

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

## TRANSLATION AND VALIDATION OF AN EPILEPSY SCREENING INSTRUMENT IN TWO GHANAIAN LANGUAGES

Emmanuel Kwame Darkwa<sup>1,2,3</sup>, Sabina Asiamah<sup>1,2,3</sup>, Elizabeth Awini<sup>1,2</sup>, Cynthia Sottie<sup>2</sup>, Anthony Godi<sup>3</sup>, John E Williams<sup>1,2</sup>, Albert Akpalu<sup>11,12</sup>, J Helen Cross<sup>4</sup>, Josemir W. Sander<sup>5-7</sup>, Arjune Sen<sup>8</sup>, Charles R. Newton<sup>8,9</sup>, Anthony Danso-Appiah<sup>3,10</sup>, Patrick Adjei<sup>11,12</sup>

1. Dodowa Health Research Centre, Research and Development Division, Accra, Ghana
2. Ghana Health Service, Accra, Ghana
3. Department of Epidemiology and Disease Control, School of Public Health, University of Ghana, Legon, Accra
4. UCL Great Ormond Street NIHR BRC Institute of Child Health, London WC1N 1EP
5. UCL Queen Square Institute of Neurology, London WC1N 3BG & Chalfont Centre for Epilepsy, Chalfont St Peter SL9 0RJ, United Kingdom
6. Stichting Epilepsie Instellingen Nederland (SEIN), Heemstede 2301 SW, The Netherlands.
7. Department of Neurology, West China Hospital, Sichuan University, Chengdu 610041, China.
8. Oxford Epilepsy Research Group, Nuffield Department of Clinical Neurosciences, John Radcliffe Hospital, Oxford OX3 9DU. United Kingdom
9. Department of Psychiatry, University of Oxford, United Kingdom
10. Centre for Evidence Synthesis and Policy, University of Ghana, Legon, Accra.
11. University of Ghana Medical School, Accra, Ghana
12. Korle Bu Teaching Hospital, Korle Bu, Accra, Ghana

Corresponding author email: [ekdarkwa002@st.ug.edu.gh](mailto:ekdarkwa002@st.ug.edu.gh)

33 **ABSTRACT**

34 **Introduction:** The prevalence of epilepsy in sub-Saharan Africa varies considerably, and the exact estimate  
35 in Ghana is unknown, with few data available from peri-urban areas. More community-based studies are  
36 required to understand the tangible burden of epilepsy in these areas and the difficulties in healthcare access.

37 **Objective:** To validate a household survey epilepsy-screening instrument in Shai-Osudoku and Ningo-  
38 Prampram District of Greater Accra Region, Ghana.

39 **Methods:** We developed a 17-item epilepsy screening instrument by modifying validated English language  
40 questionnaires. We included questions that could identify convulsive and non-convulsive seizures.  
41 Language experts translated and back-translated the survey instrument into the two languages in this region:  
42 Asante Twi and Dangme. Cases were people with epilepsy attending healthcare facilities where these  
43 languages are used. Controls were unaffected relatives of cases or people attending the healthcare centres  
44 for other medical conditions. We matched cases and controls for geographical location and ethnicity. An  
45 affirmative response to one of the seventeen questions was deemed as a positive screen.

46 **Results:** One hundred and Forty Dangme Twi speakers (70 cases and 70 controls) and 100 Twi speakers  
47 (50 cases and 50 controls) were recruited. The sensitivity and specificity for Dangme were: Stage 1; 100%  
48 (95% CI: 88.6, 94.9) and 80% (95% CI: 68.7, 88.6) and Stage 2, 98.6% (95% CI: 92.3, 100.0) and 85.7%  
49 (95% CI: 75.3, 92.9). The Dangme version reliably identified epilepsy with positive predictive values of  
50 83.3% (95% CI: 73.6, 90.6) and 87.3% (95% CI: 78.6, 90.6) at stages 1 and 2. The questionnaire excluded  
51 epilepsy with negative predictive values of 100% (95% CI: 93.6, 100.0) and 98.4% (95% CI: 91.2, 100.0).  
52 For the Twi version, the sensitivity and specificity were: 98% (95% CI: 89.4, 99.9) and 92% (95% CI: 80.8,  
53 97.8) at Stage 1, and for Stage 2, 96% (95% CI: 86.3, 99.5) and 94% (95% CI 83.5, 98.7). The Twi  
54 questionnaire reliably specified epilepsy with positive predictive values of 92.5% (95% CI: 81.8%, 97.9)  
55 and 94.1% (95% CI: 83.8, 98.8) at stages 1 and 2. It excluded epilepsy with negative predictive values of  
56 97.9% (95% CI: 88.7, 99.9) and 95.9% (95% CI: 86.0, 99.5) for the two-stages

57 **Conclusions:** Our questionnaire is valid for the two tested languages and is usable for community-based  
58 epilepsy surveys in Ghana. The questionnaire can be adapted for other resource-poor settings, although  
59 there will need to be translation and iterative in-country testing to ensure its validity is maintained.

60 **Keywords:** Sensitivity, Specificity, Predictive values, Likelihood ratios, questionnaire, Ghana

61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80

81 **1. Introduction**

82 Epilepsy is one of the most prevalent neurological diseases, affecting over 50 million people of all ages  
83 globally [1, 2]. Estimates suggest that about 80% of people with epilepsy live in a resource-poor setting  
84 with a treatment gap of about 80% [3]. The burden of the disease is disproportionately weighted towards  
85 Africa, where more than 10 million people live with epilepsy[4, 5]. In Ghana, the exact prevalence of  
86 epilepsy is unknown, but a previous estimation in a rural area suggested it to be 10 per 1000 or 1% of the  
87 population [6]. There are no data on burden in urban and peri-urban areas in Ghana.

88 Africa suffers from a chronic shortage of human resources for health more than any other region [7], with  
89 about 0.043 neurologists per 100,000 inhabitants [8]. This lack of personnel has led to task shifting, where  
90 skilled staff support and supervise less experienced healthcare workers to provide care at the primary  
91 healthcare level [9]. Screening questionnaires are needed to identify people with epilepsy in primary  
92 healthcare facilities.

93 Several epidemiologic surveys of epilepsy have been performed in Low and Middle-income Countries  
94 (LMICs) to estimate the prevalence [10]. These surveys often adopt a two-stage study design consisting of  
95 a screening phase during which trained field staff interview the population under investigation through a  
96 face-to-face meeting with participants. In the subsequent second phase, specialists clinically evaluate  
97 positive subjects to confirm true positives [11, 12]. The choice of screening questions is essential, and to  
98 validate an instrument is mandatory to establish a screening test's potential accuracy or inaccuracy.  
99 Questions targeting symptoms are vital to maximizing sensitivity (i.e., the proportion of actual cases in the  
100 population that test or screen positive), especially in a resource-poor setting with limited access to  
101 healthcare. This is important as systematically acquiring clinical information significantly increases the  
102 performance of the questionnaire, especially when electroencephalography is unavailable [12].

103 In epilepsy care and management, antiseizure medication and further interventions depend on the type of  
104 seizure, epilepsy syndrome, comorbidity, and other considerations [13]. Solving the problem of epilepsy in

105 resource-poor settings starts with the identification of people with the disease. To this end, developing  
106 reliable and accessible screening tools has gained attention [14]. Primary or non-specialist healthcare  
107 workers may use an effective screening tool to identify individuals requiring intervention. These screening  
108 questionnaires should be in the respondents' native language and culturally appropriate.

109 Translating an instrument to the target language must follow pre-determined guidelines [15]. Establishing  
110 a tool's sensitivity, specificity, and predictive value is essential and emphasizes the need for earlier  
111 validation [16]. Healthcare providers at the primary and secondary levels of care face many challenges  
112 without clinical algorithms or pragmatic rapid diagnostic tests [17]. There may be the need to enforce the  
113 widespread use of epilepsy screening questionnaires in primary and secondary healthcare settings to obtain  
114 critical information for clinical management and care as a witness. Information from relatives may be  
115 inaccurate [18].

116 We developed an epilepsy screening tool for household surveys. We sought to determine if the tool would  
117 improve the identification of all forms of epilepsy in selected health facilities in the Greater Accra Region  
118 of Ghana.

119

120

121

122

123

124

125

## 126 2. METHODS

127

### 128 2.1 Study Population

129 Our population included children and adults consecutively enrolled from the Shai-Osudoku District  
130 Hospital, Prampram Polyclinic, Ningo Health Centre, and the Korle-Bu Teaching Hospital. The cases were  
131 people coming for epilepsy treatment with a neurologist or with a physician-confirmed epilepsy diagnosis.  
132 Active epilepsy was operationally defined as “two or more unprovoked epileptic seizures separated by at  
133 least 24 hours within the last year” [19]. Controls were people attending the same hospitals for other  
134 purposes or healthy relatives who had never had a seizure. A neurologist assessed controls to ensure they  
135 had no history of seizures. Respondents with an affirmative response to screening questions were deemed  
136 screen-positive except if they had febrile convulsions. Cases and controls were matched for geographical  
137 location and ethnicity. We excluded those who were severely ill and on admission.

### 138 2.2 Study design

139 A cross-sectional study was conducted in the Greater Accra region between August and October 2022 at  
140 the outpatient department of selected facilities in the Shai-Osudoku and Ningo-Prampram districts and the  
141 Korle-Bu Teaching Hospital. The study is part of the Epilepsy Pathway Innovation in Africa (EPInA)  
142 project. (<https://epina.web.ox.ac.uk/home>).

### 143 2.3 Epilepsy screening tool development

144 We conducted a review of evidence on screening tools (questionnaires) previously used in LMICs [16, 20-  
145 22] to develop our instrument. A local neurologist reviewed the initial version to arrive at the final draft.  
146 We then translated and back-translated the tool into the two targeted languages Twi and Dangme. We  
147 included questions on convulsive and non-convulsive seizures to cover as many seizure types as possible.  
148 We divided the questionnaire into two parts. The first part is administered to either the household head or  
149 an adult member with a good knowledge of household members, and stage 2 is administered to people

150 positive in stage 1 (Table 1). For this validation, the seventeen questions were administered to the cases and  
151 controls to gauge the sensitivity and specificity of the screening questions.

152

### 153 **2.3 Translation of the screening questionnaire to the local language**

154 Bilingual experts from the Bureau of Ghanaian Languages were consulted to translate the questionnaire  
155 into two widely spoken languages in the study setting (Greater Accra region of Ghana): Twi and Dangme,  
156 which was back-translated by individuals fluent in the languages who were not involved in the initial  
157 translation, following the published guidance on the translation of questionnaires to ensure the meaning  
158 remained the same [23]. Jevetic Educational Services did the back translations. Two content experts, a local  
159 physician and a neurologist, reviewed the translated versions of the questionnaire to resolve any  
160 discrepancies before arriving at the final draft. The questionnaires were also extensively discussed at  
161 stakeholder meetings and during training of the research assistants for comprehension, socio-cultural  
162 acceptability and adaptability before they were agreed on for the final version.

### 163 **2.4 Sensitivity and Specificity of the Screening Questionnaire**

164 We measured the sensitivity and specificity of the questionnaire by administering the questionnaire to  
165 people with confirmed epilepsy and comparing the answers to those without epilepsy. The gold standard  
166 for a case was diagnosis by a physician/neurologist with epilepsy expertise. Four trained field workers read  
167 the questionnaires verbatim to the participants and recorded the responses. They were, however, not blinded  
168 to the diagnosis.

### 169 **2.5 . Sample Size Determination**

170 The sample size was estimated using the formula for testing sensitivity (or specificity) of a single diagnostic  
171 test [24] (See supplement 3), which suggested that the questionnaire should be administered to at least 44  
172 people in each language group to have 80% power with 95% confidence to measure the sensitivity and  
173 specificity.

174                    **2.6 Study variables**

175    The questionnaires collected demographic data on age, sex, education, religion, ethnicity, marital status,  
176    and the screening questions. The screening questions used at the two stages of the study are shown in Table  
177    1.

178



179 **Table 1: Questionnaire used for screening**

180

**Stage 1 ( Administered to the head of household or his/her representative)**

---

- Q1 Do you or any member of your household have fits or has someone ever told you that you/they have fits?
- Q2 Do you/this member of the household experience episodes in which your/their legs or arms have jerking movements or fall to the ground and lose consciousness?
- Q3 Have you/this household member experienced an unexplained change in your mental state or level of awareness; or an episode of “spacing out” that you/they could not control?
- Q4<sup>a</sup> Do you/any member of the household have experiences such as hallucinations or strange feelings e.g., epigastric rising and smells that are non-existent, and sudden emotional changes, such as unexplained fear, anxiety, or even *déjà vu*?
- Q5<sup>a</sup> Have you/any household member ever experienced a blank stare, unfamiliarity with surrounding and fumbling and chewing movements, and has/has no recollection of anything that happened at that time?
- Q6<sup>a</sup> Have you/any member of the household ever had reports of being unresponsive, or had an abrupt blank stare or interruption of ongoing activities for few seconds, sometimes with upward eye deviation/rolling
- Q7 Do you/any member of the household abruptly fall on your or their head/face/buttocks/back, sometimes sustaining injuries, and waking up soon after that?

**Stage 2 (To be administered to only those who are screened as positive from Stage 1)**

---

- Q1<sup>b</sup> Did anyone ever tell you that you/this member of the household had a seizure or convulsion caused by a high fever when you were a child?
- Q2 Have you/this member of the household ever been told by a doctor that you have epilepsy or epileptic fits?
- Q3 Have you/this member of the household ever been told by someone else that you have epilepsy or epileptic fits?
- Q5 Have you/this household member ever fallen to the ground without a reason and experienced twitching?
- Q6 Have you/this household member ever fallen to the ground without a reason and wet yourself?
- Q7 Have you/this household member ever fallen to the ground without a reason and bitten your tongue?
- Q8<sup>a</sup> Did anyone ever tell you/this household member that when you/they were a small child, you/they would daydream or stare into space more than other children?
- Q9 Have you/this household member ever noticed any unusual body movements or feelings when exposed to strobe lights, flickering lights, or sun glare?
- Q10 Shortly after waking up, either in the morning or after a nap, have you/this household member ever noticed uncontrollable jerking or clumsiness, such as dropping things or suddenly “flying” from your hands?
- Q11 Have you/this household member ever had any other type of repeated unusual spells?
- 

- 181 a. Non-convulsive epilepsy screening questions
- 182 b. Childhood febrile convulsion question, excluded from the overall classification of cases as
- 183 positive

184

185

## 186            **2.7 Data Management and Statistical Analysis**

187    The data collected on paper questionnaires was entered into Microsoft Excel (version 365) for validation,  
188    quality checks and cleaning, after which it was imported into Stata statistical analysis software (version  
189    16)[25] for analysis. Frequencies and percentages were used to describe the demographic data. The Stata  
190    module, ‘diag’ was used to report summary statistics for the diagnostic tests comparing the results from  
191    the questionnaire to true disease status.

## 192            **2.8 Classification of cases and controls from screening**

193    For these classifications, if a respondent answered “Yes” to any of the questions used at stages 1 and 2 of  
194    the screening (see Table 1), they were classified as positive for that stage, except for Question 1 from Stage  
195    2, which is a question on febrile seizures/convulsions and was not included in such classifications.

## 196            **2.9 Validation of the screening questionnaire**

197    Sensitivity was defined as the proportion of people with the condition correctly identified, and specificity  
198    as the proportion of healthy individuals correctly identified. The ROC (Receiver Operating Characteristic  
199    curve) defined the area under the curve (for a simple test) the average of sensitivity and specificity. The  
200    positive and negative predictive values (PPV & NPV) show the individual’s probability of having the  
201    disease following a positive or a negative test. If no prevalence figure is given, the sample is assumed to be  
202    a cohort, and PPV & NPV are the proportions of test positives and test negatives identified. Otherwise, they  
203    are estimated using the likelihood ratios, assuming the prevalence is correct.

204    The likelihood ratio of a positive test (LR+) is the ratio of the probability (likelihood) of a positive test  
205    result in an affected and in an unaffected individual = Sensitivity/ (1- specificity). Multiplying the prior  
206    odds of disease by LR+ gives the odds of disease following a positive test. The likelihood ratio of a negative  
207    test (LR-) works similarly. The positive LR is the probability of a positive outcome having a positive  
208    screening divided by the likelihood of a negative outcome having a positive screening. The negative LR is  
209    the probability of a positive outcome with a negative screening divided by the possibility of a negative  
210    outcome having a negative screening. We assessed sensitivity and false-positive rates for the instrument by

211 administering it to individuals with medical record–documented epilepsy or isolated unprovoked seizure  
212 and individuals who were seizure-free on medical record review from selected health facilities in two  
213 districts in the Shai-Osudoku and Ningo-Prampram districts of the Greater Accra Region of Ghana.

## 214 **2.9A Ethical Considerations**

215 Ethical approval for this study was obtained from the Institutional Review Board of the Dodowa Health  
216 Research Centre and the Ghana Health Service Ethics Review Committee, with the following approval  
217 numbers: DHRCIRB/95/08/20 and GHS-ERC 022/08/20, respectively. Informed consent was obtained  
218 from all study participants. For participants under the age of 18, permission was obtained from one parent  
219 or guardian, along with assent from the participant, before their involvement in the study. Participants aged  
220 18 and over provided written informed consent.

221 During the consenting process, the privacy of the respondents was ensured by conducting study activities  
222 in a secluded area with minimal exposure to other individuals. The objectives, justification, and  
223 methodologies of the study, as well as the potential risks and benefits, were thoroughly explained to all  
224 participants, who were allowed to ask questions. Participation in the study was entirely voluntary. Although  
225 immediate or direct benefits were not provided to participants, it was emphasized that their contributions  
226 would aid in advancing our understanding of epilepsy and assist in the development of a standardized  
227 screening tool for identifying individuals with epilepsy.

228 Participants were informed of their right to withdraw from the study at any time without facing any  
229 repercussions. Responses to screening questions were solicited in a yes or no format. Subsequently,  
230 interviews were recorded in Microsoft Excel and transferred to Stata for analysis. All hard and soft data  
231 were securely stored in locked file cabinets, with access restricted to the study team.

232

233 Study participants provided written informed consent.

234

## 235 3.0 RESULTS

### 236 Background characteristics of respondents

237 One hundred and forty participants (70 cases and 70 controls) were recruited for the Dangme questionnaire  
238 (Table 2). Among the controls, 40% were young adolescents (age range of 10-19 years); 40% were females,  
239 and 34.3% had no formal education (Table 2). Among the cases for the Dangme version, 34.3% were aged  
240 30-39 years; 72.9% were females, and 41.4% had completed Junior High School (JHS)/middle level of  
241 formal education (Table 2). The Asante Twi version recruited 100 people (50 cases and 50 controls). Among  
242 the 50 controls, 36% were young adults between the age range of 20-29 years, 20% were females, and 26%  
243 had completed JHS/Middle school. Among the cases for the Twi version, 24% were between the ages of  
244 30 and 39 years, 60% were females, and 22% had completed some tertiary level of education.

245

246

247

248

249

250

251

252

253

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

261

262

263

264

265

267 **Table 2: Background characteristics of respondents**

268

	Dangme				Twi			
	Cases [N=70]		Controls [N=70]		Cases [N=50]		Controls [N=50]	
	N	% (95% CI)	N	% (95% CI)	N	% (95% CI)	N	% (95% CI)
Age (years)								
<10	0	-	6	8.6 (3.8, 18.0)	0	-	2	4.0 (1.0, 15.1)
10-19	2	2.9 (0.7, 11.0)	28	40.0 (29.1, 52.0)	1	2.0 (0.3, 13.4)	13	26.0 (15.5, 40.2)
20-29	7	10.0 (4.8, 19.7)	13	18.6 (11.0, 29.6)	7	14.0 (6.7, 27.0)	18	36.0 (23.7, 50.4)
30-39	24	34.3 (24.0, 46.3)	15	21.4 (13.2, 32.8)	12	24.0 (14.0, 38.1)	9	18.0 (9.5, 31.5)
40-49	23	32.9 (22.8, 44.8)	5	7.1 (3.0, 16.3)	7	14.0 (6.7, 27.0)	4	8.0 (3.0, 19.9)
50-59	6	8.6 (3.8, 18.0)	2	2.9 (0.7, 11.0)	12	24.0 (14.0, 38.1)	1	2.0 (0.3, 13.4)
60+	8	11.4 (5.7, 21.4)	1	1.4 (0.2, 9.8)	11	22.0 (12.4, 35.9)	3	6.0 (1.9, 17.4)
Sex								
Female	51	72.9 (61.1, 82.1)	28	40.0 (29.1, 52.0)	30	60.0 (45.6, 72.8)	10	20.0 (10.9, 33.7)
Male	19	27.1 (17.9, 38.9)	42	60.0 (48.0, 70.9)	20	40.0 (27.2, 54.4)	40	80.0 (66.3, 89.1)
Education								
None	13	18.6 (11.0, 29.6)	24	34.3 (24.0, 46.3)	2	4.0 (1.0, 15.1)	4	8.0 (3.0, 19.9)
Primary	13	18.6 (11.0, 29.6)	21	30.0 (20.3, 41.9)	4	8.0 (3.0, 19.9)	10	20.0 (10.9, 33.7)
JHS/Middle School	29	41.4 (30.4, 53.4)	20	28.6 (19.1, 40.4)	17	34.0 (22.0, 48.4)	13	26.0 (15.5, 40.2)
SHS/O&A Level	12	17.1 (9.9, 28.0)	4	5.7 (2.1, 14.5)	5	10.0 (4.1, 22.3)	14	28.0 (17.1, 42.3)
Tertiary	3	4.3 (1.4, 12.7)	1	1.4 (0.2, 9.8)	22	44.0 (30.7, 58.2)	9	18.0 (9.5, 31.5)
Religion								
Christian	66	94.3 (85.5, 97.9)	67	95.7 (87.3, 98.6)	47	94.0 (82.6, 98.1)	47	94.0 (82.6, 98.1)
Other	4	5.7 (2.1, 14.5)	3	4.3 (1.4, 12.7)	3	6.0 (1.9, 17.4)	3	6.0 (1.9, 17.4)
Ethnicity								
Akan	5	7.1 (3.0, 16.3)	5	7.1 (3.0, 16.3)	22	44.0 (30.7, 58.2)	21	42.0 (28.9, 56.3)
Ewe	2	2.9 (0.7, 11.0)	2	2.9 (0.7, 11.0)	9	18.0 (9.5, 31.5)	8	16.0 (8.1, 29.3)
Ga-Dangbe	58	82.9 (72.0, 90.1)	60	85.7 (75.2, 92.2)	17	34.0 (22.0, 48.4)	18	36.0 (23.7, 50.4)
Other	5	7.1 (3.0, 16.3)	3	4.3 (1.4, 12.7)	2	4.0 (1.0, 15.1)	3	6.0 (1.9, 17.4)
Marital status								
Single/Underage	14	20.0 (12.1, 31.2)	59	84.3 (73.6, 91.2)	10	20.0 (10.9, 33.7)	40	80.0 (66.3, 89.1)
Married	47	67.1 (55.2, 77.2)	7	10.0 (4.8, 19.7)	30	60.0 (45.6, 72.8)	8	16.0 (8.1, 29.3)
Divorced/Separated/ Widowed	9	12.9 (6.7, 23.1)	4	5.7 (2.1, 14.5)	10	20.0 (10.9, 33.7)	2	4.0 (1.0, 15.1)

270

271 Table 3 provides the classification of cases and controls from screening. Seventy (100%) with confirmed  
 272 epilepsy screened positive on all items at stage I, and only one confirmed epilepsy case screened negative  
 273 on all item questions at stage II. In comparison, 14 (20%) and 10 (14.28%) controls screened positive at  
 274 stage I and II in the Dangme questionnaire. One (2%) with confirmed epilepsy screened negative on all  
 275 items at stage I, and 2 (4%) with confirmed epilepsy screened negative on all item questions at stage 2. In  
 276 comparison, among the controls, 4 (8%) and 3 (6%) screened positive on all item questions at stage 1 and  
 277 II in the Asante Twi questionnaire.

278 **Table 3: Classification of cases and controls from screening**

	Dangme (questionnaire)			Twi (questionnaire)		
	+ve	-ve	Total	+ve	-ve	Total
Stage 1						
True +ve	70	0	70	49	1	50
True -ve	14	56	70	4	46	50
Total	84	56	140	53	47	100
Stage 2						
True +ve	69	1	70	48	2	50
True -ve	10	60	70	3	47	50
Total	79	61	140	51	49	100

279 Sensitivities, specificities, PPVs and NPVs of the overall questionnaire are shown in Table 4. The overall  
 280 predictive ability of both questionnaires was good. The overall performance was 100% sensitivity and  
 281 specificity 80%, for the Dangme questionnaire at stage I and 98.6% and 85.7% at stage II. The overall PPV  
 282 and NPV at stage I was 83.3% and 100% and 87.3% and 98.4% at stage II. The Twi version's overall  
 283 sensitivity was 98%, and specificity was 92% at stage I. At stage II the sensitivity was 96% and specificity  
 284 was 94%. The PPV and NPV were above 90%, and the same for stage II of the questionnaire.

285

286

287

288  
289  
290

**Table 4: Validation of the overall classifications from the questionnaire compared to true disease status**

	Dangme			Twi		
	Test value	95% CI		Test value	95% CI	
		Lower	Upper		Lower	Upper
<b>Stage 1</b>						
Prevalence (%)	50.0	41.0	58.6	50.0	40.0	60.2
Sensitivity (%)	100.0	88.6	94.9	98.0	89.4	99.9
Specificity (%)	80.0	68.7	88.6	92.0	80.8	97.8
Positive predictive value (%)	83.3	73.6	90.6	92.5	81.8	97.9
Negative predictive value (%)	100.0	93.6	100.0	97.9	88.7	99.9
ROC area	0.90	0.85	0.95	0.95	0.91	0.99
Likelihood ratio (+)	5.00	3.13	7.99	12.30	4.78	31.40
Likelihood ratio (-)	0.00	-	-	0.02	0.00	0.15
<b>Stage 2</b>						
Prevalence (%)	50.0	41.0	58.6	50.0	40.0	60.2
Sensitivity (%)	98.6	92.3	100.0	96.0	86.3	99.5
Specificity (%)	85.7	75.3	92.9	94.0	83.5	98.7
Positive predictive value (%)	87.3	78.0	93.8	94.1	83.8	98.8
Negative predictive value (%)	98.4	91.2	100.0	95.9	86.0	99.5
ROC area	0.92	0.88	0.97	0.95	0.91	0.99
Likelihood ratio (+)	6.90	3.88	12.30	16.00	5.33	48.00
Likelihood ratio (-)	0.02	0.00	0.12	0.04	0.01	0.17

291 Individual questions' sensitivity, specificity, PPVs, and NPVs are shown in Table 5. For the Dangme  
292 version at stage I, the questions Q1-Q7 had a good sensitivity, while Q1, Q2, Q5, and Q7 had the best  
293 sensitivity overall. The sensitivity ranged between 91.5% and 97.1%. The specificity was between 91.4%  
294 and 95.7% for all individual questions. With the questions at stage II, the sensitivity was lower with some  
295 individual questions compared to the stage I individual questions with most questions having a sensitivity  
296 of 60% and below, apart from Q2, Q3, and Q5 with 94.3%, 85.7%, and 94.3%. For the Twi version, all the  
297 questions had good sensitivity except Q5, which was 38% at stage I. The specificity was between 96% and  
298 100% for all individual questions. With the questions at stage II, the sensitivity was lower in the Twi  
299 version, with most questions having a sensitivity of 54% and below, apart from questions Q2 and Q5 with  
300 84% and 82%. The specificity was between 96% and 100%.

301

302 **Table 5: Validation of the individual screening questions compared to true disease status**

Question	Dangme, %				Twi, %			
	Se	Sp	PPV	NPV	Se	Sp	PPV	NPV
Stage 1								
Q1	97.1	95.7	95.8	97.1	82.0	100.0	100.0	84.7
Q2	94.3	91.4	91.7	94.1	82.0	100.0	100.0	84.7
Q3	84.3	95.7	95.2	85.9	76.0	96.0	95.0	80.0
Q4 <sup>a</sup>	81.4	91.4	90.5	83.1	64.0	100.0	100.0	73.5
Q5 <sup>a</sup>	91.4	91.4	91.4	91.4	38.0	100.0	100.0	61.7
Q6 <sup>a</sup>	87.1	91.4	91.0	87.7	68.0	96.0	94.4	75.0
Q7	92.9	94.3	94.2	93.0	68.0	100.0	100.0	75.8
Stage 2								
Q1 <sup>b</sup>	47.1	87.1	78.6	62.2	32.0	100.0	100.0	59.5
Q2	94.3	97.1	97.1	94.4	84.0	100.0	100.0	86.2
Q3	85.7	94.3	93.8	86.8	66.0	100.0	100.0	74.6
Q5	94.3	100.0	100.0	94.6	82.0	96.0	95.3	84.2
Q6	61.4	100.0	100.0	72.2	54.0	100.0	100.0	68.5
Q7	58.6	100.0	100.0	70.7	60.0	100.0	100.0	71.4
Q8	60.0	97.1	95.5	70.8	18.0	100.0	100.0	54.9
Q9	35.7	98.6	96.2	60.5	26.0	100.0	100.0	57.5
Q10	41.4	97.1	93.5	62.4	40.0	100.0	100.0	62.5
Q11	41.4	95.7	90.6	62.0	22.0	98.0	91.7	55.7

303 Se=Sensitivity, Sp=Specificity, PPV= Positive predictive value, NPV= Negative predictive value

304 a. Non-convulsive epilepsy screening questions

305 b. Childhood febrile convulsion question, excluded from overall classification of cases as positive

306

307

308

309

310

311

312

313

314



315 **4.0 DISCUSSION**

316 We translated and validated an epilepsy screening questionnaire into two Ghanaian languages, which  
317 showed good sensitivity, specificity, PPV, and NPV. We explored the differences in individuals'  
318 sensitivities and specificities and the overall component items of the questionnaire. The likelihood ratios  
319 indicated a good but varied probability of predicting epilepsy. These screening tools are simple and can be  
320 easily used by health workers at the community level, suggesting a robust epilepsy screening tool for Ghana  
321 in these languages. There was limited difference in the specificity of individual and overall item questions,  
322 but we noted significant differences in the sensitivity across some individual questions (Tables 4 and 5).  
323 Specificity measures were also consistent between questions and languages. This means that a positive  
324 screen was consistent with a diagnosis of epilepsy”.

325 We conducted a hospital-based validation of confirmed epilepsy cases compared to controls. It is known  
326 that the diagnostic accuracy of such a study design is usually inflated. Cases with more severe forms of the  
327 condition and greater awareness of their state of health have a higher chance of being included. These  
328 people will likely screen positive with this instrument, possibly leading to overestimating the sensitivity  
329 [26]. Consequently, there is a risk of obtaining inaccurate estimates of the disease prevalence when applying  
330 a hospital-based validated questionnaire to the general population. The advantage of validation, however,  
331 is that the prevalence can be adjusted to the sensitivity and specificity of the screening test [27].

332 We also noticed some variations in the accuracy measures between the two languages. This might be due  
333 to differences in population characteristics, methods of administration of the questionnaires between the  
334 various facilities, linguistic features, and translation dynamics [22, 28]. The differences could be attributed  
335 to variations in the general literacy and epilepsy awareness and stigma between the two populations. Health  
336 facility-based validation studies are not usually as influenced by stigma-related concealment as community-  
337 or population-based studies [29]. The differences in sensitivity of some of the individual item questions  
338 may also relate to the frequency of the phenomena (e.g., incontinence, absence seizures, jerking movements

339 or falling to the ground). Absence seizures or non-convulsive seizures may often be overlooked by people  
340 living with the condition. Low sensitivity of non-convulsive seizure detection has been previously reported  
341 [30].

342 Currently, no comparable studies are available in Ghana using similar screening questionnaires. A study in  
343 Nigeria using a nine-item questionnaire reported similar sensitivity and specificity with a slightly lower  
344 PPV [22]. A study in Ecuador had a low PPV of 18.3% [20]. The Rochester Epidemiology project also had  
345 a PPV of 23% [21]. Our study had a relatively higher PPV, indicating more people with epilepsy were  
346 likely to screen positive.

347 An advantage of this screening tool is that it includes questions that address multiple seizure types, unlike  
348 other available screening tools that address only convulsive epilepsy. A further benefit of our study is the  
349 estimation of likelihood ratios for the two languages. This is crucial because sensitivity and specificity alone  
350 may not provide enough information on the probability of diagnosing epilepsy. Likelihood ratios are more  
351 appropriate for comparing individual questions [31].

352 We found no difficulties in training a local person to administer the screening questionnaires in the two  
353 local languages or any challenges with comprehension of the questions. This was mainly because the data  
354 collectors were natives who understood the test languages and administered them to respondents who spoke  
355 and understood the same.

356

357

358

359

360 **5.0 Limitations**

361 This study was conducted within healthcare facilities. This could result in selection bias as questions were  
362 administered to people with confirmed epilepsy who could differ from the general population. This  
363 selection bias limits the overall generalizability of the results. Our approach could lead to an  
364 underestimation of epilepsy at the community level, as less overt cases may be missed. The lack of  
365 awareness of epilepsy may result in people failing to seek treatment; these people may not have been  
366 captured in our study. Our eventual goal is to validate the tool for use in the general population. Here,  
367 information was collected at the facility level and from the cases about their medical histories rather than  
368 their relatives. Some individuals might be unaware of specific symptoms, which could explain why some  
369 cases screened negative. The use of proxies or caregiver questions was an option we considered for stage I  
370 of our screening tool. We did not explore this further as some cases did not involve caregivers, and we  
371 wanted to ensure consistency across data capture. Future research on the use of proxies or relatives to  
372 respond to on behalf of cases would be helpful to see if this can improve reliability, particularly for people  
373 with non-convulsive seizures.

374 **6.0 Conclusion**

375 We have validated a screening tool for epilepsy that trained community health workers can use in  
376 communities to screen for epilepsy in Ghana. Our tool could be adapted to other sub-Saharan African  
377 countries following appropriate validation.

378

379

380

381

382

383

384

385

386 **Author Contributions**

387 EKD, JWS, CN and PA conceived and designed the study. EKD and AG analyzed the data. EKD drafted  
388 the manuscript with input from PA, AA, CS, EA, SA, JHC, CN, AS, JWS, ADA, and JEW. All authors  
389 approved the final draft.

390 **Funding**

391 This research was commissioned by the National Institute for Health Research (grant number NIHR200134)  
392 using Official Development Assistance (ODA) funding. The views expressed in this publication are those  
393 of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NHS, the National Institute for Health Research or the  
394 Department of Health and Social Care.

395 **Declaration of Competing Interest**

396 The authors have no competing interest concerning this work.

397  
398 We confirm that we have read the position of the Journal regarding ethical publication and declare that this  
399 manuscript is consistent with those guidelines.

400

401 **Acknowledgments**

402 This validation was conducted before the larger Epilepsy Pathway Innovation in Africa (EPInA) household  
403 survey. EPInA receives funding from NIHR for this research work. This work was carried out at selected  
404 health facilities in Ningo-Prampram, Shai-Osudoku District and Korle-Bu Teaching Hospital. We want to  
405 thank the heads of the various facilities and staff for helping with the research work. We acknowledge those  
406 who contributed to the translation processes of the questionnaires: the Bureau of Ghana Languages for the  
407 forward translations and the Jevetic Education Services for the back translations. We are also grateful to  
408 the research assistants Daisy Ampadu, Irene Siaw, Andrews Tettey and Edmund Owusu for their assistance  
409 with data collection. We also thank the study participants whose generous contributions and time made this  
410 research possible. EKD is a Ph.D. student working on the EPInA project. JHS holds an endowed chair at  
411 UCL Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health; all her research is supported by the National Institute

412 for Health Research Biomedical Research Centre at Great Ormond Street Hospital (NIHR GOSH BRC).  
413 JWS is based at the NIHR University College London Hospitals Biomedical Research Centre, which the  
414 UK Department of Health sponsors. The UK Epilepsy Society endows his current position, and he receives  
415 research support from the Marvin Weil Epilepsy Research Fund and the Christelijke Vereniging voor  
416 deVerpleging van Lijders aan Epilepsie, Netherland. PA is a neurologist and consultant at the Korle-Bu  
417 Teaching Hospital and the University of Ghana Medical School. He is the lead researcher on the EPInA  
418 project in Ghana. CN is the overall principal investigator for the EPInA project.

419

420

421

422

423

424

425

426

427

428

429

430

431

432

433

434

435

436

437

438

439 REFERENCES

- 440 1. Fiest, K.M., et al., *Prevalence and incidence of epilepsy: a systematic review and meta-analysis of*  
441 *international studies*. Neurology, 2017. **88**(3): p. 296-303.
- 442 2. Mbuba, C.K., et al., *The epilepsy treatment gap in developing countries: a systematic review of*  
443 *the magnitude, causes, and intervention strategies*. Epilepsia, 2008. **49**(9): p. 1491-1503.
- 444 3. Meyer, A.C.L., et al., *Critical determinants of the epilepsy treatment gap: a cross-national*  
445 *analysis in resource-limited settings*. Epilepsia, 2012. **53**(12): p. 2178-2185.
- 446 4. Ba-Diop, A., et al., *Epidemiology, causes, and treatment of epilepsy in sub-Saharan Africa*. The  
447 Lancet Neurology, 2014. **13**(10): p. 1029-1044.
- 448 5. Prevett, M., *Epilepsy in sub-saharan Africa*. Practical neurology, 2013. **13**(1): p. 14-20.
- 449 6. Ae-Ngibise, K.A., et al., *Prevalence and risk factors for Active Convulsive Epilepsy in Kintampo,*  
450 *Ghana*. Pan Afr Med J, 2015. **21**: p. 29.
- 451 7. Afriyie, D.O., J. Nyoni, and A. Ahmat, *The state of strategic plans for the health workforce in*  
452 *Africa*. BMJ global health, 2019. **4**(Suppl 9): p. e001115.
- 453 8. Kissani, N., et al., *Why does Africa have the lowest number of Neurologists and how to cover the*  
454 *Gap?* Journal of the Neurological Sciences, 2022. **434**: p. 120119.
- 455 9. Willcox, M.L., et al., *Human resources for primary health care in sub-Saharan Africa: progress or*  
456 *stagnation?* Human resources for health, 2015. **13**: p. 1-11.
- 457 10. Espinosa-Jovel, C., et al., *Epidemiological profile of epilepsy in low income populations*. Seizure,  
458 2018. **56**: p. 67-72.
- 459 11. Giuliano, L., et al., *Usefulness of a smartphone application for the diagnosis of epilepsy:*  
460 *validation study in high-income and rural low-income countries*. Epilepsy & Behavior, 2021. **115**:  
461 p. 107680.
- 462 12. Reutens, D.C., et al., *Validation of a questionnaire for clinical seizure diagnosis*. Epilepsia, 1992.  
463 **33**(6): p. 1065-1071.
- 464 13. Stern, J.M., *Overview of treatment guidelines for epilepsy*. Current Treatment Options in  
465 Neurology, 2006. **8**(4): p. 280-288.
- 466 14. Wang, Z., Z. Luo, and S. Li, *Anxiety screening tools in people with epilepsy: a systematic review of*  
467 *validated tools*. Epilepsy & Behavior, 2019. **99**: p. 106392.
- 468 15. Cramer, J.A., et al., *Development and cross-cultural translations of a 31-item quality of life in*  
469 *epilepsy inventory*. Epilepsia, 1998. **39**(1): p. 81-88.

- 470 16. Keezer, M.R., H.K. Bouma, and C. Wolfson, *The diagnostic accuracy of screening questionnaires*  
471 *for the identification of adults with epilepsy: a systematic review*. *Epilepsia*, 2014. **55**(11): p.  
472 1772-1780.
- 473 17. Yaria, J.O. and A. Ogunniyi, *Calibration of the epilepsy questionnaire for use in a low-resource*  
474 *setting*. *Journal of Environmental and Public Health*, 2020. **2020**.
- 475 18. Mannan, J.B. and U.C. Wiesmann, *How accurate are witness descriptions of epileptic seizures?*  
476 *Seizure*, 2003. **12**(7): p. 444-447.
- 477 19. Fisher, R.S., et al., *ILAE official report: a practical clinical definition of epilepsy*. *Epilepsia*, 2014.  
478 **55**(4): p. 475-482.
- 479 20. Placencia, M., et al., *Validation of a screening questionnaire for the detection of epileptic*  
480 *seizures in epidemiological studies*. *Brain*, 1992. **115**(3): p. 783-794.
- 481 21. Ottman, R., et al., *Validation of a brief screening instrument for the ascertainment of epilepsy*.  
482 *Epilepsia*, 2010. **51**(2): p. 191-197.
- 483 22. Watila, M.M., et al., *Translation and validation of an epilepsy-screening questionnaire in three*  
484 *Nigerian languages*. *Epilepsy & Behavior*, 2021. **114**: p. 107604.
- 485 23. Nieuwenhuijsen, M., *Design of exposure questionnaires for epidemiological studies*.  
486 *Occupational and environmental medicine*, 2005. **62**(4): p. 272-280.
- 487 24. Hajian-Tilaki, K., *Sample size estimation in diagnostic test studies of biomedical informatics*.  
488 *Journal of biomedical informatics*, 2014. **48**: p. 193-204.
- 489 25. LLC, S., *STATA 16*. 2019, StataCorp LLC College Station, Texas.
- 490 26. Mulherin, S.A. and W.C. Miller, *Spectrum bias or spectrum effect? Subgroup variation in*  
491 *diagnostic test evaluation*. *Annals of internal medicine*, 2002. **137**(7): p. 598-602.
- 492 27. Ngugi, A.K., et al., *Prevalence of active convulsive epilepsy in sub-Saharan Africa and associated*  
493 *risk factors: cross-sectional and case-control studies*. *The Lancet Neurology*, 2013. **12**(3): p. 253-  
494 263.
- 495 28. Zavala-Rojas, D., *A procedure to prevent differences in translated survey items using SQP*. 2014.
- 496 29. Ngugi, A.K., et al., *The validation of a three-stage screening methodology for detecting active*  
497 *convulsive epilepsy in population-based studies in health and demographic surveillance systems*.  
498 *Emerging themes in epidemiology*, 2012. **9**: p. 1-8.
- 499 30. Placencia, M., et al., *A large-scale study of epilepsy in Ecuador: methodological aspects*.  
500 *Neuroepidemiology*, 1992. **11**(2): p. 74-84.

501 31. Macaskill, P., et al., *Assessing the gain in diagnostic performance when combining two*  
502 *diagnostic tests*. *Statistics in medicine*, 2002. **21**(17): p. 2527-2546.

503

504

505

506

507

508

509

510

511

512

513

514

515

516

517

518

519

520

521

522

523

524



525 **Supplement 1: Dangme version of screening questionnaire**

526 **Table 1: Questionnaire used for screening**

527

**Stage 1** ( Administered to the head of household or his/her representative)

---

- Q1 Do you or any member of your household have fits or has someone ever told you that you/they have fits?
- Q2 Do you/this member of the household experience episodes in which your/their legs or arms have jerking movements or fall to the ground and lose consciousness?
- Q3 Have you/this household member experienced an unexplained change in your mental state or level of awareness; or an episode of “spacing out” that you/they could not control?
- Q4<sup>a</sup> Do you/any member of the household have experiences such as hallucinations or strange feelings e.g., epigastric rising and smells that are non-existent, and sudden emotional changes, such as unexplained fear, anxiety, or even déjà vu?
- Q5<sup>a</sup> Have you/any household member ever experienced a blank stare, unfamiliarity with surrounding and fumbling and chewing movements, and has/has no recollection of anything that happened at that time?
- Q6<sup>a</sup> Have you/any member of the household ever had reports of being unresponsive, or had an abrupt blank stare or interruption of ongoing activities for few seconds, sometimes with upward eye deviation/rolling
- Q7 Do you/any member of the household abruptly fall on your or their head/face/buttocks/back, sometimes sustaining injuries, and waking up soon after that?

**Stage 2** (To be administered to only those who are screened as positive from Stage 1)

---

- Q1<sup>b</sup> Did anyone ever tell you that you/this member of the household had a seizure or convulsion caused by a high fever when you were a child?
- Q2 Have you/this member of the household ever been told by a doctor that you have epilepsy or epileptic fits?
- Q3 Have you/this member of the household ever been told by someone else that you have epilepsy or epileptic fits?
- Q5 Have you/this household member ever fallen to the ground without a reason and experienced twitching?
- Q6 Have you/this household member ever fallen to the ground without a reason and wet yourself?
- Q7 Have you/this household member ever fallen to the ground without a reason and bitten your tongue?
- Q8<sup>a</sup> Did anyone ever tell you/this household member that when you/they were a small child, you/they would daydream or stare into space more than other children?
- Q9 Have you/this household member ever noticed any unusual body movements or feelings when exposed to strobe lights, flickering lights, or sun glare?
- Q10 Shortly after waking up, either in the morning or after a nap, have you/this household member ever noticed uncontrollable jerking or clumsiness, such as dropping things or suddenly “flying” from your hands?
- Q11 Have you/this household member ever had any other type of repeated unusual spells?
- 

- 528 a. Non-convulsive epilepsy screening questions
- 529 b. Childhood febrile convulsion question, excluded from the overall classification of cases as
- 530 positive

531

532

533 **Supplement 3 : The formula for sample size Calculation**

534

535 
$$n = \frac{\left[ Z_{\alpha/2} \sqrt{P_0(1 - P_0)} + Z_{\beta} \sqrt{P_1(1 - P_1)} \right]^2}{(P_1 - P_0)^2}$$

536 Where  $P_0$  is the pre-determined value of sensitivity (or specificity) of the diagnostic questionnaire in  
537 English set at 98%,  $P_1$  is the expected sensitivity (or specificity) of each of the Asante Twi and Dangme  
538 translated questionnaires also set at 90%,  $Z_{\alpha/2} = 1.96$  and  $Z_{\beta} = 0.84$  are critical values from the standard  
539 normal distribution for a 95% confidence level and 80% power in estimating differences in diagnostic  
540 capabilities of the tools compared to the English one. Using the above figures, the minimum sample size  
541 required for each group (case or control) for the Asante Twi and Dangme languages was 44 persons.

542

543

544

545

546