

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

Responsiveness of Quality of Life Instruments

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the
degree of

Master of Applied Statistics
in
Statistics

At Massey University, Palmerston North,
New Zealand.

Mark Weatherall

2001

Abstract

Quality of life (QoL) is a phrase that is intuitively meaningful. As a concept it distinguishes between the mere duration of life and a life that is in some sense 'worthwhile'. QoL measurement is thought to be important in the assessment of chronic health conditions and their treatment. It is difficult to create an operational definition of QoL that takes into account different concepts of QoL as well as the heterogeneity of subjects and diseases. Responsiveness is one aspect of instruments which measure QoL. A responsive instrument captures the change in QoL in response to interventions which change underlying health conditions. Internal responsiveness, measured by a variety of standardised mean changes, reflects change in a QoL instrument score measured on subjects who 'should have' changed. External responsiveness relates change in a QoL instrument score to a change in external criteria. Methods of determining external responsiveness include receiver operating characteristic curves, correlation and simple regression. Simple linear regression can be extended using linear mixed models which can estimate parameters either by maximum likelihood or by Markov Chain Monte Carlo methods. This thesis critically examines methods of assessing responsiveness and demonstrates the methodology, including the extension to linear mixed models. The data set used for illustration is based on a study of subjects with rheumatoid arthritis who are assessed before and after a period of inpatient hospital treatment for their condition. Three new QoL instruments, the EuroQol, the Quality of Life Profile and the WHOQoL-Bref were found to be moderately responsive. However the available methodology and the extensions described in this thesis were unable to find any difference in responsiveness. Reasons for this could include that QoL instruments are relatively blunt instruments for the detection of change. The external criteria for change used may not have been ideal. The reasons for a choice of instrument for QoL assessment may be better related to ease of completion, interpretation and analysis, than on sophisticated assessment of responsiveness.

Acknowledgements

Thanks to Dr Will Taylor and Russell Simpson of the Wellington School of Medicine and Health Sciences for access to the data set. Thanks also to Associate Professor Steve Haslett who supervised this thesis. The data set on which the thesis is based was derived from the study 'Measuring change in Quality of Life: Three measures compared', performed at the Rehabilitation Research and Teaching Unit of the Department of Medicine, Wellington School of Medicine and Health Sciences. This study received ethical approval from the Wellington Ethics Committee.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Table of Contents.....	iv
Figures	viii
Tables.....	ix
Chapter 1: Health related Quality of Life.....	1
Purposes for which QoL instruments are used.....	2
How QoL instruments are generated.....	3
General issues in analysis of data derived from QoL instruments.....	7
Some criteria for QoL measurement: Validity and Reliability	9
Validity.....	9
Reliability.....	10
Chapter 2: Internal Responsiveness.....	16
RI ₁ : Guyatt responsiveness index.....	18
RI ₂ : Paired t test statistic	23
RI ₃ : The ‘relative efficiency ‘ statistic	23
RI ₄ : The ‘standardised effect size’	24
RI ₅ : The ‘standardised response mean’	24
Other issues with internal responsiveness indices	25
1. One group repeated measures designs to evaluate responsiveness.....	25
2. Ceiling and floor effects for QoL instruments	25
3. Retrospective evaluation of change to evaluate responsiveness	26

4.	How should the clinically important difference be derived?	28
5.	Dimensions and summary scores for QoL instruments may disagree	29
6.	Lack of generalisation of responsiveness assessment.....	30
Chapter 3:	External responsiveness: Receiver operating characteristic curves.....	31
Receiver operating characteristic curves.....		32
ROC curves and QoL instrument evaluation		45
Problems with the use of ROC curves		45
Chapter 4:	External responsiveness: Correlation and Regression.....	54
Correlation.....		54
Issues with correlation coefficients and responsiveness		57
Regression models		66
Issues with regression models for responsiveness		70
1.	Precedence and the model underlying QoL	70
2.	Interpreting estimates of parameters	76
3.	Is the scale on which QoL measured important?	77
4.	The change in QoL should be in a predictable direction	79
5.	Model building and QoL.....	80
6.	Instruments which are not designed to be reduced to a single score	81
7.	Simple linear regression may be insufficient.....	81
Conclusion: Regression.....		82
Chapter 5:	Mixed linear models for external responsiveness	83
Maximum likelihood estimation		85
Measures of model fit.....		86
Bayesian techniques		87
Measures of model fit.....		89
Application to external responsiveness of QoL instruments.....		90
Chapter 6:	The study.....	94
The QoL instruments.....		94
The external criteria used to analyse the external responsiveness		96
Structure of the study		96

Chapter 7: Results.....	98
Simple summary statistics.....	98
Measures of internal responsiveness.....	100
ROC curves.....	101
Correlation.....	106
Regression analysis.....	108
QLP versus HAQ discussion.....	110
WHOQoL versus HAQ discussion.....	113
EuroQol visual analogue scale (VAS) versus HAQ discussion.....	115
EuroQol rating scale versus HAQ discussion.....	118
Summary of regression statistics.....	119
Mixed models: Maximum likelihood techniques.....	121
Covariance pattern models with fixed effects.....	121
Addition of a dummy variable for an intervention effect.....	125
Random coefficients models.....	128
Analysis of residuals.....	138
HAQ.....	138
Ritchie Articular Index.....	138
ESR.....	138
Analysis of random effects coefficients.....	138
Mixed models: Bayesian techniques.....	142
Chapter 8: Discussion.....	144
Quality of Life.....	144
Internal responsiveness.....	145
Receiver operating characteristic curves.....	146
Correlation coefficients.....	147
Simple linear regression.....	148
Mixed linear models.....	149
Conclusions.....	150
Appendix 1.....	151
The EuroQol.....	152

The WHOQoL-Bref	154
Quality of life profile: Physical and sensory disabilities version.....	158
The Ritchie Articular Index	183
The Health Assessment Questionnaire.....	184
 Appendix 2: Data sets.....	 187
Data set 1: QoL and external criteria scores by subject and visit	188
Data set 2: Change in QoL and external criteria scores	195
 Appendix 3: Sample analysis programmes	 198
SAS program for mixed linear model.....	199
SAS program for ROC curves.....	201
WinBUGS program for mixed linear model.....	203
 References	 205

Figures

Figure 1: Relationships between health condition and disability.....	4
Figure 2: ROC example	34
Figure 3: The form of the empirical ROC Curve.....	36
Figure 4: Sensitivity and False positive rate plotted on binormal scaled axes.....	41
Figure 5: The projected length of the ROC curve.....	46
Figure 6: Example of the area swept out by the ROC curve 1.....	47
Figure 7: Example of the area swept out by the ROC curve 2.....	48
Figure 8: The Lorenz curve and the area used for the Gini index.....	51
Figure 9: The Lorenz curve and the area used for the Pietra index	52
Figure 10: Example of outlier	62
Figure 11: Example of clustering.....	62
Figure 12: Limits of agreement plot.....	65
Figure 13: QLP ROC curve.....	101
Figure 14: EuroQol Visual analogue scale ROC curve	102
Figure 15: EuroQol Rating scale ROC curve.....	103
Figure 16: WHOQoL total score ROC curve.....	104
Figure 17: QLP versus HAQ.....	109
Figure 18: WHOQoL versus HAQ	112
Figure 19: EuroQol visual analogue scale versus HAQ.....	114
Figure 20: EuroQol Rating Scale versus HAQ	117
Figure 21: QLP versus HAQ, mean of two measurements.....	128
Figure 22: Residuals versus predicted values for final model of QLP versus HAQ....	140
Figure 23: Histogram of residuals for final model of QLP versus HAQ.....	140
Figure 24: Random coefficient estimates for final model of QLP versus HAQ.....	141

Tables

Table 1: Construction of the kappa statistic.....	11
Table 2: Construction of ICC, first example.....	12
Table 3: Construction of ICC, second example.....	13
Table 4: Different responsiveness indices.....	16
Table 5: Abbreviations used in Table 4.....	17
Table 6: Speculated derivation of $(2 \times MS_E)^{1/2}$ for RI_1	20
Table 7: Derivation of MS_E , discussion of RI_1	21
Table 8: Allocation of subjects by diagnostic testing.....	32
Table 9: Data for illustration of ROC curve.....	33
Table 10: Confidence intervals for correlation coefficients.....	57
Table 11: Data to illustrate difference between correlation and agreement.....	64
Table 12: QoL instrument scores.....	98
Table 13: External criteria scores.....	99
Table 14: Measures of internal responsiveness.....	100
Table 15: Summary for AUC ROC.....	105
Table 16: Correlation between the change in QoL and external criteria.....	106
Table 17: Omnibus tests for differences in correlations.....	107
Table 18: QLP vs. HAQ model 1.....	110
Table 19: QLP vs. HAQ model 2.....	110
Table 20: WHOQoL vs. HAQ.....	113
Table 21: EuroQol VAS vs. HAQ model 1.....	115
Table 22: EuroQol VAS vs. HAQ model 2.....	115
Table 23: EuroQol rating vs. HAQ.....	118
Table 24: Summary of regression statistics.....	119
Table 25: Examples of covariance patterns for QLP versus HAQ.....	122
Table 26: Example of slope parameter estimates and model fitting for QLP versus HAQ.....	123
Table 27: Model fitting for QoL instruments versus HAQ.....	124
Table 28: QoL instrument versus HAQ and dummy variable: fixed effects model....	126
Table 29: QoL instrument versus Ritchie with dummy variable: fixed effects model	126
Table 30: QoL instrument versus ESR with dummy variable: fixed effects model...	127
Table 31: Random coefficients versus fixed effects models: HAQ.....	130
Table 32: Random coefficients versus fixed effects models: Ritchie Articular Index	131
Table 33: Random coefficients versus fixed effects models: ESR.....	132
Table 34: Parameter estimates for fixed and random coefficients models for the HAQ	133
Table 35: Parameter estimates for fixed and random coefficient models: Ritchie Articular Index.....	134
Table 36: Parameter estimates for fixed and random coefficient models for the ESR	134
Table 37: Random coefficients models with a dummy variable for the intervention: HAQ.....	136
Table 38: Random coefficients models with a dummy variable for the intervention: Ritchie Articular Index.....	136
Table 39: Random coefficients models with a dummy variable for the intervention: ESR.....	137
Table 40: Bayesian estimates of slope parameters.....	142