EPIDEMIOLOGICAL, CLINICAL, AND PSYCHOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF INDIVIDUALS WITH SELF-REPORTED IRRITABLE BOWEL SYNDROME BASED ON THE ROME V VERSUS ROME IV CRITERIA

Alexander Charles Ford

UEG Week Barcelona 2026 | Presentation

Small Intestine & Nutrition | Primary Care | Colorectal

October 19, 2026

Rome V criteria for IBS identify a less severely affected population than Rome IV, with only 46.9% of 1,275 UK adults with self-reported IBS meeting Rome V versus 59.0% meeting Rome IV, and agreement between the two definitions was slight (Kappa = 0.17).

KEY POINTS

- Rome V IBS patients had significantly lower mean IBS-SSS scores than Rome IV patients (235.1 vs. 330.1, P<0.001), with 25.3% reporting severe symptoms versus 64.6% in Rome IV.
- Psychological comorbidity was lower in Rome V, with anxiety scores of 9.4 vs. 11.6, depression scores of 6.1 vs. 8.7, and somatoform symptom-reporting scores of 8.7 vs. 11.6 compared to Rome IV (all P<0.001).
- Rome V patients identified urgency as their most troublesome symptom more often than Rome IV patients (31.8% vs. 19.7%), whereas abdominal pain was most troublesome in Rome IV (30.1% vs. 15.1%, P<0.001).
- IBS-related direct healthcare costs in the prior 12 months were significantly lower in Rome V versus Rome IV patients (£341.52 vs. £758.69, P<0.001).
- At 12-month follow-up, 62.8% of those meeting Rome V criteria at baseline still met criteria, versus 73.6% for Rome IV, with Rome V showing lower stability (Kappa = 0.29 vs. 0.41).
- Rome V criteria exclude more than 50% of individuals with self-reported IBS from the diagnosis, raising questions about case identification and generalisability of prior clinical trial data as Rome V becomes more widely adopted.

VIEW THIS CONTENT ON GUTFLIX

https://gutflix.eu/search/d/feb857bc-d129-11f1-a1ec-daaa6dbee0a2

AI-generated summary

This summary was generated by an AI large language model based on the content transcript. It is for informational purposes only and should not be considered a substitute for clinical judgment. Always rely on your professional expertise and the full clinical context when making clinical decisions.