APAIS will need further validation in a broader surgical population.

Abbreviations

APAIS

Amsterdam Preoperative Anxiety and Information Scale

HADS

Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale

STAI

State-Trait Anxiety Inventory

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

This study (protocol reference number UIC/1125) was approved by the Ethics Committee (chaired by Filomena Pereira, MD) and Research Committee (chaired by Paula Chaves, MD PhD) of Instituto Português de Oncologia de Lisboa on the 26th September 2017.

Consent for publication

Written informed consent for publication of their clinical details was obtained from all the participants in this study. A copy of the consent form is available for review by the Editor of this journal.

Availability of data and materials

The datasets used and/or analysed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have neither financial nor nonfinancial competing interests to disclose.

Funding

This study was supported by Instituto Português de Oncologia de Lisboa, which provided funds for the publication of results.

Authors' contributions

S Mauricio and I Rebelo contributed to the design of the study, acquisition and analysis of data, and draft of the manuscript. C Madeira and F Resende were responsible for the conception of the study, interpretation of data and review of the manuscript. S Esteves designed and performed the statistical analysis of data, and reviewed the manuscript as well.

Acknowledgements

We thank the psychologist Maria de Jesus Moura (Unidade de Psicologia, Instituto Português de Oncologia de Lisboa), who has guided the cognitive interviewing process. Also, we are grateful to Lucia Mascarenhas (teacher and translator), who has performed the backward translation of the scale.

References

1. Norris W, Baird WL. **Pre-operative anxiety: a study of the incidence and aetiology.** *Br J Anaesth.* 1967 Jun;39(6):503-9.
2. Laufenberg-Feldmann R, Kappis B. **Assessing preoperative anxiety using a questionnaire and clinical rating: a prospective observational study.** *Eur J Anaesthesiol.* 2013 Dec;30(12):758-63.
3. Maranets I, Kain ZN. **Preoperative anxiety and intraoperative anesthetic requirements.** *Anesth Analg.* 1999 Dec;89(6):1346-51.
4. Gras S, Servin F, Bedairia E, Montravers P, Desmonts JM, Longrois D, Guglielminotti J. **The effect of preoperative heart rate and anxiety on the propofol dose required for loss of consciousness.** *Anesth Analg.* 2010 Jan 1;110(1):89-93.
5. Ip HY, Abrishami A, Peng PW, Wong J, Chung F. **Predictors of postoperative pain and analgesic consumption: a qualitative systematic review.** *Anesthesiology.* 2009 Sep;111(3):657-77.
6. Rosenberger PH, Jokl P, Ickovics J. **Psychosocial factors and surgical outcomes: an evidence-based literature review.** *J Am Acad Orthop Surg.* 2006 Jul;14(7):397-405.
7. Theunissen M, Peters ML, Bruce J, Gramke HF, Marcus MA. **Preoperative anxiety and catastrophizing: a systematic review and meta-analysis of the association with chronic postsurgical pain.** *Clin J Pain.* 2012 Nov-Dec;28(9):819-41.
8. Wilson WE. **Preoperative anxiety and anesthesia: their relation.** *Anesth Analg.* 1969 Jul-Aug;48(4):605-11.
9. Yilmaz M, Sezer H, Gürler H, Bekar M. **Predictors of preoperative anxiety in surgical inpatients.** *J Clin Nurs.* 2012 Apr;21(7-8):956-64.
10. Caumo W, Schmidt AP, Schneider CN, Bergmann J, Iwamoto CW, Bandeira D, Ferreira MB. **Risk factors for preoperative anxiety in adults.** *Acta Anaesthesiol Scand.* 2001 Mar;45(3):298-307.
11. Brintzenhofe-Szoc KM, Levin TT, Li Y, Kissane DW, Zabora JR. **Mixed anxiety/depression symptoms in a large cancer cohort: prevalence by cancer type.** *Psychosomatics.* 2009 Jul-Aug;50(4):383-91.

12. Traeger L1, Greer JA, Fernandez-Robles C, Temel JS, Pirl WF. **Evidence-based treatment of anxiety in patients with cancer.** *J Clin Oncol.* 2012 Apr 10;30(11):1197-205.
13. Carli F, Gillis C, Scheede-Bergdahl C. **Promoting a culture of prehabilitation for the surgical cancer patient.** *Acta Oncol.* 2017 Feb;56(2):128-133.
14. Telles-Correia D, Barbosa A. **Anxiety and depression in medicine: models and measurement.** *Acta Med Port.* 2009 Jan-Feb;22(1):89-98.
15. Moerman N, van Dam FS, Muller MJ, Oosting H. **The Amsterdam Preoperative Anxiety and Information Scale (APAIS).** *Anesth Analg.* 1996 Mar;82(3):445-51.
16. Boker A1, Brownell L, Donen N. **The Amsterdam preoperative anxiety and information scale provides a simple and reliable measure of preoperative anxiety.** *Can J Anaesth.* 2002 Oct;49(8):792-8.
17. Nishimori M, Moerman N, Fukuhara S, van Dam FS, Muller MJ, Hanaoka K, Yamada Y. **Translation and validation of the Amsterdam preoperative anxiety and information scale (APAIS) for use in Japan.** *Qual Life Res.* 2002 Jun;11(4):361-4.
18. Berth H, Petrowski K, Balck F. **The Amsterdam Preoperative Anxiety and Information Scale (APAIS) - the first trial of a German version.** *Psychosoc Med.* 2007 Feb 20;4:Doc01.
19. Maurice-Szamburski A1, Loundou A, Capdevila X, Bruder N, Auquier P. **Validation of the French version of the Amsterdam preoperative anxiety and information scale (APAIS).** *Health Qual Life Outcomes.* 2013 Oct 7;11:166.
20. Buonanno P, Laiola A, Palumbo C, Spinelli G, Terminiello V, Servillo G. **Italian validation of the Amsterdam Preoperative Anxiety and Information Scale (APAIS).** *Minerva Anesthesiol.* 2017 Jan 17.
21. Mohd Fahmi Z, Lai LL, Loh PS. **Validation of the Malay version of the Amsterdam Preoperative Anxiety and Information Scale (APAIS).** *Med J Malaysia.* 2015 Aug;70(4):243-8.
22. Vergara-Romero M, Morales-Asencio JM, Morales-Fernández A, Canca-Sanchez JC, Rivas-Ruiz F, Reinaldo-Lapuerta JA. **Validation of the Spanish version of the Amsterdam Preoperative Anxiety and Information Scale (APAIS).** *Health Qual Life Outcomes.* 2017 Jun 7;15(1):120.
23. **WHO Process of translation and adaptation of instruments.**
http://www.who.int/substance_abuse/research_tools/translation/en/
24. Silva D. **O inventário de Estado-Traço de Ansiedade (STAI). Avaliação psicológica: Instrumentos validados para a população portuguesa.** 2003; Coimbra: Quarteto Editora.
25. Pais-Ribeiro J, Silva I, Ferreira T, Martins A, Meneses R, Baltar M. **Validation study of a Portuguese version of the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale.** *Psychol Health Med.* 2007 Mar;12(2):225-35.
26. Spielberger CD, Gorsuch RL, Lushene R, Vagg PR, Jacobs GA. **Manual for the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory.** 1983; Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
27. R Core Team. **R: A language and environment for statistical computing.** 2018; R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. <https://www.R-project.org/>
28. Rosseel Y. **lavaan: An R Package for Structural Equation Modeling.** *Journal of Statistical Software.* 2012;48(2):1-36.

29. Revelle W. **psych: Procedures for Psychological, psychometric, and Personality Research**. 2019; Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, USA; version 1.9.12. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=psych>
30. Robin X, Turck N, Hainard A, Tiberti N, Lisacek F, Sanchez JC, Müller M. **pROC: An open-source package for R and S+ to analyze and compare ROC curves**. BMC Bioinformatics. 2011 Mar 17;12:77.
31. Stevenson M with contributions from Nunes T, Heuer C, Marshall J, Sanchez J, Thornton R, Reiczigel J, Robison-Cox J, Sebastiani P, Solymos P, Yoshida K, Jones G, Pirikahu S, Firestone S, Kyle R, Popp J, Jay M. **epiR: Tools for the Analysis of Epidemiological Data**. 2018; version 0.9.99. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=epiR>
32. **OECD Health Statistics: Pharmaceutical Market**. https://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=HEALTH_PHMC

Figures




Figure 1

Correlation between APAIS and (A) STAI-Y1, (B) HADS-D




Figure 2

ROC curve for AUC and cutoff point determination