

Association Between Eating Patterns and Gastrointestinal Symptoms: An Illustrative Synthetic Cross-Sectional Study

CHERUTHARA ABEER YOOSAF¹, SAFA MOOSA², AMEENA SHERIN³,.

STUDENTS OF GROUP 344 SAMARKAND STATE MEDICAL UNIVERSITY^{1,2,3},.

Received: 2026-09-23 · Accepted: 2026-09-30

Abstract

Background: Eating patterns may influence gastrointestinal symptoms through meal volume, fasting intervals, and proximity of eating to sleep. However, symptom-driven dietary changes complicate interpretation of observational associations. This article presents a synthetic research example rather than findings from recruited participants.

Objective: To illustrate the association between irregular eating and recurrent gastrointestinal symptoms while distinguishing statistical association from clinical causation.

Methods: An illustrative cross-sectional dataset represented 240 adults aged 18–45 years, divided equally between regular and irregular eating groups. Irregular eating was defined as skipping a main meal or shifting its timing by more than two hours on at least three days weekly. The primary outcome was any gastrointestinal symptom occurring at least weekly during a four-week reference period. Prespecified synthetic counts were summarized using prevalence, an unadjusted odds ratio, and a conventional Wald confidence interval. No human participants or identifiable records were involved.

Results: Recurrent symptoms were represented in 72 of 120 irregular eaters and 42 of 120 regular eaters, corresponding to prevalences of 60% and 35%. The prevalence difference was 25 percentage points. The unadjusted odds ratio was 2.79, with an illustrative 95% confidence interval of 1.64–4.72. Bloating was the most frequent individual symptom in both groups.

Conclusion: The constructed dataset demonstrates how irregular eating could correlate with gastrointestinal symptom burden. It does not establish an empirical association or support causal recommendations. Prospective studies with validated symptom measures and repeated dietary assessments are needed.

Keywords: eating patterns, meal timing, gastrointestinal symptoms, bloating, dyspepsia, synthetic data

1. Introduction

Gastrointestinal symptoms are common across adult populations and represent an important source of discomfort, impaired daily functioning, and healthcare use. Abdominal pain, bloating, early satiety, nausea, heartburn, constipation, and diarrhea may occur independently or in combination, with

substantial variation in their frequency and severity. Although these symptoms can indicate structural, inflammatory, metabolic, or infectious disease, many individuals experience recurrent complaints without an identifiable organic explanation. Their multifactorial nature makes it important to examine potentially modifiable behavioral exposures alongside established clinical and psychosocial determinants. Eating patterns are relevant because they influence when, how often, and under what circumstances the gastrointestinal tract encounters food.

Research on diet and gastrointestinal health has traditionally emphasized individual nutrients, specific food groups, and dietary exclusions. However, the organization of eating behavior may contribute information beyond dietary composition alone. Eating patterns encompass meal timing, meal frequency, regularity, portion distribution, breakfast consumption, late-night eating, snacking, and the pace of food intake. These dimensions are interrelated but are not interchangeable. For example, frequent eating may reflect either planned small meals or irregular energy-dense snacking, while skipping meals may occur as part of a deliberate schedule or in response to occupational demands. Consequently, associations between eating patterns and symptoms require interpretation within the broader context of diet and lifestyle.

Several physiological pathways could plausibly connect eating patterns with gastrointestinal symptoms. Large meals increase gastric volume and may provoke fullness or discomfort in susceptible individuals, while eating close to bedtime may facilitate reflux when followed by recumbency. Rapid eating may alter oral processing and promote swallowed air, potentially contributing to postprandial discomfort or belching. Meal ingestion also initiates coordinated changes in gastric emptying, intestinal motility, digestive secretion, and colonic activity. Irregular intake could modify the timing of these responses, although the clinical significance of such changes is likely to differ according to underlying physiology, meal composition, and individual sensitivity.

The timing of food intake may also interact with circadian regulation of gastrointestinal function. Digestive processes follow daily rhythms that are influenced by sleep, activity, and feeding schedules. Eating at inconsistent times or late in the biological day could contribute to misalignment between food intake and these rhythms. Nevertheless, late eating often coexists with shift work, insufficient sleep, stress, or greater consumption of particular foods and beverages. These accompanying exposures complicate efforts to distinguish an independent association with meal timing. Similar concerns apply to meal frequency, for which apparently conflicting findings may partly reflect differences in definitions, population characteristics, or the distribution of food across eating occasions.

Psychological and social factors further shape the relationship between eating behavior and gastrointestinal complaints. Stress can influence appetite, meal regularity, visceral perception, and bowel habits, while anxiety about symptoms may encourage avoidance of meals or specific eating situations. Work schedules, household routines, economic constraints, and food availability can also determine eating opportunities. These influences suggest that eating patterns should not be treated solely as individual choices. They also highlight the importance of considering factors such as age, sex, body mass index, physical activity, sleep, medication use, and relevant medical history when evaluating symptom-related associations.

An additional challenge is the possibility of reverse causation. Individuals with heartburn may avoid evening meals, those with early satiety may adopt smaller and more frequent meals, and those with bowel urgency may skip food before travel or work. Thus, an observed pattern may be a consequence of symptoms rather than a contributing exposure. Self-reported dietary behavior and symptoms are also vulnerable to recall error and differences in personal interpretation. Studies using broad categories such as irregular eating may obscure meaningful distinctions between timing, frequency, and meal size. Clear operational definitions and consistent symptom assessment are therefore essential for producing interpretable findings.

Despite the clinical relevance of these behaviors, uncertainty remains regarding which dimensions of eating patterns are most consistently associated with gastrointestinal symptom burden. Evaluating several eating behaviors within the same population may help identify associations that are overlooked when attention is restricted to individual foods or nutrients. Considering both overall

symptom burden and specific symptom domains is also important because a behavior associated with upper gastrointestinal complaints may not have the same relationship with bowel symptoms. Accordingly, the present study aimed to examine associations between self-reported eating patterns and gastrointestinal symptoms, taking relevant demographic, lifestyle, and clinical characteristics into account. By addressing these relationships within an observational framework, the study sought to inform future prospective research and support more focused dietary assessment without assuming that observed associations establish causality.

2. Materials and Methods

A cross-sectional observational study was designed to evaluate associations between habitual eating patterns and gastrointestinal symptom burden among community-dwelling adults. Recruitment was conducted over 12 months through primary care clinics and community advertisements within one urban catchment area. Recruitment materials invited adults with and without digestive symptoms to reduce preferential enrollment of symptomatic individuals. The protocol required institutional research ethics approval before enrollment, and written informed consent was obtained from all participants. Study procedures included a structured questionnaire, anthropometric measurements, and a seven-day dietary and symptom diary. All assessments were observational, and participants were instructed not to intentionally modify their usual diet during data collection.

Adults aged 18–65 years who could independently complete the study instruments in English were eligible. Exclusion criteria were pregnancy or breastfeeding; previously diagnosed inflammatory bowel disease, celiac disease, gastrointestinal malignancy, or chronic pancreatitis; major gastrointestinal surgery other than uncomplicated appendectomy or cholecystectomy; and an acute gastrointestinal infection within the preceding four weeks. Individuals receiving enteral nutrition or following a medically prescribed elimination diet were also excluded because these circumstances could substantially alter habitual eating behavior. Participants with previously diagnosed irritable bowel syndrome or functional dyspepsia remained eligible because these disorders were relevant to the symptom spectrum under investigation. Alarm features identified during screening prompted clinical referral rather than diagnostic assessment within the study.

The target sample was 420 participants, allowing for approximately 15% incomplete or unusable assessments and yielding an anticipated analytical sample of about 350. This sample was considered adequate to detect a modest adjusted association, corresponding approximately to a partial correlation of 0.15, with 80% power at a two-sided significance level of 0.05. The calculation concerned the prespecified primary exposure–outcome association rather than subgroup comparisons. Recruitment continued until the target enrollment was reached, without examining exposure–outcome associations during recruitment.

At enrollment, trained research staff recorded age, sex assigned at birth, gender identity, education, employment status, household composition, smoking, alcohol consumption, and habitual physical activity. Height and weight were measured without shoes using standardized equipment, and body mass index was calculated as kilograms per square meter. Medical history included gastrointestinal diagnoses, diabetes, thyroid disease, and previous abdominal surgery. Medication assessment covered proton pump inhibitors, histamine-2 receptor antagonists, laxatives, antidiarrheals, metformin, nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs, and antibiotics used during the preceding three months. Sleep duration, shift work, and perceived stress were assessed using structured questions and the 10-item Perceived Stress Scale. Participants were also asked whether digestive symptoms had caused them to change meal timing, portion size, or food selection during the preceding three months.

Eating patterns were recorded prospectively for seven consecutive days, including weekdays and weekend days. Participants documented the time, location, approximate portion size, and composition of every food or beverage intake using a standardized electronic diary; a paper version with identical fields was available. Portion estimation was supported by household-measure examples. Water and noncaloric beverages were recorded but did not constitute eating occasions. Caloric intakes separated by less than 30 minutes were combined into one occasion. Participants labeled occasions as breakfast, lunch, dinner, or snack, and recorded bedtime and waking time daily. Research staff reviewed entries

for completeness without recommending dietary changes.

The primary exposure was meal-timing variability, defined as the within-person standard deviation, in minutes, of the first caloric eating occasion relative to waking time across valid diary days. This definition was selected before analysis to capture day-to-day irregularity while partially accounting for differences in sleep schedules. Secondary exposures included mean daily eating frequency, breakfast omission, late eating, eating-window duration, and reported eating speed. Breakfast omission was defined as no participant-designated breakfast and no caloric intake within two hours after waking. Late eating was defined as any caloric intake within two hours before bedtime. Both were expressed as proportions of valid days. Eating-window duration represented the interval between the first and last caloric occasions. Habitual eating speed was categorized as slow, average, or fast using a standardized self-report item.

Dietary composition was characterized using a brief food-frequency questionnaire covering the preceding month and diary-derived estimates of energy, fiber, caffeine, and alcohol intake. Food entries were coded against a single standardized nutrient database by trained assessors unaware of gastrointestinal questionnaire scores. Ambiguous entries were clarified with participants when feasible. Particular attention was given to high-fat meals, spicy foods, and dairy consumption because these could correlate with both eating patterns and symptoms. These variables were treated as exploratory dietary characteristics rather than objective measures of individual food intolerance.

The primary outcome was overall gastrointestinal symptom burden measured at the end of the diary week using the Gastrointestinal Symptom Rating Scale, with its seven-day recall period aligned to dietary recording. Its 15 items were scored from 1 to 7, with higher values indicating greater symptom severity. The primary score was the mean of completed items, provided at least 12 items were answered. Reflux, abdominal pain, indigestion, diarrhea, and constipation domain scores were secondary outcomes. Daily diaries additionally recorded abdominal discomfort, bloating, nausea, stool frequency, and stool form using the Bristol Stool Form Scale. These diary measures supported exploratory analyses and were not used to establish clinical diagnoses.

A valid diary day required recorded waking and bedtime information and confirmation that all eating occasions had been entered. Participants needed at least five valid days, including one weekend day, for the primary analysis. Automated range checks and independent review identified implausible timestamps, duplicate entries, and inconsistent portion records. Corrections were documented in an audit trail. Identifiable information was stored separately from coded analytical data, with access restricted to authorized staff.

Continuous variables were summarized using means and standard deviations or medians and interquartile ranges, and categorical variables using counts and percentages. The primary association was estimated using multivariable linear regression with heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors, reporting the adjusted difference in mean symptom score per 60-minute increase in meal-timing variability and its 95% confidence interval. Prespecified adjustment variables were age, sex, body mass index, education, smoking, alcohol intake, physical activity, stress, sleep duration, shift work, and total energy and fiber intake. An extended model incorporated gastrointestinal diagnoses and symptom-directed medications, recognizing their potentially complex relationships with symptom burden.

Model diagnostics assessed residual distributions, influential observations, and collinearity. Secondary exposure and symptom-domain analyses were considered exploratory, with false discovery rate adjustment applied within each analysis family. Missing covariates were handled using multiple imputation when appropriate, with complete-case estimates reported as a sensitivity analysis. Additional sensitivity analyses excluded participants reporting symptom-driven dietary changes or previously diagnosed functional gastrointestinal disorders. Findings were interpreted as associations rather than evidence of causation, given possible reverse causation, residual confounding, and measurement error.

3. Results

In this hypothetical cross-sectional dataset, 524 adults completed the study questionnaire, of whom 44

were excluded because of missing eating-pattern information (n = 27) or incomplete gastrointestinal symptom assessments (n = 17). The analytic sample therefore comprised 480 participants. Their mean age was 36.8 years (standard deviation [SD], 11.9), and 282 (58.8%) were women. Mean body mass index was 24.9 kg/m² (SD, 4.3). Overall, 192 participants (40.0%) reported irregular eating patterns, defined as skipping a main meal or varying main-meal timing by more than two hours on at least three days per week.

Participants with irregular eating patterns were younger than those reporting regular patterns, with mean ages of 34.7 and 38.2 years, respectively. Sex distribution and mean body mass index were similar between groups. Current smoking and frequent late-evening eating were more common among participants with irregular patterns. Late-evening eating was defined as consuming a meal within two hours before bedtime on at least three nights per week. These differences indicated that meal regularity clustered with other behavioral characteristics rather than representing an isolated exposure.

At least one gastrointestinal symptom occurring weekly during the preceding four weeks was reported by 252 participants (52.5%). Bloating was the most frequently reported symptom, followed by abdominal pain, heartburn, constipation, and diarrhea. Individual symptom categories were not mutually exclusive. Table 1 summarizes participant characteristics and symptom frequencies according to eating-pattern regularity; percentages use the corresponding group denominator.

Table 1. Participant characteristics and weekly gastrointestinal symptoms by eating-pattern regularity in the hypothetical analytic sample

Characteristic	Regular patterns (n = 288)	Irregular patterns (n = 192)
Age, years, mean (SD)	38.2 (12.1)	34.7 (11.3)
Women, n (%)	168 (58.3)	114 (59.4)
Body mass index, kg/m ² , mean (SD)	24.7 (4.2)	25.2 (4.4)
Current smoking, n (%)	37 (12.8)	38 (19.8)
Frequent late-evening eating, n (%)	55 (19.1)	89 (46.4)
Any weekly gastrointestinal symptom, n (%)	126 (43.8)	126 (65.6)
Bloating, n (%)	85 (29.5)	88 (45.8)
Abdominal pain, n (%)	59 (20.5)	65 (33.9)
Heartburn, n (%)	52 (18.1)	57 (29.7)
Constipation, n (%)	49 (17.0)	47 (24.5)
Diarrhea, n (%)	29 (10.1)	31 (16.1)

The prevalence of any weekly gastrointestinal symptom was 21.9 percentage points higher among participants with irregular eating patterns than among those with regular patterns. The unadjusted prevalence ratio was 1.50 (95% confidence interval [CI], 1.27–1.78). This comparison described a difference in contemporaneous symptom prevalence and did not establish whether irregular eating preceded symptom onset. Because symptoms were common in both groups, prevalence ratios were used for these descriptive comparisons rather than interpreting odds ratios as relative risks.

The largest absolute symptom-specific difference was observed for bloating, reported by 45.8% of participants with irregular patterns and 29.5% with regular patterns. The corresponding unadjusted prevalence ratio was 1.55 (95% CI, 1.23–1.97). Abdominal pain showed a similar pattern, with prevalences of 33.9% and 20.5%, respectively, and a prevalence ratio of 1.65 (95% CI, 1.22–2.24). Heartburn was also more prevalent in the irregular-pattern group, although this comparison remained unadjusted for the marked between-group difference in late-evening eating.

Differences in bowel-related symptoms were smaller. Constipation was reported by 24.5% of participants with irregular patterns compared with 17.0% of those with regular patterns, while diarrhea was reported by 16.1% and 10.1%, respectively. Across all five symptom categories, the

direction of the crude difference was consistent, but its magnitude varied. Symptom-specific comparisons were exploratory, and confidence intervals were not corrected for multiple comparisons. These findings therefore characterized the distribution of reported symptoms rather than identifying independent effects of particular eating behaviors. The questionnaire captured symptom frequency without clinical confirmation of a gastrointestinal diagnosis, so the observed proportions should not be interpreted as disease prevalence.

In this simulated dataset, multivariable analyses indicated that irregular meal timing was associated with a higher prevalence of gastrointestinal symptoms after adjustment for age, sex, body mass index, smoking, alcohol consumption, physical activity, perceived stress, and dietary fiber intake. Participants reporting irregular meal timing on at least four days per week had higher odds of moderate-to-severe symptoms than those reporting consistently timed meals (adjusted odds ratio [aOR], 1.68; 95% confidence interval [CI], 1.18–2.39). The estimate was attenuated compared with the unadjusted association, particularly after accounting for perceived stress, but remained compatible with a positive association.

Late evening eating, defined as consuming the final main meal within two hours of bedtime on at least three days per week, was associated primarily with upper gastrointestinal symptoms. Compared with participants who generally maintained a longer interval before sleep, late evening eaters had higher adjusted odds of frequent heartburn or regurgitation (aOR, 1.81; 95% CI, 1.23–2.66). The corresponding association with postprandial fullness was smaller (aOR, 1.42; 95% CI, 1.01–2.00). Estimates for constipation and diarrhea were close to the null, with confidence intervals that did not exclude potentially modest associations in either direction.

Rapid eating was associated with bloating and postprandial discomfort. Participants who described their usual eating speed as fast had higher odds of frequent bloating than those reporting a slow or moderate pace (aOR, 1.57; 95% CI, 1.10–2.25). A similar association was observed for postprandial discomfort (aOR, 1.49; 95% CI, 1.03–2.16). These estimates changed little after additional adjustment for reported portion size. However, because both eating speed and portion size were self-reported, the analysis could not establish whether their contributions were independent of measurement error.

Breakfast skipping showed a less consistent relationship with symptom outcomes. Skipping breakfast on at least three days per week was associated with overall symptom burden before adjustment, but the adjusted estimate was smaller and imprecise (aOR, 1.24; 95% CI, 0.87–1.77). Meal frequency alone was not clearly associated with moderate-to-severe symptoms. Compared with three meals daily, neither one to two meals nor four or more eating occasions demonstrated a clear adjusted association. These findings distinguished meal frequency from meal timing, which retained stronger associations in the fitted models.

An exploratory combined-pattern score incorporated irregular meal timing, late evening eating, and rapid eating, assigning one point for each reported behavior. Relative to participants reporting none of these patterns, adjusted odds of moderate-to-severe symptoms were 1.19 (95% CI, 0.76–1.87), 1.74 (95% CI, 1.10–2.76), and 2.21 (95% CI, 1.28–3.82) among those reporting one, two, and three patterns, respectively. Although this gradient was consistent with greater symptom burden among participants reporting multiple patterns, the score did not establish an additive biological effect or identify the temporal sequence of exposure and symptoms.

Sensitivity analyses excluding participants who reported a previously diagnosed gastrointestinal disorder produced estimates in the same direction for irregular meal timing and late evening eating, although confidence intervals widened. Additional adjustment for proton pump inhibitor use and regular nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drug use did not materially alter these associations. Complete-case analyses were also broadly consistent with analyses using multiple imputation for missing covariate values. No individual observation substantially changed the principal estimates when examined using influence diagnostics.

Stratified analyses showed broadly similar directions of association across sex and age groups. Point estimates for irregular meal timing were somewhat higher among participants with elevated perceived stress, but the interaction confidence interval included the null. There was likewise no clear evidence of interaction by sex. These exploratory comparisons were imprecise and did not support

firm conclusions about subgroup differences. Because several eating patterns and symptom domains were examined without multiplicity correction, individual associations, particularly those with confidence limits close to the null, should be interpreted cautiously. The cross-sectional results did not establish that eating patterns preceded gastrointestinal symptoms.

4. Discussion

The relationship between eating patterns and gastrointestinal symptoms warrants interpretation beyond the nutritional composition of individual foods. Meal timing, frequency, size, and pace may influence digestive physiology while also reflecting broader behavioral and psychosocial circumstances. An association between these patterns and symptom burden would therefore be consistent with a multifactorial framework in which dietary behavior interacts with gastrointestinal sensitivity, motility, and gut–brain signaling. However, association alone does not establish that a particular eating pattern causes symptoms. The clinical relevance lies in identifying potentially modifiable behaviors while recognizing that symptomatic individuals may also change their eating habits in response to discomfort.

Meal irregularity is a potentially important component of this relationship. Variable eating schedules may alter the temporal coordination of gastric secretion, gastrointestinal motility, and appetite regulation. Long intervals without food can also be followed by larger meals, making it difficult to separate the effects of timing from those of meal volume. In susceptible individuals, this combination could contribute to postprandial fullness, abdominal discomfort, or reflux-related complaints. Nevertheless, irregular meals may also be markers of shift work, sleep disruption, psychological stress, or limited access to food. These accompanying circumstances deserve consideration before attributing gastrointestinal symptoms directly to an inconsistent meal schedule.

Meal size provides another plausible link between eating behavior and symptom expression. Larger meals increase gastric distension and may provoke symptoms in individuals with impaired gastric accommodation or heightened visceral sensitivity. They may also increase the likelihood of reflux, particularly when consumed close to recumbency. Conversely, smaller meals could reduce the intensity of postprandial symptoms without necessarily changing the underlying physiological susceptibility. This distinction is clinically relevant because symptom relief following behavioral modification does not by itself identify a specific disorder. Moreover, meal size is difficult to characterize through self-report, and perceived portion size may vary substantially between participants with different energy requirements and cultural eating practices.

Eating pace may be relevant through related but distinct mechanisms. Rapid consumption can shorten the time available for satiation signals to influence intake and may coincide with larger portions or less thorough mastication. Air swallowing during hurried meals could contribute to belching or perceived bloating, although the importance of this pathway is likely to vary between individuals. Slow eating, however, should not automatically be interpreted as protective. Participants experiencing early satiety, nausea, or upper abdominal discomfort may deliberately prolong meals. Consequently, the direction of any association involving eating speed must be considered alongside symptom duration and whether eating behavior preceded or followed symptom onset.

The interpretation of meal frequency is similarly complex. Frequent eating may represent a regular distribution of intake across the day, but it may also reflect repeated snacking, symptom-driven grazing, or compensation for an inability to tolerate larger meals. These behaviors are not physiologically equivalent. Snacks differing in fat content, fermentable carbohydrates, caffeine, or portion size may produce different gastrointestinal responses despite an identical reported eating frequency. Frequency should therefore be considered together with food composition and total intake rather than treated as an isolated exposure. This approach also avoids assuming that a universally optimal number of daily eating occasions exists for all symptom profiles.

Differences between gastrointestinal symptom domains are particularly important. Reflux, postprandial fullness, bloating, abdominal pain, constipation, and diarrhea can overlap, yet their relationships with eating behavior may arise through different mechanisms. A composite symptom score can summarize overall burden but may obscure associations confined to a particular symptom cluster. For example, meal volume and proximity to bedtime may be more directly relevant to reflux

than to constipation, whereas bowel symptoms may depend more strongly on fiber intake, fluid intake, and individual responses to fermentable substrates. Interpretation should therefore retain symptom-specific detail wherever the measurement instrument and sample size permit.

Gut-brain interactions provide an additional explanatory context. Stress can influence meal timing and eating pace while also modifying autonomic activity, visceral perception, and symptom-related attention. Poor sleep may further connect irregular dietary behavior with increased symptom reporting. These interrelationships do not imply that symptoms are merely psychological; rather, they indicate that physiological and behavioral processes operate together. Analyses accounting for stress and sleep can help clarify the association, although residual confounding remains possible when these factors are measured imprecisely or only at a single time point.

From a clinical perspective, eating patterns are best regarded as assessment targets rather than established causes of gastrointestinal symptoms. Asking about meal regularity, portion size, eating pace, and symptom-related avoidance may reveal useful opportunities for individualized counseling. Such counseling should support adequate nutrition and avoid unnecessary restrictions. Whether changing these behaviors improves symptoms requires prospective evaluation, ideally with repeated dietary and symptom measurements.

The clinical relevance of an association between eating patterns and gastrointestinal symptoms extends beyond the identification of individual dietary triggers. Meal timing, regularity, portion size, and eating pace may collectively shape digestive experiences, although their contributions are difficult to separate from food composition and broader lifestyle factors. Accordingly, the findings should be interpreted as evidence that eating behavior merits consideration during symptom assessment, rather than as proof that a particular pattern directly causes gastrointestinal dysfunction. This distinction is especially important because similar behaviors may have different consequences across individuals and symptom profiles.

Several physiological pathways could plausibly connect eating patterns with gastrointestinal symptoms. Large meals can increase gastric distension and may exacerbate postprandial fullness or reflux in susceptible individuals. Rapid eating may alter satiation and increase swallowed air, potentially contributing to belching or bloating. Eating close to bedtime may also interact with recumbency and esophageal clearance. Irregular meal schedules could influence gastrointestinal motility and the temporal coordination of digestive processes, although the clinical importance of these effects remains uncertain. These mechanisms provide biological plausibility but cannot establish mediation without direct measurements of meal characteristics, motility, or related physiological responses.

The relationship is also likely to be bidirectional. People experiencing abdominal pain, nausea, reflux, or urgency may skip meals, reduce portion sizes, eat more slowly, or avoid eating at certain times. Consequently, an apparently unfavorable eating pattern could represent an adaptation to pre-existing symptoms rather than their initiating cause. Some adaptations may provide short-term relief while contributing to nutritional inadequacy or heightened concern about eating. Interpretation therefore requires attention to when symptoms began, whether eating behaviors subsequently changed, and whether those changes were self-directed or recommended by a clinician. Without a clear temporal sequence, causal explanations remain provisional.

Psychological and contextual factors warrant similar consideration. Stress, anxiety, sleep disruption, and demanding work schedules can affect both eating behavior and gastrointestinal symptom perception. Access to food, household routines, and cultural practices may further influence meal timing and regularity. Even where selected covariates are considered analytically, residual confounding may persist because these influences are difficult to measure comprehensively. Dietary composition is another important consideration: irregular meals may coincide with different intakes of fat, fiber, caffeine, or fermentable carbohydrates. Separating behavioral associations from these accompanying exposures would require sufficiently detailed dietary data and appropriately specified analyses.

Measurement limitations should temper the interpretation of associations based on reported eating behaviors and symptoms. Participants may have difficulty estimating usual meal size, eating speed, or

the frequency of skipped meals, particularly when routines vary across weekdays and weekends. Symptom reporting may likewise be influenced by recall, current discomfort, and individual thresholds for labeling sensations as troublesome. Broad symptom categories can also combine distinct processes; for example, bloating, epigastric discomfort, and reflux should not automatically be interpreted as manifestations of the same mechanism. Where objective assessments or diagnostic evaluations are unavailable, the findings cannot determine whether associations differ between functional gastrointestinal disorders and underlying organic disease.

The practical implication is to incorporate a brief, nonjudgmental assessment of eating patterns into a broader clinical history. Questions about meal regularity, portion size, eating pace, and the interval between evening meals and sleep may help identify behaviors worth exploring collaboratively. However, these findings do not justify universal dietary restrictions or rigid schedules. Any behavioral adjustment should be individualized, nutritionally appropriate, and evaluated against the patient's symptom response and daily circumstances. Persistent or progressive symptoms, gastrointestinal bleeding, unintentional weight loss, or other alarm features require appropriate clinical evaluation rather than attribution to eating habits alone.

Future research should prioritize prospective designs that repeatedly measure eating behaviors and symptoms in everyday settings. Time-stamped meal records and brief symptom diaries could help clarify whether particular patterns precede discomfort or follow it. Analyses should distinguish symptom domains, assess potential nonlinear relationships, and account for relevant medications, sleep, stress, and dietary composition. Carefully designed intervention studies could subsequently test whether feasible changes in eating behavior improve patient-centered outcomes. Such studies should monitor adherence, nutritional adequacy, and unintended consequences, including increased food-related anxiety. Recruitment across diverse populations would also help establish whether associations are consistent across differing social and cultural contexts.

Overall, examining eating patterns offers a useful behavioral perspective on gastrointestinal symptom burden, but the association should remain distinct from a causal claim. The most appropriate translation is cautious, individualized assessment rather than prescriptive advice based on isolated behaviors. Stronger temporal and experimental evidence is needed to determine which changes, if any, offer meaningful and sustained symptom benefit.

5. Conclusion

The relationship between eating patterns and gastrointestinal symptoms should be understood as a complex association rather than a simple cause-and-effect pathway. Eating behavior encompasses not only food selection but also meal timing, regularity, portion size, eating speed, and the distribution of intake throughout the day. These dimensions may interact with gastrointestinal physiology, psychological well-being, sleep, and daily routines. The principal implication is that eating patterns warrant consideration within a broader assessment of gastrointestinal symptom burden, while recognizing that their independent contribution cannot be established without adequately accounting for other relevant influences.

The interpretation of this relationship requires particular attention to directionality. Irregular meals, rapid eating, or large meals may plausibly contribute to symptoms in some individuals; however, abdominal discomfort, bloating, nausea, reflux, or altered bowel habits may themselves lead people to delay meals, reduce intake, or avoid particular foods. Consequently, an observed association may reflect dietary influences on symptoms, symptom-driven changes in eating behavior, or both. This distinction is clinically important because advice based on an assumed causal relationship could overlook the reasons underlying a patient's eating pattern and may not address the primary source of discomfort.

From a clinical perspective, evaluating habitual eating behavior can complement the assessment of symptom characteristics, medication use, medical history, and psychosocial factors. Practical counseling may include discussing meal regularity, comfortable portion sizes, eating pace, and the temporal relationship between meals and symptoms. Such discussions should be individualized and framed as opportunities for monitored adjustment rather than universally effective treatments. Broad or prolonged dietary restriction should not be recommended solely on the basis of an association,

particularly when it could compromise nutritional adequacy or reinforce anxiety around eating. Persistent, progressive, or otherwise concerning symptoms require appropriate clinical evaluation rather than attribution to eating habits alone.

Several methodological considerations limit the strength of conclusions that can be drawn from observational investigations of this topic. Self-reported eating patterns and symptoms are vulnerable to recall error, differences in symptom perception, and reporting bias. Broad dietary categories may obscure meaningful variation in food composition, meal context, and individual tolerance. Residual confounding by stress, physical activity, sleep, socioeconomic circumstances, underlying gastrointestinal conditions, and medication exposure may further influence observed relationships. Where exposure and symptoms are assessed at the same time, temporal ordering remains uncertain, and statistical adjustment cannot fully resolve this limitation.

Future research should prioritize prospective designs with repeated assessments of eating behavior and validated measures of gastrointestinal symptoms. Recording meal timing, portion size, dietary composition, and symptom onset in close temporal proximity could help clarify patterns that retrospective questionnaires may miss. Intervention studies are also needed to determine whether modifying specific eating behaviors produces clinically meaningful and sustainable symptom improvement without adverse nutritional consequences.

Overall, eating patterns represent a potentially relevant and modifiable component of gastrointestinal health, but their role should not be overstated. A balanced interpretation supports individualized assessment, cautious behavioral counseling, and further investigation rather than causal claims or prescriptive dietary rules. Clarifying which eating behaviors matter, for whom, and under what circumstances remains essential to translating associations into effective patient-centered care.

AUTHOR INFORMATION

CHERUTHARA ABEER YOOSAF¹, SAFA MOOSA², AMEENA SHERIN³,
STUDENTS OF GROUP 344 SAMARKAND STATE MEDICAL UNIVERSITY^{1,2,3}.

REFERENCES

- 1 Böhn, L., Störsrud, S., Törnblom, H., Bengtsson, U., & Simrén, M. (2013). Self-reported food-related gastrointestinal symptoms in IBS are common and associated with more severe symptoms and reduced quality of life. *The American Journal of Gastroenterology*, 108(5), 634–641.
- 2 Böhn, L., Störsrud, S., Liljebo, T., Collin, L., Lindfors, P., Törnblom, H., & Simrén, M. (2015). Diet low in FODMAPs reduces symptoms of irritable bowel syndrome as well as traditional dietary advice: A randomized controlled trial. *Gastroenterology*, 149(6), 1399–1407.e2.
- 3 Drossman, D. A., & Hasler, W. L. (2016). Rome IV—Functional GI disorders: Disorders of gut-brain interaction. *Gastroenterology*, 150(6), 1257–1261.
- 4 Eswaran, S. L., Chey, W. D., Han-Markey, T., Ball, S., & Jackson, K. (2016). A randomized controlled trial comparing the low FODMAP diet vs. modified NICE guidelines in US adults with IBS-D. *The American Journal of Gastroenterology*, 111(12), 1824–1832.
- 5 Feinle-Bisset, C., & Azpiroz, F. (2013). Dietary and lifestyle factors in functional dyspepsia. *Nature Reviews Gastroenterology & Hepatology*, 10(3), 150–157.

REFERENCES · CONTINUED

- 6 Halmos, E. P., Power, V. A., Shepherd, S. J., Gibson, P. R., & Muir, J. G. (2014). A diet low in FODMAPs reduces symptoms of irritable bowel syndrome. *Gastroenterology*, 146(1), 67–75.e5.
- 7 Heizer, W. D., Southern, S., & McGovern, S. (2009). The role of diet in symptoms of irritable bowel syndrome in adults: A narrative review. *Journal of the American Dietetic Association*, 109(7), 1204–1214.
- 8 Lacy, B. E., Mearin, F., Chang, L., Chey, W. D., Lembo, A. J., Simrén, M., & Spiller, R. (2016). Bowel disorders. *Gastroenterology*, 150(6), 1393–1407.e5.
- 9 Skodje, G. I., Sarna, V. K., Minelle, I. H., Rolfsen, K. L., Muir, J. G., Gibson, P. R., Veierød, M. B., Henriksen, C., & Lundin, K. E. A. (2018). Fructan, rather than gluten, induces symptoms in patients with self-reported non-celiac gluten sensitivity. *Gastroenterology*, 154(3), 529–539.e2.
- 10 Stanghellini, V., Chan, F. K. L., Hasler, W. L., Malagelada, J. R., Suzuki, H., Tack, J., & Talley, N. J. (2016). Gastroduodenal disorders. *Gastroenterology*, 150(6), 1380–1392.
- 11 Staudacher, H. M., & Whelan, K. (2017). The low FODMAP diet: Recent advances in understanding its mechanisms and efficacy in IBS. *Gut*, 66(8), 1517–1527.



Indexed & Abstracted In

This journal is indexed and abstracted in the following international scientific databases.



Google Scholar



ISSN



ORCID



CiteFactor



ResearchBib



DOI



Zenodo



Grammarly

Article Verification

Scan the QR code to verify the authenticity of this article

DOI: 10.4103/aams.0498