1	The QDIS-7: one scale for measuring the disease-specific quality-									
2	of-life impact of different medical conditions									
3										
4										
5	Corresponding Author: Shunichi Fukuhara,									
6	Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan									
7	Fukushima Medical University, Fukushima, Japan									
8	(ORCID 0000-0001-7199-1495)									
9	fukuhara.shunichi.6m@kyoto-u.jp									
10										
11	Joseph Green,									
12	Graduate School of Medicine, University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan									
13	(ORCID 0000-0003-2997-2308)									
14	jgreen@m.u-tokyo.ac.jp									
15										
16	Takafumi Wakita,									
17	Kansai University, Osaka, Japan									
18	(ORCID 0000-0003-2293-5918)									
19										
20	Yosuke Yamamoto,									
21	Department of Healthcare Epidemiology, School of Public Health in the									
22	Graduate School of Medicine, Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan									
23	(ORCID 0000-0003-1104-2612)									
24										
25	Hajime Yamazaki,									
26	Section of Clinical Epidemiology, Department of Community Medicine,									
27	Graduate School of Medicine, Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan									
28	(ORCID 0000-0002-9034-4370),									
29	yamazaki.hajime.7n@kyoto-u.ac.jp									
30										
31	John E. Ware, Jr.,									
32	John Ware Research Group, Watertown, MA, USA									
33										
34	Key words: disease-specific measures, health-related quality of life, QDIS,									
35	patient-reported outcomes, PRO									
36										
37	Word counts									
38	Abstract: 350 words									
39	Note thin the stin reports 3259 star of the in the emain text bir geview in including the title and a practice.									
40	abstract, references, figures, figure legends, table, or appendices)									

## 42 Abstract

43 Background: When studying health-related quality of life (QOL), disease-44 specific instruments have the advantage of measuring the unique effects of 45 particular medical conditions. Almost every disease-specific QOL instrument 46 uses its own metric, and measures QOL in its own content areas. The 47 unfortunate result is that scores from different disease-specific QOL 48 instruments cannot be compared. In contrast, the seven-item Quality of Life 49 Disease Impact Scale (QDIS-7) has response choices on only one scale (one 50 metric) and its content is standardized. Thus, the QDIS-7 should allow disease-51 specific QOL to be compared across different diseases. We therefore tested 52 whether, unlike scores from the traditional mutually-incompatible metrics, 53 those from the single-metric QDIS-7 are comparable across diseases. 54 Methods: Responses to the QDIS-7 questions (regarding global QOL, physical 55 functioning, role functioning, social functioning, vitality, mental health, and 56 health outlook) were used to compute a single score, based on an item-response 57 model. When the QDIS-7 was completed by respondents with different 58 diseases, the content of the question-items was the same, and the only 59 difference was the name of the disease to which the respondents explicitly 60 attributed any impact on their QOL. In an online survey, 2,627 adults who had sought care for headache, low-back pain, asthma, or diabetes, each responded 61 62 to the QDIS-7 and to a previously-validated disease-specific QOL instrument ("legacy scale") that was developed to measure QOL in their specific disease. 63 64 We examined the slopes from four regressions of legacy-scale scores on QDIS-7 65 scores. Similarity of those slopes would support the hypothesis that the QDIS-7 66 enables quantitative comparisons of disease-specific QOL across those four 67 different medical conditions. **Results:** For all four groups, the regression-line slopes were nearly the same: 68 69 0.12 to 0.14 legacy-scale standard deviations per 1-point difference in QDIS-7 70 score. Thus, each 10-point difference in QDIS-7 scores is equal to slightly more than one standard-deviation difference in legacy-scale scores, for all four 71 72 groups. **Conclusions:** The relationships of score differences on the legacy measures to 73 74 score differences on the QDIS-7 (i.e., the slopes) were similar across the four 75 groups, which is consistent with the idea that the QDIS-7 enables comparisons 76 of disease-specific QOL across different medical conditions. 350 words 77

# 79 Introduction

80

81 Health-related quality of life (QOL) is generally thought of as either generic or 82 disease-specific. Instruments for measuring generic QOL can provide 83 information not only about patients but also about people who have not been 84 given a diagnosis and are not undergoing medical evaluation or treatment. In 85 contrast, an instrument for measuring disease-specific QOL provides 86 meaningful information only about people who have the specific medical 87 condition for which that instrument was designed. Disease-specific QOL 88 instruments have one important advantage: They are especially sensitive and 89 responsive to the unique effects of particular medical conditions on QOL (1) 90 Dozens, perhaps hundreds (2, 3), of such instruments have been used in 91 research and in daily clinical practice. 92 93 Nonetheless, disease-specific instruments have an important disadvantage: 94 They do not facilitate comparisons across diseases. That disadvantage stems 95 from two facts (a) they differ in the QOL domains (i.e., the content) that they 96 measure, and (b) each instrument measures QOL on its own unique metric: The 97 question-items (i.e., the content) and the response choices used in the Headache 98 Impact Test differ from the question-items and the response choices used in the 99 Asthma Control Test, etc. The result is that disease-specific QOL scores for 100 different diseases are difficult or impossible to compare. These instruments 101 provide no answers to questions about differences in disease-specific QOL 102 across different medical conditions. For example, is the asthma-specific impact 103 on QOL in people with moderately severe asthma greater or less than the

- 104 diabetes-specific impact on QOL in people with moderately severe diabetes?
- 105 That question cannot be answered using asthma-specific and diabetes-specific
- 106 QOL instruments (4, 5), because those instruments measure QOL in different
- 107 domains (content areas) and on different metrics. Similarly, in a person who has
- 108 both diabetes and low-back pain, which condition has a greater impact on that 109 person's *disease-specific* QOL? As above, that question cannot be answered using
- 110 diabetes-specific and low-back-pain-specific QOL instruments (5, 6), because
- 111 those instruments measure QOL in different domains (content areas) and on
- 112 different metrics.
- 113
- 114 Those considerations motivated the construction and testing of the seven-item
- 115 Quality of Life Disease Impact Scale (QDIS-7) (7, 8). Unlike other disease-
- specific QOL instruments, the QDIS-7 uses only one set of question items,
- 117 together with response choices on only one scale, to measure the QOL impact

- attributed by the respondent to any namable disease. Its items are sufficiently
- 119 homogeneous (or unidimensional) to justify the simplicity of a 1-factor disease-
- 120 specific measurement model, which consistently yields highly reliable scores
- 121 quantifying QOL impact for different diseases (7, 9). It is also flexible enough to
- 122 allow measurement of QOL impact attributed not only to diseases but also to
- 123 symptoms, treatments, exposures, etc. Strictly speaking, rather than being
- 124 merely disease-specific, the QDIS-7 is attribution-specific.
- 125

126 The QDIS-7 is *sui generis* in two ways. To the best of our knowledge, no other

- 127 instrument allows comparisons of disease-specific QOL impacts between
- 128 individuals with different health conditions, and no other instrument allows
- 129 comparisons of disease-specific QOL impacts of different health conditions130 within a single individual.
- 131

132 Given the potential advantages of the QDIS-7 over the many disease-specific

133 measures of QOL that are already in widespread use (i.e., "legacy" measures),

and also given the increasing prevalence and importance of multimorbidity in

rapidly aging populations, this new instrument has the potential to be useful

136 worldwide for multiple purposes. Proliferation of the QDIS-7 will require

137 further evidence that it can be used to quantify the disease-specific magnitudes

- 138 of QOL impact across diseases in meaningfully comparable standardized units
- 139 of QOL, in various social-cultural contexts.
- 140

141 With that in mind, we compared the QDIS-7 with legacy measures of disease-

142 specific QOL in people with headache, low-back pain, asthma, and diabetes,

143 and we tested whether the disease-specific QOL impacts of those four different

144 medical conditions could be quantified on a single metric.

145

# 146

# 147 Methods

148

## 149 Participants, and minimization of potential bias

150

151 For this cross-sectional-study, the participants were in four online panels.

152 Because these QOL data come from self-reports, bias might have been

- 153 introduced if the participants' identities were known to the researchers, and
- 154 particularly if their identities were known to people involved in their health
- 155 care. Those possibilities were minimized by having a third-party survey-
- 156 research company (Cross Marketing Inc.) assemble the online panels, collect the
- 157 data, and anonymize the data to ensure that the researchers did not know the

- 158 participants' identities, and that the participants identities were also not known
- to anyone involved in their health care. The anonymization procedures were
- 160 described in the informed-consent document that was distributed to all
- 161 participants. The survey-research company also ensured that in this online
- 162 survey there were no missing data.
- 163

164 The research was planned to include women and men aged 16-84 years of age.

- 165 Balancing budgetary constraints against the need to acquire enough data for
- 166 valid and reliable comparisons and psychometric tests, each of the four online
- 167 panels had at least 500 participants. Each panel comprised people who reported
- having sought care for one of four medical conditions: headache, low-back pain,asthma, or diabetes. Basic demographic information is in Table 1.
- 170

#### 171 The QDIS-7

172

The QDIS-7 is uniquely flexible and adaptable because of the structure of its
question-items and the uniformity of its response choices (7, 8, 10). Briefly, each
question-item refers to one aspect of the respondents' QOL, and it asks the

- 176 respondents to rate the QOL impact that they attribute to a named condition. To
- 177 do that, each question-item uses a fill-in-the-attribution (fill-in-the-condition)
- 178 structure. For example, one of the QDIS-7 question-items is "In the past 4
- 179 weeks, how often did [CONDITION] limit your usual social activities with
- 180 family, friends, or others close to you?". For participants who have headache,
- 181 [CONDITION] is replaced with "headache". For those who have diabetes,
- 182 [CONDITION] is replaced with "diabetes", etc. (7). Translation and
- 183 psychometric testing of the QDIS-7 are described in Appendix 1.
- 184

185 Disease-specific QOL instruments for each of the medical conditions studied186

187 After responding to the QDIS-7, each participant also responded to a well-

188 established (i.e., "legacy") disease-specific instrument for the medical condition

189 that they reported having: Those with headache responded to the 6-item

- 190 Headache Impact Test (HIT6 (11, 12)), those with low-back pain responded to
- 191 the 24-item Roland-Morris Disability Questionnaire (RDQ (6, 13)), those with
- asthma responded to the 5-item Asthma Control Test (ACT (4, 14)), and those
- 193 with diabetes responded to the 20-item Problem Areas In Diabetes scale (PAID

194 (5, 15)).

#### 196 Analyses

197

198 The QDIS-7 scores reported here are norm-based. Norm-based scoring began199 with a sample of the population of Japan. That sample was recruited and

- 200 studied separately from the present study's participants described above. The
- 201 methods used to derive the norm-based scores are described in Appendix 2.
- 202

203 For each of the four groups, we computed the norm-based QDIS-7 scores and 204 the scores on the applicable legacy disease-specific measure (i.e., HIT6, RDQ, 205 ACT, or PAID). For the legacy disease-specific measures, scores were computed 206 as previously reported for each instrument (4-6, 11). For all further 207 computations, we reverse-scored the ACT, so that higher ACT scores would 208 indicate stronger impact of disease. That gave the QDIS-7 scores and all four 209 legacy scores the same directionality, which simplifies comparisons. Readers 210 who are familiar with the ACT should keep that reverse-scoring in mind when

- 211 reading this report.
- 212

We computed Pearson's r for each of the four groups, to quantify the strength of the associations between legacy-scale scores and QDIS-7 scores. We also computed internal-consistency reliability (alpha) and examined the frequency distributions of legacy-scale and QDIS-7 scores..

217

218 One important question is whether the QDIS-7 indeed allows the disease-219 specific QOL impact of different medical conditions to be quantified on the 220 same scale. To answer that question, we hypothesized that the differences in 221 legacy scores associated with a unit difference in QDIS-7 scores are consistent 222 across the four groups. Testing that hypothesis required computing the slope of 223 the relationship between legacy scores and QDIS-7 scores for each group, and 224 then comparing those slopes among the four groups. First we standardized the 225 legacy scores within each of the four groups, such that all four distributions of 226 legacy scores had the same mean (i.e., zero) and the same standard deviation 227 (i.e., 1). The legacy scores thus became z scores. Linear regression of those z 228 scores on the norm-based QDIS-7 scores provided the slopes used to test the 229 hypothesis posed above.

230

## 231 Patient and public involvement

232

Neither patients nor the general public were involved in planning or carryingout this study.

236	
237	Results
238	
239	Participants
240	A total of 2,627 people responded to the QDIS-7 and to one of the legacy
241	instruments. Table 1 shows the numbers of participants in each of the four
242	groups, along with basic demographic information.
243	
244	Descriptive statistics
245	The means of legacy QOL measures differ but cannot be meaningfully
246	compared, but all of the QDIS-7 means are on the same metric, so they can be
247	compared. They show that the QOL impacts of the four conditions were, from
248	highest to lowest, low-back pain > headache > asthma > diabetes. The QOL
249	impact of low-back pain was 1.61 standard deviations greater than that of
250	diabetes.
251	
252	Correlations, reliability, and frequency distributions (Figure 1, Table 1)
253	<b>Correlations:</b> The correlations (Pearson's r) between QDIS-7 scores and legacy
254	scale scores ranged from 0.660 to 0.735.
255	<b>Reliability:</b> In all four groups, the alpha of the QDIS-7 scores was at least 0.90.
256	Headache: In the group with headache, the frequency distributions of both
257	HIT6 scores and QDIS-7 scores were approximately normal.
258	Low-back pain: The distribution of RDQ scores was right-skewed. In contrast,
259	the distribution of QDIS-7 scores was closer to normal.
260	Asthma: The ACT scores were very strongly left-skewed (after reverse-scoring),
261	while the QDIS-7 scores were slightly less skewed.
262	Diabetes: Both the PAID scores and the QDIS-7 scores were markedly right-
263	skewed.
264	
265	Consistency of the magnitude of relationships between QDIS-7 scores and
266	legacy-scale scores across medical conditions
267	Figure 3 shows the results of linear regression of legacy-scale z scores on norm-
268	based QDIS-7 scores, for the four groups. The slopes of the four regression lines
269	varied over a small range (Table 1): from 0.115 to 0.144 legacy scale standard
270	deviations per 1-point difference in QDIS-7 norm-based score, for all four
271	groups.
272	
273	

#### 274 Discussion

275

#### 276 Summary of main findings

277

278 Despite the differences in content (i.e., differences in domain coverage) between 279 the QDIS-7 and the legacy scales studied, the correlations between their scores 280 were substantial (Table 1), which is consistent with the presence of a large 281 common underlying disease-specific QOL-impact factor. All of the QDIS-7 282 scores were highly reliable. For three of the four medical conditions studied, the 283 frequency distributions of QDIS-7 scores were less skewed than those of the 284 legacy-scale scores (Figure 2, Table 1). Thus, using the QDIS-7 should simplify 285 both the interpretation of group-level statistics (mean, standard deviation, etc.) 286 and the interpretation of individual scores in relation to those group means, 287 standard deviations, etc. Figure 3 shows a particularly important finding: The 288 relation between QDIS-7 scores and legacy-scale scores (i.e., the slope) was 289 consistent across the four medical conditions studied. 290

#### 291

#### 1 Advantages over generic instruments

292

293 Using generic health-related QOL tools instead of disease-specific tools entails a 294 loss of information. For example, if a person has asthma, and that person's 295 generic health-related QOL is low, we do not know why it is low. Specifically, 296 we do not know whether it is low because of their asthma or because of 297 something else related to their health. With generic health-related QOL tools, 298 QOL impacts are attributed to physical or mental health in general, not to a 299 particular, named condition. In contrast, information about QOL impacts 300 attributed to a particular condition is provided by instruments for measuring 301 disease-specific QOL, of which the QDIS-7 is one. Furthermore, in people with 302 multimorbidity, generic health-related QOL tools cannot provide information 303 about the relative QOL impacts of each of the various comorbid conditions. As 304 noted above, such information can be acquired only by measuring attribution-305 specific QOL, such as with the QDIS-7 (9).

306

# 307 Consistency of the relation between QDIS-7 scores and legacy-scale scores 308 across diseases (Figure 3)

309

310 We also tested the hypothesis that the differences in legacy scores that are

311 associated with a unit difference in QDIS-7 scores are consistent across the four

- 312 groups. The results shown in Figure 3 support that hypothesis. In all four
- 313 groups, each 10-point difference in QDIS-7 score was associated with a 1.2-to-

- 314 1.4-SD difference in the score on the legacy instrument. That is, the range over
- 315 which the regression-line slopes varied was remarkably small. That similarity
- among the four slopes has an important implication. It supports the use of a
- 317 single scale, the QDIS-7 in norm-score units, instead of the different and
- 318 mutually-incompatible legacy scales in their original units.
- 319
- 320 This might appear to be similar to the standardized mean difference, which
- puts different QOL measures on a single scale (16). However, as described inAppendix 3, that similarity is superficial.
- 323

324 Using the QDIS-7 instead of mutually-incompatible legacy scales also has an 325 advantage when comparing scores longitudinally. For example, with QDIS-7 326 scores, a 10-point improvement caused by treatment of headache would be on 327 the same scale as a 10-point improvement caused by treatment of asthma. Of 328 course, whether those two 10-point improvements would justify two similar 329 clinical decisions is a separate question. Relations between QOL and clinical 330 decisions can be addressed with different methods, such as by computing 331 minimally important changes (MIC) for each of the diagnoses in question (17, 332 18), which is beyond the scope of this study.

- 333
- 334

#### 34 Using the QDIS-7 to answer new questions

335

Among disease-specific QOL instruments, the QDIS-7 is uniquely useful. It 336 337 allows clinicians, researchers, policy makers, etc., to answer important 338 questions by making comparisons that were not possible previously. For 339 example, consider a person who has both diabetes and asthma: Of those two 340 conditions, which has more impact on that person's QOL? Neither generic QOL 341 instruments nor legacy disease-specific QOL instruments can answer that 342 question, but the QDIS-7 can. Similarly, suppose health-policy researchers 343 compare a group of people with headache to a group with low-back pain. If 344 those researchers are interested only in generic QOL, then they can simply use, 345 for example, the SF-36. But what if they are interested in disease-specific QOL? 346 That is, what if they ask: In which of those two groups is the disease-specific 347 impact on QOL greater? Again, such a question cannot be answered either by 348 using generic QOL instruments or by using legacy disease-specific QOL 349 instruments, but it can be answered by using the QDIS-7. The results of the 350 present study offer a concrete example: Which of the four groups had the highest 351 disease-specific QOL and which had the lowest? And how large was the difference in 352 disease-specific QOL between those two groups? As noted above, the mean QDIS-7 353 scores (Table 1) show that the disease-specific impact on QOL was highest for

354 those with low-back pain and it was lowest for those with diabetes: The mean

- 355 QDIS-7 scores in those two groups were 62.6 and 46.5, respectively. (This is
- 356 consistent with the fact that all people with low-back pain are symptomatic by
- 357 definition, whereas some people with diabetes are asymptomatic.) That
- 358 difference is 16.1 points on the QDIS-7 scale. With norm-based scoring, a
- 359 difference of 10 points is 1 standard deviation, so a difference of 16.1 points is
- 360 1.61 standard deviations. Differences of 1.5 standard deviations are considered
- 361 to be very large (19, 20). This answers the two questions posed above (in *italics*),
- 362 and it illustrates how the QDIS-7 can be used to answer questions about
- 363 disease-specific QOL that previously were difficult or impossible to address.
- 364

#### 365 The QDIS-7 is flexible and adaptable

366

367 Unlike generic QOL instruments, the QDIS-7 was constructed to be used 368 primarily with data from people who have a known diagnosis. In that sense, it 369 is similar to legacy disease-specific instruments. Going beyond that similarity, 370 the QDIS-7 can be used to measure not only the QOL effects of any specifiable 371 disease, but also those of almost any other namable status or condition to which 372 an impact on QOL might be attributed. Its unique fill-in-the-attribution 373 structure should make the QDIS-7 more flexible and adaptable than any other 374 QOL instrument of which we are aware. Specifically, in addition to measuring 375 the impact of diseases, the QDIS-7 can also measure the impact of symptoms 376 (headache and low-back pain in the present study), treatments (21, 22), 377 exposures (23, 24), and any other specifiable (25) status or condition that might 378 affect regular daily physical, psychological, or social functioning. Applications 379 of the QDIS-7 may include QOL associated with environmental pollution, 380 healthcare workers' QOL, maternal postpartum QOL, and caregivers' QOL, (23, 24, 26-34). None of those examples is a disease, but the QDIS-7 can be used to 381 382 quantify the specific impact of each one on QOL, using the same metric as for 383 asthma, diabetes, etc. 384

Furthermore, de novo development and testing of patient-reported outcome 385

386 measures can be very time-consuming and resource-intensive. In the presence

- 387 of new and emerging medical conditions, new disease-specific QOL
- 388 instruments suddenly become needed, as occurred during the COVID-19
- 389 pandemic (26, 35). In such situations, the QDIS-7 could be adapted to meet

390 those new needs quickly and easily.

#### 392 Summary of the main advantage of the QDIS-7

393

394 Both the QDIS-7 and legacy disease-specific QOL measures have the advantage

395 of being particularly sensitive to disease-specific impacts on QOL. For legacy

396 measures, that advantage comes with an important limitation: Impacts on QOL

397 cannot be compared across diseases. The QDIS-7 has no such limitation. The

- 398 QDIS-7's unique advantage is that it allows quantitative comparisons of
- 399 attribution-specific impacts on QOL across diseases, exposures, symptoms,
- 400 treatments, etc.
- 401

# 402 Limitations, and directions for further research

403

404 First, we used only one legacy disease-specific measure for each of the four

405 disease groups studied, but some diseases have many legacy disease-specific

406 QOL instruments, which might vary in their relationship to the QDIS-7.

407 Second, we studied only four medical conditions. Those four were chosen in

408 anticipation of using them in future work comparing QDIS-7 scores across

409 countries, and because they are commonly encountered in primary care

410 settings, and also because they are relatively likely to affect QOL (unlike, for

411 example, hypertension). Useful insights could certainly come from comparing

412 QDIS-7 scores in a larger group of medical conditions.

413 Third, as noted above, the QDIS-7 is uniquely appropriate for standardizing

414 attribution-specific QOL in people with more than one medical condition. More

- 415 work is needed on the usefulness of the QDIS-7 in people with multimorbitiies.
- 416 In that regard, recent cross-sectional (9) and longitudinal (25) studies have
- shown that people with multimorbities can distinguish between the impacts ofeach of their conditions on QOL.
- 419 Fourth, although this study was cross-sectional, disease-specific instruments are
- 420 particularly responsive to changes over time (10, 36, 37). The comparative
- 421 responsiveness of the QDIS-7, legacy instruments, and generic instruments is a
- 422 topic for future study.
- 423 Fifth, as noted above, answering questions regarding clinical interpretation and
- 424 clinical decisions requires data on the MICs of QDIS-7 scores (17, 18).
- 425
- 426

# 427 Conclusion

428

429 For measuring disease-specific QOL (in fact, attribution-specific QOL), the

- 430 QDIS-7 has an important advantage over legacy tools. It is the only QOL
- 431 measure we know of that uses a single metric to quantify the QOL impact

- 432 attributed to specific diseases, symptoms, treatments, exposures, etc. It enables,
- 433 for the first time, quantitative comparisons across different attributions. Using
- 434 the QDIS-7, researchers and clinicians can now answer questions that
- 435 previously were difficult or impossible to address.
- 436
- 437

# 438 Ethics review, funding, reporting, and availability

439

440 On August 21, 2020, the plan for this study (201611-3) was approved by the

441 Institutional Review Board of the the Institute for Health Outcomes and Process

442 Evaluation Research (iHope: <http://www.i-hope.jp/>). Funding for parts of

this study came from the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and

- 444 Technology of Japan, through the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science
- 445 (18H03024). We used the STROBE checklist for cross-sectional studies when
- 446 writing this report (38). The QDIS-7 is available after registration through
- 447 <<u>qol@qualitest.jp</u>>. It is available royalty-free for academic users.
- 448

450	Refer	ences
451		
452	1.	Patrick DL, Deyo RA. Generic and disease-specific measures in
453	assessi	ng health status and quality of life. Med Care. 1989 Mar;27(3 Suppl):S217-
454	32. doi:	10.1097/00005650-198903001-00018. PMID: 2646490.
455		,
456	2.	Fayers PM, Machin D. Quality of life: the assessment, analysis and
457	reporti	ng of patient-reported outcomes: John Wiley & Sons; 2015.
458	T	
459	3.	Nevarez-Flores AG, Chappell KJ, Morgan VA, Neil AL. Health-Related
460	Quality	of Life Scores and Values as Predictors of Mortality: A Scoping Review.
461	J Gen I	ntern Med. 2023;38(15):3389-405.
462	-	
463	4.	Nathan RA, Sorkness CA, Kosinski M, Schatz M, Li JT, Marcus P, et al.
464	Develo	pment of the asthma control test: a survey for assessing asthma control. J
465	Allergy	v Clin Immunol. 2004;113(1):59-65.
466		
467	5.	Polonsky WH, Anderson BJ, Lohrer PA, Welch G, Jacobson AM,
468	Aponte	e JE, et al. Assessment of diabetes-related distress. Diabetes care.
469	1995;18	8(6):754-60.
470		
471	6.	Roland M, Morris R. A study of the natural history of back pain. Part I:
472	develo	pment of a reliable and sensitive measure of disability in low-back pain.
473	Spine (	Phila Pa 1976). 1983;8(2):141-4.
474		
475	7.	Ware JE, Jr., Gandek B, Guyer R, Deng N. Standardizing disease-
476	specific	quality of life measures across multiple chronic conditions:
477	develop	pment and initial evaluation of the QOL Disease Impact Scale (QDIS®).
478	Health	Qual Life Outcomes. 2016;14:84.
479		
480	8.	Ware JE, Jr., Gandek B, Allison J. The Validity of Disease-specific
481	Quality	v of Life Attributions Among Adults with Multiple Chronic Conditions.
482	Int J Sta	at Med Res. 2016;5(1):17-40.
483		
484	9.	Ware JE. Factor analysis supports the validity of disease-specific health-
485	related	quality of life (QOL) measures among US population adults with
486	comort	oid conditions. Quality of Life Research. 2023;32:S106.
487		
488		
489		

490	10. Ware JE, Jr., Richardson MM, Meyer KB, Gandek B. Improving CKD-								
491	Specific Patient-Reported Measures of Health-Related Quality of Life. J Am Soc								
492	Nephrol. 2019;30(4):664-77.								
493									
494	11. Kosinski M, Bayliss MS, Bjorner JB, Ware JE, Jr., Garber WH, Batenhorst								
495	A, et al. A six-item short-form survey for measuring headache impact: the HIT-								
496	6. Qual Life Res. 2003;12(8):963-74.								
497									
498	12. Ohbu S, Igarashi H, Okayasu H, Sakai F, Green J, Heller RF, et al.								
499	Development and testing of the Japanese version of the migraine-specific								
500	quality of life instrument. Qual Life Res. 2004;13(8):1489-93.								
501									
502	13. Suzukamo Y, Fukuhara S, Kikuchi S, Konno S, Roland M, Iwamoto Y, et								
503	al. Validation of the Japanese version of the Roland-Morris Disability								
504	Questionnaire. Journal of orthopaedic science : official journal of the Japanese								
505	Orthopaedic Association. 2003;8(4):543-8.								
506									
507	14. Ueno S, Obase Y, Ohfuji T, Shimizu H, Sugiu T, Ohue Y, et al. [Asthma								
508	control test (ACT) faultiness and the remediation by peak flow (PEF)								
509	measurement at outpatient department]. Arerugi. 2008;57(7):862-71.								
510									
511	15. Ishii H. The Japanese version of problem area in diabetes scale : a								
512	clinical and research tool for the assessment of emotional functioning among								
513	diabetic patients (abstract). Diabetes (New York, NY). 1999;48(1).								
514									
515	16. Higgins JPT, Li T, Deeks JJ (editors). Chapter 6: Choosing effect								
516	measures and computing estimates of effect. In: Higgins JPT, Thomas J,								
517	Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, Welch VA (editors). <i>Cochrane Handbook</i>								
518	for Systematic Reviews of Interventions version 6.4 (updated August 2023).								
519	Cochrane, 2023. Available from <u>www.training.cochrane.org/handbook</u> and								
520	https://training.cochrane.org/handbook/current/chapter-06. Accessed on								
521	January 25, 2024.								
522									
523	17. Tsujimoto Y, Fujii T, Tsutsumi Y, Kataoka Y, Tajika A, Okada Y,								
524	Carrasco-Labra A, Devji T, Wang Y, Guyatt GH, Furukawa TA. Minimal								
525	important changes in standard deviation units are highly variable and no								
526	universally applicable value can be determined. J Clin Epidemiol. 2022								
527	May;145:92-100. doi: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2022.01.017. Epub 2022 Jan 25. PMID:								
528	35091045.								
529									

530	18.	Wyrwich KW, Norman GR. The challenges inherent with anchor-based							
531	approaches to the interpretation of important change in clinical outcome								
532	assessments. Qual Life Res. 2023 May;32(5):1239-1246. doi: 10.1007/s11136-022-								
533	03297-7. Epub 2022 Nov 18. PMID: 36396874.								
534									
535	19.	Cohen J. (1988). Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences.							
536	New Y	ork, NY: Routledge Academic							
537									
538	20.	Sullivan GM, Feinn R. Using Effect Size-or Why the P Value Is Not							
539	Enoug	h. J Grad Med Educ. 2012 Sep;4(3):279-82. doi: 10.4300/JGME-D-12-							
540	00156.1	1. PMID: 23997866; PMCID: PMC3444174.							
541									
542	21.	Fukuhara S, Yamazaki H, Wakita T, Ware JJE, Wang J, Onishi Y, et al.							
543	Valida	tion of a new instrument for measuring disease-specific quality of life: A							
544	pilot st	udy among patients with chronic kidney disease and hyperkalemia.							
545	Annals	s of Clinical Epidemiology, 2023, Volume 5, Issue 1, Pages 13-19.							
546	https:/	/doi.org/10.37737/ace.23003							
547									
548	22.	Shibagaki Y, Yamazaki H, Wakita T, Ware JE, Wang J, Onishi Y, et al.							
549	Impact	t of treatment of hyperkalaemia on quality of life: design of a prospective							
550	observ	ational cohort study of long-term management of hyperkalaemia in							
551	patient	ts with chronic kidney disease or chronic heart failure in Japan. BMJ							
552	Open.	2023;13(12):e074090.							
553	1								
554	23.	Yamazaki S, Nitta H, Murakami Y, Fukuhara S. Association between							
555	ambier	nt air pollution and health-related quality of life in Japan: ecological							
556	study.	International journal of environmental health research. 2005;15(5):383-91.							
557	5								
558	24.	Singh G, Prakash J, Ray SK, Yawar M, Habib G. Development and							
559	evalua	tion of air pollution-linked quality of life (AP-QOL) questionnaire:							
560	insight	from two different cohorts. Environ Sci Pollut Res Int. 2021							
561	Aug:28	3(32):43459-43475. doi: 10.1007/s11356-021-13754-4. Epub 2021 Apr 9.							
562	PMID:	33835344.							
563									
564	25.	McEntee ML, Gandek B, Ware IE, Improving multimorbidity							
565	measu	rement using individualized disease-specific quality of life impact							
566	assessments: predictive validity of a new comorbidity index. Health Qual Life								
567	Outcor	mes. 2022;20(1):108.							
568									

569	26.	Yamamoto R, Yamazaki H, Kobara S, Iizuka H, Hijikata Y, Miyashita J,								
570	et al. Development and Initial Psychometric Validation of the COVID-19									
571	Pandemic Burden Index for Healthcare Workers. J Gen Intern Med.									
572	2023;38(5):1239-47.									
573										
574	27. Van Laar D, Edwards JA, Easton S. The Work-Related Quality of Life									
575	scale for healthcare workers. J Adv Nurs. 2007 Nov;60(3):325-33. doi:									
576	10.1111/j.1365-2648.2007.04409.x. PMID: 17908128.									
577										
578	28.	Mishina H, Hayashino Y, Fukuhara S. Test performance of two-								
579	questio	n screening for postpartum depressive symptoms. Pediatrics								
580	interna	tional : official journal of the Japan Pediatric Society. 2009;51(1):48-53.								
581										
582	29.	Hill PD, Aldag JC, Hekel B, Riner G, Bloomfield P. Maternal								
583	Postpar	rtum Quality of Life Questionnaire. J Nurs Meas. 2006 Winter;14(3):205-								
584	20. doi:	10.1891/jnm-v14i3a005. PMID: 17278340.								
585										
586	30.	Mokhtaryan-Gilani, T., Kariman, N., Nia, H.S. et al. The Maternal								
587	Postpar	rtum Quality of Life Instrument (MPQOL-I): development and								
588	psycho	metric evaluation in an exploratory sequential mixed-method study.								
589	BMC P	regnancy Childbirth 22, 576 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12884-022-								
590	04900-у	7								
591										
592	31.	Miyashita M, Yamaguchi A, Kayama M, Narita Y, Kawada N, Akiyama								
593	M, et al	l. Validation of the Burden Index of Caregivers (BIC), a multidimensional								
594	short ca	are burden scale from Japan. Health Qual Life Outcomes. 2006;4:52.								
595										
596	32.	Novak M, Guest C. Application of a multidimensional caregiver burden								
597	invento	ory. Gerontologist. 1989 Dec;29(6):798-803. doi: 10.1093/geront/29.6.798.								
598	PMID:	2516000.								
599										
600	33.	Joseph, S., Becker, S., Elwick, H., & Silburn, R. (2012). Adult carers								
601	quality	of life questionnaire (AC-QoL): Development of an evidence-based tool.								
602	Mental	Health Review Journal, 17(2), 57–69.								
603	https:/	/doi.org/10.1108/13619321211270380								
604										
605	34.	Martin MP, McEntee ML, Suri Y. Caregiver Quality of Life: How to								
606	Measur	re It and Why. American Journal of Health Promotion. 2021;35(7):1042-								
607	1045. d	oi:10.1177/08901171211030142f								
608										

609	35.	Amdal, C.D., Taylor, K., Kuliś, D. et al. Health-related quality of life in						
610	patients with COVID-19; international development of a patient-reported							
611	outcome measure. J Patient Rep Outcomes 6, 26 (2022).							
612								
613	36.	Wiebe S, Guyatt G, Weaver B, Matijevic S, Sidwell C. Comparative						
614	respoi	nsiveness of generic and specific quality-of-life instruments. J Clin						
615	Epidemiol. 2003 Jan;56(1):52-60. doi: 10.1016/s0895-4356(02)00537-1. PMID:							
616	125898	870.						
617								
618	37.	Puhan MA, Guyatt GH, Goldstein R, Mador J, McKim D, Stahl E,						
619	Griffit	h L, Schunemann HJ: Relative responsiveness of the Chronic Respiratory						
620	Quest	ionnaire, St. Georges Respiratory Questionnaire and four other health-						
621	related	d quality of life instruments for patients with chronic lung disease.						
622	Respir	ratory medicine 2007, 101(2):308–316. 10.1016/j.rmed.2006.04.023						
623								
624	38.	Elm E v, Altman D G, Egger M, Pocock S J, Gøtzsche P C,						
625	Vande	enbroucke J P et al. Strengthening the reporting of observational studies in						
626	epider	miology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational						
627	studie	s BMJ 2007; 335 :806 doi:10.1136/bmj.39335.541782.AD						
628								
629								

#### 630 Figure legends

631

- 632 Figure 1.
- 633 Scatterplots showing the relationships between the norm-based scores on the
- 634 QDIS-7 and the scores on the four legacy disease-specific scales.
- 635
- 636 Figure 2.
- 637 Frequency distributions of the norm-based scores on the QDIS-7 and the scores
- 638 on the four legacy disease-specific scales.
- 639

640 Figure 3.

- 641 Results of regression of legacy-scale z scores on norm-based QDIS-7 scores. The
- slopes of the regression lines varied from 0.115 to 0.144 legacy score standard
- 643 deviations per 1-point difference in norm-based QDIS-7 score. Confidence
- 644 intervals of the slopes are in Table 1.
- 645



Figure 2





652 Table 1. Summary information on participants and disease-specific quality-of-life impact measures of four different medical

653 conditions

Name of condition	Headache			Low-back pain			Asthma			Diabetes	
Number of	760			722			611			514	
participants	/09 (057, 510)			(4(2, 271)						314	
(Women. Men)	(257, 512)			(402, 271)			(343, 200)			(430, 04)	
Mean & SD of	18.0	10.4	EQ 0 11 7		11 7		E7 1 10 1			62401	
participants' age	40.9	, 10.4		36.2,	, 11./		57.1, 12.1			63.	4, 9.1
Name of tool	HIT6ª	QDIS-7b		RDQ	QDIS-7		ACT <sup>c</sup>	QDIS-7		PAID	QDIS-7
Range of possible	36 78	11 68		0.24	11 68		5.25	11 68		0.100	11 68
scores	30-78	41-68		0-24	41-00		5-25	41-00		0-100	41-00
Mean	57.9	53.7		7.12	62.6		10.4	47.8		26.8	46.5
Standard deviation	7.31	5.08		5.51	5.68		4.58	5.51		23.3	5.64
Skewness <sup>d</sup>	-0.18	0.12		0.68	0.44		0.83	0.82		0.81	1.43
Reliability <sup>e</sup>	0.88	0.90		0.89	0.92		0.79	0.91		0.97	0.92
Pearson's r, and its	on's r, and its onfidence al <sup>f</sup> 0.701 to 0.766			0.6	60		0.4	266		0	665
95% confidence			0.(17				0.620 to 0.708			0.614 to 0.710	
interval <sup>f</sup>				0.617 to 0.699							
Regression-line slope,	0.144 0.134 to 0.153			0.115			0.120 0.109 to 0.131			0	117
and its 95%				0.106	0.115 0.106 to 0.125					0.117 0.106 to 0.129	
confidence intervalg				0.106 to							

- a. HIT6: the 6-item Headache Impact Test. QDIS-7: the 7-item Quality of Life Disease Impact Scale. RDQ: the Roland-Morris
- 655 Disability Questionnaire. ACT: the Asthma Control Test. PAID: the Problem Areas In Diabetes scale.
- 656 b. All QDIS-7 scores are based on Japan national-norm data.
- 657 c. The ACT was reverse-scored, so that higher ACT scores would indicate stronger impact of disease. That gave the QDIS-7
- 658 scores and all four legacy-scale scores the same directionality, to simplify comparisons. Readers who are familiar with the
- 659 ACT should keep that reverse-scoring in mind when reading this report.
- 660 d. For normal distributions, the coefficient of skewness is zero. Greater positive or negative deviations from zero indicate
- 661 more skewness.
- 662 e. Internal-consistency reliability (coefficient alpha).
- 663 f. Correlations (Pearson's r) of norm-based QDIS-7 scores with scores from legacy disease-specific instruments, and the 95%
- 664 confidence intervals of those correlation coefficients.
- 665 g. Coefficients (slopes of the lines) of the regressions of legacy-scale z scores on norm-based QDIS-7 scores, and the 95%
- 666 confidence intervals of those slopes. The units of the slopes are legacy-score standard deviations per 1-point difference in
- 667 norm-based QDIS-7 score.
- 668

# Appendix 1 Translation of the QDIS-7 into Japanese, and initial psychometric testing

672

The Japanese-language version of the QDIS-7 resulted from the commonly-used procedure of multiple forward translations, reconciliation, back-translation, and consultation with the developer of the original (Englishlanguage) version. The translators involved in the forward translations were native speakers of Japanese. Working independently, their goal was to produce a version of the QDIS-7 that would use colloquial language and would be easily understood by adults whose native language was Japanese.

All but one of the response choices in the original (English-language)
version had been used in other QOL instruments for which Japanese-language
versions already existed. In those cases, the Japanese-language version of the
QDIS-7 included Japanese-language response choices that were already being
used successfully in other QOL instruments.

The translator involved in the back-translation was a native speaker of
English. The back-translated version was used in consultations with the
developer of the original (English-language) version.

688 Initial psychometric evaluation of the QDIS-7 involved factor analysis, 689 computation of internal-consistency reliability, and criterion-related validation 690 testing. Quantitative details have been reported (21), and the overall findings 691 are summarized here. The results of factor analysis confirmed the QDIS-7's 692 hypothesized unidimensionality: More than half of the variance was explained 693 by the first factor, and all of the factor loadings were high. Internal-consistency 694 reliability of QDIS-7 scores was also high (21), as it was in the present study (Table 1). 695

696 Criterion-based validation testing showed that, as hypothesized for a
697 disease-specific QOL instrument, in patients who had chronic kidney disease
698 (CKD) the sensitively of the QDIS-7 to CKD stage was greater than that of a
699 generic QOL instrument (21).

- 700
- 701

# 702 Appendix 2

# 703 Norm-based scoring

704	Norm-based scoring began with data from 3,131 people in an age-and-gender-						
705	stratified representative sample of the population of Japan.						
706	It is important to note that these were not the people in the four groups						
707	in the main study. That is, they were not the people who provided the data						
708	used to make Table 1 and Figures 1, 2, and 3.						
709	Among those 3,131 people, 2,659 reported having at least one of the 41						
710	medical conditions listed below. The QDIS-7 scores of those 2,659 people were						
711	used as the basis for the norm-based scoring.						
712	1. Hypertension						
713	2. Myocardial infarction experienced in the past year						
714	3. Congestive heart failure or cardiomegaly						
715	4. Diabetes or high blood sugar						
716	5. Angina pectoris						
717	6. Stroke or other cerebrovascular disorders						
718	7. Cancer (excluding skin cancer)						
719	8. Asthma						
720	9. Hypothyroidism or diseases causing thyroid dysfunction						
721	10. Chronic allergy or sinusitis						
722	11. Atopic dermatitis (eczema)						
723	12. Chronic skin diseases other than atopic dermatitis						
724	13. Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD)						
725	14. Kidney disease						
726	15. Rheumatoid arthritis						
727	16. Connective tissue diseases (systemic lupus erythematosus, scleroderma,						
728	etc.)						
729	17. Osteoarthritis or degenerative joint disease						
730	18. Osteoporosis						
731	19. Stomach ulcers, gastritis, duodenitis, or other gastric diseases						
732	20. Hepatitis B or hepatitis C						
733	21. Irritable bowel syndrome						
734	22. Inflammatory bowel disease (ulcerative colitis, Crohn's disease)						
735	23. Obesity						
736	24. Anemia						
737	25. Depression						

738 26. Chronic fatigue syndrome 739 27. Migraine 740 28. Headaches other than migraine 741 29. Prostate enlargement 742 30. Erectile dysfunction (ED) 743 31. Gynecological diseases (uterus, ovaries, etc.) 744 32. Seasonal allergies such as hay fever 745 33. Chronic back pain or sciatica 746 34. Difficulty or inability to see even with glasses or contact lenses 747 35. Difficulty or inability to hear in one or both ears 748 36. Problems with upper or lower limbs (amputation, paralysis, weakness, 749 etc.) 750 37. Joint problems in the ankle or toes 751 38. Joint problems in the hip or knee 752 39. Urinary problems such as urinary incontinence or difficulty urinating 753 40. Shoulder pain or inflammation 754 41. Coldness in the back or legs 755 756 Participants who reported having more than one of those 41 medical 757 conditions were asked which one had the greatest effect on their QOL. Then 758 they responded to the QDIS-7 with regard to that one medical condition. 759 For example, suppose a participant reported having both asthma and 760 diabetes, and also reported that, of those two medical conditions, asthma had 761 the greater effect on their QOL. In that case, the participant would respond to 762 the QDIS-7 items in asthma-specific form. 763 The result was a set of QDIS-7 data with attributions to various medical 764 conditions, from 2,659 people. 765 Using those data and a 2-parameter partial-credit model based on item-766 response theory, we computed the mean  $\theta$  of each of the five response 767 categories, for each of the QDIS-7 question items. 768 Because of the nature of the item-response model, for each QDIS-7 item 769 the mean of the five responses' locations was 0 and the standard deviation was 770 1. Those were transformed to 50 and 10, respectively, and then the mean of the 771 seven QDIS-7 items was the norm-based QDIS-7 score. Thus, each 1-point 772 difference in norm-based QDIS-7 scores is a difference of 0.1 standard 773 deviations.

#### 774 Appendix 3

# 775 Differences between norm-based QDIS-7 scores and the 776 standardized mean difference

- 777 The QDIS-7 might appear to be similar to the standardized mean difference
- (SMD) (15), because both Figure 3 and the SMD put different QOL measures on
- a single scale, but that similarity is superficial. The SMD is commonly used in
- 780 meta-analyses, to combine results from different studies that "all assess the
- same outcome, but measure it in a variety of ways" (16). Its denominator is the
- standard deviation of a specified outcome among the participants in the studies
- 783 being meta-analyzed. In contrast, norm-based QDIS-7 scores are derived not
- from a group with a particular disease, but from the chronically-ill population
- as a whole (Appendix 2). The QDIS-7 quantifies QOL impact in attribution-
- 786 specific population-based units, rather than in units based on a particular set of
- 787 previously-published studies. Furthermore, using the SMD in meta-analyses
- assumes that the difference being quantified is between two measurements of
- the same domain. In contrast, the QDIS-7 is unidimensional (7, 21), so issues
- 790 regarding domains do not arise.