Purpose: Assessing the efficacy of treatment modalities for diabetic retinopathy (DR) from the patient’s perspective is restricted due to a lack of a comprehensive patient reported outcome measure. We are developing a DR-specific quality of life (QoL) item bank and we report here on the qualitative results from the first phase of this project.

Methods: Eight focus groups and 18 semi-structured interviews were conducted with 57 patients with DR. The sessions were transcribed verbatim and iteratively analysed using the constant comparative method and NVIVO software.

Results: Participants had a median age 58 years (range 27-83 years). 27 (47%) participants had proliferative DR in the better eye and 14 (25%) had clinically significant macular oedema. Nine QoL domains were identified, namely visual symptoms; ocular surface symptoms; vision-related activity limitation; mobility; emotional well-being; health concerns; convenience; social; and
Participants described many vision-related activity limitations, particularly under challenging lighting conditions; however, socio-emotional issues were equally important. Participants felt frustrated due to their visual restrictions, concerned about further vision loss and had difficulty coping with this uncertainty. Restrictions on driving were pervasive, affecting transport, social life, relationships, responsibilities, work and independence.

**Conclusions:** Patients with DR experience many socio-emotional issues in addition to vision-related activity limitations. Data from this study will be used to generate data for a DR-specific QoL item bank.
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Introduction

Diabetic retinopathy (DR) is a common microvascular complication of diabetes and it is the leading cause of blindness in the working aged population.[1, 2] In its later proliferative stage significant irreversible vision loss commonly occurs. Diabetic macular oedema (DME), which can occur at any stage of DR, also commonly causes irreversible loss of central vision.[3, 4] After 20 years of living with diabetes the majority of patients will have some degree of DR.[3, 5] The mainstay of treatment for DR is laser photocoagulation, and vitrectomy in late disease, but evidence for the benefit of new therapies, especially anti-vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF) intravitreal injections, is emerging.[6-8]

The impact of DR on patients’ visual functioning is substantial, particularly at the vision-threatening stages such as proliferative DR and clinically significant macular oedema.[9-12] Few studies, however, have systematically assessed the comprehensive impact of DR on quality of life (QoL) parameters beyond vision-related activity limitation, otherwise known as visual functioning.[13, 14] Qualitative studies have referred to a plethora of emotional reactions to DR, related vision loss and treatment including worry, loss of confidence, loss of independence, anger, depression, and low self-esteem[15-19] as well as a negative impact on family functioning, work and social life.[15-18] However, these studies have been relatively small, especially regarding patients at the severe spectrum of DR.

Quantitative research exploring the impact of DR on QoL has been restricted by the lack of an appropriate DR-specific patient reported outcome measure (PRO).[13, 14] To date, only one instrument, the Retinopathy Dependent Quality of Life Questionnaire (RetDQoL)[17, 20] is available. However, this instrument underwent only basic validation procedures and its content and structure were based largely on an existing PRO assessing the QoL impact of diabetes.[21] The RetDQoL also uses a scoring method that involves multiplying two sets of patient-reports together, an approach that has been demonstrated to be fundamentally flawed.[22]

Without an appropriate DR-specific PRO our ability to understand the full impact of DR on all relevant QoL parameters is impeded. This is vital as QoL outcomes from the patient’s perspective are becoming increasingly important in clinical trials assessing the efficacy of new
treatment interventions.[23-25] This is particularly relevant for DR, where emerging therapies such as anti-VEGF injections, may prove to have fewer side effects and greater visual acuity gains than traditional treatments.[7]

Therefore, we are developing a comprehensive DR-specific QoL outcome measure which will assess the impact of DR on all relevant QoL parameters. A key aspect of item generation involves comprehensive qualitative consultation with patients.[30, 31] In this paper we describe findings from focus groups and individual interviews covering all QoL parameters important to people with DR. In particular, we explored issues relating to symptoms and treatment, vision-related activity limitation, mobility, emotional well-being, social life, work life and finances, roles, and convenience in a large sample of patients across the spectrum of DR severity.

Methods

Participants

We recruited participants primarily from the baseline phase of a large longitudinal study, the Diabetes Management Project. Diabetes Management Project participants comprised patients from eye clinics at the Royal Victorian Eye and Ear Hospital. The methodology of the Diabetes Management Project has been described previously.[32, 33] Briefly, Diabetes Management Project participants were aged 18 years or older, had type 1 or 2 diabetes, and had no significant hearing or cognitive impairment.

We assessed DR using dilated fundus photography. We categorised DR severity as no DR (Early Treatment of Diabetic Retinopathy Study[34] level 10 to 15), mild non proliferative DR (NPDR) (level 20), moderate non proliferative DR (level 31 to 43), severe non proliferative DR (level 53 to 60), and proliferative DR (level 61 to 80). We categorised DME severity using the American Academy of Ophthalmology classification[35] as no DME=10/20, mild DME=30, moderate DME=40, and severe DME=50. We also collected socio-demographic and clinical information, such as visual acuity and DR severity for all participants.
The appropriate sample size for a qualitative study is one that adequately answers the research question and is determined by data saturation, i.e. when no new themes emerge.[36] We used a purposive sampling technique to recruit participants for this qualitative study[37, 38] in order to ensure a satisfactory range of DR severity was obtained and that both older and younger participants were represented. Therefore, participants from the Diabetes Management Project with at least mild non-proliferative DR in the better eye and/or DME, without clinical evidence of other ocular conditions were eligible (n=124).

We posted eligible participants a large-print invitation letter and followed up those who failed to respond by telephone. To capture issues pertinent to younger participants, we carried out recruitment of additional participants aged less than 55 years through a Diabetes Australia-Victoria online newsletter and seminars. At the point of recruitment, we questioned Diabetes Australia-Victoria participants at length about their ocular history and prior treatments to determine whether they had DR. We subsequently obtained their latest visual acuity and severity of DR and DME from their ophthalmologist.

The study had ethical approval from the Royal Victorian Eye and Ear Hospital Human Research Ethics Committee (# 09/888H) and was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki. We collected written informed consent from each participant before commencing the session.

**Procedure**

We conducted the focus groups between January and May 2010 and the interviews between October and November 2010 at the Royal Victorian Eye and Ear Hospital. We chose both methods of data collection as they each have certain advantages. Focus groups, for instance, encourage dynamic interactions between participants by exposing them to new viewpoints and provoking discussions, while semi-structured interviews allow informants to gain rapport with the interviewer.[39, 40]. Individual interviews were used for participants who could not attend any of the group sessions. The focus groups lasted between 77 and 114 minutes and the interviews lasted between 20 and 99 minutes.

We developed an interview schedule for the focus group and individual interview discussions using information from a comprehensive literature review[13] and input from
ophthalmic specialists (Appendix 1). The interview schedule consisted of a standard introduction, open-ended questions, probes and a summary. The questions in the interview schedule began generally (e.g. “How do your diabetic eye problems impact on your QoL?” and “What areas of your life are affected by your diabetic eye problems?”) and progressed to more specific questions about emotional well-being, social life and so on, depending on participants’ prior responses. Where necessary the interviewer used prompts to encourage further discussion or more detailed responses.

During the focus groups, a moderator’s assistant took detailed notes of the discussion. After each group, the moderator [author EF] and assistant discussed the outcomes of the session and the moderator produced a written summary of the session. The moderator reviewed and compared the written summaries after each subsequent group to ascertain whether new themes had emerged.

Data analysis

We recorded the groups and interviews using a portable digital recording device and transcribed each session verbatim. We analysed the transcripts using an inductive analytical approach which is based on the constant comparative method.[37, 38] This iterative process involves coding utterances from the transcripts into themes and constantly comparing and contrasting the coded themes within and across transcripts. A second researcher (GR) reviewed the final coding and we resolved any disagreements by discussion. We used the qualitative software NVIVO 2008 (QSR International Pty Ltd, 2007) to sort and store the data.

We performed descriptive statistical analyses on the participants’ sociodemographic and clinical data using the SPSS statistical package (Version 16.0, SPSS Science, Chicago, IL). We conducted univariate analyses using the $\chi^2$ statistic for categorical data and Student’s $t$-test for continuous data to assess any differences between participants from the Diabetes Management Project recruitment pool who agreed and declined to take part in the study.

Results

Participants
Of the 124 patients from the Diabetes Management Project sample invited to participate, 50 (40.3%) agreed. There were no significant differences between participants and non-participants from the Diabetes Management Project recruitment sample with regard to a range of sociodemographic and clinical variables (all p>0.05). Overall, we conducted eight focus groups and 18 semi-structured interviews with 57 patients with DR (50 from Diabetes Management Project and 7 from Diabetes Australia-Victoria). The size of the focus groups depended on participant availability and ranged from three to seven participants.

Participants had a median age and duration of diabetes of 58 years (range 27-83) and 17 years (range 1-53), respectively (Table 1). Just under half of participants had proliferative DR in the better eye and a quarter had severe DME. Most participants (n=39, 68%) had no distance visual impairment (≤0.3 LogMAR) in the better eye, although around half had at least mild monocular distance visual acuity impairment (>0.3 LogMAR).

Table 1. The sociodemographic characteristics of the 57 participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤55 years</td>
<td>23 (40.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 2</td>
<td>42 (73.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes Treatment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tablets</td>
<td>40 (70.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulin</td>
<td>39 (68.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>24 (42.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>39 (68.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner city</td>
<td>4 (7.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>44 (77.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural / remote</td>
<td>9 (15.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of birth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Number (Percentage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>27 (47.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>20 (35.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10 (17.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Main language spoken**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Number (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>48 (84.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English plus another</td>
<td>9 (15.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Marital status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Number (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>10 (17.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married/de facto</td>
<td>40 (70.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/separated/widowed</td>
<td>7 (12.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Education level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Number (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary or less</td>
<td>32 (56.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAFE/university degree</td>
<td>25 (43.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Employment status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Number (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Currently employed</td>
<td>18 (31.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>5 (8.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical disability pension</td>
<td>14 (24.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>20 (35.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comorbidity (yes, self-reported)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Number (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td>31 (54.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angina / heart attack</td>
<td>17 (29.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stroke</td>
<td>3 (5.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High cholesterol</td>
<td>32 (56.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vision impairment (right eye)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Number (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None (≤0.3 LogMAR)</td>
<td>28 (49.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mild (&gt;0.3 LogMAR ≤0.48)</td>
<td>8 (14.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate/severe (&gt;0.48 LogMAR)</td>
<td>19 (33.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vision impairment (left eye)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Number (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None (≤0.3 LogMAR)</td>
<td>30 (52.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mild (&gt;0.3 LogMAR ≤0.48)</td>
<td>11 (19.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate/severe (&gt;0.48 LogMAR)</td>
<td>14 (24.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vision impairment (better eye)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Number (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None (≤0.3 LogMAR)</td>
<td>39 (68.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mild (>0.3 LogMAR ≤0.48) 8 (14.0)
Moderate/severe (>0.48 LogMAR) 8 (14.0)

Severity of DR (better eye)
Mild non-proliferative DR 18 (31.6)
Moderate non-proliferative DR 7 (12.3)
Severe non-proliferative DR 4 (7.0)
Proliferative DR 27 (47.4)

Severity of DME (better eye)
None 31 (54.4)
Mild diabetic macular oedema 7 (12.3)
Moderate diabetic macular oedema 3 (5.3)
Severe diabetic macular oedema 14 (24.6)

DR treatment
Laser therapy 54 (94.7)
Vitrectomy surgery 12 (21.1)
Intraocular injections 5 (8.8)

Other eye pathology (self-report)
Cataract 5 (8.7)
Age-related macular degeneration 3 (5.3)
Glaucoma 7 (12.3)

Mean, median (range)
Age (years) 58.7, 58.4 (27.0-83.4)
Duration of diabetes (years) 18.8, 16.9 (1.2-53.0)

* Percentages for some variables may not equal 100% due to missing data

de facto = couples living in a marriage-like state for at least 2 years; DR = diabetic retinopathy; LogMAR = logarithm of the minimum angle of resolution; TAFE = Technical and Further Education.

1 Impact of DR on relevant components of QoL
2
3 Our choice of QoL domains was guided by both a “top-down” and “bottom-up” approach.
4 By top-down we refer to our comprehensive review of the literature and consideration of QoL domains proposed in existing vision-related PROs, which provided us with a working conceptual framework. However, we also utilised a bottom-up approach where we were guided by the data and the psychometric experience of the expert panel, giving us flexibility to divide, remove or add
domains based on item content. As such, we started with a solid organisational structure but had
the freedom to ensure that our unique data was faithfully represented.

We isolated nine key domains of QoL, namely visual symptoms, ocular surface
symptoms, vision-related activity limitation, mobility, emotional well-being, health
deficits, convenience, social, and economic (Table 2). We provide results for each domain,
including supporting quotes and number of supporting utterances (n) for each theme. Note that the
value of n does not refer to the number of participants.) We counted repeated references to one
theme in a dialogue by a single participant as a single utterance so as to avoid inflating the
theme’s importance. We also provide additional supporting quotes for the larger domains (i.e
vision-related activity limitation, mobility, emotional well-being, health deficits, convenience,
social, and economic) in Suppl Tables 1-7.

Table 2 – The nine QoL domains and sub-domains identified

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QoL Domains</th>
<th>Sub-domains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visual symptoms</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocular surface symptoms</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision-related activity limitation</td>
<td>Day to day tasks, Self-care &amp; diabetes management, Luminance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Walking, Public transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>Sadness, Anger, Fear, Self-perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health concerns</td>
<td>Treatment, Safety, Socio-emotional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Social isolation, Personal relationships, Roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>General limitations, Treatment, Travel limitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Work, Finance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Visual symptoms (n=237)

Participants described experiencing blurred, hazy and distorted vision and seeing black lines and
dots. Many participants also described experiencing fluctuating vision and periods of temporary
‘blackness’ due to retinal haemorrhage. Many participants referred to a ‘worse eye’ and described
being bothered by a visual difference between their two eyes. Other difficulties included distinguishing colours, peripheral vision, and depth perception.

It was like looking through…burnt trees. It's just like dead branches, burnt out dead branches everywhere. (FG1)

**Ocular surface symptoms (n=21)**

Ocular surface symptoms included pain, discomfort, tired or strained eyes, dry eyes and watery eyes as a result of DR or related treatment.

Sometimes I get this feeling of like a bruise, like bruised eyeballs. Often that's followed with a burst blood vessel (Int5)

**Vision-related activity limitation (n=803)**

Many participants complained of reading difficulties, especially with newspapers, books, labels, ingredients or prices. Particular difficulties included missing lines or parts of words. Other difficulties included reading street signs, watching TV, household tasks, sewing, gardening, cooking, pouring liquids, using appliances, shopping, handling cash, recognising faces, hobbies and driving (particularly at night).

I am not able to watch the football properly and really enjoy it, that's really hard. You’re thinking, Who's playing? You can't see the ball (FG8)

The effects on me were devastating. I had to leave my job, which was teaching, and my hobby was stamp collecting and I used to collect cigarette cards…I used to write…I was a church organist, but I play it by sight. So in every way, all my interests-just overnight I was unable to do it. (FG3)

Participants reported difficulty with self-care activities, such as eating, organising medication, dressing oneself, putting on make-up and shaving. Patients’ ability to manage their diabetes was also affected, including difficulty reading nutritional information on food products, taking insulin and diabetes medication, checking glucose levels, cutting toenails, caring for feet and exercising.

A few weeks ago the chemist gave me the wrong insulin, and I didn’t see. I ended up using it and having hypos… (FG8)

Participants reported difficulty seeing in dim lighting, at night and in glare conditions, and difficulty adjusting from dim to bright lights or vice versa.

I find that wet days, or really sunny days, or rooms like this with fluorescent lights and very light walls, it's very glary (FG5)
Mobility (n=91)

Participants reported difficulty negotiating steps and curbs, especially if they were not well distinguished. Many also found it challenging to move in crowded places, avoid tripping, cross a street, and negotiate uneven pavements or suspended objects. Participants generally had little trouble moving about in their own homes, but reported some difficulty moving around at work or other people’s houses. Issues with catching public transport included getting on and off buses, trams and trains.

*I tend to not see steps. I sort of walk out of a building and I’ll fall over sort of thing.* (Int1)

Emotional well-being

We categorised patients’ emotional responses about their DR below into sadness, anger, fear, and self-perception based on the tree-structure of emotions proposed by Parrot (2001).[41]

Sadness (n=78)

Several participants reported feeling depressed due to their DR and some even admitted to having suicidal thoughts. Others described feeling sad or low, upset, emotionally raw, miserable and devastated. Other negative emotions included ‘loss of motivation’, ‘hopelessness’, ‘loss of pleasure in things’, ‘missing work or hobbies’ and ‘loss of spontaneity’.

*But you can fall back into depression and start worrying about it, like…I’ve thought of suicide. You feel like you don’t want to live anymore.* (FG8)

Anger (n=97)

Almost all participants reported feeling frustrated because of the limitations imposed by their vision loss from DR (n=42). Many participants described feeling angry, annoyed, moody and agitated, especially in cases where their eye condition continued to worsen despite vigilant diabetic control. In these cases, participants often felt ‘cheated’ and were left despondently pondering ‘why me?’ A few participants also reported feeling oppressed because of a sudden loss of sight or gradually deteriorating vision.

*Definitely angry because I can’t do the things I used to do, or I can’t do them the way I want to do them…And then I’ll get depressed…it can be a bit of a rollercoaster sometimes.* (Int9)

Fear (n=38)
The time of diagnosis of DR was very frightening for participants. Many felt stressed about their vision and reported that it was ‘always on their mind’. Others described feeling scared when unexpected events occurred such as sudden loss of vision from a haemorrhage. Several participants described situations in which they felt vulnerable, disconcerted or nervous. Others described feeling extra pressure to maintain their vision so they could continue to care for their family.

*When the blood vessels burst or something you can’t see anything and it’s very scary.* (FG1)

Self-perception (n=47)

Participants often described feeling a loss of self-worth, self-image or self-confidence. Many felt older, less competent, inadequate or less important because of their restricted role in the family or community. In contrast, reliance on family members made other participants feel burdensome and like non-productive adults. Several participants also felt embarrassed when they had to ask a stranger for help or made a social faux pas.

*I’m not ready to be a useless couch potato. And that’s how I feel most of the time. A useless couch potato.* (Int2)

*Going out to dinner with the girls…My husband will drop me off and collect me…sort of feel like a 2 year old sometimes.* (Int1)

Health concerns

Treatment (n=59)

Participants were concerned about the pain associated with laser treatment, side effects from laser treatment, and undergoing injections or an operation. Several participants felt they did not fully understand their eye treatment and pondered whether it was working.

*I have had laser, which was awful. I found it really hard to cope with…not only was it painful, the light – I actually ended up having to take Valium before each session…It was really distressing, and I would start hyperventilating, and I nearly fainted a few times.* (Int15)

Socioemotional (n=169)

One of the most commonly reported concerns was fear of further deterioration in vision and going blind (n=33). Participants also worried about future impacts, such as loss of driver’s license resulting in increased isolation, increased dependence, loss of employment and coping. Daily
concerns included worrying about the impact of vision loss on family members, being taken advantage of, missing out on things, and offending people by not recognising them.

Yeah, really freaking out. Not outwardly, but inwardly. What am I going to do? I’m going to lose my job, I’m not going to be able to drive my car, I’m not going to be able to get around, I’m going to be stuck inside. What sort of a job could I do if I did lose my sight? All that sort of stuff. (Int7)

Participants reported that their level of vision impairment varied according to tiredness, lighting conditions, and day to day acuity fluctuations. Because of this variation, and also because their vision impairment was not visibly obvious to others, patients' frequently felt misunderstood.

Consequently, they were often upset when people became frustrated with their restricted vision.

People don’t understand…because they can’t see what’s happening to you. I can’t explain to them my situation. And then what do I do? I go somewhere and cry. (FG8)

Many participants struggled to cope with the unpredictability of not knowing what and when things might happen. One participant described how being diagnosed with DR had made her ponder her own mortality and worry about getting other diabetic complications.

For me it’s the unknown, where it’s going to go and how long it’s going to take. (FG1)

Family concerns included worrying about children growing up with a blind parent, worrying about a spouse leaving, being apprehensive about becoming pregnant and feeling sad about not being able to see family members' faces.

One thing that probably makes me a bit apprehensive is we’re trying to conceive for another child…I know there’s quite a good chance that my retinopathy will get worse while I’m pregnant. So that makes me quite anxious about being pregnant again. (Int15)

Safety (n=46)

Safety concerns included fear of tripping, falling, and bumping into things. Participants also worried about their personal safety around the house, such as cutting or scalding themselves or using appliances safely.

Convenience

General limitations

Participants made a number of emphatic statements about the profound impact of their DR and vision problems on their lifestyle. Particular complaints (n=100) included not being able to do
things they used to do or not doing them as well, taking longer to do things and having to be slower or concentrate longer on tasks. Many participants also felt restricted in when and where they could do things.

Just slows me down from doing things. I can only stand out in the outside bright light for so long before it starts hurting, I don’t get out as much, I don’t read as much, don’t watch TV or movies or anything like that as much as I used to. (Int9)

Treatment

Having multiple treatments, attending frequent appointments, and having dilating drops at every clinic appointment was burdensome for many participants (n=28) due to various associated logistical issues.

I had to arrange for someone to drive me and pick me up…And I’ve got a toddler as well so had to arrange babysitting. Just the logistics of it all. (Int15)

Travel limitations

Similarly, driving limitations not only inconvenienced participants in getting around but also affected their social life, personal relationships, roles, work and independence.

Well, first thing in my case, my license was taken off me, that was my source of income. And also…that is my quality of life because I cannot go out, hop in the car go wherever. But now I’ve got to rely heavily on my wife. (FG1)

Social life

Social isolation

Participants reported a substantial reduction in their social life (n=79). Many found themselves more reluctant to attend social occasions because they no longer enjoyed them.

Attending social events in the evening was particularly difficult for participants due to poor night vision. Consequently, many participants reported feeling socially isolated and staying home most of the time.

I was the social animal, I was the social king, that was my nickname, The King. I’ve pushed everyone away. I’m pretty much a hermit at the moment. That includes my family, I’ve pushed them away too because I don’t want my kids…to see my struggle (Int2)

Personal relationships
Considerable strain on personal relationships (n=49), particularly with partners, was reported by many participants due to the frustrations of day to day living and needing more support. Some participants also felt that family members tended to fuss over things unnecessarily.

Participants also reported difficulty maintaining family relationships or friendships due to difficulty visiting and attending social functions. For younger participants, having DR also affected important decisions such as starting a family.

My wife said to me one day, “You’re becoming a very grumpy old man”. And I’ve noticed that I’ve become very agitated. If things don’t go my way it upsets me. And sometimes I regret the way I speak to her (FG4)

I’ve lost friends because of it, too, because you can’t help them do things…they think you’re milking it. (FG8)

Roles

Many participants felt like they had lost their role in their family, as they could no longer do things like manage the household or provide financially (n=17) and consequently felt a loss of respect from family members. Others felt that they had lost their role in friendship groups, or in community endeavours such as in the church or local clubs.

Yes, definitely. I’m not the breadwinner anymore….Lower in the pecking order. I’m like an old lion that’s had his day, gets kicked out of the pride. No, I’m down the bottom. Definitely. (FG8)

Economic

Work (n=67)

Many participants stated that they had stopped working prematurely as a result of their DR. Others reported needing longer to complete tasks and finding things more difficult to accomplish. Some participants also described inconvenience associated with having to take time off work after a retinal haemorrhage or to have treatment which affected their work relationships. Some participants felt that their capacity to find employment was also affected, due to their reduced skill set or difficulty reading newspaper advertisements. Others described how their choice of career or ability to access new job opportunities such as training or promotions were now more limited.
Because I was a courier… I found it hard to park the van properly, because with one eye I can’t see at all on the left. I’ve just stopped work. (FG4)

When the situation arose that I had to mostly keep one eye closed, I didn’t go to work. It happened three or four times a year… It was problematic to my boss… It was problematic to me too because you don’t look so good. (Int4)

Finance

Participants reported several direct financial implications (n=24) as a result of their DR, including reduced income from loss of employment or restricted work hours, the cost of purchasing glasses or visual aids and the cost of treatment and specialist care. Incidental costs (n=11) included those associated with attending DR-related appointments such as parking or loss of income, having to hire help such as cleaners or taking taxis, and making mistakes such as breaking things, being taken advantage of or accidentally incurring fees from businesses.

Well financially I guess the bottom line is the laser. It’s the time out to seek the treatment and to continually stay on top of those things… For me, that’s visits down to Melbourne. That’s a day out of work for me and my hubby who comes as carer because I’m not able to drive back (Int5)

Because the eyesight’s crap, this is where it’s cost me money… Every time I turned the laptop on it updated software and it’s downloading. And it cost me a fortune… It wouldn’t have happened if I had eyesight. (Int2)

Discussion

This paper describes in detail the impact of DR and related vision loss on all relevant QoL parameters. As expected, participants reported many aspects of vision-related activity limitation particularly under difficult lighting conditions; however, emotional well-being, health concerns and social issues were equally important. Participants repeatedly described feeling frustrated due to their visual restrictions, concerned about further vision loss and future prospects and had difficulty coping with this uncertainty. Feeling misunderstood by others and issues around self-perception also frequently concerned participants. Driving restrictions affected many facets of life beyond transport, including social opportunities, relationships, responsibilities, work and independence.

The diverse emotional reactions revealed in our study, such as frustration, uncertainty, fear of becoming blind, concern about driving, working and independence in the future, and self-perception issues are supported by previous qualitative work.[15, 17, 18] Strain on personal relationships, social isolation, inability to maintain responsibilities, loss of employment, and
financial implications were also key themes in Devenney and colleagues’ recent exploratory study.[15] In contrast, the frequent grievance by participants in our study that other people did not understand their vision impairment has only briefly been mentioned previously.[17]

Given that ability to regulate emotions and access social support networks are central disease coping strategies for patients,[42-44] it is possible that DR patients with heightened emotional responses and impaired personal relationships may exhibit poor coping ability and subsequently experience worse disease outcomes. Therefore, interventions such as counselling, support groups, education for family members and strategies to enhance work-related opportunities may considerably improve patients’ overall QoL.

Our data substantiate previous qualitative and quantitative findings suggesting that DR considerably contributes to vision-related activity limitation and mobility issues.[9, 10, 12, 16, 17, 45, 46] Of particular note is our finding that many participants were impaired under difficult lighting conditions which supports previous quantitative findings.[47-49] In the current study, poor night vision was a particularly pervasive restriction as it affected participants’ ability to drive, work, attend social or sports events or perform family responsibilities, resulting in feelings of dependence and poor self-esteem.

These findings are critical as patients may not be asked to describe impairment under difficult lighting conditions during routine eye examinations or at busy clinics. Similarly, many questionnaires assessing vision-related activity limitation, with the exception of some glaucoma-specific instruments, often contain little content targeting varying lighting conditions.[50]

Consequently, it is important that clinicians assess low luminance functioning and consider early referrals to low vision services even if visual acuity loss is minimal. Researchers should ensure they choose an outcome measure which captures vision-related activity limitation in a range of lighting conditions.

Consistent with two previous qualitative studies,[15, 16] we found that the presence of DR can negatively affects patients’ ability to manage their diabetes. This is vital as it suggests the existence of a detrimental cyclic relationship, namely that poor diabetes control may lead to development and progression of DR, while presence of severe DR may result in poor diabetes
control. Diabetes and retinal specialists should be aware of the additional difficulty experienced by
visually impaired diabetics in managing their diabetes and support them in finding practical ways to
overcome this harmful cycle.

The variety of themes reported in this study regarding the impact of DR on QoL surpass
those usually found in existing vision-specific and generic QoL outcome measures,[51-53] which
tend to focus primarily on activity limitation and mobility. In addition, the themes emerging from the
Emotional, Health Concerns, Social, Convenience and Economic domains, are more
comprehensive than those captured by the RetDQoL, the only other DR-specific QoL outcome
measure currently available.

As this is a qualitative study, it is not possible to draw statistical inferences from the data.
Potential bias from the purposive sampling technique may also be present. However, the aim was
to provide depth and breadth of information about DR-related QoL impact rather than results that
are generalizable to the population. The large number of examples provided support the
conclusions drawn in this study. Strengths of this study include our large sample size of 57
participants compared with smaller samples of previous qualitative studies,[15, 16] as well as
having participants across the spectrum of DR including many with vision-threatening disease and
those of both working and non-working age.

We have used these data, along with data from qualitative interviews with diabetic and
retinal specialists and a comprehensive literature review [13, 14], to develop a comprehensive DR-
specific QoL item bank. An item bank is simply a set of items (questions) measuring a specific
latent trait that have been calibrated for difficulty on the same scale. Items are selected from the
item bank by a computer algorithm according to the ability level of each participant and their
responses to previous questions. This is known as computer adaptive testing.[26, 27] Item banking
and adaptive testing provide a more sophisticated approach to the assessment of patient reported
outcomes than traditional paper-pencil questionnaires as they are flexible and adaptable, allowing
more accurate, precise, valid and reliable measurements of the desired trait whilst requiring
implementation of fewer items.[28, 29]
The findings reported in this paper thus represent the foundation of a rigorously developed, high-quality PRO to assess comprehensively the impact of DR and associated vision loss on all domains of patients’ QoL across the spectrum of the condition. In addition, the item bank will be valuable for researchers to assess accurately the outcomes of both traditional and novel treatment therapies for DR from the patient’s perspective. Future research will involve pilot testing and validation of the DR-specific QoL item bank with a large participant sample using modern psychometric methods such as Rasch analysis.

In summary, this study found that DR and associated visual loss had a substantial impact on a range of QoL parameters. Crucially, socio-emotional factors, such as frustration, feeling misunderstood, poor self-perception, social isolation and role limitations were of great importance. Clinicians, researchers and rehabilitation workers should be aware of the detrimental socio-emotional issues experienced by participants with DR, in addition to understanding their vision-related activity limitations. We have used the data from this study to generate items for a DR-specific QoL item bank to assess comprehensively DR-related QoL impact and treatment outcomes.
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Warm up questions
Let’s start by getting to know each other. Let’s go around the group. Briefly, please let us know your name and how long you have had diabetes.

Questions and prompts
We are interested today in your diabetic eye problems and how they impact on your life.

Symptoms
First, what are some of the symptoms you experience as a result of your diabetic eye problems?

Can you describe your eyesight/vision?
How well can you see?
What factors influence your vision?

Impact on QoL
How do your eye problems impact on your QoL?

What areas of your life are affected by your diabetic eye problems?
How much would you say your diabetic eye problems impact on your QoL?
What things are harder to do because of vision loss from your diabetic eye problems?
Can you think of specific examples where your diabetic eye problem has caused you or someone else difficulty?

Do you need help from others for some things because of your eye problems?

Depending on responses so far:

In other groups I have talked to many people about how their diabetic eye problems affect them emotionally. I'm interested in your experience of this.

Can you describe how your diabetic eye problems make you feel emotionally?

How do you feel about your eye problems?

Can you describe some of your emotional reactions to vision loss?

In what ways do your diabetic eye problems affect your social or family life?

What things are you missing out on because of your vision?

What social occasions or leisure activities are affected by your vision loss?

How has your eye problem affected your family and personal relationships?

Thinking about travelling and getting out and about, can you describe how your diabetes eye problems have affected this?

What things are most difficult when travelling outside or in crowded places?

What do you find difficult when moving about in your own home?

In what ways have your diabetic eye problems impacted on your work life?

What aspects of your work are harder to do?

How have your diabetic eye problems impacted on you financially?

What things have cost you money because of your diabetic eye problems?

How about managing your diabetes? In what ways do your diabetic eye problems affect this?
What things [e.g. insulin shots, glucose monitoring, exercise] are hard to do because of your vision loss?

Finally, what is the worst thing about having diabetic eye disease?

What do you find the most annoying about your vision loss from diabetes?

Thank you all very much for sharing your experiences. I know this can be a difficult area to discuss but your input has been really valuable. Before we move on, I will briefly summarise what we have discussed so far……

Is there anything else you’d like to add to this before we move on?

Treatment and impact

I’d now like to move on to talk about eye treatments.

Has anyone had any treatment for their diabetic eye problems? What was it?

What were your experiences with this treatment?

What side effects, if any, have you experienced?

In what ways has your treatment experience affected your QoL?

Useful prompts to use throughout the focus group:

Are their any other views on this?

Is there anything else?

Would you explain further?

Can you give me an example of what you mean?

Summary

We are reaching the end of our time now. I would like to summarise the key ideas that I have heard…
Is there anything I have missed or that you would like to add to my summary?
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