Downloaded from bjo.bmj.com on 26 February 2007

Cataract visual impairment and quality of life in a Kenyan population

Sarah Polack, Hannah Kuper, Wanjiku Mathenge, Astrid Fletcher and Allen Foster

Br. J. Ophthalmol. published online 1 Feb 2007;
doi:10.1136/bjo.2006.110973

Updated information and services can be found at:
http://bjo.bmj.com/cgi/content/abstract/bjo.2006.110973v1

These include:

Rapid responses You can respond to this article at:
http://bjo.bmj.com/cgi/eletter-submit/bjo.2006.110973v1

Email alerting service Receive free email alerts when new articles cite this article - sign up in the box at the top right corner of the article

Notes

Online First contains unedited articles in manuscript form that have been peer reviewed and accepted for publication but have not yet appeared in the paper journal (edited, typeset versions may be posted when available prior to final publication). Online First articles are citable and establish publication priority; they are indexed by PubMed from initial publication. Citations to Online First articles must include the digital object identifier (DOIs) and date of initial publication.

To order reprints of this article go to:
http://www.bmjjournals.com/cgi/reprintform

To subscribe to *British Journal of Ophthalmology* go to:
http://www.bmjjournals.com/subscriptions/

Downloaded from bjo.bmj.com on 26 February 2007
BJO Online First, published on February 1, 2007 as 10.1136/bjo.2006.110973

Cataract visual impairment and quality of life in a Kenyan population

Sarah Polack[1], Hannah Kuper[1] , Wanjiku Mathenge[2], Astrid Fletcher[1] and Allen Foster[1]

[1]London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, Keppel Street London, WC1E 7HT
[2] Rift Valley Provincial General Hospital, Nakuru Town, Nakuru, Kenya

Corresponding Author: Sarah Polack
London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, Keppel Street, London, WC1E 7HT
E-mail: sarah.polack@lshtm.ac.uk
Tel: +44(0)20 7927 2917
Fax: +44 (0)20 7958 8317

Key words: Cataract, Kenya, Quality of Life

Manuscript word count: 2582

Copyright Article author (or their employer) 2007. Produced by BMJ Publishing Group Ltd under licence.

Downloaded from bjo.bmj.com on 26 February 2007

ABSTRACT

Aims

To evaluate the WHO/PBD VF20, a vision-related quality of life scale, and to describe the relationship between cataract visual impairment and vision- and generic- health related quality of life, in people ≥50 years in Nakuru district, Kenya.

Methods

The WHO/PBD VF20 was pilot tested and modified. 196 cases visually impaired from cataract and 128 population-based controls without visually impairing cataract were identified through a district-wide survey. Additional cases were identified through case finding. Vision- and health-related quality of life were assessed using the WHO/PBD VF20 scale and EuroQol generic health instrument (EQ-5D) respectively. WHO/PBD VF20 was evaluated using standard psychometric tests including factor analysis to determine item grouping for summary scores.

Results

The modified WHO/PBD VF20 demonstrated good psychometric properties. Two subscales (general functioning and psychosocial) and one overall eyesight rating item were appropriate for these data. Increased severity of visual impairment in cases was associated with worsening general functioning, psychosocial and overall eyesight scores (*P* for trend <0.001). Cases were more likely to report problems with EQ-5D descriptive dimensions than controls (p<0.001) and among cases increased severity of visual impairment was associated with worsening self-rated health score.

Conclusion

The modified WHO/PBD VF20 is a valid and reliable scale to assess vision related quality of life associated with cataract visual impairment in this Kenyan population. The association between health related quality of life and visual impairment reflects the wider health and well-being implications of cataract, beyond visual acuity alone.

Downloaded from bjo.bmj.com on 26 February 2007

INTRODUCTION

Cataract is the leading cause of blindness and low vision worldwide, estimated to be responsible for at least 17.7 of the 37 million cases of blindness in the world.(1) Cataract extraction is one of the most cost-effective medical interventions(2) and yet, coverage of cataract surgery in low-income countries remains low. (3)

Visual impairment and outcomes from sight restoring surgery have traditionally been assessed using objective clinical measures, such as visual acuity (VA). In recent years, however, there has been increasing recognition of the importance of assessing patients' views regarding the impact of medical conditions and interventions and quality of life assessment has gained increasing interest and acceptance.(4)

Vision related (disease specific) quality of life scales assess patient's experiences of visual acuity. In contrast, generic health related scales are designed to be applicable to a range of conditions, interventions and populations. The majority of studies assessing the association between cataract and quality of life are from high-income countries.(5-9) Many well validated scales exist for evaluating vision function (VF) and vision related QOL (VRQOL) in these settings.(10) Fewer scales and studies exist for low-income settings and in particular for Africa.(11, 12) No studies exploring the impact of cataract on wider health related quality of life in low-income countries were identified. Recently the World Health Organization recommended that more attention be given to the assessment of VF and VRQOL in people with visual impairment and highlighted the need for cross-cultural methods.(13) Based on this, the Indian VF33 questionnaire(14) which was developed through focus group discussion and psychometric evaluation, was reviewed to produce a 20 item visual functioning questionnaire (WHO/PBD VFQ-20). It was recommended that this scale be validated by field testing(13) but this has not occurred to date.

This study aimed to evaluate the WHO/PBD VFQ20, a new VRQOL instrument, and describe the relationship between cataract visual impairment and vision- and health- related quality of life, in people ≥50 years in a district of Kenya.

Downloaded from bjo.bmj.com on 26 February 2007

METHODS

Study Population

This study was conducted in Nakuru district between February and June 2005 as part of a wider case control study to evaluate the impact of cataract surgery on quality of life and poverty. To estimate the required number of cases (visually impaired from cataract) and controls (no visual impairment), sample size calculations were based on previous findings of a difference in mean VRQOL of at least one third. (14, 15) The power to detect this difference required a sample of 133 cases and 133 controls, with an alpha of 0.01 and 80% power.

Cases were recruited through 3 methods: a population based survey of 3,500 adults ≥50 years, using systematic cluster sampling with probability proportionate to size (82 cases)(16) ; community based case detection (65 cases) using the same cluster sampling procedure and the first 50 patients attending the Rift Valley Hospital, Nakuru who met the case definition. This hospital is the main centre for cataract surgery in Nakuru district and serves people from across the district. Three different methods were employed due to logistical and time constraints. Procedures for ophthalmic examination, case selection criteria and consent were the same in each.

Ophthalmic examination and case definition

The case definition was people aged ≥50 years with best corrected visual acuity <6/24 in the better eye due to cataract, living in Nakuru district. All clinical examinations and diagnosis were made by ophthalmologists. Visual acuity (VA) was measured with available correction using a tumbling 'E' chart. For each case in the survey, one or two age- and sex- matched control subjects (VA ≥6/18), were randomly selected from the same cluster.

Vision Related Quality of life

The WHO/PBD VFQ20(13) was translated into Swahili and two local languages (Kikuyu and Kalenjin) and back-translated by independent translators who were asked to comment on the appropriateness of language used for the target population. A review was held to discuss differences in the translations and to modify it accordingly. The scale was pilot tested on 20 patients in the eye unit, Nakuru district hospital and small modifications to the wording of some items were made to ensure local understanding. One question 'how much difficulty do you have in seeing because of glare from bright lights' caused difficulties for respondents from rural areas where there was a lack of electricity or car lights. Following consultation with an ophthalmologist this question was removed. For test-retest reliability assessment, the questionnaire was administered to 20 patients at the eye unit, Nakuru hospital in the afternoon and again the next morning by the same interviewer.

Health Related Quality of Life

To assess health related quality of life, items from the European Quality of Life Questionnaire (EQ-5D) were used. This scale was designed by the EuroQol group to be brief, simple, and practical to use in surveys alongside disease specific measures.(17) Evidence of validity and reliability in high- and low-income settings has been demonstrated.(18-20) The EQ5D includes two components. The first consists of 5 descriptive dimensions: mobility, self care, usual activity, pain/discomfort and anxiety/depression, each with three response options: no problem, some problem or extreme problem. The second is a Visual Analogue Scale (VAS), with scores ranging from 0 ('worst imaginable health state') to 100 ('best imaginable health state'). Respondents are asked to indicate on the scale where they rate their 'own health state today'. For all study members this scale was described verbally enabling those cases unable to see the scale, to respond. The same translation procedure described above was used to

Downloaded from bjo.bmj.com on 26 February 2007

translate the EQ-5D. However, due to time constraints, this was carried out independently from the Euroqol group and the versions used in this study have therefore not been approved by the Euroqol group.

Interviews
Six interviewers were trained for one week and interviews were observed periodically throughout the study.

Ethical considerations
Informed signed or thumb-printed consent was obtained from all study subjects. All cases were offered free cataract surgery at the district hospital. People with visual impairment but not eligible to be study cases were examined and referred to the district hospital accordingly. Ethical approval for this study was obtained from the ethics committees of the London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine and the Kenya Medical Research Institute.

Statistical Analysis

Visual acuity
For analysis, presenting VA in the better eye with available correction was grouped into the following categories: normal vision (≥6/18, controls only) moderate visual impairment (< 6/24 ≥ 6/60), severe visual impairment (<6/60 ≥3/60), blind (<3/60 >PL) and Perception of light (PL).

Vision Related QOL
Validity and reliability of the WHO/PBD VF20 (minus one item) were evaluated by standard psychometric methods, including item acceptability, internal consistency, test-re-test reliability, within scale analyses and analyses against external criteria, and using thresholds specified by Lamping et al. (21) Analyses were conducted on data from cases only, except for testing the ability of the scale to differentiate between groups known to be different, which compared cases and controls. Three sub-scales were originally proposed; visual symptoms (3 items); general functioning (12 items) and psychosocial (4 items) with 1 overall eyesight rating item. As modifications were made, a rotated exploratory factor analysis was conducted to determine how items should be grouped for summary scores. Maximum likelihood estimation was used and the number of distinct factors in the scale were taken as those with eigenvalues >1. (22)

Covariates
Standard socio-demographic data and indicators of socio-economic status were collected as they have been shown to influence QOL. (14) A socio-economic-status (SES) index was calculated for each household using Principle Components Analysis (PCA) to determine weights for a list of assets and wealth indicators using the method of Filmer and Pritchett (2001) (23) Variables entered into the PCA included building materials of the house, ownership of household assets, animal ownership and education of the head of the household. Assets and wealth indicators included in the PCA were selected based on published literature and discussion with local key informants. The index was created using STATA (V9; College Station, Texas) and was divided into quartiles from poorest (lowest SES index) to least poor (highest SES index).

The associations between QOL measures, VA and socio-economic variables were assessed initially using ANOVA (WHO/PBD VF20 sub-scales and EQ5D VAS score) and chi-square

Downloaded from bjo.bmj.com on 26 February 2007

(EQ5D dimensions). Multivariate linear or logistic (as appropriate) regression analysis were conducted using forward selection of variables, forcing age and gender into the models.

All analyses were conducted using STATA (V9; College Station, Texas).

Downloaded from bjo.bmj.com on 26 February 2007

RESULTS

196 cases and 128 controls were included. Controls were younger, more likely to have had some education and were in higher socio-economic groups than cases (Table 1.)

Table 1 Characteristics of cases and controls

	Cases		Controls			Age and sex adjusted odds ratio (95% CI)	
	N	(%)	N	(%)			
Age							
50-59	9	(4.6)	11	(8.6)		Baseline	
60-69	34	(17.4)	30	(23.4)		1.3	(0.5-3.8)
70-79	66	(33.7)	51	(39.8)		1.6	(0.6-4.1)
≥80	87	(44.4)	36	(28.1)		2.9	(1.1-7.8)
Sex							
Male	79	(40.3)	51	(39.8)		Baseline	
Female	117	(59.7)	77	(60.2)		1.0	(0.6-1.6)
Education							
None	148	(76.7)	74	(58.7)		Baseline	
Some	45	(23.3)	52	(41.3)		0.4	(0.2-0.7)
Literacy							
Can't read	148	(75.9)	65	(50.8)		Baseline	
Can read	47	(24.1)	63	(49.2)		0.3	(0.1-0.5)
Marital Status							
Single/widowed	110	(56.7)	59	(46.8)		Baseline	
Married	84	(43.3)	67	(53.2)		0.7	(0.4-1.2)
Socio-economic status							
1 (poorest)	57	(29.8)	22	(17.9)		Baseline	
2	52	(27.2)	27	(22.0)		0.8	(0.4-1.6)
3	46	(24.1)	35	(28.5)		0.5	(0.3-1.0)
4 (least poor)	36	(18.9)	39	(31.7)		0.4	(0.2-0.8)
Visual acuity							
≥6/18	0	(0.0)	128	(100.0)		N/A	
< 6/24 ≥ 6/60	78	(39.8)	0	(0.0)			
<6/60 ≥3/60	41	(20.9)	0	(0.0)			
<3/60 ≥PL	36	(18.4)	0	(0.0)			
PL	41	(20.9)	0	(0.0)			
	Mean	(95% CI)	Mean	(95% CI)	P-value		
Vision related quality of life[a]							
Overall eyesight	3.9	(3.9-4.1)	2.1	(2.0-2.3)	<0.001		
General Functioning	43.6	(41.5-45.8)	17.8	(16.6-19.1)	<0.001		
Psychosocial	12.2	(11.4-12.9)	5.5	(5.0-6.0)	<0.001		
Self rated health[b]	47.6	(45.1-50.1)	59.4	(56.3-62.5)	<0.001		

Some data were missing

[a] higher score denotes poorer quality of life

[b] higher score denotes better self rated health

Downloaded from bjo.bmj.com on 26 February 2007

Vision Related Quality of Life

The WHO/PBD VF20 fulfilled most standard psychometric criteria. The proportion of missing data for each item was <1%. Floor and ceiling effects were less than 80% for each item and for summary scores (i.e. less than 80% people endorsed response categories at the top and bottom of the scale for each item and for the summary scores) (Table 2). Ten items in the general functioning sub-scale had inter-item correlations (i.e. correlations with other items in the same sub-scale) above the maximum criteria of 0.75, which suggests some item redundancy. Two distinct factors were identified from the factor analysis. All originally proposed general functioning items, plus one visual symptom item loaded onto factor 1 and all proposed psychosocial items loaded onto factor 2; suggesting for these data two sub-scales, general functioning and psychosocial, are appropriate. One visual symptom item 'because of your eyesight how much pain and discomfort do you have in your eyes' did not load well onto either factor. Since the pain/discomfort item did not clearly belong with either of the sub-scales, it was analysed separately. Good sub-scale internal consistency was demonstrated by high cronbach alpha and item-total correlations (Table 2). Test-retest correlations were above the acceptable level of 0.80.

Table 2 Internal consistency and skewness values for WHO/PBD VF20 summary scores

	Inter-item Range (mean)	Item-total Range (mean)	Cronbach alpha	Skewness
Overall eyesight	-	-	-	-0.59
General Functioning	0.33-0.88 (0.70)	0.61-0.93 (0.85)	0.96	-0.15
Psychosocial	0.62 -0.80 (0.72)	0.82-0.92 (0.89)	0.91	-0.28
Pain/discomfort in eye	-	-	-	0.21

Cases had significantly poorer general functioning, psychosocial, overall eyesight and pain/discomfort scores than controls, satisfying known-group differences criteria (Table 1). The scale showed good convergent validity; poorer VA was associated with poorer mean general functioning, psychosocial and overall eyesight rating scores (test for trend $p<0.001$). The exception was the pain/discomfort item which was not significantly associated with visual acuity. Discriminant validity findings were mixed. Age was not associated with mean VRQOL scores among cases. However cases in the lower SES group had poorer general functioning (P for trend<0.001) and self-rated eyesight scores ($p=0.04$). Widowed/single cases had poorer psychosocial scores ($p=0.004$). Women, widowed/single cases and cases with no formal education reported poorer pain/discomfort scores. In multivariate analyses (Table 3) controlling for visual acuity, overall eyesight and general functioning scores were worse in poorer cases and widowed/single cases were more likely to have poorer psychosocial scores. There were no significant multivariate predictors of pain/discomfort in the eye among the cases.

Downloaded from bjo.bmj.com on 26 February 2007

Table 3 Forward selection multivariate linear regression analyses of WHO/PBD VF20 scores, presenting visual acuity and socio-demographic variables in cases visually impaired from cataract. Higher score denotes poorer VRQOL.

	Model 1: Overall Eyesight Multivariate adjusted mean	(95% CI)	**Model 2: General Functioning** Multivariate adjusted mean	(95% CI)	**Model 3: Psychosocial** Multivariate adjusted mean	(95% CI)
Presenting Visual Acuity						
< 6/24 ≥ 6/60	3.7	(3.6-3.9)	36.5	(33.7-39.3)	10.7	(9.4-11.8)
<6/60 ≥3/60	3.7	(3.7-4.1)	39.2	(33.6-39.3)	10.9	(9.3-12.6)
<3/60 ≥PL	4.0	(3.8-4.2)	47.2	(43.1-51.3)	14.2	(12.4-16.1)
PL	4.7	(4.5-4.9)	59.2	(55.3-63.1)	14.5	(12.9-16.1)
P for trend	<0.001		<0.001		<0.001	
Age						
50-59	4.2	(3.9-4.1)	41	(32.2-49.8)	11.5	(7.8-15.3)
69-69	3.9	(3.7-4.1)	40.5	(36.3-44.7)	11.1	(9.3-12.9)
70-79	4.0	(3.8-4.1)	44.9	(41.8-47.9)	13.0	(11.7-14.3)
≥80	4.0	(3.9-4.2)	44.4	(41.8-47.0)	12.0	(10.9-13.2)
P for trend	0.54		0.14		0.47	
Sex						
Male	3.9	(3.8-4.1)	43.8	(40.9-46.6)	12.3	(11.0-13.6)
Female	4.0	(3.9-4.1)	43.7	(41.4-46.0)	12.1	(11.0-13.1)
SES						
1 (poorest)	4.2	(4.0-4.4)	49.9	(46.6-53.1)		
2	4.0	(3.8-4.2)	43.3	(40.0-46.7)	-	-
3	3.9	(3.8-4.2)	39.3	(35.7-42.9)	-	-
4 (least poor)	3.7	(3.5-3.9)	40.1	(36.0-44.3)	-	-
P for trend	0.001		<0.001			
Marital status						
Married	-	-	-	-	10.6	(9.4-11.9)
Widowed/single	-	-	-	-	13.3	(12.2-14.4)
Amount of variance explained by VA (full model)	23.5%	(25.6%)	30.0%	(37.6%)	7.8%	(12.1%)

Age and sex were always included in the model and adjusted means are presented
- Did not contribute significantly to the model

Health Related Quality of Life

All five EQ-5D dimensions discriminated between cases and controls (Table 4). Among cases, adjusting for covariates, poorer visual acuity was associated with higher odds of reporting any problem with mobility (*P* for trend =0.003), self care (*P* for trend <0.001), usual

Downloaded from bjo.bmj.com on 26 February 2007

activities (*P* for trend=0.008) and pain/discomfort (*P* for trend =0.01). There was no significant association with depression.

Table 4: Response distribution to EQ5D domains and adjusted odds ratios in cases and controls

EQ-5D Domain	Cases N	(%)	Controls N	(%)	Adjusted Odds Ratio[a]	(95% CI)	p-value
Mobility							
No problem	65	(33.2)	93	(72.7)	Baseline		<0.001
Some problem	118	(60.2)	35	(27.3)	5	(3.0-8.2)[d]	
Confined to bed	13	(6.6)	0	(0.0)	-	-	
Self-Care							
No problems	106	(54.1)	114	(89.1)	Baseline[b]		<0.001
Some problems	74	(37.8)	14	(10.9)	6.2	(3.3-11.7)[d]	
Unable	16	(8.2)	0	(0.0)	-	-	
Usual Activities							
No problems	44	(22.5)	93	(72.7)	Baseline		<0.001
Some problems	103	(52.6)	33	(25.8)	8.9	(5.2-15.1)[d]	
Unable	49	(25.0)	2	(1.6)	-	-	
Pain/discomfort							
None	30	(15.3)	47	(36.7)	Baseline[c]		<0.001
Moderate	131	(66.8)	75	(58.6)	2.7	(1.5-4.8)	
Extreme	35	(17.9)	6	(4.7)	6.8	(2.5-18.9)	
Anxiety/depression							
None	40	(20.4)	64	(50.0)	Baseline[c]		<0.001
Moderate	96	(49.0)	57	(44.5)	2.8	(1.6-4.8)	
Extreme	60	(30.6)	7	(5.5)	13.9	(5.4-35.9)	

[a] Odds ratio's from forward selection multivariate logistic regression with age and sex always included in the model
[b] Adjusted for age and sex
[c] Adjusted for age, sex and literacy
[d] due to small cell sizes 'some problem' and 'severe problem' were combined to calculate odds ratios for 'any problem'

Self-rated health score was worse in cases than controls (P<0.001) (Table 1) and mean health score worsened with increasing severity of visual impairment in cases (Table 5). Widowed/single and cases in the lower SES groups had lower mean health scores.

Downloaded from bjo.bmj.com on 26 February 2007

Table 5: A forward selection multivariate linear regression analysis of self-rated health (from visual analogue scale), visual acuity and socio-demographic variables.

	Self-rated health score	
	Coefficient	(95% CI)
Visual acuity		
< 6/24 ≥ 6/60	Baseline	
<6/60 ≥3/60	0.5	(-6.2-7.2)
<3/60 ≥PL	-6.2	(-13.2-0.8)
PL	-9.6	(-16.3 - -3.0)
P for trend	0.001	
Age		
50-59	Baseline	
69-69	4.5	(-9.6-18.7)
70-79	12.9	(-0.8-26.6)
≥80	7.2	(-6.4-20.8)
P for trend	0.66	
Sex		
Male	Baseline	
Female	1.4	(-4.7-7.5)
Socio-economic status		
1 (poorest)	Baseline	
2	8.3	(1.7-14.8)
3	8.3	(1.7-14.9)
4 (least poor)	10.7	(3.3-18.1)
P for trend	0.009	
Marital status		
Single/widowed	Baseline	
Married	6.7	(0.4-12.8)

Downloaded from bjo.bmj.com on 26 February 2007

DISCUSSION

This study evaluated the WHO/PBD VF20, an instrument recommended for measuring VRQOL in low-income settings, in Nakuru district, Kenya. To our knowledge no other studies have explored the association between visual impairment from cataract and quality of life in Kenya.

The results show that the modified WHO/PBD VFQ20, with one overall rating item and two subscales, (general functioning and psychosocial) is a valid and reliable scale in this Kenyan setting. One item about glare was removed, but may have more relevance in other settings. The item about pain in the eye did not correlate well with other items in the scale. Cases reported worse pain scores than controls, however amongst the cases, there was no significant variation in pain score with visual acuity. Pain and discomfort are not typical symptoms of cataract, but this item may be more relevant for other ocular morbidities. However, it was not included in the original INDVFQ33 which was developed based on 46 focus group discussions exploring patient's perceptions about their eye conditions and associated impact on daily living.(24) There was some redundancy in items, suggesting that it may be possible to shorten this questionnaire further, though the full questionnaire should be evaluated in other settings to confirm this.

Cases were more likely to report problems with the EQ-5D dimensions than controls, Increasing severity of visual impairment was associated with higher odds of reporting problems with mobility, self-care, usual activities and pain/discomfort and mean self-rated health score. These findings correspond with studies from high-income settings(5), and highlight an impact of visual impairment on wider well-being that is not necessarily reflected by vision related scales.

Socio-demographic and economic variables influenced response independent of visual acuity. This is in accordance with other studies(5, 14) and suggests experiences of visual impairment may vary according to individual circumstances. In a study in Hong Kong, Lau et al comment that despite comparable VA and using the same scale, mean VRQOL scores were better than in China and Nepal and suggest this may be due to differences in modern household utilities which facilitate self care activities.(25) A similar reason may explain why cases in the lower SES groups in Nakuru had worse general functioning scores. Promotion of surgical services at early stages of cataract in poor communities should remain a priority. Being widowed/single increased the social and emotional burden of cataract visual impairment, as reflected by poorer psychosocial scores compared to married people. In contrast, but in accordance with findings from the INDVFQ 33 in India(14) there was no association between VRQOL scores and age or sex.

There were limitations in this study. Three different case recruitment methods were used. However all cases were from the same district and met the same case definition. According to power calculations, 133 controls were required for the study, but only 128 were identified. However, the power calculations were based on very conservative estimates, so the effect of this is likely to be minimal. The WHO/PBD VF20 was recommended as an instrument to assess all ocular morbidities and we focussed only on cataract. Further we focussed only on people ≥50 years and the scale may perform differently in other age groups. However, the original INDVFQ 33 was also developed in people aged ≥50 and, although other eye conditions were included, was largely dominated by cataract, reflecting the relative importance of this condition in the India setting. Our results indicated that some items in the Kenyan setting were not relevant or were redundant. Future studies should look at the

Downloaded from bjo.bmj.com on 26 February 2007

performance of the full WHO QOL20 scale in other populations or other disease groups. The translation of the EQ-5D questionnaire was not validated by the Euroqol group, though standard translation procedures were followed. Multiple tests of statistical significance for correlated measures were made using these data. However analyses were repeated using the Bonferroni correction and the multivariate analyses were essentially unchanged.

In this study, evidence of validity and reliability of a new scale were demonstrated and data suggest this scale would be suitable for assessing outcome of cataract surgery. The findings add weight to evidence of disability and poorer perception of own health associated with cataract visual impairment in an African country.

Downloaded from bjo.bmj.com on 26 February 2007

Acknowledgements:
The authors would like to thank all the participants from Nakuru district who took part in the survey. We thank the office manager (Redempta Muibu), the ophthalmologists (Oscar Onyango, Godfrey Nyaga, Tina Eusebio), the ophthalmic clinical officers (Maurice Oduoo, Flora Kosgey, Devina Kisorio and Maina James), the interviewers (Philip Lumula, Nimmo Gicheru, Marie Anne Cege, Emma Kamau, Mike Kepkembai, Agnes Maingi and Rose Kagwe), the information officer (Irene Chelagat), the drivers (Daniel Mutai, John and Sammy) and data entry clerks (Faith Lumula and Terry). The Rift Valley Provincial Hospital kindly offered us office space on their premises. The great assistance of the Medical Officer of Health, Nakuru, and the Electoral Commission Office in Nakuru is acknowledged.

Competing Interests:
None

Funding:
This study was funded by grants from Sight Savers International, Christian Blind Mission and ORBIS International.

Exclusive Licence
The Corresponding Author has the right to grant on behalf of all authors and does grant on behalf of all authors, an exclusive licence (or non exclusive for government employees) on a worldwide basis to the BMJ Publishing Group Ltd and its Licensees to permit this article (if accepted) to be published in BJO and any other BMJPGL products to exploit all subsidiary rights, as set out in our licence (http://bjo.bmjjournals.com/ifora/licence.pdf)

Downloaded from bjo.bmj.com on 26 February 2007

REFERENCES

1 Resnikoff S, Pascolini D, Etya'ale D, et al. Global data on visual impairment in the year 2002. Bull World Health Organ. 2004;82:844-51.
2 Javitt J, Venkataswamy G, Sommer A. The economic and social aspect of restoring sight. In: Henkind P, editor. ACTA: 24th International Congress of Ophthalmology. New York: JP Lippincott; 1983. p. 1308-12.
3 Foster A. Vision 2020: the cataract challenge. J Comm Eye Health. 2000;13(34):17-9.
4 Ellwein LB, Fletcher A, Negrel AD, et al. Quality of life assessment in blindness prevention interventions. Int Ophthalmol. 1994;18(5):263-8.
5 Wang JJ, Mitchell P, Smith W. Vision and low self-rated health: the Blue Mountains Eye Study. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci. 2000;41(1):49-54.
6 Crabtree HL, Hildreth AJ, O'Connell JE, et al. Measuring visual symptoms in British cataract patients: the cataract symptom scale. Br J Ophthalmol. 1999;83(5):519-23.
7 Chia EM, Mitchell P, Rochtchina E, et al. Unilateral visual impairment and health related quality of life: the Blue Mountains Eye Study. Br J Ophthalmol. 2003;87(4):392-5.
8 Chan CWN, Wong JCC, Chan KSK et al. Evaluation of quality of life in patients with cataract in Hong Kong. J Cataract Refract Surg. 2003;29:1753-60.
9 Lee JE, Fos PJ, Zuniga MA, et al. Assessing quality of life in cataract patients: The relationship between utility and health-related quality of life measurement. Qual Life Res. 2000;9(1127-1135).
10 Massof RW, Rubin GS. Visual function assessment questionnaires. Surv Ophthalmol. 2001 May-Jun;45(6):531-48.
11 Schemann JF, Leplege A, Keita T, et al. From visual function deficiency to handicap: measuring visual handicap in Mali. Ophthalmic Epidemiol. 2002;9(2):133-48.
12 van Dijk K, Lewallen S, Chirambo M, et al. Creation and testing of a practical visual function assessment for use in Africa: correlation with visual acuity, contrast sensitivity, and near vision in Malawian adults. Br J Ophthalmol. 1999;83(7):792-5.
13 WHO. Consultation on development of standards for characterization of vision loss and visual functioning. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2003.
14 Gupta SK, Viswanath K, Thulasiraj RD, Murthy GVS, Lamping DL, Smith SC, et al. The Development of the Indian Vision Function Questionnaire (IND-VFQ): field testing and psychometric evaluation. Br J Ophthalmol. 2005;89(5):621-7.
15 Fletcher A, Vijaykumar V, Selvaraj S, et al. The Madurai Intraocular Lens Study. III: Visual functioning and quality of life outcomes. Am J Ophthalmol. 1998 Jan;125(1):26-35.
16 Mathenge W, Kuper H, Polack S, et al. Rapid Assessment of Avoidable Blindness in Nakuru District, Kenya. Ophthalmology. In press.
17 Rabin R, de Charro F. EQ-5D: a measure of health status from the EuroQol Group. Ann Med. 2001; 33(5):337-43.
18 Brazier J, Jones N, Kind P. Testing the validity of the Euroqol and comparing it with the SF-36 health survey questionnaire. Qual Life Res. 1993 2(3):169-80.
19 Hurst NP, Kind P, Ruta D, et al. Measuring health-related quality of life in rheumatoid arthritis: validity, responsiveness and reliability of EuroQol (EQ-5D). Br J Rheumatol. 1997;36(5):551-9.
20 Tidermark J, Bergstrom G, Svensson O, et al. Responsiveness of the EuroQol (EQ 5-D) and the SF-36 in elderly patients with displaced femoral neck fractures. Qual Life Res. 2003 Dec;12(8):1069-79.
21 Lamping DL, Schroter S, Marquis P, et al. The community-acquired pneumonia symptom questionnaire: a new, patient-based outcome measure to evaluate symptoms in patients with community-acquired pneumonia. Chest. 2002;122(3):920-9.

Downloaded from bjo.bmj.com on 26 February 2007

22 Hays RD, Fayers PM. Evaluating multi-item scales. In: Fayers PM, Hays RD, editors. Assessing quality of life in clinical trials Methods and practice. New York: Oxford University Press; 2005. p. 41-53.
23 Filmer D, Pritchett L. Estimating wealth effects without expenditure data - or tears. An application to educational enrolment in states of India. Demography. 2001;38(1):115-32.
24 Murthy GVS, Gupta SK, Thulasiraj RD, et al. The development of the Indian Vision Function Questionnaire (IND-VFQ): Questionnaire Content. Br J Ophthalmol. 2005;89(4):498-503.
25 Lau J, Michon JJ, Chan WS, et al. Visual acuity and quality of life outcomes in cataract surgery patients in Hong Kong. Br J Ophthalmol. 2002;86(1):12-7.