

Effectiveness of a Text Messaging Intervention on Intuitive Eating: A randomized controlled trial

Batoul Manana¹, Claire El-Jor¹, Joelle Abi Kharma¹, Nadine Zeeni^{1*}

¹Department of Natural Sciences, School of Arts and Sciences, Lebanese American University, P.O. Box: 36-Byblos, Lebanon

***Corresponding author:** Nadine Zeeni – nadine.zeeni@lau.edu.lb, Tel. +9619547262 ext. 2317.

Shortened Title: Intuitive Eating Intervention.

Acknowledgements: We thank the study participants who devoted their time to enroll in the study.

Financial Support: This research received no specific grant from any funding agency, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Conflict of Interest: None.



This is an Accepted Manuscript for Public Health Nutrition. This peer-reviewed article has been accepted for publication but not yet copyedited or typeset, and so may be subject to change during the production process. The article is considered published and may be cited using its DOI 10.1017/S1368980023000939

Public Health Nutrition is published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Nutrition Society. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution licence (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution and reproduction, provided the original article is properly cited.

Abstract

Intuitive eating (IE) is a concept based on mind-body integration of instinct, emotion and rational thought, to improve eating behaviors, physical and mental health. Several attempts were developed to teach IE principles including text-messaging interventions given that they are easy to implement and low-cost.

Objective. The present study aimed to assess the effectiveness of a five-week text-message-based IE intervention on IE, while correcting for perceived stress (PS) and self-compassion (SC).

Design. A randomized control trial.

Setting. Online, in Lebanon.

Participants. Adults (n=195) were randomized into one of three groups: the active IE group receiving IE-related messages with a practice exercise, the passive IE group receiving only IE-related messages and the control group receiving general health-related tips. Ten messages were delivered over five weeks. Two follow-ups were made: directly post-intervention and five weeks later. Baseline data and follow-ups included demographics, nutrition-related variables and measures of IE, SC and PS.

Results. Results indicated improvements in IE scores in the two intervention groups ($p = 0.05$), with the passive IE group showing the most improvement. Also, a significant improvement in SC ($\Lambda = 0.88$, $F(2, 63) = 4.40$, $p = 0.01$), and reduction in PS ($\Lambda = 0.86$, $F(2, 63) = 5.21$, $p = 0.008$) were observed in the active IE group.

Conclusion. Text-messaging interventions might be efficient in enhancing IE. Results shed light on the need for further large-scale interventions that use visual aids and provide practical guidance to teach IE, while further characterizing the relation between IE, SC and stress.

Keywords: Intuitive Eating, Self-Compassion, Perceived Stress, Eating Behavior, Randomized Control Trial.

Introduction

Healthy eating has evolved beyond dieting and caloric restrictions. While traditional weight loss methods have shown success over a short period, they were also associated with poor weight maintenance, health issues and deterioration in quality of life of individuals⁽¹⁾. For that, intuitive eating (IE) was created as a novel concept that allows individuals to connect to their own hunger cues, where only themselves can determine when and what to eat, by listening to their body needs⁽¹⁾. Accordingly, IE is an attempt to create an enjoyable relationship with one's self on one hand and with food and eating on the other hand. It is possible by focusing on gentle nutrition, an anti-diet approach in which nutrition affects health, and joyful movement, showing respect to one's body and being kind to one's self while choosing to move your body without rules in any exercise or non-exercise form⁽¹⁾.

IE is an adaptive form of eating that guides eating behaviors according to internal hunger and satiety cues, rather than external emotional drives or dieting guidelines^(2, 3). It is defined as “the dynamic process-integrating attunement of mind, body and food” and is based on ten principles⁽¹⁾. This approach aims at enhancing the mind-body connection and reinforcing body gratitude, through the adoption of three core beliefs. The beliefs are reliance on internal rather than external hunger cues to determine what, when and how much to eat, the unconditional permission to eat unlimited amounts of food, and listening to hunger cues without ignoring them for any reason^(3, 4).

Several internal and external factors that can either restrict, enhance or inversely correlate with the ability to eat intuitively have been identified, among which perceived stress (PS), self-compassion (SC) and body mass index (BMI).⁽⁵⁻⁷⁾ More specifically, recent literature showed that IE practices were associated with lower PS levels, dieting and disordered eating, along with enhanced SC and emotional management as well as reduced BMI, with the latter being correlated to IE via mediators like the intake of specific food, binge eating frequency and speed of eating^(7, 8-12, 13, 14). However, SC and PS tend to influence each other inversely. Both intervention studies and observational analyses documented that increasing SC can decrease PS, which can also lead to an improvement in BMI⁽¹⁵⁻¹⁸⁾. This might indicate a positive effect of SC on IE, as described previously, via a reduction in PS.

In a recent systematic review of interventions investigating mindful eating and IE, neither diet quality nor energy intake were found to be significantly improved in the intervention groups, highlighting the need of further research of better study design qualities ⁽¹⁹⁾. Aside from energy intake and diet quality, several studies assessed different IE interventions and their effect on weight, BMI, self-esteem and other health-related outcomes. The Health at Every Size (HAES) program incorporated IE principles through 24 guided weekly sessions and was compared to a standard diet program ⁽²⁰⁾. HAES group participants showed better size acceptance, less dieting behaviors, and more body signal awareness and response ⁽²⁰⁾. Another study assessed the “Mind, body Food” web-based interventions, to teach IE to middle aged women ⁽²¹⁾. The intervention was delivered in 12 online modules that included IE discussions and guided-audio activities. After the intervention, enrolled women had improvement in IE, physiological flexibility, and general mental health. Moreover, a recent study examined the effectiveness of an IE intervention through text messaging vs. emailed handouts on IE, stress and self-efficacy of college students ⁽²²⁾. The texting program was five weeks long and consisted of ten messages, based on the ten IE principles. On the other hand, the email program was a single PDF handout that contained the messages’ content all at once. Results showed that the text messaging intervention significantly improved IE in the text-messaging group whereas the control group’s IE scores had not changed. Therefore, IE interventions delivered through text messages could be a promising and cost-effective approach to promote IE. However, the study did not assess participants’ engagement with the messages. Besides, previous work has shown that effective eating behavior-targeted text messaging interventions require active rather than passive involvement from the participants ⁽²³⁾. For example, childhood obesity was targeted by a messaging intervention that involved interactive questions and encouraging feedback messages to remind the participants about the learnt skills ⁽²³⁾. Hence, active engagement in the text-messages could improve the learning of the content.

To the best of our knowledge, no studies have evaluated the short and long-term effectiveness of an active and a passive text messaging intervention on intuitive eating while considering intuitive eating barriers and enhancers among the general population. Hence, the present study aimed at assessing the effectiveness of a five-week text-message-based IE intervention on IE, while correcting for SC and PS level. Accordingly, we hypothesized the following:

H1: The 5-week text message-based IE intervention will be effective in enhancing IE in the short and longer term.

H2: The active text messaging IE intervention will be more effective in enhancing IE compared to the passive intervention.

Methods

Study Design

This randomized single blinded control trial followed a parallel design, it had three arms and participants were recruited online via sharing the advertisement material and the link to the consent form on social media platforms (Facebook, Instagram and WhatsApp®). The study is registered in the Lebanese Clinical Trials registry (LBCTR2022045031). The questionnaires were filled via Google Forms and the intervention content for all the groups was communicated via Whatsapp®. A detailed description of the study methodology is provided in the supplementary material.

Participants

Men and women, living in Lebanon, aged between 18 and 50 inclusive, who have a smart phone with an active WhatsApp® account were included in the study. Phone numbers of the participants were obtained upon online consent. Participants enrolled in weight loss programs or taking medications that affect weight/appetite were excluded from the study. The sample size was calculated based on the effect size of the web-based IE intervention study⁽²¹⁾, which is similar to this study in terms of outcome measure using the same scale, and its online nature. The mean IES-2 change was 0.94 ± 0.67 indicating a moderate-high effect size, accordingly, 65 participants were needed per arm. Since there were three arms, a sample size of 195 participants was needed. Randomization took place between February 2021 and November 2021. Upon consent, participants were randomized to an active intervention group who received IE related messages with practice exercises adapted from the IE workbook⁽²⁴⁾, passive intervention group who received only IE related messages and a control group who received general health related messages. Randomization was based on permuted block sampling with six participants per block with an allocation ratio of 1:1:1. The participants were blinded for allocation and study objectives until the end of the study period.

Procedures

Recruitment and data collection were initiated online using the snowballing technique. Upon consent, participants were able to fill in the baseline survey (T0). Then, each consented participant received ten messages over five weeks, at a rate of two messages per week, i.e. every Monday and Thursday starting the first week after consent. An additional online survey (Follow-up 1, T1) was administered right at the end of the intervention (i.e. after week five) and then again five weeks post-intervention (follow-up 2, T2). Then, after follow-up 2, the participant irrespective of the allocated group received a debriefing video that explains IE principles with practical tips and examples. The surveys, messages and videos were provided in both Arabic and English.

Measures

The primary outcome of the study is intuitive eating. It was assessed through the Intuitive Eating Scale 2 (IES-2) embedded in the surveys. It is a 23-item, 5-point Likert self-reported scale used to assess the eating habits of individuals over the past month. It is composed of four subscales: the unconditional permission to eat, eating for physical rather than emotional reasons, dependence on hunger and satiety cues, and body-food congruence⁽⁴⁾. The secondary outcomes are perceived stress and self-compassion, and their scales were also embedded in the survey. Self-compassion was assessed using self-compassion (SCS), which is of 26 items, 5-point Likert-scale⁽²⁵⁾. Perceived stress was measured by Perceived Stress Scale (PSS), a 10 item, 5-point Likert scale that evaluates the participant's stress levels in relation to their feeling within the past month⁽²⁶⁾. Validity of the scales was established in previous research^(4, 27, 28). The reliabilities were assessed by Cronbach alpha coefficients with very good internal consistencies of 0.859, 0.833 and 0.787 for IES-2, SCS and PSS respectively.

The baseline survey included socio-demographic questions (age, gender, nationality, place of residence, level of education and monthly income). In addition, it included self-reported weight and height that were used to calculate the BMI. The follow-up surveys included only the anthropometric variables (weight and height) and the monthly income.

Statistical Analysis

Analysis was done based on the “intention to treat” analysis using IBM SPSS version 22 (SPSS Inc. Chicago, IL, USA). Statistical significance was reported at the conventional level of $p < 0.05$. Participants with missing data on a scale (2.56% of the whole sample) were excluded from the relative analysis. Normality tests were performed for continuous variables, accordingly, normally distributed data were presented as means and standard deviations and parametric testing was run. For non-parametric variables, median and inter quartile range were reported. Categorical data were reported as counts and percentages. Descriptive statistics were performed at T0, T1 and T2. Participants’ characteristics were compared to the assigned group, using One-Way ANOVA for continuous variables, and Chi-square or Fisher Exact tests for categorical variables. Post-hoc comparisons were made using Bonferroni's method. Changes in the same variables were assessed using One Way Repeated Measures ANOVA for continuous variables. The active and the passive IE groups were combined into one intervention group, and the analysis was repeated for intervention vs. control groups. The effect size of the result was assessed by Multivariate tests Partial Eta Squared using the commonly used guidelines proposed by Cohen (1988, pp. 284–7): 0.01= small, 0.06= moderate and 0.14= large effect size. For the categorical variable “Monthly income”, more than 40% of the sample refused to answer at each assessment point. In light of the current economic crisis in Lebanon, this was a sensitive question, so no further than baseline analysis was carried for this variable. Pearson Correlations were used to assess the correlation between IES-2, PSS, SCS and BMI at the different time points (T0, T1 and T2). Simple linear regressions were performed to identify the variables to be included in the multiple linear regression models. Variable with a p-value < 0.2 at the bivariate level were considered eligible to be included in the multiple linear regression models. Accordingly, standard multiple linear regression models were used to assess predictors of IES-2 at T0, T1 and T2. Variables were inserted manually one by one. Three models were generated. Preliminary analyses were conducted to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity, multicollinearity and homoscedasticity assessed by the normal probability plot (P-P) of the regression-standardized residuals, the scatterplot and the tolerance and the variance inflation factor (VIF). The percentage of variations in the outcome was measured by normal R Square. At T0, predictors included in the model were BMI, PSS and SCS , as well as gender. In each follow-

up regression, participants' BMI, PSS, SCS, and pre-intervention IES – 2 scores were entered as covariates.

Results

Participants Characteristics

In total, 195 participants agreed to join the study. The CONSORT diagram is reported in the supplementary material. As for the demographic characteristics, 76.4% of the study sample were females, and 75.3% had Bachelor's University degree or above. The majority lived in South Lebanon (49.7%), followed by Mount Lebanon (20%) and Greater Beirut (12.3%). Most of the participants joined the study in February, March and November 2021 (35.9%, 24.6% and 19.5% respectively). The median age (IQR) of the whole sample was 26 years (10) and the mean BMI was $25.46 \pm 4.62 \text{ kg/m}^2$. The majority of the participants did not report their monthly income (45.6%). There were no differences between groups in any of the baseline demographic characteristics. Although not of statistical significance, active IE group participants were mostly females and were older.

Baseline Scores

The baseline PSS score for the whole sample ($n=195$) was 22.38 ± 5.80 , indicating moderate stress levels⁽²⁹⁻³¹⁾. The mean SCS score for the whole sample was also indicative of moderate overall self-compassion (3.14 ± 0.42)⁽³²⁾. As for the IES score, the whole sample had a mean of 3.25 ± 0.56 . Despite being statistically insignificant, analysis by group showed that the passive IE group had lower IES total at baseline compared to both active IE and control groups (3.21 ± 0.60 vs. 3.26 ± 0.57 vs. 3.28 ± 0.53 respectively, $p > 0.05$). Interestingly, active IE group had more PSS scores compared to passive IE and control groups (23.40 ± 6.38 vs. 22.26 ± 5.71 vs. 21.49 ± 5.18 respectively, $p > 0.05$). On the other hand, control group participants had higher SCS scores compared to active and passive IE groups (3.19 ± 0.43 vs. 3.06 ± 0.39 vs. 3.18 ± 0.42 respectively, $p > 0.05$). Interestingly, the over-identification subscale was significantly different between groups (3.07 ± 0.83 in control group vs. 2.90 ± 0.67 in the passive IE group vs. 2.62 ± 0.73 in the active IE group, $p = 0.003$). (Table 1).

Within Group Analysis

As for the full sample assessment, a significant improvement in IES-2 between T0 and T2 was evident, (mean difference T2-T0= +0.096, SE= 0.04, $p = 0.049$). This effect was driven by a significant improvement in subscale two, eating for physical rather than emotional reasons (mean difference T2-T0= +0.22, SE= 0.057, $p = 0.001$). SCS also showed a significant improvement (mean difference T2-T0= +0.069, SE= 0.03, $p = 0.05$). In addition, PSS presented a significant reduction in the full sample between the different assessment points (mean difference T2-T0= -1.43, SE= 0.472, $p = 0.006$). As for subgroup analysis, for IES-2 scale, there was a significant effect of time, Wilks Lambda= 0.90, $F(2, 55) = 3.07$, $p = 0.05$, in the passive IE group only. The effect size of the intervention explained by multivariate partial eta square was 0.101, which is considered a moderate to high effect size according to the commonly used guidelines proposed by Cohen, pp.284 – 7⁽³³⁾. This significant effect of time was driven by an improvement in subscale 2, eating for physical rather than hunger cues subscale, where Wilks Lambda was 0.796, $F(2, 55) = 7.06$, $p = 0.002$, and the effect size was large (multivariate partial eta square= 0.204). For the SCS, there was a significant effect of time, Wilks Lambda= 0.88, $F(2, 63) = 4.40$, $p = 0.01$, in the Active IE group only. This indicates that SC increased significantly with time in this group. Particularly, it increased by 0.116 between T0 and T1 and was maintained by T2 (slight non-significant increase by 0.19). The effect size of the intervention was 0.123, which is considered a moderate to high effect size. For the PSS, there was a significant effect of time, Wilks Lambda= 0.86, $F(2, 63) = 5.21$, $p = 0.08$, in the active IE group only. This indicates that PS decreased significantly with time in this group. In particular, it decreased by 1.4 between T0 and T1 and by 2.51 between T0 and T2. The effect size of the intervention was 0.142, which is considered of high effect size. As for BMI, the three groups showed minor non-significant reductions in BMI with time. Results were similar when the active and passive groups were considered as one intervention group; the intervention group showed a significant improvement in IES-2 scores (mean difference T2-T0= 0.128, SE= 0.052, $p = 0.05$), whereas, the change in IES-2 among the control group participants was minimal (mean difference T2-T0= 0.025, SE= 0.059, $p = 0.382$). The effect size of the intervention explained by multivariate partial eta square was 0.05, which is considered a low to moderate effect size (Table 2).

Predictors of IES-2 at Different Time Points

Results from simple linear regression revealed that at T0, PSS, SCS, BMI and gender, and at T1 and T2, PSS, SCS, BMI and baseline IES-2 were eligible to be included in the model with IES-2 as an outcome. Three multiple linear regressions models were performed (Table 3). The model generated at T0 explained 24.7%, at T1 explained 50% and at T2 explained 31.7% of the variations in IES-2. At T0, PSS, SCS, BMI, and gender were found to be significant predictors of IES-2, with BMI being the best predictor (Beta= - 0.273, $p < 0.0001$). At T1, PSS, BMI, and baseline IES-2 scores were found to be significant predictors of IES-2 at T1, with baseline IES-2 score being the best predictor (Beta= 0.608, $p < 0.0001$). Finally, at T2, SCS and baseline IES-2 scores were found to be significant predictors of IES-2, with baseline IES-2 score being the best predictor (Beta= 0.411, $p < 0.0001$).

Discussion

The present randomized control trial aimed to assess the effectiveness of a text-message based IE program, on IE in Lebanese adults, while correcting for SC, PS and BMI. The findings suggest an improvement in IE among intervention groups.

Major Findings

Results confirmed the first hypothesis as both groups receiving IE-based text messages showed an improvement in overall IE as compared to control. However, unlike what was hypothesized, the passive IE group showed higher improvement in IE compared to the active group, driven by significant enhancement in the “eating for physical rather than emotional reasons” subscale at the second follow-up. The fact that the particular subscale is involved could be due to individuals who are new to intuitive eating taking the idea of being mindful to physical cues as a "hunger-fullness" diet, which could be very easy to remember after the messages were sent. The findings hence suggest that sending only the messages of IE without further active engagement may be more effective in improving IE, and the effect of the intervention needs time to be evident. In addition, the results suggest that the passive IE group showed better improvement in IE compared to the active. This could possibly be justified by the practice exercises reminding the participants of their habits instead of trying to engage them with the principle; especially that previous research used active engagement, in the form of questions and tips, to remind the

participants about the learnt skills⁽²³⁾. It could be useful for future research to use exercises that would reassure the IE principle instead of assessing previous habits. Moreover, the present study confirmed that gender predicts IE. Indeed, females had significantly lower IE scores compared to males. This could be possibly explained by the higher stigma and the internalization of thin ideal that females are subject to, which in turn influence their dieting behavior and body esteem⁽³⁴⁾. In addition, studies suggest that females are more likely to use food to manage their emotions while males usually have higher body appreciation, which is a predictor of IE⁽³⁵⁻³⁸⁾. Interestingly, gender lost significance at follow-ups suggesting that the intervention attenuated gender-related differences in IE.

Intervention Effect on IE

In an IE-based text messages intervention study conducted in college students in Midwestern University, IES total scores significantly increased in the text-messages group, specifically due to improvement in the reliance on hunger and satiety cues⁽²²⁾. Similarly, in the current sample, there was a significant improvement in IES-2 post intervention and at five weeks follow-up, driven by a significant increase in eating for physical rather than emotional reasons. It is worth noting that the results of this paper showed that IES-2 significantly improved in the full sample, hence, we could hypothesize that improvements in nutrition-related behaviors could be related to texting programs that increase nutrition/health knowledge in general. For example, the Mobile Myplate intervention, which aimed to assess the effectiveness of nutrition-related messages on college students' knowledge and behavior vs. email handouts, showed that this approach is helpful in promoting positive nutrition related behaviors⁽³⁹⁾. The success of such programs validate that texting interventions could be cost-effective and easy to administer behavior-changing interventions, especially that participants do not have to seek and search for the information, they receive it promptly. In addition to the significant increase in total IE scores, this study showed that IES-2 subscale 2, "eating for physical rather than emotional reasons", also increased significantly among the full sample, and particularly the passive IE group which was the only to show a significant improvement at the second follow-up. This finding may indicate that the text messages acted as a good reminder to keep the participants conscious to the difference between physical hunger and emotional hunger. Hence, this may convey that nutrition

related messages, and in particular, IE related messages would stimulate consciousness towards body hunger cues.

Intervention Effect on independent variables PS, SC and BMI

The current IE-text messaging intervention had a positive impact on PS. The findings suggest that IE-based interventions could have a positive impact on the management of PS. IE principles might have led to a better stress management, even in populations under stress like our sample, given the economic deterioration, health crisis and political combats that are currently being faced in Lebanon^(40, 41). This finding is in line with other studies correlating IE to stress. For example, in a cross sectional analysis of an interventional study in Finland, individuals with higher PS reported less IE⁽⁴²⁾. However, intervention studies reported different findings concerning IE intervention's effect on stress. Despite the significant correlation between IE and PS, Loughran et al's IE-based text messaging intervention did not associate with post-intervention PSS. Moreover, the intervention group showed an increase in PS from pre to post intervention, which opposes our findings⁽²²⁾. Authors suggested that the observed increase in PS was associated with the environment and workload of the college students under study⁽²²⁾. However, a possible justification for this result could be the fact that the IE-messages they delivered did not include coping strategies and practical tips. In this context, a randomized control trial used a non-dieting stress reduction program, offering mind-body relaxation techniques (mindfulness, meditation...) to raise awareness of thoughts and emotions, and to support the development of healthy coping strategies⁽⁴³⁾. This program led to significant increase in IE and great improvement in stress management behaviors suggesting that interventions addressing stress and mindfulness are effective in eliciting behavior change⁽⁴³⁾. In line with this, our findings suggest that participants used the received IE-related content as a coping mechanism against stress.

This particular intervention is noteworthy given that it significantly improved SC in the intervention groups. Along with this positive improvement, a positive correlation was observed between SC and IE at all assessment points, and at the last follow-up, SC became the strongest predictor of IE. Research in this field documented the effect of SC on IE by highlighting how being more self-compassionate towards internal body experiences, may enhance the ability to eat intuitively⁽⁴⁴⁾. However, no previous work studied the effect of IE interventions on SC.

Interventional studies on SC demonstrated that the latter is a skill that can be learned to influence eating behaviors and other health outcomes⁽⁴⁵⁾. Hence, SC interventions included mindfulness and mindful eating, meditation and yoga, developing a compassionate inner voice, adopting SC in daily life, and managing emotions among others⁽⁴⁵⁾. The novel addition of our study is that IE-based text-messaging interventions can be used as a method to enhance SC. The positive effect observed could be because IE principles focus a lot on connecting to body cues, attending to the soft inner voice and managing emotions without using food. Thus, IE principles acted as a means to relate the individual to his or her inner self and to stimulate his or her feelings of body appreciation, security and safety, which ideally should enhance SC^(46, 47). This is also confirmed by studies suggesting that SC influences brain centers related to threat, feeling and behaviors⁽⁴⁶⁻⁴⁹⁾. Such messages are in line with the SC interventions provided by the literature.

It was previously demonstrated in observational studies that IE is negatively correlated with BMI⁽¹⁴⁾ and in interventional studies that IE interventions could maintain BMI^(20, 21). The current study documented this negative correlation between IE and BMI. However, prior to the intervention, BMI was the strongest predictor of IE. This had changed in the follow-ups and BMI lost significance as a predictor. In other words, it can be inferred that the effect the intervention had on IE, attenuated the effect of BMI on IE. Further research is needed to elucidate the actual effect. Despite that, combining IE principles to reduce external eating, along with educating about what to eat in response to internal cues in terms of healthy food choices can provide optimal health outcomes. This should be considered in future research given that diet quality was not improved following IE intervention in previous research⁽¹⁹⁾.

Strengths and Limitations

The current study has several strengths and limitations. Strengths include its randomized interventional design, which reduces allocation and sampling biases and allows comparison to determine the actual effect. Furthermore, this study was blinded to the participants, hence maximizing the validity of the results. In addition, the study is novel in the region and in the way it looked at different interacting variables, and their influence on eating behaviors. Moreover, the design allowed to deliver an intervention that mimics daily life exposure to nutrition awareness through social media without manipulation of the participants' setting and environment.

Limitations of the study include its small sample size when compared to other text-messaging interventions and the use of self-reported surveys. Furthermore, the method of recruitment (snowball method) is a significant limitation that could have created a non-representable sample. Other limitations include the level of education and place of residence of the participants, with the majority being educated, and residing in South Lebanon, as data was collected using a snowball method. The possibility of cross contamination, where participants would share messages with each other is also a significant limitation, however, we could not guarantee that the participants know or contact each other. In addition, residual confounders that are known to influence IE such as chronic diseases, mental health, eating habits, self-efficacy, social gathering and physical activity level were not measured in an effort not to over-burden participants.

Conclusion

The present study showed that IE-based text-messages may help in enhancing IE, reducing PS and improving SC. The results may serve as a stepping-stone for future IE interventions targeting larger sample to enhance all the three outcomes, which can, thanks to the ease of text-messaging, be widespread on a public health level to inform awareness campaigns. Future studies may benefit from investigating the above studied variables in different age groups and in clinical populations (e.g., eating disorders, anxiety disorders etc.). Despite that, the empirical findings of this study are remarkable in that they represent the first study to implement the concept of active and passive engagement in texting programs, and to explore the effect of IE intervention on SC and PS, which might be of clinical significance in health programs.

Authorship: All authors contributed to the development of the research question and study design. BM carried out the data collection. BM and JAK analyzed the data. BM wrote the first draft of the manuscript. **All authors reviewed and approved the final manuscript.**

Ethical Standards Disclosure: This study was conducted according to the guidelines laid down in the Declaration of Helsinki and all procedures involving research study participants were approved by the Lebanese American University (LAU) Institutional Review Board (IRB), which is established in accordance with the U.S. Code of Federal Regulation (45CFR 46.107, 21CFR 56.107) and Good Clinical Practice ICH (Section 3). Written informed consent was obtained from all participants.

References

1. Tribole E, Resch E. *Intuitive eating*: Macmillan; 2012.
2. Tribole E, Resch E. *Intuitive eating: A revolutionary program that works* . New York: St. Martin's Press; 2012.
3. Tribole E, Resch E. *Intuitive Eating: A Revolutionary Program That Works*, St. Martin's Griffin. 2003.
4. Tylka TL, Kroon Van Diest AM. The Intuitive Eating Scale–2: Item refinement and psychometric evaluation with college women and men. *Journal of counseling psychology*. 2013;60(1):137.
5. Barraclough EL, Hay-Smith EJC, Boucher SE, et al. Learning to eat intuitively: A qualitative exploration of the experience of mid-age women. *Health psychology open*. 2019;6(1):2055102918824064.
6. Pannicke B, Kaiser T, Reichenberger J, et al. Networks of stress, affect and eating behaviour: Anticipated stress coping predicts goal-congruent eating. 2020.
7. Madden CE, Leong SL, Gray A, et al. Eating in response to hunger and satiety signals is related to BMI in a nationwide sample of 1601 mid-age New Zealand women. *Public health nutrition*. 2012;15(12):2272-9.
8. Bruce LJ, Ricciardelli LA. A systematic review of the psychosocial correlates of intuitive eating among adult women. *Appetite*. 2016;96:454-72.
9. Dalen J, Smith BW, Shelley BM, et al. Pilot study: Mindful Eating and Living (MEAL): weight, eating behavior, and psychological outcomes associated with a mindfulness-based intervention for people with obesity. *Complementary therapies in medicine*. 2010;18(6):260-4.
10. Tylka TL. Development and psychometric evaluation of a measure of intuitive eating. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*. 2006;53(2):226.
11. Cardoso A, Oliveira S, Ferreira C. Negative and positive affect and disordered eating: The adaptive role of intuitive eating and body image flexibility. *Clinical Psychologist*. 2020.
12. Burnette CB. *An Intuitive Eating Intervention for College Women With Disordered Eating: Evaluating Two Accessible and Affordable Approaches*. 2020.
13. Smith T, Hawks SR. Intuitive eating, diet composition, and the meaning of food in healthy weight promotion. *American Journal of Health Education*. 2006;37(3):130-6.

14. Van Dyke N, Drinkwater EJ. Review article relationships between intuitive eating and health indicators: literature review. *Public health nutrition*. 2014;17(8):1757-66.
15. Allen AB, Leary MR. Self-Compassion, stress, and coping. *Social and personality psychology compass*. 2010;4(2):107-18.
16. Finlay-Jones AL, Rees CS, Kane RT. Self-compassion, emotion regulation and stress among Australian psychologists: Testing an emotion regulation model of self-compassion using structural equation modeling. *PloS one*. 2015;10(7):e0133481.
17. Neff KD, Germer CK. A pilot study and randomized controlled trial of the mindful self-compassion program. *Journal of clinical psychology*. 2013;69(1):28-44.
18. Jayne JM, Ayala R, Karl JP, et al. Body weight status, perceived stress, and emotional eating among US Army Soldiers: A mediator model. *Eating behaviors*. 2020;36:101367.
19. Grider HS, Douglas SM, Raynor HA. The influence of mindful eating and/or intuitive eating approaches on dietary intake: A systematic review. *Journal of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics*. 2021; 121(4): 709-727.
20. Bacon L, Stern JS, Van Loan MD, et al. Size acceptance and intuitive eating improve health for obese, female chronic dieters. *Journal of the American Dietetic Association*. 2005;105(6):929-36.
21. Boucher S, Edwards O, Gray A, Nada-Raja S, Lillis J, Tylka TL, et al. Teaching intuitive eating and acceptance and commitment therapy skills via a web-based intervention: a pilot single-arm intervention study. *JMIR research protocols*. 2016;5(4):e5861.
22. Loughran TJ, Harpel T, Vollmer R, et al. Effectiveness of intuitive eating intervention through text messaging among college students. *College Student Journal*. 2018;52(2):232-44.
23. Bauer S, de Niet J, Timman R, et al. Enhancement of care through self-monitoring and tailored feedback via text messaging and their use in the treatment of childhood overweight. *Patient education and counseling*. 2010;79(3):315-9.
24. Tribole E, Resch E. *The intuitive eating workbook: Ten principles for nourishing a healthy relationship with food*: New Harbinger Publications; 2017.
25. Neff KD. The development and validation of a scale to measure self-compassion. *Self and identity*. 2003;2(3):223-50.
26. Cohen S, Kamarck T, Mermelstein R. Perceived stress scale. *Measuring stress: A guide for health and social scientists*. 1994;10:1-2.

27. Alabdulaziz H, Alquwez N, Almazan JU, et al. The Self-Compassion Scale Arabic version for baccalaureate nursing students: A validation study. *Nurse Education Today*. 2020;104420.
28. Chaaya M, Osman H, Naassan G, et al. Validation of the Arabic version of the Cohen Perceived Stress Scale (PSS-10) among pregnant and postpartum women. *BMC psychiatry*. 2010;10(1):111.
29. Bhat RM, Sameer M, Ganaraja B. Eustress in education: Analysis of the perceived stress score (PSS) and blood pressure (BP) during examinations in medical students. *Journal of Clinical and Diagnostic Research*. 2011;5(7):331-1335.
30. Thangaraj S, D'souza L. Prevalence of Stress Levels Among First Year Medical Undergraduate Students. 2014.
31. Swaminathan A, Viswanathan S, Gnanadurai T, et al. Perceived stress and sources of stress among first-year medical undergraduate students in a private medical college–Tamil Nadu. *National Journal of Physiology, Pharmacy and Pharmacology*. 2016;6(1):9-14.
32. Neff K. Self-compassion: An alternative conceptualization of a healthy attitude toward oneself. *Self and identity*. 2003;2(2):85-101.
33. Cohen J. *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. Hillsdale, NJ. 1988:20-6.
34. Kleppe A. *Exploring Intuitive Eating in the Adolescent Population*. 2020.
35. Andrew R, Tiggemann M, Clark L. Predictors of intuitive eating in adolescent girls. *Journal of Adolescent Health*. 2015;56(2):209-14.
36. Andrew R, Tiggemann M, Clark L. Predictors and health-related outcomes of positive body image in adolescent girls: A prospective study. *Developmental Psychology*. 2016;52(3):463.
37. Lemoine J, Konradsen H, Jensen AL, et al. Factor structure and psychometric properties of the Body Appreciation Scale-2 among adolescents and young adults in Danish, Portuguese, and Swedish. *Body image*. 2018;26:1-9.
38. Luo Y-j, Niu G-f, Kong F-c, et al. Online interpersonal sexual objectification experiences and Chinese adolescent girls' intuitive eating: The role of broad conceptualization of beauty and body appreciation. *Eating behaviors*. 2019;33:55-60.

39. Brown ON, O'Connor LE, Savaiano D. Mobile MyPlate: a pilot study using text messaging to provide nutrition education and promote better dietary choices in college students. *Journal of American College Health*. 2014;62(5):320-7.
40. Bizri M, Kassir G, Tamim H, et al. Psychological distress experienced by physicians and nurses at a tertiary care center in Lebanon during the COVID-19 outbreak. *Journal of health psychology*. 2021:1359105321991630.
41. Mourani SC, Ghreichi M-C. Mental Health Reforms in Lebanon During the Multifaceted Crisis.
42. Järvelä-Reijonen E, Karhunen L, Sairanen E, et al. High perceived stress is associated with unfavorable eating behavior in overweight and obese Finns of working age. *Appetite*. 2016;103:249-58.
43. Katzer L, Bradshaw AJ, Horwath CC, et al. Evaluation of a “nondietering” stress reduction program for overweight women: A randomized trial. *American Journal of Health Promotion*. 2008;22(4):264-74.
44. Schoenefeld SJ, Webb JB. Self-compassion and intuitive eating in college women: Examining the contributions of distress tolerance and body image acceptance and action. *Eating behaviors*. 2013;14(4):493-6.
45. Ferrari M, Hunt C, Harrysunker A, et al. Self-compassion interventions and psychosocial outcomes: A meta-analysis of RCTs. *Mindfulness*. 2019;10(8):1455-73.
46. Gilbert P. *Compassion: Conceptualisations, research and use in psychotherapy*: Routledge; 2005.
47. Kelly AC, Stephen E. A daily diary study of self-compassion, body image, and eating behavior in female college students. *Body Image*. 2016;17:152-60.
48. Depue RA, Morrone-Strupinsky JV. A neurobehavioral model of affiliative bonding: Implications for conceptualizing a human trait of affiliation. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*. 2005;28(3):313-49.
49. LeDoux J. *The emotional brain: The mysterious underpinnings of emotional life*: Simon and Schuster; 1998.

Table 1. *Baseline Survey Scores (T0)*

| Characteristics | All (n=195) | | Active IE Group (n=65) | | Passive IE Group (n=65) | | Control Group (n=65) | | P-Value |
|---|----------------|------|------------------------|------|-------------------------|------|----------------------|------|---------|
| | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | |
| BMI | 25.46 | 4.62 | 25.62 | 4.99 | 24.90 | 4.16 | 25.86 | 4.69 | 0.477 |
| IES-2 Scale | 3.25 | 0.56 | 3.26 | 0.57 | 3.21 | 0.60 | 3.28 | 0.53 | 0.76 |
| IES-2 Subscales | | | | | | | | | |
| Unconditional Permission to eat | 3.24 | 0.64 | 3.19 | 0.54 | 3.29 | 0.72 | 3.25 | 0.64 | 0.666 |
| Eating for Physical Rather than Emotional Reasons | 3.09 | 0.88 | 3.07 | 0.98 | 2.98 | 0.82 | 3.24 | 0.83 | 0.228 |
| Reliance on Hunger and Satiety Cues | 3.33 | 0.89 | 3.41 | 0.87 | 3.26 | 0.96 | 3.33 | 0.85 | 0.63 |
| Body-Food Choice Congruence | 3.36 | 0.89 | 3.51 | 0.76 | 3.38 | 0.96 | 3.19 | 0.92 | 0.122 |
| PSS | 22.38 | 5.80 | 23.40 | 6.38 | 22.26 | 5.71 | 21.49 | 5.18 | 0.169 |
| SCS | 3.14 (N = 193) | 0.42 | 3.06 | 0.39 | 3.18 (n = 64) | 0.42 | 3.19 (n = 64) | 0.43 | 0.13 |
| SCS Subscales | | | | | | | | | |
| Self - kindness | 3.31 (N = 193) | 0.77 | 3.22 | 0.74 | 3.38 (n = 64) | 0.83 | 3.33 (n = 64) | 0.72 | 0.486 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------|-------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------|----------------|
| Self - Judgment | 2.98 (N = 193) | 0.7 0 | 2.84 | 0.69 | 3.06 (n = 64) | 0.7 0 | 3.04 (n = 64) | 0.71 | 0.147 |
| Common Humanity | 3.43 (N = 194) | 0.7 2 | 3.45 | 0.76 | 3.46 (n = 64) | 0.6 5 | 3.36 | 0.73 | 0.626 |
| Isolation | 2.98 (N = 193) | 0.7 6 | 2.88 | 0.73 | 3.00 (n = 64) | 0.7 3 | 3.05 (n = 64) | 0.82 | 0.408 |
| Mindfulness | 3.30 (N = 193) | 0.6 3 | 3.32 | 0.66 | 3.27 (n = 64) | 0.5 7 | 3.31 (n = 64) | 0.67 | 0.891 |
| Over - Identification | 2.86 (N = 193) | 0.7 7 | 2.62 | 0.73 | 2.90 (n = 64) | 0.6 7 | 3.07 (n = 64) | 0.83 | 0.003 * |

BMI: Body mass index, SD: standard deviation. * stands for p-value < 0.05.

Table 2. IES-2, IES-2 subscales, PSS, SCS and BMI scores at different time points

| Outcome | Assessment Point | Full Sample (n=177) | | | Active IE Group (n=65) | | | Passive IE Group (n=57) | | | Control Group (n=55) | | |
|--|-------------------------------|---------------------|------|--------|------------------------|------|-------|-------------------------|------|------|----------------------|------|------|
| | | Mean | SD | P | Mean | SD | P | Mean | SD | P | Mean | SD | P |
| IES – 2 | T0 | 3.27 | 0.55 | 0.049* | 3.26 | 0.57 | 0.271 | 3.23 | 0.60 | 0.05 | 3.31 | 0.5 | 0.38 |
| | T1 | 3.33 | 0.48 | | 3.25 | 0.48 | | 3.38 | 0.51 | | 3.37 | 0.45 | |
| | T2 | 3.36 | 0.49 | | 3.34 | 0.50 | | 3.41 | 0.54 | | 3.33 | 0.42 | |
| | Significant Paired Assessment | T0 vs. T2 | | | | | | T0 vs. T2 | | | | | |
| IES-2 Subscales | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Unconditional Permission to eat subscale | T0 | 3.26 | 0.65 | 0.74 | 3.19 | 0.54 | 0.41 | 3.32 | 0.74 | 0.92 | 3.29 | 0.7 | 0.21 |
| | T1 | 3.23 | 0.59 | | 3.13 | 0.55 | | 3.36 | 0.61 | | 3.20 | 0.6 | |
| | T2 | 3.24 | 0.62 | | 3.23 | 0.58 | | 3.35 | 0.72 | | 3.16 | 0.57 | |
| | Significant Paired Assessment | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Eating for Physical Rather than | T0 | 3.11 | 0.89 | 0.001* | 3.07 | 0.98 | 0.23 | 2.96 | 0.81 | 0.00 | 3.30 | 0.82 | 0.18 |
| | T1 | 3.23 | 0.81 | | 3.10 | 0.84 | | 3.16 | 0.77 | | 3.44 | 0.78 | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|-----------|------|------|------|------|-------|-----------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Emotional Reasons subscale | T2 | 3.33 | 0.75 | | 3.22 | 0.75 | | 3.34 | 0.81 | | 3.43 | 0.67 | |
| | Significant Paired Assessment | T0 vs. T2 | | | | | | T0 vs. T2 | | | | | |
| Reliance on Hunger and Satiety Cues subscale | T0 | 3.34 | 0.88 | 0.08 | 3.41 | 0.87 | 0.63 | 3.29 | 0.96 | 0.1 | 3.31 | 0.81 | 0.33 |
| | T1 | 3.46 | 0.76 | | 3.43 | 0.68 | | 3.25 | 0.89 | | 3.43 | 0.77 | |
| | T2 | 3.46 | 0.85 | | 3.52 | 0.80 | | 3.51 | 0.99 | | 3.34 | 0.75 | |
| | Significant Paired Assessment | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Body-Food Choice Congruence subscale | T0 | 3.40 | 0.85 | 0.87 | 3.51 | 0.76 | 0.725 | 3.50 | 0.90 | 0.58 | 3.18 | 0.87 | 0.41 |
| | T1 | 3.44 | 0.72 | | 3.43 | 0.59 | | 3.58 | 0.85 | | 3.29 | 0.71 | |
| | T2 | 3.42 | 0.81 | | 3.46 | 0.78 | | 3.48 | 0.93 | | 3.32 | 0.71 | |
| | Significant Paired Assessment | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SCS | T0 | 3.15 | 0.42 | 0.05 | 3.06 | 0.39 | 0.01* | 3.19 | 0.4 | 0.32 | 3.21 | 0.45 | 0.88 |
| | T1 | 3.20 | 0.40 | | 3.17 | 0.42 | | 3.23 | 0.34 | | 3.20 | 0.45 | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------|-----|-------|----------------------|-----|--------|------|-----|------|------|------|------|
| | T2 | 3.22 | 0.4 | | 3.15 | 0.3 | | 3.28 | 0.4 | | 3.23 | 0.4 | |
| | Significant Paired Assessment | T0 vs. T2 | | | T0 vs. T1 | | | | | | | | |
| PSS | T0 | 22.4 | 5.7 | 0.006 | 23.4 | 6.3 | 0.008* | 22.4 | 5.5 | 0.43 | 21.2 | 5.1 | 0.31 |
| | T1 | 21.3 | 6.0 | | 22.0 | 5.8 | | 21.7 | 6.5 | | 20.1 | 5.7 | |
| | T2 | 21.0 | 5.4 | | 20.8 | 5.6 | | 21.2 | 6.1 | | 20.8 | 4.4 | |
| | Significant Paired Assessment | T0 vs. T1, T0 vs. T2 | | | T0 vs. T1, T0 vs. T2 | | | | | | | | |
| BMI | T0 | 25.4 | 4.6 | 0.11 | 25.6 | 4.9 | 0.696 | 24.9 | 4.3 | 0.06 | 25.9 | 4.5 | 0.35 |
| | T1 | 25.3 | 4.8 | | 25.5 | 4.9 | | 24.7 | 4.4 | | 25.9 | 5.1 | |
| | T2 | 25.2 | 4.6 | | 25.5 | 4.7 | | 24.5 | 4.2 | | 25.7 | 4.90 | |
| | Significant Paired Assessment | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Assessment points: T0: at baseline, T1: post-intervention, T2: five weeks follow-up. IES-2 stands for intuitive eating scale 2, PSS: perceived stress scale, SCS: self-compassion scale, BMI: body mass index.* stands for p=value <0.05.

Table 3. Multiple linear regression between independent variables and IES-2 at different time points

| Assessment Point | Dependent Variable | Predictors | Unstandardized Beta (95%CI) | Standardized Beta | P value | Model summary (R ²) |
|------------------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|-----------|---------------------------------|
| T0 | IES – 2 | PSS | -0.021 (-0.036, -0.006) | -0.217 | 0.006* | 0.247 |
| | | SCS | 0.278 (0.08, 0.476) | 0.209 | 0.006* | |
| | | BMI | -0.033 (-0.048, -0.018) | -0.273 | <0.0001** | |
| | | Gender | -0.258 (-0.429, -0.087) | -0.196 | 0.003* | |
| T1 | | PSS | -0.013 (-0.022, -0.003) | -0.155 | 0.012* | 0.5 |
| | | SCS | 0.086 (-0.062, 0.234) | 0.069 | 0.255 | |
| | | BMI | -0.013 (-0.024, -0.002) | -0.125 | 0.023* | |
| | | Baseline IES-2 | 0.534 (0.438, 0.630) | 0.608 | <0.0001** | |
| T2 | | PSS | -0.004 (-0.016, -0.009) | -0.039 | 0.564 | 0.317 |
| | | SCS | 0.337 (0.174, 0.5) | 0.278 | <0.0001** | |
| | | BMI | -0.005 (-0.018, -0.009) | -0.043 | 0.498 | |
| | | Baseline IES-2 | 0.364 (0.250, 0.478) | 0.411 | <0.0001** | |

IES-2 stands for intuitive eating scale 2, PSS: perceived stress scale, SCS: self-compassion scale, BMI: body mass index. * stands for p-value less than 0.05, ** stands for p-value less than 0.0001