# Original Article Effect of nursing intervention on quality of life of patients with gastric ulcer based on KANO model

Shuhua Chen<sup>1</sup>, Qun Hu<sup>2</sup>, Wenying Liang<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Gastroenterology, Yichun People's Hospital, Yichun 336000, Jiangxi, China; <sup>2</sup>Department of Pain, Yichun People's Hospital, Yichun 336000, Jiangxi, China; <sup>3</sup>Department of Nursing, Yichun People's Hospital, Yichun 336000, Jiangxi, China

Received July 29, 2024; Accepted February 4, 2025; Epub March 15, 2025; Published March 30, 2025

Abstract: Objective: To explore the quality attributes of nursing interventions for improving the quality of life of patients with gastric ulcers using the KANO model, and to design and implement targeted nursing measures and evaluate their effects. Methods: Clinical data from 136 inpatients with gastric ulcers hospitalized between January 2022 and January 2024 were analyzed. Patients were divided into two groups based on the nursing approach: the experimental group (n=68), which received nursing care based on the KANO model, and the control group (n=68), which received routine care. The two groups were compared in terms of general clinical data, symptom improvement, health-promoting lifestyle scores, nursing satisfaction, emotional state, and quality of life assessed using the SF-36 questionnaire. Results: Post-intervention, the experimental group demonstrated significantly lower Hamilton Anxiety and Depression Scale scores compared to the control group (both P<0.05). Scores for physical, psychological, social, and material functions in the SF-36 were also significantly higher in the experimental group (all P<0.05). Additionally, scores for health responsibility, nutrition, stress management, exercise, interpersonal support, selfactualization, and overall health-promoting lifestyle were significantly higher in the experimental group (all P<0.05). The incidence of acid reflux, abdominal pain, and burning sensation was lower in the experimental group than that in the control group after the intervention (P<0.05). Conclusions: Nursing interventions based on the KANO model effectively improve clinical symptoms, quality of life, and emotional well-being in patients with gastric ulcers. They also enhance nursing satisfaction, providing a superior approach to routine care.

Keywords: Nursing intervention, quality of life, gastric ulcer, Kano model of customer satisfaction

#### Introduction

Gastric ulcer is a common digestive system disease with a high incidence in males aged 40-46 years, primarily occurring near the lesser curvature of the stomach. The main pathogenic factors include Helicobacter pylori infection, long-term unhealthy dietary habits, and adverse psychological effects [1]. Gastric ulcers are characterized by a high recurrence rate, significantly impacting patients' psychological state, lifestyle, and emotions. Additionally, gastric ulcer is an independent risk factor for gastric cancer [2]. As the ulcer area enlarges and symptoms such as dull abdominal pain worsen, patients often experience poor sleep quality and a diminished quality of life [3].

Psychological factors have been identified as independent risk factors for gastric ulcers [4].

Currently, no radical cure exists for gastric ulcers. Patients often require long-term treatment, with frequent recurrences even after recovery, severely affecting their mental health and quality of life [5]. Studies suggest that incorporating psychological nursing interventions, tailored to patients' psychological needs, can positively influence treatment outcomes [6]. However, conventional nursing interventions primarily focus on medication and diet while neglecting comprehensive and continuous psychological guidance, limiting their efficacy in disease management.

The KANO demand analysis model, proposed by Noriaki Kano, a Japanese quality management scientist, categorizes quality characteristics into five types: attractive quality, onedimensional quality, must-be quality, indifferent quality, and reverse quality factors [7]. In



healthcare, the KANO model is used to analyze and classify patient needs, distinguishing basic factors (essential and expected), performance factors (affecting satisfaction based on their degree of fulfillment), and excitement factors (providing unexpected satisfaction). By applying this model, healthcare providers can better understand and prioritize patients' needs, ultimately enhancing the quality of nursing care.

Lin et al. reported that KANO-based nursing interventions for patients with multiple emergency injuries reduced inflammatory responses, minimized the risk of adverse events, improved prognoses, and increased patient satisfaction [8]. However, there has been no systematic study on the application of the KANO model in gastric ulcer management.

This study aims to introduce the KANO model as a novel demand analysis approach for nursing. Using a self-designed questionnaire, we investigated the nursing needs of patients and analyzed the results through the KANO model's fuzzy analysis method. The identified nursing service quality attributes account for the complex psychological needs of patients and provide a robust foundation for designing and implementing tailored nursing interventions in future gastric ulcer management.

## Materials and methods

#### Study design

This study analyzed clinical data from 136 inpatients with gastric ulcers admitted between January 2022 and January 2024. Patients were divided into two groups based on the nursing methods received: the experimental group (n=68), which received nursing care based on the KANO model, and the control group (n=68), which received routine care. The patient selection process is illustrated in **Figure 1**. Ethics committee approval was obtained from Yichun People's Hospital, and informed consent was collected from all participants.

#### Inclusion and exclusion criteria

Inclusion criteria: (1) Patients diagnosed with gastric ulcer via endoscopic examination [9]. (2) Patients with clear consciousness capable of understanding the questionnaire content and communicating effectively. (3) Age  $\geq 18$  years.

Exclusion criteria: (1) Patients with severe cardiopulmonary disorders, suspected severe shock, perforation of the digestive tract, or other critical conditions. (2) Patients with mental symptoms unable to cooperate with endoscopic examinations or those refusing gastroscopy. (3) Pregnant or lactating women. (4) Patients with consciousness or communication disorders. (5) Patients with suspected middle or lower gastrointestinal bleeding. (6) Patients with coagulation disorders, immune deficiencies, or infectious diseases. (7) Patients with a history of gastric surgery.

### Interventions

The control group received routine care, including routine health education upon admission, admission guidance, condition monitoring, medication guidance, vital sign monitoring, and telephone follow-up one month after discharge.

The experimental group received nursing care based on the KANO model, which included the following:

Identification of care factors: Nurses identified key factors affecting care, such as pain management, dietary guidance, emotional support, medication compliance, and follow-up care [10].

Pain management: Pain was assessed using the Visual Analogue Scale (VAS) [11]. Nurses assisted patients in maintaining comfortable positions to alleviate pain and administered prescribed painkillers based on the severity, duration, and impact of pain on daily life.

Dietary guidance: Nurses educated patients on appropriate dietary choices to minimize irritation and promote healing [12]. Detailed dietary plans emphasizing balanced nutrition were provided.

Emotional support: Psychological counseling, active listening, and reassurance were offered to help patients manage stress and anxiety commonly associated with gastric ulcers.

Medication compliance: Nurses explained the purpose and dosage of each medication, set up reminder systems to ensure timely administration, monitored for side effects, and addressed any patient concerns [13].

Follow-Up care: Regular check-ups were conducted to monitor ulcer healing, detect recurrence, and adjust treatment plans as necessary.

## Observation indicators

The primary observation indicator was the quality of life, assessed using the SF-36 questionnaire [14], developed by the American Medical Outcomes Research Group in 1992. This scale evaluates eight dimensions: physiological function, psychological function, physical pain, emotional function, social function, and mental health. Scores for each dimension were calculated based on weighted items in the subscale and converted to a standardized score ranging from 0 to 100. Higher scores indicate better quality of life.

Secondary observation indicators: The secondary observation indicators included clinical symptoms, negative emotions, health-promoting lifestyle, and nursing satisfaction:

Evaluation of clinical symptoms: The severity of ulcer symptoms was assessed using the total symptom score, which summed scores for burning sensation, epigastric pain, acid reflux, and bloating. Each symptom was rated on a scale of 0 (normal) to 3 (severe) [15]: 0: No symptoms. 1: Mild (occasional symptoms). 2: Moderate (frequent symptoms that do not affect daily life). 3: Severe (frequent symptoms that impact daily life). Symptom improvement was defined as a reduction of  $\geq$ 2 points or the complete disappearance of symptoms, with the time of improvement recorded.

Evaluation of negative emotions: Anxiety and depression were assessed using the Hamilton Anxiety Scale (HAMA) [16] and the Hamilton Depression Scale (HAMD) [17], respectively. HAMA includes 14 items, with each item scored from 0 to 4. HAMD includes 24 items, with each item scored from 0 to 4. Both scales were administered by two trained nurses through patient interviews and observations, with evaluations completed within 10-15 minutes. The nurses' results were summarized, and higher scores indicated more severe anxiety or depression.

Evaluation of health-promoting lifestyle: The Health-Promoting Lifestyle Profile II (HPLP-II) [18], a revised version of the HPLP introduced in Taiwan, China in 2010, was used. The scale

	Experimental group (n=68)	Control group (n=68)	t/χ²	Р
Age (years)	52.62±4.90	52.82±7.20	-1.142	0.255
Gender			0.526	0.468
Male (n%)	47 (69.1%)	43 (63.2%)		
Female (n%)	21 (30.9%)	25 (36.8%)		
BMI (kg/m²)	19.20±1.21	19.16±0.99	0.035	0.852
Smoking	20 (29.4%)	21 (30.9%)	0.197	0.844
Diabetes	21 (30.9%)	20 (29.4%)	0.035	0.852
Hypertension	16 (23.5%)	15 (22.1%)	0.042	0.838
Hyperlipidemia	3 (4.4%)	4 (5.9%)	0.151	0.698
Coronary heart disease	8 (11.8%)	10 (14.7%)	0.256	0.613
Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease	6 (8.8%)	8 (11.8%)	0.319	0.574

Table 1. Comparison of clinical characteristics between the two groups

comprises six dimensions and 48 items, each scored from 1 to 4, for a total score of 48-192. Higher scores reflect better health-promoting lifestyles.

Score classification: Low level: 1-2 points. Medium level: 2-3 points. High level: 3-4 points.

Dimension scores: Calculated as the total score for a dimension divided by the number of items in that dimension.

Evaluation of nursing satisfaction: Nursing satisfaction was assessed using a self-designed nursing satisfaction scale [19], which includes 22 items with a total score of 110.

#### Statistical analysis

SPSS 24.0 statistical software was used for data analysis. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was performed to assess the normality of all metric data. Normally distributed data were expressed as mean  $\pm$  standard deviation and analyzed using the independent sample t-test for between-group comparisons. Non-normally distributed data were represented as median (P25, P75) and analyzed using the Mann-Whitney U test. Categorical variables were expressed as counts (%) and analyzed using the chi-square test. A *p*-value of <0.05 was considered statistically significant for all tests.

#### Results

#### Comparison of clinical characteristics

There were no significant differences between the two groups in terms of age, gender, BMI, smoking status, hypertension, diabetes, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, or coronary heart disease (all P>0.05, **Table 1**).

Comparison of quality of life (SF-36 questionnaire)

The experimental group demonstrated significantly higher scores in physical function  $(87.95\pm0.58 \text{ vs. } 69.97\pm0.88, P<0.001)$ , psychological function  $(78.96\pm0.59 \text{ vs. } 73.90\pm0.57, P<0.001)$ , social function  $(85.10\pm0.59 \text{ vs. } 67.95\pm0.61, 67.95\pm0.61)$ , and material function  $(75.01\pm0.62 \text{ vs. } 64.98\pm0.57, P<0.001)$  compared to the control group after the intervention, with significant differences observed (P<0.05) (**Table 2**).

## Comparison of negative emotions

Following the intervention, HAMA and HAMD scores decreased in both groups, with the experimental group showing significantly greater improvement than the control group (HAMA: 40.30±5.85 vs. 48.67±5.46, P<0.001; HAMD: 43.17±7.14 vs. 54.28±8.45, P<0.001) (Table 3).

#### Comparison of health-promoting lifestyle

Post-intervention, the experimental group achieved higher scores in health responsibility, nutrition, stress management, exercise, interpersonal support, self-actualization, and the total health-promoting lifestyle score compared to the control group (P<0.05) (**Figure 2**).

## Comparison of nursing satisfaction

The nursing satisfaction rate in the experimental group was 95.6%, significantly higher than

		-	-	
Time	Experimental group (n=68)	Control group (n=68)	t	Р
Before intervention	60.99±0.58	60.97±1.34	0.111	0.912
After intervention	87.95±0.58	69.97±0.88	139.537	0.000
t	21.194	46.066	-	-
Р	0.000	0.000	-	-
Before intervention	61.00±0.60	60.97±1.55	0.150	0.881
After intervention	78.96±0.59	73.90±0.57	50.559	0.000
t	75.435	64.391	-	-
Р	0.000	0.000	-	-
Before intervention	62.98±0.60	62.72±2.69	0.782	0.436
After intervention	85.10±0.59	67.95±0.61	16.280	0.000
t	21.333	15.644	-	-
Р	0.000	0.000	-	-
Before intervention	65.02±0.59	64.92±0.56	1.052	0.295
After intervention	75.01±0.62	64.98±0.57	98.137	0.000
t	96.240	0.631	-	-
Р	0.000	0.529	-	-
	Time Before intervention After intervention t P Before intervention After intervention After intervention After intervention t P Before intervention After intervention After intervention After intervention t P	Time         Experimental group (n=68)           Before intervention         60.99±0.58           After intervention         87.95±0.58           t         21.194           P         0.000           Before intervention         61.00±0.60           After intervention         78.96±0.59           t         75.435           P         0.000           Before intervention         62.98±0.60           After intervention         85.10±0.59           t         21.333           P         0.000           Before intervention         65.02±0.59           After intervention         75.01±0.62           t         96.240           P         0.000	Time         Experimental group (n=68)         Control group (n=68)           Before intervention         60.99±0.58         60.97±1.34           After intervention         87.95±0.58         69.97±0.88           t         21.194         46.066           P         0.000         0.000           Before intervention         61.00±0.60         60.97±1.55           After intervention         61.00±0.60         60.97±1.55           After intervention         78.96±0.59         73.90±0.57           t         75.435         64.391           P         0.000         0.000           Before intervention         62.98±0.60         62.72±2.69           After intervention         85.10±0.59         67.95±0.61           t         21.333         15.644           P         0.000         0.000           Before intervention         65.02±0.59         64.92±0.56           After intervention         65.02±0.59         64.92±0.56           After intervention         75.01±0.62         64.98±0.57           t         96.240         0.631           P         0.0000         0.529	Time         Experimental group (n=68)         Control group (n=68)         t           Before intervention         60.99±0.58         60.97±1.34         0.111           After intervention         87.95±0.58         69.97±0.88         139.537           t         21.194         46.066         -           P         0.000         0.000         -           Before intervention         61.00±0.60         60.97±1.55         0.150           After intervention         78.96±0.59         73.90±0.57         50.559           t         75.435         64.391         -           P         0.000         0.000         -           Before intervention         62.98±0.60         62.72±2.69         0.782           After intervention         65.01±0.59         67.95±0.61         16.280           t         21.333         15.644         -           P         0.000         0.000         -           Before intervention         65.02±0.59         64.92±0.56         1.052           After intervention         75.01±0.62         64.98±0.57         98.137           t         96.240         0.631         -           P         0.0000         0.529         -

Table 2. Comparison of quality of life before and after intervention between the two g	groups
--	--------

Table 3. Comparison of negative emotions before and after intervention between the two groups

	Time	Experimental group (n=68)	Control group (n=68)	t	Р
HAMA	Before intervention	49.50±5.34	49.95±5.41	0.483	0.630
	After intervention	40.30±5.85	48.67±5.46	8.632	0.000
	t	9.584	1.371	-	-
	Р	0.000	0.172	-	-
HAMD	Before intervention	54.17±5.81	53.10±5.75	1.082	0.281
	After intervention	43.17±7.14	54.28±8.45	8.282	0.000
	t	9.859	0.955	-	-
	Р	0.000	0.341	-	-

HAMA: Hamilton Anxiety Scale, HAMD: Hamilton Depression Scale.

85.3% observed in the control group (P=0.041) (Table 4).

#### Comparison of blood urea nitrogen and hemoglobin

After the intervention, the experimental group had significantly lower blood urea nitrogen levels (P<0.01) and higher hemoglobin levels (P<0.05) compared to the control group (**Figure 3**).

## Comparison of clinical symptom improvement

After the intervention, the acid regurgitation scores in the experimental group were significantly lower than those in the control group  $(0.79\pm0.41 \text{ vs. } 1.77\pm0.52, P<0.001)$ . Similarly, the epigastric pain scores in the experimental

group were lower than those in the control group ( $0.90\pm0.35$  vs.  $1.49\pm0.43$ , P<0.001). Furthermore, the burning sensation scores in the experimental group were also lower than those in the control group ( $0.99\pm0.32$  vs.  $1.83\pm0.34$ , P<0.001) (**Table 5**).

## Discussion

Gastric ulcers result from a combination of factors, including psychological, dietary, and lifestyle influences. Therefore, clinical nursing interventions must adopt a comprehensive approach addressing these aspects [20].

In this study, nursing interventions based on the KANO model were shown to significantly improve clinical symptoms and quality of life for patients with gastric ulcers. They also effec-



**Figure 2.** Comparison of health-promoting lifestyle between the two groups. A. Exercise; B. Health responsibility; C. Interpersonal support; D. Nutrition; E. Self-actualization; F. Stress management; G. Total score of healthy lifestyle. Compared to control group, \*P<0.05, \*\*P<0.01.

tively alleviated anxiety and depression while enhancing nursing satisfaction.

The observed improvements in quality of life align with findings from previous studies [21, 22]. The KANO model allows for the identification and prioritization of patient needs by categorizing different attributes and expectations. This facilitates the development of targeted nursing measures [23]. For gastric ulcer patients, interventions such as tailored dietary guidance, pain management, and emotional support contribute directly to improved quality of life.

Regular communication and assessment enable timely adjustments to nursing interventions, ensuring alignment with patients' changing needs [24]. This dynamic and patient-centered approach helps to address potential problems promptly, thereby stabilizing and improving the patient's condition [25].

By addressing various aspects of care identified through the KANO model, nursing interventions can reduce symptoms (e.g., pain and discomfort), improve physical functioning (e.g., performing daily activities), enhance mental health (e.g., reducing anxiety and depression), and support better social functioning (e.g., facilitating normal interactions). Together, these improvements lead to a holistic enhancement in patients' quality of life.

Additionally, the positive nurse-patient relationship fostered through this approach contributes significantly to patients' psychological well-being and overall perception of care quality.

The findings of this study demonstrate that nursing interventions based on the KANO model significantly alleviate negative emotions in patients with gastric ulcers, as reflected in reduced HAMA and HAMD scores after the intervention.

Through the KANO model, personalized care plans can be developed to address the unique needs and expectations of each patient [26].

91				
Group	Experimental group (n=68)	Control group (n=68)	X <sup>2</sup>	р
Very satisfied	47 (69.1%)	34 (50.00%)		
Satisfied	18 (26.5%)	24 (35.3%)		
Dissatisfied	3 (4.4%)	10 (14.7%)		
Nursing satisfaction	65 (95.6%)	58 (85.3%)	4.168	0.041

 Table 4. Comparison of nursing satisfaction between the two

 groups



**Figure 3.** Comparison of blood urea nitrogen and hemoglobin between the two groups. A. Blood urea nitrogen; B. Hemoglobin. Compared to control group, \*P<0.05, \*\*P<0.01.

Individualized attention helps patients feel understood and cared for, thereby alleviating anxiety and stress. Additionally, continuous assessment and adjustment of interventions based on patients' responses ensure that care remains dynamic and responsive to their evolving emotional needs.

Effective communication and patient education are also integral components of the KANO model-based nursing approach [27]. Educating patients about their condition, treatment options, and self-care strategies empowers them, reducing uncertainty and enhancing their sense of control and confidence [28]. This empowerment significantly reduces negative emotions.

Interestingly, the study also found that the KANO model-based nursing intervention improved clinical symptoms such as acid reflux, abdominal pain, and burning sensation. For acid reflux, targeted interventions included dietary adjustments (e.g., avoiding foods that trigger acid secretion) and meal timing strategies to regulate gastric acid secretion [29].

Abdominal pain relief involved measures such as heat application and gentle massage to reduce muscle tension. Psychological counseling and emotional support were also emphasized, as stress and anxiety can exacerbate symptoms [30]. For burning sensations, lifestyle modifications (e.g., maintaining an upright posture after meals) and proper medication use to control gastric acid secretion and protect the gastric mucosa were emphasized [31].

This study has some limitations: The relatively small sample size may limit the generalizability of the findings. The study was conducted within a specific geographical or institutional context, which may affect the transferability of results to other settings.

Potential biases in patient selection and data collection could influence the accuracy and reliability of the conclusions. The long-term effects of the KANO model-based nursing interventions on quality of life were not fully captured. External factors, such as changes in the healthcare environment or concurrent treatments, may have impacted the outcomes but were not comprehensively analyzed. Future research should aim to expand the sample size to enhance the representativeness and reliability of the findings. Additionally, exploring the long-term effects of KANO model-based nursing interventions could provide further insights.

In conclusion, nursing interventions based on the KANO model significantly improve clinical symptoms, quality of life, and emotional wellbeing in patients with gastric ulcers. These interventions also enhance nursing satisfaction, making them a valuable approach for integration into future nursing practices.

#### Disclosure of conflict of interest

None.

Group		Experimental group (n=68)	Control group (n=68)	t	р
Acid regurgitation	Before intervention	2.22±0.64	2.06±0.55	1.585	0.115
	After intervention	0.79±0.41	1.77±0.52	12.337	0.000
	t	15.560	3.134	-	-
	Р	0.000	0.002	-	-
Celialgia	Before intervention	2.02±0.63	1.99±0.56	0.227	0.821
	After intervention	0.90±0.35	1.49±0.43	8.727	0.000
	t	12.838	5.874	-	-
	Р	0.000	0.000	-	-
Burning sensation	Before intervention	2.18±0.59	2.15±0.54	0.331	0.741
	After intervention	0.99±0.32	1.83±0.34	14.941	0.000
	t	14.699	4.055	-	-
	Р	0.000	0.000	-	-

Table 5. Comparison of clinical symptom improvement between the two groups

Address correspondence to: Wenying Liang, Department of Nursing, Yichun People's Hospital, No. 1061 Jinxiu Avenue, Yuanzhou District, Yichun 336000, Jiangxi, China. Tel: +86-18720620939; E-mail: 18720620939@163.com

#### References

- [1] Jin LX, Fang YP, Xia CM, Cai TW, Li QQ, Wang YY, Yan HF and Chen X. Helicobacter pylori infection alters gastric microbiota structure and biological functions in patients with gastric ulcer or duodenal ulcer. World J Gastroenterol 2024; 30: 3076-3085.
- [2] Desai M, Chitnavis V and Grider D. Gastric ulcer in a patient with metastatic lung cancer. Gastroenterology 2019; 156: 1572-1573.
- [3] Jin LX, Fang YP, Xia CM, Cai TW, Li QQ, Wang YY, Yan HF and Chen X. Helicobacter pylori infection alters gastric microbiota structure and biological functions in patients with gastric ulcer or duodenal ulcer. World J Gastroenterol 2024; 30: 3076-3085.
- [4] Sverdén E, Mattsson F, Sondén A, Leinsköld T, Tao W, Lu Y and Lagergren J. Risk factors for marginal ulcer after gastric bypass surgery for obesity: a population-based cohort study. Ann Surg 2016; 263: 733-737.
- [5] Gurusamy KS and Pallari E. Medical versus surgical treatment for refractory or recurrent peptic ulcer. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2016; 3: CD011523.
- [6] Xin YY and Zhao D. Impact of web-based positive psychological intervention on emotions, psychological capital, and quality of life in gastric cancer patients on chemotherapy. World J Clin Cases 2024; 12: 5877-5884.
- [7] Yao H, Guo P, Du W, Zhang Y, Li T and Xiao G. Service demand analysis and optimization strategy construction of emergency observa-

tion patients based on the Kano model. Heliyon 2024; 10: e36323.

- [8] Lin F, Chen Q, Lin M, He A, Chen H, Chen Y, Chen H, He W, Hu Y, Wang J, Lin X and Wang X. Clinical effect of nursing based on the kano model in emergency multiple injuries. Evid Based Complement Alternat Med 2022; 2022: 3586290.
- [9] Hayashi T, Yoshikawa T, Ishizu K, Tsutsui M, Wada T, Yamagata Y and Katai H. Suprapancreatic nodal dissection should not be uniformly selected in additional gastrectomy for the patients who diagnosed as pT1b gastric cancer by endoscopic resection. Eur J Surg Oncol 2022; 48: 1785-1789.
- [10] Yin L, Zhang W, Liu L, Guo L, Guo M, He X and Zhu L. Application of nursing intervention based on the IKAP model in self-management of patients with gastric cancer. Am J Transl Res 2022; 14: 6389-6398.
- [11] Åström M, Thet Lwin ZM, Teni FS, Burström K and Berg J. Use of the visual analogue scale for health state valuation: a scoping review. Qual Life Res 2023; 32: 2719-2729.
- [12] Yang M, Wu X and Sun R. The application effect of targeted nursing in the nursing of patients with chronic gastric ulcer. Minerva Gastroenterol (Torino) 2024; 70: 123-125.
- [13] Nayeri ND, Samadi N, Mehrnoush N, Allahyari I, Bezaatpour F and NaseriAsl M. Experiences of nurses within a nurse-led multidisciplinary approach in providing care for patients with diabetic foot ulcer. J Family Med Prim Care 2020; 9: 3136-3141.
- [14] Yilmaz-Oner S, Oner C, Dogukan FM, Moses TF, Demir K, Tekayev N, Atagunduz P, Tuglular S and Direskeneli H. Health-related quality of life assessed by LupusQoL questionnaire and SF-36 in Turkish patients with systemic lupus erythematosus. Clin Rheumatol 2016; 35: 617-622.

- [15] Farsimadan M, Heravi FS, Emamvirdizadeh A, Moradi S, Iranpour H, Tabasi E, Eskandarion MR, Azizian R and Tabasi M. Evaluation of helicobacter pylori genotypes in obese patients with gastric ulcer, duodenal ulcer, and gastric cancer: an observational study. Dig Dis 2022; 40: 355-361.
- [16] Rabinowitz J, Williams JBW, Hefting N, Anderson A, Brown B, Fu DJ, Kadriu B, Kott A, Mahableshwarkar A, Sedway J, Williamson D, Yavorsky C and Schooler NR. Consistency checks to improve measurement with the hamilton rating scale for anxiety (HAM-A). J Affect Disord 2023; 325: 429-436.
- [17] Tung VS, Thong NV, Mai NP, Linh LT, Son DC, Ha TT, Hoa NT, Long NT and Tuan NV. Diagnostic value in screening severe depression of the hamilton depression rating scale, hamilton anxiety rating scale, beck depression inventory scale, and Zung's self-rating anxiety scale among patients with recurrent depression disorder. Acta Inform Med 2023; 31: 249-253.
- [18] Zambrano Bermeo RN, Estrada Gonzalez C, Herrera Guerra EDP and Aviles Gonzalez CI. Reliability and validity of the health-promoting lifestyle profile II Spanish version in university students. Healthcare (Basel) 2024; 12: 1330.
- [19] Mir-Tabar A, Pardo-Herrera L, Goñi-Blanco A, Martínez-Rodríguez MT and Goñi-Viguria R. Patient satisfaction with nursing care in an intensive care unit measured through the nursing intensive-care satisfaction scale (NICSS). Enferm Intensiva (Engl Ed) 2024; 35: 201-212.
- [20] Chen B, Liu XY, Zhang HM, Zhang BJ and Wang YT. Psychological effect of comprehensive nursing intervention in elderly patients with perforated peptic ulcer: a protocol of systematic review. Medicine (Baltimore) 2020; 99: e22226.
- [21] He H, Yu F, Wang F and Liu Q. Impacts of enteral nutrition support based on multiform internet education mode on perioperative nutritional indexes and quality of life of patients with gastric cancer. Altern Ther Health Med 2024; 30: 232-237.
- [22] Wen Y, Ma J, Jiang X, Gao G, Xie H and Lu P. Influencing factors of holistic nursing intervention under a social medical model on the psychology and quality of life of patients with advanced gastric cancer. Am J Transl Res 2021; 13: 3369-3379.

- [23] Materla T, Cudney EA and Hopen D. Evaluating factors affecting patient satisfaction using the Kano model. Int J Health Care Qual Assur 2019; 32: 137-151.
- [24] Tong Y. Efficacy of the chronic disease trajectory model for nutritional support in patients with gastric cancer. Nutr Cancer 2023; 75: 296-301.
- [25] Ren D, Feng M, Zhang S, Zhang Y and Li J. Effect of apatinib combined with Seggio on the expression of serum AFP and CA724 and long-term survival rate in patients with advanced gastric cancer undergoing comfortable nursing intervention. J Healthc Eng 2022; 2022: 2004973.
- [26] Müller SD, Tsirozidis G, Mathiasen M, Nordenhof L, Jakobsen D and Mahler B. Eliciting information needs of child patients: adapting the Kano model to the design of mHealth applications. Methods Inf Med 2022; 61: 123-138.
- [27] Li X, Ding L, Ning P, Li Y, Wei H and Meng Q. Construction of a nurses' interpersonal communication knowledge system: a delphi study. Nurse Educ Today 2023; 120: 105630.
- [28] Dahiyat E, El-Dahiyat F, El Refae G and Babar ZU. Exploring the factors impacting physicians' attitudes toward health information exchange with patients in Jordanian hospitals. J Pharm Policy Pract 2023; 16: 7.
- [29] Ding W, Jian M and Xu RJ. The impact of standardized perioperative care management on improving outcomes in patients with peptic ulcer disease. Medicine (Baltimore) 2023; 102: e33769.
- [30] Xiao H, Liu J, Liu S and Chen X. Effect of lower esophageal gastric tube implantation in postoperative enteral nutritional support in patients with laryngeal cancer: a study protocol for a randomized controlled trial. Medicine (Baltimore) 2020; 99: e19771.
- [31] Jia J, Zhao H, Li F, Zheng Q, Wang G, Li D and Liu Y. Research on drug treatment and the novel signaling pathway of chronic atrophic gastritis. Biomed Pharmacother 2024; 176: 116912.