



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *Family and professionals underestimate quality of life across diverse cultures and health conditions: Systematic review*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/83032/>

Version: Accepted Version

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>

© 2016. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Reuse

Unless indicated otherwise, fulltext items are protected by copyright with all rights reserved. The copyright exception in section 29 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 allows the making of a single copy solely for the purpose of non-commercial research or private study within the limits of fair dealing. The publisher or other rights-holder may allow further reproduction and re-use of this version - refer to the White Rose Research Online record for this item. Where records identify the publisher as the copyright holder, users can verify any specific terms of use on the publisher's website.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

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

| | Physical domain | | | | | | | Psychological domain | | | | | | | Social domain | | | | | | | Environment domain | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|------|-------|------|--------|-------|--|--------------------------|------|-------|------|--------|-------|-----------------------------|---------------|--------------------------|-------|------|--|-------|-----------------------------|--------------------|-------------|--------------------------|------|--------|-------|-----------------------------|------|----|--|---------------------------|------|----|------|----|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Person | | Proxy | | Weight | Dyads | Mean difference [95% CI] | Person | | Proxy | | Weight | Dyads | Mean difference [95% CI] | Person | | Proxy | | Weight | Dyads | Mean difference [95% CI] | Person | | Proxy | | Weight | Dyads | Mean difference [95% CI] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | | | | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | | | | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | | | | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | | | | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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