Measurement of health-related quality of life for people with dementia: development of a new instrument (DEMQOL) and an evaluation of current methodology

SC Smith, ^{1,2} DL Lamping, ² S Banerjee, ^{1*} R Harwood, ³ B Foley, ¹ P Smith, ¹ JC Cook, ¹ J Murray, ¹ M Prince, ⁴ E Levin, ⁵ A Mann ⁴ and M Knapp ⁶

Department, The Institute of Psychiatry, King's College London, UK

- ² Health Services Research Unit, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, UK
- ³ Department of Health Care for the Elderly, Queen's Medical Centre, Nottingham, UK
- ⁴ Section of Epidemiology, Division of Psychological Medicine, The Institute of Psychiatry, King's College London, UK
- ⁵ National Institute for Social Work, London, UK
- ⁶ PSSRU. The London School of Economics, UK
- * Corresponding author

Executive summary

Health Technology Assessment 2005; Vol. 9: No. 10

Health Technology Assessment NHS R&D HTA Programme





Executive summary

Background

Dementia is one of the most common and serious disorders in later life. It causes irreversible decline in global intellectual and physical functioning, and has a significant personal, social, health and economic impact on people with dementia, their family carers, and health and social services. Although measures of cognitive, functional and behavioural outcomes are widely used to evaluate interventions for dementia, the challenge of measuring broader outcomes such as healthrelated quality of life (HRQoL) has only recently begun to be addressed. This presents challenges about how to assess the subjective perceptions and experiences of the person with dementia in a reliable and valid way. This report describes the development of a new measure (DEMQOL) to evaluate HRQoL in people with dementia. The new measure is designed to address limitations and/or gaps that were identified in existing dementia-specific measures.

Objectives

The purpose of this study was to develop and validate a psychometrically rigorous measure of HRQoL for people with dementia. The measure was intended to be: (1) suitable for use in the UK; (2) available in self- and proxy-report versions for people with dementia and their carers, respectively; and (3) appropriate for use in mild/moderate and severe dementia. The aim was to keep the perspective of the person with dementia central in all stages of questionnaire development and evaluation.

Methods

Gold-standard psychometric techniques were used to develop DEMQOL and DEMQOL-Proxy. First, a conceptual framework was generated from a review of the literature, qualitative interviews with people with dementia and their carers, expert opinion and team discussion. Items for each component of the conceptual framework were drafted and piloted to produce questionnaires for the person with dementia (DEMQOL) and carer

(DEMQOL-Proxy). Extensive two-stage field testing of both measures was then undertaken in large samples of people with dementia (n=130) and their carers (n=126), representing a range of severity and care arrangements. In the first field test, items with poor psychometric performance were eliminated separately for DEMQOL and DEMQOL-Proxy to produce two shorter, more scientifically robust instruments. In the second field test, the item-reduced questionnaires were evaluated along with other validating measures (n=101 people with dementia, n=99 carers) to assess acceptability, reliability and validity.

Results

The conceptual framework included five domains: daily activities and looking after yourself, health and well-being, cognitive functioning, social relationships and self-concept. The preliminary field test versions of DEMQOL and DEMQOL-Proxy contained 73 questions representing the five domains and a global question about overall quality of life. Item reduction analyses resulted in a 28-item DEMQOL and a 31-item DEMQOL-Proxy.

Rigorous evaluation in two-stage field testing with 241 people with dementia and 225 carers demonstrated that in psychometric terms: (1) DEMQOL is comparable to the best available dementia-specific HRQoL measures in mild to moderate dementia, but is not appropriate for use in severe dementia [Mini Mental State Examination (MMSE) <10]; and (2) DEMQOL-Proxy is comparable to the best available proxy measure in mild to moderate dementia, and shows promise in severe dementia. In addition, the DEMQOL system has been validated in the UK in a large sample of people with dementia and their carers, and it provides separate measures for self-report and proxy report, which allows outcomes assessment across a wide range of severity in dementia.

Conclusions

The 28-item DEMQOL and 31-item DEMQOL-Proxy provide a method for evaluating HRQoL in dementia. The new measures show comparable psychometric properties to the best available dementia-specific measures, provide both self- and proxy-report versions for people with dementia and their carers, are appropriate for use in mild to moderate dementia (MMSE ≥ 10) and are suitable for use in the UK. DEMQOL-Proxy also shows promise in severe dementia. As DEMQOL and DEMQOL-Proxy give different but complementary perspectives on quality of life in dementia, it is recommended that both measures are used together. In severe dementia, only DEMQOL-Proxy should be used.

Further research with DEMQOL is needed to: (1) confirm these findings in an independent sample; (2) evaluate responsiveness; (3) investigate

the feasibility of use in specific subgroups and in economic evaluation; and (4) develop population norms. Additional research is needed to address the psychometric challenges of self-report in dementia and validating new dementia-specific HRQoL measures.

Publication

Smith SC, Lamping DL, Banerjee S, Harwood R, Foley B, Smith P, et al. Measurement of health-related quality of life for people with dementia: development of a new instrument (DEMQOL) and an evaluation of current methodology. *Health Technol Assess* 2005;**9**(10).

NHS R&D HTA Programme

The research findings from the NHS R&D Health Technology Assessment (HTA) Programme directly influence key decision-making bodies such as the National Institute for Clinical Excellence (NICE) and the National Screening Committee (NSC) who rely on HTA outputs to help raise standards of care. HTA findings also help to improve the quality of the service in the NHS indirectly in that they form a key component of the 'National Knowledge Service' that is being developed to improve the evidence of clinical practice throughout the NHS.

The HTA Programme was set up in 1993. Its role is to ensure that high-quality research information on the costs, effectiveness and broader impact of health technologies is produced in the most efficient way for those who use, manage and provide care in the NHS. 'Health technologies' are broadly defined to include all interventions used to promote health, prevent and treat disease, and improve rehabilitation and long-term care, rather than settings of care.

The HTA programme commissions research only on topics where it has identified key gaps in the evidence needed by the NHS. Suggestions for topics are actively sought from people working in the NHS, the public, consumer groups and professional bodies such as Royal Colleges and NHS Trusts.

Research suggestions are carefully considered by panels of independent experts (including consumers) whose advice results in a ranked list of recommended research priorities. The HTA Programme then commissions the research team best suited to undertake the work, in the manner most appropriate to find the relevant answers. Some projects may take only months, others need several years to answer the research questions adequately. They may involve synthesising existing evidence or designing a trial to produce new evidence where none currently exists.

Additionally, through its Technology Assessment Report (TAR) call-off contract, the HTA Programme is able to commission bespoke reports, principally for NICE, but also for other policy customers, such as a National Clinical Director. TARs bring together evidence on key aspects of the use of specific technologies and usually have to be completed within a limited time period.

Criteria for inclusion in the HTA monograph series

Reports are published in the HTA monograph series if (1) they have resulted from work commissioned for the HTA Programme, and (2) they are of a sufficiently high scientific quality as assessed by the referees and editors.

Reviews in *Health Technology Assessment* are termed 'systematic' when the account of the search, appraisal and synthesis methods (to minimise biases and random errors) would, in theory, permit the replication of the review by others.

The research reported in this monograph was commissioned by the HTA Programme as project number 97/17/16. As funder, by devising a commissioning brief, the HTA Programme specified the research question and study design. The authors have been wholly responsible for all data collection, analysis and interpretation and for writing up their work. The HTA editors and publisher have tried to ensure the accuracy of the authors' report and would like to thank the referees for their constructive comments on the draft document. However, they do not accept liability for damages or losses arising from material published in this report.

The views expressed in this publication are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the HTA Programme or the Department of Health.

Editor-in-Chief: Professor Tom Walley

Series Editors: Dr Peter Davidson, Professor John Gabbay, Dr Chris Hyde,

Dr Ruairidh Milne, Dr Rob Riemsma and Dr Ken Stein

Managing Editors: Sally Bailey and Caroline Ciupek

ISSN 1366-5278

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2005

This monograph may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising.

Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to NCCHTA, Mailpoint 728, Boldrewood, University of Southampton, Southampton, SO16 7PX, UK.

Published by Gray Publishing, Tunbridge Wells, Kent, on behalf of NCCHTA. Printed on acid-free paper in the UK by St Edmundsbury Press Ltd, Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk.