

Yale University
EliScholar – A Digital Platform for Scholarly Publishing at Yale

Yale Medicine Thesis Digital Library

School of Medicine

2002

A History of Quality of Life Measurements

Jordan Matthew Prutkin

Alvan R. Feinstein

Follow this and additional works at: <http://elischolar.library.yale.edu/ymtdl>

 Part of the [Medicine and Health Sciences Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Prutkin, Jordan Matthew and Feinstein, Alvan R., "A History of Quality of Life Measurements" (2002). *Yale Medicine Thesis Digital Library*. 424.

<http://elischolar.library.yale.edu/ymtdl/424>

This Open Access Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Medicine at EliScholar – A Digital Platform for Scholarly Publishing at Yale. It has been accepted for inclusion in Yale Medicine Thesis Digital Library by an authorized administrator of EliScholar – A Digital Platform for Scholarly Publishing at Yale. For more information, please contact elischolar@yale.edu.

A History of Quality of Life Measurements

A Thesis Submitted to the
Yale University School of Medicine
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Degree of Doctor of Medicine

by
Jordan Matthew Prutkin, B.S.
2002

A HISTORY OF QUALITY OF LIFE MEASUREMENTS. Jordan M. Prutkin and Alvan R. Feinstein. (Sponsored by Harlan M. Krumholz). Department of Internal Medicine, Yale University, School of Medicine, New Haven, CT.

Purpose: To review the origins and early development of “quality of life” measurements in the medical literature.

Methods: A comprehensive literature review of Medline from 1966-1986 examining articles with “quality of life” as a subject heading. Studies were included if they were the original article describing a scale’s development or used scales developed in the social science literature.

Results: The measurements have been derived from two separate sources: a transfer and expansion of medical appraisals for “health status”, and an application of sociometric and psychometric methods for populational assessment of happiness, well-being, and other “affects”. Neither source of measurements used the basic principle that a person’s “quality of life” is a state of mind, not a state of health, and that a suitable personal expression should allow the opportunity to cite distinctive individual feelings. In addition, the existing approaches are often unsatisfactory for denoting changes.

Conclusions: Since “quality of life” of individual patients was not directly sought with the two original sources, its appraisal may be improved with an old clinical method of asking patients what they believe.

Acknowledgements

When I began working with Dr. Alvan Feinstein, he sized me up. He gave me two articles which I was to read before the next time I met with him. At our next meeting, he asked if I had read the two articles, and I answered yes. He then asked, "Well, would you summarize them for me?" I summarized as best I could, and we then proceeded to talk about a research project he was interested in completing. I realized only later that he wasn't trying to intimidate me, but, instead, was trying to ensure that I could complete the quality work he would expect of me.

He described my job as being "the dirty work in the trenches," trying to dig out the relevant literature and piece together where the references took me. Every week I would take a break and present to him where I was. He would force me to step back and see the big picture in what I was doing. Why was this important? What did I think? Where did I want to go next?

He was a true mentor to me. I will remember our conversations fondly. He taught me to not impose my belief system on a patient. He taught me that clinical epidemiology was as rigorous as any "scientific" field. He taught me to love what you do to your dying day. Most importantly, he taught me, even though we never saw a patient together, to always strive to be a better clinician.

I dedicate this thesis to his memory.

I would also like to thank Dr. Harlan Krumholz for taking over this project after Dr. Feinstein's death.

Table of Contents

Introduction	page 1
Statement of Purpose	page 2
Methods	page 3
Results	page 4
Development of Functional Status Indexes	
Appraisal of Functional Status	page 4
Development of Social Science Indexes	
Government Activities	page 7
Development of Social Indicators	page 8
Subjective Measures of Well-Being	page 9
Medicine and the Social Sciences	
Early Clinical Attention to Quality of Survival and Life	page 11
Early Quality-of-Life Indexes and Social Science Transfers	page 13
New Incentives for Quality-of-Life Measurement	page 15
Discussion	page 18
Reasons for plethora of Instruments	page 19
Patient-centered versus Group-centered Indexes	page 20
Single Global Rating versus Multi-item Questionnaires	page 20
Challenges in Measuring Change	page 22
Conclusion	page 23
References	page 25

Introduction

Although “quality of life” is now frequently discussed and measured in the medical literature, the measurements seem to be done with diverse approaches, methods, and components. Among the components used in various studies are the following: general health status, functional capacity, emotional function, level of well-being, life satisfaction, happiness, intellectual level, pain, nausea and vomiting, level of symptoms, fatigue, sexual functioning, social activity, memory level, financial status, and job status. Despite claims that the methods used to measure quality of life were “valid”, many studies use only one or two of these components to represent “quality of life,” even though many investigators believe this concept is usually defined more broadly [1].

These problems may arise because researchers sometimes create new instruments without a thorough search of previous literature. A more likely explanation, however, is that quality of life has not been a suitably defined concept. Quality of life appraisal may have originated in a manner that has produced the unsatisfactory framework for current measurements.

Although the current problems in quality-of-life measurement have been recently reviewed[2-9], the history of quality-of-life measurements has not been traced to show their entrance and early evolution in medicine. By knowing how the measurements developed, it is possible to provide an explanation for the current dissatisfaction and debate surrounding their use. This review traces the development of the early functional status scales and sociological surveys that were later used in the medical literature to connote quality of life.

Statement of Purpose

In this thesis, the origin and earliest uses of “quality of life” in the medical literature are examined. The current indexes seem to have arisen from two different sources: a direct transfer of indexes developed medically for measuring “health status”, and an appropriation of non-medical methods used to identify social and psychologic conditions. The disparate approaches and concepts of these two sources may contribute to the current confusion of the definition and measurement of “quality of life” [10-17]. This review concludes by suggesting a proposal for the implementation of a single global rating of quality-of-life.

Methods

A Medline searches was completed using the subject heading “quality of life,” including only English language articles from 1966-1986. In addition, “quality of life” and “quality of survival” were examined as textwords from 1966-1986. The year 1986 was chosen as the end time-point because more recent reviews have documented developments in quality of life measurement after this time. This initial search yielded about 900 references.

In another pursuit, the term “quality of life” was searched as a keyword in Yale University’s ORBIS database (the online library catalogue of books dating from 1977). Lastly, “quality of life” was searched in the card catalogue for books before 1977. Approximately 100 titles were found using this method.

Titles and abstracts were then screened to determine whether established or new instruments had been used to assess quality of life. By using the reference lists and bibliographies, the original studies which detailed the development and validation of the scales were discovered. Studies were included if they were the original article describing a scale’s development or if they used scales developed in the social science literature.

Results

The simultaneous development of functional status measures in the medical literature and social indicators in the social science literature were later used either solely or in combination with other measures in the rating of quality of life. The description that follows first traces the development of functional status measures, then describes the concurrent events in the social sciences that led to the development of subjective measures of well-being, and lastly shows how these two streams came together in the medical literature to produce the current quality-of-life measures.

Development of Functional Status Indexes

Appraisal of Functional Status

The earliest attempts to examine non-biologic aspects of patient's daily behavior seem to have been objective measurements of functional health status, defined as the ability to perform routine self-care and complete basic physical activities, and level of independent living.

The first functional classification scale for adults[18], published in 1937, was a joint project of New York's City Research Bureau of the Welfare Council, City Department of Public Welfare, and State Department of Social Welfare. Intended to examine the medical needs of elderly people receiving public assistance in New York City, the study analyzed differences "between those who are... incapacitated in various ways for normal living and those whose capacity for normal living is not seriously impaired." Patients were classified in four categories: I, no obvious disability; II, up and able to get about; III, homebound; and IV, bedridden.

Two years later, in 1939, the *New York Heart Association Classification*[19] was published by a committee evaluating the functional capacity of patients with heart disease. They were categorized in four classes: I, no restrictions on activity; II, slight limitations; III, marked limitation; and IV, inability to complete any physical activity without discomfort, and possibly angina at rest. Similar categories of limitation were used in the late 1940's by the *Visick Scale* for post-gastrectomy patients[20] and by the *American Rheumatism Association Classification*[21].

In 1947, Zeman[22] published a classification that contained categories for both functional capacity and occupational skill in patients over the age of 60 years, living in an old age home. Functional capacity was listed in five categories: Class A, unlimited and unsupervised activity; Class B, moderate activity with minimal assistance; Class C, limited capabilities and practically homebound; Class D, confined to bed; and Class E, blind or severely visually impaired. Level of skill was cited in three categories: 1, specialized; 2, ordinary; and 3, unskilled or handicapped. Thus, an active carpenter or trained cook would be classified A1, whereas a partially restricted person with no specific skills would be B3.

In 1948, David Karnofsky, evaluating the performance status of cancer patients, published a single numerical scale[23] that gave scores from 0 to 100 for a combination of three factors: the ability to carry out normal activities, including work; the need for custodial care; and the need for medical care. An improved rating on the Karnofsky scale was one of the attributes used to determine the clinical effectiveness of nitrogen mustards in palliative treatment[24].

In 1957, Moskowitz and McCann[25] published the PULSES profile. It was derived from the PULHEMS Profile developed by the Canadian army[26] and the later PULHES Profile used by the US Army[27] to examine the functional

levels of new soldiers in World War II. PULSES – an acronym for *Physical condition, Upper extremities, Lower extremities, Sensory components, Excretory function, and mental and emotional Status* – was a tandem profile index in which each of the 6 domains received a score of 1-4. The PULSES profile was probably the first functional status index to include mental and emotional status.

In 1958 and 1959, S. Katz and colleagues at a facility for chronic care in Cleveland reported *the Index of Independence of Activities of Daily Living*[28,29]. Originally used to evaluate functional deterioration in patients with hip fractures, the items in the index included such activities as employment, participation in social groups, preparation of own meals, bathing, transferring to bed, and walking up stairs. The index was subsequently[30] applied to other patients with chronic diseases such as stroke, multiple sclerosis, and arthritis. The authors initially chose the component items from previous experience plus a review of the literature, but the items were later[29] reduced to six: bathing, dressing, going to the toilet, transferring into and out of bed, continence, and feeding. The ratings of A-G depended on the number of activities patients could not complete.

The *Barthel Index*[31], from two chronic disease hospitals in Maryland, was first published in 1958. Originally developed to assess rehabilitation potential in patients with musculoskeletal or neuromuscular disorders, the index rated patients' independence according to the amount of assistance required in 10 activities. Different weightings were used for the original ten items, which included feeding, transferring from wheelchair to bed, coming to a sitting position, personal toilet (brushing teeth, shaving, washing face), going to the toilet, walking on level surface, managing stairs, dressing, bowel continence, and urinary continence. A patient who required no help received full credit for the activity while lower scores were given for increasing amounts of assistance. In

this index, continence was weighted heavily (both for transferring to the toilet and for maintaining urinary and bowel continence) because of its social consequences and the amount of time required to attend to an incontinent patient. The Barthel index, which could be used repeatedly to assess patients' changes, was later[32] amended to add "bathing" and remove "coming to a sitting position."

Chronologically, the next pertinent index appeared in 1960 when Zubrod and colleagues from the Eastern Cooperative Cancer Chemotherapy Group reported a particularly simple measurement of patient performance according to the amount of time spent in bed[33]. Scores ranged from zero for normal activity to four for bed restriction.

Lawton and Brody's *Instrumental Activities of Daily Living Scale*[34], in 1969, appraised patients' abilities in such daily tasks as shopping, food preparation, housekeeping, laundry, use of telephone, mode of transportation, responsibility for medications, and ability to handle finances. The scale was devised with the practical goals of making assessments, planning treatment, assisting casework, aiding the teaching/training process, and helping determine the need for facilities and services.

All of these early functional status indexes were developed under medical auspices; and many of the indexes are either still used today or became a basis for later alterations[17]. In a 1969 review, Bruett and Overs[35] noted many unpublished indexes as well as 12 ADL scales dating from before 1969; and we have also found 24 more[36-59].

Development of Social Science Indexes

Government Activities

In 1948, after the World Health Organization[60] defined health as “not only the absence of infirmity and disease but also a state of complete physical, mental, and social well being”, physicians were reminded that a patient’s health was more than just a corporeal state, and could be affected by environmental and social factors.

The subsequent appraisal of social and environmental factors, however, was prompted not by medical researchers, but by major changes in government activities. A National Health Survey[61], created in 1957, was intended to measure the quality of health of the American people, not just longevity, and to determine "the positive elements of good health rather than merely the absence of disease and infirmity." To provide information for government officials and public health experts, the survey was designed to examine the social aspects of health, the personal impact of illness, the steps taken to prevent illness, and the relation of medical care to other demographic variables.

In 1960, the President's Commission on National Goals – comprising academicians, public servants, and leaders of industry – reported on the state of the nation[62] and proposed an outline of national policies and goals for improvement. Since only 48 of the stipulated 82 goals were measurable at that time[63], a new set of measures was needed. During President Johnson’s administration (1963-1969), public agencies were urged and supported to develop more quantifiable new measurements to evaluate domestic social programs and to stimulate change in those deemed ineffective [64].

Development of Social Indicators

At about this time, the Social Indicators movement, led by psychologists and sociologists, began[65] to advocate “monitoring change in such areas of public life as education, health, employment, crime victimization, political participation, and population growth and measurement”. These ideas were first broadly disseminated in 1966 in a collection of essays[63] that referred to measuring various aspects of society and comparing them with goals of the nation. One of the essayists[66] complained that the widely available economic data, usually reported through government agencies, could not be used to analyze social systems.

When the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare published *Toward a Social Report*[67] three years later, the authors advocated a change in focus: "We have measures of death and illness, but no measures of physical vigor or mental health. We have measures of the level and distribution of income, but no measures of the satisfaction that income brings." The staff director of the study later[68] lamented not only the emphasis on objective measurements, but also the paucity of available non-income statistics. (Income statistics were probably a main focus of social indicators because economists were the main source of the measures).

A 1972 bibliography[69], showed that more than half of the more than 1000 articles related to Social Indicators had been published between 1970-72. In 1974, a new journal, *Social Indicators Research*, dedicated to scholarship and research on the “quality of life,” began to include articles on pertinent philosophical concepts, design and testing of new instruments, and studies using those instruments.

Subjective Measures of Well-Being

The 1976 publications of Campbell, Converse, and Rogers[70] and Andrews and Withey[71] were highly influential in expanding the scope of social science measurements. Although most previous data had referred almost exclusively to objective phenomena, the new studies showed that subjective indicators could be measured, thus enabling examination of the “soft data” for “quality of life”. The ideas were based on the work of Cantril's self-anchoring scale[72], Bradburn's *Scale of Affect Balance*[73], and Campbell and Converse's earlier *The Human Meaning of Social Change* [74].

To Hadley Cantril[72], well-being was conceived as satisfaction with life, and regarded as a cognitive process in which a person's perceptions of life were compared with his aspirations – the difference between the two being regarded as his perceived well-being. In persons from 13 different nations, Cantril found that the greatest well-being and satisfaction with life occurred when perceptions of life were closest to aspirations.

Norman Bradburn[73], using the affective aspects of experience, viewed subjective well-being as the balance between positive and negative affects. The greater the ratio of positive affect to negative affect, the higher the sense of well-being. Bradburn's scale used ten questions that each began with “During the past few weeks did you ever feel...” and were answered with “often,” “sometimes,” or “never.” Five questions aimed at positive affect (e.g., being particularly excited or interested in something), and five at negative affect (e.g., being very lonely or remote from other people). Bradburn's scale has subsequently been used extensively, particularly in a 1981 national study of 33,000 Canadians[75].

In *The Human Meaning of Social Change*[74] – which dealt with issues surrounding measurement of “aspirations, expectations, and satisfactions” –

Campbell and Converse in 1972 laid the theoretical groundwork for later publications. Their work was extended in 1976 in *The Quality of American Life*[70], using data from 1971-1972 interviews on which a representative sample of U.S. citizens described their lives. The investigators asked four separate types of questions: a global question about life satisfaction; ten life characterizations expressed in terms such as enjoyable/miserable and rewarding/disappointing; more directed questions regarding satisfaction in such domains as employment and housing; and further specifications of satisfaction within those domains. The responses were then combined in various ways to yield the *Overall Scale of Life Satisfaction, Index of Well-being, Index of General Affect, and Index of Perceived Stress*.

Using some of Campbell, Converse and Rodgers's theoretical arguments[70], Andrews and Withey[71,76] began to develop measures of life quality for interviews conducted in 1972. The conceptual model also included affective components of people's lives, rather than just their physical or social conditions. Respondents were asked questions such as, "How do you feel about your life as a whole?" and "How do you feel about what you are accomplishing in your life?" The 123 items in the questionnaire were grouped into 12 common "life domains," which were then assumed to represent quality of life.

Medicine and the Social Sciences

Early Clinical Attention to Quality of Survival and Life

Although the clinical measurements of functional status were often used for elderly people, little or no attention was given by clinicians and researchers to the early publications in the non-clinical literature of surveys that had been done by psychologists using indexes to appraise happiness and psychological well-being[77,78]. One study[77], in 1953, used objective measures: good health, financial security, hobbies and interests, friends, living with one's spouse, age,

and sex. Another study[78], in 1961, used subjective measures, expressed as a life satisfaction scale and two smaller life satisfaction indexes.

In what seems to be the first measure of the quality of survival in a clinical trial, breast cancer patients in 1966 were studied after radical mastectomy or limited surgery[79]. The post-operative questionnaire contained objective measures such as lymphedema and activity status, but also an evaluation of the patient's attitude. Activity status was determined from the patient's ability to return to the same level as before the operation. Attitude – rated as “good,” “fair,” or “poor” – was based on the patient's number of complaints. Although the authors did not clearly state how the results of the questionnaire were translated into the measures of attitude, this study seems to have been a pioneering effort to include patients' subjective opinions in comparing the effects of treatment. In a 1968 report, functional status and attitude were replaced by a battery of neurologic, psychiatric, and psychometric tests to denote quality of survival after surgery for anterior cerebral artery aneurysms[80].

Despite these early advances, the standard approach for judging efficacy of cancer therapeutic agents continued to be quantity of survival. After noting that cancer patients were often distressed by the adverse (but unmeasured) symptomatic effects of radiotherapy and chemotherapy, Feinstein *et al.*[81] in 1969 called for better methods that would measure quality of survival, at least according to a patient's pain, distress, or suffering. In studies during 1968-1983, however, general symptoms[82,83] were appraised in only two reports, and quality of survival continued to be assessed from functional status[84-90] or attitude toward life[91,92].

As a specific concept, the term “quality of life” (rather than quality of survival) seems to have entered the medical literature in a 1966 article[93] about medically-indigent patients receiving hemodialysis. After noting that the post-

dialysis medical problems included sepsis and cannula clotting, the authors concluded that, “while an effective degree of life prolongation was obtained for some of these patients, for most the *quality of life* was unacceptable” (italics added). Quality of life seems to have been judged from such events as difficulties finding a job, becoming too weak to care for children, and withdrawal from spouse and children. The authors also acknowledged that the problems, which had made all the patients contemplate suicide, might have been improved with more suitable attention.

In a subsequent editorial, “Medicine and the Quality of Life”[94], J.R. Elkinton borrowed Francis Bacon’s definition that quality of life is “the harmony within a man, and between a man and world.” In view of all the technical and ethical problems at that time, Elkinton questioned whether chronic dialysis provided an acceptable quality of life, and called for physicians to participate more actively in helping to make these decisions for society and for individual patients.

Early Quality-of-Life Indexes and Social Science Transfers

The medical literature contained no instruments specifically aimed at measuring quality of life until two appeared in 1970: the *Vitagram Index*[95] and *Life Units*[96]. The *Vitagram Index*[95] was a two-dimensional graph with duration of life on the X-axis. Quality of life, on the Y-axis, was determined from a functional status scale that gave patients points for their ability to work and ambulate. The area under the curve, regarded as the total quality of survival, was assessed for patients who were receiving one of several treatments for lung cancer.

Similar in design, *Life Units*[96] were constructed as a sum of the products of years of life and “quality of life”, as determined by “social usefulness,”

defined by restrictions on a patient's ability to work. In this index, which was designed for heart-valve transplant patients, the greater the number of life units, the greater the success of the surgery. Although intended both to determine efficacy and to aid decisions about whether a patient should undergo surgery, this index seems never to have been mentioned again after its first report.

The first quality of life measurement to become popular was Priestman and Baum's 1976 *Linear Analogue Self Assessment Scale*[97], which used a visual analogue appraisal[98-100]. On a ten-centimeter line labeled with extreme "anchors" at each end, subjects placed a mark, corresponding to their feelings at the moment. The ten questions in the index ranged from feelings of well-being, to pain, to the patient's perception of efficacy of treatment. The sum of the marks given as ratings for the ten questions became an overall measure of quality of life.

During the next few years, instead of continuing either this technique or the early approaches based on health status, many investigators began to appraise quality of life with instruments or components taken directly from the social sciences. In 1982 Johnson *et al.*[101] used seven variables and the *Affect Transformation Scale* from previous social science publications[70,73]. The research showed that patients with successful transplants had a better quality of life than hemodialysis patients for whom transplantation was not planned, awaited, or already failed. Appraising the quality of life results, the authors urged "continued efforts to apply social psychological research to clinical investigations...for evaluating medical interventions of many different kinds."

In 1984, Simmons *et al.*[102], also appraising quality of life in patients receiving hemodialysis, used a theoretical framework that combined physical, social, and emotional well-being, including the previously developed *Index of Well-Being*[70]. The latter index as well as the *Index of Psychological Affect and*

Index of Overall Life Satisfaction – all scales previously developed by Campbell, Converse, and Rodgers[70] – were used by a nephrology group, led by R.W. Evans, to measure quality of life in a study comparing patients receiving transplanted kidneys from living versus cadaver donors[103] and in another study of patients with end-stage renal disease[104]. The authors said they chose the three cited indexes because comparative data were available from a set of normal populational controls. In a 1983 analysis of outcomes after heart-valve surgery[105], the investigators used multiple instruments, but the subjective section of one of the questionnaires included Bradburn's *Scale for Well-being*[73].

From the social sciences, physicians also borrowed psychological tests as part of a battery of appraisals. Examples of such usages before 1984 include the following indexes: *Rorschach test*[106], *Shanan Sentence Completion Technique*[106], *Psychosocial Adjustment to Illness Scale*[107], *Mooney Problem Checklist*[108], *Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory*[107], and *Profile of Mood States*[108, 109]. Other borrowed approaches included the use of sociologic guidelines for questionnaires[110,111] and (in health services research) economic forms of utility analysis[112,113].

New Incentives for Quality-of-Life Measurement

In 1985-86, two major events added substantial impetus for measuring of quality of life in clinical trials.

One of these events was the Food and Drug Administration's (FDA) decision to require quality of life data as one of the "key efficacy parameters" in clinical trials for new anticancer agents[114]. The FDA said it would be willing to approve a drug in certain cases if it only reduced pain or toxic effects. A working group from the FDA and the National Cancer Institute[115] later recommended that validated quality of life instruments be used for comparing either pre- and

post-treatment, or treatment versus placebo groups. The stated belief was, “[R]easonable assurance that a new drug imparts comparable net patient benefit is a legitimate basis for demonstrating effectiveness.” In the original statement, the FDA defined quality of life only in relation to performance status or pain, but the later recommendation allowed measurement of improvement in tumor-caused symptoms, in functional status, in body mass, and in psychological status, as well as decreased reliance on medical support.

The second influential event occurred when quality-of-life assessment was used as the primary outcome in a randomized trial published prominently in the *New England Journal of Medicine* in 1986, with widespread publicity thereafter. To examine the quality of life for patients taking one of three anti-hypertensive medications, Croog *et al.*[116], checked satisfaction with life, physical state, emotional state, intellectual state, social functioning, and the *Index of Well-Being*[70]. When the results showed superiority for one of the anti-hypertensive agents, pharmaceutical manufacturers realized that their products could be promoted not just for physiologic effects, but for quality of life.

With these regulatory and commercial incentives, clinical investigators and their statistical consultants began to augment their customary data with methods of measuring quality of life, and began to rely on the “accepted” approaches offered by either the “established” health status or psychosocial indexes. A search for “quality of life” as a Medline subject heading for each year from 1969 to 2000 produced the results shown in Figure 1. A relatively small but steady rise in articles occurred during 1975-1988, but a sharp increase began in 1989 and has continued thereafter.




Figure 1. Number of articles with "Quality of Life" as a Medline subject heading, 1969-2000.

This review of the entrance and early evolution of quality of life measurements in medicine will end here, because the subsequent developments and current status of those measurements have been abundantly described elsewhere[1,3,8,17,117-119]. The field has now grown so extensively that it is regularly discussed at symposia and large meetings; and it is the sole focus of an international journal, *Quality of Life Research*.

Discussion

The current review demonstrates that the concept and measurement of “quality of life” entered medical research from two different sources, each of which led to different problems. Indexes of functional capacity and performance, originally developed for evaluating treatment of patients, were later augmented by appraisals of social, emotional, and other functions to produce indexes of health status. The health-status indexes, although often adequate for assessing health status, were then used inappropriately to denote the quality of life for individual persons.

Indexes of happiness, well-being, and other “affects” had been developed by social scientists to assess populational phenomena and had been constructed with sociometric or psychometric principles of measurement. The populational results were not always suitable, however, for individual patients, whose most pertinent quality-of-life components might not have been included or suitably weighted among the multiple items of the populational instrument. A separate problem was that a person’s “quality of life” might be influenced much more by non-medical than by medical phenomena. Furthermore, the multi-item populational instruments were not always effective in assessing the changes that occurred after therapeutic interventions.

The current instruments, while useful for measuring functional status, happiness, or other “affects,” have been misused by researchers who claim that they represent the “quality of life” of individual patients. This and other problems in the current assessment of quality of life as well as suggestions for better measurements are considered in the discussion that follows.

Reasons for Plethora of Instruments

An outsider observing the current scene might readily ask why the literature contains so many quality-of-life indexes for such a diverse array of diseases.

One immediate reason is the distinction between “quality of life” and “health-related quality of life.” To avoid including non-medical components – such as family problems, economic status, and religious or spiritual influences – investigators later decided to focus on medical factors, expressed as a combination of functional status and symptoms related to specific diseases. Whether this combination adequately reflects “health-related quality of life” is an arguable issue, but the many different symptoms of different diseases would obviously lead to a diversity of indexes for “health-related quality of life”.

Another reason for the plethora of indexes may be that investigators do not always complete a thorough search of the literature to see if an adequate index already exists for their study. A statement by Lawton and Brody[34] more than 30 years ago is often still applicable today: “The present state of the trade seems to be one in which each investigator or practitioner feels an inner compulsion [sic] to make his own scale and to cry that other existent scales cannot possibly fit his own setting.”

Perhaps the most cogent reason for the many indexes, however, may be that the clinical outcomes most desired by patients receiving treatment are relief of symptoms, improvement in function, and avoidance of adverse reactions. These attributes, though, are often transferred to a different concept, called “quality of life”, which is difficult to measure because a person’s quality of life – even when solely “health-related” – has different components, significance, and meaning that are unique for each person.

Patient-centered versus Group-centered Indexes

Since physicians and family relatives may often misconstrue patients' beliefs about quality of life[105,120-121], investigators have included different categories of people when constructing an index. This approach is well illustrated with the *QL-Index*[122], which was developed from surveys of more than 1000 people in Australia, who were asked what they regarded as quality of life and what domains should be included in a brief, simple scale. The respondents comprised cancer patients, their relatives, patients with other chronic diseases, relatives of those patients, healthy people aged ≥ 20 , doctors, nurses, social workers, and clergy who were seen in various settings that included the clinic, the hospital, and a terminal-care hospice. Despite admirable size and efforts in the survey, the result – a summary and consensus of the 1000 participants – may not allow adequate expression for the way that individual patients determine their own quality of life. A pain that is tolerated by one patient might be unbearable to another. The inability to return to work might devastate a thirty-year old but hardly affect a seventy-year old. These individual differences are not easily cited in populational-consensus quality-of-life indexes.

In multi-item questionnaires, each question may be given an equal weight or weights determined either from a group consensus or a mathematical model. If patients, however, are not invited and allowed to state their own beliefs and the relative importance of those beliefs, the result is a quality-of-life assessment produced by investigators, physicians, consensus, or mathematical formulas, not by the pertinent individual patient.

Single Global Rating versus Multi-item Questionnaires

A patient's single simple global rating (such as a visual analog mark, verbal category, or numerical score) for gradations such as poor or good can

eliminate the inadequacy and bias inherent in letting researchers choose and weight a set of individual domains. After patients give this simple rating for how they feel about the relative excellence of their own quality of life, a separate second rating can be given for “health-related quality of life,” either directly or for the impact of health on the previous rating. If desired, the particular entities that most affect the favorable or unfavorable ratings can be discerned from the patient’s further responses either to more open-ended questions or to a suitably organized checklist of possibilities.

The purpose of the results would be to provide a direct, appropriate assessment of quality of life. The new ratings would be a supplement, not a replacement, for separate pertinent indexes that appraise associated phenomena, such as changes in symptoms, functional capacity, and other components of health status.

The simple two-question approach to “quality of life” seems clinically sensible and offers unquestionable “face validity,” but more study is needed to determine the optimal method of carrying out this type of patient-centered inquiry. Among the issues to be addressed are the method of phrasing questions to be sure the patient understands what is being asked and the choice of the best type of rating scale (graphical, categorical, numerical) for the single global expressions.

The phrasing of questions is an important issue because differences in patients’ cultural and educational backgrounds may lead to different beliefs about what is meant by “quality of life.” Although ratings can be offered in the graphic form of a visual analog scale, or in verbal or numerical categories, the comparative efficacy of these formats has not been studied for quality-of-life measurements[123]. A best format did not emerge from an investigation of rating scales for pain[124].

For investigators who use patient-centered multi-item indexes, the most effective structures have also not been clearly demonstrated[125-130]. Among the issues to be resolved are the optimal number of questions to be asked, and whether patients, when asked again at later times, will change the items that they originally emphasized. To shorten the time for completing responses, various studies have constrained patients to including only five components for quality of life[126-129]. Since some patients may have more and others fewer than five important components, another uncertain issue is the optimal balance between a patient's choice of the quantity of components and the amount of time required to complete the questionnaire.

Most multi-item questions have referred only to the magnitude of a particular component, such as a disability, but not its importance. A few recent indexes[128-130] have solicited ratings of both magnitude and importance for each item, but an optimal method has not yet been developed for analyzing the concomitant pair of ratings.

Finally, any multi-item instrument for quality of life should contain optional sections marked "other," in which patients can note personally important components that were not included in the cited list of items.

Challenges in Measuring Change

A separate set of challenges arises when quality of life is measured repeatedly to appraise changes after therapy or other clinical interventions. If the same index is used each time, patients may not recall their prior ratings for each item; and their subsequent responses may not accurately represent what happened. One approach to this problem—letting the patients see their previous ratings before making new ones—is sometimes avoided because of fear that the new rating may be biased over the old one.

An alternative approach is to avoid using the original scale of ratings and, instead, to use a transition scale[131] which contains a set of comparative categories such as much better, better, same, worse, and much worse. Transition scales have the advantage that ratings of change can be given without reference to previous values. The main disadvantage is the need to be sure that patients understand the reference basis for each change, i.e., does it refer to the immediately previous state or to the original state, before treatment? (This problem does not arise with a simple two-state before-and-after transition). A separate disadvantage, which is clinically trivial but sometimes important mathematically, is that transition ratings do not permit use of the repeated-measures analysis-of-variance model, which is often favored by certain statisticians.

Finally, a different problem in multi-item instruments is the issue of responsiveness, i.e., the ability to show change. As noted by Nunally[132], the diverse up-and-down changes in multiple items can not be easily or clearly aggregated into a clear decision about change. This difficulty is an important reason for favoring the use of a single global index for expressing quality of life, and then a simple transition scale for citing change.

Conclusion

The current problems and imperfections in quality-of-life indexes can be attributed to, and explained by, an origin in two different streams of thought, neither of which has led to a fully satisfactory approach. From the medical stream, the transfer of health status indexes was not a suitable way to denote a patient's belief about quality of life. From the psychosocial stream, the multi-item instruments, based on consensus or other populational decisions, may not allow patients to express and weight the diverse features that can affect their

own feelings, and to adequately report changes in status. Since quality of life is determined uniquely by each patient, and reflects a personal reaction rather than an objective "status", a possible solution to the problems is to return to an old clinical approach, which directly asks patients to indicate what they feel.

References

1. Gill TM, Feinstein AR. 1994. A critical appraisal of the quality of quality-of-life measurements. *JAMA*. 272:619-626.
2. Bardelli D, Saracci R. 1978. Measuring the quality of life in cancer clinical trials: a sample survey of published trials. *UICC Technical Report*. 36:75-94.
3. Najman JM, Levine S. 1981. Evaluating the impact of medical care and technologies on the quality of life: a review and critique. *Soc Sci Med*. 15F:107-115.
4. de Haes J, van Knippenberg FC. 1985. The quality of life of cancer patients: a review of the literature. *Soc Sci Med*. 20:809-817.
5. Hollandsworth Jr., JG. 1988. Evaluating the impact of medical treatment on the quality of life: a 5-year update. *Soc Sci Med*. 26:425-434.
6. Maguire P, Selby P. 1989. Assessing quality of life in cancer patients. *Br J Cancer*. 60:437-440.
7. Schumacher M, Olschewski M, Schulgen G. 1991. Assessment of quality of life in clinical trials. *Stat Med*. 10:1915-1930.
8. Greenfield S, Nelson EC. 1992. Recent developments and future issues in the use of health status assessment measures in clinical settings. *Med Care*. 30:Suppl:MS23-MS41.
9. Lepage A, Hunt S. 1997. The problem of quality of life in medicine. *JAMA*. 278:47-50.
10. Krupinski J. 1980. Health and quality of life. *Soc Sci Med*. 14A:203-211.

11. Ware JE. 1984. Conceptualizing disease impact and treatment outcomes. *Cancer*. 53:Suppl:2316-2326.
12. Faden R, Leplege A. 1982. Assessing quality of life: moral implications for clinical practice. *Med Care*. 30:Suppl:MS 166-175.
13. Olweny CLM. 1993. Quality of life in cancer care. *Med J Australia*. 158:429-432.
14. Farquhar M. 1995. Elderly people's definitions of quality of life. *Soc Sci Med*. 41:1439-1446.
15. Wilson IB, Cleary PD. 1995. Linking clinical variables with health-related quality of life. *JAMA*. 273:59-65.
16. Carr AJ, Thompson PW, Kirwan JR. 1996. Quality of life measures. *Br J Rheum*. 35:275-281.
17. McDowell I, Newell C. 1996. *Measuring Health: A Guide to Rating Scales and Questionnaires*. New York: Oxford University Press.
18. *A Study of the Medical Needs of Recipients of Old Age Assistance in New York City in 1934*. 1937. Albany, NY: Dept. of Social Welfare, State of New York.
19. Criteria Committee of the New York Heart Association. 1939. *Nomenclature and Criteria for Diagnosis of Diseases of the Heart*. New York: New York Heart Association.
20. Visick AH. 1948. A study of the failures after gastrectomy. *Ann R Coll Surg*. 3:266-284.
21. Steinbrocker O, Traeger CH, Batterman RC. 1949. Therapeutic criteria in rheumatoid arthritis. *JAMA*. 140(8):659-662.

22. Zeman FD. 1947. The functional capacity of the aged: its estimation and practical importance. *J Mount Sinai Hosp.* 14:721-28.
23. Karnofsky DA, Burchenal JH. 1948. The clinical evaluation of chemotherapeutic agents in cancer. In Macleod CM (ed). *Evaluation of Chemotherapeutic Agents*. New York: Columbia University Press.
24. Karnofsky DA, Abelman WH, Craver LF, Burchenal JH. 1948. The use of nitrogen mustards in the palliative treatment of carcinoma. *Cancer.* 634-656.
25. Moskowitz E, McCann CB. 1957. Classification of disability in the chronically ill and aging. *J Chron Dis.* 5:342-46.
26. Physical Standards and Instruction For the Medical Examination of Serving Soldiers and Recruits for the Canadian Army, 1943.
27. U.S. Army Reg. No. 40-115;Department of the Army, 1948.
28. Staff of the Benjamin Rose Hospital. 1958. Multidisciplinary study of illness in aged persons I. *J Chron Dis.* 7(4):332-345.
29. Staff of the Benjamin Rose Hospital. 1959. Multidisciplinary study of illness in aged persons II. *J Chron Dis.* 9(1):55-62.
30. Katz S, Ford AB, Moskowitz RW, Jackson BA, Jaffe MW. 1963. Studies of illness in the aged. *JAMA* 185(12):914-919.
31. Mahoney FI, Wood OH, Barthel DW. 1958. Rehabilitation of chronically ill patients: the influence of complications on the final goal. *Southern Med J.* 51:605-609.

32. Mahoney FI, Barthel DW. 1965. Functional evaluation: the Barthel index. *Maryland State Med J.* 2:61-65.
33. Zubrod CG, Schneiderman M, Frei E, Brindley C, Gold GL, et al. 1960. Appraisal of methods for the study of chemotherapy of cancer in man: comparative therapeutic trial of nitrogen mustard and triethylene thiophosphoramidate. *J Chron Dis.* 11(1):7-33.
34. Lawton MP, Brody EM. 1969. Assessment of older people: self-maintaining and instrumental activities of daily living. *Gerontologist.* 9:179-186.
35. Bruett TL, Overs RP. 1969. A critical review of 12 ADL scales. *Phys Ther.* 49:857-862.
36. Deaver G, Brown M. 1945. Physical demands of daily life: An objective scale for rating the orthopedically exceptional: studies in rehabilitation No. 2. New York Institute for the Crippled and Disabled.
37. Deaver G, Brown E. 1946. The challenge of crutches: VI. Living with crutches and canes. *Arch Phys Med.* 27:683-703.
38. Bennett L, Stephens HR. 1949. Functional testing and training: physical therapy aspects. *Phys Ther Rev.* 29:99-107.
39. Brow ME. 1951. Daily activity inventory and progress record for those with atypical movement. *Am J Occup Ther.* 5:23-9, 38.
40. Rinzler SH, Brown H, Benton JG. 1951. A method for the objective evaluation of physical and drug therapy in the rehabilitation of the hemiplegic patient. *Am Heart J.* 42:710-718.

41. Hoberman M, Cicienia EF, Stephenson GR. 1952. Daily activity testing in physical therapy and rehabilitation. *Arch Phys Med.* 33:99-108.
42. Hoberman M, Springer CF. 1958. Rehabilitation of the "permanently and totally disabled" patient. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 39:235-240.
43. Sokolow J, Silson JE, Taylor EJ, Anderson ET, Rusk HA. Functional approach to disability evaluation. 1958. *JAMA.* 167:1575-1584.
44. Kahn RL, Goldfarb AI, Pollack M, Gerber IE. 1960. The relationship of mental and physical status in institutionalized aged persons. *Am J Psychiatry.* 117:120-24.
45. Carrol D. 1962. The disability in hemiplegia caused by cerebrovascular disease: serial studies of 98 cases. *J Chronic Dis.* 15:179-188.
46. Gordon EE, Kohn K, Sloan J, Gimble A, Grumes J, et al. 1962. A study of rehabilitation potential in nursing home patients over 65 years. *J Chronic Dis.* 15:311-326.
47. Kelman HR, Willner A. 1962. Problems in measurement and evaluation of rehabilitation. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 43:172-181.
48. Sokolow J, Silson JE, Taylor EJ, Anderson ET, Rusk HA. 1962. A new approach to the objective evaluation of physical disability. *J Chronic Dis.* 15:105-112.
49. Krauss TC. 1962. Use of a comprehensive rating scale system in the institutional care of geriatrics patients. *J Am Ger Soc.* 10:95-103.
50. Kleh J. 1963. A classification for the aged and other patients with chronic disease or disability. *J Am Ger Soc.* 11:638-41.

51. Gauger AB, Brownell WM, Russell WW, Retter RW. 1964. Evaluation of levels of subsistence. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 45:286-292.
52. Dinnerstein AJ, Lowenthal M, Dexter M. 1965. Evaluation of a rating scale of ability in activities of daily living. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 46:579-584.
53. Hoff WI, Mead S. 1965. Evaluation of rehabilitation outcome: an objective assessment of the physically disabled. *Am J Phys Med.* 44:113-121.
54. Schoening HA, Anderegg L, Bergstrom D, Fonda M, Steinke N, et al. 1965. Numerical scoring of self-care status of patients. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 46:689-697.
55. Miller MB. 1965. Physical, emotional, and social rehabilitation in a nursing-home population. *J Am Ger Soc.* 13:176-185.
56. Meer B, Baker JA. 1966. The Stockton geriatric rating scale. *J Gerontol.* 21:392-403.
57. Gurel L, Davis JE Jr. 1967. A survey of self-care dependency in psychiatric patients. *Hosp Comm Psychiat.* 18:135-38.
58. New PK, Ruscio AT, Priest RP, Petritsi D, George LA. 1968. The support structure of heart and stroke patients: a study of the role of significant others in patients rehabilitation. *Soc Sci Med.* 2:185-200.
59. Pool DA, Brown RA. 1968. A functional rating scale for research in physical therapy. *Tex Rep Biol Med.* 26:133-136.

60. World Health Organization. 1948. Constitution of the World Health Organization. Basic Documents. Geneva, Switzerland. World Health Organization.
61. Linder FE. 1966. The health of the American people. *Scientific American*. 214(6):21-29.
62. President's Commission on National Goals. 1960. *Goals for Americans*. Englewood, N.J.: Columbia University. Prentice Hall.
63. Bauer R. (ed). 1966. *Social Indicators*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
64. Sheldon EB, Parke R. 1975. Social indicators. *Science*. 188:693-699.
65. Campbell A. 1976. Subjective measures of well-being. *American Psychologist*. 117-124.
66. Gross, BM. 1966. The state of the nation: systems accounting. In *Social Indicators*. R. Bauer, editor. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press. 154-271.
67. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. 1969. *Toward a Social Report*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.
68. Olson M. 1969. The plan and purpose of a social report. *The Public Interest*. 15:85-97,.
69. Wilcox LD, Brooks RM, Beal GM, Klonglan GE. 1972. *Social Indicators and Societal Monitoring: An Annotated Bibliography*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
70. Campbell A, Converse PE, Rodgers WL. 1976. *The Quality of American Life*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

71. Andrews FM, Withey SB. 1976. *Social Indicators of Well-Being*. London: Plenum Publishers.
72. Cantril H. 1965. *The Patterns of Human Concern*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.
73. Bradburn NM. 1969. *The Structure of Psychological Well-Being*. Chicago: Aldine.
74. Campbell A, Converse PE. 1972. *The Human Meaning of Social Change*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
75. Health and Welfare Canada. 1981. *The Health of Canadians: Report of Canada Health Survey*. Ottawa, Canada: Ministry of Supply and Services.
76. Andrews FM, Withey SB. 1974. Developing measures of perceived life quality. *Social Indicators Research*. 1:1-26.
77. Lebo D. 1953. Some factors said to make for happiness in old age. *J Clin Psychol*. 9:385-390.
78. Neugarten BL, Havighurst RJ, Tobin SS. 1961. Measurement of life satisfaction. *J Gerontology*. 16:134-143.
79. Eisenberg HS, Goldenberg IS. 1966. A measurement of quality of survival of breast cancer patients. In *Clinical Evaluation in Breast Cancer*. JL Hayward, RD Bulbrook, editors. London:Academic Press.
80. Logue V, Durward M, Pratt RTC, Piercy M, Nixon WL. 1968. The quality of survival after rupture of an anterior cerebral aneurysm. *Br J Psychiat*. 114:137-160.

81. Feinstein AR, Pritchett JA, Schimpff CR. 1969. The epidemiology of cancer therapy: II. The clinical course: data, decisions, and temporal demarcations. *Arch Intern Med.* 123:323-344.
82. Baker HW, Burger HG, de Kretser DM, Hudson B, Rennie GC, et al. 1975. The assessment of results following endocrine therapy for prostatic cancer. *J Urology.* 113:824-828.
83. Burge PS, Richards JD, Thompson DS, Sare M, Thompson DS, et al. 1975. Quality and quantity of survival in acute myeloid leukaemia. *Lancet.* 2(7936):621-624.
84. Order SE, Hellman S, Von Essen CF, Kligerman MM. 1968. Improvement in quality of survival following whole-brain irradiation for brain metastasis. *Radiology.* 91:149-153.
85. Schottenfeld D, Robbins GF. 1970. Quality of survival among patients who have had radical mastectomy. *Cancer.* 26:650-654.
86. Liang M, Schurman DJ, Fries J. 1978. A patient-administered questionnaire for arthritis assessment. *Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research.* 131:123-129.
87. Moore FD, VanDevanter SB, Boyden CM, Lokich J, Wilson RE. 1974. Adrenalectomy with chemotherapy in the treatment of advanced breast cancer: objective and subjective response rates; duration and quality of life. *Surgery.* 76:376-388.
88. Levy NB, Wynbrandt GD. 1975. The quality of life on maintenance haemodialysis. *Lancet.* 1(7920):1328-1330.

89. Gilbert HA, Kagan AR, Nussbaum H, Rao AR, Satzman J, et al. 1977. Evaluation of radiation therapy for bone metastases: pain relief and quality of life. *Am J Roentgenol.* 129:1095-1096.
90. Mettlin C, Cookfair DL, Lane W, Pickren J. The quality of life in patients with cancer: a survey at one treatment center. 1983. *N Y S J Med.* 83:187-193.
91. Roy PH, Sauer WG, Beahrs OH, Farrow GM. 1970. Experience with ileostomies. *Am J Surgery.* 119:77-86.
92. Craig TJ, Comstock GW, Geiser PB. 1974. The quality of survival in breast cancer: a case-control comparison. *Cancer.* 33:1451-1457.
93. Retan JW, Lewis HY. 1966. Repeated dialysis of indigent patients for chronic renal
94. Elkinton, JR. Medicine and the quality of life. *Ann Intern Med.* 64:711-712.
95. Carlens E, Dahlstrom G, Nou E. 1970. Comparative measurements of quality of survival of lung cancer patients after diagnosis. *Scand J Resp Dis.* 51:268-275.
96. Tofler AB. 1970. Life units. *Br Heart J.* 32:771-773.
97. Priestman TJ, Baum M. 1976. Evaluation of quality of life in patients receiving treatment for advanced breast cancer. *Lancet.* 1(7965):899-901.
98. Aitken RCB. 1969. Measurement of feelings using visual analogue scales. *Proc R Soc Med.* 62(10):989-93.
99. Bond A, Lader M. 1974. The use of analogue scales in rating subjective feelings. *Br J Med Psychol.* 47:211-218.

100. Hayes MHS, Patterson DG. 1921. Experimental development of the graphic rating method. *Psychol Bull.* 18:98-99.
101. Johnson JP, McCauley CR, Copley JB. 1982. The quality of life of hemodialysis and transplant patients. *Kid Int.* 22:286-291.
102. Simmons RG, Anderson C, Kamstra L. 1984. Comparison of quality of life of patients on continuous ambulatory peritoneal dialysis, hemodialysis, and after transplantation. *Am J Kid Dis.* 4:253-255.
103. Evans RW, Hart LG, Manninen DL. 1984. A comparative assessment of the quality of life of successful kidney transplant patients according to source of graft. *Transpl Proc.* 16:1353-1358.
104. Evans RW, Manninen DL, Garrison Jr LP, Hart LG, Blagg CR, et al. 1985. The quality of life of patients with end-stage renal disease. *N Eng J Med.* 312:553-559.
105. Jenkins CD, Stanton BA, Savageau JA, Ockene IS, Denlinger P, et al. 1983. Physical, psychological, social, and economic outcomes after cardiac valve surgery. *Arch Int Med.* 143:2107-2113.
106. Kaplan De-Nour A, Shanan J. 1980. Quality of life of dialysis and transplanted patients. *Nephron.* 25:117-120.
107. McSweeney AJ, Grant I, Heaton RK, Adams KM, Timms RM. 1982. Life quality of patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. *Arch Intern Med.* 142:473-478.
108. Mazze RS, Lucido D, Shamon H. 1984. Psychological and social correlates of glycemic control. *Diabetes Care.* 7:360-366.

109. Prigatano GP, Wright EC, Levin D. 1984. Quality of life and its predictors in patients with mild hypoxemia and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. *Arch Intern Med.* 144:1613-1619.
110. Meyers S, Walfish JS, Sachar DB, Greenstein AJ, Hill AG, et al. 1980. Quality of life after surgery for Crohn's disease: a psychosocial survey. *Gastroenterology.* 78:1-6.
111. Meyers S. 1983. Assessing quality of life. *Mount Sinai J Med.* 50:190-192.
112. Weinstein MC, Stason WB. 1977. Foundations of cost-effectiveness analysis for health and medical practices. *N Eng J Med.* 296:716-721.
113. McNeil BJ, Weichselbaum R, Pauker SG. 1981. Speech and survival: tradeoffs between quality and quantity of life in laryngeal cancer. *N Eng J Med.* 305:982-987.
114. Johnson JR, Temple R. 1985. Food and Drug Administration requirements for approval of new anticancer drugs. *Cancer Treat Reports.* 69:1155-1157.
115. O'Shaughnessy JA, Wittes RE, Burke G, Friedman MA, Johnson JR, et al. 1991. Commentary concerning demonstration of safety and efficacy of investigational anticancer agents in clinical trials. *J Clin Oncol.* 9:2225-2232.
116. Croog SH, Levine S, Testa MA, Brown B, Bulpitt CJ, et al. 1986. The effects of antihypertensive therapy on the quality of life. *N Eng J Med.* 314:1657-1664.
117. Sanders C, Egger M, Donocan J, Tallon D, Frankel S. 1998. Reporting on quality of life in randomised controlled trials: bibliographic study. *BMJ.* 317:1191-1194.

118. Bowling, A. 1995. *Measuring Health: A Review of Quality of Life Measurement Scales*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.
119. Bowling, A. 1997. *Measuring Disease: A Review of Disease Specific Quality of Life Measurement Scales*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.
120. Jachuck SJ, Brierly H, Jachcuk S, Willcox PM. 1982. The effect of hypotensive drugs on the quality of life. *J R Coll Gen Pract.* 32:103-105.
121. Thomas MR, Lyttle D. 1980. Patient expectations about success of treatment and reported relief from low back pain. *J Psychosom Res.* 24:297-301.
122. Spitzer WO, Dobson AJ, Hall J, Chesterman E, Levi J, et al. 1981. Measuring the quality of life of cancer patients. *J Chron Dis.* 34:585-597.
123. Lara-Munoz C, Feinstein AR. 1999. How should quality of life be measured? *J Investig Med.* 47:17-24.
124. Sriwatanakul K, Kelvie W, Lasagna L, Calimlim JF, Weis OF, et al. 1983. Studies with different types of visual analog scales for measurement of pain. *Clin Pharmacol Ther.* 34:234-9.
125. MacKenzie CR, Charlson ME, DiGioia D, Kelley K. 1986. A patient-specific measure of change in maximal function. *Arch Intern Med.* 146:1325-1329.
126. Tugwell P, Bombardier C, Buchanan WW, Goldsmith CH, Grace E, et al. 1987. The MACTAR patient preference disability questionnaire - an individualized functional priority approach for assessing improvement in physical disability in clinical trials in rheumatoid arthritis. *J Rheumatol.* 14:446-451.

127. Tugwell P, Bombardier C, Buchanan WW, Goldsmith C, Grace E, et al. 1990. Methotrexate in rheumatoid arthritis: impact on quality of life assessed by traditional standard-item and individualized patient preference health status questionnaires. *Arch Intern Med.* 150:59-62.
128. O'Boyle CA, McGee H, Hickey A, O'Malley K, Joyce CRB. 1992. Individual quality of life in patients undergoing hip replacement. *Lancet.* 339(8801):1088-91.
129. Ruta DA, Garratt AM, Leng M, Russell IT, MacDonald LM. 1994. A new approach to the measurement of quality of life: the patient-generated index. *Med Care.* 32:1109-1126.
130. Wright JG, Young NL. 1997. The patient-specific index: asking patients what they want. *J Bone Joint Surg.* 79-A(7):974-983.
131. Feinstein AR. 1987. *Clinimetrics.* New Haven: Yale University Press.
132. Nunally, JC. 1978. *Psychometric Theory.* 2nd Edn. New York: McGraw-Hill.