

**THE STUDY OF CORRELATION OF QUALITY OF LIFE
ASSESSMENT WITH VISUAL FUNCTION AMONG
KELANTAN GLAUCOMATOUS PATIENTS**

By

DR AZREEN REDZAL BIN ANUAR

MBBS

**Dissertation Submitted In Partial Fulfillment Of
The Requirements For The Degree Of Master Of Medicine
(OPHTHALMOLOGY)**



**SCHOOL OF MEDICAL SCIENCES
UNIVERSITI SAINS MALAYSIA**

2008

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

My sincere thanks to my supervisor, Associate Professor Mohtar Ibrahim, Cornea And Refractive Surgeon in the Department of Ophthalmology, School of Medical Sciences, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Kubang Kerian for his support, guidance and invaluable advice in the preparation of this dissertation and throughout the completion of my study.

Also my special thanks and appreciation to Associate Professor Wan Hazabbah Wan Hitam, Head of Department of Ophthalmology, School of Medical Sciences, Universiti Sains Malaysia, all lecturers and colleagues. My sincere gratitude to Dr. Ahmad Mt Saad, Head of Department of Ophthalmology, Hospital Alor Setar, for his encouragement and being a role model.

Special thanks to Dr. Sarimah and Dr. Tengku Alina who had never failed to guide me on the statistical analysis of this study. For both my parents, Anuar Bin Abdul Aziz, Rofiah Bt. Md Noor and Madan Bin Sumiran, Mariam Bt Abdullah, thank you so much for believing on me and praying for me throughout my study.

To my beloved wife, Dr. Neti Bt. Madan thank you for the constant support and sacrifices and lastly but not least, to all my childrens, Nurul Aqilah, Muhammad Zabir, Nurul Atikah and Muhammad Zakwan, far away in Kedah, forgive me for the valuable time loss seeing all of you growing up and without whom I could never completed my study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TITLE PAGE	i
DISCLAIMER	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
APPENDICES	xi
LISTS OF TABLES	xii
LISTS OF FIGURES	xiii
ABSTRAK	xv
ABSTRACT	xvii
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2: BACKGROUND	7
2.1 GLAUCOMA	8
2.1.1 Definition	8
2.1.2 Classification	8
2.1.3 Risk factors	9
2.1.4 Pathogenesis	9
2.1.5 Epidemiology	10
2.2 QUALITY OF LIFE	10
2.2.1 Health related quality of life	12

2.2.2	Quality of life and glaucoma	13
2.2.3	Different instrument of quality of life assessment	15
2.3	UTILITY ANALYSIS	17
2.3.1	Time trade off utility analysis	18
2.3.2	Advantages of utility analysis	19
2.4	NATIONAL EYE INSTITUTE VISUAL FUNCTION QUESTIONNAIRES (NEI VFQ 25)	21
2.4.1	Advantages of NEI VFQ 25	22
2.5	VISUAL FUNCTION	22
2.5.1	Visual field and quality of life in glaucoma	23
2.5.2	Binocular visual field	24
2.5.3	Estermann binocular visual field	25
2.5.3.1	Advantages of Esterman Binocular Visual Field Test	27
2.5.4	Conversion of Snellen visual acuity to LogMAR	29
CHAPTER 3: OBJECTIVES		31
3.1	GENERAL OBJECTIVE	32
3.2	SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE	32
CHAPTER 4: METHODOLOGY		34
4.1	RESEARCH STRATEGY	34
4.2	SUBJECT SELECTION	34

4.3	PERIOD OF STUDY	34
4.4	PLACE OF STUDY	34
4.5	ETHICAL BOARD APPROVAL	35
4.6	SAMPLING SIZE AND SAMPLING PROCEDURE	35
	4.6.1 Sample size	35
	4.6.2 Sampling procedure	36
	4.6.2.1 Flow chart of sampling procedure	36
4.7	SELECTION CRITERIA	38
	4.7.1 Inclusion criteria	38
	4.7.2 Exclusion criteria	38
4.8	DEFINITION OF TERMS	39
	4.8.1 Visual acuity	39
	4.8.2 Quality of life	39
	4.8.3 Visual function	40
	4.8.4 Modified utility analysis	40
	4.8.5 Modified NEI VFQ 25	40
	4.8.6 Cronbach`s alpha coefficient	41
	4.8.7 Glaucoma	41
	4.8.8 Visual field	41
4.9	RESEARCH TOOLS	42
	4.9.1 Visual acuity chart (Standard Snellen Chart)	42
	4.9.2 Slit lamp biomicroscope	42

4.9.3	Humphrey automated perimeter	43
4.9.4	Applanation tonometer	43
4.9.5	Lens set	43
4.10	DATA COLLECTION AND MANAGEMENT	43
4.10.1	Data or variables of study	43
4.10.1.1	Socio-demographic data	43
4.10.1.2	Ocular examination data	44
4.10.1.3	Questionnaires data	44
4.10.1.4	Binocular visual field data (Esterman binocular visual field)	45
4.10.2	Phases of the study	45
4.10.2.1	Flow chart of study	47
4.10.3	Translation of questionnaires	48
4.10.4	Pilot study	49
4.10.5	Patients interview	49
4.10.6	Reliability analysis	50
4.10.7	Subject and data collection	51
4.10.8	Statistical analysis	52
4.11.9	Methods to minimize error	56
CHAPTER 5:	RESULTS	57
5.1	SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS	58
5.2	CLINICAL CHARACTERISTICS	60

5.3	RELIABILITY OF MODIFIED NEI VFQ 25 QUESTIONNAIRE	62
5.4	DESCRIPTIVE STATISTIC OF MODIFIED NEI VFQ 25 AND UTILITY ANALYSIS	63
5.5	DESCRIPTIVE STATISTIC OF MODIFIED NEI VFQ 25. II SUBSCALES AND UTILITY ANALYSIS	66
5.6	DISTRIBUTION OF ESTERMAN BINOCULAR VISUAL FIELD. LOGMAR BETTER AND LOGMAR WORSE EYE	67
5.7	CORRELATION OF MODIFIED NEI VFQ 25 AND IT SUBSCALES. WITH VISUAL ACUITY AND BINOCULAR VISUAL FIELD	69
	5.7.1 Correlation of modified NEI VFQ 25 with LogMAR better eye	73
	5.7.2 Correlation of modified NEI VFQ 25 with LogMAR worse eye	74
	5.7.3 Correlation of modified NEI VFQ 25 with Esterman binocular visual field	75
5.8	CORRELATION OF MODIFIED UTILITY ANALYSIS WITH VISUAL ACUITY AND BINOCULAR VISUAL FIELD	76
	5.8.1 Correlation of modified utility analysis with LogMAR better eye	76
	5.8.2 Correlation of modified utility analysis with LogMAR worse eye	78
	5.8.3 Correlation of modified utility analysis with Esterman binocular visual field	79
CHAPTER 6:	DISCUSSION	81
	6.1 Glaucoma and health related quality of life	82
	6.2 Visual function impairment	82

6.3	Socio-demographic and clinical characteristics	83
6.4	Modified NEI VFQ 25 questionnaires	85
6.5	Mean score of modified NEI VFQ 25 and its subscales	88
6.6	Mean score of utility analysis (value)	89
6.7	Mean score of Esterman binocular visual field	90
6.8	Mean score of LogMAR better and worse eye	90
6.9	Correlation of modified NEI VFQ 25 and subscales with visual acuity	90
6.10	Correlation of modified NEI VFQ 25 and subscales with Esterman binocular visual field	92
6.11	Correlation of modified utility analysis with visual acuity	93
6.12	Correlation of modified utility analysis with Esterman binocular visual field	94
CHAPTER 7:	CONCLUSION	96
CHAPTER 8:	LIMITATION	99
CHAPTER 9:	RECOMMENDATION	101
REFERENCES		102

APPENDICES

Appendix A:	Demographic data sheet	109
Appendix B:	Ocular examination data form	110
Appendix C:	Modified NEI VFQ 25 questionnaires	111
Appendix D:	NEI VFQ 25 questionnaires	117
Appendix E:	Forward translation 1	124
Appendix F:	Forward translation 2	128
Appendix G:	Backward translation of reconciled version NEI VFQ 25	132
Appendix H:	Scoring system and scoring key for modified NEI VFQ 25	136
Appendix I:	Esterman binocular visual field graph	140
Appendix J:	Consent form	141

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 2.1	Estimated binocular visual field	25
Table 2.2	Conversion of Snellen visual acuity to LogMAR	30
Table 5.1	Demographic characteristic of the study samples	58
Table 5.2	Clinical characteristic of the study samples	60
Table 5.3	Reliability analysis	62
Table 5.4	Distribution of modified NEI VFQ 25 and utility analysis score	63
Table 5.5	Summary statistic for the mean value and standard deviation of the modified NEI VFQ 25, its subscales and utility analysis	66
Table 5.6	Distribution of Esterman binocular visual field, LogMAR better and LogMAR worse eye	67
Table 5.7	Pearson correlation for modified NEI VFQ 25, with visual acuity and visual field score	71
Table 5.8	Pearson correlation for modified NEI VFQ 25 subscales with visual acuity and visual field score	72
Table 5.9	Pearson correlation for modified utility analysis with visual acuity and visual field score	76
Table 6.1	Summary of correlation of visual function with quality of life questionnaires of different studies	95

LISTS OF FIGURES

	Page
Figure 2.1 Esterman binocular visual field plot / graph	28
Figure 4.1 Flow chart of sampling procedure	36
Figure 4.2 Flow chart of study	47
Figure 4.3 Standard Snellen Visual Acuity Chart	53
Figure 4.4 Slit lamp biomicroscope examination	54
Figure 4.5 Interview of the patient in person	54
Figure 4.6 Interview of the patient by telephone	55
Figure 4.7 Binocular visual field test using Humphrey Perimetry	55
Figure 5.1 Distribution of modified NEI VFQ 25 score	64
Figure 5.2 Distribution of utility analysis score	65
Figure 5.3 Distribution of the binocular visual field score	68
Figure 5.4 Distribution of LogMAR score	69
Figure 5.5 Scatter plot of modified NEI VFQ 25 with LogMAR better eye	73
Figure 5.6 Scatter plot of modified NEI VFQ 25 with LogMAR worse eye	74
Figure 5.7 Scatter plot of modified NEI VFQ 25 with Esterman binocular visual field score	75
Figure 5.8 Scatter plot of modified utility analysis with LogMAR better eye	77
Figure 5.9 Scatter plot of modified utility analysis with LogMAR worse eye	78
Figure 5.10 Scatter plot of modified utility analysis with Esterman binocular visual field	79

ABSTRAK

Pengenalan:

Pengukuran pengurangan fungsi penglihatan secara objektif seperti keluasan penglihatan dan kejitian penglihatan adalah tidak memadai dan tidak menggambarkan kualiti hidup pesakit glaukoma yang sebenar. Terkini, soalan-soalan mengenai kualiti hidup ialah cara terbaik untuk menilainya. Tidak banyak kajian dilakukan untuk menentukan korelasi antara keduanya.

Objektif:

Untuk menilai reliabiliti NEI VFQ 25 yang diubahsuai di kalangan pesakit glaukoma di Kelantan dan untuk menilai korelasi antara NEI VFQ 25 yang diubahsuai, analisis utiliti dengan pengurangan keluasan penglihatan dan kejitian penglihatan.

Metodologi:

Satu kajian lintang observasi telah dijalankan dari April hingga Oktober 2006. Sebagai permulaan, terjemahan bahasa pada soalan kajian telah dilakukan secara ke depan dan ke belakang. Kajian pilot telah dilakukan ke atas 30 pesakit glaukoma dengan menggunakan soalan yang telah diubahsuai. Proses mencari reliabiliti soalan telah dilakukan selepas kajian pilot. Seramai seratus tiga puluh empat pesakit terpilih dalam kajian tersebut. Pemeriksaan mata termasuk pemeriksaan kejitian penglihatan menggunakan carta Snellen telah dilakukan. Selepas itu, pesakit ditemuduga secara individu dengan menggunakan NEI VFQ 25 yang diubahsuai dan analisis utiliti. Akhir sekali, para pesakit melakukan ujian keluasan penglihatan (Esterman) pada kedua-dua mata secara serentak dengan menggunakan peralatan Carl Zeiss Humphrey.

Keputusan:

NEI VFQ 25 yang diubahsuai menunjukkan kekukuhan dalaman yang sederhana (Cronbach's alpha =0.74). NEI VFQ 25 diubahsuai menunjukkan korelasi positif yang penting dengan keluasan penglihatan (Esterman) pada kedua-dua mata ($P<0.001$). Terdapat korelasi negatif yang nyata antara NEI VFQ 25 yang diubahsuai dengan LogMAR kejitaan penglihatan pada mata yang baik ($P=0.009$) dan juga dengan LogMAR kejitaan penglihatan pada mata yang teruk ($P<0.001$). Skala di bawah NEI VFQ 25 yang diubahsuai menunjukkan korelasi yang tinggi dengan kejitaan penglihatan pada mata yang teruk dibandingkan dengan mata yang baik. Skala di bawah NEI VFQ 25 yang diubahsuai menunjukkan korelasi yang lemah hingga kuat dengan keluasan penglihatan (Esterman) pada kedua-dua mata. Korelasi negatif yang penting terdapat antara analisis utiliti yang diubahsuai dengan LogMAR kejitaan penglihatan pada mata yang baik ($P=0.010$) dan yang teruk. Korelasi positif yang penting terdapat antara analisis utiliti yang diubahsuai dengan keluasan penglihatan (Esterman) pada kedua-dua mata.

Kesimpulan:

Kesahihan dan reliability NEI VFQ 25 yang diubahsuai adalah mencukupi. NEI VFQ 25 yang diubahsuai boleh diaplikasikan pada populasi yang menggunakan Bahasa Melayu sebagai cara untuk menilai kualiti hidup. Korelasi penting terdapat antara NEI VFQ 25 yang diubahsuai dengan keluasan dan kejitaan penglihatan pesakit glaukoma. Analisis utiliti diubahsuai juga menunjukkan korelasi penting dengan keluasan dan kejitaan penglihatan pesakit glaukoma.

ABSTRACT

Introduction:

Objective approaches of measuring the visual function impairment such as visual field and visual acuity are inadequate and do not totally reflect the true quality of life in the glaucoma patients. Currently, questionnaires are used as the health related quality of life instruments. Only few studies have been done to assess the correlation between the two.

Objective:

To evaluate the reliability of the modified NEI VFQ 25 in the Kelantan glaucomatous patients and to correlate the modified NEI VFQ 25 and utility analysis to the visual field and visual acuity impairment.

Methods:

A cross sectional study was carried out from April to October 2006. Translation of the questionnaires by translation and back translation method was carried out first, followed by a pilot study on 30 glaucoma patients using the translated questionnaires. The process of reliability assessment on the questionnaires was done after the pilot study. There were 134 patients selected for the study. Ocular examination was carried out on the patients including the visual acuity assessment using the standard Snellen chart. After completion of the ocular examination, the patients underwent an interview by in person approach using the modified NEI VFQ 25 and utility analysis questionnaire. Lastly, the patients underwent the Esterman binocular visual field test using standard Carl Zeiss Humphrey Perimetry machine.

Results:

Cronbach's α for the modified NEI VFQ 25 was 0.740, indicating moderate internal consistency. The total modified NEI VFQ 25 showed significant positive correlation with Esterman binocular visual field ($P < 0.001$). A significant negative correlation noted between modified NEI VFQ 25 score with LogMAR visual acuity in the better eye ($P = 0.009$) and also with LogMAR visual acuity in the worse eye ($P < 0.001$). Modified NEI VFQ 25 subscale showed higher correlation with the visual acuity in worse eye compared to better eye. Modified NEI VFQ 25 subscale showed low to strong correlation with Esterman binocular visual field. A significant negative correlation was noted between modified utility analysis with LogMAR visual acuity in the better eye ($P = 0.010$) and also with LogMAR visual acuity in the worse eye ($P < 0.001$). A significant positive correlation was noted between modified utility analysis with Esterman binocular visual field ($P < 0.001$).

Conclusion:

The validity and reliability of the modified NEI VFQ 25 were shown to be sufficient. This questionnaire is applicable to the Malay-speaking population as quality of life instrument. A significant correlation noted between modified NEI VFQ 25 with visual field and visual acuity of glaucoma patients. The modified utility analysis also showed significant correlation with visual field and visual acuity of glaucoma patients.

CHAPTER 1: _____
INTRODUCTION

1. INTRODUCTION

Glaucoma is one of the major causes of visual impairment worldwide. It is ranked as the third cause of visual impairment and blindness, affecting an estimated 5.2 million persons (Thylefors et al, 1994), therefore it is important to know the quality of life of these patients. As the life expectancy of the people's increases and other preventable cause of blindness like cataract and refractive error decline, glaucoma will play a significant role as a cause of permanent visual loss.

Quality of life is an outcome measure which is difficult to quantify by the doctors but for the patients, it is very important. Every patient should be asked about his or her perception on current status and also the difficulties he or she face with daily tasks. Glaucoma affects the daily life of the patients through visual deterioration and its treatment. Glaucoma patients can lose quality of life due to the diagnosis, functional loss, inconvenience of treatment, side effects and cost of the treatment (Iester et al, 2002).

Glaucoma not only affect visual function and increased cost of treatment, but it also affect patients' health related quality of life (Shutimaporn et al, 2005). Only minimal information is known about the impact of glaucoma on the quality of life of the patients. More information is needed on the evaluation of patients' capabilities in performing visual tasks and also on the correlation of perceived disabilities with visual function tests.

Health related quality of life is a measure of a person's well being that focuses on the dimensions of physical functioning, social functioning, role functioning, mental health and general health perceptions (Wilson et al, 1995). Glaucoma has a major impact on the health related quality of life. This is because health related quality of life worsened after the diagnosis of the disease due to anxiety of blindness and it can also affects patients in the productive age group (Janz et al, 2001).

Permanent blindness for this group of patients will be a burden not only for their families, but also for their country. Different factors are involved in affecting health related quality of life including complications of the ocular diseases with impaired vision, adverse effects of medications, complication of surgery and cost of treatment. Gutierrez et al (1997) reported that the most potential influence of glaucoma on health related quality of life were visual field loss and effects of treatment.

Quality of life means taking care of patients' health in the broadest sense – his physical, emotional, and spiritual well being. It is important nowadays to know the quality of life of the patients, not only just treating them. Thus the assessment of quality of life for these patients will be an important diagnostic tool in evaluation of the magnitude of the problems (Jampel et al, 2002).

If we do not have a way of validly measuring a patient's quality of life and how it is affected by our treatments, we cannot be sure whether or not we are achieving our goal as physicians that is to restore, maintain, or enhance quality of life.

Initially, objective approaches or the visual function parameter are used as a guide to grossly indicate the quality of life of the patients such as measuring the visual acuity, intraocular pressure, and visual field. All the objectives approaches does not totally reflects or measured the true quality of life of the glaucoma patients and for this reason various generic and vision specific quality of life instruments or questionnaires have been developed and validated.

All these questionnaires are known as health related quality of life measures or instruments. Various studies have been conducted to find the most accurate tools such as using specific questionnaires eg: Visual Function 14 (VF 14), National Eye Institute Visual Function Questionnaires (NEI VFQ) and utility analysis to assess the quality of life of the patients.

VF 14 was developed to assess vision related quality of life affected by cataract (Steinberg et al, 1994). It is short, simple and has been shown to have good reproducibility and responsiveness (Cassard et al, 1995). The VF 14 has been shown to have moderate correlation with visual field impairment in glaucoma patients (Parrish et al, 1997). However, it emphasizes activities that are related to visual acuity, which are affected by cataract. Activites affected by visual field such as peripheral vision, that are relevant to glaucoma patients are not evaluated.

National Eye Institute Visual Function Questionnaires 25 (NEI VFQ 25) is a vision specific health related quality of life instrument in which its reliability and validity had been established and comparable to other instruments such as NEI VFQ 51 (Mangione

et al, 2001). NEI VFQ 25 has been translated into eight languages and currently being used in seven federally funded research studies that are examining a range of ocular condition. This showed the potentially useful information one might expected to gain with this brief survey. NEI VFQ 25 will enable us to examine the influence of various eye diseases and interventions have on patient's daily functioning and well being or in simple term, the quality of life of the patients.

Utility analysis allows quantitative measurement of the quality of life associated with particular health state (Melissa et al. 2003). The higher the utility value, the better the quality of life associated with health state and the lower the value, the poorer the quality of life. Utility analysis provides a mechanism for making broad comparisons across an array of clinical settings. Thus, utility analysis will produce important data for health care economic analysis and for better allocation of fund among different diseases.

Due to the facts that the quality of life is related to the culture and customs of the daily life for each country, in our study we used a new questionnaires (translated Malay language version) of the original NEI VFQ 25 questionnaires and utility analysis in order to assess the quality of life of the glaucoma patients and its relation to visual function impairment.

Studies assessing quality of life and visual function among patients with glaucoma are still lacking in Malaysia. To our knowledge, no previous study documents subjective aspects of quality of life and visual function in patients with glaucoma, nor has any

correlation between quality of life measures and clinical indicator ever been done in this country. For this reason, we have chosen to do this study and with this reliable modified NEI VFQ 25 questionnaires and modified utility analysis, we hope it will stimulate further studies regarding quality of life of glaucoma patients in this country. In addition, this modified NEI VFQ 25 can be used as an important vision specific functioning tool in assessing the quality of life of others ocular diseases especially in this region of Asia where Malay language was one of the main spoken language.

CHAPTER 2:

BACKGROUND

2.0 BACKGROUND

2.1 GLAUCOMA

2.1.1 Definition

Glaucoma is one of the major causes of visual impairment worldwide. Glaucoma is a group of diseases characterized by progressive loss of retinal ganglion cells, characteristic optic neuropathy associated with visual field loss and the elevated intraocular pressure is a primary risk factor. Glaucoma is a chronic, progressive ocular disease involving optic neuropathy accompanied with visual field loss and blindness.

2.1.2 Classification

Glaucoma can be classified into congenital (developmental) and acquired. Further subclassification into open angle and angle closure types are based on the mechanism in which aqueous outflow is impaired. Glaucoma can also be classified into primary and secondary depending on the presence or absence of associated factors contributing to the pressure rise. In primary glaucoma, the elevation of the intraocular pressure (IOP) is not associated with any other ocular disorder whereas in secondary glaucoma, a recognizable ocular and non ocular disorders alter the aqueous outflow which results in elevation of the IOP.

2.1.3 Risk factors

Risk factors for glaucoma can be divided into ocular and non ocular. The ocular risk factors are intraocular pressure, myopia, increased cup disc ratio, asymmetric cupping, disc haemorrhage and peripapillary atrophy. The non ocular risk factors are age, race, family history, diabetes, hypertension, migraine, gender, alcohol consumption and cigarette smoking. Intraocular pressure is the primary risk factor for glaucoma and it is the only treatable ocular risk factor.

2.1.4 Pathogenesis

Pathogenesis of glaucoma suggests retinal ganglion cell damage. Retinal ganglion cell damage is due to two important causes which is necrosis and apoptosis (programmed cell death). Vascular and mechanical aspect responsible for the necrosis. Vasospastic tendency, nocturnal systemic hypotension, diastolic perfusion pressure, peripapillary ischemia and lower optic nerve blood flow are the vascular causes for necrosis. Mechanical cause is due to high intraocular pressure that damages the optic disc at the lamina cribrosa by disturbing the normal retrograde flow of trophic factors from the axon terminal to the cell body and this will trigger cell death and cause subsequent necrosis.