

Psychother Psychosom , DOI: 10.1159/000551662

Received: February 25, 2026

Accepted: March 19, 2026

Published online: March 20, 2026

The need for flexible, co-developed Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs) assessment: response to Chang & Su, Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs) in the Digital Era: An Urgent Call for Precision Assessment

Caes L, Christogianni A, Hales TG, Colvin LA

ISSN: 0033-3190 (Print), eISSN: 1423-0348 (Online)

<https://www.karger.com/PPS>

Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics

Disclaimer:

Accepted, unedited article not yet assigned to an issue. The statements, opinions and data contained in this publication are solely those of the individual authors and contributors and not of the publisher and the editor(s). The publisher and the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to persons or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to the content.

Copyright:

This article is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC) (<https://karger.com/Services/OpenAccessLicense>). Usage and distribution for commercial purposes requires written permission.

© 2026 The Author(s). Published by S. Karger AG, Basel

Letter

The need for flexible, co-developed Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs) assessment: response to Chang & Su, Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs) in the Digital Era: An Urgent Call for Precision Assessment

Line Caes^a, Aikaterini Christogianni^b, Tim G. Hales^c, Lesley A. Colvin^b

^a Division of Psychology, Faculty of Natural Sciences, University of Stirling, UK

^b Population Health and Genomics, University of Dundee, Dundee, United Kingdom

^c Division of Neuroscience, University of Dundee, Dundee, United Kingdom

Short Title: ACE assessment in the digital era

Corresponding Author:

First and last name: Line Caes

E-mail address: line.caes@stir.ac.uk

Keywords: adverse childhood experiences, assessment, indecent online content, digital era, childhood abuse, Trauma, Psychological trauma.

We thank Chang & Su [1] for their eloquent and fascinating reflections on our systematic review of validated adverse childhood experience (ACE) questionnaires [2]. As Chang & Su [1] highlight, the findings of our review identified mixed evidence with respect to existing ACEs questionnaires, demonstrating moderate to poor psychometrical quality. Furthermore, the content validity of the included questionnaires, conducted by people with lived experiences (PWLE), identified how existing ACEs questionnaires do not appropriately assess the diversity and real-life impact of ACEs. Consequently, we called for an urgent new approach towards ACEs assessments, co-developed with PWLE, to ensure ACEs assessments are trauma-informed and assess a diverse range of relevant experiences [2]. As Chang & Su [1] outline in detail and provide a strong rationale for, a key development that needs to take place within ACEs assessment is the inclusion of adverse experiences within online environments. We agree with Chang & Su [1] that this type of ACE is critically lacking from current assessments, with none of the questionnaires included in our review assessing digital or online negative experience, such as cyberbullying [2].

Despite age-restrictions being in place on most social media platforms and for adult-orientated online content, age declaration methods are easy to circumvent [3]. Consequently, many young people are exposed – often incidentally – to indecent content, including sexual exploitation and cyberbullying [4], which makes them vulnerable to experience considerable psychological harm [5]. This has led the Australian government to ban children younger than age 16 from having social media accounts [6], legislation that is also being considered by the UK government and is currently under consultation. Given the substantial rise in prevalence of young people being exposed to indecent online content since the COVID 19 pandemic, UNICEF recommends acknowledging and including cyberspace as a key environment where abuse in childhood can take place [4,5].

We agree with Chang & Su [1] that AI can further amplify harm and reinforce cyberbullying. At the same time, AI may offer powerful tools for the prevention and intervention of cyberbullying, including the real-time monitoring of vast volumes of online interactions that humans cannot otherwise monitor [7]. Consequently, AI has the potential to both intensify and mitigate digital harm. Focusing on prevention, research might consider how to 1) reduce digital harm using AI pre-emptively; 2) detect patterns of repeated, targeted harassment rather than isolated incidents; and 3) identify coordinated group attacks [8]. AI actions in response to digital harm should be organised to prompt users to reconsider their use of aggressive language and to provide victims with immediate support.

The current lack of ACE assessments addressing potential digital harm and abuse is a striking omission that urgently needs our attention. However, as alluded to by Chang & Su [1], the key to including these types of digital harm or abuse effectively and appropriately will be to fully understand the lived experiences. Furthermore, given the rapid development and changes in the digital environment, for any assessment to remain relevant and current, the developed tools will need to be responsive to change and include flexibility. To be able to achieve these two key aims for ACEs assessment, the involvement of PWLE, especially young adults with negative online experience, will be critical.

As platforms and social media evolve and technologies such as AI develop, the ACE questionnaires should be able to capture the following three aspects: asking questions that are general in concept, specific in structure, and flexible for adjustment, to allow cross-cultural adaptability through translations [9-12].

Specifically, when creating ACE questionnaires, while it is important to be specific, precise and ask clear questions, the items need to be broad enough to encompass different contexts and easy to answer. Well-structured questions that are both structurally specific and conceptually generic will ensure that respondents understand them and can provide accurate, relevant answers to these questionnaires. For example, in the context of cyberbullying, the ACE questions may focus on repeated harassment, social exclusion through digital or online communications, humiliation, and online threats. These items represent a broad context rather than provide specific examples of what might have happened (e.g., posting comments meant to shame someone [13-14]). In this way, ACE questions can capture behavioural constructs rather than lists of behaviours. With respect to

flexibility, ACE questionnaires need to be applicable and usable across different cultures, age groups and settings. To accomplish this, all questions, but especially those about cyberbullying, need to use non-culture-specific terms (i.e., avoid slang and colloquialisms), so that they can be translated without loss of meaning across languages [15].

To this end, based on the findings of our systematic review, we have co-developed with our Consortium Against Pain Inequality (CAPE) - Chronic Pain Advisory Group (CPAG) a new ACEs questionnaire, called the CAPE-ACEQ, which includes new items reflecting negative experience or harm due to online indecent content. Evaluation of the psychometrical qualities of CAPE-ACEQ is currently underway and the instrument is anticipated to be available soon.

Statements

Acknowledgement (optional)

The authors of this study are members of the Advanced Pain Discovery Platform and the Consortium Against Pain Inequality (CAPE) studying the impact of adverse childhood experiences on pain and responses to treatment.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

Funding Sources

This study was supported by a UKRI and Versus Arthritis Grant: MR/W002566/1

Author Contributions

LC took the lead on drafting the content and writing of the letter.

AC, TGH and LAC provided meaningful and comprehensive feedback and additional content on the letter drafts and have approved the final version of the letter.

References [Numerical]

1. Chang JP, Su KP. Adverse childhood experiences (ACEs) in the digital era: an urgent call for precision assessment. *Psychother Psychosom*. 2026.
2. Mosler F, et al. Assessing exposure to childhood adversity in adults: a systematic review of validated self-report childhood adversity questionnaires. *Psychother Psychosom*. 2025;1-24.
3. Luria M, Bhatia A. The kids are online. 2025.
4. Youssef E, et al. Online risks and parental mediation in social media usage among kids: a quantitative study in Rawalpindi City. *Front Commun*. 2025;9:1521814.
5. UNICEF. COVID-19 and its implications for protecting children online. 2020 Apr. Available from: <https://www.unicef.org/media/67396/file/COVID-19%20and%20Its%20Implications%20for%20Protecting%20Children%20Online.pdf>
6. Australian Government Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications and the Arts. Online safety amendment (social media minimum age) bill 2024 – fact sheet. 2024 Dec 4. Available from: <https://www.infrastructure.gov.au/department/media/publications/online-safety-amendment-social-media-minimum-age-bill-2024-fact-sheet>
7. Miklóssyová L. Using artificial intelligence in combatting cyber harassment and cyber bullying. In: *The use of algorithms in criminal law*. Abingdon: Routledge; 2025. p.189-200.
8. Chaudhary PK, Yalamati S, Palakurti NR, Alam N, Kolasani S, Whig P. Detecting and preventing child cyberbullying using generative artificial intelligence. In: *2024 Asia Pacific Conference on Innovation in Technology (APCIT)*; 2024 Jul. Piscataway (NJ): IEEE; 2024. p.1-5.
9. Alipour-Aghdam M. Ontology-driven generic questionnaire design [dissertation]. Guelph (ON): University of Guelph; 2014.
10. McLennan JD, MacMillan HL, Afifi TO. Questioning the use of adverse childhood experiences (ACEs) questionnaires. *Child Abuse Negl*. 2020;101:104331.
11. Repke L, Dorer B. Translate wisely! An evaluation of close and adaptive translation procedures in an experiment involving questionnaire translation. *Int J Sociol*. 2021;51(2):135-62.
12. Slattery EL, Voelker CC, Nussenbaum B, Rich JT, Paniello RC, Neely JG. A practical guide to surveys and questionnaires. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2011;144(6):831-7.
13. Patchin JW, Hinduja S. Measuring cyberbullying: implications for research. *Aggress Violent Behav*. 2015;23:69-74.
14. Nocentini A, Calmaestra J, Schultze-Krumbholz A, Scheithauer H, Ortega R, Menesini E. Cyberbullying: labels, behaviours and definition in three European countries. *Aust J Guid Couns*. 2010;20(2):129-42.
15. Bradley CL. Translation of questionnaires for use in different languages and cultures. In: Bradley C, editor. *Handbook of psychology and diabetes*. Abingdon: Routledge; 2013. p.43-55.