

ASSESSMENT OF NUTRITIONAL STATUS, SELF-ESTEEM, AND QUALITY OF LIFE IN STOMATIZED PATIENTS

NAWAZ A*1, RASOOL F2, ANWAR M3

¹Charge Nurse, Surgical Unit, Nishter Medical University and Hospital (NMU & H) Multan, Pakistan ²Charge Nurse, Medical Unit, Nishter Medical University and Hospital (NMU & H) Multan, Pakistan ³Charge Nurse, Neuro Trauma Unit (NTU), Nishter Medical University and Hospital (NMU & H) Multan, Pakistan *Correspondence author email address: <u>drfarah123@yahoo.com</u>

(Received, 30th January 2023, Revised 27th May 2023, Published 8th July 2023)

Abstract: The prospective study of Nishtar Hospital Multan from January 2022 to January 2023 to assess the impact of intestinal stomas on patients' quality of life and nutritional status. Patients of both genders, aged > 18 years, having intestinal stoma, were included. A total of 100 participants were included in the study. A questionnaire including demographic details, information regarding the stoma, and the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale/UNIFESP-EPM quality of Life Scale was used to collect data.59 respondents had low self-esteem (<15), having a mean Score of 0.56; 11 had normal self-esteem with a mean value of 0.64, and 30 had high self-esteem (>25), having a mean of 0.62. A significant association and positive correlation existed between self-esteem and nutritional status (P = 0.04). Linear regression analysis showed a significant association between nutritional status and duration of stoma (P = 0.011), type of stoma (P = 0.05), monthly income (P = 0.01), and number of meals/day (P = 0.002). Moreover, there was a significant difference between median QoL – SeSi scores of urostomy patients (Mdn=18.5) compared to those who had a stoma (Mdn=16.5) or an inflamed appendix (16.0) (P = 0.04). Analysis of QoL-FF Score (relation with friends and family) showed urostomy patients (Mdn = 34.5) had substantially higher ratings than colostomy patients (median = 33.5, p = 0.02), and ileostomy patients (Mdn = 32.0, p = 0.025). There was no discernible difference between colostomy as well as ileostomy ratings. It was concluded that stoma patients' quality of life, self-esteem, and nutritional status are interconnected.

Keywords: Stoma, Quality Of Life, Nutrition, Self-Esteem

Introduction

A stoma is a synthetic opening through which food, waste, or air may be introduced or removed from the body. One may get an ostomy through a combination of medicinal and surgical procedures. Depending on the site of the initial illness, an ostomy may be temporary or permanent. When a stoma is surgically implanted in a patient's belly, the person defecatesvia the conduit (Diniz et al., 2023). It has been noted that people who have received ostomies can suffer psychological and emotional changes that affect their sexuality, identity, quality of life, and even their body image (Saati et al., 2021). The decline in social status comes from the customized person's self-imposed seclusion and society's tendency to reject people who do not conform to "normal" patterns. Such people often experience anxiety, pain, and uncertainty because they fear they may be unable to return to their normal lives after being hospitalized (Atallah et al., 2020).

The Health Organization (WHO) identifies five factors that contribute to an individual's quality of life: their physical health, mental health, amount of independence, social connections, and surroundings (Kristensen et al., 2022). Measuring quality of life provides a complete perspective on the impact of a clinical disease or response to surgery. Health-related quality of life (HRQoL) is a topic of continuous study and debate, particularly concerning the patient's diet. HRQoL is hard to measure because it is a subjective biometrics construct that responds to individual expectations over various domains. Not much investigation has been made on the correlation between diet and happiness. A better nutritional condition is a deciding element in enhancing physiological function because of the significant association between nutrition and changes in muscle, immunological and cognitive processes (Goodyear et al., 2021). Because customized people's lifestyles and routines continue to change following surgery, it is more important to assess their HRQoL and sense of self-worth (Mao et al., 2021). This study aims to assess the impact of intestinal stomas on patients' quality of life and nutritional status.

Methodology

The prospective study of Nishtar Hospital Multan from January 2022 to January 2023. Patients of both genders, aged > 18 years, having intestinal stoma, were included. Patients with dementia who were unable to answer the questionnaire accurately were excluded. Total 100 participants were included in the study. Informed consent of the participants was taken. The ethical board of the hospital approved the study.

A questionnaire including demographic details, information regarding the stoma, and the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale/UNIFESP-EPM quality of Life Scale was used to collect data. The Rosenberg index is a 10-item scale with four possible responses: 1 for strongly agreeing, 2 for agreeing, 3 for disagreeing, and 4 for severely disagreeing. There are ten items, five of which measure the individual's positive self-perception, and five measure their negative self-perception. Some senior study participants sought help



from researchers in completing the instrument because of physical limitations such as hand tremors, poor eye and audio acuity, and weak eyesight.

SPSS version 23.0 was used for data analysis. To assess whether or not the distribution was proportional, the chisquared test was employed on the census profile and associated with the peritoneum variable in the statistical analysis. Kruskal-Wallis and Spearman correlation tests were also used. P value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Results

Demographic and medical data of the participants is shown in Table I. 59 respondents had low self-esteem (<15), having a mean Score of 0.56, 11 had normal self-esteem with a mean value of 0.64, and 30 had high self-esteem (>25) having a mean of 0.62 (Table II). There was a significant association and positive correlation between self-esteem and nutritional status (P=.04). Liner regression analysis showed a significant association between nutritional status and duration of stoma (P=.011), type of stoma (P=.05), monthly income (P=.01), number of meals/day (P=.002).

Analysis of quality of life Self-esteem and Self-image score (QoL – SeSi score) patients with malignant disease had significantly lower scores than those with benign illness (P=.025). Moreover, there was a significant difference between the median scores of urostomy patients (Mdn=18.5) compared to those who had a stoma (Mdn=16.5) or an inflamed appendix (16.0) (P= 0.04). Gender and stoma location had no impact on QoL – SeSi score. Analysis of QoL-FF Score (relation with friends and family) showed urostomy patients (Mdn = 34.5) had substantially higher ratings than colostomy patients (median = 33.5, p = 0.02), and ileostomy patients (Mdn = 32.0, p = 0.025). There was no discernible difference between colostomy as well as ileostomy ratings. Different domains of QoL are summarized in Table III.

 Table I Descriptive statistics of variables used in the study.

variables	Categories	Frequencies			
		Male	Female		
Age in years	25 to 30 years	16	13		
	31 to 60 years	13	23		
	More than 60 years	13	22		
Marital status	Single	13	22		
	Married	29	36		
Primary disease	Benign	36	44		
	Malignant	6	14		
Duration of stoma	Less than 12 months	31	38		
	More than 12 months	11	20		
Monthly income in rupees	<50,000	14	17		
	51,000 to 100,000	21	32		
	More than 100,000	7	9		
Type of stoma	Ileostomy	25	26		
	Colostomy	11	17		
	Urostomy	6	15		
No. of meals eaten per day	1-2 meals	9	3		
	2-3 meals	20	30		
	3-4 meals	13	25		
Diseases	Hypertension	23	34		
	Diabetes	8	9		
	Obesity	11	15		
Pattern of exercise	Regular	12	15		
	Moderate	21	28		
	Sedentary	9	15		
Use of Junk foods	Yes	9	7		
	No	33	51		

Table II Self-esteem score in the study population

Self-esteem score	Frequency	Mean	Std. Deviation
Less than 15	59	0.56	0.50
15-25	11	0.64	0.50
>25	30	0.62	0.49
Total	100	0.59	0.5

QoL -	SeSi Scor	·e*	QoL-FF	Score*		QoL-S	F Score*		QoL-I	Def Score ³	*
Mean	Media	Р	Mean	Media	Р	Mean	Media	Р	Mea	Media	Р
	n			n			n		n	n	
17.0	6.5	0.14	32.5	8.5	0.5	7.5	6.0	0.07	8.0	4.5	0.4
15.5	4.5		31.5	7.5	0	6.5	5.5		8.0	3.5	0
14.0	7.8	0.035	32.0	6.0	0.4	7.5	5.0	0.08	7.0	4.5	0.3
15.0	6.4		31.5	6.5	5	7.0	5.5	5	7.5	4.0	7
18.0	5.4		31.5	7.0		6.5	6.0		8.0	5.5	
14.0	5.5	0.025	32.5	5.5	0.3	6.5	5.5	0.75	8.0	3.7	0.5
16.0	4.5		34.5	5.0	3	7.0	3.9		8.5	4.3	5
14.0	8.8	0.25	31.5	8.4	0.3	7.5	4.0	0.97	7.5	4.5	0.6
16.0	7.0		33.5	6.5	0	7.0	6.0		6.5	4.5	5
Type of stoma											
16.0	0.5	0.04	32.0	3.5	0.0	5.5	5.5	0.07	5.5	4.5	0.1
16.5	7.8		33.5	5.5	2	7.5	6.5	5	6.5	3.5	4
18.5	7.9		34.5	6.5	5	7.5	6.5		7.5	2.8	
	QoL – Mean 17.0 15.5 14.0 15.0 18.0 14.0 16.0 16.0 16.0 16.5 18.5	QoL – SeSi Scor Mean Media n 17.0 6.5 15.5 4.5 14.0 7.8 15.0 6.4 18.0 5.4 14.0 5.5 16.0 7.0 16.0 0.5 16.5 7.8 18.5 7.9	QoL - SeSi Score* Mean Media n P 17.0 6.5 0.14 15.5 4.5 0.14 15.5 4.5 0.035 15.0 6.4 0.035 15.0 6.4 0.035 18.0 5.4 0.025 14.0 5.5 0.025 16.0 7.0 0.25 16.0 7.0 0.25 16.5 7.8 0.04 18.5 7.9 0.04	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c } \textbf{QoL-SeSi Score*} & \textbf{QoL-FF} \\ \hline Mean & Media \\ n & P & Mean \\ \hline \\ 17.0 & 6.5 & 0.14 & 32.5 \\ 15.5 & 4.5 & 0.14 & 32.5 \\ 15.5 & 4.5 & 0.14 & 32.5 \\ 15.0 & 6.4 & 31.5 \\ \hline \\ 14.0 & 5.4 & 31.5 \\ \hline \\ 18.0 & 5.4 & 31.5 \\ \hline \\ 14.0 & 5.5 & 0.025 & 32.5 \\ 16.0 & 7.0 & 32.5 \\ \hline \\ 14.0 & 8.8 & 0.25 & 31.5 \\ \hline \\ 14.0 & 8.8 & 0.25 & 31.5 \\ \hline \\ 14.0 & 8.8 & 0.25 & 31.5 \\ \hline \\ 16.0 & 7.0 & 32.0 \\ \hline \\ 16.5 & 7.8 & 33.5 \\ \hline \\ 18.5 & 7.9 & 34.5 \\ \hline \end{array}$	QoL - SeSi Score* QoL-FF Score* Mean Media P Mean Media n 17.0 6.5 0.14 32.5 8.5 15.5 4.5 0.14 32.5 8.5 15.5 4.5 0.14 32.5 8.5 15.5 4.5 0.035 31.5 7.5 14.0 7.8 0.035 32.0 6.0 15.0 6.4 15.5 6.5 31.5 7.0 14.0 5.4 0.025 32.5 5.5 5.5 16.0 4.5 0.025 31.5 8.4 16.0 7.0 31.5 6.5 16.5 7.8 0.04 32.0 3.5 16.5 7.8 0.04 32.0 3.5 16.5 7.8 0.04 32.0 3.5 16.5 7.8 34.5 6.5	QoL - SeSi Score* QoL-FF Score* Mean Media n P Mean n Media n P 17.0 6.5 0.14 32.5 8.5 0.5 15.5 4.5 0.14 32.5 8.5 0.5 15.5 4.5 0.035 31.5 7.5 0 14.0 7.8 0.035 32.0 6.0 0.4 15.0 6.4 1.5 6.5 5 5 18.0 5.4 0.025 32.5 5.5 0.3 14.0 5.5 0.025 32.5 5.5 0.3 16.0 4.5 0.25 31.5 8.4 0.3 16.0 7.0 33.5 6.5 0 16.0 0.5 0.04 32.0 3.5 2.5 16.0 0.5 0.04 32.0 3.5 5.5 2 16.5 7.8 0.04 32.0 3.5 5.5 2 <t< th=""><th>$\begin{array}{c c c c c c } \hline \textbf{QoL} - SeSi Score* & \textbf{QoL} - Score* & \textbf{QoL} - S \\ \hline \textbf{Mean} & \textbf{Media} & \textbf{P} & \textbf{Mean} & \textbf{Media} & \textbf{P} & \textbf{Mean} \\ \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{Mean} \\ \hline \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{Mean} \\ \hline \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} \\ \hline \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} \\ \hline \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} \\ \hline \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} \\ \hline \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} \\ \hline \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} \\ \hline \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} \\ \hline \textbf{n} & n$</th><th>$\begin{array}{c c c c c c } \hline \textbf{QoL-SeSi Score*} & \textbf{QoL-FF Score*} & \textbf{QoL-SF Score*} \\ \hline \textbf{Mean} & \textbf{Media} & \textbf{P} & \textbf{Mean} & \textbf{Media} & \textbf{P} & \textbf{Mean} & \textbf{Media} & \textbf{n} \\ \hline \textbf{Mean} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{Mean} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{Mean} & me$</th><th>QoL - SeSi Score*QoL-FF Score*QoL-SE Score*Mean nMedia nP Mean nMean Media nP Mean Mean nMean Media nP Mean n17.0 15.56.5 4.50.1432.5 31.58.5 31.50.5 7.57.5 6.56.0 5.50.07 6.517.0 15.56.5 4.50.1432.5 31.58.5 7.50.5 6.57.5 5.56.0 6.0 6.50.07 6.514.0 15.07.8 6.40.035 31.532.0 31.56.0 6.50.4 5 7.07.5 6.55.0 6.00.08 514.0 16.05.5 7.00.025 31.532.5 34.55.5 5.0 5.00.3 3 7.06.5 5.55.5 6.00.75 6.514.0 16.08.8 7.00.25 31.531.5 34.58.4 6.50.3 7.06.5 7.55.5 6.00.97 7.016.0 16.50.5 7.80.04 33.532.0 6.53.5 5.5 7.50.0 7.05.5 6.50.07 516.0 16.57.8 7.90.04 33.532.0 6.53.5 5.5 7.50.0 7.55.5 6.50.07 5</br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></th><th>QoL - SeSi Score* QoL-FF Score* QoL-SE Score* QoL-SE Score* QoL-I Mean Media P Mean n Mean n Mean n Mean n</th><th>QoL - SeSi Score*QoL-FF Score*QoL-SF Score*QoL-Det Score*Mean nMedia nP Mean nMean nMedia nP Mean nMean nMedia nP Mean nMean nMedia n17.06.50.1432.58.50.57.56.00.078.04.515.54.531.57.50$\overline{6.5}$$\overline{5.5}$$\overline{6.0}$$\overline{0.07}8.0\overline{4.5}$14.07.80.03532.06.0$\overline{0.4}$$\overline{7.5}$$\overline{5.0}$$\overline{0.08}$$\overline{7.0}$$\overline{4.5}$15.06.4$\overline{31.5}$$\overline{6.5}$$\overline{5.6}$$\overline{6.0}$$\overline{7.5}$$\overline{6.0}$$\overline{7.5}$$\overline{4.0}$18.0$5.4$$\overline{0.025}$$\overline{32.5}$$\overline{5.5}$$\overline{0.3}$$\overline{6.5}$$\overline{5.5}$$\overline{0.75}$$\overline{8.0}$$\overline{3.7}$14.0$5.5$$0.025$$\overline{32.5}$$\overline{5.5}$$\overline{0.3}$$\overline{6.5}$$\overline{5.5}$$\overline{0.75}$$\overline{8.0}$$\overline{3.7}$16.0$4.5$$\overline{31.5}$$\overline{5.6}$$\overline{0.3}$$\overline{7.0}$$\overline{6.0}$$\overline{0.97}$$\overline{7.5}$$\overline{4.5}$16.0$7.0$$\overline{31.5}$$\overline{5.5}$$2.5$$\overline{5.5}$$\overline{5.5}$$\overline{5.5}$$\overline{5.5}$$\overline{5.5}$$\overline{5.5}$$\overline{4.5}$16.0$7.0$$\overline{3.5}$$\overline{5.5}$$2.5$$\overline{5.5}$$\overline{5.5}$$\overline{5.5}$$\overline{5.5}$$\overline{5.5}$$\overline{5.5}$$\overline{5.5}$$\overline{5.5}$$\overline{5.5}$$\overline{5.5}$$\overline{5.5}$$5.$</th></t<>	$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c } \hline \textbf{QoL} - SeSi Score* & \textbf{QoL} - Score* & \textbf{QoL} - S \\ \hline \textbf{Mean} & \textbf{Media} & \textbf{P} & \textbf{Mean} & \textbf{Media} & \textbf{P} & \textbf{Mean} \\ \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{Mean} \\ \hline \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{Mean} \\ \hline \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} \\ \hline \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} \\ \hline \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} \\ \hline \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} \\ \hline \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} \\ \hline \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} \\ \hline \textbf{n} & \textbf{n} \\ \hline \textbf{n} & n$	$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c } \hline \textbf{QoL-SeSi Score*} & \textbf{QoL-FF Score*} & \textbf{QoL-SF Score*} \\ \hline \textbf{Mean} & \textbf{Media} & \textbf{P} & \textbf{Mean} & \textbf{Media} & \textbf{P} & \textbf{Mean} & \textbf{Media} & \textbf{n} \\ \hline \textbf{Mean} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{Mean} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{Mean} & me$	QoL - SeSi Score*QoL-FF Score*QoL-SE Score*Mean nMedia nP Mean nMean Media nP Mean Mean nMean Media nP Mean n17.0 15.56.5 4.50.1432.5 31.58.5 31.50.5 7.57.5 6.56.0 5.50.07 6.517.0 15.56.5 4.50.1432.5 31.58.5 7.50.5 6.57.5 5.56.0 6.0 6.50.07 6.514.0 15.07.8 6.40.035 31.532.0 31.56.0 6.50.4 5 7.07.5 6.55.0 6.00.08 514.0 16.05.5 7.00.025 31.532.5 34.55.5 5.0 5.00.3 3 7.06.5 5.55.5 6.00.75 6.514.0 	QoL - SeSi Score* QoL-FF Score* QoL-SE Score* QoL-SE Score* QoL-I Mean Media P Mean n Mean n Mean n Mean n	QoL - SeSi Score*QoL-FF Score*QoL-SF Score*QoL-Det Score*Mean nMedia nP Mean nMean nMedia nP Mean nMean nMedia nP Mean nMean nMedia n17.06.50.1432.58.50.57.56.00.078.04.515.54.531.57.50 $\overline{6.5}$ $\overline{5.5}$ $\overline{6.0}$ $\overline{0.07}$ 8.0 $\overline{4.5}$ 14.07.80.03532.06.0 $\overline{0.4}$ $\overline{7.5}$ $\overline{5.0}$ $\overline{0.08}$ $\overline{7.0}$ $\overline{4.5}$ 15.06.4 $\overline{31.5}$ $\overline{6.5}$ $\overline{5.6}$ $\overline{6.0}$ $\overline{7.5}$ $\overline{6.0}$ $\overline{7.5}$ $\overline{4.0}$ 18.0 5.4 $\overline{0.025}$ $\overline{32.5}$ $\overline{5.5}$ $\overline{0.3}$ $\overline{6.5}$ $\overline{5.5}$ $\overline{0.75}$ $\overline{8.0}$ $\overline{3.7}$ 14.0 5.5 0.025 $\overline{32.5}$ $\overline{5.5}$ $\overline{0.3}$ $\overline{6.5}$ $\overline{5.5}$ $\overline{0.75}$ $\overline{8.0}$ $\overline{3.7}$ 16.0 4.5 $\overline{31.5}$ $\overline{5.6}$ $\overline{0.3}$ $\overline{7.0}$ $\overline{6.0}$ $\overline{0.97}$ $\overline{7.5}$ $\overline{4.5}$ 16.0 7.0 $\overline{31.5}$ $\overline{5.5}$ 2.5 $\overline{5.5}$ $\overline{5.5}$ $\overline{5.5}$ $\overline{5.5}$ $\overline{5.5}$ $\overline{5.5}$ $\overline{4.5}$ 16.0 7.0 $\overline{3.5}$ $\overline{5.5}$ 2.5 $\overline{5.5}$ $5.$

Table III Analysis of Quality of life in stomatized patients

*QoL – SeSi score= Self-esteem and Self-image score, QoL-FF score= relation with friends and family, QoL-SF score=relation with sleep and fatigue, QoL-Def score= ostomy device functioning insecurities

Discussion

The current study evaluated QoL, self-esteem, and nutritional status of stomatized patients. In the current study, a total of 59.0 respondents had very low self-esteem (15), 11.0 had real self-esteem, and 29.0 had high selfesteem (>25). This finding backed up the findings of a previous study, which found that persons with transitory ostomies had mild to moderate self esteem, further stressing the need to address HRQOL aspects, including psychological health and social connections (Su et al., 2016). The results showed a significant association between the quantity of food intake per day, duration of stoma, type of stoma, and nutritional status. These findings were consistent with the results of a previous study which discovered that patients' nutritional status was severely influenced during the first month following ileostomy placement. The nutritional status seems negatively impacted by decreased liquids and food intake (Vasilopoulos et al., 2020).

Stoma patients' QoL may suffer for various reasons, some directly connected to the stoma and others to the underlying medical condition. Understanding the elements affecting these people's quality of life is the first step in improving our understanding of them and their care. Our primary goal in conducting this research was identifying the demographic and clinical characteristics associated with customized patients' quality of life. Overall performance or performance on any of the subdomains was not significantly different between the sexes. A previous study found that sexuality detrimentally affects women's and men's quality of life across various dimensions (Schmidt et al., 2005).

Our results on the SF-Score are close to being statistically significant, possibly due to the influence of feminism. Female patients are likely to report beneficial psychological and social effects. A Turkish study indicated that female patients rated their physical health, role mood, and mental component much worse than male patients. Regarding mental and social well-being indicators, no significant gender differences were found (SeSi and FF scores) (Tulek et al., 2020). Another research with 2497 participants found that women who had a colostomy had significantly worse life quality ratings than women who had undergone a small bowel stoma (Braumann et al., 2016).

There were no significant differences statistically between ileostomy and endometrial ablation patients regarding total QoL or domain assessment, which aligns with the prior study (Sirimarco et al., 2021). Some studies suggest that cancer patients who have had to have a stoma created may be more accepting of it being a permanent part of their bodies, according to some studies(Pape et al., 2021; Wulff-Burchfield et al., 2021). Cancer patients also had significantly greater levels of self-worth, as measured by the SeSi score and interpersonal ties (FF score). It is uncommon to evaluate how different stoma types affect patients' quality of life following surgery. Despite several studies showing that individuals with circular ileostomy had greater difficulty than those with colostomy, there seem to be no significant differences in QoL between the two kinds of stoma(Keane et al., 2020; Koç et al., 2022). The limitation of this study is the small sample size. A larger is recommended for further analysis.

Conclusion

It was concluded that anyone with stomas had low selfesteem, and stoma impacts the patient's diet. Stoma patients' quality of life, self-esteem, and nutritional status are interconnected. Knowledge of self-esteem and healthrelated quality of life in customized patients can help healthcare professionals plan their care.

Declarations

Data Availability statement

All data generated or analyzed during the study are included in the manuscript. Ethics approval and consent to participate

Not applicable Consent for publication Not applicable Funding Not applicable

Conflict of interest

The authors declared absence of conflict of interest.

References

- AAtallah, R., van de Meent, H., Verhamme, L., Frölke, J., and Leijendekkers, R. (2020). Safety, prosthesis wearing time and health-related quality of life of lower extremity bone-anchored prostheses using a press-fit titanium osseointegration implant: a prospective one-year follow-up cohort study. *PLoS One* 15, e0230027.
- Braumann, C., Müller, V., Knies, M., Aufmesser, B., Schwenk, W., and Koplin, G. (2016). Quality of life and need for care in patients with an ostomy: a survey of 2647 patients of the Berlin OStomy-Study (BOSS). *Langenbeck's archives of surgery* 401, 1191-1201.
- Diniz, I. V., Pereira da Silva, I., Silva, R. A., Garcia Lira Neto, J. C., do Nascimento, J. A., Costa, I. K. F., Mendonça, A. E. O. d., Oliveira, S. H. d. S., and Soares, M. J. G. O. (2023). Effects of the quality of life on the adaptation of people with an intestinal stoma. *Clinical Nursing Research* 32, 527-538.
- Goodyear, V., Boardley, I., Chiou, S., Fenton, S., Stathi, A., Wallis, G., Veldhuijzen van Zanten, J., Wood, G., and Thompson, J. (2021). Guidelines for using social media to inform behaviours related to physical activity, diet and quality of life.
- Keane, C., Sharma, P., Yuan, L., Bissett, I., and O'Grady, G. (2020). Impact of temporary ileostomy on long-term quality of life and bowel function: a systematic review and meta-analysis. ANZ journal of surgery 90, 687-692.
- Koç, M. A., Akyol, C., Gökmen, D., Aydın, D., Erkek, B. A., and Kuzu, M. A. (2022). Effect of prehabilitation on stoma self-care, anxiety, depression and quality of life in stoma patients: a randomized controlled trial. *Diseases of the Colon* & Rectum.
- Kristensen, H. Ø., Thyø, A., Emmertsen, K. J., Smart, N. J., Pinkney, T., Warwick, A. M., Pang, D., Elfeki, H., Shalaby, M., and Emile, S. H. (2022). Surviving rectal cancer at the cost of a colostomy: global survey of long-term health-related quality of life in 10 countries. *BJS open* 6, zrac085.
- Mao, Z., Ahmed, S., Graham, C., Kind, P., Sun, Y.-N., and Yu, C.-H. (2021). Similarities and differences in health-related quality-of-life concepts between the East and the West: A qualitative analysis of the content of health-related quality-of-life measures. *Value in Health Regional Issues* **24**, 96-106.

- Pape, E., Vlerick, I., Van Nieuwenhove, Y., Pattyn, P., Van de Putte, D., van Ramshorst, G., Geboes, K., and Van Hecke, A. (2021). Experiences and needs of patients with rectal cancer confronted with bowel problems after stoma reversal: A systematic review and thematic-synthesis. *European Journal* of Oncology Nursing 54, 102018.
- Saati, M., NasiriZiba, F., and Haghani, H. (2021). The correlation between emotional intelligence and self-esteem in patients with intestinal stoma: A descriptive-correlational study. *Nursing Open* **8**, 1769-1777.
- Schmidt, C. E., Bestmann, B., Küchler, T., Longo, W. E., Rohde, V., and Kremer, B. (2005). Gender differences in quality of life of patients with rectal cancer. A five-year prospective study. *World journal of surgery* 29, 1630-1641.
- Sirimarco, M. T., Moraes, B. H. X. d., Oliveira, D. R. L. S. d., Oliveira, A. G. d., and Schlinz, P. A. F. (2021). Thirty years of the health care service for ostomy patients in Juiz de Fora and surroundings. *Revista* do Colégio Brasileiro de Cirurgiões 48.
- Su, X., Qin, F., Zhen, L., Ye, X., Kuang, Y., Zhu, M., Yin, X., and Wang, H. (2016). Self-efficacy and associated factors in patients with temporary ostomies. *Journal of Wound, Ostomy and Continence Nursing* 43, 623-629.
- Tulek, Z., Baykal, D., Erturk, S., Bilgic, B., Hanagasi, H., and Gurvit, I. H. (2020). Caregiver burden, quality of life and related factors in family caregivers of dementia patients in Turkey. *Issues* in mental health nursing **41**, 741-749.
- Vasilopoulos, G., Makrigianni, P., Polikandrioti, M., Tsiampouris, I., Karayiannis, D., Margari, N., Avramopoulou, L., Toulia, G., and Fasoi, G. (2020). Pre-and post-operative nutrition assessment in patients with colon cancer undergoing ileostomy. *International journal of environmental research and public health* 17, 6124.
- Wulff-Burchfield, E. M., Potts, M., Glavin, K., and Mirza, M. (2021). A qualitative evaluation of a nurse-led pre-operative stoma education program for bladder cancer patients. *Supportive Care in Cancer*, 1-9.



Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <u>http://creativecommons.org/licen</u> <u>ses/by/4.0/</u>. © The Author(s) 2023