

Summary of pre-test results for WG short set of questions: VISION

Introductory phrase:

The next questions ask about difficulties you may have doing certain activities because of a HEALTH PROBLEM.

Question on vision

Do you have difficulty seeing, even if wearing glasses?

- a. No - no difficulty
- b. Yes – some difficulty
- c. Yes – a lot of difficulty
- d. Cannot do at all

Summary of pre-test results:

In the cognitive tests, 191 of the cases (out of 1014) fell into the “problematic” group of response patterns for the vision questions. Responses were more consistent when the difficulty and effort questions¹ were taken into account; only 117 out of 1014 remained in the “problematic” group of response patterns after considering responses to these additional questions. For example, there were instances where respondents answered the WG question affirmatively, but answered “no” to the near/far vision questions. This was considered a problematic response pattern because responses did not agree. However, if respondents expressed that it was difficult or required effort to see well on the difficulty/effort questions, then the difference in responses to the WG question and the near/far vision questions was no longer considered problematic since it appeared that the WG question was detecting a different aspect of vision than the more detailed near/far vision questions. Thus, it was suggested that the near and far vision questions² may not be capturing all the relevant cases. In addition, difficulties with understanding the glasses clause and its location within the question appeared to explain only part of the discrepancies between the WG question and the near/far vision questions. Seven countries had response patterns suggesting that respondents were missing or misinterpreting the glasses clause (Argentina, Brazil, Egypt, Kenya, Mexico, Paraguay and Vietnam). However, the clause was understood by respondents in 4 countries (Argentina, Brazil, Mexico and Paraguay). There were very few cases where respondents replied “no difficulty” to the WG question but reported “a lot of difficulty”/ “a lot of effort”/ “[difficulties] very often” to the extended vision questions^{1,2,3} (n=5 of 1014). There were only 15 instances where respondents reported “a lot of difficulty” or “unable” to the WG question but “no difficulty” / “no effort”/ “[difficulties] never” to the extended vision questions. It was suggested that the near and far vision questions may be

¹ Difficulty and effort questions: *Without/ With your glasses, (i) how often do you have difficulty seeing well? (ii) how much effort do you have to put into seeing?*

² Near and far vision questions: *Without/ With your glasses, do you have difficulty, (i) seeing the print in a map, newspaper or book? (ii) seeing/recognizing a person you know from 7 meters away?*

³ Additional extended question: *Do you wear glasses all of the time, only for certain activities, or none of the time?*

missing aspects of visual problems (such as cataracts, problems with one eye only) that are being reported using the WG question.

Vietnam expressed concern about the discrepancy in responses of “unable” on the WG question compared to the near/far vision questions. Their field test data indicated that while 3.3% (of 3409 persons) reported “unable” to the near/far vision questions, only 0.7% reported “unable” to the WG question. Subsequent discussion suggested that this supported the premise that the near and far vision questions detect specific aspects of visual problems whereas the WG question was more comprehensive (it appeared that respondents that were unable to see near/far reported only some difficulty seeing on the WG question because they were not unable to see at all...that is, a person unable to see closely may be able to see in the distance; this requires further analysis). WHO/ESCAP analyses indicated moderate correlation between the WG question and the extended questions and low sensitivity of the WG question compared to the extended questions. However, three issues confound the comparison of responses: the extended questions refer to a health problem lasting 30 days while the WG question has no reference to duration; the WG question asks about the quantity of the problem while the extended questions ask about severity; and finally, the extended questions have a 5 points response scale versus a 4 point scale for the WG questions. It was noted that the results of sensitivity and specificity analyses need to be interpreted with caution since there is no gold standard and to reset the cut point and re-analyze the data from the WHO/ESCAP test.

Overall, the WG question on vision was interpreted consistently across countries. Consideration will be given as to how to best address the glasses clause. It was suggested that better concept translation is needed rather than direct language translation since “even if” is not easily interpretable in some languages.