

Assessment of health-related quality of life in type 2 diabetes mellitus at Moi County referral hospital, Taita Taveta county

Ms.Dredah Wughanga Mwadulo^{1*#a} , Mbindu Madhavi^{2¶} , Beatrice Nkoroi^{3¶}

¹ School of Nursing, Department of Health and Human sciences, Mount Kenya University, Thika, Kenya

² School of Pharmacy, Department of Pharmaceutics, Mount Kenya University, Thika, Kenya

³ School of Nursing, Department of Medical-Surgical Nursing, Mount Kenya University, Thika, Kenya

#aCurent address: Department of Nursing, Pwani University, Kilifi County, Kenya

*Corresponding Author

Email: dmwadulo@gmail.com (DM)

Abstract

Health-related quality of life is one's perceived status of life in value systems and cultural settings where they dwell in and in relation to their aspirations, expectations, ideals and fears. Diabetes has always been seen as a disease of affluence but over the years it is increasingly becoming a problem in developing countries. Globally, approximately 1.5 million deaths that occurred in 2012 due to diabetes, 80% of the deaths occurred in the developing nations. There is an increasing problem of non-transmittable diseases in Sub-Saharan Africa region which has brought a change in lifestyles like smoking, physical inactivity and unhealthy diet. Such non-communicable diseases include cardiovascular diseases, neuropathies & renal disorders which are commonly associated as the complications for diabetes mellitus. Measuring the extent an illness has affected health is of significance to the care and management of those individuals with chronic diseases whose remedy is not likely and since they require long-term management and care. Quality of life has a multivariate approach as it highlights information on bodily health, emotional health, functional and social health spheres of an individual's view of the extent their health has been affected. This measure, therefore, provides holistic care for an individual with diabetes mellitus. This study seeks to solely look at how the wellness of individuals with diabetes mellitus is affected. The research adopted a cross-sectional descriptive design. 165 respondents were selected through systematic random sampling. The researcher used logistic regression whereby patient's characteristics like foot problem (aOR7.348; $p=0.005$) and numbness/pain in hands/legs/feet (aOR=0.155; $p<0.001$) were associated with low quality of life. Over half of the study participants 127 (77%) indicated that their health-related quality of life would be better without diabetes mellitus as depicted by a diabetes specific QoL mean score of -1.88 approximating to "much better" (-2). The overall mean ADDQoL AWI score (-4.48) indicated that the health-related quality of life of the patients was negatively impaired by type two diabetes mellitus. Among the 19 domain specific items, the study participants rated "sex life" as the most negatively impacted/ important (WI=-5.14). In conclusion, type two diabetes mellitus negatively affected the quality of life and diabetes neuropathy which featured as foot problem and numbness of hands/feet needs to be considered as a predisposing factor to low quality of life in diabetics. Care provided should go beyond the standard treatment that looks into how treatment, lifestyle & behavioral modifications affect daily functioning and well-being of patients thus focusing more on the individual patient's context and ultimately improving the health-related quality of life of type two diabetes mellitus patients.

Introduction

Diabetes mellitus is a long term, progressive, non-transmittable disease that ensues when the pancreas either cannot excrete sufficient insulin or when the human cells are insensitive to the insulin produced by the pancreas. Over the years, diabetes has been associated with lifestyle modifications like physical inactivity, unhealthy diet, and obesity which can lead to complications associated with cardiovascular risks and renal disorders. This, in turn, reduces the quality of life and life expectancy in people with diabetes (39).

Over 280 million people have diabetes mellitus globally with this statistic expected to increase to about 400 million by the year 2030, with the biggest population being in the developing countries. In every 5 people living with diabetes in developing countries, 4 of them are men and women who are breadwinners of their families (28).

The effects of Diabetes go beyond the individual as they also affect families, societies, national productivity and have socio-economic effects, which in the developing countries co-exist with other diseases like cardiovascular diseases (39).

The National Diabetes strategy 2015-2020 in Kenya indicates that the occurrence of diabetes in the adult population is 4.56% (750,000 persons) and 20,000 deaths annually. Moreover, this is likely not to be the true picture as 60% of individuals diagnosed with diabetes in Kenya go to health facilities with unconnected complaints (23).

The social, bodily and emotional facets of health of an individual that are affected by the person's values, hopes, and experiences are highlighted by the measure of their quality of life. It is then of significance for health care workers to recognize the bodily, social and emotional domains impacted by a chronic illness such as diabetes (16). Furthermore, the negative impact it has on the social domain, life expectancy and academic performance, ultimately affects their quality of life which is decreased by micro-vascular plus macro-vascular complications (16).

Assessment of one's well-being in the context of health is increasingly becoming a significant end result measure of treatment and health interventions in patients with long-term illnesses (11).

Current care of diabetic patients focuses on treatment and how drugs can prolong their life span leaving out on the impact diabetes has socially, emotionally and financially (16).

Health is completeness in the physical, emotional and social health and not merely the lack of an illness or disability. For an individual to be healthy in all these aspects their well-being needs to be evaluated by measuring improvement in the extent to which his/her wellbeing has been affected by an illness (39). Healthcare researchers and workers consider this assessment as an indicator of not only evaluating the effect of chronic diseases on the lives of patients but also in measuring the efficiency of health interventions and treatment programs (14). Furthermore, individuals with diabetes mellitus are susceptible to premature aging, physical inactivity and weight gain in addition to debilitating complications of diabetes mellitus, negatively affecting their quality of life (14).

A lot of the literature on this subject of interest is from advanced countries Vis a Vis in developing countries where little is known. In addition, there is better healthcare provision in advanced countries rather than in developing countries where disability due to diabetes is associated with other morbidities (34).

Materials and Methods

Study design

A cross-sectional descriptive research design was used to describe what is happening at the current moment or specific point in time. This design was adopted as it sought to highlight differences between or association among the variety of study subjects (diabetic patients). The independent variables included socio-demographic and health-related characteristics (patient characteristics) which the researcher sought to find out how they were associated with either low/ high health related quality of life (dependent variable) in type 2 diabetes mellitus patients.

Study population

They included all the patients with T2DM on follow up at the outpatient diabetic clinic at Moi County referral hospital in Taita-Taveta County. The facility receives a minimum of 90 patients monthly in the out-patient diabetic clinic.

Sample & sampling technique

Calculation of desired sample size was by use of the Yamane formula. The study adopted a confidence interval of 95% and a sampling error of 0.05. The population size (P) was approximately 281 quarterly a year and e is 0.05

$$p = \frac{P}{n}$$

$$1 + P (e)^2$$

$$p= \frac{281}{1 + 281 (0.05)^2}$$

$$1 + 281 (0.05)^2$$

$$p= 165 \text{ patients}$$

p= sample size P= population size e= level of precision

To cover for non-response, the sample size was be adjusted by using the following formula:

Adjusted Sample size = Effective sample size

(1- Non response rate anticipated)

$$= \frac{165}{(1-0.1)}$$

$$= \frac{165}{0.9}$$

$$= 183$$

$$0.9$$

$$= 183 \text{ patients (The researcher had an adjusted sample size of 199 after}$$

data collection from which 165 respondents were picked as the viable sample size)

Sampling technique

Systematic random sampling was used whereby every K^{th} patient was selected. In this research every 2nd patient who came into the diabetic clinic was selected to be part of the sample size. The patients were assigned numbers and then randomly chosen by use of a sampling interval of 2. The sampling interval was considered by division of the population size by the desired sample size. The population size was **281** while the desired sample size was **165**. This is illustrated below:

Sampling interval = Population size

Desired sample size

$$\text{Sampling interval} = \frac{281}{165}$$

Sampling interval= 1.7 approx. 2

Therefore, every 2nd patient was a member who was included in the sample size.

Data collection tool

Quantitative data was collected by the use of a structured questionnaire and the ADDQoL-19 survey tool. The ADDQoL-19 which is a Patient-Reported Outcome Measure (PROM) was developed by Professor Claire Bradley for long-term health conditions like diabetes, chronic kidney disease, HIV and others (9). Professor Claire Bradley works at the Health Psychology Research limited in the United Kingdom (UK). The ADDQoL allows the respondent to rate only personally-applicable life domains, indicating importance and influence of diabetes.

The first two items of the tool assessed “present quality of life” and “diabetes dependent quality of life.” The first item range of scoring for “present quality of life” is from +3 (excellent) to -3 (extremely bad). The second item range of scoring for “diabetes dependent quality of life” is from +1 (worse) to -3 (very much better). This second item was evaluated by a scale from +1 (maximum positive impact of the diabetes) to -3 (maximum negative impact of the diabetes). The other 19-specific aspects of life followed. For example, item 1 and 2 of the tools covered leisure and work respectively. The impact of each specific aspect was evaluated by a scale from -3 (maximum negative impact of the diabetes) to +1 (maximum positive impact of the diabetes). The respondent then further stated how important this aspect is to their quality of life from a scale of +3 (very important) to 0 (not at all important) (9). Out of the 19-specific aspects of life, five had an optional response of “not applicable.” The weighted impact score for each aspect was calculated by multiplying the impact rating by the importance rating. The weighted impact score for each aspect was calculated by multiplying the impact rating by the importance rating. The average weighted impact score was calculated by adding the weighted evaluation of each aspect and dividing it by the number of applicable specific aspects of life. The range of scoring the AWI was -9 (maximum negative impact of the diabetes) to +3 (maximum positive impact of the diabetes).

The structured questionnaire collected data on the patients’ characteristics (socio-demographic and health-related) while the ADDQoL survey tool measured the quality of life related to health of the diabetics on the aspects of bodily, emotional and social health domains. The structured questionnaire consisted of close-ended questions. Pre-test of the tool was done at Kilifi County

referral hospital with 16 respondents which is 10% of the required sample size. Any unapplicable/ unclear questions in the structured questionnaire were either omitted or replaced.

Data management and analysis

The quantitative data was processed by use of SPSS version 25. Descriptive statistics was used for the sociodemographic and health-related characteristics. Categorical variables were presented as percentages and frequencies while continuous variables were presented as mean and median. The researcher used bivariable logistic regression to assess the socio-demographic and health-related characteristics associated with the quality of life. All characteristics associated with quality of life in T2DM with a cut-off of $P < 0.25$ in the bivariable analysis were considered for inclusion in the multi-variable logistic analysis. Furthermore, patient characteristics (socio-demographic & health related) in the multivariable logistic regression that had a $P < 0.05$ were considered to be statistically significant and thus associated with the quality of life.

Ethical consideration

Ethical clearance to do the study was sought from the research committee at Moi County Referral hospital through a letter from the Ethics and Research committee of Mount Kenya University. Also, clearance was sought from NACOSTI. The research license number from NACOSTI is NACOSTI/P/22/18413. A written consent was obtained from the study participants.

The researcher sought approval from the study participants prior to data collection through a written informed consent. The Informed consent was signed by all study participants. Anonymity was guaranteed for all participants. No financial incentives were offered for participation in the study. This study was approved by the Ethics Committee at Moi County Referral hospital. This study was approved by NACOSTI (research license number NACOSTI/P/22/18413). The ADDQoL-19 survey tool was adopted from Professor Claire Bradley of the Health Psychology Research limited in the UK. Permission to adopt the tool was sought and a license to use the tool in the research was issued which was reference number HPR 4458.

Results

A total of 199 participants filled the research tool out of which 165 participants were identified as the required sample size. Most of the participants were female at 116 (70%), married were 127 (77%) and 114 (69%) had no source of income. Those living with diabetes for a duration of between 6 months-10 years were 113 (69%), most common treatment regimen was oral medication at 145 (88%) and co-morbidities like high blood pressure 113 (69%), eye/ vision problems 76 (46%), numbness or pain in feet/ legs 118 (72%) were the most common among the participants. This is illustrated in tab 1.

Table 1: Distribution of study participants by socio-demographic and health-related characteristics (N=165)

Characteristic	Category	N (%)
Age	18 -59yrs	70 (42.4)
	60yrs+	95 (57.6)
Marital status	Married	127 (77)
	Single/Widowed/Divorced	38 (23)
Gender	Male	49 (29.7)
	Female	116 (70.3)
Education	None/Primary	95 (57.6)
	High school/technical/vocational/College/University	70 (42.4)
Employment status	Employed	40 (24.2)
	Unemployed	125 (75.8)
Source of income	None	114 (69)
	Employment/ Business	51 (31)
Duration with diabetes	6 months – 10yrs	113 (68.5)
	11yrs -20yrs	43 (26.1)
	21yrs+	9 (5.5)
Treatment regimen	Diet/Oral medication only	145 (87.9)
	Insulin + oral medication	20 (12.1)
Health financing mode	Cash only	74 (44.8)
	Insurance/NHIF	91 (55.2)
High BP	No	52 (31.5)
	Yes	113 (68.5)
Kidney problem	No	163 (98.8)
	Yes	2 (1.2)

Characteristic	Category	N (%)
High cholesterol	No	164 (99.4)
	Yes	1 (0.6)
Heart disease	No	158 (95.8)
	Yes	7 (4.2)
Foot problem	No	153 (92.7)
	Yes	12 (7.3)
Eye problem	No	89 (53.9)
	Yes	76 (46.1)
Circulation problem	No	164 (99.4)
	Yes	1 (0.6)
Numbness/ pain in hands/legs/ feet	No	47 (28.5)
	Yes	118 (71.5)
Other illnesses	No	161 (97.6)
	Yes	4 (2.4)
Nil/ No illnesses	No	161 (97.6)
	Yes	4 (2.4)

In multivariable logistic regression a cut-off of $P < 0.25$ was used where by the patient characteristics of duration of living with diabetes mellitus, co-morbidities like high blood pressure, foot problem and numbness/ pain in hands or feet or legs were analyzed. Patient characteristics that remained statistically significant after controlling other variables included foot problem and numbness/ pain in hands or legs or feet. Foot problem was at (aOR=7.348; 95% CI 1.824-29.605; $P = 0.005$) while numbness/ pain in hands or legs or feet was at (aOR= 0.155; 95% CI 0.062-0.389; $P < 0.001$). This is illustrated in tab 2.

Table 2: Socio-demographic and Health-related characteristics Multivariable analysis (N=165)

Characteristic	Category	Higher QOL N (%)	Lower QOL N (%)	Crude OR [95% CI]	P-value	Adjusted OR [95% CI]	P-value
Age	18 -59yrs	16 (51.6)	54 (40.3)	0.633 (0.289-1.387)	0.253	-	-
	60yrs+	15(48.4)	80 (59.7)	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
Marital status	Married	25 (80.6)	102 (76.1)	0.765 (0.288-2.029)	0.590	-	-
	Single/Widowed/Divorced	6 (19.4)	32 (23.9)	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
Gender	Male	8 (25.8)	41 (30.6)	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
	Female	23 (74.2)	93 (69.4)	0.789	0.599	-	-
Education	None/Primary	20 (64.5)	75 (56.0)	0.699 (0.311-1.573)	0.387	-	-
	Highschool/technical/ vocational/College/ University	11 (35.5)	59 (44.0)	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
Employment status	Employed	6 (19.4)	34 (25.4)	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
	Unemployed	25 (80.6)	100 (74.6)	0.85 (0.536-3.746)	0.76	-	-
Source of income	None	22 (71.0)	92 (68.7)	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
	Employment/ Business	9 (29.0)	42 (31.3)	1.116 (0.474-2.630)	0.802	-	-
Characteristic	Category	Higher QOL N (%)	Lower QOL N (%)	Crude OR [95% CI]	P-value	Adjusted OR [95% CI]	P-value

Duration with diabetes	6 months – 10yrs	22 (71)	91 (67.9)	2.068 (0.479-8.924)	0.330	1.502 (0.258-8.747)	0.651
	11yrs -20yrs	6 (19.4)	37(27.6)	3.083 (0.603-15.775)	0.176**	4.853 (0.797-29.562)	0.087
	21yrs+	3 (9.7)	6 (4.5)	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
Treatment regimen	Diet/Oral medication only	29 (93.5)	116 (86.6)	0.444 (0.098-2.025)	0.295	-	-
	Insulin + oral medication	2 (6.5)	18 (13.4)	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
Health financing mode	Cash only	14 (45.2)	60 (44.8)	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
	Insurance/NHIF	17 (54.8)	74 (55.2)	1.016 (0.463-2.227)	0.969	-	-
High BP	No	13 (41.9)	39 (29.1)	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
	Yes	18 (58.1)	95 (70.9)	0.568 (0.254-1.271)	0.169**	0.494 (0.194-1.257)	0.139
Kidney problem	No	31 (100.0)	132 (98.5)	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
	Yes	0 (0.0)	2 (1.5)	<0.001	0.999	-	-
High cholesterol	No	31 (100.0)	133 (99.3)	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
	Yes	0 (0.0)	1 (0.7)	<0.001	1.000	-	-
Heart disease	No	31 (100.0)	127 (94.8)	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
	Yes	0 (0.0)	7 (5.2)	<0.001	0.999	-	-
Foot problem	No	25 (80.6)	128 (95.5)	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
Characteristic	Category	Higher QOL N (%)	Lower QOL N (%)	Crude OR [95% CI]	P-value	Adjusted OR [95% CI]	P-value

	Yes	6 (19.4)	6 (4.5)	5.120 (1.527- 17.170)	0.008**	7.348(1.824- 29.605)	0.005*
Eye problem	No	19 (61.3)	70 (52.2)	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
	Yes	12 (38.7)	64 (47.8)	0.691 (0.311- 1.535)	0.364	-	-
Circulation problem	No	31 (100.0)	133 (99.3)	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
	Yes	0 (0.0)	1 (0.7)	<0.001	1.000	-	-
Numbness/ pain in hands/legs/ feet	No	18 (58.1)	29 (21.6)	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
	Yes	13 (41.9)	105 (78.4)	0.199 (0.088- 0.454)	<0.001**	0.155 (0.062- 0.389)	<0.001*
Other illnesses	No	30 (96.8)	131 (97.8)	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
	Yes	1 (3.2)	3 (2.2)	1.456 1.456 (0.146- 14.484)	0.749	-	-
Nil/ No illnesses	No	30 (96.8)	131 (97.8)	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
	Yes	1 (3.2)	3 (2.2)	1.456 (0.146- 14.484)	0.749	-	-

*- p<0.05

** - p<0.25 (cut-off)

Over half 108 (65%) of the study participants stated that their quality of life was “neither good nor bad” while the least 3 (2%) stated that it was “bad” (tab 3).

Over half 127 (77%) of the study participants stated that their quality of life would be “much better” if they did not have diabetes mellitus while the least 2 (1%) stated that their quality of life would be “the same” if they did not have diabetes mellitus (tab 3).

Table 3: Responses to Overview Item one "perceived present quality of life" and overview item two "quality of life in the absence of diabetes mellitus"

Particulars	Response	Frequency (N=165)	Percentage (%)
Overview Item One: Perceived Present quality of life	Bad	3	1.8
	Neither good nor bad	108	65.5
	Good	48	29.1
	Very good	6	3.6
	Total	165	100.0
<hr/>			
Particulars	Response	Frequency (N=165)	Percentage (%)
Overview Item Two: My quality of life in the absence of Diabetes mellitus	Very much better	10	6.1
	Much better	127	77.0
	A little better	26	15.8
	The same	2	1.2
	Total	165	100.0

The range of scoring of overview item one of the ADDQOL tool is -3.00, 3.00. The score per response was as follows: “excellent” (3), “very good” (2), “good” (1), “neither good nor bad” (0), “bad” (-1), “very bad” (-2), “extremely bad” (-3).

Overview item one of the ADDQOL-19 tool which looked into the present quality of life of the participants, the responses gave a mean generic quality of life score of 0.35 approximating to “neither good nor bad” (0) as opposed to “good” (1) or “very good” (2). This is illustrated in tab 4.

The range of scoring of overview item two of the ADDQOL tool is -3.00, 1.00. The score per response was follows: “very much better” (-3), “much better” (-2), “a little better” (-1), “the same” (0), “worse” (1).

Overview item two of the ADDQOL-19 tool looked into the perceived quality of life in the absence of diabetes mellitus. The responses gave a mean generic quality of life score of -1.88 approximating to “much better” (-2). This indicated that the health-quality of life would be better without/ in the absence of diabetes mellitus. This is illustrated in tab 4.

The mean AWI score for the domain specific items for the 165 study participants was -4.48, indicating a considerable perceived negative impact of diabetes mellitus type 2 on health-related quality of life. This is illustrated in tab 4.

Table 4: Mean and Median of Patient reported outcome measures for Generic quality of life and Perceived impact of diabetes mellitus type 2 on QoL

PARTICULARS	N=165	MEAN	MEDIAN (RANGE)
Generic ADDQoL quality of life score, overview item 1 (+3, excellent to -3, extremely bad)	165	0.35	0 (-3.00, 3.00)
Diabetes-specific QOL score, overview item 2 (-3, Very much better (if I did not have diabetes) to 1, Worse (if I did not have diabetes)	165	-1.88	-2.00 (-3.00, 1.00)
AWI (Average Weighted Impact) score 19 domain-specific items (-9 maximum perceived negative impact of diabetes, to +3 maximum perceived positive impact of diabetes)	165	-4.48	-4.00 (-8.00, 0)

The weighted impact score per domain-specific item was calculated by multiplying the impact rating by the importance rating. The range of scoring the weighted impact score was (-9.00) “maximum negative impact of diabetes mellitus” to (+3.00) “maximum positive impact of diabetes mellitus.” Among the 19 domain-specific items, the study participants rated “sex life” as the most negatively impacted (WI= -5.14) significantly more so than other items. This is illustrated in tab 5.

Table 5: Mean ADDQoL Weighted impact item score

SPECIFIC ASPECT OF LIFE	N (%)	MEAN WEIGHTED IMPACT SCORE FOR EACH ASPECT OF LIFE
Leisure activities	165 (100%)	-4.06
Working life	37 (22.4%)	-4.78
Local/ long journeys	165 (100%)	-4.26
Holidays	9(5.5%)	-3.89
Things I could physically do	165 (100%)	-4.56
Family/ Family life	163	-4.71
Social life	165 (100%)	-4.63
Personal relationship	102	-4.94
Sex life	97	-5.14
Physical appearance	165 (100%)	-4.65
Self-Confidence	165 (100%)	-4.66
Motivation	165 (100%)	-4.39
The way people in general react to me	165 (100%)	-4.49
Feelings about the future	165 (100%)	-4.59
Financial situation	165 (100%)	-4.74
Living conditions	165 (100%)	-4.73
Self-dependence	165 (100%)	-3.58
Freedom to eat	165 (100%)	-4.57
Freedom to drink	165 (100%)	-4.56

Discussion

The patient characteristics that were statistically significant after multivariable logistic

analysis was, foot problem and numbness/pain in hands/legs/feet. The research findings indicated that foot problem and numbness in hands/ legs/feet were the health-related characteristics related to low HRQOL among type two diabetes mellitus patients. Study participants who had foot problem were seven times more likely to have low health-related quality of life compared to those who did not have the comorbidity. In addition, study participants who had numbness/pain in hands/legs/feet were more likely to have low health-related quality of life compared to those who did not have the co-morbidity. These study findings are similar to a study done in Brazil by (22) that showed that 34 (17%) of the elderly diabetic participants who had foot wounds had lower quality of life due to decreased autonomy and social participation as a result of decreased mobility associated with neuropathic/vascular pain. Similar study findings were found in Saudi Arabia (3) which showed that despite the overall health related quality of life being moderate, 69% of the study participants who had pain/discomfort had severe to extreme health state that translated to low health-related quality of life (3). On the influence of type two diabetes mellitus on the health-related quality, the research findings indicated a considerable perceived negative impact of diabetes mellitus type 2 on the HRQOL of the 165 patients. Over half of the study participants perceived that their health-related quality of life would be better without/ in the absence of type two diabetes mellitus. This research finding is similar to a Bulgarian study which showed that 275 (67.1%) of the respondents perceived that their quality of life would be better without T2DM since the diabetes specific QoL mean score was at -1.8 (5).

The ADDQoL scoring ignores non-applicable domains and gives greater emphasis to domains of greater importance to the individual. Among the 19 domain specific items, the study participants rated “sex life” as the most negatively impacted/ important as compared to other items. This is despite also all other items being negatively influenced by T2DM. This was further coupled with negative influence of T2DM on the health-related quality of life which was indicated with a negative mean score of the AWI of the 165 study participants.

This research finding is in contrast to most other studies using the ADDQoL, where the item reflecting the greatest negative influence of diabetes on the health-related quality of life was “Freedom to eat as I wish.” A study (10) indicated that “freedom to eat as I wish” was the most negatively impacted at (WI= -3.35). Also, a study done in Bulgaria showed that “freedom to eat as I wish” was the most negatively impacted at (WI= -4.0) followed by “Family life” WI= -3.9. In addition, the mean AWI score for the population was -2.9 which indicated an overall negative impact of T2DM on quality of life (5).

Conclusions

Over half of the study participants 127 (77%) indicated that their health-related quality of life would be better in the absence of diabetes mellitus (5). The overall mean ADDQoL AWI score (4.48) indicated that the health-related quality of life was negatively impaired by type two diabetes mellitus. Since over half of the study participants perceived a low health-related quality of life then it can be concluded that most were aware of the influence of T2DM on their health status and ultimately on their health-related quality of life (3).

Co-morbidities of foot problem and numbness/pain in hands/ legs/feet were associated with low health-related quality of life. This may be due to the fact that diabetes neuropathy and neuropathic pain is one of the many complications associated with diabetes mellitus (22). Sexual satisfaction/ sexual function was an item which was the most negatively impacted and most important domain of the patient's quality of life while "self-dependence" was the least negatively impacted domain. This may be due to the fact that microvascular complications like sexual dysfunction, infertility/ impotence is associated with diabetes mellitus (5)(10).

Acknowledgements

The researcher would like to acknowledge her research methodology lecturer Dr. Nilufar for instilling in me the most appropriate research skills and knowledge. Secondly, I thank my thesis supervisors Professor Bindu Madhavi and Ms. Beatrice Nkoroi whose continuous support has been instrumental in the development of my thesis. Lastly to my husband who has been giving me the essential psychological support throughout my thesis.

References

1. Achoki, T., Miller-Petrie, M. K., Glenn, S. D., Kalra, N., Lesego, A., Gathecha, G. K., Alam, U., Kiarie, H. W., Maina, I. W., Adetifa, I. M. O., Barsosio, H. C., Degfie, T. T., Keiyoro, P. N., Kiirithio, D. N., Kinfu, Y., Kinyoki, D. K., Kisia, J. M., Krish, V. S., Lagat, A. K., . . . Naghavi, M. (2019). Health disparities across the counties of Kenya and implications for policy makers, 1990–2016: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2016. *The Lancet Global Health*, 7(1), e81–e95.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/s2214-109x\(18\)30472-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/s2214-109x(18)30472-8)

2. AL-Mahmood, S. M. A., Razak, T. A., Fatnoon Nik Ahmad, N. N., Bin Mohamed, A. H., & Bin Che Abdullah, S. T. (2018). A cross-sectional study on the quality of life of patients with peripheral diabetic neuropathy pain in Hospital Tegku Ampaun Afzan, Kuantan, Malaysia. *Tropical Journal of Pharmaceutical Research*, *17*(1), 161.
<https://doi.org/10.4314/tjpr.v17i1.22>
3. Alshayban, D., & Joseph, R. (2020). Health-related quality of life among patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus in Eastern Province, Saudi Arabia: A cross-sectional study. *PLOS ONE*, *15*(1), e0227573. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0227573>
4. Atun, R., Davies, J. I., Gale, E. A. M., Bärnighausen, T., Beran, D., Kengne, A. P., Levitt, N. S., Mangugu, F. W., Nyirenda, M. J., Ogle, G. D., Ramaiya, K., Sewankambo, N. K., Sobngwi, E., Tesfaye, S., Yudkin, J. S., Basu, S., Bommer, C., Heesemann, E., Manne-Goehler, J., ... Werfalli, M. (2017). Diabetes in sub-Saharan Africa: From clinical care to health policy. *The Lancet Diabetes & Endocrinology*, *5*(8), 622–667.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-8587\(17\)30181-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-8587(17)30181-X)
5. Boryana Angelova Levterova, Maria Orbetzova, Georgi Levterov, Donka Dimitrova & Plamen Todorov (2018) Assessment of the impact of type 2 diabetes on the quality of
6. life by Audit of Diabetes-Dependent Quality-of-Life (ADDQoL-19), *Biotechnology & Biotechnological Equipment*, *32*:6, 1627-1634, DOI: 10.1080/13102818.2018.1532319
7. Bąk, E., Nowak - Kapusta, Z., Dobrzyn-Matusiak, D., Marcisz-Dyla, E., Marcisz, C., & Krzemińska, S. (2019). An assessment of diabetes-dependent quality of life (ADDQoL) in women and men in Poland with type 1 and type 2 diabetes. *Annals of Agricultural and Environmental Medicine*, *26*(3), 429–438. <https://doi.org/10.26444/aaem/99959>
8. Bartkeviciute, B., Lesauskaite, V., & Riklikiene, O. (2021). Individualized Health Care for Older Diabetes Patients from the Perspective of Health Professionals and Service

Consumers. *Journal of Personalized Medicine*, 11(7), 608.

<https://doi.org/10.3390/jpm11070608>

9. Bradley, C., Todd, C., Gorton, T., Symonds, E., Martin, A., & Plowright, R. (1999). The development of an individualized questionnaire measure of perceived impact of diabetes on quality of life: The ADDQoL. *Quality of Life Research*, 8(1/2), 79–91.
<https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1026485130100>
10. Bradley et al (2018). Predictors of Quality of Life and Other Patient-Reported Outcomes in the PANORAMA Multinational Study of People with Type 2 Diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2018; 41:267–276. <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc16-2655>
11. Daya, R., Bayat, Z., & Raal, F. J. (2016). Effects of diabetes mellitus on health-related quality of life at a tertiary hospital in South Africa: A cross-sectional study. *South African Medical Journal*, 106(9), 918. <https://doi.org/10.7196/SAMJ.2016.v106i9.9899>
12. *Diabetes a cause for alarm at the Coast*. (n.d.). The Standard. Retrieved April 10, 2022, from <https://www.standardmedia.co.ke/coast/article/2000062510/diabetes-a-cause-for-alarm-at-the-coast>
13. *Diabetes and health-related quality of life*. (n.d.). Physiopedia. Retrieved April 10, 2022, from https://www.physio-pedia.com/Diabetes_and_Health-Related_Quality_of_Life
14. Didarloo, A., & Alizadeh, M. (2016). Health-related quality of life and its determinants amongst women with diabetes mellitus: A cross-sectional analysis. *Nursing and Midwifery Studies, In Press* (In Press). <https://doi.org/10.17795/nmsjournal28937>
15. E.K, G., C.F, O., E.N, O., & M.C, M. (2014). Assessment of the perceived quality of life of non insulin dependent diabetic patients attending the diabetes clinic in kenyatta national hospital. *IOSR Journal of Pharmacy (IOSRPHR)*, 04(03), 15–21.
<https://doi.org/10.9790/3013-040315-21>

16. Gebremedhin, T., Workicho, A., & Angaw, D. A. (2019). Health-related quality of life and its associated factors among adult patients with type II diabetes attending Mizan Tepi University Teaching Hospital, Southwest Ethiopia. *BMJ Open Diabetes Research & Care*, 7(1), e000577. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjdr-2018-000577>
17. Gillani, S. W., Ansari, I. A., Zaghoul, H. A., Sulaiman, S. A. S., Rathore, H. A., Baig, M. R., Abdul, M. I. M., & Althagfan, S. (2019). Predictors of health-related quality of life among patients with type ii diabetes mellitus who are insulin users: A multidimensional model. *Current Therapeutic Research*, 90, 53–60.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.curtheres.2019.04.001>
18. Jain, V., Shivkumar, S., & Gupta, O. (2014). Health-related quality of life (Hr-qol) in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus. *North American Journal of Medical Sciences*, 6(2), 96. <https://doi.org/10.4103/1947-2714.127752>
19. Karuranga, S., Malanda, B., Saeedi, P., & Salpea, P. (2019). *IDF DIABETES ATLAS Ninth edition 2019*. IDF Diabetes Atlas.
https://www.diabetesatlas.org/upload/resources/material/20191218_144539_afr_factsheet_en.pdf
20. Kenya. (2018). Taita Taveta County Integrated Development plan 2018-2022. *Public Policy Repository*. <https://repository.kippra.or.ke/handle/123456789/2360>
21. Kenya—Taita Taveta. (2020, November 25). Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation. <https://www.healthdata.org/kenya-taitataveta>
22. Lima, L. R. de, Funghetto, S. S., Volpe, C. R. G., Santos, W. S., Funez, M. I., & Stival, M. M. (2018). Quality of life and time since diagnosis of Diabetes Mellitus among the elderly. *Revista Brasileira de Geriatria e Gerontologia*, 21(2), 176–185.
<https://doi.org/10.1590/1981-22562018021.170187>

23. Macharia, J. (n.d.). *Kenya National strategy for the prevention and control of non-communicable diseases 2015–2020*. Ministry of Health. Retrieved March 2022, from <https://www.who.int/nmh/ncd-task-force/kenya-strategy-ncds-2015-2020.pdf>
24. McEwen, M., & Wills, E. M. (2014). *Theoretical basis for nursing* (Fourth edition). Wolters Kluwer Health/Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.
25. Mkuu, R., Barry, A., Yonga, G., Nafukho, F., Wernz, C., Gilreath, T., Chowdhury, M. A. B., & Shevon Harvey, I. (2021). Prevalence and factors associated with overweight and obesity in Kenya. *Preventive Medicine Reports*, 22, 101340.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pmedr.2021.101340>
26. *Mombasa county leads in obese women in coast | Mombasa County news | baraka fm 95.5 fm*. (n.d.). Retrieved April 10, 2022, from <https://barakafm.org/2021/02/15/mombasa-county-leads-in-obese-women-in-coast-region/>
27. Musabi, M. (2014). *Quality of life in Children with Diabetes at Kenyatta National Hospital* [University of Nairobi].
http://erepository.uonbi.ac.ke/bitstream/handle/11295/77217/Melab_Quality%20Of%20Life%20In%20Children%20With%20Diabetes%20At%20Kenyatta%20National%20Hospital%281%29.pdf?sequence=3&isAllowed=y
28. Mwavua, S. M., Ndungu, E. K., Mutai, K. K., & Joshi, M. D. (2016). A comparative study of the quality of care and glycaemic control among ambulatory type 2 diabetes mellitus clients, at a Tertiary Referral Hospital and a Regional Hospital in Central Kenya. *BMC Research Notes*, 9(1), 12. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13104-015-1826-0>
29. Nazir, S. R., Hassali, M., Saleem, F., Bashir, S., Hashmi, F., & Aljadhey, H. (2016). A cross-sectional assessment of health-related quality of life among type 2 diabetic patients in Pakistan. *Journal of Pharmacy and Bio allied Sciences*, 8(1), 64.
<https://doi.org/10.4103/0975-7406.171734>

30. Nyanzi, R., Wamala, R., & Atuhaire, L. K. (2014). Diabetes and quality of life: A Ugandan perspective. *Journal of Diabetes Research*, 2014, 1–9.
<https://doi.org/10.1155/2014/402012>
31. Papazafiropoulou, A. K., Bakomitrou, F., Trikallinou, A., Ganotopoulou, A., Verras, C., Christofilidis, G., Bousboulas, S., & Melidonis, A. (2015). Diabetes-dependent quality of life (ADDQoL) and affecting factors in patients with diabetes mellitus type 2 in Greece. *BMC Research Notes*, 8(1), 786. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13104-015-1782-8>
32. Pham, T. B., Nguyen, T. T., Truong, H. T., Trinh, C. H., Du, H. N. T., Ngo, T. T., & Nguyen, L. H. (2020). Effects of diabetic complications on health-related quality of life impairment in Vietnamese patients with type 2 diabetes. *Journal of Diabetes Research*, 2020, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2020/4360804>
33. Purdy, A. F., Sifuna, P., Otieno, L., Omolo, K. O., Larsen, D. A., & Shaw, A. V. (2020). *Examination of mortality due to diabetes and assessment of diabetes-related healthcare services in rural western Kenya* [Preprint]. In Review. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-39511/v1>
34. Rwegerera, G. M., Moshomo, T., Gaenamong, M., Oyewo, T. A., Gollakota, S., Rivera, Y. P., Masaka, A., Godman, B., Shimwela, M., & Habte, D. (2018). Health-related quality of life and associated factors among patients with diabetes mellitus in Botswana. *Alexandria Journal of Medicine*, 54(2), 111–118.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajme.2017.05.010>
35. Saeedi, P., Petersohn, I., Salpea, P., Malanda, B., Karuranga, S., Unwin, N., Colagiuri, S., Guariguata, L., Motala, A. A., Ogurtsova, K., Shaw, J. E., Bright, D., & Williams, R. (2019). Global and regional diabetes prevalence estimates for 2019 and projections for 2030 and 2045: Results from the International Diabetes Federation Diabetes Atlas, 9th

edition. *Diabetes Research and Clinical Practice*, 157, 107843.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.diabres.2019.107843>

36. Shannon, G. D., Haghparast-Bidgoli, H., Chelagat, W., Kibachio, J., & Skordis-Worrall, J. (2019). Innovating to increase access to diabetes care in Kenya: An evaluation of Novo Nordisk's base of the pyramid project. *Global Health Action*, 12(1), 1605704.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/16549716.2019.1605704>

37. Spasić, A., Radovanović, R. V., Đorđević, A. C., Stefanović, N., & Cvetković, T. (2014). Quality of life in type 2 diabetic patients. *Acta Facultatis Medicae Naissensis*, 31(3), 193–200. <https://doi.org/10.2478/afmnai-2014-0024>

38. The Kenya Institute for Public Policy, Research and Analysis. (2018). Taita Taveta County Integrated Development plan 2018-2022. *Public Policy Repository*.

<https://repository.kippra.or.ke/handle/123456789/2360>

39. World Health Organization. (2019). *Classification of diabetes mellitus*. World Health Organization. <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/325182>

Informed Consent

Introduction

You are requested to take part in this study **on assessment of the quality of life related to health in diabetes mellitus type 2 patients.**

I request you to go through this consent form and if you have any questions before agreeing to take part in this study, do not hesitate to ask the researcher. Before you decide to take part in the study, it is important that you know the following:

- a) Your participation in this study is voluntary and refusal to participate will not be used against you.
- b) Information acquired from this study will be kept confidential and the researcher will ensure anonymity of the study participants.
- c) You have a right to withdraw from the study at any level. Your decision will be respected without consequences placed on you.

What will happen if you decide to take part in this research study?

If you agree to participate in this study, you will be interviewed by the researcher in a private area/ area of your convenience where you will feel comfortable while answering the questions. The interview will last approximately 30 minutes.

The researcher will ensure confidentiality of the information given and anonymity of the study participant.

Potential benefits and importance of the knowledge gained

There are no direct benefits to you as a study participant in this study.

The information acquired from this study will help the researcher to advice Moi County referral hospital on care of patients with diabetes mellitus type two.

If you have questions about this study, contact:

Principal Researcher

Dredah Mwadulo on mobile no 0726684128 or email: dmwadulo@gmail.com

CONSENT FORM (STATEMENT OF CONSENT)

Participant's statement

I have read this consent form / The information on this consent form has been read to me.

I have had my questions answered in a language that I understand. I understand that my participation in this study is voluntary and that I may choose to withdraw any time. I agree to

take part in this research study. I understand that all efforts will be made to keep information regarding my personal identity confidential.

Participant signature: _____ Date: _____

Tab 1

Characteristic	Category	N (%)
Age	18 -59	70 (42.4)
	60+	95 (57.6)
Marital status	Married	127 (77)
	Single/Widowed/Divorced	38 (23)
Gender	Male	49 (29.7)
	Female	116 (70.3)
Education	None/Primary	95 (57.6)
	High school/technical/vocational/College/University	70 (42.4)
Employment status	Employed	40 (24.2)
	Unemployed	125 (75.8)
Source of income	None	114 (69)
	Employment/ Business	51 (31)
Duration with diabetes	6 months – 10yrs	113 (68.5)
	11 -20	43 (26.1)
	21+	9 (5.5)
Treatment regimen	Diet/Oral medication only	145 (87.9)
	Insulin + oral medication	20 (12.1)
Health financing mode	Cash only	74 (44.8)
	Insurance/NHIF	91 (55.2)
High BP	No	52 (31.5)
	Yes	113 (68.5)
Kidney problem	No	163 (98.8)
	Yes	2 (1.2)
High cholesterol	No	164 (99.4)
	Yes	1 (0.6)
Heart disease	No	158 (95.8)
	Yes	7 (4.2)
Foot problem	No	153 (92.7)
	Yes	12 (7.3)
Eye problem	No	89 (53.9)
	Yes	76 (46.1)
Circulation problem	No	164 (99.4)
	Yes	1 (0.6)
Numbness/ pain in hands/legs/ feet	No	47 (28.5)
	Yes	118 (71.5)
Other illnesses	No	161 (97.6)
	Yes	4 (2.4)
Nil/ No illnesses	No	161 (97.6)
	Yes	4 (2.4)
	Yes	7 (4.2)

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.31.23285237>; this version posted February 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Tab 2

Characteristic	Category	Higher QOL N (%)	Lower QOL N (%)	Crude OR [95% CI]	P- value	Adjusted OR [95% CI]	P-value
Age	18 -59	16 (51.6)	54 (40.3)	0.633 (0.289- 1.387)	0.253	-	-
	60+	15(48.4)	80 (59.7)	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
Marital status	Married	25 (80.6)	103 (76.1)	0.765 (0.288- 2.029)	0.590	-	-
	Single/Widowed/ Divorced	6 (19.4)	32 (23.9)	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
Gender	Male	8 (25.8)	41 (30.6)	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
	Female	23 (74.2)	93 (69.4)	0.789	0.599	-	-
Education	None/Primary	20 (64.5)	75 (56.0)	0.699 (0.311- 1.573)	0.387	-	-
	Highschool/tech nical/ vocational/Colle ge/ University	11 (35.5)	59 (44.0)	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
Employment status	Employed	6 (19.4)	34 (25.4)	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
	Unemployed	25 (80.6)	100 (74.6)	0.85 (0.536- 3.746)	0.76	-	-
Source of income	None	22 (71.0)	92 (68.7)	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
	Employment/ Business	9 (29.0)	42 (31.3)	1.116 (0.474- 2.630)	0.802	-	-
Duration with diabetes	6 months – 10yrs	22 (71)	91 (67.9)	2.068 (0.479- 8.924)	0.330	1.502 (0.258- 8.747)	0.651

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.31.23285237>; this version posted February 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

	11 -20	6 (19.4)	37(27.6)	3.083 (0.603- 15.775)	0.176* *	4.853 (0.797- 29.562)	0.087
	21+	3 (9.7)	6 (4.5)	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
Treatment regimen	Dict/Oral medication only	29 (93.5)	116 (86.6)	0.444 (0.098- 2.025)	0.295	-	-
	Insulin + oral medication	2 (6.5)	18 (13.4)	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
Health financing mode	Cash only	14 (45.2)	60 (44.8)	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
	Insurance/NHIF	17 (54.8)	74 (55.2)	1.016 (0.463- 2.227)	0.969	-	-
High BP	No	13 (41.9)	39 (29.1)	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
	Yes	18 (58.1)	95 (70.9)	0.568 (0.254- 1.271)	0.169* *	0.494 (0.194- 1.257)	0.139
Kidney problem	No	31 (100.0)	132 (98.5)	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
	Yes	0 (0.0)	2 (1.5)	<0.001	0.999	-	-
High cholesterol	No	31 (100.0)	133 (99.3)	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
	Yes	0 (0.0)	1 (0.7)	<0.001	1.000	-	-
Heart disease	No	31 (100.0)	127 (94.8)	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
	Yes	0 (0.0)	7 (5.2)	<0.001	0.999	-	-
Foot problem	No	25 (80.6)	128 (95.5)	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
	Yes	6 (19.4)	6 (4.5)	5.120 (1.527- 17.170)	0.008* *	7.348(1.8 24- 29.605)	0.005*
Eye problem	No	19 (61.3)	70 (52.2)	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.31.23285237>; this version posted February 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

	Yes	12 (38.7)	64 (47.8)	0.691 (0.311- 1.535)	0.364	-	-
Circulation problem	No	31 (100.0)	133 (99.3)	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
	Yes	0 (0.0)	1 (0.7)	<0.001	1.000	-	-
Numbness/ pain in hands/legs/ feet	No	18 (58.1)	29 (21.6)	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
	Yes	13 (41.9)	105 (78.4)	0.199 (0.088- 0.454)	<0.001 *	0.155 (0.062- 0.389)	<0.001*
Other illnesses	No	30 (96.8)	131 (97.8)	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
	Yes	1 (3.2)	3 (2.2)	1.456 1.456 (0.146- 14.484)	0.749	-	-
Nil/ No illnesses	No	30 (96.8)	131 (97.8)	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
	Yes	1 (3.2)	3 (2.2)	1.456 (0.146- 14.484)	0.749	-	-

*- p<0.05

** - p<0.25 (cut-off)

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.31.23285237>; this version posted February 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Tab 3

Particulars	Response	Frequency (N=165)	Percentage (%)
Overview Item One: Perceived Present quality of life	Bad	3	1.8
	Neither good nor bad	108	65.5
	Good	48	29.1
	Very good	6	3.6
	Total	165	100.0
Particulars	Response	Frequency (N=165)	Percentage (%)
Overview Item Two: My quality of life in the absence of Diabetes mellitus	Very much better	10	6.1
	Much better	127	77.0
	A little better	26	15.8
	The same	2	1.2
	Total	165	100.0

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.31.23285237>; this version posted February 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license.

Tab 4

PARTICULARS	N=165	MEAN	MEDIAN (RANGE)
Generic ADDQoL quality of life score, overview item 1 (+3, excellent to -3, extremely bad)	165	0.35	0 (-3.00, 3.00)
Diabetes-specific QOL score, overview item 2 (-3, Very much better (if I did not have diabetes) to 1, Worse (if I did not have diabetes)	165	-1.88	-2.00 (-3.00, 1.00)
AWI (Average Weighted Impact) score 19 domain-specific items (-9 maximum perceived negative impact of diabetes, to +3 maximum perceived positive impact of diabetes)	165	-4.48	-4.00 (-8.00, 0)

Tab 5

SPECIFIC ASPECT OF LIFE	N (%)	MEAN WEIGHTED IMPACT SCORE FOR EACH ASPECT OF LIFE
Leisure activities	165 (100%)	-4.06
Working life	37 (22.4%)	-4.78
Local/ long journeys	165 (100%)	-4.26
Holidays	9(5.5%)	-3.89
Things I could physically do	165 (100%)	-4.56
Family/ Family life	165	-4.71
Social life	165 (100%)	-4.63
Personal relationship	102	-4.94
Sex life	97	-5.14
Physical appearance	165 (100%)	-4.65
Self-Confidence	165 (100%)	-4.66
Motivation	165 (100%)	-4.39
The way people in general react to me	165 (100%)	-4.49
Feelings about the future	165 (100%)	-4.59
Financial situation	165 (100%)	-4.74
Living conditions	165 (100%)	-4.73
Self-dependence	165 (100%)	-3.58
Freedom to eat	165 (100%)	-4.57
Freedom to drink	165 (100%)	-4.56

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.31.23285237>; this version posted February 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

This is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).