Article:
Crocker, TF, Smith, JK and Skevington, SM (2015) Family and professionals underestimate quality of life across diverse cultures and health conditions: Systematic review. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, 68 (5). pp. 584-595. ISSN 1878-5921

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2014.12.007

Table A.1: Meta-analysis of mean difference between person and proxy

	Physical domain							Psychological domain							Social domain							Environment domain						
	Person		Proxy				Mean difference	Person		Proxy				Mean difference	Person		Proxy				Mean difference	Person		Proxy				Mean difference
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Weight	Dyads	[95% CI]	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Weight	Dyads	[95% CI]	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Weight	Dyads	[95% CI]	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Weight	Dyads	[95% CI]
Alshubaili 2007 [25]	57.1	17.2	55.7	14.3	10.4%	170	1.40 [-1.96, 4.76]	57.9	18.5	55.8	16.2	9.7%	170	2.10 [-1.60, 5.80]	60.8	19.2	58.3	19.2	9.8%	170	2.50 [-1.58, 6.58]	63.8	14.4	59.4	14.4	10.2%	170	4.40 [1.34, 7.46]
Awadalla 2005 Maj Affective [26]	57.5	21.7	52.3	20.3	8.1%	120	5.20 [-0.12, 10.52]	59.2	22.1	60.0	19.4	8.5%	120	-0.80 [-6.06, 4.46]	56.3	22.5	54.4	22.1	8.3%	120	1.90 [-3.74, 7.54]	52.2	18.1	55.8	16.4	8.8%	120	-3.60 [-7.97, 0.77]
Awadalla 2005 Neurosis [26]	52.5	19.2	51.4	18.6	7.5%	80	1.10 [-4.76, 6.96]	55.0	19.6	59.0	16.5	8.2%	80	-4.00 [-9.61, 1.61]	60.0	20.8	59.8	18.7	7.9%	80	0.20 [-5.93, 6.33]	51.3	18.4	54.6	18.3	7.5%	80	-3.30 [-8.99, 2.39]
Awadalla 2005 Schizophrenia [26]	47.5	21.3	44.0	19.5	7.7%	99	3.50 [-2.19, 9.19]	51.3	23.0	51.6	17.8	8.1%	99	-0.30 [-6.03, 5.43]	47.5	24.2	46.9	21.6	7.6%	99	0.60 [-5.79, 6.99]	46.3	19.1	49.7	17.5	8.1%	99	-3.40 [-8.50, 1.70]
Bahrami 2008 [28]	55.8	20.1	55.8	17.1	8.8%	117	0.00 [-4.78, 4.78]	66.1	16.4	62.7	14.7	9.5%	117	3.40 [-0.59, 7.39]	72.8	17.1	68.3	14.1	9.9%	117	4.50 [0.48, 8.52]	74.1	11.6	67.8	13.6	10.0%	117	6.30 [3.06, 9.54]
Chachamovich 2010 [30]	78.4	12.3	68.5	10.6	11.4%	162	9.90 [7.40, 12.40]	74.7	12.1	60.4	15.5	10.2%	162	14.30 [11.27, 17.33]	72.5	16.0	66.5	17.3	10.3%	162	6.00 [2.37, 9.63]	61.8	13.5	66.1	10.4	10.6%	162	-4.30 [-6.92, -1.68]
Herrman 2002 [31]	60.7	15.4	57.0	12.5	10.9%	168	3.70 [0.70, 6.70]	56.8	17.4	51.1	13.0	10.0%	168	5.70 [2.42, 8.98]	51.3	20.3	43.4	18.8	9.8%	168	7.90 [3.72, 12.08]	51.3	20.3	43.4	18.8	9.0%	168	7.90 [3.72, 12.08]
Kim 2010 Bipolar disorder [32]	60.3	16.8	55.8	15.7	7.0%	50	4.50 [-1.87, 10.87]	55.7	17.0	52.4	16.0	7.6%	50	3.30 [-3.17, 9.77]	55.3	15.1	50.1	15.8	7.9%	50	5.20 [-0.86, 11.26]	56.5	16.9	53.9	11.8	7.5%	50	2.60 [-3.11, 8.31]
Kim 2010 Schizophrenia [32]	53.3	17.0	52.0	15.3	8.5%	81	1.30 [-3.68, 6.28]	47.2	18.1	42.0	16.7	8.4%	81	5.20 [-0.16, 10.56]	45.8	17.3	41.9	16.5	8.8%	81	3.90 [-1.31, 9.11]	49.7	17.9	48.9	16.5	7.9%	81	0.80 [-4.50, 6.10]
Rabin 2009 [34]	62.5	20.1	59.3	16.3	7.5%	73	3.20 [-2.74, 9.14]	66.0	17.0	65.6	12.7	8.8%	73	0.40 [-4.47, 5.27]	73.2	17.3	71.5	15.6	8.6%	73	1.70 [-3.64, 7.04]	63.4	11.8	62.7	12.0	9.4%	73	0.70 [-3.16, 4.56]
Schmidt 2010 [35]	70.5	15.0	70.7	16.7	12.1%	601	-0.20 [-1.99, 1.59]	73.5	17.3	65.8	17.3	10.8%	599	7.70 [5.74, 9.66]	75.8	25.5	62.3	23.8	11.0%	602	13.50 [10.71, 16.29]	72.0	16.8	69.0	17.0	11.2%	610	3.00 [1.10, 4.90]
Total:						**1721**	**3.10 [0.59, 5.60]**						**1719**	**3.69 [0.59, 6.79]**						**1722**	**4.69 [1.82, 7.56]**						**1730**	**1.15 [-1.41, 3.72]**
Test for overall bias:							**Z = 2.43 (P = 0.02)**							**Z = 2.34 (P = 0.02)**							**Z = 3.20 (P = 0.001)**							**Z = 0.88 (P = 0.38)**
Heterogeneity:							**Tau² = 12.66; Chi² = 45.79, df = 10 (P < 0.00001); I² = 78%**							**Tau² = 22.10; Chi² = 66.57, df = 10 (P < 0.00001); I² = 85%**							**Tau² = 17.44; Chi² = 43.30, df = 10 (P < 0.00001); I² = 77%**							**Tau² = 14.39; Chi² = 53.91, df = 10 (P < 0.00001); I² = 81%**

Inverse-variance random effects model

Table A.2: Meta-analysis of correlation between person and proxy

	Physical domain			Psychological domain			Social domain			Environment domain		
	Weight	Fisher's Z [95% CI]	Pearson's r [95% CI]	Weight	Fisher's Z [95% CI]	Pearson's r [95% CI]	Weight	Fisher's Z [95% CI]	Pearson's r [95% CI]	Weight	Fisher's Z [95% CI]	Pearson's r [95% CI]
Bahrami 2008 [28]	24.3%	0.55 [0.37, 0.73]	0.5 [0.35, 0.62]	22.7%	0.27 [0.08, 0.45]	0.26 [0.08, 0.42]	20.8%	0.16 [-0.02, 0.35]	0.16 [-0.02, 0.34]	12.0%	0.30 [0.11, 0.48]	0.37 [0.2, 0.52]
Herrman 2002 [31]	25.6%	0.51 [0.36, 0.66]	0.47 [0.35, 0.58]	25.8%	0.34 [0.19, 0.50]	0.33 [0.19, 0.46]	25.3%	0.32 [0.17, 0.47]	0.31 [0.17, 0.44]	17.5%	0.36 [0.21, 0.52]	0.35 [0.21, 0.48]
Rabin 2009 [34]	22.1%	0.66 [0.42, 0.90]	0.58 [0.41, 0.72]	18.2%	0.65 [0.41, 0.88]	0.57 [0.39, 0.71]	15.3%	0.51 [0.27, 0.75]	0.47 [0.26, 0.64]	7.4%	0.47 [0.24, 0.71]	0.44 [0.24, 0.61]
Schmidt 2010 [35]	28.0%	0.21 [0.13, 0.29]	0.21 [0.13, 0.28]	33.3%	0.26 [0.17, 0.34]	0.25 [0.17, 0.33]	38.7%	0.26 [0.17, 0.34]	0.25 [0.17, 0.33]	63.2%	0.30 [0.22, 0.38]	0.29 [0.22, 0.36]
Total		0.47 [0.24, 0.70]	**0.44 [0.24, 0.60]**		0.35 [0.21, 0.49]	**0.34 [0.21, 0.45]**		0.29 [0.18, 0.40]	**0.28 [0.18, 0.38]**		0.32 [0.26, 0.39]	**0.32 [0.26, 0.38]**
Heterogeneity:	Tau² = 0.05; Chi² = 26.89, df = 3 (P < 0.00001); I² = 89%			Tau² = 0.01; Chi² = 10.05, df = 3 (P = 0.02); I² = 70%			Tau² = 0.01; Chi² = 6.44, df = 3 (P = 0.09); I² = 53%			Tau² = 0.00; Chi² = 2.24, df = 3 (P = 0.52); I² = 0%		
Test for overall correlation:	Z = 4.06 (P < 0.0001)			Z = 4.93 (P < 0.00001)			Z = 5.06 (P < 0.00001)			Z = 9.92 (P < 0.00001)		

Inverse-variance random effects model