

Original Research Article

Translation and Validation of Gujarati Version of WOMAC and Lequesne Questionnaire in Subjects with Knee Osteoarthritis

Dr. Vaittianadane¹, Dr. Gopal Nambi², Dr. Priyanshu Rathod³

¹PhD Scholar, R.K. University & Principal; C. M. Patel College of Physiotherapy, Civil Hospital Campus, Sec.12, Gandhinagar, Gujarat.

²Professor, Prince Sattam Bin Abdul Aziz University, Saudi Arabia,

³Director, School of Physiotherapy, R. K. University, Rajkot, Gujarat.

Corresponding Author: Dr. Vaittianadane

ABSTRACT

Osteoarthritis (OA) of the knee is the most common joint disease in the elderly and is associated with significant physical disability for which there is no reliable and valid measure exists to determine functionality and activity of knee osteoarthritis in the Gujarati language. The WOMAC and LEQUESNE questionnaire are specifically designed for it but in English. The study aimed to translate the English version of WOMAC and LEQUESNE questionnaire into Gujarati language and validate a translated Gujarati version of it. The English version of WOMAC and LEQUESNE were translated into Gujarati language using the forward-translations and back-translation method according to WHO. After translation, the questionnaire was completed by 30 individuals (18 males and 12 females) aged 40-65 years (mean age: 51.53±9.80 years). The results on the reliability and validity of the Gujarati version of WOMAC and LEQUESNE were measured using Internal reliability index Cronbach's alpha, Intraclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC) and RASCH analysis. All the questions of WOMAC and LEQUESNE showed no statistically significant difference between the English version of WOMAC and LEQUESNE and the translated Gujarati version of WOMAC and LEQUESNE suggestive of valid tool for measuring the functionality and activity of knee OA in Gujarati population.

Key Words: Validity, Reliability, modified WOMAC, LEQUESNE questionnaire.

INTRODUCTION

Osteoarthritis of the knee is one of the most common type of arthritis and the major cause of chronic musculoskeletal pain and mobility disability in the elderly, resulting decreased functional activity. [1,2]

There is no reliable and valid measure exists to determine functionality and activity of knee osteoarthritis in the Gujarati language. Western Ontario and McMaster Universities Osteoarthritis Index (WOMAC) and LEQUESNE are the most widely used condition-specific self-reported multidimensional instrument for the assessment of hip or knee osteoarthritis

(OA), [3,4] but in English. Hence the objective of this study is to translate and to investigate the reliability and validity of modified WOMAC (mWOMAC) and LEQUESNE questionnaire Gujarati version in participants with knee OA.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

An observational study design was adopted. As there was no experimental human intervention to be undergone ethical approval was not taken for the study. The participants were selected based on the inclusion and exclusion criteria designed for the study. These participants were registered

for the study after obtaining the written informed consent form. The participants were provided with a participant information sheet. The samples included in our study were 30 individuals. The mean age of the participants was 51.53±9.80 (Table 2). The inclusion criteria were Both Male & Female patients aged between 40 years to 65 years with Chronic OA Knee (with symptoms for more than 3 months and less than 2 years) and Subjects who were not willing to take part in the study were excluded.

Process of translation of questionnaire:

For translation of modified WOMAC [5,6] and LEQUESNE from English language to Gujarati language cross culture adaptation guidelines were used. [7-9] This method included forward translation, expert panel, back-translation and testing of the questionnaire. **Step 1:** Forward translation- Two translators (one with the background of medical field and other with no background of medical field) who knew both English and Gujarati language were chosen to translate the questionnaire from English to Gujarati language. **Step 2:** Synthesis- Both the Gujarati versions were combined and two professionals who had knowledge of medical terminologies and were known to both the languages (English & Gujarati) developed a synthesised

version. **Step 3:** Back-translation- The synthesised version of the questionnaire was back translated into English language by an independent translator, who knew both English and Gujarati language and had no information of the original questionnaire which was in English language. **Step 4:** Expert panel- A bilingual (in English and the Gujarati language) expert panel was convened which included the forward translator, health experts, as well as professionals with skill in questionnaire development and translation. The changes were done in the translated questionnaire based on the suggestions of the expert panel. **Step 5:** Testing of the questionnaire- A Pre Final Gujarati version of modified WOMAC and LEQUESNE were given to 30 participants who fulfilled the inclusion and exclusion criteria to find out the reliability and validity of the questionnaire. [10,11]

► **Reliability statistics**

► Three different tests have been conducted on Womac Index and Index of Severity viz., Cronbach's Alpha, ANOVA with Cochran's Test and Intraclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC), in order to check for their reliability at baseline and on next day. The results are mentioned as below:

► **Reliability test results for WOMAC INDEX at baseline**

| Cronbach's Alpha | |
|------------------|------------|
| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
| 0.978 | 24 |

| ANOVA with Cochran's Test | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------------|------|
| | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | Cochran's Q | Sig |
| Between People | | 60.656 | 14 | 4.333 | | |
| Within People | Between Items | 66.464 | 23 | 2.890 | 236.697 | .000 |
| | Residual | 30.411 | 322 | .094 | | |
| | Total | 96.875 | 345 | .281 | | |
| Total | | 157.531 | 359 | .439 | | |

| Intraclass Correlation Coefficient | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|-----|-----|------|
| | Intraclass Correlation | 95% Confidence Interval | | F Test with True Value 0 | | | |
| | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound | Value | df1 | df2 | Sig |
| Single Measures | .375 | .228 | .611 | 15.429 | 14 | 345 | .000 |
| Average Measures | .935 | .877 | .974 | 15.429 | 14 | 345 | .000 |
| One-way random effects model | | | | | | | |

► Reliability test results for WOMAC INDEX on next day

| Cronbach's Alpha | |
|------------------|------------|
| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
| 0.979 | 24 |

| ANOVA with Cochran's Test | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------------|------|
| | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | Cochran's Q | Sig |
| Between People | | 60.917 | 14 | 4.351 | | |
| Within People | Between Items | 70.975 | 23 | 3.086 | 243.747 | .000 |
| | Residual | 29.483 | 322 | .092 | | |
| | Total | 100.458 | 345 | .291 | | |
| Total | | 161.375 | 359 | .450 | | |

| Intraclass Correlation Coefficient | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|-----|-----|------|
| | Intraclass Correlation | 95% Confidence Interval | | F Test with True Value 0 | | | |
| | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound | Value | df1 | df2 | Sig |
| Single Measures | .367 | .222 | .603 | 14.943 | 14 | 345 | .000 |
| Average Measures | .933 | .873 | .973 | 14.943 | 14 | 345 | .000 |
| One-way random effects model | | | | | | | |

► Reliability test results for index of Severity at baseline

| Cronbach's Alpha | |
|------------------|------------|
| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
| .901 | 11 |

| ANOVA with Cochran's Test | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------------|------|
| | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | Cochran's Q | Sig |
| Between People | | 15.782 | 14 | 1.127 | | |
| Within People | Between Items | 54.315 | 10 | 5.432 | 116.390 | .000 |
| | Residual | 15.685 | 140 | .112 | | |
| | Total | 70.000 | 150 | .467 | | |
| Total | | 85.782 | 164 | .523 | | |

| Intraclass Correlation Coefficient | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|-----|-----|------|
| | Intraclass Correlation | 95% Confidence Interval | | F Test with True Value 0 | | | |
| | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound | Value | df1 | df2 | Sig |
| Single Measures | .114 | .021 | .318 | 2.416 | 14 | 150 | .004 |
| Average Measures | .586 | .191 | .837 | 2.416 | 14 | 150 | .004 |
| One-way random effects model where people effects are random. | | | | | | | |

► Reliability test results for index of Severity on next day

| Cronbach's Alpha | |
|------------------|------------|
| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
| .898 | 11 |

| ANOVA with Cochran's Test | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------------|------|
| | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | Cochran's Q | Sig |
| Between People | | 15.112 | 14 | 1.079 | | |
| Within People | Between Items | 54.567 | 10 | 5.457 | 117.005 | .000 |
| | Residual | 15.388 | 140 | .110 | | |
| | Total | 69.955 | 150 | .466 | | |
| Total | | 85.067 | 164 | .519 | | |

| Intra-class Correlation Coefficient | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|-----|-----|------|
| | Intraclass Correlation | 95% Confidence Interval | | F Test with True Value 0 | | | |
| | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound | Value | df1 | df2 | Sig |
| Single Measures | .107 | .016 | .307 | 2.315 | 14 | 150 | .007 |
| Average Measures | .568 | .156 | .830 | 2.315 | 14 | 150 | .007 |
| One-way random effects model | | | | | | | |

► **Validity Statistics**

► **Validity test results for WOMAC INDEX : Rasch analysis**

| FIT OF ITEMS OF THE WOMAC INDEX TO THE RASCH MODEL | | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------|----------|-----------------|-------------|------------|-------------|
| Sr. No. | Item No. | Base Line Value | | Next Day | |
| | | INFIT MNSQ | OUTFIT MNSQ | INFIT MNSQ | OUTFIT MNSQ |
| 1 | 23 | 1.36 | 0.90 | 1.24 | 0.83 |
| 2 | 22 | 1.20 | 0.61 | 1.09 | 0.53 |
| 3 | 7 | 1.33 | 1.42 | 1.47 | 1.68 |
| 4 | 5 | 1.23 | 0.71 | 1.17 | 0.69 |
| 5 | 11 | 1.23 | 0.71 | 1.20 | 0.64 |
| 6 | 12 | 0.88 | 0.75 | 0.78 | 0.71 |
| 7 | 24 | 0.73 | 0.85 | 0.66 | 0.81 |
| 8 | 6 | 0.83 | 0.81 | 0.80 | 0.74 |
| 9 | 16 | 0.93 | 1.23 | 0.86 | 1.17 |
| 10 | 1 | 0.90 | 0.77 | 0.84 | 0.72 |
| 11 | 13 | 0.98 | 0.93 | 0.91 | 0.87 |
| 12 | 3 | 0.62 | 0.82 | 0.59 | 0.78 |
| 13 | 2 | 0.73 | 1.72 | 0.64 | 1.68 |
| 14 | 4 | 0.69 | 1.14 | 0.61 | 1.01 |
| 15 | 8 | 0.93 | 1.21 | 0.88 | 1.19 |
| 16 | 9 | 1.17 | 0.62 | 1.11 | 0.57 |
| 17 | 10 | 1.03 | 0.79 | 1.08 | 0.91 |
| 18 | 14 | 1.28 | 0.81 | 1.21 | 0.93 |
| 19 | 15 | 0.73 | 1.02 | 0.71 | 1.08 |
| 20 | 17 | 0.84 | 1.86 | 0.77 | 1.76 |
| 21 | 18 | 0.68 | 1.70 | 0.69 | 0.74 |
| 22 | 20 | 1.23 | 1.71 | 1.28 | 1.79 |
| 23 | 19 | 1.39 | 0.66 | 1.23 | 0.61 |
| 24 | 21 | 0.60 | 0.96 | 0.78 | 1.01 |

► **Validity test results for INDEX OF SEVERITY: Rasch analysis**

| FIT OF ITEMS OF THE INDEX OF SEVERITY TO THE RASCH MODEL | | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|----------|-----------------|-------------|------------|-------------|
| Sr. No. | Item No. | Base Line Value | | Next Day | |
| | | INFIT MNSQ | OUTFIT MNSQ | INFIT MNSQ | OUTFIT MNSQ |
| 1 | 3 | 1.39 | 1.20 | 1.44 | 1.33 |
| 2 | 5 | 1.01 | 0.93 | 1.09 | 1.03 |
| 3 | 6 | 0.75 | 1.16 | 0.87 | 1.28 |
| 4 | 1 | 1.23 | 1.31 | 1.17 | 1.69 |
| 5 | 4 | 1.23 | 1.71 | 1.20 | 1.64 |
| 6 | 8 | 0.77 | 0.75 | 0.78 | 0.71 |
| 7 | 9 | 0.74 | 0.61 | 0.74 | 0.61 |
| 8 | 10 | 0.79 | 0.66 | 0.80 | 0.69 |
| 9 | 7 | 0.93 | 1.23 | 0.86 | 1.04 |
| 10 | 11 | 0.89 | 0.63 | 0.84 | 0.59 |
| 11 | 2 | 0.57 | 0.50 | 0.43 | 0.48 |

► **Paired T Test for variation in WOMAC index scale response between therapist**

| Paired Samples Statistics | | | | | |
|---------------------------|-------------|-------|----|----------------|-----------------|
| | | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
| Pair between | therapist_1 | 33.40 | 15 | 2.558 | .660 |
| | therapist_2 | 33.00 | 15 | 2.070 | .535 |

| Paired Samples Test | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------------|-------|-------|----|-----------------|
| | | Paired Differences | | | | | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
| | | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | | | | |
| | | | | | Lower | Upper | | | |
| Pair between | therapist_1 and therapist_2 | 0.400 | 1.183 | 0.306 | -0.255 | 1.055 | 1.309 | 14 | 0.212 |

► **Paired T Test for variation in womax index scale response due to time gap**

| Paired Samples Statistics | | | | | |
|---------------------------|------------|-------|----|----------------|-----------------|
| | | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
| Pair 1 | first_day | 33.27 | 15 | 2.404 | .621 |
| | second_day | 33.07 | 15 | 2.520 | .651 |

| Paired Samples Test | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|-------------------------|---|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------------|-------|-------|-----------------|------|
| | | | Paired Differences | | | | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | |
| | | | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | | | | |
| | | | | | | Lower | Upper | | | |
| Pair 1 | first_day second_day | - | .200 | .561 | .145 | -.110 | .510 | 1.382 | 14 | .189 |

| Paired Samples Test | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|----------------------------|---|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------------|-------|--------|-----------------|-------|
| | | | Paired Differences | | | | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | |
| | | | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | | | | |
| | | | | | | Lower | Upper | | | |
| Pair 1 | therapist_2 therapist_1 | - | -0.133 | 0.915 | 0.236 | -0.640 | 0.374 | -0.564 | 14 | 0.582 |

► **Paired T Test for variation in index of severity scale response between therapist**

| Paired Samples Statistics | | | | | |
|---------------------------|-------------|------|----|----------------|-----------------|
| | | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
| Pair 1 | therapist_2 | 8.73 | 15 | 1.710 | .441 |
| | therapist_1 | 8.87 | 15 | 1.995 | .515 |

► **Paired T Test for variation in index of severity scale response due to time gap**

| Paired Samples Statistics | | | | | |
|---------------------------|------------|------|----|----------------|-----------------|
| | | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
| Pair 1 | first_day | 8.80 | 15 | 2.077 | .536 |
| | second_day | 8.60 | 15 | 1.682 | .434 |

| Paired Samples Test | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|-------------------------|---|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------------|-------|-------|-----------------|-------|
| | | | Paired Differences | | | | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | |
| | | | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | | | | |
| | | | | | | Lower | Upper | | | |
| Pair 1 | first_day second_day | - | 0.200 | 0.775 | 0.200 | -0.229 | 0.629 | 1.000 | 14 | 0.334 |

RESULTS

► **Reliability of both scales**

► Internal consistency was obtained through Cronbach's alpha. It was obtained good for both WOMAC (0.978 & 0.979 at first and second day respectively) and Lequesne Index (0.901 and 0.898 for first and second day respectively). Another measure to test reliability of the scales was Intraclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC), it was adequate for both scales WOMAC (0.935 and 0.933 at first and second day respectively) and Lequesne (0.586 and 0.568 at firsts and second day respectively)

► **Validity of both scales**

► It was assessed through RASCH analysis which is based on item response theory. Fit of WOMAC and Lequesne Index showed adequate fit of items to a

single construct. In WOMAC items 7, 17 and 20 show an outfit of (1.68), (1.86;1.76) and (1.71;1.79) respectively. It shows abnormal response of participants to these items. Item 22 shows less fit 0.53, thereby suggesting some redundancy in scale. For Lequesne item 1 and 4 were problematic with an outfit of 1.69 and 1.71 respectively and item 2 shows less fit. Other than these items most of the items show adequate fit to RASCH model.

► **T-Test**

► **Paired T-Test**

► It was conducted to check variation (if any) in WOMAC INDEX scale and Lequesne questionnaire response between first and second day and between two different therapists. In both scales the p value obtained was >0.05 suggesting no difference in scale measurements.

DISCUSSION

There is much emphasis today on using standardized and validated research instruments as these enable comparison of results both within and across countries. A patient reported outcome (PRO) is an umbrella term that covers a whole range of potential types of measurement; it is used specifically to refer to measures that quantify a patient's state of health in terms of outcomes reported by himself/ herself. The common feature of PROMs is their grounding in the patient's perspective. PROMs are increasingly seen as complementary to biomedical measures and they are being incorporated more frequently into clinical trials and clinical practice. When they are used, there is the underlying assumption that the use of a validated instrument ensures that it increases the certainty with which the instrument accurately reflects what it is supposed to measure. [12] Thus, in a country like India, instruments like the WOMAC have significant ethical implications for several reasons. Linguistically translated versions are not the same as those that have undergone cross-cultural adaptation; the latter being needed when the scale is used in another country, language and setting. [13] In India, there are 22 officially recognized languages. Data in multi-centric studies are ultimately pooled and, thus, cross-cultural adaptation is necessary for each one of these languages if the pooled data are to be really relevant. [14] Our results showed that Gujarati version of WOMAC and Lequesne questionnaire are used to be reliable and valuable tool for measuring the functionality and activity of knee osteoarthritis patients.

CONCLUSION

This study concluded that the translated Gujarati version of WOMAC and Lequesne Questionnaire are considered to be a valid tool for measuring functionality and activity of patient with knee osteoarthritis in Gujarati population.

REFERENCES

1. Bosomworth NJ. Exercise and knee osteoarthritis: benefit or hazard? *Can Fam Physician* 2009;55(9):871– 8.
2. Felson DT. The course of osteoarthritis and factors that affect it. *Rheum Dis Clin North Am* 1993;19:607–15.
3. Bellamy N, Buchanan WW, Goldsmith CH, Campbell J, et al. Validation study of WOMAC: A health status instrument for measuring clinically important patient relevant outcomes to antirheumatic drug therapy in patients with osteoarthritis of the hip and knee. *J Rheumatol* 1988;15:1833–40.
4. Bellamy N, Buchanan WW, Goldsmith CH, Campbell J. Validation study of WOMAC: a health status instrument for measuring clinically important patient relevant outcomes following total hip or knee arthroplasty in osteoarthritis. *J Orthop Rheumatol*. 1988;1:95-108
5. Bellamy N. WOMAC Osteoarthritis User' Guide. London, Ontario, Canada: Victoria Hospital 1995
6. M. Faucher, S. Poiraudau, M. M. Lefevre-Colau, F. Rannou, J. Fermanian and M. Revel Algo-functional assessment of knee osteoarthritis: comparison of the test–retest reliability and construct validity of the Womac and Lequesne indexes *Osteoarthritis and Cartilage* (2002) 10, 602–610
7. Gjersing L, Caplehorn JR, Clausen T. Cross-cultural adaptation of research instruments: language, setting, time and statistical considerations. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2010 Feb 10;10:13
8. Nadrian H, Moghimi N, Nadrian E, Moradzadeh R, Bahamanpour K, Iranpour A, Bellamy N. Validity and reliability of the Persian versions of WOMAC Osteoarthritis Index and Lequesne Algofunctional Index. *Clin Rheumatol*. 2012 Jul;31(7): 1097-102.
9. Faik A, Benbouazza K, Amine B, Maaroufi H, Bahiri R, Lazrak N, Aboukal R, Hajjaj-Hassouni N. Translation and validation of Moroccan Western Ontario and McMaster Universities (WOMAC) osteoarthritis index in knee osteoarthritis. *Rheumatol Int*. 2008 May; 28(7):677-83.
10. Guermazi M, Poiraudau S, Yahia M, Mezqanni M, Fermanian J, Habib Elleuch M, Revel M. Translation, adaptation and validation of the Western Ontario and

- McMaster Universities osteoarthritis index (WOMAC) for an Arab population: the Sfax modified WOMAC. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage*. 2004 Jun;12(6):459-68.
11. Beaton DE, Bombardier C, Guillemin F, Ferraz MB: Guidelines for the process of cross-cultural adaptation of self-report measures. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2000 Dec 15, 25(24):3186-91.
 12. Callahan LF, Pincus T, Huston JW 3rd, Brooks RH, Nance EP Jr, Kaye JJ. Measures of activity and damage in rheumatoid arthritis: depiction of changes and prediction of mortality over 5 years. *Arth Care Res*. 1997 Dec;10(6):381-94.
 13. Sokka T, Hakkinen A, Krishnan E, Hannonen P. Similar prediction of mortality by the health assessment questionnaire in patients with rheumatoid arthritis and the general population. *Ann Rheum Dis*. 2004 May;63(5):494-97.
 14. Breugelmans R. Dangers in using translated medical questionnaires: the importance of conceptual equivalence across languages and cultures in patient-reported outcome measures. *Chest*. 2009 Oct;136(4):1175-7.

How to cite this article: Vaittianadane, Nambi G, Rathod P. Translation and validation of Gujarati version of WOMAC and Lequesne questionnaire in subjects with knee osteoarthritis. *Int J Health Sci Res*. 2018; 8(6):151-157.
